

OPTIMAL HEDGING OF DERIVATIVES WITH TRANSACTION COSTS

ERIK AURELL

*AlbaNova University Center
Department of Physics
KTH - Royal Institute of Technology
SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
erik.aurell@physics.kth.se*

PAOLO MURATORE-GINANNESCHI

*Departments of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Helsinki PL 68
FIN-00014 Helsingin Yliopisto Finland
paolo.muratore-ginanneschi@helsinki.fi*

Abstract

We investigate the optimal strategy over a finite time horizon for a portfolio of stock and bond and a derivative in an multiplicative Markovian market model with transaction costs (friction). The optimization problem is solved by a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, which by the *verification theorem* has well-behaved solutions if certain conditions on a potential are satisfied. In the case at hand, these conditions simply imply arbitrage-free (“Black-Scholes”) pricing of the derivative. While pricing is hence not changed by friction allow a portfolio to fluctuate around a delta hedge. In the limit of weak friction, we determine the optimal control to essentially be of two parts: a strong control, which tries to bring the stock-and-derivative portfolio towards a Black-Scholes delta hedge; and a weak control, which moves the portfolio by adding or subtracting a Black-Scholes hedge. For simplicity we assume growth-optimal investment criteria and quadratic friction.

1 Introduction

An idealised model of investment is a sequence of gambles where an investor at each time step decides if to re-balance her investments, and, if so, by how much. The game is multiplicative if the pay-off is proportional to capital, and Markov if the new capital and new position only depend on the previous state and the action taken then. In two previous contributions [3, 4] we computed the strategy an investor should use to maximize the growth rate of her wealth, in the presence of transaction costs, if she can invest in stock and bonds. In this paper we extend the investment possibilities to also include a derivative security, *e.g.* an option on the stock.

Asset allocation optimization in the presence of transaction costs has a long and distinguished history in finance. The main mathematical tool is the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, introduced in the frictionless case by Merton [22, 23], and with friction by Constantinides [10]. A pedagogical introduction to the

application of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation to financial problems can be found in [6]. Our first paper, [3], overlaps with the subsequent work of Atkinson, Pliska and Wilmott [1], where also a perturbative expansion around the friction-less limit is performed. In [4] we treated also optimization over a finite-time horizon.

Turning to option pricing and hedging in the presence of transaction costs, in several contributions, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman approach was not used. A classical paper in this line of research, leading to a modified option price, is that of Leland [21], another one, also leading to a modified option price, is that of Bouchaud and Sornette [9]. Boyle and Vorst [7] looked at a portfolio replicating an option with transaction costs. This is a different setting to that of optimal control and an Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman approach. Avellaneda and Paras [2] did consider Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman, but in the limit of large transaction costs. Other notable contributions are those of Edhirisinghe, Naik and Uppal [14], Davis, Panas and Zariphopolou [12], and Bensaid, Lesne, Pages and Scheinkman [5].

A recent contribution considering a portfolio including stock and derivatives in the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman approach is the paper of Constantinides and Zariphopolou [11]. However, these authors consider derivatives which can be traded only once (section 3 of that paper), while we address the situation where derivatives are traded continuously. Constantinides and Zariphopolou show that expected utility is increased by including derivatives, and that derivative prices must obey certain bounds in their model. We note that Constantinides and Zariphopolou [11] remark that the bounds they derive would be tighter if derivatives would be traded more than once.

In our treatment, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation for the stock, bond and derivative problem leads to time-dependent controls, as in the simpler case of [4]. A feature which appears when stock and derivative are both traded continuously is that the optimization problem in general ill-defined, unless the price process obeys a solvability criterion, known as the *verification theorem* in the mathematical theory of controlled stochastic processes [16]. In Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman language, the value function is potentially unbounded, because the number of variables that can be controlled (the positions in stock and derivative) is larger than the number of independent noise sources. In the case at hand, the potential is the expected utility of the portfolio as a function of the fraction of wealth invested in stock and derivative, and the conditions simply imply arbitrage-free (“Black-Scholes”) pricing of the derivative.

While we hence find that pricing does *not* depend on market friction, the optimal investment strategy does. Qualitatively speaking, we determine the optimal control to be of two parts: a strong control, which tries to bring the stock-and-derivative portfolio close to a Black-Scholes delta hedge; and a weak control, which moves the portfolio by adding or subtracting a Black-Scholes hedge. The rationale for the presence of the weak control is that the strong control acts to oppose the underlying diffusion of the portfolio, in the direction normal to the delta hedge. The larger that diffusion, the higher will be the average friction costs, per unit time. It is therefore advantageous to invest as much in the delta hedge to make the diffusion in the normal direction as small as possible. As in [11] we find that introducing derivatives increases expected utility. Essentially, in the small friction limit, expected transaction costs decrease, and dependence upon friction parameter is pushed to higher order.

A technical contribution in this paper, analogous to [1, 4] (without derivatives), is that we introduce a multi-scale expansion around the friction-less limit. Since, however, we have two independent variables under control (the stock and the derivative), we can have different scales in two different directions. In fact, we will show that in the weak-noise limit there is a fast control direction, and a slow control direction. The fast control strives to bring the portfolio to an optimal stock portfolio plus a Black-Scholes hedge. Financially, this means that an optimal investment strategy is to hold some amount in stock, and then some number of fully hedged derivatives. That number is however controlled on a longer time scale, by the slow control. Two limit cases are of interest. First, far from expiry a derivative is not much different from stock, and the situation is similar to only investing in stock and bonds. Second we can also deal with the situation close to expiry. There, the best strategy turns out to be to hold little funds proportional to the Black-Scholes hedge, i.e. to avoid derivatives in the optimal strategy. This concurs with the practice of closing out positions in derivatives before expiry.

For simplicity we work in this paper with quadratic friction. These can be motivated as an effective description of market impact (see e.g. [15]). The reader is referred to [4] for details. Linear friction costs, arguably more realistic, lead to free boundary problems in the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman formalism, which

are considerably harder, from the analytical and numerical point of view.

For simplicity we will also furthermore assume throughout that an investor strives to optimize expected growth of capital, which in a multiplicative market model means logarithmic utility. Growth optimal strategies were first introduced by Kelly in the context of information theory [20]. Growth-optimal strategies have the well-known property of eventually, for long times, outperforming any other strategy with probability one ([18] and references therein), but do not maximize vanilla-flavored utility functions, see *e.g.* [13]. In the present context, logarithmic utilities should merely be looked upon a definite and convenient choice, which brings some mathematical tidiness.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we state the model (without derivative), and the controls we consider. We state the optimisation problem in the framework of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. In section 4 we show that the non-linear Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation governing the dynamics, in our example, is solvable in the small transaction costs limit by means of a multi-scale perturbation theory (see for example [8], or [17], chapter 9). This is the main technical result of the paper, and reduces the non-linearity to a normal form. All higher order corrections can be computed from ancillary linear non-homogeneous equations. In section 6 we solve analytically the normal form of the non-linearity. The approximation turns out to be very accurate for realistic values of the parameters in the model. The last section is devoted to a discussion of the results.

2 Bond, stock and derivatives

In this section we define notation, and state the problem. The market consists of a risk-less security (bond, or bank account) and a risky security (stock). By a change of numeraire we take the price of the risk-free security to be constant in time. The stock price is taken the standard log-normal process:

$$S_{t+dt} = S_t (1 + \mu dt + \sigma dB_t) \quad (1)$$

Here dB_t denotes the stochastic differential and μ and σ are positive constants. Nothing in the following analysis would essentially change if μ and σ would be functions of t and S_t , as long as the market is still complete, see *e.g.* [19]. Consider now first a portfolio in only stock and bond. The control variable then is the fraction of wealth an investor has invested in stock:

$$\phi_t = \frac{W_t^{\text{Stocks}}}{W_t} \quad (2)$$

This variable changes both in result to market fluctuation, i.e. (1), and re-hedging. We assume that a control can be executed of the form

$$d\phi_t^{\text{control}} = f dt \quad (3)$$

and doing so carries a cost

$$dW_t^{\text{tradingcosts}} = F(f) W_t dt \quad (4)$$

where F is a semi-positive definite functional of the stochastic control. The form of F models the transaction costs.

The coupled stochastic differential equations of W and ϕ are then

$$dW_t = W_t [(\phi_t \mu + (1 - \phi_t) r - F(f)) dt + \phi_t \sigma dB_t] \quad (5)$$

$$d\phi_t = f dt + \phi_t (1 - \phi_t) (\sigma^2 \phi_t dt + [\phi_t (1 - \phi_t)] dB_t + \phi_t F(f) dt) \quad (6)$$

For a derivation of these equations, see [4]. The time-dependent growth-optimization problem, of a stock and bond portfolio, from time t to some final time T , is simply to choose the control f such that the expected value of $\log \frac{W_T}{W_t}$ is maximized. By a change of variable, this is equivalent to maximizing the

expectation value, over the controlled diffusion process, of a potential (utility function) depending on \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{f} . Implicitly, we assume unbounded borrowing at the risk-less rate, and no restrictions on going short. These are not in fact serious limitations, because the optimal solution, with transaction costs, is to hold the fraction invested in stock close the optimal value of $\frac{1}{2}$, see [3], which is finite. In the main body of this paper, we will use quadratic friction costs, *i.e.* $F(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{f}^2$, for a discussion of linear friction costs, see [3].

Let us define a derivative security as a third investment possibility, the price of which, $C(\mathbf{x}; t)$, only depends on the moment of time t and the price of stock. The price dynamics of the derivative is

$$\frac{dC}{C} = \frac{1}{C} \left[\theta_t C + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_t^2 \theta_t^2 C \right] dt + \frac{\theta_t \sigma_t C}{C} dB_t = a_d dt + b_d dB_t \quad (7)$$

where we for later convenience introduce amplitudes a_d and b_d . Both are of course functions of t and \mathbf{x} . Let now as before the fraction invested in stock be \mathbf{x} with control \mathbf{f} , and the fraction invested in derivative \mathbf{d} , with control \mathbf{f}_d . Exercising either of the controls in a time interval dt carries a cost $F(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{f}_d) W_t dt$.

The coupled equations for wealth, W and C are then

$$dW = W \left[(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}) dt + (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d}) dB_t - F(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{f}_d) dt \right] \quad (8)$$

$$dC = [a_d + b_d F(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{f}_d)] dt + b_d dB_t \quad (9)$$

$$dC = [a_d + b_d F(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{f}_d)] dt + b_d dB_t \quad (10)$$

where the functions in the drift terms are

$$a_d = \frac{1}{C} \left[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d} \right] \left[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d} \right] \quad (11)$$

$$a_d = \frac{1}{C} \left[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d} \right] \left[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d} \right] \quad (12)$$

and the functions in the diffusive terms are

$$b_d = \frac{1}{C} \left[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d} \right] \quad (13)$$

$$b_d = \frac{1}{C} \left[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d} \right] \quad (14)$$

With analytic transaction costs we have

$$F(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{f}_d) = \mathbf{f}^2 + \mathbf{d} \mathbf{f}_d^2 \quad (15)$$

with two friction parameters \mathbf{d} and \mathbf{d} . We now state the problem we want to solve. The expected logarithmic growth rate is

$$(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}; t; T) = E \log \frac{W_T}{W_t} \quad (16)$$

In consequence the logarithmic growth is the expected value of the utility function

$$U = \frac{1}{2} \left[\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{d} \right]^2 F(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{f}_d) \quad (17)$$

over the probability density $P(\mathbf{x}^0; \mathbf{y}^0; \mathbf{p}^0; t^0; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}; t)$ is the probability of the process $(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}; t)$, to reach point $(\mathbf{x}^0; \mathbf{y}^0; \mathbf{p}^0)$ at time t^0 , given it was at $(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p})$ at time t

$$(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}; t; T) = \int_{t^0}^T dt \int U(\mathbf{z}) P(\mathbf{x}^0; \mathbf{y}^0; \mathbf{p}^0; t^0; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}; t) d\mathbf{x}^0 d\mathbf{y}^0 d\mathbf{p}^0 \quad (18)$$

Note in view of (1) the probability density factorizes to

$$P(\mathbf{x}^0; \mathbf{y}^0; \mathbf{p}^0; t^0; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}; t) = P(\mathbf{x}^0; \mathbf{y}^0; t^0; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{p}; t) P(\mathbf{p}^0; t^0; \mathbf{p}; t)$$

Furthermore, the probability density is in general non-autonomous as a_d and b_d may depend explicitly upon the time variable. The problem is now to find controls \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{f}_d that maximize the logarithmic growth.

3 The verification principle and Black-Scholes

It is useful to first discuss the friction-less case. We will then just reproduce standard elementary results in finance, but in a formulation convenient for the following discussion. Without transaction costs, the speculator is free to re hedge continuously. In such a case the optimisation problem is equivalent to finding the supremum, at any instance of time, of the instantaneous growth rate

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^2} + \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_d^2} \right) \quad (19)$$

Equation (19) is a degenerate quadratic functional of the fraction in stocks and derivatives. The Hessian of (19)

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} & -\frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^4} \\ -\frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^4} & \frac{1}{\sigma_d^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

has a zero eigenvalue along the *marginal subspace*

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} - \frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^4} = 0 \quad (21)$$

The second eigenvalue is negative, $\lambda_s = -\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} + \frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^4}\right)$, associated to the *stable subspace*

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} + \frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^4} = 0 \quad (22)$$

We now make a change of variables

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_{10} \\ e_{01} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_s \\ \sigma_d \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma_d \\ \sigma_s \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

where $(e_{10}; e_{01})$ is the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^2 and $(e_m; e_s)$ is an orthonormal basis formed by the unit vectors respectively spanning the marginal and stable subspaces of the Hessian matrix H :

$$e_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_s \\ \sigma_d \end{pmatrix}; \quad e_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_s^2 + \sigma_d^2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\sigma_d \\ \sigma_s \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

The variable e_s along the stable eigenspace describes a portfolio in which the investment in derivatives is weighted by the ratio of the volatilities

$$e_s = \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_d} \quad (25)$$

The utility function reads in these new variables

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^2} + \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_d^2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^2} + \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_d^2} \right) \quad (26)$$

This growth rate is a convex function if and only if the second term vanishes. This can happen if either of its two factors are zero. The first possibility gives the following *solvability condition*:

$$\frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_s^2} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sigma_d^2 C + \frac{\sigma_s^2}{2} \sigma_d^2 C^2 = 0 \quad (27)$$

holding for every $t \in [0, T]$ and in particular for t equal to τ

$$\partial_t C + \frac{\sigma^2 P^2}{2} \partial_P^2 C = 0 \quad (28)$$

This is the of course simply Black-Scholes equation at zero interest rate. The second possibility is that the linear combination

$$\alpha \quad \# = 0 \quad (29)$$

vanishes, which simply means that the fraction invested in derivatives is zero. Optimisation can then be carried out along the stable manifold. The utility

$$V = \frac{\sigma^2 P^2}{2} \quad (30)$$

has a maximum for

$$\alpha = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (31)$$

If nothing is invested in derivative ($\alpha = 0$) the fraction invested in stock ($\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$) is the same as the optimal investment fraction in the stock-and-bond problem. When (27) holds true any dynamics along the *marginal subspace* does not produce any gain or loss. That means we can invest W (in value) in stock and $-\frac{1}{2} W$ (in value) in derivative, for any W . Expressed in stock price P_t and numbers of stock, n , the value invested in stock is $n P_t$. The value invested in derivative is hence $-\frac{1}{2} n P_t$, but also $n_d C$, if n_d is the numbers of derivative. The number of stock per derivative is hence

$$\frac{n_s}{n_d} = \frac{-\frac{1}{2} C}{C} = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (32)$$

The portfolio along the marginal subspace is hence a simply Black-Scholes delta hedge

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} C \quad (33)$$

following the standard financial notation.

4 Hamilton-Bellman-Jacobi problem for analytic transaction costs

The use of analytic transaction costs renders the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman problem simpler to study. In the frame of reference fixed by the eigenvectors of the Hessian of the utility function, the stochastic dynamics is governed by the system of stochastic differential equations

$$dW = W [\alpha dt + \beta dB_t] - W F(f; f_\#) dt \quad (34)$$

$$d\alpha = [\alpha + a + F(f; f_\#)] dt + b dB_t \quad (35)$$

$$d\beta = [\beta + a_\# + \beta F(f; f_\#)] dt + b_\# dB_t \quad (36)$$

$$d\alpha_d = H dt + K dB_t \quad (37)$$

$$d\beta = \alpha dt + \beta dB_t \quad (38)$$

The drift and diffusion fields in these coordinates are

$$a = \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)^3 \frac{(1 + \frac{d}{2}) + \frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) + \frac{d}{2} \# \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)}{\left(\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2} \right)} + \frac{\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2}}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} \# [H + K \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)] \quad (39)$$

$$b = \frac{\left(\frac{d}{2} \right)^3 (1 + \frac{d}{2}) + \frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) + \frac{d}{2} \# \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)}{\left(\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2} \right)} + \frac{\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2}}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} \# K \quad (40)$$

$$a_{\#} = \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)^3 \frac{\left(\frac{d}{2} \right)}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} + \# \frac{\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2}}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} + \frac{\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2}}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} \# [H + \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) K] \quad (41)$$

$$b_{\#} = \frac{\frac{d}{2} \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} + \# \frac{\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2}}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} + \frac{\frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2}}{2 + \frac{d}{2}} \# K \quad (42)$$

while the time change of d is expressed in terms of two new amplitudes:

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} d + \frac{\partial}{\partial d} + \frac{d^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial d^2} \quad (43)$$

$$K = \frac{\partial}{\partial d}$$

By using the Black and Scholes equation, H can be expressed in terms of K and the other parameters:

$$H = K \frac{d}{2} + \frac{d}{2} \quad (44)$$

The dynamic programming equation for quadratic friction

$$F(f; f_{\#}) = \frac{d^4}{2} f + \frac{d}{2} f_{\#}^2 + \frac{d^4}{2} \frac{d}{2} f + \frac{d}{2} f_{\#}^2 \quad (45)$$

is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + [f + a + zF(f; f_{\#})] \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + [f_{\#} + a_{\#} + yF(f; f_{\#})] \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\ & + p \frac{\partial}{\partial p} + \frac{b^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \frac{b_{\#}^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + \frac{p^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2} + b b_{\#} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z y} + b p \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z p} + b_{\#} p \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y p} \\ & + z F(f; f_{\#}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The optimal investment strategy is sought by requiring the capital growth reach as a functional of the controls $(f; f_{\#})$ a stationary point:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial F}{\partial f} + \left(1 + z \frac{\partial F}{\partial f} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial f_{\#}} y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = 0 \\ & \frac{\partial F}{\partial f} + z \frac{\partial F}{\partial f_{\#}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + \left(1 + \frac{\partial F}{\partial f_{\#}} y \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

The stationary point equations admit a unique solution for the stochastic controls

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \frac{(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}) \mathcal{Q}_z + \frac{\sigma}{2} (\frac{\sigma}{2}) \mathcal{Q}_y}{2 \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (1 - \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_z - \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_y)} \\ f_{\#} &= \frac{(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}) \mathcal{Q}_y + \frac{\sigma}{2} (\frac{\sigma}{2}) \mathcal{Q}_z}{2 \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (1 - \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_z - \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_y)} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

which inserted in the dynamic programming equation yield the the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation for the model

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_t + a \mathcal{Q}_z + a_{\#} \mathcal{Q}_y + p \mathcal{Q}_p + \frac{\frac{\sigma}{2} (\mathcal{Q}_z + \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_y)^2 + (\frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_z - \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_y)^2}{4 \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (1 - \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_z - \frac{\sigma}{2} \mathcal{Q}_y)} \\ + \frac{b^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_z^2 + \frac{b_{\#}^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_y^2 + \frac{(p)^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_p^2 + b b_{\#} \mathcal{Q}_{zy} + b p \mathcal{Q}_{zp} + b_{\#} p \mathcal{Q}_{yp} \\ + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{2} z^2 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The dynamics is fully specified by associating to (49) the equation for the derivative volatility

$$\mathcal{Q}_t + \frac{p}{2} \mathcal{Q}_p^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \mathcal{Q}_p^2 = 0 \quad (50)$$

Equation (49) contains in principle the solution to our problem. The expected capital growth rate determines the stochastic controls through (48). Qualitative and quantitative analyses of the control strategies are pursued in sections 5 and 6 below.

The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation should be supplemented by boundary conditions on \mathcal{Q} . Arguably, the most natural would be to additionally assume that the process is confined to some domain, and hence that the normal gradient of \mathcal{Q} vanishes on the boundaries of that domain. For the rest of this paper, we will be concerned with a description close to the optimum. We will hence assume that the boundaries are far away, that the probability is there small, and that we will not need to further specify the boundary conditions.

5 Qualitative analysis of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation

Qualitatively, one can imagine the following scenario. As the utility changes with the position along the stable direction, one may postulate a *fast control* along that direction, striving to bring the position close to the marginal. Depending on where one is along the marginal, there would then be different (expected) transaction costs in keeping the position in the stable direction close to zero. Hence, all positions along the marginal are not equivalent, because they lead to different (expected) transaction costs in the stable direction. In fact, we can then posit that the preferred position along the marginal is such that b of (40), evaluated at

$$b^* = \frac{\sigma}{2} \quad (51)$$

is as small as possible. Since this function is linear in the marginal coordinate (see below), we then have a prescription for the optimum allocation into a Black-Scholes hedge, as function of time and price of the underlying

$$b^* = D + (\frac{\sigma}{2})^2 \frac{\#}{2} \frac{(\frac{\sigma}{2}) \frac{\sigma}{2} + K}{2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}} \quad (52)$$

with

$$D = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (53)$$

the diffusion amplitude in the absence of derivative trading. From the definition of K (see appendix B) the right hand side of (52) can also be rewritten as

$$b^2 = D \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2 + \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2}} \frac{\#}{2} \frac{\partial_t C}{C} \quad (54)$$

Note that the time variation of the derivative price is usually denoted in the financial literature by the Greek letter θ . The relations satisfied by the derivative- with other commonly used financial indicators as the derivative θ and σ_d are recalled in appendix B. The condition

$$b^2 = 0 \quad (55)$$

is enforced by setting

$$\# = \frac{\sigma_d}{2} \frac{(\frac{\sigma_d^2}{2} + \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2}) D C}{\partial_t C} \quad (56)$$

This equation is in one sense the main result of the present work. It is therefore useful to rewrite it directly in the original variables, i.e. the fractions invested in stock and derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 &= \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2 + \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2}} (\sigma^2 + \sigma_d \#) = \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2} \frac{\partial_t D C}{2 \partial_t C} = \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2} + \frac{D}{p} \\ \sigma^2 &= \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2 + \frac{\sigma_d^2}{2}} (\sigma_d \#) = \frac{D C}{2 \partial_t C} = \frac{D}{\sigma_d p} \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

A consequence of these equations is that if σ_d diverges, σ^2 stays finite, while $\#$ tends to zero (σ^2 diverges as σ_d). This happens for European Call Options close to expiry and at-the-money (see appendix, σ_d is then proportional to the “Greek” θ , and inversely proportional to the option price C). Following Black-Scholes hedging directly can then lead to large transaction costs, because of “portfolio flapping” (switching between the fully hedged and totally unhedged positions in response to small changes in the underlying). We see that from the perspective of optimal investment strategies, this problem does not appear, since such portfolios do not contain any at-the-money options close to expiry.

In the opposite limit of a large investment horizon, the derivative volatility tends to the volatility of the underlying. Furthermore the inequality

$$\frac{\partial_t C}{C} \leq 1 \quad (58)$$

holds true requiring increasingly large investments in derivatives in order to enforce (55). In such limit the optimal size of the investment in stocks is also seen to diverge. The reason is that the drift (39) and diffusion amplitude (40) along the stable direction become independent of the marginal direction if the infinite horizon limit is taken for any arbitrary finite value of σ . In particular (39), (40) become in the portfolio variable identical to the drift and diffusion amplitude felt in the stock and bond model studied in [4]. These phenomena indicate a break-down of the argument used to derive (55). Qualitatively one expects in this second limit the optimal investment strategy to treat the stock and the derivative in a similar manner analogous to the one depicted in [4].

6 Systematic analysis of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation

In this section we will use a systematic multi-scale analysis to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. We will show that the previous qualitative analysis is well founded. Furthermore, we are also able to treat the case when the (putative) optimal position z^* diverges, and, more generally, we can compute the control to be exerted on z and y . Nevertheless, the main interest here is conceptual, that the previous analysis can be systematically justified.

To start with it is convenient to write the logarithmic growth in the form

$$= \frac{\sigma^2}{2} (\Gamma - t) + \dots \quad (59)$$

The first term corresponds to growth in the absence of transaction costs. The intensity of transaction costs is then measured by the two adimensional parameters

$$\mu = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{d}{\sigma^2 + d} \quad (60)$$

and

$$= \frac{d}{\sigma^2 + d} \quad (61)$$

In order to construct an asymptotic expansion around the ideal case of no transaction costs it is convenient to shift the origin of the coordinates $(z; y)$ to

$$z) = z^* + z; \quad y) = y^* + y \quad (62)$$

The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t' + a \partial_z' + a_\# \partial_y' + p \partial_p' + \frac{(\sigma^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{d})}{8\mu} \frac{(\partial_z')^2 + (\partial_y')^2}{1 - (\sigma^2 + z) \partial_z' - (y^* + y) \partial_y'} \\ & + \frac{(\partial_z' + d \partial_y')^2}{8\mu} \frac{(\partial_z')^2}{1 - (\sigma^2 + z) \partial_z' - y \partial_y'} + \frac{b^2}{2} \partial_z'^2 + \frac{b_\#^2}{2} \partial_y'^2 + \frac{(p)^2}{2} \partial_p'^2 \\ & + b b_\# \partial_{zy}' + b p \partial_{zp}' + b_\# p \partial_{yp}' - \frac{\sigma^2 z^2}{2} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

By dimensional analysis, one can motivate the following choice of scales in time, stable subspace (z) and marginal subspace (y) :

$$t' = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mu^n t^{(n)} \quad \mu = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{d}{\sigma^2 + d} \quad \begin{aligned} t^{(1)} &= \frac{t}{\mu^{1/2}}; \quad t^{(2)} = \frac{t}{\mu}; \quad t^{(3)} = \frac{t}{\mu^{3/2}}; \quad t^{(4)} = \frac{t}{\mu^2}; \quad \dots \\ z^{(1)} &= \frac{z}{\mu^{1/2}}; \quad z^{(2)} = \frac{z}{\mu}; \quad z^{(3)} = \frac{z}{\mu^{3/2}}; \quad z^{(4)} = \frac{z}{\mu^2}; \quad \dots \\ y^{(1)} &= \frac{y}{\mu^{1/2}}; \quad y^{(2)} = \frac{y}{\mu}; \quad y^{(3)} = \frac{y}{\mu^{3/2}}; \quad y^{(4)} = \frac{y}{\mu^2}; \quad \dots \end{aligned}$$

Introducing fast and slow variables

$$\begin{aligned} t_{1=2} &= \frac{t}{\mu^{1/2}}; & t_{3=8} &= \frac{t}{\mu^{3/2}}; & \dots \\ z_{1=4} &= \frac{z}{\mu^{1/2}}; & z_{1=8} &= \frac{z}{\mu}; & \dots \\ y_{1=4} &= \frac{y}{\mu^{1/2}}; & & & \dots \end{aligned}$$

derivatives are rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t' &= \epsilon^{1=2} \partial_{t_1=2}^{(0)} + \epsilon^{5=8} \partial_{t_3=8}^{(0)} + \partial_{t_1=2}^{(1)} \\
&\quad + \epsilon^{3=4} \partial_{t_1=4}^{(0)} + \partial_{t_3=8}^{(1)} + \partial_{t_1=2}^{(0)} + \dots \\
\partial_z' &= \epsilon^{3=4} \partial_{z_1=4}^{(0)} + \epsilon^{7=8} \partial_{z_1=8}^{(0)} + \partial_{z_1=4}^{(1)} + \dots \\
\partial_y' &= \epsilon^{7=8} \partial_{y_1=8}^{(0)} + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

We introduce “slower” variables in the perturbative expansion for the following reason. A general feature of the expansion we are considering is that lower order approximate solutions enter the linear partial differential equations governing higher order ones in the form of non-homogeneous terms. By Fredholm’s alternative it follows that the perturbative expansion is consistent if and only if these non-homogeneous term have no overlap with kernel of the linear differential operator associated to the homogeneous part of the equations. According to the standard multiscale method (see for example [8]) slower variables can be used to enforce the consistency conditions. The hierarchy of perturbative equations starts with

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^{1=2} : \quad & \partial_{t_1=2}^{(0)} + \frac{(1 + \epsilon^2) + (1 - \epsilon^2)}{8} \partial_{z_1=4}^{(0)} + \frac{b^2}{2} \partial_{z_1=4}^{(0)} \\
& \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1^2} = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^{5=8} : \quad & L(t_1=2; z_1=4; 0) \partial_{t_1=2}^{(1)} + \frac{b^2}{2} \partial_{z_1=4}^{(1)} = L(t_3=8; z_1=8; 0) \partial_{t_3=8}^{(0)} \\
& \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} \partial_{z_1=4}^{(0)} \partial_{y_1=8}^{(0)} + b^2 b_{\#}^2 \partial_{z_1=4}^2 \partial_{y_1=8}^{(0)} \\
& b^2 \partial_{z_1=4}^2 \partial_{z_1=8}^{(0)}
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

$$\epsilon^{3=4} : \quad \dots$$

where $b^2, b_{\#}^2$ are evaluated at z equal ϵ^2 and depend parametrically upon ϵ^2 whilst

$$L(t; z; 0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{(1 + \epsilon^2) + (1 - \epsilon^2)}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1=4} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \tag{67}$$

7 Leading order asymptotics

Formally the leading order of the perturbative hierarchy of equations coincide with the one of the stock and bond market model studied in [3]. Setting

$$A = \frac{(1 + \epsilon^2) + (1 - \epsilon^2)}{2} \tag{68}$$

for z sufficiently small the asymptotic expression of the logarithmic growth of the investor capital is [4]

$$\begin{aligned}
 (z; t; T) = & \frac{b^2}{2} \frac{b^{22}}{2} (T - t) \frac{z^2}{A} \frac{1}{2} \\
 & + \frac{2b^2}{A} \ln \left(\frac{e^{2n \frac{2A}{2} \frac{T-t}{n+2}}}{2^{2n} (n+1)} H_{2n} \left(\frac{z}{2b^{24}} \right) \right) \\
 & + O(n^{1+1=8}) \quad (69)
 \end{aligned}$$

with H_{2n} denoting the Hermite polynomial of order $2n$. The argument of the logarithm can be further resummed using the Fourier representation of the generating function of the Hermite polynomials

$$H_n(ax) = (-1)^n e^{a^2 x^2} \frac{d^n e^{-y^2}}{dy^n} \bigg|_{y=ax} = e^{a^2 x^2} \frac{dp}{2} \left((-1)^n e^{pax} \frac{p^2}{4} \right) \quad (70)$$

The result is

$$\begin{aligned}
 (z; t; T) = & \frac{b^2}{2} \frac{b^{22}}{2} (T - t) \frac{z^2}{A} \frac{1}{2} \tanh \left(\frac{r}{2} \frac{2A}{2} \frac{T-t}{n+2} \right) \\
 & + \frac{b^2}{A} \ln \left(\frac{2}{1 + e^{2 \frac{2A}{2} \frac{T-t}{n+2}}} \right) \\
 & + O(n^{1+1=8}) \quad (71)
 \end{aligned}$$

At variance with [4] the diffusion coefficient b^2 in (71) depends for any finite investment horizon upon z . The logarithmic growth attains a maximum for z equal to zero corresponding to the optimal portfolio in the absence of transaction costs. The value of this maximum defines the growth rate of the investor capital. It is straightforward to verify that the conditions (55), (56) specify the *supremum* for the growth rate of the investor capital. The overall logarithmic growth becomes in such a limit

$$\begin{aligned}
 (z; t; T) \xrightarrow{b^2 \rightarrow 0} & \frac{b^2}{2} \frac{b^{22}}{2} (T - t) \frac{z^2}{A} \frac{1}{2} \tanh \left(\frac{r}{2} \frac{2A}{2} \frac{T-t}{n+2} \right) \\
 & + O(n^{1+1=8}) \quad (72)
 \end{aligned}$$

The qualitative conclusion that can be inferred from (72) is that the inclusion in the optimal portfolio of a derivative product quells the effect of transaction costs from the capital growth rate.

The mathematical conditions for the validity of the asymptotic expression (72) of the logarithmic growth are determined by (57). The corresponding portfolio is well defined close to maturity and for values of the underlying price close to the strike price, when the volatility of the derivative price becomes very large. It is also worth stressing that the asymptotics (72) holds true for values of z sufficiently small that the effect of the boundary conditions can be neglected:

$$z \ll 1 \quad (73)$$

The reasoning allowing to derive the asymptotics (72) from (71) breaks down in the large investment horizon limit as discussed at the end of section 5. Namely in such a limit the terms proportional to n^2 in (65) vanish,

leaving with an equation in the portfolio variable z of the same form of the one describing the investment strategy in the absence of derivatives the solution whereof was studied in [4].

The analysis of the intermediate dynamical regime between maturity and large horizon requires to take into account the boundary conditions associated to the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation (49) and is beyond the scope of this paper.

7.1 Corrections to the leading order

Inspection of (66) shows that it is consistent to set

$$v_{(1)} = 0 \quad (74)$$

with $v_{(0)}$ independent of the first set of slower variables. Hence the first non-trivial correction to (72) turns out to be of the order $O(\epsilon^{1+2=8} v_{(2)})$ as in the case of a market model without derivative products [4].

8 Conclusions

We have shown that optimum investment strategies in a portfolio of stocks, bond and a derivative can be determined by Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman techniques. Black-Scholes equation appears as a solvability condition for the problem to be well-founded. Optimal strategies can be described as “fuzzy Black-Scholes”: if transaction costs are small, optimal portfolios are not far from Black-Scholes delta hedges.

We believe it of conceptual interest that Black-Scholes pricing emerges as a solvability condition for an ensemble of possible investment strategies. Hence, Black-Scholes has been motivated in a weaker setting, where there is no replicating portfolio. Second, we have shown that expected transaction costs can be lowered by choosing between investments in both stocks and derivatives, and not only in stock. This is not surprising, but the point has not previously been made previously by systematic analysis, to our best knowledge. We note that the qualitative analysis can be extended to the case of several derivatives on the same stock. Although there is a “law of diminishing returns”, expected transaction costs can then be lowered further.

Finally we have made explicit the optimal fraction invested in derivatives in terms of the standard financial “Greeks”.

A European call option

The boundary condition associated to Black and Scholes’s equation for an European call option is

$$C(p; 0) = \max(p - p; 0) \quad (A.1)$$

with p the exercise (strike) price. The solution at zero discount rate is

$$C(p; T - t) = pN(d_1) - pN(d_2) \quad (A.2)$$

where

$$N(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-\frac{y^2}{2\sigma^2}} dy = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \operatorname{Erf} \left(\frac{x}{\sigma\sqrt{2}} \right) \right] \quad (A.3)$$

and

$$d_1 = \frac{\ln \frac{p}{p} + \frac{\sigma^2 (T-t)}{2}}{\sigma \sqrt{T-t}}; \quad d_2 = d_1 - \sigma \sqrt{T-t} \quad (A.4)$$

Observing that

$$\frac{\partial d_1}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial d_2}{\partial p} \quad (A.5)$$

it is found that for an European call option

$$d = \frac{p N(d_1)}{p N(d_1) + p N(d_2)} \quad (A.6)$$

Thus, in the large investment horizon limit $T - t \rightarrow 1$ and in the limit of underlying prices much larger than the strike at maturity date $p \gg p$ the volatility of the derivative product tends to the volatility of the underlying.

B Relation with the “Greeks”

The sensitivity of the derivative price to variation of the underlying are measured by the “Greeks”: a set of factor sensitivities used extensively by traders to quantify the exposures of portfolios that contain options. In the present case the Greeks of relevance are

$$\Delta = \frac{\partial C}{\partial p}; \quad \Gamma = \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial p^2}; \quad \Theta = \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} \quad (B.1)$$

In such a case

$$d = \frac{p}{C} \quad (B.2)$$

From the definition (43) of the field K and the Black and Scholes equation (28) it follows

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \frac{p}{C} \left(\frac{p^2}{C^2} + \frac{p^2}{C} \right) = d \left(1 - \frac{d}{d} \right) + d \frac{p}{C} \\ &= d \left(1 - \frac{d}{d} \right) + \frac{2}{C} \end{aligned} \quad (B.3)$$

For an European call options

$$= \frac{r}{2} \frac{p^2 e^{\frac{(\ln \frac{p}{p})^2}{2 \sigma^2 (T-t)} - \frac{\sigma^2}{8} (T-t)}}{2 \sqrt{T-t}} \quad (B.4)$$

the fields K tends to a distribution when t tends to the maturity date.

C Asymptotics of the probability distribution of the stock investment

The leading order asymptotics to the Hamilton Bellman Jacobi equation can be written as

$$\partial_t \phi + \frac{A}{4} (\partial_z \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \partial_z^2 \phi + \frac{z^2}{2} - \frac{z^2}{2} = 0 \quad (C.1)$$

It describes the evolution equation of the potential of a drift field

$$v = \frac{A}{2} \partial_z \phi \quad (C.2)$$

advecting the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t P + \partial_z (v P) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_z^2 P = 0 \quad (C.3)$$

describing within approximation the probability density of the investment in stock. The general solution can be written in path integral form

$$P(z^0; T, z; t) = \int_{z(t)=z}^z D[s] \exp(-A) \quad (C.4)$$

with

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T ds \left(\frac{1}{2} \partial_z^2 \phi - \frac{A}{2} \partial_z \phi^2 + \frac{A}{2} \partial_z^2 \phi \right) \quad (C.5)$$

The path integral can be performed exactly (see [24] for details)

$$P(z^0; T, z; t) = \exp\left(-\frac{A}{2} \frac{(T-t)}{z^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{A}{2} \frac{(z;t)}{z^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{(z^2 + z^0)^2 \cosh f! (T-t)g}{2 \sinh f! (T-t)g} - \frac{2zz^0}{2 \sinh f! (T-t)g}\right) \quad (C.6)$$

having used the boundary condition

$$\phi(z; T) = 0 \quad (C.7)$$

and the notation

$$f! = \frac{r}{\frac{A}{2}} \quad (C.8)$$

The explicit form of ϕ is obtained by imposing probability conservation over z^0 . If this latter variable takes values on the entire real axis, the result (71) given in the main text as leading asymptotic to the full solution is recovered. The corresponding form of the probability distribution is

$$P(z^0; T, z; t) = \frac{r}{2 \tanh f! (T-t)} \exp\left(-\frac{(z^0 - z \cosh f! (T-t)g)^2}{2 \tanh f! (T-t)g}\right) \quad (C.9)$$

A direct calculation allows to verify that (C.9) satisfies the equality

$$\phi(z; t) = \int_t^T ds \int_R^z dy \left(\frac{1}{2} \partial_z^2 \phi - \frac{A}{2} \partial_z \phi^2 + \frac{A}{2} \partial_z^2 \phi \right) P(y; s, z; t) \quad (C.10)$$

with $\phi(z; t)$ also given by (71) as required by the stochastic dynamics underlying the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation.

Acknowledgments

The authors are pleased to acknowledge discussions with A. Kupiainen and A. Vulpiani during the preparation of this work. This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council (E.A.), and by the Centre of Excellence *Geometric Analysis and Mathematical Physics* by the Department of Mathematics and Statistics of the University of Helsinki (P.M.G.).

References

- [1] Atkinson, Pliska and P. Wilmott “Portfolio management with transaction costs”, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **A 453** 551-562 (1997).
- [2] M. Avellaneda and A. Paras “Dynamic Hedging Portfolios for Derivative Securities in the Presence of Large Transaction Costs”, Appl. Math. Finance **1**, 165-193 (1994).
- [3] E. Aurell and P. Muratore-Ginanneschi, “Financial Friction and Multiplicative Markov Market Game”, *International J. of Theoretical and Applied Finance* (IJTAF) **3**, 501-510 (2000) and cond-mat/9908253.
- [4] E. Aurell and P. Muratore-Ginanneschi, “Growth-optimal strategies with quadratic friction over finite-time investment horizons”, *International J. of Theoretical and Applied Finance* (IJTAF) **7**, 645-657 (2004) and cond-mat/0211044.
- [5] B. Bensaid, J.-P. Lesne, H. Pages and J. Scheinkman, “Derivative Asset Pricing With Transaction Costs”, Banque de France - Direction Generale des Etudes Papers **15**, (1991).
- [6] T. Björk *Arbitrage Theory in Continuous Time*, Oxford University Press 2nd ed. (2004).
- [7] P.P. Boyle and T. Vorst “Option Replication in Discrete Time with Transaction Costs”, **47**, 271-293 (1992).
- [8] L. Bocquet, “High friction limit of the Kramers equation: the multiple time scale approach”, *American Journal of Physics* **65** (1997), 140-144 and cond-mat/9605186.
- [9] J.-P. Bouchaud and D. Sornette, ”The Black-Scholes Option Pricing Problem in Mathematical Finance: Generalizations and Extensions for a Large Class of Stochastic Processes”, *Journal de Physique I* **4**, 863 (1994).
- [10] G.M. Constantinides “Stochastic Cash Management with Fixed and Proportional Transaction Costs”, *Management Science* **22**, 1320-31 (1976).
- [11] G.M. Constantinides and T. Zariphopolou ”Bounds on Derivative Prices in an Intertemporal Setting with Proportional Transaction Costs and Multiple Securities”, *Mathematical Finance* **11**, 331-346 (2001).
- [12] M.H. Davis, V.G. Panas and T. Zariphopolou, “European option pricing with transaction costs”, *SIAM J. Control and Optimization* **31**, 470-493 (1993).
- [13] Ph.H. Dybvig, L.C.G. Rogers and K. Back, “Portfolio Turnpikes”, *The Review of Financial Studies* **12** (1999), 165-195.
- [14] C. Edirisinghe, V. Naik and R. Uppal, “Optimal replication of options with transaction costs and trading restrictions”, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **28** 117-138 (1993).

- [15] J.D. Farmer “Market force, ecology and evolution”, *Santa Fe Institute series Research in Economics* **98-12-117e** (1998) and <http://www.santafe.edu/sfi/publications/Working-Papers>.
- [16] W.H. Fleming and H. Mete Soner *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1992).
- [17] U. Frisch *Turbulence: The legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov* (Cambridge University Press, 1995)
- [18] N. Hakanson and W. Ziemba, “Capital Growth Theory”, in *Handbooks in OR & MS, Vol.9*, eds. R. Jarrow et al. (Elsevier Science, 1995).
- [19] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve *Methods of Mathematical Finance* (Springer-Verlag, 1998)
- [20] J.L. Kelly Jr., “A new interpretation of the Information Rate”, *Bell Syst. Tech. J.* **35**, 917 (1956).
- [21] H.E. Leland “Option pricing and replication with transaction costs”, *J. Finance* **40**, 1283-1301 (1985).
- [22] R.C. Merton, ”Lifetime Portfolio Selection under Uncertainty: The Continuous-Time Case”, *Review of Economics and Statistics* **51**, 247-257 (1969).
- [23] R.C. Merton, “Consumption and Portfolio Rules in a Continuous-Time Model”, *Journal Of Economic Theory* **3**, 373-413 (1971).
- [24] P. Muratore-Ginanneschi, “Models of passive and reactive tracer motions: an application of Ito calculus”, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **30** (1997), L519-L523 and cond-mat/9610166.