



Soviet-era science, translated into English

A Game Variant of the Optimal Stopping Problem

1969

SovietRxiv

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-196901.38312>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

Abstract

Full Text

UDC 518.9

E. B. Dynkin

A Game Variant of the Optimal Stopping Problem

(Presented by Academician A. N. Kolmogorov on 27 VI 1968)

1. Let an increasing sequence of σ -algebras

$\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \dots$ be given on a space Ω , and let functions $x_n(\omega)$, $\varphi_n(\omega)$, measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_n ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$), be given. The process may be stopped by the first player at those times n when $\varphi_n > 0$, and by the second player at those times when $\varphi_n < 0$. If stopping is carried out at time n , then the second player receives x_n from the first. In this game the strategies of the first player are Markov times σ subject to the condition: $\varphi_\sigma > 0$ when $\sigma < \infty$; the strategies of the second player are Markov times τ , for which $\varphi_\tau < 0$ when $\tau < \infty$. (A function $\tau(\omega)$ taking the values $0, 1, \dots, n, \dots$ and the value $+\infty$ is called a Markov time if, for every finite n , $\{\tau = n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$.) Let P be a probability measure on some σ -algebra \mathcal{F} containing \mathcal{F}_n for all n , and let $M\xi$ denote the integral of ξ with respect to P . The mean payoff corresponding to the strategies σ, τ is equal to $Mx_{\sigma \wedge \tau}$.*

We shall assume that the following condition is satisfied.

Condition A. $M\{\sup_n |x_n|\} < \infty$.

Under this condition the existence of the value of the game is proved, ϵ -optimal strategies are constructed, and some conditions for the existence of optimal strategies are derived.

If $\varphi_n < 0$ everywhere, then we arrive at the optimal stopping problem considered by Snell⁽¹⁾ and by other authors. Of special interest is also the case $x_n = g(X_n)$, $\varphi_n = \Phi(X_n)$, where $(X_t, \mathcal{F}_t, P_x)$ is some Markov chain. This case has been studied independently by E. B. Friedl.

2. Suppose the game begins at time n . Then only strategies $\sigma \geq n$ and $\tau \geq n$ are possible. (Throughout the paper it is understood that $\varphi_\sigma > 0$ when $\sigma < \infty$, and $\varphi_\tau < 0$ when $\tau < \infty$.) The corresponding mean payoff is $g(n, \sigma, \tau) = M(x_{\sigma \wedge \tau} | \mathcal{F}_n)$.

Let ξ_α be an arbitrary family of measurable functions. We agree to denote by $\text{Sup } \xi_\alpha$ a measurable function ξ satisfying the conditions: a) for every α , $\xi_\alpha \leq \xi$ (a.s.)**; b) if $\xi_\alpha \leq \eta$ (a.s.) for every α , then $\xi \leq \eta$ (a.s.). It is proved (see

(^{1,2}) that such a function ξ exists and is defined uniquely up to an a.s. zero summand, and that one can choose a sequence of values α_m so that $\text{Sup } \xi_\alpha = \sup_m \xi_{\alpha_m}$ (a.s.). Put $\text{Inf } \xi_\alpha = -\sup(-\xi_\alpha)$.

The upper and lower values of the game are defined by the formulas

$$\bar{w}_n = \text{Inf}_{\sigma \geq n} \text{Sup}_{\tau \geq n} g(n, \sigma, \tau), \quad \underline{w}_n = \text{Sup}_{\tau \geq n} \text{Inf}_{\sigma \geq n} g(n, \sigma, \tau). \quad (1)$$

The main results of the paper are contained in the following two theorems.

Theorem 1. *Almost surely $\underline{w}_n = \bar{w}_n$, and the value of the game $w = w_n = \bar{w}_n$ satisfies the equation*

$$w_n = \begin{cases} M(w_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \wedge x_n, & (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n > 0) \text{ **}, \\ M(w_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \vee x_n, & (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n < 0), \\ M(w_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n), & (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n = 0). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

* We denote the smaller of two numbers a, b by $a \wedge b$, and the larger by $a \vee b$.

The value x_∞ is, by definition, equal to zero.

** “(a.s.)” means almost surely, i.e. for all ω except for a set of measure zero.

*** “(a.s. A)” means for almost all $\omega \in A$.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$ the strategies

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\varepsilon^n &= \inf\{t : t \geq n, \varphi_t > 0, x_t \leq w_t + \varepsilon\}, \\ \tau_\varepsilon^n &= \inf\{t : t \geq n, \varphi_t < 0, x_t \geq w_t - \varepsilon\} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

are ε -optimal in the sense that for any $\sigma \geq n, \tau \geq n$

$$g(n, \sigma, \tau_\varepsilon^n) + \varepsilon \geq w_n \geq g(n, \sigma_\varepsilon^n, \tau) - \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s.}) \quad (4)$$

If $\tau_0^n < +\infty$ (a.s.) ($\sigma_0^n < +\infty$ (a.s.)), then the first (respectively the second) of inequalities (4) remains valid for $\varepsilon = 0$.

Theorem 2. Let

$$s_n = \text{Inf}_{\sigma \geq n} M(x_\sigma | \mathcal{F}_n), \quad S_n = \text{Sup}_{\tau \geq n} M(x_\tau | \mathcal{F}_n). \quad (5)$$

Then S_n is the smallest supermartingale satisfying the condition

$$S_n \geq x_n \quad (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n < 0), \quad S_n \geq 0 \quad (\text{a.s.}); \quad (6)$$

s_n is the largest submartingale satisfying the condition

$$s_n \leq x_n \text{ (a.s. } \varphi_n > 0), \quad s_n \leq 0 \text{ (a.s.).} \quad (7)$$

If with probability 1 there exists $m \geq n$ for which $S_m = x_m, \varphi_m < 0$ ($s_m = x_m, \varphi_m > 0$), then the first (respectively the second) of inequalities (4) holds for $\varepsilon = 0$.

3. Put

$$\bar{g}(n, \sigma) = \text{Sup}_{\tau \geq n} g(n, \sigma, \tau). \quad (8)$$

Obviously,

$$\bar{w}_n = \text{Inf}_{\sigma \geq n} \bar{g}(n, \sigma). \quad (9)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_n &\leq \bar{g}(n, n) = x_n \quad (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n > 0), \\ \bar{w}_n &\geq \text{Inf}_{\delta \geq n} g(n, \sigma, n) = x_n \quad (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n < 0). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Let $\sigma \geq n, \tau \geq n$. Put $\sigma' = \sigma \vee (n + 1), \tau' = \tau \vee (n + 1)$. It is not difficult to verify that

$$g(n, \sigma, \tau) = M\{g(n + 1, \sigma', \tau') \mid \mathcal{F}_n\} \quad (\text{a.s. } \sigma > n, \tau > n); \quad (11)$$

$$g(n, \sigma, \tau) = x_n \quad (\text{a.s. } \{\sigma = n\} \cup \{\tau = n\}). \quad (12)$$

4. For each n one can choose a sequence of Markov times $\sigma_m \geq n + 1$ such that $\bar{w}_{n+1} = \inf_m \bar{g}(n + 1, \sigma_m)$ (a.s.). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and denote by ν the least value of m for which

$$\bar{g}(n + 1, \sigma_m) \leq \bar{w}_{n+1} + \varepsilon. \quad (13)$$

It is easy to see that σ_ν is a Markov time and $\sigma_\nu \geq n + 1$. By virtue of (8) and (13), for any $\tau \geq n + 1$ and any m

$$g(n + 1, \sigma_m, \tau) \leq \bar{g}(n + 1, \sigma_m) \leq \bar{w}_{n+1} + \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s. } \nu = m).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
 g(n+1, \sigma_\nu, \tau) &= M(x_{\sigma_\nu \wedge \tau} | \mathcal{F}_{n+1}) = \sum_m M\{\chi_{\nu=m} x_{\sigma_m \wedge \tau} | \mathcal{F}_{n+1}\} = \\
 &= \sum_m \chi_{\nu=m} g(n+1, \sigma_m, \tau) \leq \bar{w}_{n+1} + \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s.}).
 \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of (11)

$$g(n, \sigma_\nu, \tau) = M\{g(n+1, \sigma_\nu, \tau') | \mathcal{F}_n\} \leq M(\bar{w}_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) + \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s. } \tau > n). \quad (14)$$

According to (12)

$$g(n, \sigma_\nu, \tau) = x_n \quad (\text{a.s. } \tau = n). \quad (15)$$

Since $\{\varphi_n \geq 0\} \subseteq \{\tau > n\}$, it follows from (14) that

$$\bar{g}(n, \sigma_\nu) \leq M\{\bar{w}_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n\} + \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n \geq 0). \quad (16)$$

Further, from (14) and (15),

$$\bar{g}(n, \sigma_\nu) \leq x_n \vee M(\bar{w}_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) + \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s.}). \quad (17)$$

Taking (9) into account, we conclude from (16) and (17) that

$$\bar{w}_n \leq M(\bar{w}_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \quad (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n \geq 0), \quad (18)$$

$$\bar{w}_n \leq x_n \vee M(\bar{w}_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \quad (\text{a.s.}). \quad (19)$$

5. Let $\sigma \geq n$. By virtue of (8) one can choose a sequence of Markov times $\tau_m \geq n+1$ such that

$$\bar{g}(n+1, \sigma') = \sup g(n+1, \sigma', \tau_m).$$

Let v be the smallest value of m for which

$$g(n+1, \sigma', \tau_m) \geq \bar{g}(n+1, \sigma') - \varepsilon.$$

Then τ_v is a Markov time, $\tau_v \geq n+1$, and

$$g(n+1, \sigma', \tau_v) \geq \bar{g}(n+1, \sigma') - \varepsilon$$

(a.s.). By virtue of (8), (11), and (9),

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g}(n, \sigma) &\geq g(n, \sigma, \tau_v) = M\{g(n+1, \sigma', \tau_v) \mid \mathcal{F}_n\} \geq \\ &\geq M\{\bar{g}(n+1, \sigma') \mid \mathcal{F}_n\} - \varepsilon \geq M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) - \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s. } \sigma > n). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

By virtue of (12), $g(n, \sigma, \tau_v) = x_n$ (a.s. $\sigma = n$). Therefore

$$\bar{g}(n, \sigma) \geq x_n \wedge M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) - \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s.}). \quad (21)$$

Since $\{\varphi_n \leq 0\} \subseteq \{\sigma > n\}$, according to (20)

$$\bar{w}_n \geq M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) - \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n \leq 0). \quad (22)$$

In view of the arbitrariness of $\varepsilon > 0$, from (21) and (22) we have

$$\bar{w}_n \geq M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \quad (\text{a.s. } \varphi_n \leq 0); \quad (23)$$

$$\bar{w}_n \geq x_n \wedge M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \quad (\text{a.s.}). \quad (24)$$

6. From (18) and (23) it follows that

$$\bar{w}_n = M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n)$$

(a.s. $\varphi_n = 0$). From (9), (18), and (24) we have

$$\bar{w}_n = x_n \wedge M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n)$$

(a.s. $\varphi_n > 0$). Finally, from (10), (23), and (19)

$$\bar{w}_n = x_n \vee M(\bar{w}_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n)$$

(a.s. $\varphi_n < 0$). Thus, \bar{w}_n satisfies equation (2).

When x_n is replaced by $-x_n$ and φ_n by $-\varphi_n$, the functions \underline{w}_n pass into $-\bar{w}_n$. Therefore \underline{w}_n also satisfies equation (2).

7. Fix arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and n , and put

$$\sigma_\varepsilon = \inf\{t : t \geq n, \varphi_t > 0, x_t \leq \underline{w}_t + \varepsilon\},$$

$$\tau_\varepsilon = \inf\{t : t \geq n, \varphi_t < 0, x_t \geq \bar{w}_t - \varepsilon\} \quad (25)$$

(if the set is empty, we take its lower bound to be $+\infty$). Let

$$\Lambda_n = \{t : t \geq n, \varphi_t < 0\},$$

and let \tilde{x}_n be the exact upper bound of the set x_t ($t \in \Lambda_n$), augmented by zero. Note that for $m < n$

$$\bar{w}_n \leq \sup_{\tau \geq n} g(n, \infty, \tau) \leq M(\tilde{x}_n | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq M(\tilde{x}_m | \mathcal{F}_n) \quad (\text{a.s.}) \quad (26)$$

Therefore

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}_n \leq M(\tilde{x}_m | \mathcal{F}_\infty) = \tilde{x}_m \quad (\text{a.s.}), \quad (27)$$

where \mathcal{F}_∞ is the minimal σ -algebra containing \mathcal{F}_n for all n .

It follows from (27) that

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}_n \leq U \vee 0, \quad (28)$$

where $U = 0$ if Λ_0 is finite, and U is the upper limit of x_t as $t \rightarrow \infty$ over the set Λ_0 , if Λ_0 is infinite.

Put $v_t = \bar{w}_{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge t}$. By virtue of (2), $M(\bar{w}_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t) \geq \bar{w}_t$ (a.s. $t < \tau_\varepsilon$). Therefore, for $t \geq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} M(v_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t) &= \chi_{\tau_\varepsilon > t} M(\bar{w}_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t) + \sum_{m=n}^t \chi_{\tau_\varepsilon = m} \bar{w}_m \geq \\ &\geq \chi_{\tau_\varepsilon > t} \bar{w}_t + \chi_{\tau_\varepsilon \leq t} \bar{w}_{\tau_\varepsilon} = v_t \quad (\text{a.s.}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (v_t, \mathcal{F}_t) is a submartingale, and for any $\sigma \geq n$ ${}^a a_1 W \wedge {}^a a \leq (w_\sigma | n = v_n = \bar{w}_n$ (a.s.). By condition A, Fatou's lemma is applicable to the sequence $v_{\sigma \wedge t}$. Therefore

$$M \left\{ \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} v_{\sigma \wedge t} | \mathcal{F}_n \right\} \geq \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} M(v_{\sigma \wedge t} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \bar{w}_n \quad (\text{a.s.}). \quad (29)$$

Let us note that

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} v_{\sigma \wedge t} = \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}_{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma \wedge t} = \bar{w}_{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma} \quad \text{when } \tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma < \infty. \quad (30)$$

On the other hand, by virtue of (28), if $\tau_\varepsilon = \infty$, then $U \leq 0$ (a.s.) and

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} v_{\sigma \wedge t} \leq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}_n \leq 0 \quad (\text{a.s. } \tau_\varepsilon = \infty). \quad (31)$$

From (29), (30), and (31) we have

$$M(\bar{w}_{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \bar{w}_n \quad (\text{a.s.}) \quad (32)$$

(where we put $\bar{w}_\infty = 0$). If $\tau_0 < \infty$ (a.s.), then (32) also holds for $\varepsilon = 0$.

According to (25), $x_{\tau_\varepsilon} = \bar{w}_{\tau_\varepsilon} - \varepsilon$, and by virtue of (2) $x_\sigma \geq \bar{w}_\sigma$ (a.s.) (for $\varphi_\sigma > 0$). Therefore $x_{\sigma \wedge \tau_\varepsilon} \geq \bar{w}_{\sigma \wedge \tau_\varepsilon} - \varepsilon$ (a.s.), and by virtue of (32)

$$\bar{w}_n \leq M(x_{\sigma \wedge \tau_\varepsilon} | \mathcal{F}_n) + \varepsilon = g(n, \sigma, \tau_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s.}). \quad (33)$$

Replacing x_n by $-x_n$ and φ_n by $-\varphi_n$, we obtain that for any $\tau \geq n$ $w_n \geq g(n, \sigma_\varepsilon, \tau) - \varepsilon$ (a.s.). It is easy to see that $\bar{w}_n \geq w_n$ (a.s.). Consequently, for any $\sigma \geq n$ and $\tau \geq n$,

$$g(n, \sigma_\varepsilon, \tau) - \varepsilon \leq w_n \leq \bar{w}_n \leq g(n, \sigma, \tau_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \quad (\text{a.s.}). \quad (34)$$

Putting $\sigma = \sigma_\varepsilon$, $\tau = \tau_\varepsilon$, we find that $0 \leq \bar{w}_n - w_n \leq 2\varepsilon$ (a.s.). Therefore $w_n = \bar{w}_n$ (a.s.), and (4) follows from (34). Theorem 1 is proved.

Theorem 2 is proved without difficulty, and we omit its proof.

Moscow State University
named after M. V. Lomonosov

Received
12 VI 1968

REFERENCES

- ¹ L. Shell, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., 73, 293 (1952).
- ² J. Neveu, *Bases Mathematiques du Calcul des Probabilités*, 1964.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.