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Abstract
We study a variant of the martingale optimal transport problem in a multi-period setting to derive robust price bounds of a financial derivative. On top of marginal and martingale constraints, we introduce a time-homogeneity assumption, which restricts the variability of the forward-looking transitions of the martingale across time. We provide a dual formulation in terms of superhedging and discuss relaxations of the time-homogeneity assumption by adding market frictions. In financial terms, the introduced time-homogeneity corresponds to time-consistent call prices, given the state of the stock. The time homogeneity assumption leads to improved price bounds and the possibility to utilize more market data. The approach is illustrated with two numerical examples.
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1 Introduction
We consider a discrete stock process $S_1, ..., S_T$. The goal is to find a fair price of a financial instrument $f(S_1, ..., S_T)$ depending on this stock. We follow the robust pricing idea of martingale optimal transport [4, 5], in that we determine the highest and lowest possible price for this instrument under pricing rules which are consistent with European call and put prices observed on the market (which determine the risk-neutral one-period marginal distributions of $S_1, ..., S_T$) and the assumption that the process $S_1, ..., S_T$ is a martingale. In addition, this paper adds a notion of time-homogeneity for the process $S_1, ..., S_T$, made precise in Section 3.

The reason we introduce this assumption is twofold:

1. While the martingale optimal transport approach is very robust, for practical purposes the obtained range of prices is often too wide, see also [16, 19, 22].
(2) In the martingale optimal transport setting, information obtained through option prices with maturities \( t_1, \ldots, t_k \) has little relevance for pricing an instrument depending on different time-points \( t_{k+1}, \ldots, t_K \). Hence, market information is used inefficiently.

The notion of time-homogeneity of the stock process mainly aims at overcoming the issue raised in point (2) and thus narrow the range of possible prices to improve on point (1). In the spirit of robust pricing the introduced assumption of time-homogeneity is as weak as possible, while still achieving its purpose.

Three key features of the approach are worth pointing out: First, the homogeneous martingale optimal transport problem is as numerically tractable as the martingale optimal transport problem without time-homogeneity, in that the discretized version reduces to a linear program and the dual formulation is well suited for various approaches, see e.g. [11, 14, 16]. Second, the dual formulation can be interpreted in terms of trading strategies and superhedging. And third, market frictions and relaxations of the introduced time-homogeneity assumption can be incorporated naturally.

In the recent literature, different methods have been studied to improve on point (1) and hence make the martingale optimal transport approach more practicable. In [19, 22] the authors study additional variance and Markovianity constraints on the underlying stock process. In [15] additional information from options written on the stock’s volatility is incorporated.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we give the relevant notation and recall basic facts about martingale optimal transport. In Section 3, the notion of time-homogeneity is introduced and we state basic properties and duality for the time-homogeneous version of the martingale optimal transport problem. In Section 4, extensions like market frictions, relaxed assumptions and higher dimensional markets are discussed. Section 5 gives two short numerical examples. All proofs are postponed to Section 6.

2 Notation and Martingale Optimal Transport

\( S = (S_1, \ldots, S_T) \) denotes the value of a stock at time points \( t = 1, \ldots, T \). For simplicity, we assume no risk-free rate and no dividends. We model the asset prices as the canonical process on \( \mathbb{R}^T \), i.e. \( S_t(\omega) = \omega_t \) for \( \omega \in \mathbb{R}^T \). Hereby, \( \mathbb{R}^T \) is endowed with the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra \( \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) and euclidean norm \( | \cdot | \). We denote by \( C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) (resp. \( C_b(\mathbb{R}^T) \)) the set of all continuous functions \( f : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) such that \( |f(\cdot)|/(1 + |\cdot|) \) is bounded (resp. \( f \) is bounded) and by \( \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) the set of all probability measures \( \mathbb{Q} \) on \( \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^T) \).

Let \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \) have finite first moments. The measures \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T \) model the risk-neutral marginal distributions of \( S_1, \ldots, S_T \) inferred from option prices, see [11, 17]. Further, fix \( f \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \), which defines the financial instrument \( f(S) \) to be priced. For arbitrary \( \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) and a sub-tuple \( I = (t_1, \ldots, t_{|I|}) \) of \( (1, \ldots, T) \) let \( \mathbb{Q}_I := \mathbb{Q} \circ S_I^{-1} \), where \( S_I : \mathbb{R}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|I|} \) is given by \( S_I(\omega) = (\omega_{t_1}, \ldots, \omega_{t_{|I|}}) \). Denote by \( \mathbb{Q}_t := \mathbb{Q}(t) \) the \( t \)-th marginal of \( \mathbb{Q} \), and

\[
\Pi(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T) := \{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T) : \mathbb{Q}_t = \mu_t \text{ for } t = 1, \ldots, T \},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T) := \{ \mathbb{Q} \in \Pi(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T) : \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q}[S_{t+1}|S_1, \ldots, S_t] = S_t \text{ for all } t = 1, \ldots, T - 1 \}.
\]
We call $\Pi(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T)$ the set of all couplings between $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T$ and $\mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T)$ the set of all martingale couplings. The martingale optimal transport problem is to find the lowest and highest possible price of the financial instrument $f(S)$ among models in $\mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T)$: Without loss of generality, we focus on the problem to find the highest price:

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T)} \mathbb{E}^Q[f(S)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (MOT)

In contrast, the usual (multi-marginal) optimal transport problem is stated over all couplings

$$\sup_{Q \in \Pi(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T)} \mathbb{E}^Q[f(S)].$$  \hspace{1cm} (OT)

Both problems allow for a dual formulation, which can be interpreted in terms of trading. For the (OT) problem, the dual formulation reads

$$\inf_{h_1, \ldots, h_T \in C_{lin}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{t=1}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_t \, d\mu_t.$$  \hspace{1cm} (OT-Dual)

Thereby, $h_1, \ldots, h_T$ are trading strategies for a single time-period, which corresponds to trading freely into European call options. Indeed, one can restrict each $h_t$ to be a linear combination of European call options, i.e. $h_t(S_t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i(S_t - k_i)^+$ for different strike prices $k_1, \ldots, k_N \in \mathbb{R}$, see [4]. For the (MOT) problem, the martingale condition corresponds to the assumption that one can additionally trade dynamically in the underlying, leading to

$$\inf_{h_1, \ldots, h_T \in C_{lin}(\mathbb{R}), \vartheta_1 \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^{T-1}), \ldots, \vartheta_{T-1} \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^{T-1})} \sum_{t=1}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_t \, d\mu_t.$$  \hspace{1cm} (MOT-Dual)

Thereby, $\vartheta_t(S_1, \ldots, S_t)$ is the (positive or negative) amount invested into the stock at time $t$.

### 3 Homogeneous stock movements

The purpose of this Section is the introduction and analysis of the notion of time-homogeneity added to the martingale optimal transport setting, which restricts the variability of the forward looking transitions of the martingales across time. The formal condition is introduced in Definition 3.1 and illustrated in Figure 1. Basic properties are stated in Remark 3.2 and the duality for the time-homogeneous version of the martingale optimal transport problem is given in Theorem 3.3. The duality stated in Theorem 3.3 is shortly discussed in Remark 3.4 in terms of swap contracts.

We first recall the following: Any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ can be disintegrated as $\pi = \pi_1 \otimes K$ where $\pi_1$ is the first marginal of $\pi$ and $K : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ is a (Borel measurable) stochastic kernel, which is $\pi_1$-a.s. unique. Second, for two measures $\mu, \nu$ there is a unique Lebesgue decomposition $\mu = \mu^{\nu,\text{abs}} + \mu^{\nu,\text{sing}}$, where $\mu^{\nu,\text{abs}} \ll \nu$ and $\mu^{\nu,\text{sing}} \perp \nu$. Note that $\mu^{\nu,\text{abs}}$ and $\nu^{\mu,\text{abs}}$ have the same null-sets.

The notation used in the following definition is fixed throughout the paper.
Figure 1: Illustration of Definition 3.1(ii) and Remark 3.2(i). Homogeneity for \((S_1, \ldots, S_T)\) states that the forward looking option pricing rules are independent of the time \(t\) or \(s\), given that all available information is that the stock is in the same state \(x\) for both time points.

**Definition 3.1.** Let \(\Delta = \{(s, t, \tau) \in \{1, \ldots, T\}^3 : s < t, t + \tau \leq T\}\).

(i) For \(\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})\) we say that an event holds \(\mu \wedge \nu\)-almost surely, if it holds almost surely with respect to \(\mu^\nu\text{abs}\), which is the absolutely continuous part of \(\mu\) with respect to \(\nu\) given by Lebesgue’s decomposition theorem.

(ii) We say that \(Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T)\) is homogeneous, if

\[
K_{s,s+\tau} = K_{t,t+\tau} \quad Q_s \wedge Q_t\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{for all } (s, t, \tau) \in \Delta,
\]

where \(K_{s,s+\tau}\) denotes the stochastic kernel given by \(Q_{s,s+\tau} = Q_s \otimes K_{s,s+\tau}\).

(iii) We set

\[
\mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^T) := \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T) : Q \text{ is homogeneous}\},
\]

\[
\Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T) := \Pi(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T) \cap \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T) := \mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T) \cap \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}.
\]

**Remark 3.2.** The proof of the following statements is given in Section 6.

(i) For \(Q \in \Pi(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T)\) define the pricing rule

\[
p_{s,\tau,k}(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (y - k)^+ K_{s,s+\tau}(x, dy)
= \mathbb{E}^Q[(S_{t+\tau} - k)^+|S_t = x].
\]
Then \( Q \) is homogeneous if and only if \( p_{s,\tau,k} = p_{t,\tau,k} \) holds \( \mu_s \land \mu_t \)-a.s. for all \( (s, t, \tau) \in \Delta \) and \( k \in \mathbb{R} \).

(ii) \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) is not convex, but \( \Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \) and \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \) are convex.

(iii) Let \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{HM}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) be the set of measures \( Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) such that the canonical process \( (S_1, ..., S_T) \) is a homogeneous Markov chain under \( Q \). It holds \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{HM}}(\mathbb{R}^T)) \subset \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \), which is strict for \( T \geq 3 \).

(iv) It is \( \Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \neq \emptyset \) if and only if \( (\mu_1, ..., \mu_{T-1}) \) dominates \( (\mu_2, ..., \mu_T) \) in heterogeneity (see [23, Definition 3.4.]).

To state duality, we make the following assumption:

(A) For all \( (s, t) \in \{1, ..., T\}^2 \) there exists a finite Borel measure \( \theta^{s,t} \) on \( \mathbb{R} \) which is equivalent to \( \mu^{s,t}_{\text{abs}} \) such that \( \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu^{s,t}} \) and \( \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu^{s,t}} \) are continuous and bounded.

This is satisfied in a large number of cases, for example if all marginals \( \mu_1, ..., \mu_T \) are discrete, or if all marginals have a continuous and strictly positive Lebesgue density.

We further note that properties (like continuity) of densities are always understood in the sense that there exists a representative among the almost sure equivalence class satisfying the property.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let \( \mu_1, ..., \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \) have finite first moment, and \( f \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \). Assume \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \neq \emptyset \) and (A) holds. Then

\[
\max_{Q \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T)} \mathbb{E}^Q[f(S)]
\]

\[
= \inf \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_t \, d\mu_t : \quad h_t \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}), \quad t \in \{1, ..., T\}, \right. \\
\left. \partial_t \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^t), \quad t \in \{1, ..., T-1\}, \\
g_{s,t,\tau} \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad (s, t, \tau) \in \Delta,
\right. \\
such that \\
f(S) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} h_t(S_t) + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \partial_t(S_1, \ldots, S_t)(S_{t+1} - S_t)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{(s,t,\tau) \in \Delta} \left( g_{s,t,\tau}(S_s, S_{s+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu^{s,t}}(S_s) - g_{s,t,\tau}(S_t, S_{t+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu^{s,t}}(S_t) \right)
\]

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is given in Section 6.

---

1 We thank Ruodu Wang for pointing this relation out to us.

2 In fact, the latter generalizes to the case where \( \mu_1, ..., \mu_T \) all have a continuous and strictly positive density with respect to any reference measure \( \theta \). Then, one can define \( \theta^{s,t} \) by \( \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\theta} := \min \{ \frac{d\mu}{d\theta}, \frac{d\mu}{d\theta} \} \) and finds that \( \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu^{s,t}} \) and \( \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu^{s,t}} \) are continuous and bounded by 1.
Remark 3.4. Compared to the usual martingale optimal transport, the additional trading term arising from the homogeneity condition in the dual formulation is the sum

$$\sum_{(s,t,\tau) \in \Delta} \left( g_{s,t,\tau}(S_s, S_{s+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(S_s) - g_{s,t,\tau}(S_t, S_{t+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(S_t) \right).$$

Each individual summand can be interpreted as a swap contract which, under the assumption of time-homogeneity, has fair price 0.

To simplify, say $g_{s,t,\tau}(S_s, S_{s+\tau}) = V(S_s) \cdot (S_s + \tau - k)^+$. This means, one buys $V(S_s)$ many call options at time $s$ which expire at time $s + \tau$. Under homogeneity, see Remark 3.2 (i), conditioned on $S_s = x$, the price of such a financial instrument is the same when replacing time point $s$ with some other time point $t$. If two traders were to agree that such an instrument is equally valuable for time points $s$ and $t$, it has to be taken into consideration how likely the events $S_s = x$ and $S_t = x$ are. The fair weighting to take this into account is achieved by the terms $\frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(S_s)$ and $\frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(S_t)$.

4 Extensions

This section aims at discussing the following extensions and variations of the approach:

(i) Non-equally spaced time-grids

(ii) Variations of the time-homogeneity assumption

(iii) Market frictions

(iv) Extension to several assets (high-dimensional market)

The first two points are specific to the setting at hand, while the latter two points are reoccurring themes in robust pricing. We hence go briefly over the latter two issues, while referencing related work.

Non-equally spaced time-grids. The notion of time-homogeneity introduced in Section 3 makes sense when subsequent time steps are equally far apart, i.e. if there exists a constant $C$ such that time points $t$ and $s$ are $|t - s| \cdot C$ many trading days apart. Available data on option prices is not always equally spaced. The framework can account for this by modeling the time steps as $t_1 < t_2 < \ldots < t_N$ with $t_i \in \mathbb{N}$ (instead of $t = 1, \ldots, T$), where $|t_i - t_j|$ measures the number of trading days between time points $t_i$ and $t_j$. Then one can set

$$\tilde{\Delta} := \{(i,j,\tau_i,\tau_j) \in \{1, \ldots, N\}^4 : i < j, i + \tau_i \leq N, j + \tau_j \leq N, |t_{i+\tau_i} - t_i| = |t_{j+\tau_j} - t_j| \}$$

and Definition 3.1 (i) changes to equality of $K_{i,\tau_i} = K_{j,\tau_j}$ for all $(i,j,\tau_i,\tau_j) \in \tilde{\Delta}$, where now $Q(t_i, t_{i+\tau_i}) = \mu_{t_i} \otimes K_{i,\tau_i}$, etc.
Variations of the time-homogeneity assumption. A natural stronger version of time-homogeneity is the extension from one-period transitions to many-period transitions. For two-period transitions for instance, Definition 3.1 can be extended via the condition

\[ K_{s,(s+\tau_1,s+\tau_2)} = K_{t,(t+\tau_1,t+\tau_2)} \quad \mathbb{Q}_s \land \mathbb{Q}_t \text{-a.s. for all } (s, t, \tau_1), (s, t, \tau_2) \in \Delta \text{ with } \tau_1 < \tau_2, \]

where \( \mathbb{Q}_{(s,s+\tau_1,s+\tau_2)} = \mathbb{Q}_s \otimes K_{s,(s+\tau_1,s+\tau_2)} \) and \( K_{s,(s+\tau_1,s+\tau_2)} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2) \). With such an extension, all relevant properties like convexity of \( \Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \) remain unchanged.

Weakening the notion of time-homogeneity can be done in various ways. First, note that

\[ K_{s,\tau} = K_{t,\tau} \quad \mu_s \land \mu_t \text{-a.s. } \iff \quad \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,\tau} = \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,\tau} \]

with \( \theta^{s,t} \) as in condition (A) stated before Theorem 3.3. So time-homogeneity can simply be stated as equalities of measures. A natural relaxation is to instead assume that the measures are close in a suitable distance \( D(\cdot, \cdot) \), like Wasserstein-distance or relative entropy. The relaxation from homogeneity to \( r \)-homogeneity takes the form

\[ \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,\tau} = \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,\tau} \overset{\text{Relaxation}}{\longrightarrow} D(\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,\tau}, \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,\tau}) \leq r_{s,t,\tau}, \]

where \( r_{s,t,\tau} \geq 0 \) for all \((s, t, \tau) \in \Delta\). If the mapping \((\mu, \nu) \mapsto D(\mu, \nu)\) is convex, the set of \( r \)-homogeneous couplings between \( \mu_1, ..., \mu_T \) remains convex.

Alternatively, one can directly penalize the distance between \( \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,\tau} \) and \( \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,\tau} \) in the statement of the optimization problem, which leads to

\[
\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T)} \mathbb{E}^Q[f(S)] - \sum_{(s,t,\tau) \in \Delta} \frac{1}{r_{s,t,\tau}} D(\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,\tau}, \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,\tau}). \tag{Pen-HMOT}
\]

For appropriately chosen \( D(\cdot, \cdot) \), this penalization corresponds to the inclusion of transaction costs in the dual formulation, which is discussed below.

Market frictions. The most flexible notion of market frictions that can be incorporated in the framework is that of transaction costs. Transaction costs result in more costly hedging strategies on the dual side, and in relaxed constraints for the considered models \( \mathbb{Q} \) on the primal side. Proportional transaction costs correspond to an enlargement of the set of feasible models, see e.g. \([4, 9, 14]\). With superlinear transaction costs on the other hand, the constraint is completely removed, and instead a penalization term is added to the objective function, see e.g. \([2, 7]\).

An instance of such a penalized primal formulation resulting from superlinear transaction costs is the above defined (Pen-HMOT) for appropriately chosen penalization term. If \( D = G \) is the Gini index in \( \tag{Pen-HMOT}^3 \) this corresponds to the use of quadratic transaction costs in the dual formulation, i.e. the term

\[
g_{s,t,\tau}(S_s, S_{s+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(S_s) - g_{s,t,\tau}(S_t, S_{t+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(S_t)
\]

\[ ^3 \text{For two measures } \nu, \mu \text{ the Gini index } G \text{ is defined as } G(\nu, \mu) = \int \left( \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \right)^2 d\mu - 1, \text{ if } \nu \ll \mu \text{ and } G(\nu, \mu) = \infty, \text{ else. See also } [20]. \]
would incur transaction costs
\[ 4 r_{s,t,\tau} |g_{s,t,\tau}(S_s, S_{s+\tau})|^2 \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(S_s). \]

So it holds

**Corollary 4.1.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.3, it holds

\[
\max_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_T)} \mathbb{E}^\mathcal{Q}[f(S)] - \sum_{(s,t,\tau) \in \Delta} \frac{1}{r_{s,t,\tau}} G(\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,\tau}, \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,\tau}) \quad (\text{G-Pen-HMOT})
\]

\[
= \inf \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \int h_t \, d\mu_t : h_t \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}) \text{, } t \in \{1, \ldots, T\}, \right. \\
\left. \vartheta_t \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^T) \text{, } t \in \{1, \ldots, T-1\}, \\
g_{s,t,\tau} \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{, } (s,t,\tau) \in \Delta, \\
\text{such that} \\
f(S) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{T} h_t(S_t) + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \vartheta_t(S_1, \ldots, S_t)(S_{t+1} - S_t) \\
+ \sum_{(s,t,\tau) \in \Delta} \left( g_{s,t,\tau}(S_s, S_{s+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(S_s) - g_{s,t,\tau}(S_t, S_{t+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(S_t) \\
- 4 r_{s,t,\tau} |g_{s,t,\tau}(S_s, S_{s+\tau})|^2 \right) \right\}
\]

The proof is sketched in Section 6.3. In general, the time-homogeneity assumption behaves quite similarly to the martingale or marginal assumptions in terms of transaction costs, and hence many different modeling approaches can be applied.

In one respect, the notion of time-homogeneity is however more restrictive: When including the assumption of time-homogeneity, one has to take care with relaxing the assumption of precisely knowing the marginal laws. The reason is that \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) is not convex, and the optimization problem only becomes feasible by adding constraints so that the resulting set of models \( \mathcal{Q} \) is convex (this is achieved by specifying marginal distributions, see Remark 3.2(ii)), which is crucial for the tractability of the resulting optimization problem.

**Extension to several assets.** The martingale optimal transport setting generalizes as follows to higher dimensions: One specifies \( \mu_{t,i} \) of each stock \( S_{t,i} \) for time points \( t = 1, \ldots, T \) and dimensions \( i = 1, \ldots, d \) individually. The dimensions are coupled through a joint martingale constraint \( \mathbb{E}[S_{t+1,i} | S_1, \ldots, S_t] = S_{t,i} \) where \( S_t = (S_{t,1}, \ldots, S_{t,d}) \) \(^4\).

In terms of homogeneity, one has two choices: First, one can define the notion of homogeneity as in Definition 3.1 (ii) for each dimension \( i = 1, \ldots, d \) individually. This is
Figure 2: Discrete example from Subsection 5.1 illustrated. Price bounds for a financial instrument \( f(S) = (S_9 - S_8)^+ \) are depicted. For both figures, time steps used indicates how many marginal distributions are known, i.e. how much market data is used. We see that for the martingale optimal transport approach alone, using more data does not improve the obtained price bounds. Incorporating homogeneity however leads to improved bounds when adding data.

5 Examples

In this section, we present two short numerical examples that showcase the potential of the introduced setting.

5.1 Discrete model

Consider a discrete model where \( \mu_t \) is the uniform distribution on the set \( \{100 - t, 100 - t + 2, ..., 100 + t\} \) for \( t = 1, ..., 9 \). So the support of the marginals is the same as in a binomial model where the stock starts at 100 at time point 1 and can either go up or down by 1 each period. The financial instrument is a forward start option, \( f(S) = (S_9 - S_8)^+ \). First, we solve the model using just the data (i.e. marginal distributions) from time points \( t = 8, 9 \) (time steps used = 2). Then, we gradually increase the information that is used, by adding the marginal information from \( t = 7 \) (time steps used = 3), \( t = 6 \), etc. until all marginals...
μ₁,...,μ₉ are included (time steps used = 9). The results are reported in Figure 2. On the left, we see that without the homogeneity assumption, the bounds do not get sharper with additional information used. With the added assumption of homogeneity however, the bounds tighten drastically.

5.2 Black-Scholes model

Let \( T = 3 \) and \( \mu_t \sim X_t \) for \( t = 1, 2, 3 \), where \( X_t = X_0 \exp(\sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} t) \) for \( \sigma > 0 \) is a geometric Brownian motion. Following [1, 22] we consider the option \( f(S₁, S₂, S₃) := (S₃ - S₁ + S₂)^+ \). Set \( X₀ = 1, \sigma = 0.25 \). The model price for the Black-Scholes model \( Q_{BS} \) is given by

\[ E^{Q_{BS}}[f(S)] \approx 0.111. \]

Compared to the previous example, where the (homogeneous) martingale transport problem is a linear program, the current example has to be solved approximately. Discretization is non-trivial even with just the martingale condition, see [1, 14]. Homogeneity, which crucially depends on the given marginals’ support, adds difficulty for a discretization scheme. Hence, we instead calculate this example using the dual formulation and the penalization approach of [11], i.e. we approximate each trading strategy \( h_t, \vartheta_t \) and \( g_{s,t,τ} \) by a neural network.\(^5\)

Without the homogeneity, this leads to

\[ \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mu₁,\mu₂,\mu₃)} E^Q[f(S)] \approx 0.059 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mu₁,\mu₂,\mu₃)} E^Q[f(S)] \approx 0.139. \]

On the other hand, incorporating homogeneity improves the bounds slightly but notably to

\[ \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}_\text{hom}(\mu₁,\mu₂,\mu₃)} E^Q[f(S)] \approx 0.064 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}_\text{hom}(\mu₁,\mu₂,\mu₃)} E^Q[f(S)] \approx 0.135. \]

While the strengths of the homogeneity assumption certainly lie with cases where more time steps are involved, even in this example the bounds are narrowed by around 11%.

Assuming homogeneity of the underlying process also becomes more restrictive when the marginals \( \mu₁, \mu₂, \mu₃ \) are less homogeneously evolving. As an extreme case, if in the above we instead set \( \mu₃ \sim X₄ \), then the interval of possible prices for the MOT is \([0.088, 0.184]\) while for the homogeneous MOT it is \([0.121, 0.138]\), which is drastically more narrow.

\(^5\)To approximate a trading strategy with \( d \) inputs, we use a network structure with 5 layers, hidden dimension \( 64 \cdot d \) and ReLu activation function. For the penalization as in [11], we use the product measure \( \theta = \mu₁ \times \mu₂ \times \mu₃ \) and \( \beta_+(x) = 10000 \max\{0, x\} \). For training, we use batch size 8192, learning rate 0.0001 (after the first 60000 iterations, learning rate is decreased by a factor of 0.98 each 250 iterations for another 60000 iterations), and the Adam optimizer with default parameters. The reported values are primal values, as described at the start of Section 4 in [11].

\(^6\)In comparison, using the discretization scheme from [1] Subsection 6.4, with 100 samples for each marginal, we get \( \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mu₁,\mu₂,\mu₃)} E^Q[f(S)] \approx 0.058 \) and \( \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mu₁,\mu₂,\mu₃)} E^Q[f(S)] \approx 0.139. \)
6 Proofs

6.1 Proof of Remark 3.2

Proof of (i): If \( Q \) is homogeneous, then by definition \( p_{s,\tau,k} = p_{t,\tau,k} \) holds \( \mu_s \wedge \mu_t - \text{a.s.} \). The reverse follows since the function class \( \{ h(x) = (x-k)^+ : k \in \mathbb{R} \} \) is measure determining, see e.g. [4, Footnote 2].

Proof of (ii): First, we show that \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) is not convex. Consider \( T = 3 \) and the two homogeneous Markov chains \( Q^a = 0.75 \delta_{(0,1,0)} + 0.25 \delta_{(1,0,1)} \) and \( Q^b = 0.75 \delta_{(0,0,0)} + 0.25 \delta_{(1,1,1)} \). Both Markov chains start in state 0 with probability 0.75 and state 1 with probability 0.25. Chain \( a \) always switches states and chain \( b \) always stays in the same state. Obviously \( Q^a, Q^b \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \). But \( Q := 0.5Q^a + 0.5Q^b \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \). Indeed, at time 1 the Markov chain transitions from state 0 to each state with equal probability, i.e. with the notation as in Definition 3.1 it is \( K_{1,2}(0) = 0.5 \delta_0 + 0.5 \delta_1 \). However, at time 2 it is \( K_{2,3}(0) = 0.75 \delta_0 + 0.25 \delta_1 \).

Next, we show that \( \Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \) is convex, which implies that \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \) is convex too. Let \( Q^a, Q^b \in \Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \), \( \lambda \in (0,1) \) and \( Q := \lambda Q^a + (1-\lambda)Q^b \). Take \( (s,t,\tau) \in \Delta \). We have to show \( K_{s,s+\tau} = K_{t,t+\tau} \) with notation as in Definition 3.1 i.e. \( Q_{(s,s+\tau)} = Q_s \otimes K_{s,s+\tau} \). Denote by \( K^a_{s,s+\tau} \) the stochastic kernel satisfying \( Q^a_{(s,s+\tau)} = \mu_s \otimes K^a_{s,s+\tau} \) (same for \( K^b_{s,s+\tau} \)). By the general formula

\[
K_{s,s+\tau} = \lambda \frac{dQ^a}{dQ_s} K^a_{s,s+\tau} + (1-\lambda) \frac{dQ^b}{dQ_s} K^b_{s,s+\tau},
\]

and since all measures have the same marginals, it follows \( K_{s,s+\tau} = \lambda K^a_{s,s+\tau} + (1-\lambda)K^b_{s,s+\tau} \), which yields the claim.

Proof of (iii): The inclusion is trivial: Indeed, if \( K : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \) is the transition kernel of the homogeneous Markov chain, then with the notation as in Definition 3.1 it is \( K_{s,s+\tau} = K^\tau \), which is independent of \( s \). (Hereby, \( K^\tau \) is defined as usual by \( K^\tau(x,dy) := \int K(y,A)K^\tau(x,dy). \))

That the inclusion is strict, consider the following example: Let \( Q^a := 0.5 \delta_{(0,0,1)} + 0.5 \delta_{(1,1,0)} \) and \( Q^b := 0.5 \delta_{(0,1,1)} + 0.5 \delta_{(1,0,0)} \). It is \( Q := 0.5Q^a + 0.5Q^b \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{hom}}(\mathbb{R}^3) \). However, straightforward calculation shows that \( Q \) cannot be written as a convex combination of homogeneous Markov chains, so \( Q \notin \text{conv}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{HM}}(\mathbb{R}^3)) \).

Proof of (iv): First, we note the following: If \( \Pi_{\text{HM}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) = \Pi(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \cap \mathcal{P}_{\text{HM}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \), then \( \Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \neq \emptyset \) if and only if \( \Pi_{\text{HM}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \neq \emptyset \). Indeed, by inclusion, the 'if' direction is clear. On the other hand, if \( Q \in \Pi_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \), then one can define \( Q_{HM} \in \Pi_{\text{HM}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \) as the Markov chain with initial distribution \( \mu_1 \) and transition kernel \( K_{1,2} \), where \( Q_{(1,2)} = \mu_1 \otimes K_{1,2} \). Now, by [24, Theorem 9.7.3, (iii) \( \Leftrightarrow \) (iv')], it follows that \( \Pi_{\text{HM}}(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_T) \neq \emptyset \) if and only if \( \mu_1,\ldots,\mu_{T-1} \) dominates \( \mu_2,\ldots,\mu_T \) in heterogeneity.  \( \square \)
6.2 Proof of Theorem [3.3]

Define \( \phi(f) \) as the infimum term in the statement of the proposition for \( f \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \). For \( \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T) \), the convex conjugate \( \phi^* \) is given by

\[
\phi^*(\pi) := \sup_{f \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T)} \left( \int f \, d\pi - \phi(f) \right).
\]

We show \( \phi(f) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^T)} \int f \, d\pi - \phi^*(\pi) \) using [3] Theorem 2.2.] and calculate \( \phi^*(\pi) \) so that the proposition follows.

**Dual representation:** To apply [3, Theorem 2.2.], we show that \( \phi(f) \) is real-valued on \( C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) and condition (R1) stated within the Theorem holds, i.e. for \( C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \ni f_n \downarrow 0 \) it holds \( \phi(f_n) \downarrow \phi(0) \) for \( n \to \infty \). Regarding \( \phi(f) \in \mathbb{R} \), \( \phi(f) < \infty \) is obvious. On the other hand, \( \phi(f) > -\infty \) will follow by calculation of \( \phi^*(\pi) \) and the assumption that \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \) is non-empty, since for \( \pi \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \) then \( 0 = \phi^*(\pi) \geq \int f \, d\pi - \phi(f) \) and since \( \int f \, d\pi < \infty \) (all marginals have first moments and \( f \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \)), it holds \( \phi(f) > -\infty \). Regarding condition (R1), note that \( \phi(0) = 0 \) and \( \phi(f) \leq \phi_{\text{ot}}(f) \) where \( \phi_{\text{ot}} \) is the optimal transport functional

\[
\phi_{\text{ot}}(f) := \inf_{h_1, ..., h_T \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}) \atop \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^T: \sum_{t=1}^T h_t(x_t) \geq f(x)} \sum_{t=1}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_t \, d\mu_t.
\]

Since \( \phi_{\text{ot}} \) is continuous from above on \( C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^T) \) (see e.g. [12, Proof of Theorem 1]), \( \phi \) is as well.

**Computation of the convex conjugate:** We show \( \phi^*(\pi) = 0 \), if \( \pi \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(\mu_1, ..., \mu_T) \), and \( \phi^*(\pi) = \infty \), else. First, by plugging in the definition of \( \phi(f) \), exchanging suprema and plugging in the maximal \( f \) (note that to choose \( f \) maximally, the condition that \( \theta^{s,t} \) is bounded and continuous is used), one obtains:

\[
\phi^*(\pi) = \sup_{h_t \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{t=1}^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_t \, d\pi_t - \int_{\mathbb{R}} h_t \, d\mu_t \tag{a}
\]

\[
+ \sup_{\vartheta_t \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^T} \vartheta_t(x_1, ..., x_t) \cdot (x_{t+1} - x_t) \pi(dx_1, ..., dx_T) \tag{b}
\]

\[
+ \sup_{g_{s,t,r} \in C_{\text{lin}}(\mathbb{R}^2)} \sum_{(s,t,r) \in \Delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^T} \left( g_{s,t,r}(x_s, x_{s+r}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(x_s) \right. \\
\left. - g_{s,t,r}(x_t, x_{t+r}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(x_t) \right) \pi(dx_1, ..., dx_T) \tag{c}
\]

By martingale optimal transport duality, we have: Term (a) is zero if \( \pi_t = \mu_t \) for all \( t = 1, ..., T \), and else infinity. Term (b) is zero if the canonical process is a martingale under \( \pi \), and else infinity. It only remains to show that term (c) is zero if \( \pi \) is homogeneous, and
else infinity. This is done already under the assumption that \( \pi_t = \mu_t \) for all \( t = 1, \ldots, T \). We write \( \pi_{(t,t+\tau)} = \pi_t \otimes K_{t,t+\tau} \). Then one calculates for \( (s, t, \tau) \in \Delta \) and \( g_{s,t,\tau} \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2) \)

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^T} \left( g_{s,t,\tau}(x_s, x_{s+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(x_s) - g_{s,t,\tau}(x_t, x_{t+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(x_t) \right) \pi(dx_1, \ldots, dx_T)
\]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau}(x_s, x_{s+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(x_s) \pi(s,s+\tau)(dx_s, dx_{s+\tau}) \]

\[- \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau}(x_t, x_{t+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(x_t) \pi(t,t+\tau)(dx_t, dx_{t+\tau}) \]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau}(x_s, x_{s+\tau}) \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,s+\tau}(dx_s, dx_{s+\tau}) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau}(x_t, x_{t+\tau}) \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,t+\tau}(dx_t, dx_{t+\tau}) \]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau} d\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,s+\tau} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau} d\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,t+\tau} \]

And hence, term (c) is zero if \( \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,s+\tau} = \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,t+\tau} \) for all \( (s, t, \tau) \in \Delta \), and else infinity. So it is zero if and only if \( K_{t,t+\tau} = K_{s,s+\tau} \) holds \( \theta^{s,t} \)-a.s. for all \( (s, t, \tau) \in \Delta \). This, by choice of \( \theta^{s,t} \), corresponds to \( \mu_s \wedge \mu_t \)-a.s. equality, and hence term (c) is zero if and only if \( \pi \) is homogeneous.

### 6.3 Inclusion of transaction costs

We sketch the proof for the duality formula shown for \( (G-\text{Pen-HMOT}) \) from Section 4. The argument works the same as for Theorem 3.3. The only difference is term (c), which for the case of transaction costs reads

\[
\sup_{g_{s,t,\tau} \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2)} \sum_{(s,t) \in \Delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^T} \left( g_{s,t,\tau}(x_s, x_{s+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(x_s) - g_{s,t,\tau}(x_t, x_{t+\tau}) \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_t}(x_t) \right) \pi(dx_1, \ldots, dx_T) \]

\[
- 4 \tau_{s,t,\tau} \left| g_{s,t,\tau}(x_s, x_{s+\tau}) \right| \frac{d\theta^{s,t}}{d\mu_s}(x_s) \pi(dx_1, \ldots, dx_T) \]

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.3 using \( \pi_t = \mu_t \) for \( t = 1, \ldots, T \), this simplifies to

\[
\sum_{(s,t,\tau) \in \Delta} \sup_{g_{s,t,\tau} \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau} d\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,s+\tau} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{s,t,\tau} d\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,t+\tau} \]

\[- 4 \tau_{s,t,\tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left| g_{s,t,\tau} \right|^2 d\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,s+\tau} \]

and finally the terms inside the sum are precisely the dual representation for the Gini index \( G(\theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{s,s+\tau}, \theta^{s,t} \otimes K_{t,t+\tau}) \) as shown in [20], which yields the claim.
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