

POLYTOPES ASSOCIATED WITH LATTICES OF SUBSETS AND MAXIMISING EXPECTATION OF RANDOM VARIABLES

ASSAF LIBMAN

ABSTRACT. The present paper originated from a problem in Financial Mathematics concerned with calculating the value of a European call option based on multiple assets each following the binomial model. The model led to an interesting family of polytopes $P(b)$ associated with the power-set $\mathcal{L} = \wp\{1, \dots, m\}$ and parameterized by $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, each of which is a collection of probability density function on \mathcal{L} . For each non-empty $P(b)$ there results a family of probability measures on \mathcal{L}^n and, given a function $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, our goal is to find among these probability measures one which maximises (resp. minimises) the expectation of F . In this paper we identify a family of such functions F , all of whose expectations are maximised (resp. minimised under some conditions) by the same *product* probability measure defined by a distinguished vertex of $P(b)$ called the *supervertex* (resp. the *subvertex*). The pay-offs of European call options belong to this family of functions.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

This paper originated from a problem in Financial Mathematics which we describe in Section 1.14 below. The combinatorial objects it led to are the subject of this paper.

1.1. Polytopes associated to the poset 2^m . Let $\mathcal{L} = \{0, 1\}^m \cong \wp\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ denote the poset of m -tuples of zeros and ones, i.e function $\lambda: \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Let $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ denote the Euclidean space of dimension 2^m of all functions $x: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, equipped with the standard basis $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}}$ and inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

The unit simplex $\Delta(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is the convex hull of $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}}$. It is the set of all probability density functions on \mathcal{L} , see Section 2.1. Vectors $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ are viewed as random variables on \mathcal{L} and it is clear that $\langle f, x \rangle = E_x(f)$ is the expectation.

The assignment $e_\lambda \mapsto ((-1)^{\lambda(1)}, \dots, (-1)^{\lambda(m)})$ is a bijection between the vertices of the simplex $\Delta(\mathcal{L})$ and the vertices of the m -dimensional cube $[-1, 1]^m$. There results a surjective linear map of polytopes $\Lambda: \Delta(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow [-1, 1]^m$ and we obtain a family of polytopes $P(b) \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ indexed by $b \in [-1, 1]^m$, see Definition 2.6,

$$P(b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda^{-1}(b).$$

1.2. Maximizing expectations Fix some $n > 0$. Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{L}^n)$ a compact connected subset of probability measures on \mathcal{L}^n . Then $\{E_P(F) : P \in \Gamma\}$ is a closed interval in \mathbb{R} and a fundamental question is to compute its end points

$$F_{\min}(\Gamma) = \min\{E_x(F) : x \in \Gamma\} \quad \text{and} \quad F_{\max}(\Gamma) = \max\{E_x(F) : x \in \Gamma\}.$$

In this generality the problem is hopeless unless we narrow down the choices for Γ and F .

In Section 1.3 we will define the collections $\Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$ for every $b \in [-1, 1]^m$. We will introduce the collection of truncated ℓ -positive functions $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in Definition 1.7. The main result

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 52B12, 52B55, 60B99.

Key words and phrases. Polytopes, Optimisation, Finite probability spaces.

of this paper is Theorem 1.10 which shows that $F_{\max}(\Gamma)$ and $F_{\min}(\Gamma)$ are attained at a *product measure* on \mathcal{L}^n , explicitly described in terms of b .

1.3. Trees Fix some $n \geq 0$. Let \mathcal{T} denote the set of all words of length at most n in the alphabet \mathcal{L} . It is partially ordered by $\tau \preceq \tau'$ if τ is a prefix of τ' . This renders \mathcal{T} a directed tree with the empty word as its root. The set of vertices at level k is $\mathcal{T}_k = \mathcal{L}^k$ and \mathcal{L}^n is the set of leaves. For any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}$ set

$$(1) \quad A_\omega = \{\tau \in \mathcal{L}^n : \omega \preceq \tau\}.$$

We will write $\omega\tau$ for the concatenation of words $\omega, \tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Clearly, if $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ then $A_\omega = \{\omega\tau : \tau \in \mathcal{L}^k\} \cong \mathcal{L}^k$. Let \mathcal{T}^* denote the set of words of length $< n$. The set of *successors* of $\omega \in \mathcal{T}^*$, namely $\text{succ}(\omega) = \{\omega\lambda : \lambda \in \mathcal{L}\}$, is canonically identified with \mathcal{L} . We call \mathcal{T} an \mathcal{L} -labelled tree.

A function $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ is a choice of probability measures on $\text{succ}(\omega)$ for every $\omega \in \mathcal{T}^*$. It gives rise to a probability density function $P(\Phi)$ on \mathcal{L}^n

$$(2) \quad P(\Phi)(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n) = \prod_{k=1}^n \Phi(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k-1})(\lambda_k).$$

In fact, any probability measure on \mathcal{L}^n arises in this way, see Proposition 7.1.

It is natural to consider probability measures on \mathcal{L}^n obtained from functions Φ with values in a given connected compact subset of $\Delta(\mathcal{L})$. Our interest is in $P(b) \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ and we define

$$(3) \quad \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b) = \{P(\Phi) : \Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)\}.$$

Notice that $\Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$ is compact and connected since it is the image of $\prod_{\mathcal{T}^*} P(b)$.

There is an inductive procedure to compute $E_{P(\Phi)}(F)$ for $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $P(\Phi) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$ by going down the levels of the tree \mathcal{T} . Define by induction functions $F_\Phi^{(k)}: \mathcal{T}_{n-k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $F_\Phi^{(0)} = F$ and $F_\Phi^{(k)}(\omega) = E_{\Phi(\omega)}(F_\Phi^{(k-1)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)})$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$. See Definition 7.2. Then that $F_\Phi^{(n)}(\emptyset) = E_{P(\Phi)}(F)$, see Proposition 7.4. We can now describe an algorithm to find $F_{\max}(\Gamma)$ and $F_{\min}(\Gamma)$ where $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$.

1.4. Algorithm: Define functions $F_{\max}^{(k)}: \mathcal{T}_{n-k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $k \geq 0$, and $\Phi_{\max}^{(k)}: \mathcal{T}_{n-k} \rightarrow P(b)$ where $k \geq 1$, by induction as follows. Set $F_{\max}^{(0)} = F$. Assume $F_{\max}^{(k-1)}$ has been defined where $k \geq 1$. Use the simplex method, or otherwise, to choose for any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ some $p \in P(b)$ which maximises $E_x(F_{\max}^{(k-1)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)})$ over $x \in P(b)$. Set $\Phi_{\max}^{(k)}(\omega) = p$ and let $F_{\max}^{(k)}(\omega)$ be this maximum expectation.

We obtain a function $\Phi_{\max}: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$, and one checks that $F_{\max}^{(k)} = F_{\Phi_{\max}}^{(k)}$ for all k . By the monotonicity of the expectation it easily follows by induction that $F_\Phi^{(k)}(\omega) \leq F_{\max}^{(k)}(\omega)$ for any $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$. Therefore $F_{\max}(\Gamma) = F_{\max}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ and $P(\Phi_{\max})$ is the probability measure that realises the maximum. An analogous algorithm computes $F_{\min}(\Gamma)$.

This calculation requires the simplex algorithm to be invoked $O(2^{m(n-1)})$ times, once for each $\omega \in \mathcal{T}^*$. This is exponential in n , the height of \mathcal{T} , and gives no insight to the problem. The point of Theorem 1.10 is that for truncated ℓ -positive functions F the simplex algorithm can be avoided, and if in addition F is symmetric then the calculation is polynomial in n .

1.5. Truncation and ℓ -positive vectors The *truncation* of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is $x^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$. The truncation of $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is the vector v^+ with $v^+(\lambda) = v(\lambda)^+$.

Let $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ be the rows of the matrix representing the linear map Λ in Section 1.1 and let $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ be the constant function with value 1. Let U denote the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ they span. See Definition 2.4 and Example 3.4 where the rows of the matrix L are the vectors ℓ_i when $m = 4$.

Definition 1.6. An ℓ -positive vector in U is a vector $u = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i \ell_i$ such that $a_1, \dots, a_m > 0$ (and no condition on a_0). Let $U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ be the set of these vectors. The set of *truncated ℓ -positive vectors* is $(U_{\ell\text{-pos}})^+ = \{\sum_{i=1}^k u_i^+ : u_i \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}, k \geq 0\}$.

Definition 1.7. A function $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *symmetric* if the value of $F(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n)$ is independent of the order of the λ_i 's. It is called *truncated ℓ -positive* if the function $f: \lambda \mapsto F(\omega \lambda \tau)$ is an element of $(U_{\ell\text{-pos}})^+$ for any words $\omega, \tau \in \mathcal{T}$ of total length $n - 1$.

Clearly, truncated ℓ -positive functions have non-negative values.

1.8. The supervertex and the subvertex of $P(b)$. The main observation of this paper is that we can single out a *vertex* $q^* \in P(b)$, called the *supervertex* and a *vector* $q_* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ called the *subvertex* of $P(b)$, both described purely in term of $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. See Definitions 3.10, 3.12 and 4.4. To avoid confusion the reader is imperatively warned that the subvertex q_* is only a *vector* in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ and *need not* be in general an element of $P(b)$. Remarkably, when $q_* \in P(b)$ then it is a vertex of $P(b)$. See Proposition 4.8.

The subvertex $q_* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is supported by $\nu_0, \dots, \nu_m \in \mathcal{L}$ described in Definition 4.1 and $q_*(\nu_i) = b''(i)$ where $b''(i)$ are described in Definition 4.2.

If $b(1) \geq \dots \geq b(m)$, the supervertex $q^* \in P(b)$ is supported by $\mu_0, \dots, \mu_m \in \mathcal{L}$ described in Definition 3.8 and $q^*(\mu_i) = b'(i)$ where $b'(i)$ are described in Definition 3.2.

The key results of this paper are Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 whose Corollary 5.3 we restate here.

Theorem 1.9. *Let q^* and q_* be the supervertex and subvertex of $P(b)$. For any $u \in (U_{\ell\text{-pos}})^+$ we have $\langle u, q_* \rangle \geq 0$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{E_x(u) : x \in P(b)\} &= E_{q^*}(u) = \langle u, q^* \rangle \\ \min\{E_x(u) : x \in P(b)\} &\geq \langle u, q_* \rangle \end{aligned}$$

If $\sum_{i=1}^m b(i) \leq 2 - m$ then $q_ \in P(b)$, the inequality is an equality, and $\langle u, q_* \rangle = E_{q_*}(u)$.*

Theorem 1.9 allows us to avoid appealing to the simplex method in the calculation of $F_{\max}(\Gamma)$ and $F_{\min}(\Gamma)$ in Section 1.3 for truncated ℓ -positive functions F and $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$. Moreover, $F_{\max}(\Gamma)$, and under some conditions $F_{\min}(\Gamma)$ are attained at a product measure on \mathcal{L}^n defined by the supervertex and the subvertex.

For $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ identify $F|_{A_\omega}$ with the function $F_{\omega-}: \mathcal{L}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$(4) \quad F_{\omega-}(\tau) = F(\omega\tau), \quad (\tau \in \mathcal{L}^k).$$

If ω is the empty word then $F_{\omega-} = F$.

Theorem 1.10. *Let q^* and q_* be the supervertex and subvertex of $P(b)$ and set $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$. Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a truncated ℓ -positive function. Then for any $P \in \Gamma$ and any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ such that $P(A_\omega) > 0$*

$$E_P(F|_{A_\omega}) \leq E_{q^*}(F_{\omega-}).$$

In particular $F_{\max}(\Gamma) = E_{q^}(F)$.*

If $q_ \in P(b)$, which is equivalent to the condition $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b(i) \leq \frac{2}{m} - 1$, then*

$$E_P(F|_{A_\omega}) \geq E_{q_*}(F_{\omega-}).$$

In particular $F_{\min}(\Gamma) = E_{q_}(F)$.*

When F is in addition symmetric we can give highly computable formulas for the right hand sides of the inequalities in Theorem 1.10. For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ let λ^k denote the word $\lambda \cdots \lambda$ of length k . Recall the description of q^* and q_* in Section 1.8. For $p \in \Delta(\mathcal{L})$, let p also denote the product measure on \mathcal{L}^k for any $k \geq 0$.

Proposition 1.11. *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 1.10. Assume further that F is symmetric. Then for any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$*

(a) *If b is decreasing i.e $b(1) \geq \cdots \geq b(m)$ then*

$$E_{q^*}(F_{\omega-}) = \sum_{i_0+\cdots+i_m=k} \frac{k!}{i_0! \cdots i_m!} \cdot b'(0)^{i_0} \cdots b'(m)^{i_m} \cdot F(\omega \mu_0^{i_0} \cdots \mu_m^{i_m}).$$

(b) *If $q_* \in P(b)$ then*

$$E_{q_*}(F_{\omega-}) = \sum_{i_0+\cdots+i_m=k} \frac{k!}{i_0! \cdots i_m!} \cdot b''(0)^{i_0} \cdots b''(m)^{i_m} \cdot F(\omega \nu_0^{i_0} \cdots \nu_m^{i_m}).$$

The advantage in F being symmetric is evident: the complexity of the computation, i.e the number of terms in the sums computing $F_{\max}(\Gamma)$ and $F_{\min}(\Gamma)$, is $\binom{n+m}{m}$, polynomial in n rather than exponential (take $k = n$ and ω empty). These results leave something to be desired, though. Namely are there any interesting symmetric truncated ℓ -positive functions? In addition, the condition $q_* \in P(b)$ is unreasonably strong in practical applications.

Definition 1.12. A function $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *European* if there are ℓ -positive vectors u_1, \dots, u_r such that $u_i = u_i^+$ for all i , and numbers $s_1, \dots, s_r, C \geq 0$ such that

$$F(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^r s_j \cdot u_j(\lambda_1) \cdots u_j(\lambda_n) - C \right)^+.$$

The terminology is inspired by the Financial Mathematics model in Section 1.14. European functions exist in abundance as we explain in Section 6. They are symmetric truncated ℓ -positive by Proposition 6.3 and therefore $F_{\max}(\Gamma)$ can be computed for them by Theorem 1.10. The next theorem gives a lower bound for $F_{\min}(\Gamma)$ for European functions. The bound tends to be very crude, though.

Theorem 1.13. *Let $P(b)$ be non-empty for some $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and set $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$. Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a European function defined and let $\beta(0), \dots, \beta(m)$ and $\alpha_j(0), \dots, \alpha_j(m)$ where $j = 1, \dots, r$ be the numbers in Definition 7.6 associated to F . Then*

$$F_{\min}(\Gamma) \geq \sum_{k_0+\cdots+k_m=n} \frac{n!}{k_0! \cdots k_m!} \cdot \beta(0)^{k_0} \cdots \beta(m)^{k_m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^r s_j \cdot \alpha_j(0)^{k_0} \cdots \alpha_j(m)^{k_m} - C \right)^+.$$

1.14. Financial Mathematics motivation. In this section we describe the problem in Financial Mathematics that has driven this project. This section is aimed for the non-experts and we will therefore avoid Financial Mathematics jargon and (deliberately) use non-standard terminology. A full account can be found in [3] and background material in [5, Chap. 3].

An example of a *discrete time market model* is a finite probability space (Ω, P) together with a set $\mathbb{T} = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ representing (discrete) time. It is assumed that $P(A) = 0$ if and only if $A = \emptyset$. An *asset* is a sequence of random variables $X(0), \dots, X(n)$ indexed by \mathbb{T} such that $X(0)$ is a constant random variable representing the fact that its price at time 0 is known. A discrete market model is specified by assets X_1, \dots, X_r , each is a random process indexed by \mathbb{T} . One of those assets is assumed to be a *bond process*, denoted by B . Thus $B(k)$ is the value at time $k \in \mathbb{T}$ of a unit of money deposited in a savings account at time $k = 0$. The

ratio $r(k) = (B(k) - B(k-1))/B(k-1)$ is the interest rate which in the model we describe below is assumed to be constant, i.e $B(k) = R^k$ for a fixed interest rate $R \geq 1$.

A *portfolio* is a vector $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and its *value* is $V_x = \sum_i x_i X_i$. A portfolio x is called an *arbitrage* if

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} V_x(0) &= 0 \\ V_x(n) &\geq 0 \\ E(V_x(n)) &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

It is generally assumed that financial models do not have arbitrage portfolios. It models an idealisation of reality in which no one should be able to make money out of nothing with no risk of making loss; see [2, Chapter 1].

For what follows we fix some assets S_1, \dots, S_m which we call shares of stock. A *European call option* is a contract made at time $k = 0$ which gives its holder the right, but not an obligation, to buy at time n a portfolio $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ whose value is $V_x(n) = \sum_i x_i S_i(n)$ for a given price C set in the contract. If $C < V_x(n)$ then the holder will exercise the option and buy the portfolio (for C), sell it for $V_x(n)$ and make a profit $V_x(n) - C$. If $C \geq V_x(n)$ the holder will do nothing. In other words, at time n the holder of an option will make a profit $F = \max\{V_x(n) - C, 0\}$. The random variable F is called the *pay-off*.

Of course, the option is itself an asset H for which $H(n) = F$. One of the basic problems in Financial Mathematics is to determine $H(0)$, namely the price of the option at time $k = 0$, as well as its values at any given time $k \in \mathbb{T}$ so that an arbitrage does not occur. Such a value is called *rational*.

A *risk-neutral* probability measure P_* on Ω is a martingale measure with respect to the random processes S_1, \dots, S_m with $P_*(\omega) > 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, [5, pp. 93]. That is, the conditional expectation of $S_i(k + \ell)$ given the event that the values of $S_1(t), \dots, S_m(t)$ are known for all $0 \leq t \leq k$ is R^ℓ times the known value of $S_i(k)$. To be more precise, for any $\omega \in \Omega$ consider the event $E_{k,\omega} = \bigcap_{t=0}^k \bigcap_{i=1}^m \{S_i(t) = S_i(t)(\omega)\}$. We require that

$$(6) \quad E_{P_*}(S_i(k + \ell) | E_{k,\omega}) = R^\ell S_i(k)(\omega).$$

The set Γ_* of all the risk-neutral probability measures on Ω is therefore the interior of a convex bounded polytope equal to the intersection of the simplex of all probability measures on Ω with the affine subspace defined by the system of linear equations (6). Throughout we assume that $\Gamma_* \neq \emptyset$. This is equivalent to the absence of arbitrage portfolios; see [5, (3.19)] or [2, Theorem 1.6.1] for a more general statement.

It is a fundamental result that the rational value H of an option is the conditional expectation of the pay-off with respect to a risk-neutral probability measure [2, Theorem 2.4.1], more precisely

$$(7) \quad H(k)(\omega) = E_{P_*}(F | E_{k,\omega}).$$

The risk-neutral probability P_* is not unique, and therefore neither is H . We will write H_{P_*} for the rational value in (7). Thus, the set of all rational prices at time $k = 0$, namely $\{E_{P_*}(F) | P_* \in \Gamma_*\}$, forms an open interval (F_{\min}, F_{\max}) . The question that has driven this paper was to find the values of F_{\min} and F_{\max} of a European call option in a model in which the shares S_i follow binomial processes.

Specification of the model: For any $1 \leq i \leq m$ we fix $0 < D_i < R < U_i$. We also fix $S_i(0) > 0$, prices at time 0. Each S_i follows a binomial process, namely at time k one flips a coin, possibly unfair, and according to the result $\epsilon = 0, 1$ the value of $S_i(k)$ is multiplied by either D_i (if $\epsilon = 1$) or by U_i (if $\epsilon = 0$). Thus $S_i(k + 1) = S_i(k) \cdot D_i^\epsilon U_i^{1-\epsilon}$.

The sample space suitable to describe this process is $\Omega = (\{0, 1\}^m)^n$ which in the notation of Section 1.1 is \mathcal{L}^n . Then $S_i(k)(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n) = S_i(0) \cdot D_i^{\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(i)} U_i^{k - \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j(i)}$. The pay-off (at time n) in this model is therefore the random variable

$$(8) \quad F(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n) = \max \left\{ 0, \sum_{i=1}^m S_i(0) \cdot D_i^{\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(i)} \cdot U_i^{n - \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j(i)} - C \right\}.$$

Proposition 1.15. *In the multi-step binomial model of a European call option described above, the pay-off (8) is a European function (in the sense of Definition 1.12).*

It is clear that for any $\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n$ in the sample space \mathcal{L}^n the value of $S_i(k)$ is determined by $\omega = \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_k$. Thus, in the notation of Section 1.3, $S_1(k), \dots, S_m(k)$ are constant on the events A_ω , and hence so is $H(k)$. In addition, it is easily verified that ω is determined by the values of $S_1(t), \dots, S_m(t)$ where $0 \leq t \leq k$. Therefore $E_{k, \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n} = A_\omega$. Also, one checks that equations (6) for $\ell \geq 2$ are a consequence of those with $\ell = 1$. From the latter equations one checks that P_* solves (6) and has no null-sets if and only if, with the notation of (2), $P_* = P(\Phi)$ where the values of $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ are in the set $Q \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ of the solutions of the system

$$(9) \quad E_x(S_i(1)) = RS_i(0), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m \text{ and } x \in \Delta(\mathcal{L}) \text{ and } x(\lambda) > 0.$$

Then Q is the interior of the polytope in $\Delta(\mathcal{L})$ which is the preimage of $(R, \dots, R) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ under a linear map that sends the vertices e_λ of $\Delta(\mathcal{L})$ to the vertices of the cube $[D_1, U_1] \times \dots \times [D_m, U_m]$ in \mathbb{R}^m . One checks, as we do in [3], that Q is the interior of $P(b)$ from Section 1.1 where

$$(10) \quad b(i) = \frac{2R - U_i - D_i}{U_i - D_i}$$

and that $|b(i)| \leq 1$ by the assumption that $D_i < R < U_i$, so $P(b) \neq \emptyset$. The crux is now that

$$\overline{\Gamma_*} = \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b).$$

By possibly reordering the shares S_i we can ensure that b is decreasing, i.e $b(1) \geq \dots \geq b(m)$. Recall from Section 1.8 the description of the supervertex and the subvertex of $P(b)$. We are now able to describe the interval of rational values of a European call option in this model.

Theorem 1.16. *Let F be the pay-off in (8) and H its rational value. Consider some $\omega = \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n \in \mathcal{L}^n$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$. Set $\theta = \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{n-k}$. Then*

$$\sup_{P_* \in \Gamma_*} H_{P_*}(n-k)(\omega) = E_{q^*}(F_{\theta-}) = \sum_{i_0 + \dots + i_m = k} \frac{k!}{i_0! \cdots i_m!} \cdot b'(0)^{i_0} \cdots b'(m)^{i_m} \cdot F(\theta \mu_0^{i_0} \cdots \mu_m^{i_m}).$$

If $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b(i) \leq \frac{2}{m} - 1$ then

$$\inf_{P_* \in \Gamma_*} H_{P_*}(n-k)(\omega) = E_{q_*}(F_{\theta-}) = \sum_{i_0 + \dots + i_m = k} \frac{k!}{i_0! \cdots i_m!} \cdot b''(0)^{i_0} \cdots b''(m)^{i_m} \cdot F(\theta \nu_0^{i_0} \cdots \nu_m^{i_m}).$$

Hence, the maximal value of the pay-off at time 0 in the n -step model, F_{\max} , is computed by a product measure obtained from a martingale measure which can be computed explicitly from the parameters of the model. Under some assumptions the same holds for F_{\min} . These results generalise ones obtained in [4] when $m = 2$ (in which case $\dim P(b) \leq 1$ namely it is generically an interval). This is not only a surprising result, but also has significant practical consequences since it dramatically reduces the computational complexity of F_{\max} to $O(n^m)$.

Acknowledgements. I thank Jarek Kedra for an abundance of helpful discussions and ideas. We both thank Victoria Steblovskaya for drawing our attention to this circle of problems and for discussions.

2. THE POSET \mathcal{L} , THE VECTORS ℓ_i AND THE POLYTOPES $P(b)$

2.1. Given a finite set Ω let \mathbb{R}^Ω denote the linear space of functions $x: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the standard basis $\{e_\omega\}_{\omega \in \Omega}$ and the standard inner product $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} x(\omega)y(\omega)$. The support of $x \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ is

$$\text{supp}(x) = \{\omega \in \Omega : x(\omega) \neq 0\}.$$

The unit simplex $\Delta(\Omega)$ in \mathbb{R}^Ω is the set of all probability density functions on Ω

$$\Delta(\Omega) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega : \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} x(\omega) = 1 \text{ and } x(\omega) \geq 0 \right\}.$$

The *truncation* of $x \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ is the vector $x^+ \in \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ defined by $x^+(\omega) = x(\omega)^+ = \max\{x(\omega), 0\}$.

For $m \geq 1$ set $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $[m]_0 = \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$. Throughout we will identify \mathbb{R}^m with $\mathbb{R}^{[m]}$ and \mathbb{R}^{m+1} with $\mathbb{R}^{[m]_0}$.

2.2. *The poset \mathcal{L} .* Let \mathcal{L} denote the set of functions $\lambda: [m] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ identified with the poset $\wp([m])$. Thus, $\lambda \preceq \lambda'$ if $\text{supp}(\lambda) \subseteq \text{supp}(\lambda')$. It will be convenient to regard λ as having domain $\{0, \dots, m+1\}$ and agree throughout that

$$\lambda(0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(m+1) = 1.$$

2.3. *Action of the symmetric group Σ_m .* Let Σ_m act on $[m]$ in the natural way. Any $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ gives rise to functions $\sigma_*: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ and $\sigma_*: \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, both abusively denoted by σ_* , defined by

$$\sigma_*(\lambda) = \lambda \circ \sigma^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_*(b) = b \circ \sigma^{-1}$$

with the understanding that σ acts on $[m]_0$ by fixing 0 so σ_* acts on \mathbb{R}^{m+1} by fixing the 0th entry. In turn, we obtain $(\sigma_*)_*: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ which we abusively also denote by σ_*

$$\sigma_*(x)(\lambda) = x(\sigma_*^{-1}(\lambda)) = x(\lambda \circ \sigma).$$

Thus, every $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ acts on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ as a permutation matrix, hence an orthogonal transformation.

Definition 2.4. (*The vectors ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m .*) For every $0 \leq i \leq m$ let $\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ be the vector

$$\ell_i(\lambda) = (-1)^{\lambda(i)}.$$

Let U be the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ spanned by ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m .

Notice that with the convention $\lambda(0) = 0$ in Section 2.2, ℓ_0 is the constant function with value 1. See Example 3.4 where the rows of the matrix L are the vectors ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m for $m = 4$. It is an elementary exercise to verify that ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m is an orthogonal system with respect to the standard inner product in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$, indeed $\langle \ell_i, \ell_j \rangle = 2^m \delta_{i,j}$.

Proposition 2.5. Σ_m permutes ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m in the natural way and leaves ℓ_0 fixed. That is, $\sigma_*(\ell_0) = \ell_0$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ and for any $1 \leq i \leq m$

$$\sigma_*(\ell_i) = \ell_{\sigma(i)}.$$

Proof. $\sigma_*(\ell_i)(\lambda) = \ell_i(\lambda \circ \sigma) = (-1)^{(\lambda \circ \sigma)(i)} = \ell_{\sigma(i)}(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. □

By definition of the unit simplex, $x \in \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ if and only if $\langle \ell_0, x \rangle = 1$ and $x(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. This justifies the following definition.

Definition 2.6. (The polytopes $P(b)$). Let $L: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ be the linear transformation

$$L(x)(i) = \langle \ell_i, x \rangle, \quad (0 \leq i \leq m).$$

For any $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ let $P(b) \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ be the polytope

$$P(b) = L^{-1} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ b \end{pmatrix} \right) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} : x(\lambda) \geq 0\}.$$

Notice that $P(b)$ is the intersection of an affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ with half-space, hence it is a polytope [1, §8]. Also, $L(e_\lambda) = (\ell_0(\lambda), \dots, \ell_m(\lambda))$ are the vertices of the m -dimensional cube $\{1\} \times [-1, 1]^m$ in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} . Therefore, as in Section 1.1, L restricts to a surjective linear map of polytopes $\Lambda: \Delta(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow [-1, 1]^m$ and $P(b) = \Lambda^{-1}(b)$. The next Proposition follows.

Proposition 2.7. Any two polytopes $P(b)$ and $P(b')$ are either equal or disjoint. The polytope $P(b)$ is not empty if and only if $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$, namely $|b(i)| \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. \square

Proposition 2.8. For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ and any $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ the linear map $\sigma_*: \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ restricts to an isomorphism of polytopes $\sigma_*: P(b) \rightarrow P(\sigma_*(b))$.

Proof. Regard b as a vector in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} with $b(0) = 1$. Since Σ_m acts by orthogonal transformations on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$, for any $x \in P(b)$

$$\langle \ell_i, \sigma_*(x) \rangle = \langle \sigma_*^{-1} \ell_i, x \rangle = \langle \ell_{\sigma^{-1}(i)}, x \rangle = b(\sigma^{-1}(i)) = \sigma_*(b)(i).$$

It easily follows that $\sigma_*(P(b)) = P(\sigma_*(b))$. \square

Set $\mathcal{P} = \{P(b) : P(b) \text{ is not empty}\}$. Propositions 2.7 and 2.8 readily imply

Corollary 2.9. The assignment $b \mapsto P(b)$ induces a Σ_m -equivariant bijection $[-1, 1]^m \cong \mathcal{P}$. \square

3. THE SUPERVERTEX OF $P(b)$

Recall the vectors ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m and the subspace U from Definition 2.4.

Definition 3.1. Let $\ell'_0, \dots, \ell'_m \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ be the vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \ell'_i &= \frac{1}{2}(\ell_i - \ell_{i+1}), & 0 \leq i \leq m-1 \\ \ell'_m &= \frac{1}{2}(\ell_0 + \ell_m). \end{aligned}$$

One checks that $\ell_k = -\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \ell'_i + \sum_{i=k}^m \ell'_i$ for every $0 \leq k \leq m$, thus ℓ'_0, \dots, ℓ'_m is a basis for U .

Definition 3.2. Given $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ write $b(0) = 1$ and $b(m+1) = -1$. Let $b' \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ be the vector

$$b'(i) = \frac{b(i) - b(i+1)}{2}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq m.$$

Proposition 3.3. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$. Then $x \in P(b)$ if and only if $\langle \ell'_i, x \rangle = b'(i)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m$ and $x(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$.

Proof. Similar to the linear map L in Definition 2.6 let $L': \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ be the linear transformation $L'(x)(i) = \langle \ell'_i, x \rangle$ where $0 \leq i \leq m$. Since ℓ'_0, \dots, ℓ'_m is a basis for U it follows that $\ker(L') = U^\perp = \ker(L)$. If $v \in L^{-1} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ b \end{pmatrix} \right)$ then one checks using Definitions 3.1 and 3.2 that $L'(v) = b'$. Thus, $L^{-1} \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ b \end{pmatrix} \right) = v + U^\perp = L'^{-1}(b')$ and this completes the proof. \square

Example 3.4. Suppose that $m = 4$. We write the vectors $\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ from Definition 2.4 as the rows of the matrix L below, where “ $-$ ” denotes -1 and the columns of the matrix are indexed by the elements λ of $\mathcal{L} = 2^{[4]}$ ordered lexicographically.

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 0000 & 0001 & 0010 & 0011 & 0100 & 0101 & 0110 & 0111 & 1000 & 1001 & 1010 & 1011 & 1100 & 1101 & 1110 & 1111 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & - & - & - & - & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & - & - & - & - \\ 1 & 1 & - & - & 1 & 1 & - & - & 1 & 1 & - & - & 1 & 1 & - & - \\ 1 & - & 1 & - & 1 & - & 1 & - & 1 & - & 1 & - & 1 & - & 1 & - \end{bmatrix}$$

Consider a vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ where $|b(i)| \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. The polytope $P(b)$ is the set of solutions of

$$Lx = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \quad x(\lambda) \geq 0.$$

Consider the following 5×5 matrix T and its inverse. These are the transition matrices between the bases ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m and ℓ'_0, \dots, ℓ'_m of U . See Definition 3.1.

$$T = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & - & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & - & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & - & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & - \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad T^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ - & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ - & - & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ - & - & - & 1 & 1 \\ - & - & - & - & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then $P(b)$ is the set of solutions of the equations

$$TLx = T \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \quad x(\lambda) \geq 0$$

and one checks that $L' = TL$ is the matrix whose rows are the basis elements ℓ'_0, \dots, ℓ'_4 and by inspection of Definition 3.2, $T \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ b \end{pmatrix}$ is the vector b' . Thus, $P(b)$ is the solution set of

$$L'x = b' = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - b(1) \\ b(2) - b(1) \\ b(3) - b(2) \\ b(4) - b(3) \\ 1 + b(4) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad x(\lambda) \geq 0.$$

Compare with Proposition 3.3. The matrix L' has the form

$$L' = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_4 & \mu_3 & & \mu_2 & & & & \mu_1 & & & & & & & & \mu_0 \\ 0000 & 0001 & 0010 & 0011 & 0100 & 0101 & 0110 & 0111 & 1000 & 1001 & 1010 & 1011 & 1100 & 1101 & 1110 & 1111 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & - & - & - & - & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & - & - & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & - & - & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & - & 0 & 0 & 1 & - & 0 & 0 & 1 & - & 0 & 0 & 1 & - & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Observe that the entries of L' are ± 1 or 0 . In each column the non-zero entries form a sequence of alternating 1's and -1 's, starting and ending with 1. Also notice that the columns indexed by μ_0, \dots, μ_4 form the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^{4+1} . These facts are not a coincidence and will play a major role. We now turn to prove these crucial facts.

Definition 3.5. For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ let c_λ be the vector in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} defined by

$$c_\lambda(i) = \ell'_i(\lambda), \quad 0 \leq i \leq m.$$

The vectors c_λ are the columns of the matrix L' in Example 3.4.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. With the convention $\lambda(0) = 0$ and $\lambda(m+1) = 1$ in Section 2.2,*

$$c_\lambda(i) = \lambda(i+1) - \lambda(i), \quad i = 0, \dots, m.$$

Proof. For any $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$ we have $\frac{1}{2}((-1)^a - (-1)^b) = b - a$. If $i = 0, \dots, m-1$ then $c_\lambda(i) = \ell'_i(\lambda) = (\ell_i(\lambda) - \ell_{i+1}(\lambda))/2 = ((-1)^{\lambda(i)} - (-1)^{\lambda(i+1)})/2 = \lambda(i+1) - \lambda(i)$. If $i = m$ then $c_\lambda(m) = \ell'_m(\lambda) = (\ell_0(\lambda) + \ell_m(\lambda))/2 = ((-1)^{\lambda(m)} - (-1)^{\lambda(m+1)})/2 = \lambda(m+1) - \lambda(m)$. \square

Corollary 3.7. *For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ the values of c_λ are either 0, 1 or -1 . If $0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq m$ are the indices for which $c_\lambda(i) \neq 0$ then k is odd and $c_\lambda(i_1), c_\lambda(i_2), \dots, c_\lambda(i_k)$ is a sequence of the form $1, -1, 1, -1, 1, \dots, -1, 1$ of alternating 1's and -1 's.*

Proof. Since λ only attains the values 0, 1 and $\lambda(0) = 0$ and $\lambda(m+1) = 1$, it is clear the the sequence of differences $c_\lambda(i) = \lambda(i+1) - \lambda(i)$ must consist of only 0 and ± 1 , and its support must starts at 1 (because $\lambda(0) = 0$), end at 1 (because $\lambda(m+1) = 1$) and is alternating between 1 and -1 (or else $\lambda(i) \neq 0, 1$ for some i). \square

Next, we single out a set of $m+1$ elements $\mu_0, \dots, \mu_m \in \mathcal{L}$. See Example 3.4.

Definition 3.8. For $0 \leq i \leq m$ define $\mu_i \in \mathcal{L} = 2^{[m]}$ by

$$\mu_i(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \leq i \\ 1 & \text{if } k \geq i+1 \end{cases} \quad (1 \leq k \leq m)$$

Thus, $\mu_i \in \mathcal{L}$ can be described as the following vectors

$$\mu_i = (\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i \text{ times}}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{m-i \text{ times}}).$$

By definition of the partial order on \mathcal{L} in Section 2.2

$$\mathbf{1} = \mu_0 \succ \mu_1 \succ \dots \succ \mu_m = \mathbf{0}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ are the minimal and maximal elements of the poset \mathcal{L} .

Lemma 3.9. *For any $0 \leq i \leq m$ the vector c_{μ_i} is the standard basis vector $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$.*

Proof. By Definition 3.8 and Lemma 3.6, $c_{\mu_i}(j) = \mu_i(j+1) - \mu_i(j) = \delta_{i,j}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq m$. \square

Recall that for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ we denote by $e_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ the standard basis vector $e_\lambda(\lambda') = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'}$.

Definition 3.10 (The supervertex - the decreasing case). Consider $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$. Assume that b is decreasing, namely

$$b(1) \geq b(2) \geq \dots \geq b(m)$$

Recall b' from Definition 3.2. The *supervertex* of $P(b)$ is the vector $q^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ defined by

$$q^* = \sum_{i=0}^m b'(i) \cdot e_{\mu_i},$$

Definition 3.10 requires justification: A-priori it is not clear that $q^* \in P(b)$ and that it is a vertex of this polytope. This is the content of Proposition 3.11 below.

Since the facets of $\Delta(\mathcal{L})$ are contained in the hyperplanes $H_{\lambda_0} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}} : x(\lambda_0) = 0\}$ and since $P(b)$ is the intersection of $\Delta(\mathcal{L})$ with hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$, it easily follows that $x \in P(b)$ is a vertex if and only if $\text{supp}(x)$ is minimal with respect to inclusion, namely no $y \in P(b)$ has $\text{supp}(y) \subsetneq \text{supp}(x)$.

Recall that we agree that $b(0) = 1$ and $b(m+1) = -1$. Therefore, by definition of b' ,

$$(11) \quad \text{supp}(q^*) = \{\mu_i : 0 \leq i \leq m \text{ and } b(i) > b(i+1)\}.$$

Proposition 3.11. *The vector $q^* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ from Definition 3.10 is a vertex of $P(b)$.*

Proof. First, $P(b)$ is not empty by Proposition 2.7. Since b is decreasing and $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$ we see that $b'(i) \geq 0$ for all i . Therefore $q^*(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. Next, for any $0 \leq k \leq m$, Lemma 3.9 implies that

$$\langle \ell'_k, q^* \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^m b'(i) \langle \ell'_k, e_{\mu_i} \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^m b'(i) \ell'_k(\mu_i) = \sum_{i=0}^m b'(i) c_{\mu_i}(k) = b'(k).$$

Proposition 3.3 shows that $q^* \in P(b)$.

To show that q^* is a vertex, consider $x \in P(b)$ such that $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq \text{supp}(q^*)$. Set $y = x - q^*$. Then $\text{supp}(y) \subseteq \{\mu_0, \dots, \mu_m\}$ and $\langle \ell'_i, y \rangle = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m$ by Proposition 3.3. By Lemma 3.9,

$$\langle \ell'_i, y \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^m y(\mu_j) \ell'_i(\mu_j) = \sum_{j=0}^m y(\mu_j) c_{\mu_j}(i) = y(\mu_i).$$

This shows that $y = 0$, hence $x = q^*$ as needed. \square

Recall the action of Σ_m on \mathbb{R}^m and $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ from Section 2.3.

Definition 3.12 (The supervertex - the general case). Let $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be such that $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$. Choose $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ such that $\sigma_*(b)$ is decreasing. The *supervertex* q_b^* of $P(b)$ is the preimage of the supervertex $q_{\sigma_*(b)}^* \in P(\sigma_*(b))$ in Definition 3.10 under the linear isomorphism of polytopes $\sigma_*: P(b) \rightarrow P(\sigma_*(b))$ in Proposition 2.8.

Once again, we need to justify the definition. A-priori it is not clear that the definition of q^* is independent of the choice of σ , thus making supervertices possibly non-unique.

Proposition 3.13. *Let $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfy $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$ so that $P(b)$ is not empty. Then the vertex $q_b^* \in P(b)$ from Definition 3.12 is independent of the choice of σ . Moreover, $\sigma_*(q_b^*) = q_b^*$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ such that $\sigma_*(P(b)) = P(b)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\tau \in \Sigma_m$ is another permutation with $\tau_*(b)$ decreasing. Then $\tau_*(b) = \sigma_*(b)$ and in particular $P(\sigma_*(b)) = P(\tau_*(b))$ and $q_{\sigma_*(b)}^* = q_{\tau_*(b)}^*$ in Definition 3.10. Thus, the proof of the proposition reduces to showing that for any *decreasing* $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the supervertex $q^* \in P(b)$ in Definition 3.10 is fixed by the linear isomorphism $\sigma_*: P(b) \rightarrow P(b)$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ such that $\sigma_*(b) = b$. For the remainder of the proof we fix such decreasing b and such σ . The claim that $\sigma_*(q^*) = q^*$ will follow once we show that $\sigma_*^{-1}(\lambda) = \lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \text{supp}(q^*)$.

Suppose $\mu_i \in \text{supp}(q^*)$, see (11). Since $\sigma_*^{-1}(b) = b$ it is clear that σ acts by permuting the sets of indices $j \in [m]$ for which the values of b are equal. Since b is decreasing and $b'(i) = q^*(\mu_i) > 0$, if $j \geq i+1$ then $b(\sigma(j)) = b(j) > b(i)$ so $\sigma(j) \geq i+1$. Thus, σ permutes $\{i+1, \dots, m\}$ and $\{1, \dots, i\}$ separately. It follows directly from Definition 3.8 that $\sigma_*^{-1}(\mu_i) = \mu_i$ as needed. \square

3.14. Direct description of the supervertex. Given $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$ we can describe the supervertex q^* of $P(b)$ as follows. As above, it is understood that $b(0) = 1$ and $b(m+1) = -1$. We can arrange $b(1), b(2), \dots, b(m)$ in decreasing order

$$b(i_1) \geq b(i_2) \geq \dots \geq b(i_m).$$

For $k = 0, \dots, m$ let $\theta_k \in \mathcal{L}$ be the characteristic function of $\{i_{k+1}, i_{k+2}, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq [m]$. The supervertex has the form

$$q^* = \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{b(i_k) - b(i_{k+1})}{2} \cdot e_{\theta_k},$$

where it is understood that $i_0 = 0$ and $i_{m+1} = m + 1$ and $b(0) = 1$ and $b(m + 1) = -1$.

4. THE SUBVERTEX OF $P(b)$

Definition 4.1. Define the following elements of $\nu_0, \dots, \nu_m \in \mathcal{L}$. For any $0 \leq i \leq m$

$$\nu_i(j) = 1 - \delta_{ij} \quad (1 \leq j \leq m).$$

Thus, $\nu_0 = \mathbf{1}$ is the maximal element of \mathcal{L} , and $\nu_i = (1, \dots, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 1)$ where the 0 is at the i th position.

Definition 4.2. For $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ define $b'' \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ by

$$b''(i) = \frac{b(i) + 1}{2} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m, \text{ and}$$

$$b''(0) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m b''(i).$$

Proposition 4.3. *By construction $\sum_{i=0}^m b''(i) = 1$. If $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$ then $b''(i) \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ (but $b''(0)$ may be negative). \square*

Definition 4.4. Suppose that $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$. The *subvertex* of $P(b)$ is $q_* \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ defined by

$$q_* = \sum_{i=0}^m b''(i) \cdot e_{\nu_i}.$$

Important remark: As its name suggests, as well as deceives, q_* *need not* be an element of $P(b)$. Remarkably, by Proposition 4.8 below, if $q_* \in P(b)$ then it is a vertex of this polytope

Definition 4.5. Define vectors $\ell''_0, \dots, \ell''_m \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ by

$$\ell''_0 = \ell_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \ell''_i = \frac{1}{2}(\ell_i + \ell_0) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

The next lemma follows directly from Definitions 2.6, 4.2 and 4.5.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$. Then $x \in P(b)$ if and only if $\langle \ell''_0, x \rangle = 1$ and $\langle \ell''_i, x \rangle = b''(i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $x(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. \square .*

Lemma 4.7. *With the convention $\lambda(0) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$ in Section 2.2, for any $0 \leq i \leq m$*

$$\ell''_i(\lambda) = 1 - \lambda(i).$$

In particular $\ell''_0(\nu_j) = 1$ and $\ell''_i(\nu_j) = \delta_{ij}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and all $0 \leq j \leq m$.

Proof. If $a = 0, 1$ then $\frac{1+(-1)^a}{2} = 1 - a$. \square

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose that $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$. Then q_* belongs to $P(b)$ if and only if $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b(i) \leq \frac{2}{m} - 1$. In this case q_* is in fact a vertex of the polytope $P(b)$.*

Proof. Notice that $\langle \ell''_i, q_* \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^m b''(j) \ell''_i(\nu_j)$ for all i . It follows from Lemma 4.7 and the definition of b'' that $\langle \ell''_0, q_* \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^m b''(j) = 1$ and that $\langle \ell''_i, q_* \rangle = b''(i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$ it follows that $b''(i) \geq 0$ for all $i \geq 1$, so Lemma 4.6 implies that $q_* \in P(b)$ if and only if $b''(0) \geq 0$. By Inspection of Definition 4.2, this is equivalent to the requirement $\sum_{i=1}^m b(i) \leq 2 - m$, as needed.

It remains to prove that q_* is a vertex of $P(b)$ in this case. Suppose that $x \in P(b)$ and $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq \text{supp}(q_*)$. Set $y = x - q_*$. Then $\text{supp}(y) \subseteq \text{supp}(q_*) \subseteq \{\nu_0, \dots, \nu_m\}$ and by Lemma 4.6, $\langle \ell''_i, y \rangle = 0$ for all $i \geq 0$. Clearly $\langle \ell''_i, y \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^m y(\nu_j) \ell''_i(\nu_j)$. By Lemma 4.7, if $i \geq 1$ we have $y(\nu_i) = \langle \ell''_i, y \rangle = 0$. If $i = 0$ then $0 = \langle \ell''_0, y \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^m y(\nu_j)$ so $y(\nu_0) = 0$ as well. Hence $y = 0$, so $x = q_*$, and therefore q_* is a vertex of $P(b)$. \square

5. TRUNCATION, ℓ -POSITIVE VECTORS, MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM

Throughout this section we assume that $P(b)$ is not empty, i.e. $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$. Recall ℓ_0, \dots, ℓ_m and U from Definition 2.4 and the sets $U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ and $(U_{\ell\text{-pos}})^+$ of (truncated) ℓ -positive vectors defined in Section 1.5. The purpose of this section is to prove the following theorems.

Theorem 5.1. *Let q^* be the supervertex of $P(b)$. Then for any $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$*

$$\max\{\langle u^+, x \rangle : x \in P(b)\} = \langle u^+, q^* \rangle.$$

Theorem 5.2. *Let q_* be the subvertex of $P(b)$. Then $\langle u^+, q_* \rangle \geq 0$ for any $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$, and*

$$\min\{\langle u^+, x \rangle : x \in P(b)\} \geq \langle u^+, q_* \rangle.$$

If $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b(i) \leq \frac{2}{m} - 1$ then q_ is a vertex of $P(b)$ and the inequality is an equality.*

Thus, all the functions $f(x) = \langle u^+, x \rangle$, where $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$, attain their maximum on $P(b)$ at the supervertex. It can be shown by means of examples that different such functions f attain their minimum at different vertices of $P(b)$, so Theorem 5.2 is as strong as can be. The fact that the minimum is attained uniformly at the vertex q_* for all polytopes $P(b)$ for which b belongs to a neighbourhood of the corner $(-1, \dots, -1)$ of the cube $[-1, 1]^m$ is very surprising.

Corollary 5.3. *Let q^* and q_* be the supervertex and the subvertex of $P(b)$. Let $u_1, \dots, u_n \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ and set $f = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^+$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\langle f, x \rangle : x \in P(b)\} &= \langle f, q^* \rangle \\ \min\{\langle f, x \rangle : x \in P(b)\} &\geq \langle f, q_* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

If $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m b(i) \leq \frac{2}{m} - 1$ then $q_ \in P(b)$ and equality holds.* \square

Proposition 5.4. *The set $U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ is closed under addition of vectors and multiplication by positive scalars. Also, if $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ then $u + cl_0 \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. The set $(U_{\ell\text{-pos}})^+$ is closed under addition of vectors and multiplication by positive scalars.*

Proof. Immediate from the definitions. \square

Recall the partial order \preceq on \mathcal{L} , see Section 2.2.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$. Then as a function $u: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ it is order reversing, i.e. $u(\lambda) \leq u(\lambda')$ if $\lambda' \preceq \lambda$. In particular $\text{supp}(u^+) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is closed downwards with respect to \preceq . That is, if $\lambda \in \text{supp}(u^+)$ and $\lambda' \preceq \lambda$ then $\lambda' \in \text{supp}(u^+)$.*

Proof. For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$

$$u(\lambda) = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \ell_i(\lambda) = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^{\lambda(i)} a_i = a_0 + \sum_{i \notin \text{supp}(\lambda)} a_i - \sum_{i \in \text{supp}(\lambda)} a_i.$$

Since $a_1, \dots, a_m > 0$ it is clear that if $\lambda' \preceq \lambda$, i.e. $\text{supp}(\lambda') \subseteq \text{supp}(\lambda)$, then $u(\lambda') \geq u(\lambda)$. \square

Recall the bases ℓ'_0, \dots, ℓ'_m and $\ell''_0, \dots, \ell''_m$ of U from Definitions 2.4 and 4.5.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $u = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell'_i$ be an element of U . Then $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ if and only if $\alpha_0 < \dots < \alpha_m$.*

Proof. When presented $u = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i \ell_i$, one checks that $a_0 = \frac{\alpha_0 + \alpha_m}{2}$ and $a_i = \frac{\alpha_i - \alpha_{i-1}}{2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. The lemma follows. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let $u = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell''_i$ be an element of U . Then $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ if and only if $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m > 0$ (and no condition on α_0).*

Proof. Written $u = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i \ell_i$, one checks that $\alpha_i = 2a_i$ and $\alpha_0 = a_0 - \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$. \square

Example 5.8. Let us illustrate the proof of Theorem 5.1 when $m = 4$. Let $b \in \mathbb{R}^4$ be such that $|b(i)| \leq 1$. Assume further that b is decreasing, i.e. $b(1) \geq b(2) \geq b(3) \geq b(4)$. We have seen that $P(b)$ is the solution set of the equations

$$L'x = b' \quad \text{and} \quad x(\lambda) \geq 0$$

where the rows of the matrix L' are the vectors ℓ'_0, \dots, ℓ'_4 in Definition 3.1. In the present example we will refer to Example 3.4 where we describe L' and b' explicitly. The supervertex of $P(b)$ has the form $q^* = \sum_{i=0}^4 b'(i) \cdot e_{\mu_i}$, see Definitions 3.2 and 3.8 and 3.10.

Let $u = \sum_{i=0}^4 \alpha_i \ell'_i$ be ℓ -positive. By Lemma 5.6, $\alpha_0 < \dots < \alpha_4$ and there is k such that

$$\alpha_0 < \dots < \alpha_{k-1} \leq 0 < \alpha_k < \dots < \alpha_4.$$

We will write $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_4)$ for the row vector in \mathbb{R}^5 . Then $u = \alpha \cdot L'$ and $u^+ = \alpha \cdot L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)}$ where $L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)}$ is the matrix obtained from L' by setting to zero the λ -th columns for all $\lambda \notin \text{supp}(u^+)$. Thus, for any $x \in P(b)$ considered as a column vector,

$$\langle u^+, x \rangle = \alpha \cdot L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)} \cdot x.$$

Since the μ_i -th column of L' is the standard basis vector e_i , see Example 3.4 and compare with Lemma 3.9, $u(\mu_i) = \alpha_i$ so $\mu_i \in \text{supp}(u^+) \iff i \geq k$. Since q^* is supported by μ_0, \dots, μ_4

$$\langle u^+, q^* \rangle = \alpha \cdot (L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)} \cdot q^*) = \alpha \cdot (0, \dots, 0, b'(k), \dots, b'(4)).$$

Write $\alpha_- = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\alpha_+ = (0, \dots, 0, \alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_4)$. Then $\alpha = \alpha_- + \alpha_+$. Observe that the non-zero entries of each column of L' form a sequence $1, -1, 1, \dots, 1$ of alternating ± 1 , compare with Corollary 3.7. We claim that all the entries of the (row) vector

$$(*) \quad \alpha_- \cdot L'$$

are non-positive. Indeed, its λ -th entry is equal to the product of α_- with the λ -th column of L' , which has the form $\alpha_{i_1} - \alpha_{i_2} + \alpha_{i_3} - \dots \pm \alpha_{i_t}$ where $0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t \leq k-1$. Since α is increasing and $\alpha_i \leq 0$ for $i \leq k-1$, collecting the terms in pairs shows that this is a sum of negative numbers (if t is even) and possibly a non-positive last term α_{i_t} (if t is odd). Similarly, we claim that all the entries of the vector

$$(**) \quad \alpha_+ \cdot L'$$

are non-negative. The λ -th entry is the product of α_+ with the λ -th column of L' which has the form $\alpha_{i_t} - \alpha_{i_{t-1}} + \cdots \pm \alpha_{i_1}$ where $k \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_t \leq n$. Since α is increasing and $\alpha_i > 0$ for $i \geq k$, collecting terms in pairs starting from the last term shows that this is the sum of positive numbers and possibly a positive first term α_{i_1} .

Finally, suppose that $x \in P(b)$. Then $x(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all λ and $L'x = b'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u^+, x \rangle &= \alpha \cdot L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)} \cdot x = \alpha_- \cdot L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)} \cdot x + \alpha_+ \cdot L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)} \cdot x \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \alpha_+ \cdot L'_{\text{supp}(u^+)} \cdot x \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} \alpha_+ \cdot L' \cdot x = (0, \dots, 0, \alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_n) \cdot b' = \alpha \cdot (0, \dots, 0, b'(k), \dots, b'(n)) = \langle u^+, q^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. First, choose some $\sigma \in \Sigma_m$ such that $\sigma_*(b)$ is decreasing. Since σ_* acts by permuting the factors of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ it is clear that $\sigma_*(u^+) = \sigma_*(u)^+$. Also, σ_* is an orthogonal transformation so for any $x \in P(b)$

$$\langle u^+, x \rangle = \langle \sigma_*(u^+), \sigma_*(x) \rangle = \langle \sigma_*(u)^+, \sigma_*(x) \rangle.$$

It follows from Proposition 2.5 that $\sigma_*(u)$ is ℓ -positive. Since $\sigma_*: P(b) \rightarrow P(\sigma_*(b))$ is a linear homeomorphism, we may replace b with $\sigma_*(b)$ and $P(b)$ with $P(\sigma_*(b))$ and u with $\sigma_*(u)$. So for the rest of the proof we assume that b is decreasing. Also, to avoid triviality we assume that $u^+ \neq 0$, namely $\text{supp}(u^+) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 5.6,

$$u = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell'_i \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_m.$$

By definition of the elements $\mu_0, \dots, \mu_m \in \mathcal{L}$ we have $\mu_0 \succeq \mu_1 \succeq \cdots \succeq \mu_m$. Since $\text{supp}(u^+) \neq \emptyset$ and μ_m is the minimum of \mathcal{L} , it follows from Lemma 5.5 that there is a smallest index k such that $\mu_k \in \text{supp}(u^+)$. Thus,

$$\mu_i \in \text{supp}(u^+) \iff i \geq k.$$

By Lemma 3.9 and Definition 3.5 (of c_λ)

$$u(\mu_j) = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell'_i(\mu_j) = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i c_{\mu_j}(i) = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \delta_{i,j} = \alpha_j.$$

By the choice of k we get that $u^+(\mu_i) = 0$ if and only if $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ and that

$$\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_{k-1} \leq 0 < \alpha_k < \cdots < \alpha_m.$$

Therefore, see Definition 3.10,

$$(12) \quad \langle u^+, q^* \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}} u^+(\lambda) q^*(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^m u^+(\mu_i) q^*(\mu_i) = \sum_{i=k}^m u(\mu_i) q^*(\mu_i) = \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i b'(i).$$

Consider some $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. By Definition 3.5 and with k defined above

$$(13) \quad u(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell'_i(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) + \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i c_\lambda(i).$$

Let $I = \{i : c_\lambda(i) \neq 0\}$. Let $I_- = I \cap \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. By Corollary 3.7, $I_- = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_t\}$ and the sequence $c_\lambda(i_1), \dots, c_\lambda(i_t)$ has the form $1, -1, 1, -1, \dots$. Therefore

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) = (\alpha_{i_1} - \alpha_{i_2}) + (\alpha_{i_3} - \alpha_{i_4}) + \cdots.$$

Recall that $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots$ is increasing. If t is even then this is a sum (possibly empty) of negative terms, and if t is odd then this is a sum of negative terms and of α_{i_t} which is non-positive since $i_t < k$. We deduce that

$$(14) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) \leq 0.$$

Set $I_+ = I \cap \{k, \dots, m\}$. By Corollary 3.7, $I_+ = \{i_t < i_{t-1} < \dots < i_1\}$ where $k \leq i_t$ and $i_1 \leq m$ and the sequence $c_\lambda(i_1), \dots, c_\lambda(i_t)$ has the form $1, -1, 1, -1, \dots$ and therefore

$$\sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) = (\alpha_{i_1} - \alpha_{i_2}) + (\alpha_{i_3} - \alpha_{i_4}) + \dots.$$

If t is even then this is a sum (possibly empty) of positive terms (since $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots$ is increasing) and if t is odd then it is a sum of positive terms and α_{i_t} which is also positive since $i_t \geq k$. We deduce that

$$(15) \quad \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) \geq 0.$$

Consider an arbitrary $x \in P(b)$. By definition of u^+ and equation (13)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u^+, x \rangle &= \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}} u^+(\lambda) x(\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(u^+)} u(\lambda) x(\lambda) = \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(u^+)} x(\lambda) \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) + \sum_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(u^+)} x(\lambda) \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i c_\lambda(i). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x(\lambda) \geq 0$, equations (14) and (15) allow us to continue the estimate of $\langle u^+, x \rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(u^+)} x(\lambda) \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}} x(\lambda) \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i c_\lambda(i) = \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}} \ell'_i(\lambda) x(\lambda) = \\ &= \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i \langle \ell'_i, x \rangle = \sum_{i=k}^m \alpha_i b'(i) = \langle u^+, q^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. The last statement in the theorem follows immediately from Proposition 4.8 and the first statement. So it remain to prove the inequality and that $\langle u^+, q_* \rangle \geq 0$.

By Lemma 5.7, $u = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell''_i$ where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m > 0$. Since $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$ it follows from Definition 4.2 that $b''(i) \geq 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. Suppose that $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is a vector such that $\langle \ell''_0, x \rangle = 1$ and $\langle \ell''_i, x \rangle = b''(i)$ for all $i \geq 1$. Then

$$(*) \quad \langle u, x \rangle = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i b''(i).$$

By Definition 4.4 and Lemma 4.7, q_* satisfies these conditions. By Lemma 4.6, this is also the case for any $x \in P(b)$. Suppose that $\alpha_0 \geq 0$. Then $\langle u, q_* \rangle \geq 0$ by (*). Also, $u(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell''_i(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all λ (since $\ell''_i(\lambda) \geq 0$), so $u^+ = u$. Thus, if $x \in P(b)$ then $\langle u^+, x \rangle = \langle u, x \rangle \stackrel{(*)}{=} \langle u, q_* \rangle = \langle u^+, q_* \rangle$. This prove the theorem in the case $\alpha_0 \geq 0$. So for the rest of the proof we assume that $\alpha_0 < 0$.

Lemma 4.7 shows that

$$(16) \quad u(\nu_0) = \alpha_0 \quad \text{and} \quad u(\nu_i) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_i \text{ for } i \geq 1.$$

Notice that $\nu_0 \notin \text{supp}(u^+)$ since we assume that $\alpha_0 < 0$. Set

$$I(u) = \{i : \nu_i \in \text{supp}(u^+), 0 \leq i \leq m\}$$

Then $I(u) \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ and since $b''(i) \geq 0$ for $i \geq 1$,

$$(17) \quad \langle u^+, q_* \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^m b''(i) \cdot u^+(\nu_i) = \sum_{i \in I(u)} b''(i) \cdot u(\nu_i) \geq 0.$$

This proves the first statement of the theorem. Recall from Section 2.2 the convention that $\lambda(0) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. For any $1 \leq i \leq m$ set

$$(18) \quad \mathcal{L}(i) = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{L} : \lambda(i) = 0\} \stackrel{\text{(Lemma 4.7)}}{=} \{\lambda \in \mathcal{L} : \ell''_i(\lambda) = 1\}.$$

If $i \in I(u)$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(i)$ then $u(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^m \alpha_j \ell''_j(\lambda) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_i + \sum_{j \neq 0, i} \alpha_j \ell''_j(\lambda) \geq \alpha_0 + \alpha_i = u(\nu_i) > 0$. We deduce that

$$(19) \quad \Lambda(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i \in I(u)} \mathcal{L}(i) \subseteq \text{supp}(u^+).$$

Consider some $x \in P(b)$. Since $x(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all λ

$$(20) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(u)} x(\lambda) \leq \sum_{i \in I(u)} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(i)} x(\lambda) = \sum_{i \in I(u)} \langle \ell''_i, x \rangle \stackrel{\text{(Lemma 4.6)}}{=} \sum_{i \in I(u)} b''(i).$$

Since $\ell''_0(\lambda) = 1$ by Lemma 4.7, and since $\ell''_i(\lambda) = 1 \iff \lambda \in \mathcal{L}(i)$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u^+, x \rangle &= \sum_{\lambda \in \text{supp}(u^+)} u(\lambda) x(\lambda) \stackrel{(19)}{\geq} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(u)} u(\lambda) x(\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(u)} \sum_{i=0}^m \alpha_i \ell''_i(\lambda) x(\lambda) = \\ &= \alpha_0 \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(u)} x(\lambda) + \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(u)} \ell''_i(\lambda) x(\lambda) \geq \alpha_0 \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(u)} x(\lambda) + \sum_{i \in I(u)} \alpha_i \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}(i)} \ell''_i(\lambda) x(\lambda) = \\ &= \alpha_0 \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(u)} x(\lambda) + \sum_{i \in I(u)} \alpha_i \langle \ell''_i, x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (20), (16) and to Lemma 4.6, and since $\alpha_0 < 0$ and $b''(i) \geq 0$ for all $i \geq 1$, we can continue the estimate

$$\geq \alpha_0 \sum_{i \in I(u)} b''(i) + \sum_{i \in I(u)} \alpha_i b''(i) = \sum_{i \in I(u)} u(\nu_i) b''(i) = \langle u^+, q_* \rangle.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

6. FUNCTIONS FROM \mathcal{L}^n

We fix $n > 0$ and an \mathcal{L} -labelled tree \mathcal{T} , see Section 1.3. We start this section with a simple observation about symmetric truncated ℓ -positive functions $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, see Definition 1.7.

Proposition 6.1. *The collection of (symmetric) truncated ℓ -positive functions is closed under addition and multiplication by positive scalars. \square*

6.2. Notation. Let $W(\Omega)$ denote the set of words in the alphabet Ω . For any $\omega \in \Omega$ we write ω^k for the word $\omega \cdots \omega$ of length k . For any $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and any $\omega_1 \cdots \omega_k \in W(\Omega)$ write

$$f(w) = f(\omega_1) \cdots f(\omega_k).$$

Proposition 6.3 below shows that European functions, see Definition 1.12, are examples of symmetric truncated ℓ -positive functions. In order to construct them one needs to find $u \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ such that $u = u^+$. These are easy to construct as follows. Choose $a_1, \dots, a_m > 0$ arbitrarily. Then for any choice of sufficiently large a_0 the vector $u = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i \ell_i$ is ℓ -positive and has non-negative values, i.e $u = u^+$. Explicit examples of such vectors are given in Proposition 6.4 below.

Proposition 6.3. *Any European function $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is symmetric truncated ℓ -positive.*

Proof. By definition $F(\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n) = (\sum_{j=1}^r s_j \cdot u_j(\lambda_1) \cdots u_j(\lambda_n) - C)^+$ where $u_1, \dots, u_r \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ and $u_i^+ = u_i$ and $s_j, C \geq 0$. The symmetry of F is clear. Given $\omega, \tau \in \mathcal{T}$ of total length $n-1$, the function $f(\lambda) = F(\omega\lambda\tau)$ is the vector in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^r s_j \cdot u_j(\omega) \cdot u_j(\tau) \cdot u_j - C \cdot \ell_0 \right)^+.$$

Since s_j and $u_j(\omega), u_j(\tau)$ are non-negative, this is a vector in $(U_{\ell\text{-pos}})^+$. \square

Proposition 6.4. *Choose some $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $0 < D_i < U_i$. Then $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ defined by*

$$u_i(\lambda) = D_i^{\lambda(i)} U^{1-\lambda(i)} = \begin{cases} U_i & \text{if } \lambda(i) = 0 \\ D_i & \text{if } \lambda(i) = 1 \end{cases}$$

is an element of $U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$. In addition $u_i(\lambda) > 0$ for all λ , i.e $u_i^+ = u_i$.

Proof. By definition $\ell_i(\lambda) = (-1)^{\lambda(i)}$ and $\ell_0(\lambda) = 1$. One then checks that

$$u_i = \frac{U_i - D_i}{2} \ell_i + \frac{U_i + D_i}{2} \ell_0.$$

The second assertion is clear since $D_i, U_i > 0$. \square

7. FUNCTIONS ON TREES

Let \mathcal{T} be an \mathcal{L} -labelled tree of height n , see Section 1.3. A function $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ is merely an assignment of a probability density function on the set of successors of each vertex $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^*$. For any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ there is a canonical bijection $\mathcal{L}^k \cong A_\omega$ given by $\tau \mapsto \omega\tau$, see (1). We define a function $P(\Phi, A_\omega): \mathcal{L}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(21) \quad P(\Phi, A_\omega)(\tau) = \prod_{j=1}^k \Phi(\omega\tau_1 \cdots \tau_{j-1})(\tau_j).$$

If ω is the empty word then $A_\omega = \mathcal{L}^n$ and we write $P(\Phi)$ instead of $P(\Phi, A_\emptyset)$. See (2).

Proposition 7.1. *Consider $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ where $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

- (1) $P(\Phi, A_\omega)$ is a probability density function on \mathcal{L}^k .
- (2) If $q \in \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ and $\Phi = q$ is the constant function then $P(\Phi, A_\omega)$ is the product density function $(\mathcal{L}, q)^k$ on \mathcal{L}^k .
- (3) $P(\Phi)(A_\omega) = \prod_{j=1}^{n-k} \Phi(\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{j-1})(\omega_j)$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$.
- (4) If $P(\Phi)(A_\omega) > 0$ then $P(\Phi)(A_{\omega\lambda}|A_\omega) = \Phi(\omega)(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{L}$. More generally, $P(\Phi)(B|A_\omega) = P(\Phi, A_\omega)(B)$ for any $B \subseteq A_\omega \cong \mathcal{L}^k$.
- (5) Any probability measure P' on \mathcal{L}^n has the form $P(\Phi)$ for some $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{L})$.

Proof. Elementary and left to the reader. For the last statement define $\Phi(\omega)$ by means of item (4) whenever $P'(A_\omega) > 0$ and arbitrarily otherwise. \square

The following construction will be fundamental. It gives a procedure to extend a function $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on the leaves of \mathcal{T} to the entire tree.

Definition 7.2. Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$ be functions. Define by induction on $0 \leq k \leq n$ functions $F_{\Phi}^{(k)}: \mathcal{T}_{n-k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_{\Phi}^{(0)} = F$$

and once $F_{\Phi}^{(k)}$ has been defined, for any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k-1} = \mathcal{L}^{n-k-1}$ set

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k+1)}(\omega) = \left\langle F_{\Phi}^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, \Phi(\omega) \right\rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}} F_{\Phi}^{(k)}(\omega\lambda) \cdot \Phi(\omega)(\lambda).$$

Lemma 7.3. For any $0 \leq k \leq n$ and any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k)}(\omega) = \sum_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}^k} F(\omega\theta) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^k \Phi(\omega\theta_1 \cdots \theta_{j-1})(\theta_j).$$

Proof. Straightforward induction on k . The details are left to the reader. \square

Proposition 7.4. Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{L})$ be functions. For any $0 \leq k \leq n$ and any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ recall the function $F_{\omega-}$ from (4). Then

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k)}(\omega) = E_{P(\Phi, A_{\omega})}(F_{\omega-}).$$

If $P(\Phi)(A_{\omega}) > 0$ then $F_{\Phi}^{(k)}(\omega) = E_{P(\Phi)}(F|A_{\omega})$.

Proof. Apply Lemma 7.3 and (21). If $P(\Phi)(A_{\omega}) > 0$ use Proposition 7.1(4). \square

Proposition 7.5. Let q^* and q_* be the supervertex and the subvertex of a non-empty $P(b)$. Let $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$. By abuse of notation let q^* and q_* denote the constant functions $\mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{L}}$. Let $0 \leq k \leq n$ and let $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$. Then for any $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k)}(\omega) \leq F_{q^*}^{(k)}(\omega)$$

If $q_* \in P(b)$, see Proposition 4.8, then

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k)}(\omega) \geq F_{q_*}^{(k)}(\omega)$$

Proof. Use induction on k . The case $k = 0$ is a triviality because $F_{\Phi}^{(0)}, F_{q^*}^{(0)}, F_{q_*}^{(0)} = F$ by construction. Assume the inequalities hold for k .

Consider some $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k-1}$. Since $q^*(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all λ , and by assumption also $q_*(\lambda) \geq 0$, it follows from Lemma 7.3 and Propositions 6.1 and 5.4 that the functions $f^*(\lambda) = F_{q^*}^{(k)}(\omega\lambda)$ and $f_*(\lambda) = F_{q_*}^{(k)}(\omega\lambda)$ are truncated ℓ -positive (we remark that here it is *crucial* that q^* and q_* are constant functions $\mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$). By definition, the induction hypothesis, and the monotonicity of the expectation and Corollary 5.3

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k+1)}(\omega) = \langle F_{\Phi}^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, \Phi(\omega) \rangle \leq \langle F_{q^*}^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, \Phi(\omega) \rangle \leq \langle F_{q^*}^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, q^* \rangle = F_{q^*}^{(k+1)}(\omega).$$

An identical argument (with the inequalities reversed) shows that $F_{\Phi}^{(k+1)}(\omega) \geq F_{q_*}^{(k+1)}(\omega)$ provided $q_* \in P(b)$. \square

Definition 7.6. Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a European function (Definition 1.12) given by $u_1, \dots, u_r \in U_{\ell\text{-pos}}$ and $s_1, \dots, s_r, C \geq 0$. Let $P(b)$ be non-empty. For any $0 \leq i \leq m$ set

$$\beta(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(i) = b''(i) = \frac{1+b(i)}{2}.$$

For any $1 \leq j \leq r$ and any $0 \leq i \leq m$ set

$$\alpha_j(0) = u_j(\nu_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_j(i) = u_j(\nu_i) - u_j(\nu_0).$$

The *minimizer* of F on $P(b)$ is the function $G: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows. Using the notation in 6.2 for u_j and β and α_j , for any $1 \leq k \leq n$ and any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$ set

$$G^{(k)}(\omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \{0, \dots, m\}^k} \beta(\mathbf{i}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^r s_j \cdot \alpha_j(\mathbf{i}) \cdot u_j(\omega) - C \right)^+.$$

The final result of this section gives a lower bound, albeit generally quite poor, for the values of $F_{\Phi}^{(k)}$ for European functions where $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$. Compare with Proposition 7.5.

Proposition 7.7. *Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be European and $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$. Let G be the minimizer of F on $P(b)$. Then for any $0 \leq k \leq n$ and any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$*

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k)}(\omega) \geq G^{(k)}(\omega).$$

In particular

$$E_{P(\Phi)}(F) = F_{\Phi}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \geq \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \{0, \dots, m\}^n} \beta(\mathbf{i}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^r s_j \cdot \alpha_j(\mathbf{i}) - C \right)^+.$$

In preparation for the proof we make some observations. Suppose that $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a European function defined by $u_1, \dots, u_r \geq 0$. By Proposition 2.7 all the numbers $\beta(i)$ in Definition 7.6 are non-negative. Also, ν_0 in Definition 4.1 is the maximum element $\mathbf{1}$ of \mathcal{L} . Therefore $u_j(\nu_i) \geq u_j(\nu_0)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ by Lemma 5.5. In particular $\alpha_j(i) \geq 0$, and $\alpha_j(0) = u_j(\nu_0) \geq 0$ by the assumption that $u_j = u_j^+$.

Lemma 7.8. *Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}^r$ be vectors such that $a_i, b_i, c_i \geq 0$ and $a_i \geq b_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$. Let $C \geq 0$. Then for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^r$ such that $u_i \geq 0$ for all i*

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^r c_i a_i u_i - C \right)^+ - \left(\sum_{i=1}^r c_i b_i u_i - C \right)^+ \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^r c_i (a_i - b_i) u_i - C \right)^+.$$

Proof. Denote the left and right hand sides of the inequality by LHS and RHS. Since all numbers in sight are non-negative, if $\sum_{i=1}^r c_i b_i u_i \geq C$ then $\sum_{i=1}^r c_i a_i u_i \geq C$, and since $C \geq 0$

$$\text{LHS} = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i (a_i - b_i) u_i \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^r c_i (a_i - b_i) u_i - C \right)^+ = \text{RHS}.$$

If $\sum_{i=1}^r c_i b_i u_i < C$ then the second term in the left hand side vanishes and the inequality holds since $0 \leq a_i - b_i \leq a_i$ for all i . \square

Lemma 7.9. *Let q_* be the subvertex of $P(b)$. Let $F: \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a European function and G its minimizer on $P(b)$. Then for any $0 \leq k \leq n$ and any $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k-1}$*

$$\langle G^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega), q_*} \rangle \geq G^{(k+1)}(\omega).$$

Proof. We leave it to the reader to check that Lemma 7.8 together with the facts that $u_j(\omega\nu_i) = u_j(\omega) \cdot u_j(\nu_i)$ and $\alpha_j(i) = u_j(\nu_i) - u_j(\nu_0)$ and $\beta(0) = 1$ imply that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \beta(i) \cdot (G^{(k)}(\omega\nu_i) - G^{(k)}(\omega\nu_0)) \geq G^{(k+1)}(\omega) - G^{(k)}(\omega\nu_0).$$

Observe that $(ax)^+ = a \cdot x^+$ if $a \geq 0$ and that $(\sum_i x_i)^+ \leq \sum_i x_i^+$. Since $\beta(i) = b''(i)$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $b''(0) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m b''(i)$ (Definitions 7.7, 4.2) and since $q_* = \sum_{i=0}^m b''(i) \cdot e_{\nu_i}$ (Definition 4.4)

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(k+1)}(\omega) &\leq \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \beta(i)\right) \cdot G^{(k)}(\omega\nu_0) + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta(i) \cdot G^{(k)}(\omega\nu_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m b''(i) \cdot G^{(k)}(\omega\nu_i) = \langle G^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, q_* \rangle \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 7.7. Use induction on k . The base of induction is $F_{\Phi}^{(0)} = F = G^{(0)}$. For the induction step, observe that $G^{(k)}: \mathcal{L}^{n-k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is truncated ℓ -positive by Proposition 6.1 because $\alpha_j(i), \beta_j(i), s_j$ and u_j are non-negative. The monotonicity of the expectation, Corollary 5.3 and Lemma 7.9 imply

$$F_{\Phi}^{(k+1)}(\omega) = \langle F_{\Phi}^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, \Phi(\omega) \rangle \geq \langle G^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, \Phi(\omega) \rangle \geq \langle G^{(k)}|_{\text{succ}(\omega)}, q_* \rangle \geq G^{(k+1)}(\omega).$$

This completes the induction step. The last part follows from Proposition 7.4. □

8. PROOFS OF THE RESULTS IN SECTION 1

The following lemma is an elementary counting argument and left to the reader.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_r\}$ be a finite set. We think of Ω^n as the set of words of length n . Let $f: \Omega^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be symmetric i.e $f(x_1 \dots x_n)$ does not depend on the order of the x_i 's. Then*

$$\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n \in \Omega} f(x_1 \dots x_n) = \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_r = n} \frac{n!}{k_1! \dots k_r!} \cdot f(\omega_1^{k_1} \dots \omega_r^{k_r})$$

where ω^k denotes the k -tuple $\omega \dots \omega$ for any $k \geq 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Given $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$ apply Propositions 7.5, 7.4 and 7.1(2) to $F_{\Phi}^{(k)}$ and $F_{q^*}^{(k)}$ and $F_{q_*}^{(k)}$. Use the fact that $q^*, q_* \in \Gamma$ to deduce $F_{\max}(\Gamma) = E_{q^*}(F)$ and $F_{\min}(\Gamma) = E_{q_*}(F)$. □

Proof of Proposition 1.11. Recall that $q^* = \sum_{i=0}^m b'(i) \cdot e_{\mu_i}$ and $q_* = \sum_{i=0}^m b''(i) \cdot e_{\nu_i}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} E_{q^*}(F_{\omega^-}) &= \sum_{\tau \in \text{supp}(q^*)^k} F(\omega\tau_1 \dots \tau_k) \cdot q^*(\tau_1) \dots q^*(\tau_k) \quad \text{and} \\ E_{q_*}(F_{\omega^-}) &= \sum_{\tau \in \text{supp}(q_*)^k} F(\omega\tau_1 \dots \tau_k) \cdot q_*(\tau_1) \dots q_*(\tau_k) \end{aligned}$$

and since F is symmetric, the result follows from Lemma 8.1. □

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Follows from Proposition 7.7, Lemma 8.1 and the definition of $\Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$. □

Proof of Proposition 1.15. Apply Definition 1.12 to u_1, \dots, u_m in Proposition 6.4 and $s_j = S_j(0)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.16. Recall from Section 1.14 that Γ_* is the set of risk neutral measures on \mathcal{L}^n , that $\overline{\Gamma_*} = \Gamma(\mathcal{L}^n, b)$ and that we assume that $\Gamma_* \neq \emptyset$. Fix some $\omega \in \mathcal{T}_{n-k}$. Choose some $P_* \in \Gamma_*$. By Proposition 7.15 and since P_* has no null-sets, $P_* = P(\Phi)$ for some $\Phi: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow P(b)$ with values in the interior of $P(b)$.

It follows from the binomial behaviour of the processes S_i that θ is completely determined by the values of $S_i(t), \dots, S_m(t)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq n - k$. Therefore the event $E_{n-k, \omega}$ described in Section 1.14 coincides with the event A_θ in Section 1.3. Equation (7) together with Propositions 7.4, 7.5 and 7.12 show that

$$H_{P_*}(n - k)(\omega) = E_{P_*}(F|E_{k, \omega}) = E_{P(\Phi)}(F|A_\theta) = F_{\Phi(\theta)}^{(n-k)} \leq F_{q_*}^{(n-k)}(\theta) = E_{q_*}(F_{\theta-}).$$

Similarly, if $q_* \in P(b)$ then $H_{P_*}(n - k)(\omega) \geq E_{q_*}(F_{\theta-})$. The result follows from Proposition 1.11 because q^* and q_* are limit points of the interior of $P(b)$ \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Arne Brøndsted. *An introduction to convex polytopes*, volume 90 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1983.
- [2] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. *The mathematics of arbitrage*. Springer Finance. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [3] Kedra J., A. Libman, and V. R. Steblovskaya. Contingent claims in a discrete time incomplete market. *Diskret. Mat.*, 18(2):3–28, 2006.
- [4] A. V. Nagaev and V. R. Steblovskaya. On a two-dimensional binary model of a financial market and its generalization; translation in discrete math. appl. 16 (2006), no. 2, 109–134. *Diskret. Mat.*, 18(2):3–28, 2006.
- [5] Stanley R. Pliska. *Introduction to Mathematical Finance, Discrete time models*. Blackwell Publishing, 1997.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN, KING'S COLLEGE, FRASER NOBLE BUILDING, ABERDEEN AB24 3UE, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: a.libman@abdn.ac.uk