On Brownian Local Time

by M.T. Barlow

Let B be a Brownian motion starting at 0, and L_t^a denote its local time - as usual we take a version of L which is jointly continuous in (a,t). Recently, Perkins has proved that, for fixed t, the process $a \to L_t^a$ is a semimartingale relative to the excursion fields. It is natural to ask about L_T^a , where T is a stopping time: in this note we give an example to show that L_T^a may be very far from being a semimartingale.

Given a stopping time T (which will be defined later) let

$$\mathbf{M} = \inf \left\{ \mathbf{a} : \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\mathbf{a}} > 0 \right\} = \inf_{\mathbf{S} \leq \mathbf{T}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{S}}$$

$$Y_n = L_T^{M+a}$$

 $\frac{\mathbf{y}}{\mathbf{n}}$, $\mathbf{a} > \mathbf{0}$, be the (usual augmentation of the) natural filtration of \mathbf{y}

We will choose T so that, for some fixed x>0, if $R=\inf\{a\colon Y_x=x\}$, then the process $(t,\omega)\to Y_{R+t}(\omega)$ is $B([0,\infty)) \otimes \sigma(R)$ measurable with positive probability. Since Y is never of finite variation, it follows that Y is not a semimartingale $/\underline{Y}_+$.

Let $\psi: C[0,\infty) \to [0,1]$ be injective and measurable. Set $S=\inf \left\{ \ t: \ \left| B_t \right| \ =1 \ \right\} \ , \ \text{and let} \ \ \varepsilon, x \ \ \text{be positive reals.} \ \ \text{On} \ \ \left\{ B_S=1 \right\}$ let T=S, and on $\left\{ B_S=-1 \right\}$ define

$$U = \inf \{ a : L_S^a \ge x \},$$

$$V = \psi (L_{S}^{U+\circ})$$

$$W = max \{ a < 1 : a + n\epsilon = U - \epsilon V \text{ for some } n \ge 0 \}$$

Thus $-(1+\epsilon) \le W < -1$, and $U = W = \epsilon(V+n)$ for some $n(\omega) \ge 0$. Now on $\{B_S = -1\}$ let $T = \inf\{ t > S : B_t = U \text{ or } W \}$. Then, if

$$F = \{B_S = -1\} \cap \{B_T = W\} \cap \{L_T^a < x, \text{ for } a \ge U\}$$

it is evident that ϵ, x may be chosen so that P(F) > 0. However, on F $V = [R/\epsilon]$ ([x] denotes the fractional part of x), and thus if $X_{R+} = \psi^{-1}$ ([R/\epsilon]), $1_F Y_{R+} = 1_F X_{R+}$. Thus T has the required properties, and it is clear, from, for example, the characterization of semimartingales as stochastic integrators, that Y is not a semimartingale.

Statistical Laboratory,

16, Mill Lane,

Cambridge. CB2 1SB

England