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This paper develops, in a B rownian inform ation setting, an approach for analyzing the preference for inform ation, a question that $m$ otivates the stochastic di erential utility (SDU) due to Du e and Epstein Econom etrica 60 (1992) 353\{394]. For a class of backward stochastic di erential equations (B SD E S) including the generalized SD U 【azrak and Q uenez M ath. Oper. Res. 28 (2003) 154\{180], we form ulate the inform ation neutrality property as an invariance principle when the ltration is coarser (or ner) and characterize it. W e also provide concrete exam ples of heterogeneity in inform ation that illustrate explicitly the nonneutrality property for som e G SD U s.O ur results suggest that, w thin the G SD U s class of intertem poral utilities, risk aversion or am biguity aversion are in exibly linked to the preference for inform ation.

1. Introduction. The study of decision $m$ aking is fundam ental to $m$ any applications in econom ics and nance. The decision $m$ aker typically faces uncertainty about results of an experim ent such as the pro tability of a new product or a nancialstrategy, e cacy of a m onetary policy or a social program, state of health and so on. Since many decades, decision theorists have developed theories and tools which help us to think about decision under uncertainty. T he ultim ate ob jective of this line of literature in social science is to provide explanations of the behavior under uncertainty and to give a rational support for the observable behavior in various contexts.
$T$ his paper studies the preference for inform ation for a speci c class of intertem poral utilities. For a xed consumption horizon $T>0$, a utility

[^0]function is a function $m$ apping the set of ob jects of choice, that is the pairs of state contingent consum ption process $c=f q_{t} ; 0 \quad t \quad T g$ and inform ation Itration $A=f A_{t} ; 0 \quad t \quad T g$ satisfying the usual conditions, into $R$. The question of preference for inform ation consists of analyzing the dependency of a utility function in its tration inform ation argum ent. This speci c question has been greatly sim pli ed w thin the fam iliar context of the von $N$ eum ann $\{M$ orgenstem expected utility function. Speci cally, an expected utility function is de ned by
$$
U_{t}^{A}(c)=E^{Z_{t}} e^{(s)^{t}} V\left(c_{s}\right) d s A_{t} \text {; }
$$
for tim $e t<T, V()$ is the felicity function and the expectation $E$ is conditioned by the tim e $t$ available inform ation $A_{t}$. In fact, the expected utility $m$ odel (1) does not allow for preference for inform ation in the sense that if $A \quad B$ are two Itrations such that both $A_{0}$ and $B_{0}$ are trivial, then $\mathrm{U}_{0}^{A}(\mathrm{c})=\mathrm{U}_{0}^{B}(\mathrm{c})$ for any $A$-adapted consum ption process $c$.

H ow ever, it is often observed that preference for inform ation is relevant in various decision $m$ aking situations. For instance, in $m$ any $m$ edical decisions (choice betw een various form ofprenataldiagnosis such as the am niocentesis or decision to test for diseases such asm ultiple sclerosis), the decision $m$ aker $m$ ust decide whether she $w$ ishes to have the true state of health revealed earlier or later. M ore generally, psychologists have recognized the im portance of the feelings related to the prospect of in form ation acqu isition [see G rant, K a ji i and Polack (1998) and Chew and Ho (1994) and the references cited therein ]. It has been recognized that in form ation acquisition has an extrinsic and an intrinsic m otivation.

The extrinsic $m$ otivation corresponds to the notion that people value inform ation to take appropriate contingents decisions and thus in uence in a favorable way the nal outcom e. For exam ple, certain m edical treatm ents $m$ ay low er the severity of a disease w hich provide an incentive to gather in for$m$ ation about the health state. In an investm ent context for instance, infor$m$ ation enhances the planning and should help to identify nancialstrategies which provide a higher expected pro tability. In particular, for an expected utility $m$ axim izer, Epstein (1980) has show $n$ in an investm ent problem that the prospect of greater future inform ation increases the incentives to m aintain some exibility in order to take advantage of the content of the future inform ation. [Yet, as noted above and clari ed below, the expected utility investors of Epstein (1980) are indi erent to inform ation and are interested in it only for its planning bene ts.]

On the other hand, intrinsic $m$ otivation corresponds to the notion that, planning bene ts notw ithstanding, people like (or dislike) inform ation for its own sake. In other words, intrinsic attitude tow ard inform ation is de ned as individual's direct interest to have access to $m$ ore (or less) in form ation
because they perceive it to be innately satisfying (or unsatisfying). For instance, a decision $m$ aker could be intrinsically inform ation lover because she is anxious and prefer to know earlier the outcom e of any uncertainty (think of the exam ple of a pregnant wom en who decide to do the am niocentesis prenatal diagnosis). A nother decision $m$ aker $m$ ay be intrinsically inform ation averse since he fears a bad outcom e (think to the exam ple of a person who delay a test for disease) or sim ply because he is optim istic and prefers a hopefiul feeling rather than risking a sad new s .

In a pioneering discrete tim e m odel, K reps and Porteus (1978), generalized the von $N$ eum ann $\{\mathrm{M}$ orgenstem expected utility $m$ odel (1) to perm it intrinsic inform ation aversion or in form ation loving. This w ork gave rise to the stochastic di erential utility (SDU) D u e and Epstein (1992) and its discrete tim e counterpart Epstein and Z in (1989)]. T he SD U generalized the expected utility model (1) and is associated with an \intertem poral aggregator" f, a function satisfying appropriate conditions. The SD U is de ned by
(2)

$$
U_{t}^{A}(c)=E{ }_{t}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}} ; \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{A}}(\mathrm{c})\right) \mathrm{ds} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{t}}:
$$

The SD U m odelreduces to the additive $m$ odel (1) when $f$ is linear, $f(c ; u)=$ $v$ (c) u. The SD U was prim arily m otivated by the desire to have som e exibility in the $m$ odeling of the concepts of risk aversion and the concept of consum ption intertem poral substitution. W hile the two concepts were govemed by the sam e param eter in the tim e additive model (1), the SD U allow ed som e separation of these tw o aspects of the preferences. This feature was particularly relevant from an em pirical perspective since it helped to m atch m ore closely consum ption rates data and equity retums data in the US Epstein and Zin (1991)]. At the sam e tim e, unlike the expected utility m odel (1), the SD U m odel (2) exhibits an intrinsic attitude tow ard in form ation. From a $m$ athem atical perspective, intrinsic attitude tow ard inform ation is characterized by the fact that the initial value of the SD U (2) [i.e., $U_{0}^{A}$ (c)] depends not only on consum ption but also on the ltration A.

Building on the discrete tim e approach to intrinsic attitude tow ard inform ation of $K$ reps and Porteus (1978), Skiadas (1998) shows that in the continuous tim e SD U m odel (2), the concavily (convexity) of an intertem poral aggregator $w$ ith respect to its utility argum ent $U$ im plies an intrinsic preference for late (early) resolution of uncertainty. To ilhustrate their point, consider two ltration $F \quad G$ and an intertem poral aggregator $f$ which is concave w ith respect to its utility argum ent U. Then, Jensen's inequality gives,

$$
E\left(U_{t}^{G}(c) F_{t}\right)=E{ }_{t}^{Z} f\left(C_{s} ; U_{S}^{G}(c)\right) d s F_{t}
$$
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${ }_{t} \mathrm{f}\left(C_{s} ; E\left(U_{s}^{G}(c) F_{s}\right)\right) d s F_{t}$;
for any consum ption process $c w h$ ich is progressively $m$ easurable $w$ ith respect to the coarser Itration $F$. Thus the optionalprojection process $E \mathbb{U}:(c)$ ( $F$ : $]$ $m$ aybe interpreted as a sub-solution of the recursion (2) in the setting of the ltration $A=F$ and as such, heuristically, the sub-solution $E \mathbb{U}:(c) F:]$ is sm aller ( $\mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{dt}$ a.s.) than the solution itself U : (c): Unfortunately, while pointing an elegant way of proving out an elegant way of proving a monotonicity of a utility functional $w$ th respect to its ltration argum ent, the $K$ reps $\{$ P orteus\{Skiadas $m$ ethod only provides su cient conditions for preference for early (or late) resolution of uncertainty and no characterization is obtained.

This paper is an attem pt to analyze the question of intrinsic attitude tow ard inform ation $w$ thin a m ore general class of utility functions. W e consider the class of generalized stochastic di erential utility (G SD U ) introduced in Lazrak and Q uenez (2003). It has been shown by Skiadas (2003) and Lazrak and Q uenez (2003) that the G SDU uni es the SDU of Du e and Epstein (1992) and a recent class of intertem poral utility functions. $T$ his class encom passes the portfolio decision $m$ odels of $C$ hen and Epstein (2002) and of A nderson, H ansen and Sargent (1998). These m odels have been introduced w ith the operational ob jective of $m$ odeling the im perfect know ledge of the asset retums probability distribution and its im pact on portfolio decision and asset prices. The ob jective of this paper is to identify the im plicit im plications of these utilities from the angle of the intrinsic attitude tow ard inform ation. M ore speci cally, we took the view that investors have a neutral intrinsic attitude tow ard inform ation (in a sense to be made precise later) and, characterize this property in a context of $B$ row nian infor$m$ ation and under certain assum ptions on the (generalized) intertem poral aggregator. O ur nding suggests that, in general, the inform ation neurality w illnot hold for our class ofG SD U . H ow ever, when inform ation heterogeneIty is such that the B row nian property is preserved under the ner tration, neutrality for inform ation holds.

Therefore, the G SD U s class of utility functions are generally not infor$m$ ation neutral and this suggests that the risk attitudes and the am biguity attitudes are in som e sense confounded w ith the inform ation attitude $w$ ith in th is class of utility functions. C onsequently, any prediction of these $m$ odels for portfolio decision or asset prices is also induced by the extent to which these utilities exhibit preference for in form ation. F inally, our results should be of interest to the literature on the design of risk $m$ easure for institutional investors and nancial institutions [see A rtzner, D elbaen, Eber and H eath (1999), W ang (2000), A rtzner, D elbaen, Eber, H eath and K u (2002) and $R$ iedel (2002)]. In fact, a G SD U is in som e sense a dynam ic risk m easure
and a preference for inform ation $m$ ay be desirable in that context. For instance, in a stock portfolio m anagem ent context, it is possible to have a view about how a risk $m$ easure should depend on the tim ing of in form ation releases on the stock prices. In particular, the G SD U would have then the ability to provide a quantitative prediction of the utility cost of an infor$m$ ation enhancem ent such as an increase of the frequency of the accounting reports of the underlying com panies or perkaps an increase of the coverage of the nancial analysts.
$T$ he paper is organized as follow s. In Section 2 we give the exact setting for two generalized versions of $m$ odel (2), de ne the inform ation neutrality property and give som e m athem atical prerequisites. Section 3 gives some concrete ltrations and utility models encom passed by our form ulation. Section 4 develops som e G SD U com putations for tw o exam ples of heterogeneity in inform ation that ilhustrate the problem. T he rst exam ple (B row nian anticipation) exhibits a situation where inform ation neutrality does not hold. In the second example, the coarser ltration is generated by the absolute value of the B row nian $m$ otion that drives the ner ltration and we w ill see that in this context the inform ation neutrality may hold. In Section 5; we characterize the inform ation neutrality for a class of BSD ES (including G SDUs) which driver depend on intensity $Z$ only through its Euclidean norm kZ k. W e show that the second exam ple of Section 40 ers the only type of inform ation heterogeneity that allow $s$ inform ation neutrality to hold for this class of B SD Es. In Section 6, we conclude.

## 2. The m odel.

2.1. C ontext and de nitions. Let ( ; $;$; ) be a complete probability space and forthe xed timeT; let $\mathcal{F}_{()}=f G_{t} ; 0 \quad t \quad \operatorname{Tg}$ and $\mathrm{F}_{()}=\mathrm{fF} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathbf{0} \quad \mathrm{t} \quad \mathrm{Tg}$ be two ltrations that contain all negligible events and are right-continuous and such that $F_{()}\left(_{G_{()}}\right.$: Furtherm ore, we suppose that the Itration $G_{()}$ (resp. $\mathrm{F}_{(1)}$ ) has a predictable representation property w ith respect to a standard $n$-dim ensional B rownian motions $W^{G}=\left({ }^{1} W^{G} ; W^{2} ;:::_{i}^{n} W^{G}\right)$ [resp. $\left.W^{F}=\left({ }^{1} W^{F},{ }_{2}^{2} W^{F} ;:::_{;}^{n} W^{F}\right)\right]$ : For A 2 fG;F g, each A -localm artingale M can be represented as a stochastic integralw the respect to $W^{A}$, that is, there exists an $A \underset{R_{t}}{\underset{\sim}{p}}$, $M_{t}=M_{0}+{ }_{0}^{R_{t},} d W_{s}^{A}, 0 \quad t \quad T$. In other words, follow ing the $R$ evur and Y or term inology [e.g., R evuz and Y or (1999), page 219], the ltrations $G$ and $F$ are weakly B rownian. A swew ill illustrate w ith som e speci cexam ples in Section 3, there are $m$ any ways of constructing such a couple of ltrations (representing heterogeneous inform ation). It is im portant to notioe at this stage that in general, the process $W^{F}$ is not a B rownian m otion under the ner ltration G.H ow ever, as we shall ilhustrate in Section 3, there are som e
specialspeci cations of the ltrations $G$ and $F$ underwhich the process $W$ F tums out to be a $G$ B row nian motion.
$W$ e shall denote by $P^{G}$ the $G_{()}$predictable - eld and by $P^{F}$ the $\left.F_{()}\right)^{-}$ predictable - eld. W e consider for each integer $p$ the sets $H^{2}\left(G ; R^{p}\right)=$ fX: $[0 ; T] \quad!R^{\mathrm{P}}=\mathrm{X} 2 \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{G}}$ and $\mathrm{E}\left[\mathrm{R}_{0}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{ds}\right]<1 \mathrm{~g}$ and $\mathrm{H}^{2}\left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{F}} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{P}}\right)=$ $H^{2}\left(G ; R^{p}\right) \backslash P^{F}$.

Foreach random variable $2 L^{2}\left(F_{T}\right)$, we de netheBSDE $Y^{G}() 2 H^{2}(G ; R)$ associated to the ltration $G_{()}$as the solution of the recursion

$$
\begin{align*}
& Y_{t}^{G}()=+{ }_{t}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{~h}\left(\mathrm{~s} ;!; \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{G}}() ; \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{G}}(\mathrm{)}) \mathrm{ds}{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{G}}(\mathrm{)}) \mathrm{dW}\right.  \tag{3}\\
& \mathrm{E}
\end{align*}
$$

where the driver $h$ de ned on $[0 ; T] \quad R \quad R^{n} w$ ith values in $R$, s.t. $(\mathrm{h}(\mathrm{t} ; \text { ! } \mathrm{y} \boldsymbol{y} ; \mathrm{z}))_{0} \mathrm{t} \mathrm{T}_{2} \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$ for each $(\mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{z}) 2 \mathrm{R} \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{n}}$ and h satis es the follow ing standing assum ptions.

Standing assum ptions. (A 1) There exists a constant $K 0$ s.t. P -a.s., we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8 t ; 8\left(y_{1} ; y_{2}\right) ; 8\left(z_{1} ; z_{2}\right) \\
& \left.\quad \text { h }\left(s ;!; y_{1} ; z_{1}\right) \quad h\left(s ;!; y_{2} ; z_{2}\right) j \text { K ( } \sum_{1} \quad y_{2} j+k z_{1} \quad z_{2} k\right):
\end{aligned}
$$

(A 2) $T$ he process $(h(t ;!; 0 ; 0))_{0} t$ belongs to $H^{2}(F ; R)$ :
$N$ ote that the process $Z^{G}() 2 H^{2}\left(G ; R^{n}\right)$ is part of the solution of (3) and we call it the intensity associated to the BSDE (3).

Sim ilarly, we de ne the BSDE Y ${ }^{\mathrm{F}}\left(\mathrm{)} 2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})\right.$ associated to the ltration $\mathrm{F}_{( }$) as the solution of the BSDE

$$
\begin{align*}
& Y_{t}^{F}()=+{ }_{t}^{Z} h\left(s ;!; Y_{s}^{F}() ; Z_{s}^{F}()\right) d s \quad{ }_{t}^{T} Z_{s}^{F}() \quad d W_{S}^{F}  \tag{4}\\
& \mathrm{E}+\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~h}\left(\mathrm{~s} ;!; \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{F}}\left(\mathrm{)} ; \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{F}}(\mathrm{)}) \mathrm{ds} \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{t}}:\right.\right.
\end{align*}
$$

W ew illalso be interested by a second class ofB SD E s, G SD U , an extension ofD $u$ e and Epstein (1992) m odelofSD U that hasbeen proposed in Lazrak and $Q$ uenez (2003). For any gìven contingent consum ption plan, a process $\mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$, the $\mathrm{GSDU} \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{G}}$ (c) $2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{G} ; \mathrm{R})$ associated to the Itration $\left.\mathrm{G}_{( }\right)$ solves the recursion
(5)
where the intertem poral aggregator $f$ de ned on $[0 ; T] \quad R \quad R \quad R^{n}$ w ith values in $R$, s.t. ( $\left.f\left(t_{;} q_{i} y ; z\right)\right)_{0} t \mathrm{t}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$ for each $(\mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{z}) 2 \mathrm{R} \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{n}}$ and f satis es the follow ing standing assum ptions:

Standing assum ptions. (B1) There exists a constant $K \quad 0$ s.t., $P$-a.s., for all relevant ( $\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{Y}_{1} ; \mathrm{Y}_{2} ; \mathrm{z}_{1} ; \mathrm{z}_{2}$ ) we have

$$
\text { 迁 }\left(t ; C ; Y_{1} ; z_{1}\right) \quad f\left(t_{;} ; \boldsymbol{C} Y_{2} ; z_{2}\right) j \quad K\left(\dot{\underline{y}}_{1} \quad y_{2} j+k_{1} \quad z_{2} k\right):
$$

(B2) $T$ here exists som epositive constants $k_{1} ; \mathrm{k}_{2}$ and $0<\mathrm{p}<1$ s.t. ff $(t ; c ; 0 ; 0) j$ $k_{1}+k_{2} c^{p}$

In fact, $\mathrm{D} u$ e and Epstein (1992) de ne SD U of the form (5) in a context w here the intertem poral aggregator is essentially independent of $z$; and thus we shall call this case the classical SD U .

W ede ne aswell the G SD U associated to the Itration F ( ) as the solution of the BSD E
(6)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{t}^{F}(c)={ }_{t}^{Z} f\left(s ; c ; U_{s}^{F}(c) ; V_{s}^{F} \text { (c))ds }{ }_{t}^{T} V_{S}^{F} \text { (c) } d W_{S}^{F}\right. \\
& E \quad{ }_{t} \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{~s} ; \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{S}} ; \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{S}}^{\mathrm{F}} \text { (c); } \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{S}}^{\mathrm{F}} \text { (c)) ds } \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

for each $\mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$.
$N$ ote that the intertem poral aggregator $f$ is a determ inistic function of ( $\mathrm{t} \boldsymbol{\prime} \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{z}$ ) and thus the G SD U m odel (5) is a special case of the B SD E m odel (3) that is obtained form ally by setting $=0$ and $h(t ;!; y ; z)=f(t ; q ; y ; z)$. H ow ever, as w illbe seen from the follow ing de nitions, the in form ation neutrally property has a di erent $m$ eaning in the two models and therefore a di erent $m$ ethod is needed to characterize it in the two models.

N ow let us de ne the inform ation neutrality property.
Definition 1. A BSDE exhibits inform ation neutrality (between the tration $F$ and G) if and only if the solutions of the BSDEs (3) and (4) satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{t}^{F}()=Y_{t}^{G}() ; \quad d P \quad d t \text { a.s.; } \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $2 L^{2}\left(F_{T}\right)$ :
Definition 2. A GSDU exhibits inform ation neutrality (between the tration $F$ and G) if and only if the solutions of the G SD US (5) and (6) satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{t}^{F}(c)=U_{t}^{G}(c) ; \quad P \quad d t \text { a.s.; } \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all c $2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$ :

W e m otivate these de nitions by interpreting (7) and (8) as expressing an indi erence for the purpose of decision tow ard the otherw ise anticipated utility of $m$ ore rather less inform ation. A decision $m$ aker who exhibits such a property has no intrinsic $m$ otivation to gather inform ation for a xed consum ption. In the subsequent analysis, our ob jective is to characterize this property.
2.2. M athem atical background. U nder our Lipschitz assum ptions on the driver/aggregator [assum ptions (A 1) and (B1)], it is now a standard result in the BSDE literature that existence and uniqueness (in a suitable sense) hold for the recursions (3) \{ (6).

M ore precisely, for A $2 \mathrm{fG} ; \mathrm{F} \mathrm{g}$, it follows from $P$ ardoux and $P$ eng (1990) [see also ElK aroui, Peng and Q uenez (1997) and M a and Yhong (1999)] that under assum ptions (A 1) and (A 2) and, for each $2 L^{2}\left(F_{T}\right)$, there exist a unique pair $\left(Y^{A}() ; Z^{A}()\right) 2 H^{2}(A ; R) H^{2}\left(A ; R^{n}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{t}^{A}()=E+Z_{t}^{Z} h\left(s ;!; Y_{s}^{A}() ; Z_{s}^{A}()\right) d s A_{t}: \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Sim ilarly, for A 2 fG;Fg, it follows from Pardoux and Peng (1990) that under assum ptions (B1) and (B2) and, for each $c 2 H^{2}(F ; R)$ there exist a unique pair ( $\left.U^{A}(c) ; V^{A}(c)\right) 2 H^{2}(A ; R) \quad H^{2}\left(A ; R^{n}\right)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{t}^{A}(c)=E \quad f_{t}\left(S ; C_{s} ; U_{s}^{A}(c) ; V_{s}^{A}(c)\right) d s A_{t}: \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

N ow, since we w ill extensively use them in the subsequent analysis, it is w orthw hile to recall [see ElK aroui, P eng and Q uenez (1997)] the representation theorem s of linear (resp. concave) BSDEs as a conditional expectation (resp.an essentialin nim um ofconditionalexpectations). W ew ill state these results for a ltration A $2 \mathrm{fG} ; \mathrm{Fg}$ and only for the BSDE m odel (9) the G SD U m odel (10) being a particular case of the B SD E m odel (9)].

Proposition 1. Let ( ; ) be a bounded ( $\mathrm{R} ; \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{n}}$ )-valued A -predictable process, ${ }^{\prime}$ an elem ent of $H^{2}(A ; R)$ and and elem ent of $L^{2}\left(A_{T}\right)$. Then the linear BSD E

$$
Y_{t}^{A}()=+Z_{t}^{Z_{T}}\left({ }_{s}+Y_{s}^{A}()_{s}+Z_{s}^{A}() \quad s\right) d s \quad Z_{T} Z_{s}^{A}() \quad d W_{s}^{A}
$$

has a unique solution ( $\left.Y^{A}() ; Z^{A}()\right) 2 H^{2}(A ; R) \quad H^{2}\left(A ; R^{n}\right)$ which adm its the representation
where $\underset{t}{s}$ is the adjoint process de ned for $s$ by the forward SD E

$$
d{ }_{t}^{s}={ }_{t}^{s}\left[s_{s} d s+s \quad d W_{s}^{A}\right] ; \quad{ }_{t}^{t}=1:
$$

A ltematively, when the driver $h$ is concave $w$ ith respect to $(y ; z)$, it is possible to express it as an in nim un of linear functions of ( $y ; z$ ): denoting by $H$ the polar function of $h$ de ned by

$$
\left.H(t ; ~ ; ~)=\sup _{(y ; z) 2 R} R_{R^{n}} \llbracket(t ; y ; z) \quad y \quad z\right] ;
$$

the conjugacy relationship gives [for each $(!; t)$ ]

$$
\left.h(t ; y ; z)=\inf _{(;) 2[K ; K]^{n+1}} h^{(;)}(t ; y ; z)\right] ;
$$

where $\left.h^{( }{ }^{\prime}\right)(t ; y ; z)=H(t ; ~ y \quad z$ and wherewe recall that $K$ is the Lipschitz constant for the driver $h$ (the dom ain of de nition of $H$ is a subset of $[\mathrm{K} ; \mathrm{K}]^{\mathrm{n}+1}$ ). H euristically, the representation theorem for concave BSD Es states that the in nim um of the above con jugacy relationship com $m$ utesw ith the BSDE transform, that is,

$$
Y_{t}(h) \quad Y_{t}\left(\operatorname{essinf} h^{(;)}\right)=\operatorname{essinf} Y_{t}\left(h^{(;)}\right):
$$

In order to state this result $m$ ore precisely in the follow ing proposition, we rst de ne the dom ain [see ElK aroui, P eng and Q uenez (1997)]

$$
D:=f(;) 2 P^{A} \backslash[K ; K]^{n+1} f H(; ;) 2 H^{2}(A ; R) g:
$$

Proposition 2. Leth be a concave driver satisfying assum ptions (A 1) and (A 2) and let H the associated polar function. Then the BSDE (9) adm its the dual representation

$$
Y_{t}^{A}()=\underset{(;) 2 D}{\operatorname{ess}} \inf ^{A} \underset{t ; T}{;}+{\underset{t}{\mathrm{Z}}}_{\mathrm{Z}}^{\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{S}} ; \mathrm{H}(\mathrm{~s} ; \mathrm{s} ; \mathrm{s}) \mathrm{ds} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{t}} \text {; }
$$

where $\underset{t ; s}{;}$ is the adjoint process de ned for $s$ by the forward SD E

$$
\mathrm{d} \underset{\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{s}}{;}=\underset{\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{s}}{;}\left[\mathrm{s} d \mathrm{~s}+\underset{\mathrm{s}}{ } \quad \mathrm{~d} W_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right] ; \quad \quad \underset{\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{t}}{;}=1:
$$

3. Som e exam ples of ltrations and utilities.
3.1. E xam ples of heterogeneous ltrations. There are $m$ any ways to construct a sequence of coarser or ner B rownian ltrations and we give here som e exam ples of constructions.

Losing the sign of a B rownian $m$ otion. D eparting from a com pleted $1-$ tration B generated a two-dim ensionalB row nian motion $\left(\begin{array}{l}B \\ t\end{array}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}B \\ 1 t & { }_{2} \\ 2 t\end{array}\right)\right)_{0} \quad$ t $T$ one can construct the ltration A generated by

$$
A_{t}=\left(\left(j_{1 s}^{B} \dot{j} j_{2 s}^{B}\right) ; 0 \quad s \quad t\right) ;
$$

and it follow s from $R$ evuz and Yor (1999) that $A$ is generated by the two di-

$N$ ote that this $m$ ethod provides a $w$ ay to construct an in nite sequence of coarser ltrations. Finally, it is im portant to observe that in this particular example, ${ }^{A}$ is also a B rownian $m$ otion under the ltration B .

B rownian anticipation. C onsider an $n$-dim ensionalB row nian motion ( $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & \mathrm{~s}\end{aligned} ; 0$ $s \quad t)$ that generates a com pleted Hration A. Then the process

$$
\frac{\mathrm{B}}{\mathrm{t}}:=\frac{p^{1}}{\overline{2}} \frac{\mathrm{~A}}{2 \mathrm{t}} ; \quad 0 \quad \mathrm{t} \quad \mathrm{~T} ;
$$

is a B rownian motion and generates a com pleted Itration $B$ that satis es

$$
B_{t}=A_{2 t} \quad A_{t}:
$$

$N$ otioe that in this context, is not a B m artingale and thus it is not a $B$ row nian $m$ otion under $B$.

B rownian motion with an independent random drift. A third example com es from ltering theory. Consider a scalar B row nian motion ( $t)_{0} t \mathrm{~T}$ and an independent and integrable random variable: C onsider the ltration B generated by

$$
\left.B_{t}:=(s ; 0 \quad s \quad t)\right)_{-}()
$$

and its sulb Hration

$$
A_{t}=\left(s_{s}+s ; 0 \quad s \quad t\right) ;
$$

which is well know n to be generated [see, e.g, Liptser and Shiryayev (1977)]
 how ever that this exam ple is outside the scope of this paper since $B_{0}$ is not trivial.

## 32. E xam ples of intertem poral aggregator.

T he m ulti-prior expected utility process. W hen the BSDE driver has the form

$$
\begin{align*}
& h(t ;!y ; z)=\quad X^{n} k_{i} \dot{\mathcal{Z}}_{i} \dot{j} ;  \tag{11}\\
& \mathrm{i}=1
\end{align*}
$$

where $k_{i}>0$ for $i=1 ;::: ; n$, the process $Y^{F}(U())$ de ned in (3) [resp. the process $Y^{G}(U$ ( )) de ned in (4)]w ith the term inaldata $U()$ where $U()$ is a nondecreasing and concave function $m$ apping $R$ onto $R ~ m a y ~ b e ~ i n t e r p r e t e d ~$ as a multi-prior utility for the wealth [C hen and Epstein R002)].

A ltematively, in the G SD U case, w hen the intertem poral aggregator has the follow ing form :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{f}(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{c} ; \mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{z})=\mathrm{u}(\mathrm{c})^{\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{n}}} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{i}} \dot{\mathcal{J}}_{\mathrm{i}} \dot{j} ;  \tag{12}\\
& i=1
\end{align*}
$$

$w$ here $k_{i}>0$ for $i=1 ;::: ; n$ and where $u()$ is a nondecreasing and concave function $m$ apping $R$ onto $R$, the process $U^{F}$ (c) de ned in (5) [resp. the process $U^{G}$ (c) de ned in (6)] m ay be interpreted as a multi-prior utility for the consum ption process c [C hen and Epstein (2002)].

Q uadratic G SD U . W hen the intertem poral aggregator has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(c ; y ; z)=\log (c) \quad y \quad \overline{2}^{z} ; \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith param eter restrictions: 0 and 0 the existence of the G SD U s (5) are not guaranteed anym ore since the intertem poralaggregator $f$ is not Lipschitz w ith respect to $z$. The G SD U associated to (13) is in fact in the class of quadratic BSDE that has been extensively studied in K obylansky (2000) who show sthe existence by an approxim ation technique. In the speci c case under consideration, Schroder and Skiadas (1999) show the existence and uniqueness of the solution of the BSDE (5) and consequently of the BSDE (6). T heir proof consists of building an appropriate set of consum ption plan processes (that contains but is not lim ited to the set of bounded process) and involves a xed point theorem.

Interestingly, the m odel (13) is im portant since it has been recently show $n$ by Skiadas (2003) and Lazrak and Q uenez (2003) that the G SD U associated $w$ th (13) is a uni ed form ulation of a recent approach to uncertainty aversion related to the robust control theory. This approach has been introduced by A nderson, H ansen and Sargent (1998) [see also H ansen, Sargent, Turm uham betova and W illiam s (2002) and Uppaland W ang (2003) for som e applications of that $m$ odel to asset pricing issues].
4. An ilhustrative exam ple. The ob jective of this section is to give a concrete situation where we can m easure explicitly the utility under heterogeneous ltrations. In fact, the exam ple that we shall give in the sequel w as very helpfulto us as a guide of how to handle the problem given in the previous section.

A ssum e that the tration $F$ is generated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{t}=\left(\hbar W{ }_{s}^{G} j ; 0 \quad S \quad t\right)=\left(W{ }_{S}^{F} ; 0 \quad S \quad t\right) ; \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the $F$ B row nian $m$ otion ( $W{ }_{t}^{F} ; 0 \quad t \quad T$ ) is given by

$$
W_{t}^{F}={ }_{0}^{Z} \operatorname{sgn}\left(W_{s}^{G}\right) d W{ }_{s}^{G}:
$$

A lso, we w ill consider the anticipating ltration

$$
H_{t}=\left(W{ }_{2 s}^{F} ; 0 \quad s \quad t\right)=\left(W_{s}^{H} ; 0 \quad s \quad t\right) ;
$$

where the $H$ B row nian motion ( $W_{t}^{H} ; 0 \quad t \quad T$ ) is given by

$$
W_{t}^{H}=p_{\overline{2}}^{1} W_{2 t}^{F}:
$$

It is clear that $F_{()}\left(G_{()}\right.$and $F_{()}\left(_{H_{()}}\right.$, and in order to sim plify the exposition, assum e furtherm ore that the B rownian motion $W^{G}$ is one di$m$ ensional ( $n=1$ ). N ow, in the follow ing sections, we shall consider the particular consum ption plan b2 $\mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$ gìven by

$$
\begin{equation*}
b_{t}=\exp \left(W_{t}^{F}\right) ; \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and com pute its associated G SD U for som e sim ple intertem poralaggregators under the Itrations $\mathrm{F}_{()} ; \mathrm{G}_{()}$and $\mathrm{H}_{()}$.
4.1. A linear G SD U intertem poral aggregator. N ow, let us analyze what happens if we introduce the sim plest dependence in $z$ in the intertem poral aggregator; that is, a linear additive dependence of the form

$$
f(s ; c ; y ; z)=\log (c) \quad \text { (s) } y \quad z ;
$$

where the ( ) is a determ inistic integrable function.
From Proposition 1 and for A $2 \mathrm{fF} ; G ; H \mathrm{~g}$, the $G \mathrm{SD} U$ associated $w$ th the aggregator (16) adm its the representation

$$
U_{t}^{A}(b)=E \quad \begin{align*}
& \mathrm{Z}  \tag{17}\\
& { }_{t}^{T} \quad{ }_{t}^{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{~W} \underset{\mathrm{~s}}{\mathrm{~F}} \mathrm{ds} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{t}} ; ~ ; ~
\end{align*}
$$

where ${ }_{t}^{s}$ is the adjoint process de ned for $s$ tby the forw ard SDE

$$
d \underset{t}{s}=\quad{ }_{t}^{s}\left[(s) d s+d W W_{s}^{A}\right] ; \quad{ }_{t}^{t}=1:
$$

$W$ hen $=0$; the adjoint process ${ }_{s}^{t}$ is determ inistic and by the ltering property of the conditional expectation we have

$$
U_{t}^{F}(b)=E\left[U_{t}^{G}(b) F_{t}\right]=E\left[U_{t}^{H}(b) F_{t}\right]
$$

and in particular

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{0}^{F}(b)=U_{0}^{G}(b)=U_{0}^{H}(b)=0: \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ow ever, aswe shallshow in subsequent com putations, equation (18) does not hold when $\in 0$ and, in particular, inform ation neutrality fails to hold in that case.
$M$ ore explicitly, when $\leqslant 0$, one can use the representation (17) and a sim ple $G$ irsanov transform ation to get

$$
U_{t}^{F}(b)=\begin{gather*}
Z_{T}  \tag{19}\\
t
\end{gather*} \underset{t}{s} d s W_{t}^{F} \quad Z_{T}(s \quad t){ }_{t}^{s} d s ;
$$

where we used the notation $\quad \underset{t}{s}=\exp \left(\begin{array}{cc}R_{s} \\ t & (u) d u) . T h u s, ~ b y ~ d i ~ e r e n t i a t i o n, ~\end{array}\right.$ the associated intensity is

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{t}^{F}(b)={ }_{t}^{Z_{t}} \underset{t}{s} d s: \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

O n the other hand, it is also possible to com pute the couple $\left(U^{G}(b) ; V^{G}(b)\right)$. $T$ he exercise is slightly $m$ ore involved and in order to execute it, let us rst de ne a new probability $m$ easure on $G_{T}$ by

$$
\frac{d P}{d P}_{G_{T}}=\exp \quad \frac{2}{2} T \quad W_{T}^{G}:
$$

By G irsanov's theorem, the process

$$
\hat{W}_{t}^{G}=W_{t}^{G}+t
$$

is a (F);G)-B rownian $m$ otion and reexpressing the representation (17) under the probability $\mathrm{F}^{2}$ and the ltration $G$ gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{t}^{G}(b)=E^{Z^{Z}}{ }_{t}^{T_{t}^{Z}}{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{S}} \operatorname{sgn}\left(W_{u}^{G}\right) d W{ }_{u}^{G} d s G_{t} \\
& Z_{T} \quad Z_{T} Z_{S}
\end{aligned}
$$

$w$ here $E$ is the expectation under $\mathbb{P}^{E}$. Substituting $W^{G} w$ ith fin $^{G}$ in the above expression and elim inating the stochastic integrals (which does not contribute to the expectation) gives

N ow, one can rem ark that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { u) } \left.{ }_{j} G_{t}\right] \\
& =E\left[\operatorname { s g n } \left(\overline{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\mathrm{u}} \mathrm{G}+\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{G}}\right.\right. \\
& \left(\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{u} & \mathrm{t})
\end{array}\right) \text { ]; }
\end{aligned}
$$

$w$ here $G$ is a standard $G$ aussian variable w ith zero $m$ ean and unit variance under the probability $P^{P}$. C onsequently, expressing the above quantity in term s of the cum ulative of the standard $G$ aussian variable gives
and thus
(21)

D i erentiating the above expression, and taking only the $m$ artingale part gives the intensity

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Z_{T} \\
& V_{t}^{G}(b)=\quad{ }_{t}^{s} d s \operatorname{sgn}\left(W_{t}^{G}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, it becom es clear from (19) and (21) that
(22) $U_{t}^{G}(b) \quad U_{t}^{F}(b)=2{\underset{t}{Z}}_{Z_{T}}^{Z_{s}} \quad \frac{W_{t}^{G}}{p_{i}} \frac{(u \quad t)}{u} d u \quad{ }_{t}^{s} d s \neq 0$;

P dt as. and hence the inform ation neutrality does not hold.
$F$ inally, for the G SD U s under $H$, one can use som e sim ilar $G$ irsanov transform ations and get

$$
U_{t}^{H}(b)={ }_{t}^{Z} W_{S}^{F} \quad \underset{t}{s} d s ;
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{t}^{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{~b})=0 ; \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

ift $T=2$ and
(24)

$$
V_{t}^{H}(b)={ }^{P_{2}}{ }_{2 t}^{Z} \quad \underset{t}{\mathrm{~s}} \mathrm{ds} ;
$$

if $t<T=2$.
Thus, we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{U}_{0}^{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{~b}) \quad \mathrm{U}_{0}^{\mathrm{F}}(\mathrm{~b})=\left(1 \frac{\mathrm{p}_{\overline{2}}^{2}}{2}\right){ }_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{ds} \text {; } \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

and in particular the identity (18) does not hold and hence the in form ation neutrality does not hold again. $N$ ote that when $>0$; it is clear that $\mathrm{U}_{0}^{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{b})<$ $\mathrm{U}_{0}^{\mathrm{F}}$ (b) and we interpret this inequality as a form of aversion to inform ation (the consum er prefers to have access only to the coarser ltration $\mathrm{F}_{(1)}$ ). H ow ever, this inequality is not true for every consum ption plan and it can be proved that we have the opposite inequality $\mathrm{U}_{0}^{\mathrm{H}}\left(\mathrm{b}^{0}\right)>\mathrm{U}_{0}^{\mathrm{F}}\left(\mathrm{b}^{0}\right)$ for the consum ption plan $b^{0}$ de ned by $b_{t}^{0}=\exp \left(W_{t}^{F}\right)$ :
42. A nonlinear intertem poral aggregator. Let us consider the $C$ hen and Epstein (2002) G SD U intertem poralaggregator given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(s ; c ; y ; z)=\log (c) \quad \text { (s) } y \quad k \dot{z} \dot{j} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\mathrm{k} 2 \mathrm{R}^{+}$and for a determ in istic integrable function ( ).
By Proposition 2, we know that for each ltration A 2 fF ; Gg ; the A G SD U associated w th the intertem poralaggregator (26) m aybe represented for any $\mathrm{c} 2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~A} ; \mathrm{R})$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{t}^{A}(c)=\operatorname{ess} \inf _{2} U_{t}^{A} ;(c) ; \quad P \quad d t a . s . ; \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A=f \quad 2 H^{2}(A ; R): j \mathrm{f} j \quad \mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{dt}$ a.s.g and where the process $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{A}}$; (c) is the G SD U de ned by
for each 2 A. By P roposition 1, we have the representation
where ${ }_{t}^{s}$ is the adjoint process de ned for $s$ tby the forward SD E

$$
d{\underset{t}{s}=\quad{ }_{t}^{s}\left[s d s+{ }_{s} d W_{s}^{A}\right] ; \quad{ }_{t}^{t}=1:, ~}_{t}
$$

In order to com pute $U_{t}^{F}(b)$ where we recall that the consum ption plan $b$ is de ned in (15), we rst de ne for each 2 F the probability $m$ easure $P$ by its $R$ adon $\left\{N\right.$ ikodym derivative $w$ ith respect to $P$ on $F_{T}$,

$$
\frac{d P}{d P}=\exp \quad{ }_{0}^{Z} \quad{ }_{s} d W{ }_{S}^{F} \quad \frac{1}{2}_{0}^{Z}{ }_{S}^{2} d s:
$$

By G irsanov's theorem, the representation (28) becom es

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{t}^{F ;}(b)=E \quad{ }_{t}^{S} W{ }_{S}^{F} d s F_{t}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $E$ is the expectation under the probability $P$ :Therefore, the essential in nim um of (27) is attained by $=k, P \quad d t$ a.s., and hence
and consequently the associated intensity is given by

$$
V_{t}^{F}(b)={ }_{t}^{Z_{t}}{ }_{t}^{s} d s:
$$

In order to com pute $U_{t}^{G}(b)$; one can write the BSDE satis ed by $U_{t}^{F}$ (b); and translate it under $G$ and get a uniqueness argum ent
and

$$
V_{t}^{G}(b)=\underbrace{Z_{t}}_{t} \underset{S_{t}}{ } d s \operatorname{sgn}\left(W_{t}^{G}\right):
$$

For the utility under the Hration $H$, a uniqueness argum ent note that $V^{H}$ has an invariant sign in equations (23) and (24)] allows us to conclude $\mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{H}}$ and $\mathrm{V}^{\mathrm{H}}$ are given by equations (23) and (24) w ith the replacem ent of by $k$ :
4.3. A quadratic intertem poral aggregator. Let us consider the SD U intertem poral aggregator given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{~s} ; \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{z})=\log (\mathrm{c}) \quad \overline{2} z^{2} ; \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $2 R$ : A though the intertem poral aggregator (29) is not Lipshitz, using ItO's rule, it can be shown easily that

$$
\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{A}}(\mathrm{c})=\frac{1}{-} \log \mathrm{E} \exp \quad{ }^{\mathrm{Z}} \log \left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}\right) \mathrm{ds} A_{t} \text {; }
$$

for any $\mathrm{c} 2 \mathrm{c} 2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$ and for $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{F} ; \mathrm{G}$ and H . In particular, existence and uniqueness of the associated BSD E hold when the above expectation is nite. Furtherm ore, som e straightforw ard com putations give

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{t}^{F}(b)=U_{t}^{G}(b)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
T & t
\end{array}\right) W_{t}^{F} \quad \bar{\sigma}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
T & t
\end{array}\right)^{3} ; \\
& \left.U_{t}^{H}(b)={ }_{t}^{Z} W_{S}^{F} d s+\left(\begin{array}{lll}
T & 2 t
\end{array}\right) W \underset{2 t}{F} \quad-\frac{1}{6} \quad 2 t\right)^{3} \quad \text { for } t<T=2
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
V_{t}^{F}(b)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
T & t
\end{array}\right) ; \\
V_{t}^{G}(b)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
T & t
\end{array}\right) \operatorname{sgn}\left(W_{t}^{G}\right) ; \\
V_{t}^{H}(b)
\end{array}\right)={ }^{2} \overline{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
(\mathrm{T} & \mathrm{t}
\end{array}\right): \quad \$
$$

4.4. D iscussion. W hile the com putations of this section o er a m odest contribution from a theoretical perspective, they have the $m$ erit of ilhustrating in a concrete way how a BSDE depends on its Itration.

For our ob jective of characterizing inform ation neutrality, it is w orthw hile to see what we can leam from this exam ple. F irst, the linear G SD U com putations of Section 4:1 show that the dependency in $z$ does not allow infor$m$ ation neutrality to hold (for the three types of inform ation heterogeneity under consideration).

W hen the utility is linear but independent from $z$, the GSDUS under $F$ and $G$ coincide but are di erent from the GSDU under H. This fact suggests that the inform ation heterogeneity $F$ versus $G$ has a special feature. $T$ his special feature seem $s$ to be con $m$ ed by the nonlinear intertem poral aggregators of Sections 42 and 4.3. In both cases, the G SD U s under F and $G$ coincide but are di erent from the G SD U under $H$.

A though, these statem ents have no theoretical value since they are only valid for one particular consum ption plan (b), the next theoreticalw ork w ill establish that the inform ation heterogeneity of the type $F$ versus $G$ is the unique type of in form ation heterogeneity which allow inform ation neutrally to hold for a class of intertem poral aggregators.
5. Characterization of inform ation neutrality. In this section we $x$ a couple of ltrations $\mathrm{F}_{()}$( $\mathrm{G}_{()}$: First, let us state a general necessary condition of inform ation neutrality.

Lemma 1. If a BSDE (3) [resp. a G SD U (5)] exhibits inform ation neutrality then for any $2 \mathrm{~L}^{2}\left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ [resp. for any $\mathrm{c} 2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$ ] we have

$$
k Z_{t}^{F}() k=k Z_{t}^{G}() k \quad\left[r e s p . k V_{t}^{F}(c) k=k V_{t}^{G}(c) k\right]_{r} \quad P \quad d t a . s .
$$

Proof. It follow from (7) that for each $2 \mathrm{~L}^{2}\left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{T}}\right)$,
and therefore,

$$
{ }_{0}^{Z_{t}} k Z_{s}^{F}() k^{2} d s=\int_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} k Z_{s}^{G}() k^{2} d s:
$$

C onsequently,

$$
k Z_{t}^{F}() k=k Z_{t}^{G}() k ; \quad P \quad d t \text { a.s.; }
$$

and the proof is sim ilar for the G SD U case.
5.1. The BSDE problem. In this section, and in view of Lem ma 1, we use the follow ing assum ption on the driver of the B SD E (3):
(H 1) T he B SD E driver has the form

$$
h(s ;!; y ; z)=\nwarrow(s ;!; y ; k z k):
$$

Theorem 1. U nder assum ption (H1) the follow ing statem ents are equivalent:
(a) The BSDE (3) exhibits strong inform ation neutrality.
(b) There exists a process $M:[0 ; T] \quad$ ! $R^{n}{ }^{n}$ in the set $P^{G}$ such that $M 9 M=I d_{n}$, dt $d P$ a.s. and

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{t}^{F}={ }_{0}^{Z} M_{s} d W{ }_{s}^{G} ; \quad P \quad \text { dt a.s. } \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. (b)) (a) For any $2 L^{2}\left(F_{T}\right)$, assum ption (H1) in conjunction w ith (30) implies that $\left(Y_{t}^{F}() ; \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{Z}_{t}^{\mathrm{F}}(\mathrm{)})_{0} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}\right.$ solves the BSDE (3), and by uniqueness we get $Y_{t}^{F}()=Y_{t}^{G}()$ :
(b) ) (a) For any $2 \mathrm{~L}^{2}\left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{T}}\right)$; and under assum ption (H1), substracting (3) and (4) gives, by Lem m a 1,

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{0}^{Z_{S}} Z_{s}^{F}() \quad d W_{S}^{F}={ }_{0}^{Z_{s}} Z_{s}^{G}() \quad d W_{S}^{G} ; \quad P \quad d t a . s . \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to compute explicitly $Z^{F}$ for som e particular , let us now introduce the $n$-dim ensionalprocess $\left(X_{t}=\left(X_{t} ;:: ; X_{t}\right)\right)_{0} t \quad$ that solves the stochastic di erential equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
d X_{t} & =g\left(t_{i}!; X_{t}\right) d t+d W{ }_{t}^{F} ; \\
X_{0} & =x 2 R^{n} ;
\end{aligned}
$$

where $g \mathrm{~m}$ aps $[0 ; T] \quad R^{n}$ onto $R^{n}$ and is de ned by

$$
\mathrm{g}\left(\mathrm{t}_{;}!; \mathrm{X}\right)=\left(\mathrm{K}\left(\mathrm{t}_{;}!; \mathrm{X}_{1} ; 1\right) ; \mathrm{K}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}!; \mathrm{X}_{2} ; 1\right) ;::: ; \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}!; \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{n}} ; 1\right)\right):
$$

By construction, it is clear that, for each $k=1 ;::: ; n ; Y_{t}^{F}\left(X_{T}^{k}\right)=X_{t}^{k}$ and $Z_{t}^{F}\left(X_{T}^{k}\right)=k$ where $k$ is a vector of $R^{n}$ de ned by $k k^{0}=0$ if $k k^{0}$ and $k k=1 . T$ herefore, for each $k ; i=1 ;:: ; n$; letting

$$
M_{t}^{k ; i}=Z_{t}^{i ; G}\left(X_{T}^{k}\right) ;
$$

we get, from (31),

$$
{ }^{k_{W}}{ }_{t}^{F}={ }_{0}^{Z} X_{i=1}^{n} M_{s}^{k ; i} d W_{S}^{G} ; \quad P \quad d t a . s . ;
$$

and thus for each $k ; k^{0}=1 ;::: ; n$,

$$
{ }_{k}^{0} k^{0} d t=d h^{k} W{ }^{F} \dot{k}^{0} W^{F} i_{t}=X_{i=1}^{X^{n}} M_{t}^{k ; i} M_{t}^{k^{0} ; i} d t=\left(M_{t}^{M}\right)_{k ; k^{0}} d t ;
$$

which com pletes the proof.

To be concrete, in the scalar B rownian motion case, the $\frac{\operatorname{ltration} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{t}}}{\mathrm{t}}=$
 as explained in Section 3:1 and this is an exam ple of a situation where condition (b) of Theorem 1 holds. M ore generally, Theorem 1 ilhustrates that when the link (30) exists betw een two ltrations $F$ and $G$, there is no utility cost for the inform ation loss due to accessing to $F$ rather than $G$ under assum ption (H1).

Remark 1. N ote that under assum ption (H1), it is easily seen from (30) that inform ation neutrality is also equivalent to the fact that $W$ ${ }^{F}$ is a G B row nian m otion. T hus T heorem 1 provides a possible interpretation of this condition in term s of utility cost of inform ation.

Remark 2. W hen $h=0$; the BSDE (3) is the (linear) conditional expectation and the strong inform ation neutrality becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left[F_{t}\right]=E\left[\mathcal{F}_{t}\right] ; \quad d P \quad d t \text { a.s.; } \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $2 \mathrm{~L}^{2}\left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{T}}\right)$ : In particular, the above is true for $=\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{F}}$, and from the Levy criteria, we deduce that, in fact, $W^{F}$ is a $G-B$ row nian $m$ otion and thus (30) is satis ed. Thus Theorem 1 m ay be interpreted as a generalization of property (32) to the B SD E generated by the driverh under assum ption (H1). ( T he BSD Es are denom inated som etim es nonlinear expectations.)
52. The G SD U case. In this section, and in view of Lemma 1, we use the follow ing assum ption on the G SD U intertem poral aggregator:
(H 2) T he intertem poral aggregator has the form

$$
f(s ; c ; y ; z)=\tilde{f}(s ; c ; y ; k z k):
$$

Furthem ore, for technical reasons we shall use the follow ing assum ption on the intertem poral aggregator:
(H3) The intertem poral aggregator $f$ is continuously di erentiable w ith respect to ciy;z w ith rst derivative being bounded by som e constant $\mathrm{L}>0$ and satis es for all (t; C;y;z) 2 [ $0 ; T] R \quad R \quad R^{n}$
for som e constants $C$ and $k: M$ oreover, the derivatives $@_{C} f ; @_{y} f ; @_{z} f$ are uniform ly Lipschitz w ith respect to each of the variables ciy; z w ith a Lioschitz constant M $>0$.

Theorem 2. Under assum ptions (H2) and (H 3), the following state$m$ ents are equivalent:
(a) T he G SD U (5) exhibits inform ation neutrality.
(b) Equality (30) holds for som e process $M$ : [0;T] ! $R^{n}{ }^{n}$ in the set $P^{G}$ such that $M M=I d_{n}$, $d t \quad d P$ a.s.

Proof. (b)) (a) For any c $2 \mathrm{H}^{2}$ ( F ; R ); assum ption ( H 2 ) in conjunc-
 and by uniqueness we get $U^{F}$ (c) $=U^{G}$ (c) :
(a) ) (b) A sim ilar approach of $T$ heorem 1 leads under assum ption (H 2) to the identity

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{0}^{Z} V_{S}^{F}(c) d W{ }_{s}^{F}={ }_{0}^{Z} V_{S}^{G} \text { (c) dW }{ }_{s}^{G} ; \quad P \quad d t a \cdot s . \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $\mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{H}^{2}(\mathrm{~F} ; \mathrm{R})$.
In particular, for $k=1 ;::: ; n$; let us consider the utility $U_{t}^{F}\left({ }^{k} W^{F}\right)$ associated to the consum ption processes $C_{t}={ }^{k} W{ }_{t}^{F}$ that coincides, by uniqueness of the BSDE (5), w th the solution of the scalar B SD E

Hence, $V_{t}^{F}\left({ }^{k} W^{F}\right)={ }^{k} t{ }_{k}$, where we recall that $k$ is a vector of $R^{n}$ de ned by $k k^{0}=0$ if $k \in k^{0}$ and $k k=1: N o w$, assum ing that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\jmath^{k} \mathrm{t} j>0 ; \quad \mathrm{P} \quad \text { dta.s. for } k=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{n} \text {; } \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

and applying (33) to the consum ption processes $c={ }^{k_{W}} F$ for $k=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{n}$ gives

$$
{ }^{k_{W}}{ }_{t}^{F}={ }_{0}^{Z}{ }_{i=1}^{n} M_{S}^{k ; i} d^{i} W V_{S}^{G} ; \quad P \quad \text { dt a.s.; }
$$

where

$$
M_{t}^{k ; i}:=\frac{\left.V_{t}^{i ; G} k^{k} W^{F}\right)}{k_{t}}
$$

and follow ing the sam e argum ent of $T$ heorem 1 we are done. T he follow ing lem m a show s that under assum ption (H3), inequality (34) is satis ed.

Lemma 2. Let ( $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} ; 0$ t T ) be a standard unidim ensional B rownian $m$ otion [say under ( $\mathrm{P} ; \mathrm{F}$ )] and consider the BSDE
where $g$ is de ned for each (t; $\mathrm{c} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { y }} \mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{z}) 2[0 ; \mathrm{T}] \quad \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{R}$ by

$$
g(t ; C ; y ; z)=f\left(t ; C ; y ; z_{1}\right)
$$

and where $f$ is an intertem poral aggregator satisfying assum ption (H3).
Then $j_{t}^{0} j>0 ; P d t a . s$.
Proof. First, consider the nality ofB SD Esparam etrized by $x \quad 0$ and de ned by

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{t}^{x}={ }_{t}^{Z} g\left(s ; x+B_{s} ; N_{s}^{x} ;{ }_{s}^{x}\right) d s \quad{ }_{t}^{T} \underset{S}{x} d B_{s}: \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

By a result ofM a, P rotter and Y ong [(1994), Lem m a 3.2; see also P ardoux and Peng (1992)] and for each $x \quad 0$ the solution of (35) satis es

$$
\left(\mathbb{N}_{t}^{x} ;{ }_{t}^{x}\right)=\left(\left(t_{;} \boldsymbol{x}+B_{t}\right) ; @_{x} \quad\left(t_{;} x+B_{t}\right)\right) ;
$$

where : [0;T] R ! $R$ is the unique bounded classical solution of the quasilinear parabolic equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
& @_{t}(t ; x)+\frac{1}{2} @_{x x} \quad(t ; x)+g\left(t ; x ; \quad(t ; x) ; Q_{x} \quad(t ; x)\right)=0 ; \quad(t ; x) 2 \quad(0 ; T) \quad R ; \\
& \quad(T ; x)=0:
\end{aligned}
$$

Furtherm ore, by the BSDE a priori estim ates [see Pardoux and Peng (1990) and ElK aroui, Peng and Q uenez (1997)] and the boundness of $\varrho_{c} 9$ [assum ption (H3)] we have the follow ing bounding argum ent:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Z_{T} \\
& E \sup _{t} \mathbb{N}_{t}^{x} \quad N_{t}^{0}{ }^{2}+E \quad{ }_{0}^{1} d t\left(\begin{array}{ll}
x & 0 \\
t & t
\end{array}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

for som e positive constant C .
Second, consider the linear B SD E

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_{t}= & Z_{t}\left(@_{c} G\left(s ; B_{s} ; N_{s}^{0} ;{ }_{s}^{0}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+Q_{s} @_{Y} g\left(s ; B_{s} ; N_{s}^{0} ;{ }_{s}^{0}\right)+{ }_{s} @_{z} g\left(s ; B_{s} ; N_{s}^{0} ;{ }_{s}^{0}\right)\right) d s \\
& \quad{ }_{T}{ }_{s} d B_{s}
\end{aligned}
$$

which, according to $P$ roposition 1, gives the follow ing solution:
(38) $Q_{t}=E{ }_{t}^{Z} d s @_{c} g\left(s ; B_{s} ; N_{s}^{0} ;{ }_{s}^{0}\right) \exp { }_{t}^{Z} d u @_{y} g\left(u ; B_{u} ; N_{u}^{0} ;{ }_{u}^{0}\right) \quad{ }_{t}^{s} F_{t}$;
where

$$
{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{s}}=\exp \quad \frac{1}{2}{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{du} @_{\mathrm{z}} \mathrm{~g}\left(\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{u}} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{u}}^{0} ;{ }_{\mathrm{u}}^{0}\right)^{2}+{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{~dB}_{\mathrm{u}} @_{\mathrm{z}} g\left(\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{u}} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{u}}^{0} ;{ }_{\mathrm{u}}^{0}\right) \quad:
$$

$N$ otice that from the boundness of the rst derivatives of $g$; equation (38) show s that Q satis es

$$
\operatorname{ke}^{M T}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
T & t \tag{39}
\end{array}\right) \quad \mathbb{Q}{ }_{t} j \quad M e^{M T} T
$$

and, therefore, in order to prove the lem ma, we w ill show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{t}^{0}=Q_{t} ; \quad P \quad d t a . s . \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

$M$ ore precisely, since ${ }_{t}^{0}=\varrho_{x} \quad\left(t ; B_{t}\right)$ and by the de nition of a derivative, we need only prove

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{x \# 0} N{ }_{t}^{x}=Q_{t} ; \quad P \quad d t \text { a.s.; } \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$


To that end, let us de ne for each $x>0$ the process ${ }_{t}^{x}:=\left(\begin{array}{ll}x & 0 \\ t & t\end{array}\right)=x$ and, follow ing a linearization technique of ElKaroui, Peng and Q uenez
(1997) we interpret the couple ( $N \underset{t}{x}$; ${ }_{t}^{x}$ ) as the solution of the linear B SD E

$$
N_{t}^{x}=Z_{t}^{Z}\left(\underset{S}{x}+A_{S}^{x} N \underset{S}{x}+B_{S}^{x} \quad \underset{S}{x}\right) d s \quad Z_{T} \quad \underset{S}{x} d B_{S} ;
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{t}^{x}:=\int_{0}^{1} d @_{y} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0}+\left(\mathbb{N}_{t}^{x} \quad N_{t}^{0}\right) ;{ }_{t}^{x}\right) ; \\
& \text { Z } 1 \\
& B_{t}^{x}=0 \quad d @_{z} g\left(t_{i} x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
x & 0 \\
t & t
\end{array}\right)\right. \text {; } \\
& { }_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{x}}:=\left(\mathrm{g}\left(\mathrm{t} \boldsymbol{;} \mathrm{x}+\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t} ;} \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} \boldsymbol{i} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0}\right) \quad \mathrm{g}\left(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} \boldsymbol{i} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0}\right)\right)=\mathrm{x}:
\end{aligned}
$$

U sing the B SD E a prioriestim ates [see P ardoux and Peng (1990) and E l $K$ aroui, $P$ eng and $Q$ uenez (1997)] and the inequality $(a+b+c)^{2} 4\left(a^{2}+\right.$ $b^{2}+c^{2}$ ) we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& E \sup _{t} j N{ }_{t}^{x} \quad Q_{t} \jmath^{Z} \\
& \text { Z } \\
& C E \quad 0 d t\left(A_{t}^{x} \quad @_{y} g\left(t ; B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ; \quad{ }_{t}^{0}\right)\right)^{2} Q_{t}^{2}  \tag{42}\\
& +C E{ }^{Z} \quad d t\left(B_{t}^{x} \quad @_{z} g\left(t ; B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ; \quad{ }_{t}^{0}\right)^{2} \quad \begin{array}{l}
2 \\
t
\end{array}\right. \\
& Z_{T} \\
& +C E \quad 0 \quad d t\left(\begin{array}{r}
r \\
\mathrm{t}
\end{array} @_{c} g\left(t ; \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} ;{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{0}\right)\right)^{2} ;
\end{align*}
$$

for som e positive constant C .
By R olle's theorem, we have ${ }_{t}^{x}=@_{c} g\left(t_{i} \underset{t}{x} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)$ for som ${\underset{t}{x}}_{\underset{t}{x} 2\left(B_{t} ; B_{t}+\right.}$ $x$ ) and since $@_{c} 9$ is uniform ly Lipschitz w ith respect to $c ;$ we have the follow ing bound for the third term on the right-hand side of (42):

$$
\text { CE } \quad{ }_{0}^{T} d t\left(\begin{array}{c}
r  \tag{43}\\
t
\end{array} @_{c} g\left(t ; B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)\right)^{2} \quad C_{M}^{2} x^{2}:
$$

To analyze the convergence of the rst term on the right-hand side of (42) we need the follow ing bounding argum ents:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CE } \int_{0} d t{ }_{0}^{d} @_{y} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} \boldsymbol{N}_{t}^{0}+\left(N_{t}^{x} N_{t}^{0}\right) ;{ }_{t}^{x}\right) \\
& @_{y} g\left(t ; B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)^{2} Q_{t}^{2} \\
& \mathrm{KE} \quad{ }_{0}^{Z_{T}} d t \quad{ }_{0}^{Z_{1}} d @_{y} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0}+\left(\mathbb{N}_{t}^{x} \quad N_{t}^{0}\right) ;{ }_{t}^{x}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~g}\left(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} ;{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{0}\right)^{2} \\
& Z_{T} \quad Z_{1} \\
& \text { 4K E } \\
& \text { dt } 0 \\
& d @_{y} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0}+\left(N_{t}^{x} \quad N_{t}^{0}\right) ;{ }_{t}^{x}\right) \\
& @_{y} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} N_{t}{ }^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{x}\right) \\
& Z_{T} \quad Z_{1} \\
& +4 \mathrm{KE} \quad 0 \quad \mathrm{dt} \int_{0}^{1} \mathrm{~d}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~g}\left(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{x}+\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t} ;} \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} ;{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{\mathrm{x}}\right) \\
& @_{y} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right) \\
& +4 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{E} \\
& Z_{T} \quad Z_{1} \\
& \text { d } @_{Y} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right) \\
& @_{y} g\left(t ; B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)^{2} \\
& Z_{T} \quad Z_{T} \\
& 4 K M^{2} E \quad d t\left(N_{t}^{x} \quad N_{t}^{0}\right)^{2}=3+E \quad d t\left(\begin{array}{ll}
x & 0 \\
t & t
\end{array}\right)^{2}+x^{2} \\
& 4 \mathrm{KM}^{2}\left(\mathrm{CT}^{2} \mathrm{~L}^{2}=3+\mathrm{CTL} \mathrm{~L}^{2}+1\right) \mathrm{x}^{2} \text {; }
\end{aligned}
$$

where $K=C M{ }^{2} e^{2 M T} T^{2}$ and where we used (39) to obtain the rst inequality, the uniform Lipschitz property of $@_{y} f$ to obtain third inequality and we used the a prioriestim ates in (36) to obtain the last inequality. By (43) and the above, we therefore have, on taking lim its,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lim _{x \neq 0} C E \quad 0 \quad \operatorname{dt}\left(A_{t}^{x} \quad @_{y} g\left(t ; B_{t} N_{t}{ }^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)\right)^{2} Q_{t}^{2} \\
& +C E \int_{0}^{T} d t\left(\begin{array}{r}
x \\
t
\end{array} @_{c} g\left(t ; B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)\right)^{2}=0:
\end{aligned}
$$

In order to tackle the convergence of the second term on the right-hand side of (42) we use sim ilar bound to the above and get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Z_{T} \\
& \text { CE } \quad d t \quad d @_{z} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}+\left(\begin{array}{ll}
x \\
t & 0 \\
t
\end{array}\right)\right) \\
& \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{z}} \mathrm{~g}\left(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} ;{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{0}\right)^{2}{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{2} \\
& Z_{T} \quad Z_{1} \\
& \text { 2C E } \\
& 0 \\
& \int_{0}^{1} d @_{z} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}+\left(\begin{array}{ll}
x & 0 \\
t & t
\end{array}\right)\right) \\
& @_{z} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t} ;_{t}\right)^{0}{ }^{2}{ }_{t}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

(45)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +2 \mathrm{CE}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{~T}_{0} \mathrm{dt}{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{~d} \quad @_{z} g\left(\mathrm{t} ; \mathrm{x}+\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} ; \mathrm{N}_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right) \\
& @_{z} g\left(t ; B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} \boldsymbol{i} \quad \begin{array}{ll}
0 \\
t^{2}
\end{array}{ }_{t}^{2}\right. \\
& { }_{0}^{Z_{T}} d t \quad{ }_{0}^{Z}{ }_{1} d \quad @_{z} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
x & 0 \\
t & t
\end{array}\right)\right) \\
& @_{z} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)^{2} \quad 2 \\
& +2 M^{2} x^{2} E \int_{0}^{T} d t{ }_{t}^{2} \text { : }
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, to bound the last term of (45) we m im ic a technique introduced in ElK aroui, Peng and Q uenez (1997) as follow s:
$E \quad \begin{aligned} & Z_{T} \\ & 0\end{aligned}{ }_{0}^{Z_{1}} d @_{z} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}+\left(\begin{array}{ll}x & 0 \\ t & t\end{array}\right)\right.$

$$
\mathrm{C}_{z} \mathrm{~g}\left(\mathrm{t} \boldsymbol{;} \mathrm{x}+\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} \boldsymbol{;} \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} \boldsymbol{;}{\underset{\mathrm{t}}{0})^{2}{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{2} .}^{2}\right.
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M^{2} x^{1=2} E \quad{ }_{0}^{T} d t{ }_{t}^{2} \\
& +\mathrm{E} \quad{ }_{0}^{Z_{T}} d t \quad{ }_{0}^{Z_{1}} d{ }_{t}^{2} \mathbb{1}_{f_{j}^{x}} \quad{ }_{t}^{0}>\mathrm{x}^{1=4} \mathrm{~g} \\
& \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{z}} \mathrm{~g}\left(\mathrm{t} \boldsymbol{;} \mathrm{x}+\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}} \boldsymbol{;} \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} \boldsymbol{i}{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{0}+\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mathrm{x} & 0 \\
\mathrm{t} & \mathrm{t}
\end{array}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

(46)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& @_{z} g\left(t ; x+B_{t} ; N_{t}^{0} ;{ }_{t}^{0}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Z_{T} \\
& M^{2} x^{1=2} E \quad{ }_{0}^{T} \quad t_{t}^{2} \\
& Z_{T}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +4 L^{2} x^{1=2} E \quad{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} \quad \mathrm{dt} \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{fj}}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{x} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{t}}^{0} \gg \mathrm{x}^{1=4} \mathrm{~g} \\
& Z_{T} \quad Z_{T} \\
& M^{2} x^{1=2} E \quad{ }_{0} d t{ }_{t}^{2}+4 L^{2} E \quad \int_{0} d t \mathbb{1}_{f j t \ngtr x}{ }^{1=4} g_{t}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$


where we used the uniform Lipschitz and the boundness of $@_{z} g$ to obtain the rst and the second inequality, the $M$ arkov inequality to obtain fourth inequality and (36) to obtain the last inequality. $N$ ext, since $t$ is square integrable by construction, the Lebesgue theorem im plies that

$$
\lim _{x \# 0} E \int_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{dt} \mathbb{1}_{\mathrm{fj} \mathrm{t}>\mathrm{x}} \quad{ }^{1=4} \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{t}}^{2}=0
$$

and we conclude that the bound obtained in (46) tends to 0 when $x$ \# 0 ; and thus so does the bound obtained in (45).

T he above analysis, in con junction w ith (44), im plies

$$
\lim _{x \# 0} E \sup _{t} j N N_{t}^{x} \quad Q t J^{2}=0
$$

and, in particular, (41) and thus (40) are established and we are done.

Sim ilarly to the BSDE m odel, note that under assum ptions (H2) and (H3), inform ation neutrality for the G SD U m odel is equivalent to the fact that $W^{F}$ is a GBrownian m otion. Thus Theorem 1 provides a possible interpretation of this condition in term $s$ of utility cost of inform ation in the form al sense of the G SD U m odel. From that perspective, the results of $T$ heorem s 1 and 2 have sim ilar interpretations.

The technical proofs of $T$ heorem s 1 and 2 are also sim ilar, except in the part constructing a rich set ofF $m$ artingales. In the B SD E m odel (T heorem 1), we used forw ard SD Es to construct e ciently an appropriate set of ter$m$ inaldata ( ) that generate n F m artingales which integrands form a basis of $R^{n}$. This last property allow ed us to invert the tim e derivative of form ula (31) and identify $d W{ }^{F}$ in term s of dW ${ }^{G}$. In the BSDE m odel, we did not need extra technical conditions because the assum ed Lipschitz conditions on the driver $h$ are su cient to secure the existence of strong solutions of the forw ard SDEs.

In the G SDU case, the forw ard SDEs technique will not work because the term inaldata is xed $(=0)$ and we can only choose the consum ption process. In other words, we need to control the intensity V of the G SD U by selecting appropriately the intertem poral aggregators through the choice of the consum ption process (c)]. T he m ethod that we provide in Lem ma 2 is a self-contained proofw hich relies on the link betw een B SD E s and quasilinear parabolic di erential equations $\mathbb{P}$ ardoux and $P$ eng (1992) and M a, P rotter
and Yong (1994)]. Thism ethod requires extra technical conditions [assum ption (H3)] but it is our beliefs that it is interesting by itself and it also has the $m$ erit to rely only on classical results from the BSDE literature.

H owever, assum ption (H3) is intuitively not a necessary condition to obtain our characterization [unlike assum ption (H2)] and it is possible to weaken it. For instance, using the representation of the intensity as a right $\lim$ it of the $M$ alliavin derivatives of the utility process $\left(V_{t}=\lim { }_{s \# t} D_{t} U_{s}\right)$, one can use the results of P ardoux and Peng (1992) and ElK aroui, Peng and Q uenez (1997) [see also M a and Zhang (2002)] to weaken assum ption (H3). M ore generally, our choice of consum ption process $c_{t}={ }^{k} W{ }_{t}^{F}$ to generate a rich set of F m artingales is particular. A rguably it is also possible to w eaken the required technical conditions of any $m$ ethod (either the M arkovian technique or the M alliavin derivative technique) by a di erent choice of consum ption process.
6. C onclusion. W e characterized the inform ation neutrality property for a class of BSDEs including G SD Us under the assum ption that the driver depends on the intensity $Z$ only through the Euclidian norm kZ k. Behaviorally, the inform ation neutrality property corresponds to a form of intrinsic indi erence to inform ation. W e proved that, unless the inform ation reduction is speci $c$, the class of G SDUs exhibits an intrinsic attitude tow ard in form ation. This intrinsic attitude tow ard inform ation is in fact in exibly associated to the risk aversion and the ambiguity aversion concepts and cannot be disentangled from them w thin the G SD U context. These results invite further analysis. In particular, it would be m eaningful to characterize the $m$ onotonicity, that is, strict preference (or aversion) for inform ation. T he K reps\{P orteus\{Skiadas approach only provides su cient conditions for the $m$ onotonicity for a particular class of G SD U s: the SDUs. New techniques $m$ ust be introduced since we have to $m$ anipulate sub-solution of BSDES. For instance the generating $m$ artingale technique $w i l l$ not be usefiul in this context because we only have inequalities.
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