

Sublinear expectation structure under finite states space

Shuzhen Yang* Wenqing Zhang[†]

Abstract

In this study, we propose the sublinear expectation structure under finite states space. To describe an interesting "nonlinear randomized" trial, based on a convex closed domain, we introduce a family of probability measures under finite states space. Corresponding the sublinear expectation operator introduced by S. Peng, we consider the related notation under finite states space. Within the finite states framework, the sublinear expectation can be explicitly calculated by a novel repeated summation formula, and some interesting examples are given. Furthermore, we establish Monotone convergence theorem, Fatou's lemma and Dominated convergence theorem under finite states space. Afterwards, we consider the independence under each probability measure, upon which we establish the nonlinear law of large numbers and obtain the maximal distribution under sublinear expectation.

KEYWORDS: Sublinear expectation; Finite states space; Repeated summation formula; Convergence theorems; Law of large numbers

1 Introduction

In financial market, the price data is observed at discrete times only [13]. Meanwhile continuous-time process are only approximations to physically realizable phenomena [3]. When the underlying sample path are continuous, the discretely sampled data will always appear as a sequence of discrete jumps [1] indicating that discrete models cannot be derived directly from the discretization of continuous models. Thus it is crucial to study the financial models under finite time and states.

*Shandong University-Zhong Tai Securities Institute for Financial Studies, Shandong University, PR China, (yangsz@sdu.edu.cn). This work was supported by the National Key R&D program of China (Grant No.2018YFA0703900, ZR2019ZD41), National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.11701330), and Tais-han Scholar Talent Project Youth Project.

[†]Institute of Mathematics, Shandong University, PR China, (zhangwendy@mail.sdu.edu.cn).

Cox et al. [5] developed the binary tree model and used risk-neutral probabilities to price financial derivatives. Subsequently, there has been a substantial amount of research conducted on financial models using discrete time [6, 12, 24, 11]. For continuous mathematical models of derivative pricing theory, see monograph [16].

Mean and volatility uncertainties are two important uncertainty properties in financial market. To describe the model uncertainty, Peng [17] first constructed a nonlinear expectation which provides a novel mathematical structure. Furthermore, Peng [18, 19, 20, 21] originally proposed sublinear expectation space which deduced nonlinear law of large numbers and central limit theorem. Then, sublinear expectation has been widely used in finance [7, 8, 22, 23]. Fan [9] considered the Jensen's inequality for filtration consistent nonlinear expectation without domination condition.

There are many related research focusing on the finite time and states under sublinear expectation. Cohen and Elliott [4] considered backward stochastic difference equations under discrete time with infinitely states. Belak et al. [2] provided existence, uniqueness, and stability results and established convergence of the associated discrete-time nonlinear aggregations. Grigorova and Li [10] studied the stochastic representation problem in discrete time under nonlinear expectation and applied it to the pricing of American options. At the moment, the majority of literatures are rooted in the application of sublinear expectation theory to discrete mathematical models, with limited research commencing with the construction of discrete sublinear expectation structure.

In this paper, we focus on the sublinear expectation structure under finite states space. We first consider a nonlinear randomized trial, based on which a finite states sample space $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n\}$ and a family of probability measures $\mathcal{P}_\Theta = \{P_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ are introduced. In finite states space, a family of probability measures can be characterized by a convex closed domain \mathcal{D} ,

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) : \underline{f}_1 \leq \theta_1 \leq \bar{f}_1, \dots, \underline{f}_{n-1}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-2}) \leq \theta_{n-1} \leq \bar{f}_{n-1}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-2})\},$$

where $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n-1}$ are continuous functions, and \underline{f}_i and \bar{f}_i are the lower and upper bounds of the parameter θ_i , respectively. Note that, the sublinear expectation under finite states space can be defined as

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X] := \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}). \quad (1.1)$$

Obviously, the equation (1.1) satisfies the properties of the sublinear expectation operator established by Peng [21]. Indeed, sublinear expectation can be explicitly calculated by a repeated summation formula under finite states space,

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (X(\omega_i) - X(\omega_n)) \theta_i \right] + X(\omega_n), \quad (1.2)$$

and some related examples are given to verify the repeated summation formula. Furthermore, we present Monotone convergence theorem, Fatou's lemma and Dominated convergence theorem under finite states space. Afterwards, we consider the independence under each P_θ satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X, Y)] := \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta [E_\theta [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}], \quad \varphi \in C_{b.lip}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (1.3)$$

Upon equation (1.3) and Dominated convergence theorem, we give a new proof for the nonlinear law of large numbers under finite states space, wherein the sequence converges to a maximal distribution.

The main contributions of this paper are twofold:

(i). We provide the calculation method of the sublinear expectation under the finite states space. Based on a nonlinear randomized trial, we introduce the finite states space and a family of probability measures. By utilizing a convex closed domain \mathcal{D} to describe the family of probability measures \mathcal{P}_Θ , the sublinear expectation can be calculated explicitly.

(ii). We derive some convergence theorems, and then deduce the law of large numbers based on the independence under each probability. In the finite states space, Monotone convergence theorem, Fatou's lemma and Dominated convergence theorem are deduced. Furthermore, we present a new proof for the law of large numbers under sublinear expectation.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 considers the sublinear expectation structure under finite states space and develops a calculation method by a repeated summation formula. Following that, we establish some convergence theorems and consider the independence under each P_θ , from which the law of large numbers is derived in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 concludes this paper and proposes the further study.

2 Sublinear expectation structure

Well-known that the classical randomized trial satisfies the following three properties: (i) We can repeat the trial under the same conditions; (ii) We can obtain all the results of the trial; (iii) We don't know the result of the trial before completing the trial. Since Knight [15] distinguished the risk (random) and uncertainty in the book "Risk, Uncertainty and Profit", we realize that the classical randomized trial cannot describe the uncertainty in the model. Therefore, in this study, we first introduce a nonlinear randomized trial satisfying the following properties: (i') We cannot repeat the trial under the same conditions; (ii') We can obtain all the results of the trial; (iii') We don't know the result of the trial before completing the trial. The properties (ii') and (iii') of a nonlinear randomized trial are same with that of the classical randomized trial. However, the property

(i') shows that there is no deterministic law for the nonlinear randomized trial. Thus, based on the properties (ii') and (iii'), we introduce a finite states sample space $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n\}$. Based on the property (i'), we consider to use a probability set $\mathcal{P}_\Theta = \{P_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ to describe the uncertainty law of the nonlinear randomized trial.

In the finite states space, we introduce a convex closed domain \mathcal{D} to describe a probability set \mathcal{P}_Θ . A probability set $\mathcal{P}_\Theta = \{P_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ satisfies $\Theta \in \mathcal{A} = \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) : 0 \leq \theta_i \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_i = 1, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. We employ a domain \mathcal{D} , a convex closed subset of \mathcal{A} , to describe a probability set \mathcal{P}_Θ , which is denoted by,

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) : \underline{f}_1 \leq \theta_1 \leq \bar{f}_1, \dots, \underline{f}_{n-1}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-2}) \leq \theta_{n-1} \leq \bar{f}_{n-1}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-2})\},$$

where $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n-1}$ are continuous functions, and \underline{f}_i and \bar{f}_i are the lower and upper bounds of the parameter θ_i , respectively. Some examples of domain \mathcal{D} are presented as follows.

Remark 2.1. *When there is no model uncertainty, the lower and upper bounds of the parameter θ_i in \mathcal{D} are same, i.e. $\underline{f}_i = \bar{f}_i$. Thus the domain \mathcal{D} degenerates into one point, which corresponds to a probability measure P .*

Example 2.1. *Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$, the corresponding probability set \mathcal{P}_Θ satisfies $\Theta \in \mathcal{A} = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2) : 0 \leq \theta_1 \leq 1, 0 \leq \theta_2 \leq 1, \theta_1 + \theta_2 = 1\}$. An example of the domain is $\mathcal{D} = \{\theta_1 : 0.2 \leq \theta_1 \leq 0.5\}$.*

Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$, the corresponding probability set \mathcal{P}_Θ satisfies $\Theta \in \mathcal{A} = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) : 0 \leq \theta_1 \leq 1, 0 \leq \theta_2 \leq 1, 0 \leq \theta_3 \leq 1, \theta_1 + \theta_2 + \theta_3 = 1\}$. An example of the domain is $\mathcal{D} = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2) : 0 \leq \theta_1 \leq 0.5, 0 \leq \theta_2 \leq 0.5 - \theta_1\}$.

With a given finite states space $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n\}$, let \mathcal{H} be a linear space of real valued functions defined on Ω , and suppose that \mathcal{H} satisfies: $|X| < \infty$ if $X \in \mathcal{H}$. Given a random variable $X \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $X(\omega_i) = a_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, the expectation of X under each P_θ is given by

$$E_\theta[X] = \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i)P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\theta_i.$$

Note that, there is a family of linear expectations $\{E_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{D}\}$, thus it is natural to consider the upper and lower bounds of linear expectations. Due to the dual relation between the upper and lower bounds of expectations, i.e. $\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X] = -\inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[-X]$, we just concentrate on the upper bounds of expectations, similarly the lower bounds of expectations can be obtained. Hence, we introduce the definition of upper expectation, this term can be found in Chapter 6.2 of Peng [21].

Definition 2.1 (Upper expectation). Let X be a random variable defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) . The upper expectation of X is defined as

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta}[X] := \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i) P_{\theta}(\{\omega_i\}). \quad (2.1)$$

Remark 2.2. Sublinear expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ was developed by Peng [18]. Let Ω be a given sample space and \mathcal{H} satisfies (1) $c \in \mathcal{H}$ for each constant c ; (2) $|X| \in \mathcal{H}$ if $X \in \mathcal{H}$. A sublinear expectation \mathbb{E} is a functional $\mathbb{E}[\cdot] : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

- (i). Monotonicity: $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y]$ if $X \leq Y$;
- (ii). Constant preserving: $\mathbb{E}[c] = c$ for $c \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (iii). Sub-additivity: $\mathbb{E}[X + Y] \leq \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[Y]$;
- (iv). Positive homogeneity: $\mathbb{E}[\lambda X] = \lambda \mathbb{E}[X]$ for $\lambda \geq 0$.

When $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n\}$, the upper expectation in Definition 2.1 satisfies the above four properties, thus it is a sublinear expectation. In addition, the sublinear expectation under finite states space can be expressed as a supremum of linear expectations

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta}[X], \quad (2.2)$$

where the probability uncertainty set \mathcal{D} is a convex closed domain. Upper expectation in Definition 2.1 coincides with the sublinear expectation operator in Peng [21], thus we consider sublinear expectation under finite states space in the following.

2.1 Calculation of sublinear expectation

Based on sublinear expectation under finite states space, we present the explicitly calculation formula, where the idea comes from the calculation formula of multiple integrals.

Theorem 2.1 (Repeated summation formula). Let X be a random variable defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) . The sublinear expectation can be calculated by

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (X(\omega_i) - X(\omega_n)) \theta_i \right] + X(\omega_n), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\mathcal{D} = I_1 \times \cdots \times I_{n-1}$, and $I_1 = [\underline{f}_1, \bar{f}_1]$, \dots , $I_{n-1} = [\underline{f}_{n-1}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-2}), \bar{f}_{n-1}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-2})]$.

Proof. From equation (2.2) and Definition 2.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta}[X] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i) P_{\theta}(\{\omega_i\}) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (X(\omega_i) - X(\omega_n)) \theta_i \right] + X(\omega_n).$$

Let

$$G(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (X(\omega_i) - X(\omega_n))\theta_i.$$

On the one hand, let $y = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} G(\theta)$. Thus for each $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{D}$, it is obvious that

$$\sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} G(\theta) \leq y = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} G(\theta). \quad (2.4)$$

On the contrary, let $z = \sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} G(\theta)$. Note that \mathcal{D} is a convex closed domain, its maximum value can be attained, thus there exist $\theta_1^* \in I_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}^* \in I_{n-1}$ such that $z = G(\theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_{n-1}^*)$.

Then for any θ , $G(\theta) \leq z$, it is obvious that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} G(\theta) \leq z = \sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} G(\theta). \quad (2.5)$$

Combining inequalities (2.4) and (2.5), we obtain

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (X(\omega_i) - X(\omega_n))\theta_i \right] + X(\omega_n).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.3. *Indeed, Theorem 2.1 transforms n -dimensional optimization problem into 1-dimensional one, which greatly improves the computing efficiency. In the following, we present two examples to verify Theorem 2.1.*

Example 2.2. *Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ and domain $\mathcal{D} = \{\theta_1 : 0.2 \leq \theta_1 \leq 0.5\}$. Without lose of generality, we assume that $X(\omega_1) > X(\omega_2)$, based on Theorem 2.1, the sublinear expectation can be calculated as follows*

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in [0.2, 0.5]} [(a_1 - a_2)\theta_1 + a_2] = 0.5a_1 + 0.5a_2.$$

Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ and domain $\mathcal{D} = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2) : 0 \leq \theta_1 \leq 0.5, 0 \leq \theta_2 \leq 0.5 - \theta_1\}$. Without lose of generality, we assume that $X(\omega_1) > X(\omega_2) > X(\omega_3)$, based on Theorem 2.1, the sublinear expectation can be calculated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= \sup_{\theta_1 \in [0, 0.5]} \sup_{\theta_2 \in [0, 0.5 - \theta_1]} [(a_1 - a_3)\theta_1 + (a_2 - a_3)\theta_2] + a_3 \\ &= \sup_{\theta_1 \in [0, 0.5]} [(a_1 - a_3)\theta_1 + (a_2 - a_3)(0.5 - \theta_1)] + a_3 = 0.5(a_1 + a_3). \end{aligned}$$

From the above examples, we can see that if the boundary of the domain \mathcal{D} is linear, i.e., \underline{f}_i and \bar{f}_i are linear functions, the maximum value of $E_\theta[X]$ can be obtained at the boundary. If the boundary \underline{f}_i or \bar{f}_i is a nonlinear function, by employing variable substitution, we can convert a irregular domain \mathcal{D} into a rectangular domain \mathcal{M} , and then the maximum value can be obtained on the boundary of domain \mathcal{M} . In the following, we present the transform formula.

Theorem 2.2 (Transform formula). *Let $h(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$ be continuous functions, the transformation $\{T : \theta_i = \theta_i(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}), i = 1, \dots, n-1\}$ maps a convex closed domain \mathcal{M} to a convex closed domain \mathcal{D} , where T is bijection. The Determinants of Jacobian Matrices satisfy*

$$J(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}) = \frac{\partial(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1})}{\partial(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1})} \neq 0.$$

Then

$$\sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} h(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) = \sup_{\delta_1 \in J_1} \cdots \sup_{\delta_{n-1} \in J_{n-1}} g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}).$$

Proof. Let

$$y = \sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} h(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}).$$

Owing \mathcal{D} is a convex closed domain, its maximum value can be attained, thus there exist $\theta_1^* \in I_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}^* \in I_{n-1}$, such that $y = h(\theta_1^*, \dots, \theta_{n-1}^*)$. Since the transformation $\{T : \theta_i = \theta_i(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}), i = 1, \dots, n-1\}$ is a bijection, then

$$h(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) = h(\theta_1(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}), \dots, \theta_{n-1}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1})) = g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}).$$

Since $h(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) \leq y$, we have $g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}) \leq y$. Thus

$$\sup_{\delta_1 \in J_1} \cdots \sup_{\delta_{n-1} \in J_{n-1}} g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}) \leq y = \sup_{\theta_1 \in I_1} \cdots \sup_{\theta_{n-1} \in I_{n-1}} h(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}). \quad (2.6)$$

On the contrary, let

$$z = \sup_{\delta_1 \in J_1} \cdots \sup_{\delta_{n-1} \in J_{n-1}} g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{n-1}).$$

Using the similar manner in the proof of inequality (2.6), we have $y \leq z$ which completes the proof. \square

Example 2.3. *Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2) : 0 \leq \theta_1 \leq 0.5, 0 \leq \theta_2 \leq \sqrt{\theta_1}\}$. Let $\delta_1 = \theta_1, \delta_2 = \frac{\theta_2^2}{\theta_1}$ (if $\theta_1 = 0$, let $\delta_2 = 0$), we can transform a irregular domain \mathcal{D} into a rectangular domain $\mathcal{M} = \{(\delta_1, \delta_2) : 0 \leq \delta_1 \leq 0.5, 0 \leq \delta_2 \leq 1\}$. Without lose of generality, we assume that $X(\omega_1) > X(\omega_2) > X(\omega_3)$, based on Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, the sublinear expectation can be calculated as follows*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= \sup_{\theta_1 \in [0, 0.5]} \sup_{\theta_2 \in [0, \sqrt{\theta_1}]} [(a_1 - a_3)\theta_1 + (a_2 - a_3)\theta_2] + a_3 \\ &= \sup_{\delta_1 \in [0, 0.5]} \sup_{\delta_2 \in [0, 1]} [(a_1 - a_3)\delta_1 + (a_2 - a_3)\sqrt{\delta_1\delta_2}] + a_3 \\ &= \sup_{\delta_1 \in [0, 0.5]} [(a_1 - a_3)\delta_1 + (a_2 - a_3)\sqrt{\delta_1}] + a_3 = \frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}a_2 + \frac{1 - \sqrt{2}}{2}a_3. \end{aligned}$$

In the following, we consider another example where the domain \mathcal{D} is a circle, i.e. $\mathcal{D} = \{(\theta_1, \theta_2) : (\theta_1 - 0.25)^2 + (\theta_2 - 0.25)^2 \leq (0.25)^2, \theta_1, \theta_2 \geq 0\}$. According to the polar coordinate transformation formula,

$$\begin{cases} \theta_1 = \gamma \cdot \cos(\delta) + \frac{1}{4}, \\ \theta_2 = \gamma \cdot \sin(\delta) + \frac{1}{4}, \end{cases}$$

we can transform a circle domain \mathcal{D} into a rectangular domain $\mathcal{M} = \{(\gamma, \delta) : 0 \leq \gamma \leq 0.25, 0 \leq \delta \leq 2\pi\}$. We assume that $X(\omega_1) = 2$, $X(\omega_2) = 2$, $X(\omega_3) = 1$, based on Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, the sublinear expectation can be calculated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= \sup_{\theta_1 \in [0, 0.5]} \sup_{\theta_2 \in [0, \sqrt{\theta_1(0.5-\theta_1)} + 0.25]} [(a_1 - a_3)\theta_1 + (a_2 - a_3)\theta_2] + a_3 \\ &= \sup_{\gamma \in [0, 0.25]} \sup_{\delta \in [0, 2\pi]} [(a_1 - a_3)\gamma \cos(\delta) + (a_2 - a_3)\gamma \sin(\delta)] + \frac{1}{2} + a_3 \\ &= \sup_{\gamma \in [0, 0.25]} \sqrt{2}\gamma + \frac{3}{2} = \frac{6 + \sqrt{2}}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

3 Convergence theorems and Law of large numbers

Based on the sublinear expectation under finite states space, we present Monotone convergence theorem, Fatou's lemma and Dominated convergence theorem in the following. As mentioned in Peng [21], Theorem 6.1.14 shows that $X_m \uparrow X$ can deduce $\mathbb{E}[X_m] \uparrow \mathbb{E}[X]$, yet $X_m \downarrow X$ cannot guarantee $\mathbb{E}[X_m] \downarrow \mathbb{E}[X]$ in general. However, in the finite states space, we can establish the convergence theorems under sublinear expectation.

Theorem 3.1 (Monotone convergence theorem). *Let $\{X_m\}_{m \geq 1}$ and X be random sequence and variable defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) .*

- (1) *Let $X_m \uparrow X$. Then $\mathbb{E}[X_m] \uparrow \mathbb{E}[X]$.*
- (2) *Let $X_m \downarrow X$. Then $\mathbb{E}[X_m] \downarrow \mathbb{E}[X]$.*

Proof. (1) On the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) , obviously $\mathbb{E}[X_m]$ and $\mathbb{E}[X]$ are bounded. Based on Theorem 6.1.14 in Peng [21], (1) holds true.

(2) $X_m \downarrow X$ means that $\mathbb{E}[X_m] \geq \mathbb{E}[X]$. Based on equation (2.2), we obtain

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X_m] \geq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X] = \mathbb{E}[X]. \quad (3.1)$$

On the contrary, it is easily to verify that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X_m] = \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X_m] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \geq k} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X_m]. \quad (3.2)$$

Combing equations (3.1) and (3.2), it is obvious that

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \geq k} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_m(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}).$$

Note that in the finite states space, from $X_m \downarrow X$, we have that $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N, s.t., m \geq N, |X_m - X| < \varepsilon$. Then for $k \geq N$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{m \geq k} \sum_{i=1}^n X_m(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) - \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \left| \sup_{m \geq k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_m(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) - \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{m \geq k} \sum_{i=1}^n |X_m(\omega_i) - X(\omega_i)| P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \geq k} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_m(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sup_{m \geq k} \sum_{i=1}^n X_m(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) < \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^n X(\omega_i) P_\theta(\{\omega_i\}) + \varepsilon,$$

which deduces that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m] = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \geq k} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X_m] \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X] = \mathbb{E}[X]. \quad (3.3)$$

Therefore, combining equations (3.1) and (3.3), we conclude that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m] = \mathbb{E}[X].$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.1 (Fatou's lemma). *Let $\{X_m\}_{m \geq 1}$ be a random sequence defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) .*

(1) *If there is a random variable $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $X_m \geq Y, \forall m \geq 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m] \leq \underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m].$$

(2) *If there is a random variable $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $X_m \leq Y, \forall m \geq 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m] \geq \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m].$$

Proof. We first prove (1). Let $g_m = \inf_{k \geq m} X_k$, then $g_m \uparrow \underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m$. Applying (1) in Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g_m] \leq \underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m].$$

As for the proof of (2), let $h_m = \sup_{k \geq m} X_k$, then $h_m \downarrow \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m$. Applying (2) in Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[h_m] \geq \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m].$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.2 (Dominated convergence theorem). *Let $\{X_m\}_{m \geq 1}$ and X be random sequence and variable defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) , and $X_m \rightarrow X$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. If there is a non-negative random variable $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $|X_m| \leq Y$. Then*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m] = \mathbb{E}[X].$$

Proof. It is apparent that

$$X = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m = \underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m = \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m.$$

Applying Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[\underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m] \leq \underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m] \leq \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m] \leq \mathbb{E}[\overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} X_m] = \mathbb{E}[X].$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}[X] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_m]$, this completes the proof. \square

3.1 Law of large numbers

In the finite states space, the law of large numbers can be established by Dominated convergence theorem. Before presenting the law of large numbers, we provide the definitions of identically distributed and independence. Based on sublinear expectation in Peng [21], the definition of identically distributed is the same with Definition 1.3.1 in Peng [21].

Let X_1 and X_2 be two random variables defined on the finite states space $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{H}_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{H}_2)$, respectively. They are called identically distributed, denoted by $X_1 \stackrel{d}{=} X_2$, if

$$\mathbb{E}_1[\varphi(X_1)] = \mathbb{E}_2[\varphi(X_2)], \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{b.Lip}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (3.4)$$

In the following, we present the independence for each P_θ under the finite states space.

Definition 3.1 (Independence). *Let X and Y be two random variables defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) . We call Y is independent of X , if*

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X, Y)] := \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta [E_\theta [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}], \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{b.lip}(\mathbb{R}^2). \quad (3.5)$$

Remark 3.1. Based on Definition 3.1, the independence is mutual, which means that Y is independent of X implies that X is independent of Y . Thus, the independence in Definition 3.1 differs from the one given in Peng [21], and the relationship between the two independence is that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}] \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X} \right].$$

In the following, we give an example to describe the above inequality.

Example 3.1. Given $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ and a convex domain $\mathcal{D} = \{\theta_1 : \frac{1}{3} \leq \theta_1 \leq \frac{2}{3}\}$. Let X and Y are two-point values random variables defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) ,

$$X(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1, & \omega = \omega_1 \\ 0, & \omega = \omega_2 \end{cases}, \quad Y(\omega) = \begin{cases} 0, & \omega = \omega_1 \\ 1, & \omega = \omega_2 \end{cases}.$$

First, we consider the case where $\varphi(x, y) = (x - \frac{1}{2})y^2$. Let Y be independent from X under each P_{θ} , then

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\left(X - \frac{1}{2} \right) (1 - \theta_1) \right] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} (\theta_1 - \frac{1}{2}) (1 - \theta_1) = \frac{1}{16}. \quad (3.6)$$

Let Y is independent from X under sublinear expectation, then

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X} \right] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} \sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} (1 - \theta_1) \right) \theta_1 + \left(\frac{1}{2} \sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} (\theta_1 - 1) \right) (1 - \theta_1) \right] = \frac{1}{6}. \quad (3.7)$$

Comparing equation (3.6) and (3.7), for $\varphi(x, y) = (x - \frac{1}{2})y^2$, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}] < \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X} \right].$$

Second, we consider the case where $\varphi(x, y) = x(1 - y)$. Let Y be independent from X under each P_{θ} , then

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} E_{\theta} [X\theta_1] = \sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} \theta_1^2 = \frac{4}{9}. \quad (3.8)$$

Let Y is independent from X under sublinear expectation, then

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X} \right] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[X \left(\sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} \theta_1 \right) \right] = \frac{2}{3} \sup_{\theta_1 \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]} E_{\theta} [X] = \frac{4}{9}. \quad (3.9)$$

Comparing equation (3.8) and (3.9), for $\varphi(x, y) = x(1 - y)$, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} [\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X} \right].$$

Remark 3.2. From Example 3.1, we can see that the calculation results of the independence under Definition 3.1 is the same with that in Peng [21] for some particular cases of φ .

Based on the independence under each probability P_θ , we can prove the following law of large numbers by Dominated convergence theorem.

Theorem 3.3 (Law of large numbers). Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of random variables defined on the finite states space (Ω, \mathcal{H}) . We further assume $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is an independent sequence under each probability $\{P_\theta\}_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}}$ with the same upper and lower expectations, i.e. $-\mathbb{E}[-X_1] = \underline{\mu}$, $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \bar{\mu}$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right] = \sup_{\mu \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]} \varphi(\mu), \quad \varphi \in C_{b.lip}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. Applying Theorem 3.2 and equation (2.2), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\theta \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right]. \quad (3.11)$$

Under each P_θ , by the classical law of large numbers, we have that $\{\frac{1}{n}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)\} \xrightarrow{P_\theta} \mu_\theta$. Based on the classical Dominated convergence theorem, it is apparent that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\theta \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right] = \varphi(\mu_\theta).$$

Thus

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\theta \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mu_\theta), \quad (3.12)$$

where $\mu_\theta = E_\theta[X_1]$. Note that \mathcal{D} is a convex and closed domain, there exist $\underline{\theta}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ such that $\mu_{\underline{\theta}} = \inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X_1] = \underline{\mu}$ and $\mu_{\bar{\theta}} = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_\theta[X_1] = \bar{\mu}$, and for each $\mu \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]$, there exists $\theta \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mu_\theta = \mu$. Then, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \varphi(\mu_\theta) = \sup_{\mu \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]} \varphi(\mu). \quad (3.13)$$

Combing equations (3.11) (3.12) and (3.13), it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right] = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\theta \left[\varphi \left(\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right) \right] = \sup_{\mu \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]} \varphi(\mu).$$

This completes the proof. □

Remark 3.3. Note that in Peng [21], a maximal distribution is defined as

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(\xi)] = \sup_{\mu \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]} \varphi(\mu), \quad \varphi \in C_{b.lip}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Theorem 3.3 shows that the sequence $\{\frac{1}{n}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)\}$ converges to a maximal distribution in law which is consistent with the nonlinear law of large numbers in Peng [21].

Remark 3.4. According to Peng and Jin [14], the maximum estimator is the largest unbiased estimator for the upper mean and the minimum estimator is the smallest unbiased estimator for the lower mean. Based on Theorem 3.3, we can use the moment estimation to estimate upper and lower expectations. The sample moment $\beta = \frac{1}{n}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)$ converges to the maximal distribution with parameters $\underline{\hat{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\mu}$, thus

$$\underline{\hat{\mu}} = \inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right], \quad \hat{\mu} = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{D}} E_{\theta} \left[\frac{X_1 + \cdots + X_n}{n} \right],$$

which indicates that the mean uncertainty can be estimated by the supremum and infimum of the expectation of the sequence.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, based on nonlinear randomized trial, we introduce a finite states space, and utilize a convex closed domain to describe a family of probability measures. Following that, derived from the idea of repeated summation, we provide an explicitly calculation of sublinear expectation, and some related examples are given. Furthermore, we present Monotone convergence theorem, Fatou's lemma and Dominated convergence theorem in finite states space. Based on the independence under each P_{θ} , combining the Dominated convergence theorem, we establish the law of large numbers, and the random sequence converges to the maximal distribution. In the future, we will consider to extend the sublinear expectation structure to finite time and states and the related application in financial markets.

References

- [1] Y. Ait-Sahalia. Telling from discrete data whether the underlying continuous-time model is a diffusion. *The Journal of Finance*, 57(5):2075–2112, 2002.
- [2] C. Belak, T. Seiferling, and F. T. Seifried. Backward nonlinear expectation equations. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 12:111–134, 2018.
- [3] D. Bertsimas, L. Kogan, and A. W. Lo. When is time continuous? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 55(2):173–204, 2000.
- [4] S. N. Cohen and R. J. Elliott. Backward stochastic difference equations and nearly time-consistent nonlinear expectations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 49(1):125–139, 2011.

- [5] J. C. Cox, S. A. Ross, and M. Rubinstein. Option pricing: A simplified approach. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 7(3):229–263, 1979.
- [6] J. C. Duan. The GARCH option pricing model. *Mathematical Finance*, 5(1):13–32, 1995.
- [7] L. G. Epstein and S. Ji. Ambiguous volatility and asset pricing in continuous time. *Review of Financial Studies*, 26(7):1740–1786, 2013.
- [8] L. G. Epstein and S. Ji. Ambiguous volatility, possibility and utility in continuous time. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 50:269–282, 2014.
- [9] S. J. Fan. Jensen’s inequality for filtration consistent nonlinear expectation without domination condition. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 345(2):678–688, 2008.
- [10] M. Grigorova and H. Li. Stochastic representation under g-expectation and applications: The discrete time case. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 518(1), 2023.
- [11] D. Hernández-Bustos and D. Hernández-Hernández. Portfolio management under drawdown constraint in discrete-time financial markets. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 60(1):127–147, 2023.
- [12] S. L. Heston and S. Nandi. A closed-form GARCH option valuation model. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 13(3):585–625, 2000.
- [13] J. Jacod, C. Klüppelberg, and G. Muller. Functional relationships between price and volatility jumps and their consequences for discretely observed data. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 49(4):901–914, 2012.
- [14] H. Jin and S. Peng. Optimal unbiased estimation for maximal distribution. *Probability Uncertainty and Quantitative Risk*, 6(3):189–198, 2021.
- [15] F. H. Knight. *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. Houghton Mifflin, 1921.
- [16] Y. K. Kwok. *Mathematical models of financial derivatives*. Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [17] S. Peng. *Backward stochastic differential equations stochastic optimization theory and viscosity solutions of HJB equations*, in *Topics on Stochastic Analysis*. J. Yan, S. Peng, S. Fang, and L. Wu, Science Press (in Chinese), Beijing, 85-138 edition, 1997.
- [18] S. Peng. Filtration consistent nonlinear expectations and evaluations of contingent claims. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica*, 20:1–24, 2004.

- [19] S. Peng. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications: The Abel Symposium 2005*, chapter "G-expectation, G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus of Itô type". Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [20] S. Peng. Multi-dimensional G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus under G-expectation. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 118:2223–2253, 2008.
- [21] S. Peng. *Nonlinear Expectations and Stochastic Calculus under Uncertainty*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2019.
- [22] S. Peng and S. Yang. Distributional uncertainty of the financial time series measured by G-expectation. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 66(4):729–741, 2022.
- [23] S. Peng, S. Yang, and J. Yao. Improving value-at-risk prediction under model uncertainty. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 21(1):228–259, 2023.
- [24] L. Tao, L. Xu, and H. J. Sulaimani. Nonlinear differential equations based on the BSM model in the pricing of derivatives in financial markets. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, 7(2):91–102, 2021.