

# Fatou limits of stochastic integrals

VASILY MELNIKOV

MARCH 2025

ABSTRACT

The convergence of stochastic integrals is essential to stochastic analysis, especially in applications to mathematical finance, where they model the gains associated with a self-financing strategy. However, Fatou convergence of  $(X^n)_{n=1}^\infty$ —a notion introduced for its amenability to compactness principles—implies little about the sequence of Itô integrals  $(\int_0^\cdot Y dX^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  for a fixed integrand  $Y$ . Under a boundedness condition, we find convex combinations  $(\tilde{X}^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of  $(X^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  with Fatou limit  $\tilde{X}$ , such that  $(\int_0^\cdot Y d\tilde{X}^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges in a Fatou-like sense to  $\int_0^\cdot Y d\tilde{X}$  for all continuous semimartingales  $Y$ . The result is sharp, in the sense that continuity of  $Y$  cannot be relaxed to being the left limits process of a semimartingale.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In their work on optional decompositions under constraints, Föllmer and Kramkov [FK97] defined the notion of a Fatou limit: given a dense subset  $\mathcal{T} \subset [0, \infty)$ , a sequence  $(X^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of processes Fatou converge to  $X$  on  $\mathcal{T}$  if

$$X = \limsup_{s \downarrow \cdot, s \in \mathcal{T}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_s^n = \liminf_{s \downarrow \cdot, s \in \mathcal{T}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_s^n.$$

Originally introduced to prove hedgeability of certain contingent claims, Fatou limits have become a ubiquitous tool in mathematical finance—especially so in portfolio optimization, where they play a key role both in the frictionless case (see [KS99]), and in markets with transaction costs (see [CSY15]). Underlying its adoption is the relative weakness of Fatou convergence; it satisfies various compactness principles (see, for example, Lemma 5.2, [FK97]), making it easily applicable to a variety of situations.

However, this relative weakness has a pernicious side; if  $(X^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  Fatou converges to  $X$ , it is not clear that the stochastic integrals  $(\int_0^\cdot Y dX^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  Fatou converge to  $\int_0^\cdot Y dX$  even for quite regular processes  $Y$ . Compactness principles for stochastic integrals, given their importance to mathematical finance (see [CT15]), have some precedent in the literature; however, the class of integrands deemed admissible is usually small, restricting to finite variation integrands (see [CS16]), or assuming the support of the integrand lies in some *a priori* unknowable sequence of predictable sets (see [DS99] and [Mel25]). We correct both of these issues, essentially proving that passing to Fatou limits for a sequence satisfying a boundedness condition preserves stochastic integration with respect to continuous semimartingale integrands—a wide class of processes.

More precisely, our main result is the following. If a sequence  $(X^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of semimartingales satisfies a boundedness condition, there exists  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$  and a semimartingale  $\tilde{X}$  such that  $\tilde{X} = \lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$  and

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \mathbb{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y d\tilde{X}^n = \int_0^s Y d\tilde{X}$$

for each continuous semimartingale  $Y$ , where  $\mathbb{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y d\tilde{X}^n$  denotes the limit in probability of  $\left(\int_0^s Y d\tilde{X}^n\right)_{n=1}^\infty$  for  $s \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ .

The notion of convergence above technically need not imply Fatou convergence; however, once one fixes  $Y$ , it is always possible to pass to a subsequence for which *bona fide* Fatou convergence holds. Similar issues arose in previous works (see, for example, Proposition 4.1, [CS16]).

The paper is structured as follows. In §2, we introduce our notation. In §3, we state our main theorem, as well as some corollaries. In §4, we prove our main theorem. Finally, in §5, we provide counterexamples showing the sharpness of our results and techniques.

## 2. NOTATION

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. Suppose  $(\xi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The limit in probability of  $(\xi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ , if it exists, will be denoted  $\mathbb{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_n$ . The  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. limit of  $(\xi_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ , if it exists, will be denoted  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_n$ .

Let  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t : t \in [0, \infty)\}$  be a filtration of sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathcal{F}$ , satisfying the usual conditions, and such that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is the  $\mathbb{P}$ -augmentation of the trivial  $\sigma$ -algebra. Notions understood relative to a filtration (e.g. adaptedness, predictability) are understood to be relative to  $\mathbb{F}$ . If  $X$  is a semimartingale, and  $\xi$  is an  $X$ -integrable predictable process, the Itô integral of  $\xi$  with respect to  $X$  will be denoted by  $\int_0^\cdot \xi dX$ . If  $X$  and  $Y$  are semimartingales, the quadratic covariation of  $X$  and  $Y$  will be denoted by  $[X, Y]$ .

Over the course of this paper, we will equip spaces of stochastic processes with various topologies. On the space of  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted càdlàg processes modulo evanescence, we will consider the u.c.p. (shorthand for uniform convergence on compacts in probability) topology, defined by the translation-invariant metric

$$\mathbf{D}^{ucp}(X, Y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \int_{\Omega} (X - Y)_n^* \wedge 1 d\mathbb{P}$$

where  $X^* = \sup_{s \leq \cdot} |X_s|$  denotes the maximal function of  $X$ . On the space of semimartingales modulo evanescence, we will consider the Émery topology, defined by the translation-invariant metric

$$\mathbf{D}^{sm}(X, Y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \sup_{|\xi| \leq 1} \int_{\Omega} \left( \int_0^\cdot \xi d(X - Y) \right)_n^* \wedge 1 d\mathbb{P}.$$

If  $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\text{l\`a}d\text{l\`a}g$ , we will denote by  $f_-$  the left limit of  $f$  (with the convention that  $f_{0-} = f_0$ ), and by  $f_+$  the right limit of  $f$ . The left jump of  $f$  is denoted by  $\Delta f = f - f_-$ . For later use, we will state Froda's theorem (in a slightly more general form, applying to finite variation functions of time).

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose  $f$  has locally finite variation. Then  $f$  is  $\text{l\`a}d\text{l\`a}g$  and*

$$\{t \in [0, \infty) : f \text{ is discontinuous at } t\} = \{f \neq f_-\} \cup \{f \neq f_+\}.$$

*Furthermore, the above sets are all at most countable.*

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

The main theorem of this article, Theorem 1, can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $(X^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of semimartingales such that, for each  $t \geq 0$ , the set*

$$\text{co} \left\{ \left| \int_0^t \xi dX^n \right| : n \in \mathbb{N}, \xi \text{ is predictable and } |\xi| \leq 1 \right\}$$

*is bounded in probability, and  $(X_0^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is bounded. Then there exists  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$  and a semimartingale  $\tilde{X}$  such that  $\tilde{X} = \lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$  and*

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \mathbb{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y d\tilde{X}^n = \int_0^s Y d\tilde{X}$$

*for each continuous semimartingale  $Y$ .*

The continuity condition on  $Y$  situates Theorem 1 as a stochastic counterpart to the following well-known version of Prokhorov's theorem: if  $(g_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of finite variation functions on  $[0, 1]$  with  $\sup_n \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \text{var}(g_n)_t \leq 1$ , there exists a subsequence  $(n_k)_{k=1}^\infty$  and a finite variation  $g$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 f dg_{n_k} = \int_0^1 f dg$  for all continuous  $f$ . In Section 5, we show the continuity condition in Theorem 1 cannot be weakened—mirroring the deterministic case.

The imposition of a boundedness condition on Theorem 1 is natural, and not a significant restriction. Indeed, the boundedness conditions assumed in the literature are often stronger (see, for example, [KP91; DS99]). Furthermore, since the boundedness condition from Theorem 1 is based on boundedness in probability, Theorem 1 is not chained to any particular choice of measure, an important property when working with multiple equivalent probability measures.

Let us note the following corollary of Theorem 1 for  $H^1$ -bounded sequences of martingales.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $(M^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of martingales such that*

$$\sup_n \int_\Omega (M^n)_t^* d\mathbb{P} < \infty$$

for each  $t \geq 0$ . Then there exists  $\widetilde{M}^n \in \text{co}\{M^m : m \geq n\}$  and a semimartingale  $\widetilde{M}$  such that  $\widetilde{M} = \lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{M}_s^n$  and

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \mathbb{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y d\widetilde{M}^n = \int_0^\cdot Y d\widetilde{M}$$

for each continuous semimartingale  $Y$ .

Note that one can say little about  $\widetilde{M}$  in general; in particular,  $\widetilde{M}$  may fail to be a martingale (see Example 3.1, [DS99]). However, if there exists an integrable random variable  $\xi \geq 0$  such that

$$M_t^n \geq -\xi$$

for each  $t \geq 0$ , then the Fatou limit  $\widetilde{M}$  from Corollary 1 is a supermartingale.

*Proof.* Given the validity of Theorem 1, it suffices to show that for each  $t \geq 0$ , the set

$$\text{co} \left\{ \left| \int_0^t \xi dX^n \right| : n \in \mathbb{N}, \xi \text{ is predictable and } |\xi| \leq 1 \right\}$$

is bounded in probability. This is a simple consequence of the  $p = 1$  Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF MAIN RESULT

Our proof relies heavily on the following elementary consequence of integration by parts:

$$\int_0^\cdot Y_- dZ = YZ - Y_0Z_0 - \int_0^\cdot Z_- dY - [Z, Y] \quad (1)$$

where  $Z$  is any semimartingale (note that, since  $Y$  is continuous,  $Y = Y_-$ ). Previous attempts at compactness principles for sequences of the form  $(\int_0^\cdot Y dX^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  rely to a great extent on such dual formulations of the problem (for example, see Proposition 2.12, [CS16]).

Suppose we know *a priori* that  $\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_s^n$  exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s., and is equal to a semimartingale  $X$ . When passing to a limit, the first two terms of  $\int_0^\cdot Y dX^n$  in the integration by parts formulation cause no problems. Any obstructions to Fatou convergence must therefore stem from the last two terms, which are difficult to tame. Indeed, when the continuity condition on  $Y$  is dropped, we give a counterexample in §5 showing that  $([X^n, Y])_{n=1}^\infty$  can fail to converge to the proper limit, even when all the other terms do. Another counterexample in §5 for discontinuous  $Y$  shows that the sum of all the terms in (1) can converge to the proper limit, even when none of the last two terms in (1) do. Our techniques therefore hinge on continuity of  $Y$ .

There is no evidently clear global relationship between  $X_-$  and  $(X_-^n)_{n=1}^\infty$ , and hence also between  $\int_0^\cdot X_- dY$  and  $(\int_0^\cdot X_-^n dY)_{n=1}^\infty$ . However, though  $X_-$  may fail to be the pointwise limit of  $(X_-^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  (even when one merely requires convergence outside of an

evanescent set), we show that, modulo many technicalities,<sup>1</sup> the latter does nevertheless approach the former on a predictable set  $D$  whose complement is thin (in the sense of Definition 1.30, [JS03]). Since  $Y$  is continuous, such sets are “large” relative to  $dY$ . A stopping-time argument, controlling how large the relevant processes can get, allows one to conclude convergence of the integrals  $(\int_0^\cdot X^n dY)_{n=1}^\infty$ .

For the quadratic covariation terms  $([X^n, Y])_{n=1}^\infty$ , continuity of  $Y$  is used to obtain that  $[X, Y]$  and  $([X^n, Y])_{n=1}^\infty$  have no jumps. This is relevant, since for purely discontinuous  $Y$  it is possible for  $(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \{\Delta X^n \neq 0\}) \cap \{\Delta Y \neq 0\}$  to be evanescent, while

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\omega : \exists t \in [0, \infty) \text{ with } (\omega, t) \in \{\Delta X \neq 0\} \cap \{\Delta Y \neq 0\}\}) > 0$$

so that  $[X^n, Y] = 0$  for all  $n$ , but  $[X, Y] \neq 0$  (see Theorem 2 for an example). Furthermore, the assumption of continuity allows one to focus only on the noisy part of the relevant processes when making quadratic covariation calculations, which in questions of convergence are usually easier to deal with compared to compensator processes (see, for example, [MS91]).

#### 4.1. LEMMATA

By applying a localization procedure and diagonalization, we may assume the existence of a time  $T \in [0, \infty)$  such that  $X^n$  stopped at  $T$  is  $X^n$  for all  $n$ . Furthermore, it is no loss of generality to assume that  $X_0^n = 0$  for all  $n$ .

**Lemma 2.** *There exists an equivalent probability measure  $\mathbb{Q} \sim \mathbb{P}$  and  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$  such that the following holds.*

1.  $\tilde{X}^n$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -special semimartingale for each  $n$  with  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Doob-Meyer decomposition  $\tilde{X}^n = M^n + A^n$  (where  $M^n$  is the local martingale part, and  $A^n$  is the compensator).
2. Each  $M^n$  is an  $L^2(\mathbb{Q})$ -martingale,  $(M^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges in  $L^2(\mathbb{Q})$  to some  $L^2(\mathbb{Q})$ -martingale  $M$ , and  $\|M^n - M\|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} \leq \frac{1}{4^n}$ .
3.  $\sup_n \int_\Omega \text{var}(A^n)_\infty d\mathbb{Q} < \infty$ , and  $\sup_n \text{var}(A^n)_\infty < \infty$  up to a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.
4.  $(A^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges pointwise up to an evanescent set to some predictable finite variation process  $A$ .<sup>2</sup>
5. We have that  $\tilde{A} = \lim_{s \downarrow \cdot, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_s^n$  exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and is a finite variation semimartingale.

*Proof.* We first apply some results by [Mel25] for semimartingales on a finite time interval; they are applicable by our localization procedure (see the very beginning of §4.1). By passing to convex combinations and applying (Lemma 7, [Mel25]), we may assume that  $\text{co}\{[X^n, X^n]_\infty : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is bounded in probability. Thus, using (Theorem

<sup>1</sup>In particular, it may be necessary to replace the sequence  $(X^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  with a sequence of convex combinations thereof.

<sup>2</sup>By Froda’s theorem (see Lemma 1), both the left limit process  $A_-$  and right limit process  $A_+$  are well-defined and adapted (for the former, this is obvious, while for the latter, it is a consequence of right-continuity of the filtration).

3, [Mel25]), we can find a probability measure  $\mathbb{Q} \sim \mathbb{P}$  such that each  $X^n$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -special with Doob-Meyer decomposition  $X^n = M^n + A^n$  for an  $L^2(\mathbb{Q})$ -martingale  $M^n$  and a predictable finite variation process  $A^n$ ,  $(M^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  forms a bounded sequence of  $L^2(\mathbb{Q})$ -martingales, and  $(\text{var}(A^n)_\infty)_{n=1}^\infty$  is bounded in  $L^1(\mathbb{Q})$ . Komlós's theorem implies, after a passage to convex combinations, that the latter part of (3) holds (see Lemma 2.5, [DRS93]).

By applying (Theorem 3.19, [Bre11]) in tandem with (Corollary 3.8, [Bre11]) to the Hilbert space of  $L^2(\mathbb{Q})$ -martingales and passing to convex combinations, we may assume that  $(M^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges in  $L^2(\mathbb{Q})$  to some  $M$ , and  $\|M^n - M\|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} \leq \frac{1}{4^n}$  (showing (2)).

By (Proposition 3.4, [CS06]) we have (4) after passing to convex combinations. Passing to further convex combinations and applying (Lemma 2.7, [DS99]) and (Remark 2.8, [DS99]), we obtain (5).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *The sets  $\{A \neq A_-\}$ ,  $\{A \neq A_+\}$ , and  $\{A_- \neq \tilde{A}_-\}$  are thin.*

*Proof.* By Froda's theorem (see Lemma 1), the optional sets  $\{A \neq A_-\}$  and  $\{A \neq A_+\}$  have at most countably many sections, and are therefore thin by Theorem 117 in Appendix IV of [DM78]. Remark also that  $\{\tilde{A} \neq \tilde{A}_-\}$  is thin (use a similar argument to the one we just gave, or see Proposition 1.32, [JS03]), a fact we will need for the next paragraph.

We will now prove thinness of  $\{A_- \neq \tilde{A}_-\}$ . It suffices to show that, modulo an evanescent set,  $\{A_- \neq \tilde{A}_-\}$  is contained in a thin set. Let

$$E = \{A \neq A_-\} \cup \{A \neq A_+\} \cup \{\tilde{A} \neq \tilde{A}_-\}$$

which is thin by the previous paragraph. It is clear that  $\{A_- \neq \tilde{A}_-\}$  is contained in  $E$  (modulo an evanescent set), which proves the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $Z$  be a quasi-left-continuous semimartingale, and let  $G$  and  $H$  be  $Z$ -integrable predictable processes. If  $\{G \neq H\}$  is thin, then*

$$\int_0^\cdot G dZ = \int_0^\cdot H dZ$$

*up to evanescence.*

*Proof.* Since  $G$  and  $H$  are predictable,  $\{G \neq H\}$  is a predictable set. Thus, by thinness and (Theorem IV.81.c, [DM78]), we may write

$$\{G \neq H\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket,$$

for some sequence  $(\sigma_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  of predictable stopping times with pairwise disjoint graphs. Let  $E_n = \bigcup_{m=n}^\infty \llbracket \sigma_m \rrbracket$ . Then

$$\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\Omega \times [0, \infty)) \setminus E_n} (G - H) dZ = \int_0^\cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{G=H\}} (G - H) dZ + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (G_{\sigma_i} - H_{\sigma_i}) \Delta Z_{\sigma_i} \mathbf{1}_{\llbracket \sigma_i, \infty \rrbracket} = 0$$

since  $Z$  is quasi-left-continuous, and  $\sigma_i$  is predictable. Taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we therefore obtain that

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\Omega \times [0, \infty)) \setminus E_n} (G - H) dZ = \int_0^\cdot (G - H) dZ$$

in the Émery topology by the bounded convergence theorem, so that  $\int_0^\cdot (G - H) dZ = 0$ , as desired.  $\square$

#### 4.2. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $\tilde{X} = M + \tilde{A}$ . We first show that  $\lim_{s \downarrow} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$  exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and is equal to  $\tilde{X}$ . It suffices to show that  $((M^n - M)_\infty^*)_{n=1}^\infty$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. converges to zero. Notice that, by Markov's inequality and Doob's maximal inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q} \left( \left\{ (M^n - M)_\infty^* \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \right\} \right) &\leq 2^n \int_\Omega (M^n - M)_\infty^* d\mathbb{Q} \\ &\leq 2^{n+1} \|M^n - M\|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} \leq 2^{n+1} \frac{1}{4^n} = 2^{1-n}. \end{aligned}$$

The Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that  $\mathbb{Q}(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{(M^n - M)_\infty^* \geq \frac{1}{2^n}\}) = 0$ ; the equivalence of  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  shows that  $\mathbb{P}(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{(M^n - M)_\infty^* \geq \frac{1}{2^n}\}) = 0$ , implying  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. convergence of  $((M^n - M)_\infty^*)_{n=1}^\infty$  to zero.

By equation (1), for the validity of Theorem 1, it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{s \downarrow} \mathbb{P} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( Y_s \tilde{X}_s^n - \int_0^s \tilde{X}_-^n dY - [\tilde{X}^n, Y]_s \right) = Y \tilde{X} - \int_0^\cdot \tilde{X}_- dY - [\tilde{X}, Y].$$

Thus, it suffices to show (1)  $\wedge$  (2)  $\wedge$  (3), where:

1.  $\lim_{s \downarrow} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_s \tilde{X}_s^n = Y \tilde{X}$  exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and equals  $Y \tilde{X}$ .
2.  $\left( \int_0^\cdot \tilde{X}_-^n dY - \int_0^\cdot \tilde{X}_- dY \right)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges to zero in the Émery topology (in particular, in the u.c.p. topology).
3.  $\left( \text{var} \left( [\tilde{X}^n, Y] - [\tilde{X}, Y] \right) \right)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. to zero for each  $t \geq 0$ .

(1) is clear from  $\tilde{X} = \lim_{s \downarrow} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$ .

For (2), by splitting  $\tilde{X}_-^n$  as  $\tilde{X}_-^n = M_-^n + A_-^n$  and  $\tilde{X}$  as  $\tilde{X} = M + \tilde{A}$ , it suffices to show that  $\left( \int_0^\cdot M_-^n dY - \int_0^\cdot M_- dY \right)_{n=1}^\infty$  and  $\left( \int_0^\cdot A_-^n dY - \int_0^\cdot \tilde{A}_- dY \right)_{n=1}^\infty$  converge to zero in the Émery topology.

We first show Émery convergence of  $\left( \int_0^\cdot M_-^n dY - \int_0^\cdot M_- dY \right)_{n=1}^\infty$  to zero. Let  $G = \sup_n (M^n - M)^*$  (which is finite up to an evanescent set, by  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. convergence of  $((M^n - M)_\infty^*)_{n=1}^\infty$ ), and  $H = G_-$ . It is not difficult to see that  $H$  is  $Y$ -integrable. By  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. convergence of  $((M^n - M)_\infty^*)_{n=1}^\infty$  to zero,  $(M_-^n - M_-)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges pointwise (modulo evanescent sets) to zero. Since  $|M_-^n - M_-| \leq |H|$  for each  $n$ , the stochastic dominated

convergence theorem therefore shows that  $(\int_0^\cdot M_-^n dY - \int_0^\cdot M_- dY)_{n=1}^\infty$  Émery-converges to zero.

We now show Émery convergence of  $(\int_0^\cdot A_-^n dY - \int_0^\cdot \tilde{A}_- dY)_{n=1}^\infty$  to zero.  $A$  is  $Y$ -integrable, and  $A^n$  is  $Y$ -integrable for each  $n$ . Let  $E = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \{A^n \neq A\}$ , which is predictable and thin, as  $\{A^n \neq A\}$  is predictable and thin for each  $n$  (see Proposition 1.32, [JS03]). Let  $J = \sup_n \text{var}(A^n)$ , and define a sequence  $(\sigma_m)_{m=1}^\infty$  of stopping times by  $\sigma_m = \inf\{t : J_t \geq m\}$ . Since  $\sup_n \text{var}(A^n)_\infty < \infty$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.,  $(\sigma_m)_{m=1}^\infty$  is a localizing sequence. We have that  $|(\mathbf{1}_{(\Omega \times [0, \infty)) \setminus E} A^n)^{\sigma_m}| \leq m$  for each  $m$  and  $n$ . Thus, since  $(A^n)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges to  $A$  pointwise, the stochastic dominated convergence theorem implies that  $(\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\Omega \times [0, \infty)) \setminus E} A^n dY)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges to  $\int_0^\cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\Omega \times [0, \infty)) \setminus E} A dY$  in the Émery topology. By Lemma 4 and Lemma 3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall n : \int_0^\cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\Omega \times [0, \infty)) \setminus E} A^n dY &= \int_0^\cdot A^n dY = \int_0^\cdot A_-^n dY, \\ \int_0^\cdot \mathbf{1}_{(\Omega \times [0, \infty)) \setminus E} A dY &= \int_0^\cdot A dY = \int_0^\cdot A_- dY = \int_0^\cdot \tilde{A}_- dY. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $(\int_0^\cdot A_-^n dY)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges in the Émery topology to  $\int_0^\cdot \tilde{A}_- dY$ , as desired. This finishes the proof of (2).

We now show (3).  $Y$  is a special  $\mathbb{Q}$ -semimartingale, as it is continuous; write the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Doob-Meyer decomposition of  $Y$  as  $Y = Y_0 + N + B$ , where  $N$  is a continuous local martingale with  $N_0 = 0$ , and  $B$  is a continuous finite variation semimartingale. For any semimartingale  $Z$  which decomposes as  $Z = L + V$ , where  $L$  is a local martingale, and  $V$  is a finite variation semimartingale, we have

$$[Z, Y] = [L, N] + \sum_{s \leq \cdot} (\Delta L_s \Delta B_s + \Delta V_s \Delta N_s + \Delta V_s \Delta B_s) = [L, N].$$

Thus, it suffices to show that  $(\text{var}([M^n, N] - [M, N])_t)_{n=1}^\infty$  converges  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. to zero for each  $t \geq 0$ .

Let  $\tau_n = \inf\{t : |N_t| \geq n\}$ ; it is clear that  $(\tau_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  is a localizing sequence. It suffices to show that  $(\text{var}([M^n, N] - [M, N])_{\tau_m})_{n=1}^\infty$  converges  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. to zero for each  $m$ . By Markov's inequality

$$\mathbb{Q} \left( \left\{ \text{var}([M^n, N] - [M, N])_{\tau_m} \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \right\} \right) \leq 2^n \int_\Omega \text{var}([M^n - M, N])_{\tau_m} d\mathbb{Q}.$$

By the Kunita-Watanabe inequality,

$$\int_\Omega \text{var}([M^n - M, N])_{\tau_m} d\mathbb{Q} \leq \|M^n - M\|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} \|N^{\tau_m}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{Q})} \leq \frac{m}{4^n}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{Q} \left( \left\{ \text{var}([M^n, N] - [M, N])_{\tau_m} \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \right\} \right) \leq \frac{m 2^n}{4^n} = \frac{m}{2^n}.$$



The Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \text{var}([M^n, N] - [M, N])_{\tau_m} \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \}$  has  $\mathbb{Q}$ -measure zero, hence also  $\mathbb{P}$ -measure zero. Thus,  $(\text{var}([M^n, N] - [M, N])_{\tau_m})_{n=1}^{\infty}$  converges  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. to zero for each  $m$ , as desired. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

*Remark 1.* For a fixed  $Y$ , it is of course possible via the Borel-Cantelli lemma to pass to a subsequence  $(n_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$  such that

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y d\tilde{X}^{n_k} = \int_0^\cdot Y d\tilde{X}.$$

It is unclear whether one can choose  $(n_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$  so that the above holds for all  $Y$  simultaneously.

## 5. NECESSITY OF A CONTINUOUS INTEGRAND

Theorem 1 assumes an integrand which is continuous and a semimartingale. The integration by parts techniques used to prove Theorem 1 hint at generalizations of Theorem 1 for integrands of the form  $Y_-$  for a general semimartingale  $Y$  (especially given that a semimartingale  $Y$  need not be an admissible integrand in the Itô theory, if  $Y$  is not continuous).

We show that Theorem 1 is sharp, in the sense that one cannot hope to extend Theorem 1 beyond continuous semimartingale integrands. More precisely, we have the following.

**Theorem 2.** *There exists a semimartingale  $Y$ , and a sequence  $(X^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  of semimartingales starting at zero such that the following holds.*

1.  $\sup_n \int_{\Omega} \text{var}(X^n)_{\infty} d\mathbb{P} \leq 1$ .
2. If  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$ , then  $Y = \lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$ .
3. If  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$ , then

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y_- d\tilde{X}_-^n \neq \int_0^\cdot Y_- dY,$$

*Proof.* Define  $Y = \mathbf{1}_{[1, \infty[}$ , and let  $X^n = \mathbf{1}_{[1+1/n, \infty[}$ . If  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$ , we have that  $Y = \lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$  and  $\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y_- d\tilde{X}_-^n = \mathbf{1}_{[1, \infty[} \neq 0$ , but  $\int_0^\cdot Y_- dY = 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.* If  $\mathbb{F}$  admits a totally inaccessible stopping time, the above counterexample can be modified so that  $Y$  is quasi-left-continuous (c.f. Remark 2.9, [DS99]).

However, even when  $(\int_0^\cdot Y_- dX^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  converges to the proper limit, it is possible that the techniques used in §4—the integration by parts formula (1)—are of no use.

**Theorem 3.** *There exists a semimartingale  $Y$ , and a sequence  $(X^n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  of semimartingales starting at zero such that the following holds.*

1.  $\sup_n \int_{\Omega} \text{var}(X^n)_{\infty} d\mathbb{P} \leq 1$ .
2. If  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$ , then  $Y = \lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$ .
3. If  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$ , then

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s Y_- d\tilde{X}_-^n = \int_0^{\cdot} Y_- dY,$$

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\tilde{X}^n, Y]_s \neq [Y, Y],$$

$$\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s \tilde{X}_-^n dY \neq \int_0^{\cdot} Y_- dY.$$

*Proof.* Define  $Y = \mathbf{1}_{[1, \infty[}$ , and let  $X^n = \mathbf{1}_{[1-1/n, \infty[}$  (c.f. Example 1, [Jak96]). If  $\tilde{X}^n \in \text{co}\{X^m : m \geq n\}$ , we have that  $Y = \lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_s^n$  and  $\int_0^{\cdot} Y_- d\tilde{X}_-^n = 0 = \int_0^{\cdot} Y_- dY$ . However,  $[Y, Y] \neq 0 = [\tilde{X}^n, Y]$  and  $\lim_{s \downarrow, s \in \mathbb{Q}_+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^s \tilde{X}_-^n dY \neq 0 = \int_0^{\cdot} Y_- dY$ .  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [DM78] Claude Dellacherie and Paul-André Meyer. *Probabilities and Potential*. North-Holland, 1978.
- [KP91] Thomas Kurtz and Philip Protter. “Weak limit theorems for stochastic integrals and stochastic differential equations”. In: *Annals of Probability* 19 (1991), pp. 1035–1070.
- [MS91] Jean Mémin and Leszek Słominski. “Condition UT et stabilité en loi des solutions d’équations différentielles stochastiques”. In: *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg* 25 (1991), pp. 162–177.
- [DRS93] Joseph Diestel, Wolfgang Ruess, and Walter Schachermayer. “Weak compactness in  $L^1(\mu, X)$ ”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 118.2 (1993), pp. 447–453.
- [Jak96] Adam Jakubowski. “Convergence in various topologies for stochastic integrals driven by semimartingales”. In: *Annals of Probability* 24 (1996), pp. 2141–2153.
- [FK97] Hans Föllmer and Dmitry Kramkov. “Optional decompositions under constraints”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 109 (1997), pp. 1–25.
- [DS99] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. “A compactness principle for bounded sequences of martingales with applications”. In: *Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1999, pp. 137–173.
- [KS99] Dmitry Kramkov and Walter Schachermayer. “The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets”. In: *Annals of Applied Probability* 9 (1999), pp. 904–950.

- [JS03] Jean Jacod and Albert Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2003.
- [CS06] Luciano Campi and Walter Schachermayer. “A super-replication theorem in Kabanov’s model of transaction costs”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 10 (4 2006), pp. 579–596.
- [Bre11] Haïm Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. New York: Springer, 2011.
- [CT15] Christa Cuchiero and Josef Teichmann. “A convergence result for the Emery topology and a variant of the proof of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 19 (2015), pp. 743–761.
- [CSY15] Christoph Czichowsky, Walter Schachermayer, and Junjian Yang. “Shadow prices for continuous processes”. In: *Mathematical Finance* 27 (2015), pp. 623–658.
- [CS16] Christoph Czichowsky and Walter Schachermayer. “Strong supermartingales and limits of nonnegative martingales”. In: *Annals of Probability* 44 (2016), pp. 171–205.
- [Mel25] Vasily Melnikov. “Limit theorems for  $\sigma$ -localized Émery convergence”. In: *Journal of Theoretical Probability* 38 (2025).