

# Option pricing in Volterra sandwiched volatility model

Giulia Di Nunno<sup>1,2</sup>  
giulian@math.uio.no

Yuliya Mishura<sup>3</sup>  
myus@univ.kiev.ua

Anton Yurchenko-Tytarenko<sup>1,\*</sup>  
antony@math.uio.no

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Oslo

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business and Management Science, NHH Norwegian School of Economics, Bergen

<sup>3</sup>Department of Probability Theory, Statistics and Actuarial Mathematics, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

September 23, 2022

## Abstract

We introduce a new model of financial market with stochastic volatility driven by an arbitrary Hölder continuous Gaussian Volterra process. The distinguishing feature of the model is the form of the volatility equation which ensures the solution to be “sandwiched” between two arbitrary Hölder continuous functions chosen in advance. We discuss the structure of local martingale measures on this market, investigate integrability and Malliavin differentiability of prices and volatilities as well as study absolute continuity of the corresponding probability laws. Additionally, we utilize Malliavin calculus to develop an algorithm of pricing options with discontinuous payoffs.

**Keywords:** stochastic volatility, sandwiched process, Hölder continuous noise, option pricing, Malliavin calculus

**MSC 2020:** 91G30; 60H10; 60H35; 60G22

**Acknowledgements.** The present research is carried out within the frame and support of the ToppForsk project nr. 274410 of the Research Council of Norway with title STORM: Stochastics for Time-Space Risk Models. The second author was supported by Japan Science and Technology Agency CREST JPMJCR2115.

## 1 Introduction

Despite its fundamental role in the development of mathematical finance, the classic Black–Scholes approach does not reflect numerous phenomena observed on real financial markets. In particular, numerous empirical arguments clearly indicate that the volatility is far from being constant: it is well known that time series of realized volatility are prone to clustering [17, 18] and the surface profile of implied volatility is not flat [19, 20, 30]. One of common ways to modify the vanilla Black–Scholes framework to account for such effects is to model the instantaneous volatility as a stochastic process itself. Initially, such solution was proposed in [34] and [32], and has evolved into a separate full-fledged area of research since then, see e.g. books [5, 27, 35, 36] for an overview of classical approaches.

A separate line of research on stochastic volatility is associated with the inclusion of market memory. Here, we mention the paper [12], where fractionally integrated GARCH and EGARCH models were considered, as well as the pioneering work [16], where the idea to model the log-volatility by fractional Brownian motion (fBm) with  $H > 1/2$  was proposed. The latter “fBm approach” turned out to be very fruitful and gave rise to numerous studies among which we note [13, 15] where the volatility is modeled by a fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. For a long time, the Hurst index  $H > 1/2$  prevailed in

---

\*Corresponding author.

fractional models due to the stylized fact stating presence of long memory in volatility [3, 4, 24]. Some of more recent empirical studies such as [31] argue that it is reasonable to model volatility with Hölder regularity strictly less than  $1/2$ . This observation became a core of the so-called “rough volatility” models such as [9, 26] which, in addition, prove to be consistent with the shape of the realized volatility surface [25, 29]. Another degree of freedom can be introduced by assuming that local roughness of volatility depends on time. Such an extension was justified in e.g. [7, 21] with a suggestion to use multifractional Brownian motion. In this regard, we also mention [37] where volatility is modeled by a function of a general Gaussian Volterra process and, in a sense, the latter approach is related to the model proposed in the present paper, since we also choose a Gaussian Volterra process as the source of noise in volatility. Namely, our model has the form

$$S_i(t) = S_i(0) + \int_0^t \mu_i(s) S_i(s) ds + \int_0^t Y_i(s) S_i(s) dB_i^S(s), \quad (1.1)$$

$$Y_i(t) = Y_i(0) + \int_0^t b_i(s, Y_i(s)) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) dB_i^Y(s), \quad (1.2)$$

$i = 1, \dots, d$ , where  $S_i$  and  $Y_i$  are price and volatility processes respectively,  $\mu_i$  are deterministic continuous functions,  $B_i^S, B_i^Y$  are correlated standard Brownian motions,  $\mathcal{K}_i$  are arbitrary square integrable kernels such that each process  $Z_i(t) := \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) dB_i^Y(s)$  is Hölder continuous up to the order  $H_i \in (0, 1)$ . The main distinguishing property of the model is related to the drift functions  $b_i$ : for each  $i = 1, \dots, d$  there exist two deterministic continuous functions  $0 < \varphi_i < \psi_i$  and constants  $c > 0$ ,  $\gamma > \frac{1}{H_i} - 1$  and  $y_* > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} b_i(t, y) &\geq \frac{c}{(y - \varphi_i(t))^\gamma}, & y \in (\varphi_i(t), \varphi_i(t) + y_*), \\ b_i(t, y) &\leq -\frac{c}{(\psi_i(t) - y)^\gamma}, & y \in (\psi_i(t) - y_*, \psi_i(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Processes of the type (1.2) were extensively studied in [23] and will be referred to as *sandwiched processes* due to the fact that the abovementioned shape of the drift ensures that

$$\varphi_i(t) < Y_i(t) < \psi_i(t), \quad (1.3)$$

i.e. the volatility process  $Y_i$  is “sandwiched” between  $\varphi_i$  and  $\psi_i$ .

The model (1.1)–(1.2) that will be referred to as the *Volterra Sandwiched Volatility (VSV)* model has several substantial advantages. First of all, it is very flexible in terms of the choice of noises: the class of Hölder continuous Volterra Gaussian processes is very broad and includes e.g. fractional Brownian motion. In fact, in order to ensure existence and uniqueness of the solution to equation (1.2), it is sufficient to demand only Hölder continuity of the additive noise without any assumptions on distribution. Nevertheless, we still prefer to use Gaussian Volterra processes because, on the one hand, they allow to apply various Malliavin calculus techniques and, on the other hand, enjoy adaptedness to the filtration generated by  $B_i^S, B_i^Y$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . The second advantage of the VSV model is its tractability. As it is noted in [23, Section 4], sandwiched processes can be used to define generalizations of some processes that are common for stochastic volatility modeling such as Cox–Ingersoll–Ross (CIR) or Chan–Karolyi–Longstaff–Sanders (CKLS) processes. Here we also mention [33] as well as the series of papers [38, 39, 40], where a process of the sandwiched type with  $\varphi_i \equiv 0$ ,  $\psi_i \equiv \infty$  was used in the context of CIR model driven by fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index  $H > 1/2$ . The third benefit of the VSV model is related to the functions  $\varphi_i, \psi_i$ . Leaving aside the fact that they can be regarded as another calibration parameters and a thoughtful choice of them can improve the performance of the model, the “sandwichness” (1.3) substantially improves analytical properties of both price and volatility. For example, since we choose  $\varphi_i > 0$ , the process  $Y_i$  is bounded away from zero and hence inverse volatilities  $\frac{1}{Y_i}$  are integrable w.r.t. Brownian motion generating the model. This will allow us to provide a clear description of equivalent local martingale measures on the market – a feature which is often left aside in many popular rough volatility models. Moreover, the boundedness of  $Y_i$  from above ensures that for any  $r \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} S_i^r(t) \right] < \infty \quad (1.4)$$

– a property that is often absent even in standard Brownian stochastic volatility models (see e.g. [2]).

In the first half of the paper, we introduce the VSV model and present a detailed discussion of its properties. In particular, we prove (1.4), provide description of the set of martingale measures and obtain Malliavin differentiability of both volatility and price using the method similar to [33, Theorem 3.3] based on characterization of Sobolev spaces over an abstract Wiener space from [45]. Results on Malliavin differentiability and absolute continuity of the probability law of price pave the way for some advanced numerical methods and the second part of the paper is devoted to one of them: the *Malliavin integration-by-parts quadrature* of discontinuous option payoffs. Namely, consider a European option with a *discontinuous* payoff  $f(S(T))$ . Usually, it is impossible to compute the expected payoff  $\mathbb{E}f(S(T))$  analytically, so one must apply numerical methods for that: for instance, one can take an approximation  $\widehat{S}(T)$  of  $S(T)$  using some numerical scheme and utilize one of Monte Carlo techniques to compute  $\mathbb{E}f(\widehat{S}(T))$ . However, [6] states that discontinuities in  $f$  lead to a substantial deterioration in convergence speed: for instance, the rate of convergence of  $\mathbb{E}[|f(S(T)) - f(\widehat{S}(T))|^2]$  to zero is halved in comparison to the order of the scheme for  $\widehat{S}$ . This aggravation is additionally worsened by typically low convergence rates of numerical schemes for models with rough volatility and it significantly limits application of some advanced Monte Carlo methods such as multi-level Monte Carlo. In order to overcome this problem, [1] suggested to use Malliavin integration-by-parts to replace the discontinuous  $f$  under the expectation with some Lipschitz functional and, as a result, the initial convergence rate was preserved. Similar technique was applied in [10, 40] for models driven by a fractional Brownian motion and, in the present paper, we utilize the same approach for the VSV model (1.1)–(1.2) providing some useful extensions. In particular, all [1, 10, 40] take  $\mathbb{E}f(\widehat{S}(T))$  with respect to the physical measure (i.e. it is an *expected payoff* rather than a *price*) whereas we provide a quadrature formula under the change of measure as well.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we specify the VSV market model, provide some moment bounds and describe the set of martingale measures. In Section 3, we prove Malliavin differentiability of volatility and price processes as well as present results on absolute continuity of probability laws of the latter. Section 4 adapts the Malliavin integration-by-parts quadrature method from [1] to the VSV setting. In Section 5, we give error estimates the mentioned method provided that the volatility is discretized using the drift-implicit Euler scheme from [22]. Section 6 contains simulation results.

## 2 Model description

In this Section, we define the Volterra sandwiched volatility (VSV) model as well as provide some basic results regarding its properties.

**Notation 2.1.** *Throughout this paper,  $C$  denotes any positive deterministic constant the exact value of which is not relevant. Note that  $C$  may change from line to line (or even within one line).*

### 2.1 Preliminaries and assumptions

**Probability space, filtration and correlation structure of Brownian motions.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be the canonical  $2d$ -dimensional Wiener space, i.e.  $\Omega := C_0([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$  is the classical Wiener measure,  $\mathcal{F}$  is the  $\mathbb{P}$ -augmented Borel sigma-algebra. Let also  $W$  be the corresponding  $2d$ -dimensional Brownian motion, i.e.  $W: [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ ,  $W(t, \omega) = \omega(t)$ , and  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t, t \in [0, T]\}$  be the  $\mathbb{P}$ -augmented filtration generated by  $W$ .

Now, let  $\Sigma = (\sigma_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{2d}$  be an arbitrary non-degenerate  $2d \times 2d$  real correlation matrix, i.e.  $\Sigma$  is symmetric, positive definite,  $\sigma_{i,j} \in [-1, 1]$  and  $\sigma_{i,i} = 1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, 2d$ . Since  $\Sigma$  is symmetric and positive definite, it admits a Cholesky decomposition of the form  $\Sigma = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}^T$ , where  $\mathcal{L} = (\ell_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{2d}$  is a lower triangular matrix with strictly positive diagonal entries. Define  $B(t) = (B_1(t), \dots, B_{2d}(t))^T := \mathcal{L}W(t)$  and note that components of the  $2d$ -dimensional stochastic process  $\{B(t), t \in [0, T]\}$  are 1-dimensional Brownian motions with

$$\mathbb{E}[B_i(t)B_j(s)] = (t \wedge s)\sigma_{i,j}, \quad t, s \in [0, T], \quad i, j = 1, \dots, 2d.$$

In what follows, we will need to distinguish the first  $d$  components of  $B$  (that will generate the “outer” noise for the price) from the other  $d$  components (that will generate the noise for the volatility) and thus

we introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} B^S(t) &= (B_1^S(t), \dots, B_d^S(t))^T := (B_1(t), \dots, B_d(t))^T, \\ B^Y(t) &= (B_1^Y(t), \dots, B_d^Y(t))^T := (B_{d+1}(t), \dots, B_{2d}(t))^T. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, since the matrix  $\mathcal{L}$  is not degenerate, the filtration generated by the  $2d$ -dimensional process  $B$  coincides with  $\mathbb{F}$ .

**Stochastic volatility process.** Consider now  $d$  measurable functions  $\mathcal{K}_i: [0, T]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , that satisfy the following assumption.

**Assumption A.** For any  $i = 1, \dots, d$

- (i)  $\mathcal{K}_i$  is a square integrable Volterra kernel, i.e.  $\mathcal{K}_i(t, s) = 0$  whenever  $t < s$ ,

$$\int_0^T \int_0^T \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) ds dt = \int_0^T \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) ds dt < \infty$$

and

$$\int_0^T \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) ds < \infty, \quad \int_0^T \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) dt < \infty, \quad \forall s, t \in [0, T];$$

- (ii) there exists a constant  $H_i \in (0, 1)$  such that for any  $\lambda \in (0, H_i)$

$$\int_0^t (\mathcal{K}_i(t, u) - \mathcal{K}_i(s, u))^2 du \leq C_\lambda |t - s|^{2\lambda}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $C_\lambda > 0$  is a constant, possibly dependent on  $\lambda$ .

Assumption A(i) allows to define a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian Volterra process  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_d)$  such that

$$Z_i(t) := \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) dB_i^Y(s), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.2)$$

Moreover, Assumption A(ii) ensures that the paths of each  $Z_i$  are regular a.s., which is summarized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.2** ([8], Theorem 1 and Corollary 4). *The Gaussian process  $\{Z_i(t), t \in [0, T]\}$  defined by (2.2) has a modification that is a.s. Hölder continuous up to the order  $H_i \in (0, 1)$  if and only if (2.1) holds for any  $\lambda \in (0, H_i)$ . Moreover, for any  $\lambda \in (0, H_i)$ , the random variable*

$$\Lambda_{\lambda, i} := \sup_{0 \leq s < t \leq T} \frac{|Z_i(t) - Z_i(s)|}{|t - s|^\lambda} \quad (2.3)$$

has moments of all orders.

**Remark 2.3.** By Proposition 2.2, it is evident that one can choose the modification of  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_d)$  such that for all  $\omega \in \Omega$

$$|Z_i(\omega, t) - Z_i(\omega, s)| \leq \Lambda_{\lambda, i}(\omega) |t - s|^\lambda,$$

where  $\lambda \in (0, H_i)$ . In what follows, this Hölder continuous modification will be used.

Now, let  $\varphi_i, \psi_i: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , be  $d$  pairs of functions such that

- 1)  $\varphi_i, \psi_i$  are Hölder continuous up to the order  $H_i$ , where  $H_i$  is from Assumption A(ii);
- 2) for each  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$0 < \varphi_i(t) < \psi_i(t). \quad (2.4)$$

For any  $a_1, a_2 \in [0, \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \frac{1}{2} \|\psi_i - \varphi_i\|_\infty)$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  is the standard sup-norm, denote

$$\mathcal{D}_{a_1, a_2}^i := \{(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+, y \in (\varphi_i(t) + a_1, \psi_i(t) - a_2)\} \quad (2.5)$$

and consider  $d$  functions  $b_i: \mathcal{D}_{0,0}^i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , that satisfy the following assumptions.

**Assumption B.**

(i) The functions  $b_i \in C(\mathcal{D}_{0,0}^i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ;

and there exist constants  $c > 0$ ,  $p > 1$ ,  $y_* \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \|\psi_i - \varphi_i\|_\infty)$  such that for any  $i = 1, \dots, d$  the following conditions hold:

(ii) for any  $\varepsilon \in (0, \min \{1, \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \frac{1}{2} \|\psi_i - \varphi_i\|_\infty\})$

$$|b_i(t_1, y_1) - b_i(t_2, y_2)| \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon^p} (|y_1 - y_2| + |t_1 - t_2|^\lambda), \quad (t_1, y_1), (t_2, y_2) \in \mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon}^i;$$

(iii) for some constant  $\gamma_i > \frac{1}{H_i} - 1$ , where  $H_i$  is from Assumption A(ii),

$$b_i(t, y) \geq \frac{c}{(y - \varphi_i(t))^{\gamma_i}}, \quad (t, y) \in \mathcal{D}_{0,0}^i \setminus \mathcal{D}_{y_*, 0}^i,$$

$$b_i(t, y) \leq -\frac{c}{(\psi_i(t) - y)^{\gamma_i}}, \quad (t, y) \in \mathcal{D}_{0,0}^i \setminus \mathcal{D}_{0, y_*}^i;$$

(iv) there exists a continuous partial derivative  $\frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}$  with respect to the spatial variable and

$$\frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}(t, y) < c, \quad (t, y) \in \mathcal{D}_{0,0}^i.$$

Next, consider the  $d$ -dimensional *sandwiched process*  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$  defined by

$$Y_i(t) = Y_i(0) + \int_0^t b_i(s, Y_i(s)) ds + Z_i(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (2.6)$$

where

- $Y_i(0) \in (\varphi_i(0), \psi_i(0))$  are deterministic constants;
- $Z_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are defined by (2.2) with  $\mathcal{K}_i$  satisfying Assumption A;
- $b_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , satisfy Assumption B.

**Remark 2.4.** Each equation in (2.6) is treated pathwisely and, according to [23], has a unique solution for the given  $\omega \in \Omega$  provided that the corresponding path  $Z_i(\cdot, \omega)$  of the noise is Hölder continuous up to the order  $H_i$  (and this happens a.s. by Remark 2.3). Moreover, in this case, according to [23, Theorem 3.2], for each  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $\lambda \in (\frac{1}{\gamma_i+1}, H_i)$ , where  $\gamma_i$  is from Assumption B(iii), one can find deterministic constants  $L_{1,i}$ ,  $L_{2,i} > 0$  and  $\alpha_i > 0$  that depend only on the shape of  $b_i$  and  $\lambda$  such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$\varphi(t) + \frac{L_{1,i}}{(L_{2,i} + \Lambda_{\lambda,i})^{\alpha_i}} \leq Y_i(t) \leq \psi(t) - \frac{L_i^1}{(L_{2,i} + \Lambda_{\lambda,i})^{\alpha_i}}, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\Lambda_{\lambda,i}$  is a random variable defined by (2.3). In particular, this means that  $0 < \varphi_i(t) < Y_i(t) < \psi_i(t)$  a.s.,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$  (which justifies the name “sandwiched”). Note that  $Z_i$  does not have to be Gaussian for (2.7) to hold: it is sufficient to assume  $\lambda$ -Hölder continuity with  $\lambda > \frac{1}{\gamma_i+1}$ .

Since  $\varphi_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are continuous positive functions, it is clear that for any  $r > 0$ :

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \frac{1}{Y_i^r(t)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{\min_{t \in [0, T]} \varphi_i^r(t)} < \infty.$$

Furthermore, since  $\Lambda_{\lambda,i}$  has moments of all orders, it is easy to see that for any  $r > 0$ :

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \frac{1}{(Y_i(t) - \varphi_i(t))^r} \right] < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \frac{1}{(\psi_i(t) - Y_i(t))^r} \right] < \infty.$$

**Remark 2.5.** Note that item (iv) of Assumption B are not required for existence and uniqueness of the solution to (2.6). It will be exploited later for the numerical scheme.

**Price process.** The components of the  $d$ -dimensional price process  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_d)$  will be defined as solutions to the SDEs of the form

$$S_i(t) = S_i(0) + \int_0^t \mu_i(s) S_i(s) ds + \int_0^t Y_i(s) S_i(s) dB_i^S(s), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (2.8)$$

where

- $S_i(0) > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are deterministic constants;
- $\mu_i: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are  $H_i$ -Hölder continuous functions, where each  $H_i$  is from Assumption A(ii);
- $Y_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$  are sandwiched volatility processes defined above.

We now list some simple properties of processes  $S_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

**Theorem 2.6.** For any  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , equation (2.8) has a unique solution of the form

$$S_i(t) = S_i(0) \exp \left\{ \int_0^t \left( \mu_i(s) - \frac{Y_i^2(s)}{2} \right) ds + \int_0^t Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Furthermore, for any  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} S_i^r(t) \right] < \infty.$$

*Proof.* Each  $Y_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , is a bounded process and thus existence and uniqueness of solution to the corresponding equation follows from e.g. [14, Theorem 16.1.2] while the explicit form of the solution can be checked straightforwardly via Itô's formula.

Next, using the explicit form of  $S_i$  as well as boundedness of  $Y_i$  one can see that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} S_i^r(t) &= S_i^r(0) \exp \left\{ r \int_0^t \mu_i(s) ds - \frac{r}{2} \int_0^t Y_i^2(s) ds + r \int_0^t Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right\} \\ &\leq C \exp \left\{ r \int_0^t Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right\} \\ &\leq C \exp \left\{ \frac{r^2}{2} \int_0^t Y_i^2(s) ds \right\} \times \\ &\quad \times \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (r Y_i(s))^2 ds \right\} \\ &\leq C \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (r Y_i(s))^2 ds \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Note that the Novikov's criterion immediately yields that the process

$$\mathcal{E}_t\{rY_i \cdot B_i^S\} := \exp \left\{ \int_0^t rY_i(s) dB_i^S(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (rY_i(s))^2 ds \right\}, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

is a uniformly integrable martingale such that

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_t\{rY_i \cdot B_i^S\}] = 1, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and, moreover,

$$\mathcal{E}_t\{rY_i \cdot B_i^S\} = \int_0^t \mathcal{E}_s\{rY_i \cdot B_i^S\} rY_i(s) dB_i^S(s), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

By the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathcal{E}_t \{ rY_i \cdot B_i^S \} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \mathcal{E}_s \{ rY_i \cdot B_i^S \} rY_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \mathcal{E}_s^2 \{ rY_i \cdot B_i^S \} Y_i^2(s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq C \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \psi(s) \left( \int_0^T \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_s^2 \{ rY_i \cdot B_i^S \}] ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

By Novikov’s criterion,  $\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_s(2rY_i \cdot B_i^S)] = 1$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_s^2 \{ rY_i \cdot B_i^S \}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_s \{ 2rY_i \cdot B_i^S \} \exp \left\{ \int_0^s (rY_i(u))^2 du \right\} \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_s \{ 2rY_i \cdot B_i^S \}] < \infty \end{aligned}$$

and hence, taking into account (2.10), we obtain the required result.  $\square$

**Numéraire and discounted price process.** As a numéraire, we will use the function  $e^{\int_0^t \nu(s) ds}$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $\nu: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  denotes a Hölder continuous function of order  $\min_{i=1, \dots, d} H_i$  representing an instantaneous interest rate. The discounted price process denoted as

$$\tilde{S}_i(t) := e^{-\int_0^t \nu(s) ds} S_i(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

has thus dynamics of the form

$$\tilde{S}_i(t) = S_i(0) + \int_0^t \tilde{\mu}_i(s) \tilde{S}_i(s) ds + \int_0^t Y_i(s) \tilde{S}_i(s) dB_i^S(s), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

where  $\tilde{\mu}_i := \mu_i - \nu$ .

## 2.2 Incompleteness of the market and martingale measures

Recall that our model is driven by the  $2d$ -dimensional Gaussian process

$$\begin{pmatrix} B^S(t) \\ B^Y(t) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{L} W(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where  $W = \{W(t), t \in [0, T]\}$  is a standard  $2d$ -dimensional Brownian motion and  $\mathcal{L} = (\ell_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{2d}$  is nondegenerate lower triangular  $2d \times 2d$  real matrix with positive entries on a diagonal such that  $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L}^T = \Sigma$ . Let also

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}_{11} & \mathcal{L}_{12} \\ \mathcal{L}_{21} & \mathcal{L}_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{ij}$  we denote the  $d \times d$  blocks of matrix  $\mathcal{L}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{L}_{12}$  is a zero matrix and  $\mathcal{L}_{11}$  is a lower triangular matrix with positive elements on the diagonal. In particular,  $\mathcal{L}_{11}$  is invertible, so we can define its inverse  $\mathcal{L}_{11}^{-1} = (\ell_{j,k}^{(-1)})_{j,k=1}^d$ . Finally, for a given semimartingale  $X$ , we denote the corresponding Doléans-Dade exponential by

$$\mathcal{E}_t \{ X \} := \exp \left\{ X_t - X_0 - \frac{1}{2} [X]_t \right\}.$$

The next lemma is in the spirit of Lemma 2.10 in [11].

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $M$  be a positive local  $\mathbb{P}$ -martingale w.r.t.  $\mathbb{F}$  with  $M(0) = 1$  a.s. Then  $M\tilde{S}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are all local martingales if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} M(t) &= \mathcal{E}_t \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^\cdot \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) \right\} \mathcal{E}_t \left\{ \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \int_0^\cdot \xi_l(s) dW_l(s) \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{E}_t \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^\cdot \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) + \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \int_0^\cdot \xi_l(s) dW_l(s) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\left( \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \right)_{j,k=1}^d$  are the elements of  $\mathcal{L}_{11}^{-1}$  and  $\xi_l$ ,  $l = d+1, \dots, 2d$ , are predictable processes such that  $\int_0^\cdot \xi_l(s) dW_l(s)$  are well-defined local martingales.

*Proof.* By the virtue of the local martingale representation theorem,  $M$  is a local  $\mathbb{P}$ -martingale w.r.t.  $\mathbb{F}$  if and only if there exist predictable processes  $\zeta_j = \{\zeta_j(t), t \in [0, T]\}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 2d$ , such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \int_0^T \zeta_j^2(s) ds < \infty \right) = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, 2d,$$

and

$$M(t) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \int_0^t \zeta_j(s) dW_j(s). \quad (2.13)$$

By Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} d(M(t)\tilde{S}_i(t)) &= \left( \tilde{\mu}_i(t)M(t) + Y_i(t) \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{i,j} \zeta_j(t) \right) \tilde{S}_i(t) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{2d} (\ell_{i,j} M(t) Y_i(t) + \zeta_j(t)) \tilde{S}_i(t) dW_j(t), \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $M\tilde{S}_i$  is a local martingale if and only if

$$\int_0^t \left( \tilde{\mu}_i(s)M(s) + Y_i(s) \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{i,j} \zeta_j(s) \right) \tilde{S}_i(s) ds = 0, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

This, in turn, implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{i,j} \zeta_j(t) = -M(t) \frac{\tilde{\mu}_i(t)}{Y_i(t)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

almost everywhere w.r.t.  $dt \otimes d\mathbb{P}$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is lower-triangular and each  $Y_i(t)$  is positive a.s., we have that

$$\mathcal{L}_{11} \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \zeta_d(t) \end{pmatrix} = -M(t) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_1(t)}{Y_1(t)} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\tilde{\mu}_d(t)}{Y_d(t)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.14)$$

almost everywhere w.r.t.  $dt \otimes d\mathbb{P}$  and hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \zeta_d(t) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{L}_{11}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -M(t) \frac{\tilde{\mu}_1(t)}{Y_1(t)} \\ \vdots \\ -M(t) \frac{\tilde{\mu}_d(t)}{Y_d(t)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.15)$$



almost everywhere w.r.t.  $dt \otimes d\mathbb{P}$ . Using notation  $\mathcal{L}_{11}^{-1} = \left( \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \right)_{j,k=1}^d$  and substituting (2.15) to (2.13), we see that the process  $M$  should satisfy the SDE of the form

$$dM(t) = -M(t) \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(t)}{Y_k(t)} dW_j(t) + \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \zeta_l(t) dW_l(t).$$

This SDE has a unique solution (see e.g. [14]) of the form

$$\begin{aligned} M(t) &= \mathcal{E}_t \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^\cdot \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) \right\} \times \\ &\quad \times \left( 1 + \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \int_0^t \mathcal{E}_u^{-1} \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^\cdot \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) \right\} \zeta_l(u) dW_l(u) \right) \\ &=: \mathcal{E}_t \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^\cdot \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) \right\} \left( 1 + \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \int_0^t \tilde{\zeta}_l(s) dW_l(s) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Furthermore, since the process  $M$  is positive, the continuous process  $\tilde{M}$  defined by

$$\tilde{M}(t) := 1 + \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \int_0^t \tilde{\zeta}_l(s) dW_l(s)$$

must also be positive, thus it can be represented as

$$\tilde{M}(t) = \mathcal{E}_t \left( \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \int_0^\cdot \xi_l(s) dW_l(s) \right) \quad (2.17)$$

with  $\xi_l$ ,  $l = d+1, \dots, 2d$ , being some predictable processes such that the corresponding stochastic integrals are well-defined. It remains to notice that  $\tilde{\zeta}_l$ ,  $l = d+1, \dots, 2d$ , can be arbitrary predictable stochastic processes such that the corresponding stochastic integrals are well-defined, thus  $\xi_l$ ,  $l = d+1, \dots, 2d$ , can also be chosen arbitrarily. Taking into account (2.16) and (2.17), we get the representation (2.12).  $\square$

In the literature, positive densities  $M(T)$  associated with local  $\mathbb{P}$ -martingales  $M$  such that  $M\tilde{S}_i$  all become local martingales are commonly called *strict local martingale densities* (see [43] for more detail) and Lemma 2.7 thus gives the description of the set of all strict local martingale densities on the market. However, note that the measure defined by  $d\mathbb{Q} := M(T)d\mathbb{P}$  is not necessarily a probability measure and one has to check that  $\mathbb{Q}(\Omega) = \mathbb{E}[M(T)] = 1$  (or, equivalently, that  $M$  is a uniformly integrable martingale) separately. Moreover, exploiting the Bayes' theorem for conditional expectations, it is easy to see that if  $\mathbb{Q}$  defined above is a probability measure, then  $\tilde{S}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are local  $\mathbb{Q}$ -martingales, which would imply the no-arbitrage property of the market. It turns out that the market model in consideration indeed has this property which is formulated in the next theorem.

**Theorem 2.8.** *The market defined in Subsection 2.1 is arbitrage-free and incomplete.*

*Proof.* Each  $Y_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, d$ , is bounded away from zero by the corresponding  $\min_{t \in [0, T]} \varphi_k(t) > 0$ , thus, by Novikov's condition,

$$M(t) = \mathcal{E}_t \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^\cdot \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) \right\}$$

is a uniformly integrable martingale (this case corresponds to  $\xi_l \equiv 0$  in (2.12),  $l = d+1, \dots, 2d$ ). Therefore the associated  $\mathbb{Q}$  is a probability measure, i.e. the market is arbitrage free.

Furthermore, again by Novikov's condition, any  $\xi_l$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=d+1}^{2d} \int_0^T \xi_l^2(t) dt \right\} \right] < \infty$$

leads to  $M$  being a uniformly integrable martingale, thus the market is incomplete.  $\square$

### 3 Malliavin differentiability and of volatility and price processes and absolute continuity of their laws

#### 3.1 Malliavin differentiability of volatility and price w.r.t. the initial Brownian motion $W$

In order to introduce the concept of the Malliavin differentiability, one must first fix the underlying isonormal Gaussian process and an obvious choice is the initial Brownian motion  $W$ . Recall that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is the canonical  $2d$ -dimensional Wiener space,  $W = (W_1, \dots, W_{2d})$  is the associated  $2d$ -dimensional Brownian motion and stochastic volatility processes  $Y_i = \{Y_i(t), t \in [0, T]\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , are given by

$$Y_i(t) = Y_i(0) + \int_0^t b_i(s, Y_i(s)) ds + Z_i(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where  $Y_i(0) \in (\varphi_i(0), \psi_i(0))$ , each  $b_i$  satisfies Assumption B,  $Z_i(t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) dB_i^Y$  is a Gaussian Volterra process with the kernel  $\mathcal{K}_i$  satisfying Assumption A and

$$B_i^Y := \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i,j} W_j.$$

Denote also by  $\mathcal{H}$  the associated Cameron-Martin space, i.e. the space of all continuous functions  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_{2d}) \in C_0([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})$  such that each  $F_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 2d$ , can be represented as

$$F_i(\cdot) = \int_0^\cdot f_i(s) ds,$$

where  $f = (f_1, \dots, f_{2d}) \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ . For the relation between  $F$  and  $f$  specified above, we will use the notation  $F = \int_0^\cdot f(s) ds$ . By  $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ , we denote the space of Malliavin differentiable functions (w.r.t. the  $L^2$ -closure).

Before proceeding to the main results of this Subsection, let us give an important auxiliary theorem.

**Theorem 3.1** ([45], Theorem 3.1). *A random variable  $\eta \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbb{P})$  belongs to  $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$  w.r.t.  $W$  if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- (i)  $\eta$  is ray absolutely continuous, i.e. for any  $F \in \mathcal{H}$  there exists a version of the process  $\{\eta(\omega + \varepsilon F), \varepsilon \geq 0\}$  that is absolutely continuous;
- (ii)  $\eta$  is stochastically Gateaux differentiable, i.e. there exists a random vector

$$D\eta \in L^2(\Omega; L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d}))$$

such that for any  $F = \int_0^\cdot f(s) ds \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $f \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} (\eta(\omega + \varepsilon F) - \eta(\omega)) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \langle D\eta, f \rangle_{L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})}, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In this case the random vector  $D\eta$  from (ii) is the Malliavin derivative of  $\eta$ .

In order to apply Theorem 3.1 to obtain the Malliavin differentiability of  $Y_i(t)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ , we first need to formally identify

$$Y_i(\omega + \varepsilon F, t), \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

for any  $F = \int_0^\cdot f(s) ds \in \mathcal{H}$ . For the given  $\omega$ , it is reasonable to associate these expressions with random variables  $Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t)$  given by

$$Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t) = Y_i(0) + \int_0^t b_i(s, Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, s)) ds + Z_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where  $Z_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t) := Z_i(\omega + \varepsilon F, t)$ . Indeed, equations (2.6) are treated pathwisely and each  $Z_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t)$  is Hölder continuous w.r.t.  $t$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ . This means that the equation above has a unique solution for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and

$$Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t) = Y_i(\omega + \varepsilon F, t), \quad \omega \in \Omega, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

However, in order to apply Theorem 3.1, one needs to get a more convenient representation of  $Z_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t)$  that “splits” the pieces corresponding to  $\omega$  and  $F$ . Intuitively, it is clear that a natural candidate for such a representation is

$$Z_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\cdot, t) = Z_i(\cdot, t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and this guess is formalized in the next simple proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  and  $F = \int_0^\cdot f(s) ds \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then there exists  $\Omega_{\varepsilon, F}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\varepsilon, F}) = 1$ , such that for any  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $\omega \in \Omega_{\varepsilon, F}$*

$$Z_i^{\varepsilon, F}(\omega, t) = Z_i(\omega, t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds, \quad \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

*Proof.* By definition, for any  $t \in [0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i(\cdot, t) &= L^2\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1} K_i^{n, l}(t) (B_i^Y(\cdot, t_{n, l+1}) - B_i^Y(\cdot, t_{n, l})) = \\ &= L^2\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1} K_i^{n, l}(t) (W_j(\cdot, t_{n, l+1}) - W_j(\cdot, t_{n, l})) \\ &=: L^2\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_i^n(\cdot, t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\pi^n = \{0 = t_{n, 0} < t_{n, 1} < \dots < t_{n, k_n} = t\}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , is a system of partitions such that  $\sup_{l=0, \dots, k_n-1} (t_{n, l+1} - t_{n, l}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\mathcal{K}_i^n(t, s) := \sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1} K_i^{n, l}(t) \mathbb{1}_{[t_{n, l}, t_{n, l+1})}(s)$  is such that  $\int_0^t (\mathcal{K}_i(t, s) - \mathcal{K}_i^n(t, s))^2 ds \rightarrow 0$ ,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

By the Riesz theorem, there exist  $\Omega'_t \subset \Omega$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega'_t) = 1$ , and a subsequence of partitions that will again be denoted by  $\{\pi^n, n \geq 1\}$  such that for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $\omega \in \Omega'_t$

$$Z_i(\omega, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_i^n(\omega, t). \quad (3.1)$$

Moreover, note that, by the definition of the probability space and Brownian motion  $W$ , for any  $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{2d}) \in \Omega = C_0([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_i^n(\omega, t) &= \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1} K_i^{n, l}(t) (W_j(\omega, t_{n, l+1}) - W_j(\omega, t_{n, l})) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1} K_i^{n, l}(t) (\omega_j(t_{n, l+1}) - \omega_j(t_{n, l})), \end{aligned}$$

whence, for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$Z_i^n(\omega + \varepsilon F, t) = Z_i^n(\omega) + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1} K_i^{n, l}(t) (F_j(t_{n, l+1}) - F_j(t_{n, l}))$$

and thus, for all  $\omega \in \Omega'_t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_i^n(\omega + \varepsilon F, t) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_i^n(\omega) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1} K_i^{n, l}(t) (F_j(t_{n, l+1}) - F_j(t_{n, l})) \\ &= Z_i(\omega, t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Now, denote  $\Omega_{\varepsilon, F, t} := \{\omega \in \Omega'_t : \omega + \varepsilon F \in \Omega'_t\}$ . Then  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\varepsilon, F, t}) = 1$  since, by the Cameron-Martin theorem,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\varepsilon, F, t}) = \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega'_t}(\omega + \varepsilon F) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{1}_{\Omega'_t} \exp \left\{ \varepsilon \mathcal{I}_f - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \|\mathcal{I}_f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right\} \right] = 1,$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_f := \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \int_0^T f_j(s) dW_j(s)$ , and therefore, taking into account (3.1) and (3.2), for any  $\omega \in \Omega_{\varepsilon, F, t}$

$$Z_i(\omega + \varepsilon F, t) = Z_i(\omega, t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds. \quad (3.3)$$

Finally, it remains to notice that, for the fixed  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  and  $F \in \mathcal{H}$ , both left- and right-hand sides of (3.3) are continuous w.r.t.  $t$ , whence we can put

$$\Omega_{\varepsilon, F} := \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, T]} \Omega_{\varepsilon, F, t}.$$

□

Now we are ready to prove the key result of the Subsection. We will use the same approach as in [33, Theorem 3.3] and simply check the conditions of Theorem 3.1.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let Assumptions A and B hold. Then, for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $Y_i(t) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$  and*

$$\begin{aligned} DY_i(t) &= (D^1 Y_i(t), \dots, D^{2d} Y_i(t)) \in L^2(\Omega; L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})), \\ D_u^j Y_i(t) &:= \ell_{d+i, j} \left( \mathcal{K}_i(t, u) + \int_u^t \mathcal{K}_i(s, u) \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}(s, Y_i(s)) e^{\int_s^t \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}(v, Y_i(v)) dv} ds \right) \mathbb{1}_{[0, t]}(u), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

with  $\ell_{d+i, j}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 2d$  being the corresponding elements of the matrix  $\mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* We will split the proof into three steps. First, we verify that  $DY_i(t)$  given by (3.4) indeed satisfies

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2d} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (D_u^j Y_i(t))^2 du < \infty$$

and then check the conditions of Theorem 3.1.

**Step 1: correctness of the form of derivative.** By Remark 2.4, for all  $s \in [0, T]$ :  $(s, Y_i(s)) \in \mathcal{D}^i_{\frac{1}{\xi_i(0)}, \frac{1}{\xi_i(0)}}$ , where

$$\xi_i(0) := \frac{(L_{2,i} + \Lambda_{\lambda,i})^{\alpha_i}}{L_{1,i}}$$

with  $\Lambda_{\lambda,i}$  being defined by (2.3) and  $L_{1,i}$ ,  $L_{2,i}$ ,  $\alpha_i$  being some deterministic positive constants that depend only on  $\lambda \in \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_i+1}, H_i\right)$  and the shape of the drift  $b_i$ . Whence, due to Assumption B(ii),

$$\left| \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}(s, Y_i(s)) \right| \leq c \xi_i^p(0), \quad s \in [0, T].$$

Moreover, by Assumption B(iv),

$$e^{\int_s^t \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}(v, Y_i(v)) dv} \leq e^{cT}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (D_u^j Y_i(t))^2 du &\leq 2\ell_{d+i, j}^2 \int_0^T \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, u) du \\ &\quad + 2Tc^2 e^{2cT} \ell_{d+i, j}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_i^{2p}(0) \right] \int_0^t \int_u^t \mathcal{K}_i^2(s, u) ds du \\ &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

because  $\int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) ds < \infty$  by Assumption A(i) and the random variable  $\xi_i(0)$  has moments of all orders.

**Step 2: ray absolute continuity.** Let  $F \in \mathcal{H}$  be fixed. Then, as explained above, the random process  $\{Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t), \varepsilon \geq 0\}$  defined for every  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  by the equation

$$Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t) = Y_0 + \int_0^t b_i(s, Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(s)) ds + Z_i(t) + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds \quad (3.5)$$

is a version of the process  $\{Y_i(\omega + \varepsilon F, t), \varepsilon \geq 0\}$ . Let us prove that this version is Lipschitz w.r.t.  $\varepsilon$  and hence absolutely continuous. First, fix  $\lambda \in \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_i+1}, H_i\right)$ , where  $H_i$  is from Assumption A(ii) and  $\gamma_i$  is from Assumption B(iii), and take an arbitrary  $\varepsilon^* > 0$ . Then, by Remark 2.3 and Assumption A(ii), for any  $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon^*]$

$$\begin{aligned} & |Z_i(t_1) - Z_i(t_2)| + \varepsilon \left| \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^{t_1} \mathcal{K}_i(t_1, s) f_j(s) ds - \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^{t_2} \mathcal{K}_i(t_2, s) f_j(s) ds \right| \\ & \leq \Lambda_{\lambda, i} |t_1 - t_2|^\lambda + \varepsilon \left( \int_0^{t_1 \vee t_2} (\mathcal{K}_i(t_1, s) - \mathcal{K}_i(t_2, s))^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} f_j \right\|_{L^2([0, T])} \\ & \leq \left( \Lambda_{\lambda, i} + \varepsilon^* C_\lambda \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} f_j \right\|_{L^2([0, T])} \right) |t_1 - t_2|^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, by Remark 2.4, that  $(t, Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t)) \in \mathcal{D}_i^{\frac{1}{\xi_i(\varepsilon^*)}, \frac{1}{\xi_i(\varepsilon^*)}}$  for any  $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon^*]$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_i^{\cdot, \cdot}$  is defined by (2.5) and

$$\xi_i(\varepsilon^*) := \frac{\left( L_{2, i} + \Lambda_{\lambda, i} + \varepsilon^* C_\lambda \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} f_j \right\|_{L^2([0, T])} \right)^{\alpha_i}}{L_{1, i}} \quad (3.6)$$

for some deterministic positive constants  $L_{1, i}$ ,  $L_{2, i}$  and  $\alpha_i$  that depend only on  $\lambda$  and the shape of the drift  $b_i$ . This implies, by Assumption B(ii), that for all  $s \in [0, T]$  and  $0 \leq \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon^*$ ,

$$\left| b_i(s, Y_i^{\varepsilon_2, F}(s)) - b_i(s, Y_i^{\varepsilon_1, F}(s)) \right| \leq c \xi_i^p(\varepsilon^*) \left| Y_i^{\varepsilon_2, F}(s) - Y_i^{\varepsilon_1, F}(s) \right|,$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_i^{\varepsilon_2, F}(t) - Y_i^{\varepsilon_1, F}(t)| & \leq \int_0^t \left| b_i(s, Y_i^{\varepsilon_2, F}(s)) - b_i(s, Y_i^{\varepsilon_1, F}(s)) \right| ds \\ & \quad + |\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1| \left| \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds \right| \\ & \leq c \xi_i^p(\varepsilon^*) \int_0^t \left| Y_i^{\varepsilon_2, F}(s) - Y_i^{\varepsilon_1, F}(s) \right| ds \\ & \quad + |\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1| \left( \int_0^T \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} f_j \right\|_{L^2([0, T])}. \end{aligned}$$

where  $\int_0^T \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) ds < \infty$  by Assumption A(i). Now, it follows from Gronwall's inequality that for all  $0 \leq \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon^*$

$$|Y_i^{\varepsilon_2, F}(t) - Y_i^{\varepsilon_1, F}(t)| \leq \left( \int_0^T \mathcal{K}_i^2(t, s) ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} f_j \right\|_{L^2([0, T])} e^{cT \xi_i^p(\varepsilon^*)} |\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1|,$$

which implies the desired absolute continuity w.r.t.  $\varepsilon$ .

**Step 3: stochastic Gateaux differentiability.** Again, it is sufficient to compute the limit in probability of the form

$$\mathbb{P}\text{-}\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t) - Y_i^{0, F}(t)}{\varepsilon},$$

where  $Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t)$  is defined by (3.5).

Using the mean-value theorem, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t) - Y_i^{0, F}(t) &= \int_0^t (b_i(s, Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(s)) - b_i(s, Y_i^{0, F}(s))) ds \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds \\ &= \int_0^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(s) (Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(s) - Y_i^{0, F}(s)) ds \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds, \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where  $\Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(s) := \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}(s, Y_i^{0, F}(s) + \theta_{i, \varepsilon}(s)(Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(s) - Y_i^{0, F}(s)))$  with  $\theta_{i, \varepsilon}(s)$  being some value between 0 and 1. It is easy to verify that (3.7) implies the representation of the form

$$Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t) - Y_i^{0, F}(t) = \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \int_0^t \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(v) dv \right\} dG_{i, j}(s),$$

where

$$G_{i, j}(t) := \ell_{d+i, j} \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) f_j(s) ds.$$

Note that, just like in Step 1, it follows from Remark 2.4 that for all  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$  and  $s \in [0, T]$  ( $s, Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(s) \in \mathcal{D}^i_{\frac{1}{\xi_i(1)}, \frac{1}{\xi_i(1)}}$ , where  $\xi_i(1)$  is defined via (3.6). This, together with continuity of  $\frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}$  due to Assumption B(iv) and compactness of  $\overline{\mathcal{D}^i_{\frac{1}{\xi_i(1)}, \frac{1}{\xi_i(1)}}$ , implies that there exists a finite positive random variable  $\eta_i$  such that  $|\Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(s)| \leq \eta_i$  for all  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$  and  $s \in [0, T]$ . Moreover, the mapping  $s \mapsto \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(v) dv \right\}$ ,  $s \in [0, t]$ , is Lipschitz and whence the integrals  $\int_0^t \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(v) dv \right\} dG_{i, j}(s)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 2d$ , are well-defined as pathwise limits of Riemann-Stieltjes integral sums due to the classical results of Young ([47, Section 10], see also [28, Chapter 6] for a more recent overview on the subject).

Now, applying the integration by parts formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t) - Y_i^{0, F}(t)}{\varepsilon} &= \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \int_0^t \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(v) dv \right\} dG_{i, j}(s) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \left( G_{i, j}(t) - \int_0^t G_{i, j}(s) d \left( \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(v) dv \right\} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \left( G_{i, j}(t) + \int_0^t G_{i, j}(s) \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(s) \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(v) dv \right\} ds \right), \end{aligned}$$

and, taking into account the definition of  $G_{i, j}$ ,

$$\frac{Y_i^{\varepsilon, F}(t) - Y_i^{0, F}(t)}{\varepsilon} = \sum_{j=1}^{2d} \int_0^T D_{i, j}(\varepsilon, t, u) f_j(u) du$$

with

$$D_{i, j}(\varepsilon, t, u) := \ell_{d+i, j} \left( \mathcal{K}_i(t, u) + \int_u^t \mathcal{K}_i(s, u) \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(s) \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i, \varepsilon}(v) dv \right\} ds \right) \mathbb{1}_{[0, t]}(u).$$

Now, note that for all  $s \in [0, T]$  and  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$

$$|\Theta_{i,\varepsilon}(s)| \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \Theta_{i,\varepsilon}(v) dv \right\} < \eta_i \exp\{cT\},$$

where  $c$  is from Assumption B(iv), and therefore we can apply the dominated convergence theorem to obtain that

$$\frac{Y_i^{\varepsilon,F}(t) - Y_i^{0,F}(t)}{\varepsilon} \rightarrow \langle DY_i(t), f \rangle_{L^2([0,T];\mathbb{R}^{2d})} \quad a.s., \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $DY_i(t)$  has exactly the form (3.4), which finishes the proof.  $\square$

An obvious way to obtain the Malliavin differentiability of the price processes  $(S_1, \dots, S_d)^T$  would be to notice that each  $S_i$  has the form

$$S_i(t) = e^{X_i(t)}, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where  $X_i$  is the log-price process that, due to Theorem 2.6, can be written as

$$X_i(t) := \log S_i(t) = X_i(0) + \int_0^t \left( \mu_i(s) - \frac{Y_i^2(s)}{2} \right) ds + \int_0^t Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s). \quad (3.8)$$

Then, in order to prove that  $S_i(t) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ , one can first establish that  $X_i(t) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$  and then apply an appropriate chain rule. This approach will be implemented in the rest of this Subsection.

We first begin with a version of a chain rule for the Malliavin derivative. Note that classical chain rule results (see e.g. [41, Proposition 1.2.3, Proposition 1.2.4]) require either all partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$  to be bounded (which is not the case for such functions as  $f(x) = x^2$  or  $f(x) = e^x$ ) or the law of  $\eta$  to be absolutely continuous (which we have not established yet for the log-price  $X_i(t)$ ). Note that our version of the chain rule is essentially based on [42, Lemma A.1], but proof of the latter contains a mistake in the argument. For reader's convenience, we give our own proof where the mentioned inaccuracy is treated.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k) \in (\mathbb{D}^{1,2})^k$  and  $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^k; \mathbb{R})$  be a real-valued function such that*

- 1) *if  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$  is unbounded, then there exist sequences  $\{r_n, n \geq 1\}$ ,  $\{s_{j,n}, n \geq 1\}$ ,  $r_n, s_{j,n} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , such that*

$$\left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \right| \geq s_{j,n}$$

*implies that  $|f(x_1, \dots, x_k)| \geq r_n$ ;*

- 2)  $\mathbb{E} \left[ |f(\eta)|^2 + \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(\eta) D\eta_j \right\|_{L^2([0,T];\mathbb{R}^{2d})}^2 \right] < \infty.$

*Then  $f(\eta) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$  and  $Df(\eta) = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(\eta) D\eta_j.$*

*Proof.* According to [41, Proposition 1.2.3], if all partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$  are bounded, then the claim of our Proposition is true and the chain rule holds. For the general case, let  $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  be compactly supported function such that  $\phi(x) = x$  whenever  $|x| \leq 1$  and  $|\phi(x)| \leq |x|$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

For any  $m \geq 1$  define  $f_m(x) := m\phi\left(\frac{f(x)}{m}\right)$  and observe that  $f_m$  has bounded partial derivatives. Indeed, if  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$  is bounded, so is  $\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_j}$ . Otherwise, let  $n^*$  be such that  $\frac{r_{n^*}}{m} > \max\{-\inf \text{supp } \phi, \sup \text{supp } \phi\}$ . Then, for all  $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$  such that  $|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(x_1, \dots, x_k)| \geq s_{j,n^*}$ , it holds that  $\frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_k)}{m} \notin \text{supp } \phi$  and therefore

$$\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_j}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \phi' \left( \frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_k)}{m} \right) = 0.$$

Whence

$$\left| \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_j}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \right| = \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \right| \left| \phi' \left( \frac{f(x_1, \dots, x_k)}{m} \right) \right| \leq s_{j,n^*} \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\phi'(z)|.$$

Note that  $|f_m(\eta)| \leq |f(\eta)|$  for all  $m \geq 1$  and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_m(\eta) = f(\eta)$  a.s. Moreover,

$$|Df_m(\eta)| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial x_j}(\eta) D\eta_j \right| \leq \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\phi'(z)| \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(\eta) D\eta_j \right|$$

for all  $m \geq 1$  and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} Df_m(\eta) = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(\eta) D\eta_j \quad a.s.$$

Therefore, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ |f_m(\eta) - f(\eta)|^2 + \left\| Df_m(\eta) - \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(\eta) D\eta_j \right\|_{L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})}^2 \right] = 0,$$

and the result follows by closedness of the operator  $D$ .  $\square$

Now we can get the following simple corollary.

**Corollary 3.5.** *For any  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $X_i(t) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$  and its Malliavin derivative  $DX_i(t) = (D^1 X_i(t), \dots, D^{2d} X_i(t))$  has the form*

$$D_u^j X_i(t) = \left( - \int_0^t Y_i(s) D_u^j Y_i(s) ds + \ell_{i,j} Y_i(u) + \int_0^t D_u^j Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right) \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(u).$$

*Proof.* 1) First, note that if  $u > t$ , then the claim is true due to [41, Corollary 1.2.1]. Let now  $u \leq t$ . By the definition of the Malliavin derivative,

$$D_u^j \left[ \int_0^t \mu_i(s) ds \right] = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Next, note that for any  $s \in [0, T]$   $Y_i^2(s) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ . Indeed, by Proposition 3.4, it is sufficient to check that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ Y_i^2(s) + \|Y_i(s) DY_i(s)\|_{L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{2d})}^2 \right] < \infty$$

which is true since  $Y_i(s)$  is bounded. Whence  $\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t D_u Y_i^2(s) ds = \int_0^t Y_i(s) D_u^j Y_i(s) ds$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 2d$ , these integrals are well defined and so, using the chain rule and closedness of the operator  $D$ , we can write (see e.g. [46, Theorem 1.2.2])

$$D_u^j \left[ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t Y_i^2(s) ds \right] = \int_0^t Y_i(s) D_u^j Y_i(s) ds, \quad j = 1, \dots, 2d. \quad (3.10)$$

Finally, by adaptedness and boundedness of  $Y_i$  and [41, Proposition 1.3.2],

$$\begin{aligned} D_u^j \left[ \int_0^t Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right] &= D_u^j \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{2d} \int_0^t \ell_{i,k} Y_i(s) dW_k(s) \right] \\ &= \ell_{i,j} Y_i(u) + \sum_{k=1}^{2d} \ell_{i,k} \int_0^t D_u^j Y_i(s) dW_k(s) \\ &= \ell_{i,j} Y_i(u) + \int_0^t D_u^j Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

as required.  $\square$



### 3.2 Malliavin differentiability w.r.t. the transformed Brownian motion. Absolute continuity of probability laws

In order to proceed, we will require absolute continuity of the law of  $X_i(t)$  w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure. It is well known (see e.g. [41, Chapter 2]) that a sufficient condition for that is

$$\|D.X_i(t)\|_{L^2([0,T];\mathbb{R}^{2d})} > 0 \quad a.s., \quad (3.12)$$

thus it would be sufficient to check (3.12). However, the form of  $DX_i(t)$  obtained in Subsection 3.1 is not very convenient for this matter. In order to get the desired properties, we will transform the original Brownian motion  $W$  and consider the Malliavin derivative w.r.t. this transformation.

Namely, recall that  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_{2d})^T$  is a  $2d$ -dimensional Gaussian process and

$$B(t) = \begin{pmatrix} B^S(t) \\ B^Y(t) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{L}W(t),$$

where by  $B^S = (B_1^S, \dots, B_d^S)^T$  and  $B^Y = (B_1^Y, \dots, B_d^Y)^T$  we denote the first and the last  $d$  components of  $B$  correspondingly and  $\mathcal{L} = (\ell_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{2d}$  is a lower-triangular matrix such that  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}^T = \Sigma = (\sigma_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{2d}$ . Now, define  $\mathcal{U} = (u_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{2d}$  an upper  $2d \times 2d$ -triangular matrix with positive values on the diagonal such that

$$\widetilde{W} := \mathcal{U}^{-1}B = \mathcal{U}^{-1}\mathcal{L}W$$

is a  $2d$ -dimensional Brownian motion. Let now  $\widetilde{D} = (\widetilde{D}^1, \dots, \widetilde{D}^{2d})$  be the Malliavin derivative with respect to the new Brownian motion  $\widetilde{W}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}^{1,2}$  be its domain. Clearly, the matrix  $\mathcal{U}^{-1}\mathcal{L}$  is non-degenerate and hence  $W$  and  $\widetilde{W}$  generate the same filtration  $\mathbb{F}$  and, moreover, it is easy to see that  $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}^{1,2}$ . Finally, by construction,  $\widetilde{W}_1$  is independent of the processes  $B_2^S, \dots, B_d^S, B_1^Y, \dots, B_d^Y$  coincides with  $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$  and therefore the following result holds.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let Assumptions A and B hold. Then, for any  $t \in (0, T]$ ,*

$$\widetilde{D}_v^1 X_i(t) = \begin{cases} u_{1,1} Y_1(v) \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(v), & \text{if } i = 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \neq 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\widetilde{D}_v^1 S_i(t) = \begin{cases} u_{1,1} S_1(t) Y_1(v) \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(v), & \text{if } i = 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \neq 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $u_{1,1}$  is the upper left element of  $\mathcal{U}$ . In particular,

$$\|\widetilde{D}.X_1(t)\|_{L^2([0,T];\mathbb{R}^{2d})} > 0 \quad a.s.$$

*Proof.* The expression for  $\widetilde{D}^1 X_i(t)$  is obtained straightforwardly by differentiating the right-hand side of (3.8) and taking into account that

$$B_1^S(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{2d} u_{1,k} \widetilde{W}_k(t)$$

and  $\widetilde{D}^1 Y_i(t) = 0$  due to independence of  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $B_i^Y$ . The expression for  $\widetilde{D}^1 S_i(t)$  can be easily obtained using the chain rule from Proposition 3.4.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.** *For each  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $t \in (0, T]$ , the law of  $X_i(t)$  (and therefore of  $S_i(t) = e^{X_i(t)}$ ) has continuous and bounded density.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.6,

$$\|\widetilde{D}.X_1(t)\|_{L^2([0,T];\mathbb{R}^{2d})} > 0 \quad a.s.$$

and, moreover,  $\widetilde{D}X_1(t)$  is adapted to the filtration generated by  $\widetilde{B}^i$ . Thus the result for  $X_1(t)$  follows from e.g. [41, Proposition 2.1.1]. The existence of the density for  $X_i(t)$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, d$ , can be obtained in the same manner by interchanging the order of indices.  $\square$

As we can see, each of  $X_i(t)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. However, in what follows we will require a stronger result, namely the existence of the joint density of  $X(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_d(t))$ .

**Theorem 3.8.** *For all  $t \in (0, T]$ , the law of the random vector  $X(t)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .*

*Proof.* We will follow the approach developed in [1, Theorem 5.3] for the standard Brownian Heston model. Namely, we will check that for any  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$  such that  $f$  and all its partial derivatives are bounded the following relation holds:

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(X(t)) \right] \right| \leq c_i \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)|, \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then the result will follow from [41, Lemma 2.1.1].

Note that, by applying sequentially the chain rule for the Malliavin derivative and the duality relationship between Malliavin derivative and the Skorokhod integral, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(X(t)) \right] \right| &= \frac{1}{t} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(X(t)) \tilde{D}_u^1 X_1(t) \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_u^1 X_1(t)} du \right] \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \tilde{D}_u^1 [f(X(t))] \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_u^1 X_1(t)} du \right] \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ f(X(t)) \int_0^t \frac{1}{u_{1,1} Y_1(u)} d\tilde{W}_1(u) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{tu_{1,1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{Y_i(u)} d\tilde{W}_1(u) \right| \right] \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| \\ &=: c_1 \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the required property holds for  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(X(t))$ . As for  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(X(t))$  with  $i = 2, \dots, d$ , one can reorder the elements of  $B$  so that by swapping  $B_i$  is the first one and then apply the same arguments.  $\square$

## 4 Smoothing the payoff functional by Malliavin integration by parts

In the remaining part of the paper, we will apply the results of Section 3 to numerical computation of prices of options with discontinuous payoff. We will utilize the quadrature technique via Malliavin integration by parts proposed initially in [1] and adapted to fBm-driven stochastic volatility in [10, 40]. The idea of the method is as follows: using the Malliavin calculus techniques, one can replace the discontinuous functional  $f$  under the expectation with a locally Lipschitz one and the latter expression is far more convenient for numerical algorithms and guarantees a better convergence rate. In this Section, we explain this smoothing technique whereas the numerical algorithm and the corresponding convergence results will be provided in Section 5. Note that in the papers [1, 10, 40] mentioned above  $\mathbb{E}f(S_1(T), \dots, S_d(T))$  is computed w.r.t. the physical measure and not the martingale one, i.e. the numerical algorithms described there concern the *expected payoff* rather than the *option price*. However, it is possible to modify the method to account for a measure change and we explain this modification in Subsection 4.3.

### 4.1 One-dimensional case

We start from a simpler case when  $d = 1$ , i.e. the VSV-model has the form

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) &= S(0) + \int_0^t \mu(s) S(s) ds + \int_0^t Y(s) S(s) dW_1(s), \\ Y(t) &= Y(0) + \int_0^t b(s, Y(s)) ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t, s) (\ell_{2,1} dW_1(s) + \ell_{2,2} dW_2(s)), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_1$  satisfies Assumption A with  $H_i = H$ ,  $b = b_1$  satisfies Assumption B,  $\mu = \mu_1$  is an arbitrary  $H$ -Hölder continuous function and  $\mathcal{L} = (\ell_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^2$  is such that  $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{L}^T = \Sigma = (\sigma_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^2$ . Using the transformation from Subsection 3.2, one can rewrite (4.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) &= S(0) + \int_0^t \mu(s)S(s)ds + \int_0^t Y(s)S(s) \left( u_{1,1}d\widetilde{W}_1(s) + u_{1,2}d\widetilde{W}_2(s) \right), \\ Y(t) &= Y(0) + \int_0^t b(s, Y(s))ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t, s)d\widetilde{W}_2(s), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\widetilde{W} = (\widetilde{W}_1, \widetilde{W}_2)$  is a 2-dimensional Brownian motion such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{1,1} & u_{1,2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{W}_1 \\ \widetilde{W}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1^S \\ B_1^Y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \ell_{2,1} & \ell_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let now  $f$  be a measurable payoff function that satisfies the following assumption.

**Assumption C.** Function  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is locally Riemann integrable function (not necessarily continuous) of polynomial growth, i.e. there exist constants  $q > 0$  and  $c_f > 0$  such that

$$|f(s)| \leq c_f(1 + |s|^q), \quad s > 0.$$

Denote now  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u)du$ ,  $g(x) := f(e^x)$ ,  $G(x) := F(1) + \int_0^x g(v)dv$ , i.e.  $f(S(T)) = g(X(T))$ , where  $X(t) := \log S(t)$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ . By Theorem 3.6,  $X(t) \in \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_{1,2}$  with

$$\widetilde{D}_v^1 X(t) = u_{1,1}Y(v)\mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}(v)$$

and, by Theorem 3.8,  $X(t)$  has density. Thus one can use Proposition 1.2.4 from [41] and remark after it to claim that

$$\widetilde{D}_v^1 G(X(t)) = g(X(t))\widetilde{D}_v^1 X(t), \quad t \in (0, T],$$

if  $G$  turns out to be globally Lipschitz continuous. However, we will require the Malliavin chain rule for  $G(X(T))$  in the setting provided by Assumption C, i.e. when  $G$  is only *locally* Lipschitz continuous. To do this, we will extend [41, Proposition 1.2.4] in a manner similar to [10, Remark 9].

**Proposition 4.1.** For  $G$  defined above and any  $t \in (0, T]$ ,  $G(X(t)) \in \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_{1,2}$  and

$$\widetilde{D}G(X(t)) = g(X(t))\widetilde{D}X(t), \quad t \in (0, T]. \quad (4.3)$$

*Proof.* For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote

$$g_n(x) := g(x)\mathbb{1}_{[-n,n]}(x)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(x) &:= F(1) + \int_0^x g_n(v)dv \\ &= G(x)\mathbb{1}_{[-n,n]}(x) + G(n)\mathbb{1}_{[n,\infty)}(x) + G(-n)\mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, -n]}(x). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that  $G_n$  is globally Lipschitz and thus  $G_n(X(t)) \in \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_{1,2}$  and

$$\widetilde{D}G_n(X(t)) = g_n(X(t))\widetilde{D}X(t).$$

Thus, taking into account the closedness of the operator  $\widetilde{D}$ , it is sufficient to check that

$$g_n(X(t)) \xrightarrow{L^2(\Omega)} g(X(t)), \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$g_n(X(t))\widetilde{D}X(t) \xrightarrow{L^2(\Omega; L^2([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^2))} g(X(t))\widetilde{D}X(t), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.5)$$

Observe that  $g_n(X(t)) \rightarrow g(X(t))$  a.s.,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . By Assumption C,  $f$  is of polynomial growth and thus, by Theorem 2.6,  $\mathbb{E}f^2(S(t)) = \mathbb{E}g^2(X(t)) < \infty$  and (4.4) follows from the dominated convergence theorem.

Finally, using polynomial growth of  $f$ , explicit shape of  $\tilde{D}X(t)$  given by Theorem 3.6 as well as estimates similar to the ones from Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 3.3, one can deduce that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ g^2(X(t)) \int_0^T (\tilde{D}_u^i X(t))^2 du \right] < \infty,$$

and therefore (4.5) also holds due to dominated convergence.  $\square$

Now, having Proposition 4.1, we are ready to proceed to the main result of this Subsection in the spirit of [1, Theorem 4.2] or [10, Lemma 11].

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $S(T)$  be given by (4.2),  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption C,  $X(t) := \log S(t)$ ,  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u)du$ ,  $g(x) := f(e^x)$ ,  $G(x) := F(1) + \int_0^x g(v)dv$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E}f(S(T)) = \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ G(X(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\tilde{W}_1(u) \right]. \quad (4.6)$$

Alternatively,

$$\mathbb{E}f(S(T)) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\tilde{W}_1(u) \right) \right]. \quad (4.7)$$

*Proof.* In order to obtain representation (4.6), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}f(S(T)) &= \mathbb{E}g(X(T)) = \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T g(X(T)) \tilde{D}_u^1 X(T) \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_u^1 X(T)} du \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \tilde{D}_u^1 G(X(T)) \frac{1}{Y(u)} du \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ G(X(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\tilde{W}_1(u) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the chain rule from Proposition 4.1 and duality relation between the Malliavin derivative and Skorokhod integral (which coincides in our case with the Itô integral).

As for the representation (4.7), note that

$$G(x) = F(1) + \int_0^x f(e^v) e^v \frac{1}{e^v} dv = \frac{F(e^x)}{e^x} + \int_0^x \frac{F(e^v)}{e^v} dv.$$

Moreover, using the same argument as in Proposition 4.1, it is easy to prove that

$$\tilde{D}^1 \int_0^{X(T)} \frac{F(e^v)}{e^v} dv = \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \tilde{D}^1 X(T),$$

therefore, again by the Malliavin duality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{X(T)} \frac{F(e^v)}{e^v} dv \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\tilde{W}_1(u) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{D}_u^1 \int_0^{X(T)} \frac{F(e^v)}{e^v} dv \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \frac{1}{Y(u)} du \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \tilde{D}_u^1 X(T) \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_u^1 X(T)} du \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.7).  $\square$

## 4.2 Multidimensional case

The approach described in Subsection 4.1 can also be utilized for basked options in  $d$ -dimensional VSV models. Namely, consider a  $d$ -dimensional volatility process  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$ , where each  $Y_i$  is defined by (2.6), a  $d$ -dimensional price process  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_d)$  given by (2.8) and the corresponding log-price process  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ ,  $X_i = \log S_i$ .

Consider now a basket option with a payoff  $f\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T)\right)$  with  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying Assumption C and  $\alpha_i > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . As before, define  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u)du$  and observe that the function

$$G_1(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \frac{F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x_i}\right)}{\alpha_1 e^{x_1}}, \quad (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

is locally Lipschitz continuous: if  $\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x_i} > \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x'_i}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} |G_1(x_1, \dots, x_d) - G_1(x'_1, \dots, x'_d)| &\leq \frac{e^{-x_1}}{\alpha_1} \int_{\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x'_i}}^{\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x_i}} |f(s)| ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \int_0^{\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x'_i}} |f(s)| ds |e^{-x_1} - e^{-x'_1}| \\ &\leq c_f \frac{e^{-x_1}}{\alpha_1} \left(1 + \left|\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x_i}\right|^q\right) \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j e^{x_j \vee x'_j} |x_j - x'_j| \\ &\quad + c_f \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x'_i} + \frac{1}{q+1} \left|\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x'_i}\right|^{q+1}\right) e^{-(x_1 \wedge x'_1)} |x_1 - x'_1|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that polynomial growth of  $f$  (and hence  $F$ ) together with Theorem 2.6 imply that random variables  $F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T)\right)$  and  $G_1(X_1(T), \dots, X_d(T))$  have moments of all orders. Moreover, Theorem 3.8 implies that the law of  $X$  (and hence of  $S$ ) is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Therefore, by approximating  $G_1(X(t))$  with Lipschitz functions just like in Proposition 4.1, it is straightforward to get the following chain rule for  $G_1(X(t))$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** For  $G_1$  defined above and any  $t \in (0, T]$ ,  $G_1(X(t)) \in \tilde{\mathbb{D}}_{1,2}$  and

$$\tilde{D}G_1(X(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial G_1(X(t))}{\partial x_i} \tilde{D}X_i(t), \quad t \in (0, T]. \quad (4.8)$$

We are now ready to formulate an analogue of Theorem 4.2 for the basket option.

**Theorem 4.4.** Let  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_d)$  be given by (2.8),  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  be the corresponding log-price process,  $X_i = \log S_i$ ,  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption C,  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u)du$  and  $\alpha_i > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}f\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T)\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T)\right)}{\alpha_1 S_1(T)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{T u_{1,1}} \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(u)} d\tilde{W}_1(u)\right)\right]. \quad (4.9)$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\frac{\partial G_1(x_1, \dots, x_d)}{\partial x_1} = f\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x_i}\right) - \frac{1}{\alpha_1 e^{x_1}} F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x_i}\right)$$

hence, taking into account Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 3.6,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T)\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left(f\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{X_i(T)}\right) - \frac{1}{\alpha_1 e^{X_1(T)}} F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{X_i(T)}\right)\right) dv\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha_1 e^{X_1(T)}} F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{X_i(T)} \right) \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{\partial G_1(X(T))}{\partial x_1} dv \right] + \mathbb{E} [G_1(X(T))] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{\partial G_1(X(T))}{\partial x_1} \tilde{D}_v^1 X_1(T) \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_v^1 X_1(T)} dv \right] + \mathbb{E} [G_1(X(T))] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \tilde{D}_v^1 G_1(X(T)) \frac{1}{u_{1,1} Y_1(v)} dv \right] + \mathbb{E} [G_1(X(T))] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T u_{1,1}} G_1(X(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} d\tilde{W}_1(v) \right] + \mathbb{E} [G_1(X(T))] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right)}{\alpha_1 S_1(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{T u_{1,1}} \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} d\tilde{W}_1(v) \right) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

### 4.3 Quadrature via Malliavin integration under a change of measure

Theorems 4.2 and 4.4 concern the expectation w.r.t. the physical measure, i.e. the obtained representation of the expected payoff is not the option price. In this Section, we will modify the quadrature technique to account for a measure change.

Consider a martingale measure with the density

$$\mathcal{E}_T := \mathcal{E}_T \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^T \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) \right\}, \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\ell_{j,k}^{(-1)}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_k(s)$  are given in Subsection 2.2.

**Remark 4.5.** *In the literature, the measure with the density (4.10) is commonly referred to as the minimal martingale measure, see e.g. [44].*

Recall that

$$W = \mathcal{L}^{-1} \mathcal{U} \tilde{W},$$

so denote  $\rho_{j,i}$  the values such that

$$W_j(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \rho_{j,i} \tilde{W}_i(t),$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_T & = \mathcal{E}_T \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \int_0^T \rho_{j,i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) d\tilde{W}_i(s) \right\} \\
& = \mathcal{E}_T \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \int_0^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{j,i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) \right) d\tilde{W}_i(s) \right\} \\
& = \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \int_0^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{j,i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) \right) d\tilde{W}_i(s) \right\} \times \\
& \quad \times \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \int_0^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{j,i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) \right)^2 ds \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that each  $Y_i$  is bounded away from zero by  $\varphi_i^* := \min_{t \in [0, T]} \varphi_i(t)$  and hence  $\frac{1}{Y_i(s)}$  can be represented as follows:

$$\frac{1}{Y_i(s)} = h_i(Y_i(s)), \quad h_i(y) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{y}, & y > \varphi_i^*, \\ -\frac{1}{(\varphi_i^*)^2}y + \frac{2}{\varphi_i^*}, & y \leq \varphi_i^*. \end{cases}$$

The function  $h_i$  is bounded, continuously differentiable and has bounded derivative, hence by the classical chain rule  $\frac{1}{Y_i(s)} \in \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_{1,2}$  and

$$\widetilde{D}^1 \left[ \frac{1}{Y_i(s)} \right] = 0.$$

In particular, this implies that

$$\widetilde{D}_v^1 \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2d} \int_0^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{j,i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) \right)^2 ds \right] = 0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \widetilde{D}_v^1 \left[ -\sum_{i=1}^{2d} \int_0^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{j,i} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) \right) d\widetilde{W}_i(s) \right] \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d \rho_{j,1} \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v)} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^d \left( -\sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{j,1} \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \right) \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v)} \\ &=: \sum_{k=1}^d \beta_k \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta_k := \left( -\sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{j,1} \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \right)$ . Furthermore, using the boundedness of  $Y$  and the chain rule from Proposition 3.4, it is easy to establish that  $\mathcal{E}_T \in \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_{1,2}$  and

$$\widetilde{D}_v^1 \mathcal{E}_T = \mathcal{E}_T \sum_{k=1}^d \beta_k \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v)}.$$

Let now  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption C,  $\alpha_i > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then the following modification of Theorem 4.4 is true.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_d)$  be given by (2.8),  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  be the corresponding log-price process,  $X_i = \log S_i$ ,  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption C,  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u)du$  and  $\alpha_i > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right)}{\alpha_1 S_1(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{T u_{1,1}} \left( \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} d\widetilde{W}_1(v) - \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \beta_k \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v) Y_1(v)} dv \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

*Proof.* Denote

$$G_1(x_1, \dots, x_d) := \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{x_i} \right)}{\alpha_1 e^{x_1}}, \quad (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Using polynomial growth of  $f$ , boundedness of  $Y_i$ , existence of all moments of  $S_i$  and Proposition 3.4, it is easy to prove that

$$\mathcal{E}_T G_1(X(T)) \in \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}_{1,2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{D}_v^1 [\mathcal{E}_T G_1(X(T))] &= \mathcal{E}_T \tilde{D}_v^1 G_1(X(T)) + G_1(X(T)) \tilde{D}_v^1 \mathcal{E}_T \\ &= \mathcal{E}_T \tilde{D}_v^1 G_1(X(T)) + \mathcal{E}_T G_1(X(T)) \sum_{k=1}^d \beta_k \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v)}.\end{aligned}$$

Next, observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T \left( f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{X_i(T)} \right) - G_1(X(T)) \right) \right] + \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_T G_1(X(T))]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T \left( f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i e^{X_i(T)} \right) - G_1(X(T)) \right) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T \frac{\partial G_1(X(T))}{\partial x_1} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathcal{E}_T \frac{\partial G_1(X(T))}{\partial x_1} \tilde{D}_v^1 X_1(T) \frac{1}{\tilde{D}_v^1 X_1(T)} dv \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \int_0^T \mathcal{E}_T \tilde{D}_v^1 G_1(X(T)) \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} dv \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \tilde{D}_v^1 [\mathcal{E}_T G_1(X(T))] \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} dv \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T G_1(X(T)) \tilde{D}_v^1 \mathcal{E}_T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} dv \right] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T G_1(X(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} d\tilde{W}_1(v) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ G_1(X(T)) \mathcal{E}_T \int_0^T \sum_{k=1}^d \beta_k \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v) Y_1(v)} dv \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right)}{\alpha_1 S_1(T)} \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \left( \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} d\tilde{W}_1(v) - \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \beta_k \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v) Y_1(v)} dv \right) \right].\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account all of the above, we can finally write:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right)}{\alpha_1 S_1(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \left( \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} d\tilde{W}_1(v) - \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \beta_k \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v) Y_1(v)} dv \right) \right) \right]\end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** Note that the martingale measure should not necessarily be the minimal one: it is possible to obtain a representation of the type (4.11) for other martingale measures provided that the corresponding densities are Malliavin differentiable and one can use the chain rules as in the proof of Theorem 4.6.

## 5 Approximation of the expected value of an option with discontinuous payoff

In this Section, we provide a numerical algorithm for computation of  $\mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right) \right]$ . We will exploit the representations obtained in Theorems 4.2, 4.4 and 4.6: absence of discontinuities under the expectation sign allows to avoid deterioration of the convergence speed.

The Section is structured as follows. In Subsection 5.1, we describe the numerical scheme used to simulate  $Y$ ,  $X$  and  $S$  (the corresponding numerical approximations will be denoted by  $\hat{Y}$ ,  $\hat{X}$  and  $\hat{S}$ ). In Subsection 5.2, we consider a straightforward way of computing  $\mathbb{E} \left[ f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right) \right]$  by plugging in  $\hat{Y}$



and  $\widehat{S}$  into (4.6)–(4.7), (4.9) or (4.11). An estimate of the approximation error is provided. In Subsection 5.3, we discuss another algorithm for computation of the expectation for a one-dimensional case: the vector  $\left(X(T), \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(v)} dv\right)^T$  turns out to be conditionally Gaussian w.r.t. an appropriate  $\sigma$ -field and one can use this fact to approximate (4.6) without simulating  $\widehat{X}(T)$  at all.

## 5.1 Numerical schemes

**Numerical scheme for the volatility process.** For the stochastic volatility processes  $Y_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , we will use the *drift-implicit* Euler scheme described in [22]. For reader's convenience, we briefly describe it below as well as give the necessary convergence results.

Let  $\{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$  be a uniform partition of  $[0, T]$ ,  $t_k := \frac{Tk}{N}$ ,  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ , with the mesh  $\Delta_N := \frac{T}{N}$  such that

$$\Delta_N \max_{i=1, \dots, d} \sup_{(t, y) \in \mathcal{D}_{0,0}^i} \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial y}(t, y) < 1. \quad (5.1)$$

**Remark 5.1.** Note that such  $\Delta_N$  exists due to Assumption B(iv).

Define  $\widehat{Y}_i(t)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Y}_i(0) &= Y_i(0), \\ \widehat{Y}_i(t_{k+1}) &= \widehat{Y}_i(t_k) + b_i(t_{k+1}, \widehat{Y}_i(t_{k+1}))\Delta_N + (Z_i(t_{k+1}) - Z_i(t_k)), \\ \widehat{Y}_i(t) &= \widehat{Y}_i(t_k), \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where  $Z_i(t) := \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_i(t, s) dB_i^Y(s)$ . Note that the second expression in (5.2) is considered as an equation with respect to  $\widehat{Y}_i(t_{k+1})$  and, under Assumption B, it has a unique solution such that  $\widehat{Y}_i(t_{k+1}) \in (\varphi_i(t_{k+1}), \psi_i(t_{k+1}))$ , see [22, Section 2] for more details. The convergence results from [22] for this scheme are summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.2.** Let Assumptions A and B hold and the mesh of the partition  $\Delta_N$  satisfy (5.1). Fix  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , take an arbitrary  $\lambda_i \in (0, H_i)$ , where  $H_i$  is from Assumption A, and fix  $r \geq 1$ . Then there exists a constant  $C > 0$  that does not depend on the partition such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_i(t) - \widehat{Y}_i(t)|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{\lambda_i r}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \frac{1}{Y_i(t)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_i(t)} \right|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{\lambda_i r}.$$

**Numerical scheme for the price process.** Recall that the log-price  $X_i$  has the form

$$X_i(t) = X_i(0) + \int_0^t \left( \mu_i(s) - \frac{Y_i^2(s)}{2} \right) ds + \int_0^t Y_i(s) dB_i^S(s),$$

where  $\mu_i$  is  $H_i$ -Hölder continuous with  $H_i$  being from Assumption A(ii). For a given uniform partition  $\{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$  satisfying (5.1), consider the random process  $\widehat{X}_i = \{\widehat{X}_i(t), t \in [0, T]\}$  such that for any point  $t_n$  of the partition

$$\widehat{X}_i(t_n) = X_i(0) + \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left( \mu_i(t_k) - \frac{\widehat{Y}_i^2(t_k)}{2} \right) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \widehat{Y}_i(t_k) (B_i^S(t_{k+1}) - B_i^S(t_k)),$$

where  $\widehat{Y}_i$  is defined by (5.2), and for any  $t \in (t_n, t_{n+1})$

$$\widehat{X}_i(t) = \widehat{X}_i(t_n).$$

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let Assumptions A and B hold and the mesh of the partition  $\Delta_N$  satisfy (5.1). Fix  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , take an arbitrary  $\lambda_i \in (0, H_i)$ , where  $H_i$  is from Assumption A, and fix  $r \geq 1$ . Then there exists a constant  $C > 0$  that does not depend on the partition such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{n=0,1,\dots,N} |X_i(t_n) - \widehat{X}_i(t_n)|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i}.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |X_i(T) - \widehat{X}_i(T)|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i}.$$

*Proof.* Observe that for any  $n = 1, \dots, N$

$$\begin{aligned} |X(t_n) - \widehat{X}(t_n)|^r &\leq C \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |\mu_i(s) - \mu_i(t_k)| ds \right)^r + C \left( \int_0^{t_n} |Y_i^2(s) - \widehat{Y}_i^2(s)| ds \right)^r \\ &\quad + C \left| \int_0^{t_n} (Y_i(s) - \widehat{Y}_i(s)) dB_i^S(s) \right|^r \\ &\leq C \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |s - t_k|^{\lambda_i} ds \right)^r + C \left( \int_0^T |Y_i(s) + \widehat{Y}_i(s)| |Y_i(s) - \widehat{Y}_i(s)| ds \right)^r \\ &\quad + C \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t (Y_i(s) - \widehat{Y}_i(s)) dB_i^S(s) \right| \right)^r \\ &\leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i} + C \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_i(t) - \widehat{Y}_i(t)|^r + C \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t (Y_i(s) - \widehat{Y}_i(s)) dB_i^S(s) \right| \right)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Theorem 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_n |X(t_n) - \widehat{X}(t_n)|^r \right] &\leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i} + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_i(t) - \widehat{Y}_i(t)|^r \right] \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t (Y_i(s) - \widehat{Y}_i(s)) dB_i^S(s) \right| \right)^r \right] \\ &\leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i} + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T (Y_i(s) - \widehat{Y}_i(s))^2 ds \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, denote

$$\widehat{S}_i(t) := e^{\widehat{X}_i(t)}.$$

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let Assumptions A and B hold and the mesh of the partition  $\Delta_N$  satisfy (5.1). Then, for any  $r \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n=0,1,\dots,N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{S}_i^r(t_n) \right] < \infty.$$

*Proof.* Since both  $\mu_i$  and  $\widehat{Y}_i$  are bounded and the bound does not depend on the partition, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n=0,1,\dots,N} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ r \int_0^{t_n} \widehat{Y}_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right\} \right] < \infty.$$

Consider a stochastic process

$$\exp \left\{ r \int_0^t \widehat{Y}_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right\}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Then, since  $\widehat{Y}_i$  is bounded, Novikov's condition implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r \widehat{Y}_i(s) dB_i^S(s) - \frac{r^2}{2} \int_0^t \widehat{Y}_i^2(s) ds \right\} \right] = 1$$

and hence there exist a constant  $C$  that does not depend on the partition such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ r \int_0^t \widehat{Y}_i(s) dB_i^S(s) \right\} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ r \int_0^t \widehat{Y}_i(s) dB_i^S(s) - \frac{r^2}{2} \int_0^t \widehat{Y}_i^2(s) ds \right\} \exp \left\{ \frac{r^2}{2} \int_0^t \widehat{Y}_i^2(s) ds \right\} \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r \widehat{Y}_i(s) dB_i^S(s) - \frac{r^2}{2} \int_0^t \widehat{Y}_i^2(s) ds \right\} \right] = C < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the required result.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let Assumptions A and B hold and the mesh of the partition  $\Delta_N$  satisfy (5.1). Fix  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , take an arbitrary  $\lambda_i \in (0, H_i)$ , where  $H_i$  is from Assumption A, and fix  $r \geq 1$ . Then there exists a constant  $C > 0$  that does not depend on the partition such that*

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n=0,1,\dots,N} \mathbb{E} \left[ |S_i(t_n) - \widehat{S}_i(t_n)|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i}.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |S_i(T) - \widehat{S}_i(T)|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$ , we use Theorem 2.6, Proposition 5.4 and Theorem 5.3 to write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ |S_i(t_n) - \widehat{S}_i(t_n)|^r \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ |e^{X_i(t_n)} - e^{\widehat{X}_i(t_n)}|^r \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e^{X_i(t_n)} + e^{\widehat{X}_i(t_n)} \right)^r |X_i(t_n) - \widehat{X}_i(t_n)|^r \right] \\ &\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e^{X_i(t_n)} + e^{\widehat{X}_i(t_n)} \right)^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_i(t_n) - \widehat{X}_i(t_n)|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2rX_i(t_n)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2r\widehat{X}_i(t_n)} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_i(t_n) - \widehat{X}_i(t_n)|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda_i}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  does not depend on the partition, which implies the required result.  $\square$

**Approximation of the martingale density.** In order to get an approximation of option price (i.e. under the change of measure), we need a result concerning approximation of the corresponding density. Let  $\mathcal{E}_T$  be the minimal martingale measure defined by (4.10). Fix a uniform partition  $\{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$ ,  $t_n = \frac{Tn}{N}$ , with the mesh satisfying (5.1) and put

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T := \exp \left\{ - \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(t_n)}{\widehat{Y}_k(t_n)} \right) (W_j(t_{n+1}) - W_j(t_n)) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{T}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(t_n)}{\widehat{Y}_k(t_n)} \right)^2 \right\}. \quad (5.3)$$

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let Assumptions A and B hold and the mesh of the partition  $\Delta_N$  satisfy (5.1). Let also  $\lambda < \min_{i=1,\dots,d} H_i$  with  $H_i$  being from Assumption A. Then, for any  $r \geq 1$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$  that does not depend on the partition such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathcal{E}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is straightforward, so we will provide an outline omitting all the details.

First, observe that for every  $j = 1, \dots, d$ , using boundedness of each  $\frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_k}$ ,  $\lambda$ -Hölder continuity of each  $\widetilde{\mu}_k$  as well as Theorem 5.2, we can write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(t_n)}{\widehat{Y}_k(t_n)} \right) (W_j(t_{n+1}) - W_j(t_n)) - \int_0^T \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(s)}{\widehat{Y}_k(s)} \right) dW_j(s) \right|^r \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \left( \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(t_n)}{\widehat{Y}_k(s)} - \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) \right) dW_j(s) \right|^r \right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \left( \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(t_n)}{\widehat{Y}_k(s)} - \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right) \right)^2 ds \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \sum_{k=1}^d \left( \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(t_n)}{\widehat{Y}_k(s)} - \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{Y_k(s)} \right)^2 ds \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_k^2(s)} (\tilde{\mu}_k(t_n) - \tilde{\mu}_k(s))^2 ds \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] \\
&\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \sum_{k=1}^d \left( \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_k(s)} - \frac{1}{Y_k(s)} \right)^2 ds \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} (\tilde{\mu}_k(t_n) - \tilde{\mu}_k(s))^2 ds \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left( \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_k(s)} - \frac{1}{Y_k(s)} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} (t_n - s)^{2\lambda} ds \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] + C \Delta_N^{r\lambda} \\
&\leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is, as always, a constant that does not depend on the partition and which may vary from line to line. Similarly, for each  $j = 1, \dots, d$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{T}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(t_n)}{\widehat{Y}_k(t_n)} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^T \left( \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_{j,k}^{(-1)} \frac{\tilde{\mu}_k(s)}{\widehat{Y}_k(s)} \right)^2 ds \right|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda},$$

therefore we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \log \mathcal{E}_T - \log \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T \right|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda}.$$

Using the arguments similar to Proposition 5.4, one can see that for all  $r \geq 1$  there exists a constant  $C$  that does not depend on the partition such that

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathcal{E}_T^r] + \max_{N \geq 1} \mathbb{E} [\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T^r] < C \tag{5.4}$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathcal{E}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T \right|^r \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \mathcal{E}_T + \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T \right) \left| \log \mathcal{E}_T - \log \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T \right|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda}.$$

□

## 5.2 Approximation by discretizing both $Y$ and $S$

After introducing the numerical schemes for  $Y$ ,  $X$  and  $S$ , we are ready to proceed to main results of this Section. We begin with a theorem that is in the spirit of [10, Theorem 15].

**Theorem 5.7.** *Let  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_d)$  be given by (2.8),  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  be the corresponding log-price process,  $X_i = \log S_i$ ,  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption C,  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u) du$  and  $\alpha_i > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Fix a uniform partition  $\{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$ ,  $t_n = \frac{Tn}{N}$ , with the mesh satisfying (5.1) and take  $\widehat{Y} = (\widehat{Y}_1, \dots, \widehat{Y}_d)$ ,  $\widehat{X} = (\widehat{X}_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_d)$  and  $\widehat{S} = (\widehat{S}_1, \dots, \widehat{S}_d)$  as described in Subsection 5.1. Finally, let  $\lambda < \min_{i=1, \dots, d} H_i$  with  $H_i$  being from Assumption A. Then*

1) for any  $r \geq 1$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T)\right)}{\alpha_1 S_1(T)} \left(1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_1(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u)}{Tu_{1,1}}\right) - \frac{F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \widehat{S}_i(T)\right)}{\alpha_1 \widehat{S}_1(T)} \left(1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_1(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u)}{Tu_{1,1}}\right) \right|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda},$$

2) there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ f\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T)\right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{F\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \widehat{S}_i(T)\right)}{\alpha_1 \widehat{S}_1(T)} \left(1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_1(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u)}{Tu_{1,1}}\right) \right] \right| \leq C \Delta_N^\lambda.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.4, it is enough to prove item 1. We provide the proof only for  $d = 1$  (in this case we can put  $\alpha_1 = 1$  without any loss in generality). For the general case of  $d > 1$ , the arguments are the same but require a more notation-heavy presentation. For reader's convenience, we split the proof into three steps.

**Step 1.** We begin with noting that, by the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Theorem 5.2,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \left( \frac{1}{Y(u)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} \right) d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^r \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \left( \frac{1}{Y(u)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} \right)^2 du \right)^{\frac{r}{2}} \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{\lambda r}.$$

**Step 2.** Next, let us show that for any  $r \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} - \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda}. \quad (5.5)$$

It is clear that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} - \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^r \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} - \frac{F(S(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^r \right] + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} - \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^r \right]. \quad (5.6)$$

Now we estimate both terms in the right-hand side separately. Observe that  $F$  has polynomial growth and thus, by Theorem 2.6,  $\mathbb{E}[|F(S(T))|^{2r}] < \infty$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ |F(S(T))|^r \left| \frac{1}{S(T)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^r \right] &\leq \left( \mathbb{E}[|F(S(T))|^{2r}] \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{S(T)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{S(T)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, observe that, by Theorem 2.6 and Proposition 5.4, there exists constant  $C > 0$  that does not depend on the partition such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-4r(X(T)+\widehat{X}(T))} (e^{X(T)} + e^{\widehat{X}(T)})^{4r} \right] < C,$$

thus, using Theorem 5.3 the inequality  $|e^x - e^y| \leq (e^x + e^y)|x - y|$ ,  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , we can write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{S(T)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^{2r} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2r(X(T)+\widehat{X}(T))} |e^{X(T)} - e^{\widehat{X}(T)}|^{2r} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2r(X(T)+\widehat{X}(T))} (e^{X(T)} + e^{\widehat{X}(T)})^{2r} |X(T) - \widehat{X}(T)|^{2r} \right] \\
&\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-4r(X(T)+\widehat{X}(T))} (e^{X(T)} + e^{\widehat{X}(T)})^{4r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |X(T) - \widehat{X}(T)|^{4r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C\Delta_N^{2r\lambda},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C > 0$  is again a constant that does not depend on the partition. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |F(S(T))|^r \left| \frac{1}{S(T)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^r \right] \leq C\Delta^{r\lambda}. \quad (5.7)$$

Next, observe that for any  $s_1, s_2 > 0$

$$|F(s_1) - F(s_2)| = \left| \int_{s_1 \wedge s_2}^{s_1 \vee s_2} f(u) du \right| \leq C(1 + s_1^q + s_2^q) |s_1 - s_2|,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\widehat{S}^r(T)} |F(S(T)) - F(\widehat{S}(T))|^r \right] \\
&\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\widehat{S}^{2r}(T)} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |F(S(T)) - F(\widehat{S}(T))|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |F(S(T)) - F(\widehat{S}(T))|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |F(S(T)) - F(\widehat{S}(T))|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |(1 + S^q(T) + \widehat{S}^q(T))|^{2r} |S(T) - \widehat{S}(T)|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |(1 + S^q(T) + \widehat{S}^q(T))|^{4r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |S(T) - \widehat{S}(T)|^{4r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\
&\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |S(T) - \widehat{S}(T)|^{4r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{4}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Theorem 2.6 together with Proposition 5.4 to estimate  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{S}^{-2r}(T) \right]$  together with  $\mathbb{E} \left[ |(1 + S^q(T) + \widehat{S}^q(T))|^{4r} \right]$ .

Finally, using the same argument as in the proof of (5.7), we can obtain that

$$\left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |S(T) - \widehat{S}(T)|^{4r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq C\Delta_N^{r\lambda},$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\widehat{S}^r(T)} |F(S(T)) - F(\widehat{S}(T))|^r \right] \leq C\Delta_N^{r\lambda}. \quad (5.8)$$

Now (5.5) follows from (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8).

**Step 3.** Now we proceed to the claim of the theorem. Since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \right|^{2r} \right] < \infty$$

due to the polynomial growth of the mapping  $x \mapsto \frac{F(x)}{x}$ , we can deduce by Step 1, Step 2 and Theorem 4.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u)}{Tu_{1,1}} \right) - \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u)}{Tu_{1,1}} \right) \right|^r \right] \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} - \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^r \right] \\
& \quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \int_0^T \left( \frac{1}{Y(u)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} \right) d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^r \right] \\
& \quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \left( \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} - \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right) \right|^r \right] \\
& \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda} + C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \left( \frac{1}{Y(u)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} \right) d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{F(S(T))}{S(T)} - \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda},
\end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof.  $\square$

Theorem 5.7 concerns representations (4.7) and (4.9). However, for the one-dimensional case, we also have the representation (4.6) which can also be used to approximate the expected payoff. We give the corresponding result below.

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $S$  be given by (4.2),  $X$  be the corresponding log-price process,  $X = \log S$ ,  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption C,  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u)du$ ,  $g(x) := f(e^x)$ ,  $G(x) := F(1) + \int_0^x g(v)dv$ . Fix a uniform partition  $\{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$ ,  $t_n = \frac{Tn}{N}$ , with the mesh satisfying (5.1) and take  $\widehat{Y}$ ,  $\widehat{X}$  and  $\widehat{S}$  as described in Subsection 5.1. Finally, let  $\lambda < H$  with  $H := H_1$  being from Assumption A. Then*

1) for any  $r \geq 1$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} G(X(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) - \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} G(\widehat{X}(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^r \right] \leq C \Delta_N^{r\lambda},$$

2) there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[f(S(T))] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} G(\widehat{X}(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right] \right| \leq C \Delta_N^\lambda.$$

*Proof.* Once again, item 1 implies item 2 by Theorem 4.2 and we sketch the proof of the former omitting the details. First, observe that for any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}
|G(x_1) - G(x_2)| &= \left| \int_{x_1 \wedge x_2}^{x_1 \vee x_2} g(v)dv \right| \leq \sup_{v \in [x_1 \wedge x_2, x_1 \vee x_2]} |g(v)| |x_1 - x_2| \\
&= \sup_{v \in [x_1 \wedge x_2, x_1 \vee x_2]} |f(e^v)| |x_1 - x_2| \leq c_f (1 + e^{q(x_1 \vee x_2)}) |x_1 - x_2| \\
&\leq c_f (1 + e^{qx_1} + e^{qx_2}) |x_1 - x_2|
\end{aligned}$$

and thus, using the same machinery as in the proof of Theorem 5.7, we can write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| G(X(T)) - G(\widehat{X}(T)) \right|^r \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| (1 + S^q(T) + \widehat{S}^q(T)) |X(T) - \widehat{X}(T)| \right|^r \right]$$

$$\leq C\Delta_N^{r\lambda}.$$

Due to existence of exponential moments of  $X(T)$  as well as polynomial growth of  $f$ , it is also clear that for any  $r \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}[|G(X(T))|^r] < \infty.$$

Finally, as noted in Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 5.7,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \left( \frac{1}{Y(u)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} \right) d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^r \right] \leq C\Delta_N^{r\lambda}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[ \left| G(X(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) - G(\widehat{X}(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^r \right] \\ & \leq CE \left[ \left| G(X(T)) \left( \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) - \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right) \right|^r \right] \\ & \quad + CE \left[ \left| (G(X(T)) - G(\widehat{X}(T))) \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^r \right] \\ & \leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |G(X(T))|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \left( \frac{1}{Y(u)} - \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} \right) d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + C \left( E \left[ \left| \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ |G(X(T)) - G(\widehat{X}(T))|^{2r} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq C\Delta_N^{r\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We conclude the Subsection with an approximation result in line with Theorem 5.7 involving a change of measure. We omit the proof since it is straightforward and utilizes the same machinery as the one of Theorem 5.7 (one just has to additionally use Theorem 5.6 in order to estimate expectations of the type  $\mathbb{E} \left[ |\mathcal{E}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T|^r \right]$ ).

**Theorem 5.9.** *Let  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_d)$  be given by (2.8),  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  be the corresponding log-price process,  $X_i = \log S_i$ ,  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumption C,  $F(s) := \int_0^s f(u)du$  and  $\alpha_i > 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_T$  be the minimal martingale measure defined by (4.10). Fix a uniform partition  $\{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$ ,  $t_n = \frac{Tn}{N}$ , with the mesh satisfying (5.1) and take  $\widehat{Y} = (\widehat{Y}_1, \dots, \widehat{Y}_d)$ ,  $\widehat{X} = (\widehat{X}_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_d)$ ,  $\widehat{S} = (\widehat{S}_1, \dots, \widehat{S}_d)$  and  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T$  as described in Subsection 5.1. Finally, let  $\lambda < \min_{i=1, \dots, d} H_i$  with  $H_i$  being from Assumption A. Then*

1) for any  $r \geq 1$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathcal{E}_T \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right)}{\alpha_1 S_1(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{Y_1(v)} d\widetilde{W}_1(v) - \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \beta_k \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{Y_k(v) Y_1(v)} dv \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \widehat{S}_i(T) \right)}{\alpha_1 \widehat{S}_1(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_1(v)} d\widetilde{W}_1(v) - \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \beta_k \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{\widehat{Y}_k(v) \widehat{Y}_1(v)} dv \right) \right|^r \right] \leq C\Delta_N^{r\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

2) there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{E}_T f \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i S_i(T) \right) \right] \right|$$



$$- \mathbb{E} \left[ \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T \frac{F \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \widehat{S}_i(T) \right)}{\alpha_1 \widehat{S}_1(T)} \left( 1 + \frac{\int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_1(v)} d\widetilde{W}_1(v) - \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \beta_k \frac{\widetilde{\mu}_k(v)}{\widehat{Y}_k(v) \widehat{Y}_1(v)} dv \right) \right] \leq C \Delta_N^\lambda.$$

### 5.3 Approximation via conditional Gaussianity for one-dimensional model

Assume now that  $d = 1$  and the price  $S$  is given by (4.2). The core idea of Subsection 5.2 was to plug in the simulated paths  $\widehat{Y}$ ,  $\widehat{S}$  and  $\widehat{X}$  into representations (4.6) or (4.7). However, this requires simulation of *both* volatility and the price which inevitably leads to higher variance in Monte Carlo estimations. However, it is possible to avoid simulation of the price and in this Subsection we describe the corresponding approach.

First note that the random vector  $\left( \widehat{X}(T), \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right)^T$  is conditionally Gaussian with respect to the  $\sigma$ -field  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_T^2 := \sigma\{\widetilde{W}_2(t), t \in [0, T]\}$ . The next lemma presents the parameters of the joint conditional distribution of the random vector  $\left( \widehat{X}(T), \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right)^T$ .

**Lemma 5.10.** *The random vector  $\left( \widehat{X}(T), \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right)^T$  is conditionally Gaussian with respect to the  $\sigma$ -field  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_T^2 := \sigma\{\widetilde{W}_2(t), t \in [0, T]\}$  with conditional mean*

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} X(0) + \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left( \mu(t_k) - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{Y}^2(t_k) \right) + u_{1,2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}(t_k) (\widetilde{W}_2(t_{k+1}) - \widetilde{W}_2(t_k)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ & =: \begin{pmatrix} m(\widehat{Y}) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

and conditional covariance matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{C}} &= \begin{pmatrix} u_{1,1}^2 \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}^2(t_k) & u_{1,1} T \\ u_{1,1} T & \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}^{-2}(t_k) \end{pmatrix} \\ &=: \begin{pmatrix} u_{1,1}^2 V_1^2 & u_{1,1} T \\ u_{1,1} T & V_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $V_1^2 := \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}^2(t_k)$  and  $V_2^2 := \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}^{-2}(t_k)$ . Moreover, if additionally

$$\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}} = u_{1,1}^2 (V_1^2 V_2^2 - T^2) > 0$$

with probability 1, then the random vector  $\left( \widehat{X}(T), \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right)^T$  has a conditional density of the form

$$\phi(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}}} \exp \left\{ - \frac{V_2^2 (x - m(\widehat{Y}))^2 + u_{1,1}^2 V_1^2 y^2 - 2T u_{1,1} (x - m(\widehat{Y})) y}{2 \det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Recall that the random variable  $\widehat{X}(T)$  can be represented in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X}(T) &= X(0) + \frac{T}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left( \mu(t_k) - \frac{\widehat{Y}^2(t_k)}{2} \right) + u_{1,1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}(t_k) (\widetilde{W}_1(t_{k+1}) - \widetilde{W}_1(t_k)) \\ &\quad + u_{1,2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}(t_k) (\widetilde{W}_2(t_{k+1}) - \widetilde{W}_2(t_k)). \end{aligned}$$

Now the explicit form of conditional mean, conditional covariance matrix and conditional density (provided that the conditional covariance matrix is non-degenerate) can be computed directly.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.11.** *Let  $\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}} > 0$  with probability 1, where  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$  is the conditional covariance matrix from Lemma 5.10. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{Tu_{1,1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ G(\widehat{X}(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}u_{1,1}^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x) \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{x - m(\widehat{Y})}{V_1^3} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(x - m(\widehat{Y}))^2}{2u_{1,1}^2 V_1^2} \right\} \right] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

*Proof.* Using Lemma 5.10, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ G(\widehat{X}(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ G(\widehat{X}(T)) \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(u)} d\widetilde{W}_1(u) \mid \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_T^2 \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} G(x) y \phi(x, y) dx dy \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x) \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \phi(x, y) dy \right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

The integral  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} y \phi(x, y) dy$  can be simplified. Namely, denote for simplicity  $\widetilde{x} := x - m(\widehat{Y})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \phi(x, y) dy &= \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \exp \left\{ -\frac{V_2^2 \widetilde{x}^2 + u_{1,1}^2 V_1^2 y^2 - 2u_{1,1} T \widetilde{x} y}{2 \det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \right\} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2 \det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \left( \left( u_{1,1} V_1 y - \frac{T \widetilde{x}}{V_1} \right)^2 + V_2^2 \widetilde{x}^2 - \frac{T^2 \widetilde{x}^2}{V_1^2} \right) \right\} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(V_1^2 V_2^2 - T^2) \widetilde{x}^2}{2V_1^2 \det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \right\} \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \exp \left\{ -\frac{\left( y - \frac{T \widetilde{x}}{u_{1,1} V_1^2} \right)^2}{2 \frac{\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}}{u_{1,1}^2 V_1^2}} \right\} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\widetilde{x}^2}{2u_{1,1}^2 V_1^2} \right\} \sqrt{2\pi} \frac{T \widetilde{x} \sqrt{\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}}}}{u_{1,1}^2 V_1^3} \\ &= \frac{T \widetilde{x}}{\sqrt{2\pi} u_{1,1}^2 V_1^3} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\widetilde{x}^2}{2u_{1,1}^2 V_1^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the result.  $\square$

Equation (5.10) from Theorem 5.11 essentially relies on the condition  $\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}} > 0$  with probability 1. A simple sufficient condition is provided by the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.12.** *Let  $Z(t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{K}(t, s) d\widetilde{W}_2(s)$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ , and  $\{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T\}$  be a uniform partition of  $[0, T]$  with the mesh  $\Delta_N := \frac{T}{N}$  having the following property:  $c\Delta_N < 1$ , where  $c$  is an upper bound for  $\frac{\partial b}{\partial y}$  from Assumption B(iv).*

*If the random vector*

$$(Z(t_1) - Z(t_0), Z(t_2) - Z(t_1), \dots, Z(t_N) - Z(t_{N-1}))^T$$

*has density, then  $\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}} > 0$  with probability 1 and (5.10) holds.*

*Proof.* Note that  $\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \geq 0$  a.s., because  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$  is a conditional covariance matrix, i.e. we need to check that  $\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq 0$  with probability 1. Taking into account that

$$\det \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \neq 0 \iff \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \widehat{Y}^2(t_k) \widehat{Y}^{-2}(t_l) \neq 1,$$

it is sufficient to check that the random vector  $(\widehat{Y}(t_1), \dots, \widehat{Y}(t_N))^T$  has density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Denote

$$b_n(y) := y - b(t_n, y)\Delta_N, \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$

and observe that for any  $n = 1, \dots, N$  is a 1-to-1 mapping of the interval  $(\varphi(t_n), \psi(t_n))$  onto  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $b'_n > 0$ . By (5.2), for any  $n = 1, \dots, N$

$$\widehat{Y}(t_n) = b_n^{-1} \left( \widehat{Y}(t_{n-1}) + Z(t_n) - Z(t_{n-1}) \right)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{Y}(t_1) \\ \widehat{Y}(t_2) \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{Y}(t_N) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} b_1^{-1} (Y(0) + Z(t_1) - Z(t_0)) \\ b_2^{-1} (b_1^{-1} (Y(0) + Z(t_1) - Z(t_0)) + Z(t_2) - Z(t_1)) \\ \vdots \\ b_N^{-1} (b_{N-1}^{-1} (\dots)) + Z(t_N) - Z(t_{N-1}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &=: I(Z(t_1) - Z(t_0), Z(t_2) - Z(t_1), \dots, Z(t_N) - Z(t_{N-1})). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

It is straightforward to check that function  $I: \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \prod_{n=1}^N (\varphi(t_n), \psi(t_n))$  from (5.11) is a bijection and its Jacobian  $\det J_I(\vec{z})$  is strictly positive for any  $\vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ . This implies that the random vector  $(\widehat{Y}(t_1), \dots, \widehat{Y}(t_N))^T$  has density, i.e. is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure, which ends the proof.  $\square$

## 6 Simulations

Let us illustrate the algorithms described in Section 5 with numerical simulations. For simplicity, we assume that

- $T = 1, d = 1$ ;
- an explicit shape of the VSV model is

$$\begin{aligned} S(t) &= 1 + \frac{3}{2} \int_0^t S(s) ds + \int_0^t Y(s) S(s) dW_1(s), \\ Y(t) &= 1 + \int_0^t \left( \frac{1}{(Y(s) - 0.01)^4} - \frac{1}{(5 - Y(s))^4} \right) ds + Z(t); \end{aligned}$$

- $Z$  is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index  $H \in (0, 1)$  being different in different simulations, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} Z(t) &= \int_0^t C_H \left( \left( \frac{t}{s} \right)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} (t-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - \left( H - \frac{1}{2} \right) s^{\frac{1}{2}-H} \int_s^t u^{H-\frac{3}{2}} (u-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} du \right) dW_2(s), \\ C_H &= \left( \frac{2H\Gamma(3/2-H)}{\Gamma(H+1/2)\Gamma(2-2H)} \right)^{1/2}; \end{aligned}$$

- $W_1$  and  $W_2$  (and hence  $W_1$  and  $Z$ ) are independent, which corresponds to

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$u_{1,1} = 1, \beta_1 = -1$  and  $\widetilde{W}_1 = W_1$  in the representations from Section 4;

- the instantaneous interest rate  $\nu(t) \equiv \frac{1}{2}$ ;
- the option payoff function is given by

$$f(s) = \mathbb{1}_{(1,\infty)}(s) + \mathbb{1}_{(2,\infty)}(s) + \mathbb{1}_{(4,\infty)}(s).$$

First, we exploit the double discretization method and compute  $\mathbb{E}[f(S(T))]$  (under the physical measure) by simulating 10000 independent realisations of

$$\frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \left( 1 + \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}_1(u)} dW_1(u) \right) \quad (6.1)$$

and then averaging them.

Afterwards, the same expectation is computed using the conditional Gaussianity method described in Subsection 5.3 i.e. by averaging over 10000 independent realisations of

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} G(x) \left( \frac{x - m(\widehat{Y})}{V_1^3} \right) \exp \left\{ -\frac{(x - m(\widehat{Y}))^2}{2V_1^2} \right\} dx. \quad (6.2)$$

For both methods, we considered uniform partitions of sizes  $N = 10, 100, 1000$  and  $10000$  and two choices of Hurst indices:  $H = 0.7$  (long memory case) and  $H = 0.3$  (rough case). Table 1 contains information on means and standard deviations of (6.1) and (6.2) for different partition sizes and Hurst indices.

Table 1: Computation of  $\mathbb{E}[f(S(T))]$ , double discretization vs conditional Gaussianity

Part. size, $N$	$H = 0.7$				$H = 0.3$			
	Double discr.		Cond. Gauss.		Double discr.		Cond. Gauss.	
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd
<b>10</b>	1.4154	2.0449	1.4424	0.3262	1.2941	1.9904	1.2998	0.3130
<b>100</b>	1.3849	2.0283	1.4117	0.3346	1.2030	1.9313	1.1991	0.2894
<b>1000</b>	1.4002	2.005	1.4028	0.3391	1.1444	1.8783	1.1821	0.2829
<b>10000</b>	1.4081	2.0339	1.4026	0.3333	1.1648	1.8883	1.1748	0.2802

As we can see, the method based on conditional Gaussianity produces substantially smaller standard deviations and hence is superior to the approach where both price and volatility are discretized. This happens because there is no additional error from simulating  $\widehat{S}(T)$  which results in a far more stable behaviour of (6.2) (c.f. [10]).

In the second series of simulations, we estimate  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_T f(S(T))]$ , where

$$\mathcal{E}_T := \exp \left\{ -\int_0^T \frac{1}{Y(s)} dW_1(s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \frac{1}{Y^2(s)} ds \right\}$$

is the minimal martingale measure. We do that by averaging over 10000 realizations of

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_T \frac{F(\widehat{S}(T))}{\widehat{S}(T)} \left( 1 + \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}(v)} dW_1(v) + \int_0^T \frac{1}{\widehat{Y}^2(v)} dv \right)$$

and, just like in calculations under the physical measure, we perform simulations for partition sizes  $N = 10, 100, 1000$  and  $10000$  and Hurst indices  $H = 0.7$  and  $H = 0.3$ . The results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Computation of  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_T f(S(T))]$

Part. size, $N$	$H = 0.7$		$H = 0.3$	
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd
<b>10</b>	0.6732	0.6456	0.6308	0.6968
<b>100</b>	0.6716	0.6490	0.5752	0.7059
<b>1000</b>	0.6693	0.6511	0.5759	0.7101
<b>10000</b>	0.6687	0.6506124	0.5875	0.7239

## References

- [1] ALTMAYER, M., AND NEUENKIRCH, A. Multilevel Monte Carlo quadrature of discontinuous payoffs in the generalized Heston model using Malliavin integration by parts. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* 6, 1 (Jan. 2015), 22–52.
- [2] ANDERSEN, L. B. G., AND PITERBARG, V. Moment explosions in stochastic volatility models. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2005).
- [3] ANDERSEN, T. G., AND BOLLERSLEV, T. Intraday periodicity and volatility persistence in financial markets. *Journal of empirical finance* 4, 2–3 (1997), 115–158.
- [4] ANDERSEN, T. G., BOLLERSLEV, T., DIEBOLD, F. X., AND LABYS, P. The distribution of realized exchange rate volatility. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96, 453 (2001), 42–55.
- [5] ANDERSEN, T. G., DAVIS, R. A., KREISS, J.-P., AND MIKOSCH, T. V. *Handbook of financial time series*, 2009 ed. Springer, 2009.
- [6] AVIKAINEN, R. On irregular functionals of SDEs and the Euler scheme. *Finance and stochastics* 13, 3 (2009), 381–401.
- [7] AYACHE, A., AND PENG, Q. Stochastic volatility and multifractional Brownian motion. In *Stochastic Differential Equations and Processes* (2012), Springer Berlin Heidelberg, p. 211–237.
- [8] AZMOODEH, E., SOTTINEN, T., VIITASAAARI, L., AND YAZIGI, A. Necessary and sufficient conditions for Hölder continuity of Gaussian processes. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 94 (2014), 230 – 235.
- [9] BAYER, C., FRIZ, P., AND GATHERAL, J. Pricing under rough volatility. *Quantitative finance* 16, 6 (2016), 887–904.
- [10] BEZBORODOV, V., PERSIO, L. D., AND MISHURA, Y. Option pricing with fractional stochastic volatility and discontinuous payoff function of polynomial growth. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability* 21, 1 (Aug. 2018), 331–366.
- [11] BIAGINI, F., GUASONI, P., AND PRATELLI, M. Mean-variance hedging for stochastic volatility models. *Mathematical Finance* 10, 2 (Apr. 2000), 109–123.
- [12] BOLLERSLEV, T., AND MIKKELSEN, H. O. Modeling and pricing long memory in stock market volatility. *Journal of Econometrics* 73, 1 (1996), 151–184.
- [13] CHRONOPOULOU, A., AND VIENS, F. G. Estimation and pricing under long-memory stochastic volatility. *Annals of finance* 8, 2–3 (2012), 379–403.
- [14] COHEN, S., AND ELLIOTT, R. J. *Stochastic calculus and applications*. Birkhäuser, New York, 2015.
- [15] COMTE, F., COUTIN, L., AND RENAULT, E. Affine fractional stochastic volatility models. *Annals of finance* 8, 2–3 (2012), 337–378.
- [16] COMTE, F., AND RENAULT, E. Long memory in continuous-time stochastic volatility models. *Mathematical Finance* 8, 4 (1998), 291–323.
- [17] CONT, R. Empirical properties of asset returns: stylized facts and statistical issues. *Quantitative finance* 1, 2 (2001), 223–236.
- [18] CONT, R. Volatility clustering in financial markets: Empirical facts and agent-based models. In *Long Memory in Economics* (2006), Springer Berlin Heidelberg, p. 289–309.
- [19] CONT, R., AND DA FONSECA, J. Deformation of implied volatility surfaces: an empirical analysis. In *Empirical Science of Financial Fluctuations* (2002), Springer Japan, p. 230–239.
- [20] CONT, R., AND DA FONSECA, J. Dynamics of implied volatility surfaces. *Quantitative finance* 2, 1 (2002), 45–60.

- [21] CORLAY, S., LEBOVITS, J., AND LÉVY VÉHEL, J. Multifractional stochastic volatility models. *Mathematical Finance. An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics* 24, 2 (2014), 364–402.
- [22] DI NUNNO, G., MISHURA, Y., AND YURCHENKO-TYTARENKO, A. Drift-implicit Euler scheme for sandwiched processes driven by Hölder noises. *arXiv [math.PR]* (2022).
- [23] DI NUNNO, G., MISHURA, Y., AND YURCHENKO-TYTARENKO, A. Sandwiched SDEs with unbounded drift driven by Holder noises. *To appear in Advances in Applied Probability* (2022).
- [24] DING, Z., GRANGER, C. W. J., AND ENGLE, R. F. A long memory property of stock market returns and a new model. *Journal of empirical finance* 1, 1 (1993), 83–106.
- [25] EL EUCH, O., GATHERAL, J., AND ROSENBAUM, M. Roughening Heston. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2018).
- [26] EL EUCH, O., AND ROSENBAUM, M. The characteristic function of rough Heston models. *Mathematical Finance. An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics* 29, 1 (2019), 3–38.
- [27] FOUQUE, J.-P., PAPANICOLAOU, G., AND SIRCAR, K. R. *Derivatives in financial markets with stochastic volatility*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [28] FRIZ, P. K., AND VICTOIR, N. B. *Multidimensional Stochastic Processes as Rough Paths: Theory and Applications*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [29] FUKASAWA, M. Asymptotic analysis for stochastic volatility: martingale expansion. *Finance and stochastics* 15, 4 (2011), 635–654.
- [30] GATHERAL, J. *The volatility surface: A practitioner’s guide*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [31] GATHERAL, J., JAISSON, T., AND ROSENBAUM, M. Volatility is rough. *Quantitative finance* 18, 6 (2018), 933–949.
- [32] HESTON, S. L. A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility with applications to bond and currency options. *The review of financial studies* 6, 2 (1993), 327–343.
- [33] HU, Y., NUALART, D., AND SONG, X. A singular stochastic differential equation driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 78, 14 (Oct. 2008), 2075–2085.
- [34] HULL, J., AND WHITE, A. The pricing of options on assets with stochastic volatilities. *The journal of finance* 42, 2 (1987), 281–300.
- [35] KAHL, C. *Modelling and simulation of stochastic volatility in finance*. Dissertation.com, 2008.
- [36] KNIGHT, J., AND SATCHELL, S. *Forecasting volatility in the financial markets*, 3 ed. Butterworth-Heinemann, 2007.
- [37] MERINO, R., POSPÍŠIL, J., SOBOTKA, T., SOTTINEN, T., AND VIVES, J. Decomposition formula for rough Volterra stochastic volatility models. *International journal of theoretical and applied finance* 24, 02 (2021), 2150008.
- [38] MISHURA, Y., AND YURCHENKO-TYTARENKO, A. Fractional Cox–Ingersoll–Ross process with non-zero “mean”. *Modern Stochastics: Theory and Applications* 5, 1 (2018), 99–111.
- [39] MISHURA, Y., AND YURCHENKO-TYTARENKO, A. Fractional Cox–Ingersoll–Ross process with small Hurst indices. *Modern Stochastics: Theory and Applications* 6, 1 (2018), 13–39.
- [40] MISHURA, Y., AND YURCHENKO-TYTARENKO, A. Approximating expected value of an option with non-Lipschitz payoff in fractional Heston-type model. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance* 23, 05 (July 2020), 2050031.
- [41] NUALART, D. *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*. Springer, 2014.

- [42] OCONE, D. L., AND KARATZAS, I. A generalized Clark representation formula, with application to optimal portfolios. *Stochastics and stochastic reports* 34, 3–4 (1991), 187–220.
- [43] SCHWEIZER, M. Martingale densities for general asset prices. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 21, 4 (1992), 363–378.
- [44] SCHWEIZER, M. On the minimal martingale measure and the Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition. *Stochastic analysis and applications* 13, 5 (1995), 573–599.
- [45] SUGITA, H. On a characterization of the Sobolev spaces over an abstract Wiener space. *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University* 25, 4 (1985), 717–725.
- [46] VRABIE, I. I.  *$C_0$ -Semigroups and Application*. North-Holland Mathematics Studies. JAI Press, 2003.
- [47] YOUNG, L. C. An inequality of the Hölder type, connected with Stieltjes integration. *Acta Mathematica* 67 (1936), 251–282.