## Stochastic analysis, spring 2013, Exercises-8, 21.03.2013

**3** Let  $(M_t : t \in \mathbb{R})$  a *F*-martingale under *P*, and  $\mathcal{G}_t$  a filtration such that  $\forall t \geq 0$ , the  $\sigma$ -algebrae  $\mathcal{G}_t$  and  $\sigma(M_s : s \leq t)$  are *P*-independent.

Show that under P,  $(M_t : t \in \mathbb{R}^+)$  is a martingale in the enlarged filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t \vee \mathcal{G}_t : t \ge 0).$ 

Solutions This is not always true.

What is true is that  $(M_t : t \in \mathbb{R}^+)$  is a martingale in the enlarged filtration  $(\sigma(M_s : s \leq t) \lor \mathcal{G} : t \geq 0)$ , when the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{G}$  is *P*-independent from  $(M_t : t \in \mathbb{R}^+)$ 

If  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $A \in \sigma(M_r : r \leq s)$  for  $s \leq t$ ,

$$E_P((M_t - M_s)\mathbf{1}_{A \cap G}) = E_P((M_t - M_s)\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_G) = E_P((M_t - M_s)\mathbf{1}_A)P(G) = 0$$

and the result follows since

$$\sigma(M_r : r \le s) \lor \mathcal{G} = \sigma(A \cap G : A \in \sigma(M_r : r \le s), G \in \mathcal{G})$$

## Counterexample

Let  $X_1, X_2, X_3$  i.i.d. binary variables with  $P(X_i = 1) = P(X_i = 0) = 1/2$ , and

$$X_4 = (X_1 + X_2 + X_3) \mod 2$$

It follows that the distribution of  $(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)$  is invariant under permutations of the coordinates

and for each distinct triple  $1 \le i \ne j \ne k \le 4$  and  $a, b, c \in \{0, 1\}$ 

$$P(X_i = a, X_j = b, X_k = c) = 2^{-3} = P(X_i = a)P(X_j = b)P(X_k = c)$$

The random variables  $(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4)$  are 3-wise independent but are not independent, since any three random variables determine the 4-th.

Not also that  $E_P(X_i) = P(X_i = 1) = 1/2$ . Let

> $M_0 = (X_3 - 1/2), \quad M_1 = (X_3 + X_4 - 1),$  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma(X_2, X_3) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 = \sigma(X_2, X_3, X_4).$

Now  $(M_t : t = 0, 1)$  is a martingale in the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t : t = 0, 1)$ , is not a martingale in the enlarged filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t \vee \sigma(X_1))$ , because  $M_1 \neq M_0$  are both  $\mathcal{F}_0 \vee \sigma(X_1)$  measurable, which means

$$E(M_1|\mathcal{F}_0) = M_1 \neq M_0.$$