
Note: This document is a part of the lectures given during the Jan-May 2020 Semester.

Dependence on the Underlying Asset Price:

The current price $S(0)$ of the underlying asset is fixed. However, in order to examine the dependence on the underlying asset price, we consider a portfolio consisting of x shares, so that the worth is $S = xS(0)$. In this case, the payoff of an European call with strike price X and expiration T will be $(xS(T) - X)^+$. Similarly, for a put option the payoff is $(X - xS(T))^+$. We will examine the dependence of option prices on S . For this purpose, we will denote the call and the put prices by $C^E(S)$ and $P^E(S)$, respectively, assuming that the other variables are fixed.

Result:

If $S' < S''$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C^E(S') &\leq C^E(S'') \\ P^E(S') &\geq P^E(S'') \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $C^E(S)$ and $P^E(S)$ are non-decreasing and non-increasing functions of S , respectively. Suppose that $C^E(S') > C^E(S'')$ for some $S' < S''$, where $S' = x'S(0)$ and $S'' = x''S(0)$. We sell a call on x' shares and buy a call on x'' shares with same X and T . The balance will be $C^E(S') - C^E(S'')$ which is invested at the risk-free rate r . If the sold option is exercised, then we can exercise the option we hold and make an arbitrage profit since, $(x''S(T) - X)^+ \geq (x'S(T) - X)^+$.

The proof for put option is similar.

Result:

If $S' < S''$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C^E(S'') - C^E(S') &< (S'' - S'), \\ P^E(S') - P^E(S'') &< (S'' - S'). \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

By the put-call parity

$$\begin{aligned} C^E(S'') - P^E(S'') &= S'' - Xe^{-rT}, \\ C^E(S') - P^E(S') &= S' - Xe^{-rT}. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting, we get

$$(C^E(S'') - C^E(S')) + (P^E(S') - P^E(S'')) = (S'' - S').$$

Since both terms on the LHS are non-negative, so each of the terms on the LHS cannot exceed the RHS term. This proves the result.

Remark:

The above inequalities mean that the call and the put prices as functions of the asset price satisfy the Lipschitz condition with constant 1,

$$\begin{aligned} |C^E(S'') - C^E(S')| &< |S'' - S'|, \\ |P^E(S'') - P^E(S')| &< |S'' - S'|. \end{aligned}$$

Result:

Let $S' < S''$ and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C^E(\alpha S' + (1 - \alpha)S'') &\leq \alpha C^E(S') + (1 - \alpha)C^E(S''), \\ P^E(\alpha S' + (1 - \alpha)S'') &\leq \alpha P^E(S') + (1 - \alpha)P^E(S''). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $C^E(S)$ and $P^E(S)$ are convex functions of S .

Proof:

For convenience, let $S = \alpha S' + (1 - \alpha)S''$. Also $S' = x'S(0)$ and $S'' = x''S(0)$, so that $x = \alpha x' + (1 - \alpha)x''$. Suppose that

$$C^E(S) > \alpha C^E(S') + (1 - \alpha)C^E(S'').$$

We sell a call option on a portfolio with x shares, and purchase α and $(1 - \alpha)$ options on a portfolio of x' and x'' shares, respectively. We invest the balance $C^E(S) - \alpha C^E(S') - (1 - \alpha)C^E(S'')$ at risk-free rate r . If the option sold is exercised at expiry, then we have to pay $(xS(T) - X)^+$. This can be covered by the amount $\alpha(x'S(T) - X)^+ + (1 - \alpha)(x''S(T) - X)^+$ by exercising the α and $(1 - \alpha)$ options, respectively. There is an arbitrage profit since,

$$\alpha(x'S(T) - X)^+ + (1 - \alpha)(x''S(T) - X)^+ > (xS(T) - X)^+.$$

holds.

The proof for put option is similar.

American Option:

In general, American options have similar properties to their European counterparts. Difficulties, however, arise because of the absence of put-call parity and the possibility of early exercise.

Dependence on the Strike Price:

In this case, the call and put prices will be denoted by $C^A(X)$ and $P^A(X)$, respectively. All remaining variables are kept fixed.

Result:

If $X' < X''$, then

$$C^A(X') \geq C^A(X''), \quad P^A(X') \leq P^A(X'').$$

This means that $C^A(X)$ is a non-increasing and $P^A(X)$ a non-decreasing function of X .

Proof:

Suppose that $X' < X''$, but $C^A(X') < C^A(X'')$. We can sell a call with strike price X'' and buy a call with strike price X' , investing the difference $C^A(X'') - C^A(X')$ at risk-free rate r . If the option with strike price X'' is exercised at time $t \leq T$, we pay $(S(t) - X'')^+$. We will then immediately exercise the option with strike price X' and receive $(S(t) - X')^+$. Since $X' < X''$, we have $(S(t) - X')^+ > (S(t) - X'')^+$. Thus there will be an arbitrage profit.

The proof for put option is similar.

Result:

If $X' < X''$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C^A(X') - C^A(X'') &\leq (X'' - X'), \\ P^A(X'') - P^A(X') &\leq (X'' - X'). \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

Suppose that $X' < X''$, but $C^A(X') - C^A(X'') > (X'' - X')$. We sell a call with strike price X' and buy a

call with strike X'' , investing the balance $C^A(X') - C^A(X'')$ at risk-free rate r . If the written option for X' is exercised at time $t \leq T$, then we have to pay $(S(t) - X')^+$. An immediate exercise of the other option results in receipt of an amount $(S(t) - X'')^+$. The balance from this is $-(X'' - X')$. The net arbitrage profit thus is $(C^A(X') - C^A(X''))e^{rt} - (X'' - X')$ which is positive.

The proof for put option is similar.

Result:

Suppose $X' < X''$ and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C^A(\alpha X' + (1 - \alpha)X'') &\leq \alpha C^A(X') + (1 - \alpha)C^A(X''), \\ P^A(\alpha X' + (1 - \alpha)X'') &\leq \alpha P^A(X') + (1 - \alpha)P^A(X''). \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

For convenience, let $X = \alpha X' + (1 - \alpha)X''$. Suppose that

$$C^A(X) > \alpha C^A(X') + (1 - \alpha)C^A(X'').$$

We sell an option with strike price X , and purchase α options with strike price X' and $(1 - \alpha)$ options with strike price X'' and invest the balance $C^E(X) - \alpha C^E(X') - (1 - \alpha)C^E(X'') > 0$ at risk-free rate r . If the option is not exercised at all, then we make an arbitrage profit from the risk-free investment. If the option with strike price X is exercised at $t \leq T$, then we have to pay $(S(t) - X)^+$. A simultaneous exercise of the two options being held by us will yield $\alpha(S(t) - X')^+ + (1 - \alpha)(S(t) - X'')^+$ resulting in arbitrage profit since $\alpha(S(t) - X')^+ + (1 - \alpha)(S(t) - X'')^+ \geq (S(t) - X)^+$.

The proof for put option is similar.

Dependence on the Underlying Asset Price:

As in case of European options we consider a portfolio consisting of x shares. We will denote the call and the put prices on this portfolio by $C^A(S)$ and $P^A(S)$, respectively, with $S = xS(0)$ and all the other variables being fixed. The payoffs at time $t \leq T$ are $(xS(t) - X)^+$ for calls and $(X - xS(t))^+$ for puts.

Result:

If $S' < S''$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C^A(S') &\leq C^A(S''), \\ P^A(S') &\geq P^A(S''). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $C^A(S') > C^A(S'')$ for some $S' < S''$, where $S' = x'S(0)$ and $S'' = x''S(0)$. We sell a call on x' shares and buy a call on x'' shares with same X and T . The balance will be $C^A(S') - C^A(S'')$ which is invested at risk-free rate r . If the sold option is exercised at time $t \leq T$, then we can exercise the option we hold and make an arbitrage profit since $(x'S(t) - X)^+ \leq (x''S(t) - X)^+$.

The proof for put option is similar.

Result:

Suppose that $S' < S''$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C^A(S'') - C^A(S') &\leq S'' - S', \\ P^A(S') - P^A(S'') &\leq S'' - S'. \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

The result for the call option follows in a straight forward way from a similar relation for European call options and using the fact that the price of an American call is equal to that of a European call for a

non-dividend paying stock.

For the put option suppose that $P^A(S') - P^A(S'') > S'' - S'$, for some $S' < S''$, with $S' = x'S(0)$ and $S'' = x''S(0)$. We buy $x'' - x'$ shares and a put on x'' shares and sell a put on x' shares. The balance $-(S'' - S') - P^A(S'') + P^A(S')$ is invested at risk-free rate. In case the holder of the option decides to exercise at time $t \leq T$, we will have to pay $(X - x'S(t))^+$, which can be covered by selling $x'' - x'$ shares and exercising the option on x'' shares, since $(x'' - x')S(t) + (X - x''S(t))^+ \geq (X - x'S(t))^+$ for $x'' > x'$. In case the holder of the option does not exercise then the arbitrage profit is the return from the risk-free investment.

Result:

Let $S' < S''$ and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C^A(\alpha S' + (1 - \alpha)S'') &\leq \alpha C^A(S') + (1 - \alpha)C^A(S''), \\ P^A(\alpha S' + (1 - \alpha)S'') &\leq \alpha P^A(S') + (1 - \alpha)P^A(S''). \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

For convenience, let $S = \alpha S' + (1 - \alpha)S''$. Also $S' = x'S(0)$ and $S'' = x''S(0)$, so that $x = \alpha x' + (1 - \alpha)x''$. Suppose that

$$C^A(S) > \alpha C^A(S') + (1 - \alpha)C^A(S'').$$

We sell a call option on a portfolio with x shares, and purchase α and $(1 - \alpha)$ options on a portfolio of x' and x'' shares, respectively. All these options have the same X and T . We invest the balance $C^A(S) - \alpha C^A(S') - (1 - \alpha)C^A(S'')$ at risk-free rate r . If the option sold is exercised at time $t \leq T$, then we have to pay $(xS(t) - X)^+$. This can be compensated by the amount $\alpha(x'S(t) - X)^+ + (1 - \alpha)(x''S(t) - X)^+$ by exercising the α and $(1 - \alpha)$ options, respectively. There is an arbitrage profit since

$$\alpha(x'S(t) - X)^+ + (1 - \alpha)(x''S(t) - X)^+ \geq (xS(t) - X)^+.$$

holds.

The proof for put option is similar.

Dependence on the Expiration Time

For American options one can derive the dependence of the option price on the expiration time T . For this purpose we will use the notations, $C^A(T)$ and $P^A(T)$ for American call and put, respectively, assuming that all other variables are fixed.

Result:

If $T' < T''$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C^A(T') &\leq C^A(T'') \\ P^A(T') &\leq P^A(T''). \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

Suppose that $C^A(T') > C^A(T'')$. We then sell an option for expiration T' and buy an option for expiration T'' , both with the same strike X . We invest the balance $C^A(T') - C^A(T'')$ at risk-free rate r . If the written option is exercised at time $t \leq T$, the option that we hold will be exercised to cover this position. Thus the arbitrage profit would be the return from the risk-free investment.

The proof for put option is similar.

Note that such a relationship in case of a European option is uncertain.