

Proof of Lemma 5.11

- 1) \exists a DT
- 2) \exists a trad. strategy satisfying $\begin{cases} V(o) = 0 \\ V(l, w) > 0, w \in \Omega \end{cases}$ (5.9)
- 3) \exists a trad. strategy " $\begin{cases} V(o) < 0 \\ V(l, w) > 0, w \in \Omega \end{cases}$ (5.10)

We will show 1) \Leftrightarrow 2) and 2) \Leftrightarrow 3).

1) \Leftrightarrow 2)

1) \Leftarrow 2) A strategy satisfying (5.2) is dominant. In particular, it dominates the strategy $\hat{H} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)^T$, which satisfies $\hat{V}(o) = 0$ and $\hat{V}(l, w) = 0 < V(l, w), w \in \Omega$

1) \Rightarrow 2) Suppose that the strategy \hat{H} dominates the strategy \hat{H} . Then, consider a new strategy $H := \hat{H} - \hat{H}$.
 By linearity of V as a function of H we have that
 $V(o) = \hat{V}(o) - \hat{V}(o) = 0 - 0 = 0$ and
 $V(l, w) = \hat{V}(l, w) - \hat{V}(l, w) > 0, w \in \Omega$
 \hat{H} dominates \hat{H}

2) \Leftrightarrow 3)

2) \Rightarrow 3) Suppose that the trad. strategy H is such that $V(0) = 0$ and $V(t, \omega) > 0, \omega \in \Omega$. Since $B(t, \omega) > 0 \forall \omega \in \Omega$ and $t = 0, T$ one has that $V^*(0) = \frac{V(0)}{B(0)} = 0$ and $V^*(t, \omega) = \frac{V(t, \omega)}{B(t)} > 0 \forall \omega \in \Omega$.

Since $V^*(t) = V^*(0) + G^* \Rightarrow H = (H_0, H_1, \dots, H_N)^T$ must satisfy $G^*(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^N H_n \Delta S^n(\omega) > 0$.

So it makes sense to consider the quantity

$$\delta := \min_{\omega \in \Omega} G^*(\omega) > 0$$

Introduce the strategy $\hat{H} = (\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1, \dots, \hat{H}_N)^T$ satisfying

$$\hat{H}_n := H_n, \quad n = 1, \dots, N$$

$$\hat{H}_0 = - \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(0) - \delta$$

Then, using that $\tilde{V}^*(t) = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{H}_n S_n^*(t)$ we get

$$\tilde{V}^*(0) = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(0) = -\delta < 0$$

and $\tilde{V}^*(t, \omega) = \tilde{V}^*(0) + \tilde{G}^*(\omega) = -\delta + \tilde{G}^*(\omega) \geq 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega$.

↑
By the def of δ

3) \Rightarrow 2)

Suppose that the ind. stat. \tilde{V} is such that $\tilde{V}(0) < 0$
and $V(z, \omega) \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in \Lambda$. Again, due to $B(z, \omega) > 0$,
we have that

$$\tilde{V}^*(0) = \frac{V(0)}{B(0)} < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{V}^*(z, \omega) = \frac{V(z, \omega)}{B(z)} \geq 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Lambda.$$

Since $\hat{V}^*(z, \omega) = \tilde{V}^*(0) + \hat{G}^*(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Lambda$, \hat{G}^* must satisfy
that $\hat{G}^* > 0 \quad \forall \omega \in \Lambda$.

Introduce the strategy $H = (H_0, H_1, \dots, H_N)^T$ with

$$H_n = \tilde{H}_n \quad n = 1, \dots, N.$$

$$H_0 = - \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{H}_n S_n^*(0)$$

Then,
$$V^*(0) = H_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{H}_n S_n^*(0) = 0$$

$$V^*(z, \omega) = V^*(0) + G^*(\omega) = 0 + \hat{G}^* > 0, \quad \forall \omega \in \Lambda.$$

Proof 5.13

1) Let π be a LPM.

Take $H = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Then, equation (5.12)

$$H_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(0) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi(\omega) \left(H_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(\omega) \right)$$

$$H_0 = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi(\omega) H_0 \quad (\Rightarrow) \quad \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi(\omega) = 1 \quad \checkmark$$

Combined with $\pi > 0$, we can conclude.

2) \Rightarrow) By 1) π is a prob. measure. For $i = 1, \dots, N$

the strategy $H(i) = (S_{0i}, S_{1i}, \dots, S_{Ni})$

$S_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i=j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$. Then, using equation (5.12)

$$\text{we get } S_i^*(0) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi(\omega) S_i^*(\omega).$$

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that π is a prob. meas. and (3.13) holds.
Then π is a non-negative and

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(0) &= H_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(0) \\ &= H_0 \left(\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi(\omega) \right) + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n \left(\sum_{\omega} S_n^*(L, \omega) \pi(\omega) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi(\omega) \left(H_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N H_n S_n^*(L, \omega) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \pi V^*(L, \omega) \end{aligned}$$

that is (3.11) is satisfied.

Proof of Lemma 5.16

The proof will be based on linear programming and duality theory.

Let $\bar{S}^*(o) = (B^*(o), S_1^*(o), \dots, S_n^*(o))^T$ and consider

the linear programming problem

$$(P) \max \{ c^T \pi : S^{*T}(1, n) \pi = \bar{S}^*(o), \pi \geq 0 \}$$

with associated dual problem given by

$$(D) \min \{ \bar{S}^{*T}(o) H : S^{*(1, n)} H \geq 0 \}$$

\Rightarrow) Let $\hat{\pi} = (\hat{\pi}_1, \dots, \hat{\pi}_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^k$ be a LPM.

Then, we have that $\pi \geq 0$ and

$$\bar{S}^*(o) = E \hat{\pi} [\bar{S}^*(o)] = S^{*T}(1, n) \hat{\pi}$$

hence $\hat{\pi}$ belongs to the feasible set for (P).

On the other hand the optimal value of (P) is 0 and it is obviously attained by \hat{x} .

By strong duality, we have that \exists an optimal solution \hat{H} for (D) such that has the same optimal value as the primal problem (P), that is,

$$0 = (\bar{S}^{*T}(\cdot)) \hat{H} = 1 \hat{H}_1 + S_2^*(\cdot) \hat{H}_2 + \dots + S_n^*(\cdot) \hat{H}_n = \hat{V}^*(\cdot)$$

$$0 \leq S^*(1, \Omega) \hat{H} = \hat{V}^*(1) \Rightarrow V^*(1, \omega) \geq 0 \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

In addition, since the optimal value is 0, we can conclude that $\nexists H$ such that $V^*(1) \geq 0$ and $V^*(0) < 0$, because it will contradict that \hat{H} is optimal for (D).

By Lemma 5.11, we can conclude \nexists DTS.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose \nexists DTS. By Lemma 5.11, this is equivalent to \nexists a dual strategy H satisfying $V^*(0) < 0$ and $V^*(1) \geq 0$

This means that 0 is a lower bound for the optimal value of (D). Indeed, the strategy $H = (0, \dots, 0)^T$ is a solution of (D)

By strong duality, again, we can conclude that $\hat{\pi}$ solving the problem (P) with optimal value 0. This means that $\hat{\pi}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (B^*(0), S_1^*(0), \dots, S_N^*(0))^T &= \bar{J}^*(0) = S^{*T}(2, 1) \hat{\pi} \\ &= E_{\hat{\pi}} [\bar{J}^*(1)] \end{aligned}$$

and $\hat{\pi} \geq 0 \Rightarrow \hat{\pi}$ is a LPM.