

Ergodic aspects of trading with threshold strategies

Attila Lovas[†] Miklós Rásonyi[‡]

November 30, 2021

Abstract

When applying threshold-type strategies, changes in the portfolio position are triggered by the asset price process reaching prescribed levels. Such strategies are frequently used by investors, to profit from price oscillations.

In this paper we make the first steps towards the optimization of threshold strategies by proving ergodic properties of related functionals. Assuming a minorization condition and (one-sided) boundedness of the price increments, we show, in particular, that for given thresholds, the distribution of the gain converges in the long run. Our results cover, in particular, a large class of stochastic volatility models.

We also extended recent results on the stability of overshoots of random walks from the i.i.d. increment case to Markovian increments, under suitable conditions.

Keywords: Minorization, random walk, stochastic stability, threshold-type strategies, optimal investment.

1 Introduction

Perhaps the most naive approach to speculative trading is trying to “buy low and sell high” a given financial asset. More refined versions of such strategies are actually widely used by practitioners, see [3, 1, 2]. A rigorous mathematical formulation, however, is revealed to pose thorny questions about ergodicity, as we shall point out below.

The present article starts to build a reasonable and mathematically sound framework to analyzing such problems. We establish that key functionals converge to an invariant distribution and obey a law of large numbers. We are unaware of any previous study that would tackle these questions. Our results may serve as a basis for further related investigations, using techniques of ergodic and adaptive control.

We also investigate a closely related object, studied in [11, 12]: the so-called overshoot process. We extend certain results from [11] from i.i.d. to Markovian

Both authors benefitted from the support of the “Lendület” grant LP 2015-6 of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

[†]Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics and Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Budapest, Hungary

[‡]Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Budapest, Hungary

summands. Even non-Markovian summands can be treated under suitable assumptions: we sketch the case of stochastic volatility models.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we state our main results on the stability of level crossings and related quantities of random walks with zero-mean Markovian increments satisfying a minorization and (one-sided) boundedness. In Section 3, we explain the financial setting and the significance of our results in studying optimal trading with threshold strategies. Section 4 presents our results about overshoots. Section 5 contains the proofs of the main results. Section 6 deals with further ramifications: (non-Markovian) stochastic volatility models.

2 Stability of level crossings

Let $M > 0$ and let $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a time-homogeneous Markov chain on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with state space $\mathcal{X} := (-\infty, M]$. Its transition kernel is denoted $P : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$. We consider the random walk

$$S_n = S_0 + X_1 + \dots + X_n, \quad (1)$$

where S_0 is an almost surely finite random variable independent of $\sigma(X_k : k \in \mathbb{N})$.

The next minorization condition ensures that the chain jumps, with positive probability, in one step to a small neighborhood of zero independently of the initial state, moreover the random movements of S have a diffuse component.

Assumption 2.1. *There exist $\alpha, h > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$P(x, A) \geq \alpha \ell(A) \quad (2)$$

holds where

$$\ell(A) := \frac{1}{2h} \text{Leb}([-h, h] \cap A)$$

is the normalized Lebesgue measure on $[-h, h]$.

Lemma 2.2. *Under Assumption 2.1, there is a unique probability π_* on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\text{Law}(X_n) \rightarrow \pi_*$ in total variation as $n \rightarrow \infty$, at a geometric speed.*

Proof. Assumption 2 implies that the state space \mathcal{X} is a small set. Hence the chain is uniformly ergodic by Theorem 16.2.2 of [10]. \square

Assumption 2.3. *The limit distribution has zero mean, that is*

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} x \pi_*(dx) = 0,$$

where π_* is as in Lemma 2.2.

Let us fix thresholds $\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfying $\underline{\theta} < 0 < \bar{\theta}$. Furthermore, we define the sequence of crossing times corresponding to $\underline{\theta}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ by the recursion $L_0 := 0$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$T_{n+1} := \min\{k > L_n : S_k < \underline{\theta}\}, \quad L_{n+1} := \min\{k > T_{n+1} : S_k > \bar{\theta}\}. \quad (3)$$

Lemma 2.4. *Under Assumption 2.3, the random variables T_n, L_n are well-defined and almost surely finite.*

Proof. First we remark that π_* cannot be concentrated on one point. Indeed, if this were the case and $\pi_* = \delta_c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ held then $P(c, A) = \delta_c$ should also hold, contradicting Assumption 2.1. It follows that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 \pi_*(dx) > 0$ and hence the quantity γ_g defined in Theorem 17.0.1 with the choice $g(x) := x$ is also positive.

We will prove the statement inductively, the first step being trivial since $L_0 < \infty$. Assume that the statement has been shown for $L_0, L_1, T_1, \dots, L_n$ and we go on showing it for T_{n+1} and L_{n+1} . By the law of iterated logarithm for functionals of uniformly ergodic Markov chains (Theorem 17.0.1 of [10]),

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{X}_1(x) + \dots + \bar{X}_n(x)}{\sqrt{2\gamma_g n \ln \ln n}} = -1 \right) = 1$$

for all $x \in (-\infty, M]$, where $\bar{X}(x)$ is an auxiliary Markov chain with the same transition kernel as X , independent of $S_0, (X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, starting from $\bar{X}_0 = x$. We may and will assume that $\bar{X}_t : \Omega \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is measurable.

It follows in particular that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{X}_1(x) + \dots + \bar{X}_n(x)) < -K \right) = 1,$$

for all x and for all $K > 0$. Plugging in the random variables $\tilde{K} := S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{L_n} X_j - \underline{\theta}$ and $\tilde{x} := X_{L_n}$, we can check that also

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{X}_1(\tilde{x}) + \dots + \bar{X}_n(\tilde{x})) < \underline{\theta} - S_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{L_n} X_j \right) = 1. \quad (4)$$

Notice that the process $Y_k := X_k \mathbb{1}_{k \leq L_n} + \bar{X}_{k-L_n}(\tilde{x}) \mathbb{1}_{k > L_n}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ has the same law as X_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by the strong Markov property. Hence (4) implies that $P(T_{n+1} < \infty) = 1$. A similar argument with limsup instead of liminf establishes that also $P(L_{n+1} < \infty) = 1$. \square

Although X_{T_1} can be positive when $S_0 < \underline{\theta}$, easily seen that for $n \geq 2$, X_{T_n} is always negative, moreover it is also straightforward to verify that the process

$$U_n := (X_{T_n}, S_{T_n}, X_{L_n}, S_{L_n}, L_n - T_n), \quad n > 1,$$

is a time-homogeneous Markov chain on the state space

$$\mathcal{U} := (-\infty, 0) \times (-\infty, \underline{\theta}) \times (0, M] \times (\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} + M) \times (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}).$$

The next theorem states that under our standing assumptions, the law of U_n converges to a unique limiting law, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, moreover, bounded functionals of U_n admit an ergodic behavior.

Theorem 2.5. *Under Assumption 2.1 and 2.3, there exists a probability ν on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U})$ such that $\text{Law}(U_n) \rightarrow \nu$ at a geometric speed in total variation as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, for any bounded and measurable function $\phi : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \phi(U_j)}{n} \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{U}} \phi(u) \nu(du), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5)$$

almost surely.

Proof. See in Section 5. □

Remark 2.6. As stated, Theorem 2.5 lacks symmetry. To remedy this, let us now assume that the state space of X_t is $[-M, \infty)$ for some $M > 0$. Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 remain in force. Let us define $T_0 := 0$ and then recursively, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$L_{n+1} := \min\{k > T_n : S_k > \bar{\theta}\}, \quad T_{n+1} := \min\{k > L_{n+1} : S_k < \underline{\theta}\}. \quad (6)$$

Then the process

$$U_n = (X_{L_n}, S_{L_n}, X_{T_n}, S_{T_n}, T_n - L_n), \quad n > 1$$

is a homogeneous Markov chain on the state space

$$\mathcal{U}' := (0, \infty) \times (\bar{\theta}, \infty) \times [-M, 0) \times (\underline{\theta} - M, \underline{\theta}) \times (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Theorem 2.5 remains valid for this setting, with an analogous proof. See Remark 3.1 below for a financial mathematics interpretation of this latter result.

3 Trading with threshold strategies

Let the observed price of an asset be denoted by A_t at time $t \in \mathbb{N}$. We may think of the price of a futures contract, for instance. Positive prices can also be easily handled, see Remark 3.3 below. We assume that

$$A_t = \mu t + S_t, \quad (7)$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant and $S_t := S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^t X_j$ for a Markov process X describing the fluctuations of returns which is supposed to be bounded from above by some $M > 0$, and satisfies Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3. In this price model, μt represents the drift (or “trend”) and S_t performs the fluctuations around the trend (the “martingale part”).

The minorization condition (2) is easy to interpret in such a model: whatever the current increment $x \in (-\infty, M]$ of the fluctuations S is, with a positive probability the next increment will be small (that is, the price change will be close to 0) and the movements of S are diffuse, more precisely, they have a diffuse component. As the trend in A_t has already been separated, assuming (asymptotically) zero-mean X_t and hence zero-mean S_t is reasonable, justifying also Assumption 2.3 for the present model.

Now we set up the elements of our trading mechanism. Let the thresholds $\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}$ be fixed, satisfying $\underline{\theta} < 0 < \bar{\theta}$. We interpret $\underline{\theta}$ as a level for S_t under which it is advisable to buy the asset. Analogously, it is recommended to *sell* the asset if S_t exceeds $\bar{\theta}$. Thus, to realize a “buying low, selling high”-type strategy, the asset should be bought at the times $T_n, n \geq 1$ and sold at the times $L_n, n \geq 1$ thus realizing the profit

$$A_{L_n} - A_{T_n} = S_{L_n} - S_{T_n} + \mu(L_n - T_n). \quad (8)$$

Remark 3.1. In the setting of Remark 2.6 above, the trader sells one unit of the financial asset at L_n (shortselling) and then closes the position at T_n thus realizing a profit

$$-(A_{T_n} - A_{L_n}) = S_{L_n} - S_{T_n} - \mu(L_n - T_n). \quad (9)$$

We now explain the significance of Theorem 2.5 in studying optimal trading with threshold strategies. An investor aims to maximize in $\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}$ the long-term average utility from wealth, that is,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n u(S_{L_k(\theta)} - S_{T_k(\theta)} + \mu(L_k(\theta) - T_k(\theta)))}{n}, \quad (10)$$

where $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a utility function and $L_k(\theta), T_k(\theta)$ refer to the respective stopping times defined in terms of the parameter $\theta = (\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta})$. According to Theorem 2.5, the limsup in the above expression is, in fact, a limit, for a large class of u .

Example 3.2. Let u be a non-decreasing function that is bounded from above (such as the exponential utility with risk-averse characteristic) and assume $\mu \geq 0$. Since $S_{L_k} - S_{T_k}$ is necessarily bounded from below, (5) holds with the choice $\phi = u$ and the limit in (10) exists.

In future work, we intend to optimize $\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}$ by means of recursive schemes such as the Kiefer-Wolfowitz algorithm, see [14]. To prove the convergence of such procedures, it is a prerequisite that $\text{Law}(S_{L_k} - S_{T_k} + \mu(L_k - T_k))$ has favorable ergodic properties. This is precisely the content of Theorem 2.5 above.

Remark 3.3. In an alternative setting, A_t may model the *logprice* of an asset. In that case investing one dollar between T_n and L_n yields $\exp(S_{L_n} - S_{T_n} + \mu(L_n - T_n))$ dollars. Let $u : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-decreasing function bounded from above (such as negative power utility functions). In this setting the optimization

$$\max_{\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n u(\exp(S_{L_k(\theta)} - S_{T_k(\theta)} + \mu(L_k(\theta) - T_k(\theta))))}{n}$$

corresponds to maximizing the utility of the long-term investment of one dollar using threshold strategies controlled by θ and the limit exists again by Theorem 2.5.

4 Stability of overshoots

In [11] the authors consider a zero-mean i.i.d. sequence $X_n, n \geq 1$ and a random variable S_0 independent of the X_t . They determine the (stationary) limiting law μ_* for the Markov process of *overshoots* defined by $O_0 := \max(S_0, 0)$,

$$O_n = S_{L_n}, \quad n \geq 1$$

where L_n, T_n are defined as in (3) but with the choice $\underline{\theta} = \bar{\theta} = 0$. They also establish the convergence of $\text{Law}(O_n)$ to μ_* in an appropriate sense, depending on the exact assumptions. Generalizations to *entrance Markov chains* on more general state spaces have been obtained in [12].

Using methods of the present paper, we may obtain generalizations into another direction: we may relax the independence assumption on the X_t .

Theorem 4.1. *Under Assumption 2.1 and 2.3, there exists a probability ν on $\mathcal{B}((0, \infty))$ such that $\text{Law}(O_n) \rightarrow \nu$ at a geometric speed in total variation as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, for any bounded and measurable function $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \phi(O_j)}{n} \rightarrow \int_{(0, \infty)} \phi(u) \nu(du), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (11)$$

almost surely.

Proof. See in Section 5. □

Remark 4.2. In the i.i.d. case Theorem 4.1 applies if X_t is bounded from above and the law of X_t dominates constant times the Lebesgue measure in a neighbourhood of 0. In [11] a much larger class of i.i.d. random variables is treated. On the other hand, we can handle Markovian summands unlike [11]. See also Section 6 for possible non-Markovian generalizations.

5 Proofs

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Iterated random function representation of Markov chains on standard Borel spaces is a commonly used construction, see e.g. [6]. A similar representation for $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is shown in Lemma 5.1 below which will play a crucial role in the proof. Although the proof is quite standard, we present it for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\eta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be i.i.d. sequences, independent of each other, and also independent of $\sigma(X_0, S_0)$, moreover let ξ_0, η_0 be uniform on $[0, 1]$. Then there exists a map $\Phi : \mathcal{X} \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $u \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\forall v \in [0, \alpha] \quad \Phi(x, u, v) = h(2u - 1), \quad (12)$$

where $h, \alpha > 0$ are as in Assumption 2.1. Furthermore, the process $(X'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by the recursion $X'_0 = X_0, X'_{n+1} = \Phi(X'_n, \xi_{n+1}, \eta_{n+1}), n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a version of $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. For $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$, let us consider the decomposition

$$\kappa(x, A) = \alpha \ell(A) + (1 - \alpha)q(x, A),$$

where by Assumption 2.1,

$$q(x, A) = \frac{\kappa(x, A) - \ell(A)}{1 - \alpha}$$

is a probability kernel. For $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u, v \in [0, 1]$, we define

$$\Phi(x, u, v) = \mathbb{1}_{\{v < \alpha\}} h(2u - 1) + \mathbb{1}_{\{v \geq \alpha\}} q^{-1}(x, u),$$

where $q^{-1}(x, u) := \inf\{r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q(x, (-\infty, r]) \geq u\}$, $u \in [0, 1]$ is the pseudoinverse of the cumulative distribution function $r \mapsto q(x, (-\infty, r])$, $x \in \mathcal{X} = (-\infty, M]$.

Obviously, (12) holds true, and thus for any fixed $u \in [0, 1]$, the random map $x \mapsto \Phi(x, u, \eta_{n+1})$ is constant on \mathcal{X} with probability α showing that X'_n forgets its previous state with positive probability. This observation will play later a central role later.

On the other hand, by the definition of the pseudoinverse, $\text{Law}(q^{-1}(x, \xi_0)) = q(x, \cdot)$, and thus we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Phi(x, \xi_0, \eta_0) \in A) &= \mathbb{P}(\Phi(x, \xi_0, \eta_0) \in A; \eta_0 < \alpha) + \mathbb{P}(\Phi(x, \xi_0, \eta_0) \in A; \eta_0 \geq \alpha) \\ &= \alpha \mathbb{P}(h(2\xi_0 - 1) \in A) + (1 - \alpha) \mathbb{P}(q^{-1}(x, \xi_0) \in A) \\ &= \alpha \ell(A) + (1 - \alpha)q(x, A) = \kappa(x, A). \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, the chains $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(X'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ have the same transition kernel, and their initial states also coincide showing that these processes are versions of each other. \square

Since we are interested in the distribution of U_n , from now on we may and will assume that the the random walk $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is driven by $(X'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, whereby for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, each of X_{T_n} , S_{T_n} , X_{L_n} , S_{L_n} , L_n and T_n is a function of $X_0, S_0, (\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\eta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

In what follows, we are going to prove that the minorization property of $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is inherited by $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Let us denote the transition kernel of U by $Q : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, that is for all $y \in \mathcal{U}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U})$

$$\mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B \mid U_n = y) = Q(y, B), \quad n > 1$$

holds. We aim to show that there exist a non-zero Borel measure $\tilde{\kappa} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U}) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for all $y \in \mathcal{U}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U})$,

$$Q(y, B) \geq \tilde{\kappa}(B). \quad (13)$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we define $\tau_n = \sup\{t \in \mathbb{N} \mid \eta_{L_n+k} < \alpha, k = 1, \dots, t\}$. Clearly, τ_n is independent of U_n , moreover it follows a $\text{Geo}(1 - \alpha)$ distribution counting the number of failures until the first success i.e. $\mathbb{P}(\tau_n = j) = \alpha^j(1 - \alpha)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, let $y = (\underline{x}, \underline{s}, \bar{x}, \bar{s}, r) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U})$ be arbitrary and fixed. By the tower rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(y, B) &= \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B \mid U_n = y) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B \mid U_n = y, \tau_n = k) \mathbb{P}(\tau_n = k \mid U_n = y) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B \mid U_n = y, \tau_n = k) \alpha^k (1 - \alpha) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B, L_{n+1} \leq L_n + k \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) \alpha^k (1 - \alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where we used that the sigma algebras $\sigma(\xi_{L_n+k}, \eta_{L_n+k}, k \geq 1)$ and $\sigma(U_n)$ are independent, moreover on sets $\{S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k\}$, we have

$$(X_{L_n+j}, S_{L_n+j}) = \left(h(2\xi_{L_n+j} - 1), \bar{s} + \sum_{i=1}^j h(2\xi_{L_n+i} - 1) \right), \quad 1 \leq j \leq k \quad (15)$$

implying that U_{n+1} and $(X_{T_n}, S_{T_n}, X_{L_n}, L_n - T_n)$ are conditionally independent given $\{S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k\}$ whenever $k \geq 1$.

Furthermore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B, L_{n+1} \leq L_n + k \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) = \\ &= \sum_{l=2}^k \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B, L_{n+1} = L_n + l \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) \\ &= \sum_{l=2}^k \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B, T_{n+1} = L_n + j, L_{n+1} = L_n + l \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Let us introduce the auxiliary random walk $W_n = \bar{s} + h \sum_{i=1}^n (2\xi_i - 1)$, and we introduce the associated quantities $L_0^W := 0$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$T_{n+1}^W := \min\{k > L_n^W : W_k < \underline{\theta}\}, \quad L_{n+1}^W := \min\{k > T_{n+1}^W : W_k > \bar{\theta}\}.$$

Similarly, we define $U_n^W = (h(2\xi_{T_n^W} - 1), W_{T_n^W}, h(2\xi_{L_n^W} - 1), W_{L_n^W}, L_n^W - T_n^W)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Obviously, for fixed $1 \leq j < l \leq k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B, T_{n+1} = L_n + j, L_{n+1} = L_n + l \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) &= \\ &= \mathbb{P}(U_1^W \in B, T_1^W = j, L_1^W = l). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We estimate this probability from below by taking into account only trajectories that consist of just one decreasing and one increasing segment (see Figure 1 for an illustration).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U_1^W \in B, T_1^W = j, L_1^W = l) &\geq \frac{1}{2^l} \mathbb{P}\left(U_1^W \in B, T_1^W = j, L_1^W = l \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^j \{\xi_i < 1/2\}, \bigcap_{i=j+1}^l \{\xi_i \geq 1/2\}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^l} \mathbb{P}\left(U_1^W \in B, W_j < \underline{\theta} \leq W_{j-1}, W_{l-1} \leq \bar{\theta} < W_l \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^j \{\xi_i < 1/2\}, \bigcap_{i=j+1}^l \{\xi_i \geq 1/2\}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$




Figure 1: Trajectories of $(W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with one local minimum at $n = 5$ ($\bar{s} = 1, h = 1$).

Note that the conditional distribution of (W_1, \dots, W_l) given $\bigcap_{i=1}^j \{\xi_i < 1/2\}$ and $\bigcap_{i=j+1}^l \{\xi_i \geq 1/2\}$ coincides with the distribution of (W'_1, \dots, W'_l) , where

$$W'_m := \bar{s} - h \sum_{i=1}^{\min(j,m)} \xi_i + h \sum_{i=j+1}^m \xi_i, \quad 1 \leq m \leq l$$

with the convention that empty sums are defined to be zero.

Using this, and that $B \subset \mathcal{U} = (-\infty, 0) \times (-\infty, \underline{\theta}) \times (0, M] \times (\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} + M) \times (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(U_1^W \in B, W_j < \underline{\theta} \leq W_{j-1}, W_{l-1} \leq \bar{\theta} < W_l \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^j \{\xi_i < 1/2\}, \bigcap_{i=j+1}^l \{\xi_i \geq 1/2\} \right. \right) = \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left((-h\xi_j, W'_j, h\xi_l, W'_l, l-j) \in B, \underline{\theta} \leq W'_{j-1}, W'_{l-1} \leq \bar{\theta} \right) \\ & = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{(-hw, \bar{s}-hu-hw, hz, \bar{s}-hu-hw+hv+hz, l-j) \in B} \times \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{1}_{\underline{\theta} \leq \bar{s}-hu} \times \mathbb{1}_{\bar{s}-hu-hw+hv \leq \bar{\theta}} \times f_{j-1}(u) \times f_{l-1-j}(v) \, dudvdwdz \end{aligned}$$

where for $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $f_m : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ stands for the probability density function of the sum of m independent random variables each having a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Now, we can evaluate the quadruple integral using the substitution $x_1 = -hw$, $x_2 = \bar{s} - hu - hw$, $x_3 = hz$, $x_4 = \bar{s} - hu - hw + hv + hz$, and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{(-hw, \bar{s}-hu-hw, hz, \bar{s}-hu-hw+hv+hz, l-j) \in B} \times \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{1}_{\underline{\theta} \leq \bar{s}-hu} \times \mathbb{1}_{\bar{s}-hu-hw+hv \leq \bar{\theta}} \times f_{j-1}(u) f_{l-1-j}(v) \, dudvdwdz = \\ & = \frac{1}{h^4} \int_{\bar{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}+M} \int_0^h \int_{-\infty}^{\underline{\theta}} \int_{-h}^0 \mathbb{1}_{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, l-j) \in B} \times \mathbb{1}_{\underline{\theta} \leq x_2 - x_1} \times \mathbb{1}_{x_4 - x_3 \leq \bar{\theta}} \times \\ & \quad \times f_{j-1} \left(\frac{\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1)}{h} \right) \times f_{l-1-j} \left(\frac{x_4 - x_3 - x_2}{h} \right) \, dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 dx_4 \\ & = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{(x, l-j) \in B} \times g_{\bar{s}, j, l-j}(\mathbf{x}) \, \lambda(d\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{x} is a shorthand notation for (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) , λ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^4 , and \mathcal{Y} is used for $(-\infty, 0) \times (-\infty, \underline{\theta}) \times (0, M] \times (\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} + M)$, moreover for $j, m > 1$

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\bar{s}, j, m}(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{h^4} \mathbb{1}_{\underline{\theta} \leq x_2 - x_1} \times \mathbb{1}_{x_4 - x_3 \leq \bar{\theta}} \times \mathbb{1}_{x_1 \in [-h, 0]} \times \mathbb{1}_{x_3 \in [0, h]} \\ & \quad \times f_{j-1} \left(\frac{\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1)}{h} \right) \times f_{m-1} \left(\frac{x_4 - x_3 - x_2}{h} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Substituting this back into (16) and reindexing by $m = l - j$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U_{n+1} \in B, L_{n+1} \leq L_n + k \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) & \geq \sum_{l=2}^k \sum_{j=2}^{l-2} \frac{1}{2^l} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{(x, l-j) \in B} \times g_{\bar{s}, j, l-j}(\mathbf{x}) \, \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \\ & = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{m=2}^{k-2} \sum_{j=2}^{k-m} \frac{1}{2^{j+m}} \mathbb{1}_{(x, m) \in B} \times g_{\bar{s}, j, m}(\mathbf{x}) \, \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned}$$

and thus by (14), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(y, B) &\geq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} \alpha^k (1-\alpha) \sum_{m=2}^{k-2} \sum_{j=2}^{k-m} \frac{1}{2^{j+m}} \mathbb{1}_{(x,m) \in B} \times g_{\bar{s},j,m}(\mathbf{x}) \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{(x,m) \in B} \times \mathbb{1}_{m \geq 2} \times \sum_{k=m+2}^{\infty} \sum_{j=2}^{k-m} \frac{\alpha^k (1-\alpha)}{2^{j+m}} g_{\bar{s},j,m}(\mathbf{x}) \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{(x,m) \in B} \times \mathbb{1}_{m \geq 2} \times \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \sum_{k=j+m}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^k (1-\alpha)}{2^{j+m}} g_{\bar{s},j,m}(\mathbf{x}) \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \\
&= \int_B \mathbb{1}_{m \geq 2} \times \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^{j+m}}{2^{j+m}} g_{\bar{s},j,m}(\mathbf{x}) \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \otimes \delta(dm),
\end{aligned}$$

where δ is the usual counting measure on \mathbb{N} .

Let us observe that on $\text{Supp}(g) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, $\underline{\theta} \leq x_2 - x_1 \leq \underline{\theta} + h$. Now, we fix $0 < \tilde{\gamma} < \min\left(\frac{\bar{\theta} - \underline{\theta}}{h}, 1\right)$ and consider only x_1 and x_2 satisfying $\underline{\theta} \leq x_2 - x_1 \leq \underline{\theta} + \tilde{\gamma}h$. Furthermore, since the jumps of $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are bounded from above by M , we have $\bar{\theta} < \bar{s} < \bar{\theta} + M$ hence for the argument of f_{j-1} in (19), we get

$$0 < \frac{\bar{\theta} - \underline{\theta}}{h} - \tilde{\gamma} \leq \frac{\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1)}{h} \leq \frac{\bar{\theta} - \underline{\theta}}{h} + \frac{M}{h}. \quad (20)$$

provided that $\underline{\theta} \leq x_2 - x_1 \leq \underline{\theta} + \tilde{\gamma}h$.

Introducing $\omega_j = \min\{f_{j-1}(t) \mid \frac{\bar{\theta} - \underline{\theta}}{h} - \tilde{\gamma} \leq t \leq \frac{\bar{\theta} - \underline{\theta}}{h} + M/h\}$, we arrive at the estimate

$$f_{j-1}\left(\frac{\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1)}{h}\right) \geq \omega_j \times \mathbb{1}_{\underline{\theta} \leq x_2 - x_1 \leq \underline{\theta} + \tilde{\gamma}h}$$

which is uniform in \bar{s} , and $\omega_j > 0$ whenever $j > \frac{\bar{\theta} - \underline{\theta}}{h} + M/h + 1$.

If we put all together, for $C_h = \{(x, m) \in \mathcal{U} \mid x_1 \in [-h, 0]; \underline{\theta} \leq x_2 - x_1 \leq \underline{\theta} + \tilde{\gamma}h; x_3 \in [0, h]; x_4 - x_3 \leq \bar{\theta}; m \geq 2\}$, we obtain

$$Q(B, y) \geq \int_{B \cap C_h} \frac{\alpha^m}{h^4 2^m} f_{m-1}\left(\frac{x_4 - x_3 - x_2}{h}\right) \times \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^j \omega_j}{2^j} \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \otimes \delta(dm),$$

where the right hand-side depends only on $\alpha, M, h, \underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}$, but not depends on \bar{s} hence (13) holds with

$$\tilde{\kappa}(B) = \int_{B \cap C_h} \frac{\alpha^m}{h^4 2^m} f_{m-1}\left(\frac{x_4 - x_3 - x_2}{h}\right) \times \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^j \omega_j}{2^j} \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \otimes \delta(dm) \quad (21)$$

which is obviously a non-zero Borel measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U})$.

To sum up, we showed that the chain $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies the uniform minorization condition (13), and thus by Theorem 16.2.2 in [10], there exist a probability measure, independent of (S_0, X_0) , such that $\text{Law}(U_n) \rightarrow \nu$ in total variation. Moreover, by Theorem 17.0.1 in [10], for bounded measurable functionals of U_n the law of large numbers holds as it is stated in Theorem 2.5. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. The idea of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.5, but the details are somewhat simpler. We only sketch the main steps.

We consider the process $Z_n = (X_{L_n}, S_{L_n})$, $n > 1$ which is obviously a time-homogeneous Markov chain on the state space $\Delta := \{(x, s) \in (0, M]^2 \mid x \geq s\}$. In what follows, we prove that chain $(Z_n)_{n>1}$ satisfies a minorization condition similar to (13) in the proof of Theorem 2.5. More precisely, we aim to show that there exist a non-zero Borel measure $\beta : \mathcal{B}(\Delta) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for all $z \in \Delta$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta)$,

$$Q(z, A) \geq \beta(A), \quad (22)$$

where $Q : \Delta \times \mathcal{B}(\Delta) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the transition kernel of the chain $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(\eta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as in the the proof of Theorem 2.5. For $z = (\bar{x}, \bar{s}) \in \Delta$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Delta)$ arbitrary and fixed, by the tower rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(z, A) &= \mathbb{P}(Z_{n+1} \in A \mid Z_n = z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_{n+1} \in A \mid Z_n = z, \tau_n = k) \alpha^k (1 - \alpha) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{l=2}^k \mathbb{P}(Z_{n+1} \in A, L_{n+1} = L_n + l \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) \alpha^k (1 - \alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we applied the same principles as in the derivation of (14).

Again by introducing the auxiliary random walk $W_n = \bar{s} + h \sum_{j=1}^n (2\xi_j - 1)$, and the associated quantities $L_n^W, Z_n^W = (h(2\xi_{L_n^W} - 1), W_{L_n^W})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $L_0^W := 0$ and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $L_{n+1}^W := \inf\{k > L_n^W \mid W_{k-1} \leq 0 < W_k\}$, for fixed $2 \leq l \leq k$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Z_{n+1} \in A, L_{n+1} = L_n + l \mid S_{L_n} = \bar{s}, \tau_n = k) &= \mathbb{P}(Z_1^W \in A, L_1^W = l) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^l} \mathbb{P}\left((h(2\xi_l - 1), W_l) \in A, W_{l-1} \leq 0 < W_l \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^{l-1} \{\xi_i < 1/2\}, \{\xi_l \geq 1/2\} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where similarly to (18), we have taken into account trajectories decreasing in $l-1 > 0$ steps and increasing only in the l -th step. For the conditional probability, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left((h(2\xi_l - 1), W_l) \in A, W_{l-1} \leq 0 < W_l \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^{l-1} \{\xi_i < 1/2\}, \{\xi_l \geq 1/2\} \right) = \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{(hv, \bar{s} - hu + hv) \in A} \times \mathbb{1}_{\bar{s} - hu \leq 0} \times f_{l-1}(u) du dv \\ &= \frac{1}{h^2} \int_0^h \int_0^{x_1} \mathbb{1}_{(x_1, x_2) \in A} \times f_{l-1}\left(\frac{\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1)}{h}\right) dx_2 dx_1 \\ &= \int_{(0, h]^2 \cap A} f_{l-1}\left(\frac{\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1)}{h}\right) \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \end{aligned}$$

where $f_m : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is the probability density function of the sum of $m \geq 1$ independent random variables each having a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)$, and λ denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^2 .

Notice that if $(x_1, x_2) \in (0, h] \cap \Delta$ then $0 \leq x_1 - x_2 \leq \min(M, h)$, moreover $0 < \bar{s} \leq M$ hence we have $0 \leq (\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1))/h \leq M/h + \min(M/h, 1)$, and thus we obtain

$$f_{l-1}\left(\frac{\bar{s} - (x_2 - x_1)}{h}\right) \geq \omega'_l \times \mathbb{1}_{\bar{s}' / \min(M, h) \leq x_1 - x_2}, \quad (25)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}'$ can be any fixed number in $(0, 1)$, and $\omega'_l = \inf\{f_{l-1}(t) \mid \tilde{\gamma}' \min(M/h, 1) \leq t \leq M/h + \min(M/h, 1)\}$ that is a positive number not depending on \bar{s} whenever $l > M/h + 1$.

If we put all together, we obtain the following lower estimate

$$\begin{aligned} Q(z, A) &\geq \int_{(0, h]^2 \cap A} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{l=2}^k \frac{\alpha^k (1-\alpha)}{2^l} \omega'_l \times \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\gamma}' \min(M, h) \leq x_1 - x_2} \lambda(d\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \int_{(0, h]^2 \cap A} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\gamma}' \min(M, h) \leq x_1 - x_2} \times \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^l \omega'_l}{2^l} \lambda(d\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where the right hand-side depends only on α, M, h and the choice of $\tilde{\gamma}' \in (0, 1)$, but not depends on z , moreover

$$\mathcal{B}(\Delta) \ni A \mapsto \beta(A) := \int_{(0, h]^2 \cap A} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\gamma}' \min(M, h) \leq x_1 - x_2} \times \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^l \omega'_l}{2^l} \lambda(d\mathbf{x})$$

defines a non-zeros Borel measure on $\mathcal{B}(\Delta)$, and thus (22) holds with this β .

To sum up, we proved that the chain $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the uniform minorization condition, and thus it admits a unique invariant probability measure π such that $\text{Law}(Z_n) \rightarrow \pi$ at a geometric rate in total variation as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (See for example Lemma 18.2.7 and Theorem 18.2.4 in [8]) which completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

6 Stochastic volatility models

Let $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}, (\delta_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be i.i.d. sequences of real-valued random variables, independent from each other. We assume that ε_0 is bounded with zero mean and has a density (w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure) which is bounded away from 0 on $[-u, u]$ for some $u > 0$. Actually, the δ_i may take values in arbitrary Polish spaces, we chose \mathbb{R} only for simplicity.

Furthermore, we assume that $\sigma_t = f((\varepsilon_{t-j-1})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, (\delta_{t-j-1})_{j \in \mathbb{N}})$ for a bounded measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, this is a (strongly) stationary process. We assume henceforth that $f \geq c$ for some constant $c > 0$. Let $X_t := \sigma_t \varepsilon_t$, $t \geq 1$.

Fix $\underline{\theta} < 0 < \bar{\theta}$ as before and let $S_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary constant. Consider the martingale $S_t := S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^t X_j$, $t \geq 1$ (with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\delta_j, \varepsilon_j : j \leq t)$). We may define L_n, T_n as in (3) before.

Lemma 6.1. *The random variables T_n, L_n are well-defined and almost surely finite.*

Proof. We proceed similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.4. In the induction step, we work on the events $B_k := \{L_n = k\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ separately. Fixing k , the process $M_j := \mathbb{1}_{B_k} X_{k+j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ is a square-integrable martingale with conditional quadratic variation

$$Q_j := \mathbb{E}[(M_j - M_{j-1})^2 \mid \sigma(M_i, i < j)] = \mathbb{1}_{B_k} \sigma_j^2 \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_j^2] \geq \mathbb{1}_{B_k} c^2 \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_j^2],$$

hence $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Q_j = \infty$ almost surely on B_k . Proposition VII-3-9. of [13] implies that $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} M_j = -\infty$ on B_k . It follows that, on B_k , almost surely

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} (S_0 + X_1 + \dots + X_{L_n} + \dots + X_{L_n+j}) = -\infty$$

which implies, in particular, $T_{n+1} < \infty$ on B_k . The argument for L_{n+1} is analogous. \square

We may again consider

$$A_t = \mu t + S_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}$$

with some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 6.2. This specification is a discrete-time analogue of continuous-time stochastic volatility models. The latter are of the form

$$dA_t = \mu dt + \nu_0(\Sigma_t) dW_t$$

where, for instance,

$$d\Sigma_t = \nu_1(\Sigma_t) dt + \nu_2(\Sigma_t) dW_t + \nu_3(\Sigma_t) d\bar{W}_t$$

with suitable functions $\nu_0, \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3$, where W and \bar{W} are independent Brownian motions. Non-Markovian specifications for Σ_t are also imaginable, driven by e.g. fractional Brownian motion, see [7, 9].

In our discrete-time setting, ε_t corresponds to the increments of W_t , η_t to those of \bar{W}_t and σ_t to Σ_t .

Although X_t is generically non-Markovian, it is possible to get results analogous to Theorem 2.5 above. Thus we are able to incorporate a wide class of important financial models in our setting. The boundedness of ε_i and σ_i do not restrict generality in an essential way: in numerical simulations one truncates the involved random variables anyway.

Theorem 6.3. *There exist a probability distribution ν on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{U})$ such that $\text{Law}(U_n) \rightarrow \nu$ at a geometric speed in total variation as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. We only sketch the necessary steps, which closely follow those of Section 5. By our conditions on f and ε_0 , the “non-Markovian” minorization condition

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t+1} \in A \mid (\varepsilon_{t-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{x}, (\delta_{t-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{y}) \geq \alpha \ell(A) \quad (26)$$

holds with suitable $\alpha > 0$, for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Under this condition it is possible to verify, following the proofs of Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 2.5 that also

$$\mathbb{P}(U_{t+1} \in A \mid (\varepsilon_{L_t-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{x}, (\delta_{L_t-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = \mathbf{y}) \geq \bar{\alpha} \bar{\kappa}(A)$$

for some $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ and for a suitable non-zero measure $\bar{\kappa}$. The process

$$R_t := (U_t, (\varepsilon_{L_t-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, (\delta_{L_t-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}})$$

is a Markov chain on the space $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, and thus one can find i.i.d. random mappings T_t such that $R'_0 := R_0 := (X_0, S_0, X_0, S_0, 1, (\varepsilon_{-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, (\delta_{-j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}})$,

$$R'_t := T_t R'_{t-1}, \quad t \geq 1$$

have the same laws as R_t , $t \geq 0$ and the mapping T_t is constant on \mathcal{U} with probability at least $\bar{\alpha}$. (Such constructions are standard in a Markovian context, see e.g.

[5] or Lemma 5.1 above and they can be done along the same lines in the present context as well.)

One can then check that for any probabilities μ_1, μ_2 on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$

$$\|\Pr_{\mathcal{U}} T_t \mu_1 - \Pr_{\mathcal{U}} T_t \mu_2\|_{TV} \leq (1 - \bar{\alpha}) \|\Pr_{\mathcal{U}} \mu_1 - \Pr_{\mathcal{U}} \mu_2\|_{TV}$$

where $T_t \mu_1$ refers to the corresponding push-forward probability, $\Pr_{\mathcal{U}}$ refers to taking the \mathcal{U} -marginal and $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ is the total variation norm on \mathcal{U} . The Banach fixed-point theorem now implies the result. See [4] for similar arguments. \square

It would be desirable to remove the (one-sided) boundedness assumption on the state space of X_t and relax the minorization condition (2) to some kind of local minorization. Replacing the constant drift μ by a functional of X_t would also significantly extend the family of models in consideration. In the non-Markovian case, one may also establish some kind of mixing condition for the process X_t that implies the law of large numbers. These extensions are left for future investigations.

References

- [1] Mean reversion trading: Is it a profitable strategy? <https://www.warriortrading.com/mean-reversion/>, Retrieved on 24th November 2021.
- [2] Mean reversion trading strategy with a sneaky secret. <https://tradingstrategyguides.com/mean-reversion-trading-strategy/>, Retrieved on 24th November 2021.
- [3] What is mean reversion trading strategy. <https://tradergav.com/what-is-mean-reversion-trading-strategy/>, Retrieved on 24th November 2021.
- [4] R. Bhattacharya and M. Majumdar. On a theorem of Dubins and Freedman. *J. Theor. Prob.*, 12:1067–1087, 1999.
- [5] R. Bhattacharya and E. Waymire. *Stochastic Processes with Applications*. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990.
- [6] R. N. Bhattacharya and E. C. Waymire. *Stochastic Processes with Applications*. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990.
- [7] F. Comte and É. Renault. Long memory in continuous-time stochastic volatility models. *Math. Finance*, 8:291–323, 1998.
- [8] Randal Douc, Eric Moulines, Pierre Priouret, and Philippe Soulier. *Markov chains*. Operation research and financial engineering. Springer, 2018.
- [9] J. Gatheral, T. Jaisson, and M. Rosenbaum. Volatility is rough. *Quantitative Finance*, 18:933–949, 2018.
- [10] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [11] A. Mijatović and V. Vysotsky. Stability of overshoots of zero mean random walks. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 25(none):1–22, 2020.

- [12] A. Mijatović and V. Vysotsky. Stationary entrance Markov chains, inducing, and level-crossings of random walks. *Preprint, arXiv:1808.05010*, 2020.
- [13] J. Neveu. *Discrete-parameter martingales*. North-Holland, 1975.
- [14] M. Rásonyi and K. Tikosi. Convergence of the Kiefer-Wolfowitz algorithm in the presence of discontinuities. *Preprint, arXiv:2002.04832*.