

Financial Mathematics - Notes

Dom Hutchinson

March 11, 2021

Contents

1	Financial Terminology & Single-Period Models	3
1.1	Single-Period Model	8
1.2	Risk-Neutral Probability Measures	12
1.3	Valuation of Contingent Claims	13
1.4	Complete & Incomplete Markets	15
2	Stochastic Processes in Discrete Time	17
2.1	Multi-Period Models	17
2.2	Information Structures	18
2.3	Stochastic Processes in Discrete Time	20
2.4	Conditional Expectations	22
2.5	Martingales	26
2.6	Stopping Times τ	28
3	Multi-Period Models	31
3.1	Trading Strategies	31
3.2	Arbitrage in Multi-Period Model and Martingale Measures	33
3.3	Valuation of Contingent Claims	38
3.4	American Claims	41
3.5	The Cox-Ross Rubinstein Model	47
3.6	The Cox-Ross Rubinstein Model and the Black-Scholes Formula	47
4	Stochastic Processes in Continuous Time	47
4.1	The Brownian Motion	47
4.2	Stochastic Integration	47
4.3	Itô's Lemma	47
5	Financial Market Models in Continuous Time	47
5.1	The Financial Market Model in Continuous Time	47
5.2	Trading Strategies	47
5.3	Arbitrage in the Continuous Time Model	47

5.4	The Black-Scholes Model	47
5.5	Equivalent Martingale Measures in the Black-Scholes Model	47
5.6	Pricing in the Black-Scholes Model	47
5.7	Replicating Strategies and the Black-Scholes-Merton Equation	47
0	Reference	I
1	Notation	I

1 Financial Terminology & Single-Period Models

Proposition 1.1 - *Types of Financial Objects*

In this course we consider two types of financial objects

- i). *Underlying Traded Assets* (e.g. Oil, interest rates & exchange rates).
- ii). *Derivative Securities* (contracts based on *Underlying Traded Assets*)

Proposition 1.2 - *Derivative Securities*

Derivative Securities can act as insurance, by paying the holder when the value of the *Underlying Traded Asset* goes in the opposite direction.

e.g. “I will pay you £1mn for every dollar the price of oil is over £80 on 1st December 2025.”

Our question is what such a contract is worth. To answer this we consider both *Arbitrage* and *Modelling*.

Definition 1.1 - *Modelling*

Modelling is the practice of forecasting the future value of an *Underlying Traded Asset*. Classical models for price processes involve *Brownian Motion*.

Definition 1.2 - *Arbitrage*

Arbitrage is the possibility of being able to make a profit on a transaction without being exposed to the risk of incurring a loss. Traders who try to lock in riskless profit are called *Arbitrageurs*. Generally realised by buying and selling the same asset in different markets, with the asset having a different value in each market.

(2)

Example 1.1 - *Arbitrage*

Consider a stock that is traded on both the NYSE and the LSE. Suppose the stock price is \$189 on the NYSE and £100 on the LSE, and the exchange rate is \$1.87=£1. The following *Arbitrage Opportunity* exists:

- i). Buy 100 shares in London.
- ii). Sell all these shares in NY.
- iii). Exchange dollars to sterling.

This has a riskless profit of \$200=£106.95 (assuming negligible transaction costs).

Proposition 1.3 - “No Arbitrage Principle”

The “*No Arbitrage Principle*” is the principle that *Arbitrage* opportunity do not exist (for long) in real life markets. If they did then the market activity caused by agents exploiting the *Arbitrage* opportunity^[1] would raise the cost of buying and thus remove the *Arbitrage* opportunity.

Remark 1.1 - *Arbitrage & Valuing Contracts*

When valuing contracts we assume there is no arbitrage (The “*No Arbitrage Principle*”). This means we can decide a single price for a contract, as at any other price there would be

^[1]The forces of *Supply-and-Demand*.

arbitrage.

Definition 1.3 - Short Selling

Short Selling is the practice of borrowing an asset, selling it and then at some point in the future buying an equivalent asset to reimburse whoever lent you the original asset. If the value of the asset has fallen in this time then you make a profit.

Example 1.2 -

Consider a share which trades at £10 on 1st Jan. Suppose we know that on 1st July there is a $\frac{2}{3}$ chance it will be worth £25 and $\frac{1}{3}$ chance it will be worth £5. Suppose the following contract is offer on the 1st Jan:

- i). “If the share goes up, I will pay you £4. If the share price goes down, I pay you nothing.”

What is this contract worth? (Assuming your bank account pays no interest).

You could argue that the contract should be worth the expected payout of the contract , $\frac{2}{3} \times £4 + \frac{1}{3} \times £0 = £2.66$.

However, consider creating a replicating portfolio which buys $\frac{1}{5}$ of a unit of the stock and borrows £1 from the bank. On 1st Jan this portfolio is worth $(\frac{1}{5}) \times £10 - £1 = £1$.

- If the stock goes up, the portfolio is worth $\frac{1}{5} \times £25 - £1 = £4$.
- If the stock goes down, the portfolio is worth $\frac{1}{5} \times £5 - £1 = £0$.

These two outcomes show that this replicating portfolio has exactly the same payouts as the contract being offer. This means that whatever the portfolio costs, the contract must cost the same.

Suppose the portfolio costs £1 and the contract costs £1.50. Then you would sell the contract, buy the portfolio and make £0.50 profit independent of the price of the share on 1st July. (and visa-versa).

This valuation is independent of the probability of the asset’s value increasing, but there is an interesting “phantom probability” $q = \frac{1}{4}$. The price of the contract is the expected payout of the contract, if the probability of the share price increasing was q , $\mathbb{E}[\text{payout}] = \frac{1}{4} \times £4 + \frac{3}{4} \times 0 = £1$. Also, using this probability the expected value of the stock on July 1st is $\frac{1}{4} \times £25 + \frac{3}{4} \times £5 = £10$, the same as it was on Jan 1st. (This is how we find q).

This q is known as the *Equivalent Martingale Measure*

Definition 1.4 - Equivalent Martingale Measure

TODO

Remark 1.2 - Value of Money

These problems are more interesting when we consider that the value of money is not constant due to inflation & interest rates.

Remark 1.3 - Risk-Free

When referring to an activity being “Risk-Free” we mean that the loses & profits from it are known, not that there are no loses.

Definition 1.5 - Bank Process, B_t

Bank Process, B_t , is a measure of how much the value of money has changed over t time-periods. Assume the existence of a risk-free bank account with known interest rate r (assumed to be constant over interval $[0, T]$). This means the initial deposit of one unit becomes the following after t time-steps

Continuous Time Model $B_t = e^{rt}$

Multi-Period Model $B_t = (1 + r)^t$

We must consider the performance of our portfolio relative to the *Bank Process*, by discounting our profits by factor B_t .

N.B. - The *Bank Process* is also known as a *Bond* or a *Numeraire*.

Definition 1.6 - Derivative Security

A *Derivative Security* is a contract whose value at expiration date T is a function of the values of the assets within the time interval $[0, T]$. Often, the value is just a function of the value at time T .

Definition 1.7 - Forward Contract

A *Forward Contract* is an agreement to buy or sell an asset S at future *Delivery Date*^[2] T for *Delivery Price* K . Both parties are obliged to fulfil the contract.

The agent who agrees to buy the underlying asset is said to have a *Long Position*, the other agent has a *Short Position*.

The *Forward Price* $f(t; T)$ is the delivery price which would make the contract have zero value at time t .

Remark 1.4 - Usefulness of Forward Contracts

Forward Contracts allow you to agree terms of a future purchase/sale in advance of actually transacting. This means you know the price you will receive/pay and thus can plan accordingly. (e.g. Farmers may agree to price per tonne of corn well before the harvest).

Definition 1.8 - Option Contract

An *Option* is a financial instrument giving one the right, but not the obligation, to buy or sell an asset S at (or before) a specified date T for an agreed *Strike Price*^[3] K . There are two classes of *Option Contract*

- *Call Option* - The holder has the right to buy.
- *Put Option* - The holder has the right to sell

N.B. Only one party (the holder) decides whether to exercise the contract or not, the other (the writer) has to do what the former wishes.

Definition 1.9 - European & American Options

European vs *American Options* determine when the *Option Contract* can be exercised.

- *European Option* can only be executed on the expiry date.

^[2]AKA *Settlement Date*

^[3]AKA *Exercise Price*

- *American Option* can be executed on any date up to and inc. the expiry date.

Example 1.3 - Derivative

Consider the following call option

“The holder has the right to buy 1,000 litres of petrol for £1,000 next Jan 1st”

If the market price S_T on 1st Jan is greater than £1,000 it is profitable to exercise the option. You would make profit $S_T - 1000$. However, if S_T was less than £1,000 then it is better to buy petrol at the market price.

The value on Jan 1st of the option will be $\{S_T - 1000\}_+$, a function of the random price S_T .

N.B. - a put option would the opposite analysis with profit $1000 - S_T$.

Definition 1.10 - Dividend

A *Dividend* is a one-off payment provided made to the holder of an underlying asset at a certain time. Not all underlying assets provide a *Dividend*.

Proposition 1.4 - Fair Price of a Forward Contract with a Dividend

Consider a forward contract on an asset with current price S_0 which provides a known dividend D at time point $t_0 \in (0, T)$ and has delivery date T .

Assume the existence of a risk-free bank account with constant interest rate r during the interval $[0, T]$. This means an initial deposit of one unit grows to $B_t = e^{rt}$ up to time point t .

If $D = 0$ (ie no dividend is paid) then the fair delivery price for the forward contract is $K = S_0 e^{rT}$. Else, if $D > 0$ (ie a dividend is paid) then the fair delivery price for the forward contract is $K = (S_0 - I)e^{rT}$ where $I = De^{-rt_0}$.

Proof 1.1 - Proposition 1.4

We use the “no-arbitrage principle” to prove that this is the fair price.

First assume that the price of the contract is $K > (S_0 - I)e^{rT}$ where $I = De^{-rt_0}$. Then an arbitrageur will adopt a short position on this contract by doing the following

- Borrow $\mathcal{L}S_0$ at an interest rate of r .
- Buy the underlying asset.
- Take a short position in the forward contract (i.e. agree to sell the asset for K at time T).

At time point T_0 we use the dividend to partially repay the loan. Finally, at time point T we sell the asset for K and repay the outstanding balance of the loan. The riskless profit is $K - (S_0 e^{rt_0} D)e^{(T-t_0)} = K - (S_0 - I)e^{rT}$, regardless of the price of the underlying asset at time point T .

Now assume the converse, the price of the contract is $K - (S_0 - I)e^{rT} > 0$ where $I = De^{-rt_0}$. Then an arbitrageur will adopt a long position on this contract by doing the following

- Short sell the underlying asset (N.B. you are obliged to pay dividends to the lender).
- Invest the proceeds of S_0 at the risk-free interest rate of r .
- Take a long position in the forward contract (i.e. agree to buy the asset for K at time T).

At time t_0 we have to pay the dividend from our bank account. On the delivery date the arbitrageur buys the asset for K and makes a riskless profit of $(S_0 e^{rt_0} - D)e^{r(T-t_0)} - K = (S_0 - I)e^{rT} - K > 0$ where $I = De^{-rt_0}$.^[4]

Theorem 1.1 - Equivalent Contract Valuations over Time

Consider two combinations of financial derivatives that both have the same value $V = W$ at time point T . Then their prices V_t and W_t at time point $t < T$ must also coincide.

Proof 1.2 - Theorem 1.1

We use the “no-arbitrage principle” and assume WLOG that $V_t > W_t$. Then, at time t , we would do the following

- i). Sell or short the first combination.
- ii). Buy the second combination.
- iii). Invest the difference $V_t - W_t > 0$.

At time point T we would do the following

- i). Buy the second combination for W .
- ii). Sell the first combination for $V = W$.

The risk-free profit, assuming a risk-free interest rate of r , is $(V_t - W_t)e^{r(T-t)} > 0$

Proposition 1.5 - Put-Call Parity

We apply **Theorem 1.1** to *European Put & Call Options*.

Consider a *European Put Option* and a *European Call Option* for the same underlying asset, both with strike price K and expiry date T . Assume that S_T is the price of the underlying asset at time point T then the payoff of the *Call Option* is C and the *Put Option* is P at time T , where

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \{S_T - K\}_+ \\ P &= \{K - S_T\}_+ \end{aligned}$$

For the first combination choose the *Underlying Asset* and *European Put Option*. The value of this combination at time point T is $V = S_T + P = \max\{S_T, K\}$.

For the second combination choose the *European Call Option* and a bond which matures at time point T with a price of K . The value of the second combination is $W = K + C = \max\{S_T, K\}$

Theorem 1.2 - Put-Call Parity - Formal

Let S_t be the price of the asset at time point t , $Ke^{-r(T-t)}$ the discounted value of the bond and C_t, P_t be the prices of the *European Call* and *Put Options* at time t , respectively. Then

$$S_t + P_t - C_t = Ke^{-r(T-t)} \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

If, at some time t , this relationship does not hold then an *Arbitrage Opportunity* exists at this time.

^[4] D is subtracted as you have to pay the lender the dividend, but as you have already sold the asset you do not receive the dividend from the asset.

Theorem 1.3 - Lower Bound for a European Call Option

We can use *Put-Call Parity* to determine a lower bound for a *European Call Option*

$$\begin{aligned} S_t + P_t - C_t &= Ke^{-r(T-t)} \\ \implies C_t &= S_t + P_t - Ke^{-r(T-t)} \\ \implies C_t &\geq \{S_t - Ke^{-r(T-t)}\}_+ \text{ as } P_t \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.4 - American Call Options

Let C_A be the price of an *American Call Option* and C_E be the price of a *European Call Option* for the same underlying asset, with the same strike price and expiry date.

Then, for a non-dividend paying stock we have that

$$C_A = C_E$$

This means that, for non-dividend paying stock, it is suboptimal to exercise an American call optional early.

Proof 1.3 - Theorem 1.4

First, note that exercising the American call early at time $t < T$ generates an income of $S_t - K$. However, from the inequality above, we know that selling the call options yields a cash-flow of $\{S_t - Ke^{-r(T-t)}\}_+ \geq S_t - Ke^{-r(T-t)}$. Since $e^{-r(T-t)} < 1$, exercising the call at any $t < T$ (i.e. early) is suboptimal.

1.1 Single-Period Model**Definition 1.11 - Sample Space, Ω**

The *Sample Space* Ω is the set consisting of all elementary outcomes.

Definition 1.12 - Random Variable

A *Random Variable* X is a function from the *Sample Space* to real numbers

$$X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

Definition 1.13 - Single-Period Model

The *Single-Period Model* is a model for a financial market with the following components

- Initial date $t = 0$ and terminal date $t = 1$, with trading and consumption only allowed on these two dates.
- A finite *Sample Space* Ω with $|\Omega| = K < \infty$.

$$\Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k\}$$

with each element corresponding to some state of the world.

- A *Probability Measure* \mathbb{P} on Ω with $\mathbb{P}(\omega_i) > 0 \forall \omega_i \in \Omega$.

Definition 1.14 - Bank Account Process B

A *Bank Account Process* $B = \{B_t : t = 0, 1\}$ where $B_0 = 1$ and B_1 is a *Random Variable*.

The *Bank Account Process* is distinguished from other securities because its price $B_1(\omega)$ at time $t = 1$ is assumed to be strictly positive for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Usually, in fact, $B_1 \geq 1$ in which case B_1 should be thought of as the value of the bank account at time $t = 1$, if 1 unit of currency was deposited at time $t = 0$. And, $r = B_1 - 1 \geq 0$ should be thought of as the *Interest Rate*. In many applications r and B_1 are deterministic scalars.

Definition 1.15 - Price Process^[5]

A *Price Process* $S = \{S(t) : t = 0, 1\}$ where $S(t) = (S_1(t), S_2(t), \dots, S_N(t))$, $N < \infty$ and $S_i(t)$ is the price of the i^{th} security at time t . In many applications these N risky securities are stocks.

The prices at time $t = 0$ are positive scalars that are known to the investors, whereas the prices at time $t = 1$ are non-negative random variables whose value only become known to investors at time $t = 1$.

Definition 1.16 - Trading Strategy H

A *Trading Strategy* $H = (H_0, \dots, H_N)$ describes an investor's portfolio as carried from time $t = 0$ to time $t = 1$. Specifically, H_0 is the number of units of the currency invested in the *Savings Account* and H_i with $i \geq 1$ is a scalar of the number of units invested in the i^{th} security.

Note that H_i can be positive or negative. Positive means you have bought/invested and negative means you are borrowing or short selling.

Example 1.4 - Single-Period Model (Zero Interest)

Consider a share which trades on 1st Jan for £10. Suppose we know with probability $p_1 = \frac{2}{3}$ it will be worth £25 on 1st July, and with probability $p_2 = \frac{1}{3}$ it will be worth £5 on 1st July. You also have access to a bank account which pays no interest ($r = 0$), which you can pay into or borrow from. Create a *Replicating Portfolio* as follows: buy $\frac{1}{5}$ unit of the stock, and borrow £1 from the bank.

We can rephrase this as a *Single-Period Model* for a single period ($T = 1$).

- *Bank Account Process* - $B_0 = B_1 = 1$. As no interest rate.
- *Sample Space* - $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ with ω_1 being the event the stock rises to £25 and ω_2 being the event the stock falls to £5.
- There are $N = 1$ stocks. So the *Price Process* is

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(0)(\omega_i) &= 10 \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \\ S_1(1)(\omega_i) &= \begin{cases} 25 & \text{if } i = 1 \\ 5 & \text{if } i = 2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- We can write the *Replicating Portfolio* as a vector (H_0, H_1) .

Definition 1.17 - Value Process, V

A *Value Process* $V = \{V_t : t = 0, 1\}$ describes the total value of the portfolio at each point in time

$$V_t = H_0 B_t + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n(t)$$

^[5]AKA *Stock Process*

Definition 1.18 - *Gains Process, G*

The *Gains Process* G is a random variable that describes the total profit or loss generated by the portfolio between times 0 and 1.

$$G = H_0 r + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n \Delta S_n$$

where $\Delta S_n = S_n(1) - S_n(0)$ is the change in price of the n^{th} asset.

Remark 1.5 - *Normalising Prices*

It is convenient to normalize the prices, so that the bank account becomes constant by defining discounted versions of the processes defined earlier. See **Definitions 1.19, 1.20, 1.21**.

Definition 1.19 - *Discounted Price Process, S^**

A *Discounted Price Process* S^* is the *Price Process* S normalised by the *Bank Process* B_t

$$S^* := \{S_t^* : t = 0, 1\} \text{ with } S_n^*(t) := \frac{S_n(t)}{B_t} \text{ for } n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, t = \{0, 1\}$$

Definition 1.20 - *Discounted Value Process, V^**

A *Discounted Value Process* V_t^* is the *Value Process* V_t normalised by the *Bank Process* B_t

$$V_t^* := \frac{V_t}{B_t} = H_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(t) \text{ for } t = 0, 1$$

Definition 1.21 - *Discounted Gains Process, G^**

A *Discounted Gains Process* G^* is the *Gains Process* G normalised by the *Bank Process* B_t

$$G^* := \frac{G}{B_t} = \sum_{n=1}^N H_n \Delta S_n^* \text{ with } \Delta S_n^* := S_n^*(1) - S_n^*(0)$$

Example 1.5 - *Single-Period Model (Non-Zero Interest)*

Consider a share which trades on 1st Jan for £10. Suppose we know with probability $p_1 = \frac{2}{3}$ it will be worth £25 on 1st July, and with probability $p_2 = \frac{1}{3}$ it will be worth £5 on 1st July. You also have access to a bank account which pays interest $r \in \mathbb{R}$, which you can pay into or borrow from.

We can rephrase this as a *Single-Period Model* for a single period ($T = 1$).

- Bank Account Process - $B_0 = 1, B_1 = 1 + r$.
- Probability Space - $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ where ω_1 indicates the stock going up and ω_2 indicates the stock going down.

- There is $N = 1$ units of the stock, so we have the following price process

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(0)(\omega_i) &= 10 \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} \\ S_1(1)(\omega_1) &= 25 \\ S_1(1)(\omega_2) &= 5 \end{aligned}$$

And discounted price process

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^*(0)(\omega_i) &= 10 \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} \\ S_1^*(1)(\omega_1) &= \frac{25}{1+r} \\ S_1^*(1)(\omega_2) &= \frac{5}{1+r} \end{aligned}$$

- For an arbitrary strategy H , our portfolio has initial value $V_0 = V_0^* = H_0 + 10H_1$. Thus, we can determine the gains and future values of this portfolio

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(\omega_1) &= (1+r)H_0 + 25H_1 \\ V_1^*(\omega_1) &= H_0 + \frac{25}{1+r}H_1 \\ G(\omega_1) &= rH_0 + 15H_1 \\ G^*(\omega_1) &= \left(\frac{25}{1+r} - 10\right)H_1 \\ V_1(\omega_2) &= (1+r)H_0 + 5H_1 \\ V_1^*(\omega_2) &= H_0 + \frac{5}{1+r}H_1 \\ G(\omega_2) &= rH_0 - 5H_1 \\ G^*(\omega_2) &= \left(\frac{5}{1+r} - 10\right)H_1 \end{aligned}$$

Definition 1.22 - Arbitrage Opportunity

An *Arbitrage Opportunity* is a *Trading Strategy* H with the following three properties

- i). $V_0 = 0$.
- ii). $V_1(\omega) \geq 0 \forall \omega \in \Omega$.
- iii). $\mathbb{P}(V_1(\omega) \geq 0) > 0 \forall \omega \in \Omega$.^[6]

Proposition 1.6 - Gains Process & Arbitrage Opportunity

There exists an *Arbitrage Opportunity* iff there is some trading strategy H st $G^* \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[G^*] > 0$.

This means that *Gains* is always non-negative (so not losses), and as its expected value is strictly positive there must be at least one positive value of G^* which has a non-zero probability.

Proof 1.4 - Proposition 1.6

As this is an iff statement, I prove the statement in both directions. First consider the forwards direction. Let H be an *Arbitrage Opportunity*. Since $G^* = V_1^* - V_0^*$ and $B_t > 0 \forall t, \omega$, by the definition of an *Arbitrage Opportunity*, we find that $G^* \geq 0$ and thus $\mathbb{E}[G^*] = \mathbb{E}[V_1^*] > 0$.

Now consider the other direction, suppose H satisfies $G^* \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[G^*] > 0$. Define $\hat{H} := (\hat{H}_0, H_1, \dots, H_N)$ where $\hat{H}_0 := -\sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(0)$ ^[7]. Under \hat{H} one has $V_0^* = 0$ and $V_1^* = V_0^* + G^* = G^*$.

Hence $V_1^* \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[V_1^*] = \mathbb{E}[G^*] > 0$, meaning \hat{H} is an arbitrage opportunity.

^[6]Equivalently, $\mathbb{E}[V_1] > 0$.

^[7]Any money used to buy a stock is borrowed from the bank, and any money made from short selling is deposited into the bank. This means the total value of the portfolio at $t = 0$ is 0 (requirement of an *Arbitrage Opportunity*).

1.2 Risk-Neutral Probability Measures

Definition 1.23 - Risk-Neutral Probability Measure

A probability measure \mathbb{Q} on Ω is said to be a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure* if both the following hold

- i). $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega\}) > 0 \forall \omega \in \Omega$.
- ii). $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}(S_n^*(1)) = S_n^*(0)$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Theorem 1.5 - No-Arbitrage Theorem

There are no *Arbitrage Opportunities* iff there exists a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure* \mathbb{Q} .

Theorem 1.6 - Separating Hyperplane Theorem^[8]

Let \mathbb{W} be a linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^K and \mathbb{K} be a compact convex subset in \mathbb{R}^K which is disjoint from \mathbb{W} . Then we can separate \mathbb{W} and \mathbb{K} strictly by a hyperplane containing \mathbb{W} (ie $\exists v \in \mathbb{R}^K$ which is *Orthogonal* to \mathbb{W} ^[9]) such that

$$u^T v > 0 \forall u \in \mathbb{K}$$

N.B. - Proof of this is beyond the scope of this course.

Proof 1.5 - No-Arbitrage Theorem

Consider the three following sets

- i). $\mathbb{W} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^K : X = G^* \text{ for some Trading Strategy } H\}$.

This can be considered the set of random variables which each represent a possible $t = 1$ discounted wealth when the initial value of the investment is zero. Here, \mathbb{W} is a linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^K ^[10].

- ii). $\mathbb{A} = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^K : X \geq 0, X \neq 0\}$. (\mathbb{A} is not compact, so can not be used for \mathbb{K} in *Separating Hyperplane Theorem*).

Note there exists an arbitrage opportunity iff $\mathbb{W} \cap \mathbb{A} \neq \emptyset$.

- iii). $\mathbb{A}^+ = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^N : X \geq 0, X \neq 0, \sum_{i=1}^K X_i = 1\}$.

\mathbb{A}^+ is a convex and compact subset of \mathbb{R}^K .

Assume that there is no *Arbitrage Opportunity*, then $\mathbb{W} \cap \mathbb{A} \neq \emptyset$ (They are disjoint). By the *Separating Hyperplane Theorem* $\exists Y \in \mathbb{R}^K$ which is *Orthogonal* to \mathbb{W} ($X^T Y = 0 \forall X \in \mathbb{W}$) st

$$X^T Y > 0 \forall X \in \mathbb{A}^+$$

For each $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ the k^{th} unit vector e_k is an element of \mathbb{A}^+ . Therefore, $\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ we have that

$$Y_K := e_K^T Y > 0$$

which means all entries of Y are strictly positive.

^[8]This is a consequence of the *Hahn-Banach Theorem* from functional analysis.

^[9] $u^T v = 0 \forall u \in \mathbb{W}$

^[10]Proved by showing it is complete under: addition, and scalar multiplication.

Define a probability measure \mathbb{Q} by setting

$$\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_k\}) = \frac{Y(\omega_k)}{Y(\omega_1) + \dots + Y(\omega_K)}$$

Furthermore, $\Delta S_n^* \in \mathbb{W}$ for all n because $\Delta S_n^* := S_n^*(1) - S_n^*(0)$ is the discounted wealth for the portfolio $H = e_n$ which consists of one unit of the n^{th} asset only. Since Y is orthogonal to \mathbb{W} we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\Delta S_n^*] = \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta S_n^*(\omega_k) \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_k\}) = 0 \quad \forall n$$

In other words

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[S_n^*(1)] = S_n^*(0) \quad \forall n$$

Thus \mathbb{Q} is a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure*.

For the converse, assume that \mathbb{Q} is a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure*. Then for an arbitrary *Trading Strategy* H we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[G^*] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\sum_{n=1}^N H_n \Delta S_n^* \right] = \sum_{n=1}^N H_n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\Delta S_n^*] = 0$$

and, in particular

$$\sum_{k=1}^K G^*(\omega_k) \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_k\}) = 0$$

which shows that either $G^*(\omega_k < 0)$ for some k or $G^* = 0$, but then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[G^*] = 0$. Hence, by **Proposition 1.6**, there cannot be any arbitrage opportunities. \square

1.3 Valuation of Contingent Claims

Definition 1.24 - Contingent Claim

A *Contingent Claim* in the *Single-Period Model* is a random variable X which represents the payoff at time $t = 1$. A contingent claim X is said to be “attainable” (or “marketable”) if there exists a trading strategy H st $V_1 = X$. In this case one says that H generates X and H is called the *Replicating Portfolio*.

Proposition 1.7 - Fair Price of a Contingent Claim?

Consider a *Contingent Claim* which is “attainable”, and suppose that H is its *Replicating Portfolio*. The value V_0 of H at time $t = 0$ is the fair price of the *Contingent Claim*.

Proof 1.6 - Proposition 1.7

Suppose the fair price of the *Contingent Claim* p is not equal to the value V_0 of H at time $t = 0$ (ie $p \neq V_0$). Then we have two cases

$p > V_0$ - An *Arbitrage Opportunity* arises because an arbitrageur would sell the *Contingent Claim* for p at time 0, follow the trading strategy H at a time $t = 0$ cost of V_0 and pocket the difference $p - V_0$.

At time $t = 1$ the value V_1 of the portfolio matches the obligation X of the *Contingent Claim*. We make profit $(p - V_0)e^{rT}$.

$p < V_0$ - An arbitrageur would follow the trading strategy H and purchase the *Contingent Claim*, again making a riskless profit.

Theorem 1.7 - Risk-Neutral Valuation Principle

If the *Single Period Model* is free of *Arbitrage Opportunities*, then the time $t = 0$ value of an *Attainable Contingent Claim* X is $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X/B_1]$ where \mathbb{Q} is any *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure*^[11].

Proof 1.7 - Risk-Neutral Valuation Principle

Suppose there exists a second trading strategy \hat{H} st $\hat{V}_1 = X$, but $\hat{V}_0 \neq V_0$.

Let \mathbb{Q} be a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure*, then for any trading strategy H we have seen that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[G^*] = 0$. Consequently

$$V_0 = V_0^* = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_0^*] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_1^* - G^*] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_1^*] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[G^*] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_1^*] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\frac{V_1}{B_1}\right]$$

In particular, any replicating strategy with $V_1 = X$ has time $t = 0$ value

$$V_0 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\frac{X}{B_1}\right]$$

As this holds for all \mathbb{Q} , this calculation does not depend on the choice of \mathbb{Q} and therefore $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_1^*]$ is constant even if there are two or more *Risk-Neutral Probability Measures*.

This means all *Replicating Portfolios* for the same *Attainable Contingent Claim* have the same values in time $t = 0$ and $t = 1$.

Example 1.6 - Valuation of Contingent Claims - I

Consider a stock which is trading for £10 at time $t = 0$, and we know that at time $t = 1$ it will be worth either £25 or £5.

In order to find a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure* \mathbb{Q} we need to find strictly positive numbers $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\})$ and $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_2\})$ st $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[S_n^*(1)] = S_n^*(0)$ is satisfied. That is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[S_0^*(1)] &= S_0^*(0) \\ \Rightarrow S_1^*(\omega_1)\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\}) + S_1^*(\omega_2)\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_2\}) &= S_0^* \\ \Rightarrow \frac{25}{1+r}\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\}) + \frac{5}{1+r}\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_2\}) &= 10 \end{aligned}$$

As \mathbb{Q} is a *Probability Measure*, we must have that

$$1 = \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\}) + \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_2\})$$

We deduce the values $q_1 = \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\})$, $q_2 = \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_2\})$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{25}{1+r}q_1 + \frac{5}{1+r}q_2 &= 10 \\ \& \quad q_1 + q_2 &= 1 \\ \Rightarrow q_1 &= 1 - q_2 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{5}{1+r}(5(1 - q_2) + q_2) &= 1 - \\ \Rightarrow 5 - 4q_2 &= 2(1 + r) \\ \Rightarrow q_2 &= \frac{3-2r}{4} \\ \Rightarrow q_1 &= 1 - \frac{3-2r}{4} = \frac{1+2r}{4} \end{aligned}$$

The values $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\}) = \frac{1+2r}{4}$, $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_2\}) = \frac{3-2r}{4}$ satisfy both these equations, so this is a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure* and by **Theorem 1.5** (The “No-Arbitrage Principle”) there cannot be any *Arbitrage Opportunities*.

^[11]So value is independent of the choice of \mathbb{Q}

In particular for $r = 0$ (ie No interest), we recover $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\}) = \frac{1}{4}$ which is the same as a previous example.

Example 1.7 - Valuation of Contingent Claims - II

Continuing from Example 1.6.

Suppose X is a *Contingent Claim* with $X(\omega_1) = 4$ and $X(\omega_2) = 0$. If X is *Attainable*, then the value of X at time $t = 0$ is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X/B_1] = \frac{1+2r}{4} \cdot \frac{4}{1+r} + 0 = \frac{1+2r}{1+r}$$

Check whether X can be generated by solving for $H = (H_0, H_1)^{[12][13]}$

$$\begin{aligned} 4 &= H_0(1+r) + H_1 \cdot 25 \\ 0 &= H_0(1+r) + H_1 \cdot 5 \end{aligned}$$

Solving gives

$$\begin{aligned} (4-0) &= ((1+r) - (1+r))H_0 + (25-5)H_1 \\ \implies 4 &= 20H_1 \\ \implies H_1 &= 1/5 \\ \implies 0 &= H_0(1+r) + 1 \\ \implies H_0 &= -1/(1+r) \end{aligned}$$

This means that X is indeed *Attainable*.

We check the value of the *Replicating Portfolio* H at time $t = 0$

$$V_0 = H_0 + S_1 \cdot H_1 = -\frac{1}{1+r} + 10(1/5) = \frac{1+2r}{1+r}$$

1.4 Complete & Incomplete Markets

Definition 1.25 - Complete & Incomplete Models

A model is said to be *Complete* if every *Contingent Claim* X can be generated by some trading strategy. Otherwise, the model is said to be *In-Complete*

Remark 1.6 - Checking if a Model is Complete

There are simple ways to check whether a model is *Complete*. One way is to define $K \times (N+1)$ -matrix A as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} B_1(\omega_1) & S_1(1)(\omega_1) & \dots & S_N(1)(\omega_1) \\ B_1(\omega_2) & S_1(1)(\omega_2) & \dots & S_N(1)(\omega_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B_1(\omega_K) & S_1(1)(\omega_K) & \dots & S_N(1)(\omega_K) \end{pmatrix}$$

If a particular *Contingent Claim* X is attainable, then $AH = X$ will have a solution for H .

A model is *Complete* iff $\forall X \in \mathbb{R}^K \exists H$ st $AH = X$.

NB - If the bank process B is deterministic then the first column will be identical for all rows.

Theorem 1.8 - Uniqueness of Risk-Neutral Probability Measure

^[12] H_0 is amount invested in our bank account and H_1 is amount invested in the stock.

^[13] We find (H_0, H_1) by solving $AH = X$ for defined A, X .

Suppose there are no *Arbitrage Opportunities*. Then a model is *Complete* iff there exists a unique *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure*.

Proof 1.8 - Theorem 1.8

We denote by \mathbb{M} the set of all *Risk-Neutral Probability Measures*. Since there are no *Arbitrage Opportunities* we know that $\mathbb{M} \neq \emptyset$. We consider the statement in both directions

\implies For the sake of contradiction, assume that the model is *Complete*, but \mathbb{M} contains two distinct *Risk-Neutral Probability Measures* $\mathbb{Q}, \hat{\mathbb{Q}}$. In this case there must exist some state ω_k with $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_k) \neq \hat{\mathbb{Q}}(\omega_k)$ so take the contingent claim X defined by

$$X(\omega) = \begin{cases} B_1(\omega_k) & \text{if } \omega = \omega_k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = B_1 \mathbb{1}\{\omega = \omega_k\}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X/B_1) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{1}\{\omega = \omega_k\}) = \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_k\}) \neq \hat{\mathbb{Q}}(\omega_k) = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(X/B_1)$$

But, this contradicts the calculation in **Proof 1.7** where we saw that if *Contingent Claim* X is *Attainable* then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X/B_1]$ has the same value $\forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{M}$.

\impliedby For the sake of contradiction, assume that there is only one *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure* $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$, but there exists a *Contingent Claim* X which is not *Attainable*.

Then there is no solution to the system $AH = X$. By *Separating Hyperplane Theorem* it follows that there must exist a row vector $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^K$ st

$$\pi^T A = 0^{[14]}, \pi^T X > 0$$

Let $\lambda > 0$ be small enough st

$$\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_j\}) = \hat{\mathbb{Q}}(\{\omega_j\}) + \lambda \pi_j \cdot B_1(\omega_j) > 0 \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, K\}$$

Since B_1 is the first column of A and $\pi^T A = 0$, the quantity \mathbb{Q} is defined above is actually a *Probability Measure*.^[15] Moreover, for any *Discounted Price Process* $S^* = (S_1^*, \dots, S_N^*)$ and for every $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[S_n^*(1)] &= \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_j\}) S_n(1, \omega_j) / B_1(\omega_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^K \hat{\mathbb{Q}}(\{\omega_j\}) S_n(1, \omega_j) / B_1(\omega_j) + \underbrace{\lambda \sum_{j=1}^K \pi_j S_n(1, \omega_j)}_{=0} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^K \hat{\mathbb{Q}}(\{\omega_j\}) S_n^*(1, \omega_j) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(S_n^*(1)) \\ &= S_n^*(0)^{[16]} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{M}$ which is a contradiction to the uniqueness of $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$.

^[14] π is *Orthogonal* to A .

^[15] i.e. $\sum_j \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_j\}) = \underbrace{\sum_j \hat{\mathbb{Q}}(\{\omega_j\})}_{=1} + \underbrace{\sum_j \lambda \pi_j B_1}_{=0} = 1$

^[16] As $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure*.

□

Example 1.8 - Complete Markets

Consider the situation in **Example 1.6**.

Here is another way to check that X is *Attainable* is to check if the model is *Complete*.

Consider the matrix A

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1+r & 25 \\ 1+r & 5 \end{pmatrix}$$

Since A has two linearly-independent columns, AH can take all values in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Hence the model is *Complete*.

2 Stochastic Processes in Discrete Time

2.1 Multi-Period Models

Remark 2.1 - Multi-Period vs Single-Period Model

The *Multi-Period Model* for securities markets are much more realistic than *Single-Period Models*.

Definition 2.1 - Multi-Period Model

A *Multi-Period Model* is a model for a financial market with the following elements

- $T + 1$ trading dates $\{0, 1, \dots, T\}$.
- A finite sample space Ω where each element corresponds to a certain state of the world.

$$\Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K\} \text{ with } K < \infty$$

- A probability measure \mathbb{P} on Ω with $\mathbb{P}(\omega) > 0 \forall \omega \in \Omega$.

Definition 2.2 - Filtration \mathcal{F}

A *Filtration* $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ ^[17] is a sub-model describing how the formation about the security prices is revealed to investors.

Definition 2.3 - Bank Process B

A *Bank Process* $B := \{B_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ where B is a stochastic process with $B_0 = 1$ and $B_t(\omega) > 0$.

The *Bank Process* at time t B_t should be thought of as the time t value of a savings account when 1 unit of currency was deposited at time $t = 0$.

B is usually a non-decreasing process and the (possibly random) quantity $r_t := \frac{B_t - B_{t-1}}{B_{t-1}} \geq 0$, $t = 1, \dots, T$ should be thought of as the interest rate for time-interval $(t-1, t)$.

Definition 2.4 - Price Process S

A *Price Process* $S = \{S(t) : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ where each element is multi-dimensional^[18] $S(t) = (S_1(t), \dots, S_N(t))$ and $S_i(t)$ is a non-negative stochastic process for each $i \in [1, N]$.

^[17]Each \mathcal{F}_t is a σ -Algebra

^[18]One dimension for each security in the market.

The $S_i(t)$ should be thought of as the price of the i^{th} security in time-period t .

2.2 Information Structures

Definition 2.5 - Partition \mathcal{P}

A set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ forms a partition \mathcal{P} if each element of A is disjoint and the union of all the elements of A is the whole sample space Ω .

$$a_i \cap a_j = \emptyset \quad \forall a_i, a_j \in A \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{i=1}^n a_i = \Omega$$

Example 2.1 - Information Structures

Consider a multi-period model with $T = 3$ time-periods and whether the stock either increases or decreases in value is the only event recorded in each time-period. The sample space has $K = 2^3 = 8$ different outcomes

ω_1	ω_2	ω_3	ω_4	ω_5	ω_6	ω_7	ω_8
UUU	UUD	UDU	UDD	DUU	DUD	DDU	DDD

Initially, all of these outcomes are possible (ie $A_0 = \Omega$). After the first move occurs there are only $2^2 = 4$ possible outcomes, after the second there are only $2^1 = 2$ possible outcomes and after the third there is only 1 possible outcome.

The set of possible subsets A_t at time t form a *Partition* \mathcal{P}_t .

Remark 2.2 - Flow of Information

At time $t = 0$ every state $\omega \in \Omega$ is a possible outcome (although usually not with the same probability). And, at time $t = T$, the true state of the world is known. Each new piece of information removes certain states.

One can view the evolution of information as a random sequence $\{A_t\}$ of subsets of Ω where

$$A_0 = \Omega, \quad A_T = \{\omega\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_0 \supseteq A_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq A_T$$

There exists K possible *Information Sequences* $\{A_t\}_{t \in [1, T]}$ of subsets, corresponding to the K elements of Ω . At time $t = 0$ the investors are aware of all these sequences, but they do not know which one is the true sequence.

Definition 2.6 - Information Sequence

The *Information Sequence* is fully describe by a sequence $\mathcal{P}_0, \dots, \mathcal{P}_T$ of partitions of Ω with

- $\mathcal{P}_0 = \{\Omega\}$.
- $\mathcal{P}_T = \{\{\omega_1\}, \{\omega_2\}, \{\omega_3\}, \{\omega_4\}, \{\omega_5\}, \{\omega_6\}, \{\omega_7\}, \{\omega_8\}\}$
- And, $\forall t < T$ each $A \in \mathcal{P}_t$ is equal to the union of some elements of \mathcal{P}_{t+1} .




Figure 1: Tree diagram for the structure of information from Example 2.1.




Figure 2: A sequence of pictures demonstrating the structure of information Example 2.1.

Example 2.2 -

Consider an arbitrary sequence $\{\hat{A}_t\}_{t \in [1, T]}$ and some time-point $s < T$. For each $\omega \in \hat{A}_s$ the sequence $\{A_t\}_{t \in [1, T]}$ with $A_T = \{\omega\}$ will coincide with $\{\hat{A}_t\}$ at least until time $t = s$.

The collection of subsets $\{A_{s+1}\}$ that can follow \hat{A}_s forms a partition of \hat{A}_s , that is, a collection of disjoint subsets whose union equals \hat{A}_s .

In particular, taking $s = 0$, we see that the collection $\{A_1\}$ of all possible time-period $t = 1$ subsets forms a partition of Ω . This partition is denoted \mathcal{P}_1 .

Moreover, the collection $\{A_2\}$ of all possible time-period $t = 2$ subsets also forms a partition of Ω , denoted \mathcal{P}_2 . Consider Example 2.1 where $K = 8$ and $T = 3$, the partitions are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_0 &= \{\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}\} \\ \mathcal{P}_1 &= \{\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}\} \\ \mathcal{P}_2 &= \{\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_5, \omega_6\}, \{\omega_7, \omega_8\}\} \\ \mathcal{P}_3 &= \{\{\omega_1\}, \{\omega_2\}, \{\omega_3\}, \{\omega_4\}, \{\omega_5\}, \{\omega_6\}, \{\omega_7\}, \{\omega_8\}\} \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.3 - Visualising Information Structure

There are two popular ways to visualise information structure

- i). A *Tree Diagram* where each node corresponds to an element A_t of the time t partition and where there is edge arc going from this node to each node corresponding to some $A_{t+1} \subseteq A_t$. (See **Figure 1**).
- ii). A *Sequence of Pictures* of the same space. (See **Figure 2**).

Definition 2.7 - σ -Algebra \mathcal{F}_t

A collection \mathcal{F} of subsets of Ω is called a σ -Algebra on sample space Ω if

- i). $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$.
- ii). $\forall F \in \mathcal{F}, F^c \in \mathcal{F}$.
- iii). $\forall F, G \in \mathcal{F}, (F \cup G) \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proposition 2.1 - Generated σ -Algebra

For any partition \mathcal{P} of Ω we can generate σ -Algebra \mathcal{F} by letting \mathcal{F} be the collection of all unions of elements of \mathcal{P} together with the complements of all such unions.

Hence, the sub-models of the information structure can be organised as a sequence $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [1, T]}$ of σ -Algebras.

Definition 2.8 - Filtration \mathcal{F}

A *Filtration* is a family of σ -Algebras $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ where

- i). $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$.
- ii). \mathcal{F}_T consists of all subsets of Ω .
- iii). $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$ for all $n < T$, by which we mean that each subset of \mathcal{F}_n must be an element of \mathcal{F}_{n+1} .

Example 2.3 - σ -Algebra

Consider the context of **Example 2.1**. The corresponding filtration is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{F}_0 &= \{\emptyset, \Omega\} \\
 \mathcal{F}_1 &= \{\emptyset, \Omega, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}\} \\
 \mathcal{F}_2 &= \{\emptyset, \Omega, \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_5, \omega_6\}, \{\omega_7, \omega_8\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}, \\
 &\quad \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_5, \omega_6\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_7, \omega_8\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_5, \omega_6\}, \\
 &\quad \{\omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_7, \omega_8\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_5, \omega_6\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_7, \omega_8\}, \\
 &\quad \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4, \omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

and \mathcal{F}_3 contains all the subsets of Ω (ie $\mathcal{F}_3 = 2^\Omega$).

2.3 Stochastic Processes in Discrete Time**Definition 2.9 - Stochastic Process S**

A *Stochastic Process* S is a real-valued function $S(t)(\omega)$ of two variables, t and ω .

For each fixed $\omega \in \Omega$ the function mapping $t \rightarrow S(t)(\omega)$ is called the *Sample Path*.

For each fixed $t \in [0, T]$ the function mapping $\omega \rightarrow S(t)(\omega)$ is a *Random Variable*.

NB - For simplicity, we assume $S(0)$ is constant.

Definition 2.10 - Measurable Function

A function $\omega \rightarrow W(\omega)$ is said to be *Measurable* wrt the σ -Algebra \mathcal{F} if

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ where } W^{-1}(x) \subset \mathcal{F} \text{ it is true that } W^{-1}(x) := \{\omega \in \Omega : W(\omega) = x\}.^{[19]}$$

Example 2.4 - Measurable Function

Consider random variables X, Y defined as

$$\begin{aligned} X(\omega) &= \begin{cases} 5 & , \omega \in \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\} \\ 7 & , \omega \in \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\} \end{cases} \\ Y(\omega) &= \begin{cases} 8 & , \omega \in \{\omega_1, \omega_3, \omega_5, \omega_7\} \\ 6 & , \omega \in \{\omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6, \omega_8\} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the notation of **Example 2.1**, we have that

- X is *Measurable* wrt $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_3$ as $\{\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}, \emptyset\} \subset \mathcal{F}_1$.
- Y is not *Measurable* wrt $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$, but is measurable wrt \mathcal{F}_3 , as $\{\omega_1, \omega_3, \omega_5, \omega_7\} \notin \mathcal{F}_1$.

Remark 2.4 - Measurable

If a function X is *Measurable* wrt \mathcal{F}_t then it will be *Measurable* wrt \mathcal{F}_{t+1} , as $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{t+1}$.

Definition 2.11 - Adapted

A *Stochastic Process* $S = \{S(t) : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ is said to be *Adapted* to the *Filtration* $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ if for every $t = 0, \dots, T$ the random variable $S(t)$ is *Measurable* wrt \mathcal{F}_t .

Remark 2.5 - Adapted Filtrations in Practice

In practice we often define the *Stochastic Process* S first and use the so-called “*Natural Filtration*”, defined as

- For each $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$ let \mathcal{P}_t be the partition of Ω st the *Stochastic Process* $\{S(0), \dots, S(t)\}$ takes the same value for each $\omega \in A$, for each subset $A \in \mathcal{P}_t$.
- Let \mathcal{F}_t be the σ -Algebra generated by \mathcal{P}_t .
- Then $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ is called the filtration *Generated* by the *Stochastic Process* S .

Example 2.5 -

Consider the setting in **Example 2.1** and let $S(t)$ be the upwards movements in the value of the asset by time t . Then $S(t)$ generates the *Filtration* above.

This can be summarised in the table

^[19]Equivalently, if we know which set of the σ -algebra ω is in, then we know the value of $W(\omega)$.

ω_k	$t = 0$	$t = 1$	$t = 2$	$t = 3$
ω_1	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 2$	$S(t) = 3$
ω_2	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 2$	$S(t) = 2$
ω_3	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 2$
ω_4	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 1$
ω_5	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 2$
ω_6	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 1$	$S(t) = 1$
ω_7	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 1$
ω_8	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 0$	$S(t) = 0$

Definition 2.12 - Random Walk

Let $X_t := X_0 + Y_1 + \dots + Y_t$ where Y_1, \dots, Y_t are iid random variables with finite variance σ^2 and mean $mean$. Then $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ is a *Random Walk*.

We say that $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ is a *Simple Random Walk* if Y_i takes only the values 1 with probability p and -1 with probability $1 - p$.

Proposition 2.2 - Distribution of Simple Random Walk Values

A *Simple Random Walk* takes values y at time-point t iff exactly $\frac{t+y}{2}$ of Y_1, \dots, Y_t are equal to 1, and the remaining $\frac{t-y}{2}$ equal -1.

$$\forall t \geq 0, y \in \{-t, -t+2, \dots, t-2, t\}, \quad \mathbb{P}(X_t = y) = \binom{t}{\frac{t+y}{2}} p^{(t+y)/2} (1-p)^{(t-y)/2}$$

2.4 Conditional Expectations**Definition 2.13 - Conditional Expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|A]$**

For a finite *Sample Space* Ω the *Conditional Expectation* of a discrete RV Y given the event A $\mathbb{E}[Y|A]$ is defined as

$$\mathbb{E}[Y|A] = \sum_y y \mathbb{P}(Y = y|A)$$

This *Conditional Expectation* maps from the events A to the real numbers.

Remark 2.6 - Rewriting Conditional Expectation

We can rewrite the *Conditional Expectation* as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y|A] &= \sum_y y \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y(\omega)=y, A)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in A} Y(\omega) \frac{\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.6 - Conditional Expectation

Consider **Example 2.5** with ω_i having probability $1/8$.

- If $A := \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}$ then

$$\mathbb{E}[S_3|A] = \frac{(3 + 2 + 2 + 1)(1/8)}{1/2} = 2$$

- If $A := \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}$ then

$$\mathbb{E}[S_3|A] = \frac{(2 + 1 + 1 + 0)(1/8)}{1/2} = 1$$

Definition 2.14 - Conditional Expectation /w σ -Algebra

Let \mathcal{F} be a σ -algebra and \mathcal{P} be the corresponding Partition of Ω .

We define the *Conditional Expectation* of RV Y give σ -algebra \mathcal{F} as

$$\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}] = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \mathbb{1}_A$$

This is a random-variable^[20] which is *Measurable* wrt \mathcal{F} . And,

$$\forall \omega \in A, \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}](\omega) = \mathbb{E}[Y|A]$$

Example 2.7 - Conditional Expectation /w σ -Algebras

Consider Example 2.5 with ω_i having probability $1/8$.

Recall that $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{\emptyset, \Omega, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\}\}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[S_3|A] = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } A = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\} \\ 1 & \text{if } A = \{\omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8\} \end{cases}$$

Hence $\mathbb{E}[S_3|\mathcal{F}_1]$ is a random variable with

$$\mathbb{E}[S_3|\mathcal{F}](\omega_i) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \\ 1 & \text{if } i = 5, 6, 7, 8 \end{cases}$$

This random variable is \mathcal{F}_1 -*Measurable*.

Observer that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[S_3|\mathcal{F}_1]] &= \sum_i \mathbb{P}(\omega_i) \mathbb{E}[S_3|\mathcal{F}_1](\omega_i) \\ &= 2 \cdot \frac{4}{8} + 1 \cdot \frac{4}{8} = \frac{3}{2} = \mathbb{E}[S_3]^{[21]} \end{aligned}$$

Note that if

$$Y(\omega_i) = \begin{cases} 7 & \text{if } i \leq 4 \\ 1 & \text{if } i \geq 5 \end{cases} \implies \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_1] = Y$$

Moreover, If $Z = \mathbb{1}\{\text{3rd move is up}\}$ then Z is independent of \mathcal{F}_1 and

$$\mathbb{E}[Z|\mathcal{F}_1] = \frac{1}{2} = \mathbb{E}[Z]$$

Theorem 2.1 - Properties of Conditional Expectation

Let Y be a random variable and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ be σ -algebras with $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2$.

Conditional Expectations satisfy the following properties:

- i). $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$. (The “Tower Law”)
- ii). $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1] = \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_1] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_1]|\mathcal{F}_2]$. (The “Generalised Tower Law”)
- iii). If X is a random variable which is *Measurable* wrt \mathcal{F} then $\mathbb{E}[XY|\mathcal{F}] = X\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}] = X$.^[22]

^[20]Not a sum, as there is one A st $\mathbb{1}_A = 1$ (the rest equal zero)

^[21]This is the “Tower Law”

^[22]As X is measurable wrt \mathcal{F} all information is known about it, and thus can treat it as a scalar.

iv). If Y is independent of $\mathcal{F}^{[23]}$ then $\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$.

Proof 2.1 - Theorem 2.1 i)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \mathbb{1}_A \right] \text{ by def. cond. expectation} \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A] \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{1}_A(\omega) \mathbb{P}(\omega) \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{\omega \in A} \frac{Y(\omega) \mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}(A) \left(\sum_{\omega \in A} \frac{Y(\omega) \mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \right) \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{\omega \in A} Y(\omega) \mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[Y]
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof 2.2 - Theorem 2.1 ii)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1] &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}_2} \mathbb{E}[Y|B] \mathbb{1}_B | \mathcal{F}_1 \right) \\
 &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}_2} \mathbb{E}[Y|B] \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_B | \mathcal{F}_1] \\
 &= \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}_2} \mathbb{E}[Y|B] \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_B | A] \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_1} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}_2} \mathbb{E}[Y|B] \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_B | A] \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_1} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}_2} \mathbb{E}[Y|B] \frac{\mathbb{P}(A \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \mathbb{1}_A
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the partition \mathcal{P}_2 is finer than \mathcal{P}_1 for all $B \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $A \in \mathcal{P}_1$, either $B \subset A$ or $B \cap A = \emptyset$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1] &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_1} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}_2, B \subset A} \mathbb{E}[Y|B] \frac{\mathbb{P}(B)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_1} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}_2, B \subset A} \left(\sum_{\omega \in B} Y(\omega) \frac{\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} \right) \frac{\mathbb{P}(B)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_1} \sum_{\omega \in A} Y(\omega) \frac{\mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}_1} \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_1]
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof 2.3 - Theorem 2.1 iii)

Since S is *Measurable* it is constant on sets of \mathcal{P} so we can write

$$X = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} x_A \mathbb{1}_A$$

^[23] $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}$ the distribution of Y is independent of A

with suitable scalars $x_A \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[XY|\mathcal{F}] &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[XY|A] \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[x_A Y|A] \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} x_A \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} X \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \mathbb{1}_A^{[24]} \\
 &= X \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \mathbb{1}_A \\
 &= X \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Consider the special case where $Y = 1$, then it follows that $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{F}] = X$. \square

Proof 2.4 - Theorem 2.1 iv)

If Y is independent of \mathcal{F} then for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[Y|A] &= \sum_y y \mathbb{P}(Y = y|A) \\
 &= \sum_y y \mathbb{P}(Y = y) \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[Y]
 \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proposition 2.3 - Conditional Expectation for Non-Finite Sample Spaces

Let Y be a RV, then the *Conditional Expectation* $\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]$ is the unique random variable st

- i). $\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]$ is \mathcal{F} -Measurable.
- ii). $\forall A \in \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}] \cdot \mathbb{1}_A] = \mathbb{E}[Y \mathbb{1}_A]$.

Proof 2.5 - Proposition 2.3

For an arbitrary event $A \in \mathcal{F}$ the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_A$ is \mathcal{F} -Measurable and thus $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A Y|\mathcal{F}] = \mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]$ by Theorem 2.1.

Hence, for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}] \cdot \mathbb{1}_A] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A Y|\mathcal{F}]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A Y]$$

On the other hand, suppose X is \mathcal{F} -Measurable and satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[X \mathbb{1}_A] = \mathbb{E}[Y \mathbb{1}_A] \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}$$

Then write X as in Proof 2.3 $X = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} x_A \mathbb{1}_A$.

It follows that $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}, \mathbb{E}[X \mathbb{1}_A] = x_A \mathbb{P}(A)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[Y \mathbb{1}_A] &= \sum_{\omega \in A} Y(\omega) \mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
 &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \sum_{\omega \in A} Y(\omega) \mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(A) \sum_{\omega \in A} \frac{Y(\omega) \mathbb{P}(\omega)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} \\
 &= \mathbb{P}(A) \mathbb{E}[Y|A]
 \end{aligned}$$

^[24] This holds as $\mathbb{1}_A = 1$ for only one specific A .

Thus

$$x\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{E}[X\mathbb{1}_A] = \mathbb{E}[Y\mathbb{1}_A] = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{E}[Y|A]$$

Therefore, we have found that $x_A = \mathbb{E}[Y|A] \forall A \in \mathcal{P}$ where \mathcal{P} is the partition which corresponds to σ -algebra \mathcal{F} .

Moreover, $X = \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}]$.

2.5 Martingales

Definition 2.15 - Martingale Z

Let $Z := \{Z_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ be an *Adapted Stochastic Process* defined on a *Sample Space* Ω with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$.

The process Z is said to be a *Martingale* if

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = Z_{t-1} \forall t \geq 1$$

Definition 2.16 - Super-Martingale Z

Let $Z := \{Z_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ be an *Adapted Stochastic Process* defined on a *Sample Space* Ω with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$.

The process Z is said to be a *Super-Martingale* if

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq Z_{t-1} \forall t \geq 1$$

Definition 2.17 - Sub-Martingale Z

Let $Z := \{Z_t : t = 0, 1, \dots, T\}$ be an *Adapted Stochastic Process* defined on a *Sample Space* Ω with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$.

The process Z is said to be a *Sub-Martingale* if

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq Z_{t-1} \forall t \geq 1$$

Remark 2.7 - Super- vs Sub-Martingale

You should think of a *Super-Martingale* as a process where the current value provides an upper-bound on the next value, and a *Sub-Martingale* as a process where the current value provides a lower-bound on the next value.

Theorem 2.2 - When is an Adapted Stochastic Process a Martingale?

An *Adapted Stochastic Process* Z is a *Martingale* iff

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_s] = Z_s \forall t \geq s$$

Corresponding results (with equality swapped out) hold for super- and sub-martingales.

Proof 2.6 - Theorem 2.2

\Leftarrow Clearly, if the equation in **Theorem 2.2** holds then **Definition 2.15** holds.

\implies Assume Z is a *Martingale*. Then **Theorem 2.1** implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_s] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}|\mathcal{F}_s]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Z_{t-1}|\mathcal{F}_s] \text{ as } Z \text{ is a martingale} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Z_s|\mathcal{F}_s] \text{ by repetition} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Z_s] = Z_s\end{aligned}$$

A similar proof is done for super- and sub-martingales.

Example 2.8 - Martingales

Let $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a simple random walk with parameter p and \mathcal{F}_t be the σ -algebra generated by (X_t) . Then

- i). $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a *Martingale* if $p = 1/2$ as there is an equal probability of stepping up and stepping down.
- ii). $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a *Super-Martingale* if $p \leq 1/2$ as there is a greater probability of stepping down than stepping up.
- iii). $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a *Sub-Martingale* if $p \geq 1/2$ as there is a greater probability of stepping up than stepping down.
- iv). If $p = 1/2$ then the process $\{Z_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined st $Z_t := X_t^2 - t$ for $t = 0, 1, \dots$ is a *Martingale*
- v). If $p \neq 1/2$ then the processes $\{L_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ & $\{M_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ defined by $L_0 = 1$, $L_t = \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{X_t}$ and $M_t = X_t - t(2p - 1)$ are both *Martingales*^[25].

Proof 2.7 - Example 2.8 i)-iii)

Since \mathcal{F}_t is the natural filtration, then $\{X_t\}$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable and Y_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . Therefore by **Theorem 2.1** we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[X_{t-1} + Y_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_{t-1}|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \mathbb{E}[Y_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= X_{t-1} + \mathbb{E}[Y_t]\end{aligned}$$

- If $p = 1/2$ then $\mathbb{E}[Y_t] = 0 \implies \mathbb{E}[X_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = X_{t-1}$, the definition of a *Martingale*.
- If $p \leq 1/2$ then $\mathbb{E}[Y_t] \leq 0 \implies \mathbb{E}[X_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq X_{t-1}$, the definition of a *Super-Martingale*.
- If $p \geq 1/2$ then $\mathbb{E}[Y_t] \geq 0 \implies \mathbb{E}[X_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq X_{t-1}$, the definition of a *Sub-Martingale*.

Proof 2.8 - Example 2.8 iv)

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[X_t^2 - t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(X_{t-1} + Y_t)^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - t \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_{t-1}^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + 2\mathbb{E}[X_{t-1}Y_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + \mathbb{E}[Y_t^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] - t \\ &= X_{t-1}^2 + 2X_{t-1} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Y_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}_{=\mathbb{E}[Y_t]=0} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[Y_t^2]}_{=1^{[26]}} - t \\ &= X_{t-1}^2 + 0 + 1 - t \\ &= X_{t-1}^2 - (t - 1) = Z_{t-1}\end{aligned}$$

This shows that the Z_t we defined fulfils the definition of a *Martingale*.

^[25] Proved in a homework

^[26] Y_t only takes values $\{-1, 1\}$ so $Y_t^2 = 1$ always.

2.6 Stopping Times τ

Remark 2.8 - Stopping Times & Finance

Stopping Times are useful for analysing American options.

Definition 2.18 - Stopping Time τ

Let Ω be a *Sample Space* with a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$.

A *Stopping Time* is a random variable τ which takes values in the set $\{0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$ ^[27] st each event of the form $\{\tau \leq t\}$ from some t is an element of the σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_t .^[28]

A *Stopping Time* is said to be *Bounded* if $\exists k$ st $\mathbb{P}(\tau < t) = 1$.

Example 2.9 - Stopping Time

Consider the following events

- “RBS shares hit 100p.” - This is a *Stopping Time* event.
- “RBS shares hit their maximum.” - This is not a *Stopping Time* event.

Theorem 2.3 - Stopping Times & σ -Algebras

A random variable τ is a *Stopping Time* iff each event of the form $\{\tau = t\}$ for some t is an element of the σ -Algebra \mathcal{F}_t .

Proof 2.9 - Theorem 2.3

$$\begin{aligned} \Leftarrow \quad \{\tau = t\} &= \underbrace{\{\tau \leq t\}}_{\in \mathcal{F}_t} \setminus \underbrace{\{\tau \leq t-1\}}_{\in \mathcal{F}_t} \in \mathcal{F}_t \\ \Rightarrow \quad \{\tau \leq t\} &= \bigcup_{k \leq t} \underbrace{\{\tau = k\}}_{\in \mathcal{F}_t} \in \mathcal{F}_t \end{aligned}$$

Thus the result holds in both directions.

Theorem 2.4 - Stopping Time for an Adapted Stochastic Process

Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be an *Adapted Stochastic Process* and $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

A *Stopping Time* τ_c can be defined as $\tau_c = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \geq c\}$.^[29]

Proof 2.10 - Theorem 2.4

We note that $\tau_c \leq t$ iff $\exists k \leq t$ st $X_k \geq c$.

Therefore

$$\{\tau_c \leq t\} = \bigcup_{k \leq t} \underbrace{\{X_k \geq c\}}_{\in \mathcal{F}_t} \in \mathcal{F}_t$$

Thus τ_c is a *Stopping Time*.

Theorem 2.5 - Optional Sampling Theorem^[30] - Martingales

^[27] ∞ is used for events which never occur.

^[28] Thus, we can determine whether $\{\tau \leq t\}$ has occurred just by observing \mathcal{F}_t (ie all the information available at time-point t).

^[29] The event which stops the moment X_t reaches c

^[30] AKA *Optional Stopping Theorem*

Let τ be a *Bounded Stopping Time* and $X = \{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a *Martingale*. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\tau] = \mathbb{E}[X_0] = X_0$$

Theorem 2.6 - Optional Sampling Theorem - Super-Martingales

Let τ be a *Bounded Stopping Time* and $X = \{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a *Super-Martingale*. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\tau] \leq \mathbb{E}[X_0]$$

Proof 2.11 - Theorem 2.5

Assume that $\tau \leq K$ and write

$$X_{\tau(\omega)}(\omega) = \sum_{t=0}^K X_t(\omega) \mathbb{1}\{\tau(\omega) = t\}^{[31]}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_\tau] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^K X_t \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\}\right] \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^K \mathbb{E}[X_t \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\}] \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X_K | \mathcal{F}_t] \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\}] \end{aligned}$$

Using that since τ is a *Stopping Time*, then the event $\{\tau = t\}$ is measurable wrt \mathcal{F}_t . Thus $\mathbb{E}[X_K | \mathcal{F}_t] \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\} = \mathbb{E}[X_K \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\} | \mathcal{F}_t]$.

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{t=0}^K \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X_K \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\} | \mathcal{F}_t]] \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^K \mathbb{E}[X_K \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\}] \text{ by Tower Law} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[X_K \sum_{t=0}^K \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t\}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_K \cdot 1] = \mathbb{E}[X_K] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_0] = X_0 \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.10 - Gambler's Ruin

Consider a gambler with an initial wealth of $\mathcal{L}C$. He gambles by guessing whether a coin flip results in heads or tails. If he guess correctly then he receives $\mathcal{L}1$ and he is wrong he loses $\mathcal{L}1$. The game ends when he either becomes bankrupt or he reaches a wealth of $\mathcal{L}C + G$ where $G > 0$.

Proposition 2.4 - Gambler's Ruin

^[31]This is not really a sum, due to the indicator function $\mathbb{1}$ meaning only one value is non-zero.

Let $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a *Simple Random Walk* with parameter p and $X_0 = 0$, and $C, G > 0$. Define the *Stopping-Time* event $\tau = \inf\{t : X_t = G \text{ or } X_t = -C\}$ ^[32].

If $p = 1/2$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) &= \frac{C}{C + G} \\ \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) &= \frac{G}{C + G} \\ \mathbb{E}[\tau] &= CG\end{aligned}$$

Else, if $p \neq 1/2$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) &= \frac{1 - \left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right)^C}{\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right)^G - \left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right)^C} \\ \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) \\ \mathbb{E}[\tau] &= \frac{G\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + (-C)\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C)}{2p - 1}\end{aligned}$$

Proof 2.12 - Proposition 2.4

We want to apply the *Optional Stopping Theorem* (Theorem 2.5).

The *Stopping Time* τ is not bounded, but X_τ is bounded. Therefore we can use one of the alternative versions of the *Optional Stopping Theorem* provided that $\mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) = 1$.

Note that whenever there is a run of at least $k = C + G$ successive 1's in the process Y which defines X , the process will stop and $\tau < \infty$. Thus for all m

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\tau > km) &= \mathbb{P}(\text{No run of } k \text{ 1's in } Y_1 \text{ to } Y_{mk}) \\ &= \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}(\text{No run of } k \text{ 1's in } Y_{jk+1} \text{ to } Y_{(j+1)k}) \\ &= (1 - p^k)^m \\ \implies \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) &= 1\end{aligned}$$

i). Consider the case $p = 1/2$. Using the *Optional Stopping Theorem* we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \mathbb{E}[X_\tau] \\ &= G\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + (-C)\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) \\ &= G\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + (-C)(1 - \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G)) \\ \implies C &= (G + C)\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) \\ \implies \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) &= \frac{C}{G + C} \\ \text{and } \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) &= 1 - \frac{C}{G + C} = \frac{G}{G + C}\end{aligned}$$

We determine $\mathbb{E}[X_\tau]$ by applying the *Optional Stopping Theorem* to the process $\{Z_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ where $Z_t := X_t^2 - t$. We know $\{Z_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a *Martingale* from Example 2.8 iv).

As $\{Z_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a *Martingale* it holds that

$$0 = \mathbb{E}[Z_0] = \mathbb{E}[Z_\tau] = \mathbb{E}[X_\tau^2 - \tau]$$

^[32]The event the game in Example 2.10

Thus, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\tau] &= \mathbb{E}[X_\tau^2] \\
 &= G^2 \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + C^2 \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) \\
 &= G^2 \frac{C}{C+G} + C^2 \frac{G}{C+G} \\
 &= CG
 \end{aligned}$$

ii). Consider the case $p \neq 1/2$. Using the *Optional Stopping Theorem* on the process $\{L_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ where $L_t := \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{X_t}$. We know $\{L_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a *Martingale* from **Example 2.8 v**).

$$1 = \mathbb{E}[L_0] = \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^G \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^C \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C)$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) = 1$, so we can derive each probability as

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 &= \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^G \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^C (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G)) \\
 &= \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^C + \left[\left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^G - \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^C\right] \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) \\
 \implies \mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) &= \frac{1 - \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^C}{\left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^G - \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^C}
 \end{aligned}$$

We determine $\mathbb{E}[X_\tau]$ by apply the *Optional Stopping Theorem* to the process $\{M_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ where $M_\tau := X_t - t(2p - 1)$. We know $\{M_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a *Martingale* from **Example 2.8 v**). Thus

$$0 = \mathbb{E}[M_\tau] = G\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + (-C)\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) - \mathbb{E}[\tau](2p - 1)$$

Re-arranging this we can find an expression for $\mathbb{E}[\tau]$

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= G\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + (-C)\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) - \mathbb{E}[\tau](2p - 1) \\
 \implies \mathbb{E}[\tau](2p - 1) &= G\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + (-C)\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C) \\
 \implies \mathbb{E}[\tau] &= \frac{G\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = G) + (-C)\mathbb{P}(X_\tau = -C)}{(2p - 1)}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

3 Multi-Period Models

3.1 Trading Strategies

Definition 3.1 - Predictable Stochastic Process

A *Stochastic Process* $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is called *Predictable* if it is *Measurable* wrt σ -Algebra \mathcal{F}_{t-1} .

Definition 3.2 - Trading Strategy H

A vector of *Stochastic Processes* $H := (H_0, H_1, \dots, H_N)$ is called a *Trading Strategy* if, for all n , the process H_n is *Predictable*.

Note that $H_n(t) \in \mathbb{Z}$ denotes the number of units^[33] the investor carries forward of the n^{th} security from time $t - 1$ to t . And, $H_0(t)B_{t-1}$ is the amount of money in the *Bank Account* at time $t - 1$.




Figure 3: Diagram to show relationship between trading strategies H , values processes V and stock processes S .

Definition 3.3 - Value Process V

The *Value Process* $\{V_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a stochastic process defined by

$$V_t = \begin{cases} H_0(1)B_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(1)S_n(0) & \text{if } t = 0 \\ H_0(t)B_t + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t)S_n(t) & \text{if } t \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

See Figure 3.

Definition 3.4 - Gains Process G

The *Gains Process* $\{G_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ of a *Trading Strategy* H is given by

$$G_t = \left(\sum_{u=1}^t H_0(u) \Delta B_u \right) + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{u=1}^t H_n(u) \Delta S_n(u) \text{ where } \Delta S_n(t) := S_n(t) - S_n(t-1) \text{ for } t \geq 1$$

This is an example of a stochastic integral of the trading strategy H wrt to the price process S .

Definition 3.5 - Self-Financing Trading Strategies

A *Trading Strategy* H is *Self-Financing* if

$$V_t = H_0(t+1)B_t + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t+1)S_n(t)$$

You cannot introduce money into or take money out of a *Self-Financing Trading Strategy* at any time-points t , except the first $t = 0$ and last $t = T$.

Definition 3.6 - Discounted Processes S_n^*, V^*

The *Discounted Price Process* $S_n^* = \{S_n^*(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ for $n \in [1, N]$ is defined as

$$S_n^*(t) = \frac{S_n(t)}{B_t}$$

The *Discounted Value Process* $V^* = \{V_t^*\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is defined as

$$V_t^* = \begin{cases} H_0(1) + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(1)S_n^*(0) & \text{if } t = 0 \\ H_0(t) + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t)S_n^*(t) & \text{if } t \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

^[33]Negative values indicate a short position.

The *Discounted Gains Process* $\{G_t^*\}_{t \in [1, T]}$ is defined as

$$G_t^* = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{u=1}^t H_n(u) \Delta S_n^*(u) \text{ for } t \geq 1$$

Proposition 3.1 - Self-Financing Trading Strategy and Value Process

A Trading Strategy H is *Self-Financing* iff $V_t^* = V_0^* + G_t^*$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$.

Proof 3.1 - Proposition 3.1

For all $t = 1, \dots, T$ it holds that

$$G_t^* = G_{t-1}^* + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t) \Delta S_n^*(t)$$

For convenience we define $G_0^* = 0$.

I prove the statement in both directions

\Rightarrow Assume that H is *Self-Financing*.

By the definitions of *Self-Financing*, *Discounted Processes* and the above result, we can show the following for all $t = 1, \dots, T$

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^* - G_t^* &= H_0(t) + \left(\sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t) S_n^*(t) \right) - \left(\sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t) \Delta S_n^*(t) \right) - G_{t-1}^* \\ &= H_0(t) + \left(\sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t) (S_n^*(t) - \Delta S_n^*(t)) \right) - G_{t-1}^* \\ &= H_0(t) + \left(\sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t) S_n^*(t-1) \right) - G_{t-1}^* \\ &= V_{t-1}^* - G_{t-1}^* \end{aligned}$$

By recursion we find that $V_t^* - G_t^* = V_0^*$.

\Leftarrow Assume that $V_t^* = V_0^* + G_t^*$ for all $t = 1, \dots, T$.

Then, for all $t = 1, \dots, T_1$ we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^* - V_{t+1}^* &= V_0^* + G_t^* - (V_0^* + G_{t+1}^*) \\ &= G_t^* - G_{t+1}^* \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the definitions of discounted process and the result at the start of this proof

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^* &= V_{t+1}^* - (G_{t+1}^* - G_t^*) \\ &= H_0(t+1) + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t+1) S_n^*(t+1) - \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t+1) \Delta S_n^*(t+1) \\ &= H_0(t+1) + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t+1) S_n^*(t) \end{aligned}$$

Thus H is *Self-Financing*.

3.2 Arbitrage in Multi-Period Model and Martingale Measures

Example 3.1 -

Consider a model with $N = 1$ stocks over $T = 2$ time-periods and $K = 4$ possible states.

For simplicity we change the notation of the price process to S_t instead of $S_1(t)$. The process is given by the following table

$\omega \setminus t$	0	1	2
ω_1	6	9	10
ω_2	6	9	7
ω_3	6	3	7
ω_4	6	3	1

We further assume that the interest-rate r is constant in both periods. Therefore the bank account process is $B_t = (1 + r)^t$.

The filtration generated by this price process is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_0 &= \{\emptyset, \Omega\} \\ \mathcal{F}_1 &= \{\emptyset, \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4\}, \Omega\} \\ \mathcal{F}_2 &= \{\emptyset, \{\omega_1\}, \{\omega_2\}, \{\omega_3\}, \{\omega_4\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_3\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_2, \omega_3\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_3, \omega_4\}, \\ &\quad \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_1, \omega_3, \omega_4\}, \{\omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}, \Omega\}\end{aligned}$$

Recall that the trading strategy has components $H_n(t)(\omega)$ giving the number of units of a stock held between time periods $t - 1$ and t .

Let H be an arbitrary trading strategy, then for the value process for this problem we have

$$V_0(\omega) = H_0(1)(\omega) + 6H_1(1)(\omega)$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}V_1(\omega) &= \begin{cases} (1+r)H_0(1)(\omega) + 9H_1(1)(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} \\ (1+r)H_0(1)(\omega) + 3H_1(1)(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in \{\omega_3, \omega_4\} \end{cases} \\ V_2(\omega) &= \begin{cases} (1+r)^2 H_0(2)(\omega) + 10H_1(2)(\omega) & \text{if } \omega = \omega_1 \\ (1+r)^2 H_0(2)(\omega) + 7H_1(2)(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in \{\omega_2, \omega_3\} \\ (1+r)^2 H_0(2)(\omega) + 1H_1(2)(\omega) & \text{if } \omega = \omega_4 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

The *Trading Strategy* H is *Predictable* so $H_i(1)(\omega)$ is constant for all ω , $H_i(2)(\omega_1) = H_i(2)(\omega_2)$ and $H_i(2)(\omega_3) = H_i(2)(\omega_4)$.

Now consider the gains process in this model

$$G_1(\omega) = \begin{cases} rH_0(1) + 3H_1(1) & \text{if } \omega \in \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} \\ rH_0(1) - 3H_1(1) & \text{if } \omega \in \{\omega_3, \omega_4\} \end{cases}$$

For brevity, we write $H_n(t)$ instead of $H_n(t)(\omega)$

$$G_2(\omega) = \begin{cases} rH_0(1) + 3H_1(1) + r(1+r)H_0(2) + H_1(2) & \text{if } \omega = \omega_1 \\ rH_0(1) + 3H_1(1) + r(1+r)H_0(2) - 2H_1(2) & \text{if } \omega = \omega_2 \\ rH_0(1) - 3H_1(1) + r(1+r)H_0(2) + 4H_1(2) & \text{if } \omega = \omega_3 \\ rH_0(1) - 3H_1(1) + r(1+r)H_0(2) - 2H_1(2) & \text{if } \omega = \omega_4 \end{cases}$$

For the *Trading Strategy* H to be *Self-Financing*, we must have that at time-point $t = 1$ in states ω_1, ω_2

$$V_1 = (1+r)H_0(1) + 9H_1(1) = {}^{[34]}(1+r)H_0(2) + 9H_1(2)$$

In states ω_3, ω_4 we require

$$V_1 = (1+r)H_0(1) + 3H_1(1) = {}^{[35]}(1+r)H_0(2) + 3H_1(2)$$

We consider possible arbitrage opportunities without considering the existence of martingale measures for the moment. If the interest rate is $r = 1/9$, then a possible trading strategy is as follows

^[34]Condition for H to be *Self-Financing*.

^[35]Condition for H to be *Self-Financing*.

- Start with an amount of £0.
- If $S_1 = 3$ do nothing at time points $t = 0, 1$.
- If $S_1 = 9$ at time point $t = 1$ short sell one share of the risky asset ($H_1(2) = -1$) and put the received proceeds into the bank account ($H_0(2) = 9/(1+r)$).
- Then, at time-point $t = 2$ the value of the portfolio is

$$V_2 = \begin{cases} (1+r)^2 H_0(2) + 10H_1(2) = 10 - 10 = 0 & \text{if } \omega = \omega_1 \\ (1+r)^2 H_0(2) + 7H_1(2) = 10 - 7 > 0 & \text{if } \omega = \omega_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \in \{\omega_3, \omega_4\} \end{cases}$$

If, on the other-hand, $r = 0$ then there are no arbitrage opportunities.

We now consider two ways to compute an equivalent martingale measure.

- i). Recall that **Definition 3.8** states that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\frac{S_n(t+s)}{B_{t+s}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = \frac{S_n(t)}{B_t} \quad \forall t, s \geq 0$$

Let $q_i := \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_i\})$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Further, we know that $q_1 + q_2 + q_3 + q_4 = 1$ must hold and from the above result we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (t=0, s=1) &\implies 6(1+r) = 9(q_1 + q_2) + 3(q_3 + q_4) \\ (t=0, s=2) &\implies 6(1+r)^2 = 10q_1 + 7q_2 + 7q_3 + q_4 \\ (t=1, s=1) &\implies 9(1+r) = (10q_1 + 7q_2)/(q_1 + q_2) \\ (t=1, s=1) &\implies 3(1+r) = (7q_3 + q_4)/(q_3 + q_4) \end{aligned}$$

This gives five equations with four unknowns which could be solved to find \mathbb{Q} .

- ii). We can make calculations quicker by considering conditional probabilities.

At time $t = 0$ we can obtain $p_1 := \mathbb{Q}(S_1 = 9)$ by solving

$$6(1+r) = 9p_1 + 3(1-p_1)$$

Which produces that $\mathbb{Q}(S_1 = 9) = \frac{1+2r}{2}$ and $\mathbb{Q}(S_1 = 3) = \frac{1-2r}{2}$.

At time $t = 1$ if $\omega \in \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ we can write

$$p_2 := \mathbb{Q}(S_2 = 10 | S_1 = 9) \text{ and } 9(1+r) = 10p_2 + 7(1-p_2)$$

This produces that $\mathbb{Q}(S_2 = 10 | S_1 = 9) = (2+9r)/3$ and $\mathbb{Q}(S_2 = 7 | S_1 = 9) = (1-9r)/3$.

At time $t = 1$ if $\omega \in \{\omega_3, \omega_4\}$ we can solve

$$p_3 := \mathbb{Q}(S_2 = 7 | S_1 = 3) \text{ and } 3(1+r) = 7p_3 + (1-p_3)$$

to find that $\mathbb{Q}(S_2 = 7 | S_1 = 3) = (2+3r)/6$ and $\mathbb{Q}(S_2 = 1 | S_1 = 3) = (4-3r)/6$.

By multiplying and conditional probabilities along the path leading to all four states in Ω , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_1\}) &= \frac{1+2r}{2} \cdot \frac{2-9r}{3} = \frac{1}{6}(1+2r)(2+9r) \\ \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_2\}) &= \frac{1-2r}{2} \cdot \frac{1-9r}{3} = \frac{1}{6}(1-2r)(1-9r) \\ \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_3\}) &= \frac{1}{12}(1-2r)(2+3r) \\ \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega_4\}) &= \frac{1}{12}(1-2r)(4-3r) \end{aligned}$$

All these probabilities are greater than 0 if $r < 1/9$, thus we can conclude that a *Martingale Measure* exists iff $r \in [0, 1/9)$.

Definition 3.7 - Arbitrage Opportunity - Multi-Period Model

An *Arbitrage Opportunity* in the case of a multi-period model is a *Trading Strategy* H st

- i). $V_0 = 0$ - It starts with zero money.
- ii). $V_T \geq 0$ - It does not lose money at the end.^[36]
- iii). $\mathbb{E}[V_T] > 0$ - It is expected that you always make money; And,
- iv). H is *Self-Financing*.

Proposition 3.2 - Self-Financing Strategies and Arbitrage Opportunity

A *Self-Financing Strategy* H is an *Arbitrage Opportunity* iff all the following hold

$$G_T^* \geq 0 \quad \mathbb{E}[G_T^*] > 0 \quad V_0^* = 0$$

Definition 3.8 - Martingale Measure \mathbb{Q}

A *Martingale Measure* is a probability measure \mathbb{Q} st^[37]

- i). $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega\}) > 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega$; and,
- ii). The *Discounted Price Process* S_n^* is a *Martingale* under \mathbb{Q} for every $n = 1, \dots, N$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[S_n^*(t+s)|\mathcal{F}_t] = S_n^*(t) \quad \forall t, s \geq 0$$

More precisely, a *Martingale Measure* \mathbb{Q} must satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[S_n(t+s)/B_{t+s}|\mathcal{F}_t] = S_n(t) \quad \forall t, s \geq 0$$

Theorem 3.1 - Extension of No-Arbitrage Principle

There are no *Arbitrage Opportunities* iff there exists a *Martingale Measure* \mathbb{Q} .^[38]

Proposition 3.3 - Finance Processes which are Martingales^[39]

If \mathbb{Q} is a *Martingale Measure* and H is a *Self-Financing Strategy* then

- i). The *Discounted Value Process* V^* , and
- ii). The *Discounted Gains Process* G^*

are *Martingales* under \mathbb{Q} .

Proof 3.2 - Theorem 3.3

We have to show that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_{t+1}^*|\mathcal{F}_t] = V_t^* \quad \forall t > 0$.

This is equivalent to showing that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[G_{t+1}^*|\mathcal{F}_t] = G_t^*$ using **Proposition 3.1**.

^[36]It is possible for $V_t < 0$ for $t \in (0, T)$.

^[37]This is similar to a *Risk-Neutral Probability Measure*.

^[38]This is an extension of the “No-Arbitrage Principle” from the single-period model to the multi-period model.

^[39]This proposition is useful for proving the Extension of No-Arbitrage Principle

Using the expression for $G_{t+1}^* - G_t^*$ derived in **Proof 3.1** we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} [G_{t+1}^* - G_t^* | \mathcal{F}_t] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t+1) \Delta S_n^*(t+1) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\underbrace{H_n(t+1)}_{\in \mathcal{F}_t^{[40]}} \Delta S_n^*(t+1) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t+1) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} [\Delta S_n^*(t+1) | \mathcal{F}_t] \end{aligned}$$

The last result is due to H_n being a *Trading Strategy* and thus *Predictable*.

Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} [\Delta S_n^*(t+1) | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0$ for all $t > 0$ since S_n^* is a under \mathbb{Q} .

Hence G_t^*, V_t^* are *Martingales*. □

Proposition 3.4 - Arbitrage Opportunities between Single-Period and Multi-Period Models

If the multi-period model does not have any arbitrage opportunities, then all of the underlying single period model have arbitrage opportunities.

Proof 3.3 - Proposition 3.4

For each $t < T$ and for each $A \in \mathcal{P}_t$ there is one underlying single-period model where

- *Initial Time Discounted Price* is $S_n^*(t, \omega)$ for an arbitrary $\omega \in A$ since $S_n^*(t, \omega)$ are constant on A .
- *Sample Space* contains one state for each cell $A' \in \mathcal{P}_{t+1}$ st $A' \subset A$.
- *Terminal Time Discounted Price* is $S_n^*(t+1, \omega)$ for each $n = 1, \dots, N$ for some $\omega \in A$.

If any underlying single-period model has an arbitrage opportunity in the single-period sense, then the multi-period model must have an arbitrage opportunity in the multi-period sense.

To see this, suppose there exists an *Arbitrage Opportunity* \hat{H} for the single period model corresponding to some $A \in \mathcal{P}_t$ for $t < T$. This means that the discounted gain, given as

$$\hat{H}_1 \Delta S_1^*(t+1) + \dots + \hat{H}_N \Delta S_N^*(t+1)$$

, is *non-negative* and not identical to zero on the event A .

We now construct a multi-period *Trading Strategy* H which is an *Arbitrage Opportunity*.

$$H_n(s, \omega) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \leq t \text{ or } \omega \notin A \\ \hat{H}_n & \text{if } s = t+1, \omega \in A, \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N \\ -\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{H}_i S_i^*(t) & \text{if } s = t+1, \omega \in A \text{ and } n = 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{H}_i \Delta S_i^*(t+1) & \text{if } s > t+1, \omega \in A \text{ and } n = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s > t+1, \text{ and } n = 0 \end{cases}$$

This strategy starts with zero money and does nothing unless the event A occurs at time t , in which case at time t the position \hat{H}_n is taken in the n^{th} risky security while the position in the bank account is used to self-finance.

^[40]This is due to $H_n(t+1)$ being the strategy we are building for time-step $t+1$ and thus we use all the information available in time-step t .

Subsequently, no position is taken in any of the risky securities, and non-zero value of the portfolio is reflected by a position in the bank account.

THIS *Trading Strategy* H is an *Arbitrage Opportunity* in the multi-period model. \square

Proof 3.4 - Theorem 3.1

← We first show that there can be no *Arbitrage Opportunities* provided the existence of a *Martingale Measure* \mathbb{Q} .

Suppose H is any *Self-Financing Trading Strategy* with

$$V_T^* \geq 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[V_T^*] > 0$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_T^*] > 0$$

Since V^* is a *Martingale* under \mathbb{Q} by Theorem 3.3, it follows that

$$V_0^* = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_T^*] > 0$$

Hence H cannot be an *Arbitrage Opportunity*, nor can any other trading strategies be *Arbitrage Opportunities* due to H being chosen arbitrarily.

→^[41] Using Proposition 3.4, we have that for each $t < T$ and each $A \in \mathcal{P}_t$ there is a *risk-neutral probability measure* $\mathbb{Q}(t, A)$ for the underlying single-period model.

This probability measure gives positive mass to each cell $A' \in \mathcal{P}_{t+1}$ st it sums to 1 over all such cells and it satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}(t,A)}[\Delta S_n^*(t+1)] = 0 \text{ for } n = 1, \dots, N$$

Notice that $\mathbb{Q}(t, A)$ puts probability on each branch in the information tree which emerges from the node corresponding to (t, A) .

We can calculate a *Martingale Measure* \mathbb{Q} for the multi-period model from these probabilities by setting $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega\})$ equal to the product of the conditional probabilities along the path from the node at $t = 0$ to the node at (T, ω) .

Then

- $\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathbb{Q}(\{\omega\}) = 1$.
- $\mathbb{Q}(\{\omega\}) > 0$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$ because all the conditional risk neutral probabilities are strictly positive.
- And, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[S_n^*(t+1)|\mathcal{F}_t] = S_n^*(t)$ for all t and n .

Thus \mathbb{Q} is indeed a *Martingale Measure*. \square

3.3 Valuation of Contingent Claims

Definition 3.9 - Contingent Claim^[42]

A *Contingent Claim* in the multi-period model is a random variable X which represents a payoff at the terminal time $t = T$.

A *Contingent Claim* X is said to be *Attainable*^[43] if there exists a *Self-Financing Trading Strategy* H st $V_T(\omega) = X(\omega) \forall \omega \in \Omega$. In this case one says that H “generates” X and H is

^[42]This is an extension of Definition 1.24 to the multi-period model.

^[43]AKA *Marketable*.

called the *Replicating Portfolio*.

Theorem 3.2 - Risk-Neutral Valuation Principle^[44]

The time t value of an *Attainable Contingent Claim* X is equal to V_t where V_t is the time t value of the portfolio which replicates X .

Moreover,

$$V_t^* = \frac{V_t}{B_t} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X/B_T | \mathcal{F}_t] \text{ for } t = 0, \dots, T \text{ and all } \mathbb{Q}$$

Proof 3.5 - Theorem 3.2

Let P_t denote the actual price of the *Contingent Claim* at time point t .

By Theorem 1.1, $P_t = V_t$ is the only possibility to avoid arbitrage opportunities.

Now, let \mathbb{Q} be an arbitrary *Martingale Measure* then for every $t < T$ we have that

$$V_t^* := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_t^* | \mathcal{F}_t]$$

as V_t^* is a *Martingale* by Proposition 3.3.

Moreover, since V_T^* is the discounted value of the portfolio which replicated X we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[V_T^* | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X/B_T | \mathcal{F}_t]$$

Thus $V_t^* = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X/B_T | \mathcal{F}_t]$ independent of the choice of *Martingale Measure* \mathbb{Q} .

Remark 3.1 - Computing a Generating a Trading Strategy H

If we already know the *Value Process* $\{V_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ for the replicating portfolio, we need to solve for the trading strategy H using the linear equations in the definition of the value process (keeping in mind that H is *Predictable*).

$$V_t(\omega_i) = H_0(t)B_t + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(t)S_n(t)(\omega_i) \quad \forall \omega_i \in \Omega$$

However, if we only know the *Contingent Claim* X we need to work backwards in time, deriving V and H simultaneously.

Since $V_T = X$ we must first solve the following for $H(T)$.

$$X(\omega_i) = H_0(T)B_T + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(T)S_n(T)(\omega_i)$$

Since H is self-financing, we can calculate V_{T-1} .

$$V_{T-1} = H_0(T)B_{T-1} + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(T)S_n(T-1)(\omega_i)$$

Therefore, our next step is to solve the following for $H(T_1)$.

$$V_{T-1} = H_0(T_1)B_{T-1} + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n(T-1)S_n(T-1)(\omega_i)$$

^[44]This is an extension of Theorem 1.7 to the multi-period model.

We can now continue by calculating V_{T-2} etc. until we end up with V_0 .

Example 3.2 - Finding a Replicating Portfolio

Consider a European call option with exercise price $e = 5$.

The corresponding contingent claim is $X = \{S_2 - 5\}_+$ and takes the values $\{5, 2, 2, 0\}$ in states $\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}$ respectively.

Suppose $r = 0$ then $\mathbb{Q} = (1/3, 1/6, 1/6, 1/3)$.

Since the martingale measure is unique, **Proposition 3.5** will show below that the model is complete and therefore every *Contingent Claim* is *Marketable* (inc. the European option).

At time $t = 0$ the contingent claim's value must be

$$V_0 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X] = (1/3) \cdot 5 + (1/6) \cdot 2 + (1/6) \cdot 2 + (1/3) \cdot 0 = 7/3$$

At time $t = 1$ the contingent claim's value in states ω_1, ω_2 is

$$V_1(\omega_1) = V_1(\omega_2) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X|S_1 = 9] = (2/3) \cdot 5 + (1/3) \cdot 2 = 4$$

At time $t = 1$ the contingent claim's value in states ω_3, ω_4 is

$$V_1(\omega_3) = V_1(\omega_4) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[X|S_1 = 3] = (1/3) \cdot 2 + (2/3) \cdot 0 = 2/3$$

To find a replicating portfolio we start at time $t = 2$ and find that

$$\begin{aligned} V_2(\omega_1) &= 5 = H_0(2)(\omega_1, \omega_2) \cdot B_2 + H_1(2)(\omega_1, \omega_2) \cdot 10 \\ V_2(\omega_2) &= 2 = H_0(2)(\omega_1, \omega_2) \cdot B_2 + H_1(2)(\omega_1, \omega_2) \cdot 7 \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $B_2 = 1$, we obtain that $H_0(2)(\omega_1, \omega_2) = -5$ and $H_1(2)(\omega_1, \omega_2) = 1$.

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} V_2(\omega_3) &= 2 = H_0(2)(\omega_3, \omega_4) \cdot 1 + H_1(2)(\omega_3, \omega_4) \cdot 7 \\ V_2(\omega_4) &= 0 = H_0(2)(\omega_3, \omega_4) \cdot 1 + H_1(2)(\omega_3, \omega_4) \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$$

and obtain that $H_0(2)(\omega_3, \omega_4) = -1/3$ and $H_1(2)(\omega_3, \omega_4) = 1/3$.

Now we have two ways to proceed

- i). Since we have already calculated the value of the option at time-point $t = 1$ we can proceed as in the second period.

Writing $H_0(1)$ for $H_0(1)(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_4)$ and $H_1(1)$ for $H_1(1)(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_4)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(\omega) &= 4 = H_0(1) \cdot B_1 + H_1(1) \cdot 9 \text{ for } \omega \in \{\omega_1, \omega_2\} \\ V_1(\omega) &= 2/3 = H_0(1) \cdot B_1 + H_1(1) \cdot 3 \text{ for } \omega \in \{\omega_3, \omega_4\} \end{aligned}$$

Solving these equations, and noting $B_1 = 1$, gives $H_0(1) = -1$ and $H_1(1) = 5/9$.

Note that this confirms our calculation for V_0 , since this portfolio costs $-1 + 6(5/9) = 7/3$ at time $t = 0$.

- ii). Suppose we had not already calculated the value of the option at time $t = 1$.

Using that H is *Self-Financing* we calculate the value of the portfolio at time-point $t = 1$.

So we assume that we have already calculated $H_0(2)$ and $H_1(2)$. Then

$$V_1 = H_0(2) \cdot 1 + H_1(2) \cdot 9 = -5 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 9 = 4 \text{ in } \omega_1, \omega_2$$

Similarly

$$V_1 = (-1/3) \cdot 1 + (1/3) \cdot 3 = 2/3 \text{ in } \omega_3, \omega_4$$

We proceed as above, obtaining

$$H_0(1) = -1 \quad H_1(1) = 5/9$$

Proposition 3.5 - Complete Markets and Martingale Measures

An arbitrage-free multi-period model is complete iff there exists a unique martingale measure \mathbb{Q} .

Proof 3.6 - Proposition 3.5

- If the multi-period model is complete, for any claim X we can work backwards in time to compute the trading strategy that generates X . Hence, for each underlying single-period model the matrix A must have independent columns and the model is complete.
- Conversely, if every underlying single-period model is complete then the computational procedure for the multi-period model succeeds.

Therefore, completeness of the multi-period model is equivalent to completeness of all underlying single-period models.

In particular the multi-period model is complete iff each underlying model has a unique risk-neutral probability measure.

On the other hand, uniqueness of the martingale measure \mathbb{Q} is equivalent to uniqueness of the risk-neutral probability measures of the underlying single-period models.

Obviously, the existence of several risk-neutral probability measures for a single-period model leads to several multi-period martingale measures.

However, assume there are two multi-period martingale measures. Then the conditional probability must be different for at least one specific single-period model. \square

3.4 American Claims**Definition 3.10 - American Claim Y_τ**

Let $\{Y_t\}_{t \in T}$ be a stochastic process describing the payoff of a financial derivative if exercised at time t and let τ be the stopping time representing the exercise date in an *Exercise Strategy*.

Then Y_τ is called the *American Claim* wrt to Y_t and τ .^[45]

Definition 3.11 - Attainable American Claim

The *American Claim* Y_τ is said to be *Attainable*^[46] if there exists a *Self-Financing Trading Strategy* H st the corresponding portfolio value V satisfies $V_\tau = Y_\tau$.

An *American Pay-off Process* $\{Y_t\}$ is said to be attainable if for every *Stopping Time* τ the *American Claim* Y_τ is *Attainable*.

Proposition 3.6 - Complete Markets & Attainable American Claims

If a financial market is *Complete* then every *American Claim* is *Attainable*.

Proof 3.7 - Proposition 3.6

Let $\{Y_t\}_{t \in T}$ be a payoff-process and τ be an exercise strategy.

We have to find a self-financing trading strategy H st $V_\tau = Y_\tau$.

^[45] Stopping times needs to be \mathcal{F}_t measurable so we will know at time t whether we will exercise the *American Claim*.

^[46] AKA "Marketable"

Consider the *European Claim* $X = Y_\tau(B_T/B_\tau)$ which corresponds to someone exercising the *American Claim* Y at time-point $t = \tau$ and then earning interest from a bank-account until time-point T . Since the model is complete, there must be a replicating trading strategy H st $V_T = X = Y_\tau(B_T/B_\tau)$.

This portfolio which starts at time τ with the amount of Y_τ all of which is put into and kept in the bank account until time T , has the same value at time T as H .

We conclude that $V_\tau = Y_\tau$. □

Definition 3.12 - Snell Envelope

Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ be a stochastic process adapted to some filtration \mathcal{F}_t .

Then the process $\{Z_t\}_{t \in T}$, defined below, is called the *Snell Envelope* of X .

$$Z_t = \begin{cases} X_T & \text{if } t = T \\ \max\{X_t, \mathbb{E}[Z_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]\} & \text{if } t < T \end{cases}$$

Example 3.3 - Snell Envelope

Consider rolling a six-sided die three times. After the i^{th} roll, you can either keep the score X_i on the die, or roll again. Whoever gets the highest score wins. What should your strategy be?

First, note that we have to keep the third score if we roll the die three times. Moreover, after the second roll we take

$$Z_2 = \max\{X_2, \mathbb{E}[Z_3|\mathcal{F}_2]\}^{[47]} = \max\{X_2, \mathbb{E}[X_3]\} = \max\{X_2, 7/2\}$$

This means we should stick with the second roll if it is greater than or equal to 4, otherwise re-roll. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_2] = \mathbb{E}[\max\{X_2, 7/2\}] = \frac{1}{6} \cdot \left(\frac{7}{2} + \frac{7}{2} + \frac{7}{2} + 4 + 5 + 6 \right) = \frac{17}{4}$$

After the first roll, we take

$$Z_1 = \max\{X_1, \mathbb{E}[Z_2|\mathcal{F}_1]\} = \max\{X_1, \mathbb{E}[Z_2]\} = \max\left\{X_1, \frac{17}{4}\right\}$$

This means we should stick with the first roll if it is greater than or equal to 5, otherwise re-roll.

Theorem 3.3 - Snell Envelope is the Smallest Super-Martingale

The *Snell Envelope* $\{Z_t\}$ of X is the smallest *Super-Martingale* which dominates X .

(i.e. $Z_t \geq X_t \forall t$).

Proof 3.8 - Theorem 3.3

First, $Z_t \geq \mathbb{E}[Z_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]$ and $Z_t \geq X_t$, so $\{Z_t\}$ is a super-martingale and dominates X .

Next, let $\{U_t\}_{t \in T}$ be any other supermartingale which dominates X . Since, by definition, $Z_T = X_T$ and U dominates X we must have $U_T \geq Z_T$. Assume inductively that $U_t \geq Z_t$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U_{t-1} &\geq \mathbb{E}[U_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \text{ since } U_t \text{ is a supermartingale} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \end{aligned}$$

^[47]In this game \mathcal{F}_t is not helpful as each roll is independent.

and U dominates X

$$U_{t-1} \geq X_{t-1}$$

Combining

$$U_{t-1} \geq \max\{X_{t-1}\mathbb{E}[Z_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}]\}$$

By repeating this argument we get $U_t \geq Z_t \forall t$. □

Proposition 3.7 - Snell Envelope as Discounted Value Process

Consider a financial market with a *Martingale Measure* \mathbb{Q} and an attainable *American Payoff Process* $\{Y_t\}$.

Then the *Snell Envelope* $\{Z_t\}$ of the discounted payoff process $\{Y_t/B_t\}$ is the discounted value process for Y .

Proof 3.9 - Proposition 3.7

This proof uses the Optimal Stopping Theorem (Theorem 3.4).

Let p denote the time t price of the American claim wrt the payoff process (Y_t/B_t) .

Suppose, first, that $p < Z_t$ then:

- We buy the option for p .
- If $\tau(t) = t$ ^[48] then $Z_t = Y_t/B_t$ and so we can exercise the option immediately for $(Y_t/B_t) > p$ to make a riskless profit.
- If $\tau(t) > t$ we undertake the negative of the trading strategy that replicates $Y_{\tau(t)}/B_{\tau(t)}$, as we want to short sell. The price of the replicating strategy is $\mathbb{E}_Q[Y_{\tau(t)}/B_{\tau(t)}|\mathcal{F}_t]$ by the *Risk-Neutral Valuation Principle* (Theorem 3.2), but by the *Optimal Stopping Theorem* (Theorem 3.4) this is equal to Z_t and so we can invest the difference $Z_t - p$ in the bank account.
- Later at time $\tau(t)$ we exercise the option and liquidate the replicating portfolio at the same time. The amount we collect from the option seller is equal to our liability on the portfolio^[49]. Meanwhile, we have $(Z_t - p) \cdot (B_{\tau(t)}/B_t) > 0$ in the bank account.

This shows that we make a riskless profit in any case.

Now consider the case where $p > Z_t$ then

- We sell the option for p .

Consider in detail the case where $\tau(t) > t$. Then

- We undertake the trading strategy that replicates $Y_{\tau(t)}/B_{\tau(t)}$. Again we find by using *Risk-Neutral Valuation Principle* (Theorem 3.2) and the *Optimal Stopping Theorem* (Theorem 3.4) that the price of building up the portfolio is

$$Z_t = \mathbb{E}_Q[Y_{\tau(t)}/B_{\tau(t)}|\mathcal{F}_t]$$

- Therefore there is a profit of $p - Z_t$ which we put in the bank account.

How we proceed will depend on when the buyer exercises the option.

^[48]This is unlikely as the arbitrage opportunity is obvious.

^[49]Meaning the cash flow at this time-period is net 0

i). If the buyer exercises the option at time-point $s \leq \tau(t)$ then

- We pay the buyer the payoff Y_s/B_s .
- We liquidate our portfolio and using risk-neutral valuation the value of our portfolio at time-point s is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Y_{\tau(t)}/B_{\tau(t)}|\mathcal{F}_s]$$

Since $s \in [t, \tau(t)]$ we see from the definition of $\tau(t)$ that $\tau(t) = \tau(s)$.

Using this and the *Optimal Stopping Theorem* (**Theorem 3.4**) that the value of our portfolio at time s is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Y_{\tau(t)}/B_{\tau(t)}|\mathcal{F}_s] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Y_{\tau(s)}/B_{\tau(s)}|\mathcal{F}_s] = Z_s \geq (Y_s/B_s)$$

- Therefore all transaction at time-point s will only add to our portfolio and our total profit is strictly positive.

ii). If the buyer does not exercise by time $s = \tau(t)$ where $\tau(t) < T$ then:

- We repeat the process, undertaking the trading strategy that replicates $Y_{\tau(s+1)}/B_{\tau(s+1)}$.
- The value of the portfolio to be built up is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Y_{\tau(s+1)}/B_{\tau(s+1)}|\mathcal{F}_s] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Y_{\tau(s)}/B_{\tau(s)}|\mathcal{F}_s] = Z_s$$

Therefore the change of the portfolio will only pay us some money which we put in the bank account.

- As before, if the option buyer exercises at some time $u \leq \tau(s+1)$ then the value of the portfolio will be enough to cover the payoff Y_u .

iii). If the buyer has not exercised by time $\tau(s+1)$ then we repeat this process again, and so forth. There will always be enough money in the portfolio to cover the payoff. Our overall profit will be at least $p - Z_t > 0$.

Finally, we consider the case where $\tau(t) = T$. Then the optimal strategy would be to exercise the option immediately.

- If the buyer indeed exercises at time t , then we pay them $(Y_t/B_t) = Z_t < p$ and make a riskless-profit.
- If not, then we proceed as in the previous case where the buyer does not exercise by the optimal stopping time and undertake the trading strategy which replicates $(Y_{\tau(t+1)}/B_{\tau(t+1)})$ and so forth making again profit of at least $p - Z_t$.

□

Theorem 3.4 - Optimal Stopping Theorem

This is NOT the “Optional Stopping Theorem” (**Theorem 2.5**).

Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ be a stochastic process adapted to some *Filtration* \mathcal{F}_t and Z_t be the *Snell Envelope* of $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$.

For any $t = 0, \dots, T$ we define a stopping time by $\tau(t) = \min_{s \geq t} \{Z_s = X_s\}$, then the optimal stopping rule is

$$Z_t = \mathbb{E}[X_{\tau(t)}|\mathcal{F}_t] = \max_t \{\mathbb{E}[X_{\tau}|\mathcal{F}_t] : \text{all stopping times } t \leq \tau \leq T\} \text{ for all } t = 0, \dots, T \quad (1)$$

In particular

$$Z_0 = \mathbb{E}[X_{\tau(0)}] = \max_t \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_\tau | \mathcal{F}_t] : \text{all stopping times } \tau \leq T \right\}$$

Proof 3.10 - Theorem 3.4

This proof is a backwards induction through time.

Base Case

Note first that Eq. 1 is clearly true for $t = T$ because, by definition of the *Snell Envelope*, $Z_T = X_T$ and therefore the stopping time $\tau(T)$ stops at T .

Inductive Step

Now assume that Eq. 1 is satisfied for some t , we now need to show it holds for $t - 1$. Let τ be an arbitrary stopping time between $t - 1$ and T .

Define another stopping time $\tau' = \max\{\tau, t\}$ ^[50]. Then, since $\tau \geq t \implies \tau' = \tau$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_\tau | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\tau = t-1\}X_{t-1} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > t-1\}X_\tau | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\tau = t-1\}X_{t-1} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > t-1\}X_{\tau'} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t-1\}X_{t-1} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > t-1\}\mathbb{E}[X_{\tau'} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t-1\}X_{t-1} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > t-1\}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X_{\tau'} | \mathcal{F}_t] | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \text{ by Tower Law} \end{aligned}$$

Since τ' is a stopping time st $\tau' \in [t, T]$, we find that $\mathbb{E}[X_{\tau'} | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq Z_t$ because we have assumed Eq. 1 holds for t .

Using the definition of Z_{t-1} we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_\tau | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &\leq \mathbb{1}\{\tau = t-1\}X_{t-1} + \mathbb{1}\{\tau > t-1\}\mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &\leq Z_{t-1} \text{ by def. Snell Envelope} \end{aligned}$$

In the special case where $\tau = \tau(t-1)$ we find that $\tau = (t-1)$ stops in $t-1$ iff $Z_{t-1} = X_{t-1}$, otherwise $Z_{t-1} > X_{t-1}$ ^[51] and $\tau(t-1) = \tau(t)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_{\tau(t-1)} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{1}\{Z_{t-1} = X_{t-1}\}X_{t-1} + \mathbb{1}\{Z_{t-1} > X_{t-1}\}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X_{\tau(t)} | \mathcal{F}_t] | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= \mathbb{1}\{Z_{t-1} = X_{t-1}\}X_{t-1} + \mathbb{1}\{Z_{t-1} > X_{t-1}\}\mathbb{E}[Z_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= Z_{t-1} \text{ by def. Snell Envelope} \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.4 - Snell Envelope - #1

Consider a market where there is a bank account with interest-rate $r = 0$ and a single security with the following price process

$\omega \setminus t$	0	1	2
ω_1	6	9	10
$S_t(\omega) = \omega_2$	6	9	7
ω_3	6	3	7
ω_4	6	3	1

For this model, $\mathbb{Q}(\omega) := (1/3, 1/6, 1/6, 1/3)$ is a risk-neutral probability measure.

Consider an American call option with the exercise price of £5. Then its payoff process is

^[50]This is similar to τ but can never take the value $t - 1$.

^[51]As $\{Z_t\}$ dominates $\{X_t\}$.

$\omega \setminus t$	0	1	2
$Y_t(\omega) = \omega_1$	1	4	5
ω_2	1	4	2
ω_3	1	0	2
ω_4	1	0	0

In states ω_3, ω_4 the price

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= \max\{Y_1, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_2|\mathcal{F}_1]\} \\ &= \max\{0, 2 \cdot (1/3) + 0 \cdot (2/3)\} \\ &= 2/3 \end{aligned}$$

This is equal to the European Option above $V_1(\omega_3, \omega_4)$.

In states ω_1, ω_2 the price

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= \max\{Y_1, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_2|\mathcal{F}_1]\} \\ &= \max\{4, 5 \cdot (2/3) + 2 \cdot (1/3)\} \\ &= 4 \end{aligned}$$

This is equal to the European Option above $V_1(\omega_1, \omega_2)$.

so $Z_0 = \max\{1, (2/3) \cdot (1/2) + 4 \cdot (1/2)\} = 7/3$. The time $t = 0$ price of the European call option of

Example 3.5 - Snell Envelope - #2

Consider the same scenario as **Example 3.4** except that the payoff process of the American call option is

$\omega \setminus t$	0	1	2
$Y_t(\omega) = \omega_1$	1	5	5
ω_2	1	5	2
ω_3	1	0	2
ω_4	1	0	0

At time-point $t = 2$ it still holds that $Z_2 = Y_2$. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_2|\mathcal{F}_1] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Y_2|\mathcal{F}_1]$ which is the same as **Example 3.4**.

So

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_2|\mathcal{F}_1] &= \begin{cases} (2/3) \cdot 5 + (1/3) \cdot 2 & \text{if in } \omega_1, \omega_2 \\ (1/3) \cdot 2 + (2/3) \cdot 0 & \text{if in } \omega_3, \omega_4 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if in } \omega_1, \omega_2 \\ 2/3 & \text{if in } \omega_3, \omega_4 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= \max\{Y_1, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_2|\mathcal{F}_1]\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \max\{4, 5\} = 5 & \text{if in } \omega_1, \omega_2 \\ \max\{0, 2/3\} = 2/3 & \text{if in } \omega_3, \omega_4 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For time $t = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_1|\mathcal{F}_0] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_1] \\ &= (1/2) \cdot 5 + (1/2) \cdot (2/3) \\ &= 17/6 \end{aligned}$$

in which case $Z_0 = \max\{Y_0, \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[Z_1]\} = 17/6$.

The optimal exercise strategies are

$$\tau(0)(\omega) = \tau(1)(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if in } \omega_1, \omega_2 \\ 2 & \text{if in } \omega_3, \omega_4 \end{cases}$$

and, of course, $\tau(2)(\omega) = 2 \forall \omega \in \Omega$.

Finally, we compute a replicating trading strategy for $\tau(0)$.

In states ω_3, ω_4 the stopping time $\tau(0)$ stops in time 2 so the portfolio in the second period must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(2) + 7 \cdot H_1(2) &= Y_2(\omega_3) = 2 \\ H_0(2) + 1 \cdot H_1(2) &= Y_2(\omega_4) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Let $H_i(2) := H_i(2)(\omega_3, \omega_4)$.

Then the solution is that $H_0(2) = -1/3$ and $H_1(2) = 1/3$ in states ω_3, ω_4 .

The value of this portfolio at time $t = 1$ is $-(1/3) + 3 \cdot (1/3) = 2/3$.

The values of $H_0(2)$ and $H_1(2)$ in states ω_1, ω_2 do not matter.

In the first period, the portfolio must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(1) + 9H_1(1) &= Z_1(\omega_1) = Z_1(\omega_2) = 5 \\ H_0(1) + 3H_1(1) &= Z_1(\omega_3) = Z_1(\omega_4) = 2/3 \end{aligned}$$

which has solutions $H_0(1) = -3/2$ and $H_1(1) = 13/18$.

The American option is attainable with time $t = 0$ value of $1 \cdot (-3/2) + 6 \cdot (13/18) = 17/6$ which confirms previous calculations^[52].

^[52]Showing this is a replicating portfolio.

3.5 The Cox-Ross Rubinstein Model

3.6 The Cox-Ross Rubinstein Model and the Black-Scholes Formula

4 Stochastic Processes in Continuous Time

4.1 The Brownian Motion

4.2 Stochastic Integration

4.3 Itô's Lemma

5 Financial Market Models in Continuous Time

5.1 The Financial Market Model in Continuous Time

5.2 Trading Strategies

5.3 Arbitrage in the Continuous Time Model

5.4 The Black-Scholes Model

5.5 Equivalent Martingale Measures in the Black-Scholes Model

5.6 Pricing in the Black-Scholes Model

5.7 Replicating Strategies and the Black-Scholes-Merton Equation

0 Reference

1 Notation

Notation 1.1 - *General Mathematical Notation*

Notation	Description
$\{x\}_+$	Only the positive part of x (i.e. $\max\{0, x\}$).