

Small impact analysis in stochastically illiquid markets*

– Convergence of optimal portfolio processes –

Ulrich Horst[†] Evgueni Kivman[‡]

March 11, 2021

Abstract

We consider an optimal liquidation problem with instantaneous price impact and stochastic resilience for small instantaneous impact factors. Within our modelling framework, the optimal portfolio process converges to the solution of an optimal liquidation problem with general semi-martingale controls when the instantaneous impact factor converges to zero. Our results provide a unified framework within which to embed the two most commonly used modelling frameworks in the liquidation literature and show how liquidation problems with portfolio processes of unbounded variation can be obtained as limiting cases in models with small instantaneous impact as well as a microscopic foundation for the use of semi-martingale liquidation strategies. Our convergence results are based on novel convergence results for BSDEs with singular terminal conditions and novel representation results of BSDEs in terms of uniformly continuous functions of forward processes.

AMS Subject Classification: 93E20, 91B70, 60H30.

Keywords: portfolio liquidation, singular BSDE, stochastic liquidity, singular control

1 Introduction

The impact of limited liquidity on optimal trading strategies in financial markets has recently been widely analysed in the mathematical finance and stochastic control literature. The majority of the optimal trade execution literature allows for either instantaneous (and permanent) or transient impact.

The first approach, pioneered by Bertsimas and Lo [5] and Almgren and Chriss [3], divides the price impact in a purely temporary effect, which depends only on the present trading rate and does not influence future prices, and in a permanent effect, which influences the price depending only on the total volume that has been traded in the past. The temporary impact is typically assumed to be linear in the trading rate, leading to a quadratic term in the cost functional. The original modelling framework has been extended in various directions including general stochastic settings with and without model uncertainty and multi-player and mean-field-type models by many authors including Ankirchner et al. [4], Cartea and Jaimungal [8], Fu et al. [13],

*Financial support through the Stiftung der Deutschen Wirtschaft (sdw) is gratefully acknowledged.

[†]Department of Mathematics and School of Business and Economics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany, horst@math.hu-berlin.de.

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany, kivman@math.hu-berlin.de.

Evangelista and Thamsten [11], Gatheral and Schied [15], Graewe et al. [17], Horst et al. [22] and Kruse and Popier [24].

A second approach, initiated by Obizhaeva and Wang [30], assumes that price impact is not permanent, but transient with the impact of past trades on current prices decaying over time. When impact is transient, one often allows for both absolutely continuous and singular trading strategies. When singular controls are admissible, optimal liquidation strategies usually comprise large block trades at the initial and terminal time. The work of Obizhaeva and Wang has been extended by Alfonsi et al. [2], Chen et al. [9], Fruth et al. [12], Gatheral [14], Guéant [18], Horst and Naujokat [20], Lokka and Xu [27] and Predoiu et al. [31], among many others.

A single asset liquidation problem with instantaneous and transient market impact and stochastic resilience¹, but with only absolutely continuous trading strategies has been analyzed in Graewe and Horst [16]. Their work has been generalized to a multiple asset framework by Horst and Xia [21], who also showed that the model with strict liquidation can be approximated by models with increasing penalization of open positions at the terminal time. Neuman and Voß [29] considered a penalization problem similar to [21] with both instantaneous and transient price impact and an additional predictable price signal process.

All the aforementioned papers considered portfolio processes of bounded variation. Liquidation processes of unbounded variation were first considered by Lorenz and Schied [28] to the best of our knowledge. The recent work of Ackermann et al. [1] considers an optimal liquidation problem with general càdlàg semimartingales as execution strategies. Carmona and Webster [6] provide a mathematical framework for trading on a limit order book when inventory processes are of unbounded variation. They also provide empirical evidence that supports the assumption of a non-trivial quadratic variation of inventory processes. Inventory processes of unbounded variation emerge in our framework in the limiting case of vanishing instantaneous market impact.

Cartea and Jaimungal [7] showed that the instantaneous price impact is usually much smaller than permanent (or transient) price impact; they estimate that the mean of the ratio of permanent price impact and instantaneous price impact is 2.5. Numerical simulations reported in [16] suggest that, within their modelling framework, optimal trading strategies converge to a jump process when the instantaneous impact factor converges to zero. In this paper, we establish a rigorous convergence result showing that one of the two most commonly employed benchmark models [3, 30], can be viewed as an extreme case within a generalized liquidation framework.

We prove that the optimal portfolio processes obtained in [16] converge to a diffusion process with jumps if the instantaneous price impact parameter tends to zero. In the benchmark case where all market parameters are deterministic constants, the limit coincides with the optimal portfolio process in [30]. In the stochastic case, the limiting process is fundamentally different, both mathematically and in terms of its economic interpretation.

Specifically, we prove that the optimal portfolio process converges (in the sense of graph convergence of the completed graphs in the Hausdorff distance) to a process of infinite variation, as considered in [1], with jumps. In our companion paper [19], we prove that the limiting portfolio process can be viewed as the optimal process in a liquidation problem with general semimartingale execution strategies. As such, our paper provides a microscopic foundation for liquidation models with semimartingales execution strategies.

¹Empirical work of Large [25] and Lo and Hall [26] suggests that resilience of market impact does indeed vary stochastically.

The main technical challenge in establishing the convergence results is that the optimal solution to the limiting model cannot be obtained by taking the limit of the three-dimensional quadratic BSDE system that characterizes the optimal solution in the model with positive instantaneous impact. Instead, we prove that the limit is fully characterized by the solution to a one-dimensional quadratic BSDE. Remarkably, this BSDE is independent of the liquidation requirement. As a result, full liquidation takes place if the instantaneous impact parameter converges to zero even if it is not strictly required. The reason is a loss in book value of the remaining shares that outweighs the liquidation cost for small instantaneous impact.

Our analysis is based on a novel representation result for solutions for BSDEs driven by Itô processes in terms of *uniformly* continuous functions of the forward process and on a series of novel convergence results for sequences of singular BSDEs and random ODEs. The abstract representation and convergence results are reported in Appendix A and B, respectively. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the modelling setup from [16, 21] and summarize our main results. Section 3 establishes a series of a-priori estimates. The proof of the convergence result is given in Section 4.

Notation. Randomness is described by an \mathbb{R}^m -valued Brownian motion $\{W_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ defined on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}, \mathbb{P})$ where $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ denotes the filtration generated by the Brownian motion, augmented by the \mathbb{P} -null-sets. Unless otherwise specified, all equations and inequalities hold in the \mathbb{P} -a.s. sense. For a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T]; A)$ the set of all progressively measurable A -valued stochastic processes $\{X_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ such that $\mathbb{E}(\int_0^T \|X_t\|_2^2 dt) < \infty$, while $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^\infty(\Omega \times [0; T]; A)$ denotes the subset of essentially bounded processes. $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T]; A)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^\infty(\Omega \times [0; T]; A)$ denote the respective subsets of predictable processes. Whenever $T-$ appears, we mean that there is an $\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)$ such that a statement holds for all $T' \in (T - \varepsilon; T)$.

2 Problem formulation and main results

2.1 The model

We take the liquidation model analyzed in [16, 21] as our starting point and consider an investor that needs to close a (single-asset) portfolio of $x_0 > 0$ shares within a given time interval $[0; T]$ using a trading strategy $\xi = \{\xi_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}$. If $\xi_t < 0$, the investor is selling the asset at a rate ξ_t at time $t \in [0; T]$, else she is buying it. For a given strategy ξ , the corresponding portfolio process $\bar{X}^\xi = \{\bar{X}_t^\xi\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ satisfies the ODE

$$d\bar{X}_t^\xi = \xi_t dt, \quad \bar{X}_0 = x_0.$$

The set of *admissible strategies* is given by the set $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R})$. The *transient price impact* is described by the unique stochastic process $\bar{Y}^\xi = \{\bar{Y}_t^\xi\}_{t \in [0; T]}$, which satisfies the ODE

$$d\bar{Y}_t^\xi = \gamma d\bar{X}_t^\xi - \rho_t \bar{Y}_t^\xi dt, \quad \bar{Y}_0^\xi = 0$$

for some constant $\gamma > 0$ and some essentially bounded, adapted process $\rho = \{\rho_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}$. The process \bar{Y}^ξ may be viewed as describing an additional shift in the unaffected benchmark price process generated by the large investor's trading activity.

For any *penalization factor* $N \in \mathcal{N} := [\underline{N}; \infty]^2$, where

$$\underline{N} := \gamma + 1 + \sqrt{2\eta \max(\|\lambda\|_{L^\infty}, \gamma\|\rho\|_{L^\infty})},$$

and any *instantaneous impact factor* $\eta > 0$, the *cost functional* is given by

$$J^{\eta, N}(\xi) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\eta}{2} \int_0^T (\xi_t)^2 dt + \int_0^T \bar{Y}_t^\xi d\bar{X}_t^\xi + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \lambda_t (\bar{X}_t^\xi)^2 dt + \frac{N}{2} (\bar{X}_T^\xi)^2 - \bar{X}_T^\xi \bar{Y}_T^\xi \right).$$

The first term in the above cost functional captures the *instantaneous trading costs*; the second captures the costs from *transient price impact*; the third captures *market risk* where the adapted and non-negative process $\lambda = \{\lambda_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ specifies the degree of risk. If full liquidation is required ($N = \infty$), the fourth term should formally be read as $+\infty \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{X}_T^\xi \neq 0\}}$ with the convention that $0 \cdot \infty = 0$. The fifth term captures an additional loss in book value of the remaining shares. It drops out of the cost function if $N = \infty$; see [16, 21] for further details on the impact costs and cost coefficients.

It has been shown in [16, 21] that the optimization problem

$$\min_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}} J^{\eta, N}(\xi) \quad (2.1)$$

has a solution $\xi^{\eta, N}$ for any $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $\eta > 0$. The solution is given in terms of a backward SDE system with possibly singular terminal condition. We index the optimal trading strategies and state processes by η and N as we are interested in their behavior for small instantaneous impact factors for both finite and infinite N .

Theorem 2.1 ([16, 21]). *For all $\eta \in (0; \infty)$ and $N \in \mathcal{N}$ the following holds.*

i) The BSDE system

$$\begin{aligned} -dA_t^{\eta, N} &= \left(\lambda_t - \eta^{-1} (A_t^{\eta, N} - \gamma B_t^{\eta, N})^2 \right) dt - Z_t^{\eta, N, A} dW_t, \\ -dB_t^{\eta, N} &= \left(-\rho_t B_t^{\eta, N} + \eta^{-1} (\gamma C_t^{\eta, N} - B_t^{\eta, N} + 1) (A_t^{\eta, N} - \gamma B_t^{\eta, N}) \right) dt - Z_t^{\eta, N, B} dW_t, \\ -dC_t^{\eta, N} &= \left(-2\rho_t C_t^{\eta, N} - \eta^{-1} (\gamma C_t^{\eta, N} - B_t^{\eta, N} + 1)^2 \right) dt - Z_t^{\eta, N, C} dW_t \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

with terminal condition

$$B_T^{\eta, N} = 1, \quad C_T^{\eta, N} = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

together with $A_T^{\eta, N} = N$ in the case $N < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \nearrow T} A_t^{\eta, \infty} = \infty$ in L^∞ has a solution

$$((A^{\eta, N}, B^{\eta, N}, C^{\eta, N}), (Z^{\eta, N, A}, Z^{\eta, N, B}, Z^{\eta, N, C}))$$

that belongs to the space $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^\infty(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times m}) \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times m})$ if $N < \infty$ and to the space $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^\infty(\Omega \times [0; T-]; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times m}) \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T-]; \mathbb{R}^{3 \times m})$ if $N = \infty$.

²The case $N = \infty$ captures the case where full liquidation is required; this case is analyzed in [16]. The case $\gamma + 1 \leq N < \infty$ is analyzed in [21].

ii) The liquidation problem has an optimal solution $\xi^{\eta,N}$. The corresponding state process $(X^{\eta,N}, Y^{\eta,N}) := (\bar{X}^{\xi^{\eta,N}}, \bar{Y}^{\xi^{\eta,N}})$ is given by the unique solution to the ODE system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{X}_t^{\eta,N} &= -\sqrt{\eta^{-1}}D_t^{\eta,N}X_t^{\eta,N} - \sqrt{\eta^{-1}}E_t^{\eta,N}Y_t^{\eta,N}, \\ \dot{Y}_t^{\eta,N} &= -\gamma\sqrt{\eta^{-1}}D_t^{\eta,N}X_t^{\eta,N} - \gamma\sqrt{\eta^{-1}}E_t^{\eta,N}Y_t^{\eta,N} - \rho_t Y_t^{\eta,N}\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

with initial conditions $X_0^{\eta,N} = x_0$ and $Y_0^{\eta,N} = 0$ where

$$D^{\eta,N} := \sqrt{\eta^{-1}}(A^{\eta,N} - \gamma B^{\eta,N}), \quad E^{\eta,N} := \sqrt{\eta^{-1}}(\gamma C^{\eta,N} - B^{\eta,N} + 1).$$

We now state an additional result on the optimal state process, which will be important for our subsequent analysis. In particular, we show that the optimal portfolio process never changes its sign. The proof is given in Section 3.1.

Theorem 2.2. For all $\eta \in (0; \infty)$, $N \in \mathcal{N}$, the process

$$Z^{\eta,N} := \gamma X^{\eta,N} - Y^{\eta,N}$$

is non-increasing on $[0; T]$. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[X_t^{\eta,N} \in (0; x_0), Y_t^{\eta,N} \in (-\gamma x_0; 0), Z_t^{\eta,N} \in (0; \gamma x_0) \text{ for all } t \in (0; T)\right] = 1.$$

2.2 The main results

We are interested in the dynamics of the optimal portfolio processes for small instantaneous price impact. We address this problem within a factor model where the cost coefficients λ and ρ are driven by an Itô diffusion, which is given by the unique strong solution to the SDE

$$d\chi_t = \mu(t, \chi_t)dt + \sigma(t, \chi_t)dW_t, \quad \chi_0 = \bar{\chi}_0$$

on $[0; T]$ with $\bar{\chi}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. We assume throughout that the function $(\mu, \sigma): [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is bounded, measurable and uniformly Lipschitz continuous in the space variable:

$$\|(\mu, \sigma)(t, x_1) - (\mu, \sigma)(t, x_2)\|_\infty \leq c\|x_1 - x_2\|_\infty.$$

Assumption 2.3. The processes ρ and λ are of the form

$$(\rho_t, \lambda_t) = f(t, \chi_t)$$

for some bounded $C^{1,2}$ function $f = (f^\rho, f^\lambda): [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0; \infty)^2$ with bounded derivatives. Moreover, the function f^ρ is bounded away from zero.

For convenience, we define the stochastic process $\varphi = \{\varphi_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ by

$$\varphi_t := \sqrt{\lambda_t + 2\gamma\rho_t},$$

choose constants $\underline{\rho}, \bar{\rho}, \underline{\varphi}, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{\lambda} \in (0; \infty)$ such that $\underline{\rho} \leq \rho \leq \bar{\rho}$, $0 \leq \lambda \leq \bar{\lambda}$, $\underline{\varphi} \leq \varphi \leq \bar{\varphi}$, and put

$$\bar{\kappa} := \sqrt{2 \max(\bar{\lambda}, \gamma\bar{\rho})}.$$

Our goal is to prove that $X^{\eta,N}$ converges in a suitable sense to the optimal portfolio process X^0 of a liquidation problem with singular controls as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. The singular control problem is analyzed in detail in the companion paper [19]. Even without studying this model in detail, we can heuristically identify the limiting processes X^0 . We emphasize that the limit does not depend on N and is hence the same regardless of the liquidation constraint.

Since the ODE system (2.4) is not defined for $\eta = 0$, we cannot define the limiting process as the solution to this system. Instead, we first identify the limits of the coefficients of the ODE system and then derive candidate limits for the state processes in terms of the limiting coefficients.

2.2.1 Convergence of the coefficient processes

In this section, we state the convergence results for the coefficient processes $D^{\eta,N}$ and $E^{\eta,N}$ of the ODE system (2.4) as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. In particular, we prove that their limits D^0 and E^0 exist and are driven by a common factor, which is given by the solution of a quadratic BSDE.

Heuristics in the deterministic case. Before proceeding to the limit result, we provide some heuristics for the convergence. Assuming for simplicity that all coefficients are deterministic, the dynamics of the coefficient processes satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\eta}(dD_t^{\eta,N}) &= \left((D_t^{\eta,N})^2 - \lambda_t \right) dt - \gamma dB_t^{\eta,N}, \\ \sqrt{\eta}(dE_t^{\eta,N}) &= \left(2\sqrt{\eta}\rho_t E_t^{\eta,N} + \gamma(E_t^{\eta,N})^2 - 2\rho_t + 2\rho_t B_t^{\eta,N} \right) dt - dB_t^{\eta,N}.\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\eta \rightarrow 0$, we expect that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= (D_t^0)^2 - \lambda_t - \gamma \dot{B}_t^0, \\ 0 &= \gamma(E_t^0)^2 + 2\rho_t(B_t^0 - 1) - \dot{B}_t^0,\end{aligned}$$

that is, we expect that

$$D_t^0 = \sqrt{\gamma \dot{B}_t^0 + \lambda_t} \quad \text{and} \quad E_t^0 = \sqrt{\gamma^{-1}(\dot{B}_t^0 + 2\rho_t(1 - B_t^0))}.$$

In particular, $D_t^0 + \gamma E_t^0 = \varphi_t$. As a result,

$$D_t^0 = (\varphi_t)^{-1}(\lambda_t + \gamma\rho_t B_t^0) \quad \text{and} \quad E_t^0 = (\varphi_t)^{-1}\rho_t(2 - B_t^0).$$

Hence we expect D^0 and E^0 to be driven by B^0 and B^0 to satisfy the ODE

$$\begin{aligned}-\dot{B}_t^0 &= -\rho_t B_t^0 + D_t^0 E_t^0 \\ &= -\frac{1}{\varphi_t^2} \left(\gamma(\rho_t B_t^0)^2 - 2\lambda_t \rho_t (1 - B_t^0) \right)\end{aligned}$$

with terminal condition $B_T^0 = 1$ (because $B_T^{\eta,N} = 1$). Our heuristics also suggests that the limit processes are independent of the liquidation requirement.

Convergence in the stochastic case. The preceding heuristics suggests that the limiting coefficient processes are driven by a solution to the BSDE corresponding to the above ODE for B^0 . The following lemma is proven in Section 3.2.

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a unique solution $(B^0, Z^{0,B})$ in the space*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^\infty(\Omega \times [0; T]; (0; \infty)) \times \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$$

to the BSDE

$$-dB_t^0 = -\frac{1}{\varphi_t^2} \left(\gamma(\rho_t B_t^0)^2 - 2\lambda_t \rho_t (1 - B_t^0) \right) dt - Z_t^{0,B} dW_t, \quad B_T^0 = 1. \quad (2.5)$$

The process B^0 is bounded from above by 1 and bounded from below by

$$\underline{B}_t^0 := \exp \left(-\underline{\varphi}^{-2} \gamma \bar{\rho}^2 (T - t) \right). \quad (2.6)$$

Moreover, there exists a uniformly continuous function $h: [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that B^0 and $\{h(t, \chi_t)\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ are indistinguishable.

We prove below that the process $B^{\eta, N}$ converges to B^0 as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ and that $D^{\eta, N}$ and $E^{\eta, N}$ converge to

$$D_t^0 := (\varphi_t)^{-1} (\lambda_t + \gamma \rho_t B_t^0) \quad \text{and} \quad E_t^0 := (\varphi_t)^{-1} \rho_t (2 - B_t^0), \quad (2.7)$$

respectively. In view of Lemma 2.4, the processes D^0 and E^0 are well-defined and so the dynamics of the process B^0 can be rewritten as

$$dB_t^0 = (\rho_t B_t^0 - D_t^0 E_t^0) dt - Z_t^{0,B} dW_t, \quad B_T^0 = 1. \quad (2.8)$$

Likewise, the BSDE for the process $B^{\eta, N}$ can be rewritten as

$$dB_t^{\eta, N} = \left(\rho_t B_t^{\eta, N} - D_t^{\eta, N} E_t^{\eta, N} \right) dt + Z_t^{\eta, N, B} dW_t, \quad B_T^{\eta, N} = 1. \quad (2.9)$$

This suggests that the process $B^{\eta, N}$ converges to B^0 on the entire interval $[0; T]$. By contrast, convergence of the processes $D^{\eta, N}$ and $E^{\eta, N}$ can only be expected to hold on compact subintervals of $[0; T)$ because the terminal conditions of the limiting and the approximating processes are different. Specifically, we have the following result. Its proof is given in Section 4.1.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $b^{\eta, N} := B^{\eta, N} - B^0$, $d^{\eta, N} := D^{\eta, N} - D^0$ and $e^{\eta, N} := E^{\eta, N} - E^0$. There exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that*

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon))} \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0; T]} \max \left(|b_t^{\eta, N}|, -d_t^{\eta, N}, e_t^{\eta, N}, -d_t^{\eta, N} - \gamma e_t^{\eta, N} \right) \leq \varepsilon, \right. \\ \left. \inf_{t \in [0; T - \varepsilon]} \min \left(-d_t^{\eta, N}, e_t^{\eta, N}, -d_t^{\eta, N} - \gamma e_t^{\eta, N} \right) \geq -\varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

2.2.2 Convergence of the state process

Having derived the limits of the coefficient processes, we can now heuristically derive the limits of the processes $X^{\eta, N}$, $Y^{\eta, N}$ and $Z^{\eta, N}$, which we denote by X^0 , Y^0 and Z^0 , respectively.

The candidate processes. Since $X_T^{\eta,\infty} = 0$ for all $\eta > 0$, we expect that $X_T^0 = 0$. We prove in Lemma 4.4 that this convergence also holds if N is finite.³

Assuming that the optimal trading strategy remains stable if $\eta \rightarrow 0$, the ODE (2.4) suggests that the term $D^{\eta,N} X^{\eta,N} + E^{\eta,N} Y^{\eta,N}$ is small for small η and hence that

$$D_t^0 X_t^0 = -E_t^0 Y_t^0 \quad \text{on } [0; T).$$

We do not conjecture the above relation at the terminal time because the convergence of $D^{\eta,N}$ and $E^{\eta,N}$ only holds on $[0; T)$. Assuming that $Z^0 = \gamma X^0 - Y^0$ on $[0; T)$, this implies

$$Z^0 = -\frac{\varphi}{D^0} Y^0 \quad \text{and hence} \quad Y^0 = -\frac{D^0}{\varphi} Z^0.$$

On the other hand, multiplying the first equation in (2.4) by γ and subtracting the second and then taking the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ yields $\dot{Z}^0 = \rho Y^0$ and so

$$\dot{Z}_t^0 = -\frac{\rho_t D_t^0}{\varphi_t} Z_t^0, \quad Z_0^0 = \gamma x_0. \quad (2.10)$$

We therefore expect that

$$Z_t^0 = \gamma x_0 \exp\left(-\int_0^t \frac{\rho_s D_s^0}{\varphi_s} ds\right), \quad t \in [0; T].$$

Since $X_T^0 = 0$ and $Z^0 = \gamma X^0 - Y^0$, we finally expect that

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^0 &= \mathbb{1}_{[0;T)}(t) \frac{E_t^0}{\varphi_t} Z_t^0, \\ Y_t^0 &= -\mathbb{1}_{[0;T)}(t) \frac{D_t^0}{\varphi_t} Z_t^0 - \mathbb{1}_{\{T\}}(t) Z_T^0, \quad t \in [0; T]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(X_{0-}^0, Y_{0-}^0) = (x_0, 0)$, this suggests that the limiting state process jumps at the initial and the terminal time. In particular, we cannot expect uniform convergence on $[0; T]$. We notice that the limiting state process is of unbounded variation.

Convergence. It remains to clarify in which sense the state processes converge. Contrary to the convergence result stated in Proposition 2.5, we can only expect convergence in probability because the state process follows a forward ODE while the coefficient processes follow backward SDEs; see also Appendix B.1.2. The following theorem establishes uniform convergence in probability on compact subintervals on $(0, T)$ along with some ‘‘upper/lower convergence’’ at the initial and terminal time. The proof is given in Section 4.2.

Theorem 2.6. *There exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty)^2 \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that, for all $\delta \in (0; \infty)$,*

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\delta, \varepsilon))} \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [\varepsilon; T]} \max(X_t^{\eta,N} - X_t^0, Y_t^{\eta,N} - Y_t^0) \leq \varepsilon, \right. \\ \left. \inf_{t \in [0; T-\varepsilon]} \min(X_t^{\eta,N} - X_t^0, Y_t^{\eta,N} - Y_t^0) \geq -\varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

³The proof heavily relies on the optimality of X^0 in the portfolio liquidation model analyzed in [19].

The preceding theorem does not provide a convergence result on the whole time interval, due to the jumps of the limit processes at the initial and terminal time. However, along with our results from [19], it allows us to prove the convergence of the graphs of the state processes on the entire time interval. The completed graph of a càdlàg function $X: \{0-\} \cup [0; T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with finitely many jumps is defined by

$$G_X := \{(t, x) \in [0; T] \times \mathbb{R} \mid x = X_t = X_{t-} \text{ or } X_{t-} < X_t, x \in [X_{t-}; X_t] \\ \text{or } X_{t-} > X_t, x \in [X_t; X_{t-}]\}.$$

The distance $d_\infty(G_X, G_Y)$ between two completed graphs is defined as their Hausdorff distance:

$$d_\infty(G_X, G_Y) := \max \left(\sup_{p \in G_X} \min_{q \in G_Y} \|p - q\|_\infty, \sup_{q \in G_Y} \min_{p \in G_X} \|p - q\|_\infty \right) \in [0; \infty].$$

If strict liquidation is required, then Theorem 2.6 is sufficient to prove the graph convergence of the state processes in the Hausdorff metric. If strict liquidation is not required, an additional argument is needed to prove that the terminal position converges to zero. The proof of the following proposition is given in Section 4.3.

Proposition 2.7. *There exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty)^2 \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that, for all $\delta \in (0; \infty)$,*

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\delta, \varepsilon))} \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P} \left[d_\infty(G_{X^{\eta, N}}, G_{X^0}) \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

3 A-priori estimates and regularity properties

3.1 The case $\eta > 0$

The following estimates have been established in [16, 21], except for the upper bound on $E^{\eta, N}$ for finite N , which is stronger than the corresponding one in [21]. It can be established using the same arguments as in the proof of [16, Proposition 3.2] noting that $D_T^{\eta, N} < \infty$ if N is finite.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $\eta \in (0; \infty)$, $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $s, t \in [0; T]$ with $s \leq t$, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-\bar{\rho}(T-s)) &\leq B_s^{\eta, N} \leq 1, \\ 0 &\leq E_s^{\eta, N} \leq \gamma^{-1} \bar{\kappa} \tanh\left(\sqrt{\eta^{-1} \bar{\kappa}}(T-s)\right) \leq \gamma^{-1} \bar{\kappa}, \\ 0 &< D_s^{\eta, N} \leq \bar{\kappa} \coth\left(\sqrt{\eta^{-1} \bar{\kappa}}(T-s)\right) \leq \bar{\kappa} \coth\left(\sqrt{\eta^{-1} \bar{\kappa}}(T-t)\right). \end{aligned}$$

The preceding estimates allow us to prove that neither the optimal portfolio process nor the corresponding spread process change sign.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let us put $V(t) := X_t^{\eta, N} \cdot Y_t^{\eta, N}$. Then $V(0) = 0$ and V satisfies the ODE

$$\dot{V}(t) = - \left(\sqrt{\eta^{-1}} (D_t^{\eta, N} + \gamma E_t^{\eta, N}) + \rho_t \right) V(t) - \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \left(E_t^{\eta, N} (Y_t^{\eta, N})^2 + \gamma D_t^{\eta, N} (X_t^{\eta, N})^2 \right)$$

As a result,

$$V(t) = - \exp \left(- \int_0^t \left(\sqrt{\eta^{-1}} (D_u^{\eta, N} + \gamma E_u^{\eta, N}) + \rho_u \right) du \right) \cdot \int_0^t \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \left(E_s^{\eta, N} (Y_s^{\eta, N})^2 + \gamma D_s^{\eta, N} (X_s^{\eta, N})^2 \right) \exp \left(\int_0^s \left(\sqrt{\eta^{-1}} (D_u^{\eta, N} + \gamma E_u^{\eta, N}) + \rho_u \right) du \right) ds.$$

In view of Lemma 3.1, this shows that $V(t) < 0$ on $(0; T)$. Hence, strict positivity of $X_0^{\eta, N}$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left[X_t^{\eta, N} > 0, Y_t^{\eta, N} < 0 \text{ for all } t \in (0; T)\right] = 1.$$

Thus, the definition of $Z^{\eta, N}$ along with (2.4) yields $\dot{Z}_t^{\eta, N} = \rho_t Y_t^{\eta, N} < 0$ on $(0, T)$. Moreover,

$$X_t^{\eta, N} < \gamma^{-1} Z_t^{\eta, N} \leq \gamma^{-1} Z_0^{\eta, N} = x_0 \quad \text{and} \quad Y_t^{\eta, N} > -Z_t^{\eta, N} \geq -\gamma x_0.$$

□

Next, we prove that the process $B^{\eta, N}$ satisfies an L^1 uniform continuity property. We refer to Appendix A for a discussion of general regularity properties of stochastic processes.

Lemma 3.2. *The process $B^{\eta, N}$ satisfies Assumption A.1 stated in Appendix A on $[0; T]$ uniformly in $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\eta \in (0; H]$, for all $H \in (0; \infty)$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $s > T - \varepsilon_1$. By Lemma 3.1, if ε_1 is small enough,

$$|\mathbb{E}(V(B_\tau^{\eta, N} - B_s^{\eta, N}))| \leq (1 - \exp(-\bar{\rho}\varepsilon_1))\mathbb{E}(|V|) \leq \varepsilon\mathbb{E}(|V|).$$

If $s \leq T - \varepsilon_1$, the assertion follows from the integral representation (2.9) along with the estimates established in Lemma 3.1 using that the stochastic integral in (2.9) is a martingale on $[0, T - \varepsilon_1]^4$. □

3.2 The case $\eta = 0$

We are now going to establish a priori estimates on the candidate limiting coefficient processes. We start by showing that the process B^0 is well-defined.

Proof of Lemma 2.4. The existence result follows from a standard argument. In fact, it is well known that, for any $\bar{b} \in [1; \infty)$, the BSDE

$$-dB_t^{\bar{b}} = \psi^{\bar{b}}(t, \chi_t, B_t^{\bar{b}})dt - Z_t^{\bar{b}}dW_t, \quad B_T^{\bar{b}} = 1 \quad (3.1)$$

with Lipschitz continuous driver

$$\psi^{\bar{b}}(t, \chi, b) := -\frac{1}{f^\varphi(t, \chi)^2} \left(\gamma f^\rho(t, \chi)^2 (1 \wedge b^2) - 2f^\lambda(t, \chi)f^\rho(t, \chi) \left(1 - (0 \vee (b \wedge \bar{b})) \right) \right)$$

has a unique solution $(B^{\bar{b}}, Z^{\bar{b}}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m)$ (cf. Theorem A.8). Let us then define the functions $\underline{\phi}, \bar{\phi}: \Omega \times [0; T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\underline{\phi}(t, b, z) := -\underline{\varphi}^{-2}\gamma\bar{\rho}^2b \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\phi}(t, b, z) := 0.$$

By definition, $(\underline{B}^0, 0)$ is the unique solution to the BSDE with driver $\underline{\phi}$ and terminal condition 1, where the lower bound \underline{B}^0 on the process B^0 was defined in (2.6). Likewise, $(1, 0)$ is the unique solution of the BSDE with driver $\bar{\phi}$ and the same terminal condition. Since

$$\psi^{\bar{b}}(t, \chi_t, \underline{B}_t^0) > \underline{\phi}(t, \underline{B}_t^0, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi^{\bar{b}}(t, \chi_t, 1) < \bar{\phi}(t, 1, 0),$$

⁴We emphasize that $Z^{\eta, N, B}$ is possibly defined only on $[0, T-]$ and so the stochastic integral may be a martingale only away from the terminal time

the standard comparison principle for BSDEs with Lipschitz continuous drivers yields

$$\underline{B}^0 \leq B^{\bar{b}} \leq 1.$$

This proves that (B^1, Z^1) is the desired unique bounded solution to the BSDE (2.5).

The second assertion follows Theorem A.8 applied to the BSDE (3.1) for $\bar{b} = 1$. \square

Having established the existence of the process B^0 , the processes D^0 and E^0 are well-defined. The following lemma establishes estimates and regularity properties for D^0 and E^0 .

Lemma 3.3. *The following a-priori estimates hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma \underline{\rho}}{\underline{\varphi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma \bar{\rho}^2}{\underline{\varphi}^2} T\right) &\leq D_t^0 \leq \underline{\varphi}^{-1}(\bar{\lambda} + \gamma \bar{\rho}), \\ \underline{\varphi}^{-1} \underline{\rho} &\leq E_t^0 \leq 2\underline{\varphi}^{-1} \bar{\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the processes D^0 and E^0 satisfy Assumption A.2 and A.3.

Proof. The a-priori estimates can be obtained by plugging the bounds on B^0 (cf. Lemma 2.4) into the definitions of D^0 and E^0 given in (2.7). Moreover, if we denote by h the function derived from Lemma 2.4, then for all $t \in [0; T]$,

$$D_t^0 = \left(\frac{f^\lambda + \gamma \cdot f^\rho \cdot h}{\sqrt{f^\lambda + 2\gamma \cdot f^\rho}} \right)(t, \chi_t), \quad E_t^0 = \left(\frac{f^\rho \cdot (2 - h)}{\sqrt{f^\lambda + 2\gamma \cdot f^\rho}} \right)(t, \chi_t).$$

In view of Assumption 2.3, the processes D^0 and E^0 can be represented as uniformly continuous functions of the factor process and hence the assertion follows from Theorem A.7. \square

The next lemma can be viewed as the analogue to Theorem 2.2 in the case $\eta = 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $t \in [0; T]$, $X_t^0 \in [0; x_0]$, $Y_t^0 \in [-\gamma x_0; 0]$ and $Z_t^0 \in [0; \gamma x_0]$. Moreover,*

$$\mathbb{P}[X_t^0 \in (0; x_0), Y_t^0 \in (-\gamma x_0; 0) \text{ for all } t \in (0; T)] = 1$$

and the processes X^0 and Y^0 satisfy Assumption A.3 on $[0; T]$.

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.3, D^0 is positive and hence

$$0 < Z_t^0 \leq x_0 \gamma. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $D^0 + \gamma E^0 = \varphi$ on $[0, T]$, it thus follows from Lemma 3.3 that, for all $t \in (0; T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < X_t^0 &= \frac{\varphi_t - D_t^0}{\gamma \varphi_t} Z_t^0 < \gamma^{-1} Z_t^0 \leq x_0, \\ 0 > Y_t^0 &= -\frac{\varphi_t - \gamma E_t^0}{\varphi_t} Z_t^0 > -Z_t^0 \geq -\gamma x_0. \end{aligned}$$

The desired properties for X_0^0 and Y_0^0 follow by continuity; those for X_T^0 and Y_T^0 hold by definition and due to (3.2). The fact that X^0 and Y^0 satisfy Assumption A.3 follows from Theorem A.5: E^0 and D^0 satisfy Assumption A.3 (Lemma 3.3), because φ^{-1} satisfies Assumption A.3 (cf. Theorem A.5 and Theorem A.7); Z^0 also satisfies Assumption A.3 due to its essentially bounded derivative. Moreover, all these processes are essentially bounded. \square

4 Proof of the convergence results

In this section, we prove our main convergence results. We start with the convergence of the coefficients of the ODE system (2.4). Subsequently, we prove that the convergence of the coefficients yields convergence of the state process.

4.1 Proof of Proposition 2.5

The proof of Proposition 2.5 is split into a series of lemmas. In a first step, we establish the convergence as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ of the auxiliary processes

$$F_t^{\eta,N} := D_t^{\eta,N} + \gamma E_t^{\eta,N} \quad \text{to} \quad F^0 := \varphi$$

and

$$G^{\eta,N} := \rho B^{\eta,N} + \varphi E^{\eta,N} \quad \text{to} \quad G^0 := \rho B^0 + \varphi E^0 = 2\rho.$$

On $[0; T)$, the processes $F^{\eta,N}$ and $G^{\eta,N}$ satisfy the dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} dF_t^{\eta,N} &= \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \left((F_t^{\eta,N})^2 - (\varphi_t)^2 \right) dt + 2\gamma \rho_t E_t^{\eta,N} dt \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} (Z_t^{\eta,N,A} - 2\gamma Z_t^{\eta,N,B} + \gamma^2 Z_t^{\eta,N,C}) dW_t, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} -d(\varphi^{-1} G^{\eta,N})_t &= \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \left(-G_t^{\eta,N} + 2\rho_t - E_t^{\eta,N} (F_t^{\eta,N} - \varphi_t) \right) dt - 2\rho_t E_t^{\eta,N} dt \\ &\quad - d(\varphi^{-1} \rho B^{\eta,N})_t + \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} (Z_t^{\eta,N,B} - \gamma Z_t^{\eta,N,C}) dW_t. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

A general convergence result for integral equations of the above form is established in Appendix B.1.2. It allows us to prove the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f^{\eta,N} := F^{\eta,N} - \varphi$. There exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that*

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon))} \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{s \in [0; T-\varepsilon]} f_s^{\eta,N} \leq \varepsilon, \inf_{s \in [0; T)} f_s^{\eta,N} \geq -\varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

Proof. For every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, we apply Lemma B.4 to $P^\eta := F^{\eta,N}$ with

$$\psi := 1, \quad a(x, y) := (x \vee 0)^2 - y^2, \quad P^0 := \varphi, \quad q^\eta := 0, \quad L_t^\eta := 2\gamma \int_0^t \rho_s E_s^{\eta,N} ds$$

noticing that $\varepsilon \mapsto \eta_0(\varepsilon)$ is independent of N . Assumption B.3 (i) is satisfied with $\bar{P} := \bar{\varphi} + 3\bar{\kappa}$, due to Lemma 3.1. If $N = \infty$, then Assumption B.3 (ii) a) is satisfied due to Theorem 2.1 and due to the a-priori estimates derived in Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3. If $N < \infty$ and $\eta \leq \bar{\varphi}^{-2}$, then

$$f_T^{\eta,N} = D_T^{\eta,N} + \underbrace{\gamma E_T^{\eta,N}}_{=0} - D_T^0 - \gamma E_T^0 = \sqrt{\eta^{-1}}(n - \gamma) - \varphi_T \geq \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} - \bar{\varphi} > 0,$$

which shows Assumption B.3 (ii) b). Assumption B.3 (iv) follows by direct computation using $\bar{\varepsilon} := \underline{\varphi}/2$ and $\beta := \underline{\varphi}/2$. Assumption B.3 (v) follows from Theorem A.7 and Lemma 3.1. \square

It is not difficult to show that similar arguments as those used to prove the convergence of $f^{\eta,N}$ can be applied to $-g^{\eta,N}$. As a result, the intervals $[0; T)$ and $[0; T - \varepsilon]$ in the statement of the convergence result for $g^{\eta,N}$ need to be swapped.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $g^{\eta,N} := G^{\eta,N} - 2\rho$. There exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that*

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon))} \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{s \in [0; T)} g_s^{\eta,N} \leq \varepsilon, \inf_{s \in [0; T - \varepsilon]} g_s^{\eta,N} \geq -\varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

We are now going to prove the almost sure convergence to zero of the process $b^{\eta,N} := B^{\eta,N} - B^0$. To this end, we first observe that $D^{\eta,N} = F^{\eta,N} - \gamma E^{\eta,N}$ and $\varphi E^{\eta,N} = G^{\eta,N} - \rho B^{\eta,N}$ yields

$$-D^{\eta,N} E^{\eta,N} = -f^{\eta,N} E^{\eta,N} - G^{\eta,N} + \rho B^{\eta,N} + \gamma \varphi^{-2} (G^{\eta,N} - \rho B^{\eta,N})^2.$$

Plugging this into (2.9) shows that

$$dB_t^{\eta,N} = (-G_t^{\eta,N} - f_t^{\eta,N} E_t^{\eta,N} + 2\rho_t B_t^{\eta,N} + \gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} (G_t^{\eta,N} - \rho_t B_t^{\eta,N})^2) dt + Z_t^{\eta,N,B} dW_t$$

on $[0; T)$. Performing an analogous computation for B^0 and subtracting the two equations yields

$$\begin{aligned} db_t^{\eta,N} = & \left((b_t^{\eta,N})^2 \cdot \gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} (\rho_t)^2 + b_t^{\eta,N} (2\rho_t - 2\gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} \rho_t (G_t^0 - \rho_t B_t^0)) - f_t^{\eta,N} E_t^{\eta,N} - g_t^{\eta,N} \right. \\ & \left. + \gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} g_t^{\eta,N} (g_t^{\eta,N} + 2G_t^0 - \rho_t (2b_t^{\eta,N} + 2B_t^0)) \right) dt + (Z_t^{\eta,N,B} - \overline{Z}_t^{0,B}) dW_t \end{aligned}$$

on $[0; T)$. Using that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\rho_t - 2\gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} \rho_t (G_t^0 - \rho_t B_t^0) &= 2\rho_t (\varphi_t)^{-1} D_t^0, \\ g_t^{\eta,N} + 2G_t^0 - \rho_t (2b_t^{\eta,N} + 2B_t^0) &= -g_t^{\eta,N} + 2\varphi_t E_t^{\eta,N} \end{aligned}$$

shows that

$$\begin{aligned} db_t^{\eta,N} = & \left((b_t^{\eta,N})^2 \cdot \gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} (\rho_t)^2 + b_t^{\eta,N} \cdot 2(\varphi_t)^{-1} \rho_t D_t^0 - f_t^{\eta,N} E_t^{\eta,N} \right. \\ & \left. + g_t^{\eta,N} (-1 - \gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} g_t^{\eta,N} + 2\gamma(\varphi_t)^{-1} E_t^{\eta,N}) \right) dt + (Z_t^{\eta,N,B} - \overline{Z}_t^{0,B}) dW_t \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

on $[0; T)$. This BSDE is different from (4.1) and (4.2). We apply Lemma B.2 to prove the following result.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that*

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon))} \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{s \in [0; T]} |b_s^{\eta,N}| \leq \varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

Proof. For every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, we apply Lemma B.2 with

$$\begin{aligned} a(t, b) &:= b^2 \cdot \gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} (\rho_t)^2 + b \cdot 2(\varphi_t)^{-1} \rho_t D_t^0, \\ q_t^\eta &:= -f_t^{\eta,N} E_t^{\eta,N} + g_t^{\eta,N} (2\gamma(\varphi_t)^{-1} E_t^{\eta,N} - 1 - \gamma(\varphi_t)^{-2} g_t^{\eta,N}). \end{aligned}$$

Assumption B.1 (i) follows from the a priori estimates on $B^{\eta,N}$ (Lemma 3.1), B^0 (Lemma 2.4) and D^0 (Lemma 3.3). Assumption B.1 (ii) follows from the a priori estimates on $B^{\eta,N}$ and B^0 , where the mapping $\varepsilon \mapsto \delta$ is independent of N . Assumption B.1 (iii) follows from the same estimates and Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, where the choice of η_1 is independent of N . Assumption B.1 (iv) is satisfied because we can choose $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ small enough s.t.

$$-\varepsilon_1 \gamma(\varphi)^{-1} \rho + 2D^0 \geq 0.$$

□

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.6

Convergence on compact subintervals of $[0; T)$ follows from Theorem B.8 applied to the ODEs

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{X}_t^{\eta,N} &= -\sqrt{\eta^{-1}}F_t^{\eta,N}\left(X_t^{\eta,N} - \frac{E_t^{\eta,N}}{F_t^{\eta,N}}Z_t^{\eta,N}\right), \\ \dot{Z}_t^{\eta,N} &= \gamma\rho_t X_t^{\eta,N} - \rho_t Z_t^{\eta,N}\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

and

$$X_t^0 = \frac{E_t^0}{\varphi_t}Z_t^0, \quad Z_t^0 = Z_0^0 \exp\left(\int_0^t \left(\gamma\rho_s \frac{E_s^0}{\varphi_s} - \rho_s\right) ds\right)$$

on $[0, T)$. In fact, the process $-\frac{E^0}{\varphi}$ satisfies Assumption A.3, due to Lemma 3.3, Lemma A.7 and Lemma A.5 along with the fact that φ is bounded away from zero. Moreover, Condition (B.12) follows from Proposition 2.5 and Condition (B.13) follows from Theorem 2.2. Finally, $D^0 > 0$ (Lemma 3.3), from which we deduce that $x_0 \geq \frac{E_0^0}{\varphi_0}Z_0^0$.

Thus, by Theorem B.8, applied once for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and every $\nu > 0$, for all $\nu, \delta \in (0; \infty)$, there exists $\eta_1 = \eta_1(\nu, \delta) \in (0; \infty)$ such that, for all $\eta \in (0; \eta_1]$ and all $N \in \mathcal{N}$, the set

$$M_0^{\nu,\eta,N} := \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0; T-\nu]} \max\left(|Z_t^0 - Z_t^{\eta,N}|, X_t^0 - X_t^{\eta,N}\right) \leq \nu, \inf_{t \in [\nu; T-\nu]} (X_t^0 - X_t^{\eta,N}) \geq -\nu \right\},$$

satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M_0^{\nu,\eta,N}\right) > 1 - \delta/2.\tag{4.5}$$

Near the terminal time, we cannot use this theorem since the convergence $\frac{E^{\eta,N}}{F^{\eta,N}} \rightarrow \frac{E^0}{\varphi}$ holds only on $[0; T-]$. Instead, we apply increment bounds on intervals of the form $[T-\nu; T]$ to prove that, for all $\eta > 0$, $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and for all sufficiently small

$$\nu \in (0; \varepsilon/2] \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \in (0; \varepsilon/3],\tag{4.6}$$

the set

$$M_1^{\nu,\varepsilon,\eta,N} := \left\{ \inf_{t \in [T-\nu; T]} (X_t^0 - X_t^{\eta,N}) \geq -\varepsilon \right\}$$

contains the set $M_0^{\nu,\eta,N} \cap M_2^{\beta,\nu} \cap M_3^{\nu,\eta,N}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}M_2^{\beta,\nu} &:= \left\{ \sup_{s,t \in [T-\nu; T]} |\varphi_s - \varphi_t| \vee |E_s^0 - E_t^0| \vee |X_s^0 - X_t^0| \leq \beta \right\}, \\ M_3^{\nu,\eta,N} &:= \left\{ \sup_{t \in [T-\nu; T]} e_t^{\eta,N} \vee (-f_t^{\eta,N}) \leq \nu \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The probability of the last two events can be made large, due to Theorem A.7, Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 2.5: for all $\beta, \delta, \nu \in (0; \infty)$, there exist $\nu_0(\beta, \delta), \eta_2(\nu) \in (0; \infty)$ such that

$$\inf_{\nu \leq \nu_0(\beta, \delta)} \mathbb{P}(M_2^{\beta,\nu}) > 1 - \delta/2, \quad \inf_{\eta \leq \eta_2(\nu)} \inf_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{P}(M_3^{\nu,\eta,N}) = 1.\tag{4.7}$$

In order to see that $M_1^{\nu,\varepsilon,\eta,N} \supseteq M_0^{\nu,\eta,N} \cap M_2^{\beta,\nu} \cap M_3^{\nu,\eta,N}$, we assume to the contrary that there exists

$$\omega \in \left(M_0^{\nu,\eta,N} \cap M_2^{\beta,\nu} \cap M_3^{\nu,\eta,N} \right) \setminus M_1^{\nu,\varepsilon,\eta,N}$$

and show that, for any such ω , there exists a time $s(\omega) \in [T - \nu, T)$ such that $\dot{X}_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega)$ must be both non-negative and strictly negative at the same time.

We start with the choice of $s(\omega)$. Since $\omega \notin M_1^{\nu,\varepsilon,\eta,N}$, there exists $t \in [T - \nu; T)$ such that $X_t^{\eta,N}(\omega) - X_t^0(\omega) > \varepsilon$. Since $\omega \in M_2^{\beta,\nu}$ and due to (4.6), this yields that

$$X_t^{\eta,N}(\omega) > X_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (4.8)$$

Since ω belongs to $M_0^{\nu,\eta,N}$ and due to (4.6), this implies that

$$X_{T-\nu}^{\eta,N}(\omega) < X_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} < X_t^{\eta,N}(\omega). \quad (4.9)$$

Since $X^{\eta,N}$ is continuous, we can thus choose a minimal $s(\omega) \in (T - \nu; t)$ with the property that

$$X_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) = X_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (4.10)$$

Due to minimality of $s(\omega)$, we have $\dot{X}_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) \geq 0$. We now show that this derivative must also be strictly negative. In fact, due to (4.4),

$$\sqrt{\eta} \dot{X}_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) = -F_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) X_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) + E_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) Z_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega).$$

Since $Z^{\eta,N}$ is non-increasing (Theorem 2.2), using (4.10) again, the right hand side of the above equation can be bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & -\varphi_{T-\nu}(\omega) X_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) + (\varphi_{T-\nu}(\omega) - \varphi_{s(\omega)}(\omega)) X_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) - f_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) X_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) - F_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} \\ & + E_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) Z_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) + E_{T-\nu}^0(\omega) z_{T-\nu}^{\eta,N}(\omega) + (E_{s(\omega)}^0(\omega) - E_{T-\nu}^0(\omega)) Z_{T-\nu}^{\eta,N}(\omega) + e_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) Z_{T-\nu}^{\eta,N}(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\omega \in M_3^{\nu,\eta,N}$, we have $F_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) = \varphi_{s(\omega)}(\omega) + f_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) \geq \underline{\varphi} - \nu$, which is strictly positive if $\nu < \underline{\varphi}$. Moreover, $-\varphi X^0 + E^0 Z^0 = 0$ on $[0; T)$. Since $\omega \in M_0^{\nu,\eta,N} \cap M_2^{\beta,\nu} \cap M_3^{\nu,\eta,N}$ and since X^0 , E^0 and $Z^{\eta,N}$ are bounded, this shows that $\dot{X}_{s(\omega)}^{\eta,N}(\omega) < 0$ if ν and β are chosen small enough.

The convergence of $Y^{\eta,N} - Y^0$ on $[0; T-]$ follows from

$$Y^{\eta,N} - Y^0 = \gamma(X^{\eta,N} - X^0) - (Z^{\eta,N} - Z^0)$$

and (4.5). The convergence on $[T-; T]$ follows from the fact that

$$\sup_{s \in [T-\nu; T]} \left| (Z_s^{\eta,N} - Z_s^0) - (Z_{T-\nu}^{\eta,N} - Z_{T-\nu}^0) \right|$$

can be made arbitrarily small by choosing ν small since $\dot{Z}^{\eta,N} = \rho Y^{\eta,N}$, since $\dot{Z}^0 = \rho Y^0$ and because both $Y^{\eta,N}$ and Y^0 are bounded.

4.3 Proof of Proposition 2.7

The proof of the graph convergence of the optimal portfolio processes in the Hausdorff topology follows from Theorem 2.6 if strict liquidation is required. Using results from our companion paper [19], we are now going to prove that $X_T^{\eta,N} \rightarrow X_T^0 = 0$ even if N is finite.

Under our Assumption 2.3, the limiting portfolio process X^0 admits an Itô representation of the form

$$X_t^0 = x_0 + j_t^* + \int_0^t \xi_s^* ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s^* dW_s,$$

where j^* is a pure jump process, which jumps at time $t \in \{0, T\}$. In [19], we consider an optimal liquidation model with semimartingale trading strategies where this process arises as the optimal state process. In that model, a trading strategy is given by a triple $\theta = (j, \xi, \psi)$, where j is a predictable pure jump process and ξ and ψ are suitable square-integrable progressively measurable stochastic processes.

For any such strategy, the associated portfolio process is given by

$$X_t^\theta = x_0 + j_t + \int_0^t \xi_s ds + \int_0^t \psi_s dW_s,$$

the associated impact process is denoted Y^θ and the cost function is given by

$$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} (j_0)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{(0,T]} (Y_{s-}^\theta + Y_s^\theta) dX_s^\theta + \frac{\gamma}{2} \int_0^T (\psi_s)^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \lambda_s (X_s^\theta)^2 ds \right).$$

In [19], we prove that the strategy $\theta^* = (j^*, \xi^*, \sigma^*)$ is optimal in this model. It is then easy to show that the strategy $\theta^q := (j^q, \xi^* + q, \sigma^*)$ where $j_t^q := j_t^* - \mathbb{1}_{\{T\}}(t)qT$ is admissible for any $q \in \mathbb{R}$, that the mapping $q \mapsto J(\theta^q)$ is differentiable and that

$$0 = \frac{\partial J(\theta^q)}{\partial q} \Big|_{q=0} = \mathbb{E} \left(- \int_0^T Z_t^0 dt + TZ_T^0 + \int_0^T X_t^0 t (\gamma \rho_t + \lambda_t) dt - \gamma \int_0^T X_t^0 \rho_t \exp \left(- \int_0^t \rho_u du \right) \int_0^t s \rho_s \exp \left(\int_0^s \rho_u du \right) ds dt \right). \quad (4.11)$$

This allows us to prove that full liquidation is optimal if $\eta \rightarrow 0$ even if it is not formally required.

Lemma 4.4. *We have that $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}(X_T^{\eta,N}) = 0$.*

Proof. We assume to the contrary that $\limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}(X_T^{\eta,N}) > 0$ and prove that this contradicts the optimality of $J^{\eta,N}(\xi^{\eta,N})$. To this end, we consider the admissible trading strategies

$$\xi_t^{\eta,N,q} := \xi_t^{\eta,N} + q,$$

compute the derivative of the function $q \mapsto J^{\eta,N}(\xi^{\eta,N,q})$ and show that the derivative at $q = 0$ does not vanish for small η if $\limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}(X_T^{\eta,N}) > 0$. Obviously, $\xi^{\eta,N,q} \in \mathcal{A}$ and

$$X_t^{\eta,N,q} := \overline{X}_t^{\xi^{\eta,N,q}} = X_t^{\eta,N} + qt.$$

Straightforward computations lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial q} J^{\eta, N}(\xi^{\eta, N, q}) \Big|_{q=0} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left(\eta (X_T^{\eta, N} - x_0) + \int_0^T \lambda_t t X_t^{\eta, N} dt + (N - \gamma) T X_T^{\eta, N} + T Z_T^{\eta, N} - \int_0^T Z_t^{\eta, N} dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \gamma \int_0^T X_t^{\eta, N} \left(t \rho_t - \rho_t \exp \left(- \int_0^t \rho_u du \right) \int_0^t s \rho_s \exp \left(\int_0^s \rho_u du \right) ds \right) dt \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting (4.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \mathbb{E} \left(\eta \left(\underbrace{X_T^{\eta, N}}_{\geq 0} - x_0 \right) + \int_0^T \lambda_t t (X_t^{\eta, N} - X_t^0) dt + (N - \gamma) T X_T^{\eta, N} + T (Z_T^{\eta, N} - Z_T^0) - \int_0^T (Z_t^{\eta, N} - Z_t^0) dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \gamma \int_0^T (X_t^{\eta, N} - X_t^0) \left(t \rho_t - \rho_t \exp \left(- \int_0^t \rho_u du \right) \int_0^t s \rho_s \exp \left(\int_0^s \rho_u du \right) ds \right) dt \right) \\
&\geq -\eta x_0 - \left(T(\bar{\lambda} + \gamma \bar{\rho}) + \gamma \bar{\rho}^2 T^2 e^{T \bar{\rho}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |X_t^{\eta, N} - X_t^0| dt \right) - E \left(\int_0^T |Z_t^{\eta, N} - Z_t^0| dt \right) \\
&\quad - T E \left(|Z_T^{\eta, N} - Z_T^0| \right) + T \mathbb{E} (X_T^{\eta, N}).
\end{aligned}$$

In view of Theorem 2.2, Theorem 2.6, Theorem 3.4 and using $\dot{Z}^{\eta, N} = \rho Y^{\eta, N}$ and $\dot{Z}^0 = \rho Y^0$, the sum of the three first expected values is small uniformly in N if η is small. Hence, if $\limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}(X_T^{\eta, N}) > 0$, then the sum on the right hand side of the above inequality is strictly positive when first choosing $\eta_0 > 0$ small enough and then choosing $(\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{N})$ with $\tilde{\eta} \leq \eta_0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_T^{\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{N}}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \limsup_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}(X_T^{\eta, N}).$$

□

We are now ready to prove the convergence of the graph $X^{\eta, N}$ to the completed graph of X^0 in the Hausdorff distance. To this end, we have to bound the distance of each point of any of the graphs to the other graph. In the inner interval $[\varepsilon; T - \varepsilon]$, it is enough to consider $X^{\eta, N} - X^0$, which we have bounded by Theorem 2.6.

Proof of Proposition 2.7. To prove that the probability of

$$d_\infty(G_{X^{\eta, N}}, G_{X^0}) \leq \varepsilon$$

is large for small $\eta > 0$, we need to prove that the distance of any point (t, x) from either $G_{X^{\eta, N}(\omega)}$ or $G_{X^0(\omega)}$ to the respective other graph is small on a set of large probability. To this end, we fix a small enough $\nu \in (0; \varepsilon)$. If $t \in [\nu; T - \nu]$, this follows directly from Theorem 2.6. For $t \in [0; \nu) \cup (T - \nu; T]$, we use Theorem 2.6 along with the facts that (i) the completed graph of a discontinuous function contains the line segments joining the values of the function at the points of discontinuity; (ii) X^0 satisfies Assumption A.3, due to Lemma 3.4 and (iii) $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{N \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}(X_T^{\eta, N}) = 0$, due to Lemma 4.4. For instance, let us consider an $\omega \in \Omega$ with

$$\sup_{u \in [0; T - \nu]} (X_u^0(\omega) - X_u^{\eta, N}(\omega)) \leq \nu,$$

and assume that $(t, x) \in G_{X^{\eta, N}(\omega)}$ with $t < \nu$ and $x < X_0^0(\omega) - \nu$. Since $x = X_t^{\eta, N}(\omega)$, the mean value theorem yields an $s \in [0; t]$ such that $X_s^0(\omega) = x + \nu$, which proves that $(s, x + \nu) \in G_{X^0(\omega)}$ and

$$d_\infty((t, x), (s, x + \nu)) = (t - s) + \nu \leq 2\nu.$$

□

A Regularity properties of Itô processes and BSDEs

In this appendix, we introduce some regularity properties of stochastic processes, which we later use to prove various convergence results for stochastic processes. We consider an adapted, \mathbb{R} -valued stochastic process $Y = \{Y_t\}_{t \in I}$ on some interval I and introduce the following continuity conditions.

Assumption A.1. *For all $\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)$, there exists $\delta \in (0; \infty)$ such that, for all $s \in I$, all \mathcal{F}_s -measurable and integrable $V: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and all stopping times $\tau: \Omega \rightarrow [s; s + \delta] \cap I$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(V(Y_\tau - Y_s)) \right| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}(|V|).$$

Assumption A.2. *For all $\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)$, there exists $\delta \in (0; \infty)$ such that, for all $s \in I$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [s; s + \delta] \cap I} |Y_t - Y_s| \mid \mathcal{F}_s \right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Assumption A.3. *For all $\beta, \delta \in (0; \infty)$, there exists $\nu \in (0; \infty)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{s, t \in I, |s - t| \leq \nu} |Y_t - Y_s| \leq \beta \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Definition A.4. *A family of stochastic processes is said to uniformly satisfy Assumption A.1, A.2 or A.3 on I if all processes satisfy the respective property and δ or ν can be chosen uniformly for all processes.*

Assumption A.2 implies Assumption A.1: If Y satisfies A.2, then

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(V(Y_\tau - Y_s)) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}(V \cdot \mathbb{E}(Y_\tau - Y_s \mid \mathcal{F}_s)) \right| \leq \mathbb{E}(|V| \cdot \mathbb{E}(|Y_\tau - Y_s| \mid \mathcal{F}_s)) \leq \mathbb{E}(|V|)\varepsilon.$$

However, if we want to bound a term of the form $|\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_N(Y_\tau - Y_s))|$ for some $N \subseteq M \in \mathcal{F}_s$ with $N \notin \mathcal{F}_s$, then Assumption A.1 is not enough; in this case, we need the stronger Assumption A.2.

Theorem A.5. *Let $X = \{X_t\}_{t \in I}$ and $Y = \{Y_t\}_{t \in I}$ be adapted \mathbb{R} -valued processes and let $Z := X \cdot Y$.*

- *If X and Y are essentially bounded and satisfy Assumption A.3, then Z also satisfies Assumption A.3.*
- *If X satisfies Assumption A.3 and if there exists $\underline{X} \in (0; \infty)$ such that $X \geq \underline{X}$, then $1/X$ also satisfies Assumption A.3.*

- If X and Y are essentially bounded, if X satisfies Assumption A.2 and Y satisfies Assumption A.1, then Z satisfies Assumption A.1. If, additionally, Y satisfies Assumption A.2, then Z also satisfies Assumption A.2.

Proof. The first statement follows from estimating the difference $|X_t Y_t - X_s Y_s|$ in terms of the differences $|X_t - X_s|$ and $|Y_t - Y_s|$. An analogous approach proves the second part of the last statement. The proof of the second statement follows from

$$\left| \frac{1}{X_t} - \frac{1}{X_s} \right| = \left| \frac{X_s - X_t}{X_s X_t} \right| \leq \underline{X}^{-2} |X_s - X_t|.$$

The first part of the third statement follows from

$$|\mathbb{E}(V(X_\tau Y_\tau - X_s Y_s))| \leq |\mathbb{E}(V Y_\tau (X_\tau - X_s))| + |\mathbb{E}(V X_s (Y_\tau - Y_s))|.$$

and the fact that X and Y are essentially bounded. \square

Next, we prove some properties of the concave envelope of the modulus of continuity of a uniformly continuous function. We use these results to show that a uniformly continuous function of an Itô process with bounded coefficients satisfies Assumption A.2 and A.3 if the process does.

Lemma A.6. *Let $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$ be a normed space with a non-empty and convex subset D , let (Y, d_Y) be a metric space, let $f: D \rightarrow Y$ and, for every $t \in [0; \infty)$ let*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega}_f(t) &:= \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in D, \|x_1 - x_2\|_X \leq t} d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)), \\ \omega_f(t) &:= \inf\{\psi(t) \mid \psi: [0; \infty) \rightarrow [0; \infty) \text{ concave and } \psi \geq \tilde{\omega}_f\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\tilde{\omega}_f: [0; \infty) \rightarrow [0; \infty]$, $\tilde{\omega}_f$ is non-decreasing, $\tilde{\omega}_f(0) = 0$, and for all $s, t \in [0; \infty)$ with $s > 0$,

$$\tilde{\omega}_f(t) \leq \frac{t+s}{s} \tilde{\omega}_f(s). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

If $\tilde{\omega}_f$ is finite, then ω_f takes values in $[0; \infty)$, is concave, non-decreasing and, for all $x_1, x_2 \in D$,

$$d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq \omega_f(\|x_1 - x_2\|_X). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

If f is uniformly continuous, then $\tilde{\omega}_f$ is finite, $\tilde{\omega}_f$ and ω_f are continuous in 0 and $\omega_f(0) = 0$.

Proof. By definition, $\tilde{\omega}_f$ is non-decreasing and $\tilde{\omega}_f(0) = 0$. To prove (A.1), let $s, t \in [0; \infty)$ with $s > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 \in D$ with $\|x_1 - x_2\|_X \leq t$. Let $N := \lceil t/s \rceil$ and let

$$x^k := \frac{k}{N} x_1 + \frac{N-k}{N} x_2 \quad (k = 0, \dots, N).$$

Then $x^k \in D$ because D is convex and $\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|_X = \frac{1}{N} \|x_1 - x_2\|_X \leq s$. Hence

$$d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} d_Y(f(x^k), f(x^{k+1})) \leq N \max_k \tilde{\omega}_f(\|x^k - x^{k+1}\|_X) \leq (t+s) \frac{\tilde{\omega}_f(s)}{s}.$$

Having established (A.1), we know that, if $\tilde{\omega}_f$ is finite, then it is bounded above by an affine (hence concave) function. In particular, the concave envelope is well-defined and satisfies (A.2). Concavity and monotonicity of ω_f are clear.

Uniform continuity of f implies that $\tilde{\omega}_f$ is finite and continuous in 0. In order to see $\omega_f(0) = 0$ and continuity in 0, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary and let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\tilde{\omega}_f(\delta) \leq \varepsilon/2$. Due to (A.1), $\tilde{\omega}_f$ and hence ω_f is bounded above by the affine and hence concave function $t \mapsto ((t+\delta)/\delta) \cdot (\varepsilon/2)$. In particular, for all $t \leq \delta$, we obtain $\omega_f(t) \leq \varepsilon$. \square

The next theorem shows that a uniformly continuous function of an Itô process with essentially bounded drift and diffusion coefficient satisfies the above regularity properties.

Theorem A.7. *Let $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^\infty(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\tilde{\sigma} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^\infty(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m})$. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ be the stochastic process defined by*

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \tilde{\mu}_u du + \int_0^t \tilde{\sigma}_u dW_u.$$

Let $f: [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be uniformly continuous. Then $\{f(t, X_t)\}_{t \in [0; T]}$ satisfies Assumptions A.2 and A.3. The mapping $\varepsilon \mapsto \delta$ in Assumption A.2 depends only on n, m, f and the bounds on $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$.

Proof. The following proof for the case $m = n = 1$ can easily be extended to arbitrary m and n . Let $\bar{\mu}, \bar{\sigma} \in (0; \infty)$ be essential bounds on $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ and let ω_f be as in Lemma A.6, i.e. $|f(t, X_t) - f(s, X_s)| \leq \omega_f(|t - s| \vee |X_t - X_s|)$. Due to the concavity of ω_f , a variation of Doob's maximal inequality for conditional expectations⁵ and the Itô isometry for conditional expectations, we obtain that, for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0; \infty)$ and $s \in [0; T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\max_{s \leq t \leq T \wedge (s+\delta)} |f(t, X_t) - f(s, X_s)| \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\omega_f \left(\delta \vee \max_{s \leq t \leq T \wedge (s+\delta)} |X_t - X_s| \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right) \\ & \leq \omega_f \left(\delta + \mathbb{E} \left(\max_{s \leq t \leq T \wedge (s+\delta)} \left| \int_s^t \tilde{\mu}_u du \right| \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\max_{s \leq t \leq T \wedge (s+\delta)} \left| \int_s^t \tilde{\sigma}_u dW_u \right| \middle| \mathcal{F}_s \right) \right) \\ & \leq \omega_f \left(\delta(1 + \bar{\mu}) + 2\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{\delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Assumption A.2 follows from the continuity of ω_f in 0.

Let us now prove Assumption A.3. Since $\tilde{\mu}$ is essentially bounded and f is uniformly continuous, it is enough to prove that the diffusion part of X satisfies Assumption A.3. To this end, let

$$A_{k, N}^\alpha := \left\{ \max_{\frac{T}{N}k \leq t \leq \frac{T}{N}(k+1)} \left| \int_{\frac{T}{N}k}^t \tilde{\sigma}_u dW_u \right| \geq \alpha \right\}.$$

The Markov inequality, the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and the boundedness of the diffusion coefficient yield a constant $C > 0$ that is independent of N such that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{k, N}^\alpha) \leq \frac{C}{\alpha^4 N^2}.$$

⁵In order to prove that the conditional expectation w.r.t. \mathcal{F}_s of the running maximum of a submartingale is bounded, we apply the classical Doob's maximal inequality concerning the conditional measures w.r.t. all sets $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ with positive probability.

Let $\omega \in \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{N-1} A_{k,N}^\alpha$ and $s, t \in [0; T]$ with $|s - t| \leq \frac{T}{N}$. Then, $\left| \left(\int_s^t \tilde{\sigma}_u dW_u \right) (\omega) \right| \leq 3\alpha$ and so

$$\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{N-1} A_{k,N}^\alpha \subseteq \left\{ \max_{s,t \in [0;T], |s-t| \leq \frac{T}{N}} \left| \int_s^t \tilde{\sigma}_u dW_u \right| \leq 3\alpha \right\}.$$

As a result, if N is large enough,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\max_{s,t \in [0;T], |s-t| \leq \frac{T}{N}} \left| \int_s^t \tilde{\sigma}_u dW_u \right| \leq 3\alpha \right] \geq 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}(A_{k,N}^\alpha) \geq 1 - \frac{C}{\alpha^4 N^1} \geq 1 - \delta.$$

□

Finally, we prove that our regularity properties hold for a certain class of BSDEs driven by forward SDEs. Specifically, we prove that the solution to the BSDE can be expressed as a *uniformly continuous* function of the forward process and then apply Theorem A.7. The representation of the solution in terms of a *continuous* function has been proven in [10] already.

For all $(t, x) \in [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, we consider the following SDE on $[t; T]$,

$$dX_s^{t,x} = \tilde{\mu}(s, X_s^{t,x}) ds + \tilde{\sigma}(s, X_s^{t,x}) dW_s, \quad X_t^{t,x} = x,$$

where $\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}: [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are measurable and bounded and satisfy the Lipschitz condition

$$\|(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma})(t, x_1) - (\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma})(t, x_2)\|_\infty \leq L \|x_1 - x_2\|_\infty.$$

Standard computations show that there is a constant $C \in (0; \infty)$ that depends only on L and the bounds of $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ such that, for all $t \in [0; T]$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [t; T]} \|X_s^{t,x_1} - X_s^{t,x_2}\|_\infty^2 \right) \leq C \|x_1 - x_2\|_\infty^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Theorem A.8. *Let $\Psi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded, $\psi: [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and bounded and let both function satisfy the Lipschitz condition*

$$|\Psi(x_1) - \Psi(x_2)| + |\psi(t, x_1, y_1) - \psi(t, x_2, y_2)| \leq L(\|x_1 - x_2\|_\infty + |y_1 - y_2|).$$

For $(t, x) \in [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, let $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}^2(\Omega \times [0; T]; \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m)$ be the unique solution to the BSDE on $[t; T]$,

$$-dY_s^{t,x} = \psi(s, X_s^{t,x}, Y_s^{t,x}) ds - Z_s^{t,x} dW_s, \quad Y_T^{t,x} = \Psi(X_T^{t,x}) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

driven by the forward process $X^{t,x}$, which exists due to [10, Theorem 2.1]. Then there exists a uniformly continuous function $h: [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which does not depend on (t, x) , such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[h(s, X_s^{t,x}) = Y_s^{t,x} \text{ for all } s \in [t; T] \right] = 1. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In particular, the process $Y^{t,x}$ satisfies Assumption A.2 and Assumption A.3 on $[t; T]$.

Proof. By [10, Theorem 3.4] and the remark following it, there exists a function $h: [0; T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is 1/2-Hölder continuous in t and locally Lipschitz continuous in x such that (A.5) holds. It therefore remains to prove the uniform continuity of h . Since

$$h(t, x) = \mathbb{E} \left(\Psi(X_T^{t,x}) + \int_t^T \psi \left(u, X_u^{t,x}, h(u, X_u^{t,x}) \right) du \right), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

we see that h is bounded, say $|h| \leq \bar{h}$. Then

$$\tilde{\omega}_h(s, \delta) := \sup_{\|x_1 - x_2\|_\infty \leq \delta} |h(s, x_1) - h(s, x_2)|$$

is finite, and Lemma A.6 allows us to define its concave envelope $\omega_h(s, \cdot): [0; \infty) \rightarrow [0; \infty)$.

Using the Lipschitz continuity of ψ , we obtain, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in [0; T]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & |h(t, x_1) - h(t, x_2)| \\ & \leq L \mathbb{E}(\|X_T^{t,x_1} - X_T^{t,x_2}\|_\infty) \\ & \quad + L \int_t^T \left(\mathbb{E}(\|X_u^{t,x_1} - X_u^{t,x_2}\|_\infty) + \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\omega}_h(u, \|X_u^{t,x_1} - X_u^{t,x_2}\|_\infty)) \right) du. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Using (A.3 along with Lemma A.6, if $\|x_1 - x_2\|_\infty \leq \delta$, then

$$\mathbb{E}(\|X_T^{t,x_1} - X_T^{t,x_2}\|_\infty) \leq C\delta \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\omega}_h(u, \|X_u^{t,x_1} - X_u^{t,x_2}\|_\infty)) \leq \omega_h(u, \mathbb{E}(\|X_u^{t,x_1} - X_u^{t,x_2}\|_\infty)) \leq \omega_h(u, C\delta), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

for some constant $C \in (0; \infty)$ that depends only on $\tilde{\mu}$, $\tilde{\sigma}$ and L . In view of (A.1),

$$\omega_h(u, C\delta) \leq (C + 1)\tilde{\omega}_h(u, \delta). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

This shows that

$$\tilde{\omega}_h(t, \delta) \leq LC\delta + L \int_t^T (C\delta + (C + 1)\tilde{\omega}_h(u, \delta)) du = LC\delta(1 + T - t) + L(C + 1) \int_t^T \tilde{\omega}_h(u, \delta) du.$$

Hence the Gronwall inequality implies that h is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in the second variable. Since h is uniformly 1/2-Hölder continuous in the first variable this proves the assertion. \square

B Convergence results for SDEs and random ODEs

In this appendix, we establish three convergence results for stochastic integral equations that are useful to establish the convergence of our coefficient and state processes. In Subsection B.1, we consider sequences of SDEs parametrized by $\eta \rightarrow 0$ with “positive feedback”, i.e. sequences of equations that are driven away from their limits. In Subsection B.2, we consider sequences of random ODE systems parametrized by $\eta \rightarrow 0$ with “negative feedback”, which are driven towards their limit. For equations with positive feedback, we require a priori information about the terminal value and the increments of the coefficient processes to be bounded independently

of their past (see Assumption A.1 and Assumption A.2). These bounds prevent the stochastic process from reaching its terminal value if a large difference between the limit and the pre-limit occurs at some time $s \in (0; T)$. This will imply a.s. uniform convergence. An almost sure statement under negative feedback cannot be expected. Instead, we follow a pathwise approach and establish uniform convergence in probability. Our approach requires a strong regularity assumption (Assumption A.3) on the coefficient process.

B.1 SDEs with positive feedback

B.1.1 An equation without scaling

Let us consider a family of real-valued, adapted, continuous stochastic processes $b^\eta = \{b_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$ that satisfy the integral equation

$$db_t^\eta = \left(a(t, b_t^\eta) + q_t^\eta \right) dt + \bar{Z}_t^\eta dW_t \quad \text{on } (0; T) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $a: \Omega \times (0; T) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is adapted and continuous and $\{q_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$ is an adapted, \mathbb{R} -valued, continuous stochastic process and

$$\{\bar{Z}_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)} \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^2(\Omega \times (0; T-]; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Our goal is to prove that the processes $\{b_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$ with terminal conditions $b_T^\eta = 0$ converge to 0 as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on $(0, T)$ if the process q^η does and if the mapping a is such that b^η is driven away from 0. Intuitively, the last condition makes it impossible for b^η to return to 0 at the terminal time once it has left a neighbourhood of 0. Specifically, we assume that the following assumption is satisfied.

Assumption B.1.

i) There exists a real constant $\bar{a} > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in (0; T)} \sup_{\eta \in (0; \infty)} \left| a(t, b_t^\eta) \right| \leq \bar{a}.$$

ii) For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\eta \in (0; \infty)} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [T-\delta; T]} |b_t^\eta| \leq \varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

iii) There exists a function $\eta_1: (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that

$$\inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \inf_{\eta \leq \eta_1(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in (0; T-\varepsilon]} |q_t^\eta| \leq \varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

iv) There exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{t \in (0; T)} \inf_{b \in [-\varepsilon_1; \varepsilon_1]} b \cdot a(t, b) \geq 0.$$

Lemma B.2. *Under Assumption B.1, there exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$, which depends only on η_1 and the mapping $\varepsilon \mapsto \delta$ introduced in Assumption B.1 ii), such that*

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon))} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{s \in (0; T)} |b_s^\eta| \leq \varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0; \varepsilon_1]$. In a first step, we show that there exists $\eta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta} := \inf\{t \in (0; T) \mid \mathbb{P}[b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon] = 0 \text{ for all } s \in [t; T)\}$$

satisfies $\sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta} = 0$ for all $\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon)]$. Since b^η is continuous, this will imply

$$\inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon))} \mathbb{P} \left[\inf_{s \in (0; T)} b_s^\eta \geq -\varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

The other direction of the statement can be proven analogously.

We now assume to the contrary that $0 < \sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta}$ and prove that this leads to a contradiction if η is small enough. For all $s \in (0; T)$ and $\eta \in (0; \infty)$, we can define the stopping time

$$\tau^s := \tau^{s, \varepsilon, \eta} := \inf\{u \in [s; T) \mid b_u^\eta = -\varepsilon/2\}.$$

By Assumption B.1 ii), there exists a small enough $\delta > 0$ such that, for all $s \in (0; T)$ and $\eta \in (0; \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{P}[b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon, \tau^s > T - \delta] = 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since τ^s is a stopping time, due to the square-integrability of \overline{Z}^η and Assumption B.1 i), iv), (B.1) and (B.2), we see that, for all $s \in (0; \sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta})$ and $\eta \in (0; \infty)$ (the underbrace refers to the case when $\sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta} < \tau^s$),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon] \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon\}} (b_{\tau^s}^\eta - b_s^\eta) \right) \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon\}} \left(\int_s^{\tau^s \wedge \sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta}} a(t, b_t^\eta) dt + \int_{\tau^s \wedge \sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta}}^{\tau^s} a(t, \underbrace{b_t^\eta}_{\in [-\varepsilon; -\varepsilon/2]}) dt + \int_s^{\tau^s} q_t^\eta dt \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}[b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon] \left((\sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta} - s) \overline{a} + T \sup_{t \in [0; T - \delta]} |q_t^\eta| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The assumption $0 < \sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta}$ implies that for any $\alpha > 0$, we can find

$$\sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta} - \alpha \leq s \leq \sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta}$$

with $\mathbb{P}[b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon] > 0$. However, due to Assumption B.1 ii) and iii), we can choose $\alpha \leq \varepsilon/(5\overline{a})$, $\delta \leq \varepsilon/(5T)$ and $\eta_0(\varepsilon) < \eta_1(\delta)$ such that (B.3) leads to a contradiction because $\mathbb{P}[b_s^\eta < -\varepsilon] > 0$. This implies $0 = \sigma^{\varepsilon, \eta}$. \square

B.1.2 An equation with scaling

In this section, we establish an abstract convergence result for stochastic processes $\{P_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$ indexed by some parameter $\eta > 0$ that satisfy the integral equation

$$d(\psi P^\eta)_t = \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \left(a(P_t^\eta, P_t^0) + q_t^\eta \right) dt + dL_t^\eta + \overline{Z}_t^\eta dW_t \quad \text{on } (0; T) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $a : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable mapping, $\{\psi_t\}_{t \in (0, T)}$, $\{P_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$, $\{P_t^0\}_{t \in (0, T)}$, $\{q_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$, $\{L_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$ and are adapted, \mathbb{R} -valued, continuous stochastic processes and

$$\{\overline{Z}_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)} \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^2(\Omega \times (0; T-]; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Our goal is to prove that the processes $\{P_t^\eta\}_{t \in (0, T)}$ converge to P^0 as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on compact subintervals of $(0, T)$ if the mapping $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is such that P^η is driven away from P^0 and if the boundary condition $\lim_{t \rightarrow T} (P_t^\eta - P_t^0) \geq 0$ holds. If the integral equation (B.4) holds on the whole interval $(0; T]$, then it is enough to assume that $P_T^\eta \geq P_T^0$. When applying the abstract convergence result to the BSDEs (4.1) and (4.2), the former condition holds if $N = +\infty$ while the latter holds if N is finite.

Assumption B.3.

- i) There exist positive constants $\underline{\psi}, \overline{\psi}, \overline{P}$ such that $\underline{\psi} \leq \psi \leq \overline{\psi}$, $|P^0| \leq \overline{P}$ and $P^\eta \geq -\overline{P}$. Moreover, there exists a function $\eta_1 : (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that

$$P^\eta|_{\Omega \times (0; T-\varepsilon]} \leq \overline{P} \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } \eta \leq \eta_1(\varepsilon).$$

- ii) One of the following two “boundary conditions” holds:

- a) For all $\eta > 0$, there is a $T_\eta < T$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\inf_{T_\eta \leq t < T} (P_t^\eta - P_t^0) \geq 0 \right] = 1$$

- b) The integral equation (B.4) holds on the whole interval $(0; T]$ and $\mathbb{P}[P_T^\eta \geq P_T^0] = 1$.⁶

- iii) There exists a function $\eta_2 : (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$ such that

$$\inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \inf_{\eta \leq \eta_2(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P} \left[\inf_{t \in (0; T-\varepsilon]} q_t^\eta \geq -\varepsilon, \sup_{t \in (0; T)} q_t^\eta \leq \varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

- iv) The function $a : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is non-decreasing and differentiable in the first variable and $a(P_t^0(\omega), P_t^0(\omega)) \equiv 0$. Moreover, there exist $\overline{\varepsilon}, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} a(x, P_t^0(\omega)) \geq \beta \quad \text{for all } |x - P_t^0(\omega)| \leq \overline{\varepsilon}.$$

- v) The processes ψ and P^0 satisfy Assumption A.2 and the processes L^η ($\eta > 0$) satisfy Assumption A.1 uniformly in $\eta > 0$.

⁶This requires that ψ , P^η , P^0 , q^η and L^η are continuous on $(0; T]$ and $\overline{Z}^\eta \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Prog}}^2(\Omega \times (0; T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

Lemma B.4. Let $p^\eta := P^\eta - P^0$. Under Assumption B.3, there exists a function $\eta_0: (0; \infty) \rightarrow (0; \infty)$, which depends only on $\psi, \bar{P}, \eta_1, \eta_2, P^0, \bar{\varepsilon}, \beta$ and the mapping $\varepsilon \mapsto \delta$ corresponding to the uniform satisfaction of Assumption A.1 by $\{L^\eta\}_\eta$, such that

$$\inf_{\varepsilon \in (0; \infty)} \inf_{\eta \in (0; \eta_0(\varepsilon))} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{s \in (0; T - \varepsilon]} p_s^\eta \leq \varepsilon, \inf_{s \in (0; T)} p_s^\eta \geq -\varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

Proof. Let us fix $\varepsilon \in (0; \bar{\varepsilon}]$. We first show that there exists $\eta_0(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\eta \leq \eta_0(\varepsilon)} \sup_{s \in (0; T - \varepsilon]} \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon] = 0. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Since p^η is continuous, this proves that

$$\inf_{\eta \leq \eta_0(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{s \in (0; T - \varepsilon]} p^\eta \leq \varepsilon \right] = 1.$$

To this end, we fix $\delta \leq \varepsilon/2$ and $s \in (0, T - \varepsilon]$. For all $\eta > 0$, we can define the stopping time

$$\tau^\eta := (s + \delta) \wedge \inf\{u \in [s; T] \mid |p_u^\eta| = \varepsilon/2\} \leq T - \delta.$$

Due to the L^2 -integrability of \bar{Z}^η on $[s; T - \delta]$ and by the optional sampling theorem (cf. Theorem 3.22 in [23]), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon\}} \left(\sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \int_s^{\tau^\eta} \left(a(P_u^\eta, P_u^0) + q_u^\eta \right) du + L_{\tau^\eta}^\eta - L_s^\eta \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \psi_s P_s^0 - \psi_{\tau^\eta} P_{\tau^\eta}^0 + \psi_s p_s^\eta - \psi_{\tau^\eta} p_{\tau^\eta}^\eta \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We now analyze the various terms in (B.6) separately to deduce that $\mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon] = 0$ if

$$\eta \leq \eta_0(\varepsilon) := \min(\eta_1(\varepsilon), \eta_2(\min(\delta, \beta\varepsilon/4))).$$

- We first consider the term

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon\}} \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \int_s^{\tau^\eta} \left(a(P_u^\eta, P_u^0) + q_u^\eta \right) du \right).$$

On $\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon\}$, we have that $p_u^\eta \geq \varepsilon/2$ for all $u \in [s; \tau^\eta]$ and hence

$$a(P_u^\eta, P_u^0) = a(P_u^0 + p_u^\eta, P_u^0) \geq a(P_u^0 + \varepsilon/2, P_u^0) \geq \beta \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Together with our assumption on the process q^η and our choice of η , this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon\}} \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \int_s^{\tau^\eta} \left(\underbrace{a(P_u^\eta, P_u^0)}_{\geq \beta\varepsilon/2} + \underbrace{q_u^\eta}_{\geq -\beta\varepsilon/4} \right) du \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon\}} \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} (\tau^\eta - s) \beta\varepsilon/4 \right) \\ & \geq \delta \sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \beta \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon, \tau^\eta = s + \delta] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

- By Assumption B.3 (v) and Theorem A.5, we can choose for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ some $\delta > 0$, which does not depend on η , such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon\}} (Y_{\tau^\eta} - Y_s) \right) \right| \leq \varepsilon_0 \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon], \quad \text{for } Y = \psi P^0, L^\eta. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(|\psi_{\tau^\eta} - \psi_s| | \mathcal{F}_s) \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad (\text{B.9})$$

- Using (B.8), along with the fact that $P^\eta|_{\Omega \times (0; T-\varepsilon]} \leq \bar{P}$ due to Assumption B.3 (i), yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon\}} (\psi_s p_s^\eta - \psi_{\tau^\eta} p_{\tau^\eta}^\eta) \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon, \tau^\eta < s + \delta\}} (\psi_s \varepsilon / 2 + (\psi_s - \psi_{\tau^\eta}) \varepsilon / 2) \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{p_s^\eta > \varepsilon, \tau^\eta = s + \delta\}} (\psi_s \varepsilon - \psi_{\tau^\eta} \underbrace{p_{\tau^\eta}^\eta}_{\leq 2\bar{P}}) \right) \\ & \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \underline{\psi} \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon, \tau^\eta < s + \delta] - \frac{\varepsilon \varepsilon_0}{2} \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon] \\ & \quad + (\varepsilon \underline{\psi} - 2\bar{\psi} \bar{P}) \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon, \tau^\eta = s + \delta]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Altogether this yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & \geq \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon, \tau^\eta = s + \delta] \left(\delta \sqrt{\eta_0(\varepsilon)^{-1}} \beta \varepsilon / 4 - 2\varepsilon_0 - \frac{\varepsilon \varepsilon_0}{2} + \varepsilon \underline{\psi} - 2\bar{\psi} \bar{P} \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon, \tau^\eta < s + \delta] \left(-2\varepsilon_0 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \underline{\psi} - \frac{\varepsilon \varepsilon_0}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, if we choose first ε_0 and then $\eta_0(\varepsilon)$ small enough, the coefficients that multiply the probabilities become positive. Hence both probabilities must be equal to zero and so $\mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta > \varepsilon] = 0$ if $\eta \leq \eta_0(\varepsilon)$. Analogously, we can prove that $\mathbb{P}[p_s^\eta < -\varepsilon] = 0$ for all $s \in (0; T)$. The main difference is that $\tau^\eta < T - \delta$ does not hold on the set $\{p_s^\eta < -\varepsilon\}$. Instead, we only obtain $\tau^\eta < T$ (if Assumption B.3 (ii) b) holds) or $\tau^\eta < T_\eta$ (if Assumption B.3 (ii) a) holds). Moreover, Assumption B.3 (i) is not needed in (B.10). Instead, $p_{\tau^\eta}^\eta \geq -2\bar{P}$, due to Assumption B.3 (i). \square

B.2 ODE systems with negative feedback

In this section, we establish a convergence result for ODEs with random coefficients and “nearly singular” driver. Specifically, we consider pairs of continuously differentiable stochastic processes (X^η, Z^η) , which satisfy the ODE system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}_t^\eta &= -A_t^\eta (X_t^\eta + B_t^\eta Z_t^\eta), \quad X_0^\eta = x_0, \\ \dot{Z}_t^\eta &= C_t X_t^\eta + D_t Z_t^\eta, \quad Z_0^\eta = z_0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

on some time interval $[0; S]$ for all $\eta > 0$, where A^η , B^η , C and D are continuous, adapted, real-valued stochastic processes. We assume that the process A^η converges in probability to infinity as $\eta \rightarrow 0$, that the process B^η converges to a process B^0 in probability and that the processes (X^η, Z^η) are uniformly bounded in probability.

Assumption B.5. *There exists a continuous adapted process B^0 , which satisfies Assumption A.3 such that for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0; \infty)$, there exists some $\eta_0 = \eta_0(\varepsilon, \delta) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\eta \leq \eta_0} \mathbb{P} \left[\inf_{t \in [0; S]} A_t^\eta \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \sup_{t \in [0; S]} |B_t^\eta - B_t^0| \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Moreover, for all $\delta \in (0; 1)$, there exists an $L > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\eta > 0} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0; S]} (|X_t^\eta| + |Z_t^\eta|) \leq L \right] \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

In terms of the process B^0 , we define

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^0 &:= -B_t^0 Z_t^0, \\ Z_t^0 &:= z_0 \exp \left(\int_0^t (-C_s B_s^0 + D_s) ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Our goal is to prove that $(X^\eta, Z^\eta) \rightarrow (X^0, Z^0)$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ in a suitable sense. Since the initial condition of the processes X^η does not vary with η and since $A_0^\eta \uparrow \infty$, we cannot expect convergence in $t = 0$. Instead, we first prove that $\frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta}$ converges to 0 on any compact subinterval of $(0; S]$ with lower, respectively upper convergence near the origin.

Lemma B.6. *If Assumption B.5 holds and if $x_0 + B_0^0 z_0 > 0$, then for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0; \infty)$, there exists $\eta_1 = \eta_1(\varepsilon, \delta) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\eta \leq \eta_1} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0; S]} \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta} \leq \varepsilon, \inf_{t \in [\varepsilon; S]} \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta} \geq -\varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

If $x_0 + B_0^0 z_0 < 0$, then the intervals $[0; S]$ and $[\varepsilon; S]$ in the above statement are to be swapped.

The mapping η_1 depends only on B^0, C, D, x_0, z_0 , and the mappings $(\varepsilon, \delta) \mapsto \eta_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$ and $\delta \mapsto L$ introduced in Assumption B.5.

Proof. Let $y_0 := x_0 + B_0^0 z_0$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $y_0 > 0$. Then there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ s.t.

$$y_0 - \alpha |z_0| > 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \leq \alpha_0.$$

Let us now put

$$\begin{aligned} M^{L, \eta} &:= \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0; S]} (|B_t^0| + |C_t| + |D_t| + |X_t^\eta| + |Z_t^\eta|) \leq L \right\}, \\ M^{\alpha, \eta} &:= \left\{ \inf_{t \in [0; S]} A_t^\eta \geq 1/\alpha, \sup_{t \in [0; S]} |B_t^\eta - B_t^0| \leq \alpha \right\}, \\ M^{\beta, \nu} &:= \left\{ \sup_{s, t \in [0; S], |s-t| \leq \nu} |B_s^0 - B_t^0| \leq \beta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For all $\delta > 0, \beta > 0$ and $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$, there exist constants $L_0(\delta), \eta_0(\alpha, \delta)$ and $\nu_0(\beta, \delta)$ such that

$$\inf_{\eta} \mathbb{P}[M^{L, \eta}] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{6}, \quad \inf_{\eta \leq \eta_0} \mathbb{P}[M^{\alpha, \eta}] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{6}, \quad \mathbb{P}[M^{\beta, \nu}] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{6}$$

for all $L \geq L_0$ and $\nu \leq \nu_0$. Moreover, for all $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$ and \mathbb{P} -a.a. $\omega \in M^{\alpha, \eta}$,

$$\dot{X}_0^\eta(\omega) \leq -A_0^\eta(\omega)(y_0 - |B_0^\eta(\omega) - B_0^0(\omega)||z_0|) \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha}(y_0 - \alpha|z_0|) < 0. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

We are now ready to prove that, for all $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, there exists $\eta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\eta \leq \eta_1} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0; S]} \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta} \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

To this end, we take an $\omega \in M^{L, \eta} \cap M^{\alpha, \eta} \cap M^{\beta, \nu}$ where (B.15) holds and assume that there exists some $t \in [0; S]$ such that $\frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta(\omega)}{A_t^\eta(\omega)} \geq \varepsilon$. It is enough to show that such a t cannot exist for L large and α, β, ν, η small enough. Since $\frac{\dot{X}_s^\eta(\omega)}{A_s^\eta(\omega)}$ is continuous and $\frac{\dot{X}_0^\eta(\omega)}{A_0^\eta(\omega)} < 0$ for $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$, we can choose a minimal $t \in [0; S]$ with the property that $\frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta(\omega)}{A_t^\eta(\omega)} = \varepsilon$. Let $s := \sup \{u \in (0; t) \mid \frac{\dot{X}_u^\eta(\omega)}{A_u^\eta(\omega)} = \varepsilon/2\}$. Then, $\frac{\dot{X}_s^\eta(\omega)}{A_s^\eta(\omega)} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $\frac{\dot{X}_u^\eta(\omega)}{A_u^\eta(\omega)} > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $u \in (s; t]$. We now distinguish two cases.

- Case 1: $t - s \geq \nu$. Then, the fact that $\omega \in M^{L, \eta} \cap M^{\alpha, \eta}$ yields

$$2L \geq X_t^\eta(\omega) - X_s^\eta(\omega) = \int_s^t \frac{\dot{X}_u^\eta(\omega)}{A_u^\eta(\omega)} A_u^\eta(\omega) du \geq \frac{\nu \varepsilon}{2\alpha}. \quad (\text{B.16})$$

- Case 2: $t - s < \nu$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon}{2} &= \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta(\omega)}{A_t^\eta(\omega)} - \frac{\dot{X}_s^\eta(\omega)}{A_s^\eta(\omega)} \\ &= -X_t^\eta(\omega) - B_t^\eta(\omega)Z_t^\eta(\omega) + X_s^\eta(\omega) + B_s^\eta(\omega)Z_s^\eta(\omega). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Using that $\omega \in M^{\alpha, \eta}$ yields $-X_t^\eta(\omega) + X_s^\eta(\omega) = -\int_s^t \frac{\dot{X}_u^\eta(\omega)}{A_u^\eta(\omega)} A_u^\eta(\omega) du < 0$. Using that $\omega \in M^{L, \eta} \cap M^{\beta, \nu}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon}{2} &\leq -B_t^\eta(\omega) \int_s^t \dot{Z}_u^\eta(\omega) du - Z_s^\eta(\omega)(B_t^\eta(\omega) - B_s^\eta(\omega)) \\ &\leq 2L^2\nu(|B_t^0(\omega)| + |B_t^\eta(\omega) - B_t^0(\omega)|) \\ &\quad + L(|B_t^\eta(\omega) - B_t^0(\omega)| + |B_t^0(\omega) - B_s^0(\omega)| + |B_s^0(\omega) - B_s^\eta(\omega)|) \\ &\leq 2L^2\nu(L + \alpha) + L(2\alpha + \beta). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

Now, we first choose $L \geq L_0(\delta)$, then $\beta > 0$ such that $3L\beta < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$, then $\nu \leq \nu_0(\beta, \delta)$ such that $2L^2\nu(L + \alpha_0) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$, then $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$ such that $\frac{\nu\varepsilon}{2\alpha} > 2L$ and $\alpha \leq \beta$ and finally $\eta_1(\varepsilon, \delta) \leq \eta_0(\alpha, \delta)$. Then both (B.16) and (B.18) are violated. As a result,

$$M^{L, \eta} \cap M^{\alpha, \eta} \cap M^{\beta, \nu} \subseteq \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0; S]} \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta} \leq \varepsilon \right\}$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0; S]} \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta} \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (\text{B.19})$$

It remains to prove that, for suitably chosen parameters

$$M^{L,\eta} \cap M^{\alpha,\eta} \cap M^{\beta,\nu} \subseteq \left\{ \inf_{t \in [\varepsilon; S]} \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta} \geq -\varepsilon \right\}.$$

To this end, we fix $\omega \in M^{L,\eta} \cap M^{\alpha,\eta} \cap M^{\beta,\nu}$ and assume that there exists a minimal $t \in [\varepsilon; S]$ such that $\frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta(\omega)}{A_t^\eta(\omega)} \leq -\varepsilon$. Using that $\omega \in M^{L,\eta} \cap M^{\alpha,\eta}$, it is straightforward to show that, for all sufficiently small α , there is an $r \in [0; \varepsilon]$ such that $\frac{\dot{X}_r^\eta(\omega)}{A_r^\eta(\omega)} \geq -\varepsilon/2$. Hence, we can define

$$s := \sup \left\{ u \in [0; t) \mid \frac{\dot{X}_u^\eta(\omega)}{A_u^\eta(\omega)} = -\varepsilon/2 \right\}.$$

Then $0 \leq s < t$ and $\frac{\dot{X}_u^\eta(\omega)}{A_u^\eta(\omega)} \in [-\varepsilon; -\varepsilon/2]$ for all $u \in [s; t]$. We can now use the same arguments as in the first step to conclude that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\inf_{t \in [\varepsilon; S]} \frac{\dot{X}_t^\eta}{A_t^\eta} \geq -\varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Combining (B.19) and (B.20) yields the desired result. \square

Lemma B.7. *Let Assumption B.5 be satisfied and let $x_0 + B_0^0 z_0 \neq 0$. Then for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0; \infty)$, there exists $\eta_2 = \eta_2(\varepsilon, \delta) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\eta \leq \eta_2} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0; S]} |Z_t^\eta - Z_t^0| \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

The mapping η_2 depends only on B^0, C, D, x_0, z_0 , and the mappings $(\varepsilon, \delta) \mapsto \eta_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$ and $\delta \mapsto L$ introduced in Assumption B.5.

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t^\eta - Z_t^0 &= \exp \left(\int_0^t (D_u - B_u^\eta C_u) du \right) \int_0^t \exp \left(- \int_0^s (D_u - B_u^\eta C_u) du \right) \\ &\quad \left((B_s^0 - B_s^\eta) C_s Z_s^0 - C_s \cdot \frac{\dot{X}_s^\eta}{A_s^\eta} \right) ds, \end{aligned}$$

the assertion follows from Assumption B.5 and Lemma B.6. \square

The next theorem follows by Assumption B.5, Lemma B.6 and Lemma B.7.

Theorem B.8. *If Assumption B.5 holds and $x_0 + B_0^0 z_0 > 0$, then for all $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0; \infty)$, there exists $\eta_3 = \eta_3(\varepsilon, \delta) > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\eta \leq \eta_3} \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0; S]} \max \left(|Z_t^0 - Z_t^\eta|, X_t^0 - X_t^\eta \right) \leq \varepsilon, \inf_{t \in [\varepsilon; S]} (X_t^0 - X_t^\eta) \geq -\varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

If $x_0 + B_0^0 z_0 < 0$, then the intervals $[0; S]$ and $[\varepsilon; S]$ in the statement are to be swapped.

The mapping η_3 depends only on B^0, C, D, x_0, z_0 , and the mappings $(\varepsilon, \delta) \mapsto \eta_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$ and $\delta \mapsto L$ introduced in Assumption B.5.

References

- [1] J. ACKERMANN, T. KRUSE, AND M. URUSOV, *Càdlàg semimartingale strategies for optimal trade execution in stochastic order book models*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05863, (2020).
- [2] A. ALFONSI, A. FRUTH, AND A. SCHIED, *Optimal execution strategies in limit order books with general shape functions*, *Quantitative finance*, 10 (2010), pp. 143–157.
- [3] R. ALMGREN AND N. CHRISS, *Optimal execution of portfolio transactions*, *Journal of Risk*, 3 (2001), pp. 5–40.
- [4] S. ANKIRCHNER, M. JEANBLANC, AND T. KRUSE, *Bsdes with singular terminal condition and a control problem with constraints*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 52 (2014), pp. 893–913.
- [5] D. BERTSIMAS AND A. W. LO, *Optimal control of execution costs*, *Journal of Financial Markets*, 1 (1998), pp. 1–50.
- [6] R. CARMONA AND K. WEBSTER, *The self-financing equation in limit order book markets*, *Finance and Stochastics*, 23 (2019), pp. 729–759.
- [7] A. CARTEA AND S. JAIMUNGAL, *Incorporating order-flow into optimal execution*, *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 10 (2016), pp. 339–364.
- [8] Á. CARTEA AND S. JAIMUNGAL, *Portfolio liquidation and ambiguity aversion*, SSRN, (2017).
- [9] N. CHEN, S. KOU, AND C. WANG, *A partitioning algorithm for markov decision processes with applications to market microstructure*, *Management Science*, 64 (2018), pp. 784–803.
- [10] N. EL KAROUI AND L. MAZLIAK, *Backward stochastic differential equations*, vol. 364, CRC Press, 1997.
- [11] D. EVANGELISTA AND Y. THAMSTEN, *On finite population games of optimal trading*, arXiv:2004.00790, (2020).
- [12] A. FRUTH, T. SCHÖNEBORN, AND M. URUSOV, *Optimal trade execution in order books with stochastic liquidity*, *Mathematical Finance*, 29 (2019), pp. 507–541.
- [13] G. FU, P. GRAEWE, U. HORST, AND A. POPIER, *A mean field game of optimal portfolio liquidation*, to appear in *Mathematics of Operations Research*, (2021).
- [14] J. GATHERAL, *No-dynamic-arbitrage and market impact*, *Quantitative Finance*, 10 (2010), pp. 749–759.
- [15] J. GATHERAL AND A. SCHIED, *Optimal trade execution under geometric Brownian motion in the Almgren and Chriss framework*, *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 14 (2011), pp. 353–368.
- [16] P. GRAEWE AND U. HORST, *Optimal trade execution with instantaneous price impact and stochastic resilience*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55 (2017), pp. 3707–3725.

- [17] P. GRAEWE, U. HORST, AND J. QIU, *A non-markovian liquidation problem and backward spdes with singular terminal conditions*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 53 (2015), pp. 690–711.
- [18] O. GUÉANT, *Optimal execution and block trade pricing: a general framework*, Applied Mathematical Finance, 22 (2015), pp. 336–365.
- [19] U. HORST AND E. KIVMAN, *Small impact analysis in stochastically illiquid market – the limiting process*, in preparation.
- [20] U. HORST AND F. NAUJOKAT, *When to cross the spread? trading in two-sided limit order books*, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, 5 (2014), pp. 278–315.
- [21] U. HORST AND X. XIA, *Multi-dimensional optimal trade execution under stochastic resiliency*, Finance and Stochastics, 23 (2019), pp. 889–923.
- [22] U. HORST, X. XIA, AND C. ZHOU, *Optimal portfolio liquidation under factor uncertainty*, The Annals of Applied Probability, to appear (2021).
- [23] I. KARATZAS AND S. SHREVE, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, vol. 113, springer, 1998.
- [24] T. KRUSE AND A. POPIER, *Minimal supersolutions for bsdes with singular terminal condition and application to optimal position targeting*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 126 (2016), pp. 2554–2592.
- [25] J. LARGE, *Measuring the resiliency of an electronic limit order book*, Journal of Financial Markets, 10 (2007), pp. 1–25.
- [26] D. K. LO AND A. D. HALL, *Resiliency of the limit order book*, Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 61 (2015), pp. 222–244.
- [27] A. LOKKA AND J. XU, *Optimal liquidation for a risk averse investor in a one-sided limit order book driven by a levy process*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03379, (2020).
- [28] C. LORENZ AND A. SCHIED, *Drift dependence of optimal trade execution strategies under transient price impact*, Finance and Stochastics, 17 (2013), pp. 743–770.
- [29] E. NEUMAN AND M. VOSS, *Optimal signal-adaptive trading with temporary and transient price impact*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09549, (2020).
- [30] A. A. OBIZHAEVA AND J. WANG, *Optimal trading strategy and supply/demand dynamics*, Journal of Financial Markets, 16 (2013), pp. 1–32.
- [31] S. PREDOIU, G. SHAIKHET, AND S. SHREVE, *Optimal execution in a general one-sided limit-order book*, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, 2 (2011), pp. 183–212.