

# An Exact Connection between two Solvable SDEs and a Non Linear Utility Stochastic PDEs

Mohamed M'RAD  
Joint work with Nicole El Karoui

Université Paris VI, École Polytechnique,  
elkaroui@cmapx.polytechnique.fr, mrad@cmapx.polytechnique.fr  
with the financial support of the "Fondation du Risque" and the Fédération des banques Françaises

25 MAI 2010

## Investment Banking and Utility Theory

Some remarks on martingale theory and utility functions in Investment Banking from M.Musiela, T.Zariphopoulo, C.Rogers +alii (2002-2009)

- No clear idea how to **specify** the utility function
- Classical or recursive utilities are defined in **isolation** to the investment opportunities given to an agent.
- **Explicit** solutions to optimal investment problems can only be derived under very restrictive model and utility assumptions, as Markovian assumption which yields to HJB PDEs.
- The investor may want to use intertemporal **diversification**, i.e., implement short, medium and long term strategies
- Can the same utility function be used for all time horizons?

## Consistent Dynamic Utility

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a convex family of positive portfolios, called **Test portfolios**

**Definition** : An  $\mathcal{X}$ -Consistent progressive utility  $U(t, x)$  process is a **positive** adapted random field s.t.

\* **Concavity assumption:** For  $t \geq 0, x > 0 \mapsto U(t, x)$  is an increasing concave function, (in short utility function) .

\* **Consistency with the class of test portfolios:** For any admissible wealth process  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(U(t, X_t)) < +\infty$  and

$$\mathbb{E}(U(t, X_t)/\mathcal{F}_s) \leq U(s, X_s), \quad \forall s \leq t.$$

• **Existence of optimal:** For any initial wealth  $x > 0$ , there exists an optimal wealth process (**benchmark**)  $X^* \in \mathcal{X}$  ( $X_0^* = x$ ),

$$U(s, X_s^*) = \mathbb{E}(U(t, X_t^*)/\mathcal{F}_s) \quad \forall s \leq t.$$

⊙ **In short** for any admissible wealth  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $U(t, X_t)$  is a supermartingale, and a martingale for the optimal-benchmark wealth  $X^*$ .

## The General Market Model

- ▶ The security market consists of one **riskless** asset  $S^0$ ,  $dS_t^0 = S_t^0 r_t dt$ , and  $d$  continuous **risky** assets  $S^i$ ,  $i = 1..d$  defined on a filtered Brownian space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$

$$\frac{dS_t^i}{S_t^i} = b_t^i dt + \sigma_t^i dW_t, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d$$

- ▶ **Risk premium** vector,  $\eta_t$  with  $b(t) - r(t)\mathbf{1} = \sigma_t \eta_t$

**Def** A positive wealth process is defined as a pair  $(x, \pi)$ ,  $x > 0$  is the initial value of the portfolio and  $\pi = (\pi^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$  is the (predictable) **proportion** of each asset held in the portfolio, assumed to be  $S$ -integrable process.

- ▶ Thanks to **AOA** in the market, wealth process with  $\pi$ -strategy is driven by

$$\frac{dX_t^\pi}{X_t^\pi} = r_t dt + \sigma_t \pi_t (dW_t + \eta_t dt),$$

For simplicity we denote by  $\mathcal{R}^\sigma$  the range of the matrix  $\sigma := (\sigma^i)_{i=1..d}$ ,  $\kappa := \sigma \pi$ ,  $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The class of Test portfolio in what follows is

$$\mathcal{X} := \{(X^\kappa) : \frac{dX_t^\kappa}{X_t^\kappa} = r_t dt + \kappa_t (dW_t + \eta_t^\sigma dt), \kappa_t \in \mathcal{R}_t^\sigma\}$$

## Consistent Utility of Itô's Type

Let  $U$  be a dynamic utility (concave, increasing) ,

$$dU(t, x) = \beta(t, x)dt + \gamma(t, x)dW_t$$

such that  $U(t, X_t^\kappa)$  is a supermartingale for  $X^\kappa \in \mathcal{X}$  and a martingale for the optimal one

### Open questions

- ▶ What about the drift  $\beta$  of the utility?
- ▶ What about the volatility  $\gamma$  of the utility?
- ▶ Under which assumptions on  $(\beta, \gamma)$  can one be sure that solutions are concave and increasing,

Main difficulties come from the forward definition

## Drift Constraint

Let  $U$  be a progressive utility of class  $\mathcal{C}^{(2)}$  in the sense of Kunita with local characteristics  $(\beta, \gamma)$  and **risk tolerance coefficient**  $\alpha_t^U(t, x) = -\frac{U_x(t, x)}{U_{xx}(t, x)}$ . We introduce the **utility risk premium**  $\eta^U(t, x) = \frac{\gamma_x(t, x)}{U_x(t, x)}$ . Then, for any admissible portfolio  $X^\kappa$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dU(t, X_t^\kappa) &= \left( U_x(t, X_t^\kappa) X_t^\kappa \kappa_t + \gamma(t, X_t^\kappa) \right) \cdot dW_t \\ &+ \left( \beta(t, X_t^\kappa) + U_x(t, X_t^\kappa) r_t X_t^\kappa + \frac{1}{2} U_{xx}(t, X_t^\kappa) \mathcal{Q}(t, X_t^\kappa, \kappa_t) \right) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where  $x^2 \mathcal{Q}(t, x, \kappa) := \|x\kappa_t\|^2 - 2\alpha^U(t, x)(x\kappa_t) \cdot (\eta_t^\sigma + \eta^{U, \sigma}(t, x))$ .

Let  $\gamma_x^\sigma$  be the orthogonal projection of  $\gamma_x$  on  $\mathcal{R}^\sigma$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}^*(t, x) = \inf_{\kappa \in \mathcal{R}^\sigma} \mathcal{Q}(t, x, \kappa)$ ; the minimum of this quadratic form is achieved at the optimal policy  $\kappa^*$  given by

$$\begin{cases} x\kappa_t^*(x) &= -\frac{1}{U_{xx}(t, x)} (U_x(t, x)\eta_t^\sigma + \gamma_x^\sigma(t, x)) = \alpha^U(t, x)(\eta_t^\sigma + \eta^{U, \sigma}(t, x)) \\ x^2 \mathcal{Q}^*(t, x) &= -\frac{1}{U_{xx}(t, x)^2} \|U_x(t, x)\eta_t^\sigma + \gamma_x^\sigma(t, x)\|^2 = -\|x\kappa_t^*(x)\|^2. \end{cases}$$

## Verification Theorem: I

Let  $U$  be a progressive utility of class  $\mathcal{C}^{(2)}$  in the sense of Kunita with local characteristics  $(\beta, \gamma)$ .

**Hyp** Assume the drift constraint to be **Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman nonlinear type**

$$\beta(t, x) = -U_x(t, x)r_t x + \frac{1}{2} U_{xx}(t, x) \|x \kappa_t^*(t, x)\|^2 \quad (1)$$

where  $\kappa^*$  is the optimal policy given by

$$x \kappa_t^*(x) = -\frac{1}{U_{xx}(t, x)} (U_x(t, x) \eta_t^\sigma + \gamma_x^\sigma(t, x))$$

Then the progressive utility is solution of the following **forward HJB-SPDE**

$$dU(t, x) = \left( -U_x(t, x)r_t x + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(U_x(t, x))^2}{U_{xx}(t, x)} \|\eta_t^\sigma + \frac{\gamma_x^\sigma(t, x)}{U_x(t, x)}\|^2 \right) dt + \gamma(t, x) \cdot dW_t,$$

and for any admissible wealth  $X_t^\kappa$ , the process  $U(t, X_t^\kappa)$  is a supermartingale.

## Verification Theorem: II

### Theorem

Under previous hypothesis,

- ▶ **Assume** that  $\kappa^*(t, x)$  is sufficiently smooth so that the equation

$$dX_t^* = X_t^*(r_t dt + \kappa^*(t, X_t^*) \cdot (dW_t + \eta_t^\sigma dt))$$

has a (unique? strong ?) positive solution for any initial wealth  $x > 0$ .

- ⇒ Then, the progressive increasing utility  $U$  is a  $\mathcal{X}$ -consistent utility, with optimal wealth  $X_t^*$ .



## Inverse flows

Let  $\phi$  be a **strictly monotone** Itô-Ventzel regular flow with inverse process  $\xi(t, y) = \phi(t, \cdot)^{-1}(y)$ . Assume  $d\phi(t, x) = \mu(t, x)dt + \gamma(t, x)dW_t$ ,

i) The inverse flow  $\xi(t, y)$  has as dynamics in old variable

$$d\xi(t, y) = -\xi'_y(t, y)(\mu(t, \xi)dt + \gamma(t, \xi)dW_t) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_y \frac{\|\gamma(t, \xi)\|^2}{\phi'_x(t, \xi)} dt$$

ii) In terms of new variable, with  $\nu^\xi(t, y) = -\xi'_y \gamma(t, \xi)$

$$d\xi(t, y) = \nu^\xi(t, y)dW_t + \left( \frac{1}{2}\partial_y \left( \frac{\|\nu^\xi(t, y)\|^2}{\xi'_y} \right) - \mu(t, \xi)\xi'_y(t, y) \right) dt$$

iii) If  $\phi = \Phi'_x(t, x)$  with  $d\Phi(t, x) = M(t, x)dt + C(t, x)dW_t$ , then  $\xi = \Xi'_y(t, y)$

$$d\Xi(t, y) = -C(t, \xi)dW_t - M(t, \xi)dt + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|C'_x(t, \xi)\|^2}{\Phi''_{xx}(t, \xi)} dt$$

## Duality: Convex conjugate SPDE

Let  $U$  be a consistent progressive utility of class  $\mathcal{C}^{(3)}$ , in the sense of Kunita, satisfying the  $\beta$  constraint (1), then the convex conjugate

$\tilde{U}(t, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{Q}_+^*} (U(t, x) - xy)$  satisfies

$$d\tilde{U}(t, y) = \left[ \frac{1}{2\tilde{U}_{yy}(t, y)} (\|\tilde{\gamma}_y(t, y)\|^2 - \|\tilde{\gamma}_y^\sigma(t, y) + y\tilde{U}_{yy}(t, y)\eta_t^\sigma\|^2) + y\tilde{U}_y(t, y)r_t \right] dt \\ + \tilde{\gamma}(t, y) \cdot dW_t \quad \text{with } \tilde{\gamma}(t, y) = \gamma(t, -\tilde{U}_y(t, y)).$$

- ▶ The drift  $\tilde{\beta}(t, y)$  is the value of an optimization program achieved on the optimal policy  $\nu^*(t, y) = -\tilde{\gamma}_y^\perp(t, y)/y\tilde{U}_{yy}(t, y)$ .
- ▶  $\tilde{\beta}$  can be written as the solution of the following optimization program

$$\hat{\beta}(t, y) = y\tilde{U}_y(t, y)r_t - \frac{1}{2}y^2\tilde{U}_{yy}(t, y) \inf_{\nu_t \in \mathcal{R}^{\sigma, \perp}} \{ \|\nu_t - \eta_t^\sigma\|^2 + 2(\nu_t - \eta_t^\sigma) \cdot \left( \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_y(t, y)}{y\tilde{U}_{yy}(t, y)} \right) \}$$

with  $-\tilde{\gamma}_y(t, y)/y\tilde{U}_{yy}(t, y) = \eta^U(t, -\tilde{U}(t, y)) = \gamma_x(t, -\tilde{U}(t, y))/y$ .

## Convex conjugate forward Utility

Under previous assumption,

- ▶ The conjugate Utility  $\tilde{U}(t, y)$  is a convex decreasing stochastic flows,
- ▶ **consistent** with the family  $\mathcal{Y}$  of semimartingales  $Y^\nu$ , defined from

$$\frac{dY_t}{Y_t} = -r_t dt + (\nu_t - \eta_t^\sigma) dW_t, \quad \nu_t \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\sigma, \perp}$$

- ▶ There exists a **dual optimal choice**  $Y_t^* = Y_t^{\nu^*}$  satisfying the dual identity

$$Y^*(t, y) = U_x(t, X_t^*((U_x')^{-1}(0, y))), \quad \mathcal{Y}(t, x) := U_x(t, X_t^*(x))$$

Assume  $X_t^*(x)$  is strictly monotone in  $x$ , by taking the inverse  $\mathcal{X}(t, x)$ ,

$$\Rightarrow U_x(t, x) = Y_t^*(u_x(\mathcal{X}_t(x)))$$

$$\Rightarrow U(t, x) = \int_0^x Y_t^*(u_x(\mathcal{X}_t(z))) dz$$

**Req:**  $x \mapsto X_t^*(x)$  is increasing  $\Rightarrow y \mapsto Y_t^*(y)$  is increasing.

## Flows Assumption

Let  $X^*(x)$  be **any** wealth process and  $Y^*(y)$  be **any** state price density assumed to be continuous and increasing in  $x$  (resp. in  $y$ ) from 0 to  $+\infty$ . Moreover,  $X^*$  and  $Y^*$  are Itô-Ventzel regular

$$\begin{aligned}dX_t^*(x) &= X_t^*(x)r_t dt + X_t^*(x)\kappa^*(t, X^*)(dW_t + \eta_t^\sigma dt), \quad \kappa^*(t, x) \in \mathcal{R}_t^\sigma \\dY_t^*(y) &= -Y_t^*(y)r_t dt + (\nu^*(t, Y_t^*) - \eta_t^\sigma)dW_t, \quad \nu^*(t, y) \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\sigma, \perp}\end{aligned}$$

Note that the Monotony Assumption is

- ▶ true in a lot examples,
- ▶ may be a consequence of no arbitrage opportunity.
- ▶ from flows point of view, it is implied by coefficient regularity.

## Theorem: Utility Characterization, Basic Example

Let  $\mathcal{X}(t, z)$  be the inverse flow of  $X^*(t, z)$ , satisfying  $X^* Y^\nu$  ( $\nu \in \mathcal{R}^{\sigma, \perp}$ ) is a **martingale**. Then for any utility function  $u$  such that  $u_x(\mathcal{X}(t, z))$  is locally integrable near  $z = 0$ , the stochastic process  $U$  defined by

$$U(t, x) = Y_t^\nu(1) \int_0^x u_x(\mathcal{X}(t, z)) dz, \quad U(t, 0) = 0 \quad (2)$$

is a  $\mathcal{X}$ -Consistent utility. The associated optimal wealth process is  $X^*$  and the optimal dual choice  $Y^*(y) = yY^\nu(1)$ . Moreover

$$\gamma_x(t, x) = U_x(t, x)(\nu_t - \eta_t^\sigma) - U_{xx}(t, x)\kappa^*(t, x).$$

Furthermore, the conjugate process of  $U$  denoted by  $\tilde{U}$ , is given by

$$\tilde{U}(t, y) = \int_y^{+\infty} X^*(t, -\tilde{u}_y(z/Y_t^\nu(1))) dz, \quad (3)$$

## General Characterization

### Theorem

Let  $(X_t^*(x))$ , and  $Y^*(t, y)$  be two regular stochastic flows as above and  $u$  an utility function. Denote by  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  the inverse flows and assume that  $x \mapsto Y_t^*(u_x(\mathcal{X}(t, y)))$  is locally integrable near  $z = 0$ . Define the processes  $U$  and  $\tilde{U}$  by

$$U(t, x) = \int_0^x Y_t^*(u_x(\mathcal{X}(t, z))) dz, \quad \tilde{U}(t, y) = \int_y^{+\infty} X_t^*(-\tilde{u}_y(\mathcal{Y}(t, z))) dz.$$

Then  $U$  is a consistent utility, whose the convex conjugate is  $\tilde{U}$ , and the dynamics

$$dU(t, x) = \left( -xU_x(t, x)r_t + \frac{1}{2U_{xx}(t, x)} \|\gamma_x^\sigma(t, x) + U_x(t, x)\eta_t^\sigma\|^2 \right) dt + \gamma(t, x) \cdot dW_t,$$

with volatility vector  $\gamma$  given by

$$\gamma(t, x) = -U(t, x)\eta_t^\sigma - \int_0^x \left( zU_{xx}(t, z)\kappa^*(t, z) - \nu_t^*(U_x(t, z)) \right) dz.$$

The associated optimal portfolio and the optimal dual process are  $X^*$  and  $Y^*$ .

## Connection with two Solvable SDEs

Consider a utility stochastic PDE with initial condition  $u(\cdot)$ ,

$$dU(t, x) = \left( -xU_x(t, x)r_t + \frac{1}{2U_{xx}(t, x)} \|\gamma_x^\sigma(t, x) + U_x(t, x)\eta_t^\sigma\|^2 \right) dt + \gamma(t, x) \cdot dW_t, \quad (4)$$

where the derivative  $\gamma_x$  of  $\gamma$  is the operator given by

$$\gamma_x(t, x) = -U_x(t, x)\eta_t^\sigma - xU_{xx}(t, x)\kappa_t^*(t, x) + \nu_t^*(U_x(t, x)), \quad \kappa_t^* \in \mathcal{R}_t^\sigma, \nu_t^* \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\sigma, \perp}, t \geq 0.$$

Assume that the both equations

$$\frac{dX_t^*(x)}{X_t^*(x)} = r_t dt + \kappa_t^*(t, X_t^*(x)) \cdot (dW_t + \eta_t^\sigma dt), \quad \frac{dY_t^*(y)}{Y_t^*(y)} = -r_t dt + (\nu_t^*(Y_t^*(y)) - \eta_t^\sigma) \cdot dW_t$$





admit solutions and that  $X^*$  is monotonous regular flow in the sense of Kunita  $\Rightarrow$  there exists a solution  $U$  of the SPDE (4) given by

$$U(t, x) = \int_0^x Y_t^*(u_x(\mathcal{X}(t, z))) dz$$

- ▶ If  $X^*$  and  $Y^*$  are increasing regular flows  $\Rightarrow U$  is an increasing and concave solution of the SPDE (4).
- ▶ If  $X^*$  and  $Y^*$  are unique  $\Rightarrow U$  is the unique solution of (4).

*The main assumption is that the optimal portfolio is increasing in  $x$ , because we have the same characterization in more abstract form (minimal regularities assumption), based on the properties of the optimum.*



-  El Karoui N. and M'rad M.  
**An Exact Connection between two Solvable SDEs and a Non Linear Utility Stochastic PDEs (2010).**
-  El Karoui N. and M'rad M.  
**Non Linear Utility Stochastic PDEs: General Constraints (2010).**
-  El Karoui N. and M'rad M.  
**Stochastic Utilities With a Given Optimal Portfolio : Approach by Stochastic Flows (2010).**
-  El Karoui N. and M'rad M.  
**Random Risk Aversion and Explicit Consistent Utilities Construction (2010).**

Thank you for your attention