

HW Problems for Assignment 5 - Part 2

Due 6:30 PM Wednesday, November 23, 2021

- 1. (20 Points) Calibrating to At the Money Options.** In this exercise we will reproduce the calibration results given at the end of the Model Risk lecture.

Assume 0 interest rate, and the market prices for the call options are

$$C^m(1, S_0) = \frac{\lambda_1 S_0}{4}; \quad C^m(2, S_0) = \frac{\lambda_2 S_0}{4}, \quad 0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 1.$$

We express the options prices in terms of $S_0/4$ because it makes the algebra much simpler, and we assume $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 1$ to ensure that we can calibrate. The assumption $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ reflects the call price is more valuable the longer the remaining time to maturity, and $\lambda_2 < 1$ is a very mild condition saying the time 2 call price cannot be more than 25% of the stock price.

- (a) **(10 Points)** Show that $\sigma_0 = \lambda_1/2$ and that σ_1^u, σ_1^d satisfy the equality

$$(0.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 &= \frac{1}{2} ((2 + \lambda_1)\sigma_1^u - \lambda_1) 1_{\frac{\lambda_1}{2+\lambda_1} < \sigma_1^u < 1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} ((2 - \lambda_1)\sigma_1^d - \lambda_1) 1_{\frac{\lambda_1}{2-\lambda_1} < \sigma_1^d < 1}. \end{aligned}$$

- (b) **(10 Points)** Show that (0.1) has no solution if $\sigma_1^u > \frac{2\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{2 + \lambda_1}$. However, for $0 < \sigma_1^u \leq \frac{2\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{2 + \lambda_1}$ if we set

$$\sigma_1^d = \begin{cases} \frac{2\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{2 - \lambda_1} & 0 < \sigma_1^u \leq \frac{\lambda_1}{2 + \lambda_1} \\ \frac{2\lambda_2 - (2 + \lambda_1)\sigma_1^u}{2 - \lambda_1} & \frac{\lambda_1}{2 + \lambda_1} < \sigma_1^u < \frac{2\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{2 + \lambda_1} \\ \text{any value in } \left(0, \frac{\lambda_1}{2 - \lambda_1}\right] & \sigma_1^u = \frac{2\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{2 + \lambda_1} \end{cases}$$

then (σ_1^u, σ_1^d) solve (0.1). A plot of this function is on slide 38 (you DO NOT have to plot the function). **Note:** $\lambda_2 < 1$ ensures $(2\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)/(2 + \lambda_1) < 1$.

- 2. (30 Points) VaR with Unknown Parameters.** The file

“AAPL>Data.xlsx”,

contains daily price data for Apple, Inc from November 1, 2016 through October 31, 2018. Column A contains the date, and column B the closing price. Data is sorted oldest to newest.

In this exercise, you will estimate the VaR for the losses of a \$1,000,000 portfolio in Apple index over 10/31/18 – 11/1/2018. In addition to estimating VaR, you will output confidence intervals for your estimate based off the methodologies described in class.

Assume $X_{t+\Delta} \stackrel{\mathcal{F}_t}{\sim} N(\mu_{t+\Delta}, \sigma_{t+\Delta}^2)$ where $\mu_{t+\Delta}, \sigma_{t+\Delta}^2$ are the (unknown) true values of the mean and variance. Using the full loss operator

$$L_{t+\Delta} = -V_t(e^{X_{t+\Delta}} - 1),$$

we know the (theoretical) VaR is

$$(0.2) \quad \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_{t+\Delta}) = V_t \left(1 - e^{\mu_{t+\Delta} + \sigma_{t+\Delta} N^{-1}(1-\alpha)} \right).$$

Write a simulation to estimate $\text{VaR}_\alpha(L_{t+\Delta})$ as well as the confidence intervals in the two ways listed below. For each, note that from the data file, we can obtain the number of days of data n , along with the standard estimators for the log return mean \bar{X}_n and variance S_n^2 .

- (a) **(15 Points)** Assuming $\mu_{t+\Delta}$ is known (and given by \bar{X}_n) but $\sigma_{t+\Delta}$ is unknown. In this setting, first estimate $\text{VaR}_\alpha(L_{t+\Delta})$ using 1) the empirical distribution of log returns and 2) the theoretical formula in (0.1) with the sample mean and variance. Next, produce a $100(1-\beta)\%$ confidence interval for your theoretical estimate, following the methodology of the lecture.
- (b) **(15 Points)** Assuming both $\mu_{t+\Delta}$ and $\sigma_{t+\Delta}$ are unknown. Here, write a simulation to estimate $\text{VaR}_\alpha(L_{t+\Delta})$ using the methodology described in class. Note that the simulation will produce samples $Y_m = \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_{t+\Delta})^m$ for $m = 1, \dots, M$. With these simulated values, output the average

$$\bar{Y}_M = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M Y_m,$$

as well as the confidence interval (A, B) where A is the $\beta/2$ quantile of the empirical distribution of the $\{Y_m\}$ and B is the $1 - \beta/2$ quantile of the empirical distribution of the $\{Y_m\}$.

For parameter values use $\alpha = .97$, $\beta = .02$, and $M = 125,000$ trials for your simulation in part (b). How do your VaR estimates and confidence intervals compare?