

THE INFORMATION PREMIUM ON A FINITE PROBABILITY SPACE

JAKE KOERNER, JOO SEUNG LEE, AND OLEKSII MOSTOVYI

ABSTRACT. On a finite probability space, we consider a problem of *fair pricing* of contingent claims in the sense of [FS89], and its sensitivity to a distortion of information, where we follow the *weak information* modeling approach from [Bau03]. We show that, in complete models, or more generally, for replicable contingent claims, the weak information does not affect the fair price. For incomplete models, this is not the case for non-replicable claims, where we obtain explicit formulas for the *information premium* and *correction to an optimal trading strategy*. We illustrate our results by an example, where we demonstrate that under weak information, the fair price can increase, stay the same, or decrease.

1. INTRODUCTION

While in complete markets, every contingent claim admits a unique arbitrage-free price, in incomplete markets, this is not the case. To assign a unique number (price) in such settings, alternative approaches have been used, including the ones that are based on the preferences of a given economic agent. This leads to the notions of utility-based pricing (see [HKS05]) and a closely related fair-pricing (see [FS89]). Note that the question of consistency between the utility-based and arbitrage-free pricing methodologies, typically, has an affirmative answer (see [Sio16]).

Information is another crucial ingredient that affects the pricing and hedging of non-replicable contingent claims. There are different approaches to modeling information (and the information asymmetry) in financial markets. They include immersions and enlargements of filtrations and distortions of the underlying probability measure. We also note that this area of research is very active, see, e.g., [AJ17] and [BF17] for overviews of recent developments. While immersions and enlargements of filtrations are quite technical mathematically, an approach based on conditioning from [Bau02] and [Bau03] allows to

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G07, 93E20, 91G10, 91G20.

Key words and phrases. Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition, fair pricing, asymmetric information, information premium.

This paper is a part of an REU project conducted in Summer 2020 at the University of Connecticut. The project has been supported by the National Science Foundation under grants No. DMS-1659643 and DMS-1848339.

work on the same probability space and yet it is closely connected to the theory of the initial enlargement of filtration; see the discussion in [Bau02].

The goal of this paper is to understand and quantify the effect of information on the fair-pricing and hedging methodologies. We adopt a *weak information* modeling approach from [Bau03] and investigate its impact on fair pricing and hedging in the sense of [FS89]. More specifically, we suppose that an investor is trading in a discrete-time, arbitrage-free market with zero *bid-ask spread* (i.e., no transaction cost). If possible, the investor seeks to match the payoff of a derivative security via gains from the trade using some initial capital value up to the terminal time period, at which the payoff is attained. If perfect matching, also known as replication, is not possible, the investor wants to find a trading strategy, such that the associated wealth process minimizes the expectation of the square of the difference between the payoff of the contingent claim and the wealth process associated with the trading strategy. The initial value of such a minimizing wealth process is known as a fair price, see [FS89].

Our results include explicit formulas for the change of the fair price under weak information, that is an information premium, and for the change of the trading strategy. By means of examples, we show that the fair price under weak information can increase, stay the same, or decrease. In the process of getting them, we have to analyze the existence of the optimal probability measure in the closure of a certain set of probability measures that have the same distribution as that defined by the weak information at the maturity time.

The remaining of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the fair pricing methodology in the sense of [FS89], in Section 3, we discuss the weak information approach. In Section 4, we show that in complete markets, there is no information premium, whereas, in Section 5, we provide explicit formulas for the information premium and corrections to the optimal trading strategy.

2. FAIR PRICING IN THE SENSE OF [FS89]

Let $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a finite probability space, where for some integer $N > 0$, and the filtration, $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0,1,\dots,N}$, is an increasing family of sub-algebras each containing \emptyset and Ω . We suppose that \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial, and \mathcal{F}_N is the power set of Ω . Let the probability measure \mathbb{P} be one such that $\mathbb{P}[\omega] > 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Let $S = (S_n)_{n=0,1,\dots,N}$, the discounted stock price process (i.e., if the undiscounted stock price at time $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$, is denoted \bar{S}_n , for some fixed one-period market interest rate $r > -1$, $S_n = \frac{\bar{S}_n}{(1+r)^n}$), be a real-valued \mathcal{F} -adapted process. Furthermore, we denote

$$\Delta S_n := S_n - S_{n-1}, \quad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, N,$$

to be the incremental discounted stock price process. Let $\xi = (\xi_n)_{n=1,2,\dots,N}$ be a predictable (i.e., ξ_n is \mathcal{F}_{n-1} -measurable for all $n = 1, \dots, N$) trading strategy that describes the number of shares of the stock held in the portfolio. We also suppose that there is a money market account, but since we are working in the discounted terms, the price process for the money market account equals to 1 at all times.

Definition 2.1. Let Θ be the set of all predictable trading strategies ξ . For $\xi \in \Theta$, let $G(\xi)$ be defined by

$$G_n(\xi) := \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j \Delta S_j.$$

Then, for a random variable V_N and some $V_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, one can define the following problem from [FS89]:

$$(1) \quad \text{minimize } \mathbb{E} [(V_N - V_0 - G_N(\xi))^2] \text{ over all } \xi \in \Theta \text{ and } V_0 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

2.1. Interpretation. $V_0 + G_n(\xi)$, $n = 0, \dots, N$, can be viewed as the *gains from the trade* process, starting from the initial capital V_0 . We also interpret V_N as the payoff of a contingent claim or a derivative security with maturity N and whose underlying asset does not have to be S , but it can be. The most common derivative security is the *European call option*, which gives its owner the right, but not the obligation, to buy one share of a stock at the maturity time for the *strike price* K . If the $S_N > K$, the owner can exercise the option and makes a profit of $S_N - K$, while the option would be worthless if $S_N < K$, in which case the owner does not buy a share of the stock. Therefore, the payoff of the European call option is said to be $(S_N - K)^+ := \max\{S_N - K, 0\}$. Generally, V_N can represent payoff of any security, an option on a different stock, in particular.

The solution to (1), consisting of an optimal trading strategy $\hat{\xi}$, is developed and given in [FS89] using a method known as (backward in time) sequential regression. The formula for the optimal trading strategy (recursively, backward in time) is given by:

$$(2) \quad \hat{\xi}_n = \frac{\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}} \left[V_N - \sum_{j=n+1}^N \hat{\xi}_j \Delta S_j, \Delta S_n \right]}{\text{Var}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}} [\Delta S_n]}, \quad n = N, \dots, 1,$$

where $\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}[\cdot, \cdot]$ and $\text{Var}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}[\cdot]$ denote the conditional covariance and variance conditioned on \mathcal{F}_{n-1} , respectively. Furthermore, given the optimal trading strategy $\hat{\xi}$, one can find the fair derivative security price \hat{V}_0 from (1) given by:

$$(3) \quad \hat{V}_0 = \mathbb{E}[V_N - G_N(\hat{\xi})].$$

These solutions to (1) gives one the discrete Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition of the payoff of the non-traded derivative security, V_N , defined below:

Definition 2.2. The discrete Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition, following [Sch95], is defined as follows. Let $S = M + A$ be the semimartingale decomposition of S into a martingale M and a predictable process A . Then the random variable V_N admits the discrete Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition:

$$(4) \quad V_N = \hat{V}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\xi}_j \Delta S_j + L_N$$

for some $\hat{V}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, optimal trading strategy $\hat{\xi} \in \Theta$, and a \mathbb{P} -martingale L such that:

- (1) L and M are orthogonal (i.e., LM is a \mathbb{P} -martingale),
- (2) $\mathbb{E}[L_0] = 0$,

where the second condition is just $L_0 = 0$ for a trivial \mathcal{F}_0 .

3. THE WEAK INFORMATION APPROACH

Background. The weak information approach have been initiated in [Bau02] in the context of complete markets. In [Bau03], it is further developed for incomplete financial models. It corresponds to a certain change of a probability measure and the name contrasts it from the strong information modeling approach, which is based on enlargements of filtration. We recall some notions from [Bau03, p. 61]. For some random variable¹ Y (e.g., Y can be the value of the stock price at time $T > 0$), let us consider an insider who is only *weakly informed* on Y , which means that he or she has knowledge of the filtration \mathcal{F} and of the law of Y . More precisely, with Y we associate a probability measure ν on \mathbb{R} . We assume that ν is equivalent to \mathbb{P} ([Bau03] additionally supposes the boundedness of the density that holds trivially on finite spaces). The probability ν should be interpreted as the law of Y under the effective probability of the market. A typical example of Y is the stock price at maturity.

In [Bau03], the weak information was placed into a utility maximization problem from terminal wealth and *without contingent claims (or random endowment)*, in continuous time. Let $\mathcal{A}(x)$ be the set of all *admissible* trading strategies Θ , that is the set of θ 's that are integrable with respect to S and are such that the associated wealth processes $x + \int_0^t \theta_u dS_u$, $t \in [0, T]$, where $x > 0$ is an initial wealth, stays nonnegative. Then, for some increasing, strictly concave utility function $U: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, [Bau03, p. 74] defines the financial value of the weak information on the optimal portfolio problem as

$$(5) \quad u(x, \nu) = \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{A}(x)} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[U \left(x + \int_0^T \theta_u dS_u \right) \right], \quad x > 0.$$

¹To be more precise, in [Bau03, p. 46], $Y: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable random element, where \mathcal{P} is a Polish space. We suppose that $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{R}$ for simplicity of the presentation.

Further, for a given initial wealth $x > 0$, [Bau03, p. 76] sets

$$(6) \quad u(x, \nu) - U(x)$$

to be the value of the *additional* information.

Our formulation. Combining the weak information on the outputs to (1) as it is done below in (7) has the spirit of [Bau03], however, it differs from (5) in [Bau03] by

- switching from maximization to minimization problem (this change is fairly straightforward),
- more importantly, it allows to incorporate the contingent claim V_N in a tractable way that will allow to give affirmative answers to natural questions of what is the information premium and what are the corrections to the optimal trading strategy under extra information.

Remark 3.1. The utility maximization problem with a contingent claim or a random endowment in the general settings of incomplete markets is substantially more difficult than the one without a contingent claim, and the existing results are obtained later; compare [KLSX91] and [KS99] (without random endowment) with [CSW01], [HK04], and [Mos17] (with endowment), where [CSW01] is the earliest known result.

We suppose that an insider has weak information about some random variable Y (e.g., the value of the stock price at time N), given via its distribution ν as well as about the filtration \mathcal{F} . We let \mathcal{E}^ν set of probability measures \mathbb{Q} on Ω that are equivalent to \mathbb{P} , and are such that the law of Y under \mathbb{Q} is ν (exactly as in the construction of (5)). Then we consider the following problem:

$$(7) \quad \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu} \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q} [(V_N - V_0 - G_N(\xi))^2].$$

We call the *information premium* the change in the fair price \hat{V}_0 that comes from formulations (1) and (7). This concept has some connection to the value of the additional information in (6), however it captures the changes in the fair price directly.

Discussion. This problem may be interpreted as the greatest decrease to the least squares difference between some non-traded derivative security payoff, dependent on S , and some initial capital plus the gains from the trade under some trading strategy up to time N , under the weak information on S_N . Comparing the solutions (1) to (7) may allow to quantify the financial value of the weak information through the Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition of the derivative security payoff as well as the information premium on the fair price of the security.

The novel problem (7) holds similarities to (5). One can interpret (7) as the discrete-time, quadratic analog to (5), but with some additional contingent claim with a payoff V_N . Therefore, (7) is a novel yet natural problem to investigate.

Mathematically, using sequential regression, one can obtain the solutions to (1), and identify the Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition of V_N under some measure \mathbb{P} . Note that, the fair price and the optimal trading strategy, and, as a result, the Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition of the derivative security payoff depend on which probability measure that defines the weak information is used. We now look to investigate whether one can identify the Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition of V_N or its analog based on (7), where the objective in (7) can be interpreted as considering the worst case scenario, given the uncertainty about the choice of $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu$.

Financially, we interpret having weak information on S_N as an insider having extra information on the outcomes of the asset's value during the payoff period. As such, using this weak anticipation the insider may gain some knowledge on the fair price of a non-traded derivative security whose value is derived from S , as well as the optimal trading strategy required to reduce the least-squares difference between the payoff and the initial capital plus the gains from the trade up to the terminal time period, under this optimal trading strategy.

4. THE INFORMATION PREMIUM IN COMPLETE MARKETS IS ZERO

In the settings of Section 2, a market is complete, if every contingent claim V_N can be represented as

$$(8) \quad V_N = V_0 + G_N(\xi),$$

for some $\xi \in \Theta$ and some $V_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. This corresponds to the case when $L_N = 0$ in (4): the payoff of the non-traded security V_N can be exactly replicated via the gains from trade from some $\xi \in \Theta$, starting from the initial capital V_0 .

Example 4.1 (The Binomial Model). Suppose that we have an arbitrage-free market in which for each time step $n = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$, where undiscounted S_{n+1} may take on one of two possible values, either uS_n or dS_n for some u, d satisfying $0 < d < 1 + r < u$, for a one-period interest rate $r > -1$. This is known as the *no-arbitrage binomial market model*. We assume for any \mathbb{P} such that $\mathbb{P}(\omega) > 0$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$, where $\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} = uS_n) = p \in (0, 1)$, and $\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} = dS_n) = q := 1 - p$. One may interpret $S_{n+1} = uS_n$ as the stock increasing in value from time n to $n + 1$, and $S_{n+1} = dS_n$ as the stock decreasing in value from time n to $n + 1$. Suppose $X = (X_n)_{n=0,1,\dots,N}$ is a wealth process that replicates the payoff V_N , i.e., a self-financing process that begins with initial capital X_0 such that

$$X_N(\omega) = V_N(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

Then the backward induction approach leads to the *Delta-Hedging formula* given by [Shr04]. It provides the number of stocks to trade at each time period, the self-financing trading strategy $\hat{\xi}$, in order to replicate V_N :

$$\hat{\xi}_n(\omega) = \frac{X_n(\omega H) - X_n(\omega T)}{uS_{n-1} - dS_{n-1}},$$

where $\omega = \omega_1 \dots \omega_n$, where each $\omega_i \in \{H, T\}$. Therefore, if an insider is given some weak information $\nu(S_N)$, the problem of

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu} \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} [(V_N - V_0 - G_N(\xi))^2],$$

in an arbitrage-free binomial asset pricing model is trivial. For any $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu$, (8) implies that the trading strategy ξ and an initial wealth V_0 result in

$$(9) \quad V_N - V_0 - G_N(\xi) = 0.$$

Thus, ξ and V_0 are minimizers to both (7) and (1). These minimizers depend on neither \mathbb{P} , nor \mathcal{E}^ν . Equality (9) is consistent with (3) with $\hat{\xi} = \xi$ and $\hat{V}_0 = V_0$, and (9) *also reinforces the consistency between arbitrage-free prices and fair prices in the current settings*. Note that that is also addressed in [Sio16] for utility-based prices and that in complete binomial settings the consistency of the hedging by sequential regression and the delta-hedging formula is demonstrated in [BCJ⁺20].

Comparing (2), (3) with (8), and by picking

$$\hat{\xi} = \xi \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{V}_0 = V_0$$

we deduce that the weak information premium is zero (i.e., (9) holds) not only in binomial settings, but in general complete models. This, in turn, implies *the consistency of the arbitrage-free pricing and fair pricing in complete models*. Therefore, *in complete markets, the weak information does not affect the fair price of a contingent claim, as the price is formed by a different mechanism: replication*.

5. THE INFORMATION PREMIUM IN INCOMPLETE MARKETS

In practice, most models exhibit incompleteness. This means that not all contingent claims are replicable in the sense of (8). As mentioned above, in complete markets, one can price assets through the replication and subsequently reduce the Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition of a security payoff V_N to

$$V_N = \hat{V}_0 + G_N(\hat{\xi}),$$

which is consistent with (8). Instead, for incomplete markets, for non-replicable (in the sense (8)) contingent claims, we can only ask what is the optimal trading strategy and fair price of the security under which the risk of loss is minimized, as with the least squares


minimization problem (1). Therefore, in incomplete markets for non-replicable claims, if an investor has some weak information, the objective

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu} \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} [(V_N - V_0 - G_N(\xi))^2] > 0,$$

becomes much more pertinent. For replicable claims, that is for the ones that admit representation (8), the situation is exactly the same as in complete markets though, and the information premium is 0.

Example 5.1 (An incomplete trinomial model). A classical example of a discrete-time, no-arbitrage incomplete market model is based on the trinomial asset pricing model. Here, we model a discounted risky asset S such that at each time period $n = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$, S_{n+1} may take on three different values. That is, $S_{n+1} = uS_n$, or the asset value increase by factor u from time n , $S_{n+1} = sS_n = S_n$, or the asset value remains the same as in time n , or $S_{n+1} = dS_n$, or the asset value decreases by factor d from time n .

For example, consider a 1-step trinomial asset pricing model with $S_0 = 4$, $u = 2$, $d = \frac{1}{2}$, $r = 0$, and a *European Call Option*, V_1 , expiring at time $N = 1$ with strike price $K = 7$. Note that in this market, the payoff $V_1(\omega)$ is 1 if and only if $\omega = u$. In the following subsection, we will illustrate that extra information can increase, decrease or keep the fair time-zero price \hat{V}_0 the same.



1-period Trinomial Model, with $K = 7$


The Weak Information Impact in a One-Period Trinomial Model. Using the above one-period trinomial model, assume that an un-informed investor (one without weak information on $Y = S_1$) has a naive belief that the stock prices will be uniformly distributed at time 1 (i.e., the stock price distribution at time 1 matches the probability measure $\mathbb{P} = \{p(u), p(s), p(d)\} = \{\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\}$, where $p(u), p(s), p(d)$ represent the probability of the stock price increasing, staying the same, or decreasing respectively). Now suppose we have an insider who is given some weak information on $Y = S_1$. Note that for the one-period model case, ν defines some new probability measure $\mathbb{P}' = \{p'(u), p'(s), p'(d)\}$. We thus consider a range of possible ν that an insider may be given, and show how the fair price of the option and optimal trading strategy change under different measures that may be defined. We compute the time-zero fair-price for this contingent claim using the

following formulae:

$$\hat{\xi}_1 = \frac{\text{Cov}[V_1, \Delta S_1]}{\text{Var}[\Delta S_1]},$$

$$\hat{V}_0 = \mathbb{E}[V_1] - \hat{\xi}_1 \mathbb{E}[\Delta S_1].$$

We note that under \mathbb{P} , calculating $\hat{\xi}_1$ and \hat{V}_0 yields $\frac{5}{28}$ and $\frac{3}{14}$. Analogous results can be obtained under weak information, and the following graphs give how the fair price of the contingent claim and optimal trading strategy change when an investor is given some weak information:



Positive and negative values are shown in blue and red colors, respectively. (left) Fair time-zero option price difference under ν from \mathbb{P} . (right) Strategy difference under the extra information under ν from \mathbb{P} .

Since $\mathbb{E}[V_1] = \mathbb{P}(u)$, the option is priced higher if $\mathbb{P}(u)$ increases, or $\hat{\xi}_1$ or $\mathbb{E}[\Delta S_1]$ decreases. Notice that weak information that gives extremely small $\nu(S_1 = 2)$ and $\nu(S_1 = 8)$ results in positive and negative change to the optimal trading strategy, $\hat{\xi}_1^\nu - \hat{\xi}_1^\mathbb{P}$, respectively. This matches with an intuition that if there is almost no chance of a stock losing (or gaining) its value, a trader should buy more (or less) shares of stock than he or she would have under the naive assumption, in order to hedge a position.

Therefore, weak information in the incomplete, trinomial model can change the structure of the fair price \hat{V}_0 and trading strategy $\hat{\xi}$. *The fair price can become higher, lower, or stay the same.*

5.1. **The information premium for non-replicable claims.** Let us consider the objective

$$F := \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu} \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\left(V_N - V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \Delta S_j \right)^2 \right] > 0,$$

and let us define

$$f(\mathbb{Q}) := \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\left(V_N - V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \Delta S_j \right)^2 \right], \quad \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu.$$

Let \mathbb{Q}^m , $m \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of probability measures in \mathcal{E}^ν , such that

$$(10) \quad f(\mathbb{Q}^m) \geq F - 1/m.$$

As we work on a finite probability space, each \mathbb{Q} can be represented by a finite-dimensional vector (where the dimension corresponds to the number of states, and thus such a dimension does not depend on the choice of \mathbb{Q}). The components of such a vector take values in $(0, 1)$, and in particular are bounded from above and below. Consequently, there exists a convergent subsequence \mathbb{Q}^{m_k} , $k \geq 1$, such that

$$(11) \quad [0, 1] \ni \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{Q}^{m_k}(\omega) =: \hat{\mathbb{Q}}(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

Boundedness of \mathbb{Q}^{m_k} , $k \geq 1$, implies that $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ is also a probability measure.

To recapitulate, we have obtained a probability measure $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$, which is in the closure of \mathcal{E}^ν . Such a measure is absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbb{P} . As in (7) we deal with Föllmer-Schweizer decompositions under multiple probability measures, it will be convenient to emphasize the dependence of \hat{V}_0 , $\hat{\xi}$, and L appearing in (4) on the probability measure by writing $\hat{V}_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\hat{\xi}^{\mathbb{Q}}$, and $L^{\mathbb{Q}}$, where \mathbb{Q} is the probability measure under which the expectation in (4) is considered. Let us also define

$$(12) \quad v_n^{\mathbb{Q}} := \text{Var}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Delta S_n], \quad n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}.$$

The following theorem gives the formulas for information premium and the correction of the optimal trading strategy as well as accompanying convergence of the outputs to the Föllmer-Schweizer decompositions.

Theorem 5.2. *On a finite probability space, where $\mathbb{P}(\omega) > 0$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$, let us assume that $v_n^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}$ in (12) is strictly positive, where $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ is given in (11). Then, with \mathbb{Q}^m ,*

$m \in \mathbb{N}$, given by (10) and for its subsequence in (11), we have:

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\xi}_j^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}(\omega) &= \hat{\xi}_j^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(\omega), \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \quad \omega \in \Omega, \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} G_j(\hat{\xi}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}})(\omega) &= G_j(\hat{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}})(\omega), \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \quad \omega \in \Omega, \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{V}_0^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} &= \hat{V}_0^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}, \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} L_j^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}(\omega) &= L_j^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(\omega), \quad j = 0, \dots, N, \quad \omega \in \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The probability measure $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ is optimal in the following sense

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu} \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\left(V_N - V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \Delta S_j \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[\left(V_N - \hat{V}_0^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} - G_N(\hat{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[\left(V_N - V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \Delta S_j \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The information premium (that is the correction to the fair price due to the weak information) is given by

$$(15) \quad V_0^{\mathbb{P}} - V_0^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} = \mathbb{E} \left[V_N - \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\xi}_j^{\mathbb{P}} \Delta S_j \right] - \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[V_N - \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\xi}_j^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \Delta S_j \right].$$

The correction to the optimal strategy (recursively, backward in time) is given by

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\xi}_n^{\mathbb{P}} - \hat{\xi}_n^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} &= \frac{\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[V_N - \sum_{j=n+1}^N \hat{\xi}_j^{\mathbb{P}} \Delta S_j, \Delta S_n \right]}{\text{Var}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}^{\mathbb{P}}[\Delta S_n]} \\ &\quad - \frac{\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[V_N - \sum_{j=n+1}^N \hat{\xi}_j^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \Delta S_j, \Delta S_n \right]}{\text{Var}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}[\Delta S_n]}, \quad n = N, \dots, 1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us recall that for a fixed \mathbb{Q} , the optimal ξ 's in (4) are given by

$$\hat{\xi}_n^{\mathbb{Q}} = \frac{\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[V_N - \sum_{j=n+1}^N \hat{\xi}_j^{\mathbb{Q}} \Delta S_j, \Delta S_n \right]}{\text{Var}_{\mathcal{F}_{n-1}}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Delta S_n]}, \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$

see (2). Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\xi}_N^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}(\omega) = \hat{\xi}_N^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\xi}_N^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}(\omega) \Delta S_N(\omega) = \hat{\xi}_N^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(\omega) \Delta S_N(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

In turn, this allows to deduce that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\xi}_{N-1}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}(\omega) = \hat{\xi}_{N-1}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

Continuing the backward recursion procedure, we deduce the first two equalities in (13).

From the first two equalities in (13), (3), and (11) we deduce that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{V}_0^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} = \hat{V}_0^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}},$$

that is the third equality in (13) holds. Now, from (4), we deduce that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} L_n^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}(\omega) = L_n^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}(\omega), \quad n = 0, \dots, N, \quad \omega \in \Omega,$$

which is the last equality in (13).

Let us show (14). From (13), we deduce that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(V_N - \hat{V}_0^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} - G_N(\hat{\xi}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}) \right)^2(\omega) = \left(V_N - \hat{V}_0^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} - G_N(\hat{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}) \right)^2(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega,$$

and therefore from (11), we get

$$(17) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} \left[\left(V_N - \hat{V}_0^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} - G_N(\hat{\xi}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}) \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[\left(V_N - \hat{V}_0^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} - G_N(\hat{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}) \right)^2 \right].$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{E}^\nu} \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\left(V_N - V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \Delta S_j \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} \left[\left(V_N - V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \Delta S_j \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} \left[\left(V_N - \hat{V}_0^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}} - G_N(\hat{\xi}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m_k}}) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[\left(V_N - \hat{V}_0^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} - G_N(\hat{\xi}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}}) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \inf_{V_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \xi \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[\left(V_N - V_0 - \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \Delta S_j \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where in the first equality, we used (10), in the second and fourth equalities, we have used the optimality of \hat{V}_0 's and $\hat{\xi}$'s, and in the third equality, we have used (17). Now, (18) gives (14). In turn (14) and (3) imply the representation (15), and finally (14) and (2) give (16). □

REFERENCES

- [AJ17] A. Aksamit and M. Jeanblanc. *Enlargement of Filtration with Finance in View*. Springer, 2017.
- [Bau02] F. Baudoin. Conditioned stochastic differential equations: Theory, examples and applications to finance. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, 100(1-2):109–145, 2002.
- [Bau03] F. Baudoin. Modeling anticipations on a financial market. In J.-M. Morel, F. Takens, and B. Teissier, editors, *Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance*, pages 43–94. Springer, 2003.
- [BCJ⁺20] S. Boese, T. Cui, S. Johnston, G. Molino, and O. Mostovyi. Stability and asymptotic analysis of the Föllmer-Schweizer decomposition on a finite probability space. arXiv:2002.03286 [q-fin.MF], to appear in *Involve*, 2020.
- [BF17] E. Barucci and C. Fontana. *Financial Markets Theory, Equilibrium, Efficiency and Information*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2017.
- [CSW01] J. Cvitanic, W. Schachermayer, and H. Wang. Utility maximization in incomplete markets with random endowment. *Finance Stoch.*, 5:259–272, 2001.
- [FS89] H. Föllmer and M. Schweizer. Hedging by sequential regression: An introduction to the mathematics of option trading. *ASTIN Bull.*, 18(2):147–160, 1989.
- [HK04] J. Hugonnier and D. Kramkov. Optimal investment with random endowment in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 14:845–864, 2004.
- [HKS05] J. Hugonnier, D. Kramkov, and W. Schachermayer. On utility-based pricing of contingent claims in incomplete markets. *Math. Finance*, 15:203–212, 2005.
- [KLSX91] I. Karatzas, J. P. Lehoczky, S. E. Shreve, and G. L. Xu. Martingale and duality methods for utility maximization in an incomplete market. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 29:702–730, 1991.
- [KS99] D. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 9(3):904–950, 1999.
- [Mos17] O. Mostovyi. Optimal investment with intermediate consumption and random endowment. *Math. Finance*, 27(1):96–114, 2017.
- [Sch95] M. Schweizer. Variance-optimal hedging in discrete time. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 20(1):1–32, 1995.
- [Shr04] S. Shreve. *Stochastic Calculus for Finance I: The Binomial Asset Pricing Model*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2004.
- [Sio16] P. Siorpaes. Do arbitrage-free prices come from utility maximization? *Math. Finance*, 26(3):602–616, 2016.

JAKE KOERNER, ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, WEST HENRIETTA, NY 14623 , UNITED STATES

Email address: jrk4731@rit.edu

JOO SEUNG LEE, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, IL 60201, UNITED STATES

Email address: jooseunglee@u.northwestern.edu

OLESKII MOSTOVYI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CT 06269, UNITED STATES

Email address: oleksii.mostovyi@uconn.edu