We have conducted several tests using PDE pricer to see how our price and execution time depend on grid settings.

We used a put with K=2700, expiring in 2 years, constant volatility of 15%, S=2680 and interest rates from our source data, for as of date=2014-01-20.

## Performance and precision as a function of number of time points

Firstly, we used spot grid with 50 values and varied the number of time values between 10 and 3000 with step 10.

As expected, PV moves decrease as we increase the number of points

Execution time grew linearly:

## Performance and precision as a function of number of time points, constant interest rate and volatility

We have also conducted an experiment with only varying the number of time points t, but using a constant (and not very realistic) interest rate or constant volatility. The PV graph still has significant noise on the right in both cases.

For constant volatility the noise is smaller, but still can be observed:

## Performance and precision as a function of number of spot points

We also used time grid with 50 values and varied the number of spot values between 10 and 1000 with step 10.

We observed a much better convergence in terms of PV:

Performance graph has some random spikes, but in general is linear:

A different run produced different spikes, so we are sure this is some kind of environmental effect:

The graph’s general shape means, given our 3-diagonall matrix structure for solving equations, the solver we use is able to solve them with a linear complexity.

## Performance and precision as a function of number of time and spot points

As a combined experiment, we used time and spot grids with same numbers of points, varied values between 10 and 300 with step 1.

## Analysis

We see much more noise for big numbers of time points, compared to big numbers of spot points. We can observe decreased precision when we were varying number of time points, regardless if we were varying number of spot points or not. However, for a constant number of time points, we have a much better precision. Initially we assumed this was caused by rates interpolation, so we used a constant rate to rule that out. An experiment with constant rate and varying number of T points still has much more noise that an experiment with varying number of S points. Thus, we conclude PDE implementation is inherently prone to more noise as a result of T lattice choice than S lattice choice.

Calculation time is growing linearly in first two experiments and is (thus, predictably) growing quadratically in a combined experiment.

As for the performance aspect, we observe no spikes in calculation time when we are varying the number of time points only, but we do, when we are varying the number of post points. This points to environmental causes like garbage collection, which seem to kick in more frequently when we use larger matrices, and wouldn’t be seen with number of spot points equal to 50, as seen in tests where we varied the number of time points only.