

Instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio
pricing in a regime-switching financial model

Łukasz Delong* and **Antoon Pelsser†**

December 13, 2013

*Warsaw School of Economics, Al. Niepodległości 162, Warsaw, Poland

†Maastricht University, Tongersestraat 53, Maastricht, The Netherlands

Abstract

We study hedging and pricing of claims in a non-Markovian regime-switching financial model. Our financial market consists of a bank account and a risky asset whose dynamics are driven by a Brownian motion and a multivariate counting process with stochastic intensities. The counting process is used to model the switching behavior for the states of the economy. We assume that the trajectory of the risky asset is continuous between the transition times for the states of the economy and that the value of the risky asset jumps at the time of the transition. We find the hedging strategy which minimizes the instantaneous mean-variance risk of the hedger's surplus and we set the price so that the instantaneous Sharpe ratio of the hedger's surplus equals a predefined target. We discuss key properties of our optimal price and optimal hedging strategy.

Keywords: Counting process, instantaneous mean-variance risk, instantaneous Sharpe ratio, no-good-deal pricing, model ambiguity, backward stochastic differential equations.

1 Introduction

Pricing and hedging in incomplete markets is the most important subject in the financial literature. Despite numerous papers, there is still a need to develop new pricing and hedging methods and derive prices and hedging strategies in realistic financial models. In this paper we focus on instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing of claims in a regime-switching financial model.

Empirical studies show that regime-switching models can explain empirical behaviors of many economic and financial data, especially the long term behavior of these data, see Hamilton [18], Hardy [19], Mamon and Elliott [24]. The rationale behind the regime-switching framework is that the financial market may switch between a low-volatility state and a high-volatility state, or even between more states representing the conditions of the economy. The switching behavior for the states of the financial market can be attributed to structural changes in economic conditions and changes in business environments. It is clear that there are significant fluctuations in economic variables over a long period of time. Hence, the switching behavior of the states of the financial market (the states of the economy) should be particularly incorporated in models used for valuation of long-term derivatives. We point out that the use of regime-switching models has been recommended by the American Academy of Actuaries and the Canadian Institute of Actuaries for valuation of long-term financial guarantees embedded in insurance contracts.

In this paper we consider a non-Markovian regime-switching financial model. The dynamics of a bank account and a risky asset are driven by a Brownian motion and a multivariate counting process with stochastic intensities. The interest rate, drift, volatility and intensities fluctuate over time and, in particular, they depend on the state (regime) of the economy which is modelled by the multivariate counting process. We assume that the trajectory of the risky asset is continuous between the transition times for the states of the economy and that the value of the risky asset jumps at the transition time. Such a dynamics of the risky asset clearly agrees with the idea of the switching behavior for the financial market. Since we use stochastic transition intensities, we can model an effect in which not only the stock price is affected by the transitions between the states of the economy but also the stock price determines the transition intensities, see Elliott et. al. [17] for a financial motivation of a so-called feedback effect. The goal is to price and hedge unattainable contingent claims in our general regime-switching financial model.

Pricing and hedging in regime-switching models have gained a lot of interest in the literature, see Donnelly and Heunis [14], Elliott et. al. [17], Elliott et. al. [16], Elliott et. al. [15], Siu et. al. [28], Siu [29], Wu and Li [30], where risk minimization, quadratic hedging, multi-period Markowitz optimization, the Esscher transform are applied. In this paper we use a different pricing and hedging objective and we investigate instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing. We should point out that in this paper we in fact consider

three pricing and hedging approaches: instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing, no-good-deal pricing, and pricing and hedging under model ambiguity, which are equivalent under proper specification.

Bayraktar and Young [2], Young [31], Bayraktar et. al. [3] were the first to apply instantaneous variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing. They find the hedging strategy which minimizes the instantaneous variance (the quadratic variation) of the surplus (the difference between the hedging portfolio and the price of a claim) and set the price so that the instantaneous Sharpe ratio of the surplus equals a predefined target. Bayraktar and Young [2] use this approach to price and hedge claims contingent on a non-tradeable financial risk, and Bayraktar et. al. [3], Young [31] use this approach to price stochastic mortality risk in insurance models. Interestingly, the authors show the equivalence between the local variance minimization under the Sharpe ratio constraint and no-good-deal pricing, which was popularized by Cochrane and Saá-Requejo [8] and Björk and Slinko [6]. Leitner [22] deals with an infinitesimal mean-variance risk measure of the surplus and a robust expectation of the terminal surplus under model ambiguity. He finds the hedging strategies which minimize both risk measures and the prices which make the risk measures vanish. Leitner [22] shows that both strategies and prices coincide in a diffusion model with a non-tradeable risk factor. Finally, Delong [11] considers a general combined financial and insurance model. He derives the optimal hedging strategy and the optimal price by minimizing the infinitesimal mean-variance risk measure of the surplus and by setting the infinitesimal Sharpe ratio of the surplus at a predefined level. Delong [11] also shows that the optimal strategies coincide with the strategies derived under no-good-deal pricing and pricing and hedging under model ambiguity. We point out that none of the above papers covers the case of a regime-switching financial market. We are aware that Donnelly [13] finds a no-good-deal price of a contingent claim in a regime-switching financial model. However, she considers a Markovian dynamics of the stock without jumps and without the feedback effect of the stock on the transition intensities. She also does not investigate the optimal hedging strategy which can be derived by using instantaneous mean-variance hedging or hedging under model ambiguity. Consequently, to the best of our knowledge the complete characterization of the optimal price and the optimal hedging strategy under instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing (no-good-deal pricing and robust pricing and hedging under model ambiguity) in a general non-Markovian regime-switching model is still missing. This paper fills this gap. We would like to point out that for the first time we derive the optimal price and the optimal hedging strategy under the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and the instantaneous Sharpe ratio pricing objective in a general non-Markovian regime-switching financial model with the stock the value of which changes in a discontinuous way at the transition times and with the feedback effect under which the stock affects the transition intensities.

We apply Backward Stochastic Differential Equations (BSDEs) to solve our optimization problems. For a theory of BSDEs we refer to Crépey [10] and Delong [12]. We remark that

our mathematical techniques are similar to the one used in Delong [11]. However, some non-trivial modifications are introduced since our stock price dynamics is not continuous. We characterize the optimal price and the optimal hedging strategy with a unique solution to a nonlinear, Lipschitz BSDE with jumps. It is known that a measure solution (an arbitrage-free representation of the price) may not exist and a comparison principle (monotonicity of the pricing operator) may fail for a BSDE with jumps, see Barles et. al. [1], Royer [27], Delong [11], Delong [12]. However, we provide a simple, new condition under which the optimal price (the solution to the BSDE with jumps) is arbitrage-free and monotone with respect to the terminal claim and the Sharpe ratio. We also interpret the optimal hedging strategy as a delta-hedging strategy with a correction term reflecting the use of the expected profit requirement in the hedging objective.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the regime-switching financial model. In Section 3 we describe our pricing and hedging approach and we provide an additional motivation for the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing by giving a link to no-good-deal pricing and robust pricing and hedging under model ambiguity. In Section 4 we solve our optimization problem. Key properties of the optimal hedging strategy and the optimal price are investigated in Section 5. A numerical example is discussed in Section 6.

2 The regime-switching financial model

We deal with a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with a filtration $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and a finite time horizon $T < \infty$. We assume that \mathcal{F} satisfies the usual hypotheses of completeness (\mathcal{F}_0 contains all sets of \mathbb{P} -measure zero) and right continuity ($\mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_{t+}$). On the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ we define an \mathcal{F} -adapted Brownian motion $W = (W(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ and an \mathcal{F} -adapted multivariate counting process $N = (N_1(t), \dots, N_I(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$.

We consider an economy which can be in one of I states (regimes) and switches between those states randomly. For $i = 1, \dots, I$, the counting process N_i counts the number of transitions of the economy into the state i . We assume that

(A1) the counting process N_i has intensity $\lambda_i(t)$ where $\lambda_i : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an \mathcal{F} -predictable, bounded process.

Consequently, the compensated counting process

$$\tilde{N}_i(t) = N_i(t) - \int_0^t \lambda_i(s) ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I,$$

is an \mathcal{F} -martingale, see Chapters XI.1 and XI.4 in He et. al. [20]. We remark that $\lambda_i(t)$ is an intensity of the transition of the economy into state i at time t . Furthermore, let $J = (J(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ denote an \mathcal{F} -adapted process which indicates the current state of the

economy. If the economy is in a regime $k \in \{1, \dots, I\}$ at the initial point of time, then the dynamics of the process J is given the stochastic differential equation

$$dJ(t) = \sum_{i=1}^I (i - J(t-)) dN_i(t), \quad J(0) = k \in \{1, \dots, I\},$$

A time-homogeneous Markov process J arises if we choose $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i(J(t-))$.

The financial market consists of a risk-free bank account and a risky asset. The dynamics of the risk-free bank account $B = (B(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ is given by the differential equation

$$\frac{dB(t)}{B(t)} = r(t)dt, \quad B(0) = 1, \quad (2.1)$$

and the dynamics of the risky asset $S = (S(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ is described by the stochastic differential equation

$$\frac{dS(t)}{S(t-)} = \mu(t)dt + \sigma(t)dW(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i(t)d\tilde{N}_i(t), \quad S(0) = 1. \quad (2.2)$$

We assume that

(A2) $r, \mu, \sigma, (\gamma_i)_{i=1, \dots, I} : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are \mathcal{F} -predictable, bounded processes such that there exists a unique solution S to (2.2). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t) &\geq r(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ |\delta(t)|^2 &= |\sigma(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) \geq \epsilon > 0, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \gamma_i(t) &> -1, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I. \end{aligned}$$

These conditions are standard in financial modelling. The first condition is clear. The second condition is a non-degeneracy condition for the volatility of the risky asset return. The third condition guarantees that the price process S , which solves (2.2), is strictly positive, see Theorem 4.61 in Jacod and Shiryaev [21]. We point out that we deal with a non-Markovian model. All parameters of the model (2.1)-(2.2) are driven by the Brownian motion and the multivariate counting process. The interest rate, drift, volatility, jump amplitudes, intensities fluctuate and they depend on the past and current conditions of the economy and the financial market. Let us also notice that if the economy remains in a state, then the dynamics of the risky asset is continuous. However, if a transition into a different state occurs, then the value of the risky asset changes in a discontinuous way at the time of the transition. In the sequel we use the following notation for the instantaneous variance of the risky asset return

$$|\delta(t)|^2 = |\sigma(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t),$$

and for the instantaneous Sharpe ratio of the risky asset

$$\theta(t) = \frac{\mu(t) - r(t)}{\delta(t)}.$$

The most important and practically relevant example of the financial model (2.1)-(2.2) arises when the coefficients r, μ, σ, γ_i depend only on the current state of the economy and the intensities λ_i depend on the current state of the economy and the current value of the risky asset. In that case we investigate the dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dB(t)}{B(t)} &= r(J(t-))dt, \\ \frac{dS(t)}{S(t-)} &= \mu(J(t-))dt + \sigma(J(t-))dW(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i(J(t-))d\tilde{N}_i(t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where the counting process N_i has intensity $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i(J(t-), S(t-))$ and J indicates the current state of the economy. Such a model is called a Markov-regime-switching since (S, J) is a Markov process. We remark that $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i(J(t-), S(t-))$ denotes an intensity of the transition into state i at time t given the economy is in state $J(t-)$ and the stock price equals $S(t-)$. The dependence $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i(J(t-), S(t-))$ models the so-called feedback effect in the market, see Elliott et. al. [17] for a motivation. The complete probabilistic description of regime-switching models can be found in Crépey [9].

3 Instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing

Let ξ be a contingent claim in the regime-switching financial market (2.1)-(2.2) which has to be covered at time T . We are interested in finding a hedging strategy and a price of the claim ξ .

Let $\pi = (\pi(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ denote a hedging strategy, i.e. the amount of wealth which is invested into the risky asset. We introduce the set of admissible hedging strategies.

Definition 3.1. *A strategy $\pi := (\pi(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ is called admissible, written $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$, if it satisfies the conditions:*

1. $\pi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an \mathcal{F} -predictable process,
2. $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T |\pi(t)|^2 dt] < \infty$.

The price of the claim is modelled as a solution to a Backward Stochastic Differential Equation (BSDE). We assume that the price process $Y := (Y(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ of the claim ξ solves the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned} Y(t) &= \xi + \int_t^T (-Y(s-)r(s) - f(s))ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T Z(s)dW(s) - \int_t^T \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(s)d\tilde{N}_i(s), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where f is the generator of the equation which has to be determined. The assumption that the price solves a BSDE is reasonable. First of all, we can view the price as a dynamic risk

measure, so it should satisfy a BSDE, see Chapter 13 in Delong [12]. Secondly, if the price is calculated as the conditional expected value of the discounted pay-off under an equivalent probability measure, then it satisfies a BSDE, see Chapters 3.3 and 3.4 in Delong [12]. Hence, our price dynamics (3.1) with the generator f can be justified. If we decide on the form of the generator f , then the price of the claim ξ can be defined. In order to determine the generator f , we use instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing.

First, we define the hedging portfolio. The dynamics of the hedging portfolio $X^\pi := (X^\pi(t), 0 \leq t \leq T)$ under an admissible hedging strategy $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$ is given by the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} dX^\pi(t) &= \pi(t)(\mu(t)dt + \sigma(t)dW(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i(t)d\tilde{N}_i(t)) \\ &\quad + (X^\pi(t-) - \pi(t))r(t)dt, \\ X^\pi(0) &= x. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we define the surplus process $S^\pi(t) = X^\pi(t) - Y(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, which models the profit or the loss of the hedger resulting from the past investment and the future liability. The surplus process can also be called a hedging error. The dynamics of the surplus S^π is described by the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} dS^\pi(t) &= (\pi(t)(\mu(t) - r(t)) + S^\pi(t-)r(t) - f(t))dt + (\pi(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t))dW(t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^I (\pi(t)\gamma_i(t) - U_i(t))d\tilde{N}_i(t). \end{aligned}$$

By standard properties of stochastic integrals, see Theorems II.20, 28, 29, 39 in Protter [26], we can derive the expected infinitesimal return on the surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[dS^\pi(t) - S^\pi(t-)r(t)dt | \mathcal{F}_{t-}] \\ = \pi(t)(\mu(t) - r(t))dt - f(t)dt, \quad 0 < t \leq T, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and the expected infinitesimal quadratic variation of the surplus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[d[S^\pi, S^\pi](t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}] &= |\pi(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^I |\pi(t)\gamma_i(t) - U_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) dt, \quad 0 < t \leq T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Our goal is to find an admissible hedging strategy $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$ which minimizes the instantaneous mean-variance risk of the surplus

$$\rho(S^\pi) = L(t) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[d[S^\pi, S^\pi](t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}] / dt} - (\mathbb{E}[dS^\pi(t) - S^\pi(t-)r(t)dt | \mathcal{F}_{t-}] / dt), \quad (3.4)$$

for all $t \in (0, T]$, and set the price of ξ (find the generator f of the BSDE (3.1)) in such a way that the instantaneous Sharpe ratio of the surplus equals a predefined target L , i.e.

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[dS^\pi(t) - S^\pi(t-)r(t)dt | \mathcal{F}_{t-}] / dt}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[d[S^\pi, S^\pi](t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}] / dt}} = L(t), \quad (3.5)$$

for all $t \in (0, T]$. As the result, the instantaneous mean-variance risk of the surplus (3.4) under the optimal price and hedging strategy is set to zero. The hedging and pricing objectives (3.4)-(3.5) are called the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing. We shall assume that

(A3) L is an \mathcal{F} -predictable process such that $L(t) \geq \theta(t) + \epsilon$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Since the Sharpe ratio of the surplus L is an \mathcal{F} -predictable process, it can depend on the economy and the financial market. In particular, the hedger may use different Sharpe ratios in different states of the economy. Such an assumption is important from the practical point of view since investors have different profit expectations in a bull market and in a bear market. We also require that the Sharpe ratio of the surplus is strictly greater than the Sharpe ratio of the risky asset. Such an assumption is obvious since the hedger trading ξ would require a Sharpe ratio L which is strictly greater than the Sharpe ratio θ which can be earned by simply investing in the stock S .

Bayraktar and Young [2], Young [31] and Bayraktar et. al. [3] have advocated the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing for hedging and pricing financial and insurance risks. Let us remark that the hedging and pricing objectives (3.4)-(3.5) are easy to communicate, are based on the first two moments of the hedging error, are related to the Markowitz portfolio selection problem and involve a Sharpe ratio which is well understood by investors. These four features already make the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing an appealing method for pricing and hedging risks in incomplete markets. Interestingly, the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing can be related to no-good-deal pricing and robust pricing and hedging under model ambiguity.

It turns out that the price derived under the instantaneous Sharpe ratio pricing (3.5) is equivalent to the price derived under no-good-deal pricing, see Bayraktar et. al. [3], Bayraktar and Young [2], Delong [11], Young [31]. Hence, the theory of no-good-deal pricing gives us an additional justification for the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing. The no-good-deal price of the claim ξ is defined as a solution to the following optimization problem

$$Y(t) = \sup_{(\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}} [e^{-\int_t^T r(s) ds} \xi | \mathcal{F}_t], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}$ is an equivalent martingale measure. Under no-good-deal pricing we price a claim with a least favorable pricing measure from a set of equivalent martingale measures. The set of equivalent martingale measures is defined by the Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}}{d\mathbb{P}} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = M^{\psi, \phi}(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{Q},$$

where

$$\frac{dM^{\psi, \phi}(t)}{M^{\psi, \phi}(t-)} = -\psi(t)dW(t) - \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i(t)d\tilde{N}_i(t), \quad M(0) = 1, \quad (\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{Q},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} = & \left\{ \mathcal{F}\text{-predictable processes } (\psi, \phi) = (\psi, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_I) \text{ such that} \right. \\ & |\psi(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\phi_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) \leq |L(t)|^2, \\ & \psi(t)\sigma(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t) = \mu(t) - r(t), \\ & \left. \phi_i(t) < 1, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us briefly explain the conditions from the set \mathcal{Q} . The third condition is clear as it guarantees that $M^{\psi, \phi}$ is strictly positive, see Theorem 4.61 in Jacod and Shiryaev [21]. Recalling the Girsanov's theorem, see Theorem 2.5.1 in Delong [12], we can derive the dynamics of the stock

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS(t)}{S(t-)} = & (\mu(t) - \psi(t)\sigma(t) - \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t))dt \\ & + \sigma(t)dW^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}}(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i(t)d\tilde{N}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}}(t), \end{aligned}$$

and we can observe that the second condition implies that the discounted stock process is a $\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}$ -martingale for any $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $M^{\phi, \psi}$ defines a set of equivalent martingale measures for the market (2.1)-(2.2). Finally, by the Girsanov's theorem and standard arguments for BSDEs, see Chapters 3.3 and 3.4 in Delong [12], we deduce that any arbitrage-free price process $Y^{\psi, \phi}(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}}[e^{-\int_t^T r(s)ds}\xi | \mathcal{F}_t]$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, $(\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{Q}$, has the dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} dY^{\psi, \phi}(t) = & Y^{\psi, \phi}(t-)r(t)dt + Z^{\psi, \phi}(t)\psi(t)dt + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i^{\psi, \phi}(t)\phi_i(t)\lambda_i(t)dt \\ & + Z^{\phi, \psi}(t)dt + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i^{\psi, \phi}(t)d\tilde{N}_i(t), \\ Y^{\psi, \phi}(T) = & \xi. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

We can derive the bound for the instantaneous Sharpe ratio of the arbitrage-free price process $Y^{\psi, \phi}$ of ξ :

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}[dY^{\psi, \phi}(t) - Y^{\psi, \phi}(t-)r(t)dt | \mathcal{F}_{t-}]/dt}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[d[Y^{\psi, \phi}, Y^{\psi, \phi}](t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}]/dt}} \right| = & \frac{|Z^{\psi, \phi}(t)\psi(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i^{\psi, \phi}(t)\phi_i(t)\lambda_i(t)|}{\sqrt{|Z^{\psi, \phi}(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i^{\psi, \phi}(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t)}} \\ \leq & \sqrt{|\psi(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\phi_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that the first condition in \mathcal{Q} implies that the instantaneous Sharpe ratio of an arbitrage-free price process of the claim ξ is bounded by L . The process L defines a so-called no-good-deal range in the financial market and it represents the bound on possible

gains in the financial market measured by the instantaneous Sharpe ratio. The existence of such a maximal gain L is justified by empirical financial data, see Cochrane and Saá-Requejo [8], Björk and Slinko [6] for motivation. Hence, under the no-good-deal pricing (3.6) we price the claim ξ with a least favorable pricing measure under the Sharpe ratio constraint which excludes too high (and unrealistic) gains which could be earned (but only theoretically) by writing the contract with an arbitrary high price. We remark that by the least favorable pricing measure we mean a measure which leads to the highest expected pay-off from the claim.

We solve the no-good-deal pricing problem (3.6) in Section 5.1, and we observe the equivalence between (3.6) and the instantaneous Sharpe ratio pricing (3.5).

The price and the hedging strategy derived under the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing (3.4)-(3.5) also coincide with the price and the hedging strategy derived under robust pricing and hedging under model ambiguity, see Leitner [22], Delong [11], Pelsser [25]. The objective of robust pricing and hedging under model ambiguity gives us another justification for using the objective of instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing. Let us introduce a set which consists of equivalent measures defined by the Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^{\psi,\phi}}{d\mathbb{P}} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = M^{\psi,\phi}(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{P},$$

and

$$\frac{dM^{\psi,\phi}(t)}{M^{\psi,\phi}(t-)} = -\psi(t)dW(t) - \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i(t)d\tilde{N}_i(t), \quad M(0) = 1, \quad (\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{P},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} = & \left\{ \mathcal{F} - \text{predictable processes } (\psi, \phi) = (\psi, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_I) \text{ such that} \right. \\ & |\psi(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\phi_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) \leq |L(t)|^2, \\ & \left. \phi_i(t) < 1, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}$. We now define the price and the hedging strategy as a solution to the following robust optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} Y(t) = & \inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{(\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi,\phi}} \left[- \left(e^{-\int_t^T r(s)ds} X^\pi(T) - X(t) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - e^{-\int_t^T r(s)ds} F \right) \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

The set \mathcal{P} represents different beliefs (different assumptions) about the parameters or the evolution of the risk factors in our model. One way of determining the set \mathcal{P} for ambiguity modelling is to specify confidence sets around the estimates of the parameters and to take for \mathcal{P} the class of all measures that are consistent with these confidence sets. Then, the process L

can be interpreted as an estimation error. Alternatively, the elements of \mathcal{P} can be interpreted as prior models which describe probabilities of future scenarios for the risk factors. Then, the process L can define the range of equivalent probabilities for every scenario. Hence, under the objective of pricing and hedging under model ambiguity (3.8) we aim to find a hedging strategy for the claim ξ which minimizes the expected shortfall in the terminal surplus under a least favorable measure describing future scenarios and we price the claim ξ with a value which offsets this worst expected shortfall.

The equivalence between the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing (3.4)-(3.5) and the pricing and hedging under model ambiguity (3.8) is not proved in this paper. Details can be obtained from the authors upon the request. We remark that the proof of the equivalence can be established by modifying the steps of the proofs from Becherer [5], Delong [11] and Chapter 12.1 in Delong [12].

Let us point out that the theories of no-good-deal pricing and pricing and hedging under model ambiguity provide us with additional interpretations of the Sharpe ratio coefficient L which is used in our mean-variance objective.

4 The optimal price and the optimal hedging strategy

We characterize the optimal hedging strategy and the optimal price process which solve (3.4)-(3.5) with a solution to a Backward Stochastic Differential Equation. In order to use the theory of BSDEs, we assume that the weak property of predictable representation holds, see Proposition 7.5 in Crépey [9] and Chapter XIII.2 in He et. al. [20], i.e.

(A4) every $(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{F})$ local martingale M has the representation

$$M(t) = M(0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{Z}(s) dW(s) + \int_0^t \sum_{i=1}^I \mathcal{U}_i(s) d\tilde{N}_i(s) \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

with \mathcal{F} -predictable processes $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_I)$ which are integrable in the Itô sense.

This assumption is satisfied if we define the probability space and the driving processes in a appropriate way, see Becherer [4] and Crépey [9].

We present the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 4.1. *We investigate the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing (3.4)-(3.5) of the claim ξ . Let ξ be an \mathcal{F} -measurable claim such that $\mathbb{E}[|\xi|^2] < \infty$, and*

assume that (A1)-(A4) hold. Consider the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(t) = & \xi + \int_t^T \left(-Y(s)r(s) - \frac{Z(s)\sigma(s) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(s)\gamma_i(s)\lambda_i(s)}{\delta(s)}\theta(s) \right. \\
& + \sqrt{|L(s)|^2 - |\theta(s)|^2} \\
& \cdot \sqrt{|Z(s)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i(s)|^2\lambda_i(s) - \frac{|Z(s)\sigma(s) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(s)\gamma_i(s)\lambda_i(s)|^2}{|\delta(s)|^2}} \Big) ds \\
& - \int_t^T Z(s)dW(s) - \int_t^T \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(s)d\tilde{N}_i(s), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{4.1}
\end{aligned}$$

with its unique solution (Y, Z, U_1, \dots, U_I) . The optimal admissible hedging strategy $\pi^* \in \mathcal{A}$ for ξ is of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi^*(t) = & \frac{Z(t)\sigma(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)}{|\delta(t)|^2} \\
& + \frac{\theta(t)}{\delta(t)\sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2}} \\
& \cdot \sqrt{|Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i(t)|^2\lambda_i(t) - \frac{|Z(t)\sigma(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)|^2}{|\delta(t)|^2}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{4.2}
\end{aligned}$$

and the price process of ξ is given by Y .

Proof:

Step 1) First, we find the optimal solution to our optimization problem (3.4). By (3.2) and (3.3) we have to find a minimizer of the function

$$h(\pi) = L \sqrt{|\pi\sigma - z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\pi\gamma_i - u_i|^2\lambda_i} - \pi(\mu - r).$$

Since (A3) holds, then $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow +\infty} h(\pi) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow -\infty} h(\pi) = +\infty$. Consequently, there exists an odd number of extreme points of h and at least one minimizer of h . We can notice that the function h is differentiable everywhere, except at $\pi = \frac{z}{\sigma}$ if $\frac{z}{\sigma} = \frac{u_i}{\gamma_i}$. Hence, let us find stationary points of h by solving the equation

$$0 = h'(\pi) = L \frac{(\pi\sigma - z)\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I (\pi\gamma_i - u_i)\gamma_i\lambda_i}{\sqrt{|\pi\sigma - z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\pi\gamma_i - u_i|^2\lambda_i}} - (\mu - r). \tag{4.3}$$

Given that the stationary point π must satisfy

$$0 \leq (\pi\sigma - z)\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I (\pi\gamma_i - u_i)\gamma_i\lambda_i = \pi(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2\lambda_i) - z\sigma - \sum_{i=1}^I u_i\gamma_i\lambda_i, \tag{4.4}$$

we end up with the quadratic equation

$$\frac{(\mu - r)^2}{L^2} (|\pi\sigma - z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\pi\gamma_i - u_i|^2\lambda_i) = |(\pi\sigma - z)\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I (\pi\gamma_i - u_i)\gamma_i\lambda_i|^2,$$

which after easy, but tedious, calculations reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi^2 \left(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i \lambda_i \right) \left(\left(\frac{\mu-r}{L} \right)^2 - \sigma^2 - \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i \lambda_i \right) \\
& + 2\pi \left(z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i \right) \left(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i \lambda_i - \left(\frac{\mu-r}{L} \right)^2 \right) \\
& + \left(\frac{\mu-r}{L} \right)^2 \left(z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i^2 \lambda_i \right) - \left(z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i \right)^2 = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

We can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta &= 4 \left(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i - \left(\frac{\mu-r}{L} \right)^2 \right) \left(\frac{\mu-r}{L} \right)^2 \left(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i^2 \lambda_i - \frac{(z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i)^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and we obtain that the quadratic equation (4.5) has two roots

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_1^* &= \frac{z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i} \\
&\quad + \frac{\mu-r}{(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i) \sqrt{L^2 - \frac{(\mu-r)^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i}}} \sqrt{z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i^2 \lambda_i - \frac{(z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i)^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i}}, \\
\pi_2^* &= \frac{z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i} \\
&\quad - \frac{\mu-r}{(\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i) \sqrt{L^2 - \frac{(\mu-r)^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i}}} \sqrt{z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i^2 \lambda_i - \frac{(z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i)^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that only π_1^* satisfies (4.4). By the properties of h we can now conclude that π_1^* is the unique minimizer of the function h . From (3.5) we immediately deduce that the optimal generator f^* of the BSDE is given by the formula

$$f^* = \pi_1^* (\mu - r) - L \sqrt{|\pi_1^* \sigma - z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\pi_1^* \gamma_i - u_i|^2 \lambda_i},$$

and recalling (4.3) we derive

$$f^* = \pi_1^* (\mu - r) - \frac{L^2}{\mu - r} \left((\pi_1^* \sigma - z) \sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I (\pi_1^* \gamma_i - u_i) \gamma_i \lambda_i \right).$$

Substituting π_1^* , we obtain the generator of our BSDE.

Step 2) We prove the existence of a unique solution to the BSDE (4.1). We can notice that the strategy

$$\tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t)) = \frac{Z(t)\sigma(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)}{|\delta(t)|^2}, \tag{4.6}$$

is the unique minimizer of the quadratic variation of the surplus (3.3) and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))\gamma_i(t) - U_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t)} \\
&= \sqrt{|Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) - \frac{|Z(t)\sigma(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)|^2}{|\delta(t)|^2}}. \tag{4.7}
\end{aligned}$$

We can now show that the generator f of the BSDE (4.1) is Lipschitz continuous in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |f(t, Y(t), Z(t), U(t)) - f(t, Y'(t), Z'(t), U'(t))|^2 \\
&= |Y(t)r(t) - Y'(t)r(t) \\
&\quad + \tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))(\mu(t) - r(t)) - \tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z'(t), U'(t))(\mu(t) - r(t)) \\
&\quad - \sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2} \\
&\quad \cdot \sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))\gamma_i(t) - U_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t)} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2} \\
&\quad \cdot \sqrt{|\pi^*(t, Z'(t), U'(t))\sigma(t) - Z'(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\pi^*(t, Z'(t), U'(t))\gamma_i(t) - U'_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t)} \Big|^2 \\
&\leq K \left(|\tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t)) - \tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z'(t), U'(t))|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |Y(t) - Y'(t)|^2 + |Z(t) - Z'(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i(t) - U'_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) \right) \\
&\leq K \left(|Y(t) - Y'(t)|^2 + |Z(t) - Z'(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i(t) - U'_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the representation (4.7), the boundedness assumptions (A2) and the inequality

$$|\sqrt{x^2 + a^2} - \sqrt{y^2 + b^2}| \leq |x - y| + |a - b|. \tag{4.8}$$

Since the generator f is Lipschitz continuous and the terminal condition ξ is square integrable, we can conclude that there exists a unique solution to the BSDE (4.1), see Theorem 3.1.1 in Delong [12].

Step 3) We are left with showing the admissability of the optimal strategy. The standard result on the solution to a BSDE, see Theorem 3.1.1 in Delong [12], yields that the process Y is \mathcal{F} -adapted, (Z, U_1, \dots, U_I) are \mathcal{F} -predictable, and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y(t)|^2 \right] < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |Z(s)|^2 ds \right] < \infty, \\
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^I \int_0^T |U_i(s)|^2 \lambda_i(s) ds \right] < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it is straightforward to deduce that $\pi^* \in \mathcal{A}$. \square

We succeed in characterizing the optimal hedging strategy and the optimal price process with a unique solution to a nonlinear BSDE which has a Lipschitz generator.

5 Properties of the price and the hedging strategy

In this section we investigate some important properties of the price process and the hedging strategy.

5.1 The arbitrage-free representation of the price and no-good-deal pricing

From the point of view of the arbitrage-free pricing theory, the crucial point is to check whether the price process (4.1) can be represented in the form

$$Y(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(s) ds} \xi | \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where \mathbb{Q} is an equivalent martingale measure. Looking at the BSDE (4.1), it is rather difficult to guess the form of the equivalent martingale measure and prove the arbitrage-free representation. Since we expect that the no-good-deal price coincides with the price (4.1) derived under the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing, we now solve the no-good-deal pricing problem (3.6). As a by-product, we show the equivalence of the two pricing approaches and we obtain the arbitrage-free representation of the price (4.1).

Theorem 5.1. *Let ξ be an \mathcal{F} -measurable claim such that $\mathbb{E}[|\xi|^2] < \infty$, and assume that (A1)-(A4) hold. Consider the BSDE (4.1) with its unique solution (Y, Z, U_1, \dots, U_I) . Let*

$$\sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2} + \frac{|\gamma_i(t)|\sqrt{\lambda_i(t)}}{\delta(t)}\theta(t) < \sqrt{\lambda_i(t)}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \quad (5.1)$$

on the set $\{\lambda_i(t) > 0\}$. The optimal equivalent martingale measure $\mathbb{Q}^{\psi^*, \phi^*}$ which solves the optimization problem (3.6) is determined by the processes

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^*(t) &= \theta(t)\mathbf{1}\{\forall_{i=1, \dots, I} \lambda_i(t) = 0\} \\ &\quad + \frac{Z(t) - \sigma(t)K_1^*(t, Z(t), U(t))}{2K_2^*(t, Z(t), U(t))}\mathbf{1}\{\exists_{i=1, \dots, I} \lambda_i(t) > 0\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \phi_i^*(t) &= \frac{U_i(t) - \gamma_i(t)K_1^*(t, Z(t), U(t))}{2K_2^*(t, Z(t), U(t))}\mathbf{1}\{\lambda_i(t) > 0\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_2^*(t, Z(t), U(t)) &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{|Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i(t) - \frac{|Z(t)\sigma(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)|^2}{|\delta(t)|^2}}{\sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2}}, \\ K_1^*(t, Z(t), U(t)) &= -\frac{\theta(t)}{\delta(t)} 2K_2^*(t, Z(t), U(t)) + \frac{Z(t)\sigma(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)}{|\delta(t)|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the process Y coincides with the optimal value function of the optimization problem (3.6) and we have

$$Y(t) = \sup_{(\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(s) ds} \xi | \mathcal{F}_t \right] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi^*, \phi^*}} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(s) ds} \xi | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Proof:

Step 1) First, we solve the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} z\psi + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \phi_i \lambda_i &\rightarrow_{\psi, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_I} \min \\ \psi\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i \gamma_i \lambda_i &= \mu - r, \\ |\psi|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\phi_i|^2 \lambda_i &\leq L^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

If $\lambda_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, then we immediately get the optimal solution. Let us now assume w.l.o.g. that $\lambda_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, I$. We can also assume that $u_i \lambda_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, I$. Indeed, if $\lambda_i(t) > 0$ and the terminal condition or the generator of the BSDE (4.1) depends on regime i , which is the case in the regime-switching economy, then $U_i(t) \neq 0$. We can notice that $\psi = \frac{\mu - r}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i} \sigma$, $\phi_i = \frac{\mu - r}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i} \gamma_i$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, are the non-regular point of the constraints. The value of the objective function at the non-regular point is equal to

$$\frac{z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i^2 \lambda_i} (\mu - r). \quad (5.4)$$

Let us now deal with regular points of the constraints. We introduce the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} F(\psi, \phi, K_1, K_2) &= z\psi + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \phi_i \lambda_i - K_1 \left(\psi\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i \gamma_i \lambda_i - \mu - r \right) \\ &\quad - K_2 \left(|\psi|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\phi_i|^2 \lambda_i - L^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first order conditions yield the set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} z - K_1 \sigma - 2K_2 \psi &= 0, \\ u_i \lambda_i - K_1 \gamma_i \lambda_i - 2K_2 \phi_i \lambda_i &= 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \\ \psi\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i \gamma_i \lambda_i &= \mu - r, \\ |\psi|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\phi_i|^2 \lambda_i &= L^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

and the second order condition gives us that the minimum in (5.3) is attained for $K_2 < 0$.

From (5.5) we easily obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi &= \frac{z - K_1\sigma}{2K_2}, \\
\phi_i &= \frac{u_i - K_1\gamma_i}{2K_2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \\
K_1 &= -\frac{\mu - r}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i} 2K_2 + \frac{z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i}, \\
4K_2^2 &= \left| \frac{z - K_1\sigma}{L} \right|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \left| \frac{u_i - K_1\gamma_i}{L} \right|^2 \lambda_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Substituting the formula for K_1 into the last equation in (5.6), we can derive the quadratic equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&4K_2^2 \left(L^2 - \frac{(\mu - r)^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i} \right) \\
&= \left| z - \sigma \frac{z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i} \right|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I \left| u_i - \gamma_i \frac{z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i} \right|^2 \lambda_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling (4.6)-(4.7) we get the optimal $K_2^* < 0$. We calculate the value of the objective function (5.3) at the regular point (ψ^*, ϕ^*) . Using the formulas from (5.6), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
z\psi^* + \sum_{i=1}^I \phi_i^* u_i \lambda_i &= \frac{z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i} (\mu - r) \\
&- \sqrt{L^2 - \left(\frac{\mu - r}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i} \right)^2} \sqrt{z^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |u_i|^2 \lambda_i - \frac{(z\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^I u_i \gamma_i \lambda_i)^2}{\sigma^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |\gamma_i|^2 \lambda_i}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Since (5.7) is less than (5.4), we conclude that (ψ^*, ϕ^*) is the optimal solution to (5.3).

Step 2) We now find the optimal solution to our no-good-deal optimization problem (3.6). We choose $(\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $Y^{\psi, \phi}(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}} [e^{-\int_t^T r(s) ds} \xi | \mathcal{F}_t]$, $0 \leq t \leq T$. Recalling results on linear BSDEs, see Propositions 3.3.1 and 3.4.1 in Delong [12], we conclude that the process $Y^{\psi, \phi}$ can be characterized as a unique solution to the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned}
dY^{\psi, \phi}(t) &= Y^{\psi, \phi}(t)r(t)dt + Z^{\psi, \phi}(t)\psi(t)dt + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i^{\psi, \phi}(t)\phi_i(t)\lambda_i(t)dt \\
&\quad + Z^{\phi, \psi}(t)dW(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i^{\psi, \phi}(t)d\tilde{N}_i(t), \\
Y^{\psi, \phi}(T) &= \xi.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Let us consider the process Y which solves the BSDE (4.1). The existence of a unique solution Y to (4.1) is established in Theorem 4.1. By (5.4) we can deal with the dynamics

$$\begin{aligned}
dY(t) &= Y(t)r(t)dt + Z(t)\psi^*(t)dt + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\phi_i^*(t)\lambda_i(t)dt \\
&\quad + Z(t)dW(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)d\tilde{N}_i(t), \\
Y(T) &= \xi,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where (ψ^*, ϕ^*) are defined in (5.2). By the Girsanov's theorem, see Theorem 2.5.1 in Delong [12], we derive

$$\begin{aligned} d(Y^{\psi, \phi}(t) - Y(t)) &= (Y^{\psi, \phi}(t) - Y(t))r(t)dt \\ &+ (Z(t)\psi(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\phi_i(t)\lambda_i(t) - Z(t)\psi^*(t) + \sum_{i=1}^I U_i(t)\phi_i^*(t)\lambda_i(t))dt \\ &+ (Z^{\psi, \phi}(t) - Z(t))dW^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}} + \sum_{i=1}^I (U_i^{\psi, \phi}(t) - U_i(t))d\tilde{N}_i^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}}(t), \\ Y^{\psi, \phi}(T) - Y(T) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $W^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}}$ and $\tilde{N}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}}$ are the $\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}$ -Brownian motion and the $\mathbb{Q}^{\psi, \phi}$ -compensated counting process. The result established in Step 1) and the comparison principle for BSDEs, see Theorem 3.2.2 in Delong [12], yield that $Y^{\phi, \psi}(t) \leq Y(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$. By (4.6), (4.7) and (5.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i^*(t) &= \frac{U_i(t) - \gamma_i(t) \left(-\frac{\theta(t)}{\delta(t)} 2K_2(t, Z(t), U(t)) + \tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t)) \right)}{2K_2(t, Z(t), U(t))} \\ &= \frac{\gamma_i(t)}{\delta(t)} \theta(t) \\ &\quad - \frac{(U_i(t) - \tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))\gamma_i(t)) \sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2}}{\sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^I |U_i(t) - \tilde{\pi}^*(t, Z(t), U(t))\gamma_i(t)|^2 \lambda_i}}, \end{aligned}$$

and our condition (5.1) implies that $|\phi_i^*(t)| < 1$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, $i = 1, \dots, I$. Hence, $(\phi^*, \psi^*) \in \mathcal{Q}$. Since there exists a unique solution to the BSDE (5.8), we deduce that $Y^{\phi^*, \psi^*}(t) = Y(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, and we finally conclude

$$\sup_{(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{Q}^{\phi, \psi}} Y^{\phi, \psi}(t) = Y^{\phi^*, \psi^*}(t) = Y(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

□

In Theorem 5.1 we formulate a condition which guarantees that our optimal price process (4.1) is arbitrage-free and we provide its arbitrage-free representation. We point out that in a general model with jumps the instantaneous Sharpe ratio pricing can lead to arbitrage prices and some conditions have to be introduced to exclude arbitrage prices, see Delong [11] and Chapter 10.4 in Delong [12]. Such a condition is proposed in (5.1). From the mathematical point of view, condition (5.1) guarantees that there exists an equivalent martingale measure which solves the no-good-deal optimization problem or that there exists a measure solution to the BSDE (4.1) which characterizes the price. We are aware that (5.1) is not optimal, yet we believe that it should be sufficient in many financial applications. One can notice that our arbitrage-free pricing condition (5.1) is satisfied if the surplus' Sharpe ratios L is not too large (compared to θ), the stock's Sharpe ratio θ is not too large (only required if $\gamma \neq 0$) and transition intensities λ are not too small. Those assumptions should be fulfilled in many

cases. Let us remark that Lo [23] estimates monthly Sharpe ratios for different assets in the range of (0.14, 1.26), Hardy [19] estimates the intensity of transition into a "bad" state at 0.5 and the intensity of transition into a "good" state at 6, whereas Hamilton [18] estimates those intensities at 0.5 and 1. With those estimates of θ and λ our condition (5.1) is satisfied for many values of L and γ .

It should not be surprising that our Sharpe ratio pricing objective can lead to arbitrage strategies. One could have expected that high values of the Sharpe ratio L can lead to arbitrage prices since they intuitively lead to high prices. Consequently, high values of the Sharpe ratio should be excluded from considerations to guarantee arbitrage-free pricing. As already noticed, condition (5.1) excludes high values of the Sharpe ratio L . As an example illustrating this remark, let us consider pricing of an insurance contract which pays 1 if a policyholder survives a given period. If the insurer requires a Sharpe ratio L , then this profit expectation has to be reflected in the price, in this case in the value of the death probability. If the insurer requires a very high profit, then such a high profit can only be realized by using zero death probability in pricing. Yet, zero death probability is not an equivalent death probability and the arbitrage must arise.

5.2 Monotonicity of the price

It is clear that a reasonable pricing operator should be monotone with respect to the terminal claim, in the sense that a more severe claim should be valued at a higher price. Moreover, since the process L appearing in (3.5) is interpreted as a Sharpe ratio, we should also expect that the higher the Sharpe ratio the hedger requires, the higher the price of the claim should be. Such properties of our optimal price process (4.1) could be established provided that we could apply a comparison principle for BSDEs. However, it is well known that a comparison principle for BSDEs with jumps does not always hold, see Barles et. al. [1]. Consequently, the price process (4.1) may not satisfy the monotonic properties in all cases. In the next theorem we prove a comparison principle for the BSDE (4.1) under which our optimal price process fulfills the desirable monotonic properties.

Theorem 5.2. *Let ξ, ξ' be \mathcal{F} -measurable claims such that $\mathbb{E}[|\xi|^2] < \infty, \mathbb{E}[|\xi'|^2] < \infty$. Assume that (A1)-(A4) hold and*

$$\sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2} + \frac{|\gamma_i(t)|\sqrt{\lambda_i(t)}}{\delta(t)}\theta(t) < \sqrt{\lambda_i(t)}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \quad (5.10)$$

on the set $\{\lambda_i(t) > 0\}$. Let Y and Y' denote the solutions to the BSDEs (4.1) with terminal conditions ξ and ξ' and coefficients L and L' . If $\xi \leq \xi'$ and $L(t) \leq L'(t), 0 \leq t \leq T$, then $Y(t) \leq Y'(t), 0 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof:

Let f denote the generator of the BSDE (4.1). Recalling (4.6)-(4.7) we can notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & f(Y(t), Z(t), U_1(t), \dots, U_I(t)) - f(Y(t), Z(t), U'_1(t), \dots, U'_I(t)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^I \frac{\Gamma_i(t)}{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t)} \mathbf{1}\{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t) \neq 0\} (U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_i(t) &= \frac{\gamma_i(t)\theta(t)}{\delta(t)} (U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2} \left(\sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\gamma_j(t) - U_{j,i}(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\gamma_j(t) - U_{j,i+1}(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

and we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\pi}_i(t) \\ &= \frac{Z(t)\sigma(t) + U'_1(t)\gamma_1(t)\lambda_1(t) + \dots + U'_{i-1}(t)\gamma_{i-1}(t)\lambda_{i-1}(t) + U_i(t)\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t) + \dots + U_I(t)\gamma_I(t)\lambda_I(t)}{|\delta(t)|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

$$U_{j,i}(t) = U_i(t)\mathbf{1}\{j \geq i\} + U'_i(t)\mathbf{1}\{j < i\}.$$

In order to apply a comparison principle for BSDEs with jumps we have to control the coefficients $\frac{\Gamma_i(t)}{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t)}$. We show that condition (5.10) implies $|\frac{\Gamma_i(t)}{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t)}| < 1$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, which is a sufficient condition for the application of the comparison principle from Theorem 3.2.2 in Delong [12], see also Royer [27]. It is straightforward to notice that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_i(t)| &\leq \frac{|\gamma_i(t)|}{\delta(t)} \theta(t) |U_i(t) - U'_i(t)| \lambda_i(t) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2} \left| \sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\gamma_j(t) - U_{j,i}(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\gamma_j(t) - U_{j,i+1}(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t)} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Using inequality (4.8) and the definitions of $\tilde{\pi}_i$ and $U_{i,j}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\gamma_j(t) - U_{j,i}(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \sqrt{|\tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\sigma(t) - Z(t)|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\gamma_j(t) - U_{j,i+1}(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t)} \right|^2 \\
& \leq |\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\sigma(t) - \tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\sigma(t)|^2 \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^I |\tilde{\pi}_i(t)\gamma_j(t) - \tilde{\pi}_{i+1}(t)\gamma_j(t) - U_{j,i}(t) + U_{j,i+1}(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t) \\
& = \left| \frac{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)}{|\delta(t)|^2} \right|^2 |\sigma(t)|^2 \\
& \quad + \left| \frac{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)}{|\delta(t)|^2} \gamma_i(t) - U_i(t) + U'_i(t) \right|^2 \lambda_i(t) \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^I \left| \frac{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\gamma_i(t)\lambda_i(t)}{|\delta(t)|^2} \gamma_j(t) \right|^2 \lambda_j(t) \\
& = |(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t)|^2 \frac{|\sigma(t)|^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} |\gamma_j(t)|^2 \lambda_j(t)}{\delta^2 \lambda_i(t)} \\
& \leq |(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t)|^2 \frac{1}{\lambda_i(t)}. \tag{5.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.12) with (5.13), we can derive

$$\left| \frac{\Gamma_i(t)}{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t)} \right| \leq \frac{|\gamma_i(t)|}{\delta(t)} \theta(t) + \sqrt{|L(t)|^2 - |\theta(t)|^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_i(t)}}.$$

Hence, (5.10) implies $\left| \frac{\Gamma_i(t)}{(U_i(t) - U'_i(t))\lambda_i(t)} \right| < 1$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, and the comparison now follows from Theorem 3.2.2 in Delong [12]. \square

Let us remark that the comparison principle is proved under the same assumption (5.10) which guarantees the arbitrage-free representation of the price, see (5.1).

Even though our pricing operator (4.1) may lead to arbitrage opportunities and may fail the monotonicity property in some cases, we still believe that the instantaneous mean-variance hedging and Sharpe ratio pricing is a financially sound pricing and hedging objective in the view of the advantageous presented in Section 3. It should be pointed out that one of the goals of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 is to introduce a condition which guarantees arbitrage-free instantaneous Sharpe ratio pricing and the inevitability of such a condition in our case agrees with the intuition as discussed at the end of Section 5.1.

5.3 The Markov-regime-switching model

In practical applications we deal with Markovian models. In this section we establish the relation between the solution to the BSDE (4.1) and the solution to a partial integro-differential equation. Such a relation allows us to interpret the optimal hedging strategy.

Theorem 5.3. Consider the Markov-regime-switching financial model (2.3) with the pay-off $\xi = F(S(T), J(T))$ and the Sharpe ratio $L(t) = L(J(t-))$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}[|\xi|^2] < \infty$, and let (A1)-(A4) hold. If there exists a unique classical solution V with a uniformly bounded derivative $V_s(t, s, i)$ to the system of nonlinear PIDEs

$$\begin{aligned}
& V_t(t, s, i) + V_s(t, s, i)s\mu(i) + \frac{1}{2}V_{ss}(t, s, i)s^2\sigma^2(i) \\
& + \sum_{j \neq i} (V(t, s + s\gamma_j(i), j) - V(t, s, i) - V_s(t, s, i)s\gamma_j(i))\lambda_j(i, s) = V(t, s, i)r(i) \\
& + \frac{V_s(t, s, i)s\sigma^2(i) + \sum_{j \neq i} (V(t, s + s\gamma_j(i), j) - V(t, s, i))\gamma_j(i)\lambda_j(i, s)}{\delta(i)}\theta(i) \\
& - \sqrt{L^2(i) - \theta^2(i)}\sqrt{g(V(t, s, i))}, \quad (t, s) \in [0, T] \times (0, \infty), i = 1, \dots, I, \\
& V(T, s, i) = F(s, i), \quad s \in (0, \infty), i = 1, \dots, I,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
g(V(t, s, i)) &= |V_s(t, s, i)|^2 s^2 \sigma^2(i) + \sum_{j \neq i} |V(t, s + s\gamma_j(i), j) - V(t, s, i)|^2 \lambda_j(i, s) \\
& - \frac{|V_s(t, s, i)s\sigma^2(i) + \sum_{j \neq i} (V(t, s + s\gamma_j(i), j) - V(t, s, i))\gamma_j(i)\lambda_j(i, s)|^2}{\delta^2(i)},
\end{aligned}$$

then the solution to the BSDE (4.1) can be characterized as

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(t) &= V(t, S(t), J(t)), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\
Z(t) &= V_s(t, S(t-), J(t-))S(t-)\sigma(J(t-)), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\
U_i(t) &= \left(V(t, S(t-) + S(t-)\gamma_i(J(t-)), i) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - V(t, S(t-), J(t-)) \right) \mathbf{1}\{i \neq J(t-)\} \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, I.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof:

From the Markov property of the system we can deduce that $Y(t) = V(t, S(t), J(t))$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, for some measurable function V , see Corollary 2.3 and Remark 2.4 in Barles et. al. [1]. Assuming that V is sufficiently smooth, we can apply the Itô's formula and we get the dynamics

$$\begin{aligned}
dV(t, S(t), J(t)) &= V_t(t, S(t-), J(t-))dt + V_s(t, S(t-), J(t-))S(t-)\mu(J(t-))dt \\
& + V_s(t, S(t-), J(t-))S(t-)\sigma(J(t-))dW(t) \\
& + \frac{1}{2}V_{ss}(t, S(t-), J(t-))S^2(t-)\sigma^2(J(t-)) \\
& + \sum_{j \neq J(t-)} \left(V(t, S(t-) + S(t-)\gamma_j(J(t-)), j) - V(t, S(t-), J(t-)) \right) d\tilde{N}_j(t) \\
& + \sum_{j \neq J(t-)} \left(V(t, S(t-) + S(t-)\gamma_j(J(t-)), j) - V(t, S(t-), J(t-)) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - V_s(t, S(t-), J(t-))S(t-)\gamma_j(J(t-)) \right) \lambda_j(J(t-), S(t-))dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

The result now follows by comparing the terms in (5.15) and (4.1). \square

Since the process Y models the price of the claim, the function V determines the value of the claim given the current value of the underlying risk factors. It is straightforward to notice that the optimal hedging strategy (4.2) consists of two terms. In the view of Theorem 5.3, the first term is based on the change in the price of the claim which results from a continuous change in the stock value (the interpretation of the control process Z) and on the change in the price of the claim which results from a discontinuous change in the stock value induced by a transition of the economy into a new state (the interpretation of the control processes U). Hence, the first term of the optimal hedging strategy (5.4) is a delta-hedging strategy. The second term of the optimal hedging strategy (4.2) can be seen as a correction factor for the delta-hedging strategy. Recalling the interpretation of the strategy (4.6), we can deduce that the correction term arises since the hedger optimizes the mean-variance risk measure of the surplus instead of minimizing the variance of the surplus. The correction term reflects the use of the expected profit in the hedging objective. It leads to a higher expected profit of the surplus and also to a higher variance of the surplus.

We could have used Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations to solve our optimization problems in a Markovian framework. However, it would be difficult to establish the existence of a unique classical (viscosity) solution V to the system of PIDEs (5.14), or the existence of a unique classical (viscosity) solution would be established under very strong assumptions on the parameters. Hence, we believe that our approach based on BSDEs is mathematically more tractable. Moreover, solving the PIDE (5.14) numerically by a finite difference method is generally less efficient than solving the BSDE (4.1) by a Monte Carlo methods. This remark points out an important advantage in using BSDEs instead of PIDEs in solving our pricing and hedging problem. Finally, in our general non-Markovian model we can only use the approach based on BSDEs.

6 Numerical example

In this last section we present some numerical results which show a possible application of our pricing method. We consider the Markov-regime-switching model (2.3) with 2 states of economy and the parameters which are specified in Table 1. In particular, the stock's Sharpe ratios are equal to $\theta(1) = 0.24$ and $\theta(2) = 0.04$.

We are interested in pricing 1-year call options with various strikes Q . The initial price of the derivative is determined by the solution $Y(0)$ to the BSDE (4.1). The BSDE has to be solved numerically. We apply discrete-time approximation and Least Squares Monte Carlo. In our example the solution to the BSDE (4.1) can be derived by using the backward

Table 1: The parameters of the Markov-regime-switching model.

State i	$r(i)$	$\mu(i)$	$\sigma(i)$	$\gamma.(i)$	$\lambda.(i)$
1	0.03	0.07	0.1	-0.1	2
2	0.01	0,02	0.25	0.05	5

Table 2: The prices of the call options with strike Q and the Sharpe ratios $L(1) = 0.4, L(2) = 0.2$ in the Markov-regime-switching model.

The strike	$Q = 80$	$Q = 90$	$Q = 100$	$Q = 110$	$Q = 120$
The price	24.561	16.677	10.381	5.857	2.928

recursion

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(1) &= (S(T) - Q)^+, \\
Z_i(t_k) &= \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}[Y(t_{k+1})(W(t_{k+1}) - W(t_k)) | S(t_k) = s, J(t_k) = i], \quad i = 1, 2, \\
U_1(t_k) &= \frac{1}{\lambda_1(2)h} \mathbb{E}[Y(t_{k+1})(\tilde{N}_1(t_{k+1}) - \tilde{N}_1(t_k)) | S(t_k) = s, J(t_k) = 2], \\
U_2(t_k) &= \frac{1}{\lambda_2(1)h} \mathbb{E}[Y(t_{k+1})(\tilde{N}_2(t_{k+1}) - \tilde{N}_2(t_k)) | S(t_k) = s, J(t_k) = 1], \\
Y_1(t_k) &= \frac{1}{1 + r(1)h} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[Y(t_{k+1}) | S(t_k) = s, J(t_k) = 1] \right. \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{Z_1(t_k)\sigma(1) + U_2(t_k)\gamma_2(1)\lambda_2(1)}{\delta(1)} \theta(1) \right. \\
&\quad - \sqrt{|L(1)|^2 - |\theta(1)|^2} \\
&\quad \left. \left. \cdot \sqrt{|Z_1(t_k)|^2 + |U_2(t_k)|^2 \lambda_2(1) - \frac{|Z_1(t_k)\sigma(1) + U_2(t_k)\gamma_2(1)\lambda_2(1)|^2}{|\delta(1)|^2}} \right) h \right\}, \\
Y_2(t_k) &= \frac{1}{1 + r(2)h} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[Y(t_{k+1}) | S(t_k) = s, J(t_k) = 2] \right. \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{Z_2(t_k)\sigma(2) + U_1(t_k)\gamma_1(2)\lambda_1(2)}{\delta(2)} \theta(2) \right. \\
&\quad - \sqrt{|L(2)|^2 - |\theta(2)|^2} \\
&\quad \left. \left. \cdot \sqrt{|Z_2(t_k)|^2 + |U_1(t_k)|^2 \lambda_1(2) - \frac{|Z_2(t_k)\sigma(2) + U_1(t_k)\gamma_1(2)\lambda_1(2)|^2}{|\delta(i)|^2}} \right) h \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{k-1} < t_k = 1$ and h is a time-discretization step. The processes Y, Z, U are next approximated with regression functions, see Bouchard and Elie [7].

The prices of the call options with various strikes for the Sharpe ratios $L(1) = 0.4, L(2) = 0.2$ are given in Table 2. Monotonicity of the price with respect to the strike can be observed. In Table 3 we also present the prices of the call options in two classical Black-Scholes model

Table 3: The prices of the call options with strike Q in the complete Black-Scholes model with parameters (r, σ) .

The strike	$Q = 80$	$Q = 90$	$Q = 100$	$Q = 110$	$Q = 120$
The BS price for $(0.03, 0.1)$	22.381	13.038	5.581	1.596	0.299
The BS price for $(0.01, 0.25)$	22.891	15.830	10.405	6.532	3.948

Table 4: The prices of the call options with the strike $Q = 100$ and Sharpe ratios $(L(1), L(2))$ in the Markov-regime-switching model.

The Sharpe ratios	$L(1) = 0.24$	$L(1) = 0.3$	$L(1) = 0.5$	$L(1) = 0.7$	$L(1) = 1.2$
	$L(2) = 0.04$	$L(2) = 0.1$	$L(2) = 0.3$	$L(2) = 0.5$	$L(2) = 1.2$
The price	9.827	10.082	10.660	11.226	13.168

with the parameters $(r(i), \sigma(i))$ determined by the state 1 and 2. We might have expected that the price in the regime-switching model should be between the prices in the Black-Scholes models. However, under our pricing method the hedger specifies his expected profit reflected by the Sharpe ratio L which increases the price. Hence, our price can be between the Black-Scholes prices or above the higher price. The relation between our prices in the regime-switching model and the prices in the Black-Scholes models can be observed by comparing the results in Table 2 and 3. In Table 4 we find the prices of the call options with the strike $Q = 100$ for various Sharpe ratios. Monotonicity of the price with respect to the hedger's Sharpe ratio can be observed. We remark that the pair $(0.24, 0.04)$ is the lowest Sharpe ratio and $(1.2, 1.2)$ is the highest Sharpe ratio (assuming that $L(1) \geq L(2)$) which can be used under the assumptions of Theorems 4.1, 5.1, 5.2. Consequently, in our example for all reasonable values of the hedger's Sharpe ratios the arbitrage-free condition (5.1) and the monotonicity condition (5.10) are fulfilled.

7 Conclusion

We have studied hedging and pricing of contingent claims in a non-Markovian regime-switching financial model. We have derived the hedging strategy which minimizes the instantaneous mean-variance risk of the hedger's surplus and the price under which the instantaneous Sharpe ratio of the hedger's surplus equals a predefined target. The optimal hedging strategy and the optimal price process have been characterized with a unique solution to a nonlinear, Lipschitz BSDE with jumps. We have discussed key properties of the price and the hedging strategy.

References

- [1] Barles, G.; Buckdahn, R.; Pardoux, E. Backward stochastic differential equations and integral-partial differential equations. *Stochastic and Stochastic Reports* **1997**, 60, 57-83.
- [2] Bayraktar, E.; Young, V. Pricing options in incomplete equity markets via the instantaneous Sharpe ratio. *Annals of Finance* **2008**, 4, 399-429.
- [3] Bayraktar, E.; Milevsky, M.; Promislow, S.; Young, V. Valuation of mortality risk via the instantaneous Sharpe ratio: applications to life annuities. *Journal of Economic Dynamic and Control* **2009**, 33, 676-691.
- [4] Becherer, D. Bounded solutions to BSDE's with jumps for utility optimization and indifference hedging. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **2006**, 16, 2027-2054.
- [5] Becherer, D. From bounds on optimal growth towards a theory of good-deal hedging. In *Advanced Financial Modelling*; Albecher, H.; Runggaldier, W.; Schachermayer, W. Eds.; de Gruyter, 2009; 27-52.
- [6] Björk, T; Slinko, I. Towards a general theory of good deal bounds. *Review of Finance* **2006**, 10, 221-260.
- [7] Bouchard, B.; Elie, R. Discrete time approximation of decoupled forward backward SDE with jumps. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **2008**, 118, 53-75.
- [8] Cochrane, J.; Saá-Requejo J. Beyond arbitrage: good-deal asset price bounds in incomplete markets. *Journal of Political Economy* **2008**, 1008, 79-119.
- [9] Crépey, S. About the pricing equation in finance. In *Paris-Princeton Lectures in Mathematical Finance 2010*; Carmona, R.A.; Çinlar, E.; Ekeland, I.; Jouini, E.; Scheinkman, J.A.; Touzi, N. Eds.; Springer, 2011; 63-203.
- [10] Crépey, S. *Financial Modeling: A Backward Stochastic Differential Equations Perspective*; Springer, 2013.
- [11] Delong, Ł. No-good-deal, local mean-variance and ambiguity risk pricing and hedging for an insurance payment process. *ASTIN Bulletin* **2011**, 42, 203-232.
- [12] Delong, Ł. *Backward Stochastic Differential Equations with Jumps and their Actuarial and Financial Applications*; Springer, 2013.
- [13] Donnelly, C. Good-deal bounds in a regime switching market. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization* **2011**, 18, 491-515.
- [14] Donnelly, C.; Heunis, A.J. Quadratic risk minimization in a regime-switching with portfolio constraints. *SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization* **2012**, 50, 2431-2461.

- [15] Elliott, R.J.; Siu, T.K.; Chan, L.L.; Lau, J.W. Pricing options under a generalized Markov-modulated jump-diffusion model. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications* **2007**, 35, 694-713.
- [16] Elliott, R.J.; Siu, T.K. On risk minimizing portfolios under a Markovian regime-switching Black-Scholes economy. *Annals of Operations Research* **2010**, 176, 271-291.
- [17] Elliott, R.J.; Siu, T.K.; Badescu, A. On pricing and hedging options in regime-switching models with feedback effect. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **2011**, 35, 694-713.
- [18] Hamilton, J.D. A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycles. *Econometrica* **1989**, 57, 357-384.
- [19] Hardy, M. A regime-switching model of long-term stock returns. *North American Actuarial Journal* **2001**, 52, 41-53.
- [20] He, S.; Wang, J.; Yan, J. *Semimartingale Theory and Stochastic Calculus*; CRC Press, 1992.
- [21] Jacod, J.; Shiryaev, A.N. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*; Springer, 2003.
- [22] Leitner, J. Pricing and hedging with globally and instantaneously vanishing risk. *Statistics and Decisions* **2007**, 25, 311-332.
- [23] Lo, A. W. The statistics of Sharpe ratios. *Financial Analysis Journal* **2002**, 58, 36-52.
- [24] Mamon, R.S; Elliott, R.J. *Hidden Markov Models in Finance*; Springer, 2007.
- [25] Pelsser, A. Pricing in incomplete markets. Research preport **2011**.
- [26] Protter, P. *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*; Springer, 2004.
- [27] Royer, M. Backward stochastic differential equations with jumps and related non-linear expectations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **2006**, 116, 1358-1376.
- [28] Siu, T.K.; Erlein, C.; Mamon, R.S. The pricing of credit default swaps under a Markov-modulated Merton's structural model. *North American Actuarial Journal* **2008**, 12, 19-46.
- [29] Siu, T.K. A game theoretic approach to option valuation under Markovian regime-switching models. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **2012**, 42, 1146-1158.
- [30] Wu, H.; Li, Z. Multi-period mean-variance portfolio selection with regime switching and a stochastic cash flow. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **2012**, 50, 371-384.
- [31] Young, V. Pricing life insurance under stochastic mortality via the instantaneous Sharpe ratio. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **2008**, 42, 691-703.