

## Project Proposal: Optimal Option Hedging and Pricing

---

**Authors.** Arif Ansari (aa4433@princeton.edu), Christos Avgerinos Tegopoulos (ct3125@princeton.edu), Jeremy Jun-Ping Bird (jb9895@princeton.edu),

**Project type:** 2. Applying RL to a new problem

**Introduction:** We aim to apply RL to the well-established financial problem of option pricing. Option pricing is underpinned by the idea that in complete and frictionless markets, one can perfectly replicate an option via a continuously rebalanced portfolio consisting of the underlying stock and a bond (the "replicating portfolio"). It follows from this that the price of an option will equal the cost of this replicating portfolio, subsequently making the problems of optimal hedging and option pricing synonymous.

The Black-Scholes-Merton's (BSM) model analytically solves for this replicating portfolio, effectively solving the problem of optimal option hedging and pricing. Yet option trading is still a multi-billion dollar business where traders are employed to (typically manually) price options and manage their risk. From this alone, it is clear that the traditional BSM approach to option hedging and pricing fails under realistic conditions faced outside of these "idealized" markets.

### Pitfalls of BSM:

- **Non-Continuous Reheding:** In reality, rebalancing of the replicating portfolio is done at a finite frequency (e.g. daily). Without continuous rebalancing, perfect replication is no longer feasible and the trader will be exposed to some degree of risk.
- **Transaction Costs:** Traders face transaction costs (e.g. brokerage, market impact) each time they rebalance. However, these costs are entirely neglected within the classical BSM model.
- **Stochastic Volatility:** Realistic markets exhibit non-stationary asset return volatility. BSM model, however, assumes constant volatility for stock price dynamics.

**RL Approach:** Determining optimal hedging practices requires one to balance minimizing transaction costs while trying to hedge as perfectly as possible (so as to minimize hedged portfolio PnL variance). This is an incredibly difficult problem to solve for analytically. This introduces the potential to apply RL to learn optimal policy (e.g. hedging strategy). Formally we have:

- **Actions  $a_t$ :** The amount of the underlying hedged at each timestep  $t$
- **States  $S_t$ :** The price of the underlying (or some time transformed variable  $X_t$  which normalizes for drift in the underlying dynamics)
- **Dynamics:** The underlying follows geometric Brownian motion with stochastic volatility (SABR model)
- **Reward Function  $R_t$ :** Here our reward at each period  $0 < t < T$  is equal to our change in wealth  $\Delta w_t = S_t(a_{t-1} - a_t) - \kappa|S_t(a_{t-1} - a_t)|$  minus the variance of  $\Delta w_t$  scaled by some risk-aversion parameter  $\lambda$

$$R_t = \Delta w_t - \lambda \mathbb{V}[\Delta w_t] = \Delta w_t - \lambda (\Delta w_t - \mathbb{E}[\Delta w_t])^2$$

Note that at  $t = 0$  the initial change in wealth  $\Delta w_0 = -S_0 a_0 - \kappa|S_0 a_0|$  as we must buy the initial replicating portfolio and at maturity we have  $\Delta w_T = S_T a_T - \kappa|S_T a_T| - G(S_T)$  where  $G(S_T)$  is the option payoff.

This gives final Bellman Equation

$$V^\pi(S_t) = \mathbb{E}_t^\pi[R_t(S_t, a_t, S_{t+1}) + \gamma V^\pi(S_{t+1})]$$

**Why Not Bandit?:** Due to our transaction costs, how much we choose to hedge at period  $t$  influences the transaction costs we pay when rebalancing at  $t + 1$ . For example, if we accumulate a large position of stock in a single period, at some point in the future, we will have to unwind this position (given our terminality condition), resulting in larger transaction costs. Hence, treating this as a RL problem encourages small, incremental hedges and no wild swings in position size.

**What We Hope to Achieve:** Our aim is for our RL agent to achieve the following:

- **BSM Outperformance:** As established above, we expect delta hedging according to the BSM model to be suboptimal in a more realistic market setting. Subsequently, we hope for our RL-learned hedging strategy to outperform BSM hedging (i.e. achieve superior risk adjusted PnL).
- **Model Independence:** Our RL approach does not require an explicit knowledge of market dynamics, the "greeks" or a known model for transaction costs as it is model-free and aims to learn optimal hedging based solely on observed rewards and state transitions. This is a more appropriate reflection of reality where it is impossible to perfectly model these factors.

### Final Methodology:

1. Simulate  $N$  monte-carlo paths for the underlying according to our predefined model dynamics
2. Using the RL problem setup described above, apply:
  - **Tabular Q-Learning** (*State-spaced discretized using lattice approximation of stock prices. Action-space discretized into 0.01 increments of quantity held.*)
  - **DDPG**
  - **PPO**
  - **GRPO:** May be more effective as it doesn't need to learn the critic function which can be difficult due to stochasticity of transaction costs. By using only observed Monte Carlo methods it may be better at dealing with the constraints of the problem. Although it may be potentially unstable at points with high variance we are hoping to see if running a numerous amount of trials will help normalize these results. *From DeepSeek 2024 paper*

in order to learn optimal hedging strategy. Compare each with BSM hedging. Also compare each algorithm's performance, data efficiency and rate of convergence.
3. Repeat 1 but with new stock dynamics and transaction costs and compare results. Aim is to see if our RL solution still holds up when we add excessive volatility or transaction costs.