PROCEEDINGS *of the* FOURTH BERKELEY SYMPOSIUM ON MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS AND PROBABILITY

Held at the Statistical Laboratory
University of California
June 20–July 30, 1960,
with the support of
University of California
National Science Foundation
Office of Naval Research
Office of Ordnance Research
Air Force Office of Research
National Institutes of Health

VOLUME I

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE THEORY OF STATISTICS

EDITED BY JERZY NEYMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY AND LOS ANGELES
1961

A MARTINGALE SYSTEM THEOREM AND APPLICATIONS

Y. S. CHOW
IBM RESEARCH CENTER, YORKTOWN HEIGHTS
AND
HERBERT ROBBINS
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

1. Introduction

Let $(W, \mathfrak{F}, P)$ be a probability space with points $\omega \in W$ and let $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, be an *integrable stochastic sequence:* y_n is a sequence of random variables, $\mathfrak{F}_n$ is a sequence of σ-algebras with $\mathfrak{F}_n \subset \mathfrak{F}_{n+1} \subset \mathfrak{F}$, y_n is measurable with respect to $\mathfrak{F}_n$, and $E(y_n)$ exists, $-\infty \leqq E(y_n) \leqq \infty$. A random variable $s = s(\omega)$ with positive integer values is a *sampling variable* if $\{s \leqq n\} \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ and $\{s < \infty\} = W$. (We denote by $\{\cdots\}$ the set of all ω satisfying the relation in braces, and understand equalities and inequalities to hold up to sets of P-measure 0.) We shall be concerned with the problem of finding, if it exists, a sampling variable s which maximizes $E(y_s)$.

To define a sampling variable s amounts to specifying a sequence of sets $B_n \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ such that

$$(1) \qquad 0 = B_0 \subset \cdots \subset B_n \subset B_{n+1} \subset \cdots ; \bigcup_1^\infty B_n = W,$$

the sampling variable s being defined by

$$(2) \qquad \{s \leqq n\} = B_n, \qquad \{s = n\} = B_n - B_{n-1}.$$

We shall be particularly interested in the case in which the sequence $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ is such that the sequence of sets

$$(3) \qquad B_n = \{E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq y_n\}$$

satisfies (1). We shall call this the *monotone case*. In this case a sampling variable s is defined by

$$(4) \qquad \{s \leqq n\} = \{E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq y_n\},$$

and s satisfies

$$(5) \qquad E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \begin{cases} > y_n, & s > n, \\ \leqq y_n, & s \leqq n. \end{cases}$$

The relations (5) will be fundamental in what follows.

This research was sponsored in part by the Office of Naval Research under Contract No. Nonr-226 (59), Project No. 042-205.

In the monotone case we have for the sampling variable s defined by (4) the following characterization:

$$s = \text{least positive integer } j \text{ such that } E(y_{j+1}|\mathfrak{F}_j) \leqq y_j. \tag{6}$$

Now even in the nonmonotone case we can always define a random variable s by (6), setting $s = \infty$ if there is no such j; let us call it the *conservative* random variable. The following statement is evident: the necessary and sufficient condition that there exists a sampling variable s satisfying (5) is that we are in the monotone case, and in this case s is the conservative random variable.

In section 3 we are going to show that *in the monotone case, under certain regularity assumptions, the conservative sampling variable s maximizes $E(y_s)$.*

2. An example

Before proceeding with the general theory we shall give a simple and instructive example of the monotone case in the form of a *sequential decision problem.*

Let $x, x_1, x_2, \cdots$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables with $E(x^+) < \infty$, where we denote $a^+ = \max(a, 0)$, $a^- = \max(-a, 0)$. We observe the sequence $x_1, x_2, \cdots$ sequentially and can stop with any $n \geqq 1$. If we stop with x_n we receive the reward $m_n = \max(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$, but the cost of taking the observations $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ is some strictly increasing function $g(n) \geqq 0$, so that our net gain in stopping with x_n is $y_n = m_n - g(n)$. The decision whether to stop with x_n or to take the next observation x_{n+1} must be a function of $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ alone. *Problem:* what stopping rule maximizes the expected value $E(y_s)$, where s is the random sample size defined by the stopping rule? We assume that the distribution function $F(u) = P\{x \leqq u\}$ is known. That $E(y_n)$ exists follows from the inequality

$$y_n^+ \leqq x_1^+ + \cdots + x_n^+, \tag{7}$$

which implies that $E(y_n^+) < \infty$.

Let $\mathfrak{F}_n$ be the σ-algebra generated by $x_1, \cdots, x_n$. Then $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ is an integrable stochastic sequence, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) - y_n &= \int [m_{n+1} - m_n]\, dF(x_{n+1}) - [g(n+1) - g(n)] \\ &= \int (x - m_n)^+\, dF(x) - f(n), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we have set

$$f(n) = g(n+1) - g(n) = \text{cost of taking the } (n+1)\text{st observation}. \tag{9}$$

Since we have assumed $g(n)$ to be strictly increasing, and $f(n) > 0$, it is easily seen that there exist unique constants α_n such that

$$\int (x - \alpha_n)^+\, dF(x) = f(n), \qquad n \geqq 1. \tag{10}$$

By (8) and (10),

$$E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n)\begin{cases} > y_n & \text{if} \quad m_n < \alpha_n, \\ \leqq y_n & \text{if} \quad m_n \geqq \alpha_n. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

The conservative random variable s defined by (6) is therefore

$$s = \text{least positive integer } j \text{ such that } m_j \geqq \alpha_j. \tag{12}$$

We are in the monotone case if and only if this s is a sampling variable and for every n

$$\{E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq y_n\} \subset \{E(y_{n+2}|\mathfrak{F}_{n+1}) \leqq y_{n+1}\}, \tag{13}$$

that is, $m_n \geqq \alpha_n$ implies $m_{n+1} \geqq \alpha_{n+1}$, which will certainly be the case, since $m_n \leqq m_{n+1}$, if $\alpha_n \geqq \alpha_{n+1}$, that is, if $f(n)$ is *nondecreasing* and hence α_n is *nonincreasing. We shall henceforth assume this to hold.* We shall now show that in this case the conservative random variable s is in fact a sampling variable, that is, that $P\{s < \infty\} = 1$. We have

$$\{s > n\} = \{m_n < \alpha_n\}, \tag{14}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} P\{s < \infty\} &= 1 - \lim_n P\{s > n\} = 1 - \lim_n P\{m_n < \alpha_n\} \\ &\geqq 1 - \lim_n P\{m_n < \alpha_1\} = 1 - \lim_n P^n\{x < \alpha_1\} = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

since by hypothesis $f(1) > 0$ so that by (10), $P\{x < \alpha_1\} < 1$. In fact, for any $r \geqq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(s^r) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^r P\{s = n\} \leqq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^r P\{s > n - 1\} \\ &\leqq 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^r P\{m_{n-1} < \alpha_1\} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^r P^{n-1}\{x < \alpha_1\} < \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

so that s has finite moments of all orders.

It is of interest to consider the special case $g(n) = cn$, $0 < c < \infty$. Here $f(n) = c$ and $\alpha_n = \alpha$, where α is defined by

$$\int (x - \alpha)^+ \, dF(x) = c, \tag{17}$$

and s is the first $j \geqq 1$ for which $x_j \geqq \alpha$. Hence

$$P\{s = j\} = P\{x \geqq \alpha\} P^{j-1}\{x < \alpha\},$$

$$E(s) = \frac{1}{P\{x \geqq \alpha\}},$$

$$E(y_s) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P\{s = j\} E(m_j - cj | s = j), \tag{18}$$

$$E(m_j | s = j) = E(x_j | x_1 < \alpha, \cdots, x_{j-1} < \alpha, x_j \geqq \alpha) = \frac{1}{P\{x \geqq \alpha\}} \int_{\{x \geqq \alpha\}} x \, dF(x),$$

so that

$$E(y_s) = \frac{1}{P\{x \geqq \alpha\}} \left[\int_{\{x \geqq \alpha\}} x \, dF(x) - c \right] = \frac{1}{P\{x \geqq \alpha\}} \left[\int (x - \alpha)^+ \, dF(x) - c + \alpha P\{x \geqq \alpha\} \right] = \alpha, \tag{19}$$

an elegant relation.

3. General theorems

In the following three lemmas we assume that $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ is any integrable stochastic sequence and that s and t are any sampling variables such that $E(y_s)$ and $E(y_t)$ exist.

LEMMA 1. *If for each n,*

$$E(y_s | \mathfrak{F}_n) \geqq y_n \qquad \text{if} \quad s > n, \tag{20}$$

and

$$E(y_t | \mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq y_n \qquad \text{if} \quad s = n, \ t > n, \tag{21}$$

then

$$E(y_s) \geqq E(y_t). \tag{22}$$

Conversely, if $E(y_s)$ is finite and (22) *holds for every t, then* (20) *and* (21) *hold for every t.*

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned} E(y_s) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n, t \leqq n\}} y_s \, dP + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n, t>n\}} y_n \, dP \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s \geqq n, t=n\}} y_s \, dP + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n, t>n\}} y_n \, dP \\ &\geqq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s \geqq n, t=n\}} y_n \, dP + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n, t>n\}} y_t \, dP \\ &= E(y_t). \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

To prove the converse, for a fixed n let

$$V = \{s > n \quad \text{and} \quad E(y_s|\mathfrak{F}_n) < y_n\}; \tag{24}$$

then $V \in \mathfrak{F}_n$. Define

$$t' = \begin{cases} s, & \omega \notin V, \\ n, & \omega \in V. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Then t' is a sampling variable. Since $E(y_s)$ is finite, by (22) $E(y_n) < \infty$ and then $E(y_{t'})$ exists. But

$$\begin{aligned} E(y_{t'}) &= \int_{\{t'=s\}} y_{t'}\,dP + \int_V y_{t'}\,dP = \int_{\{t'=s\}} y_s\,dP + \int_V y_n\,dP \\ &\geqq \int_{\{t'=s\}} y_s\,dP + \int_V y_s\,dP = E(y_s). \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

But by (22), $E(y_{t'}) \leqq E(y_s)$. Hence

$$\int_V y_n\,dP = \int_V y_s\,dP \tag{27}$$

and therefore $P(V) = 0$, which proves (20). To prove (21) let

$$V = \{s = n, t > n, \quad \text{and} \quad E(y_t|\mathfrak{F}_n) > y_n\}, \tag{28}$$

and define

$$t' = \begin{cases} s, & \omega \notin V, \\ t, & \omega \in V. \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} E(y_{t'}) &= \int_{\{t'=s\}} y_{t'}\,dP + \int_V y_{t'}\,dP = \int_{\{t'=s\}} y_s\,dP + \int_V y_t\,dP \\ &\geqq \int_{\{t'=s\}} y_s\,dP + \int_V y_n\,dP = \int_{\{t'=s\}} y_s\,dP + \int_V y_s\,dP = E(y_s), \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

and again $P(V) = 0$, which proves (21).

LEMMA 2. *If for each n,*

$$E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \geqq y_n, \qquad s > n, \tag{31}$$

and if

$$\liminf_n \int_{\{s>n\}} y_n^+\,dP = 0, \tag{32}$$

then for each n,

$$E(y_s|\mathfrak{F}_n) \geqq y_n, \qquad s \geqq n. \tag{33}$$

PROOF. (compare [2], p. 310). Let $V \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ and $U = V\{s \geqq n\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(34)\qquad \int_U y_n\,dP &= \int_{V\{s=n\}} y_n\,dP + \int_{V\{s>n\}} y_n\,dP \\ &\leqq \int_{V\{s=n\}} y_n\,dP + \int_{V\{s>n\}} y_{n+1}\,dP \\ &= \int_{V\{n\leqq s\leqq n+1\}} y_s\,dP + \int_{V\{s>n+1\}} y_{n+1}\,dP \\ &\leqq \cdots \leqq \int_{V\{n\leqq s\leqq n+r\}} y_s\,dP + \int_{V\{s>n+r\}} y_{n+r}\,dP \\ &\leqq \int_{V\{n\leqq s\leqq n+r\}} y_s\,dP + \int_{\{s>n+r\}} y_{n+r}^+\,dP.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$(35)\qquad \int_U y_n\,dP \leqq \int_{V\{s\geqq n\}} y_s\,dP + \liminf_n \int_{\{s>n\}} y_n^+\,dP = \int_U y_s\,dP,$$

which is equivalent to (33).

LEMMA 3. *If for each n,*

$$(36)\qquad E(y_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq y_n, \qquad s \leqq n,$$

and if

$$(37)\qquad \liminf_n \int_{\{t>n\}} y_n^-\,dP = 0,$$

then

$$(38)\qquad E(y_t|\mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq y_n, \qquad s = n,\quad t \geqq n.$$

PROOF. Let $V \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ and $U = V\{s = n, t \geqq n\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(39)\qquad \int_U y_n\,dP &= \int_{V\{s=n,\,t=n\}} y_n\,dP + \int_{V\{s=n,\,t>n\}} y_n\,dP \\ &\geqq \int_{V\{s=n,\,t=n\}} y_n\,dP + \int_{V\{s=n,\,t>n\}} y_{n+1}\,dP \\ &= \int_{V\{s=n,\,n\leqq t\leqq n+1\}} y_t\,dP + \int_{V\{s=n,\,t>n+1\}} y_{n+1}\,dP \\ &\geqq \cdots \geqq \int_{V\{s=n,\,n\leqq t\leqq n+r\}} y_t\,dP + \int_{V\{s=n,\,t>n+r\}} y_{n+r}\,dP \\ &\geqq \int_{V\{s=n,\,n\leqq t\leqq n+r\}} y_t\,dP - \int_{\{t>n+r\}} y_{n+r}^-\,dP.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\int_U y_n\,dP \geqq \int_{V\{s=n,\,t\geqq n\}} y_t\,dP - \liminf_n \int_{\{t>n\}} y_n^-\,dP = \int_U y_t\,dP, \tag{40}$$

which is equivalent to (38).

We can now state the main result of the present paper.

THEOREM 1. *Let* $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ *be an integrable stochastic sequence in the monotone case and let* s *be the conservative sampling variable*

$$s = \text{least positive integer } j \text{ such that } E(y_{j+1}|\mathfrak{F}_j) \leqq y_j. \tag{41}$$

Suppose that $E(y_s)$ *exists and that*

$$\liminf_n \int_{\{s>n\}} y_n^+\,dP = 0. \tag{42}$$

If t *is any sampling variable such that* $E(y_t)$ *exists and*

$$\liminf_n \int_{\{t>n\}} y_n^-\,dP = 0, \tag{43}$$

then

$$E(y_s) \geqq E(y_t). \tag{44}$$

PROOF. From lemmas 1, 2, and 3 and relations (5).

We shall now establish a lemma (see [2], p. 303) which provides sufficient conditions for (42) and (43).

LEMMA 4. *Let* $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ *be a stochastic sequence such that* $E(y_n^+) < \infty$ *for each* $n \geqq 1$, *and let* s *be any sampling variable. If there exists a nonnegative random variable* u *such that*

$$E(su) < \infty, \tag{45}$$

and if

$$E[(y_{n+1} - y_n)^+|\mathfrak{F}_n] \leqq u, \qquad s > n, \tag{46}$$

then

$$E(y_s^+) < \infty, \qquad \lim_n \int_{\{s>n\}} y_n^+\,dP = 0. \tag{47}$$

PROOF. Define

$$z_1 = y_1^+, \qquad z_{n+1} = (y_{n+1} - y_n)^+ \text{ for } n \geqq 1, \qquad w_n = z_1 + \cdots + z_n. \tag{48}$$

Then

$$y_n^+ \leqq w_n \tag{49}$$

(and hence $y_n^+ \leqq w_s$ if $s \geqq n$), and by (46)

$$E(z_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq u, \qquad s > n. \tag{50}$$

Hence

$$(51)\qquad \begin{aligned} E(y_s^+) &\leqq E(w_s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n\}} w_n\, dP = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{\{s=n\}} z_j\, dP \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=j}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n\}} z_j\, dP = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{s>j-1\}} z_j\, dP \\ &= E(y_1^+) + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \int_{\{s>j-1\}} E(z_j|\mathfrak{F}_{j-1})\, dP \\ &\leqq E(y_1^+) + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \int_{\{s>j-1\}} u\, dP = E(y_1^+) + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \sum_{n=j}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n\}} u\, dP \\ &= E(y_1^+) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \int_{\{s=n\}} (n-1)u\, dP = E(y_1^+) + E(su) - E(u) \\ &\leqq E(y_1^+) + E(su) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and hence from (49)

$$(52)\qquad \lim_n \int_{\{s>n\}} y_n^+\, dP \leqq \lim_n \int_{\{s>n\}} w_s\, dP = 0.$$

REMARK. Lemma 4 remains valid if we replace a^+ by a^- or by $|a|$ throughout.

4. Application to the sequential decision problem of section 2

Recalling the problem of section 2, let $x, x_1, x_2, \cdots$ be independent and identically distributed random variables with $E(x^+) < \infty$, $\mathfrak{F}_n$ the σ-algebra generated by $x_1, \cdots, x_n$, $g(n) \geqq 0$, $f(n) = g(n+1) - g(n) > 0$ and nondecreasing, $m_n = \max(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$, and $y_n = m_n - g(n)$. The constants α_n are defined by

$$(53)\qquad E[(x - \alpha_n)^+] = f(n)$$

and are nonincreasing; we are in the monotone case, and the conservative sampling variable s is the first $j \geqq 1$ such that $m_j \geqq \alpha_j$; thus

$$(54)\qquad \{s > n\} = \{m_n < \alpha_n\}.$$

We have shown in section 2 that

$$(55)\qquad P\{s < \infty\} = 1, \qquad E(s^r) < \infty \quad \textit{for} \quad r \geqq 0.$$

We wish to apply theorem 1. As concerns s it will suffice to show that $E(y_s^+) < \infty$ and that

$$(56)\qquad \lim_n \int_{\{s>n\}} y_n^+\, dP = 0,$$

which we shall do by using lemma 4. Let

$$(57)\qquad Y_n = m_n^+ - g(n).$$

Then

$$Y_n^+ = y_n^+, \quad E(Y_n^+) = E(y_n^+) \leqq E(x_1^+ + \cdots + x_n^+) = nE(x^+) < \infty, \tag{58}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E[(Y_{n+1} - Y_n)^+|\mathfrak{F}_n] &= E\{[m_{n+1}^+ - m_n^+ - f(n)]^+|\mathfrak{F}_n\} \\ &\leqq E[(m_{n+1}^+ - m_n^+)|\mathfrak{F}_n] \leqq E(x_{n+1}^+|\mathfrak{F}_n) \\ &= E(x^+) < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Hence by lemma 4, setting $u = E(x^+)$,

$$E(y_s^+) = E(Y_s^+) < \infty \tag{60}$$

and

$$\lim_n \int_{\{s>n\}} y_n^+ \, dP = \lim_n \int_{\{s>n\}} Y_n^+ \, dP = 0, \tag{61}$$

which were to be proved.

To establish the conditions on t of theorem 1 we assume that $Ex^- < \infty$; then since $y_n^- \leqq x_1^- + g(n)$ it follows that $E(y_n^-) < \infty$. Define a random variable u by setting

$$u(\omega) = f(n) \quad \text{if} \quad t(\omega) = n. \tag{62}$$

Since

$$(y_{n+1} - y_n)^- \leqq f(n) \tag{63}$$

and $f(n)$ is nondecreasing, it follows that

$$E[(y_{n+1} - y_n)^-|\mathfrak{F}_n] \leqq u \quad \text{if} \quad t \geqq n. \tag{64}$$

We now assume that $f(n) \leqq h(n)$, where $h(n)$ is a polynomial of degree $r \geqq 0$, and that $E(t^{r+1}) < \infty$. Then

$$E(tu) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\{t=n\}} nf(n) \, dP \leqq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nh(n)P\{t = n\}. \tag{65}$$

Since

$$E(t^{r+1}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{r+1}P\{t = n\} < \infty, \tag{66}$$

it follows that $E(tu) < \infty$. Then by the remark following lemma 4,

$$E(y_t^-) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_n \int_{\{t>n\}} y_n^- \, dP = 0, \tag{67}$$

and all the conditions of theorem 1 are established. Thus we have proved

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that* $E|x| < \infty$ *and that in addition to the conditions on* $g(n)$ *in the first paragraph of this section we have* $f(n) \leqq h(n)$, *where* $h(n)$ *is a polynomial of degree* $r \geqq 0$. *If* t *is any sampling variable for which* $E(t^{r+1}) < \infty$ *then* $-\infty < E(y_t) \leqq E(y_s) < \infty$, *where* s *is the conservative sampling variable defined by* (54).

If $g(n) = nc$ then $f(n) = c$ and we can take $r = 0$. Hence

COROLLARY 1. *If* $E|x| < \infty$ *and* $y_n = m_n - cn$, $0 < c < \infty$, *then if* t *is any sampling variable for which* $E(t) < \infty$, $E(y_t) \leqq E(y_s) = \alpha$ *[see (19)], where* α *is defined by* $E(x - \alpha)^+ = c$ *and* s = *the first* $j \geqq 1$ *such that* $x_j \geqq \alpha$. *Thus* s *is optimal in the class of all sampling variables with finite expectations.*

To replace the condition $E(t^{r+1}) < \infty$ in theorem 2 and corollary 1 by conditions on y_t we require the following theorem which is of interest in itself. We omit the proof.

THEOREM 3. *Let* $F(u)$ *be a distribution function. Define* $G(u) = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} F(u + n)$. *Then* $G(u)$ *is a distribution function if and only if*

$$\int_0^\infty u\, dF(u) < \infty, \tag{68}$$

and for any integer $b \geqq 1$,

$$\int_0^\infty u^b\, dG(u) < \infty \tag{69}$$

if and only if

$$\int_0^\infty u^{b+1}\, dF(u) < \infty. \tag{70}$$

COROLLARY 2. *If* $y_n = m_n - cn$, $0 < c < \infty$, *and* b *is any integer* $\geqq 1$, *then*

$$E(\sup_{n \geqq 1} y_n^+)^b < \infty \tag{71}$$

if and only if

$$E(x^+)^{b+1} < \infty. \tag{72}$$

PROOF. We can assume $c = 1$. Define

$$G(u) = P\{\sup_{n \geqq 1} y_n^+ \leqq u\}. \tag{73}$$

Then for $u \geqq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(u) &= P\{x_1 \leqq u + 1, x_2 \leqq u + 2, \cdots, x_n \leqq u + n, \cdots\} \\ &= \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} F(u + n). \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

By theorem 3,

$$E(\sup_{n \geqq 1} y_n^+)^b = \int_0^\infty u^b\, dG(u) < \infty \tag{75}$$

if and only if

$$\int_0^\infty u^{b+1}\, dF(u) = E(x^+)^{b+1} < \infty. \tag{76}$$

THEOREM 4. *Assume* $E|x| < \infty$, $E(x^+)^2 < \infty$. *If* $y_n = m_n - g(n)$ *where* $g(n)$ *is a polynomial of degree* $r \geqq 1$ *such that*

$$g(1) > 0, \tag{77}$$

$g(n+1) - g(n)$ is positive and nondecreasing, then for any sampling variable t,

$$E(y_t) \leqq E(y_s), \tag{78}$$

where s is the conservative sampling variable defined by (54).

PROOF. By theorem 2, if $E(t^r) < \infty$ then (78) holds. Hence we can assume that $E(t^r) = \infty$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} &g(1) > 0, && f(1) = g(2) - g(1) > 0,\\ &g(2) \geqq g(1) + f(1), && g(3) - g(2) \geqq f(1),\\ &g(3) \geqq g(1) + 2f(1), &&\\ &\cdots\cdots &&\\ &g(n) \geqq g(1) + (n-1)f(1). && \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Let

$$a = \frac{1}{2} \min\,[g(1), f(1)] > 0. \tag{80}$$

Then by (79),

$$g(n) \geqq an \quad \text{for} \quad n \geqq 1. \tag{81}$$

Let

$$\tilde{y}_n = m_n - \frac{a}{2}\, n. \tag{82}$$

By corollary 2, $E(\tilde{y}_t^+) < \infty$. Then since

$$y_t = \tilde{y}_t + \frac{a}{2}\, t - g(t) \leqq \tilde{y}_t^+ - \frac{1}{2}\, g(t) \tag{83}$$

we have

$$E(y_t) \leqq E(\tilde{y}_t^+) - \frac{1}{2}\, E[g(t)] = -\infty, \tag{84}$$

so that (78) holds in this case too.

REMARK. If in the case $g(n) = cn$ we define $\bar{y}_n = x_n - cn$, then

$$\bar{y}_n \leqq y_n, \qquad \bar{y}_s = y_s. \tag{85}$$

Hence for any sampling variable t,

$$E(\bar{y}_t) \leqq E(y_t) \leqq E(y_s) = E(\bar{y}_s), \tag{86}$$

so that s is also optimal for the stochastic sequence $(\bar{y}_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$.

5. A result of Snell

As an application of lemmas 1 and 2, we are going to obtain Snell's result on sequential game theory [3].

LEMMA 5 (*Snell*). *Let $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ be a stochastic sequence satisfying $y_n \geqq u$ for* *each n with $E|u| < \infty$. Then there exists a semimartingale $(x_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ such that for every sampling variable t and every n,*

$$E(x_t|\mathfrak{F}_n| \geqq x_n \quad \text{if} \quad t \geqq n, \qquad x_n \geqq E(u|\mathfrak{F}_n), \tag{87}$$

$$x_n = \min [y_n, E(x_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n)], \tag{88}$$

and

$$\liminf x_n = \liminf y_n. \tag{89}$$

We will assume the validity of this lemma, and prove the following theorem by applying lemmas 1 and 2.

THEOREM 5 (*Snell*). *Let $(y_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ and $(x_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ satisfy the conditions of lemma 5. For $\epsilon \geqq 0$ define $s = j$ to be the first $j \geqq 1$ such that $x_j \geqq y_j - \epsilon$. If $\epsilon > 0$, then*

$$E(y_s) \leqq E(y_t) + \epsilon \tag{90}$$

for every sampling variable t. If $\epsilon = 0$ and if $P\{s < \infty\} = 1$, then (90) still holds.

PROOF. It is obvious that in both cases s is a sampling variable. We need to verify that $P\{s < \infty\} = 1$. If $\epsilon > 0$, by (89) this is true.

Since $(x_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ is a semimartingale,

$$E(x_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) \geqq x_n. \tag{91}$$

By (88) and the definition of s,

$$E(x_{n+1}|\mathfrak{F}_n) = x_n \quad \text{for} \quad s > n. \tag{92}$$

Since $-x_n \leqq E(-u|\mathfrak{F}_n)$ and $E|u| < \infty$, by lemma 2 and (92), we have

$$E(x_s|\mathfrak{F}_n) \leqq x_n \quad \text{for} \quad s > n. \tag{93}$$

By (87), (93), and lemma 1, we obtain $E(x_s) \leqq E(x_t)$, and therefore, by definition of s,

$$E(y_s) \leqq E(x_s) + \epsilon \leqq E(x_t) + \epsilon \leqq E(y_t) + \epsilon. \tag{94}$$

Thus the proof is complete.

J. MacQueen and R. G. Miller, Jr., in a recent paper [1], treat the problem of section 2 by completely different methods. Reference should also be made to a paper by C. Derman and J. Sacks [4], in which the formulation and results are very similar to those of the present paper.

REFERENCES

[1] J. MACQUEEN and R. G. MILLER, JR., "Optimal persistence policies," *J. Operations Res. Soc. America*, Vol. 8 (1960), pp. 362–380.

[2] J. L. DOOB, *Stochastic Processes*, New York, Wiley, 1953.

[3] J. L. SNELL, "Application of martingale system theorems," *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 73 (1952), pp. 293–312.

[4] C. DERMAN and J. SACKS, "Replacement of periodically inspected equipment (an optimal optional stopping rule)," to appear in *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.*, Vol. 7 (1960).