Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen en Econometrie

Serie Research Memoranda

On Correlation Calculus for Multivariate Martingales

Kacha Dzhaparidze
Peter Spreij

Research Memorandum 1990-81
November 1990

vrije Universiteit *amsterdam*

On correlation calculus for multivariate martingales

Kacha Dzhaparidze
Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science
Kruislaan 413
1098 SJ Amsterdam

Peter Spreij
Department of Econometrics
Free University
De Boelelaan 1105
1081 HV Amsterdam

Abstract

In this paper the correlation between two multivariate martingales is studied. This correlation can be expressed in a non decreasing process, that remains zero in the case of linear dependence. A key result is an integral representation for this process.

1 introduction

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, P)$ be a complete filtered probability space. Let $M : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}^n$ and $m : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}^k$ be locally square integrable martingales.
Denote by $\langle m, M\rangle$ the predictable covariation process of m and M. So $\langle m, M\rangle : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}^{k\times n}$ and if m^i and M^j are the i-th and j-th components of m and M respectively, then the ij entry $\langle m, M\rangle^{ij}$ of $\langle m, M\rangle$ equals the real valued process $\langle m^i, M^j\rangle$. $\langle m\rangle = \langle m, m\rangle$ and $\langle M\rangle = \langle M, M\rangle$ are defined likewise.
Assume now that for some $t > 0$ the matrices $\langle m\rangle_t$ and $\langle M\rangle_t$ are invertible. Then, parallel to what one can do when dealing with multivariate random variables, it is natural to express the correlation between m and M over the interval [0,t] by

$$\rho(m, M)_t = \langle m\rangle_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle m, M\rangle_t \langle M\rangle_t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

Let $c(m, M)_t = \langle m\rangle_t - \langle m, M\rangle_t \langle M\rangle_t^{-1} \langle M, m\rangle_t$. Then we have the identity

$$I - \rho(m, M)_t \rho(M, m)_t = \langle m\rangle_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} c(m, M)_t \langle m\rangle_t^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It follows that $c(m, M)_t$ carries the same amount of information about the correlation between m and M as $\rho(m, M)_t$. It turns out that it is more convenient to study $c(m, M)_t$ than $\rho(m, M)_t$. The process $c(m, M)$ is of interest in its own right, because it appears at several places in probability and statistics. For example, this process — or rather a slightly different one — appears in [1], where we studied a strong law of large numbers for martingales. The results of the present paper offer an alternative approach to such a study. In a statistical context $c(m, M)$ can be interpreted as a measure of deficiency when comparing an arbitrary estimator with an optimal one. Cf [2] for details.

In the present paper we drop the restrictions that $\langle m\rangle_t$ and $\langle M\rangle_t$ are invertible. So we have to replace $\langle M\rangle_t^{-1}$ in the definition of $c(m, M)_t$ by a suitable generalized inverse. The Moore- Penrose inverse turns out to be a good choice. Working with a generalized inverse however complicates the analysis of $c(m, M)$ considerably.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we describe some properties of $\langle M\rangle$, its Moore-Penrose inverse process $\langle M\rangle^+$ and invariance properties of M under a to $\langle M\rangle_t$ related orthogonal projection. Section 3 contains an important integral representation of $c(m, M)$. In section 4 linear dependence between m and M is defined by $c(m, M) = 0$ and characterized by the property that there is constant (random) matrix C such that $m = CM$. The familiar case where m and M are random variables is easily recognized.

2 some technical results

In this section we describe some properties of the process $\langle M\rangle$. $\langle M\rangle$ takes its values in the space of positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrices $\mathcal{P}_n$, and if $t > s$, then $\langle M\rangle_t - \langle M\rangle_s \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

For fixed t, $\omega\ \langle M\rangle_t = \langle M\rangle_t(\omega)$ may have non trivial kernel. This is typically the case if $M_t = \sum_{i=1}^t x_i\varepsilon_i$,where ε_i is a real valued martingale difference sequence and x a $\mathbf{R}^n$ valued predictable process. Then $\langle M\rangle_t$ for $t < n$ is always a singular matrix.

For $t > s$ we always have $Im\langle M\rangle_t \supset Im\langle M\rangle_s$, where $Im\langle M\rangle_t$ is the image space of $\langle M\rangle_t$, a linear subspace of $\mathbf{R}^n$.

Define $r : \Omega \times [0, \infty) \to \{0, \ldots, n\}$ by $r_t = \dim Im\langle M\rangle_t = rank\langle M\rangle_t$. Then r is a predictable process (see proposition 2.1). Although $\langle M\rangle$ is a right continuous process, r may fail to be right (or left) continuous. See example 2 below. Define the stopping times T_k ($k = 0, \ldots, n+1$) by $T_0 = 0$ and $T_{k+1} = \inf\{t > T_k : r_t > r_{T_k}\}(\inf\emptyset = \infty)$. Then each $T_k : \Omega \to [0, \infty]$, and $T_{n+1} = \infty$. The T_k are in general not predictable. See example 1. For $(\omega, t) \in]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ we have that $Im\langle M\rangle_t$ does not depend on t, and hence r is constant on this stochastic interval. So we can find a (random) matrix $F(k)$ of size $n \times r_t$ such that the columns of $F(k)$ span $Im\langle M\rangle_t$ and $F(k)^T F(k) = I_{r_t}$, the $r_t \times r_t$ identity matrix. Similarly we can find matrices $G(k)$ of size $n \times r_{T_k}1_{\{T_k<\infty\}}$ such that the columns of $G(k)$ span $Im\langle M\rangle_{T_k}1_{\{T_k<\infty\}}$ and such that $G(k)^T G(k) = I_{r_{T_k}1_{\{T_k<\infty\}}}$. Moreover, since $Im\langle M\rangle_t \supset Im\langle M\rangle_s$ for $t > s$, we can always assume that $F(k)$ is of the form $[G(k), U_1(k)]$, where $U_1(k)$ is a $n \times (r_t - r_{T_k}1_{\{T_k<\infty\}})$ matrix for $(\omega, t) \in]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$, and likewise $G(k)$ is of the form $[F(k-1), U_2(k)]$.

Then for $(\omega, t) \in]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ there exists a $r_t \times r_t$ matrix $V_t(k)$ such that

$$\langle M\rangle_t = F(k)V_t(k)F(k)^T$$

and there exists a $r_{T_k}1_{\{T_k<\infty\}} \times r_{T_k}1_{\{T_k<\infty\}}$ matrix $W(k)$ such that

$$\langle M\rangle_{T_k}1_{\{T_k<\infty\}} = G(k)W(k)G(k)^T.$$

Notice that the $V_t(k)$ and the $W(k)$ are in general not diagonal. Hence

$$\langle M\rangle_. = \sum_{k=0}^{n} 1_{]\!]T_k,T_{k+1}[\![}F(k)V_.(k)F(k)^T + \sum_{k=0}^{n} 1_{[\![T_k]\!]}G(k)W(k)G(k)^T \tag{2.1}$$

On the sets where the $V_t(k)$ and $W(k)$ are defined, these matrices are invertible. Therefore we can define the generalized inverse process $\langle M\rangle^+$ by

$$\langle M\rangle_.^+ = \sum_{k=0}^{n} 1_{]\!]T_k,T_{k+1}[\![}F(k)V_.(k)^{-1}F(k)^T + \sum_{k=0}^{n} 1_{[\![T_k]\!]}G(k)W(k)^{-1}G(k)^T \tag{2.2}$$

PROPOSITION 2.1 *$\langle M\rangle_t^+$ defined by equation (2.2) is for each t the Moore-Penrose inverse of $\langle M\rangle_t$ and r and $\langle M\rangle^+$ are predictable processes.*

PROOF: First we show that the map $rank : \mathbf{R}^{m\times n} \to \{0, \ldots, m \wedge n\}$ is upper semi-continuous, that is the sets $G_p = \{A \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times n} : rankA \geq p\}$ are open in the ordinary topology on $\mathbf{R}^{m\times n}$. Let $A \in G_p$, and $rankA = q \geq p$. Then A contains a submatrix $A_q \in \mathbf{R}^{q\times q}$ with $rank\, A_q = q$. Let $\{\epsilon_k\} \subset \mathbf{R}^{m\times n}$ be a sequence of matrices converging to zero. Let ϵ_{qk} be the submatrix of ϵ_k that is obtained in the same way as A_q, that is by deleting the same rows and columns. Then $\lim_{k\to\infty} det(A_q + \epsilon_{qk}) \neq 0$. (by continuity of the determinant). Hence $rank(A_q + \epsilon_{qk}) = q$ for all k large enough and consequently $rank(A + \epsilon_k) \geq q$ for the same k. This shows that G_p is open. As a consequence $rank$ is a (Borel) measurable map. Since r is the composition $r = rank\langle M\rangle$, it is predictable. Since $\langle M\rangle_t$ and $\langle M\rangle_t^+$ are both symmetric and since they commute, it follows from [3] that $\langle M\rangle_t^+$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse of $\langle M\rangle_t$. To show predictability of $\langle M\rangle^+$, we need the following algorithm for the computation of the Moore-Penrose inverse of any symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbf{R}^{n\times n}$. Let $0 \leq k \leq n$ be the multiplicity of $\lambda = 0$ as a root of the characteristic polynomial p of A. Then $\pi(\lambda) = \lambda^{1-k}p(\lambda) = \lambda^{n-k+1} + a_1\lambda^{n-k} + \ldots + a_{n-k}\lambda$ is a polynomial and it is easy to see that $\pi(A) = 0$. Notice that a_{n-k} is equal to the product of all nonzero eigenvalues of A (an empty product equals 1). Hence $a_{n-k} \neq 0$. Let q be the polynomial of degree n-k-1 defined by $q(\lambda) = -\frac{1}{\lambda^2 a_{n-k}}[\pi(\lambda) - a_{n-k}\lambda]$. (The zero polynomial has degree -1). Then $Aq(A)A = A^2q(A) = A$, as can easily be verified. Next we define $A^+ = q(A)Aq(A)$. Using again the characterization of [3], we see that A^+ is indeed the Moore-Penrose inverse of A. Apply this procedure to $A = \langle M\rangle_t$. Because the characteristic polynomial and the eigenvalues are obtained by a continuous transformation of the elements of a matrix, we easily obtain that in the above algorithm $a_{n-k} = \prod \lambda_{it}1_{\{\lambda_{it}>0\}}$, with the λ_{it} the eigenvalues of $\langle M\rangle_t$, yields a predictable process. Moreover in this context $k = n - r_t$ is predictable. Hence $\{q(\langle M\rangle_t)\}$ and $\langle M\rangle^+$ are predictable processes. □

REMARK: Proposition 2.1 really needs a proof, since another generalized inverse of $\langle M\rangle_t$ may not yield a predictable process. Consider the following example. $\langle M\rangle_t = \begin{bmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Let a_t be an arbitrary stochastic process, possibly not adapted. Then for $t > 0 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{t} & a_t \\ a_t & ta_t^2 \end{bmatrix}$ is a generalized inverse of $\langle M\rangle_t$, different from the Moore-Penrose inverse (which corresponds with $a_t = 0$), and viewed as a stochastic process it is in general not predictable.

EXAMPLE 1: Let N be the standard Poisson process. Define $T = \inf\{t > 0 : N_t = 1\}$. Then T is a totally inaccessible stopping time. Define now the martingale M by $M_t = N_t - t - (N_{t\wedge T} - t \wedge T)$. Then $\langle M\rangle_t = t - t \wedge T$. But now $T_1 = \inf\{t > 0 : \langle M\rangle_t > 0\} = T$. So T_1 is not predictable. Notice that $r_t = 1_{\{t>T\}}$ is predictable.

We need some technical properties of M ans $\langle M\rangle$, to be used in section 3. These are formulated in the next three lemmas. In the notation introduced above we have the following

LEMMMA 2.2 *On the set $\{T_k < \infty\}$ we have*
(i) $V_{T_k-}(k-1) = \lim_{t\uparrow T_k} V_t(k-1)$ exists and is invertible.
(ii) If $F(k)=G(k)$, then $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} V_t(k) = W(k)$. If $F(k) = [G(k), U_1(k)]$, with $U_1(k)$ nontrivial, then we can write $V_t(k) = R_t(k)R_t(k)^T$ with $R_t(k) = \begin{bmatrix} a_t(k) & b_t(k) \\ 0 & c_t(k) \end{bmatrix}$, decomposed in blocks of appropriate sizes such that $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} b_t(k) = 0$, $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} c_t(k) = 0$ and $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} a_t(k)a_t(k)^T = W(k)$.

PROOF: (i) is obvious.
(ii) If $F(k) = G(k)$, then right continuity of $\langle M\rangle$ yields the result. Assume therefore that $F(k) = [G(k), U_1(k)]$. Then $\langle M\rangle_{T_k} = F(k) \begin{bmatrix} W(k) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} F(k)^T$, with the zero blocks of appropriate dimension.
Decompose $V_t(k)$ in blocks of the same dimension as $\begin{bmatrix} V_t(k)_{11} & V_t(k)_{12} \\ V_t(k)_{21} & V_t(k)_{22} \end{bmatrix}$. Since $V_t(k) > 0$, we also have $V_t(k)_{22} > 0$. Since on $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ also $\langle M\rangle_t - \langle M\rangle_{T_k} \geq 0$, we have that $\begin{bmatrix} V_t(k)_{11} - W(k) & V_t(k)_{12} \\ V_t(k)_{21} & V_t(k)_{22} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$.
Hence $V_t(k)_{11} - W(k) - V_t(k)_{12}V_t(k)_{22}^{-1}V_t(k)_{21} \geq 0$. Use the decomposition $V_t(k) = R_t(k)R_t(k)^T$ to write this inequality as

$$a_t(k)a_t(k)^T + b_t(k)b_t(k)^T - W(k) - b_t(k)c_t(k)^T[c_t(k)c_t(k)^T]^{-1}c_t(k)b_t(k)^T \geq 0$$

But $c_t(k)$ is invertible, so this inequality becomes

$$a_t(k)a_t(k)^T - W(k) \geq 0 \tag{2.3}$$

Right continuity of $\langle M\rangle$ gives $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} V_t(k)_{11} = W(k)$. So

$$0 = \lim_{t\downarrow T_k}[V_t(k)_{11} - W(k)] = \lim_{t\downarrow T_k}[(a_t(k)a_t(k)^T - W(k)) + b_t(k)b_t(k)^T]$$

The term in brackets is because of equation (2.3) the sum of two nonnegative matrices. Hence $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} a_t(k)a_t(k)^T = W(k)$ and $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} b_t(k) = 0$. Because $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} V_t(k)_{22} = 0$, we obtain $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} c_t(k) = 0$. □

Introduce the following notation. $P_t = \langle M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+$. Observe that P_t for fixed (t,ω) is the orthogonal projection on $Im\langle M\rangle_t$ along $Ker\langle M\rangle_t$. P as a process doesn't depend on t on $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$. It is, like r, nor right or left continuous at the T_k. Furthermore, for $t > s$, we have $P_tP_s = P_sP_t = P_s$, because $Im\langle M\rangle_s \subset Im\langle M\rangle_t$.

LEMMA 2.3 *M is indistinguishable from the stochastic integral $P.M$ and from the product PM.*

PROOF P is predictable (from proposition 2.1). Hence $P.M$ defines again a martingale. Then $\langle M - P.M\rangle = \langle (I-P).M\rangle = \int_0^\cdot (I-P)d\langle M\rangle(I-P)^T$. On $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ we have $Pd\langle M\rangle = d(P\langle M\rangle) = d\langle M\rangle$ which makes the integral zero over $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$. On $\{T_k < \infty\}$ we can apply the same argument if $P_{T_k} = P_{T_k-}$. Otherwise we get

$$(I - P_{T_k})\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k} = (I - P_{T_k})[\langle M\rangle_{T_k} - \langle M\rangle_{T_k-}] =$$

$$-(I - P_{T_k})\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} = -(I - P_{T_k})P_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} = 0,$$

since $P_{T_k}P_{T_k-} = P_{T_k-}$. Hence $\langle M - P.M\rangle$ is indistinguishable from the zero process. Consider now the product PM. On $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ we have $d(PM) = PdM$. Let $T_1 < \infty$. Then

$$P_{T_1}M_{T_1} = P_{T_1}\Delta M_{T_1} = \Delta(P.M)_{T_1} = \Delta M_{T_1} = M_{T_1}.$$

Now we use an induction argument. Let $T_k < \infty$ and assume that $P_{T_{k-1}}M_{T_{k-1}} = M_{T_{k-1}}$. Then

$$\Delta(P_{T_k}M_{T_k}) = P_{T_k+}M_{T_k} - P_{T_k-}M_{T_k-} = P_{T_k+}\Delta M_{T_k} + (P_{T_k+} - P_{T_k-})M_{T_k-} =$$

$$\Delta M_{T_k} + (P_{T_k+} - P_{T_k-})(M_{T_k-} - M_{T_{k-1}}) + (P_{T_k+} - P_{T_k-})P_{T_{k-1}}M_{T_{k-1}} =$$

$$\Delta M_{T_k} + (P_{T_k+} - P_{T_k-})\int_{(T_{k-1},T_k)} PdM + 0 =$$

$$\Delta M_{T_k} + (P_{T_k+} - P_{T_k-})P_{T_k-}\int_{(T_{k-1},T_k)} dM = \Delta M_{T_k}.$$

Hence PM and M are indistinguishable. □

The covariation process $\langle m, M\rangle$ enjoys the following property.

LEMMA 2.4 $\langle m, M\rangle = \langle m, M\rangle P$.

PROOF:

$$\langle m,M\rangle_t P_t 1_{]T_k,T_{k+1}[} = \int_{[0,t]} 1_{]T_k,T_{k+1}[} d\langle m,M\rangle_s P_s = \int_{[0,t]} 1_{]T_k,T_{k+1}[} d\langle m,P.M\rangle_s =$$

$$\int_{[0,t]} 1_{]T_k,T_{k+1}[} d\langle m,M\rangle_s (\text{by lemma } 2.3) = \langle m,M\rangle_t 1_{]T_k,T_{k+1}[}.$$

On $\{T_k < \infty\}$ we have

$$\langle m,M\rangle_{T_k} P_{T_k} = \Delta\langle m,M\rangle_{T_k} P_{T_k} + \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k-}(P_{T_k} - P_{T_k-}) + \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k-} P_{T_k-} =$$

$$\Delta\langle m,P.M\rangle_{T_k} + \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k-}(P_{T_k} - P_{T_k-}) + \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k-} P_{T_k-} =$$

$$\Delta\langle m,M\rangle_{T_k} + \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k-} P_{T_k-},$$

because the second term equals zero, as can be seen by the first part of the proof and by using an induction argument like in the proof of lemma 2.3. By the same argument it follows that $\langle m,M\rangle_{T_k-}P_{T_k-} = \lim_{t\uparrow T_k}\langle m,M\rangle_t P_t = \lim_{t\uparrow T_k}\langle m,M\rangle_t = \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k-}$. So $\langle m,M\rangle_{T_k}P_{T_k} = \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k}$. Combining this with the first part of the proof we get $\langle m,M\rangle = \langle m,M\rangle P$. □

REMARK: Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 as well the results in subsequent sections can be generalized by taking other generalized inverses of $\langle M\rangle$. P_t is then still a projection, although not symmetric. For our purposes the specific choice of the Moore-Penrose inverse suffices.

3 the process $c(m,M)$

Let m and M be as in section 1. Define the predictable process (related to the correlation between m and M) $c(m,M) : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}^{k\times k}$ by

$$c(m,M) = \langle m\rangle - \langle m,M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+\langle M,m\rangle$$

The main result of this section is an integral representation for $c(m,M)$. The difficulty that we encounter is that $\langle M\rangle^+$ and even $\langle m,M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+$ may not be right continuous. See example 2. Typically right limits of $\langle M\rangle^+$ at the T_k are not finite. Take for example the trivial case where $\langle M\rangle_t = t - t\wedge 1$, then $\langle M\rangle_t^+ = \frac{1}{t-1}$, for $t > 1$. Therefore we need some agreements concerning the notation that we will follow. The considerations above forbid us to define $\Delta\langle M\rangle_t^+$ as $\langle M\rangle_{t+}^+ - \langle M\rangle_{t-}^+$. Therefore we adopt the *convention*

$$\Delta\langle M\rangle_t^+ = \langle M\rangle_t^+ - \langle M\rangle_{t-}^+$$

All integrals of the type $J_t = \int_{[0,t]} \alpha d\langle M\rangle^+$ are then to be understood such that $\Delta J_t = \alpha_t \Delta\langle M\rangle_t^+ = \alpha_t(\langle M\rangle_t^+ - \langle M\rangle_{t-}^+)$, provided of course that α is such that this convention makes sense, which is the case if J is right continuous.
We need the following representation result (Cf [4] for the univariate case).

LEMMA 3.1 *There exists a (in general not unique) predictable process $\kappa : \Omega \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}^{k\times n}$, such that $m - \kappa.M$ is an $\mathbf{R}^k$ valued square integrable martingale, orthogonal to M in the sense that $\langle m - \kappa.M, M\rangle = 0$. However the martingale $m - \kappa.M$ is uniquely defined (up to indistinguishability).* □

With a process κ as in lemma 3.1 we can write

$$\begin{aligned} c(m,M) &= \langle m - \kappa.M\rangle + \langle \kappa.M\rangle - \langle m,M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+\langle M,m\rangle \\ &= \langle m-\kappa.M\rangle + c(\kappa.M,M) \end{aligned}$$

The proof of theorem 3.3 below involves some calculus rules. As for $\langle M\rangle^+$, we also use for P the notation $\Delta P_t = P_t - P_{t-}$.

LEMMA 3.2 *(i) $d\langle M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle^+_{t-} = -\langle M\rangle_t d\langle M\rangle^+_t + dP_t$*
(ii) $d\langle M\rangle_t = -\langle M\rangle_{t-}d\langle M\rangle^+_t\langle M\rangle_t + dP_t\langle M\rangle_t$

PROOF On $]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ the ordinary calculus rules apply to $V_t(k)$ and P doesn't vary with t on this stochastic interval. Hence the result follows in this case. Consider now what happens if $t = T_k < \infty$. If $\langle M\rangle$ happens to be left continuous at this point we are back in the previous case. So assume that $\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k} \neq 0$. Then

$$\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k-} + \langle M\rangle_{T_k}\Delta\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} = \langle M\rangle_{T_k}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} - \langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k-} = \Delta P_{T_k}$$

This proves (i). Similarly we have

$$\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k} + \langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\Delta\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k} = \langle M\rangle_{T_k} - \langle M\rangle_{T_k-} + \langle M\rangle_{T_k-}P_{T_k} - P_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle_{T_k}$$

$$= (I - P_{T_k-})\langle M\rangle_{T_k} - \langle M\rangle_{T_k-}(I - P_{T_k}) = \Delta P_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k}$$

which proves the second assertion. □

In the notation that we introduced above we are now able to present the principal result of this section.

THEOREM 3.3 *(i) $c(m,M)$ is a right continuous process.*
(ii) With κ as in lemma 3.1 we have for $m = \kappa.M$ the following integral representation:

$$\begin{aligned} c(m,M) &= -\int(\kappa\langle M\rangle - \langle m,M\rangle)d\langle M\rangle^+(\kappa\langle M\rangle - \langle m,M\rangle)^T \\ &= -\int(\kappa - \langle m,M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+)\langle M\rangle d\langle M\rangle^+\langle M\rangle(\kappa - \langle m,M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+)^T \\ &= -\int(\kappa - \langle m,M\rangle_-\langle M\rangle^+_-)\langle M\rangle_- d\langle M\rangle^+\langle M\rangle_-(\kappa - \langle m,M\rangle_-\langle M\rangle^+_-)^T \\ &= +\int(\kappa - \langle m,M\rangle_-\langle M\rangle^+_-)(I - \Delta\langle M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+)d\langle M\rangle(\kappa - \langle m,M\rangle_-\langle M\rangle^+_-)^T \end{aligned}$$

PROOF (i) This is a simple consequence of right continuity of all involved processes if we restrict our attention to the open intervals $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$. Therefore we consider what happens at the T_k (on $\{T_k < \infty\}$). Define the process q on $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ by $q_t = \langle m, M\rangle_t F(k) R_t(k)^{-1}$, where $R_t(k)$ is as in lemma 2.2. We will show that $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} q_t q_t^T$ exists. Write $q_t = q_t^1 + q_t^2$, with $q_t^1 = \langle m, M\rangle_{T_k} F(k) R_t(k)^{-T}$ and $q_t^2 = (\langle m, M\rangle_t - \langle m, M\rangle_{T_k}) F(k) R_t(k)^{-T}$. First we will show that $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} q_t^2 = 0$. It is sufficient to prove that $tr[q_t^2 (q_t^2)^T]$ tends to zero for $t \downarrow T_k$. Write $q_t^2 (q_t^2)^T = \int_{(T_k,t]} \kappa d\langle M\rangle \langle M\rangle_t^+ \int_{(T_k,t]} d\langle M\rangle \kappa^T \geq 0$. Let κ_i be the i-th row of κ and write $\langle M\rangle_t^+ = \sum_{j=1}^n Q_{jt} Q_{jt}^T$, where the Q_{jt} are $\mathbf{R}^n$ valued random variables and $Q_{jt}^T Q_{jt} = 0$ if i$\neq$j. Then $tr(q_t^2 q_t^{2T}) = \sum_{i,j} [\int_{(T_k,t]} \kappa_i d\langle M\rangle Q_{jt}]^2$, which is by Schwartz' inequality less than

$$\sum_{i,j} \int_{(T_k,t]} \kappa_i d\langle M\rangle \kappa_i^T \int_{(T_k,t]} Q_{jt}^T d\langle M\rangle Q_{jt} =$$
$$\sum_{i} \int_{(T_k,t]} \kappa_i d\langle M\rangle \kappa_i^T \sum_j Q_{jt}^T (\langle M\rangle_t - \langle M\rangle_{T_k}) Q_{jt} =$$
$$tr \int_{(T_k,t]} \kappa d\langle M\rangle \kappa^T tr[(\langle M\rangle_t - \langle M\rangle_{T_k}) \langle M\rangle_t^+] \tag{3.1}$$

The first factor of this product tends to zero as $t \downarrow T_k$. Consider now the second factor. First we notice that $tr[\langle M\rangle_t \langle M\rangle_t^+] = tr[F(k)F(k)^T] = tr[F(k)^T F(k)] = r_t$. (Remember that $r_t = rank \langle M\rangle_t$). Next we compute

$$tr[\langle M\rangle_{T_k} \langle M\rangle_t^+] = tr[G(k)W(k)G(k)^T F(k) V_t(k)^{-1} F(k)^T] =$$

$$tr[V_t(k)^{-1} F(k)^T G(k) W(k) G(k)^T F(k)] =$$

$$tr[V_t(k)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} W(k) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}] = tr[R_t(k)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} W(k) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} R_t(k)^{-T}] =$$
$$tr\{ \begin{bmatrix} a_t(k)^{-1} & * \\ 0 & * \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W(k) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_t(k)^{-T} & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix} =$$
$$tr \begin{bmatrix} (a_t(k)a_t(k)^T)^{-1} W(k) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = tr[(a_t(k)a_t(k)^T)^{-1} W(k)]$$

which tends to $tr[W(k)^{-1}W(k)] = r_{T_k}$. Hence $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} [(\langle M\rangle_t - \langle M\rangle_{T_k}) \langle M\rangle_t^+] = r_{T_k+} - r_{T_k} < \infty$. So from equation (3.1) we obtain that indeed $q_t^2 \to 0$ as $t \downarrow T_k$. Secondly we look at q_t^1. From lemma 2.4 we see that there exists a random matrix $A(k)$ such that $\langle m, M\rangle_{T_k} = A(k) G(k)^T$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} q_t^1 &= A(k) G(k)^T F(k) R_t(k)^{-T} \\ &= A(k) \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_t(k)^{-T} & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix} \\ &= A(k) \begin{bmatrix} a_t(k)^{-T} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

So $q_t^1 (q_t^1)^T = A(k)(a_t(k)a_t(k)^T)^{-1} A(k)^T \to A(k) W(k)^{-1} A(k)^T$, since $W(k)$ is invertible and $a_t(k)a_t(k)^T \to W(k)$ by lemma 2.2. Because of the fact that $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} q_t^2 =$

0, and that $a_t(k)$ is bounded for $t \downarrow T_k$, we get $\lim_{t\downarrow T_k} q_t q_t^T = \lim_{t\downarrow T_k} q_t^1 (q_t^1)^T = A(k)W(k)^{-1}A(k)^T$.
But $\langle m, M\rangle_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k}^+\langle M, m\rangle_{T_k} = A(k)G(k)^T G(k)W(k)^{-1}G(k)^T G(k)A(k)^T = A(k)W(k)^{-1}A(k)^T$, which gives right continuity of $\langle m, M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+\langle M, m\rangle$ at the T_k (on $\{T_k < \infty\}$), thus proving the first assertion of the theorem. In order to prove the second one we proceed as follows. Because $c(m, M)$ is right continuous we can use the results of lemma 3.2 in the computations below.

$$\begin{aligned} dc(m,M) &= \kappa d\langle M\rangle\kappa^T - \langle m,M\rangle_-\langle M\rangle_-^+ d\langle M\rangle\kappa^T \\ &\quad -\langle m,M\rangle_- d\langle M\rangle^+\langle M,m\rangle - \kappa d\langle M\rangle\langle M\rangle^+\langle M,m\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

from which we obtain by lemma 3.2

$$\begin{aligned} dc(m,M) &= -(\kappa\langle M\rangle_- - \langle m,M\rangle_-)d\langle M\rangle^+(\kappa\langle M\rangle - \langle m,M\rangle)^T \\ &\quad +\kappa dP\langle M\rangle\kappa^T - \langle m,M\rangle_- dP\kappa^T - \kappa dP\langle M,m\rangle & (3.3)\\ &= -(\kappa\langle M\rangle - \langle m,M\rangle)d\langle M\rangle^+(\kappa\langle M\rangle - \langle m,M\rangle)^T \\ &\quad +\kappa dP\langle M\rangle_-\kappa^T - \langle m,M\rangle_- dP\kappa^T - \kappa dP\langle M,m\rangle_- & (3.4) \end{aligned}$$

It is immediately seen that on $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ the last three terms vanish, whereas on $\{T_k < \infty\}$ we have

$$\Delta P_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} = \Delta P_{T_k} P_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} = 0$$

and

$$\langle m,M\rangle_{T_k}\Delta P_{T_k} = \langle m,M\rangle_{T_k} P_{T_k-}\Delta P_{T_k} = 0,$$

since $P_{T_k-}\Delta P_{T_k} = 0$. This proves the first formula of the second assertion. The other ones follow similarly. □

REMARK At $t = T_k$ it is not true that $\Delta\langle M\rangle_t^+ \le 0$ and that $\langle M\rangle_t\Delta\langle M\rangle_t^+\langle M\rangle_t \le 0$. However for all t one has $\langle M\rangle_{t-}\Delta\langle M\rangle_t^+\langle M\rangle_{t-} \le 0$. This is trivially true on the open intervals $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$. Consider what happens at T_k on $\{T_k < \infty\}$ if $\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k} \ne 0$. We know that $G(k)W(k)G(k)^T - F(k-1)V_{T_k-}(k-1)F(k-1)^T \ge 0$ or, with an obvious decomposition of $W(k)$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} W(k)_{11} - V_{T_k-}(k-1) & W(k)_{21} \\ W(k)_{12} & W(k)_{22} \end{bmatrix} \ge 0.$$

Hence, since $W(k)_{22}$ is invertible, we get

$$W(k)_{11} - W(k)_{12}W(k)_{22}^{-1}W(k)_{21} - V_{T_k-}(k-1) \ge 0 \tag{3.5}$$

Now look at

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k}^+\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} \\ =\ &\langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle_{T_k}^+\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} - \langle M\rangle_{T_k-} \\ =\ &F(k-1)V_{T_k-}(k-1)[F(k-1)^T G(k)W(k)^{-1}G(k)^T F(k-1) - \\ &V_{T_k-}(k-1)^{-1}]V_{T_k-}(k-1)F(k-1)^T. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the term in brackets. Again in obvious notation, it becomes

$$[W(k)^{-1}]_{11} - V_{T_k-}(k-1)^{-1} =$$

$$[W(k)_{11} - W(k)_{12}W(k)_{22}^{-1}W(k)_{21}]^{-1} - V_{T_k-}(k-1)^{-1} \leq 0,$$

from equation(3.5). Thus we have proved the following

COROLLARY 3.4 *The process $c(m, M)$ is non decreasing.*

4 linear dependence

In this section we will study a suitably defined notion of linear dependence between two square integrable martingales m and M. By analogy with the situation in which one deals with multidimensional random variables we have the following

DEFINITION 4.1 *(i) m is said to be linearly dependent on M if the process $c(m, M) \in \mathbf{R}^{k\times k}$ is indistuinguishable from zero.*
(ii) m and M are said to be mutually linearly dependent if both $c(m, M)$ and $c(M, m)$ are indistuinguishable from zero.

Here is the main result of this section.

THEOREM 4.2 *m is linearly dependent on M iff there exists a (possibly random) matrix $C \in \mathbf{R}^{k\times n}$ with $C\langle M\rangle$ a predictable process such that $m = CM$. Moreover in this case $C\langle M\rangle = \langle m, M\rangle$. Furthermore m and M are mutually linearly dependent iff there exist matrices C_1 and C_2 such that $m = C_1M$ and $M = C_2m$. In the latter case we also have that C_1 and C_2 are each others Moore-Penrose inverses.*

REMARK The matrix C in theorem 4.2 is not necessarily $\mathcal{F}_0$- measurable. See example 3.

PROOF Define $\gamma_t = \langle m, M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+$. Then $\gamma_t\langle M\rangle_t = \langle m, M\rangle_t$ from lemma 2.4. On $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\gamma_t &= \langle m, M\rangle_{t-}d\langle M\rangle_t^+ + d\langle m, M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+ \\ &= \gamma_{t-}\langle M\rangle_{t-}d\langle M\rangle_t^+ + \kappa_t d\langle M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+ \\ &= (\gamma_{t-} - \kappa_t)\langle M\rangle_{t-}d\langle M\rangle_t^+ \end{aligned}$$

So if $c(m, M) = 0$, then from theorem 3.3 we obtain that γ is constant on $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$. This also implies that γ admits right limits at T_k if $T_k < \infty$. We need some more properties of γ. On $\{T_k < \infty\}$ we have

$$(\gamma_{T_k+} - \gamma_{T_k})G(k) = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

$$\gamma_{T_k} - \gamma_{T_k-} = \kappa_{T_k}[G(k)G(k)^T - F(k-1)F(k-1)^T] = \kappa_{T_k}\Delta P_{T_k} \tag{4.2}$$

Indeed right continuity of $\langle m, M\rangle$ gives

$$\gamma_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k} = \langle m, M\rangle_{T_k} = \lim_{t\downarrow T_k}\langle m, M\rangle_t = \lim_{t\downarrow T_k}\gamma_t\langle M\rangle_t = \gamma_{T_k+}\langle M\rangle_{T_k}.$$

Hence $(\gamma_{T_k+} - \gamma_{T_k})\langle M\rangle_{T_k} = 0$, which is equivalent to equation (4.1). Next we use lemma 3.2 to write

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{T_k} - \gamma_{T_k-} &= \langle m, M\rangle_{T_k}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} - \langle m, M\rangle_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k-} \\
&= \langle m, M\rangle_{T_k-}\Delta\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} + \kappa_{T_k}\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} \\
&= \gamma_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\Delta\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} + \kappa_{T_k}\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} \\
&= \gamma_{T_k-}\langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\Delta\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} - \kappa_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\Delta\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} + \kappa_{T_k}\Delta P_{T_k} \\
&= (\gamma_{T_k-} - \kappa_{T_k})\langle M\rangle_{T_k-}\Delta\langle M\rangle^+_{T_k} + \kappa_{T_k}\Delta P_{T_k}
\end{aligned}$$

The assumption that $c(m, M) = 0$ yields the first term zero from theorem 3.3, which gives equation 4.2. Notice that equation 4.1 and equation 4.2 imply

$$(\gamma_{T_k} - \gamma_{T_{k-}})\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} = 0,\ (\gamma_{T_{k+}} - \gamma_{T_k})\langle M\rangle_{T_k} = 0 \tag{4.3}$$

Hence $\gamma_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k-} = 0$ and $\Delta(\gamma_{T_k}\langle M\rangle_{T_k}) = \gamma_{T_k}\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k}$, or $\Delta\langle m, M\rangle_{T_k} = \gamma_{T_k}\Delta\langle M\rangle_{T_k}$. Define now $C = \lim_{t\to\infty}\gamma_t$.We claim that this is the matrix in the assertion of the theorem. Notice that on the set $\Omega_k = \{T_k < \infty, T_{k+1} = \infty\}$ C equals $\gamma_{T_{k+}}$. Furthermore $\bigcup_{k=0}^n \Omega_k = \Omega$ and $\Omega_k \cap \Omega_l = \emptyset$ if $k \neq l$. First we prove the following facts. CM is a martingale and $CM_t = \gamma_t M_t = (\gamma.M)_t$.
From lemma 2.3: $CM_t = C\langle M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle^+_t M_t$. On Ω_k we have for $j \leq k$:

$$C\langle M\rangle_{T_j} = \gamma_{T_{k+}}\langle M\rangle_{T_j} = \sum_{i=1}^{k}(\gamma_{T_i+} - \gamma_{T_{i-1}+})\langle M\rangle_{T_j} = \sum_{i=1}^{k}(\gamma_{T_i+} - \gamma_{T_i-})\langle M\rangle_{T_j} =$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j}(\gamma_{T_i+} - \gamma_{T_i-})\langle M\rangle_{T_j} = \gamma_{T_j+}\langle M\rangle_{T_j},$$

since $(\gamma_{T_i+} - \gamma_{T_i-})\langle M\rangle_{T_j} = 0$ if $i < j$. But

$$\gamma_{T_j+}\langle M\rangle_{T_j} = (\gamma_{T_j+} - \gamma_{T_j})\langle M\rangle_{T_j} + \gamma_{T_j}\langle M\rangle_{T_j} = \gamma_{T_j}\langle M\rangle_{T_j}$$

by equation(4.3).
Furthermore on $\Omega_k \times [0,\infty)\cap]\!]T_j, T_{j+1}[\![$ we have in the same way $C\langle M\rangle_t = \gamma_{T_j+}\langle M\rangle_t$, because $(\gamma_{T_i+} - \gamma_{T_i-})F(j) = 0$ if $j < i$ and so $C\langle M\rangle$ is equal to $\gamma\langle M\rangle$.
Hence $CM_t = \gamma_t M_t = (\gamma.M)_t + \int_{[0,t]} d\gamma_s M_{s-}$. Now on Ω_k for $j \leq k$ we have $\Delta\gamma_{T_j} M_{T_j-} = \Delta\gamma_{T_j}\langle M\rangle_{T_j}\langle M\rangle^+_{T_j} M_{T_j-} = 0$. Hence $\int_{[0,t]} d\gamma_s M_{s-} = \sum_{T_j\leq t}\Delta\gamma_{T_j} M_{T_j-} = 0$.
Predictability of γ (lemma 2.3) gives that $CM = \gamma.M$ is indeed a martingale.
Finally we have to show that m and CM are indistuinguishable. Compute $\langle m - CM\rangle = \langle m - \gamma.M\rangle = \langle(\kappa - \gamma).M\rangle = \int_{[0,t]}(\kappa - \gamma)d\langle M\rangle(\kappa - \gamma)^T$. Consider $(\kappa - \gamma)_t d\langle M\rangle_t = d\langle m, M\rangle_t - \gamma_t d\langle M\rangle_t = d(\gamma_t\langle M\rangle_t) - \gamma_t d\langle M\rangle_t = d\gamma_t\langle M\rangle_{t-}$, which is zero on all $]\!]T_k, T_{k+1}[\![$, because here $d\gamma_t = 0$. At $t = T_k < \infty$ we also get zero from equation (4.2). This proves the only if part.
Next we prove the converse statement. Assume that $C\langle M\rangle$ is predictable, equivalently CP is predictable. Then the product $m = CM$ is a martingale. Indeed $CM = CPM$ is adapted. Let now $\gamma = CP$. Then $m = \gamma.M + \int_0^{\cdot} d\gamma M_- = \gamma.M + \int_0^{\cdot} d\gamma P_- M_-$. The last integral is easily seen to be zero. So m is equal to

$\gamma.M$ and thus a martingale. Moreover we also obtain $\langle m, M\rangle = \gamma.\langle M\rangle = \gamma\langle M\rangle - \int_0^\cdot d\gamma\langle M\rangle_-$, where again the last integral vanishes. But $\gamma\langle M\rangle = C\langle M\rangle$. Similarly $\langle m\rangle = C\langle M\rangle C^T$. Hence $c(m, M) = 0$. Assume finally that m and M are mutually linearly dependent. Then there exists matrices C_1 and C_2 as in the first part of the theorem. They are of the form as in the first part of the proof. Therefore we can compute $C_1C_2C_1 = \lim_{t\to\infty}\langle m, M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+\langle M, m\rangle_t\langle m\rangle^+\langle m, M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+ = \lim_{t\to\infty}\langle m, M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+\langle M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+ = \lim_{t\to\infty}\langle m, M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t^+ = C_1$. Here we used in the second equality the fact that $c(M, m) = 0$. Similarly one can prove that $C_2C_1C_2 = C_2$ and $C_1C_2 = (C_1C_2)^T$ which shows that C_1 and C_2 are each others Moore-Penrose inverses (Cf [3]). This completes the proof. □

REMARK: Consider the other extreme case. One always has $c(m, M)_t \leq \langle m\rangle_t$. Here equality holds iff $\langle m, M\rangle_t = 0$. Indeed, assume that equality holds, then $\langle m, M\rangle_t\langle M\rangle_t = 0$, and hence $\langle m, M\rangle_t P_t = 0$ and by lemma 2.4 this implies $\langle m, M\rangle_t = 0$. The converse statement is trivial.

By localization it is possible to formulate a whole string of corollaries, which are roughly all of the following type.

COROLLARY 4.3 *Let S be a stopping time and assume that*

$$c(m, M)_S 1_{\{S<\infty\}} + c(m, M)_{\infty-}1_{\{S=\infty\}} = 0$$

Then the stopped martingale m^S depends linearly on the stopped martingale M^S. Equivalently there exists C such that $1_{[0,S]}(m - CM) = 0$.

PROOF It holds that $c(m, M)^S = c(m^S, M^S)$. Hence the assumption in the corollary implies $\lim_{t\to\infty} c(m^S, M^S)_t = 0$. So $c(m^S, M^S)_t = 0\ \forall t \geq 0$, since $c(m^S, M^S)$ is non decreasing (corollary 3.4). The result now follows from theorem 4.2. □

EXAMPLE 2: Let W be Brownian motion and ε a N(0,1) distributed random variable. Assume that W and ε are independent. Let $\mu_t = W_t + 1_{\{t\geq 1\}}\varepsilon$. Define $\xi : [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}^2$ by $\xi(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} 1_{\{1\}}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ t-1 \end{bmatrix} 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$ and $M = \xi.\mu$. Let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{W_s, s \leq t; 1_{\{t\geq 1\}}\varepsilon\}$. Then M is a martingale with respect to the filtration $\mathbf{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ and

$$\langle M\rangle_t = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} 1_{\{1\}}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} t & \frac{1}{2}(t-1)^2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(t-1)^2 & \frac{1}{3}(t-1)^3 \end{bmatrix} 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$$

for $\langle\mu\rangle = t + 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$. Hence $r_t = rank\langle M\rangle_t = 1_{\{1\}}(t) + 2.1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$.
Let $K : [0,\infty) \to \mathbf{R}^{2\times 2}$ be given by $K(t) = K^1 1_{\{1\}}(t) + K^2 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$, and $m = K.M$. Then $\langle m, M\rangle_t = K.\langle M\rangle_t =$

$$K^1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} 1_{\{1\}}(t) + \{K^1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + K^2 \begin{bmatrix} t & \frac{1}{2}(t-1)^2 \\ \frac{1}{2}(t-1)^2 & \frac{1}{3}(t-1)^3 \end{bmatrix}\} 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$$

A computation shows:

$$\langle M\rangle_t^+ = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} 1_{\{1\}}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{4}{t+3} & \frac{-6}{(t-1)(t+3)} \\ \frac{-6}{(t-1)(t+3)} & \frac{12t}{(t-1)(t+3)} \end{bmatrix} 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$$

Let $K^1 = [K^1_{ij}]$ and $K^2 = [K^2_{ij}]$. Then $\gamma_t = \langle m, M\rangle_t \langle M\rangle_t^+ =$

$$K^1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} 1_{\{1\}}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(4K^1_{11}+(t-1)K^2_{11})}{t+3} & K^2_{12} + \frac{6(K^2_{11}-K^1_{11})}{(t-1)(t+3)} \\ \frac{(4K^1_{21}+(t-1)K^2_{21})}{t+3} & K^2_{22} + \frac{6(K^2_{21}-K^1_{21})}{(t-1)(t+3)} \end{bmatrix} 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$$

Hence $\lim_{t\downarrow 1} \gamma_t$ doesn't exist for arbitrary K.
Assume now that $c(m, M) = 0$, then from theorem 4.2 we know that γ is constant on $(1, \infty)$. So the following equalities have to hold: $K^1_{11} = K^2_{11}$ and $K^1_{21} = K^2_{21}$. Now γ becomes

$$\gamma_t = K^1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} 1_{\{1\}}(t) + K^2 1_{(1,\infty)}(t)$$

And in agreement with theorem 4.2 (cf. its proof) we see that $m = \gamma_{1+} M$.

EXAMPLE 3: Let ε_i be iid N(0,1) random variables. Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n\}$. Let $x_1 \ldots x_n$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathbf{R}^n$ and $x_i = 0$ for $i \geq n+1$. Let furthermore $K_i : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}^{k\times n}$ be $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ measurable. Define $M_t = \sum_{i\leq t} x_i \varepsilon_i$, $m_t = \sum_{i\leq t} K_i \Delta M_i$. Then $\langle M\rangle_t = \sum_{i\leq t} x_i x_i^T, \langle M\rangle_t^+ = \sum_{i\leq t\wedge n} x_i x_i^T$. A simple calculation shows that $c(m, M) = 0$ and that the matrix C in theorem 4.2 becomes $C = \sum_{i\leq n} K_i x_i x_i^T$, which is $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ measurable.

References

[1] K. Dzhaparidze & P.J.C. Spreij, *On SLLN for multivariate martingales*, Research Memorandum Vrije Universiteit 1989-79

[2] K. Dzhaparidze & P.J.C. Spreij, *On second order optimality of regular projective estimators, part I*, Research Memorandum Vrije Universiteit 1990-50

[3] P. Lancaster & M. Tismenetsky, *The Theory of Matrices*, Academic Press

[4] R.S. Liptser & A.N. Shiryayev, *Theory of Martingales*, Kluwer

1990-1	B. Vogelvang	Testing For Co-Integration with Spot Prices of Some Related Agricultural Commodities
1990-2	J.C.J.M. van den Bergh P. Nijkamp	Ecologically Sustainable Economic Development Concepts and Model Implications
1990-3	J.C.J.M. van den Bergh P. Nijkamp	Ecologically Sustainable Economic Development in a Regional System: A Case Study in Agri cultural Development Planning in the Netherlands
1990-4	C.Gorter P.Nijkamp P.Rietveld	Employers' Recruitment Behaviour and Re-Employment Probabilities of Unemployed
1990-5	K.Burger	Off-farm income and the farm-household the case of Kenyan smallholders
1990-6	H. Visser	Crowding out and the Government Budget
1990-7	P. Rietveld	Ordinal Data in Multicriteria Decision Making, a Stochastic Dominance Approach to Siting Nuclear Power Plants
1990-8	G. van der Laan P.H.M. Ruys D.J.J. Talman	Signaling devices for the supply of semi-public goods
1990-9	F.A.G. den Butter	Labour Productivity Slowdown and Technical Progress: An empirical analysis for The Netherlands
1990-10	R.W. van Zijp	Neo-Austrian Business Cycle Theory
1990-11	J.C. van Ours	Matching Unemployment and Vacancies: The Efficiency of the Dutch Labour Market
1990-12	B. Vogelvang	Hypotheses Testing Concerning Relationships between Spot Prices of Various Types of Coffee
1990-13	A.F. de Vos I.J. Steyn	Stochastic Nonlinearity: A Firm Basis for the Flexible Functional Form
1990-14	Y.H. van Emmerik D. de Jong W.W.A. Zuurmond D.N. Dukkers-van Emden	Opereren in overleg: geprotocolleerde samen-werking 1e-2e-lijn bij dagchirurgie
1990-15	T.J.J.B. Wolters	Mediation and Collective Bargaining: A Diagnostic Approach
1990-16	E.M.A. Scholten J. Koelewijn	Financieringsproblematiek van startende ondernemingen: een mogelijke verklaring op basis van empirisch onderzoek.
1990-17	E. Hüner H.P. Smit	Saturation and Model Specification of Passen ger car Ownership
1990-18	F.A.G. den Butter	Sociale zekerheid, de wig en economische groei
1990-19	F.A.G. den Butter R.F. v.d. Wijngaert	Who is Correcting the Error ? A Co-inte-gration Approach for Wages, Wage Space and Labour Conflicts in the Netherlands
1990-20	J.P. de Groot R. Ruben	Sistemas de Producción y Transferencia de Teconología en la Economía Cafetalera de Centroamerica
1990-21	R. Ruben	Campesinado y Reforma Agraria en El Salvador
1990-22	J. van Ours G. Ridder	Vacancies and the Recruitment of New Employees
1990-23	A.F. de Vos J.J. de Vries	The Likelihood Function of a Generalized Gravity Model; Handling the Implicit Singularity of a Nonlineair Transformation
1990-24	D. van der Wal	Geloofwaardigheid en het Nederlandse wisselkoersbeleid
1990-25	R.J. Veldwijk M. Boogaard M.V. van Dijk E.R.K. Spoor	EDSOs, implosion and explosion: concepts to automate a part of application maintenance
1990-26	B. Hanzon	The area enclosed by the (oriented) Nyquist diagram and the Hilbert-Schmidt-Hankel norm of a linear system
1990-27	R.W. van Zijp	Why Lucas is not a Hayekian
1990-28	J. Rouwendal	On discrete choice under uncertainty: A generalization of the logit model and its application
1990-29	J. Rouwendal	On the equitable distribution of the housing stock
1990-30	J. Rouwendal	Stochastic market equilibria with efficient rationing (with an application to the Dutch housing market)
1990-31	J.A. Vijlbrief	The effects of unemployment insurance on the labour market
1990-32	J.G.W. Simons H.P. Wansink	Traffic Ban, a means to combat smog?
1990-33	J.C. van Ours T. Zoethout	De Interne Arbeidsmarkt van de Gemeente Amsterdam
1990-34	H.J. Bierens	A Note On the Limiting Distribution of Sample Autocorrela-tions in the Presence of a Unit Root
1990-35	T. Kuhlman	The Economic Integration of Refugees in Developing Countries: A Research Model.
1990-36	T. Kuhlman	Towards a Definition of Refugees.
1990-37	T. Kuhlman	Organized versus Spontaneous Settlement of Refugees in Africa.
1990-38	R. Zuidema	The Neo-Austrian View on Interest
1990-39	G.v.d.Laan	General Equilibrium in a Closed International Trade Model