

Set-Valued Stochastic Differential Equations with Unbounded Coefficients

Atiqah Almuzaini* and Jin Ma†

March 26, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we mainly focus on the set-valued (stochastic) analysis on the space of convex, closed, but possibly unbounded sets, and try to establish a useful theoretical framework for studying the set-valued stochastic differential equations with unbounded coefficients. The space that we will be focusing on are convex, closed sets that are “generated” by a given cone, in the sense that the Hausdorff distance of all elements to the “generating” cone is finite. Such space should in particular include the so-called “upper sets”, and has many useful cases in finance, such as the well-known set-valued risk measures, as well as the solvency cone in some super-hedging problems. We shall argue that, for such a special class of unbounded sets, under some conditions, the cancellation law is still valid, eliminating a major obstacle for extending the set-valued analysis to non-compact sets. We shall establish some basic algebraic and topological properties of such spaces, and show that some standard techniques will again be valid in studying the set-valued SDEs with unbounded (drift) coefficients which, to the best of our knowledge, is new.

Keywords: Set-valued stochastic differential equations, unbounded coefficients, set-valued stochastic analysis on unbounded sets, L_C -space, solvency cones.

AMS subject classifications: 60H10, 28B20, 47H04, 52A07, 54C60, 91G80.

*Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 90089; email: ahalmuza@usc.edu

†Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 90089; email: jinma@usc.edu.

This author is supported in part by US NSF grant #2205972.

1 Introduction

Set-valued analysis, both deterministic and stochastic, has been widely applied in optimizations, optimal control, as well as economics and finance. However, the existing literature in set-valued analysis predominantly focuses on compact sets. Although such a limitation is often technically necessary and does not pose fundamental challenge in many applications, it becomes more pronounced when the underlying objects under investigation are unbounded in nature.

There are many practical applications that involve set-valued subjects that are necessarily unbounded. A well-known example is the *set-valued risk measures*, the extension of the univariate risk measure when the risk appears in the form of random vectors, which is often referred to as *systemic risk* in the context of default contagion (see, e.g., [11]) or multi-asset markets with transaction costs (see, e.g., [9],[8]). Mathematically, the set-valued risk measure takes the form of functions with values being the “upper sets”, that is, the convex sets that are “additively invariant” with respect to a fixed convex cone, and hence unbounded in nature. It is worth noting that a univariate *dynamic risk measure* (the family of risk measures indexed by time) satisfying the so-called *time-consistency* is often representable by the *backward stochastic differential equation* (BSDE) (cf. [3, 4, 21]), but the extension of such representation seems to be quite remote without appropriate technical tools in set-valued analysis that can deal with unbounded sets. Another example that involves upper sets is the so-called “solvency cone” proposed in, e.g., Kabanov [15, 16] and Scharchmayer [22], which are frequently used in the study of super-hedging problem that involves the transaction costs. It is quite conceivable that any dynamics whose coefficients involve the solvency cone would naturally require a framework for unbounded sets.

This paper is an attempt to establish a workable theoretical basis of set-valued analysis that is suitable for the study of set-valued SDEs that have unbounded coefficients. There are, however, several main technical obstacles that need to be recognized, before we try to build the reasonable framework. The first obstacle regarding the space of unbounded sets is the lack of the so-called cancellation law in its algebraic structure under the Minkowski addition. More precisely, for nonempty closed convex sets A , B , and $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $A + B = D + B$, it is not true in general that $A = D$, unless B is compact. The second main obstacle in dealing with unbounded sets is in its topological structure with respect to the Hausdorff metric. More precisely, there is no single set (bounded or unbounded) that has a finite distance from all unbounded sets. In particular, the Hausdorff distance between a given set and any other (unbounded) set is equal to infinity in general. Therefore, our first task is to try to identify an appropriate space of unbounded sets that possesses a “reference point”, that is, an unbounded set that has finite distance to every other elements in the space.

It turns out that the space of unbounded sets that have the “upper-set” nature with respect to a certain fixed cone is one that fits our purpose well. Not only does such a space (which we call the L_C -space in this paper) contain many well-known application, we can actually argue that such a space of unbounded sets that can be equipped with appropriate topological and algebraic structures on which our set-valued analysis will be based, and that many desired properties of set-valued analysis can be established with some efforts. Moreover, we shall extend some necessary concepts, such as set-valued Lebesgue integral and stochastic integrals and their path regularities under the new framework of L_C -valued unbounded sets.

Another main objective of this paper is to establish the existence and uniqueness of the solution to a class of set-valued stochastic differential equations with bounded drift coefficients. We recall that the first papers dealing with deterministic set-valued differential equations with compact set-valued coefficients can be traced back to the early works of [2, 6, 7]. The stochastic set-valued differential equations with compact drift and absolutely summable diffusion terms and their path-regularity can be found in, e.g., [18]. However, to the best of our knowledge, the set-valued SDEs or even stochastic differential inclusions (SDIs) with unbounded coefficients, even only on the drift part, is novel in the literature. We should remark that in this paper, we shall content ourselves with the case when the “diffusion” coefficient of the set-valued SDE to be absolutely summable (see §2 for details), mainly due to the path-regularity issue. We hope to address the well-posedness issue for more general (unbounded) set-valued SDE in our future publications.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In §2 we give the necessary preliminaries on set-valued analysis. In §3 we introduce the L_C space, a space of set-valued mappings with unbounded values and establish its basic properties. In §4 we study the set-valued Lebesgue integrals on L_C -space and prove some important technical results including the continuity of the paths and some important estimates. In §5 we prove the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to a class of stochastic differential equations with unbounded drift and absolutely summable diffusion term. Finally, in §6 we discuss the connections between the SDE and SDI in the unbounded set-valued case, and give an example of super-hedging problem with transaction costs in continuous time, which in fact motivated this work.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we give a brief introduction to set-valued analysis and all the necessary notations associated to it. Most of the materials can be found in the standard literature in set-valued analysis and stochastic analysis (see, e.g., [14, 19, 17]), but we shall try to give a self-contained presentation for ready references.

Let (\mathcal{X}, d) be a metric (vector) space and denote $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) := 2^{\mathcal{X}}$ to be the family of all nonempty subsets of \mathcal{X} , and $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ the family of all *closed* subsets of \mathcal{X} . For a set $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we shall denote the closure of A by \overline{A} or $\text{cl}A$, interchangeably. For $A, B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the *Minkowski addition* and *scalar multiplication* by, respectively,

$$A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}, \quad \alpha A := \{\alpha a : a \in A\}. \quad (2.1)$$

It is important to note that in general, $A + (-1)A \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$ unless A is a singleton. Consequently, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is not a vector space under the Minkovski addition and scalar multiplication.

Next, a set $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is called *convex* if for every $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$, it holds that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i a_i \in A$. We denote $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{X})$ to be the family of all *closed convex* sets. Let $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ we define the *convex hull* of A , denoted by $\text{co}A$, to be the smallest convex set containing A , and we denote $\overline{\text{co}}A := \text{cl}(\text{co}A) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{X})$. It is easy to check that the convex hull is exchangeable with the Minkovski addition and scalar multiplication. That is, if $A, B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then it holds that

$$\text{co}(A + B) = \text{co}(A) + \text{co}(B), \quad \text{co}(\alpha A) = \alpha \text{co}(A). \quad (2.2)$$

Finally, a set $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is called a *cone* if $\alpha x \in C$ for any $\alpha > 0$ and $x \in C$. A cone $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ being *closed* and *convex* are defined naturally. It is easy to check that $C \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is a convex cone if and only if $C + C = C$ and $\alpha C = C$, for any $\alpha > 0$.

We should note that in this paper we shall focus on the space $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$ or $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{X})$, which are non-compact in general. Therefore they are not closed under the Minkovski addition. For example, if $A, B \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X})$, then $A + B$ may not be a closed set, unless one of A and B is compact. A standard remedy for this is to introduce the extended notion of Minkovski addition, defined by

$$A \oplus B := \overline{A + B}, \quad A, B \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}). \quad (2.3)$$

Clearly, $A \oplus B = A + B$ if either A or B is compact.

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. The *Hausdorff distance* between A and B is defined by

$$h(A, B) := \max\{\overline{h}(A, B), \overline{h}(B, A)\} = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : A \subseteq B + \bar{B}_\varepsilon(0), B \subseteq A + \bar{B}_\varepsilon(0)\}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\bar{B}_r(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the closed ball centered at 0 with radius $r > 0$, and

$$\overline{h}(A, B) := \sup\{d(a, B) : a \in A\} := \sup\{\inf\{d(a, b) : b \in B\} : a \in A\}.$$

It is clear by definition that $h(A, B) = 0$ if and only if $\overline{A} = \overline{B}$, and it is well-known that $(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{X}), h)$ is a complete metric space if \mathcal{X} is. Furthermore, the following facts are used frequently in our

future discussions: for $A, B, D, E \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, then it holds that

$$\begin{cases} h(\overline{A}, \overline{B}) \leq h(A, B); & h(\overline{\text{co}}A, \overline{\text{co}}B) \leq h(A, B); \\ h(A \oplus B, D \oplus E) \leq h(A + B, D + E) \leq h(A, D) + h(B, E) \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Set-Valued Measurable Mappings and Decomposable Sets. In what follows for simplicity we shall focus on the case $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$, the d -dimensional Euclidean space, although most of the results are valid for more general topological vector spaces. Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$ be a finite measure space. If \mathbb{X} is a topological space, we take $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$, the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{X} . Consider a mapping $F : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which we shall refer to as the *set-valued mapping*. A function $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(x) \in F(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$, is called a *selector* for F . A selector f is called *measurable* if it is $\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable. We shall make use of the following definition of set-valued “measurable” mapping.

Definition 2.1. A set-valued mapping $F : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be measurable if for each $E \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it holds that $\{x \in \mathbb{X} : F(x) \cap E \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{M}$. ■

The following selection/representation properties for measurable mappings will be useful.

Proposition 2.2 ([19]). (i) If $F : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is measurable, then F admits a measurable selector, i.e. there exists an $\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable selector $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ of F ;

(ii) (Castaing Representation) $F : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is measurable if and only if there exists a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of measurable selectors for F such that $F(x) = \text{cl}\{f_n(x) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$. ■

Let us denote $\mathbb{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d) = \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ to be the set of all $\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable functions; and $\mathcal{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ the set of all measurable set-valued mappings. For $F \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, we consider the set of measurable selectors

$$S(F) := \{f \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d) : f(x) \in F(x) \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{X}\}$$

Clearly, if $F, G \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, then $F = G$, μ -a.e. if and only if $S(F) = S(G)$.

Definition 2.3. A set $V \subseteq \mathbb{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be decomposable, if $\mathbf{1}_A f + \mathbf{1}_{A^c} g \in V$ whenever $f, g \in V$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}$. ■

For a set $V \subseteq \mathbb{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we define the *decomposable hull* of V , denoted by $\text{dec}(V)$, to be the smallest decomposable set in $\mathbb{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ containing V . We shall often consider *closed decomposable hull* of V : $\overline{\text{dec}}(V) = \text{cl}[\text{dec}(V)]$. It is not too hard to verify that the following algebraic properties hold for the decomposable hull: for $V, W \subseteq \mathbb{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$,

1. $\text{dec}(\alpha V) = \alpha \text{dec}(V)$,
2. $\text{dec}(V + W) = \text{dec}(V) + \text{dec}(W)$,
3. $\overline{\text{dec}}[\text{co}(V)] = \overline{\text{co}}[\text{dec}(V)]$.

Let $p \in [1, \infty)$ and denote $\mathbb{L}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d) := \{f \in \mathbb{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d) : \|f\|_p^p := \int_{\mathbb{X}} |f(x)|^p \mu(dx) < \infty\}$. For any $F \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, we define $S^p(F) := S(F) \cap \mathbb{L}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and consider the set

$$\mathcal{A}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)) := \{F \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)) : S^p(F) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We say F is **p -integrable** if $F \in \mathcal{A}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. The following theorem (see [19]) will be important for our discussion.

Theorem 2.4. (i) Let $F \in \mathcal{A}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then there exists a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq S^p(F)$ such that $F(x) = \text{cl}\{f_n(x) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Moreover, $S^p(F) = \overline{\text{dec}}\{f_n : n \geq 1\}$.

(ii) Let $V \subset \mathbb{L}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ be a closed subset. Then there exists a measurable set-valued mapping $F \in \mathcal{A}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $V = S^p(F)$ if and only if V is decomposable. \blacksquare

Clearly, if $F, G \in \mathcal{A}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ then $F = G$ μ -a.e., if and only if $S^p(F) = S^p(G)$. Also, one can easily check that

$$S^p(\overline{\text{co}}F) = \overline{\text{co}}S^p(F), \quad S^p(F \oplus G) = S^p(F) \oplus S^p(G). \quad (2.6)$$

Throughout the rest of this paper, we shall consider a given complete, filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]})$, on which is defined a standard m -dimensional Brownian motion $B = \{B_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$, $T > 0$. The notions of set-valued random variables and stochastic processes, etc., can be defined in an analogous way as the usual “single-valued” concepts in probability. For example, a *set-valued random variable* $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an \mathcal{F} -measurable set-valued mapping; and a *set-valued stochastic process* $\Phi = \{\Phi_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a family of set-valued random variables. A set-valued process is called *measurable* if it is $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable; it is called \mathbb{F} -adapted if Φ_t is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable for each $t \in [0, T]$; it is called \mathbb{F} -nonanticipative if it is both measurable and adapted. Given a set-valued \mathbb{F} -non-anticipative process Φ , we denote $S_{\mathbb{F}}(\Phi)$ to be the set of all \mathbb{F} -non-anticipative selectors of Φ . For $p \geq 1$, we denote $S_{\mathbb{F}}^p(\Phi) := S_{\mathbb{F}}(\Phi) \cap \mathbb{L}^p([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^p([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)) = \{F \in \mathcal{L}^0([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)) : S_{\mathbb{F}}^p(F) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (2.7)$$

We now turn our attention to the notions of set-valued Lebesgue and Itô integrals. Let us assume that $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}^B$ be the natural filtration generated by B , augmented by all \mathbb{P} -null sets of \mathcal{F} so that it satisfies the usual hypothesis.

Lebesgue Set-Valued Integral: Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, and define

$$J_{0,T}(\Phi) := \left\{ \int_0^T \phi_t dt : \phi \in S_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Phi) \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (2.8)$$

Since $\overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_T}(J_{0,T}(\Phi))$ is closed and \mathcal{F}_T -decomposable, by Theorem 2.4, there exists a unique \mathcal{F}_T -measurable set-valued mapping $I_T(\Phi) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, such that $\overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_T}(J_{0,T}(\Phi)) = S_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(I_T(\Phi))$. We call $I_T(\Phi)$ the *set-valued Lebesgue integral* of Φ , and denote it by $\int_0^T \Phi_t dt := I_T(\Phi)$. Similarly, for $t \in [0, T]$, we define $\int_0^t \Phi_s ds := \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{(0,t]} \Phi_s ds$, or equivalently, by $\overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t}(J_{0,t}(\Phi)) = S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(\int_0^t \Phi_s ds)$. The following properties can be easily verified (cf., e.g., [17, 18]).

1. The set-valued integral $\int_0^t \Phi_s ds$ is defined, almost surely, for each $t \in [0, T]$, and is \mathbb{F} -adapted.
2. If Φ is convex-valued, so is $\int_0^t \Phi_s ds$.
3. If Φ is compact convex-valued, then the process $\{\int_0^t \Phi_s ds\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric h .

We would like to point out here the continuity result of the Lebesgue integral $\{\int_0^t \Phi_s ds\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ above requires the compactness of Φ . In fact, if Φ takes unbounded values, the continuity is yet to be discussed in the literature, and will be one of the main focuses on this paper.

Aumann-Itô Set-Valued Stochastic Integral: Let $\Psi \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}))$. Define

$$\mathcal{J}_{0,T}(\Psi) := \left\{ \int_0^T \psi_t dB_t : \psi \in S_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Psi) \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d). \quad (2.9)$$

Again, by Theorem 2.4, there exists a unique set-valued mapping $\mathcal{I}_T(\Psi) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $S_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\mathcal{I}_T(\Psi)) = \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\mathcal{J}_{0,T}(\Psi))$. We denote $\mathcal{I}_T(\Psi) := \int_0^T \Psi_t dB_t$, and call it the *Aumann-Itô set-valued stochastic integral* of Ψ . Similarly, we define $\int_0^t \Psi_s dB_s := \mathcal{I}_t(\Psi)$, $t \in [0, T]$, so that $S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(\mathcal{I}_t(\Psi)) = \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t}(\mathcal{J}_{0,t}(\Psi))$. Again, the following facts can be easily verified (cf., e.g., [17, 18]):

1. The integral $\int_0^t \Psi_s dB_s$ is defined almost surely for each $t \in [0, T]$, and it is \mathbb{F} -adapted.
2. If Ψ is convex-valued, so is $\int_0^t \Psi_s dB_s$.

However, the continuity of the process $\{\int_0^t \Psi_s dB_s\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ as well as the joint-measurability is more involved in the set-valued case. A well-known case is given by Kisielewicz-Mitchta [18], which we now describe. Let us denote $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}) \subset \mathbb{L}^2([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$ to be the set of all non-anticipative processes, and let $G = \{g^n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$. Since for any $E \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$, it holds that $\{(t, \omega) : G \cap E \neq \emptyset\} = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} (g^n)^{-1}(E)$, and each g^n is \mathbb{F} -non-anticipative, we see that G is a \mathbb{F} -non-anticipative set-valued process. Furthermore, $G := \{g^n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is called *absolutely summable* if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |g^n(t, \omega)| < \infty$ for $dt \times d\mathbb{P}-(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$, and it is called *square integrable* if $\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |g^n(t, \cdot)|^2 dt < \infty$. The following result gives a sufficient condition for the continuity of Aumann-Itô set-valued stochastic integral:

Theorem 2.5 (Kisielewicz-Mitchta [18]). *For every absolutely summable square integrable set-valued process $G := \{g^n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega, \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$, the set-valued process $\{\int_0^t G_s dB_s\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is almost surely continuous under Hausdorff metric h .*

We end this section by some technical results that will be useful in our later sections. Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$ be a finite measure space, and let $F \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}^p(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $p \geq 1$.

Proposition 2.6 ([19, Theorem 2.3.4]). *Let $\phi : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ be a jointly measurable function. Suppose that the integral $T_\phi(f) := \int_{\mathbb{X}} \phi(x, f(x)) \mu(dx)$ is well-defined for each $f \in S^p(F)$, and $T_\phi(f) < +\infty$ (resp. $> -\infty$) for at least one $f \in S^p(F)$. Suppose further that either (i) $\phi(x, \cdot)$ is upper semicontinuous for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{X}$ or (ii) $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$ is a complete measure space and $\phi(x, \cdot)$ is lower semicontinuous for every fixed $x \in \mathbb{X}$. Then,*

$$\inf_{f \in S^p(F)} T_\phi(f) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \inf_{y \in F(x)} \phi(x, y) \mu(dx) \text{ (resp. } \sup_{f \in S^p(F)} T_\phi(f) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} \sup_{y \in F(x)} \phi(x, y) \mu(dx)). \quad \blacksquare$$

Finally, we recall that a function $f : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be *Carathéodory* if $f(x, \cdot)$ is continuous for fixed $x \in \mathbb{X}$, and $f(\cdot, a)$ is measurable for fixed $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It can be shown that a Carathéodory function $f : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ must be $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable (see, e.g., [13, Theorem 6.1]). Accordingly, a set-valued mapping $F : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be a Carathéodory set-valued mapping if $F(x, \cdot)$ is continuous for fixed $x \in \mathbb{X}$, and $F(\cdot, a)$ is measurable for every fixed $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Furthermore, we have the following result.

Proposition 2.7 ([23]). *Let $F : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a Carathéodory set-valued mapping, and let $F(t, \omega, A) := \overline{\cup_{a \in A} F(t, \omega, a)}$, for any $A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then for every measurable \mathbb{F} -adapted set-valued mapping $X : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the set-valued mapping $F \circ X : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $(F \circ X)(t, \omega) := F(t, \omega, X(t, \omega))$ is $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{F}$ measurable. \blacksquare*

3 L_C -Space and Basic Properties

In this section we introduce the main subject of our framework, which we refer to as the L_C -Space. As we observed in the previous section, most of the concepts of the standard set-valued analysis and stochastic analysis are defined on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (or $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$), the space of all closed (convex) sets. However, many results in the set-valued analysis literature are valid only in $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the space of all *compact*, convex sets. Our main task is to remove the boundedness constraint in the analysis and establish a workable framework of set-valued analysis on unbounded sets.

To begin with, we note that the first main issue for allowing unbounded sets is the choice of the reference element, since there is no single element in the space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, to which the Hausdorff

distance from all elements is finite. Consequently, the commonly used reference point $\{\mathbf{0}\}$, as well as the “norm” $\|A\| = h(A, \{\mathbf{0}\})$, is no longer valid. To overcome this difficulty and proceed with our analysis, a reasonable remedy would be to consider a subspace of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for which there exists a fixed “reference point” that has finite Hausdorff distance to all other elements. In light of the applications mentioned in the Introduction, in this paper we shall consider the space L_C , which we now describe.

Let $C \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a fixed convex cone in \mathbb{R}^d , such that $\{\mathbf{0}\} \neq C \neq \mathbb{R}^d$. We consider the set:

$$L_C^\infty = L_C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d) : A = \overline{A + C}\}. \quad (3.1)$$

In what follows we do not distinguish L_C^∞ and $L_C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ when the context is clear. We endow the space L_C^∞ with the usual Hausdorff metric h , then it is not hard to check that L_C^∞ is “closed” under countable union and intersections. Indeed, if $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq L_C^\infty$, then $\overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n} \in L_C^\infty$ and $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty A_n \in L_C^\infty$. We note that spaces similar to L_C^∞ have appeared in the literature (e.g., [12]), as a result of a preorder relation defined on linear spaces. In fact, we have the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *(L_C^∞, h) is a complete metric space.*

Proof. Clearly, (L_C^∞, h) is a subspace of $(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d), h)$. It suffices to show the completeness. To see this, let $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a Cauchy sequence in (L_C^∞, h) , whence a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d), h)$. It then follows from [19, Theorem 1.3.1] that $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to $A := \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^\infty A_m}$ in $(\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d), h)$. Since each $A_m \in L_C^\infty$, so is A . ■

We note that, however, unlike the bounded case there is a main deficiency in the definition of L_C^∞ , that is, it is very possible for a set $A \in L_C^\infty$ to have $h(A, C) = \infty$ (!). Therefore, to facilitate our discussion, say, on SDE below, it is more desirable to consider the following subset of L_C^∞ :

$$L_C = L_C(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{A \in L_C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : h(A, C) < \infty\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Clearly, for all $A, B \in L_C$ we have $h(A, B) < \infty$, thanks to the triangle inequality. However, we note that the space L_C is no longer “closed” under countable unions. The following simple example is thus worth noting:

Example 3.2. *Let $A \in L_C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $h(A, C) = \infty$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $A_n := (A \cap B_n(0)) + C$, where $B_n(0)$ is the closed ball in \mathbb{R}^d centered at 0 with radius n . Then, $A_n \in L_C$, as $h(A_n, C) \leq n < \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, but $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty A_n \notin L_C$.* ■

We should note that, Example 3.2 notwithstanding, L_C is still a complete metric space.

Proposition 3.3. *The space L_C is a closed subspace of (L_C^∞, h) , hence a complete metric space.*

Proof. We need only check that any limit point of L_C belongs to L_C . To see this, let $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L_C$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(A_n, A) = 0$. Then $A \in L_C^\infty$, and for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, we have $h(A_N, A) \leq 1$. Thus we have $h(A, C) \leq h(A, A_N) + h(A_N, C) < \infty$, since $A_N \in L_C$. To wit, $A \in L_C$. ■

In the rest of the paper we shall focus only on the space (L_C, h) . Since the convex cone C plays a special role in the space L_C , in what follows we refer to it as the *generating cone*. Next, let us pay attention to a special type of elements in L_C . We say that a set $B \in L_C$ has a *compact component* $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $B = \tilde{B} + C$. Clearly, if in Example 3.2 $A \in L_C^\infty \cap \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the sequence (A_n) all have compact components. An important feature of such sets can be seen from the following extension of the so-called *Cancellation Law*¹ to the case involving unbounded sets.

Proposition 3.4 (Cancellation law). *Let $A, B, D \in L_C^\infty \cap \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that B has compact component. Then $A \oplus B = D \oplus B$ implies that $A = D$.*

Proof. First assume that $B = \tilde{B} + C$, where $\tilde{B} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Since the Minkowski sum of a closed set and a compact set is closed, we have $A \oplus B = A \oplus (\tilde{B} + C) = \overline{A + (\tilde{B} + C)} = (A \oplus C) + \tilde{B} = A + \tilde{B}$. Similarly, we have $D \oplus B = D + \tilde{B}$. Therefore $A \oplus B = D \oplus B$ implies that $A + \tilde{B} = D + \tilde{B}$. Since \tilde{B} is compact, we conclude that $A = D$, thanks to the usual cancellation law. ■

We should note from Proposition 3.4 and Example 3.2 that the sets in L_C that have compact components provides a useful subspace of L_C for our discussion. In fact, such sets resemble the so-called *Motzkin decomposable* sets in the literature (see e.g. [10]). To see the relation between an element in L_C that has compact component and a Motzkin decomposable set, we first recall the so-called *recession cone* of a set $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, defined by

$$0^+A := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : x + \lambda y \in A, x \in A, \lambda \geq 0\}. \quad (3.3)$$

It is easy to see that $0 \in 0^+A$, $A = A + 0^+A$, and $0^+A \neq \{0\}$ implies that A is unbounded. Moreover, if $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $0^+A \neq \{0\}$, then 0^+A is a non-trivial closed convex cone. A set $A \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $0^+A \neq \{0\}$ is called *Motzkin decomposable* if $A = \tilde{A} + 0^+A$ for some $\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We have the following result regarding the generating cone C and the recession cone of $A \in L_C^\infty$.

Proposition 3.5. *For any $A \in L_C^\infty$, the following hold:*

- (i) $0^+A \supseteq C$;
- (ii) If $A \in L_C$ and A has a compact component, then A is Motzkin-decomposable and $0^+A = C$;
- (iii) If $A \in L_C \cap \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $0^+A = C$.

¹The ‘‘Cancellation Law’’ states that for $A, B, C \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $A + B = C + B$ implies $A = C$, provided B is compact (cf. [20]).

Proof. (i) For any $c \in C$, $x \in A$, and $\lambda \geq 0$, it is readily seen that $x + \lambda c \in A + C \subseteq A$. Thus $C \subseteq 0^+A$. To see (ii), let $A \in L_C$, and let the compact component be \tilde{A} . Then we have $\tilde{A} + C = A = A \oplus 0^+A = \tilde{A} + (C \oplus 0^+A)$. Since \tilde{A} is compact, by Proposition 3.4 we obtain $C = C \oplus 0^+A$. Now since $0 \in C$, we have $0^+A = 0^+A + \{0\} \subset 0^+A + C \subseteq C$, whence $C = 0^+A$.

It remains to check (iii). First, by (i), $C \subseteq 0^+A$. On the other hand, since $h(A, C) < \infty$, by definition of Hausdorff distance (2.4), we have $A \subseteq C + \bar{B}_\varepsilon(0) =: D_\varepsilon$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\bar{B}_\varepsilon(0)$ is compact, by (ii) D_ε is Motzkin-decomposable and $0^+D_\varepsilon = C$. Now note that $A \subseteq D_\varepsilon$, by definition (3.3) we see that $C \subseteq 0^+A \subseteq 0^+D_\varepsilon = C$, proving (iii). \blacksquare

We should note that in general, $C \subsetneq 0^+A$ for $A \in L_C^\infty$. For example, let $C := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x = 0, y \geq 0\}$ and $A := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \geq 1, y \geq 1\}$. Then $A = A \oplus C$ but $0^+A = \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

To end this section let us consider the set-valued random variables taking values in the space L_C . Let us define

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{R}^d) := \{F \in \mathcal{L}^0(\Omega, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)) : F \in L_C, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}; \\ \mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{R}^d) := \{F \in \mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}) : \mathbb{E}[h^2(F, C)] < \infty\}. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

We shall also often drop \mathbb{R}^d from the notations of the spaces above when the context is clear. Next, for any $F_1, F_2 \in \mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, define $d(F_1, F_2) := (\mathbb{E}[h^2(F_1, F_2)])^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The following result is not surprising, except for some consideration due to the special structure of the L_C -space. We only give a sketch of proof for completeness.

Theorem 3.6. $(\mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}), d)$ is a complete metric space.

Proof. That $(\mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}), d)$ is a metric space is obvious, we shall argue only the completeness. To this end, let $(F_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}), d)$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, by Chebyshev's inequality we have $\mathbb{P}\{h(F_n, F_m) > \varepsilon\} \leq \frac{d^2(F_n, F_m)}{\varepsilon^2}$. Thus $(F_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is Cauchy under Hausdorff distance h , in probability. We first claim that there is a subsequence $(F_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty \subseteq (F_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that it converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. in Hausdorff metric h to some $F \in L_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$.

Indeed, let $n_1 := 1$ and for $k > 1$, $n_k := \inf\{n > n_{k-1} : \mathbb{P}\{h(F_m, F_\ell) > 2^{-k}\} < 2^{-k}, m, \ell \geq n\}$. Let $E_k := \{\omega \in \Omega : h(F_{n_{k+1}}, F_{n_k}) > 2^{-k}\}$. Then $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \mathbb{P}(E_k) < \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^{-k} < \infty$. Denoting $\mathcal{N}_l := \cup_{k=l}^\infty E_k$ and $\mathcal{N} := \cap_{l=1}^\infty \mathcal{N}_l$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}) = 0$, thanks to Borel-Cantelli lemma.

Now for any $l > 1$, let $\omega \notin \mathcal{N}_l$. Then for any $j > i > l$, it holds that

$$h(F_{n_i}(\omega), F_{n_j}(\omega)) \leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} h(F_{n_{k+1}}(\omega), F_{n_k}(\omega)) \leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} 2^{-k} \leq 2^{-(i-1)}.$$

Thus $(F_{n_k}(\omega))_{k=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in (L_C, h) . Since (L_C, h) is complete, by the proof of Theorem 3.6, for $\omega \in \mathcal{N}^c = \cup_{l=1}^\infty \mathcal{N}_l^c$, $(F_{n_k}(\omega))_{k=1}^\infty$ converges to $\cap_{l=1}^\infty \overline{\cup_{k=l}^\infty F_{n_k}(\omega)}$ in (L_C, h) .

Now let us define $F(\omega) := C\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N}}(\omega) + \cap_{l=1}^{\infty} \overline{\cup_{k=l}^{\infty} F_{n_k}(\omega)} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N}^c}(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega$, then $F(\omega) \in L_C$ for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and $(F_{n_k})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ converges to F - \mathbb{P} -a.s. We claim that F is measurable and $(F_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to F in $(\mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}), d)$. Indeed, for $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open, we have

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : F(\omega) \cap U \neq \emptyset\} = \{\omega \in \mathcal{N} : C \cap U \neq \emptyset\} \cup \{\omega \in \mathcal{N}^c : \cap_{l=1}^{\infty} \overline{\cup_{k=l}^{\infty} F_{n_k}(\omega)} \cap U \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that $\{\omega \in \mathcal{N} : C \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$ is a null set, hence measurable. On the other hand,

$$\{\omega \in \mathcal{N}^c : \cap_{l=1}^{\infty} \overline{\cup_{k=l}^{\infty} F_{n_k}(\omega)} \cap U \neq \emptyset\} = \cap_{l=1}^{\infty} \cup_{k=l}^{\infty} \{\omega \in \mathcal{N}^c : F_{n_k}(\omega) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$$

is also measurable. Thus $\{\omega \in \Omega : F(\omega) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$ is measurable, to wit, $\omega \mapsto F(\omega)$ is measurable.

Finally, we show that $(F_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to F in $(\mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}), d)$. Since $(F_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}), d)$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $N := N(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[h^2(F_n, F_m)] < \varepsilon$ for any $n, m \geq N$. Thus, for any $n > N$, we can apply Fatou's lemma to get

$$\mathbb{E}[h^2(F_n, F)] = \mathbb{E}[h^2(F_n, \lim_{n_k \rightarrow \infty} F_{n_k})] = \mathbb{E}[\lim_{n_k \rightarrow \infty} h^2(F_n, F_{n_k})] \leq \liminf_{n_k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[h^2(F_n, F_{n_k})] < \varepsilon.$$

This completes the proof. ■

4 Set-Valued Lebesgue Integral on L_C -Space

In this section, we show some results regarding set-valued Lebesgue integrals that will be useful for our discussion but not covered by the existing literature. We first recall the definition of set-valued Lebesgue integrals defined in §2.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $F : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a “constant” set-valued mapping with $F \equiv A$, for some $A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $F \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, and for $0 \leq t_0 < t \leq T$, it holds that $\int_{t_0}^t F_s ds = (t - t_0)A$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.*

In particular, if $A = C$ is a convex cone, then we have $\int_{t_0}^t F_s ds = C$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.

Proof. Let $F(t, \omega) \equiv A$, $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$ for some $A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then obviously F is measurable and \mathbb{F} -adapted. Let $\{a_n : n \geq 1\} := A \cap \mathbb{Q}^d$, then we have the simple Castaing representation: $F(t, \omega) = \text{cl}\{f_t^n(\omega) : n \geq 1\}$, $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$, where $f_t^n(\omega) \equiv a_n$. By (2.8) we can easily see that

$$S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2((t - t_0)A) = \overline{\text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t}}\{(t - t_0)a_n : n \geq 1\} = \overline{\text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t}}\left\{\int_{t_0}^t f_s^n ds : n \geq 1\right\} = \overline{\text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t}}J_{0,T}(F),$$

We conclude that $S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(\int_{t_0}^t F_s ds) = S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2((t - t_0)A)$ for any $0 \leq t_0 < t \leq T$. In particular, if $A = C$ is a convex cone, then we have $(t - t_0)C = C$, proving the proposition. ■

Next, we give a standard result for Aumann-Lebesgue integral, extended to the unbounded integrands. Again, we only provide a sketch of proof for completeness.

Proposition 4.2. $F \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then for $0 \leq t_0 < t \leq T$, it holds that

$$\int_0^t F_s ds = \int_0^{t_0} F_s ds \oplus \int_{t_0}^t F_s ds, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Proof. For simplicity, let us denote $I_0^t(F) = \int_0^t F_s ds$, $I_0^{t_0}(F) = \int_0^{t_0} F_s ds = \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0, t_0]} F_s ds$, and $I_{t_0}^t(F) = \int_{t_0}^t F_s ds = \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[t_0, t]} F_s ds$, respectively. We shall argue that

$$S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_0^t(F)) = S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_0^{t_0}(F) \oplus I_{t_0}^t(F)). \quad (4.1)$$

Since by (2.8), $S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_0^t(F)) = \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{0,t}(F) := \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \{ \int_0^t f_s ds : f \in S_{\mathbb{F}}^2(F) \}$, and by (2.6), one has

$$S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_0^{t_0}(F) \oplus I_{t_0}^t(F)) = S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_0^{t_0}(F)) \oplus S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_{t_0}^t(F)). \quad (4.2)$$

On the other hand, it is easy to check, regardless the boundedness of F , that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_0^{t_0}(F)) \oplus S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_{t_0}^t(F)) &= \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \{ J_{0,t}(\mathbf{1}_{[0, t_0]} F) \} \oplus \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \{ J_{0,t}(\mathbf{1}_{[t_0, t]} F) \} \\ &= \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \left\{ \int_0^t f_s^1 ds : f^1 \in S_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\mathbf{1}_{[0, t_0]} F) \right\} \oplus \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \left\{ \int_0^t f_s^2 ds : f^2 \in S_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\mathbf{1}_{[t_0, t]} F) \right\} \\ &= \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \left\{ \int_0^t (f_s^1 + f_s^2) ds : f^1 \in S_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\mathbf{1}_{[0, t_0]} F), f^2 \in S_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\mathbf{1}_{[t_0, t]} F) \right\} = \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} \{ J_{0,t}(F) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the last equality in the above can be easily verified using the definition of decomposibility. This, together with (4.2), leads to (4.1), proving the proposition. \blacksquare

Next, we present an important inequality regarding set-valued Lebesgue integrals. The compact counterpart of this inequality can be found in [18], we therefore only point out the special technical issues appearing in L_C -space.

Theorem 4.3. Suppose that $F, \tilde{F} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T h^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) ds] < \infty$. Then, for any $0 \leq t_0 < t \leq T$, it holds that

$$h^2\left(\int_{t_0}^t F_s ds, \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{F}_s ds\right) \leq (t - t_0) \int_{t_0}^t h^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) ds, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Fix $0 \leq t_0 < t \leq T$, and for notational simplicity, denote $I_{t_0}^t(\Phi) := \int_{t_0}^t \Phi_s ds$, for $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Since both sides of (4.3) is \mathcal{F}_t measurable, we need only to check that

$$\int_U h^2(I_{t_0}^t(F), I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F})) d\mathbb{P} \leq (t - t_0) \int_U \int_{t_0}^t h^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) ds d\mathbb{P}, \quad \forall U \in \mathcal{F}_t. \quad (4.4)$$

To this end, let $U \in \mathcal{F}_t$ be given, and consider the mapping $x \mapsto d^2(x, I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F}))$. Since $d^2(\cdot, E)$ is upper-semi continuous for $E \in \mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, it follows from Proposition 2.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \overline{h}^2(I_{t_0}^t(F), I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F})) d\mathbb{P} &= \int_U \sup\{d^2(x, I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F})) : x \in I_{t_0}^t(F)\} d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \sup\left\{\int_U d^2(u, I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F})) d\mathbb{P} : u \in S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_{t_0}^t(F))\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

By the similar argument, we can show that

$$\int_U d(u, I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F}))d\mathbb{P} = \inf \left\{ \int_U |u - v|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F})) \right\}. \quad (4.6)$$

Combining (4.5) and (4.6) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U \bar{h}^2(I_{t_0}^t(F), I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F}))d\mathbb{P} &= \sup \left\{ \inf \left\{ \int_U |u - v|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_{t_0}^t(\tilde{F})) \right\} : u \in S_{\mathcal{F}_t}^2(I_{t_0}^t(F)) \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \inf \left\{ \int_U |u - v|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F}) \right\} : u \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(F) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Now note that by Hölder's inequality and Proposition 2.6 we also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup \left\{ \inf \left\{ \int_U |u - v|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F}) \right\} : u \in J_{t_0,t}(F) \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \inf \left\{ \int_U \left| \int_{t_0}^t f_s ds - \int_{t_0}^t \tilde{f}_s ds \right|^2 d\mathbb{P} : \tilde{f} \in S^2(\tilde{F}) \right\} : f \in S^2(F) \right\} \\ &\leq (t - t_0) \sup \left\{ \inf \left\{ \int_{U \times [t_0, t]} |f_s - \tilde{f}_s|^2 d\mathbb{P} ds : \tilde{f} \in S^2(\tilde{F}) \right\} : f \in S^2(F) \right\} \\ &= (t - t_0) \int_U \left[\int_{t_0}^t \bar{h}^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) ds \right] d\mathbb{P}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Now, in light of (4.7) we shall argue that (4.8) remains true when we replace $J_{t_0,t}(F)$ and $J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F})$ on the left hand side by their decomposable hulls. To this end, first consider $u = \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i} \in \text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(F)$, where $u_i \in J_{t_0,t}(F)$ and $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a partition of Ω . Then by (4.8) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf \left\{ \int_U \left| \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i} - v \right|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F}) \right\} \leq \inf \left\{ \int_U \left| \sum_{i=1}^m u_i \mathbf{1}_{U_i} - v \right|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F}) \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sup \left\{ \inf \left\{ \int_{U \cap U_i} |u_i - v|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F}) \right\} : u_i \in J_{t_0,t}(F) \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m (t - t_0) \int_{U \cap U_i} \left[\int_{t_0}^t \bar{h}^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) ds \right] d\mathbb{P} = (t - t_0) \int_U \left[\int_{t_0}^t \bar{h}^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) ds \right] d\mathbb{P}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Since this is true for all $u \in \text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(F)$, we see that (4.9) implies that (4.8) remains true when $J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F})$ is replaced by $\overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F})$ and $J_{t_0,t}(F)$ is replaced by $\text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(F)$. To combine (4.7) and (4.8), we let $u \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(F)$, and let $(u_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(F)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|u - u_n|^2 = 0$. Since for any $n \geq 1$, we can apply the extended (4.8) to get

$$\inf \left\{ \int_U |u_n - v|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F}) \right\} \leq (t - t_0) \int_{t_0}^t \int_U \bar{h}^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) d\mathbb{P} ds. \quad (4.10)$$

In particular, (4.10) implies that for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \geq 1$, we can find $v_n \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0,t}(\tilde{F})$ such that

$$\int_U |u_n - v_n|^2 d\mathbb{P} \leq T \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[\bar{h}^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s)] ds + \varepsilon < \infty, \quad (4.11)$$

thanks to the assumption of the theorem. Since $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is convergent in $\mathbb{L}^2([0, T] \times \Omega)$ by definition, whence bounded, this in turn implies that $\{v_n \mathbf{1}_U\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded (in \mathbb{L}^2) as well. We can then apply Banach-Saks-Mazur theorem to obtain a subsequence $(v_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$ of the form: $\bar{v}_{n_k} := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k v_{n_j} \mathbf{1}_U$, such that $\{\bar{v}_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges to, say, $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{L}^2$. Since $\overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(\tilde{F})$ is convex, closed, and \mathcal{F}_t -decomposable, we see that $\bar{v}_{n_k} \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(\tilde{F})$, $k \geq 1$, and hence $\bar{v} \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(\tilde{F})$. Moreover, since $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq \text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(F)$ converges to u , and $\text{dec}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(F)$ is convex, one shows that $\bar{u}_{n_k} := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k u_{n_j} \rightarrow u$ as well. Thus by Jensen's inequality and (4.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U |\bar{u}_{n_k} - \bar{v}_{n_k}|^2 d\mathbb{P} &= \int_U \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{k} (u_{n_j} - v_{n_j}) \right|^2 d\mathbb{P} \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{k} \int_U |u_{n_j} - v_{n_j}|^2 d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq (t - t_0) \int_{t_0}^t \int_U \bar{h}^2(F, \tilde{F}) d\mathbb{P} ds + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Sending $k \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain that

$$\inf \left\{ \int_U |u - v|^2 d\mathbb{P} : v \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(\tilde{F}) \right\} \leq \int_U |u - \bar{v}|^2 d\mathbb{P} \leq (t - t_0) \int_{t_0}^t \int_U \bar{h}^2(F, \tilde{F}) d\mathbb{P} ds + \varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ and $u \in \overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(S^2(F))$ are arbitrary, and noting (4.7), we can first take a “sup” in the inequality above and then let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to conclude that (4.4) holds, proving the theorem. \blacksquare

Remark 4.4. A main technical point in this proof, compared to the compact case, is the application of Banach-Saks-Mazur theorem. In fact, in the compact case, the set $\overline{\text{dec}}_{\mathcal{F}_t} J_{t_0, t}(\tilde{F})$ is always bounded since both $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T h^2(F_s, 0) ds]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T h^2(\tilde{F}_s, 0) ds]$ are finite. The assumption $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T h^2(F_s, \tilde{F}_s) ds] < \infty$ is obviously much weaker. \blacksquare

Setting $\tilde{F} = C$ in Theorem 4.3 and noting that $\int_{t_0}^t C = C$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.5. Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T h(F_t, C) dt] < \infty$. Then for any $0 \leq t_0 < t \leq T$, it holds that

$$h^2\left(\int_{t_0}^t F_s ds, C\right) \leq (t - t_0) \int_{t_0}^t h^2(F_s, C) ds, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

To conclude this section, let us consider, similar to the spaces in (3.4), the following spaces of \mathbb{F} -nonanticipative set-valued mappings:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{L}_{C, \mathbb{F}}([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) := \{F \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)) : F_t \in L_C, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, t \in [0, T]\}; \\ \mathbb{L}_{C, \mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) := \{F \in \mathbb{L}_{C, \mathbb{F}}([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) : \mathbb{E}[\int_0^T h^2(F_s, C) ds] < \infty\}. \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

Proposition 4.6. Let $F \in \mathbb{L}_{C, \mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $\int_0^t F_s ds \in \mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t)$, $t \in [0, T]$. Furthermore, the process $\{\int_0^t F_s ds\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ has Hausdorff continuous paths, \mathbb{P} -a.s.

Proof. Let $F \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega)$. We first argue the adaptedness of the indefinite integral. Fix $t \in [0, T]$, by definition of Lebesgue set-valued integral, it is clear that $\int_0^t F_s ds$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -measurable set-valued random variable. Furthermore, since C is a convex cone containing $\mathbf{0}$, we have $\int_0^t C ds = Ct = C$. This, together with the fact that $F_t \in L_C$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. $t \in [0, T]$, yields

$$\int_0^t F_s ds \oplus C = \int_0^t F_s ds \oplus \int_0^t C ds = \int_0^t (F_s \oplus C) ds = \int_0^t F_s ds.$$

Moreover, by definition (4.12) and Corollary 4.5 we have $\mathbb{E}[h^2(\int_0^t F_s ds, C)] \leq t\mathbb{E}[\int_0^t h^2(F_s, C) ds] < \infty$. Thus $\int_0^t F_s ds \in \mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t)$, $t \in [0, T]$.

To see the continuity, let $0 \leq t_0 < t \leq T$. By Theorem 4.1, Propositions 4.2, 4.6, Corollary 4.5, and properties of Hausdorff metric, we have, \mathbb{P} -almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned} h^2\left(\int_0^t F_s ds, \int_0^{t_0} F_s ds\right) &= h^2\left(\int_0^{t_0} F_s ds \oplus \int_{t_0}^t F_s ds, \int_0^{t_0} F_s ds \oplus C\right) \\ &\leq h^2\left(\int_0^{t_0} F_s ds + \int_{t_0}^t F_s ds, \int_0^{t_0} F_s ds + C\right) \\ &\leq h^2\left(\int_{t_0}^t F_s ds, C\right) \leq (t - t_0) \int_0^T h^2(F_s, C) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $h^2(\int_0^t F_s ds, \int_0^{t_0} F_s ds) \rightarrow 0$, as $|t - t_0| \rightarrow 0$, proving the result. \blacksquare

5 Set-Valued SDEs with Unbounded Coefficients

In this section, we consider stochastic differential equations of the form:

$$X_t = \xi \oplus \int_0^t F(s, X_s) ds \oplus \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ X dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0)$ and F, \mathcal{G} are set-valued mappings taking values in $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (hence possibly unbounded), which we now describe.

Definition 5.1. A mapping $F : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow L_C$ is called a non-anticipating Carathéodory set-valued random field if it enjoys the following properties:

- (i) $F \in \mathcal{L}^0([0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d; L_C)$;
- (ii) For fixed $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $F(\cdot, \cdot, a) \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$; and
- (iii) For \mathbb{P} -a.s. $\omega \in \Omega$, $F(\cdot, \omega, \cdot)$ is a Carathéodory set-valued function.

Furthermore, for a given non-anticipating Carathéodory set-valued random field F , we define, with a slight abuse of notations, its set-to-set version $F : [0, T] \times \Omega \times L_C \rightarrow L_C$ by

$$F(t, \omega, A) := \overline{\text{co}}(\cup_{a \in A} F(t, \omega, a)), \quad A \in L_C, \quad (t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega. \quad (5.2)$$

Clearly, if the coefficient F in SDE (5.1) is a non-anticipating Carathéodory set-valued random field of the form (5.2), then it follows from Proposition 2.7 that for any $X \in L_{C,\mathbb{F}}^0([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $F(\cdot, X) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^0([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$. Furthermore, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 5.2. $F : [0, T] \times \Omega \times L_C \rightarrow L_C$ is a non-anticipative Carathéodory random field such that for some constants $\beta > 0$, the following conditions hold:

- (1) $h^2(F(t, \cdot, A), C) \leq \beta(1 + h^2(A, C))$, $A \in L_C$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.;
- (2) $h^2(F(t, \cdot, A), F(t, \cdot, \tilde{A})) \leq \beta h^2(A, \tilde{A})$, $A, \tilde{A} \in L_C$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. ■

Next, we specify the coefficient $\mathcal{G} \circ X$ in (5.1). We note that in SDE (5.1) the stochastic integral is defined in Aumann-Itô sense, and we shall try to define the process $\mathcal{G} \circ X$ so that Theorem 2.5 can be applied. We therefore begin with the following definition.

Definition 5.3. A mapping $g : [0, T] \times \Omega \times L_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ is called a non-anticipating Carathéodory random field if it enjoys the following properties:

- (i) $g \in \mathbb{L}^0([0, T] \times \Omega \times L_C; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$;
- (ii) for fixed $A \in L_C$, $g(\cdot, \cdot, A) \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^0([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$; and
- (iii) for fixed (t, ω) , the mapping $A \mapsto g(t, \omega, A)$, is Hausdorff continuous.

Now let us consider the class of sequences $\{g^n\}$ of non-anticipating Carathéodory random fields that further satisfy the following uniform Lipschitz condition.

Assumption 5.4. There exist $\alpha_n > 0$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 < \infty$, and

- (1) $|g^n(t, \cdot, C)| \leq \alpha_n$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.;
- (2) $|g^n(t, \cdot, A) - g^n(t, \omega, \tilde{A})| \leq \alpha_n h(A, \tilde{A})$, $A, \tilde{A} \in L_C$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. ■

We remark that Assumption 5.4 implies the following growth condition.

$$|g^n(t, \cdot, A)| \leq \alpha_n(1 + h(A, C)), \quad A \in L_C. \quad (5.3)$$

Furthermore, if $G := \{g^n\}$ is a sequence of non-anticipating Carathéodory random fields satisfying Assumption 5.4, and $X \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$, then in light of Theorem 2.7, for each n the mapping $g^n \circ X \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^0([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$, where $(g^n \circ X)(t, \omega) := g^n(t, \omega, X(t, \omega))$, $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$. Furthermore, since $X \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T h^2(X_t, C) dt] < \infty$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |(g^n \circ X)(t, \cdot)|^2 dt\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 [1 + h^2(X(t, \cdot), C)] dt\right] \\ &= \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T [1 + h^2(X(t, \cdot), C)] dt\right] < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

In what follows, for $G = \{g^n\}$ and $X \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ as above we denote $\mathcal{G} \circ X := \overline{\text{co}}\{g^n \circ X : n \geq 1\} = \overline{\text{co}}(G \circ X)$, then the Aumann-Itô integral $\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ X dB_s = \overline{\text{co}}[\int_0^t G \circ X dB_s]$ is well-defined for each $t \in [0, T]$, and it follows from Theorem 2.5 that the process of indefinite integrals $\{\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ X dB_s\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ has Hausdorff continuous paths.

Our main result of the well-posedness for set-valued SDE (5.1) is the following theorem.

Theorem 5.5. *Assume that the Assumptions 5.2 and 5.4 hold for the coefficients F and \mathcal{G} , respectively. Then, for each $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -valued random variable $\xi \in \mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0)$, there exists a unique convex, (Hausdorff) continuous process $X = (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, such that (5.1) holds \mathbb{P} -a.s.*

Proof. We follow the standard Picard iteration: let $Y^{(0)} \equiv \xi$, and for $k \geq 0$, we define

$$Y_t^{(k+1)} := \xi \oplus \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)}) ds \oplus \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.5)$$

We first claim that for each $k \geq 0$, $Y^{(k)} \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and has Hausdorff continuous paths. Indeed, since $\xi \in \mathbb{L}_C^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0; \mathbb{R}^d)$, the claim is trivial for $k = 0$. Now assume that the claim is true for $Y^{(k)}$. Then, by using Assumptions 5.2, 5.4, along with the estimates similar to (5.4) and an induction argument, one can easily check that $F(\cdot, Y^{(k)}) \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} \in \mathbb{L}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$. Then by Proposition 4.6 and Theorem 2.5, we further deduce that all the indefinite integrals $\int_0^t F(s, Y^{(k)}) ds$ and $\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} dB_s$, $t \in [0, T]$, are well-defined \mathbb{F} -adapted set-valued processes with Hausdorff continuous paths. Thus so is $Y^{(k+1)}$.

To show that $Y^{(k+1)} \in \mathbb{L}_{C,\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$, it remains to check $h(Y_t^{(k+1)}, C) < \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. To see this, let $t \in [0, T]$ be fixed, then noting (2.5) and the fact that C is a cone, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, C)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\xi \oplus \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)}) ds \oplus \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} dB_s, C\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\xi + \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)}) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ \xi dB_s, C + C + \{0\}\right)\right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\xi + \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)}) ds, C + C\right)\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} dB_s, \{0\}\right)\right] \\ &\leq 4\mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)] + 4\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)}) ds, C\right)\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} dB_s, \{0\}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Note that, by Corollary 4.5 and the inductual assumption, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)}) ds, C\right)\right] \leq t\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t h^2(F(s, Y_s^{(k)}), C) ds\right] < \infty. \quad (5.7)$$

Moreover, by [19, Theorem 5.4.2] and Assumption 5.4, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} dB_s, \{0\}\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |g^n \circ Y_s^{(k)}|^2 ds\right] < \infty. \quad (5.8)$$

Combining (5.6)-(5.8) we obtain $\mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, C)] < \infty$, $t \in [0, T]$, whence the claim.

Next, let us estimate $\mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)})]$, for $k \geq 0$. Again, recall (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)})] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\xi + \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)})ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)}dB_s, \xi + \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k-1)})ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k-1)}dB_s\right)\right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)})ds, \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k-1)})ds\right)\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)}dB_s, \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k-1)}dB_s\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Now, applying Theorem 4.3 and using the Assumption 5.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)})ds, \int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k-1)})ds\right)\right] \leq T\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t h^2(F(s, Y_s^{(k)}), F(s, Y_s^{(k-1)}))ds\right] \\ & \leq T\beta\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)})ds\right] = T\beta\int_0^t \mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)})]ds. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Furthermore, by [19, Theorem 5.4.2]) and Assumption 5.4 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)}dB_s, \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k-1)}dB_s\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left|\int_0^t [g^n \circ Y^{(k)} - g^n \circ Y^{(k-1)}]dB_s\right|^2\right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t \alpha_n h^2(Y^{(k)}, Y^{(k-1)})ds\right] = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n\right) \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[h^2(Y^{(k)}, Y^{(k-1)})]ds. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Combining (5.9)-(5.11) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)})] \leq 2\left[T\beta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n\right] \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)})]ds. \quad (5.12)$$

Since $Y(0) \equiv \xi$, by Assumptions 5.2 and 5.4 we can easily check that

$$\mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(1)}, Y_t^{(0)})] \leq 2\left[\beta T + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n\right](1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)])t, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.13)$$

Repeatedly applying (5.12) and noting (5.13), an induction argument leads to that

$$\mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)})] \leq M^{k+1}(1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)])\frac{t^{k+1}}{(k+1)!}, \quad (5.14)$$

where $M := 2[T\beta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n]$. Now consider the complete metric space $(\mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t), d)$ in Theorem 3.6. In terms of the metric d we see that (5.14) implies that, for $m > n$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(Y_t^{(m)}, Y_t^{(n)}) & \leq \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} d(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)}) = \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} (\mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)})])^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq (1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)])^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \left(\frac{M^{k+1}t^{k+1}}{(k+1)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m, n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\{Y_t^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t), d)$. Thus there exists $Y_t \in \mathbb{L}_C(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t)$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d(Y_t, Y_t^{(k)}) = 0$. We shall argue that the limit Y has Hausdorff continuous paths. More precisely, we claim that $\{Y^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to Y uniformly on $[0, T]$. Indeed, denoting $\Delta^{(k)} g^n(t, \cdot) := g^n(t, Y_t^{(k)}) - g^n(t, Y_t^{(k-1)})$, $\Delta^{(k)}(h \circ F)(t, \cdot) := h(F(t, Y_t^{(k)}), F(t, Y_t^{(k-1)}))$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and applying Theorem 4.3 we can easily show that, for any $k \geq 0$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)}) &\leq 2 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} t \int_0^t [\Delta^{(k)}(h \circ F)]^2(s, \cdot) ds + 2 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \int_0^t [\Delta^{(k)} g^n(s, \cdot)] dB_s \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2T\beta \int_0^T h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)}) ds + 2 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \int_0^t [\Delta^{(k)} g^n(s, \cdot)] dB_s \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

Here the second inequality above is due to Assumption 5.2. Thus, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)}) > \frac{1}{2^k}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(2T\beta \int_0^T h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)}) ds > \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(2 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \int_0^t [\Delta^{(k)} g^n(s, \cdot)] dB_s \right|^2 > \frac{1}{2^k}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Now, by Markov's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(2T\beta \int_0^T h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)}) ds > \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \leq 2^{k+1} T \beta \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)}) ds\right]. \quad (5.17)$$

Furthermore, by Burkholder-Davis-Gundy's inequality, for some $K > 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(2 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \int_0^t [\Delta^{(k)} g^n(s, \cdot)] dB_s \right|^2 > \frac{1}{2^k}\right) &\leq 2^{k+1} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t [\Delta^{(k)} g^n(s, \cdot)] dB_s \right|^2\right] \\ &\leq 2^{k+1} K \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T |\Delta^{(k)} g^n(s, \cdot)|^2 ds\right] \leq 2^{k+1} K \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)}) ds\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

Combining (5.16)-(5.18) and noting (5.14) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} h^2(Y_t^{k+1}, Y_t^{(k)}) > \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \\ &\leq 2^{k+1} T \beta \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)}) ds\right] + 2^{k+1} K \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)}) ds\right] \\ &= 2^{k+1} \left[T\beta + K \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n\right] \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s^{(k-1)})] ds \\ &\leq 2^{k+1} \left[T\beta + K \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n\right] (1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)]) \frac{M^k T^{k+1}}{(k+1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Therefore, we conclude that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} h^2(Y_t^{(k+1)}, Y_t^{(k)}) > \frac{1}{2^k}) < \infty$. A standard argument using the Borel-Cantelli lemma then yields that the sequence $\{Y_t^{(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly on $[0, T]$ to the $Y \in \mathbb{L}_{C, \mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., and thus Y has (Hausdorff) continuous paths.

Finally, the similar argument shows that, for fixed $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[h^2 \left(\int_0^t F(s, Y_s^{(k)}) ds, \int_0^t F(s, Y_s) ds \right) \right] + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[h^2 \left(\int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y^{(k)} dB_s, \int_0^t \mathcal{G} \circ Y dB_s \right) \right] \\ & \leq \left[T\beta + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \right] \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t h^2(Y_s^{(k)}, Y_s) ds \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is, Y satisfies the SDE (5.1). The argument of the uniqueness can be carried out in a similar manner, we leave it to the interested reader. \blacksquare

To end this section, we give the following *stability* results of the solution to the SDE (5.1).

Proposition 5.6. *Assume that Assumptions 5.2 and 5.4 are in force, and let X be the solution to SDE (5.1). Then for any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, it holds that*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} h^2(X_t, C)] \leq K_T (1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)]); \\ \mathbb{E}[h^2(X_t, X_s)] \leq K_T (1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)])(t - s). \end{cases} \quad (5.20)$$

where $K_T > 0$ is a generic constant depending only on T , β in Assumption 5.2, and $\{\alpha_n\}$ in Assumption 5.4.

Proof. The proof is fairly standard by now. We only give a sketch. First, in what follows let us denote K_T to be a generic constant depending only on T , β , and $\{\alpha_n\}$, which is allowed to vary from line to line. Then, similar to (5.6) we have, for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} h^2(X_s, C) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} h^2 \left(\left\{ \xi \oplus \int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau \oplus \int_0^s \mathcal{G} \circ X dB_\tau \right\}, C \right) \right] \\ & \leq 4 \left\{ \mathbb{E} [h^2(\xi, C)] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} h^2 \left(\int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau, C \right) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} h^2 \left(\int_0^s (\mathcal{G} \circ X)_\tau dB_\tau, \{\mathbf{0}\} \right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

By Theorem 4.3 and Assumption 5.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} h^2 \left(\int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau, C \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} s \int_0^s h^2(F(\tau, X_\tau), C) d\tau \right] \\ & \leq K_T \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t (1 + h^2(X_\tau, C)) d\tau \right] \leq K_T \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \sup_{s \leq \tau} h^2(X_s, C) d\tau \right] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

Similarly, by Assumption 5.4 and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} h^2 \left(\int_0^s (\mathcal{G} \circ X)_\tau dB_\tau, \{\mathbf{0}\} \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \leq t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \int_0^s (g^n \circ X)_\tau dB_\tau \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t |(g^n \circ X)_\tau|^2 d\tau \right] \leq K_T \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \sup_{s \leq \tau} h^2(X_s, C) d\tau \right] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Combining (5.21)-(5.23) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \leq t} h^2(X_s, C)\right] \leq K_T \left(1 + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \leq \tau} h^2(X_s, C)\right] d\tau\right), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

The first inequality in (5.20) then follows from the Gronwall inequality. To see the second inequality of (5.20) we note that, for $0 \leq s < t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[h^2(X_t, X_s)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau \oplus \int_0^t (\mathcal{G} \circ X) dB_\tau, \int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau \oplus \int_0^s (\mathcal{G} \circ X) dB_\tau\right)\right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau, \int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau\right)\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t (\mathcal{G} \circ X) dB_\tau, \int_0^s (\mathcal{G} \circ X) dB_\tau\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

Now applying Proposition 4.6 and noting the first inequality of (5.20) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau, \int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau + \int_s^t F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau, \int_0^s F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau + C\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_s^t F(\tau, X_\tau) d\tau, C\right)\right] \leq T\mathbb{E}\left[\int_s^t h^2(F(\tau, X_\tau), C) d\tau\right] \leq (t-s)K_T(1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)]). \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[h^2\left(\int_0^t (\mathcal{G} \circ X) dB_\tau, \int_0^s (\mathcal{G} \circ X) dB_\tau\right)\right] \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_s^t |g^n(\tau, X_\tau)|^2 d\tau\right] \\ &\leq K_T \mathbb{E}\left[\int_s^t (1 + h^2(X_\tau, C)) d\tau\right] \leq (t-s)K_T \left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq \tau \leq T} h^2(X_\tau, C)\right]\right) \\ &\leq (t-s)K_T(1 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(\xi, C)]). \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

Combining (5.24)-(5.26) we derive the second inequality of (5.20). The proof is now complete. \blacksquare

6 Connections to SDIs and Applications

The theoretical framework we have established in the previous sections can be used to study the *Stochastic Differential Inclusions* (SDI) with unbounded coefficients which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been systematically investigated. In fact, the interplay between the solutions to SDIs and those of SVSDEs, as well as some applications of SDIs in the so-called continuous time *Super-hedging* theory was one of the main motivations of this study. In this section we shall give a brief discussion on these issues, and we refer to our forthcoming work [1] for a more detailed study of the aspects in finance.

Let us begin with the description of an SDI associated with the SVSDE (5.1). Let $F : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow L_C$ and $\{g^n : n \geq 1\}$ be a family of functions $g^n : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ satisfying the following *Standing Assumptions*:

Assumption 6.1. *The functions F and $\{g^n\}$ are non-anticipative Carathéodory random fields such that:*

(i) *there exists $\beta > 0$, such that for fixed $t \in [0, T]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $A \in L_C$, it holds that*

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{x \in A} h^2(F(t, \omega, x), C) \leq \beta(1 + h^2(A, C)), \\ h^2(F(t, \omega, x), F(t, \omega, y)) \leq \beta|x - y|, \end{cases} \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega. \quad (6.1)$$

(ii) *there exist constants $\alpha_n > 0$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 < \infty$, and for fixed $t \in [0, T]$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that*

$$|g^n(t, \omega, x)| \leq \alpha_n, \quad |g^n(t, \omega, x) - g^n(t, \cdot, y)| \leq \alpha_n|x - y|, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega. \quad (6.2)$$

Assuming that F and $\{g^n\}$ are Carathéodory (set-valued) random fields satisfying Assumption 6.1, and for a given process $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times m})$, we define $(\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbf{x})_t := \overline{\text{co}}\{(g^n \circ \mathbf{x})_t : n \geq 1\}$. Then, by Theorem 2.5, the Aumann-Itô indefinite integral $\{\int_0^t (\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbf{x}) dB\}$ is well-defined and has (Hausdorff) continuous paths. We can now consider the the SDI in the following sense.

Definition 6.2. *A process $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2([0, T] \times \Omega; \mathbb{R}^d)$ is said to be a solution to a Stochastic Differential Inclusion if*

(i) *\mathbf{x} has continuous paths; and*

(ii) *the following relations holds:*

$$\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_0 \in \int_0^t F(s, \mathbf{x}_s) ds \oplus \int_0^t (\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbf{x}) dB_s, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (6.3)$$

The SDI (6.3) is closely related to the SDE studied in the previous section. For example, let F and $\{g^n\}$ be the Carathéodory random fields satisfying Assupmtion 6.1, and let us define

$$\overline{F}(t, \omega, A) := \overline{\text{co}}[\cup_{x \in A} F(t, \omega, x)], \quad \overline{g}^n(t, \omega, A) := \sup_{x \in A} g^n(t, \omega, x), \quad (t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega, \quad A \in L_C.$$

Here $\sup_{x \in A} g^n(\cdot, \cdot, x) := (\sup_{x \in A} g_{ij}^n(\cdot, \cdot, x))_{i,j=1}^{d,m}$. We claim that the mappings \overline{F} and $\overline{G} := \{\overline{g}^n\}$ are Carathéodory set-valued random fields satisfying Assumptions 5.2 and 5.4, respectively. Indeed, note that by Assumptions 6.1-(2) we have

$$h^2(\overline{F}(t, \omega, A), C) \leq h^2(\cup_{x \in A} F(t, \omega, x), C) \leq \sup_{x \in A} h^2(F(t, \omega, x), C) \leq \beta(1 + h^2(A, C)) < \infty. \quad (6.4)$$

Furthermore, since $F(t, \omega, x) \in L_C$, we have $F(t, \omega, x) = F(t, \omega, x) \oplus C$. Thus,

$$\overline{F}(t, \omega, A) = \overline{\text{co}}[\cup_{x \in A}(F(t, \omega, x) \oplus C)] = \overline{\text{co}}(\cup_{x \in A} F(t, \omega, x)) \oplus C = \overline{F}(t, \omega, A) \oplus C. \quad (6.5)$$

Here in the above we used the fact that $\overline{\text{co}}(C) = C$. Clearly, (6.4) and (6.5) imply that \overline{F} is a non-anticipative Carathéodory L_C -valued random field defined on $[0, T] \times \Omega \times L_C$, and that Assumption 5.2-(1) holds. Moreover, Assumption 5.2-(2) follows from (6.1) and [18, Lemma (4.1,1)]. To see Assumption 5.4, we note that (6.2) implies that $|\overline{g}^n(t, \cdot, A)| \leq \sup_{x \in A} |g^n(t, \cdot, x)| \leq \alpha_n$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., whence Assumption 5.4-(1). To verify Assumption 5.4-(2), we first note that all Euclidean norms on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ are equivalent, so we shall use the “maximum” norm on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, that is, $|M| := \max_{i,j} |M_{i,j}|$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$. Now let $A, \tilde{A} \in L_C$, then, for any $x \in A$, $y \in \tilde{A}$, by (6.2) we have

$$g_{ij}^n(t, \omega, x) \leq g_{ij}^n(t, \omega, y) + \alpha_n |x - y| \leq \bar{g}_{ij}^n(t, \omega, \tilde{A}) + \alpha_n |x - y|, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

Since $x \in A$, $y \in \tilde{A}$, and i, j are arbitrary, it is readily seen that the inequality above yields

$$\bar{g}_{ij}^n(t, \omega, A) = \sup_{x \in A} g_{ij}^n(t, \omega, x) \leq \bar{g}_{ij}^n(t, \omega, \tilde{A}) + \alpha_n \bar{h}(A, \tilde{A}). \quad (6.6)$$

Switching the position of A and \tilde{A} in (6.6) and recalling the definition of the maximum norm we see that $\{\bar{g}^n\}$ satisfies Assumption 5.4-(2).

We can then consider the following set-valued SDE:

$$X_t = \xi \oplus \int_0^t \overline{F}(s, X_s) ds \oplus \int_0^t (\bar{G} \circ X) dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (6.7)$$

which is well-posed, thanks to Theorem 5.5.

Remark 6.3. The connection between the solutions to SDI (6.3) and the selectors of the solution to SDE (6.7) is an interesting issue. In the compact coefficient case, it is known that there exists at least one solution to the SDI that is also a selector of the solution to SDE (cf. [18]). It would be interesting to see if an analogue for SDI (6.3) and SDE (6.7) remains true, but the arguments are actually quite subtle due to the unboundedness (whence non-compactness) of the coefficients. We prefer to pursue it in our future publications. ■

To end this section we shall give an example in finance that actually motivated this work. More precisely, we extend some well-known concepts regarding *super-hedging problems with transaction costs* (cf. e.g., [5, 15, 22]) to a continuous-time framework, and show how this would lead to an SDI whose drift coefficients will contain the so-called *solvency cone*. whence L_C -valued, and thus unbounded. We begin by a market model proposed in [5], which we now describe.

Consider a financial market consisting of one risky asset S and one riskless asset B whose dynamics are given by

$$\begin{cases} dS_t = S_t[b_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t], & S(0) = p \in (0, \infty); \\ dB_t = r_t B_t dt, & B_0 = 1. \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

A *trading strategy* is a pair (L, M) of \mathbb{F} -adapted, nondecreasing processes with $L_0 = M_0 = 0$, where L_t (resp. M_t) represent the total amount of funds transferred from B to S (resp. from S to B). We shall consider the case where there exist (proportional) transition costs in both directions, and denote $0 < \lambda < 1$ to be the proportion of the cost from B to S , and $0 < \mu < 1$ be that from S to B . Assuming that all the transaction costs are charged/deposited to the bank (riskless asset) account, then given initial holdings (x, y) and a trading strategy (L, M) , we denote *portfolio process*, representing the amount of funds in the riskless and risky assets, by $X = X^{x, L, M}$ and $Y = Y^{y, L, M}$, respectively. Then (X, Y) should have the dynamics: for $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = r_t X_t dt - (1 + \lambda)dL_t + (1 - \mu)dM_t, & X_0 = x; \\ dY_t = Y_t[b_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t] + dL_t - dM_t, & Y_0 = y. \end{cases} \quad (6.9)$$

Let us now describe the problem in terms of the *Solvency Cone* proposed in [15, 16] and [22]. We begin by considering two assets, still denoted by B and S , respectively, but without requiring B being riskless. In order that our argument can be extended to more assets, let us denote π_t^{12} to be the number of units of B that can be exchanged for one share of S at time t (including its transaction cost). That is, we have, \mathbb{P} -a.s.,

$$\pi_t^{12} B_t = (1 + \lambda) S_t \quad \text{or} \quad \pi_t^{12} = (1 + \lambda) \frac{S_t}{B_t}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (6.10)$$

Similarly, we let π_t^{21} denote the number of shares of S that can be exchanged for one unit of B at time t (including its transaction cost), so that the following identities hold:

$$\pi_t^{21} S_t = \frac{1}{1 - \mu} B_t \quad \text{or} \quad \pi_t^{21} = \frac{1}{1 - \mu} \frac{B_t}{S_t}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (6.11)$$

Now let us define $\pi_t^{11} = \pi_t^{22} \equiv 1$ and consider the matrix-valued process $\Pi_t := (\pi_t^{ij})_{i,j=1}^2$, $t \in [0, T]$. Clearly, the components π_t^{ij} satisfy the following properties:

$$\pi_t^{ij} > 0, i, j = 1, 2; \quad \pi_t^{11} = \pi_t^{22} = 1; \quad \pi_t^{12} \pi_t^{21} > 1, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (6.12)$$

We shall follow [15, 22] and call any matrix Π satisfying (6.12) the *bid-ask matrix*, and the process $\Pi = (\Pi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ taking values in bid-ask matrices the *bid-ask process*. Next we defined the so-called *Solvency Cone* associated with the bid-ask process $\Pi = (\Pi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$. Recall that for a given set

of vectors $\{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, a cone generated by $\{\xi^i\}_{i=1}^n$ is define by $K := \text{cone}\{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^n\} = \{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \xi^i : \alpha_i \geq 0\}$. Now for a given bid-ask process $\Pi_t = \{\pi_t^{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^2$, $t \in [0, T]$, we define

$$K(\Pi_t) := \text{cone}\{e^1, e^2, \pi_t^{12}e^1 - e^2, \pi_t^{21}e^2 - e^1\} = \text{cone}\{(1, 0), (0, 1), (\pi_t^{12}, -1), (-1, \pi_t^{21})\}. \quad (6.13)$$

Note that by (6.10) and (6.11), $\pi_t^{12} = (1 + \lambda)\frac{S_t}{B_t} > 0$, and $\pi_t^{21} = \frac{1}{1-\mu}\frac{B_t}{S_t} > 0$, we see that $(0, 1), (1, 0) \in \text{cone}\{(\pi_t^{12}, -1), (-1, \pi_t^{21})\}$, therefore, using the conic properties we can easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} K(\Pi_t) &= \text{cone}\left\{\left((1 + \lambda)\frac{S_t}{B_t}, -1\right), \left(-1, \frac{1}{1-\mu}\frac{B_t}{S_t}\right)\right\} = \text{cone}\left\{\left((1 + \lambda)\frac{1}{B_t}, -\frac{1}{S_t}\right), \left(-(1 - \mu)\frac{1}{B_t}, \frac{1}{S_t}\right)\right\} \\ &= \left\{\left((1 + \lambda)\frac{\alpha}{B_t} - (1 - \mu)\frac{\beta}{B_t}, \frac{\beta - \alpha}{S_t}\right) : \alpha, \beta \geq 0\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

Now let us change the unit of the portfolio process (X, Y) in (6.9) to “number of shares” and denote $h_t^1 = X_t/B_t$, $h_t^2 = Y_t/S_t$, $t \in [0, T]$. We shall call $h_t = (h_t^1, h_t^2)$, $t \in [0, T]$, the *unit portfolio process*, and we have the following “inclusion” result.

Proposition 6.4. *Assume that the portfolio process (X, Y) satisfies (6.9), and the price process (B, S) satisfies (6.8). Assume further that there exists a rate process $\theta = (\theta_t^L, \theta_t^M)_{t \in [0, T]}$, such that $\theta_t^L \geq 0, \theta_t^M \geq 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., and that the trading strategy (L, M) satisfies $L_t = \int_0^t \theta_r^L dr$ and $M_t = \int_0^t \theta_r^M ds$, $t \in [0, T]$. Then, the corresponding unit portfolio process $h = (h^1, h^2)$ satisfies the following relation \mathbb{P} -almost surely:*

$$h_t = (h_t^1, h_t^2) \in (x, y/p) + \int_0^t [-K(\Pi_s)]ds, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (6.15)$$

Proof. First, by Itô's formula and some simple calculation, we have

$$\begin{cases} dh_t^1 = d(X_t B_t^{-1}) = B_t^{-1}[-(1 + \lambda)dL_t + (1 - \mu)dM_t], & h_0^1 = x; \\ dh_t^2 = d(Y_t S_t^{-1}) = S_t^{-1}[-dM_t + dL_t], & h_0^2 = y/p. \end{cases} \quad (6.16)$$

Since $d(L_t, M_t) = (\theta_t^L, \theta_t^M)dt$ by assumption, we can write (6.16) as

$$\begin{aligned} h_t &= (h_t^1, h_t^2) = (x, y/p) - \left((1 + \lambda) \int_0^t \frac{\theta_s^L}{B_s} ds - (1 - \mu) \int_0^t \frac{\theta_s^M}{B_s} ds, \int_0^t \frac{\theta_s^M - \theta_s^L}{S_s} ds\right) \\ &= (x, y/p) - \int_0^t \left((1 + \lambda)\frac{\theta_s^L}{B_s} - (1 - \mu)\frac{\theta_s^M}{B_s}, \frac{\theta_s^M - \theta_s^L}{S_s}\right) ds, \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.17)$$

Since $\theta_t^L \geq 0, \theta_t^M \geq 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., $t \in [0, T]$, by (6.14) we see that

$$\left((1 + \lambda)\frac{\theta_t^L}{B_t} - (1 - \mu)\frac{\theta_t^M}{B_t}, \frac{\theta_t^M - \theta_t^L}{S_t}\right) \in K(\Pi_t), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Thus (6.15) follows from (6.17). ■

To derive the SDI of type (6.3) let us now consider a deterministic cone:

$$K := \left\{ \left((1 + \lambda)\alpha - (1 - \mu)\beta, \beta - \alpha \right) : \alpha, \beta \geq 0 \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (6.18)$$

Then it is easy to see from (6.14) that $(x, y) \in K$ if and only if $(\frac{x}{B}, \frac{y}{S}) \in K(\Pi)$. Consequently, since $\theta_t^L \geq 0$, $\theta_t^M \geq 0$, we have

$$((1 + \lambda)\theta_t^L - (1 - \mu)\theta_t^M, \theta_t^M - \theta_t^L) \in K, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

We can now rewrite (6.9) as

$$\begin{aligned} (X_t, Y_t) &= (x, y) - \left((1 + \lambda)L_t - (1 - \mu)M_t, M_t - L_t \right) + \left(\int_0^t X_s r_s ds, \int_0^t Y_s [b_s ds + \sigma_s dW_s] \right) \\ &\in (x, y) - \int_0^t K ds + \left(\int_0^t X_s r_s ds, \int_0^t Y_s b_s ds \right) + \left(0, \int_0^t Y_s \sigma_s dW_s \right) \\ &= (x, y) + \int_0^t [(X_s r_s, Y_s b_s) - K] ds + \int_0^t (0, Y_s \sigma_s) dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, this is a set-valued SDI with coefficients:

$$\begin{cases} F(t, \omega, \mathbf{x}) := \text{diag}[r_t(\omega), b_t(\omega)]\mathbf{x} - K; \\ g(t, \omega, \mathbf{x}) := \text{diag}[0, \sigma_t(\omega)]\mathbf{x}, \end{cases} \quad (t, \omega) \in [0, T], \quad \mathbf{x} = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\text{diag}[a, b]$ denotes the 2×2 diagonal matrix with diagonal elements a and b , and $C := K$ is a given and fixed convex cone in \mathbb{R}^2 . Clearly, if the processes r , b and σ are \mathbb{F} -adapted, then F and g satisfy Assumption 6.1. A more general multi-dimensional continuous-time super-hedging problem based on this model will be studied in our forthcoming work [1].

Acknowledgement: We would like to thank Prof. Çağın Ararat for many helpful discussions and suggestions on the subject during his visit to USC.

References

- [1] Almuzani, A., Ararat, Ç., Ma, J., (2023), *Continuous-time Super-hedging problem with transaction Costs*, work in progress.
- [2] Artstein Z. *A calculus for set-valued maps and set-valued evolution equations*, Set-valued Anal. 1995;3: 216-261.
- [3] Bion-Nadal, J., (2009), *Time consistent dynamic risk processes*, Stochastic Processes and Their Applications, **119**, 633–654.

- [4] Coquet, F., Hu, Y., Mémin, J., Peng, S., (2002), *Filtration consistent nonlinear expectations and related g-expectations*, Probability Theory and Related Fields, **123**, 1–27.
- [5] Cvitanic, J., Karatzas, I. (1996). *Hedging and portfolio optimization under transaction costs: A martingale approach*. Mathematical finance, 6(2), 133-165. Chicago.
- [6] De Blasi FS, Iervolino F. ,*Equationi differenziali con a compatto convesso [Differential equations with convex and compact values]*, Boll UMI. 1969;42:47-54.
- [7] De Blasi FS, Brandao AI, Pinto L, et al. *Uniqueness and existence theorems for differential equations with compact convex solutions*, Boll UMI (4). 1970;2:491-501. Diestel, J., (1984), *Sequences and Series in Banach Spaces*, Springer-Verlag New York.
- [8] Feinstein, Z. , Rudloff, B. (2015), *A comparison of techniques for dynamic multivariate risk measures. In Set Optimization and Applications -The State of the Art* (pp. 3-41). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, Chicago.
- [9] Föllmer, H., Schied, A. (2011). *Stochastic finance: an introduction in discrete time*. Walter de Gruyter.
- [10] Goberna, M. A., González, E., Martínez-Legaz, J. E., and Todorov, M. I. (2010). *Motzkin decomposition of closed convex sets*. Journal of mathematical analysis and applications, 364(1), 209-221. Chicago.
- [11] Hamel, A. H., Heyde, F., Rudloff, B., (2011), *Set-valued risk measures for conical market models*, Mathematics and Financial Economics, **5**(1), 1–28.
- [12] Hamel, A. H., Heyde, F., Löhne A., Rudloff B., Schrage C., (2015), *Set optimization - a rather short introduction*, in: A. H. Hamel, F. Heyde, A. Löhne, B. Rudloff, C. Schrage (eds.), *Set optimization and applications - the state of the art. From set relations to set-valued risk measures*, 65–141, Springer-Verlag Berlin.
- [13] Himmelberg, C. J. (1975). *Measurable relations*, Fundam. Chicago.
- [14] Hiriart-Urruty, J. B., Lemaréchal, C. (2013). *Convex analysis and minimization algorithms I: Fundamentals* (Vol. 305). Springer science and business media. Chicago.
- [15] Kabanov, Y. M. (1999). *Hedging and liquidation under transaction costs in currency markets*. Finance and Stochastics, 3, 237-248.

- [16] Kabanov, Y. M., Stricker, C. (2002). *Hedging of contingent claims under transaction costs*. In *Advances in finance and stochastics* (pp. 125-136). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [17] Kisielewicz, M., (2013), *Stochastic Differential Inclusions and Applications*, Springer.
- [18] Kisielewicz, M. and Michta, M., (2016), *Properties of set-valued stochastic differential equations*, Optimization, **65**(12): 2153–2169.
- [19] Kisielewicz, M., (2020), *Set-Valued Stochastic Integrals and Applications*, Springer.
- [20] Pallaschke, D., and Urbański, R., (2010) *On the Separation and Order Law of Cancellation for Bounded Sets*, Optimization, **51**(3), 487-496.
- [21] Rosazza Gianin, E., (2006), *Risk measures via g-expectations*, Insurance Mathematics and Economics **39**, 19–34.
- [22] Schachermayer, W. (2004). *The fundamental theorem of asset pricing under proportional transaction costs in finite discrete time*. Mathematical Finance: An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics, 14(1), 19-48.
- [23] Zygmunt, w. (1994). On superpositional measurability of semi- Carathèodory multifunctions. Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, 35(4), 741-744.