

# Jensen's Inequality for $g$ -Convex Function under $g$ -Expectation

Guangyan JIA\* and Shige PENG†

School of Mathematics and System Sciences  
Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, 250100, P.R.China

October 26, 2018

**Abstract.** A real valued function defined on  $\mathbb{R}$  is called  $g$ -convex if it satisfies the following “generalized Jensen’s inequality” under a given  $g$ -expectation, i.e.,  $h(\mathbb{E}^g[X]) \leq \mathbb{E}^g[h(X)]$ , for all random variables  $X$  such that both sides of the inequality are meaningful. In this paper we will give a necessary and sufficient conditions for a  $C^2$ -function being  $g$ -convex. We also studied some more general situations. We also studied  $g$ -concave and  $g$ -affine functions.

## 1 Introduction

Jensen’s inequality plays an important role in probability theory. It claims that for any given convex function  $h$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}$  we have

$$h(E[X]) \leq E[h(X)]$$

for each random variable  $X$  such that  $E[X]$  and  $E[h(X)]$  are meaningful. Here  $E[\cdot]$  stands for the expectation related to a probability  $P$ . It is worth to mention that its converse is also true: If the above inequality holds true for all random variables  $X$  such that both  $E[X]$  and  $E[h(X)]$  are meaningful, then  $h$  is a convex function.

In 1997 Peng [P1997] (see also [P1995]) introduced the notion of  $g$ -expectation  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$  defined via a backward stochastic differential equation of which the generator is a given function  $g = g(t, y, z)_{(t,y,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d}$ . A  $g$ -expectation preserves most properties of the classical expectations except that it is a nonlinear functional. Its nonlinearity is characterized by its generator  $g$ . It becomes a typical example of nonlinear expectations under which the time-consistency holds true

---

\*The author thanks the partial support from The National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program) grant No. 2007CB814901 (Financial Risk). email address: jia-gy@sdu.edu.cn

†The author thanks the partial support from The National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program) grant No. 2007CB814900 (Financial Risk). email address: peng@sdu.edu.cn

thus a theory of nonlinear martingales can be developed. It is also a useful tool to the nonlinear dynamic pricing as well as dynamic risk measures in finance.

A very interesting problem is whether, for a  $g$ -expectation, the following generalized Jensen's inequality is true:

$$h(\mathbb{E}^g[X]) \leq \mathbb{E}^g[h(X)],$$

for each  $X$  s.t.  $\mathbb{E}^g[X]$  and  $\mathbb{E}^g[h(X)]$  are meaningful.

This problem was initiated in [BCHMP, CHMP2000] in which a counterexample was given to show that the above generalized Jensen's inequality fails for a very simple convex functions  $h$ . A sufficient condition for a special situation was also provided. Chen, Kulperger and Jiang [CKJ, 2003] have obtained a very interesting result: provided  $g$  does not depend on  $y$ , the above generalized Jensen's inequality holds true for each convex function  $h$  if and only if  $g$  is a super-homogeneous function, i.e.,  $g(t, \lambda z) \geq \lambda g(t, z)$ ,  $dP \times dt - a.s.$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . This result was improved by [Hu, 2005] showing that, in fact,  $g$  must be independent of  $y$ .

In this paper we study this problem with a different point of view: For each fixed function  $g$ , to give an explicit characterization to  $h$  satisfying the above generalized Jensen's inequality. We have obtained the following result: For a  $C^2$ -function  $h$  the above generalized Jensen inequality holds if and only if  $h$  satisfies:

$$\frac{1}{2}h''(y)|z|^2 + g(t, h(y), h'(y)z) - h'(y)g(t, y, z) \geq 0, \quad dP \times dt - a.s., \quad \forall (y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The previously mentioned result of classical Jensen's inequality just corresponds a special case where  $g \equiv 0$ . The above mentioned results in [CKJ] and [Hu] can be also obtained from our new result. For the case where  $h$  is only a continuous function we have also obtained a similar result by using the notion of the well-known viscosity solution in partial differential equations.

It is natural to call a  $h$  satisfying the above inequality to be a  $g$ -convex function. In general, a continuous function  $h$  satisfying the generalized Jensen's inequality is called a  $g$ -convex function. In this paper we will study this type of functions. We also investigate the related  $g$ -concave as well as  $g$ -affine functions. A deep relation of  $g$ -convexity and backward stochastic viability property introduced by Buckdahn, Quincampoix and Rascanu in [BQR] is also disclosed.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some facts about  $g$ -expectation and BSDEs. The notion of  $g$ -convexity as well as the necessary and sufficient condition for a  $g$ -convex  $C^2$ -function will be given in Section 3. We establish the necessary and sufficient condition for a continuous  $g$ -convex function in Section 4. An equivalence between  $g$ -convexity and backward stochastic viability property is given in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6 we study functional operations preserving  $g$ -convexity and apply the results obtained in foregoing sections to prove some properties of  $g$ -expectations.

## 2 Some Facts about $g$ -Expectations

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  be a given probability space and let  $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion in this space. The natural filtration generated by  $W$  will be denoted by  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ .

Let  $T > 0$  be a fixed real number. For any  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , we denote by  $L^p(\mathcal{F}_t)$ , the space of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random variables satisfying  $E[|X|^p] < \infty$ , for  $p \geq 1$ . For a positive integer  $n$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we denote by  $|z|$  the Euclidean norm of  $z$ . We will denote by  $L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$ , the space of all progressively measurable  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued processes such that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |\psi_t|^2 dt \right] < \infty$ ; and by  $\mathcal{S}^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$  the elements in  $L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$  with continuous paths such that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\psi_t|^2 \right] < \infty$ . And we denote by  $\mathcal{D}^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T)$  the set of all RCLL (right continuous with left limit) processes  $\phi$  in  $L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R})$  such that  $E[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\phi_t|^2] < \infty$ .

Let us consider a function  $g$ , which will be in the sequel the generator of the backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE), defined on  $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ , with values in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , such that the process  $(g(t, y, z))_{t \in [0, T]}$  is progressively measurable for each  $(y, z)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ . Through out this paper the function  $g$  will satisfy the following conditions..

$$\begin{cases} (a) & \text{There exists a constant } \mu > 0, \text{ for each } (y, z), (\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}, \\ & |g(t, y, z) - g(t, \bar{y}, \bar{z})| \leq \mu(|y - \bar{y}| + |z - \bar{z}|); \\ (b) & (g(t, 0, 0))_{t \in [0, T]} \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m). \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

It is by now well known (see Pardoux and Peng [PP]) that under the assumptions (2.1), for any random variable  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ , the BSDE

$$Y_t = X + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.2)$$

has a unique adapted solution  $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m \times d})$ . In the sequel we denote equation (2.2) by  $(g, T, X)$ .

In this paper we mainly discuss the 1-dimensional BSDE, i.e.,  $m = 1$ . The following situations are typical:

$$\begin{cases} (a). & g(\cdot, 0, 0) \equiv 0, \\ (b). & g(\cdot, y, 0) \equiv 0, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Obviously (b) implies (a). The following notion of  $g$ -expectation was introduced by Peng [P1997].

**Definition 2.1** *Let  $m = 1$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{E}^g_{t, T}[X] := Y_t$ :*

$$\mathbb{E}^g_{t, T}[\cdot] : L^2(\mathcal{F}_T) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{F}_t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T < \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

$(\mathbb{E}^g_{t, T}[\cdot])_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is called  $g$ -expectation.

Applications of  $g$ -expectations in dynamic superpricing and dynamic risk measures can be found in [B-El, CE, CHMP, DE, EPQ, EQ, F-RG, P2004, P2004b, Rosazza, Yong].

**Remark 2.2** *The  $g$ -expectation originally introduced in [P1997] corresponds the case in which  $g$  satisfies (2.3)-b, that is, the situation of "zero interest rate" (see next section or [P2004]). Peng [P2004], [P2005] also introduced the notion of  $g$ -evaluation if  $g$  satisfies (2.3)-a, the situation of "self-financing". For the simplicity, we call them all  $g$ -expectation here whenever  $g$  satisfies (2.1).*

Also we have the following properties about  $g$ -expectation (see [P2004, Theorem 3.4]):

**Proposition 2.3** *Let the generator  $g$  satisfies (2.1) and (2.3)-a. Then the above defined  $g$ -expectation  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$  satisfies, for each  $t \leq T < \infty$ ,  $X, \bar{X} \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ ,*

$$(A1) \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X] \geq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[\bar{X}], \text{ a.s., if } X \geq \bar{X};$$

$$(A2) \mathbb{E}_{T,T}^g[X] = X;$$

$$(A3) \mathbb{E}_{s,t}^g[\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]] = \mathbb{E}_{s,T}^g[X], \text{ a.s., for } s \leq t;$$

$$(A4) 1_A \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X] = \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[1_A X], \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_t,$$

where  $1_A$  is the indicator function of  $A$ , i.e.  $1_A(\omega)$  equals 1 when  $\omega \in A$  and 0 otherwise.

If (2.3) does not hold, (A1)-(A3) still hold true. But (A4) is replaced by the following: for each  $X_1, \dots, X_N \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_t)$  and for each  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -partition  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^N$  of  $\Omega$  (i.e.  $A_i \in \mathcal{F}_t$ ,  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$  if  $i \neq j$  and  $\cup A_i = \Omega$ ), we have

$$(A4') \sum_{i=1}^N 1_{A_i} \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_i] = \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[\sum_{i=1}^N 1_{A_i} X_i].$$

**Lemma 2.4 (See [EPQ] or Proposition 2.2 in [BCHMP])** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and  $m = 1$ , and let  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ . Then the solution  $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  of BSDE (2.2) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[ \sup_{s \in [t, T]} (e^{\beta s} |Y_s|^2) + \int_t^T e^{\beta s} |Z_s|^2 ds | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ & \leq KE \left[ e^{\beta T} |X|^2 + \left( \int_t^T e^{(\beta/2)s} |g(s, 0, 0)| ds \right)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta = 2(\mu + \mu^2)$  and  $K$  is a positive constant only depending on  $\mu$ .

**Remark 2.5** *The above lemma implies that  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$  is continuous in  $L^2$ .*

The decomposition theorem of  $\mathbb{E}^g$ -supermartingale obtained in [P1999] (see also [P2004]) will play an important role in this paper.

**Proposition 2.6 (Decomposition theorem of  $\mathbb{E}^g$ -supermartingale)** *We assume that  $g$  satisfies (2.1) and  $m = 1$ . Let  $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{F}}^2(0, T)$  be a  $g$ -supermartingale, namely, for each  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{s,t}^g[Y_t] \leq Y_s.$$

Then there exists a unique  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted increasing and RCLL process  $A \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{F}}^2(0, T)$  (thus predictable) with  $A_0 = 0$ , such that,  $Y$  is the solution of the following BSDE:

$$Y_t = Y_T + (A_T - A_t) + \int_t^T g(t, Y_s, Z_s) - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

### 3 $g$ -Convexity for $C^2$ -functions

To begin with we give the notion of  $g$ -convexity.

**Definition 3.1** For a given  $g$ -expectation  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$ , a function  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $g$ -convex (resp.  $g$ -concave) if for each  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$  such that  $h(X) \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ , one has

$$h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]) \leq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)], \quad (\text{resp. } h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]) \geq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)]) \quad P\text{-a.s.}, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (\text{J})$$

$h$  is called  $g$ -affine if it is both  $g$ -convex and  $g$ -concave.

Clearly, for each  $g$  the function  $h(y) = y$  is  $g$ -affine. Throughout this paper, we only consider the case where  $h$  is continuous. In the case when  $h$  is a  $C^2$ -function, we have the following result. For notational convenience, we denote

$$\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z} \varphi := \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{yy}(y) |z|^2 + g(t, \varphi(y), \varphi_y(y)z) - \varphi_y(y)g(t, y, z), \quad \varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

**Theorem 3.2** Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and let  $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:

- (i)  $h$  is  $g$ -convex (resp.  $g$ -concave);
- (ii) For each  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z} h \geq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } \leq 0), \quad dP \times dt\text{-a.s.} \quad (3.1)$$

**Remark 3.3** If we assume furthermore  $g(t, y, 0) \equiv 0$  ((2.3)-b), then we can define

$$\mathbb{E}^g[X|\mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X].$$

Thus the Jensen's inequality becomes

$$\mathbb{E}^g[h(X)|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq h(\mathbb{E}^g[X|\mathcal{F}_t]).$$

In particular, when  $t = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}^g[X])$ .

Before the proof of Theorem 3.2, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4** Assume that  $g$  satisfies (2.1) and an  $C^2$ -function  $h$  satisfies (3.1). Then  $h$  is convex in the usual sense.

**Proof.** For each  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ , one has,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \frac{1}{2}h''(y_0)|z|^2 + g(t, h(y_0), h'(y_0)z) - h'(y_0)g(t, y_0, z) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}h''(y_0)|z|^2 + (g(t, h(y_0), h'(y_0)z) - g(t, 0, 0)) \\
&\quad + h'(y_0)(g(t, 0, 0) - g(t, y_0, z)) + g(t, 0, 0) - h'(y_0)(g(t, 0, 0)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}h''(y_0)|z|^2 + 2C_1|h'(y_0)||z| + C_1 + C_1|g(t, 0, 0)|
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1$  only depends on  $\mu$  and  $y_0$ . Thus

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{2}h''(y_0)|z|^2 T + 2C_2|h'(y_0)||z|T + C_2, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

where  $C_2$  only depends on  $C_1$  and  $M = E \left[ \int_0^T |g(t, 0, 0)|^2 dt \right]$ . Thus  $h''(y_0)$  must be non-negative. ■

**Lemma 3.5** *Let  $h \in C(\mathbb{R})$  be a convex function. If for each  $X \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$  we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]), \quad a.s., \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (3.2)$$

*then this relation also holds for each  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$  such that  $h(X) \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ .*

**Proof.** We need to consider two cases: (a)  $h$  is a monotone function; (b) there exists a  $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $h(y) \geq h(\bar{y})$ . For case (a), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h((-n) \vee X \wedge m)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[(-n) \vee X \wedge m]), \quad a.s. \quad m, n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Since, for each fixed  $n$ , the sequence  $\{h((-n) \vee X \wedge m)\}_{m=1}^\infty$  (resp.  $\{(-n) \vee X \wedge m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ ) monotonically converges to  $h((-n) \vee X)$  (resp.  $(-n) \vee X$ ) in  $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . We then can pass limit on the both sides of the above inequality and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h((-n) \vee X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[(-n) \vee X]), \quad a.s. \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Similarly, when  $n \uparrow \infty$ , the sequence  $\{h((-n) \vee X)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  (resp.  $\{(-n) \vee X\}_{n=1}^\infty$ ) monotonically converges to  $h(X)$  (resp.  $X$ ) in  $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ . Thus we can pass limit on the both sides of the above inequality and obtain (3.2). For case (b), we observe that then  $h$  increases on  $[\bar{y}, \infty)$  and decreases on  $(-\infty, \bar{y}]$  thus, as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $h((-m + \bar{y}) \vee X \wedge (m + \bar{y}))$  increasingly converges to  $h(X)$  in  $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ . We then pass limit on both sides of

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h((-m + \bar{y}) \vee X \wedge (m + \bar{y}))] &\geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[(-m + \bar{y}) \vee X \wedge (m + \bar{y})]), \\
a.s. \quad m &= 1, 2, \dots
\end{aligned}$$

and thus obtain (3.2). ■

**Proof of Theorem 3.2.** (ii)  $\implies$  (i): We first consider the case where  $X$  is bounded. The corresponding solution  $Y$  of  $(g, T, X)$  is also bounded since  $X$  and  $g(\cdot, 0, 0)$  are bounded. We now apply Itô's formula to  $h(Y_t)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} -dh(Y_t) &= \left[-\frac{1}{2}h''(Y_t)|Z_t|^2 + h'(Y_t)g(t, Y_t, Z_t)\right]dt - h'(Y_t)Z_t dW_t \\ &= [g(t, h(Y_t), h'(Y_t)Z_t) + \psi_t]dt - h'(Y_t)Z_t dW_t, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\psi_t = -\frac{1}{2}h''(Y_t)|Z_t|^2 - g(t, h(Y_t), h'(Y_t)Z_t) + h'(Y_t)g(t, Y_t, Z_t).$$

From (3.1), it follows that  $\psi_t \leq 0$  and thus  $h(Y)$  is a  $g$ -subsolution. By comparison theorem of BSDE it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{i,T}^g[h(X)] = \mathbb{E}_{i,T}^g[h(Y_T)] \geq h(Y_t) = h(\mathbb{E}_{i,T}^g[X]), \quad a.s., \quad \forall X \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T).$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 3.4  $h$  is convex. This with Lemma 3.5 yields (i).

(i)  $\implies$  (ii): We only give a proof for the situation where  $g(\cdot, y, z)$  is a continuous process on  $[0, T]$ . For each fixed  $(t, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , we consider the following SDE

$$-dY_s^{t,y,z} = 1_{[t,T]}(s)[g(s, Y_s^{t,y,z}, z)ds - z dW_s], \quad Y_0 = y.$$

We apply Itô's formula on  $[t, T]$ :

$$-dh(Y_s^{t,y,z}) = \left[-\frac{1}{2}h''(Y_s^{t,y,z})|z|^2 + h'(Y_s^{t,y,z})g(s, Y_s^{t,y,z}, z)\right]ds - h'(Y_s^{t,y,z})z dW_s$$

For a large number  $m > 0$ , let  $\tau_m = \inf\{s \geq t : |Y_s^{t,y,z} - y| = m\}$ . It is that  $Y^{t,y,z}$  is bounded on  $[t, \tau_m]$ . By (i),

$$\mathbb{E}_{r \wedge \tau_m, s \wedge \tau_m}^g[h(Y_{s \wedge \tau_m}^{t,y,z})] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{r \wedge \tau_m, s \wedge \tau_m}^g[Y_{s \wedge \tau_m}^{t,y,z}]) = h(Y_{r \wedge \tau_m}^{t,y,z}), \quad P\text{-}a.s., \quad \forall r \in [t, \tau_m].$$

That is,  $h(Y_s^{t,y,z})$  is a  $g$ -submartingale on  $[t, \tau_m]$ . By the decomposition theorem of  $g$ -submartingale (Proposition 2.6), it follows that there exist an increasing process  $(A_s)_{s \geq t}$  such that

$$h(Y_{s \wedge \tau_m}^{t,y,z}) = h(y) - \int_t^{s \wedge \tau_m} g(r, h(Y_r^{t,y,z}), Z_r) dr + A_{s \wedge \tau_m} + \int_t^{s \wedge \tau_m} Z_r dW_r.$$

This with

$$\begin{aligned} h(Y_{s \wedge \tau_m}^{t,y,z}) &= h(y) - \int_t^{s \wedge \tau_m} \left[\frac{1}{2}h''(Y_r^{t,y,z})|z|^2 - h'(Y_r^{t,y,z})g(r, Y_r^{t,y,z}, z)\right]dr \\ &\quad + \int_t^{s \wedge \tau_m} h'(Y_r^{t,y,z})z dW_r \end{aligned}$$

yields  $Z_s \equiv h'(Y_s^{t,y,z})z$  and

$$-\frac{1}{2}h''(Y_s^{t,y,z})|z|^2 + h'(Y_s^{t,y,z})g(s, Y_s^{t,y,z}, z) \leq g(s, h(Y_s^{t,y,z}), h'(Y_s^{t,y,z})z)$$

on  $[t, \tau_m]$ . Since  $g(\cdot, y, z)$  is a continuous process (otherwise a technique in the proof of Theorem 8.1 in [P2005b] is needed), as  $s = t$ , we can obtain (3.1). The proof is complete. ■

**Example 3.6** For the case  $g = \langle \xi_t, z \rangle$ , the  $g$ -expectation corresponds to the classical linear expectation (Girsanov transformation). Theorem 3.2, becomes the classical results:  $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$  is  $g$ -convex if and only if  $h''(y) \geq 0$ .

**Remark 3.7** A  $g$ -concave function is concave in the usual sense. Its proof is similar to that of Corollary 5.6.

From Theorem 3.2 we can also derive the following result of [CKJ] and its improved version [Hu].

**Proposition 3.8** Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1). Then the following two statements are equivalent:

(i) For each convex function  $h$ , and each  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$  such that  $h(X) \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]), \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T;$$

(ii)  $g$  is independent of  $y$ , and is super-homogeneous in  $z$ , i.e., for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $g(t, \lambda z) \geq \lambda g(t, z)$ .

**Proof.** (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): In the case when  $h \in C^2$ , this can be proved by (3.1). For general situation we can apply the same technique in the proof of (3.1) (see [CKJ]).

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): For each given  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , take  $h(x) = ax + b$ . Obviously it is a convex function and in  $C^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Thus the inequality (3.1) yields  $g(t, ay + b, az) - ag(t, y, z) \geq 0$ ,  $dP \times dt$ -a.s. Since  $a, b$  can be chosen arbitrarily,  $g$  must be independent of  $y$  and super-homogeneous in  $z$ . ■

**Corollary 3.9** Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and be independent of  $z$ , and  $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Then the following two statements equivalent:

(i)  $h$  is  $g$ -convex;

(ii)  $h$  is convex ( $h''(y) \geq 0$  for each  $y$ ) and satisfies

$$\forall y, \quad g(t, h(y)) - h'(y)g(t, y) \geq 0, \quad dP \times dt\text{-a.s.}$$

**Corollary 3.10** Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and be independent of  $y$ , and let  $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$  be  $g$ -convex. Moreover if there exist a set  $\Gamma \in \Omega \times [0, T]$  with positive measure, in which  $g(t, 0) > 0$  (resp.  $g(t, 0) < 0$ ), then  $h'(y) \leq 1$  (resp.  $h'(y) \geq 1$ ).

A simple and fundamentally important result in stochastic analysis is that, for each martingale  $X$  and for each convex function  $h$  such that  $h(X) \in L^1$ , the process  $h(X)$  is a submartingale. For  $g$ -expectation, we have:



**Theorem 3.11** *If  $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $g$ -martingale, and  $h$  is a  $g$ -convex function (resp.  $g$ -concave function,  $g$ -affine function), then  $(h(Y_t))_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $g$ -submartingale (resp.  $g$ -supermartingale,  $g$ -martingale) provided  $h(Y_t) \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_t)$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $Y_t$  be a  $g$ -martingale and  $h$  a  $g$ -convex function, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{s,t}[h(Y_t)|\mathcal{F}_s] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{s,t}[Y_t|\mathcal{F}_s]) = h(Y_s),$$

for any  $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ , as required. The proofs of other cases are similar. ■

Moreover its inverse also holds, namely,

**Theorem 3.12** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1). If for each  $g$ -martingale  $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ ,  $(h(Y_t))_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $g$ -submartingale (resp.  $g$ -submartingale,  $g$ -martingale), then  $h$  is a  $g$ -convex (resp.  $g$ -concave,  $g$ -affine) function.*

**Proof.** We only prove the case of  $g$ -submartingale. Since, for each  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ ,  $(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X])_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $g$ -martingale. Define  $\bar{Y}_t = h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X])_{t \in [0, T]}$ , we have, for  $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{s,T}^g[h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X])] = \mathbb{E}_{s,t}^g[h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X])] = \mathbb{E}_{s,t}^g[\bar{Y}_t] \geq \bar{Y}_s = h(\mathbb{E}_{s,T}^g[X])$$

In particular, as  $t = T$ , it follows that  $\mathbb{E}_{s,T}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{s,T}^g[X])$  for  $s \in [0, T]$ . Thus  $h$  is a  $g$ -convex function. ■

## 4 $g$ -Convexity for Continuous Functions

In this section we consider  $g$ -convex functions  $h \in C(\mathbb{R})$ , i.e., without the  $C^2$ -assumption.

We now recall the definition of viscosity subsolutions.

**Definition 4.1** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and independent of  $\omega$ . A continuous function  $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called a viscosity subsolution of  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z}u = 0$  if, for any  $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $u - \varphi$  attains local maximum at  $x$ , one has for each  $(t, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_g^{t,x,z}\varphi = \frac{1}{2}\varphi''(x)|z|^2 + g(t, u(x), \varphi'(x)z) - \varphi'(x)g(t, x, z) \geq 0$$

**Theorem 4.2** *Let  $h \in C(\mathbb{R})$  be of polynomial growth. Moreover let us assume that  $g$  satisfies (2.1) and is independent of  $\omega$ . The the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $h$  is a viscosity subsolution of  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z}h = 0$ ;
- (ii)  $h$  is  $g$ -convex.

**Remark 4.3** *For more basic definitions, results and related literature on viscosity solutions of PDE, we refer to Crandall, Ishii and Lions [CIL].*

For proving this theorem, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.4** *If  $g$  satisfies (2.1) and  $h$  is a continuous viscosity subsolution of  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z}h = 0$  for each  $(t, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , then  $h$  is convex in the usual sense.*

**Proof.** If on the contrary  $h$  is not convex, then there are constants  $-\infty < a < b < \infty$  such that the relation  $\psi \geq h$  fails on  $[a, b]$ , where

$$\psi(x) := \frac{h(b)(x-a)}{b-a} + \frac{h(a)(b-x)}{b-a}.$$

We set  $h_\delta(x) := \psi(x) - \delta(x-a)(x-b)$  and

$$\delta_0 = \inf\{\delta > 0 : h_\delta(x) \geq h(x), \quad \forall x \in [a, b]\}.$$

It is easy to check that  $\delta_0 > 0$ ,  $h_{\delta_0} \geq h$  on  $[a, b]$  and there exists  $\bar{x} \in (a, b)$  such that  $h_{\delta_0}(\bar{x}) = h(\bar{x})$ . But since for each  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $h$  is a viscosity subsolution of  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,z}h = 0$ , and  $h_{\delta_0} - h$  attains minimum at  $\bar{x}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathcal{L}_g^{t,z}h_{\delta_0}(\bar{x}) = -\delta_0|z|^2 + g(t, [\frac{h(b)-h(a)}{b-a} - \delta_0(2\bar{x}-b+a)]z) \\ &\quad + [\frac{h(b)-h(a)}{b-a} - \delta_0(2\bar{x}-b+a)]g(t, z). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $g$  is Lipschitz in  $z$ , there exists a positive constant  $C$  independent of  $z$ , such that

$$-\delta_0|z|^2 + C_1|z| + C_2 \geq 0, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This contradicts to  $\delta_0 > 0$ . Thus  $h$  must be convex. ■

Combining this Lemma with Theorem 4.2 we immediately have a more explicit characterization for a continuous  $g$ -convex function:

**Corollary 4.5** *We assume the same conditions as in the above theorem. Then the following condition is equivalent:*

- (i)  $h$  is convex and for each  $y$  such that  $h''(y)$  exists,  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z}h(y) \geq 0$ ;
- (ii)  $h$  is  $g$ -convex.

**Proof.** If  $h$  is a viscosity subsolution of  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z}h = 0$  then  $h$  is convex. On the other hand, by Alvarez, Lasry and Lions [ALL], if  $h$  is convex and for each  $y$  such that  $h''(y)$  exists, one has  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z}h(y) \geq 0$ , then  $h$  is a viscosity subsolution of  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z}h = 0$ . ■

**The proof of Theorem 4.2(i)  $\implies$  (ii).** Given  $(t, x, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , we consider the following SDE

$$dX_s^{t,x;z} = -g(s, X_s^{t,x;z}, z)ds + zdW_s, \quad s \in (t, T], \quad X_s^{t,x;z} = x, \quad s \in [0, t].$$

It is clear that  $X^{t,x;z}$  is also a  $g$ -martingale on  $[0, T]$ : In particular  $\mathbb{E}_{s,T}^g[X_T^{t,x;z}] = X_s^{t,x;z}$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_T^{t,x;z}] = \mathbb{E}^g[X_T^{t,x;z}] = x$ . On the other hand, by nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula, the function  $u(t, x) := \mathbb{E}^g[h(X_T^{t,x;z})]$  defined on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$  is the viscosity solution of the parabolic PDE

$$\partial_t u + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} u(t, x) |z|^2 - \partial_x u g(t, x, z) + g(t, u, z \partial_x u) = 0, \quad u|_{t=T} = h(x).$$

But the function defined by  $v(t, x) := h(x)$  is a viscosity subsolution of  $\partial_t v + \mathcal{L}_g^{t, z} v = 0$  with terminal condition  $v|_{t=T} = h$ . It follows from the maximum principle of viscosity solution that

$$u(t, x) \geq h(x), \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Or

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^g[h(X_T^{t, x; z})|\mathcal{F}_t] &= \mathbb{E}_{t, T}^g[h(X_T^{t, x; z})] \\ &\geq h(x) = h(\mathbb{E}^g[X_T^{t, x; z}]) = h(\mathbb{E}_{t, T}^g[X_T^{t, x; z}|\mathcal{F}_t]). \end{aligned}$$

We now apply a technique initialed in [P1995, pp.107, Theorem 4.6; Peng1995: Xiangfan Summer School]: Let  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be an  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable partition of  $\Omega$ ; and  $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  be given. We set  $\eta = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} z_i$ ,  $\zeta = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} x_i$ . It is easy to check that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} X_s^{t, x_i; z_i} = X_T^{t, \zeta; \eta}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \mathbb{E}^g[h(X_T^{t, x_i; z_i})|\mathcal{F}_t] &= \mathbb{E}^g[\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} h(X_T^{t, x_i; z_i})|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^g[h(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} X_T^{t, x_i; z_i})|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^g[h(X_T^{t, \zeta; \eta})|\mathcal{F}_t] \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^g[h(X_T^{t, \zeta; \eta})|\mathcal{F}_t] &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \mathbb{E}^g[h(X_T^{t, x_i; z_i})|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \mathbb{E}^g[h(X_T^{t, x_i; z_i})|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} h(\mathbb{E}^g[X_T^{t, x_i; z_i}|\mathcal{F}_t]) = h(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \mathbb{E}^g[X_T^{t, x_i; z_i}|\mathcal{F}_t]) \\ &= h(\mathbb{E}^g[X_T^{t, \zeta; \eta}|\mathcal{F}_t]) = h(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{t, T}^g[h(X_T^{t, \zeta; \eta})] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} \mathbb{E}_{t, T}^g[h(X_T^{t, x_i; z_i})] \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{A_i} h(x_i) = h(\zeta),$$

In other words, for bounded  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable simple functions  $\zeta, \eta$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{t, T}^g[h(\zeta - \int_t^T g(s, X_s^{t, \zeta; \eta}, \eta) ds + \int_t^T \eta dW_s)] \geq h(\zeta) \quad (4.1)$$

It follows that for any bounded  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random variables  $\zeta, \eta$ , we also have (4.1). Moreover, for any bounded  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process  $\eta$  and bounded  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random variables  $\zeta$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{t, T}^g[h(\zeta - \int_t^T g(s, X_s^{t, \zeta; \eta}, \eta_s) ds + \int_t^T \eta_s dW_s)] \geq h(\zeta) \quad (4.2)$$

Indeed we note that  $\zeta - \int_t^T g(s, X_s^{t,\zeta;\eta}, \eta_s) ds + \int_t^T \eta_s dW_s \in L^{2m+1}(\mathcal{F}_T)$ , this with the polynomial growth of  $h$  and the continuity of  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$  yields (4.2).

Now for any given bounded  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable  $X$ , let  $(Y_s, Z_s)_{s \in [0, T]}$  be the solution of the BSDE

$$Y_t = X + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s$$

Let  $h$  be a function with polynomial growth  $|h(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^m)$ . We note that  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t(\omega)| \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$  and,

$$E\left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{2m+1}{2}}\right] < \infty.$$

We can find a sequence of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable simple functions  $\{\zeta^i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  that converges to  $Y_t$  in  $L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t)$  and a sequence of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -progressively measurable simple processes  $\{(\eta_s^i)_{t \in [0, T]}\}_{i=1}^\infty$  such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} E\left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_s - \eta_s^i|^2 ds\right)^{\frac{2m+1}{2}}\right] = 0.$$

It follows from BDG-inequality that the random variables

$$X^i := \zeta^i - \int_t^T g(s, X_s^{t,\zeta^i;\eta^i}, \eta_s^i) ds + \int_t^T \eta_s^i dW_s$$

converges in  $L^{2m+1}(\mathcal{F}_T)$  to  $X$ . Thus  $h(X^i)$  converges to  $h(X)$  in  $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ . Thus

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)] = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X^i)] \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} h(\zeta^i) = h(Y_t) = h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]).$$

Thus (ii) holds for the case where  $X \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$ . This with the fact that  $h$  is convex and Lemma 3.5 it follows that (ii) holds for all  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$  such that  $h(X) \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ . The proof is complete. ■

**The proof of Theorem 4.2(ii)  $\implies$  (i).** We will apply a technique in [P1995, pp.126]. For a fixed  $t, x, z$ , let  $\varphi$  be a smooth and polynomial growth function such that  $\varphi \geq h$  and  $h(x) = \varphi(x)$ . We consider

$$X_s^{t,x;z} = x - \int_s^t g(r, X_r^{t,x;z}, z) dr + z(W_s - W_t), \quad s \in [t, t + \delta].$$

where  $\delta$  is a small positive number such that  $t + \delta \leq T$ . It is clear that  $X^{t,x;z}$  is a  $g$ -martingale. Since  $h$  is  $g$ -convex, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,t+\delta}^g[\varphi(X_{t+\delta}^{t,x;z})] \geq \mathbb{E}_{t,t+\delta}^g[h(X_{t+\delta}^{t,x;z})] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,t+\delta}^g[X_{t+\delta}^{t,x;z}]) = h(x) = \varphi(x).$$

Or

$$Y_t - \varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}_{t,t+\delta}^g[\varphi(X_{t+\delta}^{t,x;z})] - \varphi(x) \geq 0$$

where  $(Y, Z)$  solve the BSDE

$$\begin{cases} -dY_s &= g(s, Y_s, Z_s)ds - Z_s dW_s, \quad s \in [t, t + \delta], \\ Y_{t+\delta} &= \varphi(X_{t+\delta}^{t,x;z}). \end{cases}$$

We consider

$$Y_s^1 := Y_s - \varphi(X_s^{t,x;z}), \quad Z_s^1 := Z_s - \varphi_x(X_s^{t,x;z})z$$

which is the solution of the BSDE

$$\begin{cases} -dY_s^1 &= [g(s, Y_s^1 + \varphi(X_s^{t,x;z}), Z_s^1 + \varphi_x(X_s^{t,x;z})z) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^s \varphi(X_s^{t,x;z})]ds - Z_s^1 dW_s, \\ Y_{t+\delta}^1 &= 0. \end{cases}$$

where  $s \in [t, t + \delta]$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^s \varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{xx}(x)|z|^2 - \varphi_x(x)g(s, x, z)$ . We can prove that  $E[|Y_t^1 - Y_t^2|] = o(\delta)$ , where  $(Y^2, Z^2)$  solves

$$\begin{cases} -dY_s^2 &= [g(s, Y_s^2 + \varphi(x), Z_s^2 + \varphi_x(x)z) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^s \varphi(x)]ds - Z_s^2 dW_s, \quad s \in [t, t + \delta], \\ Y_{t+\delta}^2 &= 0. \end{cases}$$

But It is easy to check that  $Z^2 \equiv 0$  and

$$\begin{cases} -dY_s^2 &= [g(s, Y_s^2 + \varphi(x), \varphi_x(x)z) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^s \varphi(x)]ds, \\ Y_{t+\delta}^2 &= 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus from the Lipschitz continuity of  $g(s, \cdot, z)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t - \varphi(x) &= Y_t^1 = Y_t^2 + o(\delta) \\ &= \int_t^{t+\delta} [g(s, Y_s^2 + \varphi(x), \varphi_x(x)z) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^s \varphi(x)]ds + o(\delta) \\ &= \int_t^{t+\delta} [g(s, \varphi(x), \varphi_x(x)z) + \bar{\mathcal{L}}^s \varphi(x)]ds + o(\delta) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

From which it follows that  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^t \varphi(x) + g(t, \varphi(x), \varphi_x(x)z) = \mathcal{L}_g^{t,x,z} \varphi(x) \geq 0$ . Thus  $h$  is a viscosity subsolution of  $\mathcal{L}_g^{t,y,z} u = 0$ . ■

## 5 $g$ -Convexity and Viability

Surprisingly to us, the notion of  $g$ -convexity has a deep relation with the notion of viability for BSDE introduced and systematically studied by Buckdahn, Quincampoix and Rascanu in [BQR]. We recall the notion and a result about the backward stochastic viability property.

**Definition 5.1 (Definition 3 in [BQR])** *Let  $K$  be a nonempty closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ .*

(a) A stochastic process  $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is viable in  $K$  if and only if

$$Y_t \in K, \quad P\text{-a.s.}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

(b) The closed set  $K$  enjoys the backward stochastic viability property, denoted  $g$ -**BSVP**, for (2.2) if and only if:

$\forall \tau \in [0, T], \forall X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$  such that  $X \in K$   $P$ -a.s., there exists a solution  $(Y, Z)$  to BSDE (2.2) over the time interval  $[0, \tau]$ ,

$$Y_s = X + \int_s^\tau g(r, Y_r, Z_r) dr - \int_s^\tau Z_r dW_r, \quad s \in [0, \tau]$$

such that  $(Y_s)_{s \in [0, \tau]}$  is viable in  $K$ .

**Lemma 5.2 (Theorem 2.4 in [BQR])** Suppose that  $g$  satisfies condition (2.1). Let  $K$  be a nonempty closed set. If  $K$  enjoys  $g$ -BSVP for (2.2), then  $K$  is convex.

**Remark 5.3** In the above lemma, the authors in [BQR] assume that  $g$  also satisfies the following conditions:  $g(\omega, \cdot, y, z)$  is continuous, as a part of whole assumptions. But in their proof, we can see that this condition is needless to this lemma, condition (2.1) is enough.

**Theorem 5.4** Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function. Moreover assume that

$$\bar{g}(t, y^1, y^2, z^1, z^2) = \begin{pmatrix} g(t, y^1, z^1) \\ g(t, y^2, z^2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i).  $h$  is  $g$ -convex;
- (ii).  $\mathbf{epi}(h)$  enjoys  $\bar{g}$ -BSVP where

$$\mathbf{epi}(h) = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2; h(x_1) \leq x_2\}.$$

**Proof.** (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii): It is obvious that  $\mathbf{epi}(h)$  is a closed set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Given any  $X = (X_1, X_2)^T \in \mathbf{epi}(h)$   $P$ -a.s. such that  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T, \mathbb{R}^2)$ . By the definition of  $\mathbf{epi}$ , we have

$$h(X_1) \leq X_2, \quad P - a.s.,$$

which implies by the comparison theorem of BSDE and the  $g$ -convexity of  $h$  that

$$h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_1]) \leq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X_1)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_2], \quad P - a.s.$$

Thus

$$(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_1], \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_2]) \in \mathbf{epi}(h), \quad P - a.s. \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.1)$$

It is clear that  $\bar{g}$  satisfies (2.1). Moreover  $(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_1], \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_2])_{t \in [0, T]}$  is the unique solution of the following equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} Y_t^1 \\ Y_t^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \end{pmatrix} + \int_t^T \begin{pmatrix} g(s, Y_s^1, Z_s^1) \\ g(s, Y_s^2, Z_s^2) \end{pmatrix} ds - \int_t^T \begin{pmatrix} Z_s^1 \\ Z_s^2 \end{pmatrix} dW_s.$$

Then (5.1) implies that  $\mathbf{epi}(h)$  enjoys  $\bar{g}$ -BSVP, as required.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Assume that  $\mathbf{epi}(h)$  enjoys  $\bar{g}$ -BSVP, i.e., for any  $X = (X_1, X_2)^T \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T; \mathbb{R}^2)$  such that  $X \in \mathbf{epi}(h)$ , we have

$$(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_1], \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_2]) \in \mathbf{epi}(h), \quad P - a.s., \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and by the definition of  $\mathbf{epi}(h)$ ,

$$h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_1]) \leq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_2], \quad P - a.s., \quad t \in [0, T].$$

For any given  $X_1$  such that  $X_1 \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ , putting  $X_2 = h(X_1)$  yields

$$h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_1]) \leq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X_2] = \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X_1)],$$

as required.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 5.5** *In the proof of Theorem 5.4, we note that we do not need condition (b) of (2.1),  $(g(t, 0, 0))_{t \in [0, T]} \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T)$  is enough.*

**Corollary 5.6** *If a continuous functions  $h$  is  $g$ -convex, then  $h$  is convex.*

**Proof.** It is clear that  $\mathbf{epi}(h)$  enjoys  $\bar{g}$ -BSVP. By Theorem 2.4 in [BQR],  $\mathbf{epi}(h)$  is a convex set, which implies that  $h$  is a convex function.  $\blacksquare$

Clearly, a  $g$ -affine function must be affine in the usual sense. Then we have

**Theorem 5.7** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1). Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *A function  $h$  is  $g$ -affine;*
- (ii)  *$h$  has the form:  $h(y) = ay + b$  for some  $(a, b) \in \Pi_g^a$  where*

$$\Pi_g^a := \{(a, b); g(t, ay + b, az) = ag(t, y, z), \quad dP \times dt - a.s.\}$$

## 6 More Properties of $g$ -Convexity

### 6.1 Functional operations preserving $g$ -convexity

It is natural to build up new  $g$ -convex functions from simpler ones, via operations preserving  $g$ -convexity, or even yielding it.

**Proposition 6.1** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1),  $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R})$ . If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a nonempty subset of  $g$ -convex functions dominated by  $\varphi$ , then the function*

$$f(y) = \sup \{h(y) : h \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

*is  $g$ -convex.*

**Proof.** It is clear that  $f$  is convex. For any given  $h \in \mathcal{D}$ , Jensen's inequality for  $g$ -expectation holds, thus for any  $X \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]).$$

From the definition of  $f$  and comparison theorem of BSDEs, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[f(X)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]).$$

This with the arbitrariness of  $h$  and Lemma 3.5 yields what is required. ■

Clearly, the function  $f$  in Theorem 6.1 may be only continuous instead of in  $C^2$  and if  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are  $g$ -convex, then so is  $h(y) = h_1(y) \vee h_2(y)$ . In addition, for the case of  $g$ -concavity, we also have the same result, in which the "sup" is replaced by "inf".

The following result is also easy:

**Proposition 6.2** *Let  $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $g$  satisfy (2.1). If there exists at least one  $g$ -convex function that dominates  $\varphi$ , then  $\varphi$  is  $g$ -convex if and only if it is represented as the supremum of all  $g$ -convex  $C^2$ -functions that dominate  $\varphi$ .*

Motivated by Proposition 6.1 and the discussions about abstract convexity in [PR] or [Singer], we can find  $g$ -convex functions by another way.

For given  $g$ , we define

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_g^v = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : g(t, ay + b, az) \geq ag(t, y, z), \forall y, z, dP \times dt\text{-a.s.}\}$$

It is clear that that  $\mathbf{\Pi}_g^v$  cannot be empty, at least it contains a element  $(1, 0)$ , and if  $g = \langle \xi_t, z \rangle$  where  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued progressively measurable process,  $\mathbf{\Pi}_g^v = \mathbb{R}^2$ . For each  $(a, b) \in \mathbf{\Pi}_g^v$ ,  $h(y) = ay + b$  is an affine  $g$ -convex function.

**Proposition 6.3** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and  $\phi \in C(\mathbb{R})$ . Then*

$$f(y) = \sup \{h(y) = ay + b : \forall (a, b) \in \mathbf{\Pi}_g^v \text{ such that } h \leq \phi\}.$$

*is  $g$ -convex.*

**Proof.** The proof is similar to that of Proposition 6.1. ■

**Remark 6.4** *From the above theorem, it follows that for each  $(a, b) \in \mathbf{\Pi}_g^v$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[aX + b] \geq a\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X] + b.$$

*But we cannot change the sign " $\geq$ " to " $=$ " in general although  $h(y) = ay + b$  is an affine function, because  $h$  here may be not a  $g$ -affine function.*

The following property is easy to be proved:



**Proposition 6.5** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and let  $h$  and  $\psi$  be two continuous functions. Then*

- (i) *If  $\psi$  is  $g$ -affine and  $h$  is  $g$ -convex, then  $h \circ \psi$  is  $g$ -convex.*
- (ii) *If  $h$  is  $g$ -convex and increasing, and  $\psi$  is  $g$ -convex, then  $h \circ \psi$  is  $g$ -convex.*

We also have the following stability property for  $g$ -convex functions.

**Theorem 6.6** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and the  $g$ -convex (resp. concave) functions  $h_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  converge pointwise for  $k \rightarrow \infty$  to  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $h$  is  $g$ -convex (resp. concave) and, for each compact set  $S \in \mathbb{R}$ , the convergence of  $h_k$  to  $h$  is uniform on  $S$ .*

**Proof.** Convexity of  $h$  is trivial since  $h_k$  is convex. And for each compact set  $S \in \mathbb{R}$ , the convergence of  $h_k$  to  $h$  is uniform on  $S$  (See [HL, pp. 177, Theorem 3.1.5]).

We now prove that  $h$  is  $g$ -convex. Given bounded  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable  $X$ , we assume  $|X| \leq M$ . The uniform convergence means that there exists a function  $\delta_M(k)$  with  $\delta_M(k) \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  such that for each  $x \in B[0, M]$  we have

$$|h_k(x) - h(x)| \leq \delta_M(k).$$

This implies that  $h_k(X) \rightarrow h(X)$  in  $L^2$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore by the continuity of  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]), \quad P - a.s. \text{ for } t \in [0, T].$$

This with Lemma 3.5 it follows that for each  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$  such  $h(X) \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(X)] \geq h(\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X]), \quad P - a.s. \text{ for } t \in [0, T].$$

Thus  $h$  is  $g$ -convex. ■

## 6.2 Some interesting properties of $g$ -convexity

As mentioned before, for given  $g$ , the set of all  $g$ -convex functions is a subset of that of convex functions. From Corollary 5.6 and Hu's result in [Hu] (see also Corollary 3.8) it follows that if  $g$  is not super-homogeneous, then this inclusion is strict.

Unlike the classical situation, in general  $h$  is  $g$ -convex does not implies that  $-h$  is  $g$ -concave. Let us consider the following example.

**Example 6.7** *Let  $g = |z|$ , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *A function  $h$  is  $g$ -convex;*
- (ii)  *$h$  is convex ( $h''(y) \geq 0$  a.e.).*

*Moreover the following statements are also equivalent:*

- (iii) *A function  $h$  is  $g$ -concave;*
- (iv)  *$h$  is concave ( $h''(y) \leq 0$  a.e.) and nondecreasing ( $h'(y) \geq 0$  a.e.).*

The following property implies that a convex function may not be a  $g$ -convex one.

**Example 6.8** *In the case when  $g = ay$  where  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[c] = ce^{a(T-t)}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(c)] = h(c)e^{a(T-t)}$ . If  $h$  is  $g$ -convex then*

$$h(c)e^{a(T-t)} = \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[h(c)] \geq h(ce^{a(T-t)}).$$

*From this relation it is easy to find a convex  $h$  which is not  $g$ -convex.*

We consider the following self-financing condition:

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[0] \equiv 0, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

**Corollary 6.9** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1). Then the following three statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$  satisfies the self-financing condition;
- (ii)  $g$  satisfies (2.3)-a;
- (iii) The constant function  $h \equiv 0$  is  $g$ -affine.

**Proof.** The proof of the equivalence between (i) and (ii) can be found in [P2006b, Proposition 3.7]. The equivalence between (ii) and (iii) follows from Theorem 5.7 immediately. ■

The "zero interest rate" condition means:

$$\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[\eta] = \eta, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad \eta \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_t).$$

**Corollary 6.10** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1). Then the following three statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}^g[\cdot]$  satisfies the zero interest rate condition;
- (ii)  $g$  satisfies (2.3)-b;
- (iii) For each constant  $c$ , the functions  $h(y) = c$  and  $y$  are  $g$ -affine.

**Proposition 6.11** *Let  $g$  satisfy (2.1) and  $c$  be a constant, then the following statements are equivalent*

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X + c] = (\text{resp. } \geq, \leq) \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X] + c$ , for each  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ ;
- (ii)  $g(t, y + c, z) = (\text{resp. } \geq, \leq) g(t, y, z)$  for each  $y \in \mathbb{R}, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Remark 6.12** *(ii) means that  $g$  is a periodic function in  $y$  with period  $c$ .*

**Proof.** It is clear that the function  $h(y) = y + c$  is  $g$ -affine (resp.  $g$ -convex,  $g$ -concave). ■

**Corollary 6.13** *The following statements are equivalent*

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X + c] = \mathbb{E}_{t,T}^g[X] + c$ , for each  $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (ii)  $g$  is independent of  $y$ .
- (iii)  $h(y) = y + c$  is  $g$ -affine,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

This result is a generalization of Lemma 3.2 in [P2004]. In addition, it is clear that if, for each  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h + c$  is  $g$ -convex implies  $h$  is  $g$ -convex, then  $g$  must be independent of  $y$ .

## References

- [ALL] Alvarez, O., Lasry, J.-M. and Lions, P.-L., (1997) Convex viscosity solutions and state constraints, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 76, pp. 265-288.
- [BCHMP] Briand, P., Coquet, F., Hu, Y., Mémin, J. and Peng, S., (2000) A converse comparison theorem for BSDEs and related properties of  $g$ -expectation, *Electron. Comm. Probab.* 5, pp.101-117.
- [B-El] Barrieu, P. and El Karoui, N., (2005) Pricing, hedging and optimally designing derivatives via minimization of risk measures, Preprint, To appear in Volume on Indifference Pricing (ed: Rene Carmona), Princeton University Press.
- [BQR] Buckdahn, R., Quincampoix, M. and Rascanu, A., (2000) Viability property for a backward stochastic differential equations and applications to partial differential equations, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 116, pp.485-504.
- [CE] Chen, Z. and Epstein, L., (2002) Ambiguity, risk and asset returns in continuous time. *Econometrica* 70, 1403–1443.
- [CKJ] Chen, Z., Kulperger, R. and Jiang, L., (2003) Jensen’s inequality for  $g$ -expectation: part 1, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 333, pp.725-730.
- [CHMP] Coquet, F., Hu, Y., Mémin, J. and Peng, S., (2002) Filtration consistent nonlinear expectations and related  $g$ -expectations, *Probab. Theory and Related Fields* 123, pp. 1-27.
- [CIL] Crandall, M. G., Ishii, H. and Lions, P.L., Users’ guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 27:1–67, 1992.
- [DE] Duffie, D. and Epstein, L., (1992) Stochastic differential utility, *Econometrica* 60(2), pp. 353-394.
- [EPQ] El Karoui, N., Peng, S. and Quenez, M.C., (1997) Backward stochastic differential equations in finance, *Math. Finance* 7 (1), 1-71.
- [EQ] El Karoui, N. and Quenez, M.C., (1997) Nonlinear pricing theory and backward stochastic differential equations, Biais, B. (ed.) et al., Financial mathematics. Lectures given at the 3rd session of the Centro Internazionale Matematico Estivo (CIME), held in Bressanone, Italy, July 8-13, 1996. Berlin: Springer. Lect. Notes Math. 1656, 191-246.
- [F-RG] Frittelli, M. and Rossazza Gianin, E. (2004) Dynamic convex risk measures, Szegő (ed.) Risk Measures for the 21st Century, Wiley-Finance, 227–247.

- [HL] Hiriart-Urruty, J.-B. and Lemaréchal, C., (1991) *Convex Analysis and Minimization Algorithms I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, London.
- [Hu] Hu, Y., (2005) On Jensen's inequality for  $g$ -expectation and for non-linear expectation, *Archiv der Mathematik*, 85, 572-580, 2005.
- [PR] Pallaschke, D. and Rolewicz, S., (1997) *Foundations of Mathematical Optimization*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- [PP] Pardoux, E. and Peng, S., (1990) Adapted Solution of a Backward Stochastic Differential Equation, *System and Control Letters*, 14, 55-61.
- [P1995] Peng, S., (1997) BSDE and Stochastic Optimizations, Topics in Stochastic Analysis, Lecture Notes of 1995 Summer School in Math. Yan, J., Peng, S., Fang, S., Wu, L.M. Ch.2, (Chinese vers.), Science Press, Beijing.
- [P1997] Peng, S., (1997) BSDE and related  $g$ -expectation, in *Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, no. 364, "Backward Stochastic Differential Equations"*, Ed. by N. El Karoui and L. Mazliak, 141-159.
- [P1999] Peng, S., (1999) Monotonic limit theorem of BSDE and nonlinear decomposition theorem of Doob-Meyer's type, *Prob. Theory Rel. Fields* **113**(4) 473-499.
- [P2004] Peng, S., (2004) Nonlinear expectation, nonlinear evaluations and risk measures, in K. Back T. R. Bielecki, C. Hipp, S. Peng, W. Schachermayer, *Stochastic Methods in Finance Lectures*, 143-217, LNM 1856, Springer-Verlag.
- [P2004b] Peng, S., (2004) Filtration Consistent Nonlinear Expectations and Evaluations of Contingent Claims, *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica*, English Series **20**(2), 1-24.
- [P2005] Peng, S., (2005) Nonlinear expectations and nonlinear Markov chains, *Chin. Ann. Math.* **26B**(2) ,159-184.
- [P2005a] Peng, S., (2004) Dynamical evaluations, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser.I* **339** 585-589.
- [P2006a] Peng, S., (2006)  $G$ -Expectation,  $G$ -Brownian Motion and Related Stochastic Calculus of Itô's type, preprint (*pdf-file available in arXiv:math.PR/0601035v1 3Jan 2006*), to appear in *Proceedings of the 2005 Abel Symposium*.
- [P2005b] Peng, S., (2005), Dynamically consistent nonlinear evaluations and expectations, preprint (*pdf-file available in arXiv:math.PR/0501415 v1 24 Jan 2005*).

- [P2006b] Peng, S., (2006) Modelling Derivatives Pricing Mechanisms with Their Generating Functions, preprint (*pdf-file available in arXiv:math.PR/0605599v1 23 May 2006*).
- [Rosazza] Rosazza-Gianin, E. G., (2004) Risk measures via  $g$ -expectations, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **36**(1) 19–34.
- [Singer] Singer, I., (1997) Abstract Convex Analysis, Wiley-Interscience Publication, New York.
- [Yong] Yong, J., (1999) European-type contingent claims in an incomplete market with constrained wealth and portfolio, *Mathematical Finance* **9**(4) 387–412.