A game-theoretic proof of Erdős-Feller-Kolmogorov-Petrowsky law of the iterated logarithm for fair-coin tossing

Takeyuki Sasai[*], Kenshi Miyabe[†] and Akimichi Takemura[*]

November, 2014

Abstract

We give a game-theoretic proof of the celebrated Erdős-Feller-Kolmogorov-Petrowsky law of the iterated logarithm for fair-coin tossing. Our proof, based on Bayesian strategy, is explicit as many other game-theoretic proofs of the laws in probability theory.

Keywords and phrases: Bayesian strategy, constant-proportion betting strategy, lower class, upper class.

1 Introduction

Let $x_n = \pm 1$, $n = 1, 2, \dots,$ be independent symmetric Bernoulli random variables with $P(x_n = -1) = P(x_n = 1) = 1/2$. Let $S_n = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n$. Concerning the behavior of S_n, the celebrated Erdős-Feller-Kolmogorov-Petrowsky law of the iterated logarithm (EFKP-LIL [17, Chapter 5.2]) states the following:

$$P(S_n \ge \sqrt{n}\psi(n) \ \ i.o.) = 0 \text{ or } 1 \quad \text{according as} \quad \int_1^\infty \psi(\lambda) e^{-\psi(\lambda)^2/2} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} < \infty \ \text{ or } = \infty, \tag{1}$$

where ψ is a positive non-decreasing continuous function defined on $[1, \infty)$. The set of functions ψ such that $P(S_n \ge \sqrt{n}\psi(n) \ \ i.o.) = 0$ is called the *upper class* and the set of functions ψ such that $P(S_n \ge \sqrt{n}\psi(n) \ \ i.o.) = 1$ is called the *lower class* [17, pp.33-34].

As the name indicates, this is an extension of the LIL. The first one who showed this result seems to be Kolmogorov, which has been stated in Lévy's book [13] without a proof. Erdős [4] has given a complete proof, which has been generalized by Feller [5, 6] (see also Bai [1]). Petrowsky [16] has proved the statement for Brownian motion (see also Itô and McKean [8, Section 1.8 and 4.12] and Knight [10, Section 5.4]). Further developments can be seen in the

---

[*] Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, University of Tokyo

[†] School of Science and Technology, Meiji University

literature such as similar statements for self-normalized sums [7, 3], for weighted sums [2] and for Brownian motion [9].

In order to state a game-theoretic version of EFKP-LIL, consider the following fair-coin game with the initial capital $\alpha > 0$.

FAIR-COIN GAME
Players: Skeptic, Reality
Protocol:
  $\mathcal{K}_0 := \alpha$.
  FOR $n = 1, 2, \ldots$:
    Skeptic announces $M_n \in \mathbb{R}$.
    Reality announces $x_n \in \{-1, 1\}$
    $\mathcal{K}_n := \mathcal{K}_{n-1} + M_n x_n$.
Collateral Duties: Skeptic must keep $\mathcal{K}_n$ non-negative. Reality must keep $\mathcal{K}_n$ from tending to infinity.

Usually α is taken to be 1, but in Section 3 we use $\alpha \neq 1$ for notational simplicity. Let

$$I(\psi) = \int_1^\infty \psi(\lambda) e^{-\psi(\lambda)^2/2} \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}. \tag{2}$$

The goal of this paper is to prove the game-theoretic statement of EFKP-LIL in the following form.

Theorem 1.1. *Let ψ be a positive non-decreasing continuous function defined on* $[1, \infty)$. *In the fair-coin game,*

$$I(\psi) < \infty \Rightarrow \textit{Skeptic can force } S_n < \sqrt{n}\psi(n) \textit{ a.a.} \tag{3}$$

$$I(\psi) = \infty \Rightarrow \textit{Skeptic can force } S_n \geq \sqrt{n}\psi(n) \textit{ i.o.} \tag{4}$$

The first statement is the *validity* and the second statement is the *sharpness* of EFKP-LIL. For terminology and notions of game-theoretic probability see [18]. As shown in Chapter 8 of [18], game-theoretic statement of EFKP-LIL in (3) and (4) implies the measure-theoretic statement in (1). We use the same line of arguments of the proof of LIL in Chapter 5 of Shafer and Vovk [18], but we use some Bayesian strategies as ingredients. Our proof shows that the proof by Shafer and Vovk can be adapted to prove some stronger forms of LIL.

In Section 2 we give a proof of the validity and in Section 3 we give a proof of the sharpness. We discuss some topics for further research in Section 4.

We use the following notation throughout the paper

$$\ln_k n = \underbrace{\ln \ln \ldots \ln}_{k \text{times}} n.$$

2 Validity

As is often seen in the upper-lower class theory (see Feller [6, Lemma 1]), we can restrict our attention to ψ such that

$$\psi^L(n) \quad \psi(n) \quad \psi^U(n) \text{ for all sufficiently large } n, \tag{5}$$

where

$$\psi^L(n) = \sqrt{2\ln_2 n + 3\ln_3 n}, \quad \psi^U(n) = \sqrt{2\ln_2 n + 4\ln_3 n}.$$

Here L means the lower class and U means the upper class. It can be verified that $I(\psi^U) < \mathtt{1}$ and $I(\psi^L) = \mathtt{1}$. We discretize the integral in (2) as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{1} \frac{\psi(k)}{k} e^{\ \psi(k)^2/2} < \mathtt{1} \ . \tag{6}$$

Since $xe^{\ x^2/2}$ is decreasing for $x \quad 1$, the function $\lambda \ 7 \ \frac{\psi(\lambda)}{\lambda} e^{\ \psi(\lambda)^2/2}$ is decreasing for λ such that $\psi(\lambda) \quad 1$ and convergences of the integral in (2) and the sum in (6) are equivalent.

2.1 Constant-proportion betting strategy

Our proof highly depends on constant-proportion betting strategy (and its mixture). Here we give basic properties.

We fix a small positive δ for the rest of this paper, e.g., $\delta = 0.01$.

A constant-proportion betting strategy with the parameter γ sets

$$M_n = \gamma \mathtt{K}_{n \ 1}$$

for a constant $\gamma \ \mathtt{2} \ (\ 1, 1)$. For the rest of this paper we assume $0 \quad \gamma \quad \delta$. The capital process with this strategy is denoted by $\mathtt{K}_n^\gamma$. Note that $\mathtt{K}_n^\gamma$ is always positive. With the initial capital of $\mathtt{K}_0^\gamma = \alpha$, the value $\mathtt{K}_n^\gamma$ can be evaluated as

$$\mathtt{K}_n^\gamma = \alpha \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 + \gamma x_i) = \alpha \left(\frac{1+\gamma}{1 \quad \gamma} \right)^{S_n/2} (1 \quad \gamma^2)^{n/2}. \tag{7}$$

Note that $\mathtt{K}_n^\gamma$ is determined (except n and γ) by S_n and is monotone increasing in S_n. In particular, by (7), we have

$$S_n \quad 0 \quad) \quad \mathtt{K}_n^\gamma \quad \alpha. \tag{8}$$

By the fact that

$$t \quad \frac{1}{2}t^2 \quad \mathtt{j}t\mathtt{j}^3 \quad \ln(1+t) \quad t \quad \frac{1}{2}t^2 + \mathtt{j}t\mathtt{j}^3$$

for $\mathtt{j}t\mathtt{j} \quad \delta$, taking the logarithm of $\prod_{i=1}^n (1 + \gamma x_i)$ we have

$$\gamma S_n \quad \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2 n \quad \gamma^3 n \quad \ln(\mathtt{K}_n^\gamma/\alpha) \quad \gamma S_n \quad \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2 n + \gamma^3 n$$

and

$$e^{\ \gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n \ \gamma^2 n/2} \quad \mathtt{K}_n^\gamma/\alpha \quad e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n \ \gamma^2 n/2}. \tag{9}$$

For the proof of validity, we only use the lower bound in (9).

2.2 Proof of validity

In this section we let $\alpha = 1$. For notational simplicity we write $\psi_k = \psi(k)$. The convergence of the infinite series in (6) implies the existence of a non-decreasing sequence of positive reals a_k diverging to infinity (a_k " 1), such that the series multiplied term by term by a_k is still convergent:

$$Z := \sum_{k=1}^{1} a_k \frac{\psi_k}{k} e^{\ \psi_k^2/2} < 1 \ . \tag{10}$$

This is easily seen by dividing the infinite series into blocks of sums less than or equal to $1/2^k$ and multiplying the k-th block by k (see also [14, Lemma 4.15]).

For $k \quad 1$ let

$$p_k = \frac{1}{Z} a_k \frac{\psi_k}{k} e^{\ \psi_k^2/2}$$

and consider the capital process of a countable mixture of constant-proportion strategies

$$\mathrm{K}_n = \sum_{k=1}^{1} p_k \mathrm{K}_n^{\gamma_k}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \gamma_k = \frac{\psi_k}{\mathrm{p}\overline{k}}. \tag{11}$$

Obviously K_n is never negative. By the upper bound in (5), as $k \ ! \ \ 1$ we have

$$\gamma_k \qquad \sqrt{\frac{2\ln_2 k + 4\ln_3 k}{k}} \ \ ! \quad 0.$$

Hence $\gamma_k < \delta$ for sufficiently large k.

We now confirm that $\limsup_n \mathrm{K}_n = 1$ if $S_n \qquad \mathrm{p}\overline{n}\psi_n$ infinitely often. By (9) and (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z\mathrm{K}_n \quad & Z \sum_{k:\gamma_k<\delta} p_k \exp(\gamma_k S_n \quad \frac{\gamma_k^2 n}{2} \quad \gamma_k^3 n) \\ &= \sum_{k:\gamma_k<\delta} a_k \frac{\psi_k}{k} \exp(\ \frac{\psi_k^2}{2} + \gamma_k S_n \quad \frac{\gamma_k^2 n}{2} \quad \gamma_k^3 n). \end{aligned}$$

We consider n and k such that $S_n \qquad \mathrm{p}\overline{n}\psi_n$, $\gamma_k < \delta$, b$n \quad n/\psi_n$c $\quad k \quad n$ and $\psi_n/(\psi_n \quad 1) \quad 1+\delta/2$. By (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\psi_k^2}{2} + \gamma_k S_n \quad \frac{\gamma_k^2 n}{2} \qquad & \frac{\psi_k^2}{2} + \mathrm{p}\overline{n}\psi_n \frac{\psi_k}{\mathrm{p}\overline{k}} \quad \frac{\psi_k^2}{k}\frac{n}{2} \\ &= \psi_k \left(\ \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{n}{k}\right)\psi_k + \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\psi_n \right) \\ & \ \ \frac{\psi_n^2}{2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}} \quad 1\right)^2 \qquad \frac{\psi_n^2}{2}\left(\frac{n}{k} \quad 1\right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\psi_n}{\psi_n \quad 1}\right)^2 \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \delta.$$

For sufficiently large n, we have

$$\psi_n \quad \psi^U(n) < \psi^U(2k) = \sqrt{2\ln_2(2k) + 4\ln_3(2k)} < 2\sqrt{2\ln_2 k + 3\ln_3 k} = 2\psi^L(k) \quad 2\psi_k.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} Z\mathrm{K}_n &\quad \sum_{k=\lfloor n \quad n/\psi_n\rfloor}^{n} a_k\frac{\psi_k}{k}\exp(\quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \delta \quad \gamma_k^3 n)\\ &\quad a_{\lfloor n \quad n/\psi_n\rfloor}\frac{\psi_n}{2n}\sum_{k=\lfloor n \quad n/\psi_n\rfloor}^{n}\exp(\quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \delta \quad \gamma_n^3 n)\\ &\quad a_{\lfloor n \quad n/\psi_n\rfloor}\frac{\psi_n}{2n}\left(\frac{n}{\psi_n} \quad 1\right)\exp(\quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \delta \quad \gamma_n^3 n)\\ &= a_{\lfloor n \quad n/\psi_n\rfloor}\left(\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{\psi_n}{2n}\right)\exp(\quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \delta \quad \gamma_n^3 n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $a_{\lfloor n \quad n/\psi_n\rfloor} \to \infty$, $\psi_n/n \to 0$ and $\gamma_n^3 n \to 0$, we have shown

$$S_n \quad \sqrt{n}\psi_n \ i.o. \Rightarrow \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{K}_n = \infty.$$

3 Sharpness

In this section we prove the sharpness (4) of EFKP-LIL in game-theoretic probability, following the approach in Chapter 5 of [18] and [15]. We divide our proof into several subsections. For notational simplicity we use the initial capital of $\alpha = 1 \quad 2/e = (e \quad 2)/e$ in this section.

3.1 Change of time scale

The first key of our proof is a change of time scale from λ to k:

$$\lambda = e^{5k\ln k} = k^{5k}.$$

Remark 3.1. “5” in $5k\ln k$ is not essential and we use this time scale for simplicity.

By taking the derivative of $\ln\lambda = 5k\ln k$, we have

$$\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} = 5(\ln k + 1)dk.$$

Hence the integrability condition is written as

$$\int_1^\infty \psi(\lambda)e^{\quad \psi(\lambda)^2/2}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} = \infty \quad , \quad \int_1^\infty (\ln k)\psi(e^{5k\ln k})e^{\quad \psi(e^{5k\ln k})^2/2}dk = \infty.$$

Let $f(x) = \psi(e^{5x\ln x})e^{\ \psi(e^{5x\ln x})^2/2}$. Since $xe^{\ x^2/2}$ is decreasing for $x \quad 1$, the function $f(x)$ is decreasing for x such that $\psi(e^{5x\ln x}) \quad 1$. Thus, for sufficiently large k and x such that $k \quad x \quad k+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\ln x f(x) \quad \ln k f(x+1) \quad \frac{1}{2}\ln(k+1)f(k+1),\\ &\ln x f(x) \quad \ln(k+1)f(x) \quad 2\ln k f(k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\int_1^{1} (\ln k)\psi(e^{5k\ln k})e^{\ \psi(e^{5k\ln k})^2/2}dk = \mathtt{1} \quad , \quad \sum_{k=1}^{1}(\ln k)\psi(e^{5k\ln k})e^{\ \psi(e^{5k\ln k})^2/2} = \mathtt{1}\ .$$

Then, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{1}(\ln k)\psi(e^{5k\ln k})e^{\ \psi(e^{5k\ln k})^2/2} = \mathtt{1} \quad) \quad \text{Skeptic can force } S_n > \mathtt{p}\overline{n}\psi(n)\ i.o.$$

Recall that we can assume (5) here again.

3.2 Bounding relevant capital processes

In this section we introduce mixtures of constant-proportion betting strategies and bound their capital processes. We discuss relevant capital processes in further subsections.

3.2.1 Uniform mixture of constant-proportion betting strategies

We consider a continuous uniform mixture of constant-proportion strategies with the betting proportion $u\gamma$, $2/e \quad u \quad 1$. This is a Bayesian strategy, a similar one to which has been considered in [11].

Define

$$\mathtt{L}_n^{\gamma} = \int_{2/e}^{1}\prod_{i=1}^{n}(1+u\gamma x_i)du, \qquad \mathtt{L}_0^{\gamma} = \alpha = 1 \quad e/2.$$

At round n this strategy bets $M_n = \int_{2/e}^{1} u\gamma\prod_{i=1}^{n\ 1}(1+u\gamma x_i)du$. Then by induction on n, the capital process is indeed written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathtt{L}_n^{\gamma} = \mathtt{L}_{n\ 1}^{\gamma} + M_n x_n &= \int_{2/e}^{1}\prod_{i=1}^{n\ 1}(1+u\gamma x_i)du + x_n\int_{2/e}^{1}u\gamma\prod_{i=1}^{n\ 1}(1+u\gamma x_i)du\\ &= \int_{2/e}^{1}\prod_{i=1}^{n}(1+u\gamma x_i)du. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (9) and noting $u^3\gamma^3 \quad \gamma^3$, we have

$$e^{\ \gamma^3 n}\int_{2/e}^{1}e^{u\gamma S_n\ \ u^2\gamma^2 n/2}du \quad \mathtt{L}_n^{\gamma} \quad e^{\gamma^3 n}\int_{2/e}^{1}e^{u\gamma S_n\ \ u^2\gamma^2 n/2}du.$$

We further bound the integral in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2.

$$\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma \le \begin{cases} \min\left\{1, e^{\gamma^3 n}\dfrac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}\right\} & \textit{if}\quad S_n \le 0, & (12)\\ e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{2\gamma(S_n/e-\gamma n/e^2)} & \textit{if}\quad 0 < S_n \le 2\gamma n/e, & (13)\\ e^{\gamma^3 n}\min\left\{e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\dfrac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}, e^{\gamma S_n/2}\right\} & \textit{if}\quad 2\gamma n/e < S_n < \gamma n, & (14)\\ e^{\gamma^3 n}\min\left\{e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\dfrac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}, e^{\gamma S_n-\gamma^2 n/2}\right\} & \textit{if}\quad S_n \ge \gamma n. & (15)\end{cases}$$

Proof. Completing the square we have

$$-\frac{1}{2}u^2\gamma^2 n + u\gamma S_n = -\frac{\gamma^2 n}{2}\left(u - \frac{S_n}{\gamma n}\right)^2 + \frac{S_n^2}{2n}. \tag{16}$$

Hence by the change of variables

$$v = \gamma\sqrt{n}\left(u - \frac{S_n}{\gamma n}\right), \qquad du = \frac{dv}{\gamma\sqrt{n}},$$

we obtain

$$\int_{2/e}^{1} e^{u\gamma S_n - u^2\gamma^2 n/2} du = e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\int_{2/e}^{1}\exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 n}{2}\left(u - \frac{S_n}{\gamma n}\right)^2\right)du$$
$$= e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\frac{1}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}\int_{2\gamma\sqrt{n}/e - S_n/\sqrt{n}}^{\gamma\sqrt{n} - S_n/\sqrt{n}} e^{-v^2/2}dv.$$

Then for all cases we can bound $\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma$ from above as

$$\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma \le e^{\gamma^3 n + S_n^2/(2n)}\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}. \tag{17}$$

Without change of variables, we can also bound the integral $\int_{2/e}^{1} g(u)du$, $g(u) = e^{u\gamma S_n - u^2\gamma^2 n/2}$, directly as

$$\int_{2/e}^{1} g(u)du \le \max_{2/e \le u \le 1} g(u).$$

Note that

$$g(2/e) = e^{2\gamma(S_n/e - \gamma n/e^2)}, \quad g(1) = e^{\gamma S_n - \gamma^2 n/2}. \tag{18}$$

We now consider the four cases.

Case 1 $S_n \le 0$. In this case

$$\int_{2/e}^{1} e^{u\gamma S_n - u^2\gamma^2 n/2}du \le \int_{2/e}^{1} e^{-u^2\gamma^2 n/2}du \le \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}.$$

Also by (8), $\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma \le 1 - 2/e \le 1$ if $S_n \le 0$. This gives (12).

Case 2 $0 < S_n \le 2\gamma n/e$. In this case $S_n/(\gamma n) \le 2/e$ and by the unimodality of $g(u)$ we have $\max_{2/e \le u \le 1} g(u) = g(2/e)$. Hence (13) follows from (18).

Case 3 $2\gamma n/e < S_n < \gamma n$. In this case $\max_{2/e \le u \le 1} g(u) = g(S_n/(\gamma n)) = e^{S_n^2/(2n)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma \ge e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{S_n^2/(2n)}$. Furthermore in this case $S_n^2 < \gamma n S_n$ implies $S_n^2/(2n) < \gamma S_n/2$ and we also have

$$\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma \ge e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n/2}. \tag{19}$$

By (17) and (19), we have (14).

Case 4 $S_n \ge \gamma n$. Then $S_n/(\gamma n) \ge 1$ and $\max_{2/e \le u \le 1} g(u) = g(1)$. Hence

$$\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma \ge e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n - \gamma^2 n/2}. \tag{20}$$

By (17) and (20), we have (15).

3.2.2 Buying a process and selling a process

Next we consider the following capital process.

$$\mathcal{Q}_n^\gamma = 2\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma - \mathcal{K}_n^{\gamma e}.$$

This capital process consists of buying two units of $\mathcal{L}_n^\gamma$ and selling one unit of $\mathcal{K}_n^{\gamma e}$. This combination of selling and buying is essential in the game-theoretic proof of the law of the iterated logarithm in Chapter 5 of [18] and [15]. However, unlike Chapter 5 of [18] and [15], where combination of *three* processes is used, we only combine *two* capital processes.

We want to bound $\mathcal{Q}_n^\gamma$ from above.

Lemma 3.3. *Let*

$$C_1 = 2e^{\gamma^3 n} \exp\left(\frac{(2e-1)(\gamma^3(1+e^3)n + \ln 2)}{(e-1)^2} \right). \tag{21}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{Q}_n^\gamma \le \begin{cases} 2\min\left\{1, e^{\gamma^3 n}\dfrac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}\right\} & \text{if } S_n \le 0, \quad (22) \\ C_1 & \text{if } 0 < S_n \le \gamma n/e, \quad (23) \\ 2e^{\gamma^3 n}\min\left\{e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\dfrac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}, e^{\gamma S_n}\right\} & \text{if } \gamma n/e < S_n < e\gamma n, \quad (24) \\ C_1 & \text{if } S_n \ge e\gamma n. \quad (25) \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.4. In this lemma, C_1 depends on γ and n through $\gamma^3 n$. However from Section 3.3 on, we take $\gamma^3 n$ to be sufficiently small. Hence C_1 can be taken to be a constant (cf. (40)) not depending on γ and n. Also note that the interval for S_n in (24) is larger than the interval in (14).

Proof. We bound $\mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma = 2\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma \quad \mathtt{K}_n^{\gamma e}$ from above in the following four cases:

$$\text{(i) } S_n \quad 0, \quad \text{(ii) } 0 < S_n \quad \gamma n/e, \quad \text{(iii) } \gamma n/e < S_n < e\gamma n, \quad \text{(iv) } S_n \quad e\gamma n,$$

Case (i) By $\mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 2\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma$, (22) follows from (12).

Case (ii) In this case $S_n/e \quad \gamma n/e^2 \quad 0$. Hence (23) follows from (13) and $\mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 2\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma$.

Case (iii) We again use $\mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 2\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma$. If $\gamma n/e < S_n \quad 2\gamma n/e$, then

$$\frac{S_n}{e} \quad \frac{\gamma n}{e^2} \quad \frac{\gamma n}{e^2} \quad \frac{S_n}{e}$$

and $\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma \quad e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{2\gamma S_n/e} \quad e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n}$ from (13). Otherwise (24) follows from (14) and (15).

Case (iv) Since $S_n \quad en\gamma > n\gamma$, by (20) we have $\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma \quad e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n \quad \gamma^2 n/2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 2\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma \quad \mathtt{K}_n^{\gamma e} \quad & 2e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n \quad \gamma^2 n/2} \quad e^{\quad \gamma^3 e^3 n} e^{\gamma e S_n \quad \gamma^2 e^2 n/2} \\ &= 2e^{\gamma^3 n} e^{\gamma S_n \quad \gamma^2 n/2} \left(1 \quad \frac{1}{2} e^{\quad \gamma^3(1+e^3)n} e^{\gamma(e \quad 1)S_n \quad (e^2 \quad 1)\gamma^2 n/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence if the right-hand side is non-positive we have $\mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_n \quad en\gamma \text{ and } \quad & \gamma^3(1+e^3)n \quad \ln 2 + \gamma(e \quad 1)S_n \quad \frac{1}{2}(e^2 \quad 1)\gamma^2 n \quad 0 \\ &) \quad \mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 0. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Otherwise, write $A = \gamma^3(1+e^3)n + \ln 2$ and consider the case

$$\gamma(e \quad 1)S_n \quad \frac{1}{2}(e^2 \quad 1)\gamma^2 n \quad A.$$

Dividing this by $e \quad 1$ and also considering $S_n \quad en\gamma$, we have

$$\gamma S_n \quad \frac{1}{2}(e+1)\gamma^2 n \quad \frac{A}{e \quad 1}, \tag{27}$$

$$S_n + en\gamma \quad 0. \tag{28}$$

$\gamma \quad$ (28) + (27) gives

$$\frac{1}{2}(e \quad 1)\gamma^2 n \quad \frac{A}{e \quad 1} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2 n \quad \frac{A}{(e \quad 1)^2}.$$

Then by (27)

$$\gamma S_n \quad \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2 n \quad \frac{A}{e \quad 1} + \frac{e}{2}\gamma^2 n \quad \frac{A}{e \quad 1} + \frac{eA}{(e \quad 1)^2} = \frac{(2e \quad 1)A}{(e \quad 1)^2}.$$

Hence just using $\mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 2\mathtt{L}_n^\gamma$ and (20) in this case, we obtain

$$\mathtt{Q}_n^\gamma \quad 2e^{\gamma^3 n} \exp\left(\frac{(2e \quad 1)(\gamma^3(1+e^3)n + \ln 2)}{(e \quad 1)^2}\right) = C_1. \tag{29}$$

This also covers (26) and we have (29) for the whole case (iv).

3.2.3 Further continuous mixture of processes

We finally introduce another continuous mixture of capital processes. Define a capital process

$$\mathcal{M}_n^{\gamma,k} = \frac{1}{\ln k}\int_0^{\ln k} \mathcal{Q}_n^{\gamma e^{-w}}\, dw = \frac{1}{\ln k}\int_0^{\ln k} \left(2\mathcal{L}_n^{\gamma e^{-w}} - \mathcal{K}_n^{\gamma e^{-w+1}}\right) dw. \tag{30}$$

Under the same notation as in Lemma 3.3, if $S_n > 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{M}_n^{\gamma,k} \geq C_1 + \frac{2}{\ln k}\max_{\gamma' \in [\gamma k^{-1},\gamma]}\left(2e^{-\gamma'^3 n}\min\left\{e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma'\sqrt{n}}, e^{\gamma' S_n}\right\}\right), \tag{31}$$

because the length of the interval

$$\left\{w \,\middle|\, \frac{S_n}{ne} < \gamma e^{-w} < \frac{S_n e}{n}\right\}$$

is equal to 2.

If $S_n \leq 0$, since $\max_{0 \leq w \leq \ln k} e^{\gamma^3 e^{-3w} n}/e^{-w} \leq e^{\gamma^3 n} k$, integrating (22), we have

$$\mathcal{M}_n^{\gamma,k} \leq \frac{2}{\ln k}\int_0^{\ln k} \min\left\{1, e^{\gamma^3 e^{-3w} n}\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma e^{-w}\sqrt{n}}\right\} dw \leq 2\min\left\{1, \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}} e^{\gamma^3 n} k\right\}. \tag{32}$$

Also note that $\int_0^{\ln k} \mathcal{L}_n^{\gamma e^{-w}}\, dw$ is bounded by the double integral

$$\int_0^{\ln k} \mathcal{L}_n^{\gamma e^{-w}}\, dw \leq e^{\gamma^3 n}\int_0^{\ln k}\int_{2/e}^{1} e^{u e^{-w}\gamma S_n - u^2 e^{-2w}\gamma^2 n/2}\, du\, dw. \tag{33}$$

3.3 Dynamic strategy forcing the sharpness

Write

$$n_k = e^{5k\ln k} = k^{5k}, \quad \psi_k = \psi(n_k).$$

Note that ψ_k here is different from ψ_k in Section 2. As in Chapter 5 of [18] and [15], we divide the time axis into "cycles" $[n_k, n_{k+1}]$, $k \geq 1$. Betting strategy for the k-th cycle is based on the following betting proportion:

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\psi_{k+1}}{\sqrt{n_{k+1}}} k^2. \tag{34}$$

As a preliminary consideration we check the growth of n_k, ψ_k and γ_k.

Lemma 3.5.

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k^3 n_{k+1} = 0, \tag{35}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\psi^U(n_k)}{\psi_{k+1}} = 1, \tag{36}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{k^5 n_k}{n_{k+1}} = e^{-5}, \tag{37}$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \gamma_k \sqrt{n_k}\,\psi_{k+1} = 0. \tag{38}$$

Proof. By $\psi(n) \le \psi^U(n)$ for sufficiently large n, we have

$$\gamma_k^3 n_{k+1} = \frac{\psi_{k+1}^3}{\sqrt{n_{k+1}}} k^6 \le \frac{(2\ln_2 n_{k+1} + 4\ln_3 n_{k+1})^{3/2}}{(k+1)^{5(k+1)/2}} k^6 \to 0 \qquad (k \to \infty)$$

and (35) holds. All of $\psi^U(n_k)$, $\psi^U(n_{k+1})$, $\psi^L(n_k)$, $\psi^L(n_{k+1})$ are of the order

$$\sqrt{2\ln\ln e^{5k\ln k}}(1+o(1)) = \sqrt{2\ln k}(1+o(1)) \tag{39}$$

as $k \to \infty$ and (36) holds by (5). (37) holds because

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{k^{5(k+1)}}{(k+1)^{5(k+1)}} = \lim_{k\to\infty}\left(1 - \frac{1}{k+1}\right)^{5(k+1)} = e^{-5}.$$

Then $n_k/n_{k+1} = O(k^{-5})$ and (38) holds by

$$\gamma_k \sqrt{n_k}\psi_{k+1} = \psi_{k+1}^2 k^2 (n_k/n_{k+1})^{1/2} \to 0 \qquad (k \to \infty).$$

By (35), we choose k_0 such that $\gamma_k^3(1+e^3)n_{k+1} \le \delta$ for $k \ge k_0$. Then in our formulas in the previous section, in the k-th cycle, we have

$$e^{\gamma_k^3 n} \le e^{\gamma_k^3 n_{k+1}} \le e^{\delta}.$$

Furthermore C_1 in (21) can be taken as

$$C_1 = 2e^{\delta}\exp\left(\frac{(2e-1)(\delta(1+e^3)+\ln 2)}{(e-1)^2}\right). \tag{40}$$

We also take k_0 sufficiently large such that left-hand sides of (36), (37) and (38) are within δ of their respective limits.

For each cycle $[n_k, n_{k+1}]$, $k \ge k_0$, we apply the following capital process to x_n's in the cycle.

$$\mathcal{N}_n^{\gamma_k} = \alpha + \frac{1}{D}(\ln k)\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}(\alpha - \mathcal{M}_{n-n_k}^{\gamma_k,k}), \qquad \alpha = 1 - 2/e,\ D = \frac{32\sqrt{2\pi}}{\alpha}. \tag{41}$$

Here we gave a specific value of D for definiteness, but from the proof below it will be clear that any sufficiently large D can be used. Since the strategy for $\mathcal{M}_{n-n_k}^{\gamma_k,k}$ is applied only to x_n's in the cycle, $\alpha = \mathcal{N}_{n_k}^{\gamma_k} = \mathcal{M}_0^{\gamma_k}$. Concerning $\mathcal{N}_n^{\gamma_k}$ we prove the following proposition. In its proof we increase k_0 to satisfy all of (45)–(51), if needed.

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose that*

$$\sqrt{n}\psi^U(n) \ge S_n \ge \sqrt{n}\psi(n), \qquad \forall n \in [n_k, n_{k+1}]. \tag{42}$$

for all sufficiently large k. Then there exists k_0 such that for all $k \ge k_0$

$$\mathcal{N}_n^{\gamma_k} > \frac{\alpha}{2}, \ \forall n \in [n_k, n_{k+1}], \tag{43}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_{n_{k+1}}^{\gamma_k} \ge \alpha\left(1 + \frac{1-\delta}{D}(\ln k)\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}\right). \tag{44}$$

Proof. In our proof, for notational simplicity we write n instead of $n - n_k$.

For proving (43), we use (31) and (32) for $S_n - S_{n_k}$. We want to bound $\mathcal{M}_n^{\gamma_k,k}$ from above. Note that $(\ln k)\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ by (39). Hence the case $S_n \le 0$ is trivial because $\mathcal{M}_n^{\gamma_k,k}$ is bounded from above by (32).

For the case $S_n > 0$, by the term $\dfrac{2}{\ln k}$ on the right-hand side of (31), it suffices to show

$$
\begin{aligned}
&0 < S_n \le \sqrt{n_k}\,\psi^U(n_k) + \sqrt{n_k + n}\,\psi(n_k + n)\\
&\quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}\,2e^{\delta}\min\Big\{e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}}, e^{\gamma S_n}\Big\} < \frac{D\alpha}{4} - \delta, \quad \forall\gamma_k \in [k^{-1}, \gamma_k], \ \forall n \in [0, n_{k+1} - n_k],
\end{aligned}
$$

for sufficiently large k such that

$$
C_1(\ln k)\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2} < \delta. \tag{45}
$$

Let

$$
c_1 = \frac{9}{(1+2\delta)^2} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_1}} - \delta > 0. \tag{46}
$$

We distinguish two cases:

$$
\text{(a) } n \le \frac{\psi_{k+1}^2}{c_1\gamma^2}, \quad \text{(b) } \frac{\psi_{k+1}^2}{c_1\gamma^2} < n \le n_{k+1} - n_k.
$$

For case (a), $\sqrt{n_k}\,\psi^U(n_k) \le (1+\delta)\sqrt{n_k}\,\psi_{k+1}$ by (36) for sufficiently large k. Also $\psi(n_k + n) \le \psi(n_{k+1})$. Hence in this case

$$
\gamma S_n \le \Big((1+\delta)\gamma\sqrt{n_k} + \sqrt{\gamma^2 n_k + \psi_{k+1}^2/c_1}\Big)\psi_{k+1}.
$$

Then for $\gamma \le \gamma_k$, by (38)

$$
\gamma S_n \le \Big((1+\delta)\gamma_k\sqrt{n_k} + \sqrt{\gamma_k^2 n_k + \psi_{k+1}^2/c_1}\Big)\psi_{k+1} \le \frac{\psi_{k+1}^2}{\sqrt{c_1}}(1+\delta) \tag{47}
$$

for sufficiently large k. Since

$$
\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}\,2e^{\delta}e^{\gamma S_n} \le 2\psi_{k+1}e^{\delta}\exp\Big(-\psi_{k+1}^2\big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_1}} - \delta\big)\Big) \to 0 \qquad (k \to \infty), \tag{48}
$$

we have $\mathcal{N}_n^{\gamma_k} > \alpha/2$ uniformly in $\gamma \in [\gamma_k k^{-1}, \gamma_k]$ and in $n \le \psi_{k+1}^2/c_1\gamma^2$.

For case (b), $\psi_{k+1}/\sqrt{c_1} \le \gamma\sqrt{n}$ and $S_n \le ((1+\delta)\sqrt{n_k} + \sqrt{n_k + n})\psi_{k+1}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}\,2e^{\delta}e^{S_n^2/(2n)}\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}} &\le \psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}\,\frac{2e^{\delta}\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{c_1}}{\psi_{k+1}}\exp\Big(\frac{((1+\delta)\sqrt{n_k} + \sqrt{n_k + n})^2}{2n}\psi_{k+1}^2\Big)\\
&= 2e^{\delta}\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{c_1}\exp\Big(\frac{(1 + (1+\delta)^2)n_k + 2(1+\delta)\sqrt{n_k}\sqrt{n_k + n}}{2n}\psi_{k+1}^2\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\gamma \le \gamma_k$

$$\frac{\psi_{k+1}^2}{c_1\gamma^2} < n \Rightarrow \frac{n_k}{n}\psi_{k+1}^2 < c_1\gamma^2 n_k \le c_1\gamma_k^2 n_k = c_1\frac{n_k}{n_{k+1}}k^4\psi_{k+1}^2.$$

Hence $\psi_{k+1}^2 n_k/n \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Similarly $\sqrt{n_k/k}\,\psi_{k+1}^2 \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Therefore, for sufficiently large k,

$$\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2} \le 2e^{\delta}e^{-S_n^2/(2n)}\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\gamma\sqrt{n}} \le 2e^{2\delta}\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{c_1} < \frac{D\alpha}{4} - \delta, \qquad (49)$$

with the choice of D in (41) and c_1 in (46). This proves (43).

Now we prove (44). Write $n_k^0 = n_{k+1} - n_k$. We will show that $\mathcal{M}^{\gamma_k,k}_{n_k^0} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ if

$$S_{n_k^0} \le 2\sqrt{n_k}\,\psi^U(n_k) + \sqrt{n_k^0}\,\psi(n_k^0) \le 2\sqrt{n_k^0}\,\psi(n_k^0).$$

Let $y = ue^{-w}$. Then $2/(ek) \le y \le 1$ in the integral (33). As in (16), the quadratic function $y\gamma_k S_{n_k^0} - y^2\gamma_k^2 n_k^0/2$ is maximized at $y = S_{n_k^0}/(\gamma_k n_k^0)$. Now

$$\frac{S_{n_k^0}}{\gamma_k n_k^0} \le \frac{2\psi(n_k^0)}{\gamma_k\sqrt{n_k^0}} \le \frac{2\psi(n_k^0)}{\psi_{k+1}}\sqrt{\frac{n_{k+1}}{n_k^0}}\frac{1}{k^2} \le 2(1+\delta)\frac{1}{k^2} < \frac{2}{ek} \qquad (50)$$

for sufficiently large k, because $\lim_{k\to\infty} n_{k+1}/n_k^0 = 1$. Then the integrand in (33) is maximized at $y = ue^{-w} = 2/(ek)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^{\gamma_k,k}_{n_k^0} &\le 2e^{\delta}\alpha\exp\left(\frac{2}{ek}\gamma_k S_{n_k^0} - \left(\frac{2}{ek}\right)^2\gamma_k^2 n_k^0/2\right) \le 2e^{\delta}\alpha\exp\left(\frac{4}{ek}\gamma_k\sqrt{n_k^0}\,\psi(n_k^0) - \frac{2}{e^2k^2}\gamma_k^2 n_k^0\right)\\ &\le 2e^{\delta}\alpha\exp\left(\frac{4}{e}k\psi_{k+1}^2\sqrt{\frac{n_k^0}{n_{k+1}}} - \frac{2}{e^2}k^2\psi_{k+1}^2\frac{n_k^0}{n_{k+1}}\right) \to 0 \quad (k \to 0). \end{aligned} \qquad (51)$$

We assume that by the validity result, Skeptic already employs a strategy forcing $S_n \le \sqrt{n}\,\psi^U(n)$ *a.a.* In addition to this strategy, based on Proposition 3.6, consider the following strategy.

Start with initial capital $\mathcal{K}_0 = \alpha$.
Set $k = k_0$.
Do the followings repeatedly:

1. Apply the strategy in Proposition 3.6 for $n \in [n_k, n_{k+1}]$.
   If (42) holds, then go to 2. Otherwise go to 3.
2. Let $k = k + 1$. Go to 1.
3. Wait until $\exists k^0$ such that $\sqrt{n_{k^0}}\,\psi^U(n_{k^0}) \le S_{n_{k^0}} \le \sqrt{n_{k^0}}\,\psi(n_{k^0})$.
   Set $k = k^0$ and go to 1.

Since Skeptic already employs a strategy forcing $S_n < \sqrt{n}\psi^U(n)$ *a.a.*, the lower bound in (42) violated only finite number of times. Hence if $S_n < \sqrt{n}\psi(n)$ *a.a.*, then Step 3 is performed only finite number of times. Also when Step 3 is performed, the overshoot of $|x_n| = 1$ does not make Skeptic bankrupt by (43). Now for each iteration of Step 2, Skeptic multiplies his capital at least by

$$1 + \frac{1-\delta}{D}(\ln k)\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}.$$

Then

$$\frac{1-\delta}{D}\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}(\ln k)\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2} \le \prod_{k=k_0}^{\infty}\left(1 + \frac{1-\delta}{D}(\ln k)\psi_{k+1}e^{-\psi_{k+1}^2/2}\right).$$

Since the left-hand side diverges to infinity, the above strategy forces the sharpness.

4 Discussion

In this paper we gave a game-theoretic proof of EFKP-LIL. Our validity proof is very short. Our sharpness proof is elementary, but it is still long. A simpler sharpness proof is desired.

In our sharpness proof we used the change of time scale $\lambda = e^{5k\ln k}$ and formed the cycles $[n_k, n_{k+1}]$ based on this time scale. There is a question whether this scale is the best. Actually we can prove the sharpness based on the change of time scale $\lambda = e^{ck\ln_2 k}$ for large c. Any sparser cycles than $n_k = e^{ck\ln_2 k}$ can be used for proving the sharpness.

It is interesting to consider a generalization of EFKP-LIL to games other than the fair-coin game. In particular the case of self-normalized sums discussed in [7, 3] is also important from game-theoretic viewpoint. Self-normalized sums in game-theoretic probability have been studied in [12].

Another possible extension is that $\psi(n)$ is sequentially given by a third player Forecaster at the beginning of each round of the game. From the game-theoretic viewpoint it is of interest to ask whether Skeptic can force

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\psi(n)}{n}e^{-\psi(n)^2/2} = \infty \iff S_n \ge \sqrt{n}\psi(n) \ \ i.o.$$

References

[1] Z. D. Bai. A theorem of Feller revisited. *The Annals of Probability*, 17(1):385–395, 1989.

[2] I. Berkes, S. Hörmann, and M. Weber. Upper-lower class tests for weighted i.i.d. sequences and martingales. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 23:428–446, 2010.

[3] M. Csörgő, B. Szyszkowicz, and Q. Wang. Darling-Erdős theorem for self-normalized sums. *The Annals of Probability*, 31(2):676–692, 2003.

[4] P. Erdős. On the law of the iterated logarithm. *Annals of Mathematics, Second Series*, 43:419–436, 1942.

[5] W. Feller. The general form of the so-called law of the iterated logarithm. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 54:373–402, 1943.

[6] W. Feller. The law of the iterated logarithm for identically distributed random variables. *Annals of Mathematics*, 47:631–638, 1946.

[7] P. Griffin and J. Kuelbs. Some extensions of the LIL via self-normalizations. *The Annals of Probability*, 19(1):380–395, 1991.

[8] K. Itô and H. P. McKean, Jr. *Diffusion Processes and Their Sample Paths*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1974. Second printing, corrected, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 125.

[9] S. Keprta. *Integral Tests for Brownian Motion and Some Related Processes*. PhD thesis, Carleton University, 1997.

[10] F. B. Knight. *Essentials of Brownian Motion and Diffusion*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1981.

[11] M. Kumon, A. Takemura, and K. Takeuchi. Capital process and optimality properties of a Bayesian skeptic in coin-tossing games. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.*, 26(6):1161–1180, 2008.

[12] M. Kumon, A. Takemura, and K. Takeuchi. Sequential optimizing strategy in multi-dimensional bounded forecasting games. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 121(1):155–183, 2011.

[13] P. Lévy. *Théorie de l'Addition des Variables Aléatoires*. Gautier-Villars, Paris, 1937.

[14] K. Miyabe and A. Takemura. Convergence of random series and the rate of convergence of the strong law of large numbers in game-theoretic probability. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 122:1–30, 2012.

[15] K. Miyabe and A. Takemura. The law of the iterated logarithm in game-theoretic probability with quadratic and stronger hedges. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 123(8):3132–3152, 2013.

[16] I. Petrowsky. Zur ersten Randwertaufgabe der Wärmeleitungsgleichung. *Compositio Mathematica*, 1:383–419, 1935.

[17] P. Révész. *Random Walk in Random and Non-random Environments*. World Scientific, 1990.

[18] G. Shafer and V. Vovk. *Probability and Finance: It's Only a Game!* Wiley, 2001.