

A Weak Convergence Criterion Constructing Changes of Measure*

Jose Blanchet[†]

Department of Operations Research and Industrial Engineering
Columbia University

Johannes Ruf[‡]

Oxford-Man Institute of Quantitative Finance and Mathematical Institute
University of Oxford

July 26, 2021

Abstract

Based on a weak convergence argument, we provide a necessary and sufficient condition that guarantees that a nonnegative local martingale is indeed a martingale. Typically, conditions of this sort are expressed in terms of integrability conditions (such as the well-known Novikov condition). The weak convergence approach that we propose allows to replace integrability conditions by a suitable tightness condition. We then provide several applications of this approach ranging from simplified proofs of classical results to characterizations of processes conditioned on first passage time events and changes of measures for jump processes.

1 Introduction

Changing the probability measure is a powerful tool in modern probability. Changes of measure arise in areas of wide applicability such as in mathematical finance, in the setting of so-called equivalent pricing measures. A change of probability measure often relies on the specification of a nonnegative martingale process which in turn yields the underlying Radon-Nikodym derivative behind the change of measure.

The key step in the typical construction of changes of measure involves showing the martingale property of a process of putative Radon-Nikodym derivatives. In order to verify this martingale property one often starts by defining a process that easily can be seen to be a local martingale. This is the standard situation, for example, in changes of measure for diffusion processes; in this framework, a standard application of Itô's formula guarantees that a candidate exponential process is a local martingale. The difficult part then involves ensuring that the local martingale is actually a martingale.

Since the distinction between local martingales and martingales involves verification of integrability properties (the ones behind the strict definition of a martingale), it is most natural to search for a criterion based on integrability of the underlying local martingale. This is the basis, for instance, of the so-called Novikov's condition, which is a well-known criterion used to verify the martingale property of an exponential local martingale in the diffusion setting. Nevertheless, if ultimately one has the existence of a new probability measure, then one has a martingale defined by the corresponding change of measure. Thus, it appears that lifting the local martingale property for a nonnegative stochastic process to a bona-fide martingale property has more to do with the fact that the induced probability measure is indeed well-defined.

*We thank Richard Davis, Paul Embrechts, and Thomas Mikosch for putting together a very interesting Oberwolfach seminar, where this project started. We are grateful to Kay Giesecke, Peter Glynn, Jan Kallsen, Ioannis Karatzas, and Philip Protter for stimulating conversations on topics related to the theme of this project, and to Philippe Charmoy, Zhenyu Cui, Roseline Falafala, and Nicolas Perkowski for their comments on an earlier version of this note.

[†]E-Mail: jose.blanchet@columbia.edu

[‡]E-Mail: johannes.ruf@oxford-man.ox.ac.uk

Our contribution in this note consists in putting into focus the aspect of tightness when proving the martingale property of a nonnegative local martingale. Connecting tightness with the verification of the martingale property is an almost trivial exercise, formulated in Theorem 1 below. Although only a very simple observation, this point of view is powerful as the applications in Section 3 illustrate. In particular, we illustrate our result in the context of the following four applications:

1. We provide a new proof of the result by Beneš (1971) on the existence of weak solutions to certain stochastic differential equations.
2. We prove the equivalence of weak solutions to stochastic differential equations that involve compound Poisson processes, whose intensity may depend on the current state of the system.
3. We weaken the assumptions of Giesecke and Zhu (2013) that yield the martingale property of certain local martingales involving counting processes.
4. We provide a new representation for conditional expectations of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process conditioned to hit a large level before hitting zero. We believe that this representation is useful for simulation purposes.

For the sake of clear notation, for a sequence of random variables $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, each defined on a probability space $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, P_n)$, and a random variable Y , defined on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , we write

$$(P_n, Y_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{w}} (P, Y) \quad (n \uparrow \infty) \quad \text{if} \quad \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} P_n(Y_n \leq x) = P(Y \leq x) \text{ for each continuity point } x \text{ of } P(Y \leq \cdot).$$

The proof of the following Theorem 1 is very simple and only relies on the definition of tightness; it is given in Section 2.

Theorem 1. *The following two statements hold:*

1. Let $M = \{M(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote a nonnegative sub- or supermartingale on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}, P)$ with corresponding expectation operator E , and let $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $M_n = \{M_n(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote a sequence of nonnegative martingales, each defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \{\mathcal{F}_n(t)\}_{t \geq 0}, P_n)$ with corresponding expectation operators E_n such that $M_n(0) = 1$. Fix any sequence of (deterministic) times $\{t_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $t_1 = 0$ and $\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} t_m = \infty$ and assume that $(P_n, M_n(t_m)) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{w}} (P, M(t_m))$ ($n \uparrow \infty$) for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Define a family $\{Q_n^m\}_{n, m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures via $dQ_n^m = M_n(t_m)dP_n$. Then M is a true martingale with $M(0) = 1$ if and only if

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n^m(M_n(t_m) \geq \kappa) \rightarrow 0 \tag{1}$$

as $\kappa \uparrow \infty$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. That is, M is a true martingale if and only if $\{M_n(t_m)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight under the sequence of measures $\{Q_n^m\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

2. Let $M(\infty)$ denote a nonnegative random variable on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with corresponding expectation operator E , and let $\{M_n(\infty)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote a sequence of nonnegative random variables, each defined on a probability space $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, P_n)$ with corresponding expectation operators E_n such that $E_n[M_n(\infty)] = 1$. Assume that $(P_n, M_n(\infty)) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{w}} (P, M(\infty))$ ($n \uparrow \infty$). Define a family $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures via $dQ_n = M_n(\infty)dP_n$.

Then $\mathbb{E}[M(\infty)] = 1$ holds if and only if

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n(M_n(\infty) \geq \kappa) \rightarrow 0$$

as $\kappa \uparrow \infty$.

It is important to note that showing the martingale property of the underlying positive local martingale becomes an exercise in tightness in a very weak topology. Given the enormous literature on weak convergence analysis of stochastic processes, we feel that our test of martingality would be a useful one. For example, in order to show tightness of a sequence of random variables $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the form $A_n = \exp(B_n + C_n)$ it is sufficient to show tightness for the sequences of random variables $\{B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ separately; a task that is often easy, as we shall illustrate in Section 3. In addition, the martingale property of a natural approximation to the local martingale process of interest is usually immediately seen to be a martingale.

Relevant literature

The standard way to show the martingale property of a nonnegative local martingale is to check some standard integrability condition; see for example Novikov (1972), Kazamaki and Sekiguchi (1983), or Ruf (2013b). If the local martingale dynamics include jumps, a case that we explicitly allow here, then integrability conditions exist but they might not be trivial to check; see Lepingle and Mémin (1978) and Protter and Shimbo (2008) for such conditions and related literature.

Under additional assumptions on the local martingale, such as the assumption that it is constructed via an underlying Markovian process, further sufficient (and sometimes also necessary) criteria can be derived. Here we only provide the reader with some pointers to this vast literature. The following papers develop conditions different from Novikov-type conditions by utilizing the (assumed) Markovian structure of some underlying stochastic process, and contain a far more complete list of references: Cheridito et al. (2005), Blei and Engelbert (2009), Mijatović and Urusov (2012), and Ruf (2013a). Kallsen and Muhle-Karbe (2010) study the martingale property of stochastic exponentials of affine processes; their approach via the explicit construction of a candidate measure and the use of a simple lemma in Jacod and Shiryaev (2003) is close in spirit to our approach.

The weak existence of solutions to stochastic differential equations is often proven by means of changing the probability measure, see for example Portenko (1975), Engelbert and Schmidt (1984), Yan (1988), or Stummer (1993). This strategy for proving the weak existence of solutions requires the true martingale property of the putative Radon-Nikodym density. Our approach to prove the martingale property of such a density is in the spirit of the reverse direction: The tightness condition that implies the martingale property of a putative Radon-Nikodym density by Theorem 1 corresponds basically to the asserted existence of a certain probability measure — often corresponding to the existence of a solution to a stochastic differential equation.

2 Martingale property and tightness

In this section, we prove Theorem 1 and make some related observations. The proof of Theorem 1 relies on the following simple but powerful result:

Proposition 1. *Let Y denote a nonnegative random variable defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with corresponding expectation operator E , and let $\{Y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote a sequence of integrable, nonnegative random variables defined on $(\Omega_n, \mathcal{F}_n, P_n)$ with corresponding expectation operators E_n such that $(P_n, Y_n) \xrightarrow{w} (P, Y)$ ($n \uparrow \infty$) and $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} E_n[Y_n] = 1$. Then, $E[Y] = 1$ holds if and only if*

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n [Y_n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_n \geq \kappa\}}] \rightarrow 0$$

does as $\kappa \uparrow \infty$.

Proof. Assume that $E[Y] = 1$. Then, for fixed $\kappa > 1$ and for a continuous function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \kappa]$ with $f(x) \leq x$ for all $x \geq 0$, $f(x) = x$ for all $x \in [0, \kappa - 1]$ and $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [\kappa, \infty)$, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} E_n[Y_n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_n \geq \kappa\}}] &= E_n[Y_n] - E_n[Y_n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_n < \kappa\}}] \leq E_n[Y_n] - E_n[f(Y_n)] \\ &\rightarrow 1 - E[f(Y)] \leq 1 - E[Y \mathbf{1}_{\{Y \leq \kappa - 1\}}] = E[Y \mathbf{1}_{\{Y > \kappa - 1\}}] \end{aligned}$$

as $n \uparrow \infty$. As $E[Y\mathbf{1}_{\{Y > \kappa - 1\}}]$ can be made arbitrarily small by increasing κ (because Y is integrable by assumption), we obtain one direction of the statement. For the other direction, fix $\epsilon > 0$ and the continuous, bounded function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(x) = x \wedge \kappa$ for all $x \geq 0$. Then

$$E[Y] \geq E[f(Y)] = \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} E_n[f(Y_n)] \geq \liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} E_n[Y_n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_n < \kappa\}}] = \liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} (E_n[Y_n] - E_n[Y_n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_n \geq \kappa\}}]) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

for κ large enough. This yields $E[Y] \geq 1$. Similarly, we can show that $E[Y] \leq 1$. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1:

Proof of Theorem 1. The second statement is a (slightly weakened) reformulation of Proposition 1. For the first statement, observe that (1) and the martingale property of all processes M_n imply that $E[M(t_m)] = 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ by Proposition 1. Since $E[M(t)]$ is assumed to be monotone in t , this yields the martingale property of M . The reverse direction is a direct application of the same proposition. \square

A look at its proof yields that the statement of Theorem 1 can be further generalized since for each t_m a different approximating sequence of true martingales might be used.

The following corollary can be interpreted as a generalization of Theorem 1.3.5 in Stroock and Varadhan (2006) to processes with jumps. See also Lemma III.3.3 in Jacod and Shiryaev (2003) for a similar statement where a certain candidate measure Q is assumed to exist. We remark that the sequence of stopping times in the statement could, but need not, be a localization sequence of a local martingale; for example, it is sufficient that the stopping times converge to the first hitting time that the underlying local martingale hits zero.

Corollary 1. *Let $\{\tau_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of stopping times and $M_n \equiv M^{\tau_n}$ the stopped versions of a non-negative local martingale M with $M(0) = 1$. Assume that $M_n(t) \rightarrow M(t)$ P -a.s. as $n \uparrow \infty$ for all $t > 0$ and that, for each fixed n , M_n is a uniformly integrable martingale. Further, define $dQ_n = M_n(\infty)dP$. Under these assumptions the following statements hold: If $Q_n(\tau_n \leq t) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \uparrow \infty$ for all $t > 0$, then M is a martingale. Further, under the additional assumption that $\tau_n \rightarrow \infty$ P -a.s. as $n \uparrow \infty$, the converse also holds; that is, if M is a martingale then $Q_n(\tau_n \leq t) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \uparrow \infty$ for all $t > 0$.*

Proof. Fix t and $\kappa > 0$ and observe that $(P, M_n(t)) \xrightarrow{w} (P, M(t))$ ($n \uparrow \infty$). Also note that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$Q_n(M_n(t) > \kappa) \leq Q_n(\tau_n \leq t) + E[M_n(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n > t\}} \cap \{M_n(t) > \kappa\}] \leq Q_n(\tau_n \leq t) + E[M(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{M(t) > \kappa\}}]$$

because $M_n(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n > t\}} = M(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n > t\}}$. Since by assumption we can make the first term on the right-hand side arbitrarily small by increasing n , the martingale property of M follows directly from dominated convergence and Theorem 1. For the reverse direction, assume that M is a martingale and that $\tau_n \rightarrow \infty$ P -a.s. as $n \uparrow \infty$. Then, $Q_n(\tau_n \leq t) = E[M_n(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n \leq t\}}] = E[M(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n \leq t\}}] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \uparrow \infty$ by dominated convergence. \square

The next result is of course well-known and only a very special case of, for instance, the theory of BMO martingales; see for example Kazamaki (1994). However, as we shall use the result below and as we would like to make this note self-contained, we provide a proof based on the observations we have made here before:

Corollary 2. *Let $L = \{L(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote a continuous local martingale on some probability space. Assume there exists some nondecreasing (deterministic) function $c : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\min\{L_t, \langle L \rangle_t\} \leq c(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ almost surely. Then, $M = \mathcal{E}(L) := \exp(L - \langle L \rangle/2)$ is a martingale.*

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let τ_n denote the first hitting times to level n or higher by M and fix $t > 0$. Obviously, $M_n \equiv M^{\tau_n}$ satisfies $M_n(t) \rightarrow M(t)$ P -a.s. as $n \uparrow \infty$. Define the probability measures Q_n as in Corollary 1 and observe that $\{Q_n(\tau_n \leq t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence since

$$Q_{n+1}(\tau_{n+1} \leq t) \leq Q_{n+1}(\tau_n \leq t) = Q_n(\tau_n \leq t)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m > \exp(c(t))/\epsilon$ and observe that

$$\{M^{\tau_m}(t) \geq m\} \subset \{L(t \wedge \tau_m) > c(t)\} \subset \{\langle L \rangle(t \wedge \tau_m) \leq c(t)\}$$

holds P -a.s. Therefore, we have

$$\{\tau_m \leq t\} = \{M^{\tau_m}(t) \geq m\} = \{M^{\tau_m}(t) \geq m\} \cap \{\langle L \rangle(t \wedge \tau_m) \leq c(t)\} \subset \left\{ \widetilde{M}^{\tau_m}(t) > \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right\}$$

P -a.s. and thus Q_m -a.s., where $\widetilde{M} := M^{\tau_m} / \exp(\langle L \rangle(\tau_m \wedge \cdot))$ is a bounded, nonnegative Q_m -martingale by Girsanov's theorem. Markov's inequality then implies that $Q_m(\tau_m \leq t) \leq \epsilon$ and an application of Corollary 1 concludes. \square

The next observation is useful when applying Theorem 1 in a continuous setup:

Lemma 1. *Assume the notation of the first part of Theorem 1. Let $\{L_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote a sequence of continuous Q_n -local martingales with quadratic variation $\langle L_n \rangle$ and assume that the sequence $\{\langle L_n \rangle(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight along the sequence $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures for some $t \in [0, \infty]$. Then also the sequence $\{L_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight along $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.*

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let ρ_κ denote the first hitting time to level κ or higher by $\langle L_n \rangle$, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(L_n(t) > \kappa) &\leq Q_n(L_n(t \wedge \rho_\kappa) > \kappa) + Q_n(\rho_\kappa \leq t) \leq \frac{E_n[L_n^2(t \wedge \rho_\kappa)]}{\kappa^2} + Q_n(\rho_\kappa \leq t) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa} + Q_n(\langle L_n \rangle(t) > \kappa) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\kappa > 0$ by Chebyshev's inequality and the fact that $E_n[L_n^2(t \wedge \rho_\kappa)] \leq E_n[\langle L_n \rangle(t \wedge \rho_\kappa)] \leq \kappa$; those last inequalities follow from the observation that the process $L_n^2(\cdot \wedge \rho_\kappa) - \langle L_n \rangle(\cdot \wedge \rho_\kappa)$ is a local martingale, bounded from below by $-\kappa > 0$. \square

3 Applications

Our goal here is to show that our approach could have advantages in terms of its relative simplicity. We shall write $\|\cdot\|$ for the Euclidean L_2 -norm on \mathbb{R}^d for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote the space of cadlag paths $\omega : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in (0, \infty]$, endowed with the standard Skorokhod topology, by $D_{[0,t]}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For sake of brevity, we shall use $D_{[0,\infty)} = D_{[0,\infty)}(\mathbb{R}^1)$.

3.1 Continuous processes: linear growth of drift

We begin by proving an extension of the well-known result by Beneš (1971) on the existence of weak solutions to a certain stochastic differential equation. We discuss it to illustrate how considerations of tightness as suggested here can often simplify the argument that a certain process is a martingale.

Theorem 2. *Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $W = \{W(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a d -dimensional Brownian motion, $W^* = \{W^*(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ the running maximum of its vector norm; to wit, $W^*(t) := \max_{s \in [0,t]} \{\|W(s)\|\}$, and $Y = \{Y(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ a nonnegative supermartingale (under the same filtration) with cadlag paths such that $[Y, W_i]$ is a nonincreasing process for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Furthermore, let $Y^* := \{Y^*(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote its maximum process. Moreover, suppose that $\mu = \{\mu(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a progressively measurable process satisfying*

$$\|\mu(t)\| \leq c(t, Y^*(t)) (1 + W^*(t))$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and some function $c : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ that is nondecreasing in both arguments.

Then the local martingale $M = \{M(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, defined as

$$M(t) := \exp \left(\int_0^t \mu(s) dW(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|\mu(s)\|^2 ds \right),$$

is a martingale.

Proof. Let us define the sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of progressively measurable processes $\mu_n = \{\mu_n(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, defined by $\mu_n(\cdot) := (\mu(\cdot) \wedge n) \vee (-n)$, where the minimum and maximum are taken component by component. It follows easily, for example by applying the definition of the stochastic integral, that the sequence of local martingales $M_n = \{M_n(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, defined as

$$M_n(t) := \exp \left(\int_0^t \mu_n(s) dW(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|\mu_n(s)\|^2 ds \right),$$

satisfies $(P, M_n(t)) \xrightarrow{w} (P, M(t))$ ($n \uparrow \infty$) for all $t \geq 0$. By Corollary 2, the local martingale M_n is a true martingale since μ_n is bounded. Now, observe that

$$B_n(\cdot) := W(\cdot) - \int_0^\cdot \mu_n(s) ds$$

is a Brownian motion and that Y is still a nonnegative supermartingale under the probability measure Q_n , induced by $M_n(\cdot)$ via $dQ_n = M_n(t) dP$, and that

$$M_n(t) = \exp \left(\int_0^t \mu_n(s) dB_n(s) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \|\mu_n(s)\|^2 ds \right).$$

We first note that

$$\|W(t)\| \leq \|B_n(t)\| + \int_0^t c(s, Y^*(s)) (1 + W^*(s)) ds \leq B_n^*(t) + c(t, Y^*(t))t + c(t, Y^*(t)) \int_0^t W^*(s) ds$$

for all $r \leq t$, where $B_n^* = \{B_n^*(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is defined similar to W^* . An application of Gronwall's inequality then yields that $W^*(t)$ is tight along $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. This guarantees that $\{\int_0^t \|\mu_n(s)\|^2 ds\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight as well. Lemma 1 then yields the tightness of $\{\int_0^t \mu_n(s) dB_n(s)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Thus, $\{M_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight along $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and M is a true P -martingale by Theorem 1. \square

To recover the result by Beneš (1971), suppose that $\tilde{\mu} : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and satisfies

$$\|\tilde{\mu}(t, x)\| \leq \tilde{c}(t) (1 + \|x\|)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and some nondecreasing function $\tilde{c} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. Then, for any $T > 0$, with $\mu(t) = \tilde{\mu}(t, W(t))$ in the last proposition, the above computations show the weak existence of a solution to the stochastic differential equation

$$X(t) = - \int_0^t \tilde{\mu}(s, X(s)) ds + B(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where $B = \{B(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denotes a Brownian motion. For an alternative proof of this statement, using Novikov's condition along with "salami tactics," see Proposition 5.3.6 in Karatzas and Shreve (1991).

The more general assertion of Theorem 2 cannot be proven via this "salami tactics." For example, if Y is a nonnegative pure-jump supermartingale, then the quadratic variation processes of Y and the components of W are zero, even if the jump sizes of Y depend, in a nonanticipative way, on the paths of W .

3.2 Compound Poisson processes

We continue with an application of Theorem 1 to a class of stochastic differential equations (SDEs) involving jumps. Towards this end, for any $\omega \in D_{[0, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we shall write $\Delta\omega(t) := \omega(t) - \omega(t-)$. Further, for any $\omega \in D_{[0, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, define $\omega^t \in D_{[0, t)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be equal to the projection of ω onto $D_{[0, t)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$; that is, $\omega^t(s) = \omega(s)$ for all $s \in [0, t)$. We call a function g with domain $[0, \infty) \times D_{[0, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *predictable* if the function $g(\cdot, \omega)$ is measurable for each $\omega \in D_{[0, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and we have that $g(t, \omega) = g(t, \varpi)$ for all $t \geq 0$ and all $\omega, \varpi \in D_{[0, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\omega^t \equiv \varpi^t$.

Let F denote the distribution of an $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ -valued random variable for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a predictable function $g : [0, \infty) \times D \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. Define $\Psi_g(t, \omega) := \int_0^t g(s, \omega) ds$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $\omega \in D_{[0, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We say that a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$ along with an adapted process X with cadlag paths in \mathbb{R}^d is a weak solution to the SDE

$$X(t) = x_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_g(t)} Z_j^F, \quad (2)$$

if $X(0) = x_0$, the jumps $\{\Delta X \mid \Delta X \neq 0\}$ of X are independent and identically distributed according to F , and $L_g(\cdot) := N_g(\cdot) - \Psi_g(\cdot, X)$ is a P -local martingale up to the first hitting time of infinity by N_g , where $N_g(\cdot) := \sum_{s \leq \cdot} \mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta X(s) \neq 0\}}$ is the sum of jumps. Theorem 3.6 in Jacod (1975) yields the existence and uniqueness of a weak solution to (2); however, such solution might be explosive in the sense that $N_g(t) = \infty$ for some $t \in (0, \infty)$ with positive probability. Below, in Lemma 2, we will provide sufficient conditions to ensure a non-explosive solution.

Any non-explosive solution $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$, X of (2) corresponds to a compound Poisson process with jumps distributed according to F such that its instantaneous intensity to jump at time t equals $g(t, X)$; more precisely

$$\sum_{s \leq \cdot} \mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta X(s) \neq 0\}} = N(\Psi_g(\cdot, X))$$

for some Poisson process $N = \{N(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ with unit rate.

Such a non-explosive solution exists, for example, if $g(t, X) = \mathbf{g}(t)$ only depends on time and $\int_0^t \mathbf{g}(s) ds < \infty$ for all $t \geq 0$. The following lemma gives another existence result:

Lemma 2. *Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let F denote the distribution of an $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ -valued random variable whose components have finite expected value. Let $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be measurable, such that there exists $c > 0$ with $\mathbf{g}(y) \leq c(1 + \|y\|)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then there exists a non-explosive weak solution to (2) with $g(t, \omega) = \mathbf{g}(\omega(t-))$ for all $(t, \omega) \in [0, \infty) \times D$.*

Proof. Let $N = \{N(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote a Poisson process with unit rate and $Z = \{Z_j^F\}_{j \geq 1}$ a sequence of independent F -distributed random variables independent of N . First observe that

$$J(t) := x_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N(t)} Z_j^F$$

always exists and that

$$\Gamma(t) := \int_0^t \frac{1}{\mathbf{g}(J(s))} ds \geq \frac{1}{c} \int_0^t \frac{1}{1 + \|J(s)\|} ds$$

is strictly increasing (before hitting infinity) and satisfies $\lim_{t \uparrow \infty} \Gamma(t) = \infty$ since there exists $K(\omega) \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\|J(t)\| \leq K(\omega)(1 + t)$ by the law of large numbers. Thus, Γ yields a valid time change. Now, consider the non-explosive process $X(t) = J(\Gamma^{-1}(t))$ and observe that $\dot{\Gamma}^{-1}(s) = 1/\dot{\Gamma}(\Gamma^{-1}(s))$, which implies

$$\Gamma^{-1}(t) = \int_0^t \dot{\Gamma}^{-1}(s) ds = \int_0^t \mathbf{g}(J(\Gamma^{-1}(s))) ds = \int_0^t \mathbf{g}(X(s)) ds = \psi_g(t, X),$$

which in turn verifies that X is a non-explosive solution to (2). \square

The next theorem provides a sufficient condition that guarantees that the intensity in Poisson processes can be changed without changing the nullsets of the underlying probability measure. For example, any compound Poisson process with a strictly positive intensity can be changed, via an equivalent change of measure, to a compound Poisson process with unit intensity (set $g_2 \equiv 1$ below).

Theorem 3. Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let F denote the distribution of an $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ -valued random variable. Moreover, let $g_1, g_2 : [0, \infty) \times D_{[0, \infty)}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be strictly positive, predictable functions and denote the corresponding weak solutions of (2) with $g \equiv g_1$ and $g \equiv g_2$ by X_1 , and X_2 . Assume that X_2 is non-explosive. Then, the process $M = \{M(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, defined by

$$M(t) := \exp \left(\int_0^t (\log g_2(s, X_1) - \log g_1(s, X_1)) dL_{g_1}(s) - \int_0^t (g_2(s, X_1) - g_1(s, X_1)) ds \right),$$

is a true martingale; furthermore, under Q , defined on $\mathcal{F}(t)$ by $dQ|_{\mathcal{F}(t)} = M(t)dP|_{\mathcal{F}(t)}$, the distribution of X_1 equals the distribution of X_2 .

Proof. Theorem VI.2 in Brémaud (1981) yields that M is a local martingale. If M is a true martingale, then Theorem VI.3 in Brémaud (1981) yields the assertion on the distribution of X_1 under the probability measure Q . Define the approximating sequence $\{\tau_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of stopping times via

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : M(t) \geq n \text{ or } M(t) \leq 1/n\}$$

and note that we can write those stopping times as functions of the jump process X_1 ; to wit, $\tau_n = \tau_n(X_1)$. We have included the lower bound to deal with the case in which X_1 is explosive; in such case, M will hit zero at the time of the explosion. Note that such explosion, if it ever occurs, cannot occur at the time of a jump; thus the local martingale $M_n = M^{\tau_n}$ is strictly positive.

Next, fix $t > 0$. By Theorem 1 it is now sufficient to show that $\{M_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight along the sequence of probability measures $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, defined via $dQ_n = M_n(t)dP$ to obtain the martingale property of M . For $i = 1, 2$, we shall see that

$$\left\{ \int_0^{\tau_n \wedge t} |\log g_i(s, \omega)| dL_{g_1}(s) \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \int_0^{\tau_n \wedge t} g_i(s, \omega) ds \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

are tight along $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which then proves the statement. Towards this end, Theorem VI.3 in Brémaud (1981) again yields that under Q_n the process $X_1(\cdot \wedge \tau_n)$ solves the martingale problem induced by (2) with $g(s, \omega) = g_2(s, \omega) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n(\omega) > s\}}$. On the other hand, it is immediate that $X_2(\cdot \wedge \tau_n)$ also satisfies (2) with $g(s, \omega) = g_2(s, \omega) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n(\omega) > s\}}$. By the uniqueness of solutions implied by Theorem 3.6 in Jacod (1975) we have that up to the stopping time τ_n , the Q_n -dynamics of X_1 coincide with the dynamics of X_2 . Thus, it is sufficient to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n \left(\int_0^{\tau_n \wedge t} |\log g_i(s, X_1)| dL_{g_1}(s) > \kappa \right) &= P \left(\int_0^{\tau_n \wedge t} |\log g_i(s, X_2)| dL_{g_2}(s) > \kappa \right) \\ &\leq P \left(\int_0^t |\log g_i(s, X_2)| dL_{g_2}(s) > \kappa \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\kappa > 0$, where the right-hand side does not depend on n and tends to zero as κ increases (because X_2 is assumed to be non-explosive). The same observations hold for the other terms of the local martingale M . \square

3.3 Counting processes

In this application of Theorem 1, we generalize a result by Giesecke and Zhu (2013) concerning the martingale property of a local martingale involving a counting process.

Theorem 4. Let $L = \{L(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote a non-explosive counting process with compensator $A = \{A(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ and assume that A is continuous, that is, the jumps of L are totally inaccessible. Fix a measurable, deterministic function $u : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [-c, c]$ for some $c > 0$. Then the process $M = \{M(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, given by

$$M(t) := \exp \left(- \int_0^t u(s) dL(s) - \int_0^t (\exp(-u(s)) - 1) dA(s) \right)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, is a martingale.

Before we provide the proof of this result we note that Theorem 4 generalizes Proposition 3.1 in Giesecke and Zhu (2013) in two ways. First, it does not assume that the function u is constant. Second, no integrability assumption on A is made, such as $E[\exp(A_t)] < \infty$ for some $t > 0$. However, for sake of simplicity, we only considered the one-dimensional setup with unit jumps.

Proof of Theorem 4. First, observe that there exists a counting process \widehat{L} , possible on an extension of the probability space, with compensator $\widehat{c}A$, where \widehat{c} is the smallest integer greater than or equal to $\exp(c)$. For example, the process \widehat{L} can be constructed by adding \widehat{c} independent versions of L , exploiting the fact that the jumps of L are totally inaccessible. A standard thinning argument implies that there also exists a counting process L^u with compensator $A^u := \int_0^t \exp(-u(s))dA(s)$. Moreover, by Jacod (1975) and by using the minimal filtration, if two counting processes L^u and \widehat{L}^u have the same compensator then they follow the same probability law.

Simple computations yield that M is a local martingale. Let $\{\tau_n\}$ denote a localization sequence, set $M_n = M^{\tau_n}$, fix $t > 0$, and define the probability measures Q_n by $dQ_n = M_n(t)dP$. It is sufficient to prove that $\{M_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight along the sequence $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. First, observe that

$$Q_n \left(\exp \left(- \int_0^{\tau_n} u(s)dL(s) \right) \geq \kappa \right) \leq Q_n \left(\exp(cL(\tau_n)) \geq \kappa \right) \leq P \left(\exp(c\widehat{L}(t)) > \kappa \right)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\kappa > 0$. For later use, observe that we also have the tightness of $\{L^{\tau_n}(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ along the sequence $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Tightness of $\{M_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ now follows as soon as we have shown the tightness of $\{A^{\tau_n}(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, that is, $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_n(A^{\tau_n}(t) \geq \kappa) \rightarrow 0$ as $\kappa \uparrow \infty$. However, we can write

$$A^{\tau_n}(t) = \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_n} \exp(u(s \wedge \tau_n))dA^u(s) \leq \exp(c)A^{u, \tau_n}(t)$$

and thus, with $\kappa_c := \exp(-c)\kappa$ and $N = A^{u, \tau_n} - L^{\tau_n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(A^{\tau_n}(t) \geq \kappa) &\leq Q_n(A^{u, \tau_n}(t) \geq \kappa_c) = Q_n(N(t) + L^{\tau_n}(t) \geq \kappa_c) \\ &\leq Q_n(L^{\tau_n}(t) \geq \lceil \sqrt{\kappa_c} \rceil) + Q_n(N(t \wedge \rho) + \lceil \sqrt{\kappa_c} \rceil + 1 \geq \kappa_c + 1), \end{aligned}$$

where ρ is the first hitting time of $\lceil \sqrt{\kappa_c} \rceil$ by L . The tightness of $\{L^{\tau_n}(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and Markov's inequality applied to the nonnegative Q_n -supermartingale $N^\rho + \lceil \sqrt{\kappa_c} \rceil + 1$ then yield the tightness of $\{A^{\tau_n}(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and Theorem 1 yields the statement. \square

3.4 Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process given rare first passage time events

In this application, we are given an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process X , started at $X(0) = 1$ and mean-reverting to the origin. We are interested in finding a representation for conditional expectations that can be used to design simulation estimators involving the rare event that X hits a large level $N \in \mathbb{N}$ before hitting 0. Such questions arise in studying overflow probabilities within operational cycles engineering systems, such as queueing networks. Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes arise in such a setup as an approximative description of a system with infinitely many servers in heavy traffic, see Chapter 6 of Robert (2003).

We achieve such a representation by relating the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process to the time-reversal of a three-dimensional Bessel process. Although the probability of the conditioning event that X hits N before 0 decreases *exponentially* in the threshold parameter N , as we note in Remark 1 below, the representation provided here can be used to design estimators that run in *linear* time as a function of N . To obtain this representation, we use a result of Blanchet (2013) for irreducible and positive recurrent discrete-time Markov chains. We then approximate X by a sequence of such Markov chains, apply the result of Blanchet (2013), and then use the second part of Theorem 1 to conclude.

We first recall Proposition 1 in Blanchet (2013):

Proposition 2. *Let $X = \{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ denote an irreducible and positive recurrent discrete time Markov chain taking values in some countable state space \mathcal{S} and having stationary distribution π . Let $X' = \{X'_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$*

denote the time-reversal of X . For each $x \in \mathcal{S}$, let P_x denote the probability measure in the path space associated with X , conditioned on the event $\{X_0 = x\}$. Let P'_π denote the probability measure associated with X' when started in the stationary distribution. Fix a function $V : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $N \in \mathbb{R}$, and $x, b \in \mathcal{S}$ with $V(x) < N$ and $V(b) < N$. For any $y \in \mathcal{S}$ define $T_y = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : X_k = y\}$ and, similarly, T'_y . Write $T_* = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : V(X_k) \geq N\}$ and define T'_* similarly.

Then

$$P_x((X_0, \dots, X_{T_*}) \in \cdot \mid \{T_* < T_b\}) = P'_\pi\left(\left(X'_{\xi'(x)}, \dots, X'_0\right) \in \cdot \mid \{V(X'_0) \geq N\} \cap \{T'_x \leq T'_b < T'_*\}\right),$$

where $\xi'(x) = \max\{0 \leq k \leq T'_b : X'_k = x\}$.

Proposition 2 states that we can sample $\{X_k\}_{0 \leq k \leq T_*}$ conditioned on the event $\{X_0 = x\} \cap \{T_* < T_b\}$ by first sampling X'_0 from π conditioned on the event $\{V(X'_0) \geq N\}$, then sampling $\{X'_k : 1 \leq k \leq T'_b\}$ conditioned on the event $\{T'_x \leq T'_b < T'_*\}$, thereby obtaining

$$\{X'_k : 0 \leq k \leq \xi'(x)\},$$

and finally letting $X_k = X'_{\xi'(x)-k}$ for $k \in \{0, \dots, \xi'(x)\}$.

We do not provide a proof of Proposition 2 here, but instead refer to Blanchet (2013). However, to provide some intuition, we give some computations here, which indicate the validity of the result. Towards this end, let $\{K(x, y)\}_{x, y \in \mathcal{S}}$ denote the transition matrix of X and $\{K'(x, y)\}_{x, y \in \mathcal{S}}$ the one of X' . Recall that

$$K'(y, x) = \pi(x) K(x, y) / \pi(y).$$

Then, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(b) P_b(T_* < T_b) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(b) K(b, x_1) K(x_1, x_2) \cdots K(x_{k-1}, x_k) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{x_1 \neq b, V(x_1) < N, \dots, x_{k-1} \neq b, V(x_{k-1}) < N, V(x_k) \geq N} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{S}} K'(x_1, b) \pi(x_1) K(x_1, x_2) \cdots K(x_{k-1}, x_k) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{x_1 \neq b, V(x_1) < N, \dots, x_{k-1} \neq b, V(x_{k-1}) < N, V(x_k) \geq N} \\ &\quad \dots \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(x_k) K'(x_k, x_{k-1}) \cdots K'(x_2, x_1) K'(x_1, b) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{V(x_k) \geq N, x_{k-1} \neq b, V(x_{k-1}) < N, \dots, x_1 \neq b, V(x_1) < N} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{x'_0, \dots, x'_{k-1} \in \mathcal{S}} \pi(x'_0) K'(x'_0, x'_1) \cdots K'(x'_{k-2}, x'_{k-1}) K'(x'_{k-1}, b) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{V(x'_0) \geq N, x'_1 \neq b, V(x'_1) < N, \dots, x'_{k-1} \neq b, V(x'_{k-1}) < N} \\ &= E'_\pi[P'_{X'_0}(T'_b < T'_*) \mid V(X'_0) \geq N] P'_\pi(V(X'_0) \geq N) \end{aligned}$$

with the obvious notation for E'_π . The previous identities provide a representation for $P_b(T_* < T_b)$ in terms of $P'_\pi(V(X'_0) \geq N)$ and the expectation involving the probability $P'_{X'_0}(T'_b < T'_*)$, where X'_0 satisfies $V(X'_0) \geq N$. It is shown in Blanchet (2013) that the contribution of

$$E'_\pi[P'_{X'_0}(T'_b < T'_*) \mid V(X'_0) \geq N]$$

remains bounded away from zero as N increases to ∞ for a significant class of processes of interest. Therefore, computing and sampling rare event probabilities for sample path events of the form $\{T_* < T_b\}$ can be reduced to computing rare event probabilities for the random variable X'_0 following the stationary distribution, via the event $\{V(X'_0) \geq N\}$.

Note that all these computations are tailored to discrete-time processes, and cannot very easily be extended to continuous processes. Our goal in this section is to use Theorem 1 in order to obtain a suitable analogue of Proposition 2 for continuous processes. We will not provide full details of an extension in general, but will focus on proving a tractable representation for an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process conditioned on reaching a high level before returning to the origin. Tractable means that the representation should be directly applicable for the purposes of sampling.

Theorem 5. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N > 1$, a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, P)$ with expectation operator E , supporting four independent Brownian motions $B_i = \{B_i(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ for $i = 0, \dots, 3$. Let $X = \{X(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denote an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of the form

$$X(t) = 1 - \int_0^t X(s) ds + B_0(t),$$

and $X' = \{X'(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be given by

$$X'(t) = N - (B_1^2(t) + B_2^2(t) + B_3^2(t))^{1/2}.$$

For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $T_x = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X(t) = x\}$ and define T'_x similarly. Define a random variable $M'(\infty)$ by

$$M'(\infty) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \left(N^2 + T'_0 - \int_0^{T'_0} X'(s)^2 ds\right)\right) \quad (3)$$

Then the random variable $M'(\infty)$ has finite expectation under P and

$$E[f(X(s) : 0 \leq s \leq T_N) | \{T_N < T_0\}] = E\left[f(X'(\xi'(1) - s) : 0 \leq s \leq \xi'(1)) \frac{M'(\infty)}{E[M'(\infty)]}\right],$$

where $\xi'(1) = \max\{0 \leq t \leq T_0 : X'(t) = 1\}$, for all continuous and bounded functions $f : D_{[0, \infty)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 1. The previous result can be used to efficiently estimate conditional expectations involving Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, conditioned on $\{T_N < T_0\}$ when N is large, in a way that is analogous to the methods described in Blanchet (2013). This then leads to algorithms that have linear running time uniformly as $N \uparrow \infty$. This approach will be studied in future work. \square

Remark 2. It is well known that X' , the modified three-dimensional Bessel process in Theorem 5, satisfies the stochastic differential equation

$$X'(\cdot) = N - \int_0^\cdot \frac{1}{N - X'(t)} dt + B(\cdot) \quad (4)$$

for some Brownian motion $B(\cdot) = \{B(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$.

Also, note that

$$\begin{aligned} M'(\infty) &= \exp\left(-\int_0^{T'_0} X'(s) dX'(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{T'_0} X'(s)^2 ds\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\int_0^{T'_0} X'(s) dB(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{T'_0} X'(s)^2 ds\right) \exp\left(\int_0^{T'_0} \frac{X'(s)}{N - X'(s)} ds\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from an application of Itô's lemma and the last equality from (4). \square

Proof of Theorem 5. We will consider a suitably defined class of discrete processes that approximate $X(\cdot)$ and then apply Proposition 2. More precisely, we construct a sequence of stochastic processes $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $X_n = \{X_n(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, each taking values in the state space $\mathcal{S}_n = \{k\Delta_n^{1/2}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, where $\Delta_n := 2^{-2n}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let X_n evolve as a pure jump process, jumping only at times $\{k\Delta_n\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with

$$\Delta X_n(k\Delta_n) = \Delta_n^{1/2} J_n(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)),$$

where $\{J_n(k, \cdot)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies

$$J_m(k, y) = \left(2\mathbf{1}_{\{U(k) \leq 2^{-1}(1 - \Delta_n^{1/2}(y \wedge n))\}} - 1 \right) \mathbf{1}_{y>0} + \mathbf{1}_{y=0} \in \{-1, 1\},$$

for all $y \geq 0$ and $\{U(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of uniformly distributed in $(0, 1)$ i.i.d. random variables. In simple words, as long as $X_n(k\Delta_n) > 0$, the next increment is $+1$ with probability $(1 - q_n^k)/2 \in (0, 1)$ and -1 with probability $(1 + q_n^k)/2 \in (0, 1)$, where $q_n^k = \Delta_n^{1/2}(X_n(k\Delta_n) \wedge n)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the induced probability distribution of X_n on the canonical path space and the corresponding expectation operator by P_n and E_n . Note that $E_n[J_n(k, y)] = -\Delta_n^{1/2}(y \wedge n)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \geq 0$. Moreover, we define $\xi^n(1) = \max\{0 \leq t \leq T_0^n : X_n(t) = 1\}$, where $T_s^n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_n(t) = s\}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us introduce the probability measure \widehat{P}_n under which $J_n(\cdot, \cdot)$ increases by 1 or -1 with probability $1/2$ until time T_0^n . Let us also introduce the random variable

$$M'_n(\infty) = \prod_{k=1}^{T_0^n/\Delta_n} (1 - q_n^{k-1} J_n(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n))).$$

It is clear that

$$\widehat{E}_n [1 - q_n^{k-1} J_n(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)) | X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)] = 1$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $P(T_0^n < \infty) = 1$, which yields

$$\widehat{E}_n [M'_n(\infty)] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \widehat{E}_n [M'_n(\infty) \mathbf{1}_{\{T_0^n = k\}}] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P_n(T_0^n = k) = 1.$$

This implies that $P_n \ll \widehat{P}_n$ and $M'_n(\infty) = dP_n/d\widehat{P}_n$.

Let us write

$$\widehat{P}_n^h(\cdot) = \widehat{P}_n(\cdot | \{X_n(0) = N\} \cap \{T_0^n < T_N^n\}).$$

In order to describe the conditional dynamics of X under \widehat{P}_n^h , we apply Doob's h -transform and define the function $h^n : [0, N] \rightarrow (0, 1)$ by

$$h^n(x) = \widehat{P}_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = x\}) = \frac{N-x}{N}$$

for all $x \in [0, N]$. Observe that under \widehat{P}_n^h the random variable $J_n(k, y)$ is 1 with probability

$$\frac{h^n(y + \Delta_n^{1/2})}{2h(y)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\Delta_n^{1/2}}{N-y} \right)$$

and -1 with probability

$$\frac{h^n(y - \Delta_n^{1/2})}{2h(y)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\Delta_n^{1/2}}{N-y} \right),$$

conditional on the event $\{T_0^n \wedge T_N^n > k\Delta_n^{1/2}\}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

For any random variable H depending only on $\{X_n(k\Delta_n) : 0 \leq k \leq T_0^n/\Delta\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_n [H | \{X_n(0) = N\} \cap \{T_0^n < T_N^n\}] &= \frac{E_n [H \mathbf{1}_{\{T_0^n < T_N^n\}} | \{X_n(0) = N\}]}{P_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = N\})} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{E}_n [H \mathbf{1}_{\{T_0^n < T_N^n\}} M'_n(\infty) | \{X_n(0) = N\}]}{P_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = N\})} \\ &= \widehat{E}_n [H M'_n(\infty) | \{X_n(0) = N\} \cap \{T_0^n < T_N^n\}] \frac{\widehat{P}_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = N\})}{P_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = N\})} \\ &= \widehat{E}_n^h [H M'_n(\infty)] \frac{1}{\widehat{E}_n^h [M'_n(\infty)]}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of \widehat{P}_n^h and using $H = 1$.

The process X_n , being a birth-death process, is time reversible. Thus, Proposition 2 yields that for each continuous bounded function $f : D_{[0,\infty)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_n [f(X_n(s) : 0 \leq s \leq T_N) | \{X_n(0) = 1\} \cap \{T_N^n < T_0^n\}] \\ = E_n [f(X_n(\xi_n(1) - s) : 0 \leq s \leq \xi_n(1)) | \{X_n(0) = N\} \cap \{T_0^n < T_N^n\}] \\ = \widehat{E}_n^h [f(X_n(\xi_n(1) - s) : 0 \leq s \leq \xi_n(1)) M_n(\infty)], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_n(\infty) = \frac{M'_n(\infty)}{\widehat{E}_n^h[M'_n(\infty)]}. \quad (6)$$

Next, the facts that $1 - x = \exp(-x - x^2/2 + O(x^3))$ as $x \downarrow 0$ and $J_n^2 = 1$ imply that

$$M'_n(\infty) = \prod_{k=1}^{T_0^n/\Delta_n} \exp\left(-q_n^{k-1} J_n(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)) - \frac{(q_n^{k-1})^2}{2} + O(\Delta_n^{3/2})\right)$$

as $n \uparrow \infty$, where the term $O(\Delta_n^{3/2})$ is actually uniform in $X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)$ for all $k \leq T_0^n \wedge T_N^n$.

Note that, if $n > N$, on the event $\{X_m(0) = N\} \cap \{T_0^n < T_N^n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}N^2 &= \frac{1}{2}(X_n(T_N^n) - X_n(0))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{T_0^n/\Delta_n} \Delta_n^{1/2} J_n(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n))\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\Delta_n \sum_{k=1}^{T_0^n/\Delta_n} J_n^2(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{T_0^n/\Delta_n} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \Delta_n^{1/2} J_n(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)) \Delta_n^{1/2} J_n(j, X_n((j-1)\Delta_n)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}T_0^n + N^2 + \Delta_n^{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{T_0^n/\Delta_n} J_n(k, X_n((k-1)\Delta_n)) X_n((k-1)\Delta_n). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $n > N$, on the event $\{X_n(0) = N\} \cap \{T_0^n < T_N^n\}$,

$$M'_n(\infty) = \exp\left(\frac{N^2}{2} + \frac{T_0^n}{2} - \sum_{k=1}^{T_0^n/\Delta_n} \frac{(q_n^{k-1})^2}{2} + T_0^n O(\Delta_n^{1/2})\right). \quad (7)$$

It is not difficult to verify using the method of weak convergence of generators in Ethier and Kurtz (1986) that

$$(P_n(\cdot | \{X_n(0) = 1\}), X_n(\cdot \wedge T_N^n \wedge T_0^n)) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{w}} (P, X(\cdot \wedge T_N \wedge T_0)) \quad (n \uparrow \infty) \quad (8)$$

on $D_{[0,\infty)}$. Proposition 5.33 in Pitman (1975) implies that

$$\left(\widehat{P}_n^h, X_n(\cdot \wedge T_0^n)\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{w}} (P, X'(\cdot \wedge T_0)) \quad (n \uparrow \infty)$$

on $D_{[0,\infty)}$. The continuous mapping principle, applied with a standard extension to handle the stopping times $\{T_0^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, yields the weak convergence result

$$\left(\widehat{P}_n^h, M'_n(\infty)\right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{w}} (P, M'(\infty)) \quad (n \uparrow \infty),$$

where $M'(\infty)$ is defined in (3).

Observe that there exists also a subsequence $\{n_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $C = \lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \widehat{E}_{n_m}^h [M'_{n_m}(\infty)]$ exists in $[0, \infty]$. Then, an application of Fatou's lemma, in conjunction with a Skorokhod embedding argument also yields that $C > 0$. Thanks to the continuous mapping principle, in order to conclude the proof of the statement it is now sufficient to show that $\{M_n(\infty)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, given in (6), is tight under the sequence $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures, defined by $dQ_n = M_n(\infty) d\widehat{P}_n^h$. By Fatou's lemma and by (7), it is sufficient to show the tightness of $\{T_0^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ under $\{Q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$Q_n(T_0^n > \kappa) = \widehat{E}_n^h [\mathbf{1}_{\{\kappa < T_0^n\}} M_n(\infty)] = \frac{\widehat{E}_n^h [\mathbf{1}_{\{\kappa < T_0^n < T_N^n\}} M_n(\infty) | \{X_n(0) = N\}]}{\widehat{P}_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = N\})} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= P_n(T_0^n > \kappa | \{X_n(0) = N\} \cap \{T_0^n < T_N^n\}) \\ &\leq \frac{P_n(T_0^n > \kappa | \{X_n(0) = 1\}) P_n(T_1^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = N\})}{P_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = N\})} \\ &= \frac{P_n(T_0^n > \kappa | \{X_n(0) = 1\})}{P_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = 1\})}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the equality (9) comes from (5).

Recall (8); therefore

$$\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} P_n(T_0^n < T_N^n | \{X_n(0) = 1\}) = P(T_0 < T_N) > 0,$$

and $\{T_0^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight under $\{P_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$; thus, $\kappa > 0$ can be chosen so that the right hand side of (10) can be made as small as desired as $n \uparrow \infty$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 3. We end our discussion by noting that the previous result illustrates the convenience of Theorem 1. A standard approach would involve verifying directly the uniform integrability of the process $\{M'_n(\infty)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ under $\{\widehat{P}_n^h(\cdot | \{T_0^n < T_N^n\})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and the expectation of the term $\exp(T_0^n/2)$ is difficult to handle. Our technique bypasses the need for this by a simple application of the strong Markov property as shown in (10). \square

References

- Beneš, V. (1971). Existence of optimal stochastic control laws. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 9:446–472.
- Blanchet, J. (2013). Optimal sampling of overflow paths in Jackson networks. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 38(4):698–719.
- Blei, S. and Engelbert, H.-J. (2009). On exponential local martingales associated with strong Markov continuous local martingales. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 119(9):2859–2880.
- Brémaud, P. (1981). *Point Processes and Queues. Martingale Dynamics*. Springer.
- Cheridito, P., Filipović, D., and Yor, M. (2005). Equivalent and absolutely continuous measure changes for jump-diffusion processes. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 15(3):1713–1732.
- Engelbert, H. and Schmidt, W. (1984). On exponential local martingales connected with diffusion processes. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 119:97–115.
- Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. (1986). *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Giesecke, K. and Zhu, S. (2013). Transform analysis for point processes and applications in credit risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 23(4):742–762.
- Jacod, J. (1975). Multivariate point processes: predictable projection, Radon-Nikodym derivatives, representation of martingales. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 31(3):235–253.
- Jacod, J. and Shiryaev, A. N. (2003). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Springer, Berlin, 2nd edition.
- Kallsen, J. and Muhle-Karbe, J. (2010). Exponentially affine martingales, affine measure changes and exponential moments of affine processes. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 120(2):163–181.

- Karatzas, I. and Shreve, S. E. (1991). *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. Springer, New York, 2nd edition.
- Kazamaki, N. (1994). *Continuous Exponential Martingales and BMO*. Springer.
- Kazamaki, N. and Sekiguchi, T. (1983). Uniform integrability of continuous exponential martingales. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal*, 35:289–301.
- Lepingle, D. and Mémin, J. (1978). Sur l'intégrabilité uniforme des martingales exponentielles. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 42:175–203.
- Mijatović, A. and Urusov, M. (2012). On the martingale property of certain local martingales. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 152(1):1–30.
- Novikov, A. (1972). On an identity for stochastic integrals. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 17(4):717–720.
- Pitman, J. W. (1975). One-dimensional Brownian motion and the three-dimensional Bessel process. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 7(3):511–526.
- Portenko, N. (1975). Diffusion processes with unbounded drift coefficient. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 20:27–37.
- Protter, P. and Shimbo, K. (2008). No arbitrage and general semimartingales. In Ethier, S. N., Feng, J., and Stockbridge, R. H., editors, *Markov Processes and Related Topics: A Festschrift for Thomas G. Kurtz*, pages 267–283. Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Robert, P. (2003). *Stochastic Networks and Queues*. Springer.
- Ruf, J. (2013a). The martingale property in the context of stochastic differential equations. Preprint, arXiv:1306.0218.
- Ruf, J. (2013b). A new proof for the conditions of Novikov and Kazamaki. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 123:404–421.
- Stroock, D. W. and Varadhan, S. R. S. (2006). *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*. Springer, Berlin. Reprint of the 1997 edition.
- Stummer, W. (1993). The Novikov and entropy conditions of multidimensional diffusion processes with singular drift. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 97(4):515–542.
- Yan, J.-A. (1988). On the existence of diffusions with singular drift coefficient. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica. English Series*, 4(1):23–29.