A SHARP WEAK-TYPE BOUND FOR ITÔ PROCESSES AND SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS

ADAM OSĘKOWSKI

Abstract. Let $\alpha \geq 0$ and let X, Y be Itô processes

$$dX_t = \phi_t dB_t + \psi_t dt, \qquad dY_t = \zeta_t dB_t + \xi_t dt$$

such that $|X_0| \geq |Y_0|$, $|\phi| \geq |\zeta|$ and $\alpha\psi \geq |\xi|$. The purpose of the paper is to determine the optimal universal constant C_α in the weak-type estimate

$$\sup_\lambda \lambda \mathbb{P}(\sup_t |Y_t| \geq \lambda) \leq C_\alpha \sup_t \mathbb{E}|X_t|.$$

Then the inequality is extended, with unchanged constant, to the more general setting when X is a submartingale and Y is α-strongly differentially subordinate to X. As an application, a related estimate for subharmonic functions is established. The inequalities generalize and unify the earlier results of Burkholder, Choi and Hammack for Itô processes, stochastic integrals and smooth functions on Euclidean domains.

1. Introduction

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space, filtered by a nondecreasing right-continuous family $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of sub-σ-fields of $\mathcal{F}$. Assume in addition, that $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all the sets of probability 0. Let $B = (B_t)$ be an adapted Brownian motion starting from 0 such that $(B_t - B_s)_{t\geq s}$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_s$ for all $s \geq 0$. Let $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$, $Y = (Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be Itô processes with respect to B (cf. Ikeda and Watanabe [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= X_0 + \int_{0+}^t \phi_s dB_s + \int_{0+}^t \psi_s ds, \\ Y_t &= Y_0 + \int_{0+}^t \zeta_s dB_s + \int_{0+}^t \xi_s ds, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where (ϕ_s), (ψ_s), (ζ_s), (ξ_s) are predictable and satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{0+}^t |\phi_s|^2 ds < \infty \text{ and } \int_{0+}^t |\psi_s| ds < \infty \text{ for all } t > 0\right) = 1,$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{0+}^t |\zeta_s|^2 ds < \infty \text{ and } \int_{0+}^t |\xi_s| ds < \infty \text{ for all } t > 0\right) = 1.$$

Assuming control of X_0 over Y_0, ϕ over ζ and ψ over ξ, what can be said about the sizes of X and Y?

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60G44. Secondary: 60H05, 31A05.

Key words and phrases. Itô process, submartingale, subharmonic function, strong differential subordination.

Partially supported by Foundation for Polish Science and MNiSW grant N N201 397437.

This problem has gained some interest in the literature. Burkholder [4] showed that if X is a nonnegative submartingale and we have the domination $X_0 \geq |Y_0|$, $|\phi_s| \geq |\zeta_s|$ and $\psi_s \geq |\xi_s|$ for all s, then

$$\lambda \mathbb{P}(Y^* \geq \lambda) \leq 3||X||_1$$

for any $\lambda > 0$ and

$$||Y||_p \leq \max\{(p-1)^{-1}, 2p-1\}||X||_p, \quad 1 < p < \infty$$

(see also [5] for more general inequalities under the assumption of strong differential subordination). Here we have used the notation $X^* = \sup_{t \geq 0} |X_t|$ and $||X||_p = \sup_t ||X_t||_p$ for $p \geq 1$. Furthermore, both inequalities are sharp. These results have been strengthened by Choi in [6] and [7], who showed that if $\alpha \geq 0$ is a fixed number, X is a nonnegative submartingale and, in addition,

$$|X_0| \geq |Y_0|, \ |\phi_s| \geq |\zeta_s| \text{ and } \alpha\psi_s \geq |\xi_s| \text{ for all } s, \tag{1.2}$$

then

$$\lambda \mathbb{P}(Y^* \geq \lambda) \leq (\alpha+2)||X||_1$$

for any $\lambda > 0$ and

$$||Y||_p \leq \max\{(p-1)^{-1}, (\alpha+1)p-1\}||X||_p, \quad 1 < p < \infty.$$

Again, the constants $\alpha+2$ and $\max\{(p-1)^{-1}, (\alpha+1)p-1\}$ are optimal. There is a natural question about the validity of the above estimates without the assumption on the sign of X. The purpose of the present paper is to answer this question and, as an application, to establish some related results for subharmonic functions on open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In fact, we will study this problem under a weaker assumption. For any semimartingales X and Y, we say that Y is *differentially subordinate* to X, if the process $([X,X]_t - [Y,Y]_t)$ is nondecreasing and nonnegative as a function of t (see Bañuelos and Wang [1] or Wang [14] for discussion). Here $[X,X]$ denotes the quadratic variance process of X, see e.g. Dellacherie and Meyer [10]. This type of domination implies many interesting inequalities if X and Y are martingales or local martingales, see [14]. However, it turns out to be too weak for our purposes. We will work under the assumption of *α-strong differential subordination* (α-subordination in short), introduced by Wang in [14] in the particular case $\alpha = 1$, and by the author in [13] for general $\alpha \geq 0$. The definition is the following. Let X be an adapted submartingale, Y be adapted semimartingale and write Doob-Meyer decompositions

$$X = X_0 + M + C, \qquad Y = Y_0 + N + D, \tag{1.3}$$

where M, N are local martingale parts, and C, D are finite variation processes. In general the decompositions may not be unique; however, we assume that C is predictable and this determines the first of them. Let α be a fixed nonnegative number. We say that Y is α-subordinate to X, if Y is differentially subordinate to X and there is a decomposition (1.3) for Y such that the process $(\alpha C_t - |D|_t)$ is nondecreasing and nonnegative as a function of t. Here $|D|_t$ denotes the total variation of D on the interval $[0,t]$. Two observations are in order: first, in the setting of Itô processes described in (1.1), if $|X_0| \geq |Y_0|$, $|\phi_s| \geq |\zeta_s|$ and $\alpha\psi_s \geq |\xi_s|$ for all s, then, obviously, Y is α-subordinate to X. Second, the above domination extends to the case when Y takes values in a certain separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ (which can be assumed to be ℓ^2): one applies the Doob-Meyer decomposition for each coordinate of Y and then rewrites the definition of α-subordination with $[Y,Y]=\sum_{j=1}^\infty [Y^j,Y^j]$ and $|D|=\sum_{j=1}^\infty |D^j|$.

Now we are ready to state one of the main results of the paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\alpha\geq 0$ be fixed. Suppose that X is a submartingale and Y is an $\mathcal{H}$-valued semimartingale which is α-subordinate to X. Then*

$$\sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda\mathbb{P}(Y^*\geq\lambda)\leq C_\alpha||X||_1, \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$C_\alpha=\begin{cases}(\alpha+1)\big[1+(\alpha+1)^{1/\alpha}\big] & \text{if } \alpha\geq 1,\\ 6 & \text{if } \alpha\leq 1.\end{cases}$$

The constant is the best possible. It is already the best possible if $\mathcal{H}=\mathbb{R}$ and we restrict ourselves to the class of Itô processes (1.1) *satisfying* (1.2).

This theorem generalizes the following result of Hammack [11]. Suppose that X is a submartingale and Y is an Itô integral of H with respect to X, where H is a predictable process with values in the unit ball of $\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda\mathbb{P}(Y^*\geq\lambda)\leq 6||X||_1$$

and the inequality is sharp. This is an immediate consequence of our result stated above, since Y is 1-subordinate to X. Indeed, as the decomposition of Y we take $Y_t=Y_0+\int_{0+}^t H_s dM_s+\int_{0+}^t H_s dC_s$, where M, C come from (1.3), and we observe that

$$[X,X]_t-[Y,Y]_t=\int_0^t(1-|H_s|^2)d[X,X]_s \text{ and } C_t-|D_t|=\int_0^t(1-|H_s|)dC_s$$

for all $t\geq 0$.

In order to establish Theorem 1.1, we will deal with the following stronger statement.

Theorem 1.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, we have*

$$\sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda\mathbb{P}(Y^*\geq\lambda)\leq K_\alpha||X^+||_1-(C_\alpha-K_\alpha)\mathbb{E}X_0, \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$K_\alpha=\begin{cases}(\alpha+1)^{1+1/\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha\geq 1,\\ 4 & \text{if } \alpha\leq 1.\end{cases}$$

The inequality is sharp. In consequence, if the submartingale X starts from 0, *then*

$$\sup_{\lambda>0}\lambda\mathbb{P}(Y^*\geq\lambda)\leq K_\alpha||X||_1. \tag{1.6}$$

This inequality is also sharp.

Concerning the moment inequalities, we have the following negative result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $1\leq p<\infty$ and $\beta>0$. Then there is a non-trivial pair (X,Y) of Itô processes as in* (1.1) *such that*

(i) $X_0=Y_0=0$,
(ii) *X is a submartingale, Y is a martingale,*
(iii) $|\phi_s|=|\zeta_s|$ *for all $s>0$*

and

$$||Y||_1 \geq \beta ||X||_p.$$

In other words, moment inequalities fail to hold even under the most restrictive 0-*domination.*

A few words about the proof and the organization of the paper. The proof of (1.5) is based on Burkholder's method: the inequality follows if one constructs a certain special function and exploits its properties. We do this in the next section. Section 3 concerns the sharpness of the estimate and we also prove Theorem 1.3 there. In the final part of the paper we present an application: a weak-type inequality for smooth functions on Euclidean domains.

2. Proof of (1.5)

Let α be a fixed nonnegative number and let ν be a positive integer. Consider the following subsets of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu$. If $\alpha \geq 1$, then

$$D_1^\alpha = \{(x,y) : \alpha|x| + |y| \geq 1,\ x \leq 0\},$$
$$D_2^\alpha = \{(x,y) : |x| + |y| \geq 1,\ x \geq 0\},$$
$$D_3^\alpha = (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu) \setminus (D_1^\alpha \cup D_2^\alpha).$$

If $\alpha \in [0,1)$, then let $D_i^\alpha = D_i^1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The proof rests on the special functions $U_\alpha : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu \to \mathbb{R}$ given as follows. If $\alpha \geq 1$, then

$$U_\alpha(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 - K_\alpha x^+ & \text{if } (x,y) \in D_1^\alpha \cup D_2^\alpha, \\ 1 - (\alpha x - |y| + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha} & \text{if } (x,y) \in D_3^\alpha \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

and $U_\alpha(x,y) = U_1(x,y)$ for $\alpha \in [0,1)$.

Lemma 2.1. *The functions U_α enjoy the following.*

(i) *We have the majorization*

$$U_\alpha(x,y) \geq 1_{D_1^\alpha \cup D_2^\alpha}(x,y) - K_\alpha x^+.$$

(ii) *If $(x,y) \in D_3^\alpha$, then*

$$U_{\alpha x}(x,y) + \alpha |U_{\alpha y}(x,y)| \leq 0. \tag{2.2}$$

(iii) *If $(x,y) \in D_3^\alpha$ and $|y| \neq 0$, then for any $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$,*

$$U_{\alpha xx}(x,y)h^2 + 2(U_{\alpha xy}(x,y)h, k) + (kU_{\alpha yy}(x,y), k) \leq c_\alpha(x,y)(|k|^2 - h^2), \tag{2.3}$$

where $c_\alpha(x,y) = (\alpha+1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y|+1)^{1/\alpha - 1} \geq 0$ for $\alpha \geq 1$, and $c_\alpha(x,y) = 2$ for $\alpha \in [0,1)$.

(iv) *If $(x,y) \in D_3^\alpha$, then for any $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $k \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ satisfying $|k| \leq |h|$ we have*

$$U_\alpha(x+h, y+k) \leq U_\alpha(x,y) + U_{\alpha x}(x,y)h + (U_{\alpha y}(x,y), k). \tag{2.4}$$

(v) *Assume that $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu$ satisfies $|y| \leq |x|$. Then $U_\alpha(x,y) \leq -(\alpha+1)x$ for $\alpha \geq 1$ and $U_\alpha(x,y) \leq -2x$ for $\alpha \in [0,1)$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that we may restrict ourselves to the case $\alpha \geq 1$.

(i) We only need to prove the majorization on D_3^α. Then the inequality takes form

$$1 - (\alpha x - |y| + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha} \geq -K_\alpha x^+.$$

For a fixed x, the left-hand side increases as $|y|$ increases. Hence it suffices to show the estimate for $y = 0$: $1 - (\alpha x + 1)^{1+1/\alpha} \geq -K_\alpha x^+$. This is evident for

$x \leq 0$ (then $\alpha x + 1 \leq 1$), while for $x \geq 0$ we use the fact that the function $F(x) = 1 - (\alpha x + 1)^{1+1/\alpha}$ is concave and lies above the linear $G(x) = -K_\alpha x$ on $[0, 1]$, since $F(0) = G(0)$ and $F(1) = G(1) + 1 > G(1)$.

Before we proceed, let us mention the following easy consequence, which will be used below. By the fact that U_α is continuous and $1_{D_1^\alpha \cup D_2^\alpha}$ is upper semicontinuous, we see that for any $\eta > 1$ there is $R = R(\eta) > 0$ such that $R(\eta) \to 0$ as $\eta \downarrow 1$ and

$$U_\alpha(x, y) \geq 1_{D_1^\alpha \cup D_2^\alpha}(\eta x, \eta y) - K_\alpha x^+ - R(\eta). \tag{2.5}$$

(ii) A direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\alpha x}(x, y) &= -(\alpha + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha - 1}[\alpha x + 1 + (\alpha - 1)|y|], \\ U_{\alpha y}(x, y) &= (\alpha + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha - 1} y, \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

so

$$U_{\alpha x}(x, y) + \alpha|U_{\alpha y}(x, y)| = -(\alpha + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha - 1}(\alpha x + 1 - |y|) \leq 0.$$

(iii) A little calculation leads to

$$U_{\alpha xx}(x, y)h^2 + 2(U_{\alpha xy}(x, y)h, k) + (kU_{\alpha yy}(x, y), k) = I_1 + I_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= (\alpha + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha - 1}(|k|^2 - h^2), \\ I_2 &= (\alpha + 1)(1 - \alpha)|y|(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha - 2} \left[h + (y, k)/|y|\right]^2 \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

(iv) If $h = 0$, the bound is trivial. Suppose then, that $h \neq 0$ and consider a function $G : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $G(t) = U_\alpha(x + t, y + tk/h)$. Let $t_0 = \sup\{t : (x + t, y + tk/h) \in D_1^\alpha\} < 0$ and $t_1 = \inf\{t : (x + t, y + tk/h) \in D_2^\alpha\} > 0$. We have that G is continuous, equal to 1 on $(-\infty, t_0]$ and linear on $[t_1, \infty)$. In addition, G is concave on (t_0, t_1): this is guaranteed by (iii) and the assumption $|k| \leq |h|$. Thus, rewriting (2.4) in the form $G(h) \leq G(0) + G'(0)h$, we see that it suffices to prove that $G'(0) \leq 0$ and $G'(0) \geq G'(t_1+) = -K_\alpha$. By (ii), we have

$$G'(0) \leq U_{\alpha x}(x, y) + |U_{\alpha y}(x, y)| \cdot |k|/h \leq U_{\alpha x}(x, y) + \alpha|U_{\alpha y}(x, y)| \leq 0.$$

Furthermore, using $(y, k)/h \geq -|y|$ and the estimate $x + |y| \leq 1$ coming from the definition of D_3^α,

$$\begin{aligned} G'(0) &= -(\alpha + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha - 1}[\alpha x + 1 + (\alpha - 1)|y| - (y, k)/h] \\ &\geq -(\alpha + 1)(\alpha x + \alpha|y| + 1)^{1/\alpha} \geq -(\alpha + 1)^{1/\alpha + 1} = -K_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

(v) By (iv), we have

$$U_\alpha(x, y) \leq U_\alpha(0, 0) + U_{\alpha x}(0, 0)x + (U_{\alpha y}(0, 0), y) = -(\alpha + 1)x.$$

This completes the proof. □

For any semimartingale X there exists a unique continuous local martingale part X^c of X satisfying

$$[X, X]_t = |X_0|^2 + [X^c, X^c]_t + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} |\triangle X_s|^2$$

for all $t \geq 0$ (here $\triangle X_s = X_s - X_{s-}$ is the jump of X at time $s > 0$). Furthermore, $[X^c, X^c] = [X, X]^c$, the pathwise continuous part of $[X, X]$. We will need Lemma 1 from [14], which can be stated as follows.

Lemma 2.2. *If X and Y are semimartingales, then Y is differentially subordinate to X if and only if Y^c is differentially subordinate to X^c, $|Y_0| \leq |X_0|$ and for any $s > 0$ we have $|\triangle Y_s| \leq |\triangle X_s|$.*

Now we turn to the proofs of the announced estimates.

Proof of (1.5). Let us start with some reductions. First, we may assume that $||X^+||_1 < \infty$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. Second, by homogeneity, it suffices to prove that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y^* \geq 1) \leq K_\alpha ||X^+||_1 - (C_\alpha - K_\alpha)\mathbb{E}X_0. \tag{2.7}$$

The third observation is that we may restrict ourselves to the case $\alpha \geq 1$: indeed, if X, Y satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 with some $\alpha < 1$, then they satisfy the assumptions for $\alpha = 1$ as well, and $C_\alpha = C_1$, $K_\alpha = K_1$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. The next step is to reduce (1.4) to the case of finite dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$. To do this, we observe that we may take $\mathcal{H}$ to be equal to ℓ^2. For a fixed positive integer ν, the truncated process

$$Y_t^{(\nu)} = (Y_t^1, Y_t^2 \ldots, Y_t^\nu, 0, 0, \ldots)$$

is α-subordinate to X and, in addition, for any $\delta < 1$, we have $\mathbb{P}(Y^* \geq 1) \leq \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(Y^{(\nu)*} \geq \delta)$. Thus having established (2.7) for finite dimensional $\mathcal{H}$, we may write

$$\delta\mathbb{P}(Y^* \geq 1) \leq K_\alpha ||X^+||_1 - (C_\alpha - K_\alpha)\mathbb{E}X_0$$

and it suffices to let $\delta \uparrow 1$ to obtain (2.7) in full generality. Therefore, from now on, $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^\nu$ for some positive integer ν.

The main tool in the proof is the Itô formula. However, we are not allowed to apply it to the function U_α, since it is not sufficiently smooth. Therefore, we need to use some extra approximation arguments. Fix a number $\eta > 1$ and introduce the stopping time $\tau = \inf\{t : (X_t, Y_t) \notin D_3^\alpha/\eta\}$ (here $D_3^\alpha/\eta = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu : (\eta x, \eta y) \in D_3^\alpha\}$). Suppose that $\delta > 0$ satisfies

$$\mathrm{dist}(D_1^\alpha \cup D_2^\alpha, D_3^\alpha/\eta) > \delta \tag{2.8}$$

and consider a C^∞ function $g : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu \to [0, \infty)$, supported on the ball of center $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu$ and radius δ, satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^\nu} g = 1$. Introduce a function $U_\alpha^\delta : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^\nu \to \mathbb{R}$, given by the convolution

$$U_\alpha^\delta(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^\nu} U_\alpha(x - u, y - v)g(u, v)dudv.$$

Observe that by (2.8), if $(x, y) \in D_3^\alpha/\eta$, then for all (u, v) lying in the support of g we have $(x - u, y - v) \in D_3^\alpha$. Consequently, for these (x, y), the function U_α^δ enjoys the properties described in Lemma 2.1 (ii), (iii) and (iv) (in (iii), we replace $c_\alpha(x, y)$ by

$$c_\alpha^\delta(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^\nu} c_\alpha(x - u, y - v)g^\delta(u, v)dudv \geq 0).$$

Indeed, note that U_α is of class C^1 in D_3^α (see (2.6)), so the properties follow from the integration.

The function U_α^δ is of class C^∞, so we may apply Itô's formula and obtain

$$U_\alpha^\delta(X_{\tau\wedge t}, Y_{\tau\wedge t}) = U_\alpha^\delta(X_0, Y_0) + I_1 + I_2/2 + I_3 + I_4, \tag{2.9}$$

where (recall M, N, C, D given by (1.3), with the decomposition of Y coming from the α-subordination)

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha x}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})dM_s + \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha y}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})dN_s,\\
I_2 &= \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha xx}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})d[M^c,M^c] + 2\sum_{i=1}^{\nu}\int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha x y_i}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})d[M^c,N^{ic}]\\
&\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\nu}\int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha y_i y_j}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})d[N^{ic},N^{jc}]_s,\\
I_3 &= \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha x}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})dC_s + \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha y}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})dD_s,\\
I_4 &= \sum_{0<s\leq\tau\wedge t}\big[U^\delta_\alpha(X_s,Y_s) - U^\delta_\alpha(X_{s-},Y_{s-})\\
&\qquad\qquad - U^\delta_{\alpha x}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})\Delta X_s - (U^\delta_{\alpha y}(X_{s-},Y_{s-}),\Delta Y_s)\big].
\end{aligned}
$$

Now let us look at the terms in (2.9). We have that $\mathbb{E}I_1 = 0$, by the properties of stochastic integrals. Furthermore, I_2 is nonpositive. To see this, we proceed as in [14]: we approximate the integrals by appropriate Riemann sums and apply (2.3) to the function U^δ_α (which is permitted since $(X_{s-},Y_{s-})\in D^\alpha_3/\lambda$). This yields

$$I_2 \leq c^\delta_\alpha(x,y)(-[X^c,X^c]_{\tau\wedge t} + [Y^c,Y^c]_{\tau\wedge t} - (-[X^c,X^c]_0 + [Y^c,Y^c]_0)) \leq 0,$$

due to the differential subordination of Y^c to X^c. To deal with I_3, note that by α-subordination, and then by (2.2),

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_3 &\leq \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha x}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})dC_s + \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} |U^\delta_{\alpha y}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})|d|D_s|\\
&\leq \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} U^\delta_{\alpha x}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})dC_s + \int_{0+}^{\tau\wedge t} \alpha|U^\delta_{\alpha y}(X_{s-},Y_{s-})|dC_s \leq 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, $I_4 \leq 0$ due to the part (iv) of Lemma 2.1: here we use the inequality $|\triangle Y_s| \leq |\triangle X_s|$ coming from the differential subordination. Thus we have shown that

$$\mathbb{E}U^\delta_\alpha(X_{\tau\wedge t},Y_{\tau\wedge t}) \leq \mathbb{E}U^\delta_\alpha(X_0,Y_0). \tag{2.10}$$

Now note that $|U_\alpha(x,y)| \leq L + K_\alpha x^+$ for some absolute constant L, which implies that $|U^\delta_\alpha(x,y)| \leq L + K_\alpha(x^+ + \delta)$. Moreover, U_α is continuous; thus letting $\delta\to 0$ in (2.10) and using Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}U_\alpha(X_{\tau\wedge t},Y_{\tau\wedge t}) \leq \mathbb{E}U_\alpha(X_0,Y_0) \leq -(\alpha+1)\mathbb{E}X_0.$$

Here in the last passage we have exploited part (v) of Lemma 2.1 together with the fact that $|Y_0| \leq |X_0|$. Combining this with (2.5), we get

$$\mathbb{P}((X_{\tau\wedge t},Y_{\tau\wedge t}) \notin D^\alpha_3/\eta) \leq K_\alpha\mathbb{E}X^+_{\tau\wedge t} - (\alpha+1)\mathbb{E}X_0 + R(\eta).$$

Now $\{Y^* \geq 1\} \subseteq \{\tau < \infty\} = \bigcup_t\{(X_{\tau\wedge t},Y_{\tau\wedge t}) \notin D^\alpha_3/\eta\}$, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Y^*\geq 1) &\leq K_\alpha\sup_t \mathbb{E}X^+_{\tau\wedge t} - (\alpha+1)\mathbb{E}X_0 + R(\eta)\\
&\leq K_\alpha\sup_t \mathbb{E}X^+_t - (\alpha+1)\mathbb{E}X_0 + R(\eta),
\end{aligned}
$$

by Doob's optional sampling theorem (the process (X_t^+) is a submartingale). Letting $\eta \downarrow 1$ completes the proof of (1.5). $\square$

3. Sharpness and lack of moment estimates

3.1. **Sharpness.** We will construct examples of Itô processes X, Y, which will exhibit the optimality of the constants C_α, K_α in (1.4) and (1.6), respectively. This will also prove that the estimate (1.5) is sharp.

The construction will consist of two parts. The first step is to find, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, an appropriate pair (F, G) of Itô processes starting from 0 such that

$$\mathbb{P}(G^* \geq 1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad ||F_\infty||_1 \leq K_\alpha^{-1} + \varepsilon$$

and another pair (F, G) of Itô processes, satisfying $F_0 = -G_0 \equiv -C_\alpha^{-1}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(G^* \geq 1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad ||F_\infty||_1 \leq C_\alpha^{-1} + \varepsilon.$$

Here, as usual, F_∞ denotes the pointwise limit of F_t as $t \to \infty$. Next, in the second part, we shall modify these pairs so that the above conditions are satisfied, but with $||F_\infty||_1$ replaced by $||F||_1$. This will immediately yield the claim.

Part I. We will present a unified construction which produces both pairs (F, G) mentioned above. Assume first that $\alpha \geq 1$, let $x_0 \in \{-C_\alpha^{-1}, 0\}$ and pick a large positive integer N. Set $\delta = 1/(2N)$ and let $(B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a one-dimensional Brownian motion started at x_0. For $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, let

$$\ell_n = \frac{-1 + 2(n-1)\delta}{\alpha + 1}, \qquad\qquad r_n = (2n-1)\delta$$

and put $\ell_{N+1} = 0$, $r_{N+1} = 2$. Introduce the stopping times $\tau_i = \tau_i(\alpha)$, $0 \leq i \leq N+1$, as follows: $\tau_0 \equiv 0$ and, by induction,

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t > \tau_{n-1} : B_t \leq \ell_n \text{ or } B_t \geq r_n\}, \ n = 1, 2, \ldots, N+1.$$

Note that the sequence (ℓ_n) is increasing; hence if $B_{\tau_k} = \ell_k$ for some k, then $\tau_k = \tau_{k+1} = \ldots = \tau_{N+1}$. We are ready to introduce Itô processes $F = (F_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $G = (G_t)_{t\geq 0}$. Let $F_0 \equiv -G_0 \equiv x_0$,

$$dF_t = 1_{\{t\leq\tau_{N+1}\}} dB_t + 1_{\{\tau_{N+1} < t \leq \tau_{N+1} - B_{\tau_{N+1}}\}} dt$$

and

$$dG_t = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N+1} (-1)^n 1_{\{\tau_{n-1} < t \leq \tau_n\}}\right) dB_t + \alpha\, \text{sgn}(G_{\tau_{N+1}}) 1_{\{\tau_{N+1} < t \leq \tau_{N+1} - B_{\tau_{N+1}}\}} dt.$$

Clearly, F is a submartingale, which dominates G in a sense described in (1.2). For a better understanding of these two processes, it is convenient to look at the properties of $(F_t, G_t)_{t\geq 0}$ at two stages: for $t \leq \tau_{N+1}$, where it has "martingale behavior" and $t > \tau_{N+1}$, where F is nondecreasing. The pair starts from $(x_0, -x_0)$ and, for $t \in (\tau_{n-1}, \tau_n]$, $n \leq N$, it moves along the line of slope $(-1)^n$ until it reaches the set $\{(x, y) : -\alpha x + |y| = 1\}$ or $G_{\tau_n} = (-1)^n \delta$. If the first possibility occurs, we have $\tau_n = \tau_{N+1}$; in the second case the move continues and the slope switches to $(-1)^{n+1}$. On $t \in (\tau_N, \tau_{N+1}]$ the behavior is similar, but here we stop the move if F reaches 0 or 2. One easily checks that at the end of the first stage, $(F_{\tau_{N+1}}, |G_{\tau_{N+1}}|) = (2, 1)$ (this is when $B_{\tau_n} = r_n$ for all $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N+1$) or $-\alpha F_{\tau_{N+1}} + |G_{\tau_{N+1}}| = 1$ (this happens when $B_{\tau_n} = \ell_n$ for some n). Now, in the first case, the pair stops ultimately: we have $F_{\tau_{N+1}} = B_{\tau_{N+1}} = 2$, so the event

$\{\tau_{N+1} < t \leq \tau_{N+1} - B_{\tau_{N+1}}\}$ is empty. If the second possibility occurs, then $(F_{\tau_{N+1}+t}, |G_{\tau_{N+1}+t}|) = (F_{\tau_{N+1}} + t, |G_{\tau_{N+1}+t}| + \alpha t)$ for $t \in [0, -F_{\tau_{N+1}}]$ and then the pair stops. We see that $\tau := \tau_{N+1} + 1$ can be regarded as the terminal stopping time of the pair (F, G): we have that $dF_t = dG_t = 0$ for $t \geq \tau$.

In the case $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, the construction is similar. Let $\tau_j = \tau_j(1)$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots,$ $N + 1$ be the stopping times coming from the case $\alpha = 1$, and let $\tau_{N+2} = \inf\{t > \tau_{N+1} : B_t \leq -2 \text{ or } B_t \geq 0\}$. The pair (F, G) is given by $F_0 = -G_0 \equiv x_0$ and

$$dF_t = 1_{\{t \leq \tau_{N+2}\}} dB_t + 1_{\{\tau_{N+2} < t \leq \tau_{N+2} - B_{\tau_{N+2}}\}} dt,$$

$$dG_t = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N+1} (-1)^n 1_{\{\tau_{n-1} < t \leq \tau_n\}} \right) dB_t + \operatorname{sgn}(G_{\tau_{N+1}}) 1_{\{\tau_{N+1} < t \leq \tau_{N+2}\}} dB_t.$$

Therefore, comparing to the case $\alpha \geq 1$, we see that the second stage splits into two steps: a martingale move of (F, G) along the line $-x + y = 1$ or $x + y = -1$ on the interval $[\tau_{N+1}, \tau_{N+2}]$ and the second step, for $t \geq \tau_{N+2}$, when F is nondecreasing. We see that G is a martingale which is differentially subordinate to F; hence G is α-subordinate to F for any $\alpha \geq 0$. We define the terminal stopping time by $\tau := \tau_{N+2} + 2$.

Now we shall prove the aforementioned bounds for F and G.

Lemma 3.1. *We have $G^* \geq 1$ almost surely and $||F||_1 \leq 2$. Furthermore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is N such that*

$$||F_\infty||_1 = ||F_\tau||_1 \leq (1 + (\alpha + 1)x_0)(1 + \alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha} + \varepsilon.$$

Remark 3.1. Note that $(1 + (\alpha + 1)x_0)(1 + \alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha}$ is equal to C_α^{-1} or K_α^{-1} (depending on whether $x_0 = -C_\alpha^{-1}$ or $x_0 = 0$, respectively).

Proof of Lemma 3.1. The first two properties are obvious: we have $|G_\tau| = 1$ and $|F_t| \leq 2$ for any $t \geq 0$. We will prove the third condition only for $\alpha \geq 1$; for the remaining α the calculations can be carried out in a similar manner. Note that $F_\tau \in \{0, 2\}$ and $F_\tau = 2$ if and only if $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \ldots < \tau_N$ and $F_{\tau_{N+1}} = 2$, that is, $B_{\tau_n} = r_n$ for all $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N+1$. For convenience, let $r_0 = x_0$ and note that by the definition of τ_n and elementary properties of Brownian motion, we may write the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(F_\tau = 2) &= \prod_{n=1}^{N+1} \frac{r_{n-1} - \ell_n}{r_n - \ell_n} \\
&= \frac{r_0 - \ell_1}{r_1 - \ell_1} \cdot \frac{r_N - \ell_{N+1}}{r_{N+1} - \ell_{N+1}} \prod_{n=2}^{N} \frac{r_{n-1} - \ell_n}{r_n - \ell_n} \\
&= \frac{x_0 + (\alpha + 1)^{-1}}{\delta + (\alpha + 1)^{-1}} \cdot \frac{1 - \delta}{2} \cdot \prod_{n=2}^{N} \left(1 - \frac{2\delta(\alpha + 1)}{1 + \delta[(2n - 1)\alpha + 1]} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{(1 + x_0(\alpha + 1))(1 - \delta)}{2(1 + \delta(\alpha + 1))} \exp\left[-2\delta(\alpha + 1) \sum_{n=2}^{N} (1 + \delta[(2n - 1)\alpha + 1])^{-1} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{(1 + x_0(\alpha + 1))(1 - \delta)}{2(1 + \delta(\alpha + 1))} \left(\frac{1 + \delta + (2N + 1)\delta\alpha}{1 + \delta + 5\delta\alpha} \right)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here in the first inequality we have used the elementary bound $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ and in the second estimate we have exploited the fact that

$$2\delta \sum_{n=2}^{N} (1 + \delta[1 + (2n-1)\alpha])^{-1} \geq \int_{5\delta}^{(2N+1)\delta} (1 + \delta + \alpha x)^{-1} dx$$
$$= \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \frac{1 + \delta + (2N+1)\delta\alpha}{1 + \delta + 5\delta\alpha}.$$

The claim follows: recall that $\delta = (2N)^{-1}$, so letting $N \to \infty$ implies that the above upper bound for $\mathbb{P}(F_\tau = 2)$ converges to

$$\frac{(\alpha+1)x_0 + 1}{2}(1+\alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha},$$

as needed. □

Part II. Note that there is no hope for the equality $||F_\infty||_1 = ||F||_1$, since the submartingale F takes negative values. Thus we need some additional modification of the pair to ensure that the first moment of the dominating process is arbitrarily close to $||F_\tau||_1$. The main idea is to work on small portions of the probability space, using appropriate copy of (F, G) on each portion. To be more precise, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and fixed. For the sake of convenience, we split the reasoning into four steps.

Step 1. An auxiliary parameter K. By Lemma 3.1 there are N and $K > 0$ such that

$$||F_t||_1 \leq (1 + (\alpha+1)x_0)(1+\alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha} + 2\varepsilon,$$

whenever $t \geq K$.

Step 2. Time-shifted copies of (F, G). For $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, let (F^j, G^j) be a pair given by the above construction, but with $(B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ replaced by the time-shifted Brownian motion

$$B_t^j = \begin{cases} x_0 & \text{if } t \leq Kj, \\ x_0 + B_t - B_{Kj} & \text{if } t > Kj. \end{cases}$$

Then $(F_t^j, G_t^j) = (x_0, -x_0)$ for $t \leq Kj$ and

$$((F^j_{Kj+t}, G^j_{Kj+t}))_{t\geq 0} \text{ has the same distribution as } (F, G). \tag{3.1}$$

Furthermore, F^j, G^j are Itô processes with respect to the original Brownian motion B and F^j dominates G^j in the sense of (1.2).

Step 3. Definition of (X, Y). Fix a positive integer k and consider a random variable η independent of B, with the distribution $\mathbb{P}(\eta = j) = 1/k$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$. This random variable splits Ω into k parts $\{\eta = 0\}$, $\{\eta = 1\}$, $\ldots$, $\{\eta = k-1\}$. We define

$$(X_t, Y_t) = (F_t^j, G_t^j) \qquad \text{on} \quad \{\eta = j\},$$

for $t \geq 0$ and $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$. Then, by the preceding step, both X and Y are Itô processes with respect to B and the domination (1.2) is satisfied.

Step 4. Final calculations. Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y^* \geq 1) = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(G^{j*} \geq 1) = 1$$

and for any $t \geq 0$,

$$||X_t||_1 = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} ||F_t^j||_1.$$

Now, if $t \leq Kj$, then $F_t^j = x_0$, so $||F_t^j||_1 = -x_0$ and hence

$$||F_t^j||_1 \leq (1 + (\alpha+1)x_0)(1+\alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha} + 2\varepsilon.$$

If $t \in (Kj, Kj+K)$, then $||F_t^j||_1 = ||F_{t-Kj}||_1 \leq 2$ in virtue of Lemma 3.1. Finally, if $t \geq Kj + K$, then by Step 1,

$$||F_t^j||_1 = ||F_{t-Kj}||_1 \leq (1 + (\alpha+1)x_0)(1+\alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha} + 2\varepsilon.$$

In consequence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \geq 0} ||X_t||_1 &\leq \frac{k-1}{k} \left[(1 + (\alpha+1)x_0)(1+\alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha} + 2\varepsilon \right] + \frac{2}{k} \\ &< (1 + (\alpha+1)x_0)(1+\alpha)^{-(\alpha+1)/\alpha} + 3\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

provided k is sufficiently large. This completes the proof of the sharpness.

3.2. **Lack of moment inequalities.** The argumentation is similar to the previous one. Let B be a Brownian motion starting from zero, let $\tau_0 = \inf\{t > 0 : |B_t| = 1\}$ and, by induction,

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t > \tau_{n-1} : B_t = -n-1 \text{ or } B_t \geq 0\}, \qquad n = 1, 2, \ldots.$$

Now, for a fixed positive integer N, let $F_0 = G_0 \equiv 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} dF_t &= 1_{\{t \leq \tau_{2N-1}\}} dB_t + 1_{\{\tau_{2N-1} < t \leq \tau_{2N-1} - B_{\tau_{2N-1}}\}} dt, \\ dG_t &= \left(\sum_{n=1}^{2N-1} (-1)^n 1_{\{\tau_{n-1} < t \leq \tau_n\}} \right) dB_t. \end{aligned}$$

The processes F, G satisfy the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) described in Theorem 1.3. In addition, if we set $\tau = \inf\{t > \tau_0 : F_t \geq 0\}$, we have

$$||F_\tau||_p = \frac{1}{2}, \qquad ||G_\tau||_1 \geq \sum_{k=1}^{2N-1} \frac{1}{2(k+1)}. \tag{3.2}$$

The equality is trivial: $F_\tau = 1$ on the set $\{B_{\tau_0} = 1\}$ (which has probability 1/2) and $F_\tau = 0$ on the complement of this event. To prove the inequality for $||G_\tau||_1$, observe that if $k = 1, 2, \ldots, 2N-1$, then

$$|G_\tau| = \left| \sum_{n=1}^{k} (-1)^k (B_{\tau_n} - B_{\tau_{n-1}}) \right| = 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor$$

on the set $\{\tau = \tau_k > \tau_{k-1}\}$. Therefore, since

$$\{\tau = \tau_k > \tau_{k-1}\} = \{B_{\tau_0} = -1, B_{\tau_1} = -2, \ldots, B_{\tau_{k-1}} = -k, B_{\tau_k} = 0\},$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} ||G_\tau||_1 &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{2N-1} 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \mathbb{P}(\tau = \tau_k > \tau_{k-1}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{2N-1} 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{2k(k+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired estimate.

Thus for any β one can choose N such that $||G||_1 = ||G_\tau||_1 > \beta||F_\tau||_p$. However, as before, this does not give the claim, since $||F||_p > ||F_\tau||_p$. Therefore the pair (F, G) must be modified; this is done exactly in the same manner as previously, using small portions of the probability space and appropriate copies of (F, G). The details are left to the reader.

4. Inequality for smooth functions

As an application of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we present a weak-type estimate for α-subordinate smooth functions on Euclidean domains. Suppose that Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, n being a fixed positive integer, such that $0 \in \Omega$. Let $\overline{\Omega}$ be a bounded subdomain of Ω with $0 \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $\partial\overline{\Omega} \subset \Omega$. Denote by μ the harmonic measure on $\partial\overline{\Omega}$ with respect to 0. Consider two real-valued C^2 functions u, v on Ω. Following [2], we say that v is differentially subordinate to u if

$$|\nabla v(x)| \leq |\nabla u(x)| \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega.$$

Furthermore, for $\alpha \geq 0$, the function v is α-subordinate to u if it is differentially subordinate to u and, in addition,

$$|\Delta v(x)| \leq \alpha|\Delta u(x)| \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega$$

(see [5] and [8]). The inequalities comparing the sizes of u and v under the assumption of (strong) differential subordination were studied by a number of authors, see e.g. [1], [2], [3], [5], [8], [9] and [13]. Our contribution in this direction is described in the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\alpha \geq 0$ and suppose that u is subharmonic, v is α-subordinate to u and $|v(0)| \leq |u(0)|$. Then*

$$\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda\mu(|v(x)| \geq \lambda) \leq C_\alpha \int_{\partial\overline{\Omega}} |u(x)| d\mu(x) \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda\mu(|v(x)| \geq \lambda) \leq K_\alpha \int_{\partial\overline{\Omega}} u(x)^+ d\mu(x) - (C_\alpha - K_\alpha)u(0). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Consider n-dimensional Brownian motion W starting from 0 and let τ denote the exit time of $\overline{\Omega}$: $\tau = \inf\{t : W_t \notin \overline{\Omega}\}$. Introduce the processes

$$X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0} = (u(W_{\tau\wedge t}))_{t\geq 0}, \quad Y = (Y_t)_{t\geq 0} = (v(W_{\tau\wedge t}))_{t\geq 0}$$

and apply Itô's formula: for any $t \geq 0$,

$$X_t = u(0) + \int_0^t \nabla u(W_{\tau\wedge s}) dW_s + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \triangle u(W_{\tau\wedge s}) ds = X_0 + M_t + C_t,$$

$$Y_t = v(0) + \int_0^t \nabla v(W_{\tau\wedge s}) dW_s + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \triangle v(W_{\tau\wedge s}) ds = Y_0 + N_t + D_t.$$

Since

$$[M, M]_t - [N, N]_t = |u(0)|^2 - |v(0)|^2 + \int_0^t \left(|\nabla u(W_{\tau\wedge s})|^2 - |\nabla v(W_{\tau\wedge s})|^2\right) ds$$

and

$$\alpha C_t - |D|_t = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \left(\alpha\triangle u(W_{\tau\wedge s}) - |\triangle v(W_{\tau\wedge s})|\right) ds,$$

we see that α-subordination of the functions u and v implies that Y is α-subordinate to X. Since $\mu(|v(x)| \geq \lambda) \leq \mathbb{P}(Y^* \geq \lambda)$ and $||X^+||_1 = \int_{\partial\overline{\Omega}} u(x)^+ d\mu(x)$, we see that (1.5) implies (4.2) and this, in turn, yields (4.1). □

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank an anonymous referee for a very careful reading of the manuscript, many remarks and helpful suggestions.

References

[1] R. Bañuelos and G. Wang, *Sharp inequalities for martingales with applications to the Beurling-Ahlfors and Riesz transformations*, Duke Math. J. **80** (1995), 575–600.

[2] D. L. Burkholder, *Differential subordination of harmonic functions and martingales*, Harmonic Analysis and Partial Differential Equations (El Escorial, 1987), Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1384 (1989), 1–23.

[3] D. L. Burkholder, *Explorations in martingale theory and its applications*, Ecole d'Ete de Probabilits de Saint-Flour XIX—1989, pp. 1–66, Lecture Notes in Math., 1464, Springer, Berlin, 1991.

[4] D. L. Burkholder, *Sharp probability bounds for Itô processes*, in: J. K. Ghosh, S. K. Mitra, K. R. Parathasarathy, and B. L. S. Prakasa Rao, eds., Statistics and Probability: A Raghu Raj Bahadur Festschrift, Wiley, New York, 1993, pp. 135–145.

[5] D. L. Burkholder, *Strong differential subordination and stochastic integration*, Ann. Probab. **22** (1994), pp. 995–1025.

[6] C. Choi, *A norm inequality for Itô processes*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **37** Vol. 2 (1997), pp. 229–240.

[7] C. Choi, *A sharp bound for Itô processes*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **35** (1998), No. 3, pp. 713–725

[8] C. Choi, *A weak-type inequality of subharmonic functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **126** (1998), 1149–1153.

[9] C. Choi, *A weak-type inequality for differentially subordinate harmonic functions*, Trans. Amer. math. Soc. **350** (1998), 2687–2696.

[10] C. Dellacherie and P.-A. Meyer, *Probabilities and potential B: Theory of martingales*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.

[11] W. Hammack, *Sharp maximal inequalities for stochastic integrals in which the integrator is a submartingale*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **124** Vol. 3 (1996), pp. 931–938.

[12] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe, *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.

[13] A. Osękowski, *Strong differential subordination and sharp inequalities for orthogonal processes*, J. Theoret. Probab. **22**, Vol. 4 (2009), pp. 837–855.

[14] G. Wang, *Differential subordination and strong differential subordination for continuous time martingales and related sharp inequalities*, Ann. Probab. **23** (1995), 522-551.

Department of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics, University of Warsaw, Banacha 2, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland

E-mail address: ados@mimuw.edu.pl