



**HAL**  
open science

**The Dalang–Morton–Willinger version of the  
fundamental theorem of asset pricing for the three steps  
Bid-Ask financial market model**

Zhao Jun, Emmanuel Lépinette

► **To cite this version:**

Zhao Jun, Emmanuel Lépinette. The Dalang–Morton–Willinger version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing for the three steps Bid-Ask financial market model. 2017. hal-01666860v1

**HAL Id: hal-01666860**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01666860v1>**

Preprint submitted on 18 Dec 2017 (v1), last revised 26 Nov 2018 (v6)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The Dalang–Morton–Willinger version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing for the three steps Bid-Ask financial market model.

Zhao Jun,<sup>1</sup> Emmanuel LEPINETTE<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Applied Mathematics, Nanjing University of Science and Technology,  
Nanjing 210094, Jiangsu, P.R. China.  
Email: zhaojun.njust@hotmail.com*

<sup>2</sup> *Ceremade, UMR CNRS 7534, Paris Dauphine University, PSL National Research,  
Place du Maréchal De Lattre De Tassigny,  
75775 Paris cedex 16, France.  
Email: emmanuel.lepinette@ceremade.dauphine.fr*

**Abstract:** We provide an equivalent characterisation of absence of arbitrage opportunity  $NA^w$  for the three steps Bid and Ask financial market model analog to the Dalang–Morton–Willinger theorem formulated for discrete-time financial market models without friction. This result completes the Grigoriev theorem for conic models in the two dimensional case by showing that the set of all terminal liquidation values is closed under  $NA^w$ .

**Keywords and phrases:** Financial market models, Absence of arbitrage opportunities, Liquidation value, Bid and Ask prices, Transaction costs.

*2000 MSC: 60G44, G11-G13.*

## 1. Introduction

In the discrete-time models without friction, it is well known that the self-financing portfolio processes are modelled by their liquidation values. An arbitrage opportunity is the terminal value  $V_T$  at time  $T$  of such a portfolio process, starting from a zero initial capital, and such that  $P(V_T \geq 0) = 1$  and  $V_T \neq 0$ . The Dalang–Morton–Willinger (DMW) theorem [1] formulates an equivalent characterisation of absence of such an arbitrage opportunity  $NA^w$ . Precisely, it states that  $NA^w$  is equivalent to the existence of a martingale

probability measure for the price process and, moreover, under  $\text{NA}^w$  the set of all terminal portfolio processes starting from the zero initial capital is closed in probability.

The models with friction was first considered in the pioneering paper [5] and, later, were extensively studied, e.g. in the papers [6], [4], [9], [3], [8]. With proportional transaction costs, it is classical to express the portfolio processes as stochastic vectors of the invested physical units because, paying transaction costs, the exchanges are allowed between the assets. Actually, while the analog of the self-financing condition property is simple when the portfolio processes are expressed in physical units (see [7, Chapter 3]), there is no simple dynamics for their liquidation values. This is why, most of the characterisations of absence of arbitrage opportunities are formulated by expressing the portfolio processes in physical units. In particular, the Grigoriev theorem [2] provides such a characterization for the two dimensional conic model that may be seen as a financial market model with a Bond and a risky asset defined by its Bid and Ask prices. The condition  $\text{NA}^w$  which is considered is the same than in the frictionless models, i.e. there is no positive terminal liquidation value when starting from the zero initial capital. Equivalently,  $\text{NA}^w$  holds if and only if there is no vector-valued portfolio processes starting from zero and ending up with a terminal value in the first orthant  $\mathbf{R}_+^2$ , see [7, Section 3.2.1]. It appears that the set of all vector-valued terminal portfolio processes is not necessarily closed under  $\text{NA}^w$ , see [7, Example 1, Section 3.2.4 ] so that the Grigoriev theorem is not exactly the analog of the DMW theorem.

In this paper, our main contribution is the version of the DMW theorem we obtain for the three step Bid and Ask model by proving the closedness of the set of all terminal liquidation values. Nevertheless, the proof is quite complicated and does not seem to exhibit a recursive reasoning to extend it to more steps. We conjecture that the theorem holds whatever the number of steps and we leave it as a challenging open problem.

## 2. Model and basic properties

### Notations.

$e_1 = (1, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^2$ .

For a subset  $G$  of  $\mathbf{R}^2$ ,  $\partial G$  is the boundary of  $G$  and  $\text{int } G$  is its interior.

$\mathbf{R}_+^2$  is the set of all vectors in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  having only non negative components.

$\mathbb{E}$  designates the expectation of a random variable. When necessary, we denote it  $\mathbb{E}_Q$  when it is considered under  $Q \sim P$ .

For a set-valued random mapping  $E$ ,  $L^0(E, \mathcal{F})$  is the metric space of all  $E$ -valued random variables which are  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable.

$L^p(E, \mathcal{F}, P)$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty)$  (resp.  $p = \infty$ ), is the normed space of all  $E$ -valued random variables which are  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable and admitting a moment of order  $p$  under the probability  $P$  (resp. bounded).

For any subset  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $L^0(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{F})$  containing  $-L_+^0$  and  $p \in [1, \infty) \cup \{0\}$ , we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}^p$ , the closure of  $\mathcal{X}^p := \mathcal{X} \cap L^p(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{F}, P)$  with respect to the  $L^p$ -topology (the topology of convergence in probability if  $p = 0$ ). If  $Q \sim P$ , we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}^p(Q)$  the closure under  $Q$ .

**The Bid-Ask model.** We consider a discrete-time complete stochastic basis  $(\Omega, \mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t=0, \dots, T}, P)$  to construct a financial market model defined by a Bond  $S^0 = 1$  and one risky asset characterised by Bid and Ask price processes  $S^b$  and  $S^a$  adapted to the filtration  $\mathbb{F}$ .

Equivalently, the model may be defined by a sequence of  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted closed and conic sets  $(\mathbf{G}_t)_{t=0, \dots, T}$  of  $\mathbf{R}^d$ , i.e. such that:

$$\text{Graph } \mathbf{G}_t := \{(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^d : x \in \mathbf{G}_t(\omega)\} \in \mathcal{F}_t \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^d), \quad t = 0, \dots, T.$$

where  $\mathbf{G}_t$ ,  $t = 0, \dots, T$ , is interpreted as the set of all financial positions it is possible to liquidate without any debt. Precisely, let us define the liquidation value process as

$$\mathbf{L}_t(x) := x^1 + (x^2)^+ S_t^b - (x^2)^- S_t^a, \quad x = (x^1, x^2) \in \mathbf{R}^2,$$

where  $x$  is the vector of physical units of assets  $S^0$  and  $S$  respectively held in the portfolio at time  $t$ . We recall the notation  $x^+ = \max(x, 0)$  and  $x^- = -\min(x, 0)$ . We may show that  $\mathbf{L}_t(x) = \sup\{\alpha \in \mathbf{R} : x - \alpha e_1 \in \mathbf{G}_t\}$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{L}_t(x)$  is the maximal amount of cash the agent may obtain when liquidating the financial position  $x$ , and  $\mathbf{G}_t = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^2 : \mathbf{L}_t(x) \geq 0\}$ . This is a particular case of the the Kabanov model with proportional transaction costs, see [7, Chapter 3]. At any time  $t = 0, \dots, T$ , we easily observe that the following properties hold:

**Lemma 2.1.**

1. *The mapping  $x \mapsto \mathbf{L}_t(x)$  is concave hence continuous.*
2.  *$\mathbf{L}_t(x^0, z) = x^0 + \mathbf{L}_t((0, z))$  for all  $x^0 \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$ .*

3.  $x - \mathbf{L}_t(x)e_1 \in \partial G_t$  for all  $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$ .

Note that the boundary  $\partial \mathbf{G}_t = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^2 : \mathbf{L}_t(x) = 0\}$  is composed of two half lines respectively generated by the random vectors  $(S_t^a, -1)$ . and  $(-S_t^b, 1)$ . The positive dual of  $\mathbf{G}_t$  is  $\mathbf{G}_t^* := \{z \in \mathbf{R}^2 : zx \geq 0 : \text{for all } x \in \mathbf{G}_t\}$ . The latter is a random cone of  $\mathbf{R}_+^2$  whose boundary is the union of the two half lines generated by the vectors  $(1, S_t^b)$  and  $(1, S_t^a)$ . We have  $\mathbf{G}_t^* \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \text{int} \mathbf{R}_+^2$ .

**Definition 2.2.** A self-financing portfolio process  $(V_t)_{t=0, \dots, T}$  starting from the initial endowment  $V_{0-}$  is an  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process such that

$$\Delta V_t := V_t - V_{t-1} \in -\mathbf{G}_t, \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, T \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.1)$$

The interpretation is simple; when changing the position  $V_{t-1}$  into a new one  $V_t$  at time  $t$ , we liquidate without any debt the remaining part, i.e.  $-\Delta V_t \in \mathbf{G}_t$ . In the Kabanov model, we also interpret (2.1) as the paiement of proportional transaction costs to change  $V_{t-1}$  into  $V_t$ . We introduce the set of all terminal values at time  $t \leq T$  of portfolio processes starting from the zero initial endowment at time  $u \leq t$  i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}_u^t := \sum_{s=u}^t L^0(-\mathbf{G}_s, \mathcal{F}_s).$$

Associated to this set above, the terminal liquidation values are

$$\mathcal{L}_u^t := \{\mathbf{L}_t(V) : V \in \mathcal{A}_u^t\}.$$

**Remark 2.3.** Notice that for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}_0^T$ ,  $\gamma e_1 = \sum_{t=0}^T (-g_t) \in \mathcal{A}_0^T$  for some  $g_t \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_t, \mathcal{F}_t)$ . Indeed,  $\gamma = \mathbf{L}_T(V_T)$  where  $V_T = \sum_{t=0}^T \Delta V_t$  with  $\Delta V_t \in -L^0(\mathbf{G}_t, \mathcal{F}_t)$  for all  $t$  and  $V_{0-} = 0$ . Moreover,  $\gamma e_1 - V_T = \mathbf{L}_T(V_T)e_1 - V_T \in -\mathbf{G}_T$ . Thus,  $\gamma e_1 = V_T - \hat{g}_T$  where  $\hat{g}_T \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$  and finally  $\gamma e_1 \in \mathcal{A}_0^T$ . Futhermore, we may assume that  $g_t \in L^0(\partial \mathbf{G}_t, \mathcal{F}_t)$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ . Indeed, let us write  $\gamma e_1 = -(g_0 - \mathbf{L}_0(g_0)e_1) - (g_1 + \mathbf{L}_0(g_0)e_1) + \sum_{t=2}^T (-g_t)$  where  $g_0 - \mathbf{L}_0(g_0)e_1 \in \partial \mathbf{G}_0$ . As  $\mathbf{L}_0(g_0) \geq 0$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{L}_0(g_0)e_1 \in \mathbf{R}_+e_1$ , then  $g_1 + \mathbf{L}_0(g_0)e_1 \in \mathbf{G}_1$ . So replace  $g_0$  and  $g_1$  respectively by  $g_0 - \mathbf{L}_0(g_0)e_1$  and  $g_1 + \mathbf{L}_0(g_0)e_1$  and repeat the above procedure for  $t \geq 1$  to obtain that  $g_t \in \partial \mathbf{G}_t$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ .

### 3. The DMW theorem for discrete-time Bid-Ask models

**Definition 3.1.** We say that the financial market model defined by  $\mathbf{G}$  satisfies the weak no-arbitrage property ( $NA^w$ ) if  $\mathcal{L}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T) = \{0\}$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *(NA<sup>w</sup>) holds if and only if  $\mathcal{A}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T) \subseteq L^0(\partial\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that (NA<sup>w</sup>) holds and consider  $V_T \in \mathcal{A}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ . Then,  $\mathbf{L}(V_T) \in \mathcal{L}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T)$  hence  $\mathbf{L}(V_T) = 0$ , i.e.  $V_T \in \partial\mathbf{G}_T$  a.s. Reciprocally, suppose that  $\mathcal{A}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T) \subseteq L^0(\partial\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ . Any  $\gamma_T \in \mathcal{L}_0^T$  is such that  $\gamma_T e_1 \in \mathcal{A}_0^T$  since  $\gamma_T = \mathbf{L}(V_T)$  for some  $V_T \in \mathcal{A}_0^T$  such that  $V_T - \mathbf{L}(V_T)e_1 \in \mathbf{G}_T$ .  $\square$

The assumption of the following lemma is clearly satisfied for the Bid-Ask model.

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $\mathbf{G}_T$  strictly dominates  $\mathbf{R}_+^d$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{R}_+^d \setminus \{0\} \subset \text{int } \mathbf{G}_T$ , then we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T) = \{0\} \iff \mathcal{A}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+^d, \mathcal{F}_T) = \{0\}.$$

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) This part is trivial since  $\mathcal{L}_0^T e_1 = \mathcal{A}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}e_1, \mathcal{F}_T) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_0^T$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Let  $V_T \in \mathcal{A}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+^d, \mathcal{F}_T)$ . Since  $\mathbf{R}_+^d \subseteq \mathbf{G}_T$ , then  $\mathbf{L}_T(V_T) \geq 0$ . So the condition  $\mathcal{L}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T) = \{0\}$  implies  $\mathbf{L}_T(V_T) = 0$ , hence  $V_T \in \partial\mathbf{G}_T \cap \mathbf{R}_+^d = \{0\}$ .  $\square$

The equivalent condition to (NA<sup>w</sup>), as expressed in the lemma above, is studied by Grigoriev [2] and [7, Theorem 3.2.15]. The Grigoriev theorem states that Condition (NA<sup>w</sup>) holds if and only if there exists Consistent Price Systems (CPS) evolving in the positive duals of the solvency sets, precisely martingales  $(Z_t)_{t=0, \dots, T}$  satisfying  $Z_t \in \mathbf{G}_t^* \setminus \{0\}$  for all  $t = 0, \dots, T$ . This result is a weaker form of the Dalang-Morton-Willinger theorem, see [1]. Without friction, the set of all terminal claims obtained from the zero initial endowment appears to be closed. With proportional transaction costs, this is no more the case if the terminal claims are expressed in physical units, see [7, Example 1, Section 3.2.4]. In this paper, we show the Dalang-Morton-Willinger version of the Grigoriev theorem, i.e. we show that under Condition (NA<sup>w</sup>), the set of all terminal liquidation values we get from portfolio processes starting from zero is closed.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that  $T = 1, 2$  or  $T = 3$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1 (NA<sup>w</sup>)
- 2  $\mathcal{L}_0^T$  is closed in probability and  $\mathcal{L}_0^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T) = \{0\}$ .
- 3 There exists  $Q \sim P$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_Q \mathbf{L}_T(V) \leq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{L}_T(V) \in \mathcal{L}_0^T$ .

*Proof.* Note that the implication (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) is immediate by [7, Theorem 2.1.4]. The implications (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) and (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) are also trivial. It remains

to show that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Suppose that (NA<sup>w</sup>) and let us prove that  $\mathcal{L}_0^T$  is closed in probability. Recall that, by the Grigoriev theorem, there exists a CPS  $Z$ , i.e. a martingale  $Z$  such that  $Z_u \in \mathbf{G}_u^* \setminus \{0\}$  for all  $u \leq T$ . For the one step model there is nothing to prove since  $\mathcal{L}_T^T = -L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T)$ . Indeed, if  $\mathbf{L}_T(-g_T) \geq 0$  for some  $g_T \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ , then  $g_T \in (-\mathbf{G}_T) \cap \mathbf{G}_T \subseteq \partial\mathbf{G}_T$  hence  $\mathbf{L}_T(-g_T) = 0$ . Let us consider the two step model.

Assume that the sequence  $\gamma_T^n \in \mathcal{L}_{T-1}^T$  converges to  $\gamma_T^\infty$ . From Remark 2.3, we may suppose that  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -g_{T-1}^n - g_T^n$  where  $g_{T-1}^n \in L^0(\partial\mathbf{G}_{T-1}, \mathcal{F}_{T-1})$  and  $g_T^n \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ .

On the set  $\Lambda_{T-1} := \{\liminf |g_{T-1}^n| = \infty\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ , we normalize the sequences by setting  $\tilde{\gamma}_T^n := \frac{\gamma_T^n}{|g_{T-1}^n|}$ ,  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^n := \frac{g_{T-1}^n}{|g_{T-1}^n|}$  and  $\tilde{g}_T^n := \frac{g_T^n}{|g_{T-1}^n|}$ . Then,

$$\tilde{\gamma}_T^n e_1 = -\tilde{g}_{T-1}^n - \tilde{g}_T^n.$$

As  $|\tilde{g}_{T-1}^n| = 1$ , by passing to some  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable random sequence we may assume that  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^n$  converges to  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in \mathbf{G}_{T-1}$ , see [7, Lemma 2.1.2]. As  $\tilde{\gamma}_T^n e_1$  converges to zero, we deduce that  $\tilde{g}_T^n$  converges to  $\tilde{g}_T^\infty \in \mathbf{G}_T$ . Finally, we get the following equality:

$$\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \tilde{g}_T^\infty = 0$$

where  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in \partial\mathbf{G}_{T-1}$  and  $\tilde{g}_T^\infty \in \mathbf{G}_T$ . Note that, we may define  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty = \tilde{g}_T^\infty = 0$  on  $\Omega \setminus \Lambda_{T-1} \in \mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ . Let us consider a CPS  $Z$ . From,  $Z_T(\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \tilde{g}_T^\infty) = 0$  we deduce that  $Z_{T-1}\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \mathbb{E}(Z_T\tilde{g}_T^\infty|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) = 0$ . As the two terms in the right side of this equality are non negative by duality, we deduce that  $Z_{T-1}\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty = Z_T\tilde{g}_T^\infty = 0$ . Moreover,  $\tilde{g}_T = -\tilde{g}_{T-1}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$  implies that  $0 = \mathbb{E}(Z_T\tilde{g}_T^\infty|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) = Z_{T-1}\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty$ . Then,  $Z_{T-1}\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty = Z_T\tilde{g}_T^\infty$  implies that  $Z_{T-1}$  and  $Z_T$  belongs to the same half-line of  $\mathbf{R}_+^2$ . In particular, since  $Z_T \in \mathbf{G}_T^*$ , we also have  $Z_{T-1} \in \mathbf{G}_{T-1}^*$ . We deduce that  $Z_{T-1}\gamma_T^n e_1 = -Z_{T-1}g_{T-1}^n - Z_Tg_T^n \leq 0$  as  $g_{T-1}^n \in \mathbf{G}_{T-1}$  and  $g_T^n \in \mathbf{G}_T$ . Since  $Z_{T-1}e_1 > 0$ , we deduce that  $\gamma_T^n \leq 0$ . Therefore, we may replace  $g_{T-1}^n$  by  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^n = 0 \in \mathbf{G}_{T-1}$  and  $g_T^n$  by  $\bar{g}_T^n = -\gamma_T^n e_1 \in \mathbf{G}_T$  so that we still have  $\gamma_T^n = -\bar{g}_{T-1}^n - \bar{g}_T^n$ . Finally, we may write on  $\Omega$ ,  $\gamma_T^n = -\hat{g}_{T-1}^n - \hat{g}_T^n$ , where  $\hat{g}_{T-1}^n = g_{T-1}^n 1_{\Omega \setminus \Lambda_{T-1}} \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_{T-1}, \mathcal{F}_{T-1})$  and  $\hat{g}_T^n = g_T^n 1_{\Omega \setminus \Lambda_{T-1}} + \bar{g}_T^n 1_{\Lambda_{T-1}} \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ . By construction,  $\liminf_n |\hat{g}_{T-1}^n| < \infty$  hence we may suppose that  $\hat{g}_{T-1}^n \rightarrow \hat{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_{T-1}, \mathcal{F}_{T-1})$  by [7, Lemma 2.1.2]. We deduce that  $\hat{g}_T^n \rightarrow \hat{g}_T^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$  hence  $\gamma_T^\infty = -\hat{g}_{T-1}^\infty - \hat{g}_T^\infty \in \mathcal{L}_{T-1}^T$ .

Let us consider the three step model. Suppose that the sequence  $\gamma_T^n \in \mathcal{L}_{T-2}^T$  converges to  $\gamma_T^\infty$ . By Remark 2.3, we may suppose that  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -g_{T-2}^n - g_{T-1}^n - g_T^n$  where  $g_t^n \in \partial\mathbf{G}_t$  for  $t = T-2, T-1$  and  $g_T^n \in \mathbf{G}_T$ .

Let us first consider the subset  $\Gamma_{T-2} := \{\liminf |g_{T-2}^n| < \infty\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T-2}$ . By [7, Lemma 2.1.2], we may assume that  $g_{T-2}^n$  is convergent to  $g_{T-2}^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_{T-2}, \mathcal{F}_{T-2})$ . Next we consider the following two sub-cases:

(a) On the set where  $\liminf |g_{T-1}^n| < \infty$ , we may suppose that the sequences  $g_{T-1}^n$  and  $g_T^n$  are both pointwise convergent by [7, Theorem 5.2.3].

(b) On the set  $\Lambda_{T-1} := \{\liminf_n |g_{T-1}^n| = \infty\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ , we normalize the sequences by dividing the term  $|g_{T-1}^n|$  and we get

$$\tilde{\gamma}_T^n e_1 = -\tilde{g}_{T-2}^n - \tilde{g}_{T-1}^n - \tilde{g}_T^n$$

where  $\tilde{\gamma}_T^n := \frac{\gamma_T^n}{|g_{T-1}^n|}$ ,  $\tilde{g}_t^n := \frac{g_t^n}{|g_{T-1}^n|}$  for all  $t = T-2, T-1, T$ . As  $|\tilde{g}_{T-1}^n| = 1$ , up to some  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable random sequence, we may assume that  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^n$  converges to  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-1}$ . As  $\tilde{\gamma}_T^n$  and  $\tilde{g}_{T-2}^n$  both converge to zero, necessarily  $\tilde{g}_T^n$  is convergent to some limit  $\tilde{g}_T^\infty \in \mathbf{G}_T$  and

$$\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \tilde{g}_T^\infty = 0.$$

Since we only consider  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable sets, we may claim that  $\mathbf{L}_T(\tilde{g}_T^\infty) = \mathbf{L}_T(-\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \in \mathcal{L}_{T-2}^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T) = \{0\}$  hence  $\tilde{g}_T^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_T$  by  $NA^w$ .

Assume  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} > 0$  and  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)} < 0$ , the second case where  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} < 0$  and  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)} > 0$  being similar. The equality  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \tilde{g}_T^\infty = 0$  implies that  $\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(1)} < 0$  and  $\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(2)} > 0$ . This implies that we may replace  $g_{T-1}^n$  by  $g_{T-1}^n 1_{g_{T-1}^{n(2)} < 0} + \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty 1_{g_{T-1}^{n(2)} \geq 0}$  and  $g_T^n$  by  $g_T^n 1_{g_T^{n(2)} > 0} + \tilde{g}_T^\infty 1_{g_T^{n(2)} \leq 0}$ . So, we may assume that  $g_{T-1}^{n(2)} < 0$  and  $g_T^{n(2)} > 0$ . Let us define the  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable positive real-valued random variable

$$\beta^n := \frac{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} + g_{T-1}^{n(2)}}{\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)}}.$$

As  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \tilde{g}_T^\infty = 0$ , we rewrite  $\gamma_T^n e_1$  as  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -g_{T-2}^n - (g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) - (g_T^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^\infty)$ . By definition of  $\beta^n$ , the second component of the term  $g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty$  is

$$(g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty)^{(2)} = -g_{T-2}^{n(2)}.$$

Notice that  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-1}$  and  $\tilde{g}_T^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_T$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{L}_{T-1}(\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) = \tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} + \tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)} S_{T-1}^a = 0$  and  $\mathbf{L}_T(\tilde{g}_T^\infty) = \tilde{g}_T^{\infty(1)} + \tilde{g}_T^{\infty(2)} S_T^b = 0$  with  $\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(2)} = -\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)} > 0$ .

So we have  $\frac{\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)}}{\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)}} = -S_{T-1}^a$  and  $\frac{\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(1)}}{\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(2)}} = -S_T^b$ . As  $\tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty = -\tilde{g}_T^\infty$ , we have



$S_{T-1}^a = S_T^b$ . The first component of the term  $g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
(g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty)^{(1)} &= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} \\
&= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} - \frac{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} + g_{T-1}^{n(2)}}{\tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)}} \tilde{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} \\
&= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} + (g_{T-2}^{n(2)} + g_{T-1}^{n(2)}) S_{T-1}^a \\
&= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} + g_{T-1}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a + g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a \\
&= g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a
\end{aligned}$$

since  $g_{T-1}^{n(1)} + g_{T-1}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a = \mathbf{L}_{T-1}(g_{T-1}^n) = 0$ .

Then,  $g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty = (g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a, -g_{T-2}^{n(2)})$ . Notice that it satisfies the condition  $\liminf |g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty| < \infty$  since  $S_{T-1}^a \in L^\infty(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{F}_{T-1})$  and  $\liminf |g_{T-2}^{n(2)}| < \infty$ . Liquidate this position at time  $T-1$  to get

$$\mathbf{L}_{T-1}(g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) = g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a - g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} \geq 0} - g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} < 0}.$$

This implies that  $\mathbf{L}_{T-1}((g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} \geq 0}) = 0$ , i.e.,

$$(g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} \geq 0} \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-1}.$$

Otherwise, if we liquidate the position at time  $T$ , we obtain that

$$\mathbf{L}_T(g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) = g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_T^b - g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_T^a \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} \geq 0} - g_{T-2}^{n(2)} S_T^b \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} < 0}.$$

This implies that  $\mathbf{L}_T((g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} < 0}) = 0$ , i.e.,

$$(g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} < 0} \in \partial \mathbf{G}_T.$$

About the term  $g_T^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^\infty$ , it is easy to see that the second component is zero since  $\beta^n = \frac{g_T^{n(2)}}{\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(2)}}$ . The first component is

$$\begin{aligned}
(g_T^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^\infty)^{(1)} &= g_T^{n(1)} - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^{\infty(1)} \\
&= g_T^{n(1)} - \frac{g_T^{n(2)}}{\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(2)}} \tilde{g}_T^{\infty(1)} \\
&= g_T^{n(2)} \left( \frac{g_T^{n(1)}}{g_T^{n(2)}} - \frac{\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(1)}}{\tilde{g}_T^{\infty(2)}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

As  $g_T^n \in \mathbf{G}_T$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_T(g_T^n) = g_T^{n(1)} + g_T^{n(2)} S_T^b \geq 0$ . So we have  $\frac{g_T^{n(1)}}{g_T^{n(2)}} \geq -S_T^b = \frac{\bar{g}_T^{\infty(1)}}{\bar{g}_T^{\infty(2)}}$ . Thus,  $(g_T^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^\infty)^{(1)} \geq 0$ , i.e.,

$$g_T^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^\infty \in \mathbf{R}_+ e_1.$$

On the set  $\Gamma_{T-2}$ , we finally obtain that  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -g_{T-2}^n - \hat{g}_{T-1}^n - \hat{g}_T^n$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{T-1}^n &:= g_{T-1}^n 1_{\Omega \setminus \Lambda_{T-1}} + (g_{T-1}^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} \geq 0} 1_{\Lambda_{T-1}} \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_{T-1}, \mathcal{F}_{T-1}), \\ \hat{g}_T^n &:= g_T^n 1_{\Omega \setminus \Lambda_{T-1}} + (g_T^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_{T-2}^{n(2)} < 0} 1_{\Lambda_{T-1}} \\ &\quad + (g_T^n - \beta^n \tilde{g}_T^\infty) 1_{\Lambda_{T-1}} \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T). \end{aligned}$$

By construction, notice that  $\liminf_n |\hat{g}_{T-1}^n| < \infty$  on  $\Gamma_{T-2}$ . By [7, Lemma 2.1.2], we may assume that  $\hat{g}_{T-1}^n$  is convergent to  $\hat{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_{T-1}, \mathcal{F}_{T-1})$  at least for some  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable subsequence  $n_k(\omega)$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ . As we already know that  $g_{T-2}^n \rightarrow g_{T-2}^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_{T-2}, \mathcal{F}_{T-2})$ , we still have  $g_{T-2}^{n_k} \rightarrow g_{T-2}^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_{T-2}, \mathcal{F}_{T-2})$  even if  $g_{T-2}^{n_k}$  is no more  $\mathcal{F}_{T-2}$ -measurable. We deduce that  $g_T^{n_k} \rightarrow g_T^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$  and, finally,  $\gamma_T^n 1_{\Gamma_{T-2}} = -g_{T-2}^\infty - \hat{g}_{T-1}^\infty - \hat{g}_T^\infty \in \mathcal{L}_{T-2}^T$ .

On the set  $\Lambda_{T-2} := \{\liminf |g_{T-2}^n| = \infty\}$ , we use the normalization procedure to get

$$\bar{\gamma}_T^n e_1 = -\bar{g}_{T-2}^n - \bar{g}_{T-1}^n - \bar{g}_T^n,$$

where  $\bar{\gamma}_T^n := \frac{\gamma_T^n}{|g_{T-2}^n|}$ ,  $\bar{g}_t^n := \frac{g_t^n}{|g_{T-2}^n|}$  for  $t \geq T-2$ . As  $\liminf |\bar{g}_{T-2}^n| = 1$ , we may argue as we did on the complementary set  $\Gamma_{T-2}$  and assume that  $\bar{g}_t^n \rightarrow \bar{g}_t^\infty \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_t, \mathcal{F}_t)$  for  $t \geq T-2$  such that

$$\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \bar{g}_T^\infty = 0$$

with  $\bar{g}_t^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_t$  if  $t = T-2, T-1$  and  $|\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty| = 1$ . Since  $\mathbf{L}_T(\bar{g}_T^\infty) = \mathbf{L}_T(-\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty - \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \in \mathcal{L}_{T-2}^T \cap L^0(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathcal{F}_T) = \{0\}$ , we also get that  $\bar{g}_T^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_T$ .

For any CPS  $Z$ , taking the conditional expectation knowing  $\mathcal{F}_{T-2}$  in the equality  $Z_T(\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \bar{g}_T^\infty) = 0$ , we deduce that

$$Z_{T-2} \bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \mathbb{E}(Z_{T-1} \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty | \mathcal{F}_{T-2}) + \mathbb{E}(Z_T \bar{g}_T^\infty | \mathcal{F}_{T-2}) = 0.$$

All the terms of the l.h.s. being non negative, we finally obtain that  $Z_t \bar{g}_t^\infty = 0$  for all  $t \geq T-2$ . As  $\bar{g}_T^\infty = -\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty - \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable, taking the conditional expectation knowing  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$  in the equality  $Z_T \bar{g}_T^\infty = 0$ , we deduce

that  $Z_{T-1}\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0$ . But  $Z_{T-1}(\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \bar{g}_T^\infty) = 0$  hence  $Z_{T-1}\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = 0$ . Since  $|\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty| = 1$ , the two equalities  $Z_{T-2}\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = Z_{T-1}\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = 0$  implies that  $Z_{T-1}$  and  $Z_{T-2}$  belong to a same half line of  $\mathbf{G}_{T-1}^* \cap \mathbf{G}_{T-2}^*$ .

Assume  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(1)} > 0$  and  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(2)} < 0$ , the other case where  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(1)} < 0$  and  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(2)} > 0$  is similar. Up to some  $\mathcal{F}_{T-2}$ -measurable random sequence  $(\tilde{n}_k)_k$  we may assume that  $g_{T-2}^{n(1)} > 0$  and  $g_{T-2}^{n(2)} < 0$ . We then consider the following two sub cases:

(c) When  $\bar{g}_T^\infty \neq 0$ . In the case where  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty \neq 0$ , the two equalities  $Z_{T-1}\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = Z_{T-1}\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0$  implies that  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty$  and  $\bar{g}_T^\infty$  are collinear. As  $Z_T(\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \bar{g}_T^\infty) = 0$ , we have  $Z_T(\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) = 0$  where  $Z_T\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = Z_T\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0$  since  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in R_+\bar{g}_T^\infty$ . It follows that  $Z_T\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = 0$ . In the case where  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = 0$ , the equality  $Z_T(\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) = 0$  implies that  $Z_T\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = 0$ . Finally,  $Z_{T-2}\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = Z_{T-1}\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = Z_T\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = 0$  implies that  $Z_{T-2}$ ,  $Z_{T-1}$  and  $Z_T$  are both collinear with some positive coefficients of collinearity when both  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty$  and  $\bar{g}_T^\infty$  are different from zero. This implies that  $Z_T \in \mathbf{G}_t^*$  for all  $t \geq T-2$ . Since  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -g_{T-2}^n - g_{T-1}^n - g_T^n$ , we deduce that  $Z_T\gamma_T^n e_1 = -(Z_T g_{T-2}^n + Z_T g_{T-1}^n + Z_T g_T^n)$   $Z_T\gamma_T^n e_1 \leq 0$  hence  $\gamma_T^n \leq 0$  on the set  $\Lambda_{T-2} \cap \{\bar{g}_T^\infty \neq 0\}$ .

(d) When  $\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0$ ,  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = 0$ . Let us define the  $\mathcal{F}_{T-2}$ -measurable positive real-valued random variable as

$$\bar{\beta}^n := \frac{g_{T-2}^{n(2)}}{\bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(2)}}.$$

Since  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = -\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty$ ,  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} < 0$  and  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)} > 0$ , we may replace  $g_{T-1}^n$  by  $g_{T-1}^n 1_{\{g_{T-1}^{n(1)} < 0; g_{T-1}^{n(2)} > 0\}} + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty 1_{\Omega \setminus \{g_{T-1}^{n(1)} < 0; g_{T-1}^{n(2)} > 0\}}$  and assume that  $g_{T-1}^{n(1)} < 0$  and  $g_{T-1}^{n(2)} > 0$ . As  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty + \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = 0$ , we rewrite  $\gamma_T^n e_1$  as  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -(g_{T-2}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty) - (g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) - g_T^n$  where  $g_{T-2}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = 0$  by construction. As  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-2}$  and  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_{T-2}(\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty) = \bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(1)} + \bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(2)} S_{T-2}^a = 0$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{T-1}(\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) = \bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} + \bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)} S_{T-1}^b = 0$ . So we have  $\frac{\bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(1)}}{\bar{g}_{T-2}^{\infty(2)}} = -S_{T-2}^a$  and  $\frac{\bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)}}{\bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)}} = -S_{T-1}^b$ . As  $\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = -\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty$ ,  $S_{T-2}^a = S_{T-1}^b$ .

The second component of  $g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty$  is  $(g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty)^{(2)} = -g_T^{n(2)}$ . Thus,  $\bar{\beta}^n = \frac{g_{T-1}^{n(2)} + g_T^{n(2)}}{\bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)}}$ , which is  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable. Notice that  $g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty$

is also  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable. Its first component is

$$\begin{aligned}
(g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty)^{(1)} &= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} \\
&= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} - \frac{g_{T-1}^{n(2)} + g_T^{n(2)}}{\bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(2)}} \bar{g}_{T-1}^{\infty(1)} \\
&= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} + (g_{T-1}^{n(2)} + g_T^{n(2)}) S_{T-1}^b \\
&= g_{T-1}^{n(1)} + g_{T-1}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b + g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b \\
&= g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b
\end{aligned}$$

since  $g_{T-1}^{n(1)} + g_{T-1}^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b = \mathbf{L}_{T-1}(g_{T-1}^n) = 0$ . Then

$$g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = (g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b, -g_T^{n(2)})$$

so that

$$\gamma_T^n = -g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b - g_T^{n(1)}.$$

Liquidate the position  $g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty$  at time  $T - 1$  to get

$$\mathbf{L}_{T-1}(g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) = g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b - g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^a \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} > 0} - g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} \leq 0}.$$

This implies that  $\mathbf{L}_{T-1}((g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} \leq 0}) = 0$ , i.e.,

$$(g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} \leq 0} \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-1}.$$

Similarly we deduce by liquidating it at time  $T - 2$  that

$$(g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty) \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} > 0} \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-2}.$$

If we set  $h_{T-1}^n := g_{T-2}^n + g_{T-1}^n$ , then

$$h_{T-1}^n = g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty = (g_T^{n(2)} S_{T-1}^b, -g_T^{n(2)})$$

belongs to the boundary of  $\mathbf{G}_{T-2}$  or  $\mathbf{G}_{T-1}$ .

In the case where  $g_T^{n(2)} \leq 0$ , it is possible to change  $g_{T-1}^n$  into  $g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty$  which still belongs to the boundary of  $\mathbf{G}_{T-1}$ .

On the set  $\{g_T^{n(2)} > 0\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ , we consider two sub cases. On the set  $\{\sup_n g_T^{n(2)} < \infty\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ , up to a convex combination (see [7, Theorem

A.2.3]), we assume that  $g_T^{n(2)}$  is convergent. As  $\gamma_T^n = -g_T^{n(2)}S_{T-1}^b - g_T^{n(1)}$ ,  $g_T^{n(1)}$  is also convergent, i.e.  $g_T^n$  converges to  $g_T \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ . Then  $\gamma_T^\infty e_1 = \lim_n(-g_{T-2}^n - g_{T-1}^n - g_T^n) = \lim_n(-g_{T-2}^n - g_{T-1}^n - g_T)$ , i.e. we may replace  $g_T^n$  by  $g_T$ . By the initial normalization on  $\Lambda_{T-2}$ , we then get that  $\gamma_T^n = -g_T^{(2)}S_{T-1}^b - g_T^{(1)}$  instead of  $\gamma_T^n = -g_T^{n(2)}S_{T-1}^b - g_T^{n(1)}$ , i.e.  $\gamma_T^n$  does not depend on  $n$  any more: we may write  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -g_{T-2}^1 - g_{T-1}^1 - g_T^1$  where  $g_t^1$  is a constant substitution of  $g_t^n$  for each  $t \geq T-2$ .

On the  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable set  $\{\sup_n g_T^{n(2)} = \infty\}$ , first recall that for any CPS  $Z$ ,  $Z_{T-2}$  and  $Z_{T-1}$  are colinear vectors of  $\mathbf{R}_+^2$  orthogonal to the line generated by  $\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty$ . Through the normalizing procedure which consists in dividing by  $g_T^{n(2)}$  on both sides of the equality  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -h_{T-1}^n - g_T^n$ , we get that

$$\tilde{h}_{T-1} + \tilde{g}_T = 0$$

where  $\tilde{h}_{T-1} \in L^0(\mathbf{R}\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty, \mathcal{F}_{T-1})$  and  $\tilde{g}_T \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_T, \mathcal{F}_T)$ . Taking conditional expectation knowing  $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$  in the equality  $Z_T(\tilde{h}_{T-1} + \tilde{g}_T) = 0$ , we deduce that  $Z_{T-1}\tilde{h}_{T-1} + \mathbb{E}(Z_T\tilde{g}_T|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) = 0$ . As  $Z_{T-1}\tilde{h}_{T-1} = 0$  and  $Z_T\tilde{g}_T \geq 0$ , we then deduce that  $Z_T\tilde{g}_T = 0$  hence  $Z_T\tilde{h}_{T-1} = 0$ . The equality  $Z_{T-1}\tilde{h}_{T-1} = Z_T\tilde{h}_{T-1} = 0$  with  $\tilde{h}_{T-1} \neq 0$  implies that  $Z_T$  and  $Z_{T-1}$  also belongs to the same half line. Finally  $Z_T \in \mathbf{G}_t^*$  for all  $t \geq T-2$  and, by a similar argument as above, we deduce that  $\gamma_T^n \leq 0$ .

Gathering with the case (c) where  $\bar{g}_T^\infty \neq 0$ , we can conclude that on the  $\mathcal{F}_{T-2}$ -measurable set  $\Lambda_{T-2}$ , we have  $\gamma_T^n e_1 = -g_{T-2}^1 - \hat{g}_{T-1}^n - \hat{g}_T^n$  where

$$\hat{g}_t^n := \sum_{i=1}^4 \hat{g}_t^{ni} \in L^0(\mathbf{G}_t, \mathcal{F}_t), \quad t \geq T-1,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{T-1}^{n1} &:= (\|g_{T-2}^1\|\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty)\mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty \neq 0}, \\ \hat{g}_{T-1}^{n2} &:= (-g_{T-2}^1 + g_{T-1}^n - \bar{\beta}^n \bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty)\mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0}\mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} \leq 0}, \\ \hat{g}_{T-1}^{n2} &:= g_{T-1}^1\mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0}\mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} > 0}\mathbf{I}_{\sup_n g_T^{n(2)} < \infty}, \\ \hat{g}_{T-1}^{n2} &:= (-g_{T-2}^1)\mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0}\mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} > 0}\mathbf{I}_{\sup_n g_T^{n(2)} = \infty} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{g}_T^{n1} &:= (\|g_{T-2}^1\|\bar{g}_T^\infty - \gamma_T^n e_1) \mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty \neq 0}, \\
\hat{g}_T^{n2} &:= g_T^n \mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0} \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} \leq 0}, \\
\hat{g}_T^{n3} &:= g_T^1 \mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0} \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} > 0} \mathbf{I}_{\sup_n g_T^{n(2)} < \infty}, \\
\hat{g}_T^{n4} &:= (-\gamma_T^n e_1) \mathbf{I}_{\bar{g}_T^\infty = 0} \mathbf{I}_{g_T^{n(2)} > 0} \mathbf{I}_{\sup_n g_T^{n(2)} = \infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can easily see that  $\hat{g}_{T-1}^{ni} \in \partial \mathbf{G}_{T-1}$  when  $i = 2, 3, 4$  and  $\hat{g}_T^{ni} \in \mathbf{G}_T$  for all  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . The expressions of  $\hat{g}_t^{n1}$ ,  $t = T-1, T$  are obtained from the following equality:  $g_{T-2}^n = \|g_{T-2}^n\|\bar{g}_{T-2}^n = \|g_{T-2}^n\|\bar{g}_{T-2}^\infty = -\|g_{T-2}^n\|(\bar{g}_{T-1}^\infty + \bar{g}_T^\infty)$  with  $n = 1$  and  $\gamma_T^1 e_1 = -g_{T-2}^1 - (-g_{T-2}^1) - (-\gamma_T^1 e_1)$ .

Since the sequence  $(g_{T-2}^n)_{n \geq 1}$  is replaced by the constant  $g_{T-2}^1$ , we may follow the reasoning we did on the complementary  $\Gamma_{T-2}$  so that we finally obtain  $\gamma_T^\infty e_1 = -g_{T-2}^\infty - g_{T-1}^\infty - g_T^\infty$  where  $g_t^\infty \in \mathbf{G}_t$  for all  $t = T-2, T-1, T$  and  $\gamma_T^\infty = \mathbf{L}_T(\gamma_T^\infty e_1) \in \mathcal{L}_{T-2}^T$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] Dalang, E. C., Morton, A. and Willinger, W. Equivalent martingale measures and no-arbitrage in stochastic securities market models. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 1990, 29, 185-201.  
Hedging of american options under transaction costs (2008). *Finance and Stochastics*, 2009, 13, 1, 105-119.
- [2] Grigoriev P. On low dimensional case in the fundamental asset pricing theorem under transaction costs. *Statist. Decisions*, 23 (2005), 1, 33-48.
- [3] Guasoni P., Lépinette E. and Rásonyi M. The fundamental theorem of asset pricing under transaction costs. *Finance and Stochastics*, 2012, 16, 4, 741-777.
- [4] Guasoni P., Rásonyi M. and Schachermayer, W. The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for continuous processes under small transaction costs. *Annals of Finance*, 2010, 6, 2, 157-191.
- [5] Jouini E., Kallal H. Martingales and arbitrage in securities markets with transaction costs. *J. Econ. Theory*, 1995, 66, 178-97.
- [6] Schachermayer W. The fundamental theorem of asset pricing under proportional transaction costs in finite discrete time. *Mathematical Finance*, 2004, 14, 1, 19-48.

- [7] Kabanov Y., Safarian M. Markets with transaction costs. Mathematical Theory. Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [8] Kabanov Y., Lépinette E. Consistent price systems and arbitrage opportunities of the second kind in models with transaction costs. Finance and Stochastics, 16, 2011, 1, 135-154.
- [9] Rásonyi M. Arbitrage with transaction costs revisited. Optimality and Risk: Modern Trends in Mathematical Finance. Eds. Delbaen F., Rásonyi M., Stricker Ch. Springer, BerlinHeidelbergNew York, 2009.