

From entropic transport to martingale transport, and applications to model calibration

Jean-David Benamou¹, Guillaume Chazareix^{1,2}, and Grégoire Loeper²

¹INRIA Paris

²BNP Paribas Global Markets

December 3, 2024

Abstract

We propose a discrete time formulation of the semi-martingale optimal transport problem based on multi-marginal entropic transport. This approach offers a new way to formulate and solve numerically the calibration problem proposed by [17], using a multi-marginal extension of Sinkhorn algorithm as in [6, 10, 7]. When the time step goes to zero we recover, as detailed in the companion paper [8], a continuous semi-martingale process, solution to a semi-martingale optimal transport problem, with a cost function involving the so-called “specific entropy”, introduced in [13], see also [12] and [2].

1 Introduction

Applications of Semi Martingale Optimal Transport (SMOT) in finance have been the object of several recent studies ([24], [17], [18] ...). This framework is particularly well adapted to the problem of model calibration: Find a diffusion model that is compatible with observed option prices. SMOT is the stochastic version of Dynamic Optimal Transport (DOT), that was introduced by [5], as a generalization of static OT where the mass is transported by a time dependent flow minimizing the kinetic energy. While the theoretical aspects of these problems are now well understood, the numerical implementation remains challenging.

In the meantime, a stochastic relaxation of static optimal transport, known as *Entropic* Optimal Transport (EOT), has shown to be solvable efficiently, by the so-called *Sinkhorn* algorithm (see [22] for a review). Interestingly, while there is equivalence between the static OT problem and its dynamic version, the Entropic regularisation of OT can also be seen either as a static problem, or as variant of the DOT adding a constant volatility diffusion to the governing model, this dynamic problem is known as the Schrödinger problem, see [19].

Consider processes described by the SDE with drift μ and volatility σ

$$dX_t = \mu_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t, \quad X_0 \sim \nu_0,$$

where W_t is the Wiener process and ν_0 the initial law of X (typically $X_{0\#}\mathbb{P} = \delta_{x_0}$). Formally, the above SDE induces a probability \mathbb{P} on the space of continuous paths. Reciprocally, see section 2, μ and σ can be interpreted as characteristics coefficients depending on \mathbb{P} . In this setting, all problems (DOT, SMOT and EOT) are seen as a variant of :

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P}} \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P}) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T F(t, X_t, \mu_t(X_t), \sigma_t(X_t)^2) dt \right] + M_0(\mathbb{P}_0) \quad (1)$$

The cost function F may describe modelling, calibration or observations constraints or combinations of these, and M_0 enforces the ν_0 initial marginal constraint.

- Classical DOT [5] corresponds to the particular case $F = |\mu|^2$ if $\sigma \equiv 0$, $X_{t_0\#}\mathbb{P} = \rho_0$ and $X_{T\#}\mathbb{P} = \rho_T$, $+\infty$ otherwise. It corresponds to the minimization of the kinetic energy under initial and terminal conditions on the laws of $X_{t=0}$ and $X_{t=T}$ denoted ρ_0 and ρ_T .
- EOT [19] is the same as DOT except for a prescribed constant volatility $\sigma \equiv \bar{\sigma}$. It is also one of the formulations of the *Schrödinger's problem*, i.e. minimizing the relative entropy (aka Kullback Leibler divergence) of \mathbb{P} : $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}|W_{\bar{\sigma}})$, with respect to the Wiener measure $W_{\bar{\sigma}}$ (with a given constant volatility $\bar{\sigma}$) Classical EOT in its static formulation can be solved efficiently by the Sinkhorn's algorithm [11] [23] [9].
- SMOT will handle general forms of F , as long as it is convex with respect to (μ, σ^2) .
- Martingale Optimal Transport (see [3] and the references therein) implies a $\mu \equiv 0$ constraint, a pure diffusion model. For the classical martingale constrained DOT problem, feasibility requires that ρ_0 and ρ_T to be in convex order. In this paper we use a soft version of this constraint $F = C\|\mu\|^2$ with $C \gg 1$. We therefore try to achieve a mass transport governed preferably by the volatility and not the drift.
- Price calibration adds a set of discrete constraints described by $(\tau_i, c_i, G_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ where for each i the triplet (τ_i, c_i, G_i) is the maturity, the price and the payoff function of an observed derivative price on the market. In this paper penalize the cost with $C_k(X) = \lambda \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \|\mathbb{E}[G_i(X_{\tau_i})] - c_i\|^2$ ($\lambda \gg 1$) (see next section).

A general approach to DOT, EOT and their generalisations (see [4] for a review) is a time discretization that leads to a Multi-Marginal OT problem. In this setting the minimization is performed over the law \mathbb{P}^h (h is the time step) of a vector-valued random variable whose marginals represent densities at each time step. In this paper, we use this time discretization method and an entropic regularization to solve problem (1): We minimize the sum of a discretized form of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P})$ in (1), $\mathcal{F}_h(\mathbb{P}^h)$. We use in particular the natural discrete versions of μ and σ (see section 3.2) and the discrete time relative entropy regularization $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h|W_{\bar{\sigma}}^h)$.

The drawback of minimising an energy in the form $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}|W_{\bar{\sigma}})$ is that by essence the minimizer is constrained at $\sigma = \bar{\sigma}$ and cannot satisfy constraints on μ (for instance $\mu \equiv 0$ or $\mu = r$, the interest rate) familiar in finance, since μ is precisely the only degree of freedom used to comply with the distribution constraints. We propose to overcome this issue by considering a proper scaling of the discrete relative entropy and its convergence property : if \mathbb{P}^h a sequence of Markov chains converging to the law of a diffusion \mathbb{P} with drift μ and volatility σ then

$$\lim_{h \searrow 0} h \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h|W_{\bar{\sigma}}^h) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2} - 1 - \log \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2} dt \right] =: \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{P}|W_{\bar{\sigma}}), \quad (2)$$

The "specific relative entropy" \mathcal{S} defined above has been introduced in [13] see also [12] [2].

It is shown in [8] that minimizers of time discrete problem

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P}^h} \mathcal{F}_h(\mathbb{P}^h) + h \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h|W_{\bar{\sigma}}^h) + M_0(\mathbb{P}_0^h) \quad (3)$$

approximate in the limit $h \searrow 0$ a diffusion process \mathbb{P} minimizing

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P}} \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P}) + \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{P}|W_{\bar{\sigma}}). \quad (4)$$

For $h > 0$ the minimizer \mathbb{P}^h is a solutions of a Multi-Marginal EOT problem, and a discrete Markov chain that can be used for simulations. The interest of this approach is not only theoretical. Classical

methods to solve (1) involve maximizing the dual problem through gradient ascent or primal-dual approaches. These methods imply solving a fully non-linear Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation at each iteration ([5], [21], [16]). Our approach by Multi-Marginal Sinkhorn's algorithm, extending [6] and [7], computes an equivalent time discrete solution through the maximisation of a strictly concave variational problem.

This paper describes the dual formulation of the problem in the context of local volatility calibration, the associated Sinkhorn algorithm and its practical implementation, with numerical examples. A numerical study as $h \searrow 0$ is available in [8].

2 Martingale Optimal Transport for model calibration

The continuous formulation of (Semi-)Martingale Optimal Transport was introduced in [24], and extended for multiple calibration applications as presented in the survey [17]. Let $\Omega = C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, $T > 0$ be the set of continuous paths, and \mathcal{P} the set (or a convex subset of) probability measures on Ω .

Following [24], we formulate the problem as a minimization problem on \mathcal{P} , we restrain our search to the set $\mathcal{P}_s^0 \subset \mathcal{P}$ such that, for each $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^0$, $X \in \Omega$ is an $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ -semimartingale on $[0, 1]$ given by

$$X_t = X_0 + A_t^{\mathbb{P}} + M_t^{\mathbb{P}}, \quad \langle X \rangle_t = \langle M_t^{\mathbb{P}} \rangle = B_t^{\mathbb{P}}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

where $M^{\mathbb{P}}$ is an $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ -martingale on $[0, 1]$ and $(A^{\mathbb{P}}, B^{\mathbb{P}})$ is \mathcal{F} -adapted and \mathbb{P} -a.s. absolutely continuous with respect to time. In particular, \mathbb{P} is said to have characteristics $(\mu, \sigma^2)(\mathbb{P})$, which are defined in the following way,

$$\mu = \frac{dA_t^{\mathbb{P}}}{dt}, \quad \sigma_t^2 = \frac{dB_t^{\mathbb{P}}}{dt},$$

Note that (μ, σ^2) is \mathcal{F} -adapted and determined up to $d\mathbb{P} \times dt$, almost everywhere. We now let $F(t, x, a, b)$ be convex with respect to (a, b) for every (t, x) , and seek for

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \int_0^T F(t, X_t, \mu_t, \sigma_t^2) dt,$$

An example of modelling function F is to enforce a Martingale constraint on X through

$$F(\mu) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mu = 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

or its soft version ($\lambda \gg 1$):

$$F(\mu) = \lambda \|\mu\|^2$$

At this stage, the processes μ, σ are very general and can be generally path-dependent, however, as showed in [15], they can be chosen as local processes, i.e. functions of (t, X_t) only: indeed, for any choice of μ, σ , there exists a local version $\mu(t, x), \sigma(t, x)$ that preserves the constraints (i.e. option prices) and that can only reduce the cost (8). The minimization problem can therefore be formally reduced to X_t solutions of the stochastic differential equation:

$$dX_t = \mu_t(X_t) dt + \sigma_t(X_t) dB_t, \tag{5}$$

where B_t is a standard Brownian motion.

The calibration problem adds a set of discrete constraints indexed by $i \in \mathcal{I} := \{1, \dots, N_c\}$ described by $(\tau_i, c_i, G_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ where for each i the triplet (τ_i, c_i, G_i) is the maturity, the price and the payoff function of an observed derivative price on the market.

We will seek for an element $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[G_i(X_{\tau_i})] = c_i. \tag{6}$$

As an example, calibrating a set of call options at a fixed maturity t would lead to $G_i(x) = (x - K_i)^+$, where K_i is the strike of the i -th option, and $\tau_i = t$ for all i . Moreover, we assume that there is a set of listed maturities $\{\tau_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$. Because we will use $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^{N_T}$ a time discretisation of $[0, T]$ we assume for simplifications that the maturities take values in this discrete set. Thus the set of constraints \mathcal{I} can be partitioned as $\mathcal{I} = \bigcup_k \mathcal{I}_k$, $\mathcal{I}_k := \{i \in \mathcal{I}, \tau_i = t_k\}$, where t_k is the k -th distinct maturity. By convention we set $\mathcal{I}_k = \emptyset$ if there are no constraints at time t_k . To take these constraints in account in the the minimisation problem, we will use for all k , the costs:

$$C_k(\{g_i\}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g_i = c_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_k \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

or its mollified version ($\lambda \gg 1$):

$$C_k(\{g_i\}) = \lambda \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \|g_i - c_i\|^2. \quad (7)$$

Using these notations, the calibration problem becomes:

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T F(t, X_t, \mu_t, \sigma_t^2) dt \right] + \sum_{k=0}^{N_K-1} C_k(\{\mathbb{E}[G_i(X_{\tau_i})]\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}) + M_0(X_{0\#} \mathbb{P}) \quad (8)$$

Where $M_0 := \delta_{\nu_0}$ enforces the initial distribution of prices ν_0 .

The cost function can also be used to constrain the model volatility and/or its regularity. We might want for instance σ to be close to a prescribed guess $\bar{\sigma}$, which can be enforced by adding to F [20]

$$G = (\sigma - \bar{\sigma})^2$$

(which is convex in σ^2 and is linked to the Bass martingale problem [3]), or in [17]

$$G(\sigma^2) = a \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2} \right)^p + b \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2} \right)^{-q} + c \quad (9)$$

with $p, q, a, b > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that F is convex with minimum at $\sigma = \bar{\sigma}$. It is also a barrier as σ^2 goes to 0.

In this paper, as explained in section 3.3, we use

$$G(\sigma^2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2} - 1 - \log \frac{\sigma^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2}$$

corresponding to the integrand of the Specific entropy (2). It will allow to discretize (in time) the problem as a multi-marginal EOT problem. It is again convex with minimum at $\sigma^2 = \bar{\sigma}^2$ and a barrier as σ^2 goes to 0 but unlike (9) it is only sublinear as $\sigma \nearrow +\infty$ (see [8] where we need additional assumptions to prove a convergence result based on the the discretisation of F_r as (17) below).

3 Time Discretisation as a Multi-Marginal Entropic Martingale Transport

3.1 Notations

We will discretize our problem in time, replacing the interval $[0, T]$ with a regular grid of $N_T + 1$ timesteps, $t_k = k h$ for $k \in \{0, \dots, N_T\} =: \mathcal{K}^h$, where $h := T/N_T$ is the time step. We impose that all the calibration times τ_i are included in the grid, i.e. $\tau_i = t_{k_i}$ for some $k_i \in \mathcal{K}^h$.

Instead of functions $t \mapsto \omega(t)$, we consider their discrete counterparts, which are n-tuples $(\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{N_T}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_T+1}$, in which ω_k corresponds to the value of the path at time t_k . Instead of \mathbb{R}^{N_T} , we denote by \mathcal{X}_k the space of values that ω_k can take, and by $\Omega^h := \prod_{i=0}^{N_T} \mathcal{X}_i$ the space of discrete paths¹. We denote

¹ An element $(t \mapsto \omega(t)) \in \Omega$ is hence replaced by a n-tuple $(\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{N_T}) \in \Omega^h$ with $\omega_k \in \mathcal{X}_k$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}^h$.

\mathcal{P}^h the set of probability measures on Ω^h .

We are hence searching for a probability measure \mathbb{P}^h on Ω^h . We denote by $(X_k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}^h}$ the canonical process of \mathbb{P}^h on Ω^h . We will denote by $\mathbb{P}_k^h := X_k \# \mathbb{P}^h$ the marginal law of \mathbb{P}^h at timestep $k \in \mathcal{K}^h$, and by $\mathbb{P}_{k,l}^h := (X_k, X_l) \# \mathbb{P}^h$ the joint law between time steps $k \in \mathcal{K}^h$ and $l \in \mathcal{K}^h$.

We note $\mathcal{K}_{-i}^h = \mathcal{K}^h \setminus \{i\}$ the set of timesteps except timestep i , and $dx_{-i} = \prod_{\mathcal{K}_{-i}^h} dx_k$, which allows to write the marginal law \mathbb{P}_k^h as $\mathbb{P}_k^h = \int \mathbb{P}^h(x_k, dx_{-k})$ and joint laws in a similar fashion. Similarly, we note $dx_{[i,j]} = \prod_{k=i}^j dx_k$.

We note ν_0 the initial marginal of our process, which is imposed, $X_0 \sim \nu_0$. It may or may not be a Dirac mass in our case.

We denote by $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h$ the reference measure on Ω^h that we will use to regularize the problem. We will denote by $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}^h}$ the canonical process of $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h$ on Ω^h . It's law is determined by a Euler-Maruyama discretisation of the continuous reference process :

$$Y_{k+1} = Y_k + \overline{\mu}(Y_k, kh) h + \overline{\sigma}(Y_k, kh) h^{1/2} Z_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_{-0}^h, Y_0 \sim \rho_0, \quad Z_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

For any probability measure \mathbb{P}^h and $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h$ in \mathcal{P}^h , we note $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h | \overline{\mathbb{P}}^h) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^h} \left[\log \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}^h}{d\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h} \right) - 1 \right]$ the Kullback-Leibler divergence between \mathbb{P}^h and $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h$ if $\mathbb{P}^h \ll \overline{\mathbb{P}}^h$. By convention, if $\mathbb{P}^h \not\ll \overline{\mathbb{P}}^h$, we set $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h | \overline{\mathbb{P}}^h) = +\infty$.

3.2 Time discretisation of conditional moments

As opposed to the continuous-time approach, which uses Markovian projections of the processes, and as such the variable being optimised are functions representing the drift and volatility, in this discrete-time approach, we will directly optimise on \mathbb{P}^h . In order to justify the choice of moment variables in the discrete problem, let us consider the Euler-Maruyama discretization of a diffusion process. Let X_t be a diffusion process with drift μ and volatility σ , following the SDE;

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t, t) dt + \sigma(X_t, t) dW_t;$$

and consider the Euler-Maruyama time discretization of the process:

$$X_{k+1}^h = X_k^h + \mu(X_k^h, kh) h + \sigma(X_k^h, kh) h^{1/2} Z_k$$

where $\forall k \in \{0, \dots, N_T\} := \mathcal{K}^h$, Z_k is a standard normal random variable, and we note \mathbb{P}^h the law of $(X_k^h)_{k \in \mathcal{K}^h}$. We have $\mathbb{P}^h \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{EM}}^h$.

For such a process, we can compute the following quantities from conditional expectations :

$$\beta_k(x) = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1} - X_k \mid X_k = x] = \mu(x, kh), \quad (10)$$

$$\alpha_k(x) = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}[(X_{k+1} - X_k)^2 \mid X_k = x] = \mu^2(x, kh) h + \sigma^2(x, kh) \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} \sigma^2(x, kh). \quad (11)$$

These variables are computed from the law \mathbb{P}^h and are the discrete counterpart of the drift and volatility of the continuous process. They can hence be used to discretize of $F(t, X_t, \mu, \sigma^2)$.

The method actually extends to any vector of variables $(b_k) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ defined by taking the conditional expectation of a function $B : (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ to be specified and depending on two consecutive timesteps :

$$b_k(x) = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}[B(X_k, X_{k+1}) \mid X_k = x]. \quad (12)$$

In the present section the variables β_k and α_k correspond to the function $B(X, Y) = \begin{bmatrix} (Y - X) \\ 1/2 (Y - X)^2 \end{bmatrix}$, but in section 5, we will use $B(X, Y) = (1 - e^{Y-X})$.

3.3 Specific relative entropy

We give a formal derivation of the Specific Entropy (see [13] [12] [2] for rigorous smoothness hypothesis and proofs).

The Kullback-Leibler divergence between two normal laws $\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2)$ is equal to :

$$\text{KL}(\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2) | \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2)) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma_1^2 + (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}{\sigma_2^2} - 1 - \log \left(\frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2} \right) \right).$$

Consider two diffusion measures \mathbb{P} and $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ defined by the following SDEs on their respective canonical processes X and Y :

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t, t) dt + \sigma(X_t, t) dW_t, X_0 \sim \mathbb{P}_0, \quad (13)$$

$$dY_t = \bar{\mu}(Y_t, t) dt + \bar{\sigma}(Y_t, t) dW_t, Y_0 \sim \mathbb{P}_0. \quad (14)$$

We can discretize on a grid of step h as law \mathbb{P}^h and $\bar{\mathbb{P}}^h$ using the Euler-Maruyama discretization from previous section, giving their respective canonical processes X^h and Y^h :

$$X_{k+1}^h = X_k^h + \mu(X_k^h, kh) h + \sigma(X_k^h, kh) h^{1/2} Z_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}^h, X_0^h \sim \rho_0, \quad (15)$$

$$Y_{k+1}^h = Y_k^h + \bar{\mu}(Y_k^h, kh) h + \bar{\sigma}(Y_k^h, kh) h^{1/2} Z_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}^h, Y_0^h \sim \mathbb{P}_0. \quad (16)$$

Noting $\mu_k(x) = \mu(x, kh)$, $\sigma_k(x) = \sigma(x, kh)$, and $\bar{\mu}_k(x) = \bar{\mu}(x, kh)$ and $\bar{\sigma}_k(x) = \bar{\sigma}(x, kh)$, the Kullback-Leibler divergence can then be decomposed as follows :

$$\begin{aligned} h \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h | \bar{\mathbb{P}}^h) &= h \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} \int \text{KL}(\mathcal{N}(\mu_k(x)h, \sigma_k(x)^2h) | \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mu}_k(x)h, \bar{\sigma}_k(x)^2h)) \mathbb{P}_k^h(dx) \\ &= \frac{h}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} \int \left(\frac{\sigma_k(x)^2h + ((\mu_k(x) - \bar{\mu}_k(x))h)^2}{\bar{\sigma}_k(x)^2h} - 1 - \log \left(\frac{\sigma_k(x)^2h}{\bar{\sigma}_k(x)^2h} \right) \right) \mathbb{P}_k^h(dx) \\ &= \frac{h}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} \int \left(\frac{\sigma_k(x)^2 + (\mu_k(x) - \bar{\mu}_k(x))^2h}{\bar{\sigma}_k(x)^2} - 1 - \log \left(\frac{\sigma_k(x)^2}{\bar{\sigma}_k(x)^2} \right) \right) \mathbb{P}_k^h(dx) \\ &\xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{P} | \bar{\mathbb{P}}) := \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\frac{\sigma_t^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2} - 1 - \log \left(\frac{\sigma_t^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2} \right) \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

This convergence result motivates the use the Specific entropy as a regulariser of the continuous problem, because it is linked to a natural discretization in terms of the Kullback-Leibler divergence, and therefore an entropy regularization of a discretisation if (1).

3.4 Discretization and specific entropy regularisation

The cost function, simplified for the presentation is

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T F(\mu_t, \sigma_t) dt \right] + \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} C_k(\{\mathbb{E}[G_i(X_{\tau_i})]\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}) + M_0(\mathbb{P}_0).$$

The specific entropic regularisation of the continuous problem (8) is

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{P}) + \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{P} | \bar{\mathbb{P}})$$

where \mathcal{S} the specific entropy introduced in section 3.3. Its time discretisation (as in (4) and (3)) using (17) and the variables β_k and α_k defined in equations (10) and (11) can be written as:

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P}^h \in \mathcal{P}^h} \mathcal{F}^h(\mathbb{P}^h) + h \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h | \overline{\mathbb{P}^h}) \quad (18)$$

with

$$\mathcal{F}^h(\mathbb{P}^h) = h \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^h} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} F(\beta_k(X_k), \alpha_k(X_k)) \right] + \sum_{k=0}^{N_K-1} C_k(\{\mathbb{E}[G_i(X_{\tau_i})]\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}) + M_0(X_0 \# \mathbb{P}^h).$$

or

$$\mathcal{F}^h(\mathbb{P}^h) = h \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^h} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} F(b_k(X_k)) \right] + \sum_{k=0}^{N_K-1} C_k(\{\mathbb{E}[G_i(X_{\tau_i})]\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}) + M_0(X_0 \# \mathbb{P}^h), \quad (19)$$

using, for simplification, the general form of conditional moments $b_k = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^h} [B(X_k^h, X_{k+1}^h) | X_k^h]$ (section 3.2).

As customary in Entropic OT, we perform a change of variable in the definition (19) in order to apply Fenchel-Rockafellar convex duality (section 3.5) and later use Sinkhorn algorithm (section 4). Let us define, for all k :

Definition 3.1.

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_k(dx) &= X_k \# \mathbb{P}^h(dx) \\ m_k(dx) &= \nu_k(dx) b_k(dx) = \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^h} [B(dx, X_{k+1}^h)] \\ g_k &= \{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^h} [G_i(X_{\tau_i} \# \mathbb{P}^h)]\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the operator

Definition 3.2.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^\dagger : \mathcal{P}(\Omega^h) &\rightarrow (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}_k)) \times (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}_k)) \times (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathbb{R}^{\#\mathcal{I}_k}) \\ \mathbb{P}^h &\rightarrow \Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P}^h := (\{h \nu_k\}, \{h m_k\}, \{g_k\}) \end{aligned}$$

is linear. Remember that $\#I_{t_k}$ the cardinal of the set of maturities at time t_k and $\mathcal{I}_k = \emptyset$ if there are none ($\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}_k)$ is the set of vector Radon measure on \mathcal{X}_k). The h multiplicative factor is used to simplify the dual formulation.

Overloading the notation \mathcal{F}^h as a function of the new variables $(\{\nu_k\}, \{m_k\}, \{g_k\})$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}^h(\Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P}^h) = \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} \left(h \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k} \left[F\left(\frac{h m_k(X_k)}{h \nu_k(X_k)}\right) \right] + C_k(g_k) \right) + M_0(\nu_0). \quad (20)$$

and \mathcal{F}^h is a convex function of $(\{\nu_k\}, \{m_k\}, \{g_k\})$ by construction (we recognise in the integrand the perspective functions of F which is assumed to be convex).

In summary, (18) can be casted in the Fenchel Rockafellar convex setting (appendix A) with a primal problem:

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P}^h \in \mathcal{P}^h} \mathcal{F}^h(\Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P}^h) + \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{P}^h), \quad (21)$$

where the relative entropy

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{P}^h) := h \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h | \overline{\mathbb{P}^h}). \quad (22)$$

is also convex.

Remark 3.1 (Convergence as $h \rightarrow 0$). We point out that while the solution of this problem is a measure that respects the initial condition and the price constraints similarly to the continuous problem, the constraint that \mathbb{P}^h is the law of a discrete diffusion Markov chain and belongs to the set of semi-martingale laws \mathcal{P}_s^0 in the limit has been relaxed. We show in [8] under additional conditions that this relaxation is tight under additional regularity assumptions and that a minimizer of the continuous problem (8) can be constructed using a sequence in h of minimizers of (18).

3.5 Dual Problem

We first need to compute the Legendre transforms of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , and the adjoint operator of Δ^\dagger .

Lemma 3.1. \mathcal{G}^* , the Legendre-Fenchel transform of \mathcal{G} is given by :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^* : \mathcal{C}_b(\Omega^h) &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} \\ f &\rightarrow h \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h}(\exp(f/h)) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2. $\mathcal{F}^{h,*}$ the Legendre transform of \mathcal{F}^h (20) is given by :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{h,*} : (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{X}_k)) \times (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{X}_k)) \times (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathbb{R}^{\#\mathcal{I}_k}) &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} \\ \Phi := (\{\phi_{\nu_k}\}, \{\phi_{m_k}\}, \{\Lambda_k\}) &\rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} M_k^*(\phi_{\nu_k} + F^*(\phi_{m_k})) + C_k^*(\Lambda_k) \end{aligned}$$

where M_0^* is the Legendre-Fenchel transform of M^0 the function enforcing the initial law and M_k^* for $k = 1, N_T - 1$ is the indicatrix $\iota_{\phi \leq 0}$ or equivalently the Legendre-Fenchel transform of $M_k(\nu) := \iota_{\nu \geq 0}$.

Proof. The proof is a direct application of the definition of the Legendre Fenchel transform. Note that \mathcal{F}^h is separable in k and position x_k . We first rewrite the cost function in a more general form

$$\mathcal{F}^h(\Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P}^h) = \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} \left(h \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k} \left[F\left(\frac{h m_k(X_k)}{h \nu_k(X_k)}\right) \right] + M_k(\nu_k) + C_k(g_k) \right)$$

(20) corresponds to $M_k(\nu_k) = \iota_{\nu_k \geq 0}$ for $k = 1, N_T - 1$ and does not change the cost as we identify $(m, \nu) \rightarrow \nu F(m/\nu)$ with its bi-dual $\{(m, \nu) \rightarrow \nu F(m/\nu)\}^{**} = \nu F(\frac{m}{\nu})$ if $\nu > 0$, 0 if $(m, \nu) = (0, 0)$ and $+\infty$ else. We also use the classic characterisation of the LF dual of a perspective function $\{(m, \nu) \rightarrow \nu F(m/\nu)\}^*(\phi, \psi) = \iota(\phi + F^*(\psi))$.

□

Lemma 3.3. The adjoint operator to Δ^\dagger is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta : (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{X}_k)) \times (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathcal{C}_b(\mathcal{X}_k)) \times (\otimes_{k=1}^{N_T-1} \mathbb{R}^{\#\mathcal{I}_k}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}_b(\Omega^h) \\ \Phi := \{\phi_{\nu_k}\}, \{\phi_{m_k}\}, \{\Lambda_k\} &\rightarrow \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} (h\phi_{\nu_k} + \phi_{m_k} \cdot B(x_k, x_{k+1}) + \Lambda_k \cdot \{G_i(x_{\tau_i})\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}) \end{aligned}$$

We apply the Fenchel-Rockafellar duality (appendix A) to get the dual of (21) :

$$\sup_{\Phi} -\mathcal{F}^{h,*}(-\Phi) - h \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h}(\exp(\frac{\Delta\Phi}{h})) \quad (23)$$

Remark 3.2. A simplification is possible in the setting of lemma 3.2. We have $M_k^* = \iota_{\phi \leq 0}$ for $k = 1, N_T - 1$ enforcing $-\phi_{\nu_k} + F^*(-\phi_{m_k}) \leq 0$. Because $-h \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h}(\exp(\Delta\Phi/h))$ is decreasing in ϕ_{ν_k} , this constraint necessarily saturates as $\Delta\Phi$ is increasing in ϕ_{ν_k} . We can set $M_k^*(\phi_{\nu_k}) = 0$, and replace the variable ϕ_{ν_k} by $F^*(-\phi_{m_k})$ in $\Delta\Phi$.

Conversely, M_k^* can be kept as the Legendre Fenchel transform of a general convex function M_k acting on ν_k and to be added to F . See the proof of lemma 3.2.

Proposition 3.1. *Assuming the supremum in (23) is attained by Φ , then Φ induces a measure \mathbb{P}^h through*

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^h}{d\overline{\mathbb{P}^h}} = \exp\left(\frac{\Delta\Phi}{h}\right),$$

\mathbb{P}^h is the optimal solution of (21) for the constraints functions M, C that are finite under \mathbb{P}^h .

Proof. We apply theorem A.1. The first optimality condition is given by:

$$\Delta\Phi \in h \partial_{\mathbb{P}^h} \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h | \overline{\mathbb{P}^h})$$

which leads to :

$$\Delta\Phi = h \log\left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}^h}{d\overline{\mathbb{P}^h}}\right) \quad (24)$$

□

We can therefore identify the law of \mathbb{P}^h and its marginals as functions of the dual potentials. We use the following factorisation which will also be useful to implement Sinkhorn algorithm below.

Definition 3.3. *For $i = 0, N_T - 1$, let $\Delta_{i,i+1}$ the transitional part of Δ (see definition 3.3) depending only on ϕ_{m_i} :*

$$\Delta_{i,i+1}(\phi_{m_i})[x_i, x_{i+1}] = B(x_i, x_{i+1}) \cdot \phi_{m_i}(x_i),$$

and use the following simplified notation $G_k := \{G_i(x_{\tau_i})\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k}$. Let ψ_i^u, ψ_i^d potential functions factorizing the kernel after (Down) and before (Up) time t_i :

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_i^u(x_i) &= \log\left(\int \rho_0 \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} \exp\left(\frac{\Delta_{k,k+1}(\phi_{m_k})}{h} + \phi_{\nu_k} + \frac{\Lambda_k \cdot G_k}{h}\right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{k,k+1}^h} dx_{[0,i-1]}\right) \\ \psi_i^d(x_i) &= \log\left(\int \prod_{k=i}^{N_T-1} \exp\left(\frac{\Delta_{k,k+1}(\phi_{m_k})}{h} + \phi_{\nu_{k+1}} + \frac{\Lambda_{k+1} \cdot G_{k+1}}{h}\right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{k,k+1}^h} dx_{[i+1,N_T]}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let \mathbb{P}^h an optimal solution of (21). The following properties hold true :*

- *Its density of the joint law at time t_i and t_{i+1} with respect to the reference measure is given by :*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{i,i+1}^h(x_i, x_{i+1}) &= \exp[\psi_i^u(x_i) + \phi_{\nu_i}(x_i) + (\Lambda_i \cdot G_i)/h \\ &\quad + \Delta_{i,i+1}(\phi_{m_i})[x_i, x_{i+1}]/h \\ &\quad + (\Lambda_{i+1} \cdot G_{i+1})/h + \phi_{\nu_{i+1}}(x_{i+1}) + \psi_{i+1}^d(x_{i+1})] \overline{\mathbb{P}_{i,i+1}^h}(x_i, x_{i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

- *Its marginal are given by :*

$$\nu_k(x_k) = \mathbb{P}_k^h(x_k) = \exp(\psi_k^u(x_k) + \phi_{\nu_k}(x_k) + (\Lambda_k \cdot G_k)/h + \psi_k^d(x_k))$$

Proof. In Appendix B. Note we are abusing notations using the same variables for the measures and their densities. □

The following proposition is important for the implementation of Sinkhorn algorithm.

Proposition 3.3. *Remark that the quantities ψ_k^u, ψ_k^d can be computed recursively :*

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{k+1}^u &= \log\left(\int \exp\left(\psi_k^u + \frac{\Delta_{k,k+1}(\phi_{m_k})}{h} + \phi_{\nu_k} + (\Lambda_k \cdot G_k)/h\right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{k,k+1}^h} dx_k\right) \\ \psi_{k-1}^d &= \log\left(\int \exp\left(\psi_k^d + \frac{\Delta_{k-1,k}(\phi_{m_{k-1}})}{h} + \phi_{\nu_k} + (\Lambda_k \cdot G_k)/h\right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{k-1,k}^h} dx_k\right) \end{aligned}$$

with $\psi_0^u = \log \nu_0$ and $\psi_{N_T}^d = 0$.

Proof. Let $i \in \mathcal{K}$ and $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$. We can compute the following integral :

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_i^u(x_i) &= \log \left(\int \rho_0 \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} \exp \left(\frac{\Delta_{k,k+1}(\phi_{m_k}) + \phi_{\nu_k} + (\Lambda_k \cdot G_k)/h}{h} \right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{k,k+1}^h} dx_{[0,i-1]} \right) \\
&= \log \left(\int \left(\int \rho_0 \prod_{k=0}^{i-2} \exp \left(\frac{\Delta_{k,k+1}(\phi_{m_k}) + \phi_{\nu_k} + (\Lambda_k \cdot G_k)/h}{h} \right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{k,k+1}^h} dx_{[0,i-2]} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \exp \left(\frac{\Delta_{i-1,i}(\phi_{m_i})}{h} + \phi_{\nu_{i-1}} + (\Lambda_{i-1} \cdot G_{i-1})/h \right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{i-1,i}^h} dx_{i-1} \right) \\
&= \log \left(\int \exp \left(\psi_{i-1}^u + \frac{\Delta_{i-1,i}(\phi_{m_i})}{h} + \phi_{\nu_{i-1}} + (\Lambda_{i-1} \cdot G_{i-1})/h \right) \overline{\mathbb{P}_{i-1,i}^h} dx_{i-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

A symmetric computation can be done for ψ_i^d . □

4 Numerical method

4.1 Sinkhorn Algorithm

Sinkhorn algorithm is based on the iterative “à la Gauss-Seidel” resolution of the optimality conditions of the dual problem (23). This amount to coordinate-wise (in Φ) maximisation. We use the notations introduced in proposition 3.3, the additional index n corresponds to the Sinkhorn iterations rank:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\phi_{\nu_k}^{n+1} = \arg \sup_{\phi} \quad -M_k^*(-\phi + F^*(-\phi_{m_k}^n)) - \dots \\
\hspace{10em} h \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathbb{P}_k^h}} \left[\exp(\psi_k^{u,n+1} + \phi + (\Lambda_k \cdot G_k)/h + \psi_k^{d,n}) \right] \\
\Lambda_k^{n+1} = \arg \sup_{\Lambda} \quad -C_k^*(-\Lambda) - \dots \\
\hspace{10em} h \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathbb{P}_k^h}} \left[\exp(\psi_k^{u,n+1} + \phi_{\nu_k}^{n+1} + (\Lambda \cdot G_k)/h + \psi_k^{d,n}) \right] \\
\phi_{m_k}^{n+1} = \arg \sup_{\phi} \quad -M_k^*(-\phi_{\nu_k} + F^*(-\phi)) \\
\hspace{10em} -h \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathbb{P}_{k,k+1}^h}(x_i, \cdot)} \left[\exp(\psi_k^{u,n+1} + \phi_{\nu_k}^{n+1} + (\Lambda_k^{n+1} \cdot G_k)/h + \Delta_{k,k+1}(\phi) + \psi_k^{d,n}) \right]
\end{array} \right. \quad (25)$$

and this is $\forall k \in [0, N_T - 1]$. Each subproblem is a relaxation of the global strictly concave problem and therefore is well posed. Unlike in the classic OT marginal constraints case there are no explicit formula for the optimal potentials and it is necessary to use a Newton method to solve the optimality conditions equations. The maximisations can be performed point-wise in x_k for the potentials $(\phi_{\nu_k}, \phi_{m_k})$ and on the vectors (Λ_k) .

The algorithm is decomposed as follows:

Algorithm 1: Sinkhorn algorithm for problem (23)

Input: Number of timesteps N_T , support of each space $\mathcal{X}_k^{\text{dx}}$
Input: Stopping tolerance ϵ , reference measure $\overline{\mathbb{P}^h}$
Input: Initial potentials $\phi_{\nu_k}^0, \phi_{b_k}^0, \Lambda_i^0$
Result: Numerical solution of problem (23)

```

1  $\psi_0^{u,0} \leftarrow \log \nu_0;$ 
2  $\psi_{N_T}^{d,0} \leftarrow 0;$ 
3 for  $n \leftarrow 0$  to  $N$  do
4   for  $k \leftarrow N_T - 1$  to  $0$  do
5      $\psi_k^{d,n} \leftarrow \text{UpdatePsiDown}(\psi_k^{d,n}, \phi_{\nu_k}^n, \phi_{b_k}^n, \Lambda_i^n, \overline{\mathbb{P}^h});$ 
6   for  $k \leftarrow 0$  to  $N_T - 1$  do
7      $\phi_{\nu_k}^{n+1} \leftarrow \text{SolveMarginal}(\phi_{\nu_k}^n, \phi_{m_k}^n, \Lambda_k^n, \psi_k^{u,n}, \psi_k^{d,n}, \overline{\mathbb{P}^h});$ 
8      $\Lambda_k^{n+1} \leftarrow \text{SolvePrices}(\phi_{\nu_k}^{n+1}, \phi_{m_k}^n, \Lambda_k^n, \psi_k^{u,n}, \psi_k^{d,n}, \overline{\mathbb{P}^h});$ 
9      $\phi_{m_k}^{n+1} \leftarrow \text{SolveDriftVol}(\phi_{\nu_k}^{n+1}, \phi_{m_k}^n, \Lambda_k^{n+1}, \psi_k^{u,n}, \psi_k^{d,n}, \overline{\mathbb{P}^h});$ 
10     $\psi_{k+1}^{u,n+1} \leftarrow \text{UpdatePsiUp}(\psi_{k+1}^{u,n+1}, \phi_{\nu_k}^{n+1}, \phi_{b_k}^{n+1}, \Lambda_k^{n+1}, \overline{\mathbb{P}^h});$ 
11   $\phi_{\nu_{N_T}}^{n+1} \leftarrow \text{SolveMarginal}(\phi_{\nu_{N_T}}^n, \Lambda_k^n, \psi_{N_T}^{u,n}, \psi_{N_T}^{d,n}, \overline{\mathbb{P}^h});$ 
12   $\Lambda_{N_T}^{n+1} \leftarrow \text{SolvePrices}(\phi_{\nu_{N_T}}^{n+1}, \Lambda_k^n, \psi_{N_T}^{u,n}, \psi_{N_T}^{d,n}, \overline{\mathbb{P}^h});$ 
13   $e_{\max} \leftarrow \frac{\|\Phi^{n+1} - \Phi^n\|_{\infty}}{\|\Phi^n\|_{\infty}};$ 
14  if  $e_{\max} < \epsilon$  then
15    return  $\Phi, \Psi;$ 
16 return  $\Phi, \Psi;$ 

```

The functions SolveMarginal, SolvePrices and SolveDriftVol are functions that solve the maximization problems in (25). The functions UpdatePsiUp and UpdatePsiDown correspond to the recursive definitions in proposition 3.3).

4.2 Space truncation and discretization

We expect the number of (Newton) iterates to solve the maximization problems (25) is finite and the intermediate variables ψ_k^d and ψ_k^u (proposition 3.3) can be stored instead of recomputed inside the sinkhorn loop. Then for all $k \in 1 \dots N_t$, the order of number of operations will be upper bounded by the cost of computing for all $x_k \in \mathcal{X}_k$ convolutions in $x_{k+1} \in \mathcal{X}_{k+1}$ with the kernel

$$\mathcal{K}(x_k, x_{k+1}) = \exp\left(\frac{\Delta_{k,k+1}}{h}\right) \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{k,k+1}^h. \quad (26)$$

Before discretizing in space we need to truncate the support so that it has a finite width. The simplest approach is to assume that the solution remains close to the reference measure and use its standard deviations $\overline{\sigma}_k$. for each timestep $t_k = kh$ $i = 0, \dots, N_T$, we restrict the computational domain to a δ multiple (usually $\delta = 5$) of the standard deviation:

$$\overline{\mathcal{X}}_k = [-\delta v_k, \delta v_k]$$

where $v_k = \sqrt{v_0^2 + h \sum_{l=0}^k \overline{\sigma}_l^2}$ and v_0 is the standard deviation of the initial marginal ν_0 . This is also assuming the solution remains close to a martingale with 0 mean. There are many possible refinements, for exemple using a priori guess by interpolating coarse solution produced by the time multiscale strategy (see below).

On these compact supports, we discretize the potentials on a regular grid of size dx and use a parabolic scaling: for all k ,

$$dx = K \overline{\sigma}_k \sqrt{h}. \quad (27)$$

K is finite (we used $K = 50$). Under this choice the number of points at time t_k in space $N_{\mathcal{X}_k}$ is of order $O(\sqrt{N_T})$.

We again assume the solution sufficiently close to a diffusion with the reference measure as law. For all $x_k \in \mathcal{X}_k$, we and truncate the transition kernel $\mathcal{K}(x_k, \cdot)$ (26) to 0 outside a sliding window $[x_k - \delta\bar{\sigma}_k\sqrt{h}, x_k + \delta\bar{\sigma}_k\sqrt{h}]$. Therefore $\mathcal{K}(x_k, \cdot)$ has finite size δK . This is for a martingale process and needs of course to be adjusted using the drift if any.

The number of operation for one Sinkhorn loop for this implementation is therefore of order $O(N_T N_{\mathcal{X}_k}) = O(N_T^{3/2})$. This is confirmed experimentally in [8].

4.3 Acceleration of Sinkhorn iterations

Sinkhorn iterations are known to converge slowly when the ratio between displacement and regularization parameter or “temperature” goes to 0. In our case while the temperature scales with h (and therefore goes to 0), the displacement between marginals of \mathbb{P}^h decreases. We do not have a rigorous study of the speed of convergence for our sinkhorn iterates but we have implemented two acceleration procedures that seems, at least experimentally to improve it.

Since one Sinkhorn iteration $\Phi^{k+1} = s(\Phi^k)$ is a fixed-point iteration, we accelerate convergence using Anderson acceleration [1] [25].

Because the complexity of algorithm 1 scales with the number of timesteps N_T , we also perform a coarse to fine time discretisation warm restart : One way to do so (as in [8]) consists in interpolating in time the coarse potentials to initialize on a finer time grid. Alternately one can interpolate the coarse solution to construct a new reference measure. Indeed the method can be extended to non local in time and space reference volatilities. The procedure reduces the number of iterations of the finer time grid and therefore computing time. It also seems to stabilize the optimisation as Sinkhorn direct fine time grid arbitrary initialisation does not converge systematically. Probably because the price constraints are numerically infeasible with the initial volatility model.

5 Application: Local volatility calibration

It is customary for this application to minimize over positive martingale positive processes, hence to consider processes of the form $X_t = \log S_t$ where S_t is a martingale diffusion:

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = \sigma(S_t, t) dW_t.$$

Applying Ito’s lemma, in terms of $X_t = \log S_t$, we obtain the following SDE:

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t, t) dt + \sigma(X_t, t) dW_t, \quad \mu_t = -\frac{1}{2}\sigma_t^2$$

As noted in [17], the process S_t will be a martingale if

$$b_t = 2\mu_t + \sigma_t^2 = 0$$

After discretisation, this is becomes non linear equation in the coefficients β_k and α_k defined in section 3.2 equations (10-11):

$$b_k = 2\beta_k + \alpha_k - h\beta_k^2 = 0$$

The variable b_k cannot be represented as a conditional moment of \mathbb{P} and we need to back to the exponential form of the prices. Instead of the variables β and α , we will use the variable b_k corresponding

to the choice $B(X, Y) = 1 - e^{Y-X}$:

$$\begin{aligned} b_k(x) &= \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}[1 - e^{X_{k+1}-X_k} \mid X_k = x] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \frac{1}{e^{X_k}} \mathbb{E}[e^{X_k} - e^{X_{k+1}} \mid X_k = x] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \frac{1}{S_k} \mathbb{E}[S_k - S_{k+1} \mid X_k = x], \end{aligned}$$

$b_k = 0$ is the martingale constraint on the chain S_{t_k} . In practice we use a soft constraint by minimizing $F = c_{\text{mart}} \|b\|_{L^2}$ with $c_{\text{mart}} > 0$ the strength of the martingale constraint penalization.

For the price constraints, let $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be an observed price, we use the soft constraint C_i a convex function with minima in c_i , for instance, $C_i = \frac{1}{2}(\cdot - c_i)^2$. We use the payoff function $G_i(x) = \max(0, e^x - K_i)$ for a call option with strike K_i , and $G_i(x) = \max(0, K_i - e^x)$ for a put option with strike K_i .

For the initial marginal constraint, we propose using a hard constraint $M_0 = \iota_{\mu_0}$ whose dual is $\langle \phi_{\nu_0}, \mu_0 \rangle$, with $\mu_0 = \delta_{\log S_0}$.

Finally, we obtain the following problem:

$$\mathcal{V} = \inf_{\mathbb{P}^h} \sum_0^{N_T-1} h \mathbb{E}_{\nu_k} [F(b_k)] + M_0(\nu_0) + \sum_{i=1}^N C_i(g_i) + h \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^h | \overline{\mathbb{P}^h}),$$

which fits the framework of section 4 without reordering the calibration constraints using maturities (t_k)s, $g_i = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}^h_{\tau_i}} [G_i(X_{\tau_i} | \mathbb{P}^h)]$ is defined as in definition 3.1.

In dual form where (see remark 3.2) we eliminate $\phi_{\nu_k} (= F^*(-\phi_{m_k}))$, $\forall k \in [1, N_T - 1]$:

$$\mathcal{D} = \sup_{\phi_{\nu_0}, \{\phi_{m_k}\}, \{\lambda_i\}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0} [\phi_{\nu_0} - F^*(-\phi_{m_0})] + \sum_{i=1}^{N_C} C_i^*(\lambda_i) + h \mathbb{E}_{\overline{\mathbb{P}^h}} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\Delta(\{F^*(-\phi_{m_k})\}, \{\phi_{m_k}\}, \{\lambda_i\})}{h} \right) \right].$$

Numerical results We construct a synthetic data set of price using using a parametric local volatility surface.

The local volatility surface that we choose is the SSVI surface as presented in [14]. We choose the at-the-money implied total variance for the money to be $\theta_t = 0.04t$. We choose a power-law parameterization of the function ϕ described in [14] as $\phi(\theta) = \eta\theta^{-\lambda}$. The at-the-money total implied variance is then

$$\sigma_{\text{BS}}^2(k, T) = \frac{\theta_t}{2} \left(1 + \rho\phi(\theta_t)k + \sqrt{(\phi(\theta_t)k + \rho)^2 + (1 - \rho^2)} \right),$$

where k is the log-moneyness $\log(K/F)$. The parameters are chosen as $\eta = 1.6$, $\lambda = 0.4$ and $\rho = -0.15$. The resulting surface is shown in Figure 1. Prices are generated using the Black-Scholes formula.

We select five observation times to calibrate the model on generated prices : $t \in \{0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0\}$. At time τ_i , we select the calls with strikes $K \in \{S_0 + 1 + 4k_i\}$ and the puts with strikes $K \in \{S_0 - 1 - 4k_i\}$ for $k_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N_{C,i}\}$, with $N_C = (5, 7, 9, 10, 12)$. We calibrate less points for the earlier maturities as mass is almost nonexistent far from the at-the-money price at these maturities. We choose $c_{\text{mart}} = 1 \times 10^4$ as the penalization term for the martingale constraint.

We use the multiscale in time strategy and figure 2c shows the convergence of the price calibration cost versus the Sinkhorn iterations. Each vertical bar corresponds to a refinement of the time discretisation and a reinitialisation of the reference measure. The finest scale is $N_T = 81$. Figure 2a shows the

L^2 norm of the relative iterate errors $\frac{\|\Phi^{k+1} - \Phi^k\|}{\|\Phi^k\|}$ versus Sinkhorn iterations at the finest scale. Figure 2b shows the L^2 norm of the martingale error. Finally, Figure 3 shows the volatility calibration results at each time. For each of the calibration times, we show the reference implied volatility, the calibrated implied volatility, and the implied volatility generated by the forward diffusion process with the same number of timesteps and the volatility of the solution.

Algorithm 1 is implemented in Python using the PyKeops library. For this simulation The program runs in approximately 10 minutes on a V100 GPU with 24GB of GDDR5 memory and an Intel Xeon 5217 8 core CPU with 192GB or DDR4 RAM.




Figure 1: Generating model implied volatility

References

- [1] Donald G. Anderson. “Iterative Procedures for Nonlinear Integral Equations”. In: *J. ACM* 12.4 (1965), 547–560. ISSN: 0004-5411.
- [2] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas and Clara Unterberger. *On the specific relative entropy between martingale diffusions on the line*. 2023.
- [3] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas et al. *The structure of martingale Benamou–Brenier in \mathbb{R}^d* . 2023.
- [4] Jean-David Benamou. “Optimal transportation, modelling and numerical simulation”. In: *Acta Numerica* 30 (2021), pp. 249–325.




Figure 2: Convergence curves

- [5] Jean-David Benamou and Yann Brenier. “A computational fluid mechanics solution to the Monge–Kantorovich mass transfer problem”. In: *Numer. Math.* 84 (2000), pp. 375–393.
- [6] Jean-David Benamou, Guillaume Carlier, and Luca Nenna. “Generalized incompressible flows, multi-marginal transport and Sinkhorn algorithm”. In: *Numer. Math.* 142 (2019), pp. 33–54.
- [7] Jean-David Benamou et al. “An entropy minimization approach to second-order variational mean-field games”. In: *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* 29 (2019), pp. 1553–1583.
- [8] Jean-David Benamou et al. *Entropic Semi-Martingale Optimal Transport (preprint)*. 2024.
- [9] Jean-David Benamou et al. “Iterative Bregman Projections for Regularized Transportation Problems”. In: *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 2 (2015), A1111–A1138.
- [10] Guillaume Carlier et al. “Convergence of Entropic Schemes for Optimal Transport and Gradient Flows”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 49.2 (2017), pp. 1385–1418.
- [11] Marco Cuturi. “Sinkhorn Distances: Lightspeed Computation of Optimal Transport”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26 (NIPS 2013)*. Ed. by C. J. C. Burges et al. Curran Associates, 2013, pp. 2292–2300.
- [12] Hans Föllmer. “Doob Decomposition, Dirichlet Processes, and Entropies on Wiener Space”. In: *Festschrift in honour of Masatoshi Fukushima’s Beiju*. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics. 2022.
- [13] Nina Gantert. *Some large deviations of Brownian motion*. 1991.

- [14] Jim Gatheral and Antoine Jacquier. “Arbitrage-free SVI volatility surfaces”. In: *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2012).
- [15] Ivan Guo, Gregoire Loeper, and Shiyi Wang. “Calibration of Local-Stochastic Volatility Models by Optimal Transport”. In: arXiv:1906.06478 (July 2021).
- [16] Ivan Guo, Grégoire Loeper, and Shiyi Wang. “Calibration of local-stochastic volatility models by optimal transport”. In: *Mathematical Finance* 32.1 (2022), pp. 46–77.
- [17] Ivan Guo et al. “Optimal transport for model calibration”. In: *Risk* (2022).
- [18] Julien Guyon. *Dispersion-Constrained Martingale Schrödinger Bridges: Joint Entropic Calibration of Stochastic Volatility Models to S&P 500 and VIX Smiles*. en. 2022.
- [19] Christian Léonard. “A survey of the Schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport”. In: *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 34 (2014), pp. 1533–1574.
- [20] Gregoire Loeper. “Option Pricing with Linear Market Impact and Non-Linear Black-Scholes Equations”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability, 2018* (2016).
- [21] Nicolas Papadakis, Gabriel Peyré, and Edouard Oudet. “Optimal Transport with Proximal Splitting”. In: *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.* 7 (2014), pp. 212–238. ISSN: 1936-4954.
- [22] G. Peyré and M. Cuturi. “Computational optimal transport”. In: *Found. Trends Mach. Learning* 11 (Mar. 2019), pp. 355–607.
- [23] Bernard Salanié and Alfred Galichon. “Cupid’s Invisible Hand: Social Surplus and Identification in Matching Models”. In: (Sept. 2012).
- [24] Xiaolu Tan and Nizar Touzi. “Optimal transportation under controlled stochastic dynamics”. In: *The Annals of Probability* 41.5 (2013).
- [25] Homer F. Walker and Peng Ni. “Anderson Acceleration for Fixed-Point Iterations”. In: *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 49.4 (2011), pp. 1715–1735.

A Fenchel Rockaffellar

We recall the abstract Fenchel-Rockafellar theorem and hence the form of the primal problem Changer E et F

Theorem A.1 (Fenchel-Rockafellar). *Let (E, E^*) and (F, F^*) be two couples of topologically paired spaces. Let $\Delta : E \rightarrow F$ be a continuous linear operator and $\Delta^\dagger : F^* \rightarrow E^*$ be its adjoint. Let $\mathcal{F} : E^* \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathcal{G} : F^* \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be two lower semicontinuous and proper convex functions, \mathcal{F}^* and \mathcal{G}^* their Legendre-Fenchel transform. If there exists $\mathbb{P} \in F^*$ such that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{P}) < +\infty$ and \mathcal{F} is continuous at $\Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P}$, then :*

$$\sup_{\Phi \in E} -\mathcal{F}^*(-\Phi) - \mathcal{G}^*(\Delta\Phi) = \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in F^*} \mathcal{F}(\Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P}) + \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{P}),$$

and the inf is attained. Moreover, if there exists a maximizer $\Psi \in E$, then there exists $\mathbb{P} \in F^$ satisfying $\Delta\Psi \in \partial\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{P})$ and $\Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P} \in -\partial\mathcal{F}^*(-\Psi)$.*

We note the primal problem :

$$\mathcal{V} := \min_{\mathbb{P} \in F^*} \mathcal{F}(\Delta^\dagger \mathbb{P}) + \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{P}) \tag{28}$$

and the dual :

$$\mathcal{D} := \sup_{\Phi \in E} -\mathcal{F}^*(-\Phi) - \mathcal{G}^*(\Delta\Phi) \tag{29}$$

B Proof of Proposition 3.2

First, we separate the sum of λ_{g_i} per timesteps using the values defined above :

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N_C} \lambda_{g_i} G_i(x_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{N_T} \sum_{i=0}^{N_C} \lambda_{g_i} \mathbb{1}_{\tau_i=k} G_i(x_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{N_T} \Lambda_k \cdot G_k(x_k)$$

We can rewrite the operator Δ as a sum :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\phi_m, \phi_b, \lambda_g) &= \sum_{k=0}^{N_T-1} \Delta_{k,k+1}(x_k, x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_k \cdot G_k + \phi_{\nu_k}(x_k) \\ &\quad + \phi_{m_{N_T}}(x_{N_T}) + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_{N_T} \cdot G_{N_T}(x_{N_T}) \end{aligned}$$

where only consecutive timesteps are grouped together. In particular, for a given k , we can separate this sum into three parts :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\phi_m, \phi_p, \phi_d, \lambda_g) &= \Delta_{k,k+1}(x_k, x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_k \cdot G_k(x_k) + \phi_{\nu_k}(x_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_{k+1} \cdot G_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) + \phi_{\nu_{k+1}}(x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \Delta_k^u(x_k) + \Delta_{k+1}^d(x_{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$

where Δ_k^u and Δ_k^d are given by :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_k^u(x_k) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \Delta_{i,i+1}(x_i, x_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_i \cdot G_i(x_i) + \phi_{m_i}(x_i) \\ \Delta_k^d(x_k) &= \sum_{i=k}^{N_T-1} \Delta_{i,i+1}(x_i, x_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_{i+1} \cdot G_{i+1}(x_{i+1}) + \phi_{m_{i+1}}(x_{i+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We further note :

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Delta}_{k,k+1}(x_k, x_{k+1}) &= \Delta_{k,k+1}(x_k, x_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_k \cdot G_k(x_k) + \phi_{\nu_k}(x_k) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_{k+1} \cdot G_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) + \phi_{\nu_{k+1}}(x_{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$


for simplicity.

Given that $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^h$ is separable in the same fashion, we can compute the joint probability between steps k and $k+1$ as :


$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{k,k+1}^h(x_k, x_{k+1}) &= \int \mathbb{P}^h(dx_{[0,k-1]}, x_k, x_{k+1}, dx_{[k+2,N_T]}) \\ &= \int e^{(\Delta_k^u + \overline{\Delta}_{k,k+1} + \Delta_{k+1}^d)/h} \rho_0 \prod_{i=0}^{N_T} \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{i,i+1}^h dx_{[0,k-1]} dx_{[k+2,N_T]} \\ &= \left(\int e^{\Delta_k^u/h} \rho_0 \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{i,i+1}^h dx_{[0,k-1]} \right) \\ &\quad \times e^{\overline{\Delta}_{k,k+1}/h} \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{k,k+1}^h \\ &\quad \times \left(\int e^{\Delta_{k+1}^d/h} \prod_{i=k+1}^{N_T} \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{i,i+1}^h dx_{[k+2,N_T]} \right) \\ &= \exp(\psi_k^u(x_k) + \overline{\Delta}_{k,k+1}(x_k, x_{k+1})/h + \psi_{k+1}^d(x_{k+1})) \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{k,k+1}^h(x_k, x_{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly as in the previous proof, we can compute the marginal as:


$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_k^h(x_k) &= \int \mathbb{P}^h(dx_{-k}, x_k) \\
&= \int e^{(\Delta_k^u + \phi_{\nu_k}(x_k) + \Lambda_k \cdot G_k(x_k) + \Delta_k^d)/h} \rho_0 \prod_{i=0}^{N_T} \overline{\mathbb{P}_{i,i+1}^h} dx_{[0,k-1]} dx_{[k+2,N_T]} \\
&= \left(\int e^{\Delta_k^u/h} \rho_0 \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \overline{\mathbb{P}_{i,i+1}^h} dx_{[0,k-1]} \right) \\
&\quad \times e^{\phi_{\nu_k}(x_k) + \Lambda_k \cdot G_k(x_k)/h} \\
&\quad \times \left(\int e^{\Delta_k^d/h} \prod_{i=k}^{N_T} \overline{\mathbb{P}_{i,i+1}^h} dx_{[k+1,N_T]} \right) \\
&= \exp(\psi_k^u(x_k) + \phi_{\nu_k}(x_k) + \frac{1}{h} \Lambda_k \cdot G_k(x_k) + \psi_k^d(x_k))
\end{aligned}$$




(a) Calibration at time 0.2.




(b) Calibration at time 0.4.



(c) Calibration at time 0.6.



(d) Calibration at time 0.8.



(e) Calibration at time 1.

Figure 3: Calibration results.