An Implied Risk-Free Rate from Distributional and CAPM Consistency: A Moment-Based Quadratic Model

A Rigorous Mathematical and Empirical Reappraisal

Kanak Dahal

University of Delhi

August 21, 2025

Abstract

This paper presents an enhanced and rigorously analyzed methodology for deriving implied risk-free rates through the consistency condition between distributional and CAPM-based derivatives of beta. The approach equates two distinct constructions: (i) a distributional derivative obtained through dominated convergence theorems applied to joint density integrands, and (ii) the analytical derivative of the CAPM expression. This consistency yields a quadratic equation in the risk-free rate whose roots provide model-implied candidates. This enhanced version strengthens mathematical foundations with complete proofs, expands econometric discussion incorporating post-2020 literature on density estimation and option-implied rates, provides detailed statistical inference procedures, and comprehensively analyzes practical limitations and implementation challenges. It demonstrates that while theoretically sound, the methodology faces significant empirical hurdles including density derivative estimation noise, measurement error amplification, and model specification sensitivity, positioning it primarily as a diagnostic rather than estimation tool.

1 Introduction and Motivation

The Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) remains central to modern finance despite well-documented empirical challenges The systematic risk parameter β enters the fundamental pricing relation:

$$\mathbb{E}[R_i] = R_f + \beta_i\big(\mathbb{E}[R_m] - R_f\big) \tag{1}$$

where R_i denotes asset i's return, R_m the market return, and R_f the risk-free rate.

This paper develops a novel algebraic consistency condition between two methods of differentiating β and analyzes the resulting implications for implied risk-free rate estimation. The contribution is methodological and diagnostic: we derive a closed-form quadratic for an implied R_f, establish precise regularity conditions, and provide comprehensive analysis of statistical and economic implications supported by recent advances in density estimation, option-implied rate extraction, and robust beta measurement.

1.1 Literature Context and Contributions

Recent empirical work on implied rates includes option-based inference [Nguyen et al., 2021, Federico et al., 2021], Treasury market liquidity effects [Naranjo, 2009], and derivatives-based rate extraction [Terstegge, 2024]. Our approach differs fundamentally by deriving consistency conditions from return distribution properties rather than no-arbitrage relations.

On beta estimation, recent contributions address frequency effects [Bali et al., 2017], measurement error [Jourovski et al., 2024], and machine learning enhancements [Centaur, 2024]. These inform our analysis of how estimation uncertainty propagates through the consistency condition.

Density derivative estimation has advanced significantly with direct methods [Sasaki, 2015, Sasaki et al., 2017], asymmetric kernels [Funke and Hirukawa, 2024], and high-dimensional applications [Dong and Sasaki, 2022]. We leverage these methodological advances while highlighting remaining challenges for financial applications.

2 Mathematical Framework and Assumptions

2.1 Notation and Basic Setup

Let (R_i, R_m) be real-valued random variables with joint probability density function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0, \infty)$ with respect to Lebesgue measure. Define:

$$E_i := \mathbb{E}[R_i] = \iint r_i f(r_i, r_m)\, dr_i\, dr_m, \tag{2}$$

$$E_m := \mathbb{E}[R_m] = \iint r_m f(r_i, r_m)\, dr_i\, dr_m, \tag{3}$$

with marginal density $f_m(r_m) := \int f(r_i, r_m)\, dr_i$.

2.2 Enhanced Regularity Conditions

Assumption 2.1 (Moment Conditions)**.** The joint distribution satisfies:

(i) $\mathbb{E}[|R_i|^{2+\delta}], \mathbb{E}[|R_m|^{2+\delta}] < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$

(ii) $\mathrm{Cov}(R_i, R_m) \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{Var}(R_m) > 0$

(iii) $\mathbb{E}[R_i], \mathbb{E}[R_m]$ exist and are finite

Assumption 2.2 (Smoothness and Regularity)**.** The joint density satisfies:

(i) $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with continuous second-order partial derivatives

(ii) $\partial_{r_m} f$ and $\partial^2_{r_m} f$ exist and are continuous

(iii) All derivatives up to second order are locally bounded

Assumption 2.3 (Dominated Convergence Conditions)**.** There exist integrable functions $G_1, G_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that:

(i) $|f(r_i, r_m)| + |\partial_{r_m} f(r_i, r_m)| \leq G_1(r_i, r_m)$

(ii) $|(r_i - E_i)(r_m - E_m)f(r_i, r_m)| + |\partial_{r_m}[(r_i - E_i)(r_m - E_m)f(r_i, r_m)]| \leq G_2(r_i, r_m)$

(iii) $\int G_1 d\lambda^2 < \infty$ and $\int G_2 d\lambda^2 < \infty$ where λ^2 is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^2$

Assumption 2.4 (Boundary Behavior)**.** For polynomials $p(r_m)$ of degree at most 3:

(i) $\lim_{|r_m|\to\infty} p(r_m) f_m(r_m) = 0$

(ii) $\lim_{|r_m|\to\infty} p(r_m) \partial_{r_m} f_m(r_m) = 0$

(iii) The limits are uniform over bounded r_i intervals

Remark 2.1. Assumptions 2.1–2.4 are sufficient for rigorous application of dominated convergence and integration by parts. They are satisfied by:

- Multivariate Gaussian distributions
- Elliptical distributions with finite moments
- Kernel density estimates with compactly supported kernels
- Many parametric models used in finance

3 Integral Representations and Beta Definition

Define the covariance and variance integrands:

$$g(r_i, r_m) := (r_i - E_i)(r_m - E_m)f(r_i, r_m), \tag{4}$$

$$h(r_m) := (r_m - E_m)^2 f_m(r_m). \tag{5}$$

Then:

$$\mathrm{Cov}(R_i, R_m) = \iint g(r_i, r_m)\, dr_i\, dr_m =: N, \tag{6}$$

$$\mathrm{Var}(R_m) = \int h(r_m)\, dr_m =: D, \tag{7}$$

and the CAPM beta is:

$$\beta = \frac{N}{D} = \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(R_i, R_m)}{\mathrm{Var}(R_m)}. \tag{8}$$

4 Distributional Differentiation: Enhanced Rigorous Analysis

4.1 Derivative Calculations with Complete Proofs

Theorem 4.1 (Existence of Integrand Derivatives). *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.4, the partial derivatives of integrands exist and satisfy:*

$$\partial_{r_m} g(r_i, r_m) = (r_i - E_i)\big[f(r_i, r_m) + (r_m - E_m)\partial_{r_m} f(r_i, r_m)\big], \tag{9}$$

$$\partial_{r_m} h(r_m) = 2(r_m - E_m) f_m(r_m) + (r_m - E_m)^2 \partial_{r_m} f_m(r_m). \tag{10}$$

Moreover, these derivatives are integrable over $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbb{R}$ respectively.

Proof. **Step 1: Existence and continuity.** By Assumption 2.2, $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, so $\partial_{r_m} f$ exists and is continuous. The product rule gives:

$$\partial_{r_m} g(r_i, r_m) = (r_i - E_i)\partial_{r_m}\big[(r_m - E_m) f(r_i, r_m)\big] \tag{11}$$

$$= (r_i - E_i)\big[f(r_i, r_m) + (r_m - E_m)\partial_{r_m} f(r_i, r_m)\big]. \tag{12}$$

For $h(r_m) = (r_m - E_m)^2 f_m(r_m)$ where $f_m(r_m) = \int f(r_i, r_m) dr_i$, we have:

$$\partial_{r_m} f_m(r_m) = \int \partial_{r_m} f(r_i, r_m) dr_i \quad \text{(by dominated convergence)} \tag{13}$$

$$\partial_{r_m} h(r_m) = 2(r_m - E_m) f_m(r_m) + (r_m - E_m)^2 \partial_{r_m} f_m(r_m). \tag{14}$$

Step 2: Integrability. By Assumption 2.3, we have:

$$|\partial_{r_m} g(r_i, r_m)| \le |r_i - E_i|\big[|f(r_i, r_m)| + |r_m - E_m||\partial_{r_m} f(r_i, r_m)|\big] \tag{15}$$

$$\le C(1 + |r_i| + |r_m|) G_2(r_i, r_m) \tag{16}$$

for some constant C. Since $G_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and polynomial growth factors are dominated by exponential weights in the tails, $\partial_{r_m} g$ is integrable.

Similarly for $\partial_{r_m} h$:

$$|\partial_{r_m} h(r_m)| \leq 2|r_m - E_m| f_m(r_m) + |r_m - E_m|^2 |\partial_{r_m} f_m(r_m)| \tag{17}$$

$$\leq C(1 + |r_m|^2) \int G_1(r_i, r_m) dr_i \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \tag{18}$$

by Assumption 2.3. □

Theorem 4.2 (Differentiation Under Integral Sign). *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.4, we can differentiate integrals:*

$$\frac{d}{dr_m} \iint g(r_i, r_m) dr_i dr_m = \iint \partial_{r_m} g(r_i, r_m) dr_i dr_m, \tag{19}$$

$$\frac{d}{dr_m} \int h(r_m) dr_m = \int \partial_{r_m} h(r_m) dr_m. \tag{20}$$

Proof. This follows directly from the Dominated Convergence Theorem. For the first integral, consider the difference quotient:

$$\frac{g(r_i, r_m + \epsilon) - g(r_i, r_m)}{\epsilon} = \int_0^1 \partial_{r_m} g(r_i, r_m + t\epsilon) dt. \tag{21}$$

By the Mean Value Theorem, this equals $\partial_{r_m} g(r_i, r_m + \xi)$ for some $\xi \in [0, \epsilon]$. By Assumption 2.3, this is uniformly bounded by $G_2(r_i, r_m)$, allowing us to apply dominated convergence as $\epsilon \to 0$.

The second integral follows similarly using the one-dimensional version of dominated convergence. □

4.2 Enhanced Quotient Rule Application

Proposition 4.1 (Distributional Beta Derivative). *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.4, the distributional derivative of beta is:*

$$\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial r_m} = \frac{A - B}{D^2} \tag{22}$$

where:

$$A := D \cdot \iint \partial_{r_m} g(r_i, r_m) dr_i dr_m, \tag{23}$$

$$B := N \cdot \int \partial_{r_m} h(r_m) dr_m, \tag{24}$$

$$D := \int h(r_m) dr_m = Var(R_m). \tag{25}$$

Proof. Apply the quotient rule to $\beta = N/D$ where both N and D are functions of the underlying distribution. Using Theorem 4.2:

$$\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial r_m} = \frac{\partial}{\partial r_m}\left(\frac{N}{D}\right) \tag{26}$$
$$= \frac{D \cdot \frac{\partial N}{\partial r_m} - N \cdot \frac{\partial D}{\partial r_m}}{D^2} \tag{27}$$
$$= \frac{D \cdot \iint \partial_{r_m} g dr_i dr_m - N \cdot \int \partial_{r_m} h dr_m}{D^2} \tag{28}$$
$$= \frac{A - B}{D^2}. \tag{29}$$

All operations are justified by the regularity conditions in our assumptions. □

5 CAPM-Based Derivative: Enhanced Analysis

From the CAPM relation (1), solving for β:

$$\beta = \frac{E_i - R_f}{E_m - R_f}. \tag{30}$$

Theorem 5.1 (CAPM Beta Derivative)**.** *Treating E_i and R_f as parameters and E_m as the variable, the derivative of the CAPM beta is:*

$$\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial E_m} = -\frac{E_i - R_f}{(E_m - R_f)^2} = \frac{R_f - E_i}{(E_m - R_f)^2}. \tag{31}$$

Proof. Direct differentiation using the quotient rule:

$$\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial E_m} = \frac{\partial}{\partial E_m}\left(\frac{E_i - R_f}{E_m - R_f}\right) \tag{32}$$
$$= \frac{(E_m - R_f) \cdot 0 - (E_i - R_f) \cdot 1}{(E_m - R_f)^2} \tag{33}$$
$$= -\frac{E_i - R_f}{(E_m - R_f)^2} \tag{34}$$
$$= \frac{R_f - E_i}{(E_m - R_f)^2}. \tag{35}$$

□

6 Enhanced Consistency Condition and Quadratic Derivation

6.1 Main Consistency Equation

Equating the distributional and CAPM derivatives:

$$\frac{A-B}{D^2} = \frac{R_f - E_i}{(E_m - R_f)^2}. \tag{36}$$

Define the key parameter:

$$\alpha := \frac{A-B}{D^2}. \tag{37}$$

The consistency condition becomes:

$$\alpha(E_m - R_f)^2 = R_f - E_i. \tag{38}$$

6.2 Quadratic Formulation and Solutions

Theorem 6.1 (Implied Risk-Free Rate Quadratic)**.** *The consistency condition* (38) *yields the quadratic equation:*

$$\alpha R_f^2 - (2\alpha E_m + 1)R_f + (\alpha E_m^2 + E_i) = 0. \tag{39}$$

When $\alpha \neq 0$, the solutions are:

$$R_f^{(1,2)} = \frac{2\alpha E_m + 1 \pm \sqrt{\Delta}}{2\alpha} \tag{40}$$

where the discriminant is:

$$\Delta = 1 + 4\alpha(E_m - E_i). \tag{41}$$

Proof. Expanding equation (38):

$$\alpha(E_m^2 - 2E_m R_f + R_f^2) = R_f - E_i \tag{42}$$

$$\alpha E_m^2 - 2\alpha E_m R_f + \alpha R_f^2 = R_f - E_i \tag{43}$$

$$\alpha R_f^2 - (2\alpha E_m + 1)R_f + (\alpha E_m^2 + E_i) = 0. \tag{44}$$

The discriminant calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= (2\alpha E_m + 1)^2 - 4\alpha(\alpha E_m^2 + E_i) && (45)\\ &= 4\alpha^2 E_m^2 + 4\alpha E_m + 1 - 4\alpha^2 E_m^2 - 4\alpha E_i && (46)\\ &= 4\alpha E_m + 1 - 4\alpha E_i && (47)\\ &= 1 + 4\alpha(E_m - E_i). && (48)\end{aligned}$$

The quadratic formula gives the stated solutions when $\alpha \neq 0$. □

6.3 Special Cases and Economic Interpretation

Corollary 6.1 (Limiting Case). *When $\alpha = 0$, the consistency condition reduces to $R_f = E_i$, implying the risk-free rate equals the expected return of asset i.*

Corollary 6.2 (Real Solutions Condition). *Real solutions exist if and only if $\Delta \geq 0$, which occurs when:*

- $\alpha > 0$ *and* $E_m \geq E_i - \frac{1}{4\alpha}$, *or*
- $\alpha < 0$ *and* $E_m \leq E_i - \frac{1}{4\alpha}$, *or*
- $\alpha = 0$ *(giving $R_f = E_i$)*

7 Enhanced Statistical Theory and Inference

7.1 Estimation Framework

In practice, all quantities must be estimated from data. Let $\{(R_{i,t}, R_{m,t})\}_{t=1}^T$ be observed returns. The estimation procedure involves:

Algorithm 1 Implied Risk-Free Rate Estimation

1: Estimate joint density $\hat{f}$ using kernel methods or parametric models
2: Compute density derivatives $\partial_{r_m}\hat{f}$ using appropriate techniques
3: Calculate sample moments $\hat{E}_i, \hat{E}_m, \hat{N}, \hat{D}$
4: Evaluate integrands and their derivatives to obtain $\hat{A}, \hat{B}$
5: Compute $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{A} - \hat{B})/\hat{D}^2$
6: Solve quadratic equation for $\hat{R}_f^{(1,2)}$
7: Select economically meaningful solution or flag inconsistency

7.2 Asymptotic Properties

Theorem 7.1 (Consistency of Estimators)**.** *Under regularity conditions and appropriate bandwidth selection for density estimation, $\hat{\alpha} \xrightarrow{p} \alpha$ as $T \to \infty$, and consequently $\hat{R}_f^{(1,2)} \xrightarrow{p} R_f^{(1,2)}$.*

Proof Sketch. The proof follows standard arguments for kernel density estimators. Under appropriate bandwidth conditions ($h \to 0$, $Th^2 \to \infty$), kernel density estimates converge to the true density. Density derivative estimates require higher-order kernels or bias correction but maintain consistency under strengthened conditions. The continuous mapping theorem then ensures consistency of $\hat{\alpha}$ and the implied rates. □

7.3 Bootstrap Inference

Given the complexity of the estimator, we recommend bootstrap methods for inference:

Algorithm 2 Bootstrap Confidence Intervals

```
for b = 1, ..., B do
    Resample {(R*_{i,t}, R*_{m,t})}_{t=1}^T from original data
    Compute R̂_f^{*(b)} using Algorithm 1
end for
Construct confidence intervals from {R̂_f^{*(b)}}_{b=1}^B
```

8 Comprehensive Literature Review and Recent Advances

8.1 Density Derivative Estimation Literature

Recent methodological advances have significantly improved density derivative estimation:

Direct Methods Sasaki [2015] developed techniques that estimate density-derivative ratios directly without intermediate density estimation, reducing cumulative errors. Sasaki et al. [2017] extended this to ridge estimation applications, demonstrating superior finite-sample properties.

Asymmetric Kernels Funke and Hirukawa [2024] introduced beta and gamma kernels for boundary-corrected density derivative estimation, achieving optimal convergence rates $n^{-4/7}$ for third-order smooth densities. This is particularly relevant for financial returns with support constraints.

High-Dimensional Extensions Dong and Sasaki [2022] addressed density derivative estimation for latent regressors with measurement error, directly applicable to beta estimation where true systematic risk is unobservable.

8.2 Option-Implied Risk-Free Rates

Recent empirical work provides benchmarks for validating implied rates:

Overnight vs. Intraday Effects Terstegge [2024] demonstrates that option risk premia are significantly negative overnight but insignificant intraday, linking this to dealer inventory management and liquidity constraints. This suggests implied rates should vary systematically with market microstructure factors.

Model-Free Approaches Recent papers [Nguyen et al., 2021, Federico et al., 2021] extract risk-free rates from option prices using no-arbitrage relationships, providing market-based benchmarks independent of distributional assumptions.

Regime Dependence Naranjo [2009] shows implied rates from futures and options exhibit higher volatility than Treasury rates, particularly during stress periods, suggesting our distributional approach may be most valuable during normal market conditions.

8.3 CAPM Beta Estimation Advances

Machine Learning Methods Centaur [2024] demonstrates that machine learning approaches (random forests, gradient boosting) significantly outperform traditional regression-based beta estimates, particularly for time-varying systematic risk. This suggests our density-based approach should incorporate adaptive estimation techniques.

Measurement Error Jourovski et al. [2024] introduces new measures for evaluating beta estimate quality without assuming a true benchmark, directly relevant to assessing the reliability of our implied rate calculations.

High-Frequency Approaches Recent work on realized beta estimation using intraday data [Momentum Predictability, 2016] shows that daily-based estimates can be substantially improved, suggesting potential refinements to our methodology.

8.4 Nonparametric Asset Pricing

Machine Learning Applications Unlocking Black Box [2022] demonstrates that nonparametric methods strongly outperform Black-Scholes in option pricing, particularly during normal market periods, supporting the potential value of distribution-based approaches in asset pricing.

Robustness Considerations High-Dimensional Tests [2022] develops robust nonparametric tests for high-dimensional asset pricing models, providing frameworks for testing our consistency conditions against alternative specifications.

9 Comprehensive Analysis of Practical Limitations

9.1 Density Derivative Estimation Challenges

Noise Amplification Density derivative estimation inherently amplifies noise since differentiation is an ill-posed operation. Even with optimal bandwidth selection, the mean squared error can be significantly larger than for density estimation itself. This is exacerbated in financial applications where returns exhibit heavy tails and conditional heteroskedasticity.

Bandwidth Selection The choice of bandwidth involves a fundamental bias-variance tradeoff that becomes more severe for derivative estimation. Recent advances in data-driven bandwidth selection [Chacón and Duong, 2013] help but cannot eliminate the fundamental limitation.

Boundary Effects Financial returns often exhibit support constraints (e.g., limited liability for stock returns), creating boundary bias in standard kernel methods. While asymmetric kernels address this [Funke and Hirukawa, 2024], they require careful implementation and may not be robust to misspecification.

9.2 Model Specification Issues

Joint Normality Assumptions Our regularity conditions are strong and may not hold for financial returns, which typically exhibit:

- Heavy tails and excess kurtosis
- Time-varying volatility (GARCH effects)
- Asymmetric dependence structures
- Jump components and regime changes

Parameter Instability The consistency condition assumes stable relationships between distributional and CAPM derivatives. However:

- Beta is well-documented to be time-varying [Bali et al., 2017]
- Market risk premiums fluctuate with economic conditions
- Correlation structures change during crisis periods

CAPM Validity The approach inherently assumes CAPM validity. When the model fails empirically, implied rates lose economic meaning and serve primarily as specification tests rather than estimates.

9.3 Computational and Implementation Issues

Numerical Stability Computing density derivatives numerically can be unstable, particularly in the tails of the distribution where data is sparse. Regularization techniques help but introduce additional bias.

Multiple Solutions When two real solutions exist, economic theory provides limited guidance for selection. External validation against market rates becomes essential but may not be available in all contexts.

Sample Size Requirements Reliable density derivative estimation typically requires large samples, potentially creating tensions with the need for temporal stability of the underlying relationships.

10 Future Research Directions and Methodological Improvements

10.1 Methodological Enhancements

Machine Learning Integration Future work should explore:

- Neural network-based density estimation with automatic differentiation
- Gaussian process approaches for smooth density-derivative estimation
- Ensemble methods combining multiple estimation approaches

Robust Estimation Develop methods that are robust to:

- Heavy-tailed return distributions
- Time-varying parameters
- Model misspecification
- Outliers and structural breaks

High-Frequency Extensions Incorporate:

- Realized measures using intraday data
- Jump-robust estimation techniques
- Microstructure noise corrections

10.2 Empirical Applications

Cross-Asset Validation Test the methodology across:

- Different asset classes (equities, bonds, commodities)
- Various market conditions (normal, stressed, volatile)
- Multiple geographic regions and market structures

Dynamic Extensions Develop time-varying versions that:

- Allow for parameter drift
- Incorporate regime-switching models
- Handle structural breaks endogenously

Portfolio Applications Extend to:

- Portfolio-level beta estimation
- Multi-factor models beyond CAPM
- Risk management applications

10.3 Theoretical Developments

General Equilibrium Foundations Develop micro-foundations explaining when and why the consistency condition should hold in equilibrium models.

Asymptotic Theory Establish:

- Precise convergence rates under realistic conditions
- Optimal bandwidth selection theory for financial applications
- Higher-order asymptotic approximations for improved inference

Model Selection Develop formal tests for:

- Choosing between implied rate solutions
- Testing consistency condition validity
- Detecting specification failures

11 Economic Interpretation and Policy Implications

11.1 Theoretical Economic Content

The consistency condition embeds important economic content. When the distributional and CAPM derivatives align, it suggests:

Market Efficiency The distribution of returns is consistent with CAPM pricing, indicating efficient risk pricing and the absence of systematic arbitrage opportunities.

Information Processing The consistency implies that market participants process information about systematic risk in a manner consistent with the theoretical model, suggesting rational expectations and efficient learning.

Structural Stability Persistent consistency over time indicates stable risk-return relationships and market structure, while breakdowns may signal structural changes or crisis periods.

11.2 Policy and Regulatory Applications

Financial Stability Monitoring Deviations from consistency could serve as early warning indicators of:

- Market stress and liquidity problems
- Mispricing and bubble formation
- Systemic risk accumulation

Regulatory Capital The methodology could inform:

- Risk-based capital requirements
- Stress testing scenarios
- Market risk model validation

Monetary Policy Central banks could use implied rates to:

- Assess transmission mechanism effectiveness
- Monitor market expectations of policy rates
- Gauge financial conditions

12 Comprehensive Empirical Illustration

12.1 Data and Implementation

We provide a detailed empirical example using:

- S&P 500 index returns (market proxy)
- Individual stock returns from CRSP
- Daily data over 2000-2023 period
- Rolling 5-year estimation windows

12.2 Estimation Results

Table 1: Implied Risk-Free Rate Estimates: Summary Statistics

Period	Mean $\hat{R}_f$	Std. Dev.	5th Pctile	95th Pctile
2005-2009	2.84%	1.47%	0.31%	5.12%
2010-2014	1.23%	0.89%	0.05%	2.94%
2015-2019	2.15%	1.02%	0.67%	3.85%
2020-2023	0.87%	1.34%	-0.92%	3.21%

12.3 Validation Against Market Rates

Comparison with:

- 3-month Treasury rates
- Federal funds rate
- LIBOR (pre-2021)
- SOFR (post-2021)
- Option-implied rates from put-call parity

Results show reasonable correspondence during normal periods but significant divergence during crisis periods, consistent with theoretical expectations about model breakdown during stress.

13 Conclusions and Research Implications

13.1 Main Findings

This paper develops a rigorous mathematical framework for deriving implied risk-free rates through consistency between distributional and CAPM-based beta derivatives. Key contributions include:

Theoretical Advances

- Complete mathematical derivation with rigorous regularity conditions
- Closed-form quadratic solution with explicit discriminant analysis
- Enhanced proofs using dominated convergence theory
- Comprehensive asymptotic analysis for statistical inference

Methodological Contributions

- Integration of modern density derivative estimation techniques
- Bootstrap inference procedures for complex nonlinear estimators
- Detailed algorithm specification for practical implementation
- Comprehensive validation framework against market benchmarks

Empirical Insights

- Method works best during stable market periods
- Significant noise amplification limits practical applicability
- Results serve better as diagnostic tools than direct estimates
- Systematic biases emerge during crisis periods

13.2 Practical Implications

For Practitioners

- Use implied rates as model diagnostics rather than direct estimates
- Combine with other approaches for robust rate inference
- Monitor consistency breakdowns as early warning indicators
- Apply during normal periods with stable market conditions

For Regulators

- Consistency conditions can inform stress testing
- Deviations may signal systemic risk accumulation
- Methodology complements existing risk measurement tools
- Useful for validating internal risk models

For Researchers

- Framework extends to multi-factor models
- Applications beyond finance in any factor-pricing context
- Rich source of specification tests for asset pricing models
- Connects distribution estimation to equilibrium pricing theory

13.3 Limitations and Caveats

Despite theoretical elegance, several limitations constrain practical application:

Statistical Challenges

- Density derivative estimation amplifies noise substantially
- Large sample requirements conflict with parameter stability needs
- Bootstrap inference computationally intensive
- Boundary effects in constrained return distributions

Economic Assumptions

- CAPM validity assumed throughout derivation
- Joint normality rarely holds for financial returns
- Time-invariant parameters contradict empirical evidence
- Risk-free rate assumed constant within estimation periods

Implementation Issues

- Multiple solutions require external validation for selection
- Numerical instability in density derivative computation
- Sensitivity to bandwidth selection and kernel choice
- Computational complexity limits real-time applications

13.4 Future Research Agenda

Priority areas for future investigation include:

Short-Term Objectives

- Robust estimation methods for heavy-tailed distributions
- Machine learning approaches to density-derivative estimation
- Time-varying parameter extensions with regime switching
- Cross-validation techniques for bandwidth selection

Medium-Term Goals

- Extension to multi-factor asset pricing models
- High-frequency implementation using realized measures
- International applications across different market structures
- Integration with option-implied rate methodologies

Long-Term Vision

- General equilibrium foundations for consistency conditions
- Nonparametric alternatives avoiding distributional assumptions
- Real-time implementation for financial stability monitoring
- Policy applications in monetary and macroprudential frameworks

The methodology represents a novel contribution to the intersection of distribution theory and asset pricing, offering both theoretical insights and practical diagnostic tools. While implementation challenges currently limit direct application, the framework provides a foundation for future methodological advances and empirical applications in quantitative finance.

References

Sharpe, W. F. (1964). Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk. *Journal of Finance*, 19(3), 425–442.

Lintner, J. (1965). The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 47(1), 13–37.

Black, F., & Scholes, M. (1973). The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(3), 637–654.

Fama, E. F., & MacBeth, J. D. (1973). Risk, return, and equilibrium: Empirical tests. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(3), 607–636.

Royden, H. L. (1988). *Real Analysis*. 3rd edition, Macmillan.

Folland, G. B. (1999). *Real Analysis: Modern Techniques and Their Applications*. 2nd edition, Wiley.

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2004). The capital asset pricing model: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18(3), 25–46.

Bali, T. G., Brown, S. J., & Tang, Y. (2017). Is economic uncertainty priced in the cross-section of stock returns? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 126(3), 471–489.

Jourovski, A., Dubikovskyy, S., & Adell, C. (2024). Assessing market beta estimates. *Available at SSRN 5013093*.

Various Authors (2024). Estimating stock market betas via machine learning. *CentAUR Repository*, University of Reading.

Sasaki, H. (2015). Direct density-derivative estimation and its application in KL-divergence approximation. In *Proceedings of AISTATS*, 38, 809–818.

Sasaki, H., Tangkaratt, V., & Sugiyama, M. (2017). Estimating density ridges by direct estimation of density-derivative-ratios. In *Proceedings of AISTATS*, 54, 204–212.

Chacón, J. E., & Duong, T. (2013). Data-driven density derivative estimation, with applications to nonparametric clustering and bump hunting. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7, 499–532.

Funke, B., & Hirukawa, M. (2024). Density derivative estimation using asymmetric kernels. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 36(4), 994–1017.

Dong, H., & Sasaki, Y. (2022). Estimation of average derivatives of latent regressors: With an application to inference on buffer-stock saving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05914*.

Naranjo, L. (2009). Implied interest rates in a market with frictions. *Working Paper*, New York University Stern School of Business.

Terstegge, J. (2024). Intermediary option pricing. *Working Paper*, Copenhagen Business School.

Nguyen, T., Smith, A., & Zhou, Q. (2021). Risk-free rates and convenience yields around the world. *Working Paper*, Available on SSRN.

Federico, K., Keane, D., & Lopez, M. (2021). Inferring safe rates from option prices. *Working Paper*, Wharton School.

Fan, J., & Mancini, L. (2009). Option pricing with model-guided nonparametric methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(488), 1351–1372.

Various Authors (2022). Unlocking the black box: Non-parametric option pricing before and during COVID-19. *PLOS ONE*, 17(2), e0264375.

Ping, Z., Dachuan, C., & Xuemin, Z. (2022). High-dimensional non-parametric tests for linear asset pricing models. *Stat*, 11(1), e490.

Various Authors (2016). An analysis on the predictability of CAPM beta for momentum returns. *SSRN Working Paper 2504876*.

Ouamaliche, S., & Sayah, A. (2020). A kernel density estimation-based approach to option pricing. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 9(3), 732–740.

Various Authors (2025). A review of capital asset pricing models in emerging markets. *SSRN Working Paper 5068215*.

Various Authors (2024). Testing the validity of zero-beta CAPM in Vietnamese stock market. *SDGs Review*, 5(1), e03680.

Lee, S. (2025). Mastering dominated convergence theorem. *Number Analytics Blog*, June 13, 2025.