Monte Carlo methods for American options

Ahmed Kebaier kebaier@math.univ-paris13.fr

HEC, Paris

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶ - 国 - のへで







The Market model

- Let $(W_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a brownian motion under \mathbb{P}^* the risk neutral probability measure
- Under \mathbb{P}^* the Black-Scholes model is solution to

$$dS_t = rS_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t$$
, where $r \ge 0, \sigma > 0$ and $S_0 > 0$

with explicit solution given by

$$S_t = S_0 \exp\left(\left(r - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)T + \sigma W_T\right)$$

• Let $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ denotes the natural filtration associated to W.

• A European option with maturity T and with payoff $f(S_T)$ may be exercised only at the expiration date T.

• The price of this European option at time $t \in [0, T]$ is equal to the value at time t of the associated hedging portfolio given by

$$V_t = H_t^0 e^{rt} + H_t S_t.$$

• A European option with maturity T and with payoff $f(S_T)$ may be exercised only at the expiration date T.

• The price of this European option at time $t \in [0, T]$ is equal to the value at time t of the associated hedging portfolio given by

$$V_t = H_t^0 e^{rt} + H_t S_t.$$

• Under \mathbb{P}^* , the process $(\tilde{S}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ given by $\tilde{S}_t = e^{-rt}S_t$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

• A European option with maturity T and with payoff $f(S_T)$ may be exercised only at the expiration date T.

• The price of this European option at time $t \in [0, T]$ is equal to the value at time t of the associated hedging portfolio given by

$$V_t = H_t^0 e^{rt} + H_t S_t.$$

• Under \mathbb{P}^* , the process $(\tilde{S}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ given by $\tilde{S}_t = e^{-rt}S_t$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

• The portfolio V is self-financing then

$$\tilde{V}_t = V_0 + \int_0^t H_s d\tilde{S}_s$$

• A European option with maturity T and with payoff $f(S_T)$ may be exercised only at the expiration date T.

• The price of this European option at time $t \in [0, T]$ is equal to the value at time t of the associated hedging portfolio given by

$$V_t = H_t^0 e^{rt} + H_t S_t.$$

• Under \mathbb{P}^* , the process $(\tilde{S}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ given by $\tilde{S}_t = e^{-rt}S_t$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

• The portfolio V is self-financing then

$$\tilde{V}_t = V_0 + \int_0^t H_s d\tilde{S}_s$$

• Under \mathbb{P}^* , the process $(\tilde{V}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ is also an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

・ロト ・ 日下 ・ 日下 ・ 日下 ・ 今日・

• A European option with maturity T and with payoff $f(S_T)$ may be exercised only at the expiration date T.

• The price of this European option at time $t \in [0, T]$ is equal to the value at time t of the associated hedging portfolio given by

$$V_t = H_t^0 e^{rt} + H_t S_t.$$

• Under \mathbb{P}^* , the process $(\tilde{S}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ given by $\tilde{S}_t = e^{-rt}S_t$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -martingale.

• The portfolio V is self-financing then

$$\tilde{V}_t = V_0 + \int_0^t H_s d\tilde{S}_s$$

Under P^{*}, the process (V
t){0≤t≤T} is also an F_t-martingale.
Then

$$V_t = e^{-r(T-t)} \mathbb{E}^*(f(S_T) | \mathcal{F}_t).$$

• Let us consider $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T$ a discrete subdivision of [0, T].

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

• Let us consider $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T$ a discrete subdivision of [0, T].

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

- Let us consider $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T$ a discrete subdivision of [0, T].
- A Bermudan option gives the right to the buyer to exercise at any date t_0, \dots, t_n and pays $f(S_{t_k})$ at time t_k .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

• Let $(\tilde{V}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ denote the associated hedging portfolio. Then,

- Let us consider $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T$ a discrete subdivision of [0, T].
- A Bermudan option gives the right to the buyer to exercise at any date t_0, \dots, t_n and pays $f(S_{t_k})$ at time t_k .

- Let $(\tilde{V}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ denote the associated hedging portfolio. Then,
- at date $T = t_n$ we have $V_{t_n} = f(S_{t_n})$

- Let us consider $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T$ a discrete subdivision of [0, T].
- A Bermudan option gives the right to the buyer to exercise at any date t_0, \dots, t_n and pays $f(S_{t_k})$ at time t_k .
- Let $(\tilde{V}_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ denote the associated hedging portfolio. Then,
- at date $T = t_n$ we have $V_{t_n} = f(S_{t_n})$
- at date $T = t_{n-1}$ we have

$$V_{t_{n-1}} = \max\left(f(S_{t_{n-1}}); e^{-r(t_n-t_{n-1})}\mathbb{E}^*[f(S_{t_n})|\mathcal{F}_{t_{n-1}}]\right)$$

=
$$\max\left(f(S_{t_{n-1}}); e^{-r(t_n-t_{n-1})}\mathbb{E}^*[V_{t_n}|\mathcal{F}_{t_{n-1}}]\right)$$

- Let us consider $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T$ a discrete subdivision of [0, T].
- A Bermudan option gives the right to the buyer to exercise at any date t_0, \dots, t_n and pays $f(S_{t_k})$ at time t_k .
- Let $(\tilde{V}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ denote the associated hedging portfolio. Then,
- at date $T = t_n$ we have $V_{t_n} = f(S_{t_n})$
- at date $T = t_{n-1}$ we have

$$V_{t_{n-1}} = \max \left(f(S_{t_{n-1}}); e^{-r(t_n - t_{n-1})} \mathbb{E}^*[f(S_{t_n}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_{n-1}}] \right)$$

=
$$\max \left(f(S_{t_{n-1}}); e^{-r(t_n - t_{n-1})} \mathbb{E}^*[V_{t_n} | \mathcal{F}_{t_{n-1}}] \right)$$

• In the same way we get $orall k \in \{0,\cdots,n-1\}$

Remarks

• Note that as the process $(S_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ is Markovian then

$$\mathbb{E}^*\left[V_{t_{k+1}}|\mathcal{F}_{t_k}\right] = \mathbb{E}^*\left[V_{t_{k+1}}|\mathcal{S}_{t_k}\right].$$

• The price of a Bermudan option is more expensive than the price of an European option.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

• For
$$f(x) = (x - K)_+$$
 we have $e^{-r(t_{k+1} - t_k)} \mathbb{E}^*[V_{t_{k+1}} | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}] \ge f(S_{t_k})$

Remarks

• Note that as the process $(S_t)_{0 \le t \le T}$ is Markovian then

$$\mathbb{E}^*\left[V_{t_{k+1}}|\mathcal{F}_{t_k}\right] = \mathbb{E}^*\left[V_{t_{k+1}}|\mathcal{S}_{t_k}\right].$$

• The price of a Bermudan option is more expensive than the price of an European option.

• For
$$f(x) = (x - K)_+$$
 we have $e^{-r(t_{k+1} - t_k)} \mathbb{E}^*[V_{t_{k+1}} | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}] \ge f(S_{t_k})$

• If we let $n \to \infty$ than the price of the Bermudan option tends to the price of the American option.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Theorem

• Now if we consider $\forall k \in \{0, \cdots, n-1\}$

$$\begin{cases} V_T = f(S_T) \\ V_{t_k} = \max\left(f(S_{t_k}); e^{-r(t_{k+1}-t_k)} \mathbb{E}^*[V_{t_{k+1}}|\mathcal{F}_{t_k}]\right), \end{cases}$$

Then,

$$V_{t_k} = \sup_{\tau \in \{t_k, \cdots, t_n\}} e^{-r(\tau - t_k)} \mathbb{E}^* \left(f(S_\tau) | \mathcal{S}_{t_k} \right)$$

• The stopping time

$$\tau_{k}^{*} = \inf \left\{ t_{i} \in \{t_{k}, \cdots, t_{n}\} \mid f(S_{t_{i}}) \geq e^{-r(t_{i+1}-t_{i})} \mathbb{E}^{*} \left[f(S_{t_{i+1}}) | S_{t_{k}} \right] \right\}$$

satifies

$$V_{t_k} = e^{-r(\tau_k^* - t_k)} \mathbb{E}^* \left[f(S_{\tau_k^*}) | \mathcal{S}_{t_k} \right].$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Longstaff Schwarz algorithm

• We consider the sequence $(au_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ where

$$\tau_k^* = \inf \left\{ t_i \in \{t_k, \cdots, t_n\} \mid f(S_{t_i}) \ge e^{-r(t_{i+1}-t_i)} \mathbb{E}^* [f(S_{t_{i+1}}) | \mathcal{S}_{t_k}] \right\}$$

• The sequence $(\tau_k^*)_{0 \le k \le n}$ satisfies a dynamic programming principle

$$\begin{cases} \tau_n^* = T \\ \tau_k^* = t_k \mathbf{1}_{B_k} + \tau_{k+1}^* \mathbf{1}_{B_k^c}, \text{ for } 0 \le k \le n-1 \end{cases}$$

where

$$B_k = \left\{ f(S_{t_k}) \geq \mathbb{E}^*[e^{-r(\tau_{k+1}^* - t_k)}f(S_{\tau_{k+1}^*})|S_{t_k}] \right\}$$

Longstaff Schwarz algorithm

• We consider the sequence $(au_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ where

$$\tau_{k}^{*} = \inf \left\{ t_{i} \in \{t_{k}, \cdots, t_{n}\} \mid f(S_{t_{i}}) \geq e^{-r(t_{i+1}-t_{i})} \mathbb{E}^{*} \left[f(S_{t_{i+1}}) | \mathcal{S}_{t_{k}} \right] \right\}$$

• The sequence $(\tau_k^*)_{0 \le k \le n}$ satisfies a dynamic programming principle

$$\begin{cases} \tau_n^* = T \\ \tau_k^* = t_k \mathbf{1}_{B_k} + \tau_{k+1}^* \mathbf{1}_{B_k^c}, \text{ for } 0 \le k \le n-1 \end{cases}$$

where

$$B_k = \left\{ f(S_{t_k}) \geq \mathbb{E}^*[e^{-r(\tau_{k+1}^* - t_k)}f(S_{\tau_{k+1}^*})|S_{t_k}] \right\}$$

• How to approximate $\mathbb{E}^*[e^{-r(\tau_{k+1}^*-t_k)}f(S_{\tau_{k+1}^*})|S_{t_k}]$?

Regression

• We write $\mathbb{E}^*[e^{-r(\tau_{k+1}^*-t_k)}f(S_{\tau_{k+1}^*})|S_{t_k}] = \sum_{\ell \ge 1} \alpha_{k,\ell} P_\ell(S_{t_k})$ where $(P_\ell)_{\ell \ge 1}$ is a basis function.

• Using the definition of the conditional expectation, the sequence $(\alpha_{k,\ell})_{\ell \ge 1}$ is the sequence that minimizes the distance

$$\mathbb{E}^*\left[\left(e^{-r(\tau_{k+1}^*-t_k)}f(S_{\tau_{k+1}^*})-\sum_{\ell\geq 1}\alpha_{k,\ell}P_\ell(S_{t_k})\right)^2\right]$$

• In practice we need to truncate the sum $\sum_{\ell\geq 1}\alpha_{k,\ell}P_\ell(S_{t_k})$ and approximate it by

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \alpha_{k,\ell} P_{\ell}(S_{t_k}), \text{ where } L > 1.$$

Longstaff Schwarz algorithm

• Simulate
$$(S_{t_0}^j, \cdots, S_{t_n}^j)_{1 \le j \le M}$$
 M copies of $(S_{t_0}, \cdots, S_{t_n})$

2 For all $1 \le j \le M$ we set $\tau_{i,n} = t_n = T$

Solution Then compute the sequence $(\alpha_{k,\ell}^j)_{1 \le \ell \le L}$ that minimizes

$$\frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M}\left[\left(e^{-r(\tau_{j,k+1}-t_k)}f(S^j_{\tau_{j,k+1}})-\sum_{\ell=1}^{L}\alpha_{k,\ell}P_\ell(S^j_{t_k})\right)^2\right]$$

• For all $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ we define

$$au_{j,k} = t_k \mathbf{1}_{A_{j,k}} + au_{j,k+1} \mathbf{1}_{A_{j,k}^c}, \ \ \text{for} \ \ 0 \leq k \leq n-1$$

where

$$A_{j,k} = \left\{ f(S_{t_k}^j) \ge \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \alpha_{k,\ell}^j P_\ell(S_{t_k}^j) \right\}$$

Price approximation

• For k = 0 we the price of the Bermudan option is approximated by

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} e^{-r\tau_{j,0}} f(S^{j}_{\tau_{j,0}})$$

• The Longstaff Schwarz algorithm converges in L^2 as $L \to \infty$ and for fixed L converges almost surely as $M \to \infty$.

Computing the coordinates $(\alpha_{k,\ell})_{1 \le \ell \le L}$

A Basic approach

For a fixed time step t_k , this approach consists on simply solving the following system

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_1(S_{t_k}^1) & \cdots & P_L(S_{t_k}^1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ P_1(S_{t_k}^M) & \cdots & P_L(S_{t_k}^M) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{k,1} \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_{k,L} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-r(\tau_{1,k+1}-t_k)}f(S_{\tau_{1,k+1}}^1) \\ \vdots \\ e^{-r(\tau_{M,k+1}-t_k)}f(S_{\tau_{M,k+1}}^M) \end{pmatrix}$$

- Advantage: easy to implement
- Drawback: not a high accuracy.

Computing the coordinates $(\alpha_{k,\ell})_{1 \le \ell \le L}$

An optimal approach

• For a fixed time step t_k we aim at computing the sequence $(\alpha_{k,\ell}^j)_{1 \le \ell \le L}$ that minimizes

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} \left[\left(e^{-r(\tau_{j,k+1}-t_k)} f(S^j_{\tau_{j,k+1}}) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \alpha_{k,\ell} P_{\ell}(S^j_{t_k}) \right)^2 \right]$$

 $\bullet\,$ we differentiate the above quantity with respect to α_{k,ℓ_0} and solve

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} \left(e^{-r(\tau_{j,k+1}-t_k)} f(S^j_{\tau_{j,k+1}}) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \alpha_{k,\ell} P_{\ell}(S^j_{t_k}) \right) P_{\ell_0}(S^j_{t_k}) = 0$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ □臣 = のへで

An optimal approach

• This is equivelent to solve

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{M} P_{\ell}(S_{t_{k}}^{j}) P_{\ell_{0}}(S_{t_{k}}^{j}) \right) \alpha_{k,\ell} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} e^{-r(\tau_{j,k+1}-t_{k})} f(S_{\tau_{j,k+1}}^{j}) P_{\ell_{0}}(S_{t_{k}}^{j})$$

• Let $H_{\ell_0,\ell} = \sum_{j=1}^M P_\ell(S^j_{t_k}) P_{\ell_0}(S^j_{t_k})$ we need to solve

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{L} H_{\ell_0,\ell} \alpha_{k,\ell} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} e^{-r(\tau_{j,k+1}-t_k)} f(S_{\tau_{j,k+1}}^j) P_{\ell_0}(S_{t_k}^j)$$

• We can write this in a matrix equation given by

$$H\alpha_{k} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} e^{-r(\tau_{j,k+1}-t_{k})} f(S_{\tau_{j,k+1}}^{j}) P(S_{t_{k}}^{j})$$

where

$$\alpha_k = (\alpha_{k,1}, \cdots, \alpha_{k,L}) \text{ and } P(S_{t_k}^j) = (P_1(S_{t_k}^j), \cdots, P_L(S_{t_k}^j))$$