



---

A Simple proof of a Known Result in Random Walk Theory

Author(s): Austin J. Lemoine

Source: *The Annals of Probability*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Apr., 1974), pp. 347-348

Published by: Institute of Mathematical Statistics

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2959234>

Accessed: 18-06-2015 18:29 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Institute of Mathematical Statistics* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Annals of Probability*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# A SIMPLE PROOF OF A KNOWN RESULT IN RANDOM WALK THEORY<sup>1</sup>

BY AUSTIN J. LEMOINE

*The University of Texas at Austin*

Let  $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$  be a stationary independent sequence of real random variables,  $S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ , and  $\alpha_A$  the hitting time of the set  $A$  by the process  $\{S_n, n \geq 1\}$ , where  $A$  is one of the half-lines  $(0, \infty)$ ,  $[0, \infty)$ ,  $(-\infty, 0]$  or  $(-\infty, 0)$ . This note provides a simple proof of a known result in random walk theory on necessary and sufficient conditions for  $E\{\alpha_A\}$  to be finite. The method requires neither generating functions nor moment conditions on  $X_1$ .

Let  $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$  be a stationary independent process of real random variables defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ ,  $S_0 \equiv 0$ , and  $S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Set  $\alpha_A = n$  if  $n = \inf\{k: k \geq 1 \text{ and } S_k \in A\}$  and  $\alpha_A = +\infty$  if no such  $n$  exists, where  $A$  is one of  $(0, \infty)$ ,  $[0, \infty)$ ,  $(-\infty, 0]$ , or  $(-\infty, 0)$ ; that is,  $\alpha_A$  is the hitting time of the set  $A$  by the process  $\{S_n, n \geq 1\}$ . This note provides a simple proof of a known result in random walk theory on the finiteness of  $E\{\alpha_A\}$ .

Assume that  $P\{X_1 = 0\} < 1$ . It follows, without recourse to moment conditions on the distribution of  $X_1$  (see Theorem 8.2.5 in Chung (1968)), that there are three mutually exclusive possibilities for the random walk  $\{S_n, n \geq 1\}$ , each occurring with probability one:

- (i)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = -\infty$ ,
- (ii)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = +\infty$ , or
- (iii)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = -\infty$  and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = +\infty$ .

With these conditions there is the following known result from random walk theory; see Section 8.4 of [1] or the second section of Chapter 12 in Feller (1971).

**THEOREM.** *If  $A$  is  $(-\infty, 0]$  or  $(-\infty, 0)$  then  $E\{\alpha_A\} < +\infty$  if and only if (i) holds. If  $A$  is  $[0, \infty)$  or  $(0, \infty)$  then  $E\{\alpha_A\} < +\infty$  if and only if (ii) holds. If (iii) holds then  $E\{\alpha_A\} = +\infty$  for each  $A$ .*

Here is our proof of this standard result.

The second statement of the theorem follows from the first (consider the random walk generated by  $\{-X_n, n \geq 1\}$ ), and the third from the first and the second. It suffices, therefore, to prove the first statement.

---

Received May 29, 1973; revised July 30, 1973.

<sup>1</sup> This research was partly supported by a grant from the Farah Foundation and by ONR Contracts N00014-67-A-0126-0008 and N00014-67-A-0126-0009 with the Center for Cybernetic Studies, The University of Texas at Austin, and by a grant from the University Research Institute of The University of Texas at Austin.

*AMS 1970 subject classifications.* Primary 60J15; Secondary 60K25.

*Key words and phrases.* Random walks, hitting times.

Suppose condition (i) holds. For  $j \geq 0$  let  $M_j = \max(S_0, \dots, S_j)$ ,  $m_j = P\{M_j = 0\}$ ,  $M = \sup_{j \geq 0} M_j$ ,  $m = P\{M = 0\}$ ,  $f_j = P\{\alpha_{(-\infty, 0]} > j\}$ ,  $W_0 \equiv 0$ ,  $W_{j+1} = \max(W_j + X_{j+1}, 0)$  and  $L(j) = \max\{i: i \leq j \text{ and } W_i = 0\}$ . The random variables  $M_j$  and  $W_j$  are identically distributed for each  $j$ , whence

$$\begin{aligned}
 P\{M_{n+1} > 0\} &= \sum_{j=0}^n P\{W_{n+1} > 0, L(n) = j\} \\
 (*) \qquad \qquad &= \sum_{j=0}^n P\{W_j = 0, X_{j+1} > 0, \dots, X_{j+1} + \dots + X_{n+1} > 0\} \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^n m_j f_{n+1-j}
 \end{aligned}$$

for each  $n \geq 0$ . Now  $m = P\{\alpha_{(0, \infty)} = +\infty\}$  and since (i) holds it follows that  $m > 0$ ; see Theorem 8.2.4 in [1]. The above equation gives  $1 \geq m_0 f_{n+1} + \dots + m_n f_1$ , which in turn yields  $f_1 + \dots + f_{n+1} \leq m^{-1}$  because  $m_j \geq m$  for all  $j$ . We conclude that  $E\{\alpha_{(-\infty, 0]}\}$  is finite, and it then follows from (\*) that  $\alpha_{(-\infty, 0]}$  has mean  $m^{-1}$ . For  $\alpha_{(-\infty, 0)}$ , let  $\beta_0 \equiv 0$ ,  $\beta_k = \inf\{n > \beta_{k-1}: S_n \leq S_{\beta_{k-1}}\}$  and  $Y_k = S_{\beta_k} - S_{\beta_{k-1}}$  when  $k \geq 1$ . We have  $\beta_1 = \alpha_{(-\infty, 0]}$ , and by virtue of (i) each of  $\{\beta_k - \beta_{k-1}, k \geq 1\}$  and  $\{Y_k \geq 1\}$  is a stationary independent sequence. Moreover,  $P\{Y_1 < 0\} \geq P\{X_1 < 0\} > 0$ . Denoting by  $t$  the first index  $k$  for which  $Y_k < 0$ , we observe that  $\alpha_{(-\infty, 0)} = \beta_t$  and that  $t$  is geometrically distributed with parameter  $P\{Y_1 < 0\}$ . Wald's Lemma then gives  $E\{\alpha_{(-\infty, 0)}\} = E\{\alpha_{(-\infty, 0]}\} \cdot E\{t\} < +\infty$ .

To show the condition is necessary suppose that (i) does not hold. Then (ii) or (iii) holds, and either dictates that  $m_{n+1} \rightarrow 0$ , whence (\*) yields  $m_0 f_{n+1} + \dots + m_n f_1 \rightarrow 1$ . Under these circumstances  $\sum_{j \geq 1} f_j$  must diverge, that is,  $E\{\alpha_{(-\infty, 0]}\} = +\infty$ . Moreover,  $\alpha_{(-\infty, 0]} \leq \alpha_{(-\infty, 0)}$ . This completes the proof.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] CHUNG, K. L. (1968). *A Course in Probability Theory*. Harcourt, Brace and World, New York.
- [2] FELLER, W. (1971). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, 2, 2nd ed. Wiley, New York.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES  
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY  
CLEMSON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29631