

STOCHASTIC PROCESSES AND DERIVATIVES

Sheet 5

Antoine FALCK

November 17, 2017

Exercise 1. The dynamic of the price of a dividend paying asset satisfies the SDE

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = (r - q) dt + \sigma dW_t,$$

where W is a brownian motion under the risk neutral measure \mathbb{Q} , $\sigma > 0$, $r \geq 0$ rate of interest and q dividend rate. In this exercise we will prove the Call-Put symmetry

$$Call(T, S_0 e^{-\nu T}, K) = Put(T, K e^{-\nu T}, S_0), \quad \nu := r - q.$$

- For $S_0 = x$, show that the price of $Call(T, x, k)$ under the numeraire

$$X_t = \frac{S_t e^{-\nu t}}{x}$$

is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^x} \left[e^{-qT} \left(x - \frac{kx}{S_T} \right)^+ \right].$$

- Let $W_t^X := W_t - \sigma t$. Write down the formula for $\frac{kx}{S_T}$ as an exponential of W_T^X .
- Using the fact that W_T^X is a brownian motion under \mathbb{Q}^X , prove the Call-Put symmetry.

Proof. 1.

$$\begin{aligned} Call(T, x, k) &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[e^{-rT} (S_T - k)^+] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^x} \left[\frac{e^{-rT}}{X_T} (S_T - k)^+ \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^x} \left[e^{-qT} \left(x - \frac{kx}{S_T} \right)^+ \right]. \end{aligned}$$

- k is a martingale hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\left(\frac{k}{X_T}\right)}{\frac{k}{X_T}} &= (0 - \sigma) dW_T^X \\ \Leftrightarrow d\left(\frac{kx}{S_T} e^{\nu T}\right) &= -\frac{kx}{S_T} e^{\nu T} \sigma dW_T^X = -k e^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2} T} \sigma dW_T^X \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{kx}{S_T} e^{\nu T} &= k e^{-\sigma W_T^X - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} T} \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{kx}{S_T} &= k e^{-\nu T} e^{-\sigma W_T^X - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} T}. \end{aligned}$$

3.

$$\begin{aligned}
Call(T, S_0 e^{-\nu T}, K) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^x} \left[e^{-qT} \left(S_0 e^{-\nu T} - \frac{k S_0}{S_T} \right)^+ \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^x} \left[e^{-qT} \left(S_0 e^{-\nu T} - K e^{-\nu T} e^{-\sigma W_T^x - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} T} \right)^+ \right]. \\
Put(T, x, K) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} [e^{-rT} (K - S_T)^+] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} [e^{-qT} (e^{-\nu T} K - x e^{\sigma W_T - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} T})^+]. \\
Put(T, K e^{-\nu T}, S_0) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^x} \left[e^{-qT} \left(S_0 e^{-\nu T} - K e^{-\nu T} e^{\sigma W_T - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} T} \right)^+ \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The equality is proven as $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}}(W) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}}(-W) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{Q}^x}(W^X)$.

□

Exercise 2. Assume that the market offers a constant rate of interest r and that the price of an asset is given by

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = r dt + \sigma dW_t.$$

We compute the price of the Asian option with payoff $\Psi_T := \left(\exp\left(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \ln S_t dt\right) - K S_T \right)^+$.

1. Prove that $\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \ln S_t dt$ has a Gaussian distribution. Compute the mean and variance of this distribution.
2. Show that the price of the Asian option at time 0 can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}[(C_1 \exp(Z + C_2 T) - C_3 K)^+]$$

for a gaussian r.v. Z and C_1, C_2, C_3 constants. The parameters of Z and the constants are to be given explicitly.

Proof. 1. We have with the definition of the integral,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \ln S_t dt &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \ln S_{t_i} (t_{i+1} - t_i), \quad t_i = \frac{iT}{N} \\
&= \lim_N \sum_i \left(\ln S_0 + \sigma W_{t_i} + \left(r - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) t_i \right) (t_{i+1} - t_i) \\
&= T \ln S_0 + \sigma \lim_N \sum_i W_{t_i} (t_{i+1} - t_i) + \left(r - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \int_0^T t dt \\
&= T \ln S_0 + \left(r - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \frac{T^2}{2} + \lim \Sigma_N^\sigma.
\end{aligned}$$

Where,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_N^\sigma &:= \sum_i \sigma W_{t_i} (t_{i+1} - t_i) \\
&= \sum_i (W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) \beta_i^\sigma \quad \text{where } \beta_i^\sigma := \sigma \sum_{j=i}^{N-1} (t_{j+1} - t_j) = (T - t_j) \\
&\sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \sigma^2 \sum_i (T - t_i)^2 (t_{i+1} - t_i) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\Sigma_N^\sigma \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \underbrace{\mathcal{N} \left(0, \sigma^2 \int_0^T (T-t)^2 dt \right)}_{\sigma^2 \frac{T^3}{3}}$$

And finally $\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \ln S_t dt \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\ln S_0 + \left(r - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \frac{T}{2}, \sigma^2 \frac{T^3}{3} \right)$.

2.

□

Exercise 3. At time t , the market offers a bounded interest rate r_t and two assets whose prices are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_t^{(1)}}{S_t^{(1)}} &= b_t^{(1)} dt + \sigma_1 dB_t^{(1)} \\ \frac{dS_t^{(2)}}{S_t^{(2)}} &= b_t^{(2)} dt + \sigma_2 \left(\rho dB_t^{(1)} + \sqrt{1-\rho^2} dB_t^{(2)} \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $(B^{(1)}, B^{(2)})$ is a two dimensional standard brownian motion under the historical measure \mathbb{P} , $\rho \in [-1, 1]$, $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$, and $(b^{(1)}, b^{(2)})$ is a bounded \mathbb{R}^2 -valued process.

1. Compute the value of an option with payoff $\Psi = (S_T^{(2)} - K S_T^{(1)})^+$ at time 0 for $K \geq 0$.
2. Give the hedging strategy invested in the risky assets only for the option.

Proof. 1. We have under the risk neutral measure \mathbb{Q}

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_t^{(1)}}{S_t^{(1)}} &= r_t dt + \Sigma_1^* \cdot dB_t^{\mathbb{Q}}, & \Sigma_1 &:= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \frac{dS_t^{(2)}}{S_t^{(2)}} &= r_t dt + \Sigma_2^* \cdot dB_t^{\mathbb{Q}}, & \Sigma_2 &:= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_2 \rho \\ \sigma_2 \sqrt{1-\rho^2} \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

where $B_t^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a 2-dimensional brownian motion. We also define the change of numeraire

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^S}{d\mathbb{Q}} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \frac{e^{-\int_0^T r_s ds} S_t^{(1)}}{S_0^{(1)}},$$

hence the price of the option is

$$\begin{aligned}C_0 &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r_s ds} (S_T^{(2)} - K S_T^{(1)})^+ \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^S} \left[S_0^{(1)} \left(\frac{S_T^{(2)}}{S_T^{(1)}} - K \right)^+ \right]\end{aligned}$$

and $\frac{S_T^{(2)}}{S_T^{(1)}}$ is a martingale under \mathbb{Q}^S ,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d \frac{S_T^{(2)}}{S_T^{(1)}}}{\frac{S_T^{(2)}}{S_T^{(1)}}} &= (\Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1) \cdot dB_t^S \\ &= \|\Sigma\| dW_t^S,\end{aligned}$$

where B^S is a brownian motion under \mathbb{Q}^2 , $\Sigma := \Sigma_2 - \Sigma_1$, $dW_t^S := \|\Sigma\|^{-1} \left((\sigma_2 \rho - \sigma_1) dB_t^{S,1} + \sigma_2 \sqrt{1-\rho^2} dB_t^{S,2} \right)$. Hence we have a BS price:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{C_0}{S_0^{(1)}} &= \frac{S_0^{(2)}}{S_0^{(1)}} \Phi(d^+) - K \Phi(d^-); \\ d^\pm &:= \frac{\ln \frac{S_0^{(2)}}{S_0^{(1)} K}}{\|\Sigma\| \sqrt{T}} \pm \frac{1}{2} \|\Sigma\| \sqrt{T}\end{aligned}$$

2. Then the hedging strategy is to buy $\Phi(d^+)$ asset 2 and short $K\Phi(d^-)$ asset 1.

□

Exercise 4. Assume that the market offers interest rate $r = 0$ and an asset whose price is $\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = \sigma dW_t$ for some bounded, possibly random $\sigma_t > 0$. In this question, we prove the Lee formula for the small strike asymptotic:

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\sigma_I^2(x)}{|x|} = \beta_L := 2 - 4 \left(\sqrt{\tilde{q}^2 + \tilde{q}} - \tilde{q} \right), \quad \tilde{q} := \sup \{q : \mathbb{E} [S_T^{-q}] < \infty\}$$

where $x := \ln \frac{K}{S_0}$ is the log-moneyness and $\sigma_I(x)$ is the BS implied volatility. You are given the formula for the large strike asymptotic:

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_I^2(x)}{|x|} = \beta_R := 2 - 4 \left(\sqrt{\tilde{p}^2 + \tilde{p}} - \tilde{p} \right), \quad \tilde{p} := \sup \left\{ p : \mathbb{E} \left[S_T^{p+1} \right] < \infty \right\}.$$

1. Notice that

$$\mathbb{E} [(S_t - K)^+] = C^{BS(\sigma_i(x))}(S_0, K),$$

where $C^{BS(\sigma)}(\cdot)$ is the BS (volatility σ) price of a call. Apply a change of numeraire to show that

$$\mathbb{E} [(S_t - K)^+] = P^{BS(\tilde{\sigma}_i(x))}(K, S_0),$$

where $P^{BS(\sigma)}(\cdot)$ is the BS (volatility σ) price of a put, and $\tilde{\sigma}_I(x)$ is the implied volatility of the fictional asset whose price is $\tilde{S}_t = \frac{S_0 K}{S_t}$.

2. Use the put-call symmetry to show that $\sigma_I(x) = \tilde{\sigma}_I(-x)$ and therefore

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\sigma_I^2(x)}{|x|} = \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_I^2(x)}{x}.$$

3. Use the large strike asymptotic Lee formula for the asset \tilde{S} in order to prove the small strike asymptotic Lee formula for the asset S .

Proof. 1. We have by definition of the implied volatility

$$\mathbb{E} [(S_t - K)^+] \triangleq C^{BS(\sigma_i(x))}(S_0, K).$$

Now we want to apply a change of numeraire

$$\frac{dQ^S}{dQ} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \frac{S_t}{S_0},$$

hence the price is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} [(S_T - K)^+] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^S} \left[\frac{S_0}{S_T} (S_T - K)^+ \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^S} \left[\left(S_0 - \frac{K S_0}{S_T} \right)^+ \right], \quad \tilde{S}_T = \frac{K S_0}{S_T} \\ &= P^{BS(\tilde{\sigma}_I(-x))}(K, S_0). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed as the spot is K and the strike S_0 , we have $\tilde{\sigma}_I(\ln \frac{S_0}{K}) = \tilde{\sigma}_I(-x)$.

2. The symmetry (problem 1) writes $P^{BS(\sigma)}(K, S_0) = C^{BS(\sigma)}(S_0, K)$, hence in our case

$$C^{BS(\sigma_I(x))}(S_0, K) = C^{BS(\tilde{\sigma}_I(-x))}(S_0, K).$$

As the BS price is strictly growing with the volatility we have $\sigma_I(x) = \tilde{\sigma}_I(-x)$. And then

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\sigma_I^2(x)}{|x|} &= \limsup_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_I^2(-x)}{|x|} \\ &= \limsup_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_I^2(y)}{|-y|}, \quad y := -x \\ &= \limsup_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_I^2(y)}{y}, \quad \text{as } |-y| = |y| = y \text{ when } y \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

3. The large strike asymptotic Lee formula on \tilde{S} is

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_I^2(x)}{|x|} &= \beta_R := 2 - 4 \left(\sqrt{\tilde{p}^2 + \tilde{p}} - \tilde{p} \right), \quad \tilde{p} := \sup \left\{ p : \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\tilde{S}_T^{p+1} \right] < \infty \right\} \\ &= \limsup_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{\sigma_I^2(x)}{|x|}. \end{aligned}$$

And we have with a change of numeraire

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p} &= \sup \left\{ p : \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\frac{S_T}{S_0} \left(\frac{S_0 K}{S_T} \right)^{p+1} \right] < \infty \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ p : \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[S_T^{-p} \right] < \infty \right\} \\ &= \tilde{q}. \end{aligned}$$

□