

Dynamic Programming in Convex Stochastic Optimization

Teemu Pennanen

*Department of Mathematics, King's College London, United Kingdom
teemu.pennanen@kcl.ac.uk*

Ari-Pekka Perkkiö*

*Mathematics Institute, Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich, Germany
a.perkkioe@lmu.de*

Dedicated to Roger J-B Wets on the occasion of his 85th birthday.

Received: March 31, 2022

Accepted: May 5, 2023

This paper studies the dynamic programming principle for general convex stochastic optimization problems introduced by R. T. Rockafellar and R. J-B Wets [*Nonanticipativity and L^1 -martingales in stochastic optimization problems*, Math. Programming Studies 6 (1976) 170–187]. We extend the applicability of the theory by relaxing compactness and boundedness assumptions. In the context of financial mathematics, the relaxed assumptions are satisfied under the well-known no-arbitrage condition and the “reasonable asymptotic elasticity” condition of the utility function. Besides financial mathematics, we obtain several new results in linear and nonlinear stochastic programming and stochastic optimal control.

Keywords: Dynamic programming, stochastic programming, convexity.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 46N10, 90C39, 93E20.

1. Introduction

Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ with a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ (an increasing sequence of sub- σ -algebras of $\mathcal{F}$), consider the convex stochastic optimization problem

$$(SP) \quad \text{minimize} \quad Eh(x) \quad \text{over } x \in \mathcal{N},$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is a linear space of stochastic processes $x = (x_t)_{t=0}^T$ adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ (i.e., x_t is $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable). We assume that x_t takes values in a Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{n_t}$ so the process $x = (x_t)_{t=0}^T$ takes values in $\mathbb{R}^n$ where $n := n_0 + \dots + n_T$. The objective is defined on the space $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}^n)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued random variables x by

$$Eh(x) := \int_{\Omega} h(x(\omega), \omega) dP(\omega),$$

where h is a convex normal integrand, i.e. an extended real-valued function on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega$ such that $\omega \mapsto \text{epi } h(\cdot, \omega)$ is a closed convex-valued measurable mapping; see e.g. [33, Chapter 14]. By [33, Proposition 14.28], the function $h(x)(\omega) := h(x(\omega), \omega)$

* Corresponding author.

is measurable for all $x \in L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Here and in what follows, we define the integral of an extended real-valued random variable as $+\infty$ unless its positive part is integrable. The integral functional Eh is thus a well-defined extended real-valued convex function on $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P; \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Problems of the form (SP) were first studied in [30, 13] where it was observed that many more specific stochastic optimization problems can be written in this unified format. These include more traditional formulations of stochastic programming, convex stochastic control and various problems in financial mathematics; see Section 5 below.

The articles [13, 30] gave formulations of the *dynamic programming* principle general enough to apply to the abstract stochastic optimization format (SP). They extend many earlier formulations of the stochastic dynamic programming principle such as those in [1, 2, 10, 11]. Like the present article, [30] studied the convex case where decisions are described by finite dimensional vectors. The article [13] extended the results to nonconvex problems where decisions are described by elements of Polish spaces. Both assumed that the objective is lower bounded and that the decisions are taken from a compact set, uniformly compact in [30]. The compactness assumptions were relaxed in [21] in the convex case and in [25] in the nonconvex case. This paper relaxes the lower boundedness assumption of the objective. This is interesting in many applications in financial mathematics as well as in mathematical programming such as linear stochastic optimization. In portfolio optimization problems, the relaxed conditions holds if the utility function satisfies the *reasonable asymptotic elasticity condition* that is extensively studied in financial mathematics; see e.g. [18, 28]. These problems are often set in a stochastic control format, which motivates the study of stochastic control beyond lower bounded objectives as well. We also provide new results on the theory of normal integrands concerning conditional independence. This allows us to derive many well-known results on Markov decision processes using the theory of normal integrands; see Section 5.

Like [13, 30], our approach builds on the notion of *conditional expectation of a normal integrand*, introduced in [7]. This allows for significant extensions to many better known formulations of stochastic dynamic programming while greatly simplifying the measurability questions that may come up in the dynamic programming recursion. More traditional formulations will be obtained as special cases in Section 5 below. A good illustration of potential measurability complications can be found in [5] which follows a different line of analysis not building on the theory of normal integrands; see [5, Section 1.2.II] and Section 5.3 below for a further comparison.

An extended real-valued random variable X is said to be *quasi-integrable* if either X^+ or X^- is integrable. Given a quasi-integrable X and a σ -algebra $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, there exists an extended real-valued $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable random variable $E^{\mathcal{G}}X$, almost surely unique, such that

$$E[\alpha(E^{\mathcal{G}}X)] = E[\alpha X] \quad \forall \alpha \in L_+^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, P).$$

The random variable $E^{\mathcal{G}}X$ is known as the $\mathcal{G}$ -conditional expectation of X . Definition 1.1 below extends the operation of conditional expectation to normal integrands; see e.g. [35] and its references. Sufficient conditions for the existence of a normal integrand will be given in Section 2.

We say that two normal integrands h and $\tilde{h}$ equal *almost surely everywhere* (a.s.e.) and write $h = \tilde{h}$ if $h(\cdot, \omega) = \tilde{h}(\cdot, \omega)$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$. The inequality $h \leq \tilde{h}$ is interpreted analogously.

Definition 1.1. We say that a $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable normal integrand $\bar{h}$ is a $\mathcal{G}$ -conditional expectation of a normal integrand h if $\bar{h}(x) = E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)]$ a.s. for all $x \in L^0(\mathcal{G})$ for which $h(x)$ is quasi-integrable. When the $\mathcal{G}$ -conditional expectation of h exists and is a.s.e. unique, we denote it by $E^{\mathcal{G}}h$.

We will use the notations $x^t = (x_0, \dots, x_t)$, $n^t = n_0 + \dots + n_t$ and $E_t = E^{\mathcal{F}_t}$. The extended real line will be denoted by $\bar{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$. We say that an adapted sequence $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ of normal integrands $h_t : \mathbb{R}^{n^t} \times \Omega \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ solves the generalized Bellman equations for h if

$$(BE) \quad h_T = E_T h, \quad h_t = E_t \inf_{x_{t+1}} h_{t+1}$$

almost surely for $t = T-1, \dots, 0$. More precisely, this means that there exists another sequence $(\tilde{h}_t)_{t=0}^{T-1}$ of normal integrands such that

$$(BE) \quad \begin{aligned} h_T &= E_T h, \\ \tilde{h}_t(x^t, \omega) &= \inf_{x_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{t+1}}} h_{t+1}(x^t, x_{t+1}, \omega) \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ h_t &= E_t \tilde{h}_t \quad \text{for } t = T-1, \dots, 0. \end{aligned}$$

This paper gives sufficient conditions for the existence of the solutions of (BE); see Theorems 3.1 and 4.5 below. We also show that, when solutions exist, they provide useful characterizations of the optimum values and solutions of (SP); see Theorems 3.2 and 4.6 below. In the literature of stochastic control, results such as Theorems 3.2 and 4.6 relating the solutions of the Bellman equations to the solutions of the optimization problem are often called “verification theorems”; see e.g., [14]. Theorems 3.2 and 4.6 are illustrated by deriving several new results, e.g., in linear stochastic programming, stochastic control and financial mathematics.

2. Conditional expectations of normal integrands

The general theory of dynamic programming studied in this paper builds on conditional expectations of normal integrands. This section reviews the theory that will be used in the analysis in the subsequent sections. Most of the results below can be found in the literature but we include the simple proofs because that allows us to make some extensions to the existing theory.

2.1. Existence

Conditional expectations of convex normal integrands were introduced in [7]. The article [12] extended the definition to general $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable lower bounded integrands. More general conditions for the existence of a conditional expectation of a normal integrand have been given in [9, 35, 36]. Our arguments and conditions for existence in Section 2.1 are largely from [7].

We say that a normal integrand h is L -bounded if there exist $\rho, m \in L^1$ with

$$h(x) \geq -\rho|x| - m \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

almost surely. Condition (3) in the following lemma was used for the existence of a conditional expectation in [7, Theorem 2]. Recall that, given a normal integrand h , the ω -wise conjugate

$$h^*(v, \omega) := \sup\{x \cdot v - h(x, \omega)\}$$

is a normal integrand; see e.g. [33, Theorem 14.50]. As usual, the *effective domain* of an extended real-valued function g is the set $\text{dom } g := \{u \mid g(u) < \infty\}$. The *indicator function* of a set C is defined by

$$\delta_C(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in C, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The Euclidean unit ball will be denoted by $\mathbb{B}$.

Lemma 2.1. *For a convex normal integrand h , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) h is L -bounded,
- (2) there exist $v \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $m \in L^1$ such that $h(x) \geq x \cdot v - m$ a.s.
- (3) $\text{dom } Eh^* \cap L^1 \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $v \in L^1$ such that $Eh^*(v) < \infty$ is finite. By Fenchel's inequality,

$$h(x) \geq x \cdot v - h^*(v) \geq -|v||x| - h^*(v) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

almost surely, so we may choose $\rho = |v|$ and $m = h^*(v)^+$. On the other hand, $h \geq -\rho|\cdot| - m$ can be written as $(h + \rho|\cdot|)^*(0) \leq m$. By [29, Theorem 16.4], this means that

$$\inf_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{h^*(v) + \delta_{\mathbb{B}}(v/\rho)\} \leq m \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where the infimum is attained. By [33, Theorem 14.37], there is a $v \in L^0$ with $|v| \leq \rho$ and $h^*(v) \leq m$. $\square$

If a normal integrand h is L -bounded, then $h(x)$ is quasi-integrable and $E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)]$ is well-defined for every $x \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G})$. The following lemma shows that, for L -bounded normal integrands, it suffices to test with $x \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G})$ in the definition of conditional expectation.

Lemma 2.2. *Given an L -bounded normal integrand h , a $\mathcal{G}$ -normal integrand $\bar{h}$ is the $\mathcal{G}$ -conditional expectation of h if and only if*

$$\bar{h}(x) = E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for all $x \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G})$. In particular, if $h(x)$ is $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable for every $x \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G})$, then $E^{\mathcal{G}}h = h$.

Proof. It is clear that the condition holds if $\bar{h} = E^{\mathcal{G}}h$. On the other hand, if $\bar{h} \neq E^{\mathcal{G}}h$, then there exists an $x \in L^0(\mathcal{G})$ such that $h(x)$ is quasi-integrable and $\bar{h}(x) \neq E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)]$.

For ν large enough, we have $1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} \bar{h}(x) \neq 1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)]$ a.s..

The left side equals $1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} \bar{h}(1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} x)$ while the right side equals

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] &= 1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} E^{\mathcal{G}}[1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} h(x)] \\ &= 1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} E^{\mathcal{G}}[1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} h(1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} x)] = 1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} x)] \end{aligned}$$

almost surely. Thus, $\bar{h}(1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} x) \neq E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}} x)]$ so the condition fails. By [35, Lemma 6], the condition defines $\bar{h}$ uniquely almost surely everywhere. $\square$

Example 2.3. Given $Q \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$, $v \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $m \in L^1$, the function

$$h(x, \omega) := \frac{1}{2} x \cdot Q(\omega) x + x \cdot v(\omega) + m(\omega).$$

is a normal integrand, by [33, Example 14.29]. If Q is almost surely positive definite, then h is L -bounded and

$$(E^{\mathcal{G}} h)(x, \omega) = \frac{1}{2} x \cdot E^{\mathcal{G}}[Q](\omega) x + x \cdot (E^{\mathcal{G}} v)(\omega) + (E^{\mathcal{G}} m)(\omega)$$

for almost every ω .

Proof. Given $x \in L^\infty$, Lemma 6.4 in the Appendix gives

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] = \frac{1}{2} x \cdot E^{\mathcal{G}}[Q] x + x \cdot (E^{\mathcal{G}} v) + (E^{\mathcal{G}} m) \quad a.s.,$$

so the claim follows from Lemma 2.2. $\square$

Theorem 2.4. Let h be a real-valued normal integrand such that there exist $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\rho \in L^1$ with $h(\bar{x}) \in L^1$ and

$$|h(x) - h(x')| \leq \rho |x - x'| \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

almost surely. Then $E^{\mathcal{G}} h$ exists and it is characterized by

$$(E^{\mathcal{G}} h)(x, \omega) = E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)](\omega) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

for almost every ω . Moreover,

$$|(E^{\mathcal{G}} h)(x - x')| \leq (E^{\mathcal{G}} \rho) |x - x'| \quad \forall x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (1)$$

almost surely.

Proof. The assumptions imply that $h(x) \in L^1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and that, by Jensen's inequality,

$$|E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] - E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x')]| \leq (E^{\mathcal{G}} \rho) |x - x'| \quad a.s.$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let D be a countable dense set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and define $\tilde{h}(x, \omega) := E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)](\omega)$ for each $x \in D$. By countability of D , there is a P -null set $N \in \mathcal{G}$ such that, for all $\omega \in \Omega \setminus N$,

$$|\tilde{h}(x, \omega) - \tilde{h}(x', \omega)| \leq (E^{\mathcal{G}} \rho)(\omega) |x - x'| \quad \forall x, x' \in D.$$

The function $\tilde{h}$ has a unique continuous extension to $\mathbb{R}^n \times (\Omega \setminus N)$. Finally, we extend the definition of $\tilde{h}$ to all of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega$ by setting $\tilde{h}(\cdot, \omega) = 0$ for $\omega \in N$. The function $\tilde{h}$ thus constructed is a $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable Caratheodory integrand and thus, normal. It is clear that it satisfies (1) as well.

If $x = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} x^i 1_{A^i}$, where $x^i \in D$ and $A^i \in \mathcal{G}$ form a disjoint partition of Ω , we have

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} x^i 1_{A^i})] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} 1_{A^i} h(x^i)] = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} 1_{A^i} \tilde{h}(x^i) = \tilde{h}(x).$$

Any $x \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{G})$ is an almost sure limit of such simple random variables bounded by $\|x\|_{L^{\infty}}$, so dominated convergence for conditional expectations (see e.g. [34, Theorem II.7.2]) and scenariowise continuity of h and $\tilde{h}$ imply that $E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] = \tilde{h}(x)$. Thus Lemma 2.2 implies the claim. $\square$

Counterexample 2.5. The claim of Theorem 2.4 fails if ρ is not integrable. Indeed, let ξ be uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$, $\eta > 1$ be nonintegrable independent of ξ and $\mathcal{G}$ be generated by ξ . Let $h(x, \omega) = \eta(\omega)|x - \xi(\omega)|$. Then $E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] = +\infty$ for every constant $x \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, choosing $x = \xi$, we have $E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] = 0$, so $E^{\mathcal{G}}h$ is not characterized by constants even though h is Lipschitz and L -bounded convex normal integrand.

Lemma 2.6. *Let h^1 and h^2 be L -bounded normal integrands with $h^1 \leq h^2$. Then $E^{\mathcal{G}}h^1 \leq E^{\mathcal{G}}h^2$ whenever the conditional expectations exist.*

Proof. For any $x \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{G})$, $h^1(x)$ and $h^2(x)$ are quasi-integrable, so $h^1 \leq h^2$ implies

$$(E^{\mathcal{G}}h^1)(x) = E^{\mathcal{G}}[h^1(x)] \leq E^{\mathcal{G}}[h^2(x)] = (E^{\mathcal{G}}h^2)(x)$$

almost surely so the result follows from [35, Lemma 6]. $\square$

The following result is a monotone convergence theorem for conditional expectations of integrands.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $(h^{\nu})_{\nu=1}^{\infty}$ be a nondecreasing sequence of L -bounded normal integrands and $h = \sup_{\nu} h^{\nu}$.*

If each $E^{\mathcal{G}}h^{\nu}$ exists, then $E^{\mathcal{G}}h$ exists and $E^{\mathcal{G}}h = \sup_{\nu} E^{\mathcal{G}}h^{\nu}$.

Proof. For any $x \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\alpha \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{G}; \mathbb{R}_+)$, monotone convergence and Lemma 2.6 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\alpha h(x)] &= E[\alpha \sup_{\nu} h^{\nu}(x)] = \sup_{\nu} E[\alpha h^{\nu}(x)] \\ &= \sup_{\nu} E[\alpha E^{\mathcal{G}}[h^{\nu}(x)]] = E[\alpha \sup_{\nu} E^{\mathcal{G}}[h^{\nu}(x)]] \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sup_{\nu} E^{\mathcal{G}}h^{\nu} = E^{\mathcal{G}}h$. $\square$

The following is our main result on the existence of conditional normal integrands.

Theorem 2.8. *An L -bounded (convex) normal integrand admits a conditional expectation and that is L -bounded (and convex) as well.*

Proof. Let h be an L -bounded normal integrand. Assume first that $h \leq m$ for some constant $m > 0$. By [33, Example 9.11],

$$h^\nu(x, \omega) := \inf_{x'} \{h(x', \omega) + \nu\rho(\omega)|x - x'|\}$$

form a nondecreasing sequence of Caratheodory functions increasing pointwise to h . The assumed upper bound and the L -boundedness of h imply that h^ν satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.4. Thus, by Theorems 2.4 and 2.7, $E^\mathcal{G}h$ exists. To remove the assumption $h \leq m$, consider the nondecreasing sequence of functions $h^n(x) := \min\{h(x), m\}$ (which are normal integrands, by [33, Proposition 14.44]) and apply Theorem 2.7 again. The preservation of convexity follows from [36, Proposition 1.6.2]. $\square$

The truncation argument in the above proof is adapted from [35]. It gives the existence under slightly more general conditions than [7] who assumed the existence of a $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable x such that $h(x)$ is integrable. More general existence results in the nonconvex case have been given in [36, 9].

2.2. Conditional expectations in operations

Most results in this section can be found in [7] [15] and [36] with the exception of Theorem 2.11 and parts (2) and (3) of Theorem 2.13 which seem new. Theorem 2.15 extends Corollary 1 of [7, Theorem 3] by slightly relaxing the assumptions on the domains of the integral functionals.

Recall that if ξ is a quasi-integrable random variable and $\mathcal{G}'$ is a sub- σ -algebra of $\mathcal{G}$, then

$$E^{\mathcal{G}'}[E^\mathcal{G}\xi] = E^{\mathcal{G}'}\xi;$$

see Lemma 6.5. This extends to normal integrands as follows.

Theorem 2.9. (Tower property) *Assume that h is an L -bounded normal integrand, and $\mathcal{G}'$ is a sub- σ -algebra of $\mathcal{G}$. Then $E^{\mathcal{G}'}(E^\mathcal{G}h) = E^{\mathcal{G}'}h$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.8, $E^\mathcal{G}h$ exists and is L -bounded, so the result follows from the usual tower property (see Lemma 6.5) and Lemma 2.2. $\square$

Given a set $A \in \mathcal{F}$, we denote

$$1_A(\omega) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega \in A, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Given $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{F}$, σ -algebras $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$ are $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent if

$$E^\mathcal{H}[1_{A'}1_A] = E^\mathcal{H}[1_{A'}]E^\mathcal{H}[1_A]$$

for every $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and $A' \in \mathcal{G}'$. A random variable w is $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{G}$ if $\sigma(w)$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent. Likewise, we say that a normal integrand h is $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{G}$ if $\sigma(h)$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent. Here $\sigma(h)$ is the smallest σ -algebra under which $\text{epi } h$ is measurable.

In other words, $\sigma(h)$ is generated by the family

$$\{(\text{epi } h)^{-1}(O) \mid O \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \text{ open}\}.$$

Example 2.10. Let ξ be a random variable with values in a measurable space $(\Xi, \mathbb{A})$, H a $\mathbb{A}$ -normal integrand on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and

$$h(x, \omega) = H(x, \xi(\omega)).$$

If ξ is $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{G}$, then h is so too. Indeed, given an open $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we have $(\text{epi } h)^{-1}(O) = \xi^{-1}((\text{epi } H)^{-1}(O))$, so $\sigma(h) \subseteq \sigma(\xi)$. To conclude, it suffices to note that sub- σ -algebras inherit conditional independence. $\square$

If an integrable random variable w is $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{G}$, then

$$E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}}[w] = E^{\mathcal{H}}[w],$$

by Lemma 6.6. The following extension to normal integrands seems to be new.

Theorem 2.11. *Let h be an L -bounded normal integrand $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{G}$. Then*

$$E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}}h = E^{\mathcal{H}}h.$$

In particular, if h is independent of $\mathcal{G}$, then $E^{\mathcal{G}}h$ is deterministic.

Proof. Assume first that h satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.4. Then $E^{\mathcal{H}}h$ is characterized by

$$E^{\mathcal{H}}(h(x)) = (E^{\mathcal{H}}h)(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

almost surely. Likewise for $E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}}h$. Thus $E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}}h = E^{\mathcal{H}}h$, by Lemma 6.6. The first claim now follows using Lipschitz regularizations as in the proof of Theorem 2.8. The second claim follows by taking $\mathcal{H}$ the trivial σ -algebra. $\square$

Remark 2.12. Conditional expectation is a linear operator on the linear space of normal integrands that satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.4.

Proof. If h satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, then so does $-h$, and we have $h(x) \in L^1$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[-h](x) = E^{\mathcal{G}}[-h(x)] = -E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] = -(E^{\mathcal{G}}h)(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

so $E^{\mathcal{G}}[-h] = -E^{\mathcal{G}}h$, by Theorem 2.4. Additivity is proved similarly. $\square$

The class of normal integrands is not a linear space, so one cannot hope for linearity of the conditional expectation, in general.

The product of two extended real numbers is defined as zero if one of them is zero while the nonnegative scalar multiple of a function h is defined by

$$(\alpha h)(x) := \begin{cases} \alpha h(x) & \text{if } \alpha > 0, \\ \delta_{\text{cl dom } h}(x) & \text{if } \alpha = 0. \end{cases}$$

Equivalently, $(\alpha h)(x) := \alpha h(x) + \delta_{\text{cl dom } h}(x) \quad \alpha \geq 0.$

Theorem 2.13. Let h, h^1 and h^2 be L -bounded normal integrands.

- (1) $h^1 + h^2$ is L -bounded and $E^{\mathcal{G}}(h^1 + h^2) = E^{\mathcal{G}}h^1 + E^{\mathcal{G}}h^2$.
- (2) If $\alpha \in L_+^1$, h is $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable and αh is L -bounded, then $E^{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha h) = E^{\mathcal{G}}[\alpha]h$.
- (3) If $\alpha \in L_+^0(\mathcal{G})$ and αh is L -bounded, then $E^{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha h) = \alpha E^{\mathcal{G}}h$ if either α is strictly positive or $F^{\mathcal{G}}[\text{cl dom } h] = \text{cl dom } E^{\mathcal{G}}h$.

Proof. Let $x \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G})$. Since $h^1(x)^-$ and $h^2(x)^-$ are integrable, (1) follows from Lemma 2.2 and the first part of Lemma 6.4. In (2),

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[(\alpha h)(x)] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[\alpha h(x) + \delta_{\text{cl dom } h}(x)] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[\alpha]h(x) + \delta_{\text{cl dom } h}(x), = (E^{\mathcal{G}}[\alpha]h)(x),$$

by Lemma 6.4 so the claim follows from Lemma 2.2 again. In (3),

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[(\alpha h)(x)] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[\alpha h(x) + \delta_{\text{cl dom } h}(x)] = \alpha E^{\mathcal{G}}[h(x)] + E^{\mathcal{G}}[\delta_{\text{cl dom } h}(x)],$$

by Lemma 6.4. If α is strictly positive or if $F^{\mathcal{G}}[\text{cl dom } h] = \text{cl dom } E^{\mathcal{G}}h$, we thus get

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[(\alpha h)(x)] = \alpha(E^{\mathcal{G}}h)(x) + \delta_{\text{cl dom } E^{\mathcal{G}}h}(x) = (\alpha E^{\mathcal{G}}h)(x),$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

The following shows that part (3) of Theorem 2.13 may fail without the extra assumptions.

Counterexample 2.14. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be trivial, $\alpha = 0$ almost surely and $h(x, \omega) := \eta|x|$, where $\eta \notin L^1$ is nonnegative. Then $\alpha h = 0$ while $E^{\mathcal{G}}h = \delta_{\{0\}}$, so

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}(\alpha h) \neq \alpha E^{\mathcal{G}}h. \quad \square$$

Given a proper convex lsc function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, its *recession function* is given by

$$g^\infty(x) := \sup_{\alpha > 0} \frac{g(\bar{x} + \alpha x) - g(\bar{x})}{\alpha},$$

where the supremum is independent of the choice of $\bar{x} \in \text{dom } g$; see [29, Theorem 8.5]. Given a proper convex normal integrand h , its ω -wise recession function $h^\infty(x, \omega) := h(\cdot, \omega)^\infty(x)$ is a normal integrand; see e.g. [33, Exercise 14.54].

Theorem 2.15. Assume that h is a convex normal integrand such that there exists $x \in \text{dom } Eh \cap L^0(\mathcal{G})$ and $v \in \text{dom } Eh^* \cap L^1$ with $(x \cdot v)^- \in L^1$. Then

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}(h^\infty) = (E^{\mathcal{G}}h)^\infty$$

Proof. The difference quotients

$$h^\lambda(x', \omega) := \frac{h(x(\omega) + \lambda x', \omega) - h(x(\omega), \omega)}{\lambda}$$

define a sequence of normal integrands $(h^\lambda)_{\lambda=1}^\infty$ that, by convexity, increase pointwise to h^∞ . By Fenchel's inequality,

$$h^\lambda(x', \omega) \geq x' \cdot v(\omega) + x \cdot v(\omega) - h^*(v(\omega), \omega) - h(x(\omega), \omega)$$

for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, so the claim follows from Theorems 2.7 and 2.13. $\square$

3. Dynamic programming for lower bounded objectives

The optimality conditions in Theorem 3.2 are essentially from [21] but formulated here more generally. The existence results for the generalized Bellman equations for lower bounded integrands in Theorem 3.1 are from [21]. They extend those of [13, 30] in the convex case by relaxing compactness assumption on the set of feasible strategies. Lemma 6 of [21] gives also the converse of Theorem 3.1 in the sense that Assumption 1 necessarily holds if the generalized Bellman equations admit a solution and the sets N_t are linear for all t .

This section studies dynamic programming in the case where h is *lower bounded* in the sense that there exists an $m \in L^1$ such that

$$h(x) \geq m \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Assumption 1. Problem (SP) is feasible, h is lower bounded and

$$\mathcal{L} := \{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid h^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\} \quad \text{is a linear space.}$$

The following is from [21, Lemma 4].

Theorem 3.1. *Under Assumption 1, (BE) has a unique solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ of lower bounded normal integrands and the sets*

$$N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid h_t^\infty(0, x_t, \omega) \leq 0\} \quad t = 0, \dots, T$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$. In this case, if $x \in \mathcal{L}$ is such that $x^{t-1} = 0$ then $x_t \in N_t$ almost surely.

Theorem 3.2 below, shows that, if the Bellman equations (BE) admit a solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$, then the optimal solutions $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ of (SP) are characterized by scenariowise minimization of h_t .

We will denote the projection of the set $\mathcal{N}$ of adapted strategies to its first t components by

$$\mathcal{N}^t := \{x^t \mid x \in \mathcal{N}\} = \{(x_{t'})_{t'=0}^t \mid x_{t'} \in L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t'}, P; \mathbb{R}^{n_{t'}})\}.$$

The lower boundedness condition in the following result will be relaxed in Section 4 below.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that h is lower bounded, (SP) is feasible and that the Bellman equations (BE) admit a solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$. Then each h_t is lower bounded,*

$$\inf (\text{SP}) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} E h_t(x^t)$$

for all t and, moreover, an $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (SP) if and only if

$$(\text{OP}) \quad \bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} h_t(\bar{x}^{t-1}, x_t) \quad \text{a.s. for all } t.$$

If the sets $N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid h_t^\infty(0, x_t, \omega) \leq 0\}$, $t = 0, \dots, T$, are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, then there exists an optimal $x \in \mathcal{N}$ with $x_t \perp N_t$ almost surely.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{N}$. By [33, Theorem 14.60],

$$E\tilde{h}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) = \inf_{x_t \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_t)} Eh_t(x^{t-1}, x_t).$$

Since $\tilde{h}_{t-1}$ is bounded from below, $E\tilde{h}_{t-1} = Eh_{t-1}$ on $\mathcal{N}^{t-1}$ and thus

$$\inf_{x^{t-1} \in \mathcal{N}^{t-1}} Eh_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} Eh_t(x^t).$$

By induction, $\inf(\text{SP}) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} Eh_t(x^t)$.

To prove the second claim, note first that

$$\bar{x}^t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} Eh_t(x^t)$$

if and only if $\bar{x}^{t-1} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x^{t-1} \in \mathcal{N}^{t-1}} Eh_{t-1}(x^{t-1})$ and $\bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_t)} Eh_t(\bar{x}^{t-1}, x_t)$, where,

by the second part of [33, Theorem 14.60], the second inclusion means that

$$\bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} h_t(\bar{x}^{t-1}, x_t) \quad \text{a.s..}$$

An $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (SP) if and only if $\bar{x}$ minimizes Eh_T . A backward recursion shows that optimal solutions satisfy (OP). The converse follows from a forward recursion.

Applying Theorem 6.2 recursively forward in time shows that (OP) has an $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable solution $\bar{x}_t \perp N_t$ almost surely for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. The last claim thus follows from the second one. $\square$

Theorem 3.2 can be thought of as a discrete-time version of a “verification theorem” which, in the context of continuous-time stochastic control gives conditions under which solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation characterize the optimum values and solutions of optimal control problems.

4. Dynamic programming for L-bounded objectives

This section extends the results of the previous section by relaxing the lower boundedness assumption on h . The extensions are largely based on Lemma 4.2 which first appeared in [26] where it was used to extend the main result of [21] on the lower semicontinuity of the optimum value function of (SP). The extension is based on the interplay of the space $\mathcal{N}$ of adapted strategies with the set

$$\mathcal{N}^\perp := \{v \in L^1 \mid E[x \cdot v] = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{N}^\infty\},$$

where $\mathcal{N}^\infty := \mathcal{N} \cap L^\infty$. The following gives an alternative expression for $\mathcal{N}^\perp$.

Lemma 4.1. $\mathcal{N}^\perp = \{v \in L^1 \mid E_t[v_t] = 0 \quad t = 0, \dots, T\}$.

Proof. We have

$$E[x \cdot v] = \sum_{t=0}^T E[x_t \cdot v_t]$$

so $v \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ if and only if $E[x_t \cdot v_t] = 0$ for all $x_t \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t)$. The claim now follows from Lemma 6.4. $\square$

More interestingly, we have the following.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $x \in \mathcal{N}$ and $v \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$. If $E[x \cdot v]^+ \in L^1$, then $E[x \cdot v] = 0$.*

Proof. Assume first that $T = 0$. Defining $x^\nu := 1_{\{|x| \leq \nu\}}x$, we have $x^\nu \in \mathcal{N}^\infty$, so $E[x^\nu \cdot v] = 0$ and thus, $E[x^\nu \cdot v]^- = E[x^\nu \cdot v]^+$. Since $[x^\nu \cdot v] \leq [x \cdot v]^+ \in L^1$, Fatou's lemma gives

$$E[x \cdot v]^- \leq \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} E[x^\nu \cdot v]^- = \liminf_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} E[x^\nu \cdot v]^+ \leq E[x \cdot v]^+$$

so $[x \cdot v]^- \in L^1$ as well. Since $|x^\nu \cdot v| \leq |x \cdot v|$, dominated convergence theorem gives $E[x \cdot v] = \lim E[x^\nu \cdot v] = 0$.

Assume now that the claim holds for every $(T - 1)$ -period model. We then define $x^\nu := 1_{\{|x_0| \leq \nu\}}x$ and obtain

$$\left[\sum_{t=1}^T x_t^\nu \cdot v_t \right]^+ = [x^\nu \cdot v - x_0^\nu \cdot v_0]^+ \leq [x^\nu \cdot v]^+ + [x_0^\nu \cdot v_0]^- \leq [x \cdot v]^+ + [x_0^\nu \cdot v_0]^- ,$$

where the right side is integrable. Thus, $E[\sum_{t=1}^T x_t^\nu \cdot v_t] = 0$, by the induction hypothesis. Since $x_0^\nu \in L^\infty$, we also have $E[x_0^\nu \cdot v_0] = 0$ so $E[x^\nu \cdot v] = 0$. This implies $E[x \cdot v] = 0$ just like in the case $T = 0$. $\square$

The following illustrates Lemma 4.2 with the stochastic integral of an adapted process with respect to a martingale; see [16].

Example 4.3. Assume that $n_t = d$ for all t and let s be a d -dimensional martingale, i.e. an adapted integrable stochastic process such that $E_t[\Delta s_{t+1}] = 0$ for all t . If $x \in \mathcal{N}$ is such that

$$E\left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1}\right]^+ < \infty,$$

then $E[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1}] = 0$. This follows from Lemma 4.2 with $v \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ defined by $v_t = \Delta s_{t+1}$.

The extensions of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 below are based on the following lemma that allows us to reduce a more general problem to one with a lower bounded integrand.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ such that the normal integrand $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ is lower bounded. Then (BE) has a solution for h if and only if (BE) has a solution for k . In this case, the solutions are unique and related by*

$$k_t(x^t, \omega) = h_t(x^t, \omega) - x^t \cdot E_t p_t(\omega). \quad (2)$$

Proof. If (BE) admits a solution for h , there exist sequences $(\tilde{h}_t)_{t=0}^{T-1}$ and $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ of normal integrands that satisfy (BE). Since k is lower bounded, there exists $m \in L^1$ such that

$$h(x, \omega) \geq x \cdot p(\omega) - m(\omega).$$

We claim that, $h_t(x^t, \omega) \geq x^t \cdot [E_t p^t](\omega) - [E_t m](\omega)$ for $t = T, \dots, 0$ (3)

and $\tilde{h}_t(x^t, \omega) \geq x^t \cdot [E_{t+1} p^t](\omega) - [E_{t+1} m](\omega)$ for $t = T-1, \dots, 0$. (4)

Indeed, if (3) holds, then, since $E_t p_t = 0$, we get (4) for $t-1$. If (4) holds, then (3) follows from Lemma 2.6 and Example 2.3. Since $h_T = E_T h$, (3) holds for T so the claim follows by induction on t .

The lower bounds in (4) and (3) imply that the sequences $(\tilde{k}_t)_{t=0}^{T-1}$ and $(k_t)_{t=0}^T$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{k}_t(x^t, \omega) &:= \tilde{h}_t(x^t, \omega) - x^t \cdot [E_{t+1} p^t](\omega), \\ k_t(x^t, \omega) &:= h_t(x^t, \omega) - x^t \cdot [E_t p^t](\omega)\end{aligned}$$

satisfy (BE) for k . Indeed, by Theorem 2.13 and Example 2.3, $E_t \tilde{k}_t = k_t$ while, since $E_t p_t = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{k}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}, \omega) &= \tilde{h}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}, \omega) - x^{t-1} \cdot [E_t p^{t-1}](\omega), \\ &= \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} \{h_t(x^t, \omega) - x^t \cdot [E_t p^t](\omega)\} = \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} k_t(x^{t-1}, x_t, \omega).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(k_t)_{t=1}^T$ solves (BE) for k . Conversely, assume that $(k_t)_{t=0}^T$ and $(k_t)_{t=0}^{T-1}$ solve (BE) for k . By (3.1), k_t are lower bounded. Similar argument as above, then shows that the functions

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{h}_t(x^t, \omega) &:= \tilde{k}_t(x^t, \omega) + x^t \cdot [E_{t+1} p^t](\omega), \\ h_t(x^t, \omega) &:= k_t(x^t, \omega) + x^t \cdot [E_t p^t](\omega)\end{aligned}$$

satisfy (BE) for h . This completes the proof. $\square$

The following extends the existence result in Theorem 3.1 by relaxing the lower boundedness assumption on h .

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ such that the normal integrand $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ is lower bounded and*

$$\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid k^\infty(x) \leq 0 \quad a.s.\}$$

is a linear space. Then (BE) has a unique solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ of L -bounded normal integrands and the sets

$$N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid h_t^\infty(0, x_t, \omega) \leq 0\} \quad t = 0, \dots, T$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, the Bellman equations associated with k have a unique solution $(k_t)_{t=0}^T$ of lower bounded normal integrands and the measurable mappings

$$\hat{N}_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid k_t^\infty(x^t, \omega) \leq 0, \quad x^{t-1} = 0\}$$

are linear-valued for all t . Thus, by Lemma 4.4, (BE) associated with h has a unique solution of L -bounded normal integrands and, since $E_t p_t = 0$, we have $N_t = \hat{N}_t$ almost surely. $\square$

The following generalizes Theorem 3.2 by relaxing the lower boundedness assumption on h .

Theorem 4.6. *Assume that there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ such that the normal integrand $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ is lower bounded and $Ek(x) = Eh(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}$. If (SP) is feasible and the Bellman equations (BE) admit a solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$, then*

$$\inf (\text{SP}) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} Eh_t(x^t)$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ and, moreover, an $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (SP) if and only if

$$(\text{OP}) \quad \bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} h_t(\bar{x}^{t-1}, x_t) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. If the sets

$$N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid h_t^\infty(0, x_t, \omega) \leq 0\} \quad t = 0, \dots, T$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, then there exists an optimal $x \in \mathcal{N}$ with $x_t \perp N_t$ almost surely.

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, (BE) has a solution for k . Since k is lower bounded and since $Eh = Ek$ on $\mathcal{N}$, Theorem 3.2 says that

$$\inf (\text{SP}) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} Ek_t(x^t) \quad \text{for all } t = 0, \dots, T \quad (5)$$

and that an $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (SP) if and only if

$$\bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} k_t(\bar{x}^{t-1}, x_t) \quad \text{a.s. for all } t = 0, \dots, T.$$

By definition of $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$, we always have $\inf (\text{SP}) \geq \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} Eh_t(x^t)$. By (2), there exist $m_t \in L^1$ such that $h_t(x^t) \geq x^t \cdot E_t p^t - m_t$.

If $Eh_t(x^t) < \infty$, then $E[x^t \cdot (E_t p^t)] < \infty$, so Lemma 4.2 gives $Ek_t(x^t) = Eh_t(x^t)$.

Thus,

$$\inf (\text{SP}) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} Eh_t(x^t),$$

which proves the first claim. Since $E_t p_t = 0$, we have

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} k_t(x^{t-1}(\omega), x_t, \omega) = \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} h_t(x^{t-1}(\omega), x_t, \omega),$$

which proves the second claim. The last claim follows from that of Theorem 3.2 since $E_t p_t = 0$. $\square$

We combine the assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 4.6 into the following.

Assumption 2. Problem (SP) is feasible and there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ such that

- (1) $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ is lower bounded,
- (2) $Ek(x) = Eh(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}$,
- (3) $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid k^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$ is a linear space.

Note that, if h is lower bounded, one can take $p = 0$ so Assumption 2 reduces to Assumption 1. Sufficient conditions are given in Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9 below. Applications in Section 5 illustrate these conditions further. In particular, in financial mathematics, the assumption is related to the existence of a martingale measure of the price process.

The following combines Theorems 3.1 and 4.6.

Theorem 4.7. *Under Assumption 2, (BE) has a unique solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$,*

$$\inf(\text{SP}) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} E h_t(x^t)$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$, (SP) has a solution and the solutions $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ of (SP) are characterized by

$$(\text{OP}) \quad \bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} h_t(\bar{x}^{t-1}, x_t) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad t = 0, \dots, T.$$

The following lemma gives sufficient conditions for Assumption 2.

Lemma 4.8. *Assumption 2 holds if (SP) is feasible and*

- (1) *there exists a $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ and $m \in L^1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ with*

$$h(x) \geq \lambda x \cdot p - m \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

almost surely for all $\lambda \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$,

- (2) *$\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid h^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$ is a linear space.*

In this case, $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid h^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\} = \{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid k^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$.

The lower bound in (1) can be written equivalently as

$$h(x) \geq x \cdot p + \epsilon |x \cdot p| - m \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

almost surely, or as $\lambda p \in \operatorname{dom} E h^ \quad \forall \lambda \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$.*

Proof. The first condition implies

$$h(x) \geq x \cdot p - m, \quad \text{and} \quad h(x) - x \cdot p \geq \epsilon x \cdot p - m.$$

Let $x \in \mathcal{N}$. If either $E h(x) < \infty$ or $E[h(x) - x \cdot p] < \infty$, the above inequalities and Lemma 4.2 give $E[x \cdot p] = 0$, so

$$E h(x) = E[h(x) - x \cdot p].$$

The above inequalities also give

$$h^\infty(x) \geq x \cdot p, \quad \text{and} \quad h^\infty(x) - x \cdot p \geq \epsilon x \cdot p.$$

If either $h^\infty(x, 0) \leq 0$ or $h^\infty(x, 0) - x \cdot p \leq 0$ almost surely, then $x \cdot p \leq 0$ almost surely. Lemma 4.2 then implies $x \cdot p = 0$ almost surely, so

$$\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid h^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\} = \{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid h^\infty(x) - x \cdot p \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}.$$

The given linearity condition thus implies that in Assumption 2. □

Lemma 4.9. *Assumption 2 holds if (SP) is feasible and there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ such that*

- (1) $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ *is lower bounded,*
- (2) $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid x \in \text{dom } h \text{ a.s.}\} \subset \text{dom } Eh,$
- (3) $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid k^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$ *is a linear space.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{N}$ be such that either $Ek(x)$ or $Eh(x)$ is finite. Then $x \in \text{dom } h$ almost surely, so we have $x \in \text{dom } Eh$ by (2). By (1), there exists $m \in L^1$ such that $h(x) = k(x) + x \cdot p \geq x \cdot p - m$, so $E[x \cdot p] = 0$ by Lemma 4.2. Thus $Ek(x) = Eh(x)$. $\square$

Counterexample 4.10. Without Assumption 2, it is possible that (SP) does not have a solution albeit (BE) has a unique solution and there is a unique x satisfying (OP).

Indeed, let $n_t = 1$, $\alpha \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ be such that $E[\alpha p_0] = \infty$ and consider

$$h(x, \omega) := \frac{1}{2}|x_0 - \alpha(\omega)|^2 + x_0 p_0(\omega).$$

Here $h_0(x, \omega) = \frac{1}{2}|x_0 - \alpha(\omega)|^2$, so $x \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfies (OP) if and only if $x_0 = \alpha$. For such x , $Eh(x) = \infty$.

Counterexample 4.11. It is possible that (BE) has a solution,

$$\mathcal{L} := \{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid h^\infty(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$$

is a linear space but N_t in Theorem 4.6 is not linear-valued.

Indeed, let $T = 0$, $n_0 = 2$, $\mathcal{F}_0$ trivial, $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ with p nonzero almost surely and consider

$$h(x, \omega) := (x_0^2 - x_0^1)^+ + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x_0^2) + x_0^1 p_0^1(\omega).$$

Here $h_0(x, \omega) = (x_0^2 - x_0^1)^+ + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x_0^2)$, so that $N_0 = \{x_0 \mid 0 \leq x_0^2 \leq x_0^1\}$ while $\mathcal{L} = \{x \mid 0 \leq x_0^2 \leq x_0^1, x_0^1 \cdot p_0^1 \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\} = \{0\}$. $\square$

5. Applications

This section applies Theorems 3.2 and 4.6 to some well-known instances of (SP). Many of the existence results and optimality conditions below have previously been known only under more restrictive compactness and boundedness conditions. In the case of portfolio optimization in Section 5.5 below, we extend earlier results by allowing for portfolio constraints.

5.1. Mathematical programming

Consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && Ef_0(x) \quad \text{over } x \in \mathcal{N}, \\ \text{(MP)} \quad & \text{subject to} && f_j(x) \leq 0 \quad j = 1, \dots, l \text{ a.s.}, \\ & && f_j(x) = 0 \quad j = l + 1, \dots, m \text{ a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where f_j , $j = 0, \dots, m$ are convex normal integrands with f_j affine for $j > l$.

The problem fits the general framework with

$$h(x, \omega) := \begin{cases} f_0(x, \omega) & \text{if } f_j(x, \omega) \leq 0, \ j = 1, \dots, l, \ f_j(x, \omega) = 0, \ j = l+1, \dots, m, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, by [33, Example 1.32 and Proposition 14.33], h is a normal integrand. Problem (MP) is essentially from [31] where it was analyzed through convex duality. We have extended the formulation by the inclusion of affine equality constraints.

Assumption 3.

- (1) (MP) is feasible,
- (2) $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid f_j^\infty(x) \leq 0 \ j = 0, \dots, l, f_j^\infty(x) = 0 \ j = l+1, \dots, m \text{ a.s.}\}$ is a linear space,
- (3) there exists a $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $m \in L^1$ and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that, almost surely,

$$f_0(x) \geq x \cdot p + \epsilon|x \cdot p| - m$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $f_j(x) \leq 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, l$, and $f_j(x) = 0$ for all indices $j = l+1, \dots, m$.

Assumption 3 relaxes the conditions imposed in [30]. The last two conditions are sufficient for the conditions of Lemma 4.8 which imply Assumption 2. The last condition in Assumption 3 holds, in particular, if f_0 is bounded from below by an integrable function as one can then take $p = 0$. A direct application of Theorem 4.7 gives the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Under Assumption 3, (MP) has a solution.*

The following addresses linear stochastic programs that have been extensively studied in the literature; see e.g. [10, 37, 38].

Example 5.2. (Linear programming) Consider (MP) and assume that $f_0(x, \omega) = c(\omega) \cdot x$ and $f_j(x, \omega) = a_j(\omega) \cdot x - b_j(\omega)$ for random vectors c and a_j and random variables b_j . The problem can then be written in the matrix format as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && E[c \cdot x] && \text{over } x \in \mathcal{N} \\ & \text{subject to} && Ax - b \in K && \text{a.s.,} \end{aligned}$$

where A is the random $m \times n$ -matrix with the rows a_j , b is the random vector with components b_j and $K = \mathbb{R}_+^l \times \{0\}$.

In this case, Assumption 3 means that

- (1) (MP) is feasible,
- (2) $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid c \cdot x \leq 0, Ax \in K \text{ a.s.}\}$ is a linear space,
- (3) there exists a $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $m \in L^1$ and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that, almost surely,

$$c \cdot x \geq x \cdot p + \epsilon|x \cdot p| - m \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Ax - b \in K$.

The above are merely examples how the results of Section 4 can be used. In some applications, the conditions of Lemma 4.9 could be more convenient. The above

only gives the existence of solutions. When the constraint matrix in Example 5.2 has a block-diagonal form, one can write the dynamic programming recursion in a more familiar form; see Example 5.20 below.

5.2. Optimal stopping

Let R be a real-valued adapted stochastic process and consider the *optimal stopping problem*

$$(OS) \quad \text{maximize} \quad ER_\tau \quad \text{over } \tau \in \mathcal{T},$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of *stopping times*, i.e. measurable functions $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, \dots, T+1\}$ such that $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \tau(\omega) \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t$ for each $t = 0, \dots, T$. Choosing $\tau = T+1$ is interpreted as not stopping at all. Accordingly, we define $R_{T+1} := 0$. Consider also the problem

$$(ROS) \quad \text{maximize}_{x \in \mathcal{N}_+} \quad E \sum_{t=0}^T R_t x_t \quad \text{subject to} \quad x \geq 0, \sum_{t=0}^T x_t \leq 1 \text{ a.s.}$$

This is a convex relaxation of (OS) which is obtained from (ROS) by adding the constraint that $x_t \in \{0, 1\}$. Indeed, the feasible strategies x are then in one-to-one correspondence with stopping times via

$$x_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t = \tau, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \neq \tau. \end{cases}$$

The following motivates the relaxation.

Lemma 5.3. *If $R \in L^1$, then $\sup(OS) = \sup(ROS)$ and $\operatorname{argmax}(ROS)$ is the closed convex hull of strategies x that correspond to optimal solutions of (OS).*

Proof. As in the proof of [24, Lemma 2], it can be shown that the processes corresponding to stopping times are the extreme points of the feasible set of (ROS). By Banach-Alaoglu theorem, the feasible set of (ROS) is compact in the weak topology that L^∞ has as the dual of L^1 . Thus, by Krein–Milman theorem, the feasible set of (ROS) is the closed convex hull of those x corresponding to stopping times.

If $R \in L^1$, the objective is weakly continuous so the relaxation does not affect the optimum value. It is easy to verify, by contradiction, that extreme points of the weakly compact $\operatorname{argmax}(ROS)$ are extreme points of the feasible set, which, by the Krein–Milman theorem again, proves the last claim. $\square$

Problem (ROS) fits the general framework with $n_t = 1$ for all t and

$$h(x, \omega) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{t=0}^T R_t(\omega) x_t & \text{if } x \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{t=0}^T x_t \leq 1, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for an adapted real-valued process R and $x_{-1} := 0$.

Let S be the *Snell envelope* of R , i.e. the adapted stochastic process given by

$$S_{T+1} := 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_t := \max\{R_t, E_t S_{t+1}\}.$$

The Snell envelope is the smallest supermartingale that dominates the positive part R^+ of the reward process R . Indeed, let $\tilde{S}$ be another supermartingale that dominates R^+ . Then $\tilde{S}_T \geq S_T$ and $\tilde{S}_t \geq \max\{R_t, E_t \tilde{S}_{t+1}\}$, so $\tilde{S}_t \geq S_t$ for all t , by induction.

Theorem 5.4. *Assume that $R \in L^1$. The optimum value of (ROS) coincides for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ with that of*

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x \in \mathcal{N}^t}{\text{maximize}} && E \left[\sum_{s=0}^t R_s x_s + E_t[S_{t+1}] (1 - \sum_{s=1}^t x_s) \right] \\ & \text{subject to} && x^t \geq 0, \quad \sum_{s=0}^t x_s \leq 1 \quad a.s. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the optimum value of (ROS) is ES_0 . An $x \in \mathcal{N}$ is optimal if and only if

$$x_t \in \underset{x_t \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{argmax}} \left\{ (R_t - E_t[S_{t+1}])x_t \mid x_t \in [0, 1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s] \right\} \quad a.s. \quad t = 0, \dots, T.$$

In particular, optimal values of (OS) and (ROS) coincide, (OS) admits optimal solutions $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and they are characterized by $R_\tau = S_\tau$ almost surely.

Proof. The domain of h is contained in the unit simplex almost surely, so $h^\infty = \delta_{\{0\}}$ and, since $R \in L^1$, h has an integrable lower bound. Thus, by Theorem 4.5, BE has a solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$. To prove the claims concerning (ROS), it suffices, by Theorem 3.2, to show that

$$h_t(x^t, \omega) = \sum_{s=0}^t [-R_s(\omega)x_s + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x_s)] - E_t[S_{t+1}](\omega)(1 - \sum_{s=0}^t x_s) + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(1 - \sum_{s=0}^t x_s).$$

Since R is adapted, h is $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable so $h_T = h$ and the claim holds for $t = T$ since $S_{T+1} = 0$. Assume that the claim holds for t . Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ E_t[S_{t+1}](\omega)(1 - \sum_{s=0}^t x_s) \mid 0 \leq x_t \leq 1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s \right\} \\ &= \sup_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ R_t(\omega)x_t + E_t[S_{t+1}](\omega)(1 - \sum_{s=0}^t x_s) \mid 0 \leq x_t \leq 1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s \right\} \\ &= \max\{R_t(\omega), E_t[S_{t+1}](\omega)\} (1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s) + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s) \\ &= S_t(\omega)(1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s) + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s), \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_{t-1}(x_{t-1}, \omega) &:= \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}} h_t(x^t, \omega) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} [-R_s(\omega)x_s + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x_s)] - S_t(\omega)(1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s) + \delta_{\mathbb{R}_+}(1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s). \end{aligned}$$

In consequence of Example 2.3, the $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ -conditional expectation of the second last term is $E_{t-1}[S_t](\omega)(\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s - 1)$, so the claim holds for $t - 1$. It is clear that the argmax over x_t always contains either 0 or $1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s$. Thus, if $\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} x_s$ takes values in $\{0, 1\}$, we can choose an optimal x_t such that $\sum_{s=0}^t x_s$ takes values in $\{0, 1\}$. Thus an induction gives an optimal strategy taking values in $\{0, 1\}$. $\square$

The above is classical in stochastic analysis (see e.g. [27]) but our proof via the convex relaxation (ROS) seems new. The process $(R_t)_{t=0}^T$ is *Markov* if, for all t , $(R_{t+1}, \dots, R_T)$ is R_t -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$.

Remark 5.5. If $R \in L^1$ is a Markov process, then $S_t = \psi_t(R_t)$ for some measurable function ψ_t . In particular, the optimal stopping times $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ are characterized by the condition $R_\tau = \psi_\tau(R_\tau)$.

Proof. Clearly, $S_{T+1} := 0$ is of the required form. Assume that $S_{t+1} = \psi_{t+1}(R_{t+1})$ so that $S_t = \max\{R_t, E_t[\psi_{t+1}(R_{t+1})]\}$. By the conditional independence and Doob-Dynkin lemma [17, Lemma 1.13], $E_t[\psi_{t+1}(R_{t+1})] = E^{\sigma(R_t)}[\psi_{t+1}(R_{t+1})] = \hat{\psi}_t(R_t)$ for some measurable function $\hat{\psi}_t$. Defining $\psi_t(x) := \max\{x, \hat{\psi}_t(x)\}$, we get $S_t = \psi_t(R_t)$, so the claim follows by induction. $\square$

5.3. Optimal control

Consider the optimal control problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(OC)} \quad & \text{minimize} && E\left[\sum_{t=0}^T L_t(X_t, U_t)\right] \quad \text{over } (X, U) \in \mathcal{N}, \\ & \text{subject to} && \Delta X_t = A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t \quad \text{a.s. } t = 1, \dots, T \end{aligned}$$

where the *state* X and the *control* U are processes with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathbb{R}^M$, respectively, A_t and B_t are $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random matrices, W_t is an $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random vector and the functions L_t are convex normal integrands. The linear constraints in (OC) are called the *system equations*. Problem (OC) fits the general framework with $x = (X, U)$ and

$$h(x, \omega) = \sum_{t=0}^T L_t(X_t, U_t, \omega) + \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_{\{0\}}(\Delta X_t - A_t(\omega)X_{t-1} - B_t(\omega)U_{t-1} - W_t(\omega)).$$

The special structure in (OC) allows us to express the solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ of the general Bellman equations (BE) in terms of normal integrands $J_t : \mathbb{R}^N \times \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $I_t : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^M \times \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ that solve the following “dynamic programming” equations

$$\begin{aligned} J_{T+1} &= 0 \\ I_{t+1}(X_t, U_t) &= J_{t+1}(X_t + A_{t+1}X_t + B_{t+1}U_t + W_{t+1}) \\ J_t(X_t) &= \inf_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^M} E_t(L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Note that J_t is a function only of x_t and ω while the functions h_t in the general Bellman equations (BE) may depend on the whole path x^t of x up to time t . The functions J_t are often called the “value functions” or “cost-to-go functions”. This terminology is well justified by Theorem 5.7 below.

Informally, (6) can be written in the more familiar form

$$J_{T+1} = 0$$

$$J_t(X_t) = \inf_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^M} E_t[L_t(X_t, U_t) + J_{t+1}(X_t + A_{t+1}X_t + B_{t+1}U_t + W_{t+1})],$$

which are the equations studied in e.g. [3, Section 2.2], [5, Section 1.2] and [8, Proposition 4.12] when applied to the convex case. We have introduced the functions I_t to clarify that the conditional expectations are taken here in the sense of normal integrands. This resolves many of the measurability problems that arise in earlier formulations. The optimality conditions and the existence results for the convex control problems in Theorems 5.7 and 5.10 below seem new in the presented generality.

Essentially, our formulation of (OC) in terms of normal integrands is what [5, Section 1.2.II] calls “semicontinuous models”. In [5], these models were, however, interpreted quite narrowly with the exclusion of even the classical linear quadratic model in Example 5.14. The discrepancy seems to have come from the belief that “in the usual stochastic programming model, the controls cannot influence the distribution of future states”; see page 12 of [5]. It is clear in (OC), however, that the controls do influence the distribution of future states. What is crucial for convexity is that the state equations are affine. In nonconvex dynamic programming recursions of [13, 25], even this assumption can be relaxed.

Compared to the general Bellman equations (BE), (6) provides a significant dimension-reduction with respect to time: the optimal control does not depend on the past states. This is often referred to as the “dynamic programming principle”. This reduction is essentially due to the time-separable structure of (OC) where, conditionally on the current state, the future is “independent” of the previous states. We will see a further dimension-reduction with respect to scenarios when the random elements in the problem exhibit certain form of independence; see Example 5.13 below. Under appropriate conditions, the functions J_t in (6) turn out to be deterministic.

When applied to (OC), Theorem 3.2 gives the following.

Theorem 5.6. *Assume that (OC) is feasible, L_t are lower bounded and that $(I_t, J_t)_{t=0}^T$ is a solution of (6). Then the optimum value of the optimal control problem coincides with that of*

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && E \left[\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_s L_s)(X_s, U_s) + J_t(X_t) \right] \quad \text{over } (X^t, U^t) \in \mathcal{N}^t, \\ &\text{subject to} && \Delta X_s = A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s \quad \text{a.s. } s = 1, \dots, t \end{aligned}$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ and, moreover, an $(\bar{X}, \bar{U}) \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (OC) if and only if it satisfies the system equations and

$$\bar{U}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^M} E_t(L_t + I_{t+1})(\bar{X}_t, \bar{U}_t) \quad \text{a.s. for all } t = 0, \dots, T.$$

If the sets

$$N_t(\omega) = \{(X_t, U_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid X_t = 0, (E_t(L_t + I_{t+1}))^\infty(0, U_t, \omega) \leq 0\}$$

are linear, then there exists an optimal $x \in \mathcal{N}$ with $x_t \perp N_t$ almost surely.

Rather than proving Theorem 5.6 directly, we will prove the following more general result the proof of which is based on Theorem 4.6. In addition to $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, the assumptions involve $y_t \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Throughout, we set $y_0 := y_{T+1} := 0$ and $X_{T+1} := 0$. The ω -wise transposes of A_t and B_t will be denoted by A_t^* and B_t^* , respectively.

Theorem 5.7. *Assume that (OC) is feasible, $(I_t, J_t)_{t=0}^T$ is an L -bounded solution of (6) and that there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $y \in L^1$ and $m_t \in L^1$ such that $A_t^* y_t, B_t^* y_t$ and $W_t \cdot y_t$ are integrable for all t and*

- (1) $E \sum_{t=0}^T L_t(X_t, U_t) = E \sum_{t=0}^T [L_t(X_t, U_t) - (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t]$ for all $(X, U) \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying the system equations,
- (2) $L_t(X_t, U_t) \geq (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t - X_t \cdot \Delta y_{t+1} - (A_{t+1} X_t + B_{t+1} U_t + W_{t+1}) \cdot y_{t+1} - m_t$ almost surely for all t .

Then the optimum value of the optimal control problem coincides with that of

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && E \left[\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_s L_s)(X_s, U_s) + J_t(X_t) \right] && \text{over } (X^t, U^t) \in \mathcal{N}^t, \\ & \text{subject to} && \Delta X_s = A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s && \text{a.s. } s = 1, \dots, t \end{aligned}$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ and, moreover, an $(\bar{X}, \bar{U}) \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (OC) if and only if it satisfies the system equations and

$$\bar{U}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^M} E_t(L_t + I_{t+1})(\bar{X}_t, \bar{U}_t) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. If the sets

$$N_t(\omega) = \{(X_t, U_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{nt} \mid X_t = 0, (E_t(L_t + I_{t+1}))^\infty(0, U_t, \omega) \leq 0\}$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, then there exists an optimal $x \in \mathcal{N}$ with $x_t \perp N_t$ almost surely.

Proof. Let $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$. Condition (1) means that $Ek = Eh$ on $\mathcal{N}$. For any (X, U) satisfying the system equations, the lower bound in (2) can be written as

$$L_t(X_t, U_t) \geq (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t - X_t \cdot \Delta y_{t+1} - \Delta X_{t+1} \cdot y_{t+1} - m_t.$$

Summing up, shows that k is lower bounded. All the claims follow from Theorem 4.6 once we show that $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} h_t(x^t, \omega) &:= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_s L_s)(X_s, U_s, \omega) + E_t(L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^t \delta_{\{0\}}(-\Delta X_s + A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

is an L -bounded solution of (BE). Indeed, by Theorem 4.6, the optimum value of (OC) can then be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} E h_t(x^t) &= \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s, \omega) + E_t(L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t) \mid \right. \\
&\quad \left. \Delta x_s = A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s \ s = 1, \dots, t \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s, \omega) + J_t(X_t) \mid \right. \\
&\quad \left. \Delta x_s = A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s \ s = 1, \dots, t \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds by [33, Theorem 14.60]. Also, if (7) holds, then by Theorem 4.6, an $(\bar{X}, \bar{U}) \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (OC) if and only if $(\bar{X}_t, \bar{U}_t)$ minimizes (7) almost surely.

Assume that (7) solve (BE) from t onwards. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{h}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) &= \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}} h_t(x^{t-1}, x_t) \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s) \\
&\quad + \inf_{(X_t, U_t)} \{ E_t(L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t) \mid X_t = X_{t-1} + A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t \} \\
&\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta_{\{0\}}(-\Delta X_s + A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s) \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s) + J_t(X_{t-1} + A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t) \\
&\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta_{\{0\}}(-\Delta X_s + A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s) \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s) + I_t(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta_{\{0\}}(-\Delta X_s + A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s) \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.13 again,

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) &= E_{t-1} \tilde{h}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} (E_{t-1} L_s)(X_s, U_s, \omega) + E_{t-1}(L_{t-1} + I_t)(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta_{\{0\}}(-\Delta X_s + A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s).
\end{aligned}$$

We have $h_T = E_T h$, by Theorem 2.13. Thus, by induction, the normal integrands h_t given by (7) solve (BE). $\square$

Remark 5.8. The lower bounds in Theorem 5.7 hold if and only if

$$E[L_t^*(p_t - (\Delta y_{t+1} + A_{t+1}^* y_{t+1}, B_{t+1}^* y_{t+1})) - W_{t+1} \cdot y_{t+1}] < \infty,$$

for all t . Here $y_0 := y_{T+1} := 0$, $A_{T+1} := 0$ and $B_{T+1} := 0$. The assumption is closely connected with the feasibility of a problem dual to (OC); see [23].

Proof. By Fenchel's inequality, for feasible (X, U) ,

$$\begin{aligned} & L_t(X_t, U_t) + L_t^*(p_t - (\Delta y_{t+1} + A_{t+1}^* y_{t+1}, B_{t+1}^* y_{t+1})) - W_{t+1} \cdot y_{t+1} \\ & \geq (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t - X_t \cdot (\Delta y_{t+1} + A_{t+1}^* y_{t+1}) - U_t \cdot (B_{t+1}^* y_{t+1}) - W_{t+1} \cdot y_{t+1} \\ & = (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t + X_t \cdot y_t - (X_t + A_{t+1} X_t + B_{t+1} U_t + W_{t+1}) \cdot y_{t+1} \\ & = (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t + X_t \cdot y_t - (X_{t+1}) \cdot y_{t+1} \\ & = (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t - X_t \cdot \Delta y_{t+1} - \Delta X_{t+1} \cdot y_{t+1} \end{aligned}$$

almost surely, which gives the equivalence. $\square$

Theorem 3.1 gives the following existence result for (6).

Theorem 5.9. Assume that L_t are lower bounded and that the set

$$\left\{ (X, U) \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^T L_t^\infty(X_t, U_t) \leq 0, \Delta X_t = A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} \text{ a.s.} \right\}$$

is linear. Then (6) has a unique solution $(J_t, I_t)_{t=0}^{T+1}$, each J_t and I_t is lower bounded and the sets

$$N_t(\omega) := \{(X_t, U_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid X_t = 0, (E_t(L_t + I_{t+1}))^\infty(0, U_t, \omega) \leq 0\}$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

Rather than proving Theorem 5.9 directly, we will prove the following more general result the proof of which is based on Theorem 4.5.

Theorem 5.10. Assume that there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $y \in L^1$ and $m_t \in L^1$ such that

(1) the set

$$\left\{ (X, U) \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^T (L_t^\infty(X_t, U_t) - p_t \cdot (X_t, U_t)) \leq 0, \Delta X_t = A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} \text{ a.s.} \right\}$$

is linear,

(2) $L_t(X_t, U_t) \geq (X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t - X_t \cdot \Delta y_{t+1} - (A_{t+1} X_t + B_{t+1} U_t + W_{t+1}) \cdot y_{t+1} - m_t$ almost surely for all t .

(3) $A_t^* y_t$, $B_t^* y_t$ and $W_t \cdot y_t$ are integrable and $E_t[A_t^* y_t] = A_t^* E_t y_t$, $E_t[B_t^* y_t] = B_t^* E_t y_t$ and $E_t[W_t \cdot y_t] = W_t \cdot E_t y_t$ for all t .

Then (6) has a unique solution $(J_t, I_t)_{t=0}^{T+1}$, each J_t and I_t is L -bounded and the sets

$$N_t(\omega) := \{(X_t, U_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid X_t = 0, (E_t(L_t + I_{t+1}))^\infty(0, U_t, \omega) \leq 0\}$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof. Summing up the lower bounds in (2) shows that $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ is lower bounded while (1) means that $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid k^\infty(x) \leq 0\}$ is a linear space. By Theorem 4.5, (BE) has a unique solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ for h and

$$N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid h_t^\infty(x^t, \omega) \leq 0, x^{t-1} = 0\}$$

is linear-valued for all t .

Assume that $(I_{t'}, J_{t'})_{t'=t+1}^{T+1}$ are normal integrands satisfying (6) from time $t+1$ onwards, and that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_t(x^t) &= \sum_{s=0}^t (E_{t+1} L_s)(X_s, U_s) + I_{t+1}(X_t, U_t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^t \delta_{\{0\}}(\Delta X_s - A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s), \\ J_{t+1}(X_{t+1}) &\geq X_{t+1} \cdot E_{t+1} y_{t+1} - \sum_{t'=t+1}^T E_{t+1} m_{t'}. \end{aligned}$$

Here E_{T+1} is defined as the identity mapping so the above hold for $t = T$. The lower bound gives

$$\begin{aligned} I_{t+1}(X_t, U_t) &= J_{t+1}(X_t + A_{t+1} X_t + B_{t+1} U_t + W_{t+1}) \\ &\geq (X_t + A_{t+1} X_t + B_{t+1} U_t + W_{t+1}) \cdot E_{t+1} y_{t+1} - \sum_{t'=t+1}^T E_{t+1} m_{t'} \\ &= X_t \cdot E_{t+1} y_{t+1} + X_t \cdot A_{t+1}^* E_{t+1} y_{t+1} + U_t \cdot B_{t+1}^* E_{t+1} y_{t+1} \\ &\quad + W_{t+1} \cdot E_{t+1} y_{t+1} - \sum_{t'=t+1}^T E_{t+1} m_{t'}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Under conditions (2) and (3), all the terms in the expression of $\tilde{h}_t$ above are L-bounded, by Theorem 2.8. By Theorems 2.13 and 2.9,

$$\begin{aligned} h_t(x^t) &= (E_t \tilde{h}_t)(x^t) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s) + E_t (L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^t \delta_{\{0\}}(\Delta X_s - A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s). \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} N_t(\omega) &= \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid h_t^\infty(x_t) \leq 0, x^{t-1} = 0\} \\ &= \{(X_t, U_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid X_t = 0, (E_t (L_t + I_{t+1}))^\infty(0, U_t) \leq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is linear by Theorem 4.5. Thus, by Theorem 6.2, the functions

$$J_t(X_t) := \inf_{U_t} E_t (L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t)$$

and

$$I_t(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) := J_t(X_{t-1} + A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t)$$

are convex normal integrands.

As in (8),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{h}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s) + J_t(X_{t-1} + A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta_{\{0\}}(-\Delta X_s + A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s) \\
 &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t L_s)(X_s, U_s) + I_t(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta_{\{0\}}(-\Delta X_s + A_s X_{s-1} + B_s U_{s-1} + W_s).
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.6 and Example 2.3, conditions (2) and (3) give

$$\begin{aligned}
 (E_{t+1} L_t)(X_t, U_t) &\geq (X_t, U_t) \cdot E_{t+1} p_t - X_t \cdot E_{t+1} [\Delta y_{t+1}] \\
 &\quad - X_t \cdot A_{t+1}^* E_{t+1} y_{t+1} - U_t \cdot B_{t+1}^* E_{t+1} y_{t+1} \\
 &\quad - W_{t+1} \cdot E_{t+1} y_{t+1} - E_{t+1} m_t.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (9) gives

$$(E_{t+1} L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t) \geq (X_t, U_t) \cdot E_{t+1} p_t + X_t \cdot E_{t+1} y_t - \sum_{t'=t}^T E_{t+1} m_{t'}.$$

By Lemma 2.6 and Example 2.3,

$$E_t (L_t + I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t) \geq X_t \cdot E_t y_t - \sum_{t'=t}^T E_t m_{t'}.$$

and thus,

$$J_t(X_t) \geq X_t \cdot E_t y_t - \sum_{t'=t}^T E_t m_{t'}.$$

The claim thus follows by induction on t . $\square$

Example 5.11. Assumptions of Theorems 5.7 and 5.10 hold if (OC) is feasible,

- (1) $\{(X, U) \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^T L_t^\infty(X_t, U_t) \leq 0, \Delta X_t = A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} \text{ a.s.}\}$ is linear.
- (2) There exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $\lambda \in (1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)$ there exist $y \in L^1$ and $m \in L^1$ such that $A_t^* y_t, B_t^* y_t, y_t \cdot W_t$ are integrable and

$$L_t(X_t, U_t) \geq \lambda(X_t, U_t) \cdot p_t - X_t \cdot \Delta y_{t+1} - \Delta X_{t+1} \cdot y_{t+1} - m_t \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for all feasible (X, U) and for all t . Here $X_{t+1} := y_0 := y_{T+1} := 0$.

Proof. The second assumption clearly implies the lower bound in both theorems. Summing up the lower bounds in (2), we see that Lemma 4.8 is applicable, which implies the rest of the assumptions. $\square$

Remark 5.12. Denoting $Q_t := E_t(L_t + I_{t+1})$, we can write (6) as

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q_{T+1} &:= 0, \\
 I_t(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) &:= \inf_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^M} Q_t(X_{t-1} + A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t, U_t), \\
 Q_{t-1} &:= E_{t-1}(L_{t-1} + I_t)
 \end{aligned}$$

and the optimality condition as $U_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^M} Q_t(X_t, U_t)$ a.s..

If $(Q_t)_{t=0}^T$ satisfies the above, then the functions

$$J_t(X_t) := \inf_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^M} Q_t(X_t, U_t)$$

satisfy (6). Formulation of the dynamic programming recursion in terms of the Q -functions is often used in the context of reinforcement learning e.g. in [4]. $\square$

Example 5.13. (Conditional independence) Assume that L_t are L -bounded, that $(J_t, I_t)_{t=0}^T$ is an L -bounded solution of (6) and that there is a sequence of sigma-algebras $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t=0}^T$ such that

- (1) L_t is $\mathcal{H}_t$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$ and $\sigma(A_{t+1}, B_{t+1}, W_{t+1})$ is $\mathcal{H}_{t+1} \vee \mathcal{H}_t$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$.
- (2) $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ is $\mathcal{H}_t$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$.

Then J_t is $\mathcal{H}_t$ -measurable and $E_t(L_t + I_{t+1}) = E^{\mathcal{H}_t}(L_t + I_{t+1})$.

In particular, if $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t=0}^{T+1}$ are mutually independent and A_t , B_t and W_t are $\mathcal{H}_t$ -measurable, then each $E_t I_{t+1}$ is deterministic. If, in addition, L_t is independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$, then J_t is deterministic.

Proof. Assume that J_{t+1} is $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ -measurable. Then

$$I_{t+1}(X_t, U_t) = J_{t+1}(X_t + A_{t+1}X_t + B_{t+1}U_t + W_{t+1})$$

is $\sigma(A_{t+1}, B_{t+1}, W_{t+1}) \vee \mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ -measurable. By [17, Proposition 6.8], conditions (1) and (2) imply that I_{t+1} is $\mathcal{H}_t$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$. By Theorem 2.11,

$$E_t(L_t + I_{t+1}) = E^{\mathcal{H}_t}(L_t + I_{t+1}),$$

so J_t is $\mathcal{H}_t$ measurable, by Theorem 6.2. By Theorem 2.11, condition (1) implies that J_T is $\mathcal{H}_T$ -measurable, so the claim follows from induction.

Under the additional assumptions, I_{t+1} is $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ -measurable, so mutual independence of $\mathcal{H}_t$ gives, by Theorem 2.11, that $E_t I_{t+1} = E^{\mathcal{H}_t} I_{t+1}$ is deterministic.

When, in addition, L_t is independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$, $E_{t-1}(L_{t-1} + I_t)$ is deterministic as well, and so too is J_t . $\square$

Example 5.14. (Linear-quadratic control) Consider (OC) in the case

$$L_t(X_t, U_t) = \frac{1}{2}X_t \cdot Q_t X_t + \frac{1}{2}U_t \cdot R_t U_t,$$

where $Q_t \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ and $R_t \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{M \times M})$ are random symmetric positive semi-definite matrices. Assume that the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} K_T &:= E_T[Q_T], \\ K_{t-1} &:= E_{t-1}[Q_{t-1} + (I + A_t)^* K_t (I + A_t)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} E_{t-1}[(I + A_t)^* K_t B_t] (E_{t-1}[R_{t-1} + B_t^* K_t B_t])^{-1} E_{t-1}[B_t^* K_t (I + A_t)] \end{aligned}$$

is well-defined, $W_t \cdot K_t A_t$ and $W_t \cdot K_t A_t$ are integrable, W_t has zero mean and is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ and of $A_{t'}$, $B_{t'}$, $Q_{t'}$ and $R_{t'}$ for $t' \geq t$. Then

$$J_t(X_t) = \frac{1}{2} X_t \cdot K_t X_t + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t'=t+1}^T E_t[W_{t'} \cdot Q_{t'} W_{t'}]$$

and the optimal control is given by $\bar{U}_t = -\Lambda_t X_t$, where

$$\Lambda_t = (E_t[R_t + B_{t+1}^* K_{t+1} B_{t+1}])^{-1} E_t[B_{t+1}^* K_{t+1} (I + A_{t+1})].$$

Note that if, in addition, Q_t , R_t , A_{t+1} and B_{t+1} are independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$, then the matrices K_t and Λ_t are deterministic with

$$\begin{aligned} K_T &:= E[Q_T], \\ K_{t-1} &:= E[Q_{t-1} + (I + A_t)^* K_t (I + A_t)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} E[(I + A_t)^* K_t B_t] (E[R_{t-1} + B_t^* K_t B_t])^{-1} E[B_t^* K_t (I + A_t)] \end{aligned}$$

and $\Lambda_t = (E[R_t] + E[B_{t+1}]^* K_{t+1} E[B_{t+1}])^{-1} E[B_{t+1}]^* K_{t+1} E[I + A_{t+1}]$.

The backward recursion for $(K_t)_{t=0}^T$ are known as Riccati equations. The matrices K_t are well-defined e.g. when Q_t , R_t , A_t and B_t are all deterministic and R_t are positive definite.

Proof. By Example 2.3,

$$E_t L_t(X_t, U_t) = \frac{1}{2} X_t \cdot E_t[Q_t] X_t + \frac{1}{2} U_t \cdot E_t[R_t] U_t,$$

for all t , so $J_T(X_T) = \frac{1}{2} X_T \cdot E_T[Q_T] X_T$.

Assume that the expression for $J_{t'}$ in the claim is valid for $t' = t, \dots, T$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} I_t(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) &= J_t((I + A_t)X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} X_{t-1} \cdot (I + A_t)^* K_t (I + A_t) X_{t-1} + \frac{1}{2} U_{t-1} \cdot B_t^* K_t B_t U_{t-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} W_t \cdot K_t W_t + X_{t-1} \cdot (I + A_t)^* K_t B_t U_{t-1} \\ &\quad + W_t \cdot K_t (X_{t-1} + A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t'=t+1}^T E_t[W_{t'} \cdot Q_{t'} W_{t'}]. \end{aligned}$$

When W_t has zero mean and is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, $Q_{t'}$, $R_{t'}$, $A_{t'}$ and $B_{t'}$ for $t' \geq t$ and W_t is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, Example 2.3 gives

$$\begin{aligned} E_{t-1}(L_{t-1} + I_t)(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) &= \frac{1}{2} X_{t-1} \cdot E_{t-1}[Q_{t-1} + (I + A_t)^* K_t (I + A_t)] X_{t-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} U_{t-1} \cdot E_{t-1}[R_{t-1} + B_t^* K_t B_t] U_{t-1} + X_{t-1} \cdot E_{t-1}[(I + A_t)^* K_t B_t] U_{t-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t'=t}^T E_{t-1}[W_{t'} \cdot Q_{t'} W_{t'}]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{t-1}(X_{t-1}) &= \inf_{U_{t-1} \in \mathbb{R}^M} E_{t-1}(L_{t-1} + I_t)(X_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} X_{t-1} \cdot E_{t-1}[Q_{t-1} + (I + A_t)^* K_t (I + A_t)] X_{t-1} + \frac{1}{2} E_{t-1}[W_t \cdot K_t W_t] \\
&\quad + \inf_{U_{t-1} \in \mathbb{R}^M} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} U_{t-1} \cdot E_{t-1}[R_{t-1} + B_t^* K_t B_t] U_{t-1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + X_{t-1} \cdot E_{t-1}[(I + A_t)^* K_t B_t] U_{t-1} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} X_{t-1} \cdot K_{t-1} X_{t-1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t'=t}^T E_t[W_{t'} \cdot Q_{t'} W_{t'}],
\end{aligned}$$

where the infimum is attained by the $\bar{U}_t$ in the statement. The claim thus follows by induction on t . $\square$

5.4. Problems of Lagrange

Consider the problem

$$(L) \quad \text{minimize} \quad E \sum_{t=0}^T K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t) \quad \text{over } x \in \mathcal{N},$$

where x is a process of fixed dimension d , K_t are convex normal integrands and $x_{-1} := 0$. This fits the general format with

$$h(x, \omega) = \sum_{t=0}^T K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t, \omega).$$

Problem (L) is a special case of a stochastic problem of Bolza studied in [32] whose objective contains an additional convex function of (x_0, x_T) . This section analyzes the dynamic programming principle for (L). The results below seem to be new.

If in the linear stochastic programming model Example 5.2, the constraints can be grouped as

$$T_t \Delta x_t + W_t x_t - b_t \in C_t \quad t = 0, \dots, T \quad (10)$$

for given random matrices T_t and W_t and cones C_t , then the problem in Example 5.2 is an instance of (L) with

$$K_t(\Delta x_t, x_t, \omega) = \begin{cases} c_t(\omega) \cdot x_t & \text{if } T_t(\omega) \Delta x_t + W_t(\omega) x_t - b_t(\omega) \in C_t(\omega), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note also that the problem of optimal control (OC) is a special case of (L) with $x_t = (X_t, U_t)$ and

$$K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t) = \begin{cases} L_t(X_t, U_t) & \text{if } \Delta X_t = A_t X_{t-1} + B_t U_{t-1} + W_t, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Other examples can be found e.g. in financial mathematics; see [6, Example 3.6].

Much like in the optimal control problem (OC), the time-separable structure here allows us to express the solutions of the generalized Bellman equations (BE) in

terms of normal integrands V_t and $\tilde{V}_t$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \Omega$ that solve the following dynamic programming equations

$$\begin{aligned} V_T &= 0, \\ \tilde{V}_{t-1}(x_{t-1}, \omega) &= \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{(E_t K_t)(x_t, \Delta x_t, \omega) + V_t(x_t, \omega)\}, \\ V_{t-1} &= E_{t-1} \tilde{V}_{t-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Note that V_t is a function only of x_t and ω while the functions h_t in the general Bellman equations (BE) may depend on the whole path of x up to time t .

Theorem 3.1 gives the following existence result for (L).

Theorem 5.15. *Assume that (L) is feasible, K_t are lower bounded and $(V_t)_{t=0}^T$ is a solution of (11). Then*

$$\inf (L) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} E \left[\sum_{s=0}^t (E_s K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s) + V_t(x_t) \right] \quad t = 0, \dots, T,$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ and, moreover, an $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (L) if and only if

$$\bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{(E_t K_t)(x_t, \Delta x_t) + V_t(x_t)\} \quad a.s.$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$. If the sets

$$N_t(\omega) = \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (E_t K_t)^\infty(x_t, x_t, \omega) + V_t^\infty(x_t, \omega) \leq 0\}$$

are linear almost surely, then there exists an optimal $x \in \mathcal{N}$ with $x_t \perp N_t$ almost surely.

Rather than proving Theorem 5.15 directly, we will prove the following more general result the proof of which is based on Theorem 4.6. In addition to the “shadow price of information” $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, the assumptions in this section involve other “dual variables” $y_t \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Throughout, we set $y_{T+1} := 0$.

Theorem 5.16. *Assume that (L) is feasible, $(V_t)_{t=0}^T$ is an L -bounded solution of (11) and that there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $y \in L^1$ and $m_t \in L^1$ such that*

- (1) $E \sum K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t) = E \sum [K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t) - x_t \cdot p_t]$ for all $x \in \mathcal{N}$,
- (2) $K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t) \geq x_t \cdot (p_t + \Delta y_{t+1}) + \Delta x_t \cdot y_t - m_t$ almost surely for all t .

Then
$$\inf (L) = \inf_{x^t \in \mathcal{N}^t} E \left[\sum_{s=0}^t (E_s K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s) + V_t(x_t) \right] \quad t = 0, \dots, T,$$

for all $t = 0, \dots, T$ and, moreover, an $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$ solves (L) if and only if

$$\bar{x}_t \in \operatorname{argmin}_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{(E_t K_t)(x_t, \Delta x_t) + V_t(x_t)\} \quad a.s. \text{ for all } t = 0, \dots, T.$$

If the sets $N_t(\omega) = \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (E_t K_t)^\infty(x_t, x_t, \omega) + V_t^\infty(x_t, \omega) \leq 0\}$ are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, then there exists an optimal $x \in \mathcal{N}$ with $x_t \perp N_t$ almost surely.

Proof. Summing up the lower bounds in (2) shows that $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ is lower bounded while 1 means that $Ek = Eh$ on $\mathcal{N}$. Assume that $(V_t)_{t=0}^T$ is an L -bounded solution of (11). All the claims follow from Theorem 4.6 once we show that $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ given by

$$h_t(x^t, \omega) := \sum_{s=0}^t (E_t K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s, \omega) + V_t(x_t, \omega)$$

is an L -bounded solution of (BE). Assume that $(h_{t'})_{t'=t}^T$ satisfies (BE) from time t onwards. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}, \omega) &:= \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} h_t(x^{t-1}, x_t, \omega) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s, \omega) + \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{(E_t K_t)(x_t, \Delta x_t, \omega) + V_t(x_t, \omega)\} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s, \omega) + \tilde{V}_{t-1}(x_{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.13 again, $h_{t-1} = E_{t-1} \tilde{h}_{t-1}$.

Since $V_T = 0$, we have $h_T = E_T h$, by Theorem 2.13. Thus, by induction, $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ solves (BE). $\square$

The following gives sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions to the Bellman equations (11).

Theorem 5.17. Assume that K_t are lower bounded and that

$$\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^T (K_t^\infty(x_t, \Delta x_t) - x_t \cdot p_t) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$$

is a linear space. Then (11) has a unique solution $(V_t)_{t=0}^T$, each V_t is lower bounded and the sets

$$N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (E_t K_t)^\infty(x_t, x_t, \omega) + V_t^\infty(x_t, \omega) \leq 0\} \quad (12)$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

Rather than proving Theorem 5.17 directly, we will prove the following more general result the proof of which is based on Theorem 4.5.

Theorem 5.18. Assume that there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$, $y \in L^1$ and $m_t \in L^1$ such that

- (1) $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^T (K_t^\infty(x_t, \Delta x_t) - x_t \cdot p_t) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$ is a linear space,
- (2) $K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t) \geq x_t \cdot (p_t + \Delta y_{t+1}) + \Delta x_t \cdot y_t - m_t$ almost surely for all t .

Then (11) has a unique solution $(V_t)_{t=0}^T$, each V_t is L -bounded and the sets

$$N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (E_t K_t)^\infty(x_t, x_t, \omega) + V_t^\infty(x_t, \omega) \leq 0\} \quad (13)$$

are linear for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof. Summing up the lower bounds in (2) shows that $k(x, \omega) := h(x, \omega) - x \cdot p(\omega)$ is lower bounded while (1) means that $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid k^\infty(x) \leq 0\}$ is a linear space.

By Theorem 4.5, (BE) has a unique solution $(h_t)_{t=0}^T$ for h and

$$N_t(\omega) := \{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t} \mid h_t^\infty(0, x_t, \omega) \leq 0\} \quad (14)$$

is linear for almost every ω and for every t . Assume that $(V_{t'})_{t'=t}^T$ are normal integrands satisfying (11) from time t onwards, and that

$$\begin{aligned} h_t(x^t) &= \sum_{s=0}^t (E_t K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s) + V_t(x_t) \\ V_t(x_t) &\geq -x_t \cdot (E_t y_{t+1}) - E_t \sum_{t'=t+1}^T m_{t'} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

almost surely. We get

$$\tilde{h}_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) = \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} h_t(x^{t-1}, x_t) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_t K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s) + \tilde{V}_{t-1}(x_{t-1}), \quad (16)$$

where $\tilde{V}_{t-1}(x_{t-1}) := \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{(E_t K_t)(x_t, \Delta x_t) + V_t(x_t)\}$.

The equation in (15) and the linearity of (14) imply that (13) is linear. Thus, by Theorem 6.2, $\tilde{V}_{t-1}$ is a normal integrand.

By Lemma 2.6 and Example 2.3, condition (2) implies

$$(E_t K_t)(x_t, \Delta x_t) \geq x_t \cdot E_t \Delta y_{t+1} + \Delta x_t \cdot E_t y_t - E_t m_t$$

Combining with the inequality in (15) gives

$$\tilde{V}_{t-1}(x_{t-1}) \geq -x_{t-1} \cdot E_t y_t - E_t \sum_{t'=t}^T m_{t'}.$$

By Theorem 2.8, there is a unique normal integrand V_{t-1} such that $V_{t-1} = E_{t-1} \tilde{V}_{t-1}$. By Lemma 2.6 and Example 2.3, V_{t-1} satisfies the inequality in (15). Taking conditional expectations on both sides of (16) and using Theorems 2.13 and 2.9, we get

$$h_{t-1}(x^{t-1}) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (E_{t-1} K_s)(x_s, \Delta x_s) + V_{t-1}(x_{t-1}).$$

For $t = T$, $V_T = 0$ so (15) holds by Theorem 2.13. The claim thus holds by induction on t . $\square$

The following analogue of Lemma 4.8 gives sufficient conditions for the assumptions of Theorem 5.16.

Example 5.19. Assumptions of Theorems 5.16 and 5.18 hold if (L) is feasible,

- (1) $\{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^T K_t^\infty(x_t, \Delta x_t) \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\}$ is a linear space,
- (2) there exists $p \in \mathcal{N}^\perp$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $\lambda \in (1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)$, there exist $y \in L^1$ and $m_t \in L^1$ with

$$K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t) \geq x_t \cdot (\lambda p_t + \Delta y_{t+1}) + \Delta x_t \cdot y_t - m_t \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for all t .

Proof. The second assumption clearly implies the lower bound in both theorems. Summing up the lower bounds in (2), we see that Lemma 4.8 is applicable, which implies the rest of the assumptions. $\square$

The linearity condition in Example 5.19 holds, in particular, if we have $K_t^\infty \geq 0$ and $K_t^\infty(x_t, x_t) > 0$ for every $t = 0, \dots, T$ and $x_t \neq 0$. Indeed, in this case

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{t=0}^T K_t^\infty(x_t, \Delta x_t) \leq 0\} = \{0\}$$

almost surely. The last condition in Example 5.19 will be discussed in [23].

Example 5.20. (Block-diagonal stochastic LP) Consider the stochastic linear programming problem from Example 5.2 and assume that the constraint $Ax - b \in C$ can be written as

$$T_t \Delta x_t + W_t x_t - b_t \in C_t \quad t = 0, \dots, T.$$

This is an instance of (L) with

$$K_t(\Delta x_t, x_t, \omega) = \begin{cases} c_t(\omega) \cdot x_t & \text{if } T_t(\omega) \Delta x_t + W_t(\omega) x_t - b_t(\omega) \in C_t(\omega), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If T_t , W_t , b_t and C_t are $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable, then K_t is an $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable convex normal integrand and the dynamic programming recursion (11) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} V_T &= 0, \\ \tilde{V}_{t-1}(x_{t-1}, \omega) &= \inf_{x_t \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{c_t(\omega) \cdot x_t + V_t(x_t, \omega) \mid T_t(\omega) \Delta x_t + W_t(\omega) x_t - b_t(\omega) \in C_t(\omega)\}, \\ V_{t-1} &= E_{t-1} \tilde{V}_{t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This is the classic formulation for linear stochastic programs. Theorem 5.18 gives sufficient conditions for this to be well-defined.

Existence of solutions to Bellman equations for linearly constrained problems have been established also in [20].

Example 5.21. (Conditional independence) Assume that K_t are L-bounded, that $(V_t)_{t=0}^T$ and $(\tilde{V}_t)_{t=0}^T$ are an L-bounded solution of (11) and that there is a sequence of sigma-algebras $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t=0}^T$ such that $\mathcal{H}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t$ and

- (1) K_t is $\mathcal{H}_t$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$,
- (2) $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ is $\mathcal{H}_t$ -conditionally independent of $\mathcal{F}_t$.

Then $\tilde{V}_t$ is $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ -measurable and $V_t = E^{\mathcal{H}_t} \tilde{V}_t$.

In particular, if $(\mathcal{H}_t)_{t=0}^{T+1}$ are mutually independent, then V_t are deterministic.

Proof. By definition, $V_T = 0$ is $\mathcal{H}_T$ -measurable. Assume now that V_{t+1} is $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ -measurable. By Theorem 2.11, condition (1) implies $E_{t+1} K_{t+1}$ is $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ -measurable. Thus, $\tilde{V}_t$ is then $\mathcal{H}_{t+1}$ -measurable as well. By Theorem 2.11 again, condition (2) implies $V_t = E^{\mathcal{H}_t} \tilde{V}_t$, so the first two claims follow by induction. The last claim follows from Theorem 2.11. $\square$

Remark 5.22. Even under the assumptions of Theorems 5.16 and 5.18, $K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t)$ need not be integrable for an optimal solution x of (L). Indeed, defining

$$K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t, \omega) := x_t \cdot \Delta y_{t+1}(\omega) + y_t(\omega) \cdot \Delta x_t,$$

for a process $y \in L^1$ with $y_{T+1} := 0$, the assumptions of Example 5.19 are satisfied with $p = 0$. Since $\sum_{t=0}^T K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t, \omega) = 0$, any $x \in \mathcal{N}$ is optimal, but $K_t(x_t, \Delta x_t)$ need not be integrable.

5.5. Financial mathematics

Let $s = (s_t)_{t=0}^T$ be an adapted $\mathbb{R}^J$ -valued stochastic process describing the unit prices of traded assets in a perfectly liquid financial market. Consider the problem of finding a dynamic trading strategy $z = (z_t)_{t=0}^T$ that provides the “best hedge” against the financial liability of delivering a random amount $c \in L^0$ of cash at time T . If we measure our risk preferences over random cash-flows with the “expected shortfall” associated with a nondecreasing nonconstant convex “loss function” $V : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, the problem can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(ALM)} \quad & \text{minimize} \quad EV \left(c - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1} \right) \quad \text{over} \quad x \in \mathcal{N}, \\ & \text{subject to} \quad x_t \in D_t \quad t = 0, \dots, T \text{ a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where D_t is a random $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable set describing possible portfolio constraints. We will assume $D_T = \{0\}$, which means that all positions have to be closed at the terminal date. Note that nondecreasing convex loss functions V are in one-to-one correspondence with nondecreasing concave utility functions U via $V(c) = -U(-c)$.

Problem (ALM) is standard in financial mathematics although it is based on quite unrealistic assumptions on the financial market. In particular, it assumes that we can buy and sell arbitrary quantities of all assets at prices given by s . It also assumes that one can lend and borrow arbitrary amounts of cash at zero interest rate. Under these assumptions, the random variable c can be thought of as the difference of the claim to be hedged and the initial wealth and the sum in the objective can be interpreted as the proceeds from trading from time $t = 0$ to $t = T$.

Problem (ALM) fits the general framework with

$$h(x, \omega) = V \left(c(\omega) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1}(\omega), \omega \right) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \delta_{D_t(\omega)}(x_t, \omega).$$

We start by giving sufficient conditions for the main existence results in Section 4. It turns out that, in the absence of portfolio constraints, the linearity condition in Lemma 4.8 becomes the classical *no-arbitrage* condition

$$\text{(NA)} \quad x \in \mathcal{N}, \quad \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1} \geq 0 \text{ a.s.} \implies \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1} = 0 \text{ a.s.};$$

see Remark 5.24 below.

The lower bound in Lemma 4.8 holds, in particular, if there exists a martingale measure $Q \ll P$ such that

$$cy, V^*(dQ/dP) \in L^1,$$

V is deterministic and either

$$AE_-(V) := \limsup_{u \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{uV'(u)}{V(u)} < 1 \quad \text{or} \quad AE_+(V) := \liminf_{u \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{uV'(u)}{V(u)} > 1;$$

see Remark 5.25. The above limits are known as “asymptotic elasticities” of V . The conditions above are satisfied by most familiar loss functions such as the exponential, logarithmic and power loss functions.

The problem (ALM) fits the general framework with

$$h(x, \omega) = V\left(c(\omega) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1}(\omega), \omega\right) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \delta_{D_t(\omega)}(x_t, \omega).$$

As before, we assume that V is a nondecreasing, nonconstant convex normal integrand on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. This implies, in particular that, the recession function V^∞ of V (see the end of Section 2) is nondecreasing and strictly positive on strictly positive reals.

Theorem 5.23. (Existence of solutions) *Assume that*

(1) *there exist $y \in L^0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that*

$$cy, y\Delta s_t, \sigma_{D_t}(E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}]), V^*(\lambda y) \in L^1 \quad \forall t, \lambda \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$$

(2) *the set $\mathcal{L} = \{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1} \geq 0, x_t \in D_t^\infty \text{ a.s.}\}$ is linear.*

Then (ALM) admits optimal solutions.

Proof. By Theorems 4.6 and 4.7, it suffices to show that the two conditions in Lemma 4.8 hold. By Fenchel’s inequality, $V(u) \geq \lambda uy - V^*(\lambda y)$ and

$$\delta_{D_t}(x_t) \geq \lambda x_t \cdot (E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}]) - \lambda \sigma_{D_t}(E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}]).$$

Hence,

$$h(x) \geq \lambda cy - V^*(\lambda y) - \lambda \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot [y\Delta s_{t+1} - E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}]] - \lambda \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sigma_{D_t}(E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}]).$$

Choosing $p_t = E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}] - y\Delta s_{t+1}$ and

$$m = \max_{\lambda \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]} \{V^*(\lambda y) + \lambda \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sigma_{D_t}(E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}]) - \lambda cy\}$$

gives the first condition of Lemma 4.8. Indeed, by convexity of V^* , the maximum in the expression of m is attained scenariowise at $\lambda = 1 - \epsilon$ or $\lambda = 1 + \epsilon$ so m is integrable as the pointwise maximum of two integrable functions.

By [33, Theorem 9.3],

$$h^\infty(x, \omega) = V^\infty\left(-\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1}(\omega), \omega\right) + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \delta_{D_t^\infty(\omega)}(x_t, \omega)$$

so condition (2) in Lemma 4.8 means that

$$\mathcal{L} = \{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid V^\infty\left(-\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1}\right) \leq 0, \ x_t \in D_t^\infty \text{ a.s.}\}$$

is a linear space. Since V is not a constant function, we have $V^\infty(u) > 0$ for $u > 0$ and hence

$$V^\infty\left(-\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1}\right) \leq 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1} \geq 0.$$

Thus,
$$\mathcal{L} = \{x \in \mathcal{N} \mid \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} x_t \cdot \Delta s_{t+1} \geq 0, \ x_t \in D_t^\infty \text{ a.s.}\},$$

so condition (2) in Lemma 4.8 holds. $\square$

The above extends the existence results in Theorems 2.7 and 2.10 of [28] by allowing for portfolio constraints and more general utility functions.

Remark 5.24. In the absence of portfolio constraints, condition (2) in Theorem 5.23 becomes (NA).

Remark 5.25. Condition (1) in Theorem 5.23 holds, in particular, if V is lower bounded since then, $EV^*(0) < \infty$ so one can simply take $y = 0$. More generally, the condition holds if there exists a $y \in L^1$ such that

$$cy, \sigma_{D_t}(E_t[y\Delta s_{t+1}]), V^*(y) \in L^1 \quad \forall t$$

and one of the following conditions hold

(A) There exist $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, $\bar{y} \in \text{dom } EV^*$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$V^*(\lambda y, \omega) \leq CV^*(y, \omega) \quad \forall y \in [0, \bar{y}(\omega)]$$

for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

(B) There exist $\lambda > 1$, $\bar{y} \in \text{dom } EV^*$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$V^*(\lambda y, \omega) \leq CV^*(y, \omega) \quad \forall y \geq \bar{y}(\omega)$$

for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.

If V is deterministic, then condition (A) holds if $AE_-(V) < 1$ while (B) holds if $AE_+(V) > 1$.

Proof. The first claim is obvious. As to the second, let $y \in \text{dom } EV^*$. Under A,

$$\begin{aligned} EV^*(\lambda y) &= E1_{\{y \leq \bar{y}\}} V^*(\lambda y) + E1_{\{y > \bar{y}\}} V^*(\lambda y) \\ &\leq E1_{\{y \leq \bar{y}\}} V^*(\lambda y) + E1_{\{y > \bar{y}\}} \max\{V^*(\lambda \bar{y}), V^*(y)\} \\ &\leq E1_{\{y \leq \bar{y}\}} CV^*(y) + E1_{\{y > \bar{y}\}} \max\{CV^*(\bar{y}), V^*(y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from the convexity of V^* .

Since $\bar{y}, y \in \text{dom } EV^*$, the last expression is integrable. Under B,

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\lambda y) &= 1_{\{y \leq \bar{y}\}} V^*(\lambda y) + 1_{\{y > \bar{y}\}} V^*(\lambda y) \\ &\leq 1_{\{y \leq \bar{y}\}} \max\{V^*(y), V^*(\lambda \bar{y})\} + 1_{\{y > \bar{y}\}} V^*(\lambda y) \\ &\leq 1_{\{y \leq \bar{y}\}} \max\{V^*(y), CV^*(\bar{y})\} + 1_{\{y > \bar{y}\}} CV^*(y), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from the convexity of V^* . Thus, under both (A) and (B), $\lambda \text{dom } EV^* \subseteq \text{dom } EV^*$ so condition (1) in Theorem 5.23 holds.

We have $AE_-(V) < p$ if and only if there exists $\bar{u} < 0$ such that

$$V'(u) \leq pV(u)/u \quad \forall u \leq \bar{u},$$

while $AE_+(V) > p$ if and only if there exists $\bar{u} > 0$ such that

$$V'(u) \geq pV(u)/u \quad \forall u \geq \bar{u},$$

Thus, the last claim follows from [22, Lemmas 20 and 21]. $\square$

When applied directly to (ALM), the generalized Bellman equations (BE) do not provide much information about the solutions. We will thus reformulate (ALM) as an optimal control problem and find that the optimal investment strategy at time t depends on the past allocations only through the current level of wealth. If s is componentwise almost surely nonzero, we can write (ALM) as a stochastic control problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && EV(c - X_T) \quad \text{over} \quad (X, U) \in \mathcal{N}, \\ &\text{subject to} && X_0 = 0 \\ &&& \Delta X_t = R_t \cdot U_{t-1} \quad \forall t = 1, \dots, T \\ &&& U_t \in \tilde{D}_t \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, T \end{aligned}$$

where X_t stands for the wealth generated by the trading strategy up to time t , then $R_t^j := \Delta s_t^j / s_{t-1}^j$ is the rate of return on asset j , $U_t^j := s_t^j x_t^j$ is the amount of cash invested in asset j over the period $(t, t+1]$ and

$$\tilde{D}_t(\omega) = \{U \in \mathbb{R}^J \mid (U^j / s_t^j(\omega))_{j \in J} \in D_t(\omega)\}.$$

This formulation can be extended as follows.

Example 5.26. Consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && EV(c - X_T) \quad \text{over} \quad (X, U) \in \mathcal{N}, \\ &\text{subject to} && X_0 = w \text{ a.s.} \\ &&& \Delta X_t = R_t \cdot U_{t-1} \quad \forall t = 1, \dots, T \text{ a.s.} \\ &&& (X_t, U_t) \in \hat{D}_t \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, T-1 \text{ a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{D}_t$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random set in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^J$ and $w \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_0)$ is a given initial wealth. The dependence of the portfolio constraint on the wealth X_t has practical significance. For instance,

$$\hat{D} = \{(X_t, U_t) \mid 1 \cdot U_t \leq \alpha X_t\}$$

describes a capital requirement where at most the proportion α of the current wealth can be invested in the risky assets while the constraint

$$\widehat{D} = \{(X_t, U_t) \mid 1 \cdot U_t = X_t\}$$

would require the whole wealth to be invested in the risky assets. Various combinations of the above e.g., with short-selling constraints, can be incorporated into the constraints $\widehat{D}$.

The above model fits the control format with $N = 1$, $M = |J|$, $A_t = 0$, $B_t = R_t$, $W_t = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} L_T(X_T, U_T) &= V(c - X_T), \\ L_t(X_t, U_t) &= \delta_{\widehat{D}_t}(X_t, U_t), \\ L_0(X_0, U_0) &= \delta_{\{w\}}(X_0) + \delta_{\widehat{D}_0}(X_0, U_0). \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that V and c are $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable, the dynamic programming equations (6) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(X_T) &= V(c - X_T) \\ I_{t+1}(X_t, U_t) &= J_{t+1}(X_t + R_{t+1} \cdot U_t) \quad t = T-1, \dots, 0, \\ J_t(X_t) &= \inf_{U_t \in \mathbb{R}^J} \{(E_t I_{t+1})(X_t, U_t) \mid (U_t, X_t) \in \widehat{D}_t\} \quad t = T-1, \dots, 1, \\ J_0(X_0) &= \delta_{\{w\}}(X_0) + \inf_{U_0 \in \mathbb{R}^J} \{(E_0 I_1)(X_0, U_0) \mid (X_0, U_0) \in \widehat{D}_0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The optimality conditions (17) imply that the optimal portfolio U_t depends on the past decisions only via X_t .

Example 5.27. (Exponential utility) Consider the model of Example 5.26 in the case where $V(u) = \exp(\rho u)/\rho$ and $\widehat{D}_t(\omega) = \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{D}_t(\omega)$. A simple induction argument in (17) gives

$$J_t(X_t) = \alpha_t V(-X_t),$$

where $\alpha_T = \exp(\rho c)$ and $\alpha_t = \inf_{U_t \in \tilde{D}_t} E_t[\alpha_{t+1} \exp(-\rho R_{t+1} \cdot U_t)]$.

An adapted portfolio process $\bar{U}$ satisfies the optimality condition if and only if $\bar{U}_t$ achieves the infimum above almost surely for all t . Note that the amounts of wealth U_t invested in the risky assets do not depend on the level of wealth X_t .

Assuming further that each R_t is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ and that $\tilde{D}_t$ and c are deterministic, we see that α_t are constants and the cost-to-go functions J_t are deterministic. If, in addition, if R_t is normally distributed with mean μ_t and covariance Σ_t , then, by the properties of moment generating functions,

$$\begin{aligned} E_t[\alpha_{t+1} \exp(-\rho R_{t+1} \cdot U_t)] &= \alpha_{t+1} E[\exp(-\rho R_{t+1} \cdot U_t)] \\ &= \alpha_{t+1} \exp(-\rho U_t \cdot \mu_t + \frac{\rho^2}{2} U_t \cdot \Sigma_t U_t), \end{aligned}$$

so, when there are no portfolio constraints, it is optimal to take $U_t = \Sigma_t^{-1} \mu_t / \rho$. This is a classic finding in portfolio optimization going back to [19].

6. Appendix

The following is a reformulation of [29, Theorem 9.2].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be convex and assume that*

$$N := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f^\infty(x, 0) \leq 0\}$$

is linear. Then

$$p(u) := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x, u, \omega)$$

is a convex lsc function and

$$p^\infty(u) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f^\infty(x, u).$$

Moreover, $\operatorname{argmin} f(\cdot, u) \cap N^\perp \neq \emptyset$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Proof. Since N is a convex cone, the linearity condition means that

$$f^\infty(x, u) \leq 0, f^\infty(-x, -u) > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad A(x, u) \neq 0,$$

where $A(x, u) = u$. Thus, by [29, Theorem 9.2], p is a lsc convex function, the formula for p^∞ is valid and the infimum in the definition of p is attained. That the infimum is attained by $x \in N^\perp$ follows from [29, Corollary 8.6.1] $\square$

The following was used in the proof of Theorem 3.2 and some of its corollaries in Section 5.

Theorem 6.2. *Let f be a convex normal integrand on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \Omega$ and assume that the set-valued mapping*

$$N(\omega) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f^\infty(x, 0, \omega) \leq 0\}$$

is linear-valued. Then

$$p(u, \omega) := \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(x, u, \omega)$$

is a normal integrand on $\mathbb{R}^m \times \Omega$ and

$$p^\infty(u, \omega) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f^\infty(x, u, \omega).$$

Moreover, given a $u \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{F})$, there is an $x \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{F})$ with $x(\omega) \perp N(\omega)$ and

$$p(u(\omega), \omega) = f(x(\omega), u(\omega), \omega).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.1, the linearity condition implies for every $\omega \in \Omega$, that the set

$$S(\omega) := N(\omega)^\perp \cap \operatorname{argmin}_x f(x, u, \omega)$$

is nonempty and that $p(\cdot, \omega)$ is a lower semicontinuous convex function with

$$p^\infty(u, \omega) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} f^\infty(x, u, \omega).$$

Following [33, Proposition 14.47], the lower semicontinuity implies that p is a normal integrand. By [33, Exercise 14.54, Proposition 14.33, Proposition 14.11, Theorem 14.37], the set S is measurable so, by [33, Corollary 14.6], it admits a measurable selection x . $\square$

The three lemmas below extend classical properties of expectations and conditional expectations to general, possibly nonintegrable random variables.

Lemma 6.3. *Given extended real-valued random variables ξ_1 and ξ_2 , we have*

$$E[\xi_1 + \xi_2] = E[\xi_1] + E[\xi_2]$$

under any of the following:

- (1) $\xi_1^+, \xi_2^+ \in L^1$ or $\xi_1^-, \xi_2^- \in L^1$.
- (2) $\xi_1 \in L^1$ or $\xi_2 \in L^1$,
- (3) ξ_1 or ξ_2 is $\{0, +\infty\}$ -valued.

Proof. If both ξ_1 and ξ_2 are positive, the equation holds by the monotone convergence theorem. Assume now that $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L^1$ and let $\xi = \xi_1 + \xi_2$. Then we have $\xi_+ - \xi_- = \xi_1^+ - \xi_1^- + \xi_2^+ - \xi_2^-$, so $\xi^+ + \xi_1^- + \xi_2^- = \xi^- + \xi_1^+ + \xi_2^+$ and

$$E\xi^+ + E\xi_1^- + E\xi_2^- = E\xi^- + E\xi_1^+ + E\xi_2^+.$$

Rearranging gives the equality. In general,

$$\begin{aligned} (\xi_1 + \xi_2)^+ &\leq \xi_1^+ + \xi_2^+, & (\xi_1 + \xi_2)^- &\leq \xi_1^- + \xi_2^-, \\ \xi_i^+ &\leq (\xi_i + \xi_j)^+ + \xi_j^-, & \xi_i^- &\leq (\xi_i + \xi_j)^- + \xi_j^+. \end{aligned}$$

If $\xi_1^+, \xi_2^+ \in L^1$, the first inequality implies $(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^+ \in L^1$. If $\xi_i^- \notin L^1$, the last inequality gives $(\xi_i + \xi_j)^- \notin L^1$ so the equation holds. The sufficiency of $\xi_1^-, \xi_2^- \in L^1$ follows by an analogous argument. Assume now $\xi_1 \in L^1$. If $\xi_2^+ \in L^1$, the equation holds by (1) while if $\xi_2^+ \notin L^1$, the second inequality gives $(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^+ \notin L^1$, so the equation holds again. Claim (3) is clear. $\square$

Lemma 6.4. *Let ξ_1 and ξ_2 be extended real-valued random variables.*

- (1) *If ξ_1 and ξ_2 are quasi-integrable and satisfy any of the conditions in Lemma 6.3, then $\xi_1 + \xi_2$ is quasi-integrable and*

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1 + \xi_2] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1] + E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_2].$$

- (2) *If ξ_2 and $(\xi_1 \xi_2)$ are quasi-integrable, and ξ_1 is $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable, then*

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1 \xi_2] = \xi_1 E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_2].$$

Proof. Let $\alpha \in L_+^{\infty}(\mathcal{G})$. In (1), Lemma 6.3 gives

$$E[\alpha(\xi_1 + \xi_2)] = E[\alpha\xi_1] + E[\alpha\xi_2] = E[\alpha E^{\mathcal{G}}\xi_1] + E[\alpha E^{\mathcal{G}}\xi_2] = E[\alpha(E^{\mathcal{G}}\xi_1 + E^{\mathcal{G}}\xi_2)].$$

To prove (2), note first that the claim is clear if ξ_1 is bounded and either nonpositive or nonnegative. Let ξ_1^{ν} be the projection of ξ_1 to the $\mathbb{B}_{\nu}$. Since $\xi_1 \xi_2$ is quasi-integrable, (1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2] &= E^{\mathcal{G}}[1_{\{\xi_1^{\nu} \geq 0\}} \xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2] + E^{\mathcal{G}}[1_{\{\xi_1^{\nu} < 0\}} \xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2] \\ &= 1_{\{\xi_1^{\nu} \geq 0\}} \xi_1^{\nu} E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_2] + 1_{\{\xi_1^{\nu} < 0\}} \xi_1^{\nu} E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_2] \\ &= \xi_1^{\nu} E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_2]. \end{aligned}$$

The last term converges almost surely to $\xi_1 E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_2]$. On the other hand, by (1),

$$E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[(\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2)^+ - (\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2)^-] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[(\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2)^+] + E^{\mathcal{G}}[-(\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2)^-].$$

Since both terms on the right are monotone in ν and one of them is bounded,

$$\lim E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2] = \lim E^{\mathcal{G}}[(\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2)^+] + \lim E^{\mathcal{G}}[-(\xi_1^{\nu} \xi_2)^-].$$

By conditional monotone convergence (see, e.g., [34, Theorem II.7.2]),

$$\lim E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1 \xi_2] = E^{\mathcal{G}}[(\xi_1 \xi_2)^+] + E^{\mathcal{G}}[-(\xi_1 \xi_2)^-],$$

where, by (1), the right side equals $E^{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_1 \xi_2]$. $\square$

Lemma 6.5. *Assume that ξ is quasi-integrable and that $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$. Then*

$$E^{\mathcal{G}'} \xi = E^{\mathcal{G}'}[E^{\mathcal{G}} \xi] \quad \text{and} \quad E \xi = E[E^{\mathcal{G}} \xi].$$

Proof. The first claim follows directly from the definition. As to the second, apply Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.3 to $\xi = \xi^+ - \xi^-$. $\square$

The following is essentially [17, Proposition 6.6 and Corollary 6.7]

Lemma 6.6. *Given σ -algebras $\mathcal{G}'$, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{G}'$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are $\mathcal{H}$ -conditionally independent,
- (2) $E^{\mathcal{H}}[w'w] = E^{\mathcal{H}}[w']E^{\mathcal{H}}[w]$ for every $w' \in L^1(\mathcal{G}')$ and $w \in L^\infty(\mathcal{G})$,
- (3) $E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}}[w'] = E^{\mathcal{H}}[w']$ for every $w' \in L^1(\mathcal{G}')$.

In this case, if $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are independent, so too are $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$.

Proof. The first implies the second by the monotone class theorem.

When (2) holds, we have, for any $w' \in L^1(\mathcal{G}')$, $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and $B \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$E[E^{\mathcal{H}}[w']1_{A \cap B}] = E[E^{\mathcal{H}}[w'1_A]1_B] = E[w'1_A1_B] = E[E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}}[w']1_{A \cap B}],$$

and, by the monotone class theorem, this extends from sets of the form $A \cap B$ to any set in $\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}$. Thus (2) implies (3). Assuming (3), we have, for $A' \in \mathcal{G}'$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_A 1_{A'}] &= E^{\mathcal{H}}[E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}}[1_A 1_{A'}]] = E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_A E^{\mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{H}} 1_{A'}] \\ &= E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_A E^{\mathcal{H}} 1_{A'}] = E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_A] E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_{A'}], \end{aligned}$$

so (1) holds.

Assume now in addition that $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are independent. Given any $A' \in \mathcal{G}'$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E[1_{A'} 1_A] &= E[E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_{A'} 1_A]] = E[E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_{A'}] E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_A]] \\ &= E[E^{\mathcal{H}}[1_{A'}] E[1_A]] = E[1_{A'}] E[1_A], \end{aligned}$$

which implies the independence of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}'$. $\square$

References

- [1] E. M. L. Beale: *On minimizing a convex function subject to linear inequalities*, J. Royal Stat. Soc. Ser. B 17 (1955) 173–184; discussion, *ibid.* (1955) 194–203.
- [2] R. Bellman: *Dynamic Programming*, Reprint of the 1957 ed., Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton (2010).
- [3] D. P. Bertsekas: *Dynamic Programming and Stochastic Control*, Mathematics in Science and Engineering Vol. 125, Academic Press, New York (1976).
- [4] D. P. Bertsekas: *Reinforcement Learning and Optimal Control*, Athena Scientific Optimization and Computation Series, Athena Scientific, Nashua (2019).
- [5] D. P. Bertsekas, S. E. Shreve: *Stochastic Optimal Control*, Mathematics in Science and Engineering Vol. 139, Academic Press, New York (1978).
- [6] S. Biagini, T. Pennanen, A.-P. Perkkiö: *Duality and optimality conditions in stochastic optimization and mathematical finance*, J. Convex Analysis 25/2 (2018) 403–420.
- [7] J.-M. Bismut: *Intégrales convexes et probabilités*, J. Math. Analysis Appl. 42 (1973) 639–673.
- [8] P. Carpentier, J.-P. Chancelier, G. Cohen, M. De Lara: *Stochastic Multi-Stage Optimization*, Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling Vol. 75, Springer, Cham (2015).
- [9] C. Choirat, C. Hess, R. Seri: *A functional version of the Birkhoff ergodic theorem for a normal integrand: A variational approach*, Ann Probability 31/1 (2003) 63–92.
- [10] G. B. Dantzig: *Linear programming under uncertainty*, Management Sci. 1 (1955) 197–206.
- [11] E. B. Dynkin: *Probabilistic concave dynamic programming*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 87/129 (1972) 490–503.
- [12] E. B. Dynkin, I. V. Evstigneev: *Regular conditional expectation of correspondences*, Teor. Ver. Primen. 21/2 (1976) 334–347.
- [13] I. V. Evstigneev: *Measurable selection and dynamic programming*, Math. Oper. Res. 1/3 (1976) 267–272.
- [14] W. H. Fleming, R. W. Rishel: *Deterministic and Stochastic Optimal Control*, Applications of Mathematics Vol. 1, Springer, Berlin (1975).
- [15] F. Hiai, H. Umegaki: *Integrals, conditional expectations, and martingales of multi-valued functions*, J. Multivar. Analysis 7/1 (1977) 149–182.
- [16] J. Jacod, A. N. Shiryaev: *Local martingales and the fundamental asset pricing theorems in the discrete-time case*, Finance Stochastics 2/3 (1998) 259–273.
- [17] O. Kallenberg: *Foundations of Modern Probability*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York (2002).
- [18] D. Kramkov, W. Schachermayer: *The condition on the asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets*, Ann Appl. Probab. 9/3 (1999) 904–950.
- [19] R. C. Merton: *Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: The continuous-time case*, Rev. Econ. Stat. 3 (1969) 373–413.
- [20] P. Olsen: *When is a multistage stochastic programming problem well-defined?*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 14/3 (1976) 518–527.

- [21] T. Pennanen, A.-P. Perkkiö: *Stochastic programs without duality gaps*, Math. Programming 136/1 (2012) 91–110.
- [22] T. Pennanen, A.-P. Perkkiö: *Convex duality in optimal investment and contingent claim valuation in illiquid markets*, Finance Stochastics 22/4 (2018) 733–771.
- [23] T. Pennanen, A.-P. Perkkiö: *Duality in convex stochastic optimization*, arxiv: 2205.02045 (2022).
- [24] T. Pennanen, A.-P. Perkkiö: *Optimal stopping without Snell envelopes*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (2023).
- [25] T. Pennanen, A.-P. Perkkiö, M. Rásonyi: *Existence of solutions in non-convex dynamic programming and optimal investment*, Math. Financial Econ. 11/2 (2017) 173–188.
- [26] A.-P. Perkkiö: *Stochastic programs without duality gaps for objectives without a lower bound*, manuscript (2016).
- [27] G. Peskir, A. Shiryaev: *Optimal Stopping and Free-Boundary Problems*, Lectures in Mathematics at the ETH Zürich, Birkhäuser, Basel (2006).
- [28] M. Rásonyi, L. Stettner: *On utility maximization in discrete-time financial market models*, Ann. Appl. Probab. 15/2 (2005) 1367–1395.
- [29] R. T. Rockafellar: *Convex Analysis*, Princeton Mathematical Series Vol. 28, Princeton University Press, Princeton (1970).
- [30] R. T. Rockafellar, R. J.-B. Wets: *Nonanticipativity and L^1 -martingales in stochastic optimization problems*, Math. Programming Studies 6 (1976) 170–187.
- [31] R. T. Rockafellar, R. J.-B. Wets: *The optimal recourse problem in discrete time: L^1 -multipliers for inequality constraints*, SIAM J. Control Optimization 16/1 (1978) 16–36.
- [32] R. T. Rockafellar, R. J.-B. Wets: *Deterministic and stochastic optimization problems of Bolza type in discrete time*, Stochastics 10/3-4 (1983) 273–312.
- [33] R. T. Rockafellar, R. J.-B. Wets: *Variational analysis*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften Vol. 317, Springer, Berlin (1998).
- [34] A. N. Shiryaev: *Probability*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics Vol. 95, Springer, New York (1996).
- [35] L. Thibault: *Espérances conditionnelles d'intégrandes semi-continues*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Sect. B (N.S.) 17/4 (1981) 337–350.
- [36] A. Truffert: *Conditional expectation of integrands and random sets*, Ann. Oper. Res. 30/1-4 (1991) 117–156.
- [37] R. J.-B. Wets: *Programming under uncertainty: The complete problem*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete 4 (1965/66) 316–339.
- [38] R. J.-B. Wets: *Programming under uncertainty: The equivalent convex program*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. 14 (1966) 89–105.