



HAL
open science

APPROXIMATE HEDGING PROBLEM WITH TRANSACTION COSTS IN STOCHASTIC VOLATILITY MARKETS

Huu Thai Nguyen, Serguei Pergamenshchikov

► **To cite this version:**

Huu Thai Nguyen, Serguei Pergamenshchikov. APPROXIMATE HEDGING PROBLEM WITH TRANSACTION COSTS IN STOCHASTIC VOLATILITY MARKETS. *Mathematical Finance*, 2017, 27, pp.832 - 865. 10.1111/mafi.12094 . hal-02334874

HAL Id: hal-02334874

<https://hal.science/hal-02334874>

Submitted on 29 Oct 2019

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.

Approximate hedging problem with transaction costs in stochastic volatility markets*

Thai Huu Nguyen[†] and Serguei Pergamenschikov[‡]

September 22, 2014

Abstract

This paper studies the problem of option replication in general stochastic volatility markets with transaction costs, using a specification for the adjusted volatility in Leland's algorithm [23]. We prove several limit theorems for the normalized replication error of Leland's strategy, as well as the strategy suggested by Lépinette [27]. The asymptotic results obtained not only recover the existing results, but also enable us to fix the under-hedging property pointed out by Kabanov and Safarian in [18]. We also discuss possible methods to improve the convergence rate and to reduce the option price inclusive of transaction costs.

Keywords: Leland strategy, transaction costs, stochastic volatility, quantile hedging, approximate hedging, high frequency markets

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 91G20; 60G44; 60H07

JEL Classification G11; G13

1 Introduction

Leland [23] suggests a simple method for pricing standard European options in markets with proportional transaction costs. He argues that transaction costs can be accounted for in the option price by increasing volatility parameter in the classical Black-Scholes model [4]. Leland then claims, without giving a mathematically rigorous argument, that the replicating portfolio of the corresponding discrete delta strategy converges to the option payoff as the number of revisions n goes to infinity, if the transaction cost rate is a constant independent of n , or decreases to zero at rate $n^{-1/2}$. The latter statement is proved by Lott

*The second author is partially supported by Russian Science Foundation (research project No. 14-49-00079) and by the National Research Tomsk State University.

[†]Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, UMR 6085 CNRS-Université de Rouen, France and Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Economics, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, e-mail: thaibopy@gmail.com, huu.nguyen@etu.univ-rouen.fr.

[‡]Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, UMR 6085 CNRS-Université de Rouen, France, and National Research University - Higher School of Economics, Laboratory of Quantitative Finance, Moscow, Russia, e-mail: serge.pergamenchikov@univ-rouen.fr.

in his PhD thesis [30]. In fact, this property still holds if the transaction cost coefficient converges to zero at any power rate [18].

However, a careful analysis shows that the replicating portfolio does not converge to the option payoff when the cost rate is a constant independent of n . Kabanov and Safarian [18] find an explicit limit for the hedging error, which is negative, showing that the replication problem is not completely solved in Leland's framework. Pergamenshchikov [34] obtains a weak convergence for the normalized hedging error and points out that, for the case of constant transaction cost, the rate of convergence in Kabanov-Safarian's result is $n^{1/4}$. This limit theorem is of practical importance because it provides the asymptotic distribution of the hedging error. Note that the rate of convergence can be improved using non-uniform revisions [27, 9]. In these papers, Lépinette and his co-authors suggest a modification to Leland's strategy to solve the discrepancy indicated in Kabanov-Safarian's result. For a recent account of the theory, we refer the reader to Section 2 and [18, 24, 26, 27, 13, 14, 9, 34].

In this study, we examine the problem of approximate hedging of European style options with constant transaction costs in stochastic volatility (SV) markets (the reader is referred to e.g. [11] and the references therein for motivations and detailed discussions related to SV models). In particular, we establish a weak convergence for the normalized hedging error of Leland's strategy using a simple form of *adjusted volatility* in a general SV setting. The results obtained not only recover the existing results, but also provide a method of improving the rate of convergence. Furthermore, it turns out that superhedging can be attained by controlling a model parameter.

Let us emphasize that the classic form for adjusted volatility proposed in [23] and then applied in [18, 19, 24, 25, 27] may be no longer practically applicable for SV models. The reason is that option pricing and hedging in SV markets are intrinsically different from those in the classical Black-Scholes framework. In particular, the option price is now substantially dependent on future realizations of the volatility process. In general cases, this information may not be statistically available for all investors. To treat this issue, we suggest a new specification for adjusted volatility in Leland's algorithm. Although we employ an artificially modified volatility simpler than the well-known version used in the previous works, the same asymptotic results are obtained for SV contexts. In addition, the rate of convergence can be improved by controlling a model parameter. Note that in the above-mentioned papers, approximation procedures are mainly based on moment estimates. This essential technique no longer works in general SV models, unless some intrinsic conditions are imposed on the model parameters [2, 28]. It is useful to remember that our goal is to establish a weak convergence for the normalized replicating error which only requires convergence in probability of the approximation terms. Thus, in the approximation procedure, the integrability issue can be avoided in order to keep our model setting as general as possible.

As discussed in [34], the option price (inclusive of transaction costs) in Leland's algorithm may be high (it, in fact, approaches the buy-and-hold price), even for small values of the revision number. Another practical advantage of our method is that the option price can be reduced as long as the option seller is willing to take a risk in option replication. This approach is inspired by the theory of quantile hedging [10].

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give a brief review of Leland's approach. Section 3 is devoted to formulating the problem and presenting our

main results. Section 4 presents some direct applications to pricing and hedging. Section 5 discusses common SV models that fulfill our condition on volatility function. A numerical result for Hull-White's model is also provided for illustration. Section 6 connects our results to high-frequency markets with proportional transaction costs. The proofs of our main results are reported in Section 7. Auxiliary lemmas can be found in the Appendix.

2 Approximate hedging with transaction costs: A review of Leland's approach

In a complete no-arbitrage model (i.e., there exists a unique equivalent martingale measure under which the stock price is a martingale), options can be completely replicated by a self-financing trading strategy. The option price, defined as the replication cost, is the initial capital that the investor must introduce into his portfolio to obtain a complete hedge. In fact, the option price can be computed as the expectation of the discounted claim under the unique equivalent martingale measure. This principle plays a central role in the well-known Black-Scholes model. For simplicity, let us consider a continuous time model of two-asset financial market on the time interval $[0, 1]$, where the bond price is equal to 1 over time. The stock price dynamics follow the stochastic differential equation

$$dS_t = \sigma_0 S_t dW_t, \quad (2.1)$$

where S_0 and σ_0 are positive constants and $(W_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is a standard Wiener process. As usual, let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{W_u, 0 \leq u \leq t\}$. We recall that a financial strategy $(\beta_t, \gamma_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is an *admissible self-financing strategy* if it is bounded from below, (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted with $\int_0^t (|\beta_t| + \gamma_t^2) dt < \infty$ a.s., and the portfolio value satisfies the equality

$$V_t = \beta_t + \gamma_t S_t = V_0 + \int_0^t \gamma_u dS_u, \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

The classic hedging problem is to find an admissible self-financing strategy (β_t, γ_t) whose terminal portfolio value exceeds the payoff $h(S_1) = \max(S_1 - K, 0)$, or

$$V_1 = V_0 + \int_0^1 \gamma_u dS_u \geq h(S_1) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where K is the strike price. By the pricing principle, the option price $C(t, S_t)$ is given by the well-known formula [4]

$$C(t, x) = C(t, x, \sigma_0) = x\Phi(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(t, x)) - K\Phi(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(t, x) - \sigma_0\sqrt{1-t}), \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(t, x) = \mathbf{v}(\sigma_0^2(1-t), x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}(\lambda, x) = \frac{\ln(x/K)}{\sqrt{\lambda}} + \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2}. \quad (2.3)$$

Here, Φ is the standard normal distribution function. In the following, we denote by φ the $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ density: $\varphi(z) = \Phi'(z)$. One can check directly that

$$C_x(t, x) = \Phi(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(t, x)) \quad \text{and} \quad C_{xx}(t, x) = \frac{\varphi(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}(t, x))}{x\sigma_0\sqrt{1-t}}. \quad (2.4)$$

By assuming that continuous portfolio adjustments are possible with zero transaction costs, Black and Scholes [4] argue that the option payoff can be dynamically replicated using the delta strategy (i.e., the partial derivative of the option price with respect to the stock price).

It is clear that the assumption of continuous portfolio revision is not realistic. Moreover, continuous trading would be ruinously expensive in the case of nonzero constant proportional transaction costs because the delta strategy has infinite variation. This simple intuition contradicts the argument of Black and Scholes that if trading takes places reasonably frequently, then hedging errors are relatively small. Therefore, option pricing and replication with nonzero trading costs are intrinsically different from those in the Black-Scholes setting. Note that it may be very costly to assure a given degree of accuracy in replication with transaction costs. In what follow, we show that Leland's increasing volatility principle [23] is practically helpful in such contexts.

2.1 Constant volatility case

Leland's approach [23] provides an efficient technique to deal with transaction costs. This method is simply based on the intuition that transaction costs can be accounted for in the option price as a reasonable extra fee, necessary for the option seller to cover the option return. It means that in the presence of transaction costs, the option becomes more expensive than in the classic Black-Scholes framework. This would be intuitively equivalent to an increase in the volatility parameter in the Black-Scholes formula. Let us shortly describe the Leland's approach [23, 18]. Suppose that for each trading activity, the investor has to pay a fee directly proportional to the trading volume, measured in dollar value. We assume that the transaction cost rate is given by the law $\kappa_* n^{-\alpha}$, where n is the number of revisions. Here, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1/2$ and $\kappa_* > 0$ are two fixed parameters. The basic idea of Leland's method is to replace the true volatility parameter in the Black-Scholes model by $\hat{\sigma}$, artificially modified as

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \sigma_0^2 + \varrho n^{1/2-\alpha} \quad \text{with} \quad \varrho = \kappa_* \sigma_0 \sqrt{8/\pi}. \quad (2.5)$$

In this case, the option price is given by $\hat{C}(t, x) = C(t, x, \hat{\sigma})$ by the Black-Scholes's formula. For the problem of option replication, Leland suggests the following discrete strategy, known as Leland's strategy,

$$\gamma_t^n = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{C}_x(t_{i-1}, S_{t_{i-1}}) \mathbf{1}_{(t_{i-1}, t_i]}(t), \quad t_i = \frac{i}{n}, \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (2.6)$$

Here, the number of shares held in the interval $(t_{i-1}, t_i]$ is the delta strategy calculated at the left bound of this interval. Then, the replicating portfolio value takes the following form

$$V_1^n = V_0^n + \int_0^1 \gamma_u^n dS_u - \kappa_* n^{-\alpha} J_n, \quad (2.7)$$

where the total trading volume is given by $J_n = \sum_{i=1}^n S_{t_i} |\gamma_{t_i}^n - \gamma_{t_{i-1}}^n|$ (measured in dollar value). Recall that the option price $\hat{C}(t, x)$ is the solution of the Black-Scholes PDE with the adjusted volatility $\hat{\sigma}$

$$\hat{C}_t(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}^2 x^2 \hat{C}_{xx}(t, x) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t < 1; \quad \hat{C}(1, x) = h(x). \quad (2.8)$$

Using Itô's formula, we can represent the tracking error, $V_1^n - h(S_1)$, as

$$\int_0^1 \left(\gamma_t^n - \widehat{C}_x(t, S_t) \right) dS_t + \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_0^2) \int_0^1 S_t^2 \widehat{C}_{xx}(t, S_t) dt - \kappa_* n^{-\alpha} J_n. \quad (2.9)$$

Remark 1 (Leland). *The specific form (2.5) results from the following intuition: the Lebesgue's integral in (2.9) is clearly well approximated by the Riemann sum of the terms $\sigma_0 S_{t_{i-1}}^2 \widehat{C}_{xx}(t_{i-1}, S_{t_{i-1}}) \Delta t$, while $S_{t_i} |\gamma_{t_i}^n - \gamma_{t_{i-1}}^n|$ can be replaced by*

$$\approx \sigma_0 S_{t_{i-1}}^2 \widehat{C}_{xx}(t_{i-1}, S_{t_{i-1}}) |\Delta W_{t_i}| \approx \sigma_0 \sqrt{2/(n\pi)} S_{t_{i-1}}^2 \widehat{C}_{xx}(t_{i-1}, S_{t_{i-1}}),$$

since $\mathbf{E}|\Delta W_{t_i}| = \sqrt{2/\pi} \sqrt{\Delta t} = \sqrt{2/(\pi n)}$. Hence, it is reasonable to expect that choosing the modified volatility defined in (2.5) may give an appropriate approximation to compensate transaction costs.

Leland [23] conjectures that the replication error converges in probability to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for the case of constant proportional transaction cost (i.e., $\alpha = 0$). He also gives a remark, without giving a rigorous proof, that this property is also true for the case $\alpha = 1/2$. In fact, Leland's second conjecture for the case $\alpha = 1/2$ is correct and is proved by Lott in his PhD thesis [30].

Theorem 2.1 (Leland-Lott). *For $\alpha = 1/2$, strategy (2.6) defines an approximately replicating portfolio as the number of revision intervals n tends to infinity*

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_1^n = h(S_1).$$

This result is then extended by Ahn *et al.* in [1] to general diffusion models. Kabanov and Safarian [18] observe that Leland-Lott's theorem remains true as long as the cost rate converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.2 (Kabanov-Safarian [18]). *For any $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$, $\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_1^n = h(S_1)$.*

In [26, 19], the authors study Leland-Lott's approximation in the sense of L^2 convergence for the case $\alpha = 1/2$ ¹.

Theorem 2.3 (Kabanov-Lépinette). *Let $\alpha = 1/2$. The mean-square approximation error of Leland's strategy, with ϱ defined in (2.5), satisfies the following asymptotic equality*

$$\mathbf{E} (V_1^n - h(S_1))^2 = An^{-1} + o(n^{-1}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where A is some positive function.

Theorem 2.3 suggests that the normalized replication error converges in law as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.4 (Lépinette-Kabanov [19]). *For $\alpha = 1/2$, the processes $Y^n = n^{1/2}(V_1^n - h(S_1))$ converge weakly in the Skorokhod space $\mathcal{D}[0, 1]$ to the distribution of the process $Y_\bullet = \int_0^\bullet B(S_t) dZ_t$, where Z is an independent Wiener process.*

¹ Seemingly, mean-square replication may not contain much useful information because gains and losses have different meaning in practice. Clearly, if $\alpha = 1/2$ the modified volatility is independent of n .

Remark 2. An interesting connection of this case with the problem of hedging under proportional transaction costs in high-frequency markets is discussed in Section 6.

It is important to note that Leland's approximation in Remark 1 is not mathematically correct and thus, his first conjecture is not valid for the case of constant transaction costs. In fact, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the trading volume J_n can be approximated by the following sum (which converges in probability to $J(S_1, \varrho)$ defined in (2.11))

$$-\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{i-1}^{-1/2} S_{t_{i-1}} \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_{i-1}, S_{t_{i-1}}) |\sigma_0 \varrho^{-1} Z_i + q(\lambda_{i-1}, S_{t_{i-1}})| \Delta \lambda_i,$$

where $\lambda_i = \lambda_{t_i} = \hat{\sigma}^2(1 - t_i)$, $Z_i = \Delta W_{t_i} / \sqrt{\Delta t_i}$ and

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) = \varphi(\mathbf{v}(\lambda, x)), \quad q(\lambda, x) = \frac{\ln(x/K)}{2\lambda} - \frac{1}{4}. \quad (2.10)$$

A careful study confirms that there is a *non trivial discrepancy* between the limit of the replicating portfolio and the payoff for the case $\alpha = 0$.

Theorem 2.5 (Kabanov-Safarian [18]). For $\alpha = 0$, V_1^n converges to $h(S_1) + \min(S_1, K) - \kappa_* J(S_1, \varrho)$ in probability, where

$$J(x, \varrho) = x \int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{-1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) \mathbf{E} |\tilde{\varrho} Z + q(\lambda, x)| d\lambda, \quad (2.11)$$

with $\tilde{\varrho} = \sigma_0 \varrho^{-1}$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ independent of S_1 .




Figure 1: $\min(S_1, K) - \kappa_* J(S_1)$ on the left and $J(S_1)$ on the right with $K = 5$.

Under-hedging: It is important to observe that the problem of option replication is not completely solved in the case of constant transaction costs. Indeed, considering that $\mathbf{E} |\tilde{\varrho}Z| = 1/(2\kappa_*)$ and the identity

$$x \int_0^{\infty} \lambda^{-1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) d\lambda = 2 \min(x, K), \quad (2.12)$$

we obtain (for the parameter ϱ given in (2.5)) that $\min(x, K) - \kappa_* J(x, \varrho) = x\kappa_*$ equals $\int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{-1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) (\mathbf{E} |\tilde{\varrho}Z| - \mathbf{E} |\tilde{\varrho}Z + q(\lambda, x)|) d\lambda$. Now, Anderson's inequality (see, for example [17], page 155) implies directly that for any $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{E} |\tilde{\varrho}Z + q| \geq \mathbf{E} |\tilde{\varrho}Z|$. Therefore, $\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (V_1^n - h(S_1)) \leq 0$, thus, the option is asymptotically under-hedged in this case.

In approximation procedures, one should also pay attention to the fact that \hat{C} and its derivatives substantially depend on the number of revisions when $0 \leq \alpha < 1/2$. In addition, the coefficient ϱ appearing in (2.5) can be chosen in an arbitrary way. Pergamenschikov [34] shows that the rate of convergence in Kabanov-Safarian's theorem is $n^{1/4}$ and provides a weak convergence for the normalized replication error.

Theorem 2.6 (Pergamenschikov [34]). *Consider Leland's strategy (2.6) with $\alpha = 0$, and let ϱ in (2.5) be some fixed positive constant. Then, the sequence of random variables*

$$n^{1/4}(V_1^n - h(S_1) - \min(S_1, K) + \kappa_* J(S_1, \varrho)) \quad (2.13)$$

weakly converges to a centered mixed Gaussian variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.6 is of practical importance because it not only gives the asymptotic information of the hedging error, but also provides a reasonable way to fix the under-hedging issue (see Section 4). Darses and Lépinette [9] modify Leland's strategy in order to improve the convergence rate in Theorem 2.6 by applying a non-uniform revision policy $(t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, defined by

$$t_i = g(i/n), \quad g(t) = 1 - (1 - t)^\mu \quad \text{for some } \mu \geq 1. \quad (2.14)$$

The adjusted volatility is then taken as $\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \sigma_0^2 + \kappa_* \sigma_0 \sqrt{8/\pi} \sqrt{n f'(t)}$, where f is the inverse function of g . Furthermore, the discrepancy in Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 can be removed by employing the following modified strategy, known as Lépinette's strategy [27],

$$\bar{\gamma}_t^n = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\hat{C}_x(t_{i-1}, S_{t_{i-1}}) - \int_0^{t_{i-1}} \hat{C}_{xt}(u, S_u) du \right) \mathbf{1}_{(t_{i-1}, t_i]}(t). \quad (2.15)$$

Theorem 2.7. *Let V_1^n be the terminal portfolio value of the strategy (2.15) with $\alpha = 0$. Then, for any $1 \leq \mu < \mu_{\max}$, the sequence $n^\beta (V_1^n - h(S_1))$ weakly converges to a centered mixed Gaussian variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where*

$$\beta = \frac{\mu}{2(\mu + 1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\max} = \frac{3 + \sqrt{57}}{8}. \quad (2.16)$$

2.2 Time-dependent volatility case

Assume now that σ is a positive non-random function and the payoff H is a continuous function with continuous derivatives, except at a finite number of points. Under the non-uniform rebalancing plan (2.14), the enlarged volatility should take the form

$$\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \sigma^2(t) + \kappa_* \sigma(t) n^{1/2-\alpha} \sqrt{f'(t)8/\pi}. \quad (2.17)$$

Theorem 2.8 (Lépinette [24]). *Let σ be a strictly positive Lipschitz and bounded function. Moreover, suppose that $H(\cdot)$ is a piecewise twice differentiable function and there exist $x_* \geq 0$ and $\delta \geq 3/2$, such that $\sup_{x \geq x_*} x^\delta |H''(x)| < \infty$. Then, for any $1/2 \geq \alpha > 0$, the replicating portfolio of Leland's strategy converges in probability to the payoff $H(S_1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, for $\alpha = 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_1^n = H(S_1) + H_1(S_1) - \kappa_* H_2(S_1),$$

where $H_1(\cdot)$ and $H_2(\cdot)$ are positive functions that depend on the payoff H .

Remark 3. *Theorem 2.7 still holds in the context of Theorem 2.8 (see [27]).*

2.3 Discussion

From Remark 1, the modified volatility defined by (2.5) would give an appropriate approximation to account for transaction costs. However, this is not always the case because the option price inclusive of transaction costs now intrinsically depends on the rebalancing number. In more general models, this specific choice may generate technical issues. For example, in local volatility models [24], proving the existence of the solution to (2.8) requires patience and effort, because $\hat{\sigma}$ depends on the stock price. On the other hand, it is interesting to observe that the true volatility plays no role in the approximation procedure from a mathematical point of view. In fact, all the results for the case $\alpha = 0$ can be obtained by using the form $\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \kappa_* \sigma(t) n^{1/2} \sqrt{f'(t)8/\pi}$, where the first term $\sigma^2(t)$ has been removed. More generally, we can take the following form

$$\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \varrho \sqrt{nf'(t)}, \quad (2.18)$$

for some positive constant ϱ , which will be specified later. Of course, the limiting value of transaction costs will change slightly. Let us emphasize that using the simple form (2.18) has two folds of importance. First, it allows us to carry out a far simpler approximation than is used in the existing literature. Second, Leland's strategy with $\hat{\sigma}$ defined in (2.5) may no longer works in stochastic volatility (SV) markets. Indeed, in the latter context, option prices are substantially dependent on volatility future realizations, which are not statistically available. We show in the remainder of the paper that the simple form (2.18) (a deterministic function of t) is helpful for approximate hedging in a very general SV setting. It should be noted that the approximation methodology developed here still work well for the classical form (2.5) if the volatility risk premium depends only on the current value of the volatility process [36, 37].

We conclude the section by mentioning that Leland's algorithm is of practical importance owing to its easy and practical implementation. The case of constant transaction

costs $\alpha = 0$ should be investigated in more general situations, for instance, where volatility depends on external random factors, or jumps in stock prices are considered. Note that the method of modern approximate hedging theory requires a delicate treatment, which is seemingly impossible in general SV models.

3 Model and main results

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}, \mathbf{P})$ be a standard filtered probability space with two standard independent $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ adapted Wiener processes $(W_t^{(1)})$ and $(W_t^{(2)})$, taking their values in \mathbb{R} . Our financial market consists of one risky asset governed by the following equations on the time interval $[0, 1]$

$$dS_t = \sigma(y_t)S_t dW_t^{(1)}; \quad dy_t = F_1(t, y_t)dt + F_2(t, y_t)(\mathbf{r}dW_t^{(1)} + \sqrt{1 - \mathbf{r}^2}dW_t^{(2)}), \quad (3.1)$$

where $-1 \leq \mathbf{r} \leq 1$ is the correlation coefficient. It is well known in the literature of SDEs that if $F_1(t, y)$ and $F_2(t, y)$ are measurable in $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$, linearly bounded and locally Lipschitz, there exists a unique solution y to the last equation of system (3.1). For this fundamental result, see Theorem 5.1 and [12, 29]. For simplicity, we assume that the bond interest rate equals zero. In other words, the non-risky asset is chosen as the *numéraire*.

In this section, we consider the problem of approximate hedging with constant proportional costs using the principle of increasing volatility for model (3.1). As discussed in Subsection 2.3, the adjusted volatility is chosen as

$$\hat{\sigma}_t^2 = \varrho \sqrt{nf'(t)} = \mu^{-1/2} \varrho \sqrt{n} (1-t)^{\frac{1-\mu}{2\mu}}, \quad 1 \leq \mu < 2. \quad (3.2)$$

The replicating portfolio is revised at (t_i) , as defined by (2.14). Note that the parameter $\varrho > 0$ plays an important role in controlling the rate of convergence and is specified later. As shown below, limiting value of the total trading volume is essentially related to the dependence of ϱ on the number of revisions.

Remark 4. *Intuitively, using an independent adjusted volatility is not too natural because it does not take into account the market information. However, our techniques developed in this note are well adapted to the case when the adjusted volatility depends on the volatility process that is driven by an independent Brownian motion. In such a context, if the volatility risk premium depends only on the current volatility process, then the no-arbitrage option price (without transaction costs) is given as the average of the Black-Scholes prices over the future paths of the volatility process [36, 37]. The detail will be reported in a next publication.*

For the reader's convenience, we recall that $\hat{C}(t, x)$ is the solution of the Cauchy problem (2.8) with two first derivatives, as described in (2.4): $\hat{C}_x(t, x) = \Phi(\mathbf{v}(\lambda_t, x))$ and $\hat{C}_{xx}(t, x) = x^{-1} \lambda_t^{-1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_t, x)$, where

$$\lambda_t = \int_t^1 \hat{\sigma}_s^2 ds = \tilde{\mu} \varrho \sqrt{n} (1-t)^{\frac{1}{4\beta}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu} = 2\sqrt{\mu}/(\mu + 1). \quad (3.3)$$

Remark 5. We see in Section 4 that the under-hedging situation pointed out in [18] can be fixed by controlling the parameter ϱ .

We make use of the following condition on the volatility function.

(C₁) Assume that σ is a C^2 function and there exists σ_{\min} such that

$$0 < \sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma(y) \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E}[\sigma^2(y_t) + |\sigma'(y_t)|] < \infty.$$

Assumption (C₁) is not restrictive and is fulfilled in many popular SV models (see Section 5 and [35]).

3.1 Asymptotic results for Leland's strategy

Let us study the replication error for Leland's strategy γ_t^n defined in (2.6). The replicating portfolio V_1^n is defined by (2.7). Now, by Itô's formula, we obtain

$$h(S_1) = \widehat{C}(1, S_1) = \widehat{C}(0, S_0) + \int_0^1 \widehat{C}_x(t, S_t) dS_t - \frac{1}{2} I_{1,n}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $I_{1,n} = \int_0^1 (\widehat{\sigma}_t^2 - \sigma^2(y_t)) S_t^2 \widehat{C}_{xx}(t, S_t) dt$. Setting $V_0 = \widehat{C}(0, S_0)$, we can represent the replication error as

$$V_1^n - h(S_1) = \frac{1}{2} I_{1,n} + I_{2,n} - \kappa_* J_n, \quad (3.5)$$

where $I_{2,n} = \int_0^1 (\gamma_t^n - \widehat{C}_x(t, S_t)) dS_t$ and J_n is defined as in (2.7).

Let us first emphasize that complete replication in SV models is far from obvious. In our setting, $I_{2,n}$ converges to zero faster than n^β , with β defined as in (2.16). The gamma error $I_{1,n}$ approaches $2 \min(S_1, K)$ at the same rate. On the other hand, the total trading volume J_n converges in probability to the random variable $J(S_1, y_1, \varrho)$, defined by

$$J(x, y, \varrho) = x \int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{-1/2} \widetilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) \mathbf{E} |\sigma(y) \varrho^{-1} Z + q(\lambda, x)| d\lambda, \quad (3.6)$$

where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ independent of S_1 and y_1 . Our goal is to study the convergence of the normalized replication error corrected by these explicit limiting values by applying the theory of limit theorems for martingales [15]. To do so, we search for the martingale part in the approximation of the above terms by developing a special discretization procedure in Section 7.

Theorem 3.1. Suppose that condition (C₁) holds and $\varrho > 0$ is a fixed positive constant. Then,

$$n^\beta (V_1^n - h(S_1) - \min(S_1, K) + \kappa_* J(S_1, y_1, \varrho))$$

weakly converges to a centered mixed Gaussian variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 6. This theorem is a generalization that includes an improved convergence rate of the results in [18, 34], where the uniform revision is taken and the volatility is assumed to be a constant.

Remark 7. Remark that $h(x) + \min(x, K) = x$, where $h(x) = (x - K)^+$ is the payoff of a classical European call option. Then, from Theorem 3.1, the wealth process V_1^n approaches $S_1 - \kappa_* J(S_1, y_1, \varrho)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This can be explained by the fact that the option is now sold at a higher price because $C(0, S_0, \hat{\sigma}) \rightarrow S_0$ as $\hat{\sigma} \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, Leland's strategy now converges to the well-known buy-and-hold [22]: buy a stock share at time $t = 0$ for price S_0 and keep it until expiry.

We now present a method of improving the rate of convergence in Theorem 3.1. To this end, by letting $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$, we observe that

$$\lim_{\varrho \rightarrow \infty} J(x, y, \varrho) = x \int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{-1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) |q(\lambda, x)| d\lambda := J^*(x), \quad (3.7)$$

which is independent of y . This suggests that the rate of convergence in Theorem 3.1 can be improved if ϱ is taken as a function of n . Our next result is established under the following condition on ϱ .

(C₂) The parameter $\varrho = \varrho(n)$ is a function of n such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(n) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho n^{-\frac{\mu}{2(\mu+2)}} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.2. Under conditions (C₁) – (C₂),

$$\theta_n (V_1^n - h(S_1) - \min(S_1, K) + \kappa_* J^*(S_1)), \quad \text{with} \quad \theta_n = n^\beta \varrho^{2\beta},$$

weakly converges to a centered mixed Gaussian variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 8. The asymptotic distributions in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 are explicitly determined in their proofs in Section 7.

3.2 Asymptotic result for Lépinette's strategy

Let us study the replication error of Lépinette's strategy $\bar{\gamma}_t^n$, as defined in (2.15). As before, the replicating portfolio is given by $\bar{V}_1^n = \bar{V}_0^n + \int_0^1 \bar{\gamma}_t^n dS_t - \kappa_* \bar{J}_n$, where

$$\bar{J}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n S_{t_i} |\bar{\gamma}_{t_i}^n - \bar{\gamma}_{t_{i-1}}^n|. \quad (3.8)$$

Now, by Itô's formula, the tracking error is

$$\bar{V}_1^n - h(S_1) = \frac{1}{2} I_{1,n} + \bar{I}_{2,n} - \kappa_* \bar{J}_n, \quad (3.9)$$

where $\bar{I}_{2,n} = I_{2,n} + \sum_{i \geq 1} (S_{t_i} - S_{t_{i-1}}) \int_0^{t_{i-1}} \hat{C}_{xt}(u, S_u) du$. Then, we have the following strengthening of Theorem 2.7.

Theorem 3.3. Suppose that (C₁) is fulfilled. Then, for any $\varrho > 0$, the sequence

$$n^\beta (\bar{V}_1^n - h(S_1) - \eta \min(S_1, K)), \quad \text{with} \quad \eta = 1 - \kappa_* \sigma(y_1) \varrho^{-1} \sqrt{8/\pi},$$

weakly converges to a centered mixed Gaussian variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 9. Theorem 2.7 can be established from Theorem 3.3 with $\varrho = \kappa_* \sigma \sqrt{8/\pi}$ when the volatility is a constant. In addition, in our model, the parameter μ takes its values in the interval $[1, 2)$, which is slightly more general than the condition imposed in Theorem 2.7. Moreover, if the classical form of adjusted volatility is applied for Lépinette's strategy, then complete replication can be reached by taking $\varrho = \kappa_* \sqrt{8/\pi}$, and we again have the result established in [9].

Corollary 3.1. Under conditions $(\mathbf{C}_1) - (\mathbf{C}_2)$, the wealth sequence \bar{V}_1^n converges in probability to $h(S_1) + \min(S_1, K) = S_1$.

Note that we do not obtain an improved convergence version of Theorem 3.3 because $\kappa_* \bar{J}_n$ converges to zero at order of ϱ .

4 Application to the pricing problem

In this section, we present an application for the problem of option pricing with transaction costs. We first emphasize that it is impossible to obtain a *non-trivial* perfect hedge in the presence of transaction costs, even in constant volatility models. In fact, the seller can take the *buy-and-hold* strategy, but this leads to a high option price. We show below that option price can be reduced in certain ways so that the payoff is covered with a given probability.

4.1 Super-hedging with transaction costs

To be on the safe side, the investor search for strategies that provide the terminal value greater than the payoff. Such strategies usually concern solutions to dynamic optimization problems. More precisely, let H be a general contingent claim and denote $\mathcal{A}(x)$ and $V_T^{\pi, x}$ as the set of all *admissible strategies* π with initial capital x and the terminal value of strategy π , respectively. Then, the super-replication cost for H is determined as

$$U_0 = \inf \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \exists \pi \in \mathcal{A}(x), V_T^{\pi, x} \geq H \text{ a.s.}\}, \quad (4.1)$$

(see [22] and the references therein for more detail). In the presence of transaction costs, Cvitanović and Karatzas [8] show that the *buy-and-hold strategy* is the unique choice for super-replication, and then S_0 is the super-replication price. In this section, we show that this property still holds for approximate super-hedging. The following observation is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.2 when ϱ is used as a function of n .

Proposition 4.1. Under conditions $(\mathbf{C}_1) - (\mathbf{C}_2)$, $\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_1^n \geq h(S_1)$. The same property holds for Lépinette's strategy.

Proof. Note first that $J^*(x) \leq \min(x, K)$, for all $x > 0$. Hence, by Theorem 3.2,

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (V_1^n - h(S_1)) \geq (1 - \kappa_*) \min(S_1, K). \quad (4.2)$$

The left-hand side is obviously non-negative since $\kappa_* < 1$. The conclusion for Lépinette's strategy directly follows from Theorem 3.3. \square

4.2 Asymptotic quantile pricing

As seen earlier, super-hedging in the presence of transaction costs leads to a high option price. Practically, one can ask that how much the initial capital can be reduced by accepting a shortfall probability at the terminal moment. More precisely, for a given significance level $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, the seller may look for hedges with a minimal initial cost defined by

$$\inf \{x \in \mathbb{R}, \exists \pi \in A(x) : \mathbf{P}(V_T^{\pi, x} \geq H) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}.$$

This construction is motivated by quantile hedging theory, which goes back to [10, 33]. For related discussions, we refer to [10, 33, 34, 5, 7, 6]. Here, we adapt this idea to the hedging problem. Recall that the super-hedging price of Leland's algorithm is S_0 . On the seller's side, we propose a price $\delta S_0 < S_0$ for the option, for a properly chosen $0 < \delta < 1$. We then follow Leland's strategy for replication. To be safe at the terminal moment, we need to choose ρ such that the probability of the terminal portfolio exceeding the sum of the real objective (i.e., the payoff) and the additional amount $(1 - \delta)S_0$ is greater than $1 - \varepsilon$. Here, ε is a significance level predetermined by the seller. By Proposition 4.1, this aim can be achieved for sufficiently large ρ . To determine the option price, it now remains to choose the smallest value of δ . Motivated by (4.2), we define this by

$$\delta_\varepsilon = \inf \{a > 0 : \Upsilon(a) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}, \quad \Upsilon(a) = \mathbf{P}((1 - \kappa_*) \min(S_1, K) > (1 - a)S_0). \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, the reduction in the option price is given by $(1 - \delta_\varepsilon)S_0$. Clearly, smaller values of δ_ε yield cheaper options.

Next, we show that the option price is significantly reduced, compared with powers of parameter ε .

Proposition 4.2. *Assume that $\sigma_{\max} = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \sigma(y) < \infty$. Then, for any $r > 0$ and δ_ε defined by (4.3),*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (1 - \delta_\varepsilon) \varepsilon^{-r} = +\infty. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. We first observe that $0 < \delta_\varepsilon \leq 1$ and δ_ε tends to 1 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Set $b = 1 - \kappa_*$. Then, for sufficiently small ε such that $\delta_\varepsilon > a > 1 - bK/S_0$, one has

$$1 - \varepsilon > \mathbf{P}(b \min(S_1, K) > (1 - a)S_0) = 1 - \mathbf{P}(S_1/S_0 \leq (1 - a)/b).$$

Therefore,

$$\varepsilon < \mathbf{P}(S_1/S_0 \leq (1 - a)/b) \leq \mathbf{P}(X_1 \leq -z_a), \quad (4.5)$$

where $X_t = \int_0^t \sigma(y_t) dW_t^{(1)}$ and $z_a = \ln(b/(1 - a)) - \sigma_{\max}^2/2$. To estimate this probability, we note that for any integer $m \geq 1$, $\mathbf{E}(X_1)^{2m} \leq \sigma_{\max}^{2m} (2m - 1)!!$ (see [29, Lemma 4.11, p.130]). Set $R(v) = 2v\sigma_{\max}^2$. For any $0 < v < 1/2\sigma_{\max}^2$,

$$\mathbf{E} e^{vX_1^2} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{v^m}{m!} \mathbf{E}(X_1)^{2m} \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{v^m}{m!} \sigma_{\max}^{2m} (2m - 1)!! \leq \frac{1}{1 - R(v)}.$$

Therefore, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{P}(X_1 \leq -z_a) = \mathbf{P}(-X_1 \geq z_a) \leq e^{-vz_a^2} \mathbf{E} e^{vX_1^2} \leq \frac{e^{-vz_a^2}}{1 - R(v)}.$$

Then, $1 - a \geq b e^{-\iota_\varepsilon(v)}$, where $\iota_\varepsilon(v) = \sqrt{|\ln \varepsilon(1 - R(v))|/v} + \sigma_{\max}^2/2$. Letting $a \rightarrow \delta_\varepsilon$, we get $1 - \delta_\varepsilon \geq b e^{-\iota_\varepsilon(v)}$, which implies (4.4). \square

The boundedness of the volatility function is essential for the above comparison result. If we wish to relax this assumption, the price reduction will be less free than in Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that $\mathbf{E} \exp\{\alpha \int_0^1 \sigma^2(y_s) ds\} < \infty$, for some constant $\alpha > 1/2$. Then, for $r_\alpha = (2\sqrt{2\alpha} + 1)/2\alpha$,*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-r_\alpha} (1 - \delta_\varepsilon) > 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. For any positive constant L we set

$$\tau = \tau_L = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \int_0^t \sigma^2(y_s) ds \geq L \right\} \wedge 1, \quad (4.7)$$

which is understood to be the first time that the log-price's variance passes level L . Then, from (4.5),

$$\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{P} \left(\mathcal{E}_1^{-1}(\sigma) \geq u_a, \int_0^1 \sigma^2(y_s) ds \leq L \right) + \mathbf{P} \left(\int_0^1 \sigma^2(y_s) ds \geq L \right), \quad (4.8)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_t(\sigma) = e^{\int_0^t \sigma(y_s) dW_s^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sigma^2(y_s) ds}$, $u_a = (1 - \kappa_*)/(1 - a)$, and $\delta_\varepsilon > a > 1 - bK/S_0$. Note that for any $p > 0$, the stopped process $\chi_t = \mathcal{E}_{\tau \wedge t}(-p\sigma)$ is a martingale and $\mathbf{E}\chi_t = 1$. Therefore, the first probability on the right side of (4.8) can be estimated as

$$(u_a)^{-p} \mathbf{E} \mathcal{E}_\tau^{-p}(\sigma) = (u_a)^{-p} \mathbf{E} \chi_1 e^{\check{p} \int_0^\tau \sigma^2(y_s) ds} \leq (u_a)^{-p} e^{\check{p}L},$$

where $\check{p} = (p^2 + p)/2$. By the hypothesis and Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\int_0^1 \sigma^2(y_s) ds \geq L \right) \leq C_\alpha e^{-\alpha L}, \quad \text{with } C_\alpha = \mathbf{E} \exp \left\{ \alpha \int_0^1 \sigma^2(y_s) ds \right\}.$$

Hence, $\varepsilon \leq (u_a)^{-p} e^{\check{p}L} + C_\alpha e^{-\alpha L}$. By choosing $L = \alpha^{-1} \ln(2C/\varepsilon)$ and letting $a \rightarrow \delta_\varepsilon$, one deduces that for any $p > 0$ and for some positive constant \tilde{C}_α ,

$$1 - \delta_\varepsilon \geq \tilde{C}_\alpha \varepsilon^{\gamma^*(p)}, \quad \text{where } \gamma^*(p) = (p + 1)/(2\alpha) + p^{-1}.$$

Note that $r_\alpha = \min_{p > 0} \gamma^*(p) = \gamma^*(\sqrt{2\alpha})$. Then, including in the last inequality $p = \sqrt{2\alpha}$ we obtain property (4.6). \square

Remark 10. *It is clear that $r_\alpha < 1$ for $\alpha > 3/2 + \sqrt{2}$. The condition used in Proposition 4.3 holds for such α when σ is linearly bounded and y_t follows an Orstein-Uhlenbeck process (see the Appendix C). The same quantile pricing results can be established for the Lépinette strategy.*

5 Examples and numerical results

In this section, we list some well-known SV models for which condition (\mathbf{C}_1) is fulfilled. To this end, we need some moment estimates for solutions to general SDEs,

$$dy_t = F_1(t, y_t)dt + F_2(t, y_t)dZ_t, \quad y(0) = y_0, \quad (5.1)$$

where Z is a standard Wiener process and F_1, F_2 are two smooth functions. We first recall the well-known result in SDE theory (see for example [12, Theorem 2.3, p.107]).

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that $F_1(t, y)$ and $F_2(t, y)$ are measurable in $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$, linearly bounded and locally Lipschitz. If $\mathbf{E}|y_0|^{2m} < \infty$ for some integer $m \geq 1$, then there exists a unique solution (y_t) to (5.1) and*

$$\mathbf{E}|y_t|^{2m} < (1 + \mathbf{E}|y_0|^{2m})e^{\alpha t}, \quad \mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |y_s|^{2m} < M(1 + \mathbf{E}|y_0|^{2m}),$$

where α, M are positive constants dependent on t, m .

In the context of Theorem 5.1, condition (\mathbf{C}_1) holds if volatility function and its derivative satisfy the condition of polynomial growth $|\sigma(y)| \leq C(1 + |y|^m)$, for some positive constant C and $m \geq 1$.

Hull-White models: Assume that y_t follows a geometric Brownian motion

$$dS_t = (y_t + \sigma_{\min})S_t dW_t \quad \text{and} \quad dy_t = y_t(adt + bdZ_t), \quad (5.2)$$

where $\sigma_{\min} > 0$, a and b are some constants, and Z is a standard Brownian motion correlated to W_t . Put $y^* = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |y_t|$. Then, by Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(y^*)^{2m} \leq C(1 + \mathbf{E}|y_0|^{2m}) < \infty, \quad m \geq 1,$$

as long as $\mathbf{E}|y_0|^{2m} < \infty$. Therefore, condition (\mathbf{C}_1) is fulfilled in (5.2).

Uniform elliptic volatility models: Suppose that volatility is driven by an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process of mean-reverting

$$dS_t = (y_t^2 + \sigma_{\min})S_t dW_t \quad \text{and} \quad dy_t = (a - by_t)dt + dZ. \quad (5.3)$$

In this case, $\sigma(y) = y^2 + \sigma_{\min}$. Thus, condition (\mathbf{C}_1) is verified throughout Theorem 5.1.

Stein-Stein models: Assume that

$$dS_t = \sqrt{y_t^2 + \sigma_{\min}} S_t dW_t \quad \text{and} \quad dy_t = (a - by_t)dt + dZ_t. \quad (5.4)$$

We have $\sigma(y) = \sqrt{y^2 + \sigma_{\min}}$ and condition (\mathbf{C}_1) is also verified by Theorem 5.1.

Heston models: Heston [16] proposes a SV model where volatility is driven by a CIR process, which also known as squared root process. This model can be used in our context. Indeed, assume now that the price dynamics are given by the following:

$$dS_t = \sqrt{y_t + \sigma_{\min}} S_t dW_t \quad \text{and} \quad dy_t = (a - by_t)dt + \sqrt{y_t} dZ_t, \quad y_0 \geq 0. \quad (5.5)$$

For any a and $b > 0$, the last equation admits a unique strong solution $y_t > 0$. Note that the Lipschitz condition in Theorem 5.1 is violated, but by using the stopping times

technique, we can directly show that $\mathbf{E}y^* < \infty$. Hence, this implies that condition (\mathbf{C}_1) is satisfied for model (5.5).

Similarly, we can check that (\mathbf{C}_1) also holds for Ball-Roma's models [3] or, more generally, for a class of processes of bounded diffusion holding the following condition.

(A) *There exist positive constants a, b , and M such that*

$$yF_1(t, y) \leq a - by^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |F_2(t, y)| \leq M, \quad \text{for all } t > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proposition 5.1. *Under condition (A), there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\mathbf{E}e^{\alpha y^{*2}} < \infty$.*

Proof. The proof uses the same method as in Proposition 1.1.2 in [20]. \square

Scott models: Suppose that volatility follows an Orstein-Uhlenbeck, as in Stein-Stein's models, and the function σ takes the exponential form

$$dS_t = (e^{\delta y_t} + \sigma_{\min})S_t dW_t^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad dy_t = (a - by_t)dt + dZ_t, \quad (5.6)$$

where a, b and $\sigma_{\min} > 0$ are constants. Here, $\delta > 0$ is chosen such that $2\delta \leq \alpha$, defined as in Proposition 5.1. Clearly, $\sigma(y) = e^{\delta y} + \sigma_{\min}$ and condition (\mathbf{C}_1) is fulfilled since

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\sigma(y)|^2 \leq 2\sigma_{\min}^2 + 2\mathbf{E}(e^{2\delta} \mathbf{1}_{\{|y_t| \leq 1\}} + e^{2\delta|y_t|^2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|y_t| > 1\}}) < \infty.$$

Numerical result for Hull-White's model: We provide a numerical example for the approximation result of Lépinette's strategy in Hull-White's model (5.2). By Theorem 3.3, the corrected replication error is given by $V_1^n - \max(S_1 - K, 0) - \eta \min(S_1, K)$, where $\eta = 1 - \kappa_* \sigma(y_1) \varrho^{-1} \sqrt{8/\pi}$. The difference $V_1^n - \max(S_1 - K, 0)$ can be seen as the gain/loss

n	gain/loss	corrected error	lower bound	upper bound	price	strategy
10	0.1523845	-0.2225988	-0.2363122	-0.2088854	0.7914033	0.9013901
50	0.2966983	-0.0596194	-0.0670452	-0.0521936	0.9399330	0.9706068
100	0.3086120	-0.0288526	-0.0350141	-0.0226911	0.9746527	0.9875094
500	0.2955755	0.0032387	-0.0005821	0.0070594	0.9991733	0.9995891
1000	0.2851002	0.0012409	-0.0021596	0.0046415	0.9999300	0.9999652

Table 1: Convergence for Lépinette's strategy with $\kappa_* = 0.01, \varrho = 2$.


n	gain/loss	corrected error	lower bound	upper bound	price	strategy
10	0.2859197	-0.0744180	-0.0813544	-0.0674816	0.9246420	0.9659700
50	0.3172523	-0.0069238	-0.0115426	-0.0023049	0.9921661	0.9962377
100	0.3033519	0.0007474	-0.0030916	0.0045864	0.9984346	0.9992385
500	0.3618707	0.0001296	-0.0024741	0.0027333	0.9999977	0.9999989
1000	0.3334375	0.0003996	-0.0020559	0.0028550	1	1

Table 2: Convergence for Lépinette's strategy with $\kappa_* = 0.001, \varrho = 4$.


of strategy $\bar{\gamma}^n$. For a numerical view, we simulate $N = 500$ trajectories in a crude Monte-Carlo method, where correlation coefficient of two Brownian motions is 0.05 and the other initial values are given by $S_0 = K = 1, y_0 = 2, \sigma_{\min} = 2, a = -2$ and $b = 1$. For each

value of n , we estimate the average value of the corrected error and give the corresponding 95% intervals defined by lower and upper bounds. Initial numbers of shares to hold are given in the last column of Table 1 and Table 2. It turns out that strategy $\bar{\gamma}_t^n$ converges to the buy-and-hold and the option prices approach the super-hedging price S_0 . We also see that the convergence of the corrected replication error to zero is somehow slow. In fact, increasing values of ϱ can provide a better convergence, but this unexpectedly leads to super-replication more rapidly.

We now provide a numerical illustration for the quantile hedging result of Proposition 4.2. For simplicity, we now suppose that $\sigma(y) = \sin^2(y) + 0.1$ and that y follows a geometric Brownian motion as above. To compare the reduction factor $1 - \delta_\varepsilon$ with powers of significance level ε , we compute $(1 - \delta_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-r}$ for $0.001 \leq \varepsilon \leq 0.1$ and $0 \leq r \leq 0.1$, with $\kappa_* = 0.001$. Then, (4.4) is confirmed by the simulation result (see Figure 2a). The simulation also shows that the option price inclusive of transaction costs is $1 - 0.385 = 0.615$, which is cheaper than the super-hedging price $S_0 = 1$, for a shortfall probability less than 0,1%. Of course it is reasonable to replace S_0 by the option price inclusive of transaction costs $\widehat{C}(0, S_0)$. Then, simulation result for the reduction in the option price $(1 - \delta_\varepsilon)\widehat{C}(0, S_0)$ is given in Figure 2b.



(a) Reduction factor $1 - \delta_\varepsilon$ and powers of ε



(b) Reduction amount and ε

6 High-frequency markets

We now assume that purchases of the risky asset are carried out at a higher ask price $S_t + \varepsilon_t$, whereas sales only earn a lower bid price $S_t - \varepsilon_t$. Here the mid-price S_t is given as in model (3.1) and ε_t is the halfwidth of the bid-ask spread. Then, for any trading strategy of finite variation ψ_t , the wealth process can be determined by

$$V_t = V_0 + \int_0^t \psi_s dS_s - \int_0^t \varepsilon_s d|\psi|_s, \quad (6.1)$$

where $|\psi|$ is the total variation of ψ_t . Observe that the first two terms are the classic components in frictionless frameworks, and respectively describe the initial capital and

gains from trading. The last integral in (6.1) accounts for transaction costs incurred from the trading activities by weighting the total variation² of the strategy with the halfwidth of the spread.

For optimal investment and consumption with small transaction costs [21], the additional terms should be added in the formulation of V_t . In such cases, approximate solutions are usually determined throughout an asymptotic expansion around zero of the halfwidth spread ε , where the leading corrections are obtained by collecting the inputs from the frictionless problem.

In this section, we are only interested in the replication purpose using discrete strategies in Leland's spirit. Assume that for his replication aim, the option seller applies a discrete hedging strategy $\psi_t^{n,\varepsilon}$, revised at n dates defined by $t_i = g(i/n)$ as in Section 3. The corresponding wealth process is now given by

$$V_t^{n,\varepsilon} = V_0^{n,\varepsilon} + \int_0^t \psi_s^{n,\varepsilon} dS_s - \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_{t_i} |\psi_{t_i}^{n,\varepsilon} - \psi_{t_{i-1}}^{n,\varepsilon}|. \quad (6.2)$$

To treat the risk of transaction costs, we again apply the increasing volatility principle. Note that in high frequency markets, the bid-ask spread is, in general, of the same order of magnitude as price jumps³. Hence, ε_t should be of the form $\kappa_* n^{-1/2} S_t$, for some positive constant κ_* . Then, this case corresponds to Leland-Lott's framework with $\alpha = 1/2$.

In our context, the method in Section 3 is still helpful when $\psi_t^{n,\varepsilon}$ is replaced by Leland's or Lépinette's strategy.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\varepsilon_t = \kappa_* n^{-1/2} S_t$, and assume that the enlarged volatility is of the form $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \varrho \sqrt{nf'(t)}$ as in (3.2). For both Leland's and Lépinette's strategies, the sequence of replicating portfolio values $V_1^{n,\varepsilon}$ converges in probability to $h(S_1) + \min(S_1, K) = S_1$. In particular, $n^\beta (V_1^{n,\varepsilon} - S_1)$ converges to a mixed Gaussian variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1, because the total transaction cost now converges to zero. \square

Note that the case $\alpha = 0$ studied in Section 3 corresponds to the assumption $\varepsilon_t = \kappa_* S_t$, for some constant κ_* . This specific form means that the market is more illiquid and the bid-ask spread is now proportional to the spot asset price in every trade. Therefore, approximate hedging results for this case are the same as those in Section 3.

We conclude the section by supposing that the stock spreads remain constant all the time, regardless of the current stock price. In other words, $\varepsilon_t = \kappa_*$ for some positive constant κ_* . Intuitively, transaction costs are now based on the volume of traded shares, instead of on the traded amount of money as in the literature and Section 3. It is interesting to see that our methodology still works in this case. The following result is just an analog of Theorem 3.1, with a small modification to the limiting value of transaction costs, defined by

$$J_0(x, y, \varrho) = \int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{-1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) \mathbf{E} \left| \sigma(y) \varrho^{-1} Z + \frac{\ln(x/K)}{2\lambda} - \frac{1}{4} \right| d\lambda, \quad (6.3)$$

²It is important to know that the classical Black-Scholes strategy is not finite variation.

³We would like to thank the anonymous referee for pointing out the correspondence of the case $\alpha = 1/2$ to this setting.

where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ independent of S_1, y_1

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose that $\varepsilon_t = \kappa_* > 0$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \varrho \sqrt{nf'(t)}$. For Leland's strategy under condition (\mathbf{C}_1) , the sequence $n^\beta (V_1^{n,\varepsilon} - h(S_1) - \min(S_1, K) + \kappa_* J_0(S_1, y_1 \varrho))$ weakly converges to a centered mixed Gaussian variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, for Lépinette's strategy, $n^\beta (\bar{V}_1^{n,\varepsilon} - h(S_1) - (1 - \eta_0) \min(S_1, K))$ weakly converges to a centered mixed Gaussian variable, where $\eta_0 = \sigma(y_1) \varrho^{-1} S_1^{-1} \sqrt{8/\pi}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.1 (see Section 7). \square

Remark 11. *When $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$ under condition (\mathbf{C}_2) , one obtains an improved-rate version of Proposition 6.2, as in Theorem 3.2.*

7 Proofs

Our main results are proved in the following generic procedure.

Step 1: Determine the principal term of the hedging error. In particular, we will show that the gamma term $I_{1,n}$ converges to $2 \min(S_1, K)$, while the cumulative transaction cost approaches J defined in (3.6). Both convergences are at rate $\theta_n = n^\beta \varrho^{2\beta}$.

Step 2: Represent the residual terms as discrete martingales. To this end, stochastic integrals will be discretized by following a special procedure set up in Subsection 7.2.

Step 3: Determine the limit distribution of normalized replication error by applying Theorem 7.1. This result is the key tool but we need in fact some special versions compatible with our context. These will be explicitly constructed in Subsection 7.3.

7.1 Preliminary

Note first that $\widehat{C}(t, x)$ and its derivatives can be represented as functions of λ_t and x , where

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_0 (1 - t)^{\frac{1}{4\beta}} := \lambda_0 \nu(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_0 = \tilde{\mu} \varrho \sqrt{n}. \quad (7.1)$$

Moreover, the function $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$, which appears in all k -th ($k \geq 2$) degree derivatives of \widehat{C} with respect to x and derivatives in time via the relation (2.8), is exponentially decreasing to zero when λ tends to zero or infinity. This property motivates our analysis in terms of variable λ . In particular, let us fix two functions l_*, l^* and let $1 \leq m_1 < m_2 \leq n$ be two integers such that $l_* = \lambda_0 \nu(g(m_2/n))$ and $l^* = \lambda_0 \nu(g(m_1/n))$. Then, all terms corresponding to index $j \notin [m_1, m_2]$ can be ignored at a certain order which depends on the choice of l_* and l^* . For our purpose, the desired order is $\theta_n \sim \lambda_0^{2\beta}$. Therefore, we take, for example, $l_* = 1/\ln^3 n$, $l^* = \ln^3 n$ and define

$$m_1 = n - \left[n (l^*/\lambda_0)^{2/(\mu+1)} \right] + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad m_2 = n - \left[n (l_*/\lambda_0)^{2/(\mu+1)} \right], \quad (7.2)$$

where the notation $[x]$ stands for the integer part of a real number x . Below, we focus on the subsequence (t_j) of trading times and the corresponding sequence (λ_j) , defined as

$$t_j = 1 - (1 - j/n)^\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_j = \lambda_0 (1 - t_j)^{\frac{1}{4\beta}}, \quad m_1 \leq j \leq m_2. \quad (7.3)$$




Figure 3: The sequences (λ_j) and (t_j) defined by (7.3).

Note that (t_j) is an increasing sequence taking values in $[t^*, t_*]$, where $t_* = 1 - (l_*/\lambda_0)^{4\beta}$ and $t^* = 1 - (l^*/\lambda_0)^{4\beta}$, whereas (λ_j) is decreasing in $[l_*, l^*]$. Therefore, we make use the notations $\Delta t_j = t_j - t_{j-1}$, whereas $\Delta \lambda_j = \lambda_{j-1} - \lambda_j$, for $m_1 \leq j \leq m_2$, to avoid recopying the negative sign in discrete sums.

Below, Itô stochastic integrals will be discretized throughout the following sequences of independent normal random variables

$$Z_{1,j} = \frac{W_{t_j}^{(1)} - W_{t_{j-1}}^{(1)}}{\sqrt{t_j - t_{j-1}}} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{2,j} = \frac{W_{t_j}^{(2)} - W_{t_{j-1}}^{(2)}}{\sqrt{t_j - t_{j-1}}}. \quad (7.4)$$

We set

$$p(\lambda, x, y) = \frac{\varrho}{\sigma(y)} \left(\frac{\ln(x/K)}{2\lambda} - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad (7.5)$$

and write for short $p_{j-1} = p(\lambda_{j-1}, S_{t_{j-1}}, y_{t_{j-1}})$. This style of reduced notation is abusively applied for functions appearing in the approximation procedure. Define

$$\begin{cases} Z_{3,j} = |Z_{1,j} + p_{j-1}| - \mathbf{E} (|Z_{1,j} + p_{j-1}| | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}), \\ Z_{4,j} = |Z_{1,j}| - \mathbf{E} (|Z_{1,j}| | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = |Z_{1,j}| - \sqrt{2/\pi}. \end{cases} \quad (7.6)$$

The sequences $(Z_{3,j})$ and $(Z_{4,j})$ will serve in finding the Dood decomposition of our approximation terms. In order to represent the limit of transaction costs, we introduce

$$\begin{cases} G(a) = \mathbf{E} (|Z + a|) = 2\varphi(a) + a(2\Phi(a) - 1), \\ \Lambda(a) = \mathbf{E} (|Z + a| - \mathbf{E} |Z + a|)^2 = 1 + a^2 - G^2(a), \end{cases} \quad (7.7)$$

for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. We also write $o(a_n^{-r})$ for generic sequences of random variables (X_n) satisfying $\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n^r X_n = 0$.

7.2 Approximation for stochastic integrals

For any $L > 0$, we consider the stopping time

$$\tau^* = \tau_L^* = \inf \{t \geq 0 : \sigma(y_t) + |\sigma'(y_t)| > L\}, \quad (7.8)$$

and denote by $S_t^* = S_{\tau^* \wedge t}$ and $y_t^* = y_{\tau^* \wedge t}$ the corresponding stopped processes. We provide an approximation procedure for Itô's stochastic integrals throughout the sequences $(Z_{1,j})$ and $(Z_{2,j})$. The discrete approximation concerns the class of functions holding the below technical condition.

(H) $A : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously differentiable function satisfying the following: there exist $\gamma > 0$ and a positive function U such that for any $x \geq 0, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sup_{\lambda > 0} \min(\lambda^\gamma, 1) |A(\lambda, x, y)| \leq U(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} (S_t^*)^m U^{2r}(S_t^*, y_t^*) < \infty,$$

for any $-\infty < m < +\infty, r \geq 0$ and $L > 0$.

Remark 12. We can check directly that for $k \geq 2$, $\partial_x^k \widehat{C}(\lambda, x) = x^{k-1} \lambda^{-k/2} \widetilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) P(\ln(x/K))$, where P is some polynomial. Therefore, all functions A_0 appearing in the below approximation are of the form $\lambda^{-k/2} x^m \bar{\sigma}(y) P(\ln(x/K))$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ can be a power of σ or of its two first derivatives σ', σ'' . In bounded volatility settings, it can be shown with some computational effort (see e.g., [9, 24, 27]) that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} S_t^m \ln^{2r} S_t < \infty, \quad \text{for any } m \in \mathbb{R}, r \geq 0. \quad (7.9)$$

The latter property is, however, not always fulfilled for SV models with unbounded volatility. In fact, it has been demonstrated in [2, 28] that the stock price does not admit integrable moments in general SV markets, unless some natural conditions necessarily imposed on the correlation and the volatility dynamics coefficients. Thus, asymptotic analysis using L^2 estimates as in the existing works may be impossible in general SV frameworks. Nevertheless, note that (7.9) is true for processes stopped by τ^* . Below, the approximation analysis will be established in the sense of convergence in probability in order to avoid this integrability issue.

For simplicity, we use the notation $\check{S} = (S, y)$. The following technique is frequently applied in our asymptotic analysis.

Proposition 7.1. Let $A(\lambda, x, y) = A_0(\lambda, x, y) \widetilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$, where $A_0 = A_0(\lambda, x, y)$ is a function satisfying **(H)**. Then, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\int_0^1 \widehat{\sigma}_t^2 \left(\int_t^1 A(\lambda_u, \check{S}_u) dW_u^{(i)} \right) dt = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \bar{A}_{j-1} Z_{i,j} \Delta \lambda_j + o(\theta_n^{-1}), \quad (7.10)$$

where $\theta_n = n^\beta \varrho^{2\beta}$, $\bar{A}_j = \bar{A}(\lambda_j, \check{S}_{t_j})$ and $\bar{A}(\lambda, x, y) = \int_\lambda^\infty A(z, x, y) dz$.

Proof. By making use of the stochastic Fubini theorem, we gets

$$\widehat{I}_n = \int_0^1 \widehat{\sigma}_t^2 \left(\int_t^1 A(\lambda_u, \check{S}_u) dW_u^{(i)} \right) dt = \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^u \widehat{\sigma}_t^2 A(\lambda_t, \check{S}_u) dt \right) dW_u^{(i)}.$$

Then, changing the variables $v = \lambda_t$ for the inner integral yields

$$\int_0^u \widehat{\sigma}_t^2 A(\lambda_t, \check{S}_u) dt = \int_{\lambda_u}^{\lambda_0} A(v, \check{S}_u) dv = \overline{A}(\lambda_u, \check{S}_u) - \overline{A}(\lambda_0, \check{S}_u).$$

In other words, $\widehat{I}_n = \widehat{I}_{1,n} - \widehat{I}_{2,n}$, where $\widehat{I}_{1,n} = \int_0^1 \check{A}_u dW_u^{(i)}$, $\check{A}_u = \overline{A}(\lambda_u, \check{S}_u)$ and $\widehat{I}_{2,n} = \int_0^1 \overline{A}(\lambda_0, \check{S}_u) dW_u^{(i)}$. Moreover, we have

$$\widehat{I}_{1,n} = \int_0^{t^*} \check{A}_u dW_u^{(i)} + \int_{t^*}^1 \check{A}_u dW_u^{(i)} + \int_{t^*}^1 \check{A}_u dW_u^{(i)} := R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} + R_{3,n}. \quad (7.11)$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $b > 0$. One observes that $\mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\widehat{I}_{2,n}| > \varepsilon)$ is bounded by $\mathbf{P}(\tau_L^* < 1) + \mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\widehat{I}_{2,n}| > \varepsilon, \tau_L^* = 1)$. By condition (\mathbf{C}_1) , we have

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\tau_L^* < 1) = 0. \quad (7.12)$$

In view of (\mathbf{H}) , one deduces $|\overline{A}(\lambda_0, x, y)| \leq C\sqrt{K}\widetilde{U}(x, y)e^{-\lambda_0/8}$, where $\widetilde{U}(x, y) = x^{-1/2}U(x, y)$. Now, putting $\check{A}_u^* = \check{A}_{u \wedge \tau^*}$ and $\widehat{I}_{2,n}^* = \int_0^1 \check{A}_u^* dW_u^{(i)}$, one has $\mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\widehat{I}_{2,n}| > \varepsilon, \tau_L^* = 1) = \mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\widehat{I}_{2,n}^*| > \varepsilon)$. Using the Chebychev inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\widehat{I}_{2,n}^*| > \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{-2} \theta_n^2 \mathbf{E}(\widehat{I}_{2,n}^*)^2 \leq C\varepsilon^{-2} \theta_n^2 e^{-\lambda_0/8} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} \widetilde{U}^2(\check{S}_t^*).$$

Hence, due to condition (\mathbf{H}) , $\widehat{I}_{2,n} = o(\theta_n^{-1})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, taking into account that $t^* \leq \lambda_u \leq \lambda_0$ for $0 \leq u \leq t^*$, we get $R_{1,n} = o(\theta_n^{-1})$.

Next, let us show the same behavior for the last term in (7.11). Indeed, for some fixed $\eta > 0$ and $L > 0$, one has

$$\mathbf{P}(\theta_n |R_{3,n}| > \varepsilon) \leq \mathbf{P}(\theta_n |R_{3,n}| > \varepsilon, \Gamma_{1,\eta,L}) + \mathbf{P}(\Gamma_{1,\eta,L}^c), \quad (7.13)$$

where $\Gamma_{1,\eta,L} = \{\inf_{t^* \leq u \leq 1} |\ln(S_u/K)| > \eta, \tau_L^* = 1\}$. Then, by taking into account Lemma A.3 and the integrability condition (\mathbf{C}_1) , one gets

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\Gamma_{1,\eta,L}^c) = 0.$$

On $\Gamma_{1,\eta,L}$, we have $\check{A} = \check{A}^*$ and

$$|\check{A}_u^*| \leq U(\check{S}_u^*) \int_{\lambda_u}^{\infty} (1+z^{-\gamma}) \widetilde{\varphi}(z, S_u^*) dz \leq \widetilde{U}(\check{S}_u^*) \check{f}_u^*,$$

where $\check{f}_u^* = \sqrt{K/(2\pi)} \int_{\lambda_u}^{\infty} (1+z^{-\gamma}) e^{-\eta^2/(2z)-z/8} dz$. Set $\Gamma_{3,j} = \{|\check{A}_u| \leq \widetilde{U}(\check{S}_u^*) \check{f}_u^*\}$, $\widehat{A}_u^* = \check{A}_u^* \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_{3,j}}$ and $\widehat{R}_{3,n} = \int_{t^*}^1 \widehat{A}_u^* dW_u^{(i)}$. By Chebychev's inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(\theta_n |R_{3,n}| > \varepsilon, \Gamma_{1,\eta,L}) \leq \theta_n^2 \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{t^*}^1 \mathbf{E}(\widehat{A}_u^*)^2 du \leq \theta_n^2 \varepsilon^{-2} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \mathbf{E} \widetilde{U}^2(\check{S}_u^*) \int_{t^*}^1 (\check{f}_u^*)^2 du,$$

which converges to zero since $\int_{t^*}^1 (\check{f}_u^*)^2 du \leq C\lambda_0^{-4\beta} l_*$. Hence, $R_{3,n} = o(\theta_n^{-1})$. It remains to discretize the integral term $R_{2,n}$ via the sequence $(Z_{i,j})$. The key steps for this aim are the followings. First, we represent $R_{2,n} = \int_{t^*}^{t_j} \check{A}_u dW_u^{(i)} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \check{A}_u dW_u^{(i)}$ and replace the Itô integral in the last sum with $\bar{A}_{j-1} Z_{i,j} \sqrt{\Delta t_j}$. Next, Lemma A.1 allows to substitute $\sqrt{\Delta t_j} = \varrho^{-1} \Delta \lambda_j$ into the last sum to obtain the martingale \mathcal{M}_{m_2} defined by $\mathcal{M}_k = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^k \bar{A}_{j-1} Z_{i,j} \Delta \lambda_j$. We need to show that $|R_{2,n} - \mathcal{M}_{m_2}| = o(\theta_n^{-1})$ or equivalently, $\sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} B_{j,n} = o(\theta_n^{-1})$, where $B_{j,n} = \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \tilde{A}_{u,j} dW_u^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{A}_{u,j} = \bar{A}(\lambda_u, \check{S}_u) - \bar{A}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_{t_{j-1}})$. For this aim, we introduce the set

$$\Gamma_{2,b} = \left\{ \sup_{t^* \leq u \leq 1} \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} (|A(z, \check{S}_u)| + |\partial_x \bar{A}(z, \check{S}_u)| + |\partial_y \bar{A}(z, \check{S}_u)|) \leq b \right\}.$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} B_{j,n}| > \varepsilon)$ is bounded by $\mathbf{P}(\Gamma_{2,b}^c) + \mathbf{P}(\tau^* < 1) + \varpi_n$, where $\varpi_n = \mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} B_{j,n}| > \varepsilon, \Gamma_{2,b}, \tau^* = 1)$. Put $\hat{B}_{j,n} = \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \hat{A}_{u,j} dW_u^{(i)}$, where

$$\hat{A}_{u,j} = \tilde{A}_{u,j} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tilde{A}_{u,j}| \leq b(|\lambda_u - \lambda_{j-1}| + |S_u^* - S_{t_{j-1}}^*| + |y_u^* - y_{t_{j-1}}^*|)\}}.$$

Then, $\varpi_n = \mathbf{P}(\theta_n |\sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \hat{B}_{j,n}| > \varepsilon)$, which is smaller than $\varepsilon^{-2} \theta_n^2 \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{E} \hat{B}_{j,n}^2$ by Chebychev's inequality. Clearly, $\mathbf{E} \hat{B}_{j,n}^2$ is bounded by

$$3b^2 \left(\int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} ((\lambda_u - \lambda_{j-1})^2 + \mathbf{E}(S_u^* - S_{t_{j-1}}^*)^2 + \mathbf{E}(y_u^* - y_{t_{j-1}}^*)^2) du \right) \leq (\Delta \lambda_j)^3 + (\Delta t_j)^2$$

up to a multiple constant. Consequently, $\theta_n^2 \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{E} \hat{B}_{j,n}^2 \leq C \theta_n^2 \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} ((\Delta \lambda_j)^3 + (\Delta t_j)^2)$, which converges to 0 by Lemma A.1 and condition (C₂). On the other hand, by Lemma A.4, we get $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\Gamma_{2,b}^c) = 0$. The proof is completed. \square

7.3 Limit theorem for approximations

We first recall the following result in [15], which is useful for studying asymptotic distribution of discrete martingales.

Theorem 7.1. [Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.1, p.58 in [15]] Let $\mathcal{M}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ be a zero-mean, square integrable martingale and ς be an a.s. finite random variable. Assume that both following convergences are satisfied in probability:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left(X_i^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_i| > \delta\}} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{for any } \delta > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} (X_i^2 | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) \longrightarrow \varsigma^2.$$

Then, (\mathcal{M}_n) converges in law to X whose characteristic function is $\mathbf{E} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \varsigma^2 t^2)$, i.e., X has a Gaussian mixture distribution.

In this subsection, we establish some special versions of Theorem 7.1. In fact, our aim is to study the asymptotic distribution of discrete martingales resulting from approximation (7.10) in Proposition 7.1. First, we define

$$\mathcal{M}_k = \sum_{j=m_1}^k v_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2, \quad (7.14)$$

where $v_j = \sum_{i=1}^3 A_{i,j-1} Z_{i,j} \Delta \lambda_j$, $A_{i,j} = A_i(\lambda_j, \check{S}_{t_j})$ and $Z_{i,j}$ defined as in (7.4) and in (7.6). To describe the asymptotic variance of (\mathcal{M}) , we introduce the following function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}(\lambda, x, y) &= A_1^2(\lambda, x, y) + 2A_1(\lambda, x, y)A_3(\lambda, x, y)(2\Phi(p) - 1) \\ &\quad + A_3^2(\lambda, x, y) \Lambda(p) + A_2^2(\lambda, x, y), \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

where p is defined in (7.5). Set

$$\check{\mu} = \frac{1}{2}(\mu + 1)\tilde{\mu}^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu} = (\mu - 1)/(\mu + 1). \quad (7.16)$$

Proposition 7.2. *Let $A_i^0 = A_i^0(\lambda, x, y)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ be functions having property **(H)** and $A_i(\lambda, x, y) = A_i^0(\lambda, x, y)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$. Then, for any fixed $\varrho > 0$ the sequence $(n^\beta \mathcal{M}_{m_2})_{n \geq 1}$ weakly converges to a mixed Gaussian variable with mean zero and variance ζ^2 defined as $\zeta^2 = \zeta^2(\check{S}_1) = \check{\mu}\varrho^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{\hat{\mu}} \mathbf{L}(\lambda, \check{S}_1) d\lambda$. The same property still holds if some (or all) of the functions A_i are of the form $\int_\lambda^\infty A_i^0(z, x, y)\tilde{\varphi}(z, x) dz$.*

Proof. Note that the square integrability property is not guaranteed for (v_j) . To overcome this issue, we consider their ‘‘stopped version’’ (v_j^*) , which are obtained by substituting $\check{S}_{t_{j-1}}$ by $\check{S}_{t_{j-1}}^*$ in A_i , i.e., $v_j^* = \sum_{i=1}^3 A_i(\lambda_j, \check{S}_{t_j}^*) Z_{i,j} \Delta \lambda_j$. Let $\mathcal{M}_k^* = \sum_{j=m_1}^k v_j^*$, the corresponding stopped martingale. First, we show, throughout Theorem 7.1, that for any $L > 0$, this martingale weakly converges to a mixed Gaussian variable with mean zero and variance $\zeta^{*2}(L) = \zeta^2(\check{S}_1^*)$. To this end, setting $\Gamma_{1,\eta} = \{\inf_{t^* \leq u \leq 1} |\ln(S_u^*/K)| > \eta\}$ and $\mathbf{a}_j^* = \mathbf{E}(v_j^{*2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|v_j^*| > \delta\}} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1})$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P} \left(n^{2\beta} \left| \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{a}_j^* \right| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \mathbf{P} \left(n^{2\beta} \left| \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{a}_j^* \right| > \varepsilon, \Gamma_{1,\eta} \right) + \mathbf{P}(\Gamma_{1,\eta}^c). \quad (7.17)$$

It suffices to show that the first probability on the right side of (7.17) converges to zero. Indeed, from the proof of Proposition 7.1, one observes that on the set $\Gamma_{1,\eta}$,

$$\max_{i=1,2,3} |A_i(\lambda_u, \check{S}_u^*)| \leq \tilde{U}(\check{S}_u^*)(1 + \lambda_u^{-\gamma}), \quad t^* \leq u \leq t_*, \quad (7.18)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$ and $\tilde{U}(\check{S}) = S^{-1/2}U(\check{S})$. Set $\hat{v}_j^* = v_j^* \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma_{3,j}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_j^* = \mathbf{E}(\hat{v}_j^{*2} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\hat{v}_j^*| > \delta\}} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1})$, where

$$\Gamma_{3,j} = \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq 3} |A_i(\lambda_u, \check{S}_u^*)| \leq \tilde{U}(\check{S}_u^*)(1 + \lambda_u^{-\gamma}) \right\}.$$

We have

$$\mathbf{P} \left(n^{2\beta} \left| \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{a}_j^* \right| > \varepsilon, \Gamma_{1,\eta,L} \right) = \mathbf{P} \left(n^{2\beta} \left| \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j^* \right| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \varepsilon^{-1} n^{2\beta} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{E} \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j^*,$$

by Markov's inequality. By using Chebychev's inequality and then again Markov's inequality, we observe that

$$\mathbf{E} \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j^* \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{E} \widehat{v}_j^{*4}} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}(|\widehat{v}_j^*| > \delta)} \leq \delta^{-2} \mathbf{E} \widehat{v}_j^{*4} \leq 9\delta^{-2} (1 + \lambda_u^{-\gamma})^4 (\Delta\lambda_j)^4 \mathbf{E} \widetilde{U}^4 (\check{S}_u^*) \sum_{i=1}^3 Z_{i,j}^4.$$

Note that $Z_{i,j}$ have bounded moments. Then, by using (7.18), we obtain $\varepsilon^{-1} n^{2\beta} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{E} \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j^*$ is bounded by $9\varepsilon^{-1} \delta^{-2} n^{2\beta} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} (1 + \lambda_u^{-\gamma})^4 (\Delta\lambda_j)^4$, which converges to zero by Lemma A.1.

We now verify the limit of the sum of conditional variances $\mathbf{E}(v_j^{*2} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1})$. Set $v_{i,j}^* = A_{i,j-1}^* Z_{i,j} \Delta\lambda_j$. Since $Z_{1,j}$ and $Z_{2,j}$ are independent, $\mathbf{E}(v_{1,j}^* v_{3,j}^* | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \mathbf{E}(v_{2,j}^* v_{3,j}^* | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = 0$. It follows that

$$\mathbf{E}(v_j^{*2} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \mathbf{E}(v_{1,j}^{*2} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) + \mathbf{E}(v_{2,j}^{*2} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) + \mathbf{E}(v_{3,j}^{*2} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) + 2\mathbf{E}(v_{1,j}^* v_{2,j}^* | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}).$$

Now, observe that for $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ and some constant a , $\mathbf{E}(Z | Z + a) = 2\Phi(a) - 1$ and $\mathbf{E}(Z + a)^2 - (\mathbf{E}|Z + a|)^2 = \Lambda(a)$. On the other hand, $\Delta\lambda_j = n^{-2\beta} (1 + o(1)) \check{\rho} \varrho^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \lambda_{j-1}^{\widehat{\mu}}$ by Lemma A.1. Therefore,

$$n^{2\beta} \mathbf{E}(v_j^{*2} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = (1 + o(1)) \check{\rho} \varrho^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \lambda_{j-1}^{\widehat{\mu}} \mathbf{L}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_{t_{j-1}}^*) \Delta\lambda_j.$$

By Lemma A.5, $n^{2\beta} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{E}(v_j^{*2} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1})$ converges in probability to $\varsigma^{*2}(L)$. Thus, $n^\beta \mathcal{M}_{m_2}^*$ weakly converges to $\mathcal{N}(0, \varsigma^{*2}(L))$ by Theorem 7.1. Moreover, property (7.12) implies that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(n^\beta |\mathcal{M}_{m_2} - \mathcal{M}_{m_2}^*| > \delta) = 0.$$

Therefore, by taking into account that $\varsigma^{*2}(L)$ converges a.s. to ς^2 as $L \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $n^\beta \mathcal{M}_{m_2}$ converges in law to $\mathcal{N}(0, \varsigma^2)$. This completes the proof. \square

Next, we study the asymptotic property of the following martingale

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_k = \sum_{j=m_1}^k (A_{1,j-1} Z_{1,j} + A_{2,j-1} Z_{2,j} + A_{4,j-1} Z_{4,j}) \Delta\lambda_j. \quad (7.19)$$

The limiting variance will be defined throughout the function

$$\overline{\mathbf{L}}(\lambda, x, y) = A_1^2(\lambda, x, y) + A_2^2(\lambda, x, y) + (1 - 2/\pi) A_4^2(\lambda, x, y). \quad (7.20)$$

The following result is similar to Proposition 7.2.

Proposition 7.3. Let $A_i^0 = A_i^0(\lambda, x, y)$, $i = 1, 2, 4$ be functions having property **(H)** and $A_i(\lambda, x, y) = A_i^0(\lambda, x, y)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$. Then, for any fixed $\varrho > 0$ the sequence $(n^\beta \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2})_{n \geq 1}$ weakly converges to a mixed Gaussian variable with mean zero and variance $\bar{\zeta}^2$ given by $\bar{\zeta}^2 = \check{\mu} \varrho^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{\check{\mu}} \bar{\mathbf{L}}(\lambda, \check{S}_1) d\lambda$. The same property still holds if some (or all) A_i are of the form $\int_\lambda^\infty A_i^0(z, x, y)\tilde{\varphi}(z, x) dz$.

Proof. The conclusion follows directly from the proof of Proposition 7.2 and the observation that $\mathbf{E} Z_{4,j}^2 = \mathbf{E}(|Z_{1,j}| - \sqrt{2/\pi})^2 = 1 - 2/\pi$, and $\mathbf{E}(Z_{i,j}Z_{4,j}) = 0$, for $i = 1, 2$ and $m_1 \leq j \leq m_2$. \square

In the rest of the subsection, we establish a limit theorem for a martingale of the following form

$$\check{\mathcal{M}}_k = \sum_{j=m_1}^k (A_{1,j-1} Z_{1,j} + A_{3,j-1} Z_{3,j}) \Delta\lambda_j := \sum_{j=m_1}^k \check{v}_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2,$$

where $A_i(\lambda, x, y) = A_i^0(\lambda, x, y)\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$ and A_i^0 , $i = 1, 3$ are functions having property **(H)**. The following result is helpful for the case when ϱ diverges to infinity as in Theorem 3.2.

Proposition 7.4. Under condition **(C₂)**, the sequence $(n^\beta \varrho^{\frac{-1}{\mu+1}} \check{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2})$ weakly converges to a mixed Gaussian variable with mean zero and variance $\zeta^2 = \check{\mu} \int_0^{+\infty} \lambda^{\check{\mu}} \check{\mathbf{L}}(\lambda, S_1) d\lambda$, where $\check{\mathbf{L}}(\lambda, x, y) = A_1^2(\lambda, x, y) + 2A_1(\lambda, x, y)A_3(\lambda, x, y) + A_3^2(\lambda, x, y)$. The same property still holds if some (or all) A_i are of the form $\int_\lambda^\infty A_i^0(z, x, y)\tilde{\varphi}(z, x) dz$.

Proof. We determine the limit of conditional variances of $n^\beta \varrho^{\frac{-1}{\mu+1}} \check{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2}$. We first observe that

$$n^{2\beta} \varrho^{\frac{-2}{\mu+1}} \mathbf{E}(\check{v}_j^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \check{\mu}(1 + o(1)) \lambda_{j-1}^{\check{\mu}} \check{\mathbf{Q}}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_{t_{j-1}}) \Delta\lambda_j, \quad (7.21)$$

where $\check{\mathbf{Q}}(\lambda, x, y) = A_1^2(\lambda, x, y) + A_3^2(\lambda, x, y) \Lambda(p) + 2A_1(\lambda, x, y)A_3(\lambda, x, y) (2\Phi(|p|) - 1)$. Moreover, it can be checked directly that the function $G(\cdot)$ defined in (7.7) satisfies the following inequalities: $|a| \leq G(a) \leq |a| + 2\varphi(a)$, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that $|\Lambda(a) - 1| \leq 4|a|\varphi(a) + \varphi^2(a)$, hence, $\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} |\Lambda(a)| < \infty$. Note also that $\check{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow \check{\mathbf{L}}$ a.s. as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because $p(\lambda, x, y) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varrho = \varrho(n) \rightarrow \infty$, for any $x > 0$ and $\lambda \neq 2 \ln(x/K)$. Using Lemma A.5, we claim that the sum of the terms on the right-hand side of (7.21) converges in probability to ζ^2 . The proof is completed by running again the argument in the proof of Proposition 7.2. \square

7.4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We first observe that $I_{1,n}$ approaches $2 \min(S_1, K)$ at order θ_n . In particular, setting $\bar{I}_{1,n} = \int_0^1 \lambda_t^{-1/2} \hat{\sigma}_t^2 (S_t \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_t, S_t) - S_1 \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda_t, S_1)) dt$ and changing variables $v = \int_t^1 \hat{\sigma}_s^2 ds$, we can represent $I_{1,n} = S_1 \int_0^{\lambda_0} v^{-1/2} \tilde{\varphi}(v, S_1) dv + \bar{I}_{1,n} + o(\theta_n^{-1})$. The first integral in the right side converges a.s. to $2 \min(S_1, K)$ by (2.12), while $\bar{I}_{1,n}$ is approximated by $\int_0^1 \hat{\sigma}_t^2 \left(\int_t^1 \sigma(y_u) S_u H(\lambda_t, S_u) dW_u^{(1)} \right) dt$, where $H = (2^{-1} \lambda^{-1/2} - \lambda^{-3/2} \ln(x/K)) \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$.

Discretization technique of Proposition 7.1 can be applied to replace the latter double integral by \mathcal{U}_{1,m_2} , defined by

$$\mathcal{U}_{1,k} = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^k \sigma(y_{t_{j-1}}) S_{t_{j-1}} \check{H}_{j-1} Z_{1,j} \Delta \lambda_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2, \quad (7.22)$$

where $\check{H}(\lambda, x) = \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} (z^{-1/2}/2 - z^{-3/2} \ln(x/K)) \tilde{\varphi}(z, x) dz$. We summarize the asymptotic form of $I_{1,n}$ in the following.

Proposition 7.5. *If ϱ either is constant or satisfies condition (\mathbf{C}_2) then,*

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n |I_{1,n} - 2 \min(S_1, K) - \mathcal{U}_{1,m_2}| = 0.$$

Next, we claim that $I_{2,n} = o(\theta_n^{-1})$.

Proposition 7.6. *If ϱ either is a positive constant or satisfies condition (\mathbf{C}_2) , then $\theta_n I_{2,n}$ converges to zero in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. See the Appendix B. \square

Let us study the trading volume J_n . First, it is easy to check that for any $v > 0$, $1 - \Phi(v) \leq v^{-1} \varphi(v)$. Now, observe that $|\gamma_{t_i}^n - \gamma_{t_{i-1}}^n| \leq |1 - \gamma_{t_i}^n| + |1 - \gamma_{t_{i-1}}^n|$, which almost surely converges to zero more rapidly than any power of n when $\inf_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_i \geq l^* \iff i \leq m_1$. The same property can be deduced for the case $\sup_i \lambda \leq l_* \iff i \geq m_2$. To see this, we note that for $\lambda_u \leq l_*$, $S_u(\omega) = S_{1 - (\lambda_u/\lambda_0)^{4\beta}}(\omega)$ converges to $S_1(\omega)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda_u \in [0, l_*]$, for any ω outside the zero probability set $\{S_1 = K\}$. Therefore, one can truncate the sum and keep only the part corresponding to index $m_1 \leq j \leq m_2$. In other words, J_n is approximated by $J_{1,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} S_{t_j} |\Delta \Phi_j|$. Putting $b_j = |\Delta \Phi_j| - \tilde{\varphi}_{j-1} |\Delta \mathbf{v}_j|$, we can represent $J_{1,n} = J'_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{1,n} + \varepsilon_{2,n}$, where $J'_{1,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} S_{t_{j-1}} \tilde{\varphi}_{j-1} |\Delta \mathbf{v}_j|$, $\varepsilon_{1,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \Delta S_{t_{j-1}} |\Delta_j \Phi|$ and $\varepsilon_{2,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} S_{t_{j-1}} b_j$. In view of (A.1) and condition (\mathbf{C}_2) , $\varepsilon_{1,n} = o(\theta_n^{-1})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, by using the Taylor expansion, we obtain $|\varepsilon_{2,n}| \leq S_{\sup} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} |\Delta \mathbf{v}_j|^2$ up to a multiple constant, where $S_{\sup} = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} S_t$. Now, by taking into account that

$$\mathbf{E} |\mathbf{v}_{j-1} - \mathbf{v}_j|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n \lambda_{j-1}} + \left(\lambda_{j-1}^{1/2} - \lambda_j^{1/2} \right)^2 + \left(\lambda_{j-1}^{-1/2} - \lambda_j^{-1/2} \right)^2$$

up to a multiple constant and using condition (\mathbf{C}_2) together with (A.1), we get $|\varepsilon_{2,n}| = o(\theta_n^{-1})$. Next, by using Itô's Lemma and the substitution $\lambda_j = \lambda_0 (1 - t_j)^{4\beta}$, we replace $J'_{1,n}$ by

$$J_{2,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \lambda_{j-1}^{-1/2} S_{t_{j-1}} \tilde{\varphi}_{j-1} |\varkappa_j| \Delta \lambda_j := \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \zeta_j, \quad \varkappa_j = \varrho^{-1} \sigma(y_{t_{j-1}}) Z_{1,j} + q_{j-1}, \quad (7.23)$$

where q is defined in (2.10). We need to determine the limit of J_n throughout the Doob's decomposition of $J_{2,n}$ w.r.t. the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_j)_{m_1 \leq j \leq m_2}$. To this end, note that

$$\mathbf{E}(\zeta_j | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \lambda_{j-1}^{-1/2} S_{t_{j-1}} \tilde{\varphi}_{j-1} \Delta \lambda_j \mathbf{E}(|\varkappa_j| | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}),$$

where $\mathbf{E}(|\varkappa_j| | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \varrho^{-1} \sigma(y_{t_{j-1}}) G(p_{j-1}) := D_{j-1}$ and $G(p)$ defined in (7.7). Let

$$B(\lambda, x, y) = \lambda^{-1/2} x \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) D(\lambda, x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad J_{3,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} B_{j-1} \Delta \lambda_j. \quad (7.24)$$

We observe that $J_{2,n} = J_{3,n} + \mathcal{U}_{2,m_2}$, where

$$\mathcal{U}_{2,k} = \sum_{j=m_1}^k \lambda_{j-1}^{-1/2} S_{t_{j-1}} \tilde{\varphi}_{j-1} \bar{\varkappa}_j \Delta \lambda_j \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\varkappa}_j := |\varkappa_j| - D_{j-1}. \quad (7.25)$$

By substituting $\check{S}_{t_{j-1}}$ by \check{S}_1 everywhere in $J_{3,n}$, we write $J_{3,n} = J_{4,n} + J_{5,n}$, where $J_{4,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} B(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_1) \Delta \lambda_j$, $J_{5,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} B_{j-1}^* \Delta \lambda_j$ and $B_{j-1}^* = B(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_{t_{j-1}}) - B(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_1)$. Then, by Lemma A.2, we can check that $J_{4,n}$ converges a.s. to $J(S_1, y_1, \varrho)$ at rate θ_n . Now, an application of Itô's Lemma for B_{j-1}^* yields stochastic integrals with respect to the Wiener processes. Owing to Proposition 7.1, the sum of these integrals can be approximated by \mathcal{U}_{3,m_2} , defined by

$$\mathcal{U}_{3,k} = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=m_1}^k Q_{i,j-1} Z_{i,j} \Delta \lambda_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2,$$

where $Q_1 = \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} (x \sigma(y) \partial_x B + \mathbf{r} F_2(t(\lambda), y) \partial_y B) dz$ and $Q_2 = \sqrt{1 - \mathbf{r}^2} F_2(t(\lambda), y) \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} \partial_y B dz$ and $t(\lambda) = 1 - (\lambda/\lambda_0)^{4\beta}$. The asymptotic form of J_n is summarized in the following.

Proposition 7.7. *For any fixed $\varrho > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n |J_n - J(S_1, y_1, \varrho) - (\mathcal{U}_{2,m_2} + \mathcal{U}_{3,m_2})| = 0.$$

Now, the martingale part of the hedging error is given by \mathcal{M}_{m_2} , defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_k = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{U}_{1,k} - \kappa_* (\mathcal{U}_{2,k} + \mathcal{U}_{3,k}) = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^k \sum_{i=1}^3 A_{i,j-1} Z_{i,j} \Delta \lambda_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2,$$

where $A_1 = -\sigma(y) x \check{H}/2$, $A_2 = \kappa_* Q_2$ and $A_3 = -\kappa_* \sigma(y) \lambda^{-1/2} x \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$. It is easy to see that the assumption of Proposition 7.2 is fulfilled for A_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$. Hence, the sequence $(n^\beta \mathcal{M}_{m_2})_{n \geq 1}$ converges in law to a mixed Gaussian variable by Proposition 7.2, which proves Theorem 3.1. \square

7.5 Proof of Theorem 3.2

When $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$ under condition (C₂), the approximation for J_n is slightly different. In particular, observe first that for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{E} |aZ + b|$ can be approximated by $b(2\Phi(b/a) - 1)$ as $a \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, we can replace $J_{3,n}$ in (7.24) by the sum $\hat{J}_{3,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \hat{B}_{j-1} \Delta \lambda_j$, where $\hat{B}(\lambda, x) = \lambda^{-1/2} x \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) q(\lambda, x) \tilde{\Phi}(\varrho q(\lambda, x))$, with $\tilde{\Phi}(q) = 2\Phi(\varrho q) - 1$ and $q(\lambda, x)$ defined in (2.10). Putting $\hat{J}_{4,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \hat{B}(\lambda_{j-1}, S_1) \Delta \lambda_j$ and $\hat{B}_{j-1}^* = \hat{B}(\lambda_{j-1}, S_{t_{j-1}}) - \hat{B}(\lambda_{j-1}, S_1)$, we represent $\hat{J}_{5,n} := \hat{J}_{3,n} - \hat{J}_{4,n} = \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \hat{B}_{j-1}^* \Delta \lambda_j$. Now, using Lemma A.2,

we can directly show that $|\widehat{J}_{4,n} - J^*(S_1)| = o(\theta_n^{-1})$. Furthermore, owing to Itô's formula, we replace \widehat{B}_{j-1}^* by $\int_{t_{j-1}}^1 \partial_x \widehat{B}(\lambda_{j-1}, S_u) dS_u$. Direct calculations yield that

$$\partial_x \widehat{B} = \lambda^{-1/2} \widetilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x) [-2q^2(\lambda, x) \widetilde{\Phi}(\lambda, x) + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \widetilde{\Phi}(\lambda, x) + \frac{\varrho}{\lambda} \varphi(\varrho q(\lambda, x))].$$

Clearly, $\widetilde{\Phi}(\varrho q) \rightarrow \text{sign}(q)$ and $\varphi(\varrho q) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$. Now, using Proposition 7.1, we can approximate $\widehat{J}_{5,n}$ by \widehat{U}_{3,m_2} , defined by $\widehat{U}_{3,k} = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^k \sigma(y_{t_{j-1}}) S_{t_{j-1}} N_{j-1} Z_{1,j} \Delta \lambda_j$, where $N(\lambda, x) = \int_{\lambda}^{+\infty} z^{-1/2} \widetilde{\varphi}(z, x) (-2q^2(z, x) + 1/(2z)) \text{sign}(q(z, x)) dz$. The asymptotic representation of trading volume is summarized in the following.

Proposition 7.8. *Under conditions (C₁) – (C₂),*

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n |J_n - J^*(S_1) - (\mathcal{U}_{2,m_2} + \widehat{U}_{3,m_2})| = 0.$$

Now, the martingale part $\varrho^{-1} \check{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2}$ of the hedging error is determined by

$$\check{\mathcal{M}}_k = \frac{\varrho}{2} \mathcal{U}_{1,k} - \kappa_* \varrho (\mathcal{U}_{2,k} + \widehat{U}_{3,k}) = \sum_{j=m_1}^k (\check{A}_{1,j-1} Z_{1,j} + \check{A}_{3,j-1} Z_{3,j}) \Delta \lambda_j,$$

where \check{A}_i , $i = 1, 2$ are explicitly determined and satisfy the assumption of Proposition 7.4. Then, in view of $\theta_n \varrho^{-1} \check{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2} = n^\beta \varrho^{-\frac{1}{\mu+1}} \check{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2}$, Theorem 3.2 is proved throughout Proposition 7.4. \square

7.6 Proof of Theorem 3.3

The key technique in Proposition 7.1 can be used to obtain a smart martingale approximation for the sum $\sum_{i \geq 1} \Delta S_{t_i} \int_0^{t_i-1} \widehat{C}_{xt}(u, S_u) du$.

Proposition 7.9. *If ϱ either is a positive constant or satisfies condition (C₂), then $|\bar{I}_{2,n} - \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{1,m_2}| = o(\theta_n^{-1})$, where $Y(\lambda, x) = \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} z^{-3/2} \ln(x/K) \widetilde{\varphi}(z, x) dz$ and*

$$\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{1,k} = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^k \sigma(y_{t_{j-1}}) S_{t_{j-1}} Y_{j-1} Z_{1,j} \Delta \lambda_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2.$$

Proof. The proof follows from the substitution ΔS_{t_j} by $\varrho^{-1} \sigma(y_{t_{j-1}}) S_{t_{j-1}} \Delta \lambda_{t_j}$ as in Proposition 7.1. \square

Let us now study the trading volume \bar{J}_n by following the procedure in the approximation of J_n . First, by Itô's lemma,

$$\bar{\gamma}_{t_i} - \bar{\gamma}_{t_{i-1}} = \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \widehat{C}_{xx}(u, S_u) dS_u + \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \widehat{C}_{xxx}(u, S_u) \sigma^2(y_u) S_u^2 du,$$

where the time-correction, which involves the term q_{j-1} in the formula of \varkappa_j defined by (7.23), has been removed. We now approximate \bar{J}_n by

$$\bar{J}_{1,n} = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \bar{B}_{j-1} |Z_{1,j}| \Delta \lambda_j \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{B}(\lambda, x, y) = \sigma(y) x \lambda^{-1/2} \widetilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x).$$

Since $\mathbf{E}|Z| = \sqrt{2/\pi}$, for $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, the Dood' decomposition of $\bar{J}_{1,n}$ is given by $\bar{J}_{2,n} + \bar{U}_{2,m_2}$, where $\bar{J}_{2,n} = \varrho^{-1} \sqrt{2/\pi} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \bar{B}_{j-1} \Delta \lambda_j$ and $\bar{U}_{2,m_2} = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \bar{B}_{j-1} Z_{4,j} \Delta \lambda_j$. Now, putting $\bar{B}_{j-1}^* = \bar{B}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_{t_{j-1}}) - \bar{B}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_1)$, we write $\bar{J}_{2,n} = \bar{J}_{4,n} + \bar{J}_{3,n}$, where

$$\bar{J}_{4,n} = \varrho^{-1} \sqrt{2/\pi} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \bar{B}_{j-1} \Delta \lambda_j, \quad \bar{J}_{3,n} = \varrho^{-1} \sqrt{2/\pi} \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \bar{B}_{j-1}^* \Delta \lambda_j.$$

Observe that $\bar{J}_{4,n}$ converges a.s. to $\eta \min(S_1, K)$ by Lemma A.2 and (2.12). We now find the suitable martingale approximation for $\bar{J}_{3,n}$. By Itô's formula, \bar{B}_{j-1}^* can be replaced by $\sum_{i=1}^2 \int_t^1 \bar{Q}_i(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_u) dW_u^{(i)}$, where $\bar{Q}_1 = \sigma(y)x \partial_x \bar{B} + \mathbf{r} F_2(t(\lambda), y) \partial_y \bar{B}$ and $\bar{Q}_2 = \sqrt{1 - \mathbf{r}^2} F_2(t(\lambda), y) \partial_y \bar{B}$. Direct calculations show that $\partial_x \bar{B} = \sigma(y)(2^{-1} \lambda^{-1/2} - \lambda^{-3/2} \ln(X/K)) \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$ and $\partial_y \bar{B} = \sigma'(y) \lambda^{-1/2} x \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$. Now, Proposition 7.1 can be applied to approximate $\bar{J}_{3,n}$ by the martingale \bar{U}_{3,m_2} , defined by

$$\bar{U}_{3,k} = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^k (\bar{A}_{1,j-1} Z_{1,j} + \bar{A}_{2,j-1} Z_{2,j}) \Delta \lambda_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2,$$

for explicit functions $\bar{A}_i, i = 1, 2$. The final asymptotic form of \bar{J}_n is given below.

Proposition 7.10. *If ϱ is a positive constant independent of n then,*

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n |\bar{J}_n - \eta \min(S_1, K) - (\bar{U}_{2,m_2} + \bar{U}_{3,m_2})| = 0.$$

Hence, the martingale part of the hedging error for Lépinette's strategy is determined by $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2} = \mathcal{U}_{1,m_2} + \bar{U}_{1,m_2} - \kappa_* (\bar{U}_{2,m_2} + \bar{U}_{3,m_2})$. The latter martingale sum can be represented in the form

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}}_k = \varrho^{-1} \sum_{j=m_1}^k (A_{1,j-1} Z_{1,j} + A_{4,j} Z_{4,j-1} + A_{2,j-1} Z_{2,j}) \Delta \lambda_j, \quad m_1 \leq k \leq m_2,$$

for explicit functions A_i holding the assumption of Proposition 7.3. Then, $(n^\beta \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{m_2})_{n \geq 1}$ converges in law to a mixed Gaussian variable, which completes the proof. \square

8 Conclusion

We studied the problem of approximate option replication in SV settings using a new specification for adjusted volatility. Although our model employed an adjusted volatility simpler than those of previous works, we obtain the same asymptotic results for both Leland' and Lépinette's strategies in general SV markets. A possible connection with high frequency markets with proportional transaction costs was also discussed. As an application, we showed that the option price inclusive of transaction costs can be reduced adapting the theory of quantile hedging. Note that our approach is still helpful for more general settings, for example, when the friction rule admits a separate-variable representation [31]. This generalization includes the case where trading costs are based

on the physical number of traded shares. Lastly, in the accompanying paper, we extended the method to multidimensional frameworks for European options with a general payoff written on several assets [32].

Acknowledgment: The authors would like to thank the two referees and editor for their remarks and suggestions which are largely useful for the paper's improvement. The first author wishes to express his gratitude to the Vietnam Overseas Scholarship Program (project 322) for financial support.

Appendix

A Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma A.1. *There exist two positive constants C_1, C_2 such that*

$$C_1 n^{-2\beta} \varrho^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \nu_0(l_*) \leq \inf_{m_1 \leq j \leq m_2} |\Delta \lambda_j| \leq \sup_{m_1 \leq j \leq m_2} |\Delta \lambda_j| \leq C_2 n^{-2\beta} \varrho^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \nu_0(l^*), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\nu_0(x) = x^{(\mu-1)/(\mu+1)}$. Moreover, for any $m_1 \leq j \leq m_2$,

$$\Delta \lambda_j = n^{-2\beta} \varrho^{\frac{2}{\mu+1}} \nu_0(\lambda_{j-1})(1 + o(1)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \lambda_j (\Delta t_j)^{-1/2} = \varrho(1 + o(1)). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Proof. It follows directly from the relation (7.3). \square

A technical condition (H₀): $A : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously differentiable function having absolutely integrable derivative A' and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n \left(\int_0^{l_*} |A(\lambda)| d\lambda + \int_{l^*}^{+\infty} |A(\lambda)| d\lambda \right) = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \theta_n = n^\beta \varrho^{2\beta}.$$

The following result is straightforward to check.

Lemma A.2. *Let ϱ either be a positive constant or satisfy condition (C₂). Then, for any function A satisfying condition (H₀),*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n \left| \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\lambda_{j-1} \geq a\}} A(\lambda_{j-1}) \Delta \lambda_j - \int_a^\infty A(\lambda) d\lambda \right| = 0. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

In particular, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n \left| \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} A(\lambda_{j-1}) \Delta \lambda_j - \int_0^\infty A(\lambda) d\lambda \right| = 0$.

Lemma A.3. *For any $K > 0$, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{v \rightarrow 1} \mathbf{P}(\inf_{v \leq u \leq 1} |\ln(S_u/K)| \leq \varepsilon) = 0$.*

Proof. It follows from the fact that conditioning on σ -field generated by the volatility process, the log-price process $\ln S_t$ has Gaussian distribution. \square

Lemma A.4. *Suppose that A_0 and its derivatives $\partial_x A_0, \partial_y A_0$ verify condition (H). Set $A(\lambda, x, y) = A_0(\lambda, x, y) \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda, x)$, $\bar{A}(\lambda, x, y) = \int_\lambda^\infty A(z, x, y) dz$ and define*

$$r_n = \sup_{(z, r, d) \in [l_*, l^*] \times \mathcal{B}} (|\partial_\lambda \bar{A}(z, r, d)| + |\partial_x \bar{A}(z, r, d)| + |\partial_y A(z, r, d)|),$$

where $\mathcal{B} = [S_{\min}, S_{\max}] \times [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$ with $S_{\min} = \inf_{t^* \leq u \leq t_*} S_u$, $S_{\max} = \sup_{t^* \leq u \leq t_*} S_u$ and $y_{\min} = \inf_{t^* \leq u \leq t_*} y_u$, $y_{\max} = \sup_{t^* \leq u \leq t_*} y_u$. Then, $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(r_n > b) = 0$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. On the set $\Gamma_{1,\varepsilon} = \{\inf_{t^* \leq u \leq 1} |\ln(S_u/K)| \geq \varepsilon\}$,

$$\sup_{S_{\min} \leq r \leq S_{\max}} \tilde{\varphi}(q, r) \leq (2\pi)^{-1/2} \sqrt{Kr^{-1}} \exp\{-\varepsilon^2/(2q) - q/8\}.$$

By condition **(H)**, there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$|\bar{A}_x(z, r, d)| \leq C|\tilde{U}(r, d)| \int_z^\infty (q^{-1/2} + q^\gamma) e^{-\varepsilon^2/(2q) - q/8} dq \leq C_\varepsilon \tilde{U}(r, d),$$

where \tilde{U} is some function verifying $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} \tilde{U}(\check{S}_t^*) < \infty$. For any $\eta > 0$ and $N > 0$, let

$$\Gamma_{2,\eta} = \left\{ \sup_{(r,d) \in \mathcal{B}} |\tilde{U}(r, d) - \tilde{U}(\check{S}_1)| < \eta \right\} \cap \left\{ |\tilde{U}(\check{S}_1)| < N \right\}.$$

It is clear that $|\tilde{U}(r, d)| < N + \eta$ on the set $\Gamma_{2,\eta}$. Similarly, taking into account $\partial_\lambda \bar{A}(z, r, d) = -A(z, r, d)$, $\partial_y \bar{A}(z, r, d) = \int_\lambda^\infty \partial_y A_0(z, x, y) \tilde{\varphi}(z, x)$ we deduce that both $|\partial_\lambda \bar{A}(z, r, d)|$ and $|\partial_y \bar{A}(z, r, d)|$ are bounded on $\Gamma_{2,\eta}$ by a constant $C_{N,\eta}$ independent of b . Now, for $b > N + \eta + 2C_{N,\eta}$, $\mathbf{P}(r_n > b)$ is bounded by

$$\mathbf{P}(\Gamma_{1,\varepsilon}^c) + \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{(r,d) \in \mathcal{B}} |\tilde{U}(r, d) - \tilde{U}(\check{S}_1^*)| \geq \eta\right) + \mathbf{P}(|\tilde{U}(\check{S}_1^*)| > N) + \mathbf{P}(\tau^* < 1).$$

By Lemma A.3, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\Gamma_{1,\varepsilon}^c) \rightarrow 0$. Thanks to the continuity of the functions S_t and y_t , one gets $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{(r,d) \in \mathcal{B}} |\tilde{U}(r, d) - \tilde{U}(\check{S}_1^*)| \geq \eta\right) = 0$. Moreover, the integrability of $\tilde{U}(\check{S}_1^*)$ implies that $\mathbf{P}(|\tilde{U}(\check{S}_1^*)| > N)$ converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. By (7.12), $\mathbf{P}(\tau^* < 1)$ converges to 0 as $L \rightarrow \infty$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma A.5. *Let $\bar{A}(\lambda, x, y) = \int_\lambda^\infty A^0(z, x, y) \tilde{\varphi}(z, x) dz$, $\tilde{A} = \bar{A}^2$, where A^0 is a function having property **(H)**. Then, for any $\gamma > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \lambda_{j-1}^\gamma \tilde{A}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_{t_{j-1}}) \Delta \lambda_j - \int_0^\infty \lambda^\gamma \tilde{A}(\lambda, \check{S}_1) d\lambda \right| = 0,$$

where $\check{S}_t = (S_t, y_t)$. The same property still holds if $\bar{A}(\lambda, x, y) = A^0(\lambda, x, y) \tilde{\varphi}(x, y)$ or is a product of these above kinds.

Proof. We only prove for the first case $\bar{A}(\lambda, x, y) = \int_\lambda^\infty A^0(z, x, y) \tilde{\varphi}(z, x) dz$ since the same argument can be made for the other cases. First, we split the expression under the absolute sign as $\sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \lambda_{j-1}^\gamma \tilde{A}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_1) \Delta \lambda_j + \sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \Delta_{j,n} \Delta \lambda_j$, where $\Delta_{j,n} = \hat{A}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_{t_{j-1}}) - \hat{A}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_1)$ and $\hat{A}(\lambda, x, y) = \lambda^\gamma \tilde{A}(\lambda, x, y)$. It is clear that for any (x, y) , the function $\hat{A}(\cdot, x, y)$ satisfies condition **(H₀)**. Hence, $\sum_{j=m_1}^{m_2} \hat{A}(\lambda_{j-1}, \check{S}_1) \Delta \lambda_j$ converges a.s. to zero by Lemma A.2. It remains to show that $\mathbf{P}(|\Delta_n| > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, but it can be done by the same way as in Lemma A.3. \square

B Proof of Proposition 7.6

The singularity of \widehat{C} at the maturity $T = 1$ requires a separate treatment. Let $\varepsilon_n = n^{-2\beta} \varrho^{-4\beta} l_*$. We then represent $I_{2,n} = \int_0^{1-\varepsilon_n} \varpi_n(t) dW_t^{(1)} + \int_{1-\varepsilon_n}^1 \varpi_n(t) dW_t^{(1)}$, where $\varpi_n(t) = (\gamma_t^n - \widehat{C}_x(t, S_t)) \sigma(y_t) S_t$. Taking into account that $|\gamma_t^n - \widehat{C}_x(t, S_t)| \leq 1$, we obtain $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n^2 \mathbf{E} \int_{1-\varepsilon_n}^1 \varpi_n^2(t) dt = 0$. Now put $\widehat{t}_j = \min(t_j, 1 - \varepsilon_n)$. It then remains to prove that $\sum_{j=1}^n \int_{\widehat{t}_{j-1}}^{\widehat{t}_j} \mathbf{E}(\gamma_t^n - \widehat{C}_x(t, S_t))^2 dt = o(\theta_n^{-2})$. Let us introduce the discrete sums $w_1(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_t^{-1} (x_t - x_{\widehat{t}_{j-1}})^2 \xi_j(t)$, $w_2(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n x_t^2 (\lambda_t^{-1/2} - \lambda_{\widehat{t}_{j-1}}^{-1/2})^2 \xi_j(t)$ and $w_3(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda_t^{1/2} - \lambda_{\widehat{t}_{j-1}}^{1/2})^2 \xi_j(t)$, where $\xi_j(t) = \mathbf{1}_{(\widehat{t}_{j-1}, \widehat{t}_j]}(t)$ and $x_t = \ln(S_t/K)$. Clearly, $|\gamma_t^n - \widehat{C}_x(t, S_t)|^2 \leq w_1(t) + w_2(t) + w_3(t)$. By taking into account that

$$\sup_{n, 1 \leq j \leq n} n \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E}(x_t - x_{\widehat{t}_{j-1}})^2 \xi_j(t) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} x_t^2 < \infty,$$

we have $\theta_n^2 \mathbf{E} \int_0^{1-\varepsilon_n} w_1(t) dt \leq C n^{2\beta-3/2} \varrho^{4\beta-1}$, which converges to zero by **(C₂)**. Now, the particular choice of ε ensures that $\theta_n^2 \mathbf{E} \int_0^{1-\varepsilon_n} w_2(t) dt \leq C \theta_n^2 n^{-2} (\varepsilon_n)^{-(4\beta+1)/4\beta} \lambda_0^{-1}$, which tends to zero. The convergence for $w_3(t)$ can be shown in the same way. \square

C Moments of Orstein-Uhlenbeck's processes

Lemma C.1. *Suppose that $\sigma(z) \leq \gamma(1 + |z|)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, for some constant $\gamma > 0$. Let y_t be an Orstein-Uhlenbeck process defined by $dy_t = (a - by_t)dt + dZ_t$ with some constants a and $b > 0$. Put $X_\alpha = \exp\left\{2\alpha\gamma^2 \int_0^1 y_s^2 ds\right\}$ and $\alpha_* = b^2(2\gamma^2(2b + a^2))^{-1}$. Then, $\mathbf{E}X_\alpha < \infty$ for any $0 < \alpha < \alpha_*$.*

Proof. Remark that $(a - by)y \leq a^2/(2b) - by^2/2$. Then, by adapting Proposition 1.1.5 in [20, p.24], we can show that $\mathbf{E}|y_t|^{2m} \leq m! (2/b + a^2/b^2)^m$ for any integer $m \geq 1$. It follows that for any $0 < \alpha < \alpha_*$,

$$\mathbf{E}X_\alpha \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (\alpha 2\gamma^2)^m (m!)^{-1} \mathbf{E}|y_t|^{2m} \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (2/b + a^2/b^2)^m (\alpha 2\gamma^2)^m < \infty.$$

If y_t is mean-reverting then b takes very big values. Hence, it is possible to choose $\alpha > 3/2 + \sqrt{2}$ as discussed in Remark 10. \square

References

- [1] Ahn H., Dayal M., Grannan E., Swindle G. (1998): Option replication with transaction costs: General diffusion limits, *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, **8**(3), 767-707 .
- [2] Andersen L., Piterbarg V. (2007): Moment explosions in stochastic volatility models, *Finance and Stochastics*, **11**, 29-50.
- [3] Ball C., Roma A. (1994): Stochastic volatility option pricing, *Finance and Quantitative Analysis*, **29**(4), 589-607.

- [4] Black F., Scholes M. (1973): The pricing of options and corporate liabilities, *J. Political Economy*, **81**, 637-659.
- [5] Baran M. (2003): Quantile hedging on markets with proportional transaction costs, *Appl. Math. Warsaw*, **30**, 193-208.
- [6] Barski M. (2011): Quantile hedging for multiple assets derivatives, preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1010.5810>.
- [7] Bratky M., Mishura Y. (2008): The generalization of the quantile hedging problem for price process model involving finite number of Brownian and fractional Brownian motions, *Th. Stoch. Proc.*, **14**(3-4), 27-38.
- [8] Cvitanić J., Karatzas I. (1996): Hedging and portfolio optimization under transaction costs: a martingale approach, *Mathematical Finance*, **6**, 133-165.
- [9] Darses. S., Lépinette L. (2011): Limit theorem for a modified Leland hedging strategy under constant transaction costs rate, *The Musiela Festschrift*, Springer.
- [10] Föllmer H., Leukert P. (1999): Quantile hedging, *Finance and Stochastic*, **3**, 251-273.
- [11] Fouque J. P., Papanicolaou G., Sircar K. R. (2000): *Derivatives in Financial Markets with Stochastic Volatility*, Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Friedman A. (1975): *Stochastic differential equations and applications*, vol.1, Academic Press.
- [13] Gamys M., Kabanov Y. (2009): Mean square error for the Leland–Lott hedging strategy, *Recent Advances in Financial Engineering*, Proceedings of the 2008 Daiwa Int. Workshop on Financial Engineering, World Scientific.
- [14] Granditz P., Schachinger W. (2001): Leland’s approach to option pricing: The evolution of discontinuity, *Mathematical Finance*, **11**, 347-355.
- [15] Hall P. (1980): *Martingale limit theory and its applications*, Academic Press.
- [16] Heston S. (1993): A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility with applications to bond and currency options, *Rev. Fin. Stud.*, **6**(2), 327-343.
- [17] Ibragimov A. I., Hasminskii Z. R. (1981): *Statistical estimation: asymptotic theory*, English transl. by Samuel Kotz, Springer Verlag-Berlin.
- [18] Kabanov Y., Safarian M. (1997): On Leland’s strategy of option pricing with transaction costs, *Finance and Stochastics*, **1** , 239-250.
- [19] Kabanov Y., Safarian M. (2009): *Markets with transaction costs: Mathematical Theory*, Springer - Verlag Berlin.
- [20] Kabanov Y., Pergamenschikov S. (2003): *Two-scale stochastic systems, Asymptotic Analysis and Control*, Springer - Verlag Berlin.

- [21] Kallsen J., Muhle-Karbe J. The general structure of optimal investment and consumption with small transaction costs, *preprint*.
- [22] Karatzas I., Shreve S. (1998): *Methods of mathematical finance*, Springer-Verlag Berlin.
- [23] Leland H. (1985): Option pricing and replication with transactions costs, *Journal of Finance*, **40**, 1283-1301.
- [24] Lépinette E. (2008): Marché avec coûts de transaction: approximation de Leland et arbitrage, *Thèse doctorale*, Université de Franche-Comté Besançon.
- [25] Lépinette E. (2009): Leland's approximations for concave pay-off functions, *Recent Advances in Financial Engineering*, World Scientific.
- [26] Lépinette E., Kabanov Y. (2010): Mean square error for the Leland-Lott hedging strategy: convex payoffs, *Finance and Stochastics*, **14**(4), 625-667.
- [27] Lépinette E. (2012): Modified Leland's strategy for constant transaction costs rate, *Mathematical Finance*, **22**(4), 741-752.
- [28] Lions P.-L., Musiela M. (2007): Correlations and bounds for stochastic volatility models, *Ann. I. H. Poincaré*, **24**, 1-16.
- [29] Liptser R. S., Shiryaev N. A. (2001): *Statistics of random processes I: General Theory*, Applications of Mathematics, Springer - Verlag Berlin .
- [30] Lott K. (1993): Ein verfahren zur eplikation von optionen unter transaktionkosten in stetiger Zeit, *Dissertation*, Universität der Bundeswehr München.
- [31] Nguyen H. T.: Option replication with general transaction costs in stochastic volatility markets, *preprint*.
- [32] Nguyen H. T.: Approximate hedging with proportional transaction costs for multi-asset options, *submitted*.
- [33] Novikov A. (1997): Hedging of options with a given probability, *Theory Probability Applications*, **43**(1), 135-143.
- [34] Pergamenschikov S. (2003): Limit theorem for Leland's strategy, *Annals of Applied Probability*, **13**, 1099-1118.
- [35] Pham H. (2002): Smooth solutions to optimal investment models with stochastic volatilities and portfolio constraints, *Appl. Math. Optim.*, **46**, 55-78.
- [36] Pham H., Touzi N. (1996): Equilibrium state prices in a stochastic volatility model, *Mathematical Finance*, **6**, 215-236.
- [37] Renault E., Touzi N. (1996): Option hedging and implicit volatilities, *Mathematical Finance*, **6**, 279-302.