

APPROXIMATION CONVERGENCE IN THE INVERSE FIRST-PASSAGE TIME PROBLEM

BY YOANN POTIRON¹,

¹*Faculty of Business and Commerce, Keio University, potiron@fbc.keio.ac.jp*

The inverse first-passage time problem determines a boundary such that the first-passage time of a Wiener process to this boundary has a given distribution. An approximation which is based on the starting value of the boundary to a smooth boundary by a piecewise linear boundary is given by equating the probability of the first-passage time to a linear boundary and the increment of the distribution on each interval. We propose a modification of that approximation which also approximates the starting value of the boundary. First, we show that the approximation is well-defined when assuming that the boundary is absolutely continuous. Second, we show that a subsequence of this new approximation uniformly converges to the boundary when the length of each interval of linear approximation goes to 0 asymptotically. The results are obtained using Arzelà-Ascoli theorem on any compact space on which we further assume that the boundary admits uniformly dominated derivative. As the starting value of the boundary is unknown, this makes the new approximation more suitable for applications. The results are also proved in the first-passage time problem of a reflected Wiener process.

1. Introduction. The first-passage time (FPT) problem in statistics can at least be traced back to the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic for which the stochastic process is equal to the difference between the true and empirical cumulative distribution function (cdf). Explicit solutions of the distribution are only found for the linear boundary (see [Doob \(1949\)](#) (Equation (4.2), p. 397) or [Malmquist \(1954\)](#) (p. 526)), the upper and lower linear boundary (see [Anderson \(1960\)](#) (Theorem 5.1, p. 191)), the Daniels boundary (see [Daniels \(1969\)](#)), a general boundary setup but which depends on asymptotic conditional expectations (see [Durbin \(1985\)](#)), the one-sided square root boundary (see [Novikov \(1971\)](#)), the quadratic boundary (see [Salminen \(1988\)](#)), the piecewise-linear boundary (see [Wang and Pötzelberger \(1997\)](#)) and the piecewise-specific boundary ([Novikov, Frishling and Kordzakhia \(1999\)](#)) where "specific" can refer to any of the aforementioned cases. [Mehr and McFadden \(1965\)](#) consider a Gauss-Markov stochastic process. [Lai \(1974\)](#), [Lai and Siegmund \(1977\)](#), [Lai and Siegmund \(1979\)](#), [Gut \(1974\)](#), [Woodroffe \(1976\)](#) and [Woodroffe \(1977\)](#) consider the case when the stochastic process is a discrete-time sum of i.i.d. variables. [Siegmund \(1986\)](#) develops tools to calculate FPT cdf when the stochastic process is a Wiener process and discusses applications in sequential analysis. [Matthews, Farewell and Pyke \(1985\)](#) show

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62M86; secondary 60J65, 60G40.

Keywords and phrases: Inverse first-passage time problem, boundary approximation, piecewise linear boundary, subsequence convergence, Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, Wiener process.

that tests based on maximal score statistics involve the solution to a FPT problem of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. In survival analysis, [Butler and Huzurbazar \(1997\)](#) present a Bayesian approach when the stochastic process is a semi-Markov process. In econometrics, [Abbring \(2012\)](#) and [Renault, Van der Heijden and Werker \(2014\)](#) study mixed FPT where the stochastic process is respectively a spectrally negative Levy process and the sum of a Wiener process and a positive linear trend.

The inverse first-passage problem determines the boundary function such that the first-passage time of a standard Wiener process to this boundary has a given distribution. Almost 50 years ago, A. Shiryaev, during a Banach center meeting in 1976, asked if one can determine a continuous boundary with exponential distribution, which is commonly referred as the inverse Shiryaev problem. [Dudley and Gutmann \(1977\)](#) show the existence of a stopping time with respect to a general stochastic process, but this stopping time is not a FPT. The existence of lower semi-continuous solutions was established in [Anulova \(1981\)](#) for the FPT of a reflected Wiener process by compactness arguments in a discrete approximation of the boundary and the distribution. When the distribution is non-atomic, [Cheng et al. \(2006\)](#) and [Chen et al. \(2011\)](#) show the existence and uniqueness of the inverse first-passage problem for diffusions by a transfer into a free boundary problem. For a general distribution, [Ekström and Janson \(2016\)](#) show the existence and uniqueness for Wiener processes by discretizing an optimal stopping problem. [Beiglböck et al. \(2018\)](#) consider a more general optimal stopping problem which yields existence and uniqueness as a by-product. [Chen, Chadam and Saunders \(2022\)](#) study higher-order regularity properties of the solution of the inverse first-passage problem. The uniqueness for reflected Wiener processes is shown by a discrete approximation argument along with stochastic ordering in [Klump and Kolb \(2023\)](#). The existence and the uniqueness for Levy processes and diffusions are studied in [Klump and Savov \(2023\)](#). There are other related papers. The problem was reformulated as a nonlinear Volterra integral equation in [Peskir \(2002a\)](#). [Peskir \(2002b\)](#) study the behavior in the neighborhood of 0. [Abundo \(2006\)](#) consider extensions to the general diffusion process case.

As explicit solutions are only found in a few cases, the literature related to the inverse first-passage problem relies heavily on approximation as in [Zucca and Sacerdote \(2009\)](#) and [Song and Zipkin \(2011\)](#). Based on [Wang and Pötzelberger \(1997\)](#), an approximation to a continuous boundary by a piecewise linear boundary is given by equating the probability of the FPT to a linear boundary and the increment of the cdf on each interval in [Zucca and Sacerdote \(2009\)](#). That approximation is based on the starting value of the boundary, which has to be guessed in practice since it is unknown. Assuming that the FPT cdf is absolutely continuous and the boundary is concave or convex, they prove that the error due to the approximation does not explode but that it is dominated by the initial error. We propose a modification of that approximation which also approximates the starting value of the boundary, which makes it more suitable for applications. First, we show that the new approximation is well-defined when the boundary is absolutely continuous. This is a rigorous result of Remark 3.2 in [Zucca and Sacerdote \(2009\)](#) which also shows that the starting value of the new approximation is well-defined. Also, we have more explicit assumptions than the cited paper

who assumes that all regularity assumptions ensuring the existence of the objects introduced and properties imposed are fulfilled. Second, we show that a subsequence of this new approximation uniformly converges to the boundary when the length of each interval of linear approximation goes to 0 asymptotically. The results are obtained using Arzelà-Ascoli theorem on any compact space on which we assume that the boundary is absolutely continuous with uniformly dominated derivative. The use of an asymptotic when the length of each interval of linear approximation goes to 0 and the convergence result are new to the literature on inverse FPT problem and important as they indicate that this new approximation can be relatively safely used to approximate the unknown boundary when choosing a small length in practice. The results are also proved in the FPT problem of a reflected Wiener process, which are also new.

2. Setting and main results. We consider the complete stochastic basis $\mathcal{B} = (\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F})$, where \mathcal{F} is a σ -field and $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$ is a filtration. For $t_0 \geq 0$, $A \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $t_0 \in A$, we define the set of continuous functions with non-negative starting values at time t_0 as $\mathcal{C}_{t_0}^+(A, B) = \{h : A \rightarrow B \text{ s.t. } h \text{ is continuous and } h(t_0) \geq 0\}$. We first give the definition of the set of boundary functions. Since the approximation by a piecewise linear boundary given in [Wang and Pötzelberger \(1997\)](#) requires continuity of the boundary, we restrict ourselves to the continuous boundary case.

DEFINITION 2.1. We define the set of boundary functions started at time $t_0 \geq 0$ as $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{C}_{t_0}^+(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R})$.

DEFINITION 2.2. We define the FPT of an \mathbf{F} -adapted continuous process $(Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$ started at time $t_0 \geq 0$ to a boundary $g \in \mathcal{G}$ as

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{T}_g^Z = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ s.t. } Z_t - Z_{t_0} \geq g(t_0 + t)\}.$$

We define an \mathbf{F} -standard Wiener process as $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$. We will consider the two cases in the following of this paper:

1. (Wiener process) $Z_t = W_t$
2. (reflected Wiener process) $Z_t = |W_t|$

Since the stochastic process Z is continuous and \mathbf{F} -adapted and the set generated by the points above the boundary is optional, the first-hitting time \mathbb{T}_g^Z is a \mathbf{F} -stopping time by Theorem I.1.27 (p. 7) in [Jacod and Shiryaev \(2003\)](#). We define the cdf of Z as

$$(2.2) \quad P_g^Z(t) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_g^Z \leq t) \text{ for any } t \geq 0.$$

The basic assumption for the approximation by a piecewise linear boundary given in [Zucca and Sacerdote \(2009\)](#) is that P_g^Z is absolutely continuous. Accordingly, the authors assume that all regularity assumptions ensuring the existence of the objects introduced and properties imposed are fulfilled. When g is continuous, we know by Theorem 8.1 in [Ekström and Janson \(2016\)](#) that P_g^Z is continuous. When g is continuous with continuous

derivative, we know by Lemma 3.3 in [Strassen \(1967\)](#) that P_g^Z is continuous with continuous derivative. In fact, we can show that when g is absolutely continuous, then P_g^Z is absolutely continuous.

ASSUMPTION A. We assume that g is absolutely continuous on $[t_0, \infty)$ and that $\liminf_{t \rightarrow t_0, t > t_0} g'(t) > 0$ if $g(t_0) = 0$.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *We assume that **Assumption A** holds. Then, P_g^Z is absolutely continuous on \mathbb{R}^+ .*

Since $P_g^Z(t)$ is absolutely continuous, there exists a pdf $f_g^Z : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, defined as

$$(2.3) \quad f_g^Z(t) = \frac{dP_g^Z(t)}{dt} \text{ for any } t \geq 0.$$

By [Proposition 2.1](#) along with **Assumption A**, there is no loss of generality in restricting ourselves to the absolute continuous cdf case.

DEFINITION 2.3. A function $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a survival cdf if F is nondecreasing, absolutely continuous, i.e., with pdf $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, defined as

$$(2.4) \quad f(t) = \frac{dF(t)}{dt} \text{ for any } t \geq 0,$$

and satisfies $F(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t) = 1$.

The inverse first-passage time problem determines a boundary $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad f_g^Z(t) = f(t) \text{ for any } t \geq 0.$$

As explicit solutions are only found in a few cases, the literature related to the inverse first-passage problem relies heavily on approximations. Based on [Wang and Pötzelberger \(1997\)](#) idea, an approximation to a continuous boundary by a piecewise linear boundary is given in [Zucca and Sacerdote \(2009\)](#). More specifically, they consider a time discretization $t_m = t_0 + m\Delta$, where $t_0 \geq 0$ is the starting time, $\Delta > 0$ is the length of each interval of linear approximation and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. That approximation is based on the starting value of the boundary, i.e., $g(0)$. Since $g(0)$ is unknown, it has to be guessed in practice. The driving idea of their algorithmic approximation is to determine recursively the slope α_m of the linear increment approximation on $[t_m, t_{m+1}]$ by equating the probability of the FPT of W to the approximation and the increment of the survival cdf, i.e., $\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} f(s)ds$. Although their approximation works for any fixed $\Delta > 0$, they do not propose any asymptotic result when $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. First, we propose a modification of that approximation which also approximates the starting value of the boundary, which makes it more suitable for applications. Second, we consider an asymptotics where the length of each interval of linear approximation goes to 0, i.e., $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. We define $t_f \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}_*^+$ as the final time where $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_*^+ = \mathbb{R}_*^+ \cup \infty$ and $t_0 < t_f$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, we consider a time discretization $t_m^n = t_0^n + m\Delta_n$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$ where $t_0^n = t_0$ and $\Delta_n = \frac{(t_f - t_0)\mathbf{1}_{\{t_f < \infty\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{t_f = \infty\}}}{2^n}$. We consider a discretization length in the

order $\frac{1}{2^n}$ so that we obtain that the time discretization is nested, i.e., for any t_m^n and any $l \geq m$ there exists a time t_k^l such that $t_m^n = t_k^l$. This is required in our proofs to prove that the limit of a subsequence obtained by Arzelà-Ascoli theorem satisfies Equation (2.5).

DEFINITION 2.4. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, we define the subset of piecewise linear boundary functions as

$$\mathcal{G}_{PL}^n = \left\{ g \in \mathcal{G} \text{ s.t. } g \text{ is linear on each interval } [t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n] \right\}.$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, we define the sequence of piecewise linear approximation of the boundary $g^n \in \mathcal{G}_{PL}^n$ recursively on m as

$$(2.6) \quad g^n(0) = \alpha_0^n,$$

$$(2.7) \quad g^n(u) = g^n(t_m^n) + \alpha_{m+1}^n (u - t_m^n) \text{ for any } u \in (t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n], m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f,$$

with $\alpha_0^n \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and $\alpha_m^n \in \mathbb{R}$ for $m \neq 0$ satisfying

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{\alpha_0^n}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) = \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s) ds,$$

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{g^n}^Z \in [m\Delta_n, (m+1)\Delta_n]) = \int_{m\Delta_n}^{(m+1)\Delta_n} f(s) ds \text{ for any } m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f.$$

Equations (2.6)-(2.7) and Equation (2.9) correspond exactly to Equations (3.1)-(3.2) in [Zucca and Sacerdote \(2009\)](#). The novelty in this paper is Equation (2.8) in which we determine the approximation of the starting value of the boundary, i.e., α_0^n , by equating the probability of the FPT of Z to a constant boundary equal to α_0^n and the increment of the survival cdf on the first interval. The next lemma gives a more explicit form to α_0^n since the only unknown value in Equation (2.11) is α_0^n . We define the probability of the FPT started at time t_0^n to a constant boundary equal to $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ on $[t_0^n, t_1^n]$ as $G_0^n : \mathbb{R}_*^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.10) \quad G_0^n(\alpha) = 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{-2(\alpha - x_1)\alpha}{\Delta_n}\right) \right) \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta_n}} dx_1.$$

LEMMA 2.1. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, Equation (2.8) can be reexpressed as

$$(2.11) \quad G_0^n(\alpha_0^n) - \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s) ds = 0.$$

In the next lemma, we give a more explicit form to α_1^n from Equation (2.9) based on the known value α_0^n . We define the probability of the FPT started at time t_0^n from α_0^n to a linear boundary with trend $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ on $[t_0^n, t_1^n]$ as $G_1^n : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad G_1^n(\alpha) = 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + \alpha\Delta_n} \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + \alpha\Delta_n - x_1)\alpha_0^n}{\Delta_n}\right) \right) \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta_n}} dx_1.$$

LEMMA 2.2. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $m = 1$, Equation (2.9) can be reexpressed as

$$(2.13) \quad G_1^n(\alpha_1^n) - \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s) ds = 0.$$

In the next lemma, we give a more explicit form to α_2^n from Equation (2.9) based on the known values α_1^n and α_0^n . We define the probability of the FPT started at time t_1^n from $g^n(t_1^n)$ to a linear boundary with trend $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ on $[t_1^n, t_2^n]$ as $G_2^n : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.14) \quad G_2^n(\alpha) = 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n} \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + (\alpha_1^n + \alpha) \Delta_n} \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + (\alpha_1^n + \alpha) \Delta_n - x_2)(\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n - x_1)}{\Delta_n} \right) \right) \frac{\exp(-\frac{(x_2 - x_1)^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} \\ \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n - x_1) \alpha_0^n}{\Delta_n} \right) \right) \frac{\exp(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} dx_1 dx_2.$$

LEMMA 2.3. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $m = 2$, Equation (2.9) can be reexpressed as

$$G_2^n(\alpha_2^n) - \int_0^{2\Delta_n} f(s) ds = 0.$$

In the lemma that follows, we give a more explicit form to α_m^n from Equation (2.9) in the case $m > 2$ based on known values $(\alpha_k^n)_{k=0, \dots, m-1}$. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m > 2$ and $t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f$, we define $x_0 = 0$ and the probability of the FPT started at time t_{m-1}^n from $g^n(t_{m-1}^n)$ to a linear boundary with trend $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ on $[t_{m-1}^n, t_m^n]$ as $G_m^n : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.15) \quad G_m^n(\alpha) = 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n} \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + (\alpha_1^n + \alpha_2^n) \Delta_n} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + (\sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_k^n + \alpha) \Delta_n} \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + (\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^n + \alpha) \Delta_n - x_{m+1})(\alpha_0^n + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^n \Delta_n - x_m)}{\Delta_n} \right) \right) \\ \frac{\exp(-\frac{(x_{m+1} - x_m)^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} \prod_{k=0}^{m-1} \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i^n \Delta_n - x_{k+1})(\alpha_0^n + \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i^n \Delta_n - x_k)}{\Delta_n} \right) \right) \\ \frac{\exp(-\frac{(x_{k+1} - x_k)^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} dx_1 dx_2 \dots dx_{m+1}.$$

LEMMA 2.4. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m > 2$ and $t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f$, Equation (2.9) can be reexpressed as

$$(2.16) \quad G_m^n(\alpha_m^n) - \int_0^{m\Delta_n} f(s) ds = 0.$$

With the same arguments as in the proofs of Lemmas 2.1-2.2-2.3-2.4, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ we can define H_0^n as $H_0^n : \mathbb{R}_*^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and H_m^n as $H_m^n : \mathbb{R}_*^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$ which are defined in the same way as G_m^n for the reflected Wiener process. As the obtained equations are much longer than in the Wiener process case, we do not report them. Our next result establishes that the sequence α_m^n is well-defined. This is a rigorous result of Remark 3.2 in Zucca and Sacerdote (2009). This also includes that α_0^n is well-defined, which is not

treated in the cited paper. Moreover, we have more explicit assumptions than the cited paper who assumes that all regularity assumptions ensuring the existence of the objects introduced and properties imposed are fulfilled. The main idea of the proof is based on Equations (3.4)-(3.5) from the cited paper.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *We assume that **Assumption [A]** holds. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, Equation (2.8) defines a unique $\alpha_0^n \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and Equation (2.9) defines a unique $\alpha_m^n \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$.*

We give our main result in the next theorem. This shows that a subsequence of the approximation uniformly converges to the boundary when the length of each interval of linear approximation goes to 0 asymptotically. The results are obtained using Arzelà-Ascoli theorem on any compact space $[t_0, t_f]$, so we make the following assumption.

ASSUMPTION B. We assume that $t_f < \infty$.

Finally, we assume that the boundary has a uniformly dominated derivative on $[t_0, t_f]$. This allows us to show that the α_m^n are uniformly bounded, which in turn implies that the approximated boundary is uniformly bounded and uniformly equicontinuous.

ASSUMPTION C. We assume that $g'(t)$ exists and is uniformly dominated on $[t_0, t_f]$, i.e. that $\sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g'(t)| < \infty$.

THEOREM 2.5. *We assume that **Assumption [A]**, **Assumption [B]** and **Assumption [C]** hold. Then, there exists a subsequence g^{n_k} of g^n which converges uniformly to g on $[t_0, t_f]$, i.e., $\sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g^{n_k}(t) - g(t)| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

3. Proof that the approximation is well-defined. In this section, we prove that α_m^n is well-defined. We start with the proof of Proposition 2.1, which extends the arguments from the proof of Lemma 3.3 in Strassen (1967).

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.1. By **Assumption [A]**, we have that g is absolutely continuous on $[t_0, \infty)$. Thus g admits a derivative almost everywhere on $[t_0, \infty)$, i.e., there exists a Lebesgue-negligible set $\mathcal{N} \subset [t_0, \infty)$ such that g admits a derivative for any $t \in [t_0, \infty) - \mathcal{N}$. we define the set of linear transformation from \mathcal{N} as $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $t \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ if $t + t_0 \in \mathcal{N}$. Since \mathcal{N} is a Lebesgue-negligible set, we have by construction that $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ is a Lebesgue-negligible set. We show now that P_g^W is absolutely continuous on \mathbb{R}^+ . Since $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ is a Lebesgue-negligible set, it is sufficient to show that P_g^W admits a derivative for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^+ - \tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. It is then sufficient to show that P_g^W admits a derivative on any open interval (u, v) where $u \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfy $u < v$ and $(u, v) \cap \tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \emptyset$. We can show this statement by extending the arguments from the proof of Lemma 3.3 in Strassen (1967) along with the assumption that $\liminf_{t \rightarrow t_0, t > t_0} g'(t) > 0$ if $g(t_0) = 0$ by **Assumption [A]**. The reflected

Wiener process case follows since the FPT of a reflected Wiener process to a linear boundary is equal to the FPT of a Wiener process to a symmetric upper linear boundary and lower linear boundary when the boundary from the reflected Wiener process and the upper boundary are equal. \square

DEFINITION 3.1. We define the transition pdf of the stochastic process Z at time t constrained by the absorbing boundary g over $[s, t]$ given that $Z_s = y$ as $p_g^Z(t, x | s, y)$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad p_g^Z(t, x | s, y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mathbb{P}(Z_t < x, \Gamma_g^Z > t | Z_s = y)$$

with $x < g(t)$, $t > s \geq 0$ and $y < g(s)$ given and fixed.

In the following lemma, we give the pdf and the transition pdf for the FPT of a Wiener process to a linear boundary. This is a consequence to [Doob \(1949\)](#) (Equation (4.2), p. 397), [Malmquist \(1954\)](#) (p. 526) and [Durbin \(1971\)](#) (Lemma 1).

LEMMA 3.1. *We assume that*

$$g(t) = \alpha_1 t + \alpha_0 \text{ for any } t \geq 0,$$

where $t_0 \geq 0$, $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$, $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(t_0) > x_0$. We have that the pdf is equal to

$$(3.2) \quad f_g^W(t | t_0, x_0) = \frac{\alpha_0 - x_0}{\sqrt{2\pi}(t - t_0)^3} \exp\left(-\frac{(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1(t - t_0) - x_0)^2}{2(t - t_0)}\right).$$

The transition pdf is equal to

$$(3.3) \quad p_g^W(t_1, x_1 | t_0, x_0) = \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{-2(g(t_1) - x_1)(g(t_0) - x_0)}{t_1 - t_0}\right)\right) \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(x_1 - x_0)^2}{2(t_1 - t_0)}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}(t_1 - t_0)}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1. Equation (3.2) is obtained in [Doob \(1949\)](#) (Equation (4.2), p. 397) or [Malmquist \(1954\)](#) (p. 526). Equation (3.3) follows from [Durbin \(1971\)](#) (Lemma 1). \square

In the following lemma, we give the pdf and the transition pdf for the FPT of a Wiener process to a continuous piecewise linear boundary. Equation (3.5) is already available in [Wang and Pötzelberger \(1997\)](#) and [Zucca and Sacerdote \(2009\)](#) (Section 2.1.3, pp. 1323-1324)

LEMMA 3.2. *We assume that*

$$g(t) = \alpha_i t + \beta_i, \text{ for any } t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$$

with $t_i = i\Delta + t_0$, where $t_0 \geq 0$, $\Delta > 0$ and $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\alpha_{i+1} + \beta_{i+1}t_i = \alpha_i + \beta_i t_i$ so that the boundary is continuous. We can reexpress the transition pdf as

$$(3.4) \quad p_g^W(t_1, x_1, \dots, t_n, x_n | t_0, x_0) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_g^W(t_i, x_i | t_{i-1}, x_{i-1}),$$

with $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x_i \leq g(t_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $x_0 < g(t_0)$ where $t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$ are given and fixed. We can reexpress the transition pdf with an explicit expression as

$$(3.5) \quad p_g^W(t_1, x_1, \dots, t_n, x_n | t_0, x_0) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \exp\left(\left(\frac{-2(g(t_i) - x_i)(g(t_{i-1}) - x_{i-1})}{t_i - t_{i-1}}\right)\right)\right) \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(x_i - x_{i-1})^2}{2(t_i - t_{i-1})}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi(t_i - t_{i-1})}}.$$

We can deduce that

$$(3.6) \quad \mathbb{P}(W_{t_1} \in C_1, \dots, W_{t_n} \in C_n, \mathbb{T}_g^W > t_n | W_{t_0} = x_0) = \int_{C_1} \dots \int_{C_n} p_g^W(t_1, x_1, \dots, t_n, x_n | t_0, x_0) dx_1 \dots dx_n$$

for any Borel set $C_i \subset (-\infty, g(t_i)]$ with $i = 1, \dots, n$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.2. Equation (3.4) is obtained by Definition (3.1) and follows by induction with conditional probability formula. Then, Equation (3.5) can be deduced by plugging Equation (3.3) into Equation (3.4). Finally, Equation (3.6) is a direct consequence of Equation (3.5). \square

In the following lemma, we give the pdf for the FPT of a reflected Wiener process to a linear boundary. This is based on the explicit solution from Anderson (1960) (Theorem 5.1, p. 191) for the FPT to an upper linear boundary and a lower linear boundary. This is due to the fact that the FPT of a reflected Wiener process to a linear boundary is equal to the FPT of a Wiener process to a symmetric upper linear boundary and lower linear boundary when the boundary from the reflected Wiener process and the upper boundary are equal. Note that we could deduce the transition pdf and transition pdf for the piecewise linear boundary with the same arguments as for the proofs of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2.

LEMMA 3.3. *We assume that*

$$g(t) = \alpha_1 t + \alpha_0 \text{ for any } t \geq 0,$$

where $t_0 \geq 0$, $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$, $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(t_0) > x_0$. We have that the pdf is equal to

$$(3.7) \quad f_g^{|W|}(t_0 | t_0, x_0) = 0,$$

$$(3.8) \quad f_g^{|W|}(t | t_0, x_0) = \frac{2}{(t - t_0)^{3/2}} \phi\left(\frac{\alpha_1 t + \alpha_0 - x_0}{\sqrt{t - t_0}}\right) \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \left\{ (4r + 1)(\alpha_0 - x_0) e^{-(8r(r+1)(\alpha_0 - x_0)(\alpha_1 t + \alpha_0 - x_0)/t)} - (4r + 2)(\alpha_0 - x_0) e^{-(4(r+1)(2r+1)(\alpha_0 - x_0)(\alpha_1(t-t_0) + \alpha_0 - x_0)/(t-t_0))} \right\} \text{ for any } t > t_0,$$

where ϕ is defined as the standard Gaussian density function.

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.3. We first consider the FPT of a Wiener process to an upper linear boundary and a lower linear boundary. We first assume that the boundary is upper linear and lower linear, i.e., that

$$g(t) = (\gamma_2 + \delta_2 t, \gamma_1 + \delta_1 t),$$

where $\gamma_1 > 0$, $\gamma_2 < 0$, $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2$ and not $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$. By Anderson (1960) (Theorem 5.1, p. 191), we have that the FPT pdf is equal to

$$(3.9) \quad f_g^W(0) = 0,$$

$$(3.10) \quad f_g^W(t) = \frac{1}{t^{3/2}} \left[\phi\left(\frac{\delta_1 t + \gamma_1}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \left\{ ((2r+1)\gamma_1 - 2r\gamma_2) e^{-(2r/t)(r\gamma_1 - (r+1)\gamma_2)(\delta_1 t + \gamma_1 - (\delta_2 t + \gamma_2))} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - (2(r+1)\gamma_1 - 2r\gamma_2) e^{-(2(r+1)/t)((r+1)\gamma_1 - r\gamma_2)(\delta_1 t + \gamma_1 - (\delta_2 t + \gamma_2))} \right\} \right. \\ \left. + \phi\left(\frac{\delta_2 t + \gamma_2}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \left\{ (2r\gamma_1 - (2r+1)\gamma_2) e^{-(2(r+1)/t)((r+1)\gamma_1 - r\gamma_2)(\delta_1 t + \gamma_1 - (\delta_2 t + \gamma_2))} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - (2(r+1)\gamma_1 - 2r\gamma_2) e^{-(2r/t)(r\gamma_1 - (r+1)\gamma_2)(\delta_1 t + \gamma_1 - (\delta_2 t + \gamma_2))} \right\} \right]$$

for any $t > 0$. Now we assume that the boundaries are symmetric, i.e., that $g = (-\alpha_1 t - \alpha_0, \alpha_1 t + \alpha_0)$ where $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$. From Equations (3.9)-(3.10), we can deduce that

$$(3.11) \quad f_g^W(0) = 0,$$

$$(3.12) \quad f_g^W(t) = \frac{2}{t^{3/2}} \phi\left(\frac{\alpha_1 t + \alpha_0}{\sqrt{t}}\right) \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \left\{ (4r+1)\alpha_0 e^{-(8r(r+1)\alpha_0)(\alpha_1 t + \alpha_0)/t} \right. \\ \left. - (4r+2)\alpha_0 e^{-(4(r+1)(2r+1)\alpha_0)(\alpha_1 t + \alpha_0)/t} \right\} \text{ for any } t > 0.$$

From Equations (3.11)-(3.12) and since the FPT of a reflected Wiener to a linear boundary is equal to the FPT of a Wiener process to a symmetric upper linear boundary and lower linear boundary when the boundary from the reflected Wiener process and the upper boundary are equal, we can deduce Equations (3.7)-(3.8). □

The next lemma gives the transition pdf for a FPT of a Wiener process W at time t_{m+1}^n constrained by the absorbing boundary g^n over $[t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n]$ given that $W_{t_m} = x_m$.

LEMMA 3.4. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f$ we have

$$(3.13) \quad p_{g^n}^W(t_{m+1}^n, x_{m+1} | t_m^n, x_m) = \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{-2(g^n(t_{m+1}^n) - x_{m+1})(g^n(t_m^n) - x_m)}{\Delta_n}\right) \right) \\ \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(x_{m+1} - x_m)^2}{\Delta_n}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.4. Equation (3.13) can be obtained directly from Equation (3.3) in Lemma 3.1. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.1. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.14) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{\alpha_0^n}^W \in [0, \Delta_n]) &= \mathbb{P}((T_{\alpha_0^n}^W > \Delta_n)^C) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(T_{\alpha_0^n}^W > \Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}((W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, \alpha_0^n], T_{\alpha_0^n}^W > \Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n} p_{\alpha_0^n}^W(t_1^n, x_1 | t_0^n, 0) dx_1 \\
&= 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n} (1 - \exp(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n - x_1)\alpha_0^n}{\Delta_n})) \frac{\exp(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta_n}} dx_1
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $T_{\alpha_0^n}^W \geq 0$ a.s. by Definition 2.2 along with the completeness of the filtration \mathbf{F} in the first equality, elementary probability facts in the second equality, the fact that $T_{\alpha_0^n}^W \subset \{(W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, \alpha_0^n]\}$ in the third equality, Equation (3.6) from Lemma 3.2 in the fourth equality and Equation (3.13) from Lemma 3.4 in the fifth equality. Finally, we can deduce Equation (2.1) by plugging Equation (2.8) into Equation (3.14). \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.2. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.15) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{g^n}^W \in [0, \Delta_n]) &= \mathbb{P}((T_{g^n}^W > \Delta_n)^C) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(T_{g^n}^W > \Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}((W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_1^n)], T_{\alpha_0^n}^W > \Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} p_{g^n}^W(t_1^n, x_1 | t_0^n, 0) dx_1 \\
&= 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} (1 - \exp(\frac{-2(g^n(t_1^n) - x_1)g^n(t_0^n)}{\Delta_n})) \frac{\exp(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta_n}} dx_1 \\
&= 1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n} (1 - \exp(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n - x_1)\alpha_0^n}{\Delta_n})) \frac{\exp(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta_n}} dx_1
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $T_{g^n}^W \geq 0$ a.s. by Definition 2.2 along with the completeness of the filtration \mathbf{F} in the first equality, elementary probability facts in the second equality, the fact that $T_{g^n}^W \subset \{(W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_1^n)]\}$ in the third equality, Equation (3.6) from Lemma 3.2 in the fourth equality, Equation (3.13) from Lemma 3.4 in the fifth equality and Equations (2.6)-(2.7) in the sixth equality. Finally, we can deduce Equation (2.1) by plugging Equation (2.8) into Equation (3.15). \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.3. We have that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{g^n}^W \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]) = \mathbb{P}((T_{g^n}^W < \Delta_n, T_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n)^C)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < \Delta_n, \mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < \Delta_n) - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(0 \leq \mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < \Delta_n) - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n) \\
(3.16) \quad &= 1 - \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s)ds - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use elementary probability facts in the first and second equalities, the fact that $\{\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < \Delta_n\}$ and $\{\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n\}$ are disjoint events in the third equality, the fact that $\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W \geq 0$ a.s. by Definition 2.2 along with the completeness of the filtration \mathbf{F} in the fourth equality, Equation (2.8) in the fifth equality. Also, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.17) \quad &\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n) = \mathbb{P}((W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_1^n)], (W_{t_2^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_2^n)], \\
&\quad \mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_2^n)} p_{g^n}^W(t_1^n, x_1, t_2^n, x_2 | t_0^n, 0) dx_1 dx_2 \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_2^n)} p_{g^n}^W(t_2^n, x_2 | t_1^n, x_1) p_{g^n}^W(t_1^n, x_1 | t_0^n, 0) dx_1 dx_2 \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_2^n)} (1 \\
&\quad - \exp(\frac{-2(g^n(t_2^n) - x_2)(g^n(t_1^n) - x_1)}{\Delta_n})) \frac{\exp(-\frac{(x_2 - x_1)^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} \\
&\quad (1 - \exp(\frac{-2(g^n(t_1^n) - x_1)g^n(t_0^n)}{\Delta_n})) \frac{\exp(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} dx_1 dx_2 \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n} \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + (\alpha_1^n + \alpha_2^n) \Delta_n} (1 - \exp(\\
&\quad \frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + (\alpha_1^n + \alpha_2^n) \Delta_n - x_2)(\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n - x_1)}{\Delta_n})) \frac{\exp(-\frac{(x_2 - x_1)^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} \\
&\quad (1 - \exp(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n - x_1)\alpha_0^n}{\Delta_n})) \frac{\exp(-\frac{x_1^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi \Delta_n}} dx_1 dx_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that

$$\{\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > 2\Delta_n\} \subset \{(W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_1^n)], (W_{t_2^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_2^n))\}$$

in the first equality, Equation (3.6) in the second equality, Equation (3.4) in the third equality, Equation (3.13) from Lemma 3.4 in the fourth equality and Equations (2.6)-(2.7) in the fifth equality. Finally, we can deduce Equation (2.15) by plugging Equation (3.17) and Equation (2.9) into Equation (3.16). \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.4. We have that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{g^n}^W \in [m\Delta_n, (m+1)\Delta_n]) = \mathbb{P}((\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < m\Delta_n, \mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n)^C)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < m\Delta_n, \mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < m\Delta_n) - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}(0 \leq \mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < m\Delta_n) - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n) \\
(3.18) \quad &= 1 - \int_0^{m\Delta_n} f(s)ds - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use elementary probability facts in the first and second equalities, the fact that $\{\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W < m\Delta_n\}$ and $\{\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n\}$ are disjoint events in the third equality, the fact that $\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W \geq 0$ a.s. by Definition 2.2 along with the completeness of the filtration \mathbf{F} in the fourth equality, Equations (2.8)-(2.9) in the fifth equality. Also, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n) &= \mathbb{P}((W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_1^n)], (W_{t_2^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_2^n)], \dots, \\
&\quad (W_{t_{m+1}^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_{m+1}^n)], \mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_2^n)} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_{m+1}^n)} p_{g^n}^W(t_1^n, x_1, t_2^n, x_2, \dots, t_{m+1}^n, x_{m+1} \mid \\
&\quad t_0^n, 0) dx_1 dx_2 \dots dx_{m+1} \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_2^n)} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_{m+1}^n)} \prod_{k=0}^m p_{g^n}^W(t_{k+1}^n, x_{k+1} \mid t_k^n, x_k) \\
&\quad dx_1 dx_2 \dots dx_{m+1} \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_1^n)} \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_2^n)} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{g^n(t_{m+1}^n)} \prod_{k=0}^m (1 - \\
&\quad \exp(\frac{-2(g^n(t_{k+1}^n) - x_{k+1})(g^n(t_k^n) - x_k)}{\Delta_n})) \\
&\quad \frac{\exp(-\frac{(x_{k+1} - x_k)^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta_n}} dx_1 dx_2 \dots dx_{m+1}, \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + \alpha_1^n \Delta_n} \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + (\alpha_1^n + \alpha_2^n) \Delta_n} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_0^n + \sum_{k=1}^{m+1} \alpha_k^n \Delta_n} \prod_{k=0}^m (1 - \\
&\quad \exp(\frac{-2(\alpha_0^n + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i^n \Delta_n - x_{k+1})(\alpha_0^n + \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i^n \Delta_n - x_k)}{\Delta_n})) \\
&\quad \frac{\exp(-\frac{(x_{k+1} - x_k)^2}{\Delta_n})}{\sqrt{\pi\Delta_n}} dx_1 dx_2 \dots dx_{m+1},
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.19}$$

where we use the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^W > (m+1)\Delta_n\} &\subset \{(W_{t_1^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_1^n)], (W_{t_2^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_2^n)], \dots, \\
&\quad (W_{t_{m+1}^n} - W_{t_0^n}) \in (-\infty, g^n(t_{m+1}^n)]\},
\end{aligned}$$

in the first equality, Equation (3.6) in the second equality, Equation (3.4) in the third equality, Equation (3.13) from Lemma 3.4 in the fourth equality and Equations (2.6)-(2.7) in the fifth

equality. Finally, we can deduce Equation (2.16) by plugging Equation (3.19) and Equation (2.8) into Equation (3.18). \square

The next lemma will be useful in showing the existence and unicity of α_0^n , i.e., in the proof of Proposition 2.2. This basically states that the probability of the FPT started at time t_0^n to a constant boundary on $[t_0^n, t_1^n]$, i.e., G_0^n or H_0^n , is a strictly decreasing bijection from \mathbb{R}_*^+ to $(0, 1)$.

LEMMA 3.5. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ we have that G_0^n and H_0^n are continuous and strictly decreasing bijections from \mathbb{R}_*^+ to $(0, 1)$.*

PROOF. From Equation (2.10), we can see that G_0^n is continuous, and admits a derivative which is negative for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$. Thus we have that G_0^n is strictly decreasing. We also have that $G_0^n(\alpha) \rightarrow 1$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $G_0^n(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, thus G_0^n is continuous a bijection from \mathbb{R}_*^+ to $(0, 1)$. We can prove the case H_0^n with the same arguments. \square

The next lemma is the counterpart of Lemma 3.5 when considering G_m^n and H_m^n for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$.

LEMMA 3.6. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$ we have that G_m^n and H_m^n are continuous and strictly decreasing bijections from \mathbb{R} to $(0, \int_{m\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s)ds)$.*

PROOF. From Equations (2.12)-(2.14)-(2.15), we can see that G_m^n is continuous, and admits a derivative which is negative for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$. Thus we have that G_m^n is strictly decreasing. We also have that $G_m^n(\alpha) \rightarrow \int_{m\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s)ds$ as $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$ and $G_m^n(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, thus G_m^n is continuous a bijection \mathbb{R} to $(0, \int_{m\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s)ds)$. We can prove the case H_m^n with the same arguments. \square

The following lemma shows the almost everywhere positivity of f when we assume that **Assumption [A]** holds.

LEMMA 3.7. *We assume that **Assumption [A]** holds. Then, we have that f is positive on \mathbb{R}^+ almost everywhere.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.7. To prove Lemma 3.7, it is sufficient by Borel arguments to prove that

$$(3.20) \quad 0 < \int_{m\Delta_n}^{(m+1)\Delta_n} f(s)ds$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and by induction on $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$. We start with the $m = 0$ case, i.e.,

$$(3.21) \quad 0 < \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s)ds.$$

We define the maximum of the absolute boundary g on $[t_0, t_f]$ as

$$g_+ := \sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g(t)|.$$

By **Assumption [A]**, we have that g is continuous on $[t_0, t_f]$, and since it is a compact space it implies that $g_+ < \infty$. By Definition 2.2, we can deduce that $T_g^Z \leq T_{g_+}^Z$ a.s.. Thus, we can deduce that

$$(3.22) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_g^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]).$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) = G_0^n(g_+)$ or $\mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) = H_0^n(g_+)$, we obtain by Lemma 3.5 that $\mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) > 0$. Then, we can deduce Equation (3.21) since f is equal to the density of T_g^Z by Equation (2.2) and Equation (2.5). The $m > 0$ case follows since by **Assumption [A]**, we have that g admits a derivative almost everywhere which implies that $\mathbb{P}(T_g^Z \in [m\Delta_n, (m+1)\Delta_n]) > 0$. □

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.2. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, we prove Proposition 2.2 by induction on $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$. We start with the $m = 0$ case, i.e., we show that $\alpha_0^n \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ is well-defined. By Lemma 3.7 along with **Assumption [A]** we can deduce that

$$(3.23) \quad 0 < \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s) ds < 1.$$

From Expression (3.23) and Lemma 2.1, we can then deduce that

$$(3.24) \quad 0 < G_0^n(\alpha_0^n) < 1 \text{ and } 0 < H_0^n(\alpha_0^n) < 1.$$

Finally, an application of the intermediate value theorem together with Lemma 3.5 and Expression (3.24) provides the existence and uniqueness of $\alpha_0^n \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$. We consider now the $m > 0$ case, i.e., we show that $\alpha_m^n \in \mathbb{R}$ is well-defined. By Lemma 3.7 along with **Assumption [A]** we get

$$(3.25) \quad 0 < \int_{m\Delta_n}^{(m+1)\Delta_n} f(s) ds < \int_{m\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s) ds.$$

From Expression (3.25) and Lemmas 2.2-2.3-2.4, we can deduce that

$$(3.26) \quad 0 < G_m^n(\alpha_m^n) < \int_{m\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s) ds \text{ and } 0 < H_m^n(\alpha_m^n) < \int_{m\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s) ds.$$

To conclude, an application of the intermediate value theorem along with Lemma 3.6 and Equation (3.26) provides the existence and uniqueness of $\alpha_m^n \in \mathbb{R}$. □

4. Proof of approximation convergence. In this section, we show that a subsequence of the approximation uniformly converges to the boundary when the length of each interval of linear approximation goes to 0 asymptotically. The proof goes in two steps. First, we show that the approximation uniformly converges to some boundary $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}$ using Arzelà-Ascoli theorem on any compact space $[t_0, t_f]$. Second, we show that $\tilde{g}(t) = g(t)$ for any $t \in [t_0, t_f]$. In what follows, we give the definition of uniform boundedness and uniform equicontinuity, and the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem.

DEFINITION 4.1. The sequence $g^n \in \mathcal{G}_{PL}^n$ defined on the interval $[t_0, t_f]$ is uniformly bounded if there is a constant number $M > 0$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad \sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f], n \in \mathbb{N}^*} |g^n(t)| \leq M.$$

DEFINITION 4.2. The sequence $g^n \in \mathcal{G}_{PL}^n$ defined on the interval $[t_0, t_f]$ is uniformly equicontinuous if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad \sup_{t, s \in [t_0, t_f], |t-s| < \delta, n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \|g^n(t) - g^n(s)\| \leq \varepsilon.$$

THEOREM 4.3 (Arzelà-Ascoli theorem). *If the sequence $g^n \in \mathcal{G}_{PL}^n$ defined on the interval $[t_0, t_f]$ is uniformly bounded and uniformly equicontinuous, then there exists a subsequence which converges uniformly to some $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}$ defined on the interval $[t_0, t_f]$.*

In the following proposition, we show that if we assume that the α_m^n are uniformly bounded, then the sequence g^n is uniformly bounded and uniformly equicontinuous.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *We assume that Assumption [A] and Assumption [B] hold. If we also assume that the α_m^n are uniformly bounded, i.e.,*

$$(4.3) \quad \sup_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{N} \\ m=0, \dots, 2^n}} |\alpha_m^n| \leq K,$$

the sequence g^n is uniformly bounded and uniformly equicontinuous, i.e., it satisfies Equations (4.1)-(4.2).

PROOF. We start with the proof of Equation (4.1). By algebraic manipulation, we can rewrite Equations (2.6)-(2.7) as

$$(4.4) \quad g^n(u) = \alpha_0^n + \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i^n + \alpha_{m+1}^n (u - t_m^n), u \in (t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n], m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f.$$

We obtain that for $u \in (t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n], m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |g^n(u)| &\leq |\alpha_0^n| + \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^m |\alpha_i^n| + |\alpha_{m+1}^n| (u - t_m^n) \\ &\leq |\alpha_0^n| + \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} |\alpha_i^n| \\ &\leq |\alpha_0^n| + \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} |\alpha_i^n| \\ &\leq |\alpha_0^n| + (t_f - t_0) \sup_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{N} \\ i=1, \dots, 2^n}} |\alpha_i^n| \\ &\leq (1 + (t_f - t_0)) \sup_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{N} \\ i=0, \dots, 2^n}} |\alpha_i^n| \\ &\leq (1 + (t_f - t_0))K, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the triangular inequality in the first inequality, the fact that $u \in (t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n]$ in the second inequality, **Assumption [B]** in the third equality, the definition of Δ_n in the fourth equality and Equation (4.3) in the last inequality. We have thus shown that Equation (4.3) \implies Equation (4.1). We now prove Equation (4.2). We consider any arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. Accordingly, we set

$$(4.5) \quad \delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{2K}.$$

For any $t \in [t_0, t_f]$, we define the corresponding m_t^n such that $t \in [t_{m_t^n}^n, t_{m_t^n+1}^n]$. From Equation (4.4), we can deduce that

$$(4.6) \quad g^n(t) = \alpha_0^n + \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{m_t^n} \alpha_i^n + \alpha_{m_t^n+1}^n (t - t_{m_t^n}^n).$$

Thus, for any $t_0 \leq s \leq t \leq t_f$ such that

$$(4.7) \quad |t - s| < \delta.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} |g^n(t) - g^n(s)| &= \left| \alpha_0^n + \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{m_t^n} \alpha_i^n + \alpha_{m_t^n+1}^n (t - t_{m_t^n}^n) - (\alpha_0^n + \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{m_s^n} \alpha_i^n + \alpha_{m_s^n+1}^n (s - t_{m_s^n}^n)) \right| \\ &= \left| \Delta_n \sum_{i=m_s^n}^{m_t^n} \alpha_i^n + \alpha_{m_t^n+1}^n (t - t_{m_t^n}^n) - \alpha_{m_s^n+1}^n (s - t_{m_s^n}^n) \right| \\ &\leq |t - s| \sup_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{N} \\ i=0, \dots, 2^n}} |\alpha_i^n| \\ &\leq K |t - s|, \\ &\leq \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Equation (4.6) in the first equality, algebraic manipulation in the second equality and the first equality, Equation (4.3) in the second inequality, Equation (4.5) and Expression (4.7) in the last inequality. We have thus shown that Equation (4.3) \implies Equation (4.2). \square

In the following proposition, we show that if we assume that **Assumption [A]**, **Assumption [B]** and **Assumption [C]** hold, then we have that the α_m^n are uniformly bounded.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *We assume that **Assumption [A]**, **Assumption [B]** and **Assumption [C]** hold. Then, we have that the α_m^n are uniformly bounded, i.e., Equation (4.3) is satisfied.*

PROOF. We define the bound as

$$(4.8) \quad K = \sup(\sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g(t)|, \sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g'(t)|).$$

Since we have that t_f is finite by **Assumption [B]** and that g is continuous on the compact space $[t_0, t_f]$ by **Assumption [A]**, we can deduce that

$$\sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g(t)| < \infty.$$

We can also obtain by **Assumption [C]** that

$$\sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g'(t)| < \infty.$$

Thus, we can deduce that $K < \infty$. Moreover, K does not depend on n or m by definition. Then, to prove Proposition 4.2 it is sufficient to show that Equation (4.3) is satisfied with K defined in Equation (4.8). For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, we consider a proof by induction on $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t_m^n \leq t_f$. We start with the case $m = 0$, i.e., we show that $\alpha_0^n \leq K$. By Definition 2.2, we can deduce that $T_g^Z \leq T_{g_+}^Z$ a.s.. Thus, we can deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_g^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]).$$

By Equations (2.2)-(2.3), the above inequality can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \int_0^{\Delta_n} f_g^Z(s) ds.$$

By Equation (2.5), the above inequality can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s) ds.$$

By Equation (2.8), the above inequality can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{g_+}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_{\alpha_0^n}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]).$$

By Equation (2.10) and Lemma 2.1, the above inequality can be reexpressed as

$$G_0^n(g_+) \leq G_0^n(\alpha_0^n),$$

or $H_0^n(g_+) \leq H_0^n(\alpha_0^n)$. Since we have that G_0^n and H_0^n are continuous and strictly decreasing bijections from \mathbb{R}_*^+ to $(0, 1)$ by Lemma 3.5, we can deduce that $\alpha_0^n \leq g_+$ which implies $\alpha_0^n \leq K$. We consider now the case $m = 1$, i.e., we show that $|\alpha_1^n| \leq K$. We define the maximum of the absolute boundary derivative g' on $[t_0, t_f]$ as

$$g'_+ := \sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |g'(t)|.$$

For $t \geq t_0$, we define the linear boundary started at $g(t_0)$ with trend g'_+ and $-g'_+$ as respectively $\bar{g}(t) = g(t_0) + g'_+(t - t_0)$ and $\underline{g}(t) = g(t_0) - g'_+(t - t_0)$. By Definition 2.2, we can deduce that $T_{\underline{g}}^Z \leq T_g^Z \leq T_{\bar{g}}^Z$ a.s.. Thus, we can deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\bar{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_g^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]).$$

By Equations (2.2)-(2.3), the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\bar{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \int_0^{\Delta_n} f_{\bar{g}}^Z(s) ds \leq \mathbb{P}(T_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]).$$

By Equation (2.5), the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\bar{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \int_0^{\Delta_n} f(s) ds \leq \mathbb{P}(T_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]).$$

By Equation (2.9), the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [0, \Delta_n]).$$

By Equation (2.12) and Lemma 2.2, the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$G_1^n(g'_+) \leq G_1^n(\alpha_1^n) \leq G_1^n(-g'_+),$$

or $H_1^n(g'_+) \leq H_1^n(\alpha_1^n) \leq H_1^n(-g'_+)$. Since we have that G_1^n and H_1^n are continuous and strictly decreasing bijections from \mathbb{R} to $(0, \int_{\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s)ds)$ by Lemma 3.6, we can deduce that $|\alpha_1^n| \leq g'_+$ which implies $|\alpha_1^n| \leq K$. By Equation (2.12) and Lemma 2.2, the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$G_1^n(g'_+) \leq G_1^n(\alpha_1^n) \leq G_1^n(-g'_+),$$

or $H_1^n(g'_+) \leq H_1^n(\alpha_1^n) \leq H_1^n(-g'_+)$. Since we have that G_1^n and H_1^n are continuous and strictly decreasing bijections from \mathbb{R} to $(0, \int_{\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s)ds)$ by Lemma 3.6, we can deduce that $|\alpha_1^n| \leq g'_+$ which implies $|\alpha_1^n| \leq K$. We consider now the case $m = 2$, i.e., we show that $|\alpha_2^n| \leq K$. For $t \geq t_0$, we define the boundary which is equal to g on $[t_0^n, t_1^n]$ and linear with trend g'_+ and $-g'_+$ for $t \geq t_1^n$ as respectively

$$\bar{g}(t) = g(t) \text{ for any } t \in [t_0^n, t_1^n]$$

$$\bar{g}(t) = g(t_1^n) + g'_+(t - t_1^n) \text{ for any } t \geq t_1^n$$

and

$$\underline{g}(t) = g(t) \text{ for any } t \in [t_0^n, t_1^n]$$

$$\underline{g}(t) = g(t_1^n) - g'_+(t - t_1^n) \text{ for any } t \geq t_1^n.$$

By Definition 2.2, we can deduce that $\mathbb{T}_{\underline{g}}^Z \leq \mathbb{T}_g^Z \leq \mathbb{T}_{\bar{g}}^Z$ a.s.. Thus, we can deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\bar{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_g^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]).$$

By Equations (2.2)-(2.3), the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\bar{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]) \leq \int_{\Delta_n}^{2\Delta_n} f_g^Z(s)ds \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]).$$

By Equation (2.5), the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\bar{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]) \leq \int_{\Delta_n}^{2\Delta_n} f(s)ds \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]).$$

By Equation (2.9), the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\bar{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{g^n}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T}_{\underline{g}}^Z \in [\Delta_n, 2\Delta_n]).$$

By Equation (2.14) and Lemma 2.3, the above inequalities can be reexpressed as

$$G_2^n(g'_+) \leq G_2^n(\alpha_2^n) \leq G_2^n(-g'_+),$$

or $H_2^n(g'_+) \leq H_2^n(\alpha_2^n) \leq H_2^n(-g'_+)$. Since we have that G_2^n and H_2^n are continuous and strictly decreasing bijections from \mathbb{R} to $(0, \int_{2\Delta_n}^{+\infty} f(s)ds)$ by Lemma 3.6, we can deduce that $|\alpha_2^n| \leq g'_+$ which implies $|\alpha_2^n| \leq K$. The case with $m > 2$ follows with the same arguments. \square

The following corollary is an application of Arzelà-Ascoli theorem.

COROLLARY 4.1. *We assume that **Assumption [A]**, **Assumption [B]** and **Assumption [C]** hold. Then, there exists a subsequence g^{n_k} of g^n which converges uniformly to some $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}$ defined on the interval $[t_0, t_f]$.*

PROOF. This is an application of Theorem 4.3 (Arzelà-Ascoli theorem) along with Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.2. \square

The following lemma gives a.s. convergence of $T_{h^n}^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_{h^n}^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}}$ to $T_h^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_h^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}}$ when h^n converges uniformly to h on $[t_0, t_f]$. For the proof of convergence, we only require the convergence in distribution.

LEMMA 4.1. *For any sequence $h^n \in \mathcal{G}^n$ which converges uniformly on $[t_0, t_f]$ to some $h \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying **Assumption A**, we have that $T_{h^n}^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_{h^n}^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}}$ converges a.s. to $T_h^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_h^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}}$. As a by-product, we deduce that $T_{h^n}^Z$ converges in distribution to T_h^Z on $[t_0, t_f]$.*

PROOF. To prove that $T_{h^n}^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_{h^n}^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}}$ converges a.s. to $T_h^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_h^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}}$, it is sufficient to show that for any arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $N_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ with $n \geq N_\epsilon$ we have a.s.

$$(4.9) \quad \left| T_{h^n}^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_{h^n}^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}} - T_h^Z \mathbf{1}_{\{T_h^Z \leq t_f - t_0\}} \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

As h^n converges uniformly to h on $[t_0, t_f]$, we have that for any $\epsilon_h > 0$, there exists $N_{\epsilon_h} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$ with $n \geq N_{\epsilon_h}$ we have

$$(4.10) \quad \sup_{t \in [t_0, t_f]} |h^n(t) - h(t)| \leq \epsilon_h.$$

We set the value of ϵ_h as

$$(4.11) \quad \epsilon_h = \frac{1}{2} \sup_{T_h^Z - \epsilon \leq t \leq T_h^Z + \epsilon \leq t_f - t_0} |Z_t - h(t)|.$$

First, we can see that ϵ_h defined in Equation (4.11) is positive. Second, we have that a.s. Z_t first hits h^n on $[T_h^Z - \epsilon, T_h^Z + \epsilon]$, i.e., we have shown that $T_{h^n}^Z \in [T_h^Z - \epsilon, T_h^Z + \epsilon]$ whenever Equation (4.10) holds with ϵ_h from Equation (4.11). Thus, we have shown Equation (4.9) with $N_\epsilon = N_{\epsilon_h}$. \square

We consider a discretization length in the order $\frac{1}{2^n}$ so that we obtain that the time discretization is nested, i.e., for any t_m^n and any $l \geq m$ there exists a time t_k^l such that $t_m^n = t_k^l$. This is required to prove the following lemma which in turn will be used to prove that the limit of a subsequence obtained by Arzelà-Ascoli theorem satisfies Equation (2.5).

LEMMA 4.2. *We assume that **Assumption [A]** holds. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, any $l \in \mathbb{N}_*$ with $l \geq n$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f$, the approximated boundary satisfies*

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{P}(T_{g^l}^Z \in [t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n]) = \int_{t_m^n}^{t_{m+1}^n} f(s) ds.$$

PROOF. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, any $l \in \mathbb{N}_*$ with $l \geq n$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $t_{m+1}^n \leq t_f$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{T}_{g^l}^Z \in [t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n]\right) &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } t_m^n \leq t_i^l \leq t_{i+1}^l \leq t_{m+1}^n} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{T}_{g^l}^Z \in [t_i^l, t_{i+1}^l]\right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } t_m^n \leq t_i^l \leq t_{i+1}^l \leq t_{m+1}^n} \int_{t_i^l}^{t_{i+1}^l} f(s) ds \\ &= \int_{t_m^n}^{t_{m+1}^n} f(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $[t_m^n, t_{m+1}^n] = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } t_m^n \leq t_i^l \leq t_{i+1}^l \leq t_{m+1}^n} [t_i^l, t_{i+1}^l]$ since the time discretization is nested in the first equality, and Equations (2.8)-(2.9) in the second equality. \square

We provide in what follows the proof of the main result of our paper, which shows that a subsequence of the new approximation uniformly converges to the boundary when the length of each interval of linear approximation goes to 0 asymptotically. This proof is based on application of previously obtained results and shows that $\tilde{g}(t) = g(t)$ for any $t \in [t_0, t_f]$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5. By Corollary 4.1 along with **Assumption [A]-Assumption [B]-Assumption [C]**, there exists a subsequence g^{n_k} of g^n which converges uniformly to some $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}$ defined on the interval $[t_0, t_f]$. We first show that the density of $f_{\tilde{g}}^Z(t) = f(t)$ for any $t \in [0, t_f - t_0]$. By Borel arguments, it is sufficient to show that for any $p \in \mathbb{N}_*$ and $k = 0, \dots, 2^p - 1$ we have

$$(4.13) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{g}}^Z \in [k\Delta_p, (k+1)\Delta_p]\right) = \int_{k\Delta_p}^{(k+1)\Delta_p} f(s) ds.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{g}}^Z \in [k\Delta_p, (k+1)\Delta_p]\right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{T}_{g^{n_k}}^Z \in [k\Delta_p, (k+1)\Delta_p]\right) \\ &= \int_{k\Delta_p}^{(k+1)\Delta_p} f(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality corresponds to the convergence in distribution of $\mathbb{T}_{g^{n_k}}^Z$ to $\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{g}}^Z$ by Lemma 4.1 along with **Assumption [A]**, and we use Lemma 4.2 in the second equality. Thus, we have shown Equation (4.13), which implies that $f_{\tilde{g}}^Z(t) = f(t)$ for any $t \in [0, t_f - t_0]$. Since there is uniqueness of the inverse first-passage problem by the papers mentioned in the introduction, we can deduce that $\tilde{g}(t) = g(t)$ for any $t \in [t_0, t_f]$. \square

Funding. The author was supported in part by Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) 23H00807 and Early-Career Scientists 20K13470.

REFERENCES

- ABBRING, J. H. (2012). Mixed Hitting-Time Models. *Econometrica* **80** 783–819.
- ABUNDO, M. (2006). Limit at zero of the first-passage time density and the inverse problem for one-dimensional diffusions. *Stochastic analysis and applications* **24** 1119–1145.
- ANDERSON, T. W. (1960). A modification of the sequential probability ratio test to reduce the sample size. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **31** 165–197.
- ANULOVA, S. (1981). On Markov stopping times with a given distribution for a Wiener process. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **25** 362–366.
- BEIGLBÖCK, M., EDER, M., ELGERT, C. and SCHMOCK, U. (2018). Geometry of distribution-constrained optimal stopping problems. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **172** 71–101.
- BUTLER, R. W. and HUZURBAZAR, A. V. (1997). Stochastic network models for survival analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **92** 246–257.
- CHEN, X., CHADAM, J. and SAUNDERS, D. (2022). Higher-order regularity of the free boundary in the inverse first-passage problem. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **54** 4695–4720.
- CHEN, X., CHENG, L., CHADAM, J. and SAUNDERS, D. (2011). Existence and uniqueness of solutions to the inverse boundary crossing problem for diffusions. *Annals of Applied Probability* **21** 1663–1693.
- CHENG, L., CHEN, X., CHADAM, J. and SAUNDERS, D. (2006). Analysis of an inverse first passage problem from risk management. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* **38** 845–873.
- DANIELS, H. E. (1969). The minimum of a stationary Markov process superimposed on a U-shaped trend. *Journal of Applied Probability* **6** 399–408.
- DOOB, J. L. (1949). Heuristic approach to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov theorems. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **20** 393–403.
- DUDLEY, R. M. and GUTMANN, S. (1977). Stopping times with given laws. *Séminaire de Probabilités de Strasbourg* **11** 51–58.
- DURBIN, J. (1971). Boundary-crossing probabilities for the Brownian motion and Poisson processes and techniques for computing the power of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. *Journal of Applied Probability* **8** 431–453.
- DURBIN, J. (1985). The first-passage density of a continuous Gaussian process to a general boundary. *Journal of Applied Probability* **22** 99–122.
- EKSTRÖM, E. and JANSON, S. (2016). The inverse first-passage problem and optimal stopping. *Annals of Applied Probability* **26** 3154–3177.
- GUT, A. (1974). On the moments and limit distributions of some first passage times. *The Annals of Probability* **2** 277–308.
- JACOD, J. and SHIRYAEV, A. (2003). *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, 2nd ed. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- KLUMP, A. and KOLB, M. (2023). Uniqueness of the Inverse First-Passage Time Problem and the Shape of the Shiryaev Boundary. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **67** 570–592.
- KLUMP, A. and SAVOV, M. (2023). Conditions for existence and uniqueness of the inverse first-passage time problem applicable for Levy processes and diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10967*.
- LAI, T. L. (1974). Control charts based on weighted sums. *The Annals of Statistics* **2** 134–147.
- LAI, T. L. and SIEGMUND, D. (1977). A nonlinear renewal theory with applications to sequential analysis I. *The Annals of Statistics* **5** 946–954.
- LAI, T. L. and SIEGMUND, D. (1979). A nonlinear renewal theory with applications to sequential analysis II. *The Annals of Statistics* **7** 60–76.
- MALMQUIST, S. (1954). On certain confidence contours for distribution functions. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **25** 523–533.

- MATTHEWS, D., FAREWELL, V. and PYKE, R. (1985). Asymptotic score-statistic processes and tests for constant hazard against a change-point alternative. *The Annals of Statistics* **13** 583–591.
- MEHR, C. B. and MCFADDEN, J. (1965). Certain properties of Gaussian processes and their first-passage times. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **27** 505–522.
- NOVIKOV, A. A. (1971). On stopping times for a Wiener process. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **16** 449–456.
- NOVIKOV, A., FRISHLING, V. and KORDZAKHIA, N. (1999). Approximations of boundary crossing probabilities for a Brownian motion. *Journal of Applied Probability* **39** 1019–1030.
- PESKIR, G. (2002a). On integral equations arising in the first-passage problem for Brownian motion. *The Journal of Integral Equations and Applications* **14** 397–423.
- PESKIR, G. (2002b). Limit at zero of the Brownian first-passage density. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **124** 100–111.
- RENAULT, E., VAN DER HEIJDEN, T. and WERKER, B. J. (2014). The dynamic mixed hitting-time model for multiple transaction prices and times. *Journal of Econometrics* **180** 233–250.
- SALMINEN, P. (1988). On the first hitting time and the last exit time for a Brownian motion to/from a moving boundary. *Advances in Applied Probability* **20** 411–426.
- SIEGMUND, D. (1986). Boundary crossing probabilities and statistical applications. *The Annals of Statistics* **14** 361–404.
- SONG, J.-S. and ZIPKIN, P. (2011). An approximation for the inverse first passage time problem. *Advances in Applied Probability* **43** 264–275.
- STRASSEN, V. (1967). Almost sure behavior of sums of independent random variables and martingales. In *Proc. Fifth Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Probability (Berkeley, Calif., 1965/66)* **2** 315–343.
- WANG, L. and PÖTZELBERGER, K. (1997). Boundary crossing probability for Brownian motion and general boundaries. *Journal of Applied Probability* **34** 54–65.
- WOODROOFE, M. (1976). A renewal theorem for curved boundaries and moments of first passage times. *The Annals of Probability* **4** 67–80.
- WOODROOFE, M. (1977). Second order approximations for sequential point and interval estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* **7** 984–995.
- ZUCCA, C. and SACERDOTE, L. (2009). On the inverse first-passage-time problem for a Wiener process. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **19** 1319–1346.