

OPTIMAL INVESTMENT IN AMBIGUOUS FINANCIAL MARKETS WITH LEARNING

NICOLE BÄUERLE*

Institute of Stochastics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), D-76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

ANTJE MAHAYNI

Mercator School of Management, University of Duisburg–Essen, Lotharstr. 65, 47057, Duisburg, Germany

ABSTRACT. We consider the classical multi-asset Merton investment problem under drift uncertainty, i.e. the asset price dynamics are given by geometric Brownian motions with constant but unknown drift coefficients. The investor assumes a prior drift distribution and is able to learn by observing the asset price realizations during the investment horizon. While the solution of an expected utility maximizing investor with constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) is well known, we consider the optimization problem under risk and ambiguity preferences by means of the KMM (Klibanoff et al. [2005]) approach. Here, the investor maximizes a double certainty equivalent. The inner certainty equivalent is for given drift coefficient, the outer is based on a drift distribution. Assuming also a CRRA type ambiguity function, it turns out that the optimal strategy can be stated in terms of the solution without ambiguity preferences but an adjusted drift distribution. To the best of our knowledge an explicit solution method in this setting is new. We rely on some duality theorems to prove our statements.

Based on our theoretical results, we are able to shed light on the impact of the prior drift distribution as well as the consequences of ambiguity preferences via the transfer to an adjusted drift distribution, i.e. we are able to explain the interaction of risk and ambiguity preferences. We compare our results with the ones in a pre-commitment setup where the investor is restricted to deterministic strategies. It turns out that (under risk and ambiguity aversion) an infinite investment horizon implies in both cases a maximin decision rule, i.e. the investor follows the worst (best) Merton fraction (over all realizations of it) if she is more (less) risk averse than a log-investor. We illustrate our findings with an extensive numerical study.

KEY WORDS: optimal investment, learning, smooth ambiguity, duality theory, Bayesian investment problem

JEL CLASSIFICATIONS: C61, G11, D81

1. INTRODUCTION

We investigate the effects of model ambiguity preferences on optimal investment decisions in a multi asset Black Scholes market. Since the seminal paper by Ellsberg [1961], we know that decision makers may have a non-neutral attitude towards model ambiguity. As a result, preferences are decomposed into risk preferences (based on known probabilities) and preferences concerning the degree of uncertainty about the (unknown) model parameters and are evaluated separately. This is in particular relevant for portfolio optimization problems. A recent literature

E-mail addresses: nicole.baeuerle@kit.edu, amahayni@uni-due.de.

* Corresponding author.

suggests that model ambiguity is at least as prominent as risk in making investment decisions, see Chen and Epstein [2002].

There are different ways to incorporate model ambiguity in decision making, like for example summarized in Guidolin and Rinaldi [2013]. In our setting, model ambiguity refers to the drift uncertainty in the dynamics of asset prices¹ and we apply the smooth ambiguity approach of Klibanoff et al. [2005] to deal with it. The risk in asset prices itself is evaluated by a utility function applied to the terminal wealth. Thus, the expected utility is itself a random variable (determined by the prior distribution of the drift parameters) which is evaluated by a second utility function (ambiguity function) capturing the model ambiguity. This approach allows for a separation of risk and ambiguity. As a result we end up with a stochastic optimization problem over a nested expectation which leads to non-linear expectations and the fact that we cannot solve the problem with a standard HJB approach. As in Balter et al. [2021] we assume that both the risk aversion and ambiguity aversion of the investor are described by (CRRA) power functions. While Balter et al. [2021] consider pre-commitment strategies, we take into account for the possibility that the investor is able to gradually learn about the drift by observing the asset price movements.

First of all, we contribute to the literature by analytically solving the portfolio optimization problem under drift uncertainty and learning while taking into account for both, risk and ambiguity preferences. To the best of our knowledge this has not yet been achieved before in our setting. We exploit the fact that the norm-like functions which appear in the concatenations of the certainty equivalents for risk and ambiguity allow for a specific dual representation. On the one hand, such a result should have been expected from previous research about the representation of smooth ambiguity, see Iwaki and Osaki [2014], on the other hand it shows that smooth ambiguity is nothing else than a special kind of robust control. Indeed, we can think of the optimization problem as a classical Bayesian problem with adjusted prior probability distribution for the drift where the adjustment is computed in a second optimization problem. The attitude towards ambiguity depends on the relation of the levels of risk and ambiguity aversion (Balter et al. [2021], Iwaki and Osaki [2014]). Our quasi closed form solutions allow an in depth analysis of the interaction of risk and ambiguity preferences. Among others it turns out that with relatively increasing ambiguity aversion, the prior distribution is smoothly shifted from 'good' to 'bad' drift scenarios, i.e. an ambiguity averse decision maker is more pessimistic.

Second, we are able to determine the long-time behavior of an ambiguity neutral/averse Bayes investor in the multi asset case. This is much more challenging than in the single-asset case. There it has been shown in Bäuerle and Grether [2017] that the worst/best drift is crucial. In the vector-valued case it is not clear which drift scenarios are worst and which best cases. It turns out that these extreme scenarios are determined by the Euclidean norm of the possible drift vectors. An investor who is more (less) risk averse than a log-investor² then tends to a maximin (maximax) decision rule (which does not depend on the probability distribution of the drift). More precisely, an infinite investment horizon implies that the more (less) risk averse investor initially acts as someone who knows that the drift belongs to the worst (best) case scenario. Relying on this result we are able to compare the optimal strategy under learning with pre-commitment strategies, i.e. strategies where the investor is restricted to strategies which are deterministic functions of time. We are able to explain why (compared to a pre-commitment strategy) the value of learning is rather low, even in the case of high investment horizons. For short investment horizons (or remaining investment horizons), the investor is not able to learn *much* about the drift. For long investment horizons, both investors are initially guided by the worst (best) scenario. Finally this observation also carries over to the investor with model ambiguity since she essentially behaves like a Bayesian investor with adjusted prior which does not play a role when a large time horizon is present. This is maybe expected since a large time

¹It is well-known that the drift of stock prices is notoriously difficult to estimate, Gennotte [1986]

²investor with logarithmic utility

horizon allows for perfectly learning the model.

Related literature:

Bayes optimization problems and their sensitivity: We treat the fact that the asset drifts or market prices of risk are unknown as a Bayesian problem where we have a prior distribution (knowledge) about the values of the parameters which are here the drift or equivalently the market price of risk. The observations of the asset prices can then be used to update the belief which is also known as learning. This is done with the help of a filter. This filter then becomes part of the state process of the optimization problem. Techniques like these are well-known in finance, see e.g. Lakner [1995] Brennan [1998], Karatzas and Zhao [2001], Honda [2003], Rieder and Bäuerle [2005], Björk et al. [2010] for investment problems in Black Scholes markets. The sensitivity of the optimal investment strategy in a single-asset Bayesian Black Scholes model w.r.t. model parameters is an interesting topic and investigated among others in Rieder and Bäuerle [2005], Longo and Mainini [2016], Bäuerle and Grether [2017].

Duality and ambiguity: One early approach to deal with ambiguity is to consider robust approaches, e.g. Gilboa and Schmeidler [2004], Hansen and Sargent [2001] and in continuous time control problems with semimartingale markets Schied [2007], Schied et al. [2009]. The latter survey paper discusses different robust formulations and their connection to risk measures. Robust approaches care about worst-case scenarios and have sometimes been criticised for being too pessimistic. Thus, Klibanoff et al. [2005] introduced smooth ambiguity (KMM) which weights possible scenarios in a smooth way. Using Yaari's duality theory (Yaari [1987]), Iwaki and Osaki [2014] already showed that there is a dual approach to smooth ambiguity which connects the 'smoothing function' to some distorted probabilities. The dual representation of entropic risk measures is used in Bäuerle and Rieder [2020] to tackle discrete-time decision problems with exponential utility for the KMM ambiguity applied to an unknown parameter. In Skiadas [2003, 2013] the author relates a robust control to a recursive utility approach.

Solving smooth ambiguity: Smooth ambiguity models are by definition more complex than standard decision models under uncertainty. There are not many explicitly solved cases and approaches to tackle the problem. A static two-asset problem is considered and solved directly in Gollier [2011]. In Balter et al. [2021], the authors treat a Black-Scholes market with one risky asset and restrict to deterministic strategies which excludes learning. In Guan and Li [2022] the authors look for equilibrium strategies in a smooth ambiguity problem with investment in a single-asset Black Scholes market and reinsurance and the mean-variance criterion. The recent paper Guan et al. [2023] also considers equilibrium portfolio strategies for smooth ambiguity preferences.

Learning and ambiguity: The effect of learning under ambiguity has e.g. been investigated in Epstein and Schneider [2007] among others with the help of dynamic variants of the Ellsberg problem. In Ju and Miao [2012] a generalized recursive smooth ambiguity and the effects on learning are considered. Both references deal with problems in discrete time. Suzuki [2018] generalizes the results in Ju and Miao [2012] by taking a limit to continuous time. Whereas in Baillon et al. [2018] the effect of learning information on people's attitudes toward ambiguity is investigated.

The outline of the paper is as follows. First, Section 2 states the optimization problem and its solution. We start with a multi-asset Black Scholes model where we set the interest rate to zero for simplicity. Then we review the classical Bayesian case and explain how the problem with ambiguity can be solved analytically. A main tool is Sion's minimax theorem. Proofs are deferred to the appendix. Sec. 3 first analyzes the optimal strategy in the Bayesian model, since the optimal strategy in the ambiguous case boils down to this setting with adjusted prior. We discuss the behavior of the optimal investment strategy for short and long time horizon. The latter one being quite difficult to analyse. A particular focus is on the special case with two-point prior where we can represent the optimal investment strategy as a convex combination of Merton fractions which are optimal in the setting with complete information given by the

two drift settings. We also consider the case with pre-commitment i.e. when the investment strategy has to be chosen at time 0 and compare the two cases. Finally we simplify in the two-prior scenario the problem with model ambiguity. In Section 4 we present an extensive numerical study which sheds further light on our theoretical statements and gives some intuitive explanations. We restrict here to the single-asset case and two-point prior. The appendix contains proofs and further parameter constellations not discussed in the main sections.

2. OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM AND SOLUTION

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space and $T > 0$ be a finite time horizon. The underlying financial market consists of d stocks and one riskless bond, each defined on the previously mentioned probability space. The price process $S = (S_1(t), \dots, S_d(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ of the d stocks will for $i = 1, \dots, d$ be given by

$$dS_i(t) = S_i(t) \left[\mu_i dt + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma_{ij} dW_j(t) \right] = S_i(t) \left[\sum_{j=1}^d \sigma_{ij} dY_j(t) \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where $W = (W_1(t), \dots, W_d(t))_{t \in [0, T]}^\top$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion, $\mu_i, \sigma_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}, i, j = 1, \dots, d$ and $\sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ is regular. We further set

$$Y(t) := W(t) + \Theta t, \quad \Theta^\top := \sigma^{-1} \mu, \quad \mu := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d),$$

where Θ denotes the market price per unit of risk. The price process of the riskless bond is for simplicity assumed to be identical to 1.

We further assume that μ is not known and thus a random variable. This implies that the market price of risk Θ is not known to the investor. The random variable Θ may take one of the values $\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_m$. We assume a prior knowledge about the values given by $\mathbb{P}(\Theta = \vartheta_i) = p_i$.

In a next step we introduce a suitable set of trading strategies. Since the riskless bond is equal to 1 and we only consider self-financing strategies we can express the wealth process with the help of the investment in risky assets only. By $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_d)$ we denote a d -dimensional stochastic process representing the trading strategy of some investor, where $\pi_k(t)$ describes the amount invested in the k -th stock at time $t \in [0, T]$. We denote by

$$\mathcal{F}^Y(t) := \sigma(Y(s), 0 \leq s \leq t), \quad \mathcal{F}^Y := (\mathcal{F}^Y(t))$$

the filtration generated by Y which is equivalent to the filtration generated by S . Strategies π should be \mathcal{F}^Y -progressively measurable. This means that the agent is able to observe the stock prices and updates the belief about the market price of risk from this observation. In other words, the agent is able to *learn* the right market price of risk. The associated wealth process denoted by $(X_t^\pi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is given by

$$X_t^\pi = x_0 + (\pi \cdot S)_t, \quad \text{where } (\pi \cdot S)_t = \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^t \pi_k(u) dS_k(u) \quad (2.2)$$

with initial capital $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. In what follows let

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha} x^\alpha, \quad \alpha < 1, \alpha \neq 0$$

be a CRRA utility function. The absolute and relative risk aversion is here given by

$$R_A(x) := -\frac{u''(x)}{u'(x)} = \frac{1-\alpha}{x} \quad \text{and} \quad R_R(x) := x R_A(x) = 1 - \alpha.$$

It is well-known that the limiting case $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to the logarithmic utility.

2.1. The classical Bayesian case. The investor aims to maximize her expected utility of terminal wealth. First we assume that the investor is risk-neutral w.r.t. the unknown parameter and consider

$$V(x_0) = \sup_{\pi} \int \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[u(X_T^{\pi})] \mathbb{P}(d\vartheta) \quad (2.3)$$

where the supremum is taken over all \mathcal{F}^Y -adapted strategies π for which the stochastic integral and the expectations are defined. We denote this set by \mathcal{A} . This problem is the well-known Bayesian adaptive portfolio problem. We summarize its solution in the following theorem (Karatzas and Zhao [2001], Rieder and Bäuerle [2005]) (where $\|\cdot\|$ is the usual Euclidean norm):

Theorem 2.1. *The maximal expected utility attained in (2.3) is given by*

$$V(x_0) = \frac{x_0^{\alpha}}{\alpha} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, z)^{\gamma} \varphi_T(z) dz \right)^{1/\gamma}, \quad x_0 > 0 \quad (2.4)$$

where $\gamma = 1/(1 - \alpha)$, φ_T is the density of the d -dimensional normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, TI)$ (I being the identity matrix) and for $t \geq 0, z \in \mathbb{R}^d, i = 1, \dots, m$ we define

$$F(t, z) := \sum_{i=1}^d L_t(\vartheta_i, z) p_i, \quad L_t(\vartheta_i, z) := \begin{cases} \exp(z \cdot \vartheta_i - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_i\|^2 t) & t > 0 \\ 1 & t = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

The optimal fractions invested in the stocks are for $t \geq 0$ given by

$$\frac{\pi^*(t)}{X^*(t)} = \gamma(\sigma^{\top})^{-1} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla F(T, z + Y(t)) (F(T, z + Y(t)))^{\gamma-1} \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (F(T, z + Y(t)))^{\gamma} \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz} \quad (2.6)$$

where X^* is the wealth process under the optimal strategy π^* .

Remark 2.2. Recall in particular that in case the market price of risk is known and is equal to ϑ , the optimal fractions which have to be invested do not depend on time and wealth and are given by

$$\kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \vartheta) := \gamma(\sigma^{\top})^{-1} \vartheta.$$

This is a special case of our model when the prior distribution is concentrated on ϑ . It is often named *Merton fractions* of a CRRA investor with a level of relative risk aversion $\frac{1}{\gamma} = 1 - \alpha$.

2.2. The case with model ambiguity concerns. Now we are interested in an investor who takes model ambiguity into account, i.e. instead of problem (2.3) we consider for a second utility function $v(x) = 1/\lambda x^{\lambda}, \lambda < 1, \lambda \neq 0$ the problem (see e.g. Balter et al. [2021])

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} v^{-1} \int v \circ u^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[u(X_T^{\pi})] \mathbb{P}(d\vartheta) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\int (\mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}]^{\lambda/\alpha} \mathbb{P}(d\vartheta) \right)^{1/\lambda} \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

This means that model ambiguity, represented by an uncertain market price of risk, is evaluated with a second utility function v which is here of the same form but with possibly different parameter. In case $\alpha > 0$ problem (2.7) is equivalent to

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbb{E}_{\Theta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}]^{\lambda/\alpha}) \right]^{\alpha/\lambda} \right), \quad (2.8)$$

in case $\alpha < 0$ it is equivalent to

$$\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbb{E}_{\Theta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}]^{\lambda/\alpha}) \right]^{\alpha/\lambda} \right), \quad (2.9)$$

In case $\alpha = \lambda$ the problem reduces to the Bayesian problem discussed previously. Thus, if model risk and the market risk is evaluated with the same parameter we are back in the setting of Section 2.1.

2.2.1. *The ambiguity loving case.* Let us now assume that $\lambda > \alpha > 0$ and define $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha > 1$. The economic interpretation is that the agent is less concerned about model ambiguity than about the risk in the stock market itself. In this case by using the $L^{\mathbf{p}}$ norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{p}}$ we can write problem (2.8) as

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \|\mathbb{E}_{\Theta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}]\|_{\mathbf{p}} \quad (2.10)$$

where the norm is w.r.t. Θ . It is well-known that the $L^{\mathbf{p}}$ norm has the following dual representation for a r.v. $X \geq 0$, where $1/\mathbf{p} + 1/\mathbf{q} = 1$ (see e.g. Rudin [1991]):

$$\|X\|_{\mathbf{p}} = \sup \left\{ \int X d\mathbb{Q} : \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_{\mathbf{q}} \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (2.11)$$

On the right-hand side of (2.11) the supremum is taken over all measures \mathbb{Q} (not necessarily probability measures) which are absolutely continuous w.r.t. \mathbb{P} . For a r.v. X with values $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and corresponding probabilities p_1, \dots, p_d we can write

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}} = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i : \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{p_i} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i \leq 1, q_i \geq 0 \right\}. \quad (2.12)$$

Define the set

$$\Omega := \left\{ (q_i) : \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{p_i} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i \leq 1, q_i \geq 0 \right\} \quad (2.13)$$

as the set of measures which satisfy the constraints in (2.12). This gives rise to the following formulation of our problem:

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \|\mathbb{E}_{\Theta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}]\|_{\mathbf{p}} = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \Omega} \int \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] \mathbb{Q}(d\vartheta) = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \Omega} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \int \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] \mathbb{Q}(d\vartheta). \quad (2.14)$$

After normalizing \mathbb{Q} , the inner optimization problem is however, exactly the Bayesian portfolio problem of the previous section with distribution $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}} := \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{R})$ for the unknown parameter. So solving (2.8) boils down to solving the classical Bayesian portfolio problem first and then in a second step finding the optimal prior distribution implied by \mathbb{Q}^* which is obtained from the outer optimization problem.

2.2.2. *The ambiguity averse case.* Let us now assume that $\alpha > \lambda > 0$, i.e. the agent is more concerned about model ambiguity than about the risk in the financial market. This case is slightly more complicated. Define again $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha < 1$ and \mathbf{q} by $1/\mathbf{p} + 1/\mathbf{q} = 1$. Note that $\mathbf{q} < 0$. We obtain (see Appendix 6.1):

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}} = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i : \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{p_i} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i \leq 1, q_i \geq 0 \right\}. \quad (2.15)$$

Again, the infimum on the right hand side is taken over all measures $\mathbb{Q} = (q_i)$ which satisfy the constraints. Hence we get

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}_{\Theta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}])^{\mathbf{p}})^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}} = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \Omega} \int \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] \mathbb{Q}(d\vartheta). \quad (2.16)$$

We have to show next that we can interchange the infimum and supremum in order to solve the problem as in the previous case. We proceed as in Bäuerle and Rieder [2020] and use the following minimax theorem (see Sion [1958]):

Theorem 2.3. *Let M be any space and O be a compact space, h a function on $M \times O$ that is concave-convexlike. If $h(x, y)$ is lower semi-continuous in y for all $x \in M$ then*

$$\sup_x \inf_y h(x, y) = \inf_y \sup_x h(x, y).$$

Theorem 2.4. *In our setting we obtain*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathfrak{Q}} \int \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] \mathbb{Q}(d\vartheta) = \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathfrak{Q}} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \int \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] \mathbb{Q}(d\vartheta). \quad (2.17)$$

Proof. We apply Theorem 2.3 to the function $L : \mathcal{A} \times \mathfrak{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$L(\pi, \mathbb{Q}) = \int \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta}[(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] \mathbb{Q}(d\vartheta).$$

where \mathcal{A} is the set of admissible strategies. The set \mathfrak{Q} is not compact, however since we want to minimize over this set we can replace it by a set $\tilde{\mathfrak{Q}}$ where the components of \mathbb{Q} are bounded by a constant $K > 0$. Next the mapping $\mathbb{Q} \mapsto L(\mathbb{Q}, \pi)$ is linear and continuous w.r.t. weak convergence. Finally, since X_T^{π} is linear in π and x^{α} is concave, the mapping $\pi \mapsto L(\mathbb{Q}, \pi)$ is concave. Hence the assumptions are satisfied and Theorem 2.3 implies that we are able to interchange the infimum and supremum. \square

As a result we can solve problem (2.16) as in the previous section. The other cases with $\alpha, \lambda < 0$ are discussed in Appendix 6.1.

3. SENSITIVITY AND COMPARISON RESULTS

In the previous section we have seen that solving the optimization problem with smooth ambiguity boils down to solving the classical Bayesian investment problem with the 'right' prior distribution for the unknown market price of risk. In particular, as far as sensitivity results are concerned, the model behaves as the classical Bayesian problem. Thus, we first prove some sensitivity results for the classical case, i.e. for the optimal fractions in Theorem 2.1 which we denote by

$$\kappa(t, T, Y(t)) := \frac{\pi^*(t)}{X^*(t)}.$$

3.1. Limiting results for optimal investment fraction - General prior. In what follows, the i -th row of $(\sigma^{\top})^{-1}$ will be denoted by $(\sigma^{\top})_i^{-1}$ and $\|\cdot\|$ is the usual Euclidean norm. When we assume that $p_k > 0$ for all k , we obtain the following results:

Theorem 3.1. *In the Bayesian model it holds for the optimal investment fractions:*

a) for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \kappa(0, T, y) = \gamma(\sigma^{\top})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^m \vartheta_k p_k.$$

b) when $\|\vartheta_1\| < \dots < \|\vartheta_m\|$ and $\alpha > 0$ then for all $t \geq 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(t, T, y) = \gamma(\sigma^{\top})^{-1} \cdot \vartheta_m = \kappa^{Mer}(\gamma, \vartheta_m).$$

c) when $\|\vartheta_1\| < \dots < \|\vartheta_m\|$ and $\alpha < 0$ then for all $t \geq 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(t, T, y) = \gamma(\sigma^{\top})^{-1} \cdot \vartheta_1 = \kappa^{Mer}(\gamma, \vartheta_1).$$

d) for all $t \geq 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$:

$$\gamma \min_k \{(\sigma^{\top})_i^{-1} \cdot \vartheta_k\} \leq \kappa_i(t, T, y) \leq \gamma \max_k \{(\sigma^{\top})_i^{-1} \cdot \vartheta_k\}.$$

e) for all $T > 0$:

$$\lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \kappa(0, T, 0) = (\sigma^{\top})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^m \vartheta_k p_k.$$

A proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix 6.2. Recall again that the limiting case $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to the logarithmic utility. Indeed with a logarithmic utility the so-called *certainty equivalent principle holds*, i.e. the unknown market price of risk ϑ is simply replaced by its expectation in the Merton fraction $\kappa^{\text{Mer}}(1, \vartheta)$ given by the right-hand side of the equation in e). The same is true, when the time horizon is short, see a). For a large time horizon (b), c)) investors tend to extreme Merton fractions. In general the optimal investment fractions can be bounded by the entries in the Merton fractions (see d)).

Remark 3.2. The statements are substantially easier to formulate and prove in the case when we have only one stock. In this case part a), d) and e) are special cases of Theorem 9 in Rieder and Bäuerle [2005], part b) and c) are Theorem 3.1/3.3 in Bäuerle and Grether [2017]. Further sensitivity results in the one risky asset case can be found in Longo and Mainini [2016].

3.2. Representation for optimal investment fraction - Two-point prior. Assume now further that $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d)$ can take only two possible (arbitrary) values $\bar{\mu} = (\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_d)$ and $\underline{\mu} = (\underline{\mu}_1, \dots, \underline{\mu}_d)$. We assume that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu = \bar{\mu}) = p \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\mu = \underline{\mu}) = 1 - p, \quad p \in (0, 1). \quad (3.1)$$

The optimization problem (2.3) boils down to

$$V(x_0) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} p \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}}[u(X_T^\pi)] + (1 - p) \mathbb{E}_{\underline{\mu}}[u(X_T^\pi)]. \quad (3.2)$$

where $u(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha} x^\alpha$. In this case the function F appearing in (2.1) is given by $F(t, z) = pL_t(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + (1 - p)L_t(\underline{\vartheta}, z)$. Let us further denote

$$\hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)) := \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z + Y(t)) (F(T, z + Y(t)))^{\gamma-1} \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} (F(T, z + Y(t)))^\gamma \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz}.$$

Then we can express the solution of (3.2) more explicitly.

Lemma 3.3. *In the case of a priori distribution of μ given by (3.1), the optimal investment fractions $\kappa(t, T, Y(t)) := \frac{\pi^*(t)}{X^*(t)}$ of the Bayesian problem (3.2) can be written as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(t, T, Y(t)) &= \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} \bar{\vartheta} \alpha(t, T, Y(t)) + \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} \underline{\vartheta} (1 - \alpha(t, T, Y(t))) \\ &= \kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \bar{\vartheta}) \alpha(t, T, Y(t)) + \kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \underline{\vartheta}) (1 - \alpha(t, T, Y(t))) \end{aligned}$$

with $\alpha(t, T, Y(t)) = 1 - (1 - p)\hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)) \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. From Theorem 2.1 we know that the optimal fraction is given by:

$$\kappa(t, T, Y(t)) = \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla F(T, z + Y(t)) (F(T, z + Y(t)))^{\gamma-1} \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (F(T, z + Y(t)))^\gamma \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz} \quad (3.3)$$

We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla F(t, z) &= p \nabla L_t(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + (1 - p) \nabla L_t(\underline{\vartheta}, z) \\ &= p L_t(\bar{\vartheta}, z) \bar{\vartheta} + (1 - p) L_t(\underline{\vartheta}, z) \underline{\vartheta} \\ &= \bar{\vartheta} F(t, z) - (1 - p) L_t(\underline{\vartheta}, z) (\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\kappa(t, T, Y(t)) = \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} \bar{\vartheta} - (1 - p) \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} (\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta}) \hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)).$$

The stated representation is obtained from

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(t, T, Y(t)) &= \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} \bar{\vartheta} - (1 - p) \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} (\bar{\vartheta} - \underline{\vartheta}) \hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)) \\ &= \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} \bar{\vartheta} \left(1 - (1 - p) \hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)) \right) + \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1} \underline{\vartheta} (1 - p) \hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)). \end{aligned}$$

What is left to prove is that $1 - \alpha(t, T, Y(t)) = (1 - p)\hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)) \in [0, 1]$. Non-negativity is clear. For the upper bound note that $(1 - p)L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z + Y(t)) \leq F(T, z + Y(t))$. \square

Thus, we can see that the optimal fraction is always a convex combination between the two possible Merton fractions $\gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1}\bar{\vartheta}$ and $\gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1}\underline{\vartheta}$.

3.3. Pre-commitment. We will also compare the optimal investment fraction $\kappa(t, T, Y(t))$ under learning with the optimal pre-commitment strategy. The optimal pre-commitment strategy is a constant, \mathcal{F}_0^Y -measurable investment fraction κ_T^{pre} which is defined by the optimal constant investment fraction κ which solves the optimization problem (Branger et al. [2023])

$$V^{\text{pre}}(x_0) = \sup_{\pi} p \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}}[u(X_T^\pi)] + (1-p)\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\mu}}[u(X_T^\pi)] \text{ s.t. } \pi(t) = \kappa X(t). \quad (3.4)$$

The expectation appearing in (3.4) can be computed explicitly and the first-order condition for the optimal κ_T^{pre} can implicitly be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_T^{\text{pre}} &= \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1}\bar{\vartheta} \left(\frac{pe^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\bar{\mu}T}}{pe^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\bar{\mu}T} + (1-p)e^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\underline{\mu}T}} \right) + \gamma(\sigma^\top)^{-1}\underline{\vartheta} \left(\frac{(1-p)e^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\underline{\mu}T}}{pe^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\bar{\mu}T} + (1-p)e^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\underline{\mu}T}} \right) \\ &= \kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \bar{\vartheta}) \left(\frac{pe^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\bar{\mu}T}}{pe^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\bar{\mu}T} + (1-p)e^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\underline{\mu}T}} \right) + \kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \underline{\vartheta}) \left(\frac{(1-p)e^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\underline{\mu}T}}{pe^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\bar{\mu}T} + (1-p)e^{\alpha\kappa_T^{\text{pre}}\cdot\underline{\mu}T}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can again write the optimal pre-commitment fraction as a convex combination of the two Merton fractions $\kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \bar{\vartheta})$ and $\kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \underline{\vartheta})$. For the special case $d = 1$ see Branger et al. [2023], Prop. 2 and 3. Obviously it holds

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \kappa_T^{\text{pre}} = p\kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \bar{\vartheta}) + (1-p)\kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \underline{\vartheta}).$$

In case $d = 1$ when $\bar{\mu} > \underline{\mu}$ and $\alpha > 0$ we further obtain

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\pi}_T^{*, \text{pre}} = \kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \bar{\vartheta}).$$

These limiting results coincide with the limits in Theorem 3.1 where we allow for learning.

3.4. Impact of model ambiguity preferences. Now we consider an investor who is concerned about model ambiguity, i.e. instead of problem (2.3) we consider for a second utility function $v(x) = x^\lambda, 0 < \lambda < 1$ problem (2.7). We treat the multi-asset case but with only two possible values $\bar{\mu} = (\bar{\mu}_1, \dots, \bar{\mu}_d)$ and $\underline{\mu} = (\underline{\mu}_1, \dots, \underline{\mu}_d)$ for $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d)$. The optimization problem is then

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \left(p(\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}}[(X_T^\pi)^\alpha])^{\frac{\lambda}{\alpha}} + (1-p) \left(\mathbb{E}_{\underline{\mu}}[(X_T^\pi)^\alpha] \right)^{\frac{\lambda}{\alpha}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \quad (3.5)$$

3.4.1. Probability adjustment in the case of less ambiguity concerns. Let us first consider the case of $0 < \alpha < \lambda$ where $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha > 1$. The optimization problem (3.5) is then according to (2.14) and Theorem 2.1 equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \Omega} \left\{ (q_1 + q_2)x_0^\alpha \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\frac{q_1}{q_1 + q_2} L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + \frac{q_2}{q_1 + q_2} L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z) \right)^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \right)^{1/\gamma} \right\} \\ &= x_0^\alpha \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \Omega} \left\{ \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \right)^{1/\gamma} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ it is enough to solve

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz. \quad (3.7)$$

The solution of this problem can be summarized as follows (the same solution is obtained for $\lambda < \alpha < 0$):

Lemma 3.4. *Let $0 < \alpha < \lambda$ or $\lambda < \alpha < 0$, thus $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha > 1$. An optimal solution $(q_1^*, h(q_1^*))$ of (3.7) is obtained by*

$$\sup_{0 \leq q_1 \leq q_1^b} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + h(q_1) L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \right\}$$

$$h(x) := \left(\frac{1 - x^{\mathbf{q}} p^{1-\mathbf{q}}}{(1-p)^{1-\mathbf{q}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}}}$$

with $q_1^b = p^{1/\mathbf{p}}$.

Proof. Note first that the set \mathfrak{Q} is bounded. Indeed, when we set $q_2 = 0$, the maximal value of q_1 is given by $p^{1/\mathbf{q}}$. Moreover, since both $L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z)$ and $L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z)$ are positive, the optimal pair (q_1, q_2) will satisfy the constraint with equality, i.e.

$$\left(\frac{q_1}{p} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p + \left(\frac{q_2}{1-p} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} (1-p) = 1.$$

Solving this equation for q_2 yields the function h . \square

The optimal solution (q_1^*, q_2^*) in Lemma 3.4 then determines the prior distribution $(q_1^*/(q_1^* + q_2^*), q_2^*/(q_1^* + q_2^*))$ which has to be used for the Bayesian problem in order to solve problem (3.5).

Example 3.5. To make things more explicit consider the case that the initial prior distribution is uniform on the two outcomes, i.e. $p = \frac{1}{2}$ and that $0 < \alpha < \lambda$ with $\alpha = 0.5$. This implies that $\gamma = 1/(1-\alpha) = 2$. In this special case we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathfrak{Q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \\ &= 2^{1/\mathbf{q}-1} \sup_{0 \leq \tilde{y} \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\tilde{y}^{1/\mathbf{q}} L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + (1-\tilde{y})^{1/\mathbf{q}} L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^2 \varphi_T(z) dz \\ &= 2^{1/\mathbf{q}-1} \sup_{0 \leq \tilde{y} \leq 1} (\tilde{y}^{2/\mathbf{q}} \exp(T\|\bar{\vartheta}\|^2) + (1-\tilde{y})^{2/\mathbf{q}} \exp(T\|\underline{\vartheta}\|^2) + 2\tilde{y}^{1/\mathbf{q}}(1-\tilde{y})^{1/\mathbf{q}} \exp(T\underline{\vartheta}^\top \bar{\vartheta})). \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding optimal prior distribution will depend on $T, \bar{\vartheta}, \underline{\vartheta}$. It is easy to see that for small time horizon T , the optimal prior distribution is again close to the uniform distribution. For very large T , the optimal prior distribution will have large mass on the larger of the two outcomes $\|\bar{\vartheta}\|^2, \|\underline{\vartheta}\|^2$. However, the optimal prior distribution will always be in $(0, 1)$. This can easily be seen by inspecting the derivatives of the function to maximize at $\tilde{y} = 0$ and $\tilde{y} = 1$.

3.4.2. Probability adjustment in the case of more ambiguity concerns. Let us next consider the case of $0 < \lambda < \alpha$ where $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha < 1$. Recall that in this case $\mathbf{q} < 0$. The optimization problem (3.5) is then according to (2.14) and Theorem 2.1 equivalent to

$$x_0^\alpha \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathfrak{Q}} \left\{ \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \right)^{1/\gamma} \right\}.$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ it is enough to solve

$$\inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathfrak{Q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz. \quad (3.8)$$

The solution of this problem can be summarized as follows. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4 and we skip it here (the same solution is obtained for $\alpha < \lambda < 0$).

Lemma 3.6. *Let $0 < \lambda < \alpha$ or $\alpha < \lambda < 0$, thus $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha < 1$. An optimal solution $(q_1^*, h(q_1^*))$ of (3.8) is obtained by*

$$\inf_{q_1 \geq q_1^b} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + h(q_1) L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \right\}$$

with q_1^b and h as in Lemma 3.4.

Example 3.7. We can again consider the case that the initial prior distribution is uniform on the two outcomes, i.e. $p = \frac{1}{2}$ and that $0 < \lambda < \alpha$ with $\alpha = 0.5$. This implies that $\gamma = 1/(1 - \alpha) = 2$. In this special case we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{q_1 \geq q_1^b} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \\ &= 2^{1/\mathbf{q}-1} \inf_{0 \leq \tilde{y} \leq 1} (\tilde{y}^{2/\mathbf{q}} \exp(T\|\bar{\vartheta}\|^2) + (1 - \tilde{y})^{2/\mathbf{q}} \exp(T\|\underline{\vartheta}\|^2) + 2\tilde{y}^{1/\mathbf{q}}(1 - \tilde{y})^{1/\mathbf{q}} \exp(T\underline{\vartheta}^\top \bar{\vartheta})). \end{aligned}$$

Again the optimal prior distribution will always be in $(0, 1)$ since the function tends to $+\infty$ at the boundary. According to Theorem 3.1 b) this implies that for a very large time horizon the optimal investment fraction is hardly influenced by model ambiguity.

3.4.3. Probability adjustment in the case of much less ambiguity concerns. Let us finally consider the case of $0 < \lambda$ and $\alpha < 0$ where $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha < 0$. Recall that in this case $0 < \mathbf{q} < 1$. The optimization problem (3.5) is then according to (2.14) and Theorem 2.1 equivalent to

$$x_0^\alpha \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathfrak{Q}'} \left\{ \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \right)^{1/\gamma} \right\}.$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ it is enough to solve

$$\inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathfrak{Q}'} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + q_2 L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz. \quad (3.9)$$

The solution of this problem can be summarized as follows. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4 and we skip it here (the same solution is obtained for $\alpha > 0, \lambda < 0$).

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\alpha < 0 < \lambda$ or $\lambda < 0 < \alpha$, thus $\mathbf{p} := \lambda/\alpha < 0$. An optimal solution $(q_1^*, h(q_1^*))$ of (3.9) is obtained by*

$$\inf_{0 \leq q_1 \leq q_1^b} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (q_1 L_T(\bar{\vartheta}, z) + h(q_1) L_T(\underline{\vartheta}, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz \right\}$$

with q_1^b and h as in Lemma 3.4.

4. NUMERICAL ILLUSTRATION AND ECONOMIC DISCUSSION

The following discussions and numerical illustrations refer to the case of one risky asset with a two point prior distribution where only two drift scenarios $\underline{\mu}$ and $\bar{\mu}$ ($0 < \underline{\mu} \leq \bar{\mu}$) are possible. The market price of risk is thus positive in both scenarios ($0 < \underline{\vartheta} < \bar{\vartheta}$).³ Along the lines of Eqn. (3.1), p denotes the prior probability for the higher drift $\bar{\mu}$ (good or upper drift scenario) such that the prior probability for the lower drift scenario $\underline{\mu}$ is given by $1 - p$. In addition, we refer to the initial date $t = 0$ where $Y(t) = 0$.⁴

We consider intuitive explanations of the previous results and shed further light on the impact of the two sources of risk on the optimal investment strategy. Along the lines of Eqn. (2.7), the strategy is obtained by maximizing the expected utility over a double risk situation where the two sources of risk are evaluated with different utility functions u and v . Our economic reasoning is first based on the classical Bayesian problem which coincides with the special case that the two utility functions v and u , are identical ($\lambda = \alpha$, respectively). Since the general case can be captured by modifying the probability p towards $q_1^*/(q_1^* + q_2^*)$ (cf. Lemma 3.4, 3.6 and 3.8), all sensitivities can be explained by the probability adjustment and the sensitivities of the

³From a technical point of view, the results are reversed in the case of a negative market price of risk (cf. Longo and Mainini [2016]).

⁴The discussion can also be extended to future dates $t > 0$ where $Y(t) \neq 0$. Using the log-investor as a benchmark then implies that the prior distribution is replaced by the 'updated' distribution.

model parameter				level of relative risk aversion $\frac{1}{\gamma} = 1 - \alpha$		
$\underline{\mu}$	$\bar{\mu}$	σ	p	less than log-investor	log-investor	more than log-investor
0.03	0.09	0.15	0.5	$1/\gamma = 0.5$	$1/\gamma = 1$	$1/\gamma = 2$

TABLE 1. Benchmark parameter setup (classical Bayesian case). If not otherwise mentioned, the investment horizon is $T = 10$ years.

classical setup in p . Thus, we first discuss and illustrate the Bayesian case ($\lambda = \alpha$) and consider the impact of $\lambda \neq \alpha$ on the prior probability adjustment subsequently. In addition, we comment on the implications of pre-commitment instead of learning.

In what follows the classical Merton problem with a constant market price of risk ϑ (known drift, respectively) is referred to as the *inner risk situation*. Here, the optimal investment fraction $\kappa^{\text{Mer}}(\gamma, \vartheta) = \gamma \frac{\vartheta}{\sigma}$ is constant (it does not depend on the investment horizon T). It is increasing in the market price of risk ϑ and decreasing in the level of relative risk aversion $\frac{1}{\gamma} = 1 - \alpha$. In contrast to the inner risk, we refer to the probability distribution over the market price of risk as the *outer risk situation*. The impact of this outer risk on the optimal investment strategy is more demanding since, in general, it depends on the investment horizon T . An exception is the log-investor (an investor with a log utility function) who can be used as an intuitive benchmark for other investors (more or less risk averse investors).

If not mentioned otherwise, we refer to the three benchmark parameter constellation summarized in Table 1.

4.1. Sensitivities in the classical Bayesian case. If u and v coincide, Lemma 3.3 immediately separates the impact of the inner and outer risk on the optimal investment fraction. The optimal myopic investment fraction of all investors (all levels of relative risk aversion $1 - \alpha$), is given by the convex combination of the Merton fractions of the inner risk situations (good and bad scenario). Thus, the impact of the inner risk is simply as in the classical Merton problem while the impact of the outer risk can be stated by the weight on the good (or bad scenario). Along the lines of Lemma 3.3, the weight on the lower Merton solution (the bad scenario) is given by

$$1 - \alpha(t, T, Y(t)) = (1 - p)\hat{F}(t, T, Y(t)).$$

such that it is convenient to discuss ($t = 0$ and $Y(t) = 0$)

$$g(\alpha, p, T, \underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}) := 1 - \alpha(0, T, 0) = (1 - p)\hat{F}(0, T, 0).$$

4.1.1. Benchmark log-investor. Formally, the justification that the log-investor $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ (with a level of relative risk aversion $1 - \alpha$ equal to 1) defines a convenient benchmark is given by Theorem 3.1 e), i.e.

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} g(\alpha, p, T, \underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}) = \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} g(\alpha, p, T, \underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}) = 1 - p.$$

Observe that the log-investor behaves in a myopic way. In the short run ($T \rightarrow 0$), the impact of the outer risk (weight on the bad scenario/lower Merton solution) is given by the prior probability $1 - p$. While the within regime Merton fractions depend on the individual levels of risk aversion, the myopic solution of the outer risk is *risk neutral* in the sense that it is given by the expected value (under the prior distribution) of the within regime Merton fractions. Obviously, for $T \rightarrow 0$ there is no hedging demand. For the log-investor, this is also true for investment horizons $T > 0$ (cf. Figure 1 upper left plot). In addition, the log-investor gives an important distinction: an investor who is less (more) risk averse uses a lower (higher) weight on the lower Merton fraction (bad regime), cf. Figure 1 (lower left plot).⁵ Economically, this is explained by the trade-off between speculating on the better regime (and following the optimal strategy for the good regime) and hedging against the worse regime (and following the optimal

⁵Rieder and Bäuerle [2005] Theorem 9 d).

Weight $g(\alpha, p, T, \underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta})$ on lower Merton investment fraction




FIGURE 1. The figure is based on the benchmark parameter setup of Table 1 but considers the dependence on the investment horizon (upper left plot), the probability for the good drift scenario p (upper right plot), the level of relative risk aversion $1 - \alpha$ (lower left plot), and the parameter for the good drift scenario $\bar{\mu}$ (lower right plot). The plots depict the weight on the lower Merton fraction in the optimal investment strategy. In addition, each figure contains the log-investor (dashed line) and the more (black line) and less (gray line) risk averse investor than the log-investor.

strategy for the bad regime). While the log-investor acts neutral, the hedging (speculation) motive dominates for the more (less) risk averse investor.

Intuitively, the larger the difference between the two regimes, the stronger is the hedging (speculating) motive, and the more the optimal strategy moves towards the worst(best)-case strategy. An illustration is given in Figure 1 (lower right plot) which depicts the weight on the lower Merton solution for varying $\bar{\mu}$. The higher $\bar{\mu}$ (the higher the difference between the regimes), the larger is the impact of the hedging (speculation) motive for the more (less) risk averse investor.

4.1.2. *Long run investor.* Similar reasoning applies to the investment horizon T . The outer risk is 'higher' for longer investment horizons. In the long run, the investor who is more risk averse than the log-investor only considers the Merton solution of the bad regime, i.e. for $\alpha < 0$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} g(\alpha, p, T, \underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}) = 1.$$

Thus, w.r.t. the outer risk, the long term investor who is more risk averse than the log-investor acts extremely risk averse. In contrast, a long term investor who is less risk averse than the log-investor only considers the good regime.⁶ In consequence, for long term investment horizons ($T \rightarrow \infty$), the prior distribution has no impact on the weight $\alpha(0, T, y)$, i.e. $\alpha(0, T, y) = 0$

⁶Bäuerle and Grether [2017] Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.3




FIGURE 2. If not otherwise mentioned below, the figure refers to the benchmark parameter scenario of Table 1. The figure compares, for varying priors p , the weight on the lower Merton fraction to the one of the log-investor, i.e. it depicts the difference $g(\alpha, p, T, \underline{\vartheta}, \overline{\vartheta}) - (1 - p)$. The black (gray) lines refer to the investor who is more (less) risk averse than the log-investor. The investment horizon is $T = 10$ (thick lines) and $T = 20$ (dashed lines). The upper right figure is then based on $\bar{\mu} = 0.12$ (instead of the benchmark parameter $\bar{\mu} = 0.09$). The lower left plot then considers the benchmark scenario with the exception that $\underline{\mu} = 0.01$ (instead of $\underline{\mu} = 0.03$). The last figure (lower right plot) considers a higher risk aversion ($\alpha = -2$ instead of $\alpha = -1$) for the black lines and a lower risk aversion ($\alpha = 0.6$ instead of $\alpha = 0.5$) for the gray lines.

($\alpha(0, T, y) = 1$) for $\alpha < 0$ (for $\alpha > 0$). The long term investor only considers the worst (best) case drift, i.e. $\underline{\mu}$ ($\bar{\mu}$) and behaves along the lines of a maximin (maximax) decision rule. This is further emphasized by means of the sensitivities of the optimal weight on the lower Merton investment fraction. An illustration is given by Figure 1 (upper left plot) which depicts the weight on the lower Merton fraction for varying investment horizons T .

4.1.3. Impact of prior distribution. Intuitively, the weight on the lower Merton investment fraction is decreasing (increasing) in the prior probability p ($1 - p$) (upper right plot of Figure 1). This is obvious for the log-investor who simply relies on the prior probability. However, notice again the important distinction based on the benchmark log-investor. While the more risk averse investor (black line) uses a higher weight on the lower Merton solution, the opposite is true for the less risk averse investor (gray line). Intuitively, the discrepancy is the highest for some intermediate p . While there is no outer risk implied in the extreme cases that $p \rightarrow 0$ or $p \rightarrow 1$, the outer risk is 'maximal' for some intermediate p (which depends on the investment horizon T , the level of relative risk aversion $1 - \alpha$, and the relation between good and bad scenario). The outer risk situation also increases in the distance between the good and bad regime ($\bar{\mu}$ and $\underline{\mu}$). Thus, the deviation of a more (less) risk averse investor from the log-investor is the higher, the

Comparison of optimal initial learning and pre-commitment strategy




FIGURE 3. If not otherwise mentioned below, the figure refers to the benchmark parameter scenario of Table 1. The upper plots are based on $p = 0.75$ (i.e. $1 - p = 0.25$) while the lower plots refer to $p = 0.25$ (i.e. $1 - p = 0.75$). The left hand figures compare the optimal weight on the lower Merton solution of the learning (black) and pre-commitment setup (dashed) for varying investment horizons T . The upper (lower) figure concerns the investor who is more (less) risk averse than the log-investor. The right hand figures depict, for $T = 10$ (black) and $T = 20$ (gray), the weight on the lower Merton solution for varying levels of relative risk aversion. Again, the black lines refer to strategies under learning while the dashed ones are pre-commitment strategies.

higher the distance is, e.g. it is increasing in $\bar{\mu}$ (cf lower right figure of Figure 1). An additional illustration is given by Figure 2 which depicts the difference to the log-investor by means of

$$g(\alpha, p, T, \underline{\vartheta}, \bar{\vartheta}) - (1 - p),$$

i.e. the difference of the weight on the lower Merton solution and $1 - p$ which is the weight of the log-investor. All figures include two investment horizons ($T = 10$ and $T = 20$). Observe that the deviation from the log-investor is the higher, the higher the investment horizon is. For the investor who is more (less) risk averse than the log-investor, the highest deviation is obtained for $p > 0.5$ ($p < 0.5$). Recall that the more (less) risk averse investor tends to hedge (speculate) the bad (good) drift scenario. In consequence, the prior probability p with the highest deviation increases (decreases) in the investment horizon. Analogous reasoning is true w.r.t. the sensitivity to $\bar{\mu}$ ($\underline{\mu}$) and the level of risk aversion $1 - \alpha$ (cf. Figure 2).

4.1.4. Learning vs. pre-commitment. It is worth to mention that similar reasoning as above is valid in a pre-commitment setup (cf. optimization problem (3.4)). First notice that, in the classical Bayesian setup, the optimal investment fraction of the log-investor does not depend on T . Thus, the optimal pre-commitment and learning strategies coincide (at $t = 0$). In addition, this is true for the limiting cases of a myopic investor ($T \rightarrow 0$) and the long term

investor ($T \rightarrow \infty$). For an investor who is more risk averse than the log-investor, recall now the hedging motive. W.r.t. the trade-off between speculating on the better regime (and following the optimal strategy for the good regime) and hedging against the worse regime (and following the optimal strategy for the bad regime), the hedging motive dominates. In addition, observe that the hedging motive is increasing in the investment horizon T . Compared to the setup under learning, pre-commitment implies that the investor must pre-commit to a constant investment fraction at $t = 0$. In the optimum, she anticipates that gradually over time, the remaining investment horizon decreases. Therefore, at $t = 0$, the hedging demand is, for rather high investment horizons T , lower in the pre-commitment setup than under learning. The above reasoning is illustrated in Figure 3. The left figure compares (for an investor who is more risk averse than the log-investor) the optimal weight on the lower Merton solution of the learning (black) and pre-commitment setup (dashed) for varying investment horizons T . Observe that the strategies coincide in the limiting cases. In addition, for intermediate investment horizons T , the pre-commitment strategy has a lower weight on the bad scenario (lower Merton solution). This implies that (at $t = 0$) the pre-commitment strategy is more aggressive than the learning strategy. As mentioned above, this is due to the fact that the investor who must pre-commit already has to anticipate that, in the future, the remaining investment horizon is lower which is associated with a lower hedging demand (against the bad scenario). The right plot of Figure 3 depicts the weight on the lower Merton solution for varying levels of relative risk aversion. Again, the black line refers to learning while the dashed one is pre-commitment. Observe that the strategies (the weights on the lower Merton solution) coincide in the case of a log-investor ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$) with level of relative risk aversion equal to one. Overall, however, our numerical results do not show a very big difference between the pre-commitment and the learning strategy.

4.2. Impact of ambiguity. Throughout the following, we assume that the investor is more risk averse than the log-investor, i.e. $\alpha < 0$. Notice that the investor is risk averse if and only if u is concave, while she is ambiguity averse if and only if v is a concave transformation of u . Assuming that u and v are CRRA functions with relative risk (ambiguity) aversion $1 - \alpha$ ($1 - \lambda$) implies that an ambiguity neutral investor is characterized by $\lambda = \alpha$ while she is ambiguity averse (loving) for $\lambda < \alpha < 0$ ($0 > \lambda > \alpha$).

Again, we consider the impact of the outer risk (evaluated by the ambiguity function v) by means of the weight on the lower (upper) Merton solution (implied by the utility function u), i.e. we are interested in $g(\alpha, p^{\text{mod}}, \dots)$ where

$$p^{\text{mod}} := q_1^*/(q_1^* + q_2^*)$$

(cf. Lemma 3.4, 3.6 and 3.8). We call p^{mod} the adjusted or modified probability. The ambiguity neutral investor serves as a benchmark since $p^{\text{mod}} = p$, i.e. the modified probability coincides with the prior probability.

Recall (cf. Subsection 4.1.3) that the weight on the lower Merton solution is decreasing in the prior probability p . Thus, introducing ambiguity aversion (loving) is equivalent to decreasing (increasing) the prior probability p for the good drift scenario. Assume now that both, the level of risk aversion and ambiguity aversion are above the one of the benchmark log-investor, i.e. $\alpha < 0$ and $\lambda < 0$. Recall that we already discussed the special case $\lambda = \alpha$ in Subsection 4.1. Intuitively, the investor chooses less risk (a higher weight on the lower Merton solution) under ambiguity aversion, i.e. if the relative ambiguity aversion is higher than the level of risk aversion, i.e. if $\lambda < \alpha$ ($1 - \lambda > 1 - \alpha$). In terms of the probability adjustment this implies that the modified probability p^{mod} is smaller than p , i.e. the investor is characterized by a lower weight on the upper Merton solution than the ambiguity neutral investor. In contrast, if $\lambda > \alpha$ ($1 - \lambda < 1 - \alpha$) implies that p^{mod} is higher than p . A numerical illustration of the modified probability is given in Figure 4 (left plot). The level of relative risk aversion is $1 - \alpha = 4$. Notice that the modified prior probability p^{mod} is decreasing in the level of relative ambiguity aversion $1 - \lambda$. In particular, it is above (below) the prior p in the case that $1 - \lambda < 1 - \alpha$ ($1 - \lambda > 1 - \alpha$). Notice that the effect is more pronounced for higher times to maturity T , i.e. the impact on

Impact of ambiguity aversion on modified probability p^{mod} and weight on lower Merton solution




FIGURE 4. Model parameters are given as before (cf. Table 1). The prior probability for the good drift scenario is $p = 0.5$, the level of relative risk aversion is equal to 4 ($1 - \alpha = 4$). The figure on the left hand side depicts the modified prior probability for varying levels of relative ambiguity aversion $1 - \lambda$. The figure on the right hand side gives the corresponding weights on the lower Merton solution. The black lines refers to an investment horizon of $T = 10$ years, the dashed one to $T = 20$, and the gray one to $T = 50$.

the modified prior probability is increasing in T . However, recall that the impact of the prior probability is decreasing in T , i.e. for $T \rightarrow \infty$ the (more than log) risk averse investor only relies on the worst drift scenario. Hence the effect of ambiguity aversion is fading for large time horizons. This is natural, since a large time horizon allows for perfectly learning the model. The overall effect on the investment fraction (represented by the weight on the lower Merton solution) is *smooth* (cf. Figure 4 (right plot)).

5. CONCLUSION

We consider a classical multi-asset investment problem within a Black Scholes market with terminal utility of CRRA type. In contrast to established literature we include ambiguity aversion by means of the KMM (Klibanoff et al. [2005]) approach where we assume that the drift of the stocks is not known (model ambiguity), but only a prior distribution is given and the investor is able to learn about the drifts by observing the stock prices. Thus, a second utility function of CRRA type for ambiguity aversion is included. We show analytically how problems of this type can be reduced to the solution of a classical Bayesian investment problem with adapted prior. Based on this result we are able to carry out an extensive numerical study where we discuss the impact of ambiguity preferences. It turns out that investors choose less risk (in terms of a higher weight on the lower Merton ratio) under ambiguity aversion. We consider in particular the short-term and the long-term investment behavior. For the long-term investment it turns out that only the risk aversion of the investor matters and the investor behaves like one who knows the drift and this is either the most optimistic one (if she is less risk averse than the log-investor) or the most pessimistic one (if she is more risk averse than the log-investor) independent from model ambiguity. Whereas it is clear what this means in the single-asset case, in the multi-asset scenario we first have to figure out what the worst and best drift parameters indeed are. We have shown that the Euclidean norm of the drift vector is here the relevant quantity. For the short-term horizon investment, only the prior distribution is important and the solution is given by the average of within regime Merton solutions. This is again independent from model ambiguity.

6. APPENDIX

6.1. Duality results. Throughout we assume here that $x_i \geq 0$ for all i .

6.1.1. Dual representation of $L^{\mathbf{p}}$ norm. Let $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} > 1$ such that $1/\mathbf{p} + 1/\mathbf{q} = 1$ and \mathfrak{Q} as defined in (2.13). We prove:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}} = \sup_{(q_i) \in \mathfrak{Q}} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i. \quad (6.1)$$

First note that the constraint is a convex function in (q_i) and the target function

$$\sup_{(q_i) \in \mathfrak{Q}} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i = - \inf_{(q_i) \in \mathfrak{Q}} \sum_{i=1}^m (-x_i) q_i$$

is linear, i.e. we have a convex optimization problem. The Lagrangian is given by

$$L((q_i), \eta) := \sum_{i=1}^m (-x_i) q_i + \eta \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{p_i} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i - 1 \right).$$

The Slater condition is satisfied and a KKT point will yield the optimal solution.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} L((q_i), \eta) = -x_i + \eta \mathbf{q} q_i^{\mathbf{q}-1} p_i^{1-\mathbf{q}} = 0$$

if and only if

$$q_i = \left(\frac{x_i}{\eta \mathbf{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}-1}} p_i$$

In order to determine the Lagrange multiplier η we set

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{x_i}{\eta \mathbf{q}} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i = 1.$$

The solution is given by

$$\eta = \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}} > 0.$$

Plugging this into the equation for (q_i) gives

$$q_i^* = x_i^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}-1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m x_j^{\mathbf{p}} p_j \right)^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}}} p_i.$$

In order to check for the correct value we compute

$$\sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i^* = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}}$$

which implies the statement.

6.1.2. Dual representation for $0 < \mathbf{p} < 1$. Again let \mathbf{q} be such that $1/\mathbf{p} + 1/\mathbf{q} = 1$ which implies $\mathbf{q} < 0$ and let \mathfrak{Q} be as defined in (2.13). We prove:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}} = \inf_{(q_i) \in \mathfrak{Q}} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i. \quad (6.2)$$

The constraint is convex and the target function linear. The Lagrangian is given by

$$L((q_i), \eta) := \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i + \eta \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{p_i} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i - 1 \right).$$

The Slater condition is satisfied and a KKT point will yield the optimal solution.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} L((q_i), \eta) = x_i + \eta \mathbf{q} q_i^{\mathbf{q}-1} p_i^{1-\mathbf{q}} = 0$$

if and only if

$$q_i = \left(\frac{-x_i}{\eta \mathbf{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}-1}} p_i$$

In order to determine the Lagrange multiplier η we set

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{-x_i}{\eta \mathbf{q}} \right)^{\mathbf{p}} p_i = 1.$$

The solution is given by

$$\eta = \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m (-x_j)^{\mathbf{p}} p_j \right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}} > 0.$$

Plugging this into the equation for (q_i) gives

$$q_i^* = p_i (x_i)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}-1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m x_j^{\mathbf{p}} p_j \right)^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}}}.$$

In order to check for the correct value we compute

$$\sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i^* = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}}$$

which implies the statement.

6.1.3. *Dual representation for $\mathbf{p} < 0$.* Let $0 < \mathbf{q} < 1$ be such that $1/\mathbf{p} + 1/\mathbf{q} = 1$ and

$$\mathfrak{Q}' := \left\{ (q_i) : \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{p_i} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i \geq 1, q_i \geq 0 \right\}.$$

We prove:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}} = \inf_{(q_i) \in \mathfrak{Q}'} \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i. \quad (6.3)$$

The constraint is convex and the target function linear. The Lagrangian is given by

$$L((q_i), \eta) := \sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i + \eta \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{q_i}{p_i} \right)^{\mathbf{q}} p_i \right).$$

The Slater condition is satisfied and a KKT point will yield the optimal solution.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} L((q_i), \eta) = x_i - \eta \mathbf{q} q_i^{\mathbf{q}-1} p_i^{1-\mathbf{q}} = 0$$

if and only if

$$q_i = \left(\frac{x_i}{\eta \mathbf{q}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}-1}} p_i$$

In order to determine the Lagrange multiplier η we set

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{x_i}{\eta \mathbf{q}} \right)^{\mathbf{p}} p_i = 1.$$

The solution is given by

$$\eta = \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m x_j^{\mathbf{p}} p_j \right)^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}} > 0.$$

Plugging this into the equation for (q_i) gives

$$q_i^* = x_i^{\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}-1}} p_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^m x_j^{\mathbf{p}} p_j \right)^{-\frac{1}{\mathbf{q}}}.$$

In order to check for the correct value we compute

$$\sum_{i=1}^m x_i q_i^* = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i^{\mathbf{p}} p_i \right)^{1/\mathbf{p}}$$

which implies the result.

6.1.4. *Summary of different cases.* For the following table let

$$F(\pi) := \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{\Theta} [(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] \right)^{\lambda/\alpha} \right] \right)^{\alpha/\lambda}, \quad G(\pi, (q_i)) := \sum_i \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta_i} [(X_T^{\pi})^{\alpha}] q_i.$$

Problem (2.7) is equivalent to

	$\lambda > 0$	$\lambda < 0$
$\alpha > 0$	$\lambda/\alpha > 1$	$\sup_{\pi} F(\pi)$
	$\sup_{\pi} F(\pi)$ $= \sup_{\pi} \sup_{(q_i) \in \Omega} G(\pi, (q_i))$	$\sup_{\pi} F(\pi)$
	$\lambda/\alpha < 1$	$= \sup_{\pi} \inf_{(q_i) \in \Omega'} G(\pi, (q_i))$
	$\sup_{\pi} F(\pi)$ $= \sup_{\pi} \inf_{(q_i) \in \Omega} G(\pi, (q_i))$	
$\alpha < 0$	$\lambda/\alpha > 1$	$\inf_{\pi} F(\pi)$
	$\inf_{\pi} F(\pi)$ $= \inf_{\pi} \sup_{(q_i) \in \Omega'} G(\pi, (q_i))$	$\inf_{\pi} F(\pi)$
	$\lambda/\alpha < 1$	$= \inf_{\pi} \inf_{(q_i) \in \Omega} G(\pi, (q_i))$
	$\inf_{\pi} F(\pi)$ $= \inf_{\pi} \inf_{(q_i) \in \Omega} G(\pi, (q_i))$	

In all cases sup and inf can be interchanged.

6.2. **Proof of Theorem 3.1.** Part a) follows directly by inspecting the expression in Theorem 2.1.

Next we prove b). The optimal fraction invested in stock i at time t given observation $y \in \mathbb{R}$ can more explicitly be written as (we denote $(\sigma^{\top})^{-1} =: \tilde{\sigma}$):

$$\kappa_i(t, T, y) = \gamma \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{k=1}^m (\tilde{\sigma})_i \cdot \vartheta_k p_k L_T(\vartheta_k, y+z) F(T, y+z)^{\gamma-1} \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, y+z)^{\gamma} \varphi_{T-t}(z) dz} \quad (6.4)$$

where $(\tilde{\sigma})_i \cdot \vartheta_k = \sum_{j=1}^d (\tilde{\sigma})_{ij} \vartheta_{kj}$ and $\varphi_T(z) = (2\pi T)^{-d/2} e^{-\|z\|^2/2T}$ is the density of $N(0, TI)$.

We will show the statement for $t = 0$ and $y = 0$. The proof of the general case is similar. First suppose that $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Define for $k = 1, \dots, m$:

$$f_k(T) := \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_k L_T(\vartheta_k, z) F(T, z)^{\gamma-1} \varphi_T(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, z)^{\gamma} \varphi_T(z) dz}.$$

Obviously we have by definition of L_T and F that $0 \leq f_k(T)$ and $\sum_{k=1}^m f_k(T) = 1$. Thus, it is enough to show that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} f_m(T) = 1$. Let us now consider the following inequality where

the integral in the last equation can be computed with the formula of the moment generating function of a multivariate normal distribution.

$$\begin{aligned} f_m(T) &\geq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_m L_T(\vartheta_m, z) (p_m L_T(\vartheta_m, z))^{\gamma-1} \varphi_T(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, z)^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (p_m L_T(\vartheta_m, z))^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, z)^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz} = \frac{p_m^\gamma \exp(\frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_m\|^2 T \gamma (\gamma - 1))}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, z)^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz}. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that the lower bound tends to 1 for $T \rightarrow \infty$. In what follows we consider the denominator. We can write it as $\mathbb{E}[F(T, Z)^\gamma]$ with $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, TI)$. Let A be an (m, d) -matrix with rows consisting of $\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_m$. Then $X := AZ \sim \mathcal{N}(0, TAA^\top)$. In particular the marginal distribution is given by $X_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, T\|\vartheta_j\|^2)$ and we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[F(T, Z)^\gamma] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^m p_k \exp(X_k - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_k\|^2 T)\right)^\gamma\right].$$

Now let $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$, i.e. we can write $\gamma = \frac{n}{l}$. Recall that $\gamma = 1/(1 - \alpha) > 1$ in this case. Then we obtain with $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in \mathbb{N}_0^m$ and with the notation $|\beta| = \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_m$ and

$$\binom{n}{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m} = \frac{n!}{\beta_1! \dots \beta_m!}$$

using the multinomial formula that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^m p_k \exp(X_k - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_k\|^2 T)\right)^n\right]^{\frac{1}{l}} = \\ &\left[\sum_{|\beta|=n} \binom{n}{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m} p_1^{\beta_1} \exp(\beta_1(X_1 - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_1\|^2 T)) \dots p_m^{\beta_m} \exp(\beta_m(X_m - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_m\|^2 T))\right]^{\frac{1}{l}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now since $(x_1 + \dots + x_K)^{\frac{1}{l}} \leq x_1^{\frac{1}{l}} + \dots + x_K^{\frac{1}{l}}$ for $x_i \geq 0$ we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\sum_{|\beta|=n} \binom{n}{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m} p_1^{\beta_1} \exp(\beta_1(X_1 - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_1\|^2 T)) \dots p_m^{\beta_m} \exp(\beta_m(X_m - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_m\|^2 T))\right]^{\frac{1}{l}} \\ &\leq \sum_{|\beta|=n} \binom{n}{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m} p_1^{\frac{\beta_1}{l}} \exp\left(\frac{\beta_1}{l}(X_1 - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_1\|^2 T)\right) \dots p_m^{\frac{\beta_m}{l}} \exp\left(\frac{\beta_m}{l}(X_m - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_m\|^2 T)\right) \\ &= p_1^\gamma \exp\left(\gamma(X_1 - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_1\|^2 T)\right) + \dots + p_m^\gamma \exp\left(\gamma(X_m - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_m\|^2 T)\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{|\beta|=n \\ \beta_i \neq n}} C_\beta \exp\left(\frac{\beta_1}{l}(X_1 - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_1\|^2 T) + \dots + \frac{\beta_m}{l}(X_m - \frac{1}{2} \|\vartheta_m\|^2 T)\right), \end{aligned}$$

for some constants C_β which do not depend on T . The last summands can be written as

$$\exp\left(\frac{\beta_1}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_1\|\tilde{X}_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_1\|^2 T) + \dots + \frac{\beta_m}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_m\|\tilde{X}_m - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_m\|^2 T)\right)$$

with marginal distribution $\tilde{X}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Since the function

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto \exp\left(\frac{\beta_1}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_1\|x_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_1\|^2 T) + \dots + \frac{\beta_m}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_m\|x_m - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_m\|^2 T)\right)$$

is supermodular (follows e.g. with Lemma 2.1 in Bäuerle [1997]) we obtain with the Lorentz-inequality (see e.g. Lemma 2.4 a) in Bäuerle [1997])

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{\beta_1}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_1\|\tilde{X}_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_1\|^2 T) + \dots + \frac{\beta_m}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_m\|\tilde{X}_m - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_m\|^2 T)\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{\beta_1}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_1\|X - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_1\|^2 T) + \dots + \frac{\beta_m}{l}(\sqrt{T}\|\vartheta_m\|X - \frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_m\|^2 T)\right)\right] \end{aligned}$$

with the same random variable $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Now taking the expectation and using the formula of the moment generating function of a normal distribution yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(T, Z)^\gamma] &\leq p_1^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_1\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1)T\right) + \dots + p_m^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_m\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1)T\right) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{|\beta|=n \\ \beta_i \neq n}} C_\beta \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}T\left[\left(\|\vartheta_1\|\beta_1 + \dots + \|\vartheta_m\|\beta_m\right)^2\frac{1}{l^2} - \left(\beta_1\|\vartheta_1\|^2 + \dots + \beta_m\|\vartheta_m\|^2\right)\frac{1}{l}\right]\right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

Let us now consider the exponent in the last line for an arbitrary admissible β without the factor $\frac{1}{2}T$ in front. Obviously we can choose numbers $\|\vartheta^*\|$ and $\|\bar{\vartheta}\|$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vartheta_1\|\beta_1 + \dots + \|\vartheta_m\|\beta_m &= \|\bar{\vartheta}\|\beta \\ \beta_1\|\vartheta_1\|^2 + \dots + \beta_m\|\vartheta_m\|^2 &= \|\vartheta^*\|^2\beta. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vartheta^*\| &= \sqrt{\frac{\beta_1}{|\beta|}\|\vartheta_1\|^2 + \dots + \frac{\beta_m}{|\beta|}\|\vartheta_m\|^2} \\ &\geq \frac{\beta_1}{|\beta|}\|\vartheta_1\| + \dots + \frac{\beta_m}{|\beta|}\|\vartheta_m\| = \|\bar{\vartheta}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover we have that $\|\vartheta^*\| < \|\vartheta_m\|$ since at least two β_i are non-zero. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} &(\|\vartheta_1\|\beta_1 + \dots + \|\vartheta_m\|\beta_m)^2\frac{1}{l^2} - \left(\beta_1\|\vartheta_1\|^2 + \dots + \beta_m\|\vartheta_m\|^2\right)\frac{1}{l} \\ &\leq \|\vartheta^*\|^2\frac{|\beta|^2}{l^2} - \|\vartheta^*\|^2\frac{|\beta|}{l} = \|\vartheta^*\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1) < \|\vartheta_m\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1). \end{aligned}$$

This shows us that all summands of the upper bound are of the form $\exp(\frac{1}{2}Tc)$ with the largest $c = \|\vartheta_m\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1)$. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} f_m(T) \\ &\geq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_m^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}T\|\vartheta_m\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1)\right)}{\sum_k p_k^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}T\|\vartheta_k\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1)\right) + \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}T\|\vartheta^*\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1)\right) \sum_{\substack{|\beta|=n \\ \beta_i \neq n}} C_\beta} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

which implies the statement for $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$. Since the expression is continuous in γ we obtain the statement for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Part c) The proof for the case $\alpha < 0$ can be done similar. In this case we have to show that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} f_1(T) = 1$. Note that here $\gamma := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \in (0, 1)$. We start with the similar inequality

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(T) &\geq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_1 L_T(\vartheta_1, z) (p_1 L_T(\vartheta_1, z))^{\gamma-1} \varphi_T(z) dz}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, z)^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz} \\ &= \frac{p_1^\gamma \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\|\vartheta_1\|^2 T \gamma(\gamma-1)\right)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(T, z)^\gamma \varphi_T(z) dz} \end{aligned}$$

For the denominator we can use the same lines of inequality until (6.5). Defining $\|\vartheta^*\|$ in the same way we obtain $\|\vartheta^*\| > \|\vartheta_1\|$ and since $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ that

$$\|\vartheta^*\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1) < \|\vartheta_1\|^2\gamma(\gamma-1).$$

Looking again for the highest exponents in the denominator we obtain the statement as in part b).

Part d) follows from the representation

$$\kappa_i(t, T, y) = \gamma \sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{\sigma}_i \cdot \vartheta_k f_k(T)$$

in the beginning of part b).

Part e) can be obtained by direct calculation.

REFERENCES

- Aurélien Baillon, Han Bleichrodt, Umut Keskin, Olivier l’Haridon, and Chen Li. The effect of learning on ambiguity attitudes. *Management Science*, 64(5):2181–2198, 2018.
- Anne G Balter, Antje Mahayni, and Nikolaus Schweizer. Time-consistency of optimal investment under smooth ambiguity. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 293(2):643–657, 2021.
- Nicole Bäuerle. Inequalities for stochastic models via supermodular orderings. *Stochastic Models*, 13(1):181–201, 1997.
- Nicole Bäuerle and Stefanie Grether. Extremal behavior of long-term investors with power utility. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 20(05):1750029, 2017.
- Nicole Bäuerle and Ulrich Rieder. Markov decision processes under ambiguity. *Banach Center Publications*, 2020.
- Tomas Björk, Mark HA Davis, and Camilla Landén. Optimal investment under partial information. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 71(2):371–399, 2010.
- Nicole Branger, Lara Becker, Antje Mahayni, and Sascha Offermann. On the impacts of time inconsistency in optimal asset allocation problems. *Preprint*, 2023.
- Michael J Brennan. The role of learning in dynamic portfolio decisions. *Review of Finance*, 1(3):295–306, 1998.
- Zengjing Chen and Larry Epstein. Ambiguity, risk, and asset returns in continuous time. *Econometrica*, 70(4):1403–1443, 2002.
- Daniel Ellsberg. Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 75(4):643–669, 1961.
- Larry G Epstein and Martin Schneider. Learning under ambiguity. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 74(4):1275–1303, 2007.
- Gerard Genotte. Optimal portfolio choice under incomplete information. *The Journal of Finance*, 41(3):733–746, 1986.
- Itzhak Gilboa and David Schmeidler. Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior. In *Uncertainty in economic theory*, pages 141–151. Routledge, 2004.
- Christian Gollier. Portfolio choices and asset prices: The comparative statics of ambiguity aversion. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 78(4):1329–1344, 2011.
- Guohui Guan and Bin Li. Equilibrium investment and reinsurance strategies under smooth ambiguity with a general second-order distribution. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 143:104515, 2022.
- Guohui Guan, Zongxia Liang, and Jianming Xia. Equilibrium portfolio selection for smooth ambiguity preferences. *arXiv:2302.08181*, 2023.
- Massimo Guidolin and Francesca Rinaldi. Ambiguity in asset pricing and portfolio choice: A review of the literature. *Theory and Decision*, 74(2):183–217, 2013.
- LarsPeter Hansen and Thomas J Sargent. Robust control and model uncertainty. *American Economic Review*, 91(2):60–66, 2001.
- Toshiki Honda. Optimal portfolio choice for unobservable and regime-switching mean returns. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 28(1):45–78, 2003.
- Hideki Iwaki and Yusuke Osaki. The dual theory of the smooth ambiguity model. *Economic Theory*, 56(2):275–289, 2014.
- Nengjiu Ju and Jianjun Miao. Ambiguity, learning, and asset returns. *Econometrica*, 80(2):559–591, 2012.
- Ioannis Karatzas and Xiaoliang Zhao. Bayesian adaptive portfolio optimization. *Option pricing, interest rates and risk management*, pages 632–669, 2001.
- Peter Klibanoff, Massimo Marinacci, and Sujoy Mukerji. A smooth model of decision making under ambiguity. *Econometrica*, 73(6):1849–1892, 2005.
- Peter Lakner. Utility maximization with partial information. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 56(2):247–273, 1995.

- Michele Longo and Alessandra Mainini. Learning and portfolio decisions for CRRA investors. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 19(03):1650018, 2016.
- Ulrich Rieder and Nicole Bäuerle. Portfolio optimization with unobservable Markov-modulated drift process. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 42(2):362–378, 2005.
- Walter Rudin. *Functional analysis*, McGraw Hill. 1991.
- Alexander Schied. Optimal investments for risk-and ambiguity-averse preferences: a duality approach. *Finance and Stochastics*, 11(1):107–129, 2007.
- Alexander Schied, Hans Föllmer, and Stefan Weber. Robust preferences and robust portfolio choice. *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, 15:29–87, 2009.
- Maurice Sion. On general minimax theorems. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):171–176, 1958.
- Costis Skiadas. Robust control and recursive utility. *Finance and Stochastics*, 7(4):475–489, 2003.
- Costis Skiadas. Smooth ambiguity aversion toward small risks and continuous-time recursive utility. *Journal of Political Economy*, 121(4):775–792, 2013.
- Masataka Suzuki. Continuous-time smooth ambiguity preferences. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 90:30–44, 2018.
- Menahem E Yaari. The dual theory of choice under risk. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 55:95–115, 1987.