

## Solutions second exam Probability III

November 25, 2020

### Problem 1

(a) Provide the definition of a  $\sigma$ -algebra defined on the sample space  $\Omega$ . (3p)

**Solution:** A collection of subsets of  $\Omega$  (say  $\mathcal{F}$ ) is a  $\sigma$ -algebra if 1)  $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$ , 2) If  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  then also the complement  $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$  and 3) if  $A_1, A_2, \dots$  is a sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  then also  $\cup_n A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ .

(b) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega = (0, 1)$  containing all open intervals contained in  $(0, 1)$ . Show that every single point  $x \in (0, 1)$  is an element of  $\mathcal{F}$ . (4p)

**Solution:** Both  $(0, x) \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $(x, 1) \in \mathcal{F}$  because they are open intervals. Therefore, by the third defining property of a  $\sigma$ -algebra,  $B = (0, x) \cup (x, 1) \in \mathcal{F}$  and by the second defining property of a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $B^c = \{x\} \in \mathcal{F}$ .

(c) Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega = (0, 1)$  containing all single points in  $(0, 1)$ . Show that  $\mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{F}$ . That is, give an element of  $\mathcal{F}$  which is not in  $\mathcal{G}$  and explain why this element is not in  $\mathcal{G}$ . (5p)

**Solution:** The  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by single points contains all countable unions of single points and complements of those sets. Because countable unions of countable sets are countable and a union containing at least one set with a countable complement, has at most a countable complement, we have that  $\mathcal{G}$  only contains sets which have countably many elements or a countable complement. the interval  $(0, 1/2)$  is therefore not in  $\mathcal{G}$  because it has uncountably many elements and its complement  $[1/2, 1)$  is also uncountable.

**Problem 2**

a) Let  $X$  be an exponential distributed random variable with expectation  $1/\lambda$ . That is,  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) = e^{-\lambda x}$  for all  $x \geq 0$ . Provide the characteristic function  $\varphi_X(t)$  of  $X$ . (3p)

**Hint:** You may assume without proof that  $\varphi_X(t) = \psi(it)$ , where  $i = \sqrt{-1}$  and  $\psi(t)$  is the moment generating function of  $X$ .

**Solution:** The exponential distributed random variable has density function  $f(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$  for  $x > 0$ . Therefore, for  $t < \lambda$ .

$$\psi(t) = \int_0^{\infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda x} e^{tx} dx = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - t}$$

and  $\varphi_X(t) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - it}$ .

b) Let  $Y$  be a random variable with distribution defined through

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y = -1) = 1/2.$$

Let  $Z = YX$ . Deduce what  $\varphi_Z(t)$ , the characteristic function of  $Z$ , is. (3p)

**Solution:** The quick way is to note that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e^{itXY} | Y]] = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{E}[e^{itX}] + e^{-itX}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - it} + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + it} \right) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\lambda^2 + t^2}.$$

If you are less comfortable with complex numbers: Note that  $\varphi_Z(t) = \mathbb{E}[\cos(tZ)] + i\mathbb{E}[\sin(tZ)]$  and using the telescoping property of expectations.

$$\mathbb{E}[\cos(tZ)] = \mathbb{E}[\cos(tXY)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\cos(tXY) | Y]] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\cos(tX)] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\cos(-tX)].$$

Because  $\cos(\cdot)$  is symmetric, we have that  $\mathbb{E}[\cos(tX)] = \mathbb{E}[\cos(-tX)]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\cos(tZ)] = \mathbb{E}[\cos(tX)]$ .

Similarly, by the anti-symmetry of  $\sin(\cdot)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\sin(tZ)] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\sin -tX] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\sin(-tX)] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\sin -tX] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\sin -tX] = 0.$$

So,  $\varphi_Z(t) = \mathbb{E}[\cos(tX)] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{itX}] + \mathbb{E}[e^{i(-t)X}]}{2}$ . Using part a) We then obtain that

$$\varphi_Z(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - it} + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + it} \right) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left( \frac{(\lambda + it) + (\lambda - it)}{(\lambda - it)(\lambda + it)} \right) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\lambda^2 + t^2}.$$

Let  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  and  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be independent random variables, where  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  are all distributed as  $Y$  and for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $X_k$  is exponentially distributed with expectation  $1/\sqrt{k}$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $Z_k = Y_k X_k$ .

c) Provide the characteristic function of  $W_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}} \sum_{k=1}^n Z_k$ . Use this to show that  $W_n$  converges in distribution to some random variable as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . What is the distribution of this random variable? (6p)

**Hint:** You may use without proof that for a positive function  $c(n) \geq 0$ , which decreases to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$n^{-c(n)} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{c(n)}{k}\right) \rightarrow 1.$$

**Solution:** Define  $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n Z_k$  and let  $\varphi_{S_n}(t)$  be its characteristic function, while the characteristic function of  $Z_n$  is given by  $\varphi_{Z_n}(t)$  and  $\varphi_{W_n}(t)$  is defined similarly.

Because the  $Z_n$ 's are all independent we have that

$$\varphi_{S_n}(t) = \prod_{k=1}^n \varphi_{Z_k}(t).$$

Furthermore,

$$\varphi_{W_n}(t) = \varphi_{S_n}(t/\sqrt{\log n}).$$

So,

$$\varphi_{W_n}(t) = \prod_{k=1}^n \varphi_{Z_k}(t/\sqrt{\log n}).$$

From part b) we know that  $\varphi_{Z_k}(t) = \frac{k}{k+t^2}$  and thus that

$$\varphi_{W_n}(t) = \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{k}{k + t^2/\log n}$$

and thus that

$$\frac{1}{\varphi_{W_n}(t)} = \prod_{k=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{c(n)}{k}\right), \quad \text{where } c(n) = t^2/\log n.$$

Now we can use the hint and observe that  $n^{-c(n)} = e^{-c(n)\log n} = e^{-t^2}$ . So,

$$e^{-t^2} \frac{1}{\varphi_{W_n}(t)} \rightarrow 1$$

and thus  $\varphi_{W_n}(t) \rightarrow e^{-t^2}$ . which is the characteristic function of a Normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1/2. Because convergence of the characteristic functions implies convergence in distribution of the corresponding random variables.

**Problem 3**

Assume in all subproblems that  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots$  are random variables defined on the same probability space  $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}\}$ . Assume in both part a) and b) that  $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} X$ .

a) Show that there exists a non-random strictly increasing sequence of positive integers  $n_1, n_2, \dots$ , such that  $X_{n_k} \xrightarrow{a.s.} X$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . (6p)

**solution:** We know that  $\mathbb{P}(|X_n - X| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ , for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then choose  $n_k$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_{n_k} - X| > 1/k) < 1/k^2$$

Now we observe that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(|X_{n_k} - X| > \epsilon) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{n_k} - X| > \min\left(\frac{1}{k}, \epsilon\right)\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor 1/\epsilon \rfloor} \mathbb{P}(|X_{n_k} - X| > \epsilon) + \sum_{k=\lfloor 1/\epsilon \rfloor}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{n_k} - X| > \frac{1}{k}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor 1/\epsilon \rfloor} 1 + \sum_{k=\lfloor 1/\epsilon \rfloor}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{n_k} - X| > \frac{1}{k}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{n_k} - X| > \frac{1}{k}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

and by the first Borel-Cantelli Lemma we obtain that  $\mathbb{1}(|X_{n_k} - X| > \epsilon) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  and by the hint it follows that  $X_{n_k} \xrightarrow{a.s.} X$ .

b) Show that if  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous function, then  $g(X_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} g(X)$ . (6p)

**Hint:** Note that if  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous, then it is uniform continuous on any interval  $[-M, M]$  with  $M \in (0, \infty)$ . That is, for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|g(x) - g(y)| < \epsilon$  if  $|x - y| < \delta$  and  $x, y \in [-M, M]$ .

**Solution:** We need to prove that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and all  $\epsilon_1 > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(|g(X_n) - g(X)| > \epsilon) < \epsilon_1$  for all  $n > N$ .

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\epsilon_1 > 0$  and let  $M$  be such that  $\mathbb{P}(|X| > M - 1) < \epsilon_1/2$ .

Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  be such that  $|g(x) - g(y)| < \epsilon$  if  $|x - y| < \delta$  and  $x, y \in [-M, M]$  (which is possible by the hint).

Let  $N$  be such that  $\mathbb{P}(|X_n - X| \geq \delta) < \epsilon_1/2$  for all  $n > N$  (which is possible by  $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} X$ ).

Then for  $n > N$  we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(|g(X_n) - g(X)| > \epsilon) \\ = & \mathbb{P}(|g(X_n) - g(X)| > \epsilon, |X| > M - 1) + \mathbb{P}(|g(X_n) - g(X)| > \epsilon, |X| \leq M - 1) \\ \leq & \mathbb{P}(|X| > M - 1) \\ & + \mathbb{P}(|g(X_n) - g(X)| > \epsilon, |X_n - X| \geq \delta, |X| \leq M - 1) \\ & + \mathbb{P}(|g(X_n) - g(X)| > \epsilon, |X_n - X| < \delta, |X| \leq M - 1) \end{aligned}$$

The first summand is less than  $\epsilon_1/2$  by the definition of  $M$ . The second summand is less than  $\mathbb{P}(|X_n - X| \geq \delta)$ , which is by the definition of  $N$  less than  $\epsilon_1/2$ . The third summand is 0, because if both  $|X_n - X| < \delta$  and  $|X| < M - 1$ , then both  $|X| < M$  and  $|X_n| < M$  and by the definition of  $\delta$ ,  $|g(X_n) - g(X)|$  must be less than  $\epsilon$ . The result now follows.

**Problem 4**

Let  $\lambda > 1$  be constant. For  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$  let  $X_{ij}$  be independent and identically distributed random variables with a Poisson distribution with expectation  $\lambda$ . That is,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{ij} = k) = \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda} \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Define  $Z_0 = 1$ . For  $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$  define

$$Z_{i+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{Z_i} X_{ij},$$

where we define  $\sum_{j=1}^0 = 0$ .

a) Show (e.g. by induction) that  $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \lambda^n$  and  $\mathbb{E}[(Z_n)^2] = \lambda^n \frac{\lambda^{n+1} - 1}{\lambda - 1}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . (4p)

**Solution:**

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Z_n | Z_{n-1}]] = \lambda \mathbb{E}[Z_{n-1}] = \dots = \lambda^n Z_0 = \lambda^n.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(Z_n)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(Z_n)^2 | Z_{n-1}]] = \mathbb{E}[Z_{n-1} \lambda + (Z_{n-1} \lambda)^2 | Z_{n-1}] \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}[Z_{n-1}] + \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[(Z_{n-1})^2] = \lambda^n + \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[(Z_{n-1})^2] \\ &= \lambda^n + \lambda^2 (\lambda^{n-1} + \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[(Z_{n-2})^2]) = \dots = \lambda^n \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda^k = \lambda^n \frac{\lambda^{n+1} - 1}{\lambda - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

b) Show that

$$W_n := \frac{1}{\lambda^n} Z_n$$

converges almost surely to some random variable  $W$ . Furthermore, show that  $\mathbb{P}(W < \infty) = 1$ . (4p)

**Solution:** We use the martingale convergence theorem.

To do this we note that  $\mathbb{E}[|W_n|] = 1$  for all  $n$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbb{E}[W_{n+1} | Z_n] = \lambda Z_n / \lambda^{n+1} = W_n$  and finally.

$$\mathbb{E}[(W_n)^2] = \frac{1}{\lambda^{2n}} \mathbb{E}[(Z_n)^2] = \frac{\lambda - \lambda^{-n}}{\lambda - 1},$$

by part a). The right hand side increases to  $\lambda / (\lambda - 1) < \infty$ . So, we can use the theorem and we now that  $W_n$  converges almost surely and in mean square (and therefore in mean) to some random variable  $W$ . Because  $W_n$  converges to  $W$  in mean, we obtain that  $\mathbb{E}[|W|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|W_n - W|] + \mathbb{E}[W_n] \rightarrow 0 + 1$ . If  $\mathbb{P}(W = \infty) > 0$  then  $\mathbb{E}[W] \geq \infty \mathbb{P}(W = \infty) = \infty$ , which is a contradiction.

c) Show that

$$V_n = \lambda^{-n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$$

converges almost surely to  $V = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-i}\right) W = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} W$ . (4p)

**Solution:** Note

$$V_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^{-(n-i)} (\lambda^{-i} Z_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^{-(n-i)} W_i.$$

We show that if for  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have that  $W_n(\omega) \rightarrow W(\omega)$  then  $V_n(\omega) \rightarrow V(\omega)$ . Note that  $W_n(\omega) \rightarrow W(\omega)$  means that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n > N$  we have  $|W_n(\omega) - W(\omega)| < \epsilon$ .

Let  $N_1 = N_1(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$  be such that  $|W_i(\omega) - W(\omega)| < \epsilon_1$  for all  $n \geq N_1$ . Then for all  $n > N_1$  we have

$$|V_n(\omega) - V(\omega)| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{N_1-1} \lambda^{-(n-i)} (W_i(\omega) - W(\omega)) + \sum_{i=N_1}^n \lambda^{-(n-i)} (W_i(\omega) - W(\omega)) - \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^{-i} W(\omega) \right|.$$

By the triangle inequality we then obtain

$$|V_n(\omega) - V(\omega)| \leq \lambda^{-n} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1-1} \lambda^i |W_i(\omega) - W(\omega)| + \sum_{i=N_1}^n \lambda^{-(n-i)} \epsilon_1 + \left| \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^{-i} W(\omega) \right|.$$

The first summand converges to 0 for fixed  $N_1$  and  $\omega$ . The second summand converges to  $\epsilon_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{-j} = \epsilon_1 \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1}$ . The third summand is equal to  $\lambda^{-n} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1} W(\omega)$  which converges to 0 for fixed  $\omega$ . So, if  $W_n(\omega) \rightarrow W(\omega)$  then for each  $\epsilon_1$  there exists  $N_2 > N_1$  such that for all  $n > N_2$  we have  $|V_n(\omega) - V(\omega)| \leq 2\epsilon_1$ .

**Problem 5**

Let  $p \in (0, 1)$  be constant and  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be independent and identically distributed random variables, satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 = 1) = p \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(X_1 = -1) = 1 - p.$$

For reasons of convenience set  $X_0 = -1$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $K_n = 0$  if  $X_n = -1$  and otherwise let  $K_n$  be the length of the sequence of consecutive +1's ending at  $n$ . That is,  $K_n = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N}_0; X_{n-j} = -1\}$ .

Let  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  be a given integer. We are interested in  $T = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}; K_n = L\}$ , which is the first time a sequence of  $L$  consecutive +1's appears.

To study  $T$  we can use the loss (or gain, if negative) of a casino in which the following happens:

1. At time 0 the loss of the casino is 0.
2. At each positive integer time point one new gambler arrives with gambling capital 1 SEK which he or she puts immediately at stake.
3. At time  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $X_k = -1$ , all gamblers which were still in the casino and arrived at time  $k$  or before, leave the casino empty handed.
4. At time  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $X_k = 1$ , all gamblers present at the casino (including the one that arrived at time  $k$ ) multiply their capital instantly by a factor  $1/p$ , which they will put again at stake at time  $k + 1$ .

So, at time  $n$  (immediately after the arrival of the  $n$ -th gambler and the  $n$ -th bet) the number of gamblers in the casino is  $K_n$ .



a) Show that the loss of the casino at time  $n$  (when the new arrival and time  $n$  gambling has already occurred) is given by

$$M_n = \frac{p^{-K_n} - 1}{1 - p} - n$$

and show that  $M_1, M_2, \dots$  constitutes a martingale with respect to  $\underline{\mathcal{F}}$ , the filtration generated by  $X_1, X_2, \dots$ . (4p)

**Solution:** The total number of newly brought in money by gamblers is  $n$  times 1 SEK. The last  $K_n$  gamblers are still in the casino. For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $K_n \geq k$ , the gambler that entered at time  $n - k + 1$  has capital  $(1/p)^k$  at time  $n$ . The total loss of the casino is the the total capital of the gamblers minus the ammount of money the gamblers brought in. Which is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K_n} (1/p)^k - n = \left( \frac{(1/p)^{K_n+1} - 1}{1/p - 1} - 1 \right) - n = \frac{(1/p)^{K_n} - 1}{1 - p} - n = M_n$$

We note that  $\mathbb{E}[M_n] \leq \frac{(1/p)^{n-1}}{1-p} + n < \infty$  for all  $n$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] &= p \left( \frac{p^{-(K_n+1)} - 1}{1 - p} - (n+1) \right) + (1-p)(0 - (n+1)) \\ &= \frac{p^{-K_n} - p}{1 - p} - (n+1) = \frac{p^{-K_n} - 1}{1 - p} - n = M_n, \end{aligned}$$

and we showed that  $M_n$  is a martingale.

b) Compute  $\mathbb{E}[T]$ . You may use without proof that  $T$  is a stopping time with respect to  $\underline{\mathcal{F}}$  and that  $\mathbb{E}[T] < \infty$ . (3p)

**Solution:** We note that for  $K_n < L$  (which is the case if  $n < T$ ), we have  $|M_{n+1} - M_n| = p^{-(K_n+1)} - 1 < p^{-L}$  if  $X_{n+1} = 1$  and we have

$$|M_{n+1} - M_n| = \frac{p^{-K_n} - 1}{1 - p} + 1 = \frac{p}{1 - p} (p^{-(K_n+1)} - 1) < \frac{p}{1 - p} p^{-L}$$

if  $X_{n+1} = -1$ . So, we can use Optimal Stopping theorem III (Thm 26 of cheat sheet) and obtain that  $\mathbb{E}[M_T] = M_0$  That is  $\frac{p^{-L}-1}{1-p} - \mathbb{E}[T] = 0$ .

c) Let  $s \in [0, 1]$  be a constant. Compute  $\mathbb{E}[s^T]$ . (5p)

**Hint:** A way to solve this might be to adapt step 2 above in such a way that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the customer arriving at time  $n$  has initial gambling capital  $s^{n-1}$ . Note that partial answers might be worth points.

**Solution:** If the gambler entering at time  $n$  comes in with capital  $s^n$ , then the total capital brought in by gamblers up to and including time  $n$  is

$$\sum_{k=1}^n s^k = s \frac{1 - s^n}{1 - s}.$$

While if  $k \leq K_n$  the gambler that entered at time  $n - k + 1$  is given by  $s^{n-k+1}p^{-k}$ . So, we can define the martingale

$$\begin{aligned} Y_n &= \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} s^{n-k+1}p^{-k} - s \frac{1 - s^n}{1 - s} = s^n p^{-1} \frac{(sp)^{-K_n} - 1}{(sp)^{-1} - 1} - s \frac{1 - s^n}{1 - s} \\ &= s \left( s^n \frac{(sp)^{-K_n} - 1}{1 - sp} - \frac{1 - s^n}{1 - s} \right) = s^n \left( \frac{s(sp)^{-K_n} - s}{1 - sp} + \frac{s}{1 - s} \right) - \frac{s}{1 - s}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] &= sp \left( s^{n+1} \frac{(sp)^{-(K_n+1)} - 1}{1 - sp} - \frac{1 - s^{n+1}}{1 - s} \right) + s(1 - p) \left( 0 - \frac{1 - s^{n+1}}{1 - s} \right) \\ &= s^{n+1} \frac{(sp)^{-K_n} - sp}{1 - sp} - s \frac{1 - s^{n+1}}{1 - s} \\ &= s^{n+1} \left( \frac{(sp)^{-K_n} - 1}{1 - sp} + 1 \right) - s \left( \frac{1 - s^n}{1 - s} + s^n \right) = Y_n. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_n|] < s \left( \frac{p^{-n} - s^n}{1 - sp} + \frac{1 - s^n}{1 - s} \right) < \infty$  and from the gambler interpretation we know that the if  $K_n < L$ , the capital of the gamblers present changes in step  $n + 1$  at most

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K_n} p^{-K_n} \max((p^{-1} - 1), 1) + p^{-1} < \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} p^{-L} + p^{-1},$$

while the total capital brought in changes by at most  $s$ . So the change is bounded and we can apply Thm 26 of cheat sheet. and obtain that  $\mathbb{E}[Y_T] = \mathbb{E}[Y_0] = 0$  (and thus  $\frac{1-s}{s}\mathbb{E}[Y_T] = 0$ ), which gives

$$\mathbb{E}[s^T] \left( ((sp)^{-L} - 1) \frac{1 - s}{1 - sp} + 1 \right) = 1.$$