

Technische Universität Dresden  
Fachrichtung Mathematik

Institut für Mathematische Stochastik

**Fractional Brownian Motion and  
Applications in Financial Mathematics**

Diplomarbeit

zur Erlangung des ersten akademischen Grades

**Diplommathematiker**

**(Wirtschaftsmathematik)**

vorgelegt von

Name: Zhu

Vorname: Ke

geboren am: 03.12.1985

in: Wuhan

Tag der Einreichung: 01.03.2015

Betreuer: Prof. Dr. rer. nat. Martin Keller-Ressel



## Abstract

blahblah



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Gaussian Process and Brownian Motion</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Probability Space and Stochastic Process . . . . .	4
2.2	Normal Distribution and Gaussian Process . . . . .	5
2.3	Brownian Motion . . . . .	11
<b>3</b>	<b>Stable Measures and Stable Integrals</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1	Stable Variables . . . . .	16
3.2	Stable Random Measures . . . . .	17
3.3	Stable Integrals . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Fractional Brownian Motion</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1	Definition of Fractional Brownian Motion . . . . .	20
4.2	Regularity . . . . .	23
4.3	Fractional Brownian Noise . . . . .	24
4.4	FBM is not Semimartingale for $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . . . . .	27
<b>5</b>	<b>Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process</b>	<b>31</b>
5.1	Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process . . . . .	31
<b>6</b>	<b>Applications in Financial Mathematics</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1	Fractional Black-Scholes Model . . . . .	34
6.2	Fractional Stochastic Volatility Model . . . . .	38
6.3	Rough Fractional Stochastic Volatility Model . . . . .	41
6.4	Weighted Fractional Stochastic Volatility Model . . . . .	43
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>47</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>49</b>

---



## 1 Introduction

blah

---

blah



blah

---

## 2 Gaussian Process and Brownian Motion

In this section we start off by looking at some general concepts of probability spaces and stochastic processes. Of this, a most important case we then describe is Gaussian process. Within the framework of Gaussian processes, one could specify a stationary and independent behaviour of increments of it. This leads us to introduce the Brownian motion as a fine example.

### 2.1 Probability Space and Stochastic Process

**DEFINITION 2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a collection of subsets of a set  $\Omega$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to be a  $\sigma$ -Algebra on  $\Omega$ , if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i)  $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- (ii) For any set  $F \in \mathcal{A}$ , its complement  $F^c \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- (iii) If there is a series  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , then  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} F_n \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**DEFINITION 2.2.** A mapping  $\mathcal{P}$  is said to be a *probability measure* from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , if  $\mathcal{P}[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}[F_n]$  for any  $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  disjoint in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**DEFINITION 2.3.** A *probability space* is defined as a triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$  of a set  $\Omega$ , a  $\sigma$ -Algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\Omega$  and a measure  $\mathcal{P}$  from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

The  $\sigma$ -Algebra generated of all open sets on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is called the *Borel  $\sigma$ -Algebra* which we denote as usual by  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Indeed,  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n), \mu)$  is a special case that probability space on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A function  $f$  mapping from  $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}, \mu)$  into  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}, \nu)$  is *measurable*, if its collection of the inverse image of  $\mathcal{E}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{D}$ . A *random variable* is a  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued measurable function on some probability space. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  represent a probability measure, recall that in probability theory, for  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  we call  $\mathcal{P}[\{X \in B\}]$  the *distribution* of  $X$ . We write also  $\mathcal{P}_X[\cdot]$  or  $\mathcal{P}[X]$  for convenience for those notations.

**DEFINITION 2.4.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$  be a probability space. A *n-dimensional stochastic process*  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  is a family of random variable such that  $X_t(\omega) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \forall t \in T$ , where  $T$  denotes the set of Index of Time.

Some basic definitions, which are needed in following sections, are given.

**DEFINITION 2.5.** A stochastic process  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  is said to be *stationary*, if the joint distribution

$$\mathcal{P}[X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n}] = \mathcal{P}[X_{t_1+\tau}, \dots, X_{t_n+\tau}]$$

for  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  and  $t_1 + \tau, \dots, t_n + \tau \in T$ .

Remark that, Definition 2.5 means the distribution of a stationary process is independent of a shift of time.

**DEFINITION 2.6.** Let  $(X_t)_t$  be a stochastic process.

$$\varsigma_X(t, s) := \text{Cov}(X_t, X_s)$$

is called *autocovariance* between  $s, t$  and

$$\eta_X(t, s) := \frac{\text{Cov}[X_t, X_s]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[X_t]\text{Var}[X_s]}}$$

is called *autocorrelation* between  $s, t$ .

If  $(X_t)_t$  is stationary process, we write  $\varsigma_X(\tau)$  for  $\varsigma_X(t, t + \tau)$  for any  $t$ .  $\eta_X(\tau)$  is used in the same way.

We use a notation  $X \sim Y$  represents  $X$  equals  $Y$  in distribution.

**DEFINITION 2.7.** A stochastic process  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  is said to be  $\alpha$ -self similar if  $(X_{ct_1}, \dots, X_{ct_k}) \sim (c^\alpha X_{t_1}, \dots, c^\alpha X_{t_k})$  for any  $t_1, \dots, t_k, ct_1, \dots, ct_k \in T$  and  $c > 0$ .

## 2.2 Normal Distribution and Gaussian Process

**DEFINITION 2.8** (1-dimensional normal distribution). A  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variable  $X$  is said to be *standard normal distributed* or *standard Gaussian*, if its distribution can be described as

$$\mathcal{P}[X \leq x] = (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du \quad (2.1)$$

for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The integrand of (2.1) is also called *density function* of a Gaussian random variable.

**DEFINITION 2.9.** A  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variable  $X$  is said to be *normal distributed* or *Gaussian* with a *expected value*  $\mu$  and a *variance*  $\sigma^2$ , if

$$(X - \mu)/\sigma$$

is standard Gaussian.

**PROPOSITION 2.10.** Let  $X$  be a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Gaussian random variable with expected value  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ , then it is distributed as

$$\mathcal{P}[X \leq x] = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-\frac{(u-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} du$$

**Proof.** Suppose  $X = \sigma Y + \mu$  with  $Y$  standard Gaussian. We denote this mapping by  $g(y) : y \rightarrow \sigma y + \mu$  and give the inverse  $g^{-1}(x) : x \rightarrow \frac{(x-\mu)}{\sigma}$ . The distribution function of  $X$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{P}[X \in dx] &= \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{P}[Y \circ g \in dy] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \circ g} f_X \circ g^{-1}(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(\frac{(y-\mu)}{\sigma}\right)^2}{2}\right\} dy \\ &= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(y-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_X$  is density function of  $X$ . □

It is denoted by  $X \sim (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx$ , if  $X$  is standard Gaussian. In order to verifying the behaviour of a normal distributed random variable we use the characteristic function in probability theory, Cf.[1].

**THEOREM 2.11.** Let  $X$  be a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Gaussian random variable. The characteristic function of  $X$

$$\Psi_X(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{ix\xi} \mathcal{P}[X \in dx] = e^{i\mu\xi - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma\xi)^2} \quad (2.2)$$

for  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** Cf.[16]. We assume firstly  $X$  is standard Gaussian. In terms of the Definition of characteristic function of a standard Gaussian  $X$ , integrating its density function over  $\mathbb{R}$  we get

$$\Psi_X(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} e^{ix\xi} dx,$$

take differentiating both sides of the equation by  $\xi$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi'_X(\xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} e^{ix\xi} ix dx \\ &= (-i) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}} (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{d}{dx} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}\right) e^{ix\xi} dx \\ &\stackrel{part.int.}{=} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} e^{ix\xi} \xi dx \\ &= -\xi \Psi_X(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously,  $\Psi(\xi) = \Psi(0)e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}}$  is the solution of the partial differential equation, and  $\Psi(0)$  equals 1, hence  $\Psi(\xi) = e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}}$ . In particular, the characteristic function of a Gaussian random variable with a expected value  $\mu$  and a variance  $\sigma^2$ , which denoted by  $\Psi_{X_{\mu,\sigma^2}}(\xi)$ , is  $e^{i\mu\xi - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma\xi)^2}$ . To achieve this result, we just need to substitute  $x$  by  $(x - \mu)/\sigma$  in the previous calculation. □

**DEFINITION 2.12.** Let  $X$  be a  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued random vector.  $X$  is said to be *normal distributed* or *Gaussian*, if for any  $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $d^T X$  is Gaussian in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**DEFINITION 2.13.** A stochastic process  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  is said to be *Gaussian process* if the joint distribution of any finite instance is Gaussian, that means  $(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})$  has joint Gaussian distribution in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in T$ .

The definition immediately shows every instances  $X_t$  in Gaussian process is Gaussian.

**COROLLARY 2.14.** Let  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  be a stochastic process. The following condition is equivalent to Definition 2.13.

$$\sum_j^n c_{t_j} X_{t_j} \quad (2.3)$$

is Gaussian for any  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in T, c_{t_j} \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $j \in 1, \dots, n$ .

**Proof.** It is clear due to Definition 2.12. □

**LEMMA 2.15.** Let  $X$  be a  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued normal distributed random vector. Then its characteristic function is

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\xi^T X} = e^{i\xi^T m - \frac{1}{2}\xi^T \Sigma \xi}. \quad (2.4)$$

For  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Where  $m \in \mathbb{R}^n, \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  are *mean vector*, *covariance matrix* of  $X$  respectively. Furthermore, the density function of  $X$  is

$$(2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} (\det \Sigma)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-m)^T \Sigma^{-1}(x-m)}. \quad (2.5)$$

Remark, the equation (2.4) can also be as definition of characteristic function of a  $n$ -dimensional normal distributed random variable. I.e., any normal distributed random variable can be characterized by form of the equation (2.4).

**Proof.** Since  $X$  normal distributed on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\xi^T X$  is normal distributed on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Due to the Theorem 2.11, there is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{i\xi^T X} &= \mathbb{E} e^{i \cdot 1 \cdot \xi^T X} \\ &= e^{i\mathbb{E}[\xi^T X] - \frac{1}{2}\text{Var}[\xi^T X]} \\ &= e^{i\xi^T \mathbb{E}[X] - \frac{1}{2}\xi^T \text{Var}[X]\xi} \\ &= e^{i\xi^T m - \frac{1}{2}\xi^T \Sigma \xi}. \end{aligned}$$

## 2.2 Normal Distribution and Gaussian Process

---

Moreover, since  $\Sigma$  symmetric and positive definite, there exist  $\Sigma^{-1}$ ,  $\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} (\det \Sigma)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix^T \xi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-m)^T \Sigma^{-1}(x-m)} dx \\
= & (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} (\det \Sigma)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{ix^T \xi} e^{i(x-m)^T \xi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-m)^T \Sigma^{-1}(x-m)} dx \\
= & (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} (\det \Sigma)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{im^T \xi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(x-m)^T \xi} e^{i(x-m)^T \xi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-m)^T \Sigma^{-1}(x-m)} dx \\
\stackrel{y=\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}x}{=} & (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{im^T \xi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}y)^T \xi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|y|^2} dy \\
= & (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{im^T \xi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{iy^T (\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|y|^2} dy \\
\stackrel{\text{Fourier transformation}}{=} & e^{im^T \xi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi|^2} \\
= & e^{im^T \xi} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \xi^T \Sigma \xi}
\end{aligned}$$

In terms of the uniqueness theorem of characteristic function (in [1], p.199, Satz 23.4), then we can deduce (2.5) is density function of  $X$ .  $\square$

**THEOREM 2.16.** A linear combination of independent normal distributed random variable (or vector) is Gaussian.

**Proof.** We suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_m$  are independent random vectors on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_m \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let have a look at the characteristic function of it,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} e^{i\xi^T \sum_{j=1}^m (c_j X_j)} & \stackrel{\text{independent}}{=} \prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} e^{i\xi^T (c_j X_j)} \\
& = \prod_{j=1}^m \exp \left( i\xi^T \mathbb{E}[c_j X_j] - \frac{1}{2} \xi^T \text{Var}[c_j X_j] \xi \right) \\
& = \exp \left( i\xi^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m c_j X_j \right] - \frac{1}{2} \xi^T \sum_{j=1}^m \text{Var}[c_j X_j] \xi \right) \\
& \stackrel{\text{independent}}{=} \exp \left( i\xi^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m c_j X_j \right] - \frac{1}{2} \xi^T \text{Var} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m c_j X_j \right] \xi \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a form of characteristic function of normal distribution. That means  $\sum_{j=1}^m c_j X_j$  is Gaussian.  $\square$

**EXAMPLE 2.17** (Bivariate Normal Distribution). Cf.[13], p.241, Example 8.6. Suppose  $S_1, S_2$  are independent random variables and have standard normal distributions.  $\begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \end{pmatrix}$  has standard normal joint distribution since they are independent. We define

$$\begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 & 0 \\ \sigma_2 \rho & \sigma_2(1-\rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{R}, -1 \leq \rho \leq 1$ . Again,  $Y_1, Y_2$  are Gaussian and the joint distribution  $\begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix}$  is also Gaussian. We set  $E[Y_1] = \mu_1, E[Y_2] = \mu_2$  for short. Since  $S_1, S_2$  are independent,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[Y_1] &= \text{Var}[\sigma_1 S_1] \\
&= \sigma_1^2, \\
\text{Var}[Y_2] &= \text{Var}[\sigma_2 \rho S_1] + \text{Var}[\sigma_2(1 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} S_2] \\
&= \sigma_2^2 \rho^2 + \sigma_2^2(1 - \rho^2) \\
&= \sigma_2^2, \\
\text{Cov}[Y_1, Y_2] &= E[(Y_1 - E[Y_1])(Y_2 - E[Y_2])] \\
&= E[Y_1 Y_2 - \mu_1 Y_2 - \mu_2 Y_1 + \mu_1 \mu_2] \\
&= E[(\sigma_1 S_1 + \mu_1)(\sigma_2 \rho S_1 + \sigma_2(1 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} S_2 + \mu_2)] - \mu_1 \mu_2 \\
&= \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \underbrace{E[S_1^2]}_{=1} \rho + \mu_1 \sigma_2 \rho \underbrace{E[S_1]}_{=0} + \sigma_1 \sigma_2 (1 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \underbrace{E[S_1 S_2]}_{=E[S_1]E[S_2]=0} \\
&\quad + \mu_1 \sigma_2 (1 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \underbrace{E[S_2]}_{=0} + \sigma_1 \underbrace{E[S_1]}_{=0} \mu_2 + \mu_1 \mu_2 - \mu_1 \mu_2 \\
&= \rho \sigma_1 \sigma_2,
\end{aligned}$$

that means the correlation of  $Y_1, Y_2$  is  $\rho$ . Because of the equation (2.5), the joint density function

$$f_{Y_1, Y_2}(y_1, y_2) = (2\pi)^{-1} (\det(\Sigma))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp((y_1 - \mu_1) \Sigma^{-1} (y_2 - \mu_2)),$$

where  $\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & 0 \\ \sigma_2^2 \rho & \sigma_2^2(1 - \rho^2) \end{pmatrix}$

Indeed,

$$\det(\Sigma) = (1 - \rho^2) \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2$$

and

$$\Sigma^{-1} = \frac{\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_2^2(1 - \rho^2) & 0 \\ -\sigma_2^2 \rho & \sigma_1^2 \end{pmatrix}}{(1 - \rho^2) \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2}.$$

Namely,

$$f_{Y_1, Y_2}(y_1, y_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi(1 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_1 \sigma_2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2(1 - \rho^2)}(z_1^2 - 2\rho z_1 z_2 + z_2^2)\right) \quad (2.7)$$

where  $z_1 = \frac{y_1 - \mu_1}{\sigma_1}, z_2 = \frac{y_2 - \mu_2}{\sigma_2}$ .

**COROLLARY 2.18.** Let  $Y_1, Y_2$  be  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variables and  $\begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix}$  has a joint normal distribution, then the conditional expected value of  $Y_2$  given  $Y_1$

$$E[Y_2|Y_1 = y_1] = E[Y_2] + \rho(y_1 - E[Y_1])\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1},$$

and the conditional variance of  $Y_2$  given  $Y_1$

$$\text{Var}[Y_2|Y_1 = y_1] = \sigma_2^2(1 - \rho^2).$$

Where  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  are standard deviations of  $Y_1, Y_2$  and  $\rho$  is the correlation of  $Y_1, Y_2$ .

**Proof.** Recall the equation (2.7), we can specify the joint density function if  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho$  are known. As result of this,  $\begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix}$  has a form of the equation (2.6). Suppose  $S_1, S_2$  are independent standard normal distributed random variables. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\sim \frac{(Y_1 - E[Y_1])}{\sigma_1} \\ Y_2 &\sim \sigma_2 \rho S_1 + \sigma_2(1 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} S_2 + E[Y_2], \end{aligned}$$

more precisely,

$$Y_2 \sim \sigma_2 \rho \frac{(Y_1 - E[Y_1])}{\sigma_1} + \sigma_2(1 - \rho^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} S_2 + E[Y_2].$$

Take expectation of both sides,

$$E[Y_2|Y_1 = y_1] = \sigma_2 \rho \frac{(y_1 - E[Y_1])}{\sigma_1} + E[Y_2].$$

Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[Y_2|Y_1 = y_1] &= E[(Y_2 - \mu_{Y_2|Y_1})^2|Y_1 = y_1] \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (y_2 - \mu_{Y_2|Y_1})^2 f_{Y_2|Y_1}(y_2, y_1) dy_2 \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ y_2 - \mu_2 - \frac{\rho\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}(y_1 - \mu_1) \right]^2 f_{Y_2|Y_1}(y_2, y_1) dy_2, \end{aligned}$$

After multiplying both sides by the density function of  $Y_1$  and integrating it by  $y_1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Var}[Y_2|Y_1 = y_1] f_{Y_1}(y_1) dy_1 \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ y_2 - \mu_2 - \frac{\rho\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}(y_1 - \mu_1) \right]^2 \underbrace{f_{Y_2|Y_1}(y_2, y_1) f_{Y_1}(y_1)}_{f_{Y_1, Y_2}(y_1, y_2)} dy_2 dy_1 \\ &\iff \\ &\quad \text{Var}[Y_2|Y_1 = y_1] \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{Y_1}(y_1) dy_1}_1 \\ &= E \left[ \left( Y_2 - \mu_2 - \left( \frac{\rho\sigma_2}{\sigma_1} \right) (Y_1 - \mu_1) \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$



multiplying right side out, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[Y_2|Y_1 = y_1] &= \underbrace{\text{E}[(Y_2 - \mu_2)^2]}_{\sigma_2^2} - 2 \frac{\rho\sigma_2}{\sigma_1} \underbrace{\text{E}[(Y_1 - \mu_1)(Y_2 - \mu_2)]}_{\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho^2\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2} \underbrace{\text{E}[(Y_1 - \mu_1)^2]}_{\sigma_1^2} \\
&= \sigma_2^2 - 2\rho^2\sigma^2 + \rho^2\sigma_2^2 \\
&= \sigma_2^2 - \rho^2\sigma_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**THEOREM 2.19.** Let  $X$  be a Gaussian random variable, then

$$\text{E}[\exp(\beta X)] = \exp(\beta\mu + \frac{1}{2}\beta^2\sigma^2). \quad (2.8)$$

Where  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  are  $\text{E}[X]$  and  $\text{Var}[X]$  respectively.

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{E}[\exp(\beta X)] \\
&= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(\beta x) \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\
&= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(\beta x) \exp\left(-\frac{(x^2 - 2x\mu + \mu^2)}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\
&= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 - 2(\beta\sigma^2 + \mu)x + \mu^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\
&= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 - 2(\beta\sigma^2 + \mu)x + (\beta\sigma^2 + \mu)^2 - (\beta\sigma^2 + \mu)^2 + \mu^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\
&= (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - (\beta\sigma^2 + \mu))^2 + \mu^2 - (\beta\sigma^2 + \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx \\
&= \exp\left(\frac{(\beta\sigma^2 + \mu)^2 - \mu^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \underbrace{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - (\beta\sigma^2 + \mu))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx}_1 \\
&= \exp\left(\frac{\beta^2\sigma^4 + 2\mu\beta\sigma^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= \exp(\mu\beta + \frac{1}{2}\beta^2\sigma^2)
\end{aligned}$$

□

### 2.3 Brownian Motion

The Brownian motion was first introduced by Bachelier in 1900 in his PhD thesis. We now give the common definition of it.

### 2.3 Brownian Motion

---

**DEFINITION 2.20.** Let  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued stochastic process.  $(B_t)$  is called *Brownian motion* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i)  $B_0 = 0$  a.s. .
- (ii)  $(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}), \dots, (B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})$  are independent for  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (iii)  $B_t - B_s \sim B_{t-s}$ , for  $0 \leq s \leq t < \infty$ .
- (iv)  $B_t - B_s \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t - s)^{\otimes n}$ .
- (v)  $B_t$  is continuous in  $t$  a.s. .

A usual saying for (ii) and (iii) is the Brownian motion has independent, stationary increments. In (iv),  $N$  represent a random variable which has a normal distribution.  $B_t$  is normal distributed due to (ii). It is clear that the increments of Brownian motion is stationary.

**PROPOSITION 2.21.** Let  $(B_t)$  be  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Brownian motion. Then the covariance of  $B_m, B_n$  for  $m, n \geq 0$  is  $m \wedge n$ .

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we assume that  $m \geq n$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[B_m B_n] &= \mathbb{E}[(B_m - B_n)B_n] + \mathbb{E}[B_n^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[B_m - B_n]\mathbb{E}[B_n] + n \\ &= n. \end{aligned}$$

□

**PROPOSITION 2.22.** Let  $(B_t)$  be  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Brownian motion. Then  $B_{cm} \sim c^{\frac{1}{2}} B_m$ .

**Proof.** Because  $B_m$  is normal distributed for any  $m > 0$ , we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi B_{cm}}] &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}cm\xi^2} \\ &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}(c(m)^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi)^2} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi c^{\frac{1}{2}} B_m}]. \end{aligned}$$

□

**THEOREM 2.23.** A  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Brownian motion is a Gaussian process.

**Proof.** The following idea using the independence of increments to prove the claim come from [16]. We choose  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Define  $V = (B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n})^T$ ,

$K = (B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, \dots, B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})^T$  and  $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Let us see the characteristic function of  $V$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi^T V}] \\
 = & \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi^T AK}] \\
 = & \mathbb{E}[e^{iA^T \xi K}] \\
 = & \mathbb{E}[\exp(i(\xi^{(1)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)}, \xi^{(2)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)}, \dots, \xi^{(n)}) \\
 & \cdot (B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})^T) \\
 \stackrel{\text{ind.increments}}{=} & \prod_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\exp(i(\xi^{(j)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)})(B_{t_j} - B_{t_{j-1}}))] \\
 \stackrel{\text{stat.increments}}{=} & \prod_{j=1}^n \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(t_j - t_{j-1})(\xi^{(j)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)})^2) \\
 = & \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n (t_j - t_{j-1})(\xi^{(j)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)})^2\right) \\
 = & \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n t_j (\xi^{(j)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)})^2 - \sum_{j=1}^n t_{j-1} (\xi^{(j)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)})^2\right)\right) \\
 = & \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} t_j ((\xi^{(j)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)})^2 - (\xi^{(j+1)} + \dots + \xi^{(n)})^2) + t_n (\xi^{(n)})^2\right)\right) \\
 = & \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} t_j \xi^{(j)} (\xi^{(j)} + 2\xi^{(j+1)} + \dots + 2\xi^{(n)}) + t_n (\xi^{(n)})^2\right)\right) \\
 = & \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j,h=1}^n (t_j \wedge t_h) \xi^{(j)} \xi^{(h)}\right)\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Recall with Proposition 2.3,  $(t_j \wedge t_h)_{j,h=1,\dots,n}$  is the covariance matrix of  $V$  and therefore it is symmetric and positive definit. The mean vector of it is zero, then we have been proved that the characteristic function is a form of some normal distributed random vector, i.e.,  $V$  is Gaussian.  $\square$

Schilling gave in his lecture [16] the relationship between a one-dimensional Brownian motion and a  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion. In fact,  $(B_t^{(l)})_{l=1,\dots,n}$  is Brownian motion if and only if  $B_t^{(l)}$  is Brownian motion and all of the component are independent. Using this independence and the theorem of Fubini in the characteristic function for high dimensional Brownian motion we can say a  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion is also a Gaussian process.

### 2.3 Brownian Motion

---

**DEFINITION 2.24.** Let  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  be a stochastic process.  $(Y_t)_{t \in T}$  is defined on the same probability space as  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$  and said to be *modification* of  $(X_t)_{t \in T}$ , if

$$\mathcal{P}[X_t = Y_t] = 1 \quad \forall \quad t \in T.$$

**THEOREM 2.25** (Kolmogorov Chentsov). Let  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a stochastic process on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$[|X_j - X_k|^\alpha] \leq c|j - k|^{1+\beta} \quad \forall \quad j, k \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad j \neq k,$$

for  $\alpha, \beta > 0, c < \infty$ . Then  $(X_t)_t$  has a modification  $(Y_t)_t$  with continuous sample path such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{|Y_j - Y_k|}{|j - k|^\gamma}\right)^\alpha\right] < \infty$$

for all  $\gamma \in (0, \frac{\beta}{\alpha})$ .

**Proof.** See [10], p.519. □

**LEMMA 2.26.** Let  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be Brownian motion. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[B_t^{2k}] = (2k - 1)!! t^k$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

**Proof.** Cf.[16]. Taking expectation of  $B_t^{2k}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[B_t^{2k}] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^{2k} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2t}} dx \\ &\stackrel{x=\sqrt{2t}y}{=} \frac{2^k t^k}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{\infty} y^{k-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-y} dy \\ &= \frac{2^k t^k}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{\infty} y^{k+\frac{1}{2}-1} e^{-y} dy \\ &= \frac{2^k t^k}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Gamma(k + \frac{1}{2}) \\ &= \frac{2^k t^k}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}) \prod_{j=1}^k (j - \frac{1}{2}) \\ &= 2^k t^k \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{2j-1}{2}\right) \\ &= (2k-1)!! \cdot t^k \end{aligned}$$

□

**COROLLARY 2.27.** Let  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be Brownian motion. Then  $B_t$  is  $\gamma$ -Hölder continuous on a compact set of time almost surely for all  $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ .

**Proof.** Because of Lemma 2.26, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(B_t - B_s)^{2k}] &= \mathbb{E}[B_{t-s}^{2k}] \\ &= (2k-1)!! \cdot |t-s|^k. \end{aligned}$$

In terms of the Theorem of Kolmogorov Chenstov,  $B_t$  is  $\gamma$ -Hölder continuous a.s. for  $\gamma \in (0, \frac{k}{2k})$ . □

---

### 3 Stable Measures and Stable Integrals

In order to represent a integration form of fractional Brownian motion, we deal with the stable integral in this section. In fact, fractional Brownian motion is a Gaussian process with zero mean. To show Gaussian properties of it, we define it by a stable integral which can imaged as stochastic process of stable variables on time.

#### 3.1 Stable Variables

**DEFINITION 3.1.** Let  $X$  be a random variable.  $X$  is said to have a stable distribution, if there exist  $0 < \gamma \leq 2, \delta \geq 0, -1 \leq \kappa \leq 1, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$  such that its characteristic function can be described as following

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp i\xi X] = \begin{cases} \exp\{i\xi\theta - |\delta\xi|^\gamma(1 - i\kappa \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(\xi) \tan \frac{\gamma\pi}{2})\}, & \text{if } \gamma \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2], \\ \exp\{i\xi\theta - |\delta\xi|(1 + i\frac{2}{\pi}\kappa \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(\xi) \ln |\xi|)\}, & \text{if } \gamma = 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

Where

$$\operatorname{sgn}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0 \\ -1, & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Notice, we write  $\Lambda(\gamma, \kappa, \theta, \delta)$  as one random variable whose characteristic function equals (3.9).

**THEOREM 3.2.**  $X$  is Gaussian if and only  $X \sim \Lambda(\gamma, \kappa, \theta, \delta)$  with  $\gamma = 2$ .

**Proof.** In one hand, if  $X$  is Gaussian, indeed,  $\gamma$  must equal 2. On the other hand, if  $\gamma = 2$ , then  $i\kappa \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(\xi) \tan \frac{\gamma\pi}{2}$  vanishes since  $\tan(\pi) = 0$ . Therefore,  $X$  is Gaussian because  $\mathbb{E}[\exp i\xi X] = \exp\{i\xi\theta - |\delta\xi|^2\}$ .  $\square$

Remark, if  $\gamma = 2$ , then  $\kappa$  is irrelevant in Definition. We specific  $\kappa = 0$  without loss of generality. For instance,  $B_t \sim \Lambda(2, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2})$  when  $(B_t)_t$  is Brownian motion.

**DEFINITION 3.3.** A random variable  $X$  is said to be *symmetric* if  $X$  and  $-X$  have the same distribution.

**PROPOSITION 3.4.** Let  $X$  be have a stable distribution.  $X$  is *symmetric* if and only if  $X \sim \Lambda(\gamma, 0, 0, \delta)$ . I.e. its characteristic function has the form

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{i\xi X\}] = \exp\{-|\delta\xi|^\gamma\} \quad (3.10)$$

**Proof.** The Definition of symmetricity implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp\{i\xi\theta - |\delta\xi|^\gamma(1 - i\kappa \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(\xi) \tan \frac{\gamma\pi}{2})\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}[i\xi X] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[i\xi(-X)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[i(-\xi)X] \\
&= \exp\{i(-\xi)\theta - |\delta\xi|^\gamma(1 - i\kappa \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(-\xi) \tan \frac{\gamma\pi}{2})\},
\end{aligned}$$

this requires  $\theta = \kappa = 0$ . □

**COROLLARY 3.5.** Let  $(B_t)_t$  be Brownian motion, then  $B_t$  has a symmetric stable distribution.

**Proof.** It is clear due to the previous Proposition. □

### 3.2 Stable Random Measures

In this subsection we suppose  $(D, \mathcal{D})$  and  $(E, \mathcal{E})$  are probability spaces,  $\kappa(\cdot) : \Omega \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  is a measurable function.

**DEFINITION 3.6.** Let  $\nu$  be a measure such that

$$\nu : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}.$$

$\nu$  is said to be *independently scattered*, if  $\nu[D_1], \dots, \nu[D_n]$  are independent for any  $D_1, \dots, D_n$  disjoint  $\in \mathcal{D}$ .

For the next definition we need a notation

$$\mathcal{G} = \{D \in \mathcal{D} : \mu[D] < \infty, \mu : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (3.11)$$

**DEFINITION 3.7.** Let  $\nu$  be an independent cattered and  $\sigma$ -additive set function such that

$$\nu : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P}).$$

$\nu$  is said to be *stable random measure* on  $(D, \mathcal{D})$  with control measure  $\mu$ , degree  $\gamma$  and skewness intensity  $\kappa(\cdot)$  if

$$\nu[F] \sim \Lambda\left(\gamma, \frac{\int_F \kappa(x) \mu[dx]}{\mu[F]}, 0, (\mu[F])^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}\right) \quad (3.12)$$

for  $F \in \mathcal{D}$ .

### 3.3 Stable Integrals

---

Samorodnitsky and Taqqu show the existence of stable measures, see [12], pp.119~120.

**EXAMPLE 3.8.** Suppose  $[0, T]$  is a index set and  $0 = t_0, t_1, \dots, t_k \in [0, T]$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We show the mapping  $\nu : \mathcal{B}([0, T]) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ , where  $\nu[A_j](\omega) := B_{t_{j+1}}(\omega) - B_{t_j}(\omega)$ ,  $A_j = [t_j, t_{j+1})$ .

Firstly, we show  $\nu$  is independently scattered and  $\sigma$ -additive. We take  $\{A_j\}$  such that  $\cup_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j = [0, T]$ .  $\{\nu[A_k]\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  has independent elements since  $B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, \dots, B_{t_{j+1}} - B_{t_j}$  are independent.

Secondly,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu[(\cup_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j)] &= B_T - B_1 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (B_{t_{j+1}} - B_{t_j}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu[A_j]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \nu[A_j])] &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi (B_{t_{j+1}} - B_{t_j}))] \\ &= \exp(-\frac{(t_{j+1} - t_j)\xi^2}{2}) \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with (3.9), we deduce the control measure must be  $\frac{|\cdot|}{2}$ . In fact,  $\nu[A_j] \sim \Lambda(2, 0, 0, \frac{|t_{j+1} - t_j|}{2})$ .

### 3.3 Stable Integrals

Samorodnitsky and Taqqu defined an Integral with respect to stable measure as stochastic process in [12]. The stable Integral is given as

$$\int_F f(x) \nu(dx). \quad (3.13)$$

Where  $f : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a measurable function such that

$$\begin{cases} \int_F |f(x)|^\gamma \mu(dx) < \infty, & \text{if } \gamma \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2], \\ \int_F |\kappa(x) f(x) \ln |f(x)|| \mu(dx) < \infty, & \text{if } \gamma = 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

,  $\gamma, \mu, \kappa$  are, respectively, degree, control measure and skewness intensity of the stable measure  $\nu$ .

Some properties of the stable function are given by Samorodnitsky and Taqqu.



**PROPOSITION 3.9.** Let  $J(f)$  be a stable integral as form of (3.13). Then

$$J(f) \sim \Lambda(\gamma, \kappa, \theta, \delta)$$

for the degree, control measure, skewness intensity, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\in (0, 2], \\ \kappa &= \frac{\int_F \kappa(x) |f(x)|^\gamma \cdot \text{sgn}(f(x)) \mu(dx)}{\int_F |f(x)|^\gamma \mu(dx)}, \\ \theta &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \gamma \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2], \\ -\frac{2}{\pi} \int_F \kappa(x) f(x) \ln |f(x)| \mu(dx), & \text{if } \gamma = 1, \end{cases} \\ \delta &= \left( \int_F |f(x)|^\gamma \mu(dx) \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}, \end{aligned}$$

of the stable measure  $\nu$ .

**Proof.** See [12], p.124, Proposition 3.4.1 . □

**PROPOSITION 3.10.** The stable integral is linear, in fact,

$$J(c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} c_1 J(f_1) + c_2 J(f_2) \tag{3.15}$$

for any  $f_1, f_2$  integrable with respect to some stable measure and real numbers  $c_1, c_2$ .

**Proof.** See [12], p.117, Property 3.2.3 . □

---

## 4 Fractional Brownian Motion

The fractional Brownian motion (FBM) was defined by Kolmogorov primitively. After that Mandelbrot and Van Ness has present the work in detail. This section is concerned with the definition and some properties of it.

### 4.1 Definition of Fractional Brownian Motion

Mandelbrot and Van Ness [14] gave a integration presentation of the definition of FBM.

**DEFINITION 4.1.** Let  $(U_H(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  be a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued stochastic process and  $H$  be such that  $0 < H < 1$ .  $(U_H(t))$  is said to be *fractional Brownian motion* if

$$U_H(t) - U_H(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2})} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq u\}} \cdot (t - u)^{H - \frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq s\}} (-u)^{H - \frac{1}{2}} dB_u \right) \quad (4.1)$$

for  $t \geq s, t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Where  $(B_u)$  is defined as two-sides Brownian motion, the integral is in sense of stable integral as in previous section.  $H$  is called Hurst exponent or Hurst index of FBM.

As usual, we set  $U_H(0) = 0$ , then equation (4.1) is equivalent to

$$U_H(t) = \frac{1}{(\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2}))^2} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq u\}} \cdot (t - u)^{H - \frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq 0\}} (-u)^{H - \frac{1}{2}} dB_u \right). \quad (4.2)$$

**LEMMA 4.2.** The equation (4.2) is well-defined,  $U_H(t)$  has stable distribution and

$$U_H(t) \sim \Lambda(2, 0, 0, \frac{1}{\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2})} (\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(u)|^2 \frac{du}{2})^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

Where  $f(x)$  is the integrand of integral in (4.2).

**Proof.** Firstly,  $B_t$  is Gaussian and symmetric stable measure with zero mean and  $\frac{|t|}{2}$  as the control measure of it shown in Example 3.8.

Secondly, the well-definition was referred to by Samorodnitsky and Taqqu in [12], p.321, Proposition 7.2.6 for not only  $H = \frac{1}{2}$ , but also  $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . Which satisfies, in other words, the condition  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f^2(u) \frac{du}{2} < \infty$ .

Finally, in terms of Proposition 3.9, we get the claim.  $\square$

Remark that, if we take  $H = \frac{1}{2}$  choosing a restriction of the integrand on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $(U_2(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a Brownian motion.

**THEOREM 4.3.** Let  $(U_H(t))_t$  be a FBM. Then  $U_H(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2})^2} (\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(u)|^2 du))$ .

**Proof.** In terms of Lemma 4.2,  $E[i\xi U_H(t)] = \exp\{-\xi^2 \frac{1}{2\Gamma(H+\frac{1}{2})^2} (\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(u)|^2 du)\}$ . The rest is clear thanks to the form of characteristic function of a Gaussian random variable.  $\square$

**LEMMA 4.4.** Let  $(U_H(t))_t$  be a FBM. Then  $U_H(t)$  has an expected value 0 and variance  $t^{2H} EU_H^2(1)$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** It is clear that  $U_H$  is Gaussian with zero mean due to Lemma 4.2. We suppose that  $t \geq s \geq 0$ ,  $c(H) = \frac{1}{(\Gamma(H+\frac{1}{2}))^2}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E[(U_H(t) - U_H(s))^2] \\
 = & c(H) E\left[\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} [\mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq u\}} \cdot (t-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{s \geq u\}} \cdot (s-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}] U_H(u) du\right)^2\right] \\
 \stackrel{\text{Theorem 4.3}}{=} & c(H) E\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq u\}} \cdot (t-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{s \geq u\}} \cdot (s-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 du\right] \\
 = & c(H) E\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{t-s \geq u\}} \cdot (t-s-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{0 \geq u\}} \cdot (-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 du\right] \\
 \stackrel{m=t-s}{=} & c(H) E\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{m \geq u\}} \cdot (m-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{0 \geq u\}} \cdot (-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 du\right] \\
 \stackrel{u=ml}{=} & c(H) E\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{m \geq ml\}} \cdot (m-ml)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{0 \geq ml\}} \cdot (-ml)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 m \cdot dl\right] \\
 = & c(H) E\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{1 \geq l\}} \cdot (1-l)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{0 \geq l\}} \cdot (-l)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 \cdot m^{2H-1} \cdot m \cdot dl\right] \\
 = & c(H) m^{2H} E[U_H(1)^2] \\
 = & c(H) (t-s)^{2H} E[U_H(1)^2]
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Using the same calculation, we get

$$E[(U_H(t))^2] = c(H) t^{2H} E[U_H(1)^2]. \tag{4.4}$$

(4.4) is variance of  $U_H(t)$  due to  $E[U_H(t)] = 0$ .  $\square$

To normalize the variance, a definition of standard FBM is given.

**DEFINITION 4.5.** A stochastic process  $(U_H(t))_t$  is said to be a *standard fractional Brownian motion* (sFBM) if

$$U_H(t) = \hat{c}(H) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq u\}} \cdot (t-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq 0\}} (-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} dB_u. \tag{4.5}$$

Where  $\hat{c}(H) = \frac{1}{E[U_H(1)^2]}$ .

We consider from now on sFBM as FBM.

**THEOREM 4.6.** Let  $(U_H(t))_t$  be a FBM. The Covariance function of  $U_H(t), U_H(s)$  is  $\frac{1}{2}(t^{2H} + s^{2H} - |t-s|^{2H})$  for  $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** Cf.[14], Theorem 5.3 .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Cov}[U_H(t), U_H(s)] &= \mathbb{E}[U_H(t)U_H(s)] \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{E}[U_H(t)^2] + \mathbb{E}[U_H(s)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(U_H(t) - U_H(s))^2]) \\
 &\stackrel{(4.4)}{=} \frac{1}{2}(t^{2H} + s^{2H} - |t - s|^{2H})
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

□

**THEOREM 4.7.**  $(U_H(t))_t$  is Gaussian process.

**Proof.** We just need to prove that for an arbitrary finite linear combination of values of time is Gaussian. We take  $t_1, \dots, t_k \in T, c_1, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{R}$ , and the stable integral  $J(f)$  is a linear functional with  $\gamma = 2, \kappa = 0, \theta = 0, \delta = (\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f^2(u) du)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  due to Corollary 3.15. Suppose  $f_1, \dots, f_k$  are integrands of the form of stable integral of  $U_H(t_1), \dots, U_H(t_k)$ .

Consider now, according to the Minkowski inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\sum_{j=1}^k c_j f_j)^2 du &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (c_j f_j)^2 du}_{< \infty} \\
 &< \infty.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j=1}^k c_j U_H(t_j) &= \sum_{j=1}^k c_j J(f_j) \\
 &= J(\sum_{j=1}^k c_j f_j) \\
 &\sim \Lambda(2, 0, 0, (\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\sum_{j=1}^k c_j f_j)^2 du)^{\frac{1}{2}})
 \end{aligned}$$

is Gaussian and the rest is clear. □

**COROLLARY 4.8.** Let  $(U_H(t))_t$  be a FBM, then  $(U_H(t))_t$  has stationary and H-self similar increments .

**Proof.** Assume that  $s \geq u$ . Because the joint distribution of  $(U_H(s), U_H(u))^T$  is Gaussian,  $(1, -1) \cdot (U_H(s), U_H(u))^T$  is Gaussian. In other words,  $U_H(s) - U_H(u) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (s - u)^{2H})$  which is only dependent on  $(s - u)$  and  $(U_H(t))$  has therefore stationary increments.

$(U_H(t))$  has zero mean and  $\text{Var}[U_H(s)] = s^{2H} \text{Var}[U_H(1)]$  we get  $U_H(s) \sim s^H U_H(1)$  due to it is Gaussian. To show FBM has H-self similar increments, we have to prove

$(U_H(z t_1), U_H(z t_2), \dots, U_H(z t_n)) \sim (z^H U_H(t_1), z^H U_H(t_2), \dots, z^H U_H(t_n))$  for any  $z > 0$ .

Obviously, the former and the latter of the term are Gaussian and  $\text{Var}[U_H(z t_i), U_H(z t_j)] = \text{Var}[z^H U_H(t_i), z^H U_H(t_j)] = \frac{1}{2} z^{2H} (t_i^{2H} + t_j^{2H} - |t_i - t_j|^{2H})$ . Thus they have the same covariance matrix and zero mean in their characteristic function. Using uniqueness theorem we can prove the claim.  $\square$

## 4.2 Regularity

**THEOREM 4.9** (Kolmogorov Chentsov). FBM has almost surely continuous sample path.

**Proof.** Cf.[14] Proposition 4.1 . Let  $(U_H(t))_t$  be FBM with Hurst index  $H$ . Fix  $\alpha$  such that  $1 < \alpha H$ . Let look at the expectation of  $(U_H(t) - U_H(s))^\alpha$  using the same calculation in (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(U_H(t) - U_H(s))^\alpha] &= |t - s|^{\alpha H} \cdot \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{1 \geq u\}} \cdot (1 - u)^{H - \frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq 0\}} (-u)^{H - \frac{1}{2}} dB_u \right)^\alpha}_{c(\alpha, H)} \\ &= c(\alpha, H) \cdot |t - s|^{\alpha H}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

We choose  $\beta = \alpha H - 1$  and  $\gamma \in (0, H - \frac{1}{\alpha})$  then the rest follows from Theorem 2.25 .  $\square$

Remark,  $U_H(t)$  is, in fact,  $\gamma$ -Hölder continuous with  $\gamma < H$  almost surely.

**THEOREM 4.10.** The sample path of FBM is almost surely not differentiable.

**Proof.** Cf. [14] Proposition 4.2 . Fix  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we assume  $c > 0, t_j \rightarrow s$ .

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{P}[\limsup_{t \rightarrow s} \left| \frac{U_H(t) - U_H(s)}{t - s} \right| > c] \\ &= \mathcal{P}[\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t_j \neq s} \left| \frac{U_H(t_j) - U_H(s)}{t_j - s} \right| > c] \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Since continuity of measures from above, then

$$\begin{aligned} (4.8) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}[\sup_{t_j \neq s} \left| \frac{U_H(t_j) - U_H(s)}{t_j - s} \right| > c] \\ &\geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}[ \left| \frac{U_H(t_j) - U_H(s)}{t_j - s} \right| > c] \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}[ \left| \frac{(t_j - s)^H U_H(1)}{t_j - s} \right| > c] \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}[ |(t_j - s)^{H-1} U_H(1)| > c] \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}[ |U_H(1)| > \underbrace{|t_j - s|^{1-H}}_{\xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 0} c] \\ &\xrightarrow{j \rightarrow \infty} 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

**THEOREM 4.11.** Let  $(U_H(k))_k$  be FBM. The conditional expectation of  $U_H(s)$  given  $U_H(t) = x$  is

$$\frac{|\frac{s}{t}|^{2H} + 1 - |\frac{s}{t} - 1|^{2H}}{2} \cdot x$$

for all  $s < t$ .

**Proof.** Cf. [14] Theorem 5.3. Taking conditional expectation of  $U_H(s)$  given  $U_H(t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[U_H(s)|U_H(t)] \\ \stackrel{\text{Corollary 2.18}}{=} & \mu_s + \rho_{s,t} \left( \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_t} U_H(t) - \mu_t \right) \\ = & \rho \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_t} U_H(t) \\ = & \frac{\rho \cdot \sigma_s \sigma_t \cdot U_H(t)}{\sigma_t^2} \\ = & \frac{\mathbb{E}[U_H(s)U_H(t)]}{\mathbb{E}[U_H^2(t)]} \cdot U_H(t) \\ \stackrel{(4.6)}{=} & \frac{s^{2H} + t^{2H} - |s - t|^{2H}}{2\mathbb{E}[U_H^2(t)]} \cdot U_H(t) \\ = & \frac{s^{2H} + t^{2H} - |s - t|^{2H}}{2t^{2H}} \cdot U_H(t) \\ = & \frac{|\frac{s}{t}|^{2H} + 1 - |\frac{s}{t} - 1|^{2H}}{2} \cdot U_H(t) \end{aligned}$$

□

### 4.3 Fractional Brownian Noise

**DEFINITION 4.12.** Let  $(U_H(t))_t$  be a FBM. The *fractional Brownian noise* is a sequence  $(S_k)_k$  forms

$$S_H(k) = U_H(k+1) - U_H(k)$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.13.** Fractional Brownian noise is stationary and its autocovariance is

$$\varsigma_{S_H}(\tau) = \frac{1}{2}(|\tau + 1|^{2H} - 2|\tau|^{2H} + |\tau - 1|^{2H}) \quad (4.9)$$

for  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Proof.** Cf. [15], p.333, Proposition 7.2.9 . The first part of the claim is clear due to FBM has stationary increments.

In terms of definition of fractional Brownian noise we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varsigma_{S_H}(\tau) &= \mathbb{E}[S_H(0)S_H(\tau)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(U_H(1) - U_H(0))(U_H(\tau + 1) - U_H(\tau))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(U_H(1) - U_H(0))(U_H(\tau + 1) - U_H(\tau))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[U_H(1)(U_H(\tau + 1) - U_H(\tau))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[U_H(1)U_H(\tau + 1)] - \mathbb{E}[U_H(1)U_H(\tau)] \\
&= \varsigma_{U_H}(1, \tau + 1) - \varsigma_{U_H}(1, \tau) \\
&\stackrel{(4.6)}{=} \frac{1}{2}(1 + |1 + \tau|^{2H} - \tau^{2H}) - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \tau^{2H} - |1 - \tau|^{2H}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(|1 + \tau|^{2H} - 2|\tau|^{2H} + |1 - \tau|^{2H})
\end{aligned}$$

for  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ . □

**DEFINITION 4.14.** A stationary stochastic process  $(X_t)_t$  is said to have *long memory* if its autocovariance  $\varsigma_X(\tau)$  tend to 0 with so slowly such that  $\sum_{\tau=-\infty}^{\infty} \varsigma_X(\tau)$  diverges for  $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

**LEMMA 4.15** (Cauchy Condensation test). Let  $(a_n)$  be a real-valued positive non-increasing sequence. Then  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges if and only if  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n a_{2^n}$  converges.

**Proof.** See [11], p.391, Theorem 13.13 . □

**THEOREM 4.16.** The fractional Brownian noise has long memory for  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ .

**Proof.** Cf. [15], p.335, Proposition 7.2.10 .

Without loss of generality, we suppose  $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_0^+$ . For  $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^-$ , we deal with it in a similar way and  $\tau = 0$  is clear. Following (4.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varsigma(\tau) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\tau^{2H-2}\left\{\tau^2\left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2H} - 2 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2H}\right]\right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\tau^{2H-2}\left\{\frac{\left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2H} - 1}{\frac{1}{\tau^2}} - \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tau}\right)^{2H}}{\frac{1}{\tau^2}}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

We deal with the former of the content in  $\{ \}$  with L'Hôpital's rule as  $\tau$  tend to infinity.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H} - 1}{\frac{1}{\tau^2}} \\
 &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2H(1 + \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-1}(-\frac{1}{\tau^2})}{-\frac{4}{\tau^3}} \\
 &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H(1 + \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-1}}{\frac{1}{\tau}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We calculate the Latter of the content in  $\{ \}$  in a similar way. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \varsigma(\tau) \\
 &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \tau^{2H-2} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{H(1 + \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-1}}{\frac{1}{\tau}} - \frac{H(1 - \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-1}}{\frac{1}{\tau}} \right\} \\
 &\stackrel{\text{L'Hôpital}}{=} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \tau^{2H-2} \left\{ \frac{H(2H-1)(1 + \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-2}(-\frac{1}{\tau^2})}{-\frac{1}{\tau^2}} - \frac{H(2H-1)(1 - \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-2} \frac{1}{\tau^2}}{-\frac{1}{\tau^2}} \right\} \\
 &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \tau^{2H-2} \left\{ H(2H-1)(1 + \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-2} + H(2H-1)(1 - \frac{1}{\tau})^{2H-2} \right\} \\
 &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \tau^{2H-2} 2H(2H-1) \\
 &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} H(2H-1) \tau^{2H-2}
 \end{aligned}$$

For  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $\sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \varsigma(\tau)$  converges due to if we take the Cauchy condensation test for it

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} 2^{\tau} \left( \frac{1}{2^{\tau}} \right)^{2-2H} \\
 &= \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} 2^{\tau - \tau(2-2H)} \\
 &= \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} 2^{\tau(1-2+2H)}
 \end{aligned}$$

This is geometric series if  $2H - 1 < 0$ , namely,  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ .

Otherwise, if  $\frac{1}{2} < H < 1$ , namely,  $-1 < 2H - 2 < 0$ ,  $\sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \varsigma(\tau)$  diverges because it is greater than the harmonic series. With  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \varsigma(\tau) = 0$ , we achieve the claim.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 4.17.** Let  $S_H$  be fractional Brownian noise,  $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\varsigma_{S_H}(\cdot)$  its autocovariance. Then  $\sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}} \varsigma_{S_H}^2(\tau) < \infty$  if and only if  $H < \frac{3}{4}$ .

**Proof.** Cf. [15], p.72, Lemma 6.3. In Theorem 4.16, we have  $\varsigma_{S_H}^2(\tau) \propto H^2(2H-1)^2 \tau^{4H-4}$ . The sum of it is finite if and only if, according to the same reason as in Theorem 4.16,  $\tau^{4H-4} < -1$ . That means  $H < \frac{3}{4}$ .  $\square$



#### 4.4 FBM is not Semimartingale for $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$

Let look at our Integration representation for FBM, in the case of FBM with Hurst index  $\frac{1}{2}$ , it must be an ordinary Brownian motion. Except for this, we will show FBM is not a semimartingale.

**DEFINITION 4.18.** The *Hermite polynomials* form as following

$$\eta_n(u) = (-1)^n e^{\frac{u^2}{2}} \left( \frac{\partial^n}{\partial u^n} e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} \right), \quad (4.10)$$

for  $u \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.19.** Let  $(\eta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a family of Hermite polynomials,  $W$  a standard Gaussian variable,  $f, g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  continuously differentiable. It has then following properties

- (i)  $\eta_{n+1}(u) = (n+1)\eta_n(u)$  and  $\eta_{n+2}(u) = u \cdot \eta_{n+1}(u) - (n+1)\eta_n(u)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0, u \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (ii) Let  $W, V$  be standard Gaussian distributed such that  $(W, V)$  have a disjoint Gaussian distribution. Then

$$\int_{\Omega} \eta_j(W) \cdot \eta_k(V) \mathcal{P} = \begin{cases} j! (\mathbb{E}[WV])^j & \text{if } j = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (iii) Let  $W$  be standard Gaussian distributed, then

$$\frac{1}{j!} \int_{\Omega} \eta_j(W) \eta_k(W) \mathcal{P} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark that, (iii) means, in fact,  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{j!}} \cdot \eta_j\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$  is an orthonormal basis in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx)$ .

**Proof.** See [15] p.3, Propostion 1.3. □

**LEMMA 4.20.** Let  $(U_H(t))_t$  be a FBM,  $W$  standrad Gaussian variable, and  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , Borel-measurable function such that  $\mathbb{E}[f^2(G)] < \infty$ . Then,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1)) \xrightarrow{\text{in } \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{P})} \mathbb{E}[f(W)],$$

as  $n$  tend to  $\infty$ . In particular,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|^\beta \xrightarrow{\text{in } \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{P})} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \beta > \frac{1}{H} \\ \infty & \text{if } \beta < \frac{1}{H} \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

as  $n$  tend to  $\infty$ .

**Proof.** C.f. [15], p.17, Theorem 2.1 .

Firstly, because  $E[f^2(W)] < \infty$  one has  $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx)$ . In terms of Proposition 4.19(iii), taking expectation

$$E[f(x)] = E\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_j H_j(x)}{\sqrt{j!}}\right],$$

for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Notice  $H_0 = 1$  due to (4.10). Setting  $x = W$ , Equating coefficients leads to  $a_0 = E[f(W)]$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1)) - E[f(W)]\right\}^2\right] \\ &= E\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (f(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1)) - E[f(W)])\right\}^2\right] \\ &= E\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_k}{\sqrt{k!}} H_k(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1))\right) - E[f(W)]\right\}^2\right] \\ &= E\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_k}{\sqrt{k!}} H_k(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1))\right)\right\}^2\right] \end{aligned}$$

Consider now

$$E[f^2(W)] < \infty,$$

which requires  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k)^2 < \infty$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & E\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1)) - E[f(W)]\right\}^2\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} E\left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_k^2}{k!} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n H_k(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1))\right)^2\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_k^2}{k!} \sum_{j=1, m=1}^n E[H_k(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1)) H_k(U_H(m) - U_H(m-1))] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Proposition 4.19(ii)}}{=} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^2 \sum_{j=1, m=1}^n (E[(U_H(j) - U_H(j-1))(U_H(m) - U_H(m-1))])^k \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^2 \sum_{j=1, m=1}^n (E[S_H(j-1) S_H(m-1)])^k \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^2 \sum_{j=1, m=1}^n (\varsigma_{S_H}(j-m))^k \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\varsigma_{S_H}(k)| &= |\varsigma_{S_H}(|k|)| \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[(U_H(1) - U_H(0))(U_H(|x| + 1) - U_H(|x|))] \\
 &\stackrel{\text{Cauchy Schwartz}}{\leq} \underbrace{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[U_H(1)^2]}}_{=1} \cdot \underbrace{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[U_H(|x| + 1) - U_H(|x|)]^2}}_{=1} \\
 &= 1
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $(\varsigma_{S_H}(j - m))^k \leq |\varsigma_{S_H}(j - m)|$ . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(U_H(j) - U_H(j - 1)) - \mathbb{E}[f(W)]\right\}^2\right] \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ =:\alpha < \infty}}^{\infty} a_k^2 \sum_{j=1, m=1}^n |\varsigma_{S_H}(j - m)| \\
 &= \frac{\alpha}{n^2} \sum_{j=1, m=1}^n |\varsigma_{S_H}(j - m)| \\
 &= \frac{\alpha}{n^2} 2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{m < j} |\varsigma_{S_H}(j - m)| \\
 &\leq \frac{\alpha}{n^2} 2n \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |\varsigma_{S_H}(k)| \\
 &= \frac{2\alpha}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\varsigma_{S_H}(k)|,
 \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof in Theorem 4.16,  $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\varsigma_{S_H}(k)| \propto H(2H - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j^{2H-2} \propto H(2H - 1)n$ .

$n^{2H-2} \propto n^{2H-1}$  and  $\frac{2\alpha}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\varsigma_{S_H}(k)| \propto n^{2H-2}$  as  $k$  goes to infinity. This leads  $\mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(U_H(j) - U_H(j - 1)) - \mathbb{E}[f(W)]\right\}^2\right] = 0$  due to  $n^{2H-2} \rightarrow 0$  for  $0 < H < 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Secondly, we apply previous result for (4.11), In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|^\beta \\
 &= \frac{1}{n^{\beta H}} \sum_j^n |U_H(j) - U_H(j - 1)|^\beta \\
 &= \frac{1}{n^{\beta H - 1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_j^n |U_H(j) - U_H(j - 1)|^\beta \\
 &\longrightarrow n^{1 - \beta H} \mathbb{E}[|W|^\beta]
 \end{aligned}$$

Due to  $\mathbb{E}[|W|^\beta] < \infty$ , (4.11) holds as well as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . □

**THEOREM 4.21.** FBM is not a semimartingale for  $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$ .

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we set the Time index  $T = [0, 1]$ . Choosing  $\beta = 2$  in (4.11), we suppose  $U_H(t)$  were a semimartingale.

Case  $H < \frac{1}{2}$ . Then  $\sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|^2 = \infty$  contradicts that semimartingale has finite quadratic variation.

Case  $H > \frac{1}{2}$ .  $\sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|^2 = 0$ . On the one hand, according to Doob-Meyer decomposition,  $U_H(t) = M(t) + A(t)$ , where  $M(t)$  is a local martingale and  $A(t)$  is local finite variation process. Due to  $A(t)$  is local finite, we have  $0 = \langle U_H, U_H \rangle = \langle M, M \rangle$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is denoted for quadratic variation. Consequently,  $M(t)$  is zero process due to Cauchy Schwarz inequality. In other words,  $U_H(t) = A(t)$  which has finite variation. On the other Hand, choosing  $1 < \gamma < \frac{1}{H}$ , then  $\sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|^\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ . Precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &\leftarrow \sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|^\gamma \\ &\leq \underbrace{\sup_{1 \leq j \leq n} |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|^{\gamma-1}}_{(\gamma-1)\text{-H\"older}_0} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})|, \end{aligned}$$

this leads to  $\sum_{j=1}^n |U_H(\frac{j}{n}) - U_H(\frac{j-1}{n})| \rightarrow \infty$  contradicts mentioned above that  $U_H(t)$  has finite variation.

Given all that, FBM is not a semimartingal for  $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . □

## 5 Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process

In this section we turn our attention on the fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (for short, we denote FOU). Consider the following stochastic dynamics

### 5.1 Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process

$$dX_t = -aX_t dt + \gamma dU_H(t), \quad (5.1)$$

where  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a stochastic process,  $a \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $(U_H(t))_{t \geq 0}$  a FBM with Hurst exponent  $H$ . In fact, given a initial solution  $X_0(\omega) = b(\omega)$ , then it is

$$X_t(\omega) = b(\omega) - a \int_0^t X_u(\omega) du + \gamma U_H(t)(\omega) \quad (5.2)$$

for  $t \geq 0$ .

Due to  $U_H(t)$  is  $\alpha$ -Hölder-continuous with  $\alpha < H$ , we have following

**LEMMA 5.1.** Let  $U_H(t)$  be a FBM and  $u, d \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $d \leq s$ . Then there exist a Riemann-Stieljes integral such that

$$\int_d^s e^{au} dU_H(u) = e^{as}U_H(s) - e^{ad}U_H(d) - a \int_d^s U_H(u)e^{au} du. \quad (5.3)$$

**Proof.** See. [4], p.11, Proposition A.1 . □

**THEOREM 5.2.**  $\hat{X}_t^{b,H} := e^{-at} \left( b + \gamma \int_0^t e^{au} dU_H(u) \right)$  is the solution that solves (5.2) for  $u \geq 0$ .

**Proof.** Cf. [4], p.11, Proposition A.1 . We define

$$Y(t) := \int_0^t X_u du,$$

for  $t \geq 0$ . Rewirte (5.2) with  $Y_t$  and  $Y(0) = 0$ ,

$$Y'(t) = b - aY(t) + \gamma U_H(t)$$

And the solution of that linear differential equation with  $Y(0) = 0$  is

$$Y(t) = e^{-at} \int_0^t e^{au} (b + \gamma U_H(u)) du,$$

in terms of Definition above, using (5.3)

$$\begin{aligned}
 X(t) &= Y'(t) \\
 &= -ae^{-at} \int_0^t e^{au} (b + \gamma U_H(u)) du + e^{-at} e^{at} (b + \gamma U_H(t)) \\
 &= -ae^{-at} \int_0^t e^{au} (b + \gamma U_H(u)) du + b + \gamma U_H(t) \\
 &= e^{-at} \left( \underbrace{-a \int_0^t e^{au} \gamma U_H(u) du + e^{at} \gamma U_H(t)}_{\gamma \int_0^t e^{au} dU_H(u)} - a \int_0^t e^{au} du \cdot b \right) + b \\
 &= e^{-at} \left( \gamma \int_0^t e^{au} dU_H(u) - e^{au} \Big|_{u=0}^{u=t} \cdot b \right) + b \\
 &= e^{-at} \left( \gamma \int_0^t e^{au} dU_H(u) + b \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Let  $\hat{X}_{H,t} := \hat{X}_t^{\gamma \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{au} dU_H(u), H} := e^{-at} \left( \gamma \int_{-\infty}^t e^{au} dU_H(u) \right)$ .

**THEOREM 5.3.**  $(\hat{X}_{H,t})_{t \geq 0}$  is Gaussian and stationary.

**Proof.** Fix  $\epsilon^j > 0, H \in (0, 1)$ , then there exists  $\{u_0 < u_1^j < \dots < u_{k_j}^j \leq t_j\}$  such that

$$\left| \int_{-\infty}^{t_j} e^{au} dU_H(u) - \sum_{l=0}^{k_j-1} e^{au_l^j} (U_H(u_{l+1}^j) - U_H(u_l^j)) \right| < \epsilon^j.$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq d$ .

In one hand, we calculate the characteristic function of  $(\hat{X}_{t_1}, \dots, \hat{X}_{t_d})$  approximately with respect to  $\epsilon^1, \dots, \epsilon^d$ .

$$E[\exp\{i \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \hat{x}_{t_j}\}] \approx E[\exp\{i \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \left( \sum_{l=0}^{k_j-1} e^{au_l^j} (U_H(u_{l+1}^j) - U_H(u_l^j)) \right)\}]$$

Notice that since  $(U_H(t))$  is Gaussian process, any linear transform of its instance is Gaussian again. In other words,

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \left( \sum_{l=0}^{k_j-1} e^{au_l^j} (U_H(u_{l+1}^j) - U_H(u_l^j)) \right)$$

is Gaussian. Passing  $\epsilon^1, \dots, \epsilon^d$  to zero, it implies immediately  $(\hat{X}_{t_1}, \dots, \hat{X}_{t_d})$  is Gaussian due to the continuity theorem of characteristic function.

On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{i \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \hat{x}_{t_j}\}] \approx \mathbb{E}[\exp\{i \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \left( \sum_{l=0}^{k_j-1} e^{aw_l^j} (U_H(w_{l+1}^j) - U_H(w_l^j)) \right)\}]]$$

Since  $\{U_H(t)\}$  has stationary increments, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\exp\{i \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \left( \sum_{l=0}^{k_j-1} e^{aw_l^j} (U_H(w_{l+1}^j) - U_H(w_l^j)) \right)\}]] \\ = & \mathbb{E}[\exp\{i \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \left( \sum_{l=0}^{k_j-1} e^{aw_l^j} (U_H(w_{l+1}^j + \tau) - U_H(w_l^j + \tau)) \right)\}]] \end{aligned}$$

which is convergent if  $\epsilon$ 's tend to zero and must be equal  $\mathbb{E}[\exp\{i \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j \hat{X}_{t_j+\tau}\}]$ , i.e.,  $(\hat{X}_t)$  is stationary process.  $\square$

**THEOREM 5.4.** Let  $H$  be that  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ . Then

$$\varsigma_{X_H}(\tau) = \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \sum_{k=1}^N a^{-2k} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{2k-1} (2H - j) \right) \tau^{2(H-k)} + \lambda(\tau^{2(H-N-1)})$$

for  $N \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma, a$  are constants in (5.2) and  $\lambda(\tau^{2(H-N-1)}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\tau$  goes to infinity.

**Proof.** See [4], p.7, Theorem 2.3.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 5.5.**  $(\hat{X}_{H,t})_{t \geq 0}$  has long memory for  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ .

**Proof.** Consider the autocovariance of  $(\hat{X}_{H,t})$ , with a given function  $c(a, \gamma, N, H)$ ,

$$\varsigma_{X_H}(\tau) = \sum_{k=1}^N c(a, \gamma, N, H) \tau^{2H-2k} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{2(H-N-1)})$$

is obviously tend to zero as  $\tau$  goes to infinity. And For  $\sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \varsigma_{X_H}(\tau)$ , we only need to check the term structure  $k = 1$  in the sum, because in the case  $k > 1$ ,  $\tau^{2H-2k} < \tau^{2H-2}$  for  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . We deal with it in same way as in Theorem 4.16 (use Cauchy condensation test). That means, for  $2H - 2 < -1$ , namely  $H < \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \varsigma_{X_H}(\tau)$  converges. For  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , it diverges. Thus  $(\varsigma_{X_H}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  has long memory for  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ .  $\square$

---

## 6 Applications in Financial Mathematics

### 6.1 Fractional Black-Scholes Model

blah...blah First we give some basic concepts in following. Through this section we denote  $\mathcal{F}_t^X$  the filtration of a stochastic process  $(X_t)$ . Our finance market consist of  $\hat{X} := (X_t^0, \dots, X_t^n)$ .

**DEFINITION 6.1.** A  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ -valued stochastic process  $(\hat{\xi}_t)_t := (\xi_t^0, \xi_t^1, \dots, \xi_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is said to be a *strategy*, if  $\hat{\xi}_t \in \mathcal{F}_j^X$  for  $0 \leq j \leq t$ .

**DEFINITION 6.2.** A stochastic process  $(V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is said to be *value process* with respect to strategy  $\hat{\xi}_{t \in [0, T]}$ , if

$$V_t = \sum_{k=0}^n \xi_t^k X_t^k =: \hat{\xi}_t \cdot \hat{X}_t.$$

for  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**DEFINITION 6.3.** A stochastic process  $(\tilde{V}_{t \in [0, T]})$  is said to be *discounted value process* of a value process  $(V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  with respect to  $\hat{\xi}_{t \in [0, T]}$ , if

$$\tilde{V}_t = \frac{V_t}{X_t^0}$$

for  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**DEFINITION 6.4.** A strategy  $(\hat{\xi}_t)$  is said to be *self-financing*, if

$$V_T = V_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\xi}_{s_j} \cdot (\hat{X}_{s_j} - \hat{X}_{s_{j-1}}) \quad (6.1)$$

for  $0 = s_0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_m = T$ .

**DEFINITION 6.5.** A self-financing strategy  $\hat{\xi}$  is said to be *arbitrage*, if its discounted process satisfies following conditions

- (i)  $\mathcal{P}[\tilde{V}_T - \tilde{V}_0] = 1$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{P}[\tilde{V}_T > 0] > 0$ .

To be specific, our finance market is modeled with two stochastic processes that a process of a riskless asset  $(A_t)_t$  and a process of price of a stock  $(S_t)_t$ . The stock is assumed that it pays no dividends. Setting initial values  $A_0 = 1, S_0 = 1$ , we give our fractional Black-Scholes model as follows



$$\begin{aligned} A_t &= \exp(rt) \\ S_t &= \exp((rt + \mu(t) + \sigma U_H(t)), t \in [0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

where  $r \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+, \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mu(t) < \infty$ .

**LEMMA 6.6.** Let  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a stochastic process continuous in  $t$ . If  $(X_t)$  is a modification of the process

$$\left( \int_0^t (t-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} dB_u \right)_{t \geq 0}$$

for  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  a Brownian motion and  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , then

$$\mathcal{P}[\sup_{t \in [a, b]} X_t \leq -c] > 0$$

for  $c \geq 0$  and  $0 < a \leq b$ .

**Proof.** See [3], p.15, Lemma 4.2 . □

TODO: wiener sample path space.....

**THEOREM 6.7.** Let  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be a stochastic process such that

$$\tilde{S}_t = \exp(\mu(t) + \sigma U_H(t)), \quad (6.3)$$

where  $\mu, \sigma$  are as in (6.2),  $U_H(t)$  is a FBM. If there exist

$$\xi_t^1 = f_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f_k \mathbb{1}_{(\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}]}(t)$$

where  $t \in [0, T], \{f_k\}_0^{n-1}$  is family of  $\mathcal{F}_k^{U_H}$ -measurable function,  $0 = \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_n = T$  are stopping times with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_t^{U_H}$  respectively, with  $\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k \geq m$  and  $\mathcal{P}[f_k \neq 0] > 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{P}[(\xi^1 \cdot \tilde{S})_T < 0] > 0.$$

**Proof.** Cf.[3], p.18, Theorem 4.3 .  $\xi^1$  is predictable. Assume  $\mathcal{P}[(\xi^1 \cdot \tilde{S})_T < 0] = 0$ , then there exist

$$l = \min\{j : \mathcal{P}[f_j \neq 0] > 0, \quad \mathcal{P}\left[\sum_{k=1}^j f_k (e^{U_H(\tau_{k+1})} - e^{U_H(\tau_k)}) \geq 0\right] = 1\}$$

This leads to

$$\mathcal{P} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} f_k(e^{U_H(\tau_{k+1})} - e^{U_H(\tau_k)}) \right) \leq 0 \right] = 1$$

Ignoring constant term, we define

$$U_H(t)(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq u\}} \cdot (t - u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq 0\}}(-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} d\omega(u).$$

where  $\omega(u) := B_u(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega^w$ . We give the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t^{\Omega^w})$  denoting by

$$\mathcal{F}_t^{\Omega^w} := \sigma(\{\{w \in \Omega^w : \omega(u) \in \mathbb{R}\} : -\infty < u \leq t, c \in \mathbb{R}\}).$$

Then  $\tau_k$  is also stopping time of  $\mathcal{F}_t^{\Omega^w}$  due to

$$\mathcal{F}_t^{U_H} \subset \mathcal{F}_t^{\Omega^w}, t \in \mathbb{R}$$

For  $\omega \in \Omega^w$ , we split it into two parts as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\omega(u) &:= \omega(u) \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, \tau_l(\omega)]}, u \in \mathbb{R} \\ \phi_\omega(u) &:= \omega(\tau_l(\omega) + m) - \omega(\tau_l(\omega)), u \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Corresponding to each, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^1 &:= \{\psi_\omega \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}) : \omega \in \Omega^w\} \\ \Omega^2 &:= \{\phi_\omega \in \mathcal{C}([0, \infty)) : \omega \in \Omega^w\} \end{aligned}$$

And for the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra of all subsets, respectively, of  $\Omega^1, \Omega^2$  denoted by  $\mathcal{B}^1, \mathcal{B}^2$ .

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \{\tau_l \leq t\} \cap \{\psi_\omega \in \Omega^w\} &= \{\{\omega \in \Omega^w : \omega(u) \in \mathbb{R}\} : -\infty < u \leq t\} \\ &\in \mathcal{F}_t^{\Omega^w}, \end{aligned}$$

therefore is  $\psi_\omega$  a  $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_l}^{\Omega^w}$ -measurable mapping. Moreover, since the strong Markovian property of Brownian motion,  $\phi_\omega$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_l}^{\Omega^w}$  and it must be a Brownian motion.

We replace the  $\omega$  by  $\psi_\omega, \phi_\omega$  calculating the value process

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left( \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} f_k(e^{U_H(\tau_{k+1})} - e^{U_H(\tau_k)}) + f_l(e^{U_H(\tau_l+m)} - e^{U_H(\tau_l)}) \right) (\omega) \\
 = & \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{l-1} f_k(e^{U_H(\tau_{k+1})} - e^{U_H(\tau_k)})}_{:=J^1}(\omega) + f_l \left( e^{U_H(\tau_l)} \left( (e^{U_H(\tau_l+m)} - e^{U_H(\tau_l)}) - 1 \right) \right) (\omega) \\
 = & J^1(\omega) + f_l \left( \exp \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_l \geq u\}} (\tau_l(\omega) + m - u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_l \geq u\}} (\tau_l(\omega) - u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} d\omega(u) \right. \right. \\
 & \left. \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{(\tau_l, \tau_l+m]} (\tau_l + m - u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} d\omega(u) \right\} \right) \\
 = & J^1(\psi_\omega) + f_l \underbrace{\left( \exp \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_l(\psi_\omega)} (\tau_l(\psi_\omega) + h + u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - (\tau_l(\psi_\omega) - u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} d\psi_\omega(u) \right\} \right)}_{:=J^2(\psi_\omega, m)} \\
 & \cdot \underbrace{\left( \exp \left\{ \int_0^m (m - u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} d\phi_\omega(u) \right\} - 1 \right)}_{:=J^3(\phi_\omega, m)} \\
 = & J(\psi_\omega, \phi_\omega, m)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $J$  is defined as

$$J(\psi, \phi, t) := J^1(\psi) + J^2(\psi, t) \quad \cdot \quad J^3(\phi, t)$$

for  $\psi \in \Omega^1, \phi \in \Omega^2$ .

Indeed, fixing  $\psi \in \Omega^1, \phi \in \Omega^2$ ,  $J(\psi, \phi, \cdot)$  has continuous path on  $(\Omega^1 \times \Omega^2, \mathcal{B}^1 \otimes \mathcal{B}^2)$ , then we can define a  $\mathcal{B}^1 \otimes \mathcal{B}^2$ -measurable set

$$E := \{(\psi, \phi) : \sup_{m \leq t \leq T} J(\psi, \phi, t) < 0\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_E(\omega_1, \phi_\omega) | \psi_\omega = \omega_1] &= \mathcal{P}^\omega \left[ \sup_{m \leq t \leq T} J(\omega_1, \phi_\omega, t) < 0 \right] \\
 &\geq \mathcal{P}^\omega [J^1(\omega_1) + \sup_{m \leq t \leq T} J^2(\omega_1, t) \cdot \sup_{m \leq t \leq T} J^3(\phi_\omega, t) < 0]
 \end{aligned}$$

It is clear  $J^2(\omega_1)$  is bounded for a fixed  $\omega_1$  on the compact set and  $J^1(\omega_1)$  also. We set  $J^1(\omega_1) = c_1$ ,  $\sup_{m \leq t \leq T} J^2(\omega_1, t) = c_2$ . Thanks to Lemma 6.6, there exist  $D \subset \Omega^w$  such that  $\mathcal{P}^w[C] > 0$  and

$$\int_0^m (m - u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} d\phi_\omega(u) < c_3$$

## 6.2 Fractional Stochastic Volatility Model

---

for  $\omega \in D$ . where  $c_3$  could be small enough that  $c_2 \cdot e^{c_3-1} < 0$ . Under assumption at beginning,  $c_1 \leq 0$  almost surely. All of this leads to

$$\mathcal{P}^w[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_E(\omega_1, \phi_\omega)|\psi_\omega = \omega_1]] > 0$$

for  $\omega \in \Omega^w$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}^w\left[\sum_{k=1}^l f_k(e^{U_H(\tau_{k+1})} - e^{U_H(\tau_k)}) < 0\right] \\ & \geq \mathcal{P}^w\left[\sum_{k=1}^{l-1} f_k(e^{U_H(\tau_{k+1})} - e^{U_H(\tau_k)}) + \sup_{m \leq t \leq T} f_l(e^{U_H(\tau_l+t)} - e^{U_H(\tau_l)}) < 0\right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_E(\omega_1, \phi_\omega)|\psi_\omega = \omega_1]] > 0 \end{aligned}$$

this contradicts our assumption. It must be that  $\mathcal{P}[(\xi^1 \cdot S)_T < 0] > 0$ .  $\square$

**COROLLARY 6.8.** Let strategy  $(\xi^0, \xi^1)$  be such that,  $\xi^1$  is given as in Theorem 6.4. Then the strategy has no arbitrage in our finance market.

**Proof.** Assume  $(\xi^0, \xi^1)$  is a self-financing strategy. In terms of Definition 6.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_T - \tilde{V}_0 &= \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(\xi_k^0 A_k + \xi_k^1 S_k)}{A_k} - \frac{(\xi_k^0 A_{k-1} + \xi_k^1 S_{k-1})}{A_{k-1}} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \xi_k (\tilde{S}_k - S_{k-1}) \end{aligned}$$

It follows then from 6.4,  $\mathcal{P}[(\tilde{V}_T - \tilde{V}_0) < 0] > 0$ , since and therefore there is no arbitrage in this sense.  $\square$

## 6.2 Fractional Stochastic Volatility Model

In framework of Black-scholes, the asset price modeled as follows

$$dS_t = rS_t dt + \sigma S_t dw \quad (6.4)$$

In the simplest case, the volatility is assumed as a constant or a function of deterministic function of time and information up to underlying asset price. Such models, however, are not only a time-inhomogeneous but also generate unrealistic volatility dynamics. For solve this problem, in such Hull-White, Heston or SABR models, the volatility also modeled as a stochastic process(e.g. semimartingal).

In our paper, the log-volatility is assumed to obey fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. That means

$$dX_t = -a(X_t - \mu) dt + \gamma dU_H(t) \quad (6.5)$$

where  $X_t = \log(\sigma_t)$ . As in proceeding section, we have a stationary solution

$$\hat{X}_{H,t} = \mu + e^{-at} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{au} dU_H(u) \quad (6.6)$$

for an appropriate initial value. Where  $\hat{\sigma}_{H,t} = \exp \hat{X}_{H,t}$ . As result of this, ( $\hat{\sigma}_{H,t}$ ) is obviously stationary, because the exp function does not change the distribution of ( $\hat{X}_{H,t}$ ).

**PROPOSITION 6.9.** Let  $\hat{\sigma}_{H,t}$  be such that as in (6.6), then ( $\hat{\sigma}_{H,t}$ ) has long memory for  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ .

For the sake of simplicity meaning in (6.6), putting  $\mu$  off,  $\hat{X}_{H,t} = e^{-at} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{au} dU_H(u)$ .

**Proof.** We start our proof by definition of the autocovariance of  $\hat{\sigma}_{H,t}$

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_{\hat{\sigma}_H}(\tau) &= \text{Cov}[\hat{\sigma}_{H,t}, \hat{\sigma}_{H,t+\tau}] \\ &= \text{E}[\hat{\sigma}_{H,t} \hat{\sigma}_{H,t+\tau}] - \text{E}[\hat{\sigma}_{H,t}] \text{E}[\hat{\sigma}_{H,t+\tau}] \\ &= \text{E}[\exp(\hat{X}_{H,t} + \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau})] - \text{E}[\exp(\hat{X}_{H,t})] \text{E}[\exp(\hat{X}_{H,t+\tau})] \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\hat{X}_{H,t}, \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}$  are centred Gaussian, we apply (2.8) for it

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_{\hat{\sigma}_H}(\tau) &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t} + \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}]\right) - \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}]\right) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}]\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $(\hat{X}_{H,t})_t$  is stationary, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_{\hat{\sigma}_H}(\tau) &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t} + \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}]\right) - \exp(\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}]) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} (\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}] + \text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}] + \text{E}[\hat{X}_{H,t} \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}])\right) - \exp(\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}]) \\ &= \exp(\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Cov}[\hat{X}_{H,t}, \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}]) - \exp(\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}]) \end{aligned}$$

The term structure  $\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}]$  is independent of  $\tau$ . We define  $\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}] = C$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_{\hat{\sigma}_H}(\tau) &= \exp(C) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(\tau)\right) - \exp(C) \\ &= \exp(C) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(\tau) - 1\right) \\ &= c \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(\tau) - 1\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some  $c$ .

In one hand, as we known,  $\varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(\tau)$  vanishes ,for  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , as  $\tau$  goes to infinity. I.e.,

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} c \exp(\frac{1}{2} \varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(\tau) - 1) = 0.$$

On the other hand, Consider in Theorem 5.4,

$$\varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(\tau) = k\tau^{2H-2} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{2H-2N-2})$$

for some  $k$ . This implies  $\varsigma_{\hat{\sigma}_H}(\tau) = ck\tau^{2H-2} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^{2H-2N-2})$ . For the same reason as in Theorem 4.16, the long memory property requires  $-1 < 2H - 2 < 0$ , namely,  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ .  $\square$

This Long memory property may explain why blah blah. . . In order to model long memory volatility process, Comte and Renault are forced to set  $H \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  in 6.6 named fractional volatility stochastic(FSV), see[6]. In [5], Comte gave a truncated representation form of long memory process  $(Y_{\alpha,t})$

$$U_{\alpha,t} = \int_0^t \frac{(t-s)^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)} dB_u, \quad (6.7)$$

where  $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $(B_u)$  Brownian motion. Notice that  $\alpha$  is given by  $H - \frac{1}{2}$  as in previous representation and the long memory property remains true. Then, we have our truncated FOU process

$$X_{\alpha,t} = \gamma \int_0^t e^{-a(t-u)} dU_{\alpha,u} \quad (6.8)$$

for  $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ .

**PROPOSITION 6.10.** There is a quantity  $X_t^{(\alpha)}$  in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+))$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{(\alpha)} &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t \frac{(t-u)^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\gamma)} X_{\alpha,u} du \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{(t-u)^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\gamma)} dX_{\alpha,u}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

**Proof.** See [5], p.21, equation(7).  $\square$

Obviously,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \frac{(t-u)^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)} dX_u^{(\alpha)} \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{(t-u)^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)} \frac{(t-u)^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} dX_{\alpha,u} \\ &= X_{\alpha,t} \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

To approximate  $X_{\alpha,t}$  in discrete time, Comte had defined a quantity

$$X_{\alpha,n}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \frac{(t - \frac{k-1}{n})^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)} \left( X_{\frac{k}{n}}^{(\alpha)} - X_{\frac{k-1}{n}}^{(\alpha)} \right) \quad (6.11)$$

Since  $X_{\alpha,n}(t)$  is asymptotically stationary and Gaussian, with a centre Gaussian innovation, an AR(1) approach of  $X_{\alpha,n}$  could be give,

$$(1 - c_n L_n) X_{\frac{k}{n}}^{(\alpha)} = \epsilon\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \quad (6.12)$$

where  $\epsilon(\cdot) \sim N(0, \text{Var}[X^{(\alpha)}])$ ,  $L_n$  represent the Lag operator and  $c_n$  are coefficients corresponding to (6.11). Moreover, in one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\alpha,n}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) &= \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{(\frac{k}{n} - \frac{l-1}{n})^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)} \left( X_{\frac{l}{n}}^{(\alpha)} - X_{\frac{l-1}{n}}^{(\alpha)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{(k-l+1)^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)n^\alpha} \left( X_{\frac{l}{n}}^{(\alpha)} - X_{\frac{l-1}{n}}^{(\alpha)} \right) \\ &\stackrel{m=k-l}{=} \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{(m+1)^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)n^\alpha} \left( X_{\frac{k-m}{n}}^{(\alpha)} - X_{\frac{k-m-1}{n}}^{(\alpha)} \right) \\ &= \left( \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{(m+1)^\alpha - m^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)n^\alpha} \cdot L_n^m \right) X_{\frac{k}{n}}^{(\alpha)} \\ &\stackrel{(6.12)}{=} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{(m+1)^\alpha - m^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)n^\alpha} \cdot L_n^m \right) (1 - c_n L_n)^{-1} \epsilon\left(\frac{k}{n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

That is

$$\left( \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{(m+1)^\alpha - m^\alpha}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)n^\alpha} \cdot L_n^m \right)^{-1} (1 - c_n L_n) X_{\alpha,n}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) = \epsilon\left(\frac{k}{n}\right).$$

On the other hand,

$$(1 - L_n)^\alpha (1 - c_n L_n) X_{\alpha,n}\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)$$

is in general not Gaussian. In the other words, the ARFIMA(1,  $\alpha$ , 0) may not be fit such a high-frequency data that is comfortable with the FSV.

### 6.3 Rough Fractional Stochastic Volatility Model

In order to generate a disirable volatility dynamics, Gatheral et al.(2014) take the implied volatility  $\sigma^{BS}(m, \tau)$  into account. The implied volatility refer to the value of volatility required in the Black-Scholes model such that the pricing is coincide with the asset price

observed. Graphing implied Volatility as a function of moneyness and time to expiration seems to be a U-shape which is so-called volatility smile. In particular, the term structure of volatility skew of at-the-money of stylized data

$$\kappa(\tau) = \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \sigma^{BS}(m, \tau) \right|_{m=0},$$

acts as a power law with exponent around  $-\frac{1}{2}$ , which explained for example in [9]. In the one hand, in the FSV model with  $H \in (\frac{1}{2})$ , the volatility smile is depressed by arising  $\tau$ , see [7], p.350, equation (4.7). On the other hand, in [8], the volatility is driven by FBM with Hurst exponent  $H$  in Fukasawa's model has volatility skew of at the money a form  $\kappa(\tau) \sim \tau^{H-\frac{1}{2}}$  as  $\tau$  goes to zero. All of this suggested us, there exist a stochastic volatility model which is driven by FBM with Hurst exponent  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ .

Replaced by  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  in (6.5), we have the rough fractional stochastic volatility model (RFSV)

$$dX_t = -a(X_t - \mu) dt + \gamma dU_H(t), \quad (6.14)$$

And a stationary solution

$$\hat{X}_{H,t} = \mu + e^{-at} \gamma \int_{-\infty}^t e^{au} dU_H(u). \quad (6.15)$$

Consider a quantity defined on  $[0, T]$  with mesh  $\tau$

$$s(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N |\log(\sigma_{k\tau}) - \log(\sigma_{(k-1)\tau})|^2 \quad (6.16)$$

Due to the volatilities are not observable, we could take spot volatility values instead of them. In [3], the daily spot variances by daily realized variance estimates are used. A plotting of  $\log(s(\tau))$  against  $\log(\tau)$  looks then as straight line, i.e.,

$$s(\tau) = k\tau^z \quad (6.17)$$

We take our attention on our stochastic volatility model,

$$s(\tau)^{SV} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N |\hat{X}_{H,k\tau} - \hat{X}_{H,(k-1)\tau}|^2$$

Since  $(\hat{X}_{H,t})$  is stationary, we could apply weak law of large number,

$$\begin{aligned} s(\tau)^{SV} &= \mathbb{E}[|\hat{X}_{H,t+\tau} - \hat{X}_{H,t}|^2] \\ &= 2\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t}] - 2\text{Cov}[\hat{X}_{H,t}, \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau}] \end{aligned}$$



We recall (4.9), then

$$\begin{aligned} s(\tau)^{SV} &= 2(\varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(0) - \varsigma_{\hat{X}_H}(\tau)) \\ &= 1 - |\tau + 1|^{2H} + 2|\tau|^{2H} - |\tau - 1|^{2H} \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

in general not linear.

**THEOREM 6.11.** Let  $(\hat{X}_{H,t,a})$  be as in (6.15) with  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $a, \gamma$  parameters defined in (6.15). Then, as  $a$  goes to zero,

$$\text{Var}[\hat{X}_{H,t,a}] - \text{Cov}[\hat{X}_{H,t,a}, \hat{X}_{H,t+\tau,a}] = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2\tau^{2H} \quad (6.19)$$

for  $t > 0, \tau > 0$ .

**Proof.** Cf. [9], p.16, Corollary 3.2 . □

(6.19) shows, the choise of  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$  enable us to model the log-volatility process as form of 6.17. It may turn out to be RFSV is more reasonable for this empirical result of Linearity between  $\log(s(\tau))$  and  $\log(\tau)$ .

## 6.4 Weighted Fractional Stochastic Volatility Model

**DEFINITION 6.12.** A *mixed fractional Brownian motion* is defined as follows

$$M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t) = \alpha U_{H_1}(t) + \beta U_{H_2}(t) \quad (6.20)$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\alpha, \beta$  are real numbers and  $U_{H_1}, U_{H_2}$  are two independent FBM's with Hurst exponents  $H_1 \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), H_2 \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$  respectively.

**PROPOSITION 6.13.** The mixed fractional Brownian motion  $M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t)$  has following properties

- (i)  $M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(0) = 0$  and it is a centered Gaussian process.
- (ii)  $\text{Cov}[M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t), M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(s)] = \alpha^2 \text{Cov}[U_{H_1}(t), U_{H_1}(s)] + \beta^2 \text{Cov}[U_{H_2}(t), U_{H_2}(s)] = \frac{1}{2} (\alpha^2(t^{2H_1} + s^{2H_1} + |t - s|^{2H_1}) + \beta^2(t^{2H_2} + s^{2H_2} + |t - s|^{2H_2}))$ .
- (iii)  $M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(qt) \sim M_{\alpha q^{H_1}, \beta q^{H_2}, H_1, H_2}(t)$ .

**Proof.** (i):  $M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t) = \alpha U_{H_1}(t) + \beta U_{H_2}(t) = \alpha \cdot 0 + \beta \cdot 0 = 0$ . To prove it is a Gaussian process, we have a look at it's characteristic function

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \sum_{k=1}^d c_k M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(k))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \sum_{k=1}^d c_k (\alpha U_{H_1}(k) + \beta U_{H_2}(k)))] \end{aligned}$$

Since  $U_{H_1}(t), U_{H_2}(t)$  are independent centre Gaussian,  $c_k(\alpha U_{H_1}(k) + \beta U_{H_2}(k))$  is centre Gaussian and therefore  $(M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t))_t$  is centre Gaussian process. (ii): Using independence of  $U_{H_1}(t)$  and  $U_{H_2}(t)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Cov}[M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t), M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(s)] \\
 &= \text{Cov}[\alpha U_{H_1}(t) + \beta U_{H_2}(t), \alpha U_{H_1}(s) + \beta U_{H_2}(s)] \\
 &= \text{E}[(\alpha U_{H_1}(t) + \beta U_{H_2}(t))(\alpha U_{H_1}(s) + \beta U_{H_2}(s))] \\
 &= \text{E}[\alpha^2 U_{H_1}(t)U_{H_1}(s)] + \underbrace{\text{E}[\alpha\beta U_{H_2}(t)U_{H_1}(s)]}_{=0} + \underbrace{\text{E}[\alpha\beta U_{H_1}(t)U_{H_2}(s)]}_{=0} + \text{E}[\beta^2 U_{H_2}(t)U_{H_2}(s)] \\
 &= \alpha^2 \text{Cov}[U_{H_1}(t), U_{H_1}(s)] + \beta^2 \text{Cov}[U_{H_2}(t), U_{H_2}(s)].
 \end{aligned}$$

And the rest is clear.

(iii):

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(qt) &= \alpha U_{H_1}(qt) + \beta U_{H_2}(qt) \\
 &\sim \alpha q^{H_1} U_{H_1} + \beta q^{H_2} U_{H_2} \\
 &= M_{\alpha q^{H_1}, \beta q^{H_2}, H_1, H_2}(t)
 \end{aligned}$$

□

We could give our stochastic volatility model driven by the mixed FBM. Given all parameter as in the assumption, we have

$$dX_t = -a(X_t - \mu) dt + \gamma dM_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t) \quad (6.21)$$

for  $t \geq 0$ .

**PROPOSITION 6.14.** For an appropriate initial condition of (6.21), there exist a stationary solution  $\hat{X}_t$  satisfies following properties

- (i)  $\hat{X}_t$  is a centered Gaussian and stationary process.
- (ii)  $\hat{X}_t$  has long memory.

**Proof.** In terms of (6.21), then

$$X_t = X_0 - a \int_0^t X_u du + M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}(t).$$

The integral in sense of Riemann-Stieljet of  $M_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2}$  is well-defined because  $U_{H_1}, U_{H_2}$  of it are well-defined. As in Theorem 5.2, we have the solution

$$\begin{aligned}
X_t &= e^{-at} \left( \gamma \int_0^t e^{au} dM_{\alpha,\beta,H_1,H_2} + X_0 \right) \\
&= e^{-at} \left( \gamma \int_0^t e^{au} d(\alpha U_{H_1} + \beta U_{H_2}) + X_0 \right) \\
&= e^{-at} \left( \alpha \gamma \int_0^t e^{au} dU_{H_1} + \beta \gamma \int_0^t e^{au} dU_{H_2} + X_0 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Given  $X_0$  so that

$$X_t = \underbrace{\alpha \gamma e^{-at} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{au} dU_{H_1}}_{:=J_{H_1}(t)} + \underbrace{\beta \gamma e^{-at} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{au} dU_{H_2}}_{:=J_{H_2}(t)}.$$

Notice  $(J_{H_1}(t)), (J_{H_2}(t))$  are fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and for (i):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \sum_{k=1}^d c_k \hat{X}(k))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \sum_{k=1}^d c_k (\alpha J_{H_1}(k) + \beta J_{H_2}(k)))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \sum_{k=1}^d c_k (\alpha J_{H_1}(k+s) + \beta J_{H_2}(k+s)))]
\end{aligned}$$

for a fixed  $s$ . This shows  $(\hat{X}_t)$  is centered Gaussian and stationary.

For (ii):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varsigma(\tau) \\
&= \text{Cov}[X_0, X_\tau] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[X_0 X_\tau] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(\alpha J_{H_1}(0) + \beta J_{H_2}(0))(\alpha J_{H_1}(\tau) + \beta J_{H_2}(\tau))] \\
&= \alpha^2 \mathbb{E}[J_{H_1}(0) J_{H_1}(\tau)] + \alpha \beta \mathbb{E}[J_{H_1}(0) J_{H_2}(\tau)] + \alpha \beta \mathbb{E}[J_{H_2}(0) J_{H_1}(\tau)] + \beta^2 \mathbb{E}[J_{H_2}(0) J_{H_2}(\tau)].
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $J_{H_1}(t), J_{H_2}(t)$  defined as integral of  $U_{H_1}, U_{H_2}$  of Riemann-Stieljes sense and they are

therefore independent. Because they are also centered Gaussian, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \varsigma(\tau) \\
 = & \alpha^2 \mathbb{E}[J_{H_1}(0)J_{H_1}(\tau)] + \alpha\beta \mathbb{E}[J_{H_1}(0)]\mathbb{E}[J_{H_2}(\tau)] + \alpha\beta \mathbb{E}[J_{H_2}(0)]\mathbb{E}[J_{H_1}(\tau)] + \beta^2 \mathbb{E}[J_{H_2}(0)J_{H_2}(\tau)] \\
 = & \alpha^2 \mathbb{E}[J_{H_1}(0)J_{H_1}(\tau)] + \beta^2 \mathbb{E}[J_{H_2}(0)J_{H_2}(\tau)] \\
 \stackrel{\text{Theorem 5.4}}{=} & \frac{1}{2}(\alpha\gamma)^2 \sum_{k=1}^N a^{-2k} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{2k-1} (2H-j) \right) \tau^{2(H_1-k)} + \imath(\tau^{2(H_1-N-1)}) \\
 + & \frac{1}{2}(\alpha\gamma)^2 \sum_{k=1}^N a^{-2k} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{2k-2} (2H-j) \right) \tau^{2(H_2-k)} + (\tau^{2(H_1-N-1)})
 \end{aligned}$$

□

## 7 Conclusion

blah

---

blah

---

## References

- [1] BAUER, H. (2002). Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie(5th. durchges. und verb. Aufl.). Berlin: W. de Gruyter.
  - [2] CHERIDITO, P., & NUALART, D. (2005). Stochastic Integral of Divergence Type with Respect to Fractional Brownian Motion with Hurst Parameter  $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 41(6):1049-1081.
  - [3] CHERIDITO, P. (2003). Arbitrage in Fractional Brownian Motion Models. Finance Stoch. 7. no. 4, 533-553.
  - [4] CHERIDITO, P., & KAWAGUCHI, H., & MAEJIMA, M. (2003) Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Processes. Electron. J. Probab., 8(3):1-14.
  - [5] COMTE, F (1996). Simulation and Estimation of Long Memory Continuous Times Models. J. Series Anal. 17(1):19-36.
  - [6] COMTE, F. & RENAULT, E. (1998). Long Memory in Continuous-time Stochastic Volatility Models. Mathematical Finance, 8(4):291-323.
  - [7] COMTE, F. & COUTIN, L, & RENAULT, E (2012). Affine Fractional Stochastic Volatility Models. Annals of Finance. 8(2-3):337-378.
  - [8] FUKASAWA, M. (2011). Asymmmptotic Analysis for Stochastic Volatility: Martingale expansion. Finance and Stochastics. 15(4):634-654.
  - [9] GRADINARU, M., NOURDIN, I., RUSSO, F., VALLOIS, P. (2005). m-Order Integrals and Generalized Ito's Formula; The Case of a Fractional Brownian Motion with Any Hurst Index. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 41(4):781-806.
  - [10] LÒEVE, M. (1960). Probability Theory (2nd ed.). N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Princeton.
  - [11] SCHRAMM, J.M. (2008). Introduction to Real Analysis(dovered edition). New York: Dover Publications.
  - [12] SAMORODNITSKY, G., & TAQQU, M. (1994). Stable Non-Gaussian Random Processes: Stochastic Models with Infinite Variance. New York: Chapman & Hall.
  - [13] SEVERINI, T. (2005). Elements of Distribution Theory. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
  - [14] MANDELBROT, B.B., & VAN NESS, J.W. (1968). Fractional Brownian Motions, Fractional Noises and Applications. SIAM Review 10(4):422-437.
-

## REFERENCES

---

- [15] NOURDIN, I. (2012). Selected Aspects of Fractional Brownian Motion. Milano: Springer Milan.
- [16] (2012, October 1). Stochastic Processes. Lecture conducted from SCHILLING, R., Dresden.
- [17] GATHERAL, J. & JAISSON, T. & ROSENBAUM, M (2014). Volatility is Rough.