

Profit and loss decomposition in continuous time and approximations

Gero Junike*[†], Hauke Stier*, Marcus Christiansen*

December 20, 2024

Abstract

Financial institutions and insurance companies that analyze the evolution and sources of profits and losses often look at risk factors only at discrete reporting dates, ignoring the detailed paths. Continuous-time decompositions avoid this weakness and also make decompositions consistent across different reporting grids. We construct a large class of continuous-time decompositions from a new extended version of Itô's formula and uniquely identify a preferred decomposition from the axioms of exactness, symmetry and normalization. This unique decomposition turns out to be a stochastic limit of recursive Shapley values, but it suffers from a curse of dimensionality as the number of risk factors increases. We develop an approximation that breaks this curse when the risk factors almost surely have no simultaneous jumps.

Keywords profit and loss attribution; sequential decompositions; change analysis; risk decomposition; Itô's formula

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020) 60H05, 60H30, 91G10, 91G60, 91G30, 91G40

JEL Classification C02, C30, C63, G10, G12

1 Introduction

Profit and loss (P&L) attribution, also known as change analysis, has a long history in risk management. P&L attribution is the process of analyzing the change between two valuation dates and explaining the evolution of the P&L by the movement of the sources (risk factors) between the two dates, see Candland and Lotz (2014). In other words, the change in the P&L over time is *decomposed* in terms of the different risk factors to explain how each factor *contributes* to the P&L. In the literature, there are many ways to obtain a P&L attribution. For example, consider a portfolio in EUR consisting of a long position in the S&P 500, Y for short. The P&L of such a portfolio is driven by two risk factors: Y and the USDEUR exchange rate, X for short. To decompose the P&L over one year, we look for two real numbers D_X and D_Y , such that

$$X(1)Y(1) - X(0)Y(0) \stackrel{!}{=} D_X + D_Y.$$

*Carl von Ossietzky Universität, Institut für Mathematik, 26129 Oldenburg, Germany.

[†]Corresponding author. ORCID: 0000-0001-8686-2661, E-Mail: gero.junike@uol.de

This article is accepted in the journal *Finance and Stochastics*.

The numbers D_X and D_Y are interpreted as the contribution of X and Y to the P&L. In the literature we can find many desirable properties that a decomposition should possess, see Shubik (1962), Friedman and Moulin (1999) and Shorrocks (2013) among many others. The authors argue that a decomposition should be *symmetric*, i.e., the contributions of the risk factors should be independent of the way in which the risk factors are labeled or ordered. These authors also require that the sum of all contributions equals the P&L, such decompositions are called *exact*. Further, Christiansen (2022) argues that a decomposition should be *normalized*, i.e., if a risk factor remains constant, its contribution to the P&L should be zero. It is also desirable for a decomposition to consider the full path of each risk factor, i.e., to use all available information, see Mai (2023) and Flaig and Junike (2024).

Common decomposition principles

A common method for creating decompositions is to sequentially update the risk factors one by one while ‘freezing’ all other risk factors. This idea dates back at least to Oaxaca (1973) and Blinder (1973), who developed a *sequential updating* (SU) decomposition technique in a one-period setting. The SU decomposition works as follows when we update the risk factor X first:

$$D_X = X(1)Y(0) - X(0)Y(0), \quad D_Y = X(1)Y(1) - X(1)Y(0).$$

Alternatively, one may update Y first to obtain

$$D_X = X(1)Y(1) - X(0)Y(1), \quad D_Y = X(0)Y(1) - X(0)Y(0).$$

Each SU decomposition is exact, but if there are d risk factors, there are $d!$ different updating orders and therefore $d!$ different SU decompositions. Candland and Lotz (2014) call the one-period SU decomposition *waterfall* and apply it to P&L attribution. See Fortin et al. (2011) for an overview on how the SU decomposition is used in various fields of economics.

The SU decomposition can also be defined in a multi-period setting by dividing the time horizon into sub-intervals and applying the SU decomposition recursively on each sub-interval. Jetses and Christiansen (2022) and Christiansen (2022) analyzed the limit of the SU decomposition when the mesh size of the time grid converges to zero. In the limit, the decomposition takes the whole path into account and the limiting SU decomposition is called the *infinitesimal sequential updating* (ISU) decomposition. The ISU decomposition is independent of any time grid, which is helpful “to prevent inconsistencies when using conflicting sub-intervals for different purposes”, see Flaig and Junike (2024, p. 2).

The *averaged sequential updating* (ASU) decomposition, also known as the *Shapley value*, is simply the arithmetic average of the $d!$ possible SU decompositions. It has many desirable properties, in particular: it is exact and symmetric. Shapley (1953) introduces the ASU decomposition for cooperative games. Shubik (1962) defines the ASU decomposition for cost functions. Sprumont (1998) and Friedman and Moulin (1999) provide an axiomatization of the ASU decomposition for cost functions. Jetses and Christiansen (2022) define the *infinitesimal averaged sequential updating* (IASU) decomposition as the average of the $d!$ possible ISU decompositions.

Main contributions

In this paper, we start directly in a time-continuous setting: If the portfolio is a twice differentiable function of the risk factors and the risk factors have continuous paths, Itô’s formula provides a natural additive decomposition of the portfolio. Our main contributions are as follows: In order to treat risk factors with jumps, we prove an expanded version of Itô’s formula

and use it to define a large class of reasonable decompositions, which we call *Itô decompositions* and which include all $d!$ ISU and the IASU decompositions as special cases. We prove that there is a unique Itô decomposition (up to indistinguishability) that satisfies the three axioms of exactness, symmetry and normalization. We show that it is indistinguishable from the IASU decomposition. We further show that the IASU decomposition can be interpreted as the limiting case of the ASU decomposition: compared to Jetses and Christiansen (2022), who assume that the covariations between the risk factors are zero, we use much weaker assumptions to prove the convergence of the SU/ ASU decompositions to the ISU/ IASU decompositions.

In summary, we propose to use the IASU decomposition to obtain a P&L attribution because it considers the whole paths of the risk factors and satisfies the axioms of exactness, symmetry and normalization. However, in practical applications, the IASU decomposition has two drawbacks: a) similar to the ASU decomposition, it suffers from the curse of dimensionality; b) the IASU decomposition is defined by stochastic integrals, which somehow must be approximated in practice. Naively approximating these integrals can lead to decompositions that are no longer exact. As another important contribution of this paper, we show that the IASU decomposition does not suffer from the curse of dimensionality if the risk factors do not have simultaneous jumps. In this case, the IASU decomposition is indistinguishable from the average of two (suitably selected) ISU decompositions. To avoid point b), we suggest approximating ISU/ IASU by SU/ ASU.

Up to now, most practitioners have applied an arbitrary SU decomposition in a one-period setting to obtain an annual P&L attribution, see Candland and Lotz (2014). Working with real market data, Flaig and Junike (2024) empirically show that the SU decomposition depends significantly on the order or labeling of the risk factors, and that some SU decompositions may even ignore relevant risk factors, which may “lead to wrong trading and hedging decisions”, see Flaig and Junike (2024, p. 2).

Our theoretical analysis suggests using the average of only two SU decompositions¹ with a sufficiently fine time grid to obtain a P&L attribution, since such a decomposition is arbitrarily close to the IASU decomposition when the risk factors do not have simultaneous jumps. Thus, our analysis is highly relevant for practitioners: we recommend computing two SU decompositions instead of one and using a finer grid than just annual data to obtain a decomposition that is much closer to the IASU decomposition than a single SU decomposition. While the choice of the decomposition (the average of two SU decompositions) is theoretically justified, we have only numerical experiments available to estimate the time grid and we recommend using monthly or weekly data.

Further literature review

Is there any other way to break the curse of dimensionality? Christiansen (2022) proves that the ISU decomposition is symmetric if it is stable with respect to small perturbations in the empirical observation of the risk factors. In Appendix A.4, we show that the ISU decomposition of a simple product of two correlated Brownian motions is not stable. This shows that stability is a rather strong assumption.

There are other decomposition principles as well: There is the so-called *one-at-a-time* (OAT) decomposition, which is also known as *bump and reset*, see Candland and Lotz (2014). The OAT decomposition is closely related to the SU decomposition. It is symmetric, but generally not exact. Frei (2020) analyzes the limit of the OAT decomposition when the mesh size of the time grid converges to zero.

¹Define one SU decomposition in any order, e.g., alphabetically ascending, and the other SU decomposition by the reverse order, e.g., alphabetically descending, see Theorem 3.10 for details.

There are also completely different approaches: Fischer (2004) uses a conditional expectations approach. Rosen and Saunders (2010) use the Hoeffding method for a decomposition of credit risk portfolios. Frei (2020) uses the Euler principle for risk attribution. Ramlau-Hansen (1991) and Norberg (1999) decompose surplus in life insurance by heuristic integral representations, where the integrators are interpreted as the driving forces of change and determine the attribution. A similar idea is used in Schilling et al. (2020) based on the martingale representation theorem.

Contents

In Section 2, we establish some notation. In Section 3, we develop an extended version of Itô's formula and introduce the family of Itô decompositions. We show that the IASU decomposition is the only exact and symmetric Itô decomposition, and we break the curse of dimensionality of the IASU decomposition in Theorem 3.10. In Section 4, we prove that the IASU decomposition can be approximated by the ASU decomposition. In Section 5, we provide some numerical applications. Section 6 concludes.

2 Notation

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, P)$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions, i.e., \mathcal{F}_0 contains all null sets and \mathbb{F} is right-continuous. Let \mathcal{X} be the set of all \mathbb{F} -semimartingales. A so-called *risk basis* or *information basis* is a d -dimensional semimartingale $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$, and its d components are denoted as *risk factors* or *sources of risk*. For a stopping time s , we define the stopped semimartingale by $X^s = (X_1^s, \dots, X_d^s)$. Equality of random variables is understood in the almost sure sense and equality of stochastic processes is understood up to indistinguishability. Let \mathcal{C}_2 be the set of twice differentiable functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} . For $f \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, we write f_i and f_{ij} for the partial derivatives $\partial_i f$ and $\partial_i \partial_j f$. We call a map $F : \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ *non-anticipative* if for any stopping time s it holds that

$$F(X^s)(t) = F(X)(\min(t, s)), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

Such a non-anticipative mapping depends only on the information up to time t , i.e., on X^t . By \mathcal{M} we denote some sub-space of all non-anticipative mappings. By $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$ we denote the space of functionals $F : \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that $F(X) = (f(X(t)))_{t \geq 0}$, $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$, for some $f \in \mathcal{C}_2$, which are clearly non-anticipative. By σ_d we denote the set of all $d!$ permutations of $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Let $id \in \sigma_d$ be the identity. In a slight abuse of notation, we define for $\pi \in \sigma_d$

$$\pi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = (x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(d)}), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and

$$\pi(X_1, \dots, X_d) = (X_{\pi(1)}, \dots, X_{\pi(d)}), \quad X \in \mathcal{X}^d.$$

For two one-dimensional semimartingales Z and Y and a càglàd process H , we denote by $\int_0^t H(s) dZ(s) := \int_{0+}^t H(s) dZ(s)$ the stochastic integral. In particular $\int_0^0 H(s) dZ(s) = 0$ by convention. We further set $Z(0-) = 0$,

$$Z(t-) = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} Z(t - \varepsilon), \quad t > 0, \quad \Delta Z(t) = Z(t) - Z(t-), \quad t \geq 0,$$

$$[Z, Y] = ZY - Z(0)Y(0) - \int_0^\cdot Z(u-) dY - \int_0^\cdot Y(u-) dZ$$

and

$$[Z, Y]^c = [Z, Y] - \sum_{0 < s \leq \cdot} \Delta Z(s) \Delta Y(s).$$

By “ \xrightarrow{P} ” we denote the convergence in probability of a sequence of random variables. For $A \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ we define the projection

$$p_A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \\ x \mapsto (x_1 1_A(1), \dots, x_d 1_A(d)),$$

where the function $1_A(h)$ is one if $h \in A$ and zero otherwise.

3 Family of Itô decompositions

Similar to Shorrocks (2013) and Christiansen (2022), we define a *decomposition* as follows:

Definition 3.1. A map

$$\delta : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d \\ (F, X) \mapsto (\delta_1(F, X), \dots, \delta_d(F, X))$$

is called a *decomposition*.

We interpret $\delta_i(F, X)(t)$ as the contribution of X_i to the profit and loss $F(X)(t) - F(X)(0)$ in $(0, t]$. We recall the following three axioms from the literature:

i) A decomposition is called *exact* if for all $F \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$ the following equation holds:

$$F(X) - F(X)(0) = \delta_1(F, X) + \dots + \delta_d(F, X).$$

ii) A decomposition is called *symmetric* if for all $\pi \in \sigma_d$, all $F \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$ the following implication holds:

$$F(X) = F(\pi(X)) \implies \delta_i(F, X) = \delta_{\pi^{-1}(i)}(F, \pi(X)).$$

iii) A decomposition is called *normalized* if for all $0 \leq r < s < \infty$, all $i = 1, \dots, d$, all $F \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$ the following implication holds:

$$X_i \text{ is indistinguishable from a constant process on } (r, s] \\ \implies \delta_i(F, X) \text{ is indistinguishable from a constant process on } (r, s].$$

Axiom i) ensures that a decomposition is able to fully explain the P&L, see Shorrocks (2013) and Christiansen (2022). Axiom ii) considers symmetric maps F and states that if F does not depend on the order or labeling of the risk factors, then the decomposition shall also be independent of the order or labeling of the risk factors. The symmetry axiom is motivated by the fact that $\delta_i(F, X)$ represents the contribution of X_i and that the term $\delta_{\pi^{-1}(i)}(F, \pi(X))$ also describes the contribution of

$$\pi(X)_{\pi^{-1}(i)} = (X_{\pi(1)}, \dots, X_{\pi(d)})_{\pi^{-1}(i)} = X_i.$$

The symmetry axiom has already been mentioned in similar form in Friedman and Moulin (1999) and Shorrocks (2013). If the risk factor X_i remains constant during some time interval $(r, s]$, it

does not contribute to $F(X)(s) - F(X)(r)$, so the contribution of X_i in $(r, s]$ should also be zero. This is exactly reflected by the normalization axiom, taken from Christiansen (2022).

Next, we indicate how Itô's formula helps to define decomposition principles: Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be twice continuously differentiable. For $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ let

$$I_i := \int_0^\cdot f_i(X(s-))dX_i(s), \quad I_{ij} := \int_0^\cdot f_{ij}(X(s-))d[X_i, X_j]^c(s), \quad (2)$$

$$S := \sum_{0 < s \leq \cdot} \left\{ f(X(s)) - f(X(s-)) - \sum_{i=1}^d f_i(X(s-))\Delta X_i(s) \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Itô's formula states that for $t \geq 0$ it holds for any semimartingale X that

$$f(X(t)) - f(X(0)) = \sum_{i=1}^d I_i(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d I_{ii}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d I_{ij}(t) + S(t). \quad (4)$$

Assume that X has continuous paths without interaction effects, i.e., $S = 0$ and $I_{ij} = 0$, $i \neq j$. Then, Eq. (4) provides a natural way to additively decompose the P&L $f(X(t)) - f(X(0))$:

By the normalization axiom, I_i and I_{ii} should be assigned to δ_i , which is interpreted as the contribution of X_i . To see this, assume that some δ_j would depend on I_i or I_{ii} for $i \neq j$. Assume that X_j is constant everywhere. According to the normalization axiom, we would then have $\delta_j = 0$. So, δ_j must not depend on I_i or on I_{ii} .

However, how to handle the interaction effects I_{ij} , $i \neq j$ and the jump part S is not so obvious. Therefore, in Proposition 3.3 we provide an extended version of Itô's formula. Based on Proposition 3.3, we define the large family of *Itô decompositions* in Definition 3.4 and show in Section 3 that the family of Itô decompositions contains many well-known decomposition principles as special cases. Within the family of Itô decompositions, we will identify a single decomposition that satisfies the axioms of exactness, symmetry and normalization. For $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $s > 0$ define

$$Y_i^A(s) := f\left(X(s-) + p_A(\Delta X(s))\right) - f\left(X(s-) + p_{A \setminus \{i\}}(\Delta X(s))\right) - f_i(X(s-))\Delta X_i(s)$$

and

$$S_i^A(X) := \sum_{0 < s \leq \cdot} Y_i^A(s).$$

For $\pi \in \sigma_d$ define

$$S_i^\pi(X) := S_i^{\{j \mid \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(X). \quad (5)$$

To obtain $S_i^\pi(X)$, all time points s where X_i jumps are considered. All risk factors except X_i are fixed at s or $s-$, depending on the choice of π , and only X_i varies between $s-$ and s .

Lemma 3.2. *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$ and $A \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$. If $i \in A$, then $S_i^A(X)$ is a semimartingale with a.s. paths of finite variation on compacts.*

Proof. Fix $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$. Let N be a null set such that $u \mapsto |X_i(u)(\omega)|$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, is càdlàg for $\omega \in \Omega \setminus N$ and

$$\sum_{h,j=1}^d \sum_{0 < s \leq t} |\Delta X_h(s)(\omega)\Delta X_j(s)(\omega)| < \infty, \quad \omega \in \Omega \setminus N, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

Such N exists since X is a semimartingale. Let $\omega \in \Omega \setminus N$ and $t \geq 0$. Let $\mathcal{M}_\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the closure of the set $\{X(u)(\omega), u \in [0, t]\}$, which is compact. The function f and its derivatives are continuous and reach a maximum and minimum on the convex hull of \mathcal{M}_ω , which is compact by Carathéodory's theorem, see Grünbaum (2013, Sec. 2.3). Hence, f and its derivatives are bounded on the convex hull of \mathcal{M}_ω . Let $s \in (0, t]$. Let us develop f around $X(s-)(\omega)$ using a Taylor expansion. We have that

$$f\left(X(s-)(\omega) + p_A(\Delta X(s)(\omega))\right) = f(X(s-)(\omega)) + \sum_{h \in A} f_h(X(s-)(\omega)) \Delta X_h(s)(\omega) + R(\omega),$$

where $R(\omega)$ is the remainder of the Taylor expansion, i.e., for some $\theta(\omega) \in [0, 1]$ it holds that

$$R(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{h, j \in A} f_{hj}\left(X(s-)(\omega) + \theta(\omega)p_A(\Delta X(s)(\omega))\right) \Delta X_h(s)(\omega) \Delta X_j(s)(\omega).$$

The term $f\left(X(s-)(\omega) + p_{A \setminus \{i\}}(\Delta X(s)(\omega))\right)$ can be treated similarly. Since $i \in A$, it holds for some $C(\omega) > 0$, which does not depend on s or $\theta(\omega)$, that

$$Y_i^A(s) \leq C(\omega) \sum_{h, j \in A} |\Delta X_h(s)(\omega) \Delta X_j(s)(\omega)|.$$

It follows by Inequality (6) that

$$\sum_{0 < s \leq t} |Y_i^A(s)(\omega)| < \infty, \quad \omega \in \Omega \setminus N. \quad (7)$$

Since t was arbitrarily chosen, Inequality (7) implies that $u \mapsto S_i^A(X)(u)(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega \setminus N$, is càdlàg and of finite variation on compacts. Therefore, $S_i^A(X)$ is a semimartingale. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\pi \in \sigma_d$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$. For all $t \geq 0$ it holds that*

$$f(X(t)) - f(X(0)) = \sum_{i=1}^d \left\{ I_i(t) + \frac{1}{2} I_{ii}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d I_{ij}(t) + S_i^\pi(t) \right\},$$

where I_i and I_{ij} are defined in Eq. (2) and S_i^π is defined in Eq. (5).

Proof. Since the series telescopes, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & f(X(s)) - f(X(s-)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d f\left(X(s-) + p_{\{j \mid \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))\right) - f\left(X(s-) + p_{\{j \mid \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))\right). \end{aligned}$$

By Inequality (7), it holds for any $t \geq 0$ that

$$\sum_{i=1}^d S_i^\pi(X)(t) = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \sum_{i=1}^d Y_i^{\{j \mid \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(s) = S(t), \quad (8)$$

where S is defined in Eq. (3). The claim follows then by the classical Itô's formula. \square

Proposition 3.3 generalizes the classical Itô's formula, because for any $\pi \in \sigma_d$ it holds that $\sum_{i=1}^d S_i^\pi(X) = S$, see Eq. (8).

Definition 3.4. Let $\lambda_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, d$. Let $\mu_\pi \in [0, 1]$ for $\pi \in \sigma_d$. The decomposition

$$\delta^{\text{Itô}} : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2) \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d, \quad (F, X) \mapsto (\delta_1^{\text{Itô}}(F, X), \dots, \delta_d^{\text{Itô}}(F, X)),$$

where

$$\delta_i^{\text{Itô}}(F, X) = I_i + \frac{1}{2}I_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^d \lambda_{ij} I_{ij} + \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \mu_\pi S_i^\pi(X), \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

is called *Itô decomposition with parameters* $(\lambda_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$ and $(\mu_\pi)_{\pi \in \sigma_d}$.

The definition of the Itô decomposition is motivated by Proposition 3.3 and the normalization axiom: Below Eq. (4) we already argued that I_i and I_{ii} should be attributed to X_i in order to satisfy the normalization axiom. If parts of the interaction effect I_{ij} were assigned to the contribution of X_h for $h \notin \{i, j\}$, the decomposition would no longer be normalized. Therefore, only the risk factors X_i and X_j are assigned shares λ_{ij} and λ_{ji} of the interaction effect I_{ij} .

Note that $S_i^\pi(X)$ contains only jumps in the i -th component. If $S_i^\pi(X)$ were assigned to the contribution of some X_j , $j \neq i$, the normalization axiom would be violated if X_j is constant. Therefore, S_i^π should be assigned to the contribution of X_i . Since there are $d!$ different ways to decompose the jumps without violating neither the normalization axiom nor the exactness axiom, we propose to assign to X_i a weighted average of all $S_i^\pi(X)$, $\pi \in \sigma_d$.

Remark 3.5. Since each Itô decomposition is linear in the first argument F , a portfolio can be decomposed by decomposing each individual instrument.

We recall some special members of the family of Itô decompositions, namely the IASU and the $d!$ different ISU decompositions, which were introduced in Jetses and Christiansen (2022). All Itô decompositions are normalized. We will prove that the IASU decomposition is the only Itô decomposition that is exact and symmetric. We will also see that the ISU decomposition is closely related to the IASU decomposition and that the IASU decomposition is the limiting case of the well-known ASU decomposition (also known as Shapley value), which is defined over a discrete time grid in Section 4.

Definition 3.6. The *IASU (infinitesimal averaged updating) decomposition* $\delta^{\text{IASU}} : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2) \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d$ is defined by

$$\delta_i^{\text{IASU}}(F, X) = I_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d I_{ij} + \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} S_i^\pi(X), \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Remark 3.7. The Itô decompositions are overparameterised: based on Eq. (20) in Lemma A.2, we can represent the IASU decomposition as

$$\delta_i^{\text{IASU}}(F, X) = I_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d I_{ij} + \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} S_i^A(X) \xi_{i,A},$$

where

$$\xi_{i,A} := \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \sigma_d \\ \{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\} = A}} \frac{1}{d!} = \frac{(|A| - 1)!(d - |A|)!}{d!}. \quad (9)$$

Hence, the computational cost to obtain δ_i^{IASU} can be reduced from $\mathcal{O}(d!)$ to $\mathcal{O}(2^{d-1})$ for $d \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 3.8. Let $\pi \in \sigma_d$. The ISU (infinitesimal updating) decomposition $\delta^{ISU, \pi} : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2) \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d$ with updating order π is defined by

$$\delta_i^{ISU, \pi}(F, X) = I_i + \frac{1}{2}I_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) < \pi(i)}}^d I_{ij} + S_i^\pi(X), \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Theorem 3.9. Every Itô decomposition that is symmetric and exact is indistinguishable from the IASU decomposition. The IASU decomposition is related to the ISU decomposition by

$$\delta_i^{IASU}(F, X) = \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \delta_i^{ISU, \pi}(F, X), \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}^d, \quad F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2). \quad (10)$$

Proof. The proof of Theorem 3.9 can be found in Appendix A.2. \square

The next theorem shows that the curse of dimensionality of the IASU decomposition can be broken if there are no simultaneous jumps.

Theorem 3.10. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$ and $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$. If $\Delta X_h \Delta X_j = 0$ for all $h, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $h \neq j$, then

$$\delta_i^{IASU}(F, X) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_i^{ISU, \pi}(F, X) + \delta_i^{ISU, \pi'}(F, X)), \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (11)$$

for any $\pi \in \sigma_d$ and $\pi' = d + 1 - \pi$.

Proof. Let $0 < s < \infty$. In the case of $\Delta X_i(s) = 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & f(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))) - f(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))) \\ &= f(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))) - f(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the case of $\Delta X_i(s) \neq 0$, it holds that $X_j(s) = X_j(s-)$ for all $j \neq i$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))) - f(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(\Delta X(s))) \\ &= f(X(s)) - f(X(s-)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\pi \in \sigma_d$ and $i = 1, \dots, d$ it holds that

$$\delta_i^{ISU, \pi} = I_i + \frac{1}{2}I_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) < \pi(i)}}^d I_{ij} + \sum_{\substack{0 < s \leq \cdot \\ \Delta X_i(s) \neq 0}} \{f(X(s)) - f(X(s-)) - f_i(X(s-))\Delta X_i(s)\}. \quad (12)$$

Due to Eqs. (10, 27), we have that

$$\delta_i^{IASU}(F, X) = I_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d I_{ij} + \sum_{\substack{0 < s \leq \cdot \\ \Delta X_i(s) \neq 0}} \{f(X(s)) - f(X(s-)) - f_i(X(s-))\Delta X_i(s)\}. \quad (13)$$

Let $\delta_i^{ISU, \pi}$ be the ISU decomposition with updating order $\pi \in \sigma_d$ and define $\pi'(i) = d + 1 - \pi(i)$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. Note that

$$\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) < \pi(i)}}^d + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi'(j) < \pi'(i)}}^d = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) < \pi(i)}}^d + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) > \pi(i)}}^d = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^d. \quad (14)$$

Eqs. (12, 13, 14) imply Eq. (11). \square

Remark 3.11. Theorem 3.10 can be generalized to the case where some but not all risk factors have simultaneous jumps. For example, suppose $d = 3$ and $\Delta X_1 \Delta X_j = 0$, $j \in \{2, 3\}$ but possibly $\Delta X_2 \Delta X_3 \neq 0$. It is then easy to see that Eq. (11) still holds. Or, if $d = 4$ and $\Delta X_1 \Delta X_j = 0$, $j \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, the IASU decomposition can be written as a weighted average of four ISU decompositions instead of eight ISU decompositions, which would be necessary if all risk factors had simultaneous jumps.

Corollary 3.12. *Let $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$ and $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$. If $[X_h, X_j] = 0$ for all $h, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $h \neq j$, then*

$$\delta_i^{\text{IASU}}(F, X) = \delta_i^{\text{ISU}, \pi}(F, X), \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

where $\pi \in \sigma_d$ is arbitrary.

Proof. The assumption $[X_i, X_j] = 0$ for $i \neq j$ implies $\Delta X_i \Delta X_j = \Delta[X_i, X_j] = 0$. Therefore, $S_i^{\pi_1} = S_i^{\pi_2}$, $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \sigma_d$, see the proof of Theorem 3.10. The assertion follows directly from the Definitions 3.6 and 3.8. \square

Example 3.13. How does the IASU decomposition treat simultaneous jumps? Let $d = 2$ and assume that $X = (X_1, X_2)$ is a pure-jump semimartingale of finite variation. Then the IASU decomposition is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1^{\text{IASU}}(F, X) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{0 < s \leq \cdot} \left\{ \{f(X(s), X_2(s-)) - f(X(s-))\} + \{f(X(s)) - f(X_1(s-), X_2(s))\} \right\}, \\ \delta_2^{\text{IASU}}(F, X) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{0 < s \leq \cdot} \left\{ \{f(X(s)) - f(X_1(s), X_2(s-))\} + \{f(X_1(s-), X_2(s)) - f(X(s-))\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter formulas are averages of sequential updates from time point $s-$ to time point s .

Example 3.14. We decompose the P&L of the portfolio $P = X_1 X_2$ of a foreign stock, where X_1 is the foreign exchange rate and X_2 is the stock price in the foreign currency. The instantaneous P&L of the foreign stock in domestic currency is given by

$$dP(t) = X_1(t-)dX_2(t) + X_2(t-)dX_1(t) + d[X_1, X_2](t),$$

i.e., it can be decomposed into the variation of the exchange rate, variation of the stock price and interaction effects, compare with Mai (2023). The IASU decomposition equally distributes the interaction effect between δ_1^{IASU} and δ_2^{IASU} . To see this, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1^{\text{IASU}}(F, X) &= \int_0^\cdot X_2(s-)dX_1(s) + \frac{1}{2}[X_1, X_2]^c \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{0 < s \leq \cdot} \left\{ \{X_1(s)X_2(s-) - X_1(s-)X_2(s-)\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \{X_1(s)X_2(s) - X_1(s-)X_2(s)\} - 2X_2(s-)(X_1(s) - X_1(s-)) \right\} \\ &= \int_0^\cdot X_2(s-)dX_1(s) + \frac{1}{2}[X_1, X_2], \end{aligned}$$

where $F(X) = X_1 X_2$. For δ_2^{IASU} the reasoning is similar.

4 SU and ASU decompositions and their limits

The time-dynamic SU and ASU decompositions are defined on discrete time grids, see Jetses and Christiansen (2022) and Christiansen (2022). A light introduction to the SU decomposition can be found in Candland and Lotz (2014). In this section, we recall the definitions of these decompositions and we provide sufficient conditions such that the SU and the ASU decompositions converge to the ISU and IASU decompositions, respectively, as the mesh size of the discrete time grid converges to zero. We recall the following definition from Protter (2005, p. 64).

Definition 4.1. An infinite sequence of finite stopping times $0 = s_0 < s_1 < s_2 < \dots$ such that $\sup_k s_k = \infty$ a.s. is called an *unbounded random partition*. A sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of unbounded random partitions $\gamma_n = \{0 = s_0^n < s_1^n < s_2^n < \dots\}$ is said to *tend to the identity* if $\sup_k |s_{k+1}^n - s_k^n| \rightarrow 0$ a.s. for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 4.2. Let $\gamma = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots\}$ be an unbounded random partition. The *SU (sequential updating) decomposition* $\delta^{SU, \pi, \gamma} : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d$ with updating order $\pi \in \sigma_d$ is defined by

$$\delta_i^{SU, \pi, \gamma}(F, X) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\{ F(X^{s_l} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l})) - F(X^{s_l} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l})) \right\}. \quad (15)$$

In words, divide the time horizon $[0, t]$ into finitely many sub-intervals, and to obtain the contribution of X_i , fix all risk factors at the beginning s_l or the end s_{l+1} of each sub-interval (depending on the updating order π) and allow only X_i to vary between s_l and s_{l+1} .

Proposition 4.3. The decomposition $\delta^{SU, \pi, \gamma} : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d$ is well defined by Eq. (15) and exact. The sum in Eq. (15) evaluated at $t \in [0, \infty)$ is a.s. finite.

Proof. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$, $F \in \mathcal{M}$, $\pi \in \sigma_d$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $t \geq 0$. By $x \wedge y$ we denote the minimum of two real numbers x and y . Using Eq. (1) twice, we get

$$\delta_i^{SU, \pi, \gamma}(F, X)(t \wedge s_n) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\{ F(X^{s_l \wedge s_n} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1} \wedge s_n} - X^{s_l \wedge s_n}))(t) - F(X^{s_l \wedge s_n} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1} \wedge s_n} - X^{s_l \wedge s_n}))(t) \right\} \quad (16)$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \left\{ F(X^{s_l} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l}))(t \wedge s_n) - F(X^{s_l} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l}))(t \wedge s_n) \right\} \quad (17)$$

since all addends with $l \geq n$ on the right hand-side of Eq. (16) are equal to zero. By Eq. (17), for each n , the process $\delta_i^{SU, \pi, \gamma}(F, X)$ stopped at s_n is a finite sum of semimartingales and hence a semimartingale. By Protter (2005, Part II, Sec. 2) and since $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ a.s. for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the process $\delta_i^{SU, \pi, \gamma}(F, X)$ is a semimartingale and the decomposition $\delta^{SU, \pi, \gamma}$ is therefore well defined. The fact that $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ a.s. implies that the sum in Eq. (15) evaluated at t is a.s. finite. We show exactness: Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Since

$$p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\pi^{-1}(d))\}}(x) = x \quad \text{and} \quad p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(\pi^{-1}(1))\}}(x) = 0,$$

we have for any $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by Eq. (17) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^d \delta_i^{\text{SU}, \pi, \gamma}(F, X)(t \wedge s_n) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq \pi^{-1}(d)}}^d \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} F(X^{s_l} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l}))(t \wedge s_n) + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} F(X^{s_{l+1}})(t \wedge s_n) \\ & \quad - \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq \pi^{-1}(1)}}^d \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} F(X^{s_l} + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}}(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l}))(t \wedge s_n) - \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} F(X^{s_l})(t \wedge s_n). \end{aligned}$$

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{\pi^{-1}(d)\}$ there is exactly one $k \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus \{\pi^{-1}(1)\}$ such that

$$p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}}(x) = p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(k)\}}(x),$$

since $\pi(k) = \pi(i) + 1$ if and only if $k = \pi^{-1}(\pi(i) + 1)$. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d \delta_i^{\text{SU}, \pi, \gamma}(F, X)(t \wedge s_n) &= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} F(X^{s_{l+1}})(t \wedge s_n) - \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} F(X^{s_l})(t \wedge s_n) \\ &= F(X^{s_n})(t \wedge s_n) - F(X^{s_0})(t \wedge s_n) \\ &= F(X)(t \wedge s_n) - F(X)(0). \end{aligned}$$

Since t and n were arbitrary and $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ a.s., the decomposition $\delta^{\text{SU}, \pi, \gamma}$ is exact. To see the last point, note that two processes with càdlàg paths are indistinguishable if they are modifications. \square

Example 4.4. Assume $d = 2$. The SU decomposition with respect to γ defines $d! = 2$ decompositions, namely $\delta^{\text{SU}, id, \gamma}(F, X)$ and $\delta^{\text{SU}, \varrho, \gamma}(F, X)$ with $\varrho(1) = 2$ and $\varrho(2) = 1$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1^{\text{SU}, id, \gamma}(F, X) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \{F(X_1^{s_{l+1}}, X_2^{s_l}) - F(X_1^{s_l}, X_2^{s_l})\}, \\ \delta_2^{\text{SU}, id, \gamma}(F, X) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \{F(X_1^{s_{l+1}}, X_2^{s_{l+1}}) - F(X_1^{s_{l+1}}, X_2^{s_l})\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1^{\text{SU}, \varrho, \gamma}(F, X) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \{F(X_1^{s_{l+1}}, X_2^{s_{l+1}}) - F(X_1^{s_l}, X_2^{s_{l+1}})\}, \\ \delta_2^{\text{SU}, \varrho, \gamma}(F, X) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \{F(X_1^{s_l}, X_2^{s_{l+1}}) - F(X_1^{s_l}, X_2^{s_l})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.5. Let $\gamma = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots\}$ be an unbounded random partition. The ASU (averaged sequential updating) decomposition $\delta^{\text{ASU}, \gamma} : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d$ is defined by

$$\delta_i^{\text{ASU}, \gamma}(F, X) = \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \delta_i^{\text{SU}, \pi, \gamma}(F, X), \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Remark 4.6. As in Shorrocks (2013), we observe that

$$\delta_i^{ASU,\gamma}(F, X) = \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \delta_i^{\text{SU},\pi,\gamma}(F, X) = \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} \delta_i^{\text{SU},A,\gamma}(F, X) \xi_{i,A}$$

for $\xi_{i,A}$ defined in Eq. (9) and

$$\delta_i^{\text{SU},A,\gamma}(F, X) := \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\{ F(X^{s_l} + p_A(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l})) - F(X^{s_l} + p_{A \setminus \{i\}}(X^{s_{l+1}} - X^{s_l})) \right\}.$$

Thereby, the computational cost to obtain $\delta_i^{ASU,\gamma}$ can be reduced from $\mathcal{O}(d!)$ to $\mathcal{O}(2^{d-1})$.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\pi \in \sigma_d$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of unbounded random partitions tending to the identity. Let $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$, $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$, $t \geq 0$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Then it holds for $n \rightarrow \infty$ that*

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i^{\text{SU},\pi,\gamma_n}(F, X)(t) &\xrightarrow{P} \delta_i^{\text{IASU},\pi}(F, X)(t), \\ \delta_i^{ASU,\gamma_n}(F, X)(t) &\xrightarrow{P} \delta_i^{\text{IASU}}(F, X)(t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of Theorem 4.7 can be found in Appendix A.3. □

The next example shows that the assumption $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$ in Theorem 4.7 is important to ensure convergence.

Example 4.8. Let Z be a stochastic process with independent increments and $Z_0 = 0$. Jumps of Z shall only occur at fixed times $J = \{2 - l^{-1}, l \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the process jumps by $\pm l^{-1}$ with equal probability for upward and downward movements. The process Z stays constant between jumps. Then, Z is a semimartingale, see Černý and Ruf (2021). Let

$$f(x_1, x_2) = |x_1 - x_2|,$$

so $f \notin \mathcal{C}_2$. Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a deterministic sequence of unbounded partitions $\gamma_n = \{0 = s_0^n < s_1^n < \dots\}$ tending to the identity such that γ_n contains the first n smallest elements of J but the intersection with $(2 - n^{-1}, 2]$ is empty. Assume that $X = (Z, Z)$. Then, for $t \geq 2$ it follows that

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left\{ f(X_1^{s_{l+1}^n}(t), X_2^{s_l^n}(t)) - f(X_1^{s_l^n}(t), X_2^{s_l^n}(t)) \right\} = \sum_{l=1}^n l^{-1},$$

which is divergent for $n \rightarrow \infty$, so the SU decomposition does not converge for the map $F(X)(t) := f(X(t))$, $t \geq 0$.

How can the IASU decomposition be computed efficiently in practice? If we naively approximate the integrals in Definition 3.6 numerically, then we may lose exactness of the decomposition, which is undesirable in many applications. Theorem 4.7 suggests using the ASU decomposition as an approximation of the IASU decomposition. However, this becomes computationally infeasible for moderately large d , since the computational cost to obtain $\delta_i^{ASU,\gamma}$ scales like $\mathcal{O}(2^{d-1})$. The next corollary provides an elegant solution when there are no simultaneous jumps.

Definition 4.9. Let $\gamma = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots\}$ be an unbounded random partition. The *2SU (average of two sequential updating) decomposition* $\delta^{2\text{SU},\pi,\gamma} : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d$ with updating order $\pi \in \sigma_d$ is defined by

$$\delta_i^{2\text{SU},\pi,\gamma}(F, X) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\delta_i^{\text{SU},\pi,\gamma}(F, X) + \delta_i^{\text{SU},\pi',\gamma}(F, X) \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

where $\pi' = d + 1 - \pi$.

Corollary 4.10. Let $\pi \in \sigma_d$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of unbounded random partitions tending to the identity. Let $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$, $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $t \geq 0$.

i) If $\Delta X_h \Delta X_j = 0$ for all $h, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $h \neq j$, then

$$\delta_i^{2SU, \pi, \gamma_n}(F, X)(t) \xrightarrow{p} \delta_i^{IASU}(F, X)(t), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

ii) If $[X_h, X_j] = 0$ for all $h, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $h \neq j$, then

$$\delta_i^{SU, \pi, \gamma_n}(F, X)(t) \xrightarrow{p} \delta_i^{IASU}(F, X)(t), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. If $\Delta X_h \Delta X_j = 0$, $h \neq j$, it holds by Theorem 3.10 that $\delta_i^{IASU}(F, X) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_i^{ISU, \pi}(F, X) + \delta_i^{ISU, \pi'}(F, X))$, which is the limit of $\delta_i^{2SU, \pi, \gamma_n}(F, X)$ by Theorem 4.7. If $[X_h, X_j] = 0$, $h \neq j$, apply Corollary 3.12 and Theorem 4.7. \square

In particular, the 2SU decomposition with arbitrary updating order π is exact and approximates the IASU decomposition when the risk factors do not have simultaneous jumps. In this case, the computationally expensive averaging to obtain the ASU decomposition can be omitted and the computational complexity to approximate δ_i^{IASU} decreases from $\mathcal{O}(2^{d-1})$ to $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Theorem 4.7 and Corollary 4.10 are also illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Overview of discrete approximations of the IASU decomposition.

Last, we define the OAT decomposition. To obtain the contribution of X_i , all risk factors are fixed at the origin and only X_i is allowed to change from the beginning of a sub-interval to the end of that sub-interval.

Definition 4.11. Let $\gamma = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots\}$ be an unbounded random partition. The *OAT (one-at-a-time) decomposition* $\delta^{OAT, \gamma} : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{X}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^d$ is defined by

$$\delta_i^{OAT, \gamma}(F, X) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \{F(X_1^{s_l}, \dots, X_{i-1}^{s_l}, X_i^{s_{l+1}}, X_{i+1}^{s_l}, \dots, X_d^{s_l}) - F(X^{s_l})\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Remark 4.12. The OAT decomposition is symmetric but in general not exact. Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of unbounded random partitions tending to the identity. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ choose a permutation $\pi_i \in \sigma_d$ such that $\pi_i(i) = 1$. Then δ_i^{OAT, γ_n} is indistinguishable from $\delta_i^{SU, \pi_i, \gamma_n}$. If $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$ then it holds by Theorem 4.7 for $t \geq 0$ that

$$\delta_i^{OAT, \gamma_n}(F, X)(t) \xrightarrow{p} \delta_i^{ISU, \pi_i}(F, X)(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, d$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, by Corollary 3.12, the three decompositions principles OAT, SU (with arbitrary order $\pi \in \sigma_d$) and ASU are asymptotically indistinguishable if there are no interaction effects.

5 Applications

Investment portfolios of financial institutions or insurance companies may include instruments such as stocks, plain vanilla or callable bonds, convertible bonds, inflation-linked bonds, contingent convertible bonds (CoCos), basket options, foreign exchange options and structured products. These instruments often depend on multiple risk factors such as different foreign exchange rates, interest rates for different maturities, credit spreads, inflation rate, some trigger activations for CoCos, multiple equities and time decay. Candland and Lotz (2014) also considered defaults and rating changes as risk factors.

In order to obtain a P&L attribution of such instruments, we propose the IASU decomposition because it is exact, symmetric and normalized, and it takes into account the whole paths of the risk factors, i.e., uses all available information. The last point also avoids inconsistencies when reporting a P&L attribution for different time grids, e.g., on an annual, quarterly, monthly and weekly basis. The IASU decomposition involves a stochastic integral. To approximate the IASU decomposition, we propose the ASU or 2SU decomposition with a sufficiently fine time grid, as such an approximation is always an exact decomposition. The use of the 2SU decomposition is theoretically justified when the risk factors do not have simultaneous jumps.

In Section 5.1, we provide an exemplary decomposition of a plain vanilla call option with stochastic interest rates on a foreign stock. A change in the P&L of this option can be explained by movements in the stock, the yield curve, the foreign exchange rate and time decay. Thus, there are $d = 4$ risk factors. We analyze the unexplained P&L of the OAT decomposition, the range of the SU and 2SU decompositions over all possible updating orders $\pi \in \sigma_d$ for different time grids, and the convergence of the ASU decomposition to the IASU decomposition.

Computing the ASU decomposition to approximate the IASU decomposition becomes infeasible when the number of risk factors d is moderately large: For example, a plain vanilla bond paying coupons may depend on d yield curves. A basket option may depend on d stocks. In practice, $d = 30$ is a common case for basket options, see Grzelak et al. (2023). In Section 5.2, we decompose a digital cash-or-nothing basket put option. We illustrate that it is impossible to obtain the ASU decomposition in reasonable time when $d = 30$ and we show how the 2SU decomposition is able to break the curse of dimensionality.

5.1 Decomposing a call option with stochastic interest rates

In this section, we allocate the P&L of the price of a plain vanilla European call option with strike K and maturity $T = 10$ with stochastic interest rates and foreign exchange exposure. The stock price S is given by a Black-Scholes model with constant volatility $\sigma_S > 0$ and with stochastic interest rates r . The dynamics under the risk neutral measure are given by

$$dS(t) = r(t)S(t)dt + \sigma_S S(t)dB_S(t)$$

and

$$dr(t) = \kappa(\eta - r(t))dt + \sigma_r dB_r(t)$$

with constant volatility $\sigma_r > 0$, long term mean $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ and speed of mean reversion $\kappa > 0$. Under the physical measure, the stock has drift $\mu_S \in \mathbb{R}$ and the foreign exchange rate Y is assumed to follow a geometric Brownian motion with drift $\mu_Y \in \mathbb{R}$ and volatility $\sigma_Y > 0$ driven by the Brownian motion B_Y . The Brownian motions are assumed to have correlations

$$dB_S(t)dB_r(t) = \rho_{Sr}dt, \quad dB_S(t)dB_Y(t) = \rho_{SY}dt, \quad \text{and} \quad dB_Y(t)dB_r(t) = \rho_{Yr}dt.$$

The time left to maturity is denoted by $\tau(t) = T - t$. The price of the plain vanilla call option $p_{call}(t)$ at time t is given by a twice differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, see Rabinovitch (1989),

i.e.,

$$p_{call}(t) = f(S(t), r(t), Y(t), \tau(t)) =: F(S, r, Y, \tau)(t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

with

$$f(s, r, y, \tau) = yS\Phi(d_+(s, r, \tau)) - yKP(r, \tau)\Phi(d_-(s, r, \tau)),$$

where Φ denotes the distribution function of a standard normal distribution and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\pm}(s, r, \tau) &= \frac{\log\left(\frac{s}{KP(r, \tau)}\right) \pm \frac{1}{2}v(\tau)}{\sqrt{v(\tau)}}, \\ v(\tau) &= \sigma_S^2\tau + \sigma_r^2\frac{\tau - 2g_{\kappa}(\tau) + g_{2\kappa}(\tau)}{\kappa^2} - 2\rho_{Sr}\sigma_S\sigma_r\frac{\tau - g_{\kappa}(\tau)}{\kappa}, \\ g_{\kappa}(\tau) &= \frac{1 - e^{-\kappa\tau}}{\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

The bond price $P(r, \tau)$ is given by

$$P(r, \tau) = A(\tau)e^{-g_{\kappa}(\tau)r},$$

where

$$A(\tau) = \exp\left(\left(\eta + \frac{\sigma_r^2\lambda}{\kappa} - \frac{\sigma_r^2}{2\kappa^2}\right)(g_{\kappa}(\tau) - \tau) - \frac{1}{\kappa}\left(\frac{\sigma_r g_{\kappa}(\tau)}{2}\right)^2\right)$$

and λ denotes the market price of risk. For simplicity, we set the market price of risk to zero and hence assume that the dynamics of r under the physical and the risk neutral measure are identical. Björk (2009, Sec. 24.2) describes how to estimate the parameters for r from market data. We simulate 1000 paths of the stock, interest rate and foreign exchange rate under the physical measure over one year. For each path, we decompose the price of the call option at time $t = 1$ with respect to the $d = 4$ risk factors $X := (S, r, Y, \tau)$. We use the following parameters:

$$K = S(0) = 100, \quad \mu_S = 0.05, \quad \sigma_S = 0.4, \quad Y(0) = 1.1, \quad \mu_Y = 0, \quad \sigma_Y = 0.05$$

and

$$r(0) = 0.08, \quad \kappa = 0.1, \quad \eta = 0.05, \quad \sigma_r = 0.01, \quad \rho_{Sr} = -0.7, \quad \rho_{SY} = -0.4, \quad \rho_{Yr} = 0.7.$$

By $\Delta F := F(X)(1) - F(X)(0)$, we denote the P&L of the option over one year. Figure 2 shows the relative unexplained P&L of the OAT decomposition, i.e.,

$$\frac{|\Delta F - \sum_{i=1}^d \delta_i^{OAT, \gamma}(F, X)(1)|}{|\Delta F|}.$$

We use as time grids γ annual, quarterly, monthly, weekly and daily time steps. As observed in Flaig and Junike (2024), we also see that the unexplained P&L of the OAT decomposition is significant for all time grids.

Figure 3 shows the relative range of the $d!$ SU decompositions for the risk factor S , i.e.,

$$\max_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \left(\frac{\delta_1^{SU, \pi, \gamma}(F, X)(1)}{\delta_1^{IASU}(F, X)(1)} \right) - \min_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \left(\frac{\delta_1^{SU, \pi, \gamma}(F, X)(1)}{\delta_1^{IASU}(F, X)(1)} \right)$$

and the relative range of the $\frac{d!}{2}$ 2SU decompositions for the risk factor S . The limiting IASU decomposition is approximated by an ASU decomposition with 10,000 time steps per year. We

observe that the range is significant for the SU decompositions and insignificant for the 2SU decompositions.

The speed of convergence of the ASU to the IASU decomposition is illustrated in Figure 4 for the risk factor S , i.e., we show the convergence of

$$\frac{\delta_1^{ASU,\gamma}(F, X)(1)}{\delta_1^{IASU}(F, X)(1)}$$

to one when the partition γ tends to the identity. Figures 3 and 4 look similar for other risk factors.

In further numerical experiments, we calculate the relative difference between the ASU decomposition and the 2SU decompositions

$$\left| \frac{\delta_i^{2SU,\pi,\gamma}(F, X)(1) - \delta_i^{ASU,\gamma}(F, X)(1)}{\delta_i^{IASU,\gamma}(F, X)(1)} \right|$$

over all risk factors $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, time grids γ and updating orders $\pi \in \sigma_d$, and observe values of less than 0.6% in 95% of the simulations. In conclusion, we find that the ASU decomposition and the 2SU decompositions are strongly dependent on the time grid, but using monthly or weekly time steps instead of annual time steps significantly reduces the deviation of the ASU and 2SU decompositions from the IASU decomposition.




Figure 2: Relative unexplained P&L for the OAT decomposition of a plain vanilla call option in a foreign currency at time $t = 1$ for different time grids.




Figure 3: Relative range of all SU decompositions and 2SU decompositions for the risk factor S .




Figure 4: Convergence of the ASU decomposition to the IASU decomposition for the risk factor S .

5.2 Decomposing a basket option

In this section, we compare the computational cost of obtaining a one-year P&L attribution of a basket option using a naive SU decomposition with annual time grid with the computational cost of obtaining an ASU and a 2SU decomposition based on a monthly time grid, respectively. We consider d risk factors: time decay and $d - 1$ different stocks. A digital cash-or-nothing basket put option pays \$1 at maturity T if $S_1(T) \leq K, \dots, S_{d-1}(T) \leq K$ and zero otherwise. The stock prices are given by a Black-Scholes model. We set the interest rate r to zero. We set $S_i(0) = K = 100, i = 1, \dots, d - 1$ and $T = 2$. The price of the option at time $t \in [0, T)$ is equal to $\Phi(\log(K), \dots, \log(K))$, where Φ is the distribution function of a $d - 1$ dimensional normal distribution with location

$$\left(\log(S_1(t)) - \left(r - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)(T - t), \dots, \log(S_{d-1}(t)) - \left(r - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)(T - t) \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$$

and covariance matrix $\Sigma(T - t)$, where we set $\sigma = 0.2, \rho = 0.5$ and

$$\Sigma_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sigma^2, & i = j \\ \rho\sigma^2, & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Basket options are often priced using Monte Carlo techniques, see Glasserman (2004). For moderate dimensions, many basket options can also be priced using faster Fourier techniques, see Eberlein et al. (2010) and Junike and Stier (2024). We compute Φ using a simple Monte Carlo simulation implemented in C++ with 100,000 simulations. The experiments are performed on a laptop with Intel i7-11850H processor and 32 GB RAM.

Table 1 shows the CPU time needed to obtain Φ for $d \in \{4, 15, 30\}$. We measure CPU times by averaging over 100 runs. Since in some cases the arguments of Φ to obtain a SU decomposition with a certain update order π are the same for different contributions, we need to evaluate Φ only $dL + 1$ times, where L is the number of sub-intervals of $[0, T]$, to obtain the d individual contributions. For example, the 2SU and ASU decompositions with a monthly time grid require $(12d + 1) \cdot 2$ and $(12d + 1) \cdot 2^{d-1}$ evaluations of Φ , respectively.

Table 1 also shows the CPU time to compute the SU, ASU and 2SU decompositions. A naive SU decomposition based on an annual time grid is at most 24 times faster than a 2SU decomposition with a monthly time grid. The computational cost of the 2SU decomposition for each contribution is dimension independent, except for the longer time required to evaluate Φ . Compared to the ASU decomposition, the 2SU decomposition is 2^{d-2} times faster. The ASU decomposition cannot be computed in reasonable time for $d \geq 30$.

	Number of evaluations of Φ	$d = 4$	$d = 15$	$d = 30$
Evaluation of Φ	1	0.018 sec	0.15 sec	0.54 sec
SU with annual grid	$d + 1$	(0.09 sec)	(2.4 sec)	(16.7 sec)
2SU with monthly grid	$(12d + 1) \cdot 2$	(1.76 sec)	(54.3 sec)	(390 sec)
ASU with monthly grid	$(12d + 1) \cdot 2^{(d-1)}$	(7.06 sec)	(123.6 hours)	(3318.7 years)

Table 1: CPU time to compute the d contributions of the SU, ASU and 2SU decompositions of a basket option over one year using different time grids. The CPU time of Φ is obtained from a Monte Carlo simulation. The CPU times in brackets are estimated using the CPU time of Φ and the known complexities of the three decompositions.

Remark 5.1. To reduce the computational time, it is possible to compute the d contributions for the SU, 2SU and ASU decompositions in parallel, which would reduce the numerical effort by a factor of d . Furthermore, the sums for the SU, 2SU and ASU decompositions can also be parallelized. For example, for the 2SU decomposition we need to perform $2(dL + 1)$ function evaluations to obtain all d contributions. If a function evaluation takes 0.54 sec in $d = 30$ dimensions as in the Table 1, the computation time for the 2SU decomposition with monthly time grid could be reduced from 390 sec to about 0.54 sec using 722 cores for parallelization.

6 Conclusions

We showed that the IASU decomposition is the only (up to indistinguishability) exact and symmetric decomposition in the family of Itô decompositions, which is a large class of normalized decompositions based on an extended version of Itô's formula. This axiomatic result, together with the fact that the IASU decomposition is grid-independent and considers the full paths of the risk basis, makes it a decomposition of choice from a theoretical perspective. In practice, the calculation of the IASU decomposition comes with two challenges: it involves stochastic integrals that must be approximated, and the computational effort explodes as the number of risk factors increases.

We have shown that the IASU decomposition can be approximated by the ASU decomposition (which is always exact and symmetric) if we use a sufficiently fine time grid, but the ASU decomposition also suffers from the curse of dimensionality as the number of risk factors increases. For applications where different risk factors may have interactions but almost surely do not have simultaneous jumps, we have shown that the IASU decomposition is indistinguishable from the average of two ISU decompositions, thus breaking the curse of dimensionality. Therefore, from a theoretical point of view, the 2SU decomposition with sufficiently fine time steps is an appropriate approximation of the IASU decomposition.

Based on our own numerical experiments and the empirical analysis of Flaig and Junike (2024), we recommend using monthly or even weekly time steps instead of annual time steps.

The additional computational cost of our two recommendations is moderate, but the theoretical properties of the decomposition are dramatically improved.

Acknowledgements

We thank Bernd Buchwald and Andreas Märkert from Hannover Re, Solveig Flaig from Deutsche Rück, Julien Hambuckers from University of Liège, Jan-Frederik Mai from XAIA Investment GmbH, Thorsten Schmidt from Universität Freiburg and an anonymous referee for very helpful comments that improved this paper.

A Appendix

A.1 Auxiliary results

Lemma A.1. *Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Let $\pi, \eta \in \sigma_d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then it holds that*

$$\eta^{-1} \left(p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\eta(x)) \right) = p_{\{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(x). \quad (18)$$

Proof. Let $k \in \{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}$, which is equivalent to

$$\eta(k) \in \{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}.$$

Since $(\eta^{-1}(x))_{\eta(k)} = x_k$ and $(\eta(x))_k = x_{\eta(k)}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\eta^{-1}(p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\eta(x))) \right)_{\eta(k)} &= \left(p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\eta(x)) \right)_k \\ &= (p_{\{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(x))_{\eta(k)}, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to Eq. (18). \square

Lemma A.2. Let $\eta \in \sigma_d$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$, $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$ and $(\mu_\pi)_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \subset [0, 1]$. If $F(\eta(X)) = F(X)$, then it holds that

$$\sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \mu_\pi S_{\eta^{-1}(i)}^\pi(\eta(X)) = \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} S_i^A(X) \xi_{i,A,\eta}$$

with

$$\xi_{i,A,\eta} := \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \sigma_d \\ \{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\} = A}} \mu_\pi. \quad (19)$$

In particular, for an Itô decomposition δ with parameters $(\lambda_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$ and $(\mu_\pi)_{\pi \in \sigma_d}$, we have that

$$\delta_i(F, X) = I_i + \frac{1}{2} I_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^d \lambda_{ij} I_{ij} + \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} S_i^A(X) \xi_{i,A, id}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let $\eta \in \sigma_d$ and $F(X)(t) = f(X(t))$, $t \geq 0$, with $F(\eta(X)) = F(X)$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. By Eq. (18) it holds for $s > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & f\left(\eta(X(s-)) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\Delta\eta(X)(s))\right) \\ &= f\left(\eta\left[X(s-) + \eta^{-1}\left[p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\eta(\Delta X(s)))\right]\right]\right) \\ &\stackrel{(18)}{=} f\left(\eta\left[X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\Delta X(s))\right]\right) \\ &= f\left(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\Delta X(s))\right). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the symmetry of f . Similarly, if we replace “ \leq ” with “ $<$ ”, we get that

$$f\left(\eta(X(s-)) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\Delta\eta(X)(s))\right) = f\left(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) < \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\}}(\Delta(X)(s))\right).$$

Let $\eta \in \sigma_d$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_2$. If $f(x) = f(\eta(x))$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it is straightforward to see that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ it holds that

$$f_i(x) = f_{\eta^{-1}(i)}(\eta(x)), \quad f_{ij}(x) = f_{\eta^{-1}(i)\eta^{-1}(j)}(\eta(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\eta(x))_{\eta^{-1}(i)} = x_i. \quad (21)$$

Therefore it follows that

$$S_{\eta^{-1}(i)}^{\pi}(\eta(X)) = S_i^{\pi \circ \eta^{-1}}(X). \quad (22)$$

Thus, similarly to Shorrocks (2013), for any re-ordering $\eta(X)$ of the risk basis X we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \mu_{\pi} S_{\eta^{-1}(i)}^{\pi}(\eta(X)) &\stackrel{(22)}{=} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \mu_{\pi} S_i^{\pi \circ \eta^{-1}}(X) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \sigma_d \\ \{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\} = A}} \mu_{\pi} S_i^{\pi \circ \eta^{-1}}(X) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} S_i^A(X) \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \sigma_d \\ \{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\} = A}} \mu_{\pi} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} S_i^A(X) \xi_{i,A,\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Eq. (20) follows directly for $\eta = id$. \square

Lemma A.3. *Let δ be an Itô decomposition with parameters $(\lambda_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$ and $(\mu_{\pi})_{\pi \in \sigma_d}$. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. If δ is symmetric and exact, it follows that*

$$\xi_{i,A,id} = \xi_{\eta^{-1}(i),\eta^{-1}(A),id} \quad (23)$$

for any $\eta \in \sigma_d$, where $\xi_{i,A,id}$ is defined in Eq. (19) and $\eta(A) := \{\eta(j) : j \in A\}$. Further, for any $a \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ it holds that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ |A|=a, j \in A}} \xi_{j,A,id} = 1. \quad (24)$$

Proof. First we show Eq. (23). Let $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $i \in A$. Let $\pi, \eta \in \sigma_d$. Because of

$$\{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\} = A \Leftrightarrow \{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\} = \eta^{-1}(A),$$

it holds that

$$\xi_{i,A,\eta} = \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \sigma_d \\ \{j | \pi(\eta^{-1}(j)) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\} = A}} \mu_{\pi} = \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \sigma_d \\ \{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(\eta^{-1}(i))\} = \eta^{-1}(A)}} \mu_{\pi} = \xi_{\eta^{-1}(i),\eta^{-1}(A),id}. \quad (25)$$

Now let $f(x) = \prod_{j=1}^d x_j^2$ and $F(X)(t) = f(X(t))$, $t \geq 0$, so that $F(X) = F(\pi(X))$, $\pi \in \sigma_d$. For $B \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $i \in B$ and $t \geq 0$, let

$$X_j(t) = \begin{cases} 1_{[1,\infty)}(t), & j \in B \\ 1_{[0,1)}(t), & j \notin B. \end{cases}$$

Then it follows that

$$f\left(X(1-) + p_A(\Delta X(1))\right) = \begin{cases} 1, & A = B \\ 0, & A \neq B \end{cases}$$

and therefore

$$S_i^A(X)(1) = \begin{cases} 1, & A = B \\ 0, & A \neq B \end{cases}$$

for $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $i \in A$. For $\eta \in \sigma_d$ it follows by Lemma A.2 that

$$\delta_{\eta^{-1}(i)}(F, \eta(X))(1) = \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ i \in A}} S_i^A(X)(1) \xi_{i,A,\eta} = \xi_{i,B,\eta}.$$

Since δ is symmetric, we have that

$$\xi_{\eta^{-1}(i), \eta^{-1}(B), id} \stackrel{(25)}{=} \xi_{i,B,\eta} = \delta_{\eta^{-1}(i)}(F, \eta(X))(1) = \delta_i(F, X)(1) = \xi_{i,B,id}.$$

Since B was arbitrary, we have just shown Eq. (23).

Now we iteratively show Eq. (24). Let $X_j(t) = 1_{[1,\infty)}(t)$, $t \geq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, d$ and let $f^a \in \mathcal{C}_2$ such that for $a \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$f^a(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \sum_{j=1}^d x_j = a \\ 0, & \sum_{j=1}^d x_j \in (-\infty, a-1] \cup [a+1, \infty) \end{cases}$$

and $f_i^a(X) = 0$ if $\sum_{j=1}^d x_j \leq a-1$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. Let $F^a(X)(t) = f^a(X(t))$, $t \geq 0$. If $a = d$, then

$$S_j^A(X)(1) = \begin{cases} 1, & |A| = a \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $j \in A$. By exactness and Lemma A.2 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= F^a(X)(1) - F^a(X)(0) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \delta_j(F^a, X)(1) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ j \in A}} S_j^A(X)(1) \xi_{j,A,id} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ |A|=d, j \in A}} \xi_{j,A,id}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Now let $a = d-1$, then

$$S_j^A(X)(1) = \begin{cases} 1, & |A| = a \\ -1, & |A| = a+1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $j \in A$. Again, by exactness we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= F^a(X)(1) - F^a(X)(0) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^d \delta_j(F^a, X) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ j \in A}} S_j^A(X)(1) \xi_{j,A,id} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ |A|=d-1, j \in A}} \xi_{j,A,id} - \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ |A|=d, j \in A}} \xi_{j,A,id}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Eq. (26) we obtain that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ |A|=d-1, j \in A}} \xi_{j,A,id} = 1.$$

Iteratively for any $a \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ |A|=a, j \in A}} \xi_{j,A,id} = 1.$$

□

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.9

Proof. First we show that the IASU decomposition is exact and symmetric and satisfies Eq. (10): By Proposition 3.3, it follows that δ^{IASU} is an exact Itô decomposition. Use Eq. (21) to see that the IASU decomposition is symmetric. If $d = 1$, Eq. (10) is trivially true. Assume $d \geq 2$. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Note that

$$\sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} 1_{\{\pi(j) < \pi(i)\}} = \begin{cases} \frac{d!}{2}, & j \neq i \\ 0, & j = i. \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) < \pi(i)}}^d I_{ij} &= \sum_{j=1}^d \left\{ I_{ij} \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in \sigma_d} 1_{\{\pi(j) < \pi(i)\}} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} I_{i1} + \dots + \frac{1}{2} I_{i(i-1)} + \frac{1}{2} I_{i(i+1)} + \dots + \frac{1}{2} I_{id} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} I_{ij}. \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Eq. (27) implies Eq. (10). Now we show that all exact and symmetric Itô decompositions are indistinguishable from the IASU decomposition. Let δ be a symmetric and exact Itô decomposition with parameters $(\lambda_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,d}$ and $(\mu_\pi)_{\pi \in \sigma_d}$. Since the Itô decomposition is over-parameterised,

we use the alternative parametrization according to Eq. (20). To prove that δ is indistinguishable from the IASU decomposition, we show that λ_{ij} and $\xi_{i,A,id}$ are equal to the coefficients $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\xi_{i,A}$ as defined in Eq. (9).

Suppose that $\lambda_{hk} \neq \frac{1}{2}$. Let $X \in \mathcal{X}^d$ have continuous paths with $X_i = 1$, $i \notin \{h, k\}$, and $[X_h, X_k] \neq 0$. Let $F(X) = \prod_{i=1}^d X_i$. Then $F(X) = F(\pi(X))$ for $\pi \in \sigma_d$. Note that $I_{kh} = I_{hk}$. As δ is exact, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \delta_i(F, X) = I_h + I_k + \lambda_{hk} I_{hk} + \lambda_{kh} I_{kh} = F(X) - F(X)(0) = I_h + I_k + I_{hk},$$

hence $\lambda_{kh} = 1 - \lambda_{hk} \neq \lambda_{hk}$. Let $\pi \in \sigma_d$ such that $\pi^{-1}(h) = k$. Then, it follows that

$$\delta_{\pi^{-1}(h)}(F, \pi(X)) = \delta_k(F, \pi(X)) = I_h + \lambda_{kh} I_{kh} \neq I_h + \lambda_{hk} I_{hk} = \delta_h(F, X).$$

That means that δ is not symmetric, which is a contradiction to our assumption. So we necessarily have that $\lambda_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, d$.

Now let $a \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. For $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, let $A, B \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $|A| = |B| = a$ and $i \in A$, $j \in B$. Then there is a permutation $\eta \in \sigma_d$ such that $\eta^{-1}(A) = B$ and $j = \eta^{-1}(i)$. By Eq. (23) it follows that

$$\xi_{i,A,id} = \xi_{j,B,id}. \quad (28)$$

Let $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $j \in A_j$ and $|A_j| = a$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Since

$$|\{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} : j \in A, |A| = a\}| = \binom{d-1}{a-1}, \quad (29)$$

we obtain by Eqs. (24), (28) and (29) that

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\} \\ |A|=a, j \in A}} \xi_{j,A,id} = \sum_{j=1}^d \binom{d-1}{a-1} \xi_{j,A_j,id} = d \binom{d-1}{a-1} \xi_{i,A,id}$$

for $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $i \in A$ and $|A| = a$. Therefore we can conclude that

$$\xi_{i,A,id} = \frac{1}{d \binom{d-1}{|A|-1}} = \frac{(|A|-1)!(d-|A|)!}{d!}.$$

□

A.3 Proof of Theorem 4.7

Proof. Let $t > 0$. Fix some $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and some permutation π . Since $F \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C}_2)$, by definition there is an $f \in \mathcal{C}_2$ such that $F(X)(t) = f(X(t))$, $t \geq 0$. We first show that $\delta^{\text{SU}, \pi, \gamma_n}(F, X)(t) \xrightarrow{P} \delta^{\text{ISU}, \pi}(F, X)(t)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\gamma_n = \{0 = s_0^n < s_1^n < \dots\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of unbounded random partitions tending to the identity. Let $\alpha > 0$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha := \{s \in (0, t] : \max_{j=1, \dots, d} |\Delta X_j(s)| > \alpha\}.$$

The set \mathcal{A}_α contains all time points in $[0, t]$ where at least one component of a path $u \mapsto X(u)$ has jumps greater than α . The SU decomposition $\delta_i^{\text{SU}, \pi, \gamma_n}$ with respect to γ_n can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i^{\text{SU}, \pi, \gamma_n}(F, X)(t) &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{A}_\alpha} \left\{ f \left(X^{s_l^n}(t) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}} \left(X^{s_{l+1}^n}(t) - X^{s_l^n}(t) \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f \left(X^{s_l^n}(t) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}} \left(X^{s_{l+1}^n}(t) - X^{s_l^n}(t) \right) \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{A}_\alpha^c} \left\{ f \left(X^{s_l^n}(t) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}} \left(X^{s_{l+1}^n}(t) - X^{s_l^n}(t) \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f \left(X^{s_l^n}(t) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}} \left(X^{s_{l+1}^n}(t) - X^{s_l^n}(t) \right) \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbb{A}_\alpha = \{l \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \mathcal{A}_\alpha \cap (s_l^n, s_{l+1}^n] \neq \emptyset\}$ and $\mathbb{A}_\alpha^c = \mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \mathbb{A}_\alpha$. The first sum at the right-hand side of Eq. (30) converges a.s. for $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \left\{ f \left(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}} (\Delta X(s)) \right) - f \left(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}} (\Delta X(s)) \right) \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Using a Taylor expansion and the same arguments as in the proof of the classical Itô's formula, one can show that the second sum of the right-hand side of Eq. (30) converges in probability for $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$\begin{aligned} I_i(t) + \frac{1}{2} H_{ii}(t) + \sum_{\pi(j) < \pi(i)} H_{ij}(t) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \left\{ f_i(X(s-)) \Delta X_i(s) + \frac{1}{2} f_{ii}(X(s-)) (\Delta X_i(s))^2 \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) < \pi(i)}}^d f_{ij}(X(s-)) \Delta X_i(s) \Delta X_j(s) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $H_{ij} = \int_0^t f_{ij}(X(s-)) d[X_i, X_j](s)$. The sum of the Eqs. (31) and (32) is

$$I_i(t) + \frac{1}{2} H_{ii}(t) + \sum_{\pi(j) < \pi(i)} H_{ij}(t) + \quad (33)$$

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \left\{ f \left(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) \leq \pi(i)\}} (\Delta X(s)) \right) - f \left(X(s-) + p_{\{j | \pi(j) < \pi(i)\}} (\Delta X(s)) \right) \right. \\ \left. - f_i(X(s-)) \Delta X_i(s) \right\} \quad (34)$$

$$- \sum_{s \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \frac{1}{2} f_{ii}(X(s-)) (\Delta X_i(s))^2 \quad (35)$$

$$- \sum_{s \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \pi(j) < \pi(i)}}^d f_{ij}(X(s-)) \Delta X_i(s) \Delta X_j(s). \quad (36)$$

Since X is a semimartingale, and because of Lemma 3.2, we can see that the sums (34), (35) and (36) are absolutely convergent for $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ so that (33-36) converge for $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ to $\delta^{\text{ISU}, \pi}(F, X)(t)$, using that

$$I_{ij} = H_{ij} - \sum_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot} f_{ij}(X(s-)) \Delta X_i(s) \Delta X_j(s).$$

By Theorem 3.9 we get $\delta^{\text{ASU}, \tau^n}(F, X)(t) \xrightarrow{P} \delta^{\text{IASU}, \pi}(F, X)(t)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

A.4 Stability

In this section, we use the notation of Christiansen (2022). For $i = 1, 2$, let $\tau_i : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\tau_i(t) \leq t$ for all $t \geq 0$. The function

$$\tau(t) = (\tau_1(t), \tau_2(t))$$

is called a *delay*. A delay is called *phased* if there is an unbounded partition $\{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots\}$ of $[0, \infty)$ such that on each interval $(s_l, s_{l+1}]$, at most one component of τ is nonconstant. Let $(\tau^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a *refining sequence of delays that increase to identity (rsdii)*, i.e.,

$$\tau_i^n([0, t]) \subset \tau_i^{n+1}([0, t]), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_i^n([0, t])} = [0, t], \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Let \mathcal{T} be a set containing at least one phased rsdii. Let $X = (X_1, X_2)$ be a semimartingale, and define

$$X \diamond \tau := (X_1 \circ \tau_1, X_2 \circ \tau_2), \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Let

$$\mathbb{X} = \{X \diamond \tau : \tau \in \mathcal{T}\} \cup \{X\}.$$

Let \mathbb{D}_0 be the set of càdlàg processes starting in zero and let $\varrho : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0^2$. A mapping $\delta : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0^2$ is called *decomposition scheme of ϱ* . The mapping δ assigns to each $Y \in \mathbb{X}$ a decomposition of $\varrho(Y)$. The ISU decomposition scheme is abbreviated δ^{ISU} . A decomposition scheme is called *stable at X* if

$$\delta(X \diamond \tau^n)(t-) \xrightarrow{P} \delta(X)(t-), \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

at each $t > 0$ for all rsdii $(\tau^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{T}$.

Proposition A.4. *Assume that $X = (X_1, X_2)$ with $X_1 = X_2 = B$ for a Brownian motion B . Let $\varrho(Y) = Y_1 Y_2$ be a simple product. Then, there is a set \mathcal{T} of continuous phased rsdii such that the ISU decomposition δ^{ISU} of ϱ is not stable at X .*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{T} contains a continuous phased rsdii $(\tau^n) = (\tau_1^n, \tau_2^n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\tau_1^n \leq \tau_2^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For a partition $(a_{l,i}^n, b_{l,i}^n]$, $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $i = 1, 2$ of $[0, \infty)$ such that $(\tau_j^n)_{j \neq i}$ is constant on $(a_{l,i}^n, b_{l,i}^n]$, let $\tau_1^n(a_{l,2}^n) = \tau_2^n(a_{l,2}^n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In addition, let \mathcal{T} also contain $(\tilde{\tau}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = ((\tau_2^n, \tau_1^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Since $\tau_2^n(a_{l,1}^n) = \tau_2^n(b_{l,1}^n) = \tau_1^n(b_{l,1}^n)$ and by the multidimensional Taylor theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1^{\text{ISU}}(X \diamond \tau^n)(t) &= \sum_l \left(\varrho((X \diamond \tau^n)^{b_{l,1}^n \wedge t}) - \varrho((X \diamond \tau^n)^{a_{l,1}^n \wedge t}) \right) \\ &= \sum_l \varrho_1((X \diamond \tau^n)^{a_{l,1}^n \wedge t}) \left(X_1(\tau_1^n(b_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) - X_1(\tau_1^n(a_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of X_1 , X_2 and ρ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_1^{ISU}(X \diamond \tau^n)(t) &= \sum_l B(\tau_2^n(a_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) \left(B(\tau_1^n(b_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) - B(\tau_1^n(a_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) \right) \\
&= \sum_l B(\tau_1^n(b_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) \left(B(\tau_1^n(b_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) - B(\tau_1^n(a_{l,1}^n \wedge t)) \right) \\
&= \sum_l B(t_l) (B(t_l \wedge t) - B(t_{l-1} \wedge t)) \\
&= 2 \sum_l \frac{(B(t_l) + B(t_{l-1}))}{2} (B(t_l \wedge t) - B(t_{l-1} \wedge t)) \\
&\quad - \sum_l B(t_{l-1}) (B(t_l \wedge t) - B(t_{l-1} \wedge t))
\end{aligned}$$

for $t_l^n := \tau_1^n(b_{l,1}^n) = \tau_1^n(a_{l+1,1}^n) = \tau_2^n(b_{l-1,2}^n) = \tau_2^n(a_{l,2}^n)$. Let $\int_0^t B_s \circ dB_s$ denote the Stratonovich integral and $\int_0^t B_s dB_s$ the Itô integral. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_1^{ISU}(X \diamond \tau^n)(t) &\xrightarrow{P} 2 \int_0^t B_s \circ dB_s - \int_0^t B_s dB_s \\
&= \frac{1}{2} B_t^2 + \frac{1}{2} t
\end{aligned}$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. By the same arguments,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_1^{ISU}(X \diamond \tilde{\tau}^n)(t) &= \sum_l \left(\varrho((X \diamond \tilde{\tau}^n)^{b_{l,2}^n \wedge t}) - \varrho((X \diamond \tilde{\tau}^n)^{a_{l,2}^n \wedge t}) \right) \\
&= \sum_l \varrho_1((X \diamond \tilde{\tau}^n)^{a_{l,2}^n \wedge t}) \left(X_2(\tau_2^n(b_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) - X_2(\tau_2^n(a_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) \right) \\
&= \sum_l B(\tau_1^n(a_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) \left(B(\tau_2^n(b_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) - B(\tau_2^n(a_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) \right) \\
&= \sum_l B(\tau_2^n(a_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) \left(B(\tau_2^n(b_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) - B(\tau_2^n(a_{l,2}^n \wedge t)) \right) \\
&= \sum_l B(t_l) (B(t_{l+1} \wedge t) - B(t_l \wedge t)) \\
&\xrightarrow{P} \int_0^t B_s dB_s \\
&= \frac{1}{2} B_t^2 - \frac{1}{2} t
\end{aligned}$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore,

$$\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_i^{ISU}(X \diamond \tau^n)(t) \neq \text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_i^{ISU}(X \diamond \tilde{\tau}^n)(t), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

for $t > 0$, and hence, the ISU decomposition of $\varrho(X)$ cannot be stable at X . \square

References

Björk, T.: Arbitrage theory in continuous time. Oxford university press (2009)

- Blinder, A.S.: Wage discrimination: reduced form and structural estimates. *J. Hum. Resour.* 436–455 (1973)
- Candland, A., Lotz, C.: Profit and Loss attribution. In: *Internal Models and Solvency II – From Regulation to Implementation*, Risk Books, London (2014)
- Černý, A., Ruf, J.: Pure-jump semimartingales. *Bernoulli* **27**(4), 2624–2648 (2021)
- Christiansen, M.C.: On the decomposition of an insurer’s profits and losses. *Scand. Actuar. J.* 1–20 (2022)
- Eberlein, E., Glau, K., Papapantoleon, A.: Analysis of Fourier transform valuation formulas and applications. *Appl. Math. Finance* **17**(3), 211–240 (2010)
- Fischer, T.: On the decomposition of risk in life insurance. Working Paper, Technische Universität Darmstadt (2014)
- Flaig, S., Junike, G.: Profit and loss attribution: an empirical study. *European Actuarial Journal* (2024)
- Fortin, N., Lemieux, T., Firpo, S.: Decomposition methods in economics. In *Volume 4, Part A of Handbook of Labor Economics*. Elsevier 10, P. Amsterdam: S0169-7218. (2011)
- Frei, C.: A new approach to risk attribution and its application in credit risk analysis. *Risks* **8**(2), 65 (2020)
- Friedman, E., Moulin, H.: Three methods to share joint costs or surplus. *Journal of economic Theory* **87**(2), 275-312 (1999)
- Glasserman, P.: *Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering.* , vol. 53. Springer, New York (2004)
- Grünbaum, B.: *Convex polytopes.* In: *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 221. Springer, New York (2013)
- Grzelak, L. A., Jablecki, J., Gatarek, D.: Efficient pricing and calibration of high-dimensional basket options. *International Journal of Computer Mathematics* 1–24 (2023)
- Jetses, J., Christiansen, M.C.: A general surplus decomposition principle in life insurance. *Scand. Actuar. J.* 1–25 (2022)
- Junike, G., Stier, H.: From characteristic functions to multivariate distribution functions and European option prices by the damped COS method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12843* (2024).
- Mai, J. F.: Performance attribution with respect to interest rates, FX, carry, and residual market risks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01010* (2023).
- Norberg, R.: A theory of bonus in life insurance. *Finance Stoch.* **3**(4), 373–390 (1999)
- Oaxaca, R.: Male-female wage differentials in urban labor markets. *Int. Econ. Rev.* 693–709 (1973)
- Protter, P.: *Stochastic differential equations.* In: *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations.* Springer, New York (2005)

- Rabinovitch, R.: Pricing stock and bond options when the default-free rate is stochastic. *J. Financ. Quant. Anal.* **24**(4), 447–457 (1989)
- Ramlau-Hansen, H.: Distribution of surplus in life insurance. *ASTIN Bull.* **21**(1), 57–71 (1991)
- Rosen, D., Saunders, D.: Risk factor contributions in portfolio credit risk models. *J. Bank. Financ.* **34**(2), 336–349 (2010)
- Schilling, K., Bauer, D., Christiansen, M.C., Kling, A.: Decomposing dynamic risks into risk components. *Manag. Sci.* **66**(12), 5738–5756 (2020)
- Shorrocks, A.F.: Decomposition procedures for distributional analysis: a unified framework based on the Shapley value. *J. Econ. Inequal.* **11**(1), 99–126 (2013)
- Shapley, Lloyd S.: A Value for n-person Games. In Kuhn, H. W.; Tucker, A. W. (eds.). *Contributions to the Theory of Games*. *Annals of Mathematical Studies*. Vol. **28**. Princeton University Press, pp. 307-317 (1953)
- Shubik, M.: Incentives, decentralized control, the assignment of joint costs and internal pricing. *Manage. Sci.* **8**, , 325-343. (1962)
- Sprumont, Y.: Ordinal cost sharing. *Journal of Economic Theory* **81**, 126-162. (1998)