

# First Passage Time Properties for Time-varying Diffusion Models: A Martingale Approach

Vaibhav Srivastava<sup>a</sup>, Samuel F. Feng<sup>\*b</sup>, Jonathan D. Cohen<sup>c,d</sup>, Naomi Ehrich Leonard<sup>a</sup>, Amitai Shenhav<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Applied Mathematics and Sciences, Khalifa University, Abu Dhabi, UAE*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Psychology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA*

<sup>d</sup>*Princeton Neuroscience Institute, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA*

---

## Abstract

In this work, we use Martingale theory to derive formulas for the expected decision time, error rates, and first passage times associated with a multistage drift diffusion model, or a Wiener diffusion model with piecewise constant time-varying drift rates and decision boundaries. The model we study is a generalization of that considered in Ratcliff (1980). The derivation relies on using the optional stopping theorem for properly chosen Martingales, thus obtaining formulae which may be used to compute performance metrics for a particular stage of the stochastic decision process. We also explicitly solve the case of a two stage diffusion model, and provide numerical demonstrations of the computations suggested by our analysis. Finally we present calculations that allow our techniques to approximate time-varying Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. By presenting these explicit formulae, we aim to foster the development of refined numerical methods and analytical techniques for studying diffusion decision processes with time-varying drift rates and thresholds.

---

## 1. Introduction

Continuous time stochastic processes based on drift and diffusion between two absorbing boundaries have been used in a wide variety of applications including statistical physics (Farkas and Fulop, 2001), finance (Lin, 1998), and health science (Horrocks and Thompson, 2004). In this article, we focus on applications to decision making tasks, where such models have successfully accounted for behavior and neural activity in a wide array of two alternative forced choice tasks (Ratcliff and Rouder, 1998; Bogacz et al., 2006; Ratcliff and McKoon, 2008; Simen et al., 2009; Gold and Shadlen, 2001, 2007; Brunton et al., 2013; Feng, 2009; Shadlen and Newsome, 2001), including phenomena such as the speed-accuracy tradeoff and the dynamics of neural activity during decision making in such tasks. In particular, we will discuss extensions of a specific class of diffusion model referred to as the pure drift diffusion model (DDM; Eq. (1) below), which can be shown to be statistically optimal (Wald, 1945; Wald and Wolfowitz, 1948). Varieties of diffusion models have been applied within and outside of psychology and neuroscience to elucidate mechanisms for perception, decision-making, memory, attention, and cognitive control (see reviews in (Ratcliff and Smith, 2004; Bogacz et al., 2006)).

In the pure DDM (and related models), the state variable  $x(t)$  is thought to represent the amount of accumulated noisy evidence at time  $t$  for decisions represented by the two absorbing boundaries, which we refer to as the upper (+) and lower (-) boundaries. The evidence  $x(t)$  evolves in time according to a biased random walk with Gaussian increments, which may be written as  $dx(t) \sim \text{Normal}(A dt, \sigma^2 dt)$ , and a decision is made at time  $\tau$ , the smallest time  $t$  for which  $x(t)$  hits either the top boundary ( $x(\tau) = +z$ ) or bottom boundary ( $x(\tau) = -z$ ). Hitting either of the two boundaries corresponds to making one of two possible decisions at time  $\tau$ . The resulting decision dynamics are thus described by the first passage times of the underlying drift diffusion process. In studying these processes one is often interested in relating performance

---

\*Corresponding author

metrics such as the mean decision time and error rate (i.e. the probability of hitting the boundary opposite to the direction of drift) to empirical data. For example, one may be interested in studying how actions and cognitive processes might seek to maximize reward rate, which is a simple function of error rate and mean decision time (Bogacz et al., 2006).

However, not all decisions can be well described with a standard DDM with uniform (i.e., time-invariant) decision parameters. Many decisions may require time-varying drift rates, diffusion rates, and/or thresholds in order to model "bottom-up" changes over the course of the decision process, for instance in sensory processing, or "top-down" changes, for instance in attentional focus or application of cognitive control (Krajbich et al., 2010; White et al., 2011). In this article, we study performance metrics for such extensions of the DDM, in which model parameters are time-varying. In doing so, we build on recent work that is focused on similar time-varying random walk models (Hubner et al., 2010; Diederich and Oswald, 2014). We offer an alternative approach to deriving performance metrics in this setting, including first passage time distributions as well as expected error rates and decision times, and describe how our approach can be applied to the more general class of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes. An in-depth discussion of how the present article interfaces with other studies of time-varying DDMs is given in Section 7.

## 2. Drift diffusion models

In this section we recall the pure DDM and formally introduce the MSDDM.

### 2.1. The (single stage) drift diffusion model

The single stage pure DDM (Ratcliff and Rouder, 1998; Bogacz et al., 2006) models human decision making in two alternative forced choice tasks. The DDM models the evolution of the evidence for decision making using the following stochastic differential equation (SDE):

$$dx(t) = A dt + \sigma dW(t), \quad x(t_0) = x_0, \quad (1)$$

where parameters  $A$  and  $\sigma$  are constants referred to as the drift and diffusion rate, respectively;  $x_0$  is the initial condition (the starting point of the decision process), and  $\sigma dW(t)$  are independent Wiener increments with variance  $\sigma^2 dt$ . The pure DDM (1) models a decision process in which an agent is integrating noisy evidence until sufficient evidence is gathered in favor of one of the two alternatives.

A decision is made when the evidence  $x(t)$  crosses one of the two symmetric decision thresholds  $\pm z$  for the first time (i.e., also referred to as its *first passage time*). In other words, the decision time is the first passage time of the drift diffusion process (1) with respect to the set of points within boundaries  $\pm z$ .

We will use the terms *correct* and *incorrect* to refer to responses that cross the threshold of equivalent or opposite sign of the drift rate for the decision process. For instance, if  $A > 0$ , a correct decision is one for which threshold  $+z$  is crossed first; conversely, an incorrect response refers to the case in which threshold  $-z$  was crossed first. Accordingly, we refer to the probability of crossing the negative threshold in this case as the *error rate* and the time at which the decision variable crosses one of the thresholds as the *decision time*.

The "pure" DDM contrasts with Ratcliff's (1978) "extended" DDM, in which drift rate and the initial condition are allowed to vary across instantiations of the model (e.g., across trials in an experimental session). This paper will focus entirely on analyses of the former model, (as well as its applications to Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes). Note also that the parameterization we use for the pure DDM is different from those in some other cases, e.g., (Smith, 2000; Ratcliff and Smith, 2004; Navarro and Fuss, 2009), although the underlying model is equivalent.

### 2.2. The multistage drift diffusion model

The DDM has been extremely successful in explaining behavioral and neural data from two alternative forced choice tasks. However, its basic assumption – that model parameters such as drift rate and threshold remain constant throughout the decision process – is unlikely to hold in a number of cases. For instance, in several experimental (and real-world) contexts the quality of evidence is not stationary (i.e., the drift rate

and possibly even the diffusion rate are not a constant function of time) or decision urgency leads thresholds to decay with time.

For purposes of modeling situations described above, we introduce an extension of the DDM, the *multistage drift diffusion model* (MSDDM), which is a generalization of the two stage process considered in (Ratcliff, 1980). In an MSDDM, the drift rate, the diffusion rate, and the thresholds are piecewise constant functions of time.

To implement an MSDDM, we partition the set of non-negative real numbers (time axis) into  $n$  sets  $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $t_0 = 0$  and  $t_n = +\infty$ . We then assume that the drift rate, the diffusion rate, and the decision thresholds are constant within each interval, but that their values may be different for different intervals. In particular, the evidence integration in the MSDDM is modeled by

$$dx(t) = a(t) dt + \sigma(t)dW(t), \quad x(t_0) = x_0, \quad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= a_i, & \text{for } t_{i-1} \leq t < t_i, \\ \sigma(t) &= \sigma_i, & \text{for } t_{i-1} \leq t < t_i, \end{aligned}$$

for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Note that for  $n = 1$ , the MSDDM reduces to the pure DDM. For simplicity of presentation, we first consider the case with constant decision thresholds at  $\pm z$ . In section 4, we describe how to incorporate piecewise constant time-varying thresholds into the MSDDM.

We will frequently refer to the  $i$ -th stage DDM of the MSDDM. For  $t > t_{i-1}$ , it is written as

$$dx(t) = a_i dt + \sigma_i dW(t), \quad x(t_{i-1}) = X_{i-1}, \quad \text{decision thresholds } \pm z. \quad (3)$$

The initial condition is now a random variable  $X_{i-1}$  defined as  $x(t_{i-1})$  conditioned on no decision until time  $t_{i-1}$ , i.e., the density of  $X_{i-1}$  is the conditional distribution of  $x(t_{i-1})$  given that  $\tau > t_{i-1}$ . Thus, the random variable  $X_{i-1}$  corresponds to realizations of the MSDDM that remain within the thresholds  $\pm z$  until time  $t_{i-1}$ . Note that  $X_0$  is a point mass distribution centered at  $x_0$ .

We introduce the following notations throughout this paper:

- $\tau = \inf\{t > 0 | x(t) \notin (-z, z)\}$ , the first passage time for the entire multistage process
- $\tau_i = \tau | \tau > t_{i-1}$ , the first passage time for the  $i$ -th stage DDM (3).
- $\theta_i = (a_i, \sigma_i, z)$ , and  $\theta_{1:\ell} = (a_1, \dots, a_\ell, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_\ell, z)$ .
- $s_i = a_i / \sigma_i^2$ , the  $i$ -th stage signal to noise square ratio.

### 3. First passage time metrics for the multistage drift diffusion model

In this section we derive first passage time (FPT) properties of the MSDDM. At a higher level, our approach can be summarized as follows:

The MSDDM can be viewed as a cascade of  $n$  modified DDMs in which the initial condition is a random variable and only the decisions made before a deadline are considered. For the  $i$ -th stage DDM with a known distribution of  $X_{i-1}$ , we derive (i) properties of the FPT conditioned on a decision before the deadline  $t_i$ , and (ii) distribution of  $X_i$ , i.e., the distribution of the  $x(t_i)$  conditioned on the FPT for the  $i$ -th stage DDM greater than  $t_i$ . We then use these properties sequentially for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  to determine FPT properties during each stage. Finally, we aggregate FPT property metrics at each stage to compute FPT metrics for the MSDDM as a whole—that is, for the FPT in the final stage contingent on all previous stages.

In the following, we first recall FPT properties for the pure DDM. We then use these properties, together with observations from Martingale theory, to derive FPT metrics for the modified  $i$ -th stage DDM described above. Finally, we use total probability formulae to merge these metrics and obtain FPT metrics for the MSDDM. Throughout this section, we assume the decision thresholds are fixed at  $\pm z$ , the number of stages is  $n$ , and  $t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = \infty$ .

### 3.1. FPT properties of the pure DDM

We first review some well known results for the pure DDM (1), which is equivalent to a 1-stage MSDDM. Without loss of generality, we assume that the drift rate  $a_1 \geq 0$ . For the 1-state MSDDM

(i) The error rate  $\text{ER}(x_0, \theta_1)$  is

$$\text{ER}(x_0, \theta_1) = \mathbb{P}(x(\tau_1) = -z) = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{-2s_1 x_0} - e^{-2s_1 z}}{e^{2s_1 z} - e^{-2s_1 z}}, & \text{if } a_1 > 0, \\ \frac{z - x_0}{2z}, & \text{if } a_1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Throughout the remainder of the section, for brevity, we let  $\text{ER} = \text{ER}(x_0, \theta_1)$ .

(ii) The mean decision time  $\text{mDT}(x_0, \theta_1)$  is given by

$$\text{mDT}(x_0, \theta_1) = \mathbb{E}[\tau] = \mathbb{E}[\tau_1] = \begin{cases} \frac{(1-2\text{ER})z - x_0}{a_1}, & \text{if } a_1 > 0, \\ \frac{z^2 - x_0^2}{\sigma_1^2}, & \text{if } a_1 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

(iii) The first passage time density  $f(t; x_0, \theta_1)$ , i.e., the probability density function of the decision time is

$$f(t; x_0, \theta_1) = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t) = e^{-\frac{a_1^2 t}{2\sigma_1^2}} \left( e^{-s_1(z+x_0)} \mathfrak{B}\left(t; \frac{z-x_0}{\sigma_1}, \frac{2z}{\sigma_1}\right) + e^{s_1(z-x_0)} \mathfrak{B}\left(t; \frac{z+x_0}{\sigma_1}, \frac{2z}{\sigma_1}\right) \right), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{B}(t; u, v) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{v - u + 2kv}{\sqrt{2\pi t^{3/2}}} e^{-(v-u+2kv)^2/2t}, \quad u < v.$$

(iv) The expected decision time conditioned on the correct response  $\text{mDT}_+$  and the expected decision time conditioned on the incorrect response  $\text{mDT}_-$  are

$$\text{mDT}_+ = \frac{\text{m}\hat{\text{DT}}_+(x_0, \theta_1)}{(1 - \text{ER})} = \begin{cases} \frac{2z}{a_1} \coth(2s_1 z) - \frac{z+x_0}{a_1} \coth(s_1(z+x_0)), & \text{if } a_1 > 0, \\ \left( \frac{4z^2}{3\sigma_1^2} - \frac{(z+x_0)^2}{3\sigma_1^2} \right), & \text{if } a_1 = 0; \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{mDT}_- = \frac{\text{m}\hat{\text{DT}}_-(x_0, \theta_1)}{\text{ER}} = \begin{cases} \frac{2z}{a_1} \coth(2s_1 z) - \frac{z-x_0}{a_1} \coth(s_1(z-x_0)), & \text{if } a_1 > 0, \\ \left( \frac{4z^2}{3\sigma_1^2} - \frac{(z-x_0)^2}{3\sigma_1^2} \right), & \text{if } a_1 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where  $\text{m}\hat{\text{DT}}_{\pm} = \mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_1) = \pm z)]$ .

Note that  $\text{mDT}_+$  corresponds to the average decision time computed by dividing the sum of decision times associated with the correct decision with the instances of such decisions; while  $\text{m}\hat{\text{DT}}_+$  corresponds average decision time computed by dividing the sum of decision times associated with the correct decision with the instances of all (correct and incorrect) decisions.

(v) The first passage time density conditioned on a particular decision is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t | x(\tau_1) = z) = \frac{f^+(t; x_0, \theta_1)}{1 - \text{ER}} = \frac{e^{-\frac{a_1^2 t}{2\sigma_1^2} + s_1(z-x_0)}}{1 - \text{ER}} \mathfrak{B}\left(t; \frac{z+x_0}{\sigma_1}, \frac{2z}{\sigma_1}\right) \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t | x(\tau_1) = -z) = \frac{f^-(t; x_0, \theta_1)}{\text{ER}} = \frac{e^{-\frac{a_1^2 t}{2\sigma_1^2} - s_1(z+x_0)}}{\text{ER}} \mathfrak{B}\left(t; \frac{z-x_0}{\sigma_1}, \frac{2z}{\sigma_1}\right), \quad (10)$$

where  $f^{\pm}(t; x_0, \theta_1) = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t \ \& \ x(\tau) = \pm z)$ , i.e.,  $f^{\pm}(t; x_0, \theta_1) dt$  is the probability of the event  $\tau \in [t, t + dt)$  and  $x(\tau) = \pm z$ . Note that  $f$  defined in (6) is the sum of  $f^+$  and  $f^-$ .

(vi) The joint density  $g_{\text{ddln}}(x, t; x_0, \theta_1)$  of the evidence  $x(t)$  and the event  $\tau \geq t$  is

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\text{ddln}}(x, t; x_0, \theta_1) &= \frac{d}{dx} \mathbb{P}(x(t) \leq x \ \& \ \tau \geq t) = \frac{d}{dx} \mathbb{P}(x(t) \leq x \ \& \ \tau_1 \geq t) \\ &= \mathbf{1}(-z, z) \frac{e^{-\frac{a_1^2 t + 2a_1(x-x_0)}{2\sigma_1^2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi t \sigma_1^2}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left( e^{-\frac{(x-x_0+4nz)^2}{2\sigma_1^2 t}} - e^{-\frac{(2z-x-x_0+4nz)^2}{2\sigma_1^2 t}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{1}(-z, z)$  is the indicator function representing  $x \in (-z, z)$ .

The joint density  $g^{\text{ddln}}$  can also be used to determine the FPT distribution by integrating it over the range of  $x$ . More importantly, dividing  $g_{\text{ddln}}$  by  $\mathbb{P}(\tau \geq t)$  yields the conditional density of the evidence  $x(t)$  conditioned of no decision until time  $t$ . This is critical for the analysis of the MSDDM. In particular, we use a slight modification  $g_{\text{ddln}}$  at the  $i$ -th stage to determine the density of the initial condition  $X_i$  for the  $(i+1)$ -th stage.

Various derivations for the error rate, decision time, and FPT densities may be found in the decision making literature (Ratcliff and Smith, 2004; Bogacz et al., 2006; Navarro and Fuss, 2009). In the probability literature, the expressions for the error rate and the expected decision time may be derived using a differential equation approach (Gardiner, 2009) or a Martingale-based approach (Durrett, 2010). Under the latter, the FPT densities are found by first finding the Laplace transform, via constructing an appropriate Martingale (Durrett, 2010; Borodin and Salminen, 2002; Lin, 1998). Taking the inverse Laplace transforms yields the conditional FPT densities. Differentiating the Laplace transform with respect to  $\alpha$ , evaluating at  $\alpha = 0$ , and changing sign yields the conditional mean decision times. The final statement is derived by repeatedly applying the reflection principle, followed by Cameron-Martin formula (Douady, 1999; Durrett, 2010). Formulas for the Laplace transform are given in Appendix A.

It is worth noting that the infinite series solutions for the FPT given in (6) are equivalent to the small-time representations for the FPT analyzed in (Navarro and Fuss, 2009; Blurton et al., 2012). For completeness we also state the large-time representation that can be obtained by solving the Fokker-Planck equation (Feller, 1968):

$$f(t; x_0, \theta_1) = \frac{\pi \sigma_1^2}{4z^2} e^{-\frac{a_1^2 t}{2\sigma_1^2}} \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} (-1)^{n-1} n e^{-\frac{n^2 \pi^2 \sigma_1^2 t}{8z^2}} \left( e^{\frac{a_1(z-x_0)}{\sigma_1^2}} \sin\left(\frac{n\pi(z+x_0)}{2z}\right) + e^{-\frac{a_1(z+x_0)}{\sigma_1^2}} \sin\left(\frac{n\pi(z-x_0)}{2z}\right) \right).$$

The small-time and the large-time representation means that the associated series has nice convergence properties (e.g., monotonicity) for small and large values of decision times, respectively.

### 3.2. FPT properties of the $i$ -th stage DDM

In this section we analyze the  $i$ -th stage DDM. Recall from above that  $X_{i-1}$  is the random variable  $x(t_{i-1})$  conditioned on the event  $\tau > t_{i-1}$ , and that  $\tau_i$  is the FPT conditioned on the event  $\tau > t_{i-1}$ .

For that  $i$ -th DDM, the initial condition is  $X_{i-1}$  and only decisions made before the deadline  $t_i$  are relevant. For the analysis of such a system, the two key ingredients are the density of  $X_{i-1}$  and the density of the FPT  $\tau_i$ .

Conditioned on a realization of  $X_{i-1}$ , the density of  $X_i$  can be computed using (12). If the density of  $X_{i-1}$  is known, then the unconditional density of  $X_i$  can be obtained by computing the expected value of the conditional density with respect to  $X_{i-1}$ . Since the density of  $X_0$  is known, this procedure can be recursively applied to obtain densities of  $X_{i-1}$ , for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Formally, the joint density  $g_i^{\text{ddln}}(x; x_0, \theta_{1:i})$  of the evidence  $x(t_i)$  and the event  $\tau \geq t_i$  is

$$\begin{aligned} g_i^{\text{ddln}}(x; x_0, \theta_{1:i}) &= \frac{d}{dx} \mathbb{P}(x(t_i) \leq x \ \& \ \tau_i > t_i) = \frac{d}{dx} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[g(x, t_i - t_{i-1}; X_{i-1}, \theta_i)], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[\cdot]$  denotes the expected value with respect to  $X_{i-1}$ . The density of  $X_i$ , i.e.,  $x(t_i)$  conditioned on  $\tau_i > t_i$  is determined by dividing  $g_i^{\text{ddln}}$  by  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i)$  which can be computed by integrating  $g_i^{\text{ddln}}$  over the range of  $x(t_i)$ . Note that the parameters in  $g_i^{\text{ddln}}$  are  $x_0$  and  $\theta_{1:i}$ ; this highlights the fact that the distribution of  $X_i$  depends on all previous stages.

Similarly, the FPT density for the  $i$ -th stage DDM conditioned on a realization of  $X_{i-1}$  can be computed using (6), and the unconditional density can be obtained by computing the expected value of the conditional density with respect to  $X_{i-1}$ . Formally, the FPT density for  $i$ -th stage DDM  $f_i(t; x_0, \theta_{1:i})$  is

$$f_i(t; x_0, \theta_{1:i}) = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t) = \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[f(t - t_{i-1}; X_{i-1}, \theta_i)], \quad (13)$$

where  $t > t_{i-1}$ . The cumulative distribution function  $F_i(t; x_0, \theta_{1:i}) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t)$  is obtained by integrating  $f_i(t; x_0, \theta_{1:i})$ . Note that every trajectory crossing the decision threshold before  $t \leq t_i$  does so irrespective of the deadline at  $t_i$ . Thus, the expression for density  $f_i$  does not depend on  $t_i$ .

We are now ready to establish performance metrics for the  $i$ -th DDM. The detailed derivations of the expressions presented in this section are contained in Appendix B.

- (i) The error rate during the  $i$ -th stage  $\text{ER}_i(x_0, \theta_{1:i})$ , i.e., the probability of an incorrect decision given that a response is made during the  $i$ -th stage,  $\mathbb{P}(x(\tau) = -z | t_{i-1} < \tau \leq t_i)$ , is

$$\text{ER}_i(x_0, \theta_{1:i}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[e^{-2s_i X_{i-1}}] - \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[e^{-2s_i X_i}] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) - e^{-2s_i z} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)}{(e^{2s_i z} - e^{-2s_i z}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)}, & \text{if } a_i > 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(\mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[X_{i-1}] - \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[X_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i))}{2z \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)}, & \text{if } a_i = 0. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

In the following we drop the arguments of  $\text{ER}_i(x_0, \theta_{1:i})$  and refer it by  $\text{ER}_i$ .

- (ii) The joint FPT density for the  $i$ -th stage DDM and a given response  $f_i^\pm(t; x_0, \theta_{1:i}) = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t \ \& \ x(\tau_i) = \pm z)$  is

$$f_i^+(t; x_0, \theta_{1:i}) = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t \ \& \ x(\tau_i) = z) = \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[f^+(t - t_{i-1}; X_{i-1}, \theta_i)] \quad (15)$$

$$f_i^-(t; x_0, \theta_{1:i}) = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t \ \& \ x(\tau_i) = -z) = \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[f^-(t - t_{i-1}; X_{i-1}, \theta_i)], \quad (16)$$

where the functions  $f^\pm(t; x_0, \theta_i)$  are taken from (9) and (10).

- (iii) The mean decision time given that a response is made during the  $i$ -th stage  $\text{mDT}_i(x_0, \theta_{1:i})$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mDT}_i(x_0, \theta_{1:i}) &= \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i] \\ &= \begin{cases} t_{i-1} + \frac{(1 - 2\text{ER}_i)z \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) - \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[X_{i-1}] + \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[X_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) - a_i(t_i - t_{i-1}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i)}{a_i \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)}, & \text{if } a_i > 0, \\ t_{i-1} + \frac{z^2 \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) - \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[X_{i-1}^2] + \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[X_i^2] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) - \sigma_i^2(t_i - t_{i-1}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i)}{\sigma_i^2 \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)}, & \text{if } a_i = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

- (iv) The expected decision time conditioned on a particular response made during the  $i$ -th stage is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i] &= \frac{\text{m}\hat{\text{DT}}_i^+(x_0, \theta_{1:i})}{(1 - \text{ER}_i) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(1 - \text{ER}_i) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)} \left( t_{i-1} \mathbb{P}(x(\tau_i) = z) + \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[\text{m}\hat{\text{DT}}^+(X_{i-1}, \theta_i)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[\text{m}\hat{\text{DT}}^+(X_i, \theta_i)] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) + t_i \mathbb{P}(x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i > t_i) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\tau_i | x(\tau_i) = -z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i] &= \frac{\text{m}\hat{\text{D}}\text{T}_i^-(x_0, \theta_{1:i})}{\text{ER}_i \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\text{ER}_i \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)} \left( t_{i-1} \mathbb{P}(x(\tau_i) = -z) + \mathbb{E}_{X_{i-1}}[\text{m}\hat{\text{D}}\text{T}^-(X_{i-1}, \theta_i)] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \mathbb{E}_{X_i}[\text{m}\hat{\text{D}}\text{T}^-(X_i, \theta_i)] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) + t_i \mathbb{P}(x(\tau_i) = -z \ \& \ \tau_i > t_i) \right), \quad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{m}\hat{\text{D}}\text{T}_i^\pm(x_0, \theta_{1:i}) = \mathbb{E}[\tau_i \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = \pm z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)]$ ,  $\text{m}\hat{\text{D}}\text{T}^\pm(X_{i-1}, \theta_i)$  is calculated using (7) and (8),  $\mathbb{P}(x(\tau_i) = \pm z)$  is calculated using (4), and  $\mathbb{P}(x(\tau_i) = \pm z \ \& \ \tau_i > t_i)$  is calculated using (18) and (19).

### 3.3. FPT properties of the MSDDM

We now use the FPT properties of the  $i$ -th DDM derived in §3.2 to derive FPT properties of the MSDDM. In particular, we view the MSDDM as a cascade of modified DDMs in which the initial condition is a random variable and only the decisions made before a deadline are considered. Given an initial condition of  $x_0$ , we sequentially compute all of the distributions of the initial conditions  $X_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  using (12). Then, we compute the properties of the FPT associated with the  $i$ -th stage DDM. Now, we use total probability formula to aggregate properties of these DDMs to compute FPT properties of the MSDDM.

We now describe the FPT properties of the MSDDM (2). The derivations of these expressions are contained in Appendix C.

- (i) For  $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$ , for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the FPT distribution for the MSDDM is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t) &= 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \leq t) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) \\
&= 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \leq t) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i), \quad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) = \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_{k-1})$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_k \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t | \tau > t_{k-1})$ .

- (ii) The expected decision time for the MSDDM is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\tau] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \text{mDT}_i(x_0, \theta_{1:i}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \right). \quad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the expected decision time is the weighted sum of the expected decision times for the DDMs at each stage and the weight is the probability of the decision in that stage.

- (iii) The error rate for the MSDDM is

$$\text{ER} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \text{ER}_i \mathbb{P}(\tau_i < t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \right). \quad (22)$$

Similar to the case of the expected decision time, the error rate is the weighted sum of the error rates during each stage.

(iv) The expected decision time conditioned on a particular decision is

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau|x(\tau) = z] = \frac{1}{1 - \text{ER}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbb{E}[\tau_i|x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i](1 - \text{ER}_i)\mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \right) \quad (23)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau|x(\tau) = -z] = \frac{1}{\text{ER}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbb{E}[\tau_i|x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i]\text{ER}_i\mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \right). \quad (24)$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_i|x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i]\text{ER}_i = \mathbb{E}[\tau_i \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = z)|\tau_i \leq t_i]$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) = \mathbb{P}(t_{i-1} < \tau \leq t_i)$ .

(v) for  $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$ , for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$ , the FPT distribution conditioned on a particular decision is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t|x(\tau) = z)(1 - \text{ER}) &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \leq t \ \& \ x(\tau_k) = z) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i \ \& \ x(\tau_i) = z) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t|x(\tau) = -z)\text{ER} &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \leq t \ \& \ x(\tau_k) = -z) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i \ \& \ x(\tau_i) = -z) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Note that  $\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) = \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_{i-1})$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i \ \& \ x(\tau_i) = z)\mathbb{P}(\tau > t_{i-1}) = \mathbb{P}(t_{i-1} < \tau \leq t_i \ \& \ x(\tau) = z)$ .

#### 4. Time-varying thresholds

For clarity of exposition, the argument leading to results in §3 assumes the same thresholds for each stage. Now suppose that the thresholds for the  $i$ -th stage DDM are  $\pm z_i$ . In the case of constant thresholds above,  $z_i = z > 0$ , for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

Suppose that  $z_{i+1}$  is smaller than  $z_i$ . Then the probability of instantaneous absorption into the top boundary at  $t_i$  is found by integrating (12) from  $z_{i+1}$  to  $z_i$ . Likewise, the probability of instantaneous absorption into the bottom boundary at  $t_i$  is determined by integrating (12) from  $-z_i$  to  $-z_{i+1}$ . The density of  $X_i$  is then found by truncating the support of the density in (12) to  $(-z_{i+1}, z_{i+1})$  and normalizing the truncated density. In the cases where  $z_{i+1} > z_i$ , there is no instantaneous absorption, and the density of  $X_i$  is found by extending of the density in (12), assigning zero density to the previously undefined support. In all cases, the new, updated  $X_i$  may be used for computations dealing with the  $i+1$ -th stage of the MSDDM.

#### 5. Time-varying Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes

In this section we study FPT properties of an O-U process with piecewise constant parameters. Similarly to the MSDDM, the  $n$ -stage O-U process is defined by

$$dx(t) = a(t)dt - \lambda(t)x(t)dt + \sigma(t)dW(t), \quad x(t_0) = x_0, \quad (27)$$



where

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= a_i, & \text{for } t_{i-1} \leq t < t_i, \\ \sigma(t) &= \sigma_i, & \text{for } t_{i-1} \leq t < t_i, \\ \lambda(t) &= \lambda_i, & \text{for } t_{i-1} \leq t < t_i, \end{aligned}$$

for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . The multistage O-U process is obtained from the multistage drift-diffusion process by adding a term  $-\lambda(t)x(t)dt$ , i.e., the O-U process is a leaky integrator, while the drift-diffusion process is a perfect integrator. In this section, we compute an approximation of the distribution for the FPT for the O-U process (27) defined by  $\tau = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid x(t) \in \{-z, z\}\}$ , where  $\pm z$  are predefined thresholds.

First, we show that a 1-stage O-U process can be written as a transformation of the Wiener process, and then use this transformation to write the FPT problem for the O-U process as a FPT problem for the Wiener process with time-varying thresholds. Finally, we approximate the time-varying thresholds with piecewise constant time-varying thresholds to compute the approximate FPT distribution of the O-U process and use it to recursively compute the FPT distribution of the multistage O-U process.

### 5.1. The O-U process as a transformation of the Wiener process

Consider the 1-stage O-U process

$$dx(t) = a_1 dt - \lambda_1 x(t) dt + \sigma_1 dW(t), \quad x(t_0) = x_0. \quad (28)$$

It is known (Cox and Miller, 1965) that the solution to (28) is

$$x(t) = \frac{a_1}{\lambda_1} (1 - e^{-\lambda_1 t}) + e^{-\lambda_1 t} x_0 + e^{-\lambda_1 t} W\left(\frac{\sigma_1^2 (e^{2\lambda_1 t} - 1)}{2\lambda_1}\right).$$

Define the transformed time  $u_1(t) := \frac{\sigma_1^2 (e^{2\lambda_1 t} - 1)}{2\lambda_1}$ . Equivalently,  $t = \frac{1}{2\lambda_1} \log(1 + \frac{2\lambda_1 u_1}{\sigma_1^2})$ . Thus,

$$x_0 + W(u_1(t)) = \left(x(t) - \frac{a_1}{\lambda_1}\right) e^{\lambda_1 t} + \frac{a_1}{\lambda_1} = \left(x(t) - \frac{a_1}{\lambda_1}\right) \sqrt{1 + \frac{2\lambda_1 u_1(t)}{\sigma_1^2}} + \frac{a_1}{\lambda_1}.$$

Therefore, if  $x(t) = \pm z$ , we have  $x_0 + W(u_1) = (\pm z - \frac{a_1}{\lambda_1}) \sqrt{1 + \frac{2\lambda_1 u_1}{\sigma_1^2}} + \frac{a_1}{\lambda_1} =: z_1^\pm(u_1)$ . Consequently, the FPT for  $x(t)$  with respect to thresholds  $\pm z$  is homeomorphic to the FPT of a Wiener process starting at  $x_0$  and evolving on a transformed time  $u_1$  with respect to time-varying thresholds  $z_1^\pm(u_1)$ . Since  $u_1$  is a monotonically increasing function, the FPT distribution  $\tau$  is readily obtained from  $u_1(\tau)$ , the FPT distribution of the Wiener process. Also, the error rates for the two processes are also the same.

The computation of FPT distribution for the Wiener process with time-varying thresholds is, in general, not analytically tractable. However, the time-varying thresholds can be approximated by piecewise constant time-varying thresholds and approximate FPT distributions can be computed using the MSDDM. While the thresholds  $z_1^\pm$  are asymmetric in this setting, unlike in the case described for the MSDDM, such a case can be easily handled by replacing the expression in (6) and (12) with corresponding expressions for asymmetric thresholds (see Douady (1999) and (Borodin and Salminen, 2002)).

### 5.2. Approximate computation of the FPT distribution of the multistage O-U process

The solution to the multistage O-U process (27) for  $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$  is

$$x(t) = \frac{a_i}{\lambda_i} (1 - e^{-\lambda_i (t-t_{i-1})}) + e^{-\lambda_i (t-t_{i-1})} x(t_{i-1}) + e^{-\lambda_i (t-t_{i-1})} W\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2 (e^{2\lambda_i (t-t_{i-1})} - 1)}{2\lambda_i}\right). \quad (29)$$

Let  $u_i(t) = \frac{\sigma_i^2(e^{2\lambda_i(t-t_{i-1})}-1)}{2\lambda_i}$ . Also, let  $\tau_i$  and  $X_{i-1}$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  be defined similarly to the MSDDM. Then, conditioned on a realization of  $X_{i-1}$ , the FPT problem of the  $i$ -th stage O-U process can be equivalently written as the FPT problem of the Wiener process  $X_{i-1} + W(u_i(t))$  with respect to thresholds

$$z_i^\pm(u_i(t)) = \left( \pm z - \frac{a_i}{\lambda_i} \right) \sqrt{1 + \frac{2\lambda_i u_i(t)}{\sigma_i^2}} + \frac{a_i}{\lambda_i}.$$

If the distribution of  $X_{i-1}$  is known, then analogous to the case of MSDDM, the distribution of  $\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i$  can be computed. However, in this case the distribution will be approximately computed using an MSDDM for the  $i$ -th stage O-U process. Furthermore, analogous to the MSDDM, the distribution of  $X_{i-1} + W(u_i(t_i))$  conditioned on  $\tau_i > t_i$  can also be computed, which in conjunction with (29) yields the distribution of  $X_i$ . Then, a recursive procedure akin to the MSDDM yields the approximate FPT distribution for the multistage O-U process.

## 6. Illustrative examples

Codes used to produce all figures may be found at <https://github.com/PrincetonUniversity/msddm>

### 6.1. Two stage DDM

Consider the MSDDM (2) with two stages, i.e.,  $n = 2$ . For such a two stage DDM, following expressions for the error rate and the expected decision time can be computed using Theorem ??:

$$\text{ER} = \text{ER}_1 \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t_1) + \text{ER}_2 \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 > t_1),$$

where

$$\text{ER}_1 = \frac{e^{-2s_1 x_0} - \mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_1 x_1(t_1)}] \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 > t_1) - e^{-2s_1 z} \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t_1)}{(e^{2k_1 z} - e^{-2s_1 z}) \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t_1)},$$

$$\text{ER}_2 = \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_2 X_1}] - e^{-2s_2 z}}{e^{2s_2 z} - e^{-2s_2 z}},$$

and


$$\mathbb{E}[\tau] = \frac{(1 - 2\text{ER}_1)z \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 \leq t_1) - x_0 + \mathbb{E}[X_1] \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 > t_1)}{a_1} + \frac{(1 - 2\text{ER}_2)z - \mathbb{E}[X(t_1)]}{a_2} \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 > t_1).$$

### 6.2. First passage times of a four stage process


To illustrate the output of the equations described above, we consider a four stage MSDDM. The drift rates and diffusion rates in each stage are  $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = (0.1, 0.2, 0.05, 0.3)$  and  $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4) = (1, 1.5, 1.25, 2)$ , respectively. Let the stage initiation times be  $(t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3) = (0, 1, 2, 3)$  and the initial condition be  $x_0 = -0.2$ . The FPT of the unconditional and conditional decision time for  $z = 2$  is shown in Figure 1(a) The error rate, expected overall decision times, and expected decision times conditional on which threshold was crossed are shown in Figure 1(b) as a function of threshold  $z$ .

### 6.3. First Passage Time Distribution for DDM with Alternating Drift

One potential application of these analyses is to describe situations in which evidence accumulation changes dynamically with the focus of attention. For instance, Krajbich and colleagues (2010) have shown that the process of weighing two value-based options (e.g., foods) can be modeled with a DDM in which drift rates vary during the decision the process based on the option being attended at any given moment. We consider such a case using a 30-stage DDM in which the drift rates 1 and  $-0.75$  alternate (i.e.,  $a_1 = 1$ ,  $a_2 = -0.75$ ,  $a_3 = 1$ , ...) to capture a situation in which the decision maker's attention alternates between two options, one of which has greater perceived value (higher drift rate) than the other. Let  $t_1 = 0$  and the remaining 29 stage initiation times be randomly and uniformly selected between  $(0, 10)$ . Assume  $x_0 = 0$ ,  $z = 2$ , and let the diffusion rate be stationary and equal to unity. The unconditional and conditional FPT distributions in this scenario are shown in Figure 2.



(a) Unconditional and Conditional First Passage Time Distribution



(b) Unconditional Mean Decision Time, Error Rate, and Conditional Mean Decision Time

Figure 1: Performance metrics for a four stage DDM with drift rates  $(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = (0.1, 0.2, 0.05, 0.3)$ , diffusion rates  $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4) = (1, 1.5, 1.25, 2)$ , stage initiation times  $(t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3) = (0, 1, 2, 3)$ , and initial condition  $x_0 = -0.2$ . The FPT distribution is computed for threshold  $z = 2$ .




Figure 2: Unconditional and conditional FPT distributions for a 30-stage DDM with alternating drift rate. The drift rates are  $(a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots) = (1, -0.75, 1, \dots)$ , diffusion rate at each stage is unity, the threshold  $z = 2$ , and stage initiation times are chosen randomly in the interval  $(0, 10)$ .

#### 6.4. First Passage Time Distribution for DDM with Gradually Time-varying Drift

These analyses can also be applied to situations in which changes in evidence accumulation occur gradually over time. For instance, White and colleagues (2011) proposed a "shrinking spotlight" model of the Eriksen Flanker Task, a task in which participants responding to the direction of a central arrow are influenced by the direction of arrows in the periphery (see also Servan-Schreiber et al. (1990); Liu et al. (2009); Servant et al. (2015)). According to these models, evidence accumulation is initially influenced by all of the arrows (central as well as flankers, which may drive an incorrect response) but as the attentional spotlight narrows the drift rate is gradually more influenced by the central arrow alone. We now consider such a situation, using a 20-stage DDM as an approximation to the DDM with time-varying drift rate. Assume that the diffusion rate is constant and equal to unity. Let  $x_0 = 0$ ,  $z = 2$ , and stage initiation times be uniformly selected in the interval  $[0, 5]$ . Let the drift rate in the  $i$ -th stage be  $-0.2 + 0.0263(i - 1)$ . The unconditional and conditional FPT distributions for such 20-stage DDM are shown in Figure 3.

#### 6.5. First Passage Time Distribution for DDM with Collapsing Thresholds

Analogously to the previous section, one might also be interested in modeling a decision process in which thresholds are dynamic rather than uniform across stages. This can be used to describe discrete changes in choice strategy, or a continuous change in thresholds over time (e.g., collapsing boundaries); the latter approach has been successful at describing behavior under conditions that either involve an explicit response deadline (e.g., Milosavljevic et al. (2010); Frazier and Yu (2008)) or where there is an implicit opportunity cost for longer time spent accumulating evidence (Drugowitsch et al., 2012). We model such a situation, using a 20-stage DDM as an approximation to the DDM with collapsing threshold. Assume that the drift rate diffusion rate are constant and equal to 0.15 and 1, respectively. Let  $x_0 = 0$ , and stage initiation times be uniformly selected in the interval  $[0, 5]$ . Let the threshold in the  $i$ -th stage be  $z_i = 3 - 0.1579(i - 1)$ . The unconditional and conditional FPT distributions for such 20-stage DDM are shown in Figure 4.




Figure 3: Unconditional and conditional FPT distributions for a 20-stage DDM with gradually increasing drift rate. The drift rate for the  $i$ -th stage is  $a_i = -0.2 + 0.0263(i - 1)$ , diffusion rate at each stage is unity, the threshold  $z = 2$ , and stage initiation times are chosen uniformly in the interval  $[0, 5]$ .




Figure 4: Unconditional and conditional FPT distributions for a 20-stage DDM with collapsing thresholds. The drift rate and diffusion rate at each stage are 0.15 and 1, respectively. The stage initiation times are chosen uniformly in the interval  $[0, 5]$ , and the threshold at  $i$ -th stage is  $z_i = 3 - 0.1579(i - 1)$ .

## 7. Closing discussion

We have analyzed in detail the FPT properties of the multistage drift diffusion model, which is a Wiener diffusion model with piecewise time-varying drift rate, noise parameter, and decision thresholds. Ratcliff (1980) studied the two stage version of the MSDDM with constant thresholds and gave a procedure for how to compute the FPT density. Here, we have extended this result to  $n$ -stages and time-varying thresholds, which required relaxing the assumption that the initial condition  $x_0$  is a point mass. Indeed, the initial condition of the  $i$ -th DDM is not a deterministic quantity but is a random variable. Furthermore, in contrast to integrating FPT density to obtain conditional and unconditional expected decision times and error rates, our Martingale based approach allows for direct computation of these quantities. The bulk of our contribution, however, is to show how the various other performance metrics such as the error rate during the  $i$ -th stage, evolve as the underlying dynamics change. Using these, one may compute a variety of behavioral performance metrics, without resorting to first computing the FPT densities. We also independently derived the FPT density for the MSDDM.

The calculations in §3 are relatively straightforward to implement, and code for doing so is available online<sup>1</sup>, along with code that reproduces the figures in this article. It is important to note, however, the other highly optimized software packages for computing FPT statistics for time-varying diffusion models. One of first such packages in this domain is that of Smith (2000), which solves an integral equation, and a code by Drugowitsch and Peugot is online<sup>2</sup>. Diederich and Busemeyer (2003) introduced a matrix based approach, similar to Markov chain Monte-Carlo methods, to efficiently implement and analyze performance metrics for a variety of extensions of the DDM. The matrix approach has been used to analyze multistage processes associated with multiattribute choice Diederich and Oswald (2014). Also relevant is (Voss and Voss, 2008), which develops an efficient numerical algorithm for estimating parameters of the time-varying diffusion model from reaction time data (i.e. first passage times). More recently, very fast codes for a broad class of diffusion models have been developed by Verdonck et al. (2015), with implementations on both CPUs and GPUs for considerable performance increases.

The primary intent of our contributions is twofold. First, our results suggest avenues for numerical work. Particularly relevant is the work of (Navarro and Fuss, 2009; Blurton et al., 2012; Gondan et al., 2014) who develop efficient numerical schemes for evaluating the relevant infinite sums involved in FPT calculations. Similar methods could be applied to results in §3.2 and §3.3 to develop efficient and accurate MSDDM codes, which could in turn contribute to the growing collection of numerical tools available for practitioners using diffusion models to study decision making. Second, these results may serve as a starting point for further analysis of more complicated stochastic decision models. As an important step in this direction, we have also shown how the equations for the MSDDM can be applied to Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, which can approximate leaky integration over the course of evidence accumulation (e.g., the Leaky Competing Accumulator model [LCA] Usher and McClelland (2001)). Given that the LCA itself can in certain cases approximate a reduced form of more complex and biologically plausible models of interactions across neuronal populations (e.g., Wang REF, Bogacz TiCS REF), our analyses offer an important step toward better understanding time-varying dynamics within and across neural networks, and how these might explain complex cognitive phenomena. More generally, we believe our analysis furthers the theory surrounding diffusion models with time-varying drift rates, and the tools and formulae introduced will contribute to the ongoing effort to develop and understand psychologically and neurally plausible models of decision making.

## 8. Acknowledgements

We thank Ryan Webb for the reference to Smith 2000 and associated code. This work was funded by the C.V. Starr Foundation (A.S.). V.S. and N.E.L. have been supported in part by ONR grants N00014-14-1-0635, ARO grant W911NF-14-1-0431 and NSF grant ECCS-1135724.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/PrincetonUniversity/msddm>

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/jdrugo/dm>

## 9. Bibliography

### References

- Blurton, S. P., Kesselmeier, M., Gondan, M., 2012. Fast and accurate calculations for cumulative first-passage time distributions in Wiener diffusion models. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 56 (6), 470–475.
- Bogacz, R., Brown, E., Moehlis, J., Holmes, P. J., Cohen, J. D., 2006. The physics of optimal decision making: A formal analysis of models of performance in two-alternative forced-choice tasks. *Psychological Review* 113 (4), 700–765.
- Borodin, A. N., Salminen, P., 2002. *Handbook of Brownian motion: Facts and Formulae*. Springer.
- Brunton, B. W., Botvinick, M. M., Brody, C. D., 2013. Rats and humans can optimally accumulate evidence for decision-making. *Science* 340 (6128), 95–98.
- Cox, D. R., Miller, H. D., 1965. *The Theory of Stochastic Processes*. Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Diederich, A., Busemeyer, J. R., 2003. Simple matrix methods for analyzing diffusion models of choice probability, choice response time, and simple response time. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 47 (3), 304 – 322.
- Diederich, A., Oswald, P., 2014. Sequential sampling model for multiattribute choice alternatives with random attention time and processing order. *Frontiers in human neuroscience* 8 (697), 1–13.
- Douady, R., 1999. Closed form formulas for exotic options and their lifetime distribution. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance* 2 (1), 17–42.
- Drugowitsch, J., Moreno-Bote, R., Churchland, A. K., Shadlen, M. N., Pouget, A., 2012. The cost of accumulating evidence in perceptual decision making. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 32 (11), 3612–3628.
- Durrett, R., 2010. *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press.
- Farkas, Z., Fulop, T., 2001. One-dimensional drift-diffusion between two absorbing boundaries: application to granular segregation. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 34 (15), 3191–3198.
- Feller, W., 1968. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*. Vol. 1. John Wiley & Sons.
- Feng, S., H. P. R. A. . N. W. T., 2009. Can monkeys choose optimally when faced with noisy stimuli and unequal rewards. *PLoS Computational Biology* 5 (2), e1000284.
- Frazier, P., Yu, A. J., 2008. Sequential hypothesis testing under stochastic deadlines. In: Platt, J., Koller, D., Singer, Y., Roweis, S. (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 20. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 465–472.
- Gardiner, C., 2009. *Stochastic Methods: A Handbook for the Natural and Social Sciences*, 4th Edition. Springer.
- Gold, J. I., Shadlen, M. N., 2001. Neural computations that underlie decisions about sensory stimuli. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 5 (1), 10–16.
- Gold, J. I., Shadlen, M. N., 2007. The neural basis of decision making. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 30 (1), 535–574.
- Gondan, M., Blurton, S. P., Kesselmeier, M., Jun. 2014. Even faster and even more accurate first-passage time densities and distributions for the Wiener diffusion model. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 60, 20–22.
- Horrocks, J., Thompson, M. E., 2004. Modeling event times with multiple outcomes using the Wiener process with drift. *Lifetime Data Analysis* 10 (1), 29–49.
- Hubner, R., Steinhauser, M., Lehle, C., 2010. A dual-stage two-phase model of selective attention. *Psychological Review* 117 (3), 759–784.
- Krajbich, I., Armel, C., Rangel, A., 2010. Visual fixations and the computation and comparison of value in simple choice. *Nature Neuroscience* 13 (10), 1292–1298.
- Lin, X. S., 1998. Double barrier hitting time distributions with applications to exotic options. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 23 (1), 45–58.
- Liu, S., Yu, A. J., Holmes, P., 2009. Dynamical analysis of bayesian inference models for the eriksen task. *Neural Computation* 21 (6), 1520–1553.
- Miloslavjevic, M., Malmaud, J., Huth, A., Koch, C., Rangel, A., 2010. The drift diffusion model can account for the accuracy and reaction time of value-based choices under high and low time pressure. *Judgment and Decision Making* 5 (6), 437–449.

- Navarro, D. J., Fuss, I. G., 2009. Fast and accurate calculations for first-passage times in Wiener diffusion models. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 53 (4), 222–230.
- Ratcliff, R., 1980. A note on modeling accumulation of information when the rate of accumulation changes over time. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 21 (2), 178–184.
- Ratcliff, R., McKoon, G., 2008. The diffusion decision model: Theory and data for two-choice decision tasks. *Neural Computation* 20 (4), 873 – 922.
- Ratcliff, R., Rouder, J. N., 1998. Modeling response times for two-choice decisions. *Psychological Science* 9 (5), 347–356.
- Ratcliff, R., Smith, P. L., 2004. A comparison of sequential sampling models for two-choice reaction time. *Psychological Review* 111 (2), 333–367.
- Servan-Schreiber, D., Printz, H., Cohen, J., 1990. A network model of catecholamine effects- gain, signal-to-noise ratio, and behavior. *Science* 249 (4971), 892–895.
- Servant, M., White, C., Montagnini, A., Burle, B., 2015. Using covert response activation to test latent assumptions of formal decision-making models in humans. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 35 (28), 10371–10385.
- Shadlen, M. N., Newsome, W. T., 2001. Neural basis of a perceptual decision in the parietal cortex (area lip) of the rhesus monkey. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 86 (4), 1916–1936.
- Simen, P., Contreras, D., Buck, C., Hu, P., Holmes, P., Cohen, J. D., 2009. Reward rate optimization in two-alternative decision making: Empirical tests of theoretical predictions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 35 (6), 1865.
- Smith, P. L., 2000. Stochastic dynamic models of response time and accuracy: A foundational primer. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 44 (3), 408 – 463.
- Usher, M., McClelland, J. L., 2001. The time course of perceptual choice: The leaky, competing accumulator model. *Psychological Review* 108 (3), 550.
- Verdonck, S., Meers, K., Tuerlinckx, F., Mar 2015. Efficient simulation of diffusion-based choice RT models on CPU and GPU. *Behavior Research Methods*.
- Voss, A., Voss, J., Feb 2008. A fast numerical algorithm for the estimation of diffusion model parameters. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 52 (1), 1 – 9.
- Wald, A., 1945. Sequential tests of statistical hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 16 (2), 117–186.
- Wald, A., Wolfowitz, J., 1948. Optimum character of the sequential probability ratio test. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 19 (3), 326–339.
- White, C. N., Ratcliff, R., Starns, J. J., 2011. Diffusion models of the flanker task: discrete versus gradual attentional selection. *Cognitive Psychology* 63 (4), 210–238.

## Appendix A. Laplace transforms for the pure DDM

The Laplace transform, or moment generating function, of the FPT density conditioned on response is given for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha\tau_1} | x(\tau_1) = z] = \frac{e^{\frac{\alpha_1(z-x_0)}{\sigma_1^2}} \sinh\left(\frac{(z+x_0)\sqrt{2\alpha\sigma_1^2+a_1^2}}{\sigma_1}\right)}{(1 - \text{ER}_1) \sinh\left(\frac{2z\sqrt{2\alpha\sigma_1^2+a_1^2}}{\sigma_1}\right)},$$

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha\tau_1} | x(\tau_1) = -z] = \frac{e^{-\frac{\alpha_1(z+x_0)}{\sigma_1^2}} \sinh\left(\frac{(z-x_0)\sqrt{2\alpha\sigma_1^2+a_1^2}}{\sigma_1}\right)}{\text{ER}_1 \sinh\left(\frac{2z\sqrt{2\alpha\sigma_1^2+a_1^2}}{\sigma_1}\right)}.$$

References for these expressions may be found in the main text.



## Appendix B. Derivation of expressions in §3.2

We first establish (14). First consider the case  $a_i > 0$ . Let  $\{\mathcal{F}_t^i\}_{t \geq t_{i-1}}$  be the filtration defined by the evolution of the MSDDM (2) until time  $t$  conditioned on  $\tau > t_{i-1}$ . For some  $s \in (t_{i-1}, t)$ , it can be shown that  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_i x(t)} | \mathcal{F}_s^i] = e^{-2s_i x(s)}$ . Thus,  $\{e^{-2s_i x(t)}\}_{t \geq t_{i-1}}$  is a Martingale. Furthermore,  $\hat{\tau}_i := \min\{\tau_i, t_i\}$  is a stopping time. Therefore, it follows from optional stopping theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_i X_{i-1}}] &= \mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_i x(\hat{\tau}_i)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_i x(\tau_i)} | \tau_i \leq t_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + \mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_i X_i}] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) \\ &= (e^{-2s_i z} (1 - \text{ER}_i) + e^{2kz} \text{ER}_i) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + \mathbb{E}[e^{-2s_i X_i}] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i). \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above equation for  $\text{ER}_i$ , we obtain the desired expression.

For  $a_i = 0$ , we note that  $\{x(t)\}_{t \geq t_i}$  is a Martingale. Therefore, applying the optional stopping theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_{i-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[x(\hat{\tau}_i)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[x(\tau_i) | \tau_i \leq t_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + \mathbb{E}[X_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) \\ &= (1 - 2\text{ER}_i) z \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + \mathbb{E}[X_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i). \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above equation for  $\text{ER}_i$ , we obtain the desired expression.

The formulas (15) and (16) immediately follow from applying expectation to (9) and (10), respectively.

To establish (17) for  $a_i > 0$ , we note that for the DDM (1),  $\{x(t) - a_i t\}_{t \geq t_i}$  is a Martingale. Therefore, applying the optional stopping theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_{i-1}] - a_i t_{i-1} &= \mathbb{E}[x(\hat{\tau}_i) - a_i \hat{\tau}_i] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[x(\tau_i) - a_i \tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + \mathbb{E}[(X_i - a_i t_i) | \tau_i > t_i] \\ &= (z(1 - \text{ER}_i) - z \text{ER}_i - a_i \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i]) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + (\mathbb{E}[X_i] - a_i t_i) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i). \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above equation for  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i]$  yields the desired expression. For  $a_i = 0$ , we note that  $\{x(t)^2 - \sigma_i^2 t\}_{t \geq t_{i-1}}$  is a Martingale. Therefore, applying the optional stopping theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] - \sigma_i^2 t_{i-1} &= \mathbb{E}[x(\hat{\tau}_i)^2 - \sigma_i^2 \hat{\tau}_i] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[x(\tau_i)^2 - \sigma_i^2 \tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + \mathbb{E}[X_i^2 - \sigma_i^2 t_i | \tau_i > t_i] \\ &= (z^2 - \sigma_i^2 \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i]) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) + (\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] - \sigma_i^2 t_i) \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i). \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above equation for  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i]$  yields the desired expression.

Next, we need to establish that the Laplace transform of the density for the FPT for a particular decision made before  $t_i$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = z | \tau_i \leq t_i)] &= \frac{e^{-\alpha t_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[T_+^{\text{mgf}}(a_i, \sigma_i, z, X_{i-1}, \alpha)] - e^{-\alpha t_i} \mathbb{E}[T_+^{\text{mgf}}(a_i, \sigma_i, z, X_i, \alpha)] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)}, \\ \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = -z | \tau_i \leq t_i)] &= \frac{e^{-\alpha t_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[T_-^{\text{mgf}}(a_i, \sigma_i, z, X_{i-1}, \alpha)] - e^{-\alpha t_i} \mathbb{E}[T_-^{\text{mgf}}(a_i, \sigma_i, z, X_i, \alpha)] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

To establish this, we consider the stochastic process  $e^{\lambda x(t) - \lambda a_i t - \lambda^2 \sigma_i^2 t / 2}$ . Since

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda x(t) - \lambda a_i t - \lambda^2 \sigma_i^2 t / 2} | \mathcal{F}_s^i] = e^{\lambda x(s) - \lambda a_i s - \lambda^2 \sigma_i^2 s / 2},$$

it follows that  $\{e^{\lambda x(t) - \lambda a_i t - \lambda^2 \sigma_i^2 t / 2}\}_{t \geq t_{i-1}}$  is a Martingale for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . We choose two particular values of  $\lambda$ :

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{-a_i - \sqrt{a_i^2 + 2\alpha\sigma_i^2}}{\sigma_i^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{-a_i + \sqrt{a_i^2 + 2\alpha\sigma_i^2}}{\sigma_i^2}.$$

Note that for  $\lambda \in \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ ,  $\lambda a_i t + \lambda^2 \sigma_i^2 t / 2 = \alpha$ . Therefore, stochastic processes  $\{e^{\lambda_1 x(t) - \alpha t}\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{e^{\lambda_2 x(t) - \alpha t}\}_{t \geq t_{i-1}}$  are Martingales. Now applying the optional stopping theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_1 X_{i-1} - \alpha t_{i-1}}] &= \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_1 x(\hat{\tau}) - \alpha \hat{\tau}}] = e^{\lambda_1 z} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)] \\ &\quad + e^{-\lambda_1 z} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = -z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)] + e^{-\alpha t_i} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_1 X_i}] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_2 X_{i-1} - \alpha t_{i-1}}] &= e^{\lambda_2 z} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)] \\ &\quad + e^{-\lambda_2 z} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = -z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)] + e^{-\alpha t_i} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_2 X_i}] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Equations (B.1) and (B.2) are two simultaneous equations in two unknowns  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = -z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)]$ . Solving for these unknowns, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)] = \frac{e^{-\alpha t_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_1 (X_{i-1} + z)} - e^{\lambda_2 (X_{i-1} + z)}] - e^{-\alpha t_i} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_1 (X_i + z)} - e^{\lambda_2 (X_i + z)}] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i)}{e^{2\lambda_1 z} - e^{2\lambda_2 z}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha \tau_i} \mathbf{1}(x(\tau_i) = -z \ \& \ \tau_i \leq t_i)] \\ = \frac{e^{-\alpha t_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda_1 (z - X_{i-1})} - e^{-\lambda_2 (z - X_{i-1})}] - e^{-\alpha t_i} \mathbb{E}[(e^{-\lambda_1 (z - X_i)} - e^{-\lambda_2 (z - X_i)})] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i)}{e^{-2\lambda_1 z} - e^{-2\lambda_2 z}}. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying these expressions, we obtain the desired expression.

Finally, (18) and (19) follow from differentiating the Laplace transform with respect to  $\alpha$ , flipping sign, and then evaluating at  $\alpha = 0$ .

### Appendix C. Performance metrics for the overall process

We start by establishing (20). Since  $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t) &= \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t \ \& \ \tau \leq t_{k-1}) + \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t \ \& \ \tau > t_{k-1}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t_{k-1}) + \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t | \tau > t_{k-1}) \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_{k-1}) \\ &= 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_i | \tau > t_{i-1}) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \leq t) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_i | \tau > t_{i-1}) \\ &= 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_k \leq t) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_i > t_i). \end{aligned}$$

We now establish (21). We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tau] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau \mathbf{1}(t_{i-1} < \tau \leq t_i)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau \mathbf{1}(\tau \leq t_i) | \tau > t_{i-1}] \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_{i-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbb{E}[\tau_i | \tau_i \leq t_i] \mathbb{P}(\tau_i \leq t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \right). \end{aligned}$$

To establish (22), we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{ER} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbb{P}(x(\tau) = -z \text{ and } t_{i-1} \leq \tau < t_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbb{P}(x(\tau) = -z \text{ and } \tau < t_i | \tau > t_{i-1}) \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_{i-1}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbf{ER}_i \mathbb{P}(\tau_i < t_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{P}(\tau_j > t_j) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (23) and (24) follow similarly to (21). Finally, Equations (25) and (26), follows similarly to (20).