Mathematical Foundations for Finance

Exercise Sheet 6

Exercise 6.1 Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$ be a filtered probability space with $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. Let $X = (X_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be an adapted and integrable process.

(a) Find the *Doob decomposition* of X. In other words, prove that there exist a martingale $M = (M_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and an integrable and predictable process $A = (A_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ that are both null at zero, and such that

$$X = X_0 + M + A \ P\text{-a.s.}$$

Hint: You may define $M_k := \sum_{j=1}^{k}(X_j - E[X_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}])$, *for* $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(b) Prove that M and A are unique up to P-a.s. equality.

Solution 6.1 To simplify notation, we omit "P-a.s." from all equalities below.

(a) For each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, take

$$M_k := \sum_{j=1}^{k}(X_j - E[X_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}]).$$

It is immediate that M is adapted, integrable, and null at zero. Then, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[M_k - M_{k-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] &= E\Big[X_k - E[X_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \Big| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\Big] \\ &= E[X_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] - E[X_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, M is a martingale. Next, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} A_k := X_k - X_0 - M_k &= X_k - X_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{k}(X_j - E[X_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}]) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{k}(E[X_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] - X_{j-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then A is predictable with $A_0 = 0$, and of course $X = X_0 + M + A$, as required.

(b) Suppose the processes $M^{(1)}, A^{(1)}$ and $M^{(2)}, A^{(2)}$ both satisfy the conditions of the problem. Subtracting the equalities

$$X - X_0 = M^{(1)} + A^{(1)},$$
$$X - X_0 = M^{(2)} + A^{(2)}$$

gives

$$M^{(1)} - M^{(2)} = A^{(2)} - A^{(1)}.$$

For notational convenience, we set $Y := M^{(1)} - M^{(2)} = A^{(2)} - A^{(1)}$. Since $Y = A^{(2)} - A^{(1)}$, then Y is predictable, and hence for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$Y_k = E[Y_k \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}].$$

But since the difference of two martingales is a martingale, Y is a martingale, and hence the above can be rewritten as

$$Y_k = Y_{k-1} \ \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $Y_0 = 0$, this implies that $Y_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and hence

$$M^{(1)} = M^{(2)} \text{ and } A^{(1)} = A^{(2)}.$$

This completes the proof.

Exercise 6.2 Let $W = (W_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $W' = (W'_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be two *independent* Brownian motions (BM) defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. Show that

(a) $W^1 := -W$ is a BM.

(b) $W^2_t := W_{T+t} - W_T$, for $t \geq 0$, is a BM for any $T \in (0, \infty)$.

(c) $W^3 := \alpha W + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} W'$ is a BM for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

(d) Show that the independence of W and W' in (c) cannot be omitted, i.e., if W and W' are *not* independent, then W^3 need not be a BM. Give two examples.

Solution 6.2 We first recall the definition of a Brownian motion in order to know what needs to be checked. A *Brownian motion* with respect to P is a real-valued stochastic process $W = (W_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that

(BM0) $W_0 = 0$ P-a.s.

(BM1) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any times $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < \infty$, the increments $W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}}$ are independent and normally distributed with variance $t_i - t_{i-1}$ under P, i.e.

$$W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t_i - t_{i-1}) \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

(BM2) W has P-a.s. continuous trajectories.

(a) We check (BM0), (BM1) and (BM2) separately.

(BM0) This is clear since $W^1_0 = -W_0 = 0$ P-a.s.

(BM1) Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < \infty$. Then we have, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, that

$$W^1_{t_i} - W^1_{t_{i-1}} = -(W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}}),$$

which are independent under P. Since $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ if and only if $-X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, we also conclude that $W^1_{t_i} - W^1_{t_{i-1}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t_i - t_{i-1})$.

(BM2) This is trivial, since $W^1 = -W$. The sign does not alter continuity.

(b) We check (BM0), (BM1) and (BM2) separately.

(BM0) We obviously have $W^2_0 = W_T - W_T = 0$ P-a.s.

(BM1′) Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < \infty$. Then we have for $i = 1, \dots, n$ that

$$W^2_{t_i} - W^2_{t_{i-1}} = W_{T+t_i} - W_T - (W_{T+t_{i-1}} - W_T) = W_{T+t_i} - W_{T+t_{i-1}}.$$

Denoting $t'_i = T + t_i$, we see from the definition (BM1′) that the increments of W^2 are independent under P, and since $t'_i - t'_{i-1} = t_i - t_{i-1}$, we also conclude that for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$W^2_{t_i} - W^2_{t_{i-1}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t_i - t_{i-1}).$$

(BM2) This is again easy, since W^2 is simply W shifted in time by T minus a random variable which does not depend on t.

(c) We check (BM0), (BM1) and (BM2) separately.

(BM0) $W^3_0 = \alpha W_0 + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} W'_0 = 0$ P-a.s., since both W_0 and W'_0 are equal to 0 P-a.s.

(BM1′) Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < \infty$. Then we have, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, that

$$W^3_{t_i} - W^3_{t_{i-1}} = \alpha \left(W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}} \right) + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} \left(W'_{t_i} - W'_{t_{i-1}} \right).$$

Since W and W' are independent under P, we conclude that the right-hand side is an independent family of random variables. Since W and W' are BMs, we additionally have that

$$W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t_i - t_{i-1}),\ i = 1, \dots, n,$$
$$W'_{t_i} - W'_{t_{i-1}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t_i - t_{i-1}),\ i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Recall the general fact that if $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \eta^2)$ are independent, then we have for any linear combination $s_1 X + s_2 Y$ that

$$s_1 X + s_2 Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, s_1^2 \sigma^2 + s_2^2 \eta^2).$$

Using this, we conclude that

$$\alpha\Big(W_{t_i} - W_{t_{i-1}}\Big) + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\Big(W'_{t_i} - W'_{t_{i-1}}\Big) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t_i - t_{i-1})$$

since

$$\alpha^2(t_i - t_{i-1}) + (1-\alpha^2)(t_i - t_{i-1}) = t_i - t_{i-1}.$$

(BM2) This is evident, since W^3 is a linear combination of two processes whose paths are P-a.s. continuous.

(d) Two possible choices are $W = \pm W'$. In this case, we have

$$W^3 = \left(\alpha \pm \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\right) W,$$

which is not a Brownian motion because $W_1^3 \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, (\alpha \pm \sqrt{1-\alpha^2})^2\right)$ and $\left(\alpha \pm \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}\right)^2 \neq 1$ in general.

Exercise 6.3 Let $W = (W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Brownian motion defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$, where $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a filtration satisfying the usual conditions.

(a) Let $f \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary convex function. Show that if the stochastic process $\Big(f(W_t)\Big)_{t \geq 0}$ is integrable, then it is a $(P, \mathbb{F})$-submartingale.
Hint: We have done something similar in discrete time.

(b) Given a $(P, \mathbb{F})$-martingale $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and a measurable function $g \colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$, show that the process

$$\Big(M_t + g(t)\Big)_{t \geq 0}$$

is a $(P, \mathbb{F})$-supermartingale if and only if g is decreasing, and a $(P, \mathbb{F})$-submartingale if and only if g is increasing.

Solution 6.3

(a) First recall that W is a $(P, \mathbb{F})$-martingale. Adaptedness is clear since f is continuous. Indeed, recall that any real-valued convex function is continuous on the interior of its domain. Integrability is assumed. Then by Jensen's inequality for conditional expectations, we can compute

$$E\left[f(W_t) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\right] \geq f\Big(E\left[W_t \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\right]\Big) = f(W_s) \; P\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $t \geq s$, and thus conclude that $f(W)$ is a $(P, \mathbb{F})$-submartingale.

(b) For any measurable function $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$, we have that, for each $t \geq 0$, $M_t + g(t)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable and

$$E\left[|M_t + g(t)|\right] \leq E\left[|M_t|\right] + E\left[|g(t)|\right] = E\left[|M_t|\right] + |g(t)| < \infty.$$

Hence $\big(M_t + g(t)\big)_{t\geq 0}$ is adapted and integrable. We can then compute

$$E\left[M_t + g(t) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\right] = E\left[M_t \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\right] + g(t) = M_s + g(s) + g(t) - g(s) \ P\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $t \geq s$. As a result, $\big(M_t + g(t)\big)_{t\geq 0}$ has the $(P, \mathbb{F})$-supermartingale property, i.e.

$$E\left[M_t + g(t) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\right] \leq M_s + g(s) \ P\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $t > s$, if and only if g is decreasing. Analogously, $\big(M_t + g(t)\big)_{t\geq 0}$ has the $(P, \mathbb{F})$-submartingale property, i.e.

$$E\left[M_t + g(t) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_s\right] \geq M_s + g(s) \ P\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $t > s$, if and only if g is increasing.