

How do optimal portfolios depend on the time horizon?

Martin Schweizer

Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich,
and Swiss Finance Institute

Workshop on Foundations of Mathematical Finance

January 11–15, 2010

Fields Institute, Toronto, Canada

14.01.2010

joint work with **Tahir Choulli** (University of Alberta, Edmonton)

Basic question

Financial problem

- **Standard problem:** optimal portfolio choice with time horizon T , i.e.

$$E[U(x + \vartheta \cdot S_T)] = E\left[U\left(x + \int_0^T \vartheta_u dS_u\right)\right] = \max !$$

over admissible strategies ϑ on $[0, T]$.

- Denote solution by

$$\hat{X}_T = x + \hat{\vartheta}^{(T)} \cdot S_T = x + \int_0^T \hat{\vartheta}(T, u) dS_u.$$

- **Basic question:** How does all that depend on the time horizon T ?

Mathematical problem

- **Semimartingale** S with “usual no arbitrage assumptions”.
- **Utility field** $U(T, y, \omega)$ such that
 - $y \mapsto U(t, y, \omega)$ is standard utility function.
 - $(T, \omega) \mapsto U(T, y, \omega)$ is reasonable stochastic process (right-continuous, of locally integrable variation).
- For each T , we get **random variable** of the form

$$\hat{X}_T = x + \int_0^T \hat{v}(T, u) dS_u.$$

- **What kind of stochastic process is $(\hat{X}_T)_{T \geq 0}$?**
- Double dependence on parameter T makes problem difficult.

Literature ?

- ???
- **very little**
- ???

Main results

Main results in a nutshell

- **1)** The process $\hat{X} = (\hat{X}_T)_{T \geq 0}$ of optimal wealths has a version \tilde{X} which is a **semimartingale**.
- **2)** The optimal strategy field $(\hat{\vartheta}(T, u))_{T \geq 0, 0 \leq u \leq T}$ has a version $\tilde{\vartheta}$ which is **of finite variation with respect to the time horizon T** .
- **3)** The semimartingale \tilde{X} admits a **unique decomposition** as

$$\tilde{X}_T = x + \int_0^T \tilde{\vartheta}_u dS_u + \bar{B}_T \quad \text{for all } T \geq 0$$

for an **integrand $\tilde{\vartheta}$** which does not depend on T and a **predictable process \bar{B}** which is **of finite variation**.

Potential applications

Ideas for applications

- Can replace horizon-dependent strategy $\hat{v}^{(T)}$ by “universal strategy” \bar{v} ; then \bar{B}_T quantifies “utility loss” for T -horizon problem.
- With dependence of strategy on time horizon well understood, can study random horizon models.
- Can study “random endowment” \bar{B}_T as incentive to eliminate influence of time horizon on portfolio choice.
- many more possibilities ...

Outline of proof

Semimartingale version \widetilde{X} for \widehat{X}

Getting a regular version for \hat{X}

- Recall optimal wealth $\hat{X}_T = x + \int_0^T \hat{v}(T, u) dS_u$.
- First prove that $T \mapsto \hat{X}_T$ is **right-continuous in probability**.
 - Similar argument as in **Kramkov/Schachermayer**, who prove continuity with respect to x .
 - Uses right-continuity of U with respect to T (plus technical conditions).
- Next prove that \hat{X} **satisfies (NUPBR) with respect to simple integrands for \hat{X}** .
 - Uses that S satisfies (NUPBR).
 - Uses translation of admissible simple integrands for \hat{X} into general admissible integrands for S .
 - Needs **technical result on good change of measure**.

Getting a semimartingale version for \hat{X}

- **An adapted process satisfying (NUPBR) for simple admissible integrands admits right and left limits along the rationals.**
 - Combines stochastic analysis and mathematical finance.
 - Inspired from **Delbaen/Schachermayer**.
 - Substitute for **Bichteler–Dellacherie**.
- A process which is right-continuous in probability and has left and right limits along the rationals admits an RCLL version.
- **Indirect:** If \hat{X} is no **semimartingale**, then S admits arbitrage; uses again translation of simple admissible stochastic integrals over \hat{X} into general admissible stochastic integrals over S .

Properties of optimal strategy field $\hat{v}(T, u)$

First properties of $\hat{v}(T, u)$

- View $\hat{v}(\cdot, \cdot)$ as process on $\bar{\Omega} := \Omega \times (0, \infty)$ indexed by T .
- First prove that $T \mapsto \hat{v}(T, \cdot)$ is **right-continuous in measure** (for $P \otimes [S]$, morally).
- Then prove that \hat{v} **has a product-measurable version v'** on $[0, \infty) \times \bar{\Omega}$.
 - Uses that $T \mapsto \hat{X}_T$ is right-continuous in probability.
 - Combination with good change of measure gives even continuity in L^2 (locally).
 - Use isometry of stochastic integral after change of measure.
 - ...
- Prove that **diagonal \bar{v} of v' is predictable and S -integrable**.
- How to get **finite variation** property with respect to T ?

Getting finite variation for $T \mapsto \hat{v}(T, \cdot)$

- Again view $\hat{v}(\cdot, \cdot)$ as process indexed by T and defined on $\bar{\Omega} := \Omega \times (0, \infty)$. Use constant filtration $\mathcal{P}_t \equiv \mathcal{P}$ on $\bar{\Omega}$.
- **Idea:** Prove that v' has a version \tilde{v} which is a **semimartingale** (indexed by T) on $\bar{\Omega}$.
 - First show that **mapping** $f \mapsto \int_0^\infty f(T) v'(dT, \cdot)$ **is continuous** on very simple predictable processes f on $\bar{\Omega}$.
 - Exploits structure of v' as family of optimal strategies.
 - Prove that v' is a **quasimartingale** over $\bar{\Omega}$.
 - Deduce existence of version \tilde{v} which is **right-continuous in T** .
 - Now use again continuity and Bichteler–Dellacherie to get **semimartingale** property for \tilde{v} .

Decomposition of \tilde{X} and stochastic Fubini

Idea for decomposition

- $T \mapsto \tilde{v}(T, \cdot)$ is of finite variation; so

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{X}_T &= x + \int_0^T \tilde{v}(T, u) dS_u \\ &= x + \int_0^T \tilde{v}(u, u) dS_u + \int_0^T \int_u^T \tilde{v}(dt, u) dS_u.\end{aligned}$$

- So \bar{v} must be **diagonal** of $\tilde{v}(\cdot, \cdot)$ — and we know that **diagonal \bar{v} of $\tilde{v}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is good integrand for S .**

Decomposition of \tilde{X} : main problem

- How about second term in decomposition?
- Consider the process

$$\bar{B}_T := \int_0^T \int_u^T \tilde{v}(dt, u) dS_u \quad \text{for } T \geq 0 :$$

- Is it of **finite variation** ?
- Is it **predictable** ?
- Can we get rid of double dependence on T somehow?
“Obvious” idea: Use Fubini somehow.

Towards a stochastic Fubini result

- **Idea:** Since $\tilde{\nu}(\cdot, u)$ charges only $(u, T]$, write

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_T &= \int_0^T \int_u^T \tilde{\nu}(dt, u) dS_u &= \int_0^T \left(\tilde{\nu}(\cdot, u) (I_{(0, T]}) \right) dS_u \\ & & \stackrel{(\text{???})}{=} \left(\int_0^T \tilde{\nu}(\cdot, u) dS_u \right) (I_{(0, T]}) . \end{aligned}$$

- **(???)** : How and why ?
- View $\tilde{\nu}$ as process indexed by u and taking values in the space of finite signed measures (with respect to T).
- So we need ...

Fubini ingredients and aspects ...

- ... a **measure-valued stochastic integral** $\phi \cdot M$, with respect to a martingale M , of a measure-valued integrand ϕ .
- ... a version of **Fubini's theorem** for such stochastic integrals.
- ... a result on **predictability**.
- ... why martingale? Again, use **good change of measure** ...
- ... ideas inspired by **Björk/Di Masi/Kabanov/Runggaldier**, but technically different.
- ... generalises several existing results on “stochastic Fubini theorems”.

Assumptions

Assumptions on S

- S is **semimartingale**.
- S satisfies a **variant of “existence of an equivalent σ -martingale measure”**, namely $\mathcal{Z}_{e,\sigma} \neq \emptyset$: There exists local P -martingale $Z > 0$ such that ZS is P - σ -martingale and such that $Z \log Z$ is **locally P -integrable**.

Assumptions on S

- S is **semimartingale**.
- S satisfies a **variant of “existence of an equivalent σ -martingale measure”**, namely $\mathcal{Z}_{e,\sigma} \neq \emptyset$: There exists local P -martingale $Z > 0$ such that ZS is P - σ -martingale and such that $Z \log Z$ is **locally P -integrable**.
 - **Globally weaker** than (NFLVR), since Z need not be a true UI martingale (so need no existence of equivalent measure).
 - **Locally stronger** than (NFLVR), since we want a little bit more than local integrability for Z .
 - Very remarkably, this condition is **invariant under change to $Q \approx P$ if dQ/dP is bounded**.

Assumptions on U

- $y \mapsto U(T, y, \omega)$ is **standard utility function on $[0, \infty)$** .
- $(T, \omega) \mapsto U(T, y, \omega)$ is **adapted, right-continuous and of locally integrable variation**.
- For each finite time horizon T , problem of maximising $E[U(T, x + \vartheta \cdot S_T)]$ over all x -admissible ϑ for S up to time T has **unique solution \hat{X}_T and finite value**.

Assumptions on U

- $y \mapsto U(T, y, \omega)$ is **standard utility function on $[0, \infty)$** .
- $(T, \omega) \mapsto U(T, y, \omega)$ is **adapted, right-continuous and of locally integrable variation**.
- For each finite time horizon T , problem of maximising $E[U(T, x + \vartheta \cdot S_T)]$ over all x -admissible ϑ for S up to time T has **unique solution \hat{X}_T and finite value**.
- For any uniformly bounded sequence of stopping times (τ_n) decreasing to τ and any $0 < a \leq b < \infty$, we have P -a.s.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{a \leq y \leq b} |U(\tau_n, y, \omega) - U(\tau, y, \omega)| = 0.$$

References, etc.

Last words

This is work still in progress (but hopefully finished very soon).
Look for it on my homepage

<http://www.math.ethz.ch/~mschweiz>

Thank you for your attention !