

# Finding the nonnegative minimal solutions of Cauchy PDEs in a volatility-stabilized market \*

Nicole Tianjiao Yang<sup>†</sup> and Tomoyuki Ichiba<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract.

The strong relative arbitrage problem in Stochastic Portfolio Theory seeks to generate an investment strategy that almost surely outperforms a benchmark portfolio at the end of a given time horizon. The highest relative return in relative arbitrage opportunities is characterized by the smallest nonnegative continuous solution of a Cauchy problem for a partial differential equation (PDE). However, solving this type of PDE poses analytical and numerical challenges, due to the high dimensionality and its non-unique solutions. In this paper, we discuss numerical methods to address the relative arbitrage problem and the associated PDE in a volatility-stabilized market, using time-changed Bessel bridges. We present a practical algorithm and demonstrate numerical results through an example in volatility-stabilized markets.

**Key words.** Optimal arbitrage, Cauchy PDEs, Bessel bridges, Stochastic Portfolio Theory

**1. Introduction.** Stochastic Portfolio Theory (SPT), introduced by Robert Fernholz [11], analyzes portfolio behavior and the structure of the equity market. No assumption is made regarding the existence of an equivalent (local) martingale measure, that is, arbitrage opportunities are not excluded. An important topic, the relative arbitrage opportunity, is first defined in the SPT. The focus of the relative arbitrage problem is to generate a strategy that almost surely outperforms a benchmark portfolio at the end of a certain time horizon and look for the highest relative return. The best possible relative arbitrage opportunity is constructed in [9] with respect to the market portfolio. Specific examples of the market, including the stabilized volatility model, in which there is relative arbitrage, are introduced in [12]. In [15] and [17], investors can have influence on stock price processes, and this results in a relative arbitrage problem with interactions between investors.

However, the tractability of single-player or multi-player relative arbitrage models remains a challenge. Even if we only consider a single investor and a simplified market structure, it is hard to get an analytical solution. There is still a high dimensionality coming from the assets in the market. Traditional ways to solve PDEs usually rely on evolution of operators along spatiotemporal grids. This poses expensive computational costs, especially for high-dimensional PDEs or the so-called “curse of dimensionality”: memory requirements and complexity grow exponentially with dimension. Furthermore, the optimal arbitrage is modeled as the non-negative minimal solution of an associated Cauchy PDE in [9], [10], [15]. PDE problems with multiple solutions remain a challenge in both numerical methods and deep learning approaches [5]. However, it is of great practical need to tackle PDE problems that may have multiple solutions or to model problems as differential inequalities. There are

---

\*Submitted to the editors DATE.

**Funding:** Funding information goes here.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA (E-mail: [tyang31@emory.edu](mailto:tyang31@emory.edu))

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, South Hall, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA (E-mail: [ichiba@pstat.ucsb.edu](mailto:ichiba@pstat.ucsb.edu)) Part of research is supported by National Science Foundation grants DMS-1615229 and DMS-2008427.

multiple solutions in some examples of the Black-Scholes model with stochastic volatility [7] or pricing under financial bubbles [14]. BSDEs with singular terminal conditions and their minimal non-negative solutions are discussed in [3].

In this paper, we develop a grid-based solution for relative arbitrage in volatility-stabilized models and give a numerical solution for optimal arbitrage by constructing a stochastic process from the capitalization to serve as a clock and perform a time change to the Bessel bridges. In addition, we should ensure positive values of discretized  $\mathcal{X}(t_k)$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, K$  by analyzing the logarithmic dynamics. It can happen quite frequently that the discretized dynamics evolves to be a small quantity that goes near zero, which causes an overflow and loss of precision problem. In volatility-stabilized models, we can model  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot)$  using Bessel processes to solve this problem.

**Organization of the paper.** We present the numerical solution for optimal arbitrage opportunities ([9]) relative to the market portfolio in the volatility-stabilized market. We summarize the relative arbitrage and the probabilistic solution for optimal arbitrage in Section 2.2. We introduce the numerical methods based on time-changed Bessel processes and Bessel bridge interpolation in Section 3. Then, in Section 4, we propose general grid-based methods for optimal arbitrage considering the associated backward stochastic differential equation of the Cauchy PDE for optimal arbitrage.

**2. Relative arbitrage.** For a given finite time horizon  $[0, T]$ , we consider an admissible market model  $\mathcal{M}$  consisting of a given standard Brownian motion  $W(\cdot) := (W_1(\cdot), \dots, W_n(\cdot))'$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The filtration  $\mathbb{F}$  represents the “flow of information” in the market driven by the Brownian motion, that is,  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}^W(t)\}_{0 \leq t < \infty}$  and  $\mathcal{F}^W(t) := \{\sigma(W(s)); 0 < s < t\}_{0 \leq t < \infty}$  with  $\mathcal{F}^W(0) := \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ , mod  $\mathbb{P}$ . All local martingales and supermartingales are with respect to the filtration  $\mathbb{F}$  if not written specifically.

**2.1. Market model.** There are  $n$  risky assets (stocks) with prices per share  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot) := (X_1(\cdot), \dots, X_n(\cdot))'$  driven by  $n$  independent Brownian motions. Here,  $'$  stands for the transpose of matrices. We assume the capitalization follows the system of stochastic differential equations below: for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$(2.1) \quad dX_i(t) = X_i(t)(\beta_i(\mathcal{X}(t))dt + \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_{ik}(\mathcal{X}(t))dW_k(t)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

with initial condition  $X_i(0) = x_i$ . We assume that the number of independent Brownian motions is  $n$ , that is, we have exactly as many randomness sources as there are stocks on the market  $\mathcal{M}$ . The dimension  $n$  is chosen to be large enough to avoid unnecessary dependencies among the stocks we define. Here,  $\beta(\cdot) = (\beta_1(\cdot), \dots, \beta_n(\cdot))' : \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  as the mean rates of return for  $n$  stocks and  $\sigma(\cdot) = (\sigma_{ik}(\cdot))_{1 \leq i, k \leq n} : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \text{GL}(n)$  as volatilities are assumed to be invertible,  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable in which  $\text{GL}(n)$  is the space of  $n \times n$  invertible real matrices. For simplicity, denote  $\mathcal{X}(t) := (\mathcal{X}(t))$ . To satisfy the integrability condition, we assume that for any  $T > 0$ ,

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^T \left( |\beta_i(\mathcal{X}(t))| + \alpha_{ii}(\mathcal{X}(t)) \right) dt < \infty,$$

where  $\alpha(\cdot) := \sigma(\cdot)\sigma'(\cdot)$ , and its  $i, j$  element  $\alpha_{i,j}(\cdot)$  is the covariance process between the logarithms of  $X_i$  and  $X_j$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . The market  $\mathcal{M}$  is therefore a complete market.

**Definition 2.1 (Investment strategy and wealth).** An  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable  $n$ -dimensional process  $\pi$  is called an admissible investment strategy if

$$(2.3) \quad \int_0^T (|(\pi(t))'\beta(\mathcal{X}(t))| + (\pi(t))'\alpha(\mathcal{X}(t))\pi(t))dt < \infty, \quad T \in (0, \infty), \quad a.e.$$

The strategy here is a self-financing portfolio, since wealth at any time is obtained by trading the initial wealth according to the strategy  $\pi(\cdot)$ . We denote the admissible set of the investment strategy process of an investor by  $\mathbb{A}$ .

If the admissible strategy  $\pi(\cdot) = (\pi_1(\cdot), \dots, \pi_n(\cdot))'$  takes values in the set

$$\Delta_n := \{\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \pi_1 + \dots + \pi_n = 1\},$$

then  $\pi(\cdot)$  is a portfolio. The dynamics of the wealth process  $V(\cdot) = V^{\pi, v_0}(\cdot)$  of an investor is determined by

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{dV(t)}{V(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i(t) \frac{dX_i(t)}{X_i(t)}, \quad V(0) = v_0.$$

In particular, the market portfolio  $\mathbf{m}$  is used to describe the behavior of the market. By investing in proportion to the market weight of each stock,

$$(2.5) \quad \pi_i^{\mathbf{m}}(t) := \frac{X_i(t)}{X(t)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad t \geq 0,$$

the corresponding wealth process  $V^{\mathbf{m}}(\cdot)$  follows

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{dV^{\mathbf{m}}(t)}{V^{\mathbf{m}}(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i^{\mathbf{m}}(t) \cdot \frac{dX_i(t)}{X_i(t)} = \frac{dX(t)}{X(t)}, \quad t > 0, \quad V^{\mathbf{m}}(0) = x_0.$$

That is, the market portfolio amounts to the ownership of the entire market  $X(t) = X_1(t) + \dots + X_n(t)$ , for  $t \in (0, T]$ , and  $X(0) := x_0$ .

**2.2. Benchmark of the market and investors.** The performance of a portfolio is measured with respect to a certain benchmark. Given two investment strategies  $\pi(\cdot)$  and  $\rho(\cdot)$ , with the same initial capital  $V^\pi(0) = V^\rho(0) = 1$ , we shall say that  $\pi(\cdot)$  represents an arbitrage opportunity relative to  $\rho(\cdot)$  over the time horizon  $[0, T]$ , with a given  $T > 0$ , if

$$\mathbb{P}(V^\pi(T) \geq V^\rho(T)) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(V^\pi(T) > V^\rho(T)) > 0.$$

The optimal arbitrage relative to the performance of the market portfolio is defined below.

**Definition 2.2 (Optimal arbitrage).** Given the dynamics of the market  $\mathcal{X}(0)$ , the initial wealth of the investor  $v$ , and the admissible portfolio  $\pi \in \mathbb{A}$ . In the market system (2.1), the investor pursues the optimal arbitrage characterized by the smallest initial relative wealth

$$(2.7) \quad u(T) = \inf \left\{ w \in (0, \infty) \mid \text{there exists } \pi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{A} \text{ such that } v = wX(0), \quad V^{v, \pi}(T) \geq X(T) \right\}$$

and the relative arbitrage portfolio  $\{\pi(t)\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  that achieves such smallest initial relative wealth  $u(T)$ .

In fact, we can define a sequence of subproblems  $u(T-t, \cdot)$ , which represents the initial optimal arbitrage quantity to start at  $t \in [0, T)$  such that we match or exceed the benchmark portfolio at terminal time  $T$ . It follows

$$(2.8) \quad u(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t)) = \inf \left\{ \omega \in (0, \infty) \mid \text{there exists } \tilde{\pi}(\cdot) \in \mathbb{A} \text{ such that } v = \omega \tilde{X}(t), \tilde{V}(T) \geq \tilde{X}(T) \right\}$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq T$ . At every time  $t$ , the investor optimizes  $\tilde{\pi}(\cdot)$  from  $t$  to  $T$ , to obtain the optimal quantity as defined in (2.8).

**Assumption 1.** Let  $X_i(t)\beta_i(t) =: b_i(\mathcal{X}(t))$ ,  $X_i(t)\sigma_{ik}(t) =: s_{ik}(\mathcal{X}(t))$ ,  $\sum_{k=1}^n s_{ik}(t)s_{jk}(t) =: a_{ij}(\mathcal{X}(t))$  for  $t \geq 0$ . We assume that the market price of the risk process  $\theta : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  exists and is square-integrable. That is, there exists an  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable process such that for any  $t \in [0, \infty)$ ,

$$(2.9) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{X}(t))\theta(\mathcal{X}(t)) = \beta(\mathcal{X}(t)), \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \int_0^T \|\theta(\mathcal{X}(t))\|^2 dt < \infty, \forall T \in (0, \infty) \right) = 1.$$

We define the deflator based on the market price of the risk process  $L(t)$  as

$$(2.10) \quad dL(t) = -\theta(t)L(t)dW_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad L(0) = 1.$$

The market is endowed with the existence of a local martingale  $L(\cdot)$  with  $\mathbb{E}[L(T)] \leq 1$  under Assumption 1. It has shown in [9] that with Markovian market coefficients,  $u(T)$  in (2.7) can be represented as  $u(T, \mathcal{X}(0))$  from

$$(2.11) \quad u(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t)) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[L(T)X(T)|\mathcal{F}_t]}{L(t)X(t)}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

**3. Numerical solution to optimal arbitrage.** The optimal quantity  $u(\cdot)$  in (2.11) is the minimal non-negative continuous solution  $u \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  of the semi-linear parabolic Cauchy problem,

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}(\tau, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) D_{ij}^2 u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{a_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) D_i u(\tau, \mathbf{x})}{x_1 + \dots + x_n},$$

$$(3.2) \quad u(0, \cdot) = 1,$$

where  $\tau := T - t$ . See [9] for details. In general, this PDE has no explicit solution and the grid-based method is also hard to compute in high dimensions. This section starts by looking at the volatility-stabilized market model ([12]) and its optimal arbitrage opportunities. In Section 3.3, we give a numerical solution for optimal arbitrage in the volatility-stabilized market by simulating stocks from Bessel bridges. We discuss the numerical performance for different interpolation schemes to obtain the capitalization process at terminal time  $T$ .

**3.1. Challenges in finite difference methods.** The handling of (3.1) - (3.2) with finite-difference methods yields several challenges. Firstly,  $u(\tau, \mathbf{x})$  is on an unbounded domain of  $(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+^n$  and the solutions of (3.1) - (3.2) are not unique. Some artificial boundary conditions of  $u(\tau, \mathbf{x})$  need to be carefully chosen for implementation. However, it is a delicate issue to select the correct minimal nonnegative solution, especially with a constant initial condition (3.2) and additional boundary conditions. Secondly, the capitalization takes values in the positive cone  $(0, \infty)^n$ , and thus it should not explode or go to zero. Direct simulation  $\mathcal{X}(t)$  by discretizing (2.1) with, for example, the Euler scheme produces  $\mathcal{X}(t)$  values that are inevitably very close to zero. This causes a numerical overflow when approximating  $u(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t))$  by (3.5). In experiments, we found that the approximated solution explodes or goes to zero quite easily even when the number of stocks is set as small as  $n = 2$ . Thirdly, the grid-based numerical schemes are notoriously expensive in terms of its computational costs, known as ‘‘curse of dimensionality’’.

**3.2. Volatility-stabilized market model (VSM).** The volatility stabilized market model (VSM), introduced in [12], possesses similar characteristics in real markets, such as the *leverage effect*, where instantaneous rates of return and volatility have a negative correlation with the capitalization of the stock relative to the market  $\{\mathbf{m}_i(t)\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ .

The market capital in volatility-stabilized model is modeled as a system of stochastic differential equation for  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot) = (X_1(\cdot), \dots, X_n(\cdot))$  defined by

$$(3.3) \quad dX_i(t) = \kappa X(t)dt + \sqrt{X_i(t)X(t)}dW_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

with  $X(\cdot) = X_1(\cdot) + \dots + X_n(\cdot)$ , where  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\kappa \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ . This corresponds to  $a_{ij} = \sqrt{X_i(t)X(t)}\delta_{ij}$  in (3.1), where  $\delta_{ij} = 1$  if  $i = j$ , and  $\delta_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. Here,  $W_1(\cdot), \dots, W_n(\cdot)$  are independent standard Brownian motions

We study the Bessel process and some of its properties, as the Bessel process is closely related to stock capital  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot)$ .

**Definition 3.1.** For every  $m \geq 0$  and  $x \geq 0$ , the unique strong solution of the equation

$$(3.4) \quad dQ_t = mdt + 2\sqrt{|Q_t|}dW_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad Q_0 = x,$$

is called the square of  $m$ -dimensional Bessel process started at  $x$ .  $W_t$  is a linear Brownian motion with quadratic variation  $\langle W, W \rangle_t = t$ ,  $t \geq 0$ . Based on process  $Q_t$ , the  $m$ -dimensional Bessel process follows as its positive square root

$$R_t := \text{sgn}(Q_t)\sqrt{|Q_t|}, \quad R_0 = \text{sgn}(x)\sqrt{|x|}.$$

In [13], it is shown that (3.4) has a unique strong solution for all  $m \geq 0$  and  $x \geq 0$ . Furthermore, the stock capitalization  $\mathcal{X}(t)$  as the unique-in-distribution solution of (3.3), can be written as a time-changed squared Bessel process.

If the market follows (3.6), the resulting solution  $u(\cdot)$  is

$$(3.5) \quad u(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t)) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[L(T)X(T)|\mathcal{F}_t]}{L(t)X(t)} = \frac{X_1(t) \dots X_n(t)}{X_1(t) + \dots + X_n(t)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{X_1(T) + \dots + X_n(T)}{X_1(T) \dots X_n(T)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

**3.3. Numerical solution of optimal arbitrage in VSM.** In the section, we show a numerical solution to optimal arbitrage in a class of volatility-stabilized markets by simulating  $\{\mathcal{X}(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  through time-changed Bessel processes.

With  $\kappa = 1$ , it reduces to the system of the stochastic differential equations

$$(3.6) \quad dX_i(t) = X_i(t)dt + \sqrt{X_i(t)X(t)}dW_i(t), \quad t \geq 0$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Consider the processes  $R_i(t) = \sqrt{X_i(\Lambda^{-1}(t))}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $\Lambda^{-1}(\cdot)$  is the inverse function of continuous, non-decreasing stochastic process

$$(3.7) \quad \Lambda(t) := \int_0^t \frac{\mathcal{X}(s)}{4} ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

That is,  $\Lambda^{-1}(t)$  serves as the stochastic clock. The squared capitalization process with the clock gives the independent Bessel processes of order  $m$ ,  $R_1(\cdot), \dots, R_n(\cdot)$

$$dR_i(s) = \frac{m-1}{2R_i(s)} ds + d\widehat{W}_i(s),$$

where  $m = 4\kappa = 2(1 + \zeta)$ ,  $\widehat{W}_i(t) = \int_0^{\Lambda^{-1}(t)} \sqrt{\Lambda'(s)} dW_i(s)$  for  $t, s \geq 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and  $\langle \widehat{W}_i, \widehat{W}_j \rangle(s) = s\delta_{ij}$ .

Given the starting time  $s \in [0, T]$ , the time-changed stock capitalization processes follow squared Bessel processes in  $m$  dimension,

$$(3.8) \quad Y_i(t_k) = R_i^2(t_k) = X_i(\Lambda^{-1}(t_k)) = X_i(\Lambda^{-1}(t_0)) + \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^k \Delta W(t_\ell) \right)^2$$

with uniform mesh  $t_k := s + k\Delta t$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . The time-changed, total capital of the stocks is  $Y(\cdot) := \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(\cdot)$ . This sum  $Y(\cdot)$  satisfies the following equation

$$(3.9) \quad Y(t) = X_1(\Lambda^{-1}(t)) + \dots + X_n(\Lambda^{-1}(t)) = 4\Lambda'(\Lambda^{-1}(t)); \quad t \geq 0.$$

Thus, the mapping of the clock  $t_k \rightarrow \theta_k$  is

$$\theta_k := \Lambda^{-1}(t_k) = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \frac{4}{Y(t_\ell)} \Delta t.$$

With this, we can find the required range of uniform mesh such that  $\theta_{N-1} \leq T \leq \theta_N$  for an appropriate  $N$ . We can then use the results of  $Y_i(\cdot)$  and  $Y(\cdot)$  to estimate (3.5) by refining the last segment  $[\theta_{N-1}, \theta_N]$ . We interpolate between  $(\theta_{N-1}, X(\theta_{N-1}))$  and  $(\theta_N, X(\theta_N))$ . We next discuss how to choose a suitable interpolation scheme.

For a quick implementation, one can choose a linear interpolation as

$$(3.10) \quad X_i(\theta) = \frac{\theta_k - \theta}{\theta_k - \theta_{k-1}} Y_i(t_{k-1}) + \frac{\theta - \theta_{k-1}}{\theta_k - \theta_{k-1}} Y_i(t_k)$$

with  $\theta = T$ . Thus, we obtain the simulation of  $X_i(T)$  and  $X(T)$  from it. A more accurate interpolation can be obtained by simulating the Bessel bridge in the last time step between  $(\theta_{N-1}, X(\theta_{N-1}))$  and  $(\theta_N, X(\theta_N))$ . To do this, we simulate Bessel bridges  $R_b(t)$  which can be derived by Itô's formula and Brownian bridges. Bessel bridges can be constructed on the basis of Brownian bridges ([16]). That is,  $R_b(t) = (\sum_{i=1}^m (H_t^i)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , where  $H_t$  is the Brownian bridge from  $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$  to  $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$  over  $[\theta_{k-1}, \theta_k]$ . Let  $R_{\theta_{k-1}}^b := (Y_i(t_{k-1}))^{\frac{1}{2}} > 0$ . By Itô's formula

$$(3.11) \quad dR_b(t) = \left( \frac{m-1}{2R_b(t)} - \frac{R_b(t)}{T-t} + \frac{z \sum_{i=1}^m Y_t^{(i)}}{R_b(t)(T-t)} \right) dt + dZ_t,$$

where the end point is  $R_{\theta_k}^b = Y_i(t_k)$ .  $Z_t$  is a standard Brownian motion.

Now, we can solve the optimal arbitrage which is the nonnegative minimal solution of (3.1)-(3.2) through (3.5) and the time-changed Bessel processes. At each time  $t$ ,  $\mathcal{X}(t) = \mathbf{x}$  is given. Hence, at time step  $t$ , we rerun the simulation of  $\{\mathcal{X}(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  from the given state at  $t$  to satisfy the Markov property and provides the correct conditional expectations for  $u(\cdot)$  in (3.5). We implement this by the Monte Carlo scheme with  $N$  different realizations of the Brownian motion, and thus  $N$  sample paths with initial point  $\mathcal{X}(s) := \{X_1(s), \dots, X_n(s)\}$  such that

$$(3.12) \quad u(T-s, \mathcal{X}_s) = \frac{X_1(s) \dots X_n(s)}{X(s)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{X^{(k)}(T)}{X_1^{(k)}(T) \dots X_n^{(k)}(T)},$$

where  $X_i^{(k)}(\cdot)$  is the  $k$ -th realization of the sample trajectory of stock capitalization.

#### 3.4. Algorithm and experimental results.

We summarize the steps in Algorithm 3.1.

---

**Algorithm 3.1** Solve  $u$  by simulating Bessel processes in VSM

---

**Input:**  $n$  = the number of capitalization processes in the market,  $m$  = the dimension of the time-changed Bessel processes to model  $X_i(t)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $N_T$  = the number of uniform meshes on  $[0, T]$ ,  $n_p$  = sample trajectories used for Monte Carlo simulation of  $u(\cdot)$ .

For  $s = 0$  to  $N_T$ :

1. Initialize  $k = 0$ , the states  $\mathcal{X}(s) := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $\theta_0 = s$ .
2. While  $\theta_k \leq T$ :
  - (a) Set  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ,  $t_k := s + k\Delta t$ .
  - (b) Generate  $n_p$  samples of  $m$ -dimensional independent Brownian Motion  $W(t_k)$ .
  - (c) Simulate  $n_p$  independent samples of  $mn$ -dimensional squared Bessel processes  $Y(t_k) = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(t_k)$ , where  $Y_i(t_k)$  is defined in (3.8) for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
  - (d) Update  $\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k + \frac{4}{Y(t_k)} \Delta t$ , where  $\Delta t := T/N_T$ .
3. Evaluate  $X_i(T)$  using interpolation techniques between the non-uniform mesh points  $(\theta_k, \theta_{k+1})$ . Then, compute  $u(T-s, \mathcal{X}_s)$  by the Monte Carlo estimation (3.12).

**Output:** The optimal arbitrage path  $u(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t))$  for  $t := s\Delta t$ ,  $s = 0, 1, \dots, N_T$ .

---

The implementation of Algorithm 3.1 and numerical examples is carried out in Python.

We first conduct the experiment with  $\mathcal{X}(T)$  obtained from a linear interpolation (3.10). Figure 1 shows the evaluated quantity of  $u(T - t, \mathbf{x})$  along the  $\mathbf{x}$  axis and the time  $t$  axis, respectively, where we consider two and eight stock capitals in the market model and present the result of  $u(T, \mathbf{x})$ , respectively. We also observe that the results are prone to numerical instability, as in the plots (c)-(d) of Figure 1, when the initial value of capitalization is taken to be a small value. In particular, we visualize  $u(T, \mathbf{x})$  with  $(x_1, x_2)$  taken from a mesh  $[3.5, 9]^2$ , discretized by 50 cells in each direction. The subfigure (c) in Figure 1 takes the rest of the initial conditions  $x_i = 4$  for  $i = 3, \dots, 8$ , and the subfigure (d) takes the rest of the initial conditions  $x_i = 14$  for  $i = 3, \dots, 8$ . One possible approach to solve this is the scaling property of the squared Bessel process, see [4], [6].




Figure 1: Fix  $T = 1$ , time step  $\Delta t = 0.01$ , number of sample paths  $N = 1000$  of Brownian motions to generate Bessel processes of dimension  $m = 4$ . We solve the optimal arbitrage for the number of stocks  $n = 2$  in (a) - (b), and  $n = 8$  in (c) - (d). (a): Approximated  $u(T, x)$  with  $(x_1, x_2)$  taken from a mesh  $[3.5, 9]^2$  with discretization of 50 cells in each direction. (b): Solution  $u(T - t, \mathbf{x})$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ , with  $(x_1, x_2) = (1, 1)$ . (c): Approximated  $u(T, \mathbf{x})$  with  $(x_1, x_2)$  taken from a mesh  $[3.5, 9]^2$  with discretization of 50 cells in each direction,  $\{x_i\}_{i=3}^8$  is taken to be 4. (d): Approximated  $u(T, x)$  with  $(x_1, x_2)$  taken from a mesh  $[3.5, 9]^2$  with discretization of 50 cells in each direction,  $\{x_i\}_{i=3}^8$  is taken to be 14.

From the interpolation by the Bessel bridge, we get the results in Figure 2. Higher-order numerical SDE solvers, such as the Milstein method, can be used to simulate the Bessel bridge process more accurately with numerical stability.

It is shown in [9] and [15] that having a non-trivial relative arbitrage (strictly less than one in this case), it amounts to showing that the auxiliary process

$$d\zeta_i(t) = \zeta_i(t) dt + \sqrt{\zeta_i(t) (\zeta_1(t) + \dots + \zeta_n(t))} dW_i(t), \quad t \geq 0$$

may hit the boundary of the domain  $[0, \infty)^n$  in finite time. We visualize this behavior in Figure 2(c).

For a more general class of volatility-stabilized markets, let us consider  $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ . For  $\mathcal{X}(t) = \mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , the optimal arbitrage can be derived from the PDE characterization in [9] that

$$u(T-t, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{(x_1 \cdots x_n)^{\frac{1+\zeta}{2}}}{x_1 + \dots + x_n} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{x}} \left[ \frac{X_1(T) + \dots + X_n(T)}{(X_1(T) \cdots X_n(T))^{\frac{1+\zeta}{2}}} e^{-\int_t^T (1-\zeta^2)(X_1(s) + \dots + X_n(s)) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{8X_j(s)} ds} \right].$$






Figure 2: Consider  $n = 2$  stocks.  $T = 1$ , and  $\Delta t = 0.01$ . The interpolation with Bessel bridges is using time increment  $\Delta t_t^b = 0.0001$ ; number of sample paths  $N = 1000$  of Brownian motions to generate Bessel processes of dimension  $m = 4$ . (a): Approximated  $u(T, x)$  with  $(x_1, x_2)$  taken from a mesh  $[3.5, 9]^2$  with discretization of 50 cells in each direction. (b): Solution  $u(T - t, \mathbf{x})$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ , with  $(x_1, x_2) = (1, 1)$ . The comparison of computing with (left) or without (right) the initial condition  $u(0, \mathbf{x}) = 1$ . (c): Sample trajectories of the  $n$  dimensional auxiliary process  $(\zeta_1(\cdot), \dots, \zeta_n(\cdot))$  over time horizon  $[0, 1]$ . The sample trajectories that touch the boundary  $\{x_i = 0\}_{i=1}^n$  is marked red. The trajectories that stay positive is marked blue.

This can be implemented similarly using the numerical approach in this section. In the next section, we propose a more general approach to deal with the PDE characterization (3.1)-(3.2) of the optimal arbitrage.

**4. A general approach via reflected Backward Stochastic Differential Equations.** The nonnegative minimal solution of PDEs is not only of interest in optimal arbitrage problem, as we have introduced in Section 1. In this section, we demonstrate a different approach based on reflected Backward Stochastic Differential Equations (BSDEs) to solve the minimal solution of (3.1)-(3.2) that is not limited to volatility-stabilized market.

Consider the PDE below

$$\min[u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) - h(\tau, \mathbf{x}), \partial_\tau u - \mathcal{A}u(\tau, \mathbf{x})] = 0, \quad (\tau, \mathbf{x}) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

$$u(0, \mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We can write this equivalently as

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_\tau u - \mathcal{A}u(\tau, \mathbf{x}), & \{(\tau, \mathbf{x}) : u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) > h(\tau, \mathbf{x})\}, \\ u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) &\geq h(\tau, \mathbf{x}), & (\tau, \mathbf{x}) : (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) &\in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n), & \{(\tau, \mathbf{x}) : u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) = h(\tau, \mathbf{x})\}, \\ u(0, \mathbf{x}) &= g(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

While the non-negative solution of a parabolic PDE of our interest is

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_\tau u - \mathcal{A}u(\tau, \mathbf{x}), & (\tau, \mathbf{x}) &: (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) &\geq h(\tau, \mathbf{x}), & (\tau, \mathbf{x}) &: (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) &\in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n), & (\tau, \mathbf{x}) &: (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n, \\ u(0, \mathbf{x}) &= g(\mathbf{x}), & \mathbf{x} &\in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{D}_1$  be the domain of the optimization problem  $\min u^r(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ , subject to (4.1),  $\mathcal{D}_2$  be the domain of optimization problem  $\min u(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ , subject to (4.2). We see that  $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ . Denote  $u^{r*}(\tau, \mathbf{x}) := \min u^r(\tau, \mathbf{x})$  and  $u^*(\tau, \mathbf{x}) := \min u(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ . If both problems are feasible, then  $u^{r*}(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \leq u^*(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ .

*Proposition 4.1.* Suppose  $u \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  is a solution of (3.1). Define  $\mathcal{X}(t) := (X_1(t), \dots, X_n(t))$ , for each  $X_i(t)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$dX_i(t) = b_i(t)dt + \sum_{k=1}^n s_{ik}(t)dW_k(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Then  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ -adapted processes  $\{\mathcal{X}_r^{t,x}, Y_r^{t,x}, Z_r^{t,x}\} := \{\mathcal{X}_r^{t,x}, u(T-r, \mathcal{X}_r^{t,x}), (s\nabla u)(T-r, \mathcal{X}_r^{t,x})\}$  solves

$$(4.3) \quad u(T-t, \mathcal{X}_t^{t,x}) = u(0) - \int_t^T f(\mathcal{X}_r^{t,x}, Y_r^{t,x}, Z_r^{t,x})dr - \int_t^T (Z_r^{t,x})' dW(r),$$

where

$$f(\mathcal{X}_t, Y_t, Z_t) = b(\mathbf{x})(s^T(t, \mathcal{X}_t))^{-1}Z_t - \frac{1}{x_1 + \dots + x_n} \mathbf{1}' s(t, \mathcal{X}_t) Z_t.$$

*Proof.* By Itô's formula on  $u(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ ,  $\tau := T - t$ , it follows

$$du(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t)) = (\mathcal{L}u - \frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau})(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t))dt + \sum_{k=1}^n R_k(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t))dW_k(t),$$

where  $R(\tau, \mathbf{x})$  is  $n$ -dimensional vector with  $R_k(\tau, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i s_{ik}(\mathbf{x}) D_i u(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ .  $\mathcal{L}$  is the infinitesimal generator for  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot)$ , i.e.,

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{L}u(\tau) = \left( b(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \partial_x u(\tau) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[a(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \partial_{xx}^2 u(\tau)] \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathcal{X}(t)}.$$

Substitute  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}(\tau, \mathbf{x})$  with the Cauchy problem (3.1), we get that the minimal non-negative continuous solution of the above equation satisfies  $u(0) = 1$ ,

$$du(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t)) = f(\mathcal{X}(t), u, Du)dt + \sum_{k=1}^n R_k(T-t, \mathcal{X}(t))dW_k(t),$$

where  $f(\mathbf{x}, u, Du) = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i(\mathbf{x}) D_i u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{a_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) D_i u(\tau, \mathbf{x}) D_j u(\tau, \mathbf{x})}{x_1 + \dots + x_n}$ . For  $\forall t \leq T$ , integrate  $du(T-r, \mathcal{X}(r))$  with respect to time  $r$ ,  $r \in [t, T]$ , we get that  $\{\mathcal{X}_r^{t,x}, u(r, \mathcal{X}_r^{t,x}), (s\nabla u)(r, \mathcal{X}_r^{t,x})\}$  solves (4.3), where  $u \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ .  $\blacksquare$

Now, we can approach the minimal nonnegative solution of the Cauchy PDEs in [9], [15], [17] by considering the following obstacle problem,

$$(4.5) \quad Y_t = g(\mathcal{X}_T) + \int_t^T f(\mathcal{X}_s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s + K_T - K_t, t \leq s \leq T,$$

where  $S_t = h(\tau, \mathcal{X}_t)$ ,  $\tau = T - t$  is a continuous obstacle process that satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} S_t^2] < \infty$  and  $S_T$  is bounded almost surely.  $\{K_t\}$  is continuous nondecreasing predictable process, such that  $K_0 = 0$ ,  $\int_0^T (Y_t - S_t) dK_t = 0$ . This acts as a minimal push, as the push occurs only when the constraint is reached  $Y_t = S_t$ . The minimal solution of (4.5),  $(Y, Z, K)$ , is in the sense that for any other solution  $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{K})$ ,  $Y \leq \tilde{Y}$ . Here, we take  $S_t = 0$ . We can use the penalization method in [8] to approximate the minimal solution. Given the obstacle process  $S_t$ , the viscosity solution of the obstacle problem (4.1) is shown in [8] to be equivalent to the associate reflected BSDE (4.5).

**5. Discussion.** Numerical approaches to solve high-dimensional PDEs have been focused on the unique solution of the PDEs. In the paper, we investigate a probabilistic approach to solve the nonnegative minimal solution of a Cauchy PDE under the volatility-stabilized market. The existence of multiple solutions of the PDE is essential in the relative arbitrage and Stochastic Portfolio Theory literature. Through the transformation of the stock capitalization to time-changed squared Bessel processes, we solve the optimal arbitrage quantity numerically and demonstrate the smooth behavior of the arbitrage quantity with respect to time and space from the numerical experiments.

The extension of this approach to volatility-stabilized market with interacting investors is related to the numerical methods for stochastic differential games. One possible way is to solve the discretized system of forward-backward PDEs. The finite-difference scheme is first introduced by [1], focusing on stationary and evolutive versions of the MFG models. The existence and uniqueness properties and the bounds for the solutions of the discrete schemes are also proved. The paper [2] extends the aforementioned finite difference scheme to extended mean field games where the players interact through both the states and controls. In general, a promising next step is to look for an efficient deep learning approach to tackle differential equations with multiple solutions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Achdou and I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta. Mean field games: numerical methods. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 48(3):1136–1162, 2010.
- [2] Y. Achdou and Z. Kobeissi. Mean field games of controls: Finite difference approximations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03968*, 2020.
- [3] S. Ankirchner, M. Jeanblanc, and T. Kruse. Bsdes with singular terminal condition and a control problem with constraints. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 52(2):893–913, 2014.
- [4] P. Carr and M. Schröder. Bessel processes, the integral of geometric brownian motion, and asian options. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 48(3):400–425, 2004.
- [5] M. Di Giovanni, D. Sondak, P. Protopapas, M. Brambilla, et al. Finding multiple solutions of odes with neural networks. In *Combining Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning with Physical Sciences 2020*, volume 2587, pages 1–7. CEUR-WS, 2020.
- [6] D. Dufresne. *Bessel processes and a functional of Brownian motion*. Centre for Actuarial Studies, Department of Economics, University of Melbourne, 2004.

- [7] E. Ekström and J. Tysk. The black–scholes equation in stochastic volatility models. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 368(2):498–507, 2010.
- [8] N. El Karoui, C. Kapoudjian, E. Pardoux, S. Peng, and M.-C. Quenez. Reflected solutions of backward sde’s, and related obstacle problems for pde’s. *the Annals of Probability*, 25(2):702–737, 1997.
- [9] D. Fernholz and I. Karatzas. On optimal arbitrage. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 20(4):1179–1204, 2010.
- [10] D. Fernholz and I. Karatzas. Optimal arbitrage under model uncertainty. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 21(6):2191–2225, 2011.
- [11] E. R. Fernholz and E. R. Fernholz. *Stochastic portfolio theory*. Springer, 2002.
- [12] R. Fernholz and I. Karatzas. Relative arbitrage in volatility-stabilized markets. *Annals of Finance*, 1:149–177, 2005.
- [13] I. Goia. *Bessel and volatility-stabilized processes*. Columbia University, 2009.
- [14] S. L. Heston, M. Loewenstein, and G. A. Willard. Options and bubbles. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 20(2):359–390, 2007.
- [15] T. Ichiba and T. Yang. Relative arbitrage opportunities in  $n$  investors and mean-field regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15158*, 2020.
- [16] B. Oksendal. *Stochastic differential equations: an introduction with applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [17] N. T. Yang and T. Ichiba. Relative arbitrage opportunities in an extended mean field system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.02690*, 2023.