

Entropy Martingale Optimal Transport and Nonlinear Pricing-Hedging Duality

Alessandro Doldi* Marco Frittelli†

February 4, 2022

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to develop a duality between a novel Entropy Martingale Optimal Transport problem (A) and an associated optimization problem (B). In (A) we follow the approach taken in the Entropy Optimal Transport (EOT) primal problem by Liero et al. “Optimal entropy-transport problems and a new Hellinger-Kantorovic distance between positive measures”, *Invent. math.* 2018, but we add the constraint, typical of Martingale Optimal Transport (MOT) theory, that the infimum of the cost functional is taken over martingale probability measures, instead of finite positive measures, as in Liero et al. The Problem (A) differs from the corresponding problem in Liero et al. not only by the martingale constraint, but also because we admit less restrictive penalization terms \mathcal{D}_U , which may not have a divergence formulation. In Problem (B) the objective functional, associated via Fenchel conjugacy to the terms \mathcal{D}_U , is not any more linear, as in OT or in MOT. This leads to a novel optimization problem which also has a clear financial interpretation as a non linear subhedging value. Our theory allows us to establish a nonlinear robust pricing-hedging duality, which covers a wide range of known robust results. We also focus on Wasserstein-induced penalizations and we study how the duality is affected by variations in the penalty terms, with a special focus on the convergence of EMOT to the extreme case of MOT.

Keywords: Martingale Optimal Transport problem, Entropy Optimal Transport problem, Pricing-hedging duality, Robust finance, Pathwise finance.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 49Q25, 49J45, 60G46, 91G80, 90C46.

1 Introduction

In this research we exploit Optimal Transport (OT) theory to develop the duality¹

$$A := \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}_U(Q)) = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_{\Delta}(c)} S^U(\varphi) =: B. \quad (1)$$

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Saldini 50, 20133 Milano, Italy, alessandro.doldi@unimi.it.

†Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Saldini 50, 20133 Milano, Italy, marco.frittelli@unimi.it.

¹The notations are explained in this Introduction and the duality is further discussed in Section 1.2.

In (A) we recognize the approach taken in the Entropy Optimal Transport primal problem (Liero et al. [52]) with the additional constraints, typical of Martingale Optimal Transport (MOT), that the infimum of the cost functional c is taken over *martingale probability* measures, instead of finite positive *measures*, as in [52]. This is a consequence of the additional supremum over the integrands $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$ in problem (B), and of the cash additivity of the functional S^U . The functional S^U is associated to a, typically non linear, utility functional U and represents the pricing rule over suitable continuous functions φ defined on Ω . We observe that the marginal constraints, typical of OT problems, in (A) are relaxed by introducing the functional \mathcal{D}_U , also associated to the map U , which may have a divergence formulation. The counterpart of this in Problem (B) is that the functional S^U , associated via Fenchel conjugacy to the penalization functional \mathcal{D}_U is not *necessarily linear*, as in OT or in MOT. Both S^U and \mathcal{D}_U may also depend on the marginals of some martingale measure \hat{Q} . The duality (1) generalizes the well known robust pricing hedging duality in financial mathematics.

We provide a clear financial interpretation of both problems and observe that the novel concept of a non linear subhedging value expressed by (B) was not previously considered in the literature.

1.1 Pricing-hedging duality in financial mathematics

The notion of subhedging price is one of the most analyzed concepts in financial mathematics. In this Introduction we will take the point of view of the subhedging price, but obviously an analogous theory for the superhedging price can be developed as well. We are considering a discrete time market model with zero interest rate. It may be convenient for the reader to have at hand the summary described in Table 1 on page 13.

The classical setup In the classical setup of stochastic securities market models, one considers an adapted stochastic process $X = (X_t)_t$, $t = 0, \dots, T$, defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_t, P)$, representing the price of some underlying asset. Let $\mathcal{P}(P)$ be the set of all probability measures on Ω that are absolutely continuous with respect to P , $\text{Mart}(\Omega)$ be the set of all probability measures on Ω under which X is a martingale and $\mathcal{M}(P) = \mathcal{P}(P) \cap \text{Mart}(\Omega)$. We also let \mathcal{H} be the class of admissible integrands and $I^\Delta := I^\Delta(X)$ be the stochastic integral of X with respect to $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$. Under reasonable assumptions on \mathcal{H} , the equality

$$E_Q [I^\Delta(X)] = 0 \tag{2}$$

holds for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}(P)$ and, as well known, all linear pricing functionals compatible with no arbitrage are expectations $E_Q[\cdot]$ under some probability $Q \in \mathcal{M}(P)$ such that $Q \sim P$.

We denote with p the **subhedging price** of a contingent claim $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ written on the payoff X_T of the underlying asset. Let $\mathcal{L}(P) \subseteq L^0((\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, P))$ be the space of random payoffs satisfying appropriate integrability or boundedness assumptions and let $Z := c(X_T) \in \mathcal{L}(P)$. Then $p : \mathcal{L}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$p(Z) := \sup \{m \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } m + I^\Delta(X) \leq Z, P - \text{a.s.}\}. \tag{3}$$

The subhedging price is independent from the preferences of the agents, but it depends on the

reference probability measure via the class of P -null events. It satisfies the following two key properties:

(CA) Cash Additivity on $\mathcal{L}(P)$: $p(Z + k) = p(Z) + k$, for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$, $Z \in \mathcal{L}(P)$.

(IA) Integral Additivity on $\mathcal{L}(P)$: $p(Z + I^\Delta) = p(Z)$, for all $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$, $Z \in \mathcal{L}(P)$.

When a functional p satisfies (CA), then Z, k and $p(Z)$ must be expressed in the same monetary unit and this allows for the *monetary* interpretation of p , as the price of the contingent claim. This will be one of the key features that we will require also in the novel definition of the nonlinear subhedging value. The (IA) property and $p(0) = 0$ imply that the p price of any stochastic integral $I^\Delta(X)$ is equal to zero, as in (2).

Since the seminal works of El Karoui and Quenez [33], Karatzas [51], Delbaen and Schachermayer [30], it was discovered that, under the no arbitrage assumption, the dual representation of the subhedging price p is

$$p(Z) = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(P)} E_Q [Z]. \quad (4)$$

More or less in the same period, the concept of **coherent risk measure** was introduced in the pioneering work by Artzner et al. [3]. A Coherent Risk Measure $\rho : \mathcal{L}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ determines the minimal capital required to make acceptable a financial position and its dual formulation is assigned by

$$-\rho(Y) = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(P)} E_Q [Y], \quad (5)$$

where Y is a random variable representing future profit-and-loss and $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(P)$. Coherent Risk Measures ρ are convex, cash additive, monotone and positively homogeneous. We take the liberty to label both the representations in (4) and in (5) as the “*sublinear case*”.

In the study of incomplete markets the concept of the (buyer) **indifference price** p^b , originally introduced by Hodges and Neuberger [48], received, in the early 2000, increasing consideration (see Frittelli [36], Rouge and El Karoui [58], Delbaen et al. [29], Bellini and Frittelli [7]) as a tool to assess, *consistently with the no arbitrage principle*, the value of non replicable contingent claims, and not just to determine an upper bound (the superhedging price) or a lower bound (the subhedging price) for the price of the claim. Differently from the notion of subhedging, p^b is based on some concave increasing utility function $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ of the agent. By defining the indirect utility function

$$U(w_0) := \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} E_P [u(w_0 + I^\Delta(X))],$$

where $w_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is the initial wealth, the indifference price p^b is defined as

$$p^b(Z) := \sup \{m \in \mathbb{R} \mid U(Z - m) \geq U(0)\}.$$

Under suitable assumptions, the dual formulation of p^b is

$$p^b(Z) = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(P)} \{E_Q [Z] + \alpha_u(Q)\}, \quad (6)$$

and the penalty term $\alpha_u : \mathcal{M}(P) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is associated to the particular utility function u appearing in the definition of p^b via the Fenchel conjugate of u . We observe that in case of the exponential

utility function $u(x) = 1 - \exp(-x)$, the penalty is $\alpha_{\text{exp}}(Q) := H(Q, P) - \min_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(P)} H(Q, P)$, where

$$H(Q, P) := \int_{\Omega} F \left(\frac{dQ}{dP} \right) dP, \quad \text{if } Q \ll P \text{ and } F(y) = y \ln(y),$$

is the relative entropy. In this case, the penalty α_{exp} is a divergence functional, as those that will be considered below in Section 3.4. Observe that the functional p^b is concave, monotone increasing and satisfies both properties (CA) and (IA), but it is not necessarily linear on the space of all contingent claims. As recalled in the conclusion of Frittelli [36], “there is no reason why a price functional defined on the whole space of bundles and consistent with no arbitrage should be linear also outside the space of marketed bundles”.

It was exactly the particular form (6) of the indifference price that suggested to Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin [37] the introduction of the concept of **Convex Risk Measure** (also independently introduced by Follmer and Schied [34]), as a map $\rho : \mathcal{L}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is convex, cash additive and monotone decreasing. Under good continuity properties, the Fenchel-Moreau Theorem shows that any convex risk measure admits the following representation

$$-\rho(Y) = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(P)} \{E_Q[Y] + \alpha(Q)\} \quad (7)$$

for some penalty $\alpha : \mathcal{P}(P) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$. We will then label functional in the form (6) or (7) as the “*convex case*”. As a consequence of the cash additivity property, in the dual representations (6) or (7) the infimum is taken with respect to *probability measures*, namely with respect to normalized non negative elements in the dual space, which in this case can be taken as $L^1(P)$. Differently from the indifference price p^b , convex risk measures do not necessarily take into account the presence of the stochastic security market, as reflected by the absence of any reference to martingale measures in the dual formulation (7) and (5), in contrast to (6) and (4).

Pathwise finance As a consequence of the financial crisis in 2008, the uncertainty in the selection of a reference probability P gained increasing attention and led to the investigation of the notions of arbitrage and of the pricing hedging duality in different settings. On the one hand, the single reference probability P was replaced with a family of - a priori non dominated - probability measures, leading to the theory of Quasi-Sure Stochastic Analysis. On the other hand, taking an even more radical approach, a probability free, pathwise, theory of financial markets was developed, as in Acciaio et al. [1], Burzoni et al. [18], Burzoni et al. [19], Burzoni et al. [17], Riedel [57]. In such a framework, Optimal Transport theory became a very powerful tool to prove pathwise pricing hedging duality results with very relevant contributions by many authors (Beiglböck et al. [6], Davis et al. [27], Dolinski and Soner [31], Dolinsky and Soner [32]; Galichon et al. [39], Henry-Labordère [42], Henry-Labordère et al. [44]; Hou and Oblój [49], Tan and Touzi [61]). Recent works on the topic include also Bartl et al. [5], Cheridito et al. [20], Guo and Oblój [41], Wiesel [63]. Stability issues have been studied in Backhoff-Veraguas and Pammer [4] and Neufeld and Sester [53]. These contributions mainly deal with what we labeled above as the sublinear case, while our main interest in this paper is to develop the convex case theory, as explained below. Pennanen and Perkkiö [55] also developed a generalized Optimal Transport duality, which can be applied to study the pricing-hedging duality in a context similar to our additive setup of Section 3.

The addition of an entropic term to optimal transport problems was popularized by Cuturi [26], with several applications especially from the computational point of view (see for examples the survey/monograph Peyré and Cuturi [56]). Sinkhorn’s algorithm can be applied with the entropic regularization procedure described in these works (see Benamou et al. [10] for some advantages). Convergence for this algorithm is studied e.g. in Ireland and Kullback [50] and Rüschendorf [59]. After the present paper was posted on ArXiv, several relevant advances were made regarding such topic. We mention here Nutz and Wiesel (2021) [54], Bernton et al. (2021) [11], Ghosal et al. (2021) [40]. We stress that these papers address a *different* problem: the addition of the entropic term in Cuturi and subsequent works is made without smoothing the strict marginal constraints, which are kept, unlike in our problems where we add uncertainty regarding the marginals themselves. The works [11] and [40] also study geometric properties of minimizers of the entropic OT, by means of the concept of cyclical invariance. This is a counterpart to the characterization, using c -cyclical monotonicity, of the geometry of optimal transport plans in the classical framework of OT. Even though a similar study of geometric properties for optimizers of EMOT would be of great interest, such a topic is beyond the scope of this paper and is left for future research. We also mention that a Sinkhorn algorithm approach was adopted in De March and Henry-Labordère [28] for building an arbitrage-free implied volatility surface from bid-ask quotes, while Henry-Labordère [43] studies a problem related to the entropic relaxation of an optimal transportation problem and Blanchet et al. [13] studies the number of operations needed for approximation of the transport cost with given accuracy, in the case of entropic regularization.

In the framework of [52] (i.e., with penalizations of the marginals induced by divergence functions) and after the first version of the present work was posted on ArXiv, duality results were obtained in the context of Weak Martingale Optimal Entropy Transport Problems by Chung and Trinh (2021) [22].

To introduce the pathwise robust approach to the pricing-hedging duality, from now on we will work without a reference probability measure. We consider $T \in \mathbb{N}$, $T \geq 1$, and

$$\Omega := K_0 \times \cdots \times K_T$$

for closed (possibly non compact) subsets K_0, \dots, K_T of \mathbb{R} and denote with X_0, \dots, X_T the canonical projections $X_t : \Omega \rightarrow K_t$, for $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$. We will work later in a multidimensional setup for the price process, but we stick to the one dimensional case here for notational simplicity. We write

$$\text{Mart}(\Omega) := \{\text{Martingale probability measures for the canonical process of } \Omega\},$$

and, when μ is a measure defined on the Borel σ -algebra of $(K_0 \times \cdots \times K_T)$, its marginals will be denoted with μ_0, \dots, μ_T . We consider a contingent claim $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ which is now allowed to depend on the whole path and we admit semistatic trading strategies for hedging. This means that in addition to dynamic trading in X via the admissible integrands $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$, we may invest in “vanilla” options $\varphi_t : K_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For modeling purposes we take vector subspaces $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}(K_t)$ for $t = 0, \dots, T$, where $\mathcal{C}(K_t)$ is the space of real-valued continuous functions on K_t . Some requirements on the spaces \mathcal{E}_t will be added later on when describing the technical setup. For each t , \mathcal{E}_t is the set of static options that can be used for hedging, say affine combinations of vanilla

options with different strikes and same maturity t . The key assumption in the robust, Optimal Transport based formulation is that the marginals $(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T)$ of the underlying price process X are known, see the seminal papers by Breeden and Litzenberger [15] and Hobson [47], as well as the many contributions by Hobson [45], Cox and Oblój [23], [24], Cox and Wang [25], Labordère et al. [44], Brown et al. [16], Hobson and Klimm [46]. Such marginals can be identified knowing a (very) large number of prices of plain vanilla options maturing at each intermediate date, for example knowing the prices of *all the call options* with such intermediate maturities and ranging strikes. In this case, the class of arbitrage-free pricing measures that are compatible with the observed prices of the options is given by

$$\mathcal{M}(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T) := \left\{ Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega) \mid X_t \sim_Q \hat{Q}_t \text{ for each } t = 0, \dots, T \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{C}_b(K_0 \times \dots \times K_T)$ consist of real valued continuous and bounded functions defined on $K_0 \times \dots \times K_T$ and set

$$\mathcal{H} := \{ \Delta = [\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_{T-1}] \mid \Delta_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_0 \times \dots \times K_t) \}, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{I} := \left\{ I^\Delta(x) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \Delta_t(x_0, \dots, x_t)(x_{t+1} - x_t) \mid \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

In this framework, the sub-hedging duality, obtained in [6] Theorem 1.1, takes the form

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T)} E_Q[c] = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t] \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \forall x \in \Omega \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where the RHS of (10) is known as the **robust subhedging price** of c . Comparing (10) with the duality between (3) and (4), we observe that: (i) the P -a.s. inequality in (3) has been replaced by an inequality that holds for all $x \in \Omega$; (ii) in (10) the infimum of the price of the contingent claim c is taken under all martingale measure compatible with the option prices, with no reference to the probability P ; (iii) static hedging with options is allowed.

As can be seen from the LHS of (10), this case falls into the category labeled above as the *sublinear case*, and the purpose of this paper is to investigate the *convex case*, in the robust setting, using the tools from Entropy Optimal Transport (EOT) recently developed in Liero et al. [52].

Let us first describe the financial interpretation of the problems that we are going to study.

The dual problem The LHS of (10), namely $\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T)} E_Q[c]$, represents the dual problem in the financial application, but is typically the primal problem in **Martingale Optimal Transport** (MOT). We label this case as the *sublinear case* of MOT. In [52], the primal **Entropy Optimal Transport** (EOT) problem takes the form

$$\inf_{\mu \in \text{Meas}(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} c d\mu + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\mu_t) \right), \quad (11)$$

where $\text{Meas}(\Omega)$ is the set of all positive finite measures μ on Ω , and $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\mu_t)$ is a divergence in the form:

$$\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\mu_t) := \int_{K_t} F_t \left(\frac{d\mu_t}{d\hat{Q}_t} \right) d\hat{Q}_t, \text{ if } \mu_t \ll \hat{Q}_t, \quad t = 0, \dots, T, \quad (12)$$

otherwise $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\mu_t) := +\infty$. We label with $F := (F_t)_{t=0, \dots, T}$ the family of divergence functions $F_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ appearing in (12). Problem (11) represents the *convex case* of OT theory. Notice that in the EOT primal problem (11) the typical constraint that μ has prescribed marginals $(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T)$ is relaxed (as the infimum is taken with respect to all positive finite measures) by introducing the divergence functional $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\mu_t)$, which penalizes those measures μ that are “far” from some reference marginals $(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T)$. We are then naturally led to the study of the convex case of MOT, i.e. to the Entropy Martingale Optimal Transport (EMOT) problem

$$\mathfrak{D}_{F, \hat{Q}}(c) := \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(Q_t) \right) \quad (13)$$

having also a clear financial interpretation. The marginals are not any more fixed a priori, as in (10), because we may not have sufficient information to detect them with enough accuracy, for example, in case there are not sufficiently many traded call and put options on the underlying assets in the market and it is not possible to extract precisely the marginals via the Breeden and Litzenberger [15] approach. Alternatively, the exact prices of the options might be unknown, say by market impact effects.

Again, the infimum is taken over *all martingale probability measures*, but those that are far from some estimate $(\hat{Q}_0, \hat{Q}_1, \dots, \hat{Q}_T)$ are appropriately penalized through $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}$. This is a key difference with classical MOT problem and also with the approach taken in the above mentioned works [11], [40], [26], [54] and [56]. When $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\cdot) = \delta_{\hat{Q}_t}(\cdot)$, the EMOT reduces to the classical MOT problem, where only martingale probability measures with fixed marginals are allowed. Here δ_A is the characteristic function of a set A , as customarily defined in convex analysis. Our framework also allows for the use of the penalization $Q \mapsto \sum_{t=0}^T \delta_{\hat{Q}_t}(Q_t) + \tilde{D}(Q)$, for some entropic term \tilde{D} , so that the EMOT reduces to the MOT problem with an additional entropic regularization term, as analyzed in the above mentioned literature.

Observe that in addition to the martingale property, the elements $Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ in (13) are required to be probability measures, while in the EOT theory in (11) all positive finite measures are allowed. As it was recalled after equation (7), this normalization feature of the dual elements ($\mu(\Omega) = 1$) is not surprising when one deals with dual problems of primal problems with a cash additive objective functional as, for example, in the theory of coherent and convex risk measures.

Potentially, we could push our smoothing argument above even further: in place of the functionals $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\mu_t)$, $t = 0, \dots, T$, we might as well consider more general marginal penalizations, not necessarily in the divergence form (12), yielding the problem

$$\mathfrak{D}(c) := \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t) \right). \quad (14)$$

These penalizations $\mathcal{D}_0, \dots, \mathcal{D}_T$ will be better specified later. Here we only observe that such penalization terms could be induced by market prices or by a Wasserstein distance.

The primal problem: the Nonlinear Subhedging Value We provide the financial interpretation of the primal problem which will yield the EMOT problem $\mathfrak{D}_{F, \hat{Q}}$ as its dual. It is convenient to reformulate the robust subhedging price in the RHS of (10) in a more general setting.

Definition 1.1. Consider a measurable function $c : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ representing a (possibly path dependent) option, the set \mathcal{V} of hedging instruments and a suitable pricing functional $\pi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then the robust Subhedging Value of c is defined by

$$\Pi_{\pi, \mathcal{V}}(c) = \sup \{ \pi(v) \mid v \in \mathcal{V} \text{ s.t. } v \leq c \}.$$

In the classical setting, functionals of this form (and even with a more general formulation) are known as general capital requirement, see for example Frittelli and Scandolo [38]. We stress however that in Definition 1.1 the inequality $v \leq c$ holds for all elements in Ω with no reference to a probability measure whatsoever. The novelty in this definition is that a priori π may not be linear and it is crucial to understand which evaluating functional π we may use. For our discussion, we assume that the vector subspaces $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}(K_t)$ satisfies $\mathcal{E}_t + \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{E}_t$, for $t = 0, \dots, T$. We let $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$, and $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{E}_0 + \dots + \mathcal{E}_T + \mathcal{I}$. Suppose we took a linear pricing rule $\pi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined via a $\hat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ by

$$\pi(v) := E_{\hat{Q}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \right] \stackrel{(i)}{=} E_{\hat{Q}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right] \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^T E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t], \quad (15)$$

where we used (2) and the fact that \hat{Q}_t is the marginal of \hat{Q} . In this case, we would trivially obtain for the robust subhedging value of c

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\pi, \mathcal{V}}(c) &= \sup \{ \pi(v) \mid v \in \mathcal{V} \text{ s.t. } v \leq c \} & (16) \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t] \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E} \text{ is s.t. } \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ m \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H}, \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ s.t. } m - \sum_{t=0}^T E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t] + \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ m \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H}, \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ with } E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t] = 0 \text{ s.t. } m + \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c \right\}, & (17) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we replaced φ_t with $(E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t] - \varphi_t) \in \mathcal{E}_t$, which satisfies:

$$E_{\hat{Q}_t} \left[E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t] - \varphi_t \right] = 0. \quad (18)$$

Interpretation: $\Pi_{\pi, \mathcal{V}}(c)$ is the supremum amount $m \in \mathbb{R}$ for which we may buy options φ_t and dynamic strategies $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $m + \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c$, where the value of both the options and the stochastic integrals are computed as the expectation under the same martingale measure (\hat{Q} for the integral I^Δ ; its marginals \hat{Q}_t for each option φ_t).

However, as mentioned above when presenting the indifference price p^b , there is a priori no reason why one has to allow only linear functional in the evaluation of $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

We thus generalize the expression for $\Pi_{\pi, \mathcal{V}}(c)$ by considering valuation functionals $S : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $S_t : \mathcal{E}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ more general than $E_{\hat{Q}}[\cdot]$ and $E_{\hat{Q}_t}[\cdot]$.

Nonetheless, in order to be able to repeat the same key steps we used in (16)-(17) and therefore to keep the same interpretation, we shall impose that such functionals S and S_t satisfy the property in (18) and the two properties (i) and (ii) in equation (15), that is:

- (a) $S_t[\varphi_t + k] = S_t[\varphi_t] + k$ and $S_t[0] = 0$, for all $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$, $t = 0, \dots, T$.
- (b) $S \left[\left(\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right) + I^\Delta(x) \right] = S \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right]$ for all $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$.
- (c) $S \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right] = \sum_{t=0}^T S_t[\varphi_t]$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$.

We immediately recognize that (a) is the Cash Additivity (CA) property on \mathcal{E}_t of the functional S_t and (b) implies the Integral Additivity (IA) property on \mathcal{V} . As a consequence, repeating the same steps in (16)-(17), we will obtain as primal problem the **nonlinear subhedging value** of c :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{P}(c) &= \sup \{ S(v) \mid v \in \mathcal{V} : v \leq c \} \\
&= \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E} \text{ is s.t. } \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \quad (19) \\
&= \sup \left\{ m \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H}, \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \text{ with } S_t(\varphi_t) = 0 \text{ s.t. } m + \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

to be compared with (17).

Interpretation: $\mathfrak{P}(c)$ is the supremum amount $m \in \mathbb{R}$ for which we may buy *zero value* options φ_t and dynamic strategies $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $m + \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c$, where the value of both the options and the stochastic integrals are computed with the same functional S .

It is easy to check that (19) can be rewritten as:

$$\mathfrak{P}(c) = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_\Delta(c)} \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t) \quad (20)$$

where

$$\Phi_\Delta(c) := \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \forall x \in \Omega \right\}.$$

It is quite a natural question to ask whether one can induce valuations satisfying (a),(b),(c) above, especially starting from given functionals $S_t, t = 0, \dots, T$. This can be obtained with the concept of Stock Additivity which we now discuss, before further elaborating on the formulation in (20). Stock Additivity is the natural counterpart of properties (IA) and (CA) when we are evaluating hedging instruments depending solely on the value of the underlying stock X at some fixed date $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. Let X_t be the identity function $x_t \mapsto x_t$ on K_t , which can also be thought as the projection on the t -th component $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. As before, the set of hedging instruments is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}(K_t)$ and we will suppose that $X_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$ (that is, we can use units of stock at time t for hedging) and that $\mathcal{E}_t + \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{E}_t$ (that is, deterministic amounts of cash can be used for hedging as well). Finally, we assume for the following Definition that the value of X_0 is known, namely $K_0 = \{x_0\}$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 1.2. *A functional $p_t : \mathcal{E}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is stock additive on \mathcal{E}_t if $p_t(0) = 0$ and*

$$p_t(\varphi_t + \alpha_t X_t + \beta_t) = p_t(\varphi_t) + \alpha_t x_0 + \beta_t \quad \forall \varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t, \beta_t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha_t \in \mathbb{R},$$

We now clarify the role of stock additive functionals in our setup. Suppose that $S_t : \mathcal{E}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are stock additive on \mathcal{E}_t , $t = 0, \dots, T$. It can be shown (see Lemma A.2) that if there exist $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t = \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t + I^\Delta$ then

$$\sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\psi_t).$$

This allows us to define a functional $S : \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{E}_0 + \dots + \mathcal{E}_T + \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$S(v) := \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t), \quad \text{for } v = \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta. \quad (21)$$

Then S is a well defined, integral additive functional on \mathcal{V} , and S, S_0, \dots, S_T satisfy the properties (a), (b), (c).

In conclusion, when we consider stock additive functionals S_0, \dots, S_T that induce the functional S as explained in (21), we can focus our attention to the optimization problem (20), that will be referred to as our primal problem.

As explained in Example 1.3 below, there is a natural way to produce a variety of stock additive functionals,

Example 1.3. Consider a martingale measure $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ and a concave non decreasing utility function $u_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$, satisfying $u(0) = 0$ and $u_t(x_t) \leq x_t \quad \forall x_t \in \mathbb{R}$. We can then take

$$S_t(\varphi_t) = U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \beta \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u_t(\varphi_t(x_t) + \alpha x_t + \beta) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) - (\alpha x_0 + \beta) \right).$$

As shown in Lemma 4.2 the stock additivity property is then satisfied for these functionals.

The Duality As a consequence of our main results we prove the following duality (see Theorem 3.4). If

$$\mathcal{D}_t(Q_t) := \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t} \left(S_t(\varphi_t) - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ_t \right) \quad \text{for } Q_t \in \text{Prob}(K_t), \quad t = 0, \dots, T,$$

and $\mathfrak{D}(c)$ and $\mathfrak{P}(c)$ are defined respectively in (14) and (20), then

$$\mathfrak{D}(c) = \mathfrak{P}(c). \quad (22)$$

In the particular case of S_0, \dots, S_T induced by utility functions, as explained in Example 1.3, the problem corresponding to (19) or to (20) becomes

$$\mathfrak{P}_{U, \widehat{Q}}(c) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E} \text{ is s.t. } \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\}. \quad (23)$$

We also show the duality between (13) and (23), namely we prove in Section 4.1

$$\mathfrak{D}_{F, \widehat{Q}}(c) := \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{F_t, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t) \right) = \mathfrak{P}_{U, \widehat{Q}}(c). \quad (24)$$

The divergence functions F_t appearing in $\mathfrak{D}_{F, \widehat{Q}}$ (via $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \widehat{Q}_t}$) are associated to the utility functions u_t appearing in $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}$ and in $\mathfrak{P}_{U, \widehat{Q}}$ via the conjugacy relation:

$$F_t(y) := v_t^*(y) = \sup_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}} \{x_t y - v(y)\} = \sup_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}} \{u_t(x_t) - x_t y\},$$

where $v(y) := -u(-y)$. Thus, depending on which utility function u is selected in the primal problem $\mathfrak{P}_{U, \hat{Q}}(c)$ to evaluate the options through $U_{\hat{Q}_t}$, the penalization term $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}$ in the dual formulation $\mathfrak{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(c)$ has a particular form induced by $F_t = v_t^*$. In the special case of linear utility functions $u_t(x_t) = x_t$, we recover the sublinear MOT theory. Indeed, in this case, $v_t^*(y) = +\infty$, for all $y \neq 1$ and $v_t^*(1) = 0$, so that $\mathcal{D}_{F_t, \hat{Q}_t}(\cdot) = \delta_{\hat{Q}_t}(\cdot)$ and thus we obtain the robust pricing-hedging duality (10) of the classical MOT.

1.2 EMOT

To describe our main result (Theorem 2.11) we introduce two general functionals U and \mathcal{D}_U that are associated through a Fenchel-Moreau type relation, see (28). The valuation functional $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ is defined on the space of hedging instruments \mathcal{E} , where the vector space \mathcal{E} consists of vectors of continuous functions $\varphi = [\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_T]$ satisfying the sublinearity condition of the form $\varphi_t(x_t) \leq \alpha(1 + |x_t|)$ for some $\alpha \geq 0$. As the map U is not necessarily cash additive, we rely on the notion of the Optimized Certainty Equivalent (OCE), that was introduced in Ben Tal and Teboulle [8] and further analyzed in Ben Tal and Teboulle [9]. We introduce the Generalized Optimized Certainty Equivalent associated to U as the functional $S^U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ defined by

$$S^U(\varphi) := \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (25)$$

Thus we obtain a cash additive map $S^U(\varphi + \beta) = S^U(\varphi) + \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t$, which will guarantee that in the problem (11) the elements $\mu \in \text{Meas}(\Omega)$ are normalized, i.e. are probability measures. Then the duality (22), $\mathfrak{D}(c) = \mathfrak{P}(c)$, will take the form

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}_U(Q)) = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_{\Delta}(c)} S^U(\varphi), \quad (26)$$

and we will also prove the existence of the optimizer for the problem in the LHS of (26). The primal problem in (20) can be recovered from the more general expression in the RHS of (26): indeed, it is enough to take $U(\varphi) := \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t)$, with stock additive functional S_t , and observe that by cash additivity $S^U(\varphi) = U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t)$. The generality consists in considering valuation of the *process* $\varphi = [\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_T] \in \mathcal{E}$ rather than the valuation of the terminal values $\varphi_t(x_t)$ only.

The penalization term $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_U$ associated to U does not necessarily have an additive structure, $\mathcal{D}(Q) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t)$, as in (14), nor needs to have the divergence formulation, as described in (12), and so it does not necessarily depend on a given martingale measure \hat{Q} (see e.g. Section 4.4). This additional flexibility in choosing \mathcal{D} constitutes one key generalization of the Entropy Optimal Transport theory of [52]. Of course, the other additional difference with EOT is the presence in (26) of the additional supremum with respect to admissible integrand $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$. As a consequence, in the LHS of (26) the infimum is now taken with respect to martingale measures. We also point out that in [52], the cost functional c is required to be lower semicontinuous and nonnegative and that the theory is developed only for the bivariate case ($t = 0, 1$), while in this paper we take c lower semicontinuous and with superlinear growth (as given by (49)), and consider the multivariate case ($t = 0, \dots, T$) and a multidimensional process.

Our framework allows to establish and comprehend several different duality results, even if under different type of assumptions:

1. The new non linear robust pricing-hedging duality with options described in (24) and proved in Corollary 4.3.
2. The new non linear robust pricing-hedging duality with options and singular components, proved in Corollary 4.4.
3. The linear robust pricing-hedging duality with options (see [6] Theorem 1.1, or [1] Theorem 1.4) described in (10) and proved in Corollary 5.3.
4. The linear robust pricing-hedging duality without options (see for example [19] Theorem 1.1) proved in Corollary 4.6.
5. A new robust pricing-hedging duality with penalization function based on market data (see Section 4.4).
6. A new robust pricing-hedging duality with penalty terms given via Wasserstein distance (see Section 4.5).
7. A new dual robust representation for the Optimized Certainty Equivalent functional (see Section 5.1).

As already mentioned before, we work with (possibly) noncompact K_0, \dots, K_T (which corresponds to working with possibly unbounded price processes), and we allow for traded options $\varphi_t, t = 0, \dots, T$ which satisfy a sublinearity condition of the form $|\varphi_t(x_t)| \leq \alpha(1 + |x_t|)$ for some $\alpha \geq 0$. Our order continuity-type assumptions (see(45)) in the main result, Theorem 2.11, are essentially automatically satisfied when the compactness assumption on K_0, \dots, K_T is added (see Corollary 2.16).

One additional feature of the paper consists in replacing the set of stochastic integrals \mathcal{I} with a general set \mathcal{A} of suitable hedging instruments, that will be a general convex cone. Particular choices of such a set \mathcal{A} , apart from the usual set of stochastic integrals, allow us to work with ε -martingale measures, supermartingales and submartingales in the duality (see Subsection 2.2). This extends EMOT beyond the strict martingale property in the strict sense.

Finally, Section 2.5 is devoted to *stability and convergence* issues, as we analyze how the duality is affected by variations in the penalty terms. In the Examples 4.12, 4.16 and 5.4 we apply this result to the convergence of EMOT to the “extreme” case of MOT, and in Subsection 4.5 we focus on Wasserstein-induced penalization terms.

We summarize the preceding discussion in the following Table and we point out that in *this paper we develop the duality theory sketched in the last line of the Table and provide its financial interpretation*. Differently from rows 1, 2, 5, 6, in rows 3, 4, 7, 8, the financial market is present and martingale measures are involved in the dual formulation. In rows 1, 2, 3, 4 we illustrate the classical setting, where the conditions in the functional form hold P -a.s., while in the last four rows Optimal Transport is applied to treat the robust versions, where the inequalities holds for all elements of Ω .

Table 1: $\Pi(\Omega)$ is the set of all probabilities on Ω ; $\mathcal{P}(P) = \{Q \in \Pi(\Omega) \mid Q \ll P\}$; $\text{Mart}(\Omega)$ is the set of all martingale probabilities on Ω ; $\mathcal{M}(P) = \text{Mart}(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{P}(P)$; $\Pi(Q_1, Q_2) = \{Q \in \Pi(\Omega) \text{ with given marginals}\}$; $\text{Mart}(Q_1, Q_2) = \{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega) \text{ with given marginals}\}$; $\text{Meas}(\Omega)$ is the set of all positive finite measures on Ω ; $\text{Sub}(c)$ is the set of static parts of semistatic subhedging strategies for c ; U is a concave proper utility functional and S^U is the associated generalized Optimized Certainty Equivalent.

		FUNCTIONAL FORM	SUBLINEAR	CONVEX
1	- Coherent R.M.	$-\inf\{m \mid c + m \in \mathcal{A}\}, \mathcal{A} \text{ cone}$	$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(P)} E_Q [c]$	
2	- Convex R.M.	$-\inf\{m \mid c + m \in \mathcal{A}\}, \mathcal{A} \text{ convex}$		$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(P)} (E_Q [c] + \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}(Q))$
3	Subrepl. price	$\sup\{m \mid \exists \Delta : m + I^\Delta(X) \leq c\}$	$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(P)} E_Q [c]$	
4	Indiff. price	$\sup\{m \mid U(c - m) \geq U(0)\}$		$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{M}(P)} (E_Q [c] + \alpha_U(Q))$
5	O.T.	$\sup_{\varphi + \psi \leq c} (E_{Q_1}[\varphi] + E_{Q_2}[\psi])$	$\inf_{Q \in \Pi(Q_1, Q_2)} E_Q [c]$	
6	E.O.T.	$\sup_{\varphi + \psi \leq c} U(\varphi, \psi)$		$\inf_{Q \in \text{Meas}(\Omega)} (E_Q [c] + \mathcal{D}_U(Q))$
7	M.O.T.	$\sup_{[\varphi, \psi] \in \text{Sub}(c)} (E_{Q_1}[\varphi] + E_{Q_2}[\psi])$	$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(Q_1, Q_2)} E_Q [c]$	
8	E.M.O.T.	$\sup_{[\varphi, \psi] \in \text{Sub}(c)} S^U(\varphi, \psi)$		$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q [c] + \mathcal{D}_U(Q))$

2 The Entropy Martingale Optimal Transport Duality

In this section we present the detailed mathematical setting, the main results and their proofs. The main Theorem 2.11 relies on: (i) a Fenchel-Moreau argument applied to the dual system $(C_{0:T}, (C_{0:T})^*)$, where $C_{0:T}$ is a set of appropriately weighted continuous functions; (ii) Daniell-Stone Theorem that guarantees that the elements, in the dual space $(C_{0:T})^*$, that enter in the dual representation can be represented by probability measures. In order to make this possible, an order continuity type assumption on the valuation functional is enforced (see (45)).

2.1 Setting

For a metric space \mathbb{X} , $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ denotes the Borel σ -algebra and $m\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ denotes the class of real-valued, Borel-measurable functions on \mathbb{X} . We define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ca}(\mathbb{X}) &:= \{\gamma : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty) \mid \gamma \text{ is finite signed Borel measure on } \mathbb{X}\}, \\ \text{Meas}(\mathbb{X}) &:= \{\mu : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty) \mid \mu \text{ is a non negative finite Borel measure on } \mathbb{X}\}, \\ \text{Prob}(\mathbb{X}) &:= \{Q : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid Q \text{ is a probability Borel measure on } \mathbb{X}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}) &:= \{\varphi : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \varphi \text{ is continuous on } \mathbb{X}\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{X}) &:= \{\varphi : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \varphi \text{ is bounded and continuous on } \mathbb{X}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now introduce the following families of continuous functions. For a $\psi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X})$ we set

$$C_\psi := \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X}) \mid \|\phi\|_\psi := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \frac{|\phi(x)|}{1 + |\psi(x)|} < +\infty \right\}.$$

As it can be easily verified just following the classical case of bounded continuous functions with sup-norm, C_ψ is a Banach lattice under the norm $\|\cdot\|_\psi$.

Notice also that $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{X}) \ni \varphi \mapsto (1 + |\psi|)\varphi \in C_\psi$ defines an isomorphism between Banach spaces. Hence if \mathbb{X} is separable, so is C_ψ . The topological dual of C_ψ will be denoted by $(C_\psi)^*$. Fix now $d \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq 1$, modeling the number of stocks in the market, and fix $d(T+1)$ closed subsets of $\mathbb{R} : K_0^1, \dots, K_0^d, \dots, K_T^1, \dots, K_T^d$. For $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ we take

$$\Omega_{s:t} := \prod_{u=s}^t \prod_{j=1}^d K_u^j \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega := \Omega_{0:T} = \prod_{t=0}^T \prod_{j=1}^d K_t^j.$$

We will consider the following weighted spaces of continuous functions

$$C_{s:t} := \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{C}(\Omega_{s:t}) \mid \|\phi\|_{s:t} := \sup_{x \in \prod_{u=s}^t \prod_{j=1}^d K_u^j} \frac{|\phi(x)|}{1 + \sum_{u=s}^t \sum_{j=1}^d |x_u^j|} < +\infty \right\},$$

$$C_t = C_{t:t} := \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{C} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d K_t^j \right) \mid \|\phi\|_t := \sup_{x \in \prod_{j=1}^d K_t^j} \frac{|\phi(x)|}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j|} < +\infty \right\}.$$

In general, for an index set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \times \{0, \dots, T\}$ we introduce

$$C_I := \left\{ \phi \in \mathcal{C} \left(\prod_{(j,t) \in I} K_t^j \right) \mid \|\phi\|_{0:T} := \sup_{x \in \prod_{(j,t) \in I} K_t^j} \frac{|\phi(x)|}{1 + \sum_{(j,t) \in I} |x_t^j|} < +\infty \right\}.$$

The corresponding norms will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{s:t}, \|\cdot\|_t, \|\cdot\|_I$ respectively.

Remark 2.1. Notice that if $K_0^1, \dots, K_0^d, \dots, K_T^1, \dots, K_T^d$ are compact sets then

$$C_{0:T} = C_b(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad (C_{0:T})^* = \text{ca}(\Omega).$$

Analogously, we introduce the spaces B_ψ and B_I in a similar fashion, just substituting the condition $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{X})$ with the condition $\varphi \in m\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ in the definitions. In particular

$$B_{0:T} := \left\{ \phi \in m\mathcal{B}(\Omega) \mid \|\phi\|_{0:T} := \sup_{x \in \Omega} \frac{|\phi(x)|}{1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j|} < +\infty \right\}$$

turns out to be a Banach lattice under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{0:T}$. Observe that by slight abuse of notation (regarding the domains of the functions) for index sets $I \subseteq J \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \times \{0, \dots, T\}$ we have a constant $0 < \theta \leq 1$ such that

$$C_I \subseteq C_J, \quad \theta \|\phi\|_I \leq \|\phi\|_J \leq \|\phi\|_I \quad \forall \phi \in C_I. \quad (27)$$

Such a constant θ is given by

$$\theta = \frac{1 + \alpha}{1 + \alpha + \sum_{(j,t) \in J \setminus I} \min_{x_t^j \in K_t^j} |x_t^j|}$$

where $\alpha = \min \left\{ \sum_{(j,t) \in I} |x_t^j| \mid x_t^j \in K_t^j \quad \forall (j,t) \in I \right\}$.

As already mentioned in [55] and [21], every finite signed measure γ on the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ such that $C_{0:T} \subseteq L^1(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}), |\gamma|)$ induces a continuous linear functional $\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$ via integration:

$$c \mapsto \langle c, \lambda \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{X}} c d\gamma, \quad \forall c \in C_{0:T}.$$

The collection of such functionals, identified with the corresponding measures, will be denoted by $\text{ca}^1(\mathbb{X})$, that is

$$\text{ca}^1(\mathbb{X}) = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \text{ is a finite signed measure on } \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \text{ with } C_{0:T} \subseteq L^1(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}), |\gamma|)\},$$

while the classes of non negative measures and probability measures in $\text{ca}^1(\mathbb{X})$ will be denoted by

$$\text{Meas}^1(\mathbb{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Prob}^1(\mathbb{X}).$$

In a discrete time framework with finite horizon T and assuming zero interest rate, we model a market with d stocks using the canonical d -dimensional process given by $X_t^j(x) = x_t^j, j = 1, \dots, d, t = 0, \dots, T$.

Observe that every $\phi \in C_{0:T}$ satisfies: $|\phi(x)| \leq \|\phi\|_{0:T} \left(1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j|\right)$ and so, for any measure $\mu \in \text{Meas}^1(\mathbb{X})$, we have: $C_{0:T} \subseteq L^1(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}), \mu)$ iff $X_t^j \in L^1(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}), \mu)$ for all j and all t .

Fix now vector subspaces $\mathcal{E}_0, \dots, \mathcal{E}_T$ with $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_{0:t}, t = 0, \dots, T$. We set

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T.$$

The space \mathcal{E} represents the class of financial instruments that can be used for static hedging, which may, for example, contain plain vanilla options.

Let $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ be a proper, concave functional, representing the evaluation functional of the hedging instruments in \mathcal{E} . Consider the proper, convex functional

$$V(\varphi) := -U(-\varphi),$$

and set

$$\text{dom}(U) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{E} \mid U(\varphi) > -\infty\}, \quad \text{dom}(V) = \{\varphi \in \mathcal{E} \mid V(\varphi) < +\infty\}.$$

We define the (convex) conjugate $\mathcal{D} : \times_{t=0}^T (C_{0:t})^* \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ of the functional U by

$$\mathcal{D}(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T) := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(U(\varphi) - \sum_{t=0}^T \langle \varphi_t, \gamma_t \rangle \right) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \langle \varphi_t, \gamma_t \rangle - V(\varphi) \right), \quad \gamma \in \times_{t=0}^T (C_{0:t})^*. \quad (28)$$

\mathcal{D} is a convex functional and is $\sigma(\times_{t=0}^T (C_{0:t})^*, \mathcal{E})$ -lower semicontinuous, even if we do not require that U is $\sigma(\mathcal{E}, \times_{t=0}^T (C_{0:t})^*)$ -upper semicontinuous. When a $\gamma \in (C_{0:T})^*$ is given, we somehow improperly write $\mathcal{D}(\gamma) = \mathcal{D}(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T)$, where γ_t is the restriction of γ to $C_{0:t}$. We also set

$$\text{dom}(\mathcal{D}) = \left\{ [\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T] \in \times_{t=0}^T (C_{0:t})^* \mid \mathcal{D}(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T) < +\infty \right\}.$$

As an immediate consequence of the definitions, the Fenchel inequality holds: if $[\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_T] \in \mathcal{E}$ and $[\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T] \in \times_{t=0}^T (C_{0:t})^*$

$$\sum_{t=0}^T \langle \varphi_t, \gamma_t \rangle \leq \mathcal{D}(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T) + V(\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_T). \quad (29)$$

Remark 2.2. Another way to introduce our setting, that will be used in Subsections 4.4 and 4.5, is to start initially with a proper convex functional $\mathcal{D} : \text{ca}^1(\Omega) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ which is $\sigma(\text{ca}^1(\Omega), \mathcal{E})$ -lower semicontinuous for an $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T \subseteq (C_{0:T})^{T+1}$. By the Fenchel-Moreau Theorem we then have the representation

$$\mathcal{D}(\gamma) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \int_{\Omega} \varphi_t d\gamma - V(\varphi) \right),$$

where now V is the Fenchel-Moreau (convex) conjugate of \mathcal{D} , namely

$$V(\varphi) := \sup_{\gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega)} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \int_{\Omega} \varphi_t d\gamma - \mathcal{D}(\gamma) \right). \quad (30)$$

Setting

$$U(\varphi) := -V(-\varphi), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (31)$$

we get back that \mathcal{D} satisfies (28) and additionally that U is $\sigma(\mathcal{E}, \text{ca}^1(\Omega))$ -upper semicontinuous. In conclusion, a pair (U, \mathcal{D}) satisfying (28) might be defined either providing a proper concave $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$, as described at the beginning of this section, or assigning a proper convex and $\sigma(\mathcal{E}, \text{ca}^1(\Omega))$ -lower semicontinuous functional $\mathcal{D} : \text{ca}^1(\Omega) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ as explained in this Remark.

For a given proper and concave functional $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ we define, as in (25), the functional $S^U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ by

$$S^U(\varphi) := \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right), \quad \text{with} \quad \text{dom}(S^U) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{E} \mid S^U(\varphi) > -\infty\},$$

whose properties are collected in Lemma A.1.

Definition 2.3. *Given a convex cone $\mathcal{A} \subseteq C_{0,T}$ and a measurable $c \in m\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ we define*

$$\mathfrak{P}(c) := \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) \in [-\infty, +\infty] \quad (32)$$

where

$$\Phi_z(c) := \left\{ \varphi \in \text{dom}(S^U) \mid \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_0, \dots, x_t) + z(x) \leq c(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\},$$

and the usual convention $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$ is adopted.

From (20) we recognize that the problem $\mathfrak{P}(c)$ in (32) is a generalized robust subhedging problem for c , with a general set, namely $-\mathcal{A}$, replacing the set of terminal values of stochastic integrals used before. Some relevant examples for choices of \mathcal{A} are provided in Section 2.2. The use of $-\mathcal{A}$ in place of \mathcal{A} is somehow a matter of taste, as explained in Remark 2.13. Observe also that in this notation the *superhedging* problem (with respect to \mathcal{A}) for c is

$$\mathfrak{S}(c) := \inf_{z \in \mathcal{A}} \inf_{\varphi \in \Psi_z(c)} S_V(\varphi) \in [-\infty, +\infty]$$

where

$$S_V(\varphi) := -S^U(-\varphi), \quad \text{dom}(S_V) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{E} \mid S_V(\varphi) < +\infty\} = -\text{dom}(S^U)$$

$$\Psi_z(c) := \left\{ \varphi \in \text{dom}(S_V), \quad \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_0, \dots, x_t) + z(x) \geq c(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\}.$$

Using $-\mathcal{A}$ for \mathfrak{P} and \mathcal{A} for \mathfrak{S} we then get that the two are linked by $\mathfrak{S}(c) = -\mathfrak{P}(-c)$, and the duality results for \mathfrak{P} can then easily be translated in duality results for \mathfrak{S} . Of course, when \mathcal{A} is a vector space as in the case of stochastic integrals (see (33) and Example 2.4) we have $\mathcal{A} = -\mathcal{A}$ and there is no need for distinguishing the two possibilities.

We define the polar \mathcal{A}° of the cone \mathcal{A} to be the set

$$\mathcal{A}^\circ := \{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \langle z, \lambda \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall z \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

and we observe that for any $\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda) := \sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}} \langle z, \lambda \rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \lambda \in \mathcal{A}^\circ \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

2.2 Examples

These examples deal with possible choices of the convex cone \mathcal{A} and its polar \mathcal{A}° (observe that the set $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$ appears in the main duality (50)).

Example 2.4. (Martingale measures) To introduce martingale measures in this setup we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^d &:= \{\Delta = [\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_{T-1}] \mid \Delta_t \in (\mathcal{C}_b(K_0 \times \dots \times K_t))^d\}, \\ I^\Delta(x) &:= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \Delta_t^j(x_0, \dots, x_t)(x_{t+1}^j - x_t^j) \ \forall x \in \Omega, \\ \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I} &:= \{I^\Delta \mid \Delta \in \mathcal{H}^d\} \subseteq C_{0:T}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Thus the space \mathcal{H}^d is the class of admissible trading strategies and \mathcal{I} is the set of elementary stochastic integral. The (possibly empty) class of martingale measures for the canonical process is denoted by $\text{Mart}(\Omega)$, and consists of all the probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ which make each of the processes $(X_t^j)_t$ a martingale under the natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(X_s^j, s \leq t, j = 1, \dots, d), t = 0, \dots, T$. Equivalently,

$$\text{Mart}(\Omega) := \{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \mid E_Q[I^\Delta] = 0, \forall \Delta \in \mathcal{H}^d\} = \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ.$$

Example 2.5. (ε -martingale measures) For every $\varepsilon \geq 0$, the set of ε -martingale measures (see [41]) is

$$\text{Mart}_\varepsilon(\Omega) := \left\{ Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \mid E_Q[I^\Delta] \leq \varepsilon \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \|\Delta_t^j\|_\infty, \forall \Delta \in \mathcal{H}^d \right\}.$$

Thus, taking

$$\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon := \text{convex} \left(\left\{ I^\Delta - \varepsilon \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \|\Delta_t^j\|_\infty, \Delta \in \mathcal{H}^d \right\} \right) \tag{34}$$

(here $\text{convex}(\cdot)$ stands for the convex hull in $C_{0:T}$, which is easily seen to be a cone since \mathcal{H}^d is a vector space), one sees that

$$\text{Mart}_\varepsilon(\Omega) = \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap (\mathcal{A}^\varepsilon)^\circ.$$

Alternatively, we observe that $\text{Mart}_\varepsilon(\Omega) = M_\varepsilon^1(\Omega) \cap \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$ where

$$M_\varepsilon^1(\Omega) := \left\{ \lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \lambda \geq 0, \langle I^\Delta, \lambda \rangle \leq \varepsilon \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \|\Delta_t^j\|_\infty \lambda(1), \forall \Delta \in \mathcal{H}^d \right\}$$

is a $\sigma((C_{0:T})^*, C_{0:T})$ (i.e. weak*) closed convex cone by direct computation. Suppose $M_\varepsilon^1(\Omega) \neq \emptyset$ and set $\mathcal{A} = (M_\varepsilon^1(\Omega))^\circ \subseteq C_{0:T}$. Then by the Bipolar Theorem \mathcal{A} is a closed convex cone with

$\mathcal{A}^\circ = \text{M}_\varepsilon^1(\Omega)$. Consequently, for a $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$ we have: either $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Q) = 0$, which happens if and only if $Q \in \text{Mart}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$, or $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Q) = +\infty$ otherwise. From this it follows that \mathcal{A} is the weak closure of \mathcal{A}^ε , since they are both convex cones with the same polar set. Taking in particular $\varepsilon = 0$ we have $\text{Mart}_0(\Omega) = \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ as in Example 2.4.

It is interesting to notice that for any sequence $\varepsilon_n \downarrow_n 0$ we have

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{A}^{\varepsilon_n}}(Q) \uparrow_n \sigma_{\mathcal{I}}(Q) \quad \forall Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega). \quad (35)$$

Example 2.6. (Super/submartingale measures) Alternative choices for the set \mathcal{A} are $\mathcal{A}^\pm = \{I^\Delta \mid \Delta \in (\mathcal{H}^\pm)^d\}$ where $\mathcal{H}^+ = \{\Delta \in \mathcal{H} \mid \Delta_t \geq 0 \ \forall t = 0, \dots, T\}$ and $\mathcal{H}^- = -\mathcal{H}^+$. \mathcal{A}^+ models dynamic trading with no short selling and yields

$$\{\text{supermartingale measures for the canonical process}\} = \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap (\mathcal{A}^+)^{\circ}.$$

Example 2.7. Let $(C_{0:T})_+ := \{f \in C_{0:T} \mid f \geq 0\}$. For any set \mathcal{A} such that $\{0\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq -(C_{0:T})_+$ we obtain $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega) = \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$. As explained in Section 4.3, this choice will then determine the Entropy Optimal Transport duality with no dynamic hedging.

2.3 The main results

Before providing all the mathematical details, we wish to identify a suitable candidate for the objective functional for our (primal) problem. To do so, we start from the EMOT (dual) problem and proceed with an heuristic argument. In order to avoid all integrability issues and keep notation as simple as possible, in this introductory discussion we suppose that $d = 1$, that $K_t^1 := K_t$, $t = 0, \dots, T$ are all compact sets and that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}$, as in Example 2.4.

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q)) \quad (36)$$

$$= \inf_{Q \in \text{Prob}(\Omega)} \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \left(E_Q \left[c - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \Delta_t(X_0, \dots, X_t)(X_{t+1} - X_t) \right] + \mathcal{D}(Q) \right) \quad (37)$$

$$= \inf_{\mu \in \text{Meas}(\Omega)} \sup_{\substack{\Delta \in \mathcal{H} \\ \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \left[c - I^\Delta + \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right] d\mu - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t + \mathcal{D}(\mu) \right) \quad (38)$$

$$= \inf_{\mu \in \text{Meas}(\Omega)} \sup_{\substack{\Delta \in \mathcal{H} \\ \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \left[c - I^\Delta + \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right] d\mu - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t + \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(U(\varphi) - \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right) d\mu \right) \right) \quad (39)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}, \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \\ \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}}} \left(\inf_{\mu \in \text{Meas}(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} \left[c - I^\Delta + \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t - \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right] d\mu - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t + U(\varphi) \right) \quad (40)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}, \\ \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}}} \sup \left\{ U(\varphi) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, c - I^\Delta + \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t - \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \geq 0 \right\} \quad (41)$$

$$= \sup_{\substack{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}, \\ \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}}} \sup \left\{ U(\varphi + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c \right\} \quad (42)$$

$$= \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup \left\{ \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c \right\}. \quad (43)$$

The equality chain above is justified as follows: as K_t is compact, $X_t \in L^1(K_t, \mathbb{B}(K_t), \mu)$ for all $\mu \in \text{Meas}(\Omega)$ and then (36)=(37) follows using the same argument as in [6] Lemma 2.3, which yields that the inner supremum explodes to $+\infty$ unless Q is a martingale measure on Ω ; (37)=(38) follows observing that the inner supremum over $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ explodes to $+\infty$ unless $\mu(\Omega) = 1$; (38)=(39) exploits (28); in (39)=(40) we proceed heuristically interchanging supremum and infimum; (40)=(41) is motivated observing that the infimum in (40) equals $-\infty$ unless the inequality $c - I^\Delta + \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t - \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \geq 0$ holds on Ω ; (41)=(42) is a simple rewriting, and so is (42)=(43). To conclude, we expect our duality to look as follows:

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q)) = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup \left\{ S^U(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \leq c \right\}.$$

A rigorous proof of this duality, based on the above argument and on a minimax type Theorem that justify (39)=(40), can be found in a previous version of this paper (see A. Doldi and M. Frittelli, Entropy Martingale Optimal Transport and Nonlinear Pricing-Hedging Duality, Preprint: arXiv:2005.12572v1, 2020, where we also assumed that all the sets K_t were compact). We now proceed providing a rigorous proof of the duality above under the more general setup stated in Assumption 2.8. In the proof we will rely on a Fenchel-Moreau type Theorem for the functional \mathfrak{F} , rather than exploiting a minimax argument.

Assumption 2.8.

- (i) Let $K_0^1, \dots, K_0^d, \dots, K_T^1, \dots, K_T^d$ be closed subset of \mathbb{R} and let $\Omega = \times_{t=0}^T \times_{j=1}^d K_t^j$. The vector subspaces $\mathcal{E}_0, \dots, \mathcal{E}_T$ satisfy $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_{0:t}$, $t = 0, \dots, T$ and we set $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$. The functional $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ is concave with $U(0) \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq C_{0:T}$ is a convex cone with $0 \in \mathcal{A}$.
- (ii) For every $t = 0, \dots, T$ there exist a sequence of compact sets $\mathfrak{K}_t(n) \subseteq \times_{j=1}^d K_t^j$, $n \geq 1$ and a sequence of functions $0 \leq f_t^n \in \mathcal{E}_t$, $n \geq 1$ such that:

$$1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j| \leq \sum_{t=0}^T f_t^n(x_0, \dots, x_t) \quad \forall [x_0, \dots, x_T] \in \Omega \setminus \mathfrak{K}_0(n) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{K}_T(n) \quad (44)$$

and

$$V(\Gamma f_0^n, \dots, \Gamma f_T^n) \rightarrow_n 0 \quad \forall \Gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \Gamma > 0. \quad (45)$$

Assumption 2.8.(ii) is inspired by [21] and admits a very simple interpretation, described in Remark 2.10.

Example 2.9. Let

$$\begin{aligned} f^\alpha(x) &:= (x - \alpha)^+ + (-\alpha - x)^+ = (|x| - \alpha)^+, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \geq 0, \\ f_{j,t}^\alpha &:= f^\alpha|_{K_t^j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d, t = 0, \dots, T \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

and suppose that $f_{j,t}^\alpha \in \mathcal{E}_t$ for every $\alpha \geq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, $t = 0, \dots, T$. Set also $f_t^n := \sum_{j=1}^d f_{j,t}^{\frac{n}{\beta}}$ for $\beta = \beta(d, T)$ given in Proposition A.3. In order to guarantee that (44) and (45) are satisfied, it is enough to request that V is (componentwise) nondecreasing on $\times_{t=0}^T \mathcal{E}_t$, $V(0) = 0$ and

$$V_t(\alpha f_{j,t}^{\frac{n}{\beta}}) := V(0, \dots, 0, \alpha f_{j,t}^{\frac{n}{\beta}}, 0, \dots, 0) \rightarrow_n 0 \quad (47)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $t = 0, \dots, T$. V_t is here represents a valuation of the static hedging strategy consisting of a single option having maturity t . To see that the former assumptions imply (44), one can select $\mathfrak{R}_t(n) = \times_{j=1}^d K_t^j \cap [-n, n]^d$ and observe that Proposition A.3 guarantees that (44) holds. Moreover, by convexity of V we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = V(0) &\leq V(\alpha f_0^n, \dots, \alpha f_T^n) \leq \sum_{t=0}^T \frac{1}{T+1} V_t(\alpha(T+1)f_t^n) \\ &= \frac{1}{T+1} \sum_{t=0}^T V_t \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d d(T+1)\alpha f_{j,t}^{\frac{n}{\beta}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{d(T+1)} \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d V_t \left(d(T+1)\alpha f_{j,t}^{\frac{n}{\beta}} \right) \rightarrow_n 0, \end{aligned}$$

that is (45).

Remark 2.10. In the particular case $K_0^1, \dots, K_0^d, \dots, K_T^1, \dots, K_T^d \subseteq [0, +\infty)$, the conditions $V_t(\alpha f_{j,t}^{\frac{n}{\beta}}) \rightarrow_n 0$ in (47) means that the valuations over a suitable sequence of call options on the underlying stocks converge to zero when the corresponding strikes diverge to infinity.

Theorem 2.11. *Suppose Assumption 2.8 is fulfilled.*

(i) If

$$\mathfrak{P}(\hat{c}) < +\infty \text{ for some } \hat{c} \in B_{0:T}, \quad (48)$$

then $\mathfrak{P}(c) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $c \in B_{0:T}$ and $\mathfrak{P} : B_{0:T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is norm continuous, cash additive, concave and nondecreasing on $B_{0:T}$;

(ii) For every lower semicontinuous $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ satisfying

$$c(x) \geq -A \left(1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j| \right) \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \quad \text{for some } A \in [0, +\infty), \quad (49)$$

we have

$$\mathfrak{P}(c) := \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) = \inf_{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q)) \quad (50)$$

for $\Omega_{0:t} := \times_{s=0}^t \times_{j=1}^d K_s^j$ and

$$\mathcal{D}(Q) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(U(\varphi) - \sum_{t=0}^T \int_{\Omega_{0:t}} \varphi_t dQ_t \right) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \int_{\Omega_{0:t}} \varphi_t dQ_t - V(\varphi) \right),$$

where Q_t is the marginal of $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$ on $\mathcal{B}(\Omega_{0:t})$. Furthermore, if $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$ the infimum in RHS of (50) is a minimum.

Remark 2.12. Notice that the condition $\mathfrak{P}(\hat{c}) < +\infty$ for some $\hat{c} \in B_{0:T}$ is not required for the validity of Theorem 2.11 Item (ii). In addition, we allow in (50) $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ = \emptyset$ with the usual convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. We now provide conditions ensuring that $\mathfrak{P}(0) < +\infty$. By Item (i) this will then imply that $\mathfrak{P}(c) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $c \in B_{0:T}$.

(a) If there exists a $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}^\circ \cap \partial U(0) \subseteq (C_{0:T})^*$ then $\mathfrak{P}(0) < +\infty$ (here, $\partial U(0) \subseteq \times_{t=0}^T (C_{0:T})^*$ is the supergradient of U at $0 \in \mathcal{E}$, and we are identifying λ with the vector of its restrictions in writing improperly $\lambda \in \partial U(0)$). To see this, let λ satisfy $S^U(\varphi) \leq \sum_{t=0}^T \langle \varphi_t, \lambda_t \rangle$, $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. In particular then for all $z \in -\mathcal{A}$ and all $\varphi \in \Phi_z(0)$ it holds that $S^U(\varphi) \leq \langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t, \lambda \rangle \leq \langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + z, \lambda \rangle \leq 0$, as $\langle z, \lambda \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}^\circ$, which in turns yields $\mathfrak{P}(0) \leq 0$.

(b)

There exists $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$ such that $\mathcal{D}(Q) < +\infty \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{P}(0) < +\infty$.

Indeed, by definition we have $\mathfrak{P}(0) \leq \int_{\Omega} 0 \, dQ + \mathfrak{P}^*(Q) = \mathfrak{P}^*(Q)$, but from Lemma 2.20 (which does not rely on Lemma 2.18) we have $\mathfrak{P}^*(Q) = \mathcal{D}(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Q) = \mathcal{D}(Q)$ (the latter inequality coming from $Q \in \mathcal{A}^\circ$). Hence $\mathfrak{P}(0) \leq \mathcal{D}(Q) < +\infty$. Conversely, $\mathfrak{P}(0) < +\infty$ implies the existence of a minimum point in (50).

(c) The existence of the optimizer in MOT implies that $\mathcal{M}(\widehat{Q}_0, \widehat{Q}_1, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T)$ is not empty and that the marginals must be in convex order. In EMOT the optimizer Q^* belongs to $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$ with $\mathcal{D}(Q^*) < +\infty$ with no other requirement.

Remark 2.13. From the proof of Theorem 2.11 it becomes clear that the use of $-\mathcal{A}$ in place of \mathcal{A} in defining $\mathfrak{P}(c)$ is somehow a matter of taste. Now the infimum in (50) is in fact taken over measures in the polar \mathcal{A}° . Instead, without the minus sign in defining $\mathfrak{P}(c)$, we would work with $(-\mathcal{A})^\circ$, which is less comfortable in the computations of the proof.

Corollary 2.14. *Suppose that Assumption 2.8.(i) holds with $K_0^1, \dots, K_0^d, \dots, K_T^1, \dots, K_T^d$ compact subsets of \mathbb{R} , that $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is lower semicontinuous and that $U(\varphi) = 0$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. Then (50) holds true and if $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$ then there exists an optimum in the RHS of (50).*

Proof. When $K_0^1, \dots, K_0^d, \dots, K_T^1, \dots, K_T^d$ are compact then $C_{0:T} = C_b(\Omega)$. If $U(\varphi) = 0$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$, then (44) and (45) are automatically satisfied: indeed one can take $\mathfrak{K}(n) = \Omega$ and $f_t^n \equiv -\varphi_t, t = 0, \dots, T, n \geq 1$. Obviously, a possible choice for such a φ is $\varphi = 0$. \square

We now rephrase our findings in Theorem 2.11, with minor additions, to get the formulations in Corollary 2.15 and Corollary 2.16 which will simplify our discussion of Section 4. In particular, this reformulation will come in handy when dealing with subhedging dualities in Corollaries 4.3-4.6 and Proposition 4.9.

For a given proper concave $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, recall the definition of S^U in (25) and, for $V(\cdot) = -U(-\cdot)$, the definition $S_V(\varphi) := -S^U(-\varphi)$.

Furthermore, given functions $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$, $g : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ we introduce the sets

$$\mathcal{S}_{sub}(c) := \left\{ \varphi \in \text{dom}(S^U) \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi(x_0, \dots, x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \quad (51)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{sup}(g) := \left\{ \varphi \in \text{dom}(S_V) \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi(x_0, \dots, x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \geq g(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \quad (52)$$

and observe that $\mathcal{S}_{sup}(g) = -\mathcal{S}_{sub}(-g)$.

Corollary 2.15. *Suppose that the assumptions in Theorem 2.11 are satisfied, that $g : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ is upper semicontinuous and that also condition (49) holds replacing c with $-g$. Then the following hold*

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q)) = \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{sub}(c)} S^U(\varphi), \quad (53)$$

$$\sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[g] - \mathcal{D}(Q)) = \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{sup}(g)} S_V(\varphi). \quad (54)$$

Finally, if LHS of (53) (resp. (54)) is finite, then an optimum exists in the LHS of (53) (resp. (54)).

Proof. Equation (53) is an easy rephrasing of the corresponding (50), taking $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}$ as in Example 2.4 so that $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ = \text{Mart}(\Omega)$. Existence of an optimum in the case of finiteness of LHS of (53) follows again from Theorem 2.11. As to (54), we observe that for $c := -g$ we get from (53)

$$\sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{sub}(-g)} S^U(\varphi) = \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[-g] + \mathcal{D}(Q)) = - \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[g] - \mathcal{D}(Q)).$$

From $\mathcal{S}_{sup}(g) = -\mathcal{S}_{sub}(-g)$ and $S_V(\cdot) = -S^U(-\cdot)$, we get $\sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{sub}(-g)} S^U(\varphi) = -\inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{sup}(g)} S_V(\varphi)$. Existence of an optimum when LHS of (54) is finite can be inferred in a similar way. \square

Corollary 2.16. *If $d = 1$ and $\Omega := K_0 \times \dots \times K_T$ for compact sets $K_0, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, (53) and (54), as well as existence of optima, are guaranteed by the following simplified set of assumptions: $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is lower semicontinuous, $g : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is upper semicontinuous and $U(\varphi) = 0$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. When $K_0, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ are compact, we may repeat the proof of Corollary 2.15 invoking the Corollary 2.14 in place of the more general Theorem 2.11. \square

Observe that in the previous results, we allow to choose, for static hedging, for each $t = 0, \dots, T$, a subspace $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_{0:t}$, potentially allowing to consider also Asian and path dependent options in the sets \mathcal{E}_t . In some of the subsequent results we will instead consider for static hedging the sets $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_t$, $t = 0, \dots, T$ consisting of deterministic amounts, units of underlying stock at time t and call options with different strike prices and same maturity t .

In the subsequent sections we will only formulate the statements regarding the subhedging price, as the corresponding statements for the superhedging price can be obtained in the obvious way just described.

2.4 Proof of Theorem 2.11

Remark 2.17. Set

$$\tilde{\Phi}_z(c) := \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_0, \dots, x_t) + z(x) \leq c(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\}$$

and observe that $\Phi_z(c) = \tilde{\Phi}_z(c) \cap \text{dom}(S^U)$. Then, under the convention $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$,

$$\mathfrak{P}(c) := \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) = \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)} S^U(\varphi). \quad (55)$$

To see this, we consider different cases for a fixed $z \in -\mathcal{A}$.

Case 1: $\Phi_z(c) = \emptyset$, which means $\sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) = -\infty$ by convention. If $\tilde{\Phi}_z(c) = \emptyset$ then $\sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) = -\infty$ by convention, if $\tilde{\Phi}_z(c) \neq \emptyset$ then $\sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) = -\infty$ since for every $\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)$ we have $S^U(\varphi) = -\infty$, as $\varphi \notin \text{dom}(S^U)$.

Case 2: $\Phi_z(c) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\tilde{\Phi}_z(c) \neq \emptyset$ too, and $\sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) = \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi)$ since we can ignore all the $\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c) \setminus \Phi_z(c)$ (which produce values $S^U(\varphi) = -\infty$).

The proof of Theorem 2.11 is split in the following Lemmas 2.18, 2.20, 2.22, 2.23, 2.24 which are then combined in Lemma 2.25.

Lemma 2.18. *Under Assumptions 2.8 and (48), Item (i) in Theorem 2.11 holds. Moreover, the restriction of \mathfrak{P} to $C_{0:T}$ satisfies*

$$\mathfrak{P}(c) = \min_{\substack{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*, \\ \lambda \geq 0, \lambda(1) = 1}} \langle c, \lambda \rangle + \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \quad \forall c \in C_{0:T} \quad (56)$$

for

$$\mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) = \sup_{c \in C_{0:T}} (\mathfrak{P}(c) - \langle c, \lambda \rangle), \quad \lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathfrak{P}(\hat{c}) < +\infty$ for some $\hat{c} \in B_{0:T}$. To prove that $\mathfrak{P}(c) > -\infty$ for every $c \in B_{0:T}$, it is (more than) enough to show that

$$\Phi_z(c) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall z \in -\mathcal{A}. \quad (57)$$

Set $\mathfrak{K}_n = \mathfrak{K}_0(n) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{K}_T(n) \subseteq \Omega$. Observe that whenever $c \in B_{0:T}$ is given we have for every $n \geq 1$

$$c(x) - z(x) \geq - \sup_{x \in \mathfrak{K}_n} |c(x) - z(x)| \geq - \|c - z\|_{0:T} \sup_{x \in \mathfrak{K}_n} \left(1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j| \right) > -\infty \quad \forall x \in \mathfrak{K}(n)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c(x) - z(x) &\geq - \|c - z\|_{0:T} \left(1 + \sum_{s \leq u \leq t} \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j| \right) \\ &\stackrel{(44)}{\geq} - \|c - z\|_{0:T} - \|c - z\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T f_t^n(x_0, \dots, x_t) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \setminus \mathfrak{K}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$c(x) - z(x) \geq - \|c - z\|_{0:T} - \sup_{x \in \mathfrak{K}_n} |c(x) - z(x)| - \|c - z\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T f_t^n(x_0, \dots, x_t) \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

If we now show that for n big enough $[-\|c - z\|_{0:T} f_t^n]_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in \text{dom}(S^U)$, we then conclude that $[-\|c - z\|_{0:T} - \sup_{x \in \mathfrak{K}_n} |c(x) - z(x)| - \|c - z\|_{0:T} f_t^n]_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in \text{dom}(S^U)$ by cash additivity of S^U and at the same time $[-\|c - z\|_{0:T} - \sup_{x \in \mathfrak{K}_n} |c(x) - z(x)| - \|c - z\|_{0:T} f_t^n]_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in \Phi_z(c)$ by definition. This in particular proves $\mathfrak{P}(c) > -\infty$. Going then back to checking $[-\|c - z\|_{0:T} f_t^n]_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in \text{dom}(S^U)$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} S^U[-\|c - z\|_{0:T} f_t^n] &= \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U([- \|c - z\|_{0:T} f_t^n]_t + \alpha) - \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t \right) \\ &\geq U(-\|c - z\|_{0:T} [f_t^n]_t) = -V(\|c - z\|_{0:T} [f_t^n]_t) \rightarrow_n 0 > -\infty \end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 2.8. The fact that $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$ will follow once we show monotonicity, cash additivity and concavity. Monotonicity is trivial: if $c_1 \leq c_2$ then $\Phi_z(c_1) \subseteq \Phi_z(c_2)$ for every $z \in -\mathcal{A}$ (both the sets might be empty). The cash additivity property can be seen as follows: given $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and setting $\mathbf{1} = [1, \dots, 1] \in \mathbb{R}^T$, observe that whenever $z \in \mathcal{A}$ is given $\varphi \in \Phi_z(c + \beta) \Leftrightarrow \varphi - \frac{\beta}{T+1} \mathbf{1} \in \Phi_z(c)$ since, by cash additivity of S^U , $\text{dom}(S^U) + \mathbb{R}^{T+1} = \text{dom}(S^U)$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}(c + \beta) &= \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c + \beta)} S^U(\varphi) = \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U\left(\varphi + \frac{\beta}{T+1} \mathbf{1}\right) \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^T \frac{\beta}{T+1} + \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) = \mathfrak{P}(c) + \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Coming to concavity, it is convenient to rewrite $\mathfrak{P}(c)$ in a slightly more convenient form

$$\mathfrak{P}(c) = \sup \left\{ S^U(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \text{dom}(S^U), \exists z \in -\mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_0, \dots, x_t) + z(x) \leq c(x) \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \quad (58)$$

and to recall that whenever $c \in B_{0:T}$ is given, the set over which we take the supremum in RHS of (58) is not empty by (57). Take then $c_i \in B_{0:T}$ and associated $z_i \in -\mathcal{A}, \varphi^i \in \text{dom}(S^U)$ with $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t^i + z_i \leq c_i$. Define $c_\alpha = \alpha c_1 + (1 - \alpha)c_2$ and analogously z_α and φ^α for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then clearly $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t^\alpha + z_\alpha \leq c_\alpha$. Combining this with Lemma A.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha S^U(\varphi^1) + (1 - \alpha) S^U(\varphi^2) \stackrel{(98)}{\leq} S^U(\varphi^\alpha) \\ & \leq \sup \left\{ S^U(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \text{dom}(S^U), \exists z \in -\mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_0, \dots, x_t) + z(x) \leq c_\alpha(x) \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \\ & \stackrel{(58)}{=} \mathfrak{P}(c_\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Taking now the supremum over z_i, φ^i with $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t^i + z_i \leq c_i$ we obtain

$$\alpha \mathfrak{P}(c_1) + (1 - \alpha) \mathfrak{P}(c_2) \leq \mathfrak{P}(\alpha c_1 + (1 - \alpha)c_2) \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1], c_1, c_2 \in B_{0:T}. \quad (59)$$

Notice that up to this point we have $\mathfrak{P}(c_i) \in (-\infty, +\infty]$ so (59) makes sense.

Now we can combine (59) with the fact that $\mathfrak{P}(c) > -\infty$ for every $c \in B_{0:T}$ to show that $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$ for every $c \in B_{0:T}$. Indeed, suppose that $\mathfrak{P}(\tilde{c}) = +\infty$ for some $\tilde{c} \in B_{0:T}$. We know by hypothesis that $\mathfrak{P}(\hat{c}) < +\infty$ for some $\hat{c} \in B_{0:T}$, and by what we have previously proved we know that $\mathfrak{P}(2\hat{c} - \tilde{c}) > -\infty$. Observing that $\hat{c} = \alpha(2\hat{c} - \tilde{c}) + (1 - \alpha)\tilde{c}$ for $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, we have from (59)

$$+\infty = \alpha \mathfrak{P}(2\hat{c} - \tilde{c}) + (1 - \alpha) \mathfrak{P}(\tilde{c}) \leq \mathfrak{P}(\alpha(2\hat{c} - \tilde{c}) + (1 - \alpha)\tilde{c}) = \mathfrak{P}(\hat{c}) < +\infty.$$

This yields a contradiction, thus there can be no $\tilde{c} \in B_{0:T}$ with $\mathfrak{P}(\tilde{c}) = +\infty$. Hence $\mathfrak{P} : B_{0:T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is cash additive, concave and nondecreasing on $B_{0:T}$. Then it is automatically norm continuous on $B_{0:T}$ by the Extended Namioka-Klee Theorem (see [12]). The Fenchel-Moreau type dual representation (56) holds, again by the Extended Namioka-Klee Theorem, this time applied on the restriction of \mathfrak{P} to $C_{0:T}$, plus standard arguments involving monotonicity and cash additivity to prove that $\mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) < +\infty \Rightarrow \lambda \geq 0, \lambda(1) = 1$. See for example [35] Theorem 4.16 for an exploitable technique for a similar argument. \square

Remark 2.19. Under Assumptions 2.8 and (48), $S^U(\varphi) < +\infty$ for every $\varphi \in \text{dom}(S^U)$. Indeed, choosing $c_\varphi := \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t$ we get that $\varphi \in \Phi_0(c_\varphi)$ and thus $S^U(\varphi) \leq \mathfrak{P}(c_\varphi) < +\infty$, by Lemma 2.18.

Lemma 2.20. *For every $\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$ such that $\lambda \geq 0$ we have*

$$\mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) = (S^U)^*(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda).$$

If in addition $\lambda(1) = 1$ then

$$(S^U)^*(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(S^U(\varphi) - \sum_{t=0}^T \langle \varphi_t, \lambda_t \rangle \right) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda).$$

Proof. See Appendix A.1. \square

Remark 2.21. Under Assumption 2.8, $U(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ and therefore $(S^U)^*(\lambda) \geq S^U(0) \geq U(0) > -\infty$ for every $0 \leq \lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$.

Lemma 2.22. *Under Assumptions 2.8 and (48) let $0 \leq \lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$, $\lambda(1) = 1$ be given and define $0 \leq \lambda_t = \lambda|_{C_{0:t}} \in (C_{0:t})^*$. If $[\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T] \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{D})$ then there exists a unique $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$ which represents λ on $C_{0:T}$, i.e.*

$$\langle \varphi, \lambda \rangle = E_Q[\varphi], \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{0:T}.$$

Proof. The proof is an adaption of [14] Theorem 7.10.6. We first stress the fact that $\lambda_t = \lambda|_{C_{0:t}} \in (C_{0:t})^*$ is a consequence of (27). We will apply Proposition A.5. To do so, we show that for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and for n big enough, we may define a set $K_\varepsilon := \mathfrak{K}_0(n) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{K}_T(n)$ that is compact (since so are all the factors) and satisfies the assumptions in Proposition A.5. Suppose that a given $\varphi \in C_{0:T}$ satisfies: $\varphi(x) = 0$ for every $x \in \times_{t=0}^T \mathfrak{K}_t(n)$. We also have automatically that

$$|\varphi(x)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \left(1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j| \right) \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

By Assumption 2.8 we then have:

$$|\varphi(x)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T f_t^n(x_0, \dots, x_t) \right) \quad \forall [x_0, \dots, x_T] \in \Omega \setminus \mathfrak{K}_0(n) \times \dots \times \mathfrak{K}_T(n).$$

Since moreover by assumption $\varphi \equiv 0$ on $\times_{t=0}^T \mathfrak{K}_t(n)$ we get:

$$|\varphi(x)| \leq \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T f_t^n(x_0, \dots, x_t) \right) \quad \forall [x_0, \dots, x_T] \in \Omega. \quad (60)$$

Then, the following chain of inequalities holds for every $\Gamma > 0$ (additional motivation will be provided immediately after):

$$|\langle \varphi, \lambda \rangle| \leq \langle |\varphi|, \lambda \rangle \leq \langle \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T f_t^n, \lambda \rangle = \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T \langle f_t^n, \lambda \rangle = \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T \langle f_t^n, \lambda_t \rangle \quad (61)$$

$$= \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \frac{1}{\Gamma} \sum_{t=0}^T \langle \Gamma f_t^n, \lambda_t \rangle \leq \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma} \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) + \frac{1}{\Gamma} V(\Gamma f_0^n, \dots, \Gamma f_T^n) \right). \quad (62)$$

Here, (61) follows from positivity of λ , from (60), from linearity and the fact that one defines $\lambda_t := \lambda|_{C_{0:t}} \in (C_{0:t})^*$, while (62) follows from linearity and from Fenchel inequality (29). Since we are assuming by hypothesis that $[\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T] \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{D})$, we can select $\Gamma > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{\Gamma} \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Select now n in such a way that $\frac{1}{\Gamma} V(\Gamma f_0^n, \dots, \Gamma f_T^n) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for every $s \leq T$ (which is possible by Assumption 2.8). Then continuing from (62) we get

$$|\langle \varphi, \lambda \rangle| \leq \|\varphi\|_{0:T} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \leq \varepsilon \|\varphi\|_{0:T}.$$

The thesis now follows combining Proposition A.5 and Daniell-Stone Theorem A.6. \square

Lemma 2.23. *Under Assumptions 2.8 and (48), the equation (50) holds for every $c \in C_{0:T}$, with a minimum in place of the infimum.*

Proof. Combining Lemma 2.18, Lemma 2.20, and Lemma 2.22 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{P}(c) &\stackrel{\text{L.2.18}}{=} \min_{\substack{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*, \\ \lambda \geq 0, \lambda(1)=1}} (\langle c, \lambda \rangle + \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda)) \\
&\stackrel{\text{L.2.20}}{=} \min_{\substack{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*, \\ \lambda \geq 0, \lambda(1)=1}} (\langle c, \lambda \rangle + \mathcal{D}(\lambda) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda)) \\
&\stackrel{(\star)}{=} \min_{\substack{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*, [\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T] \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{D}) \\ \lambda \geq 0, \lambda(1)=1}} (\langle c, \lambda \rangle + \mathcal{D}(\lambda) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda)) \\
&\stackrel{\text{L.2.22}}{=} \min_{\substack{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega), \\ Q \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{D})}} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Q)) \tag{63} \\
&\stackrel{(\star)}{=} \min_{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(Q))
\end{aligned}$$

where in (\star) we used the fact that \mathcal{D} is bounded from below by $S^U(0)$ by Remark 2.21, hence $[\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T] \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{D}) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) < +\infty$, and in (63) we identified probability measures $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$ and their induced functionals, as well as the marginals Q_t of such measures with the restrictions of such functionals to $C_{0:t}$. \square

Lemma 2.24. *Under Assumptions 2.8 and (48) the sublevel*

$$\{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ \mid \mathcal{D}(Q) \leq \Xi\}$$

is $\sigma((C_{0:T})^, C_{0:T})|_{\text{Prob}^1(\Omega)}$ - (sequentially) compact for every $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. We show that $\{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \lambda \geq 0, \lambda(1) = 1, \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi\}$ is weak*-(sequentially) compact. To do so, it is enough to prove that $\{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi\}$ is weak*-(sequentially) compact. Once this is done notice that, combining the fact that $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} = \delta_{\mathcal{A}^\circ}$ and Lemma 2.20, $\{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi\} = \{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \lambda \geq 0, \lambda(1) = 1, \mathcal{D}(\lambda) \leq \Xi\} \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$. Since by Lemma 2.22 there is a natural identification between normalized nonnegative functionals in $\text{dom}(\mathfrak{P}^*)$ and the measures in $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$, the proof will be complete. In order to prove that $\{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi\}$ is weak*-(sequentially) compact, observe first that by (56) we have for every $r > 0$ and $\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$ s.t. $\mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi$

$$\sup_{\substack{c \in C_{0:T}, \\ \|c\|_{0:T} \leq r}} |\langle c, \lambda \rangle| = \sup_{\substack{c \in C_{0:T}, \\ \|c\|_{0:T} \leq r}} \langle c, \lambda \rangle \leq \sup_{\substack{c \in C_{0:T}, \\ \|c\|_{0:T} \leq r}} (-\mathfrak{P}(-c)) + \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi + \sup_{\substack{c \in C_{0:T}, \\ \|c\|_{0:T} \leq r}} (-\mathfrak{P}(-c)). \tag{64}$$

Now since $-\mathfrak{P}(\cdot)$ is real valued, convex and continuous on $C_{0:T}$ (Lemma 2.18) it follows from [2] Theorem 5.43 that the RHS in (64) is finite for some $r > 0$. Then, the operator norms of elements of the set $\{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi\}$ are uniformly bounded, implying that $\{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi\}$ is contained in some (weak* compact, by Banach Alaoglu Theorem, and sequentially compact by separability of $C_{0:T}$, see [2] Theorem 6.30) ball of $(C_{0:T})^*$. Since \mathfrak{P}^* is weak* lower semicontinuous by its own very definition, its sublevel sets are weak* closed. This concludes the proof of weak*-(sequential) compactness of $\{\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^* \mid \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \Xi\}$. \square

Lemma 2.25. *Under Assumption 2.8, for every lower semicontinuous $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ satisfying (49), the duality (50) holds and, if $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$, the infimum in (50) is a minimum.*

Proof. Take c as in the statement. Observe that, from the definition of \mathfrak{P} and the Fenchel inequality on S^U , for any $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{P}(c) &= \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) \leq \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} \left((S^U)^*(Q_0, \dots, Q_T) + E_Q \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right] \right) \\
&\leq \sup_{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ} \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} \left((S^U)^*(Q_0, \dots, Q_T) + E_Q \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + z \right] \right) \\
&\stackrel{\text{L.2.20}}{\leq} \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q)) \\
&= E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence:

$$\mathfrak{P}(c) \leq \inf_{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ} E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q) \quad (65)$$

The case $\mathfrak{P}(c) = +\infty$ is thus trivial and we now focus on the case $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$. Let $c^A(x) := -A \left(1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j| \right)$, $x \in \Omega$. Then $c \geq c^A \in C_{0:T}$ and $\mathfrak{P}(c^A) \leq \mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$, as can be easily verified.

A standard argument produces a sequence $(c_n)_n \subseteq C_{0:T}$ with $c_n \uparrow_n c$ pointwise on Ω . We claim that, given a sequence of optima for the dual problems of $\mathfrak{P}(c_n)$, taking a suitable converging subsequence the limit \hat{Q} satisfies $\hat{Q} \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$ and $E_{\hat{Q}}[c] + \mathcal{D}(\hat{Q}) \leq \mathfrak{P}(c)$. This and (65) will then imply (50).

To prove the claim, recall from Lemma 2.23 and $+\infty > \mathfrak{P}(c) \geq \mathfrak{P}(c_n)$, that each dual problem for $\mathfrak{P}(c_n)$ admits an optimum, call it $Q^n \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$. We proceed observing that $\mathcal{D}(Q^n) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every n and

$$\mathfrak{P}(c_n) = E_{Q^n}[c_n] + \mathcal{D}(Q^n) \geq -E_{Q^n} \left[\|c_1\|_{0:T} \left(1 + \sum_{t=0}^T \eta_t \right) \right] + \mathcal{D}(Q^n) \quad (66)$$

where we set $\eta_t(x_t) = \sum_{j=1}^d |x_t^j|$, $x_t \in K_t$. Now by Fenchel inequality (29), mimicking the argument in (62),

$$E_{Q^n} \left[\|c_1\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T \eta_t \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}(Q^n) + \frac{1}{2} V(2 \|c_1\|_{0:T} \eta_0, \dots, 2 \|c_1\|_{0:T} \eta_T).$$

Going back to (66) we then get

$$\mathfrak{P}(c_n) \geq \zeta + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}(Q^n) \quad (67)$$

where $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant depending on $c_1, V, \eta_0, \dots, \eta_T$. Since now $\mathfrak{P}(c_n) \leq \mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$ we conclude that $\sup_n \mathcal{D}(Q^n) < +\infty$, which in turns implies that the sequence $(Q_n)_n$ lies in $\{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ \mid \mathcal{D}(Q) \leq \Xi\}$ for $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}$ big enough. We know that the latter set is weak* sequentially compact by Lemma 2.24, thus we can extract a weak* converging subsequence, which

we rename again $(Q^n)_n$, say converging to a $\hat{Q} \in \text{Prob}^1 \cap \mathcal{A}^\circ$. Now it is easily seen that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\hat{Q}}[c] + \mathcal{D}(\hat{Q}) &= \lim_n E_{\hat{Q}}[c_n] + \mathcal{D}(\hat{Q}) \\
&\stackrel{(\star)}{\leq} \lim_n \liminf_m (E_{Q^m}[c_n] + \mathcal{D}(Q^m)) \\
&\stackrel{(\star\star)}{\leq} \lim_n \liminf_m (E_{Q^m}[c_m] + \mathcal{D}(Q^m)) \\
&= \liminf_m (E_{Q^m}[c_m] + \mathcal{D}(Q^m)) = \lim_m \mathfrak{F}(c^m) \leq \mathfrak{F}(c)
\end{aligned}$$

where in (\star) we exploited the fact that $Q \mapsto E_Q[c_n]dQ + \mathcal{D}(Q)$ is weak* lower semicontinuous being sum of weak* lower semicontinuous functionals, and in $(\star\star)$ we used the fact that $c_n \leq c_m$ if $m \geq n$. \square

2.5 Convergence of EMOT

In this Section 2.5 we study some stability and convergence results for the EMOT problem. In particular, we show how under suitable convergence assumptions on the penalty terms, one can see the classical MOT as a limit case for EMOT.

We suppose that for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ we are given a functional U_n and a set $\mathcal{A}_n \subseteq C_{0:T}$. We denote the corresponding problem as in (32) by $\mathfrak{F}_n(c)$.

Proposition 2.26. *Suppose that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, the same assumptions of Theorem 2.11 hold for $\mathfrak{F}_n(c)$ and that $\mathfrak{F}_n(c) < +\infty$. Suppose that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_\infty(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(Q) &= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{D}_n(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q)) \\
\mathcal{D}_{n+1}(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_{n+1}}(Q) &\geq \mathcal{D}_n(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

for every $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_n(c) \uparrow_n \mathfrak{F}_\infty(c)$ for every $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ which is lower semicontinuous and satisfies (49).

Proof. From Lemma 2.23 we see that each dual problem for $\mathfrak{F}(c_n)$ admits an optimum, call it $Q^n \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{A}_n^\circ$. for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $+\infty > \mathfrak{F}_\infty(c) \geq \sup_n \mathfrak{F}_n(c) = \lim_n \mathfrak{F}_n(c)$ and that, with an argument similar to the one yielding (67),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{F}_n(c) &= E_{Q^n}[c] + \mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n) \geq E_{Q^n} \left[-\|c\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right] + \mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n) \\
&\geq -\frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{F}_n^*(Q^n) + \frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{F}_n \left(-2\|c\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right) + \mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n) \\
&\stackrel{L.2.20}{=} \frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{F}_n \left(-2\|c\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{F}_1 \left(-2\|c\|_{0:T} \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}_1(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(Q^n).
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for some constant η ,

$$+\infty > \mathfrak{F}_\infty(c) \geq \mathfrak{F}_n(c) \geq \eta + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{D}_1(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_1}(Q^n)$$

Hence, all the measures $(Q_n)_n$ belong to the a sublevel in the form $\{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega) \cap (\mathcal{A}_1)^\circ \mid \mathcal{D}_1(Q) \leq \Xi\}$ which is $\sigma(\text{Prob}^1(\Omega), C_{0:T})$ -(sequentially) compact by Lemma 2.24. Extract a subsequence, which will be renamed again $(Q_n)_n$, converging to the limit $Q^\infty \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$. Since $\mathcal{D}_n, \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ are lower semicontinuous, so is $\mathcal{D}_n + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap \{\infty\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\infty(Q^\infty) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(Q^\infty) &\stackrel{(68)}{=} \sup_K (\mathcal{D}_K(Q^\infty) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_K}(Q^\infty)) \leq \sup_K \liminf_n (\mathcal{D}_K(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_K}(Q^n)) \\ &\stackrel{(68)}{\leq} \sup_K \liminf_n (\mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n)) = \liminf_n (\mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n)) . \end{aligned}$$

Up to taking a further subsequence, again renamed $(Q_n)_n$ we might as well assume that the \liminf above is in fact a limit, so that

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty(Q^\infty) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(Q^\infty) \leq \lim_n (\mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n)) .$$

Since now $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is lower semicontinuous and satisfies (49) for some $A \geq 0$, there exists a sequence $(c_n)_n \subseteq C_{0:T}$ with $c_n \uparrow_n c$ pointwise on Ω , just as in the proof of Lemma 2.25. Notice that by Monotone Convergence Theorem we then have that $E_Q[c] = \sup_n E_Q[c_n]$. We conclude that $Q \mapsto E_Q[c]$ is the supremum of linear functional, each being continuous w.r.t the topology induced by $\sigma((C_{0:T})^*, C_{0:T})$ on $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$. Then, $Q \mapsto E_Q[c]$ is lower semicontinuous w.r.t. such topology and $E_{Q^\infty}[c] \leq \liminf_n E_{Q^n}[c]$. Passing again to a further subsequence we can assume that $\liminf_n E_{Q^n}[c] = \lim_n E_{Q^n}[c]$. From the previous arguments we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}_\infty(c) &\leq E_{Q^\infty}[c] + \mathcal{D}_\infty(Q^\infty) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(Q^\infty) \leq \lim_n E_{Q^n}[c] + \mathcal{D}_\infty(Q^\infty) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(Q^\infty) \\ &\leq \lim_n E_{Q^n}[c] + \lim_n \mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n) = \lim_n (E_{Q^n}[c] + \mathcal{D}_n(Q^n) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_n}(Q^n)) = \lim_n \mathfrak{F}_n(c) . \end{aligned}$$

where we exploited the fact that $(Q^n)_n$ are optima. Since we already know $\lim_n \mathfrak{F}_n(c) \leq \mathfrak{F}_\infty(c)$ this concludes the proof of $\mathfrak{F}_n(c) \uparrow_n \mathfrak{F}_\infty(c)$. \square

3 Additive structure

In Section 2, we did not require any particular structural form of the functionals \mathcal{D}, U . Here instead, we will assume an additive structure of U and, complementarily, an additive structure of \mathcal{D} . In the whole Section 3 we take for each $t = 0, \dots, T$ a vector subspace $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}_t$ such that $\mathcal{E}_t + \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{C}_t$ and set $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$. Observe that we automatically have $\mathcal{E} + \mathbb{R}^{T+1} = \mathcal{C}$. It is also clear that \mathcal{E} is a subspace of $(C_{0:T})^{T+1}$, if we interpret $\mathcal{E}_0, \dots, \mathcal{E}_T$ as subspaces of $C_{0:T}$. We also mention here that up to now we used for a $\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$ (resp. for a measure $\mu \in \text{ca}(\Omega)$), the notation λ_t (resp. μ_t) for restrictions to $C_{0:t}$ (resp. marginals on $\Omega_{0:t}$). This was motivated by the fact that we were considering general $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_{0:t}$. Since from now on we will mostly work with $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq \mathcal{C}_t$, we change notation slightly.

Notation 3.1. For the whole Sections 3, 4, 5, given a $\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$ (resp. given a measure $\mu \in \text{ca}(\Omega)$), we use the notation λ_t (resp. μ_t) for restrictions to \mathcal{C}_t (resp. marginals on $\times_{j=1}^d K_t^j$).

3.1 Additive structure of U

Setup 3.2. For every $t = 0, \dots, T$ we consider a proper concave functional $U_t : \mathcal{E}_t \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$. We define \mathcal{D}_t on $\text{ca}^1(K_t)$ similarly to (28) as

$$\mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t) := \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t} \left(U_t(\varphi_t) - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\gamma_t \right), \quad \gamma_t \in \text{ca}^1(K_t)$$

and observe that \mathcal{D}_t can also be thought to be defined on $\text{ca}^1(\Omega)$ using for $\gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega)$ the marginals $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T$ and setting $\mathcal{D}_t(\gamma) := \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t)$. We may now define, for each $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$, $U(\varphi) := \sum_{t=0}^T U_t(\varphi_t)$ and define \mathcal{D} on $\text{ca}^1(\Omega)$ using (28). Recall from (25)

$$S^U(\varphi) := \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right), \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \quad S^{U_t}(\varphi_t) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} (U(\varphi_t + \alpha) - \alpha), \quad \varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t.$$

Lemma 3.3. In Setup 3.2 and under the convention $+\infty - \infty = -\infty$ we have

$$\mathcal{D}(\gamma) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t), \quad \forall \gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega), \quad S^U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T S^{U_t}(\varphi_t) \text{ for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (69)$$

and for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$

$$S^U(\varphi + \beta) = S^U(\varphi) + \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t, \text{ for } \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}, \quad S^{U_t}(\varphi_t + \beta) = S^{U_t}(\varphi_t) + \beta, \text{ for } \beta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. We will only focus on (69), since the remaining claims are easily checked. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\gamma) &= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T U_t(\varphi_t) - \sum_{t=0}^T \int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\gamma \right) = \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t} \left(U_t(\varphi_t) - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\gamma_t \right) \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

As to the second claim in (69), in view of $+\infty - \infty = -\infty$, we observe that

$$\sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right) = \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} (U_t(\varphi_t + \beta) - \beta) = \sum_{t=0}^T S^{U_t}(\varphi_t).$$

□

3.2 Duality for the general Cash Additive setup

As a consequence of Theorem 2.11, we are now ready to prove the duality $\mathfrak{D}(c) = \mathfrak{P}(c)$ announced in the Introduction, in equation (22).

Theorem 3.4. Suppose that $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_t$ with $X_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$ and that $S_t : \mathcal{E}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a concave, cash additive functional null in 0. Set $U(\varphi) := \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t)$, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$ and suppose that Assumption 2.8 is fulfilled. Consider for every $t = 0, \dots, T$ the penalizations

$$\mathcal{D}_t(Q_t) := \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t} \left(S_t(\varphi_t) - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ_t \right) \text{ for } Q_t \in \text{Prob}^1(K_t).$$

Let $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ be lower semicontinuous and such that (49) holds. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}(c) &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E} \text{ is s.t. } \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \\ &= \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

and the infimum in (70) is a minimum provided that $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{D} be defined as in (28). Observe that we are in Setup 3.2. Lemma 3.3 tells us that $S^U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t)$, since S_0, \dots, S_T are cash additive, and that \mathcal{D} coincides on $\text{Mart}(\Omega)$ with the penalization term $Q \mapsto \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t)$, as provided in the statement of this Theorem. All the assumptions of Theorem 2.11 are fulfilled, so that we can apply Corollary 2.15, which yields exactly $\mathfrak{D}(c) = \mathfrak{P}(c)$. \square

3.3 Additive structure of \mathcal{D} .

The results of this subsection will be applied in Subsections 4.4 and 4.5. In the spirit of Remark 2.2, we may now reverse the procedure taken in the previous subsection: we start from some functionals \mathcal{D}_t on $\text{ca}^1(K_t)$, for $t = 0, \dots, T$, and build an additive functional \mathcal{D} on $\text{ca}^1(\Omega)$. Our aim is to find the counterparts of the results in Section 3.1.

Setup 3.5. For every $t = 0, \dots, T$ we consider a proper, convex, $\sigma(\text{ca}^1(K_t), \mathcal{E}_t)$ -lower semicontinuous functional $\mathcal{D}_t : \text{ca}^1(K_t) \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$. We can then extend the functionals \mathcal{D}_t to $\text{ca}^1(\Omega)$ by using, for any $\gamma \in \text{ca}(\Omega)$, the marginals $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_T$. If $\gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega)$, we set

$$\mathcal{D}_t(\gamma) := \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}(\gamma) := \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t).$$

We define $V(\varphi)$ for $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$ and $V_t(\varphi_t)$ for $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$, for $t = 0, \dots, T$ similarly to (30), as

$$V(\varphi) := \sup_{\gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \right) d\gamma - \mathcal{D}(\gamma) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad V_t(\varphi_t) := \sup_{\gamma \in \text{ca}^1(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\gamma - \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma) \right).$$

We define on \mathcal{E} the functional $U(\cdot) = -V(\cdot)$, as in (31), and similarly $U_t(\cdot) = -V_t(\cdot)$ on \mathcal{E}_t , for $t = 0, \dots, T$. Finally, $S^U(\varphi)$, $S^{U_0}(\varphi_0), \dots, S^{U_T}(\varphi_T)$ are defined as in Setup 3.2.

Lemma 3.6. In Setup 3.5 we have:

1. $\mathcal{D}_0, \dots, \mathcal{D}_T$, as well as \mathcal{D} , are $\sigma(\text{ca}^1(\Omega), \mathcal{E})$ -lower semicontinuous.
2. Under the additional assumption that $\text{dom}(\mathcal{D}_t) \subseteq \text{Prob}^1(K_t)$ for every $t = 0, \dots, T$, for any $\varphi = [\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_T] \in \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$

$$U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T U_t(\varphi_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T -V_t(-\varphi_t), \quad (71)$$

$$S^U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T S^{U_t}(\varphi_t). \quad (72)$$

Proof.

Item 1. For each $t = 0, \dots, T$ $\mathcal{D}_t(\gamma) = \mathcal{D}_t \circ \pi_t(\gamma)$, where \mathcal{D}_t is $\sigma(\text{ca}^1(K_t), \mathcal{E}_t)$ -lower semicontinuous and π_t , the projection to the t -th marginal, is $\sigma(\text{ca}^1(\Omega), \mathcal{E}) - \sigma(\text{ca}^1(K_t), \mathcal{E}_t)$ continuous. Hence, for each $t = 0, \dots, T$ $\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma)$ is $\sigma(\text{ca}^1(\Omega), \mathcal{E})$ -lower semicontinuous. Lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{D} is then a consequence of the fact that the sum of lower semicontinuous functions is lower semicontinuous.

Item 2, equation (71). We have that for $\psi = -\varphi$

$$\begin{aligned}
-U(\varphi) &= V(\psi) = \sup_{\gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega)} \left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right) d\gamma - \mathcal{D}(\mu) \right) = \sup_{\gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega)} \sum_{t=0}^T \left(\int_{K_t} \psi_t d\gamma - \mathcal{D}_t(\mu_t) \right) \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T \left(\int_{K_t} \psi_t d\gamma_t - \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t) \right) \mid \gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega) \text{ with } \gamma_t \in \text{Prob}^1(K_t) \forall t = 0, \dots, T \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T \left(\int_{K_t} \psi_t dQ_t - \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t) \right) \mid [Q_0, \dots, Q_T] \in \text{Prob}^1(K_0) \times \dots \times \text{Prob}^1(K_T) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Prob}^1(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \psi_t dQ_t - \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t) \right) \stackrel{(iii)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\gamma_t \in \text{ca}^1(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \psi_t d\gamma_t - \mathcal{D}_t(\gamma_t) \right) \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^T V_t(\psi_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T -U_t(\varphi_t)
\end{aligned}$$

where for (i) we used

$$\text{dom}(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \mathcal{Z} := \{ \gamma \in \text{ca}^1(\Omega) \mid \gamma_t \in \text{Prob}^1(K_t) \forall t = 0, \dots, T \}.$$

In (ii) we applied the facts that: (1) any vector of probability measures $[Q_0, \dots, Q_T]$ with $Q_t \in \text{Prob}^1(K_t)$, $t = 0, \dots, T$ identifies $\gamma := Q_0 \otimes \dots \otimes Q_T \in \mathcal{Z}^2$ with $\mathcal{D}(\gamma) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t)$; (2) for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{Z}$ (setting $Q_t := \gamma_t \in \text{Prob}^1(K_t)$) we have $\mathcal{D}(\gamma) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t(Q_t)$. The equality (iii) follows from $\text{dom}(\mathcal{D}_t) \subseteq \text{Prob}^1(K_t)$ for each $t = 0, \dots, T$.

Item 2, equation (72). The argument is identical to the one in the proof of Lemma 3.3, using the additive structure of U we obtained in the previous step of the proof. \square

3.4 Divergences induced by utility functions

In this section we provide the exact formulation of the divergences induced by utility functions $u_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$, distinguishing the two cases: $\text{dom}(u_t) = \mathbb{R}$ and $\text{dom}(u_t) \supseteq [0, +\infty)$.

Assumption 3.7. We consider concave, upper semicontinuous nondecreasing functions $u_0, \dots, u_T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ with $u_0(0) = \dots = u_T(0) = 0$, $u_t(x) \leq x \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ (that is $1 \in \partial u_0(0) \cap \dots \cap \partial u_T(0)$). For each $t = 0, \dots, T$ we define $v_t(x) := -u_t(-x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$v_t^*(y) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (xy - v_t(x)) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (u_t(x) - xy), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (73)$$

We observe that $v_t(y) = v_t^{**}(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (xy - v_t^*(y))$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ by Fenchel-Moreau Theorem and that v_t^* is convex, lower semicontinuous and lower bounded on \mathbb{R} .

²Note that this does not hold for a general vector of (signed) measures, which is why we need the additional assumption on the domains of the penalization functionals for Item 2

Example 3.8. Assumption 3.7 is satisfied by a wide range of functions. Just to mention a few with various peculiar features, we might take u_t of the following forms: $u_t(x) = 1 - \exp(-x)$, whose convex conjugate is given by $v_t^*(y) = -\infty$ for $y < 0$, $v_t^*(0) = 0$, $v_t^*(y) = (y \log(y) - y + 1)$ for $y > 0$; $u_t(x) = \alpha x 1_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$ for $\alpha \geq 1$, so that $v_t^*(y) = +\infty$ for $y < 0$, $v_t^*(y) = 0$ for $y \in [0, \alpha]$, $v_t^*(y) = +\infty$ for $y > \alpha$; $u_t(x) = \log(x+1)$ for $x > -1$, $u_t(x) = -\infty$ for $x \leq -1$, so that $v_t^*(y) = +\infty$ for $y \leq 0$, $v_t^*(y) = y - \log(y) - 1$ for $y > 0$; $u_t(x) = -\infty$ for $x \leq -1$, $u_t(x) = \frac{x}{x+1}$ for $x > -1$ so that $v_t^*(y) = -\infty$ for $y < 0$, $v_t^*(y) = y - 2\sqrt{y} + 1$ for $y \geq 0$; $u_t(x) = -\infty$ for $x < 0$, $u_t(x) = 1 - \exp(-x)$ for $x \geq 0$, so that $v_t^*(y) = +\infty$ for $y < 0$, $v_t^*(y) = y \log(y) - y + 1$ for $0 \leq y \leq 1$, $v_t^*(y) = 0$ for $y > 1$.

Fix $\hat{\mu}_t \in \text{Meas}(K_t)$. We pose for $\mu \in \text{Meas}(K_t)$

$$\mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t}(\mu) := \begin{cases} \int_{K_t} v_t^* \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\hat{\mu}_t} \right) d\hat{\mu}_t & \text{if } \mu \ll \hat{\mu}_t \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (74)$$

In the next two propositions, whose proofs are postponed to the Appendix A.1, we provide the dual representation of the divergence terms.

Proposition 3.9. *Take u_0, \dots, u_T satisfying Assumption 3.7 with $\text{dom}(u_0) = \dots = \text{dom}(u_T) = \mathbb{R}$, consider closed (possibly noncompact) $K_0, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and let $\hat{\mu}_t \in \text{Meas}(K_t)$, $t = 0, \dots, T$. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t}(\mu) = \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t(x_t) d\mu(x_t) - \int_{K_t} v_t(\varphi_t(x_t)) d\hat{\mu}_t(x_t) \right). \quad (75)$$

Set:

$$(v_t^*)'_\infty := \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{v_t^*(y)}{y}, \quad t = 0, \dots, T.$$

As $u_t(0) = 0$, $(v_t^*)'_\infty \in [0, +\infty]$ since $v_t^*(y) \geq u_t(0) - 0 \cdot y = 0$. Let $\hat{Q}_t \in \text{Prob}(K_t)$ and, for $\mu \in \text{Meas}(K_t)$, let $\mu = \mu_a + \mu_s$ be the Lebesgue Decomposition of μ with respect to \hat{Q}_t , where $\mu_a \ll \hat{Q}_t$ and $\mu_s \perp \hat{Q}_t$. Then we can define for $\mu \in \text{Meas}(K_t)$

$$\mathcal{F}_t(\mu | \hat{Q}_t) := \int_{K_t} v_t^* \left(\frac{d\mu_a}{d\hat{Q}_t} \right) d\hat{Q}_t + (v_t^*)'_\infty \mu_s(K_t)$$

where we use the convention $\infty \times 0 = 0$, in case $(v_t^*)'_\infty = +\infty$, $\mu_s(K_t) = 0$. Observe that the restriction of $\mathcal{F}(\cdot | \hat{Q}_t)$ to $\text{Meas}(K_t)$ coincides with the functional in [52] (2.35) with $F = v_t^*$, and that whenever $\text{dom}(u_t) = \mathbb{R}$ we have $(v_t^*)'_\infty = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{v_t^*(y)}{y} = +\infty$ and $\mathcal{F}_t(\cdot | \hat{Q}_t)$ coincides with $\mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \hat{Q}_t}(\cdot)$ (see (74)) on $\text{Meas}(K_t)$.

Proposition 3.10. *Suppose that $u_0, \dots, u_T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ satisfy Assumption 3.7, and assume that $K_0, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ are compact. If $\hat{Q}_t \in \text{Prob}(K_t)$, $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, has full support then*

$$\mathcal{F}_t(\mu | \hat{Q}_t) = \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t(x_t) d\mu(x_t) - \int_{K_t} v_t(\varphi_t(x_t)) d\hat{Q}_t(x_t) \right). \quad (76)$$

Example 3.11. The requirement that $\hat{Q}_0, \dots, \hat{Q}_T$ have full support is crucial for the proof of Proposition 3.10. We provide a simple example to the fact that (76) does not hold in general when such

an assumption is not fulfilled. To this end, take $K = \{-2, 0, 2\}$, $\widehat{Q} = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\{-2\}} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\{+2\}}$, $\mu = \delta_{\{0\}}$, $u(x) := \frac{x}{x+1}$ for $x \geq -1$ and $u(x) = -\infty$ for $x < -1$. It is easy to see that the associated v^* via (73) is defined by $v^*(y) = 1 + y - 2\sqrt{y}$ for $y \geq 0$ and $v^*(y) = -\infty$ for $y < 0$, so that $(v_t^*)'_\infty = 1$. It is also easy to see that $\mu \perp \widehat{Q}$, hence in the Lebesgue decomposition with respect to \widehat{Q} , $\mu_a = 0$ and $\mu_s = \mu$. Hence $\mathcal{F}(\mu | \widehat{Q}) = 1 + 1\mu(K) = 2$. At the same time we see that taking $\varphi_N \in \mathcal{C}_b(K)$ defined via $\varphi_N(-2) = \varphi_N(2) = 0, \varphi_N(0) = -N$ (observe that for N sufficiently large $u(\varphi_N) \notin \mathcal{C}_b(K)$) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b(K)} \left(\int_K \varphi d\mu - \int_K v(\varphi) d\widehat{Q} \right) &= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_b(K)} \left(\int_K u(\varphi) d\widehat{Q} - \int_K \varphi d\mu \right) \\ &\geq \sup_N \left(\int_K u(\varphi_N) d\widehat{Q} - \int_K \varphi_N d\mu \right) \geq \sup_N \left((0) \frac{1}{2} + (0) \frac{1}{2} - (-N) \right) = +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

4 Applications in the compact case

The pricing-hedging dualities numbered 1., 2., 4., 5., 6., announced in the Introduction (page 12) are proved in this section.

We suppose, in the whole Section 4 that the following requirements are fulfilled.

Standing Assumption 4.1. *Let $d = 1$ and $\Omega := K_0 \times \dots \times K_T$ for compact sets $K_0, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$; $K_0 = \{x_0\}$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$; the functional $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is lower semicontinuous; $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ is a given martingale measure with marginals $\widehat{Q}_0, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T$; $c \in L^1(\widehat{Q})$.*

Under this assumption, $C_{0:T} = \mathcal{C}_b(\Omega)$ and $(C_{0:T})^* = \text{ca}(\Omega) = \text{ca}^1(\Omega)$. We observe that the stock X_t is assumed to be bounded due to the compactness assumption on K_0, \dots, K_T . As a consequence, if we consider, for example, the call option $(X_t - \alpha)^+$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then it is also bounded on Ω . The selection $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_b(K_0) \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_b(K_T)$ is then, in this context, appropriate.

4.1 Subhedging with vanilla options

As in [6], in this Section 4.1 we suppose that the elements in \mathcal{E}_t represent portfolios obtained combining call options with maturity t , units of the underlying stock at time t (x_t) and deterministic amounts, that is \mathcal{E}_t consists of all the functions in $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ with the following form:

$$\varphi_t(x_t) = a + bx_t + \sum_{n=1}^N c_n(x_t - \alpha_n)^+, \text{ for } a, b, c_n, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}, x_t \in K_t \quad (77)$$

and take $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$. As shown in the proofs of Corollaries 4.3 and 4.5, which are the core content of this Section 4.1, one could as well take $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{C}_b(K_0) \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_b(K_T)$ preserving validity of (80) and (82).

As it will become clear from the proofs, in all the results in Section 4.1 the functional U is real valued on the whole \mathcal{E} and cash additive, which yields $\text{dom}(U) = \text{dom}(S^U) = \mathcal{E}$. Thus, we will exploit Corollary 2.14 and Corollary 2.15, in particular (51) and (52), in the case $\text{dom}(S^U) = \mathcal{E}$.

We set for $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$

$$U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) = \sup_{\alpha, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t(x_t) + \alpha x_t + \lambda) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) - (\alpha x_0 + \lambda) \right). \quad (78)$$

We observe that Assumption 3.7 does **not** impose that the functions u_t are real valued on the whole \mathbb{R} . Nevertheless, for the functional $U_{\hat{Q}_t}$ we have:

Lemma 4.2. *Under Assumption 3.7 for each $t = 0, \dots, T$*

1. $U_{\hat{Q}_t}$ is real valued on $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ and null in 0.
2. $U_{\hat{Q}_t}$ is concave and nondecreasing.
3. $U_{\hat{Q}_t}$ is stock additive on $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$, namely for every $\alpha_t, \lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$

$$U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t + \alpha_t X_t + \lambda_t) = U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) + \alpha_t x_0 + \lambda_t.$$

Proof. Clearly $U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) > -\infty$, as we may choose $\lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $(\varphi_t + 0X_t + \lambda_t) \in \text{dom}(u) \supseteq [0, +\infty)$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) &\stackrel{1 \in \partial U_t(0)}{\leq} \sup_{\alpha, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{K_t} (\varphi_t + \alpha X_t + \lambda) d\hat{Q}_t - (\alpha x_0 + \lambda) \right) \\ &\stackrel{\hat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)}{=} \sup_{\alpha, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\hat{Q}_t + (\alpha x_0 + \lambda - \alpha x_0 - \lambda) \right) \leq \|\varphi_t\|_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Finally, $0 = \int_{K_t} u(0) d\hat{Q}_t \leq U_{\hat{Q}_t}(0) \leq \|0\|_\infty$.

Item 2: monotonicity is trivial from the definition, while for concavity we see that whenever $\varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t), 0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ are given, setting $\varphi^\gamma = \gamma\varphi^1 + (1-\gamma)\varphi^2$ and defining for $\lambda^1, \alpha^1, \lambda^2, \alpha^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ the values $\lambda^\gamma, \alpha^\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ analogously, we have by concavity of U

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi^1) + (1-\gamma)U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi^2) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda^1, \alpha^1, \lambda^2, \alpha^2 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\gamma (U(\varphi^1 + \alpha^1 X_t + \lambda^1) - (\alpha^1 x_0 + \lambda^1)) + (1-\gamma) (U(\varphi^2 + \alpha^2 X_t + \lambda^2) - (\alpha^2 x_0 + \lambda^2)) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda^1, \alpha^1, \lambda^2, \alpha^2 \in \mathbb{R}} (U(\varphi^\gamma + \alpha^\gamma X_t + \lambda^\gamma) - (\alpha^\gamma x_0 + \lambda^\gamma)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}} (U(\varphi^\gamma + \alpha X_t + \lambda) - (\alpha x_0 + \lambda)) = U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi^\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Item 3: we see that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t + \alpha_t X_t + \lambda_t) &= \sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}}} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t(x_t) + (\alpha + \alpha_t)x_t + (\lambda + \lambda_t)) d\hat{Q}_t(x_t) - (\alpha x_0 + \lambda) \right) \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}}} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t(x_t) + (\alpha + \alpha_t)x_t + (\lambda + \lambda_t)) d\hat{Q}_t(x_t) - ((\alpha_t + \alpha)x_0 + (\lambda_t + \lambda)) \right) + \alpha_t x_0 + \lambda_t, \end{aligned}$$

in which we recognize the definition of $U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) + \alpha_t x_0 + \lambda_t$. \square

Corollary 4.3. *Take u_0, \dots, u_T satisfying Assumption 3.7 and suppose $\text{dom}(u_0) = \dots = \text{dom}(u_T) = \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \hat{Q}_t}(Q_t) \right) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{sub}}(c) \right\}. \quad (80)$$

Moreover, if LHS of (80) is finite, a minimum point exists.

Proof. Set $U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t)$ for $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. By Lemma 4.2 for each $t = 0, \dots, T$ the monotone concave functional $\varphi_t \mapsto U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t)$ is actually well defined, finite valued, concave and nondecreasing on the whole $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$. Hence, by the Extended Namioka-Klee Theorem (see [12]) it is norm continuous on $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$.

We also observe that in this case we are in Setup 3.2 and we can apply Lemma 3.3 Equation (69). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(Q) &:= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(U(\varphi) - \sum_{t=0}^T \int_{K_t} \varphi_t \, dQ_t \right) = \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t} \left(U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t \, dQ_t \right) \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t \, dQ_t \right) \tag{81} \\
&\stackrel{(\star)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t), \alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t + \alpha_t X_t + \lambda_t) \, d\hat{Q}_t - \int_{K_t} (\varphi_t + \alpha_t X_t + \lambda_t) \, dQ_t \right) \\
&\stackrel{(\star\star)}{=} \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t) \, d\hat{Q}_t - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t \, dQ_t \right) \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^T \sup_{\psi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \psi_t \, dQ_t - \int_{K_t} v_t(\psi_t) \, d\hat{Q}_t \right) = \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \hat{Q}_t}(Q_t), \quad \forall Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)
\end{aligned}$$

where: in (81) we combined the aforementioned continuity of $U_{\hat{Q}_t}$ on $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ with the fact that \mathcal{E}_t consists of all piecewise linear functions on K_t hence \mathcal{E}_t is norm dense in $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$; in (\star) we used the fact that for $\tilde{\varphi}_t := \varphi_t + \alpha_t X_t + \lambda_t$, and for every $Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$, $\int_{K_t} \tilde{\varphi}_t \, dQ_t = \int_{K_t} \varphi_t \, d\hat{Q}_t + \alpha_t x_0 + \lambda_t$, and in $(\star\star)$ we exploited the fact that $\tilde{\varphi}_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$ for every $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$, $\alpha_t, \lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}$; the last equality follows from Proposition 3.9 Equation (75).

Using Lemma 3.3 and the fact that $U_{\hat{Q}_0}, \dots, U_{\hat{Q}_T}$ are cash additive we get $S^U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T S^{U_{\hat{Q}_t}}(\varphi_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) = U(\varphi)$. By Lemma 4.2 Item 1, the assumptions of Corollary 2.16 are satisfied so that we obtain

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c(X)] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \hat{Q}_t}(Q_t) \right) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T U_{\hat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{sub}}(c) \right\}.$$

Existence of optima follows again from Corollary 2.16. \square

We stress the fact that in Corollary 4.3 we assume that all the functions u_0, \dots, u_T are real valued on the whole \mathbb{R} . A more general result can be obtained when weakening this assumption, but it requires an additional assumption on the marginals of \hat{Q} .

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose Assumption 3.7 is fulfilled. Assume that $\hat{Q}_0, \dots, \hat{Q}_T$ have full support on K_0, \dots, K_T respectively³. Then Equation (80) holds true replacing $\mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \hat{Q}_t}(Q_t)$ with $\mathcal{F}_t(Q_t | \hat{Q}_t)$. Moreover, finiteness of the problem in the LHS of (80) implies the existence of a minimum.*

Proof. The proof can be carried over almost literally as the proof of Corollary 4.3, with the exception of replacing the reference to Proposition 3.9 with the reference to Proposition 3.10. \square

³Observe that we are requesting the full support property on K_0, \dots, K_T with respect to their induced (Euclidean) topology. In particular, this means that whenever $k_t \in K_t$ is an isolated point, $\hat{Q}_t(\{k_t\}) > 0$. This is consistent with the assumption $K_0 = \{x_0\}$, which implies $\text{Prob}(K_0)$ reduces to the Dirac measure, $\text{Prob}(K_0) = \{\delta_{\{x_0\}}\}$.

We now take $u_t(x) = x$ for each $t = 0, \dots, T$, and get $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) = V_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) = E_{\widehat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t]$. Hence with an easy computation we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } Q_t \equiv \widehat{Q}_t \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega).$$

Recalling that $\text{Mart}(\widehat{Q}_0, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T) = \{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega) \mid Q_t \equiv \widehat{Q}_t \forall t = 0, \dots, T\}$, from Corollary 4.3 we can recover the following result of [6] (under the compactness assumption, which will be dropped in Corollary 5.3).

Corollary 4.5. *The following equality holds:*

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\widehat{Q}_0, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T)} E_Q[c] = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T E_{\widehat{Q}_t}[\varphi_t] \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{sub}}(c) \right\}. \quad (82)$$

Moreover, if LHS of (82) is finite, a minimum point exists.

4.2 Subhedging without Options

The pricing-hedging duality without options takes the following form.

Corollary 4.6. *The following equality hold:*

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} E_Q[c] = \sup \{m \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } m + I^\Delta \leq c\} := \Pi^{\text{sub}}(c). \quad (83)$$

Moreover, if LHS of (83) is finite, a minimum point exists.

Proof. We take $\mathcal{E}_0 = \dots = \mathcal{E}_T = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T = \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$. For each $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\varphi = [m_1, \dots, m_T]$, $m \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ we select⁴ $U(\varphi) = \sum_{t=0}^T m_t$. Then by definition of \mathcal{D} (see Section 2.1) we get

$$\mathcal{D}(\gamma) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } \gamma \in \text{ca}(\Omega) \text{ s.t. } \gamma(\Omega) = 1 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular $\mathcal{D}(Q) = 0$ for every $Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$. Moreover we observe that $\mathcal{S}^U(\varphi) = U(\varphi)$ for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. Applying Corollary 2.16, from Equation (53) we get that

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} E_Q[c] = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T m_t \mid m_0, \dots, m_T \in \mathbb{R} \text{ s.t. } \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } \sum_{t=0}^T m_t + I^\Delta \leq c \right\}.$$

We recognize in the RHS above the RHS of (83). Finally, existence of optima follows again from Corollary 2.16. \square

4.3 Subhedging without the market

As in Example 2.7 we let $\{0\} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq -(C_{0:T})_+$, so that $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega) = \mathcal{A}^\circ \cap \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$.

⁴As $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$, we notice that if $u_t(x_t) = x_t$, $t = 0, \dots, T$, and $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$, the functional $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}$ defined in (78) is given by $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(m_t) = m_t$ and so $U(m) = \sum_{t=0}^T U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(m_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T m_t$ for all $m \in \mathcal{E}$.

Corollary 4.7. Let $\mathcal{E} = \times_{t=0}^T \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ and suppose that $U(\varphi) = 0$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. Then:

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}(Q)) = \sup \left\{ S^U(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \leq c \right\}. \quad (84)$$

Proof. It is enough to apply Corollary 2.14, and to observe that since $f \in -\mathcal{A} \Rightarrow f \in (C_{0:T})_+$ we have

$$\sup \left\{ S^U(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + f \leq c \text{ for some } f \in -\mathcal{A} \right\} = \sup \left\{ S^U(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t \leq c \right\}.$$

□

The LHS of (84) is the Entropy Optimal Transport problem as in [52], but with $\text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$ replacing $\text{Meas}(\Omega)$ and (84) is the subhedging price where only options can be used for hedging. Notice that a similar argument yields the same duality in the noncompact case, provided that one invokes (if the corresponding assumptions on c and U are satisfied) Theorem 2.11 in place of its Corollary 2.14.

4.4 Penalization with market price

In this Section we change our perspective. Instead of starting from a given U , we will give a particular form of the penalization term \mathcal{D} and proceed in identifying the corresponding U in the spirit of Remark 2.2. For each $t = 0, \dots, T$ we suppose that finite sequences $(c_{t,n})_{1 \leq n \leq N_t} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $(f_{t,n})_{1 \leq n \leq N_t} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ are given. The functions $(f_{t,n})_{1 \leq n \leq N_t} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ represent payoffs of options whose prices $(c_{t,n})_{1 \leq n \leq N_t} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ are known from the market. We also take $\mathcal{E} = \times_{t=0}^T \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$.

We introduce the notion of a loss function that will be useful here and also in the sequel (see Section 4.5 and Section 4.5.1) to build penalization functions.

Definition 4.8. A function $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is called a loss function if it is convex, nondecreasing, lower semicontinuous and satisfies $G(0) = 0$. We set $\text{dom}(G) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid G(x) < +\infty\}$. The conjugate function $G^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$, defined by $G^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (xy - G(x))$, satisfies, due to the monotonicity of G , $G^*(y) = +\infty$ for every $y < 0$.

Our requirements allow for a wide range of penalizations. For example, we might use power-like penalizations, i.e. $G(x) = \frac{x^p}{p}$ for $x > 0$ and for $p \in (1, +\infty)$, $G(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 0$. In such a case for every $x \geq 0$ we have $G^*(x) = \frac{x^q}{q}$ for $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Alternatively, we might take for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq \varepsilon \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \implies G^*(y) = \varepsilon y \text{ for } y \geq 0. \quad (85)$$

We define

$$\text{Mart}_t(K_t) = \{\gamma_t \in \text{Prob}(K_t) \mid \exists Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega) \text{ with } \gamma_t \equiv Q_t\} \subseteq \text{ca}(K_t) \quad (86)$$

and for for $\gamma_t \in \text{ca}(K_t)$

$$\mathcal{D}_t^G(\gamma_t) := \begin{cases} \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n} \left(\left| \int_{K_t} f_{t,n} d\gamma_t - c_{t,n} \right| \right) & \text{for } \gamma_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.9. For every $n = 0, \dots, N_t$, $t = 0, \dots, T$, we assume that $G_{n,t} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is a loss function and we suppose that the martingale measure $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ in Standing Assumption 4.1 also satisfies $\left| \int_{K_t} f_{t,n} d\widehat{Q}_t - c_{t,n} \right| \in \text{dom}(G_{t,n})$. Then

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t^G(Q_t) \right) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T U_t^G(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{sub}}(c) \right\}, \quad (87)$$

where

$$U_t^G(\varphi_t) := \sup_{y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N_t}} \left(\Pi^{\text{sub}} \left(\varphi_t + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} (f_{t,n} - c_{t,n}) \right) - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right)$$

is a stock additive functional and Π^{sub} is given in (83). Finally, if LHS of (87) is finite, a minimum point exists.

Proof.

Step 1: Set $g_{t,n} := f_{t,n} - c_{t,n}$. For any $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ we prove that the functional \mathcal{D}_t^G is $\sigma(\text{ca}(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ -lower semicontinuous and that, for every $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$, its Fenchel-Moreau (convex) conjugate satisfies

$$V_t^G(\varphi_t) := \sup_{\gamma_t \in \text{ca}(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\gamma_t - \mathcal{D}_t^G(\gamma_t) \right) = \inf_{y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N_t}} \left(\Pi^{\text{sup}} \left(\varphi_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} g_{t,n} \right) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right),$$

and thus

$$U_t^G(\varphi_t) := -V_t^G(-\varphi_t) = \sup_{y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N_t}} \left(\Pi^{\text{sub}} \left(\varphi_t + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} g_{t,n} \right) - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right). \quad (88)$$

Here we are using the definition of the superhedging price $\Pi^{\text{sup}}(g) := -\Pi^{\text{sub}}(-g) = \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} E_Q [g]$, by Corollary 4.6. We observe that \mathcal{D}_t^G is $\sigma(\text{ca}(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ -lower semicontinuous (it is a sum of functions, each being composition of a lower semicontinuous function and a continuous function on $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ which is $\sigma(\text{ca}(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ -compact by Lemma A.4). We now need to compute

$$V_t^G(\varphi_t) = \sup_{\gamma_t \in \text{ca}(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\gamma_t - \mathcal{D}_t^G(\gamma_t) \right) = \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ_t - \mathcal{D}_t^G(Q_t) \right).$$

Recall now that from Fenchel-Moreau Theorem that $G_{t,n}(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} (xy - G_{t,n}^*(y))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^G(\varphi_t) &= \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} \sup_{y_{t,n} \in \mathbb{R}} \left(y_{t,n} \int_{K_t} g_{t,n} dQ_t - G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} \sup_{y_{t,n} \in \text{dom}(G_{t,n}^*)} \left(y_{t,n} \int_{K_t} g_{t,n} dQ_t - G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \inf_{y_t \in \text{dom}} \left(\int_{K_t} \left(\varphi_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} g_{t,n} \right) dQ_t + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right) \\ &=: \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}(K_t)} \inf_{y_t \in \text{dom}} \mathcal{T}(y_t, Q_t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{dom} = \text{dom}(G_{t,1}^*) \times \dots \times \text{dom}(G_{t,N_t}^*) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{N_t}$. We now see that \mathcal{T} is real valued on $\text{dom} \times \text{Mart}_t(K_t)$, is convex in the first variable and concave in the second. Moreover, $\{\mathcal{T}(y_t, \cdot) \geq C\}$ is $\sigma(\text{Mart}_t(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ -closed in $\text{Mart}_t(\Omega)$ for every $y_t \in \text{dom}$, and $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ is $\sigma(\text{Mart}_t(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ -compact (by Lemma A.4). As a consequence $\mathcal{T}(y_t, \cdot)$ is $\sigma(\text{Mart}_t(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ -lower semicontinuous

on $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$. We can apply [60] Theorem 3.1 with $A = \text{dom}$ and $B = \text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ endowed with the topology $\sigma(\text{Mart}_t(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$, and interchange inf and sup. From our previous computations we then get

$$\begin{aligned}
V_t^G(\varphi_t) &= \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \inf_{y_t \in \text{dom}} \mathcal{T}(y_t, Q_t) = \inf_{y_t \in \text{dom}} \sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \mathcal{T}(y_t, Q_t) \\
&= \inf_{y_t \in \text{dom}} \left(\sup_{Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \int_{K_t} \left(\varphi_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} g_{t,n} \right) dQ_t + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right) \\
&= \inf_{y_t \in \text{dom}} \left(\sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} \left(\varphi_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} g_{t,n} \right) dQ + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right) \\
&= \inf_{y_t \in \text{dom}} \left(\Pi^{sup} \left(\varphi_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} g_{t,n} \right) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right) \\
&= \inf_{y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N_t}} \left(\Pi^{sup} \left(\varphi_t - \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} y_{t,n} g_{t,n} \right) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_t} G_{t,n}^*(y_{t,n}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (88) can be obtained with minor manipulations.

Step 2: conclusion. We are clearly in the setup of Corollary 2.16 with \mathcal{D} given as in Setup 3.5 from $\mathcal{D}_0^G, \dots, \mathcal{D}_T^G$, and by definition $\text{dom}(\mathcal{D}_t^G) \subseteq \text{Prob}(K_t)$ for each $t = 0, \dots, T$. Using Lemma 3.6 Item 2, together with the computations in Step 1 and the fact that clearly $S^{U_t^G} \equiv U_t^G$ by cash additivity of U_t^G , we get the desired equality from Corollary 2.16 Equation (53): indeed, $G_{t,n}^*$ is lower bounded and proper by our assumptions on $G_{t,n}$, and Π^{sub} is real valued and cash additive on bounded continuous functions. This guarantees that $V_t^G(\varphi_t)$ is null for an appropriate choice of (constant) φ_t . Existence of optima follows again from Corollary 2.16. \square

Remark 4.10. Our assumption of existence of a particular $\hat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ in Proposition 4.9 expresses the fact that we are assuming our market prices $(c_{t,n})_{t,n}$ are close enough to those given by expectations under some martingale measure.

Example 4.11. Proposition 4.9 covers a wide range of penalizations. For example, we might impose a threshold for the fitting, by taking into account only those martingale measure Q such that $|\int_{\Omega} f_{t,n} dQ_t - c_{t,n}| \leq \varepsilon_{t,n}$ for some $\varepsilon_{t,n} \geq 0$. To express this, just take $G_{t,n}$ in the form (85) for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{t,n}$

Example 4.12. We now study the convergence of the penalized problem described above to the classical MOT problem. We suppose that our information on the marginal distributions increases, by increasing the number of prices available from the market. We take $f_{t,n}(x_t) = (x_t - \alpha_n)^+$ to be call options with maturity t and strikes $(\alpha_n)_n$ that are a dense subset of \mathbb{R} .

We take as loss functions $G_{t,n}(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 0$ and $G_{t,n}(x) = +\infty$ for all $x > 0$ $t = 0, \dots, T$, $n \geq 1$. This means that in LHS of (87) the infimum is equivalently taken only over martingale measures whose theoretical prices exactly match the ones for the data, namely $c_{t,n}$. For each $t = 0, \dots, T$, $(c_{t,n})_n$ is a given sequence of prices, and we suppose that they are all computed under the same martingale measure $\hat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$. We consider for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the initial segment $c_{t,1}, \dots, c_{t,N_t(k)}$ for sequences $N_t(k) \uparrow_k \infty$, $t = 0, \dots, T$.

This means that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_k(Q) &:= \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{n=1}^{N_t(k)} G_{t,n} \left(\left| \int_{K_t} f_{t,n} dQ_t - c_{t,n} \right| \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{n=1}^{N_t(k+1)} G_{t,n} \left(\left| \int_{K_t} f_{t,n} dQ_t - c_{t,n} \right| \right) =: \mathcal{D}_{k+1}(Q) \quad \forall Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty(Q) = \sup_k \mathcal{D}_{k+1}(Q) = \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} G_{t,n} \left(\left| \int_{K_t} f_{t,n} dQ_t - c_{t,n} \right| \right)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty(Q) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \int_{K_t} f_{t,n} dQ_t = c_{t,n} \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, n \geq 1 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

From the density of $(\alpha_n)_n$ we conclude that

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty(Q) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } Q_t \equiv \hat{Q}_t, \forall 0 \leq t \leq T \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

As a consequence, by Proposition 2.26, we have the convergence

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} (E_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}_k(Q)) \rightarrow_k \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\hat{Q}_0, \dots, \hat{Q}_T)} E_Q[c].$$

4.5 Penalty terms given via Wasserstein distance

Let d_t be a metric on K_t (equivalent to the Euclidean one). Call $W_t : \text{Prob}(K_t) \times \text{Prob}(K_t) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the (1-)Wasserstein distance induced by d_t . Let $\text{Lip}(1, K_t)$ be the the class of d_t -Lipschitz functions on K_t with Lipschitz constant not bigger than 1. Notice that $\text{Lip}(1, K_t) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ since d_t is equivalent to the Euclidean metric. For each t , let $G_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ be a loss function as given in Definition 4.8. For $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ as given in Section 4.4, we introduce

$$Q_t \in \text{Prob}(K_t) \mapsto \mathcal{D}_t^W(Q_t) := \begin{cases} G_t(W_t(Q_t, \hat{Q}_t)) & \text{for } Q_t \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (89)$$

\mathcal{D}_t^W is lower semicontinuous w.r.t. the topology of weak convergence of probability measures, since the Wasserstein metric metrizes it for compact underlying spaces and $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ is compact under such a topology, by Lemma A.4. We are then in Setup 3.5 and of Lemma 3.6 Item 2. As is Section 4.4 we take $\mathcal{E} = \times_{t=0}^T \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$.

Proposition 4.13. *For each $t = 0, \dots, T$, suppose that G_t is a loss function, that there exists a $Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ such that $G_t(W_t(Q_t, \hat{Q}_t)) < +\infty$, where $\hat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ is the martingale measure from Standing Assumption 4.1 and take \mathcal{D}_t^W as defined in (89). Then*

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t^W(Q_t) \right) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T U_t^W(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{sub}}(c) \right\}, \quad (90)$$

where

$$U_t^W(\varphi_t) := \sup_{\substack{y \geq 0 \\ \ell_t \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)}} \left(\Pi^{\text{sub}}(\varphi_t + y\ell_t) - \int_{K_t} y\ell_t d\hat{Q}_t - G_t^*(y) \right)$$

is a stock additive functional and Π^{sub} is given in (83). Finally, if LHS of (90) is finite, a minimum point exists.

Proof. Starting from \mathcal{D}_t^W , we compute now the associated V_t^W as

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^W(\varphi_t) &:= \sup_{\gamma \in \text{ca}(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\gamma - \mathcal{D}_t^W(\gamma) \right) = \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ - G_t(W_t(Q, \hat{Q}_t)) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ - \sup_{y \geq 0} \left(yW_t(Q, \hat{Q}_t) - G_t^*(y) \right) \right) \\ &= \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \inf_{y \geq 0} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ - yW_t(Q, \hat{Q}_t) + G_t^*(y) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \inf_{y \in \text{dom}(G_t^*)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t dQ - y \sup_{\ell \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \ell dQ - \int_{K_t} \ell d\hat{Q}_t \right) + G_t^*(y) \right) \\ &= \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \inf_{\substack{y \in \text{dom}(G_t^*) \\ \ell \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)}} \left(\int_{K_t} (\varphi_t - y\ell) dQ + \int_{K_t} y\ell d\hat{Q}_t + G_t^*(y) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \inf_{\substack{y \in \text{dom}(G_t^*) \\ \ell \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)}} \left(\sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}_t(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} (\varphi_t - y\ell) dQ \right) + \int_{K_t} y\ell d\hat{Q}_t + G_t^*(y) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} \inf_{\substack{y \in \text{dom}(G_t^*) \\ \ell_t \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)}} \left(\Pi^{\text{sup}}(\varphi_t - y\ell_t) + \int_{K_t} y\ell_t d\hat{Q}_t + G_t^*(y) \right) = \inf_{\substack{y \geq 0 \\ \ell_t \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)}} \left(\Pi^{\text{sup}}(\varphi_t - y\ell_t) + \alpha(y, \ell_t) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for the penalty $\alpha(y, \ell_t) := \int_{K_t} y\ell_t d\hat{Q}_t + G_t^*(y)$. In the equality chain above we use the following facts: in (a) we used the dual representation of G_t , in (b) we exploited the definition of $\text{dom}(G_t^*)$ and the classical Kantorovich-Rubinstein Duality (see [62] Remark 6.5), in (c) we applied [60] Theorem 3.1, observe that $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ is compact by Lemma A.4, in (d) we used the definition of the superhedging price $\Pi^{\text{sup}}(g) := -\Pi^{\text{sub}}(-g) = \sup_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} E_Q[g]$, by Corollary 4.6. Once we have V_t^W , we have U_t^W and we can argue as in Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 4.9, also regarding existence of an optimum. \square

Remark 4.14. If U_t^W (as well as U_t^G in the previous Proposition 4.9) is real valued on $\mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$, one might take \mathcal{E}_t as the set of functions in the form (77) in place of $\mathcal{E}_t = \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ in both Proposition 4.9 and 4.13, using norm density of the piecewise linear functions just as in the proof of Corollary 4.3.

Remark 4.15. The reader can check that the property $\hat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ is not used in the proof, and that it would suffice to have only $\hat{Q} \in \text{Prob}(\Omega)$. This will be exploited in Section 4.5.1.

Example 4.16. Taking $G_t(x) = 0$ if $x \leq \varepsilon_t$, $G_t(x) = +\infty$ otherwise, we get $G_t^*(y) = \varepsilon_t y$ if $y \geq 0$ and $G_t^*(y) = +\infty$ otherwise. In this case

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_t^W(Q) \right) = \inf \left\{ E_Q[c] \mid Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega) \text{ and } W_t(Q_t, \hat{Q}_t) \leq \varepsilon_t \forall t = 0, \dots, T \right\}. \quad (91)$$

One can verify, with the same techniques of Example 4.12, that we have convergence, as $\varepsilon_t \downarrow 0$ for every $t = 0, \dots, T$, of the problems in RHS of (91) to the MOT problem in LHS of (82).

For the dual problem, we show that in this particular case, calling V_{ε_t} the associated V_t^W as computed above, $\lim_{\varepsilon_t \downarrow 0} V_{\varepsilon_t}(\varphi_t) = V_0(\varphi_t)$. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon_t \downarrow 0} V_{\varepsilon_t}(\varphi_t) &= \inf_{\varepsilon_t > 0} V_{\varepsilon_t}(\varphi_t) = \inf_{\substack{y \geq 0 \\ \ell_t \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)}} \inf_{\varepsilon_t > 0} \left(\Pi^{\text{sup}}(\varphi_t - y\ell_t) + \int_{K_t} y\ell_t d\widehat{Q}_t + G_t^*(y) \right) \\ &= \inf_{\substack{y \geq 0 \\ \ell_t \in \text{Lip}(1, K_t)}} \left(\Pi^{\text{sup}}(\varphi_t - y\ell_t) + \int_{K_t} y\ell_t d\widehat{Q}_t \right) = V_0(\varphi_t). \end{aligned}$$

Now, one can also see that $V_0(\varphi_t) = E_{\widehat{Q}}[\varphi_t]$ using the definition of V_0 and observing that for $\varepsilon = 0$ we have $\mathcal{D}_t^W = \delta_{\widehat{Q}_t}$.

4.5.1 Convergence with Wasserstein induced penalization

As already mentioned, in the classical MOT framework, the marginals $\widehat{Q}_0, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T$ need to be determined, potentially from the prices of vanilla options. It is then reasonable to suppose that in a real-world situation, one proceeds by approximation, that is one determines sequences of candidates $(\widehat{Q}_t^n)_n \subseteq \text{Prob}(\Omega)$ for $t = 0, \dots, T$. If such approximation scheme (whose details are beyond the scope of this paper) is working, one has a convergence of these sequences to the true marginals. One suitable candidate for such a convergence is the weak one, that is one might suppose that $\widehat{Q}_t^n \rightarrow_n \widehat{Q}_t^\infty := \widehat{Q}_t$ for $t = 0, \dots, T$ in the weak sense for probability measures. We are here supposing that K_0, \dots, K_T are compact sets and so such a weak convergence is equivalent to the convergence in the Wasserstein distance. Proposition 4.17 will show how the EMOT problems treated in Proposition 4.13 and associated to the approximating measures $\widehat{Q}_t^n, t = 0, \dots, T$ converge to the original MOT problem for the true marginals $\widehat{Q}_0, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T$, provided that the loss functions G_t^n appropriately converge.

Let us now move to a mathematically precise formulation. For each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $t = 0, \dots, T$ let $\widehat{Q}_t^n \in \text{Prob}(K_t)$ be a fixed probability measure. Notice that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we do not require these measures to be marginals of some martingale measure.

Proposition 4.17. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $t = 0, \dots, T$ let G_t^n be a loss functions with $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_t^n(x) = G_t^\infty(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $G_t^\infty(x) = +\infty$ for every $x > 0$. For every $t = 0, \dots, T$ assume that $W_t(\widehat{Q}_t^n, \widehat{Q}_t^\infty) \rightarrow_n 0$ and that there exists a $Q^* \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$, with $c \in L^1(Q^*)$, having marginals \widehat{Q}_t^∞ . If $\lim_n G_t^n(W_t(\widehat{Q}_t^n, \widehat{Q}_t^\infty)) = 0$ for every $t = 0, \dots, T$, then*

$$\lim_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c) = \mathfrak{P}_\infty^W(c) = \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\widehat{Q}_0^\infty, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T^\infty)} E_Q[c], \quad (92)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{P}_n^W(c) = \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_1(Q_t, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Proof. We first prove that $\mathfrak{P}_\infty^W(c) \leq \liminf_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c)$. Observe that there exists by assumption a martingale measure Q^* with $c \in L^1(Q^*)$ and marginals $Q_t^* \equiv \widehat{Q}_t^\infty, t = 0, \dots, T$. By hypothesis,

$G_t^n(W_t(\widehat{Q}_t^n, Q_t^*)) = G_t^n(W_t(\widehat{Q}_t^n, \widehat{Q}_t^\infty)) \rightarrow_n 0$ for every $t = 0, \dots, T$, thus $G_t^n(W_t(\widehat{Q}_t^n, Q_t^*)) < +\infty$ for every $t = 0, \dots, T$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough and $n = +\infty$. Since Ω is compact and $G_t^n, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, t = 0, \dots, T$ are nonnegative on $[0, +\infty)$ we have

$$-\infty < \inf_{x \in \Omega} c(x) \leq \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_t(Q_t, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) \leq E_{Q^*} [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_t(Q_t^*, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) < +\infty$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough and for $n = +\infty$. Hence $\mathfrak{P}_n(c) < +\infty$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ big enough and $n = +\infty$, and w.l.o.g. we assume that $\mathfrak{P}_n^W(c)$ is finite for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Given then optima Q^n (which exist by Proposition 4.13 applied together with Remark 4.15) we can take a subsequence such that $E_{Q^{n_k}} [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^{n_k}(W_t(Q_t^{n_k}, \widehat{Q}_t^{n_k}))$ converges to $\liminf_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c)$ and such that $W_t(Q^{n_k}, \tilde{Q}) \rightarrow_k 0$ for some $\tilde{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ (since $\text{Mart}(\Omega)$ is compact, recall the proof of Lemma A.4). Since $Q \mapsto \int_\Omega c dQ$ is lower semicontinuous w.r.t. the weak convergence, G_t^n is lower semicontinuous and $W_t(\tilde{Q}_t, \widehat{Q}_t^\infty) = \lim_k W_t(Q_t^{n_k}, \widehat{Q}_t^{n_k})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(E_{\tilde{Q}} [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^N(W_t(\tilde{Q}_t, \widehat{Q}_t^\infty)) \right) = \lim_k \left(E_{Q^{n_k}} [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^N(W_t(Q_t^{n_k}, \widehat{Q}_t^{n_k})) \right) \\ & = \liminf_n \left(E_{Q^n} [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^N(W_t(Q_t^n, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) \\ & \leq \liminf_{n \geq N} \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^N(W_t(Q_t, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) \\ & \leq \liminf_{n \geq N} \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_t(Q_t, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) = \liminf_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c). \end{aligned}$$

Taking then a supremum over N and an infimum over martingale measures, and using the particular form of $G_t^\infty, t = 0, \dots, T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}_\infty^W(c) &= \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\widehat{Q}_0^\infty, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T^\infty)} E_Q [c] = \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \sup_N \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^N(W_t(Q_t, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) \\ &\leq \liminf_n \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_t(Q_t, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) = \liminf_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c). \end{aligned}$$

We now move on proving that $\mathfrak{P}_\infty^W(c) \geq \limsup_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c)$. Since $\mathfrak{P}_\infty^W(c) < +\infty$, we have an optimum Q^∞ and its marginals satisfy: $Q_t^\infty = \widehat{Q}_t^\infty, t = 0, \dots, T$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}_\infty^W(c) &= E_{Q^\infty} [c] = \lim_n \left(E_{Q^\infty} [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_t(\widehat{Q}_t^\infty, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) \\ &= \lim_n \left(E_{Q^\infty} [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_t(Q_t^\infty, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) \\ &\geq \limsup_n \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c] + \sum_{t=0}^T G_t^n(W_t(Q_t, \widehat{Q}_t^n)) \right) = \limsup_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c). \end{aligned}$$

Since now we have $\limsup_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c) \leq \mathfrak{P}_\infty^W(c) \leq \limsup_n \mathfrak{P}_n^W(c)$, (92) follows. \square

5 Applications in the noncompact case

In the noncompact case, Corollary 4.3 takes the following form:

Corollary 5.1. *Take $d = 1$, $K_0 = \{x_0\}$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $K_1, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be closed subsets of \mathbb{R} . Consider nondecreasing u_0, \dots, u_T satisfying Assumption 3.7, and suppose $\text{dom}(u_0) = \dots = \text{dom}(u_T) = \mathbb{R}$. Take for each $t = 0, \dots, T$ the vector space $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_t$ of functions in the form (77), let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$ and fix a $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\int_{K_t} v_t(\alpha(1 + |x_t|)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) < +\infty \quad \forall \alpha > 0, t = 0, \dots, T. \quad (93)$$

Suppose that $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is lower semicontinuous and satisfies (49). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}(c) &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E} \text{ is s.t. } \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \\ &= \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

where $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t)$ is defined in (78) for general $\varphi_t \in C_t$ and $\mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \widehat{Q}_t}$ is given in (75). Moreover, the infimum in (94) is a minimum provided that $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$.

Proof. All the claims follow from Theorem 3.4, provided that we show all its hypotheses are satisfied. To do so, we check that: (i) $S_t(\varphi_t) := U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t)$ is real valued on C_t , concave and cash additive; (ii) $\mathcal{D}_t(Q_t) = \mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t)$ for every $Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$; (iii) S_t is null in 0 for every $t = 0, \dots, T$ and the conditions (44) and (45) hold setting $f_t^n(x_t) := (|x_t| - n)^+$, $t = 0, \dots, T$ as in Example 2.9. To check (i) observe that for every $t = 0, \dots, T$ and $\varphi_t \in C_t$

$$\begin{aligned} -\infty &< - \int_{K_t} v_t(\|\varphi_t\|(1 + |x_t|)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) = \int_{K_t} u_t(-\|\varphi_t\|(1 + |x_t|)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) \\ &\leq \int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) \leq U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) \stackrel{(\otimes)}{\leq} \int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\widehat{Q}_t \leq \int_{K_t} \|\varphi_t\|_t (1 + |x_t|) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) < +\infty \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where in (\otimes) we argued as in (79) and the finiteness of the last term comes from the fact that $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$. Notice that we just showed also that $\widehat{Q}_t \in \partial U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(0)$. Concavity and cash additivity can be checked along the lines of the proof of Lemma 4.2 Item (2)-(3). Coming to (ii), from Proposition 3.9 and Fenchel inequality for every $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$ and $t = 0, \dots, T$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t) &\stackrel{(75)}{=} \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t(x_t) dQ_t(x_t) - \int_{K_t} v_t(\varphi_t(x_t)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\varphi_t \in C_t} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t(x_t) dQ_t(x_t) - \int_{K_t} v_t(\varphi_t(x_t)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) \right) \leq \mathcal{D}_{v_t^*, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t). \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_t$ the proof of (ii) is then concluded observing that for every $\varphi_t \in C_t$ there exists a sequence of $(\varphi_t^n)_n \subseteq C_t$, with each φ_t^n in the form (77), such that $\varphi_t^n \rightarrow \varphi_t$ pointwise on K_t and $\sup_n \|\varphi_t^n\|_t < +\infty$. Indeed, this in turns implies, using $\int_{K_t} v_t(\alpha(1 + |x_t|)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) < +\infty \quad \forall \alpha > 0$, that one has

$$\int_{K_t} \varphi_t(x_t) dQ(x_t) - \int_{K_t} v_t(\varphi_t(x_t)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) = \lim_n \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t^n(x_t) dQ(x_t) - \int_{K_t} v_t(\varphi_t^n(x_t)) d\widehat{Q}_t(x_t) \right)$$

for every $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$, by Dominated Convergence Theorem. Finally, (iii) is verified observing that

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} 0 d\widehat{Q} \geq S_t(0) \geq S_t(-f_t^n) \geq \int_{\Omega} u_t(-f_t^n) d\widehat{Q} \rightarrow_n 0$$

where the limit in RHS is motivated by Dominated Convergence Theorem together with (93) \square

Remark 5.2. Observe that Corollary 5.1 would remain valid replacing $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\cdot)$ with $S_{\widehat{Q}_t}^{u_t}(\cdot) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\cdot + \alpha) d\widehat{Q}_t - \alpha \right)$ for general $\widehat{Q}_t \in \text{Prob}^1(K_t)$ without requesting these are marginals of a martingale measure. Indeed, the only point where the martingale property played a role was in showing (*), which remains valid if one replaces $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\cdot)$ with $S_{\widehat{Q}_t}^{u_t}(\cdot)$ (the argument is essentially identical). A prominent role was given to $U_{\widehat{Q}_t}$ since it serves as an example of stock additive functional (see Example 1.3).

Just as we obtained Corollary 4.5 from Corollary 4.3, using the linear utility functions $u_t(x_t) = x_t$, we now deduce the following result from Corollary 5.1

Corollary 5.3 ([6] Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2). *Take $d = 1$, $K_0 = \{x_0\}$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $K_1, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be closed subsets of \mathbb{R} . Take for each $t = 0, \dots, T$ the vector space $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_t$ of functions in the form (77), let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$ and fix a $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$. Then for any $c : \Omega \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ lower semicontinuous and satisfying (49)*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}(c) &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^T E_{\widehat{Q}_t}(\varphi_t) \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{E} \text{ is s.t. } \exists \Delta \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) + I^\Delta(x) \leq c(x) \ \forall x \in \Omega \right\} \\ &= \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\widehat{Q}_0, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T)} E_Q[c] \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

and if $\mathfrak{P}(c) < +\infty$, a minimum point exists for the infimum in (97).

Example 5.4. We now come to the study of the convergence to the MOT problem. Take $u_0, \dots, u_T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying Assumption 3.7, and assume additionally that these are all differentiable in 0 (which implies that $\{1\} = \partial u_0(0) = \dots = \partial u_T(0)$). Observe that setting $u_t^n(x) := nu_t(\frac{x}{n})$, $x \in \mathbb{R}, t = 0, \dots, T$ the functions u_0^n, \dots, u_T^n still satisfy Assumption 3.7. Moreover $(v_t^n)^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (u_t^n(x) - xy) = nv_t^*(y)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $u_t(0) = 0$, we have $v_t^* \geq 0$ and as a consequence

$$\sup_n (v_t^n)^*(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v_t^*(y) = 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Moreover $v_t^*(y) = 0 \Rightarrow y \in \partial u_t(0) = \{1\}$. Consider the set \mathcal{A}^ε of ε -martingale measures defined in equation (34), take $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ and a sequence $\varepsilon_n \downarrow_n 0$. Using (35), for every $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$

$$\sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{(v_t^n)^*, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}^{\varepsilon_n}}(Q_t) \uparrow_n \mathcal{D}_\infty(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(Q)$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_\infty(Q) + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(Q) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega) \text{ and } Q_t \equiv \widehat{Q}_t \ \forall t = 0, \dots, T \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

As a consequence, by Proposition 2.26

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q[c] + \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{D}_{(v_t^n)^*, \widehat{Q}_t}(Q_t) \right) \rightarrow_n \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\widehat{Q}_0, \dots, \widehat{Q}_T)} E_Q[c].$$

5.1 Dual representation for generalized OCE associated to the indirect utility function

In the following we will treat a slightly different problem, which however helps understanding how also the extreme case $\mathcal{E}_t = C_{0:t}, t = 0, \dots, T$ is of interest. Corollary 2.15 yields the following dual robust representation of the generalized Optimized Certainty Equivalent associated to the indirect utility function. We stress here the fact that, again, $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ is a fixed martingale measure, but we will not focus anymore on its marginals only, as will become clear in the following.

Proposition 5.5. *Take $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_0 = \dots, u_T := u$ satisfy Assumption 3.7 and let v^* be defined in (73) with u in place of u_t . Take $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$, such that (93) holds.*

Let $U_{\widehat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}} : C_{0:T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the associated indirect utility

$$U_{\widehat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}(\varphi) := \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{Q}}[u(\varphi + I^\Delta)].$$

and $S^{U_{\widehat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}}$ be the associated Optimized Certainty Equivalent defined according to (25), namely

$$S^{U_{\widehat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}}(\varphi) := \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \left(U_{\widehat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}(\varphi + \beta) - \beta \right) \quad \varphi \in C_{0:T}.$$

Then for every $c \in C_{0:T}$ the dual representation holds:

$$S^{U_{\widehat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}}(c) = \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(\mathbb{E}_Q[c] + \mathcal{D}_{\widehat{Q}}(Q) \right)$$

where for $Q \in \text{Prob}^1(\Omega)$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\widehat{Q}}(Q) := \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} v^* \left(\frac{dQ}{d\widehat{Q}} \right) d\widehat{Q} & \text{if } Q \ll \widehat{Q} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Take $\mathcal{E}_t = C_{0:t}$ for $t = 0, \dots, T$. Define $U(\psi) := U_{\widehat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right)$ for $\psi \in \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$. From (93), it follows that $U(\psi) > -\infty$ for any $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$, similarly to the argument in (95). Since $\widehat{Q} \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ and $u(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we also have $U(\psi) \leq \int_{\Omega} \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t d\widehat{Q} < +\infty$ (since $\text{Mart}(\Omega) \subseteq \text{Probq}^1(\Omega)$). Moreover it is easy to verify that for any $Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)$ we have

$$\mathcal{D}(Q) := \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(U(\psi) - \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right) dQ \right) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_{0:T}} \left(\int_{\Omega} u(\varphi) d\widehat{Q} - \int_{\Omega} \varphi dQ \right)$$

and arguing as in (96) we get $\mathcal{D}(Q) = \mathcal{D}_{\widehat{Q}}(Q)$. The assumptions of Corollary 2.15 are satisfied: take indeed $f_t^n(x_0, \dots, x_t) := -(|x_t| - n)^+$ as in Example 2.9, so that (44) holds. Then, using the fact that $U(\psi) \leq \int_{\Omega} \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t d\widehat{Q}$, we have

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} 0 d\widehat{Q} \geq U(0, \dots, 0) \geq U(-f_0^n, \dots, -f_T^n) \geq \int_{\Omega} u \left(-\sum_{t=0}^T f_t^n \right) d\widehat{Q} \rightarrow_n 0$$

where the limit in RHS is motivated by Dominated Convergence Theorem together with (93). This implies that also (45) is satisfied. $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}$ is clearly a convex cone with $0 \in \mathcal{A}$, and $U(0, \dots, 0) = 0$ (as can be easily verified). Hence, Assumption 2.8.(i)-(ii) are satisfied.

By Theorem 2.11, as a consequence, we have

$$\inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c(X)] + \mathcal{D}_{\hat{Q}}(Q) \right) = \inf_{Q \in \text{Mart}(\Omega)} \left(E_Q [c(X)] + \mathcal{D}(Q) \right) = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\psi \in \Phi_{I\Delta}(c)} S^U(\psi).$$

Observe now that S^U satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} S^U(\psi) &:= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\psi + \lambda) - \sum_{t=0}^T \lambda_t \right) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t + \sum_{t=0}^T \lambda_t \right) - \sum_{t=0}^T \lambda_t \right) \\ &= \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}} \left(U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t + \beta \right) - \beta \right) =: S^{U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right). \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily verified that $S^{U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}}$ is real valued on $C_{0:T}$, since $\int_{\Omega} \varphi d\hat{Q} \geq S^{U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}}(\varphi) \geq U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}(\varphi)$, and nondecreasing. Furthermore, $S^{U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}} : C_{0:T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is (IA). Hence

$$\sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\psi \in \Phi_{I\Delta}(c)} S^{U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t \right) = \sup_{\Delta \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{\psi \in \Phi_{I\Delta}(c)} S^{U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}} \left(\sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t + I\Delta \right) = S^{U_{\hat{Q}}^{\mathcal{H}}}(c)$$

by definition of $\Phi_{I\Delta}(c)$ and since $c \in C_{0:T}$. \square

A Appendix

Let \mathbb{X} be a metric space and $C(\mathbb{X})$ be the space of continuous functions on \mathbb{X} . Let $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C(\mathbb{X})$, $t = 0, \dots, T$, be a vector space and $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$, let $U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ be proper and concave and define $S^U : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ as in (25).

Lemma A.1. *Assume the usual convention $\infty \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \infty = 0$. Then S^U is concave on the convex set*

$$\text{dom}(S^U) := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{E} \mid S^U(\varphi) > -\infty\},$$

that is: if $\varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \text{dom}(S^U)$ then for every $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ we have $\alpha\varphi^1 + (1-\alpha)\varphi^2 \in \text{dom}(S^U)$ and

$$S^U(\alpha\varphi^1 + (1-\alpha)\varphi^2) \geq \alpha S^U(\varphi^1) + (1-\alpha)S^U(\varphi^2) \quad \forall \varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \text{dom}(S^U) \quad (98)$$

where the expression makes sense and holds even if either $S^U(\varphi^1)$ or $S^U(\varphi^2)$ or both are equal to $+\infty$. Finally, S^U satisfies:

$$S^U(\varphi + \alpha) = S^U(\varphi) + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{E}, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}.$$

Proof. Since the claim is trivially true for $\alpha = 0, 1$ (assuming the usual convention $\infty \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \infty = 0$), we can assume $0 < \alpha < 1$. Observe that since $\varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \text{dom}(S^U)$ for some $\beta^1, \beta^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\infty &< \alpha U(\varphi^1 + \beta^1) + (1-\alpha)U(\varphi^2 + \beta^2) - \left[\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t^1 + (1-\alpha) \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t^2 \right] \\ &\leq U(\alpha\varphi^1 + (1-\alpha)\varphi^2 + [\alpha\beta^1 + (1-\alpha)\beta^2]) - \left[\alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t^1 + (1-\alpha) \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t^2 \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\alpha\varphi^1 + (1-\alpha)\varphi^2 + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \right) =: S^U(\alpha\varphi^1 + (1-\alpha)\varphi^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now if both $S^U(\varphi^1), S^U(\varphi^2) < +\infty$ it is enough to take suprema over $\beta^1, \beta^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ to get (98). If otherwise either $S^U(\varphi^1) = +\infty$ or $S^U(\varphi^2) = +\infty$, taking the supremum over $\beta^1, \beta^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ yields $S^U(\alpha\varphi^1 + (1-\alpha)\varphi^2) = +\infty = \alpha S^U(\varphi^1) + (1-\alpha)S^U(\varphi^2)$, and again we get (98). Also, (98) clearly implies that if $\varphi^1, \varphi^2 \in \text{dom}(S^U)$ then for every $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ we have $\alpha\varphi^1 + (1-\alpha)\varphi^2 \in \text{dom}(S^U)$. As to the last property, fix $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. There are three cases: either (i) $U(\varphi + \beta) = -\infty \forall \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$, so that $S^U(\varphi + \alpha) = S^U(\varphi) = S^U(\varphi) + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t = -\infty$, or (ii) $U(\varphi + \beta) = +\infty$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$ in which case $S^U(\varphi + \alpha) = S^U(\varphi) = S^U(\varphi) + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t = +\infty$, or (iii) we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
S^U(\varphi + \alpha) &= \sup \left\{ U(\varphi + \alpha + \beta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \beta_t \mid \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}, U(\varphi + \beta + \alpha) > -\infty \right\} \\
&= \sup \left\{ U(\varphi + (\alpha + \beta)) - \sum_{t=0}^T (\beta_t + \alpha_t) + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t \mid \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}, U(\varphi + (\beta + \alpha)) > -\infty \right\} \\
&= \sup \left\{ U(\varphi + \eta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \eta_t + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t \mid \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}, U(\varphi + \eta) > -\infty \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(\star)}{=} \sup \left\{ U(\varphi + \eta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \eta_t \mid \eta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}, U(\varphi + \eta) > -\infty \right\} + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t \\
&= \sup_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \eta) - \sum_{t=0}^T \eta_t \right) + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t = S^U(\varphi) + \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t
\end{aligned}$$

where in (\star) we are exploiting the fact that we are in the case of $U(\varphi + \beta) < +\infty \forall \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Take closed sets $K_1, \dots, K_T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, and suppose that $K_0 = \{x_0\}$ and $\text{card}(K_{t+1}) \geq \text{card}(K_t)$ for every $t = 0, \dots, T-1$. Take $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_T$ for vector subspaces $\mathcal{E}_t \subseteq C_t(K_t)$ such that $X_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$ and $\mathcal{E}_t + \mathbb{R} = \mathcal{E}_t$, for $t = 0, \dots, T$. Suppose there exist $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{H}$, where \mathcal{H} is defined in (8), such that $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t = \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t + I^\Delta$. Then there exist constants $k_0, \dots, k_T, h_0, \dots, h_T \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for each $t = 0, \dots, T$ $\psi_t(x_t) = \varphi_t(x_t) + k_t x_t + h_t$, $\forall x_t \in K_t$. In particular for $S_t : \mathcal{E}_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t = 0, \dots, T$ stock additive functionals we have*

$$\sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\psi_t).$$

and for $\mathcal{V} := \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{E}_t + \mathcal{I}$ (see (9)) the map

$$v = \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta \mapsto S(v) := \sum_{t=0}^T S_t(\varphi_t)$$

is well defined on \mathcal{V} , (CA) and (IA).

Proof.

Step 1: we prove that if $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t = \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t + I^\Delta$ then $\Delta = [\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_{T-1}] \in \mathcal{H}$ is a deterministic vector $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^T$. If $\text{card}(K_T) = 1$ this is trivial. We can then suppose $\text{card}(K_T) \geq 2$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_T(x_T) - \psi_T(x_T) &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (\psi(x_t) - \varphi_t(x_t)) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-2} \Delta_t(x_0, \dots, x_t)(x_{t+1} - x_t) + \\
&+ \Delta_{T-1}(x_0, \dots, x_{T-1})(x_T - x_{T-1}) = f(x_0, \dots, x_{T-1}) + \Delta_{T-1}(x_0, \dots, x_{T-1})x_T
\end{aligned}$$

for some function f . If Δ_{T-1} were not constant, on two points it would assume values $a \neq b$, with corresponding values of f that we call f_a, f_b . Then $f_a + ax_T = f_b + bx_T$ has a unique solution, contradicting the fact that all the equalities need to hold on the whole K_0, \dots, K_T and in particular for two different values of x_T . We proceed one step backward. If $\text{card}(K_{T-1}) = 1$, the claim trivially follows, given our previous step. If $\text{card}(K_{T-1}) \geq 2$, similarly to the previous computation

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) - \psi_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) &= \sum_{s \neq T-1} (\psi_s(x_s) - \varphi_s(x_s)) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-3} \Delta_t(x_0, \dots, x_t)(x_{t+1} - x_t) + \\ &\quad + \Delta_{T-2}(x_0, \dots, x_{T-2})(x_{T-1} - x_{T-2}) + \Delta_{T-1}(x_T - x_{T-1}) \\ &= f(x_s, s \neq T-1) + (\Delta_{T-2}(x_0, \dots, x_{T-2}) - \Delta_{T-1})x_{T-1}. \end{aligned}$$

An argument similar to the one we used in the previous time step shows that $\Delta_{T-2}(x_0, \dots, x_{T-2}) - \Delta_{T-1}$ is constant, hence so is Δ_{T-2} . Our argument can be clearly be iterated up to Δ_0 .

Step 2: we prove existence of the vectors $k, h \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}$, as stated in the Lemma. From Step 1 it is clear that there exist constants k_0, \dots, k_T such that $I^\Delta(x) = \sum_{t=0}^T k_t x_t$. Hence $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t(x_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T (\psi_t(x_t) + k_t x_t)$ for all $x \in \Omega$, which yields for each $t = 0, \dots, T$ that $\varphi_t(x_t) - (\psi_t(x_t) + k_t x_t)$ does not depend on x_t , hence is constant, call it $-h_t$. Then $k_0, \dots, k_T, h_0, \dots, h_T \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy our requirements. The last claim $\sum_{t=0}^T S_t^U(\varphi_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T S_t^U(\psi_t)$ is then an easy consequence of stock additivity.

Step 3: well posedness and properties of S . Observe that whenever $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{E}$, $\Delta, H \in \mathcal{H}$ are given with $\sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + I^\Delta = \sum_{t=0}^T \psi_t + I^H$ we have by Steps 1-2 that $\sum_{t=0}^T S_t^U(\varphi_t) = \sum_{t=0}^T S_t^U(\psi_t)$. As a consequence, S is well defined. Cash Additivity is inherited from S_0, \dots, S_T while Integral Additivity is trivial from the definition. \square

Proposition A.3. *There exist $a = a(d, T), \beta = \beta(d, T) > 0$ such that for every $A > 1$*

$$1 + \sum_{s=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_s^j| \leq a \sum_{s=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d f_{j,s}^{\frac{A}{\beta}}(x_s^j) \quad \forall [x_0, \dots, x_T] \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{T+1} \setminus ([-A, A]^d)^{T+1}$$

where $f_{j,s}^\alpha$ is defined in (46).

Proof. Observe that $f_{j,s}^{\frac{A}{\beta}}(x_s^j) = \left(|x_s^j| - \frac{A}{\beta}\right)^+$. Fix $x \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{T+1} \setminus ([-A, A]^d)^{T+1}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) &:= \{j, s \in \{1, \dots, d\} \times \{0, \dots, T\} \mid |x_s^j| > A\} \\ I^c(x) &:= \{j, s \in \{1, \dots, d\} \times \{0, \dots, T\} \mid |x_s^j| \leq A\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\{1, \dots, d\} \times \{0, \dots, T\} = I(x) \cup I^c(x)$ and $I(x) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover for $\beta > 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
& a \sum_{s=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d f_{j,s}^{\frac{A}{\beta}}(x_s^j) - \left(1 + \sum_{s=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_s^j|\right) \\
&= a \sum_{s=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d \left(|x_s^j| - \frac{A}{\beta}\right)^+ - \left(1 + \sum_{s=0}^T \sum_{j=1}^d |x_s^j|\right) \\
&= \sum_{(j,s) \in I(x)} \left(a \left(|x_s^j| - \frac{A}{\beta}\right) - |x_s^j|\right) + \sum_{(j,s) \in I^c(x)} \left(\left(|x_s^j| - \frac{A}{\beta}\right)^+ - |x_s^j|\right) - 1 \\
&\geq (a-1) \sum_{(j,s) \in I(x)} |x_s^j| - \frac{aA}{\beta} |I(x)| - \sum_{(j,s) \in I^c(x)} |x_s^j| - 1 \\
&\geq (a-1)A - \frac{aA}{\beta} d(T+1) - d(T+1)A - 1 \\
&= aA \left(1 - d \frac{T+1}{\beta}\right) - [A + d(T+1)A + 1]
\end{aligned}$$

Then, selecting e.g. $\beta = 2d(T+1)$, we can solve the inequality

$$aA \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\right) - [A + d(T+1)A + 1] \geq 0$$

getting $a \geq 2d(T+2) + \frac{2}{A}$. This yields a possible selection $a = 2d(T+2) + 2$ too, depending only on the dimensions d, T . \square

Lemma A.4. *The set $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ defined in (86) is $\sigma(\text{ca}(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ -compact.*

Proof. We see that $\text{Mart}(\Omega)$ is a $\sigma(\text{ca}(\Omega), \mathcal{C}_b(\Omega))$ -closed subset of the $\sigma(\text{ca}(\Omega), \mathcal{C}_b(\Omega))$ -compact set $\text{Prob}(\Omega)$ (which is compact since Ω is a compact Polish Space, see [2] Theorem 15.11), hence it is compact himself. $\text{Mart}_t(K_t)$ is then the image of a compact set via the marginal map $\gamma \mapsto \gamma_t$ which is $\sigma(\text{ca}(\Omega), \mathcal{C}_b(\Omega)) - \sigma(\text{ca}(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ continuous, hence it is $\sigma(\text{ca}(K_t), \mathcal{C}_b(K_t))$ compact. \square

Proposition A.5. *Let $L \in (C_\psi)^*$ be continuous, linear and positive. Suppose that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact $K_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ such that*

$$\varphi \in C_\psi, \varphi|_{K_\varepsilon} \equiv 0 \implies |\langle \varphi, L \rangle| \leq \varepsilon \|\varphi\|_\psi.$$

Then for every sequence $(c_n)_n \in C_\psi$ with $c_n \downarrow_n 0$ pointwise on \mathbb{X} it holds that $L(c_n) \downarrow 0$.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and take the associated compact K_ε . By Dini's Lemma, $\sup_{x \in K_\varepsilon} c_n(x) \downarrow_n 0$. Take n big enough in such a way that $\sup_{x \in K_\varepsilon} c_n(x) < \varepsilon$. Define $0 \leq g_n^\varepsilon := \min(c_n, \varepsilon)$. Then clearly

$$g_n^\varepsilon(x) = |g_n^\varepsilon(x)| \leq \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon(1 + |\psi(x)|) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{X} \implies \|g_n^\varepsilon\|_\psi \leq \varepsilon \implies |\langle g_n^\varepsilon, L \rangle| \leq \|L\| \|g_n^\varepsilon\|_\psi \leq \|L\| \varepsilon \quad (99)$$

where $\|L\|$ is the operator norm ($\|L\| < +\infty$ since L is continuous). Also, since $\sup_{x \in K_\varepsilon} c_n(x) < \varepsilon$, c_n and g_n^ε coincide on K_ε , namely $(c_n - g_n^\varepsilon)|_{K_\varepsilon} \equiv 0$. But using the hypothesis on L we then get

$$(c_n - g_n^\varepsilon)|_{K_\varepsilon} \equiv 0 \implies |\langle c_n - g_n^\varepsilon, L \rangle| \leq \varepsilon \|c_n - g_n^\varepsilon\|_\psi \leq \varepsilon(\|c_n\|_\psi + \|g_n^\varepsilon\|_\psi) \leq \varepsilon(\|c_1\|_\psi + \varepsilon) \quad (100)$$

where in the last step we used the Banach lattice property of $\|\cdot\|_\psi$ and the fact that as shown before $\|g_n^\varepsilon\|_\psi \leq \varepsilon$. We now combine (99) and (100) to get

$$0 \leq \langle c_n, L \rangle = \langle c_n - g_n^\varepsilon, L \rangle + \langle g_n^\varepsilon, L \rangle \leq |\langle c_n - g_n^\varepsilon, L \rangle| + \langle g_n^\varepsilon, L \rangle \leq \varepsilon(\|c_1\|_\psi + \varepsilon) + \|L\| \varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $L(c_n) \downarrow 0$. \square

Theorem A.6 (Daniell-Stone). *Let \mathfrak{F} be a vector lattice of functions (i.e. $f, g \in \mathfrak{F} \Rightarrow \max(f, g) \in \mathfrak{F}$) on a set \mathbb{X} such that $1 \in \mathfrak{F}$. Let L be a linear functional on \mathfrak{F} with the following properties: $L(f) \geq 0$ whenever $f \geq 0$, $L(1) = 1$, and $L(f_n) \rightarrow_n 0$ for every sequence of functions f_n in \mathfrak{F} monotonically decreasing to zero. Then, there exists a unique probability measure μ on the σ -algebra $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(\mathfrak{F})$ generated by \mathfrak{F} such that $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq L^1(\mu)$ and*

$$L(f) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} f \, d\mu, \quad \forall f \in \mathfrak{F}.$$

Proof. See [14] Theorem 7.8.1. □

A.1 Proofs

Proof of Lemma 2.20. Fix $\lambda \in (C_{0:T})^*$ such that $\lambda \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) &= \sup_{c \in C_{0:T}} (\mathfrak{P}(c) - \langle c, \lambda \rangle) = \sup_{c \in C_{0:T}} \left(\sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) - \langle c, \lambda \rangle \right) \\ &\stackrel{(55)}{=} \sup_{c \in C_{0:T}} \left(\sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)} S^U(\varphi) - \langle c, \lambda \rangle \right) \\ &= \sup_{c \in C_{0:T}} \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)} (S^U(\varphi) - \langle c, \lambda \rangle) \\ &\leq \sup_{c \in C_{0:T}} \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(c)} \left(S^U(\varphi) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + z, \lambda \right\rangle \right) \\ &= \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(S^U(\varphi) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + z, \lambda \right\rangle \right) = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}} \langle z, \lambda \rangle + \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(S^U(\varphi) - \sum_{t=0}^T \langle \varphi_t, \lambda_t \rangle \right) \\ &= \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda) + (S^U)^*(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T). \end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Consequently

$$\mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) \leq \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda) + (S^U)^*(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T). \tag{102}$$

At the same time, for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$, $z \in -\mathcal{A}$ and for $\hat{c} = \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + z \in C_{0:T}$ we have that $\varphi \in \Phi_z(\hat{c})$. Thus

$$S^U(\varphi) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + z, \lambda \right\rangle \leq \sup_{\varphi \in \tilde{\Phi}_z(\hat{c})} (S^U(\varphi) - \langle \hat{c}, \lambda \rangle) \stackrel{(101)}{\leq} \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda)$$

and hence

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}} \langle z, \lambda \rangle + \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(S^U(\varphi) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t, \lambda \right\rangle \right) = \sup_{z \in -\mathcal{A}} \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(S^U(\varphi) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t + z, \lambda \right\rangle \right) \leq \mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda). \tag{103}$$

Combining (102) and (103) we get that $\mathfrak{P}^*(\lambda) = \sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda) + (S^U)^*(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T)$.

If additionally $\lambda(1) = 1$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(S^U)^*(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) &= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(S^U(\varphi) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t, \lambda_t \right\rangle \right) \\
&= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \alpha) - \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t \right) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t, \lambda \right\rangle \right) \\
&= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(\left(U(\varphi + \alpha) - \sum_{t=0}^T \alpha_t \right) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t, \lambda \right\rangle \right) \\
&= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{T+1}} \left(U(\varphi + \alpha) - \sum_{t=0}^T \langle \varphi_t + \alpha_t, \lambda \rangle \right) \\
&= \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{E}} \left(U(\varphi) - \left\langle \sum_{t=0}^T \varphi_t, \lambda \right\rangle \right) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_T) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.9. We will use [52] Theorem 2.7 and [52] Remark 2.8. To do so, let us rename $F := v_t^*$ ((see (73) for the definition of v^*), which implies that $F^\circ(y) := -F^*(-y)$ of [52] Equation (2.45) satisfies $F^\circ(y) := -F^*(-y) = -v_t^{**}(-y) = -v_t(-y) = u_t(y)$, by Fenchel-Moreau Theorem. All the assumptions of [52] Section 2.3 on F are satisfied, since for every $y \geq 0$ $F(y) \geq u_t(0) - 0y = 0$ and $F(1) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (u_t(x) - x) \leq 0$ (recall $u_t(x) \leq x, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$). Also, since $\text{dom}(u_t) = \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(y)}{y} = F'_\infty = +\infty$. We can then apply [52] Theorem 2.7 and [52] Remark 2.8, obtaining (75). We stress the fact that since u_t is finite valued on the whole \mathbb{R} , it is continuous there and for every $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$, $F^\circ(\varphi_t) = u_t(\varphi_t) \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$, hence the additional constraint $F^\circ(\varphi_t) \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ (below [52] (2.49)) would be redundant in our setup. □

Proof of Proposition 3.10. We will exploit again [52] Theorem 2.7 and [52] Remark 2.8 (with u_t in place of F°), as we explain now. Since u_t is nondecreasing, either its domain is in the form $[M, +\infty)$ or $(M, +\infty)$, with $M \leq 0$. Given a $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ and a $\mu \in \text{Meas}(K_t)$

- Either $\inf(\varphi_t(\mathbb{R})) > M$, in which case $u_t(\varphi_t) \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ since u_t is continuous on the interior of its domain.
- Or $\inf(\varphi_t(\mathbb{R})) < M$, in which case $\{\varphi_t < M\}$ is open nonempty and hence has positive \widehat{Q}_t measure, as \widehat{Q}_t has full support. Thus $\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t) d\widehat{Q}_t = -\infty$.
- Or $\inf(\varphi_t(\mathbb{R})) = M$ in which case $u_t(\varphi_t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} u_t(\max(\varphi_t, M + \varepsilon))$ (since u_t is nondecreasing and upper semicontinuous) $u_t(\max(\varphi_t, M + \varepsilon)) \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)$ (see first bullet) and by Monotone Convergence Theorem

$$\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t) d\widehat{Q}_t - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\mu = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\max(\varphi_t, M + \varepsilon)) d\widehat{Q}_t - \int_{K_t} \max(\varphi_t, M + \varepsilon) d\mu \right).$$

Then we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\mu - \int_{K_t} v_t(\varphi_t) d\widehat{Q}_t \right) = \sup_{\varphi_t \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t)} \left(\int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t) d\widehat{Q}_t - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\mu \right) \\
&= \sup \left\{ \int_{K_t} u_t(\varphi_t) d\widehat{Q}_t - \int_{K_t} \varphi_t d\mu \mid \varphi_t, u_t(\varphi_t) \in \mathcal{C}_b(K_t) \right\}, \tag{104}
\end{aligned}$$

and from [52] Theorem 2.7, [52] Remark 2.8 and from (104) we conclude the thesis.

□

References

- [1] B. Acciaio, M. Beiglböck, F. Penkner, and W. Schachermayer. A model-free version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing and the super-replication theorem. *Math. Finance*, 26(2):233–251, 2016.
- [2] C. D. Aliprantis and K. C. Border. *Infinite dimensional analysis*. Springer, Berlin, third edition, 2006.
- [3] P. Artzner, F. Delbaen, J.-M. Eber, and D. Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Math. Finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- [4] J. Backhoff-Veraguas and G. Pammer. Stability of martingale optimal transport and weak optimal transport. *Preprint: arXiv:1904.04171v2*, 2020.
- [5] D. Bartl, M. Kupper, D. J. Prömel, and L. Tangpi. Duality for pathwise superhedging in continuous time. *Finance Stoch.*, 23(3):697–728, 2019.
- [6] M. Beiglböck, P. Henry-Labordère, and F. Penkner. Model-independent bounds for option prices—a mass transport approach. *Finance Stoch.*, 17(3):477–501, 2013.
- [7] F. Bellini and M. Frittelli. On the existence of minimax martingale measures. *Math. Finance*, 12(1):1–21, 2002.
- [8] A. Ben-Tal and M. Teboulle. Expected utility, penalty functions, and duality in stochastic nonlinear programming. *Management Sci.*, 32(11):1445–1466, 1986.
- [9] A. Ben-Tal and M. Teboulle. An old-new concept of convex risk measures: the optimized certainty equivalent. *Math. Finance*, 17(3):449–476, 2007.
- [10] J.-D. Benamou, G. Carlier, M. Cuturi, L. Nenna, and G. Peyré. Iterative Bregman projections for regularized transportation problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 37(2):A1111–A1138, 2015.
- [11] E. Bernton, P. Ghosal, and M. Nutz. Entropic optimal transport: Geometry and large deviations. *Preprint: arXiv:2102.04397*, 2021.
- [12] S. Biagini and M. Frittelli. On the extension of the Namioka-Klee theorem and on the Fatou property for risk measures. In *Optimality and risk—modern trends in mathematical finance*, pages 1–28. Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [13] J. Blanchet, A. Jambulapati, C. Kent, and A. Sidford. Towards Optimal Running Times for Optimal Transport. *Preprint: arXiv:1810.07717v3*, 2020.
- [14] V. I. Bogachev. *Measure theory. Vol. I, II*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.

- [15] D. T. Breeden and R. H. Litzenberger. Prices of State-Contingent Claims Implicit in Option Prices. *The Journal of Business*, 51(4):621–651, 1978.
- [16] H. Brown, D. Hobson, and L. C. G. Rogers. Robust hedging of barrier options. *Math. Finance*, 11(3):285–314, 2001.
- [17] M. Burzoni, M. Frittelli, Z. Hou, M. Maggis, and J. Oblój. Pointwise arbitrage pricing theory in discrete time. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 44(3):1034–1057, 2019.
- [18] M. Burzoni, M. Frittelli, and M. Maggis. Universal arbitrage aggregator in discrete-time markets under uncertainty. *Finance Stoch.*, 20(1):1–50, 2016.
- [19] M. Burzoni, M. Frittelli, and M. Maggis. Model-free superhedging duality. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 27(3):1452–1477, 2017.
- [20] P. Cheridito, M. Kiiski, D. J. Prömel, and H. M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport duality. *Mathematische Annalen*, Jan 2020.
- [21] P. Cheridito, M. Kupper, and L. Tangpi. Duality formulas for robust pricing and hedging in discrete time. *SIAM J. Financial Math.*, 8(1):738–765, 2017.
- [22] N.-P. Chung and T.-S. Trinha. Weak Optimal Entropy Transport Problems. *Preprint: arXiv:2101.04986v2*, 2021.
- [23] A. M. G. Cox and J. Oblój. Robust hedging of double touch barrier options. *SIAM J. Financial Math.*, 2(1):141–182, 2011.
- [24] A. M. G. Cox and J. Oblój. Robust pricing and hedging of double no-touch options. *Finance Stoch.*, 15(3):573–605, 2011.
- [25] A. M. G. Cox and J. Wang. Root’s barrier: construction, optimality and applications to variance options. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(3):859–894, 2013.
- [26] M. Cuturi. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 2292–2300. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- [27] M. Davis, J. Oblój, and V. Raval. Arbitrage bounds for prices of weighted variance swaps. *Math. Finance*, 24(4):821–854, 2014.
- [28] H. De March and P. Henry-Labordère. Building arbitrage-free implied volatility: Sinkhorn’s algorithm and variants. *Preprint: arXiv:1902.04456v2*, 2020.
- [29] F. Delbaen, P. Grandits, T. Rheinländer, D. Samperi, M. Schweizer, and C. Stricker. Exponential hedging and entropic penalties. *Math. Finance*, 12(2):99–123, 2002.
- [30] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer. A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing. *Math. Ann.*, 300(3):463–520, 1994.

- [31] Y. Dolinsky and H. M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport and robust hedging in continuous time. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 160(1-2):391–427, 2014.
- [32] Y. Dolinsky and H. M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport in the Skorokhod space. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 125(10):3893–3931, 2015.
- [33] N. El Karoui and M.-C. Quenez. Dynamic programming and pricing of contingent claims in an incomplete market. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 33(1):29–66, 1995.
- [34] H. Föllmer and A. Schied. Convex measures of risk and trading constraints. *Finance Stoch.*, 6(4):429–447, 2002.
- [35] H. Föllmer and A. Schied. *Stochastic Finance. An introduction in discrete time*. De Gruyter Graduate. De Gruyter, Berlin, fourth revised and extended edition, 2016.
- [36] M. Frittelli. Introduction to a theory of value coherent with the no-arbitrage principle. *Finance Stoch.*, 4(3):275–297, 2000.
- [37] M. Frittelli and E. Rosazza Gianin. Putting order in risk measures. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 26(7):1473–1486, 2002.
- [38] M. Frittelli and G. Scandolo. Risk measures and capital requirements for processes. *Math. Finance*, 16(4):589–612, 2006.
- [39] A. Galichon, P. Henry-Labordère, and N. Touzi. A stochastic control approach to no-arbitrage bounds given marginals, with an application to lookback options. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(1):312–336, 2014.
- [40] P. Ghosal, M. Nutz, and E. Bernton. Stability of Entropic Optimal Transport and Schrödinger Bridges. *Preprint: arXiv:2106.03670*, 2021.
- [41] G. Guo and J. Obłój. Computational methods for martingale optimal transport problems. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 29(6):3311–3347, 2019.
- [42] P. Henry-Labordère. Automated option pricing: numerical methods. *Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance*, 16(8):1350042, 27, 2013.
- [43] P. Henry-Labordère. From (Martingale) Schrodinger bridges to a new class of Stochastic Volatility Models. *Preprint: arXiv:1904.04554*, 2019.
- [44] P. Henry-Labordère, J. Obłój, P. Spoida, and N. Touzi. The maximum maximum of a martingale with given n marginals. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 26(1):1–44, 2016.
- [45] D. Hobson. The Skorokhod embedding problem and model-independent bounds for option prices. In *Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance 2010*, volume 2003 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 267–318. Springer, Berlin, 2011.
- [46] D. Hobson and M. Klimmek. Maximizing functionals of the maximum in the Skorokhod embedding problem and an application to variance swaps. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(5):2020–2052, 2013.

- [47] D. G. Hobson. Robust hedging of the lookback option. *Finance and Stochastics*, 2(4):329–347, 1998.
- [48] S. D. Hodges and A. Neuberger. Optimal replication of contingent claims under transaction costs. *Review Futures Market*, 8:222–239, 1989.
- [49] Z. Hou and J. Oblój. Robust pricing-hedging dualities in continuous time. *Finance Stoch.*, 22(3):511–567, 2018.
- [50] C. T. Ireland and S. Kullback. Contingency tables with given marginals. *Biometrika*, 55:179–188, 1968.
- [51] I. Karatzas. *Lectures on the mathematics of finance*, volume 8 of *CRM Monograph Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.
- [52] M. Liero, A. Mielke, and G. Savaré. Optimal entropy-transport problems and a new Hellinger-Kantorovich distance between positive measures. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 211(3):969–1117, 2018.
- [53] A. Neufeld and J. Sester. On the stability of the martingale optimal transport problem: A set-valued map approach. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 176:109131, 2021.
- [54] M. Nutz and J. Wiesel. Entropic optimal transport: Convergence of potentials. *Preprint: arXiv:2104.11720*, 2021.
- [55] T. Pennanen and A.-P. Perkkiö. Convex duality in nonlinear optimal transport. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 277(4):1029–1060, 2019.
- [56] G. Peyré and M. Cuturi. Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- [57] F. Riedel. Financial economics without probabilistic prior assumptions. *Decis. Econ. Finance*, 38(1):75–91, 2015.
- [58] R. Rouge and N. El Karoui. Pricing via utility maximization and entropy. *Mathematical Finance*, 10(2):259–276, 2000.
- [59] L. Rüschendorf. Convergence of the iterative proportional fitting procedure. *Ann. Statist.*, 23(4):1160–1174, 1995.
- [60] S. Simons. *Minimax and monotonicity*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [61] X. Tan and N. Touzi. Optimal transportation under controlled stochastic dynamics. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(5):3201–3240, 2013.
- [62] C. Villani. *Optimal transport*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.
- [63] J. Wiesel. Continuity of the martingale optimal transport problem on the real line. *Preprint: arXiv:1905.04574v2*, 2019.