

How reactive gambling can backfire: ruin probability is increasing in p , Hölder continuous in initial fortune

Aditya Guha Roy, Yuval Peres, Shuo Qin, and Junchi Zuo

ABSTRACT. A gambler with an initial fortune x starts by betting a dollar, then doubles the bet after every win and halves the bet after every loss. Let $p \in (0, 1)$ be the probability of winning for each round. We show that the gambler survives with positive probability if and only if $p < 1/2$ and $x > 2$. Moreover, the ruin probability is increasing and real-analytic in p , but a singular, Hölder continuous function of x .

1. INTRODUCTION

As mentioned in [8, Chapter 1], about half of the players at blackjack tables increase their bets after winning, and decrease them after losing. This motivates us to study the following betting strategy: a gambler doubles the bet after every win and halves the bet after every loss. More precisely, let $B_1 := 1$ and $W_0 := x \geq 1$, and let $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be i.i.d. Rademacher random variables with parameter $p \in [0, 1]$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}(\xi_1 = 1) = 1 - \mathbf{P}(\xi_1 = -1) = p,$$

where $\xi_n = 1$ (resp. -1) represents the gambler wins (resp. loses) the n -th round. For $n \geq 1$, let

$$W_n := W_{n-1} + \xi_n B_n, \text{ and } B_{n+1} := B_n 2^{\xi_n}. \quad (1)$$

The random variables W_n and B_n should be interpreted, respectively, as the wealth of the gambler at time n and the amount of money the gambler bets at time step n . The rule $B_{n+1} = B_n 2^{\xi_n}$ means that the bet size is doubled after every win and halved after each loss. We will be interested in how the ruin probability

$$f(x, p) := \mathbf{P}(W_n \leq 0 \text{ for some } n | W_0 = x)$$

depends on the initial fortune x and the chance p of winning each round. In the cases of $p = 0$ and $p = 1$, the process is deterministic, which is of less interest: One has $f(x, 0) = 1$ if $x < 2$, and $f(x, 0) = 0$ if $x \geq 2$. Also, $f(x, 1) = 0$ for all $x \geq 1$. We shall henceforth assume that $p \in (0, 1)$.

Our first main result answers the question under what conditions the gambler can survive with positive probability (i.e., $f(x, p) < 1$).

Theorem 1.1. *The ruin probability $f(x, p) < 1$ if and only if $x > 2$ and $p < 1/2$.*

Remark 1.1. From the proof of Theorem 1.1, one can show that if we assumed in (1) that $B_{n+1} := B_n \rho^{\xi_n}$ for some $\rho > 1$, then the threshold for x would be $\rho/(\rho - 1)$.

To approximate the value of $f(x, p)$ on $(2, \infty) \times (0, 1/2)$ numerically, we can use the following sequence of functions $(f_n(x, p))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined on $\mathbb{R} \times (0, 1)$: Set $f_0(x, p) := \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 2]}(x)$, and let

$$f_{n+1}(x, p) = p f_n\left(\frac{x+1}{2}, p\right) + (1-p) f_n(2x-2, p), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2)$$




FIGURE 1. $f_n(x, p)$ is a step function in x and an analytic function in p

Proposition 1.2. *For $x > 2$, the sequence $(f_n(x, \cdot))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f(x, \cdot)$ locally uniformly on $(0, 1/2)$. For $p \in (0, 1/2)$, the sequence $(f_n(\cdot, p))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f(\cdot, p)$ locally uniformly on $(2, \infty)$. In particular, $f(x, p)$ satisfies*

$$f(x, p) = pf\left(\frac{x+1}{2}, p\right) + (1-p)f(2x-2, p), \quad (x, p) \in (2, \infty) \times \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right). \quad (3)$$

See Figure 1 for an illustration of $(f_n(x, p))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Notice that (2) implies that for any n , the function $x \mapsto f_n(x, p)$ is a step function for any p , while $p \mapsto f_n(x, p)$ is a polynomial for any x .

It is easy to see that $f(\cdot, p)$ is a decreasing function in x . Surprisingly, the ruin probability is an increasing function in p , the chance of winning each round.

Corollary 1.3. *For fixed $x > 2$, $f(x, \cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function on $(0, 1/2)$.*

Gambling theory offers natural examples of functions with singular differentiability properties, as shown by Dubins and Savage [3] and Billingsley [2]. In our case, the monotone functions $f(\cdot, p)$ and $f(x, \cdot)$ exhibit significantly different behaviors in terms of regularity:

- For $p \in (0, 1/2)$, the function $f(\cdot, p)$ is Hölder continuous with exponent bounded above by $\log_{1/2}(1-p)$, and is singular continuous, i.e., $f(\cdot, p)$ is continuous in x and $\partial_x f(x, p) = 0$ for almost every x with respect to the Lebesgue measure, see Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 (i) below.
- For $x > 2$, the function $f(x, \cdot)$ is analytic on $(0, 1/2)$, see Theorem 1.5 (ii) below.

Theorem 1.4. *For any $p \in (0, 1/2)$ and $x \geq 2, h > 0$, one has*

$$0 < f(x, p) - f(x+h, p) \leq \frac{C}{(1-2p)^2} \left(h^{\beta p^2} + h^{\beta(1-2p)^3} \right), \quad (4)$$

where C and β are two positive constants. Moreover, for $p \in (0, 1/2)$, we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 2+} \frac{\log(f(2, p) - f(x, p))}{\log(x-2)} = \log_{1/2}(1-p). \quad (5)$$

Theorem 1.5. (i) *For $p < 1/2$, the function $f(\cdot, p)$ is singular continuous.*
(ii) *For $x > 2$, the function $f(x, \cdot)$ is a real analytic function on $(0, 1/2)$.*

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let

$$Y_n := \frac{W_n}{B_{n+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad X_n = Y_n - 2. \quad (6)$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *If $Y_k \leq 2$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then the gambler goes bankrupt eventually a.s..*

Proof. By definition, one has

$$Y_{n+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{Y_n + 1}{2}, & \text{if } \xi_{n+1} = 1, \\ 2(Y_n - 1), & \text{if } \xi_{n+1} = -1. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Therefore, by induction, one has $Y_n \leq 2$ for all $n \geq k$. Since $p > 0$, a.s. there exists (a random) $k_1 > k$ such that $\xi_{k_1} = 1$, and in particular, $Y_{k_1} \leq 3/2$. Again, by induction, we see from (7) that $Y_n \leq 3/2$ for all $n \geq k_1$. Since $p < 1$, a.s. there exist $k_3 > k_2 > k_1$ such that $\xi_{k_3} = \xi_{k_2} = -1$. Similarly, one can show that

$$Y_n \leq 1, \text{ for all } n \geq k_2; \quad Y_{k_3} \leq 0,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Let $S_0 := 0$, and $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$ for $n \geq 1$ where $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are as in Section 1. Define

$$S := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n=1\}} 2^{S_{n-1}}. \quad (8)$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $x > 2$ and let S be as in (8). One has $f(x, p) = \mathbf{P}(S > x - 2)$.*

Proof. By (6) and (7), one has

$$X_{n+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{X_n - 1}{2}, & \text{if } \xi_{n+1} = 1, \\ 2X_n, & \text{if } \xi_{n+1} = -1. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

One can then easily check by induction that

$$X_n = 2^{-S_n}(x - 2) - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i=1\}} 2^{-S_n+S_{i-1}}, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (10)$$

Therefor, $Y_n > 2$ if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i=1\}} 2^{S_{i-1}} < x - 2. \quad (11)$$

By Lemma 2.1, the gambler survives eventually if and only if $Y_n > 2$ for all n , or equivalently,

$$S = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n=1\}} 2^{S_{n-1}} \leq x - 2,$$

where we used that $S > \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i=1\}} 2^{S_{i-1}}$ a.s. for any n . \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Lemma 2.1, if $x = Y_0 \leq 2$, then $f(x, p) = 1$. Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the filtration generated by $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$, i.e. $\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma(\xi_m, n \leq m)$. By the conditional Borel-Cantelli lemma, see e.g. [4, Theorem 4.3.4],

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n=1, S_{n-1} \geq 0\}} = \infty \quad \text{a.s. on } \left\{ \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{n-1} \geq 0\}} \mathbf{P}(\xi_n = 1 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \infty \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{P}(\xi_n = 1 \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = p$. If $p \geq 1/2$, then $S_n \geq 0$ infinitely often a.s., and in particular,

$$S \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n=1, S_{n-1} \geq 0\}} = \infty, \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.2, $f(x, p) = 1$ if $p \geq 1/2$.

It remains to show that $\mathbf{P}(S \leq x - 2) > 0$ if $x > 2$ and $p < 1/2$. Let $\varepsilon := 1/2 - p < -\mathbf{E}\xi_1$. By the strong law of large numbers, there exists a positive integer N_1 such that

$$\mathbf{P}(E_{N_1}) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{where } E_{N_1} := \bigcap_{n \geq N_1} \{S_n \leq -\varepsilon n\}.$$

By possibly choosing a larger N_1 , we have,

$$S \leq \sum_{n=N_1}^{\infty} 2^{S_n} \leq \frac{2^{-\varepsilon N_1}}{1 - 2^{-\varepsilon}} < x - 2 \quad \text{on} \quad \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{N_1} \{\xi_i = -1\} \right) \cap E_{N_1}. \quad (12)$$

A coupling argument implies that for any $(a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N_1} \in \{-1, 1\}^{N_1}$,

$$\mathbf{P}(E_{N_1} \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^{N_1} \{\xi_i = -1\}) \geq \mathbf{P}(E_{N_1} \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^{N_1} \{\xi_i = a_i\}).$$

In particular, the total probability theorem gives

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{N_1} \{\xi_i = -1\}\right) \cap E_{N_1}\right) = (1-p)^{N_1} \mathbf{P}(E_{N_1} \mid \bigcap_{i=1}^{N_1} \{\xi_i = -1\}) \geq (1-p)^{N_1} \mathbf{P}(E_{N_1}),$$

which completes the proof in view of (12). \square

3. RUIN PROBABILITY AS A FUNCTION OF THE INITIAL FORTUNE

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 (i). We first recall the Hoeffding-Azuma inequality, see [1].

Lemma 3.1 (Hoeffding-Azuma inequality). *Let $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a martingale (or submartingale) such that, for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, we can find positive constant c_j satisfying $|M_j - M_{j-1}| \leq c_j$ almost surely. Then, for any positive L ,*

$$\mathbf{P}(M_n - M_0 \leq -L) \leq e^{-\frac{L^2}{2 \sum_{k=1}^n c_k^2}}.$$

For $p < 1/2$, we let

$$R := \max \left\{ 2, \frac{2p}{(1-2p) \log 2} + 1 \right\}. \quad (13)$$

The following two lemmas will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p \in (0, 1/2)$ and $x > 2$. Let R be as in (13). Recall $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given in (6).*

(i) *The process $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by $M_0 := 0$ and*

$$M_n := \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\log X_j - \log X_{j-1} - \left(\frac{1}{2} - p\right) \log 2 \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{j-1} \geq R\}}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

is a submartingale such that $|M_n - M_{n-1}| \leq (5 \log 2)/2$ for all $n \geq 1$.

(ii) *For $k \geq 1$, let*

$$T_k := \#\{j \leq k : X_j \geq R\}$$

be the total time X has spend in $[R, \infty)$ until time k . Then, there exist positive constants C and β independent of x , p and k such that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(T_k > \frac{3k}{4}, X_n \leq 0 \text{ for some } n \geq k\right) \leq \frac{C}{(1-2p)^2} e^{-\beta(1-2p)^3 k}.$$

Proof. (i) Using that $\log(1+t) < t$ for $t > 0$, we have

$$\log\left(1 - \frac{1}{R}\right) = -\log\left(1 + \frac{1}{R-1}\right) > -\frac{1}{R-1} \geq -\frac{1-2p}{2p} \log 2.$$

Therefore, for all $r \geq R$,

$$p \log \frac{r-1}{2} + (1-p) \log 2r - \log r = p \log\left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right) + (1-2p) \log 2 > \left(\frac{1}{2} - p\right) \log 2. \quad (14)$$

which implies that $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a submartingale in view of (9). In addition, (9) yields

$$\log 2 \geq (\log X_n - \log X_{n-1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{n-1} \geq R\}} \geq -\log 2 + \log\left(1 - \frac{1}{R}\right) \geq -2 \log 2. \quad (15)$$

This shows that $|M_n - M_{n-1}| \leq (5 \log 2)/2$.

(ii) We first show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (\log X_j - \log X_{j-1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{j-1} \geq R\}} \leq (\log X_k - \log R) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{k-1} \geq R\}}. \quad (16)$$

This is trivial if $T_{k-1} = \emptyset$. We assume that $T_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$ and write T_{k-1} as a disjoint union of closed intervals, i.e. $T_{k-1} = \cup_{i=1}^{\ell} [a_i, b_i]$ where $\ell \geq 1$ and $a_1 \leq b_1 < a_2 \leq b_2 < \dots < a_{\ell} \leq b_{\ell}$ are natural numbers. Then, for each $i < \ell$, one has

$$\log X_{b_i+1} - \log X_{b_i} < \log R - \log X_{b_i} \leq \sum_{j=b_i+1}^{a_{i+1}} \log X_j - \log X_{j-1}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k (\log X_j - \log X_{j-1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{j-1} \geq R\}} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{j=a_i+1}^{b_i+1} (\log X_j - \log X_{j-1}) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=a_i+1}^{b_{\ell}+1} (\log X_j - \log X_{j-1}) \leq \log X_{b_{\ell}+1} - \log R, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (16). Note that if $X_{k-1} \geq R$, then $b_{\ell} + 1 = k$; if $X_{k-1} < R$, then $X_{b_{\ell}+1} < R$. Using (16), we obtain

$$M_k \leq (\log X_k - \log R) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{k-1} \geq R\}} - \frac{(1-2p) \log 2}{2} (T_k - 1).$$

Apply Lemma 3.1 with $c_j \equiv (5 \log 2)/2$ to get

$$\mathbf{P}\left(T_k > \frac{3k}{4}, X_k \leq 2^{\frac{(1-2p)k}{4}} R\right) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(M_k \leq -\frac{(1-2p) \log 2}{8} k\right) \leq e^{-\frac{(1-2p)^2}{800} k}. \quad (17)$$

Given that $X_k > 2^{(1-2p)k/4} R$, let $\tau := \inf\{n > k : X_n < R\}$. By (15), we have $\tau - k \geq (1-2p)k/8$. For any $n \geq k + \lceil (1-2p)k/8 \rceil$ where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is the usual ceiling function, on the event $\{\tau = n\}$, one has

$$M_n - M_k = \log X_n - \log X_k - \frac{(1-2p) \log 2}{2} (n - k).$$

Therefore, again, by Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\tau < \infty, X_k > 2^{(1-2p)k/4} R) &\leq \sum_{n=k+\lceil (1-2p)k/8 \rceil}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\left(M_n - M_k \leq \frac{(1-2p) \log 2}{2} (n - k)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=\lceil (1-2p)k/8 \rceil}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(1-2p)^2}{50} m} \leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\frac{(1-2p)^2}{50}}} e^{-\frac{(1-2p)^3}{400} k}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Now observe that $\mathbf{P}(T_k \geq 3k/4, X_n \leq 0 \text{ for some } n \geq k)$ is at most

$$\mathbf{P}(T_k > 3k/4, X_k \leq 2^{(1-2p)k/4}R) + \mathbf{P}(X_k > 2^{(1-2p)k/4}R, X_n < R \text{ for some } n \geq k),$$

and that

$$\frac{1}{1 - e^{-\frac{(1-2p)^2}{50}}} \sim \frac{50}{(1-2p)^2}, \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then (ii) follows from (17) and (18). \square

Lemma 3.3. *In the setting of Lemma 3.2, there exist positive constants C and β independent of x , p and k such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(X_k > 0, T_k \leq \frac{3k}{4}\right) \leq C \left(2^{-\beta p^2 k} + 2^{\frac{\beta(1-2p)}{\log_2(1-2p)}k}\right).$$

Proof. We define inductively a sequence of stopping times $(\theta_n)_{n \geq 1}$: let $\theta_1 := \inf\{m \in \mathbb{N} : 0 < X_m < R\}$, and for any $n > 1$, let

$$\theta_n := \inf\{m \geq \theta_{n-1} + \lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1 : 0 < X_m < R\},$$

with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. On the event $\{X_k > 0, T_k \leq 3k/4\}$, one has

$$\{j \leq k : X_j < R\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_k} [\theta_i, \theta_i + \lceil \log_2 R \rceil],$$

where $n_k := \max\{n : \theta_n \leq k\}$. In particular,

$$n_k \geq \frac{k+1-3k/4}{\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1} = \frac{k+4}{4\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 4}.$$

For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, given that $X_j \in (0, R)$, by (9) (or (11) and imagine that the gambler starts at time j),

$$X_{j+\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1} \leq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \bigcap_{i=j+1}^{j+\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1} \{\xi_i = 1\}.$$

Therefore, for any $n > 1$,

$$\mathbf{P}(\theta_n < \infty | \mathcal{F}_{\theta_{n-1}}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_{n-1} < \infty\}} \leq (1 - p^{\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\theta_{n-1} < \infty\}},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(X_k > 0, T_k \leq \frac{3k}{4}\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}(\theta_{\lceil \frac{k+4}{4\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 4} \rceil} \leq k) \leq (1 - p^{\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1})^{\lceil \frac{k+4}{4\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 4} \rceil - 1} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{k}{4\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 4} \cdot \log_{1/2}(1 - p^{\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1})} \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where we used that $1 - p^{\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1} > 1/2$. We now consider the asymptotic behavior of the last term in (19) as $p \rightarrow 0$ or $p \rightarrow 1/2$.

- For small p , say $p < 1/3$, R defined by (13) equals 2. Also, observe that

$$\log_{1/2}(1 - p^2) \sim \frac{p^2}{\log 2}, \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow 0.$$

- As $p \rightarrow 1/2$, one has $\log_2 R \sim -\log_2(1 - 2p)$ and

$$\log_{1/2}(1 - p^{\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1}) \sim \frac{p^{\lceil \log_2 R \rceil + 1}}{\log 2} \geq \frac{p^2}{\log 2} p^{\log_2 R} = \frac{p^2}{\log 2} R^{\log_2 p} \sim \frac{1 - 2p}{4}.$$

Then Lemma 3.3 follows from (19). \square

We now finish the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We first prove (5). For any $x \in (2, 3)$, one can find an integer $k \geq 1$ such that $x - 2 \in [2^{-k}, 2^{-k+1})$. Then, by Theorem 1.1 and (8),

$$\mathbf{P}(S \leq 2^{-k} | \bigcap_{i=1}^k \{\xi_i = -1\}) = \mathbf{P}(\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_n=1\}} 2^{S_{n-1}-S_k} \leq 1) = \mathbf{P}(S \leq 1) = 1 - f(3, p) > 0.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.2,

$$f(2, p) - f(x, p) = \mathbf{P}(S \leq x - 2) \geq \mathbf{P}(S \leq 2^{-k}) \geq (1 - f(3, p))(1 - p)^k. \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, we see from (8) that $S > 2^{-k+1}$ on $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} \{\xi_i = 1\}$, and in particular,

$$f(2, p) - f(x, p) \leq \mathbf{P}(S \leq 2^{-k+1}) \leq (1 - p)^{k-1}. \quad (21)$$

Now observe that

$$(1 - p)^k \leq (x - 2)^{\log_{1/2}(1-p)} \leq (1 - p)^{k-1}.$$

Then (5) follows from (20) and (21).

Now assume that $p \in (0, 1/2)$ and $x \geq 2, h > 0$. Choose a positive integer K such that $h > 2^{-K+1}$. Then, there exist $a_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_K) \in \{0, 1\}^K$ such that

$$x \leq \sum_{n=0}^K a_n 2^{-n} < \frac{1}{2^K} + \sum_{n=0}^K a_n 2^{-n} \leq x + h.$$

We will show in the proof of Theorem 1.5 (i) (see (28)) that

$$S = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n 2^{-n}$$

where $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are \mathbb{N} -valued i.i.d. random variables such that $\mathbf{P}(A_0 = i) > 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(x - 2 < S \leq x - 2 + h) &\geq \mathbf{P}\left(S \in \left(\sum_{n=0}^K a_n 2^{-n}, \frac{1}{2^K} + \sum_{n=0}^K a_n 2^{-n}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}\left(\bigcap_{n=0}^K \{A_n = a_n\}\right) \mathbf{P}\left(0 < \sum_{n=K+1}^{\infty} A_n 2^{-n} \leq \frac{1}{2^K}\right) \\ &= (1 - f(4, p)) \prod_{n=0}^K \mathbf{P}(A_n = a_n) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\sum_{n=K+1}^{\infty} A_n 2^{-n+K+1} \stackrel{d}{=} S$ and Lemma 2.2 in the third line. This proves the first inequality in (4).

To prove the second inequality in (4), it suffices to show that for any $x \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$, one has

$$\mathbf{P}(x - 2 < S \leq x + 4^{-k} - 2) \leq \frac{C}{(1 - 2p)^2} \left(2^{-2\beta(1-2p)^3 k} + 2^{-2\beta p^2 k}\right). \quad (22)$$

Indeed, (22) implies that if $4^{-k-1} < h \leq 4^{-k}$ for some $k \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(x - 2 < S \leq x + h - 2) &\leq \mathbf{P}(x - 2 < S \leq x + 4^{-k} - 2) \stackrel{(22)}{\leq} \frac{C}{(1 - 2p)^2} \left(4^{-\beta(1-2p)^3 k} + 4^{-\beta p^2 k}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(1 - 2p)^2} \left(4^{\beta(1-2p)^3} h^{\beta(1-2p)^3} + 4^{\beta p^2} h^{\beta p^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired result with a larger constant C . Note that if $h \geq 1/4$, then any positive constants $C \geq 4$, $\beta \leq 1$ would satisfy

$$f(x, p) - f(x + h, p) = \mathbf{P}(x - 2 < S \leq x + h - 2) \leq 1 \leq \frac{C}{4^\beta} \leq Ch^\beta.$$

The proof of (22) when $x = 2$ was given in (21) (note that $\log_{1/2}(1 - p) \sim p/\log 2$ as $p \rightarrow 0$). We now assume that $x > 2$ and denote the event on the left-hand side of (22) by $E(x, k)$. Recall we have shown in (11) that $X_k \leq 0$ if and only if $\sum_{n=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_n=1\}} 2^{S_{n-1}} \geq x - 2$. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_k \leq 0, E_{x,k}) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_n=1\}} 2^{S_{n-1}} \leq 4^{-k}\right) \leq (1 - p)^k = 2^{-k \log_{1/2}(1-p)}. \quad (23)$$

From the proof of Lemma 2.2, we see that $X_n \leq 0$ for some n if $S > x - 2$. By Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, there exist positive constants C and β independent of x, p and k such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(X_k > 0, E_{x,k}) &\leq \mathbf{P}(T_k > 3k/4, X_n \leq 0 \text{ for some } n \geq k) + \mathbf{P}(X_k > 0, T_k \leq 3k/4) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{(1 - 2p)^2} 2^{-\beta(1-2p)^3 k} + C \left(2^{-\beta p^2 k} + 2^{\frac{\beta(1-2p)}{\log_2(1-2p)} k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (23), this proves (22) with possibly a larger C and a smaller β where we used that

$$\log_{1/2}(1 - p) \sim \frac{p}{\log 2} \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow 0+, \text{ and } (1 - 2p)^3 = o\left(\frac{1 - 2p}{-\log_2(1 - 2p)}\right) \quad \text{as } p \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

For any $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$D_{j,k} : [0, \infty) \mapsto \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^k - 1\}, \quad D_{j,k}(x) = \lfloor 2^{j+k} x \rfloor \bmod 2^k,$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the usual floor function. The following result is a direct consequence of the Birkhoff's ergodic theorem or (the Borel normal theorem), see e.g. [7, Section 4.2.2].

Lemma 3.4. *Let k be an positive integer and assume that $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^k - 1\}$. Then, for almost every $x \in [0, \infty)$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{D_{j,k}(x)=\ell\}}}{n} = \frac{1}{2^k}. \quad (24)$$

To prove Theorem 1.5 (i), we shall also need the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(\zeta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be \mathbb{N} -valued i.i.d. random variables such that $\mathbf{P}(\zeta_0 = i) > 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $\hat{S} := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_n 2^{-n}$ converges a.s.. For any positive integer k and $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^k - 1\}$, one has, almost surely,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{D_{j,k}(\hat{S})=\ell\}}}{n} = \mathbf{P}(D_{0,k}(\hat{S}) = \ell). \quad (25)$$

Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^k - 1\}$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $Z_j := \lfloor 2^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_{n+j} 2^{-n} \rfloor$ and write $\pi(i) := \mathbf{P}(Z_0 = i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We note that by definition,

$$D_{j,k}(\hat{S}) = \left\lfloor 2^k \sum_{n=0}^{j-1} \zeta_n 2^{j-n} + 2^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_{n+j} 2^{-n} \right\rfloor \bmod 2^k = Z_j \bmod 2^k.$$

We shall show that $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an irreducible aperiodic Markov chain on \mathbb{N} with stationary distribution $(\pi(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, which, by the ergodic theorem for Markov chains, see e.g. [6, Theorem 1.10.2] (with

$f(i) = \mathbb{1}_{\{i \bmod 2^k = \ell\}}$ in the notation there), would imply (25): Almost surely,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{D_{j,k}(\hat{S}) = \ell\}}}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \bmod 2^k = \ell\}}}{n} = \mathbf{P}(Z_0 \bmod 2^k = \ell) = \mathbf{P}(D_{0,k}(\hat{S}) = \ell).$$

We first show that $\pi(i) > 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_n 2^{-n}$ converges almost surely, there exists $J \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi(J) > 0$. Now observe that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, one has $Z_j \stackrel{d}{=} Z_0$ and

$$Z_j = \left\lfloor 2^k \zeta_j + 2^{k-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_{n+j+1} 2^{-n} \right\rfloor = 2^k \zeta_j + \left\lfloor \frac{Z_{j+1}}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad (26)$$

where we used that if $2i \leq 2^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_{n+j+1} 2^{-n} < 2i + 2$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\left\lfloor 2^{k-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_{n+j+1} 2^{-n} \right\rfloor = i = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \left\lfloor 2^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta_{n+j+1} 2^{-n} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor.$$

Note also that ζ_j is independent of $(Z_n)_{n \geq j+1}$. Thus, by (26),

$$\pi\left(\left\lfloor \frac{J}{2} \right\rfloor\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(Z_j = \left\lfloor \frac{J}{2} \right\rfloor\right) \geq \mathbf{P}(Z_{j+1} = J, \zeta_j = 0) = \pi(J) \mathbf{P}(\zeta_0 = 0) > 0.$$

Repeating this argument, we see that $\pi(J), \pi(\lfloor J/2 \rfloor), \dots, \pi(0) > 0$. Therefore, by using (26) again, one has, for any $i_k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\pi(i_k 2^k) = \mathbf{P}(Z_j = i_k 2^k) \geq \mathbf{P}(Z_{j+1} = 0, \zeta_j = i_k) = \pi(0) \mathbf{P}(\zeta_0 = i_k) > 0,$$

and for any $i_k, i_{k-1} \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\pi(i_k 2^k + i_{k-1} 2^{k-1}) \geq \mathbf{P}(Z_{j+1} = i_{k-1} 2^k, \zeta_j = i_k) = \pi(i_k 2^k) \mathbf{P}(\zeta_0 = i_k) > 0.$$

We can repeat this argument to conclude that $\pi(i) > 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ since we can write $i = i_k 2^k + i_{k-1} 2^{k-1} + \dots + i_0$ for some $i_k, i_{k-1}, \dots, i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$.

For $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$, we let

$$p(x, y) := \mathbf{P}\left(2^k \xi_0 = y - \left\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \right\rfloor\right), \quad P(x, y) := \frac{p(y, x) \pi(y)}{\pi(x)}.$$

For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(z_0, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m, z_{m+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{m+1}$, by (26),

$$\mathbf{P}(Z_j = z_j, 0 \leq j \leq m+1) = \pi(z_{m+1}) \prod_{t=0}^m p(z_{m+1-t}, z_{m-t}). \quad (27)$$

If the left-hand side of (27) is positive, then (27) shows that (note that (27) also holds if one replaces $m+1$ by m)

$$\mathbf{P}(Z_{m+1} = z_{m+1} \mid Z_j = z_j, 0 \leq j \leq m) = \frac{\pi(z_{m+1})}{\pi(z_m)} p(z_{m+1}, z_m) = P(z_m, z_{m+1}).$$

This implies that $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Markov chain with initial distribution $(\pi(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and transition probabilities $(P(x, y))_{x, y \in \mathbb{N}}$. Notice that in the proof of that $\pi(i) > 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have shown that each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ commutes with the site 0, and in particular, the Markov chain $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is irreducible. It is aperiodic since $P(0, 0) \geq \mathbf{P}(\zeta_0 = 0) \pi(0) > 0$. Moreover, for any $y \in \mathbb{N}$, one has

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}} \pi(x) P(x, y) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}} \pi(y) p(y, x) = \pi(y),$$

which implies that $(\pi(i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a stationary distribution for $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. \square

Now we give the proof of Theorem 1.5 (i).

Proof of Theorem 1.5 (i). That $f(\cdot, p)$ is continuous was already proved in Theorem 1.4. To prove that $\partial_x f(x, p) = 0$ for almost every $x \in [1, \infty)$, by Lemma 2.2 and [5, Proposition 3.30], it is equivalent to show that the distribution of S and the Lebesgue measure are mutually singular. We argue by contradiction and assume that the distribution of S and the Lebesgue measure are not mutually singular. For any positive integer k , Lemma 3.4 shows that H_k^c has Lebesgue measure 0 where

$$H_k := \left\{ x \geq 0 : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{D_{j,k}(x)=\ell\}}}{n} = \frac{1}{2^k}, \text{ for any } \ell \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^k - 1\} \right\}.$$

Then, by our assumption, $\mathbf{P}(S \in H_k) > 0$ for all $k \geq 1$. For any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tau_i := \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : S_n = -i\}$, and in particular, $\tau_0 = 0$. Note that τ_i is a.s. finite if $p < 1/2$. Now define

$$A_i = \sum_{n=\tau_i+1}^{\tau_{i+1}+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n=1\}} 2^{S_{n-1}+i}.$$

Then by the strong Markov property of $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we see that $(A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are \mathbb{N} -valued i.i.d. random variables. Moreover,

$$S = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n=1\}} 2^{S_{n-1}} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i 2^{-i} \quad (28)$$

converges a.s.. In addition, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbf{P}(A_0 = i) \geq \mathbf{P}(\xi_1 = 1, \xi_2 = -1, \xi_3 = 1, \xi_4 = -1, \dots, \xi_{2i-1} = 1, \xi_{2i} = -1, \xi_{2i+1} = -1) > 0.$$

Then, by Lemma 3.5, a.s. on $\{S \in H_k\}$, for any $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^k - 1\}$,

$$\frac{1}{2^k} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{D_{j,k}(S)=\ell\}}}{n} = \mathbf{P}(D_{0,k}(S) = \ell).$$

Notice that two constants are equal with positive probability if and only if they are equal. Thus, by (20), for any $k \geq 1$,

$$(1 - f(3, p))(1 - p)^k \leq \mathbf{P}(S \leq \frac{1}{2^k}) \stackrel{(4)}{=} \mathbf{P}(S < \frac{1}{2^k}) \leq \mathbf{P}(D_{0,k}(S) = 0) = \frac{1}{2^k},$$

which is impossible for large k because $p < 1/2$. \square

4. RUIN PROBABILITY AS A FUNCTION OF THE CHANCE OF WINNING

In this section, we prove Corollary 1.3, Theorem 1.5 (ii), and Proposition 1.2.

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Assume that $x > 2$ and $0 < p_1 < p_2 < 1/2$. We need to prove that $f(x, p_1) < f(x, p_2)$. Let $(U_n^{(1)})_{n \geq 1}$ and $(U_n^{(2)})_{n \geq 1}$ be i.i.d. uniform $(0, 1)$ random variables. For each $n \geq 1$, let

$$\xi_n^{(1)} = 2\mathbb{1}_{(0, p_1)}(U_n^{(1)}) - 1, \quad \xi_n^{(2)} = 2 \left(\mathbb{1}_{(0, p_1)}(U_n^{(1)}) + \mathbb{1}_{[p_1, 1)}(U_n^{(1)}) \mathbb{1}_{(0, \frac{p_2 - p_1}{1 - p_1})}(U_n^{(2)}) \right) - 1.$$

Then $(\xi_n^{(1)})_{n \geq 1}$ (resp. $(\xi_n^{(2)})_{n \geq 1}$) are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables with parameter p_1 (resp. parameter p_2). Since $\xi_n^{(1)} \leq \xi_n^{(2)}$ for each $n \geq 1$, one has

$$S^{(1)} := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n^{(1)}=1\}} 2^{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i^{(1)}} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n^{(2)}=1\}} 2^{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i^{(2)}} =: S^{(2)}.$$

Notice also that $\xi_n^{(2)} = 1$ if $U_n^{(2)} < (p_2 - p_1)/(1 - p_1)$. In particular, there exists a positive integer K such that

$$S^{(2)} \geq \sum_{n=1}^K \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n^{(2)}=1\}} 2^{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_i^{(2)}} > x - 2 \quad \text{on} \quad \bigcap_{n=1}^K \left\{ U_n^{(2)} < \frac{p_2 - p_1}{1 - p_1} \right\}.$$

By Lemma 2.2 and that $(\xi_n^{(1)})_{n \geq 1}$ and $(U_n^{(2)})_{n \geq 1}$ are independent, one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, p_2) - f(x, p_1) &= \mathbf{P}(S^{(2)} > x - 2) - \mathbf{P}(S^{(1)} > x - 2) = \mathbf{P}(S^{(2)} > x - 2 \geq S^{(1)}) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P} \left(\bigcap_{n=1}^K \left\{ U_n^{(2)} < \frac{p_2 - p_1}{1 - p_1} \right\} \right) \mathbf{P}(S^{(1)} \leq x - 2) \\ &= \left(\frac{p_2 - p_1}{1 - p_1} \right)^K (1 - f(x, p)) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5 (ii). By definition, $X_0 = x - 2 > 0$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$h_k(p) := \mathbf{P}(X_k > 0), \quad g_k(p) := h_k(p) - h_{k+1}(p) = \mathbf{P}(X_k > 0, X_{k+1} \leq 0).$$

Note that $h_k(p)$ and $g_k(p)$ are polynomial functions in p . For integers $m \geq 5$, let $I_m := (1/m, 1/2 - 1/m)$. Fix m , then p and $(1 - 2p)$ are both bounded away from 0 if $p \in I_m$. Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 implies that there exist positive constants C and $\rho_m < 1$ such that for all $x > 2$, $p \in I_m$ and $k \geq 1$,

$$g_k(p) \leq \frac{C \rho_m^k}{(1 - 2p)^2}. \quad (29)$$

Let

$$\Theta_k := \{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in \{-1, 1\}^k : X_k > 0, X_{k+1} \leq 0 \text{ if } (\xi_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k} = (a_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k}\}.$$

Then one can write

$$g_k(p) = \sum_{j=0}^k C_j(k) p^j (1 - p)^{k-j}$$

where $C_j(k) = \#\{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in \Theta_k : \sum_{i=1}^k a_i = 2j - k\}$. We now view $h_k(z)$ and $g_k(z)$ as complex functions:

$$g_k(z) := \sum_{j=0}^k C_j(k) z^j (1 - z)^{k-j}, \quad h_k(z) := 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} g_i(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Fix $p \in I_m$, for any $z \in B(p, \varepsilon/m)$ with $\varepsilon = (1 - \rho_m)/2$,

$$\max_{j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}} \left| \frac{z}{p} \right|^j \left| \frac{1 - z}{1 - p} \right|^{k-j} \leq \max_{j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k\}} \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{mp} \right)^j \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{m(1 - p)} \right)^{k-j} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^k.$$

Therefore, by (29),

$$|g_k(z)| \leq \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k C_j(k) |z^j (1 - z)^{k-j}|}{\sum_{j=0}^k C_j(k) p^j (1 - p)^{k-j}} g_k(p) \leq \frac{C \rho_m^k (1 + \varepsilon)^k}{(1 - 2p)^2}.$$

Note that $\rho_m(1 + \varepsilon) < 1$ by the choice of ε . Then, $(h_k(z))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some function $h(z)$ uniformly on the rectangle $U_m := I_m \times (-\varepsilon/m, \varepsilon/m)$. By the Weierstrass' theorem, $h(z)$ is holomorphic (or equivalently, complex analytic) on U_m . In particular, for every $p \in (1/m, 1/2 - 1/m)$,

there exists $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ and a power series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^n$ such that

$$h(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n (z - p)^n, \quad z \in B(p, \tilde{\varepsilon}) \subset U_m.$$

Since $h(p) = 1 - f(x, p)$ for $p \in (1/m, 1/2 - 1/m)$, the coefficients c_n are all real and

$$f(x, q) = 1 - c_0 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n (q - p)^n, \quad q \in (p - \tilde{\varepsilon}, p + \tilde{\varepsilon}).$$

which completes the proof since $(0, 1/2) = \bigcup_{m=5}^{\infty} (1/m, 1/2 - 1/m)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Recall that $S_0 = 0$ and $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$ for $n \geq 1$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let

$$\tilde{f}_n(x, p) := \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_i=1\}} 2^{S_{i-1}} \geq x - 2\right), \quad (x, p) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, 1).$$

with the convention that $\tilde{f}_0(x, p) = \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, 2]}(x)$. Observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_i=1\}} 2^{S_{i-1}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_1=1\}} \left(1 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_{i+1}=1\}} 2^{S_i - S_1}\right) + \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_1=-1\}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_{i+1}=1\}} 2^{S_i - S_1}\right),$$

which, by the Markov property of $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{n+1}(x, p) &= p \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_{i+1}=1\}} 2^{S_i - S_1} \geq \frac{x+1}{2} - 2\right) + (1-p) \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_{i+1}=1\}} 2^{S_i - S_1} \geq 2x - 4\right) \\ &= p \tilde{f}_n\left(\frac{x+1}{2}, p\right) + (1-p) \tilde{f}_n(2x - 2, p). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using (2), one can show that $(\tilde{f}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by induction. Again, note that $S > \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_i=1\}} 2^{S_{i-1}}$ a.s. for any n . If $x > 2$, then by Lemma 2.2,

$$f(x, p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}_n(x, p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x, p).$$

This yields (3). Moreover, we have shown in the proof of Theorem 1.5 (ii) that for any $x > 2$, $(f_n(x, \cdot))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $f(x, \cdot)$ locally uniformly on $(0, 1/2)$ (note that $f_n(x, p) = 1 - h_x(p)$ in view of (11)). For $p \in (0, 1/2)$, since $f(\cdot, p)$ is continuous and $f_n(\cdot, p)$ are decreasing functions, the sequence $(f_n(\cdot, p))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ also converges to $f(\cdot, p)$ locally uniformly on $(2, \infty)$. \square

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Yuval Peres is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Number W2531011. Shuo Qin is supported by the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation under Grant Number 2025M773086.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kazuoki Azuma. Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 19:357–367, 1967.
- [2] Patrick Billingsley. The singular function of bold play: Gambling theory provides a natural examples of a function with anomalous differentiability properties. *American Scientist*, 71(4):392–397, 1983.
- [3] Lester E. Dubins and Leonard J. Savage. *How to gamble if you must. Inequalities for stochastic processes*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Toronto-London-Sydney, 1965.
- [4] Rick Durrett. *Probability—theory and examples*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, fifth edition, 2019.

- [5] Gerald B. Folland. *Real analysis*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. Modern techniques and their applications, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [6] J. R. Norris. *Markov chains*, volume 2 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. Reprint of 1997 original.
- [7] Marcelo Viana and Krerley Oliveira. *Foundations of ergodic theory*, volume 151 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [8] W.A. Wagenaar. *Paradoxes of Gambling Behaviour*. Routledge Library Editions: Addictions. Taylor & Francis, 2016.

(Aditya Guha Roy)

Email address: guharoyagradya@gmail.com

(Yuval Peres) BEIJING INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS

Email address: yperes@gmail.com

(Shuo Qin) BEIJING INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS, AND YAU MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES CENTER, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY

Email address: qinshuo@bimsa.cn

(Junchi Zuo) QIUZHEN COLLEGE, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY

Email address: zuojc21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn