J. Appl. Prob. **53,** 1206–1220 (2016)
*doi:*10.1017/jpr.2016.75

ASYMPTOTICS FOR RANDOMLY REINFORCED URNS WITH RANDOM BARRIERS

PATRIZIA BERTI,* *Università di Modena e Reggio-Emilia*
IRENE CRIMALDI,** *IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca*
LUCA PRATELLI,*** *Accademia Navale Livorno*
PIETRO RIGO,**** *Università di Pavia*

Abstract

An urn contains black and red balls. Let Z_n be the proportion of black balls at time n and $0 \le L < U \le 1$ random barriers. At each time n, a ball b_n is drawn. If b_n is black and $Z_{n-1} < U$, then b_n is replaced together with a random number B_n of black balls. If b_n is red and $Z_{n-1} > L$, then b_n is replaced together with a random number R_n of red balls. Otherwise, no additional balls are added, and b_n alone is replaced. In this paper we assume that $R_n = B_n$. Then, under mild conditions, it is shown that $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z$ for some random variable Z, and $D_n := \sqrt{n}\,(Z_n - Z) \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ conditionally almost surely (a.s.), where σ^2 is a certain random variance. Almost sure conditional convergence means that $\mathbb{P}(D_n \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{w}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ a.s., where $\mathbb{P}(D_n \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n)$ is a regular version of the conditional distribution of D_n given the past $\mathcal{G}_n$. Thus, in particular, one obtains $D_n \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ stably. It is also shown that $L < Z < U$ a.s. and Z has nonatomic distribution.

Keywords: Bayesian nonparametric; central limit theorem; random probability measure; stable convergence; urn model

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60B10
Secondary 60F05; 60G57; 62F15

1. Introduction

In recent times, there has been a growing interest in the study of randomly reinforced urns. A meaningful version of this topic, introduced in [1] and supported by real applications, is explained in what follows.

1.1. Framework

An urn contains $b > 0$ black balls and $r > 0$ red balls. At each time, a ball is drawn and then replaced, possibly together with a random number of balls of the same color. Precisely, for each $n \ge 1$, let b_n denote the ball drawn at time n and Z_n the proportion of black balls in the urn at time n. Then,

- if b_n is black and $Z_{n-1} < U$, where U is a random barrier, b_n is replaced together with a random number $B_n \ge 0$ of black balls;

Received 15 October 2015; revision received 5 February 2016.
* Postal address: Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Informatiche e Matematiche, Università di Modena e Reggio-Emilia, via Campi 213/B, 41100 Modena, Italy.
** Postal address: IMT School for Advanced Studies, Piazza San Ponziano 6, 55100 Lucca, Italy.
*** Postal address: Accademia Navale Livorno, viale Italia 72, 57100 Livorno, Italy.
**** Postal address: Dipartimento di Matematica 'F. Casorati', Università di Pavia, via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy. Email address: pietro.rigo@unipv.it

- if b_n is red and $Z_{n-1} > L$, where $L < U$ is another random barrier, b_n is replaced together with a random number $R_n \geq 0$ of red balls;
- otherwise, b_n is replaced without additional balls, so that the composition of the urn does not change.

To model such urns, we fix a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ supporting the random variables $(L, U, X_n, B_n, R_n : n \geq 1)$ such that

$$0 \leq L < U \leq 1, \qquad X_n \in \{0, 1\}, \qquad 0 \leq B_n \leq c, \quad 0 \leq R_n \leq c \quad \text{for some constant } c.$$

We let

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \sigma(L, U), \qquad \mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(L, U, X_1, B_1, R_1, \dots, X_n, B_n, R_n), \qquad Z_0 = \frac{b}{b+r},$$

$$Z_n = \frac{b + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i B_i \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1} < U\}}}{b + r + \sum_{i=1}^n [X_i B_i \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1} < U\}} + (1 - X_i) R_i \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1} > L\}}]},$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the indicator function. Furthermore, we assume that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = Z_n \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{and} \quad (B_n, R_n) \quad \text{independent of} \quad \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{n-1}, X_n),$$

where, as usual, 'a.s.' means almost surely.

Clearly, X_n should be regarded as the indicator of the event {black ball at time n} and Z_n as the proportion of black balls in the urn at time n.

1.2. State of the art

Though the literature on randomly reinforced urns is quite extensive, random barriers have been a less popular area of study. In other words, the case $L = 0$ and $U = 1$ has been widely investigated (see, e.g. [2], [3], [4]–[6], [8], [11]–[15], and the references therein) but

$$\mathbb{P}(\{L > 0\} \cup \{U < 1\}) > 0$$

is almost neglected. To the best of the authors' knowledge, the only explicit reference is [1]. In that paper, the barriers L and U are not random (i.e. they are constant) and (B_n) and (R_n) are independent sequences of independent and identically distributed random variables. The a.s. convergence of Z_n is investigated, and it is shown that $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} L$ if $\mathbb{E}(B_1) < \mathbb{E}(R_1)$ and $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U$ if $\mathbb{E}(B_1) > \mathbb{E}(R_1)$, where '$\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}$' denotes almost sure convergence. Among other applications, this model could be usefully exploited in clinical trials, where a response adaptive design is needed to target a fixed asymptotic allocation.

1.3. Results

In a sense, in this paper we deal with the opposite case with respect to [1]. Indeed, while (B_n) and (R_n) are independent sequences in [1], throughout this paper it is assumed that

$$R_n = B_n \quad \text{for each } n \geq 1. \tag{1.1}$$

Condition (1.1) looks reasonable in several real applications. Furthermore, under (1.1), in addition to the a.s. convergence of Z_n, a central limit theorem can be obtained. Precisely, the following two results are proved.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theorem 1.1. *In the framework of Subsection 1.1, suppose that*

$$R_n = B_n \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_n \mathbb{E}(B_n) > 0.$$

Then,

$$Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z \quad \text{for some random variable } Z$$

such that $L \le Z \le U$ *and* $0 < Z < 1$ *a.s.*

Theorem 1.2. *In the framework of Subsection 1.1, suppose that*

$$R_n = B_n, \qquad m := \lim_n \mathbb{E}(B_n) > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad q := \lim_n \mathbb{E}(B_n^2).$$

Define

$$D_n = \sqrt{n}(Z_n - Z) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{qZ(1-Z)}{m^2},$$

where Z *is the a.s. limit of* Z_n. *Then,* $D_n \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ *conditionally a.s. with respect to* $(\mathcal{G}_n)$. *Moreover,* Z *has a nonatomic distribution and* $L < Z < U$ *a.s.*

In Theorem 1.2, $\mathcal{N}(a, b)$ denotes the Gaussian law with mean a and variance $b \ge 0$, where $\mathcal{N}(a, 0) = \delta_a$. Almost sure conditional convergence is a strong form of stable convergence, introduced in [9] and [10] and employed in [3], [6], [14], and [15]. The general definition is discussed in Section 2. In the present case, it means that

$$\mathbb{P}(D_n \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n)(\omega) \xrightarrow{\text{w}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(\omega)) \quad \text{for almost all } \omega \in \Omega,$$

where $\mathbb{P}(D_n \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n)$ is a regular version of the conditional distribution of D_n given $\mathcal{G}_n$, and '$\xrightarrow{\text{w}}$' denotes weak convergence. Thus, in particular, Theorem 1.2 yields $D_n \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ stably; see Lemma 2.1.

In Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 we establish the asymptotics for randomly reinforced urns with random barriers when $R_n = B_n$. The $R_n \ne B_n$ case, as well as some other possible developments, are discussed in Section 4.

A last note is that Theorem 1.2 agrees with the result obtained when random barriers are not taken into account. Indeed, if $L = 0$ and $U = 1$, Theorem 1.2 follows from [6, Corollary 3]. Similarly, Theorem 1.1 is quite in line with intuition. Thus, in a sense, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are fairly expected. Despite this fact, their proofs (or at least our proofs) are long and surprisingly involved. Such proofs are delayed to Section 3 after recalling some technical facts in Section 2.

2. Almost sure conditional convergence

Almost sure conditional convergence, introduced in [9] and [10], may be regarded as a strong form of stable convergence. We now make it precise.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and S a metric space. A *kernel* on S (or a *random probability measure* on S) is a measurable collection $N = \{N(\omega) \colon \omega \in \Omega\}$ of probability measures on the Borel σ-field on S. Measurability means that

$$N(\cdot)(f) = \int f(x) N(\cdot)(\mathrm{d}x)$$

is a real random variable for each bounded Borel map $f \colon S \to \mathbb{R}$. To denote such a random variable in the sequel, we will often write $N(f)$ instead of $N(\cdot)(f)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For each $n \geq 1$, fix a sub-σ-field $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathcal{A}$. Also, let (Y_n) be a sequence of S-valued random variables and N a kernel on S. Say that Y_n converges to N, *conditionally a.s. with respect to* $(\mathcal{F}_n)$, if

$$\mathbb{E}(f(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} N(f) \quad \text{for each } f \in C_b(S). \tag{2.1}$$

If S is Polish, condition (2.1) has a quite transparent meaning. Suppose, in fact, S is Polish, and fix a regular version $\mathbb{P}(Y_n \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_n)$ of the conditional distribution of Y_n given $\mathcal{F}_n$. Then, condition (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_n \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_n)(\omega) \xrightarrow{\text{w}} N(\omega) \quad \text{for almost all } \omega \in \Omega.$$

So far, $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ is an arbitrary sequence of sub-σ-fields. Suppose now that $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ is a filtration, in the sense that $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathcal{F}_{n+1} \subset \mathcal{A}$ for each n. Then, under a mild measurability condition, almost sure conditional convergence implies stable convergence. This is noted in [9, Section 5] but we give a proof to make the paper self-contained. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma\Big(\bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n\Big).$$

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ is a filtration such that $N(f)$ and Y_n are $\mathcal{F}_\infty$-measurable for all $f \in C_b(S)$ and $n \geq 1$. If $Y_n \to N$ conditionally a.s. with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_n)$, then $Y_n \to N$ stably; that is,*

$$\mathbb{E}(N(f) \mid H) = \lim_n \mathbb{E}(f(Y_n) \mid H),$$

whenever $f \in C_b(S)$, $H \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\mathbb{P}(H) > 0$.

Proof. Let $f \in C_b(S)$ and $H \in \mathcal{A}$. If $H \in \bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n$ then $H \in \mathcal{F}_n$ for each sufficiently large n, so that

$$\mathbb{E}(N(f)\,\mathbf{1}_H) = \lim_n \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(f(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n)\,\mathbf{1}_H) = \lim_n \mathbb{E}(f(Y_n)\,\mathbf{1}_H).$$

Since $\bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n$ is a field, by standard arguments, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(N(f)V) = \lim_n \mathbb{E}(f(Y_n)V),$$

whenever V is bounded and $\mathcal{F}_\infty$-measurable. Hence, for arbitrary $H \in \mathcal{A}$, the measurability condition implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(N(f)\,\mathbf{1}_H) = \mathbb{E}(N(f)\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_H \mid \mathcal{F}_\infty)) = \lim_n \mathbb{E}(f(Y_n)\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_H \mid \mathcal{F}_\infty)) = \lim_n \mathbb{E}(f(Y_n)\,\mathbf{1}_H),$$

concluding the proof. □

Note that the measurability condition of Lemma 2.1 holds trivially if $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \mathcal{A}$.

We refer the reader to [9] and [10] for more on almost sure conditional convergence. Here, for ease of reference, we report three useful facts. The first and the second are already known (see [6, Proposition 1 and Lemma 2] and [10, Theorem 2.2]), while the third is an immediate consequence of condition (2.1). In each of these facts, $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ is a filtration.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that the Y_n are real random variables such that $Y_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Y$. Then,*

$$\sqrt{n}(Y_n - Y) \to \mathcal{N}(0, U), \quad \textit{conditionally a.s. with respect to } (\mathcal{F}_n),$$

where U is a real random variable, provided that

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(i) (Y_n) *is a uniformly integrable martingale with respect to* $(\mathcal{F}_n)$*;*

(ii) $\mathbb{E}(\sup_n \sqrt{n}|Y_n - Y_{n-1}|) < \infty$*;*

(iii) $n\sum_{k\geq n}(Y_k - Y_{k-1})^2 \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U$.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that the* Y_n *are real random variables. If* (Y_n) *is adapted to* $(\mathcal{F}_n)$*,* $\sum_n n^{-2}\mathbb{E}(Y_n^2) < \infty$*, and* $\mathbb{E}(Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U$ *for some real random variable* U*, then*

$$n\sum_{k\geq n}\frac{Y_k}{k^2} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} Y_k \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that* $Y_n \to N$ *conditionally a.s. with respect to* $(\mathcal{F}_n)$*. Define* $Q(A) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_A V)$ *for* $A \in \mathcal{A}$*, where* $V \geq 0$*,* $\mathbb{E}(V) = 1$*, and* V *is* $\mathcal{F}_\infty$*-measurable. Then* $Y_n \to N$*, conditionally a.s. with respect to* $(\mathcal{F}_n)$*, under* Q *as well.*

Proof. Suppose first that $\sup V < \infty$ and define $K_n = V - \mathbb{E}(V \mid \mathcal{F}_n)$. Given $f \in C_b(S)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_Q(f(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}(Vf(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n)}{\mathbb{E}(V \mid \mathcal{F}_n)}\\ &= \mathbb{E}(f(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n) + \frac{\mathbb{E}(K_n f(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n)}{\mathbb{E}(V \mid \mathcal{F}_n)}, \qquad Q\text{-a.s.},\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_Q$ denotes expectation under Q. Since $\sigma(V) \subset \mathcal{F}_\infty$ and $|K_n| \leq \sup V$ a.s., the martingale convergence theorem (in the version of [7]) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(V \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}(V \mid \mathcal{F}_\infty) = V, \qquad |\mathbb{E}(K_n f(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n)| \leq \sup|f|\mathbb{E}(|K_n| \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

Since $Q(V > 0) = 1$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_Q(f(Y_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \to N(f)$, Q-a.s. This concludes the proof for bounded V. If V is not bounded, it suffices to replace V with $V\,\mathbf{1}_{\{V\leq v\}}/\mathbb{E}(V\,\mathbf{1}_{\{V\leq v\}})$ and to take the limit as $v \to \infty$. □

3. Proofs

In the sequel, for any events $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}$, we say that A_n *eventually holds on* B (or, more briefly, A_n *eventually on* B) whenever

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega \in B : \omega \notin A_n \text{ for infinitely many } n) = 0.$$

Assume the conditions of Subsection 1.1 hold and $R_n = B_n$. Let

$$S_n = b + r + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[X_i B_i\,\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}<U\}} + (1 - X_i)B_i\,\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}>L\}}]$$

denote the denominator of Z_n; namely, the number of balls in the urn at time n. Also, the filtration $(\mathcal{G}_n)$ is abbreviated to $\mathcal{G}$.

After some (tedious but easy) algebra, one obtains

$$Z_{n+1} - Z_n = Z_n H_n + \Delta_{n+1},$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where

$$H_n = \frac{B_{n+1}}{S_n + B_{n+1}}(1 - Z_n)(\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n<U\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n>L\}}),$$
$$\Delta_{n+1} = \frac{B_{n+1}}{S_n + B_{n+1}}(X_{n+1} - Z_n)((1 - Z_n)\,\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n<U\}} + Z_n\,\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n>L\}}).$$

Expressing $Z_{n+1} - Z_n$ in this form is fundamental for our purposes.

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this subsection, it is assumed that $\liminf_n \mathbb{E}(B_n) > 0$.

Since $\mathbb{E}(X_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n, B_{n+1}) = \mathbb{E}(X_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = Z_n$ a.s. then $\mathbb{E}(\Delta_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = 0$ a.s. This fact has two useful consequences. First,

$$M_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Delta_i$$

is a $\mathcal{G}$-martingale. Secondly, (Z_n) is a $\mathcal{G}$-sub-martingale in the $U = 1$ case. In fact, $U = 1$ implies $H_n \geq 0$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_{n+1} - Z_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = \mathbb{E}(Z_n H_n + \Delta_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n) = Z_n \mathbb{E}(H_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \geq 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Similarly, if $L = 0$ then (Z_n) is a $\mathcal{G}$-super-martingale. Therefore, it is not difficult to see that Z_n converges a.s. on the set $\{L = 0\} \cup \{U = 1\}$.

We next state two lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $Z_* = \liminf_n Z_n$ and $Z^* = \limsup_n Z_n$. Each of the following statements implies the subsequent:*

(i) $0 < L < U < 1$ *a.s.;*

(ii) $0 < Z_* \leq Z^* < 1$ *a.s.;*

(iii) $\liminf_n (S_n/n) > 0$ *a.s.;*

(iv) M_n *converges a.s.*

Proof. We show that (i) implies (ii). Let $H = \{Z_* = 0,\ L > 0\}$. On the set H, one obtains

$$\sup_n S_n = \infty, \qquad \lim_n (Z_{n+1} - Z_n) = 0, \qquad Z_n > L \quad \text{for infinitely many } n.$$

Define $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\tau_n = \inf\{k\colon k > \tau_{n-1},\ Z_{k-1} > L,\ Z_k \leq L\}$. Then, $\tau_n < \infty$ for all n on H. Observe now that $Z_j \geq Z_{j-1}$ whenever $Z_{j-1} \leq L$. Hence, $Z_* = \liminf_n Z_n = \liminf_n Z_{\tau_n}$ on H, which implies the contradiction

$$Z_* \geq \liminf_n Z_{\tau_{n-1}} + \liminf_n (Z_{\tau_n} - Z_{\tau_{n-1}}) = \liminf_n Z_{\tau_{n-1}} \geq L > 0 \quad \text{a.s. on } H.$$

Thus, under (i), we obtain $\mathbb{P}(Z_* = 0) = \mathbb{P}(H) = 0$. Similarly, $\mathbb{P}(Z^* = 1) = 0$.

We now show that (ii) implies (iii). Define

$$K_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}<U\}}[X_i B_i - Z_{i-1}\mathbb{E}(B_i)] + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}>L\}}[(1 - X_i)B_i - (1 - Z_{i-1})\mathbb{E}(B_i)]}{i}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since K_n is a $\mathcal{G}$-martingale and $\sup_n \mathbb{E}(K_n^2) < \infty$, then K_n converges a.s. Thus, Kronecker's lemma implies that $(1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n i K_i \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$, so that

$$\liminf_n \frac{S_n}{n} = \liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}<U\}} Z_{i-1}\mathbb{E}(B_i) + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}>L\}}(1 - Z_{i-1})\mathbb{E}(B_i)) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since $\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}<U\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}>L\}} \ge 1$, we finally obtain

$$\liminf_n \frac{S_n}{n} \ge \{Z_* \wedge (1 - Z^*)\} \liminf_n \mathbb{E}(B_n) > 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We now show that (iii) implies (iv). Since $0 \le B_{n+1} \le c$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}((M_{n+1} - M_n)^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_n) &= \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{n+1}^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_n)\\ &\le \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{B_{n+1}^2}{S_n^2} \mid \mathcal{G}_n\bigg)\\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}(B_{n+1}^2)}{S_n^2}\\ &\le \frac{c^2}{n^2}\frac{1}{(S_n/n)^2} \quad \text{a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sum_n \mathbb{E}((M_{n+1} - M_n)^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_n) < \infty$ a.s. by condition (iii). It follows that the $\mathcal{G}$-martingale M_n converges a.s. □

Lemma 3.2. *If* $\liminf_n(S_n/n) > 0$ *a.s., then* $\mathbb{P}(D) = 0$*, where*

$$D = \{Z_a \le L \text{ for infinitely many } a \text{ and } Z_b \ge U \text{ for infinitely many } b\}.$$

Proof. On D, there is a sequence (a_n, b_n) such that $a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < b_2 < \cdots$ and

$$Z_{a_n} \le L, \qquad Z_{b_n} \ge U, \qquad L < Z_k < U \quad \text{for each } a_n < k < b_n.$$

Since $H_k = 0$ if $a_n < k < b_n$, then

$$U - L \le Z_{b_n} - Z_{a_n} = \sum_{k=a_n}^{b_n-1}(Z_{k+1} - Z_k) = \sum_{k=a_n}^{b_n-1}(Z_k H_k + \Delta_{k+1}) = Z_{a_n} H_{a_n} + M_{b_n} - M_{a_n}.$$

Since $\liminf_n(S_n/n) > 0$ a.s. then $\sup_n S_n = \infty$ a.s., which implies that $H_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$. Also, by Lemma 3.1, M_n converges a.s. Hence, taking the limit as $n \to \infty$, we obtain $U - L \le 0$ a.s. on D. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(D) = 0$. □

We are now ready to prove the a.s. convergence of Z_n.

Since Z_n converges a.s. on the set $\{L = 0\} \cup \{U = 1\}$, it can be assumed that $\mathbb{P}(0 < L < U < 1) > 0$. In turn, up to replacing $\mathbb{P}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid 0 < L < U < 1)$, it can be assumed that $0 < L < U < 1$ a.s. Then, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 imply that $\mathbb{P}(D^c) = 1$ and the a.s. convergence of M_n. Write

$$Z_n - Z_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(Z_{i+1} - Z_i) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} Z_i H_i + M_n = K_n + M_n,$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $K_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} Z_i H_i$. On the set D^c, one has either $Z_i H_i \geq 0$ eventually or $Z_i H_i \leq 0$ eventually. Hence, on D^c, the sequence K_n converges if and only if it is bounded. But K_n is a.s. bounded, since $|K_n| \leq 1 + \sup_k |M_k|$ and M_n converges a.s. Thus, Z_n converges a.s. on D^c. This proves the a.s. convergence of Z_n for $\mathbb{P}(D^c) = 1$.

Let Z denote the a.s. limit of Z_n. Since $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 1$ on the set $\{Z < L\}$ and $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$ on the set $\{Z > U\}$, then $L \leq Z \leq U$ a.s.

It remains to show that $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = \mathbb{P}(Z = 1) = 0$. We prove only $\mathbb{P}(Z = 1) = 0$. The proof of $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 0$ is quite analogous.

Since $Z \leq U \leq 1$ a.s. then $\mathbb{P}(Z = 1) \leq \mathbb{P}(U = 1)$. Thus, it can be assumed that $\mathbb{P}(U = 1) > 0$. In turn, up to replacing $\mathbb{P}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid U = 1)$, it can be assumed that $U = 1$ everywhere. Then, Z_n is a $\mathcal{G}$-sub-martingale, so that

$$Y_n = \frac{Z_n}{1 - Z_n}$$

is still a $\mathcal{G}$-sub-martingale. Let $H = \{\sum_n \mathbb{E}(Y_{n+1} - Y_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n) < \infty\}$. Since Y_n is a positive $\mathcal{G}$-sub-martingale, Y_n converges a.s. (to a real random variable) on the set H. Thus, to obtain $\mathbb{P}(Z = 1) = 0$, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_n \mathbb{E}(Y_{n+1} - Y_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n) < \infty \quad \text{a.s. on the set } \{Z = 1\}. \tag{3.1}$$

To prove (3.1), let

$$J_n = b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i B_i \quad \text{and} \quad L_n = S_n - J_n = r + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - X_i) B_i \, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1} > L\}}$$

be the numbers of black balls and red balls, respectively, in the urn at time n (recall that $U = 1$, so that $Z_{i-1} < U$ automatically holds). On noting that $Y_n = J_n / L_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(Y_{n+1} - Y_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \\
&\quad = -Y_n + \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{J_n + B_{n+1}}{L_n} X_{n+1} + \frac{J_n}{L_n + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > L\}} \, B_{n+1}} (1 - X_{n+1}) \;\bigg|\; \mathcal{G}_n\bigg) \\
&\quad = -Y_n + Z_n \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{J_n + B_{n+1}}{L_n} \;\bigg|\; \mathcal{G}_n\bigg) + (1 - Z_n) \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{J_n}{L_n + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > L\}} \, B_{n+1}} \;\bigg|\; \mathcal{G}_n\bigg) \\
&\quad = -Y_n (1 - Z_n) + \frac{Z_n \mathbb{E}(B_{n+1})}{L_n} + Y_n (1 - Z_n) \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{L_n}{L_n + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > L\}} \, B_{n+1}} \;\bigg|\; \mathcal{G}_n\bigg) \\
&\quad = \frac{Z_n \mathbb{E}(B_{n+1})}{L_n} - Z_n \, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > L\}} \, \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{B_{n+1}}{L_n + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > L\}} \, B_{n+1}} \;\bigg|\; \mathcal{G}_n\bigg) \\
&\quad \leq \frac{Z_n \mathbb{E}(B_{n+1})}{L_n} - Z_n \, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > L\}} \, \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{B_{n+1}}{L_n + c} \;\bigg|\; \mathcal{G}_n\bigg) \\
&\quad = \frac{Z_n \mathbb{E}(B_{n+1})}{L_n} - Z_n \, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_n > L\}} \, \frac{\mathbb{E}(B_{n+1})}{L_n + c} \quad \text{a.s.}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z$ then $Z_n > L$ eventually on the set $\{Z = 1\}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{n+1} - Y_n \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \leq Z_n \mathbb{E}(B_{n+1}) \bigg(\frac{1}{L_n} - \frac{1}{L_n + c}\bigg) \leq \frac{c^2}{L_n^2} \quad \text{eventually on } \{Z = 1\}.$$

Next, given $k \in (1, 2)$, it is not hard to see that

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{J_{n+1}}{L_{n+1}^k} - \frac{J_n}{L_n^k} \,\bigg|\, \mathcal{G}_n\bigg) \le 0 \quad \text{eventually on } \{Z = 1\}.$$

We omit the calculations as they exactly agree with those for proving [13, Lemma A.1(ii)]. Thus, the sequence J_n/L_n^k converges a.s. on $\{Z = 1\}$. Furthermore, the independence of the B_n yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_n \frac{J_n}{n} &= \liminf_n \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i}{n} \frac{S_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i} Z_n \\
&= \liminf_n \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i}{n} \\
&= \liminf_n \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(B_i)}{n} \\
&\ge \liminf_n \mathbb{E}(B_n) \\
&> 0 \quad \text{a.s. on } \{Z = 1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Given any $\gamma < 1$, it follows that

$$\frac{n^\gamma}{L_n^k} = \frac{n^\gamma}{n} \frac{n}{J_n} \frac{J_n}{L_n^k} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0 \quad \text{a.s. on } \{Z = 1\}.$$

Thus, $L_n > n^{\gamma/k}$ eventually on $\{Z = 1\}$. Since $k < 2$, one can take $\gamma < 1$ such that $\gamma/k > \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, condition (3.1) holds, and this concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this subsection, it is assumed that

$$m := \lim_n \mathbb{E}(B_n) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad q := \lim_n \mathbb{E}(B_n^2).$$

By Theorem 1.1, $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z$ for some random variable Z such that $L \le Z \le U$ and $0 < Z < 1$ a.s.

On noting that $0 < Z_* = Z = Z^* < 1$ a.s., the same argument used after Lemma 3.2 yields $\sum_n Z_n |H_n| < \infty$ a.s. Since $Z > 0$ a.s., it follows that

$$\sum_n |H_n| < \infty \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{3.2}$$

Define

$$T_n = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 + H_i) \quad \text{and} \quad W_n = \frac{Z_n}{T_n}.$$

Condition (3.2) implies that $T_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} T$, for some real random variable $T > 0$, so that

$$W_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{Z}{T} := W.$$

Our next goal is to show that $\sqrt{n}(W_n - W)$ converges conditionally a.s. To this end, we first fix the asymptotic behavior of S_n.

Lemma 3.3. *It holds that* $S_n/n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} m$.

Proof. Let $Q_n = \sum_{i=1}^n B_i[X_i\, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}\geq U\}} + (1-X_i)\, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}\leq L\}}]$. Since $Z_i \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z$ then $1-Z_i > (1-Z)/2$ eventually. Moreover, $\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}\geq U\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}\leq L\}} = |\,\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}<U\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}>L\}}\,|$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} B_i[X_i\, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}\geq U\}} + (1-X_i)\, \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}\leq L\}}] &\leq B_i\,|\,\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}<U\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{i-1}>L\}}\,| \\ &= |H_{i-1}| \frac{S_{i-1}+B_i}{1-Z_{i-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{2|H_{i-1}|}{1-Z}(S_{i-1}+B_i) \quad \text{eventually.} \end{aligned}$$

By condition (3.2) and Kronecker's lemma,

$$\frac{Q_n}{S_n} \leq \frac{2}{1-Z}\frac{1}{S_n}\sum_{i=1}^n |H_{i-1}|S_{i-1} + \frac{2c}{1-Z}\frac{1}{S_n}\sum_{i=1}^n |H_{i-1}| \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{Q_n}{n} = \frac{Q_n}{S_n}\frac{S_n}{n} \leq \frac{Q_n}{S_n}\frac{r+b+nc}{n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

On noting that $(1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n B_i \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} m$, we finally obtain

$$\frac{S_n}{n} = \frac{r+b}{n} - \frac{Q_n}{n} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i}{n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} m. \qquad \square$$

In view of the next lemma, we recall that

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{qZ(1-Z)}{m^2}.$$

Lemma 3.4. *It holds that*

$$\sqrt{n}(W_n - W) \to \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\sigma^2}{T^2}\right) \quad \textit{conditionally a.s. with respect to } \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. First note that W_n can be written as

$$W_n = Z_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\Delta_{i+1}}{T_{i+1}}.$$

Thus, W_n is a $\mathcal{G}$-martingale and the obvious strategy would be applying Lemma 2.2 to $Y_n = W_n$. However, Lemmas 2.2(i)–(iii) are not easy to check with $Y_n = W_n$. Accordingly, we adopt an approximation procedure.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$W_n^{(\varepsilon)} = Z_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\Delta_{i+1}\,\mathbf{1}_{A_i}}{\varepsilon \vee T_{i+1}},$$

where $A_i = \{2S_i > im\}$. For fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $W_n^{(\varepsilon)}$ is still a $\mathcal{G}$-martingale and

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}((W_n^{(\varepsilon)})^2) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}(\Delta_{i+1}^2\,\mathbf{1}_{A_i}) \leq 1 + \frac{c^2}{\varepsilon^2}\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_i}}{S_i^2}\right) \leq 1 + \left(\frac{2c}{m\varepsilon}\right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^\infty \frac{1}{i^2}.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hence, $W_n^{(\varepsilon)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} W^{(\varepsilon)}$ for some random variable $W^{(\varepsilon)}$. Since $S_n/n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} m$, the events A_n hold eventually, so that

$$W - W_n = \sum_{i \geq n} \frac{\Delta_{i+1}}{T_{i+1}} = \sum_{i \geq n} \frac{\Delta_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{A_i}}{\varepsilon \vee T_{i+1}} = W^{(\varepsilon)} - W_n^{(\varepsilon)} \quad \text{eventually on } \{T > \varepsilon\}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that, for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sqrt{n}\{W_n^{(\varepsilon)} - W^{(\varepsilon)}\} \to \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\sigma^2}{(\varepsilon \vee T)^2}\right) \quad \text{conditionally a.s. with respect to } \mathcal{G}.$$

In turn, since $W_n^{(\varepsilon)}$ is a uniformly integrable $\mathcal{G}$-martingale, it suffices to check Lemmas 2.2(ii) and 2.2(iii) with $Y_n = W_n^{(\varepsilon)}$ and $U = \sigma^2/(\varepsilon \vee T)^2$. As to Lemma 2.2(ii),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\left(\sup_n \sqrt{n}|W_n^{(\varepsilon)} - W_{n-1}^{(\varepsilon)}|\right)^4\right) &\leq \sum_n n^2 \mathbb{E}((W_n^{(\varepsilon)} - W_{n-1}^{(\varepsilon)})^4) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \sum_n n^2 \mathbb{E}(\Delta_n^4 \mathbf{1}_{A_{n-1}}) \\
&\leq \frac{c^4}{\varepsilon^4} \sum_n n^2 \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_{n-1}}}{S_{n-1}^4}\right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{2c}{m\varepsilon}\right)^4 \sum_n \frac{n^2}{(n-1)^4} \\
&< \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

We next turn to Lemma 2.2(iii). We have to prove that

$$n \sum_{k \geq n} (W_k^{(\varepsilon)} - W_{k-1}^{(\varepsilon)})^2 = n \sum_{k \geq n} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{A_{k-1}} \Delta_k^2}{(\varepsilon \vee T_k)^2} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \frac{\sigma^2}{(\varepsilon \vee T)^2}.$$

Since $T_k \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} T$, the above condition reduces to

$$n \sum_{k \geq n} \mathbf{1}_{A_{k-1}} \Delta_k^2 \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \sigma^2. \tag{3.3}$$

Since $1 - Z_k > (1 - Z)/2$ eventually and $\sum_k |H_k| < \infty$ a.s., Abel's summation formula yields

$$\begin{aligned}
n \sum_{k \geq n} \mathbf{1}_{A_{k-1}} \frac{B_k^2}{(S_{k-1} + B_k)^2} (\mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{k-1} \geq U\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{k-1} \leq L\}}) &= n \sum_{k \geq n} \mathbf{1}_{A_{k-1}} \frac{B_k}{S_{k-1} + B_k} \frac{|H_{k-1}|}{1 - Z_{k-1}} \\
&\leq \frac{2cn}{1 - Z} \sum_{k \geq n} \mathbf{1}_{A_{k-1}} \frac{|H_{k-1}|}{S_{k-1}} \\
&\leq \frac{4cn}{m(1 - Z)} \sum_{k \geq n} \frac{|H_{k-1}|}{k - 1} \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hence, in order to obtain (3.3), it suffices to prove that

$$n\sum_{k\geq n}\mathbf{1}_{A_{k-1}}\frac{B_k^2}{(S_{k-1}+B_k)^2}(X_k-Z_{k-1})^2\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}\sigma^2.$$

Finally, such a condition follows from Lemma 2.3 if $\mathbb{E}(V_{n+1}\mid\mathcal{G}_n)\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}\sigma^2$, where

$$V_n=n^2\,\mathbf{1}_{A_{n-1}}\frac{B_n^2}{(S_{n-1}+B_n)^2}(X_n-Z_{n-1})^2.$$

In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(V_{n+1}\mid\mathcal{G}_n)&=\mathbf{1}_{A_n}(n+1)^2\mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{B_{n+1}^2}{(S_n+B_{n+1})^2}(X_{n+1}-Z_n)^2\;\bigg|\;\mathcal{G}_n\bigg)\\&\leq(n+1)^2\mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{B_{n+1}^2}{S_n^2}(X_{n+1}-Z_n)^2\;\bigg|\;\mathcal{G}_n\bigg)\\&=\frac{(n+1)^2}{S_n^2}\mathbb{E}(B_{n+1}^2(X_{n+1}-Z_n)^2\mid\mathcal{G}_n)\\&=\frac{(n+1)^2}{S_n^2}\mathbb{E}(B_{n+1}^2)\mathbb{E}((X_{n+1}-Z_n)^2\mid\mathcal{G}_n)\\&=\frac{(n+1)^2}{S_n^2}\mathbb{E}(B_{n+1}^2)Z_n(1-Z_n)\\&\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}\frac{qZ(1-Z)}{m^2}\\&=\sigma^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since the events A_n hold eventually, we similarly obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(V_{n+1}\mid\mathcal{G}_n)&\geq\mathbf{1}_{A_n}(n+1)^2\mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{B_{n+1}^2}{(S_n+c)^2}(X_{n+1}-Z_n)^2\;\bigg|\;\mathcal{G}_n\bigg)\\&=\mathbf{1}_{A_n}\frac{(n+1)^2}{(S_n+c)^2}\mathbb{E}(B_{n+1}^2(X_{n+1}-Z_n)^2\mid\mathcal{G}_n)\\&\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}\sigma^2.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E}(V_{n+1}\mid\mathcal{G}_n)\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}\sigma^2$. This proves condition (3.3) and concludes the proof. □

Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.4. Define in fact

$$D_n=\sqrt{n}(Z_n-Z)\quad\text{and}\quad F_n=\prod_{i=n}^{\infty}(1+H_i).$$

Due to Lemma 3.4,

$$\sqrt{n}(F_nZ_n-Z)=T\sqrt{n}(W_n-W)\to\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)$$

conditionally a.s. with respect to $\mathcal{G}$.

If $L<Z<U$ a.s. then $L<Z_n<U$ eventually, which, in turn, implies that $F_n=1$ and $D_n=\sqrt{n}(F_nZ_n-Z)$ eventually. Thus, $D_n\to\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)$, conditionally a.s. with respect to $\mathcal{G}$, provided that $L<Z<U$ a.s.

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemma 3.5. *It holds that* $\mathbb{P}(L < Z < U) = 1$.

Proof. We prove only that $\mathbb{P}(Z = L) = 0$. The proof of $\mathbb{P}(Z = U) = 0$ is the same. Since $\mathbb{P}(Z = L = 0) \le \mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 0$, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}(Z = L > 0) = 0$. Let $H = \{Z = L > 0\}$. Toward a contradiction, suppose that $\mathbb{P}(H) > 0$ and define $Q(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid H)$. Since $\sqrt{n}(Z_n - L)$ is $\mathcal{G}_n$-measurable and

$$D_n = \sqrt{n}(Z_n - Z) \le \sqrt{n}(Z_n F_n - Z) \quad \text{if } F_n \ge 1,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_{\{\sqrt{n}(Z_n-L)\le 0\}} &= Q(D_n \le 0 \mid \mathcal{G}_n)\\ &\ge Q(F_n \ge 1,\ \sqrt{n}(Z_n F_n - Z) \le 0 \mid \mathcal{G}_n)\\ &\ge Q(\sqrt{n}(Z_n F_n - Z) \le 0 \mid \mathcal{G}_n) - Q(F_n < 1 \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \quad \text{a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

Since $Z_n < U$ eventually on H, then $F_n \ge 1$ eventually on H. Hence, the martingale convergence theorem in [7] yields $Q(F_n < 1 \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \to 0$, Q-a.s. By Lemma 2.4 and $\sigma^2 > 0$ a.s., it follows that

$$Q(\sqrt{n}(Z_n F_n - Z) \le 0 \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)((-\infty, 0]) = \tfrac{1}{2}, \quad Q\text{-a.s.}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{1}_{\{\sqrt{n}(Z_n-L)\le 0\}} \to 1$, Q-a.s., namely, $Z_n \le L$ eventually on H, which implies the contradiction $Z_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 1$ on H. Thus, $\mathbb{P}(H) = 0$. □

It remains only to show that Z has nonatomic distribution. This follows from the same argument of Lemma 3.5. Suppose in fact $\mathbb{P}(Z = z) > 0$ for some $z \in (0, 1)$ and define $Q(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid Z = z)$. Then, on the complement of a Q-null set, one obtains the contradiction $\sigma^2 = qz(1 - z)/m^2 > 0$ and

$$\delta_{\sqrt{n}(Z_n - z)}(\cdot) = Q(D_n \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{w}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2).$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

4. Concluding remarks

Some hints for future research, partly suggested by an anonymous referee, are listed in this section.

- The assumption $R_n = B_n$ makes sense in a number of real applications. But clearly Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 would be much improved if such an assumption could be relaxed. In case $L = 0$ and $U = 1$, actually, $R_n = B_n$ may be weakened into

  $$\mathbb{E}(R_n) = \mathbb{E}(B_n) \quad \text{for all } n \ge 1;$$

  see [6, Corollary 3]. Also, up to minor complications, various points in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 seem to run assuming only that $\mathbb{E}(R_n) = \mathbb{E}(B_n)$. Thus, we *conjecture* that Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are still valid if $R_n = B_n$ is replaced by $\mathbb{E}(R_n) = \mathbb{E}(B_n)$.

- Let $\overline{X}_n = (1/n)\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $C_n = \sqrt{n}(\overline{X}_n - Z_n)$. If $L = 0$ and $U = 1$, as shown in [6, Corollary 3], one obtains

  $$C_n \to \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 - Z(1 - Z)) \quad \text{stably.}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/jpr.2016.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus, the asymptotic behavior of C_n, or even of the pair (C_n, D_n), could be investigated in the general case $0 \le L < U \le 1$. Again, this could be (tentatively) performed assuming that $\mathbb{E}(R_n) = \mathbb{E}(B_n)$ instead of $R_n = B_n$.

- Since $\mathcal{G}_0 = \sigma(L, U)$ and (B_n, R_n) is independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_{n-1}, X_n)$, the barriers L and U could be assumed to be constants (i.e. nonrandom). Such an assumption has not been made, however, for it does not simplify any point in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Rather, L and U could be made dependent on the time. In other words, L and U could be replaced by L_n and U_n such that $L_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} L$ and $U_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U$.
- Let μ be the probability distribution of Z. Even if $L = 0$ and $U = 1$, very little about μ is known; see [2]. Some information on μ, possibly in the general case $0 \le L < U \le 1$, would be a major step forward. For instance, under which conditions is μ absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure? Or else, is it possible to (explicitly) connect μ with the distribution of (L, U)?
- A last (obvious) improvement is considering multicolor urns instead of two-color urns. Indeed, most additional problems arising in the multicolor case are of the notational type. Similarly, the framework in Subsection 1.1 could be generalized. For instance, $B_n \vee R_n \le c$ could be replaced by a suitable moment condition. Or else, (B_n, R_n) independent of $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_{n-1}, X_n)$ could be replaced by (B_n, R_n) conditionally independent of X_n given $\mathcal{G}_{n-1}$.

Acknowledgements

Irene Crimaldi acknowledges support from CNR PNR Project 'CRISIS Lab'. Moreover, she is a member of the Italian group 'Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA)' of the Italian Institute 'Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM)'.

References

[1] Aletti, G., Ghiglietti, A. and Paganoni, A. M. (2013). Randomly reinforced urn designs with prespecified allocations. *J. Appl. Prob.* **50,** 486–498.

[2] Aletti, G., May, C. and Secchi, P. (2007). On the distribution of the limit proportion for a two-color, randomly reinforced urn with equal reinforcement distributions. *Adv. Appl. Prob.* **39,** 690–707.

[3] Aletti, G., May, C. and Secchi, P. (2009). A central limit theorem, and related results, for a two-color randomly reinforced urn. *Adv. Appl. Prob.* **41,** 829–844.

[4] Bai, Z. D. and Hu, F. (2005). Asymptotics in randomized URN models. *Ann. Appl. Prob.* **15,** 914–940.

[5] Berti, P., Crimaldi, I., Pratelli, L. and Rigo, P. (2010). Central limit theorems for multicolor urns with dominated colors. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **120,** 1473–1491.

[6] Berti, P., Crimaldi, I., Pratelli, L. and Rigo, P. (2011). A central limit theorem and its applications to multicolor randomly reinforced urns. *J. Appl. Prob.* **48,** 527–546.

[7] Blackwell, D. and Dubins, L. (1962). Merging of opinions with increasing information. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **33,** 882–886.

[8] Chauvin, B., Pouyanne, N. and Sahnoun, R. (2011). Limit distributions for large Pólya urns. *Ann. Appl. Prob.* **21,** 1–32.

[9] Crimaldi, I., Letta, G. and Pratelli, L. (2007). A strong form of stable convergence. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XL* (Lecture Notes Math. **1899**), Springer, Berlin, pp. 203–225.

[10] Crimaldi, I. (2009). An almost sure conditional convergence result and an application to a generalized Pólya urn. *Internat. Math. Forum* **4,** 1139–1156.

[11] Laruelle, S. and Pagès, G. (2013). Randomized urn models revisited using stochastic approximation. *Ann. Appl. Prob.* **23,** 1409–1436.

[12] Mahmoud, H. M. (2009). *Pólya Urn Models*. CRC, Boca Raton, FL.

[13] MAY, C. AND FLOURNOY, N. (2009). Asymptotics in response-adaptive designs generated by a two-color, randomly reinforced urn. *Ann. Statist.* **37,** 1058–1078.

[14] ZHANG, L.-X. (2014). A Gaussian process approximation for two-color randomly reinforced urns. *Electron. J. Prob.* **19,** 86.

[15] ZHANG, L.-X., HU, F., CHEUNG, S. H. AND CHAN, W. S. (2014). Asymptotic properties of multicolor randomly reinforced Pólya urns. *Adv. Appl. Prob.* **46,** 585–602.