

# An Exact and Explicit Implied Volatility Inversion Formula

Yuxuan Xia <sup>\*</sup>      Zhenyu Cui <sup>†</sup>

February 1, 2018

## Abstract

In this paper, we develop an exact and explicit (model-independent) Taylor series representation of the Black-Scholes implied volatility in terms of market-observed option prices. Based on an extended Faà di Bruno formula under the operator calculus setting, we first derive the Taylor series of the Black-Scholes formula with respect to the volatility around a pre-chosen positive initial value. Then we apply the Lagrange inversion theorem to explicitly invert the Taylor series to obtain the implied volatility formula. We rigorously establish that our formula converge to the true implied volatility as the truncation order increases, and choose the initial value as the model-independent upper bound of the true implied volatility. Numerical examples illustrate the remarkable accuracy of the formula. Our formula distinguishes from previous literature in that it converges to the true exact implied volatility, is a closed-form formula whose coefficients are explicitly determined and do not involve numerical iterations, and is extremely efficient, which makes it suitable for industrial implementation and adoption.

**Keywords:** Implied volatility, Taylor Series, Arbitrary Greeks, Lagrange inversion theorem, Operator Calculus

**AMS subject classifications:** 91G80, 93E11, 93E20

---

<sup>\*</sup>School of Business, Stevens Institute of Technology. Email: yxia16@stevens.edu

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author. School of Business, Stevens Institute of Technology, 1 Castle Point on Hudson, Hoboken, NJ 07030. Email: zcui6@stevens.edu

## 20 1 Introduction

21 As late Steve Ross wrote in the Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, “ ... option pricing theory is the  
22 most successful theory not only in finance, but in all of economics.” The Black-Scholes-Merton theory  
23 is one of the most important and influential in the option pricing theory. Due to the observed market  
24 volatility fluctuations, the Black-Scholes formula is rarely used in the original direction, but rather  
25 is often used in the opposite direction to quote option prices through the “implied volatility”. The  
26 implied volatility is a single number that summarizes the essential features of the option contract,  
27 and it allows traders to compare option prices on different underlying and with different strikes and  
28 maturities, etc. In the practice of financial engineering, one of the most frequently executed numerical  
29 task is to calculate the implied volatility for market-observable European call and put options.

30 It is long-believed that there is no closed-form formula for the implied volatility. Thus, in practice,  
31 the implied volatility is usually determined from an iterative numerical root solving algorithm, such as  
32 the Newton-Raphson method or the Dekker-Brent (i.e. bisection) method. It is documented that the  
33 numerical root-solving methods suffer from slow speed, divergence issues, and biases that may lead  
34 to artificial fake smiles. See the recent interesting empirical evidence in Chance et al. (2017), where  
35 the authors found that even if options are traded following the Black-Scholes model, there are still  
36 observed smiles, skews, and smirks due to inaccuracies of the numerical inversion algorithms employed.  
37 Given that market option prices are observed with plausible errors, especially for those away-from-  
38 the-money options, small changes in the option price characteristics can produce large errors in the  
39 implied volatility estimates. There are extensive empirical studies documenting this phenomenon in  
40 Hentschel (2003), where the author showed that “Implied volatilities can also show pronounced smiles  
41 or smirks, even if all of the Black-Scholes assumptions hold but prices are measured with plausible  
42 errors.”

43 From the practical applications viewpoint, the computation of implied volatility across a wide range  
44 of option price surface is an important component of any financial toolbox, and is central to pricing  
45 and hedging, risk management, and model calibrations involving market option prices. On a particular  
46 trading day, millions of real-time option prices have to be converted to the implied volatilities at the  
47 same time, thus there is a need for a quick evaluation method for implied volatilities. There is a deep  
48 literature on developing efficient non-iterative approximations to the implied volatility in order to  
49 speed up the calibration process. We roughly classify this strand of this literature into two categories:

50 (i) The first category is based on direct approximation of the Black-Scholes formula, and then

51 carrying out explicit or semi-explicit inversion of the approximate formula. The resulting implied  
52 volatility approximation usually does not converge to the true implied volatility and there is an  
53 associated bias that is hard to quantify or bound. Some recent literature within this category  
54 includes Li (2008); Tehranchi (2016); Stefanica and Radoičić (2017), etc.

- 55 (ii) The second category aims at developing *asymptotic* expansion of the implied volatility either in  
56 some extreme parameter regimes (i.e. small maturity or large strike) or through perturbations of  
57 the associated partial differential equations (PDE) or estimates of semi-groups. Usually only the  
58 first few leading order terms are explicitly calculated, and these asymptotic expansion methods  
59 may not work well outside those extreme parameter regimes. Some recent literature includes  
60 Berestycki et al. (2004); Medvedev and Scaillet (2006); Gao and Lee (2014), etc.

61 The above theoretical and practical needs motivate us to develop a closed-form exact and explicit  
62 (model-independent) formula for the implied volatility in terms of market-observed option prices. The  
63 contributions of our paper are as follows:

- 64 1. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first time that an exact explicit closed-form formula for  
65 the Black-Scholes implied volatility is obtained. This is achieved through the novel use of the  
66 operator calculus and the Lagrange inversion theorem.
- 67 2. The implied volatility formula is given as a real-valued Taylor series, which is well-defined, and  
68 with all the expansion coefficients explicitly expressed through known functions and constants.
- 69 3. The implied volatility formula does not involve iterative numerical procedures, and is guaranteed  
70 to converge to the true implied volatility.
- 71 4. The explicit closed-form formula allows us to carry out implied volatility inversion for multiple  
72 market-observed options simultaneously, which is not a feasible task for other iterative-based  
73 numerical root finding methods, such as the Newton-Raphson method or the Dekker-Brent  
74 method.

75 It is important to distinguish our paper from a recent important ground-breaking work of Aït-Sahalia et al.  
76 (2017). They make a remarkable breakthrough in establishing the direct explicit link between the im-  
77 plied volatility and the model parameters in a general class of stochastic volatility models. Our work  
78 is similar to theirs in the sense that explicit and exact formulas are developed. However, there are two  
79 main differences between our work and theirs:

(a) The main objective of this paper is to establish an exact Taylor series representation of the implied volatility in terms of *market-observed* put/call option prices, which is a model-independent and non-parametric formula. The focus of Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) is on parametric models, i.e. stochastic volatility models, and seek to represent implied volatility in terms of model parameters rather than market-observed option prices.

(b) Note that the problem of explicitly inverting the Black-Scholes formula in terms of market-observed option prices, which is achieved in this paper, has not been solved in Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017). One key equation established in their paper is the equation (A.9) on page 37, which presents a closed-form representation of the *sensitivity* of the inverse Black-Scholes formula. The footnote on page 37 of their paper states that:

“Though  $P_{BS}$  is in closed-form as shown in the Black-Scholes formula (4), its inverse function  $P_{BS}^{-1}$  is **implicit**. Thus, it is **impossible** to express the explicit dependence of its derivative  $P_{BS}^{-1,(l_1,l_2,l_3)}$  on  $P$ ”

From this quote, it is clearly seen that the problem of *explicitly* inverting the Black-Scholes formula (i.e. explicit expression for  $P_{BS}^{-1}$ ) has not been solved in their paper. However, in order to achieve the goal of linking the implied volatility to model parameters, they cleverly bypass this by employing the equation (A9). Note that their equation (A9) can not yield (as indicated in the quote above) an **explicit** expression of  $P_{BS}^{-1}$ , which is the main contribution of this paper. It can also be alternatively seen from the first sentence in their Section 5.2 on page 19 quoted here: “... by comparing them to the **numerically** computed implied volatilities...” It is clear that they employed *numerical* procedures in evaluating  $P_{BS}^{-1}$ , while we *analytically* express  $P_{BS}^{-1}$  in terms of explicit closed-form series of market-observed option prices.

To summarize, the focus of Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) is to express the implied volatility in closed-form in terms of the model parameters of a parametric stochastic volatility model, while this paper expresses the implied volatility in a non-parametrical way in terms of market-observed option prices. The techniques in Aït-Sahalia et al. (2017) do not cover our problem as can be seen from the above quote from their paper. Furthermore, based on the explicit inversion of the Black-Scholes formula achieved in this paper, by taking derivatives with respect to the coefficients in the closed-form explicit series expression, it paves the way to “express the explicit dependence of  $P_{BS}^{-1,(l_1,l_2,l_3)}$  on  $P$ ”. Thus our explicit inversion of  $P_{BS}^{-1}$  can replace their equation (A9), and facilitate the task of linking implied

volatility to model parameters if we assume for example a parametric underlying stochastic volatility model. This is left for future research.

The structure of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the general theoretical framework, and presents the main result, an explicit power series expansion of the implied volatility in terms of market observable option prices. Section 3 conducts detailed numerical studies that confirm the convergence and accurateness of our explicit formula, and compares with other methods in the literature. Section 4 concludes the paper.

## 2 Arbitrary Greeks and Explicit Implied Volatility Series

Consider a vanilla European call option on an underlying asset price which is log-normally distributed, i.e. the risky asset price evolves according to the following stochastic differential equation:

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = (r - q)dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad (1)$$

then the Black-Scholes implied volatility (denoted as  $\sigma_{imp}$ ) is the unique positive solution to the following equation:

$$BS(\sigma_{imp}) = V_{market},$$

where  $V_{market}$  is the market-observed price of a call option, and the left hand side is the Black-Scholes formula:

$$BS(\sigma) := V(S, T; \sigma, r, q, K) = SN(d_1) - Ke^{-rT}N(d_2), \quad (2)$$

where  $d_1, d_2$  are defined as

$$d_1 = \frac{\ln(S/K) + rT + \sigma^2 T/2}{\sigma\sqrt{T}}, \quad d_2 = \frac{\ln(S/K) + rT - \sigma^2 T/2}{\sigma\sqrt{T}}.$$

The case for the put option can be similarly defined, and we also use the notation  $V_{market}$  to denote the market -observed put option price when the context is clear.

Our analysis consists of the following four steps:

Step 1. We first obtain the Taylor series expansion of the Black-Scholes call/put option price with respect to  $\sigma$  around a positive initial value  $\sigma_0$ . Note that the usual Taylor series of call/put option prices in terms of  $\sigma$  is singular at  $\sigma = 0$ , and by expanding around a positive level  $\sigma_0$ , the resulting Taylor series is well-defined. The coefficients of all orders are calculated explicitly through operator calculus techniques inspired by Carr (2001).

Step 2. For any given positive initial value  $\sigma_0$ , we invoke the Lagrange inversion theorem, and carry out the series inversion. We obtain the power series of the implied volatility in terms of the market-observed option prices. The coefficients of the inverted power series can be explicitly calculated up to any arbitrary order in terms of the explicit coefficients of the Taylor series in step 1.

Step 3. Furthermore, we investigate the convergence radius of the power series representation of the implied volatility correspondent to the initial point  $\sigma_0$ .

Step 4. Finally we choose an appropriate model-independent  $\sigma_0$ , which is within the convergence radius of the power series in step 3.

In order to obtain a Taylor series expansion of the Black-Scholes option price with respect to  $\sigma$ , we need the explicit formulae for the higher order derivatives of the option price with respect to  $\sigma$ , i.e. we need arbitrary order Greeks of the option price with respect to the volatility. Note that the first order derivative is the vega. Thus in this section, we first consider the problem of obtaining arbitrary Greeks. The direct calculation is intense in computation and hardly leads to explicit formulae. Inspired by Carr (2001), we first link all Greeks to the spatial derivatives using the operator calculus.

Denote the log stock price as  $x = \ln S$ , then the Black-Scholes formula can be re-expressed as:

$$V(S, T) = U(x, T) = e^{x - qT} N(d_1) - K e^{-rT} N(d_2),$$

where

$$d_1 = \frac{x + (r - q)T - \ln K + \sigma^2 T/2}{\sigma \sqrt{T}}, \quad d_2 = d_1 - \sigma \sqrt{T}.$$

In the following, we shall use the two equivalent notations  $V(S, T)$  and  $U(x, T)$  interchangeably. There are two desirable properties associated with using the log stock price as the variable:

- (i) The component of the partial derivative operator corresponding to  $x$  commute to each other (see Appendix A.2).
- (ii) By transformation from  $S$  to  $x$ , the Black-Scholes formula bears no singularity on  $x$  (see Appendix B).

**Lemma 1** (*Spatial derivatives of the Black-Scholes formula*)

For  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , the  $n$ -th order derivative of the European option price with respect to  $x$  is given by

$$\partial_x^n \text{Call}(S, T) = e^{x-qT} \frac{1}{2} (1 + \text{erf}(g(x)) + \frac{e^{x-qT}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{n-1}{j} (-1)^{j-1} (\sqrt{2}\sigma\sqrt{T})^{-j} (e^{-g^2(x)} H_{j-1}(g(x))) ; \quad (3)$$

$$\partial_x^n \text{Put}(S, T) = -e^{x-qT} \frac{1}{2} (1 + \text{erf}(g(x)) - \frac{e^{x-qT}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{n-1}{j} (-1)^{j-1} (-\sqrt{2}\sigma\sqrt{T})^{-j} (e^{-g^2(x)} H_{j-1}(g(x))) , \quad (4)$$

where

$$g(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{x - \ln K + (r-q)T + \sigma^2 T/2}{\sqrt{2}\sigma\sqrt{T}}, & \text{for the call option;} \\ -\frac{x - \ln K + (r-q)T + \sigma^2 T/2}{\sqrt{2}\sigma\sqrt{T}}, & \text{for the put option,} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{erf}(x) := \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt.$$

Here  $H_n(\cdot)$  are the Hermite polynomials given by

$$H_n(x) := (-1)^n e^{x^2} \left( \frac{d^n}{dx^n} e^{-x^2} \right).$$

148 The proof of Lemma 1 is given in Appendix A.1.

149 The next step is to calculate the other Greeks by linking them to the calculation of spatial deriva-  
150 tives, and this is achieved through operator calculus. In the following theorem, we present these  
151 formulae explicitly. For more details about the calculation, one can refer to the Appendix A to Ap-  
152 pendix A.2. Note that in Appendix A.2, we novelly generalize the Faà di Bruno formula in the context  
153 of operator calculus in order to facilitate the derivation of arbitrary Greeks.

154 **Theorem 1** (*Arbitrary Greeks*)

For  $n=1,2,\dots$ , the  $n$ -th order derivative of the European option price with respect to  $\sigma$  can be represented in terms of the security's spatial derivatives as:

$$\partial_\sigma^n V(S, T) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{n!}{(2k-n)!(n-k)!} \cdot \frac{T^k \sigma^{2k-n}}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{j=0}^k k \binom{k}{j} (-1)^{k-j} \partial_x^{k+j} V(S, T), \quad (5)$$

$$\partial_r^n V(S, T) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-1)^{n-k} \partial_x^k V(S, T), \quad (6)$$

$$\partial_q^n V(S, T) = (-1)^n \partial_x^n V(S, T), \quad (7)$$

155 where the spatial derivatives  $\partial_x^k V$  are given in Lemma 1.

156 The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix A.2. Note that the formula (5) applies to both call and  
 157 put options. In the following, we focus on the higher order Greeks with respect to  $\sigma$ , as provided in  
 158 equation (5) in Theorem 1.

**Proposition 2** *The  $n$ -th order Taylor series expansion of the Black-Scholes formula with respect to  $\sigma$  around a positive value  $\sigma_0$  is given by*

$$\tilde{V}_n(S, T; \sigma) = V(S, T; \sigma_0) + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial_{\sigma}^k V(S, T; \sigma_0)}{k!} (\sigma - \sigma_0)^k, \quad (8)$$

159 where, the coefficients  $\partial_{\sigma}^k V$  is determined by equation (5) in Theorem 1 combined with either equation  
 160 (3) or equation (4) in Lemma 1 depending on whether we are considering a call or a put option.  
 161 The representation  $\tilde{V}_n(S, T; \sigma)$  converges to the true value  $V(S, T; \sigma)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if  $0 < \sigma < 2\sigma_0$  and  
 162 diverges if  $\sigma > 2\sigma_0 > 0$ .

163 The proof of Proposition 2 follows from the classical Taylor expansion theorem, and the determi-  
 164 nation of the convergence radius is given in Appendix B.

Given a market-observed call/put option price  $V_{market}$ , denote the Black-Scholes implied volatility as  $\Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market})$ , then by definition, we have

$$V_{market} = V(S, T; \Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market})) = \tilde{V}_{\infty}(S, T; \Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market})), \quad (9)$$

165 where the right hand side has a Taylor series expansion representation given in (8). Intuitively,  
 166 given a power series representation of the market-observed call/put option prices  $V_{market}$  in terms  
 167 of  $\Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market}) - \sigma_0$ , a natural idea is to invert the power series and obtain a representation of  
 168  $\Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market}) - \sigma_0$  in terms of the inverse power series of the market-observed call/put option prices.  
 169 Then, after adding  $\sigma_0$  to both sides, we obtain a power series representation of  $\Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market})$  in terms  
 170 of market-observed option prices. Thus in the next step, we aim to invert the Taylor series expansion  
 171  $V(S, T; \sigma) = \tilde{V}_{\infty}(S, T; \sigma)$ . The existence and well-definedness of the inverted series are guaranteed by  
 172 the Lagrange inversion theorem (see for example Whittaker and Watson (1996)), which we recall as  
 173 follows.

174 **Theorem 3** (*Lagrange Inversion Theorem*)

175 Suppose that a function  $f(\cdot)$  is analytic at a point  $x_0$ , and  $f'(x_0) \neq 0$ , then we can express the  
 176 function  $f(\cdot)$  in its Taylor series. Moreover, the inverse function  $g(\cdot) = f^{-1}(\cdot)$  can also be represented  
 177 as a formal power series which has a non-zero convergence radius.



It is straightforward to verify that  $f(\sigma) := V(S, T; \sigma)$  is analytic at the positive level  $\sigma_0$ , and that  $f'(\sigma_0) \neq 0$ . The corresponding Taylor series expansion of  $f(\cdot)$  is explicitly given in equation (8). Thus the Lagrange inversion theorem guarantees that the inverse series exists with a non-zero convergence radius. After establishing the existence of the inverse series, the next task is to calculate the coefficients of the inverse series. In general, if we are given a power series  $y = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i x^i$ , then the inverse series has the following form:  $x = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} A_j y^j$ , where the coefficients are explicitly given by the following formula (see for example Morse and Feshbach (1954)):

$$A_n := \frac{1}{na_1^n} \sum_{s \neq \mu} (-1)^{s+t+u+\dots} \frac{n(n+1) \cdots (n-1+s+t+u+\dots)}{s!t!u!\dots} \left(\frac{a_2}{a_1}\right)^s \left(\frac{a_3}{a_1}\right)^t \cdots, \quad (10)$$

where

$$s + 2t + 3u + \dots = n - 1.$$

The first few inversion coefficients are explicitly calculated as below:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= 1/a_1; \\ A_2 &:= -a_1^{-3}a_2; \\ A_3 &:= a_1^{-5}(2a_2^2 - a_1a_3); \\ A_4 &:= a_1^{-7}(5a_1a_2a_3 - a_1^2a_4 - 5a_2^3); \\ A_5 &:= a_1^{-9}(6a_1^2a_2a_4 + 3a_1^2a_3^2 + 14a_2^4 - a_1^3a_5 - 21a_1a_2^2a_3); \\ A_6 &:= a_1^{-11}(7a_1^3a_2a_5 + 7a_1^3a_3a_4 + 84a_1a_2^3a_3 - a_1^4a_6 - 28a_1^2a_2a_3^2 - 42a_2^5 - 28a_1^2a_2^2a_4); \\ A_7 &:= a_1^{-13}(8a_1^4a_2a_6 + 8a_1^4a_3a_5 + 4a_1^4a_4^2 + 120a_1^2a_2^3a_4 + 180a_1^2a_2^2a_3^2 \\ &\quad + 132a_2^6 - a_1^5a_7 - 36a_1^3a_2^2a_5 - 72a_1^3a_2a_3a_4 - 12a_1^3a_3^3 - 330a_1a_2^4a_3), \text{ etc } \dots \end{aligned}$$

Alternative to the expression (10), the inversion coefficients can be expressed through the Bell polynomials:

$$A_n = \frac{1}{a_1^n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-1)^k n^{(k)} B_{n-1,k}(\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2, \dots, \hat{a}_{n-k}), \quad n \geq 2,$$

where

$$\hat{a}_k = \frac{a_{k+1}}{(k+1)a_1}, \quad A_1 = \frac{1}{a_1}, \text{ and } n^{(k)} := n(n+1) \cdots (n+k-1).$$

Here  $B_{n-1,k}$  denotes the  $(n-1, k)$ -th partial exponential Bell polynomial, which is defined as:

$$B_{n-1,k}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-k}) := \sum \frac{(n-1)!}{j_1!j_2!\dots j_{n-k}!} \left(\frac{x_1}{1!}\right)^{j_1} \left(\frac{x_2}{2!}\right)^{j_2} \cdots \left(\frac{x_{n-k}}{(n-k)!}\right)^{j_{n-k}},$$

where the summation is taken over all sequences  $j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_{n-k}$  of non-negative integers such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} j_1 + j_2 + \dots + j_{n-k} &= k, \\ j_1 + 2j_2 + \dots + (n-k)j_{n-k} &= n-1. \end{aligned}$$

The Bell polynomial is a commonly-used function in science and engineering. It is a built-in function in many scientific computing languages such as Mathematica, Maple, Matlab and in some packages such as *sympy* in Python. Next we present the main result of the paper summarized in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4** (*The Lagrange Inversion Series of Implied Volatility: An Explicit Taylor Series*)

Denote  $V(\cdot)$  and  $V_{\text{market}}$  respectively as the Black-Scholes formula and the market-observed prices for call/put options, then the Black-Scholes implied volatility  $\Sigma_{\text{imp}}^{BS}(V_{\text{market}})$  has the following series representation:

$$\Sigma_{\text{imp}}^{BS}(V_{\text{market}}) = \sigma_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \cdot \frac{\partial^n \Sigma_{\text{imp}}^{BS}}{\partial V^n}(V(\sigma_0)) \cdot (V_{\text{market}} - V(\sigma_0))^n. \quad (11)$$

The coefficients of (11) are explicitly represented by:

(i) For  $n = 1$ ,

$$\frac{\partial \Sigma_{\text{imp}}^{BS}}{\partial V}(V(\sigma_0)) = \frac{1}{V_1};$$

(ii) For  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n!} \cdot \frac{\partial^n \Sigma_{\text{imp}}^{BS}}{\partial V^n}(V(\sigma_0)) = \frac{1}{V_1^n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-1)^k \frac{(n+k-1)!}{(n-1)!} B_{n-1,k}(\hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2, \dots, \hat{V}_{n-k}),$$

where

$$V_k := \partial_{\sigma}^k V(\sigma_0), \quad \hat{V}_k := \frac{V_{k+1}}{(k+1)V_1}.$$

Here  $V(\sigma_0) := V(S, T; \sigma_0)$ , and  $\partial_{\sigma}^k V(\sigma_0)$  are explicitly given in Theorem 1 and Lemma 1.

The proof of Theorem 4 follows straightforwardly from Lemma 1, Theorem 1, Proposition 2 and the Lagrange inversion theorem.

The next result establishes the convergence of the Lagrange inversion series given in (11).

**Proposition 5** (*Convergence of the Lagrange Inversion Series of Implied Volatility*)

The convergence of the series (11) around a non-degenerate neighborhood centered at  $V(\sigma_0)$  is guaranteed by both the original Black-Scholes Taylor series expansion with respect to the volatility at the fixed point  $\sigma_0$  and the Lagrange inversion theorem.

The proof of Proposition 5 follows from the Taylor's theorem (see for example Apostol (1967)) and the Lagrange inversion theorem (see Theorem 4). Note that the classical Lagrange inversion theorem only guarantees the convergence within a non-degenerate convergence interval, but does not specify the length of the convergence radius. In practical applications of inverting the implied volatility, we carry out further in-depth study of the convergence radius. The details of discussions are given in Appendix B.

Given that the original Taylor series is convergent (i.e. (8) is convergent), the Lagrange inversion theorem *only* guarantees that the inverted Taylor series is convergent around a *non-degenerate* neighborhood centered at the value we expand around (i.e.  $V(\sigma_0)$ ), but it does not provide an explicit theoretical formula for the determination of the *convergence radius*. Thus in the numerical experiments, we shall numerically determine the actual convergence radius of the series (11). A summary of the properties of the two Taylor series is given in Table 1.

Properties	Taylor Series 8	Taylor Series 11
Convergence radius	$\sigma_0$	some $R > 0$ (numerically determined)
Convergence interval	$(0, 2\sigma_0)$	$(V(\sigma_0) - R, V(\sigma_0) + R)$

Table 1: Summary of properties of the two Taylor series

In choosing the initial value  $\sigma_0$ , we base our analysis on several recent literature on model-independent uniform bounds on the Black and Scholes implied volatility, and in particular, the results of Stefanica and Radoičić (2017) and Tehranchi (2016). For most parameter ranges, one can use the tight approximation results in Stefanica and Radoičić (2017), but this approximation fail to be real numbers in some extreme parameter ranges. Thus we choose to set the fixed point  $\sigma_0$  as the model-independent upper bound in Tehranchi (2016). We prefer an upper bound because it guarantees the convergence of the Taylor series (8), since the true implied volatility is within  $(0, \sigma_0)$ , which falls into the convergence interval as established in Proposition 5 (see also Table 1).

Given the initial stock price  $S$ , the strike  $K$ , the maturity  $T$ , the continuously compounded interest rate  $r$  and dividend rate  $q$ , denote  $V_{market}^c$  as the market price for an European call option, and  $V_{market}^p$

for an European put option. Introduce the notations:

$$c := \frac{V_{market}^c}{e^{-qT}S}, \quad p = \frac{V_{market}^p}{e^{-qT}S}, \quad k = \ln \frac{K}{Se^{(r-q)T}}.$$

Recall the put-call parity:

$$c - p = 1 - e^k \quad (12)$$

212 Recall the following result in Tehranchi (2016):

213 **Proposition 6** (*Uniform Bounds for the Black-Scholes Implied Volatility*)

Fix  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $(1 - e^k)^+ \leq c < 1$ . For  $k \geq 0$  the following inequalities hold:

$$-2N^{-1} \left( \frac{1-c}{2} \right) \leq \Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market})\sqrt{T} \leq -2N^{-1} \left( \frac{1-c}{1+e^k} \right),$$

and for  $k < 0$  we have

$$-2N^{-1} \left( \frac{1-c}{2e^k} \right) \leq \Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market})\sqrt{T} \leq -2N^{-1} \left( \frac{1-c}{1+e^k} \right).$$

For any  $k \in \mathbb{R}$ , from the put-call parity 12, the upper bound of implied volatility is given by

$$\Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market}) \leq -\frac{2}{\sqrt{T}}N^{-1} \left( \frac{1-c}{1+e^k} \right) = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{T}}N^{-1} \left( \frac{e^k - p}{1+e^k} \right) =: \sigma_0, \quad (13)$$

214 and the two equivalent expressions on the right hand side are for cases when market call or put option  
 215 prices are available. In the last equality above, we set the initial level  $\sigma_0$  as this model-independent  
 216 upper bound for both call and put options.

### 217 3 Numerical Implementation

218 In this section, we implement the exact explicit closed-form formula for the Black-Scholes implied  
 219 volatility as given in (11). The numerical experiment is designed as follows: we use call and put  
 220 option prices generated from a Black-Scholes model, and compare the inverted implied volatility value  
 221  $\sigma_{imp}$  with the true value  $\sigma$  that we start with. In this way, we have the exact benchmark value for the  
 222 true implied volatility, and can precisely analyze the convergence behavior of the series depending on  
 223 the choice is initial value  $\sigma_0$ , and also study the accuracy improvement of the series when we increase  
 224 the truncation order. We report the log errors for three cases: at-the-money (ATM), in-the-money  
 225 (ITM) and out-of-the-money (OTM). All numerical computations are conducted using Mathematica  
 226 version 11.2.0.0 on a personal computer with an Intel Core i5 1.60 GHZ processor. The source codes  
 227 and associated numerical figures for all numerical experiments are available upon request.

### 228 3.1 Numerical experiments with the convergence radius

229 From Table 1, it is clear that the choice of the positive initial value  $\sigma_0$  is of crucial importance for the  
 230 convergence of the two Taylor series (8) and (11). In order for the Taylor series (8) to be convergent,  
 231 we need to choose  $\sigma_0$  such that the true implied volatility falls within the convergence interval, i.e.  
 232  $0 < \Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market}) < \sigma_0$ . A naive choice of the initial value is for example to set  $\sigma_0 = 1$ , since in practice  
 233 the implied volatility is never above 100% (e.g. it is around 70% even in the most extreme market  
 234 condition during the 2008 financial crisis). In this way, we can guarantee that the Taylor series (8) is  
 235 convergent. Note that if it happens that  $\Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market}) > 2\sigma_0$ , or equivalently  $\sigma_0 < \Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V_{market})/2$ ,  
 236 then the theoretical analysis (Proposition 2) indicates that the Taylor series (8) is divergent, and  
 237 consequently the inverted Taylor series (11) should also be divergent.

238 In order to analyze the sensitivity of the inverted Taylor series with respect to  $\sigma_0$ , and also to  
 239 substantiate the above discussions, we test the explicit implied volatility formula given in equation  
 240 (11) for different values of  $\sigma_0$ , using option prices generated from a Black and Scholes model. We start  
 241 from a true value of  $\sigma = 0.3$ , and assume an initial stock price  $S = 100$ , the time to maturity  $T = 1$ ,  
 242 the interest rate  $r = 0.05$ , and that no dividend is paid. We generate the “market” option price using  
 243 the Black-Scholes formula. Then we plug the generated “market” option prices into our formula (11)  
 244 and compare the inverted implied volatility value with the true value  $\sigma = 0.3$  that we start with. We  
 245 consider four different truncation levels, i.e.  $n = 1, 4, 8, 16$ . For practically relevant implied volatility  
 246 values, here we take different initial values of  $\sigma_0$  within the range  $(0, 1)$ , and plot the values from the  
 247 formula for different truncation orders. Note that the true implied volatility can not be practically  
 248 larger than 100%, even in the most extreme market conditions in the 2008 financial crisis.

249 The numerical results are summarized in Figure 1. There are two red dashed lines in each of  
 250 the five sub-graphs: the upper one represents the case when the absolute error equals  $10^{-2}$ , and the  
 251 lower one correspond to the case when the absolute error is at  $10^{-4}$ . We justify the results by these  
 252 two benchmark lines. For error curves below the upper dashed red line, we categorize it as a *feasible*  
 253 estimation. For error curves below the lower dashed red line, we categorize it as a *good* estimation.  
 254 We make the following observations:

- 255 (a) Fixing the level of the truncation order  $n$ , the absolute error of the implied volatility formula  
 256 converges to 0 rapidly as the initial point approaches the true value ( $\sigma_0 \rightarrow \sigma = 0.3$  in this case)  
 257 either from the left or from the right.
- 258 (b) Fixing the level of  $\sigma_0$ , and conditional on that the series is convergent with this chosen  $\sigma_0$  level,




Figure 1: The log error corresponding to different initial values of  $\sigma_0$ .

the implied volatility formula is converging to the true value (i.e.  $\sigma = 0.3$ ) as the truncation order increases.

(c) The implied volatility formula exhibits stable convergence patterns when  $\sigma_0$  is residing on the right hand side of the true implied volatility value, i.e.  $\sigma_0 > 0.3$ .

(d) The implied volatility formula is divergent when the initial value  $\sigma_0$  is taken to be smaller than half of the true value (i.e.  $\sigma_0 < \frac{1}{2}\sigma = 0.15$ ). This phenomenon is consistent with the theoretical findings in Proposition 5 and Table 1. Note that in this case, the original Taylor series (8) is divergent, thus the corresponding inverted Taylor series (11) is also divergent.

(e) For ATM case, a truncation order  $n=4$  is good enough for the log error to be below the lower dashed red line, i.e. a *good* estimation. For extreme OTM cases, in order to achieve a *good* estimation, a truncation order of  $n = 8$  is required. For extreme ITM cases, a truncation order of  $n = 16$  is needed.

In practice, one can choose the initial value  $\sigma_0$  independent from any model parameter (e.g. choose  $\sigma_0 = 1$  in any case) and our stationary test shows that even this naive choice leads to stable (although slow) convergence to the true exact value as the truncation order increases. One natural extension is to use some reasonable estimate based on information of the option that are independent from the underlying stochastic model assumed, i.e. the strike, the maturity and the interest rate etc. In the following, we shall illustrate the significant gain in accuracy if we choose  $\sigma_0$  based on the above basic information of an option, which is still model-independent. Thus our final implied volatility formula (equation (8)) is model-independent inherited from the fact that the choice of  $\sigma_0$  does not depend on the underlying stochastic model.

From now on, we set  $\sigma_0$  to be equal to the model-independent upper bound (see Proposition 6) given in Tehranchi (2016). In the following Table 2, we report the log errors of the explicit implied volatility formula as compared to the exact value. To report one entire row (ten entries) in Table 2, it takes the following CPU times: 0.01 sec ( $n = 1$ ); 0.4 sec ( $n = 5$ ); 7.4 sec ( $n = 10$ ); 52.9 sec ( $n = 15$ ). We notice that most of the CPU time is spent on the calculation using the Faà di Bruno formula, and it is possible to carry out these related symbolic formulae in an offline fashion to further save on the computing time. Furthermore, our implementation is conducted in Mathematica for its convenience of handling symbolic computation, and we believe that the implementation procedure of the explicit closed-form formula in (11) and the choice of programming language can be further optimized.

To summarize, using our volatility representation formula, combined with Tehranchi (2016)'s upper bound as the initial point  $\sigma_0$ , the results (see Figure 2) are uniformly accurate from very extreme ITM regime to the extreme OTM regime across a wide range of strikes. The formula converges to the true implied volatility as the truncation order increases.

### 3.2 A hybrid iteration procedure based on Lagrangian inversion series

Moreover, in order to make this method more accurate and efficient for practical considerations, we introduce the following hybrid scheme:

Step 1. Start with  $\sigma_0$  set as the model-independent upper bound in Tehranchi (2016), with a fixed truncation order  $n$ , we obtain the first-step estimate the implied volatility  $\sigma_{imp}^{(1)}$ .




Figure 2: Lagrange Inversion Expansion combined with upper bound in Tehranchi (2016)

strike	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150
n=1	-0.930977	-1.36495	-2.06819	-3.3251	-6.90561	-8.14309	-3.72417	-2.59724	-1.97486	-1.58266
n=5	-1.34988	-2.15033	-3.67624	-6.66223	-13.5289	-14.1285	-7.6069	-4.92013	-3.46269	-2.59865
n=10	-1.65706	-2.84722	-5.35769	-10.5755	-15.6536	-16.2556	-12.2517	-7.50653	-4.99536	-3.56167
n=15	-1.89052	-3.44412	-6.91698	-14.3806	-15.6536	-16.2556	-15.6536	-9.96422	-6.40771	-4.4155

Table 2: log error corresponding to different truncation orders without iteration

strike	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150
n=1	-1.49323	-2.3975	-4.03645	-7.03956	-15.9546	-15.9546	-7.99151	-5.30098	-3.81427	-2.89237
n=5	-3.8121	-8.74515	-15.6536	-15.3014	-15.7785	-16.2556	-16.2556	-15.1764	-15.3014	-11.7103
n=10	-7.96287	-15.3014	-15.9546	-15.9546	-15.6536	-16.2556	-16.2556	-15.4775	-15.9546	-15.7785
n=15	-13.6536	-15.4105	-15.1095	-15.4105	-15.6536	-16.2556	-16.2556	-15.7785	-15.5566	-15.7785

Table 3: log error corresponding to different truncation orders with 1-step iteration

strike	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150
n=1	-2.35705	-4.32938	-7.94478	-14.4105	-15.9546	-16.2556	-15.7785	-10.7002	-7.45814	-5.42719
n=5	-14.6758	-15.4105	-15.9546	-15.5566	-15.7785	-16.2556	-16.2556	-15.2556	-15.3014	-15.3014
n=10	-14.9546	-15.2142	-15.9546	-15.4775	-15.6536	-16.2556	-16.2556	-15.3525	-15.9546	-15.7785
n=15	-14.7785	-15.0252	-15.7785	-16.2556	-15.6536	-16.2556	-16.2556	-15.3014	-15.3014	-15.7785

Table 4: log error corresponding to different truncation orders with 2-steps iteration

Step 2. Then we set  $\sigma_0 := \sigma_{imp}^{(1)}$ , and then apply the same formula again with the same fixed truncation order  $n$ , and obtain the second-step estimate  $\sigma_{imp}^{(2)}$ . (Repeat Step 2 for more iterations).

The values of  $\sigma_{imp}^{(1)}$  and  $\sigma_{imp}^{(2)}$  are respectively reported in Table 2 and Table 3. We can apply the above iteration steps twice, and obtain  $\sigma_{imp}^{(3)}$ , which is reported in Table 4. From Table 3, we conclude



that even with the truncation order equal to 10, one can obtain a remarkably good accuracy for any moneyness including very extreme situations. For the two-step iteration method, Table 4 shows that the absolute errors for any claims are around  $10^{-15}$  and lower bounded by  $10^{-16.2556}$ , which reaches the machine precision in Mathematica.

## 4 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we obtain for the first time an explicit and exact model-independent Taylor series representation of the implied volatility in terms of market-observed option prices. We establish the convergence of the formula to the true exact implied volatility. We utilize a model-independent upper bound of the true implied volatility as the initial expansion point  $\sigma_0$ , which is within the convergence radius. The formula performs extremely well when the options are close to the money, and even in extreme cases (e.g. deep in the money and deep out of the money), the accuracy is remarkably good. We also propose a hybrid scheme where we iteratively evaluate our formula, and numerical experiments demonstrate the improved accuracy across all parameter ranges, and in particular significant improvement in accuracy for extreme moneyness cases. We foresee that the proposed formula can be highly valuable to both the theory and practice of financial engineering.

## References

- Aït-Sahalia, Y., C. Li, and C. X. Li (2017). Closed-form implied volatility surfaces for stochastic volatility models. *working paper*.
- Apostol, T. (1967). *Calculus*. Jon Wiley & Sons.
- Berestycki, H., J. Busca, and I. Florent (2004). Computing the implied volatility in stochastic volatility models. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 57(10), 1352–1373.
- Carr, P. (2001). Deriving derivatives of derivative securities. *Journal of Computational Finance* 4(2), 5–29.
- Chance, D. M., T. A. Hanson, W. Li, and J. Muthuswamy (2017). A bias in the volatility smile. *Review of Derivatives Research* 20(1), 47–90.
- Gao, K. and R. Lee (2014). Asymptotics of implied volatility to arbitrary order. *Finance and Stochastics* 18(2), 349–392.
- Hentschel, L. (2003). Errors in implied volatility estimation. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 38(4), 779–810.
- Knopp, K. (1990). *Theory and Application of Infinite Series*. Dover Publications.
- Li, M. (2008). Approximate inversion of the Black–Scholes formula using rational functions. *European Journal of Operational Research* 185(2), 743–759.
- Medvedev, A. and O. Scaillet (2006). Approximation and calibration of short-term implied volatilities under jump-diffusion stochastic volatility. *Review of Financial Studies* 20(2), 427–459.
- Morse, P. and H. Feshbach (1954). Methods of theoretical physics. *American Journal of Physics* 22(6), 410–413.

- 336 Stefanica, D. and R. Radoičić (2017). An explicit implied volatility formula. *working paper* .
- 337 Tehranchi, M. (2016). Uniform bounds for Black–Scholes implied volatility. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*  
338 7(1), 893–916.
- 339 Whittaker, E. T. and G. N. Watson (1996). *A course of modern analysis*. Cambridge university press.

## 340 A Operator Calculus and Proofs of Main Results

341 In this section, we mainly discuss about how to utilize operator calculus to decouple different model  
 342 parameters. An alternative application is to build bridge between different parameters, and the details  
 343 are discussed in Appendix A.2.

### 344 A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Recall the following well-known identity:

$$FN'(d_1)\frac{\partial d_1}{\partial S} - KN'(d_2)\frac{\partial d_2}{\partial S} \equiv 0,$$

where  $F := Se^{(r-q)T}$  is the forward stock price and  $K$  is the strike price. The spatial derivative with respect to  $x = \ln S$  is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial V}{\partial x} &= c \cdot e^{x-qT} N(c \cdot d_1) \\ &= c \cdot e^{x-qT} \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{c \cdot d_1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right),\end{aligned}$$

345 where  $c$  is the option type indicator, i.e.  $c = 1$  for the call option, and  $c = -1$  for the put option.

We denote the  $j$ -th partial differential operator with respect to  $x$  as  $\partial_x^j$ . To simplify the notation, we denote the term in the error function as  $g(x)$ , i.e.  $g(x) := \frac{c \cdot d_1}{\sqrt{2}}$ , or equivalently

$$g(x) := c \cdot \frac{x + (r - q)T - \ln(K) + \sigma^2 T / 2}{\sigma \sqrt{T}}.$$

346 We first recall the following result on the derivatives of the error function.

**Lemma 2** ( *$n$ -th derivatives of the error function*)

$$\operatorname{erf}^{(j)}(y) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-y^2} H_{j-1}(y) (-1)^{j-1}, \quad (14)$$

where function  $H_n(\cdot)$  are Hermite polynomials given by

$$H_n(x) = (-1)^n e^{x^2} \left( \frac{d^n}{dx^n} e^{-x^2} \right) = \left( 2x - \frac{d}{dx} \right)^n \cdot 1. \quad (15)$$

One can utilize these formulas to obtain the derivatives of the option value:

$$\frac{\partial^{n+1} V}{\partial x^{n+1}} = \frac{e^{x-qT}}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^n}{\partial x^n} (e^{x-qT} \operatorname{erf}(g(x))) \quad (16)$$

$$= \frac{e^{x-qT}}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} e^{x-qT} \partial_x^j \operatorname{erf}(g(x)) \quad (17)$$

$$= \frac{e^{x-qT}}{2} (1 + \operatorname{erf}(g(x))) + \frac{e^{x-qT}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{n}{j} \partial_x^j \operatorname{erf}(g(x)) \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{e^{x-qT}}{2} (1 + \operatorname{erf}(g(x))) + \frac{e^{x-qT}}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{n}{j} \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} (-1)^{j-1} (\sqrt{2} \sigma \sqrt{T})^{-j} (\exp(-g(x)^2) H_{j-1}(g(x))), \quad (19)$$

347 where  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 348 A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

349 In this section, we present a formal derivation of the arbitrary higher order Greeks of the Black-Scholes  
 350 model, which is based on operator calculus and the Faà di Bruno formula. To simplify our analysis, we  
 351 denote the spatial parameter as  $x = \ln S$ . Our goal is to express higher order derivatives with respect  
 352 to the volatility  $\sigma$ , interest rate  $r$ , the dividend rate  $q$  in terms of the spatial derivatives  $x$  derived in  
 353 Appendix A.1. Below, we first consider the Black-Scholes equation and derive its formal solution.

**Definition 7** *The Black-Scholes price  $U(x, \tau)$  is determined by the evolution problem:*

$$\frac{\partial U(x, \tau)}{\partial \tau} = \mathcal{L} \circ U(x, \tau), \quad 0 < \tau < T \quad (20)$$

$$U(x, 0) = f(x), \quad (21)$$

where  $\tau$  denotes the time to maturity, and the parameterized linear operator  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\sigma, r, q)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &:= \frac{\sigma^2 S^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial S^2} + (r - q) S \frac{\partial}{\partial S} - r \mathcal{I} \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) + (r - q) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - r \mathcal{I} \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) - q \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + r \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \mathcal{I} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

354 Operator calculus treats equation (20) as an ordinary differential equation (ODE) in  $\tau$ . If we  
 355 further assume that the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}$  is time-independent, then we can treat it as a constant.  
 356 Therefore, the formal solution of equation (20) subject to the terminal condition (21) is given by

$$U(x, \tau) = \exp\{\tau \mathcal{L}\} \circ f(x), \quad (23)$$

357 where  $\exp\{\tau \mathcal{L}\}$  is itself a linear operator with the following series representation:

$$\exp\{\tau \mathcal{L}\} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\tau \mathcal{L})^k}{k!}. \quad (24)$$

358

359 **Remark 1** *Recall that two operators  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$  are said to commute if  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B} \equiv \mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}$  holds. To simplify our*  
 360 *calculation, we decompose the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}$  into three commuting operators:*

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_\sigma + \mathcal{L}_q + \mathcal{L}_r, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma(\sigma) := \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right), \quad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_q(q) := -q \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \quad (27)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_r(r) := r \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \mathcal{I} \right). \quad (28)$$

**Remark 2** In Definition 7,  $\mathcal{L}$  is parameterized by  $(\sigma, r, q)$ , which are the model parameters. We have that any derivative with respect to a model parameter  $z$  will have the following representation:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^n U(x, \tau)}{\partial z^n} &= \frac{\partial^n}{\partial z^n} (\exp\{\tau \mathcal{L}(z)\} \circ f(x)) \\ &= \frac{\partial^n \exp\{\tau \mathcal{L}(z)\}}{\partial z^n} \circ f(x).\end{aligned}\quad (29)$$

To begin our derivation, we briefly recall the well-known Faà di Bruno formula.

**Theorem 8** (Faà di Bruno formula)

Given a composite function  $f(g(x))$ , the following equation holds,

$$\frac{d^n}{dx^n} f(g(x)) = \sum_{k=1}^n f^{(k)}(g(x)) \cdot B_{n,k} \left( g'(x), g''(x), \dots, g^{(n-k+1)}(x) \right), \quad (30)$$

where  $B_{n,k}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-k+1})$  are the Bell polynomials defined by

$$B_{n,k}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-k+1}) = \sum \frac{n!}{j_1! j_2! \dots j_{n-k+1}!} \left( \frac{x_1}{1!} \right)^{j_1} \left( \frac{x_2}{2!} \right)^{j_2} \dots \left( \frac{x_{n-k+1}}{(n-k+1)!} \right)^{j_{n-k+1}}. \quad (31)$$

Here the summation is taken over all sequences  $j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_{n-k+1}$  of non-negative integers, such that

$$\begin{aligned}j_1 + j_2 + j_3 + \dots + j_{n-k+1} &= k, \\ j_1 + 2j_2 + 3j_3 + \dots + (n-k+1)j_{n-k+1} &= n.\end{aligned}$$

The above result is valid in the context of real-valued  $C^\infty$  function  $f$  and  $g$ . To obtain an extended Faà di Bruno formula suitable for calculating (29), we provide an operator extension as follows:

**Proposition 9** (Extended Faà di Bruno formula)

Given a function represented through the evolution equation (23), the higher order derivatives of  $U(x, \tau)$  with respect to the model parameter  $z$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_z^n [\exp(\mathcal{G}(z)) f(x)] &= (\partial_z^n \exp(\tau \mathcal{L}(z))) \cdot f(x) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n B_{n,k}(\mathcal{G}'(z), \mathcal{G}''(z), \dots, \mathcal{G}^{(n-k+1)}(z)) \exp^{(k)}(\mathcal{G}(z)) f(x) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n B_{n,k}(\mathcal{G}'(z), \mathcal{G}''(z), \dots, \mathcal{G}^{(n-k+1)}(z)) \exp(\mathcal{G}(z)) f(S)(\mathcal{G}(z)) f(x),\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} = \tau \mathcal{L} = \tau(\mathcal{L}_\sigma + \mathcal{L}_r + \mathcal{L}_q). \quad (33)$$

We denote the above method as the “extended Faà di Bruno formula” since it is a straightforward

extension under operator calculus. In addition, derivatives with respect to model parameters satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\sigma^n \mathcal{G} &= \tau \cdot \partial_\sigma^n \mathcal{L}_\sigma \\ &= \begin{cases} \tau \cdot \sigma \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right), & n = 1 \\ \tau \cdot \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right), & n = 2 \\ 0, & n \geq 3 \end{cases}\end{aligned}\quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_q^n \mathcal{G} &= \tau \cdot \partial_q^n \mathcal{L}_q \\ &= \begin{cases} -\tau \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, & n = 1 \\ 0, & n \geq 2 \end{cases}\end{aligned}\quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_r^n \mathcal{G} &= \tau \cdot \partial_r^n \mathcal{L}_r \\ &= \begin{cases} \tau \cdot \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \mathcal{I} \right), & n = 1 \\ 0, & n \geq 2 \end{cases}\end{aligned}\quad (36)$$

From the above calculations, it can be seen that the higher order derivatives of operators  $\mathcal{L}$  vanish to zero, which brings convenience in computing the Greeks of the Black-Scholes formula. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\sigma^n U(x, \tau) &= (\partial_\sigma^n \exp(\tau \cdot \mathcal{L}) f(x)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n B_{n,k}(\mathcal{G}'(\sigma), \mathcal{G}''(\sigma), \dots, \mathcal{G}^{(n-k+1)}(\sigma)) \exp^{(k)}(\tau \cdot \mathcal{L}) f(x)\end{aligned}\quad (37)$$

$$= \underbrace{0 + \dots + 0}_{k=2} + B_{n,n-1}(\mathcal{G}'(\sigma), \mathcal{G}''(\sigma)) \exp(\tau \cdot \mathcal{L}) f(x) + B_{n,n}(\mathcal{G}'(\sigma)) \exp(\tau \cdot \mathcal{L}) f(x), \quad (38)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}B_{n,n}(x) &= x^n, \\ B_{n,n-1}(x, y) &= \frac{n!}{2(n-2)!} x^{n-2} y.\end{aligned}$$

By substitution and simplification, we have

$$\partial_\sigma^n U(x, \tau) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{n!}{(2k-n)!(n-k)!} \frac{T^k \sigma^{2k-n}}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{k}{j} (-1)^{k-j} \partial_x^{k+j} f(x).$$

This corresponds to (5), which is one of the key formulae in Theorem 1. To obtain higher-order derivatives of the option price with respect to other model parameters such as  $r$  and  $q$ , one can substitute (27) and (28) into (32), and follow similar calculations. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## B Convergence of the Power Series

In this section, we discuss in more details the radius of convergence of the Taylor series 8 and 11. For illustration purpose, we quote several well established results in the theory of power series of analytic functions.

## 375 B.1 Convergence of the Taylor Series in (8)

376 First, we review some basic results on analytic functions in complex analysis. Recall the following basic  
377 property about Taylor series.

378 **Proposition 10** (*Singularities and the Convergence Radius of Taylor Series*) *Given the singularities*  
379 *of a function as the points at which the function is not analytic, let  $f(x)$  be analytic everywhere except*  
380 *at a finite number of singularities. Denote  $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$  as the distance from  $x_0$  to the closest singularity of*  
381  *$f$ . Then, the Taylor series of  $f$  about  $x_0$  converges to  $f$  at every point  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $|x - x_0| < R$ .*

382 In the current study, the only singularity of the Black-Scholes formula (2) as a function of  $\sigma$  is at  
383 the origin  $\sigma = 0$ , which is an *essential singularity*, i.e. it is neither a pole or a removable singularity.  
384 Thus the Taylor series 8 converges in a disc with radius being the distance from  $\sigma_0$  to the origin. The  
385 radius of convergence is clearly  $|\sigma_0 - 0| = \sigma_0$  and the series is divergent beyond this radius. In the real  
386 line, the power series (8) converges uniformly to the Black-Scholes formula as the truncation order  
387  $n \rightarrow \infty$  when  $0 < \sigma < 2\sigma_0$  and diverges when  $\sigma > 2\sigma_0$ .

## 388 B.2 Convergence of the Taylor Series in (11)

389 The Lagrange inversion theorem (i.e. Theorem 3) ensures that the Taylor series 11 has a non-zero  
390 radius of convergence, however, it is not easy to find the explicit radius of convergence. This motivates  
391 us to test the actual radius in a numerical experiment. First, we recall Theorem 94 in chapter 18 of  
392 Knopp (1990).

393 **Theorem 11** (*The Radius of Convergence of Power Series*) *If the power series  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j(x - x_0)^j$  is given*  
394 *and  $\mu$  denotes the upper limit of the (positive) sequence of numbers  $|a_1|, \sqrt{|a_2|}, \sqrt[3]{|a_3|}, \dots, \sqrt[n]{|a_n|}, \dots$ ,*  
395 *i.e.  $\mu = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|}$ , then*

396 (a)

- 397 1. if  $\mu = 0$ , the power series is everywhere convergent;
- 398 2. if  $\mu = +\infty$ , the power series is nowhere convergent;
- 399 3. if  $0 < \mu < \infty$ , the power series

400 (a) converges absolutely for every  $|x - x_0| < \frac{1}{\mu}$ ,

401 (b) but diverges for every  $|x - x_0| > \frac{1}{\mu}$ .

thus, with the suitable interpretation,

$$R = \frac{1}{\mu} = \frac{1}{\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|}}$$

402 is the radius of convergence of the given power series.

403 By the merit of the simplicity of this theorem, a standard numerical method to estimate the radius  
404 of convergence is given by follows. Denote

$$R_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt[n]{|a_n|}}. \quad (39)$$

405 In the following, we first investigate the convergence property of  $R_n$ , and then estimate it to  
 406 see whether our representation is within the radius of convergence. The test is carried out under  
 407 different sets of parameters reflecting different scenarios. Denote the initial stock price as  $S$ , the time  
 408 to maturity as  $T$ , the strike price as  $K$ , the interest rate as  $r$ , the dividend rate as  $q$ , and the true  
 409 volatility as  $\sigma$ . Assume that the market price  $V$  is generated from plugging  $\sigma$  into the Black-Scholes  
 410 formula.

411 In testing the asymptotic property of  $R_n$ , we fix our initial point using the Tehranchi (2016)'s  
 412 upper bound, i.e.  $\sigma_0 := \sigma_{Teh}(V, S, K, T, r, q)$ . We vary the values of the other model parameters in  
 413 some extreme cases and evaluate  $R_n$  from  $n = 1$  to a sufficient large number  $N$ . Figure 3 showcases  
 414 the sequence  $R_n$  against the index  $n$  under different scenarios. Note that the ten test cases (cases  
 415 (a)-(i)) considered here reflect situations of normal market conditions as well as very extreme market  
 416 situations, e.g. deep ITM, deep OTM, high and low volatility levels, high and low interest rate  
 417 environments, and short and long maturities. We believe that these ten cases are representative of  
 418 practical market situations.




Figure 3: The convergence of  $R_n$  under different model parameters. (a)  $S = 100, K = 100, T = 1, r = 0.05, q = 0, \sigma = 0.3$ ; (b)  $S = 100, K = 40, T = 1, r = 0.05, q = 0, \sigma = 0.3$ ; (c)  $S = 100, K = 200, T = 1, r = 0.05, q = 0, \sigma = 0.3$ ; (d)  $S = 100, K = 100, T = 0.5, r = 0.05, q = 0, \sigma = 0.3$ ; (e)  $S = 100, K = 100, T = 2, r = 0.05, q = 0, \sigma = 0.3$ ; (f)  $S = 100, K = 100, T = 1, r = 0.01, q = 0, \sigma = 0.3$ ; (g)  $S = 100, K = 100, T = 1, r = 0.1, q = 0, \sigma = 0.3$ ; (h)  $S = 100, K = 100, T = 1, r = 0.05, q = 0, \sigma = 0.1$ ; (i)  $S = 100, K = 100, T = 1, r = 0.05, q = 0, \sigma = 0.6$ .



From Figure 3, it is clear that in all ten scenarios the sequence  $\{R_n\}$  is convergent to some positive number  $R_\infty$ . Moreover, the observed monotonically decreasing property of this sequence after some sufficient large number further guarantees that

$$R_\infty = \frac{1}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|}} = \frac{1}{\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|}} = R.$$

Therefore,  $R_N$  can be viewed as the  $N$ -th order approximation for the true (unknown) radius of convergence  $R$ .

Next, we employ this numerical approximation of the radius of convergence, and compare it with the absolute price deviation  $|V_{market} - V_{\sigma_0}|$  by plotting them onto the same graph. Here  $V_{\sigma_0}$  is obtained by substituting the Tehranchi (2016)'s upper bound (13) into the Black-Scholes formula. The results of the test under different parameter settings are summarized in Figure 4, respectively.

Figure 4 demonstrates that the absolute price deviation is always within the approximate radius of convergence  $R_{30}$ , i.e.  $|V_{market} - V_{\sigma_0}| < R_{30}$ . Note that  $R_{30}$  is already a very precise estimate of the true radius of convergence  $R$ , thus we can conclude that  $|V_{market} - V_{\sigma_0}| < R$  most of the time if not always. This means that our representation  $\Sigma_{imp}^{BS}(V, S, K, T, r, q)$  defined by (11) converges to the true implied volatility since it is within the radius of convergence. On the other hand, the graphs have a hump in the radius of convergence around  $K = F = e^{(r-q)T}S$ , whereas the price deviation approaches its minimum within the same area. In fact, it reflects that the Lagrange inversion series converges more rapidly when  $K = F = e^{(r-q)T}S$ , i.e. when the option is very close to the money from the right or from the left. Thus we shall expect that the performance of the inversion series is extremely well for ATM options. This observation is consistent with numerical evidence exhibited in Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4 by comparing the columns in the middle to those in the left and right ends.




Figure 4: The convergence radius and the price deviation are plotted as a function of the strike for different maturities  $T$ , interest rates  $r$  and true volatilities  $\sigma$ . We first fix the initial point  $\sigma_0$  as defined by (13). The blue line corresponds to the radius of convergence of the Lagrange inversion series 11, obtained by equation (39) combined with Theorem 4, and then numerically solved to the 30th order approximation  $R_{30}$ . The dark yellow line corresponds to the deviation of the price to the center point  $|V_{market} - V_{\sigma_0}|$ . The parameters are: (a)  $S=100$ ,  $40 \leq K \leq 200$ ,  $T=1$ ,  $r=0.05$ ,  $q=0$ ,  $\sigma = 0.3$ ; (b)  $S=100$ ,  $40 \leq K \leq 200$ ,  $T=0.5$ ,  $r=0.05$ ,  $q=0$ ,  $\sigma = 0.3$ ; (c)  $S=100$ ,  $40 \leq K \leq 200$ ,  $T=2$ ,  $r=0.05$ ,  $q=0$ ,  $\sigma = 0.3$ ; (d)  $S=100$ ,  $40 \leq K \leq 200$ ,  $T=1$ ,  $r=0.01$ ,  $q=0$ ,  $\sigma = 0.3$ ; (e)  $S=100$ ,  $40 \leq K \leq 200$ ,  $T=1$ ,  $r=0.1$ ,  $q=0$ ,  $\sigma = 0.3$ ; (f)  $S=100$ ,  $40 \leq K \leq 200$ ,  $T=1$ ,  $r=0.05$ ,  $q=0$ ,  $\sigma = 0.1$ ; (g)  $S=100$ ,  $40 \leq K \leq 200$ ,  $T=1$ ,  $r=0.05$ ,  $q=0$ ,  $\sigma = 0.6$ .