From Doob's inequality to model-free super-hedging

W. Schachermayer

University of Vienna Faculty of Mathematics

joint work with B. Acciaio, M. Beiglböck, F. Penkner, J. Temme

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Doob's Maximal Inequality

To a martingale $(S_t)_{t=0}^T$ we associate the maximal function process

$$\overline{S}_t = \max_{0 \leq u \leq t} |S_u|, \qquad t = 0, \dots, T.$$

Doob's L^2 -inequality:

For every square-integrable martingale S, we have

 $\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{S}_{T}^{2}\right] \leq 4\mathbb{E}[S_{T}^{2}].$

The factor 4 is sharp, but the inequality is not attained (except for $S \equiv 0$).

Pathwise L²-inequality [ABPST 2012]

For every martingale S, there is a predictable strategy H such that

$$\bar{S}_T^2 \leq \left[\sum_{t=1}^T H_t \ \Delta S_t\right] + 4S_T^2, \qquad \text{almost surely.}$$

We may choose $H_t = -4\bar{S}_{t-1}$.

Doob's Maximal Inequality

To a martingale $(S_t)_{t=0}^T$ we associate the maximal function process

$$\overline{S}_t = \max_{0 \leq u \leq t} |S_u|, \qquad t = 0, \dots, T.$$

Doob's L^2 -inequality:

For every square-integrable martingale S, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{S}_{T}^{2}\right] \leq 4\mathbb{E}[S_{T}^{2}].$$

The factor 4 is sharp, but the inequality is not attained (except for $S \equiv 0$).

Pathwise L²-inequality [ABPST 2012]:

For every martingale S, there is a predictable strategy H such that

$$ar{S}_T^2 \leq \left[\sum_{t=1}^T H_t \ \Delta S_t
ight] + 4S_T^2, \qquad ext{almost surely.}$$

We may choose $H_t = -4\bar{S}_{t-1}$.

Of course the pathwise inequality implies the classical inequality as

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T H_t \ dS_t\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T H_t \ \Delta S_t\right] = 0.$$

To show the pathwise inequality we need an easy result.

Elementary Fact

Let s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_T be non-negative numbers and $\overline{s}_t = \max_{0 \le u \le t} s_u$. Then

$$\bar{s}_{T}^{2} \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} (-4\bar{s}_{t-1})[s_{t} - s_{t-1}] + 4s_{T}^{2} - 2s_{0}^{2}.$$
(1)

Of course the pathwise inequality implies the classical inequality as

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T H_t \ dS_t\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^T H_t \ \Delta S_t\right] = 0.$$

To show the pathwise inequality we need an easy result.

Elementary Fact:

Let s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_T be non-negative numbers and $\bar{s}_t = \max_{0 \le u \le t} s_u$. Then

$$\bar{s}_{T}^{2} \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} (-4\bar{s}_{t-1})[s_{t} - s_{t-1}] + 4s_{T}^{2} - 2s_{0}^{2}.$$
(1)

Sketch of Proof:

$$4\int_{0}^{T} \bar{s}_{t} ds_{t} = 4\int_{0}^{T^{*}} \bar{s}_{t} ds_{t} + 4\int_{T^{*}}^{T} \bar{s}_{t} ds_{t}$$

$$= 4\int_{0}^{T^{*}} \bar{s}_{t} d\bar{s}_{t} + 4\bar{s}_{T^{*}}[s_{T} - \bar{s}_{T}]$$

$$= 2[\bar{s}_{T}^{2} - s_{0}^{2}] + 4\bar{s}_{T}s_{T} - 4\bar{s}_{T}^{2}$$

$$= -\bar{s}_{T}^{2} - (2s_{T} - \bar{s}_{T})^{2} + 4s_{T}^{2} - 2s_{0}^{2}$$

Equality holds in (1) if and only if $\bar{s}_T = 2s_T$ a.s.

Theorem (slightly sharpend) Doob inequality [ABPST 2012]:

 $\|\bar{S}_T\|_2 \le \|S_T\|_2 + \|S_T - S_0\|_2$

This inequality is attained for certain continuous Azema-Yor martingales.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Compare [Burkholder, Cox, Peskir,...]

Sketch of Proof:

$$4\int_{0}^{T} \bar{s}_{t} ds_{t} = 4\int_{0}^{T^{*}} \bar{s}_{t} ds_{t} + 4\int_{T^{*}}^{T} \bar{s}_{t} ds_{t}$$

$$= 4\int_{0}^{T^{*}} \bar{s}_{t} d\bar{s}_{t} + 4\bar{s}_{T^{*}}[s_{T} - \bar{s}_{T}]$$

$$= 2[\bar{s}_{T}^{2} - s_{0}^{2}] + 4\bar{s}_{T}s_{T} - 4\bar{s}_{T}^{2}$$

$$= -\bar{s}_{T}^{2} - (2s_{T} - \bar{s}_{T})^{2} + 4s_{T}^{2} - 2s_{0}^{2}$$

Equality holds in (1) if and only if $\bar{s}_T = 2s_T$ a.s.

Theorem (slightly sharpend) Doob inequality [ABPST 2012]:

$$\|\bar{S}_T\|_2 \le \|S_T\|_2 + \|S_T - S_0\|_2$$

This inequality is attained for certain continuous Azema-Yor martingales.

Compare [Burkholder, Cox, Peskir,...]

Financial Interpretation of the pathwise inequality

Interpret $S = (S_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ as a *stock price* process.

Exotic option: pays \overline{S}_T^2 at time T. European option: pays S_T^2 at time T.

For each predictable H the random variable

$$(H \cdot S)_T = \int_0^T H_t dS_t$$

can be interpreted as the (random) gains/losses when applying the *trading strategy* H. These random variables must have price 0 (*no arbitrage*) which corresponds to the martingale property of S.

The pathwise inequality

$$\bar{S}_T^2 \le \int_0^T H_t dS_t + 4S_T^2$$

can now be interpreted as a *model-free super-hedge* of the exotic option \bar{S}_T^2 .

Financial Interpretation of the pathwise inequality

Interpret $S = (S_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ as a stock price process.

Exotic option: pays \overline{S}_T^2 at time T. European option: pays S_T^2 at time T.

For each predictable H the random variable

$$(H \cdot S)_T = \int_0^T H_t dS_t$$

can be interpreted as the (random) gains/losses when applying the *trading strategy* H. These random variables must have price 0 (*no arbitrage*) which corresponds to the martingale property of S.

The pathwise inequality

$$\bar{S}_T^2 \leq \int_0^T H_t dS_t + 4S_T^2$$

can now be interpreted as a *model-free super-hedge* of the exotic option \bar{S}_T^2 .

Classical (model-based) Mathematical Finance

Given is a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}, \mathbb{P})$ and an adapted semi-martingale $(S_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$. Let $\mathcal{M}^e(S)$ denote the set of probability measures Q on \mathcal{F} , with $Q \sim \mathbb{P}$, and such that S is a (local) Q-martingale.

Basic assumption (no-arbitrage): $\mathcal{M}^{e}(S) \neq \emptyset$.

1. Complete case (Bachelier, Black-Scholes):

Suppose that $\mathcal{M}^{e}(S) = \{Q\}$. In this case the martingale representation theorem [Itô,...,Yor] gives that every "contingent claim" $S_{T} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ can be replicated as

$$X_T = \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T] + \int_0^T H_t dS_t,$$

for some predictable strategy H on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}, \mathbb{P})$.

Classical (model-based) Mathematical Finance

Given is a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}, \mathbb{P})$ and an adapted semi-martingale $(S_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$. Let $\mathcal{M}^e(S)$ denote the set of probability measures Q on \mathcal{F} , with $Q \sim \mathbb{P}$, and such that S is a (local) Q-martingale.

Basic assumption (no-arbitrage): $\mathcal{M}^{e}(S) \neq \emptyset$.

1. Complete case (Bachelier, Black-Scholes):

Suppose that $\mathcal{M}^{e}(S) = \{Q\}$. In this case the martingale representation theorem [Itô,...,Yor] gives that every "contingent claim" $S_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ can be replicated as

$$X_T = \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T] + \int_0^T H_t dS_t,$$

for some predictable strategy H on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}, \mathbb{P})$.

Example:

The contingent claim $X_{\mathcal{T}} = ar{S}_{\mathcal{T}}^2 - 4S_{\mathcal{T}}^2$ can be *replicated* by

$$\bar{S}_T^2 - 4S_T^2 = X_0 + \int_0^T H_t dS_t$$

where $X_0 = \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T] < 0$ is a negative real number, and H some predictable strategy.

Incomplete case:

Suppose that $\mathcal{M}^{e}(S) \neq \emptyset$, but not a singleton.

Super-replication Theorem:

Every contingent claim $X_T \in L^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ can be super-replicated by

$$X_T \leq X_0 + \int_0^T H_t dS_t,$$

where

$$X_0 = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}^e(S)} \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T]$$

and H a predictable strategy.

Example:

The contingent claim $X_{\mathcal{T}} = ar{S}_{\mathcal{T}}^2 - 4S_{\mathcal{T}}^2$ can be *replicated* by

$$\bar{S}_T^2 - 4S_T^2 = X_0 + \int_0^T H_t dS_t$$

where $X_0 = \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T] < 0$ is a negative real number, and H some predictable strategy.

2. Incomplete case:

Suppose that $\mathcal{M}^{e}(S) \neq \emptyset$, but not a singleton.

Super-replication Theorem:

Every contingent claim $X_T \in L^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ can be super-replicated by

$$X_T \leq X_0 + \int_0^T H_t dS_t,$$

where

$$X_0 = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}^e(S)} \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T]$$

and H a predictable strategy.

Example:

The contingent claim $X_{\mathcal{T}} = ar{S}_{\mathcal{T}}^2 - 4S_{\mathcal{T}}^2$ can be *replicated* by

$$\bar{S}_T^2 - 4S_T^2 = X_0 + \int_0^T H_t dS_t$$

where $X_0 = \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T] < 0$ is a negative real number, and H some predictable strategy.

2. Incomplete case:

Suppose that $\mathcal{M}^{e}(S) \neq \emptyset$, but not a singleton.

Super-replication Theorem:

Every contingent claim $X_T \in L^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ can be super-replicated by

$$X_{\mathcal{T}} \leq X_0 + \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} H_t dS_t,$$

where

$$X_0 = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}^e(S)} \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T]$$

and H a predictable strategy.

This theorem goes back to [El Karoui-Quenez] and, in greater generality, to [Delbaen-S.].

Example

In a (not necessarily complete) market model, the contingent claim $X_T = \bar{S}_T^2 - 4S_T^2$ can be *super-replicated* by

$$X_T = \bar{S}_T^2 - 4S_T^2 = X_0 + \int_0^T H_t dS_t,$$

where

$$X_0 = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}^e(S)} \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T] < 0.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

This theorem goes back to [El Karoui-Quenez] and, in greater generality, to [Delbaen-S.].

Example

In a (not necessarily complete) market model, the contingent claim $X_T = \bar{S}_T^2 - 4S_T^2$ can be *super-replicated* by

$$X_T = \overline{S}_T^2 - 4S_T^2 = X_0 + \int_0^T H_t dS_t,$$

where

$$X_0 = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}^e(S)} \mathbb{E}_Q[X_T] < 0.$$

Model-free Super-replication

This is a presently active field of research initiated some 15 years ago by D. Hobson:

- D. Hobson, A. Cox, M. Davis, J. Obloj, B. Acciaio, M. Beiglböck,
- B. Bouchard, P. Henry-Labordère, M. Soner, N. Touzi, J. Zhang,

Y. Dolinsky,...

We start with a simple setting: the time set of the process $S = (S_t)_{t=0}^2$ only ranges in $t \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. The real number S_0 , as well as the *laws* μ_1 and μ_2 of the random variables S_1 and S_2 are given. This corresponds to assuming that one can trade all *European options*.

What is unknown, is the *joint law* of (S_1, S_2) .

We also are given an *exotic option* $X_T = c(S_0, S_1, S_2)$, e.g. $X_T = \max(S_0, S_1, S_2)$.

Denote by \mathcal{P}^{mart} the set of all probability measures π on \mathbb{R}^3 such that, under π , the coordinate process $S = (S_0, S_1, S_2)$ is a *martingale* and such that the one-dimensional marginals are given by μ_0, μ_1 , and μ_2 , where $\mu_0 = \delta_{S_0}$.

Theorem [Beiglböck, Henry-Labordère, Penkner 2013]:

Consider $(S_t)_{t=0}^2$ as above. Let *c* be bounded and upper semi-continuous, and consider the contingent claim $X_T = c(S_1, S_2)$. Then the *largest* model independent martingale expectation price, defined by

$$P = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{mart}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[c(S_1, S_2) \right] \right\}$$

equals the smallest model independent arbitrage free price, defined by

$$D = \inf_{h_1, h_2, H_1} \left\{ d : c(S_1, S_2) \le d + \underbrace{h_1(S_1) + h_2(S_2)}_{\text{European options}} + \underbrace{H_1(S_1)[S_2 - S_1]}_{\text{dynamic trading}} \right\}$$

where $h_1(\cdot), h_2(\cdot)$ are bounded, measurable functions with $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_1}[h_1] = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_2}[h_2] = 0$, and $H_1(\cdot)$ is bounded and measurable.

Sketch of proof:

$$P = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{mart}} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [c(S_1, S_2)] \}$$

=
$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}^{mart}} \inf_{H_1(\cdot)} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [c(S_1, S_2) - H_1(S_1)[S_2 - S_1]] \}$$

=
$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}} \inf_{H_1(\cdot)} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [c(S_1, S_2) - H_1(S_1)[S_2 - S_1]] \}.$$

Here \mathcal{P} denotes *all* probability measures on \mathbb{R}^3 with the given marginals $\mu_0 = \delta_{S_0}, \mu_1, \mu_2$, but which are not necessarily martingale measures for the coordinate process.

The compactness of $\ensuremath{\mathcal{P}}$ now allows to interchange the sup and the inf, so that

$$P = \inf_{H_1(\cdot)} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[c(S_1, S_2) - H_1(S_1) [S_2 - S_1] \right] \}$$

For fixed H_1 we finally may apply the duality theory of optimal transport [Kellerer 1984] to obtain P = D.

The extension of the above theorem to finite discrete time is straight-forward [Beiglböck, Henry-Labordère, Penkner 2013].

Remarkable progress was recently made by [Dolinsky-Soner, 2013] who prove a version of the model-free super-replication theorem in *continuous time*, provided that the cost functional $c((S_t)_{0 \le t \le T})$ satisfies some continuity property with respect to the Skorohod topology.

[Beiglböck, Henry-Labordère, Huesman 2014] proved a similar result for cost functionals which are invariant under time change.

The extension of the above theorem to finite discrete time is straight-forward [Beiglböck, Henry-Labordère, Penkner 2013].

Remarkable progress was recently made by [Dolinsky-Soner, 2013] who prove a version of the model-free super-replication theorem in *continuous time*, provided that the cost functional $c((S_t)_{0 \le t \le T})$ satisfies some continuity property with respect to the Skorohod topology.

[Beiglböck, Henry-Labordère, Huesman 2014] proved a similar result for cost functionals which are invariant under time change.

Towards a model-independent Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing

B. Bouchard, A. Cox, M. Davis, D. Hobson, M. Nutz...

We now assume that the financial market is given by some \mathbb{R}_+ -valued discrete time process $S = (S_t)_{t=0}^T$, where S_0 and T are fixed. We do not specify further the model and/or a probabilistic base for S, except that we prescribe the *law of the terminal value* S_T , denoted by μ_T , which we assume to have finite first moment and barycenter S_0 .

Let $(\varphi_n)_{n=0}^N$ be exotic options, given by continuous functions $\varphi_n = \varphi_n(s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_N)$ which are at most of linear growth. We suppose that all φ_n can be traded at time 0 and assume w.l.g. that their price equals zero.

Definition

S allows for *model-independentent arbitrage* if there are real scalars a_1, \ldots, a_N , and continuous bounded functions $\Delta_t(s_1, \ldots, s_{t-1})$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \varphi_n(s_1,\ldots,s_T) + \sum_{t=1}^T \Delta_t(s_1,\ldots,s_{t-1})[s_{t-1}-s_t] > 0,$$

for all $(s_1, \ldots, s_T) \in \mathbb{R}^T$.

Definition

For given S, a market compatible *martingale measure* is a measure π on \mathbb{R}^{T} such that the coordinate process is a π -martingale, the law of the last coordinate S_{T} equals μ_{T} , and such that $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}(\varphi_{n}) = 0$ for n = 1, ..., N.

Definition

S allows for *model-independentent arbitrage* if there are real scalars a_1, \ldots, a_N , and continuous bounded functions $\Delta_t(s_1, \ldots, s_{t-1})$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n \varphi_n(s_1, \ldots, s_T) + \sum_{t=1}^{T} \Delta_t(s_1, \ldots, s_{t-1})[s_{t-1} - s_t] > 0,$$

for all $(s_1, \ldots, s_T) \in \mathbb{R}^T$.

Definition

For given *S*, a market compatible *martingale measure* is a measure π on \mathbb{R}^T such that the coordinate process is a π -martingale, the law of the last coordinate S_T equals μ_T , and such that $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}(\varphi_n) = 0$ for n = 1, ..., N.

Theorem [Acciaio, Beiglböck, Penkner, S. 12]

Under the above assumptions the following statements are equivalent. (i) S does not allow for model-independent arbitrage (ii) There exists a market compatible martingale measure on \mathbb{R}^{T} .

[Bouchard, Nutz 2013] recently proved a remarkable result in a similar spirit, but based on the more flexible notion of *quasi-sure convergence*.

Theorem [Acciaio, Beiglböck, Penkner, S. 12]

Under the above assumptions the following statements are equivalent. (i) S does not allow for model-independent arbitrage (ii) There exists a market compatible martingale measure on \mathbb{R}^{T} .

[Bouchard, Nutz 2013] recently proved a remarkable result in a similar spirit, but based on the more flexible notion of *quasi-sure convergence*.

Joyeux anniversaire, cher Ivar!

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで