

# CONTROLLED RANDOM WALK WITH A TARGET SITE

KENNETH S. ALEXANDER

ABSTRACT. We consider a simple random walk  $\{W_i\}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $d = 1, 2$ , in which the walker may choose to stand still for a limited time. The time horizon is  $n$ , the maximum consecutive time steps which can be spent standing still is  $m_n$  and the goal is to maximize  $P(W_n = 0)$ . We show that for  $d = 1$ , if  $m_n \gg (\log n)^{2+\gamma}$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , there is a strategy for each  $n$  yielding  $P(W_n = 0) \rightarrow 1$ . For  $d = 2$ , if  $m_n \gg n^\epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$  then there are strategies yielding  $\liminf_n P(W_n = 0) > 0$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION.

We consider a process  $\{W_i, 0 \leq i \leq n\}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  ( $d = 1$  or  $2$ ) in which  $W_0 = 0$  and each step  $W_i - W_{i-1}$  either is  $0$  (i.e. standing still) or is a step  $\pm e_i$  of symmetric simple random walk (SSRW), with  $e_i$  being the  $i$ th unit coordinate vector. The choice between standing still and SSRW step is determined by a strategy. Formally, a *strategy* (or *n-strategy*) is a mapping  $\delta_n : \mathcal{T}_n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  defined on the space

$$\mathcal{T}_n = \left\{ \{(i, w_i), 0 \leq i \leq j\} : 0 \leq j \leq n-1, |w_i - w_{i-1}| \leq 1 \text{ for all } i \right\}$$

of all space-time trajectories of length less than  $n$ ; here the values  $0$  and  $1$  for  $\delta_n$  correspond to standing still and taking a SSRW step, respectively. Thus the choice of whether to take a step at a time  $i$  depends on the trajectory up to time  $i-1$ . Letting  $\{Y_i, i \geq 1\}$  be SSRW, we then construct the controlled random walk process iteratively from the strategy by

$$W_0 = 0, \quad W_i - W_{i-1} = \Delta_i(Y_i - Y_{i-1}) \quad i \leq n,$$

where

$$\Delta_i = \delta_n \left( \{(k, W_k) : 0 \leq k \leq i-1\} \right).$$

We define the time since the last SSRW step to be

$$J_i = \min\{j \in [0, i-1] : W_{i-j} \neq W_{i-j-1}\},$$

with  $J_i = i$  if the set in this definition is empty. We designate a maximum number  $m_n - 1$  of consecutive steps standing still and say that a strategy is *admissible* if  $J_i \leq m_n - 1$  a.s. for all  $i \leq n$ . A strategy is *Markov* if the value of  $\delta_n(\{(k, W_k) : 0 \leq k \leq i-1\})$  depends only on the pair  $(W_i, J_i)$ . It is easily seen that if the strategy is Markov, then  $\{(W_i, J_i) : i \geq 0\}$  is a Markov process. We write  $\mathcal{A}_n$  for the set of all admissible strategies and  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$  for the set of all admissible Markov strategies. When the dependence on the

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 60G50; Secondary: 93E20.

*Key words and phrases*. random walk, stochastic control.

This research was supported by NSF grant DMS-0804934.

strategy needs to be made clear, we write  $P(\cdot; \delta_n)$  for probability when strategy  $\delta_n$  is used, but generally we suppress the  $\delta_n$  in the notation.

We are interested in steering the process toward a target site, and specifically in the behavior of

$$(1.1) \quad \hat{P}(W_n = 0) = \sup_{\delta_n \in \mathcal{A}_n} P(W_n = 0; \delta_n)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The word “steering” is a bit misleading here, as the process never has a drift. For SSRW, of course  $P(W_n = 0) \sim Cn^{-d/2}$ . (Here and throughout the paper,  $C$  and  $C_1, C_2, \dots$  are generic constants, and  $a_n \sim b_n$  means the ratio converges to 1.) A simple strategy to increase this is to minimize steps, i.e. always stand still as long as allowed, taking only  $n/m_n$  steps, yielding  $P(W_n = 0) \asymp (m_n/n)^{d/2}$ , where we use  $a_n \asymp b_n$  to mean the ratio is bounded away from 0 and  $\infty$ . A slightly more sophisticated strategy is to minimize steps until time  $n - m_n$  then maximize steps (i.e. never stand still) until  $\{W_i\}$  hits 0 (if it does), and then stand still until time  $n$ . For  $d = 1$ , conditionally on  $\{|W_{n-m_n}| \leq m_n^{1/2}\}$  this strategy has a success probability of order 1, so the unconditional success probability is of order  $\min(m_n/n^{1/2}, 1)$ ; in particular it is bounded away from 0 if  $m_n \geq Cn^{1/2}$ .

This brings up two questions. For which  $\{m_n\}$  is  $\hat{P}(W_n = 0)$  bounded away from 0? And are there nontrivial  $\{m_n\}$  for which  $\hat{P}(W_n = 0) \rightarrow 1$ ? Our two main theorems give some answers.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose  $d = 1$  and  $m_n \gg (\log n)^{2+\gamma}$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ . Then  $\hat{P}(W_n = 0) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

In one dimension, the “more sophisticated” strategy described above relies on the fact that a SSRW started at distance  $k$  from 0 has a probability of order one to hit 0 by time  $k^2$ . In two dimensions, this probability is only of order  $(\log k)^{-1}$  so it is more difficult to construct a strategy based on waiting for the RW to return to 0 after it has wandered away. Nonetheless we have the following.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Suppose  $d = 2$  and  $m_n \gg n^\epsilon$ , for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then*

$$\liminf_n \hat{P}(W_n = 0) > 0.$$

In (1.1) one could consider only Markov strategies, i.e. take the sup over  $\mathcal{A}_n^*$ . Since the underlying SSRW is Markov, one cannot actually do better with a non-Markov strategy, so the two sups are the same. Allowing non-Markov strategies simply lets us use ones that can be concisely described and analyzed.

**Remark 1.3.** One could consider alternate ways of slowing down the controlled RW, in place of standing still. For example, one could allow a choice between a standard SSRW step and a delayed SSRW step, the latter meaning we stand still with probability  $1 - \frac{1}{m_n}$  and take a standard SSRW step of  $\pm e_i$  with probability  $1/m_n$ , with no limit on how many consecutive times we choose the delayed SSRW step. A brief examination of the proofs shows that both theorem statements above remain valid in this case.

**Remark 1.4.** The continuous analog of the problem we consider is a diffusion  $\xi_t$  in which the drift is always 0 and one can control the diffusivity  $\sigma(x, t)$ , but constrained to an

interval  $[\sigma_1, \sigma_2]$ , on a time interval  $[0, T]$ , where  $\sigma_1 > 0$ . We take  $[\sigma_1, \sigma_2] = [\epsilon_T, 1]$  and ask, how slowly can we have  $\epsilon_T \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  and still have  $\hat{P}(|\xi_T| < 1) \rightarrow 1$  or  $\liminf_T P(|\xi_T| < 1) > 0$ ? Note that  $\epsilon_T$  is the analog of  $1/m_n$ . McNamara [3] considered closely related questions for a one-dimensional diffusion; see also [2] for another variant. He proved that there are constants  $K = K(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$  and  $\beta = \beta(\sigma_1/\sigma_2)$  such that

$$(1.2) \quad \hat{P}^x \left( |\xi_T| \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \leq K \left( \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{T}} \right)^\beta \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}, \delta > 0,$$

while in the other direction, for each  $h > 0$  there exists  $\Delta > 0$  such that

$$(1.3) \quad \hat{P}^0 \left( |\xi_T| \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \right) > K \left( \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{T}} \right)^{\beta+h} \quad \text{for all } \delta \in (0, \Delta).$$

Here  $\hat{P}^x$  denotes probability (maximized over the allowed controls) for a process started at  $x$ . Numerical evidence was given that  $\beta$  is approximately proportional to  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2$ . If we assume this to be true and consider  $\epsilon_T$  of order  $1/\log T$ , we get  $\beta$  of order  $1/\log T$  as well. If we could take  $h$  also of this order, then the right side of (1.3) would be bounded away from 0 in  $T$ , as desired. The problem is that one cannot get a useful result from (1.3) if one takes  $h$  depending on  $T$ , since then  $\delta$  must also depend on  $T$ . Nonetheless we may observe that  $\epsilon_T \leq C/\log T$  corresponds to  $m_n \geq C \log n$  in our discrete problem. Further, still assuming  $\beta$  proportional to  $\sigma_1/\sigma_2$ , we see that since we want the left side of (1.2) bounded away from 0, we cannot allow  $\epsilon_T \gg 1/\log T$ , suggesting that we perhaps cannot do better than requiring  $m_n \geq C \log n$  in Theorem 1.1.

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Throughout the paper we will make use of various quantities which approach infinity as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $\lambda > 0$  let  $u_n(\lambda) = \max\{k : m_n^{1+k\lambda} \leq n\}$ ; note that  $u_n(\lambda)$  is of order  $\log n / \log m_n$  for all  $\lambda > 0$ . Also, the hypothesis that  $m_n \gg (\log n)^{2+\gamma}$  for some  $\gamma > 0$  is equivalent to

$$(2.1) \quad m_n \gg \left( \frac{(\log n)^2}{\log \log n} \right)^{1/(1-\eta)} \quad \text{for some } \eta \in (0, 1).$$

Fixing such an  $\eta$  and writing  $u_n$  for  $u_n(\eta)$ , we observe that (2.1) is equivalent to

$$m_n^{1-\eta} \log m_n \gg (\log n)^2,$$

hence also to

$$m_n^{1+\eta\theta(m_n^{1-\eta}/\log m_n)^{1/2}} \geq n \quad \text{for all large } n, \text{ for every } \theta > 0,$$

and therefore finally to

$$(2.2) \quad u_n = o \left( \left( \frac{m_n^{1-\eta}}{\log m_n} \right)^{1/2} \right).$$

Fix  $n$ , write  $m$  for  $m_n$ . and define

$$\epsilon_m = \frac{\log m}{m^{1-\eta}}, \quad \text{so} \quad \epsilon_m = o \left( \frac{1}{u_n^2} \right) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We define a sequence of windows  $\{t_k\} \times I_k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq u_n$ , in space-time, with size decreasing as  $k$  increases and the target  $(n, 0)$  is approached; we then construct a strategy which makes the space-time trajectory of the process pass through all of these windows, with high probability. Specifically, let

$$t_k = n - m^{1+\eta(u_n-k)}, \quad 2 \leq k \leq u_n, \quad \text{and } t_0 = 0, \quad t_1 = \frac{t_2}{2}, \quad t_{u_n+1} = n,$$

$$N_k = t_k - t_{k-1}, \quad h_{mk} = (\epsilon_m N_{k+1})^{1/2}.$$

Let  $I_0 = \{0\}$ ,

$$I_k = [-h_{mk}, h_{mk}], \quad 1 \leq k \leq u_n, \quad \text{and } I_{u_n+1} = \{0\}.$$

We want to find a strategy, and choice of  $\epsilon_m$ , for which we can show

$$(2.3) \quad \max_{k \leq u_n+1} P(W_{t_k} \notin I_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} \in I_{k-1}) = o\left(\frac{1}{u_n}\right) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

From (2.2) and (2.3) it follows that

$$(2.4) \quad P(W_n = 0) \geq \prod_{k=1}^{u_n+1} P(W_{t_k} \in I_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} \in I_{k-1}) \geq \left(1 - o\left(\frac{1}{u_n}\right)\right)^{u_n+1} = 1 - o(1)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , proving the theorem.

For (2.3), fix  $1 \leq k \leq u_n + 1$  and let  $\tau_0 = \tau_0^{(k)} = \min\{t > t_{k-1} : W_t = 0\}$ . Fix  $x \in I_{k-1}$  and observe that

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} P(W_{t_k} \notin I_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x) &\leq P(\tau_0 > t_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x) \\ &+ P(\tau_0 \leq t_k, |W_{t_k}| > h_{mk} \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x). \end{aligned}$$

To fully specify, and then bound, these probabilities we need to designate a strategy; we do so by describing how the strategy works between  $t_{k-1}$  and  $t_k$ , for general  $k$ . For  $k \leq u_n$ , we begin by taking all SSRW steps (i.e. no standing still) from time  $t_{k-1}$  until time  $\tau_0 \wedge t_k$ . If  $\tau_0 > t_k$ , we deem the strategy to have failed and we continue in an arbitrary manner, say all SSRW steps. If  $\tau_0 \leq t_k$ , we continue from time  $\tau_0$  to  $t_k$  by always standing still for the maximum allowed period of time  $m$  during the interval  $(\tau_0, t_k]$ , that is, we take an SSRW step every  $m$ th time step. The last standing period is truncated if it would otherwise go beyond time  $t_k$ .

For  $k = u_n + 1$ , our strategy during  $(t_{u_n}, t_{u_n+1}] = (n - m, n]$  is to maximize steps until the the time  $\tau_0 = \tau_0^{(u_n+1)}$  when the process first hits 0 (if  $\tau_0 \leq n$ ), then stand still until time  $n$ .

We now bound the first term on the right side of (2.5). From the Reflection Principle we have (for  $\ell, h_{mk}$  of opposite even-odd parity):

$$(2.6) \quad P(\tau_0^{(k)} - t_{k-1} > \ell \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x) = P(-|x| < Y_\ell < |x|),$$

and hence for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} P(\tau_0^{(k)} - t_{k-1} > yx^2 \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x) &\sim 2 \left( \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{y}}\right) - \Phi(0) \right) \\ &\text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty, \text{ uniformly over } y \in [\epsilon, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

The left side of (2.6) is a nondecreasing function of  $|x|$ , so for all  $x \in I_k$ , by (2.7)

$$(2.8) \quad P(\tau_0 > t_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x) \leq P(\tau_0 - t_{k-1} > N_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = h_{mk}) \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon_m}.$$

Turning to the second term on the right side of (2.5), it is 0 for  $k = u_n + 1$  so we consider  $k \leq u_n$ . We can condition also on  $\tau_0$  as follows: for  $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$ , using Hoeffding's Inequality [1],

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} P(|W_{t_k}| > h_{mk} \mid \tau_0 = t, W_{t_{k-1}} = x) &= P(|W_{t_k}| > h_{mk} \mid W_t = 0) \\ &= P(|Y_{(t_k-t)/m}| > h_{mk}) \\ &\leq e^{-h_{mk}^2 m / 2N_k} \\ &= e^{-m\epsilon_m N_{k+1} / 2N_k}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $k \geq 1$  we have  $N_{k+1}/N_k \geq m^{-\eta}$  (with equality for  $k \geq 3$ ), so (2.9) says that

$$(2.10) \quad P(|W_{t_k}| > h_{mk} \mid \tau_0 = t, W_{t_{k-1}} = x) \leq m^{-1/2} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_m}.$$

Since  $x \in I_{k-1}$  is arbitrary, combining (2.5), (2.8) and (2.10) yields that for all  $1 \leq k \leq u_n + 1$ ,

$$(2.11) \quad P(W_{t_k} \notin I_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} \in I_{k-1}) \leq C\sqrt{\epsilon_m} = o\left(\frac{1}{u_n}\right) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

proving (2.3) and thereby proving Theorem 1.1.

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We keep the same definition of  $u_n(\lambda)$  and note that now our hypothesis on  $m_n$  is equivalent to the statement that  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded, say  $u_n \leq u < \infty$  for all  $n$ . We keep the same formula for  $t_k$  but with  $\eta$  replaced by  $\kappa$ , determined as follows. Choose

$$\theta \in \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right),$$

so  $1 - 2\theta < \epsilon$ , then choose  $\kappa$  small enough so

$$(3.1) \quad 0 < \frac{1 - 2\theta}{1 - 2\kappa\theta} < \epsilon.$$

We then write  $u_n$  for  $u_n(\kappa)$ . For our windows, in place of the interval  $I_k$  we have the square  $Q_k = [-N_{k+1}^\theta, N_{k+1}^\theta]^2$ . To distinguish dimensions clearly, we now write  $\{Y_i^{(d)}\}$  for  $d$ -dimensional SSRW,  $d = 1, 2$ . We use the same strategy as in one dimension: in each interval  $(t_{k-1}, t_k]$ , take an SSRW step every time step until time  $\tau_0^{(k)}$ , then an SSRW step every  $m$ th time step from time  $\tau_0^{(k)}$  to  $t_k$ . In place of (2.3), we will need that for some  $C > 0$ ,

$$(3.2) \quad P(W_{t_k} \in Q_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} \in Q_{k-1}) \geq C \quad \text{for all } k, \text{ for all large } n.$$

Let  $L_{[a,b]}$  be the number of visits to 0 by the SSRW  $\{Y_i^{(2)}\}$  during the time interval  $[a, b]$ . In comparison to (2.8), we have for all  $x \in Q_{k-1}$ :

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} P(\tau_0 \leq t_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x) &= P(\tau_0 \leq t_k \mid Y_{t_{k-1}}^{(2)} = x) \\ &\geq \frac{E(L_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} \mid Y_{t_{k-1}}^{(2)} = x)}{E(L_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} \mid \tau_0 \leq t_k, Y_{t_{k-1}}^{(2)} = x)} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|x| \leq CN_k^\theta$  with  $\theta < \frac{1}{2}$ , the numerator in (3.3) is equal to

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} P(Y_i = 0 \mid Y_0^{(2)} = x) \geq C \sum_{i=|x|^2}^{N_k} \frac{1}{i} \geq C_1 \log N_k.$$

Here  $C_1$  depends on  $\theta$ . The denominator in (3.3) is bounded above by

$$(3.5) \quad E(L_{(t_{k-1}, t_k]} \mid Y_0^{(2)} = 0) \leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \frac{1}{i} \leq C_2 \log N_k.$$

Therefore we have the analog of (2.8):

$$(3.6) \quad P(\tau_0 \leq t_k \mid W_{t_{k-1}} = x) \geq \frac{C_1}{C_2} > 0 \quad \text{for all } k \leq u_n, x \in Q_{k-1}.$$

In comparison to (2.9), we have for  $x \in Q_k$  and  $t \in (t_{k-1}, t_k]$ , using again Hoeffding's Inequality [1]:

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} P(W_{t_k} \notin Q_k \mid \tau_0 = t, W_{t_{k-1}} = x) &= P(W_{t_k} \notin Q_k \mid W_t = 0) \\ &= P(Y_{(t_k-t)/m} \notin Q_k \mid Y_0^{(2)} = 0) \\ &\leq 2 \max_{j \leq N_k/m} P(|Y_j^{(1)}| > N_{k+1}^\theta) \\ &\leq 4e^{-mN_{k+1}^{2\theta}/2N_k}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $k \geq 1$  we have  $N_{k+1} \geq m^{-\kappa} N_k$  (with equality for  $k \geq 3$ ), so by (3.1),

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{mN_{k+1}^{2\theta}}{N_k} \geq \frac{m^{1-2\kappa\theta}}{N_k^{1-2\theta}} \geq \frac{m^{1-2\kappa\theta}}{n^{1-2\theta}} \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combining (3.6), (3.7) and (3.8) we see that (3.2) holds. Since  $\{u_n\}$  is bounded, it follows as in (2.4) that  $\liminf_n P(W_n = 0) > 0$ .

#### 4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Ananda Weerasinghe for helpful conversations.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **58**, 13–30. MR0144363
- [2] McNamara, J. M. (1983). Optimal control of the diffusion coefficient of a simple diffusion process. *Math. Oper. Res.* **8**, 373–380.
- [3] McNamara, J. M. (1985). A regularity condition on the transition probability of a diffusion process. *Stochastics* **15**, 161–182.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS KAP 108, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES,  
CA 90089-2532 USA

*E-mail address:* alexandr@usc.edu