

Game pricing and double sequence of random variables

Yukio Hirashita

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Chukyo University, Nagoya, Aichi 466-8666, Japan

Abstract

In this paper, we study a game with positive or plus infinite expectation and determine the optimal proportion of investment for maximizing the limit expectation of growth rate per attempt. With this objective, we introduce a new pricing method in which the price is different from that obtained by the Black-Scholes formula for a European option.

JEL classification: G11

Keywords: Proportion of investment; Game pricing; Black-Scholes formula

1. Introduction

The portfolio pricing equation (Luenberger (1998) 9.7) is useful for determining prices only if the optimal portfolio is already known. In this paper, we determine both the price and optimal proportion of investment for any effective game (Section 6).

The determination of the utility function is more experimental than mathematical. In general, despite the equality $(\prod_{j=1}^n X_j)^{1/n} = \exp(\Sigma_{j=1}^n \log X_j/n)$, the two expectations $E[(\prod_{j=1}^n X_j)^{1/n}]$ and $\exp(E[\Sigma_{j=1}^n \log X_j/n])$ are not equal for a sequence of independent random variables $\{X_j > 0 \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Therefore, we use neither the notion of utility from consumption nor the law of large numbers (Luenberger (1998) 15.2).

The investor should repeatedly invest a fixed proportion of his or her own current capital without borrowing. As a rule, if the investor invests 1 dollar, then he or she receives $a(x)$ dollars (including the invested 1 dollar) with a distribution function $F(x)$ defined on an interval I . For simplicity, we omit the currency notation. Let $M > 0$ be the investor's capital, $u > 0$ the price of the game, and $0 \leq t \leq 1$ the proportion of investment. Then, after one attempt, he or she has capital of $Mta(x)/u + M(1-t)$ if x occurs. It should be noted that the reserved part $M(1-t)$ does not include the interest, that is the custom, for example, in foreign exchange accounts.

Let $M_n > 0$ be the capital after n attempts. In general, growth rate implies $M_{n+1}/M_n - 1$ or $\log(M_{n+1}/M_n)$ after one attempt. However, for the purposes of succinctness in this paper M_{n+1}/M_n is used to define the growth rate. In this context, the growth rate per attempt is defined as $(M_n/M_0)^{\frac{1}{n}}$.

Without dealing with $(M_n/M_0)^{\frac{1}{n}}$ directly, this paper defines a double sequence of random variables $\{X_{N,n}\}$ with respect to the bounded step functions $\{f_N(x)\}$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_N(x) = a(x)$ (Section 5). It is shown that the finite limit $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}]$ exists if, and only if, the game is effective. In this case, the equalities $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] = G_u(t) := \exp(\int_I \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1)d(F(x)))$ and

$\lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow +\infty \\ N \rightarrow +\infty}} V[X_{N,n}] = 0$ are obtained. These equalities again support the well-known assertion that although in principle an investor may choose any utility function, a repetitive situation tends to hammer the utility into one that is close to the logarithm (Luenberger (1998) 15.4, Kelly (1956)).

We study the optimal proportion of investment, t_u , for the price $u > 0$ in order to maximize the limit expectation of growth rate per attempt. In order to determine the price of the game, we require a riskless interest rate, $r > 0$, for a particular period. The equation $G_u(t_u) = r + 1$ (if r is simple) or $G_u(t_u) = e^r$ (if r is continuously compounded) is used to determine the price of a game. If $a(x) \geq 0$ for each $x \in I$, then the existence and uniqueness of the price are guaranteed by the fact that $G_u(t_u)$ is continuous and strictly decreases from $+\infty$ to 1 with respect to $0 < u < E := \int_I a(x)d(F(x))$ (Theorem 4.1). In this context, the price of the St. Petersburg game (Daniel Bernoulli (1738; English trans. 1954)) is determined to be 5.1052 if the riskless interest rate is 4% (Example 6.4). On the other hand, the Black-Scholes formula is deduced from the equation $E/u = e^r$, where E is the expectation of a European option (Example 6.6).

2. Optimal proportion of investment

Assume that the profit function $a(x)$ is measurable with the distribution function $F(x)$ defined on an interval $I \subseteq (-\infty, +\infty)$. Set $\xi := \inf_{x \in I} a(x)$. We also assume that $\xi > -\infty$ and ξ is the essential infimum of $a(x)$, that is, $\int_{a(x) < \xi + \varepsilon} d(F(x)) > 0$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Further, assume that $a(x)$ is not a constant function (a.e.), that is, $\int_{a(x) < \xi + \delta} d(F(x)) < 1$ for some $\delta > 0$.

We use the following notation.

$$E := \int_I a(x)d(F(x)), \quad H := \int_I \frac{1}{a(x)}d(F(x)), \quad H_\xi := \int_I \frac{1}{a(x) - \xi}d(F(x)). \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we assume that $E > 0$. If $\int_{a(x)=\xi} d(F(x)) > 0$, we define $H_\xi = +\infty$ and $1/H_\xi = 0$.

Since $a(x)$ is not constant, we have $\xi < E$, $H_\xi > 0$, and $1/H_\xi < +\infty$. From the relation

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \left(\int_I \sqrt{a(x) - \xi} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(x) - \xi}} d(F(x)) \right)^2 \\ &< \int_I (a(x) - \xi) d(F(x)) \times \int_I \frac{1}{a(x) - \xi} d(F(x)) = (E - \xi)H_\xi, \end{aligned}$$

we have $\xi + 1/H_\xi < E$. In particular, if $\xi = 0$, $0 \leq 1/H < E$. If $\xi > 0$, then using $1/\xi \geq 1/a(x)$ and $1 = \sqrt{a(x)} \times (1/\sqrt{a(x)})$, we have $\xi < 1/H < E$.

For price $u > 0$, let $t_u \in [0, 1]$ be the optimal proportion of investment. The precise definition of the term "optimal" and its significance is provided in Section 5. Here, we present certain properties of t_u in order to explain the approximate outline of the paper.

(a) If $u > E$, $t_u = 0$.

Assume that $u > E$ and $t \in (0, 1]$, then the expectation of profits, $Mt \int_I a(x)/u d(F(x)) + M(1-t) = M - M(1 - E/u)t$, is less than M . More precisely, using Jensen's inequality, we have $G_u(t) < 1 - (1 - E/u)t < 1 = G_u(0)$ for each $t \in (0, 1]$. Therefore, $t_u = 0$.

In the proof of Theorem 5.1, we will show that:

$$\{u \mid t_u = 0\} = \begin{cases} [E, +\infty), & \text{if } E < +\infty, \\ \phi, & \text{if } E = +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

(b) If $\xi > 0$ and $0 < u \leq \xi$, then $t_u = 1$.

From $0 < u \leq \xi \leq a(x)$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, we have $Mta(x)/u + M(1-t) = Ma(x)/u - M(1-t)(a(x)/u - 1) \leq Ma(x)/u$ for each $x \in I$. This implies that $G_u(t) < G_u(1)$ for each $t \in [0, 1]$, that is, $t_u = 1$.

Accordingly, in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we will also show that

$$\{u \mid t_u = 1\} = \begin{cases} (0, 1/H], & \text{if } \xi > 0, \text{ or } \xi = 0 \text{ and } H < +\infty, \\ \phi, & \text{if } \xi < 0, \text{ or } \xi = 0 \text{ and } H = +\infty, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

which yields a maximum price of $1/H$ at which all the capital should be repeatedly invested.

(c) If $\max(0, \xi) < u$, $t_u \leq u/(u - \xi)$.

If $t > u/(u - \xi)$, $u - \xi - u/t > 0$. Therefore, the negative result $Mta(x)/u + M(1-t) < 0$ occurs with a positive probability $\int_{\xi \leq a(x) < \xi + (u - \xi - u/t)} d(F(x)) > 0$. This contradicts the concept of continual investment without borrowing.

In the proof of Theorem 5.1, the existence of t_u is shown such that:

$$\{u \mid t_u = \frac{u}{u - \xi}\} = \begin{cases} (0, \xi + 1/H_\xi], & \text{if } \xi \leq 0 \text{ and } \xi + 1/H_\xi > 0, \\ \phi, & \text{if } \xi > 0 \text{ or } \xi + 1/H_\xi \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

(d) Theorem 5.1 also shows that $t_u \notin \{0, 1, u/(u - \xi)\}$ if and only if $1/H < u < E$ (if $\xi \geq 0$) or $\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi) < u < E$ (if $\xi < 0$). In this case, t_u can be uniquely determined by the property:

$$\int_I \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)t_u - ut_u + u} d(F(x)) = 0. \quad (5)$$

3. Pre-optimal proportion

We denote the integral $\int_I (a(x) - \beta)/(a(x)z - z\beta + \beta) d(F(x))$ by $w_\beta(z)$, in which z and β are complex variables.

Lemma 3.1. *The function $w_\beta(z)$ is holomorphic with respect to two complex variables $z := t + si$ and $\beta := u + hi$ such that,*

- (a) $\max(\varepsilon, \xi) < u < L$,
 - (b) $|h| < \varepsilon^6/(32(L+1)R^2)$,
 - (c) $|z| < R$ and $z \notin \{|s| \leq \varepsilon\} \cap \{t \leq \varepsilon \text{ or } t \geq u/(u - \xi) - \varepsilon\}$,
- where $0 < \varepsilon < \min(1/2, u/(2(u - \xi)))$, $\max(\varepsilon, \xi) < L < +\infty$, $\max(2, u/(u - \xi)) < R < +\infty$, $i := \sqrt{-1}$, $\text{Im}(z) = s$ and $\text{Im}(\beta) = h$.

Proof. We obtain certain operator exchange properties such as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_\beta(z) = \int_I \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{a(x) - \beta}{a(x)z - z\beta + \beta} \right) d(F(x))$$

by proving that the related integrands are bounded. Because $(a(x) - \beta)/(a(x)z - z\beta + \beta)$ satisfies the Cauchy-Riemann equations, $w_\beta(z)$ is shown to be holomorphic due to Hartogs's theorem.

It should be noted that the condition (a) above leads to $\beta \neq 0$, and if $a(x) \neq \beta$, then we have

$$\frac{a(x) - \beta}{a(x)z - z\beta + \beta} = \frac{1}{z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}}}.$$

In the following four cases, we assume that $a(x) \neq \beta$.

In this proof, we will frequently use the inequality $|1/(1 - z)| \leq |2/z|$ if $|z| \geq 2$.
 <Case 1> $|a(x)| \geq 8(L + 1)/\varepsilon$.

As a result of the conditions, we have $|a(x)/u| > |a(x)/L| > |a(x)/(L + 1)| \geq 8/\varepsilon > 16$, which leads to $|1/(1 - a(x)/u)| \leq |2/(a(x)/u)| < |2(L + 1)/a(x)| \leq \varepsilon/4$. On the other hand, the inequality $|a(x)/\beta| > \left| \frac{a(x)}{L+1} \right| \geq 8/\varepsilon > 16$ leads to $|1/(1 - a(x)/\beta)| \leq |2/(a(x)/\beta)| < |2(L + 1)/a(x)| \leq \varepsilon/4$, where $|\beta| \leq u + |h| < L + 1$.

Moreover, from $\xi \leq a(x)$ we have $1 - a(x)/u \leq (u - \xi)/u$. If $1 - a(x)/u > 0$ then $u/(u - \xi) \leq 1/(1 - a(x)/u)$, which leads to $|z - 1/(1 - a(x)/u)| > \varepsilon$ due to (c). If $1 - a(x)/u < 0$ then $1/(1 - a(x)/u) < 0$, which leads to $|z - 1/(1 - a(x)/u)| > \varepsilon$ due to (c). If $1 - a(x)/u = 0$ then $L > u = |a(x)| \geq 8(L + 1)/\varepsilon$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have

$$\left| z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right| = \left| z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}} + \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}} - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

which establishes

$$\frac{1}{\left| z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right|} < \frac{2}{\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, using $|a(x)/(1 - a(x)/\beta)| \leq |2\beta|$, $|1/(1 - a(x)/\beta)| < \varepsilon/4$, and $1/|\beta| < 1/\varepsilon$, we have

$$\left| \frac{a(x)}{\beta^2 \left(z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta} \right)^2} \right| < \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

<Case 2> $|a(x)| < 8(L + 1)/\varepsilon$ and $|a(x)/\beta - 1| \leq \varepsilon/R$.

Since $|(a(x)/\beta - 1)z| \leq \varepsilon$, we have $|a(x)z/\beta - z + 1| \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{\frac{a(x)}{\beta} - 1}{\frac{a(x)}{\beta}z - z + 1} \right| \leq \frac{\frac{\varepsilon}{R}}{1 - \varepsilon} < \frac{2\varepsilon}{R}.$$

Moreover, using $1/|\beta| < 1/\varepsilon$ and $1/(1-\varepsilon) < 2$, we have

$$\left| \frac{a(x)}{\beta^2 \left(z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta} \right)^2} \right| = \left| \frac{a(x)}{\beta^2 \left(\frac{a(x)}{\beta} z - z + 1 \right)^2} \right| < \frac{32(L+1)}{\varepsilon^3}.$$

<Case 3> $|a(x)| < 8(L+1)/\varepsilon$, $|a(x)/\beta - 1| > \varepsilon/R$, and $|a(x)/u - 1| > \varepsilon/(2R)$.
From $1/|\beta| < 1/\varepsilon$, $1/u < 1/\varepsilon$, and condition (b) mentioned above, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}} - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right| = \left| \frac{a(x)hi}{u\beta(1 - \frac{a(x)}{u})(1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta})} \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Therefore, as in Case 1, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{1}{z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}}} \right| < \frac{2}{\varepsilon}.$$

Moreover, this implies that

$$\left| \frac{a(x)}{\beta^2 \left(z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta} \right)^2} \right| < \frac{32(L+1)R^2}{\varepsilon^7}.$$

<Case 4> $|a(x)| < 8(L+1)/\varepsilon$, $|a(x)/\beta - 1| > \varepsilon/R$, and $|a(x)/u - 1| \leq \varepsilon/(2R)$.

This case is void as shown below:

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2R} < \left| \frac{a(x)}{\beta} - 1 \right| - \left| \frac{a(x)}{u} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \frac{a(x)}{\beta} - \frac{a(x)}{u} \right| = \frac{|ha(x)|}{|\beta u|} < \frac{\varepsilon^3}{4R^2},$$

which leads to the contradiction $4 < 2R < \varepsilon^2 < 1/4$.

<Conclusion> From the inequalities mentioned above, the four integrands on the right-hand side of the following equalities are bounded. Therefore, the Cauchy-Riemann equations for $w_\beta(z)$ hold.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_\beta(z) &= \int_{a(x) \neq \beta} \frac{-1}{\left(z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right)^2} d(F(x)), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial s} w_\beta(z) &= \int_{a(x) \neq \beta} \frac{-i}{\left(z - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\beta}} \right)^2} d(F(x)), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial u} w_\beta(z) &= \int_{a(x) \neq \beta} \frac{-a(x)}{\beta^2 \left(\frac{a(x)}{\beta} z - z + 1 \right)^2} d(F(x)), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial h} w_\beta(z) &= \int_{a(x) \neq \beta} \frac{-a(x)i}{\beta^2 \left(\frac{a(x)}{\beta} z - z + 1 \right)^2} d(F(x)). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

□

Henceforth, in this Section, we assume that $\max(0, \xi) < u < E$ and $0 < t < u/(u - \xi)$. It should be noted that $a(x)t - ut + u \geq \xi t - ut + u = (u - \xi)(u/(u - \xi) - t) > 0$ for each $x \in I$.

Lemma 3.2. $w_u(t)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to t .

Proof. According to Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} w_u(t) = - \int_I \left(\frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)t - ut + u} \right)^2 d(F(x)) < 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.3. $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} w_u(t) = E/u - 1$.

Proof. Since $(a(x) - u)/(a(x)t - ut + u)$ is strictly decreasing ($a(x) \neq u$) with respect to $0 < t < u/(u - \xi)$, using Lebesgue (monotone convergence) theorem, we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} w_u(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_I \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)t - ut + u} d(F(x)) = \int_I \frac{a(x) - u}{u} d(F(x)) = \frac{E}{u} - 1.$$

□

Lemma 3.4. $\lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u - \xi))^-} w_u(t) = (1 - \xi/u)H_\xi(\xi + 1/H_\xi - u)$.

Proof. Using the same principle as above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u - \xi))^-} w_u(t) &= \frac{u - \xi}{u} \int_I \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x) - \xi} d(F(x)) \\ &= \frac{u - \xi}{u} (1 - (u - \xi)H_\xi) = (1 - \xi/u)H_\xi(\xi + 1/H_\xi - u). \end{aligned}$$

□

From the above lemmas, if $\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi) < u < E$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} w_u(t) > 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u - \xi))^-} w_u(t) < 0$. Thus, the equation $w_u(t) = 0$ has the only solution $\tilde{t}_u \in (0, u/(u - \xi))$, and we refer to it as *pre-optimal proportion*. Note that, due to Lemma 3.1 and the inverse mapping theorem, \tilde{t}_u is continuous with respect to u .

Lemma 3.5. If $\xi > 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi < 1/H$.

Proof. Since $w_u(t)$ is strictly decreasing and $1 < u/(u - \xi)$, $w_u(1) > \lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u - \xi))^-} w_u(t)$, that is,

$$\int_I \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x) - u + u} d(F(x)) = H(1/H - u) > (1 - \xi/u)H_\xi(\xi + 1/H_\xi - u)$$

for each $\xi < u < E$. If $1/H \leq \xi + 1/H_\xi$, then selecting $u = \xi + 1/H_\xi < E$ leads to the contradiction that $0 \geq H(1/H - u) > (1 - \xi/u)H_\xi(\xi + 1/H_\xi - u) = 0$. □

Lemma 3.6. If $\xi \geq 0$, then \tilde{t}_u is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$.

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, \tilde{t}_u is analytic. Using

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left(\frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u} \right) = - \frac{a(x) + (a(x) - u)^2 \frac{d\tilde{t}_u}{du}}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2},$$

$dw_u(\tilde{t}_u)/du = 0$, and $a(x) \geq \xi \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{d\tilde{t}_u}{du} = \frac{- \int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x))}{\int_I \frac{(a(x) - u)^2}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x))} < 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.7. $\lim_{u \rightarrow E^-} \tilde{t}_u = 0$.

Proof. <Case 1>. Assume that $E = +\infty$. From $\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} u/(u - \xi) = 1$, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1/3$, there exists N such that $1 - \varepsilon < u/(u - \xi) < 1 + \varepsilon$ for each $u > N$. This implies that

$$\left| \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)t - ut + u} \right| = \frac{1}{\left| t - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}} \right|} < \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \quad (\varepsilon \leq t \leq 1 - 2\varepsilon, u > N, a(x) \neq u).$$

Therefore, by Lebesgue (dominated-convergence) theorem, we obtain

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} w_u(t) = \int_I \frac{1}{t - 1} d(F(x)) = \frac{-1}{1 - t} < 0.$$

In particular, $\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} w_u(\varepsilon) = -1/(1 - \varepsilon) < 0$. Therefore, there exists $M > 0$ such that $w_u(\varepsilon) < -1/(2(1 - \varepsilon))$ for each $u > M$. On the basis of the fact that $w_u(t)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to t , we have $0 < \tilde{t}_u < \varepsilon$ for each $u > M$. This implies that $\lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{t}_u = 0$.

<Case 2> Assume that $E < +\infty$. By Lemma 3.1, the analytic function $w_E(t)$ is well defined with respect to $t \in (0, E/(E - \xi))$. Similarly, from Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we know that $w_E(t)$ is strictly decreasing and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} w_E(t) = 0$. Therefore, we have $w_E(t) < 0$.

If $0 < \varepsilon < E/(2(E - \xi))$ and $(E + \max(0, \xi))/2 < u < E$, then due to $0 < \varepsilon < u/(u - \xi)$, $w_u(\varepsilon)$ is well defined. By Lemma 3.1 we have $\lim_{u \rightarrow E^-} w_u(\varepsilon) = w_E(\varepsilon) < 0$. Therefore, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $w_u(\varepsilon) < 0$ for each $u \in (E - \delta, E)$. This implies that $0 < \tilde{t}_u < \varepsilon$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow E^-} \tilde{t}_u = 0$. □

Lemma 3.8. If $\xi > 0$, $\tilde{t}_{1/H} = 1$.

Proof. If $\xi > 0$, then by Lemma 3.5 we have $\xi + 1/H_\xi < 1/H < E$ and $1 < u/(u - \xi)$. Therefore, $w_u(t)$ and \tilde{t}_u are analytic near $(u, t) = (1/H, 1)$. The conclusion follows from the equality

$$w_{1/H}(1) = \int_I \frac{a(x) - \frac{1}{H}}{a(x) - \frac{1}{H} + \frac{1}{H}} d(F(x)) = 0.$$

□

Lemma 3.9. If $\xi > 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{t}_u = 1 + \xi H_\xi$.

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.6, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{t}_u$ exists, and we denote it by γ . It is clear that $\gamma > 1$. According to the inequality $\tilde{t}_u < u/(u - \xi)$, we have $\gamma \leq 1 + \xi H_\xi$.

Assume $H_\xi < +\infty$ and $\gamma < 1 + \xi H_\xi$, then, for any $0 < \varepsilon < \min((1 + \xi H_\xi - \gamma)/3, \gamma/2)$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|\tilde{t}_u - \gamma| < \varepsilon \text{ and } \left| \frac{u}{u - \xi} - (1 + \xi H_\xi) \right| < \varepsilon$$

for each $u \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, \xi + 1/H_\xi + \delta)$. This implies that

$$\left| \tilde{t}_u - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}} \right| > \varepsilon,$$

where $a(x) \neq u$. By Lebesgue theorem, we obtain

$$0 = \lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \int_I \frac{1}{\tilde{t}_u - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}}} d(F(x)) = \int_I \frac{1}{\gamma - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\xi + 1/H_\xi}}} d(F(x)).$$

This is a contradiction because the term on the right is positive, which is deduced from the fact that the function

$$\int_I \frac{1}{t - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{\xi + 1/H_\xi}}} d(F(x))$$

is strictly decreasing from $E/(\xi + 1/H_\xi) - 1 > 0$ to 0 with respect to $t \in (0, 1 + \xi H_\xi)$.

Assume $H_\xi = +\infty$ and $\gamma < +\infty$. Then, we have $0 < 1/(a(x)\gamma - \xi\gamma + \xi) \leq 1/(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - \xi\tilde{t}_u + \xi) \leq 1/\xi$ for each $\xi < u < E$. Therefore, by Lebesgue theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{u \rightarrow \xi^+} \int_I \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u} d(F(x)) \\ &= \lim_{u \rightarrow \xi^+} \frac{1}{\tilde{t}_u} (1 - u \int_I \frac{1}{a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u} d(F(x))) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} (1 - \xi \int_I \frac{1}{a(x)\gamma - \xi\gamma + \xi} d(F(x))) > \frac{1}{\gamma} (1 - \xi \int_I \frac{1}{\xi} d(F(x))) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. This implies that if $H_\xi = +\infty$, $\gamma = 1 + \xi H_\xi = +\infty$. \square

Lemma 3.10. *If $\xi < 0$ and $\xi + 1/H_\xi > 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{t}_u = 1 + \xi H_\xi$.*

Proof. Due to $1/H_\xi > -\xi > 0$, we have $H_\xi < +\infty$. It should be noted that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that \tilde{t}_u is strictly increasing or decreasing in the interval $u \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, \xi + 1/H_\xi + \delta)$, which is demonstrated in the proof of Lemma 3.16. Therefore, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{t}_u$ exists and denoted by γ . By the inequality $\tilde{t}_u < u/(u - \xi)$, we have $\gamma \leq 1 + \xi H_\xi$. Assume $\gamma < 1 + \xi H_\xi$, then, as in the proof of Lemma 3.9, we have a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.11. *If $\xi = 0$ and $1/H > 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} \tilde{t}_u = 1$.*

Proof. It should be noted that $H < +\infty$. Due to Lemma 3.6, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} \tilde{t}_u$ exists, and is denoted by γ . According to the relation $\tilde{t}_u < u/(u - \xi) = 1$, we have $\gamma \leq 1$. Assume $\gamma < 1$, then as in the proof of Lemma 3.9, the function mentioned there is strictly decreasing from $HE - 1 > 0$ to 0 in the interval $t \in (0, 1)$, which leads to a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.12. *If $\xi < 0$ and $\xi + 1/H_\xi \leq 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u = 0$.*

Proof. On the basis of the definition, $0 < \tilde{t}_u < u/(u - \xi)$ and $\max(0, \xi) = 0 < u < E$. Therefore, $0 \leq \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u \leq \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} u/(u - \xi) = 0$. \square

Lemma 3.13. *If $\xi \leq 0$, $\tilde{t}_u < \int_{a(x) \neq 0} d(F(x))$.*

Proof. As $\xi \leq 0$, we have $0 < \tilde{t}_u < u/(u - \xi) \leq 1$ for each $u \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$. In this case, the equation $w_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{-1}{-\tilde{t}_u + 1} \int_{a(x)=0} d(F(x)) + \frac{1}{\tilde{t}_u} \int_{a(x) \neq 0} d(F(x)) \\ &= \frac{u}{\tilde{t}_u} \int_{a(x) \neq 0} \frac{1}{a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u} d(F(x)) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to $\tilde{t}_u < \int_{a(x) \neq 0} d(F(x))$. \square

Lemma 3.14. *If $\xi = 0$ and $H = +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u = \int_{a(x) > 0} d(F(x))$.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.6, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u$ exists, and we denote it by γ . We can choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\gamma/2 < \tilde{t}_u < \gamma$ for each $u \in (0, \delta)$. It should be noted that the equation $w_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{-1}{-\tilde{t}_u + 1} \int_{a(x)=0} d(F(x)) + \int_{a(x) > 0} \frac{1}{\tilde{t}_u - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}}} d(F(x)) = 0.$$

Assume that $\gamma < 1$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{\tilde{t}_u - \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a(x)}{u}}} \right| < \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-\gamma}, & \text{if } 0 < a(x) < u, \\ \frac{2}{\gamma}, & \text{if } a(x) > u, \end{cases}$$

for each $u \in (0, \delta)$. In this case, by Lebesgue theorem, we obtain

$$\frac{-1}{-\gamma + 1} \int_{a(x)=0} d(F(x)) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{a(x) > 0} d(F(x)) = 0,$$

which implies that $\gamma = \int_{a(x) > 0} d(F(x))$.

In the case in which $\gamma = 1$, due to Lemma 3.13, we have $\gamma \leq \int_{a(x) > 0} d(F(x)) \leq 1$. Thus, $\gamma = \int_{a(x) > 0} d(F(x))$. \square

Lemma 3.15. *The function \tilde{t}_u/u is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), E)$.*

Proof. Using the equality

$$\int_I \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u} d(F(x)) = \int_I \frac{(a(x) - u)^2 \tilde{t}_u + a(x)u - u^2}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x)) = 0$$

and by the proof of Lemma 3.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{du} \left(\frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} \right) &= - \frac{u \int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x)) + \tilde{t}_u \int_I \frac{(a(x)-u)^2}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x))}{u^2 \int_I \frac{(a(x)-u)^2}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x))} \\ &= - \frac{\int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x))}{\int_I \frac{(a(x)-u)^2}{(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u)^2} d(F(x))} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

We define the continuous function \bar{t}_u in the interval $[0, +\infty)$ as follows:

$$\text{If } \xi > 0, \text{ then } \bar{t}_u := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 \leq u \leq 1/H, \\ \tilde{t}_u, & \text{if } 1/H < u < E, \\ 0, & \text{if } u \geq E. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{If } \xi = 0, \text{ then } \bar{t}_u := \begin{cases} \int_{a(x)>0} d(F(x)), & \text{if } u = 0, \\ 1, & \text{if } 0 < u \leq 1/H, \\ \tilde{t}_u, & \text{if } 1/H < u < E, \\ 0, & \text{if } u \geq E. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{If } \xi < 0, \text{ then } \bar{t}_u := \begin{cases} \frac{u}{u-\xi}, & \text{if } 0 \leq u \leq \max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), \\ \tilde{t}_u, & \text{if } \max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi) < u < E, \\ 0, & \text{if } u \geq E. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Lemma 3.16. *If $\xi < 0$, then the value $0 < u_{\max} < E$ exists, which satisfies the following properties:*

- (a) \bar{t}_u is strictly increasing in the interval $0 < u < u_{\max}$.
- (b) \bar{t}_u is strictly decreasing in the interval $u_{\max} < u < E$.

Proof. $\bar{t}_u/u = 1/(u - \xi)$ is strictly decreasing in the interval $0 < u < \xi + 1/H_\xi$, if $\xi + 1/H_\xi > 0$. Using Lemma 3.15, we have that \bar{t}_u/u is strictly decreasing in the interval $0 < u < E$. We denote the value of $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \bar{t}_u/u$ by $\eta > 0$. As the function $y := \bar{t}_u/u$ is strictly decreasing with respect to u , \bar{t}_u can be considered to be a function with a variable $y \in (0, \eta)$.

If $u \in (\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), E)$, $\bar{t}_u = \tilde{t}_u$. From $w_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 0$ we have

$$\int_I \frac{1}{a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1} d(F(x)) = 1.$$

Thus,

$$\int_I \frac{a(x) - \frac{d\bar{t}_u}{dy}}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x)) = 0.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{d\bar{t}_u}{dy} = \frac{\int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x))}{\int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x))}.$$

Denoting $\int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x))$ by s , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \bar{t}_u}{dy^2} &= \frac{1}{s^2} \left(\begin{aligned} &-2s \int_I \frac{a(x)(a(x) - \frac{d\bar{t}_u}{dy})}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \\ &+ 2 \int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x)) \times \int_I \frac{a(x) - \frac{d\bar{t}_u}{dy}}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \end{aligned} \right) \\ &= \frac{-2}{s^3} \left(\begin{aligned} &s^2 \int_I \frac{a(x)^2}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \\ &- 2s \int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x)) \int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \\ &+ \left(\int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x)) \right)^2 \times \int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \end{aligned} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As a quadratic function with respect to s , $-s_3/2 \times d^2 \bar{t}_u / dy^2$ has the determinant given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^2} d(F(x)) \right)^2 \times \\ &\left(\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \right)^2 \\ &- \int_I \frac{a(x)^2}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \times \int_I \frac{1}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^3} d(F(x)) \end{aligned} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Due to Hölder inequality with respect to the two functions $\frac{a(x)}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^{3/2}}$ and $\frac{1}{(a(x)y - \bar{t}_u + 1)^{3/2}}$, this determinant is negative. Therefore, we have $\frac{d^2 \bar{t}_u}{dy^2} < 0$, which implies that $\frac{d\bar{t}_u}{dy}$ is strictly decreasing.

First, we assume that $\xi + 1/H_\xi \leq 0$. Assign $\alpha := \lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} d\bar{t}_u/dy$ and $\beta := \lim_{y \rightarrow \eta^-} d\bar{t}_u/dy$.

If $\alpha \leq 0$, then $d\bar{t}_u/dy < 0$ for each $0 < y < \eta$. This contradicts the fact that $\bar{t}_u = 0$ if $y = 0$ (Lemma 3.7), and $\bar{t}_u > 0$ if $0 < y < \eta$. Therefore, $\alpha > 0$.

If $\beta \geq 0$, $d\bar{t}_u/dy > 0$ for each $0 < y < \eta$. This contradicts the fact that $\bar{t}_u = 0$ if $y = \eta$ (Lemma 3.11), and $\bar{t}_u > 0$ if $0 < y < \eta$. Therefore, $\beta < 0$.

The value $0 < y_{\max} < \eta$ such that $d\bar{t}_u/dy|_{y=y_{\max}} = 0$ can then be determined. The value $0 < u_{\max} < E$ required is determined using y_{\max} .

Second, we assume that $\xi + 1/H_\xi > 0$. If $u \in (0, \xi + 1/H_\xi)$, then $\bar{t}_u = u/(u - \xi)$ is strictly increasing. Moreover, we have $u/(u - \xi)|_{u=\xi+1/H_\xi} = 1 + \xi H_\xi = \lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \bar{t}_u$ (Lemma 3.10) and $y|_{u=\xi+1/H_\xi} = H_\xi$. Redefine β as $\lim_{y \rightarrow H_\xi^-} d\bar{t}_u/dy$. If $\beta < 0$, then as above, we obtain the required value $H_\xi < u_{\max} < E$. If $\beta \geq 0$, $d\bar{t}_u/dy > 0$ for each $0 < y < H_\xi$. This implies that $d\bar{t}_u/du = d\bar{t}_u/dy \times dy/du < 0$ since $dy/du < 0$ for each $u \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, E)$ (Lemma 3.15). Thus, \bar{t}_u is strictly decreasing. Therefore, the required value is $u_{\max} = \xi + 1/H_\xi$. \square

4. Pre-growth rate

In this Section we assume that $u \in (\max(0, \xi), E)$ and $\rho, t \in (0, u/(u - \xi))$ unless otherwise mentioned. Define $G_{u,\rho}(t)$ by the equality

$$\exp \left(\int_\rho^t w_u(t) dt \right) = \exp \left(\int_I \log \frac{a(x)t - ut + u}{a(x)\rho - u\rho + u} d(F(x)) \right), \quad (10)$$

which can be verified using the following inequalities.

$$\min \left(\frac{t}{\rho}, \frac{u/(u - \xi) - t}{u/(u - \xi) - \rho} \right) < \left| \frac{a(x)t - ut + u}{a(x)\rho - u\rho + u} \right| < \max \left(\frac{t}{\rho}, \frac{u/(u - \xi) - t}{u/(u - \xi) - \rho} \right),$$

$$\left| \frac{a(x) - u}{a(x)s - us + u} \right| < \frac{1}{\min(\rho, t, u/(u - \xi) - \rho, u/(u - \xi) - t)}$$

for each $x \in I$ and $s \in (\min(\rho, t), \max(\rho, t))$. As $w_u(t)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to t from the positive value $E/u - 1$, to the value $(1 - \xi/u)H_\xi(\xi + 1/H_\xi - u)$ (Lemmas 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4), $\int_\rho^t w_u(t)dt$ is strictly decreasing with respect to ρ near 0^+ . Therefore, the limit

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \exp \left(\int_\rho^t w_u(t)dt \right) &= \exp \left(\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \int_I \log \frac{a(x)t - ut + u}{a(x)\rho - u\rho + u} d(F(x)) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\int_I \log (a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

finitely exists or $+\infty$, which we denote by $\tilde{G}_u(t)$ and refer to as *pre-growth rate*. The equality mentioned above is obtained using Lebesgue theorem because the integrand is monotone with respect to ρ in $\{x \mid a(x) > u\}$ or $\{x \mid a(x) < u\}$.

Lemma 4.1. $\tilde{G}_u(t) < E/u$.

Proof. By Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I \log (a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) &\leq \log \int_I (a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \\ &= \log (Et/u - t + 1) < \log (E/u). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.2. $\int_{a(x) < u} |\log (a(x)t/u - t + 1)| d(F(x)) < +\infty$.

Proof. In general, $a(x)t/u - t + 1 \geq (u - \xi)(u/(u - \xi) - t)/u > 0$. If $a(x) < u$, $a(x)t/u - t + 1 < 1$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\int_{a(x) < u} |\log (a(x)t/u - t + 1)| d(F(x)) \leq \left| \log \left(\frac{u - \xi}{u} \left(\frac{u}{u - \xi} - t \right) \right) \right| < +\infty.$$

□

Lemma 4.3. *The following three statements are equivalent.*

- (1) $\int_{a(x) > 1} \log a(x) d(F(x)) < +\infty$.
- (2) $\tilde{G}_u(t) < +\infty$ for each u and t .
- (3) $\tilde{G}_{u_1}(t_1) < +\infty$ for some u_1 and t_1 .

Proof. (1) \implies (2). The function $\log (a(x)t/u - t + 1)$ satisfies the following inequalities.

$$\int_{u < a(x) \leq 1 \text{ or } 1 \leq a(x) < u} |\log a(x)| d(F(x)) \leq |\log u| < +\infty.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{a(x)>u} \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) - \int_{a(x)>u} \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{a(x)>u} \left(\log \frac{t}{u} + \log \left(1 + \frac{u(1-t)}{a(x)t} \right) \right) d(F(x)) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \log \frac{t}{u} \right| + |\log t| < +\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Based on Lemma 4.2, we obtain the integrability of $\log(a(x)t/u - t + 1)$.

(3) \implies (1). It should be noted that $u_1 \in (\max(0, \xi), E)$ and $t_1 \in (0, u_1/(u_1 - \xi))$. The result can be obtained in a similar manner as above.

(2) \implies (3). It is clear. \square

If one of the above three statements is satisfied, we can write $\tilde{G} < +\infty$.

Lemma 4.4. *If $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(t) = 1$.*

Proof. Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} w_u(t) = E/u - 1 > 0$ (Lemma 3.3), $\int_0^t w_u(t) dt$ is strictly increasing and bounded with respect to t near 0^+ . Therefore, we obtain that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^t w_u(t) dt = 0$. \square

Lemma 4.5. *If $u \in (\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), E)$, $\max_{0 < t < u/(u-\xi)} G_{u,\rho}(t) = G_{u,\rho}(\tilde{t}_u)$.*

Proof. It is clear from the facts that $0 < G_{u,\rho}(t) < +\infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial G_{u,\rho}(t)/\partial t &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \exp \left(\int_\rho^t w_u(t) dt \right) \\
&= G_{u,\rho}(t) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_\rho^t w_u(t) dt \right) = G_{u,\rho}(t) w_u(t).
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 4.6. *If $\tilde{G} < +\infty$ and $u \in (\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), E)$, $\max_{0 < t < u/(u-\xi)} \tilde{G}_u(t) = \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)$.*

Proof. In a similar manner as that of the proof of Lemma 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \tilde{G}_u(t)}{\partial t} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \exp \left(\int_\rho^t w_u(t) dt \right) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \exp \left(\int_\rho^t w_u(t) dt \right) \\
&= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} G_{u,\rho}(t) w_u(t) = \tilde{G}_u(t) w_u(t),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the conclusion. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Two functions $G_{u,\rho}(t)$ and $\tilde{G}_u(t)$ ($< +\infty$) are concave with respect to t .*

Proof. Using Lemmas 3.2, 4.5, and Hölder inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^2 G_{u,\rho}(t)/\partial t^2 &= G_{u,\rho}(t)(w_u^2(t) + \partial w_u(t)/\partial t) \\
&= G_{u,\rho}(t) \left(\frac{\left(\int_I (a(x) - u)/(a(x)t - ut + u) d(F(x)) \right)^2}{-\int_I (a(x) - u)^2/(a(x)t - ut + u)^2 d(F(x))} \right) < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Using the above result, we also have $\partial^2 \tilde{G}_u(t)/\partial t^2 < 0$.

Lemma 4.8. *If $\xi \geq 0$ and $t > \rho$, $G_{u,\rho}(t)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to u .*

Proof. From $a(x) \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial G_{u,\rho}(t)}{\partial u} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \exp \left(\int_{\rho}^t w_u(t) dt \right) = G_{u,\rho}(t) \times \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \int_{\rho}^t w_u(t) dt \\ &= -G_{u,\rho}(t) \times \int_{\rho}^t \left(\int_I \frac{a(x)}{(a(x)t - ut + u)^2} d(F(x)) \right) dt < 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.9. *If $\xi \geq 0$ and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\tilde{G}_u(t)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to u .*

Proof. Using Lemma 4.8, we obtain the conclusion. □

Lemma 4.10. *If $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u-\xi))^-} \tilde{G}_u(t) = \exp(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x))) / (u - \xi)$ for each u .*

Proof. If $a(x) > u$, $a(x)t/u - t + 1$ is strictly increasing with respect to t . Therefore, using Lebesgue theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u-\xi))^-} \int_{a(x) > u} \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \\ &= \int_{a(x) > u} \log \frac{a(x) - \xi}{u - \xi} d(F(x)) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $a(x) < u$, then $a(x)t/u - t + 1$ is strictly decreasing with respect to t . Hence, using Lebesgue theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u-\xi))^-} \int_{a(x) < u} \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \\ &= \int_{a(x) < u} \log \frac{a(x) - \xi}{u - \xi} d(F(x)) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{t \rightarrow (u/(u-\xi))^-} \tilde{G}_u(t) \\ &= \exp \left(\int_{a(x) > u} \log \frac{a(x) - \xi}{u - \xi} d(F(x)) + \int_{a(x) < u} \log \frac{a(x) - \xi}{u - \xi} d(F(x)) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x)) \right) / (u - \xi). \end{aligned}$$

□

As an expansion of the definition of $\tilde{G}_u(t)$, we define $\tilde{G}_u((u/(u-\xi))^-)$ by $\exp(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x))) / (u - \xi)$ for each $u \in (\max(0, \xi), E)$.

Lemma 4.11. $\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) > 1$ if $u \in (\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), E)$.

Proof. If $0 < t < \tilde{t}_u$, $w_u(t) > 0$. Hence, we have

$$\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = \exp\left(\int_0^{\tilde{t}_u} w_u(t) dt\right) > e^0 = 1.$$

□

Lemma 4.12. $\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)$ ($< +\infty$) is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), E)$.

Proof. If $|a(x)| \leq 2|\xi|$, we have

$$\left| \frac{a(x)}{a(x)t - ut + u} \right| = \left| \frac{a(x)}{(a(x) - \xi)t + \xi t - ut + u} \right| \leq \frac{2|\xi|}{(u - \xi)(u/(u - \xi) - t)}.$$

On the other hand, if $a(x) > 2|\xi|$, we have

$$\left| \frac{a(x)}{a(x)t - ut + u} \right| = \left| \frac{a(x)}{(a(x) - \xi)t + \xi t - ut + u} \right| \leq \left| \frac{a(x)}{(a(x) - \xi)t} \right| < \frac{2}{t}.$$

Thus, by the definition of $\tilde{G}_u(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{G}_u(t)}{\partial u} &= \tilde{G}_u(t) \int_I \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \\ &= -\frac{t}{u} \tilde{G}_u(t) \times \left(\int_I \frac{a(x)}{a(x)t - ut + u} d(F(x)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The definition $w_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 0$ leads to $\int_I a(x)/(a(x)\tilde{t}_u - u\tilde{t}_u + u) d(F(x)) = 1$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)}{\partial u} = -\frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) < 0.$$

□

Lemma 4.13. If $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow E^-} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 1$.

Proof. From Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12, $\lim_{u \rightarrow E^-} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) \geq 1$ exists. Assume that $\xi \geq 0$, then from Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7, $\tilde{t}_u/(1 - \tilde{t}_u)$ is strictly decreasing near $u = E^-$. Applying Lebesgue theorem to the equality

$$\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) - 1 + \tilde{t}_u = (1 - \tilde{t}_u) \left(\exp \left(\int_I \log \left(\frac{a(x)\tilde{t}_u}{u(1 - \tilde{t}_u)} + 1 \right) d(F(x)) \right) - 1 \right)$$

we have

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow E^-} \left(\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) - 1 + \tilde{t}_u \right) = \exp \left(\int_I \log(0 + 1) d(F(x)) \right) - 1 = 0.$$

This implies that $\lim_{u \rightarrow E^-} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 1$.

In the case in which $\xi < 0$, Lemma 3.16 can be used as a substitution of Lemma 3.6 near $u = E^-$, where \tilde{t}_u is strictly decreasing to 0. In order to apply Lebesgue theorem, it is sufficient to divide the above integration into two parts $\{x \mid a(x) \geq 0\}$ and $\{x \mid a(x) < 0\}$. □

Lemma 4.14. If $\tilde{G} < +\infty$ and $u \in (\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi), \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = \exp \left(\int_u^E \tilde{t}_u/u du \right))$.

Proof. Using $\partial \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)/\partial u = -\tilde{t}_u/u \times \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)$ (Lemmas 4.12 and 4.13), we can solve the differential equation. \square

Lemma 4.15 *If $\xi = 0$ and $H = +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = +\infty$.*

Proof. Lemma 4.12 ensures the existence of $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)$, which is finite or $+\infty$. If $a(x) > 0$, $a(x)/u$ is strictly decreasing with respect to u . Using Lebesgue theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) &\geq \underline{\lim}_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \\ &\geq \underline{\lim}_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(\int_{a(x) > 0} \log \frac{a(x) + u}{2u} d(F(x)) \right) = +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 4.16. *If $\xi = 0$, $H < +\infty$, and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right)$.*

Proof. By definition, $\tilde{G} < +\infty$ implies that $\int_{a(x) > 1} \log a(x) d(F(x)) < +\infty$. From Jensen's inequality theorem, we have

$$+\infty > \log H = \log \int_I \frac{1}{a(x)} d(F(x)) \geq \int_I \log \frac{1}{a(x)} d(F(x)),$$

which implies that $\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) > -\infty$. Therefore, $\log a(x)$ is integrable.

It should be noted that $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} \tilde{t}_u = 1$ (Lemma 3.11). Using the equalities $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} \tilde{t}_u/u = H$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} (1 - \tilde{t}_u)u/\tilde{t}_u = 0$, we can choose $0 < \delta < \min(1/H, E - 1/H)$, such that $H/2 < \tilde{t}_u/u < 3H/2$ and $(1 - \tilde{t}_u)u/\tilde{t}_u < 1/2$ for each $u \in (1/H, 1/H + \delta)$. Therefore, we have the following properties.

(1) If $a(x) \geq 1/2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\log(a(x)\tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1)| &= \left| \log \frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} + \log \left(a(x) + \frac{(1 - \tilde{t}_u)u}{\tilde{t}_u} \right) \right| \\ &< \max \left(\left| \log \frac{H}{2} \right|, \left| \log \frac{3H}{2} \right| \right) + \log 2 + |\log a(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

(2) If $a(x) < 1/2$,

$$|\log(a(x)\tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1)| < \max \left(\left| \log \frac{H}{2} \right|, \left| \log \frac{3H}{2} \right| \right) + |\log a(x)|.$$

Using the above properties, we can apply Lebesgue theorem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) &= \lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^+} \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x)\tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1) d(F(x)) \right) \\ &= H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 4.17. *If $\xi = 0$, $H < +\infty$, and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^-} \tilde{G}_u(1^-) = H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right)$.*

Proof. In the case in which $\xi = 0$, based on the definition which is mentioned beneath the proof of Lemma 4.10, we have $\tilde{G}_u(1^-) = \exp\left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x))\right) / u$. Thus, we obtain the conclusion. \square

Lemma 4.18. *If $\xi = 0$, $H < +\infty$, and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(1^-) = +\infty$.*

Proof. Due to Lemmas 4.11, 4.12, and 4.16, we have $H \exp\left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x))\right) > 1$. Therefore, by the definition of $\tilde{G}_u(1^-)$ we obtain

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(1^-) = \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \exp\left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x))\right) / u \geq \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} 1/H/u = +\infty.$$

\square

Lemma 4.19. *If $\xi > 0$ and $H_\xi = +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow \xi^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = +\infty$.*

Proof. Lemma 4.12 ensures the existence of $\lim_{u \rightarrow \xi^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)$, which is finite or $+\infty$. If $a(x) > \xi$, then $(a(x) - \xi)/(2(u - \xi))$ is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (\xi, E)$. Using Lebesgue theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{u \rightarrow \xi^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) &\geq \underline{\lim}_{u \rightarrow \xi^+} \tilde{G}_u\left(\frac{u}{2(u - \xi)}\right) \\ &\geq \underline{\lim}_{u \rightarrow \xi^+} \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(\int_{a(x) > \xi} \log\left(\frac{a(x) - \xi}{2(u - \xi)} + \frac{1}{2}\right) d(F(x))\right) = +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 4.20. *If $\xi > 0$, $H_\xi < +\infty$, and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = H_\xi \exp\left(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x))\right)$.*

Proof. An argument similar to that in the proof of Lemma 4.16 ensures that $\log(a(x) - \xi)$ is integrable.

It should be noted that $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{t}_u = 1 + \xi H_\xi$ (Lemma 3.9). From the fact that $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{t}_u/u = H_\xi$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi + 1/H_\xi)^+} (\xi \tilde{t}_u - u \tilde{t}_u + u)/\tilde{t}_u = 0$, we can choose $0 < \delta < \min(\xi + 1/H_\xi, E - \xi - 1/H_\xi)$, such that $H_\xi/2 < \tilde{t}_u/u < 3H_\xi/2$ and $(\xi \tilde{t}_u - u \tilde{t}_u + u)/\tilde{t}_u < 1/2$ for each $u \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, \xi + 1/H_\xi + \delta)$. Therefore, we have the following properties.

(1) If $a(x) \geq \xi + 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\log(a(x) \tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1)| \\ &= \left| \log \frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} + \log \left(a(x) - \xi + \frac{\xi \tilde{t}_u - u \tilde{t}_u + u}{\tilde{t}_u} \right) \right| \\ &< \max\left(\left| \log \frac{H_\xi}{2} \right|, \left| \log \frac{3H_\xi}{2} \right|\right) + \log 2 + |\log(a(x) - \xi)|. \end{aligned}$$

(2) If $a(x) < \xi + 1/2$,

$$|\log(a(x) \tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1)| < \max\left(\left| \log \frac{H_\xi}{2} \right|, \left| \log \frac{3H_\xi}{2} \right|\right) + |\log(a(x) - \xi)|.$$

Using the above properties, we can apply Lebesgue theorem as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) &= \lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x)\tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1) d(F(x)) \right) \\ &= H_\xi \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.21. *If $\xi > 0$, $\tilde{G}_{1/H}(\tilde{t}_{1/H}) = H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right)$.*

Proof. It should be noted that $0 < \xi < 1/H < E$ and $1 < 1/H/(1/H - \xi)$. From Lemma 3.8, we have $\tilde{t}_{1/H} = 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_{1/H}(\tilde{t}_{1/H}) &= \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x)/(1/H) - 1 + 1) d(F(x)) \right) \\ &= H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.22. *If $\xi > 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^-} \tilde{G}_u(1) = H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right)$.*

Proof. From $0 < \xi < u$, we have $1 < u/(u - \xi)$. Thus, by Lemma 4.21 we obtain

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow (1/H)^-} \tilde{G}_u(1) = \tilde{G}_{1/H}(1) = H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right).$$

□

If $\xi > 0$ and $0 < u \leq \xi$, $a(x)t/u - t + 1 \geq 1$ for each $t > 0$. Therefore, we can expand the definition of $\tilde{G}_u(t) = \exp(\int_I \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)))$, which is greater than 1 and finite or $+\infty$, in the domain $0 < u \leq \xi$ and $t > 0$.

Lemma 4.23. *If $\xi > 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(1) = +\infty$.*

Proof. It should be noted that $\tilde{G}_{1/H}(\tilde{t}_{1/H}) = H \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right) > 1$ (Lemma 4.21). From the expansion of $\tilde{G}_u(t)$ which is defined beneath the proof of Lemma 4.22, we have

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(1) = \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \exp \left(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)) \right) / u \geq \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} 1/H/u = +\infty.$$

□

Lemma 4.24. *If $\xi < 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi > 0$ and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = H_\xi \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x)) \right)$.*

Proof. It should be noted that $H_\xi < +\infty$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^+} \tilde{t}_u = 1 + \xi H_\xi$ (Lemma 3.10). The proof is formally the same as that of Lemma 4.20. □

Lemma 4.25. *If $\xi < 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi > 0$, and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow (\xi+1/H_\xi)^-} \tilde{G}_u((u/(u - \xi))^-) = H_\xi \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x)) \right)$.*

Proof. We obtain the conclusion using the definition which is mentioned beneath the proof of Lemma 4.10. \square

Lemma 4.26. *If $\xi < 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi > 0$, and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(u/(u - \xi)^-) = \exp\left(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x))\right) / (-\xi)$.*

Proof. We obtain the conclusion by applying the same process as in Lemma 4.25. \square

From Lemma 3.15, \tilde{t}_u/u is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (0, E)$, if $\xi + 1/H_\xi \leq 0$. Therefore, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u/u$ exists, and we denote it by $\eta > 0$. From $0 < \tilde{t}_u < u/(u - \xi)$, we have $\eta \leq -1/\xi$.

Lemma 4.27. *If $\xi < 0$ and $\xi + 1/H_\xi < 0$, $\eta < -1/\xi$.*

Proof. It should be noted that the definition $w_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 0$ implies that

$$\int_I \frac{1}{a(x) \frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} - \tilde{t}_u + 1} d(F(x)) = 1.$$

From Lemma 3.12, we have $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u = 0$. Using Fatou's lemma, we obtain

$$\int_I \frac{1}{a(x)\eta + 1} d(F(x)) = \int_I \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{a(x) \frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} - \tilde{t}_u + 1} d(F(x)) \leq 1.$$

Assume that $\eta = -1/\xi$, we have

$$\int_I \frac{1}{-a(x)/\xi + 1} d(F(x)) = -\xi H_\xi \leq 1.$$

This implies that $\xi + 1/H_\xi \geq 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.28. *If $\xi < 0$ and $\xi + 1/H_\xi = 0$, $\eta = -1/\xi$.*

Proof. Since $H_\xi < +\infty$, $1/(a(x) - \xi)$ is integrable. Thus, from $\int_I 1/(a(x)\tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1) d(F(x)) = 1$ and by Lebesgue theorem, we have $\int_I 1/(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x)) = 1$. On the other hand, it is clear that $\int_I 1/(a(x) \times 0 + 1) d(F(x)) = 1$ and $\int_I 1/(a(x)(-1/\xi) + 1) d(F(x)) = -\xi H_\xi = 1$. This implies that the equation $\int_I 1/(a(x)y + 1) d(F(x)) = 0$ with respect to $y \in [0, -1/\xi]$ has three solutions $y = 0$, $y = \eta$, and $y = -1/\xi$. Note that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \int_I \frac{1}{a(x)y + 1} d(F(x)) = \int_I \frac{a(x)^2}{(a(x)y + 1)^3} d(F(x)) > 0.$$

Therefore, the equation $\int_I 1/(a(x)y + 1) d(F(x)) = 0$ has at most two solutions. This implies that $\eta = -1/\xi$. \square

Lemma 4.29. *If $\xi < 0$, $\xi + 1/H_\xi \leq 0$, and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = \exp\left(\int_I \log(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x))\right)$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.12 implies that $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u = 0$. From Lemma 3.15, \tilde{t}_u/u is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (0, E)$. Due to Lemma 3.16, \tilde{t}_u is strictly

increasing with respect to $u \in (0, u_{\max})$. Therefore, if $a(x) > 0$ then $a(x)\frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} - \tilde{t}_u + 1$ is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (0, u_{\max})$. This ensures that

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{a(x) > 0} \log\left(\frac{a(x)}{u} \tilde{t}_u - \tilde{t}_u + 1\right) d(F(x)) = \int_{a(x) > 0} \log(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x)).$$

If $H_\xi < +\infty$, using Jensen's inequality theorem, we see that $\log(a(x) - \xi)$ is integrable. If $a(x) \leq 0$ and $0 < u < \min(-\xi, E)$, then we have

$$0 \leq \frac{a(x) - \xi}{-2\xi} \leq \frac{a(x) - \xi}{u - \xi} < a(x) \frac{\tilde{t}_u}{u} - \tilde{t}_u + 1 < 1,$$

and

$$|\log(a(x)\tilde{t}_u/u - \tilde{t}_u + 1)| < |\log(a(x) - \xi)| + |\log(-2\xi)|.$$

Therefore, we can apply Lebesgue theorem to the following equality.

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{a(x) \leq 0} \log\left(\frac{a(x)}{u} \tilde{t}_u - \tilde{t}_u + 1\right) d(F(x)) = \int_{a(x) \leq 0} \log(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x)).$$

Thus, we accomplish

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = \exp\left(\int_I \log(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x))\right).$$

If $H_\xi = +\infty$, from Lemma 4.27, $\eta < -1/\xi$. If we assign $\varepsilon := (\xi\eta + 1)/2 > 0$, then, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\tilde{t}_u < \varepsilon$ for each $u \in (0, \delta)$. Hence, if $a(x) \leq 0$, then we have

$$1 > \frac{a(x)}{u} \tilde{t}_u - \tilde{t}_u + 1 \geq \xi\eta - \varepsilon + 1 = \varepsilon.$$

Thus, we can apply Lebesgue theorem in the domain $\{x \mid a(x) < 0\}$ and obtain the conclusion. \square

Here, we redefine η to be $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{t}_u/u$. If $\xi < 0$ and $\xi + 1/H_\xi > 0$, by the definition of \tilde{t}_u , we have $\eta = -1/\xi$. Therefore, Lemma 4.26 implies that $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = \exp\left(\int_I \log(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x))\right)$. Summing up the above-mentioned Lemmas, we obtain the following

Theorem 4.1. *If $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in (0, E)$. The range of $\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u)$ is $(1, +\infty)$ (if $\xi \geq 0$) or $(1, \exp(\int_I \log(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x))))$ (if $\xi < 0$).*

Afterward, we will show the equality $\tilde{G}_u(\tilde{t}_u) = G_u(t_u)$ (Theorem 5.1).

5. Double sequence of random variables

It should be noted that a series of step functions exists such that $\xi \leq f_N(x) \leq f_{N+1}(x) \leq a(x)$ and $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_N(x) = a(x)$ for each $x \in I$, in which $\xi = \inf_{x \in I} a(x) > -\infty$ is the essential infimum.

For example, for each positive integer N , assign $M := 2^N N + 1$ and

$$f_N(x) := \begin{cases} a_j := \xi + \frac{j-1}{2^N}, & \text{if } \xi + \frac{j-1}{2^N} \leq a(x) < \xi + \frac{j}{2^N} \quad (1 \leq j \leq M-1), \\ a_M := \xi + N, & \text{if } a(x) \geq \xi + N. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

In general, suppose $\{f_N(x) \mid x \in I\} = \{a_j \mid j = 1, \dots, M\}$, where $\xi = a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_M < +\infty$. Set $p_j := \int_{a_j \leq a(x) < a_{j+1}} d(F(x))$ ($1 \leq j \leq M-1$) and $p_M := \int_{a(x) \geq a_M} d(F(x))$, then we have $\sum_{j=1}^M p_j = 1$.

Assume $u > 0$, $t \geq 0$, and $\xi t/u - t + 1 > 0$. Then $a_j t/u - t + 1 > 0$ for each $1 \leq j \leq M$. For the game $\{(a_j, p_j) \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$, the growth rate per attempt after n attempts is

$$\left(\prod_{k=1}^s (a_{j_k} t/u - t + 1)^{m_{j_k}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (13)$$

where a_{j_k} occurs m_{j_k} times ($m_{j_1} + m_{j_2} + \dots + m_{j_s} = n$) with probability $p_{j_1}^{m_{j_1}} \dots p_{j_s}^{m_{j_s}}$. Such event has $n! / (m_{j_1}! m_{j_2}! \dots m_{j_s}!)$ permutation patterns. We denote $X_{N,n}$ by this random variable. Then, the expectation $E[X_{N,n}]$ is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_{j_1} + \dots + m_{j_s} = n} \frac{n!}{m_{j_1}! \dots m_{j_s}!} \left(\prod_{k=1}^s (a_{j_k} t/u - t + 1)^{m_{j_k}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} p_{j_1}^{m_{j_1}} \dots p_{j_s}^{m_{j_s}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^M (a_j t/u - t + 1)^{\frac{1}{n}} p_j \right)^n \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{\log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M (a_j t/u - t + 1)^{\frac{1}{n}} p_j \right)}{\frac{1}{n}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Moreover, the variance $V[X_{N,n}]$ is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_{j_1} + \dots + m_{j_s} = n} \frac{n!}{m_{j_1}! \dots m_{j_s}!} \left(\prod_{k=1}^s (a_{j_k} t/u - t + 1)^{m_{j_k}} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} p_{j_1}^{m_{j_1}} \dots p_{j_s}^{m_{j_s}} \\ &= E[X_{N,n}]^2 \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{\log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M (a_j t/u - t + 1)^{\frac{2}{n}} p_j \right)}{\frac{1}{n}} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{2 \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^M (a_j t/u - t + 1)^{\frac{1}{n}} p_j \right)}{\frac{1}{n}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Lemma 5.1.

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] \right) = \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \right).$$

Proof. If n approaches $+\infty$, using L'Hopital's theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \exp \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^M (a_j t/u - t + 1)^h \log(a_j t/u - t + 1) p_j}{\sum_{j=1}^M (a_j t/u - t + 1)^h p_j} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\int_I \log(f_N(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $f_N(x) \leq f_{N+1}(x) \leq a(x)$, and $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_N(x) = a(x)$, we obtain the conclusion. \square

It is easily verified that if $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} V[X_{N,n}] = 0$ for each N .

Lemma 5.2. If $\nu > 0$, the following statements are equivalent.

- (1) $\int_{a(x) > 1} a(x)^\nu d(F(x)) < +\infty$.
- (2) $\int_I (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^\nu d(F(x)) < +\infty$ for each $u > 0$, $t > 0$, and $\xi t/u - t + 1 > 0$.
- (3) $\int_I (a(x)t_1/u_1 - t_1 + 1)^\nu d(F(x)) < +\infty$ for some $u_1 > 0$, $t_1 > 0$, and $\xi t_1/u_1 - t_1 + 1 > 0$.

Proof. If $a(x) > 2u/t \times |1 - t|$, we have $a(x) < 2u/t \times (a(x)t/u - t + 1)$ and $a(x)t/u - t + 1 < 2t/u \times a(x)$. This implies the conclusion. \square

We say that a game $(a(x), F(x))$ is *effective* when $\int_{a(x) > 1} a(x)^\nu d(F(x)) < +\infty$ for some $\nu > 0$, with the additional conditions $E > 0$ and $\xi > -\infty$.

It should be noted that for each $0 < \nu < 1$, there exists h_ν such that $\log(x + 1) < h_\nu x^\nu$ for each $x > 0$.

Lemma 5.3. If a game is effective, $\tilde{G} < +\infty$.

Proof. If $a(x) > 1$ and $0 < \nu < 1$, we have $\log a(x) < h_\nu(a(x) - 1)^\nu < h_\nu a(x)^\nu$. If $a(x) > 1$ and $\nu \geq 1$, we have $\log a(x) < a(x) \leq a(x)^\nu$. Thus, we obtain the conclusion. \square

For example, the game $(\exp(1/\sqrt{x}), x)$ ($x \in (0, 1]$) is ineffective and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$.

Lemma 5.4. If a game is effective, $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} (\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}]) = \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] < +\infty$.

If a game is ineffective, $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] = +\infty$ for each n , if $t > 0$.

Proof. For the assumption $\int_{a(x)>1} a(x)^\nu d(F(x)) < +\infty$, we can assume that $\nu < 1$. Suppose $0 < h < \nu/2$ and $a(x) > u$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial h} (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^h \right| &< (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^{\nu/2} \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) \\ &< h_{\nu/2} (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^\nu. \end{aligned}$$

This guarantees that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial h} \int_I (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^h d(F(x)) = \int_I \frac{\partial}{\partial h} (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^h d(F(x)) < +\infty.$$

Thus, since $f_N(x) \leq f_{N+1}(x) \leq a(x)$, and $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} f_N(x) = a(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\int_I (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^h \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x))}{\int_I (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^h d(F(x))} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \right) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] \right).$$

Set $\alpha := \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} (\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}])$, $U_N := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}]$, and $W_n := \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}]$. Since $f_N(x) \leq f_{N+1}(x) \leq a(x)$, $E[X_{N,n}]$ increases with respect to N . By setting $h := 1/n$ and applying L'Hopital's theorem twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial h} E[X_{N,n}] \\ &= \frac{\exp \left(\int_I \log(f_N(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \right)}{2} \times \\ &\quad \left(\frac{\int_I (\log(f_N(x)t/u - t + 1))^2 d(F(x))}{\left(\int_I \log(f_N(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \right)^2} \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $E[X_{N,n}]$ decreases with sufficiently large n . For $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_0 > 0$ such that $|U_N - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ for each $N \geq N_0$. Moreover, for $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_1 > 0$ such that $|W_n - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ for each $n \geq N_1$. Therefore, we have $\alpha - \varepsilon < U_N \leq E[X_{N,n}] \leq W_n < \alpha + \varepsilon$, which implies $\lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow +\infty \\ N \rightarrow +\infty}} E[X_{N,n}] = \alpha$.

If $\int_{a(x)>1} a(x)^\nu d(F(x)) = +\infty$ for each $\nu > 0$, using Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} E[X_{N,n}] = \exp \left(\frac{\log \left(\int_I (a(x)t/u - t + 1)^{\frac{1}{n}} d(F(x)) \right)}{\frac{1}{n}} \right) = +\infty$$

for each $n \geq 1$ and $t > 0$. □

Lemma 5.5. *If a game is effective, $\lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow +\infty \\ N \rightarrow +\infty}} V[X_{N,n}] = 0$.*

Proof. This can be proved in a manner similar to Lemma 5.4. □

Lemma 5.6. *If a game is effective,*

$$\lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow +\infty \\ N \rightarrow +\infty}} E \left[\left(X_{N,n} - \exp \left(\int_I \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)) \right) \right)^2 \right] = 0.$$

Proof. The equality $E[(X_{N,n} - c)^2] = V[X_{N,n}] + (E[X_{N,n}] - c)^2$ for each c implies the conclusion (Lemmas 5.1, 5.4, and 5.5). \square

We denote $\exp(\int_I \log(a(x)t/u - t + 1) d(F(x)))$ by $G_u(t)$ for each $u > 0$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, and $\xi t/u - t + 1 > 0$. We refer to this as *the limit expectation of growth rate*. We adopt the criteria $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1, \xi t/u - t + 1 > 0} G_1(t)$. In order to explain an advantage of this criteria, we compare the following two games. After the consideration below, it is reasonable for investors to prefer Game-2, which has the lower expectation 1.3125 (< 1.5) than that of Game-1.

Game-1. The profit 3 or 0 occurs with probability 0.5. In this case, we have $E = 1.5$, $\max_{0 \leq t \leq 1, \xi t/u - t + 1 > 0} G_1(t) = \sqrt{9/8} \doteq 1.0607$, and $\tilde{t}_1 = 0.25$ (Example 6.3).

If the investors continue to invest all their current capital in Game-1 with price 1, then, after 30 attempts they will be ruined with probability $1 - 0.5^{30} \doteq 0.9999999907$.

If the investors continue to invest 0.25 of their current capital in Game-1 with price 1, after 30 attempts their capital will increase by a factor of $E[X_{N, 30}] = ((3 \times 0.25 + 0.75)^{1/30}/2 + 0.75^{1/30}/2)^{30} \doteq 1.0628$ ($1.0628^{30} \doteq 6.2165$) with a small variance $V[X_{N, 30}] \doteq 0.0045$ for each $N \geq 3$, where $f_N(x)$ is defined by (12). Moreover, $E[X_{N,n}] < 1.0929$ for each $n \geq 2$ and $N \geq 3$.

Game-2. The profit 2 or 0.625 occurs with probability 0.5. In this case, we have $E \doteq 1.3125$, $\max_{0 \leq t \leq 1, \xi t/u - t + 1 > 0} G_1(t) = \sqrt{121/96} \doteq 1.1227$, and $\tilde{t}_1 = 5/6 \doteq 0.8333$ (Example 6.3).

If the investors continue to invest 0.8333 of their current capital in Game-2 with price 1, after 30 attempts their capital will increase by a factor of $E[X_{N, 30}] = ((2 \times 0.8333 + 0.1667)^{1/30}/2 + (0.625 \times 0.8333 + 0.1667)^{1/30}/2)^{30} \doteq 1.1272$ ($1.1272^{30} \doteq 36.3103$) with a small variance $V[X_{N, 30}] \doteq 0.0102$ for each $N \geq 3$, where $f_N(x)$ is defined by (12). Moreover, $E[X_{N,n}] > 1.1227$ for each $n \geq 2$ and $N \geq 3$.

In general, the asymptotic optimality principle states that any alternative is dominated in the long run by the log-optimum strategy (Algoet and Cover (1988)). However, it should be noted that, despite Lemma 5.1, when a game is ineffective, the limit expectation of growth rate dose not have a solid significance as shown by Lemma 5.4.

We say that t_u is *the optimal proportion of investment* in order to continue to invest without borrowing with respect to $u > 0$, if

$$\overline{\lim}_{\substack{\rho \rightarrow t_u \\ 0 \leq \rho \leq 1 \\ \xi \rho/u - \rho + 1 > 0}} \int_I \log \frac{a(x)t/u - t + 1}{a(x)\rho/u - \rho + 1} d(F(x)) \leq 0 \quad (16)$$

for each $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $\xi t/u - t + 1 > 0$. It follows that $0 \leq t_u \leq 1$ and $\xi t_u/u - t_u + 1 \geq 0$.

It is clear that $G_u(t) = \tilde{G}_u(t)$ on the intersection of domains. If $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow t, 0 \leq \rho \leq 1, \xi \rho / u - \rho + 1 > 0} G_u(t)$ exists, we extend $G_u(t)$ by the value. Suppose $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, then, the equation $G_u(t_u) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1, \xi t / u - t + 1 > 0} G_u(t)$ implies that t_u is the optimal proportion.

Theorem 5.1. $t_u = \bar{t}_u$ ($u > 0$), where \bar{t}_u is a continuous function defined by (7), (8) and (9).

Proof. (1) If $u \geq E$, $t_u = 0$.

It should be noted that Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and equality (10) are valid even if $u \geq E$. Using $\partial w_u(t) / \partial t < 0$ and $w_u(0^+) = E/u - 1 \leq 0$, we have $w_u(t) < 0$ for each $0 < t < \min(1, u/(u - \xi))$. Therefore, we have

$$\int_{\rho}^t w_u(t) dt = \int_I \log \frac{a(x)t - ut + u}{a(x)\rho - u\rho + u} d(F(x)) < 0$$

for each $0 < \rho < t < \min(1, u/(u - \xi))$. This implies that $t_u = 0$. The uniqueness of t_u can be easily verified.

(2) If $\xi \leq 0$ and $0 < u \leq \xi + 1/H_\xi$, $t_u = u/(u - \xi)$.

As shown in (1), it is sufficient to show that $\int_{\rho}^t w_u(t) dt < 0$ for each $0 < t < \rho < u/(u - \xi)$. It is clear that $0 < H_\xi < +\infty$. Using $w_u(u/(u - \xi)^-) = (1 - \xi/u)H_\xi(\xi + 1/H_\xi - u) \geq 0$ (Lemma 3.4) and $\partial w_u(t) / \partial t < 0$, we have $w_u(t) > 0$ for each $0 < t < u/(u - \xi)$. Thus, we obtain the conclusion.

(3) If $\xi > 0$ and $\xi < u \leq \xi + 1/H_\xi$, $t_u = 1$.

Since $u/(u - \xi) > 1$, we can show that $\int_{\rho}^t w_u(t) dt < 0$ for each $0 < t < \rho < 1$ as shown in (2).

(4) If $\xi > 0$ and $\xi + 1/H_\xi < u \leq 1/H$, $t_u = 1$.

From Lemmas 3.6 and 3.8, we have $\tilde{t}_u \geq 1$ for each $u \in (\xi + 1/H_\xi, 1/H]$. Therefore, from $w_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 0$ and Lemma 3.2, we have $w_u(t) > 0$ for each $0 < t < 1$. Thus, we obtain the conclusion as shown in (3).

(5) If $\xi > 0$ and $0 < u \leq \xi$, $t_u = 1$.

From $u \leq \xi \leq a(x)$, we have $1 \leq a(x)t/u - t + 1 \leq a(x)\rho/u - \rho + 1$ for each $0 < t < \rho < 1$. Therefore, $\int_I \log((a(x)t/u - t + 1)/(a(x)\rho/u - \rho + 1)) d(F(x)) \leq 0$, which implies $t_u = 1$.

(6) If $\xi > 0$ and $1/H < u < E$, $t_u = \tilde{t}_u$.

It should be noted that $u/(u - \xi) > 1$. It is sufficient to show that $\int_{\tilde{t}_u}^t w_u(t) dt < 0$ for each $0 < t < 1$. From Lemmas 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8, we have $0 < \tilde{t}_u < 1$. Moreover, from $w_u(\tilde{t}_u) = 0$, we have $w_u(t) > 0$ for each $0 < t < \tilde{t}_u$ and $w_u(t) < 0$ for each $\tilde{t}_u < t < 1$. Therefore, we obtain the conclusion.

(7) If $\xi \leq 0$ and $\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi) < u < E$, $t_u = \tilde{t}_u$.

It should be noted that $u/(u - \xi) \leq 1$. It is sufficient to show that $\int_{\tilde{t}_u}^t w_u(t) dt < 0$ for each $0 < t < u/(u - \xi)$. From Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, we have $0 < \tilde{t}_u < u/(u - \xi)$. Thus, we obtain the conclusion as shown in (6). \square

Hereafter, we assume that $\tilde{G} < +\infty$. Thus, it is easy to verify the following corollaries.

Corollary 5.1. *Suppose $\xi \geq 0$ and $1/H < u < E$, or $\xi < 0$ and $\max(0, \xi + 1/H_\xi) < u < E$. Then, the optimal proportion of investment t_u is uniquely determined by $\int_I (a(x) - u)/(a(x)t_u - ut_u + u) d(F(x)) = 0$, and the maximized limit expectation of the growth rate is $\exp(\int_I \log(a(x)t_u/u - t_u + 1) d(F(x)))$.*

Corollary 5.2. *Suppose $\xi < 0$ and $0 < u \leq \xi + 1/H_\xi$. Then, the optimal proportion of investment is $u/(u - \xi)$, and the maximized limit expectation of the growth rate is $\exp(\int_I \log(a(x) - \xi) d(F(x)))/(u - \xi)$.*

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose $\xi \geq 0$ and $0 < u \leq 1/H$. Then, the optimal proportion of investment is 1, and the maximized limit expectation of the growth rate is $\exp(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x)))/u$.*

Corollary 5.4. *Suppose $u \geq E$. Then, the optimal proportion of investment is 0, and the maximized limit expectation of the growth rate is 1.*

6. Game pricing

In order to determine the price u of the game, we require the riskless (simple or continuously compounded) interest rate $r > 0$ for a period. If $\xi \geq 0$ and $\tilde{G} < +\infty$, the solution of the equation $G_u(t_u) = r + 1$ (if r is simple) or $G_u(t_u) = e^r$ (if r is continuously compounded) is uniquely determined (Theorems 4.1 and 5.1). In particular, if $u \in (1/H, E)$, t_u is uniquely determined by the equation $\int_I (a(x) - u)/(a(x)t_u - ut_u + u) d(F(x)) = 0$ (Corollary 5.1). If $\xi < 0$, $\tilde{G} < +\infty$ and $\exp(\int_I \log(a(x)\eta + 1) d(F(x))) > r + 1$ (or e^r), the solution of the equation $G_u(t_u) = r + 1$ (or e^r) is uniquely determined (Theorems 4.1 and 5.1).

In this section we assume that $r = 0.04$. It is easy to verify that the following examples are effective games (Lemma 5.3).

Example 6.1. Suppose that the profit and distribution functions are given by $a(x) = x$ and $F(x) = x \in I = [0, 1]$ respectively, then $\xi = 0$, $E = 1/2$, and $H = +\infty$. Set $y = t_u/u$ ($0 < u < 1/2$), then the equation $w_u(t_u) = 0$ can be reduced to $\int_I 1/(xy - t_u + 1) dx = 1$. This integral equation has the solution $t_u = (e^y - y - 1)/(e^y - 1)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$G_u(t_u) = \frac{y}{e^y - 1} \exp\left(y - 1 + \frac{y}{e^y - 1}\right),$$

which strictly increases from 1 to $+\infty$ with respect to $y \in (0, +\infty)$. The price u should be the solution of the equation $G_u(t_u) = 1.04$ (if $r = 0.04$ is simple). Thus, the price is $u \doteq 0.4195$, where $t_u \doteq 0.4118$ ($y \doteq 0.9818$).

It should be noted that the equation $E/u = 1.04$ implies the (higher) price $u \doteq 0.4808$ (> 0.4195), where $t_u \doteq 0.1109$ and $G_u(t_u) \doteq 1.0022$ (< 1.04).

Example 6.2. Suppose that the profit a or b ($a > 1 > b$) occurs with probability p or $q = 1 - p$, respectively. Further assume that $1/H < u = 1 < E$ (if $b > 0$) or

$u = 1 < E$ (if $b \leq 0$). Then, from $(a-u)p/(at_u-ut_u+u)+(b-u)q/(bt_u-ut_u+u) = 0$, we obtain

$$t_1 = \frac{q}{1-a} + \frac{p}{1-b} \quad (\text{Kelly (1956)}), \quad (17)$$

$$G_1(t_1) = (a-b) \left(\frac{q}{a-1} \right)^q \left(\frac{p}{1-b} \right)^p.$$

Samuelson (1971) deals with the case in which $a = 2.7$, $b = 0.3$, and $p = q = 0.5$, where $\xi = 0.3$, $E = 1.5$, $1/H = 0.54$ and $t_1 = 50/119 \doteq 0.4202$. However, Samuelson (1971) may have misinterpreted the criterion to be the geometric mean $2.7^{0.5}0.3^{0.5} = 0.9 < 1$, instead of $G_1(t_1) = (2.7 - 0.3)(0.5/1.7)^{0.5}(0.5/0.7)^{0.5} \doteq 1.1000 > 1$.

When $u \doteq 1.1704$, we have $t_u \doteq 0.2898$ and $G_u(t_u) = 1.04$.

It should be noted that the equation $E/u = 1.04$ implies the (higher) price $u \doteq 1.4423 (> 1.1704)$, where $t_u \doteq 0.0579$, and $G_u(t_u) \doteq 1.0012 (< 1.04)$.

Example 6.3. In order to obtain the optimal proportions (t, s) of two independent games $(a(x), F(x))$ and $(b(x), G(x))$ with the same price $u > 0$, we should find the supremum of the function

$$\exp \left(\int_J \int_I \log((a(x)t + b(y)s)/u - t - s + 1) d(F(x))d(G(y)) \right), \quad (18)$$

where $t \geq 0$, $s \geq 0$, $s + t \leq 1$, and $(\xi_a t + \xi_b s)/u - t - s + 1 > 0$. It should be noted that ξ_a (or ξ_b) is the essential infimum of $a(x)$ (or $b(x)$).

In Section 5, we introduced the following two games:

Game-1. The profit 3 or 0 occurs with probability 0.5. In this case, we have $E = 1.5$, $\xi = 0$, $\max_{0 \leq t \leq 1, \xi t - t + 1 > 0} G_1(t) = \sqrt{9/8} \doteq 1.0607$, and $t_1 = 0.25$. When $u \doteq 1.0880$, we have $t_u \doteq 0.2155$ and $G_u(t_u) = 1.04$.

Game-2. The profit 2 or 0.625 occurs with probability 0.5. In this case, we have $E = 1.3125$, $\xi = 0.625$, $\max_{0 \leq t \leq 1, \xi t - t + 1 > 0} G_1(t) = \sqrt{121/96} \doteq 1.1227$, and $t_1 = 5/6 \doteq 0.8333$. When $u \doteq 1.1237$, we have $t_u \doteq 0.4856$ and $G_u(t_u) = 1.04$.

If the same price is $u = 1$, the limit expectation of growth rate is given by

$$\exp \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \log(3t + 2s - t - s + 1) + \log(3t + 0.625s - t - s + 1) \\ + \log(2s - t - s + 1) + \log(0.625s - t - s + 1) \end{array} \right) / 4 \right).$$

This function attains the maximum value 1.1798 at $t \doteq 0.2142$ and $s \doteq 0.7809$.

If the same price is $u \doteq 1.8153$, the maximized limit expectation of growth rate is $r + 1 = 1.04$ at $t \doteq 0.1683$ and $s \doteq 0.3175$.

Example 6.4. In the St. Petersburg game (Bernoulli(1738; English trans. 1954)), suppose that the profit 2^j occurs with probability $1/2^j$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots$), then $\xi = 2$, $E = +\infty$, and $H = 1/3$. This game is effective, because $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (2^j)^{1/2}/2^j < +\infty$. From Lemma 4.21 we have $G_{1/H}(t_{1/H}) = 1/3 \times \exp(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\log 2^j)/2^j) = 4/3$. Thus, $G_u(t_u)$ ($u \in (3, +\infty)$) strictly decreases from $4/3$ to 1. The equation $G_u(t_u) = 1.04$ yields the price $u \doteq 5.1052$. Therefore, if the investors invest $t_u \doteq 0.1658$ of their current capital, they can maximize the limit expectation of growth rate to 1.04.

It should be noted that the equation $E/u = 1.04$ has no solution.

Example 6.5. The lognormal distributed game is given by

$$a(x) = Se^r e^x, \quad d(F(x)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x+\sigma^2/2)^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx, \quad (19)$$

and $I = (-\infty, +\infty)$. In this case, we have $E = Se^r$, $H = (e^{-r+\sigma^2})/S$, and $\exp(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x))) = Se^{r-\sigma^2/2}$.

When $S = 100$, $\sigma = 0.3$, and $r = 0.04$, we have $\xi = 0$, $E \doteq 104.0811$, $H \doteq 0.0105125$, and $1/H \doteq 95.1230$. From Lemma 4.16, $G_u(t_u)$ ($u \in (1/H, E)$) strictly decreases from $H \exp(\int_I \log a(x) d(F(x))) = e^{\sigma^2/2} \doteq 1.0460$ to 1. The equation $G_u(t_u) = e^{0.04} \doteq 1.0408$ yields the price $u \doteq 95.6132$. Therefore, if the investors invest $t_u \doteq 0.9450$ of their current capital, then they can maximize the limit expectation of growth rate to $e^{0.04}$.

It is clear that the equation $E/u = e^r$ yields the (higher) price $u = 100$ (> 95.6132). Under this price, if the investors invest $t_u \doteq 0.4433$ of their current capital, they can maximize the limit expectation of growth rate to 1.0088 ($< e^{0.04} \doteq 1.0408$). Because $\exp(r - \sigma^2/2) \doteq 0.9950$ (< 1.0088), the statement that the expected growth rate is equal to $r - \sigma^2/2$ (Luenberger (1998) 15.5) is not necessarily true.

Example 6.6. The European put option is given by

$$a(x) = \max(K - Se^{rT} e^x, 0), \quad d(F(x)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x+\sigma^2 T/2)^2}{2\sigma^2 T}} dx, \quad (20)$$

and $I = (-\infty, +\infty)$. We assume that the stock price $Y = Se^{rT} e^X$ is lognormally distributed with volatility $\sigma\sqrt{T}$, where S is the current stock price, r is the continuously compounded interest rate, K is the exercise price of the put option, and T is the exercise period. The expectation E is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T}\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^{\log \frac{K}{S} - rT} (K - Se^{rT} e^x) e^{-\frac{(x+\sigma^2 T/2)^2}{2\sigma^2 T}} dx \\ &= KN \left(-\frac{\log \frac{S}{K} + (r - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})T}{\sigma\sqrt{T}} \right) - Se^{rT} N \left(-\frac{\log \frac{S}{K} + (r + \frac{\sigma^2}{2})T}{\sigma\sqrt{T}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $N(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-x^2/2}/\sqrt{2\pi} dx$ is the cumulative standard normal distribution function.

When $S = 90$, $K = 120$, $T = 2$, $\sigma = 0.1$, and $r = 0.04$, we have $\xi = 0$, $E \doteq 22.9848$, and $H = +\infty$. Therefore, from Theorems 4.1 and 5.1, $G_u(t_u)$ ($u \in (0, E)$) strictly decreases from $+\infty$ to 1. The equations $w_u(t_u) = 0$ and $G_u(t_u) = e^{0.08}$ yield the price $u \doteq 17.8157$. With this price, if investors continue to invest $t_u \doteq 0.5434$ of their current capital, they can maximize the limit expectation of growth rate to $e^{0.08} \doteq 1.0833$.

In general, the equation $E/u = e^{rT}$ yields the price

$$u = Ke^{-rT} N \left(-\frac{\log \frac{S}{K} + (r - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})T}{\sigma\sqrt{T}} \right) - SN \left(-\frac{\log \frac{S}{K} + (r + \frac{\sigma^2}{2})T}{\sigma\sqrt{T}} \right), \quad (22)$$

which is the Black-Scholes formula for a European put option. Substituting the above-mentioned values for this formula, we obtain the (higher) price $u \doteq 21.2176$

(> 17.8157). With this price, if the investors continue to invest $t_u \doteq 0.2278$ of their current capital, they can maximize the limit expectation of growth rate to 1.0096 (< 1.0833).

References

- Algoet, P.H., Cover, T., 1988. Asymptotic optimality and asymptotic equipartition properties of log-optimum investment. *The Annals of Probability* 16, 876-898.
- Bernoulli, D., 1954. Exposition of a new theory of the measurement of risk. *Econometrica* 22, 23-36.
- Black, F., Scholes, M., 1973. The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy* 81, 637-654.
- Browne, S., Whitt, W., 1996. Portfolio choice and the Bayesian Kelly criterion. *Advances in Applied Probability* 28, 1145-1176.
- Carter, M., van Brunt, B., 2000. *The Lebesgue Stieltjes integral*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Dutka, J., 1988. On the St. Petersburg paradox. *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 39, 13-39.
- Feller, W., 1957. *An introduction to probability theory and its application*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Karatzas, I., Shreve, S.E., 1998. *Methods of mathematical finance*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Kelly, J.L.Jr., 1956. A new interpretation of information rate. *Bell system Technical Journal* 35, 917-926.
- Luenberger, D.G., 1993. A preference foundation for log mean-variance criteria in portfolio choice problems. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 17, 887-906.
- Luenberger, D.G., 1998. *Investment science*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Robbins, H., 1961. Recurrent games and the Petersburg paradox. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 32, 187-194.
- Rotando, L.M., Thorp, E.O., 1992. The Kelly criterion and the stock market. *American Mathematical Monthly* 99, 922-931.
- Samuelson, P., 1971. The fallacy of maximizing the geometric mean in long sequences of investing or gambling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 68, 2493-2496.
- Samuelson, P., 1977. St. Petersburg paradoxes: defanged, dissected, and historically described. *Journal of Economic Literature* 15, 24-55.

E-mail address: yukioh@cnc.chukyo-u.ac.jp

This paper is followed by the articles such as

- Hirashita, Y., 2007. Ratio of price to expectation and complete Bernstein functions. Preprint, arXiv:math.OA/0703077.
- Hirashita, Y., 2007, Translation invariance of investment. Preprint, arXiv:math.OA/0703078.
- Hirashita, Y., 2007, Least-Squares prices of games. Preprint, arXiv:math.OA/0703079.