

# Robust No-Arbitrage under Projective Determinacy

Alexandre Boistard<sup>1</sup>, Laurence Carassus<sup>2</sup>, and Safae Issaoui<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dominante Mathématiques et Data Science, Centrale-Supélec, Université Paris-Saclay,  
France

<sup>2</sup>MICS, Centrale-Supélec, Université Paris-Saclay, France

April 2, 2025

## Abstract

Drawing from set theory, this article contributes to a deeper understanding of the no-arbitrage principle in multiple-priors settings and its application in mathematical finance.

In the quasi-sure discrete-time frictionless market framework of Bouchard and Nutz, the equivalence between the quasi-sure no-arbitrage condition and the existence of a probability measure for which the local one-prior no-arbitrage condition holds and the affine hull of the support is equal to the quasi-sure support, all of this in a quasi-sure sense, was established by Blanchard and Carassus. We aim to extend this result to the projective setup introduced by Carassus and Ferhoun. This setup allows for standardised measurability assumptions, in contrast to the framework of Bouchard and Nutz, where prices are assumed to be Borel measurable, strategies and stochastic kernels universally measurable, and the graphs of one-step priors analytic sets.

To achieve this, we assume the classical axioms of Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, including the axiom of choice (ZFC), supplemented by the Projective Determinacy (PD) axiom. In ZFC+PD the existence of such probability measures was assumed by Carassus and Ferhoun to prove the existence of solutions in a quasi-sure nonconcave utility maximisation problem. The equivalence with the quasi-sure no-arbitrage was only conjectured.

**Keywords:** Robust Finance, Quasi-sure No-Arbitrage, Projective Determinacy, Projective sets.

## 1. Introduction

The no-arbitrage hypothesis is a cornerstone in financial mathematics and economic theory, ensuring the internal consistency of pricing models, optimal solutions in portfolio selection models and preventing arbitrage opportunities that could destabilise markets. The no-arbitrage principle asserts that making a non-risky profit with zero net investment is impossible. Traditional approaches assume a single probability measure to describe the evolution of asset prices; however, in a multiple-priors (or robust or Knightian) framework, uncertainty is modelled through a family of probability measures or a set of events. This generalization accounts for ambiguity and model uncertainty, making it particularly relevant in modern financial markets where agents may hold diverse and even conflicting beliefs about future states of the world. The earliest literature assumed that the set of beliefs is dominated. We refer to [14] for a comprehensive survey of the dominated case. Unfortunately, this setting excludes volatility uncertainty and is easily violated in discrete time (see [8]); this is why we focus on the non-dominated case.

Different notions of arbitrage have been developed in robust finance. The quasi-sure no-arbitrage condition of Bouchard and Nutz ([9])  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$  states that if the terminal value of a trading strategy, starting from 0, is non-negative  $\mathcal{Q}$ -quasi-surely, then it always equals 0  $\mathcal{Q}$ -quasi-surely, where  $\mathcal{Q}$  represents all the possible probability measures or beliefs. The pathwise approach takes a scenario-based interpretation of arbitrage rather than relying on a set of probability measures: a subset of relevant events or scenarios without specifying their relative weight is given (see for example [10]). Notably, [21] have unified the quasi-sure and the pathwise approaches, demonstrating, under certain regularity assumptions, that both approaches are equivalent. We also mention the model-independent approach, discussed, for example, in [23].

Here, we focus on the quasi-sure no-arbitrage condition of Bouchard and Nutz, which has become dominant in the literature. However, under this condition, it is not even clear if there exists a belief  $P \in \mathcal{Q}$  satisfying the uni-prior no-arbitrage condition  $NA(P)$ . It is indeed true, but  $\mathcal{Q}$  might still contain some models that are not arbitrage-free (see [8]). In [8], the authors have shown that the  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$  condition is equivalent to the existence of a subclass of priors  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  have the same polar sets (roughly speaking the same relevant events) and  $NA(P)$  holds for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ . So instead of  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$ , one may assume that every model in  $\mathcal{P}$  is arbitrage-free. Under quasi-sure uncertainty, these perspectives provide a more flexible framework for pricing and hedging. It also allows tractable theorems for the existence of solutions to the problem of robust utility maximisation (see [7], [4] or [22]). The construction of  $\mathcal{P}$  is based on the existence of a probability measure for which the local one-prior no-arbitrage condition holds  $\mathcal{Q}$ -quasi-surely and the affine hull of the support is equal to the quasi-sure support again  $\mathcal{Q}$ -quasi-surely.

In the framework of Bouchard and Nutz, random sets of “local” priors are first given. These probability measures are “local” in that they represent the investor’s belief between two successive moments. The cornerstone assumption of [9] is that the graphs of these random sets are analytic sets. Thanks to this assumption and to the measurable selection theorem of Jankov-von Neumann (see [6]), it is possible to obtain local beliefs that are analytically and, thus, universally measurable, as a function of the path. The intertemporal set of beliefs can then be constructed from these kernels as product measures. Measurable selection is also necessary to do the way back, for example to go from intertemporal quasi-sure inequalities to local quasi-sure ones as when going from intertemporal no-arbitrage to local ones. For that, Bouchard and Nutz rely on the uniformisation of Suslin set (also called nucleus of Suslin scheme) on the product of the universal sigma-algebra and the Borel one, as discussed by Leese in [17]. So, one needs to go outside the class of analytic sets (which are the nuclei of Suslin schemes on the Borel sigma algebra). Moreover, Bouchard and Nutz use upper semianalytic functions. A technical issue is that the composition of two upper semianalytic functions may not remain upper semianalytic. This is why the prices are assumed to be Borel measurable. Furthermore, analytic sets are not stable by complement. For example, the set where the local quasi-sure no-arbitrage holds is co-analytic, and if we restrict upper semianalytic functions to this set, they are no longer upper semianalytic. Summing up in the classical framework of Bouchard and Nutz, the price processes are assumed to be Borel measurable, the graphs of random beliefs to be analytic sets, while trading strategies are only obtained to be universally measurable. The conditions of measurability are not homogeneous, and you have to assume a lot (Borel, analytical sets) to obtain little (universally measurable).

To address this issue, a key development in robust finance is the connection between no-arbitrage conditions and advanced set-theoretic axioms. Projective Determinacy, an axiom from descriptive set theory, has emerged as a powerful tool when dealing with Knightian uncertainty ([11] and [13]). Using projective sets instead of analytic sets or nuclei of Suslin schemes has been particularly fruitful in handling non-dominated model uncertainty, especially in non-concave utility maximisation. Assuming the axiom of Projective Determinacy, projective sets share the same regularity properties as analytic sets. They

are also stable by complement and the composition of projectively measurable functions remains projectively measurable. Projective Determinacy, a concept from descriptive set theory, is rooted in early 20th-century mathematical logic, with contributions from various mathematicians and logicians. In the 1980s, significant advances were made by Martins (see [20] and [19]) and then by Woodin with the connection to the existence of large cardinals (see [26] for a survey). Determinacy refers to the existence of a winning strategy for one of the two players in an infinite game. Other examples in mathematical finance and economics where some set-theoretic axioms (outside the usual ZFC) are used in [18] and [3]. So, this paper aims to characterise the quasi-sure no-arbitrage condition in the projective setup, where the price processes are assumed to be projectively measurable, the graphs of random beliefs to be projective sets and where we obtain projectively measurable trading strategies. The interplay between Projective Determinacy and measurable selection provides a powerful foundation for understanding dynamic decision-making in ambiguous environments, reinforcing the theoretical underpinnings of multiple-priors financial models.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 explains the projective setup, while Section 3 presents the financial setting. Section 4 contains our main results. Finally, Section 5 collects the proofs.

We finish this introduction with some notations and definitions related to polar sets. For all Polish spaces  $X$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{P}(X)$  the set of probability measures defined on the measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$ , where  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  is the Borel sigma-algebra on  $X$ . We define the universal sigma-algebra on  $X$  as

$$\mathcal{B}_c(X) := \bigcap_{P \in \mathfrak{P}(X)} \mathcal{B}_P(X),$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_P(X)$  denotes the completion of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  with respect to  $P \in \mathfrak{P}(X)$ . For the rest of this paper, we use the same notation for  $P \in \mathfrak{P}(X)$  and its (unique) extension on  $\mathcal{B}_P(X)$ .

In this context, a set  $A$  is called  $\mathcal{Q}$ -polar for some  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(X)$  if there exists  $N \in \mathcal{B}_c(X)$  such that  $A \subseteq N$  and  $P[N] = 0$  for all  $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Moreover, a set  $B$  is of  $\mathcal{Q}$ -full-measure if  $X \setminus B$  is  $\mathcal{Q}$ -polar.

## 2. Projective setup

We introduce our projective setup.

**Definition 1** (Projective Sets). *Let  $X$  be a Polish space. An analytic set of  $X$  is the projection into  $X$  of a Borel subset of  $X \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . The class of such sets is denoted by  $\Sigma_1^1(X)$ . The complement of an analytic set is called a co-analytic set, which class is denoted by  $\Pi_1^1(X)$ .*

*For  $n \geq 2$ , the classes of analytic and co-analytic sets of order  $n$  are defined recursively:*

$$\Sigma_n^1(X) := \{\text{proj}_X(C) : C \in \Pi_{n-1}^1(X \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}})\}, \quad \Pi_n^1(X) := \{X \setminus C : C \in \Sigma_n^1(X)\}.$$

*For all  $n \geq 1$ , the intersection of these two classes defines  $\Delta_n^1(X)$ :*

$$\Delta_n^1(X) := \Sigma_n^1(X) \cap \Pi_n^1(X).$$

*Finally, the class of projective sets on  $X$  is defined as*

$$\mathbf{P}(X) := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \Delta_n^1(X).$$

Note that Borel sets are projective (see [16, Theorem 14.11, p88]):

$$\mathcal{B}(X) = \Sigma_1^1(X) \cap \Pi_1^1(X). \tag{1}$$

Let  $X$  be a Polish space. We now define the notion of measurability used in this paper.

**Definition 2** (Projectively Measurable Functions). *A function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is  $\Delta_n^1(X)$ -measurable if  $f^{-1}(B)$  belongs to  $\Delta_n^1(X)$  for all Borel sets  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . The function  $f$  is projectively measurable, or  $\mathbf{P}(X)$ -measurable, if there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $f$  is  $\Delta_n^1(X)$ -measurable.*

For two Polish spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , we will denote set-valued mappings<sup>1</sup> as  $F : X \rightrightarrows Y$ .

**Definition 3** (Projectively Measurable Mappings). *A set-valued mapping  $F : X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^d$  is  $\Delta_n^1(X)$ -measurable if  $F^{-1}(O) := \{x \in X : F(x) \cap O \neq \emptyset\}$  belongs to  $\Delta_n^1(X)$  for all open sets  $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  (see also [25, Definition 14.1, p.643]). The mapping  $F$  is projectively measurable, or  $\mathbf{P}(X)$ -measurable, if there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $F$  is  $\Delta_n^1(X)$ -measurable.*

**Remark 1.** *The  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  defined in these two definitions is independent of the Borel or open set and only depends on the function or set-valued mapping.*

We need the notion of determined sets to state the (PD) axiom. Consider a two-player infinite game. Player I plays  $a_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , then Player II plays  $b_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , then Player I plays  $a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ , etc. A play is a sequence  $(a_0, b_0, a_1, b_1, \dots) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Player I wins the game if  $(a_0, b_0, a_1, b_1, \dots) \in A$ . Otherwise, if  $(a_0, b_0, a_1, b_1, \dots) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus A$ , Player II wins. A winning strategy for a Player is a strategy under which the Player always wins; that is, the result of the game always belongs to the set  $A$  for Player I or to  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus A$  for Player II, regardless of what the other Player plays.

**Definition 4** (Determined Sets). *A set  $A$  is determined if a winning strategy exists for one of the two players.*

**Axiom 1** (Projective Determinacy). *The Projective Determinacy (PD) axiom states that if  $A$  is a projective set of a Polish space, then  $A$  is determined.*

We refer to the introduction and Carassus and Ferhoun [13] and the references therein for discussion on the (PD) axiom. We will not apply the (PD) axiom directly but rather the two consequences recalled in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1** (Consequences of the (PD) axiom). *Assume the (PD) axiom.*

- i) If  $X$  is a Polish space, then  $\mathbf{P}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_c(X)$ .*
- ii) Measurable selection can be performed on projective sets. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces and  $A \in \mathbf{P}(X \times Y)$ . Then, there exists a projectively measurable function  $\phi : \text{proj}_X(A) \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\text{Graph}(\phi) \subseteq A$ .*

*Proof.* See [16, Theorem 38.17, p. 326] and [13, Proposition 9]. □

### 3. Financial setting

We fix a time horizon  $T$  and introduce a family of Polish spaces  $(\Omega_t)_{t \in \{1, \dots, T\}}$ . For all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ , let  $\Omega^t := \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_t$  with the convention that  $\Omega^0$  is a singleton. For all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ , let  $S_t : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then,  $S := (S_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$  is the  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process representing the price of the  $d$  risky assets over time. A riskless asset whose price equals 1 is also available. We are now in place to state our first assumption.

**Assumption 1** (Measurability of the Prices). *For all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ ,  $S_t$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.*

<sup>1</sup>A set-valued mapping  $F : X \rightrightarrows Y$  is a mapping such that for every  $x \in X$ ,  $F(x)$  is a subset of  $Y$ .

**Definition 5** (Trading Strategy). *Let  $\phi_t : \Omega^{t-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . A trading strategy  $\phi$  is a  $d$ -dimensional process  $\phi := \{\phi_t : t \in \{1, \dots, T\}\}$  such that  $\phi_t$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^{t-1})$ -measurable for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . We denote by  $\Phi$  the set of such self-financing strategies.*

For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $x \cdot y$  (scalar product) will be concatenated as  $xy$ . For  $\phi \in \Phi$ ,  $V_t^{x, \phi}$  denotes the value of the strategy  $\phi$  at time  $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$  with initial investment of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . We get that

$$V_t^{x, \phi} = x + \sum_{s=1}^t \phi_s \Delta S_s.$$

We now construct the set  $\mathcal{Q}^T$  of all prevailing priors. The set  $\mathcal{Q}^T$  captures all the investor's beliefs about the law of nature. It is construct out of the one-step priors  $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$  where  $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$  is the set of all possible priors for the  $t + 1$ -th period given the state  $\omega^t$  at time  $t$ , for all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T - 1\}$ . The following assumption allows us to perform measurable selection (see Proposition 1).

**Assumption 2** (Measurability of the Beliefs). *The set  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  is nonempty and convex. For all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T - 1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$  is a nonempty and convex-valued random set such that*

$$\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) := \{(\omega^t, P) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : P \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\} \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})).$$

Let  $t \in \{0, \dots, T - 1\}$ . For  $q_{t+1}(\cdot | \cdot) : \mathcal{B}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we say that  $q_{t+1} \in SK_{t+1}$  if for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ ,  $q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$  and  $\omega^t \mapsto q_{t+1}(A | \omega^t)$  is projectively measurable for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega^t)$ . So,  $SK_{t+1}$  is the set of projectively measurable stochastic kernels on  $\Omega_{t+1}$  given  $\Omega^t$ .

**Remark 2** (About Assumptions). *In the setting of Bouchard and Nutz,  $S_t$  is assumed to be Borel measurable and  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1})$  to be an analytic set. As without the (PD) axiom, Borel measurable functions are projectively measurable (choose  $n = 1$  in Definition 2 and recall (1)), and as analytic sets are projective sets (see Definition 1), our assumptions are thus weaker in the classical ZFC context. Under the (PD) axiom, if  $\phi \in \Phi$ , then  $\phi$  is universally measurable (see Proposition 1), which is the usual assumption in the quasi-sure literature. The same reasoning holds for stochastic kernels. So, our assumptions are again weaker, but we are assuming the (PD) axiom this time.*

Under the (PD) axiom and Assumption 2, Proposition 1 allows us to perform measurable selection on  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$  and we obtain that there exists  $q_{t+1} \in SK_{t+1}$  such that for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$  (recall that  $\text{proj}_{\Omega^t} \text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) = \{\mathcal{Q}_{t+1} \neq \emptyset\} = \Omega^t$  from Assumption 2),  $q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ .

Now, for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , there exists (see Remark 3) a unique product measure  $q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes q_t$  which belongs to  $\mathfrak{P}(\Omega^t)$  and is such that for all  $A^t := A_1 \times \dots \times A_t \in \Omega^t$ :

$$q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes q_t[A^t] := \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_t} q_t(d\omega_t | (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{t-1})) \dots q_1(d\omega_1).$$

Now we can define our intertemporal sets of priors  $\mathcal{Q}^t \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\Omega^t)$  by:

$$\mathcal{Q}^t := \{q_1 \otimes q_2 \otimes \dots \otimes q_t : q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_1, q_{s+1} \in SK_{s+1}, q_{s+1}(\cdot | \omega^s) \in \mathcal{Q}_{s+1}(\omega^s), \forall \omega^s \in \Omega^s, \forall s \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}\}.$$

We also set  $\mathcal{Q}^0 := \{\delta_{\omega_0}\}$ , where  $\delta_{\omega_0}$  is the Dirac measure on the single element  $\omega_0$  of  $\Omega^0$ . If  $P := q_1 \otimes q_2 \otimes \dots \otimes q_T \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ , we write for any  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ ,  $P^t := q_1 \otimes q_2 \otimes \dots \otimes q_t$  and  $P^t \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ . In this paper, we mostly work directly on the disintegration of  $P$  rather than  $P$ .

**Remark 3** (Integrals, Product Measure). *Let  $X$  be a Polish space. Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$  be a universally measurable function and let  $p \in \mathfrak{P}(X)$ . We define the  $(-\infty)$  integral denoted by  $\int_- f dp$  and*

the  $(+\infty)$  integral denoted by  $\int^- f dp$  as follows. When  $\int f^+ dp < +\infty$  or  $\int f^- dp < +\infty$ , both integrals are equal and are defined as the extended integral of  $f$ :

$$\int_- f dp = \int^- f dp := \int f^+ dp - \int f^- dp.$$

Otherwise,  $\int_- f dp := -\infty$  and  $\int^- f dp := +\infty$ . We use in this definition the arithmetic rule  $\infty - \infty = -\infty + \infty = -\infty$ . In this paper, we use  $\int_- f dp$  and simply denote it by  $\int f dp$  if no further precision is necessary.

We have seen in Proposition 1 that under the (PD) axiom, any projective set  $A$  is universally measurable. This allows us to define  $p[A]$  for any probability measure  $p$  and, more generally, to use classical measure theory results in the projective context. First, any projectively measurable function  $f$  is universally measurable (see Proposition 1) so that  $\int f dp$  (as defined above) is well-defined. Moreover, it is possible to construct a unique probability measure on the product space from projectively measurable stochastic kernels and also to use Fubini's theorem when  $f$  is a projectively measurable function (see [6, Proposition 7.45 p.175]). So, the sets  $(Q^t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}}$  are indeed well-defined.

**Definition 6** (Multiple-priors Supports). *Let  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$  and  $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$  with the fixed disintegration  $P := q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes q_T$ . The random sets  $E^{t+1} : \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $D^{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $D_P^{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  are defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} E^{t+1}(\omega^t, p) &:= \bigcap \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d : \text{closed}, p[\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in A] = 1\}, \\ D^{t+1}(\omega^t) &:= \bigcap \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d : \text{closed}, p[\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in A] = 1, \forall p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\}, \\ D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t) &:= \bigcap \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d : \text{closed}, q_{t+1}(\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in A \mid \omega^t) = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

We call  $D^{t+1}$  the quasi-sure support of  $\Delta S_{t+1}$  and  $D_P^{t+1}$  the support of  $\Delta S_{t+1}$  relatively to  $P$ .

If  $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\text{Aff}(R)$  denotes the smallest affine set containing  $R$ ,  $\text{conv}(R)$  denotes the smallest convex set containing  $R$  and if  $R$  is convex,  $\text{Ri}(R)$  is the interior of  $R$  relatively to  $\text{Aff}(R)$ .

**Remark 4.** *For all  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$  and all  $p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ ,  $E^{t+1}(\omega^t, p) \subseteq D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ . Indeed, let  $p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ . As  $p[\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in D^{t+1}(\omega^t)] = 1$  (see [9, Lemma 4.2]) and  $D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$  is closed, by definition of  $E^{t+1}(\omega^t, p)$  as an intersection of such sets,  $E^{t+1}(\omega^t, p) \subseteq D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ .*

*If  $P := q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes q_T \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ , then for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$  and  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ ,  $D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t) = E^{t+1}(\omega^t, q_{t+1}(\cdot \mid \omega^t))$ .*

We now introduce the definitions of no-arbitrage.

**Definition 7** (Quasi-sure No-arbitrage Condition). *The condition  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  holds true if*

$$V_T^{0, \phi} \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}^T\text{-q.s. for some } \phi \in \Phi \implies V_T^{0, \phi} = 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}^T\text{-q.s.}$$

**Definition 8** (Single-prior No-arbitrage Condition). *The condition  $NA(P)$  holds true if*

$$V_T^{0, \phi} \geq 0 \text{ } P\text{-a.s. for some } \phi \in \Phi \implies V_T^{0, \phi} = 0 \text{ } P\text{-a.s.}$$

**Definition 9** (Local No-arbitrage Condition). *Fix  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$  and  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ . The condition  $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t))$  holds true if*

$$y \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s. for some } y \in \mathbb{R}^d \implies y \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) = 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.}$$

## 4. No-arbitrage characterizations

### 4.1. Main results

We are now able to state the paper's main results, which proofs are given in Section 5.

**Theorem 1** (Characterization of  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ ). *Assume the (PD) axiom. The following conditions are equivalent under Assumptions 1 and 2.*

- i)  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  holds true.*
- ii) There exists  $P^* \in \mathcal{Q}^T$  such that  $\text{Aff}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\cdot) = \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\cdot)$   $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -q.s. and  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{conv}(D_{P^*}^{t+1}))(\cdot)$   $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -q.s. for all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ .*

By  $\mathcal{H}_T$ , we denote the set containing such probability measures  $P^*$ . So, Theorem 1 says that  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}_T \neq \emptyset$ . Theorem 1 was proved by Blanchard and Carassus in the setup of Bouchard and Nutz (see [8, Theorem 3.29]) and has been conjectured by Carassus and Ferhoun in the projective setup. The implication *ii)* implies *i)* has been proved there, see [13, Lemma 1(iv) and Remark 3]. Note that, for all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ , the  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure set where *ii)* holds true is the set  $\Omega_{NA}^t$  introduced in Proposition 3.

The next theorem generalizes [8, Theorem 3.6] to the projectif setup and is an easy consequence of Theorem 1. It proposes a fruitful characterization of  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  by the existence of a subclass of priors  $\mathcal{P}^T \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^T$  such that  $\mathcal{P}^T$  and  $\mathcal{Q}^T$  have the same polar sets and  $NA(P)$  holds for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}^T$ . So, instead of  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ , one may assume that every model in  $\mathcal{P}^T$  is arbitrage-free. Under quasi-sure uncertainty, this characterization offers tractable theorems for the existence of solutions to the problem of robust utility maximisation (see [7], [4] or [22]).

**Theorem 2** (Characterization of  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ ). *Assume the (PD) axiom. The following conditions are equivalent under Assumptions 1 and 2.*

- i)  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  holds true.*
- ii) There exists some  $\mathcal{P}^T \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^T$  such that  $\mathcal{P}^T$  and  $\mathcal{Q}^T$  have the same polar sets and such that  $NA(P)$  holds for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}^T$ .*

The next proposition is the generalization of [15, Theorem 3] to the projective setup. It is a direct consequence of Theorem 1 applied to  $\mathcal{Q}^T = \{p_1 \otimes p_2 \otimes \dots \otimes p_T\}$ . Note that this is not the case in the Bouchard and Nutz setting since  $\text{Graph}(p_t)$  belongs a priori to  $\mathcal{B}_c(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$  and not to the analytic sets of  $\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ .

**Proposition 2** (Characterization of  $NA(P)$ ). *Assume the (PD) axiom. Assume that Assumption 1 holds true and let  $P \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega^T)$  with the fixed disintegration  $P := p_1 \otimes p_2 \otimes \dots \otimes p_T$  where  $p_t \in SK_t$  for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . Then, the  $NA(P)$  condition holds if and only if  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(D_P^{t+1}))(\cdot)$   $P^t$ -a.s. for all  $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ .*

To prove Theorem 1, we will start by working in a one-period framework (see Section 4.2 and Proposition 4). Then, we generalize the result to the multi-period framework with measurable selection techniques to find stochastic kernels and then to “glue” them together. However, it requires first to prove that the quasi-sure no-arbitrage is consistent with the local no-arbitrage at each time step; see Proposition 3 below. This proposition generalizes [9, Theorem 4.5] in the projective framework under the (PD) axiom and allows us to work in a one-step model.

**Proposition 3** (Equivalence of Global and Local No-arbitrage). *Assume the (PD) axiom. The following conditions are equivalent under Assumptions 1 and 2.*

i)  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  holds true.

ii) For all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ , there exists a projective set  $\Omega_{NA}^t$  of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure, such that  $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t))$  holds true for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$ .

#### 4.2. One-period model

We now introduce the one-period model and construct a probability measure for which the single-prior no-arbitrage condition holds in a quasi-sure sense. Let  $(\bar{\Omega}, \mathcal{G})$  be a measured space,  $\mathfrak{P}(\bar{\Omega})$  the set of all probability measures defined on  $\mathcal{G}$ , and  $\mathcal{Q}$  a non-empty convex subset of  $\mathfrak{P}(\bar{\Omega})$ . Let  $Y$  be a  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random variable. The following sets are the pendants in the one-period case of the ones introduced in Definition 6. Let  $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,

$$E(p) := \bigcap \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d : \text{closed}, p[Y(\cdot) \in A] = 1\},$$

$$D := \bigcap \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d : \text{closed}, q[Y(\cdot) \in A] = 1, \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

We now define the pendant of the no-arbitrage in the one-period framework.

**Definition 10** (Quasi-sure One-period No-arbitrage Condition). *The condition  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$  holds true if*

$$hY(\cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}\text{-q.s. for some } h \in \mathbb{R}^d \implies hY(\cdot) = 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}\text{-q.s.}$$

**Definition 11** (One-prior One-period No-arbitrage Condition). *Let  $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ . The condition  $NA(p)$  holds true if*

$$hY(\cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } p\text{-a.s. for some } h \in \mathbb{R}^d \implies hY(\cdot) = 0 \text{ } p\text{-a.s.}$$

**Proposition 4** (Construction of  $P^*$  in the one-period case). *Assume that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is nonempty and convex and that the quasi-sure one-period no-arbitrage condition holds. Then there exists some  $P^* \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $0 \in \text{ri}(\text{Conv}(E(P^*)))$  and  $\text{Aff}(E(P^*)) = \text{Aff}(D)$ .*

*Proof.* See Section 5. □

## 5. Proofs

We first prove Proposition 3. The proof differs from the one of [9] and is based on Corollary 1 in the appendix which allows to transform  $\mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ -q.s. inequality to  $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ -q.s. one for  $\omega^t$  in a projective set of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure.

*Proof of Proposition 3. (ii) implies (i).*

Assume that *ii*) holds. We prove inductively on  $T$  that *i*) holds.

If  $T = 1$ ,  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^1) = NA(\mathcal{Q}_1(\omega^0))$  holds true as  $\Omega^0 = \{\omega^0\}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}^1 = \mathcal{Q}_1(\omega^0)$ .

We fix  $t \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$  and assume the claim at time  $t$ , i.e. that if for all  $s \in \{0, \dots, t-1\}$ , there exists a projective set  $\Omega_{NA}^s$  of  $\mathcal{Q}^s$ -full-measure, such that for all  $\omega^s \in \Omega_{NA}^s$ ,  $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{s+1}(\omega^s))$  holds true, then  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^t)$  holds true.

Now, suppose that for all  $s \in \{0, \dots, t\}$ , there exists a projective set  $\Omega_{NA}^s$  of  $\mathcal{Q}^s$ -full-measure, such that for all  $\omega^s \in \Omega_{NA}^s$ ,  $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{s+1}(\omega^s))$  holds true. We prove that  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^{t+1})$  holds true. Note first that



$NA(\mathcal{Q}^t)$  holds by induction. Let  $\phi \in \Phi$  such that  $V_{t+1}^{0,\phi} \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ -q.s. Lemma 2 shows that  $V_{t+1}^{0,\phi}(\cdot)$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^{t+1})$ -measurable under Assumption 1. Then Corollary 1, under the (PD) axiom and Assumption 2, implies that there exists  $\tilde{\Omega}^t \subseteq \Omega^t$ , a projective set of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure, such that for all  $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t$

$$V_{t+1}^{0,\phi}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.} \quad (2)$$

Let  $\tilde{\Omega}^t := \tilde{\Omega}^t \cap \Omega_{NA}^t$ . Then, as  $\tilde{\Omega}^t$  is the intersection of two projective sets,  $\tilde{\Omega}^t$  is projective (see Proposition 5). Moreover,  $\tilde{\Omega}^t$  is also of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure as an intersection of full-measure sets. Let  $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t$ . The previous arguments show that

$$\phi_{t+1}(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq -V_t^{0,\phi}(\omega^t) \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.} \quad (3)$$

Assume for a moment that  $\{V_t^{0,\phi} \geq 0\}$  is of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure. Then, as  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^t)$  holds, we get that  $V_t^{0,\phi} = 0$   $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -q.s. Considering (3) for  $\omega^t$  in the intersection of  $\tilde{\Omega}^t$  and  $\{V_t^{0,\phi} = 0\}$ , which is a projective set of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure, we get that

$$\phi_{t+1}(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.}$$

So, we can apply the local no-arbitrage  $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t))$  to get that  $\phi_{t+1}(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) = 0$   $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ -q.s. Therefore, using Fubini's theorem (recall that we are on a projective and full-measure set), it follows that  $\phi_{t+1} \Delta S_{t+1} = 0$   $\mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ -q.s. and also  $V_{t+1}^{0,\phi} = 0$   $\mathcal{Q}^{t+1}$ -q.s., meaning that  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^{t+1})$  holds as well. It remains to prove that  $V_t^{0,\phi} \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -q.s. We consider the function  $\phi_{t+1}^* = \phi_{t+1} \mathbf{1}_{\{V_t^{0,\phi} < 0\}}$ . We have that  $\phi^*$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable (see Proposition 5). Let  $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t \subseteq \tilde{\Omega}^t$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{t+1}^* \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) &\geq V_t^{0,\phi}(\omega^t) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_t^{0,\phi} < 0\}}(\omega^t) + \phi_{t+1}^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \\ &= V_{t+1}^{0,\phi}(\omega^t, \cdot) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_t^{0,\phi} < 0\}}(\omega^t) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2) for the last inequality. We can apply the local no-arbitrage  $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t))$  and we get that  $\phi_{t+1}^* \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) = 0$   $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ -q.s. So, for all  $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq V_{t+1}^{0,\phi}(\omega^t, \cdot) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_t^{0,\phi} < 0\}}(\omega^t) &= V_t^{0,\phi}(\omega^t) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_t^{0,\phi} < 0\}}(\omega^t) + \phi_{t+1}^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \\ &= V_t^{0,\phi}(\omega^t) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_t^{0,\phi} < 0\}}(\omega^t) \leq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\text{-q.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $V_t^{0,\phi}(\omega^t) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_t^{0,\phi} < 0\}}(\omega^t) = 0$  for all  $\omega^t \in \tilde{\Omega}^t$  which is of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure, and  $V_t^{0,\phi} \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -q.s. follows.

(i) implies (ii).

Suppose now that  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  holds true. Fix  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ . First, we rewrite the set  $N^t$  where the local no-arbitrage fails:

$$\begin{aligned} N^t &:= \{\omega^t \in \Omega^t : NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)) \text{ fails}\} \\ &= \{\omega^t \in \Omega^t : \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \exists q \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t) \text{ s.t. } \inf_{p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} p [y \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0] = 1 \text{ and } q [y \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) > 0] > 0\} \\ &= \text{proj}_{\Omega^t} [\{(\omega^t, q, y) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d : q \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t), \lambda_{\text{inf}}(\omega^t, q, y) = 1 \text{ and } \lambda(\omega^t, q, y) \in (0, 1]\}] \\ &= \text{proj}_{\Omega^t} [(\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \{\lambda_{\text{inf}} = 1\} \cap \{\lambda \in (0, 1]\}] = \text{proj}_{\Omega^t}(A), \end{aligned}$$

where  $A := (\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d) \cap \{\lambda_{\text{inf}} = 1\} \cap \{\lambda \in (0, 1]\}$  and the functions  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_{\text{inf}}$  are defined as

follows:

$$\lambda : \begin{cases} \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (\omega^t, q, y) \mapsto q[y\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) > 0] = \int_{-} \mathbf{1}_{\{y\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) > 0\}} q(d\omega_{t+1}) \end{cases}$$

$$\lambda_{\text{inf}} : \begin{cases} \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (\omega^t, q, y) \mapsto \inf_{p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} p[y\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0]. \end{cases}$$

We now prove that  $A$  is a projective set. Using Assumption 2 and  $\mathbb{R}^d \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq \mathbf{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  (see Proposition 5). Assume for a moment that  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_{\text{inf}}$  are projectively measurable. Then,  $\{\lambda_{\text{inf}} = 1\}$  and  $\{\lambda \in (0, 1]\}$  belong to  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ . So, Proposition 5 provides stability under intersection, implying that  $A \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  as well, and also stability under projection and complement, resulting in  $N^t \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$  and  $\Omega_{N^A}^t := \Omega^t \setminus N^t \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ . It remains to prove that  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_{\text{inf}}$  are projectively measurable.

Let  $J = (0, +\infty)$  or  $J = [0, +\infty)$ . Applying Proposition 6 to the stochastic kernel  $p$  defined by  $p(d\omega_{t+1} | \omega^t, y, q) = q(d\omega_{t+1})$ , which is Borel (see [6, Proposition 7.25]) and thus projectively measurable and to  $f(\omega^t, y, q, \omega_{t+1}) = \mathbf{1}_{\{y\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) \in J\}}$ , which is projectively measurable (see Assumption 2 and Proposition 5), we obtain that

$$\alpha^J : (\omega^t, y, q) \in \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \mapsto \int_{-} \mathbf{1}_{\{y\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) \in J\}} q(d\omega_{t+1})$$

is projectively measurable. Using [13, Proposition 10] with  $D = \{(\omega^t, y, q) \in \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : q \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)\}$  we get that  $\alpha_{\text{inf}}^J : (\omega^t, y) \in \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \inf_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} \alpha^J(\omega^t, y, q)$  is also projectively measurable. Then, as measurability is preserved by composition with Borel (thus projectively measurable) functions (see Proposition 5), we conclude by remarking that  $\lambda = \alpha^{(0, +\infty)} \circ \iota$  where  $\iota : (\omega^t, q, y) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto (\omega^t, y, q)$  is Borel and  $\lambda_{\text{inf}} = \alpha_{\text{inf}}^{[0, +\infty)} \circ \rho$  where  $\rho : (\omega^t, q, y) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto (\omega^t, y)$  is also Borel.

Now, we claim that  $\Omega_{N^A}^t$  is of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure. Suppose by contraposition that  $N^t$  is not  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -polar. This means that  $P[N^t] > 0$  for some  $P \in \mathcal{Q}^t$  having the disintegration  $P := p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_t$ . We must now apply measurable selection to find an intertemporal arbitrage contradicting the quasi-sure no-arbitrage hypothesis.

As  $A \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ , Proposition 1 gives the existence of a function  $\Xi = (q^*, \phi^*) : \text{proj}_{\Omega^t}(A) = N^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable, such that  $\text{Graph}(\Xi) \subseteq A$ . So, for all  $\omega^t \in N^t$ ,  $q^*(\omega^t)$  is a probability measure on  $\Omega_{t+1}$  and we write  $q^*(\cdot) = q^*(\cdot | \omega^t)$ . Moreover,  $\omega^t \in N^t \mapsto q^*(B | \omega^t)$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_{t+1})$ , and the inclusion  $\text{Graph}(\Xi) \subseteq A$  implies that for all  $\omega^t \in N^t$ ,  $q^*(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ . We also have that  $\phi^*$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable and for all  $\omega^t \in N^t$

$$\inf_{p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)} p[\phi^*(\omega^t)\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \geq 0] = 1 \text{ and } q^*(\phi^*(\omega^t)\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) > 0 | \omega^t) > 0. \quad (4)$$

We set  $\hat{\phi}_{t+1} := \phi^*$  on  $N^t$ ,  $\hat{\phi}_{t+1} := 0$  on  $\Omega^t \setminus N^t$ , and  $\hat{\phi}_s := 0$  for  $s \neq t+1$ . We also set  $\hat{q} := q^*$  on  $N^t$ ,  $\hat{q} := \tilde{q}$  on  $\Omega^t \setminus N^t$ , where  $\tilde{q} \in SK_{t+1}$  is such that  $\tilde{q}(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$  for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$  ( $\tilde{q}$  is obtained by performing measurable selection on  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1})$  as Assumption 2 holds). This defines a strategy and a stochastic kernel, which are indeed projectively measurable (see Proposition 5 and the proof of Lemma 3 where similar results are proved with more details). We now show that  $\hat{\phi}$  is an arbitrage.

Let  $s \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . By construction of  $\hat{\phi} \in \Phi$ , for all  $\omega^{s-1} \in \Omega^{s-1}$ ,  $\hat{\phi}_s(\omega^{s-1})\Delta S_s(\omega^{s-1}, \cdot) \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}_s(\omega^{s-1})$ -q.s.

(see (4)). Fubini's theorem is then applied to obtain that  $\hat{\phi}_s \Delta S_s \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}^T$ -q.s. We conclude that

$$\sum_{s=1}^T \hat{\phi}_s \Delta S_s \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}^T\text{-q.s.}$$

Moreover, we define  $\hat{P} := P \otimes \hat{q} \otimes p_{t+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes p_T$ . Then  $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{Q}^T$  by construction, and using Fubini's theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P} \left[ \sum_{s=1}^T \hat{\phi}_s \Delta S_s > 0 \right] &= \int_{\Omega^T} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{s=1}^T \hat{\phi}_s \Delta S_s > 0\}}(\omega^T) \hat{P}(d\omega^T) \\ &= \int_{\Omega^{t+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{\phi}_{t+1} \Delta S_{t+1} > 0\}}(\omega^{t+1}) P \otimes \hat{q}(d\omega^{t+1}) \\ &= \int_{\Omega^t} \int_{\Omega^{t+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{\phi}_{t+1} \Delta S_{t+1} > 0\}}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) \hat{q}(d\omega_{t+1} | \omega^t) P(d\omega^t) \\ &= \int_{N^t} q^*(\phi^*(\omega^t) \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) > 0 | \omega^t) P(d\omega^t) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

as the integral of a strictly positive function (see (4)) on a non-null set (relative to the measure  $P$ ). So,  $\hat{\phi}$  is an intertemporal arbitrage, which contradicts  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$ .  $\square$

The following proof is inspired from [5, Lemma 2.2] which gives the existence of some  $p^* \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $NA(p^*)$  holds true and  $\text{Aff}(E(p^*)) = \text{Aff}(D)$ .

*Proof of Proposition 4.* Assume that the quasi-sure one-period no-arbitrage  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$  holds true and that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is nonempty and convex. As  $0 \in \text{Aff}(D)$  (see Lemma 1),  $\text{Aff}(D)$  is a linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We denote for all  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,

$$N(q) := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d : hY(\cdot) = 0 \text{ } q\text{-a.s.}\} \text{ and } N(\mathcal{Q}) := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d : hY(\cdot) = 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}\text{-q.s.}\}.$$

Then, using Lemma 1,

$$\text{Aff}(D)^\perp := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d : hy = 0, \forall y \in \text{Aff}(D)\} = N(\mathcal{Q}).$$

Let  $h \in \text{Aff}(D) \cap S(0, 1)$  with  $S(0, 1) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| = 1\}$ , where  $|x|$  is the Euclidian norm of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . There exists  $p_h \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $p_h[hY(\cdot) < 0] > 0$ . If not, then  $hY(\cdot) \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}$ -q.s. and  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$  implies that  $hY(\cdot) = 0$   $\mathcal{Q}$ -q.s., which means that  $h \in N(\mathcal{Q}) = \text{Aff}(D)^\perp$ . Thus,  $h \in \text{Aff}(D) \cap \text{Aff}(D)^\perp = \{0\}$ . This is impossible because  $|h| = 1$ . Furthermore, using separation arguments in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , see for example [24, Theorems 11.1, 11.3], there exists  $\epsilon_h > 0$  such that

$$p_h[h'Y(\cdot) < 0] > 0 \text{ for all } h' \in B(h, \epsilon_h), \quad (5)$$

where  $B(h, \epsilon_h) := \{h' \in \mathbb{R}^d : |h' - h| < \epsilon_h\}$ . Now, using that  $\text{Aff}(D) \cap S(0, 1)$  is compact in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , one can extract a finite subcover of the open cover  $\cup_{h \in \text{Aff}(D) \cap S(0, 1)} B(h, \epsilon_h)$  and there exist  $k \geq 1$  and  $h_i \in \text{Aff}(D) \cap S(0, 1)$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that  $\text{Aff}(D) \cap S(0, 1) \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^k B(h_i, \epsilon_i)$  setting  $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_{h_i}$ . We associate to each  $h_i$ , the probability  $p_{h_i} \in \mathcal{Q}$  constructed above and we set

$$\bar{p} := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k p_{h_i}.$$

Then,  $\bar{p} \in \mathcal{Q}$  by convexity. Furthermore, for all  $h \in \text{Aff}(D) \cap S(0, 1)$ , we have that  $h \in B(h_j, \epsilon_j)$  for a

certain  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , and we can apply (5) for the probability  $p_{h_j}$

$$\bar{p}[hY(\cdot) < 0] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k p_{h_i}[hY(\cdot) < 0] \geq \frac{1}{k} p_{h_j}[hY(\cdot) < 0] > 0.$$

Let

$$\bar{\mathcal{Q}} = \{p \in \mathcal{Q} : p[hY(\cdot) < 0] > 0, \forall h \in \text{Aff}(D) \cap S(0, 1)\}. \quad (6)$$

We just prove that  $\bar{\mathcal{Q}} \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover,

$$\bar{\mathcal{Q}} \subseteq \{p \in \mathcal{Q} : NA(p) \text{ holds}\}.$$

Indeed, let  $p \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}$ . Assume that there exists  $l \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $p[lY(\cdot) \geq 0] = 1$  and such that  $p[lY(\cdot) = 0] \neq 1$ , meaning that  $l \notin N(\mathcal{Q})$ . Then, the orthogonal projection of  $l$  on  $\text{Aff}(D)$  is a nonzero vector (or else  $l \in \text{Aff}(D)^\perp = N(\mathcal{Q})$ ) and we can write  $l = l' + l^\perp$  where  $l' \in \text{Aff}(D)$  and  $l^\perp \in N(\mathcal{Q})$  are the respective orthogonal projections of  $l$  on  $\text{Aff}(D)$  and on  $\text{Aff}(D)^\perp = N(\mathcal{Q})$ . Then,  $p[lY(\cdot) < 0] = p[l'Y(\cdot) < 0] = 0$ . This contradicts the fact that  $p[\frac{l'}{|l'|}Y(\cdot) < 0] > 0$ , see (6). Therefore,  $NA(\bar{p})$  holds as claimed.

For all  $q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}$ , as  $NA(q)$  holds true, Lemma 1 shows that  $0 \in \text{Aff}(E(q))$ , which is thus a linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We also have the inclusion  $E(q) \subseteq D$  (see Remark 4), thus  $\text{Aff}(E(q)) \subseteq \text{Aff}(D)$ . Now, we set  $\delta : q \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}} \mapsto \dim(\text{Aff}(E(q)))$ . As  $\delta(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})$  is a nonempty subset of  $\{0, \dots, d\}$ ,  $m = \max_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}} \delta$  is attain by some  $\hat{p} \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}$  and we have that

$$\delta(\hat{p}) = m = \max_{\bar{\mathcal{Q}}} \delta = \dim(\text{Aff}(E(\hat{p})) \leq \dim(\text{Aff}(D)).$$

Using Lemma 1,

$$\text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))^\perp := \{h \in \mathbb{R}^d : hy = 0, \forall y \in \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))\} = N(\hat{p}).$$

Now, we prove that  $\text{Aff}(E(\hat{p})) = \text{Aff}(D)$ . Else, suppose that  $\text{Aff}(E(\hat{p})) \subsetneq \text{Aff}(D)$ . First, we prove that  $[\text{Aff}(D) \setminus \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))] \cap N(\hat{p}) \neq \emptyset$ . Indeed, we can build an orthonormal basis  $B := (b_1, \dots, b_d)$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , adapted to the decomposition  $\mathbb{R}^d = \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p})) \oplus N(\hat{p})$ , which  $m$  first vectors make a basis of  $\text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))$ , and which  $d_D := \dim \text{Aff}(D)$  first vectors make a basis of  $\text{Aff}(D)$ . We consider  $b_{m+1}$ . We have that  $b_{m+1} \in [\text{Aff}(D) \setminus \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))] \cap N(\hat{p})$ . Indeed, remember that  $b_{m+1} \in \text{Aff}(D)$ . Moreover, let  $l := \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i b_i \in \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))$ , where  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $b_{m+1}l = \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i b_{m+1}b_i = 0$ . Thus,  $b_{m+1} \in \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))^\perp = N(\hat{p})$ . Finally,  $b_{m+1} \notin \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))$ , else  $b_{m+1} \in \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p})) \cap \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))^\perp = \{0\}$ . However,  $b_{m+1} \neq 0$ . We set  $h^* := b_{m+1} \in [\text{Aff}(D) \setminus \text{Aff}(E(\hat{p}))] \cap N(\hat{p})$ . Note that  $h^* \neq 0$ .

Now, as  $h^* \in \text{Aff}(D)$  and  $\text{Aff}(D) \cap \text{Aff}(D)^\perp = \{0\}$ , we have that  $h^* \notin \text{Aff}(D)^\perp = N(\mathcal{Q})$ , which means that there exists  $q^* \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $q^*[h^*Y(\cdot) \neq 0] > 0$ . We set  $p' = \frac{\hat{p} + q^*}{2}$ . By convexity  $p' \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Remark that  $N(p') \subseteq N(\hat{p})$ . Indeed, let  $l \in N(p')$ , then  $\frac{\hat{p} + q^*}{2}[lY(\cdot) = 0] = 1$ , and necessarily  $\hat{p}[lY(\cdot) = 0] = 1$  as well, thus  $l \in N(\hat{p})$ . Moreover,  $N(p') \subsetneq N(\hat{p})$ . Indeed,  $h^* \in N(\hat{p})$  and as

$$p'[h^*Y(\cdot) \neq 0] = \frac{\hat{p} + q^*}{2}[h^*Y(\cdot) \neq 0] \geq \frac{q^*}{2}[h^*Y(\cdot) \neq 0] > 0$$

we have that  $h^* \notin N(p')$ . So,  $N(p') \subsetneq N(\hat{p})$  and  $\text{Aff}(E(\hat{p})) \subsetneq \text{Aff}(E(p'))$ . Thus,  $\delta(\hat{p}) < \delta(p')$ , a contradiction to the maximality of  $\hat{p}$  for  $\delta$ .

So, we have construct  $\hat{p} \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}$ , such that  $\text{Aff}(E(\hat{p})) = \text{Aff}(D)$ . As  $\hat{p} \in \bar{\mathcal{Q}}$ ,  $NA(\hat{p})$  holds true and Lemma 1

implies that  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{conv}(E(\hat{p})))$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

The following lemma recalls well-known results about supports and no-arbitrage in a one-period framework, which can, for example, be founded in [8]. They are recalled for the reader's convenience.

**Lemma 1.** *i) If  $0 \notin \text{Ri}(\text{conv}(D))$ , there exists some  $h^* \in \text{Aff}(D)$ ,  $h^* \neq 0$  such that  $h^*y \geq 0$  for all  $y \in D$ .*

*ii) For any  $h \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ ,*

$$hY(\cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}\text{-q.s.} \iff hy \geq 0, \forall y \in D \quad (7)$$

$$hY(\cdot) = 0 \text{ } \mathcal{Q}\text{-q.s.} \iff hy = 0, \forall y \in D. \quad (8)$$

*iii) Let  $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ . For any  $h \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ ,*

$$hY(\cdot) \geq 0 \text{ } p\text{-a.s.} \iff hy \geq 0, \forall y \in E(p) \quad (9)$$

$$hY(\cdot) = 0 \text{ } p\text{-a.s.} \iff hy = 0, \forall y \in E(p). \quad (10)$$

*iv) Assume that  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$  holds. Then,  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{conv}(D))$ .*

*v) Let  $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Assume that  $NA(P)$  holds. Then,  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{conv}(E(p)))$ .*

*Proof.* Assertion *i)* is a classical exercise relying on separation arguments in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , see [24, Theorems 11.1, 11.3]. For *ii)* and *iii)*, we only show (7). Indeed, (8) will follow applying (7) to  $\pm h$ . Then, (8) and (9) are obtained choosing  $\mathcal{Q} = \{p\}$ . We show the direct implication in (7). If there exists  $y_0 \in D$  such that  $hy_0 < 0$ , then there exists some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $hy < 0$  for all  $y \in B(y_0, \delta)$ . But by definition of  $D$  there exists some  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $q[Y(\cdot) \in B(y_0, \delta)] > 0$ , a contradiction. For the reverse implication, we use that  $q[Y(\cdot) \in D] = 1$  for all  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  (see Remark 4).

We prove *iv)*. If  $0 \notin \text{Ri}(\text{conv}(D))$ , *i)* implies that there exists some  $h^* \in \text{Aff}(D)$ ,  $h^* \neq 0$  such that  $h^*y \geq 0$  for all  $y \in D$  or equivalently  $h^*Y(\cdot) \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}$ -q.s. using (7). As  $NA(\mathcal{Q})$  holds true,  $h^*Y(\cdot) = 0$   $\mathcal{Q}$ -q.s. or  $h^*y = 0$  for all  $y \in D$  using (8). Thus,  $h^* \in D^\perp = (\text{Aff}(D))^\perp$  and also  $h^* \in (\text{Aff}(D))^\perp \cap \text{Aff}(D)$ . So,  $h^* = 0$  is a contradiction. Finally, *v)* follows from *iv)* choosing  $\mathcal{Q} = \{p\}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1. Reverse implication.*

This is proved in [13, Lemma 1 (iv)].

*Direct implication.*

The proof is an adaptation of [8, Proof of Theorem 3.29] to the projectif setup. Assume that  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  holds true. Proposition 3 shows that for all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ , there exists a projective set  $\Omega_{NA}^t$  of  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure, such that  $NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t))$  holds true for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$ . Fix  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}_{t+1} : \Omega^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$  be defined for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$  by

$$\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(\omega^t) := \{p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t) : 0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p)) \text{ and } \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p) = \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t)\}.$$

Let  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ . Recalling Definitions 9 and 10 and applying Proposition 4, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} NA(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)) \text{ holds true} &\implies \exists p \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t) \text{ with } 0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p)) \\ &\quad \text{and } \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p) = \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t) \\ &\iff \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(\omega^t) \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we deduce that  $\Omega_{NA}^t \subseteq \{\mathcal{E}_{t+1} \neq \emptyset\}$ . Suppose for a moment that we have established the existence of  $\hat{p}_{t+1}$  on  $\Omega_{NA}^t$  such that  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t \mapsto \hat{p}_{t+1}(B|\omega^t)$  is projectively measurable for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_{t+1})$  and  $\hat{p}_{t+1}(\cdot|\omega^t) \in \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$  for every  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$ . Let  $\tilde{q}_{t+1} \in SK_{t+1}$  be obtained by performing measurable selection on  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1})$  as Assumption 2 holds. We set  $q_{t+1}^* := \hat{p}_{t+1}$  on  $\Omega_{NA}^t$  and  $q_{t+1}^* := \tilde{q}_{t+1}$  on  $\Omega^t \setminus \Omega_{NA}^t$ . Define  $P^* := p_1^* \otimes \cdots \otimes p_T^*$ . By construction of  $P^*$ , as  $\Omega_{NA}^t$  and  $\Omega^t \setminus \Omega_{NA}^t$  are projective sets, we have that  $P^* \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ . Furthermore, using Remark 4 and  $q_{t+1}^* := \hat{p}_{t+1}$  on  $\Omega_{NA}^t$ , we obtain for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aff}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\omega^t) &= \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p_{t+1}^*(\cdot|\omega^t)) = \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, \hat{p}_{t+1}(\cdot|\omega^t)) = \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t) \\ 0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, \hat{p}_{t+1}(\cdot|\omega^t))) &= \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p_{t+1}^*(\cdot|\omega^t))) = \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\omega^t)), \end{aligned}$$

and this will conclude the proof as  $\Omega_{NA}^t$  is a  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure set.

Thus, it remains to establish the existence of  $\hat{p}_{t+1}$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} B &:= \{(\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : \text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1}))(\omega^t, p) \cap \{0\} \neq \emptyset\} \\ C &:= \{(\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p) = \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from Proposition 7 (i) that  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1}))$  is closed-valued and  $\Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable. So, we can apply [25, Theorem 14.3] in the measurable space  $(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}), \Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})))$  and we conclude that  $B \in \Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ . It also implies that  $B \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ .

Let  $h : \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by

$$h(\omega^t, p) := d(\text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p), \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t)) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |d(x, \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p)) - d(x, \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t))|. \quad (11)$$

Here  $d(F, G)$  is the Hausdorff distance between two non-empty sets  $F, G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , see for instance [1, Definition 3.70 and Lemma 3.74] and  $d(x, F) = \inf\{|x - y| : y \in F\}$  where the symbol  $|\cdot|$  refers to the Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Proposition 7 (i) shows that  $\text{Aff}(E^{t+1})$  is  $\Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable and applying [1, Theorem 18.5] with the same measurable space as before, we conclude that

$$((\omega^t, p), x) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto d(x, \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p))$$

is a Caratheodory function. This means that for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $(\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \mapsto d(x, \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p))$  is  $\Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable and for every  $(\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto d(x, \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p))$  is continuous. Now, Proposition 7 (iii) shows that  $\text{Aff}(D^{t+1})$  is  $\Delta_q^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurable and applying [1, Theorem 18.5] with the measurable space  $(\Omega^t, \Delta_q^1(\Omega^t))$ , we get that

$$(\omega^t, x) \in \Omega^t \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto d(x, \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t))$$

is a Caratheodory function, which implies that for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t \mapsto d(x, \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t))$  is  $\Delta_q^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurable and for every  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ , the function  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto d(x, \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t))$  is continuous. So,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto |d(x, \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p)) - d(x, \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t))|$  is continuous and we can replace  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\mathbb{Q}^d$  in (11). Then, Proposition 5 (v) and (vii) shows that  $(\omega^t, p) \mapsto |d(x, \text{Aff}(E^{t+1})(\omega^t, p)) - d(x, \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t))|$  is  $\Delta_r^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable with  $r = \max(n, q + 1)$  and that  $h$  is also  $\Delta_r^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable, as a countable supremum. So, we obtain that

$$C = h^{-1}(\{0\}) \in \Delta_r^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})) \subseteq \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})).$$

As  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1})) = \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(E^{t+1}))$ , see [24, Theorem 6.3], Assumption 2 and Proposition 5 (ii) show

that

$$\text{Graph}(\mathcal{E}_{t+1}) = \text{Graph}(\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}) \cap B \cap C \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})).$$

Using Proposition 1 for  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{E}_{t+1})$  gives the existence for all  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$  of  $\hat{p}_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})$  such that  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t \mapsto \hat{p}_{t+1}(B | \omega^t)$  is projectively measurable for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_{t+1})$  and  $\hat{p}_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$  for every  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$ . Indeed, recall that  $\text{proj}_{\Omega^t} \text{Graph}(\mathcal{E}_{t+1}) = \{\mathcal{E}_{t+1} \neq \emptyset\} \supseteq \Omega_{NA}^t$ . Now, the proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Let  $P \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega^T)$  with the fixed disintegration  $P := p_1 \otimes p_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes p_T$  where  $p_t \in SK_t$  for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . We want to apply Theorem 1 to  $\mathcal{Q}^T := \{p_1 \otimes p_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes p_T\}$ . For that we need to prove that  $\text{Graph}(p_{t+1}) \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$  for all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ . Remark that

$$\text{Graph}(p_{t+1}) = \left\{ (\omega^t, q) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : p_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) = q \right\}.$$

Since  $p_{t+1} \in SK_{t+1}$ , we get that  $h : (\omega^t, q) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \mapsto p_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) - q$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable and

$$\text{Graph}(p_{t+1}) = h^{-1}(0) \in \Delta_l^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})) \subseteq \mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$$

for some  $l \geq 1$ , see Definition 2. So, Theorem 1 with  $\mathcal{Q}^T := \{p_1 \otimes p_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes p_T\}$  asserts that  $NA(P)$  is equivalent to  $0 \in \text{ri}(\text{conv}(D_P^{t+1}))(\cdot)$   $P^t$ -a.s. for all  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* The proof is copy-paste from [8, Theorem 3.6] and is given for the reader's convenience.

*Step 1: Reverse implication.*

Assume now that there exists some  $\mathcal{P}^T \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^T$  such that  $\mathcal{P}^T$  and  $\mathcal{Q}^T$  have the same polar sets and the  $NA(P)$  condition holds for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}^T$ . If  $NA(\mathcal{P}^T)$  fails, there exist some  $\phi \in \Phi$  and  $P \in \mathcal{P}^T$  such that  $V_T^{0, \phi} \geq 0$   $\mathcal{P}^T$ -q.s. and  $P(V_T^{0, \phi} > 0) > 0$ :  $NA(P)$  also fails. So,  $NA(\mathcal{P}^T)$  holds and also  $NA(\mathcal{Q}^T)$  as  $\mathcal{P}^T$  and  $\mathcal{Q}^T$  have the same polar sets.

*Step 2: Direct implication.*

Theorem 1 implies that there exists some  $P^* \in \mathcal{Q}^T$  with the fixed disintegration  $P^* := p_1^* \otimes p_2^* \otimes \cdots \otimes p_T^*$  such that  $\text{Aff}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\omega^t) = \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t)$  and  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(D_{P^*}^{t+1}))(\omega^t)$  for all  $\omega^t$  in some  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -full-measure set, namely  $\Omega_{NA}^t$ , and all  $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}^T$  be defined recursively:  $\mathcal{P}^1 := \{lp_1^* + (1-l)p : p \in \mathcal{Q}^1, 0 < l \leq 1\}$  and for all  $1 \leq t \leq T-1$

$$\mathcal{P}^{t+1} := \left\{ P \otimes (lp_{t+1}^* + (1-l)q) : 0 < l \leq 1, P \in \mathcal{P}^t, q \in SK_{t+1}, q(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t) \forall \omega^t \in \Omega^t \right\}. \quad (12)$$

i)  $\mathcal{P}^t \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^t$  for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ .

This follows by induction from the convexity of  $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ ; see (12) and recall that  $p_{t+1}^*(\cdot | \omega^t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(\omega^t)$ .

ii)  $\mathcal{Q}^t$  and  $\mathcal{P}^t$  have the same polar-sets for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ .

Fix some  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . As  $\mathcal{P}^t \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^t$ , it is clear that a  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -polar set is also a  $\mathcal{P}^t$ -polar set. The other inclusion follows from (13) below for  $n = 2$ . Let  $Q^t := q_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes q_t \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ , then there exist some  $(R_k^t)_{0 \leq k \leq t-1} \subset \text{Conv}(\mathcal{Q}^t)$  which are independent of  $n$  and satisfy

$$P_n^t := \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t Q^t + \frac{1}{n^t} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \binom{t}{k} (n-1)^k R_k^t \in \mathcal{P}^t. \quad (13)$$

This equality is proved in [13, Lemma 15] by induction on  $t$ . So, for any  $Q^t \in \mathcal{Q}^t$ , we find that

$P_2^t := \frac{1}{2^t}(Q^t + \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \binom{t}{k} R_k^t) \in \mathcal{P}^t$  and  $Q^t \ll P_2^t$ . This proves that a  $\mathcal{P}^t$ -polar set is also a  $\mathcal{Q}^t$ -polar set.

iii) The NA( $P$ ) holds for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}^T$ .

Fix some  $P := p_1 \otimes p_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes p_T \in \mathcal{P}^T \subseteq \mathcal{Q}^T$ , some  $0 \leq t \leq T-1$  and  $\omega^t \in \Omega_{NA}^t$ . We establish that  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(D_P^{t+1}))(\omega^t)$ . Then, as  $P^t(\Omega_{NA}^t) = 1$ , Proposition 2 shows that NA( $P$ ) holds true and iii) follows. Remark 4 and (12) ( $p_{t+1}^*(\cdot|\omega^t) \ll p_{t+1}(\cdot|\omega^t)$ ) imply that  $D_{P^*}^{t+1}(\omega^t) \subseteq D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t) \subseteq D^{t+1}(\omega^t)$ . Thus,  $0 \in \text{Conv}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\omega^t) \subseteq \text{Conv}(D_P^{t+1})(\omega^t)$ . We have that

$$\text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t) = \text{Aff}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\omega^t) \subseteq \text{Aff}(D_P^{t+1})(\omega^t) \subseteq \text{Aff}(D^{t+1})(\omega^t).$$

As  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(D_{P^*}^{t+1}))(\omega^t)$ , there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$B(0, \varepsilon) \cap \text{Aff}(D_P^{t+1})(\omega^t) = B(0, \varepsilon) \cap \text{Aff}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\omega^t) \subseteq \text{Conv}(D_{P^*}^{t+1})(\omega^t) \subseteq \text{Conv}(D_P^{t+1})(\omega^t),$$

which concludes the proof of  $0 \in \text{Ri}(\text{Conv}(D_P^{t+1}))(\omega^t)$ .  $\square$

## Appendix

### 5.1. Properties of projective sets and projectively measurable functions

We present key properties of projective sets and projectively measurable functions used in our proofs.

**Proposition 5** (Properties of Projective Sets and Projectively Measurable Functions). *Let  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  be Polish spaces.*

- (i) *The sequence  $(\Delta_n^1(X))_{n \geq 1}$  is a nondecreasing sequence of  $\sigma$ -algebras.*
- (ii) *The class  $\mathbf{P}(X)$  is closed under complements, finite unions and finite intersections. If  $A \in \mathbf{P}(X \times Y)$ , then  $\text{proj}_X(A) \in \mathbf{P}(X)$ , while if  $A \in \Sigma_n^1(X \times Y)$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , then  $\text{proj}_X(A) \in \Sigma_n^1(X)$ .*
- (iii) *Let  $n \geq 1$ . We have that  $\Delta_n^1(X) \times \Delta_n^1(Y) \subseteq \Delta_n^1(X \times Y)$ ,  $\mathbf{P}(X) \times \mathbf{P}(Y) \subseteq \mathbf{P}(X \times Y)$  and*

$$\Sigma_n^1(X) \subseteq \Delta_{n+1}^1(X). \quad (14)$$

- (iv) *Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  for some  $p \geq 1$ . If  $f$  and  $g$  are projectively measurable functions, then  $fg$  and  $f + g$  are projectively measurable.*
- (v) *Let  $g : D \rightarrow Y$  and  $f : E \rightarrow Z$  where  $D \subseteq X$  and  $g(D) \subseteq E \subseteq Y$ . Assume that  $f$  is  $\Delta_p^1(Y)$ -measurable and that  $g$  is  $\Delta_q^1(X)$ -measurable for some  $p, q \geq 1$ . Then,  $f \circ g$  is  $\Delta_{p+q}^1(X)$ -measurable. Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are projectively measurable. Then,  $f \circ g$  is projectively measurable.*
- (vi) *Let  $h : X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ . If  $h$  is projectively measurable. Then  $h(x, \cdot) : y \mapsto h(x, y)$  is projectively measurable for all  $x \in X$  and  $h(\cdot, y) : x \mapsto h(x, y)$  is projectively measurable for all  $y \in Y$ .*
- (vii) *For all  $n \geq 0$ , let  $f, f_n, g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ . Let  $p \geq 1$ . Assume that  $f, f_n$  and  $g$  are  $\Delta_p^1(X)$ -measurable for all  $n \geq 0$ . Then,  $f + g, -f, \min(f, g), \max(f, g), \inf_{n \geq 0} f_n, \sup_{n \geq 0} f_n$  are  $\Delta_p^1(X)$ -measurable. Now, if  $f, f_n$  and  $g$  are projectively measurable, then the previous functions are also projectively measurable.*

*Proof.* Items (i) to (iii) are proved applying [13, Proposition 8]. Note that for the projection properties in (ii), we choose the direct image with the Borel function  $f := \text{proj}_X$  in [13, Proposition 8 (i) and (vi)]. Then, (iv) is proved in [13, Lemma 7] while (v) and (vi) are proved in [13, Lemma 10] and (vii) in [13, Lemma 8].  $\square$



**Proposition 6** (Integral of Projectively Measurable Functions). *Assume the (PD) axiom. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces. Let  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$  and let  $q$  be a stochastic kernel on  $Y$  given  $X$ . Let  $\lambda : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$  be defined by*

$$\lambda(x) := \int_{-} f(x, y)q(dy|x).$$

(i) *Assume that  $x \mapsto q(\cdot|x)$  is  $\Delta_r^1(X)$ -measurable for some  $r \geq 1$  and that  $f$  is  $\Delta_p(X \times Y)$ -measurable for some  $p \geq 1$ . Then,  $\lambda$  is  $\Delta_{p+r+2}^1(X)$ -measurable.*

(ii) *Assume that  $x \mapsto q(\cdot|x)$  is projectively measurable and that  $f$  is projectively measurable. Then,  $\lambda$  is projectively measurable.*

*Proof.* This is exactly [13, Proposition 12]. □

## 5.2. Projective measurability of portfolio values and of the supports.

We now prove the measurability of the portfolio values and of the supports.

**Lemma 2** (Projective Measurability of Portfolio Values). *Assume Assumption 1. For all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\phi \in \Phi$ ,  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t \mapsto V_t^{x, \phi}(\omega^t)$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable, and for all  $\omega^{t-1} \in \Omega^{t-1}$ ,  $\omega_t \in \Omega_t \mapsto V_t^{x, \phi}(\omega^{t-1}, \omega_t)$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_t)$ -measurable.*

*Proof.* Let  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ ,  $V_t^{x, \phi} = x + \sum_{s=1}^t \phi_s \Delta S_s$ . We have that  $\phi_s$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^{s-1})$ -measurable, and by Assumption 1,  $S_s$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^s)$ -measurable, Proposition 5 (iv) shows that  $\phi_s \Delta S_s$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^s)$ -measurable, and then  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t \mapsto V_t^{x, \phi}(\omega^t)$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable. Now, Proposition 5 (vi) shows that  $\omega_t \in \Omega_t \mapsto V_t^{x, \phi}(\omega^{t-1}, \omega_t)$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega_t)$ -measurable for all  $\omega^{t-1} \in \Omega^{t-1}$ . □

The following proposition generalizes [8, Lemma 2.6] using similar ideas as in [13, Proposition 13].

**Proposition 7** (Projective Measurability of the Supports). *Assume the (PD) axiom and let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$  be fixed.*

(i) *The random sets  $E^{t+1}$ ,  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Aff}(E^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1}))$  are non-empty, closed-valued and  $\Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable for some  $n \geq 1$ , and thus also  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable.*

(ii) *Let  $P \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ . The random sets  $D_P^{t+1}$ ,  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(D_P^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Aff}(D_P^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(D_P^{t+1}))$  are non-empty, closed-valued and  $\Delta_m^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurable for some  $m \geq n + 1$ , and thus also  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.*

(iii) *The random sets  $D^{t+1}$ ,  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(D^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Aff}(D^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(D^{t+1}))$  are non-empty, closed-valued and  $\Delta_q^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurable for some  $q \geq 1$ , and thus also  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.*

*Proof.* Recall that  $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$  is fixed. Fix also some open set  $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ .

*Proof of (i).*

First, we show that  $(\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \mapsto p[\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in O]$  is  $\Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable for some  $n \geq 1$ . Assumption 1 and Proposition 5 imply that  $\omega^{t+1} \in \Omega^{t+1} \mapsto \Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^{t+1})$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^{t+1})$ -measurable and thus  $\Delta_r^1(\Omega^{t+1})$ -measurable, for some  $r \geq 1$ . We apply Proposition 6 to the stochastic kernel  $q$  defined by  $q(d\omega_{t+1}|(p, \omega^t)) = p(d\omega_{t+1})$ , which is Borel (see [6, Proposition 7.25]) and thus  $\Delta_1^1(\mathbf{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \Omega^t)$ -measurable and the function  $f$  defined by  $f(p, \omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) \in O\}}$  which is  $\Delta_r^1(\mathbf{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \Omega^{t+1})$ -measurable (see Proposition 5). Thus,

$$(p, \omega^t) \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \Omega^t \mapsto \int_{\Omega_{t+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \omega_{t+1}) \in O\}} p(d\omega_{t+1})$$

is  $\Delta_{r+3}^1(\mathbf{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \times \Omega^t)$ -measurable. As  $(\omega^t, p) \mapsto (p, \omega^t)$  is  $\Delta_1^1(\Omega^t \times \mathbf{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable, we get that  $(\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \mapsto p[\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in O]$  is  $\Delta_{r+4}^1(\Omega^t \times \mathbf{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable (see Proposition 5 (v)). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \left\{ (\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : E^{t+1}(\omega^t, p) \cap O \neq \emptyset \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : p[\Delta S_{t+1}(\omega^t, \cdot) \in O] > 0 \right\} \in \Delta_{r+4}^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})). \end{aligned}$$

So, we have proved the  $\Delta_{r+4}^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurability of  $E^{t+1}$ . Applying [25, Proposition 14.2, Exercise 14.12] and [2, Lemmata 5.2 and 5.7] in the measurable space  $(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}), \Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})))$  with  $n = r+4$ , proves that  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Aff}(E^{t+1})$  and  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1}))$  are  $\Delta_n^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable. So, we also obtain that  $E^{t+1}$ ,  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Aff}(E^{t+1})$  and  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(E^{t+1}))$  are  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable.

*Proof of (ii).*

Let  $P := q_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes q_T \in \mathcal{Q}^T$ . Recalling Remark 4, then for all  $t \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$  and  $\omega^t \in \Omega^t$ ,  $D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t) = E^{t+1}(\omega^t, q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t))$ . We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \omega^t \in \Omega^t : D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t) \cap O \neq \emptyset \right\} &= \left\{ \omega^t \in \Omega^t : \exists p \in \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}), q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) = p, E^{t+1}(\omega^t, p) \cap O \neq \emptyset \right\} \\ &= \text{proj}_{\Omega^t} A \cap \left\{ (\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) = p \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $q_{t+1} \in SK_{t+1}$ , we have that  $(\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) \mapsto q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) - p$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable, see Proposition 5 (vii), and thus  $\Delta_{n'}^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}))$ -measurable for some  $n' \geq 1$ . Thus,

$$A \cap \left\{ (\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) = p \right\} \in \Delta_{m-1}^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})) \subseteq \Sigma_{m-1}^1(\Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1})),$$

where  $m = \max(n, n') + 1$ , see Proposition 5 (i). It follows that

$$\left\{ \omega^t \in \Omega^t : D_P^{t+1}(\omega^t) \cap O \neq \emptyset \right\} = \text{proj}_{\Omega^t} A \cap \left\{ (\omega^t, p) \in \Omega^t \times \mathfrak{P}(\Omega_{t+1}) : q_{t+1}(\cdot | \omega^t) = p \right\} \in \Sigma_{m-1}^1(\Omega^t) \subseteq \Delta_m^1(\Omega^t),$$

see Proposition 5 (ii) and (14). So, we have proved the  $\Delta_m^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurability of  $D_P^{t+1}$ . Similarly, by [25, Proposition 14.2, Exercise 14.12] and [2, Lemmata 5.2 and 5.7], but this time in the measurable space  $(\Omega^t, \Delta_m^1(\Omega^t))$ , we prove that  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(D_P^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Aff}(D_P^{t+1})$  and  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(D_P^{t+1}))$  are  $\Delta_m^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurable, and thus  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable.

*Proof of (iii).*

Proposition 13 in [13] proves that there exists  $q \geq 1$  such that  $D^{t+1}$  is  $\Delta_q^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurable. So again, by applying [25, Proposition 14.2, Exercise 14.12] and [2, Lemmata 5.2 and 5.7] in the measurable space  $(\Omega^t, \Delta_q^1(\Omega^t))$ , we prove that  $\overline{\text{Conv}}(D^{t+1})$ ,  $\text{Aff}(D^{t+1})$  and  $\text{Ri}(\overline{\text{Conv}}(D^{t+1}))$  are  $\Delta_q^1(\Omega^t)$ -measurable, and thus  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega^t)$ -measurable. □

### 5.3. Section of jointly measurable sets

Let  $\Omega$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  be two Polish spaces and suppose that the set-valued mapping  $\mathcal{P} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\tilde{\Omega})$  is nonempty-valued. Recall that  $SK$  is the set of stochastic kernels such that  $q(\cdot | \omega)$  is a probability measure in  $\mathfrak{P}(\tilde{\Omega})$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\omega \mapsto q(A | \omega)$  is projectively measurable for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\Omega})$ . Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\tilde{\Omega})$ , we set

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{ R \otimes q : R \in \mathcal{R}, q \in SK, q(\cdot | \omega) \in \mathcal{P}(\omega) \forall \omega \in \Omega \}.$$

In the quasi-sure literature, it is necessary to prove that if  $\Xi : \Omega \times \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $\Xi \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}$ -q.s., then there exists some  $\mathcal{R}$ -full measure set, with the right measurability, such that for all  $\omega$  in this set,  $\Xi(\omega, \cdot) \geq 0$

$\mathcal{Q}(\omega)$ -q.s. This is Corollary 1. It is based on Lemma 3, which generalizes Lemma A.1 of [12] to the projectif setup. The proofs are very similar. The main difference is in the proof of the measurability of  $\lambda$ .

**Lemma 3** (Section of Jointly Measurable Sets). *Assume the (PD) axiom. Assume that  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{P}) \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \tilde{\Omega})$ . Let us choose some set  $\bar{B} \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \tilde{\Omega})$ . For  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we denote by  $\bar{B}_\omega$  the section of  $\bar{B}$  along  $\omega$ , that is*

$$\bar{B}_\omega := \{\tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\Omega} : (\omega, \tilde{\omega}) \in \bar{B}\}.$$

Then, we have

$$B := \{\omega \in \Omega : q[\bar{B}_\omega] = 1, \forall q \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)\} \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega).$$

If furthermore  $\bar{B}$  is a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -full measure set, then  $B$  is a  $\mathcal{R}$ -full measure set.

*Proof.* Remark that  $B = \{\Lambda \geq 1\}$ , where

$$\Lambda(\omega) := \inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)} q[\bar{B}_\omega].$$

First, we prove that  $\Lambda$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega)$ -measurable. For that, we define,

$$(\omega, q) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega}) \mapsto \lambda(\omega, q) := q[\bar{B}_\omega] = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}_\omega}(\tilde{\omega}) q(d\tilde{\omega}).$$

We have that the function  $(\omega, q, \tilde{\omega}) \mapsto \mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}_\omega}(\tilde{\omega}) = \mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}}(\omega, \tilde{\omega})$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \tilde{\Omega})$ -measurable since  $\bar{B} \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \tilde{\Omega})$ . Let  $p(\cdot|\cdot) : \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\Omega}) \times (\Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega}))$  be defined by  $p(A|(\omega, q)) = q[A]$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\Omega})$  and  $(\omega, q) \in \Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega})$ . As  $p(\cdot|(\omega, q)) = q[\cdot]$  is a probability measure on  $\tilde{\Omega}$  and  $(\omega, q) \mapsto p(A|(\omega, q)) = q[A]$  is Borel measurable (see [6, Proposition 7.25]), and thus projectively measurable, we obtain that  $q \in SK$ . Recalling that  $((\omega, q), \tilde{\omega}) \mapsto \mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}_\omega}(\tilde{\omega})$  is projectively measurable, we conclude by Proposition 6 that the function  $(\omega, q) \mapsto \lambda(\omega, q)$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega}))$ -measurable. For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define:

$$E_c := \{(\omega, q) \in \Omega \times \mathfrak{P}(\tilde{\Omega}) : \lambda(\omega, q) < c\} \cap \text{Graph } \mathcal{P}.$$

Then,  $E_c \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega}))$ . Moreover, by definition of  $\Lambda$  and  $E_c$ , we obtain that  $\{\omega \in \Omega : \Lambda(\omega) < c\} = \text{proj}_\Omega E_c$ . Now, Proposition 5 (ii) shows that  $\text{proj}_\Omega E_c \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega)$ , and we conclude that  $\Lambda$  is  $\mathbf{P}(\Omega)$ -measurable, and  $B = \{\Lambda \geq 1\} \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega)$ .

Assume now that  $\bar{B}$  is a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -full measure set. We prove that  $B$  is a  $\mathcal{R}$ -full measure set. Assume by contradiction that there exists  $\tilde{R} \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\tilde{R}[\Omega \setminus B] > 0$ .

Since  $E_1 \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega}))$ , we can perform measurable selection on  $E_1$  using Proposition 1. So, there exists  $\hat{q} : \text{proj}_\Omega E_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\Omega})$ , such that  $(\omega, \hat{q}(\cdot|\omega)) \in E_1$  for all  $\omega \in \text{proj}_\Omega E_1 = \Omega \setminus B$ .

Since  $\text{proj}_\Omega \text{Graph}(\mathcal{P}) = \Omega$  and  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{P}) \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \tilde{\Omega})$ , we can also perform measurable selection on  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{P})$  using again Proposition 1, proving the existence of a projectively measurable stochastic kernel  $\bar{q}$  such that for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\bar{q}(\cdot|\omega) \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ . We set:

$$\tilde{q}(\cdot|\omega) := \hat{q}(\cdot|\omega)\mathbf{1}_{\Omega \setminus B} + \bar{q}(\cdot|\omega)\mathbf{1}_B.$$

We have that  $\tilde{q} \in SK$ . Indeed, since  $\bar{q}(\cdot|\omega)$  and  $\hat{q}(\cdot|\omega)$  are both probability measures on  $\tilde{\Omega}$ ,  $\tilde{q}(\cdot|\omega)$  is also a probability measure. Moreover, for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\Omega})$ , as  $\omega \mapsto \hat{q}(A|\omega)$  and  $\omega \mapsto \bar{q}(A|\omega)$  are projectively measurable, and  $B, \Omega \setminus B \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega)$ , we have that  $\omega \mapsto \tilde{q}(A|\omega)$  is projectively measurable.

Moreover, as for  $\omega \in \Omega \setminus B$ ,  $(\omega, \hat{q}(\cdot|\omega)) \in E_1 \subseteq \text{Graph}(\mathcal{P})$ , we conclude that  $\tilde{q}(\cdot|\omega) \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  and that  $\tilde{R} \otimes \tilde{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{R} \otimes \tilde{q}[\bar{B}] &= \int_B \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \mathbf{1}_{\bar{B}}(\omega, \tilde{\omega}) \tilde{q}(d\tilde{\omega}|\omega) \tilde{R}(d\omega) + \int_{\Omega \setminus B} \hat{q}(\bar{B}_\omega|\omega) \tilde{R}(d\omega) \\
&\leq \tilde{R}[B] + \int_{\Omega \setminus B} \lambda(\omega, \hat{q}(\cdot|\omega)) \tilde{R}(d\omega) \\
&< \tilde{R}[B] + \tilde{R}[\Omega \setminus B] = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

as for all  $\omega \in \Omega \setminus B$ ,  $(\omega, \hat{q}(\cdot|\omega)) \in E_1 \subseteq \{\lambda < 1\}$  and  $\tilde{R}[\Omega \setminus B] > 0$ . This contradicts the fact that  $\bar{B}$  is of  $\mathcal{Q}$ -full measure, and we conclude that  $B$  is a  $\mathcal{R}$ -full measure set.  $\square$

**Corollary 1** (From Global to Local Positivity). *Assume the (PD) axiom. Assume that  $\text{Graph}(\mathcal{P}) \in \mathbf{P}(\Omega \times \tilde{\Omega})$ . Let  $\Xi : \Omega \times \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a projectively measurable function. Then, there is an equivalence between:*

i)  $\Xi \geq 0$   $\mathcal{Q}$ -q.s.

ii) There exists a projective set of  $\mathcal{R}$ -full-measure  $\bar{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$ , such that for all  $\omega \in \bar{\Omega}$ ,  $\Xi(\omega, \cdot) \geq 0$   $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ -q.s.

*Proof.* To show that (i) implies (ii), we apply Lemma 3 to  $\bar{B} = \{\Xi \geq 0\}$ . The reverse implication is obtained by Fubini's theorem.  $\square$

## References

- [1] C. D. Aliprantis and K. C. Border. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*. third. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [2] Z. Artstein. "Set-Valued Measures". In: *Transaction of the American Mathematical Society* 165 (1972), pp. 103–125.
- [3] D Bartl, Cheridito P, and M Kupper. "Robust expected utility maximization with medial limit". In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 471(1-2) (2019), pp. 752–775.
- [4] D. Bartl, P. Cheridito, and M. Kupper. "Robust expected utility maximization with medial limits". In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 471(1-2) (2019), pp. 752–775.
- [5] E. Bayraktar and Z. Zhou. "On Arbitrage and Duality under Model Uncertainty and Portfolio Constraints". In: *Mathematical Finance* 27.4 (2017), pp. 998–1012.
- [6] D. P. Bertsekas and S. E. Shreve. *Stochastic Optimal Control: The Discrete Time Case*. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- [7] R. Blanchard and L. Carassus. "Multiple-priors Investment in Discrete Time for Unbounded Utility Function". In: *Annals of Applied Probability* 88.2 (2018), pp. 241–281.
- [8] R. Blanchard and L. Carassus. "No-arbitrage with Multiple Priors in Discrete Time". In: *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* 130 (2020), pp. 6657–6688.
- [9] B. Bouchard and M. Nutz. "Arbitrage and Duality in Nondominated Discrete-Time Models". In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 25.2 (2015), pp. 823–859.
- [10] M. Burzoni, M. Frittelli, and M. Maggis. "Universal Arbitrage Aggregator in Discrete Time Markets under Uncertainty". In: *Finance and Stochastics* 20.1 (2016), pp. 1–50.

- 
- [11] M. Burzoni et al. “Pointwise Arbitrage Pricing Theory in Discrete Time”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 44.3 (2019), pp. 1034–1057.
- [12] L. Carassus. “Quasi-sure essential supremum and applications to finance”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 29 (2025), pp. 219–260.
- [13] L. Carassus and M. Ferhoun. “Nonconcave Robust Utility Maximization under Projective Determinacy”. In: *arXiv preprint* 2403.11824 (2024). Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.11824>.
- [14] H. Föllmer, A. Schied, and S. Weber. “Robust preferences and robust portfolio choice”. In: *Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Methods in Finance* (2009).
- [15] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev. “Local martingales and the fundamental asset pricing theorems in the discrete-time case”. In: *Finance Stochastic* 2 (1998), pp. 259–273.
- [16] A. S. Kechris. *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*. Vol. 156. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. New York: Springer, 1995. ISBN: 978-0-387-94374-9.
- [17] S. J. Leese. “Measurable Selections and the Uniformization of Souslin Sets”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 100.1 (1978), pp. 19–41.
- [18] A. Maitra, R. Purves, and W. Sudderth. “Leavable Gambling Problems with Unbounded Utilities”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 320 (2) (1990), pp. 543–567.
- [19] D.A. Martin and J.R. Steel. “A proof of projective determinacy”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 2(1) (1989), pp. 71–125.
- [20] D.A. Martin. “Borel Determinacy”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 102(2) (1975), pp. 363–371.
- [21] J. Oblój and J. Wiesel. “A unified framework for robust modelling of financial markets in discrete time”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 25 (2021), pp. 427–468.
- [22] M. Rásonyi and A. Meireles-Rodrigues. “On Utility Maximisation Under Model Uncertainty in Discrete-Time Markets”. In: *Mathematical Finance* 31(1) (2021), pp. 149–175.
- [23] F. Riedel. “Finance Without Probabilistic Prior Assumptions.” In: *Decisions in Economics and Finance* 38 (2015), 75–91.
- [24] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [25] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets. *Variational Analysis*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1998, pp. xiv+733.
- [26] W. H. Woodin. “The Continuum Hypothesis, Part I”. In: *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 48 (2001).