Math-Net.Ru

Общероссийский математический портал

S. C. Yam, S. P. Yung, W. Zhou, A unified “bang-bang” principle with respect to R-invariant performance benchmarks, *Теория вероятн. и ее примен.*, 2012, том 57, выпуск 2, 405–414

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4213/tvp4457>

Использование Общероссийского математического портала Math-Net.Ru подразумевает, что вы прочитали и согласны с пользовательским соглашением

<http://www.mathnet.ru/rus/agreement>

Параметры загрузки:

IP: 54.224.60.19

26 апреля 2023 г., 17:08:19

15. *Najim J.* A Cramér type theorem for weighted random variables. — Electron. J. Probab., 2002, v. 7, №4, p. 1–32.
16. *Perrin O., Zani M.* Large deviations for sample paths of Gaussian processes quadratic variations. — Зап. науч. сем. ПОМИ, 2005, т. 328, с. 169–181.
17. *Рокафеллар Р. Т.* Выпуклый анализ. М.: Мир, 1973, 469 с.
18. *Rockafellar R. T.* Integrals which are convex functionals II. — Pacific J. Math., 1971, v. 39, p. 439–469.
19. *Санов И. Н.* О вероятности больших отклонений случайных величин. — Матем. сб., 1957, т. 42, №1, с. 11–44.
20. *Varadhan S. R. S.* Asymptotic probabilities and differential equations. — Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 1966, v. 19, p. 261–286.
21. *Zani M.* Grandes déviations pour des fonctionnelles issues de la statistique des processus. Thèse, Orsay, 2000.

Поступила в редакцию
19.I.2010

Исправленный вариант
10.III.2011

© 2012 г.

YAM S. C. P.*, YUNG S. P.***, ZHOU W.***

A UNIFIED «BANG-BANG» PRINCIPLE WITH RESPECT TO $\mathcal{R}$ -INVARIANT PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS¹⁾

В последнее время появился ряд работ, посвященных нахождению оптимального момента продажи акции — так, чтобы ожидаемое отношение цены продажи к некоторому эталону (т.е. к последней наивысшей цене акции) при конечном временном горизонте было максимальным. И хотя задача формулировалась в различных постановках, оптимальное решение в результате имело вид «bang-bang», который был изначально найден в работе А. Н. Ширяева, Ц. Сюя и С. И. Чжоу [12] и который можно буквально интерпретировать как «Купить-и-держатель» или «Продать-сразу-же» — в зависимости от качества акции. В настоящей статье мы сначала предлагаем три алгебраических условия на класс бенчмарков и называем любой бенчмарк, удовлетворяющий этим трем условиям, $\mathcal{R}$ -инвариантным характеристическим бенчмарком. Мы показываем, что если F есть $\mathcal{R}$ -инвариантный характеристический бенчмарк, то соответствующая задача оптимальной остановки имеет оптимальное решение типа «bang-bang». Предлагаемый нами подход позволяет дать единое доказательство всех похожих задач для броуновского движения, рассматриваемых в литературе, а также получить новые результаты; в частности, в п. 3.2 решена оставшаяся часть — не получившая освещения в литературе — задачи, первоначально сформулированной А. Н. Ширяевым (см. [11]).

Ключевые слова и фразы: оптимальная остановка, правило «Купить-и-держатель», правило «Продать-сразу-же», $\mathcal{R}$ -инвариантный характеристический бенчмарк.

* Department of Statistics, Chinese University of Hong Kong; e-mail: scpyam@sta.cuhk.edu.hk

** Department of Mathematics, University of Hong Kong; e-mail: spyung@hkn.hk; wzhou@gmail.com

¹⁾ The first author — Phillip Yam acknowledges financial support from The Hong Kong RGC GRF 502909. The second author — S. P. Yung is supported by an HKU internal grant of code 201109176016.

1. Introduction. In recent years, a considerable amount of work has been devoted to the determination of an optimal stopping time of a drifted Brownian motion beating nonanticipative benchmarks. For instance, motivated by the financial problem of selling a stock at a price «as close as possible» to its highest price over a finite time horizon, Shiryaev, Xu and Zhou [12] and Du Toit and Peskir [8], using different probabilistic approaches, solved the following optimal stopping problem

$$\sup_{\tau \leq T} \mathbf{E} \left[\exp(-(M_T^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda)) \right] \quad (1.1)$$

for some $T > 0$, $\omega^\lambda \triangleq \lambda \cdot \omega$ with $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ and ω being a continuous path in $C[0, T]$, $M_T^\lambda \triangleq \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} \omega_t^\lambda$ and the expectation is taken with respect to the Wiener measure $\mathbf{P}$ under which $(\omega_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion. In (1.1) the supremum is taken over the set of all stopping times τ adapted to the process $(\omega_t)_{t \geq 0}$ for which $\mathbf{P}(\tau \leq T) = 1$. To our best knowledge, the above problem was first formulated in the present form by Shiryaev on the first Bachelier Congress held in Paris, 2000 (see [11]). In his recent work, Allaart [2] considered the extended problem

$$\sup_{\tau \leq T} \mathbf{E} [f(M_T^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda)] \quad (1.2)$$

in which f is a nonincreasing and convex function. In both problems (1.1) and (1.2), the ultimate maximum M_T^λ can be regarded as a (nonanticipative) benchmark and one wants to beat this benchmark by stopping a Brownian motion «as close as possible» to it. From a PDE point of view, Dai, Jin, Zhong, and Zhou [4] also solved problem (1.1) and considered a similar problem that uses the ultimate minimum of the drifted Brownian motion as the benchmark:

$$\sup_{\tau \leq T} \mathbf{E} \left[\exp(-(m_T^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda)) \right], \quad (1.3)$$

where $m_T^\lambda = \min_{0 \leq t \leq T} \omega_t^\lambda$. In [4], problem (1.3) is interpreted as an optimal stock selling problem in which the investor attempts to sell his stock at a price «as far as possible» to its lowest price over a finite time horizon. Using a similar approach, Dai and Zhong [5] also studied the following problem:

$$\sup_{\tau \leq T} \mathbf{E} \left[\exp(-(A_T^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda)) \right], \quad (1.4)$$

where $A_T^\lambda = \ln(T^{-1} \int_0^T \exp(\omega_t^\lambda) dt)$ or $A_T^\lambda = T^{-1} \int_0^T \omega_t^\lambda dt$, i.e., in (1.4) the benchmark is taken to be the ultimate average (both arithmetic and geometric) of the drifted Brownian motion. While all benchmarks in problems (1.1) to (1.4) are different, a striking result is that they share a common optimal stopping rule which is of «bang-bang» type: if $\lambda \geq 0$, then $\tau^* = T$ is an optimal stopping time; while if $\lambda \leq 0$, then $\tau^* = 0$ is an optimal stopping time. Motivated by these results, in our present work, we establish a general form of the benchmark (which we shall call an $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmark) with respect to which the optimal stopping rule is still of «bang-bang» type; indeed, our present work solves all four problems mentioned above in a unified way and also imply new results which have not yet appeared in the literature.

More precisely, define $D[0, T]$ to be the space of all piecewise continuous functions γ on $[0, T]$, with at most finitely many jump points $\{t_i\}$ such that for each i

$$\gamma_{t_i} = \lim_{t \downarrow t_i} \gamma_t \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{t \uparrow t_i} \gamma_t.$$

The reason that we introduce the notion of $D[0, T]$ in addition to $C[0, T]$ is that the permutation specified in Definition 2.1 below may convert an element in $C[0, T]$ to one that can only be defined in $D[0, T]$; in other words, the functional F defined in Section 2, in general, maps continuous paths to discontinuous ones. Also let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a monotone and convex function, $F: D[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ an $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmark (see

Definition 2.3 below), then the solution to the optimal stopping problem

$$\sup_{\tau \leq T} \mathbf{E} \left[f(F(\omega^\lambda) - \omega_\tau^\lambda) \right] \quad (1.5)$$

is of «bang-bang» type. That is to say, (i) if f is nonincreasing and convex, then an optimal stopping time is $\tau^* = T$ for $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\tau^* = 0$ for $\lambda \leq 0$; while (ii) if f is nondecreasing and convex, then an optimal stopping time is $\tau^* = 0$ for $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\tau^* = T$ for $\lambda \leq 0$.

2. Optimal stopping with respect to $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmarks.

In this section, we shall specify conditions on the Wiener functional F so that the solution to problem (1.5) is still of «bang-bang» type. For $t \leq T$, $y \in D[0, t]$, we shall write y^{-1} to denote the time reversed path of y on $[0, t]$, i.e., $y^{-1}(s) = y(t - s)$,²⁾ we shall also write y^1 to denote itself. For each $n \in \mathbf{N}$, define

$$\Delta_n \triangleq \left\{ (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n : \sum_{k=1}^n l_k = T \right\}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_n \triangleq \{ (y_1, \dots, y_n) : y_k \in D[0, l_k] \text{ for some } (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \Delta_n \}. \quad (2.2)$$

And for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathcal{H}_n$, we define

$$(y_1 y_2 \cdots y_n)(s) \triangleq \begin{cases} y_1(s) & \text{for } s \in [0, l_1), \\ y_k \left(s - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} l_i \right) & \text{for } s \in \left[\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} l_i, \sum_{i=1}^k l_i \right), \quad k = 2, \dots, n-1, \\ y_n \left(s - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} l_i \right) & \text{for } s \in \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} l_i, \sum_{i=1}^n l_i \right]. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Definition 2.1. Given a path $y \in D[0, T]$, if there exist $n \in \mathbf{N}$, $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathcal{H}_n$, a permutation $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ such that for all $s \in [0, T]$, $y(s) = (y_{i_1}^{p_1} y_{i_2}^{p_2} \cdots y_{i_n}^{p_n})(s)$, then we say that $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is a representative of y .

The above definition induces an equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ on $D[0, T]$. More precisely, for $y, z \in D[0, T]$, we say y is $\mathcal{R}$ -equivalent to z if y and z have a common representative.

Definition 2.2. A functional $F: D[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is called $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant if $F(y) = F(z)$ whenever y is $\mathcal{R}$ -equivalent to z .

The following lemma provides a convenient criterion to check whether a Wiener functional is $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant or not. For each $t \in [0, T]$, define $F_t: D[0, t] \times D[0, T-t] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by

$$F_t(y_1, y_2) = F(y_1 y_2), \quad (2.4)$$

where $y_1 \in D[0, t]$, $y_2 \in D[0, T-t]$ and $y_1 y_2$ is as defined in (2.3).

Lemma 2.1. A functional $F: D[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant if and only if $F_t(y_1, y_2) = F_t(y_1, y_2^{-1})$ for each t , $y_1 \in D[0, t]$, and $y_2 \in D[0, T-t]$.

P r o o f. First suppose F is $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant. Since the path $y_1 y_2^{-1}$ is $\mathcal{R}$ -equivalent to $y_1 y_2$, we have $F(y_1 y_2^{-1}) = F(y_1 y_2)$. Now suppose that for each t , $y_1 \in D[0, t]$, and $y_2 \in D[0, T-t]$, we have $F_t(y_1, y_2) = F_t(y_1, y_2^{-1})$, i.e., $F(y_1 y_2) = F(y_1 y_2^{-1})$, then clearly $F(y) = F(y^{-1})$ for any $y \in D[0, T]$. Upon noting that the time reversal process of $y_1 y_2^{-1}$ is $y_2 y_1^{-1}$, we have

$$F(y_1 y_2) = F(y_1 y_2^{-1}) = F(y_2 y_1^{-1}) = F(y_2 y_1), \quad (2.5)$$

²⁾ Although the time reversed path y^{-1} of y depends on the domain on which the path is reversed, for simplicity of notation, we shall not express this dependence explicitly. Instead, we will always first define the natural domain of y , and then y^{-1} will refer to the time reversed path of y on its natural domain.

and hence

$$F(y_1 y_2) = F(y_2 y_1^{-1}) = F(y_1^{-1} y_2). \quad (2.6)$$

To prove F is $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant, it suffices to show that for any integer n and $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathcal{H}_n$, we have

$$F(y_1 \cdots y_k \cdots y_n) = F(y_1 \cdots y_k^{-1} \cdots y_n) \quad \text{for each } k, \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$F(y_1 \cdots y_i y_{i+1} \cdots y_n) = F(y_1 \cdots y_{i+1} y_i \cdots y_n) \quad \text{for each } i. \quad (2.8)$$

We have already proved (2.7) and (2.8) for the case $n = 2$. For general n , by applying our result for the case $n = 2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(y_1 \cdots y_{k-1} y_k \cdots y_n) &= F(y_k \cdots y_n y_1 \cdots y_{k-1}) \\ &= F(y_k^{-1} \cdots y_n y_1 \cdots y_{n-1}) = F(y_1 \cdots y_{n-1} y_k^{-1} \cdots y_n), \end{aligned}$$

so the equality (2.7) is proved. To prove (2.8), first note that if $i = 1$, then by applying (2.5), $F(y_1 y_2 \cdots y_n) = F(y_3 \cdots y_n y_1 y_2)$. Then applying (2.6), $F(y_3 \cdots y_n y_1 y_2) = F((y_3 \cdots y_n)^{-1} y_1 y_2) = F(y_n^{-1} \cdots y_3^{-1} y_1 y_2)$. Next using (2.7) for twice, we see that $F(y_n^{-1} \cdots y_3^{-1} y_1 y_2) = F(y_n^{-1} \cdots y_3^{-1} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1})$. Finally $F(y_n^{-1} \cdots y_3^{-1} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1}) = F((y_n^{-1} \cdots y_3^{-1} y_1^{-1} y_2^{-1})^{-1}) = F(y_2 y_1 y_3 \cdots y_n)$. So (2.8) is proved when $i = 1$. For general i ,

$$\begin{aligned} F(y_1 \cdots y_i y_{i+1} \cdots y_n) &= F(y_i y_{i+1} \cdots y_n y_1 \cdots y_{i-1}) \\ &= F(y_{i+1} y_i \cdots y_n y_1 \cdots y_{i-1}) = F(y_1 \cdots y_{i-1} y_i \cdots y_n), \end{aligned}$$

so the equality (2.8) is also proved.

In his work on problem (1.2), Allaart [2] has remarked that the following identity is the key to establish his result: for each $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(M_t^\lambda - \omega_t^\lambda, \omega_t^\lambda) \stackrel{d}{=} (M_t^{-\lambda}, -\omega_t^{-\lambda}), \quad (2.9)$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ means that distributions of two sides coincide under the Wiener measure $\mathbf{P}$. The following lemma extends identity (2.9) from maximal functional to any $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant functional F .

Lemma 2.2. *Let $t \in [0, T]$, $y \in D[0, t]$, $\omega \in C[0, T - t]$. If $F: D[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant, then for any $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$*

$$(F_t(y, \omega^\lambda - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda), \omega_{T-t}^\lambda) \stackrel{d}{=} (F_t(y, \omega^{-\lambda}), -\omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda}), \quad (2.10)$$

where $\omega^\lambda = (\lambda s + \omega_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}$.

P r o o f. Write $v_s = \omega_s^\lambda - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda$ for $s \in [0, T - t]$, then

$$(v_s^{-1})_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} = (\omega_{T-t-s}^\lambda - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} \stackrel{d}{=} (\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq T-t},$$

which in the case $s = T - t$ gives $\omega_{T-t}^\lambda \stackrel{d}{=} -\omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda}$. Therefore

$$(\omega_{T-t-s}^\lambda - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda, \omega_{T-t}^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} \stackrel{d}{=} (\omega_s^{-\lambda}, -\omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}. \quad (2.11)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (F_t(y, \omega^\lambda - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda), \omega_{T-t}^\lambda) &= (F_t(y, v), \omega_{T-t}^\lambda) = (F_t(y, v^{-1}), \omega_{T-t}^\lambda) \\ &= (F_t(y, \omega_{T-t}^\lambda - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda), \omega_{T-t}^\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where in the second equality the $\mathcal{R}$ -invariance of F and Lemma 2.1 have been applied. Combining (2.11) and (2.12), we obtain (2.10). Lemma 2.2 is proved.

Definition 2.3. A functional $F: D[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is called a performance benchmark if it satisfies the following two conditions:

(C1) F is translation invariant in the sense that for any $c \in \mathbf{R}$ and $y \in D[0, T]$, we have $F(y + c) = F(y) + c$;

(C2) F is nondecreasing in the sense that for any two paths $y_1, y_2 \in D[0, T]$ with $y_1(t) \geq y_2(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have $F(y_1) \geq F(y_2)$.

It is called an $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmark if in addition to (C1) and (C2), it also satisfies

(C3) F is $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant.

Throughout the rest of this paper, we shall assume that the functional F in problem (1.5) is an $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmark.

For each $t \in [0, T]$, define $D_t: D[0, t] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $G_t: D[0, t] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by

$$D_t(y) = \mathbf{E} \left[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot - \lambda}) - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda}) \right], \quad (2.13)$$

$$G_t(y) = \mathbf{E} \left[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot \lambda})) \right], \quad (2.14)$$

where $\omega^\lambda = (\lambda s + \omega_s)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}$. The following lemma is the key result to establish the main theorem.

Lemma 2.3. Under either one of the following conditions, $D_t(y) \geq G_t(y)$ for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $y \in D[0, t]$:

1. $\lambda \leq 0$ and f is nonincreasing and convex;
2. $\lambda \geq 0$ and f is nondecreasing and convex.

P r o o f. See the Appendix.

Corollary 2.1. Under either one of the conditions of Lemma 2.3, $\mathbf{E}[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot - \lambda}) - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})] \geq \mathbf{E}[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot \lambda}))]$ for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $y \in D[0, t]$.

P r o o f. Under both conditions, using condition (C2),

$$G_t(y) = \mathbf{E} \left[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot \lambda})) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot - \lambda})) \right],$$

hence by Lemma 2.3, $\mathbf{E}[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot - \lambda}) - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})] = D_t(y) \geq G_t(y) \geq \mathbf{E}[f(F_t(y, \omega^{\cdot \lambda}))]$.

We now prove the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.1. Let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a monotone and convex function, $F: D[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ an $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmark. Consider the optimal stopping problem (1.5).

1. If f is nonincreasing, then an optimal stopping time is $\tau^* = T$ for the case $\lambda \geq 0$, and is $\tau^* = 0$ for the case $\lambda \leq 0$.
2. If f is nondecreasing, then the optimal stopping time is $\tau^* = 0$ for the case $\lambda \geq 0$, and is $\tau^* = T$ for the case $\lambda \leq 0$.

P r o o f. The idea of the proof below is essentially due to Du Toit and Peskir [8].

Consider the case f is nonincreasing and convex. First let $\lambda \geq 0$. It suffices to establish the following inequality:

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_T^\lambda \right) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_\tau^\lambda \right) \right] \quad (2.15)$$

for any stopping time τ adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $\mathbf{P}(\tau \leq T) = 1$. For this, it suffices to prove

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_T^\lambda \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_\tau^\lambda \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right],$$

which, upon using condition (C1), is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_\tau((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^\lambda, (\omega_s^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda)_{\tau \leq s \leq T}) - (\omega_T^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \\ & \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_\tau((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^\lambda, (\omega_s^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda)_{\tau \leq s \leq T}) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Using the strong Markov property of Brownian motion, (2.16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda \right) \right] \Big|_{t=\tau, y=(\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^\lambda} \\ & \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) \right) \right] \Big|_{t=\tau, y=(\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda \right) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) \right) \right] \quad (2.17)$$

with $t = \tau(\omega)$ and $y = (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^\lambda$. Inequality (2.17) follows from case 1 of Corollary 2.1 with $-\lambda$ being replaced by λ . Therefore inequality (2.15) is established. Next let $\lambda \leq 0$, we need to show that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) \right) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_\tau^\lambda \right) \right] \quad (2.18)$$

for any stopping time τ adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $\mathbf{P}(\tau \leq T) = 1$. Using Lemma 2.2, we see that the above inequality is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq T} - \omega_T^{-\lambda}) \right) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_\tau^\lambda \right) \right]. \quad (2.19)$$

To prove (2.19), it suffices to prove

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_T^{-\lambda} \right) \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_\tau^\lambda \right) \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau \right],$$

which, upon using condition (C1) and the strong Markov property of Brownian motion, is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda} \right) \right] \Big|_{t=\tau, y=(\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^{-\lambda}} \\ & \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) \right) \right] \Big|_{t=\tau, y=(\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$D_t((\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^{-\lambda}) \geq G_t((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^\lambda) \quad (2.20)$$

with $t = \tau(\omega)$. Using condition (C2) and the fact that f is nonincreasing, we see that if $y_i \in D[0, t]$ with $y_1(s) \geq y_2(s)$ for $s \in [0, t]$, then $G_t(y_1) \leq G_t(y_2)$. Define $y_1 = (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^\lambda$ and $y_2 = (\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^{-\lambda}$. Since $\lambda \leq 0$, we have $y_1(s) = \omega_s^\lambda - \omega_t^\lambda \geq \omega_s^{-\lambda} - \omega_t^{-\lambda} = y_2(s)$ for $s \in [0, t]$, therefore

$$G_t((\omega_u^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq u \leq t} - \omega_t^{-\lambda}) \geq G_t((\omega_u^\lambda)_{0 \leq u \leq t} - \omega_t^\lambda). \quad (2.21)$$

Combining case 1 of Lemma 2.3 and (2.21), we prove inequality (2.20) and hence inequality (2.18).

Consider the case f is nondecreasing and convex. First let $\lambda \leq 0$, we shall show that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_T^\lambda \right) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_\tau^\lambda \right) \right] \quad (2.22)$$

for any stopping time τ adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $\mathbf{P}(\tau \leq T) = 1$. Using similar arguments as above, it is enough to prove

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) - \omega_{T-t}^\lambda \right) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F_t(y, (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}) \right) \right] \quad (2.23)$$

with $t = \tau(\omega)$ and $y = (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq \tau} - \omega_\tau^\lambda$. Since inequality (2.23) follows from case 2 in Corollary 2.1 with $-\lambda$ replaced by λ , inequality (2.22) is proved. Next let $\lambda \geq 0$, we need to prove that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) \right) \right] \geq \mathbf{E} \left[f \left(F((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq T}) - \omega_\tau^\lambda \right) \right] \quad (2.24)$$

for any stopping time τ adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $\mathbf{P}(\tau \leq T) = 1$. Using similar arguments as in the first case, it suffices to prove

$$D_t((\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^{-\lambda}) \geq G_t((\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^\lambda). \quad (2.25)$$

Using condition (C2) and the fact f is nondecreasing, we see that if $y_i \in D[0, t]$ with $y_1(s) \geq y_2(s)$ for $s \in [0, t]$, then $G_t(y_1) \geq G_t(y_2)$. Define $y_1 = (\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^{-\lambda}$ and $y_2 = (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^\lambda$. Since $\lambda \geq 0$, we have $y_1(s) = (\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^{-\lambda} \geq (\omega_s^\lambda)_{0 \leq s \leq t} - \omega_t^\lambda = y_2(s)$ for $s \in [0, t]$, therefore

$$G_t((\omega_u^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq u \leq t} - \omega_t^{-\lambda}) \geq G_t((\omega_u^\lambda)_{0 \leq u \leq t} - \omega_t^\lambda). \quad (2.26)$$

Combining case 2 of Lemma 2.3 and (2.26), we can prove inequality (2.25) and hence inequality (2.24).

3. Applications of «bang-bang» principle with respect to $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmarks.

3.1. Existing results in literature. We now demonstrate that our theorem includes the four concrete problems stated in Section 1.

1. If $F(y) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} y_t$ for $y \in D[0, T]$, we can see that F satisfies both conditions (C1) and (C2). Since for $y \in D[0, t]$ and $z \in D[0, T-t]$, $F_t(y, z) = (\max_{0 \leq s \leq t} y_s) \vee (\max_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} z_s)$ and $\max_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} z_s = \max_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} z_s^{-1}$, by Lemma 2.1 F also satisfies condition (C3). By taking $f(x) = e^{-x}$, it yields problem (1.1); while by taking f to be any nonincreasing convex function, it yields problem (1.2).

2. If $F(y) = \min_{0 \leq t \leq T} y_t$ for $y \in D[0, T]$, then for $y \in D[0, t]$ and $z \in D[0, T-t]$,

$$F_t(y, z) = \left(\min_{0 \leq s \leq t} y_s \right) \wedge \left(\min_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} z_s \right).$$

Upon the fact that $\min_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} z_s = \min_{0 \leq s \leq T-t} z_s^{-1}$, we can also see that F satisfies conditions (C1)–(C3). By taking $f(x) = e^{-x}$, we also arrive to problem (1.3).

3. If $F(y) = T^{-1} \int_0^T y_t dt$ for $y \in D[0, T]$, then for $y \in D[0, t]$ and $z \in D[0, T-t]$,

$$F_t(y, z) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^t y_s ds + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^{T-t} z_s ds.$$

Since $\int_0^{T-t} z_s ds = \int_0^{T-t} z_s^{-1} ds$, we can again see that this F also satisfies conditions (C1)–(C3). On the other hand, if $F(y) = \ln(T^{-1} \int_0^T \exp(y_t) dt)$ for $y \in D[0, T]$, then for $y \in D[0, t]$ and $z \in D[0, T-t]$,

$$F_t(y, z) = \ln \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\int_0^t \exp(y_s) ds + \int_0^{T-t} \exp(z_s) ds \right) \right).$$

Again $\int_0^{T-t} e^{z_s} ds = \int_0^{T-t} e^{z_s^{-1}} ds$, hence F satisfies conditions (C1)–(C3). Taking $f(x) = e^{-x}$ we recover problem (1.4).

Thus we see that problems (1.1)–(1.4) are included in case 1 of Theorem 2.1, i.e., when f is nonincreasing and convex. Furthermore, Theorem 2.1 also shows that in the case that f is nondecreasing and convex, the solutions to problems (1.1)–(1.4) are still of «bang-bang» type yet in a reverse manner.

3.2. New results in literature. In addition to these four problems as quoted in Section 1, our theorem also ensures some new results which are still absent in literature.

1. Let $F(y) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} y_t$ for $y \in D[0, T]$, and $f(x) = -x^p$ for $0 < p < 1$, then problem (1.5) becomes

$$\inf_{\tau \leq T} \mathbf{E}[(M_T^\lambda - \omega_\tau^\lambda)^p]. \quad (3.1)$$

Since we have seen that the maximum functional satisfies conditions (C1)–(C3), and that $x \mapsto -x^p$ is nonincreasing and convex, Theorem 2.1 suggests that the solution to problem (3.1) is given by $\tau^* = T$ for the case $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\tau^* = 0$ for the case $\lambda \leq 0$. Problem (3.1)

for all $p > 0$ was first formulated by Shiryaev (see [11]). For the two cases (i) $p \geq 1$ and $\lambda = 0$ and (ii) $p = 2$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$, problem (3.1) has already been solved in the literature (see [9], [10], [7]), with optimal stopping times given by the first hitting times of the process $M^\lambda - \omega^\lambda$ to some nontrivial time dependent boundaries. Also note that it has been remarked (see [10, Remark 2.3]) that for the case $0 < p < 1$ and $\lambda = 0$, $\tau^* = 0$ is the optimal stopping rule for problem (3.1). Thus our Theorem 2.1 supplements existing results by solving for the case $0 < p < 1$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$.

2. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, $y \in D[0, T]$, define

$$F^\alpha(y) \triangleq \inf \left\{ x > 0: \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{y_s \leq x\}} ds \geq \alpha T \right\}.$$

$F^\alpha(y)$ is called the α -quantile of the path y . For discussions on the distribution of F^α under $\mathbf{P}$, its representation in terms of maximum and minimum, and its application on α -quantile option, one can see [1] and [6] for details. Since for any $c \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{y_s \leq x\}} ds = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{y_s + c \leq x + c\}} ds,$$

F^α clearly satisfies condition (C1). If $y_1(s) \geq y_2(s)$ for $s \in [0, T]$, then for each $x \geq F^\alpha(y_1)$, by definition, we have $\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1 \leq x\}} ds \geq \alpha T$, and hence

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{y_2 \leq x\}} ds \geq \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1 \leq x\}} ds \geq \alpha T,$$

which implies $x \geq F^\alpha(y_2)$. This shows that F^α satisfies condition (C2). Finally for $y_1 \in D[0, t]$ and $y_2 \in D[0, T - t]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{(y_1 y_2)(s) \leq x\}} ds &= \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1(s) \leq x\}} ds + \int_0^{T-t} \mathbf{1}_{\{y_2(s) \leq x\}} ds \\ &= \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1(s) \leq x\}} ds + \int_0^{T-t} \mathbf{1}_{\{y_2^{-1}(s) \leq x\}} ds = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1 y_2^{-1}(s) \leq x\}} ds, \end{aligned}$$

hence $F_t^\alpha(y_1 y_2) = F_t^\alpha(y_1 y_2^{-1})$ and therefore F^α also satisfies condition (C3). If we take $f(x) = e^{-x}$, Theorem 2.1 suggests that the solution to the problem

$$\sup_{\tau \leq T} \mathbf{E} \left[\exp \left(- (F^\alpha(\omega^\lambda) - \omega_\tau^\lambda) \right) \right] \quad (3.2)$$

is given by $\tau^* = T$ for the case $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\tau^* = 0$ for the case $\lambda \leq 0$, i.e., if an investor attempts to sell his stock with reference to the α -quantile, then the optimal selling strategy is still buy-and-hold for superior stock and sell-at-once for inferior stock.

As a remark, if we replace the Brownian motion in problem (1.5) by Bernoulli random walks, then similar results as in Theorem 2.1 can also be obtained by similar arguments. See the work of [13] and [2] on «bang-bang» principle for Bernoulli random walk. Allaart [3] also extended the «bang-bang» principle to a general class of random walks and Lévy processes.

4. Appendix: Proof of Lemma 2.3. To prove the lemma, we extend Allaart's argument (see [2]) to the case of an $\mathcal{R}$ -invariant performance benchmark. Using condition (C1) and Lemma 2.2, respectively, we obtain that

$$D_t(y) = \mathbf{E} \left[f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda}, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) \right], \quad G_t(y) = \mathbf{E} \left[f(F_t(y, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) \right],$$

where $\omega^{-\lambda} = (\omega_s^{-\lambda})_{0 \leq s \leq T-t}$. Writing $\Omega = C[0, T - t]$, we have

$$D_t(y) - G_t(y) = \int_{\Omega} \left(f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda}, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) - f(F_t(y, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) \right) d\mathbf{P}(\omega)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\Omega} \left(f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda}, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) - f(F_t(y, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda} \geq 0\}} d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \left(f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda}, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) - f(F_t(y, \omega^{-\lambda} - \omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda})) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{T-t}^{-\lambda} \leq 0\}} d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\
&\triangleq I^+ + I^-.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
I^- &= \int_{\Omega} \left(f(F_t(y + \omega_{T-t}^{\lambda}, \omega^{\lambda})) - f(F_t(y, \omega^{\lambda})) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{T-t}^{\lambda} \geq 0\}} d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left(f(F_t(y + \omega_{T-t}, \omega)) - f(F_t(y, \omega)) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{T-t} \geq 0\}} \\
&\quad \times \exp \left\{ \lambda \omega_{T-t} - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} (T-t) \right\} d\mathbf{P}(\omega),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where the first equality is a consequence of Lemma 2.2 and the second equality is a consequence of Girsanov transform. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
I^+ &= \int_{\Omega} \left(f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{T-t} \geq 0\}} \\
&\quad \times \exp \left\{ -\lambda \omega_{T-t} - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} (T-t) \right\} d\mathbf{P}(\omega).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these results, we obtain that

$$I^+ + I^- = \int_{\Omega} \psi(\omega) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{T-t} \geq 0\}} e^{-\lambda^2 (T-t)/2} d\mathbf{P}(\omega),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\omega) &= \left(f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) \right) e^{-\lambda \omega_{T-t}} \\
&\quad + \left(f(F_t(y + \omega_{T-t}, \omega)) - f(F_t(y, \omega)) \right) e^{\lambda \omega_{T-t}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

For the case $\lambda \leq 0$ and f is nonincreasing and convex, on $\{\omega_{T-t} \geq 0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) &\geq 0, \\
f(F_t(y + \omega_{T-t}, \omega)) - f(F_t(y, \omega)) &\leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

then upon using condition (C1) and the fact $\lambda \leq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\omega) &\geq f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) \\
&\quad + f(F_t(y + \omega_{T-t}, \omega)) - f(F_t(y, \omega)) \\
&= (f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t}) + \omega_{T-t})) \\
&\quad - (f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t}) + \omega_{T-t})) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds, since f is convex. Therefore in this case we proved $I^+ + I^- \geq 0$ and hence $D_t(y) \geq G_t(y)$. For the case $\lambda \geq 0$ and f is nondecreasing and convex, on $\{\omega_{T-t} \geq 0\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) &\leq 0, \\
f(F_t(y + \omega_{T-t}, \omega)) - f(F_t(y, \omega)) &\geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

then upon using condition (C1) and the fact $\lambda \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\omega) &\geq f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t})) \\
&\quad + f(F_t(y + \omega_{T-t}, \omega)) - f(F_t(y, \omega)) \\
&= (f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t}) + \omega_{T-t}) - f(F_t(y, \omega - \omega_{T-t}))) \\
&\quad - (f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t}) + \omega_{T-t}) - f(F_t(y - \omega_{T-t}, \omega - \omega_{T-t}))) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds, since f is convex. Therefore in this case we also have $I^+ + I^- \geq 0$ and hence $D_t(y) \geq G_t(y)$. Lemma 2.3 is proved.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful for the valuable comments, inspiring suggestions, discussions, and generous support on an earlier version of this paper from Alain Bensoussan, Zhi-Ming Ma, Jia-an Yan, and anonymous reviewers. We are grateful to many other people who offered insights into this work, including seminar participants at Chinese University of Hong Kong, The University of Hong Kong, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Academy of Math and Systems Science of Chinese Academy of Science, and conference participants at the Sixth World Congress of the Bachelier Finance Society 2010.

REFERENCES

1. *Akahori J.* Some formulae for a new type of path-dependent option. — *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 1995, v. 5, № 2, p. 383–388.
2. *Allaart P. C.* A general «bang-bang» principle for predicting the maximum of a random walk. — *J. Appl. Probab.*, 2010, v. 47, № 4, p. 1072–1083.
3. *Allaart P. C.* A «bang-bang» principle for predicting the supremum of a random walk or Lévy process. arXiv:0912.0615, 2009.
4. *Dai M., Jin H. Q., Zhong Y. F., Zhou X. Y.* Buy low and sell high. — *Contemporary Quantitative Finance: Essays in Honour of Eckhard Platen*. Berlin: Springer, 2010, p. 317–333.
5. *Dai M., Zhong Y. F.* Optimal stock selling/buying strategy with reference to the ultimate average. — *Math. Finance*, 2012, v. 22, № 1, p. 165–184.
6. *Dassios A.* The distribution of the quantile of a Brownian motion with drift and the pricing of related path-dependent options. — *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 1995, v. 5, № 2, p. 389–398.
7. *Du Toit J., Peskir G.* The trap of complacency in predicting the maximum. — *Ann. Probab.*, 2007, v. 35, № 1, p. 340–365.
8. *Du Toit J., Peskir G.* Selling a stock at the ultimate maximum. — *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 2009, v. 19, № 3, p. 983–1014.
9. *Graversen S. E., Peskir G., Shiryaev A. N.* Stopping Brownian motion without anticipation as close as possible to its ultimate maximum. — *Теория вероятн. и ее примен.*, 2001, т. 45, в. 1, с. 125–136.
10. *Pedersen J. L.* Optimal prediction of the ultimate maximum of Brownian motion. — *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.*, 2003, v. 75, № 4, p. 205–219.
11. *Shiryaev A. N.* Quickest detection problems in the technical analysis of the financial data. — *Mathematical Finance — Bachelier Congress (Paris, 2000)*. Berlin: Springer, 2002, p. 487–521.
12. *Shiryaev A. N., Xu Z., Zhou X. Y.* Thou shalt buy and hold. — *Quant. Finance*, 2008, v. 8, № 8, p. 765–776.
13. *Yam S. C. P., Yung S. P., Zhou W.* Two rationales behind the «buy-and-hold or sell-at-once» strategy. — *J. Appl. Probab.*, 2009, v. 46, № 3, p. 651–668.

Поступила в редакцию
13.IX.2010