FINANCE 601

Fall 2024

Chapter 7: Answers and Solutions to Exercises Instructor: C.C.Y. Kwan

Question 1 (C50, Ch. 7, #1)

As the price of a put option on a non-dividend paying stock is no lower than the present value of the exercise price and the underlying stock price, we have

$$P \ge Xe^{-rT} - S$$
.

For X = \$40, r = 5% = 0.05, T = 0.5 years, and S = \$37, we have

$$P \ge 40 \times e^{-5\% \times 0.5} - 37 = \$2.0124.$$

As the put is selling for only \$1, it is under-priced.

An arbitrage strategy is as follows:

| | t = 0 | Outcome at $t = 0.5$ years | |
|-------------------------|--------------|---|-----------|
| | | if $S \ge 40$ | if S < 40 |
| Borrow at the | | | |
| risk-free interest rate | \$38 | -\$38.962 | -\$38.962 |
| | | (The above amount is for loan repayment.) | |
| Buy put | - \$1 | 0 | \$40 - S |
| Buy stock | -\$37 | S | S |
| | \$0 | S - 38.962 | \$1.038 |
| | | \geq \$1.038 | |

This is an investment requiring no outlays. In 6 months from now, the arbitrage profit will be at least \$1.038.

Question 2 (C51, Ch. 7, #2)

The Black-Scholes option pricing formula is

$$C = S \cdot \mathbf{N}(d_1) - X \cdot e^{-rT} \cdot \mathbf{N}(d_2)$$

where

$$d_1 = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{T}} \left[\ln\left(\frac{S}{X}\right) + \left(r + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) T \right]$$

and $d_2 = d_1 - \sigma\sqrt{T}$.

For X = \$40, T = 0.5 years, S = \$28, $\sigma = \sqrt{0.5}$, and r = 6% = 0.06, we have

$$d_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{0.5} \times \sqrt{0.5}} \left[\ln \left(\frac{28}{40} \right) + \left(0.06 + \frac{0.5}{2} \right) \times 0.5 \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{0.5} [-0.356675 + 0.155]$$

$$= -0.40335$$

and
$$d_2 = -0.40335 - \sqrt{0.5} \times \sqrt{0.5} = -0.90335$$
.

By linear interpolation of available information from a table of the standard normal distribution, we have

$$\frac{0.40335 - 0.40}{0.41 - 0.40} = \frac{x - 0.1554}{0.1591 - 0.1554},$$
$$x = 0.1566,$$

and then

$$N(-0.40335) = 0.5 - 0.1566 = 0.3434.$$

Likewise, we also have

$$\frac{0.90335 - 0.90}{0.91 - 0.90} = \frac{y - 0.3159}{0.3186 - 0.3159},$$

$$y = 0.3168,$$

and then

$$N(-0.90335) = 0.5 - 0.3168 = 0.1832.$$

It follows that

$$C = $28 \times 0.3434 - $40 \times e^{(-0.06 \times 0.5)} \times 0.1832$$

= $$9.6152 - $7.1114 = 2.5038 .

Question 3 (C52, Ch. 7, #3)

According to the put-call parity, we have

$$C - P = S - X \cdot e^{-rT}$$

If we can get C from Black-Scholes option pricing formula, we can compute P via the put-call parity.

For X = \$20, T = 0.5 years, S = \$20, $\sigma = 60\% = 0.6$, and r = 8% = 0.08, we use

$$C = S \cdot \mathbf{N}(d_1) - X \cdot e^{-rT} \cdot \mathbf{N}(d_2) = \$20 \cdot \mathbf{N}(d_1) - \$20 \cdot e^{-0.08 \times 0.5} \cdot \mathbf{N}(d_2)$$

where

$$d_1 = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{T}} \left[\ln\left(\frac{S}{X}\right) + \left(r + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) T \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{0.6 \times \sqrt{0.5}} \left[\ln\left(\frac{20}{20}\right) + \left(8\% + \frac{0.6^2}{2}\right) \times 0.5 \right]$$

$$= 0.3064$$

and
$$d_2 = d_1 - \sigma \sqrt{T} = 0.3064 - 0.6\sqrt{0.5} = -0.1179$$

to compute C.

By linear interpolation of available information from a table of the standard normal distribution, we have

$$\frac{0.3064 - 0.30}{0.31 - 0.30} = \frac{x - 0.1179}{0.1217 - 0.1179},$$
$$x = 0.1203.$$

and then

$$N(0.3064) = 0.5 + 0.1203 = 0.6203.$$

Likewise, we have

$$\frac{0.1179 - 0.11}{0.12 - 0.11} = \frac{y - 0.0438}{0.0478 - 0.0438},$$
$$y = 0.04696,$$

and then

$$N(-0.1179) = 0.5 - 0.04696 = 0.45304.$$

It follows that

$$C = $20 \times 0.6203 - $20 \times e^{(-0.08 \times 0.5)} \times 0.45304$$
$$= 12.406 - 8.7055 = $3.7005$$

and then

$$P = C - S + X \cdot e^{-rT}$$

= $\$3.7005 - \$20 + \$20 \times e^{(-0.08 \times 0.5)} = \$2.9163.$

• Alternatively, the put price can be computed by using the Black-Scholes option pricing formula for put options. The end result will be the same.

Question 4 (X19b, Ch. 7, #4)

Two alternative methods are provided below; find C first and use put-call parity to deduce P, or find P directly. Regardless the method involved, the first step is find $N(d_1)$ and $N(d_2)$. Linear interpolation for each leads to

$$\frac{0.0367 - 0.03}{0.04 - 0.03} = \frac{x - 0.0120}{0.0160 - 0.0120}$$

$$\frac{0.0067}{0.01} = \frac{x - 0.012}{0.004}$$

$$x = 0.01468;$$

$$\frac{0.0633 - 0.06}{0.07 - 0.06} = \frac{y - 0.0239}{0.0279 - 0.0239}$$

$$\frac{0.0033}{0.01} = \frac{y - 0.0239}{0.004}$$

$$y = 0.02522.$$

$$N(d_1) = 0.5 + 0.01468 = 0.51468$$

 $N(d_2) = 0.5 - 0.02522 = 0.47478.$

Then, we have

$$N(-d_1) = 0.5 - 0.01468 = 0.48532;$$

 $N(-d_2) = 0.5 + 0.02522 = 0.52522;$

$$C = SN(d_1) - X \exp(-rT)N(d_2)$$

$$= \$19.75 \times 0.51468 - \$20 \times [\exp(-0.045 \times 0.25)] \times 0.47478$$

$$= \$10.1649 - \$20 \times 0.988813 \times 0.47478 = \$0.7756;$$

and
$$P = C - S + X \exp(-rT)$$

= $\$0.7756 - \$19.75 + \$20 \times 0.988813$
= $\$0.8018$.

Alternatively, we have directly

$$P = C - S + X \exp(-rT)$$

$$= SN(d_1) - X \exp(-rT)N(d_2) - S + X \exp(-rT)$$

$$= X \exp(-rT)[1 - N(d_2)] - S[1 - N(d_1)]$$

$$= X \exp(-rT)N(-d_2) - SN(-d_1)$$

$$= \$20 \times [\exp(-0.045 \times 0.25)] \times 0.52522 - \$19.75 \times 0.48532$$

$$= \$20 \times 0.988813 \times 0.52522 - \$9.5851$$

$$= \$0.8018.$$

Question 5 (X23b, Ch. 7, #5)

To satisfy the put-call parity holds requires that

$$C - P = S - Xe^{-rT}.$$

For S = \$52, X = \$50, r = 0.04, T = 0.25 years, C = \$3.100, and P = \$0.585, we have

$$C - P = \$3.100 - \$0.585 = \$2.515$$

and

$$S - Xe^{-rT} = \$52 - \$50 \times e^{-0.04 \times 0.25} = 2.4975,$$

indicating that

$$C - P > S - Xe^{-rT}.$$

This inequality is equivalent to

$$P - C + S < Xe^{-rT}$$
.

As

$$S \ge C \ge 0$$
 and $P \ge 0$,

we must have

$$P - C + S \ge 0$$
.

An investor buys the put option with P = \$0.585, writes the corresponding call option to receive C = \$3.100, and buys the underlying stock with S = \$52.000. The required cash is P - C + S = \$49.485. To finance this portfolio, the investor also borrows less than $Xe^{-rT} = \$49.5025$, at a continuously compounded risk-free interest rate r = 0.04.

On the expiry date of the two options, which is T=0.25 years afterwards, the repayment of the loan requires less than

$$(Xe^{-rT})e^{rT} = X = $50.$$

Let us label, on the expiry date of the two options, the stock price as S_T , the call option price as C_T , and the put option price as P_T . We can have $S_T > X = \$50$, $S_T = X = \$50$, or $S_T < X = \$50$. If $S_T > X = \$50$, only the call option is exercised. With

$$C_T = S_T - X$$
 and $P_T = 0$,

the investor's portfolio is worth

$$P_T - C_T + S_T = 0 - (S_T - X) + S_T = X = $50.$$

If $S_T = X = 50 , neither option is exercised. With

$$C_T = 0$$
 and $P_T = 0$,

the investor's portfolio is worth

$$P_T - C_T + S_T = 0 - 0 + S_T = S_T = X = $50.$$

If $S_T < X = 50 instead, only the put option is exercised. With

$$C_T = 0$$
 and $P_T = X - S_T$,

the investor's portfolio is worth

$$P_T - C_T + S_T = (X - S_T) - 0 + S_T = X = $50.$$

As the loan repayment requires less than \$50, the investor has an arbitrage profit in each of the three cases.

Question 6 (X23a, Ch. 7, #6)

For a European put option on a stock that pays no dividend, the following inequality holds:

$$P > Xe^{-rT} - S$$
.

For T = 0.25 years, S = \$38, X = \$40, and r = 0.05, we have

$$Xe^{-rT} - S = \$40e^{-0.05 \times 0.25} - \$38 = \$1.503,$$

which is greater than P = \$1.45. This is a case where

$$P < Xe^{-rT} - S$$

or, equivalently,

$$P + S < Xe^{-rT}$$
.

We show below that an investor will earn an arbitrage profit by buying both the put option and the underlying stock, entirely with borrowed money, which is

$$P + S = $39.45$$
.

A crucial point here is that the investor's immediate cash outlay is intended to be zero.

With the dollar amount of the loan being less than

$$Xe^{-rT} = $39.503,$$

the repayment of the loan on the expiry date of the option is less than

$$(Xe^{-rT})e^{rT} = X = $40.$$

On the expiry date of the option, if S < X = \$40, the investor will exercise the option by selling the stock (that the investor has acquired at the beginning) to the writer of the option and will receive

X = \$40 for it. As the repayment of the loan is less than X = \$40, the investor will make an arbitrage profit.

On the expiry date of the option, if S = X = \$40 instead, there is no incentive for the investor to exercise the option. The investor will sell the stock in the market for a price that is equal to X = \$40. As the amount is more than what is required to repay the loan, the arbitrage profit will still be the same as that for the case of S < X = \$40.

On the expiry date of the option, if S > X = \$40 instead, the option will not be exercised. The investor will sell the stock in the market for a price that is greater than X = \$40. As the repayment for the loan requires an amount less than X, the arbitrage profit is even higher.

Question 7 (X16a23c, Ch. 7, #7)

(a) The connection between the two models pertaining to the time-value factors is via

$$(1+r_f)^N = \exp(rT),$$

which can be expressed equivalently as

$$1 + r_f = [\exp(rT)]^{1/N}$$
.

For N = 10, r = 6.5% = 0.065, and T = 2/12 years, we have

$$\exp(rT) = \exp\left(0.065 \times \frac{2}{12}\right) = 1.010892$$

and then

$$r_f = (1.010892)^{1/10} - 1 = 0.001084 = 0.1084\%.$$

(b) There are different ways to set parameters u and d in an N-period setting to match the volatility parameter σ in the Black-Scholes model. One of them is

$$u = \frac{1}{d} = \exp\left(\sigma\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}}\right).$$

For u = 0.00160, T = 0.25 years, and N = 10,000, we have

$$\sigma\sqrt{\frac{T}{N}} = \ln(u);$$

$$\sigma = \ln(u)\sqrt{\frac{N}{T}} = 0.0015987\sqrt{\frac{10,000}{0.25}} = 0.31974 = 31.974\%.$$