

A central limit theorem and its application to the limiting distribution of volatility target index

Xuan Liu* and Michel Gauthier†

Abstract

We study the limiting distribution of a volatility target index as the discretisation time step converges to zero. Two limit theorems (a strong law of large numbers and a central limit theorem) are established, and as an application, the exact limiting distribution is derived. We demonstrate that the volatility of the limiting distribution is consistently larger than the target volatility, and converges to the target volatility as the observation-window parameter λ in the definition of the realised variance converges to 1. Besides the exact formula for the drift and the volatility of the limiting distribution, their upper and lower bounds are derived. As a corollary of the exact limiting distribution, we obtain a vega conversion formula which converts the rho¹ sensitivity of a financial derivative on the limiting diffusion to the vega² sensitivity of the same financial derivative on the underlying of the volatility target index.

1 Introduction

In financial markets, a type of financial index called volatility target indices has been popular among insurance companies, mutual funds, and investment banks for more than a decade, and is widely used in industry for quantitative investment strategies (QIS) and fixed indexed annuities (FIA). Volatility target indices replicate the performance of volatility targeting strategies by dynamically adjusting the weights of a risky asset and a risk free asset, so that the portfolio volatility remains at a fixed level. They provide a control of balance between return and risk. There has been extensive empirical research showing that volatility target indices are able to generate higher Sharpe ratio³ than a buy-and-hold strategy (cf. [11, 14]), especially under extreme market conditions (cf. [13] for empirical results for performance of volatility target indices under volatility cluster). Investors investing in volatility target indices seek risk protection by means of financial derivatives written on these indices. Various numerical methods such as Monte Carlo simulation can be used to capture the exact contractual terms of these indices. However, those methods tend to become rapidly inconvenient when the underlying (of financial derivatives or volatility target indices themselves) increases in complexity. Another common and more efficient approach in practice is to approximate a volatility target index as an ordinary risky asset (i.e. an Itô diffusion) with volatility close to the target volatility, and apply the Black–Scholes formula to this Itô diffusion. This approach however suffers from uncertainty of the drift and the volatility of the approximating diffusion, and fails to provide a direct quantification of vega sensitivity on the underlying risky asset, which is often assumed to be negligible. To the best of our knowledge, there is no existing result in the literature on the exact distribution of the limiting process for vanishing discretisation time step. The purpose of this paper is to derive the exact limiting distribution of volatility target indices, and to study their asymptotic behaviours. A crucial ingredient of our derivation is a central limit theorem for dependent sequence, which can also be applied to the study of other types of volatility based indices.

In this paper, we will assume that the risky asset is a stock with its dynamics given by

$$dS_t = \rho(t)S_t dt + \sigma(t)S_t dW_t, \quad (1.1)$$

under the martingale measure, where

- $\rho(t) \in L^\infty(0, T)$ is a deterministic function of t representing the sum of the discount rate (denoted by $r^{\text{disc}}(t)$), the repo rate, and the dividend yield;
- $\sigma(t) \in L^\infty(0, T)$ is a deterministic functions of t representing the volatility, and

$$0 < \sigma_* < \sigma(t) < \sigma^* < \infty, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (1.2)$$

for some constants σ_* and σ^* .

*Nomura Securities, Hong Kong SAR. Email: xuan.liu@nomura.com

†Nomura Securities, Tokyo, Japan. Email: michel.gauthier@nomura.com

¹The *rho* of a financial derivatives is a general terminology which may refer to the partial derivative of the value function with respect to the discount rate, or the repo rate, or the dividend rate, depending on the context.

²The *vega* of a financial derivatives refers to the partial derivative of its value function with respect to the volatility of the underlying financial asset.

³The Sharpe ratio is the ratio of expected return and volatility.

Definition 1.1. Let $r(t) \in L^\infty(0, T)$ be a deterministic function representing a *risk free rate*⁴. Let $T > 0$ be a fixed time, Δt be the *observation window size*, and $N = T/\Delta t$. The (*discrete time*) *volatility target index* $\tilde{I}_t^{(N)}$ is the adaptive process defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{I}_{t_n}^{(N)}}{\tilde{I}_{t_{n-1}}^{(N)}} &= 1 + (1 - w_{n-1}^{(N)}) \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} r(t) dt + w_{n-1}^{(N)} \left(\frac{S_{t_n}}{S_{t_{n-1}}} - 1 \right), \quad n \geq 1, \\ \tilde{I}_{t_0}^{(N)} &= I_0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

and $\tilde{I}_t^{(N)} = \tilde{I}_{t_n}^{(N)}$ for $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1})$, where $t_n = n\Delta t$, $\bar{\sigma}$ is a constant called the *target volatility*, and

$$w_n^{(N)} = \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_n^{(N)}}} \quad (1.4)$$

is the *risky asset leverage*, and v_n is the *realised annual variance*

$$\begin{aligned} v_n^{(N)} &= \lambda v_{n-1}^{(N)} + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\Delta t} \left(\frac{S_{t_n}}{S_{t_{n-1}}} - 1 \right)^2, \quad n \geq 1, \\ v_0^{(N)} &= v_0, \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

or equivalently,

$$v_n^{(N)} = \lambda^n v_0 + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \left[\exp \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \left(\rho(t) - \frac{\sigma(t)^2}{2} \right) dt + \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \right) - 1 \right]^2. \quad (1.6)$$

with $I_0 > 0$, $v_0 > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ being some constants.

Note that the definition (1.3) is model-free. However, it is not convenient for the study of its limiting distribution. This is because the right hand side of (1.3) can be negative. The definition (1.7) below is the continuous time version of (1.3). As we will show in Proposition 5.3 in the appendix, when the risky asset dynamics is given by (1.1), the processes defined by (1.3) and (1.7) converge to the same limiting distribution. Moreover, the process defined by (1.7) is always positive and more convenient for the study of the limiting distribution. Therefore, in this paper, we will adopt Definition 1.2 below.

Definition 1.2. The (*continuous time*) *volatility target index* $\{I_t^{(N)}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is defined to be the process

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI_t^{(N)}}{I_t^{(N)}} &= (1 - w_{n-1}^{(N)}) r(t) dt + w_{n-1}^{(N)} \frac{dS_t}{S_t}, \quad t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n), \\ I_{t_0}^{(N)} &= I_0. \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

We would like to point out that the leverage process $w_n^{(N)}$ in (1.4) is physically observable and model-free. Different versions of the leverage $w_n^{(N)}$ have been adopted in the literature, some of which are not observable. For example, in [12], the leverage process is defined to be $w^h(t) = \left(\int_0^t \sigma_{t-s}^2 h(s) ds \right)^{1/2}$ with $h \in L^2([0, \infty))$, $\|h\|_{L^2} = 1$, and σ_t is a stochastic volatility process. With this definition, option pricing for volatility target index is studied in [12] under stochastic volatility models.

Remark 1.3. (i) The realised variance $v_{n-1}^{(N)}$ in (1.7) can be replaced with $v_{n-l}^{(N)}$ for any fixed $l \geq 1$. The results in this paper remain the same, and their proof are similar to the case of $v_{n-1}^{(N)}$.

(ii) The definition of $v_n^{(N)}$ in (1.5) is an exponential moving average of annualised returns. There is an alternative definition using simple moving average. The arguments used in this paper can be easily adapted to this variety, and similar results hold. See Remark 1.9 (ii) below.

(iii) A popular variety of volatility target index is to replace the risky asset leverage $w_n^{(N)} = (v_n^{(N)})^{-1/2} \bar{\sigma}$ by

$$w_n^{(N)} = \min [w^*, (v_n^{(1,N)})^{-1/2} \bar{\sigma}, (v_n^{(2,N)})^{-1/2} \bar{\sigma}], \quad (1.8)$$

where $w^* > 0$ is a constant preventing large leverage of the risky asset, and the realised variances $v_n^{(1,N)}$ and $v_n^{(2,N)}$ are defined by replacing λ by different λ_1 and λ_2 in (1.5). For this variety, the approach used in this paper is still applicable, and the limiting distribution is again an Itô diffusion of the form (1.10). We will give a brief discussion on this direction in Remark 2.5 in Section 2.3. We would like to point out that, in practice, the values of λ_1 and λ_2 are close to each other, and w^* is away from $\bar{\sigma}/\sigma$. Therefore, (1.7) provides a good approximation to the variety (1.8).

⁴A risk free rate is usually the discount rate plus some customized spread.

(iv) From a finance point of view, it is desirable to also consider dividend protection or a fee charge on the volatility target index, that is,

$$\frac{\tilde{I}_{t_n}^{(N)}}{\tilde{I}_{t_{n-1}}^{(N)}} = 1 + (1 - w_{n-1}^{(N)}) \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} r(t) dt + w_{n-1}^{(N)} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} a(t) dt + w_{n-1}^{(N)} \left(\frac{S_{t_n}}{S_{t_{n-1}}} - 1 \right), \quad n \geq 1, \quad (1.9)$$

where $a(t)$ represents an adjustment rate, which could be the dividend yield or a rate of fee charge. For (1.9), results similar to those in Theorem 1.4 still hold (see Remark 1.5 (iv) below).

The process $v_n^{(N)}$ is an estimate of the historical volatility and also a forecast of the instantaneous volatility. Such interpretation often leads to the intuition that $\{I_t^{(N)}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is approximately equal to a diffusion given by $dI_t = \mu(t)I_t dt + \bar{\sigma}I_t dW_t$ when Δt is small. However, this is only true when λ is close to 1, as we will see in Theorem 1.4.

In the rest of this section, we summarise the main results of this paper and make some comments.

Theorem 1.4. (i) As $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, the process $\{I_t^{(N)}\}_{t \geq 0}$ converges in law to the Itô diffusion

$$dX_t = (r(t) + (\rho(t) - r(t))\sigma(t)^{-1}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda))X_t dt + \bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}X_t dW_t, \quad (1.10)$$

where

$$U(\lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi(1-\lambda)}} \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1 + t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1/2} dt, \quad (1.11)$$

and

$$V(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2(1-\lambda)} \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1 + t \lambda^k)^{-1/2} dt. \quad (1.12)$$

(ii) The multipliers $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ satisfy that $U(\lambda) > 1$, $V(\lambda) > 1$ and $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} U(\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} V(\lambda) = 1$. Moreover, for $\lambda \in (0.7, 1)$, the following bounds for $U(\lambda)$

$$\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^{-1.2} \log \lambda^{-1}}{\lambda^{-1} - 1}} \leq U(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2e^{-2\pi^2/\log(\lambda^{-1})}} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda^{-1.25} \log \lambda^{-1}}{\lambda^{-1} - 1}}, \quad (1.13)$$

and bounds for $V(\lambda)$

$$\frac{\lambda^{-1.45} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1} \leq V(\lambda) \leq \frac{\lambda^{-1.5} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1}, \quad (1.14)$$

hold.

Remark 1.5. (i) Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2 in Section 4 below show the effectiveness of the bounds in (1.13) and (1.14). As shown in these figures, these bounds, and their arithmetic or geometric averages, are good approximations to $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ respectively⁵.

(ii) Suppose that $\sigma(t) = \sigma$ is a constant. When $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ and $\bar{\sigma} \rightarrow \sigma$, the diffusion (1.10) reduces to the diffusion (1.1), which is in line with the intuition that targeting the same volatility level as S_t results in the risky asset S_t itself when $\lambda \rightarrow 1$.

(iii) Suppose that $r(t)$, $\rho(t)$, and $\sigma(t)$ are constants, and that $dS_t = \mu S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t$ is the risky asset dynamics under the physical measure. The annualised Sharpe ratio of $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is $(\mu - \sigma^2/2 - r)/\sigma = (\mu - r)/\sigma - \sigma/2$. By Theorem 1.4, the annualised Sharpe ratio of the limiting process $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is

$$\frac{r + (\mu - r)\sigma^{-1}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda) - \bar{\sigma}^2V(\lambda)/2 - r}{\bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}} = \frac{(\mu - r)U(\lambda)}{\sigma V(\lambda)^{1/2}} - \bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}/2.$$

For λ close to 1, the above Sharpe ratio is close to $(\mu - r)/\sigma - \bar{\sigma}/2$, which is larger than $(\mu - r)/\sigma - \sigma/2$ when $\bar{\sigma} < \sigma$. This is consistent with the empirically observed Sharpe ratio improvement.

(iv) When the volatility target index has dividend protection or a fee charge, i.e. the variety given by (1.9), the limiting process is given

$$dX_t = (r(t) + (\rho(t) - r(t) + a(t))\sigma(t)^{-1}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda))X_t dt + \bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}X_t dW_t. \quad (1.15)$$

When approximating the volatility target index with its limiting distribution, it is important to know risk sensitivities with respect to the underlying risky asset $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. Since the spot of $I_t^{(N)}$ is a simple function of the spot of S_t , spot sensitivity with respect to $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ can be obtained by the chain rule. However, the volatility sensitivity with respect to $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is less obvious. The following proposition gives the desired vega conversion formula, which will be useful for vega hedging.

⁵In practice, λ is usually between 0.87 and 0.97, which correspond to half-life being a week and a month respectively.

Proposition 1.6. (i) Let $G(I_T^{(N)})$ be a payoff function on the volatility target index, and let

$$\psi_{S,\Delta t}(r, \rho, \sigma) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r^{disc}(t) dt} G(I_T^{(N)}) \right]$$

be the price function⁶ of $G(I_T^{(N)})$. For any $\mu \in L^\infty(0, T)$ and $\nu \in L^\infty(0, \infty)$, let $\{Y_t^{\mu, \nu}\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the diffusion

$$dY_t^{\mu, \nu} = \mu(t)Y_t^{\mu, \nu} dt + \nu(t)Y_t^{\mu, \nu} dW_t,$$

and denote

$$\psi_Y(\mu, \nu) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r^{disc}(t) dt} G(Y_T^{\mu, \nu}) \right]. \quad (1.16)$$

Then

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \psi_{S,\Delta t}(r, \rho, \sigma) = \psi_Y(r + (\rho - r)\sigma^{-1}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda), \bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}). \quad (1.17)$$

(ii) If, in addition, the coefficients $r(t) = r$, $\rho(t) = \rho$, and $\sigma(t) = \sigma$ are constants, the following rho-vega conversion holds

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} (\partial_\sigma \psi_{S,\Delta t})(r, \rho, \sigma) = (r - \rho)\sigma^{-2}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda)(\partial_\mu \psi_Y)(r + (\rho - r)\sigma^{-1}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda), \bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}). \quad (1.18)$$

Remark 1.7. (i) The formula (1.18) is essentially a result on the interchangeability of limiting and differentiation.

(ii) The rho-vega conversion formula (1.18) shows that the vega of the original payoff $G(I_T^{(N)})$ (i.e. with respect to the stock volatility) is not related to the vega of the same payoff on the approximating Itô diffusion $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. Instead, it is a constant multiple of the rho sensitivity of the payoff G on the approximating Itô diffusion $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. On the other hand, the formula (1.18) implies that the vega with respect to the stock $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is small when $\rho - r$ is small.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 relies on Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.10 below, which are a law of large numbers and a central limit theorem for sequence of dependent random variables. They are applied to derive the conclusion of Theorem 1.4 for a simple case. A continuity argument is then utilized to extend the result to the general case. The law of large numbers was initially established for i.i.d. sequence (see, for example, [1, 2]). Since then, there have been many researches extending the result to different type of sequence of dependent random variables (see, for example, [8, 9] and references therein). The central limit theorem was also initially obtained for i.i.d. sequence. A comprehensive discussion on central limit theorems for martingales can be found in [3]. For convergence rate of martingale central limit theorems, see for example [4, 5].

Theorem 1.8. Let $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of non-negative numbers such that $\sum_{n=0}^\infty \lambda_n = 1$ and $\sup_{n \geq 0} \gamma^{-n} \lambda_n < \infty$ for some constant $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Let $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. non-negative random variables, $\omega_0 > 0$ be a constant, and

$$\omega_n = \left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_{n-k}\right) \omega_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_{n-k} \xi_k, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (1.19)$$

Suppose that the Laplace transform of ξ_1

$$\phi(t) = \mathbb{E}(e^{-t\xi_1}), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1.20)$$

satisfies the property

$$1 - t^\alpha \leq \phi(t) \leq c(1+t)^{-\beta}, \quad (1.21)$$

for some constants $0 < \alpha \leq 1, \beta \geq 0$, and $c > 0$. Let $F(s)$ be a function satisfying the following properties:

(P.1) $0 \leq F(s) < \infty$ on $s \in (0, \infty)$.

(P.2) $F(s)$ has non-negative inverse Laplace transform $f \geq 0$ with at most polynomial growth at infinity, that is,

$$F(s) = \mathcal{L}(f)(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} f(t) dt, \quad s > 0, \quad (1.22)$$

and

$$f(t) \leq c(1+t)^m, \quad t \geq 1, \quad (1.23)$$

for some constants $c > 0$ and $m \geq 0$.

Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} F(\omega_k) = \int_0^\infty f(t) \prod_{k=0}^\infty \phi(\lambda_k t) dt < \infty \quad a.s. \quad (1.24)$$

Remark 1.9. (i) Below are some examples of the function $F(s)$ satisfying the property (P.2).

- $F(s) = s^{-p}$ for any $p > 0$.

⁶We use the subscript S in $\psi_{S,\Delta t}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ to indicate that the underlying diffusion is $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, and $\{I_t^{(N)}\}_{t \geq 0}$ is calculated as a functional of $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$.

- $F(s) = e^{-bs}(s+a)^{-n}$ for any $a, b > 0$ and integer $n \geq 1$.
- $F(s) = s^{-1}(1 - e^{-bs})$ for any $b > 0$.
- If $F(s)$ and $G(s)$ satisfy the property (P.2), then $F(s) + G(s)$ and $F(s)G(s)$ also satisfy the property (P.2).

(ii) An example of the sequence $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is $\lambda_n = (1 - \lambda)\lambda^n$, for which $\omega_n = \lambda^n \omega_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \xi_k$. Another example of $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is $\lambda_n = L^{-1}$ when $0 \leq n \leq L-1$, and $\lambda_n = 0$ when $n \geq L$, for which $\omega_n = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \xi_{n-k}$, $n \geq L$. For this case, the corresponding multiplier functions in (1.10) are given by $U(L) = (L/2)^{-1/2} \Gamma[(L-1)/2] / \Gamma(L/2)$ and $V(L) = L/(L-2)$, with $\Gamma(z)$ being the Gamma function.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\{\lambda_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of non-negative numbers satisfying the conditions $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n = 1$ and $\sup_{n \geq 0} \gamma^{-n} \lambda_n < \infty$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Let $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables of which the Laplace transform $\phi(t) = \mathbb{E}(e^{-t\xi_1})$ satisfies the property (1.21), and $F(s)$ be a function of which the inverse Laplace transform $f(t) = \mathcal{L}^{-1}(F)(t)$ satisfies the properties (P.1) and (P.2). Let $\omega_0 > 0$ be a constant and $\{\omega_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be the sequence defined by (1.19). Suppose that $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence of random variables such that η_{n+1} is independent of $\{(\xi_k, \eta_k) : 1 \leq k \leq n\}$, and*

$$\mathbb{E}(\eta_n) = 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\eta_n^2) = 1.$$

Suppose, in addition, that $\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E}(|\eta_n|^p) < \infty$ for some $p > 2$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N F(\omega_{k-1}) \eta_k \rightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, \int_0^{\infty} (f * f)(t) \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi(\lambda_k t) dt\right), \quad (1.25)$$

in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ is the normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 , and the convolution $f * f$ is defined by extending $f|_{(-\infty, 0)} = 0$, i.e.

$$(f * f)(t) = \int_0^t f(s) f(t-s) ds.$$

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the proof of the main results, i.e. Theorem 1.8, Theorem 1.10, and Theorem 1.4 as their application. Section 3 is devoted to the study of properties of the functions $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$, and the derivation of the upper and lower bounds in (1.13) and (1.14). In Section 4, we present some numerical test results confirming the conclusions of Theorem 1.4.

2 Proof of The Main Results

This section consists of four subsections. In Section 2.1, we prove the key limit theorems, Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.10. In Section 2.2, we show that the convergence of $I_r^{(N)}$ can be reduced to a simpler process (see Proposition 2.2 below). In Section 2.3, as an application of Theorem 1.8, Theorem 1.10, and Proposition 2.2, we establish Theorem 1.4 under the additional assumption that $r(t)$, $\rho(t)$, and $\sigma(t)$ are constants. In the last subsection, we prove the general case of Theorem 1.4 using the constant coefficient case and a continuity argument.

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.10

We start with the proof of Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. We will prove the theorem in 3 steps.

Step 1. We first show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(F(\omega_n)) = \int_0^{\infty} f(t) \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi(\lambda_k t) dt < \infty, \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)^2] = \int_0^{\infty} (f * f)(t) \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi(\lambda_k t) dt < \infty, \quad (2.2)$$

Let $r_n = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \lambda_k$. By (1.22),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(F(\omega_n)) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^{\infty} f(t) e^{-\omega_n t} dt\right) = \int_0^{\infty} f(t) \mathbb{E}(e^{-\omega_n t}) dt \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} f(t) e^{-r_n t \omega_0} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}(e^{-\lambda_{n-k} t \xi_k}) dt = \int_0^{\infty} f(t) e^{-r_n t \omega_0} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{n-k} t) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

By (1.21) and (1.23), for sufficiently large $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\int_1^\infty f(t) \prod_{k=0}^{K-1} \phi(\lambda_k t) < \infty$. Moreover, since $F(s) < \infty$, we have

$$\int_0^1 f(t) \prod_{k=0}^{K-1} \phi(\lambda_k t) dt \leq e \int_0^1 e^{-t} f(t) dt \leq eF(1) < \infty.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^\infty f(t) \prod_{k=0}^{K-1} \phi(\lambda_k t) dt < \infty,$$

which, together with $\phi(\lambda_k t) \leq 1$ and the dominated convergence theorem, implies (2.1).

For (2.2), since $\mathcal{L}(f * f) = \mathcal{L}(f)^2 = F^2$, by an argument similar to the above, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)^2] = \int_0^\infty (f * f)(t) e^{-r_n t \omega_0} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{n-k} t) dt. \quad (2.4)$$

Clearly, $f * f \geq 0$ and $(f * f)(t) \leq c_m(1+t)^{2m}$ for some $c_m > 0$ depending only on c and m . This, together with (1.21) and (2.4), implies (2.2).

Step 2. We next show that

$$\text{Cov}(F(\omega_n), F(\omega_{n+k})) \leq c\gamma^{\alpha k}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant independent of n, k .

Since $f \geq 0$, we see that $F(s)$ is decreasing in s . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)F(\omega_{n+k})] &= \mathbb{E}\left[F(\omega_n)F\left(r_{n+k}\omega_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{n+k} \lambda_{n+k-j}\xi_j\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[F(\omega_n)F\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{k-j}\xi_{n+j}\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)]\mathbb{E}\left[F\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{k-j}\xi_{n+j}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)]\mathbb{E}\left[F\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{k-j}\xi_j\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.3) to the case $\omega_0 = 0$ gives that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)F(\omega_{n+k})] \leq \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)]J_k,$$

where

$$J_k = \mathbb{E}\left[F\left(\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_{k-j}\xi_j\right)\right] = \int_0^\infty f(t) \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(F(\omega_n), F(\omega_{n+k})) &= \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)F(\omega_{n+k})] - \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)]\mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{n+k})] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)](J_k - J_{n+k}) + \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)](J_{n+k} - \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{n+k})]). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

For the first term in the last inequality of (2.6), we have

$$J_k - J_{n+k} = \int_0^\infty f(t) \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) \right) \left(1 - \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{k+j} t) \right) dt \leq \int_0^\infty f(t) \left(1 - \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{k+j} t) \right) dt.$$

Denote $A = \sup_{n \geq 0} \gamma^{-n} \lambda_n < \infty$. By (1.21) and $\lambda_n \leq A\gamma^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{k+j} t) &= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \left(\prod_{j=l+1}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{k+j} t) - \prod_{j=l}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{k+j} t) \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} [1 - \phi(\lambda_{k+l} t)] \prod_{j=l+1}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{k+j} t) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} [1 - \phi(\lambda_{k+l} t)] \leq \frac{A^\alpha \gamma^{\alpha k} t^\alpha}{1 - \gamma^\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the convention that $\prod_{j=l+1}^{n-1} \phi(\lambda_{k+j} t) = 1$ when $l+1 > n-1$. Let K be an integer such that $K > (m+2)/\beta$. By (1.21) and (1.23), $\int_0^\infty t^\alpha f(t) \prod_{j=0}^{K-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt < \infty$. Moreover, for any $k > K$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_k - J_{n+k} &\leq \frac{A^\alpha \gamma^{\alpha k}}{1 - \gamma^\alpha} \int_0^\infty t^\alpha f(t) \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt \\ &\leq \frac{A^\alpha \gamma^{\alpha k}}{1 - \gamma^\alpha} \int_0^\infty t^\alpha f(t) \prod_{j=0}^{K-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt = c\gamma^{\alpha k}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant independent of n, k , and may vary at different appearances. This, together with (2.1), implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)](J_k - J_{n+k}) \leq c\gamma^{\alpha k}. \quad (2.7)$$

For the second term in the last inequality of (2.6), let K be same integer as above. By (1.21) and (1.23), $\int_0^\infty tf(t) \prod_{j=0}^{K-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt < \infty$. Therefore, for $k \geq K$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{n+k} - \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{n+k})] &\leq \int_0^\infty f(t) (1 - e^{-r_{n+k}t\omega_0}) \prod_{j=0}^{n+k-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt \\ &\leq r_{n+k}\omega_0 \int_0^\infty tf(t) \prod_{j=0}^{n+k-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt \leq r_{n+k}\omega_0 \int_0^\infty tf(t) \prod_{j=0}^{K-1} \phi(\lambda_j t) dt = c\omega_0 r_{n+k}. \end{aligned}$$

By $r_{n+k} \leq A \sum_{j=n+k}^\infty \gamma^j \leq c\gamma^{n+k}$ and (2.1), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\omega_n)](J_{n+k} - \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{n+k})]) \leq c\gamma^{n+k}. \quad (2.8)$$

Combining (2.7) and (2.8) gives (2.5).

Step 3. We now prove the a.s. convergence (1.24).

By (2.2), we have $L = \sup_n \text{Var}(F(\omega_n)) < \infty$. Denote $\psi_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} F(\omega_k)$. By (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\psi_n) &= n^{-2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \text{Var}(F(\omega_k)) + 2n^{-2} \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq n} \text{Cov}(F(\omega_k), F(\omega_l)) \\ &\leq n^{-1}L + 2cn^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{l=k+1}^n \gamma^{\alpha(l-k)} \leq n^{-1} \left(L + 2c \frac{\gamma^\alpha}{1-\gamma^\alpha} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

To derive the a.s. convergence of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n$ from the variance estimate (2.9), we use an argument similar to that in [1]. For any $\theta > 1$, let $\theta_n = [\theta^n]$ be the integer part of θ^n . Then $\theta_n \geq \theta^n/2$. Hence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{P}(|\psi_{\theta_n} - \mathbb{E}(\psi_{\theta_n})| > \varepsilon) \leq \left(\frac{L}{2} + c \frac{\gamma^\alpha}{1-\gamma^\alpha} \right) \sum_{n=1}^\infty \theta_n^{-1} \leq \left(\frac{L}{2} + c \frac{\gamma^\alpha}{1-\gamma^\alpha} \right) \sum_{n=1}^\infty \theta^{-n} < \infty.$$

By the Borel–Cantelli lemma, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\psi_{\theta_n} - \mathbb{E}(\psi_{\theta_n})] = 0$ a.s. By (2.1), we see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\theta_n} = J_\infty = \int_0^\infty f(t) \prod_{k=0}^\infty \phi(\lambda_k t) dt \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For any $n > 0$, let $k(n)$ be such that $\theta_{k(n)} < n \leq \theta_{k(n)+1}$. Then $\theta_{k(n)+1}/\theta_{k(n)} \leq \theta$, and therefore

$$\frac{\theta_{k(n)}}{\theta_{k(n)+1}} \psi_{\theta_{k(n)}} = \frac{1}{\theta_{k(n)+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{\theta_{k(n)}-1} F(\omega_k) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} F(\omega_k) \leq \frac{1}{\theta_{k(n)}} \sum_{k=0}^{\theta_{k(n)+1}-1} F(\omega_k) = \frac{\theta_{k(n)+1}}{\theta_{k(n)}} \psi_{\theta_{k(n)+1}}.$$

Setting $n \rightarrow \infty$ gives that

$$\theta^{-1} J_\infty \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n \leq \theta J_\infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for any $\theta > 1$, which implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n = J_\infty = \int_0^\infty f(t) \prod_{k=0}^\infty \phi(\lambda_k t) dt \quad \text{a.s.}$$

This completes the proof. \square

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.10.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Let $M_n = \sum_{k=1}^n F(\omega_{k-1})\eta_k$, $M_0 = 0$. Clearly $\{M_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a martingale. Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\xi_k, \eta_k : 1 \leq k \leq n)$ be the filtration generated by $\{(\xi_n, \eta_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} s_n &= \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Var}(M_k - M_{k-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Var}(F(\omega_{k-1})\eta_k), \\ v_n &= \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Var}(M_k - M_{k-1} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Var}(F(\omega_{k-1})\eta_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By independence of η_k and \mathcal{F}_{k-1} , we have $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}(F(\omega_{k-1})^2)$ and $v_n = \sum_{k=1}^n F(\omega_{k-1})^2$. We will show that the Lindeberg condition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{k-1})^2 \eta_k^2 \chi_{\{|F(\omega_{k-1})\eta_k| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\}}] = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_n}{v_n} = 1 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.11)$$

Once (2.10) and (2.11) are proved, by the martingale central limit theorem⁷, we may deduce that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_N}} \sum_{k=1}^N F(\omega_{k-1}) \eta_k \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (2.12)$$

in distribution. Moreover, by (2.2), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_n}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(F(\omega_n)^2) = \int_0^\infty (f * f)(t) \prod_{k=0}^\infty \phi(\lambda_k t) dt \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.13)$$

Combining (2.12) and (2.13) proves the desired convergence (1.25).

To prove that the Lindeberg condition (2.10) holds, for any integer $m \geq 1$, note that by $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(FG) = \mathcal{L}^{-1}(F) * \mathcal{L}^{-1}(G)$, F^m has non-negative inverse Laplace transform and its Laplace transform has at most polynomial growth at infinity. Applying (2.1) to F^m gives that $\sup_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E}(F(\omega_{k-1})^m) < \infty$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{k-1})^2 \eta_k^2 \chi_{\{|F(\omega_{k-1})\eta_k| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\}}] &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{p-2} n^{p/2-1}} \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{k-1})^p |\eta_k|^p] \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{p-2} n^{p/2-1}} \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{k-1})^p] \mathbb{E}[|\eta_k|^p] \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon^{p-2} n^{p/2-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[F(\omega_{k-1})^2 \eta_k^2 \chi_{\{|F(\omega_{k-1})\eta_k| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\}}] \leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon^{p-2} n^{p/2-1}} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It remains to prove (2.11). Note that $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(F^2) = f * f \geq 0$, and $f * f$ has at most polynomial growth at infinity. Therefore, the function F^2 also satisfies the properties (P.1) and (P.2) in Theorem 1.8. By Theorem 1.8, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_n}{n} = \int_0^\infty (f * f)(t) \prod_{k=0}^\infty \phi(\lambda_k t) dt \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (2.14)$$

which, together with (2.13) implies (2.11). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.10. \square

2.2 Reduction to An Equivalent Convergence

In this subsection, we will show that the convergence of the marginal random variable

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{I_T^{(N)}}{I_0} &= \int_0^T r(t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\rho(t) - r(t)] dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{v_{k-1}^{(N)}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

is equivalent to the convergence of a simpler random variable $X_T^{(N)}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dX_t^{(N)}}{X_t^{(N)}} &= \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{t_{n-1}}^{(N)}}}\right) r(t) dt + \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{t_{n-1}}^{(N)}}} \frac{dS_t}{S_t}, \quad t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n), \\ X_0^{(N)} &= I_0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

where

$$u_n^{(N)} = \lambda u_n^{(N)} + \frac{1-\lambda}{\Delta t} \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \right)^2, \quad u_0^{(N)} = v_0,$$

⁷See, for example, [3, page 9–10]

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{X_T^{(N)}}{I_0} &= \int_0^T r(t)dt + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\rho(t) - r(t)]dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{u_{k-1}^{(N)}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

and

$$u_n^{(N)} = \lambda^n v_0 + \frac{1-\lambda}{\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \right)^2. \quad (2.18)$$

We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $h(x) = x^{-\alpha}$, $\alpha > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}[h(u_n^{(N)})] < \infty, \quad (2.19)$$

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}[h(v_n^{(N)})] < \infty. \quad (2.20)$$

and for any $p \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}[|h(u_n^{(N)}) - h(v_n^{(N)})|^p] = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Proof. We first prove (2.19). Note that the inverse Laplace transform of $h(x)$ is $\mathcal{L}^{-1}(h)(t) = t^{\alpha-1}/\Gamma(\alpha)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(u_n^{(N)})] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-u_n^{(N)} t} dt\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} \mathbb{E}(e^{-u_n^{(N)} t}) dt = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda^n v_0 t} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_k) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_k = \exp\left(-\frac{1-\lambda}{\Delta t} t \lambda^{n-k} \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t\right)^2\right)$. Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_k) = \left[1 + 2\frac{1-\lambda}{\Delta t} t \lambda^{n-k} \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt\right)\right]^{-1/2} \leq [1 + 2t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\sigma_*^2]^{-1/2}.$$

Therefore, by the above and (2.22),

$$\mathbb{E}[h(u_n^{(N)})] \leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda^n v_0 t} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} [1 + 2t(1-\lambda)\lambda^k \sigma_*^2]^{-1/2} dt. \quad (2.23)$$

Let m be an integer such that $m > 2\alpha$. For $n \geq m$, by (2.23),

$$\mathbb{E}[h(u_n^{(N)})] \leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} \prod_{k=0}^{m-1} [1 + 2t(1-\lambda)\lambda^k \sigma_*^2]^{-1/2} dt. \quad (2.24)$$

For $n < m$, by (2.23) again,

$$\mathbb{E}[h(u_n^{(N)})] \leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda^n v_0 t} dt. \quad (2.25)$$

The uniform L^1 bound (2.19) follows from (2.24) and (2.25).

We next prove (2.20). Denote $\theta_k = \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} (\rho(t) - \sigma(t)^2/2)dt$, $Y_k = \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t$, and $R_k = (\Delta t)^{-1/2}(\theta_k + Y_k)$. Then

$$v_n^{(N)} = \lambda^n v_0 + \frac{1-\lambda}{\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} [e^{\sqrt{\Delta t} R_k} - 1]^2.$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta t}} |e^{\sqrt{\Delta t} x} - 1| \geq e^{-\sqrt{\Delta t} |x|} |x| \chi_{\{x \geq -1\}} + \frac{1 - e^{-\sqrt{\Delta t}}}{\sqrt{\Delta t}} \chi_{\{x < -1\}}. \quad (2.26)$$

Indeed, when $x \geq 0$, we have $|e^{\sqrt{\Delta t}x} - 1|/\sqrt{\Delta t} \geq |x|$. When $-1 \leq x < 0$, we have $|e^{\sqrt{\Delta t}x} - 1|/\sqrt{\Delta t} = e^{-\sqrt{\Delta t}|x|}(e^{\sqrt{\Delta t}x} - 1)/\sqrt{\Delta t} \geq e^{-\sqrt{\Delta t}|x|}$. Moreover, when $x < -1$, $|e^{\sqrt{\Delta t}x} - 1|/\sqrt{\Delta t} \geq (1 - e^{-\sqrt{\Delta t}})/\sqrt{\Delta t}$. This proves (2.26). By (2.26)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\frac{(e^{\sqrt{\Delta t}R_k} - 1)^2}{\Delta t}\right)\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}R_k^2} + \exp\left(-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\frac{(1 - e^{-\sqrt{\Delta t}})^2}{\Delta t}\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}R_k^2}] + e^{-ct(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Since Y_k has normal distribution with variance $\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e^{-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}R_k^2}] &= \mathbb{E}(\exp[-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}(\Delta t)^{-1}(\theta_k + Y_k)^2]) \\ &= [1 + 2t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\sigma_k^2]^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\theta_k^2(\Delta t)^{-1}}{1 + 2t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\sigma_k^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_k^2 = (\Delta t)^{-1} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt$. By $\sigma(t) \geq \sigma_*$, we obtain that $\mathbb{E}[e^{-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}R_k^2}] \leq [1 + 2t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\sigma_*^2]^{-1/2}$, and therefore, by (2.27)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\frac{(e^{\sqrt{\Delta t}R_k} - 1)^2}{\Delta t}\right)\right] \leq \min(1, [1 + ct(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}]^{-1/2}).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(v_n^{(N)})] &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda^n v_0 t} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-t(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}\frac{(e^{\sqrt{\Delta t}R_k} - 1)^2}{\Delta t}\right)\right] dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} e^{-\lambda^n v_0 t} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \min(1, [1 + ct(1-\lambda)\lambda^{n-k}]^{-1/2}) dt, \end{aligned}$$

which, similar to the proof of (2.19), implies the uniform L^1 -bound (2.20).

We now prove the uniform convergence (2.21). It suffices to prove this for integer p . By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - v_n^{(N)}|^{2p}) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} |(e^{\theta_k + Y_k} - 1)^2 - Y_k^2|\right)^{2p}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{(\Delta t)^{2p}} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} |(e^{\theta_k + Y_k} - 1)^2 - Y_k^2|^{2p}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1-\lambda}{(\Delta t)^{2p}} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \mathbb{E}[(e^{\theta_k + Y_k} - 1 - Y_k)^{4p}]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[(e^{\theta_k + Y_k} - 1 + Y_k)^{4p}]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Let $M > (\sigma^*)^2$ be such that $\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(0,T)} \leq M$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(e^{\theta_k + Y_k} - 1 + Y_k)^{4p}] &\leq c_p [e^{4p\theta_k} \mathbb{E}[(e^{Y_k} - 1)^{4p}] + (e^{\theta_k} - 1)^{4p} + \mathbb{E}(Y_k^{4p})] \\ &\leq c_{p,M,T} [\mathbb{E}[(e^{Y_k} - 1)^{4p}] + (e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p} + (\Delta t)^{2p}] \\ &\leq c_{p,M,T} [\mathbb{E}[(|Y_k| e^{|Y_k|})^{4p}] + (e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p} + (\Delta t)^{2p}] \\ &\leq c_{p,M,T} [\mathbb{E}(|Y_k|^{8p})^{1/2} \mathbb{E}(e^{8p|Y_k|})^{1/2} + (e^{c_{p,M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p} + (\Delta t)^{2p}] \\ &\leq c_{p,M,T} [(e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p} + (\Delta t)^{2p}], \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

where $c_{p,M,T} > 0$ is a constant depending only on p, M, T . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(e^{\theta_k + Y_k} - 1 - Y_k)^{4p}] &\leq c \mathbb{E}[e^{4p\theta_k} (e^{Y_k} - 1 - Y_k)^{4p} + (e^{\theta_k} - 1)^{4p} (1 + Y_k)^{4p}] \\ &\leq c_{M,T} [\mathbb{E}[(e^{Y_k} - 1 - Y_k)^{4p}] + (e^{\theta_k} - 1)^{4p} (1 + \mathbb{E}(Y_k^{4p}))] \\ &\leq c_{M,T} [\mathbb{E}[(Y_k^2 e^{|Y_k|})^{4p}] + (e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p}] \\ &\leq c_{M,T} [\mathbb{E}(Y_k^{16p})^{1/2} \mathbb{E}(e^{8p|Y_k|})^{1/2} + (e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p}] \\ &\leq c_{M,T} [(\Delta t)^{4p} + (e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p}]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

By (2.28), (2.29), and (2.30), we deduce that

$$\sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - v_n^{(N)}|^{2p}) \leq c_{M,T} \left[1 + \left(\frac{e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1}{\Delta t}\right)^2\right]^{1/2} [(e^{c_{M,T}\Delta t} - 1)^{4p} + (\Delta t)^{2p}]^{1/2} \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.31)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. By the monotonicity of h' ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|h(u_n^{(N)}) - h(v_n^{(N)})|^p] &\leq \mathbb{E}[(|h'(u_n^{(N)})|^p + |h'(v_n^{(N)})|^p) \cdot |u_n^{(N)} - v_n^{(N)}|^p] \\ &\leq [\mathbb{E}(|h'(u_n^{(N)})|^{2p})^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}(|h'(v_n^{(N)})|^{2p})^{1/2}] \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - v_n^{(N)}|^{2p})^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.19) and (2.20) to $|h'|^{2p}$ gives that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}(|h'(u_n^{(N)})|^{2p})^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}(|h'(v_n^{(N)})|^{2p})^{1/2} < \infty,$$

which, together with (2.31) implies (2.21). \square

The following proposition shows that $I_T^{(N)}$ converges in distribution if and only if $X_T^{(N)}$ converges in distribution.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $u_T^{(N)}$ be the random variable defined in (2.18). Then the random variable*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\rho(t) - r(t)] dt \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{v_{k-1}^{(N)}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{u_{k-1}^{(N)}} \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt + \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

converges in distribution to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $I_T^{(N)}$ converges in distribution if and only if $X_T^{(N)}$ converges in distribution.

Proof. For the first term in (2.32), applying (2.21) to $h(x) = x^{-1/2}$ and $p = 2$ gives

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}[|(v_n^{(N)})^{-1/2} - (u_n^{(N)})^{-1/2}|^2] = 0. \quad (2.33)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(N^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^N [(v_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2} - (u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2}] \right)^2 \right] \leq N^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[|(v_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2} - (u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2}|^2] \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.34)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, which, together with the boundedness of $\rho(t)$ and $r(t)$, implies that $\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\rho(t) - r(t)] dt \rightarrow 0$ in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For the second term in (2.32), applying (2.21) to $h(x) = x^{-1}$ and $p = 2$ gives $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}[|(v_n^{(N)})^{-1} - (u_n^{(N)})^{-1}|^2] = 0$. Note that $\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt \leq c\Delta t = cT/N$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^N [(v_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1} - (u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1}] \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt \right)^2 \right] \leq c\mathbb{E}\left[\left(N^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^N |(v_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1} - (u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1}| \right)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{v_{k-1}^{(N)}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{u_{k-1}^{(N)}} \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t)^2 dt \rightarrow 0$ in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For the last term, let

$$M_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t.$$

Then $\{M_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a martingale. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(M_N^2) &= \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \bar{\sigma}^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[|(v_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2} - (u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2}|^2] \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{(\bar{\sigma}\sigma^*)^2 T}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[|(v_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2} - (u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-1/2}|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

By the above inequality and (2.33), we deduce that $\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{k-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \rightarrow 0$ in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof. \square

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.4: Constant Coefficient Case

In this subsection, we prove part (i) of Theorem 1.4 under the assumption that $r(t) = r$, $\rho(t) = \rho$, and $\sigma(t) = \sigma$ are constants. The derivation of the upper and lower bounds in part (ii) is given in Section 3. Under the constant coefficient assumption, the random variable $\log(X_T^{(N)}/I_0)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{X_T^{(N)}}{I_0} &= rT + \frac{(\rho - r)T}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-1}}{\sqrt{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \\ &\quad - \frac{T}{2N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} Z_k, \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

and $u_n^{(N)}$ can be written as

$$\sigma^{-2} u_n^{(N)} = \lambda^n \sigma^{-2} v_0 + (1 - \lambda) \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} Z_k^2, \quad (2.36)$$

where $Z_n = \Delta W_n / \sqrt{\Delta t}$, $n = 1, \dots, N$ are i.i.d. standard random normal distributions.

Proposition 2.3. Let $\{u_n^{(N)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the sequence of random variables defined in (2.18). Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} = U(\lambda) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (2.37)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}} = V(\lambda), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.38)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Z_k}{\sqrt{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V(\lambda)) \quad (2.39)$$

in distribution, where $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ are defined in (1.11) and (1.12) respectively. Therefore,

$$\log X_T^{(N)} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}((r + (\rho - r)\bar{\sigma}\sigma^{-1} - \bar{\sigma}^2 V(\lambda)/2)T, \bar{\sigma}^2 T) \quad (2.40)$$

in distribution, where $X_T^{(N)}$ is the random variable defined in (2.22).

Proof. Let $F(s) = s^{-1/2}$, $\xi_n = Z_n^2$. Then $\mathcal{L}(F)(t) = \sqrt{\pi} t^{-1/2} = \sqrt{\pi} F(t)$, and therefore $f(t) = \mathcal{L}^{-1}(F)(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi t}}$. Clearly $f(t)$ satisfies the property 1.23. Moreover, $\phi(t) = \mathbb{E}(e^{-t\xi_1}) = (1 + 2t)^{-1/2}$ satisfies the condition (1.21). Applying Theorem 1.8 to F , ξ_n , and $\lambda_n = (1 - \lambda)\lambda^n$ gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} F(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi t}} \prod_{k=0}^\infty [1 + 2(1 - \lambda)\lambda^k t]^{-1/2} dt = U(\lambda) \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation is obtained by a simple change of variable.

Furthermore, note that

$$(f * f)(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^t \frac{ds}{\sqrt{s(t-s)}} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{\sqrt{s(1-s)}} = \frac{1}{\pi} B\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) = 1,$$

where $B(z_1, z_2) = \int_0^1 t^{z_1-1} (1-t)^{z_2-1} dt$ is the Beta function. Applying Theorem 1.8 to F^2 , ξ_n , and $\lambda_n = (1 - \lambda)\lambda^n$ gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} F(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^2 \\ &= \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty [1 + 2(1 - \lambda)\lambda^k t]^{-1/2} dt = V(\lambda) \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation is obtained by a simple change of variable. . Moreover, by Theorem 1.10, we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Z_k}{\sigma_{k-1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N F(\sigma_{k-1}^2) Z_k \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V(\lambda)).$$

This completes the proof.

The convergence (2.40) follows immediately from (2.37) and (2.39). \square

Proposition 2.4. *The results in part (i) of Theorem 1.4 hold under the addition assumption that $r(t) = r$, $\rho(t) = \rho$ and $\sigma(t) = \sigma$ are constants.*

Proof. By (2.35) and Proposition 2.3, we see that $\log(I_T^{(N)}/I_0)$ converges in distribution to

$$\mathcal{N}((r + (\rho - r)\bar{\sigma}\sigma^{-1}U(\lambda) - \bar{\sigma}^2V(\lambda)/2)T, \bar{\sigma}^2T)$$

as $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. To deduce convergence in law from the convergence of marginal distribution, let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the filtration generated by the Brownian motion $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, and let $0 < s < t \leq T$. Conditional on \mathcal{F}_s , by the above convergence of marginal distribution, we see that

$$\log\left(\frac{I_t^{(N)}}{I_s^{(N)}}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}((r + (\rho - r)\bar{\sigma}\sigma^{-1}U(\lambda) - \bar{\sigma}^2V(\lambda)/2)(t - s), \bar{\sigma}^2(t - s)). \quad (2.41)$$

Note that the limiting distribution in (2.41) is independent of \mathcal{F}_s , which implies that the limiting process $\{\log X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ has i.i.d. Wiener increments. Hence $\{\log X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a scaled Brownian motion with drift, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.5. We are in a position to make some comments on how the result of Proposition 2.3 can be extended to the variety of volatility target index defined by (1.8). The analogue of Proposition 2.3 for this variety are the three convergence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sigma w_{n-1}^{(N)} &= U(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, w^*), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sigma^2 (w_{n-1}^{(N)})^2 &= V(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, w^*), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^N \sigma w_{n-1}^{(N)} Z_n &\rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, V(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, w^*)). \end{aligned}$$

As we see from the proof of Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.10, the derivation of these convergence lies on the following key ingredients: (i) convergence of $\mathbb{E}(w_n^{(N)})$ as $N \rightarrow \infty, n \rightarrow \infty$; (ii) convergence of $\mathbb{E}[(w_n^{(N)})^2]$ as $N \rightarrow \infty, n \rightarrow \infty$; and (iii) exponential decay of covariance $\text{Cov}(w_n^{(N)}, w_{n+k}^{(N)}) \leq c\lambda^k$ for some c and λ . The convergence of $\mathbb{E}(w_n^{(N)})$ and $\mathbb{E}[(w_n^{(N)})^2]$ can be established once convergence in distribution of $w_n^{(N)}$ is obtained. To see the convergence in distribution of $w_n^{(N)}$, let $F(x_1, x_2) = \min(x_1, x_2, w^*)$. Then $w_n^{(N)} = F(v_n^{(1,N)}, v_n^{(2,N)})$. Note that the characteristic functions of the random vector $(v_n^{(1,N)}, v_n^{(2,N)})$ is

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi_1 v_n^{(1,N)} + i\xi_2 v_n^{(2,N)})] = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} [1 - 2i\xi_1(1 - \lambda_1)\lambda_1^k - 2i\xi_2(1 - \lambda_2)\lambda_2^k]^{-1/2},$$

which converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that $(v_n^{(1,N)}, v_n^{(2,N)})$, and therefore $w_n^{(N)}$, converge in distribution. Moreover, the expectations $\mathbb{E}(w_n^{(N)})$ and $\mathbb{E}[(w_n^{(N)})^2]$ can be expressed using the inverse Laplace transform of $F(x_1, x_2)$. For the exponential covariance decay, note that $v_{n+k}^{(j,N)} = \lambda_j^k v_n^{(j,N)} + (1 - \lambda_j) \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_j^{k-l} Z_{n+l}^2$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(v_n^{(j,N)})F(v_{n+k}^{(j,N)})] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[F(v_n^{(j,N)})F\left((1 - \lambda_j) \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_j^{k-l} Z_{n+l}^2\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F(v_n^{(j,N)})] \mathbb{E}\left[F\left((1 - \lambda_j) \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_j^{k-l} Z_l^2\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}[F(v_n^{(j,N)})] \mathbb{E}[F(v_k^{(j,N)} - \lambda_j^k v_0)], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the notation $F(v_n^{(j,N)}) = F(v_n^{(1,N)}, v_n^{(2,N)})$. It is routinary to verify that $\mathbb{E}[F(v_k^{(j,N)})] - \mathbb{E}[F(v_k^{(j,N)} - \lambda_j^k v_0)]$ has exponential decay in k . Combining the above gives the desired exponential decay of covariance. Thus, all key ingredients can be established.

We now turn to the proof of the vega conversion formula in Proposition 1.6.

Proof of Proposition 1.6. Without loss of generality, we may assume that G is a smooth function with bounded derivative. Let $J_T^{(N)}$ be the path wise derivative of $\log(I_T^{(N)})$ with respect to σ . Then

$$\partial_\sigma \Psi_{S,\Delta t}(r, \rho, \sigma) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r^{\text{disc}}(t) dt} G'(I_T^{(N)}) I_T^{(N)} J_T^{(N)} \right].$$

Similarly, let $L_T^{(N)}$ be the path wise derivative of $\log(X_T^{(N)})$ with respect to σ . By an argument similar to the proof of 2.2, it can be shown that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (J_T^{(N)} - L_T^{(N)}) = 0$ in distribution. Therefore,

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \partial_\sigma \Psi_{S,\Delta t}(r, \rho, \sigma) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r^{\text{disc}}(t) dt} G'(X_T^{(N)}) X_T^{(N)} L_T^{(N)} \right], \quad (2.42)$$

provided that the limit on the right hand side exists. We now turn to the limiting distribution of $L_T^{(N)}$. Let $\beta_T^{(N)}$ be the path wise derivative of $\sigma^{-2} u_n^{(N)}$ with respect to σ , that is $\beta_n^{(N)} = -2\lambda^n \sigma^{-3} v_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} L_T^{(N)} &= \frac{(r-\rho)T}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} + \frac{(r-\rho)T}{2N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-1} \beta_{k-1}^{(N)}}{(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{3/2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{T}{2N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2 \beta_{k-1}^{(N)}}{(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^2} - \sqrt{\frac{T}{4N}} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\bar{\sigma} \beta_{k-1}^{(N)}}{(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{3/2}} Z_k \\ &= (r-\rho)T \bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-2} H_1 + \frac{(r-\rho)T \bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-1}}{2} H_2 + \frac{T \bar{\sigma}^2}{2} H_3 - \sqrt{\frac{T \bar{\sigma}^2}{4}} H_4. \end{aligned}$$

For H_1 , by (2.37),

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} H_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)}}} = U(\lambda) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For H_2 and H_3 , by applying (2.19) to $h(x) = x^{-3/2}$, we see that $A_1 = \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}[(\sigma^{-2} u_n^{(N)})^{-3/2}] < \infty$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}(|H_2|) \leq \frac{c}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\lambda^{k-1} (\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{3/2}] \leq \frac{cA_1}{N} \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, $H_2 \rightarrow 0$ in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$. By a similar argument, it is easy to show that $H_3 \rightarrow 0$ in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

For H_4 , let

$$M_n = -\frac{2\sigma^{-3} v_0}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{3/2}} Z_k.$$

Then $\{M_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a martingale. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}(M_N^2) = \frac{c}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\lambda^{2k-2}}{(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^3} Z_k^2 \right] = \frac{c}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda^{2k-2} \mathbb{E}[(\sigma^{-2} u_{k-1}^{(N)})^{-3}]. \quad (2.43)$$

Applying (2.19) to $h(x) = x^{-3}$ shows that $A_2 = \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}[(\sigma^{-2} u_n^{(N)})^{-3}] < \infty$, which, together with (2.43) implies that $H_4 = M_N \rightarrow 0$ in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore, we have shown that $L_T^{(N)} \rightarrow (r-\rho)T \bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-2} U(\lambda)$ in distribution. Moreover, by (2.42),

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \partial_\sigma \Psi_{S,\Delta t}(r, \rho, \sigma) = (r-\rho)T \bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-2} U(\lambda) \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r^{\text{disc}}(t) dt} G'(X_T) X_T \right]. \quad (2.44)$$

On the other hand, by

$$d \log(Y_t^{\mu, \nu}) = (\mu(t) - \nu(t)^2/2) dt + \nu(t) dW_t,$$

the path wise derivative of $\log(Y_T^{\mu, \nu})$ with respect to μ is T . Therefore,

$$\partial_\mu \Psi_Y(\mu, \nu) = T \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r^{\text{disc}}(t) dt} G'(Y_T^{\mu, \nu}) Y_T^{\mu, \nu} \right].$$

Since $Y_t^{r+(\rho-r)\sigma^{-1}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda), \bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}} = X_t$, we deduce that

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \partial_\sigma \Psi_{S,\Delta t}(r, \rho, \sigma) = (r-\rho) \bar{\sigma} \sigma^{-2} U(\lambda) \partial_\mu \Psi_Y(r+(\rho-r)\sigma^{-1}\bar{\sigma}U(\lambda), \bar{\sigma}V(\lambda)^{1/2}).$$

□

2.4 Proof of Theorem 1.4: General Case

In this section, we consider the general case when $r(t)$, $\rho(t)$ and $\sigma(t)$ are deterministic functions of t . Let $L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T))$ be space of stochastic processes $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ such that

$$\|Q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T))} = \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Q_t| \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} < \infty.$$

Let $L_+^2(0, T)$ be the subset of $L^2(0, T)$ consisting of functions $\sigma \in L^2(0, T)$ such that $\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \sigma(t) > 0$. For any integer $N \geq 1$ and any $(r, \rho, \sigma) \in L^1(0, T) \times L^1(0, T) \times L_+^2(0, T)$, let $\mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma) \in L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T))$ be the processes defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t}{\mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t} &= \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}}\right) r(t) dt + \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \frac{dS_t}{S_t}, \quad t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n], \\ \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)_0 &= I_0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

Define $\mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ to be the process given by

$$d\mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t = [r(t) + (\rho(t) - r(t))\sigma(t)^{-1} \bar{\sigma} U(\lambda)] \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t dt + \bar{\sigma} V(\lambda)^{1/2} \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t dW_t. \quad (2.46)$$

By Proposition 2.2, $I_t^{(N)} \rightarrow X_t = \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t$ in law if and only if $\mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t \rightarrow \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t$ in law. We now turn to prove the general case of part (i) of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4, (i). Let

$$\mathfrak{J}^{(N)} : L^1(0, T) \times L^1(0, T) \times L_+^2(0, T) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T)),$$

and

$$\mathfrak{J} : L^1(0, T) \times L^1(0, T) \times L_+^2(0, T) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T)),$$

be the mappings defined by (2.45) and (2.46) respectively. We need to prove that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma) = \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ in law.

Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the filtration generated by $\{W_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. For any simple functions $r(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m r_j \mathcal{X}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(t)$, $\rho(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_j \mathcal{X}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(t)$, and $\sigma(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j \mathcal{X}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(t)$, with $\sigma_j > 0$. Denote $\mathfrak{J} = \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ and $\mathfrak{J}^{(N)} = \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)$. Since $r(t)$, $\rho(t)$, $\sigma(t)$ are constants on $[s_j, s_{j+1})$, by Proposition 2.4, conditional on \mathcal{F}_{s_j} ,

$$\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_{s_j}^{(N)}} \rightarrow \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_{s_j}}, \quad t \in [s_j, s_{j+1}),$$

in distribution as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and the limiting distribution is independent of \mathcal{F}_{s_j} . Therefore, with $\tau(t) = \sup\{j : s_j \leq t\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_s^{(N)}} &= \sum_{j=\tau(s)+1}^{\tau(t)} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_{s_j}^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_{s_{j-1}}^{(N)}} + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_{s_{\tau(t)}}^{(N)}} \\ &= \sum_{j=\tau(s)+1}^{\tau(t)} \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_{s_j}}{\mathfrak{J}_{s_{j-1}}} + \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_{s_{\tau(t)}}} \\ &= \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_s}, \end{aligned}$$

in distribution. Therefore, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma) = \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ in law for simple functions r, ρ, σ .

We will show that, for any $0 < \delta < M < \infty$, $\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ is uniformly continuous in (r, ρ, σ) on

$$A_{\delta, M} = \left\{ (r, \rho, \sigma) : \sup_{t \in [0, T]} (|r(t)| + |\rho(t)|) \leq M, \delta \leq \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \sigma(t) \leq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sigma(t) \leq M \right\} \quad (2.47)$$

Assume the uniform continuity for the moment. Clearly, $\log \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ is continuous in (r, ρ, σ) on $A_{\delta, M}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, since simple functions are dense in $L^1(0, T)$ and $L_+^2(0, T)$, we may choose simple functions $\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ such that $(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma}) \in A_{\delta, M}$ and $\sup_{N \geq 1} \|\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)} - \log \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}^{(N)}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T))} \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\log \mathfrak{J} - \log \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T))} \leq \varepsilon$, where, to simplify notation, we denote $\mathfrak{J} = \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)$, $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}} = \mathfrak{J}(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})$, and similarly for $\mathfrak{J}^{(N)}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}^{(N)}$. For any smooth function f with bounded derivative, by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_s^{(N)}} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_s} \right) \right] \right| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| f \left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_s^{(N)}} \right) - f \left(\log \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_t^{(N)}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_s^{(N)}} \right) \right| \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| f \left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_s} \right) - f \left(\log \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_t}{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_s} \right) \right| \right] + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\log \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_t^{(N)}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_s^{(N)}} \right) - f \left(\log \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_t}{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_s} \right) \right] \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| f\left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_s^{(N)}}\right) - f\left(\log \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_t^{(N)}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_s^{(N)}}\right) \right| &\leq 2\|f'\|_{L^\infty} \|\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)} - \log \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}^{(N)}\|_{L^\infty(0,T)}, \\ \left| f\left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_s}\right) - f\left(\log \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_t}{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_s}\right) \right| &\leq 2\|f'\|_{L^\infty} \|\log \mathfrak{J} - \log \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}\|_{L^\infty(0,T)}, \end{aligned}$$

and that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}^{(N)} = \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}$ in distribution, we deduce that

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_s^{(N)}}\right)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_s}\right)\right] \right| \leq 4\|f'\|_{L^\infty} \varepsilon.$$

This implies that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t^{(N)}}{\mathfrak{J}_s^{(N)}} = \log \frac{\mathfrak{J}_t}{\mathfrak{J}_s},$$

in distribution, and the limiting distribution is independent of \mathcal{F}_s . This implies that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma) = \mathfrak{J}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ in law.

It suffices to prove the uniform continuity of $\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ in (r, ρ, σ) on $A_{\delta, M}$. Suppose that $(r, \rho, \sigma), (\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma}) \in A_{\delta, M}$. Let $q = r - \rho$ and $\tilde{q} = \tilde{r} - \tilde{\rho}$. Denote $\tilde{u}_n^{(N)}$ be random variables defined in (2.18) with (r, ρ, σ) replaced by $(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} d[\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma) - \log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})]_t &= [r(t) - \tilde{r}(t)]dt - \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} q(t) - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \tilde{q}(t) \right) dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}^2 \sigma(t)^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2 \tilde{\sigma}(t)^2}{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}} \right) dt + \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma} \sigma(t)}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma}(t)}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right) dW_t \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n)$. By the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)_t - \log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})_t|^2\right) \\ &\leq c \left(\int_0^T |r(t) - \tilde{r}(t)| dt \right)^2 + c \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \left| \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} q(t) dt - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \tilde{q}(t) dt \right|^2 \right) \right] \\ &\quad + c \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \left| \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \sigma(t)^2 dt - \frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \tilde{\sigma}(t)^2 dt \right|^2 \right) \right] \\ &\quad + c \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \sigma(t) dW_t - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \tilde{\sigma}(t) dW_t \right) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= c \|r - \tilde{r}\|_{L^1(0, T)}^2 + cE_1 + cE_2 + cE_3. \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

To estimate the expectations E_1, E_2, E_3 , we first derive an L^p bound of $|h(u_{n-1}^{(N)}) - h(\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)})|$ for any $h(x) = x^{-\alpha}$ with $p \geq 1$ and $\alpha > 0$. By (2.18) and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - \tilde{u}_n^{(N)}|^{2p}) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \left| \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \right)^2 - \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \tilde{\sigma}(t) dW_t \right)^2 \right| \right)^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1-\lambda}{(\Delta t)^{2p}} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \left| \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \sigma(t) dW_t \right)^2 - \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} \tilde{\sigma}(t) dW_t \right)^2 \right|^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1-\lambda}{(\Delta t)^{2p}} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)] dW_t \right|^{2p} \left| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) + \tilde{\sigma}(t)] dW_t \right|^{2p} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1-\lambda}{(\Delta t)^{2p}} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)] dW_t \right|^{4p} \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) + \tilde{\sigma}(t)] dW_t \right|^{4p} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - \tilde{u}_n^{(N)}|^{2p}) &\leq c_p \frac{1-\lambda}{(\Delta t)^{2p}} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt \right|^{2p} \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) + \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt \right|^{2p} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq c_{p, M} \frac{1-\lambda}{(\Delta t)^p} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{n-k} \left(\int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt \right)^p \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - \tilde{u}_n^{(N)}|^{2p})^{1/p} \leq c_{p,M} \frac{(1-\lambda)^{1/p}}{\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{(n-k)/p} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt,$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - \tilde{u}_n^{(N)}|^{2p})^{1/p} &\leq c_{p,M} \frac{(1-\lambda)^{1/p}}{\Delta t} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda^{(n-k)/p} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt, \\ &= c_{p,M} \frac{(1-\lambda)^{1/p}}{\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{n=k}^N \lambda^{(n-k)/p} \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt \\ &= c_{p,M} \frac{(1-\lambda)^{1/p}}{(1-\lambda^{1/p})\Delta t} \sum_{k=1}^N \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt \\ &\leq c_{p,\lambda,M} (\Delta t)^{-1} \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

By the monotonicity of $h'(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(|h(u_{n-1}^{(N)}) - h(\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)})|^p) &\leq \mathbb{E}[(|h'(u_{n-1}^{(N)})|^p + |h'(\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)})|^p) |u_n^{(N)} - \tilde{u}_n^{(N)}|^p] \\ &\leq c_p [\mathbb{E}(|h'(u_{n-1}^{(N)})|^{2p})^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}(|h'(\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)})|^{2p})^{1/2}] \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - \tilde{u}_n^{(N)}|^{2p})^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying (2.19) to h' ,

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}(|h'(u_{n-1}^{(N)})|^{2p}) < c_{\alpha,p,\delta,M} < \infty,$$

where $c_{\alpha,p,\delta,M}$ is a constant depending only on α , p , δ and M . Therefore, by (2.49),

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|h(u_{n-1}^{(N)}) - h(\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)})|^p) \leq c_{\alpha,p,\delta,M} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|u_n^{(N)} - \tilde{u}_n^{(N)}|^{2p})^{1/p} \leq c_{\alpha,p,\lambda,\delta,M} (\Delta t)^{-1} \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2. \tag{2.50}$$

We now revert to the estimates of E_1 , E_2 , and E_3 . For E_1 , by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \left| \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right| \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |\tilde{q}(t)| dt \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |q(t) - \tilde{q}(t)| dt \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |\tilde{q}(t)| dt \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |\tilde{q}(t)| dt \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |q(t) - \tilde{q}(t)| dt \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |q(t) - \tilde{q}(t)| dt \right) \right] \\ &\leq c_{M,T} \Delta t \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \right] + \|q - \tilde{q}\|_{L^1(0,T)} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} \right] \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |q(t) - \tilde{q}(t)| dt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

By applying (2.19) to $h(x) = x^{-1}$, we have

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} \right] < c_{\delta,M} < \infty, \tag{2.52}$$

Moreover, applying (2.50) to $h(x) = x^{-1/2}$ and $p = 2$ gives

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \right] \leq c_{\lambda,\delta,M} (\Delta t)^{-1} \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2. \tag{2.53}$$

By (2.51), (2.52), and (2.53), we deduce that

$$E_1 \leq c_{\lambda,\delta,M,T} (\|q - \tilde{q}\|_{L^1(0,T)}^2 + \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0,T)}^2). \tag{2.54}$$

For E_2 , similar to (2.51), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &\leq c_{M,T} \Delta t \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + c_{M,T} \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0,T)} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} \right] \left(\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)| dt \right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.55}$$

By (2.52)

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} \right] \left(\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} |\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)| dt \right) \leq c_{\delta, M, T} \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0, T)}. \quad (2.56)$$

Combining (2.55), (2.56), and (2.53) gives that

$$E_2 \leq c_{\lambda, \delta, M, T} \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0, T)}^2. \quad (2.57)$$

For E_3 , by the martingale property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_3 &\leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \left(\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \tilde{\sigma}(t) dW_t \right)^2 \right] + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} \left(\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)] dW_t \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{u_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{u}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \tilde{\sigma}(t)^2 dt \right] + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{u_{n-1}^{(N)}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt \right] \\ &\leq C_M \Delta t \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{v_{n-1}^{(N)}}} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{\tilde{v}_{n-1}^{(N)}}} \right)^2 \right] + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\bar{\sigma}^2}{v_{n-1}^{(N)}} \left(\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} [\sigma(t) - \tilde{\sigma}(t)]^2 dt \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.58)$$

By (2.56) and (2.53), we obtain that

$$E_3 \leq c_{\lambda, \delta, M, T} \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0, T)}^2. \quad (2.59)$$

By (2.48), (2.54), (2.57), and (2.59), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma) - \log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(\tilde{r}, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\sigma})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P}; L^\infty(0, T))} \\ &\leq c_{\lambda, \delta, M, T} (\|r - \tilde{r}\|_{L^1(0, T)} + \|q - \tilde{q}\|_{L^1(0, T)} + \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0, T)}) \\ &\leq c_{\lambda, \delta, M, T} (\|r - \tilde{r}\|_{L^1(0, T)} + \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_{L^1(0, T)} + \|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{L^2(0, T)}), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_{\lambda, \delta, M, T} > 0$ is a constant independent of N . This proves the uniform continuity of $\log \mathfrak{J}^{(N)}(r, \rho, \sigma)$ on $A_{\delta, M}$, which completes the proof. \square

3 Asymptotic Properties of The Functions $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$

In this section, we study the asymptotic properties and derive upper and lower bounds of the functions $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ defined in (1.11) and (1.12) respectively. The exponent $-1/2$ in the terms $(1+t^2\lambda^k)^{-1/2}$ and $(1+t\lambda^k)^{-1/2}$ makes direct computation of $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ difficult. We will start with studying the following two closely related integrals $\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1+t^2\lambda^k)^{-1} dt$ and $\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1+t\lambda^k)^{-1} dt$, for which the integral of corresponding partial products can be computed explicitly.

Some results regarding the q -binomial coefficients and the q -gamma function will be needed.

Definition 3.1. Let $q \in \mathbb{R}, q \neq 1$. For any integers $n \geq k \geq 0$, the q -binomial coefficient is defined by

$$\binom{n}{k}_q = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n (1-q^j)}{[\prod_{j=1}^k (1-q^j)] \cdot [\prod_{j=1}^{n-k} (1-q^j)]}.$$

Remark 3.2. Since $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} (1-q^j)/(1-q) = j$, it is easily seen that the q -binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{k}_q$ converges to the ordinary binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$ as $q \rightarrow 1$.

Theorem 3.3 below is the q -analogue of the binomial theorem. A proof of Theorem 3.3 can be found in [10, Corollary 10.2.2, page 490].

Theorem 3.3 (The q -Binomial Theorem). *For any $q, t \in \mathbb{R}$, and any integer $n \geq 1$, it holds that*

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1+tq^k) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}_q t^k q^{k(k-1)/2}.$$

Definition 3.4. Let $q \in \mathbb{R}, |q| < 1$. The q -gamma function is defined by

$$\Gamma_q(x) = (1-q)^{1-x} \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1-q^{n+1}}{1-q^{n+x}}.$$

Lemma 3.5 below shows that the q -gamma function converges to the ordinary gamma function. A proof of Lemma 3.5 can be found in [10, Corollary 10.3.4, page 495].

Lemma 3.5. Let $\Gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt$ be the ordinary gamma function. Then $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \Gamma_q(x) = \Gamma(x)$.

We now turn to the computation of the integrals $\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1+t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dt$ and $\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1+t \lambda^k)^{-1} dt$.

Lemma 3.6. For any $n \geq 1$,

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dt = \frac{\pi}{2} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1-\lambda^{k+1/2}}{1-\lambda^{k+1}}, \quad (3.1)$$

and therefore,

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1+t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dt = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{(1-\lambda)^{1/2}}{\Gamma_\lambda(1/2)}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Let $f(z) = \log(z) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+z^2 \lambda^k)^{-1}$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty)$. We select the analytic branch of $\log(z)$ such that $\text{Im}[\log(z)] \in (0, 2\pi)$. Consider the contour which goes from 0 to $R > 0$ along the x -axis, then anti-clock wise along the circle centered at the origin and with radius R , and then from R to 0 along the x -axis. By the residue theorem, integrating $f(z)$ along this contour gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^R \log(t) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dt - \int_0^R [\log(t) + i2\pi] \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dt \\ & + \int_{|z|=R} \log(z) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+z^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dz = i2\pi \sum_{k=0}^n (\text{Res}(f, i\lambda^{-k/2}) + \text{Res}(f, -i\lambda^{-k/2})). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Note that

$$\left| \int_{|z|=R} \log(z) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+z^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dz \right| \leq \frac{2\pi R \log(R)}{\lambda^{n+1} R^{2n+2} - 1} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Setting $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.3) gives

$$\int_0^R \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dt = - \sum_{k=0}^n (\text{Res}(f, i\lambda^{-k/2}) + \text{Res}(f, -i\lambda^{-k/2})).$$

It is easy to see that

$$\text{Res}(f, i\lambda^{-k/2}) + \text{Res}(f, -i\lambda^{-k/2}) = - \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{\lambda^{-k/2}}{\prod_{0 \leq j \leq n, j \neq k} (1-\lambda^{j-k})} = \frac{\pi}{2 \prod_{j=1}^n (1-\lambda^j)} \binom{n}{k}_\lambda (-1)^{k-1} \lambda^{k^2/2}.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^R \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t^2 \lambda^k)^{-1} dt &= \frac{\pi}{2 \prod_{j=1}^n (1-\lambda^j)} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}_\lambda (-1)^k \lambda^{k^2/2} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2 \prod_{j=1}^n (1-\lambda^j)} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}_\lambda (-\lambda^{1/2})^k \lambda^{k(k-1)/2} = \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1-\lambda^{k+1/2})}{\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1-\lambda^{k+1})}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (3.1). The equality (3.2) follows from (3.1) and Definition 3.4. \square

Lemma 3.7. For any $n \geq 1$,

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t \lambda^k)^{-1} dt = \frac{\log(\lambda^{-1})}{1-\lambda^n}, \quad (3.4)$$

and therefore,

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1+t \lambda^k)^{-1} dt = \log(\lambda^{-1}). \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Let $f(z) = \log(z) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+z \lambda^k)^{-1}$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty)$. Again we select the analytic branch of $\log(z)$ such that $\text{Im}[\log(z)] \in (0, 2\pi)$. Consider the same contour as in the proof of Lemma 3.6. By the residue theorem, integrating $f(z)$ along this contour gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^R \log(t) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t \lambda^k)^{-1} dt - \int_0^R [\log(t) + i2\pi] \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t \lambda^k)^{-1} dt \\ & + \int_{|z|=R} \log(z) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+z \lambda^k)^{-1} dz = i2\pi \sum_{k=0}^n \text{Res}(f, -\lambda^{-k}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

It is easily seen that $\left| \int_{|z|=R} \log(z) \prod_{k=0}^n (1+z \lambda^k)^{-1} dz \right| \leq \frac{2\pi R \log(R)}{\lambda^n R^{n+1} - 1} \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, setting $R \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.6) gives that

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^n (1+t \lambda^k)^{-1} dt = - \sum_{k=0}^n \text{Res}(f, -\lambda^{-k}).$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Res}(f, -\lambda^{-k}) &= \frac{\lambda^{-k} \log(-\lambda^{-k})}{\prod_{0 \leq j \leq n, j \neq k} (1 - \lambda^{j-k})} = \frac{\lambda^{-k} [k \log(\lambda^{-1}) + i\pi]}{[\prod_{j=1}^k (1 - \lambda^{-j})] [\prod_{j=1}^{n-k} (1 - \lambda^j)]} \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - \lambda^j)} \binom{n}{k}_\lambda (-1)^k \lambda^{k(k-1)/2} [k \log(\lambda^{-1}) + i\pi].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^n (1 + t\lambda^k)^{-1} dt = \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n (1 - \lambda^j)} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}_\lambda (-1)^{k-1} \lambda^{k(k-1)/2} [k \log(\lambda^{-1}) + i\pi]. \quad (3.7)$$

By Theorem 3.3,

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}_\lambda s^k \lambda^{k(k-1)/2} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 + s\lambda^k). \quad (3.8)$$

Hence

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}_\lambda (-1)^k \lambda^{k(k-1)/2} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \lambda^k) = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Differentiating (3.8) at $s = -1$ gives

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}_\lambda k (-1)^{k-1} \lambda^{k(k-1)/2} = \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - \lambda^k). \quad (3.10)$$

Combining (3.7), (3.9), and (3.10) proves (3.4). \square

We can now derive the upper and lower bounds for $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$.

Lemma 3.8. (i) For any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$,

$$\frac{\lambda^{-1} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1} \leq V(\lambda) \leq \frac{\lambda^{-2} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1},$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} V(\lambda) = 1.$$

(ii) If, in addition, $\lambda \in (0.7, 1)$, then

$$\frac{\lambda^{-1.45} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1} \leq V(\lambda) \leq \frac{\lambda^{-1.5} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1}.$$

Proof. (i) Note that

$$\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^k)^{-1/2} = \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} [(1 + t\lambda^{2k})(1 + t\lambda^{2k+1})]^{-1/2} \geq \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^{2k})^{-1}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.7,

$$V(\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{2(1-\lambda)} \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^{2k})^{-1} dt = \frac{\log(\lambda^{-2})}{2(1-\lambda)} = \frac{\lambda^{-1} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^k)^{-1/2} = \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} [(1 + t\lambda^{2k})(1 + t\lambda^{2k+1})]^{-1/2} \leq \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^{2k+1})^{-1},$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}V(\lambda) &\leq \frac{1}{2(1-\lambda)} \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^{2k+1})^{-1} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\lambda(1-\lambda)} \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^{2k})^{-1} dt = \frac{\lambda^{-2} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves (i).

(ii) The argument of (i) can be slightly modified to prove (ii). By Jensen's inequality,

$$(1 + t\lambda^{2k})(1 + t\lambda^{2k+1}) \geq (1 + t\lambda^{2k+1/2})^2,$$

which implies that

$$V(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{2(1-\lambda)} \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 + t\lambda^{2k+1/2})^{-1} dt = \frac{\lambda^{-3/2} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1} - 1}.$$

On the other hand, we choose $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$(1+t\lambda^{2k})(1+t\lambda^{2k+1}) \leq (1+t\lambda^{2k+\alpha})^2, \quad (3.11)$$

Once such an α is chosen, we obtain that

$$V(\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{2(1-\lambda)} \int_0^\infty \prod_{k=0}^\infty (1+t\lambda^{2k+\alpha})^{-1} dt = \frac{\lambda^{-1-\alpha} \log(\lambda^{-1})}{\lambda^{-1}-1}.$$

The inequality (3.11) is equivalent to $\lambda^{4k+1} \leq \lambda^{4k+2\alpha}$ and $\lambda^{2k} + \lambda^{2k+1} \leq 2\lambda^{2k+\alpha}$. These inequalities can be combined to the inequality

$$\alpha \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\log(2) - \log(1+\lambda)}{\log(\lambda^{-1})} \right\}.$$

When $\lambda \in (0.7, 1)$,

$$\frac{\log(2) - \log(1+\lambda)}{\log(\lambda^{-1})} \geq \frac{\log(2) - \log(1+0.7)}{\log(1/0.7)} > 0.45.$$

Therefore, the inequality (3.11) holds for $\alpha = 0.45$ and $\lambda \in (0.7, 1)$, which completes the proof of (ii). \square

Lemma 3.9. (i) For any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{(1+\lambda)^{1/2}}{\Gamma_{\lambda^2}(1/2)} \leq U(\lambda) \leq \lambda^{-1/2} \frac{(1+\lambda)^{1/2}}{\Gamma_{\lambda^2}(1/2)}, \quad (3.12)$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 1^-} U(\lambda) = 1. \quad (3.13)$$

(ii) If, in addition, $\lambda \in (0.7, 1)$, then

$$\lambda^{-0.1} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda^{-1} \log \lambda^{-1}}{\lambda^{-1}-1}} \leq U(\lambda) \leq \frac{\lambda^{-0.125}}{1-2e^{-2\pi^2/\log(\lambda^{-1})}} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda^{-1} \log \lambda^{-1}}{\lambda^{-1}-1}}. \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. (i) The inequality (3.12) can be obtained by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.8. The limit (3.13) follows from (3.12) and Lemma 3.5.

(ii) Using an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.8, it can be easily shown that

$$\lambda^{-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{(1+\lambda)^{1/2}}{\Gamma_{\lambda^2}(1/2)} \leq U(\lambda) \leq \lambda^{-1/4} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{(1+\lambda)^{1/2}}{\Gamma_{\lambda^2}(1/2)}, \quad (3.15)$$

where $\alpha = 0.45$. We now derive upper and lower bounds of $\Gamma_{\lambda^2}(1/2)$. By the following Gauss's formula⁸,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda^{n(n+1)/2} = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1-\lambda^{2n}}{1-\lambda^{2n-1}}.$$

Denote $h = \sqrt{\log \lambda^{-1}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\lambda^2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) &= (1-\lambda^2)^{1/2} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1-\lambda^{2n}}{1-\lambda^{2n-1}} = \frac{(1-\lambda^2)^{1/2}}{h} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-n(n+1)h^2/2} h \\ &= e^{h^2/8} \sqrt{\frac{1-\lambda^2}{\log \lambda^{-1}}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-(n+1/2)^2 h^2/2} h = \frac{e^{h^2/8}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1-\lambda^2}{\log \lambda^{-1}}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(n+1/2)^2 h^2/2} h. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Note that $\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(n+1/2)^2 h^2/2} h$ is a Riemann sum converging to $\sqrt{\pi/2}$. To derive bounds of this Riemann sum for small $h > 0$, let $g(x) = e^{-h^2 x^2/2}$. The Fourier transform of g is given by

$$\hat{g}(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(x) e^{-i2\pi\xi x} dx = \sqrt{2\pi} h^{-1} e^{-2\pi^2 \xi^2/h^2}.$$

By the Poisson summation formula⁹, we have

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} g(n+x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{g}(n) e^{i2\pi n x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.17)$$

⁸See [10, Section 10.9, page 523]

⁹See [6, page 252]

Setting $x = 1/2$ in (3.17) gives that

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(n+1/2)^2 h^2 / 2} = \sqrt{2\pi} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi^2 n^2 / h^2} e^{i\pi n} = \sqrt{2\pi} \left(1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n e^{-2\pi^2 n^2 / h^2} \right),$$

which implies that

$$\sqrt{2\pi} (1 - 2e^{-2\pi^2 / h^2}) \leq \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(n+1/2)^2 h^2 / 2} \leq \sqrt{2\pi}. \quad (3.18)$$

Combining (3.16) and (3.18) and $h = \sqrt{\log \lambda^{-1}}$ gives that

$$\lambda^{-1/8} \sqrt{\frac{\pi(1-\lambda^2)}{2 \log \lambda^{-1}}} (1 - 2e^{-2\pi^2 / \log(\lambda^{-1})}) \leq \Gamma_{\lambda^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \leq \lambda^{-1/8} \sqrt{\frac{\pi(1-\lambda^2)}{2 \log \lambda^{-1}}}. \quad (3.19)$$

The estimate (3.14) follows from (3.15) and (3.19) readily. \square

4 Numerical Tests

In this section, we present some numerical test results which verify the conclusions of Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 1.6.

Figure 4.1 compares the function $U(\lambda)$ and the bounds in (1.13), where the blue curves refer to $U(\lambda)$ and the two dashed red curves refer to the corresponding upper and lower bounds. Figure 4.2 presents a similar comparison for the function $V(\lambda)$ and the bounds in (1.14). These figures show that the bounds in (1.13) and (1.14) are good approximations to the functions $U(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$.




Figure 4.1: Approximation of $U(\lambda)$.




Figure 4.2: Approximation of $V(\lambda)$.

Figure 4.3 shows the sample probability density function of $\log(I_T)$ and the density function of $\log(X_T)$. The parameters we use are $T = 1.0$, $\lambda = 0.9$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$. For Monte Carlo simulation of I_T , we use 2000 time steps for discretisation and 50000 number of paths. The sample density function of $\log(I_T)$ is computed from the sample histogram using Gaussian kernel interpolation.




Figure 4.3: Approximation of sample density. Parameters used are $T = 1.0$, $\lambda = 0.9$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$

Figure 4.4 shows the sample volatility of $\log(I_T)$ against the limiting volatility $\bar{\sigma}\sqrt{V(\lambda)T}$ for a range of different $\lambda > 0$. The three curves for $\log(I_T)$ correspond to number of time steps $N = 1000, 2000, 5000$ respectively. The parameters we use are $T = 1.0$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$. For Monte Carlo simulation of I_T , we use 50000 number of paths




Figure 4.4: Convergence of volatility for different λ (x -axis). Parameters used are $T = 1.0$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$

Figure 4.5 compares the value of a European call option on a volatility target index with a range of λ . The curves in Figure 4.5 are computed using Monte Carlo method to simulate volatility target index with $N = 1000, 2000, 5000$ time steps, and using the Black–Scholes formula with the limiting diffusion (1.10). The parameters for the volatility target index are $T = 1.0$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$. The strike of the call option is $K = 1.0$.




Figure 4.5: Convergence of European call option price for different λ (x -axis). Parameters used are $T = 1.0$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$

Figure 4.6 compares the vega of a European call option on a volatility target index with a range of λ . The curves in Figure 4.6 are

computed using Monte Carlo method to simulate volatility target index with $N = 1000, 2000, 5000$ time steps and $\Delta\sigma = 0.001$, and using the Black–Scholes formula and the vega conversion formula (1.18). The parameters for the volatility target index are $T = 1.0$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$. The strike of the call option is $K = 1.0$.




Figure 4.6: Convergence of European call option vega for different λ (x -axis). Parameters used are $T = 1.0$, $\sigma = 0.5$, $v_0 = 0.02$, $r = 0.05$, $\rho = 0.03$, $S_0 = I_0 = 1$, and $\bar{\sigma} = 0.2$

5 Appendix

In this appendix, we show that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [\log(I_T^{(N)}) - \log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)})] = 0$ in distribution, and hence the definitions (1.3) and (1.7) are equivalent when $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$. We start with some estimates on the probability of events where remainders of Taylor expansions can be controlled.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\{\xi_n^{(N)}\}_{1 \leq n \leq N}$ be an array of random variables such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|\xi_n^{(N)}|^p) = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

for some $p > 0$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^N \{|\xi_n^{(N)}| \leq \varepsilon\}\right) = 1. \quad (5.2)$$

Proof. By Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N \{|\xi_n^{(N)}| > \varepsilon\}\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{P}(|\xi_n^{(N)}| > \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{-p} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|\xi_n^{(N)}|^p).$$

By (5.1), we obtain that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N \{|\xi_n^{(N)}| > \varepsilon\}\right) = 0,$$

which implies (5.2). □

Let $r_n^{(N)} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} r(t) dt$, $\rho_n^{(N)} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \rho(t) dt$, $(\sigma_n^{(N)})^2 = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \sigma(t)^2 dt$, and

$$Z_n^{(N)} = \frac{1}{\sigma_n \sqrt{\Delta t}} \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \sigma(t) dW_t, \quad (5.3)$$

$$R_n^{(N)} = e^{(\rho_n - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_n^2) \Delta t + \sigma_n \sqrt{\Delta t} Z_n} - 1. \quad (5.4)$$

Then, for each N , $\{Z_n^{(N)}\}_{n < N}$ are i.i.d. standard normal distributions.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $Z_n^{(N)}$ be defined in (5.3). For any $\theta > 0$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^N \{(\Delta t)^\theta |Z_n^{(N)}| \leq \varepsilon\}\right) = 1, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^N \{(\Delta t)^\theta |W_{n-1}^{(N)}| \leq \varepsilon\}\right) = 1, \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{n=1}^N \{(\Delta t)^\theta w_{n-1}^{(N)} |Z_n^{(N)}| \leq \varepsilon\} \right) = 1. \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. The limit (5.5) follows from

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|(\Delta t)^\theta Z_n^{(N)}|^{1+2/\theta}) \leq c_T N^{-1-\theta}$$

and Lemma 5.1. By (2.20),

$$A_p = \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{n < N} \mathbb{E}(|w_n^{(N)}|^p) < \infty, \quad p > 0. \quad (5.8)$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|(\Delta t)^\theta w_{n-1}^{(N)}|^{2/\theta}) \leq c_{\theta, T} N^{-1},$$

which, together with Lemma 5.1, implies (5.6). Similarly,

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|(\Delta t)^\theta w_{n-1}^{(N)} Z_n^{(N)}|^{1+2/\theta}) = (\Delta t)^{2+\theta} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(|w_{n-1}^{(N)}|^{1+2/\theta}) \mathbb{E}(|Z_n^{(N)}|^{1+2/\theta}) \leq c_{\theta, T} N^{-1-\theta}.$$

The limit (5.7) follows from the above and Lemma 5.1. \square

Proposition 5.3. Let $I_T^{(N)}$ and $\tilde{I}_T^{(N)}$ be defined by (1.7) and (1.3) respectively. Then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [\log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)}) - \log(I_T^{(N)})] = 0,$$

in distribution.

Proof. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)}) &= \sum_{n=1}^N \log[1 + (1 - w_{n-1}^{(N)})r_n \Delta t + w_{n-1}^{(N)}R_n^{(N)}], \\ \log(I_T^{(N)}) &= \sum_{n=1}^N \left(r_n^{(N)} + w_{n-1}^{(N)}(\rho_n^{(N)} - r_n^{(N)}) - \frac{1}{2}(w_{n-1}^{(N)}\sigma_n^{(N)})^2 \right) \Delta t + \sum_{n=1}^N w_{n-1}^{(N)}\sigma_n^{(N)}\sqrt{\Delta t}Z_n^{(N)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $M = 1 + \|r\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} + \|\sigma^2\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$, and let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be such that

$$E_N = \bigcap_{n=1}^N (\{ \Delta t |w_{n-1}^{(N)}| \leq \varepsilon \} \cap \{ \sqrt{\Delta t} w_{n-1}^{(N)} |Z_n^{(N)}| \leq \varepsilon \} \cap \{ \sqrt{\Delta t} |Z_n^{(N)}| \leq \varepsilon \}).$$

Then, by Lemma 5.2,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(E_N) = 1. \quad (5.9)$$

In what follows, to simplify notations, we will suppress the superscript and denote $w_n^{(N)}$, $r_n^{(N)}$, $\rho_n^{(N)}$, $\sigma_n^{(N)}$, $Z_n^{(N)}$ by w_n , r_n , ρ_n , σ_n , Z_n respectively whenever no confusion occurs. In view of Lemma 5.2, the uniform L^p bound (5.8), and

$$\begin{aligned} |e^x - 1 - x - \frac{1}{2}x^2| &\leq c|x|^3, \quad |x| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \left| \log(1+x) - x + \frac{1}{2}x^2 \right| &\leq c|x|^3, \quad |x| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

by choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)}) \chi_{E_N} \\ &= \left[(1 - w_{n-1})r_n \Delta t + w_{n-1}R_n - \frac{1}{2}[(1 - w_{n-1})r_n \Delta t + w_{n-1}R_n]^2 \right] \chi_{E_N} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^{3/2}) \\ &= \left[(1 - w_{n-1})r_n \Delta t + w_{n-1} \left((\rho_n - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_n^2)\Delta t + \sigma_n \sqrt{\Delta t}Z_n + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_n^2 \Delta t Z_n^2 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2}w_{n-1}^2 \sigma_n^2 \Delta t Z_n^2 \right] \chi_{E_N} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^{3/2}) \\ &= \left[\left(r_n \Delta t + w_{n-1}(\rho_n - r_n) - \frac{1}{2}w_{n-1}^2 \sigma_n^2 \right) \Delta t + w_{n-1} \sigma_n \sqrt{\Delta t}Z_n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}w_{n-1}(1 - w_{n-1})\sigma_n^2 \Delta t (Z_n^2 - 1) \right] \chi_{E_N} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^{3/2}) \\ &= \left(\log(I_T^{(N)}) + \frac{1}{2}w_{n-1}(1 - w_{n-1})\sigma_n^2 \Delta t (Z_n^2 - 1) \right) \chi_{E_N} + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^{3/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\xi_n^{(N)} = O((\Delta t)^\theta)$ if

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n < N} (\Delta t)^{-\theta} \mathbb{E}(|\xi_n^{(N)}|) < \infty.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)}) - \log(I_T^{(N)}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N w_{n-1}(1-w_{n-1})\sigma_n^2 \Delta t (Z_n^2 - 1) \right) \chi_{E_N} = 0, \quad (5.10)$$

in distribution. Note that $\sum_{k=1}^n w_{k-1}(1-w_{k-1})\sigma_k^2 \Delta t (Z_k^2 - 1)$ is a martingale, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{n=1}^N w_{n-1}(1-w_{n-1})\sigma_n^2 \Delta t (Z_n^2 - 1) \right)^2 \right] &\leq c_{M,T} N^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(w_{n-1}^2 (1-w_{n-1})^2 (Z_n^2 - 1) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= c_{M,T} N^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left(w_{n-1}^2 (1-w_{n-1})^2 \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq c_{M,T} N^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[\mathbb{E}(w_{n-1}^4) + \mathbb{E}(w_{n-1}^8) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.8), implies that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N w_{n-1}(1-w_{n-1})\sigma_n^2 \Delta t (Z_n^2 - 1) = 0, \quad (5.11)$$

in distribution. It follows from (5.10) and (5.11) that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[\log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)}) - \log(I_T^{(N)}) \right] \chi_{E_N} = 0, \quad (5.12)$$

in distribution.

For any continuous function $f \in C(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[f(\log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)})) - f(\log(I_T^{(N)}))] \right| \leq \left| \mathbb{E}[f(\log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)})\chi_{E_N}) - f(\log(I_T^{(N)})\chi_{E_N})] \right| + 2\|f\|_{L^\infty}(1 - \mathbb{P}(E_N)).$$

It follows from (5.9), (5.12), and the above that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(\log(\tilde{I}_T^{(N)})) - f(\log(I_T^{(N)}))] = 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

References

- [1] Etemadi, N. (1981). An elementary proof of the strong law of large numbers. *Zeitschrift Für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie Und Verwandte Gebiete*, 55(1), 119–122.
- [2] Feller, W. (1968). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, vol. 1, 3rd ed.* New York: Wiley.
- [3] Hall, P., Lukacs, E., Birnbaum, Z. W., and Heyde, C. C. (1980). *Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application*. Academic Press.
- [4] Bolthausen, E. (1982). Exact convergence rates in some martingale central limit theorems. *Annals of Probability*, 10(3).
- [5] Haeusler, E. (1984). A note on the rate of convergence in the martingale central limit theorem. *Annals of Probability*, 12(2).
- [6] Stein, E. M., and Weiss, G. L. (1971). *Introduction to Fourier Analysis on Euclidean Spaces*. Princeton University Press.
- [7] Aronson, D. G. (1968). Non-negative solutions of linear parabolic equations. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche*, 22(4), 607-694.
- [8] Kuczmaszewska, A. (2005). The strong law of large numbers for dependent random variables. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 73(3), 305–314.
- [9] Małuła, P. (1992). A note on the almost sure Δ convergence of sums of negatively dependent random variables. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 15(3), 209–213.
- [10] Andrews, G. E., Askey, R., and Roy, R. (1999). *Special Functions*. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Harvey, C. R., Hoyle, E., Korgaonkar, R., Rattray, S., Sargaison, M., and Van Hemert, O. (2018). The impact of volatility targeting. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 45(1), 14–33.

- [12] Torricelli, L. (2018). Volatility targeting using delayed diffusions. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 25(3), 213-246.
- [13] Bongaerts, D., Kang, X., and Van Dijk, M. (2020). Conditional volatility targeting. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 76(4), 54–71.
- [14] Bégin, J., and Sanders, B. (2024). Benefit volatility-targeting strategies in lifetime pension pools. *Insurance Mathematics and Economics*, 118, 72–94.