

Monte Carlo Methods for American Options

Luca Capriotti

Guest Lecture for the Master of Finance
Baruch College, New York, December 7, 2017

General Concepts

- American/Bermudan Options and Exercise Policies
- Optimality and Dynamic Programming
- Monte Carlo Challenges

Variational Principle and Lower Bound Methods

- Parametric Exercise Boundary Methods
- Regression Approaches
- Longstaff-Schwartz Method

Upper Bound Method

- Super-martingales and Doob-Meyer Decomposition
- Duality and Upper Bounds
- Primal-Dual Algorithm

European vs. American/Bermudan Options

- ▶ Contrary to European options, American and Bermudan options can be exercised on multiple days up to trade expiry.
- ▶ Bermudan options can be exercised on a discrete set of dates while American options can be exercised in continuous time intervals.
- ▶ More choices, more value:

$$\text{European} \leq \text{Bermudan} \leq \text{American}$$

- ▶ In the following we will mainly restrict our discussion to the case of Bermudan options as it is the one of more relevance in practice.
- ▶ The case of American options can be obtained as a limiting case when the number of exercise dates per unit time tends to infinity.

Exercise Policies and Stopping Times

- ▶ We indicate with T_1, \dots, T_B , the exercise dates of the option and with $\mathcal{D}(t)$ the deterministic set of exercise dates T_i larger or equal to time t , namely $\mathcal{D}(t) = \{T_i \geq t\}$.
- ▶ An *exercise policy* is represented mathematically by a *stopping time* taking values in $\mathcal{D}(t)$. Recall that a random variable τ is a stopping time if the event $\{\tau \leq t\}$ can be determined using only the information available up to time t .
- ▶ We indicate with $\mathcal{T}(t)$ the set of stopping times taking values in $\mathcal{D}(t)$.
- ▶ We assume $t < T_{B-1}$ as in the last period the Bermudan option becomes European.

Optimal Exercise

- ▶ A rational investor will exercise the option that she holds in such a way to maximize its economic value.
- ▶ As a result, the value of a Bermudan option is the supremum of the option value over all the possible exercise policies, namely

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} \right]$$

where $E(t)$ is the exercise value of the option, and $N(t)$ is the chosen *numeraire*.

- ▶ In this equation $V(t)$ is the value of the option with early exercise *conditional on exercise not taking place strictly before time t* .

Continuation or Hold Value

- ▶ Indicate with $\eta(t)$ the smallest integer such that $T_{\eta(t)+1} > t$.
- ▶ The **hold value** $H_\eta(t)$ ($T_{\eta(t)} \leq t < T_{\eta(t)+1}$) is the value of the Bermudan option when the exercise dates are restricted to $\mathcal{D}(T_{\eta(t)+1})$

$$\frac{H_\eta(t)}{N(t)} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{V(T_{\eta+1})}{N(T_{\eta+1})} \right]$$

- ▶ Clearly $H_\eta(t) = V(t)$ for $T_\eta < t < T_{\eta+1}$, since there are no exercise opportunities in this interval.
- ▶ Instead $H_\eta(T_\eta)$ can be interpreted as the hold value of the Bermudan option at time T_η , i.e., the value of the option if we decide **not** to exercise at time T_η .

Optimal Exercise and Dynamic Programming

- ▶ The option holder following an optimal exercise policy will exercise her option if the exercise value is larger than the hold value

$$V(T_\eta) = \max(E(T_\eta), H_\eta(T_\eta))$$

- ▶ This, when combined with the definition of hold value, leads to the so-called *dynamic programming* or Bellman principle formulation, namely,

$$\frac{H_\eta(t)}{N(t)} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max \left(\frac{E(T_{\eta+1})}{N(T_{\eta+1})}, \frac{H_{\eta+1}(T_{\eta+1})}{N(T_{\eta+1})} \right) \right]$$

for $T_\eta \leq t < T_{\eta+1}$, and $\eta = 1, \dots, B-1$.

Optimal Exercise Time

- ▶ Starting from the terminal condition $H_B(T_B) \equiv 0$, this defines a backward iteration in time for $H_\eta(T_\eta)$.
- ▶ By definition, this is also equal to $V(t)$ if t is not an exercise date.
- ▶ Conversely, if t is an exercise date, $t = T_\eta$, then

$$V(T_\eta) = \max(E(T_\eta), H_\eta(T_\eta))$$

- ▶ The dynamic programming formulation above implies that the stopping time defining optimal exercise (as seen as time t) is given by

$$\tau^* = \inf[T_i \geq t : E(T_i) \geq H_i(T_i)]$$

Example: American put option

- ▶ Consider an American put option struck at K on a stock $S(t)$:

$$\frac{dS(t)}{S(t)} = rdt + \sigma dW_t$$

where r is the (constant) instantaneous risk free rate of interest, σ is the volatility and W_t is a standard Brownian motion.

- ▶ The value of the Bermudan put option can be expressed as

$$V(t) = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[e^{-r(\tau-t)} (K - S(\tau))^+ \right]$$

Example: American put option (cont'd)

- ▶ The optimal exercise time is given by

$$\tau^* = \inf[t \in \mathcal{D}(t) : (K - S(t))^+ \geq H(t)]$$

- ▶ Since $H(t)$ is function itself of $S(t)$ the latter condition can be expressed equivalently as

$$\tau^* = \inf[t \in \mathcal{D}(t) : S(t) < b^*(t)]$$

for a deterministic function $b^*(t)$, assuming the natural interpretation of *exercise boundary*.

Example: American put option (cont'd)




Figure: Exercise Boundary for the American Put option on a single stock (taken from Ref. [1]).

Monte Carlo challenges

- ▶ The dynamic programming recursion can be easily implemented in the context of deterministic numerical methods (multinomial trees or PDEs), which are based on *backward induction*.
- ▶ These are limited by the *curse of dimensionality*.
- ▶ On the other hand, in the context of Monte Carlo methods, the paths describing the time evolution of the underlying risk factors are generated *forward in time*, thus making the direct application of backward induction impossible.
- ▶ This makes pricing Bermudan options, whose dimensionality is too high to be treated by deterministic numerical methods, very challenging.

Variational Principle and Lower Bound Methods

- ▶ An immediate consequence of

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} \right]$$

is that for any stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)$

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} \geq \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} \right]$$

- ▶ As a result, a *lower bound* for the value of the Bermudan option $V(t)$ can be computed by means of Monte Carlo through any exogenous guess for the optimal exercise strategy τ^* .

Parametric Exercise Boundary Methods

- ▶ Parametric lower bound methods involve a user supplied specification of a parametric stopping rule $\tau_\theta \in \mathcal{T}_\theta(t)$ where $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{N_\theta}$ is a N_θ dimensional parameter vector.
- ▶ Due to the variational principle, for any value of θ the stopping rule generates a lower bound, $V_\theta(t)$, of the true value of the Bermudan option, $V(t)$.
- ▶ Clearly, the best approximation of such value within the chosen class, is the one for which the value $V_\theta(t)$ is the largest, namely

$$V_{\theta^*}(t) = \sup_{\theta} V_\theta(t)$$

Algorithm

Step 1 Generate n independent paths of the underlying Markov process $X^{(k)} = (X^{(k)}(T_{\eta(t)+1}), \dots, X^{(k)}(T_B))$, for $k = 1, \dots, n$. For path k , let $\tau^{(k)}(\theta)$ be the exercise time suggested by the stopping rule for the given value of the parameter θ .

Step 2 For each path k , set:

$$E_{\theta}^{(k)} = E(X(\tau_{\theta}^{(k)}))$$
$$V_{\theta}^{(k)} = \frac{E_{\theta}^{(k)}}{N(X(\tau_{\theta}^{(k)}))}$$

Algorithm (cont'd)

Step 3 Return:

$$\bar{V}_\theta(t) = N(t) \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n V_\theta^{(k)}$$

Step 4 Find:

$$\theta^* = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bar{V}_\theta(t)$$

Step 5 Return:

$$\tilde{V}_{\theta^*}(t) = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bar{V}_\theta(t)$$

Lower Bound?

- ▶ The value $\tilde{V}_{\theta^*}(t)$ is an estimate of the true value of the Bermudan option $V(t)$. *However we do not know whether it is a lower bound or an upper bound.*
- ▶ This is because while $V_{\theta^*}(t) \leq V(t)$, because of the variational principle, the estimator $\tilde{V}_{\theta^*}(t)$ is instead *biased high* with respect to $V_{\theta^*}(t)$.
- ▶ Indeed, as a result of Jensen's inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{V}_{\theta^*}(t)] = \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bar{V}_{\theta}(t)] \geq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}[\bar{V}_{\theta}(t)] = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} V_{\theta}(t) = V_{\theta^*}(t)$$

so that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{V}_{\theta^*}(t)] \geq V_{\theta^*}(t) \leq V(t)$$

Algorithm: Lower Bound!

- ▶ In order to avoid this problem one can replace Step 5 with the following two steps:

Step 5' Draw N *independent* paths for $X^{(k)}$ and compute for each path:

$$E_{\theta^*}^{(k)} = E(X(\tau_{\theta^*}^{(k)}))$$

$$V_{\theta^*}^{(k)} = \frac{E_{\theta^*}^{(k)}}{N(X(\tau_{\theta^*}^{(k)}))}$$

Step 6 Return:

$$\bar{V}_{\theta^*}(t) = N(t) \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N V_{\theta^*}^{(k)}$$

- ▶ Since $\mathbb{E}[\bar{V}_{\theta^*}(t)] = V_{\theta^*}(t) \leq V(t)$, this provides a genuine lower bound estimator.

A Useful Parameterization of the Exercise Boundary

- ▶ The optimization in Step 4 above can be simplified whenever the parameter θ decomposes into $B - 1$ sub-components, with the i -th subset parametrizing the exercise decision at time T_i , i.e. $\theta = (\theta_{\eta(t)+1}, \dots, \theta_{B-1})$ with each θ_i possibly a vector itself.
- ▶ For instance, this is the case for the so-called *moneyiness stopping rule*

$$\tau(\theta) = \inf_{i > \eta(t)} [T_i : E(X(T_i)) > \theta_i]$$

prescribing early exercise whenever the option is in the money 'deeply enough'.

A Useful Parameterization of the Exercise Boundary (cont'd)

- ▶ This can be seen as a simplification of the optimal stopping rule

$$\tau^* = \inf[T_i \geq t : E(T_i) \geq H_i(T_i)]$$

in which the hold value, $H_i(X(T_i))$, is replaced by the constant θ_i .

- ▶ In this case, Step 4 above is replaced by the following step:

Step 4' Proceeding backwards in time, for $i = B - 1, \dots, \eta(t) + 1$ find $\tilde{\theta}_i$ by keeping $(\tilde{\theta}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_{B-1})$ fixed and maximizing:

$$\tilde{V}(t) = N(t) \times \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{E(X(\tilde{\tau}_i))}{N(\tilde{\tau}_i)} \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_i = \tilde{\tau}(\theta_i, \tilde{\theta}_{i+1}, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_{B-1}) \in \mathcal{D}(T_i)$.

A Useful Parameterization of the Exercise Boundary (cont'd)

Note that:

- ▶ Step 4' does not involve repeating the Monte Carlo simulation from scratch. Rather the same set of n paths can be reused.
- ▶ With a finite number of paths the one in Step 4' is a non-smooth optimization problem and is best solved by an iterative search rather than a derivatives based approach.
- ▶ There is no guarantee the algorithm in Step 4' produces the optimum $\theta^* = \arg \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bar{V}_\theta(t)$. This is because each $\tilde{\theta}_i$ is optimized assuming exercise only after T_i . In reality, only a subset of the paths would arrive to T_i without triggering early exercise beforehand.

Exercise 1

Consider a Bermudan option on the maximum of two assets following a geometric Brownian motion of the form

$$\frac{dS_i(t)}{S_i(t)} = (r - \delta)dt + \sigma dW_t^i$$

where $r = 5\%$, $\delta = 10\%$, $\sigma = 20\%$ and $S_1(0) = S_2(0)$. The two assets are assumed independent. The (undiscounted) payoff upon exercise at time T_i is

$$(\max(S_1(t), S_2(t)) - K)^+$$

where $K = 100$ is the strike price. The maturity of the option is $T_B = 3$ and can be exercised at nine equally spaced dates $T_i = i/3$ with $i = 1, \dots, 9$. The exact option prices obtained are 13.90, 8.08 and 21.34 for $S_i(0) = 100, 110$ and 90, respectively. Use the parametric lower bound method and the moneyness stopping rule to estimate the value of the option (use both a single value of θ and a different value of θ for each exercise date). Compare the results obtained with Steps 1 to 5 and Steps 1 to 6 (through Step 5') of the algorithm above.

Regression Approaches

- ▶ The optimal exercise strategy defined by

$$\tau^* = \inf[T_i \geq t : E(T_i) \geq H_i(T_i)]$$

can be approximated by constructing an estimate of the hold value $H_i(T_i)$, $i = \eta(t) + 1, \dots, B - 1$.

- ▶ In general, in a Markov setting the hold value is a function of the state vector at time T_i

$$H_i(x) = N(x) \times \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V(X(T_{i+1}))}{N(X(T_{i+1}))} \middle| X(T_i) = x \right]$$

Regression Approaches (cont'd)

- ▶ Regression-based MC ([4] [5]) techniques provide an effective way of computing conditional expectation values of the form above.
- ▶ Regression methods are based on the observation that given a real-valued random input vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and Y a real valued random output, the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[Y|X]$ is the function of X that best approximates in the least squares sense the output Y . That is,

$$\mathbb{E}[Y|X] = \operatorname{argmin}_c \mathbb{E}[(Y - c)^2] .$$

- ▶ In particular, assuming that the conditional expectation is a linear function of some unknown vector of parameters β ,

$$\mathbb{E}[Y|X] = \beta^T X ,$$

this reduces to the well-known linear regression conditions, giving for the optimal vector of parameters

$$\beta = \mathbb{E} \left[X X^T \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E}[X Y] .$$

Regression Approaches (cont'd)

- ▶ In the context of the valuation of Bermudan-style options, the hold value on an exercise date T_m

$$H_i(x) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{N(X(T_i))}{N(X(T_{i+1}))} V(X(T_{i+1})) \mid X(T_i) = x \right] .$$

is assumed to be of the form

$$\hat{H}_i(x) = \beta_i^T \psi(x)$$

where $\psi(x) = (\psi_1(x), \dots, \psi_d(x))^T$ is a vector of d basis functions.

- ▶ The vector of coefficients $\beta_i = (\beta_{1i}, \dots, \beta_{di})^T$ can be determined by regressing

$$N(X(T_i))/N(X(T_{i+1}))V(X(T_{i+1}))$$

versus

$$\psi(X(T_{i+1})) .$$

Regression Approaches (cont'd)

- ▶ This gives

$$\beta_i = \Psi_i^{-1} \Omega_i ,$$

where we define the $d \times d$ matrix

$$\Psi_i = \mathbb{E} \left[\psi(X(T_i)) \psi^T(X(T_i)) \right]$$

and the $d \times 1$ vector

$$\Omega_i = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{N(X(T_i)) V(X(T_{i+1}))}{N(X(T_{i+1}))} \psi(X(T_i)) \right] .$$

Regression Approaches (cont'd)

- ▶ These equations provide a straightforward recipe to compute the regression coefficients β_i by substituting Ψ and Ω with their sample average over n Monte Carlo replications, $\bar{\Psi}_i$ and $\bar{\Omega}_i$.
- ▶ More explicitly, considering a set of Monte Carlo paths of the Markov state variable X sampled on the Bermudan exercise dates

$$(X^{(k)}(T_{\eta(t)+1}), \dots, X^{(k)}(T_{B-1}))$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n$ one could compute the sample averages

$$\bar{\Psi}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \psi(X^{(k)}(T_i)) \psi^T(X^{(k)}(T_i))$$
$$\bar{\Omega}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{N(X^{(k)}(T_i)) \hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_{i+1}))}{N(X^{(k)}(T_{i+1}))} \psi(X^{(k)}(T_i))$$

Regression Approaches (cont'd)

- ▶ In the last equation \hat{V} is given by

$$\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_i)) = \max(E(X^{(k)}(T_i), \hat{H}_i(X^{(k)}(T_i)))$$

for $i = \eta(t) + 1, \dots, B - 1$, where we have replaced the true value H with the estimate \hat{H} according to

$$\hat{H}_i(X^{(k)}(T_i)) = \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_{ij} \psi_j(X^{(k)}(T_i))$$

- ▶ However this depends on the *yet to be determined coefficients* β_i .

Backward Induction

- ▶ As a result, the calculation of the sample averages $\bar{\Psi}_i$ and $\bar{\Omega}_i$ needs to be performed backwards. Indeed, starting from the penultimate Bermudan exercise date T_{B-1} on which

$$\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_B)) = \max(E(X^{(k)}(T_B)), 0)$$

one can compute

$$\bar{\beta}_{B-1} = \bar{\Psi}_{B-1}^{-1} \bar{\Omega}_{B-1}$$

which allows one to compute for $i = B - 2$ the estimate of the hold value

$$\hat{H}_{B-1}(X^{(k)}(T_{B-1})) = \sum_{j=1}^d \bar{\beta}_{B-1j} \psi_j(X^{(k)}(T_{B-1}))$$

required to compute the estimate $\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_{B-1}))$. This can be iterated until we get to $i = \eta(t) + 1 \dots$

Algorithm

Step 1 Simulate n independent paths ($k = 1, \dots, n$)

$$(X^{(k)}(T_{\eta(t)+1}), \dots, X^{(k)}(T_{B-1}))$$

Step 2 At final expiry compute the value:

$$\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_B)) = \max(E(X^{(k)}(T_B)), 0)$$

Step 3 For $i = B - 1, \dots, \eta(t) + 1$

a) Compute:

$$\bar{\Psi}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \psi(X^{(k)}(T_i)) \psi^T(X^{(k)}(T_i))$$

b) Compute:

$$\bar{\Omega}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{N(X^{(k)}(T_i)) \hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_{i+1}))}{N(X^{(k)}(T_{i+1}))} \psi(X^{(k)}(T_i))$$

using the value of $\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_{i+1}))$ computed in the previous time step.

Algorithm (cont'd)

- c) Compute by matrix inversion and multiplication:

$$\bar{\beta}_i = \bar{\Psi}_i^{-1} \bar{\Omega}_i$$

- d) Set for the estimate of the hold value at time T_i :

$$\hat{H}_i(X^{(k)}(T_i)) = \bar{\beta}_i \psi_i(X^{(k)}(T_i))$$

- e) Set for the estimate of the Bermudan option value at time T_i :

$$\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_i)) = \max(E(X^{(k)}(T_i)), \hat{H}_i(X^{(k)}(T_i)))$$

Step 4 Compute:

$$\bar{V}(t) = N(t) \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_{\eta(t)+1}))}{N(X^{(k)}(T_{\eta(t)+1}))}$$

Longstaff-Schwartz Method

- ▶ A modification of this algorithm was proposed by Longstaff and Schwartz and entails replacing

$$\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_i)) = \max(E(X^{(k)}(T_i)), \hat{H}_i(X^{(k)}(T_i)))$$

in Step 3e, with

$$\hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_i)) = \begin{cases} E(X^{(k)}(T_i)) & \text{if } E(X^{(k)}(T_i)) > \hat{H}_i(X^{(k)}(T_i)) \\ \hat{V}(X^{(k)}(T_{i+1}))N(X^{(k)}(T_i))/N(X^{(k)}(T_{i+1})) & \text{otw} \end{cases}$$

which in the examples considered was shown to lead to more accurate results.

- ▶ Similarly to the parametric exercise boundary methods, regression based approaches produce lower bound estimate of the true Bermudan option value if this is computed by means of a second simulation in which the continuation value estimated in the first simulation is used to determine early exercise.

Exercise 2

Consider the Bermudan option of Exercise 1. Compare the results obtained with the regression based approach (including the modification of Longstaff and Schwartz). Use basis functions of the form $S_1^\alpha S_2^\beta$. Include results obtained directly from the backward induction Steps 1-4 in this Section and those obtained by means of a second independent simulation using the hold value estimated by means of the backward induction in the first simulation.

Super-martingale Property

- ▶ The pricing problem for American or Bermudan option admit a 'dual' formulation in which it can be expressed as a *minimization problem*.
- ▶ The dynamic programming equations

$$\frac{H_\eta(t)}{N(t)} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{V(T_{\eta+1})}{N(T_{\eta+1})} \right]$$
$$V(T_\eta) = \max(E(T_\eta), H_\eta(T_\eta))$$

imply

$$\frac{V(X(T_i))}{N(X(T_i))} \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V(X(T_{i+1}))}{N(X(T_{i+1}))} \middle| X(T_i) \right]$$

Super-martingale Property

- ▶ Hence the discounted value of a Bermudan option, $V(X(T_i))/N(X(T_i))$, is a *super-martingale*.
- ▶ In addition one also has:

$$\frac{V(X(T_i))}{N(X(T_i))} \geq \frac{E(X(T_i))}{N(X(T_i))}$$

- ▶ In fact, the discounted value of a Bermudan option is the *minimal* super-martingale dominating the discounted exercise value $E(X(T_i))/N(X(T_i))$.

Duality and Upper Bounds

- Consider a martingale M with $M(t) = \mathbb{E}_t[M(s)] = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} &= \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} \right] \\ &= \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} + M(\tau) - M(\tau) \right] = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M(\tau) \right]\end{aligned}$$

- Hence, using Jensen's inequality:

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} = \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(t)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M(\tau) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}(t)} \left(\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M(\tau) \right) \right]$$

As a result an *upper bound* on the value of the Bermudan option is

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} \leq \inf_{M(t)=0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}(t)} \left(\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M(\tau) \right) \right]$$

Duality and Upper Bounds (cont'd)

- ▶ Interestingly, we can show that

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} \leq \inf_{M(t)=0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}(t)} \left(\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M(\tau) \right) \right]$$

holds with equality i.e., it is possible to find M^* such that

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}(t)} \left(\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M^*(\tau) \right) \right]$$

Duality and Upper Bounds (cont'd)

- ▶ This is a consequence of the so called *Doob-Mayer decomposition* for super-martingales:

$$\frac{V(s)}{N(s)} = \frac{V(t)}{N(t)} + M^*(s) - A(s)$$

where $A(s)$ is a non decreasing predictable process with $A(t) = 0$.
Indeed, choosing for M the martingale component above

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{V(t)}{N(t)} &\leq \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}(t)} \left(\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M^*(\tau) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{V(t)}{N(t)} + \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}(t)} \left(\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - \frac{V(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - A(\tau) \right) \right] \leq \frac{V(t)}{N(t)} \end{aligned}$$

Duality and Upper Bounds (cont'd)

- ▶ As a result the Bermudan option value can be obtained by finding the martingale component of the deflated option price.
- ▶ Of course this is in general as difficult as the original problem. Nonetheless any approximation of such martingale component will provide an upper bound of the option price through

$$\frac{V(t)}{N(t)} \leq \inf_{M(t)=0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}(t)} \left(\frac{E(\tau)}{N(\tau)} - M(\tau) \right) \right]$$

- ▶ Conceivably the better the approximation the tighter the upper bound.

Martingales from Approximate Option Values

- ▶ Given an approximation of the deflated option price $V(X_s)/N(X_s)$ one can extract the corresponding martingale component to construct an approximation of $M^*(s)$
- ▶ One natural choice is

$$\hat{M}^*(t) = \sum_{j=\eta(t)+1}^B \Delta(T_j)$$

with $M(t) = 0$, and

$$\Delta(T_j) = \frac{V(X(T_j))}{N(X(T_j))} - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{V(X(T_j))}{N(X(T_j))} \middle| X(T_{j-1})\right]$$

for $j > \eta(t) + 1$ and

$$\Delta(T_{\eta(t)+1}) = \frac{V(X(T_{\eta(t)+1}))}{N(X(T_{\eta(t)+1}))} - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{V(X(T_{\eta(t)+1}))}{N(X(T_{\eta(t)+1}))} \middle| X(t)\right]$$

Martingales from Approximate Option Values (cont'd)

- ▶ By applying the 'Tower law' of conditional expectations it is immediate to see that \hat{M}^* is indeed a martingale.
- ▶ The same is true if we replace V with the estimators \hat{V} defined e.g., by a regression based approach.
- ▶ However, replacing the true deflated hold value $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{V(X(T_j))}{N(X(T_j))} \middle| X(T_{j-1})\right]$ with an approximate one \hat{H}/N would not guarantee the martingale property for $\Delta(T_j)$.
- ▶ As a result, the deflated hold value needs to be valued by means of a single time-step nested simulation of N' paths spun out of $X(T_{j-1})$ namely

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{V(X(T_j))}{N(X(T_j))} \middle| X(T_{j-1})\right] \simeq \frac{1}{N'} \sum_{m=1}^{N'} \frac{\hat{V}(X^{(m)}(T_j))}{N(X^{(m)}(T_j))}$$

Martingales from Approximate Stopping Times

- ▶ Alternatively one can employ approximations of the optimal stopping time.
- ▶ Denote with τ_j the stopping time as seen at time T_j , i.e. $\tau_j \in \mathcal{D}(T_j)$, and suppose that these stopping times are defined by approximate hold value functions \hat{H} , namely,

$$\tau_j = \min (k = j, \dots, B : E(X(T_k)) \geq \hat{H}(X(T_k)))$$

where \hat{H} could be estimated for instance by means of regression.

- ▶ One can construct $\Delta(T_j)$ as

$$\Delta(T_j) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{E(X(\tau_j))}{N(X(\tau_j))} \middle| X(T_j) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{E(X(\tau_j))}{N(X(\tau_j))} \middle| X(T_{j-1}) \right]$$

Martingales from Approximate Stopping Times (cont'd)

- ▶ Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{E(X(\tau_j))}{N(X(\tau_j))} \middle| X(T_j) \right] \\ &= \begin{cases} E(X(T_j))/N(X(T_j)) & \text{if } E(X(T_j)) \geq \hat{H}(X(T_j)) , \\ \mathbb{E} \left[E(X(\tau_{j+1}))/N(X(\tau_{j+1})) \middle| X(T_j) \right] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ As a result the only quantities that need to be valued are those of the form

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{E(X(\tau_{j+1}))}{N(X(\tau_{j+1}))} \middle| X(T_j) \right]$$

which can be computed by sub-simulation.

Upper Bond Algorithm

Step 1 Generate n independent paths of the underlying Markov process $X^{(k)} = (X^{(k)}(T_{\eta(t)+1}), \dots, X^{(k)}(T_B))$, for $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Step 2 For each path k , at each $X^{(k)}(T_j)$, $j = \eta(t) + 1, \dots, B$

a) Evaluate:

$$E_j^{(k)} = E(X^{(k)}(T_j))$$

$$\hat{H}_j^{(k)} = \hat{H}(X^{(k)}(T_j))$$

$$N_j^{(k)} = N(X^{(k)}(T_j))$$

b) Simulate N' subpaths starting from $X^{(k)}(T_j)$ and compute

$$\bar{E}_j^{(k)} = \frac{1}{N'} \sum_{m=1}^{N'} E(X^{(k,m)}(\tau_{j+1})) .$$

c) Compute $\hat{\Delta}_j^{(k)}$ using the information above.

Upper Bond Algorithm

Step 3 For each path k , compute: $M^{(k)}(T_i)$ for $i = \eta(t) + 1, \dots, B$.

Step 4 For each path k , evaluate: $E^{(k)}(T_i) - M^{(k)}(T_i)$ for $i = \eta(t) + 1, \dots, B$.

Step 5 For each path k , evaluate:

$$U^{(k)} = \min_{i=\eta(t)+1, \dots, B} \left(\frac{E^{(k)}(T_i)}{N(X(T_i))} - M^{(k)}(T_i) \right) .$$

Step 6 Return:

$$\bar{V}(t) = N(t) \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N U^{(k)} .$$

Exercise 3

Consider the Bermudan option of Exercise 1. Apply the upper bound method described in this Section. Use the different estimators of the exercise time considered in Exercise 2 in order to construct approximate martingales components of the deflated option price.

References I

- [1] P. Glasserman, *Monte Carlo methods in Financial Engineering*, Springer, New York (2004).
- [2] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical recipes in C++: the art of scientific computing*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2002).
- [3] P. Boyle, J. Evnine, and S. Gibbs, *Numerical evaluation of multivariate contingent claims*, Review of Financial Studies **2**, 241-250 (1989).
- [4] J. Tsitsiklis and B. Van Roy, *Regression methods for complex American-style options*, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks **12**, 694-703 (2001).
- [5] F.A. Longstaff and E. S. Schwartz, *Valuing American options by simulation: a simple least-square approach*, Review of Financial Studies **14**, 113-147 (2001).
- [6] S. E. Shreve, *Stochastic calculus for Finance*, Springer-Verlag, New York (2004).
- [7] L. Andersen and M. Broadie, *A primal dual algorithm for pricing multidimensional American options*, Management Science **50**, 1222-1234 (2004).

Disclaimer

This material has been prepared by the Quantitative Strategy Group ("Quant Strategists") which is part of the institutional trading desk of Credit Suisse and/or its affiliates (collectively "CS"). Quant Strategists are not part of the Research Department and the written materials disseminated by Quant Strategists are not research reports. The views of CS' Quant Strategists may differ materially from the views of the Research Department and other divisions at CS. CS has a number of policies in place designed to ensure the independence of CS' Research Department from CS' Trading Desks, including policies relating to the front-running of research reports. These policies do not apply to the materials provided by Quant Strategists. This material may have previously been communicated to the CS trading desk or other CS clients. You should assume that the CS' trading desk makes markets and/or currently maintains positions in the securities (or related securities) or derivatives thereof that are the subject of these materials, and such positions may be inconsistent with the materials provided by Quant Strategists.

This material is being provided to you solely for information purposes, is intended for your use and does not constitute an offer or commitment, a solicitation of an offer or commitment, or any advice or recommendation to enter into a transaction (whether on the indicative terms or any other). This has been prepared based on assumptions and parameters determined in good faith. Calculations in these materials may reflect CS's theoretical (i.e., model) prices only and may not take into account other potentially significant factors. It is important that you (recipient) understand that those assumptions and parameters are not the only ones that might have reasonably been selected or that could apply in the preparation of these materials or in an assessment of any transaction. A variety of other assumptions or parameters, or other market factors or conditions, could result in different contemporaneous good faith analysis or assessment of a transaction. Past performance should not be taken as an indication or guarantee of future performance, and no warranty or representation, expressed or implied is made regarding future performance. Opinions and estimates may be changed without notice. The information set forth above has been obtained from or based upon sources believed by CS to be reliable, but CS does not represent or warrant its accuracy or completeness. This material does not purport to contain all of the information that an interested party may desire. In all cases, interested parties should conduct their own investigation and analysis of the data set forth in these materials. Each person receiving these materials should make an independent assessment of the merits of pursuing a transaction described in these materials and should consult their own professional advisors. CS may from time to time, participate or invest in other financing transactions with the issuers of securities referred to herein, perform services for or solicit business from such issuers, and/or have a position or effect transactions in the securities of derivatives thereof. The market value of any security may be affected by changes in economic, financial, and political factors (including, but not limited to, spot and forward interest and exchange rates), time to maturity, market conditions and volatility and the credit quality of any issuer or reference issuer. Any investor interested in purchasing a product should conduct its own investigation and analysis of the product and consult with its own professional advisors as to the risk involved in making such a purchase.

CS is not qualified to give tax or accounting advice. This document is not to be relied upon in substitution for the exercise of independent judgment and for consultation of an external tax or accounting advisor. CS may have issued other documents that are inconsistent with, and reach different conclusions from, the information presented in this document. Those documents may reflect different assumptions, views and analytical methods of the analysts who prepared them. This document may not be reproduced in whole or in part or made available without the written consent of CS. The distribution of this information may be restricted by local law or regulation in certain jurisdictions.

CS may provide various services to US municipal entities or obligated persons ("municipalities"), including suggesting individual transactions or trades and entering into such transactions. Any services CS provides to municipalities are not viewed as "advice" within the meaning of Section 975 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. CS is providing any such services and related information solely on an arm's length basis and not as an advisor or fiduciary to the municipality. In connection with the provision of the any such services, there is no agreement, direct or indirect, between any municipality (including the officials, management, employees or agents thereof) and CS for CS to provide advice to the municipality. Municipalities should consult with their financial, accounting and legal advisors regarding any such services provided by CS. In addition, CS is not acting for direct or indirect compensation to solicit the municipality on behalf of an unaffiliated broker, dealer, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, or investment adviser for the purpose of obtaining or retaining an engagement by the municipality for or in connection with Municipal Financial Products, the issuance of municipal securities, or of an investment adviser to provide investment advisory services to or on behalf of the municipality.