

Calibration of Local Volatility Models with Stochastic Interest Rates using Optimal Transport

Grégoire Loeper¹, Jan Obłój², and Benjamin Joseph^{3*}

¹ BNP Paribas Global Markets
gregoire.loeper@bnpparibas.com

² Mathematical Institute and St John's College, University of Oxford
jan.obloj@maths.ox.ac.uk

³ Mathematical Institute and Christ Church, University of Oxford
benjamin.joseph@maths.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

We develop a non-parametric, optimal transport driven, calibration methodology for local volatility models with stochastic interest rate. The method finds a fully calibrated model which is the closest to a given reference model. We establish a general duality result which allows to solve the problem via optimising over solutions to a non-linear HJB equation. We then apply the method to a sequential calibration setup: we assume that an interest rate model is given and is calibrated to the observed term structure in the market. We then seek to calibrate a stock price local volatility model with volatility coefficient depending on time, the underlying and the short rate process, and driven by a Brownian motion which can be correlated with the randomness driving the rates process. The local volatility model is calibrated to a finite number of European options prices via a convex optimisation problem derived from the PDE formulation of semimartingale optimal transport. Our methodology is analogous to Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Obłój, et al., 2022a but features a novel element of solving for discounted densities, or sub-probability measures. We present numerical experiments and test the effectiveness of the proposed methodology.

1 Introduction

Modelling involves inevitable trade-offs: “All models are wrong, some models are useful” as Box and Draper, 1987 put it. Models need to capture the important aspects of the system they represent but they also need to be tractable, and analytically and/or numerically solvable. In particular, calibration – picking model parameters which recover known outputs – is an essential part of any modelling process. It is a key challenge faced by the financial industry practitioners on a daily basis, as their pricing models need to match market prices of liquid instruments before they can be used to price any bespoke or illiquid products.

In practice, models for a key underlying, such as the S&P500 index, will need to be calibrated to a large number of options with different maturities and strikes. This may be nigh impossible for a simple parametric model. Dupire, 1994 derived a formula to calibrate a local volatility model to an arbitrary number of options, establishing it as a benchmark for equities modelling. However, it came with its own shortcomings. It was criticised for wrong dynamic behaviour compared to suitable stochastic volatility models, see Hagan et al., 2002. Its calibration poses serious numerical challenges, see Bain, Mariapragassam, and Reisinger, 2021, and requires interpolation of the data as Dupire’s formula assumes a continuum of prices across strikes and maturities. This becomes even more significant for extensions or when more market data is considered. A good example of the former are local-stochastic volatility models, which aim to address the issues of wrong spot-vol dynamics. A good example of the latter is joint calibration to SPX and VIX options, see Guo, Loeper, Obłój, et al., 2022a.

*This research has been supported by BNP Paribas Global Markets and the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Mathematics of Random Systems: Analysis, Modelling and Simulation (EP/S023925/1).

Recently, an optimal transport driven, fully non-parametric, calibration method has been proposed which aims to address the above challenges. In Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2019 a method drawing on Benamou and Brenier, 2000 and semimartingale transport of Tan and Touzi, 2013 was used to calibrate a local volatility model, in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 the duality approach as in Huesmann and Trevisan, 2019 was used to calibrate a local-stochastic volatility model, in Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a the same duality technique was used to jointly calibrate SPX and VIX. A general duality result and applications to calibration to path dependent options was considered in Guo and Loeper, 2021. An overview of these results is given in Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022b. It is worth noting that whilst the link with optimal transport was not recognised, a variational approach to calibrating local volatility models was first constructed already in Avellaneda et al., 1997. The core contribution is to build a method which gives a fully calibrated model while trying to preserve desirable features of a given model. In effect, we offer an abstract projection in the space of feasible models: we project a given reference model onto the set of calibrated models. As the calibration constraints depend on one-dimensional marginals, classical mimicking results, see Gyöngy, 1986 and Brunick and Shreve, 2013, allow us to restrict to Markovian models. This in turns allows to use PDE methods to solve the dual problem.

Our contribution here is to consider a setup with stochastic interest rates and understand how to develop and calibrate joint models for rates and equities. We develop suitable duality results and seek to calibrate a stock price local volatility model with volatility coefficient depending on time, the underlying and the short rate process, and driven by a Brownian motion which can be correlated with the randomness driving the rates process. In a sequel paper Loeper, Oblój, and Joseph, 2023, we consider a simultaneous joint calibration problem. A particular difficulty here is in dealing with the path dependent discount terms while keeping the number of state variables, and thus the dimension of the problem, at $d = 2$. This is important for computational reasons as the numerical methods rely on solving a non-linear HJB equation and pricing PDEs, which becomes computationally increasingly more difficult by standard techniques when the dimension $d \geq 3$. In particular, while our duality result cover abstract interest rates models, more involved setups would make our numerical methods infeasible.

2 Preliminaries and Notation

We adopt the setup of Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a, who in turn used the formulation of Tan and Touzi, 2013. Let E be a Polish space equipped with the Borel σ -algebra, let $C(E)$ be the space of continuous functions on E and $C_b(E)$ be the space of continuous bounded functions on E . Let $\mathcal{M}(E)$ be the space of finite signed Borel measures endowed with the weak- $*$ topology, let $\mathcal{M}_+(E) \subset \mathcal{M}(E)$ be the subset of non-negative finite Borel measures, and $\mathcal{P}(E)$ be the set of Borel probability measures also under the weak- $*$ topology. Note that if E is compact, then the topological dual of $C_b(E)$ is given by $C_b(E)^* = \mathcal{M}(E)$, but if E is non-compact, then $C_b(E)^*$ is larger than $\mathcal{M}(E)$. Let $BV(E)$ be the set of bounded variation functions on E and $L^1(d\mu)$ be the space of μ -integrable functions. For unambiguity we write $C_b(E; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathcal{M}(E; \mathbb{R}^d)$, $BV(E; \mathbb{R}^d)$, and $L^1(d\mu; \mathbb{R}^d)$ for the vector valued versions of those spaces (with an analogous definition for the matrix valued versions). Write \mathbb{S}^d for the set of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices and $\mathbb{S}_+^d \subset \mathbb{S}^d$ as the subset of positive semidefinite symmetric matrices. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ write $a \cdot b$ for the inner product $a^\top b$ and for $A, B \in \mathbb{S}^d$ write $A : B$ for their inner product $\text{Tr}(A^\top B)$. As a shorthand, we define $\Lambda := [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d$, which will be used for the domain and range of the triple representing the law of the semimartingale, the drift and the volatility. Finally, denote the duality bracket between $C_b(E)$ and $C_b(E)^*$ by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$.

We fix a time horizon $T > 0$ and consider the space $\Omega := C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$, $T > 0$ of continuous \mathbb{R}^d -valued paths on $[0, T]$ with canonical process X and canonical filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$. We consider all probability measures \mathbb{P} on (Ω, \mathcal{F}_T) such that $X \in \Omega$ is an (\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}) -semimartingale with decomposition

$$X_t = X_0 + A_t^\mathbb{P} + M_t^\mathbb{P}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.},$$

where $(M_t^\mathbb{P})_{t \geq 0}$ is an (\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}) -martingale and $(A_t^\mathbb{P})_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a finite variation process, both are absolutely continuous relative to the Lebesgue measure and can be characterised in the following sense.

Definition 2.1. *We say that \mathbb{P} is characterised by $(\alpha_t^\mathbb{P}, \beta_t^\mathbb{P})$ if*

$$\alpha_t^\mathbb{P} = \frac{dA_t^\mathbb{P}}{dt}, \quad \beta_t^\mathbb{P} = \frac{d\langle M^\mathbb{P} \rangle_t}{dt} \quad dt \times \mathbb{P}(d\omega)\text{-a.e.},$$

where $(\alpha_t, \beta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d$ -valued, progressively measurable process.

Note that $(\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}, \beta_t^{\mathbb{P}})$ is only determined up to $d\mathbb{P} \times dt$ -almost everywhere. The set of probability measures \mathbb{P} satisfying the conditions above is denoted \mathcal{P} . We note that regular conditional probabilities exist on Ω and we will use these implicitly, e.g., $\mathbb{E}_{t,x}^{\mathbb{P}}[\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}]$ will denote the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}} \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ seen as a measurable function of (t, X_t) and evaluated at $X_t = x$.

We further consider the subset $\mathcal{P}^1 \subset \mathcal{P}$ of measures satisfying the following integrability condition:

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T |\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}| + |\beta_t^{\mathbb{P}}| dt \right] < +\infty, \quad (1)$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the L^1 norm. This integrability assumption is so that we can apply Brunick and Shreve, 2013, Corollary 3.7. These mimicking results, extending earlier works of Krylov, 1984 and Gyöngy, 1986, allow us to construct a Markov process with the same one-dimensional marginals as a given semimartingale. As our constraints and cost will only depend on these marginals, it will allow us restrict our attention to Markov processes. Markovian projection relies on the classical result that the marginal law of a diffusion process is a distributional solution to the corresponding Fokker-Planck equation, with the converse result given in Figalli, 2008 where existence and uniqueness results are constructed for the corresponding SDE satisfied by a process with marginal law that is a weak solution to a Fokker-Planck equation. These results are summarised in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2 (Markovian Projection). *Let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^1$ and $\bar{\rho}_t^{\mathbb{P}} = \bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}}(t, \cdot) = \mathbb{P} \circ X_t^{-1}$ be the marginal distribution of X_t under \mathbb{P} , $t \leq T$. Then $\bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}}$ is a weak solution to the Fokker-Planck equation*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{\rho}_t^{\mathbb{P}} + \nabla_x \cdot (\bar{\rho}_t^{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}_{t,x}^{\mathbb{P}}[\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}]) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 : (\bar{\rho}_t^{\mathbb{P}} (\mathbb{E}_{t,x}^{\mathbb{P}}[\beta_t^{\mathbb{P}}])) = 0, & \text{on } [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \bar{\rho}_0^{\mathbb{P}} = \delta_{X_0}, & x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Moreover, there exists another probability measure $\mathbb{P}' \in \mathcal{P}^1$ under which X has the same marginals, $\bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}'} = \bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}}$, and is a Markov process satisfying:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \alpha^{\mathbb{P}'}(t, X_t) dt + (\beta^{\mathbb{P}'}(t, X_t))^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t^{\mathbb{P}'}, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ X_0 = x_0. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Where $W^{\mathbb{P}'}$ is a \mathbb{P}' -Brownian motion, and the drift and diffusion coefficients are given by $\alpha^{\mathbb{P}'}(t, x) = \mathbb{E}_{t,x}^{\mathbb{P}'}[\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}'}]$, $\beta^{\mathbb{P}'}(t, x) = \mathbb{E}_{t,x}^{\mathbb{P}'}[\beta_t^{\mathbb{P}'}]$, a.s.

Remark 2.3 (Existence and Uniqueness of Solutions). *Under suitable conditions on (α, β) the SDE and the corresponding Fokker-Planck equation admit unique solutions - in the sense of measure valued solutions for (2) and martingale solutions for (3), see Figalli, 2008, and Trevisan, 2016. These conditions will be satisfied in our setting as our characteristics (α, β) will be a functional of the spatial derivatives of a function $\varphi \in \text{BV}([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$, given in Lemma 3.11 below. Note that $\bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}}(t, \cdot)$ is a measure but depending on the context we write $\bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}}(t, x)$ or $\bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}}(t, dx)$.*

We let \mathcal{P}_{loc}^1 denote the subset of measures in \mathcal{P}^1 under which X is a Markov process satisfying (3). Our calibration problem will be written as a minimization of a cost functional: the cost will be set to $+\infty$ if the model is not calibrated and will otherwise represent its “distance” to a given favourite reference model. We will take a strongly convex cost function $F : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as non-negative, proper lower semicontinuous in (α, β) . It will be set to take value $+\infty$ outside of a set Γ , see for example (31). In particular, we will always set $F = +\infty$ if $\beta \notin \mathbb{S}_+^d$ to ensure β is a legitimate covariance matrix. We use this implicitly whenever we restrict to $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$. The strong convexity assumption of F (see Nesterov, 2018, Definition 2.1.3) means that for any subderivative ∇ performed over $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d$ that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $(t, x, \alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta') \in \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d$, when $F(t, x, \alpha, \beta) < \infty$ we have

$$F(t, x, \alpha', \beta') \geq F(t, x, \alpha, \beta) + \langle \nabla F(t, x, \alpha, \beta), (\alpha' - \alpha, \beta' - \beta) \rangle + C(\|\alpha - \alpha'\|_2^2 + \|\beta - \beta'\|_{\text{Fro}}^2). \quad (4)$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_{\text{Fro}}$ denotes the Frobenius norm, which for a matrix M is given by $\|M\|_{\text{Fro}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} |m_{i,j}|^2}$. We additionally assume that F is p -coercive, that is there exists $p > 1$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $(t, x, \alpha, \beta) \in \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d$ we have

$$\|\alpha\|^p + \|\beta\|^p \leq C(1 + F(t, x, \alpha, \beta)). \quad (5)$$

The Legendre-Fenchel transform of F (see for example Rockafellar, 1970, §12) is given by

$$F^*(t, x, a, b) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d, \beta \in \mathbb{S}_+^d} \{\alpha \cdot a + \beta : b - F(\alpha, \beta)\}, \quad (6)$$

where the supremum is a priori over $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d$ but can be restricted $\beta \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$ by the comment above, or indeed can be later restricted to the set Γ as $F = +\infty$ elsewhere. While F itself may not be differentiable with respect to (α, β) , since F is strictly convex in (α, β) we therefore have that $F^*(t, x, a, b)$ is differentiable in (a, b) (see Rockafellar, 1970, Theorem 26.3). For convenience, we will denote $F(\alpha, \beta) := F(t, x, \alpha, \beta)$ and $F^*(a, b) := F^*(t, x, a, b)$.

3 Problem formulation and duality results

Consider a d -dimensional Markov process $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and without loss of generality write $X_t := [X_t^r, \tilde{X}_t]^\top$, where $(X_t^r)_{t \in [0, T]}$ corresponds to the short rate process in our setting and $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is $(d-1)$ -dimensional process corresponding to the underlying asset, such as the S&P 500, and extra state variables, e.g., extra assets, stochastic factors in the volatility functions, or multi-factors in the short rate. We want to calibrate our model to n market prices of options, the i^{th} option has maturity $\tau_i \in (0, T)$, payoff $G_i \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R})$ and price u_i . We let $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$, $G(x) = (G_1(x), \dots, G_n(x))$ and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$. In addition, we consider the augmented process $\hat{X}_t = [X_t^r, \exp(-\int_0^t X_s^r ds), \tilde{X}_t]^\top$. Recall that \mathcal{P}_{loc}^1 denotes the subset of measures in \mathcal{P}^1 under which X is a Markov process satisfying (3), and analogously write $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}^1$ for those measures under which \hat{X} is a Markov process.

Definition 3.1. *Given an initial distribution μ_0 , expiry times τ , market prices u corresponding to payoffs G , we introduce the set of calibrated measures*

$$\mathcal{P}(\mu_0, \tau, u) = \left\{ \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^1 : \mathbb{P} \circ X_0^{-1} = \mu_0, \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[e^{-\int_0^{\tau_i} X_s^r ds} G_i(X_{\tau_i}) \right] = u_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \right\}. \quad (7)$$

And we denote $\mathcal{P}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u) = \mathcal{P}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u) \cap \mathcal{P}_{loc}^1$ the calibrated models under which X is a Markov process satisfying (3) and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u) = \mathcal{P}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u) \cap \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}^1$.

We note that $\mathcal{P}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u) \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$, and also remark that we will usually take $\mu_0 = \delta_{X_0}$ where X_0 are the observed initial values of our semimartingale.

3.1 The primal problem

We now formulate our primal problem which consists in selecting one of the possible calibrated models in $\mathcal{P}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$. The selection is done by minimising a cost functional. Similarly to Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022, Proposition 3.4, since market constraints only depend on marginal distributions and the cost functional is convex, a combination of Markovian projection in Lemma 2.2 and Jensen's inequality readily shows that we can restrict our attention to Markov process.

Lemma 3.2. *Given an initial distribution μ_0 , expiration times τ , and market prices u , we have*

$$\inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mu_0, \tau, u)} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} F(\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}, \beta_t^{\mathbb{P}}) dt \right] = \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u)} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} F(\alpha^{\mathbb{P}}(t, X_t), \beta^{\mathbb{P}}(t, X_t)) dt \right].$$

Proof. If $\mathcal{P}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$ is empty, then so is $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$, so equality holds as the infimum of the empty set is taken to be $+\infty$. Otherwise, take $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$ and use Lemma 2.2 to find the corresponding $\mathbb{P}' \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$ such

that \hat{X} has the same marginals under \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}' . Using the tower property and Jensen's inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} F(\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}, \beta_t^{\mathbb{P}}) dt \right] &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} \mathbb{E}_{t, \hat{X}_t}^{\mathbb{P}} [F(\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}, \beta_t^{\mathbb{P}})] dt \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} F(\mathbb{E}_{t, \hat{X}_t}^{\mathbb{P}}[\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}], \mathbb{E}_{t, \hat{X}_t}^{\mathbb{P}}[\beta_t^{\mathbb{P}}]) dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} F(\alpha^{\mathbb{P}'}(t, \hat{X}_t), \beta^{\mathbb{P}'}(t, \hat{X}_t)) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This gives one inequality between the two infimum. The other is trivial since $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$. \square

The discount factor $e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds}$ appears in (7) and in the expressions in Lemma 3.2 above. It is a path dependent term and increases the dimension of the problem from d to $d+1$ when we change from X to \hat{X} . The resulting HJB equation from our duality method will have the same number of dimensions as the primal problem has state variables. In particular, when we consider the joint calibration of a local volatility model and a short rate, we would obtain a three dimensional fully nonlinear PDE instead of a two dimensional one increasing the numerical effort significantly. We propose a solution to this problem in the next section.

3.2 A 'discounted density' transformation

We propose now a new approach to deal with the stochastic discount term. Instead of working with probability measures, we will work with discounted densities, i.e., sub-probability measures. We let $D^{\mathbb{P}}(t, x) = \mathbb{E}_{t,x}^{\mathbb{P}} [e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds}]$, which is a jointly measurable function. When a $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{loc}^1$ is fixed, we write $\bar{\rho}, \alpha$, etc., for $\bar{\rho}^{\mathbb{P}}, \alpha^{\mathbb{P}}$, etc.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{loc}^1$ so that X solves (3). Let $\eta_{t,x}(\cdot)$ be the law of $\int_0^t X_s^r ds$ conditional on $X_t = x = [x_r, \tilde{x}]^{\top}$, where $x_r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Define the 'discounted density'*

$$\rho(t, x) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-y} \eta_{t,x}(dy) \right) \bar{\rho}(t, x) = D(t, x) \bar{\rho}(t, x), \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (8)$$

Then ρ solves the 'discounted' version of the Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t \rho(t, x) + \nabla_x \cdot (\alpha(t, x) \rho(t, x)) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 : (\beta(t, x) \rho(t, x)) + x_r \rho(t, x) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (9)$$

Proof. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth compactly supported test function which is zero at zero. Conditioning on X_t and using the tower property, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} \right] = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} [\varphi(X_t) D(t, X_t)] = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \rho(t, dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \partial_t \rho(t, dx). \quad (10)$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\varphi(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds}$, and denoting the Hadamard product by \odot , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} &= \int_0^t \left(e^{-\int_0^s X_u^r du} \nabla_x \varphi(X_s) \odot \sqrt{\text{diag}(\beta(s, X_s))} \right) \cdot dW_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^s X_u^r du} \left[\alpha(s, X_s) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi(X_s) + \frac{1}{2} \beta(s, X_s) : \nabla_x^2 \varphi(X_s) \right] ds - \int_0^t X_s^r e^{-\int_0^s X_u^r du} \varphi(X_s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Thus, taking expectations in (11), applying Fubini twice, and taking the time derivative, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^t X_s^r ds} \middle| X_t \right] \left(\alpha(t, X_t) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi + \frac{1}{2} \beta(t, X_t) : \nabla_x^2 \varphi(X_t) - X_t^r \varphi(X_t) \right) \right] \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\alpha(t, x) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi(x) + \frac{1}{2} \beta(t, x) : \nabla_x^2 \varphi(x) - x_r \varphi(x) \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-y \eta_{t,x}}(dy) \bar{\rho}(t, dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\alpha(t, x) \cdot \nabla_x \varphi(x) + \frac{1}{2} \beta(t, x) : \nabla_x^2 \varphi(x) - x_r \varphi(x) \right) \rho(t, dx), \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \left(-\nabla_x \cdot (\alpha(t, x) \rho(t, dx)) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 : (\beta(t, x) \rho(t, dx)) - x_r \rho(t, dx) \right). \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining (10) and (12), we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \left(\partial_t \rho(t, dx) + \nabla_x \cdot (\alpha(t, x) \rho(t, dx)) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 : (\beta(t, x) \rho(t, dx)) + x_r \rho(t, dx) \right) = 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}). \tag{13}$$

Thus, from (13), we have that ρ solves the discounted version of the Fokker-Planck equation (9). \square

3.3 The dual problem

We consider now the objective from Lemma 3.2. We showed there that it is sufficient to consider Markovian dynamics in $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$ instead of $\mathcal{P}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$. From now on, we restrict further and consider dynamics in $\mathcal{P}_{loc}(\mu_0, \tau, u)$ only. Note, that instead of making this restriction, we could have replaced the discount term $\exp(-\int_0^t X_s^r ds)$ with its conditional version $D^\mathbb{P}$ in the objective in Lemma 3.2. Then, the equality holds for infimum over \mathcal{P} , over $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{loc}$ and over \mathcal{P}_{loc} .

We use Lemma 3.3 to subsume the discount factor in the objective in Lemma 3.2 into the density ρ and eliminate the additional state variable. This results in the following value function.

Problem 3.4 (Primal Problem). *The value function for the Primal Problem is given by*

$$V := \inf_{\rho, \alpha, \beta} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(\alpha(t, x), \beta(t, x)) \rho(t, dx) dt, \tag{14}$$

where the infimum is taken over $(\rho, \alpha, \beta) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \times L^1(d\rho_t dt; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(d\rho_t dt; \mathbb{S}^d)$, subject to the following constraints in the sense of distributions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \rho(t, x) + \nabla_x \cdot (\rho(t, x) \alpha(t, x)) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 : (\rho(t, x) \beta(t, x)) + x_r \rho(t, x) &= 0, \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{15} \\
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G_i(x) \rho(\tau_i, dx) &= u_i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n, \\
\rho(0, \cdot) &= \mu_0.
\end{aligned}$$

The existence of $\rho \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as a solution to (15) is guaranteed by our integrability assumption (1), see Trevisan, 2016, Remark 2.3. To solve this constrained optimisation problem, we will use a duality method inspired by Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a. This proof relies mainly on the Fenchel-Rockafellar duality theorem (see Villani, 2009 for a formulation of this classical result), and an adjustment to make the problem convex. As our primal problem is quite similar, the approach used there can be adapted to our setting. The following result uses the notion of viscosity solution from Definition 3.10 below.

Theorem 3.5 (Dual Problem). *The dual expression for the value function V is*

$$V = \sup_{\lambda} \left(\lambda \cdot u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi^\lambda(0, x) d\mu_0 \right), \tag{16}$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi^\lambda = \varphi$ is the viscosity solution to the HJB equation:

$$\partial_t \varphi - x_r \varphi + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} + F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi \right) = 0, \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{17}$$

with terminal condition $\varphi(T, \cdot) = 0$. If V is finite, then the infimum in Problem 3.4 is attained. If the supremum is attained for some $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with $\varphi^* \in \text{BV}([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $\varphi^*(T, \cdot) = 0$ solving the corresponding HJB equation, and $(\rho^*, \alpha^*, \beta^*)$ being the optimal solution of Problem 3.4, then (α^*, β^*) is given by:

$$(\alpha_t^*, \beta_t^*) = \nabla F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi^*(t, \cdot), \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^*(t, \cdot) \right), \quad d\rho_t^* dt - \text{almost everywhere.}$$

Remark 3.6. Solving the dual problem in Theorem 3.5 yields the primal optimisers (α^*, β^*) . These characterise the distribution of the Markov process solving (3) with these coefficients, i.e., $\bar{\rho}$ solves (2), and the associated measure \mathbb{P}^* on Ω , $\bar{\rho}_t^* = \mathbb{P}^* \circ X_t^{-1}$. We can then compute D and apply the transformation (8) to obtain that $\bar{\rho}^*(t, x) = D(t, x)\rho(t, x)$ is a solution of (9).

We prove the duality result above in the remainder of this section through a series of lemmas. Our first observation is that the objective function (14) is not jointly convex in (ρ, α, β) . We define the measures $\mathcal{A} := \rho\alpha$, $\mathcal{B} := \rho\beta$, so \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are absolutely continuous with respect to ρ . Then, the objective function is convex in $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ with constraints that are affine in $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. This arises from the classical notion that the function $\bar{f}(z_1, z_2, z_3) := z_3 f\left(\frac{z_1}{z_3}, \frac{z_2}{z_3}\right)$ is convex in (z_1, z_2, z_3) whenever f is convex in (z_1, z_2) on the set $\{z_3 > 0\}$. Note also that we write $d\mathcal{A}$ for $\alpha(t, x)\rho(t, dx) dt$ and $d\mathcal{B}$ for $\beta(t, x)\rho(t, dx) dt$. Moreover, our constraints in Problem 3.4 can be formulated in the weak sense as:

$$\int_{\Lambda} \partial_t \varphi d\rho + \nabla \varphi \cdot d\mathcal{A} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \varphi : d\mathcal{B} - x_r \varphi d\rho + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi d\mu_0 = 0, \quad (18)$$

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} d\rho - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i = 0. \quad (19)$$

for any smooth compactly supported test function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Lambda)$ with $\varphi(T, \cdot) = 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The terminal condition on φ arises when performing an integration by parts to derive (18), since we need the $\rho(T, \cdot)$ boundary term to vanish as we do not have a priori knowledge of $\rho(T, \cdot)$. Therefore we can write Problem 3.4 as the following saddle point problem:

Problem 3.7.

$$V = \inf_{\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \sup_{\varphi, \lambda} \left\{ \int_{\Lambda} F \left(\frac{d\mathcal{A}}{d\rho}, \frac{d\mathcal{B}}{d\rho} \right) d\rho - \partial_t \varphi d\rho - \nabla \varphi \cdot d\mathcal{A} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \varphi : d\mathcal{B} \right. \\ \left. + x_r \varphi d\rho - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi d\mu_0 - \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} d\rho + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken across $(\rho, \alpha, \beta) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \times L^1(d\rho_t dt; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^1(d\rho_t dt; \mathbb{S}^d)$ and the supremum is taken across $(\varphi, \lambda) \in C_c^\infty(\Lambda; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

We now want to find a functional with convex conjugate equal to (14), and another that is the remainder of the infimum in Problem 3.7. To do this, we use the following terminology from Huesmann and Trevisan, 2019 in their duality arguments for finding the dual formulation of martingale optimal transport. Denote $\text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as the set of $\varphi \in \text{BV}([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $\varphi(T, \cdot) = 0$.

Definition 3.8. We say that the triple $(\gamma, a, b) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})$ is represented by $(\varphi, \lambda) \in \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \times \mathbb{R}^n$ if

$$\gamma + \partial_t \varphi - x_r \varphi + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} = 0, \\ a + \nabla \varphi = 0, \\ b + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \varphi = 0.$$

Since $(\gamma, a, b) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})$, the presence of the dirac delta functions give that $t \mapsto \varphi(t, \cdot)$ is of bounded variation on $[0, T]$ with jump discontinuities at $t = \tau_i$, which we denote as $\varphi \in \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$, since we require φ to be at least C^2 in space. Proceeding in an analogous way to Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 to obtain the dual problem, first define functionals $\Phi : C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $\Psi : C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\gamma, a, b) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \gamma + F^*(a, b) \leq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ \Psi(\gamma, a, b) &= \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(0, x) d\mu_0 - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i, & \text{if } (\gamma, a, b) \text{ is represented by } (\varphi, \lambda) \in \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d)) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.9. *The objective function V can be expressed in terms of Φ and Ψ as*

$$V = \inf_{\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}} \{ \Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \}, \quad (20)$$

where the infimum is taken across $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in C_b(\Lambda, \mathcal{X})^*$.

We remark that switching from $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Lambda)$ (with $\varphi(T, \cdot) = 0$) to $\varphi \in \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ does not change the value of the supremum, which will be formalised by the notion of viscosity solutions later in Definition 3.10

Proof. As shown in Lemma A.1 of Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022, we can compute Ψ^* by restricting the domain of the convex conjugate from $\Phi^* : C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ to $\mathcal{M}(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})$. Since ρ is given by (8), we have $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+(\Lambda; \mathbb{R})$; moreover our definition of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} give that $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \ll \rho$, and therefore $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\Lambda; \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d)$, so $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{M}_+(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &= \sup_{\gamma + F^*(a, b) \leq 0} \int_{\Lambda} \left(\gamma + a \cdot \frac{d\mathcal{A}}{d\rho} + b : \frac{d\mathcal{B}}{d\rho} \right) d\rho \\ &= \sup_{a, b} \int_{\Lambda} \left(a \cdot \frac{d\mathcal{A}}{d\rho} + b : \frac{d\mathcal{B}}{d\rho} - F^*(a, b) \right) d\rho \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \sup_{a, b} \left(a \cdot \frac{d\mathcal{A}}{d\rho} + b : \frac{d\mathcal{B}}{d\rho} - F^*(a, b) \right) d\rho \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} F \left(\frac{d\mathcal{A}}{d\rho}, \frac{d\mathcal{B}}{d\rho} \right) d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

Since the construction of $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ give that the restriction of $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ to $\mathcal{M}(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})$ is equivalent to the restriction of $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ to $\mathcal{M}_+(\Lambda, \mathcal{X})$ with $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \ll \rho$, we have

$$\Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \begin{cases} \int_{\Lambda} F \left(\frac{d\mathcal{A}}{d\rho}, \frac{d\mathcal{B}}{d\rho} \right) d\rho & \text{if } (\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda, \mathcal{X}), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

We now compute $\Psi^* : C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, we first note that if this is restricted to $(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda, \mathcal{X})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) &= \sup_{(\gamma, a, b) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})} \left\{ \langle (\gamma, a, b), (\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rangle - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(0, x) d\mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\varphi, \lambda} \left\{ \left\langle \left(x_r \varphi - \partial_t \varphi - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i}, -\nabla \varphi, -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \varphi \right), (\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \right\rangle - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(0, x) d\mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\varphi, \lambda} \left\{ \left\langle \int_{\Lambda} x_r \varphi d\rho - \partial_t \varphi d\rho - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} d\rho - \nabla_x \varphi d\mathcal{A} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi : d\mathcal{B} \right\rangle - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(0, x) d\mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Thus, since Φ^* is independent of (φ, λ) we can simply add (21) and (22) together to get the argument of the infimum in Problem 3.7, so

$$V = \inf_{(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})} (\Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})).$$

Now, we apply Lemma A.2 in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and we get that

$$V = \inf_{(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{M}(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})} \{\Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\} = \inf_{(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})^*} \{\Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\}.$$

□

Now we apply the Fenchel-Rockafellar duality theorem. We first note that as the constraints in the functionals Φ and Ψ are affine, the functionals are clearly convex in (γ, a, b) . We now check the conditions of the theorem at the point $(0, O^{d \times 1}, O^{d \times d})$ which is represented by $(\varphi, \lambda) = (e^{tx_r}, O^{n \times 1})$ where O refers to the zero matrix of appropriate dimension. Since F is non-negative:

$$F^*(O^{d \times 1}) = - \inf_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d} F(\alpha, \beta) \leq 0.$$

Therefore, we have $\Phi(0, O^{d \times 1}, O^{d \times d}) = 0$ and $(0, O^{d \times 1}, O^{d \times d})$ is a point of continuity of Φ since F^* is continuous. Moreover, since $\varphi(t, x) = e^{tx_r}$ and μ_0 is a probability measure:

$$\Psi(0, O^{d \times 1}, O^{d \times d}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(0, x) d\mu_0 = 1.$$

Thus, as Ψ is finite and Φ is finite and continuous at $(0, O^{d \times 1}, O^{d \times d})$ and both take values in $(-\infty, +\infty]$ we may apply the Fenchel-Rockafellar duality theorem and obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{(\gamma, a, b) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})} \{\Phi(-\gamma, -a, -b) + \Psi(\gamma, a, b)\} &= \sup_{(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})^*} \{-\Phi^*(-\rho, -\mathcal{A}, -\mathcal{B}) - \Psi^*(-\rho, -\mathcal{A}, -\mathcal{B})\} \\ &= \sup_{(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})^*} \{-\Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) - \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\} \\ &= - \inf_{(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})^*} \{\Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus rearranging we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \inf_{(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})^*} \{\Phi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) + \Psi^*(\rho, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\} \\ &= \sup_{(\gamma, a, b) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})} \{-\Phi(-\gamma, -a, -b) - \Psi(\gamma, a, b)\} \\ &= \sup_{(\gamma, a, b) \in C_b(\Lambda; \mathcal{X})} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(0, x) d\mu_0 : -\gamma + F^*(-a, -b) \leq 0, (\gamma, a, b) \text{ is represented by } (\varphi, \lambda) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{(\lambda, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i u_i - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(0, x) d\mu_0 : \partial_t \varphi - x_r \varphi + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} + F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi \right) \leq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Now, to obtain equality in the HJB equation constraint and thus the HJB equation (17) and dual formulation in Theorem 3.5, we adapt the classical notion of viscosity solutions from Lions, 1983 to include the required jump discontinuities, in analogy to Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022. First define disjoint intervals $I_k := [\tau_{k-1}, \tau_k)$ with $\tau_0 = 0$, with $\bigcup_{k=1}^n I_k = [0, T)$.

Definition 3.10 (Viscosity Solution). *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we say $\varphi \in \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is a viscosity subsolution (supersolution) of (17) if $\varphi|_{I_k \times \mathbb{R}^d} \in C_b(I_k; C_b(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is a classical (continuous) viscosity subsolution (supersolution) of (17) in $I_k \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ has jump discontinuities:*

$$\varphi(t, x) = \varphi(t^-, x) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i(x) \mathbb{1}_{\{t=\tau_i\}}.$$

With terminal condition $\varphi(T, \cdot) = 0$. In addition, $\varphi \in \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is a viscosity solution of (17) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and viscosity supersolution of (17).

The expression for V in (23) involved supersolutions to (17) and the first step is to show that we can restrict to viscosity solutions, as stated in the first part of Theorem 3.5. For this we follow the proof of Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022, Prop. 3.5.

Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022, Remark 3.9 provides a comparison principle, which is the classical comparison principle of viscosity solutions applied to φ on $I_k \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for each k . Using this, one can deduce existence and uniqueness of solutions to (17) via Crandall, Ishii, and Lions, 1992. The comparison principle also implies that V in (16) is smaller than the supremum over viscosity solutions.

We then use the smoothing argument from Bouchard, Loeper, and Zou, 2017, which shows that any viscosity solution of (17) can be approached by smooth supersolutions. This, together with (23) shows that V is larger than the supremum over viscosity solutions. This allows us to conclude the proof of the first point of Theorem 3.5.

We now seek to obtain the form of the optimal (α, β) for the second part of Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 3.11. *If the supremum in Theorem 3.5 is attained for some λ^* with $\varphi^* \in \text{BV}_T([0, T]; C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ solving the corresponding HJB equation, and $(\rho^*, \alpha^*, \beta^*)$ being the optimal solution of Problem 3.4, then (α^*, β^*) is given by:*

$$(\alpha_t^*, \beta_t^*) = \nabla F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi^*(t, \cdot), \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^*(t, \cdot) \right), \quad d\rho^* \text{ - almost everywhere.} \quad (24)$$

Remark 3.12. *Here we need to assume that $\varphi \in C^2$ in space to make sense of (24).*

Proof. Let (α^*, β^*) be the optimal solution of Problem 3.4, then $(\rho^*, \rho^* \alpha^*, \rho^* \beta^*)$ also achieves the infimum in Problem 3.7. Assume that λ^* is the optimal solution solving (16) with corresponding solution to (17) φ^* . Then, λ^* achieves the supremum in Problem 3.7, so with our optimal solution we may rewrite Problem 3.7 as:

$$V = \int_{\Lambda} \left(F(\alpha^*, \beta^*) - \partial_t \varphi^* - \nabla_x \varphi^* \cdot \alpha^* - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* : \beta^* + x_r \varphi^* - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^* G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} \right) d\rho^* - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi^* d\mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^* u_i. \quad (25)$$

Since (φ^*, λ^*) are optimal, we have from Theorem 3.5 that

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^* u_i - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi^* d\mu_0.$$

Therefore, (25) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Lambda} \left(F(\alpha^*, \beta^*) - \partial_t \varphi^* - \nabla_x \varphi^* \cdot \alpha^* - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* : \beta^* + x_r \varphi^* - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^* G_i(x) \delta_{\tau_i} \right) d\rho^* \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \left(F(\alpha^*, \beta^*) + F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi^*, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* \right) - \nabla_x \varphi^* \cdot \alpha^* - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* : \beta^* \right) d\rho^*. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Now define $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})$ as:

$$(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = \nabla F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi^*, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* \right).$$

Note that

$$(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = \nabla F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi^*, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* \right) = \arg \max_{(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d} \left(a \cdot \nabla_x \varphi^* + b : \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* - F(a, b) \right). \quad (27)$$

Thus,

$$F^* \left(\nabla_x \varphi^*, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* \right) = \sup_{(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d} \left\{ \nabla_x \varphi^* \cdot a + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* : b - F(a, b) \right\} = \nabla_x \varphi^* \cdot \bar{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* : \bar{\beta} - F(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}).$$

Since F is convex, its Legendre transform is an involution (see Rockafellar, 1970, Corollary 12.2.1), so taking the double Legendre transform, we have

$$(A, B) := \nabla F(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = \nabla F^{**}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = \arg \max_{(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d} (a \cdot \bar{\alpha} + b : \bar{\beta} - F^*(a, b)).$$

Therefore,

$$F^{**}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = A \cdot \bar{\alpha} + B : \bar{\beta} - F^*(A, B) = A \cdot \bar{\alpha} + B : \bar{\beta} - \max_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}_+^d} (A \cdot x + B : y - F(x, y)).$$

Since $F(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = F^{**}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})$, from (27) we have that for the affine terms to cancel, we need $(A, B) = (\nabla_x \varphi^*, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^*)$. So, substituting into (26) we have:

$$0 = \int_{\Lambda} \left(F(\alpha^*, \beta^*) - F(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) - \nabla_x \varphi^* \cdot (\alpha^* - \bar{\alpha}) - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^* : (\beta^* - \bar{\beta}) \right) d\rho^*. \quad (28)$$

Since $F(\alpha, \beta)$ is assumed to be strongly convex in (α, β) , we have from (4) that for some constant $C > 0$:

$$F(\alpha^*, \beta^*) - F(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) \geq \langle \nabla F(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}), (\alpha^* - \bar{\alpha}, \beta^* - \bar{\beta}) \rangle + C (\|\alpha^* - \bar{\alpha}\|^2 + \|\beta^* - \bar{\beta}\|^2).$$

Applying this inequality to (28) and noting that $\nabla F(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = (\nabla_x \varphi^*, \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x^2 \varphi^*)$ gives us

$$0 \geq \int_{\Lambda} C (\|\alpha^* - \bar{\alpha}\|^2 + \|\beta^* - \bar{\beta}\|^2) d\rho^* \geq 0.$$

Therefore we have $(\alpha^*, \beta^*) = (\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta})$ up to $d\rho^*$ almost everywhere. \square

3.4 Sequential Calibration Setup

We now specify the setting in which we seek to apply Theorem 3.5. We first specify the state variables of our model: we consider $d = 2$, $X_t = (r_t, Z_t)$, where r_t is the short rate and Z_t is the log-stock price. We start with a setting in which a model for the short rate is fixed and has already been calibrated. We refer to this as a ‘‘sequential calibration’’ problem. Our aim is then to calibrate a local volatility model for the stock price, where the local volatility function can depend on the short rate. For this we will employ the OT methodology developed above. The joint calibration problem in which both the short rate and the stock price are calibrated simultaneously using the OT methodology, and in particular the short rate model parameters can depend on the stock price, is considered in our sequel paper Loeper, Obłój, and Joseph, 2023.

Specifically, we take now a given pre-calibrated Hull-White model for the interest rate, see Hull and White, 1990; Hull and White, 1994, and a local volatility dynamics for the log-price:

$$\begin{aligned} dZ_t &= r_t - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(t, Z_t, r_t) + \sigma(t, Z_t, r_t) dW_t^1 \\ dr_t &= (b(t) - ar_t) dt + \sigma_r dW_t^2 \\ d\langle W^1, W^2 \rangle_t &= \xi(t, Z_t, r_t) dt \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Where $a, \sigma_r(t) > 0$ are constants and $b(\cdot)$ is a function of time, calibrated so that the dynamics of $(r_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ match the market data (e.g., suitable interest rates caps and floors). Both a and σ_r being positive constants is not a particularly restrictive constraint as remarked in Brigo and Mercurio, 2007; Hull and White, 1995. Note that $b(t)$ will therefore need to be calibrated to fit the term structure of interest rates seen in the market. Our aim now is to calibrate $\sigma(t, Z_t, r_t)$ and $\xi(t, Z_t, r_t)$ using our OT-methodology. In order to calibrate the local volatility and correlation, we will want to find a cost function that forces $\alpha_t^{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\beta_t^{\mathbb{P}}$ to take the form above. As discussed before, we achieve this by using a functional form for F as long as $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma$ for some convex set Γ , with $F = +\infty$ otherwise. The set Γ will enforce that at least β is positive semidefinite and symmetric, and $\beta_{22} = \sigma_r^2$, which defines a set that is convex in β . With no further constraints on β_{12} , we obtain a non-explicit form of the Legendre transform of the cost function, F^* , which in general will require a numerical solver at each (t, x) . To reduce the computational difficulty of the numerical solution, as in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022, we first restrict the correlation to the following form, which still keeps the set Γ convex:

$$\xi(t, Z_t, r_t) = \frac{\sigma_r(t)}{\sigma(t, Z_t, r_t)} \xi_{\text{ref}}(t, Z_t, r_t), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T], \quad (30)$$

where $\xi_{\text{ref}}(t, Z_t, r_t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ here is a fixed reference function. We then set:

$$\Gamma(t, Z_t, r_t) = \left\{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^2 : \alpha_1 = r_t - \frac{1}{2}\beta_{11}, \alpha_2 = (b(t) - ar_t), \beta_{12} = \beta_{21} = \xi_{\text{ref}}\sigma_r^2, \beta_{22} = \sigma_r^2 \right\}, \quad (31)$$

where one would change the set Γ suitably if a different short rate model was fixed initially. We also require the inequality $\xi_{\text{ref}}(t, Z_t, r_t)^2 \sigma_r(t)^2 \leq \sigma^2(t, Z_t, r_t)$ to keep $\xi(t, Z_t, r_t) \in [-1, 1]$ as a correlation also. Since r_t is on a much lower scale to Z_t , we have that $\sigma_r^2 \ll \sigma^2$, so this condition is not financially restrictive. To enforce this condition, we will define a convex function $H : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ with a parameter $p > 2$:

$$H(x, \bar{x}, s) := \begin{cases} (p-1) \left(\frac{x-s}{\bar{x}-s} \right)^{1+p} + (p+1) \left(\frac{x-s}{\bar{x}-s} \right)^{1-p} - 2p, & \text{if } x, \bar{x} > s, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The coefficients of each term ensure that $H(x, \bar{x}, s)$ is minimised over x at $x = \bar{x}$ with $\min_x H(x, \bar{x}, s) = 0$. We fix a reference local volatility function $\bar{\sigma}^2 = \bar{\sigma}^2(t, Z_t, r_t)$ that represents the desired model. Our aim is to find a calibrated model which does not deviate too much from the reference one. To achieve this we set

$$F(t, Z, r, \alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} H(\beta_{11}, \bar{\sigma}^2, \xi_{\text{ref}}^2 \sigma_r^2), & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma(t, Z_t, r_t), \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Remark 3.13. *It is easy to check that the function F defined in (32) satisfies the assumptions for the duality proof.*

This cost function will ensure that we retain the Hull-White model in the interest rate, while also matching the market prices for the call options by calibrating the volatility of the stock. Additionally, we wish to enforce that the matrix β from our model characteristics is positive definite and that ξ_{ref} remains a correlation function, and we achieve this by setting $s = \xi_{\text{ref}}^2 \sigma_r^2$ as an argument of H in the definition of F . Applying Theorem 3.5, we have the following dual formulation with the given cost function $F(\alpha, \beta)$:

Problem 3.14 (Hull-White Dual Formulation).

$$V = \sup_{\lambda} \lambda \cdot u - \varphi^\lambda(0, Z_0, r_0).$$

Where $\varphi^\lambda = \varphi(t, z, r)$ solves the HJB equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (\exp(z) - K_i)^+ \delta_{\tau_i} + \partial_t \varphi + \sup_{\beta_{11}} \left(\left(r - \frac{1}{2}\beta_{11} \right) \partial_z \varphi \right. \\ & \left. + (b(t) - ar) \partial_r \varphi + \frac{1}{2}\beta_{11} \partial_{zz}^2 \varphi + \bar{\xi} \sigma_r^2 \partial_{zr}^2 \varphi + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_r^2 \partial_{rr}^2 \varphi - r\varphi - H(\beta_{11}, \bar{\sigma}^2, \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2) \right) = 0, \quad (t, z, r) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Lemma 3.15 (Analytic Formula for the Optimal Characteristic). *The optimal characteristic in the HJB equation (33), β_{11}^* is given by*

$$\beta_{11}^*(t, z, r) = \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2 + \left(\frac{(\bar{\sigma}^2 - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^p (\varphi_{zz} - \varphi_z)}{4(p^2 - 1)} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\frac{(\bar{\sigma}^2 - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^p (\varphi_{zz} - \varphi_z)}{2(p^2 - 1)} \right)^2 + 4(\bar{\sigma}^2 - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^{2p}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (34)$$

Proof. By differentiating the argument of the supremum in (33) with respect to β_{11} , we notice that solving the supremum over β_{11} in (33) is equivalent to solving the equation for x :

$$\frac{1}{2} (\partial_{zz}^2 \varphi - \partial_z \varphi) = \partial_x H(x, \bar{\sigma}^2, \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2). \quad (35)$$

Computing the right hand term and rearranging, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} H(x, \bar{\sigma}^2, \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2) = (p^2 - 1) \left(\left(\frac{x - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2 - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2} \right)^p - \left(\frac{x - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2}{\bar{\sigma}^2 - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2} \right)^{-p} \right)$$

We again rearrange and arrive at the quadratic in $(x - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^p$:

$$(x - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^{2p} - (x - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^p (\bar{\sigma}^2 - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^p \frac{\varphi_{zz} - \varphi_z}{2(p^2 - 1)} - (\bar{\sigma}^2 - \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2)^{2p} = 0$$

Thus solving this and taking the positive root since $x > \bar{\xi}^2 \sigma_r^2$ gives us the desired answer. \square

Once the optimal β_{11}^* is obtained the full model dynamics are specified and we can compute the model price $\psi(0, z, r)$ of an instrument with payoff \tilde{G} and maturity $\tilde{\tau} \leq T$ by solving the standard pricing PDE:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \psi + (r - \frac{1}{2} \beta_{11}^*) \partial_z \psi + (b(t) - ar) \partial_r \psi + \frac{1}{2} \beta_{11}^* \partial_{zz}^2 \psi + \bar{\xi} \sigma_r^2 \partial_{zr}^2 \psi + \sigma_r^2 \partial_{rr}^2 \psi - r\psi = 0, & (t, z, r) \in [0, \tilde{\tau}) \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \psi(\tilde{\tau}, z, r) = \tilde{G}(z, r), & (z, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

If we denote \mathbb{P}^* the measure corresponding to the dynamics of the selected model, then via the Feynman-Kac formula, $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^*} \left[e^{-\int_0^{\tilde{\tau}} r_s ds} \tilde{G}(Z_{\tilde{\tau}}, r_{\tilde{\tau}}) \mid Z_0 = z, r_0 = r \right] = \psi(0, z, r)$.

4 Numerical Method

In this section, we outline the numerical method used to solve the dual formulation in Theorem 3.5. We will use and adapt the methods presented in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a for ease of implementation. We first remark, as in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a, that in order to compute the supremum in 3.5, we must solve an HJB equation for a given λ , and then update the λ using an optimisation algorithm. To speed up the convergence, we compute the gradients with respect to λ of the dual objective function.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose Problem 3.4 is admissible, and define the dual objective function as*

$$L(\lambda) = \lambda \cdot u - \varphi^\lambda(0, Z_0, r_0). \quad (37)$$

Then the gradients of the dual objective function are given by

$$\partial_{\lambda_i} L(\lambda) = u_i - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[e^{-\int_0^{\tau_i} r_s ds} G_i(Z_{\tau_i}) \right]. \quad (38)$$

The gradients are obtained via the same method in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022, Lemma 4.5, but with the discounting appearing in the expectation as a result of the $-r\varphi$ term in the HJB equation from the Feynman-Kac formula. The interpretation is the same here, that the gradients represent the difference between the model and market prices. We briefly outline the numerical method from Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a which can be directly applied here. We are first given an initial guess λ , which will usually be taken to be a zero vector, and then solve (33) to obtain $\varphi(0, Z_0, r_0)$. Since the HJB equation (33) has dirac deltas at the times $(\tau_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$, the solution also has jump discontinuities in time. However, in-between these jump discontinuities, the solution is continuous so can be solved using standard techniques backwards in time, and then the jump discontinuities can be incorporated into a terminal condition at the expiration time. That is, we take the final jump discontinuity as a terminal condition, solve the HJB equation up to the next calibrating option expiry, and then add the jump discontinuity to the solution as a new terminal condition at the next jump discontinuity in the same way as given in Definition 3.10 since we understand the solution in the viscosity sense. Then, given $\varphi(0, Z_0, r_0)$, we calculate the objective value (37), and apply an optimisation algorithm to update the λ to a new guess. As in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a, the L-BFGS algorithm of Liu and Nocedal, 1989 displayed good convergence, and with the gradients calculated in Lemma 4.1 the convergence can be made faster. We remark that to compute (38), the $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[e^{-\int_0^{\tau_i} r_s ds} G_i(Z_{\tau_i}) \right]$ term is simply the model price of the i^{th} option. This expectation can either be computed via Monte Carlo methods, for which a change of numeraire will be required to eliminate the path dependent discount term, or using standard pricing PDE techniques by solving (36) with β_{11}^* obtained from the solution of the HJB equation. This process is then repeated until $\|\nabla_\lambda L(\lambda)\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ for some specified tolerance $\varepsilon > 0$, which corresponds to the model prices matching all of the market prices.

We perform the constant rescaling in the short rate variable $r_t \mapsto Rr_t$ where we choose $R = 100$ for stability reasons in the finite difference approximations to make it of the same order as the other coordinate. In addition, we rescale the calibrating option prices and their payoffs by their vegas computed from their Black-Scholes implied volatility. In addition to helping the stability of the numerical method by reducing the magnitude of the jump discontinuities, it also converts pricing errors into implied volatility errors since the vega represents how much the option price will change as the volatility changes by 1%.

4.1 Numerically Solving the HJB Equation

We now outline how to solve the HJB equation (33). In Barles and Souganidis, 1991, it has been shown that monotonicity, stability and consistency of a numerical scheme guarantees convergence locally uniformly so long as there exists a comparison principle for the analytic solution. We use a policy iteration method (see Ma and Forsyth, 2017) similar to that in Guo, Loeper, and Wang, 2022 and Guo, Loeper, Oblój, et al., 2022a, where we solve the HJB equation using an implicit finite difference method, with central difference approximations for the spatial derivatives from In't Hout and Foulon, 2010. We choose a boundary far away enough such that the boundary conditions have less of an effect on the HJB equation solution, and our boundary conditions are such that the second derivative of φ does not change with time between each calibrating option. That is, for all x on the boundary of our computational domain, and for a subsequence of the calibrating option maturity times $(\tau_{i_k})_{k=1, \dots, m}$ such that for $k = 1, \dots, m$ all τ_{i_k} are distinct, and with $\tau_{i_0} = 0$,

$$\nabla_x^2 \varphi(t, x) = \nabla_x^2 \varphi(\tau_i, x), \quad \text{for } t \in (\tau_{i_{k-1}}, \tau_{i_k}], \quad k = 1, \dots, m, \quad x = (z, r).$$

At each time step, we start with the value of φ at the previous time step, we then approximate the PDE coefficients α and β using Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.15, and then solve the HJB equation at that time step using one step of a fully implicit spatially second order finite difference scheme. We then use Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.15 again at the same time step to approximate the PDE coefficients again with the new value of φ . This process is repeated until convergence within some specified tolerance, after which we proceed to the next time step. Once we have solved the HJB equation at all time steps, we then use the value of β_{11} computed from solving the HJB equation, compute β_{12} from the convexity adjustment, and use them to solve the linearised model pricing PDE via the ADI method to generate the model prices. In the simulated data example, we use a discretisation on a uniform 100×100 spatial grid of $[4, 5] \times [0, 5]$ for the log-stock and rescaled interest rates, and partition the time interval into year fractions at the resolution of one day, so that $dt = \frac{1}{365}$. We use the minimisation package, minfunc, of Schmidt, 2005 for an implementation of L-BFGS.

We now summarise this idea in an algorithm. Let $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N = T$ be a discretisation of the time interval $[0, T]$ such that the expiration times of the calibrating instruments $(\tau_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ are a subset of the discretisation times. Let ε_1 be the tolerance of the model prices to the calibrating prices, so that $\|\nabla_\lambda L(\lambda)\|_\infty < \varepsilon_1$,

where the gradients are given in Lemma 4.1, and let ε_2 be the tolerance of the policy iteration for approximating the optimal characteristics.

Algorithm 1: Policy iteration algorithm.

Data: Input an initial λ and market prices u_i .
Result: Calibrated model prices, optimal characteristics

```

1 while  $\|\nabla_\lambda L(\lambda)\|_\infty > \varepsilon_1$  do
  /* Solve the HJB equation backwards in time */
2  for  $k = N - 1, \dots, 0$  do
  /* Terminal Conditions - adding  $\lambda$  multiplied by the payoff */
3  if  $t_{k+1} = \tau_i$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, n$  then
4  |  $\varphi_{t_{k+1}} \leftarrow \varphi_{t_{k+1}} + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i G_i \mathbb{1}_{\{t_{k+1}=\tau_i\}}$ 
5  | end
  /* Policy iteration to approximate the optimal characteristics */
6   $\varphi_{t_k}^{\text{new}} \leftarrow \varphi_{t_{k+1}}$  // Approximate using previous time step
7  while  $\|\varphi_{t_k}^{\text{new}} - \varphi_{t_k}^{\text{old}}\| > \varepsilon_2$  do
8  |  $\varphi_{t_k}^{\text{old}} \leftarrow \varphi_{t_k}^{\text{new}}$  // Store the old value of  $\varphi$ 
9  | Approximate  $\beta_{11}^*$  using Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.15 with  $\varphi_{t_k}^{\text{old}}$ . // Use old values to
  | approximate optimal characteristics
10 | Use  $\beta_{11}^*$  to compute  $\alpha_1^*$  and  $\beta_{12}^*$ , then plug into (33) to remove the supremum and solve using
  | one step of an implicit finite difference method, and set the solution to  $\varphi_{t_k}^{\text{new}}$ .
11 | end
12 |  $\varphi_{t_k} \leftarrow \varphi_{t_k}^{\text{new}}$  // Save the solution once the  $\varphi$  has converged to the optimal solution
13 end
  /* Computing the model prices and gradients */
14 Compute the model prices by solving the pricing PDE (36) using the ADI method.
15 Compute the gradients (38).
16 Use the L-BFGS algorithm to update  $\lambda$ .
17 end

```

4.2 Numerical Results

We present now numerical results showcasing the performance of our proposed calibration method. We use simulated market data to investigate the advantages and drawbacks of our method, and in particular its dependence on the reference model $\bar{\sigma}$ in (32).

We use the CEV (constant elasticity of variance) model of Cox, 1996, with different sets of parameters for the model used to generate the option prices and for our reference model. The underlying $S_t = \exp(Z_t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, thus solves the following stochastic differential equation:

$$dS_t = r_t S_t dt + \sigma(t, S_t) S_t dW_t^1, \quad (39)$$

with $\sigma(t, S_t) = \sigma S_t^{\gamma-1}$, where $\sigma \geq 0$ and $\gamma \geq 0$ are both constants. We remark that this is a special case of the SABR (“stochastic α, β, ρ ”) model derived in Hagan et al., 2002 as a stochastic volatility extension of the CEV model.

We solve a pricing PDE to compute the generating model prices and consider the following instruments:

1. calls on the underlying with an expiration of 60 days;
2. calls on the underlying with an expiration of 120 days.

We note that the payoffs of these options are not smooth and cause instabilities when computing the derivatives in the terminal conditions of the HJB equation. Thus, we use the smoothed version of the call option payoffs, which for $\varepsilon \ll K$ is given by:

$$(S_T - K)^+ \approx \frac{1}{2} \left(\tanh \left(\frac{S_T - K}{\varepsilon} \right) + 1 \right). \quad (40)$$

We keep the interest rate model parameters the same throughout since that is assumed to be given.

We present two numerical examples, the “good” reference model where the initial reference model is parametrically close to the generating model, and the “bad” reference model where it is not parametrically close to the generating model and in particular has a correlation with a different sign. Note that in the extreme case when the generating model and the reference model are the same, the calibration procedure will stop instantly and recover the generating model. The parameters for all the models are summarised in Table 1.

Parameter	Value	Interpretation
Z_0	$\log(92)$	Initial log-underlying price
r_0	0.025×100	Initial short rate scaled by $R = 100$
ε_1	1×10^{-4}	Tolerance for the difference in model and market implied volatility
ε_2	1×10^{-8}	Tolerance for the policy iteration approximation of the optimal characteristics
p	4	Exponent in the cost function
σ	0.78	Volatility scaling of generating CEV model
γ	0.9	Power law in generating CEV model
$\theta(t)$	$ar_0 + \frac{\sigma_r^2}{2a}(1 - e^{-2at})$	Initial term structure of Hull-White generating model
a	0.4	Speed of mean reversion of Hull-White generating model
σ_r	0.05	Volatility of Hull-White generating model
ξ	-0.6	Instantaneous correlation between short rate and log-stock in generating model
$\bar{\sigma}_{\text{good}}$	0.9	Volatility scaling of the “good” reference CEV model
$\bar{\gamma}_{\text{good}}$	0.9	Power law in the “good” reference CEV model
$\bar{\xi}_{\text{good}}$	-0.4	Instantaneous correlation between short rate and log-stock in the “good” reference model
$\bar{\sigma}_{\text{bad}}$	1.2	Volatility scaling of the “bad” reference CEV model
$\bar{\gamma}_{\text{bad}}$	0.78	Power law in the “bad” reference CEV model
$\bar{\xi}_{\text{bad}}$	0.4	Instantaneous correlation between short rate and log-stock in the “bad” reference model

Table 1: Parameter values for the simulated data example.

Our numerical methods converged for both the “good” and “bad” reference model case, calibrating all the call options to a tolerance of 10^{-4} , with the calibrated model implied volatility replicating the prices of the generating model. The generating and calibrated model implied volatility skews are indistinguishable for both maturities within the range $K = [85, 120]$ in which our options’ strikes were taken, indicating that our optimal transport model replicates the observed simulated data both at and in-between the calibrating option strikes. The dependence on the reference model is only observed outside of this range, which is to be expected. The plots are given in Figure 1 with the exact results summarised in Table 2. We include also Monte-Carlo simulations of the generating and calibrated dynamics to demonstrate how the calibrated and the generating model dynamics compare, see Figure 2.

A feature of our method is that it is designed to find a calibrated model closest to the reference model, in the sense of minimising (14). This results in a spiky volatility surface – the method tries to stick to the reference one whilst making sharp deviations needed to calibrate to the given options’ prices. This is not necessarily a desired feature and we propose to smooth the surface to obtain a reasonable volatility surface while matching the market data. We used an iterative procedure: once we obtained convergence of the model prices to the generating model prices within the tolerance of ε_1 , we then stored those characteristics as the new reference model, applied an interpolation method using cubic splines to smooth the surface and then restarted the process with the smoothed surface as our reference model. We remark that the final epoch of the calibration algorithm involved no interpolation, as this spoils calibration, so the overall algorithm provided the OT calibrated surface after iterating through smoothed reference models. In addition to providing more reasonable model dynamics, the smoothed reference model iteration also improved the numerical stability of the algorithm, and thus allowed us to achieve a better calibration. This came at a significant computational cost due to the iterations of the calibration routine, however both ran on a standard notebook laptop in a matter of hours. Both reference models were smoothed around 10 times before changes in the volatility surface plots were no longer noticeable.

We remark that the aforementioned reference model iteration could be circumvented via a regularisation

technique by encoding a smoothing penalty into the cost function, such as via a second order Tikhonov regularisation method. Clearly this would change the optimal characteristics given in (34), but the optimal surface would then have this smoothing penalty encoded into it. However, this would require at all gridpoints to estimate the first and second derivatives of β_{11} via a central difference method, which would substantially increase the computational load beyond that of the reference model iteration method, and additionally potentially require extra state variables to account for the spatial derivatives of β .




Figure 1: Implied volatility skews under the generating model, reference model and OT-calibrated models with both reference models and across two maturities.




Figure 2: Monte Carlo simulations of the SPX in the (a) calibrated model with a “good” reference, (b) calibrated model with a “bad” reference and (c) generating model.

Option Type	Strike	Generating Model		Calibrated Model: Good Reference		Calibrated Model: Bad Reference	
		Price	IV	Price	IV	Price	IV
SPX Call options at $t = 60$ days	85	11.3666	0.4941	11.3666	0.4941	11.3668	0.4941
	92	7.5389	0.4921	7.5398	0.4922	7.5396	0.4922
	99	4.7538	0.4906	4.7549	0.4906	4.7537	0.4905
	106	2.8616	0.4893	2.8625	0.4894	2.8613	0.4893
	113	1.6523	0.4884	1.6532	0.4885	1.6526	0.4884
	120	0.9189	0.4875	0.9192	0.4876	0.9192	0.4876
SPX Call options at $t = 120$ days	85	14.2787	0.4923	14.2787	0.4923	14.2780	0.4923
	92	10.7017	0.4905	10.7007	0.4904	10.7009	0.4904
	99	7.8563	0.4886	7.8580	0.4887	7.8575	0.4886
	106	5.6560	0.4866	5.6575	0.4866	5.6568	0.4866
	113	3.9917	0.4840	3.9918	0.4840	3.9910	0.4840
	120	2.7493	0.4802	2.7495	0.4802	2.7483	0.4802

Table 2: Table of the generating and calibrated model prices and implied volatilities.

To better illustrate the features of the OT-calibrated model, we present plots of the surfaces of the model characteristics, both on their own – see Figures 3 and 4 – and superimposed with the characteristics of the generating and reference models for comparison, see Figures 5 and 6. Broadly speaking, as discussed above, the OT-calibrated model is close to the generating one in the region specified by the data and close to the reference one otherwise. In addition, the surfaces we obtain for the correlation ξ are highly dependent on the reference model, as one may expect from the the convexity adjustment in (30). The choice of reference value will therefore mean that ξ is always close to the reference model in this case with some fluctuations obtained through the change in the value β_{11} . In consequence, the modeller’s (or trader’s) insight in specifying correct correlation (not least its sign) are relatively more important as the market data alone will not necessarily help to correct a widely wrong reference guess.




Figure 3: Plots of β_{11} at $t = 30, 60, 90,$ and 120 days for the calibrated model.




Figure 4: Plots of ξ at $t = 30, 60, 90,$ and 120 days for the calibrated model.




Figure 5: Plots of β_{11} at $t = 30, 60, 90,$ and 120 days for the calibrated model compared with the generating model.




Figure 6: Plots of ξ at $t = 30, 60, 90,$ and 120 days for the calibrated model compared with the generating model.

5 Conclusions

This paper developed a non-parametric optimal-transport driven method to calibrate stock price model in a stochastic interest rate environment. By switching to sub-probability measures representing discounted densities the method manages not to increase the dimension of the state variables. The method is flexible and can accommodate different calibrating instruments. We developed a generic duality result and applied it in the context of Hull-White short rate model and a local volatility stock price model with short rate dependence. We illustrated the numerical performance of the method considering a sequential calibration problem: the short rate model is calibrated first in a parametric setting and it then feeds into our non-parametric local volatility calibration. We highlighted how some model features are pinned well via the market prices of options. However others, notably the correlation between the Brownian motions driving the rates and the stock price, are much more sensitive to the modeller's choice of their reference model. In a follow up paper Loeper, Obłój, and Joseph, 2023, we apply the duality result developed here to consider simultaneous OT-driven calibration for a joint model for the stochastic interest rates and the stock price process, and demonstrate its performance on real market data. We note that here and in Loeper, Obłój, and Joseph, 2023, we restrict ourselves to short-rate models to keep the dimension of the HJB equation to two state variables. It would be of interest to consider more realistic fixed income models, such as market models of Brace, Gałtarek, and Musiela, 1997; Miltersen, Sandmann, and Sondermann, 1997; Jamshidian, 1997 or more recent multi-curve framework models, see Henrard, 2007; Henrard, 2010, where the post 2008 financial crisis effects of the LIBOR-OIS spreads are taken into account. This however would drastically increase the dimension of our state process. It would likely necessitate novel tools to solve the resulting PDEs, such as recent machine learning methods, see Han, Jentzen, and Weinan, 2018; Weinan, Han, and Jentzen, 2021. We believe these are very interesting avenues for future research.

References

- Avellaneda, Marco et al. (1997). “Calibrating volatility surfaces via relative-entropy minimization”. In: *Applied Mathematical Finance* 4.1, pp. 37–64.
- Bain, Alan, Matthieu Mariapragassam, and Christoph Reisinger (2021). “Calibration of local-stochastic and path-dependent volatility models to vanilla and no-touch options”. In: *Journal of Computational Finance* 24.4.
- Barles, Guy and Panagiotis Souganidis (1991). “Convergence of approximation schemes for fully nonlinear second order equations”. In: *Asymptotic Analysis* 4.3, pp. 271–283.
- Benamou, Jean-David and Yann Brenier (2000). “A computational fluid mechanics solution to the Monge–Kantorovich mass transfer problem”. In: *Numerische Mathematik* 84.3, pp. 375–393.
- Bouchard, Bruno, Grégoire Loeper, and Yiyi Zou (2017). “Hedging of covered options with linear market impact and gamma constraint”. In: *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 55.5, pp. 3319–3348.
- Box, George and Norman Draper (1987). *Empirical model-building and response surfaces*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Brace, Alan, Dariusz Gątarek, and Marek Musiela (1997). “The market model of interest rate dynamics”. In: *Mathematical Finance* 7.2, pp. 127–155.
- Brigo, Damiano and Fabio Mercurio (2007). *Interest rate models-theory and practice: with smile, inflation and credit*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Brunick, Gerard and Steven Shreve (2013). “Mimicking an Itô process by a solution of a stochastic differential equation”. In: *Annals of Applied Probability* 23.4, pp. 1584–1628.
- Cox, John (1996). “The constant elasticity of variance option pricing model”. In: *Journal of Portfolio Management*, pp. 15–17.
- Crandall, Michael G, Hitoshi Ishii, and Pierre-Louis Lions (1992). “User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 27.1, pp. 1–67.
- Dupire, Bruno (1994). “Pricing with a smile”. In: *Risk* 7.1, pp. 18–20.
- Figalli, Alessio (2008). “Existence and uniqueness of martingale solutions for SDEs with rough or degenerate coefficients”. In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 254.1, pp. 109–153.
- Guo, Ivan and Grégoire Loeper (2021). “Path dependent optimal transport and model calibration on exotic derivatives”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 31.3, pp. 1232–1263.
- Guo, Ivan, Grégoire Loeper, Jan Obłój, et al. (2022a). “Joint Modeling and Calibration of SPX and VIX by Optimal Transport”. In: *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* 13.1, pp. 1–31.
- (2022b). “Optimal transport for model calibration”. In: *Risk Magazine*.
- Guo, Ivan, Grégoire Loeper, and Shiyi Wang (2019). “Local volatility calibration by optimal transport”. In: *2017 MATRIX Annals*. Springer, pp. 51–64.
- (2022). “Calibration of local-stochastic volatility models by optimal transport”. In: *Mathematical Finance* 32.1, pp. 46–77.
- Gyöngy, István (1986). “Mimicking the one-dimensional marginal distributions of processes having an Itô differential”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 71.4, pp. 501–516.
- Hagan, Patrick et al. (2002). “Managing smile risk”. In: *The Best of Wilmott* 1, pp. 249–296.
- Han, Jiequn, Arnulf Jentzen, and E Weinan (2018). “Solving high-dimensional partial differential equations using deep learning”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115.34, pp. 8505–8510.
- Henrard, Marc (2007). “The Irony in the Derivatives Discounting”. In: *Wilmott Magazine*, pp. 92–98.
- (2010). “The irony in derivatives discounting part II: The crisis”. In: *Wilmott Journal* 2.6, pp. 301–316.
- Huesmann, Martin and Dario Trevisan (2019). “A Benamou–Brenier formulation of martingale optimal transport”. In: *Bernoulli* 25.4A, pp. 2729–2757.
- Hull, John and Alan White (1990). “Pricing interest-rate-derivative securities”. In: *The Review of Financial Studies* 3.4, pp. 573–592.
- (1994). “Branching out”. In: *Risk* 7.7, pp. 34–37.
- (1995). “A note on the models of Hull and White for pricing options on the term structure: Response”. In: *The Journal of Fixed Income* 5.2, pp. 97–102.
- In’t Hout, KJ and S Foulon (2010). “ADI finite difference schemes for option pricing in the Heston model with correlation.” In: *International Journal of Numerical Analysis & Modeling* 7.2, pp. 303–320.
- Jamshidian, Farshid (1997). “LIBOR and swap market models and measures”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 1.4, pp. 293–330.

- Krylov, Nikolai (1984). “Once more about the connection between elliptic operators and Itô’s stochastic equations”. In: *Statistics and Control of Stochastic Processes, Steklov Seminar*, pp. 214–229.
- Lions, Pierre-Louis (1983). “Optimal control of diffusion processes and Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations part 2: viscosity solutions and uniqueness”. In: *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 8.11, pp. 1229–1276.
- Liu, Dong and Jorge Nocedal (1989). “On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization”. In: *Mathematical Programming* 45.1, pp. 503–528.
- Loeper, Grégoire, Jan Oblój, and Benjamin Joseph (2023). “Joint Calibration of Local Volatility with Stochastic Interest Rates model using Optimal Transport”. Working Paper.
- Ma, K and PA Forsyth (2017). “An unconditionally monotone numerical scheme for the two-factor uncertain volatility model”. In: *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 37.2, pp. 905–944.
- Miltersen, Kristian, Klaus Sandmann, and Dieter Sondermann (1997). “Closed form solutions for term structure derivatives with log-normal interest rates”. In: *The Journal of Finance* 52.1, pp. 409–430.
- Nesterov, Yurii (2018). *Lectures on convex optimization*. Vol. 137. Springer.
- Rockafellar, R. Tyrrell (1970). *Convex analysis*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Schmidt, Mark (2005). “minFunc: unconstrained differentiable multivariate optimization in Matlab”. In: <http://www.cs.ubc.ca/~schmidtm/Software/minFunc.html>.
- Tan, Xiaolu and Nizar Touzi (2013). “Optimal transportation under controlled stochastic dynamics”. In: *The Annals of Probability* 41.5, pp. 3201–3240.
- Trevisan, Dario (2016). “Well-posedness of multidimensional diffusion processes with weakly differentiable coefficients”. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 21.
- Villani, Cédric (2009). *Optimal transport: old and new*. Vol. 338. Springer.
- Weinan, E, Jiequn Han, and Arnulf Jentzen (2021). “Algorithms for solving high dimensional PDEs: from non-linear Monte Carlo to machine learning”. In: *Nonlinearity* 35.1, pp. 278–310.