

Stratonovich representation of semimartingale rank processes

Robert Fernholz¹

September 18, 2018

Abstract

Suppose that X_1, \dots, X_n are continuous semimartingales that are reversible and have nondegenerate crossings. Then the corresponding rank processes can be represented by generalized Stratonovich integrals, and this representation can be used to decompose the relative log-return of portfolios generated by functions of ranked market weights.

Introduction

For $n \geq 2$, consider a family of continuous semimartingales X_1, \dots, X_n defined on $[0, T]$ under the usual filtration \mathcal{F}_t^X , with quadratic variation processes $\langle X_i \rangle$. Let $r_t(i)$ be the rank of $X_i(t)$, with $r_t(i) < r_t(j)$ if $X_i(t) > X_j(t)$ or if $X_i(t) = X_j(t)$ and $i < j$. The corresponding *rank processes* $X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}$ are defined by $X_{(r_t(i))}(t) = X_i(t)$. We shall show that if the X_i are *reversible* and have *nondegenerate crossings*, then the rank processes can be represented by

$$dX_{(k)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t)=X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (1)$$

where $\circ d$ is the generalized Stratonovich integral developed by Russo and Vallois (2007).

An *Atlas model* is a family of positive continuous semimartingales X_1, \dots, X_n defined as an Itô integral on $[0, T]$ by

$$d \log X_i(t) = (-g + ng \mathbb{1}_{\{r_t(i)=n\}}) dt + \sigma dW_i(t), \quad (2)$$

where g and σ are positive constants and (W_1, \dots, W_n) is a Brownian motion (see Fernholz (2002)). Here the X_i represent the capitalizations of the companies in a stock market, and $d \log X_i$ represents the log-return of the i th stock. We shall show the representation (1) is valid for the Atlas rank processes $\log X_{(k)}$.

In Fernholz (2016) it was shown that in a stock market with stocks represented by positive continuous semimartingales, under certain conditions the log-return of a portfolio can be decomposed into a *structural process* and a *trading process*, and for a portfolio generated by a C^2 function of the market weight processes, these components correspond to the log-change in the generating function and the drift process (see Fernholz (2001)). The Stratonovich representation (1) allows us to extend this decomposition to portfolios generated by C^2 functions of the ranked market weight processes in Atlas models.

Itô integrals and Stratonovich integrals

Let X and Y be continuous semimartingales on $[0, T]$ with the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^{X,Y}$. Then the *Fisk-Stratonovich integral* is defined by

$$\int_0^t Y(s) \circ dX(s) \triangleq \int_0^t Y(s) dX(s) + \frac{1}{2} \langle Y, X \rangle_t, \quad (3)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, where the integral on the right hand side is the Itô integral and $\langle X, Y \rangle_t$ is the cross variation of X and Y over $[0, t]$ (see Karatzas and Shreve (1991)). The Fisk-Stratonovich integral is defined only for semimartingales, but in some cases can be extended to more general integrands. Following Russo and Vallois (2007), Definition 1, for a continuous semimartingale X and a locally integrable process Y , both defined on $[0, T]$, we define the *forward integral*, *backward integral*, and *covariation process* by

$$\int_0^t Y(s) d^- X(s) \triangleq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_0^t Y(s) \frac{X(s+\varepsilon) - X(s)}{\varepsilon} ds \quad (4)$$

¹INTECH, One Palmer Square, Princeton, NJ 08542. bob@bobfernholz.com. The author thanks Ioannis Karatzas and Mykhaylo Shkolnikov for their invaluable comments and suggestions regarding this research.

$$\int_0^t Y(s) d^+ X(s) \triangleq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_0^t Y(s) \frac{X(s) - X(s - \varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} ds \quad (5)$$

$$[X, Y]_t \triangleq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_0^t \frac{(X(s + \varepsilon) - X(s))(Y(s + \varepsilon) - Y(s))}{\varepsilon} ds, \quad (6)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, where the limits are uniform in probability on $[0, T]$. We shall use the convention of Russo and Vallois (2007) that for the evaluation of these limits a continuous function X defined on $[0, T]$ is implicitly extended to \mathbb{R} by setting $X(t) = X(0)$ for $t < 0$ and $X(t) = X(T)$ for $t > T$. Then, by Russo and Vallois (2007), Definition 10, the *Stratonovich integral* is given by

$$\int_0^t Y(s) \circ dX(s) \triangleq \int_0^t Y(s) dX(s) + \frac{1}{2}[Y, X]_t, \quad (7)$$

where the integral on the right hand side is the Itô integral. If both X and Y are continuous semimartingales, then

$$\langle X, Y \rangle_t = [X, Y]_t, \quad \text{a.s.},$$

and the Stratonovich integral is equivalent to the Fisk-Stratonovich integral.

For a continuous semimartingale X and C^2 function F defined on the range of X , Itô's rule establishes that

$$F(X(t)) - F(X(0)) = \int_0^t F'(X(s)) dX(s) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t F''(X(s)) d\langle X \rangle_s, \quad \text{a.s.},$$

and with the Fisk-Stratonovich integral, this becomes

$$F(X(t)) - F(X(0)) = \int_0^t F'(X(s)) \circ dX(s), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (8)$$

as in ordinary calculus (see Karatzas and Shreve (1991)). The relationship (8) can be extended to a wider class of functions in some cases. For example, for an absolutely continuous function F and Brownian motion W , it was shown in Föllmer et al. (1995), Corollary 4.2, that (8) holds, so for the absolute-value function we have

$$|W(t)| = \int_0^t \text{sgn}(W(s)) \circ dW(s), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (9)$$

where $\text{sgn}(x) \triangleq \mathbb{1}_{\{x > 0\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq 0\}}$. The Russo and Vallois (2007) results allow us to extend this relationship to a class of continuous semimartingales.

Definition 1. Let X be a continuous semimartingale defined on $[0, T]$ under the filtration \mathcal{F}_t^X . Then X is *reversible* if the time-reversed process \widehat{X} defined by $\widehat{X}(t) = X(T - t)$ is also a continuous semimartingale on $[0, T]$ under the time-reversed filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^{\widehat{X}}$.

Definition 2. The continuous semimartingales X_1, \dots, X_n have *nondegenerate crossings* if for any $i \neq j$ the set $\{t : X_i(t) = X_j(t)\}$ almost surely has measure zero with respect to $d\langle X_k \rangle_t$, for $1 \leq k \leq n$.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that the continuous semimartingales X_1, \dots, X_n have nondegenerate crossings. Then the same is true for the rank processes $X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}$.*

Proof. Let $p_t \in \Sigma_n$ be the inverse permutation to the rank function r_t . If $X_{(k)}(t) = X_{(\ell)}(t)$ for $k \neq \ell$, then $X_i(t) = X_j(t)$ for $i = p_t(k) \neq p_t(\ell) = j$, so

$$\bigcup_{i \neq j} \{t : X_i(t) = X_j(t)\} = \bigcup_{k \neq \ell} \{t : X_{(k)}(t) = X_{(\ell)}(t)\}. \quad (10)$$

From Banner and Ghomrasni (2008) we have the representation

$$dX_{(k)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t)=X_{(k)}(t)\}} dX_i(t) + \text{finite variation terms, a.s.,}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n$, so $d\langle X_{(k)} \rangle_t \ll d\langle X_1 \rangle_t + \dots + d\langle X_n \rangle_t$, for $k = 1, \dots, n$. In the same manner we can show that $d\langle X_i \rangle_t \ll d\langle X_{(1)} \rangle_t + \dots + d\langle X_{(n)} \rangle_t$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, so sets of the form $\{t : X_i(t) = X_j(t)\}$, for $i \neq j$, or $\{t : X_{(k)}(t) = X_{(\ell)}(t)\}$, for $k \neq \ell$, will almost surely have measure zero with respect to $d\langle X_i \rangle_t$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and with respect to $d\langle X_{(k)} \rangle_t$, for $k = 1, \dots, n$, and the same holds for finite unions of such sets, as in (10). \square

Lemma 2. *Let X be a reversible continuous semimartingale defined on $[0, T]$, and suppose that the set $\{t : X(t) = 0\}$ almost surely has measure zero with respect to $d\langle X \rangle_t$. Then*

$$|X(t)| - |X(0)| = \int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) \circ dX(s), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (11)$$

Proof. References in this proof denoted by R&V are from Russo and Vallois (2007).

The Tanaka-Meyer formula states that for the Itô integral

$$\int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) dX(s) = |X(t)| - |X(0)| + 2\Lambda_X(t), \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad (12)$$

where Λ_X is the local time at zero for X (see Karatzas and Shreve (1991)). From R&V, Proposition 1,

$$\int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) \circ dX(s) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) d^- X(s) + \int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) d^+ X(s) \right), \quad (13)$$

with the forward and backward integrals defined by (4) and (5). Since $\text{sgn}(X)$ is continuous outside the set $\{t : X(t) = 0\}$, and this set almost surely has measure zero with respect to $d\langle X \rangle_t$, R&V Proposition 6 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) d^- X(s) &= \int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) dX(s) \\ &= |X(t)| - |X(0)| + 2\Lambda_X(t), \quad \text{a.s.,} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

by equation (12).

By R&V, Proposition 1,

$$\int_0^t \text{sgn}(X(s)) d^+ X(s) = - \int_{T-t}^T \text{sgn}(\widehat{X}(s)) d^- \widehat{X}(s), \quad (15)$$

where \widehat{X} is the time-reversed version of X . By hypothesis, \widehat{X} is a continuous semimartingale on $[0, T]$ with respect to the reverse filtration, so as in (14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T-t}^T \text{sgn}(\widehat{X}(s)) d^- \widehat{X}(s) &= |\widehat{X}(T)| - |\widehat{X}(T-t)| + 2(\Lambda_{\widehat{X}}(T) - \Lambda_{\widehat{X}}(T-t)) \\ &= |X(0)| - |X(t)| + 2\Lambda_X(t), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

If we combine (13), (14), (15), and (16), then (11) follows. \square

Lemma 3. *Let X and Y be reversible continuous semimartingales defined on $[0, T]$ under a common filtration and suppose that they have nondegenerate crossings. Then*

$$|X(t) - Y(t)| - |X(0) - Y(0)| = \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) \circ dX(s) - \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) \circ dY(s), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (17)$$

Proof. References in this proof denoted by R&V are from Russo and Vallois (2007).

Since $X - Y$ is a reversible continuous semimartingale, it follows from Lemma 2 that

$$|X(t) - Y(t)| - |X(0) - Y(0)| = \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) \circ d(X(s) - Y(s)), \quad \text{a.s.},$$

so, due to linearity of the integral with respect to the differentials, it suffices to show that the integrals in (17) are defined. Let us first consider the integral with respect to dX .

By the definition of the Stratonovich integral in (7),

$$\int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) \circ dX(s) = \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) dX(s) + [\operatorname{sgn}(X - Y), X]_t, \quad (18)$$

if the terms on the right hand side are defined. The Itô integral in (18) is defined, so we need only consider the covariation term. From R&V Proposition 1,

$$[\operatorname{sgn}(X - Y), X]_t = \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) d^+ X(s) - \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) d^- X(s), \quad (19)$$

and will be defined if the two integrals are. Since $\operatorname{sgn}(X - Y)$ is continuous outside $\{t : X(t) = Y(t)\}$, which almost surely has measure zero with respect to $d\langle X \rangle_t$, R&V Proposition 6 implies that

$$\int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) d^- X(s) = \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) dX(s), \quad (20)$$

and since this Itô integral is defined, so is the forward integral. By R&V Proposition 1,

$$\int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X(s) - Y(s)) d^+ X(s) = - \int_{T-t}^T \operatorname{sgn}(\widehat{X}(s) - \widehat{Y}(s)) d^- \widehat{X}(s), \quad (21)$$

where \widehat{X} and \widehat{Y} are the time-reversed versions of X and Y on $[0, T]$. By hypothesis, the time-reversed process \widehat{X} is a continuous semimartingale, so as in (20) its forward integral is defined, and this defines the backward integral in (21). Hence, the covariation in (19) is defined, so both terms on the right hand side of (18) are defined, and this defines the Stratonovich integral with respect to dX in (17).

The same reasoning holds for the integral with respect to dY . □

A Stratonovich representation for rank processes

We would like to prove (1), and we shall start with a lemma that establishes this result for $n = 2$ and then apply the lemma to prove the general case with $n \geq 2$.

Lemma 4. *Let X_1 and X_2 be reversible continuous semimartingales defined on $[0, T]$ under a common filtration, and suppose that they have nondegenerate crossings. Then*

$$X_1(t) \vee X_2(t) - X_1(0) \vee X_2(0) = \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_1(s) \geq X_2(s)\}} \circ dX_1(s) + \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_1(s) < X_2(s)\}} \circ dX_2(s), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$X_1(t) \wedge X_2(t) - X_1(0) \wedge X_2(0) = \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_1(s) < X_2(s)\}} \circ dX_1(s) + \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_1(s) \geq X_2(s)\}} \circ dX_2(s), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (23)$$

Proof. For $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$X_1(t) \vee X_2(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(X_1(t) + X_2(t) + |X_2(t) - X_1(t)| \right), \quad \text{a.s.},$$

so by Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(t) \vee X_2(t) - X_1(0) \vee X_2(0) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(X_1(t) + X_2(t) - X_1(0) - X_2(0) + \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X_2(s) - X_1(s)) \circ dX_2(s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X_2(s) - X_1(s)) \circ dX_1(s) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \left(1 + \operatorname{sgn}(X_2(s) - X_1(s)) \right) \circ dX_2(s) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \left(1 - \operatorname{sgn}(X_2(s) - X_1(s)) \right) \circ dX_1(s) \\ &= \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_1(s) < X_2(s)\}} \circ dX_2(s) + \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_1(s) \geq X_2(s)\}} \circ dX_1(s), \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (22). Equation (23) follows from this and the fact that

$$X_1(t) \wedge X_2(t) = X_1(t) + X_2(t) - X_1(t) \vee X_2(t), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \square$$

Proposition 1. *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be continuous semimartingales defined on $[0, T]$ that are reversible and have nondegenerate crossings. Then the rank processes $X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(n)}$ satisfy*

$$dX_{(k)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (24)$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4 that (24) holds for $n = 2$, so let us assume that it holds for X_1, \dots, X_{n-1} , and prove that it then holds for X_1, \dots, X_n . Let $\tilde{X}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{(n-1)}$ be the ranked processes X_1, \dots, X_{n-1} , so by our inductive hypothesis we have

$$d\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = \tilde{X}_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (25)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n-1$. By Lemma 1, the processes $\tilde{X}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{(n-1)}$ have nondegenerate crossings as do X_1, \dots, X_n , so the same holds for $\tilde{X}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{(n-1)}, X_n$.

Now,

$$X_{(1)}(t) = \tilde{X}_{(1)}(t) \vee X_n(t), \quad \text{a.s.},$$

and we can apply Lemma 4, so by our inductive hypotheses,

$$\begin{aligned} dX_{(1)} &= \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(1)}(t) \geq X_n(t)\}} \circ d\tilde{X}_{(1)}(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(1)}(t) < X_n(t)\}} \circ dX_n(t) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(1)}(t) \geq X_n(t)\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = \tilde{X}_{(1)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{X_n(t) = X_{(1)}(t)\}} \circ dX_n(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = X_{(1)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{X_n(t) = X_{(1)}(t)\}} \circ dX_n(t) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t)=X_{(1)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For $2 \leq k \leq n-1$, we have

$$X_{(k)}(t) = \tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) \wedge (\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) \vee X_n(t)), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since

$$\{t : \tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) = (\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) \vee X_n(t))\} \subset \{t : \tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) = \tilde{X}_{(k)}(t)\} \cup \{t : \tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) = X_n(t)\}$$

and $d\langle \tilde{X}_{(k)} \vee X_n \rangle_t \ll d\langle \tilde{X}_{(k)} \rangle_t + d\langle X_n \rangle_t$, it follows that $\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}$ and $\tilde{X}_{(k)} \vee X_n$ have nondegenerate crossings. Hence, by Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned} dX_{(k)}(t) &= \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) < \tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) \vee X_n(t)\}} \circ d\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) \geq \tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) \vee X_n(t)\}} \circ d(\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) \vee X_n(t)) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) < X_n(t)\}} \circ d\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) \geq X_n(t)\}} (\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) \geq X_n(t)\}} \circ d\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) < X_n(t)\}} \circ dX_n(t)) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) < X_n(t)\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = \tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k)}(t) \geq X_n(t)\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = \tilde{X}_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_{(k-1)}(t) \geq X_n(t) > \tilde{X}_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_n(t) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{(k)}(t) < X_n(t)\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{(k)}(t) \geq X_n(t)\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{X_n(t) = X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_n(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t) + \mathbb{1}_{\{X_n(t) = X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_n(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t) = X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ dX_i(t), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $k = n$, we have

$$dX_{(n)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n dX_i(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} dX_{(k)}(t), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \square$$

Stratonovich representation for Atlas rank processes

We would like to apply Proposition 1 to the Atlas model (2). To do so we must show that the log-capitalization processes for an Atlas model are reversible and have nondegenerate crossings.

Proposition 2. *For the Atlas model (2), the processes $\log X_1, \dots, \log X_n$ are reversible and have nondegenerate crossings.*

Proof. Girsanov's theorem and the properties of multidimensional Brownian motion imply that the processes $\log X_i$ of (2) have nondegenerate crossings and that there are no *triple points*, i.e., for $i < j < k$, $\{t : \log X_i(t) = \log X_j(t) = \log X_k(t)\} = \emptyset$, a.s. (see Karatzas and Shreve (1991)). It remains to show that the $\log X_i$ are reversible.

Choose $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $t_0 \in [0, T]$, and suppose that $\log X_j(t_0) = \log X_{(k)}(t_0)$. If for all $i \neq j$ we have $\log X_i(t_0) \neq \log X_j(t_0)$, then there is a neighborhood U of t_0 in $[0, T]$ such that for $t \in U$, if $i \neq j$ then $\log X_i(t) \neq \log X_j(t)$. In this case, within U , the process $\log X_j$ is Brownian motion with drift, which is reversible. Now suppose that $\log X_i(t_0) = \log X_j(t_0)$ for some $i \neq j$. No-triple-points implies that there is a neighborhood U of t_0 such that for $t \in U$, if $\ell \neq i, j$ then $\log X_i(t) \neq \log X_\ell(t) \neq \log X_j(t)$. Hence, within U we can confine our attention to the two processes $\log X_i$ and $\log X_j$, in which case it was shown in Fernholz, Ichiba, Karatzas, and Prokaj (2013) or Fernholz, Ichiba, and Karatzas (2013) that the time-reversed versions of these processes are continuous semimartingales.

For each k , the compactness of $[0, T]$ ensures that a finite subfamily of the neighborhoods U will include all values of t , so the $\log X_i$ are reversible on $[0, T]$. \square

Corollary 1. *For the Atlas model (2), the rank processes $\log X_{(1)}, \dots, \log X_{(n)}$ satisfy*

$$d \log X_{(k)}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t)=X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ d \log X_i(t), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (26)$$

Proof. Follows immediately from Propositions 1 and 2. \square

An application to portfolio return decomposition

For $n \geq 2$, consider a stock market of stocks with capitalizations represented by the positive continuous semimartingales X_1, \dots, X_n defined on $[0, T]$. The *market weight processes* μ_1, \dots, μ_n are defined by

$$\mu_i(t) \triangleq \frac{X_i(t)}{X_1(t) + \dots + X_n(t)},$$

and the *ranked market weight processes* $\mu_{(k)}$ are defined accordingly. If the processes $\log X_1, \dots, \log X_n$ of a market are reversible and have nondegenerate crossings, the same will hold for the log-weight processes $\log \mu_1, \dots, \log \mu_n$.

The *market portfolio* is the portfolio with weights μ_i and portfolio value process

$$Z_\mu(t) = X_1(t) + \dots + X_n(t), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

In Fernholz (2016) it was shown that for a portfolio π , the relative log-return $d \log(Z_\pi/Z_\mu)$ can be decomposed into

$$d \log(Z_\pi(t)/Z_\mu(t)) = d \log \mathcal{S}_\pi(t) + d \mathcal{T}_\pi(t), \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where \mathcal{S}_π is a *structural process* defined by

$$d \log \mathcal{S}_\pi(t) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i(t) \circ d \log \mu_i(t), \quad (27)$$

and \mathcal{T}_π is a *trading process* with

$$d \mathcal{T}_\pi(t) \triangleq d \log(Z_\pi(t)/Z_\mu(t)) - d \log \mathcal{S}_\pi(t),$$

at least when the Stratonovich integrals in (27) are all defined.

Let S be a real-valued C^2 function defined on a neighborhood of the unit simplex $\Delta^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then we shall say that the portfolio π is *generated by* the function \mathbf{S} of the ranked market weights if $\mathbf{S}(\mu(t)) = S(\mu_{(1)}(t), \dots, \mu_{(n)}(t))$ and the portfolio weight processes π_i are given by

$$\pi_{p_t(k)}(t) = \left(D_k \log S(\mu_{(\cdot)}(t)) + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_{(j)}(t) D_j \log S(\mu_{(\cdot)}(t)) \right) \mu_{(k)}(t), \quad (28)$$

where p_t is the inverse of $r_t \in \Sigma_n$. In this case, the relative log-return of π will satisfy

$$d \log (Z_\pi(t)/Z_\mu(t)) = d \log \mathbf{S}(\mu(t)) + d\Theta(t), \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where Θ is a function of locally bounded variation (see Fernholz (2001) or Fernholz (2002), Theorem 4.2.1).

Proposition 3. *Suppose that the market log-weight processes $\log \mu_1, \dots, \log \mu_n$ are reversible and have nondegenerate crossings. Let π be the portfolio generated by the function \mathbf{S} of the ranked market weights. Then*

$$d \log \mathcal{S}_\pi(t) = d \log \mathbf{S}(\mu(t)), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (29)$$

and

$$d\mathcal{T}_\pi(t) = d\Theta(t), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (30)$$

Proof. By hypothesis, $\mathbf{S}(\mu(t)) = S(\mu_{(\cdot)}(t))$, where S is a real-valued C^2 function defined on a neighborhood of the unit simplex $\Delta^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d \log \mathbf{S}(\mu(t)) &= d \log S(\mu_{(\cdot)}(t)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n D_k \log S(\mu_{(\cdot)}(t)) \circ d\mu_{(k)}(t) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n D_k \log S(\mu_{(\cdot)}(t)) \mu_{(k)}(t) \circ d \log \mu_{(k)}(t) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \pi_{p_t(k)}(t) \circ d \log \mu_{(k)}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{k=1}^n \pi_{p_t(k)}(t) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t)=X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ d \log \mu_i(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n \pi_{p_t(k)}(t) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i(t)=X_{(k)}(t)\}} \circ d \log \mu_i(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i(t) \circ d \log \mu_i(t) \\ &= d \log \mathcal{S}_\pi(t) \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where (31) is due to (28) and the fact that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \mu_{(k)}(t) \circ d \log \mu_{(k)}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^n d\mu_{(k)}(t) = d \sum_{k=1}^n \mu_{(k)}(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.s.},$$

and (32) follows from Proposition 1.

The representation for \mathcal{T}_π follows by construction. \square

Corollary 2. *For the Atlas model (2), a portfolio generated by a function of the ranked market weights satisfies the decomposition (29) and (30).*

Proof. Follows immediately from Propositions 2 and 3. \square

Remark. The lemmata leading to Proposition 1 depend on the reversibility of the semimartingales X_i . The localization argument in Proposition 2 to establish this reversibility for Atlas models depends on no-triple-points along with the $n = 2$ results of Fernholz et al. (2013) and Fernholz, Ichiba, and Karatzas (2013). However, triple points may exist in *first-order models* and *hybrid Atlas models*, so for these more general models localization to two dimensions fails and reversibility cannot immediately be established (see

Banner et al. (2005), Ichiba et al. (2011), and Fernholz et al. (2012)). Hence, it appears that other methods may be needed to extend Corollary 2 to more general rank-based models.

References

- Banner, A., R. Fernholz, and I. Karatzas (2005). On Atlas models of equity markets. *Annals of Applied Probability* 15, 2296–2330.
- Banner, A. and R. Ghomrasni (2008). Local times of ranked continuous semimartingales. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 118, 1244–1253.
- Fernholz, R. (2001). Equity portfolios generated by functions of ranked market weights. *Finance and Stochastics* 5, 469–486.
- Fernholz, R. (2002). *Stochastic Portfolio Theory*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Fernholz, R. (2016). A new decomposition of portfolio return. *ArXiv:1606.05877*, 1–4.
- Fernholz, R., T. Ichiba, and I. Karatzas (2012). A second-order stock market model. *Annals of Finance*, 1–16.
- Fernholz, R., T. Ichiba, and I. Karatzas (2013). Two Brownian particles with rank-based characteristics and skew-elastic collisions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 123, 2999–3026.
- Fernholz, R., T. Ichiba, I. Karatzas, and V. Prokaj (2013). A planar diffusion with rank-based characteristics and perturbed Tanaka equations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 156, 343–374.
- Föllmer, H., P. Protter, and A. N. Shiriyayev (1995). Quadratic covariation and an extension of Itô’s formula. *Bernoulli* 1(1–2), 149–169.
- Ichiba, T., V. Papathanakos, A. Banner, I. Karatzas, and R. Fernholz (2011). Hybrid Atlas models. *Annals of Applied Probability* 21, 609–644.
- Karatzas, I. and S. E. Shreve (1991). *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Russo, F. and P. Vallois (2007). Elements of stochastic calculus via regularisation. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XL. Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Volume 1899, pp. 147–185. Springer, Berlin.