

# Convex ordering for stochastic control: the swing contracts case.

Gilles Pagès<sup>1</sup> and Christian Yeo<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sorbonne Université, Laboratoire de Probabilités, Statistique et Modélisation, UMR 8001, case 158, 4, pl. Jussieu, F-75252 Paris Cedex 5, France

<sup>2</sup>Engie Global Markets, 1 place Samuel Champlain, 92400 Courbevoie, France

## Abstract

We investigate propagation of convexity and convex ordering on a typical stochastic optimal control problem, namely the pricing of “*Take-or-Pay*” swing option, a financial derivative product commonly traded on energy markets. The dynamics of the underlying asset is modelled by an *ARCH* model with convex coefficients. We prove that the value function associated to the stochastic optimal control problem is a convex function of the underlying asset price. We also introduce a domination criterion offering insights into the monotonicity of the value function with respect to parameters of the underlying *ARCH* coefficients. We particularly focus on the one-dimensional setting where, by means of Stein’s formula and regularization techniques, we show that the convexity assumption for the *ARCH* coefficients can be relaxed with a semi-convexity assumption. To validate the results presented in this paper, we also conduct numerical illustrations.

**Keywords** - *swing option, convex order, convexity propagation, stochastic optimal control.*

**AMS subject classification (2020).** 60E15, 91G15, 90C39, 93E20.

## Introduction

This paper explores theoretical properties of the value function in a context of stochastic optimal control and in connection with convexity. To this end, we rely on *convex ordering theory*. Let us now recall the main definitions at the origin of this theory. Denote by  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^1(\mathbb{P})$  the space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $\mathbb{P}$ -integrable random vectors for some probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  and let  $U, V \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^1(\mathbb{P})$  with respective distributions  $\mu, \nu$ . We say that  $U$  is dominated for the convex order by  $V$ , denoted  $U \preceq_{cvx} V$ , if, for every convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one has

$$\mathbb{E}f(U) \leq \mathbb{E}f(V) \quad (0.1)$$

or, equivalently, that  $\mu$  is dominated for the convex order by  $\nu$  (denoted  $\mu \preceq_{cvx} \nu$ ) if, for every convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\xi) d\mu(\xi) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\xi) d\nu(\xi). \quad (0.2)$$

It can be shown that, in the preceding definition, we may restrict to Lipschitz continuous and convex functions (see Lemma A.4) or to convex functions with at most linear growth (see Lemma A.1 in [1]). Besides, it is to note that the convex order definition implies that both distributions have the same expectation thanks to the convexity of functions  $f(\xi) = \pm \xi_i$ ,  $i = 1 : d$ , are convex.

If  $d = 1$  and (0.1) or (0.2) only holds for every *non-decreasing* (resp. *non-increasing*) convex functions, we speak of domination for the *non-decreasing* (resp. *non-increasing*) convex order denoted by  $U \preceq_{inv} V$  (resp.  $U \preceq_{dvx} V$ ). Besides, the preceding definitions of convex ordering are consistent in the sense that, for any integrable  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random vector  $U$  and for any convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one has  $\mathbb{E}f(U) \in (-\infty, +\infty]$  (see Appendix (A.1) for a proof).

An important remark to keep in mind is that this partial order on  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^1(\mathbb{P})$  is closely related to martingale processes. Indeed, if  $(M_\lambda)_{\lambda \geq 0}$  denotes a martingale indexed by a parameter  $\lambda$ , then  $\lambda \mapsto M_\lambda$  is non-decreasing for the convex order in the sense that for any  $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda'$ ,  $M_\lambda$  is dominated by  $M_{\lambda'}$  for the convex order. This is a straightforward consequence of Jensen's inequality. The converse is generally not true, but the Kellerer's theorem [18] gives a (weaker) converse proposition which states that: if  $\lambda \mapsto X_\lambda$  in non-decreasing for the convex ordering, then there exists a martingale  $(M_\lambda)_{\lambda \geq 0}$ , called the “1-martingale”, such that  $X_\lambda \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{\sim} M_\lambda$  for any fixed  $\lambda$  (note that this is much weaker than equality in law between processes). Unfortunately, the proof of the existence of a 1-martingale is not constructive. That is, for a non-decreasing process  $(X_\lambda)_\lambda$  for the convex order with corresponding family of 1-martingale  $(M_\lambda)_\lambda$  there is no explicit and concrete expression for  $M_\lambda$ . For a thorough analysis of this question, we refer the reader to [14].

Convex ordering-based approaches have recently been used to compare European option prices [7], American option prices [26] or (in a functional version) to compare functionals of McKean Vlasov processes [24, 25] with an application to mean-field games and more recently to compare solutions of Volterra equations [17]. It has also been used to prove convexity results in case of American-style options [26]. The aim of this paper is to extend the latter type of results to Stochastic Optimal Control problems. To this end, we focus on *swing contracts*. This commodity derivative product enables its holder to purchase amounts of energy  $q_k$ , at predetermined exercise dates,  $t_k = \frac{kT}{n}$  ( $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ ), until the contract maturity at time  $t_n = T$ . The purchase price, or *strike price*, at each exercise date, is denoted by  $K_k$  and can either be a constant value (i.e.,  $K_k = K$ , where  $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ ) or indexed on either the same commodity or another commodity past/future prices. The holder of the swing contract ought to purchase, at every time  $t_k$ , a quantity  $q_k$  of the commodity subject to *local constraints* i.e.

$$q_{\min} \leq q_k \leq q_{\max}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1. \quad (0.3)$$

There also exists a *global constraint* meaning that, at the maturity of the contract, the cumulative purchased volume must not be lower than  $Q_{\min}$  or greater than  $Q_{\max}$  i.e.

$$Q_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} q_k \in [Q_{\min}, Q_{\max}], \quad \text{with } Q_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq Q_{\min} \leq Q_{\max} < +\infty. \quad (0.4)$$

Such a contract is called a *take-or-pay* contract, where all constraints are firm. Besides, there exists an alternative setting where the holder has to respect local constraints but may violate global ones. In this setting, in case of violation of global constraints, the holder has to pay a penalty, at the expiry date  $t_n = T$ , that is proportional to the excess/deficit of consumption.

For the two volume constraint settings aforementioned, at each exercise date  $t_k$ , the reachable cumulative consumption  $Q_k = \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} q_\ell$  (with  $Q_0 = 0$ ) lies within the set  $\mathcal{Q}_m(t_k)$ , for  $m \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$ , defined by (we assume  $q_{\min} = 0$  since one may always be reduced to this case [4])

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{firm}}(t_k) := \left[ \underbrace{\max(0, Q_{\min} - (n-k) \cdot q_{\max})}_{Q^d(t_k)}, \underbrace{\min(k \cdot q_{\max}, Q_{\max})}_{Q^u(t_k)} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}_{\text{pen}}(t_k) := [0, k \cdot q_{\max}] \quad (0.5)$$

depending on the nature of the constraints. The pricing of swing contracts appears as a (discrete time) stochastic optimal control problem where the sequence  $(q_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n-1}$  represents the control. As such, this contract can be evaluated through the *Backward Dynamic Programming Equation*. To fix the probabilistic framework, we assume that the underlying asset (which is generally a forward contract) has a price  $F_{t_k}$  at time  $t_k$  that can be expressed as:

$$F_{t_k} = f(t_k, X_{t_k}), \quad 0 \leq k \leq n, \quad (0.6)$$

where  $f : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is a Borel function and  $(X_{t_k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$  is a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Markov process  $(X_{t_k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ . We also consider a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \{\mathcal{F}_{t_k}^X, 0 \leq k \leq n\}, \mathbb{P})$  where  $(\mathcal{F}_{t_k}^X, 0 \leq k \leq n)$  is the

natural (completed) filtration of  $(X_{t_k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ . Then, we assume that the decision process  $(q_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n-1}$  is defined on the same probability space and is  $\mathcal{F}_{t_k}^X$ -adapted. At each time  $t_k$ , by purchasing an amount  $q \geq 0$ , the holder of the swing contract makes an algebraic profit given by the following payoff function

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_k: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{k+1} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (t_k, q, x_{0:k}) &\mapsto \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}), \end{aligned} \quad (0.7)$$

where we used the notation  $x_{0:k} = (x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ . Then, under mild assumptions, for  $k = 0, \dots, n$ ,  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$  and  $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ , one may prove (see [5, 6]) that the swing price is given by the following backward equation

$$\begin{cases} v_k(x_{0:k}, Q_k) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) + \mathbb{E} \left( v_{k+1}(x_{0:k}, X_{t_{k+1}}, Q_k + q) \mid X_{t_{0:k}} = x_{0:k} \right) \right], \\ v_n(x_{0:n}, Q_n) = P_c(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q_n), \end{cases} \quad (0.8)$$

where  $X_{t_{0:k}} := (X_{t_0}, \dots, X_{t_k})$  and  $\mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)$  for  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$  is the set of admissible controls at time  $t_k$  depending on the cumulative consumption  $Q_k$  up to time  $t_{k-1}$ . As already mentioned, the index  $c$  designates the constraint type, so that the preceding set is defined by

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{A}_{\text{firm}}(t_k, Q_k) := [\max(0, Q^d(t_{k+1}) - Q_k), \min(q_{\max}, Q^u(t_{k+1}) - Q_k)], \\ \mathbb{A}_{\text{pen}}(t_k, Q_k) := [0, q_{\max}], \end{cases} \quad (0.9)$$

In Equation (0.8), the function  $P_c$ , defined on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , corresponds to the penalty function which is null in the firm constraints setting and proportional the excess/deficit of consumption when considering a swing contract with penalty. That is,

$$\begin{cases} P_{\text{firm}}(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q_n) = 0, \\ P_{\text{pen}}(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q_n) := -f(t_n, x_n) \cdot \left( A \cdot (Q_n - Q_{\min})_- + B \cdot (Q_n - Q_{\max})_+ \right), \end{cases} \quad (0.10)$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are positive real constants. Then, denote by  $v_k^{[\sigma]}$  the swing value function at time  $t_k$ , where the superscript  $[\sigma]$  is to recall that the underlying process  $X_{t_k}$  has a volatility function  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . In a ARCH framework of the form  $X_{t_{k+1}} = X_{t_k} + \sigma(X_{t_k})Z_{k+1}$  with  $(Z_k)_k$  *i.i.d.* radial centered, one of the main results of this paper is the following.

**Theorem 0.1** (Main results). *Suppose that for any  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, n$ ,  $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$  and  $q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)$ , the functions  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \ni x_{0:k} \mapsto \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k})$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \ni x_{0:n} \mapsto P_c(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q_n)$  are convex. Then one has the following two results.*

**(P1).** *[Convexity propagation] If for all  $k = 0, \dots, n$ ,  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  is semi-convex, then, at any time  $t_k$ , the swing price function  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \ni x_{0:k} \mapsto v_k(x_{0:k}, Q_k)$  is convex.*

**(P2).** *[Domination criterion] For all  $k = 0, \dots, n$ , consider two volatility functions  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot), \theta(t_k, \cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . If  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  or  $\theta(t_k, \cdot)$  is semi-convex then, at any time  $t_k$ , one has the following monotonicity result of the swing price function*

$$\sigma(t_k, \cdot) \leq \theta(t_k, \cdot) \implies v_k^{[\sigma]}(\cdot, \cdot) \leq v_k^{[\theta]}(\cdot, \cdot).$$

Both results in the preceding theorem are derived using the *Backward Dynamic Programming Principle* (BDPP) presented in (0.8). Convex ordering theory will intervene in the propagation of convexity through what is often called the *continuation value* which is represented by the conditional expectation involved in the BDPP. Besides, it is worth noting that, even if the latter two properties have been specified in

dimension one, we prove them for an arbitrary dimension. However, for dimensions that are higher than one, instead of the semi-convexity assumption, the matrix-valued volatility function  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  will be assumed to be “convex” in a sense to be defined later on.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 provides a brief overview of convex ordering and presents the main results of this paper, along with the associated proofs, all within an *ARCH* framework and assuming the volatility function is convex. In Section 2, we establish that the results stated in Section 1 remain valid in one dimension when relaxing the convexity assumption to a semi-convexity one. For that, we use regularization techniques and rely on Proposition 2.1. The latter demonstrates that the “truncated” Euler scheme can propagate convexity when  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  is only semi-convex. In Section 3, we conduct numerical simulations to illustrate the results of this paper.

**Notations.** •  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is equipped with the canonical Euclidean norm denoted by  $|\cdot|$ .

- For all  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d), y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i$  denotes the canonical inner (Euclidean) product.
- $x_{0:k}$  denotes the vector  $(x_0, \dots, x_k)$ .
- $\mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$  denotes the space of real-valued matrix with  $d$  rows and  $q$  columns and is equipped with either the classical Fröbenius norm or the operator norm defined respectively by,

$$\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(AA^\top)} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^q a_{i,j}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|A\|_{op} = \sup_{|x|=1} |Ax|.$$

- $\mathcal{B}(0, R)$  denotes the closed ball with radius  $R \geq 1$  defined by  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq R\}$ . We also define the uniform norm on this ball: for any continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}(0,R)} := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}(0,R)} |f(x)|.$$

- $\mathcal{S}^+(q, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R})$  denote respectively the subsets of  $\mathbb{M}_{q,q}(\mathbb{R})$  of symmetric positive semi-definite and orthogonal matrices with real entries.
- For a countable set  $E$ ,  $|E|$  denotes its cardinality.
- $\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$  will denotes the set of real-valued twice continuously differentiable functions.
- $f * g$  is the convolution product on  $\mathbb{R}$  between two functions  $f, g : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ , defined by

$$(f * g)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{K}} f(t) \cdot g(x - t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{K}} f(x - t) \cdot g(t) dt.$$

- $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denotes the set of probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $p^{\text{th}}$  finite moment.
- For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\text{sgn}(x) := \mathbf{1}_{x>0} - \mathbf{1}_{x<0}$  and  $\overline{\text{sgn}}(x) := \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} - \mathbf{1}_{x < 0}$ .

## 1 Ordering of swing contract values

### 1.1 Short background on convex ordering

We start this section by some preliminaries following the general definition of convex ordering. This will serve as a basis to establish our main results. We refer the reader to Appendix B for a proof.

**Proposition 1.1.** (a) Let  $U, V \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2(\mathbb{P})$  and define  $\text{Var}(U) := \mathbb{E}|U|^2 - |\mathbb{E}U|^2$ . Then, by setting  $f : x \mapsto x_i^2, i = 1 : d$ , one has,

$$U \preceq_{cvx} V \implies \text{Var}(U) \leq \text{Var}(V).$$

(b) (**Gaussian distributions (centered)**): Let  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_q)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  and let  $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$ , then

$$BB^\top - AA^\top \in \mathcal{S}^+(d, \mathbb{R}) \implies AZ \preceq_{cvx} BZ$$

or equivalently  $\mathcal{N}(0, AA^\top) \preceq_{cvx} \mathcal{N}(0, BB^\top)$ . In particular, if  $d = q = 1$ , one has

$$|\sigma| \leq |\vartheta| \implies \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \preceq_{cvx} \mathcal{N}(0, \vartheta^2).$$

**Remark 1.2** (Convex ordering and risk measure). Convex ordering had been widely used in actuarial science and quantitative finance to quantify or compare risk through the notion of risk measure [10, 11, 13]. In particular, one may show that convex ordering is consistent with certain risk measures on certain probability spaces [11]. The latter means that for two integrable random variables  $X, Y$  (which may represent potential losses) and an appropriate risk measure  $\rho : \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ , one has,

$$X \preceq_{cvx} Y \quad \text{or} \quad X \preceq_{icv} Y \implies \rho(X) \leq \rho(Y).$$

Following this definition of the coherence, one may notice that, convex ordering is coherent with standard deviation, as a deviation risk measure [29], based on result (a), and with the classic Conditional Value at Risk CVaR assuming  $X, Y$  (which is straightforward using the Rockafeller-Uryasev representation [30]).

It is worth noting that, in the preceding proposition, claim (b) admits a generalization for *radial distributions*. This is stated in the following proposition and we refer the reader to [16] for a proof.

**Proposition 1.3** (Radial distributions (generalization)). *Let  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^q$  be a  $q$ -dimensional random vector having a radial distribution in the sense that*

$$\forall O \in \mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R}), \quad OZ \sim Z.$$

Let  $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$ . Then, we have the following equivalence

$$BB^\top - AA^\top \in \mathcal{S}^+(d, \mathbb{R}) \iff AZ \preceq_{cvx} BZ. \quad (1.1)$$

Then, to establish our main results, we will assume that the matrix-valued volatility function  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  is convex w.r.t. a certain preorder on matrix space specified in the following definition.

**Definition 1.4.** i. **Preorder.** Let  $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$ . We define the following preorder on  $\mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$

$$A \preceq B \quad \text{if} \quad BB^\top - AA^\top \in \mathcal{S}^+(d, \mathbb{R}). \quad (1.2)$$

ii.  **$\preceq$ -Convexity.** A matrix-valued function  $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$  is  $\preceq$ -convex if for every  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and every  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , there exist  $O_{\lambda,x}, O_{\lambda,y} \in \mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\sigma(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \preceq \lambda \sigma(x) O_{\lambda,x} + (1 - \lambda) \sigma(y) O_{\lambda,y} \quad (1.3)$$

i.e.

$$(\lambda \sigma(x) O_{\lambda,x} + (1 - \lambda) \sigma(y) O_{\lambda,y}) (\lambda \sigma(x) O_{\lambda,x} + (1 - \lambda) \sigma(y) O_{\lambda,y})^\top - \sigma \sigma^\top(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \in \mathcal{S}^+(d, \mathbb{R}).$$

**Remark 1.5.** In particular, when  $d = q = 1$ , by setting  $O_{\lambda,x} = \text{sgn}(\sigma(x))$  one checks that condition (1.3) is equivalent to the convexity of the real-valued function  $|\sigma|$ .

**Remark 1.6** ( $\preceq$ -convexity: a quite general example). Condition (1.3) for the  $\preceq$ -convexity may appear difficult to verify at first given a matrix-valued function. However, there exists a quite general class of matrix which satisfies this condition.

Let  $\lambda_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, k = 1, \dots, q$  such that all  $|\lambda_k|$  are convex. Set:

$$\sigma(x) := A \cdot \text{diag}(\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_q(x)) \cdot O, \quad A \in \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R}), O \in \mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R}).$$

Then  $\sigma$  is  $\preceq$ -convex. We refer the reader to Lemma A.5 for a proof.

## 1.2 Main results

We establish two key results concerning the convexity of the swing price with respect to the underlying asset price and its “monotonicity” with respect to the underlying volatility function. To this end, we consider an (martingale) *ARCH* framework, meaning that the Markov process is given by the following discrete dynamics

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^{[\sigma]} = X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]} + \sigma(t_k, X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]})Z_{k+1}, \quad X_{t_0}^{[\sigma]} = x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (1.4)$$

The superscript  $[\sigma]$  emphasizes the dependence of the process  $(X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$  on the matrix-valued volatility function,

$$\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (1.5)$$

$(Z_k)_k$  are *i.i.d.* copies of an  $\mathbb{R}^q$ -valued random vector  $Z$  which has a *radial distribution*. This framework includes the normal distribution which is often used to model a random noise. Besides, note that we could have considered a more general *ARCH* process i.e.

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^{[\sigma]} = A_k \cdot X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]} + \sigma(t_k, X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]})Z_{k+1}, \quad X_{t_0}^{[\sigma]} = x \in \mathbb{R}^d, A_k \in \mathbb{M}_{d,d}(\mathbb{R}) \quad (1.6)$$

and all the results in the paper would still hold true. However, we opted to omit the matrix  $A_k$  since in the subsequent analysis, we will be focusing on the Euler scheme.

In the *ARCH* framework, the *BDPP* (0.8) reads:

$$\begin{cases} v_k(x_{0:k}, Q_k) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) + (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}v_{k+1}(x_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(x_k) \right], \\ v_n(x_{0:n}, Q_n) = P_c(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q_n), \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

where for a given function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with at most linear growth, the operator  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1}$  is defined by (for all  $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ ):

$$\mathbb{R}^d \ni x_k \mapsto (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}f)(x_k) := (\mathcal{T}f)(x_k, \sigma(t_k, x_k)) \quad (1.8)$$

and the operator  $\mathcal{T}$  is in turn defined by:

$$\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R}) \ni (x, A) \mapsto (\mathcal{T}f)(x, A) := \mathbb{E}f(x + AZ). \quad (1.9)$$

One of the main results of this paper concerns the propagation of convexity in the *BDPP* (1.7) provided that the payoff function and the penalty function are both convex. This uses the propagation of convexity through the operator  $\mathcal{G}_{k+1}$  (1.8), and consequently, through the operator  $\mathcal{T}$  (1.9). The following proposition shows that operator  $\mathcal{T}$  actually propagates convexity. We refer the reader to Appendix B for a proof.

**Proposition 1.7.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function with linear growth. Then, the following properties hold concerning the operator  $\mathcal{T}$  defined in (1.9).*

i. For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}f(x, \cdot)$  is right  $\mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R})$ -invariant i.e.,

$$\forall O \in \mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R}), \quad \mathcal{T}f(x, AO) = \mathcal{T}f(x, A).$$

ii.  $\mathcal{T}f(\cdot, \cdot)$  is convex.

iii. For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}f(x, \cdot)$  is non-decreasing with respect to the pre-order on matrices (defined in (i.)) i.e.,  $A \preceq B \implies \mathcal{T}f(x, A) \leq \mathcal{T}f(x, B)$ .

We now have key ingredients to state the main results of this paper. To this end, we consider a volume constraint modelling  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$  and the following assumptions:

$(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$ : For all  $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $q \in [0, q_{\max}]$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_n)$ , the payoff function

$$(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1} \ni x_{0:k} \mapsto \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k})$$

and the penalty function,

$$(\mathbb{R}^d)^{n+1} \ni x_{0:n} \mapsto P_c(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q)$$

are convex with at most linear growth for the  $|\cdot|_{\text{sup}}$ -norm.

The growth condition on the payoff and the penalty function ensures that the random variables  $v_k(X_{t_k}, \cdot)$  are integrable, provided that  $X_{t_0}$  is integrable. This is a straightforward result of a backward induction using the *BDPP* (1.7).

$(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma]})$ : For all  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  is  $\preceq$ -convex, with linear growth for the Fröbenius norm or the operator norm.

As it will be discussed in Remark 1.9, the volatility function  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  often satisfies requirements of Lemma 1.6, whence is  $\preceq$ -convex. In section 2, we will prove that, in a continuous time and in the one-dimensional case ( $d = q = 1$ ), this assumption may be relaxed into a semi-convexity assumption.

With these assumptions, we establish the first main result, namely the propagation of convexity through the *BDPP*.

**Theorem 1.8** (Backward propagation of convexity). *Let  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$ . Under assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma]})$ , for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$  and any  $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ , one has*

$$(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1} \ni x_{0:k} \mapsto v_k(x_{0:k}, Q_k) \quad \text{is convex.}$$

*Proof.* We proceed by a backward induction on  $k$ . For any  $Q_n \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_n)$ , we have  $v_n(x_{0:n}, Q_n) = P_c(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q_n)$ . Thus owing to assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$ ,  $v_n(\cdot, Q_n)$  is convex. Let us assume that the proposition holds true for  $k+1$ . Let  $x_{0:k}, y_{0:k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1}$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . For any  $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} v_k(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, Q_k) &= \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, \lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\mathcal{G}_{k+1} v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(\lambda x_k + (1-\lambda)y_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the induction assumption,  $v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q)$  is convex. Thus Proposition ii. implies that  $(\mathcal{T} v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(\cdot, \cdot)$  is also convex. Proposition iii. in turns implies that

$$\mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R}) \ni A \mapsto (\mathcal{T} v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(\lambda x_k + (1-\lambda)y_k, A)$$

is non-decreasing w.r.t. the pre-order on matrices (defined in (i.)). Therefore, using the convexity Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma]})$  for the matrix-valued functions  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  with respect to  $\preceq$ , there exist  $O_x, O_y \in \mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{G}_{k+1} v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(\lambda x_k + (1-\lambda)y_k) \\ &= (\mathcal{T} v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(\lambda x_k + (1-\lambda)y_k, \sigma(t_k, \lambda x_k + (1-\lambda)y_k)) \\ &\leq (\mathcal{T} v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(\lambda x_k + (1-\lambda)y_k, \lambda \sigma(t_k, x_k) O_x + (1-\lambda) \sigma(t_k, y_k) O_y) \\ &= \mathbb{E} v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1-\lambda)y_{0:k}, \lambda(x_k + \sigma(t_k, x_k) O_x Z) + (1-\lambda)(y_k + \sigma(t_k, y_k) O_y Z), Q_k + q). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since by the induction assumption  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+2} \ni x_{0:k+1} \mapsto v_{k+1}(x_{0:k+1}, Q + q)$  is convex, then one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}v_{k+1}(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1 - \lambda)y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(\lambda x_k + (1 - \lambda)y_k) \\
& \leq \lambda \cdot \mathbb{E}v_{k+1}(x_{0:k}, x_k + \sigma(t_k, x_k)O_x Z, Q_k + q) \\
& \quad + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \mathbb{E}v_{k+1}(y_{0:k}, y_k + \sigma(t_k, y_k)O_y Z, Q_k + q) \\
& = \lambda \cdot (\mathcal{T}v_{k+1}(x_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(x_k, \sigma(t_k, x_k)O_x) \\
& \quad + (1 - \lambda) \cdot (\mathcal{T}v_{k+1}(y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(y_k, \sigma(t_k, y_k)O_y) \\
& = \lambda \cdot (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}v_{k+1}(x_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(x_k) \\
& \quad + (1 - \lambda) \cdot (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}v_{k+1}(y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(y_k),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, we used the right  $\mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R})$ -invariance of the operator  $\mathcal{T}$  (see Proposition i.). Then, it follows from Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$  on the convexity of the payoff function that

$$\begin{aligned}
v_k(\lambda x_{0:k} + (1 - \lambda)y_{0:k}, Q_k) & \leq \lambda \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) + (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}v_{k+1}(x_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(x_k) \right] \\
& \quad + (1 - \lambda) \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, y_{0:k}) + (\mathcal{G}_{k+1}v_{k+1}(y_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(y_k) \right] \\
& = \lambda v_k(x_{0:k}, Q_k) + (1 - \lambda)v_k(y_{0:k}, Q_k).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

The previous proposition addresses the convexity of the swing price as a function of the *ARCH* process  $(X_{t_k})_k$ . However, since this variable is not directly observable in markets, practitioners are typically more concerned with the properties of the swing price as a function of the forward price (refer to (0.6)), which is observable. The following remark highlights that the earlier propagation of convexity generally remains valid when considering the swing price as a function of the forward price.

**Remark 1.9** (Convexity with respect to forward price). Forward contracts are generally [9, 8, 21, 28] modelled through the following general diffusion:

$$dF_t = \tilde{\sigma}(t, F_t)dW_t, \quad t \leq T, \quad (1.10)$$

where  $\tilde{\sigma}(t, \cdot)$  is convex. Note that the Euler scheme of the preceding diffusion at times  $(t_k, k = 0, \dots, n)$  falls into our *ARCH* model (1.4) with a volatility function  $\sqrt{T/n} \cdot \tilde{\sigma}(t_k, F_{t_k})$  which is convex as a function of  $F_{t_k}$ . Thus instead of considering the forward as a function of an ARCH process, we may directly consider the forward price (i.e.  $f(t, x) := x$ ) and the propagation of convexity also holds true.

**Remark 1.10.** The convexity property we have shown in the preceding proposition does not depend on volume constraints (assuming the space of constraints does not depend on the underlying price). Furthermore, we claim that, given a stochastic optimal control problem (either constrained or not) with its associated backward dynamic programming principle, where the set of constraints, if any, does not depend on the variable of interest, the same proof works in an *ARCH* framework.

**Remark 1.11** (“Hedging”). We call the “delta” of a swing price, the first partial derivative of its price with respect to the initial forward price  $F_0$  (e.g., the starting value of the diffusion in (1.10)). The existence of such a derivative in our stochastic optimal control problem is guaranteed, under some assumptions, by the envelope theorem. Besides, since a differentiable and convex function has a non-decreasing first derivative, we deduce that the delta of the swing contract is an increasing function of the initial forward price. This result will be illustrated by numerical examples in Section 3 (see also [22] for details).

The convexity of the swing value function, proved in the preceding proposition, enables us to deduce our second main result concerning the monotonicity of the latter function with respect to the matrix-valued volatility function  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$ .



**Theorem 1.12** (Domination criterion). *Let  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$ . Consider assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$  and the following two ARCH processes*

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^{[\sigma]} = X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]} + \sigma(t_k, X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]})Z_{k+1}, \quad X_{t_0}^{[\sigma]} = x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.11)$$

$$X_{t_{k+1}}^{[\theta]} = X_{t_k}^{[\theta]} + \theta(t_k, X_{t_k}^{[\theta]})Z_{k+1}, \quad X_{t_0}^{[\theta]} = x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (1.12)$$

where  $\sigma, \theta : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $(Z_k)_k$  are i.i.d. copies of  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^q$  which distribution is radial. Assume that assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma]})$  or  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\theta]})$  holds as well as the following assumption

**(\mathcal{H}\_3)** : For all  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$\sigma(t_k, \cdot) \preceq \theta(t_k, \cdot). \quad (1.13)$$

Then, for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , and for all  $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ , one has

$$v_k^{[\sigma]}(x_{0:k}, Q_k) \leq v_k^{[\theta]}(x_{0:k}, Q_k),$$

where  $v_k^{[\sigma]}$  and  $v_k^{[\theta]}$  are swing value functions defined by (1.7) associated to processes  $X_{t_k}^{[\sigma]}$  and  $X_{t_k}^{[\theta]}$  respectively.

*Proof.* We prove this proposition by a backward induction on  $k$ . The proposition holds for  $k = n$  since  $v_n^{[\sigma]}(x_{0:n}, Q_n) = v_n^{[\theta]}(x_{0:n}, Q_n)$  for all  $Q_n \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_n)$ . Assume now that it holds for  $k + 1$ . For any  $x_{0:k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k+1}$  and  $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ , we have,

$$v_k^{[\sigma]}(x_{0:k}, Q_k) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) + (\mathcal{T}v_{k+1}^{[\sigma]}(x_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(x_k, \sigma(t_k, x_k)) \right]. \quad (1.14)$$

From Assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma]})$  or  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\theta]})$ , either  $v_{k+1}^{[\sigma]}(\cdot, Q_k + q)$  or  $v_{k+1}^{[\theta]}(\cdot, Q_k + q)$  is a convex function as a result of Theorem 1.8. Then using Proposition iii. and Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_3)$  in (1.14) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} v_k^{[\sigma]}(x_{0:k}, Q_k) &\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) + (\mathcal{T}v_{k+1}^{[\sigma]}(x_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(x_k, \theta(t_k, x_k)) \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q_k)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) + (\mathcal{T}v_{k+1}^{[\theta]}(x_{0:k}, \cdot, Q_k + q))(x_k, \theta(t_k, x_k)) \right] \\ &= v_k^{[\theta]}(x_{0:k}, Q_k), \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the second-last inequality the induction assumption and the positiveness of the linear operator  $\mathcal{T}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.13** (Domination with correlation). *Let  $\rho \in (-\frac{1}{q-1}, 1)$ . Assume that, for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ , the matrix-valued volatility functions  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  are of the form:*

$$\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \sigma(t_k, \cdot) := \lambda(x)^\top L(\rho) \in \mathbb{M}_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \lambda(x)^\top = (\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_q(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^q,$$

where all functions  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \lambda_i(x)$  are non-negative and convex.  $L(\rho)$  is the Cholesky decomposition of the correlation matrix  $\Gamma(\rho) := [\rho + (1 - \rho)\mathbf{1}_{i=j}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq q}$  which is definite positive. Then  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \sigma(t_k, x)$  is  $\preceq$ -convex. Indeed, by simple algebra one has

$$\begin{aligned} &(\alpha\sigma(t_k, x) + (1 - \alpha)\sigma(t_k, y)) \cdot (\alpha\sigma(t_k, x) + (1 - \alpha)\sigma(t_k, y))^\top \\ &\quad - \sigma(t_k, \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \sigma^\top(t_k, \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^q \rho_{i,j} \left[ \alpha^2 \lambda_i(x) \lambda_j(x) + 2\alpha(1 - \alpha) \lambda_i(x) \lambda_j(y) + (1 - \alpha)^2 \lambda_i(y) \lambda_j(y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \lambda_i(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \lambda_j(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \right] \end{aligned}$$

and the r.h.s. is non-negative owing to the convexity of all non-negative function  $\lambda_i$ . This implies the  $\preceq$ -convexity of volatility functions  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  as a straightforward application of Definition (1.3). Besides, owing to Proposition C.2, the monotonicity of  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$  w.r.t.  $\rho$  holds so that the domination criterion holds. This example proves that, in the considered volatility modelling, the swing price is increasing with the correlation parameter  $\rho$ .

The *domination criterion* provides a comparison criterion of swing contract prices with respect to the matrix-valued volatility function in our ARCH setting (1.4). This leads to several practical implications, some of them are mentioned in the following remark.

**Remark 1.14.** (a) Consider two matrix-valued volatility functions  $\sigma_{low}, \sigma_{high} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$  and assume that Assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$   $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma_{low}]})$  and  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma_{high}]})$  are in force. If for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ :

$$\sigma_{low}(t_k, \cdot) \preceq \sigma(t_k, \cdot) \preceq \sigma_{high}(t_k, \cdot) \quad (1.15)$$

then one has,

$$v_0^{[\sigma_{low}]}(x_0) \leq v_0^{[\sigma]}(x_0) \leq v_0^{[\sigma_{high}]}(x_0).$$

In particular, in one dimension, if the volatility is bounded by explicit constants  $\sigma_{low}$  and  $\sigma_{high}$ , then the swing price is bounded by swing prices corresponding to the volatility bounds. This result may help knowing the potential range of the swing price following a move of market data (provided that swing prices  $v_0^{[\sigma_{low}]}$  and  $v_0^{[\sigma_{high}]}$  are known). The latter is formalized in the following point.

- (b) Assume that the matrix-valued volatility functions  $\sigma_\lambda(t_k, \cdot) \in \mathbb{M}_{d,q}(\mathbb{R})$  (for  $k = 0, \dots, n$ ) are convex and depend on a parameter  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then if  $\mathbb{R} \ni \lambda \mapsto \sigma_\lambda(t_k, x)$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , is monotonous (with the same monotonicity disregarding  $x$ ), then  $\mathbb{R} \ni \lambda \mapsto v_0^{[\sigma_\lambda]}(x_0)$  will have the same monotonicity. We can thus pinpoint the effect of a model parameter's evolution involved in the volatility function. One may refer to Example 1.13 for an illustration.

**Remark 1.15.** In light of the proof of the domination criterion, one may notice that the terminal conditions, namely the penalty function, do not need to be the same. More precisely, under assumptions of Theorem 1.12, the domination criterion still holds true when assuming:

$$v_n^{[\sigma]}(x_{0:n}, Q) = P_c^{[\sigma]}(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q), \quad v_n^{[\theta]}(x_{0:n}, Q) = P_c^{[\theta]}(t_n, x_{0:n}, Q),$$

with  $P_c^{[\sigma]}(t_n, \cdot, Q), P_c^{[\theta]}(t_n, \cdot, Q)$  being two convex functions such that  $P_c^{[\sigma]}(t_n, \cdot, Q) \leq P_c^{[\theta]}(t_n, \cdot, Q)$ . Besides, note that, if Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma]})$  (resp.  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\theta]})$ ) holds, then just  $P_c^{[\sigma]}(t_n, \cdot, Q)$  (resp.  $P_c^{[\theta]}(t_n, \cdot, Q)$ ) needs to be a convex function.

To end this section, it is worth noting that the two preceding propositions have been established for the generic payoff function  $\Psi_k$  defined in (0.7). This may include multiple possible cases of swing contracts. Among others the most traded contracts are,

- **Fixed strike swing contract.** In this case, at each exercise date  $t_k$ , the holder of the swing contract receives, per unit of exercised volume, the difference between the forward price  $F_{t_k}$  (e.g. gas delivery contract) and a fixed amount  $K$  decided at the conclusion of the contract. That is,

$$\Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) := q \cdot \left( f(t_k, x_k) - K \right). \quad (1.16)$$

- **Indexed strike swing contract.** This case is the same as the previous one except that the fixed amount  $K$  is replaced by an average of past prices of the same commodity. Namely,

$$\Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) := q \cdot \left( f(t_k, x_k) - \frac{1}{|I_k|} \sum_{i \in I_k} f(t_i, x_i) \right), \quad (1.17)$$

where for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , we have  $I_k \subseteq \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ .

## 2 One dimensional case: some refinements

The *domination criterion* and the propagation of convexity proved above rely on the convexity assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{\sigma})$  for the matrix-valued volatility function  $\sigma(t_k, \cdot)$ . In general, this assumption cannot be reasonably relaxed. This section focuses on the one-dimensional setting i.e.,  $d = q = 1$ , where we prove that, in this specific case, it is possible to get rid of the convexity assumption.

From now on, in this section, we set  $d = q = 1$  and consider that the payoff functions, at time  $t_k$ , only depends on the price at time  $t_k$ , i.e. of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_k : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (t_k, q_k, x_k) &\mapsto \Psi_k(t_k, q_k, x_k). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Besides, we consider the general Brownian diffusion:

$$X_t^x = x + \int_0^t \beta(s, X_s^x) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(s, X_s^x) dW_s, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $(W_t, t \geq 0)$  is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. We assume that the diffusion coefficients  $\beta : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  are Lipschitz continuous in  $x$  uniformly with respect to  $t \in [0, T]$  i.e.

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |\beta(t, x) - \beta(t, y)| + |\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, y)| \leq K|x - y| \quad (2.3)$$

for a positive constant  $K$  so that the integrated *SDE* (2.2) admits a strong solution. We also assume that they satisfy:

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\beta(t, \cdot)| + |\sigma(t, \cdot)| < +\infty. \quad (2.4)$$

We then consider the swing pricing problem where our ARCH process (1.4) is replaced by diffusion (2.2) at dates  $(t_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ . We define by a backward induction the function  $v_k$  satisfying:

$$\begin{cases} v_k(x, Q) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x) + \mathbb{E}(v_{k+1}(X_{t_{k+1}}, Q + q) | X_{t_k} = x) \right], \\ v_n(x, Q) = P_c(t_n, x, Q). \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

For  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , we consider a regular discretization of the time interval  $[0, T]$  by dates  $t_\ell^{(mn)} := \frac{\ell T}{mn}$  for  $\ell = 0, \dots, mn$ . Note that these dates coincide, when  $\ell = km$ , with the actual exercise dates of the swing contract i.e.  $t_{km}^{(mn)} = t_k$  for  $k = 0, \dots, n$ . We then consider the Euler scheme of the diffusion (2.2), with step  $\frac{T}{mn}$ , at dates  $t_\ell^{(mn)}$  i.e. we consider (denoting  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$ ):

$$\overline{X}_{t_{\ell+1}^{(mn)}}^x \sim \xi_\ell^{(mn)} \left( \overline{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^x, Z_{\ell+1} \right), \quad \overline{X}_0 = x \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{with} \quad \xi_\ell^{(mn)}(x, z) := x + h\beta(t_\ell^{(mn)}, x) + \sqrt{h}\sigma(t_\ell^{(mn)}, x)z, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $(Z_\ell)_\ell$  are *i.i.d.* copies of  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Note that, in the notation  $\overline{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^x$ , we opted not to highlight the step  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$  of the Euler scheme. We made this choice as, in this paper, only this Euler scheme with step  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$  will be used. Thus there is no ambiguity and this choice allows to alleviate notations.

The process  $\left( \overline{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^x \right)_{0 \leq \ell \leq mn}$  is clearly an  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Markov chain. We may associate to this process its transitions defined for a bounded or non-negative Borel function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$P_\ell^{(mn)}(f)(x) := \mathbb{E}f(\xi_\ell^{(mn)}(x, Z)), \quad 0 \leq \ell \leq mn - 1. \quad (2.7)$$

We also define for  $i < j \in \{0, \dots, mn - 1\}$ :

$$P_{i:j}^{(mn)} := P_i^{(mn)} \circ \dots \circ P_{j-1}^{(mn)} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\ell:\ell}^{(mn)}(f) := f. \quad (2.8)$$

Then, the *BDPP* (1.7) related to this Markov chain reads

$$\begin{cases} v_k^{(m)}(x, Q) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x) + P_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right], \\ v_n^{(m)}(x, Q) = P_c(t_n, x, Q). \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

We aim at propagating the convexity through the *BDPP* (2.5) but, this time, assuming the volatility function  $\sigma$  is *semi-convex*. To achieve this, we follow the following scheme (still with  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$ ).

Proof scheme: We first proceed as in [15] by truncating the Gaussian noise  $Z$ . That is,  $Z$  is replaced by

$$\tilde{Z}^h := Z \cdot 1_{\{|Z| \leq s_h\}} \quad (2.10)$$

for a positive threshold  $s_h$  such that  $s_h \rightarrow +\infty$  when  $h \rightarrow 0$ . We then show in Proposition 2.1 that, for an appropriate choice of  $s_h$ , the truncated Euler  $\xi_\ell^{(mn)}(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  propagates convexity i.e. for any convex function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the function  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{E}f(\xi_\ell^{(mn)}(x, \tilde{Z}^h))$  is convex. This allows us to prove Proposition 2.3 which states that convexity actually propagates through the *truncated BDPP* (see (2.22)) i.e. the *BDPP* (2.9) where the actual white noise  $Z$  is replaced by its truncated version  $\tilde{Z}^h$ . To show that the preceding result still holds true for the *BDPP* of interest given by Equation (2.5), we send  $h \rightarrow 0$  and use the fact that the truncated Euler scheme converges towards the regular one as  $h \rightarrow 0$ .

Let us start by showing that the truncated Euler scheme  $\xi_\ell^{(mn)}(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  propagates convexity. In the following proposition, the time index  $k$  is omitted for generality. Similarly, the time dependence of the diffusion coefficients  $\beta$  and  $\sigma$  is omitted in notation for simplicity and  $\xi^{(mn)}$  is replaced by  $\xi^h$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *Assume that the volatility function  $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is Lipschitz continuous and semi-convex i.e.,*

$$a_\sigma := \inf \{ a \geq 0 : \mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \sigma^2(x) + ax^2 \text{ is convex} \} < +\infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Furthermore, assume that the drift function  $\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex and such that,

$$c_\beta := \inf \{ c \geq 0 : \mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \beta(x) + cx \text{ is non-decreasing} \} < +\infty. \quad (2.12)$$

Let  $h \in (0, \frac{1}{2c_\beta})$  (with the convention  $\frac{1}{0} = +\infty$ ) and set  $s_h = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{h \cdot (\|\sigma\|_{Lip}^2 + a_\sigma)}}$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2+\sqrt{2}})$ . Then, the following propositions hold true:

- (a) The random function  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is non-decreasing when  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^1(\mathbb{P})$  is equipped with the stochastic order.
- (b) The random function  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is non-increasing when  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^1(\mathbb{P})$  is equipped with the increasing convex order.
- (c) If  $\beta$  is affine, the random function  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is convex when  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^1(\mathbb{P})$  is equipped with the convex order.

**Remark 2.2.** The semi-convexity property (2.11) of the function  $\sigma$  in the preceding Proposition is weaker than assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_2^{[\sigma]})$  since a convex function is also semi-convex in the sense of (2.11). Besides, the semi-convexity property has been seemingly introduced in Mathematical Finance [12] and can also be found in various papers on the pricing and hedging of American style options like [20, 2, 3].

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* Our proof is divided into five steps and starts with some preliminary results. Note that to prove claim (b) (resp. claim (c)), we need to prove that for any function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is convex and non-decreasing (resp. convex) that  $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}[f(\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))]$  is non-decreasing (resp. convex). In our proof scheme, until *Step 5*, we will prove these results for  $f$  being twice continuously differentiable, convex and non-decreasing (resp. convex). At *Step 5*, the  $\mathcal{C}^2$  regularity will be relaxed.

Let us start with the first step that jumbles some useful results which will be used in the subsequent analysis. We assume that the volatility function is not constant. The constant case is not of interest as it implies the volatility function is convex and this has already been handled.

(Step 1). (*Preliminaries*). Note that the volatility function  $\sigma$  is not constant so that  $[\sigma]_{Lip} > 0$  and  $s_h < +\infty$ . Let  $\rho$  be a  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  probability density on the real line with compact support such that,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} u\rho(u) du = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2\rho(u) du = 1. \quad (2.13)$$

$\rho$  is then associated to its sequence of modifiers  $\rho_p(x) = p \cdot \rho(px)$  for all  $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . We also set, for every  $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,

$$\sigma_p(x) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{p} + \rho_p * \sigma^2(x)} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_p(x) := \rho_p * \beta(x).$$

The continuity of the convex function  $\beta$  implies that  $\beta_p$  converges pointwise to  $\beta$  as  $p \rightarrow +\infty$ . Likewise,  $\sigma_p$  converges pointwise to  $\sigma$ . Thus, to prove the three results of the proposition when  $\sigma$  is non-constant, we start by proving them when replacing the random function  $\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  with, for each  $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,

$$\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h) := x + h\beta_p(x) + \sqrt{h}\sigma_p(x)\tilde{Z}^h.$$

It follows from triangle inequality and then Cauchy Schwartz's one that,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma_p^2(x) - \sigma_p^2(y)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\sigma(x-z) - \sigma(y-z)| \cdot (\sigma(x-z) + \sigma(y-z)) \rho_p(z) dz \\ &\leq [\sigma]_{Lip} \cdot |x-y| \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(x-z) \rho_p(z) dz + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma(y-z) \rho_p(z) dz \right) \\ &\leq [\sigma]_{Lip} \cdot |x-y| \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_p(z) dz \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left( \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma^2(x-z) \rho_p(z) dz \right)^{1/2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sigma^2(y-z) \rho_p(z) dz \right)^{1/2} \right) \\ &\leq [\sigma]_{Lip} |x-y| (\sigma_p(x) + \sigma_p(y)), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we use the fact that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_p(z) dz = 1$ , since  $\rho$  is a probability density and, the definition of  $\sigma_p$ . Thus  $\sigma_p$  is Lipschitz with the same Lipschitz constant as  $\sigma$ . Moreover, since the Lipschitz continuous function  $\sigma$  has at most affine growth, the non-negative function  $\rho_p * \sigma^2$  is differentiable and so is  $\sigma_p$ . Thus,

$$|\sigma_p'| \leq [\sigma]_{Lip}. \quad (2.14)$$

Besides, we know that,  $x \mapsto \sigma^2(x) + a_\sigma x^2$  is convex since the infimum defining  $a_\sigma$  holds as a minimum. Hence, its convolution by  $\rho_p$  is convex too and one checks that it is infinitely differentiable. On the other hand, using (2.13), one has

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \sigma(x-y)^2 + a_\sigma \cdot (x-y)^2 \right) \rho_p(y) dy = \sigma_p^2(x) + a_\sigma x^2 + \frac{a_\sigma}{p^2} - \frac{1}{p}$$

so that by definition of  $a_\sigma$ ,  $x \mapsto \sigma_p^2(x) + a_\sigma x^2$  is convex with  $(\sigma_p^2)'' \geq -2a_\sigma$ . We also note that  $\beta_p$  is infinitely differentiable, convex and such that  $x \mapsto \beta_p(x) + c_\beta x$  is non-decreasing.

(Step 2). (*Differentiation*). This step aims at formally differentiating the function  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))]$  which will be the key to prove claims (b) and (c).

Note that if  $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is convex and continuously twice differentiable, since the random variable  $\tilde{Z}^h$  is bounded by  $s_h < +\infty$ , one may show that the function  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))]$  is twice continuously differentiable with its first two partial derivatives given by:

$$\partial_x \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))] = \mathbb{E}\left[f'(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) \cdot (1 + \sqrt{h}\sigma_p'(x)\tilde{Z}^h + h\beta_p'(x))\right] \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{xx} \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))] &= \mathbb{E}\left[f'(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) \cdot (\sqrt{h}\sigma_p''(x)\tilde{Z}^h + h\beta_p''(x))\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[f''(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) \cdot (1 + \sqrt{h}\sigma_p'(x)\tilde{Z}^h + h\beta_p'(x))^2\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

(Step 3). (*Claims (a) and (b) for  $\xi_p^h(\cdot, \tilde{Z}^h)$* ).

We start by proving (a). When  $h \leq \frac{1}{2c_\beta}$ , since  $x \mapsto \beta_p(x) + c_\beta x$  is non-decreasing, one has  $h\beta_p'(x) \geq -c_\beta h \geq -\frac{1}{2}$  and, by definition of the threshold  $s_h$  and using (2.14), one has

$$\partial_x \xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h) = 1 + \sqrt{h}\sigma_p'(x)\tilde{Z}^h + h\beta_p'(x) \geq 1 - \sqrt{h}|\sigma_p'(x)|s_h - \frac{1}{2} \geq 1 - \lambda - \frac{1}{2} > 0$$

since  $\lambda < \frac{1}{2+\sqrt{2}} < 1/2$ . Therefore  $x \mapsto \xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is non-decreasing with respect to the non-decreasing stochastic ordering. Thus letting  $p \rightarrow +\infty$  implies (a). It remains then to prove claim (b).

Having in mind that  $|\sigma'| \leq [\sigma]_{Lip}$ , one has

$$1 + \sqrt{h}\sigma_p'(x)\tilde{Z}^h + h\beta_p'(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{h}[\sigma]_{Lip} \cdot s_h \geq \frac{1}{2} - \lambda > 0. \quad (2.17)$$

Thus, if  $f$  is convex, non-decreasing and twice continuously differentiable, then the partial derivative in (2.15) is non-negative. Hence, the random function  $\xi_p^h(\cdot, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is non-decreasing for the increasing convex order. This partially proves (b) since, as already mentioned, we need to prove the same result but for the random function  $\xi^h(\cdot, \tilde{Z}^h)$  and without assuming that  $f$  is twice differentiable.

(Step 4). (*Claim (c) for  $\xi_p^h(\cdot, \tilde{Z}^h)$* ).

It follows from Stein Lemma that for a twice continuously differentiable function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[f'(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))\tilde{Z}^h\right] &= \int_{-s_h}^{s_h} f'(\xi_p^h(x, z))ze^{-\frac{z^2}{2}} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &= \int_{-s_h}^{s_h} f''(\xi_p^h(x, z))\sqrt{h}\sigma_p(x)\left(e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}} - e^{-\frac{s_h^2}{2}}\right) \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[f''(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))\sqrt{h}\sigma_p(x)1_{\{\tilde{Z}^h \neq 0\}} \underbrace{\left(1 - e^{-\frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2}}\right)}_{\geq 0}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this equality in (2.16) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{xx} \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))] &= \mathbb{E}\left[f'(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))h\beta_p''(x)\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[f''(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))\left((1 + \sqrt{h}\sigma_p'(x)\tilde{Z}^h + h\beta_p'(x))^2\right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left.+ h1_{\{\tilde{Z}^h \neq 0\}}\left(1 - e^{-\frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2}}\right)\sigma_p\sigma_p''(x)\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

When  $f$  is non-decreasing, then the first expectation in the right-hand side is non-negative by the convexity of  $\beta_p$ . It is still non-negative disregarding the monotonicity of  $f$  when  $\beta$  is affine since  $\beta_p''$  vanishes. Let us handle the second expectation. Using the identity  $\sigma_p \sigma_p''(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_p^2)'' - (\sigma_p')^2$ , the definition of  $a_\sigma$  and the elementary inequality  $1 - e^{-u} \leq u$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned}
h\left(1 - e^{-\frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2}}\right) \sigma_p \sigma_p''(x) &= \frac{h}{2} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2}}\right) ((\sigma_p^2)'' + 2a_\sigma) - h\left(1 - e^{-\frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2}}\right) ((\sigma_p')^2 + a_\sigma) \\
&\geq -h\left(1 - e^{-\frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2}}\right) ((\sigma_p')^2 + a_\sigma) \\
&\geq -h \frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2} ([\sigma]_{Lip}^2 + a_\sigma) \\
&\geq -\frac{hs_h^2}{2} ([\sigma]_{Lip}^2 + a_\sigma) = -\frac{\lambda^2}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Inequalities (2.17) and (2.19) imply that, on the event  $\{\tilde{Z}^h \neq 0\}$ ,

$$(1 + \sqrt{h} \sigma_p'(x) \tilde{Z}^h + h \beta_p'(x))^2 + h 1_{\{\tilde{Z}^h \neq 0\}} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{s_h^2 - (\tilde{Z}^h)^2}{2}}\right) \sigma_p \sigma_p''(x) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda\right)^2 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} > 0$$

since  $\lambda < 1 - 1/\sqrt{2} = \frac{1}{2+\sqrt{2}}$ . Note that the latter expression is also positive on  $\{\tilde{Z}^h = 0\}$ . As  $f''$  is non-negative when  $f$  is convex, we deduce that the second expectation in the right-hand side of (2.18) is non-negative. Hence when  $f$  is moreover non-decreasing or  $\beta$  is affine (so that  $\beta_p$  is affine too), we get

$$\partial_{xx} \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))] \geq 0,$$

which implies that the random function  $\xi_p^h(\cdot, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is convex for the convex ordering.

(Step 5). (*Claims (b) and (c): General form*).

Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a twice continuously differentiable function. As already mentioned  $\beta_p \rightarrow \beta$  and  $\sigma_p \rightarrow \sigma$  pointwise and  $\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is a bounded random variable when  $h$  is fixed. When  $h \in (0, \frac{1}{2c_\beta})$ , if  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{C}^2$ , non-decreasing and convex, one has almost surely  $f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) \rightarrow f(\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))$  as  $p \rightarrow +\infty$  and

$$\mathbb{E}f(\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}f(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) \tag{2.20}$$

since  $f$  is locally bounded. The same holds true for regular convex order (with  $f$  convex and  $\mathcal{C}^2$ ) when  $\beta$  is affine. Thus, owing to (2.20), claims (b) and (c) previously established for the random function  $\xi_p^h(\cdot, \tilde{Z}^h)$  also hold for the random function  $\xi^h(\cdot, \tilde{Z}^h)$  but still assuming  $f$  is twice continuously differentiable.

In order to relax the regularity of  $f$ , we proceed as previously by considering  $f_p := f * \rho_p$ . Assume  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-decreasing and convex. Then  $f$  is continuous,  $f_p$  is well-defined,  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ , convex and  $f_p \rightarrow f$  pointwise. Moreover  $\sup_p |f_p|$  is bounded on every compact interval  $[-A, A] \subset \mathbb{R}$  ( $A > 0$ ), by

$\sup_{|y| \leq A, u \in \text{supp}(\rho)} |f(y - u)| < +\infty$ . As the random variables  $\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h), x \in [-A, A]$ , have values in a fixed compact, it follows by the dominated convergence theorem and result (2.20) that, for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}f(\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}f_j(\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}f_j(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)), \tag{2.21}$$

hence  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{E}f(\xi^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))$  is non-decreasing since we have previously shown that for all  $j$ ,  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{E}f_j(\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h))$  is non-decreasing. This completes the proof of (b). To establish convex ordering, we can restrict to Lipschitz convex functions owing to Lemma A.4. Assume  $f$  to be Lipschitz and convex. Then all the functions  $f_p$  defined as above are well-defined and uniformly Lipschitz since  $[f_p]_{Lip} \leq [f]_{Lip}$ . Still

using that  $\xi_p^h(x, \tilde{Z}^h)$  is a bounded random variable, we derive that (2.21) still holds true for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  owing to the dominated convergence theorem. This allows to transfer convex ordering. Thus result (c) is completely proved.  $\square$

We now consider the *truncated BDPP*, replacing the random noise  $Z$  by its truncated version  $\tilde{Z}^h$  in the *BDPP* (2.9). That is, we consider:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{v}_k^{(m)}(x, Q) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x) + \bar{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right], \\ \bar{v}_n^{(m)}(x, Q) = P_c(t_n, x, Q), \end{cases} \quad (2.22)$$

where for  $i < j \in \{0, \dots, mn - 1\}$  (still with  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$ ), we used the following notations:

$$\bar{P}_{i:j}^{(mn)} := \bar{P}_i^{(mn)} \circ \dots \circ \bar{P}_{j-1}^{(mn)} \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{P}_\ell^{(mn)}(f)(x) := \mathbb{E}f(\xi_\ell^{(mn)}(x, \tilde{Z}^h)) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq \ell \leq mn - 1. \quad (2.23)$$

The *truncated BDPP* (2.22) is well-defined and the proof is the same as that of the actual *BDPP* (1.7). The following proposition shows that the convexity propagates through this *truncated BDPP*.

**Proposition 2.3** (Convexity propagation: truncated BDPP). *Let  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$ . Under assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$  and if, in addition, assumptions of Proposition 2.1 hold true, then for any  $0 \leq k \leq n$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \bar{v}_k^{(m)}(x, Q) \quad \text{is convex.}$$

*Proof.* We proceed by backward induction on  $k$ . Owing to Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$ ,  $\bar{v}_n^{(m)}(\cdot, Q)$  is convex for any  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_n)$ . Let us assume that the proposition holds for  $k + 1$ . Let  $x_k, y_k \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . For any  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ , we have,

$$\bar{v}_k^{(m)}(\lambda x_k + (1 - \lambda)y_k, Q) = \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x) + \bar{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(\lambda x_k + (1 - \lambda)y_k) \right].$$

Since by the induction assumption,  $\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q)$  is convex for any  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_{k+1})$ , then using Proposition (c) and a straightforward induction one shows that

$$\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \bar{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \quad \text{is convex.}$$

The latter, combined with the convexity Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$  of the payoff function, yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}_k^{(m)}(\lambda x_k + (1 - \lambda)y_k, Q) &\leq \lambda \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, x_k) + \bar{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x_k) \right] \\ &\quad + (1 - \lambda) \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left[ \Psi_k(t_k, q, y_k) + \bar{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(y_k) \right] \\ &= \lambda \bar{v}_k^{(m)}(x_k, Q) + (1 - \lambda) \bar{v}_k^{(m)}(y_k, Q). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

We proved that, given the semi-convexity assumption on  $\sigma$ , the propagation of convexity through the *BDPP* holds when the involved random noise is truncated. The next step is to establish that this property holds even when using the actual random noise. This is stated in Proposition 2.8 and relies on two ingredients: (1) the convergence of the truncated Euler scheme towards the actual one. (2) the Lipschitz continuous property of the swing value function.

We still set the threshold  $s_h$  as in Proposition 2.1. For  $i \in \{0, \dots, mn\}$ , we consider the processes  $\left( \bar{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^{x, i} \right)_{i \leq \ell \leq mn}$  and  $\left( \tilde{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^{x, i} \right)_{i \leq \ell \leq mn}$  denoting the Euler scheme (still with step  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$ ) and its truncated version starting at  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  at time  $t_i^{(mn)}$  respectively. Then, we have the following convergence result.



**Proposition 2.4.** For all  $u \geq 1$  and  $i \leq \ell \in \{0, \dots, mn\}$  we have, for any compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in K} \left\| \tilde{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^{x,i} - \bar{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^{x,i} \right\|_u \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow +\infty} 0. \quad (2.24)$$

*Proof.* Let  $x \in K$  with  $K \subset \mathbb{R}$  being a compact set. Using the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [15], one may show that there exists a sequence  $(c_m)_{m \geq 1}$  (not depending on  $x$ ) such that:

$$\left\| \tilde{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^{x,i} - \bar{X}_{t_\ell^{(mn)}}^{x,i} \right\|_u \leq c_m(1 + |x|) \quad \text{with} \quad c_m \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow +\infty} 0. \quad (2.25)$$

The result also holds true when taking the supremum for  $x$  lying in the compact set  $K$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

To extend our result to the case using the true random noise, we also need to prove our second ingredient namely, the Lipschitz continuous property of the swing value function. This is the aim of the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.5.** Assume the following properties.

$(\mathcal{H}_4)$  : For all  $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $\Psi_k(t_k, q, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz continuous uniformly in  $q \in [0, q_{\max}]$ . Denote by  $[\Psi_k]_{Lip}$  the Lipschitz coefficient.

$(\mathcal{H}_5^c)$  : For  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$ ,  $P_c(t_n, \cdot, Q)$  is Lipschitz continuous uniformly in  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_n)$ . Denote by  $[P_{c,n}]$  its Lipschitz coefficient. Note that  $[P_{\text{firm},n}]_{Lip} = 0$ .

Then, for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , the swing value functions  $v_k^{(m)}(\cdot, Q)$  and  $\bar{v}_k^{(m)}(\cdot, Q)$  are Lipschitz continuous uniformly in  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$  with a Lipschitz coefficient  $[v_k^{(m)}]_{Lip}$  satisfying:

$$[v_k^{(m)}]_{Lip} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)} \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|v_k^{(m)}(x, Q) - v_k^{(m)}(y, Q)|}{|x - y|} \leq \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} C_{h,\beta,\sigma}^{mi} [\Psi_i]_{Lip} + C_{h,\beta,\sigma}^{mn} [P_{c,n}]_{Lip},$$

where  $C_{h,\beta,\sigma} := 1 + hC_{\beta,\sigma} := 1 + h\left([\beta]_{Lip} + \frac{[\sigma]_{Lip}^2}{2}\right)$ .

**Remark 2.6.** • Note that  $[v_k^{(m)}]_{Lip}$  is bounded uniformly in  $m$  by the constant  $e^{t_i^{(n)} C_{\beta,\sigma}}$  where  $t_i^{(n)} := \frac{Ti}{n}$  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ . Indeed, it suffices to notice that using the classic inequality  $1 + x \leq e^x$  and the fact that  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$ , one has for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ :

$$C_{h,\beta,\sigma}^{mi} \leq e^{mihC_{\beta,\sigma}} = e^{t_i^{(n)} C_{\beta,\sigma}}.$$

- Under Assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_4)$  and the Lipschitz property of  $\beta(t_\ell^{(mn)}, \cdot)$  and  $\sigma(t_\ell^{(mn)}, \cdot)$  (uniformly in  $t_\ell^{(mn)}$ ), one may also show that the value function given by (2.5) is Lipschitz continuous. Indeed, by a straightforward backward induction, one may notice that:

$$|v_k(x, Q) - v_k(y, Q)| \leq [\Psi_k]_{Lip} \cdot |x - y| + [v_{k+1}]_{Lip} \cdot \left\| X_{t_{k+1}}^{x,t_k} - X_{t_{k+1}}^{y,t_k} \right\|_2,$$

where  $X_{t_{k+1}}^{x,t_k}$  denotes the diffusion (2.2) at time  $t_{k+1}$  and starting at  $x$  at time  $t_k$ . The proof ends by noticing that it is classic background (see Theorem 7.10 in [27]) that the flow  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto X_{t_{k+1}}^{x,t_k}$  is Lipschitz continuous in  $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^2(\mathbb{P})$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.5.* We only prove the Lipschitz property of  $v_k^{(m)}(\cdot, Q)$  using a backward induction on  $k$ . That of  $\bar{v}_k^{(m)}(\cdot, Q)$  can be proved likewise.

Assumption  $(\mathcal{H}_5^c)$  implies that the result holds for  $k = n$ . Assume now that the result holds for  $k + 1$ . Then, it follows from triangle inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} |v_k^{(m)}(x, Q) - v_k^{(m)}(y, Q)| &\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} |\Psi_k(t_k, q, x) - \Psi_k(t_k, q, y)| \\ &\quad + \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(y) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

But note that, for any Lipschitz continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , one has for  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, mn - 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{P}_\ell^{(mn)}(f)(x) - \mathbb{P}_\ell^{(mn)}(f)(y)| \\ &\leq [f]_{Lip} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left| x - y + h(\beta(t_\ell^{(mn)}, x) - \beta(t_\ell^{(mn)}, y)) + \sqrt{h}(\sigma(t_\ell^{(mn)}, x) - \sigma(t_\ell^{(mn)}, y))Z \right| \\ &\leq [f]_{Lip} \cdot \left\| x - y + h(\beta(t_\ell^{(mn)}, x) - \beta(t_\ell^{(mn)}, y)) + \sqrt{h}(\sigma(t_\ell^{(mn)}, x) - \sigma(t_\ell^{(mn)}, y))Z \right\|_2 \\ &\leq [f]_{Lip} \cdot |x - y| \cdot \left( 1 + h^2[\beta]_{Lip}^2 + 2h[\beta]_{Lip} + h[\sigma]_{Lip}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq [f]_{Lip} \cdot |x - y| \cdot \underbrace{\left( 1 + h \left( [\beta]_{Lip} + \frac{[\sigma]_{Lip}^2}{2} \right) \right)}_{C_{h,\beta,\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last majoration is used for the sake of simpler notation. This proves that  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(f)(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous. Thus, by a straightforward induction, one shows that for any  $i < j \in \{0, \dots, mn - 1\}$ ,  $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{P}_{i:j}^{(mn)}(f)(x)$  is Lipschitz continuous and its Lipschitz coefficient satisfies:

$$[\mathbb{P}_{i:j}^{(mn)}(f)]_{Lip} \leq [f]_{Lip} \cdot C_{h,\beta,\sigma}^{j-i}.$$

Thus, we deduce that,

$$|v_k^{(m)}(x, Q) - v_k^{(m)}(y, Q)| \leq \left( [\Psi_k]_{Lip} + [v_{k+1}^{(m)}]_{Lip} \cdot C_{h,\beta,\sigma}^m \right) \cdot |x - y|$$

so that,

$$[v_k^{(m)}]_{Lip} \leq [\Psi_k]_{Lip} + [v_{k+1}^{(m)}]_{Lip} \cdot C_{h,\beta,\sigma}^m.$$

Iterating this inequality yields the desired result.  $\square$

We now have key components of our last step in the proof of the propagation of convexity under the semi-convexity assumption of the volatility function. This relies on the following two convergence results. For the remaining of this section, we consider the *discrete volume setting*. In other words, we assume that volume constraints are integers, and  $Q_{\max} - Q_{\min}$  is a multiple of  $q_{\max}$ . As highlighted in [5], this configuration ensures the existence of a bang-bang optimal consumption. This implies that, for any time step  $k$ , the set  $\mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$  reduces to a finite set of values.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $c \in \{firm, pen\}$  and consider Assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$ ,  $(\mathcal{H}_4)$ ,  $(\mathcal{H}_5^c)$  as well as the discrete volume setting. Then, for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ , one has*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in K} \left| \bar{v}_k^{(m)}(x, Q) - v_k^{(m)}(x, Q) \right| = 0.$$

*Proof.* We proceed by a backward induction on  $k$ . The result clearly holds true for  $k = n$ . Assume now it holds for  $k + 1$ . For any  $x \in K$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$ , using successively the classic inequality,  $|\sup_{i \in I} a_i - \sup_{i \in I} b_i| \leq \sup_{i \in I} |a_i - b_i|$ , and the triangle inequality, one has:

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{v}_k^{(m)}(x, Q) - v_k^{(m)}(x, Q)| &\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right| \\ &\quad + \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us deal with the r.h.s. sum term by term. We omit the supremum for  $q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)$  as it holds as a maximum in the *discrete volume setting*. Denote by  $\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{(mn)}$  the truncated Euler scheme at instant  $t_{k+1} = t_{(k+1)m}^{(mn)}$  and also denote by  $\bar{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}$ ,  $\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}$  the Euler scheme (with step  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$ ) and its truncation at time  $t_{k+1} = t_{(k+1)m}^{(mn)}$ , starting at time  $t_k = t_{km}^{(mn)}$  at point  $x$ . Then, for  $R \geq 1$ , it is straightforward that, for the first term, there exists a positive constant  $\kappa_{\beta, \sigma, k}^{(1)}$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{(mn)}, Q + q) | \tilde{X}_{t_k}^{(mn)} = x) - \mathbb{E}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{(mn)}, Q + q) | \tilde{X}_{t_k}^{(mn)} = x) \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q) - v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(0, R)} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left| \left( \bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}, Q + q) - v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}, Q + q) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}| \geq R\}} \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q) - v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(0, R)} + \kappa_{\beta, \sigma, k}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left( \left( 1 + |\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}| \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}| \geq R\}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we used the Lipschitz property of functions  $\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q)$ ,  $v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q)$  with their Lipschitz coefficients hidden in the positive constant  $\kappa_{\beta, \sigma, k}^{(1)}$ . Besides, note that for  $R \geq 1$ , using the Lipschitz property of  $\beta(t_\ell^{(mn)}, \cdot)$ ,  $\sigma(t_\ell^{(mn)}, \cdot)$  uniformly in  $t_\ell^{(mn)}$  and standard arguments, there exists a positive constant  $\kappa_{\beta, \sigma, k}^{(2)}$  such that:

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \left( 1 + |\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}| \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km}| \geq R\}} \right) \leq \frac{2}{R} \cdot \left\| \tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}^{(mn)}}^{x, km} \right\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\kappa_{\beta, \sigma, k}^{(2)}}{R} (1 + |x|^2).$$

Putting all together, for any  $R \geq 1$ , one has:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{x \in K} \left| \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q) - v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(0, R)} + \frac{\kappa_{\beta, \sigma, k}^{(1)} \kappa_{\beta, \sigma, k}^{(2)}}{R} \left( 1 + \sup_{x \in K} |x|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $K$  is compact set, first letting  $m \rightarrow +\infty$  and using the induction assumption and then letting  $R \rightarrow +\infty$  yields:

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in K, q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(\bar{v}_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q + q))(x) \right| = 0.$$

We now handle the second term. One has:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\tilde{X}_{t_{k+1}}^{(mn)}, Q+q) | \tilde{X}_{t_k}^{(mn)} = x) - \mathbb{E}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\overline{X}_{t_{k+1}}^{(mn)}, Q+q) | \overline{X}_{t_k}^{(mn)} = x) \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}v_{k+1}^{(m)}\left(\tilde{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km}\right) - \mathbb{E}v_{k+1}^{(m)}\left(\overline{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km}\right) \right| \\
&\leq [v_{k+1}^{(m)}]_{Lip} \cdot \left\| \tilde{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} - \overline{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} \right\|_1 \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow +\infty} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the convergence is uniform w.r.t.  $x$  lying in the compact set  $K$ , owing to Remark 2.6, Proposition 2.4 and Proposition 2.5. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.8** (Convexity propagation: dimension one). *Let  $c \in \{\text{firm}, \text{pen}\}$  and consider the discrete volume setting. Under Assumptions  $(\mathcal{H}_1^c)$ ,  $(\mathcal{H}_4)$ ,  $(\mathcal{H}_5^c)$  and if, in addition, assumptions of Proposition 2.1 hold true, then for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ ,  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$  and any compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}$*

$$K \ni x \mapsto v_k(x, Q) \quad \text{is convex.}$$

*Proof.* Since limits propagate convexity, and by Proposition 2.3 the function  $\overline{v}_k^{(m)}(\cdot, Q)$  is convex, then it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{x \in K} \left| v_k(x, Q) - \overline{v}_k^{(m)}(x, Q) \right| \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Hence by Proposition 2.7 and a straightforward application of the triangle inequality, it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{x \in K} \left| v_k(x, Q) - v_k^{(m)}(x, Q) \right| \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

Which we are going to prove using a backward induction on  $k$ . The result clearly holds true for  $k = n$ . Let us assume it holds for  $k+1$ . For any  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_c(t_k)$  and  $x \in K$ , using the classic inequality,  $\left| \sup_{i \in I} a_i - \sup_{i \in I} b_i \right| \leq$

$\sup_{i \in I} |a_i - b_i|$ , and then the triangle inequality, one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| v_k(x, Q) - v_k^{(m)}(x, Q) \right| &\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \mathbb{E}(v_{k+1}(X_{t_{k+1}}, Q+q) | X_{t_k} = x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \mathbb{E}(v_{k+1}(X_{t_{k+1}}, Q+q) | X_{t_k} = x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) \right| \\
&\quad + \sup_{q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

We then handle the two terms in the r.h.s. sum successively, omitting the supremum on  $q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)$  as it holds as a maximum in the *discrete volume setting*.

For the first term, one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E}(v_{k+1}(X_{t_{k+1}}, Q+q) | X_{t_k} = x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}\left(v_{k+1}\left(\overline{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km}, Q+q\right)\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(v_{k+1}\left(X_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km}, Q+q\right)\right) \right| \\
&\leq [v_{k+1}]_{Lip} \cdot \left\| \overline{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} - X_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} \right\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $X_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km}$ ,  $\overline{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km}$  denote the diffusion (2.2) and its Euler scheme (with step  $h = \frac{T}{mn}$ ) at time  $t_{k+1} = t_{(k+1)m}^{(mn)}$ , starting at time  $t_k = t_{km}^{(mn)}$  and at point  $x$ . It is classic background that the type of bounds like those established in (2.25) also holds for the error  $\left\| \overline{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} - X_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} \right\|_1$ . Thus, one has:

$$\sup_{x \in K} \left\| \overline{X}_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} - X_{t_{(k+1)m}}^{x,km} \right\|_1 \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Let us now deal with the second term. We apply the same scheme as in the proof of Proposition 2.7. We show that there exist positive constants  $\kappa_{\beta,\sigma,k}^{(1)}$ ,  $\kappa_{\beta,\sigma,k}^{(2)}$  such that for any  $R \geq 1$  one has:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in K} \left| \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(m)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) \right| \\ & \leq \left\| v_{k+1}(\cdot, Q+q) - v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q+q) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}(0,R)} + \frac{\kappa_{\beta,\sigma,k}^{(1)} \kappa_{\beta,\sigma,k}^{(2)}}{R} \left( 1 + \sup_{x \in K} |x|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

So that letting  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ , and then  $R \rightarrow +\infty$  and using the induction assumption yields:

$$\sup_{x \in K, q \in \mathbb{A}_c(t_k, Q)} \left| \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(mn)}(v_{k+1}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) - \mathbb{P}_{km:(k+1)m}^{(m)}(v_{k+1}^{(m)}(\cdot, Q+q))(x) \right| \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Numerical experiments

This section illustrates the main results of this paper, namely the convexity result (see Theorem 1.8) and the monotonicity result (see Theorem 1.12). To this end, we consider a 15-day swing contract with daily exercise rights and a strike price set at 20. The volume constraints configuration is given by parameters:  $q_{\min} = 0$ ,  $q_{\max} = 6$ ,  $Q_{\min} = 50$ , and  $Q_{\max} = 80$ . The swing physical space, representing the attainable cumulative consumption at each exercise date, is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The swing volume grid (*firm constraints*).

For the pricing, we used the Deep Neural Network (*DNN*) approach introduced in [22] and named *NN strat*, which has shown competitive performance compared to State-Of-The-Art methods. Our neural network architecture consists of two hidden layers, of 10 units each. The Rectified Linear Unit (*ReLU*) is used as activation function and a batch normalization is applied. We implement the *DNN* using the *PyTorch*

[19] toolbox and optimize it using the Preconditioned Stochastic Gradient Langevin Descent (PSGLD) method developed in [23]. To perform the valuation, we use a Monte Carlo simulation with a sample size of  $10^7$ . Here, only the spot price is considered, denoted  $S_t := F_{t,t}$ .

In what follows, we will represent swing prices as well as their sensitivities with respect to the forward price. The computation of sensitivities boils down to a computation of a derivative of a certain function which, in our case, is the swing price defined by a stochastic optimal control problem. In this case, as done in [22], we rely on the *envelope theorem*.

In the next two sections, we perform numerical illustrations that are built upon a log-normal forward diffusion model. More precisely, we consider a  $q$ -factor forward diffusion model whose dynamics is given by,

$$\frac{dF_{t,T}}{F_{t,T}} = \sum_{i=1}^q \tilde{\sigma}_i e^{-\alpha_i(T-t)} dW_t^i, \quad t \leq T, \quad (3.1)$$

where for all  $(W_t^i)_{t \geq 0}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq q$ , are correlated Brownian motion i.e.:

$$\langle dW^i, dW^j \rangle_t = \begin{cases} dt & \text{if } i = j, \\ \rho_{i,j} \cdot dt & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

In model (3.1), the spot price is given by a straightforward application of Itô's formula,

$$S_t = F_{0,t} \cdot \exp \left( \langle \tilde{\sigma}, X_t \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_t^2 \right),$$

where  $\tilde{\sigma} = (\tilde{\sigma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_q)^\top$ ,  $X_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^q)^\top$  and for all  $1 \leq i \leq q$ ,

$$X_t^i = \int_0^t e^{-\alpha_i(t-s)} dW_s^i \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_t^2 = \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2}{2\alpha_i} (1 - e^{-2\alpha_i t}) + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq q} \rho_{i,j} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_i \tilde{\sigma}_j}{\alpha_i + \alpha_j} (1 - e^{-(\alpha_i + \alpha_j)t}).$$

### 3.1 One factor model

We start by a one-factor log-normal model, that is  $q = 1$ . The dynamics (3.1) reads,

$$\frac{dF_{t,T}}{F_{t,T}} = \tilde{\sigma} e^{-\alpha(T-t)} dW_t, \quad t \leq T, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $W$  is a standard Brownian motion and,

$$S_t = F_{0,t} \cdot \exp \left( \tilde{\sigma} X_t - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_t^2 \right), \quad X_t = \int_0^t e^{-\alpha(t-s)} dW_s \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_t^2 = \frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{2\alpha} (1 - e^{-2\alpha t}). \quad (3.3)$$

The Euler-Maruyama scheme of the diffusion (3.2) writes,

$$F_{t_{k+1},T} = F_{t_k,T} + \sigma_{\tilde{\sigma}}(t_k, F_{t_k,T}) Z_{k+1} \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma_{\tilde{\sigma}}(t_k, x) = \tilde{\sigma} x \sqrt{\Delta t_k} e^{-\alpha(T-t_k)},$$

where  $\Delta t_k = t_{k+1} - t_k$  and  $(Z_k)_k$  are *i.i.d.* copies of  $Z \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ . Note that this model clearly meets our *ARCH* assumption (1.4). Besides  $\sigma_{\tilde{\sigma}}(t_k, \cdot)$  is affine (hence convex) and for  $0 < \tilde{\sigma}_1 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_2$ , we clearly have  $|\sigma_{\tilde{\sigma}_1}(t_k, x)| \leq |\sigma_{\tilde{\sigma}_2}(t_k, x)|$  meaning that  $\sigma_{\tilde{\sigma}_1}(t_k, x) \preceq \sigma_{\tilde{\sigma}_2}(t_k, x)$ . Hence assumptions for domination and convexity propagation hold true for this model. Results are illustrated in Figure 2 with  $\alpha = 0.4$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = 0.2$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}_2 = 0.7$ . We see that the swing price is increasing with the volatility parameter  $\tilde{\sigma}$  and the first partial derivative of the swing price (*delta*) is increasing; confirming the convexity.




Figure 2: Swing price and its delta in terms of initial forward price for different values of  $\tilde{\sigma}$ .

We then consider the *call* version of the payoff function defined in (1.16). That is,

$$\Psi_k(t_k, q, x_{0:k}) := q \cdot \left( f(t_k, x_k) - K \right)^+. \quad (3.4)$$

For this payoff function, the swing prices are depicted in 3 with  $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = 0.2, \tilde{\sigma}_2 = 0.4$ .




Figure 3: Swing price and its delta in terms of initial forward price for the call payoff (3.4).

Results presented in Figures 2 and 3 provide numerical evidence that the swing price is convex with respect to the forward price. Besides, it is also noteworthy that the convex shape of the swing price becomes more pronounced when the payoff exhibits a stronger convex shape as when we used the *call* payoff (3.4) (see Figure 3).

The same numerical illustrations are performed on the penalty setting using  $A = B = 0.2$  for the penalty function (see (0.10)). Results are depicted in Figure 4 with  $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = 0.3, \tilde{\sigma}_2 = 0.7$ .




Figure 4: Prices and forward delta in terms of initial forward price (swing with penalty). We considered the one factor model (3.2).

### 3.2 Multi-factor model

We finally consider a three factor model (i.e.,  $q = 3$ ) whose dynamics is given by,

$$\frac{dF_{t,T}}{F_{t,T}} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \tilde{\sigma}_i e^{-\alpha_i(T-t)} dW_t^i. \quad (3.5)$$

Here we set  $\alpha_i = \alpha = 0.8, \tilde{\sigma}_i = 0.7, \rho_{i,j} = \rho \in [-1, 1]$ . The Euler-Maruyama scheme of (3.5) is,

$$F_{t_{k+1},T} = F_{t_k,T} + \sigma_\rho(t_k, F_{t_k,T}) \cdot Z_{k+1},$$

where the matrix-valued function  $\sigma_\rho(t_k, \cdot)$  is given by,

$$\sigma_\rho(t_k, x) = \left( x \sqrt{\Delta t_k} \tilde{\sigma}_1 e^{-\alpha_1(T-t_k)}, \dots, x \sqrt{\Delta t_k} \tilde{\sigma}_q e^{-\alpha_q(T-t_k)} \right) \cdot L(\rho) \in \mathbb{M}_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}) \quad (3.6)$$

with  $L(\rho) = (L_{i,j}(\rho))_{1 \leq i,j \leq q}$  being the Cholesky decomposition of the correlation matrix  $\Gamma := (\rho_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq q}$  given by (assuming  $\rho > -\frac{1}{q-1}$ ),

$$\Gamma(\rho) = [\rho + (1 - \rho)\mathbf{1}_{i=j}]_{1 \leq i,j \leq q} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho & \cdots & \cdots & \rho \\ \rho & 1 & \ddots & & \rho \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 & \rho \\ \rho & \cdots & \cdots & \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}^+(q, \mathbb{R}) \quad (3.7)$$

and  $(Z_k)_k$  being *i.i.d.* copies of  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_3)$ . For this specific matrix  $\Gamma(\rho)$  (3.7), its Cholesky decomposition  $L(\rho)$  has an explicit form given by Proposition C.1. Besides owing to Proposition C.2, the matrix-valued function (3.6) meets the domination criterion when parameter  $\rho$  varies. That is, if  $\rho_1 \leq \rho_2$  then  $\sigma_{\rho_1}(t_k, x) \preceq \sigma_{\rho_2}(t_k, x)$ . It remains to discuss the  $\preceq$ -convexity of  $\sigma_\rho(t_k, \cdot)$ . It suffices to note that  $\sigma_\rho(t_k, \cdot)$  can be written as in Remark 1.6. Indeed, one has

$$\sigma_\rho(t_k, x) = A \cdot \underbrace{\text{diag} \left( x \cdot \sqrt{\Delta t_k}, \dots, x \cdot \sqrt{\Delta t_k} \right)}_{\in \mathbb{M}_{q,q}(\mathbb{R})}$$



with  $A := (\tilde{\sigma}_1 e^{-\alpha_1(T-t_k)}, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_q e^{-\alpha_q(T-t_k)}) \cdot L(\rho) \in \mathbb{M}_{1,q}(\mathbb{R})$ . Therefore, with the notations of Remark 1.6, it suffices to set  $O = I_q \in \mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R})$ . This shows that  $\sigma_\rho(t_k, \cdot)$  is  $\preceq$ -convex. Thus, by the domination criterion, the swing price in model (3.5) is increasing with the correlation parameter  $\rho$ . This claim is in line with what can be observed in the numerical illustrations in [22]. Results are shown in Figures 5 and 6 with  $\rho_1 = 0.1, \rho_2 = 0.4$ .




Figure 5: Swing price and its delta in terms of initial forward price for different correlation parameters  $\rho$ .




Figure 6: Swing price and its delta in terms of initial forward price for the call payoff (3.4).

We have studied domination criterion with respect to the correlation parameter  $\rho$ . However, one may also prove a domination result with respect to volatility parameters  $(\tilde{\sigma}_j)_j$ . Since the  $\preceq$ -convexity of  $\sigma_\rho(t_k, \cdot)$  has already been shown, it remains to prove the  $\preceq$ -monotonicity of the matrix-valued function  $\sigma_\rho(t_k, x)$  with respect to parameters  $(\tilde{\sigma}_j)_j$  (using the pointwise order). This holds owing to Proposition C.3. Indeed, keeping in mind equation (3.6) and setting,

$$A(\tilde{\sigma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_q) := \left( x\sqrt{\Delta t_k} \tilde{\sigma}_1 e^{-\alpha_1(T-t_k)}, \dots, x\sqrt{\Delta t_k} \tilde{\sigma}_q e^{-\alpha_q(T-t_k)} \right) \in \mathbb{M}_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}),$$

one may deduce, owing to Proposition C.3, that if  $\tilde{\sigma}_j \leq \tilde{\sigma}'_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq q$  then  $A(\tilde{\sigma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_q) \preceq A(\tilde{\sigma}'_1, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}'_q)$ . Results are illustrated in Figure 7. We used  $\rho = 0.3$ .




Figure 7: Swing price (left) and swing price with call payoff (right) in terms of initial forward price.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Benjamin Jourdain, Vincent Lemaire, and Asma Meziou for fruitful discussions. The PhD thesis of the second author is funded by Engie Global Markets. The first author benefited from the support of the “Chaire Risques Financiers”, Fondation du Risque.

## References

- [1] Aurélien Alfonsi, Jacopo Corbetta, and Benjamin Jourdain. Sampling of probability measures in the convex order by wasserstein projection. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 56(3):1706 – 1729, 2020.
- [2] Vlad Bally and Gilles Pagès. Error analysis of the optimal quantization algorithm for obstacle problems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 106:1–40, 2003.
- [3] Vlad Bally, Gilles Pagès, and Jacques Printems. A quantization tree method for pricing and hedging multidimensional american options. *Mathematical Finance*, 15, 2005.
- [4] Olivier Bardou, Sandrine Bouthemy, and Gilles Pagès. Optimal quantization for the pricing of swing options. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 16:183–217, 2009.
- [5] Olivier Bardou, Sandrine Bouthemy, and Gilles Pagès. When are swing options bang-bang? *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance (IJTAF)*, 13:867–899, 09 2010.
- [6] Christophe Barrera-Esteve, Florent Bergeret, Charles Dossal, Emmanuel Gobet, Asma Meziou, Rémi Munos, and Damien Reboul-Salze. Numerical methods for the pricing of swing options: A stochastic control approach. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 8:517–540, 2006.
- [7] Jan Bergenthum and Ludger Rüschendorf. Comparison results for path-dependent options. *Statistics & Decisions*, 26(1):53–72, 2008.
- [8] Petter Bjerksund, Heine Rasmussen, and Gunnar Stensland. *Valuation and Risk Management in the Norwegian Electricity Market*, pages 167–185. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [9] Petter Bjerksund, Gunnar Stensland, and Frank Vagstad. Gas storage valuation: Price modelling v. optimization methods. *The Energy Journal*, 32(1):203–227, 2011.

- [10] Christian Burgert and Ludger Rüschendorf. Consistent risk measures for portfolio vectors. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 38(2):289–297, 2006.
- [11] Nicole Bäuerle and Alfred Müller. Stochastic orders and risk measures: Consistency and bounds. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 38(1):132–148, 2006.
- [12] A. P. Caverhill and Webber N. *Options: recent advances in theory and practice*, chapter American options: theory and practice. Manchester University P., 1990.
- [13] Arjun Gupta and Mohammad Aziz. Convex ordering of random variables and its applications in econometrics and actuarial science. *European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics [electronic only]*, 3, 01 2010.
- [14] Francis Hirsch, Christophe Profeta, Bernard Roynette, and Marc Yor. *Some Examples of Peacocks*, pages 1–86. Springer Milan, Milano, 2011.
- [15] Benjamin Jourdain and Gilles Pagès. Convex ordering of solutions to one-dimensional sdes. *ArXiv*, 2312.09779, 2023.
- [16] Benjamin Jourdain and Gilles Pagès. Convex Order, Quantization and Monotone Approximations of ARCH Models. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 35(4):2480–2517, December 2022.
- [17] Benjamin Jourdain and Gilles Pagès. Convex ordering for stochastic Volterra equations and their euler schemes. *To appear in Finance and Stochastics*, 2022.
- [18] Hans G. Kellerer. Markov-komposition und eine anwendung auf martingale. *Mathematische Annalen*, 198:99–122, 1972.
- [19] Nikhil Ketkar. *Introduction to PyTorch*, pages 195–208. Apress, Berkeley, CA, 2017.
- [20] Lamberton. Brownian optimal stopping and random walks. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 45:283–324, 2002.
- [21] Nina Lange. *Correlation in Energy Markets*. Frederiksberg: Copenhagen Business School (CBS), 2017.
- [22] Vincent Lemaire, Gilles Pagès, and Christian Yeo. Swing contract pricing: With and without neural networks. *Frontiers of Mathematical Finance*, 3(2):270–303, 2024.
- [23] Chunyuan Li, Changyou Chen, David Edwin Carlson, and Lawrence Carin. Preconditioned stochastic gradient langevin dynamics for deep neural networks. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [24] Yating Liu and Gilles Pagès. Functional convex order for the scaled McKean–Vlasov processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(6A):4491–4527, 2023.
- [25] Yating Liu and Gilles Pagès. Monotone convex order for the McKean–Vlasov processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 152:312–338, 2022.
- [26] Gilles Pagès. *Convex Order for Path-Dependent Derivatives: A Dynamic Programming Approach*, pages 33–96. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.
- [27] Gilles Pagès. *Numerical Probability: An Introduction with Applications to Finance*, chapter 7, pages 271–361. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018.
- [28] Tommaso Pellegrino and Piergiacomo Sabino. On the use of the moment-matching technique for pricing and hedging multi-asset spread options. *Energy Economics*, 45:172–185, 2014.

- [29] R Rockafellar, Stan Uryasev, and Michael Zabarankin. Deviation measures in risk analysis and optimization. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2002.
- [30] R.Tyrrell Rockafellar and Stanislav Uryasev. Conditional value-at-risk for general loss distributions. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 26(7):1443–1471, 2002.

## A Some useful results

**Lemma A.1** (Consistency [1]). *Expectations in (0.1) are always well-defined (in  $(-\infty, +\infty]$ ). Indeed, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , since  $f$  is convex, we have*

$$f(x) \geq f(0) + \langle \nabla_s f(0), x \rangle,$$

where  $\nabla_s f(0)$  denotes a subgradient of  $f$  at 0. Then applying the function  $x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto x^- := \max(-x, 0)$  on both sides of the last inequality yields,

$$f^-(x) \leq (f(0) + \langle \nabla_s f(0), x \rangle)^- \leq |f(0) + \langle \nabla_s f(0), x \rangle| \leq |f(0)| + |\langle \nabla_s f(0), x \rangle| \leq |f(0)| + |\nabla_s f(0)| \cdot |x|,$$

where we successively used triangle inequality and then Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Thus for every  $U \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{R}^d}^1(\mathbb{P})$  we have,

$$\mathbb{E}f^-(U) \leq |f(0)| + |\nabla_s f(0)| \cdot \mathbb{E}|U| < +\infty.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}f(U) = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}f^+(U)}_{\in[0,+\infty]} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}f^-(U)}_{\in[0,+\infty]} \in (-\infty, +\infty],$$

where  $x^+ := \max(x, 0)$ .

**Lemma A.2** (Stein lemma). *Suppose  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ . Then consider a  $\mathcal{C}^1$  function  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with at most exponential growth i.e., there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that  $|g(z)| \leq Ce^{|z|}$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}(g(Z)(Z - \mu)) = \sigma^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}g'(Z).$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may assume that  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  since the case where  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$  will then be straightforward by setting  $Z' = \frac{Z - \mu}{\sigma}$ . Using integration by parts, we get,

$$\mathbb{E}(Zg(Z)) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} zg(z) \cdot \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dz = \left[ -g(z) \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right]_{z=-\infty}^{z=+\infty} + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g'(z) \cdot \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dz.$$

Owing to the exponential growth assumption, the first term in the right hand side sum is equal to 0. So that,

$$\mathbb{E}(Zg(Z)) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g'(z) \cdot \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dz = \mathbb{E}g'(Z).$$

□

**Lemma A.3** (See [17]). *For any convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  there exists a sequence  $(f_n)_n$  of Lipschitz convex functions such that  $f_n \uparrow f$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function and consider the inf-convolution,

$$f_n(x) := \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} (f(y) + n|x - y|), \quad n \geq 1.$$

Then it is straightforward that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$f_n(x) \leq f_{n+1}(x) \leq f(x). \tag{A.1}$$

Moreover, since  $f$  is convex, one has for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) + n|y - x| &\geq f(x) + \langle \nabla_s f(x), y - x \rangle + n|x - y| \\ &\geq f(x) + (n - |\nabla_s f(x)|)|x - y| \end{aligned}$$

so that for all  $n \geq |\nabla_s f(x)|$ , one has  $f_n(x) \geq f(x)$ . In the second last line, we used Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Thus combining the latter with Equation (A.1) yields for all  $n \geq |\nabla_s f(x)|$ ,  $f_n(x) = f(x)$  so that  $f_n \uparrow f$ . The convexity of functions  $f_n$  is straightforward.  $\square$

**Lemma A.4** (Characterization of convex ordering [17]). *In Definition 0.1, other characterizations of convex ordering allow to restrict proofs to Lipschitz convex functions. Indeed, it suffices to consider the inf-convolution of the convex function  $f$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  as follows,*

$$f_n(x) := \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} (f(y) + n|x - y|), \quad n \geq 1.$$

*Then, one may show (see Lemma A.3) that  $f_n$  is a convex function and  $f_n \uparrow f$  pointwise. Thus it suffices to check inequality (0.1) for Lipschitz convex functions and obtain the same inequality for convex function as a straightforward application of monotone convergence theorem.*

**Lemma A.5** (Proof of Remark 1.6). *Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , set*

$$O_{\alpha, x} = O^\top \cdot \text{diag}(\overline{\text{sgn}}(\lambda_1(x)), \dots, \overline{\text{sgn}}(\lambda_q(x))).$$

*Note that, for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ , matrix  $O_{\alpha, x}$ ,  $O_{\alpha, y}$  thus defined are orthogonal as a product of two orthogonal matrix. Then, by simple algebra, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} &(\alpha\sigma(x)O_{\alpha, x} + (1 - \alpha)\sigma(y)O_{\alpha, y})(\alpha\sigma(x)O_{\alpha, x} + (1 - \alpha)\sigma(y)O_{\alpha, y})^\top - \sigma\sigma^\top(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \\ &= A \left[ \tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y) - D(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y)^2 \right] A^\top, \end{aligned}$$

*where the diagonal matrix  $\tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y) \in \mathbb{M}_{q, q}(\mathbb{R})$  is given by,*

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y) := \alpha^2 D^2(x) + \alpha(1 - \alpha) D(x) O O_{\alpha, x} O_{\alpha, y}^\top O^\top D(y) + \alpha(1 - \alpha) D(y) O O_{\alpha, y} O_{\alpha, x}^\top O^\top D(x) + (1 - \alpha)^2 D^2(y).$$

*But, using simple algebra and the definition of matrix  $O_{\alpha, x}$ ,  $O_{\alpha, y}$ , one has*

$$D(x) O O_{\alpha, x} O_{\alpha, y}^\top O^\top D(y) = \overline{D}(x) \cdot \overline{D}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad D(y) O O_{\alpha, y} O_{\alpha, x}^\top O^\top D(x) = \overline{D}(x) \cdot \overline{D}(y)$$

*with*

$$\overline{D}(x) := \text{diag}(|\lambda_1(x)|, \dots, |\lambda_q(x)|).$$

*Thus the diagonal matrix  $\tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y)$  reads,*

$$\tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y) = \alpha^2 D^2(x) + 2\alpha(1 - \alpha) \overline{D}(x) \cdot \overline{D}(y) + (1 - \alpha)^2 D^2(y)$$

*and the diagonal matrix  $\tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y) - D(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y)^2$  has non-negative diagonal entries owing to the convexity of all  $|\lambda_i|$ . This prove that  $\tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y) - D(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y)^2 \in \mathcal{S}^+(d, \mathbb{R})$  and as a straightforward consequence that  $A \left[ \tilde{D}_\alpha(x, y) - D(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y)^2 \right] A^\top \in \mathcal{S}^+(d, \mathbb{R})$ . This completes the proof.*

## B Background on convex ordering (Proofs)

*Proof of Proposition 1.1.* We only prove (B). First notice that if  $U = \mathbb{E}(V|U)$  then one has for every convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by applying (conditional) Jensen's inequality and then the law of iterated expectations, one has

$$\mathbb{E}f(U) = \mathbb{E}(f(\mathbb{E}(V|U))) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(f(V)|U)) = \mathbb{E}f(V)$$

so that  $U \preceq_{cvx} V$ . Besides, let  $Z_1, Z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_q)$  be independent random vectors. We define

$$U = AZ_1 \quad \text{and} \quad V = U + (BB^\top - AA^\top)^{1/2}Z_2,$$

where for some  $d \times d$  real matrix  $M \in \mathcal{S}^+(d, \mathbb{R})$ , the matrix  $M^{1/2}$  is defined and satisfy  $M^{1/2} \cdot (M^{1/2})^\top = M$ . We have  $V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, AA^\top + ((BB^\top - AA^\top)^{1/2})^2) = \mathcal{N}(0, BB^\top)$  and the result follows by noticing that  $U = \mathbb{E}(V|U)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 1.7.* i. For any  $O \in \mathcal{O}(q, \mathbb{R})$ , since  $Z$  has a radial distribution,  $Z \stackrel{\mathcal{L}}{\sim} OZ$ , so that

$$\mathcal{T}f(x, AO) = \mathbb{E}f(x + AOZ) = \mathbb{E}f(x + AZ) = \mathcal{T}f(x, A).$$

ii. For any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , the convexity of  $f$  yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}f(\lambda(x, A) + (1 - \lambda)(y, B)) &= \mathbb{E}f(\lambda(x + AZ) + (1 - \lambda)(y + BZ)) \\ &\leq \lambda \mathbb{E}f(x + AZ) + (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}f(y + BZ) \\ &= \lambda \mathcal{T}f(x, A) + (1 - \lambda) \mathcal{T}f(y, B). \end{aligned}$$

iii. Note that if  $A \preceq B$  then Proposition 1.3 implies  $AZ \preceq_{cvx} BZ$ . Thus using the convexity of  $f(x + \cdot)$  (owing to the convexity of  $f$ ), one has

$$\mathcal{T}f(x, A) = \mathbb{E}f(x + AZ) \leq \mathbb{E}f(x + BZ) \leq \mathcal{T}f(x, B).$$

$\square$

## C Some results on matrix $\Gamma$

We focus on the correlation matrix  $\Gamma$  (3.7).

**Proposition C.1** (Explicit Cholesky decomposition). *Consider the matrix  $\Gamma$  defined in (3.7) with  $\rho \in (-\frac{1}{q-1}, 1)$  (so that  $\Gamma$  is a definite positive matrix.). Then the Cholesky decomposition of  $\Gamma$  is given by,*

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \ell_1 & d_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \ell_1 & \ell_2 & d_3 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \\ \ell_1 & \ell_2 & \ell_3 & \cdots & d_q \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{M}_{q,q}(\mathbb{R}),$$

where  $d_1 = 1, \ell_1 = \rho$  and for any  $j \geq 2$ ,

$$d_j = \sqrt{d_{j-1}^2 - \ell_{j-1}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_j = \frac{\rho - 1}{d_j} + d_j.$$

*Proof.* We proceed by an induction on  $q$ . It is straightforward that the result holds for  $q = 2$ . Assume it holds for some  $q$ . For convenience we use  $\Gamma_q$  instead of  $\Gamma$  to specify that  $\Gamma$  lies in  $\mathbb{M}_{q,q}(\mathbb{R})$ . By the induction assumption and using block partition of  $\Gamma_q$ , we have,

$$\Gamma_q = \begin{pmatrix} L_{q-1} & 0 \\ v_q & d_q \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} L_{q-1}^\top & v_q^\top \\ 0 & d_q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} L_{q-1} \cdot L_{q-1}^\top & L_{q-1} \cdot v_q^\top \\ v_q \cdot L_{q-1}^\top & v_q \cdot v_q^\top + d_q^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $v_q = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{q-1})$ . Then equating the bottom right element of these two matrices gives,

$$v_q \cdot v_q^\top + d_q^2 = 1. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Using (C.1) which implies  $v_q \cdot v_q^\top = 1 - d_q^2$  and then identifying the off-diagonal elements in the final column yields, for  $1 \leq i < q$ ,  $\rho = [L_{q-1} \cdot v_q^\top]_i$  so that,

$$L_{q-1} \cdot v_q^\top = (\rho, \dots, \rho). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Coming back to our purpose which is to show that,

$$\Gamma_{q+1} = \begin{pmatrix} L_q \cdot L_q^\top & L_q \cdot v_{q+1}^\top \\ v_{q+1} \cdot L_q^\top & v_{q+1} \cdot v_{q+1}^\top + d_{q+1}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It suffices to prove that  $L_q \cdot v_{q+1}^\top = (\rho, \dots, \rho)$  and  $v_{q+1} \cdot v_{q+1}^\top + d_{q+1}^2 = 1$ . But,

$$L_q \cdot v_{q+1}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} L_{q-1} & 0 \\ v_q & d_q \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} v_q^\top \\ \ell_q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} L_{q-1} \cdot v_q^\top \\ v_q \cdot v_q^\top + d_q \cdot \ell_q \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, it follows from (C.1) that  $v_q \cdot v_q^\top + d_q \cdot \ell_q = 1 - d_q^2 + d_q \cdot (\frac{\rho-1}{d_q} + d_q) = \rho$ . Combined with (C.2) implies that  $L_q \cdot v_{q+1}^\top = (\rho, \dots, \rho)$ . Finally, it follows from the block partition of  $v_{q+1}$  and equation (C.1),

$$v_{q+1} \cdot v_{q+1}^\top + d_{q+1}^2 = v_q \cdot v_q^\top + \ell_q^2 + d_{q+1}^2 = 1 - d_q^2 + \ell_q^2 + d_{q+1}^2 - \ell_q^2 = 1.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition C.2** ( $\preceq$ -monotony in  $\rho$ ). *Let  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in (-\frac{1}{q-1}, 1)$  such that  $\rho_1 \leq \rho_2$ . For any  $p \in \{1, 2\}$ , consider the matrix-valued field,*

$$\sigma_{\rho_p}(x) := (\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_q(x)) \cdot L(\rho_p) \in \mathbb{M}_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}),$$

for some non-negative (real) functions  $\lambda_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq q$ ) and where  $L(\rho_p)$  denotes the Cholesky decomposition of the correlation matrix  $\Gamma(\rho_p)$  i.e., the matrix  $\Gamma$  in (3.7) associated with the correlation parameter  $\rho_p$ . Then we have,

$$\sigma_{\rho_1}(x) \preceq \sigma_{\rho_2}(x).$$

*Proof.* Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\rho_p} \sigma_{\rho_p}^\top(x) &= (\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_q(x)) \cdot \Gamma(\rho_p) \cdot (\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_q(x))^\top \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q \Gamma_{i,j}(\rho_p) \lambda_i(x) \lambda_j(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \lambda_i(x)^2 + \rho_p \cdot \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq q} \lambda_i(x) \lambda_j(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since  $\rho_1 \leq \rho_2$  and  $\lambda_i(x)$  are non-negative, then  $\sigma_{\rho_1} \sigma_{\rho_1}^\top(x) \leq \sigma_{\rho_2} \sigma_{\rho_2}^\top(x)$  so that  $\sigma_{\rho_1}(\cdot) \preceq \sigma_{\rho_2}(\cdot)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition C.3.** Let  $A, B \in \mathbb{M}_{1,q}(\mathbb{R})$ . Consider the correlation matrix  $\Gamma$  in (3.7) and denote by  $L$  its Cholesky decomposition. We have the following results.

(a) If,

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q (B_{1,i}B_{1,j} - A_{1,i}A_{1,j}) \cdot \Gamma_{i,j} \geq 0, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

then, we have  $AL \preceq BL$ .

(b) In particular, if  $\rho \geq 0$ , then  $|A|^2 \leq |B|^2 \implies AL \preceq BL$ .

*Proof.* (a) Since  $LL^\top = \Gamma$ , we have,

$$(BL)(BL)^\top - (AL)(AL)^\top = B\Gamma B^\top - A\Gamma A^\top = \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q (B_{1,i}B_{1,j} - A_{1,i}A_{1,j}) \cdot \Gamma_{i,j}.$$

Thus condition (C.3) implies that  $0 \leq A\Gamma A^\top \leq B\Gamma B^\top$  which yields  $AL \preceq BL$ .

(b) Assume that  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ . Using the definition of the correlation matrix  $\Gamma$ , one has:

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q (B_{1,i}B_{1,j} - A_{1,i}A_{1,j}) \cdot \Gamma_{i,j} = \rho \left( \sum_{i=1}^q B_{1,i} - A_{1,i} \right)^2 + (1 - \rho) \sum_{i=1}^q B_{1,i}^2 - A_{1,i}^2$$

which is non negative if  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  and  $|A|^2 \leq |B|^2$ . This completes the proof. □