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Abstract

In this paper we study the problem of nonlinear pricing of an American option with a right-continuous left-limited (RCLL) payoff process in an incomplete market with default, from the buyer’s point of view. We show that the buyer’s price process can be represented as the value of a stochastic control/optimal stopping game problem with nonlinear expectations, which corresponds to the maximal subsolution of a constrained reflected Backward Stochastic Differential Equation (BSDE). We then deduce a nonlinear optional decomposition of the buyer’s price process. To the best of our knowledge, no dynamic dual representation (resp. no optional decomposition) of the buyer’s price process can be found in the literature, even in the case of a linear incomplete market and brownian filtration. Finally, we prove the "infimum" and the "supremum" in the definition of the stochastic game problem can be interchanged. Our method relies on new tools, as simultaneous nonlinear Doob-Meyer decompositions of processes which have a $\mathcal{F}^\nu$-submartingale property for each admissible control $\nu$.
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1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to study the problem of nonlinear pricing of an American option with RCLL payoff process $(\xi_t)$ in an incomplete market with default, from the buyer’s point of view. The financial market consists of one riskless asset and one risky asset, whose dynamics are
driven by a one-dimensional Brownian motion and an independent compensated martingale, associated with a single jump process \( N \) defined by \( N_t = \mathbf{1}_{\vartheta \leq t} \), where \( \vartheta \) represents a default time. The nonlinearity is incorporated in the wealth dynamics and allows to take into account the market imperfections. Moreover, the market is considered to be incomplete, in the sense that it is not always possible to replicate the payoff of an European option by a controlled portfolio.

The case of a nonlinear complete market has already been addressed in e.g. [20], [23], [35] within different frameworks. As shown in these papers, the seller’s price (resp. the buyer’s price) can be written in terms of an optimal stopping problem with nonlinear expectations, which is further related to the solution of a given reflected BSDE.

The option pricing under incompleteness has been studied by many authors in the case of linear markets, using different techniques (see e.g. [1], [9], [25], [26], [30], [32], [31]). The stochastic control approach consists in embedding the initial market into an auxiliary family of markets \( \{ \mathcal{M}_\nu, \nu \in \mathcal{D} \} \) (with \( \mathcal{D} \) the set of admissible controls). The seller’s price (which corresponds to the minimal initial capital which allows the seller to be super-hedged) can be expressed in terms of a mixed stochastic control/optimal stopping problem, and shown to admit an optional decomposition. The simultaneous Doob-Meyer decompositions, valid under a whole family of probability measures \( \{ Q_\nu, \nu \in \mathcal{D} \} \), play an important role in the analysis (see e.g. [9], [32], [31], [36]). On its turn, the buyer’s price (defined as the supremum of initial prices which allow the buyer to select an exercise time \( \tau \) and a portfolio strategy \( \varphi \) so that he/she is superhedged) can be represented as a stochastic control/optimal stopping game problem. The roles of the buyer and of the seller are asymmetric in the context of American options, and this asymmetry reflects itself in the definitions of the prices and in the mathematical treatment of the control problems.

In this paper, we show that the buyer’s price process in our nonlinear incomplete market can be characterized through the value family

\[
\bar{Y}(S) := \text{essinf}_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}} \text{esssup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S} \mathcal{E}^\nu_{S,\tau}(\xi_\tau), \tag{1.1}
\]

with \( \mathcal{T}_S \) the set of stopping times greater than \( S \) and \( \mathcal{E}^\nu \) the nonlinear conditional expectation associated with a given driver \( f^\nu \). Using tools from the control theory, we obtain a dynamic dual representation of the buyer’s price process in terms of the maximal subsolution of a constrained reflected backward stochastic differential equation. From this dynamic characterization, we easily deduce a nonlinear optional decomposition. To the best of our knowledge, no dynamic dual representation (and no optional decomposition) of the buyer’s price process can be found in the previous literature, even in the case of linear markets and brownian filtration, and this result is the main contribution of the paper. A key ingredient of our approach is represented by the simultaneous nonlinear Doob-Meyer decompositions of the value process which aggregates the value family given by (1.1), which is shown to be a \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \), where the nonlinear operator \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \) is defined through the unique solution of a reflected BSDE with obstacle process \( (\xi_t) \) and driver \( f^\nu \). Our method seems to be completely new for the study of game problems written in the form (1.1). Using
the dynamic dual representation of the buyer’s price process, we also show that the "infimum" and the "supremum" in (1.1) can be interchanged. We would like to emphasize that, due to the control/optimal stopping game aspect of the problem, the proofs are quite involved and require fine techniques of the general theory of stochastic processes.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we introduce the financial market model, as well as some notation and assumptions. In Section 3.1, we give some first properties of the value family given by (1.1) and in particular show that (\bar{Y}(S)) is the greatest family satisfying the Y_\nu-submartingale property for each \nu \in \mathcal{D}. In Section 3.2, we provide a detailed analysis of \mathcal{Y}-submartingale families/processes (with \(g\) a general nonlinear driver). Section 3.3 is devoted to the simultaneous nonlinear Doob-Meyer decompositions of processes which have the \mathcal{Y}_\nu-submartingale property for each \nu, leading to the representation of such processes as the maximal subsolution of a constrained reflected BSDE. A nonlinear optional decomposition is deduced. In Section 3.4, we apply these results to the family value \bar{Y}(S). In Section 3.5, we prove the dynamic dual representation of the buyer’s price process in terms of the maximal subsolution of a constrained reflected BSDE. Finally, we show that (\bar{Y}(S)) corresponds to the buyer’s price process and that the "infimum" and "supremum" in (1.1) can be interchanged.

2 The model

We consider a financial market \(\mathcal{M}\) that consists of one risk-free asset whose price process \(S^0 = (S^0_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\) satisfies

\[ dS^0_t = S^0_t r_t dt \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

and one risky asset with price process \(S = (S_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\) which evolves according to the equation

\[ dS_t = S_t \left( \mu_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t + \beta_t dM_t \right). \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

Here, \(W\) is a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion and \(M\) represents the compensated martingale associated with a jump process \(N\) given by \(N_t = 1_{\vartheta \leq t}\) for any \(t \in [0, T]\), where \(\vartheta\) is a random variable which modelizes a default time. The processes \(W\) and \(N\) are defined on a complete probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{G}, P)\) and we shall denote by \(\mathcal{G} := \{\mathcal{G}_t, t \geq 0\}\) the \(\mathbb{P}\)-augmentation of the filtration generated by \(W\) and \(N\). We assume that the default \(\vartheta\) can appear at any time, that is \(P(\vartheta \geq t) > 0\) for any \(t \geq 0\). Moreover, we suppose that \(W\) is a \(\mathcal{G}\)-Brownian motion. Let \(\mathcal{P}\) be the \(\mathcal{G}\)-predictable \(\sigma\)-algebra.

We denote by \((\Lambda_t)\) the predictable compensator of the nondecreasing process \((N_t)\). Note that \((\Lambda_{t \wedge \vartheta})\) then corresponds to the predictable compensator of \((N_{t \wedge \vartheta}) = (N_t)\). By uniqueness of the predictable compensator, we get that \(\Lambda_{t \wedge \vartheta} = \Lambda_t, t \geq 0\) a.s. We assume that \(\Lambda\) is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue’s measure, so that there exists a nonnegative process.
\(\lambda\), called the intensity process, such that \(\Lambda_t = \int_0^t \lambda_s ds, t \geq 0\). Since \(\Lambda_{t \wedge \vartheta} = \Lambda_t\), \(\lambda\) vanishes after \(\vartheta\). The compensated martingale \(M\) satisfies

\[ M_t = N_t - \int_0^t \lambda_s ds. \]

The coefficients of \(\mathcal{M}\), that is, the processes \(r_t, \mu_t, \sigma_t\) and \(\beta_t\) are supposed to be predictable (that is \(\mathcal{P}\)-measurable), satisfying \(\sigma > 0\) and \(\beta_\vartheta > -1\), and such that \(\sigma, \mu, \lambda, \sigma^{-1}, \beta\) are bounded. All processes encountered throughout the paper will be defined on the fixed, finite horizon \([0, T]\). Moreover, the following sets will be used:

- \(\mathcal{S}^2\) is the set of \(\mathcal{G}\)-optional processes \(\varphi\) such that \(\mathbb{E}[\text{ess sup}_{\tau \in T} |\varphi_\tau|^2] < +\infty\).
- \(\mathcal{A}^2\) is the set of real-valued non decreasing RCLL predictable processes \(A\) with \(A_0 = 0\) and \(\mathbb{E}(A_T^2) < \infty\).
- \(\mathcal{A}_o^2\) is the set of real-valued non decreasing RCLL optional processes \(A\) with \(A_0 = 0\) and \(\mathbb{E}(A_T^2) < \infty\).
- \(\mathcal{C}^2\) is the set of real-valued purely discontinuous non decreasing RCLL optional processes \(C\) with \(C_0 = 0\) and \(\mathbb{E}(C_T^2) < \infty\).
- \(\mathcal{H}^2\) is the set of \(\mathcal{G}\)-predictable processes \(Z\) such that \(\|Z\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2 := \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T |Z_t|^2 dt\right] < \infty\).
- \(\mathcal{H}_\lambda^2 := L^2(\Omega \times [0, T], \mathcal{P}, \lambda_t dt)\), equipped with the scalar product \(\langle U, V \rangle_\lambda := \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T U_t V_t \lambda_t dt\right]\), for all \(U, V\) in \(\mathcal{H}_\lambda^2\). For each \(U \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda^2\), we set \(\|U\|_{\mathcal{H}_\lambda^2}^2 := \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T |U_t|^2 \lambda_t dt\right] < \infty\).

We can suppose, without loss of generality, that for each \(U\) in \(\mathcal{H}_\lambda^2 = L^2(\Omega \times [0, T], \mathcal{P}, \lambda_t dt)\), \(U\) (or its representant still denoted by \(U\)) vanishes after \(\vartheta\).

Moreover, \(\mathcal{T}_\vartheta\) is the set of stopping times \(\tau\) such that \(\tau \in [0, T]\) a.s. and for each \(S\) in \(\mathcal{T}_\vartheta, \mathcal{T}_S\) is the set of stopping times \(\tau\) such that \(S \leq \tau \leq T\) a.s.

We now give the definition of a \(\lambda\)-admissible driver.

**Definition 2.1 (Driver, \(\lambda\)-admissible driver).** A function \(g\) is said to be a driver if \(g : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; (\omega, t, y, z, k) \mapsto g(\omega, t, y, z, k)\) which is \(\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^3)\)-measurable, and such that \(g(\cdot, 0, 0, 0) \in \mathcal{H}^2\).

A driver \(g\) is called a \(\lambda\)-admissible driver if moreover there exists a constant \(C \geq 0\) such that \(dP \otimes dt\)-a.s., for each \((y, z, k), (y_1, z_1, k_1), (y_2, z_2, k_2)\),

\[ |g(\omega, t, y, z_1, k_1) - g(\omega, t, y, z_2, k_2)| \leq C(|y_1 - y_2| + |z_1 - z_2| + \sqrt{t}|k_1 - k_2|). \tag{2.3} \]

The positive real \(C\) is called the \(\lambda\)-constant associated with driver \(g\).

Note that condition \(\text{2.3}\) implies that for each \(t > \vartheta\), since \(\lambda_t = 0\), \(g\) does not depend on \(k\). In other terms, for each \((y, z, k)\), we have: \(g(t, y, z, k) = g(t, y, z, 0), t > \vartheta \) \(dP \otimes dt\)-a.s.
Wealth process. We consider an investor, endowed with an initial wealth equal to $x$, who can invest his wealth in the two assets of the market. At each time $t$, he chooses the amount $\varphi_t$ of wealth invested in the risky asset.

For an initial wealth $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and a portfolio strategy $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^2$, we denote by $V^{x,\varphi}_t$ (or simply $V_t$) the value of the associated portfolio (also called wealth), which is supposed to satisfy the following dynamics:

$$-dV_t = f(t, V_t, \varphi_t \sigma_t)dt - \varphi_t \sigma_t dW_t - \varphi_t \beta_t dM_t,$$

with $V_0 = x$, where $f$ is a nonlinear $\lambda$-admissible driver independent on $k$, which modelizes the imperfections in the market and which satisfies $f(t, 0, 0) = 0$. Note that in the classical case (linear market), the driver $f$ is given by $f(t, \omega, y, z) = -y r_t(\omega) - z \theta_t$, with $\theta_t = \frac{\mu_t - r_t}{\sigma_t}$ (see e.g. [20]).

Using a change of variable which associates to $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^2$ another process $Z \in \mathcal{H}^2$ given by $Z = \varphi \sigma$, one can write (2.4) as follows:

$$-dV_t = f(t, V_t, Z_t)dt - Z_t dW_t - Z_t \lambda_t^{-1} \beta_t dM_t.$$

Note that the market is incomplete, as it is not possible for all $\zeta \in L^2$ to find $(V, Z) \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying (2.5) with $V_T = \zeta$.

3 Dynamic dual representation of the buyer’s price process of an American option

Let $g$ be a $\lambda$-admissible driver and let $\zeta \in L^2(\mathcal{G}_T)$. By Proposition 2 in [18], for each $T' \in [0, T]$ and $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{G}_{T'})$ there exists a unique solution $(\mathcal{X}(T', \eta), \mathcal{Z}(T', \eta), \mathcal{K}(T', \eta))$ in $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2$ (simply denoted by $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{K})$) of the following backward SDE:

$$-d\mathcal{X}_t = g(t, \mathcal{X}_t, \mathcal{Z}_t, \mathcal{K}_t)dt - \mathcal{Z}_t dW_t - \mathcal{K}_t dM_t; \quad \mathcal{X}_T = \zeta.$$

As it is already well known, one can define an associated nonlinear operator (called $g$-expectation) as follows: $\mathcal{E}_g^\eta(\cdot) := \mathcal{X}_\cdot$. In order to ensure the monotonicity of the operator $\mathcal{E}_g(\cdot)$, the driver $g$ should satisfy the following assumption.

**Assumption 3.1.** Assume that there exists a map

$$\gamma : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^4 \mapsto \mathbb{R}; \quad (\omega, t, y, z, k_1, k_2) \mapsto \gamma^y_z(k_1, k_2)(\omega)$$

$\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^4)$-measurable, satisfying $d\mathcal{P} \otimes dt$-a.e., for each $(y, z, k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{R}^4$,

$$|\gamma^y_z(k_1, k_2) \sqrt{\lambda_t}| \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^y_z(k_1, k_2) \geq -1$$

and

$$g(t, y, z, k_1) - g(t, y, z, k_2) \geq \gamma^y_z(k_1, k_2)(k_1 - k_2) \lambda_t$$

(where $C$ is a positive constant).
We now address the problem of pricing and hedging the American option from the buyer’s point of view. We define the superhedging price for the buyer of the American option with RCLL payoff process $\xi$, belonging to $\mathcal{F}^2$ as the maximal initial capital which allows the buyer to find a superhedging strategy for the claim, that is

$$v_0 := \sup\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \exists (\varphi, \tau) \in \mathcal{B}(x)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(x) = \{(\varphi, \tau) \in \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{T}_0 \mid V_{-\tau}^{x, \varphi} + \xi_{\tau} \geq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$.

Now, we aim at providing a dual representation of the buyer’s superhedging price in terms of a stochastic control/optimal stopping game, which will be later on characterized as the maximal supersolution of a constrained reflected BSDE. To this purpose, we define the driver $\bar{f}(t, \omega, y, z) := -f(t, \omega, -y, -z)$, which is clearly $\lambda$-admissible and denote by $\bar{E}$ the associated nonlinear conditional expectation. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of bounded predictable processes $\nu$ such that $\nu_t > -1$ for all $t \in [0, T] \lambda dP \otimes dt$-a.s.

Fix $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$. We denote by $\mathcal{E}^\nu$ or $\mathcal{E}^{\bar{E}}$ the nonlinear conditional expectation associated with the Lipschitz driver $\bar{f}^\nu(t, y, z, k) := \bar{f}(t, y, z) + \nu_t \lambda_t(k - \beta_t(\sigma_t)^{-1}z)$.

For each $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$, we define the $\mathcal{G}_S$-measurable random variable $\bar{Y}(S)$ as follows:

$$\bar{Y}(S) := \essinf_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}} \esssup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S} \mathcal{E}^{\bar{E}}_{S, \tau}(\xi_{\tau}).$$

Note that for each $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{E}^{\bar{E}}_{S, \tau}(\xi_{\tau})$ depends on the control $\nu$ only through the values of $\nu$ on the interval $[S, \nu]$. For each $S \in \mathcal{D}$, define $\mathcal{D}_S$ the set of bounded predictable processes $\nu$ defined on $[S, T]$ such that $\nu_t > -1 \lambda_t dP \otimes dt$. Therefore, we have

$$\bar{Y}(S) := \essinf_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}_S} \esssup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S} \mathcal{E}^{\bar{E}}_{S, \tau}(\xi_{\tau}) \text{ a.s.} \tag{3.3}$$

In order to ensure some integrability properties of the above value family, we introduce the following assumption:

**Assumption 3.2.** There exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^2$ such that $|\xi_t| \leq V_{-t}^{x, \varphi}$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ a.s.

Under the above assumption, we can show that $E[\esssup_{\{T}_0} \bar{Y}^2(\tau)] < \infty$. Indeed, as $\nu \equiv 0$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}$, we have $\bar{Y}(S) \leq \esssup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0} \bar{E}^0_{S, \tau}(\xi_{\tau}) = \bar{Y}^0_S$ a.s., where $\bar{Y}^0_t$ is the first coordinate of the solution of the reflected BSDE associated with driver $\bar{f}$ and lower obstacle $(-\xi_t)$. Now, since $|\xi_t| \leq V_{-t}^{x, \varphi}$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ a.s., we get that for all $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{D}_S$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{\bar{E}}_{S, \tau}(\xi_{\tau}) = -\mathcal{E}^{\bar{E}}_{S, \tau}(-\xi_{\tau}) \leq -\mathcal{E}^{\nu}_{S, \tau}(\xi_{\tau}) \geq (\mathcal{E}^{\nu}_{S, \tau}(V_{-\tau}^{x, \varphi})) = -V_{-\tau}^{x, \varphi} \text{ a.s.},$$

where the last equality follows by the $\nu$-martingale property of $V_{-t}^{x, \varphi}$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{D}_S$. Hence, taking the essential supremum over $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S$ and then the essential infimum over $\nu \in \mathcal{D}_S$ in this inequality, we obtain $\bar{Y}(S) \geq -V_{-\tau}^{x, \varphi} \text{ a.s.}$ Since $\bar{Y}^0 \in \mathcal{F}^2$ and $V_{-t}^{x, \varphi} \in \mathcal{F}^2$, it follows that

$$E[\esssup_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0} \bar{Y}(S)^2] < +\infty. \tag{3.4}$$
3.1 First properties of the value family ($\bar{Y}(S)$)

For each driver $g$, we denote by $\mathcal{V}^g$ the nonlinear operator (semigroup) associated with the reflected BSDE with lower obstacle ($\xi$) and driver $g$, which is the analogous of the operator $\mathcal{E}^g$, induced by the non-reflected BSDE with driver $g$.

**Definition 3.3 (Nonlinear operator $\mathcal{V}^g$).** Let $g$ be a $\lambda$-admissible driver. For each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0$ and each $\zeta \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$ such that $\zeta \geq \xi_\tau$ a.s., we define $\mathcal{V}^g_\tau(\zeta) := Y_\tau$, where $Y_\tau$ corresponds to the first component of the solution of the reflected BSDE associated with terminal time $\tau$, driver $g$ and lower obstacle ($\xi_1 I_{t<\tau} + \zeta I_{t\geq \tau}$).

Recall that, by the flow property for reflected BSDEs, for each driver $g$, the operator $\mathcal{V}^g$ is consistent (or, equivalently, satisfies a semigroup property) with respect to terminal condition $\zeta$. Under Assumption 3.1, by the comparison theorem for reflected BSDEs with RCLL obstacle (see Th. 4.4. in [40]), we get that $\mathcal{V}^g$ is monotone with respect to the terminal condition.

Using the characterization of the solution of a reflected BSDE with RCLL lower obstacle in terms of an optimal stopping problem with $g$-expectations (see Th. 3.3. in [40]), we can rewrite (3.3) as follows

$$\bar{Y}(S) = \text{essinf}_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}_S} \mathcal{V}^\nu_{S,T}(\xi_T),$$

where for simplicity we denote by $\mathcal{V}^\nu$ the operator $\mathcal{V}^{\nu'}$ associated with driver $\tilde{f}^\nu$.

Using standard arguments (see e.g. Lemma 3.2. in [13]), one can show that the family $(\bar{Y}(S), S \in \mathcal{T}_0)$ is admissible. Moreover, we give below a result concerning the existence of an optimizing sequence.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$. There exists a sequence of controls $(\nu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $(\nu^n)$ in $\mathcal{D}_S$, for all $n$, such that the sequence $(\mathcal{V}^{\nu^n}_{S,T}(\xi_T))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non increasing and satisfies:

$$\bar{Y}(S) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \downarrow \mathcal{V}^{\nu^n}_{S,T}(\xi_T) \text{ a.s.}$$

**Proof.** It is enough to show that for each $S \in \mathcal{T}$, the family $\{\mathcal{V}^\nu_{S,T}(\xi_T), \nu \in \mathcal{D}_S\}$ is directed downward. Indeed, let $\nu, \nu' \in \mathcal{D}_S$. Set $A = \{\mathcal{V}^{\nu'}_{S,T}(\xi_T) \geq \mathcal{V}^\nu_{S,T}(\xi_T)\}$. We have $A \in \mathcal{F}_S$. Set $\tilde{\nu} = \nu 1_A + \nu' 1_{A^c}$. Then $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{D}_S$. We have $\mathcal{V}^{\tilde{\nu}}_{S,T}(\xi_T) 1_A = \mathcal{V}^{\nu'}_{S,T}(\xi_T) 1_A = \mathcal{V}^{\nu'}_{S,T}(\xi_T) 1_A$ a.s. and similarly on $A^c$. It follows that $\mathcal{V}^{\nu'}_{S,T}(\xi_T) 1_A + \mathcal{V}^{\nu'}_{S,T}(\xi_T) 1_{A^c} = \mathcal{V}^{\nu'}_{S,T}(\xi_T) 1_A \wedge \mathcal{V}^{\nu'}_{S,T}(\xi_T)$. \hfill \Box

We now recall the definition of an $\mathcal{V}^g$-submartingale family (resp. an $\mathcal{V}^g$-martingale family) for a given $\lambda$-admissible driver. This notion is first introduced in [13].

**Definition 3.5.** An admissible family $(X(S), S \in \mathcal{T}_0)$ is said to be an $\mathcal{V}^g$-submartingale family (resp. an $\mathcal{V}^g$-martingale family) if $E[\text{esssup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0} X^2(\tau)] < \infty$, if for each $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $X(S) \geq \xi_S$ and if, for all $S, S' \in \mathcal{T}_0$ such that $S \geq S'$ a.s., $\mathcal{V}^{g}_{S',S}(X(S)) \geq X(S')$ a.s., (resp. $\mathcal{V}^{g}_{S',S}(X(S)) = X(S')$ a.s.).
We also recall the definition of a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale process (resp. strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-martingale process) (see [13]).

**Definition 3.6.** An optional process $X \in \mathcal{F}^2$ is said to be a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale process (resp. a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-martingale process) if for each $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $X_S \geq \xi_S$ and if, for all $S, S' \in \mathcal{T}_0$ such that $S \geq S'$ a.s.,

$$\mathcal{Y}^g_{S',S}(X_S) \geq X_{S'} \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad \text{(resp. } \mathcal{Y}^g_{S',S}(X_S) = X_{S'} \quad \text{a.s.)}$$

We now give the following characterization of the family $(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}(S))$.

**Proposition 3.7.** The family $(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}(S))$ is the greatest family such that for each $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$, it is an $\mathcal{Y}^\nu$-submartingale family equal to $\xi_T$ at terminal time $T$.

**Proof.**

We first show that $(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}(S))$ is a $\mathcal{Y}^\nu$-submartingale family, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$. Let $\theta' \in \mathcal{T}_0$ and $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\theta'}$. By Proposition 3.4, there exists $(\nu^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that equality (3.6) holds with $S = \theta$. First, notice that $\bar{\mathcal{Y}}(\theta) \geq \xi_\theta$ a.s for all $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_0$. By the continuity property of reflected BSDEs with respect to terminal condition, $\mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta',\theta}(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}(\theta)) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta',\theta}(\mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta,T}(\xi_T))$ a.s. For each $n$, we set $\bar{v}^n_t := \nu_t[0,\theta](t) + \nu^n_t[0,\theta](t)$. Note that $\bar{v}^n \in \mathcal{D}_{\theta'}$ and that $\bar{f}^n = \bar{f}^n[0,\theta] + \bar{f}^n[0,\theta]$. We thus obtain

$$\mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta',\theta}(\mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta,T}(\xi_T)) = \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta',\theta}(\mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta,S,T}(\xi_T)) = \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta',T}(\xi_T) \quad \text{a.s.,}$$

where the last equality follows from the consistency property of the operator $\mathcal{Y}^\nu$. We thus get that $\mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta',\theta}(\bar{\mathcal{Y}}(\theta)) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta',T}(\xi_T) \geq \bar{\mathcal{Y}}(\theta')$ a.s., where the last equality follows from the definition of $\bar{\mathcal{Y}}(\theta')$. We now show the second assertion. Let $(Y'(S), S \in \mathcal{T}_0)$ be an admissible family such that for each $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$, it is an $\mathcal{Y}^\nu$-submartingale family such that $Y'(T) = \xi_T$ a.s. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$. By the properties of $Y'$, for all $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $Y'(\theta) \leq \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta,T}(Y'(T)) = \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{\theta,T}(\xi_T)$ a.s. Taking the essential infimum over $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$, we derive $Y'(\theta) \leq \bar{\mathcal{Y}}(\theta)$ a.s.

$\square$

### 3.2 $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale families/processes

We give here some properties of $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale families/processes in the case of a RCLL payoff process $(\xi_t)$. We first provide an aggregation result, which has been first established in a more specific setting in [13].

**Lemma 3.8 (Aggregation of a $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale family by a right-l.s.c. process).** Let $(X(S), S \in \mathcal{T}_0)$ be an $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale family. Then, there exists a right-l.s.c. optional process $(X_t)$ belonging to $\mathcal{F}^2$ which aggregates the family $(X(S), S \in \mathcal{T}_0)$, that is such that $X(S) = X_S$ a.s. for all $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$. Moreover, the process $(X_t)$ is a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale, that is for each $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $X_S \in L^2$, $X_S \geq \xi_S$ and for all $S, S' \in \mathcal{T}_0$ such that $S \geq S'$ a.s., $\mathcal{Y}^g_{S',S}(X_S) \geq X_{S'}$ a.s.
Proof. Let $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a nondecreasing sequence of stopping times such that $\tau_n \downarrow \tau$ a.s. The definition of $\mathcal{Y}^g$ implies that

$$X(\tau) \leq \mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau_n}(X(\tau_n)) \text{ a.s., for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.7)$$

Since the sequence $(\tau_n)_n$ is nondecreasing and the operator $\mathcal{Y}^g$ is consistent, we derive that

$$\mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau_n}(X(\tau_n)) = \mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau_{n+1}}(\mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau_{n+1},\tau_n}(X(\tau_n))) \geq \mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau_{n+1}}(X(\tau_{n+1})) \text{ a.s.},$$

where the last inequality follows by (3.7). This implies that the sequence $\mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau_n}(X(\tau_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is nondecreasing and thus it converges almost surely. Moreover,

$$X(\tau) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau_n}(X(\tau_n)) \text{ a.s.} \quad (3.8)$$

Since $\limsup_{n \to \infty} X(\tau_n) \geq \xi_\tau$ a.s., one can use the Fatou lemma for Reflected BSDEs (see Proposition 3.13 in [15]). We thus get

$$X(\tau) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau_n}(X(\tau_n)) \leq \mathcal{Y}^g_{\tau,\tau}(\limsup_{n \to \infty} X(\tau_n)) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} X(\tau_n). \quad (3.9)$$

By Lemma 5 in [11], we conclude that the family $(X(S), S \in \mathcal{T}_0)$ is right lower semicontinuous. It follows from Theorem 4 in [11] that there exists a right-l.s.c. optional process $(X_t)$ which aggregates the family $(X(S), S \in \mathcal{T}_0)$, which is clearly a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.9.** The above proposition implies that any strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale process is right lower semicontinuous.

We will now show that, if a process $(X_t)$ is a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale, then the process $(X_{t^+})$ is a $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale as well. This is an analagous result of the one given in the case of classical linear expectations (see e.g. [31]).

**Lemma 3.10.** Suppose that $(\xi_t)$ is a strong semimartingale. If $(X_t)_{t \in [0,T]}$ is a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale, then the process of right-limits $(X_{t^+})_{t \in [0,T]}$ (where, by convention, $X_{T^+} := X_T$) is a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale.

Proof. Since $(X_t)$ is a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale, $X_t \geq \xi_t$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ a.s. Moreover, since $(\xi_t)$ is a strong semimartingale, the strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale $(X_t)$ has right limits (see Remark [42]) and $X_t \geq \xi_t$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ a.s.

We have to show that the process $(X_{t^+})$ is a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale. Let us first show that $(X_{t^+})$ is greater than $(\xi_t)$. Since $(X_t)$ is a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale, by Remark [3.9] it follows that $(X_t)$ is right-l.s.c., which implies that for each $\theta \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $X_{\theta^+} \geq X_\theta$ a.s. Since $X_\theta \geq \xi_\theta$ a.s., we derive that $X_{\theta^+} \geq \xi_\theta$ a.s.

Let $S, \theta \in \mathcal{T}_0$ with $S \leq \theta$ a.s. There exist two nondecreasing sequences of stopping times $(S_n)$ and $(\theta_n)$ such that for each $n$, $S_n \leq \theta_n$ a.s., $S_n > S$ a.s. on $\{S < T\}$, $\theta_n >
\( \theta \) a.s. on \( \{ \theta < T \} \) and \( S_n \to S \) a.s. (resp. \( \theta_n \to \theta \)) when \( n \to \infty \). Since \( (X_t) \) is a strong \( \mathcal{Y}^g \)-submartingale, using the consistency and the monotonicity properties of \( \mathcal{Y}^g \), we get \( \mathcal{Y}^g_{S,S_n}(X_{\theta_n}) = \mathcal{Y}^g_{S,S_n}(\mathcal{Y}^g_{S,S_n}(X_{\theta_n})) \geq \mathcal{Y}^g_{S,S_n}(X_{S_n}) \) a.s. Since \( (\xi_t) \) is RCLL, the continuity property with respect to terminal time and terminal condition of reflected BSDEs holds. Hence, letting \( n \) tend to \(+\infty\) in the above inequality, we obtain \( \mathcal{Y}^g_{S,S(\xi_{\theta} +)} \geq \mathcal{Y}^g_{S,S}(X_{S^+}) = X_{S^+} \) a.s. We thus conclude that the process \((X_{t^+})\) is a strong \( \mathcal{Y}^g \)-submartingale. \( \square \)

### 3.3 Processes which are strong \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingales for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \)

In this subsection, we show that a RCLL process which is a \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \) admits a dynamic characterization via constrained reflected BSDEs. To this purpose, we first prove that a process \((X_t)\) which is a \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \) admits a RCLL version.

**Proposition 3.11.** Suppose that \((\xi_t)\) is a strong semimartingale. Let \((X_t)_{t\in[0,T]}\) be an optional process. Suppose that \((X_t)\) is the largest strong \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \) such that \( X_T = \xi_T \) a.s. Then, \((X_t)\) admits a RCLL version (still denoted by \((X_t)\)).

**Proof.**

Since \((X_t)\) is a strong \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \), it follows by Lemma 3.10 that \((X_{t^+})\) is a strong \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \). By the maximality property of \((X_t)\), it follows that \( X_t \geq X_{t^+}, 0 \leq t \leq T \) a.s. On the other hand, as \((X_t)\) is right-l.s.c. (cf. Remark 3.9), we have \( X_{t^+} \geq X_t, 0 \leq t \leq T \) a.s. We conclude that \( X_t = X_{t^+}, 0 \leq t \leq T \) a.s. \( \square \)

We recall here the following definition from [17].

**Definition 3.12.** Let \( A = (A_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \) and \( A' = (A'_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \) belonging to \( \mathcal{A}^2 \). The measures \( dA_t \perp dA'_t \) are said to be mutually singular and we write \( dA_t \perp dA'_t \) if there exists \( D \in \mathcal{P} \) such that

\[
E[\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_D dA_t] = E[\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_D dA'_t] = 0.
\]

Similarly, one can define mutually singular random measures associated with non-decreasing RCLL optional processes.

We now prove a constrained reflected BSDE characterization of a RCLL process which is a \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \).

**Proposition 3.13.** Suppose that \((\xi_t)\) is a strong semimartingale. Let \((X_t) \in \mathcal{D}^2 \) be a RCLL strong \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \). There exists an unique process \((Z,K,A,A') \in \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2_{\nu} \times (\mathcal{A}^2)^2 \) such that

\[
-dX_t = \tilde{f}(t,X_t,Z_t)dt - Z_t dW_t - K_t dM_t - dA'_t + dA_t, \tag{3.10}
\]
with \( dA_t \perp dA'_t \) and

\[
\int_0^T (Y_s - \xi_s^-)dA_s = 0 \text{ a.s.}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.11)

and

\[
1_{\{Y_s > \xi_s^-\}}(K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t \geq 0, \ t \in [0, T], \ dt \otimes dP \text{ a.s.}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)

and

\[
1_{\{Y_s > \xi_s^-\}}(dA'_t - (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t) \geq 0, \ t \in [0, T], \ a.s.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.13)

Proof.

First note that, by the \( \mathscr{Y}_0\)-Mertens decomposition of the strong \( \mathscr{Y}_0\)-submartingale \( (X_t) \) (proved in [13] and recalled in Appendix, see Th.4.1), there exists an unique process \((Z, K, A, A', C, C') \in \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{H}_\nu^2 \times (\mathcal{A}_2)^2 \times (\mathcal{A}_2)^2 \) such that

\[
-dX_t = \bar{f}(t, X_t, Z_t)dt - Z_t dW_t - K_t dB_t - dA'_t + dA_t - dC'_{t^-} + dC_{t^-} \tag{3.14}
\]

Since the process \((X_t)\) is assumed to be RCLL and \(\Delta C_\tau = (X_{\tau^+} - X_\tau)^- \) (resp. \(\Delta C'_\tau = (X_{\tau^+} - X_\tau)^+\)), we deduce that \(C = C' = 0\).

Fix \( \nu \in \mathcal{D}\). Since \((X_t)\) is a RCLL strong \(\mathscr{Y}_\nu\)-submartingale in \( \mathcal{S}^2 \) and using similar arguments as above, there exists an unique process \((Z_\nu, K_\nu, A'_\nu, A''_\nu) \in \mathcal{H}_\nu \times \mathcal{H}_\nu \times (\mathcal{A}_2)^2 \times (\mathcal{A}_2)^2 \) such that

\[
-dX_t = (\bar{f}(t, X_t, Z'_\nu) + (K'_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z'_t)\nu_t \lambda_t) dt - Z'_\nu dW_t - K'_t dB_t - dA''_t + dA'_t; \tag{3.15}
\]

The uniqueness of the decompositions of a semimartingale and of a martingale lead to \(Z_t = Z'_\nu \ dt \otimes dP\text{-a.s.} \) and \(K_t = K'_t \ dP \otimes dt\text{-a.s.} \). This implies that \(\bar{f}(t, X_t, Z_t) = \bar{f}(t, X_t, Z'_\nu) dt \otimes dP\text{-a.s.} \). Then, using the uniqueness of the finite variation part of the decomposition of the semimartingale \((X_t)\), we derive that

\[
dA''_t - dA''_\nu = dA_t - dA'_t - (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\nu_t \lambda_t dt. \tag{3.16}
\]

Since by the Skorohod conditions \(dA''_t = dA_t = 0 \) on \(\{X_{t^-} > \xi_{t^-}\}\), we derive that

\[
dA''_t = dA'_t + (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\nu_t \lambda_t dt \text{ on } \{X_{t^-} > \xi_{t^-}\}. \tag{3.17}
\]
We now show that this implies that \( 1_{\{X_t > \xi_t\}}(K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t \geq 0 \) \( \otimes dP \) a.s. Let us define the set \( B := \{(K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t < 0, X_t > \xi_t\} \). Suppose by contradiction that \( P(B) > 0 \). For each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), set \( \nu^n := n1_B \), which belongs to \( \mathcal{Q} \). From relation (3.15), we get for \( n \) sufficiently large, \( E[\int_0^T 1_{\{X_t > \xi_t\}}dA_t^{\nu^n}] = E[\int_0^T 1_{\{X_t > \xi_t\}}dA'_t + n \int_0^T (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t dt] < 0 \). This leads to a contradiction, which implies that \( 1_{\{X_t > \xi_t\}}(K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t \geq 0 \) \( \otimes dP \) a.s. We now show that (3.13) holds. Assume by contradiction that there exists \( \varepsilon > 0 \), \( u, v \in [0, T] \) with \( u < v \) and \( D \in \mathcal{G}_T \) with \( P(D) > 0 \) such that

\[
\int_u^v 1_{X_t > \xi_t} \left( dA'_t - (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t dt \right) \leq -\varepsilon \text{ a.s. on } D.
\]

Considering the sequence of controls \( \nu^n \equiv -1 + \frac{1}{n} \) (which are clearly admissible) and using (3.15), we get \( -\frac{1}{n} \int_u^v 1_{X_t > \xi_t} (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t dt \leq -\varepsilon \) on \( D \). Letting \( n \) tend to infinity, we get a contradiction and thus conclude that (3.13) holds.

Using the previous proposition, we can provide a nonlinear optional decomposition of \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingales, for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{Q} \).

**Theorem 3.14** (Nonlinear optional decomposition). Let \( (X_t) \) be a RCLL process belonging to \( \mathcal{H}^2 \). Suppose that it is an \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-strong submartingale for each \( \nu \in \mathcal{Q} \). Then, there exists \( Z \in \mathcal{H}^2 \) and \( k, k' \in \mathcal{A}^2 \) such that

\[
-dX_t = \bar{f}(t, X_t, Z_t)dt - Z_t \sigma_t^{-1}(\sigma_t dW_t + \beta_t dM_t) + dk_t - dk'_t; \quad (3.16)
\]

\[
dk_t \perp dk'_t;
\]

\[
\int_0^T (X_{s^-} - \xi_{s^-})dk_s = 0 \text{ a.s.} \quad (3.17)
\]

Moreover, this decomposition is unique.

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.13 there exists an unique process \( (Z, K, A, A') \in \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{H}^2 \times \mathcal{A}^2 \) such that (3.10), (3.11), (3.12), (3.13) hold.

By classical results, the finite variational optional RCLL process \( f_t := A_t - A'_t - \int_0^t (K_s - \beta_s \sigma_s^{-1}Z_s)dM_s \) can be uniquely decomposed as \( l = k - k' \), where \( (k_t) \) and \( (k'_t) \) are two processes in \( \mathcal{A}^2 \) with \( k_0 = k'_0 = 0 \) and \( E[k_t^2] < \infty \) (resp. \( E[k'_t^2] < \infty \)). Recall that \( dk_t \perp dk'_t \).

Using classical notation of Measure Theory, we can write:

\[
dk_t = (dA_t - dA'_t - (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)dM_t)^+
\]

and

\[
dk'_t = (dA_t - dA'_t - (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)dM_t)^-.
\]

Since \( dM_t = dN_t - \lambda_t dt \), we have

\[
dk_t = \left(dA_t - (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)dN_t - (dA'_t - (K_t - \beta_t \sigma_t^{-1}Z_t)\lambda_t dt\right)^+.
\]
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Using the constraints (3.11), (3.12), (3.13), we derive that \( 1_{\{X_t > \xi_t\}} dk_t = 0 \). Hence, the Skorohod condition (3.17) hold. By (3.10) and using the definition of \( dB \), we derive that equation (3.16) is satisfied.

Let us show that this decomposition is unique. By equation (3.16), we have

\[
\Delta X_\theta = Z_\theta \sigma_\theta^{-1} \beta_\theta - \Delta k_\theta + \Delta k'_\theta.
\] (3.19)

Set \( dB_t := dk_t - \Delta k_\theta, dB'_t := dk'_t - \Delta k'_\theta \) and \( dX'_t = dX_t - \Delta X_\theta \). Note that the non decreasing processes \( B, B' \) have only predictable jumps, which implies that \( B, B' \in \mathcal{A}^2 \). Moreover, \( dB_t \perp dB'_t \). By (3.16), using \( dN_t = dM_t + \lambda_t dt \), we get

\[
-dX'_t = f(t, X_t, Z_t)dt - Z_t dW_t + Z_t \sigma_t^{-1} \beta_t \lambda_t dt + dB_t - dB'_t.
\] (3.20)

By uniqueness of the semimartingale and martingale decompositions, we derive the uniqueness of the processes \( Z, k, k' \). By (3.19), we obtain \( \Delta k'_\theta - \Delta k_\theta = \Delta X_\theta - Z_\theta \sigma_\theta^{-1} \beta_\theta \). Since moreover \( dk \perp dk' \), we finally derive the uniqueness of \( dk_t = dB_t + \Delta k_\theta \) and \( dk'_t = d'_t + \Delta k'_\theta \).

\[ \square \]

### 3.4 Infinitesimal characterisation of the value process \( (\bar{Y}_t) \)

Using the results given in the previous sections, we will obtain an infinitesimal characterisation of the value process \( (\bar{Y}_t) \). We first introduce the following definition.

**Definition 3.15.** A process \( (X_t) \) is called a subsolution of the reflected BSDE driven by the martingale \( m^S_t := W_t + \int_0^t \sigma_s^{-1} \beta_s dM_s \) associated with driver \( f \) and obstacle \( \xi \) if there exists a process \( (Z, k, k') \in \mathcal{H}^2 \times (\mathcal{A}^2)^2 \) such that

\[
-dX_t = \bar{f}(t, X_t, Z_t)dt - Z_t dW_t + Z_t \sigma_t^{-1} \beta_t \lambda_t dt + dB_t - dB'_t,
\] (3.21)

with

\[ X_t \geq \xi_t, \ t \in [0, T] \text{ a.s.; } X_T = \xi_T \text{ a.s.} \]

and

\[
\int_0^T (X_s - \xi_s^-) dk_s = 0, \ \ dk_t \perp dk'_t.
\] (3.22)

**Remark 3.16.** Since \( M \) has only a totally inaccessible jump, for each predictable \( \tau \in \mathcal{T}_0 \), we have \( \Delta k_\tau = (\Delta X_\tau)^- \). Since \( k \) satisfies the Skorohod condition (3.22), we get \( \Delta k_\tau = 1_{\{Y_\tau = \xi_\tau^-\}}(\xi_\tau^- - X_\tau^-)^+ \leq 1_{\{X_\tau^- = \xi_\tau^-\}}(\xi_\tau^- - X_\tau^-)^+ \) a.s. where the (last) inequality follows from the left u.s.c. property of \( \xi \). Since \( \xi \leq X \), we derive \( \Delta k_\tau \leq 0 \) a.s., which implies that \( \Delta k_\tau = 0 \) a.s. We note also that \( X \) can jump (on the left) at totally inaccessible stopping times; these jumps of \( X \) come from the jumps of the stochastic integral with respect to \( M \) in (3.10).
We now show that the value process \( \bar{Y}_t \) is a maximal subsolution of the reflected BSDE given in the above definition.

**Theorem 3.17.** The process \( \bar{Y}_t \) is the maximal subsolution of the reflected BSDE (3.21), that is, if \( Y_t \) is a subsolution of (3.21), then \( Y_t \leq \bar{Y}_t, \ t \in [0, T] \) a.s.

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.7 and Proposition 3.14, we derive that \( \bar{Y}_t \) is a subsolution of the reflected BSDE (3.21). By Proposition 3.7, we also derive that \( \bar{Y}_t \) is the greatest process which is a strong \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale, for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \).

It remains to prove that \( \bar{Y}_t \) is the maximal subsolution of the reflected BSDE (3.21). Assume that \((Y, Z, K, k, k')\) be a subsolution of the same reflected BSDE (cf. (3.21)). Let \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \). Note that we have

\[
-dY_t = \tilde{f}^\nu(t, Y_t, Z_t, Z_{t-} \beta_t)dt - Z_t dm^S_t + dk_t - dk'_t, \tag{3.23}
\]

with \( Y \geq \xi, \ Y_T = \xi_T \) and the Skorohod condition (3.22). This implies that \( (Y, Z, Z_{t-} \beta, k) \) is the solution of the reflected BSDE associated with generalized driver \( \tilde{f}^\nu(\cdot)dt - dk'_t \) and obstacle \( \xi_t \). Using the (generalized) comparison theorem for reflected BSDEs, we have that for all \( S, S' \in \mathcal{T} \) with \( S \geq S' \) a.s., \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{S',S}(Y_S) \geq Y_{S'} \) a.s. since \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu_{S'}(Y_S) \) is the solution of the reflected BSDE associated with driver \( \tilde{f}^\nu \), obstacle \( \xi_t \) and terminal condition \( Y_S \). Hence, \( (Y_t) \) is a strong \( \mathcal{Y}^\nu \)-submartingale for each \( \nu \in \mathcal{D} \). Moreover, \( Y_T = \xi_T \) a.s. Hence, by Proposition 3.7 we get \( Y_t \leq \bar{Y}_t, \ 0 \leq t \leq T \) a.s. \( \square \)

### 3.5 Dynamic dual representation of the buyer’s price process

Taking advantage of the previous theorem, we are now able to provide a dynamic dual representation of the buyer’s price process of an American option in a nonlinear incomplete market. We first consider the simpler case when \( \xi \) is left-u.s.c. and, for simplicity, first provide the dual representation of the price at time 0, which will be extended in Theorem 3.19 to any stopping time.

**Theorem 3.18** (**Buyer’s superhedging price and super-hedge**). Let \( (\xi_t) \) be a left-u.s.c. along stopping times strong semimartingale. The buyer’s price \( v_0 \) of the American option is given by

\[
v_0 = \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{\tau \in T_0} \bar{E}^\nu_{0,\tau}(\xi_{\tau}). \tag{3.24}
\]

Moreover, \( v_0 = \bar{Y}_0 \), where \( \bar{Y} \) is the maximal subsolution of the constrained reflected BSDE (3.21). Let \((\bar{Z}, k, k')\) be the associated processes which appear in the representation (3.21). The risky assets strategy \( \bar{\varphi} := -\sigma^{-1}\bar{Z} \) and the stopping time \( \bar{\tau} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{Y}_t = \xi_t\} \) is a superhedging strategy for the buyer, that is, \((\bar{\tau}, \bar{\varphi}) \in \mathcal{B}(v_0) \).
Proof. By Theorem 3.17, we have $\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}_T} \mathbb{E}_0^\nu(\xi_\tau) = \overline{Y}_0$. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that $v_0 = Y_0$ and $(\overline{\tau}, \overline{\varphi}) \in \mathcal{B}(Y_0)$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the set of initial capitals which allow the buyer to be “super-hedged”, that is $\mathcal{I} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \exists (\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{B}(x) \}$. Remark that $v_0 = \sup \mathcal{I}$.

Let us first show that $\overline{Y}_0 \leq v_0$. To this aim, we prove that

$$ (\overline{\tau}, \overline{\varphi}) \in \mathcal{B}(\overline{Y}_0). \tag{3.25} $$

We consider the portfolio associated with the initial capital $-\overline{Y}_0$ and the strategy $\overline{\varphi} = -\sigma^{-1}Z$. By (2.4), the value of the portfolio process $(V_t - Y_0, \overline{\varphi})$ satisfies the following forward differential equation:

$$ V_t - Y_0, \overline{\varphi} = -\overline{Y}_0 - \int_0^t f(s, V_s - Y_0, \overline{\varphi}, -\overline{Z}_s) ds - \int_0^t \overline{Z}_s dm_s^Y, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{3.26} $$

Moreover, since $\overline{Y}$ is the solution of the reflected BSDE (3.21), it satisfies:

$$ \overline{Y}_t = Y_0 - \int_0^t f(s, Y_s, \overline{Z}_s) ds + \int_0^t \overline{Z}_s dm_s^Y - \overline{k}_t + \overline{k}_t', \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{3.27} $$

We have $\overline{k} = \overline{k}^c + \overline{k}^d$, where $\overline{k}^c$ (resp. $\overline{k}^d$) is the continuous (resp. discontinuous) part of $\overline{k}$. We first show that $\overline{k}^c = 0$ on $[0, \overline{\tau}]$. Now, by definition of $\overline{\tau}$, we have that almost surely on $[0, \overline{\tau}]$, $\overline{Y}_t > \xi_t$. By the Skorokhod condition (3.22), we get that the process $\overline{k}^c$ is equal to 0 on $[0, \overline{\tau}]$. The continuity of $\overline{k}^c$ implies that $\overline{k}^c = 0$ a.s. on $[0, \overline{\tau}]$. Under the left upper-semicontinuity assumption on the process $(\xi_t)$, by Remark 3.10 we derive that $\Delta k_\overline{\tau} = 0$ a.s. for all predictable stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0$. It remains to show that $\Delta k_\theta = 0$ a.s. on $\{ \theta = \overline{\tau} \}$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\tau_n := \inf\{ t \geq 0 : Y_t \leq \xi_t + \frac{1}{n} \}$. Note that $(\tau_n)_n$ is a non-decreasing sequence of stopping times, which satisfies $\lim_{n \to \infty} \tau_n = \overline{\tau}$ a.s. Since $\vartheta$ is a totally inaccessible stopping time, we get that for a.e. $\omega$ such that $\overline{\tau}(\omega) = \vartheta(\omega)$, there exists $n_0(\omega)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0(\omega)$ we have $\tau_n(\omega) = \vartheta(\omega)$. Let us consider such an $\omega$. By definition of $\tau_n(\omega)$, we get that $Y_{\tau_n(\omega)} - \xi_{\tau_n(\omega)} + \frac{1}{n} > 0$, from which we derive that $Y_{\vartheta(\omega)} - \xi_{\vartheta(\omega)} + \frac{1}{n} > 0$. By the Skorokhod condition (3.22), we get that $\Delta k_\vartheta = 0$. We thus conclude that $\overline{k}_\overline{\tau} = 0$ a.s.

By multiplying by $(-1)$ the equation (3.27), and using the definition of the driver $\overline{f}$, we derive that the $(-\overline{Y}_t)$ satisfies the following equation:

$$ -\overline{Y}_t = -Y_0 - \int_0^t \overline{f}(s, -\overline{Y}_s, -\overline{Z}_s) ds - \int_0^t \overline{Z}_s dm_s^Y - \overline{k}_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq \overline{\tau}, \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{3.28} $$

Therefore, by the comparison result for forward differential equations, we get $V_t - Y_0, \overline{\varphi} \geq -\overline{Y}_t$, $0 \leq t \leq \overline{\tau}$ a.s. By definition of the stopping time $\overline{\tau}$, and the right continuity of the processes $(\overline{Y}_t)$ and $(\xi_t)$, we derive that $\overline{Y}_t = \xi_t$ a.s. We thus conclude that $V_t - Y_0, \overline{\varphi} \geq -\xi_t$ a.s., which implies that $(\overline{\tau}, \overline{\varphi}) \in \mathcal{B}(Y_0)$ and thus $\overline{Y}_0 \leq v_0$.

We now prove the converse inequality. Let $x \in \mathcal{I}$. By definition of $\mathcal{I}$, there exists $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{B}(x)$ such that $V_t - X, \varphi \geq -\xi_t$ a.s. Let $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$. By taking the $\mathcal{E}^\nu$-evaluation in
the above inequality, using the monotonicity of $\delta^\nu$ and the $\delta^\nu$-martingale property of the wealth process $V^{-x,\varphi}$, we derive that $-x = \delta^\nu_{0,\tau}(V_{\tau}^{-x,\varphi}) \geq \delta^\nu_{0,\tau}(-\xi_\tau) = -\delta^\nu_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau)$. We thus get $x \leq \delta^\nu_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau)$, which implies $x \leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \delta^\nu_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau)$. By arbitrariness of $\nu \in \mathcal{D}$, we get
\[
x \leq \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0} \delta^\nu_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau) = \bar{Y}_0,
\]
which holds for any $x \in \mathcal{S}$. By taking the supremum over $x \in \mathcal{S}$, we get $v_0 \leq \bar{Y}_0$. It follows that $v_0 = \bar{Y}_0$. By (3.25), we get $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\varphi}) \in \mathcal{B}(v_0)$, which completes the proof. \[\Box\]

We now define the buyer’s price of the American option at each stopping time $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$. We define for each initial wealth $X \in L^2(\mathcal{G}_S)$, a super-hedge against the American option from the buyer’s point of view as a portfolio strategy $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^2$ and a stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S$ such that $V^S_{\tau} - X, \varphi + \xi_{\tau} \geq 0$ a.s., where $V^S_{\tau} - X, \varphi$ represents the wealth process associated with initial time $S$ and initial condition $X$. The buyer’s price at time $S$ is defined by the random variable
\[
v(S) = \operatorname{ess sup}\{X \in L^2(\mathcal{G}_S), \exists (\varphi, \tau) \in \mathcal{B}_S(X)\},
\]
with $\mathcal{B}_S(X)$ the set of all super-hedges associated with initial time $S$ and initial wealth $X$. By Theorem 3.17 and using similar arguments as in Theorem 3.18, one can show the following result.

**Theorem 3.19 (Buyer’s price process and dynamic dual representation).** Let $(\xi_t)$ be a left-u.s.c. along stopping times strong semimartingale. For each time $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$, the buyer’s price $v(S)$ at time $S$ of the American option satisfies
\[
v(S) = \operatorname{ess inf}_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}_S} \operatorname{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_S} \delta^\nu_{S,\tau}(\xi_\tau) = \bar{Y}_S \text{ a.s.},
\]
where $\bar{Y}$ is the maximal subsolution of the constrained reflected BSDE (3.21). Let $(\bar{Z}, \bar{k}, \bar{k}')$ be the associated processes which appear in the representation (3.21). The risky assets strategy $\bar{\varphi} := -\sigma^{-1} \bar{Z}$ and the stopping time $\bar{\tau}_S := \inf\{t \geq S : Y_t = \xi_t\}$ is a superhedging strategy for the buyer, that is $(\bar{\tau}_S, \bar{\varphi}) \in \mathcal{B}_S(v(S))$.

Let us now address the general case when $\xi$ is only RCLL. Again, for simplicity, we will provide the results for the initial time 0, which can be easily extended to any time/stopping time $S \in \mathcal{T}_0$ as in the case of a left upper-semicontinuous payoff process $(\xi_t)$.

We introduce the definition of an $\varepsilon$-super-hedge for the buyer.

**Definition 3.20.** For each initial price $x$ and for each $\varepsilon > 0$, an $\varepsilon$-super-hedge for the buyer of an American option is a pair $(x, \varphi)$ of a stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0$ and a risky-assets strategy $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^2$ such that
\[V_{\tau}^{-x,\varphi} + \xi_{\tau} \geq -\varepsilon \text{ a.s.}\]

**Theorem 3.21 (Buyer’s superhedging price and super-hedge).** Let $(\xi_t)$ be a RCLL strong semimartingale. The buyer’s price $v_0$ of the American option is satisfies
\[v_0 = \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0} \delta^\nu_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau) = \bar{Y}_0,\]
(3.29)
where $\bar{Y}$ is the maximal subsolution of the constrained reflected BSDE (3.21). Let $(\bar{Z}, \bar{k}, \bar{k}')$ be the associated processes which appear in the representation (3.21).

Consider the risky assets strategy $\bar{\varphi} := -\sigma^{-1} \bar{Z}$ and for each $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$\bar{\tau}_{\varepsilon} := \inf \{ t \geq 0 : \ Y_t \leq \xi_t + \varepsilon \}. \tag{3.30}$$

The pair $(\bar{\varphi}, \bar{\tau}_{\varepsilon})$ is an $\varepsilon$-superhedging strategy for the buyer (associated with the initial price $v_0$).

Proof. By the same arguments as in the previous proof, we derive that the equation (3.28) holds on $[0, \bar{\tau}_{\varepsilon}]$. Hence, by the comparison theorem for forward equations, we get $V_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi} Y_0, \bar{\varphi}} \geq -Y_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi}}$ a.s. Moreover, using the same arguments as in the previous proof, we obtain that

$$Y_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi}} \leq \xi_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi}} + \varepsilon \text{ a.s.} \tag{3.31}$$

We thus conclude that $V_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi} Y_0, \bar{\varphi}} \geq -Y_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi}} \geq -\xi_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi}} - \varepsilon$ a.s., which implies that the pair $(\bar{\tau}_{\varepsilon}, \bar{\varphi})$ is an $\varepsilon$-super-hedge for the buyer associated with the initial price $Y_0$. We now prove that $Y_0 = v_0$. By Theorem 3.17 we have $\inf \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}, \tau \in T_0} \bar{E}^\nu_{0, \tau}(\xi_\tau) = Y_0$. Using this property and the same arguments as in the proof of the second part of the previous theorem (which do not require the continuity of the process $\bar{k}$), we derive that $v_0 \leq Y_0$.

We now show the converse inequality $Y_0 \leq v_0$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $(Y', Z', K')$ be the solution of the BSDE associated with generalized driver $\bar{f} - d\bar{k}'$, terminal time $\bar{\tau}_{\varepsilon}$ and terminal condition $\xi_{\tau_{\varepsilon}} \wedge \bar{Y}_{\tau_{\varepsilon}}$. By (3.31) and a priori estimates on BSDEs with jumps, we derive that $Y_0 \leq Y'_0 + C\varepsilon$, with $C$ a constant depending on $\bar{f}$. Now, by the assumption $Y_{\tau_{\varepsilon}}' = \xi_{\tau_{\varepsilon}} \wedge \bar{Y}_{\tau_{\varepsilon}}$, we deduce that $Y'_{\tau_{\varepsilon}} \leq \xi_{\tau_{\varepsilon}}$. Moreover, one can easily remark that $-V_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi}, Y_0} \geq Y'$. Therefore, we deduce that $-V_{\varphi=\bar{\varphi}, Y_0} \leq \xi_{\tau_{\varepsilon}}$. This implies that $(\tau_{\varepsilon}, \varphi')$ is a super-hedging strategy associated with the initial price $Y_0'$. Since the price $Y_0'$ allows the buyer to be super-hedged, we derive that $Y_0 - C\varepsilon \leq Y_0' \leq v_0$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence, $v_0 \geq Y_0 - C\varepsilon$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$. We thus conclude that $v_0 \geq Y_0$. \qed

We now show that the operations of "infimum" and "supremum" in the dual representation (3.29) of the buyer’s superhedging price $v_0$ can be interchanged. We prove this result in the case of a left upper semicontinuous payoff process; the proof in the general case of a RCLL process follows exactly the same steps, by replacing the optimal stopping time by an $\varepsilon$-optimal stopping time.

**Proposition 3.22 (Interchange inf-sup).** Assume that the process $(\xi_t)$ is left upper semicontinuous along stopping times. The buyer’s superhedging price of the American option satisfies:

$$v_0 = \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{\tau \in T_0} \bar{E}^\nu_{0, \tau}(\xi_\tau) = \sup_{\tau \in T_0} \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{D}} \bar{E}^\nu_{0, \tau}(\xi_\tau).$$
Proof. Recall that by Theorem 3.18 we have \( v_0 = \inf \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}, \tau \in T_0} \bar{\bar{\delta}}_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau) = \bar{Y}_0 \), where the process \((\bar{Y}_t)\) is the maximal subsolution of the constrained reflected BSDE (3.10) and \((\bar{Z}, \bar{A}, \bar{A}')\) the associated processes. We define:

\[
\bar{Y}_0 := \sup_{\tau \in T_0} \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} \bar{\bar{\delta}}_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau).
\]

We have to show that \( \bar{Y}_0 = Y_0 \). We clearly have \( Y_0 \geq Y_0 \). It thus remains to prove that \( Y_0 \leq Y_0 \).

Let \( \bar{\tau} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{Y}_t = \xi_t\} \). The right continuity of the processes \((\xi_t)\) and \((\bar{Y}_t)\) yields the equality \( \bar{Y}_{\bar{\tau}} = \xi_{\bar{\tau}} \) a.s. Since \((\bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{A}, \bar{A}')\) is a subsolution of the constrained reflected BSDE (3.10), we have

\[
\bar{Y}_0 = \bar{Y}_{\bar{\tau}} + \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} \bar{f}(s, \bar{Y}_s, \bar{Z}_s)ds - \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} \bar{Z}_s dW_s - \int_0^{\bar{\tau}} \bar{K}_s dM_s + \bar{A}_{\bar{\tau}} - A_{\bar{\tau}}'.
\]

Note that \( \bar{Y} > \xi \) on \([0, \bar{\tau}]\). Hence, the process \((A_t)\) is constant equal to 0 on \([0, \bar{\tau}]\) a.s. Now, the left upper semicontinuity assumption on the process \((\xi_t)\) ensures that the process \((A_t)\) is continuous (see Th. 3.7 in [17]). It follows that \( A_{\bar{\tau}} = 0 \) a.s.

Moreover, by the constraints satisfied by \( A'\), \( \bar{Z} \) and \( \bar{K} \) on the set \( \{\bar{Y}_t > \xi_t\} \), and since \( \nu > 1 \), we derive that

\[
\bar{f}(s, \bar{Y}_s, \bar{Z}_s)ds - dA' \leq \bar{f}(s, \bar{Y}_s, \bar{Z}_s)ds - (\bar{K}_s - \beta_s \sigma_s^{-1} \bar{Z}_s)\lambda_s ds \leq \bar{f}(s, \bar{Y}_s, \bar{Z}_s)ds + (\bar{K}_s - \beta_s \sigma_s^{-1} \bar{Z}_s)\lambda_s \nu_s ds,
\]

\( 0 \leq t \leq \bar{\tau} \) a.s. By the comparison theorem for BSDEs (with generalized driver) on \([0, \bar{\tau}]\), we get

\[
\bar{Y}_0 \leq \bar{\bar{\delta}}_{0,\bar{\tau}}(\bar{Y}_{\bar{\tau}}) = \bar{\bar{\delta}}_{0,\bar{\tau}}(\xi_{\bar{\tau}}).
\]

By arbitrariness of \( \nu \in \mathcal{G} \), we derive

\[
\bar{Y}_0 \leq \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} \bar{\bar{\delta}}_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau) \leq \sup_{\tau \in T_0} \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{G}} \bar{\bar{\delta}}_{0,\tau}(\xi_\tau) = \bar{Y}_0.
\]

We thus conclude that \( \bar{Y}_0 = Y_0 \), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

4 Appendix

We recall here the \( \mathcal{G} \)-Mertens decomposition of \( \mathcal{G} \)-submartingales proved in [13] (see Th. 3.9).

**Theorem 4.1** \( \mathcal{G} \)-Mertens decomposition of \( \mathcal{G} \)-submartingales. Let \((\xi_t)\) be an optional strong semimartingale right upper semicontinuous belonging to \( \mathcal{H}^2 \) and let \((Y_t)\) be an optional process in \( \mathcal{H}^2 \). Then \((Y_t)\) is a \( \mathcal{G} \)-submartingale if and only if there exist two non decreasing right continuous and predictable processes \( A, A' \) in \( \mathcal{H}^2 \), two non decreasing adapted right.
continuous and purely discontinuous processes $C$ and $C'$ in $C^2$ and $(Z, K) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$ such that
\[-dY_s = g(s, Y_s, Z_s, K_s)ds - Z_s dW_s - K_t dM_t - dA'_s - dC'_s + dA_s + dC_s; \quad (4.1)\]
\[Y_t \geq \xi_t, \quad t \in [0, T] \text{ a.s.;} \]
\[\int_0^T (Y_s - \xi_s) dA_s = 0 \text{ a.s.;} \]
\[(Y_\tau - \xi_\tau)(C_\tau - C_{\tau^-}) = 0 \text{ a.s. for all } \tau \in \mathcal{T};\]
\[dA_t \perp dA'_t; \quad dC_t \perp dC'_t.\]
Moreover, this decomposition is unique.

**Remark 4.2.** Using the above decomposition, we deduce that a $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale admits left and right limits. Note also that by Remark 3.9, a strong $\mathcal{Y}^g$-submartingale process is right-l.s.c., which gives that $Y_{t+} \geq Y_t$ for all $t \in [0, T] \text{ a.s.}$
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