



MULTIPLE-PRIORS OPTIMAL INVESTMENT IN DISCRETE TIME FOR UNBOUNDED UTILITY FUNCTION

Romain Blanchard, Laurence Carassus

► To cite this version:

Romain Blanchard, Laurence Carassus. MULTIPLE-PRIORS OPTIMAL INVESTMENT IN DISCRETE TIME FOR UNBOUNDED UTILITY FUNCTION. 2018. hal-01883787

HAL Id: hal-01883787

<https://hal.science/hal-01883787>

Preprint submitted on 28 Sep 2018

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.

MULTIPLE-PRIORS OPTIMAL INVESTMENT IN DISCRETE TIME FOR UNBOUNDED UTILITY FUNCTION

BY ROMAIN BLANCHARD

LMR, Université Reims Champagne-Ardenne (URCA), France.

AND

BY LAURENCE CARASSUS

Research Center, Léonard de Vinci Pôle Universitaire and LMR, URCA, France.

This paper investigates the problem of maximizing expected terminal utility in a discrete-time financial market model with a finite horizon under non-dominated model uncertainty. We use a dynamic programming framework together with measurable selection arguments to prove that under mild integrability conditions, an optimal portfolio exists for an unbounded utility function defined on the half-real line.

1. Introduction. We consider investors trading in a multi-period and discrete-time financial market. We study the problem of terminal wealth expected utility maximisation under Knightian uncertainty. It was first introduced by F. Knight (Knight, 1921) and refers to the “unknown unknown”, or uncertainty, as opposed to the “known unknown”, or risk. This concept is very appropriate in the context of financial mathematics as it describes accurately market behaviors which are becoming more and more surprising. The belief of investors are modeled with a set of probability measures rather than a single one. This can be related to model misspecification issues or model risk and has triggered a renewed and strong interest by practitioners and academics alike.

The axiomatic theory of the classical expected utility was initiated by (von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1947). They provided conditions on investor preferences under which the expected utility of a contingent claim X can be expressed as $E_P U(X)$ where P is a given probability measure and U is a so-called utility function. The problem of maximising the von Neumann and Morgenstern expected utility has been extensively studied, we refer to (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2005) and (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2006) for the discrete-time case and to (Kramkov and Schachermayer, 1999) and (Schachermayer, 2001) for the continuous-time one. In the presence of Knightian uncertainty, (Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989) provided a pioneering contribution by extending the axiomatic of von Neumann and Morgenstern. In this case, under suitable conditions on the investor preferences, the utility functional is of the form $\inf_{P \in Q^T} E_P U(X)$ where Q^T is the set of all possible probability measures representing the agent beliefs. Most of the literature on the so-called multiple-priors or robust expected utility maximisation assumes that Q^T is dominated by a reference measure. We refer to (Föllmer, Schied and Weber, 2009) for an extensive survey.

However assuming the existence of a dominating reference measure does not always provide the required degree of generality from an economic and practical perspective. Indeed, uncertain volatility models (see (Avellaneda, Levy and Paras, 1996), (Denis and

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 93E20, 91B70, 91B16 Secondary 91G10, 28B20, 49L20

Keywords and phrases: Knightian uncertainty; multiple-priors; optimal investment; non-dominated model

Martini, 2006), (Lyons, 1995)) are concrete examples where this hypothesis fails. On the other hand, assuming a non-dominated set of probability measures significantly raises the mathematical difficulty of the problem as some of the usual tools of probability theory do not apply. In the multiple-priors non-dominated case, (Denis and Kervarec, 2013) obtained the existence of an optimal strategy, a worst case measure as well as some “min-max” results under some compactness assumption on the set of probability measures and with a bounded (from above and below) utility function. This result is obtained in the continuous-time case. In the discrete-time case, (Nutz, 2016) (where further references to multiple-priors non-dominated problematic can be found) obtained the first existence result without any compactness assumption on the set of probability measures but for a bounded (from above) utility function. We also mention two articles subsequent to our contribution. The first one (see (Bartl, 2016)) provides a dual representation in the case of an exponential utility function with a random endowment and the second one (see (Neufeld and Sikic, 2016)) study a market with frictions in the spirit of (Pennanen and Perkkio, 2012) for a bounded from above utility function.

To the best of our knowledge, this paper provides the first general result for unbounded utility functions assuming a non-dominated set of probability measures (and without compactness assumption). This includes for example, the useful case of Constant Relative Risk Aversion utility functions (*i.e.* logarithm or power functions). In Theorem 1.11, we give sufficient conditions for the existence of an optimizer to our “maxmin” problem (see Definition 1.9). We work under the framework of (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015) and (Nutz, 2016). The market is governed by a non-dominated set of probability measures \mathcal{Q}^T that determines which events are relevant or not. Assumption 1.1, which is related to measurability issues, is the only assumption made on \mathcal{Q}^T and is the cornerstone of the proof. We introduce two integrability assumptions. The first one (Assumption 3.1) is related to measurability and continuity issues. The second one (Assumption 3.5) replaces the boundedness assumption of (Nutz, 2016) and allows us to use auxiliary functions which play the role of properly integrable bounds for the value functions at each step. The no-arbitrage condition is essential as well, we use the one introduced in (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015) and propose a “quantitative” characterisation in the spirit of (Jacod and Shiryaev, 1998) and (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2005). Finally, we introduce an alternative “strong” no-arbitrage condition (the *sNA*, see Definition 2.4) and prove in Theorem 3.6 that under the *sNA* condition, Theorem 1.11 applies to a large range of settings.

As in (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015) and (Nutz, 2016) our proof relies heavily on measure theory tools, namely on analytic sets. Those sets display the nice property of being stable by projection or countable unions and intersections. However they fail to be stable by complementation, hence the sigma-algebra generated by analytic sets contains sets that are not analytic which leads to significant measurability issues. Such difficulties arise for instance in Lemma 3.26, where we are still able to prove some tricky measurability properties, as well as in Proposition 3.30 which is pivotal in solving the dynamic programming. Note as well, that we have identified (and corrected) a small issue in (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Lemma 4.12) which is also used in (Nutz, 2016) to prove some important measurability properties. Indeed it is not enough in order to have joint-measurability of a function $\theta(\omega, x)$ to assume that $\theta(\cdot, x)$ is measurable and $\theta(\omega, \cdot)$ is lower-semicontinuous, one has to assume for example that $\theta(\omega, \cdot)$ is convex (see Lemma 4.5 as well as the counterexample 4.4).

To solve our optimisation problem we follow a similar approach as (Nutz, 2016). We first consider a one-period case with strategy in \mathbb{R}^d . To “glue” together the solutions found in the one-period case we use dynamic programming as in (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2005), (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2006), (Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016), (Carassus, Rásonyi and Rodrigues, 2015), (Nutz, 2016) and (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016) together with measurable selection arguments (Auman and Jankov-von Neumann Theorems).

In the remainder of the introduction, we recall some important properties of analytic sets, present our framework and state our main result. In section 2 we prove our quantitative version of the multiple-priors no-arbitrage condition. In section 3 we solve the expected utility maximisation problem, first in the one period case. Finally, section 4 collects some technical results and proofs as well as some counter-examples to (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Lemma 4.12).

1.1. Polar sets and universal sigma-algebra. For any Polish space X (i.e. complete and separable metric space), we denote by $\mathcal{B}(X)$ its Borel sigma-algebra and by $\mathfrak{P}(X)$ the set of all probability measures on $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$. We recall that $\mathfrak{P}(X)$ endowed with the weak topology is a Polish space (see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Propositions 7.20 p127, 7.23 p131)). If P in $\mathfrak{P}(X)$, $\mathcal{B}_P(X)$ will be the completion of $\mathcal{B}(X)$ with respect to P and the universal sigma-algebra is defined by $\mathcal{B}_c(X) := \bigcap_{P \in \mathfrak{P}(X)} \mathcal{B}_P(X)$. It is clear that $\mathcal{B}(X) \subset \mathcal{B}_c(X)$. In the rest of the paper we will use the same notation for P in $\mathfrak{P}(X)$ and for its (unique) extension on $\mathcal{B}_c(X)$. A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ (where Y is an other Polish space) is universally-measurable or $\mathcal{B}_c(X)$ -measurable (resp. Borel-measurable or $\mathcal{B}(X)$ -measurable) if for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$, $f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{B}_c(X)$ (resp. $f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{B}(X)$). Similarly we will speak of universally-adapted or universally-predictable (resp. Borel-adapted or Borel-predictable) processes.

For a given $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathfrak{P}(X)$, a set $N \subset X$ is called a \mathcal{P} -polar if for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists some $A_P \in \mathcal{B}_c(X)$ such that $P(A_P) = 0$ and $N \subset A_P$. We say that a property holds true \mathcal{P} -quasi-surely (q.s.), if it is true outside a \mathcal{P} -polar set. Finally we say that a set is of \mathcal{P} -full measure if its complement is a \mathcal{P} -polar set.

1.2. Analytic sets. An analytic set of X is the continuous image of a Polish space, see (Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 12.24 p447). We denote by $\mathcal{A}(X)$ the set of analytic sets of X and recall some key properties that will often be used in the rest of the paper without further references (see also (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Chapter 7) for more details on analytic sets). The projection of an analytic set is an analytic set (see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.39 p165)) and the countable union, intersection or cartesian product of analytic sets is an analytic set (see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Corollary 7.35.2 p160, Proposition 7.38 p165)). However the complement of an analytic set does not need to be an analytic set. We denote by $\mathcal{CA}(X) := \{A \in X, X \setminus A \in \mathcal{A}(X)\}$ the set of all coanalytic sets of X . We have that (see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.36 p161, Corollary 7.42.1 p169))

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{B}(X) \subset \mathcal{A}(X) \cap \mathcal{CA}(X) \text{ and } \mathcal{A}(X) \cup \mathcal{CA}(X) \subset \mathcal{B}_c(X).$$

Now, for $D \in \mathcal{A}(X)$, a function $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is lower-semianalytic or lsa (resp. upper-semianalytic or usa) on X if $\{x \in X \mid f(x) < c\} \in \mathcal{A}(X)$ (resp. $\{x \in X \mid f(x) > c\} \in \mathcal{A}(X)$) for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote by $\mathcal{LSA}(X)$ (resp. $\mathcal{USA}(X)$) the set of all lsa (resp. usa) functions

on X . A function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ (where Y is another Polish space) is analytically-measurable if for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$, $f^{-1}(B)$ belongs to the sigma-algebra generated by $\mathcal{A}(X)$. From (1) it is clear that if f is lsa or usa or analytically-measurable then f is $\mathcal{B}_c(X)$ -measurable, again this will be used through the paper without further references.

1.3. Measurable spaces, stochastic kernels and definition of \mathcal{Q}^T . We fix a time horizon $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and introduce a sequence $(\Omega_t)_{1 \leq t \leq T}$ of Polish spaces. We denote by $\Omega^t := \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_t$, with the convention that Ω^0 is reduced to a singleton. An element of Ω^t will be denoted by $\omega^t = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_t) = (\omega^{t-1}, \omega_t)$ for $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_t) \in \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_t$ and $(\omega^{t-1}, \omega_t) \in \Omega^{t-1} \times \Omega_t$ (to avoid heavy notation we drop the dependency in ω_0). It is well known that $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^t) = \mathcal{B}(\Omega^{t-1}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\Omega_t)$, see (Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 4.44 p149). However we have only that $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^{t-1}) \otimes \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega_t) \subset \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$, which makes the use of the Projection Theorem problematic and enlighten why analytic sets are introduced. For all $0 \leq t \leq T-1$, we denote by SK_{t+1} the set of universally-measurable stochastic kernel on Ω_{t+1} given Ω^t (see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Definition 7.12 p134, Lemma 7.28 p174)). Fix some $1 \leq t \leq T$, $P_{t-1} \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega^{t-1})$ and $p_t \in SK_t$. Using Fubini's Theorem, see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.45 p175), we set for all $A \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$

$$P_{t-1} \otimes p_t(A) := \int_{\Omega^{t-1}} \int_{\Omega_t} 1_A(\omega^{t-1}, \omega_t) p_t(d\omega_t, \omega^{t-1}) P_{t-1}(d\omega^{t-1}).$$

For all $0 \leq t \leq T-1$, we consider the random sets $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$: $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ can be seen as the set of possible models for the $t+1$ -th period given the state ω^t until time t .

Assumption 1.1 For all $0 \leq t \leq T-1$, \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} is a non-empty and convex valued random set such that $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) = \{(\omega^t, P), P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\} \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$.

From the Jankov-von Neumann Theorem, see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.49 p182), there exists some analytically-measurable $q_{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ such that for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $q_{t+1}(\cdot, \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ (recall that for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t) \neq \emptyset$). In other words $q_{t+1} \in SK_{t+1}$ is a universally-measurable selector of \mathcal{Q}_{t+1} . For all $1 \leq t \leq T$ we define $\mathcal{Q}^t \subset \mathfrak{P}(\Omega^t)$ by

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{Q}^t := \{Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_t, Q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_1, q_{s+1} \in SK_{s+1}, q_{s+1}(\cdot, \omega^s) \in \mathcal{Q}_{s+1}(\omega^s) \text{ } Q_s\text{-a.s. } \forall 1 \leq s \leq t-1\},$$

where if $Q_t = Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_t \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ we write for any $2 \leq s \leq t$ $Q_s := Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_s$ and $Q_s \in \mathcal{Q}^s$. For any fixed $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$, E_P denotes the expectation under P .

1.4. The traded assets and strategies. Let $S := \{S_t, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ be a universally-adapted d -dimensional process where for $0 \leq t \leq T$, $S_t = (S_t^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ represents the price of d risky securities in the financial market in consideration. We make the following assumptions which were already stated in (Nutz, 2016).

Assumption 1.2 The process S is Borel-adapted.

Remark 1.3 If Assumption 1.2 is not postulated, we cannot obtain some crucial measurability properties (see (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Remark 4.4), Lemma 2.2 below as well as (26) and (27) and (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (3) p178)). Note that this assumption is not needed in the one period case.

Assumption 1.4 There exists some $0 \leq s < \infty$ such that $-s \leq S_t^i(\omega^t) < +\infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Note that we can easily incorporate the case where $-s \leq S_t^i < +\infty$ only on a Borel \mathcal{Q}^T -full measure set. There exists also a riskless asset for which we assume a price constant equal to 1, for sake of simplicity. Without this assumption, all the developments below could be carried out using discounted prices. The notation $\Delta S_t := S_t - S_{t-1}$ will often be used. If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ then the concatenation xy stands for their scalar product. The symbol $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d (or on \mathbb{R}). Trading strategies are represented by d -dimensional universally-predictable processes $\phi := \{\phi_t, 1 \leq t \leq T\}$ where for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $\phi_t = (\phi_t^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ represents the investor's holdings in each of the d assets at time t . The family of all such trading strategies is denoted by Φ . We assume that trading is self-financing. As the riskless asset's price is constant equal to 1, the value at time t of a portfolio ϕ starting from initial capital $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is given by $V_t^{x,\phi} = x + \sum_{s=1}^t \phi_s \Delta S_s$.

From now on the positive (resp. negative) part of some number or random variable Y is denoted by Y^+ (resp. Y^-). We will also write $f^\pm(Y)$ for $(f(Y))^\pm$ for any random variable Y and (possibly random) function f .

1.5. No arbitrage condition, risk preferences and main result.

Definition 1.5 The $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition holds true if for $\phi \in \Phi$, $V_T^{0,\phi} \geq 0$ \mathcal{Q}^T -q.s. implies that $V_T^{0,\phi} = 0$ \mathcal{Q}^T -q.s. (see also (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Definition 1.1)).

Definition 1.6 A *random utility* U is a function defined on $\Omega^T \times (0, \infty)$ taking values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ such that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $U(\cdot, x)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^T)$ -measurable and for every $\omega^T \in \Omega^T$, $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is proper¹, non-decreasing and concave on $(0, +\infty)$. We extend U by (right) continuity in 0 and set $U(\cdot, x) = -\infty$ if $x < 0$.

Remark 1.7 Fix some $\omega^T \in \Omega^T$ and let $\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}, U(\omega^T, x) > -\infty\}$ be the domain of $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$. Then $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is continuous on $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot))$, the relative interior of the domain of $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ (see (Rockafellar, 1970, Theorem 10.1 p82)). Note that if $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is improper then $U(\omega^T, \cdot) = +\infty$ on $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot))$ and if $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is assumed to be upper semicontinuous (usc from now) then it is infinite on all \mathbb{R} (see (Rockafellar, 1970, Theorem 7.2 and Corollary 7.2.1, p53)) which is a rather uninteresting case. Nevertheless our results hold true for an improper usc function. Here $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ will not be assumed to be usc since Assumption 3.1 is postulated. Indeed it implies that $\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot) = (0, \infty)$ if $\omega^T \in \Omega_{Dom}^T$ which is a Borel \mathcal{Q}^T -full measure set (see Lemma 3.2). Then U can be modified so that it remains Borel-measurable, that $\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot) = (0, \infty)$ and thus extending $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ by continuity in 0 is enough to get an usc function for all $\omega^T \in \Omega^T$. If $\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot) = (0, \infty)$ is not true on a Borel \mathcal{Q}^T -full measure set then one cannot avoid the usc assumption : $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is continuous on $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot)) = (m(\omega^T), \infty)$ and one need to extend $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ by (right)-continuity in $m(\omega^T)$ which might be strictly positive. This is the reason why in the dynamic programming part we force the value function to be usc on all Ω^t by taking their closure (see Lemma 3.18, (19) and (24)). Note that we can easily include the case where $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is non-decreasing and concave only for ω^T in a Borel \mathcal{Q}^T -full measure set. We introduce the following notations.

Definition 1.8 Fix some $x \geq 0$. For $P \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega^T)$ fixed, we denote by $\Phi(x, P)$ the set of all strategies $\phi \in \Phi$ such that $V_T^{x,\phi}(\cdot) \geq 0$ P -a.s. and by $\Phi(x, U, P)$ the set of all strategies

¹There exists $x \in (0, +\infty)$ such that $U(\omega^T, x) > -\infty$ and $U(\omega^T, x) < +\infty$ for all $x \in (0, +\infty)$.

$\phi \in \Phi(x, P)$ such that either $E_P U^+(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi}(\cdot)) < \infty$ or $E_P U^-(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi}(\cdot)) < \infty$. Then

$$(3) \quad \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T) := \bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} \Phi(x, P) \text{ and } \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T) := \bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} \Phi(x, U, P).$$

Under $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$, if $\phi \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ then $P_t(V_t^{x, \phi}(\cdot) \geq 0) = 1$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ and $1 \leq t \leq T$, see Lemma 4.3. Note that in (Nutz, 2016, Definition of \mathcal{H}_x , top of p10), this intertemporal budget constraint was postulated. We now state our main concern.

Definition 1.9 Let $x \geq 0$, the *multiple-priors portfolio problem* with initial wealth x is

$$(4) \quad u(x) := \sup_{\phi \in \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi}(\cdot)).$$

Remark 1.10 We will use the convention $+\infty - \infty = +\infty$ throughout the paper. This choice is rather unnatural when studying maximisation problem. The reason for this is that we will use (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.48 p180) (which relies on (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (4) p177)) for lower-semianalytic function where this convention is required.

We now present our main result under conditions which will be detailed in section 3.

Theorem 1.11 Assume that the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition and Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.1 and 3.5 hold true. Let $x \geq 0$. Then, there exists some optimal strategy $\phi^* \in \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ such that

$$u(x) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi^*}(\cdot)) < \infty.$$

In Theorem 3.6, we will propose a fairly general set-up where Assumption 3.5 is satisfied.

2. No-arbitrage condition characterisation. We will often use the following one-period version of the no-arbitrage condition. For $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ fixed we say that $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t))$ condition holds true if for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$(5) \quad h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.} \Rightarrow h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) = 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.}$$

We introduce the affine hull (denoted by Aff) of the (robust) conditional support of ΔS_{t+1} .

Definition 2.1 Let $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$ be fixed, the random set $D^{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as

$$D^{t+1}(\omega^t) := \text{Aff} \left(\bigcap \left\{ A \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \text{ closed, } P_{t+1}(\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in A) = 1, \forall P_{t+1} \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t) \right\} \right).$$

A strategy $\phi \in \Phi$ such that $\phi^{t+1}(\omega^t) \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ have nice properties, see (6) and Lemma 3.11. If $D^{t+1}(\omega^t) = \mathbb{R}^d$ then, intuitively, there are no redundant assets for all model specifications. Otherwise, for any $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable strategy ϕ_{t+1} , one may always replace $\phi_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot)$ by its orthogonal projection $\phi_{t+1}^\perp(\omega^t, \cdot)$ on $D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ without changing the portfolio value (see Remark 3.10 below and (Nutz, 2016, Lemma 2.6)). The following lemma establishes some important properties of D^{t+1} .

Lemma 2.2 Let Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 hold true and $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$ be fixed. Then D^{t+1} is a non-empty, closed valued random set and $\text{Graph}(D^{t+1}) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof. The proof uses similar arguments as in (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 14.8 p648, Ex. 14.2 p652) together with (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Lemma 4.3) and is thus omitted. \square

Similarly as in (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2005) and (Jacod and Shiryaev, 1998) (see also (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016)), we prove a “quantitative” characterisation of the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition.

Proposition 2.3 *Assume that the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition and Assumptions 1.1, 1.2 hold true. Then for all $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$, there exists some \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set $\Omega_{NA}^t \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ such that for all $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$, $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t))$ holds true, $D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ is a vector space and there exists $\alpha_t(\omega^t) > 0$ such that for all $h \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ there exists $P_h \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ satisfying*

$$(6) \quad P_h \left(\frac{h}{|h|} \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) < -\alpha_t(\omega^t) \right) > \alpha_t(\omega^t).$$

We prove in (Blanchard and Carassus, 2017) that there is in fact an equivalence between the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition and (6). We also prove that $\omega^t \rightarrow \alpha_t(\omega^t)$ is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.

Proof. Using (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Theorem 4.5), $N_t := \{\omega^t \in \Omega^t, NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)) \text{ fails}\} \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ and $P(N_t) = 1$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$. So setting $\Omega_{NA}^t := \Omega^t \setminus N_t$, we get that (5) holds true for all $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$. We fix some $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$. If $h \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$, we have that

$$(7) \quad h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.} \Rightarrow h = 0.$$

Indeed as $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$, (5) together with (Nutz, 2016, Lemma 2.6) imply that $h \in (D^{t+1}(\omega^t))^\perp$ the orthogonal space of $D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and $h = 0$. Therefore, for all $h \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$, $h \neq 0$, there exists $P_h \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ such that $P_h(h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0) < 1$. Using a slight modification of (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemma 3.5) we get that $0 \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ (i.e. $D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ is a vector space). We introduce for $n \geq 1$

$$A_n(\omega^t) := \left\{ h \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t), |h| = 1, P_{t+1} \left(h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \leq -\frac{1}{n} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n}, \forall P_{t+1} \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t) \right\}$$

and we define $n_0(\omega^t) := \inf\{n \geq 1, A_n(\omega^t) = \emptyset\}$ with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. If $D^{t+1}(\omega^t) = \{0\}$, then $n_0(\omega^t) = 1 < \infty$. We assume now that $D^{t+1}(\omega^t) \neq \{0\}$ and prove by contradiction that $n_0(\omega^t) < \infty$. Suppose that $n_0(\omega^t) = \infty$. For all $n \geq 1$, we get some $h_n(\omega^t) \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ with $|h_n(\omega^t)| = 1$ and such that for all $P_{t+1} \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ $P_{t+1}(h_n(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \leq -\frac{1}{n}) \leq \frac{1}{n}$. By passing to a sub-sequence we can assume that $h_n(\omega^t)$ tends to some $h^*(\omega^t) \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ with $|h^*(\omega^t)| = 1$. Then $\{h^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) < 0\} \subset \liminf_n B_n(\omega^t)$, where $B_n(\omega^t) := \{h_n(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \leq -1/n\}$. Fatou's Lemma implies that for any $P_{t+1} \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$

$$P_{t+1}(h^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) < 0) \leq \liminf_n \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} 1_{B_n(\omega^t)}(\omega_{t+1}) P_{t+1}(d\omega_{t+1}) = 0.$$

This implies that $P_{t+1}(h^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0) = 1$ for all $P_{t+1} \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and $h^*(\omega^t) = 0$ (see (7)), which contradicts $|h^*(\omega^t)| = 1$. Thus $n_0(\omega^t) < \infty$. We set for $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$, $\alpha_t(\omega^t) := \frac{1}{n_0(\omega^t)}$, $\alpha_t \in (0, 1]$ and by definition of $A_{n_0(\omega^t)}(\omega^t)$, (6) holds true. \square

Finally, we introduce an alternative notion of no arbitrage, called strong no arbitrage.

Definition 2.4 We say that the $sNA(Q^T)$ condition holds true if for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ and $\phi \in \Phi$, $V_T^{0,\phi} \geq 0$ P -a.s. implies that $V_T^{0,\phi} = 0$ P -a.s.

The $sNA(Q^T)$ condition holds true if the “classical” no-arbitrage condition in model P , $NA(P)$, holds true for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$. Note that if $\mathcal{Q}^T = \{P\}$ then $sNA(Q^T) = NA(Q^T) = NA(P)$. Clearly the $sNA(Q^T)$ condition is stronger than the $NA(Q^T)$ condition.

As in (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Definition 3.3), we introduce for all $P = P_1 \otimes q_2 \otimes \dots \otimes q_T \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ and for all $1 \leq t \leq T-1$,

$$D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t) := \text{Aff} \left(\bigcap \left\{ A \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \text{ closed, } q_{t+1}(\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in A, \omega^t) = 1 \right\} \right).$$

The case $t = 0$ is obtained by replacing $q_{t+1}(\cdot, \omega^t)$ by $P_1(\cdot)$.

Proposition 2.5 Assume that the $sNA(Q^T)$ condition and Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 hold true and let $0 \leq t \leq T-1$. Fix some $P = P_1 \otimes q_2 \otimes \dots \otimes q_T \in \mathcal{Q}^T$. Then there exists $\Omega_P^t \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega^t)$ with $P_t(\Omega_P^t) = 1$ such that for all $\omega^t \in \Omega_P^t$, there exists $\alpha_t^P(\omega^t) \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $h \in D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t)$, $q_{t+1}(h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \leq -\alpha_t^P(\omega^t)|h|, \omega^t) \geq \alpha_t^P(\omega^t)$. Furthermore $\omega^t \rightarrow \alpha_t^P(\omega^t)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.

Proof. This is a careful adaptation of (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Proposition 3.7) since $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ is not a product sigma-algebra. \square

3. Utility maximisation problem.

Assumption 3.1 For all $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$ $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U^-(\cdot, r) < +\infty$.

The proof of the following lemma follows directly from (Rockafellar, 1970, Theorem 10.1 p82).

Lemma 3.2 Assume that Assumption 3.1 holds true. Then $\Omega_{Dom}^T := \{U(\cdot, r) > -\infty, \forall r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0\} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega^T)$ is a \mathcal{Q}^T -full measure set. For all $\omega^T \in \Omega_{Dom}^T$, $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } U(\omega^T, \cdot)) = (0, \infty)$ and $U(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$, right-continuous in 0 and thus usc on \mathbb{R} .

Remark 3.3 Assumption 3.1, which does not appear in the mono-prior case (see (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016)), allows to work with countable supremum (see (18)) and to have value functions with “good” measurability properties (see also Remark 3.14). We will prove (see Proposition 3.27) that Assumption 3.1 is preserved through the dynamic programming procedure. Assumption 3.1 is superfluous in the case of non-random utility function. Indeed let $m := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R}, U(x) > -\infty\} \geq 0$ and $\bar{U}(x) = U(x + m)$. Then $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \bar{U}(\cdot)) = (0, \infty)$, \bar{U} satisfies Definition 1.6 and if $\bar{\phi}^*$ is a solution of (4) for \bar{U} with an initial wealth x , then it will be a solution of (4) for U starting from $x + m$. Assumption 3.1 is also useless in the one-period case.

Example 3.4 We propose the following example where Assumption 3.1 holds true. Assume that there exists some $x_0 > 0$ such that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U^-(\cdot, x_0) < \infty$. Assume also that there exists some functions $f_1, f_2 : (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ as well as some non-negative $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^T)$ -measurable random variable D verifying $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P D(\cdot) < \infty$ such that for all $\omega^T \in \Omega^T$, $x \geq 0, 0 < \lambda \leq 1$, $U(\omega^T, \lambda x) \geq f_1(\lambda)U(\omega^T, x) - f_2(\lambda)D(\omega^T)$. This condition is a kind of elasticity assumption around zero. It is satisfied for example by the logarithm function. Fix some $r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0$. If $r \geq x_0$, it is clear from Definition 1.6 that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U^-(\cdot, r) < \infty$.

If $r < x_0$, we have for all $\omega^T \in \Omega^T$, $U(\omega^T, r) \geq f_1(\frac{r}{x_0})U(\omega^T, x_0) - f_2(\frac{r}{x_0})D(\omega^T)$ and $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U^-(\cdot, r) < \infty$ follows immediately.

The following condition (together with Assumption 3.1) implies that if $\phi \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ then $E_P U(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi}(\cdot))$ is well defined for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ (see Proposition 3.25). It also allows us to work with auxiliary functions which play the role of properly integrable bounds for the value functions at each step (see (20), (27), (28) and (29)).

Assumption 3.5 We assume that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} \sup_{\phi \in \Phi(1, P)} E_P U^+(\cdot, V_T^{1, \phi}(\cdot)) < \infty$.

Assumption 3.5 is not easy to verify : we propose an application of Theorem 1.11 in the following fairly general set-up where Assumption 3.5 is automatically satisfied. We introduce for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $r > 0$,

$$\mathcal{W}_t^r := \left\{ X : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}, \mathcal{B}(\Omega^t)\text{-measurable, } \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^t} E_P |X|^r < \infty \right\} \text{ and } \mathcal{W}_t := \bigcap_{r>0} \mathcal{W}_t^r.$$

In (Denis, Hu and Peng, 2011, Proposition 14) it is proved that \mathcal{W}_t^r is a Banach space (up to the usual quotient identifying two random variables that are \mathcal{Q}^t -q.s. equal) for the norm $\|X\| := (\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^t} E_P |X|^r)^{\frac{1}{r}}$. Hence, the space \mathcal{W}_t is the “natural” extension of the one introduced in the mono-prior classical case (see (Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016) or (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, (16))).

Theorem 3.6 Assume that the $sNA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition and Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 3.1 hold true. Assume furthermore that $U^+(\cdot, 1), U^-(\cdot, \frac{1}{4}) \in \mathcal{W}_T$ and that for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$, $\Delta S_t, \frac{1}{\alpha_t^P} \in \mathcal{W}_t$ (recall Proposition 2.5 for the definition of α_t^P). Let $x \geq 0$. Then, there exists some optimal strategy $\phi^* \in \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ such that

$$u(x) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi^*}(\cdot)) < \infty.$$

3.1. One period case. Let $(\bar{\Omega}, \mathcal{G})$ be a measurable space, $\mathfrak{P}(\bar{\Omega})$ the set of all probability measures on $\bar{\Omega}$ defined on \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{Q} a non-empty convex subset of $\mathfrak{P}(\bar{\Omega})$. Let $Y(\cdot) := (Y_1(\cdot), \dots, Y_d(\cdot))$ be a \mathcal{G} -measurable \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable (which could represent the change of value of the price process).

Assumption 3.7 There exists some constant $0 < b < \infty$ such that $Y_i(\cdot) \geq -b$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Finally, as in Definition 2.1, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the smallest affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^d containing the support of the distribution of $Y(\cdot)$ under P for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Assumption 3.8 The set D contains 0 (D is a non-empty vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^d).

The pendant of the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition in the one-period model is given by

Assumption 3.9 There exists some constant $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ such that for all $h \in D$ there exists $P_h \in \mathcal{Q}$ satisfying $P_h(hY(\cdot)) \leq -\alpha|h| \geq \alpha$.

Remark 3.10 Let $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $h' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the orthogonal projection of h on D . Then $h - h' \perp D$ hence

$$\{Y(\cdot) \in D\} \subset \{(h - h')Y(\cdot) = 0\} = \{hY(\cdot) = h'Y(\cdot)\}.$$

By definition of D we have $P(Y(\cdot) \in D) = 1$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ and therefore $hY = h'Y$ \mathcal{Q} -q.s.

For $x \geq 0$ and $a \geq 0$ we define

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{H}_x^a := \left\{ h \in \mathbb{R}^d, x + hY \geq a \text{ } \mathcal{Q}\text{-q.s.} \right\} \text{ and } D_x := \mathcal{H}_x \cap D, \text{ where } \mathcal{H}_x := \mathcal{H}_x^0.$$

Lemma 3.11 *Assume that Assumption 3.9 holds true. Then for all $x \geq 0$, $D_x \subset B(0, \frac{x}{\alpha})$ where $B(0, \frac{x}{\alpha}) = \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d, |h| \leq \frac{x}{\alpha}\}$ and D_x is a convex and compact subspace of \mathbb{R}^d .*

Proof. For $x \geq 0$, the convexity and the closedness of D_x are clear. Let $h \in D_x$ be fixed. Assume that $|h| > \frac{x}{\alpha}$, then from Assumption 3.9, there exists $P_h \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $P_h(x + hY(\cdot) < 0) \geq P_h(hY(\cdot) \leq -\alpha|h|) \geq \alpha > 0$, a contradiction. The compactness of D_x follows immediately. \square

Assumption 3.12 We consider a function $V : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ such that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $V(\cdot, x) : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable, for every $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$, $V(\omega, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is non-decreasing, concave and usc, and $V(\cdot, x) = -\infty$, for all $x < 0$.

The reason for not excluding at this stage improper concave function is related to the multi-period case. Indeed if Assumption 3.9 is not verified, then v (or $v^{\mathbb{Q}}, \text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})$) might be equal to $+\infty$. So in the multi-period part, finding a version of the value function that is proper for all ω^t while preserving its measurability is challenging since Ω_{NA}^t (the set where Assumption 3.9 holds true, see Proposition 2.3) is only universally-measurable. So here we do not assume that $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is proper but we will prove in Theorem 3.23 that the associated value function is finite. We also assume that $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is usc for all ω , see Remark 1.7.

Assumption 3.13 For all $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$, $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P V^-(\cdot, r) < \infty$.

Remark 3.14 This assumption is essential to prove in Theorem 3.23 that (14) holds true as it allows to prove that \mathbb{Q}^d is dense in $\text{Ri}(\{h \in \mathcal{H}_x, \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} EV(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)) > -\infty\})$. Note that the one-period optimisation problem in (9) could be solved without Assumption 3.13 (see Remark 3.3).

The following lemma is similar to Lemma 3.2 (recall also (see (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemma 7.12)).

Lemma 3.15 *Assume that Assumptions 3.12 and 3.13 hold true. Then $\Omega_{Dom} := \{V(\cdot, r) > -\infty, \forall r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0\} \in \mathcal{G}$ and Ω_{Dom} is \mathcal{Q} -full measure set on which $\text{Ri}(Dom V(\omega, \cdot)) = (0, \infty)$ and thus $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is continuous on $(0, \infty)$. Moreover $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is right-continuous in 0 for all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$.*

Our main concern in the one period case is the following optimisation problem

$$(9) \quad v(x) := \begin{cases} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_x} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P V(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)), & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We use the convention $\infty - \infty = \infty$ (recall Remark 1.10), but we will see in Lemma 3.21 that under appropriate assumptions, $E_P V(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot))$ is well-defined. Note also that for $x \geq 0$ (see Remark 3.10)

$$(10) \quad v(x) = \sup_{h \in D_x} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P V(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)).$$

We present now some integrability assumptions on V^+ which allow to assert that there exists some optimal solution for (9).

Assumption 3.16 For every $P \in \mathcal{Q}$, $h \in \mathcal{H}_1$, $E_P V^+(\cdot, 1 + hY(\cdot)) < \infty$.

Remark 3.17 If Assumption 3.16 is not true, (Nutz, 2016, Example 2.3) shows that one can find a counterexample where $v(x) < \infty$ but the supremum is not attained in (9). So one cannot use the “natural” extension of the mono-prior approach, which should be that there exists some $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $E_P V^+(\cdot, 1 + hY(\cdot)) < \infty$ for all $h \in \mathcal{H}_1$ (see (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Assumption 5.9)).

We define now

$$v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) := \begin{cases} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_x \cap \mathbb{Q}^d} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P V(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)), & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, we introduce the closure of $v^{\mathbb{Q}}$ denoted by $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})$ which is the smallest usc function $w : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ such that $w \geq v^{\mathbb{Q}}$. We will show in Theorem 3.23 that $v(x) = v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) = \text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})(x)$, which allows in the multiperiod case (see (18)) to work with a countable supremum (for measurability issues) and an usc value function (see Remark 1.7). But first we provide two lemmata which are stated under Assumption 3.12 only. They will be used in the multi-period part to prove that the value function is usc, concave (see (24) and (25)) and dominated (see (28)) for all ω^t . This avoid difficult measurability issues when proving (26) and (27) coming from full-measure sets which are not Borel and on which Assumptions 3.8, 3.9, 3.13 and 3.16 hold true. This can be seen for example in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 3.30 where we need to apply Lemma 3.18 using only Assumption 3.12.

Lemma 3.18 Assume that Assumption 3.12 holds true. Then v , $v^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})$ are concave and non-decreasing on \mathbb{R} and $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})(x) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x + \delta)$.

Proof. As V is non-decreasing (see Assumption 3.12), v and $v^{\mathbb{Q}}$ are clearly non-decreasing. The proof of the concavity of v or $v^{\mathbb{Q}}$ relies on a midpoint concavity argument and on Ostrowski Theorem, see (Donoghue, 1969, p12). It is very similar to (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2006, Proposition 2) or (Nutz, 2016, Lemma 3.5) and thus omitted. Using (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Proposition 2.32 p57), we obtain that $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})$ is concave on \mathbb{R} . Then, using for example (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, 1(7) p14), we get that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})(x) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{|y-x| < \delta} v^{\mathbb{Q}}(y) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x + \delta)$ and the proof is completed. \square

Let $x \geq 0$ and $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ be fixed. We introduce $H_x(P) := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d, x + hY \geq 0 \text{ } P\text{-a.s.}\}$. Note that $\mathcal{H}_x = \bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} H_x(P)$ (see (8)).

Lemma 3.19 Assume that Assumption 3.12 holds true. Let $I : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a function such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $I(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot))$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable, $I(\omega, \cdot)$ is non-decreasing and non-negative for all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ and $V \leq I$. Set

$$i(x) := 1_{[0, \infty)}(x) \sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} 1_{H_x(P)}(h) E_P I(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)).$$

Then i is non-decreasing, non-negative on \mathbb{R} and $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})(x) \leq i(x + 1)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Since $I(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot))$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $I \geq 0$, the integral in the definition of i is well-defined (potentially equals to $+\infty$). It is clear that i is non-decreasing and non-negative on \mathbb{R} . As $V \leq I$ and $\mathcal{H}_x \subset H_x(P)$ if $P \in \mathcal{Q}$, it is clear that $v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) \leq i(x)$ for $x \geq 0$. And since $v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) = -\infty < i(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$, $v^{\mathbb{Q}} \leq i$ on \mathbb{R} (note that $v \leq i$ on \mathbb{R} for the same reasons). Applying Lemma 3.18, $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})(x) \leq v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x+1) \leq i(x+1)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

Proposition 3.20 *Assume that Assumptions 3.12 and 3.13 hold true. Then there exists some non negative \mathcal{G} -measurable random variable C such that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P(C) < \infty$ and for all $\omega \in \Omega_{Dom}$ (see Lemma 3.15), $\lambda \geq 1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$(11) \quad V(\omega, \lambda x) \leq 2\lambda \left(V\left(\omega, x + \frac{1}{2}\right) + C(\omega) \right).$$

Proof. We use similar arguments as (Rásonyi and Stettner, 2006, Lemma 2). It is clear that (11) is true if $x < 0$. We fix $\omega \in \Omega_{Dom}$, $x \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lambda \geq 1$. Then $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } V(\omega, \cdot)) = (0, \infty)$ (recall Lemma 3.15). We assume first that there exists some $x_0 \in \text{Dom } V(\omega, \cdot)$ such that $V(\omega, x_0) < \infty$. Since $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is usc and concave, using similar arguments as in (Rockafellar, 1970, Corollary 7.2.1 p53), we get that $V(\omega, \cdot) < \infty$ on \mathbb{R} . Using the fact that $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is concave and non-decreasing we get that (recall that $x \geq \frac{1}{2}$)

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} V(\omega, \lambda x) &\leq V(\omega, x) + \frac{V(\omega, x) - V(\omega, \frac{1}{4})}{x - \frac{1}{4}} (\lambda - 1)x \leq V(\omega, x) + 2(\lambda - 1) \left(V(\omega, x) + V^-\left(\omega, \frac{1}{4}\right) \right) \\ &\leq V(\omega, x) + 2 \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(V(\omega, x) + V^-\left(\omega, \frac{1}{4}\right) \right) + V^-\left(\omega, \frac{1}{4}\right) \\ &\leq 2\lambda \left(V(\omega, x) + V^-\left(\omega, \frac{1}{4}\right) \right) \leq 2\lambda \left(V\left(\omega, x + \frac{1}{2}\right) + V^-\left(\omega, \frac{1}{4}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Fix now $0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lambda \geq 1$. Using again that $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is non-decreasing and the first inequality of (12), $V(\omega, \lambda x) \leq V(\omega, \lambda(x + \frac{1}{2})) \leq 2\lambda (V(\omega, x + \frac{1}{2}) + V^-(\omega, \frac{1}{4}))$, and Proposition 3.20 is proved setting $C(\omega) = V^-(\omega, \frac{1}{4})$ (recall Assumption 3.13) when there exists some $x_0 \in \text{Dom } V(\omega, \cdot)$ such that $V(\omega, x_0) < \infty$. Now, if this is not the case, $V(\omega, x) = \infty$ for all $x \in \text{Dom } V(\omega, \cdot)$, $C(\omega) = V^-(\omega, \frac{1}{4}) = 0$ and (11) also holds true for all $x \geq 0$. \square

Lemma 3.21 *Assume that Assumptions 3.8, 3.9, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.16 hold true. Then there exists a non negative \mathcal{G} -measurable L such that for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}$, $E_P(L) < \infty$ and for all $x \geq 0$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}_x$, $V^+(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)) \leq (4x + 1)L(\cdot)$ \mathcal{Q} -q.s.*

Proof. The proof is a slight adaptation of the one of (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemma 5.11) (see also (Nutz, 2016, Lemma 2.8)) and is thus omitted. Note that the function L is the one defined in (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemma 5.11). \square

Lemma 3.22 *Assume that Assumptions 3.8, 3.9, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.16 hold true. Let \mathcal{H} be the set valued function that assigns to each $x \geq 0$ the set \mathcal{H}_x . Then $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}) = \{(x, h) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d, h \in \mathcal{H}_x\}$ is a closed and convex subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$*

be defined by

$$\psi(x, h) := \begin{cases} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P V(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)) & \text{if } (x, h) \in \text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}), \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then ψ is usc and concave on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $\psi < +\infty$ on $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\psi(x, 0) > -\infty$ for all $x > 0$.

Proof. For all $P \in \mathcal{Q}$, we define $\psi_P : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ by $\psi_P(x, h) = E_P V(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot))$ if $(x, h) \in \text{Graph}(\mathcal{H})$ and $-\infty$ otherwise. As in (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemma 5.12), $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H})$ is a closed convex subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, ψ_P is usc on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\psi_P < \infty$ on $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H})$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}$. Furthermore the concavity of ψ_P follows immediately from the one of V . The function $\psi = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} \psi_P$ is then usc and concave. As $\psi_P < \infty$ on $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H})$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}$, it is clear that $\psi < +\infty$ on $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H})$. Finally let $x > 0$ be fixed and $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ be such that $r < x$, then we have $-\infty < \psi(r, 0) \leq \psi(x, 0)$ (see Assumptions 3.12 and 3.13). \square

We are now able to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.23 *Assume that Assumptions 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.16 hold true. Then for all $x \geq 0$, $v(x) < \infty$ and there exists some optimal strategy $\hat{h} \in D_x$ such that*

$$(13) \quad v(x) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P(V(\cdot, x + \hat{h}Y(\cdot))).$$

Moreover v is usc, concave, non-decreasing and $\text{Dom } v = (0, \infty)$. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(14) \quad v(x) = v^{\mathcal{Q}}(x) = \text{CI}(v^{\mathcal{Q}})(x).$$

Proof. Let $x \geq 0$ be fixed. Fix some $P \in \mathcal{Q}$. Using Lemma 3.21 we have that $E_P V(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)) \leq E_P V^+(\cdot, x + hY(\cdot)) \leq (4x + 1) E_P L(\cdot) < \infty$, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}_x$. Thus $v(x) < \infty$. Now if $x > 0$, $v(x) \geq \psi(x, 0) > -\infty$ (see Lemma 3.22). Using Lemma 3.18, v is concave and non-decreasing. Thus v is continuous on $(0, \infty)$.

From Lemma 3.22, $h \rightarrow \psi(x, h)$ is usc on \mathbb{R}^d and thus on D_x (recall that D_x is closed and use (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemma 7.11)). Since D_x is compact (see Lemma 3.11), recalling (10) and applying (Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 2.43 p44), we find that there exists some $\hat{h} \in D_x$ such that (13) holds true.

We prove now that v is usc in 0 (the proof works as well for all $x^* \geq 0$). Let $(x_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of non-negative numbers converging to 0. Let $\hat{h}_n \in D_{x_n}$ be the optimal strategies associated to x_n in (13). Let $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be a subsequence such that $\limsup_n v(x_n) = \lim_k v(x_{n_k})$. Using Lemma 3.11, $|\hat{h}_{n_k}| \leq x_{n_k}/\alpha \leq 1/\alpha$ for k big enough. So we can extract a subsequence (that we still denote by $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$) such that there exists some \underline{h}^* with $\hat{h}_{n_k} \rightarrow \underline{h}^*$. As $(x_{n_k}, \hat{h}_{n_k})_{k \geq 1} \in \text{Graph}(\mathcal{H})$ which is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (see Lemma 3.22), $\underline{h}^* \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Thus using that ψ is usc, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_n v(x_n) &= \lim_k \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P V(\cdot, x_{n_k} + \hat{h}_{n_k} Y(\cdot)) = \lim_k \psi(x_{n_k}, \hat{h}_{n_k}) \\ &\leq \psi(0, \underline{h}^*) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}} E_P V(\cdot, \underline{h}^* Y(\cdot)) \leq v(0). \end{aligned}$$

For $x < 0$ all the equalities in (14) are trivial. We prove the first equality in (14) for $x \geq 0$ fixed. We start with the case $x = 0$. If $Y = 0$ \mathcal{Q} -q.s. then the first equality is trivial. If $Y \neq 0$ \mathcal{Q} -q.s., then it is clear that $D_0 = \{0\}$ (recall Assumption 3.8) and the first equality in (14) is true again. We assume now that $x > 0$. From Lemma 3.22, $\psi_x : h \rightarrow \psi(x, h)$ is concave, $0 \in \text{Dom } \psi_x$. Thus $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x) \neq \emptyset$ (see (Rockafellar, 1970, Theorem 6.2 p45)) and we can apply Lemma 4.2. Assume for a moment that we have proved that \mathbb{Q}^d is dense in $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x)$. As ψ_x is continuous on $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x)$ (recall that ψ_x is concave), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_x} \psi_x(h) = \sup_{h \in \text{Dom } \psi_x} \psi_x(h) = \sup_{h \in \text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x)} \psi_x(h) \\ &= \sup_{h \in \text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x) \cap \mathbb{Q}^d} \psi_x(h) \leq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_x \cap \mathbb{Q}^d} \psi_x(h) = v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x), \end{aligned}$$

since $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x) \subset \mathcal{H}_x$ and the first equality in (14) is proved. It remains to prove that \mathbb{Q}^d is dense in $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x)$. Fix some $h \in \text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$. From Lemma 4.1, there is some $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$ such that $h \in \mathcal{H}_x^r$. Using Lemma 3.22 we obtain that $\psi_x(h) \geq \psi(r, 0) > -\infty$ thus $h \in \text{Dom } \psi_x$ and $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x) \subset \text{Dom } \psi_x$. Recalling that $0 \in \text{Dom } \psi_x$ and that $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$ is an open set in \mathbb{R}^d (see Lemma 4.1) we obtain that $\text{Aff}(\text{Dom } \psi_x) = \mathbb{R}^d$. Then $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x)$ is an open set in \mathbb{R}^d and the fact that \mathbb{Q}^d is dense in $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } \psi_x)$ follows easily.

The second equality in (14) follows immediately : $v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) = v(x)$ for all $x \geq 0$ and v is usc on $[0, \infty)$ thus $\text{Cl}(v^{\mathbb{Q}})(x) = v^{\mathbb{Q}}(x)$ for all $x \geq 0$. \square

3.2. Multiperiod case.

Proposition 3.24 *Assume that Assumption 3.1 holds true. Then there exists a non negative, $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^T)$ -measurable random variable C_T such that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P(C_T) < \infty$ and for all $\omega^T \in \Omega_{Dom}^T$ (recall Lemma 3.2), $\lambda \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$U(\omega^T, \lambda x) \leq 2\lambda \left(U \left(\omega^T, x + \frac{1}{2} \right) + C_T(\omega^T) \right) \text{ and } U^+(\omega^T, \lambda x) \leq 2\lambda \left(U^+ \left(\omega^T, x + \frac{1}{2} \right) + C_T(\omega^T) \right).$$

Proof. This is just Proposition 3.20 for $V = U$ and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{B}(\Omega^T)$ (recall Lemma 3.2), setting $C_T(\cdot) = U^-(\cdot, \frac{1}{4})$. The second inequality follows immediately since C_T is non-negative. \square

Proposition 3.25 *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 3.5 hold true and fix some $x \geq 0$. Then*

$$M_x := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} \sup_{\phi \in \phi(x, P)} E_P U^+(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi}(\cdot)) < \infty.$$

Moreover, $\Phi(x, U, P) = \Phi(x, P)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ and thus $\Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T) = \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$.

Proof. Fix some $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$. From Assumption 3.5 we know that $\Phi(1, P) = \Phi(1, U, P)$ and $M_1 < \infty$. Let $x \geq 0$ and $\phi \in \Phi(x, P)$ be fixed. If $x \leq 1$ then $V_T^{x, \phi} \leq V_T^{1, \phi}$, so from Definition 1.6 we get that $M_x \leq M_1 < \infty$ and $\Phi(x, P) = \Phi(x, U, P)$. If $x \geq 1$, from Proposition 3.24 we get that for all $\omega^T \in \Omega_{Dom}^T$

$$U^+(\omega^T, V_T^{x, \phi}(\omega^T)) = U^+ \left(\omega^T, 2x \left(\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\phi_t(\omega^{t-1})}{2x} \Delta S_t(\omega^t) \right) \right) \leq 4x \left(U^+(\omega^T, V_T^{1, \frac{\phi}{2x}}(\omega^T)) + C_T(\omega^T) \right).$$

As $\frac{\phi}{2x} \in \Phi(\frac{1}{2}, P) \subset \Phi(1, P) = \Phi(1, U, P)$, we get that $M_x \leq 4x (M_1 + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P C_T) < \infty$ (see Proposition 3.24). Thus $\Phi(x, P) = \Phi(x, U, P)$ and the last assertion follows from (3). \square

We introduce now the dynamic programming procedure. First we set for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$, $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $P \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ and $x \geq 0$

$$(15) \quad H_x^{t+1}(\omega^t, P) := \left\{ h \in \mathbb{R}^d, x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } P\text{-a.s.} \right\},$$

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t) := \left\{ h \in \mathbb{R}^d, x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.} \right\},$$

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{D}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t) := \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t) \cap D^{t+1}(\omega^t),$$

where D^{t+1} was introduced in Definition 2.1. For all $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$, $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $P \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ and $x < 0$, we set $H_x^{t+1}(\omega^t, P) = \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t) = \emptyset$. We introduce now the value functions U_t from $\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. To do that we define the closure of a random function $F : \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. Fix $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, then $x \rightarrow F_{\omega^t}(x) := F(\omega^t, x)$ is a real-valued function and its closure is denoted by $\text{Cl}(F_{\omega^t})$. Now $\text{Cl}(F) : \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is defined by $\text{Cl}(F)(\omega^t, x) := \text{Cl}(F_{\omega^t})(x)$. For $0 \leq t \leq T$, we set for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$

$$\mathcal{U}_T(\omega^T, x) := U(\omega^T, x) 1_{\Omega_{Dom}^T \times [0, \infty) \cup \Omega^T \times (-\infty, 0)}(\omega^T, x)$$

(18)

$$\mathcal{U}_t(\omega^t, x) := \begin{cases} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t) \cap \mathbb{Q}^d} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}), \\ \text{if } x \geq 0 \text{ and } -\infty, \text{ if } x < 0 \end{cases}$$

(19)

$$U_t(\omega^t, x) := \text{Cl}(\mathcal{U}_t)(\omega^t, x).$$

Since \mathcal{U}_T is usc (recall Lemma 3.2), it is clear that $U_T = \mathcal{U}_T$. As already mentioned for $t = 0$ we drop the dependency in ω_0 and note $U_0(x) = U_0(\omega^0, x)$. The convention $\infty - \infty = \infty$ is used in the integral in (18) (recall Remark 1.10), where the intersection with \mathbb{Q}^d is taken since measurability issues are better handled in this way, see the discussion before (Nutz, 2016, Lemma 3.6). We introduce the function $I_t : \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ which allow us to remove the boundedness assumption of Nutz (2016) and will be used for integrability issues. We set $I_T := U_T^+$, then for all $0 \leq t \leq T-1$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$

(20)

$$I_t(\omega^t, x) := 1_{[0, \infty)}(x) \sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} 1_{H_x^{t+1}(\omega^t, P)}(h) \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + 1 + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}).$$

Lemma 3.26 *Assume that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 hold true. Let $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ be fixed, G be a fixed non-negative, real-valued, $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable random variable and consider the following random sets $\mathcal{H}^{t+1} : (\omega^t, x) \mapsto \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and $\mathcal{D}_G^{t+1} : \omega^t \mapsto \mathcal{D}_{G(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$. They are closed valued, $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}^{t+1}) \in \mathcal{CA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{D}_G^{t+1}) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover $(\omega^t, P, h, x) \mapsto 1_{H_x^{t+1}(\omega^t, P)}(h)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable.*

Proof. It is clear that \mathcal{H}^{t+1} and \mathcal{D}_G^{t+1} are closed valued. Lemma 4.7 will be in force. First it allows to prove the last assertion since $\{(\omega^t, P, h, x), P(x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0) = 1\} \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. Then it shows that

$$\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}^{t+1}) = \left\{ (\omega^t, x, h), \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} P(x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0) = 1 \right\} \in \mathcal{CA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For any integer $k \geq 1$, $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$ we introduce the following \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable and random set $\Delta S_{k,t+1}(\cdot) := \Delta S_{t+1}(\cdot) 1_{\{|\Delta S_{t+1}(\cdot)| \leq k\}}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{r,t+1}(\omega^t) := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d, x + \Delta S_{k,t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq r \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.}\}$ for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$. In the sequel, we will write $\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ instead of $\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{0,t+1}(\omega^t)$. We first prove that $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (recall (16)). Since $\mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\cdot) = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1}(\cdot)$, it is enough to prove that $\text{Graph}(\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1})) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for any fixed $k \geq 1$. Indeed from Lemma 4.1, for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1})(\omega^t) = \mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and Lemma 4.8 i) applies. Since $\Delta S_{k,t+1}$ is bounded, we also get for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ that $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1})(\omega^t) = \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{r,t+1}(\omega^t)$. Using Lemmata 4.7 and 4.6 we obtain that for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$, $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{r,t+1})$ and also $\text{Graph}(\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1}))$ are coanalytic sets. Lemma 4.8 ii) implies that $\text{Graph}(\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_{k,x}^{t+1})) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Now let $\mathcal{H}_G^{t+1} : \omega^t \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{G(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ then it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}_G^{t+1}) &= \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 1} \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}, q \geq 0} \left\{ (\omega^t, h) \in \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, q \leq G(\omega^t) \leq q + \frac{1}{n}, h \in \text{Graph}\left(\mathcal{H}_{q+\frac{1}{n}}^{t+1}\right) \right\} \\ &\in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d), \end{aligned}$$

since G is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable. So using Lemma 2.2 and that $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{D}_G^{t+1}) = \text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}_G^{t+1}) \cap \text{Graph}(D^{t+1})$, we obtain that $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{D}_G^{t+1}) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which concludes the proof. \square

We introduce for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$

$$(21) \quad J_T^r(\omega^T) := U_T^-(\omega^T, r), \text{ for } \omega^T \in \Omega^T,$$

$$(22) \quad J_t^r(\omega^t) := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} J_{t+1}^r(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) P(d\omega_{t+1}) \text{ for } t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}, \omega^t \in \Omega^t.$$

As usual we will write $J_0^r = J_0^t(\omega^0)$.

Proposition 3.27 *Assume that Assumptions 1.1 and 3.1 hold true. Then for any $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$, the function $\omega^t \rightarrow J_t^r(\omega^t)$ is well defined, non-negative, usa and verifies $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^t} E_P J_t^r < \infty$. Furthermore, there exists some \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set $\widehat{\Omega}^t \in \mathcal{CA}(\Omega^t)$ on which $J_t^r(\cdot) < \infty$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on t . Fix some $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$. For $t = T$, $J_T^r(\cdot) = U_T^-(\cdot, r)$ is non negative and usa (see Definition 1.6, Lemma 3.2 and (1)). We have that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P(J_T^r) < \infty$ by Assumption 3.1. Using Lemma 3.2, $\widehat{\Omega}^T := \Omega_{Dom}^T \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega^T) \subset \mathcal{CA}(\Omega^T)$ (see (1)), $P(\widehat{\Omega}^T) = 1$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ and $J_T^r < \infty$ on $\widehat{\Omega}^T$. Assume now that for some $t \leq T-1$, J_{t+1}^r is non negative, usa and that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}} E_P(J_{t+1}^r) < \infty$. As $J_{t+1}^r(\cdot) \geq 0$, it is clear that $J_t^r(\cdot) \geq 0$. We apply (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.48 p180)² with $X = \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$, $Y = \Omega_{t+1}$, $f(\omega^t, P, \omega_{t+1}) = J_{t+1}^r(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})$ and $q(d\omega_{t+1} | \omega^t, P) = P(d\omega_{t+1})$. Indeed f is usa (see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.38 p165)), $(\omega^t, P) \rightarrow P(d\omega_{t+1}) \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ is a $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable

²As we will often use similar arguments in the rest of the paper, we provide some details at this stage.

stochastic kernel. So we get that $j_t^r : (\omega^t, P) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} J_{t+1}^r(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) P(d\omega_{t+1})$ is usa. As Assumption 1.1 holds true ($\text{Proj}_{\Omega^t}(\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1})) = \Omega^t$), (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.47 p179) applies and $\omega^t \rightarrow \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} j_t^r(\omega^t, P) = J_t^r(\omega^t)$ is usa. We set $\Omega_r^t := \{\omega^t \in \Omega^t, J_t^r(\omega^t) < \infty\}$, then $\Omega_r^t = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \{\omega^t \in \Omega^t, J_t^r(\omega^t) \leq n\} \in \mathcal{CA}(\Omega^t)$. Fix some $\varepsilon > 0$. From (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.50 p184) (recall Assumption 1.1), there exists some analytically-measurable $p_\varepsilon : \omega^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ ($p_\varepsilon \in SK_{t+1}$), such that $p_\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ and

$$(23) \quad j_t^r(\omega^t, p_\varepsilon) = \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} J_{t+1}^r(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) p_\varepsilon(d\omega_{t+1}, \omega^t) \geq \begin{cases} J_t^r(\omega^t) - \varepsilon & \text{if } \omega^t \in \Omega_r^t \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Assume that Ω_r^t is not a \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set. Then there exists some $P^* \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ such that $P^*(\Omega_r^t) < 1$. Set $P_\varepsilon^* := P^* \otimes p_\varepsilon$ then $P_\varepsilon^* \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ (see (2)) and we have that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} E_P J_{t+1}^r \geq E_{P_\varepsilon^*} J_{t+1}^r \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (1 - P^*(\Omega_r^t)) - \varepsilon P^*(\Omega_r^t).$$

As the previous inequality holds true for all $\varepsilon > 0$, letting ε go to 0 we obtain that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} E_P(J_{t+1}^r) = +\infty$: a contradiction and Ω_r^t is a \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set. Now, for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$, we set $P_\varepsilon = P \otimes p_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ (see (2)). Then, using (23) we get that

$$E_P J_t^r - \varepsilon = E_P 1_{\Omega_r^t} J_t^r - \varepsilon \leq E_{P_\varepsilon} J_{t+1}^r \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} E_P(J_{t+1}^r).$$

Again, as this is true for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ we obtain that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^t} E_P(J_t^r) \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} E_P(J_{t+1}^r) < \infty$. Finally we set $\hat{\Omega}^t = \bigcap_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \Omega_r^t$. It is clear that $\hat{\Omega}^t \in \mathcal{CA}(\Omega^t)$ is a \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set and that $J_t^r(\cdot) < \infty$ on $\hat{\Omega}^t$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0$. \square

Let $1 \leq t \leq T$ be fixed. We introduce the following notation: for any $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^{t-1})$ -measurable random variable G and any $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$, $\phi_t(G, P)$ is the set of all $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^{t-1})$ -measurable random variable ξ (one-step strategy), such that $G(\cdot) + \xi \Delta S_t(\cdot) \geq 0$ P -a.s. Propositions 3.28 to 3.30 solve the dynamic programming procedure and hold true under the following set of conditions.

(24) $\forall \omega^t \in \Omega^t, U_t(\omega^t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is non-decreasing, usc and concave on \mathbb{R} ,

(25) $\forall \omega^t \in \Omega^t, I_t(\omega^t, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is non-decreasing and non-negative on \mathbb{R} ,

(26) $U_t \in \mathcal{LSA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R})$,

(27) $I_t \in \mathcal{USA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R})$,

(28) $U_t(\omega^t, x) \leq I_t(\omega^t, x+1)$ for all $(\omega^t, x) \in \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}$,

(29) $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^t} \sup_{\xi \in \phi_t(G, P)} \int_{\Omega^t} I_t(\omega^t, G(\omega^{t-1}) + \xi(\omega^{t-1}) \Delta S_t(\omega^t)) P(d\omega^t) < \infty$,

for any $G := x + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \phi_s \Delta S_s$, where $x \geq 0$, $(\phi_s)_{1 \leq s \leq t-1}$ is universally-predictible,

(30) $U_t(\omega^t, r) \geq -J_t^r(\omega^t)$ for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, all $r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0$.

Proposition 3.28 *Let $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ be fixed. Assume that the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition, that Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 hold true and that (24), (25), (26), (27), (28), (29) and (30)*

hold true at stage $t + 1$. Then there exists some \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set $\tilde{\Omega}^t \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ such that for all $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t$ the function $(\omega_{t+1}, x) \rightarrow U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x)$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.23 (or Lemmata 3.21 and 3.22) with $\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega_{t+1}$, $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega_{t+1})$, $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$, $Y(\cdot) = \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot)$, $V(\cdot, \cdot) = U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot, \cdot)$ where V is defined on $\Omega_{t+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ (shortly called context $t + 1$ from now).

Note that under the assumptions of Proposition 3.28, for all $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t$ and $x \geq 0$ we have that (see (14), (18) and (19))

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} U_t(\omega^t, x) &= \mathcal{U}_t(\omega^t, x) \\ &= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t)} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To prove the proposition we will review one by one the assumptions needed to apply Theorem 3.23 in the context $t + 1$. First from Assumption 1.4 for $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ fixed we have that $Y_i(\cdot) = \Delta S_{t+1}^i(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq -b := -\max(1 + s + S_t^i(\omega^t), i \in \{1, \dots, d\})$ and $0 < b < \infty$: Assumption 3.7 holds true. From (24) at $t + 1$ for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ and $\omega_{t+1} \in \Omega_{t+1}$, $U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, \cdot)$ is non-decreasing, usc and concave on \mathbb{R} . From (26) at $t + 1$, U_{t+1} is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^{t+1} \times \mathbb{R})$ -measurable. Fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, then $\omega_{t+1} \rightarrow U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x)$ is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega_{t+1})$ -measurable, see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.29 p174). Thus Assumption 3.12 is satisfied in the context $t + 1$.

We now prove the assumptions that are verified for ω^t in some well chosen \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set. First from Proposition 2.3, for all $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$, Assumptions 3.8 and 3.9 hold true in the context $t + 1$. Fix $\omega^t \in \hat{\Omega}^t$ and some $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$. Using (30) at $t + 1$ and Proposition 3.27, we get that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}^-(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, r) P(d\omega_{t+1}) \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} J_{t+1}^r(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) P(d\omega_{t+1}) = J_t^r(\omega^t) < \infty,$$

and Assumption 3.13 in context $t + 1$ is verified for all $\omega^t \in \hat{\Omega}^t$. We finish with Assumption 3.16 in context $t + 1$ whose proof is more involved. We want to show that for ω^t in some \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set to be determined, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}_1^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and $P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ we have that

$$(32) \quad \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}^+(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, 1 + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}) < \infty.$$

Let $i_t(\omega^t, h, P) = \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, 2 + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1})$ and $I^t(\omega^t) := \{(h, P) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t), P(1 + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0) = 1, i_t(\omega^t, h, P) = \infty\}$. Fix some $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, then using (25) and (28) at $t + 1$ we have that if $h \in \mathcal{H}_1^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and $P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ are such that (32) does not hold true then $(h, P) \in I^t(\omega^t)$. Thus (32) holds true for all $h \in \mathcal{H}_1^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and $P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ if $\omega^t \in \{I^t = \emptyset\}$ and if this set is of \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure, Assumption 3.16 in context $t + 1$ is proved. We first prove that $\text{Graph}(I^t) \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$. From (27) at $t + 1$, Assumption 1.2 and (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (3) p178), $(\omega^t, h, \omega_{t+1}) \rightarrow I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, 2 + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}))$ is usc. Then using (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.48 p180) (which can be used with similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.27), we get that i_t is usc. It follows that

$$i_t^{-1}(\{\infty\}) = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \{(\omega^t, h, P), i_t(\omega^t, h, P) > n\} \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})).$$

Now using Assumption 1.1 together with Lemma 4.7 we get that

$$\{(\omega^t, h, P), P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t), P(1 + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0) = 1\} \in \mathcal{A}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$$

and the fact that $\text{Graph}(I^t)$ and $\text{Proj}_{\Omega^t}(\text{Graph}(I^t)) = \{I^t \neq \emptyset\}$ are analytic sets (recall (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.39 p165)) follows immediately. Applying the Jankov-von Neumann Projection Theorem (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.49 p182), we obtain that there exists some analytically-measurable and therefore $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable function $\omega^t \in \{I^t \neq \emptyset\} \rightarrow (h^*(\omega^t), p^*(\cdot, \omega^t)) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ such that for all $\omega^t \in \{I^t \neq \emptyset\}$, $(h^*(\omega^t), p^*(\cdot, \omega^t)) \in I^t(\omega^t)$. We may and will extend h^* and p^* on all Ω^t so that h^* and p^* remain $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.

We prove now by contradiction that $\{I^t = \emptyset\}$ is a \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set. Assume that there exists some $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ such that $\tilde{P}(\{I^t \neq \emptyset\}) > 0$ and set $\tilde{P}^* = \tilde{P} \otimes p^*$. Since $p^* \in SK_{t+1}$ and $p^*(\cdot, \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $\tilde{P}^* \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ (see (2)). It is also clear that $\tilde{P}^*(2 + h^*(\cdot)\Delta S_{t+1}(\cdot) \geq 0) = 1$. Now for all $\omega^t \in \{I^t \neq \emptyset\}$, we have that $i_t(\omega^t, h^*(\omega^t), p^*(\cdot, \omega^t)) = \infty$ and thus

$$\int_{\Omega^{t+1}} I_{t+1}(\omega^{t+1}, 2 + h^*(\omega^t)\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^{t+1})) \tilde{P}^*(d\omega^{t+1}) \geq \int_{\{I^t \neq \emptyset\}} (+\infty) \tilde{P}(d\omega^t) = +\infty$$

a contradiction with (29) at $t + 1$.

We can now define $\tilde{\Omega}^t := \{I^t = \emptyset\} \cap \hat{\Omega}^t \cap \Omega_{NA}^t \subset \hat{\Omega}^t$. It is clear, recalling Propositions 2.3 and 3.27, that $\tilde{\Omega}^t \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ is a \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set and the proof is complete. \square

The next proposition enables us to initialize the induction procedure that will be carried on in the proof of the main theorem.

Proposition 3.29 *Assume that the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition, Assumptions 3.1 and 3.5 hold true. Then (24), (25), (26), (27), (28), (29) and (30) hold true for $t = T$.*

Proof. As $U_T = U1_{\Omega_{Dom}^T \times [0, \infty) \cup \Omega^T \times (-\infty, 0)}$ and $I_T = U_T^+$, using Definition 1.6, (25), (28) and (30) (recall (21)) for $t = T$ are true. For all $\omega^T \in \Omega^T$, $U_T(\omega^T, \cdot)$ is also right-continuous and usc (see Lemma 3.2), thus (24) also holds true. Moreover $U_T(\cdot, x)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^T)$ -measurable for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, thus U_T is $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^T) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable (see (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemma 7.16)) and (26) and (27) hold true for $t = T$. It remains to prove that (29) is true for $t = T$. Let $G := x + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \phi_t \Delta S_t$ where $x \geq 0$ and $(\phi_s)_{1 \leq s \leq T-1}$ is universally-predictable. Fix some $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ and $\xi \in \phi_T(G, P)$. Let $(\phi_i^\xi)_{1 \leq i \leq T} \in \Phi$ be defined by $\phi_T^\xi = \xi$ and $\phi_s^\xi = \phi_s$ for $1 \leq s \leq T-1$ then $V_T^{x, \phi^\xi} = G + \xi \Delta S_T$, $\phi^\xi \in \Phi(x, P)$, $\int_{\Omega^T} I_T(\omega^T, G(\omega^{T-1}) + \xi(\omega^{T-1})\Delta S_T(\omega^T)) P(d\omega^T) = E_P U^+(\cdot, V_T^{x, \phi^\xi}(\cdot))$ and (29) follows from Proposition 3.25. \square

The next proposition proves the induction step.

Proposition 3.30 *Let $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ be fixed. Assume that the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition holds true as well as Assumptions 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and (24), (25), (26), (27), (28), (29) and (30) at $t+1$. Then (24), (25), (26), (27), (28), (29) and (30) are true for t .*

Moreover for all $X = x + \sum_{s=1}^t \phi_s \Delta S_s$, where $x \geq 0$, $(\phi_s)_{1 \leq s \leq t}$ is universally-predictable and $\{X \geq 0\}$ is \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set, there exists some \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set $\Omega_X^t \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$,

such that $\Omega_X^t \subset \tilde{\Omega}^t$ (see Proposition 3.28 for the definition of $\tilde{\Omega}^t$) and some $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable random variable \hat{h}_{t+1}^X such that for all $\omega^t \in \Omega_X^t$, $\hat{h}_{t+1}^X(\omega^t) \in \mathcal{D}_{X(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and

$$(33) \quad U_t(\omega^t, X(\omega^t)) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, X(\omega^t) + \hat{h}_{t+1}^X(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}).$$

Proof. First we prove that (24) is true at t . We fix some $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$. From (24) at $t+1$, the function $U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, \cdot)$ is usc, concave and non-decreasing on \mathbb{R} for all $\omega_{t+1} \in \Omega_{t+1}$. From (18) and (19), $U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x) = -\infty$ for all $x < 0$ and $\omega_{t+1} \in \Omega_{t+1}$. Then using (26) at $t+1$ and Lemma 4.6, we find that $U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot, x)$ is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega_{t+1})$ -measurable for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, Assumption 3.12 of Lemma 3.18 holds true in the context $t+1$ and we obtain that $x \rightarrow U_t(\omega^t, x) = \text{Cl}(\mathcal{U}_t)(\omega^t, x)$ (see (18) and (19)) is usc, concave and non-decreasing. As this is true for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, (24) at t is proved. Note that we also obtain that $x \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_t(\omega^t, x)$ is non decreasing for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$. Now we prove (26) at t . Since integrals might not always be well defined we need to be a bit cautious. We introduce first u_t and $\hat{u}_t : \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty) \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$

$$\begin{aligned} u_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) &= \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}) \\ \hat{u}_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) &= 1_{\mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t)}(h) u_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) + (-\infty) 1_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t)}(h). \end{aligned}$$

As U_{t+1} is lsa (see (26) at $t+1$) and Assumption 1.2 holds true, (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (3) p177) implies that $(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, h, x) \rightarrow U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}))$ is lsa. So (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.48 p180) (recall the convention $\infty - \infty = \infty$, see Remark 1.10) shows that u_t is lsa. Fix some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and set $\hat{C} := \hat{u}_t^{-1}((-\infty, c))$, $C := u_t^{-1}((-\infty, c))$, $A := \{(\omega^t, h, x), h \in \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t)\} \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ and $A^c := \{(\omega^t, h, x), h \notin \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t)\} \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$, then $\hat{C} = (C \cap A) \cup A^c = C \cup A^c$. As u_t is lsa, C is an analytic set. Lemma 3.26 implies that $A^c = \{(\omega^t, h, x), (\omega^t, x, h) \notin \text{Graph}(\mathcal{H}^{t+1})\} \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$, and thus \hat{C} , are analytic sets and \hat{u}_t is lsa. Using Assumption 1.1 and (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.47 p179), we get that

$$(34) \quad \tilde{u}_t : (\omega^t, h, x) \rightarrow \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \hat{u}_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) \in \mathcal{LSA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}).$$

Then (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (2) p178) implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t : (\omega^t, x) \rightarrow \sup_{h \in \mathbb{Q}^d} \tilde{u}_t(\omega^t, h, x)$ is lsa and since $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_t = \mathcal{U}_t$ on $\Omega^t \times [0, \infty)$, it follows that \mathcal{U}_t is lsa. We have already seen that $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $\mathcal{U}_t(\omega^t, \cdot)$ is non-decreasing, thus, for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we get that (recall (19))

$$U_t(\omega^t, x) = \text{Cl}(\mathcal{U}_t)(\omega^t, x) = \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \mathcal{U}_t(\omega^t, y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}_t \left(\omega^t, x + \frac{1}{n} \right).$$

As $(\omega^t, x) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_t(\omega^t, x + \frac{1}{n})$ is lsa, (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (2) p178) implies that U_t is also lsa. We prove now that (27) holds true for t . We introduce $\hat{\mathbf{i}}_t : \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty) \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (recall (15))

$$(35) \quad \hat{\mathbf{i}}_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) = 1_{\mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t, P)}(h) \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + 1 + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}).$$

Note that, using (25) at $t + 1$, the integral in (35) is well defined (potentially infinite valued). Using Assumption 1.2, (27) at $t + 1$ and (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (3) p177) we find that $(\omega^{t+1}, h, x, P) \rightarrow I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + 1 + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}))$ is usa. Thus (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.48 p180) applies³ and

$$(\omega^t, h, x, P) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + 1 + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}) \in \mathcal{USA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})).$$

Lemma 3.26 together with (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (4) p177) imply that \hat{I}_t is usa. Finally as $\{(\omega^t, h, x, P), P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\}$ is analytic (see Assumption 1.1), (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.47 p179, Lemma 7.30 (4) p178) applies and recalling (20) and (35), we get that

$$I_t(\omega^t, x) = 1_{[0, \infty)}(x) \sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \hat{I}_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) \text{ is usa and (27) for } t \text{ is proved.}$$

For later purpose, we set $\bar{I}_t : \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty) \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$

$$(36) \quad \bar{I}_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) := \hat{I}_t(\omega^t, h, x, P) + (-\infty)1_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus H_x^{t+1}(\omega^t, P)}(h).$$

Using Lemma 3.26, \bar{I}_t is usa and $\bar{I}_t(\omega^t, x) := 1_{[0, \infty)}(x) \sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \bar{I}_t(\omega^t, h, x, P)$ is usa as before. Furthermore as $\hat{I}_t \geq 0$ we have that $\bar{I}_t = I_t$. To prove (25) and (28) at t , we apply Lemma 3.19 to $V(\omega_{t+1}, x) = U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x)$, $I(\omega_{t+1}, x) = I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + 1)$ (recall (20)) and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega_{t+1})$ for any fixed $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$. Indeed we have already proved (see the proof of (24) at t) that Assumption 3.12 holds true for V . From (25) and (28) at $t + 1$, $I(\omega_{t+1}, \cdot)$ is non-decreasing and non-negative on \mathbb{R} for all ω_{t+1} and $V \leq I$. Finally using Assumption 1.2 and (27) at $t + 1$ together with (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 p177), we get that $\omega_{t+1} \rightarrow I_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + 1 + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}))$ is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega_{t+1})$ -measurable. We prove now (30) at t . Fix some $r \in \mathbb{Q}$, $r > 0$. We have from the definition of U_t (see (18), and (19)), (30) at $t + 1$ and the definition of J_t^r (see (22)) that for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$

$$\begin{aligned} U_t(\omega^t, r) &\geq \mathcal{U}_t(\omega^t, r) \geq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, r) P(d\omega_{t+1}) \\ &\geq \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} -J_{t+1}^r(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) P(d\omega_{t+1}) = -J_t^r(\omega^t). \end{aligned}$$

We prove now (29) at t . Choose $x \geq 0$, $(\phi_s)_{1 \leq s \leq t-1}$ universally-predictable random variables and set $\bar{G} := x + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \phi_s \Delta S_s$. Furthermore, fix some $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$, $\xi \in \phi_t(\bar{G}, P)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and set $G(\cdot) := \bar{G}(\cdot) + \xi(\cdot) \Delta S_t(\cdot)$. We apply (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.50 p184) to \bar{I}_t (see (36)) in order to obtain $S^\varepsilon : (\omega^t, x) \rightarrow (h^\varepsilon(\omega^t, x), p^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, x)) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ that is analytically-measurable such that $p^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, x) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $x \geq 0$ and (recall that $\bar{I}_t = I_t$)

$$(37) \quad \bar{I}_t(\omega^t, h^\varepsilon(\omega^t, x), x, p^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, x)) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, & \text{if } I_t(\omega^t, x) = \infty \\ I_t(\omega^t, x) - \varepsilon, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $h_G^\varepsilon(\omega^t) := h^\varepsilon(\omega^t, 1_{\{G \geq 0\}}(\omega^t)G(\omega^t))$ and $p_G^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t) := p^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, 1_{\{G \geq 0\}}(\omega^t)G(\omega^t))$. Using (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.44 p172), both h_G^ε and p_G^ε are $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.

³As already mentioned, (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.48 p180) relies on (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (4) p177) applied for upper-semianalytic functions where the convention $-\infty + \infty = -\infty$ needs to be used. But here, as we deal with a non-negative function the convention is useless.

For some $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $y \geq 0$ fixed, if $h^\varepsilon(\omega^t, y) \notin H_y^{t+1}(\omega^t, p^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, y))$, using (36), we have $\bar{I}_t(\omega^t, h^\varepsilon(\omega^t, y), y, p^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, y)) = -\infty < \min(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, I_t(\omega^t, y) - \varepsilon)$ (indeed from (25) at t , $I_t \geq 0$). This contradicts (37) and therefore $h^\varepsilon(\omega^t, y) \in H_y^{t+1}(\omega^t, p^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, y))$ and also $h_G^\varepsilon(\omega^t) \in H_{G(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t, p_G^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t))$ for $\omega^t \in \{G \geq 0\}$. We set $P_G^\varepsilon := P \otimes p_G^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ (see (2)) and get that

$$P_G^\varepsilon(G(\cdot) + h_G^\varepsilon(\cdot) \Delta S_{t+1}(\cdot) \geq 0) = \int_{\{G \geq 0\}} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} p_G^\varepsilon(G(\omega^t) + h_G^\varepsilon(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) \geq 0, \omega^t) P(d\omega^t) = 1,$$

since $\{G \geq 0\}$ is a \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set, $h_G^\varepsilon \in \phi_{t+1}(G, P_G^\varepsilon)$ follows. Using (35) and (36),

$$\int_{\Omega^t} \bar{I}_t(\omega^t, h_G^\varepsilon(\omega^t), p_G^\varepsilon(\omega^t), G(\omega^t)) P(d\omega^t) = \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} I_{t+1}(\omega^{t+1}, G(\omega^t) + 1 + h_G^\varepsilon(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^{t+1})) P_G^\varepsilon(d\omega^{t+1}) \leq A,$$

where $A := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} \sup_{\xi \in \phi_{t+1}(G+1, P)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} I_{t+1}(\omega^{t+1}, G(\omega^t) + 1 + \xi(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^{t+1})) P(d\omega^{t+1})$ and $A < \infty$ using (29) at $t+1$ ($\phi_{t+1}(G, P) \subset \phi_{t+1}(G+1, P)$). Combining with (37) we find that

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\{I_t(\cdot, G(\cdot)) = \infty\}} P(d\omega^t) + \int_{\{I_t(\cdot, G(\cdot)) < \infty\}} (I_t(\omega^t, G(\omega^t)) - \varepsilon) P(d\omega^t) \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega^t} \bar{I}_t(\omega^t, h_G^\varepsilon(\omega^t), G(\omega^t), p_G^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t)) P(d\omega^t) \leq A < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

As this is true for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $P(\{I_t(\cdot, G(\cdot)) = \infty\}) = 0$ follows. Using again (38), we get that $\int_{\Omega^t} I_t(\omega^t, \bar{G}(\omega^{t-1}) + \xi(\omega^{t-1}) \Delta S_t(\omega^t)) P(d\omega^t) \leq A$ and as this is true for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ and $\xi \in \phi_t(\bar{G}, P)$, (29) is true for t .

We are left with the proof of (33) for U_t . Let $X = x + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \phi_s \Delta S_{s+1}$, with $x \geq 0$ and $(\phi_s)_{1 \leq s \leq t-1}$ some universally-predictable random variables, be fixed such that $X \geq 0$ \mathcal{Q}^t -q.s. Let $\Omega_X^t := \tilde{\Omega}^t \cap \{X(\cdot) \geq 0\}$. Then $\Omega_X^t \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ is a \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set. We introduce the following random set $\psi_X : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\psi_X(\omega^t) := \left\{ h \in \mathcal{D}_{X(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t), U_t(\omega^t, X(\omega^t)) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, X(\omega^t) + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}) \right\},$$

for $\omega^t \in \Omega_X^t$ and $\psi_X(\omega^t) = \emptyset$ otherwise ($\mathcal{D}_{X(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ is defined in (17)). To prove (33), it is enough to find some $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable selector for ψ_X and to show that $\Omega_X^t \subset \{\psi_X \neq \emptyset\}$. The last point follows from Proposition 3.28 and Theorem 3.23 (see (13), (14), (18), (19) and recall that $\Omega_X^t \subset \tilde{\Omega}^t$). Let $u_X : \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm \infty\}$ be defined by (recall (34)) $u_X(\omega^t, h) = 1_{\Omega_X^t}(\omega^t) \tilde{u}_t(\omega^t, h, X(\omega^t))$. Using (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Proposition 14.39 p666, Corollary 14.34 p664) we first prove that $-u_X$ is a $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -normal integrand (see (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Definition 14.27 p661)) and that u_X is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable. Indeed we show that for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $u_X(\cdot, h)$ is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable and for all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $u_X(\omega^t, \cdot)$ is usc and concave. The first point follows from the fact that \tilde{u}_t is lsa, X is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable, $\Omega_X^t \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ and (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.44 p172). Now we fix $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$. If $\omega^t \notin \Omega_X^t$, it is clear that $u_X(\omega^t, \cdot)$ is usc and concave. If $\omega^t \in \Omega_X^t \subset \tilde{\Omega}^t$, we know from Proposition 3.28 that Lemma 3.22 applies and that $\phi_{\omega^t}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is usc and concave where $\phi_{\omega^t}(x, h) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, x + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1})$ if $x \geq 0$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}_x^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ and $-\infty$ otherwise. In particular for

$\omega^t \in \Omega_X^t$ and $x = X(\omega^t)$ we get that $\phi_{\omega^t}(X(\omega^t), \cdot) = u_X(\omega^t, \cdot)$ is usc and concave. Now, from the definitions of ψ_X and u_X for $\omega^t \in \Omega_X^t$, we have that

$$\psi_X(\omega^t) = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{D}_{X(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t), U_t(\omega^t, X(\omega^t)) = u_X(\omega^t, h) \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.26 implies that $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{D}_X^{t+1}) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since U_t is lsa, U_t is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R})$ -measurable and (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.29 p174) implies that $U_t(\cdot, x)$ is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed. From (24) $U_t(\omega^t, \cdot)$ is usc and nondecreasing for any fixed $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, so (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Lemmata 7.12, 7.16) implies that U_t is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable. As X is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable, we obtain that $U_t(\cdot, X(\cdot))$ is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable (see (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.44 p172)). It follows that $\text{Graph}(\psi_X) \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we can apply the Projection Theorem (see (Castaing and Valadier, 1977, Theorem 3.23 p75)) and we get that $\{\psi_X \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$. Using Auman Theorem (see (Sainte-Beuve, 1974, Corollary 1)) there exists some $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable $\hat{h}_{t+1}^X : \{\psi_X \neq \emptyset\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for all $\omega^t \in \{\psi_X \neq \emptyset\}$, $\hat{h}_{t+1}^X(\omega^t) \in \psi_X(\omega^t)$. This concludes the proof of (33) extending \hat{h}_{t+1}^X on all Ω^t ($\hat{h}_{t+1}^X = 0$ on $\Omega^t \setminus \{\psi_X \neq \emptyset\}$). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.11. We proceed in three steps. First, we handle some integrability issues that are essential to the proof and where not required in (Nutz, 2016). In particular we show that it is possible to apply Fubini Theorem. Then, we build by induction a candidate for the optimal strategy and finally we establish its optimality. The proof of the two last steps is very similar to the one of (Nutz, 2016).

Integrability Issues

First from Proposition 3.25 and (4), $u(x) \leq M_x < \infty$. We fix some $x \geq 0$ and $\phi \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T) = \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ (see again Proposition 3.25). From Proposition 3.29, we can apply by backward induction Proposition 3.30 for $t = T - 1, T - 2, \dots, 0$. In particular, we get that (28) and (29) hold true for all $0 \leq t \leq T$ and choosing $G = V_{t-1}^{x+1, \phi}$ and $\xi = \phi_t$ (use Lemma 4.3 since $\phi \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$), we get for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$,

$$(39) \quad \int_{\Omega^t} U_t^+ \left(\omega^t, V_t^{x, \phi}(\omega^t) \right) P(d\omega^t) < \infty.$$

So for all $P = P_{t-1} \otimes p \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ (see (2)) (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.45 p175) implies that

$$(40) \quad \int_{\Omega^t} U_t \left(\omega^t, V_t^{x, \phi}(\omega^t) \right) P(d\omega^t) = \int_{\Omega^{t-1}} \int_{\Omega_t} U_t \left(\omega^{t-1}, \omega_t, V_t^{x, \phi}(\omega^{t-1}, \omega_t) \right) p(d\omega_t, \omega^{t-1}) P_{t-1}(d\omega^{t-1}).$$

Construction of ϕ^*

We fix some $x \geq 0$ and build by induction our candidate ϕ^* for the optimal strategy which will verify that

$$(41) \quad U_t \left(\omega^t, V_t^{x, \phi^*}(\omega^t) \right) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1} \left(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, V_t^{x, \phi^*}(\omega^t) + \phi_{t+1}^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) \right) P(d\omega_{t+1}).$$

We start at $t = 0$ and use (33) in Proposition 3.30 with $X = x \geq 0$. We set $\phi_1^* := \hat{h}_1^x \in \mathcal{D}_x^1$ and we obtain that $P_1(x + \phi_1^* \Delta S_1(\cdot) \geq 0) = 1$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^1$ and that (41) holds true for $t = 0$. Assume that until some $t \geq 1$ we have found some universally-predictable

random variables $(\phi_s^*)_{1 \leq s \leq t}$ and some sets $(\bar{\Omega}^s)_{1 \leq s \leq t-1}$ such that $\bar{\Omega}^s \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^s)$ is a \mathcal{Q}^s -full measure set, $\phi_{s+1}^*(\omega^s) \in D^{s+1}(\omega^s)$ for all $\omega^s \in \bar{\Omega}^s$, $\{V_{s+1}^{x,\phi^*}(\cdot) \geq 0\}$ is a \mathcal{Q}^{s+1} -full measure set and (41) holds true at s for all $\omega^s \in \bar{\Omega}^s$ where $s = 0, \dots, t-1$. We apply Proposition 3.30 with $X = V_t^{x,\phi^*}$ and there exists \mathcal{Q}^t -full measure set $\bar{\Omega}^t := \Omega_{V_t^{x,\phi^*}}^t \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ and some $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable random variable $\phi_{t+1}^* := \hat{h}_{t+1}^{V_t^{x,\phi^*}}$ such that $\phi_{t+1}^*(\omega^t) \in \mathcal{D}_{V_t^{x,\phi^*}(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ for all $\omega^t \in \bar{\Omega}^t$ and (41) holds true at t . Let $P^{t+1} = P \otimes p \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ where $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ and $p \in SK_{t+1}$ with $p(\cdot, \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ for all $\omega^t \in \bar{\Omega}^t$ (see (2)). From (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.45 p175) we get

$$P_{t+1}(V_{t+1}^{x,\phi^*} \geq 0) = \int_{\Omega^t} p(V_t^{x,\phi^*}(\omega^t) + \phi_{t+1}^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0, \omega^t) P(d\omega^t) = 1,$$

where we have used that $\phi_{t+1}^*(\omega^t) \in \mathcal{H}_{V_t^{x,\phi^*}(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ for all $\omega^t \in \bar{\Omega}^t$ and $P(\bar{\Omega}^t) = 1$ and we can continue the recursion. Thus, we have found that $\phi^* \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ and from Proposition 3.25, $\phi^* \in \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)$.

Optimality of ϕ^*

We fix some $P = P_{T-1} \otimes p_T \in \mathcal{Q}^T$. Using (40), $P_{T-1}(\bar{\Omega}^{T-1}) = 1$ and (41) for $t = T-1$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} E_P U(\cdot, V_T^{x,\phi^*}(\cdot)) &= \int_{\bar{\Omega}^{T-1}} \int_{\Omega_T} U_T(\omega^{T-1}, \omega_T, V_{T-1}^{x,\phi^*}(\omega^{T-1}) + \phi_T^*(\omega^{T-1}) \Delta S_T(\omega^{T-1}, \omega_T)) p_T(d\omega_T, \omega^{T-1}) P_{T-1}(d\omega^{T-1}) \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega^{T-1}} U_{T-1}(\omega^{T-1}, V_{T-1}^{x,\phi^*}(\omega^{T-1})) P_{T-1}(d\omega^{T-1}). \end{aligned}$$

We iterate the process by backward induction and obtain that (recall that $\Omega^0 := \{\omega_0\}$) $U_0(x) \leq E_P U(\cdot, V_T^{x,\phi^*}(\cdot))$. As the preceding equality holds true for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ and as $\phi^* \in \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)$, we get that $U_0(x) \leq u(x)$ (see (4)). So ϕ^* will be optimal if $U_0(x) \geq u(x)$. We fix some $\phi \in \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ and show that

$$(42) \quad \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} E_P U_{t+1}(\cdot, V_{t+1}^{x,\phi}(\cdot)) \leq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}^t} E_Q U_t(\cdot, V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot)), \quad t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}.$$

Then $\inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P U_T(\cdot, V_T^{x,\phi}(\cdot)) \leq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}^1} E_Q U_1(\cdot, V_1^{x,\phi}(\cdot)) \leq U_0(x)$ is obtained recursively (recall (31)). As this is true for all $\phi \in \Phi(x, U, \mathcal{Q}^T)$, $u(x) \leq U_0(x)$ and the proof is complete. We fix some $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ and prove (42). As U_{t+1} is lsa (see (26)) and Assumption 1.2 holds true, (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Lemma 7.30 (3) p177, Proposition 7.48 p180) imply that f is lsa where

$$f(\omega^t, y, h, P) := \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, y + h \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) P(d\omega_{t+1}).$$

Let $f^*(\omega^t, y, h) = \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} f(\omega^t, y, h, P)$ and fix some $\varepsilon > 0$. Then since $\{(\omega^t, y, h, P), P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\}$ is an analytic set (recall Assumption 1.1), (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.50 p184) implies that there exists some universally-measurable $\tilde{p}_{t+1}^\varepsilon : (\omega^t, y, h) \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ such that $\tilde{p}_{t+1}^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, y, h) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ for all $(\omega^t, y, h) \in \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$(43) \quad f(\omega^t, y, h, \tilde{p}_{t+1}^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, y, h)) \leq \begin{cases} f^*(\omega^t, y, h) + \varepsilon, & \text{if } f^*(\omega^t, y, h) > -\infty \\ -\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $p_{t+1}^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t) = \tilde{p}_{t+1}^\varepsilon(\cdot, \omega^t, V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t), \phi_{t+1}(\omega^t))$: (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.44 p172) implies that p_{t+1}^ε is $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t)$ -measurable. For all $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t \cap \{V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot) \geq 0\}$, $f^*(\omega^t, V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t), \phi_{t+1}(\omega^t)) \leq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t)}^{t+1}(\omega^t)} f^*(\omega^t, V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t), h) = U_t(\omega^t, V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t))$ (use Lemma 4.3 since $\phi \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ and recall (31)). Choosing $y = V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t)$, $h = \phi_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ in (43), we find that for all $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t \cap \{V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot) \geq 0\}$

$$\int_{\Omega_{t+1}} U_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}, V_{t+1}^{x,\phi}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1})) p_{t+1}^\varepsilon(d\omega_{t+1}, \omega^t) - \varepsilon \leq \max \left(U_t(\omega^t, V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t)), -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \right).$$

Fix some $Q \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ and set $P^\varepsilon := Q \otimes p_{t+1}^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ (see (2)). Using (40) and since $\tilde{\Omega}^t \cap \{V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot) \geq 0\}$ is a \mathcal{Q}^t full measure set (recall again that $\phi \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$ and Lemma 4.3), we get

$$\inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} E_P U_{t+1}(\cdot, V_{t+1}^{x,\phi}(\cdot)) - \varepsilon \leq E_{P^\varepsilon} U_{t+1}(\cdot, V_{t+1}^{x,\phi}(\cdot)) - \varepsilon \leq E_Q \max \left(U_t(\cdot, V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot)), -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \right).$$

Since for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $\max \left(U_t(\cdot, V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot)), -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \right) \leq -1 + U_t^+(\cdot, V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot))$, recalling (39), letting ε go to zero and applying Fatou's Lemma, we obtain that $\inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^{t+1}} E_P U_{t+1}(\cdot, V_{t+1}^{x,\phi}(\cdot)) \leq E_Q U_t(\cdot, V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot))$. As this holds true for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}^t$, (42) is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.6. Since the $sNA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition holds true, the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition is also verified and to apply Theorem 1.11 it remains to prove that Assumption 3.5 is satisfied. We fix some $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ $x \geq 0$ and some $\phi \in \Phi(x, P)$. Since the $NA(P)$ condition holds true, using similar arguments as in the proof of (Blanchard, Carassus and Rásonyi, 2016, Theorem 4.17) we find that for P_t -almost all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$, $|V_t^{x,\phi}(\omega^t)| \leq \prod_{s=1}^t \left(x + \frac{|\Delta S_s(\omega^s)|}{\alpha_{s-1}^P(\omega^{s-1})} \right)$. Note that $V^{x,\phi}$ is universally-adapted and that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^t} E_P |V_t^{x,\phi}(\cdot)|^r < \infty$ for all $r > 0$ (recall that $\Delta S_s, \frac{1}{\alpha_s^P} \in \mathcal{W}_s$ for all $s \geq 1$). The monotonicity of U^+ and Proposition 3.24 (with $\lambda = 2 \prod_{s=1}^T \left(1 + \frac{|\Delta S_s(\omega^s)|}{\alpha_{s-1}^P(\omega^{s-1})} \right) \geq 1$) implies that for P_t -almost all $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$

$$(44) \quad U^+(\omega^T, V_T^{1,\phi}(\omega^T)) \leq 4 \left(\prod_{s=1}^T \left(1 + \frac{|\Delta S_s(\omega^s)|}{\alpha_{s-1}^P(\omega^{s-1})} \right) \right) (U^+(\omega^T, 1) + C_T(\omega^T)).$$

We set $N := 4 \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}^T} E_P \left(\left(\prod_{s=1}^T \left(1 + \frac{|\Delta S_s(\omega^s)|}{\alpha_{s-1}^P(\omega^{s-1})} \right) \right) (U^+(\omega^T, 1) + C_T(\omega^T)) \right)$. Since $U^+(\cdot, 1), U^-(\cdot, \frac{1}{4}) \in \mathcal{W}_T$ and $\Delta S_s, \frac{1}{\alpha_s^P} \in \mathcal{W}_s$ for all $s \geq 1$, we obtain that $N < \infty$ (recall the definition of C_T in Proposition 3.24). Using (44) we find that $E_P U^+(\cdot, V_T^{1,\phi}(\cdot)) \leq N < \infty$ and as this is true for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ and $\phi \in \Phi(1, P)$, Assumption 3.5 holds true. \square

4. Appendix.

4.1. Auxiliary results. The two first Lemmata were used in the proof of Theorem 3.23 and Lemma 3.26. The second one is a well-know result on concave functions which proof is given since we did not find some reference.

Lemma 4.1 Assume that Assumption 3.7 holds true. For all $x > 0$, we have $\text{Aff}(\mathcal{H}_x) = \mathbb{R}^d$, $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$ is an open set in \mathbb{R}^d and \mathbb{Q}^d is dense in $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$ ⁴. Moreover $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x) \subset \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \mathcal{H}_x^r \subset \mathcal{H}_x$ and therefore $\overline{\bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \mathcal{H}_x^r} = \mathcal{H}_x$, where the closure is taken in \mathbb{R}^d . If furthermore, we assume that there exists some $0 \leq c < \infty$ such that $Y_i(\omega) \leq c$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d, \omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ (recalling Assumption 3.7, $|Y|$ is bounded) then $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x) = \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \mathcal{H}_x^r$.

Proof. Fix some $x > 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $x - \varepsilon > 0$ and $R := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d, 0 \leq h_i \leq \frac{x-\varepsilon}{db}\}$. Using Assumption 3.7, if $h \in R$ for all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$, $x + hY(\omega) \geq x - b \sum_{i=1}^d h_i \geq \varepsilon$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}_x^\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{H}_x$. Thus $R \subset \mathcal{H}_x$ and $\text{Aff}(\mathcal{H}_x) = \mathbb{R}^d$ follows (recall that $0 \in \mathcal{H}_x$). Therefore $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$ is the interior of \mathcal{H}_x in \mathbb{R}^d and thus an open set in \mathbb{R}^d and the fact that \mathbb{Q}^d is dense in $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$ follows immediately. Fix now some $h \in \text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$. As $0 \in \mathcal{H}_x$, there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(1 + \varepsilon)h \in \mathcal{H}_x$, see (Rockafellar, 1970, Theorem 6.4 p47) which implies that $x + hY(\cdot) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}x > 0$ \mathcal{Q} -q.s., hence $h \in \mathcal{H}_x^r$ for $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $0 < r \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}x$ and $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x) \subset \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \mathcal{H}_x^r \subset \mathcal{H}_x$ is proved and also $\overline{\bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \mathcal{H}_x^r} = \mathcal{H}_x$ since $\overline{\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)} = \mathcal{H}_x$. Assume now that $|Y|$ is bounded by some constant $K > 0$. Let $h \in \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0} \mathcal{H}_x^r$ and $r \in \mathbb{Q}, r > 0$ be such that $h \in \mathcal{H}_x^r$, we set $\varepsilon := \frac{r}{2K}$. Then for any $g \in B(0, \varepsilon)$, we have for \mathcal{Q} -almost all $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ that $x + (h + g)Y(\omega) \geq r + gY(\omega) \geq r - |g||Y(\omega)| \geq \frac{r}{2}$, hence $h + g \in \mathcal{H}_x$, $B(h, \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{H}_x$ and h belongs to the interior of \mathcal{H}_x (and also to $\text{Ri}(\mathcal{H}_x)$). \square

Lemma 4.2 Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ be a concave function such that $\text{Ri}(\text{Dom } f) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\sup_{h \in \text{Dom } f} f(h) = \sup_{h \in \text{Ri}(\text{Dom } f)} f(h)$.

Proof. Let $C := \sup_{h \in \text{Ri}(\text{Dom } f)} f(h)$ and $h_1 \in \text{Dom } f \setminus \text{Ri}(\text{Dom } f)$ be fixed. We have to prove that $f(h_1) \leq C$. If $C = \infty$ there is nothing to show. So assume that $C < +\infty$. Let $h_0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Dom } f)$ and introduce $\phi : t \in \mathbb{R} \rightarrow f(th_1 + (1 - t)h_0)$ if $t \in [0, 1]$ and $-\infty$ otherwise. From (Rockafellar, 1970, Theorem 6.1 p45), $th_1 + (1 - t)h_0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Dom } f)$ if $t \in [0, 1]$ and thus $[0, 1] \subset \{t \in [0, 1], \phi(t) \leq C\}$. Clearly, ϕ is concave on \mathbb{R} . Since $\text{Dom } f$ is convex, $\text{Dom } \phi = [0, 1]$. So, using (Föllmer and Schied, 2002, Proposition A.4 p400), ϕ is lsc on $[0, 1]$ and $\{t \in [0, 1], \phi(t) \leq C\}$ is a closed set in \mathbb{R} . It follows that $1 \in \{t \in [0, 1], \phi(t) \leq C\}$, i.e. $f(h_1) \leq C$ and the proof is complete. \square

The following lemma was used several times.

Lemma 4.3 Assume that the $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ condition holds true. Let $\phi \in \Phi$ such that $V_T^{x, \phi} \geq 0$ \mathcal{Q}^T -q.s. (i.e. $\phi \in \Phi(x, \mathcal{Q}^T)$), then $V_t^{x, \phi} \geq 0$ \mathcal{Q}^t -q.s. for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$.

Proof. Let $\phi \in \Phi$ be such that $V_T^{x, \phi} \geq 0$ \mathcal{Q}^T -q.s. and assume that $V_t^{x, \phi} \geq 0$ \mathcal{Q}^t -q.s. for all t does not hold true. Then $n := \sup\{t, \exists P_t \in \mathcal{Q}^t, P_t(V_t^{x, \phi} < 0) > 0\} < T$ and there exists some $\hat{P}_n \in \mathcal{Q}^n$ such that $\hat{P}_n(A) > 0$ where $A = \{V_n^{x, \phi} < 0\} \in \mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^n)$ and for all $s \geq n + 1$, $P \in \mathcal{Q}^s$, $P(V_s^{x, \phi} \geq 0) = 1$. Let $\Psi_s(\omega^{s-1}) = 0$ if $1 \leq s \leq n$ and $\Psi_s(\omega^{s-1}) = 1_A(\omega^n)\phi_s(\omega^{s-1})$ if $s \geq n + 1$. Then $\Psi \in \Phi$ and $V_T^{0, \Psi} = \sum_{k=n+1}^T \Psi_k \Delta S_k = 1_A(V_T^{x, \phi} - V_n^{x, \phi})$. Thus $V_T^{0, \Psi} \geq 0$ \mathcal{Q}^T -q.s. and $V_T^{0, \Psi} > 0$ on A . Let $\hat{P}_T := \hat{P}_n \otimes p_{n+1} \cdots \otimes p_T \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ where for $s = n + 1, \dots, T$, $p_s(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a

⁴For a Polish space X , we say that a set $D \subset X$ is dense in $B \subset X$ if for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $b \in B$, there exists $d \in D \cap B$ such that $d(b, d) < \varepsilon$ where d is a metric on X consistent with its topology.

given universally-measurable selector of Q^s (see (2)). It is clear that $\widehat{P}_T(A) = \widehat{P}_n(A) > 0$, hence we get an arbitrage opportunity. \square

4.2. Measure theoretical issues. In this section, we first provide some counterexamples to (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Lemma 4.12) and propose an alternative to this lemma. Our counterexample 4.4 is based on a result from (Gelbaum and Olmsted, 1964) originally due (Sierpinski, 1920). An other counterexample can be found (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Proposition 14.28 p661).

Example 4.4 We denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the Lebesgue sigma-algebra on \mathbb{R}^2 . Recall that $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Let $A \notin \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that every line has at most two common points with A (see (Gelbaum and Olmsted, 1964, Example 22 p142) for the proof of the existence of A) and define $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F(x, y) := 1_A(x, y)$. We fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $A_x^1 := \{y \in \mathbb{R}, (x, y) \in A\}$. By assumption, A_x^1 contains at most two points: thus it is a closed subset of \mathbb{R} . It follows that $\{y \in \mathbb{R}, F(x, y) \geq c\}$ is a closed subset of \mathbb{R} for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $F(x, \cdot)$ is usc. Similarly the function $F(\cdot, y)$ is usc and thus $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed. But since $A \notin \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, F is not $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ -measurable and therefore not $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable.

We propose now the following correction to (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Lemma 4.12). Note that Lemma 4.5 can be applied in the proof of (Nutz, 2016, Lemma 3.7) since the considered function is concave (as well as in the proof of (Bouchard and Nutz, 2015, Lemma 4.10) where the considered function is convex).

Lemma 4.5 *Let (A, \mathcal{A}) be a measurable space and let $\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ be a function such that $\omega \rightarrow \theta(y, \omega)$ is \mathcal{A} -measurable for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \rightarrow \theta(y, \omega)$ is lsc and convex for all $\omega \in A$. Then θ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ -measurable.*

Proof. It is a direct application of (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Proposition 14.39 p666, Corollary 14.34 p664). \square

We finish with three lemmata related to measurability issues used throughout the paper.

Lemma 4.6 *Let X, Y be two Polish spaces and $F : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ be usa (resp. lsa). Then, for $x \in X$ fixed, the function $F_x : y \in Y \rightarrow F(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is usa (resp. lsa).*

Proof. Assume that F is usa and fix some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $C := F^{-1}((c, \infty)) \in \mathcal{A}(X \times Y)$. Fix now some $x \in X$. Since $I_x : y \rightarrow (x, y)$ is $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ -measurable, applying (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.40 p165), we get that $\{y \in Y, F_x(y) > c\} = \{y \in Y, (x, y) \in C\} = I_x^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{A}(Y)$. \square

Lemma 4.7 *Assume that Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2 hold true. Let $0 \leq t \leq T-1$, $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$.*

Then

$F_B : (\omega^t, P, h, x) \rightarrow P(x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in B)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\Omega^t) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable

$$H_B : (\omega^t, h, x) \rightarrow \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} P(x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in B) \in \mathcal{LSA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})$$

$$K_B : (\omega^t, h) \rightarrow \sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} P(x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in B) \in \mathcal{USA}(\Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Proof. The first assertion follows from (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.29 p144) applied to $f(\omega_{t+1}, \omega^t, P, h, x) = 1_{x+h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in B(\omega_{t+1})}$ (recall Assumption 1.2) and $q(d\omega_{t+1}|\omega^t, P, h, x) = P(d\omega_{t+1})$. The second one is obtained applying (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.47 p179) to F_B (recall Assumption 1.1). The last assertion is using $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} P(x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in B) = 1 - \inf_{P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} P(x + h\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in B^c)$ and Lemma 4.6. \square

Lemma 4.8 *Let X be a Polish space and Λ be an \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable.*

- i) *Assume that $\text{Graph}(\Lambda) \in \mathcal{B}_c(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $\text{Graph}(\bar{\Lambda}) \in \mathcal{B}_c(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where $\bar{\Lambda}$ is defined by $\bar{\Lambda}(x) = \Lambda(x)$ for all $x \in X$ (where the closure is taken in \mathbb{R}^d).*
- ii) *Assume now that Λ is open valued and $\text{Graph}(\Lambda) \in \mathcal{CA}(X \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $\text{Graph}(\Lambda) \in \mathcal{B}_c(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. From (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 14.8 p648), Λ is $\mathcal{B}_c(X)$ -measurable (see (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Definition 14.1 p643)) and using (Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 18.6 p596) we get that $\text{Graph}(\bar{\Lambda}) \in \mathcal{B}_c(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Now we prove ii). Fix some open set $O \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\Lambda^c(x) = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Lambda(x)$. As $\text{Graph}(\Lambda^c) = (X \times \mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \text{Graph}(\Lambda) \in \mathcal{A}(X \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, from (Bertsekas and Shreve, 2004, Proposition 7.39 p165) we get that

$$\{x \in X, \Lambda^c(x) \cap O \neq \emptyset\} = \text{Proj}_X((X \times O) \cap \text{Graph}(\Lambda^c)) \in \mathcal{A}(X) \subset \mathcal{B}_c(X).$$

Thus Λ^c is $\mathcal{B}_c(X)$ -measurable and as Λ^c is closed valued, (Rockafellar and Wets, 1998, Theorem 14.8 p648) applies and $\text{Graph}(\Lambda^c)$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}_c(X) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\text{Graph}(\Lambda)$ as well. \square

Acknowledgments. L. Carassus thanks LPMA (UMR 7599) for support.

References.

- ALIPRANTIS, C. D. and BORDER, K. C. (2006). *Infinite Dimensional Analysis : A Hitchhiker's Guide. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 3rd edition.
- AVELLANEDA, M., LEVY, A. and PARAS, A. (1996). Pricing and hedging derivatives securities in markets with uncertain volatilities. *Applied Mathematical Finance* **2** 73-88.
- BARTL, D. (2016). Exponential utility maximization under model uncertainty for unbounded endowments. *ArXiv*.
- BERTSEKAS, D. P. and SHREVE, S. (2004). *Stochastic Optimal Control: The Discrete-Time Case*. Athena Scientific.
- BLANCHARD, R., CARASSUS, L. and RÁSONYI, M. (2016). Non-concave optimal investment and no-arbitrage: a measure theoretical approach. *arXiv:1602.06685*.
- BLANCHARD, R. and CARASSUS, L. (2017). Quantitative fundamental theorem of asset pricing in discrete-time case with multiple priors. *in preparation*.

- BOUCHARD, B. and NUTZ, M. (2015). Arbitrage and Duality in Nondominated Discrete-Time Models. *Annals of Applied Probability* **25** 823-859.
- CARASSUS, L., RÁSONYI, M. and RODRIGUES, A. M. (2015). Non-concave utility maximisation on the positive real axis in discrete time. *Mathematics and Financial Economics* **9** 325-348.
- CARASSUS, L. and RÁSONYI, M. (2016). Maximization of Non-Concave Utility Functions in Discrete-Time Financial Market. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **41** 146-173.
- CASTAING, C. and VALADIER, M. (1977). *Convex Analysis and Measurable Multifunctions* **580**. Springer, Berlin.
- DENIS, L., HU, M. and PENG, S. (2011). Function spaces and capacity related to a Sublinear Expectation: application to G-Brownian Motion Paths. *Potential Analysis* **34** (2).
- DENIS, L. and KERVAREC, M. (2013). Optimal investment under model uncertainty in nondominated models. *SIAM Journal on control and optimization* **51** 1803-1822.
- DENIS, L. and MARTINI, C. (2006). A theoretical framework for the pricing of contingent claims in the presence of model uncertainty. *Annals of Applied Probability* **16**(2) 827-852.
- DONOGHUE, W. F. (1969). Distributions and Fourier transforms. Vol. 32 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Elsevier.
- FÖLLMER, H. and SCHIED, A. (2002). *Stochastic Finance: An Introduction in Discrete Time*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.
- FÖLLMER, H., SCHIED, A. and WEBER, S. (2009). Robust preferences and robust portfolio choice. *Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Methods in Finance*.
- GELBAUM, B. R. and OLMSTED, J. H. (1964). *Counterexamples in Analysis*. Dover Publications, Inc.
- GILBOA, I. and SCHMEIDLER, D. (1989). Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **18**(2) 141-153.
- JACOD, J. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (1998). Local martingales and the fundamental asset pricing theorems in the discrete-time case. *Finance Stochastic* **2** 259-273.
- KNIGHT, F. (1921). *Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit*. Boston, MA: Hart, Schaffner Marx; Houghton Mifflin Co.
- KRAMKOV, D. O. and SCHACHERMAYER, W. (1999). The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets. *Annals of Applied Probability* **9** 904-950.
- LYONS, F. (1995). Uncertain volatility and the risk-free synthesis of derivatives. *Journal of Applied Finance* **2** 117-133.
- NEUFELD, A. and SIKIC, M. (2016). Robust utility maximization in discrete time with friction. *ArXiv*.
- NUTZ, M. (2016). Utility Maximisation under Model Uncertainty in Discrete Time. *Mathematical Finance* **26** 252-268.
- PENNANEN, T. and PERKKIO, A.-P. (2012). Stochastic programs without duality gaps. *Mathematical Programming* **136** 91-220.
- RÁSONYI, M. and STETTNER, L. (2005). On the utility maximization problem in discrete-time financial market models. *Annals of Applied Probability* **15** 1367-1395.
- RÁSONYI, M. and STETTNER, L. (2006). On the Existence of Optimal Portfolios for the Utility Maximization Problem in Discrete time Financial Models. In: *Kabanov, Y.; Lipster, R.; Stoyanov, J. (Eds), From Stochastic Calculus to Mathematical Finance*, Springer. 589-608.
- ROCKAFELLAR, R. T. (1970). *Convex Analysis*. Princeton.
- ROCKAFELLAR, R. T. and WETS, R. J. B. (1998). *Variational analysis. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. MR1491362
- SAINTE-BEUVE, M. F. (1974). On the Extension of Von Neumann-Aumann's Theorem. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **17** 112-129.
- SCHACHERMAYER, W. (2001). Optimal investment in incomplete markets when wealth may become negative. *Annals of Applied Probability* **11** 694-734.
- SIERPINSKI, W. (1920). Sur un problème concernant les ensembles mesurables superficiellement. *Fundamenta Mathematica* **1** p112-115.
- VON NEUMANN, J. and MORGENSTERN, O. (1947). *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton University Press.