

Ergodic robust maximization of asymptotic growth under stochastic volatility

David Itkin*, Benedikt Koch†, Martin Larsson‡, Josef Teichmann§

November 29, 2022

Abstract

We consider an asymptotic robust growth problem under model uncertainty and in the presence of (non-Markovian) stochastic covariance. We fix two inputs representing the instantaneous covariance for the asset process X , which depends on an additional stochastic factor process Y , as well as the invariant density of X together with Y . The stochastic factor process Y has continuous trajectories but is not even required to be a semimartingale. Our setup allows for drift uncertainty in X and model uncertainty for the local dynamics of Y . This work builds upon a recent paper of Kardaras & Robertson [20], where the authors consider an analogous problem, however, without the additional stochastic factor process. Under suitable, quite weak assumptions we are able to characterize the robust optimal trading strategy and the robust optimal growth rate. The optimal strategy is shown to be functionally generated and, remarkably, does not depend on the factor process Y . Our result provides a comprehensive answer to a question proposed by Fernholz in 2002. Mathematically, we use a combination of partial differential equation (PDE), calculus of variations and generalized Dirichlet form techniques.

Keywords: Robust Finance, Stochastic Portfolio Theory, Functionally Generated Portfolios, Stochastic Volatility, Invariant Measure, Ergodic Process, Generalized Dirichlet Forms.

MSC 2020 Classification: Primary 60G44, 60J60, 91G10; Secondary 60J46.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider an investor's asymptotic growth maximization problem in a d -dimensional market under model uncertainty, in the presence of stability (i.e. some invariant measure) and (non-Markovian) stochastic covariance. We study the quantity

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \Pi} g(\theta; \mathbb{P}),$$

*Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, d.itkin@imperial.ac.uk

†Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, benedikt.koch@seh.ox.ac.uk

‡Department of Mathematical Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, larsson@cmu.edu. This work has been partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant NSF DMS-2206062

§Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich, josef.teichmann@math.ethz.ch

where Θ is a large set of admissible trading strategies, Π represents the set of admissible models and $g(\theta; \mathbb{P})$ is the investor's asymptotic growth rate when they employ the strategy θ and when \mathbb{P} governs the law of the asset price process X . We take a general setup and assume that X takes values in a fixed open, connected set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (all relevant quantities are precisely defined in Section 2). Our work builds on that of [20], which considers a similar robust growth problem in the presence of stability, but does not allow for models with (non-Markovian) stochastic covariance.

The main motivation for this line of research comes from the empirically observed stability of the *ranked market weights* in US equity markets; see [9, Chapter 5]. Stochastic Portfolio Theory (SPT) is a framework designed to study this stability, and exploit it for investment problems. In our setting this corresponds to E being the d -dimensional open simplex and viewing X as the market weight process. Many researchers have proposed models that produce stable market weight processes, investigated approaches to statistically estimate the capital distribution curve and studied the performance of trading strategies under this observed stability [1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 15, 16, 26, 27].

Fernholz, in his celebrated book on SPT, proposes the research question of developing a theory of portfolio optimization that depends only on observable quantities [9, Problems 3.1.7 & 3.1.8]. Observable quantities are prices, maybe instantaneous covariance along the trajectory as well as some factors, which influence it, and some invariant laws. Certainly neither instantaneous drifts nor jump structures can be considered observable in the presence of typical noises in financial markets. One class of portfolios solely depending on those observables, for which performance guarantees can be deduced under model uncertainty, are *functionally generated portfolios*. Indeed, an investor who trades using a functionally generated portfolio can compute their prescribed holdings by only using current market prices. Moreover, performance guarantees for functionally generated portfolios can be obtained assuming some knowledge on instantaneous covariance and stability of the asset process [9, 10, 17, 19, 22].

The work of Kardaras & Robertson [20] makes important progress towards solving the question introduced by Fernholz. They take two inputs:

- (i) a matrix valued function $\bar{c}_X(x)$, which serves as the instantaneous covariance matrix for X ,
- (ii) a positive function $\bar{p}(x)$ with $\int_E \bar{p} = 1$, serving as the invariant density for X , i.e. encoding stability.

They consider an admissible class of laws Π to be all measures under which

- (i) X is a continuous semimartingale with $\bar{c}_X(X_t)$ as its instantaneous covariance matrix,
- (ii) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(X_t) dt = \int_E h \bar{p}$ for any $h \in L^1(\bar{p})$,
- (iii) the laws of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ are tight.

This class includes all measures with the specified covariance structure and specified stable behaviour, but the setup allows of course for drift uncertainty. The authors are then able to show that the robust optimal strategy is functionally generated and obtain a partial differential equation (PDE) characterization for the optimal function. They do this in a two-step procedure. First, the asymptotic growth rate is optimized over a class of functionally generated portfolios. For this class of strategies performance guarantees can be derived under any admissible measure. Secondly, an admissible worst-case measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ is constructed under which the functionally generated portfolio from the first step is growth-optimal over *all* portfolios. With those two ingredients one can fully solve the min-max problem.

One important drawback of the setup in [20] is that the instantaneous covariance matrix c_X is in feedback form, i.e. does not depend on further factors. Indeed, it is widely accepted that the

volatility of asset price processes is influenced by market forces other than the current price level (see e.g. [8]). To address this issue, we model the instantaneous covariance of X via $c_X(X_t, Y_t)$, where Y is a stochastic factor process taking values in an open bounded convex set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and, analogous to [20], $c_X(x, y)$ is a fixed matrix valued function taken as input. We do not prescribe the dynamics of Y , but restrict the process to be such that (X, Y) is jointly stable with fixed (unique) limiting density $p(x, y)$. In particular, Y is not required to be a semimartingale, but its ergodicity and invariant law (jointly with X) are known, a usual assumption in econometrics. We are again able to show that the robust optimal portfolio is functionally generated, obtain a PDE characterization for it and, remarkably, show that its portfolio weights do not depend on the factor process Y but only on the current prices X . This result provides a more complete answer to Fernholz's questions [9, Problems 3.1.7 & 3.1.8] by greatly generalizing the admissible class of measures to allow for stochastic covariance. Theorem 5.1, in Section 5, below contains the precise statement of our main result.

From a mathematical point of view, the introduction of a stochastic covariance process introduces a delicate technical challenge. Indeed, while the construction of the worst-case measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ and verification of the ergodic property in [20] were done using the classical theory of positive harmonic functions (see [25] for a reference), in our case these results are no longer applicable due to a loss in regularity of the coefficients induced by the inclusion of the stochastic covariance factor process.

To overcome this difficulty we modify the input matrix c_X on an arbitrarily small neighbourhood near the boundary of E (notice that the modification does not happen in absence of the factor process). Then using a combination of ideas from elliptic PDE theory, calculus of variations and recent developments in the theory of generalized Dirichlet forms [14, 23] we are able to construct an admissible worst-case measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ (see Theorem 5.4 below). Importantly, the robust optimal strategy and robust optimal growth rate only depend on the original inputs $c_X(x, y)$ and $p(x, y)$, not on the modified inputs. Additionally, we show in Corollary 5.5 that in certain special cases the modifications are unnecessary. As such, we view these modifications as purely technical in nature. This point is further discussed in Section 6.3.

The layout of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces the mathematical framework and the robust asymptotic growth problem we study. In Section 3, we discuss the main ideas to tackle the problem and then introduce additional technical assumptions in Section 4. Section 5 contains the precise statements of all our results. Section 6 contains a discussion of the results emphasizing the financial interpretation and relationship to the results in [20]. We consider several pertinent examples in Section 7. Appendix A contains results for a class of degenerate elliptic PDEs corresponding to certain variational problems. We were unable to find a standard reference for these results and so have developed them in a general framework in the appendix. Lastly, Appendix B contains the proofs of most of the results stated in Section 5. In particular, the results developed in Appendix A are crucially applied in Appendix B to construct the worst-case measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ described above.

2 Setup

We fix integers $d, m \geq 1$ and non-empty open sets $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Set $F = E \times D$. We will generically denote elements of E by x , elements of D by y and set $z = (x, y)$ for elements of F . For a function u we write $\nabla_x u$ for $(\partial_{x_1} u, \dots, \partial_{x_d} u)$, $\operatorname{div}_x u$ for $\sum_{i=1}^d \partial_{x_i} u$, and use $\nabla_y u$ and $\operatorname{div}_y u$ analogously.

The set E will serve as the state space for the d -dimensional asset process X , while the set D

serves as the state space for a m -dimensional factor process Y . Consequently the joint $(d + m)$ -dimensional process $Z = (X, Y)$ has state space F . We take as input a matrix valued function $c_X : F \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{++}^d$ and a positive function $p : F \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, which will serve as the instantaneous covariance matrix for X (which also depends on Y), and the joint invariant density of X and Y . We impose the following regularity assumptions on the inputs.

Assumption 2.1 (Regularity Assumptions). For a fixed $\gamma \in (0, 1]$,

- (i) D is a bounded convex set,
- (ii) $c_X \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,\infty}(F; \mathbb{S}_{++}^d) \cap C(F; \mathbb{S}_{++}^d)$ and for every $y \in D$, $c_X(\cdot, y) \in C^{2,\gamma}(E; \mathbb{S}_{++}^d)$.
- (iii) $p \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,\infty}(F; (0, \infty)) \cap C(F; (0, \infty))$ and for every $y \in D$, $p(\cdot, y) \in C^{2,\gamma}(E; (0, \infty))$. Additionally it is assumed that $\int_F p = 1$.

Here \mathbb{S}_{++}^d is the set of symmetric positive definite $d \times d$ matrices and $W_{\text{loc}}^{k,p}(F; V)$ is the Sobolev space of k -times weakly differentiable functions taking values in V , whose weak derivatives up to order k (including the function itself) belong to $L^p(U)$ for every set U with compact closure in F . $C(F; V)$ denotes the set of continuous functions with domain F taking values in V , and similarly $C^{2,\gamma}(F; V)$ is the set of twice continuously differentiable functions whose second derivatives are γ -Hölder continuous.

Given inputs c_X and p as in Assumption 2.1 we set denote the averaged instantaneous covariance with

$$A^{ij}(x) = \int_D c_X^{ij}(x, y) p(x, y) dy; \quad i, j = 1, \dots, d, \quad x \in E. \quad (2.1)$$

We will need to allow ourselves to modify the input c_X outside of a compact set $K \subset E$, but without changing the average value A .

Definition 2.2 (K -modifications). Let c_X and p satisfying Assumption 2.1 be given. Define

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \tilde{c}_X \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,\infty}(F; \mathbb{S}_{++}^d) \cap C(F; \mathbb{S}_{++}^d) : \int_D \tilde{c}_X(x, y) p(x, y) dy = A(x) \text{ for all } x \in E \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

For a compact set $K \subset E$ we define the class

$$\mathcal{C}_K = \{ \tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C} : \tilde{c}_X = c_X \text{ on } K \}. \quad (2.3)$$

We say an element \tilde{c}_X of \mathcal{C}_K is a K -modification of c_X .

We work on the path space $\Omega = C([0, \infty); F)$ with Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{F} induced by the topology of locally uniform convergence. We denote by $Z = (X, Y)$ the coordinate process and let $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the right-continuous enlargement of the filtration generated by Z . The component X will serve as the asset price process and, as such, will be a continuous semimartingale. The process Y , however, is not required to be a semimartingale. We are now ready to define our admissible class of measures, which is as general as possible.

Definition 2.3 (Admissible Class of Measures). Let Assumption 2.1 be satisfied. For a compact set $K \subset E$ we denote by Π_K the set of all measures \mathbb{P} on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) such that the following conditions hold:

- (i) X is a \mathbb{P} -semimartingale with covariation process $\langle X \rangle = \int_0^\cdot \tilde{c}_X(Z_t) dt$ for some $\tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C}_K$,

(ii) For any locally bounded $h \in L^1(F, \mu)$, where $\mu(dz) := p(z)dz$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(Z_t) dt = \int_F hp; \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

(iii) The laws of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ under \mathbb{P} are tight.

We also define the classes $\Pi_{\cup} = \bigcup_{K \subset E} \Pi_K$ and $\Pi_{\cap} = \bigcap_{K \subset E} \Pi_K$, where the union and intersection are taken over compact sets K .

Note that if $K_1 \subset K_2$ then $\mathcal{C}_{K_2} \subset \mathcal{C}_{K_1}$ so that $\Pi_{K_2} \subset \Pi_{K_1}$. Additionally any measure $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_{\cap}$ has $\langle X \rangle = \int_0^\cdot c_X(Z_t) dt$, rather than a K -modification appearing as the instantaneous covariance matrix.

We now introduce trading strategies. Let Θ be the set of all predictable processes that are X -integrable with respect to every $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_{\cup}$. For any $\theta \in \Theta$ we define the investor's wealth process by

$$V^\theta = \mathcal{E} \left(\int_0^\cdot \theta_t^\top dX_t \right),$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ denotes the Doléans-Dade exponential of a semimartingale. The goal is to maximize the investor's asymptotic growth rate over our admissible class of measures, which is defined as follows:

Definition 2.4 (Asymptotic Growth Rate). For a strategy $\theta \in \Theta$ and a measure $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_{\cup}$ we define the *asymptotic growth rate* to be

$$g(\theta; \mathbb{P}) = \sup \left\{ \gamma \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(T^{-1} \log V_T^\theta \geq \gamma) = 1 \right\}.$$

Our goal, akin to the one in [20], is to study the quantity

$$\lambda_K := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_K} g(\theta; \mathbb{P}) \tag{2.4}$$

for a given compact set $K \subset E$.

3 Heuristic argument

We first establish a class of strategies $\Theta_0 \subset \Theta$ that have the following *growth rate invariance* property:

$$g(\theta; \mathbb{P}) \text{ is independent of } \mathbb{P} \in \Pi_{\cup} \text{ for every } \theta \in \Theta_0.$$

To this end define

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ \phi \in C^2(E) : \int_E \left| \frac{\text{tr}(A \nabla^2 e^\phi)}{e^\phi} \right| < \infty \right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

The class

$$\Theta_0 = \{ \theta. = \nabla \phi(X.) : \phi \in \mathcal{D} \}$$

of *functionally generated portfolios* has the growth rate invariance property. Indeed, denoting by $\theta^\phi \in \Theta_0$ the strategy determined by ϕ we see by Itô's formula that under any measure $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_{\cup}$,

$$\log V_T^{\theta^\phi} = \phi(X_T) - \phi(X_0) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \frac{\text{tr}(\tilde{c}_X(X_t, Y_t) \nabla^2 e^{\phi(X_t)})}{e^{\phi(X_t)}} dt,$$

for some $\tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C}$. By tightness of the laws of $\{X_T\}_{T \geq 0}$ we have that $\phi(X_T)/T \rightarrow 0$ in probability as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, by the ergodic property and the definition of $\tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C}$ it follows that

$$g(\theta; \mathbb{P}) = -\frac{1}{2} \int_F \frac{\text{tr}(\tilde{c}_X(x, y) \nabla^2 e^{\phi(x)})}{e^{\phi(x)}} p(x, y) dx dy = -\frac{1}{2} \int_E \frac{\text{tr}(A(x) \nabla^2 e^{\phi(x)})}{e^{\phi(x)}} dx. \quad (3.2)$$

We maximize the right hand side of (3.2) over functions $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$, which is a non-trivial procedure due to lack of compactness properties of the underlying space, but as in [20] we are able to show that a maximizer $\hat{\phi}$ exists. Set $\hat{\theta} = \theta^{\hat{\phi}}$. By the growth rate invariance property and maximality of $\hat{\phi}$ this yields a *lower bound* on the robust growth rate

$$\lambda_K \geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_K} g(\theta; \mathbb{P}) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} g(\theta; \mathbb{P}^0) = g(\hat{\theta}; \mathbb{P}^0). \quad (3.3)$$

Here $\mathbb{P}^0 \in \Pi_{\cup}$ is an arbitrary but fixed measure in Π_K .

To obtain an upper bound we construct a measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K \in \Pi_K$ under which $\hat{\theta}$ is growth optimal over *all* strategies $\theta \in \Theta$. The requirement for $\hat{\theta}$ to be growth optimal together with Definition 2.3(i) pins down the required dynamics of X under $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$,

$$dX_t = \tilde{c}_X(X_t, Y_t) \nabla \hat{\phi}(X_t) dt + \tilde{c}_X^{1/2}(X_t, Y_t) dW_t^X, \quad (3.4)$$

for some $\tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C}_K$, where $\tilde{c}_X^{1/2}$ is a matrix square root of \tilde{c}_X and W^X is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion. The Y dynamics are, at the moment, unspecified, but suppose for the time being that we have specified them in such a way that $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K \in \Pi_K$. Then we obtain

$$\lambda_K \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} g(\theta; \hat{\mathbb{P}}^K) = g(\hat{\theta}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}^K),$$

which together with (3.3) and the growth rate invariance property characterizes λ_K by enforcing equality in (3.3). In particular it establishes $\hat{\theta}$ as the growth-optimal strategy, which, notably does not depend on K , as well as $\lambda := \lambda_K$ does not depend on K .

We view $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ as a worst-case measure. This is because one cannot outperform the robust growth-optimal strategy $\hat{\theta}$ under this measure. The main difficulty in constructing $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ is to specify the dynamics of Y such that the ergodic property, Definition 2.3(ii), holds. Our construction of $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ requires additional assumptions on the inputs c_X and p , which are stated as Assumption 4.1 in the next section. We note that our method ensures the existence of a worst-case measure (i.e. a measure in Π_K , under which X has dynamics (3.4)), but we do not expect this worst-case measure to be unique. Indeed, Example 7.5 exhibits uncountably many worst-case measures.

4 Nondegeneracy assumptions

To carry out the program laid out in Section 3 we need to construct a worst-case measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K \in \Pi_K$. Our construction is such that under $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$

- X has dynamics given by (3.4),
- Y will be a continuous semimartingale,
- X will have zero covariation with Y ; that is, $d\langle X, Y \rangle_t = 0$ for every t .

We stress that (X, Y) only possesses these very special properties under the worst-case measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ we construct. These properties are not assumed to hold for arbitrary measures in the class Π_K . In particular, laws where X and Y have nontrivial covariation are permitted and, as previously mentioned, laws where Y is not a semimartingale are permissible in Π_K . Additionally, as discussed in the previous section, we do not expect there to be a unique worst-case measure. Our construction just guarantees the existence of at least one such measure.

To carry out this construction, and to even establish that the class Π_K is nonempty, we impose the following additional assumption.

Assumption 4.1 (Nondegeneracy Assumptions). We assume that there exists a $c_Y : F \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{++}^m$ such that the conditions below hold. To simplify the notation set $c = \text{diag}(c_X, c_Y) : F \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{++}^{d+m}$ and define ℓ via $\ell = \frac{1}{2}c^{-1} \text{div } c + \frac{1}{2}\nabla \log p$ where $\text{div } c^i = \sum_{j=1}^{d+m} \partial_j c^{ij}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d+m$. We assume that

- (i) $c_Y \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,\infty}(F; \mathbb{S}_{++}^m)$ and is such that $c_Y(x, \cdot)p(x, \cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous for every $x \in E$.
- (ii) For every fixed $x \in E$, there exists a constant $k_x \geq 0$ and a concave function $\rho_x : D \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that $\lambda_{\min}(c_Y(x, y))p(x, y) = \rho_x(y)^{k_x}$.
- (iii) For every fixed $x \in E$ and every $C \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ we have

$$\int_D \frac{\text{div}_x(c_X \ell_X)^2 + (\ell_X^\top c_X (\nabla_x \log p + b))^2 + \text{tr}(c_X M)^2 + C}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)} p < \infty. \quad (4.1)$$

- (iv) $\int_F \ell^\top c \ell p < \infty$.
- (v) $\int_F \text{div}_x(c_X \ell_X p) < \infty$.
- (vi) There exist functions $\varphi_n \in C_c^\infty(E)$ and $\psi_n \in C_c^\infty(D)$ satisfying $0 \leq \varphi_n, \psi_n \leq 1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n = 1$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \nabla \varphi_n^\top A \nabla \varphi_n(x) dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_D \nabla \psi_n^\top B \nabla \psi_n(y) dy = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

where A is given by (2.1) and $B(y) = \int_E c_Y(x, y)p(x, y) dx$.

Remark 4.2. A candidate choice is $c_Y(x, y) = h(x)\rho_{\partial D}^k/p(x, y)I_m$ for some $k \geq 0$, where I_m is the $m \times m$ identity matrix, h is a positive continuous function and $\rho_{\partial D}$ is a *regularized distance to the boundary*. That is $\rho_{\partial D}$ is C^2 , concave and such that there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ with $\frac{1}{C} \text{dist}(y, \partial D) \leq \rho_{\partial D}(y) \leq C \text{dist}(y, \partial D)$ for every $y \in D$; see [24, Theorem 1.4] for the construction of $\rho_{\partial D}$. In this case Assumption 4.1(i) is satisfied. Additionally, $\lambda_{\min}(c_Y(x, y))p(x, y) = h(x)\rho_{\partial D}^k(y)$ so that Assumption 4.1(ii) is also satisfied since $\rho_{\partial D}$ is concave. Hence, under this choice it just remains to check the integrability conditions Assumption 4.1(iii)-(vi).

Assumption 4.1(ii) ensures that a certain weighted Poincaré inequality holds, which is crucial for our construction of a worst case measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}^K$. Condition (iii) is used to verify that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ satisfies the ergodic property. Conditions (iv)-(vi) are analogues of [20, Assumption 1.4] in our setting. The integrability bounds (iv) and (v) ensure that the robust optimal growth rate is finite and achieved

by a strategy $\hat{\theta} \in \Theta$. Assumption 4.1(vi) is needed for well-posedness of the problem. Indeed, in [20] it was shown that, in the one dimensional case, if [20, Assumption 1.5(iii)] fails then the corresponding robust optimal growth problem of that paper is degenerate in the sense that either the admissible class of probability measures is empty or the robust growth rate is infinite. [20, Assumption 1.5(iii)] can be equivalently rephrased in terms of test function conditions, similar to (4.2) (see [11, Section 1.6]). Consequently, (vi) is the analogous condition in our setting.

We will now show that Assumption 4.1(vi) implies that Π_Γ is nonempty. Define

$$d\mu(z) = p(z) dz \quad (4.3)$$

and the symmetric Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^0, D(\mathcal{E}^0))$ as the closure on $L^2(F, \mu)$ of

$$\mathcal{E}^0(u, v) := \int_F \nabla u^\top c \nabla v p; \quad u, v \in C_c^\infty(F). \quad (4.4)$$

By our regularity assumptions on c and p it follows from [2, Theorem 1.12] that the corresponding semigroup $(T_t^0)_{t>0}$ is strong Feller and that there exists a (a priori possibly explosive) weak solution \mathbb{P}_z^0 to the generalized martingale problem corresponding to

$$L^0 := \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}(c \nabla) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \log p^\top c \nabla = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(c \nabla^2) + \ell^\top c \nabla \quad (4.5)$$

for every starting point $z \in F$. From the form of the generator L^0 we see that \mathbb{P}_z^0 is a weak solution to the SDE

$$dZ_t = c(Z_t) \ell(Z_t) dt + c^{1/2}(Z_t) dW_t \quad (4.6)$$

with initial condition $Z_0 = z$, where W is a $(d+m)$ -dimensional Brownian motion.

We will now establish ergodicity of the Dirichlet form and corresponding process. First note that by [11, Example 4.6.1], $(\mathcal{E}^0, D(\mathcal{E}^0))$ is irreducible, so to prove ergodicity we just have to establish recurrence. To this end define $\chi_n(x, y) = \varphi_n(x) \psi_n(y)$, where φ_n, ψ_n are given in Assumption 4.1(vi). Then $\chi_n \in C_c^\infty(F)$, $0 \leq \chi_n \leq 1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \chi_n = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^0(\chi_n, \chi_n) &= \int_F \nabla \varphi_n(x)^\top c_X(x, y) \nabla \varphi_n(x) \psi_n^2(y) p(x, y) dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_F \nabla \psi_n(y)^\top c_Y(x, y) \nabla \psi_n(y) \varphi_n^2(x) p(x, y) dx dy \\ &\leq \int_E \nabla \varphi_n(x)^\top A(x) \nabla \varphi_n(x) dx + \int_D \nabla \psi_n(y)^\top B(y) \nabla \psi_n(y) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Hence, Assumption 4.1(vi) implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^0(\chi_n, \chi_n) = 0$, from which we deduce that \mathcal{E}^0 is recurrent, courtesy of [11, Theorem 1.6.3]. Ergodicity of the form and corresponding process now follows from [11, Theorem 1.6.5(iii)]. From (4.6) we see that X has the correct volatility structure so it follows that $\mathbb{P}_z^0 \in \Pi_\Gamma$ for every $z \in F$.

5 Results

We are now ready to state our main results. Recall A , λ_K and \mathcal{D} defined in (2.1), (2.4) and (3.1) respectively.

Theorem 5.1 (Main result). *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 be satisfied. Then there exists a unique (up to additive constant) $\hat{\phi}$ satisfying*

$$\hat{\phi} = \arg \min_{\phi \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{2} \int_E \frac{\text{tr}(A(x) \nabla^2 e^{\phi(x)})}{e^{\phi(x)}} dx. \quad (5.1)$$

Define

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \int_E \nabla \hat{\phi}^\top A \nabla \hat{\phi} \quad (5.2)$$

and the strategy

$$\hat{\theta}_t := \nabla \hat{\phi}(X_t); \quad t \geq 0.$$

Then for every compact set $K \subset E$ we have that $\lambda_K = \lambda$. Moreover, $g(\hat{\theta}; \mathbb{P}) = \lambda$ for every $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_K$, so that $\hat{\theta}$ is robust growth-optimal.

As discussed in Section 3, proving Theorem 5.1 includes two main parts: (i) establishing the existence of $\hat{\phi}$ and (ii) constructing a worst case measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K \in \Pi_K$. To establish the existence of $\hat{\phi}$ note that whenever $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$ is compactly supported we have, courtesy of integration by parts, the identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_E \frac{\text{tr}(A \nabla^2 e^\phi)}{e^\phi} = \frac{1}{2} \int_E \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \text{div} A - \nabla \phi \right)^\top A \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \text{div} A - \nabla \phi \right) - \frac{1}{8} \int_E \text{div} A^\top A^{-1} \text{div} A.$$

The expression on the right hand side is more amenable to analysis than the one on the left hand side. Hence, as in [20], we minimize the expression on the right hand side and show that the optimum $\hat{\phi}$ satisfies (5.1) as well.

Proposition 5.2 (Existence of optimizer). *There exists a unique (up to additive constant) minimizer $\hat{\phi}$ to the variational problem*

$$\inf_{\phi \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(E)} \int_E \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \text{div} A - \nabla \phi \right)^\top A \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \text{div} A - \nabla \phi \right). \quad (5.3)$$

Moreover $\hat{\phi} \in C^{2,\gamma'}(E)$ for some $0 < \gamma' \leq \gamma$ and $\hat{\phi}$ satisfies the Euler–Lagrange equation

$$\text{div}(A(x) \nabla \hat{\phi}(x) - \frac{1}{2} \text{div} A(x)) = 0; \quad x \in E. \quad (5.4)$$

Additionally, $\hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{D}$ and satisfies (5.1).

For the construction of the worst case measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$, the dynamics of X are pinned down by (3.4), but the dynamics of Y need to be carefully selected. We take c_Y from Assumption 4.1 to be the instantaneous covariance matrix of Y under $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$, as is the case under \mathbb{P}^0 . To select the drift of Y we identify a function \hat{v} , which will be used to specify the dynamics. To state the next lemma we introduce some notation. Whenever $\tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C}$ is given we write $\tilde{\ell}_X$ for $\frac{1}{2} \tilde{c}_X^{-1} \text{div}_x \tilde{c}_X + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x \log p$.

Lemma 5.3 (Existence of \tilde{c}_X and \hat{v}). *For every compact $K \subset E$ there exists a $\tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C}_K$ and a $\hat{v} : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following properties:*

- (i) For every $x \in E$, $\hat{v}(x, \cdot) \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(D)$ and $\nabla_y \hat{v} \in L_{\text{loc}}^q(F; \mathbb{R}^m)$ for every $q \in [2, \infty)$.
(ii) \hat{v} is a weak solution to the PDE

$$\operatorname{div}_y(c_Y(\ell_Y - \nabla_y \hat{v})p) = -\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p)$$

on F ; that is,

$$\int_F \operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p) \psi - (\ell_Y - \nabla_y \hat{v})c_Y \nabla_y \psi p = 0; \quad \text{for every } \psi \in C_c^1(F). \quad (5.5)$$

- (iii) We have the inequality

$$\int_F \nabla_y \hat{v}^\top c_Y \nabla_y \hat{v}, p \leq C \left(\int_F \frac{(\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)p} + \int_F \ell_Y^\top c_Y \ell_Y p \right) < \infty \quad (5.6)$$

for a constant $C > 0$, which only depends on the diameter of D .

Now we have all the ingredients to define a worst case measure.

Theorem 5.4 (Worst-case measure). *For every compact set $K \subset E$ and every $(x, y) \in F$ there exists a measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K$ on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) which is a weak solution to the stochastic differential equation*

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= \tilde{c}_X(X_t, Y_t) \nabla \hat{\phi}(X_t) dt + \tilde{c}_X^{1/2}(X_t, Y_t) dW_t^X \\ dY_t &= c_Y(X_t, Y_t) \nabla_y \hat{v}(X_t, Y_t) dt + c_Y^{1/2}(X_t, Y_t) dW_t^Y \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

and satisfies $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K(X_0 = x, Y_0 = y) = 1$. Here $W := (W^X, W^Y)$ is a standard $(d+m)$ -dimensional Brownian motion, c_Y is from Assumption 4.1, $\hat{\phi}$ is the optimum from Proposition 5.2 and \tilde{c}_X, \hat{v} are given by Lemma 5.3.

We additionally have that μ , given by (4.3), is an invariant measure for (X, Y) and for every locally bounded $h \in L^1(F, \mu)$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(X_t, Y_t) dt = \int_F h p; \quad \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K\text{-a.s.} \quad (5.8)$$

Consequently, the laws of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ are tight under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K$ and so we have that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K \in \Pi_K$ for every $(x, y) \in F$.

The construction of $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K$ and, in particular, verifying that it satisfies the ergodic property (5.8) is a delicate matter. Indeed our methods rely on a combination of PDE techniques and recent results in the theory of generalized Dirichlet forms. Our reason for introducing K -modifications and the class Π_K is because, in general, it is not clear when the process (5.7) with \tilde{c}_X replaced by c_X is ergodic. However, if one can verify that

$$\int_F \frac{(\operatorname{div}_x(c_X(\ell_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)p} < \infty \quad (5.9)$$

then (5.7) with \tilde{c}_X replaced by c_X is ergodic and the K -modifications are not needed. In a special case we can ensure that (5.9) holds in which case we get a refined version of Theorem 5.1. We state this case as a corollary.

Corollary 5.5. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 hold. Assume additionally that $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A$ is the gradient of a function and that*

$$\int_F \frac{(\operatorname{div}_x(c_X(\ell_X - \frac{1}{2}A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A)p))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)p} < \infty. \quad (5.10)$$

Define

$$\lambda_\cap = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_\cap} g(\theta; \mathbb{P}).$$

Then $\lambda_\cap = \lambda$, where λ is given by (5.2). Moreover, $g(\hat{\theta}; \mathbb{P}) = \lambda$ for every $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_\cap$ so that $\hat{\theta}$ is robust growth-optimal.

We would like to point out that when $m = 1$ and $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A$ is the gradient of a function then any solution \hat{v} to (5.5) satisfies

$$\int_F (\ell_Y - \nabla_y \hat{v})^\top c_Y (\ell_Y - \nabla_y \hat{v}) p = \int_F \frac{(\operatorname{div}_x(c_X(\ell_X - \frac{1}{2}A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A)p))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)p}. \quad (5.11)$$

Finiteness of the left hand side of (5.11) is crucially used to show recurrence of the worst-case measure. Hence, using our methods and at this level of generality, the integrability condition (5.10) cannot be improved upon when studying the robust problem without K -modifications.

The proofs of Proposition 5.2, Lemma 5.3, Theorem 5.4 and Corollary 5.5 are contained in Appendix B, but we give a proof of Theorem 5.1 here.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Since $\hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{D}$, in view of the discussion of Section 3, we have that the asymptotic growth rate of $\hat{\theta}$ is the same (finite) value for every admissible measure. This yields the lower bound $\lambda_K \geq g(\hat{\theta}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}^K)$, where we chose $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ constructed in Theorem 5.4 for concreteness and omitted the starting point from the notation for simplicity. Conversely, since $\hat{\theta}$ is growth-optimal under $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K \in \Pi_K$ we obtain the upper bound $\lambda_K \leq g(\hat{\theta}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}^K)$. This establishes the robust growth-optimality of $\hat{\theta}$ and so it just remains to prove the formula (5.2).

To this end note that under $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ we have that

$$\log V_T^{\hat{\theta}} = M_T + \frac{1}{2} \langle M \rangle_T, \quad (5.12)$$

where $M_T = \int_0^T \nabla \hat{\phi}(X_t)^\top \tilde{c}_X^{1/2}(X_t, Y_t) dW_t^X$. By the ergodic property we have $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ -a.s. that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle M \rangle_T}{T} = \int_F \nabla \hat{\phi}(x)^\top \tilde{c}_X(x, y) \nabla \hat{\phi}(x) p(x, y) dx dy = \int_E \nabla \hat{\phi}(x)^\top A(x) \nabla \hat{\phi}(x) dx < \infty. \quad (5.13)$$

Using [9, Lemma 1.3.2] we obtain that $M_T/T \rightarrow 0$, $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ -a.s. as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Hence we see from (5.12) and (5.13) that $g(\hat{\theta}; \hat{\mathbb{P}}^K) = \frac{1}{2} \int_E \nabla \hat{\phi}^\top A \nabla \hat{\phi}$ which completes the proof. \square

6 Discussion

In this section we discuss the results of the previous section and their financial interpretation.

6.1 Dependence of Y on $\hat{\theta}$ and λ

Note that the optimal strategy $\hat{\theta}$ from Theorem 5.1 is functionally generated, and hence in feedback form, but only depends on X , not Y . Remarkably, this is the case even though Y may be (partially) observable. Indeed, if $y \mapsto c_X(x, y)$ is invertible on D for every $x \in E$, then one can back out Y_t from observing X_t and $c_X(X_t, Y_t)$. However, what Theorem 5.1 shows is that knowing the trajectory of Y does not improve performance in an adversarially chosen measure. Indeed, the measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}^K$ constructed in Theorem 5.4 is precisely such a measure. Therefore a strategy, including those that depend on the trajectory of Y , cannot perform better than $\hat{\theta}$ under this measure. This is surprising since Y , even though possibly having vanishing covariation with X , is *not* independent of X , but tied to it by the nature of the invariant measure p .

Clearly distributional information about Y does enter into and influence the optimal strategy $\hat{\theta}$ and robust optimal growth-rate λ . Indeed, the function $\hat{\phi}$, which specifies $\hat{\theta}$, is determined by A through (5.4). A itself, given by (2.1), is the average of the instantaneous covariance coefficient $c_X(x, \cdot)$ with respect to the density $p(x, \cdot)$. These average quantities suffice to determine the optimal strategy and growth rate because Definition 2.3 of the admissible class Π_K only restricts the long-term behavior of Y . No restrictions on the local dynamics of Y are imposed. An interesting question for future research is to investigate how, by restricting the local dynamics of Y , the optimal strategy would depend on Y_t itself and not just its ergodic distribution.

6.2 Relationship to [20]

Since the optimal strategy $\hat{\theta}$ only depends on X , it is also the optimal strategy for the problem considered in [20] when one takes appropriate inputs $\bar{c}_X(x)$ and $\bar{p}(x)$ satisfying the required assumptions in [20]. Indeed, up to technical conditions, the requirement on \bar{c} and \bar{p} that is needed to ensure $\hat{\phi}$ of Proposition 5.2 determines the optimal strategy in the problem considered by Kardaras & Robertson is to have

$$\bar{c}_X(x)\bar{p}(x) = A(x); \quad \text{for all } x \in E. \quad (6.1)$$

One particular instantiation of this, which has a clear interpretation, is to set $\bar{p}(x) = \int_D p(x, y) dy$ and $\bar{c}_X(x) = A(x)/\bar{p}(x)$. Then \bar{p} is the marginal density of X in our setting and using the definition of A , we have that

$$\bar{c}_X(x) = \int_D c_X(x, y) \frac{p(x, y)}{\bar{p}(x)} dy = \mathbb{E}[c_X(X, Y)|X = x],$$

where (X, Y) have joint density p . The matrix $\bar{c}_X(x)$ can then be viewed as an *effective volatility matrix* for X as Y was averaged out, conditional on $X = x$, with respect to the invariant measure.

We now remark that Theorem 5.1 can be viewed as generalization of the main theorem in [20], where robustness of the optimal strategy is shown over a much larger class of measures by allowing the volatility to depend on a factor process. Indeed, suppose that, instead of the setup of our paper, we take the setup of [20] with inputs $\bar{c}_X(x)$ and $\bar{p}(x)$. The admissible class of measures Π of their paper is the class of measures satisfying items (i)-(iii) stated in the introduction. Then our Theorem 5.1 shows that (up to technical conditions) the strategy $\hat{\theta}$ is not only optimal for the class of measures Π but also for the classes Π_K of Definition 2.3 depending on *any* factor process Y taking values in *any* bounded convex open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ for *any* m with *any* inputs c_X and p as in Assumption 2.1 as long as the average quantity A given by (2.1) coincides with the one given

by (6.1). We do also point out here that ellipticity of c_X can possibly be relaxed towards hypo-ellipticity, which still allows to establish ergodicity of the involved process. The analysis of this aspect is left for future research. We also note that for several parts of the analysis only ellipticity properties of A matter, which in presence of stochastic factors can be met (due to averaging) even if c_X is not invertible anymore.

This generalized result provides a more complete answer to, and connects, the two questions posed by Fernholz [9, Problems 3.1.7 & 3.1.8]. Indeed, our result shows that assuming only the presence of sufficient volatility and stability in the market, positive long-term relative growth is achievable and, additionally, that the optimal strategy achieving this growth rate is functionally generated. Although our result takes explicitly given inputs c_X and p , Example 7.4 below shows that this result holds in substantial generality even when an explicit form for the volatility is not assumed. Example 7.4 is outside the scope of [20] but can be handled by our setup.

6.3 K -modifications

Our result Theorem 5.1 requires K -modifications. That is, we allow modifications to the input matrix c_X outside of a sufficiently large compact set $K \subset E$. We introduce K -modifications for technical reasons in order to be able to construct the admissible worst-case measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_K$ of Theorem 5.4. Corollary 5.5 supports the case that this is a technical matter since, under additional analytic assumptions, our main result continues to hold without the need for K -modifications.

Importantly, the optimal strategy $\hat{\theta}$ and the robust optimal growth rate λ remain independent of K . Moreover, the K -modification \tilde{c}_X of c_X appearing in Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.4 is explicitly given by (B.2) in Appendix B. Additionally we would like to point out that the amount of time X spends in the modified set can be made arbitrarily small under all measures $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_{\cup}$ simultaneously. Indeed, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and choose a compact $K \subset E$ such that $\mu(K \times D) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, where we recall that μ given by (4.3) is the probability measure on F with density p . Then for any $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_{\cup}$ we have by the ergodic property that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T 1_{\{X_t \in E \setminus K\}} dt = \mu((E \setminus K) \times D) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Consequently, when K is large, estimating the instantaneous covariation matrix accurately for $x \in E \setminus K$ is infeasible as the process rarely enters this region. As such, allowing K -modifications does not restrict the empirical estimation of the inputs. One can view our result as having additional robustness with respect to data sensitivity since the robust-optimal strategy $\hat{\theta}$ is independent of K .

7 Examples

We now consider a few examples. Where not explicitly verified we assume that the inputs c_X and p are such that Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 are satisfied.

7.1 The gradient case

Analogously to [20], when $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A(x) = \nabla h(x)$ for some function h , we see from (5.4) that $\hat{\phi} = h/2$. Consequently, this is an important special case as it yields a fairly explicit optimal strategy, whereas otherwise solving (5.4) can be a difficult numerical problem, especially when d is large. All of the examples below are cases where $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A$ is a gradient.

7.2 The one dimensional case

When $d = 1$ we have that $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A(x) = (\log A)'(x)$ so that $\hat{\phi} = \frac{1}{2} \log A$. Expanding using the definition of A we see that

$$(\log A)'(x) = \frac{\int_D \partial_x (c_X p)(x, y) dy}{\int_D c_X p(x, y) dy} = \int_D \partial_x \log(c_X p) \frac{c_X p(x, y)}{\int_D c_X p(x, w) dw} dy.$$

Consequently we can write

$$\hat{\phi}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\partial_x \log(c_X p(X, Y)) | X = x],$$

where the random variables (X, Y) have joint density proportional to $c_X p$. In the special case when X and Y are independent under this measure; i.e. if $c_X p(x, y) = f_X(x) f_Y(y)$ for some functions f_X, f_Y then this simplifies to $\hat{\phi}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\partial_x \log(c_X p(x, Y))]$.

7.3 A tractable class of models

Assume that $p(x, y) = p_X(x) p_Y(y)$ and set

$$c_X^{ij}(x, y) = \begin{cases} f_{ii}(x_{-i}, y) f_i(x^i) g(x) h_{ii}(y), & i = j, \\ f_{ij}(x_{-ij}, y) f_i(x^i) f_j(x^j) g(x) h_{ij}(y), & i \neq j \end{cases}$$

for some functions $p_X, p_Y, f_{ij}, f_i, g, h_{ij}$. Here x_{-i} is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional vector obtained from x by removing the i^{th} component and x_{-ij} is a $(d-2)$ -dimensional vector obtained from x by removing the i^{th} and j^{th} components. In this case we have that

$$A^{ij}(x) = \begin{cases} \bar{f}_{ii}(x_{-i}) f_i(x^i) g(x) p_X(x), & i = j, \\ \bar{f}_{ij}(x_{-ij}) f_i(x^i) f_j(x^j) g(x) p_X(x), & i \neq j \end{cases},$$

where $\bar{f}_i(x_{-i}) = \int_D f_{ii}(x_{-i}, y) h_{ii}(y) p_Y(y) dy$ and $\bar{f}_{ij}(x_{-ij}) = \int_D f_{ij}(x_{-ij}, y) h_{ij}(y) p_Y(y) dy$. This matrix is reminiscent of the one introduced in [17]. A direct calculation shows that $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A$ is a gradient and as a consequence we obtain that

$$\hat{\phi}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{2} \log f_i(x^i) + \frac{1}{2} \log g(x) + \frac{1}{2} \log p_X(x).$$

7.4 Exogenous stochastic volatility and ergodic independence

Here we look at the case when c_X only depends on y and $p(x, y) = p_X(x) p_Y(y)$. Then

$$A^{ij}(x) = \bar{A}^{ij} p_X(x),$$

where $\bar{A}^{ij} = \int_D c_X^{ij}(y) p_Y(y)$ is a constant matrix. Consequently $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A(x) = \nabla \log p_X(x)$ and so $\hat{\phi}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \log p_X(x)$. The robust growth rate is given by

$$\lambda = \int_E \nabla \log p_X(x)^\top \bar{A} \nabla \log p_X(x) p_X(x) dx.$$

Importantly, the optimal strategy does not depend on c_X or p_Y . When we take the volatility as exogenously given and only impose some asymptotic structure on its behaviour, which is independent of the asymptotic behaviour of X , the best strategy in a robust setting only depends on the stability properties of X . The other quantities in this case do not yield additional information that can be exploited under the admissible adversarial measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}^K \in \Pi_K$. Moreover, aside from the case when p_X is constant, we have $\lambda > 0$ so that strictly positive robust asymptotic growth is achievable even when c_X does not depend on x . Although the optimal strategy does not depend on c_X or p_Y , the robust growth rate does through the average value \bar{A} .

7.5 One-dimensional Beta densities

Set $E = D = (0, 1)$ and take

$$\begin{aligned} c_X(x, y) &= \sigma^2 x^{b_1} (1-x)^{b_2} (x+y)^{q_1} (2-x-y)^{q_2}, \\ p(x, y) &= \frac{x^{a_1-1} (1-x)^{a_2-1} y^{\alpha_1-1} (1-y)^{\alpha_2-1}}{B(a_1, a_2) B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma^2 > 0$ and the other parameters are such that

$$q_1, q_2 \geq 0, \quad a_1, a_2 > 0 \quad b_1, b_2 \geq 1, \quad \alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1, \quad b_1 + a_1 > 2, \quad b_2 + a_2 > 2. \quad (7.1)$$

Here $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Beta function. In this case

$$\ell_X(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{b_1 + a_1 - 1}{x} - \frac{b_2 + a_2 - 1}{1-x} + \frac{q_1}{x+y} - \frac{q_2}{2-x-y} \right).$$

The parameter constraints (7.1) ensure that $\int_F \ell_X^2 c_X p < \infty$ and $\int_F \partial_x (c_X \ell_X p) < \infty$. Next set $c_Y(x, y) = y^{\beta_1} (1-y)^{\beta_2}$, where

$$2 - \alpha_i < \beta_i < 2\alpha_i - 1; \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \quad (7.2)$$

Note that since $\alpha_i > 1$, the interval $(2 - \alpha_i, 2\alpha_i - 1)$ is nonempty. Next, we have that

$$c_Y(x, y) p(x, y) = \frac{x^{a_1-1} (1-x)^{a_2-1} y^{\alpha_1+\beta_1-1} (1-y)^{\alpha_2+\beta_2-1}}{B(a_1, a_2) B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)}.$$

Since the functions $y \mapsto y^\gamma (1-y)$ and $y \mapsto y(1-y)^\gamma$ are concave for $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ it follows that Assumption 4.1(ii) is satisfied. Moreover, for every fixed $x \in (0, 1)$, $\int_0^1 c_Y^{-1}(x, y) p(x, y)^2 dy < \infty$. Since the numerator of (4.1) is bounded in y for every fixed x it also follows that Assumption 4.1(iii) is also satisfied.

For this specification we have that

$$\ell_Y(x, y) = \frac{\alpha_1 + \beta_1 - 1}{2y} - \frac{\alpha_2 + \beta_2 - 1}{2(1-y)}$$

so that under the parameter conditions (7.1) and (7.2) we have that $\int_0^1 \ell_Y^2 c_Y p < \infty$.

Hence it only remains to verify Assumption 4.1(vi). Note that in this setup $A(x) = x^{a_1+b_1-1} (1-x)^{a_2+b_2-1} h(x)$, where $h(x)$ is positive and bounded. Similarly we have that $B(y) = C y^{\alpha_1+\beta_1-1} (1-y)^{\alpha_2+\beta_2-1} h(y)$.

$y)^{\alpha_2 + \beta_2 - 1}$ for some constant $C > 0$. For $r \in \mathbb{R}$ define $u_n(r) = n(r - 1/n) \wedge n(1 - 1/n - r) \wedge 1 \vee 0$. Let $\eta_n \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be nonnegative with $\int_0^1 \eta(r) dr = 1$ and such that $\text{supp}(\eta_n) \subset (-1/(2n), 1/(2n))$. Define

$$\varphi_n := \psi_n := (u_n * \eta_n)|_{(0,1)}.$$

By construction $\varphi_n(x) = 0$ whenever $x \leq 1/(2n)$ or $x \geq 1 - 1/(2n)$ and $\varphi_n(x) = 1$ whenever $\frac{5}{2n} \leq x \leq 1 - \frac{5}{2n}$. In particular we see that $\varphi_n \rightarrow 1$ pointwise. Finally note that u_n is n -Lipschitz, so by properties of convolution φ_n is also n -Lipschitz. Since φ_n is only nonconstant for $x \in (1/(2n), 5/(2n)) \cup (1 - 5/(2n), 1 - 1/(2n))$ we have from this and the Lipschitz property that

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi'_n(x)| &\leq n \leq \frac{5}{2} \max \left\{ \frac{1}{x}, \frac{1}{1-x} \right\} (1_{(\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{5}{2n})}(x) + 1_{(1-\frac{5}{2n}, 1-\frac{1}{2n})}(x)) \\ &\leq \frac{5}{2} \frac{1}{x(1-x)} (1_{(\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{5}{2n})}(x) + 1_{(1-\frac{5}{2n}, 1-\frac{1}{2n})}(x)) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently we see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \varphi'_n(x)^2 A(x) dx \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 x^{a_1 + b_1 - 3} (1-x)^{a_2 + b_2 - 3} (1_{(\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{5}{2n})}(x) + 1_{(1-\frac{5}{2n}, 1-\frac{1}{2n})}(x)) dx = 0,$$

where the last equality followed by the dominated convergence theorem since

$$\int_0^1 x^{a_1 + b_1 - 3} (1-x)^{a_2 + b_2 - 3} dx < \infty$$

due to our choice of parameters (7.1). A similar calculation shows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \psi'_n(y)^2 B(y) dy = 0$. We have now verified Assumptions 2.1 and 4.1 so that Theorem 5.1 applies.

When $q_1 = q_2 = 1$, direct calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\int_0^1 c_X p(x, y) dy \right) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{x^{a_1 + b_1 - 1} (1-x)^{a_2 + b_2 - 1}}{B(a_1, a_2)} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(x(1-x) + x \frac{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2 + 1)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} + (1-x) \frac{B(\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} + \frac{B(\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2 + 1)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and the robust growth-optimal strategy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_t &= \frac{a_1 + b_1 - 1}{2X_t} - \frac{a_2 + b_2 - 1}{2(1-X_t)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - 2X_t + \frac{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2 + 1)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} - \frac{B(\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)}}{X_t(1-X_t) + X_t \frac{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2 + 1)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} + (1-X_t) \frac{B(\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} + \frac{B(\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2 + 1)}{B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally note that for the given inputs c_X and p , Theorem 5.4 yields a worst case measure for every β_1, β_2 satisfying (7.2). Indeed, β_1 and β_2 affect the dynamics of Y , but do not enter in the dynamics of X or in $\hat{\phi}$ so that $\hat{\theta}$ is growth-optimal under all of the corresponding measures. In particular, we see that there are uncountably many worst-case measures in this case.

A Estimates for certain degenerate elliptic PDEs and variational problems

Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a bounded convex domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. In this appendix we collect and prove some results for the minimizer of the variational problem

$$\min_{u \in \mathcal{W}_0} J(u), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where \mathcal{W}_0 will be specified below and

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_D (\nabla u - \xi)^\top a(\nabla u - \xi) + \int_D f u.$$

Here $a : D \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{++}^m$, $\xi : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, and $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are measurable and satisfy Assumption A.1 below. We present the results of this section in a general setting and then apply them in Appendix B, where they play a crucial role in the proof of Lemma 5.3. We now introduce some notation used in both appendices.

Notation

- $L_w^p(D)$ for measurable $w : D \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is the weighted L^p space with norm $\|u\|_{L_w^p(D)} = (\int_D |u|^p w)^{1/p}$,
- The mean over D with weight w of any $f \in L_w^1(D)$ is denoted by $f_{w,D} = \int_D f w / \int_D w$. If $w \equiv 1$ we write f_D for $f_{1,D}$,
- $U \Subset V$: the closure \overline{U} is compact and contained in V ,
- $\delta_U(y) = \inf_{x \in U} |x - y|$: distance from y to the set U .

We make the following additional assumptions on the coefficients.

Assumption A.1 (Coefficients Assumption). Set $w(y) = \lambda_{\min}(a(y))$ for $y \in D$. We assume that

- a is locally Lipschitz continuous on D ,
- $w(y) = \rho(y)^k$ for some positive concave function ρ and some $k \geq 0$,
- $\int_D \xi^\top a \xi < \infty$,
- $f_D = 0$ and $f/\sqrt{w} \in L^2(D)$.

As a consequence of Assumption A.1(i) we have that a is uniformly elliptic on compact subsets of D , but may degenerate at the boundary. The Euler–Lagrange PDE associated to (A.1) is

$$\operatorname{div}(a(\nabla u - \xi)) = f. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For $u \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(D)$ the standard weak formulation of (A.2) is

$$\int_D (\nabla \varphi^\top a(\nabla u - \xi) + \varphi f) = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in C_c^1(D). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Solutions u will be found in a space $\mathcal{W}_0 \subset W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(D)$ which we now introduce. We rely on the following weighted Poincaré inequality of Chua and Wheeden [4, Theorem 1.1]: for any bounded convex domain $U \subset D$ we have that

$$\|u - u_{w,U}\|_{L_w^2(U)} \leq \frac{\operatorname{Diam}(U)}{\pi} \|\nabla u\|_{L_w^2(U)} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for every Lipschitz function u on U . Now let $\{D_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of bounded convex domains such that $D_n \Subset D_{n+1}$ and $\cup_n D_n = D$. By the density of Lipschitz functions in $W^{1,2}(D_n)$ and the uniform ellipticity of a on D_n we obtain (A.4) for all $u \in W^{1,2}(D_n)$ by approximation.

Set

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{W}} = \left(\int_D \nabla u^\top a \nabla u \right)^{1/2} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for any weakly differentiable u , and define

$$\mathcal{W} = \left\{ u \in L_w^2(D) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(D) : \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}} < \infty \text{ and } \int_D uw = 0 \right\}.$$

Using (A.4) and the inequality $\int_D |\nabla u|^2 w \leq \int_D \nabla u^\top a \nabla u$ one has

$$\|u - u_{w,D_n}\|_{L_w^2(D_n)} \leq \frac{\text{Diam}(D_n)}{\pi} \|\nabla u\|_{L_w^2(D_n)} \leq \frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \|\nabla u\|_{L_w^2(D)} \leq \frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}}$$

for $u \in \mathcal{W}$. Sending $n \rightarrow \infty$, using dominated convergence and the fact that $u_{w,D} = 0$ for $u \in \mathcal{W}$ yields

$$\|u\|_{L_w^2(D)} \leq \frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Next note that for $v \in \mathcal{W}$ we have, courtesy of (A.6), the bound

$$\left| \int_D f v \right| = \left| \int_D \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} v \sqrt{w} \right| \leq \left\| \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} \|v\|_{L_w^2(D)} \leq \frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \left\| \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} \|v\|_{\mathcal{W}} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}}$ is induced by the inner product $(u, v)_{\mathcal{W}} = \int_D \nabla u^\top a \nabla v$. Equipped with this inner product \mathcal{W} becomes a Hilbert space, since any Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{W} converges in $L_w^2(D)$ and in $W^{1,2}(U)$ for every $U \Subset D$. Indeed, the $L_w^2(D)$ convergence follows from (A.6). To see the $W^{1,2}(U)$ convergence first note that $\|\cdot\|_{L_w^2(U)}$ is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(U)}$ since w is bounded from above and away from zero on U . As such, there exists a $\kappa_U > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,2}(U)} \leq \kappa_U (\|u\|_{L_w^2(U)} + \|\nabla u\|_{L_w^2(U)}) \leq \kappa_U \left(1 + \frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi}\right) \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}},$$

where the last inequality follows from the definition of w and (A.6). Define the subspace

$$\mathcal{W}_0 = \overline{\{\varphi - \varphi_{w,D} : \varphi \in C_c^1(D)\}}^{\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{W}}}.$$

This is where we will look for solutions to (A.1). We are now ready to state the main result of this appendix. To simplify the notation to come write $|\xi|_{\mathcal{W}}^2$ for $\int_D \xi^\top a \xi$.

Theorem A.2 (Characterization of Minimizer). *There exists a unique solution $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{W}_0$ of (A.1), and this solution satisfies*

$$\|\hat{u}\|_{\mathcal{W}} \leq \frac{2\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \left\| \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} + 2|\xi|_{\mathcal{W}} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Moreover, \hat{u} is the unique solution in \mathcal{W}_0 of (A.3). If in addition $a \in C^{1,\alpha}(D)$ and $f \in C^\alpha(D)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then \hat{u} belongs to $C^{2,\alpha}(D)$ and satisfies (A.2) classically.

The proof of Theorem A.2 is broken up into several lemmas. However, we first prove another result, which is a consequence of Theorem A.2. For a set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the open ε -fattening of U is the set U_ε of all points closer than ε to U , namely $U_\varepsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \delta_U(x) < \varepsilon\}$.

Theorem A.3. Fix $q \in [2, \infty)$, suppose that $f \in L^q_{\text{loc}}(D)$ and $a\xi \in W^{1,q}_{\text{loc}}(D; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Fix $U \Subset D$ and let ε be a positive number less than the distance between U and ∂D , i.e., $\varepsilon \in (0, \inf_{y \in U} \delta_{\partial D}(y))$. Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be such that

$$\inf_{y \in U_\varepsilon} \lambda_{\min}(a(y)) \geq \kappa, \quad \|a\|_{L^\infty(U_\varepsilon)} \leq \kappa^{-1}, \quad \|\operatorname{div}(a)\|_{L^\infty(U_\varepsilon)} \leq \kappa^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Then the unique solution $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{W}_0$ of (A.1) satisfies

$$\|\hat{u}\|_{W^{2,q}(U)} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^q(U_\varepsilon)} + \|\operatorname{div}(a\xi)\|_{L^q(U_\varepsilon)} + \left\| \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} + |\xi|_{\mathcal{W}} \right), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where C is a constant that only depends on $m, q, \varepsilon, \kappa$, the volume of U , the modulus of continuity of a on U_ε , and $\operatorname{Diam}(D)$.

Proof. Note that Assumption A.1 ensures that κ as in (A.9) can be found. We use the notation $B_r(z)$ for the open ball of radius r centered at z . Select points $z_1, \dots, z_n \in U$ such that the balls $B_{\varepsilon/2}(z_i)$ cover U . The number of points required, n , can be bounded in terms of ε and the volume of U . Fix i . Since $B_\varepsilon(z_i) \Subset D$, we have from [12, Theorem 8.8] that $\hat{u} \in W^{2,2}(B_\varepsilon(z_i))$ and that

$$\operatorname{tr}(a\nabla^2 \hat{u}) + \operatorname{div}(a)^\top \nabla \hat{u} = f + \operatorname{div}(a\xi) \text{ a.e. in } B_\varepsilon(z_i).$$

From [21, Theorem 11.2.3] with the operator $L = \operatorname{tr}(a\nabla^2) + \operatorname{div}(a)^\top \nabla$ we get

$$\|\hat{u}\|_{W^{2,q}(B_{\varepsilon/2}(z_i))} \leq C' \left(\|f\|_{L^q(B_\varepsilon(z_i))} + \|\operatorname{div}(a\xi)\|_{L^q(B_\varepsilon(z_i))} + \|\hat{u}\|_{L^2(B_\varepsilon(z_i))} \right) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where the constant C' only depends on $d, q, \varepsilon, \kappa$, and the modulus of continuity of a on $B_\varepsilon(z_i)$, hence on U_ε . (More specifically, we apply that theorem with $\Omega = B_\varepsilon(z_i)$, $R = \varepsilon/2$, $z = z_i$, and (p, q) replaced by $(2, q)$. We also modify the coefficients of L outside $B_\varepsilon(z_i)$ so that the assumed bounds and modulus of continuity hold globally.) Recall that $U \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n B_{\varepsilon/2}(z_i)$. Thus by summing (A.11) over i and using that $B_\varepsilon(z_i) \subset U_\varepsilon$ for all i we obtain

$$\|\hat{u}\|_{W^{2,q}(U)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{2,q}(B_{\varepsilon/2}(z_i))} \leq nC' \left(\|f\|_{L^q(U_\varepsilon)} + \|\operatorname{div}(a\xi)\|_{L^q(U_\varepsilon)} + \|\hat{u}\|_{L^2(U_\varepsilon)} \right).$$

Next note that w is bounded away from zero on U_ε so there exists a $\kappa_\varepsilon \geq 1$ such that $\|\hat{u}\|_{L^2(U_\varepsilon)} \leq \kappa_\varepsilon \|\hat{u}\|_{L^2_w(U_\varepsilon)} \leq \kappa_\varepsilon \|\hat{u}\|_{L^2_w(D)}$, where the last inequality follows since $U_\varepsilon \subset D$. Thanks to (A.6) and (A.8) we have $\|\hat{u}\|_{L^2_w(D)} \leq \frac{\operatorname{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \|f/\sqrt{w}\|_{L^2(D)} + 2|\xi|_{\mathcal{W}}$ so the result follows with the constant $C = nC' \kappa_\varepsilon \left(\frac{\operatorname{Diam}(D)}{\pi} + 2 \right)$. \square

We now turn our attention to proving Theorem A.2. Recall the variational problem (A.1). Note that J is strictly convex on \mathcal{W}_0 , continuous in the norm topology on \mathcal{W}_0 , and lower semicontinuous in the weak topology on \mathcal{W}_0 . This follows from the corresponding convexity and continuity properties of norms and the fact that the bounded linear functional $v \mapsto \int_D f v$ is both strongly and weakly continuous on \mathcal{W}_0 .

Lemma A.4. *An element $u \in \mathcal{W}_0$ is optimal for (A.1) if and only if it satisfies (A.3).*

Proof. Suppose $u \in \mathcal{W}_0$ is optimal. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varphi \in C_c^1(D)$ one has

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (J(u + \varepsilon(\varphi - \varphi_{w,D})) - J(u)) = \int_D \nabla \varphi^\top a(\nabla u - \xi) + \int_D f \varphi + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_D \nabla \varphi^\top a \nabla \varphi,$$

where we used the fact that $f_D = 0$. Applying this with $\pm \varphi$ and sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields (A.3). Conversely, suppose $u \in \mathcal{W}_0$ is not optimal, so that $J(u + v) - J(u) < 0$ for some $v \in \mathcal{W}_0$. By density in \mathcal{W}_0 we can assume that $v = \varphi - \varphi_{w,D}$ for some $\varphi \in C_c^1(D)$. Then

$$0 > J(u + v) - J(u) = \int_D \nabla \varphi^\top a(\nabla u - \xi) + \int_D f \varphi + \frac{1}{2} \int_D \nabla \varphi^\top a \nabla \varphi \geq \int_D \nabla \varphi^\top a(\nabla u - \xi) + \int_D f \varphi$$

showing that u does not satisfy (A.3). \square

Remark A.5. Since $f_D = 0$, by density of $\{\varphi - \varphi_{w,D} : \varphi \in C_c^1(D)\}$ in \mathcal{W}_0 we can equivalently require that (A.3) holds for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{W}_0$.

In view of this identification, the existence and uniqueness statements in Theorem A.2 follow once we prove the corresponding properties for the variational problem (A.1) and its solution.

Lemma A.6. *The variational problem (A.1) has a unique optimal solution $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{W}_0$. This solution satisfies (A.8).*

Proof. Uniqueness follows from strict convexity of J . To prove existence of \hat{u} observe courtesy of (A.7) that

$$J(u) \geq \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}}^2 - \|u\|_{\mathcal{W}} \left(\frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \left\| \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} + |\xi|_{\mathcal{W}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} |\xi|_{\mathcal{W}}^2$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{W}_0$. This can be rearranged to

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{W}} \leq \frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \left\| \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} + |\xi|_{\mathcal{W}} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\text{Diam}(D)}{\pi} \left\| \frac{f}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} + |\xi|_{\mathcal{W}} \right)^2 + 2J(u) - |\xi|_{\mathcal{W}}^2}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Write $\hat{J} = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{W}_0} J(u)$ and consider a sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{W}_0$ such that $J(u_n) \rightarrow \hat{J}$. Since $J(0) < \infty$ we clearly have that $\hat{J} < \infty$. Thanks to (A.12), $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in the Hilbert space \mathcal{W}_0 and hence admits a weakly convergent subsequence, again denoted by $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Call the limit \hat{u} . Weak lower semicontinuity yields $J(\hat{u}) \leq \liminf_n J(u_n) = \hat{J}$, so \hat{u} is optimal. The estimate (A.8) follows from (A.12) and the fact that $J(\hat{u}) = \hat{J} \leq J(0) = \frac{1}{2} |\xi|_{\mathcal{W}}^2$. \square

The last statement of Theorem A.2 is a consequence of the following two lemmas, where \hat{u} is the unique optimal solution of (A.1), and hence the unique solution of (A.3), obtained in Lemma A.6.

Lemma A.7. *If $a\xi \in L_{\text{loc}}^{q/2}(D)$ and $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^q(D)$ for some $q > d$ then \hat{u} is locally Hölder continuous in D .*

Proof. Let $U \Subset D$. By Assumption A.1(i) we have that $a, \text{div}(a) \in L^\infty(U)$ and a is uniformly elliptic in U . The hypotheses of the lemma ensure that $a\xi \in L^{q/2}(U)$ and $f \in L^q(U)$. Additionally, \hat{u} belongs to $W^{1,2}(U)$ and \hat{u} is a weak solution of (A.2) in U in the sense that (A.3) holds with U in place of D . Thus [12, Theorem 8.22] implies that \hat{u} is locally Hölder continuous in U , and hence in D since U was arbitrary. \square

Lemma A.8. *Assume that $a, \xi \in C^{1,\alpha}(D)$, $f \in C^\alpha(D)$, and $f_D = 0$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then $\hat{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(D)$ and satisfies (A.2) classically in D .*

Proof. Consider an open ball $U \Subset D$. We have that a is uniformly elliptic and uniformly Lipschitz in U , $f + \operatorname{div}(a\xi)$ belongs to $L^2(U)$, and $\hat{u} \in W^{1,2}(U)$ is a weak solution of (A.2) in U in the sense that (A.3) holds with U in place of D . Thus [12, Theorem 8.8] implies that \hat{u} belongs to $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,2}(U)$ and satisfies the PDE (A.2) in non-divergence form,

$$\operatorname{tr}(a\nabla^2 u) + \operatorname{div}(a) \cdot \nabla u = f + \operatorname{div}(a\xi), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

almost everywhere in U .

We claim that, in fact, $\hat{u} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(U)$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$. To see this, consider any open ball $V \Subset U$ and let $p \geq 2$ (this suffices). Since \hat{u} belongs to $W^{2,2}(V)$ and satisfies (A.13) almost everywhere in V , and since $f \in L^p(V)$ for all p , it follows from [21, Theorem 11.2.3] that \hat{u} belongs to $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(V)$ for all p . (Specifically, in that theorem we take $\Omega = V$, z the center of V and R half its radius, and (p, q) replaced by $(2, p)$.) Since V was arbitrary, we conclude that $\hat{u} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(U)$ for all p as claimed.

Next, we consider the PDE (A.13) in U with boundary condition $u = \hat{u}$ on ∂U . The hypotheses imply that a is uniformly elliptic in U and that a , $\operatorname{div}(a)$, $\operatorname{div}(a\xi)$ and f belong to $C^\alpha(U)$. Thanks to Lemma A.7, \hat{u} is continuous on ∂U . Because U is a ball it satisfies an exterior sphere condition at every boundary point. [12, Theorem 6.13] then implies that there is a unique classical solution $\hat{v} \in C(\overline{U}) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(U)$.

To summarize, both \hat{u} and \hat{v} belong to $W_{\text{loc}}^{2,p}(U) \cap C(\overline{U})$ for all $p \in [1, \infty)$ and satisfy (A.13) almost everywhere in U as well as $\hat{u} = \hat{v}$ on ∂U . Taking $p = d$ we may apply [12, Theorem 9.5] to conclude that $\hat{u} = \hat{v}$. Thus $\hat{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(U)$ and satisfies (A.13), hence (A.2), classically in U . Since the ball U was arbitrary, the lemma is proved. \square

Proof of Theorem A.2. The result follows from Lemmas A.4, A.6 and A.8. \square

B Proofs for Section 5

The purpose of this section is to prove the remaining results of Section 5. We start with Proposition 5.2.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. The existence and regularity of $\hat{\phi}$ as well as (5.4) will follow from [20, Lemma A.1] once we establish that $\int_E \operatorname{div} A^\top A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A < \infty$. To this end for a measurable vector field $\Psi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ define the quantity

$$H(\Psi) = \int_F (\ell_X(x, y) - \Psi(x))^\top c_X(x, y) (\ell_X(x, y) - \Psi(x)) p(x, y) dx dy.$$

Clearly H is nonnegative and by choosing $\Psi = 0$ we get the bound $0 \leq \inf_\Psi H(\Psi) \leq \int_F \ell_X^\top c_X \ell_X p < \infty$, where finiteness is due to Assumption 4.1(iv). A direct calculation integrating out the y component shows that

$$H(\Psi) = \int_E (\Psi^\top A \Psi - 2 \operatorname{div} A^\top \Psi) + \int_F \ell_X^\top c_X \ell_X p.$$

Minimizing the integrand pointwise yields

$$\inf_\Psi H(\Psi) = H(A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A) = - \int_E \operatorname{div} A^\top A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A + \int_F \ell_X^\top c_X \ell_X p.$$

Since this is nonnegative we obtain $\int_E \operatorname{div} A^\top A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A \leq \int_F \ell_X^\top c_X \ell_X p < \infty$.

Thus it just remains to prove that $\hat{\phi}$ minimizes (5.1). To this end recall the measure \mathbb{P}^0 constructed in Section 4, where we omit the starting point for notational convenience. Using the dynamics (4.6) and arguing in the exact same way as in [17, Lemma 3.4] yields that for any portfolio $\theta_t = \theta(X_t, Y_t)$ in feedback form we have

$$g(\theta; \mathbb{P}^0) = \frac{1}{2} \int_F (\ell_X^\top c_X \ell_X - (\ell_X - \theta)^\top c_X (\ell_X - \theta)) p. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Indeed, the proof of [17, Lemma 3.4] only relies on the optimal growth rate being finite and the ergodic property, both of which hold under \mathbb{P}^0 . Now let $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$ be given and consider the trading strategy $\theta_t^\phi = \nabla \phi(X_t)$. Then from (B.1) by integrating out the y component we see that

$$g(\theta^\phi; \mathbb{P}^0) = \frac{1}{8} \int_E \operatorname{div} A^\top A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A - \frac{1}{2} \int_E \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A - \nabla \phi \right)^\top A \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A - \nabla \phi \right).$$

However, by the growth rate invariance property we have for any measure $\mathbb{P} \in \Pi_U$ – and in particular for \mathbb{P}^0 – that the growth rate of θ^ϕ is given by (3.2). Equating the two expressions for the growth rate shows that minimizing the integral on the right hand side of (5.1) over $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$ is equivalent to minimizing the integral in (5.3) over $\phi \in \mathcal{D}$. Since $\hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{D} \subset W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(E)$ is a minimizer of (5.3) it follows that $\hat{\phi}$ also satisfies (5.1). This completes the proof. \square

We now work towards proving Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.4. To this end fix a compact set $K \subset E$ and choose an open set V such that $K \subset V \Subset E$. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(E)$ be nonnegative and such that $\eta = 1$ on K and $\eta = 0$ on $E \setminus V$. Define the K -modification

$$\tilde{c}_X(x, y) = \eta(x) c_X(x, y) + \frac{1 - \eta(x)}{p(x, y)} \frac{A(x)}{|D|} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and set $f^x(y) = \operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p)(x, y)$ for $(x, y) \in F$. We are now ready to prove Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Fix $x \in E$. Since $\tilde{c}_X \in \mathcal{C}_K$ and $\hat{\phi}$ satisfies (5.4) we have that

$$\int_D f^x = - \int_D (\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla_x \hat{\phi})p)(x, y) dy = \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div} A(x) - A(x) \nabla \hat{\phi}(x)\right) = 0,$$

so that $f_D^x = 0$. Moreover, by Assumption 4.1(iii), together with the form of the K -modification (B.2) we have that $f^x / \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y(x, \cdot))p(x, \cdot)} \in L^2(D)$ (the precise values of C, b and M used to apply Assumption 4.1(iii) can be computed by expanding out the divergence term in the numerator and using the fact that $A, \nabla \hat{\phi}$ and η do not depend on y). Hence, we can apply Theorem A.2 (with $a = c_Y p(x, \cdot)$, $\xi = \ell_Y(x, \cdot)$ and $f = f^x$) to obtain a $\hat{v}(x, \cdot) \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(D)$ satisfying (A.3). Since $\psi(x, \cdot) \in C_c^1(D)$ whenever $\psi \in C_c^1(F)$ we obtain (5.5) by integrating (A.3) over $x \in E$, which establishes (ii).

Theorem A.2 additionally yields that $\hat{v}(x, \cdot)$ satisfies the bound (A.8) for every $x \in E$. By squaring both sides, integrating over $x \in E$ and applying elementary bounds we obtain the first inequality in (5.6). Consequently (iii) will follow once we show finiteness of the right hand side. By Assumption 4.1(iv) we have that $\int_F \ell_Y^\top c_Y \ell_Y p < \infty$, so it just remains to prove that

$$\int_F \frac{(\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)p} < \infty.$$

To this end note that when $x \in E \setminus V$ then $\tilde{c}(x, y) = A(x)/(|p(x, y)|D)$. Using the fact that $\hat{\phi}$ satisfies (5.4) we have whenever $x \in E \setminus V$ that

$$\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X \tilde{\ell}_X p)(x, y) = \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div} A(x)\right)/|D| = \operatorname{div}(A(x) \nabla \hat{\phi}(x))/|D| = \operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X \nabla \hat{\phi} p)(x, y).$$

Consequently, the numerator of the integrand is identically zero in this set so that

$$\int_F \frac{(\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)p} = \int_V \int_D \frac{(\operatorname{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y)p}(x, y) dy dx.$$

Again by Assumption 4.1(iii) we have that the inner integral is finite for every x , so the finiteness of the double integral follows from the continuity in x of all the ingredients (i.e. continuity of derivatives of $\tilde{c}_X, p, \nabla \hat{\phi}$) on \bar{V} , which establishes (iii).

It now just remains to prove that $\nabla_y \hat{v} \in L^q_{\text{loc}}(F; \mathbb{R}^m)$ for every $q \in [2, \infty)$. Fix such a q . The main tool for proving this will be Theorem A.3, but we first need to ensure that the constant C appearing in (A.10) is independent of x . To this end let $U \subseteq F$ be given and note that $U \subset U_D \times U_E$ for some $U_D \subseteq D$ and $U_E \subseteq E$. Pick $\varepsilon \in (0, \inf_{y \in U_D} \delta_{\partial U}(y))$ and set $U_{D, \varepsilon} := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \delta_{U_D}(y) < \varepsilon\}$. Note that $U_{D, \varepsilon} \subseteq D$. Next, since $c_Y p$ is uniformly elliptic on $U_\varepsilon \times U_{D, \varepsilon}$ and, by Assumption 2.1(iii) and Assumption 4.1(i), $\operatorname{div}_y(c_Y p)$ is bounded on $U_\varepsilon \times U_{D, \varepsilon}$ we can choose a $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\inf_{x \in U_E} \inf_{y \in U_{D, \varepsilon}} \lambda_{\min}(c_Y p(x, y)) \geq \kappa, \quad \|c_Y p\|_{L^\infty(U_E \times U_{D, \varepsilon})} \leq \kappa^{-1}, \quad \|\operatorname{div}_y(c_Y p)\|_{L^\infty(U_E \times U_{D, \varepsilon})} \leq \kappa^{-1}.$$

Theorem A.3 now yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{v}(x, \cdot)\|_{W^{2, q}(U_D)} \leq & C \left(\|f^x\|_{L^q(U_{D, \varepsilon})} + \|\operatorname{div}_y(c_Y \ell_Y p)(x, \cdot)\|_{L^q(U_{D, \varepsilon})} \right. \\ & \left. + \left\| \frac{f^x}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(c_Y(x, \cdot))p(x, \cdot)}} \right\|_{L^2(D)} + \left(\int_D \ell_Y^\top c_Y \ell_Y p(x, y) dy \right)^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of $x \in U_E$ by our choice of κ . Since f^x, c_Y and p are continuous in x , the functions ℓ_Y, c_Y, p are locally bounded and $\operatorname{div}_y(c_Y \ell_Y p) \in L^q(U_E \times U_{D, \varepsilon})$, courtesy of Assumption 2.1(iii) and Assumption 4.1(i), we can raise both sides of (B.3) to the power q and integrate over $x \in U_E$ to establish that $\int_{U_E \times U_D} |\nabla_y \hat{v}(x, y)|^q dx dy < \infty$. Since $U \subset U_E \times U_D \subseteq F$ was arbitrary we see that $\nabla_y \hat{v} \in L^q_{\text{loc}}(F; \mathbb{R}^m)$. This completes the proof. \square

We now turn our attention to proving Theorem 5.4. The proof is broken up into several lemmas. Our method of construction uses the theory of *generalized Dirichlet forms*. We refer to [23] for terminology used below that is not explicitly defined in this paper. We start by introducing the relevant objects. It will be convenient to set $\tilde{c} = \operatorname{diag}(\tilde{c}_X, c_Y)$ and $\tilde{\ell} = (\tilde{\ell}_X, \ell_Y)$. We define the symmetric Dirichlet form $(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^0, D(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^0))$ as the closure on $L^2(F, \mu)$ of

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^0(u, v) = \int_F \nabla u^\top \tilde{c} \nabla v p \quad u, v \in C_c^\infty(F)$$

and its corresponding generator $(\tilde{L}^0, D(\tilde{L}^0))$, which when acting on functions $u \in C_c^\infty(F)$ has the form

$$\tilde{L}^0 u = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}(\tilde{c} \nabla^2 u) + \tilde{\ell}^\top \tilde{c} \nabla u.$$

These object are as in (4.4) and (4.5) with c replaced by \tilde{c} . Next we define β via

$$\beta(x, y) = \tilde{c}(x, y) \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \hat{\phi}(x) \\ \nabla_y \hat{v}(x, y) \end{array} \right) - \tilde{\ell}(x, y) \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \tilde{c}_X(x, y)(\nabla \hat{\phi}(x) - \tilde{\ell}_X(x, y)) \\ c_Y(x, y)(\nabla_y \hat{v}(x, y) - \ell_Y(x, y)) \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

for a.e. $(x, y) \in F$. The first course of business is to obtain the existence and regularity of a certain semigroup.

Lemma B.1. *There exists an operator $(\widehat{L}^K, D(\widehat{L}^K))$ on $L^1(F, \mu)$ such that the following hold:*

(i) $C_c^\infty(F) \subset D(\widehat{L}^K)$ and

$$\widehat{L}^K u = \widetilde{L}^0 u + \beta^\top \nabla u; \quad u \in C_c^\infty(F). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

(ii) For every bounded $u \in D(\widehat{L}^K)$ and every compactly supported and bounded $v \in W^{1,2}(F)$ we have

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^0(u, v) - \int_F v \beta^\top \nabla u p = - \int_F v \widehat{L}^K u p. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

(iii) $(\widehat{L}^K, D(\widehat{L}^K))$ generates a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(\widehat{T}_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$ on $L^1(F, \mu)$. Moreover $\widehat{T}_t^K f$ has a continuous version $\widehat{P}_t^K f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(F)$ and $t > 0$.

Remark B.2. In view of Lemma B.1(iii) we will use the version \widehat{P}_t^K of \widehat{T}_t^K in the sequel.

Proof. To apply the results of [23] and [28] we need to verify that $\beta \in L_{\text{loc}}^q(F; \mathbb{R}^{d+m})$ for some $q > d + m$ and

$$\int_F (\widetilde{L}^0 u + \beta^\top \nabla u) p = 0 \quad (\text{B.7})$$

for every $u \in C_c^\infty(F)$. Since $\widetilde{L}^0 u p = \text{div}(\tilde{c} \nabla u p)$ the divergence theorem yields $\int_F \widetilde{L}^0 u p = 0$ for every $u \in C_c^\infty(F)$. Next note that by the local boundedness of $\tilde{c}, \tilde{\ell}$ and $\nabla \hat{\phi}$ together with Lemma 5.3(i) we see that $\beta \in L_{\text{loc}}^q(F; \mathbb{R}^{d+m})$ for any $q \in [2, \infty)$; in particular for $q > d + m$. Moreover, we have by the divergence theorem that for any $u \in C_c^\infty(F)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_F \beta^\top \nabla u p &= - \int_F \text{div}(\beta p) u \\ &= \int_E \int_D \left(\text{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p) + \text{div}_y(c_Y(\ell_Y - \nabla_y \hat{v})p) \right) u(x, y) dy dx \\ &= \int_E \int_D \left(\text{div}_x(\tilde{c}_X(\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})p)u(x, y) - (\ell_Y - \nabla_y \hat{v})^\top c_Y \nabla_y u p(x, y) \right) dy dx = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where the last equality follows from (5.5). The first two items of the lemma now follow from [28, Theorem 1.5], while the last item follows from [23, Theorem 2.31], which is applicable courtesy of [23, Remark 2.40]. \square

Next we establish existence of the process. To construct the process we initially augment the state space F with a cemetery state Δ . To this end let $F_\Delta = F \cup \{\Delta\}$ be the one-point compactification of F . We set

$$\Omega_\Delta := \{\omega \in C([0, \infty), F_\Delta) : \omega_{t+h} = \Delta \text{ if } \omega_t = \Delta \text{ for all } h, t \geq 0\},$$

let \mathcal{F}_Δ be the Borel σ -algebra induced by the topology of locally uniform convergence and (with a slight abuse of notation) denote the coordinate process by Z .

Lemma B.3. *There exists a diffusion process*

$$\mathbb{M} = (\Omega_\Delta, \mathcal{F}_\Delta, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}, (\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K)_{z \in F_\Delta})$$

with state space F , lifetime $\zeta := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t = \Delta\}$ and transition semigroup $(\widehat{P}_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$ given by Lemma B.1(iii). That is, for every $t \geq 0$, $z \in F$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(F)$ it holds that $\widehat{P}_t^K f(z) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_z^K[f(Z_t)]$ where $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_z^K[\cdot]$ denotes expectation under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K$.

Proof. By [28, Theorem 3.5 and Proposition 3.6] together with [29, Theorem 6] we obtain a diffusion process $\check{\mathbb{M}} = (\Omega_\Delta, \mathcal{F}_\Delta, (\check{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \geq 0}, (\check{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0}, (\check{\mathbb{P}}_z^K)_{z \in F_\Delta})$ with state space F , lifetime $\check{\zeta} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \check{Z}_t = \Delta\}$ and such that for every $t \geq 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(F)$ we have

$$\widehat{P}_t^K f(z) = \check{\mathbb{E}}_z^K[f(\check{Z}_t)]; \quad \text{for a.e. } z \in F.$$

Using the (more than) strong Feller properties of the semigroup $(\widehat{P}_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$ developed in [23, Section 2.3] (which hold in this setting due to [23, Remark 2.40]) and following the proofs of [23, Section 3] verbatim up to and including Theorem 3.11 (which only depend on the results of Section 2.3 and 2.4) we obtain a diffusion process $\mathbb{M} = (\Omega_\Delta, \mathcal{F}_\Delta, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}, (\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K)_{z \in F_\Delta})$ as in the statement of the lemma. \square

Lemma B.4. *The process \mathbb{M} of Lemma B.3 is strictly irreducible, recurrent and nonexplosive (i.e. $\zeta = \infty$, $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K$ -a.s. for every $z \in F$). Moreover, \mathbb{M} is a weak solution to (5.7).*

Proof. The strict irreducibility is due to [23, Proposition 2.39]. To prove recurrence we use the criteria developed in [14] together with Assumption 4.1(vi). First note that the same calculation as in (4.7) yields that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^0(\chi_n, \chi_n) = 0$ where $\chi_n(x, y) = \varphi_n(x)\psi_n(y)$ and φ_n, ψ_n are given by Assumption 4.1(vi). Next note by Cauchy–Schwarz that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_F |\beta^\top \nabla \chi_n| p \right)^2 &\leq \left(\int_F \nabla \chi_n^\top \tilde{c} \nabla \chi_n p \right) \left(\int_F \left(\tilde{\ell} - \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_x \hat{\phi} \\ \nabla_y \hat{v} \end{pmatrix} \right)^\top \tilde{c} \left(\tilde{\ell} - \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_x \hat{\phi} \\ \nabla_y \hat{v} \end{pmatrix} \right) p \right) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^0(\chi_n, \chi_n) \left(\int_E \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A - \nabla \hat{\phi} \right)^\top A \left(\frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A A - \nabla \hat{\phi} \right) - \frac{1}{4} \int_E \operatorname{div} A^\top A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_F \tilde{\ell}_X^\top \tilde{c}_X \tilde{\ell}_X p + \int_F (\ell_Y - \nabla_y \hat{v})^\top c_Y (\ell_Y - \nabla \hat{v}) p \right). \end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

The equality followed from the fact that \tilde{c} is block diagonal and by integrating out y in the $\int_F (\tilde{\ell}_X - \nabla \hat{\phi})^\top \tilde{c}_X (\tilde{\ell} - \nabla \hat{\phi}) p$ term. Since $\hat{\phi}$ is a minimizer for (5.3), the first integral on the right hand side is finite. As in the proof of Proposition 5.2, Assumption 4.1(iv) implies that the second integral is finite. This, together with the definition of \tilde{c} , also implies that the third integral is finite. Finally, finiteness of the fourth integral follows from (5.6). Consequently, the term on the left hand side of (B.9) tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In summary, we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^0(\chi_n, \chi_n) + \int_F |\beta^\top \nabla \chi_n| p = 0.$$

[14, Remark 15] together with [14, Corollary 8(b)] now yield recurrence of the semigroup $(\widehat{P}_t^K)_{t>0}$. Since, by Lemma B.3, $(\widehat{P}_t^K)_{t>0}$ is the transition semigroup for the process \mathbb{M} it immediately follows that the process is strictly irreducible recurrent.

Next, note that by [14, Corollary 20] $(\widehat{P}_t^K)_{t\geq 0}$ is conservative since it is recurrent, which yields the nonexplosiveness of \mathbb{M} (see [13, Remark 3]). The fact that \mathbb{M} is a weak solution to (5.7) now follows via standard arguments by first connecting the process to the martingale problem for \widehat{L}^K using (B.6) and then using the well-known equivalence between martingale problems and weak solutions to SDEs. Indeed following the proofs of [23, Chapter 3] verbatim from Proposition 3.12 onwards, but in our setting of a general open domain F rather than all of \mathbb{R}^{d+m} , we obtain the result of Theorem 3.22(i), which establishes that \mathbb{M} is a weak solution to (5.7). \square

We now establish the ergodicity of \mathbb{M} .

Lemma B.5. *μ is an ergodic measure for \mathbb{M} and (5.8) holds for every locally bounded $h \in L^1(F, \mu)$.*

Proof. To establish that μ is an invariant measure we must show that for every $A \subset \mathcal{B}(F)$ we have $\widehat{P}_t^K \mu(A) := \int_F \widehat{P}_t^K 1_A(x) d\mu(x) = \mu(A)$. To this end define $\beta_* := -\beta$ and note that $\beta_* \in L_{\text{loc}}^q(F; \mathbb{R}^{d+m})$ for any $q > d+m$ and it also satisfies (B.7). Consequently, we obtain an operator $(\widehat{L}_*^K, D(\widehat{L}_*^K))$ and process \mathbb{M}_* as in Lemmas B.1 and B.3 respectively corresponding to β_* . Additionally the conclusions of Lemma B.4 hold for \mathbb{M}_* which, in particular, yield conservativity of the corresponding semigroup $(\widehat{P}_{*,t}^K)_{t>0}$. Moreover, it holds that $\widehat{P}_{*,t}^K$ is the adjoint operator of \widehat{P}_t^K on $L^2(F, \mu)$ (see [28, Remark 1.7] or [23, Definition 2.7]). Consequently by conservativity and the adjointness property we have for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(F)$ and $t > 0$ that

$$\widehat{P}_t^K \mu(A) = \int_F \widehat{P}_t^K 1_A(x) d\mu(x) = \int_F 1_A(x) \widehat{P}_{*,t}^K 1(x) d\mu(x) = \mu(A),$$

establishing invariance.

Define for $z \in F$ and $t > 0$ the measures $\widehat{P}_t^K(z, \cdot) := \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_z^K[Z_t \in \cdot]$. Note that $(\widehat{P}_t^K)_{t\geq 0}$ is a stochastically continuous semigroup. Indeed, for any $z \in F$ and $r > 0$ such that $B_r(z) \subset F$ we have by right continuity that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \widehat{P}_t^K(z, B_r(z)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_z^K[1_{B_r(z)}(Z_t)] = 1$. Hence by [7, Proposition 4.1.1 and Theorem 4.2.1] we see that μ is strongly-mixing and hence ergodic. Moreover, μ is the unique invariant measure for $(\widehat{P}_t^K)_{t\geq 0}$ and the measures $\widehat{P}_t^K(z, \cdot)$ are equivalent to μ for every $t > 0$ and $z \in F$.

Next we establish that Z is a stationary process under the measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu^K$ given by $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu^K(A) = \int_F \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(A) d\mu(z)$ for $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Indeed note that for $f \in C_0^2(F)$ we have

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\mu^K[f(Z_t)] = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\mu^K[f(Z_0)] + \int_0^t \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\mu^K[\widehat{L}^K f(Z_s)] ds$$

and, again by conservativity and adjointness, that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\mu^K[\widehat{L}^K f(Z_s)] = \int_F \widehat{P}_s^K \widehat{L}^K f(z) d\mu(z) = \int_F \widehat{L}^K f(z) d\mu(z) = 0,$$

where the last equality followed by (B.5) and (B.7). By approximation we now obtain that $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\mu^K[f(Z_t)] = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_\mu^K[f(Z_0)]$ for every $f \in C_b(F)$ so that, under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu^K$, $\text{Law}(Z_t) = \mu$ for every $t \geq 0$.

As a consequence we obtain (see e.g. [18, Corollary 25.9]) for any measurable nonnegative h that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(Z_t) dt = \int_F hp; \quad \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu^K\text{-a.s.} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

By definition of $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\mu^K$ we see that the convergence in (B.10) also holds $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K$ -a.s. for almost every $z \in F$.

To obtain the ergodic property for *every* $z \in F$ we fix a locally bounded $h \in L^1(F, \mu)$ and argue as in [11, Theorem 4.7.3(iv)]. We reproduce the proof of that result for the reader's convenience. Let

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(Z_t(\omega)) dt = \int_F hp \right\}.$$

We have already deduced that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(\Lambda) = 1$ for $z \in F \setminus N$, where N is some Lebesgue null set. Next define $\Gamma_n = \{\omega \in \Omega : \int_0^{1/n} h(Z_t(\omega)) dt < \infty\}$. For a fixed $z \in F$, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(\Gamma_n) = 1$ by the right continuity of Z_t and the local boundedness assumption on h . Moreover, it is clear that $\theta_{1/n}^{-1} \Lambda \cap \Gamma_n \subset \Lambda$ where $\theta_t : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ for $t > 0$ is the shift operator: $\theta_t(\omega(\cdot)) = \omega(\cdot + t)$.

Since $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(Z_{1/n} \in N) = 0$ by the equivalence of $\widehat{P}_{1/n}^K(z, \cdot)$ with μ we see that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(\Lambda) \geq \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(\theta_{1/n}^{-1} \Lambda \cap \Gamma_n) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_z^K[\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{Z_{1/n}}^K(\Lambda); \Gamma_n, Z_{1/n} \in F \setminus N] = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(\Gamma_n).$$

Sending $n \rightarrow \infty$ now yields that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_z^K(\Lambda) = 1$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.4. The existence of the SDE follows from Lemma B.4 and the ergodic property (5.8) follows from Lemma B.5. The tightness of the laws of $\{X_t\}_{t>0}$ under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K$ for every $(x, y) \in F$ are clear from the ergodic property of μ (see e.g. [7, Theorem 4.2.1(i)]) and establishes that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}^K \in \Pi_K$. \square

Lastly we prove Corollary 5.5.

Proof of Corollary 5.5. The result will follow in the same way as Theorem 5.1 if we can construct a worst-case measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}} \in \Pi_\cap$ under which $\hat{\theta}$ is growth-optimal and c_X is the instantaneous covariation matrix for X . Since $A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A$ is a gradient of a function we see from the variational problem (5.3) that $\nabla \hat{\phi} = \frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \operatorname{div} A$. Hence (5.10) is equivalent to (5.9).

Next we obtain a \hat{v} satisfying the three items in Lemma 5.3 with c_X replacing \tilde{c}_X . In particular, as a consequence of (5.9), we have finiteness in (5.6). We now construct the operator $(\widehat{L}, D(\widehat{L}))$ and corresponding semigroup \widehat{P} as in Lemma B.1 with c_X replacing \tilde{c}_X . We obtain a process \mathbb{M} as in Lemma B.3 corresponding to \widehat{P} . The properties of Lemma B.4 hold for this \mathbb{M} as well – in particular we are able to get recurrence without needing a K -modification courtesy of (5.9). The ergodic property then follows as in Lemma B.5, which yields a measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)} \in \Pi_\cap$ for every $(x, y) \in F$, where the dynamics of (X, Y) under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{(x,y)}$ are given by (5.7) with c_X replacing \tilde{c}_X . This completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] Adrian D. Banner, Robert Fernholz, and Ioannis Karatzas. Atlas models of equity markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(4):2296–2330, 2005.

- [2] Benedict Baur, Martin Grothaus, and Patrik Stilgenbauer. Construction of \mathcal{L}^p -strong feller processes via dirichlet forms and applications to elliptic diffusions. *Potential Analysis*, 38(4):1233–1258, 2013.
- [3] Steven Campbell and Ting-Kam Leonard Wong. Functional portfolio optimization in stochastic portfolio theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10925*, 2021.
- [4] Seng-Kee Chua and Richard L. Wheeden. Estimates of best constants for weighted Poincaré inequalities on convex domains. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 93(1):197–226, 2006.
- [5] Christa Cuchiero. Polynomial processes in stochastic portfolio theory. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 129(5):1829–1872, 2019.
- [6] Christa Cuchiero, Walter Schachermayer, and Ting-Kam Leonard Wong. Cover’s universal portfolio, stochastic portfolio theory, and the numéraire portfolio. *Math. Finance*, 29(3):773–803, 2019.
- [7] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems*, volume 229 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [8] Robert F Engle and Andrew J Patton. What good is a volatility model? In *Forecasting volatility in the financial markets*, pages 47–63. Elsevier, 2007.
- [9] E. Robert Fernholz. *Stochastic portfolio theory*, volume 48 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability.
- [10] Robert Fernholz and Ioannis Karatzas. Relative arbitrage in volatility-stabilized markets. *Ann. Finance*, 1(2):149–177, 2005.
- [11] Masatoshi Fukushima, Yoichi Oshima, and Masayoshi Takeda. *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, volume 19 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2011.
- [12] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [13] Minjung Gim and Gerald Trutnau. Conservativeness criteria for generalized Dirichlet forms. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 448(2):1419–1449, 2017.
- [14] Minjung Gim and Gerald Trutnau. Recurrence criteria for generalized Dirichlet forms. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 31(4):2129–2166, 2018.
- [15] Tomoyuki Ichiba, Vassilios Papathanakos, Adrian Banner, Ioannis Karatzas, and Robert Fernholz. Hybrid atlas models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 21(2):609–644, 2011.
- [16] David Itkin and Martin Larsson. Open markets and hybrid jacobi processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14046*, 2021.
- [17] David Itkin and Martin Larsson. Robust asymptotic growth in stochastic portfolio theory under long-only constraints. *Math. Finance*, pages 1–58, 2021.

- [18] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*, volume 99 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer Cham, third edition, 2021.
- [19] Ioannis Karatzas and Johannes Ruf. Trading strategies generated by Lyapunov functions. *Finance Stoch.*, 21(3):753–787, 2017.
- [20] Constantinos Kardaras and Scott Robertson. Ergodic robust maximization of asymptotic growth. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(4):1787–1819, 2021.
- [21] N. V. Krylov. *Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Sobolev spaces*, volume 96 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [22] Martin Larsson and Johannes Ruf. Relative arbitrage: Sharp time horizons and motion by curvature. *Mathematical Finance*, 31(3):885–906, 2021.
- [23] Haesung Lee, Wilhelm Stannat, and Gerald Trutnau. *Analytic Theory of Itô–Stochastic Differential Equations with Non-smooth Coefficients*. SpringerBriefs in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, 2022.
- [24] Gary M. Lieberman. Regularized distance and its applications. *Pacific J. Math.*, 117(2):329–352, 1985.
- [25] Ross G. Pinsky. *Positive harmonic functions and diffusion*, volume 45 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [26] Johannes Ruf and Kangjiana Xie. Generalised Lyapunov functions and functionally generated trading strategies. *Appl. Math. Finance*, 26(4):293–327, 2019.
- [27] Johannes Ruf and Kangjiana Xie. The impact of proportional transaction costs on systematically generated portfolios. *SIAM J. Financial Math.*, 11(3):881–896, 2020.
- [28] Wilhelm Stannat. (Nonsymmetric) Dirichlet operators on L^1 : existence, uniqueness and associated Markov processes. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 28(1):99–140, 1999.
- [29] Gerald Trutnau. On Hunt processes and strict capacities associated with generalized Dirichlet forms. *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.*, 8(3):357–382, 2005.