Department of APPLIED MATHEMATICS

On the existence of optimal controls for a singular stochastic control problem in finance.

by

Fred E. Benth, Kenneth H. Karlsen and Kristin Reikvam

Report no. 152

November 2000



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN Bergen, Norway



Depotbiblioteket

ISSN 0084-778x

Department of Mathematics University of Bergen 5008 Bergen Norway

On the existence of optimal controls for a singular stochastic control problem in finance.

by

Fred E. Benth, Kenneth H. Karlsen and Kristin Reikvam

Report no. 152

November 2000



On the existence of optimal controls for a singular stochastic control problem in finance

Fred E. Benth, Kenneth H. Karlsen, and Kristin Reikvam

Abstract. We prove existence of optimal investment-consumption strategies for an infinite horizon portfolio optimization problem in a Lévy market with intertemporal substitution and transaction costs. This paper complements our previous work [4], which established that the value function can be uniquely characterized as a constrained viscosity solution of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation (but [4] left open the question of existence of optimal strategies). In this paper, we also give an alternative proof of the viscosity solution property of the value function. This proof exploits the existence of optimal strategies and is consequently simpler than the one proposed in [4].

1. Introduction

We prove existence of optimal controls for the singular stochastic control problem studied in Benth, Karlsen, and Reikvam [4] (see also [1, 2, 3] for related problems). An optimal consumption-investment problem over an infinite investment horizon in a market consisting of one risky asset (stock) and one risk-free asset (bank) is considered. The dynamics of the risky asset follows a geometric-type Lévy motion, generalizing the classical Black & Scholes model. Proportional transaction costs are incurred when selling or buying assets. In addition, following Hindy and Huang [9], the investor derives utility from an average of present and past consumption.

In Benth, Karlsen, and Reikvam [4], the value function of this optimization problem was characterized as the unique constrained viscosity solution [6] of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. Due to the singular controls and the Lévy dynamics of the risky asset, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations takes the form of a second-order *integro-differential* variational inequality.

The existence of optimal controls was not addressed in [4]. To prove existence of an optimal control, we shall here use the convex analysis techniques described in Ekeland and Temam [10] together with the martingale methods of Cvitanić and Karatzas [7]. The main problem we are facing is the infinite investment horizon, which leads to unbounded controls. However, from Benth, Karlsen, and Reikvam

Benth is partially sponsored by MaPhySto - Centre for Mathematical Physics and Stochastics (University of Aarhus, Denmark), funded by a grant from the Danish National Research Foundation. Reikvam is supported by the Norwegian Research Council (NFR) under grant 118868/410.

On the existence of optimal controls for a singular stochastic control problem in finance

Fred M. wheels, M. Angels, H. Kurkell, and P. Toblet Runt, and

The Man of the Man of the

"The economic of optigat controls are not optigations (1) and a second statement of the second statement o

להקשור להיה מששטען היישה עניים איזי ביו על העירות היינטייתניין בער לקשול להעניבולי להעיק לאיזי של שנה לעלולים רעים האמי לכיי על לעעות היינטי להיימונעל לי היותר ליידה עבוצע היותריעה היוער ערצע אלי הללפים לאיזיה של ליידה אנ נערים להיה המש הייצוע היותר להיילום אין היימוצלים להיה איזיה על להיה אין להיונה על היילולי ערצע איינו לאינטי לא [5], we have explicit bounds on the expected growth of the controls, which enables us to introduce a time-weighted L^2 - space. This space provides the starting point for using the martingale methods in [7].

We end this paper by giving an alternative proof of the result in [4] stating that the value function is a constrained viscosity solution of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. Compared with the proof proposed in [4], the present proof is simpler since we exploit the existence of an optimal strategies.

2. Formulation of the control problem

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}, P)$ be a filtered complete probability space satisfying the usual hypotheses. We consider a single investor who divides her wealth between one risk-free asset (bank account) paying a fixed interest rate r > 0 and a risky asset (stock). We denote by B(t) the amount of money the investor has in the bank account and S(t) the amount of money the investor has in the stock, at time $t \geq 0$. We assume that the holdings of the investor follow the dynamics

$$\begin{cases} B(t) = b_0 - C(t) + \int_0^t r B(s) \, ds - (1+\lambda)L(t) + (1-\mu)M(t), \\ S(t) = s + \int_0^t aS(s) \, ds + \int_0^t \sigma S(s) \, dW(s) \\ + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \eta(z)S(s-) \, \tilde{N}(ds, dz) + L(t) - M(t), \end{cases}$$
(1)

where $a, \sigma > 0$ are constants, C(t) is the cumulative consumption up to time t, L(t) is the cumulative value of the shares *bought* up to time t, M(t) is the cumulative value of the shares *sold* up to time t, and $\mu \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ are the proportional transaction costs of respectively selling and buying shares from the stock. We assume $\mu + \lambda > 0$. In addition, W(s) is a standard Brownian motion and \tilde{N} is a compensated Poisson random measure independent of W with Lévy measure $\ell(dz)$. The function $\eta(z)$ is assumed to be Borel measurable on $\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ with the property $\eta(z) > -1$ to ensure that the stock holdings remains positive as long as we are not short of stocks. In addition, we require the following integrability conditions on the Lévy measure:

$$\int_{|z|<1} (\eta(z))^2 \, \ell(dz) < \infty, \quad \int_{|z|\ge 1} |\eta(z)| \, \ell(dz) < \infty.$$

We assume throughout the paper that the expected rate of return a of the stock is greater than or equal to the risk-free interest rate r.

Introduce the process of average past consumption,

$$dY(t) = \beta \, dC(t) - \beta Y(t) \, dt, \qquad \beta > 0, \tag{2}$$

E. E. Renthell, E. E. Farber, and h. Feilerun

(ii) we have equival boards on the experied ghowith of the corrects black and he in the menodule attacks weighted 2⁻¹ - gravity fins made provides the market and in dama do market, at which add no 13

bin med ants polyten in gibbing die dienen werden ander in die operatie die staat werde meeste ing staas the verifië fraktikaan de strongen die die die die staat gegenen die die operatie die die Hermition Jaar Minster verschiede die Geschenen verbende van strong gegenen die her aan die ges proven geboerte staap de die ook ooglate die engineeren aan die engineeren die ook ook ook ook ook ook ook ook

analyzed for the test of the second particulation of

Let (A. S. (Street, J. Date B. Based, complete generality report of strat, sith uppit hyperimeter, No consults a single investor charter for all the vester brack, sith uppit for second force attends), contrast thread attends of the second of the strates attend we donted the following the maximum of another site means of the investor (Street, and a G. Buy another at the investor of an investor (Street, and a strategy of the investor instance attended to a second of the strategy site of the strategy of the investor instance and the investor (Street) and the strategy of the investor (Street) and a instance at the investor (Street) and the strategy of the strategy of the investor instance at the investor (Street) and the strategy of the strategy of the investor (Street).

where $a_{1,0} > 0$ are constants (if $a_{1,0}$ is the dust state of $a_{1,0}$ is the constant basis of $a_{1,0}$ is the dust state $a_{1,0}$

Via assesse the appoint. One paper that the experted rate of adhesive electric reads: Is present face at equilat localization care barrants rater.

Interactive the process of stances your containing them.

which has the explicit solution

$$Y(t) = y \mathrm{e}^{-\beta t} + \beta \mathrm{e}^{-\beta t} \int_{[0,t]} \mathrm{e}^{\beta s} \, dC(s).$$

The investor will derive utility from this average, rather than directly from present consumption [9].

The market considered here does not allow short-selling of stocks nor borrowing of money in the bank. In other words, the amount of money allocated in the bank account and the stocks must stay nonnegative. Hence the domain for the control problem is

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ x = (b, s, y) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x > 0 \right\}.$$

We refer to $\Pi = (C, L, M)$ as a policy for investment and consumption if Π belongs to the set \mathcal{A}_x of *admissible controls*. For $x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$, we say that $\Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x$ if the following conditions hold:

- (C.1) C(t), L(t), M(t) are adapted, nondecreasing, and right-continuous with left limits. Moreover, C(0-) = M(0-) = L(0-) = 0.
- (C.2) The state process X(t) = (B(t), S(t), Y(t)) is a solution to the stochastic differential equations (1) and (2) and respects the state-space constraint $X(t) = X^{\Pi}(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ for all t > 0.

Note that $0 \in A_x$. The objective of the investor is to maximize her expected utility over an infinite investment horizon. The functional to be optimized is

$$\mathcal{J}(x;\Pi) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(Y^{\Pi}(t)) \, dt\Big], \quad x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}},$$

where U is the investor's utility function and $\delta > 0$ is the discount factor. We introduce the following assumptions on the utility function:

- (U.1) U(z) is a continuous, nondecreasing, and concave function on $[0, \infty)$ with U(0) = 0.
- (U.2) There exist $\gamma \in (0,1)$ and constant K > 0 such that $U(z) \leq K(1+z)^{\gamma}$ for all $z \in [0,\infty)$.

Define the value function of the optimization problem to be

$$V(x) = \sup_{\Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x} \mathcal{J}(x; \Pi), \qquad x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}.$$
 (3)

Our singular stochastic control problem is to find an optimal control $\Pi^* \in \mathcal{A}_x$ such that

$$V(x) = \mathcal{J}(x; \Pi^*), \qquad x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}.$$
(4)

Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the existence of Π^* , while Section 5 is devoted to a brief discussion of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation satisfied (in a suitable sense) by the value function (3).

In what follows (Sections 3 and 4), the point $x \in \overline{D}$ will always be considered as fixed and not explicitly mentioned anymore.

which has supported with a solution

The investor will drain white, form the revenuence in the test ment in model when a second second second second

The serves constance to a target the server in an an entry store server in a server the server moving of money in the bank. In other was do the store to serve the damain of the server the bank account and the stores and attar money store to the damain for the cost of motion is

We when to H = (0, 5, 10) as a pairsy flat investment and guamments of 0 briefgas in the set, 4g of admission is controle. Febrary 10, we prothat H = Ag it the failoring conditions follo:

(C.1) C(al., L(a), M(a) new millioned, nondemiced in proving heat meth-residential orders being frammer, Monterrate, Crow-1 == 1770, -1 == 1700, -1 = 0.

(C.2) The state process $\Sigma(t) = (S(a), S(t), S(t), S(a), a solution to the Heidlerich$ differential equivalence (1) and (2) and respects the states by the scale signler of but solution $<math>X(t) = X^{2}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all t > t

Note that $0 \in \mathcal{A}_{n}$. The algorithm of the integral is to mathematic hereach, and whiley over an infinite investment formed in $\overline{\Omega}$

where C is the unvestor's usuity function and 5 > 0 is the electron fares. We introduce the following againstitution or the efficient function:

- (0.1) D(z) is a continuous, undersymbolic, and matches function 0, 0, 0, with D(z) = 0.
- (0.2) There exist y 6 (0.1) and collatanticly is the minimulation (2.1) (2.16 (1.4.2)) for
 - Define the other futurities of the contribution each set of the

Our singular anothesic costral problem, is trend an optimul electric H 7.6 A, such that

Berthme, 3 and 4 are dispited to the cristence of RC, while Section (Reviewert) a brief discussion of the Revolution-Decking sociation articled (Ry a wright) sense) by the value function (3):

la vinat followe (Sereacion's and 4), the popie e - 12 will always be controllined to fixed and hos expelicities councilated anymore.

3. Some estimates on the control and state processes

We recall some results from [5] which will be needed in Section 4. The first result states that the set of admissible controls is uniformly bounded in $L^2(P)$. Moreover, we can control the growth in time.

Proposition 3.1. For every $t \ge 0$, the controls are uniformly bounded in $L^2(P)$:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{I}\in\mathcal{A}_x} \mathbb{E}\big[C_t^2 + L_t^2 + M_t^2\big] \le Ke^{kt},$$

where K is a positive constant and

4

$$k = 2r + 2(a - r)(2K_1^2 + K_2) + 2K_2^2 \Big(\sigma^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} (\eta(\xi))^2 \ell(d\xi)\Big),$$

for $K_1 = (x_0 + (1 + \lambda)x_1)/(\lambda + \mu)$ and $K_2 = (1 + \lambda)/(\mu + \lambda)$.

Proof. This result is proven in [5], where the rate of the exponential growth is explicitly calculated. \Box

We have a similar uniform bound on the averaging process Y_t^{Π} :

Proposition 3.2. For every $t \ge 0$,

$$\sup_{\Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x} \mathbb{E}\big[(Y_t^{\Pi})^2 \big] \le K(y + e^{kt}),$$

where K is a positive constant and k is as in Proposition 3.1.

Proof. This follows from the fact that $Y_t \leq y + C_t$ and the estimate on $\mathbb{E}[C_t^2]$. \Box

Via the growth of V proven in [4, Cor. 3.5], we have that the value function is well-defined, that is, the following result holds:

Proposition 3.3. There exists a positive constant K such that

$$0 \leq V(x) \leq K(1+|x|)^{\gamma}$$
.

4. Existence of optimal controls

In this section we prove existence of an optimal control. Let $\alpha > k$, for the k given in Prop. 3.1, and introduce the measure $m_{\alpha}(dt) = e^{-\alpha t} dt$ on \mathbb{R}_+ . Notice that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{ct} m_{\alpha}(dt) < \infty, \qquad \forall c \le k.$$
(5)

Define the the (weighted Hilbert) space

$$\mathcal{H}_x^{\alpha} = \left\{ 0 \le H \in L^2(m_{\alpha} \otimes P) : \exists \Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x \text{ s. t. } H \le Y^{\Pi}, \, m_{\alpha} \otimes P \text{ - a. e.} \right\}.$$

The next two lemmas show that \mathcal{H}_x^{α} is a non-empty, bounded, convex, and closed subspace of $L^2(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$:

Lemma 4.1. \mathcal{H}_x^{α} is a non-empty, bounded, and convex subspace of $L^2(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$.

F. E. Bennis, K. S. Karnan, and E. Eskennis

and the references on the rentral and state production

We include some recenter from [0] which will be meaned in Section 4. This field reads stares that the set of admissione controls manifement bounded of 2. Mencioner, we may control the second in since

Proposition 2.1. For comp.1 2 the for some to an employing hard-former 1 2.9

sing in land, and the second second

$$u = 2t + 2tu - 2122tt + 4tu) + 2K_{2}(u^{2} + 0)$$

Inv K = (20 v (1 v A) and (A + 10 and K) = (1 v B) (10 v A).
Proof. This estable is proved in [3], where the rate of the strategical activity is

We assure a similar unitaria transf of the second sec

Proposition 5.2. Personality

where A is a marking charter and the an of Propagation of A.

Proof. This follows from the fact that Y & werfs and the remaining on Eddy . D

vat the powin at it proven in plat of 2.45 we have last div value function is well-defined, that is, the relevant result below:

Proposition 3.3. There answere provide to which the first

In this section we prove applemented an application design for a self for the section length

Define the the (weighted) (Sticker) subco.

introducts of L²(maple 2ths

Lenner 4.1. N. 20. 38 activity coupers in interests, and Sources evenence and S. (A. 1991).

Proof. Since $Y_t^{\Pi} \geq 0$ for all $\Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x$, it follows that $0 \in \mathcal{H}_x^{\alpha}$. The uniform exponential bound of Y^{Π} in Prop. 3.2 proves that \mathcal{H}_x^{α} is a norm-bounded subspace of $L^2(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$. Let $H^1, H^2 \in \mathcal{H}_x^{\alpha}$ be such that $H^1 \leq Y^{\Pi^1}$ and $H^2 \leq Y^{\Pi^2}$. Define the control $\Pi := \theta \Pi^1 + (1 - \theta) \Pi^2$ for $\theta \in (0, 1)$. From the proof of Prop. 5.1 in [4], it follows that $\Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x$. Moreover, by uniqueness of paths, $Y^{\Pi} = \theta Y^{\Pi^1} + (1 - \theta) Y^{\Pi^2}$, and hence $H := \theta H^1 + (1 - \theta) H^2 \leq Y^{\Pi}$. This proves the convexity of \mathcal{H}_x^{α} . \Box

Lemma 4.2. \mathcal{H}_{r}^{α} is closed in $L^{2}(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$.

Proof. Choose a sequence H^n in \mathcal{H}_x^{α} which converges to H in $L^2(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$. We can associate a control Π^n to each H^n such that $H^n \leq Y^{\Pi^n}$. Moreover, by the uniform bound on the controls (see Section 3) and (5), we know that $\{\Pi^n\}_n$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$, and, hence by the Dunford-Pettis compactness criterion, there exists $\Pi \in L^1(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$ and a subsequence, also denoted Π^n , such that $\Pi^n \to \Pi$ weakly in $L^1(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$. The question is whether Π is an admissible control or not. Following the arguments of Karatzas and Shreve [11, Section 4], we can prove the existence of a version of Π , still denoted by Π , for which $\Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x$ and $\Pi^n \to \Pi$ weakly. In addition, as in Cvitanić and Karatzas [7, Appendix A], we can show that $B^{\Pi^n} \to B^{\Pi}$, $S^{\Pi^n} \to S^{\Pi}$, and $Y^{\Pi^n} \to Y^{\Pi}$ weakly. Since $H^n \leq Y^{\Pi^n}$ for every n, we conclude $H \leq Y^{\Pi}$, thereby proving the closedness of \mathcal{H}_x^{α} .

Define the functional $\mathcal{I}: \mathcal{H}_x^{\alpha} \to \mathbb{R}$ to be

$$\mathcal{I}(H) = -\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(H_s) \, ds\Big].$$

Lemma 4.3. If $\delta > \alpha/2$, then \mathcal{I} is proper, convex, and lower-semicontinuous with respect to the $L^2(m_\alpha \otimes P)$ - norm.

Proof. From the growth property of V in Prop. 3.3 it follows that \mathcal{I} is proper. Furthermore, since U is assumed to be concave, \mathcal{I} is obviously convex.

To prove the lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{I} , we modify slightly the argument of Cvitanić and Karatzas. Let H^n be a sequence in \mathcal{H}^{α}_x that converges to H in $L^2(m_{\alpha} \otimes P)$. From the sublinear growth of U, there exist positive constants a and b such that $a + bH - U(H) \geq 0$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}_x$. Fatou's lemma gives us

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \left(a + bH_t - U(H_t)\right) dt\Big] \le \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \left(a + bH_t^n - U(H_t^n)\right) dt\Big]$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \left(a + bH_t\right) dt\Big] + \liminf_{n \to \infty} -\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(H_t^n) dt\Big].$$

The last step holds true due to the assumption $\delta > \alpha/2$ since, from Hölder's inequality,

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} H_t \, dt \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} H_t^n \, dt \right] \right| \le \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} |H_t - H_t^n| \, dt \right]$$
$$\le \left(\int_0^\infty e^{-(2\delta - \alpha)t} \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} |H_t - H_t^n|^2 \, dt \right]^{1/2} \to 0.$$

A state of the second stat

Lounds d.J. Hit is should be him to Phil

Briffier Die fractional 22 P.C. - P. E. In Die

Learning 4.2, 16.0 > 447. Minn 2 is printer, complete and brane evolutionarian and more

Proof. Proof the provid prophet of 17 of Prove 2.2 it follows that 2 is failed: Porthermore while 17 is assumed to be compared it is provided enounce.

To prove the anset separation and M, by an interface standard to a provide the respective the sequences $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ and $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ that compares the $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ and $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ that compares the rest $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ and $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ that a substant sequence m and $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ that m is a substant sequence m and $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ and $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ that m is a substant sequence m and $L^{2}(m_{s},m)$ and

. Fun hast step holds time the (6 the succession) à 2 tr/2 pans, firme (650/ar's fragmality. In conclusion,

$$-\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(H_t) \, dt\Big] \le \liminf_{n \to \infty} -\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(H_t^n) \, dt\Big]$$

and hence the lower-semicontinuity of \mathcal{I} follows.

Remark 4.4. We mention that if the utility function $U(\cdot)$ is Hölder continuous, then one can prove, under a slightly different assumption on δ , that the functional \mathcal{I} is continuous (and not merely semicontinuous).

Set

$$\mathcal{V}(x) = -\inf_{H \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}_{+}} \mathcal{I}(H).$$

From Ekeland and Temam [10] we can conclude that there exists a $H^* \in \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}_x$ such that $\mathcal{V}(x) = -\mathcal{I}(H^*)$. We claim that Π^* associated to H^* is an optimal control, that is,

$$V(x) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(Y_t^{\Pi^*}) \, dt\Big].$$

First, observe that since $Y^{\Pi} \in \mathcal{H}_x^{\alpha}$ for every $\pi \in \mathcal{A}_x$, \mathcal{A}_x can be naturally imbedded in \mathcal{H}_x^{α} , which implies $V(x) \leq \mathcal{V}(x)$. We next claim that $H^* = Y^{\Pi^*}$ $m_{\alpha} \otimes P$ - a.e. If not, $H^* < Y^{\Pi^*}$ on a set with positive measure. But this contradicts the optimality of H^* since $Y^{\Pi^*} \in \mathcal{H}_x^{\alpha}$ and U is nondecreasing. Hence,

$$V(x) \le \mathcal{V}(x) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(H_t^*) \, dt\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} U(Y_t^{\Pi^*}) \, dt\Big] \le V(x).$$

Summing up, we have proven the following main theorem:

Theorem 4.5. Suppose $\delta > \alpha/2$. For each $x \in \overline{D}$, there exists an optimal control $\Pi^* \in \mathcal{A}_x$ for the singular stochastic control problem (3) such that (4) holds.

Remark 4.6. Theorem 4.5 may easily be generalized to hold for n risky assets, as is the set-up in [4].

5. The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation

Thm. 4.5 is only of theoretical interest since it says nothing about the structure of the optimal strategies or how we can compute them. A natural way to compute the optimal strategies is via the dynamic programming method, which is based on Bellman's principle of dynamic programming:

Proposition 5.1 (Dynamic programming principle). For any stopping time τ and $t \geq 0$, the value function satisfies

$$V(x) = \sup_{\Pi \in \mathcal{A}_x} \mathbb{E} \Big[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau} e^{-\delta s} U(Y^{\Pi}(s)) \, ds + e^{-\delta(t \wedge \tau)} V(X^{\Pi}(t \wedge \tau)) \Big]. \tag{6}$$

6

In conclusion.

and hence the lower stmicomignity of 7 follows.

binamin's 4.4. No paretion that Y the waity particular definition field was chait and can prove, analyr a shaftiy different anterapter on to that the function of , as electricities (and not merely semicondiment)

138

From Electron and Teamans (Mol. av can coordinate dust there estates a NC 4: WE on It has Diff.) - 11(N⁺), We chains shut II^{*}, reprodukted to N^{*} is an definition estated.

Bush obseque hind shade I'' o 'C be every e C An A, out he wathout should be 'C. 'Volution implies I'(c) 'C V(c). We must claim them block if' a. 60F - a.e. Hend, I'' < 'F' on a set of positive ansactive. Net this emphasizers

Scientific up we have grown the following main theorem:

Theorem 6.6. Suppose 6 is a 2.5 there each a $\in T_{2}$ there eachs in optimical analous $\Pi^{*} \in A_{2}$ for the random variation evolution $\Pi^{*} \in A_{2}$ for the random variation evolution (3) and (4) for the random variation evolution (3) and (4) for the random variation (3) for the random variation (3) and (4) for the random variation (3) for the ra

Rammer data Afrencenn dat bida breide he perimetered to tald for narrahis meaner, de se the relevant of

S. The Manufold Level Seven and and

Thus, 4.5 In only of theoretical interest, describ care mobiling tabout the direction of the optimal manipulation at how the and complete them. A matrixal way to compute the optimal strateging is with the approximation programming method, which is based of Delivaria a relativity of dynamic meet manipulations.

Proposition 0.1 (Dramma must invariant and grades). Ger ang station f has $t \geq 0$, the bills parameter and these

the start and a start of the st

Thanks to the dynamic programming principle, the value function (3) can be associated with the so-called Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, which is the infinitesimal version of (6). For $x = (b, s, y) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$, define a second order degenerate elliptic integro-differential operator \mathcal{A} by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}v &= -\beta y v_y + r b v_b + a s v_s + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 s^2 v_{ss} \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \left(v(b, (1+\eta(z))s, y) - v(x) - \eta(z) s v_s(x) \right) n(dz). \end{aligned}$$

The Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation of our control problem is a second order degenerate elliptic integro-differential variational inequality of the form

$$F(x, v, v_b, v_s, v_y, v_{ss}) = \max \left(U(y) - \delta v + \mathcal{A}v, -v_b + \beta v_y, -(1+\lambda)v_b + v_s, (1-\mu)v_b - v_s \right) = 0.$$
(7)

The point is now that value function (3) as well as the optimal control Π^* (whose existence is guaranteed by Thm. 4.5) can be found by (numerically) solving the fully nonlinear partial differential equation in (7).

The main result of our previous work [4] was a characterization of the value function (3) as the unique constrained viscosity solution [6] of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, which indeed constitutes a starting point for computing (numerically) the optimal value (3) as well as the optimal control Π^* .

Since we have only been able to show that the value function is continuous (see [4]), we cannot interpret the value function as a solution of (7) in the usual classical sense, but we have to resort to a weaker notion of solution that does not require differentiability of candidate solutions. The proper notion of weak solutions turns out to be that of constrained viscosity solutions as described in, e.g., Crandall, Ishii, and Lions [6].

We recall that the value function V is a constrained viscosity solution of (7) if it is simultaneously a viscosity subsolution in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ and a viscosity supersolution in \mathcal{D} . For example, the value function V is a viscosity subsolution of (7) in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ if $\forall \phi \in C^2(\overline{\mathcal{D}})$ (growing at most linearly as $x \to \infty$) we have:

$$\begin{cases} \text{for each } x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}} \text{ s. t. } V \leq \phi \text{ and } (V - \phi)(x) = 0, \\ F(x, \phi, \phi_b, \phi_s, \phi_y, \phi(x)) \geq 0. \end{cases}$$
(8)

A viscosity supersolution is defined similarly, see [4] for details.

The purpose of this section is to give an alternative proof of the viscosity subsolution property of the value function, which is simpler than the proof in [4]. The proof below exploits that we have Thm. 4.5 at our disposal. We refer to [4] for results concerning continuity of the value function as well as uniqueness of the viscosity solution characterization.

Theorem 5.2. The value function (3) is a constrained viscosity solution of (7).

Thunks to the dynamic polycomming principle, the value function (3) can be associated with the so-quird Hamilton Irophi-Britana equation, when is the infinitednal version of (5). For $x = (2, x, y) \in \mathbb{N}$ define a record order deginerary elliptic integro-differential operator A is

The Hamilton-Iscob-Islinant equation of our control problem is a second strike dependente elliptic integro-difficiential variational inequality of the form

in m (in - whe - it ar marks with a the article seconds - site - who) have -

The point is now that where function (3) as well as the optional control II' (where existence is quicked by Thus Address and its fund by (numerically) where the fully annihilate medial Gillerminal equation for (7).

The name result of our previous work [6] was a characterization of the feature interface (3) as the anti-mo-constructory variation of the Barachen involu-Spilmen equation, which indext constructs a starting point for comparing mamentedby) the optical ratio of a work is the optical control fr

Sance we have only have adde to show that the value function is continuous (sea [4]), we cannot have not the ratio function at a satulation of (7) in him word, dimetcal series, has we him to be ratio to reserve in contest rotation of adhere him the art require differentiability of merchology is white rotation of adhere him the solutions terms out to be that of contracted at source of saturation at the proper to the more defined in the former first of a saturation of the proper to the first of activities terms and to be that of a saturation is a saturation at the proper to the solutions terms and to be that of a saturation of a saturation at the proper to the saturation at the contest of the term of the second of the saturation of the satura

We much that the value function V is a transmission value g_{1} and g_{2} approximate (i) if i is simultaneously a value of the value i if i is simultaneously a proving the function $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. For example, the value function V is a value g_{1} and g_{2} is G in G if V is G is G is G if V is G if V is G if V is G if V

A measury reparational management minibule party for the details

The purpose of the sector have a distribute to the sector with he structure pool of the viscal or subsolution property of the value function with he structure than the proof h [4]. The proof below requisits that we have the life that did at our disperse. We will a [4], for results concerning costrative of the value fraction as well as initiatement of the security adopted damagenteeder.

Theorem 5.2. The miles thursday [1] in origination and statistic values of (T)

Proof. The proof of the viscosity supersolution property goes as before [4]. We therefore concentrate on the viscosity subsolution property.

Let ϕ be as in (8). Arguing by contradiction, we suppose that the subsolution inequality (8) is violated. Then, by continuity, there is a nonempty open ball \mathcal{N} centered at x and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $V \leq \phi - \varepsilon$ on $\partial \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{D}$ and in $\overline{\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{D}}$ we have

$$\beta \phi_y - \phi_b \le 0, \quad -(1+\lambda)\phi_b + \phi_s \le 0, \quad (1-\mu)\phi_b - \phi_s \le 0,$$
 (9)

as well as $U(\cdot) - \delta \phi + \mathcal{A} \phi \leq -\varepsilon \delta$.

From Thm. 4.5, there exists an optimal investment-consumption strategy $\Pi^*(t) = (L^*(t), M^*(t), C^*(t)) \in \mathcal{A}_x$. Let $X^*(t) = (B^*(t), S^*(t), Y^*(t))$ denote the corresponding optimal trajectory with $X^*(0) = x$. In Lemma 5.3 below, it is shown that $X^*(t)$ has no control-jumps P - a.s. at x. Hence P - a.s., we have

$$\tau = \inf \{ t \in [0, \infty) : X^*(t) \notin \overline{\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{D}} \} > 0.$$

Let us introduce the short-hand notation $\hat{X}^*(t)$ for the vector

$$\left(B(t-) - \Delta C^*(t) - (1+\lambda)\Delta L^*(t) + (1+\mu)\Delta M^*(t), \\ S(t-) + \Delta L^*(t) - \Delta M^*(t), Y(t-) + \beta \Delta C^*(t) \right),$$

and let $\Delta^{\Pi^*} \phi(t) := \phi(\hat{X}(t)) - \phi(X(t-))$. Note that by the dynamic programming principle (6), we can without loss of generality assume that $\hat{X}^*(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{D}}$. Let $L^{*,c}$, $M^{*,c}$, and $C^{*,c}$ denote the continuous parts of L^* , M^* , and C^* , respectively.

Using Itô's formula for semimartingales together with the inequalities stated above (see 9), we get

$$\begin{split} V(x) &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} U(Y^*(t)) \, dt + e^{-\delta \tau} V(X^*(\tau))\Big] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} U(Y^*(t)) \, dt + e^{-\delta} \phi(X^*(\tau))\Big] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\phi(x) + \int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \Big(U(Y^*(t)) - \delta \phi(X^*(t)) + \mathcal{A}\phi(X^*(t))\Big) \, dt\Big] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \Big(-\phi_b + \beta \phi_y\Big) \, dC^{*,c}(t)\Big] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \Big(-(1+\lambda)\phi_b + \phi_s\Big) \, dL^{*,c}(t)\Big] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} \Big((1-\mu)\phi_b - \phi_s\Big) \, dM^{*,c}(t)\Big] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t \in [0,1] \cap [0,\tau]} e^{-\delta t} \Delta^{\Pi^*} \phi(t)\Big] \leq \phi(x) - \varepsilon \mathbb{E}\big[e^{-\delta \tau}\big] < \phi(x), \end{split}$$

which is a contradiction since $(V - \phi)(x) = 0$.

Lem. 5.3 below, which was used in the proof of Thm. 5.2, is similar to Lem. 3.5 in Davis, Panas, and Zariphopoulou [8].

8

P. H. Benth, R. H. Karlein, Suid E. Heikwans .

Photof, "The proof of this educentic supercollegion, projectly gene achieve the firm the construction of the construction of the second s

Let a be at a YeV. A setting for contrasticities, for any time classifier the setting of the setting of the set of the s

From This so, the other interplane investment commerces stategy $R^{*}(t) = (L^{*}(t), M^{*}(t), T^{*}(t)) = R^{*}(t) = (L^{*}(t), M^{*}(t), M^{$

1.0 < [전 11] 전 1 (2) "조, 1 (4:1 (2) 문제(11) [4:1 (2)]

Lat us introduce the sheet-hand points in X "(1) for the verice

1.8(-1-32) (0) - 17 + 3/AZ (0) + (0 + (0 + 1) A)

Step - 25 - 4 - 51 - 10 - 10 - 6 - 5 + 82 C - 15 -

and let Δ^{22} of a) set (X,Y) = (X,Y) = (X,Y) which due to the demander product of X_{1} is a function of the transmission of the transmis

showe (see \$), we get

Winds is a contradiction society of the should be

Lemma 5.3. Let $A = A(\omega)$ denote the event that the optimal trajectory $X^*(t)$ starting at x = (b, s, y) has an initial control-jump of size $(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C) > 0$. Suppose that the inequalities in (9) hold. Then P(A) = 0.

Proof. Notice that the state (after the control-jump) is

$$\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L,\varepsilon_M,\varepsilon_C) := \left(b - (1+\lambda)\varepsilon_L + (1-\mu)\varepsilon_M - \varepsilon_C, s + \varepsilon_L - \varepsilon_M, y + \beta\varepsilon_C\right).$$

By the dynamic programming principle (6), we can without loss of generality assume that $\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C) \in \overline{\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{D}}$. Again by (6), we have

$$V(x) = \mathbb{E} \Big[V \big(\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C) \big) \Big] = \int_{A(\omega)} V \big(\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C) \big) \, dP + \int_{\Omega - A(\omega)} V(x) \, dP.$$

From this equality it follows that

$$\int_{A(\omega)} \left(V \left(\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C) \right) - V(x) \right) dP = 0,$$

and, since $V \leq \phi$ and $(V - \phi)(x) = 0$ (recall that ϕ comes from (8)),

$$\int_{A(\omega)} \left(\phi \left(\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C) \right) - \phi(x) \right) dP \ge 0.$$
(10)

From (9), we get

$$\phi(\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C)) \le \phi(\hat{x}(\varepsilon, 0, 0)), \quad \forall \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_L,$$
(11)

$$\phi(\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C)) \le \phi(\hat{x}(0, \varepsilon, 0)), \qquad \forall \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_M,$$
(12)

$$\phi(\hat{x}(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C)) \le \phi(\hat{x}(0, 0, \varepsilon)), \quad \forall \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_C.$$
(13)

Suppose $\varepsilon_L > 0$. We then claim that

$$\left[-(1+\lambda)\phi_b(x) + \phi_s(x)\right]P(A) \ge 0.$$
(14)

From (10) and (11) it follows that

$$\int_{A(\omega)} \left(\phi(\hat{x}(\varepsilon, 0, 0)) - \phi(x) \right) dP \ge 0, \qquad \forall \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_L,$$

and therfore by Fatou's lemma

$$\int_{A(\omega)} \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left[\frac{\phi \left(b - (1 + \lambda)\varepsilon, \, s + \varepsilon, \, y \right) - \phi(b, s, y)}{\varepsilon} \right] dP \ge 0.$$

Hence, (14) follows. Similarly, if $\varepsilon_M > 0$, we can use (10) and (12) to prove

$$[(1-\mu)\phi_b(x) - \phi_s(x)]P(A) \ge 0.$$
(15)

Finally, if $\varepsilon_C > 0$, we can use (10) and (13) to prove

$$\left[-\phi_b(x) + \beta\phi_y(x)\right]P(A) \ge 0. \tag{16}$$

Summing up, if at least one of the jump-sizes $\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_C$ is greater than zero, then we can conclude (from (9), (14), (15), (16)) that P(A) = 0.

because his let A = vite provide the owners that the variant memory I fin university of a = 10, a. o. Low are writed example, proop of also (a., e.a., e.g.) is 0, Supplies must be discussion to CD with Third PCA, e.g.

By the dynamic thoughthread intuitible (6), we can dreboth had of generally assume that free, the set of Print assume that free, the set of Print Automatic assume that free the set of the Automatic as the set of the set

From this equality is followed to

$$(0, -1) = (1, 1) = (1, -1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) = (1, 1) =$$

and, since $V < \phi$ and $(V - \phi)(x) = 0$ (secal) that a correct from (eq.)

From (9), swe get -

Suppose $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{L}} > 0$. We then claim this is

From (10) and (11) is follows that

and theritize by Fatou's long

Rence, (14) follows filenter's Regissel, we can use (10) and (12) to prove

$$(1 - \mu) \alpha(\alpha) + \beta_{1}(\alpha) \beta_{1}(\alpha) \geq 0,$$
 (3.1)

Flashy, if an > 0, we can not (00) and (03) or prove

Summing up if at least one of the imposed in the $\beta_{1,1}$ and $\beta_{2,1}$ and $\beta_{2,1}$ in the second in the second in the second interval interval in the second interval interval in the second interval in

References

- F. E. Benth, K. H. Karlsen, and K. Reikvam, Optimal portfolio selection with consumption and nonlinear integro-differential equations with gradient constraint: A viscosity solution approach, Preprint, MaPhySto Research Report No 21, University of Aarhus, Denmark. (1999). To appear in Finance & Stochastics.
- [2] F. E. Benth, K. H. Karlsen, and K. Reikvam, Optimal portfolio management rules in a non-Gaussian market with durability and intertemporal substitution, Preprint No 12, University of Oslo, Norway. (2000). To appear in Finance & Stochastics.
- [3] F. E. Benth, K. H. Karlsen, and K. Reikvam, A note on portfolio management under non-Gaussian logreturns, Preprint, MaPhySto Research Report No 5, University of Aarhus, Denmark. (2000). To appear in Intern. J. Theor. Appl. Finance.
- [4] F. E. Benth, K. H. Karlsen, and K. Reikvam, Portfolio optimization in a Lévy market with intertemporal substitution and transaction costs, Preprint, MaPhySto Research Report No 15, University of Aarhus, Denmark, (2000).
- [5] F. E. Benth, K. H. Karlsen, and K. Reikvam, Finite horizon portfolio optimization in a Lévy market with intertemporal substitution and transaction costs, manuscript in preparation (2000).
- [6] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions, User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* (N.S.) 27 (1992), no. 1, 1–67.
- [7] J. Cvitanić and I. Karatzas, *Hedging and portfolio optimization under transaction costs: A martingale approach*, Math. Finance, **6**(2) (1996), 133-165.
- [8] M. H. A. Davis, V. G. Panas, and T. Zariphopoulou, European option pricing with transaction costs, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **31** (1993), no. 2, 470–493.
- [9] A. Hindy and C. Huang, Optimal consumption and portfolio rules with durability and local substitution, Econometrica, **61** (1993), 85-121.
- [10] I. Ekeland and R. Temam, Convex analysis and variational problems, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1976).
- [11] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve, Connections between optimal stopping and singular stochastic control I. Monotone follower problems, SIAM J. Control Optim., 22(6) (1984), 856-877.

(Benth and Reikvam)

Department of Mathematics, University of Oslo PO Box 1053 Blindern, N-0316 Oslo, Norway *E-mail address*: fredb@math.uio.no and kre@math.uio.no

(Karlsen)

Department of Mathematics, University of Bergen Johs. Brunsgt. 12, N-5008 Bergen, Norway *E-mail address*: kennethk@mi.uib.no

References

- [1] F. E. Bouch, S. E. Karawa, and E. Badanari, Quintul periphic relation with some manyions and multi-some definite differential membras with gradient quark-units A meanity induction approach, Property. MaPar. Sta Danates Report No. 45, Puredo 19, etc. Anatom Danates (1999). To attempt in States of States and States and Anatom Danates (1999). To attempt in States of States and States and States and States and States and States and Anatom Danates (1999). To attempt in States of States and States
- [29] E. M. Barada, K. H. Kaylesan, and K. Hadaman, Optimus distribution adoption in a subing an anno-Henderican material unificial distribution and quantizing-coll constitutions, Program for U.S. Construction of Outor Material (2000). The approximate Science of Science and Not U.S. Construction of Outor Material (2000). The approximate Science of Science and Science and Science and Science and Outor Material (2000). The approximate Science of Science and Science and Science and Science and Science Material (2000). The approximate Science of Science and Science and Science and Science and Science Material (2000).
- [3] F. E. Beddin, K. H. Karban, and K. Sankerga, A ratio an particle memopropert and more Comparison terretures, Pression, Mathematica Research Frequence Mo. 3, 15,099(19)(19)(19), 105 Anthony, Demonstrat, (2000), The approximate Schemer, J. Winner, Appl. Phagmar.
- [4] F. E. Morris, K. H. Karlson, and T. Dekness, Pergelo aptimization of a fight suppliciterm manufactorial meaninghost and draw option outs. Property, MaPhysics Research Report No. 15, University of Astriny, Spannark, (2006).
- [5] F. E. Brutht E. E. E. Manimur, and E. Terserar, Princip harding services applicated in a 2-day market with the interchargeous submitting with transferming party, manuscript in propagation (2012).
- [6] M. G. Crundall, H. Laini, and P. L. Linns, Lencis philo in special multiplica of metals and partial difference of minimum free free free starts. Soc. (5):1111022, pp. 1, 1-67.
- The Contrast and the sources the property of the property of the state of the state
- [8] M. B. A. Darge, V. O. Panari, and T. Tarritorival a Data pair and relian hereita and an ditrainaction areas, 5121 J. J. Computer Vision, 21 (1997), pp. 2, 420–400.
- [9] A. Bindy and O. Huang. Opphical equivanesians and gampling rates intra-filledity and load anisocratical Economycrical, 61 (1993); Ph. 291
- [16] L. Ekeland and R. Trantsi, Convex antipait and variationed problems, Martin-Hullan & Problemm, Con., American (1997).
- [11] L. H. and Sana and A. Maranan, Connections infasted and intelling strain menter. In charge combest 1. Minimum fields or problems, States 1, Control Optics, 124(8) (1994), 856–817.

(singestable lang direct)

separationent of subtractions ics. A subtraction of (Sale-

en se la la sector de la construction de la

(hereine Al)

Department of Mathematics, Financian of Bergen Joins, Brunges, 12, 12, 2008, Bargen, Nethener,

-01



