## SOME REVERSE MAXIMAL INEQUALITIES FOR SUPERMARTINGALES

## N. K. AGBEKO

Dept. of Probability Theory and Statistics, Eötvös Loránd University, 1088 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 6-8.

(On leave from Togo)

(Received June 22, 1984)

1. Let  $\varphi(t)$  be a nonnegative increasing function, continuous on the left, such that  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and  $\lim \varphi(t) = \infty$ . For  $x \ge 0$  define the function

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{0}^{x} \varphi(t)dt.$$

Then  $\Phi$  is increasing, continuous and convex.  $\Phi$  is called a Young-function. We define the conjugate Young-function as follows: for t>0 put  $\psi(t)=0$ 

=  $\sup(x>0: \varphi(x)<t)$  and  $\psi(0)=0$ . It is easily shown that  $\psi$  satisfies all the properties imposed on  $\varphi$ . It is also true that

$$\psi(\varphi(x)) \leq x \leq \psi(\varphi(x) + 0).$$

The Young-function

$$\Psi(x) = \int_{0}^{x} \psi(t)dt$$

is said to be conjugate to  $\Phi$ .

The pair  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  of conjugate Young-functions satisfies the following inequality of Young:  $xy \le \Phi(x) + \Psi(y)$ , for all  $x \ge 0$ ,  $y \ge 0$ . Equality holds if and only if  $x \in [\psi(y), \psi(y+0)]$  or  $y \in [(x), \psi(x+0)]$ .

We say that  $\Phi$  satisfies the growth condition if there exist constants a>1 and A>0 such that for all  $x\geq 0$ , the inequality

$$(1.1) \Phi(ax) \leq A\Phi(x)$$

holds. The growth condition (1.1) is equivalent to

(1.2) 
$$\sup_{x>0} \frac{x\varphi(x)}{\Phi(x)} = p < \infty.$$

p is called the power of  $\Phi$ . The power q of  $\Psi$  is defined similarly.

4 ANNALES - Sectio Computatorica - Tomus VI.

**2.** Let  $(X_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ ,  $n \ge 0$ , be a nonnegative supermartingale. Denote by  $X_n^*$  the corresponding maximal function defined as follows

$$X_n^* = \max_{0 \le k \le n} X_k.$$

Recall the following inequality for nonnegative supermartingales (e.g. [7]): For any nonnegative supermartingale  $(X_n, \mathcal{F}_n)$ ,  $n \ge 0$ , the inequality

$$xP(X_n^* \ge x) \le EX_0 \land x$$

holds for all x > 0. We shall reverse this inequality under Gundy's condition.

**Lemma 2. 1.** Let  $(X_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$  be any nonnegative supermartingale satisfying Gundy's condition

$$X_n \leq c X_{n-1}$$
 a.e.,

for all  $n \ge 1$  and for some positive constant c. Then

$$(2.1) EX_n \chi(X_n^* \ge x) \le EX_0 \chi(X_0 \ge x) + cx E \chi(X_n^* \ge x)$$

for all x > 0.

**Proof.** Calculate  $EX_n\chi(X_n^* \ge x)$ .

$$EX_n\chi(X_n^* \ge x) = E\sum_{i=0}^n X_n[\chi(X_i^* \ge x) - \chi(X_{i-1}^* \ge x)]$$

with  $X_{-1} \equiv X_{-1}^* \equiv 0$ . It is clear that the random variable  $\chi(X_i^* \ge x) - \chi(X_{i-1}^* \ge x)$  is nonnegative (since the function  $\chi(y \ge x)$  increases in y) and  $\mathfrak{F}_i$ -measurable. The supermartingale property and the conditional expectation property together with the above facts imply

$$EX_n\chi(X_n^*\geq x)\leq \sum_{i=1}^n EX_i[\chi(X_i^*\geq x)-\chi(X_{i-1}^*\geq x)].$$

By Gundy's condition it ensues that

$$\begin{split} EX_{n}\chi(X_{n}^{*} \geq x) \leq EX_{0}\chi(X_{0} \geq x) + c & \sum_{i=1}^{n} EX_{i-1}[\chi(X_{i}^{*} \geq x) - \chi(X_{i-1}^{*} \geq x)] \leq \\ \leq EX_{0}\chi(X_{0} \geq x) + c & \sum_{i=1}^{n} EX_{i-1}^{*}[\chi(X_{i}^{*} \geq x) - \chi(X_{i-1}^{*} \geq x)] \leq \\ \leq EX_{0}\chi(X_{0} \geq x) + cE & \int_{X_{0}}^{x} yd(\chi(y \geq x)) = \\ = EX_{0}\chi(X_{0} \geq x) + cxE[\chi(X_{n}^{*} \geq x) - \chi(X_{0} \geq x)] \leq \\ \leq EX_{0}\chi(X_{0} \geq x) + cxE\chi(X_{n}^{*} \geq x), \end{split}$$

and this was to be proved.  $\Box$ 

Consider an arbitrary pair of conjugate Young-functions  $(\Phi, \Psi)$  defined on  $[0, \infty)$ , and introduce the Laplace transform

$$I(t) = \int_{0}^{\pi} e^{-t\lambda} d\Psi(\lambda),$$

for all 0 < t < 1.

**Theorem 2.2.** Consider a potential  $(X_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ , generated by an adapted increasing process  $A_n$ ,  $n \ge 0$  i.e.

$$X_n = E(A_{\infty} \mid \mathfrak{F}_n) - A_n.$$

If  $I(t) < \infty$ , then

$$(2.2) EX_n^* \leq E\left(\max_{1\leq i\leq n} E(A_\infty \mid \mathcal{F}_n)\right) \leq E\Phi(A_\infty) + I(t)(1-t)^{-1}.$$

The first inequality on the left-hand side is trivial. The second one is the consequence of the following statement ([5]): For every nonnegative submartingale  $(X_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$  we have

(2.3) 
$$EX_n^* \leq E\Phi(X_n) + I(1)(1-t)^{-1},$$

provided that  $I(t) < \infty$ .

We are now in the position to reverse inequality (2.2).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $(X_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$  be a potential. Suppose that

$$\Psi(\varphi(x)) = x\varphi(x) - \Phi(x) = O(x), \quad as \quad x \to \infty.$$

Then under Gundy's condition, we have

(2.4) 
$$E\Phi(X_n^*) \le cx_0\varphi(x_0) + EX_0\varphi(X_0) + cK_{\varphi}EX_n^*,$$

where  $x_0 > 0$  is a suitable canstant.

**Proof.** Integrate inequality (2.1) on the interval  $(0, \infty)$  with respect to the measure  $d(\varphi(x))$ . By Fubini's theorem, we have

$$EX_n\varphi(X_n^*)\leq EX_0\varphi(X_0)+cE\int\limits_0^{X_0^*}xd(\varphi(x)).$$

Since  $\varphi$  is an increasing function, it is obvious that  $EX_n\varphi(X_n) \leq EX_n\varphi(X_n^*)$ . Consequently,

$$EX_n\varphi(X_n) \leq EX_0\varphi(X_0) + cE \int_0^{X_0} xd(\varphi(x)).$$

One can easily verify that

$$\int_{0}^{x} t d(\varphi(t)) = \Psi(\varphi(x)).$$

which implies

$$EX_n\varphi(X_n) \leq EX_0\varphi(X_0) + cE\Psi(\varphi(X_n^*)).$$

Further, the assumption of the theorem ensures the existence of a positive constant  $K_{\varphi}$ , depending only on  $\Phi$ , such that

$$\Psi(\varphi(x)) \leq K_{\varphi} \cdot x, \ x \geq x_0.$$

Hence

$$EX_{n}\varphi(X_{n}) \leq EX_{0}\varphi(X_{0}) + c \int_{(X^{*}_{n} \leq x_{0})} \Psi(\varphi(X_{n}^{*}))dP +$$

$$+ c \int_{(X^{*}_{n} \geq x_{0})} \Psi(\varphi(X_{n}^{*}))dP \leq EX_{0}\varphi(X_{0}) + c\Psi(\varphi(x_{0})) + cK_{\varphi} \int_{(X^{*}_{n} \geq x_{0})} X_{n}^{*}dP \leq$$

$$\leq c\Psi(\varphi(x_{0})) + EX_{0}\varphi(X_{0}) + cK_{\varphi}EX_{n}^{*}.$$

Using the fact that  $x\varphi(x) \ge \Psi(\varphi(x))$  for all  $x \ge 0$ , we can conclude on the validity of the desired inequality, finishing the proof of the theorem.  $\Box$ 

We shall give an example of a potential satisfying Gundy's condition.

Let  $(x_n)$ ,  $n \ge 1$ , be any real sequence such that  $x_n \nmid x$ , for an arbitrary positive constant x. Consider the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, P)$ , with  $\Omega = \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}$  being the  $\sigma$ -field of all the subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ . The probability measure will be defined on  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A})$  by the formula,

$$P({n}) = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n+1}.$$

Define for all  $n \ge 1$  the random variables

$$X_n(\omega) = x - x_n \chi(\omega \le n),$$

and let  $\mathfrak{F}_n = \sigma(\{1\}, \ldots, \{n\}, \{n+1, n+2, \ldots\})$  be the minimal  $\sigma$ -field generated by the measurable partition given in the brackets.

Then it is easily checked that  $(X_n, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ ,  $n \ge 1$ , is a potential on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{A}, P)$ , satisfying Gundy's condition with c = 1, since  $-x_{n+1}\chi(\omega \le n+1) \le -x_n\chi(\omega \le n)$ . Consequently,  $x-x_{n+1}\chi(\omega \le n+1) \le x-x_n\chi(\omega \le n)$ , i.e.  $X_{n+1} \le X_n$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Garsia A. M.: Martingale Inequalities. Benjamin, Reading, Massachusetts, 1973.
- [2] Gundy R. F.: On the class L log L martingales and singular integrals, Studia Math. 23 (1969), 109-118.
- [3] Krasnosel'ski M. A. and Rutickii B. Ya.: Convex Functions and Orlicz-spaces. (Transl. from Russian by L. F. Boron) Noordhoff, Groningen, 1961.
- [4] Meyer P. A.: Martingales and Stochastic Integrals I. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 284 Springer, Berlin, 1972.
- [5] Mogyoródi J.: On some problems for predictable r.v.'s. In: Stat. and Probability: Proc. of the 3rd Pannonian Symp. on Math. Stat. (Visegrád, 1982), 1984, 221-230.
- [6] Mogyoródi J. and Móri T. F.: Necessary and sufficient condition for the maximal inequality of convex Young-functions. Acta Sci. Math. 45 (1983), 325 332.
- [7] Neveu J.: Martingales à temps discrets. Masson et Cie, Paris, 1972.