

Win Rates at First-Passage Times for Biased Simple Random Walks

F. Thomas Bruss¹ and Davy Paindaveine^{1,2}

¹Université libre de Bruxelles

²Toulouse School of Economics, Université Toulouse 1 Capitole

Abstract

We study the win rate R_{N_d}/N_d of a biased simple random walk S_n on \mathbb{Z} at the first-passage time $N_d = \inf\{n \geq 0 : S_n = d\}$, with $p = \mathbb{P}[X_1 = +1] \in [1/2, 1)$. Using generating-function techniques and integral representations, we derive explicit formulas for the expectation and variance of R_{N_d}/N_d along with monotonicity properties in the threshold d and the bias p . We also provide closed-form expressions and use them to design unbiased coin-flipping estimators of π based on first-passage sampling; the resulting schemes illustrate how biasing the coin can dramatically improve *both* approximation accuracy and computational cost.

1 Introduction

Let $(S_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a random walk on \mathbb{Z} with $S_0 = 0$ and mutually independent increments

$$X_n := S_n - S_{n-1} \in \{+1, -1\}, \quad \mathbb{P}[X_n = +1] = p, \quad \mathbb{P}[X_n = -1] = q := 1 - p,$$

for $n \geq 1$. This is one of the most standard settings in the theory of random walks and Markov chains; see, e.g., [1–3]. Write

$$R_n := \#\{1 \leq k \leq n : X_k = +1\}$$

for the number of right steps (“wins”) up to time n , and, for any positive integer d , define the one-sided hitting time

$$N_d := \inf\{n \geq 0 : S_n = d\}.$$

Throughout, we restrict to the case $p \geq 1/2$ for which N_d is almost surely finite. The object of interest in this work is the *win rate at the stopping time N_d* , namely R_{N_d}/N_d , together with its expectation, variance, and related distributional properties. Note that R_{N_d}/N_d can also be seen as a performance measure for choosing d induced by the stopping time N_d .

A first motivation is rooted in goal-based stopping and the reporting bias it induces. Interpreting each increment as a win/loss outcome, one may view S_n as the net gain after n rounds and R_n/n as the observed proportion of successes. In many settings, one does not fix the number of rounds in advance, but rather stops upon reaching a performance target; here this corresponds to N_d , the first time the net gain hits level d . The ratio R_{N_d}/N_d is then exactly the win rate one would report at the moment the target is achieved. Crucially, this is a *success-conditioned* report: the data are shown only at the time the target is met, which preferentially selects paths with an excess of wins over losses. Quantifying the resulting bias is a natural way to measure the selection effect created by “stop upon success” rules; see, e.g., standard discussions of stopping times and conditioning in random-walk and martingale settings [4, 5].

A second motivation is methodological and concerns what classical martingale theory does *not* immediately provide. Optional stopping theorems control expectations of martingales at stopping times, typically for linear functionals such as S_N (and, under additional conditions, for N itself), but they do not directly address nonlinear statistics such as the ratio R_N/N . In particular, even in this elementary random-walk model, the behavior of the empirical proportion $\hat{p}_N := R_N/N$ can differ substantially from its fixed- n counterpart once the sample size N is chosen in a path-dependent manner. Boundary-crossing rules are among the simplest and most classical sequential schemes; see, e.g., [6, 7]. For the prototypical rule $N_d = \inf\{n \geq 0 : S_n = d\}$, the statistic R_{N_d}/N_d is precisely the naive empirical proportion evaluated at the first time the cumulative evidence reaches level d . Thus, quantifying the expectation and variance of R_{N_d}/N_d —and their dependence on d and p —provides a concrete, probabilistic answer to a recurring question in sequential procedures: how does optional stopping distort empirical proportions, and how does the distortion scale with the stopping threshold?

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we derive integral representations for the expectation and variance of the win rate R_{N_d}/N_d at the first-passage time, and we establish their basic monotonicity and limiting properties as functions of the threshold d and the bias p . Section 3 then provides closed-form expressions for $\mathbb{E}[R_{N_d}/N_d]$, distinguishing between odd and even values of d . In Section 4, we illustrate how these formulas can be leveraged to construct efficient coin-flipping estimators of π and $\ln 2$ based on first-passage sampling. Finally, we briefly discuss extensions and limitations in Section 5.

2 Main results

Our first main result provides the expectation and the variance of R_{N_d}/N_d .

Theorem 2.1. *Fix $p \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and a positive integer d . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2} \int_0^1 u^{d-1} h_p(u) du$$

and

$$\text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{d^2}{4} \left\{ \int_0^1 u^{d-1} h_p(u) \ell_p(u) du - \left(\int_0^1 u^{d-1} h_p(u) du \right)^2 \right\},$$

where we let

$$h_p(u) := \frac{p - qu^2}{p + qu^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_p(u) := \ln\left(\frac{p + qu^2}{u}\right).$$

Proof. Observe that $S_n = R_n - (n - R_n) = 2R_n - n$ for any n . Since $p \geq \frac{1}{2}$, the walk hits $+d$ almost surely, so N_d is finite with probability 1. Using $S_{N_d} = d$, we obtain $d = 2R_{N_d} - N_d$, hence

$$\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2N_d}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d}\right] \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{d^2}{4} \text{Var}\left[\frac{1}{N_d}\right], \quad (1)$$

and it is sufficient to evaluate the expectation and variance of $1/N_d$.

Let $T = \min\{n \geq 0 : S_n = 1\}$ be the first time the walk starting at zero hits level $+1$. Of course, to reach $+d$ from 0, one must pass through $1, 2, \dots, d$ in order. By spatial homogeneity

and the strong Markov property, the time needed to go from k to $k+1$ has the same distribution as T , and these increments are mutually independent. Thus,

$$N_d \stackrel{d}{=} T_1 + T_2 + \cdots + T_d, \quad (2)$$

where T_1, \dots, T_d are mutually independent copies of T . Let the probability generating function of T be $\phi(t) := \mathbb{E}[t^T]$. A standard first-step argument yields

$$\phi(t) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4pqt^2}}{2qt};$$

see, e.g., (3.6) in Chapter XI of [8] or Section 5.3 in [9]. Since the T_i 's are mutually independent copies of T , the generating function of N_d is then

$$\phi_d(t) := \mathbb{E}[t^{N_d}] = (\phi(t))^d = \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4pqt^2}}{2qt} \right)^d. \quad (3)$$

Using the identity

$$\frac{1}{n} = \int_0^1 t^{n-1} dt, \quad n \geq 1,$$

the monotone convergence theorem yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d}\right] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P}[N_d = n] = \int_0^1 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[N_d = n] t^{n-1} dt = \int_0^1 \frac{\phi_d(t)}{t} dt.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d}\right] = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4pqt^2}}{2qt} \right)^d dt.$$

Letting $t = u/(p + qu^2)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d}\right] = \int_0^1 u^{d-1} h_p(u) du, \quad (4)$$

with the function h_p defined in the statement of the theorem. Plugging this expression in (1) establishes the expectation part of the result. Let us then turn to the variance. The identity

$$\frac{1}{n^2} = - \int_0^1 t^{n-1} (\ln t) dt, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

(this results from integration by parts) provides

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d^2}\right] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{P}[N_d = n] = - \int_0^1 (\ln t) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[N_d = n] t^{n-1} dt = - \int_0^1 (\ln t) \frac{\phi_d(t)}{t} dt.$$

Using (3) and performing the same substitution as above yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d^2}\right] = \int_0^1 u^{d-1} h_p(u) \ell_p(u) du. \quad (5)$$

Since (1) provides

$$\text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{d^2}{4} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d^2}\right] - \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N_d}\right] \right)^2 \right\},$$

the result follows from (4) and (5). \square

Theorem 2.1 allows us to establish the following monotonicity and limiting results.

Corollary 2.2. *Fix $p \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] > \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_{d+1}}}{N_{d+1}}\right]$$

for any positive integer d ; moreover,

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = p \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = 0.$$

The variance is not monotone in d in general; for instance, for $p = 9/10$, we have

$$\text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_1}}{N_1}\right] < \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_2}}{N_2}\right] \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_2}}{N_2}\right] > \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_3}}{N_3}\right].$$

More importantly, recall that, from a sequential analysis perspective, R_{N_d}/N_d is an estimator of p . Corollary 2.2 readily entails that this estimator is (positively) biased for any finite d but that it converges to p in probability as d diverges to infinity (since $0 \leq R_{N_d}/N_d \leq 1$, this estimator is therefore asymptotically unbiased). This shows that the distortion introduced by the stopping procedure does not affect consistency.

Proof. Using Theorem 2.1, integrating by parts, and noting that $h'_p(u) < 0$ for $u \in (0, 1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_{d+1}}}{N_{d+1}}\right] &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \{d u^{d-1} - (d+1)u^d\} h_p(u) du \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 (u^d - u^{d+1}) h'_p(u) du > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which establishes the monotonicity result. We turn to the limiting results. Note that the result in Theorem 2.1 rewrites

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)] \tag{6}$$

and

$$\text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{1}{4} \left\{ d \mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d) \ell_p(U_d)] - (\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)])^2 \right\},$$

where the random variable U_d is such that $\mathbb{P}[U_d \leq u] = u^d$ for any $u \in [0, 1]$. Since U_d converges in law to one and h_p is a bounded continuous function, $\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)] \rightarrow h_p(1) = 2p - 1$, so that

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} h_p(1) = p,$$

which establishes the expectation result. Thus, it only remains to prove the variance result. Since $\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)] \rightarrow \alpha := 2p - 1$, we need to show that

$$d \mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d) \ell_p(U_d)] \rightarrow \alpha^2. \tag{7}$$

To do so, fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and split

$$d \mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d) \ell_p(U_d)] = d \mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d) \ell_p(U_d) \mathbb{I}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon]] + d \mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d) \ell_p(U_d) \mathbb{I}[U_d \geq 1 - \varepsilon]],$$

where $\mathbb{I}[A]$ denotes the indicator of the event A . We treat both terms separately:

- Since $|h_p(u)| \leq 1$ and $|\ell_p(u)| \leq c_0 - \ln u$ for some $c_0 > 0$,

$$|\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)\ell_p(U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon]]| \leq c_0 \mathbb{P}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon] + \mathbb{E}[(-\ln U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon]].$$

Now, $\mathbb{P}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon] = (1 - \varepsilon)^d$, and a direct computation gives

$$\mathbb{E}[(-\ln U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon]] = -d \int_0^{1-\varepsilon} u^{d-1}(\ln u) du = (1 - \varepsilon)^d \left(-\ln(1 - \varepsilon) + \frac{1}{d} \right).$$

Hence, $d\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)\ell_p(U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon]] \rightarrow 0$.

- On the compact interval $[1 - \varepsilon, 1]$, the functions h_p and ℓ_p are twice continuously differentiable. Moreover, $\ell_p(1) = 0$ and $\ell'_p(1) = -\alpha$, so that Taylor's theorem at 1 guarantees the existence of a constant $C_\varepsilon < \infty$ such that for all $u \in [1 - \varepsilon, 1]$,

$$|h_p(u) - \alpha| \leq C_\varepsilon(1 - u) \quad \text{and} \quad |\ell_p(u) - \alpha(1 - u)| \leq C_\varepsilon(1 - u)^2.$$

Consequently, there exists a (possibly larger) constant C_ε such that

$$|h_p(u)\ell_p(u) - \alpha^2(1 - u)| \mathbb{I}[u \geq 1 - \varepsilon] \leq C_\varepsilon(1 - u)^2$$

for all $u \in (0, 1]$. Thus,

$$|\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)\ell_p(U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d \geq 1 - \varepsilon]] - \alpha^2 \mathbb{E}[(1 - U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d \geq 1 - \varepsilon]]| \leq C_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[(1 - U_d)^2].$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 - U_d)^2] = \frac{2}{(d+1)(d+2)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[1 - U_d] = \frac{1}{d+1},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)\ell_p(U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d \geq 1 - \varepsilon]] &= d\alpha^2 \mathbb{E}[(1 - U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d \geq 1 - \varepsilon]] + O\left(\frac{1}{d}\right) \\ &= \frac{d\alpha^2}{d+1} - d\alpha^2 \mathbb{E}[(1 - U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon]] + O\left(\frac{1}{d}\right) \\ &= \alpha^2 + O\left(\frac{1}{d}\right), \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbb{E}[(1 - U_d)\mathbb{I}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon]] \leq \mathbb{P}[U_d < 1 - \varepsilon] = (1 - \varepsilon)^d$.

This establishes (7) and hence the result. \square

A more probabilistic proof of the monotonicity result in Corollary 2.2 can be obtained by considering the random variables U_d introduced when proving the limiting results. Indeed, since $\mathbb{P}[U_d \leq u] = u^d > u^{d+1} = \mathbb{P}[U_{d+1} \leq u]$ for any $u \in [0, 1]$, the random variable U_{d+1} is stochastically larger than U_d . Recalling that h_p is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1]$, this implies that $\mathbb{E}[h_p(U_{d+1})] \leq \mathbb{E}[h_p(U_d)]$, which, in view of (6), establishes the monotonicity result again.

Corollary 2.3. *Fix a positive integer d . Then,*

$$p \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] \tag{8}$$

is strictly increasing over $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$; moreover,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = 0.$$

Again, the variance of R_{N_d}/N_d does not show a similar monotonic behavior; in particular, for $d \geq 3$, the right-derivative of $p \mapsto \text{Var}[R_{N_d}/N_d]$ at $1/2$ is positive, but this variance must be decreasing for larger values of p since it converges to zero as $p \rightarrow 1$.

Proof. Using Theorem 2.1, dominated convergence directly yields that

$$\frac{d}{dp} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} \right] = \frac{d}{2} \int_0^1 u^{d-1} \frac{\partial h_p(u)}{\partial p} du = d \int_0^1 \frac{u^{d+1}}{(p + qu^2)^2} du > 0$$

for any $p \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, so that the function in (8) is strictly increasing over $[\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Since $R_{N_d}/N_d = 1$ almost surely for $p = 1$, this extends to $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. We turn to the proof of the limiting results. For any $p \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $u \in (0, 1)$, one has $|h_p(u)| \leq 1$ and $|\ell_p(u)| \leq c_0 - \ln u$ for some $c_0 > 0$. Therefore, $|u^{d-1}h_p(u)| \leq u^{d-1}$ and $|u^{d-1}h_p(u)\ell_p(u)| \leq u^{d-1}(c_0 - \ln u)$, where the upper bounds are integrable on $(0, 1)$. For any $u \in (0, 1)$, we have $h_p(u) \rightarrow 1$ and $\ell_p(u) \rightarrow \ln(1/u)$ as $p \rightarrow 1$. By dominated convergence, we thus have

$$\int_0^1 u^{d-1}h_p(u) du \rightarrow \int_0^1 u^{d-1} du = \frac{1}{d}$$

and

$$\int_0^1 u^{d-1}h_p(u)\ell_p(u) du \rightarrow - \int_0^1 u^{d-1}(\ln u) du = \frac{1}{d^2}.$$

Plugging this into Theorem 2.1 yields

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} \right] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2} \times \frac{1}{d} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \text{Var} \left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} \right] = \frac{d^2}{4} \left(\frac{1}{d^2} - \frac{1}{d^2} \right) = 0,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

3 An explicit expression for the expectation

The following result provides an explicit expression for $\mathbb{E}[R_{N_d}/N_d]$.

Theorem 3.1. *Fix $p \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and a positive integer d . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} \right] = (-1)^{(d-1)/2} d \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{d/2} \arctan \left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \right) + 1 - d \sum_{k=0}^{(d-1)/2} \frac{(-1)^k}{d-2k} \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^k$$

for d odd, and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} \right] = (-1)^{d/2} \frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{d/2} (\ln p) + 1 - \frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{p}{q} \right)^{d/2} \sum_{k=1}^{d/2} (-1)^{(d/2)+k} \binom{d/2}{k} \frac{p^{-k} - 1}{k}$$

for d even.

It follows from this result that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_1}}{N_1} \right] = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \sqrt{\frac{p}{q}} \arctan \left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \right) = 1,$$

in accordance with Corollary 2.3. For $p = q = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain for instance the values

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_1}}{N_1} \right] = \frac{\pi}{4}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_2}}{N_2} \right] = \ln 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{R_{N_3}}{N_3} \right] = 3 \left(1 - \frac{\pi}{4} \right). \quad (9)$$

Proof. Since

$$h_p(u) = 1 - \frac{2qu^2}{p + qu^2},$$

Theorem 2.1 provides

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2}\left(\frac{1}{d} - 2q \int_0^1 \frac{u^{d+1}}{p + qu^2} du\right) = 1 - dr \int_0^1 \frac{u^{d+1}}{1 + ru^2} du, \quad (10)$$

where we let $r := q/p$. We treat separately the cases d odd and d even.

(a) Assume that $d = 2m + 1$ for some nonnegative integer m . We need to compute

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = 1 - drF_{m+1}, \quad \text{with } F_k := \int_0^1 \frac{u^{2k}}{1 + ru^2} du, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (11)$$

For $k \geq 1$,

$$\frac{u^{2k}}{1 + ru^2} = \frac{1}{r}\left(u^{2k-2} - \frac{u^{2k-2}}{1 + ru^2}\right),$$

so integrating from 0 to 1 gives

$$F_k = \frac{1}{r(2k-1)} - \frac{1}{r}F_{k-1}. \quad (12)$$

Iterating this recursion from the base case $F_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} \arctan(\sqrt{r})$ yields

$$F_{m+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{2(m+1-j)+1} r^{-j} + \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{r^{m+1}} F_0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] &= 1 - d \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{2(m+1-j)+1} r^{-(j-1)} + \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{r^{m+(1/2)}} \arctan(\sqrt{r}) \right) \\ &= 1 - d \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{(-1)^k}{2(m-k)+1} r^{-k} + \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{r^{m+(1/2)}} \arctan(\sqrt{r}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the result.

(b) Assume that $d = 2m$ for some positive integer m . Setting $u = \sqrt{(x-1)/r}$ in (10), we need to compute

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = 1 - dr \int_0^1 \frac{u^{d+1}}{1 + ru^2} du = 1 - \frac{d}{2r^m} \int_1^{1+r} \frac{(x-1)^m}{x} dx.$$

Expanding $(x-1)^m$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^{1+r} \frac{(x-1)^m}{x} dx &= \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} (-1)^{m-k} \int_1^{1+r} x^{k-1} dx \\ &= (-1)^m \ln(1+r) + \sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} (-1)^{m-k} \frac{(1+r)^k - 1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right] = 1 + (-1)^{m+1} \frac{d}{2r^m} \ln(1+r) - \frac{d}{2r^m} \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^{m-k} \binom{m}{k} \frac{(1+r)^k - 1}{k},$$

which establishes the result. \square

The closed-form expressions in Theorem 3.1 can be numerically delicate when d is moderate or large, since they involve alternating sums and may therefore suffer from cancellation between terms of comparable magnitude. For stable numerical evaluation, it is preferable to use recursions rather than these closed forms. In particular, for d odd we recommend computing $E[R_{N_d}/N_d]$ using the quantities $(F_k)_{k \geq 0}$ in (11) and the recursion in (12): while each update involves a subtraction, it is of the form $1/(2k-1) - F_{k-1} \geq 0$ (since $F_{k-1} \leq \int_0^1 u^{2(k-1)} du = 1/(2k-1)$), which helps control cancellation. An analogous recursion can be formulated for even d as well.

4 An application: fast approximations of π or $\ln 2$ with a coin

Theorem 3.1 makes it possible to use coin-flipping to approximate irrational constants such as π (for d odd) and $\ln 2$ (for d even). For a fair coin ($p = 1/2$), the result in particular implies that

$$\hat{\pi}_d := (-1)^{(d-1)/2} \frac{4}{d} \left\{ \frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} - \left(1 - d \sum_{k=0}^{(d-1)/2} \frac{(-1)^k}{d-2k} \right) \right\}, \quad d \text{ odd},$$

is an unbiased ‘‘estimator’’ of $4 \arctan(\sqrt{q/p}) = \pi$. The approximation error can be controlled by Chebyshev’s inequality via

$$E[(\hat{\pi}_d - \pi)^2] = \text{Var}[\hat{\pi}_d] = \frac{16}{d^2} \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right].$$

This variance, which can be evaluated by using Theorem 2.1, converges rather quickly to zero as d diverges to infinity; see Figure 1. However, this approximation strategy is not satisfactory in practice: for $p = 1/2$, the number of flips N_d is almost surely finite, but its distribution is very heavy-tailed with an infinite expectation, resulting in a computational burden to evaluate $\hat{\pi}_d$ that quickly deteriorates with d ; see the right panel of Figure 2. This panel shows that the medians of N_d obtained from 100 independent replications increase faster than linearly with d (we consider the median since $E[N_d]$ is infinite) and that the maximal value of N_d over these replications may be huge.




Figure 1: Plots of $\ln(d \text{Var}[\hat{\pi}_d])$ and $\ln(d \text{Var}[\tilde{\pi}_d])$ versus $d \in \{1, 3, \dots, 101\}$.




Figure 2: Monte Carlo illustrations for the unbiased estimators $\hat{\pi}_d$ (fair coin, $p = \frac{1}{2}$) and $\tilde{\pi}_d$ (biased coin, $p = \frac{3}{4}$), over odd thresholds $d \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$. (Left:) for each d , the two shaded bands show the intervals $\text{Ave}[\hat{\pi}_d] \pm \frac{1}{2} \text{SD}[\hat{\pi}_d]$ and $\text{Ave}[\tilde{\pi}_d] \pm \frac{1}{2} \text{SD}[\tilde{\pi}_d]$, based on the averages and standard deviations obtained from $M = 100$ replications; the horizontal line marks π . (Right:) sample medians of the corresponding hitting times N_d (one curve for each estimator), with the numerical labels indicating, for each d , the maximum observed value of N_d among the $M = 100$ replications.

This can be improved significantly by using a biased coin. Indeed, the expected computational cost $E[N_d] = d/(2p-1)$ is then finite and increases only linearly in d (obviously, this cost decreases with p). Since $6 \arctan(\sqrt{1/3}) = \pi$, we take $p = 3/4$ and consider the unbiased estimator

$$\tilde{\pi}_d := (-1)^{(d-1)/2} \frac{6}{3^{d/2} d} \left\{ \frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} - \left(1 - d \sum_{k=0}^{(d-1)/2} \frac{(-3)^k}{d-2k} \right) \right\}, \quad d \text{ odd},$$

of π resulting from Theorem 3.1. When investigating the dependence on d of the corresponding approximation error, it is natural to consider the quantity

$$d \text{Var}[\tilde{\pi}_d] = \frac{4}{3^{d-2} d} \text{Var} \left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} \right]; \quad (13)$$

indeed, since the computational cost increases linearly with d , it is equally costly on average to evaluate $\tilde{\pi}_d$ as to obtain d mutually independent estimators $\tilde{\pi}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\pi}_1^{(d)}$, which would provide the averaged estimator $\frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{\pi}_1^{(k)}$ that has variance $\frac{1}{d} \text{Var}[\tilde{\pi}_1]$. Therefore, the quantity in (13) gives a way to study how the approximation error depends on d while keeping the computational budget fixed. Figure 1 indicates that this error proxy decays exponentially fast to 0. As a result, for sufficiently large d , the accuracy gain from increasing d dominates the linear growth of the computational cost by any prescribed factor. This behavior is corroborated in Figure 2, where the biased-coin procedure is seen to outperform the fair-coin one both in terms of approximation accuracy and computational cost.

In practice, one needs to choose a value of d that will ensure a level of accuracy with some

sufficient guarantee. Applying Chebyshev's inequality, we obtain

$$P[|\tilde{\pi}_d - \pi| > \varepsilon] \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \text{Var}[\tilde{\pi}_d] = \frac{4}{3^{d-2} d^2 \varepsilon^2} \text{Var}\left[\frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d}\right],$$

where the variance can be evaluated by using Theorem 2.1. For any given $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$, this can be used to identify a value of d for which $|\tilde{\pi}_d - \pi| \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. For instance, with $d = 45$, the probability that $|\tilde{\pi}_d - \pi| \leq 10^{-9}$ is above $1 - 10^{-6}$. While $d = 45$ may seem large, the bias of the considered random walk keeps the computational burden under control. In 10^4 independent replications with $d = 45$, the maximal value of $|\tilde{\pi}_d - \pi|$ was below 10^{-12} , and the minimal, average, and maximal values of N_d were 47, 89.9, and 181, respectively (for $p = 3/4$, N_d has expectation $2d$ and standard deviation $\sqrt{6d}$).

It is natural to wonder whether Theorem 3.1 may lead to an even better procedure to approximate π . Obviously, the larger p , the smaller the computational cost. Moreover, for odd d , the leading term in Theorem 3.1 involves the factor $(p/q)^{d/2}$, which suggests that increasing p should also improve accuracy at a fast rate. Two remarks are in order.

- If one insists that the ratio $r := q/p$ be *rational* and that $\arctan(\sqrt{r})$ be a rational multiple of π , then there is no gain beyond $r = 1/3$. Indeed, if $\theta = \arctan(\sqrt{r}) = m\pi/n$ with positive integers m, n , then

$$\cos(2\theta) = \frac{1 - \tan^2 \theta}{1 + \tan^2 \theta} = \frac{1 - r}{1 + r}$$

is rational. Since $2\theta \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$, Theorem 1 in [10] (see also Corollary 3.12 in [11]) implies that $\cos(2\theta) \in \{0, \pm\frac{1}{2}, \pm 1\}$, hence $r \in \{0, \frac{1}{3}, 1, 3\}$. In particular, among rational $r > 0$ such that $\arctan(\sqrt{r}) \in \pi\mathbb{Q}$, the smallest possible value is $r = 1/3$.

- The situation is different if we allow r to be an algebraic real number, though. For any integer $k \geq 4$, set

$$\theta_k := \frac{\pi}{k}, \quad r_k := \tan^2(\theta_k), \quad p_k := \frac{1}{1 + r_k}, \quad \text{and} \quad q_k := \frac{r_k}{1 + r_k}.$$

Then, r_k is algebraic (e.g., $r_8 = (\sqrt{2} - 1)^2$ and $r_{12} = (2 - \sqrt{3})^2$) and satisfies $\arctan(\sqrt{r_k}) = \theta_k = \pi/k$, so that $\pi = k \arctan(\sqrt{r_k})$. Obviously, $r_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, one can take $p_k \rightarrow 1$ while keeping an exact identity $\pi = k \arctan(\sqrt{r_k})$, thereby reducing the expected cost $E[N_d] = d/(2p_k - 1)$ essentially down to d . For given k , the unbiased estimator of π resulting from Theorem 3.1 is

$$\tilde{\pi}_{d,k} := (-1)^{(d-1)/2} \frac{kr_k^{d/2}}{d} \left\{ \frac{R_{N_d}}{N_d} - \left(1 - d \sum_{j=0}^{(d-1)/2} \frac{(-1)^j}{d-2j} r_k^{-j} \right) \right\}, \quad d \text{ odd.}$$

For $k = 6$, this recovers $\tilde{\pi}_d$, while any $k > 6$ would improve on computational cost and approximation accuracy, at the expense of a slightly more complex estimator.

The situation is similar when estimating $\ln 2$ based on the result for d even in Theorem 3.1.

5 Extensions and limitations

As mentioned briefly in the introduction, optimal stopping problems and the assessment of the “performance” of decision rules have been widely studied. Although we did not address optimality questions in this paper, our results connect naturally to them. For example, fix $0 < p < 1$ and define the performance of choosing a threshold d as $E[R_{N_d}/N_d]$. If d must be

selected from a finite set $\{d_1, \dots, d_s\}$ and picking d_k carries a price π_k , then maximizing the price-weighted performance means identifying the optimal choice of d . Similar questions can be extended from random walks to other base processes (e.g., Brownian motion or Poisson jump processes), since random walks are building blocks for many such models. One can also consider other directions such as multiple stopping-time problems. For instance, let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. random variables on $[0, 1]$ that are observed sequentially, and assume that one wants to maximize the probability of identifying online, and without recall, the last k records in X_1, \dots, X_n . The optimal strategy was found by [12] in terms of a generalized odds algorithm. If we define different rewards for $n \geq k$ (for k fixed) as a function of n and achieving the objective, then the optimal reward-weighted performance identifies the optimal strategy at the same time.

It would be interesting to go further: ideally, a suitable notion of performance would not only single out an optimal strategy (as in the examples above) but would also help to construct it. Here we encounter limitations, because in some problems we do not see a performance measure that offers a way around the complexity of the original problem. Consider, for instance, the celebrated unsolved Robbins' problem of minimizing the expected rank: let the random variables X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. uniform on $[0, 1]$. We say that X_i has rank k if it is the k th smallest value among X_1, \dots, X_n (for instance, X_i has rank 1 if and only if $X_i = \min(X_1, \dots, X_n)$). A sequential observer of X_1, \dots, X_n , who must stop on exactly one of the X_k 's without recall, would like to minimize the expected rank of their choice. Note that if one stops at X_k , its expected rank is $r(X_k) + (n - k)X_k$, where $r(X_k)$ is the relative rank of X_k observed so far. This expected rank must be compared with the optimal value by continuing. The latter is, however, fully history-dependent, i.e., depends on all X_1, \dots, X_k ; consequently, no simpler sufficient statistic exists. The problem is thus intractable for larger n and the solution is only known for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$; see [13]. Note that those of the future values X_{k+1}, \dots, X_n which fall into $[0, X_k]$ are again i.i.d. uniform on $[0, X_k]$, and the problem is the same as in the beginning. This raises the question: which performance measure could potentially reduce the complexity of Robbins' problem? If we could identify one that converges sufficiently fast before the end of the horizon as n grows, it could be crucial.

References

- [1] Rick Durrett. *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 5th edition, 2019.
- [2] Gregory F. Lawler and Vlada Limic. *Random Walk: A Modern Introduction*, volume 123 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [3] David A. Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2nd edition, 2017.
- [4] Søren Asmussen and Hansjörg Albrecher. *Ruin Probabilities*, volume 14 of *Advanced Series on Statistical Science & Applied Probability*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2nd edition, 2010.
- [5] David Williams. *Probability with Martingales*. Cambridge Mathematical Textbooks. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [6] David Siegmund. *Sequential Analysis: Tests and Confidence Intervals*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 1985.
- [7] Alexander G. Tartakovsky, Igor Nikiforov, and Michèle Basseville. *Sequential Analysis: Hypothesis Testing and Changepoint Detection*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2014.

- [8] William Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Volume I*. John Wiley & Sons, 3rd edition, 1968.
- [9] Gordana Žitković. Lecture 5: Random walks – advanced methods. Course notes for “Introduction to Stochastic Processes”, University of Texas at Austin, 2019. URL https://web.ma.utexas.edu/users/gordanz/notes/advanced_random_walks_color.pdf.
- [10] J. M. H. Olmsted. Rational values of trigonometric functions. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 52: 507–508, 1945.
- [11] Ivan Niven. *Irrational Numbers*, volume 11 of *Carus Mathematical Monographs*. Mathematical Association of America, 1956.
- [12] F. Thomas Bruss and Davy Paindaveine. Selecting a sequence of last successes in independent trials. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 37(2):389–399, 2000.
- [13] Rémi Dendievel and Yvik C. Swan. One step further: an explicit solution to Robbins’ problem when $n = 4$. *Math. Appl.*, 44(1):135–148, 2016.