

American Passport options in an exponential Lévy model

Marah Zakaria

marahzakaria1@gmail.com

August 1, 2023

Abstract

In this paper we examine the problem of valuing an exotic derivative known as the American passport option where the underlying is driven by a Lévy process. The passport option is a call option on a trading account. We derive the pricing equation, using the dynamic programming principle, and prove that the option value is a viscosity solution of variational inequality. We also establish the comparison principle, which yields uniqueness and the convexity of the viscosity solution.

Keywords: Lévy process, American Passport options, Viscosity solution .

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35D40,91B25 .

1 Introduction

Hyer et al. [5] introduced passport option, that allows the holder to adopt a trading strategy involving securities, while being compensated for the losses resulting from the adoption of such a strategy. They construct the Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB, in short) equation and solve the PDE via Green’s functions. They also define a non-symmetric version of the problem for which the PDE is solved numerically. Andersen et al. [1] use the change of numéraire to give the one-dimension PDE for the European type and extend it to the American type. Bian et al. [3] establish the mathematical foundation for pricing the European passport option. They prove the comparison principle, uniqueness and convexity preserving of the viscosity solutions of related HJB. Wang et al. [8] study the pricing problem for the European passport options in a jump-diffusion model by using the method of viscosity solutions. In another paper Wang et al. [9] study the pricing problem for the American passport options. This paper is concerned with the American passport option. In the work Wang et al. [9], the underlying stock follows geometric Brownian motion. However, various empirical studies show that such models seem to dissatisfy the real market behavior. The purpose of this paper is to give a pricing analysis for the American passport option when the underlying follows a Lévy process which include the case of Jump diffusion model. The purpose of this paper is to give a pricing analysis for the European passport option in a jump-diffusion model by a viscosity approach. To our knowledge, the American option with jump-diffusion processes has not appeared in the literature before.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sect. 2, we rigorously establish the mathematical model for the American passport option pricing problem. We show that the price of the American passport option verifies a variational inequality. In Sect. 3, we prove the the existence, the uniqueness and the convexity of the viscosity solution.

2 Model formulation

A Lévy process X is a càdlàg stochastic process with values in \mathbb{R} , starting from 0, with stationary and independent increments. The random process X can be interpreted as the independent superposition of a Brownian motion with drift and an infinite superposition of independent (compensated) Poisson processes. More precisely we give the following Lévy–Itô decomposition presentation of X :

$$dX_t = \left(r - a - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^z - 1) - z 1_{|z| < 1} \nu(dz) \right) dt + \sigma dW_t \quad (2.1)$$

$$+ \int_{|z| < 1} z (J(dt, dz) - \nu(dz)dt) + \int_{|z| > 1} z J(dt, dz) \quad (2.2)$$

In Equation (2.1), W_t is a Brownian motion process which is adapted to the filtration. The component $J(ds, dz)$ is a Poisson random measure with intensity measure $\nu(dz)$. The measure ν is a positive Radon measure on $\mathbb{R} \setminus 0$, called the Lévy measure, and it satisfies

$$\int_{|z| > 1} e^z \nu(dz) < \infty,$$

$J(ds, dz) - \nu(ds, dz)$ is the compensated Poisson random measure that corresponds to $J(ds, dz)$.

We will from now on assume \mathbb{P} to be a risk-neutral measure, the interest rate to be a constant r and a constant positive dividend yield a , per annum.

We suppose the risky asset $(S_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and defined on a filtered probability space $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$, evolves according to the following expression:

$$S_t = e^{X_t} \quad (2.3)$$

Applying Ito lemma:

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = (r - a)dt + \sigma dW_t + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^z - 1)(J(dt, dz) - \nu(dz)dt) \quad (2.4)$$

The passport option, introduced and marketed by Bankers Trust, is a call option on the balance of a trading account. Denote the option holder's trading strategy by q_t , the number of shares held at time t . q_t can be positive (if the option holder thinks the asset price will rise) or negative (if he/she thinks the asset price will fall). There is a constraint on q_t : $|q_t| \leq C$. At expiry T , the issuer has to pay $X_T^+ = \max(X_T, 0)$ to the option holder, where X_t represents the value of the trading account.

$$dX_t = q_t(dS_t - rS_t dt) + rX_t dt$$

We are interested in American-type of Passport derivative of the form:

$$V(t, S_t, X_t) = \sup_{|q| \leq C} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} \mathbb{E}[e^{-r(\tau-t)} X_T^+ | \mathcal{F}_t] \quad (2.5)$$

Throughout this paper, we assume that $C = 1$. We do not lose generality because $V_{C=C^*}(t, S_t, X_t) = V_{C=1}(t, C^* S_t, X_t)$

Proposition 1. *Let*

$$V^q(t, S_t, X_t) = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} \mathbb{E}[e^{-r(\tau-t)} X_T^+ | \mathcal{F}_t]$$

We denote $L_t = \frac{X_t}{S_t}$. Then we have the following relationship:

$$V^q(t, S_t, X_t) = S_t \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[e^{-a(\tau-t)} L_T^+ | \mathcal{F}_t]$$

where \mathbb{Q} is defined by:

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{S_T}{S_0 e^{-(r-a)T}}$$

As a conclusion we can reduce the problem (2.6) by one dimension:

$$V(t, S_t, X_t) = S_t u(t, L_t)$$

where

$$u(t, L_t) = \sup_{|q| \leq 1} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \mathbb{E}[e^{-a(\tau-t)} L_T^+ | \mathcal{F}_t] \quad (2.6)$$

Proposition 2. Let $f(t, x) = \sup_{|q| \leq 1} \mathbb{E}[e^{-r(\tau-t)} X_T^+ | \mathcal{F}_t]$ then f verifies the following IPDE

$$0 = \partial_t f(t, L_t) dt + \sup_{|q| \leq 1} \left\{ \sigma^2 \frac{(q_t - L_t)^2}{2} \partial_{ll} f(t, L_t) - (q_t - L_t) \partial_x f(t, L_t) \right. \\ \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t, L_{t-} + (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z}, \cdot) - f(t, L_{t-}) - (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} \partial_L f(t, L_{t-}) \tilde{\nu}(dt, dz) \right\} - af(t, L_t)$$

Proof. Apply Ito's formula to get

$$d \frac{X_t}{S_t} = \left(q_t - \frac{X_t}{S_t} \right) (\sigma dW_t - (\sigma + a) dt) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} J(dt, dz) - e^z \nu(dz) dt$$

We define the following change (cf. Jacod and Shiryaev [6])

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{S_T}{S_0 e^{-(r-a)T}} = \mathcal{E} \left(\int_0^T \sigma dW_s + \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^z - 1) (J(ds, dz) - \nu(dz) ds) \right)$$

$$dW_t^{\mathbb{Q}} = -\sigma dt + dW_t, \\ \tilde{\nu} = e^z \nu,$$

then

$$dL_t = (q_t - L_t) \left(-adt + \sigma dW_t^{\mathbb{Q}} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} (J(dt, dz) - \tilde{\nu}(dz) dt) \right).$$

Let $e^{-at} f(t, L_t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[e^{-aT} L_T^+ | \mathcal{F}_t]$, which is a martingale by definition. Using Ito lemma,

$$de^{-at} f(t, L_t) = e^{-at} \left[\partial_t f(t, L_t) dt + \partial_l f(t, L_t) dL_t + \sigma^2 \frac{(q_t - L_t)^2}{2} \partial_{ll} f(t, L_t) - af(t, L_t) dt \right. \\ \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(t, L_{t-} + (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z}) - f(t, L_{t-}) \tilde{J}(dt, dy) \right. \\ \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t, L_{t-} + (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z}) - u(t, L_{t-}) - (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} \partial_L u(t, L_{t-}) \tilde{\nu}(dt, dz) \right].$$

Using the martingale property then we can conclude our result. \square

The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB in short) equation associated with the problem (2.6) is a variational inequality involving, at least heuristically, a non-linear second order parabolic integro-differential equation (see Bensoussan, J.L. Lions [2])

$$\begin{cases} \min\{-\partial_t u(t, x) - \mathcal{L}u(t, x) + au(t, x), u(t, x) - x\} = 0 \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \\ u(T, x) = x^+ \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}u(t, x) = & \sup_{|q| \leq 1} \left\{ \sigma^2 \frac{(q_t - L_t)^2}{2} \partial_{ll} u(t, L_t) - (q_t - L_t) \partial_x u(t, L_t) \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(t, L_{t-} + (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z}) - u(t, X_{t-}) - (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} \partial_L u(t, L_{t-}) \tilde{\nu}(dt, dz) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. *If the risky asset $(S_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is under jump-diffusion model:*

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = (r - a)dt + \sigma dW_t + \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^z - 1 J(dt, dz), \quad (2.8)$$

we write the operator \mathcal{L} as following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}u(t, x) = & \sup_{|q| \leq 1} \left\{ \sigma^2 \frac{(q_t - L_t)^2}{2} \partial_{ll} u(t, L_t) - (q_t - L_t) \partial_x u(t, L_t) \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(t, L_{t-} + (q_t - L_t) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z}) - u(t, X_{t-}) \tilde{\nu}(dt, dz) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

It is well known that the value function u defined in (2.7) is not always smooth enough for the expression u to be well defined. Therefore, it is natural to ask for a weak solution such that u is unique even though it is not smooth. One such weak solution, called a viscosity solution, was introduced by Crandall and Lions see Crandall et al. [4].

We shall need the following spaces of semi-continuous functions on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}) & := \left\{ v : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \text{ it is upper semi-continuous} \right\} \\ LSC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}) & := \left\{ v : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}, \text{ it is lower semi-continuous} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 1. *Let u be a locally bounded function:*

- *A viscosity sub-solution (super-solution) of (2.7) if for any $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$, wherever $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ is a maximum (minimum) of $u - \psi$*

$$\max \left(\partial_t \psi(t, x) + \mathcal{L}\psi(t, x) - a\psi(t, x), x - \psi(t, x) \right) \leq 0 (\geq)$$

- *u is a viscosity solution of (2.7) if it is both super and subsolution.*

3 Viscosity solutions

3.1 Continuity

This section is devoted to the continuity property of the value function u .

Proposition 3. *u is continuous and*

$$|u(t, x) - u(s, y)| \leq C(\sqrt{t-s} + |x - y|) \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[|L_t^x - L_t^y|^2 \right] &\leq C \left(|x - y|^2 + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\int_0^t q_u |L_s^x - L_s^y|^2 ds \right] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} |L_s^x - L_s^y|^2 |e^z - 1|^2 \tilde{\nu}(dz) ds \right] \right) \\ &\leq C(|x - y|^2 + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\int_0^t |L_s^x - L_s^y|^2 ds \right]) \end{aligned}$$

Using Gronwall lemma we conclude that We have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[|L_t^x - L_t^y|^2 \right] \leq C(|x - y|^2)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} |u(t, x) - u(t, y)| &= \sup_{|q| \leq 1} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, x}} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-a(\tau-t)} |(L_T^{t, x})^+ - (L_T^{t, y})^+| \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[|L_t^x - L_t^y| \right] \\ &\leq C(|x - y|) \end{aligned}$$

We now show continuity with respect to time for fixed x . Let $0 \leq t \leq t' \leq T$. Take $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{T-t}$ and define $\tau' = \tau \wedge (T - t')$. We note that $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}_{T-t'}$ and $\tau' \leq \tau \leq \tau' + t' - t$

$$\begin{aligned} |u(t, x) - u(t', x)| &\leq C \sup_{\tau' \leq s \leq \tau' + t' - t} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} [|L_s^{t, x} - L_{\tau'}^{t, x}|] \\ &\leq C \sqrt{(1 + x^2) |t' - t|} \end{aligned}$$

Where we used the fact that

$$\sup_{\tau \leq s \leq \tau'} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} [|L_s^{t, x} - L_{\tau'}^{t, x}|^2] \leq C(\tau' - \tau)(1 + |x|^2) \quad (3.2)$$

So u is continuous with respect to time. \square

The dynamic programming principle for the optimal stopping of a controlled process is the following (Proposition 3.2 in [7]):

Lemma 1. *Let $\delta > 0$, we define the stopping time as*

$$\tau_{q, t, x}^{\delta} = \inf \{ 0 \leq s \leq T - t \mid u(t + s, X_s^x) \leq X_s^x + \delta \}$$

For any $\tau \leq \tau_{q, t, x}^{\delta}$

$$u(t, x) = \sup_{|q| \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-a\tau} u(t + \tau, X_{\tau}^x) \right]$$

Now we are ready to give the existence result of a viscosity solution.

Theorem 1. *u is a viscosity solution of IPDE (2.7).*

Proof. We already know that u is continuous. Let's start by showing that u is a super-solution of (2.7). Let $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}(\mathcal{O})$ such that without loss of generality

$$0 = (u - \psi)(t, x, v) = \min_{[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}} u - \psi. \quad (3.3)$$

Applying lemma (1), for any stopping time $\epsilon \in [t, T]$

$$u(t, x) \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{-a\epsilon} u(t + \epsilon, X_\epsilon^x)].$$

By (3.3)

$$0 \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{-a\epsilon} \psi(t + \epsilon, X_\epsilon^x) - \psi(t, x)]$$

Using Ito lemma we have

$$0 \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\epsilon (\partial_t + \mathcal{L} - a)\psi(t + s, X_s^x) ds\right],$$

dividing by ϵ and taking the limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$0 \geq (\partial_t + \mathcal{L} - a)\psi(t, x)$$

We next prove that u is a subsolution of (2.7). Let $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$ such that without loss of generality

$$0 = (u - \psi)(t, x) = \max_{\bar{\theta} \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+} (u - \psi)(\bar{\theta}) \quad (3.4)$$

We already know that $u(t, x) \geq x$. If $u(t, x) = x$, the inequality of subsolution is obviously satisfied. Assume therefore that $u(t, x) > x$. and define

$$\delta = \frac{u(t, x) - x}{2} > 0$$

For each admissible control $|q| \leq 1$, we define the stopping time

$$\tau^{\delta_m} = \inf\{0 \leq s \leq T - t \mid u(t + s, X_s^x) \leq X_s^{t,x} + \delta_m\}$$

such that $\delta_m \rightarrow 0$. To prove the subsolution property, we assume on the contrary that

$$(-\partial_t - \mathcal{L} + a)\psi(t, x) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u(t, x) - x > 0$$

As the operator $\partial_t + \mathcal{L}$ is continuous at (t, x) then there exists an $\eta > 0$ and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$(-\partial_t - \mathcal{L} + a)\psi(s, y) \geq \epsilon$$

for all s, y in $B((t, x), \eta) = \{(s, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ : |y - x| + |s - t| \leq \eta\}$. Let

$$\tau_0 = \inf\{0 \leq s \leq T - t \mid |X_s^x - x| + s > \eta\}$$

We define $\tau = \tau_0 \wedge \tau^{\delta_m}$

$$u(t, x) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-a\tau} u(t + \tau, X_\tau^{t,x})] \quad (3.5)$$

Using (3.4), (3.5) and the definition of τ_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-a\tau}\psi(t+\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) - \psi(t, x)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\tau (\partial_s + \mathcal{L} - a)\psi(t+s, X_s^{t,x})ds\right] \leq -\epsilon\mathbb{E}[\tau]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Using Tchebyshev's inequality we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}(\tau_0 \leq \tau^{\delta_m}) &\leq \mathbb{Q}\left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq \tau^{\delta_m}} |X_s^x - x| > \eta\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\eta^2} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q}\left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq \tau^{\delta_m}} |X_s^x - x|^2\right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since

$$\mathbb{Q}(\tau_0 > \tau^{\delta_m}) \leq \frac{1}{\tau^{\delta_m}} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q}[\tau_0 \wedge \tau^{\delta_m}] \leq 1,$$

this implies that $\frac{1}{\tau^{\delta_m}} \mathbb{E}[\tau]$ converges to 1 when $m \rightarrow \infty$. We conclude from (3.6) that $\epsilon \leq 0$ which is a contradiction. Then ψ is a subsolution. \square

3.2 Uniqueness and convexity

In this section, we prove a comparison result from which we obtain the uniqueness of the solution of the IPDE (2.7). We discuss the convexity of viscosity solutions using the comparison technique. In proving the uniqueness result and convexity for viscosity solutions of second order equations, we will need a fair amount of notation. We define the second order sub and super "jets" $J^{2,+}$, $J^{2,-}$ of mappings $u \in \mathcal{C}([0, T] \times \Omega)$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} J^{2,+} &= \left\{ (p_0, p, X) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : u(y) \leq u(x) + p_0(t-s) + p(y-x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}X(y-x)^2 + o(|y-x|^2) \text{ as } (s, y) \rightarrow (t, x) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} J^{2,-} &= \left\{ (p_0, p, X) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : u(y) \geq u(x) + p_0(t-s) + p(y-x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}X(y-x)^2 + o(|y-x|^2) \text{ as } (s, y) \rightarrow (t, x) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2. *Let u (resp. v) $\in USC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$ (resp. $\in LSC([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$) be a viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolution) of (2.7). If $u(T, x) \leq v(T, x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then*

$$u(t, x) \leq v(t, x) \quad \forall [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$$

Proof. let us define the function $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$. We introduce the function

$$\Psi(t, x, y) = u(t, x) - v(t, y) - \frac{|x-y|^2}{2\alpha} - \frac{\theta}{2}e^{\lambda(T-t)}(x^2 + y^2) \quad (3.7)$$

where ϵ, α are positive parameters which are devoted to tend to zero.

Since $u, v \in \mathcal{C}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$, Ψ admits a maximum at $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ such that is a global maximum point of Ψ . We have that $\Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{x}) + \Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{y}) \leq 2\Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ and using (3.1), which give

$$\frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^2}{2\alpha} \leq 2C(1 + \tilde{x} + \tilde{y}) \quad (3.8)$$

$\Psi(T, 0, 0) \leq \Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ and (3.1) give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\theta}{2}(\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) &\leq v(T, 0) - u(T, 0) + u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) \\ &\leq 2C(1 + \tilde{x} + \tilde{y}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

We deduce that there exists a constant C , depending on θ , such that:

$$\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \leq C_\theta \quad (3.10)$$

It follows from (3.8) and (3.10) that, along a subsequence $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ converges to $(t_0, x_0, y_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ as α go to zero and $x_0 = y_0$.

If $\tilde{t} = T$ then knowing that $\Psi(t, x, x) \leq \Psi(T, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$, we have

$$u(t, x) - v(t, x) - \theta e^{\lambda(T-t)} x^2 \leq u(T, \tilde{x}) - v(T, \tilde{y})$$

sending α and θ to zero give us $u(t, x) \leq v(t, x)$.

In the remaining of the proof we consider the case $\tilde{t} < T$. Applying Theorem 8.3 of Crandall-Ishii [4] to the function Ψ at point $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$, we can find real numbers p_0, \tilde{X} and $\tilde{Y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(p_0 - \lambda \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2), p_x, \tilde{X} \right) &\in J^{2,+} u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) \\ \left(p_0, p_y, \tilde{Y} \right) &\in J^{2,-} v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$p_x = \frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|}{\alpha} + \theta e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} \tilde{x} \quad p_y = \frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|}{\alpha} - \theta e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} \tilde{y}$$

Since u and v are respectively sub and supersolution of (2.7), we have for some $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$

$$\min \left(au(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - p_0 + \lambda \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) - A(t, \tilde{x}, u, p_x, \tilde{X}, \phi), u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - \tilde{x} \right) \geq 0 \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\min \left(av(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) - p_0 - A(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}, p_y, \tilde{Y}, \phi), v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) - \tilde{y} \right) \leq 0 \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$A(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, p, X, \phi) := \sup_{q \leq 1} \left\{ L(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, p, X) + K_\delta[u, \phi, \tilde{x}] + K^\delta[u, \phi, \tilde{x}] \right\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} K_\delta[u, \phi, x] &:= \int_{|z| \leq \delta} \phi(t, x + \zeta(x, z)) - \phi(t, x) - \zeta(x, z) \partial_x \phi(t, x) \tilde{\nu}(dz) \\ K^\delta[u, \phi, x] &:= \int_{|z| > \delta} u(t, x + \zeta(x, z)) - u(t, x) - \zeta(x, z) p_x \tilde{\nu}(dz) \\ \zeta(x, z) &= (q - x) \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$L(t, x, p, X) := \sigma^2 \frac{(q - x)^2}{2} X - (q - x)p$$

Subtracting the two inequalities (3.11) and (3.12), and remarking that $\min(a, b) - \min(d, e) \leq 0$ implies either $(a - d) \leq 0$ or $(b - e) \leq 0$, we divide our consideration into two cases:

- The first case when:

$$a(u(t, \tilde{x}) - v(t, \tilde{y})) + \lambda \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-t)} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) \leq A(t, \tilde{x}, p_x, \tilde{X}) - A(t, \tilde{y}, p_y, \tilde{Y})$$

We have the first estimates:

$$L(t, \tilde{x}, p_x) - L(t, \tilde{y}, p_y) \leq C \left[\frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^2}{\alpha} + \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-t)} (1 + \tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) \right] \quad (3.13)$$

Since ϕ is a C^2 -function we have:

$$\phi(t, x + \zeta(x, z)) - \phi(t, x) - \zeta(x, z) \partial_x \phi(t, x) \leq C |q - x|^2$$

then

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} K_\delta[v, \phi, \tilde{x}] \leq 0$$

From the definition of Ψ (3.17) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x} + \zeta(\tilde{x}, z)) - u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - \zeta(\tilde{x}, z) \left(\frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|}{\alpha} + \theta e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} \tilde{x} \right) \tilde{\nu}(dz) \\ &\quad - v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y} + \zeta(\tilde{y}, z)) - v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) + \zeta(\tilde{y}, z) \left(\frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|}{\alpha} - \theta e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} \tilde{y} \right) \tilde{\nu}(dz) \\ &= \Psi(\tilde{t}, \zeta(\tilde{x}, z), \zeta(\tilde{y}, z)) - \Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha} \left| \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} \right|^2 |\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^2 + \theta e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} \left| \frac{e^z - 1}{e^z} \right|^2 (|q - \tilde{x}|^2 + |q - \tilde{y}|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ is a maximum point of Ψ then $\Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x} + \zeta(\tilde{x}, z), \tilde{y} + \zeta(\tilde{y}, z)) - \Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq 0$, therefore

$$K^\delta \leq C \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} |\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^2 + \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} (1 + |\tilde{x}|^2 + |\tilde{y}|^2) \right). \quad (3.14)$$

Therefore we can conclude that

$$a(u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y})) + \lambda \theta e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) \leq C \left[\frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^2}{\alpha} + \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-\tilde{t})} (1 + \tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) \right] \quad (3.15)$$

knowing that $\Psi(t, x, x) \leq \Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ then

$$u(t, x) - v(t, x) - \theta e^{\lambda(T-t)} x^2 \leq u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) \quad (3.16)$$

Using (3.15) we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, x) - v(t, x) - \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-t)} x^2 &\leq 2C \left[\frac{|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|^2}{a\alpha} + \frac{\theta}{2a} e^{\lambda(T-t)} (1 + \tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda}{2a} \theta e^{\lambda(T-t)} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) \end{aligned}$$

Sending $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ we had $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \rightarrow (t_0, x_0, x_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, x) - v(t, x) - \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\lambda(T-t)} x^2 &\leq C \frac{\theta}{2a} e^{\lambda(T-t_0)} (1 + 2x_0^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda}{a} \theta e^{\lambda(T-t_0)} x_0^2 \end{aligned}$$

By taking λ big enough we have

$$u(t, x) - v(t, x) - \theta e^{\lambda(T-t)} x^2 \leq 0$$

By sending θ to zero we have

$$u(t, x) \leq v(t, x)$$

- The second case: we have

$$u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - v(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) + (\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}) \leq 0$$

Using (3.16) and letting α and θ go to zero we find out that $u(t, x) \leq v(t, x)$.

□

Corollary 1. *u viscosity solution of (2.7) is unique.*

The following proposition discusses the convexity of viscosity solutions using the comparison technique.

Proposition 4. *Let $u \in C([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$ be a viscosity solution of (2.7). If $u(T, x)$ is convex for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then $u(t, x)$ is convex for all $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let $\Psi(t, x, y, z) = u(t, z) - \lambda u(t, x) - (1 - \lambda)u(t, y) - \psi(t, x, y, z)$ a function where $(t, x, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ and

$$\psi(t, x, y, z) = \frac{|z - \lambda x - (1 - \lambda)y|^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-t)} (z^2 + x^2 + y^2) \quad (3.17)$$

Since $u \in C([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})$, Ψ admits a maximum at $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$ such that is a global maximum point of Ψ . As in theorem (2) we have that along a subsequence $(t, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$ converges to $(t_0, x_0, y_0, z_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^3$ as α go to zero and $z_0 = \lambda x_0 + (1 - \lambda)y_0$.

If $\tilde{t} = T$, we had that $\Psi(t, x, y, \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \Psi(T, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$ for all $(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) - \lambda u(t, x) - (1 - \lambda)u(t, y) - \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-t)} (z^2 + x^2 + y^2) \\ \leq u(T, \tilde{z}) - \lambda u(T, \tilde{x}) - (1 - \lambda)u(T, \tilde{y}) \end{aligned}$$

Sending α and θ gives the convexity of u knowing that u is convex in T . In the following we suppose $\tilde{t} \leq T$. Applying Theorem 8.3 of Crandall-Ishii [4] to the function Ψ at point $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$, we can find real numbers $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $(X, Y, Z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{0x}, -p_x, X) &\in J^{2,-} \lambda u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) \\ (p_{0y}, -p_y, Y) &\in J^{2,-} (1 - \lambda)u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) \\ (p_{0z} - \frac{\theta}{2} \rho e^{\rho(T-t)} (\tilde{z}^2 + \tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2), p_z, Z) &\in J^{2,+} u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}) \end{aligned}$$

where $p_{0x} + p_{0y} - p_{0z} = 0$, and

$$p_{x_i} := \partial_{x_i} \psi(t, x_1, x_2, x_3)$$

We know that u is a viscosity solution and using the same notation as in theorem (2) we have:

$$\min \left(au(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - \frac{1}{\lambda} (p_{0x} + A(t, \tilde{x}, u, p_x, X)), u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - \tilde{x} \right) \geq 0 \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$\min \left(au(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) - \frac{1}{1-\lambda} (p_{0y} + A(t, \tilde{y}, u, p_y, Y)), u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) - \tilde{y} \right) \geq 0 \quad (3.19)$$

finally

$$\min \left(au(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}) + \rho \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-\tilde{t})} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2 + \tilde{z}^2) + p_{0,z} + A(t, \tilde{z}, u, p_z, Z), u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}) - \tilde{z} \right) \leq 0 \quad (3.20)$$

Next, take (3.20) minus λ times (3.18) minus $(1-\lambda)$ times (3.19), and remarking that $\min(a, b) - \lambda \min(d, e) - (1-\lambda) \min(f, g) \leq 0$ implies either $(a - \lambda d - (1-\lambda)f) \leq 0$ or $(b - \lambda e - (1-\lambda)g) \leq 0$, we divide our consideration into two cases: we divide our consideration into two cases.

- The first case:

$$\begin{aligned} & a(u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}) - \lambda u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) - (1-\lambda)u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y})) + \rho \theta e^{\rho(T-\tilde{t})} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2 + \tilde{z}^2) \\ & \leq A(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}, p_z, Z) - A(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, p_x, X) - A(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}, p_y, Y) \end{aligned}$$

then using (3.13) and (3.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & a(u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}) - \lambda u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) - (1-\lambda)u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y})) + \rho \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-\tilde{t})} (\tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2 + \tilde{z}^2) \\ & \leq C \left(\frac{|\tilde{z} - \lambda \tilde{x} - (1-\lambda)\tilde{y}|^2}{2\alpha} + \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-\tilde{t})} (\tilde{z}^2 + \tilde{x}^2 + \tilde{y}^2) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

We know that $\Psi(t, x, y, \lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) \leq \Psi(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$ for all $(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} & u(t, \lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) - \lambda u(t, x) - (1-\lambda)u(t, y) - \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-t)} (z^2 + x^2 + y^2) \\ & \leq u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}) - \lambda u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - (1-\lambda)u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Taking in account the inequality (3.21) in (3.22) and taking $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ we had $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \rightarrow (t_0, x_0, y_0, \lambda x_0 + (1-\lambda)y_0)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & u(t, \lambda x - (1-\lambda)y) - \lambda u(t, x) - (1-\lambda)u(t, y) - \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-t)} (z^2 + x^2 + y^2) \leq C \frac{\theta}{a} e^{\rho(T-t_0)} (1 + x_0^2 + y_0^2 + z_0^2) \\ & \quad - \frac{\rho}{2a} \theta e^{\rho(T-t_0)} (x_0^2 + y_0^2 + z_0^2) \end{aligned}$$

By taking ρ big enough we have

$$u(t, \lambda x - (1-\lambda)y) - \lambda u(t, x) - (1-\lambda)u(t, y) - \frac{\theta}{2} e^{\rho(T-t)} (z^2 + x^2 + y^2) \leq 0$$

By sending θ to zero we conclude

$$u(t, \lambda x - (1-\lambda)y) \leq \lambda u(t, x) + (1-\lambda)u(t, y)$$

- The second case:

$$u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{z}) - \lambda u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}) - (1-\lambda)u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{y}) - \left(\tilde{z} - \lambda \tilde{x} - (1-\lambda)\tilde{y} \right) \leq 0$$

Using (3.22) and letting α and θ go to zero we find that u is convex

□

References

- [1] Andersen, L., Andreasen, J., Brotherton-Ratcliffe, R.: The passport option. *J. Comput. Finance* 1(3), 15–36 (1998)
- [2] A. Bensoussan and J.L. Lions. *Contrôle Impulsionnel et Inéquations Quasivariationnelles*. Paris: Dunod,
- [3] Bian, B., Wang, Y., Zhang, J.: Viscosity solutions of HJB equations arising from the valuation of European passport options. *Acta Math. Sci.* 30B(1), 187–202 (2010)
- [4] Crandall, M.G., Ishii, H., Lions, P.-L.: User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 27(1), 1–67 (1992)
- [5] Hyer, T., Lipton-Lifschitz, A., Pugachevsky, D.: Passport to success. *Risk* 10(9), 127–131 (1997)
- [6] Jacod, J., A. N. Shiryaev(1987): *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Berlin: Springer.
- [7] Pham, H.: Optimal stopping of controlled jump diffusion processes: a viscosity solution approach. *J. Math. Syst. Estim. Control* 8, 1–27 (1998)
- [8] Wang, Y., Bian, B., Zhang, J.: Viscosity solutions of integro-differential equations and passport options in a jump-diffusion model. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 161(1), 122–144 (2014)
- [9] Wang, Y., Bian, B., Zhang, J.: The Valuation of American Passport Options: A Viscosity Solution Approach. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 180, 608–633 (2019)