Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica
Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science

K.O. Dzhaparidze, P.J.C. Spreij

On SLLN for martingales with deterministic quadratic variation

Department of Operations Research, Statistics, and System Theory Report BS-R8933 December

The Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science is a research institute of the Stichting Mathematisch Centrum, which was founded on February 11, 1946, as a nonprofit institution aiming at the promotion of mathematics, computer science, and their applications. It is sponsored by the Dutch Government through the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Research (N.W.O.).

On SLLN for Martingales with Deterministic Quadratic Variation

Kacha Dzhaparidze
Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science
P.O. Box 4079 1009 AB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Peter Spreij
Department of Econometrics
Free University
P.O. Box 7161 1007 MC Amsterdam, The Netherlands

The strong law of large numbers is proved for multivariate martingales with deterministic quadratic variation, along the same lines as in Lai, Wei and Robbins (1979), though the setting here is more general.

1980 Mathematics Subject Classification: 60 F 15, 60 G 42, 62 J 05.
Keywords and phrases: martingale, quadratic variation process, strong law of large numbers, least squares estimation.

1. Introduction

1.1. For scalar valued martingales the strong law of large numbers is relatively easily proved (see Liptser and Shiryayev, 1989, Section 2.6). But in the multivariate case the matter is different due to the possible complicated dependence structure between the components (see e.g. Christopeit (1986), Lai and Wei (1982), Le Breton and Musiela (1987, 1989), Mel'nikov (1986) and Novikov (1985)).

As is shown in this paper, the problem still has a relatively simple solution under the restriction that the quadratic variation process of the multivariate martingale in question is deterministic.

The first result in this direction has been proved by Lai, Wei and Robbins (1979) in the discrete time setting in a paper on least squares estimation (see also Le Breton and Musiela (1986)). Their proofs heavily depend on the fact that all components are actually transforms of one and the same real valued martingale. Both these limitations are dropped in the present paper. Our approach is much in spirit of Lai, Wei and Robbins (1979), and loosely speaking generalizes all the intermediate steps undertaken in it.

It should be noticed however that unlike the present paper in Lai, Wei and Robbins (1979) the object in question is not necessarily formed by transforming a real valued martingale (but actually any so - called convergence system: see e.g. Chen, Lai and Wei (1981), Lai and Wei (1984); cf. also Solo (1981)), while in Kaufmann (1987) it is a

Report BS-R8933
Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science
P.O. Box 4079, 1009 AB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

transformation of a real valued martingale which satisfies some moment conditions.

1.2. In Section 2 the main results of this paper are formulated. The calculations presented in Section 3 are then used for proving in Section 5 a key convergence theorem formulated in Section 4. The proof of the main theorem 1 is given in Section 6. Finally, we discuss in Section 7 an application to least square estimation.

2. Main results

2.1. The basic setting is as follows. On a complete filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$ all our stochastic processes are defined. All martingales are understood as being so with respect to the filtration $\mathbb{F}$.

Let $M: \Omega \times [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a martingale. Let $< M >: \Omega \times [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ be its predictable quadratic variation process. So we assume that for all components m^i of M we have that $E\,(m_t^i)^2 < \infty$, for all $t \geq 0$, that is $M \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_d^2$. Moreover, we will assume throughout this paper that the quadratic variation process $< M >$ is deterministic. So for its ij - element we have $< M >^{ij} = E\,(m^i m^j)$.

It may happen that for some (or all) t the matrix $< M >_t$ is singular. Therefore we will consider $\varepsilon I_d + < M >_t$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ and I the identity matrix, and denote it by A_t. Let $V = (\varepsilon I_d + < M >)^{-1} = A^{-1}$ and $B = - V$ for convenience.

2.2. We will be interested in the limit behaviour of $V_t M_t$ as $t \to \infty$ and we will show that $V_t M_t \to 0$ a.s. under suitable assumptions.

First we introduce some notations. Let e_i be the i - th unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $c_{it}^{-1} = e_i' V_t\, e_i$.

Let $g: [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that the following integral exists

$$\int_0^\infty \left(\frac{g(x)}{x}\right)^2 dx < \infty. \qquad (1)$$

Let $D: [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ be such that D_t is a diagonal matrix for all $t \geq 0$, with diagonal elements $D_{it} = g\,(c_{it})$.

2.3. The main result of this paper is the following

Theorem 1. *Let* g, c, V *and* D *be as defined above. Then*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} D_t V_t M_t \text{ exists and is finite a.s.}$$

Moreover if $\lim_{t\to\infty} c_{it} = \infty$, *then* $\lim_{t\to\infty} e_i' D_t V_t M_t = 0$ *a.s.*

The proof of this theorem is presented in Section 5. It involves a series of auxiliary results, which we present after some additional computations.

2.4. Assertion (i) of the following corollary is obvious, and assertion (ii) is proved in Section 7.2.

Corollary 2. (i) *Let* $< M >_t$ *be non singular for* t *large enough. Then the assertion of Theorem* 1 *remains true if we take* $\varepsilon = 0$.

(ii) *Assume* $\lim_{t \to \infty} u' < M >_t u$ *for all* $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *is either zero or infinity. Then*

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} V_t M_t = 0 \; a.s.$$

This statement remais valid if V *is substituded by a generalized inverse* $< M >^+$.

3. Auxiliary assertions

3.1. First we introduce some more notations. Write $M = \begin{bmatrix} m \\ M \end{bmatrix}$, where $m \in \mathcal{M}_1^{\;2}$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}_{d-1}^{\;2}$. Surely $m = e_1'M$ and $M = I_d'M$ with $I_d' = [\,0, I_{d-1}]$. Denote

$$A = \varepsilon I_{d-1} + < M > = I_d' A \, I_d \text{ and } V = A^{-1} = - B.$$

We repeatedly will use the following identities:

$$dA\, B + A_- dB = dB\, A + B_- dA = 0, \quad dA = A_- dB\, A, \quad dB = B_- dA\, B$$

$$dA - A\, dB\, A = dA\, B_- \Delta A \geq 0, \quad dB - B\, dA\, B = dB\, A_- \Delta B \geq 0. \tag{2}$$

We can present V as follows:

$$V = c^{-1} bb' + I_d V\, I_d' \text{ with } b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ - V < M, m > \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } c^{-1} = c_1^{-1} = e_1' V\, e_1. \tag{3}$$

(Here and elsewhere the time index t will often be omitted.) This is easily seen by using the representation

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & < m, M > V \\ 0 & I_{d-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c & 0 \\ 0 & V \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ V < M, m > & I_{d-1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{4}$$

where $c = a - < m, M > V < M, m >$ with $a = \varepsilon + < m >$. Observe that

$$Ab = c e_1 \text{ and } c = \det A \,/\, \det A = b' A\, b = b' A_1 \text{ with } A_1 = A\, e_1. \tag{5}$$

Hence by (3)

$$V\, M = c^{-1}\, b\, b'\, M + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ V M \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

and we see that the first component in (6) is equal to $c^{-1}\, b'\, M$. Therefore it is easily seen that studying of V M is equivalent to studying of quantities like $c^{-1}\, b'\, M$, since any component of V M is of this form after a suitable permutation of M and < M >.

3.2. We need the following multivariate version of Theorem 8 in Liptser and Shiryayev (1989), Section 2.2, adapted to the present situation.

Proposition 3. *Let* M *and* M *be as above. There exists a* d × (d - 1) - *matrix valued* *process* ϕ *with the following properties*:

(i) $\phi\, d\langle M\rangle = d\langle M, M\rangle$,

(ii) $\phi\, d\langle M\rangle \phi' \leq d\langle M\rangle$.

The proof proceeds along the same lines as in the univariate case.

Remark. Unlike in the univariate case the process ϕ here may be not uniquely determined as, for instance, in the typical case in which $M = v \cdot m$ with a vector valued function v and a scalar valued martingale m, because now $d\langle M\rangle_t / d\langle m\rangle_t = v_t v_t'$ is singular for each t. However the martingale $\phi \cdot M$ does not depend on the particular choice of ϕ. Here and elswhere below $\cdot$ means stochastic integration.

3.3. Given the $d \times (d-1)$ - matrix valued process ϕ define $\psi = \phi' b$ which is a $d-1$ dimensional process.

The behaviour of b' M will be studied by representing it as

$$b' M = b' \cdot M + M_-' \cdot b \tag{7}$$

Proposition 4. *Let* $g = M_-' \cdot b$. *Let* $N = b' \cdot M$ *and* $n = \psi' \cdot M$ *with* (the integration variable is usually omitted) $\langle N\rangle_t = \int_{[0,\,t]} b'\, d\langle M\rangle\, b$ *and* $\langle n\rangle_t = \int_{[0,\,t]} \psi' d\langle M\rangle\, \psi$. *Then*

(i) $g_t = - \int_{[0,\,t]} M_-' V_-\, d\langle M\rangle\, \psi$.

(ii) $\langle N - n, M\rangle = 0$.

(iii) $\langle N\rangle_t - \langle n\rangle_t = c_t - \int_{[0,\,t]} \psi' A\, dB\, A\, \psi$.

(iv) $\langle n\rangle_t \leq \langle N\rangle_t \leq c_t$, $t \geq 0$, *i.e.* $d\langle n\rangle / dc \leq 1$ *and* $d\langle N\rangle / dc \leq 1$.

(v) $dB_1 << d\gamma$ *with* $\gamma = -c^{-1} = e_1' B\, e_1$ *and* $B_1 = B\, e_1 = \gamma b$.

Proof: (i) By (2)

$$db = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ - V\, d\langle M, M\rangle b_- \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ - V_-\, d\langle M, M\rangle b \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ - V_-\, d\langle M\rangle \psi \end{bmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

Indeed, the second and third equality, for instance, are easily verified as follows:

$$d(V\langle M, m\rangle) = V_-\,(d\langle M, m\rangle \; - \; d\langle M\rangle V \langle M, m\rangle)$$
$$= V_-\,[d\langle M, m\rangle \quad d\langle M\rangle]\, b = V_-\, d\langle M, M\rangle\, b$$
$$= V_-\, d\langle M\rangle \phi' b = V_-\, d\langle M\rangle \psi.$$

Now, (i) follows from (8) by definition of g.

(ii) As is easily seen by definition of ϕ and ψ, the martingales N - n and M are orthogonal:

$$< N - n, M > = b' \cdot < M, M > - \psi' \cdot < M > = 0.$$

(iii) By (5) $dc = d(b'A)\, e_1 = b_-' d< M > e_1 + db'\, A\, e_1$, hence

$$dc = b_-' d< M > b \tag{9}$$

and

$$< N >_t - c_t = \sum_{[0,\, t]} \Delta b' \Delta < M > b = \sum_{[0,\, t]} [0 \quad - b' \Delta < M, M > V_-] \Delta < M > b$$

$$= - \sum_{[0,\, t]} b' \Delta < M, M > V_- \Delta < M, M > b = - \sum_{[0,\, t]} \psi' \Delta < M > V_- \Delta < M > \psi.$$

This gives (iii), since by (2) we have

$$< n >_t - \int_{[0,\, t]} \psi' A\, dB\, A\, \psi = \sum_{[0,\, t]} \psi' \Delta < M > \Delta V\, A\, \psi = - \sum_{[0,\, t]} \psi' \Delta < M > V_- \Delta < M > \psi.$$

(iv) Surely, (iii) implies (iv), since the second term on the right hand side of (iii) gives a non negative contribution.

(v) Observe that c^{-1} is non increasing because $c^{-1} = e_1' V e_1$ with V non increasing, since $< M >$ is non decreasing, and γ is non decreasing. The equality $B_1 = \gamma\, b$ follows from the first relation in (5).

For any non negative (measurable) function q we have

$$\int_{[0,\, \infty)} q d\gamma = \int_{[0,\, \infty)} q e_1' dB\, e_1 \geq \int_{[0,\, \infty)} q B_1' dA\, B_1$$

by (2), so that if $q = 0$ $d\gamma$ a.e., then

$$\int_{[0,\, \infty)} q\, B_1' \,dA\, B_1 = 0.$$

This means that $\int_{[0,\, \infty)} q\, dA\, B_1 = - \int_{[0,\, \infty)} q\, A_-\, dB_1 = 0$, as $A > 0$ (see (2)). Hence $q\, A_-$ is dB_1 a.e. zero on $(0, \infty)$ and so q is a.e. zero on $(0, \infty)$ with respect to dB_1.

4. A convergence theorem

4.1. The following theorem is crucial for studing the behaviour of $g = M_-' \cdot b$.

For h: $[0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ we use the following notation $h \in L^2([0, \infty), dA)$ if the following integral is well defined and finite:

$$\int_{[0,\infty)} h'\, dA\, h.$$

Theorem 5. *Let* M *be an* $\mathbb{R}^d$*- valued martingale with* $<M>_t = E(M_t M_t') < \infty$ *for all* t ≥ 0. *Let* $A = \varepsilon I + <M>$, $B = -A^{-1}$ *and* h: $(0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $h \in L^2((0,\infty), dB)$.

Then $\lim_{t \to \infty} \int_{[0,t]} h'\, dB\, M_-$ *exists and is finite a.s.*

The proof of this theorem is given in Section 5. It is based on a series of technical lemmas which are presented below.

4.2. Let A: $[0, \infty) \to \mathcal{P}^d$ where $\mathcal{P}^d$ is the set of non negative definite (d×d) - matrices. Assume that $A_0 > 0$ and that A is non decreasing, so $A_t \geq A_s$ for $t \geq s$. Since all the A_t are invertible, $B_t = -A_t^{-1}$ is well defined for all $t \geq 0$, and for $t > 0$ we have $dB = B\, dA\, B_-$ (see (2)). Define similarly $L^2((0,\infty), dB)$.

Lemma 6. *For a given* $h \in L^2((0,\infty), d\overline{B})$, *the function* $\tilde{h}$: $[0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ *given by*

$$\tilde{h}_t = \int_{(t,\infty)} dB\, h \qquad (10)$$

is well defined, and moreover $\tilde{h} \in L^2([0,\infty), dA)$.

Proof. We prove the following three facts:

(i) $\tilde{h}_t' A_t \tilde{h}_t$ is finite for all $t \geq 0$ and tends to zero as $t \to \infty$, which also shows that $\tilde{h}_t$ is well defined for all $t \geq 0$.

(ii) $Bh \in L^2((0,\infty), dA)$

(iii) $\hat{h} = \tilde{h} + Bh \in L^2((0,\infty), dA)$ and $\int_{(0,\infty)} \hat{h}'\, dA\, \hat{h} = \int_{(0,\infty)} h'\, dB\, h - \tilde{h}_0' A_0 \tilde{h}_0$.

Observe that the last fact means that $\tilde{h} \in L^2([0,\infty), dA)$, since

$$\int_{[0,\infty)} \tilde{h}'\, dA\, \tilde{h} = \int_{(0,\infty)} \tilde{h}'\, dA\, \tilde{h} + \tilde{h}_0' A_0 \tilde{h}_0 \text{ with the convention } A_{0-} = 0.$$

(i) Denote by R the matrix such that $A = R^2$ and $R = R'$. Taking into consideration that $B_t \to B_\infty$ exists and is negative semi definite, we get (i) due to the following consequence of Schwartz' inequality:

$$\tilde{h}_t' A_t \tilde{h}_t = \sum_i (e_i' R_t \tilde{h}_t)^2 = \sum_i [\int_{(t,\infty)} e_i' R_t dB_s h_s]^2 \leq \sum_i \int_{(t,\infty)} e_i' R_t dB_s R_t e_i \int_{(t,\infty)} h'\, dB\, h$$

$$= \sum_i e_i' R_t (B_\infty - B_t) R_t e_i \int_{(t,\infty)} h' \, dB \, h \le \sum_i e_i' R_t V_t R_t e_i \int_{(t,\infty)} h' \, dB \, h = d \times \int_{(t,\infty)} h' dB \; h.$$

(ii) On $(0, \infty)$ the identities (2) are valid, so that (ii) is implied by $dB - B \, dA \, B \ge 0$.

(iii) Along with the identities (2), we have $d\tilde{h} = - dB \, h$ on $(0, \infty)$. Now, by

$$\hat{h} - \tilde{h}_- = B_- h \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}' d(A \tilde{h}) = -\tilde{h}' A_- dB \, h + \tilde{h}' \, dA \, \tilde{h} = \tilde{h}' \, dA \, B \, h + \tilde{h}' \, dA \, \tilde{h} = \tilde{h}' \, dA \, \hat{h}$$

we get

$$\hat{h}' \, dA \, \hat{h} - d(\tilde{h}' A \, \tilde{h}) = h' \, dB \, A_- \tilde{h}_- - (\tilde{h}' - \hat{h}') \, dA \, \hat{h} = h' \, B \, dA \, (\hat{h} - \tilde{h}_-) = h' \, dB \, h.$$

Hence

$$d(\tilde{h}' A \, \tilde{h}) = \hat{h}' \, dA \, \hat{h} - h' \, dB \, h \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{(0,\infty)} \hat{h}' \, dA \, \hat{h} = \int_{(0,\infty)} h' \, dB \, h - \tilde{h}_0' A_0 \, \tilde{h}_0,$$

where we have used (i).

Lemma 7. *Let* m *be a real valued square integrable martingale. Let* A *be an increasing function with* $A_0 > 0$ *such that* $\langle m \rangle \ll A$ *and* $d\langle m \rangle / dA$ *is bounded. Assume* $h \in L^2(dB)$ *where* $B = - 1 / A$.

Then $\lim_{t \to \infty} \int_{[0,t]} h \, m_- \, dB$ *exists and is finite a.s.*

Proof. Integrating by parts we get $\int_{[0,t]} h \, m_- \, dB = \int_{[0,t]} \tilde{h} \, dm - \tilde{h}_t \, m_t$ where $\tilde{h}$ is given by (10). Then $\tilde{h} \in L^2([0, \infty), dA)$ in view of Lemma 5. Let now

$$\tilde{m} = \int_{[0,t]} \tilde{h} \, dm \quad \text{with} \quad E \, \tilde{m}_t^2 = \int_{[0,t]} \tilde{h}^2 \, d\langle m \rangle = \int_{[0,t]} \tilde{h}^2 \, (d\langle m \rangle / dA) \, dA,$$

which is bounded in t. Hence $\lim_{t \to \infty} \tilde{m}_t$ exists and is finite a.s. Surely also $\int_{[0,t]} \mathcal{h} \, dm$ has a limit a.s. where $\mathcal{h}_t = \int_{(t,\infty)} | h | \, dB$. Then Kronecker's lemma for martingales (see Liptser and Shiryayev (1989), Section 2.6) applies, since $| \mathcal{h}_t |$ decreases to zero, which yields $| \tilde{h}_t | \, m_t \to 0$ a.s. and hence $| \tilde{h}_t \, m_t | \to 0$ a.s.

4.3. We want to emphasize here that in this lemma it is important that h and B are deterministic, because now $\tilde{h}$ is also deterministic and therefore $\tilde{m}$ in Section 4.2 is a convergent martingale. If we would started with predictable processes h and B, it would be not have been possible to define, as we did above, a martingale like $\tilde{m}$.

It is indeed Lemma 7, and its generalization Theorem 5, that has no counterpart if one wants to treat only predictable quadratic variation processes. Therefore we want to stress that it is at this point that we obtain sharper results then, for instance, in Christopeit (1986), Lai and Wei (1982), Le Breton and Musiela (1987, 1989), Mel'nikov (1986) or Novikov (1985).

5. Proof of Theorem 5

5.1. We use induction with respect to the dimention d of the space where M takes its values. Clearly for $d = 1$ the theorem reduces to Lemma 6. So assume the theorem holds for $d - 1$. As in Section 3 we write $\mathsf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} m \\ \mathsf{M} \end{bmatrix}$, preserving all the notations introduced there. Using (6) and the relation $d\mathsf{B} = \mathsf{B}\, d\langle \mathsf{M} \rangle \mathsf{B}_-$ (cf.(2)) we split the integral in question in two terms

$$\int_{[0,\ t]} \mathsf{h}'\, d\mathsf{B}\, \mathsf{M}_- = I_1(t) + I_2(t)$$

where

$$I_1(t) = \int_{[0,\ t]} h'\mathsf{B}\, d\langle \mathsf{M} \rangle \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathsf{V}_- M_- \end{bmatrix} = \int_{[0,\ t]} h'\mathsf{B}\, d\langle \mathsf{M}, M \rangle\, \mathsf{V}_- M_- = \int_{[0,\ t]} h'\, dB\, M_- \tag{11}$$

with $h = A\, \phi'\mathsf{B}\, \mathsf{h}$ and ϕ defined by $d\langle \mathsf{M}, M \rangle = \phi\, d\langle M \rangle$ as in Proposition 3, and

$$I_2(t) = \int_{[0,\ t]} \gamma_-\mathsf{h}'\, \mathsf{B}\, d\langle \mathsf{M} \rangle\, \mathsf{b}_- \mathsf{b}_-' \mathsf{M}_- = - \int_{[0,\ t]} \mathsf{h}'\, d\mathsf{B}_1\, \mathsf{b}_-' \mathsf{M}_- \tag{12}$$

(see Proposition 4 (v)), since $d\mathsf{B}_1 = \mathsf{B}\, d\langle \mathsf{M} \rangle\, \mathsf{B}_{1-}$ by (2).

5.2. We will show that $h \in L^2(dB)$ as $\mathsf{h} \in L^2(d\mathsf{B})$ by asumption, and this will imply that $I_1(t)$ has a limit a.s. as $t \to \infty$, that is

$$\int_{[0,\ \infty)} h'\, dB\, h < \infty \Rightarrow \int_{[0,\ \infty)} h'\, dB\, M_- < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

since by the induction hypothesis we have assumed that the assertion of the theorem holds for $d - 1$. In fact, by (2) and Proposition 3 (ii)

$$\int_{[0,\ \infty)} h'\, dB\, h \le \int_{[0,\ \infty)} \mathsf{h}'\, \mathsf{B}\, \phi\, A\, dB\, A\, \phi'\, \mathsf{B}\, \mathsf{h} \le \int_{[0,\ \infty)} \mathsf{h}'\, \mathsf{B}\, \phi\, dA\, \phi'\, \mathsf{B}\, \mathsf{h} \le \int_{[0,\ \infty)} \mathsf{h}'\, d\mathsf{B}\, \mathsf{h}.$$

5.3. Next we direct our attention towards $I_2(t)$. As above, we denote by N and g the first and second terms on the right hand side of (6) to write $I_2(t) = I_3(t) + I_4(t)$ with

$$I_3(t) = -\int_{[0,\,t]} h'\, dB_1\, N_- = -\int_{[0,\,t]} h'\,(dB_1/d\gamma)\, N_-\, d\gamma \quad\text{and}\quad I_4(t) = -\int_{[0,\,t]} h'\, dB_1\, g_-$$

(see Proposition 4 (v)).

Since $d\langle N\rangle/d\gamma \le 1$ by Proposition 4 (iv), $I_3(t)$ converges by Lemma 7, provided

$$\int_{[0,\,\infty)} (h'dB_1/d\gamma)^2\, d\gamma \le \int_{[0,\,\infty)} h'(dB/d\tau)\, h\, d\tau = \int_{[0,\,\infty)} h'\, dB\, h < \infty$$

with $\tau = \mathrm{tr}\, B$ (so that dB is dominated by $d\tau$). We have the second inequality by assumption, and the first by the following consequence of Schwartz' inequality:

$$(d\gamma/d\tau)^2\,(h'dB_1/d\gamma)^2 = (h'dB_1/d\tau)^2 \le h'(dB/d\tau)\, h\; d\gamma/d\tau.$$

5.4. The next term that we have to consider is $I_4(t)$. Introduce

$$p_t = \int_{(t,\,\infty)} h'\, dB_1.$$

Integrating by parts we get

$$I_4(t) = p_t \int_{[0,\,t]} \psi'\, A\, dB\, M_- - \int_{[0,\,t]} p\psi'\, A\, dB\, M_- \tag{13}$$

by (2) and Proposition 4 (i). Again, we will show by the induction hypothesis that the second term on the left hand side of (13) has a limit as $t \to \infty$ a.s., that is by checking that

$$\int_{[0,\,\infty)} p^2\, \psi'\, A\, dB\, A\, \psi \le \int_{[0,\,\infty)} p^2\, dC < \infty.$$

The first inequality follows from Proposition 4 (iii), and second from the fact that $p \in L^2(d\gamma)$ with $\gamma = -1/C$, which is verified as follows: in view of Proposition 4 (v), write

$$p_t = \int_{(t,\,\infty)} h'\,(dB_1/d\gamma)\, d\gamma$$

and then apply Lemma 6 (scalar case). Hence, the second term in (13) converges a.s. as $t \to \infty$. Of course, if in this term we replace p_t by

$$\int_{(t,\,\infty)} |h'\,(dB_1/d\gamma)|\, d\gamma,$$

then we still have that the a.s. limit exists as $t \to \infty$. Using Kronecker's lemma again, we get from (13) that $I_4(t)$ converges a.s. as $t \to \infty$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.

6. Proof of Theorem 1

6.1. It is sufficient to look at the first component of DVM which, in the notations of Sections 2 and 3, can be written as follows:

$$c^{-1} g(c) N + c^{-1} g(c) g. \qquad (14)$$

If c is bounded, so is $< N >$ (see Proposition 4 (iv)) and then both $\lim_{t\to\infty} c_t^{-1} g(c_t)$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} N_t$ are finite a.s. If $c_t \to \infty$, then $c_t^{-1} g(c_t) N_t$ still has a finite limit which equals zero as

$$\int_{[0,\infty)} (c^{-1} g(c))^2 \, d< N > \leq \int_{[0,\infty)} (c^{-1} g(c))^2 \, dc < \infty$$

by (1) and Proposition 4 (iv).

6.2. Next we look at the second term in (16). Consider first

$$\int_{[0,t]} c^{-1} g(c) \, dg = \int_{[0,t]} c^{-1} g(c) \psi' \, d< M > V_- M_- = \int_{[0,t]} c^{-1} g(c) \psi' A \, dB M_-$$

(see (2) and Proposition 4 (i)). According to Theorem 5 this expression converges since

$$\int_{[0,\infty)} (c^{-1} g(c))^2 \psi' A \, dB A \psi \leq \int_{[0,\infty)} (c^{-1} g(c))^2 \, dc < \infty$$

by (1) and Proposition 4 (iii) and (iv).

If c_t converges to a finite limit, then it is seen, in a similar manner as above, that g_t has a finite limit a.s. as $t \to \infty$. If $c_t \to \infty$, then Kronecker's lemma gives that the second term in (14) tends to zero. Theorem 1 is proved.

7. Additional remarks. Application to least squares estimation

7.1. It may happen that $\lim_{t\to\infty} V_t M_t = 0$ a.s. even if the functions c_{it} remain bounded. Consider for instance the following example.

Example. Let w be a standard Brownian motion, and $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $M_t = v w_t$ with $< M >_t = vv' t$. Consider

$$V_t = (\varepsilon I_d + < M >_t)^{-1} = \varepsilon^{-1} (I_d - (\varepsilon + v'v\, t)^{-1} vv' t).$$

We see that $c_{it}^{-1} = \varepsilon^{-1} (\varepsilon + v'v\, t)^{-1} (v'v - v_i^2) t$, where v_i is the i-th component of v, tends to $\varepsilon^{-1} (v'v - v_i^2) / v'v$ which is in general larger then zero. However

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} V_t M_t = \lim_{t\to\infty} v\ (\varepsilon + v'v\ t)^{-1}\ w_t = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Observe that in this example $< M >_t$ is singular for all t. Careful inspection of this example leads to assertion (ii) of Corollary 2.

7.2. This assertion will be proved here. Notice first that rank $< M >_t$ is increasing. Assume $\lim_{t\to\infty}$ rank $< M >_t = k < d$. Then there is $t_k > 0$ such that rank $< M >_t = k$ for $t \geq t_k$. Assume below that $t \geq t_k$. Write $< M >_t = r_t r_t'$, with rank $r_t = k$. Then

$$V_t = \varepsilon^{-1} - \varepsilon^{-1} r_t (I_d + \varepsilon^{-1} r_t' r_t)^{-1} r_t' \varepsilon^{-1}.$$

Since *there exist a constant matrix* K *and a martingale* Y_t *with values in* $\mathbb{R}^k$ *such that* $M_t = K\ Y_t$, *and an invertible matrix* r_t *such that* $r_t = K\ r_t$ *and* $r_t r_t' = < Y >_t$ (this claim is proved below), we have

$$V M = V K Y = V r r^{-1} Y = \varepsilon^{-1} r (I_d + \varepsilon^{-1} r'r)^{-1} r^{-1} Y = r (\varepsilon I_d + r'r)^{-1} r' < Y >^{-1} Y.$$

Use now $r (\varepsilon I_d + r'r)^{-1} r' = (I_d - \varepsilon V)\ (K^+)'$ where K^+ is a left inverse of K. Since the limit of V_t exists as $t \to \infty$ and $< Y >_t^{-1} Y_t$ tends to zero by Corollary 2 (i), we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} V_t M_t =$ 0 a.s.

In conclusion we prove the above claim in italics as follows. In view of the fact that not only rank $< M >_t$ remains constant but also Im $< M >_t =$ Im r_t, take now k vectors $\kappa_1, ..., \kappa_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that Im $r_t =$ Im K with $K = [\kappa_1, ..., \kappa_k]$. Then there exists an invertible matrix r_t such that $r_t = K\ r_t$. Define now $Y_t = K^+ M_t$. Then $M_t = K\ Y_t$ a.s. for all t. Indeed it is easily verified that $< M - K Y > \equiv 0$, and this proves the claim.

Observe that $r_t r_t' = < Y >_t$ and $< Y >_t \to \infty$. Indeed for a $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $v \neq 0$ there exists $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $v = K'u$, since K' has a full row rank. Then $v' < Y >_t v = u' < M >_t u$. If this remains zero, then $u \in$ Ker $< M >_t$ for all $t \geq t_k$. Hence $u \in$ Ker K', but this contradicts $v \neq 0$. Hence $v' < Y >_t v \to \infty$.

7.3. As an application we treat least squares estimation for linear models. In many instances it is possible transform the observations in such a way to we may assume that we observe $x_s = < m >_s \theta + m_s$ on $0 \leq s \leq t$, where m is an $\mathbb{R}^d$ valued square integrable martingale and θ un unknown d-dimentional parameter. (For example in case of the familiar model $y_s = a_s'\theta + \varepsilon_s$, $s = 1, ..., t$ one may define $x_s = a_1 y_1 + ... + a_s y_s$)

The least squares estimator for θ by definition then minimizes

$$(x_t - < m >_t \theta) < m >_t^+ (x_t - < m >_t \theta)$$

where $< m >_t^+$ is a generalized inverse of $< m >_t$. The set of least square estimators θ_t is given by $\{ < m >_t^+ x_t + K \mid K \in \text{Ker} < m >_t \}$. If $< m >_t$ eventually becomes non singular, then $\theta_t - \theta = < m >_t^{-1} m_t$ and Corollary 2 (i) applies. Otherwise let K be as in Section 7.2.

Preserving then the notations used there we have

$$K'(\theta_t - \theta) = K' < m >_t^+ m_t = (KK^+)' < Y >_t^{-1} K_t^+ m_t = < Y >_t^{-1} Y_t \to 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

whenever $< Y >_t^{-1} \to 0$. So we obtain that if $u' < m >_t u$ eider tends to infinity for $t \to \infty$ or remains zero for all t, then a.s. $\lim_{t\to\infty} \theta_t - \theta$ belongs to $\lim_{t\to\infty} \text{Ker} < m >_t$.

References

Chen Gui-Jing, T.L. Lai and C.Z. Wei (1981), Convergent systems and strong consistency of least squares estimates in regression models. *J. Multivariate Analysis* 11, 319 - 333.

N. Christopeit (1986), Quasi-least-squares estimation in semimartingale regression models. *Stochastics* 16, 255 -278.

H. Kaufmann (1987), On the strong law of large numbers for multivariate martingales. *Stochastic Processes and Appl.* 26, 73 - 85.

T.L. Lai, H. Robbins and C.Z. Wei (1979), Strong consistency of least squares estimates in multiple regression. *J. Multivariate Analysis* 9, 343 - 361.

T.L. Lai and C.Z. Wei (1982), Least squares estimates in stochastic regression models with applications to identification and control of dynamic systems. *Ann. Statist.* 10, 154 - 166.

T.L. Lai and C.Z. Wei (1984), Moment inequalities with applications to regression and time series models, in "*Inequalities in Statistics and Probability*". IMS Lecture Notes-Monograph Series 5, 163 - 172.

A. Le Breton and M. Musiela (1986), Ordre de convergence d'estimateurs des moindres carres en regression lineaire multiple. *C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris*, t. 302, Serie I, n° 8, 333 - 336.

A. Le Breton and M. Musiela (1987), Laws of large numbers for semimartingales with applications to stochastic regression. Preprint.

A. Le Breton and M. Musiela (1989), Order of convergence of regression parameter estimates in models with infinite variance. *J. Mult. Analysis*, 31, 59 - 62.

R.Sh. Liptser and A.N. Shiryayev (1989), *Theory of Martingales*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publ.

A.V. Mel'nikov (1986), The law of large numbers for multidimentional martingales. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 33, 131 - 135.

A.A. Novikov (1985), Consistency of least squares estimates in regression models with martingale errors, in "*Statistics and Control of Stochastic Processes*". Eds. N.V. Krilov et al. Berlin, Springer, 389 - 409.

V. Solo (1981), Strong consistency of least squares estimators in regression with correlated disturbances. *Ann. Statist.* 9, 689 - 693.