

Esquível, Manuel L.; Veiga, Carlos; Wystup, Uwe

**Working Paper**

## Unifying exotic option closed formulas

CPQF Working Paper Series, No. 23

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Frankfurt School of Finance and Management

*Suggested Citation:* Esquível, Manuel L.; Veiga, Carlos; Wystup, Uwe (2010) : Unifying exotic option closed formulas, CPQF Working Paper Series, No. 23, Frankfurt School of Finance & Management, Centre for Practical Quantitative Finance (CPQF), Frankfurt a. M.

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/40174>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

**CPQF Working Paper Series  
No. 23**

**Unifying Exotic Option Closed Formulas**

**Manuel L. Esquivel, Carlos Veiga and Uwe Wystup**

January 2010

Authors:

*Carlos Veiga*  
PhD Student CPQF  
Frankfurt School of Finance & Management  
Frankfurt/Main  
c.m.veiga@frankfurt-school.de

*Uwe Wystup*  
Professor of Quantitative Finance  
Frankfurt School of Finance & Management  
Frankfurt/Main  
u.wystup@frankfurt-school.de

*Manuel L. Esquivel*  
Faculty of Science and Technology, Dep. of Mathematics  
Universidade Nova de Lisboa  
Caparica, Portugal  
mle@fct.unl.pt

Publisher:

Frankfurt School of Finance & Management  
Phone: +49 (0) 69 154 008-0 ■ Fax: +49 (0) 69 154 008-728  
Sonnemannstr. 9-11 ■ D-60314 Frankfurt/M. ■ Germany

# Unifying Exotic Option Closed Formulas

Carlos Veiga <sup>\*†</sup>

c.m.veiga@frankfurt-school.de

Tel.: +49 (0)69 154008-771

Fax.: +49 (0)69 154008-4771

Frankfurt School of Finance & Management

Centre for Practical Quantitative Finance

Sonnemannstraße 9-11, 60314 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Uwe Wystup

uwe.wystup@mathfinance.com

Tel.: +49 (0)69 154008-719

Fax.: +49 (0)69 154008-4719

Frankfurt School of Finance & Management

Centre for Practical Quantitative Finance

Sonnemannstraße 9-11, 60314 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Manuel L. Esquível

mle@fct.unl.pt

Tel.: +351 21 2948388

Fax.: +351 21 2948391

Universidade Nova de Lisboa

Faculty of Science and Technology, Dep. of Mathematics

Quinta da Torre, 2829-516 Caparica, Portugal

## Abstract

This paper aims to unify exotic option closed formulas by generalizing a large class of existing formulas and by setting a framework that allows for further generalizations. The formula presented covers options from the plain vanilla to most, if not all, mountain range exotic options and is developed in a multi-asset, multi-currency Black-Scholes model with time dependent parameters. The general formula not only covers existing cases but also enables the combination of diverse features from different types of exotic options. It also creates implicitly a language to describe payoffs that can be used in industrial applications to decouple the functions of payoff definition from

---

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author.

<sup>†</sup>The author wishes to thank Millennium bcp investimento, S.A. for the financial support being provided during his PhD. studies.

pricing functions. Examples of several exotic options are presented, benchmarking the closed formulas' performance against Monte Carlo simulations. Results show a consistent over performance of the closed formula reducing calculation time by double digit factors.

**Key words:** exotic options, mountain range, discrete lookback, closed formula, payoff language, multi-asset multi-currency model

# 1 Introduction

The pricing of exotic options, defined in most references as every option type apart from the European and American vanilla options, is performed either by using a closed formula or by relying on a numerical method to evaluate the integral the pricing function involves. Whenever available, a closed formula is more precise and requires less computational effort. This is the reasoning behind our search for general closed formulas that unify exotic option pricing.

The closed formulas for pricing exotic options have mainly been developed to price options whose payoffs exhibit one, and only one, very specific feature, and they assume an elementary market setup. However, the industry requirements go well beyond these simplifications. Exotic options underlying assets spread across several currency zones, and exotic options payoff profiles include features from multiple exotic option types.

This need to account for multiple features in a computationally simple process calls for a unification of the existing closed exotic option pricing formulas. Thus, instead of proceeding to develop formulas for specific option types, we propose a general approach that is able to accommodate several of the features seen in most exotics. Hence, we produce a formula for a generic payoff, covering thus all exotic options whose features are included in it. The market setting underlying the formula is also able to accommodate very diverse market setups, covering as many currency zones as needed.

Finally, the general formula allows the development of payoff languages. Payoff languages are extremely useful in industrial pricing applications as they enable the decoupling the payoff definition process from the pricing routines. Thus, as long as the payoff only uses the features covered by this general formula, the development of a new payoff profile does not necessitate the development of a new pricing routine. This means that industry agents can freely combine the desired features, while using the same pricing routines.

This paper is divided into four sections. This first section covers the motivation for the paper and the literature review. The second section develops the model, the payoff of a generic claim and its pricing formula. Section three then discusses the applications, including performance matters, and provides examples and the final section concludes.

## 1.1 Literature Review

Literature on exotic options is vast and dates back to the late 1970s. It is not our intention to give a complete chronology of the works related to this field but just to refer some landmark contributions for each of the main threads of research. Compilations of exotic options descriptions and pricing formulas may be found in Nelken (1995), Zhang (1997), Haug (1998), and

Hakala and Wystup (2002).

According to our exotic option definition above, there are three threads of research in exotics, the first of which deals with options on multiple underlyings. The distinctive characteristic of these options is their high sensitivity to correlations. The landmark closed formulas were Margrabe (1978) - exchange options, Stulz (1982) maximum/minimum of two assets and Johnson (1987) for several assets. One other thread deals with path-dependent options, namely lookback and barrier, which this paper only includes in their discrete version. The main contributions on this thread are Rubinstein and Reiner (1991) for barrier options and Goldman et al.(1979) and Conze and Viswanathan (1991) for lookbacks. Further developments on barrier options were due to work by Heynen and Kat (1994), Carr (1995) and Wystup (2003). For a remarkable description of the barrier option problem see Björk (1998) whose general approach covers a wide class of payoffs. The last thread deals with Asian option and basket options. Their distinctive characteristic is the need to handle sums of geometric Brownian motions. Initial contributions for simpler geometric average problems are from Vorst (1992), and a major development for arithmetic average problems is due to Večer (2001). The present paper extends previous work on this subject by Veiga (2004).

## 2 Formula Development

### 2.1 Model Description

The model on which we develop a closed formula can be classified as a multivariate Black–Scholes model. It is a multi-asset model in which all assets are tradable including for example stocks, currencies, precious metals and indexes composed by these.

We assume the existence of  $n$  assets  $A_i$ , and the respective bank accounts  $B_i$  where asset  $A_i$  may be deposited, with  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Each of the accounts yields a return, in units of the same asset, at a continuously compounded rate of  $r_i$ . Such a rate may be interpreted as an interest rate of a currency or as a repo rate<sup>1</sup> of a stock. Although it is also common also to use this rate to represent dividend payments for individual stocks, we advise against it since dividend payments are typically not payed continuously and are not proportional to the asset price, see [22] for details. Each bank account thus follows the dynamics

$$dB_i(t)/B_i(t) = r_i(t)dt. \tag{1}$$

We furthermore assume the existence of one, and only one, price process for each asset  $A_i$  allowing its expression in units of another asset  $A_j$ . This structure is usually referred to as a tree structure. Though here the

---

<sup>1</sup>rate paid on a repurchase agreement or stock lending contract.

definition of the root (asset) of the tree is not critical, any asset can play that role, what is critical is to have one path, and only one path, to express the price of one asset in terms of any other. Such a structure excludes triangular relationships as for example EUR/USD, USD/JPY and EUR/JPY foreign exchange pairs. We exclude these relationships because they impose restrictions on the volatilities and correlations between the assets, see [10] for details.

Hence, we assume the existence of price processes  $S_{ij}$ , that is the price of one unit of  $A_i$  expressed in units of  $A_j$ , with the dynamics following the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$dS_{ij}(t)/S_{ij}(t) = \mu_{ij}(t)dt + \sigma_{ij}(t)dW_i(t), \quad (2)$$

where  $W_i(t)$  is a Brownian motion under the real world measure  $P$ ,  $\mu_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Furthermore,  $W_{ij}(t)$  is correlated with the Brownian motions that drive the other asset prices. Let  $W_{kl}(t)$  be one such process,  $\rho_{ij,kl}(t)$  its correlation with  $W_{ij}(t)$ , and  $\varsigma_{ij,kl}(t) = \rho_{ij,kl}(t)\sigma_{ij}(t)\sigma_{kl}(t)$  the respective covariance.

Although other setups are also plausible, we choose this one for three reasons: it is general enough to accommodate most exotic options we have encountered, the formulas generated are still manageable, and the volatilities and correlations can be freely specified. Figure 1 illustrates a model setup that would underlie the valuation of a typical structured product that depends on several equity indexes spread across the world.




Figure 1: Example of market setup. The abbreviations refer to the following: USD to United States dollars, EUR to the euro currency, JPY to the Japanese yen, XAU to the gold ounce, SPX to the S&P500 index, SX5E to the DJ Eurostoxx 50 index, and NKY to the Nikkei index.

It shows a market with seven assets and six prices. It includes the currencies of the three main monetary zones and the most popular indexes of each. The currency pairs  $S_{21}$  and  $S_{13}$  are the most liquid and are defined according to market standards, EUR/USD and USD/JPY respectively. The prices of the baskets of stocks that compose each of the equity indexes  $A_5$ ,  $A_6$  and  $A_7$  are naturally expressed in terms of their respective currencies.

It is well known that a market with the same number of random sources driven by (correlated) Brownian motions  $W_{ij}(t)$  as of tradable assets  $A_i$  is

complete and arbitrage free. See Björk [1] or Shreve [18] for details. Therefore, there exists a unique martingale measure  $Q_k$ , equivalent to measure  $P$ . In such a measure  $Q_k$ , all portfolios expressed in terms of units of the *numéraire* portfolio  $B_k(t)$  are martingales. In this model, the transformation from measure  $P$  to  $Q_k$  is found by solving a simple system of equations in which the matrix is triangular. This system yields a transformation of the type

$$dW_{ij}(t) = dW_{ij,k}(t) - \frac{1}{\sigma_{ij}(t)} \left( r_i(t) + \mu_{ij}(t) - r_j(t) + \sum_{h=1}^n \lambda_{j_h} \varsigma_{ij,i_h}(t) \right) dt. \quad (3)$$

where  $n$  is the number of price conversions needed to express the asset in which the price of  $A_i$  is expressed, i.e.  $A_j$ , to  $A_k$ ;  $\lambda_{j_h}$  accounts for the direction of each of the prices, which may be natural ( $\lambda_{j_h} = 1$ ) or inverse ( $\lambda_{j_h} = -1$ ). A price expressed in the natural direction, with respect to the price path from  $A_j$  to  $A_k$ , is one that multiplies the previous quantity to yield the next. Conversely, a price expressed in the inverse direction is one that divides. Finally,  $i_h$  are the indexes of the assets that stand between assets  $A_j$  and  $A_k$ . The indexes are unique as the tree structure implies that there is one, and only one, shortest conversion path connecting the assets.

Applying the transformation to  $S_{ij}(t)$  in equation (2) we get the dynamics of  $S_{ij}(t)$  under the measure  $Q_k$  as

$$dS_{ij}(t)/S_{ij}(t) = \left( r_j(t) - r_i(t) - \sum_{h=1}^n \lambda_{j_h} \varsigma_{ij,i_h}(t) \right) dt + \sigma_{ij}(t) dW_{ij,k}(t). \quad (4)$$

In the example above, if the EUR bank account is chosen as *numéraire*, the dynamics of the index NKY are

$$dS_{73}(t)/S_{73}(t) = (r_3(t) - r_7(t) - (-\varsigma_{73,13}(t) - \varsigma_{73,21}(t))) dt + \sigma_{73}(t) dW_{73,2}(t). \quad (5)$$

Now that we have all dynamics of all prices  $S$  under one arbitrary martingale measure  $Q_k$ , the relevant information concerning the location of  $A_i$  in the tree structure is condensed in the summation  $\sum_{h=1}^n \lambda_{j_h} \varsigma_{ij,i_h}(t)$ . Therefore, we can suppress the letter in the subscript of  $S$ ,  $\sigma$ ,  $\rho$  and  $\varsigma$  that tracks the asset in which the price is expressed. Thus,  $ij$  will be only  $i$  from now on. Furthermore, we will also assign the symbol  $d_i(t)$  to the drift term function, yielding (4) in a more economic form as

$$dS_i(t)/S_i(t) = d_i(t)dt + \sigma_i(t)dW_{ik}(t), \quad (6)$$

where we also removed the comma on the diffusion term because, from now on, we shall only need one symbol to refer to an asset.



## 2.2 Abstract Assets

Apart from the physical assets  $A_i$ , we assume the existence of a new set of abstract assets  $\mathbb{A}_i$ . The conditions these assets need to fulfill are that (i) their price is a function of the prices  $S_i$ , and (ii) their price follows, under any given measure  $Q_k$ , a dynamic of the type

$$d\mathbb{S}_i(t)/\mathbb{S}_i(t) = d_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t)dt + \sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t)dW_{\mathbb{S}_i k}(t). \quad (7)$$

Thus, we define  $\mathbb{S}_i$  as the most general case we can conceive

$$\mathbb{S}_i(t) = \prod_{j=1}^m (S_{i_j, t_j}(t))^{\alpha_j}, \quad (8)$$

where  $S_{i_j, t_j}(t)$  is the process  $S_{i_j}(t)$  frozen at time  $t_j$ , i.e.,  $S_{i_j}(t \wedge t_j)$  and  $i_j$  is an index of an asset. Hence, the process  $S_{i_j, t_j}(t)$  has zero drift and diffusion after time  $t_j$ , and we write its dynamics as

$$dS_{i_j, t_j}(t)/S_{i_j, t_j}(t) = \delta_{i_j}(t)dt + \theta_{i_j}(t)dW_{ik}(t), \quad (9)$$

with  $\delta_{i_j}(t) = d_{i_j}(t)$  and  $\theta_{i_j}(t) = \sigma_{i_j}(t)$  for  $t < t_j$  and both equal to zero otherwise. The covariance is also redefined as  $\zeta_{i_j i_h}(t) = \theta_{i_j}(t)\theta_{i_h}(t)\rho_{i_j, i_h}(t)$ . Without loss of generality we assume  $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$ .

This form exploits the geometric nature of the asset prices  $S_i$ , and that linear combinations of normally distributed random variables are still normal.

To characterize the asset  $\mathbb{A}_i$  and its price  $\mathbb{S}_i$  we need to determine the following quantities: the correlation with any other asset  $\zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i k}(t)$ , the drift term  $d_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t)$ , the volatility term  $\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t)$ , and the rate of return of deposits of  $\mathbb{A}_i$ , i.e.,  $r_{\mathbb{A}_i}(t)$ .

Using the Itô formula we obtain the dynamic of  $\mathbb{S}_i$  as

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbb{S}_i(t)/\mathbb{S}_i(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \left( \delta_{i_j}(t) - \frac{\theta_{i_j}^2(t)}{2} + \sum_{h=1}^m \frac{\alpha_h \zeta_{i_j i_h}(t)}{2} \right) dt \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \theta_{i_j}(t) dW_{i_j k}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We thus have  $d_{\mathbb{S}_i}$  and  $\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}^2$  as

$$\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}^2(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{h=1}^m \alpha_j \alpha_h \zeta_{i_j i_h}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{h=1}^m \alpha_j \alpha_h S_{i_j, i_h}(t) \mathbb{I}_{\{t < t_j, t < t_h\}}, \quad (11)$$

$$d_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \left( \delta_{i_j}(t) - \frac{\theta_{i_j}^2(t)}{2} \right) + \frac{\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}^2(t)}{2}, \quad (12)$$

with  $\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}^2(t)$  the variance of a sum of correlated normals.

As to the covariance of  $\mathbb{S}_i$  with any other price  $\mathbb{S}_j$ , we make use of the relationship  $\zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i\mathbb{S}_j}(t)dt = \sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t)\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_j}(t)dW_{\mathbb{S}_i k}(t)dW_{\mathbb{S}_j k}(t)$  and, using (10), conclude that

$$\zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i\mathbb{S}_j}(t) = \sum_{a=1}^{m_i} \sum_{b=1}^{m_j} \alpha_a \alpha_b \zeta_{i_a i_b}(t) = \sum_{a=1}^{m_i} \sum_{b=1}^{m_j} \alpha_a \alpha_b \varsigma_{a,b}(t) \mathbb{I}_{\{t < t_a, t < t_b\}}, \quad (13)$$

and, in the special case where one of the abstract assets is equal to an asset price  $S_x$ , we also have

$$\zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i x}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \zeta_{i_j x}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \varsigma_{j,x}(t) \mathbb{I}_{\{t < t_j\}}. \quad (14)$$

The return rate  $r_{\mathbb{S}_i}$  of the bank account  $\mathbb{B}_i$  associated with asset  $\mathbb{A}_i$  can be easily calculated using the fact that the dynamics of  $\mathbb{B}_i$  expressed in terms of  $B_k$ , under the measure  $Q_k$ , is a martingale. A simple application of the Itô formula yields

$$d\left(\frac{\mathbb{B}_i \mathbb{S}_i}{B_k}\right)(t) = \left(\frac{\mathbb{B}_i \mathbb{S}_i}{B_k}\right)(t) \left( (r_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t) + d_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t) - r_k(t)) dt + \sigma_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t) dW_{\mathbb{S}_i k}(t) \right). \quad (15)$$

Consequently,

$$r_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t) = r_k(t) - d_{\mathbb{S}_i}(t). \quad (16)$$

We can now even write the SDE of the price process  $S_l$  under the martingale measure associated with  $\mathbb{S}_i$ ,  $Q_{\mathbb{S}_i}$ , just adding one extra price conversion to the path from  $A_j$  to  $A_k$ , described in section 2.1, yielding

$$dS_l(t)/S_l(t) = (d_l(t) + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i l}(t)) dt + \sigma_l(t) dW_{l\mathbb{S}_i}(t), \quad (17)$$

and consequently

$$d\mathbb{S}_l(t)/\mathbb{S}_l(t) = (d_{\mathbb{S}_l}(t) + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i \mathbb{S}_l}(t)) dt + \sigma_{\mathbb{S}_l}(t) dW_{l\mathbb{S}_i}(t). \quad (18)$$

Before we conclude this subsection, we would like to make a remark on how these abstract assets fit the arbitrage theory framework. As in Björk [1], Chapter 24, arbitrage theory requires that the *numéraire* of a given model definition must be a *traded* asset. Clearly these abstract assets are not traded *per se*, and they cannot be replicated by any self-financing portfolio. However, we were able to find the  $Q_{\mathbb{S}_i}$  measure in which all the portfolios  $\vartheta$  of the above assets and abstract assets, expressed in units of  $\mathbb{B}_k$ , are martingales when translated to units of  $\mathbb{B}_i$ , by  $\frac{\vartheta(t)B_k(t)}{\mathbb{B}_i(t)\mathbb{S}_i(t)}$ ,

### 2.3 Generic Contract

Now we need an abstract definition of a contract, or a claim, that should include as many features and existing contracts as possible. Hence, we propose the following payoff definition expressed in terms of asset  $A_k$

$$\Phi_k = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \mathbb{I}_{C_i}, \quad (19)$$

with  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i)$  as the price of an abstract asset  $\mathbb{A}_{I_i}$  expressed in terms of  $A_k$ , observed at time  $t_i$ , to be settled at time  $T_i$ , and  $\mathbb{I}_{C_i}$  the indicator function of the set  $C_i$  that will be defined in section 2.4. For the payoff to be adapted, we need  $t_i \leq T_i$ . We note that  $\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t)$  is actually a stopped process as above and, likewise,  $d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}(t)$ ,  $\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}(t)$  and  $\zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i} x}(t)$  are zero for  $t > t_i$ . Likewise, the return rate  $r_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}(t) = r_k(t)$  for  $t > t_i$ .

To be able to price this claim, we assume the existence of a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, P)$  and that all prices  $S_i$  are adapted. The arbitrage free price of such a contract is, as usual, the discounted expected payoff under the unique equivalent martingale measure  $Q_k$ , thus

$$V(t_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i B_k(t_0) E_{t_0}^{Q_k} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \mathbb{I}_{C_i}}{B_k(T_i)} \right], \quad (20)$$

where  $E_{t_0}^{Q_k}$  is the conditional expectation, under the measure  $Q_k$ , conditioned on the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}$ . We also use the fact that the conditional expectation is a linear operator to interchange it with the summation.

For each term of the summation we may write, with  $V(t_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i(t_0)$ ,

$$\frac{v_i(t_0)}{B_k(t_0)} = E_{t_0}^{Q_k} \left[ c_i \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \mathbb{I}_{C_i}}{B_k(T_i)} \right], \quad (21)$$

which is a martingale by definition of  $Q_k$ .

We now translate the price and the payoff expressed in units of  $B_k$  in units of  $\mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i)$ . These new quantities are martingales under the measure  $Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}$ , and therefore

$$\frac{v_i(t_0)}{B_k(t_0)} \frac{B_k(t_0)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) \mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0)} = E_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}} \left[ c_i \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \mathbb{I}_{C_i}}{B_k(T_i)} \frac{B_k(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i)} \right]. \quad (22)$$

This step can be view as a change of *numéraire* from  $B_k$  to  $\mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}$  as in Geman *et al.* [7]. However, despite the similarity, this is not a standard change of *numéraire* because neither  $\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i)$  is the price of a traded asset nor is  $\mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i)$  a portfolio of tradable assets. Similar measures may be found in Carr [4] and Björk and Landén [2]<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>The authors wish to thank Prof. Tomas Björk for his advice on this issue.

Canceling terms and rearranging we get

$$V(t_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) \mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) E_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}} \left[ \frac{\mathbb{I}_{C_i}}{\mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i)} \right]. \quad (23)$$

Additionally, we know that  $\mathbb{B}_i$  is a deterministic processes under the measure  $Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}$  and can thus be taken out of the expectation, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} V(t_0) &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) \frac{\mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0)}{\mathbb{B}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i)} P_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}}(C_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{T_i} r_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}(u) du \right\} P_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}}(C_i), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where  $P_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}}(C_i)$  is the probability of the set  $C_i$ , under the risk neutral measure  $Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}$ , and considering the prices at time  $t_0$ .

However, in general the expression on the right hand side of (24) does not lead to a closed formula and may require numerical integration. Hence, we need to impose some restrictions on the shape of the set  $C_i$  to make sure the probability terms  $P_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}}(C_i)$  can be evaluated using a closed form expression. More specifically, we will constrain the set  $C_i$  in a way that guarantees that  $P_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}}(C_i)$  can be evaluated by a sum of multivariate normal cumulative distribution functions.

## 2.4 Set Definition and its Probability

Before we state the main result of this section we need the following:

**Proposition 2.1.** *The processes  $\log(S_{l,s}(t))$ , with  $l$  iterating over all asset prices in the model, and  $s \geq 0$ , are jointly normally distributed for any time  $t > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Standard stochastic calculus, applied to equation (17), yields its solution as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{l,s}(t) &= S_l(t_0 \wedge s) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0 \wedge s}^{t \wedge s} \left( d_l(u) + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i l}(u) - \frac{\sigma_l^2(u)}{2} \right) du \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{t_0 \wedge s}^{t \wedge s} \sigma_l(u) dW_{\mathbb{S}_i}(u) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

From this solution, it follows immediately that  $\log(S_{l,s}(t))$  is normally distributed with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\psi$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \log(S_l(t_0 \wedge s)) + \int_{t_0 \wedge s}^{t \wedge s} \left( d_l(u) + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_i l}(u) - \frac{\sigma_l^2(u)}{2} \right) du, \\ \psi &= \int_{t_0 \wedge s}^{t \wedge s} \sigma_l^2(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, any linear combination of the logs of frozen processes is still normally distributed. Without loss of generality, let  $0 = s_0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_m$ . Then

$$\sum_{g=1}^m \alpha_g \log(S_{l_g, s_g}(t)) = \sum_{g=1}^m \alpha_g \mu_g + \sum_{g=1}^m \int_{t_0 \wedge s_g}^{t \wedge s_g} \alpha_g \sigma_{l_g}(u) dW_{l_g \mathbb{S}_i}(u) \quad (26)$$

is normally distributed, with mean  $\sum_{g=1}^m \alpha_g \mu_g$  and variance

$$\sum_{g=1}^m \int_{t \wedge s_{g-1}}^{t \wedge s_g} \sum_{a=g}^m \sum_{b=g}^m \alpha_a \alpha_b \varsigma_{l_a, l_b}(u) du. \quad (27)$$

By theorem 9.5.13 of [6], this is enough to prove that any set of random variables  $\log(S_{l,s}(t))$  is jointly normally distributed.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let the set  $C_i$  be of the form*

$$\bigcap_{l=1}^{m_i} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_u, t_{l_u}}(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_d, t_{l_d}}(T_i)} < h_l \right\}, \quad (28)$$

with  $I_u, I_d$  denoting the indexes of abstract assets,  $h_l \geq 0$  and  $t_{l_u}, t_{l_d} \leq T_i$ .

Then  $P_i^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}}(C_i)$  is of the form

$$\mathcal{N}_{m_i}^{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}(v; \phi, \Sigma), \quad (29)$$

with  $\mathcal{N}_{m_i}$  denoting the  $m_i$ -dimensional multivariate normal cumulative distribution function, with covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  and mean vector  $\phi$ , evaluated at vector  $v$ .

*Proof.* By (8) and recalling that all  $\mathbb{S}_i(t)$  are positive by definition, we have

$$\bigcap_{l=1}^{m_i} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_u, t_{l_u}}(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_d, t_{l_d}}(T_i)} < h_l \right\} = \quad (30)$$

$$\bigcap_{l=1}^m \left\{ \sum_{a=1}^{m_{l_u}} \alpha_a \log(S_{i_a, t_a}(t_{l_u})) - \sum_{b=1}^{m_{l_d}} \alpha_b \log(S_{i_b, t_b}(t_{l_d})) < \log(h_l) \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Proposition 2.1 tells us that all  $\log(S_{l,s}(t))$  are jointly normally distributed. Therefore, the random vector  $X$  with  $m_i$  elements

$$X_l = \sum_{a=1}^{m_{l_u}} \alpha_a \log(S_{i_a, t_a}(t_{l_u})) - \sum_{b=1}^{m_{l_d}} \alpha_b \log(S_{i_b, t_b}(t_{l_d})), \quad (32)$$

with  $l = 1, \dots, m_i$ , is just a linear transformation of the vector of variables of the type of  $\log(S_{l,s}(t))$  and, therefore, is normally distributed (or its elements are jointly normally distributed).

From proposition 2.1 we can derive their mean. Thus,  $\phi = [\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{m_i}]^T$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_l &= \sum_{a=1}^{m_{l_u}} \alpha_a \left( \log(S_{i_a}(t_0 \wedge t_a)) + \int_{t_0 \wedge t_a}^{t_{l_u} \wedge t_a} d_{i_a}(s) + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i} i_a}(s) - \frac{\sigma_{i_a}^2(s)}{2} ds \right) - \\ &\quad - \left( \sum_{b=1}^{m_{l_d}} \alpha_b \left( \log(S_{i_b}(t_0 \wedge t_b)) + \int_{t_0 \wedge t_b}^{t_{l_d} \wedge t_b} d_{i_b}(s) + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i} i_b}(s) - \frac{\sigma_{i_b}^2(s)}{2} ds \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \log(\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}(t_0)) + \int_{t_0}^{T_i} d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}}(s) - \frac{\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}}^2(s)}{2} + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i} \mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}}(s) ds \\ &\quad - \left( \log(\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}(t_0)) + \int_{t_0}^{T_i} d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}}(s) - \frac{\sigma_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}}^2(s)}{2} + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i} \mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}}(s) ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Let us define  $\Sigma_{ef}$ , the elements of  $\Sigma$ , with  $e, f = 1, \dots, m_i$ . The covariance between two of the random variables  $X_e, X_f$  is, by definition,

$$\Sigma_{ef} = E_{t_0}^{Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}} [(X_e - \phi_e)(X_f - \phi_f)], \quad (35)$$

which yields, after some simple algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0}^{T_i} \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}^e \mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}^f}(s) - \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}^e \mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}^f}(s) \\ &\quad - \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}^e \mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}^f}(s) + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}^e \mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}^f}(s) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where  $\mathbb{S}^e$  and  $\mathbb{S}^f$  are the assets in conditions  $l = e$  and  $l = f$  respectively. It is worth noting that the covariance is the same whatever the measure under which the expectation is taken. This follows the well known fact that changes of martingale measures only modify the location of the distribution and not its shape.

The variance of  $X_e$  is obtained with  $f = e$ . The elements of the vector  $v$  are  $v_l = \log(h_l)$ , with  $l = 1, \dots, m_i$ .  $\square$

## 2.5 Pricing Formula

Proposition 2.2 together with Equation (24) allow us to write the following:

**Theorem 2.1.** *The arbitrage free price of the claim with payoff  $\Phi_k$  as in (19) and the sets  $C_i$  as in (28) can be calculated using the formula*

$$V(t_0) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{T_i} r_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}(u) du \right\} \mathcal{N}_{m_i}^{\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}}(v; \phi, \Sigma). \quad (37)$$

Finally, we may also consider the complement of sets  $C_i$  in proposition 2.2, as we have  $P_t^{Q_{S_{I_i}, t_i}}(\overline{C_i}) = 1 - \mathcal{N}_{m_i}^{S_{I_i}, t_i}(v; \phi, \Sigma)$ , by the properties of cumulative distribution functions.

## 2.6 Derivatives

Developing a closed pricing formula has immediate benefits when it comes to pricing the claims and also opens the possibility of allowing the calculation of the quantities relevant for hedging strategies and risk management, i.e., partial derivatives, also by closed formulas. This assumes special importance as the numeric methods to calculate the price typically show significant degradation when used to evaluate partial derivatives.

The approach we take to calculate the relevant partial derivatives relies on the works of Carr [4] and of Reiß and Wystup [17]. The first paper shows how to calculate spatial derivatives, i.e., derivatives with respect to the asset prices, by deriving the payoff function instead of the pricing formula. The second enables us to write the derivatives with respect to the other parameters in the model as functions of the spatial derivatives, in particular with respect to correlation parameters.

We start by writing the partial differential equation (PDE) implicit in the pricing formula (20) by using the Feynman-Kac theorem

$$V_t + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \zeta_{S_{I_i}, S_{I_j}} S_{I_i} S_{I_j} V_{S_{I_i}, S_{I_j}} + \sum_{i=1}^n d_{S_{I_i}} S_{I_i} V_{S_{I_i}} = r_k V, \quad (38)$$

where we removed the parameters of all the functions and processes to promote clarity and also the freeze time subscript making  $S_{I_i, t_i}(t) = S_{I_i}$ .  $n$  is the number of abstract assets in the model and the subscripts of  $V$  denote partial derivatives. See Björk [1] for details.

If we derive PDE (38) with respect to any  $S_{I_i}$  we get a PDE for the derivative function, the quantity needed for delta-hedging the claim. Consecutive derivations yield PDEs for all higher order spatial derivatives.

We now need to write the PDE (38) derivative with respect to an arbitrary sequence of variables. Hence, we write it as

$$V_{tD_p} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \zeta_{S_{I_i}, S_{I_j}} S_{I_i} S_{I_j} V_{S_{I_i}, S_{I_j}, D_p} + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(D_p) S_{I_i} V_{S_{I_i}, D_p} = b(D_p) V_{D_p}, \quad (39)$$

with  $D_p$  denoting the sequence of derivations, formally  $D_p = \prod_{h=1}^p S_{I_h}$ , and  $I_h$  an index of an abstract asset in the model. Additionally,  $a_i$  and  $b$  are functions of time  $t$  defined by

$$a_i(D_p) = d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i}} + \sum_{h=1}^p \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i} \mathbb{S}_{I_h}}, \quad (40)$$

$$b(D_p) = r_k - \sum_{h=1}^p d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_h}} - \sum_{f=1}^p \sum_{g=f+1}^p \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_f} \mathbb{S}_{I_g}}. \quad (41)$$

We list  $a_i$  and  $b$  in Table 1 for the first and second order derivatives.

Table 1:  $a_i$  and  $b$  for the first and second order derivatives.

	$p = 0$	$p = 1$	$p = 2$
$D_p$	1	$\mathbb{S}_{I_1}$	$\mathbb{S}_{I_1} \mathbb{S}_{I_2}$
$a_i(D_p)$	$d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i}}$	$d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i}} + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i} \mathbb{S}_{I_1}}$	$d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i}} + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i} \mathbb{S}_{I_1}} + \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_i} \mathbb{S}_{I_2}}$
$b(D_p)$	$r_k$	$r_k - d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_1}}$	$r_k - d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_1}} - d_{\mathbb{S}_{I_2}} - \zeta_{\mathbb{S}_{I_1} \mathbb{S}_{I_2}}$

It is worth noting that  $a_i$  and  $b$  of the first order derivatives recover the trend of all  $\mathbb{S}_{I_i}$ s under the measure  $Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_1}}$  in equation (18) and the deposit rate  $r_{\mathbb{S}_{I_1}}$  in equation (16), respectively. The volatilities and covariances are trivially recovered since they do not change. Hence, the measure under which we should take the expectation of the first derivative of the payoff, with respect to  $\mathbb{S}_{I_1}$ , is the measure where  $\mathbb{S}_{I_1}$  itself is the *numéraire*, i.e.,  $Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_1}}$ . Therefore, we denote the measure produced by the  $p$ -th order derivative as  $Q_{D_p}$  with the respective *numéraire*  $D_p = \prod_{h=1}^p \mathbb{S}_{I_h}$  and deposit return rate  $r_{D_p} = b(D_p)$ .

To apply the Feynman-Kac theorem to the PDE (39), all we need is to calculate the respective boundary condition. We do so on a term by term basis of contract function (19)

$$\frac{\partial^p \Phi_k}{\partial D_p} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \frac{\partial^p (\mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \mathbb{I}_{C_i})}{\partial D_p}. \quad (42)$$

We can now proceed to write an expression for the spatial derivatives.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Spatial derivatives of the pricing function of the  $V(t(0))$  are given by the expression*

$$\frac{\partial^p V(t_0)}{\partial D_p(t_0)} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{T_i} r_{D_p}(u) du \right\} E_{t_0}^{Q_{D_p}} \left[ \frac{\partial^p \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \mathbb{I}_{C_i}}{\partial D_p} \right]. \quad (43)$$

Despite its condensed look, this formula harbors some amount of complexity. To clarify, and for completeness, we write the evaluation formulas for the first order derivatives. We start by writing explicitly the first derivative of the contract function. To consider only sets  $C_i$  that yield closed form



solutions, we use the definition in Proposition 2.2 as a product of indicator functions. Thus,

$$\mathbb{I}_{C_i} = \prod_{l=1}^{m_i} \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}(T_i)} < h_l \right\}. \quad (44)$$

To derive the contract function, all we need is to apply the product rule and to recall that

$$\frac{\partial \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{a}{b} < c \right\}}{\partial b} = \delta(a - bc), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{a}{b} < c \right\}}{\partial a} = -\delta(a - bc), \quad (45)$$

with  $\delta(x)$  the Dirac delta function.<sup>3</sup>

We find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Phi_k}{\partial \mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}(T_i)} &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \left( \mathbb{I}_{\{(I_x, t_x) = (I_i, t_i)\}} \mathbb{I}_{C_i} \right. \\ &+ \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(T_i) \left( \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbb{I}_{\{(I_x, t_x) = (I_{j_d}, t_{j_d})\}} \delta \left( \mathbb{S}_{I_{j_u}, t_{j_u}}(T_i) - h_j \mathbb{S}_{I_{j_d}, t_{j_d}}(T_i) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \prod_{l \neq j}^{m_i} \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}(T_i)} < h_l \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbb{I}_{\{(I_x, t_x) = (I_{j_u}, t_{j_u})\}} \delta \left( \mathbb{S}_{I_{j_u}, t_{j_u}}(T_i) - h_j \mathbb{S}_{I_{j_d}, t_{j_d}}(T_i) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \prod_{l \neq j}^{m_i} \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_u}, t_{l_u}}(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_{l_d}, t_{l_d}}(T_i)} < h_l \right\} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking advantage of the fact that  $Q_{D_p} = Q_{\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}}$ , the first order derivative formula turns out to be

<sup>3</sup>The Dirac delta function is characterized by the two properties

$$\delta(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } x = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta(x) dx = 1.$$

$$\frac{\partial V(t_0)}{\partial \mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}(t_0)} = \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_0}^{T_i} r_{\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}}(u) du \right\}. \quad (46a)$$

$$\left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{(I_x, t_x) = (I_i, t_i)\}} c_i \mathcal{N}_{m_i}^{\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}}(v; \phi, \Sigma) \right) \quad (46b)$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbb{I}_{\{(I_x, t_x) = (I_{j_d}, t_{j_d})\}} \mathcal{N}_{m_i}^{\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}} \left( v; \phi, \Sigma \mid \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_{j_u}, t_{j_u}}(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_{j_d}, t_{j_d}}(T_i)} = h_j \right) \quad (46c)$$

$$- \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{S}_{I_i, t_i}(t_0) \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mathbb{I}_{\{(I_x, t_x) = (I_{j_u}, t_{j_u})\}} \mathcal{N}_{m_i}^{\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}} \left( v; \phi, \Sigma \mid \frac{\mathbb{S}_{I_{j_u}, t_{j_u}}(T_i)}{\mathbb{S}_{I_{j_d}, t_{j_d}}(T_i)} = h_j \right). \quad (46d)$$

For performance reasons, it is important to observe that the probabilities  $\mathcal{N}_{m_i}^{\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}}(v; \phi, \Sigma)$  in (46b) are also calculated in the context of the pricing function.

In order to recover the derivatives with respect to real asset prices  $S_l$ , all we need is to apply the chain rule. Thus,

$$\frac{\partial V(t_0)}{\partial S_l(t_0)} = \sum_{x=1}^n \frac{\partial V(t_0)}{\partial \mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}(t_0)} \frac{\partial \mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}(t_0)}{\partial S_l(t_0)}. \quad (47)$$

The first factor in the summation is the one we derived above; the second factor is a simple derivative that either yields zero, if  $S_l(t_0)$  no longer affects  $\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}(t_0)$ , or yields  $\mathbb{S}_{I_x, t_x}(t_0) \frac{\alpha_l}{S_l(t_0)}$  otherwise, with  $\alpha_l$  as in the definition (8).

Finally, we can use the result from Reiß and Wystup [17] to calculate the derivatives with respect to the other model parameters. As an example, in a model with constant volatilities and correlations, a derivative with respect to the correlation between two asset prices is given by

$$\frac{\partial V(t_0)}{\partial \rho_{jk}} = S_j(t_0) S_k(t_0) \sigma_j \sigma_k \frac{\partial^2 V(t_0)}{\partial S_j(t_0) \partial S_k(t_0)} (t^* - t_0), \quad (48)$$

With  $t^*$  the maximum  $t$ , with  $t_0 \leq t \leq T$ , such that both  $S_j(t)$  and  $S_k(t)$  still influence the payoff function  $\Phi_k$ .

### 3 Applications

We believe that this paper provides relevant contributions to several practical problems. First of all, it offers a multi-currency, multi-asset model description fit for implementation. The model itself is of the Black–Scholes

type with time dependent parameters. The general description of the contract payoff allows for implementations where each instrument is defined through a payoff language. Such a payoff language enables addition of new instruments without additional development of the application. The payoff profiles that are covered by the general form of the contract, in (19) and (28), are the following: European style vanilla options, exchange options, digital options, forward start and cliquet options, options on the  $n^{\text{th}}$ -best/worst, options on the discretely observed maximum/minimum, most types of mountain range options, discrete barriers and lookbacks, power options and combinations of these. It allows the use of the following prices as underlying assets: stocks prices denominated on domestic currency, foreign currency (quanto), and foreign currency translated to domestic, as well as geometric averages of stocks prices to produce geometric Asian options or geometric basket options. These last two types are not as common in the industry as their arithmetic counterparts, but their prices are still very useful as control variates, which are very effective in reducing the variance of Monte Carlo simulations of the arithmetic versions. To illustrate the breadth of instruments covered by the contract definition above, we provide below a series of examples.

### 3.1 Performance

As the pricing formula for the contract requires several evaluations of multivariate normal probabilities, it is crucial to weight its computational cost against that of the alternative methods. To calculate the multivariate normal, we used the method developed by Genz [8]. The alternative, as far as we know, is only a Monte Carlo simulation that may, or may not, include variance reduction techniques. However, due to the fact that the convergence of Monte Carlo simulations depends strongly on the payoff profile of the contract, it is impossible to run a performance comparison valid for the contract's general form (28). Therefore, we shall provide only case based performance analyses in each example of section 3.2. For a performance comparison focused only on the calculation of the multivariate normal probabilities, we refer to Genz [8]. The Genz method also relies on a Monte Carlo simulation but does so in the context of a chain of unidimensional integrals. For this reason, the closed formula prices of the examples below will also show an error term.

In most cases, we have encountered that the closed formula outperforms the Monte Carlo simulation, though to different degrees depending on several factors. The addition of asset prices to the payoff implies an increase in the number of dimensions of both procedures, although it generally weighs heavier on Monte Carlo simulation. The presence of several time points at which stock prices are observed to compose the claim's payoff greatly increases the dimensionality of the Monte Carlo simulation, degrading thus

its performance. Several time points also have an impact on the closed formula alternative, as they give rise to highly correlated random variables. The complexity of the payoff may require the evaluation of a large number of summands in (37), thus worsening the performance of the closed formula while not necessarily changing the Monte Carlo's performance.

Finally, the integrals of the parameter functions  $r, \sigma$  and  $\varsigma$  typically have closed form solutions, as their definition is usually done as piece-wise linear functions or functions that have indefinite integrals. Therefore, its calculation has a residual impact on the overall computation time. The same is true, by definition, for integrals of  $\delta, \theta$  and  $\zeta$  functions.

### 3.2 Examples

Our market setup for the cases included in this section is described as follows. The *numéraire* asset is chosen to be the asset in which the options pay off. It is the same for all options, and it yields risk free returns at the rate of 5%. We then have 5 currencies with risk free yields, from the first to the last, of 1%, 2%, ..., 5% respectively. The price of each currency is expressed in terms of the *numéraire* asset (in the natural direction) and they have volatilities, from the first to the last, of 11%, 12%, ..., 15% respectively. The correlation between the currencies' prices is 20% for all combinations. There are also five equity indexes that yield risk free returns, from the first to the last, of 2%, 4%, ..., 10% respectively. The price of each index is expressed (in the natural direction) in terms of the currency with the same cardinal as the index. All indexes start with a price of 100. The volatilities of each index, from the first to the last, are 22%, 24%, ..., 30% respectively. The correlation between any two indexes is 60%. The correlation between any combination of index and currency is 10%.

We consider four options: a cliquet on the first index, a best of five indexes, a discrete lookback on the first index, and a Himalaya on the first three indexes. All options have a maturity of one year,  $T = 1$ ,  $t_0 = 0$ .

The cliquet option has five periods of equal length. Hence, it can be viewed as a portfolio of a vanilla at-the-money (spot) option plus four forward start at-the-money (spot) options. As vanillas and forward start options involve only one condition, the cliquet option is evaluated instantly. In fact, in this case, the general formula (37) reduces to the known closed formula for cliquets.

$$\Phi = \sum_{n=1}^5 \Phi_n \left( \frac{n}{5} T \right), \quad \Phi_n \left( \frac{n}{5} T \right) = \left( S_1 \left( \frac{n}{5} T \right) - S_1 \left( \frac{n-1}{5} T \right) \right)^+.$$

The best of five pays off the difference, if positive, between the maximum of the five index values at maturity and 100.

$$\Phi(T) = (\max(S_1(T), \dots, S_5(T)) - 100)^+.$$

The discrete lookback pays off the difference, if positive, of the highest stored value of the first index and 100. The index values are stored 12 times during the year at evenly spaced times, starting at 1/12.

$$\Phi(T) = \left( \max \left( S_1 \left( \frac{1}{12}T \right), S_1 \left( \frac{2}{12}T \right), \dots, S_1 \left( \frac{12}{12}T \right) \right) - 100 \right)^+$$

At the end of each period of 1/3 units of time, the Himalaya option pays off the best return of the three first indexes over that period times 100, but only if the best return is positive. The indexes that pay out are not considered for any of the subsequent periods.

$$\Phi = \sum_{n=1}^3 \Phi_n \left( \frac{n}{3}T \right),$$

$$\Phi_n \left( \frac{n}{3}T \right) = 100 \max \left( 0, \eta_{n,1} \frac{S_1 \left( \frac{n}{3}T \right)}{S_1 \left( \frac{n-1}{3}T \right)}, \eta_{n,2} \frac{S_2 \left( \frac{n}{3}T \right)}{S_2 \left( \frac{n-1}{3}T \right)}, \eta_{n,3} \frac{S_3 \left( \frac{n}{3}T \right)}{S_3 \left( \frac{n-1}{3}T \right)} \right),$$

where  $\eta_{n,i}$  equals 0 if the asset  $i$  has determined the payout of one of the payments at any time  $t < \frac{n}{3}T$ , and 1 otherwise.

The parameterization of these payoff functions, including the set definition for each of the terms in the payoff summation, is given in the appendix.

To assess the performance of the closed formula, we benchmark the results against a Monte Carlo experiment. The results are shown in Table 2. The Table shows a price estimate and a 99% confidence error bound expressed in percentage of the price estimate. The pricing routines were allowed to run for 10 seconds and for five minutes.

Table 2: Tests results.

	Cliquet		Best of 5		Lookback		Himalaya	
calculation time = 10 <sup>7</sup>								
MC	18.27	0.53%	19.16	0.43%	13.50	1.03%	174.46	0.57%
CF	18.33	—	19.16	0.29%	13.47	1.24%	173.90	0.05%
calculation time = 5 <sup>7</sup>								
MC	18.33	0.10%	19.16	0.08%	13.50	0.19%	173.97	0.10%
CF	18.33	—	19.15	0.05%	13.51	0.23%	173.93	0.01%

The results show that the closed formula is superior in all cases but the lookback. The cliquet case just shows that the general formula is able to produce the already known formulas, namely for vanilla options, exchange options, forward starts, digitals and others of European style that constitute

unidimensional problems. The best-of-5 is an example with low correlation between random variables, in this case between different stocks, and only one time horizon, the maturity date. The closed formula increases the precision by a factor of 1.45(=0.427%/0.294%). Hence, considering the rate of convergence of the Monte Carlo, the closed formula is 2.11(=1.45<sup>2</sup>) times faster. In the Himalaya case, the performance is even more extreme with the precision increasing by a factor of 10.52(=0.571%/0.543%) or, equivalently, 111(=10.52<sup>2</sup>) times faster. The Himalaya is a case in which the closed formula performs particularly well. Even though it requires the evaluation of 63 cumulative probability functions, they are of low dimensionality, 6.9 on average, while the Monte Carlo engine needs to account for a 9 dimensional problem (3 stocks observed at 3 time horizons). In the Lookback case, the dimensionality was 12 for both methods and required the evaluation of 13 cumulative probability functions.

The Lookback result came as a surprise as the closed formula performed worse than in the Monte Carlo simulation. To figure out what was causing the poor performance, we applied two variations to the initial problem. We first diminished the number of observation points to 4 to test if the dimensionality constituted a problem. Then we enlarged the time between two observations from 1 month to 3 months. The results for 5 minute simulations are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Lookback results.

	Observations							
	12				4			
	MC		CF		MC		CF	
$\Delta t = 1/12$	13.50	0.19%	13.51	0.23%	6.85	0.09%	6.85	0.10%
$\Delta t = 3/12$	20.99	0.20%	20.99	0.14%	11.33	0.10%	11.34	0.06%

These results lead us to conclude that the closed formula does not provide better performance when the time between observations is small and starts to perform better the larger the time between observations. Small intervals between observations give rise to highly correlated random variables, the asset prices at each observation moment. Such cases are known to carry convergence problems for numerical procedures, and thus it is not surprising that the multivariate normal numerical procedure performance shows degradation. What is surprising though is that it shows worst results than the Monte Carlo simulation, which also suffers from the same effect as it is also a numerical procedure.

## 4 Conclusion and Future Research

The results above produce a closed formula that generalizes a large class of multivariate European style options, ranging from the plain vanilla to moun-

tain range options. It does so in a generalized Black-Scholes model, with time dependent parameters, able to cope with an arbitrary number of currency zones. It introduces the concept of abstract assets as an intermediate random variable that allows the formula to cover variations like geometric averages, baskets, asset prices expressed in foreign currencies, and forward start features. In fact, abstract assets are a useful generalization of the asset concept and should be considered as a replacement of plain assets in Monte Carlo engines.

The closed formula performs better than the alternative Monte Carlo simulations in most cases, improving performance by more than 100 times in the most extreme. However, for problems with highly correlated random variables the performance was worse than Monte Carlo's. The examples show that even when the closed formula requires the evaluation of a large number of cumulative probability functions, it still outperforms Monte Carlo.

As a byproduct of the definition of the closed formula, a language for option payoff definition arises. This language acquires extreme importance in industrial systems as it enables the decoupling of the payoff definition function from the pricing function. Hence, the pricing function is able to price any option as long as its payoff is expressible in terms of the language.

Future research should focus on including other features of options for which there are closed formulas, namely continuous barrier and lookback features. The problem with including barrier options in the general formula above is that it requires the knowledge of the joint distribution of a Brownian motion with time dependent drift and its running maximum. The results on Brownian motion with constant drift are applicable neither to models with time dependent parameters nor to abstract asset's dynamics.

## Appendix

The payoff parameterization of the options considered in the examples section above follows expression (19) and uses that same notation. The  $C_i$  set definition follows expression (28) and also uses its notation. For each term in the payoff (19), it is still required to select if the set  $C_i$  or its complement,  $\overline{C_i}$ , determines the payment.

The index of the *numéraire* asset is  $I = 0$ . As the examples do not include payments of currency prices, we index the underlying equity indexes with  $I = 1, \dots, 5$ .

### Cliquet Option

This option payoff is composed of 10 terms. The terms follow a structure that can be summarized by iterating  $t = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1$ . In this case the sets  $C_i$  have only one condition for all terms, i.e.,  $m_i = 1$ .

Term  $i = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9$  (strike payment for each  $t$ )

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
-1	1	$t - 0.2$	$t$	false

Set  $C_i$

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
1	$t - 0.2$	1	$t$	1

Term  $i = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10$  (index price reception for each  $t$ )

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
1	1	$t$	$t$	false

Set  $C_i$

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
1	$t - 0.2$	1	$t$	1

### Best of 5

This option payoff is composed of 6 terms, five for the reception of each of the five possible maximum index prices at maturity, and one payment of the exercise price 100.

The terms for each of the five index payments follow the following rule. Let  $a_i = 1, \dots, 5$  and let  $b_{i,1}, \dots, b_{i,4}$  be the elements of the set  $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \setminus a_i$ .

The terms for reception of each of the five index prices is parameterized by

Term  $i = 1, \dots, 5$  (index price reception)

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
1	$a_i$	1	1	false

Set  $C_i$

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
0	0	$a_i$	1	1/100
$b_{i,1}$	1	$a_i$	1	1
$b_{i,2}$	1	$a_i$	1	1
$b_{i,3}$	1	$a_i$	1	1
$b_{i,4}$	1	$a_i$	1	1

The term of the strike payment is parameterized as

Term  $i=6$  (strike payment)

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
-100	0	1	1	true

Set  $C_6$

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
$a_1$	1	0	0	100
$a_2$	1	0	0	100
$a_3$	1	0	0	100
$a_4$	1	0	0	100
$a_5$	1	0	0	100



## Discrete Lookback

This option payoff is composed of 13 terms, 12 for the reception of each of the 12 possible maximum values of the index prices during the life of the option, and one payment of the exercise price 100.

The terms for each of the 12 index payments follow the following rule. Let  $u_i = 1/12, 2/12, \dots, 12/12$  and let  $v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,11}$  be the elements of the set  $\{1/12, 2/12, \dots, 12/12\} \setminus u_i$ .

The terms for reception of each of the 12 possible maximum index prices is parameterized by

*Term  $i = 1, \dots, 12$  (index price reception)*

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
1	1	$u_i$	1	<i>false</i>

*Set  $C_i$*

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
0	0	1	$u_i$	1/100
1	$v_{i,1}$	1	$u_i$	1
1	$v_{i,2}$	1	$u_i$	1
		$\vdots$		
1	$v_{i,11}$	1	$u_i$	1

The term of the strike payment is parameterized as

*Term  $i=13$  (strike payment)*

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
-100	0	0	1	<i>true</i>

*Set  $C_{13}$*

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
1	$u_1$	0	0	100
1	$u_2$	0	0	100
		$\vdots$		
1	$u_{12}$	0	0	100

## Himalaya

This option has payments at three distinct times. For each of the periods that end at these payment dates, only the period return matters and not the accumulated return since inception. We represent each of these returns with an abstract asset price of the form

$$\mathbb{S}_j = S_{j, \frac{n}{3}T} / S_{j, \frac{n-1}{3}T},$$

the ratio of two versions of the same price process frozen at different moments in time. The numerator version, frozen at the end and the denominator at the beginning of the reference return period. As we have 3 assets and 3 return periods, we have 9 abstract assets for all combinations of both.

We shall index the abstract assets that represent the first period return on the first 3 assets by  $a_{1,i} = 1, 2, 3$ . The returns of the second period returns are indexed as  $a_{2,i} = 4, 5, 6$ . Finally, the returns of the third period are indexed by  $a_{3,i} = 7, 8, 9$ , with  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . We also have  $b_{j,i,1}, b_{j,i,2}$ , the elements of the set  $\{a_{j,1}, a_{j,2}, a_{j,3}\} \setminus a_{j,i}$ .

For the payments at the end of the first period, at  $t = T/3$  we have 3 terms in the payoff function.

*Term  $i = 1, 2, 3$  (index price return reception,  $t = T/3$ )*

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
100	$a_{1,i}$	1	1	<i>false</i>

*Set  $C_i$*

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
$a_{1,i}$	0	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$b_{1,i,1}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$b_{1,i,2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1

For the payments at the end of the first period, at  $t = 2T/3$  we have 12 terms in the payoff function. For each of the 3 possible return payments there are 4 terms, all with the same asset payment and the 4 sets  $C_i$  below.

*Term  $i$ , with  $i = 1, 2, 3$  (index price return reception,  $t = 2T/3$ )*

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
100	$a_{2,i}$	2	2	<i>false</i>

*Sets  $C_i$ , with  $g_1, g_2$  the elements of all the possible permutations of the elements of the set  $\{1, 2\}$*

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$	$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
$a_{2,i}$	1	$a_{2,i}$	2	1	$a_{2,i}$	1	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$b_{2,i,1}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1	$b_{2,i,1}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$b_{2,i,2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1	$b_{2,i,2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,1}$	1	1	$b_{1,i,g_1}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,2}$	1	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,g_2}$	1	1

$I_{l_u}$	$t_{l_u}$	$I_{l_d}$	$t_{l_d}$	$h_l$
$a_{2,i}$	1	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$b_{2,i,1}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$b_{2,i,2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$b_{1,i,1}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$b_{1,i,2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	0	1

For the payments at the end of the first period, at  $t = 3T/3$  we have 48 terms in the payoff function. For each of the 3 possible return payments there are 16 terms, all with the same asset payment and the 16 sets  $C_i$  below.

*Term  $i$ , with  $i = 1, 2, 3$  (index price return reception,  $t = 3T/3$ )*

$c_i$	$I_i$	$t_i$	$T_i$	Set Complement Flag
100	$a_{3,i}$	3	3	<i>false</i>

*Sets  $C_i$ , with  $g_1, g_2$  the elements of all the possible permutations of the*

elements of the set  $\{1, 2\}$ , and  $h_1, h_2$  also the elements of a similar permutation.

$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$	$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$
$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,1}$	1	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,1}$	1	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,2}$	1	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,2}$	1	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,1}$	2	1	$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,g_1}$	2	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,2}$	2	1	$b_{2,i,g_2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$	$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$
$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,h_1}$	1	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,h_1}$	1	1
$b_{1,i,h_2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1	$b_{1,i,h_2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,1}$	2	1	$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,g_1}$	2	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,2}$	2	1	$b_{2,i,g_2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$	$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$
$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,1}$	1	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,g_1}$	1	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$b_{1,i,2}$	1	1	$b_{1,i,g_2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$b_{2,i,1}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1	$b_{2,i,1}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$b_{2,i,2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1	$b_{2,i,2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	1	1	$a_{2,i}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	1	1
$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$	$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$
$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1	$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{1,i,1}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1	$b_{1,i,1}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$b_{1,i,2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1	$b_{1,i,2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	0	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	0	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,1}$	2	1	$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,g_1}$	2	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$b_{2,i,2}$	2	1	$b_{2,i,g_2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1

$I_u$	$t_u$	$I_d$	$t_d$	$h_l$
$a_{3,i}$	1	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,1}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{3,i,2}$	2	$a_{3,i}$	2	1
$b_{1,i,1}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$b_{1,i,2}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	1	1
$a_{1,i}$	1	$a_{1,i}$	0	1
$b_{2,i,1}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$b_{2,i,2}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	2	1
$a_{2,i}$	2	$a_{2,i}$	1	1

## References

- [1] Björk, T. (1998). *Arbitrage Theory in Continuous Time*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- [2] Björk, T. and Landen, C. (2002). On the Term Structure of Futures and Forward Prices, *Mathematical Finance - Bachelier Congress 2000*, 111–150.
- [3] Carr, P. (1995). Two extensions to barrier options valuation. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, **2**(3), 173–209.
- [4] Carr, P. (2001) Deriving Derivatives of Derivative Securities. *Journal of Computational Finance*, Winter 2000/2001, Vol. 4, No. 2.
- [5] Conze A. and Viswanathan (1991). Path dependent options: the case of lookback options. *Journal of Finance*, **46**(5), 1893–1907.
- [6] Dudley, R. (2002). *Real Analysis and Probability*. UK, Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Geman, H., El Karoui, N. and Rochet, J.C. (1995). Changes of Numéraire, Changes of Probability Measure and Option Pricing *Journal of Applied Probability*, **32**, 443–458.
- [8] Genz, A. (1992). Numerical Computation of Multivariate Normal Probabilities *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, **1**(2), 141–149.
- [9] Goldman, M., Soson, H. and Gatto, M. (1979). Path dependent options: buy at the low, sell at the high. *Journal of Finance*, **34**(5), 1111–1127.
- [10] Hakala, J. and Wystup, U. (2002). *Foreign Exchange Risk*. London, Risk Books.
- [11] Haug, E. (1998). *The complete guide to option pricing formulas*. New York, McGraw-Hill Professional.

- [12] Heynen, R. and Kat, H. (1994). Partial barrier options. *Journal of Financial Engineering*, **3**(3), 253–274.
- [13] Johnson, H. (1987). Options on the minimum and maximum of several assets. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, **22**, 277–283
- [14] Margrabe, W. (1978). The value of an option to exchange one asset for another. *Journal of Finance*, **33**, 177–186.
- [15] Nelken, I. (1995). *The Handbook of Exotic Options: Instruments, Analysis, and Applications*. New York, McGraw-Hill Professional.
- [16] Rubinstein, M. and Reiner, E. (1997). Breaking Down Barriers. *Risk Magazine*, **4**(9), 28–35.
- [17] Reiß, O. and Wystup, U. (2001). Efficient Computation of Option Price Sensitivities Using Homogeneity and Other Tricks. *The Journal of Derivatives*, Vol. 9, No. 2, Winter.
- [18] Shreve, S. (2004). *Stochastic Calculus for Finance II, Continuous-Time Models*. New York, Springer.
- [19] Stulz, R. (1982). Options on the minimum and maximum of two risky assets. *Journal of Financial Economics*, **10**, 161–185.
- [20] Večeř, J. (2001). A new PDE approach for pricing arithmetic average Asian options. *Journal of Computational Finance*, **4**(4), 105–113.
- [21] Veiga, C. (2004). Expanding Further the Universe of Exotic Options Closed Pricing Formulas. In: *Proceedings of the 2004 International Conference on Stochastic Finance*.
- [22] Veiga, C. and Wystup, U. (2009). Closed Formula for Options with Discrete Dividends and its Derivatives. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, **16**(6), 517–531.
- [23] Vorst, T. (1992). Prices and hedge ratios of average exchange rate options. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, **1**, 179–193.
- [24] Wystup, U. (2003). The market price of one-touch options in foreign exchange markets. *Derivatives Week*, **12**(13), 8–9.
- [25] Zhang, P. (1997). *Exotic Options*. Singapore, World Scientific.

## FRANKFURT SCHOOL / HFB – WORKING PAPER SERIES

No.	Author/Title	Year
134.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Entropy, Function and Evolution: Naturalizing Peircian Semiosis	2010
133.	Bannier, Christina E. / Behr, Patrick / Güttler, Andre Rating opaque borrowers: why are unsolicited ratings lower?	2009
132.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Social Capital, Chinese Style: Individualism, Relational Collectivism and the Cultural Embeddedness of the Institutions-Performance Link	2009
131.	Schäffler, Christian / Schmaltz, Christian Market Liquidity: An Introduction for Practitioners	2009
130.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Dimensionen des Wissens: Ein kognitiv-evolutionärer Ansatz auf der Grundlage von F.A. von Hayeks Theorie der „Sensory Order“	2009
129.	Hankir, Yassin / Rauch, Christian / Ueber, Marc It's the Market Power, Stupid! – Stock Return Patterns in International Bank M&A	2009
128.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Outline of a Darwinian Theory of Money	2009
127.	Cremers, Heinz / Walzner, Jens Modellierung des Kreditrisikos im Portfoliofall	2009
126.	Cremers, Heinz / Walzner, Jens Modellierung des Kreditrisikos im Einwertpapierfall	2009
125.	Heidorn, Thomas / Schmaltz, Christian Interne Transferpreise für Liquidität	2009
124.	Bannier, Christina E. / Hirsch, Christian The economic function of credit rating agencies - What does the watchlist tell us?	2009
123.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten A Neurolinguistic Approach to Performativity in Economics	2009
122.	Winkler, Adalbert / Vogel, Ursula Finanzierungsstrukturen und makroökonomische Stabilität in den Ländern Südosteuropas, der Türkei und in den GUS-Staaten	2009
121.	Heidorn, Thomas / Rupprecht, Stephan Einführung in das Kapitalstrukturmanagement bei Banken	2009
120.	Rosbach, Peter Die Rolle des Internets als Informationsbeschaffungsmedium in Banken	2009
119.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Diversity Management und diversitätsbasiertes Controlling: Von der „Diversity Scorecard“ zur „Open Balanced Scorecard“	2009
118.	Hölscher, Luise / Clasen, Sven Erfolgsfaktoren von Private Equity Fonds	2009
117.	Bannier, Christina E. Is there a hold-up benefit in heterogeneous multiple bank financing?	2009
116.	Roßbach, Peter / Gießbamer, Dirk Ein eLearning-System zur Unterstützung der Wissensvermittlung von Web-Entwicklern in Sicherheitsthemen	2009
115.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Kulturelle Hybridisierung und Wirtschaftstransformation in China	2009
114.	Schalast, Christoph: Staatsfonds – „neue“ Akteure an den Finanzmärkten?	2009
113.	Schalast, Christoph / Alram, Johannes Konstruktion einer Anleihe mit hypothekarischer Besicherung	2009
112.	Schalast, Christoph / Bolder, Markus / Radünz, Claus / Siepmann, Stephanie / Weber, Thorsten Transaktionen und Servicing in der Finanzkrise: Berichte und Referate des Frankfurt School NPL Forums 2008	2009
111.	Werner, Karl / Moormann, Jürgen Efficiency and Profitability of European Banks – How Important Is Operational Efficiency?	2009
110.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Moralische Gefühle als Grundlage einer wohlstandschaffenden Wettbewerbsordnung: Ein neuer Ansatz zur erforschung von Sozialkapital und seine Anwendung auf China	2009

109.	Heidorn, Thomas / Kaiser, Dieter G. / Roder, Christoph Empirische Analyse der Drawdowns von Dach-Hedgefonds	2009
108.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten Neuroeconomics, Naturalism and Language	2008
107.	Schalast, Christoph / Benita, Barten Private Equity und Familienunternehmen – eine Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung deutscher Maschinen- und Anlagenbauunternehmen	2008
106.	Bannier, Christina E. / Grote, Michael H. Equity Gap? – Which Equity Gap? On the Financing Structure of Germany's Mittelstand	2008
105.	Herrmann-Pillath, Carsten The Naturalistic Turn in Economics: Implications for the Theory of Finance	2008
104.	Schalast, Christoph (Hrsg.) / Schanz, Kay-Michael / Scholl, Wolfgang Aktionärsschutz in der AG falsch verstanden? Die Leica-Entscheidung des LG Frankfurt am Main	2008
103.	Bannier, Christina E./ Müsch, Stefan Die Auswirkungen der Subprime-Krise auf den deutschen LBO-Markt für Small- und MidCaps	2008
102.	Cremers, Heinz / Vetter, Michael Das IRB-Modell des Kreditrisikos im Vergleich zum Modell einer logarithmisch normalverteilten Verlustfunktion	2008
101.	Heidorn, Thomas / Pleißner, Mathias Determinanten Europäischer CMBS Spreads. Ein empirisches Modell zur Bestimmung der Risikoaufschläge von Commercial Mortgage-Backed Securities (CMBS)	2008
100.	Schalast, Christoph (Hrsg.) / Schanz, Kay-Michael Schaeffler KG/Continental AG im Lichte der CSX Corp.-Entscheidung des US District Court for the Southern District of New York	2008
99.	Hölscher, Luise / Haug, Michael / Schweinberger, Andreas Analyse von Steueramnestiedaten	2008
98.	Heimer, Thomas / Arend, Sebastian The Genesis of the Black-Scholes Option Pricing Formula	2008
97.	Heimer, Thomas / Hölscher, Luise / Werner, Matthias Ralf Access to Finance and Venture Capital for Industrial SMEs	2008
96.	Böttger, Marc / Guthoff, Anja / Heidorn, Thomas Loss Given Default Modelle zur Schätzung von Recovery Rates	2008
95.	Almer, Thomas / Heidorn, Thomas / Schmaltz, Christian The Dynamics of Short- and Long-Term CDS-spreads of Banks	2008
94.	Barthel, Erich / Wollersheim, Jutta Kulturunterschiede bei Mergers & Acquisitions: Entwicklung eines Konzeptes zur Durchführung einer Cultural Due Diligence	2008
93.	Heidorn, Thomas / Kunze, Wolfgang / Schmaltz, Christian Liquiditätsmodellierung von Kreditzusagen (Term Facilities and Revolver)	2008
92.	Burger, Andreas Produktivität und Effizienz in Banken – Terminologie, Methoden und Status quo	2008
91.	Löchel, Horst / Pecher, Florian The Strategic Value of Investments in Chinese Banks by Foreign Financial Institutions	2008
90.	Schalast, Christoph / Morgenschweis, Bernd / Sprengel, Hans Otto / Ockens, Klaas / Stachuletz, Rainer / Safran, Robert Der deutsche NPL Markt 2007: Aktuelle Entwicklungen, Verkauf und Bewertung – Berichte und Referate des NPL Forums 2007	2008
89.	Schalast, Christoph / Stralkowski, Ingo 10 Jahre deutsche Buyouts	2008
88.	Bannier, Christina E./ Hirsch, Christian The Economics of Rating Watchlists: Evidence from Rating Changes	2007
87.	Demidova-Menzel, Nadeshda / Heidorn, Thomas Gold in the Investment Portfolio	2007
86.	Hölscher, Luise / Rosenthal, Johannes Leistungsmessung der Internen Revision	2007
85.	Bannier, Christina / Hänsel, Dennis Determinants of banks' engagement in loan securitization	2007
84.	Bannier, Christina "Smoothing" versus "Timeliness" - Wann sind stabile Ratings optimal und welche Anforderungen sind an optimale Berichtsregeln zu stellen?	2007

83.	Bannier, Christina E. Heterogeneous Multiple Bank Financing: Does it Reduce Inefficient Credit-Renegotiation Incidences?	2007
82.	Cremers, Heinz / Löhr, Andreas Deskription und Bewertung strukturierter Produkte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung verschiedener Marktszenarien	2007
81.	Demidova-Menzel, Nadeshda / Heidorn, Thomas Commodities in Asset Management	2007
80.	Cremers, Heinz / Walzner, Jens Risikosteuerung mit Kreditderivaten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Credit Default Swaps	2007
79.	Cremers, Heinz / Traugber, Patrick Handlungsalternativen einer Genossenschaftsbank im Investmentprozess unter Berücksichtigung der Risikotragfähigkeit	2007
78.	Gerdemeier, Dieter / Roffia, Barbara Monetary Analysis: A VAR Perspective	2007
77.	Heidorn, Thomas / Kaiser, Dieter G. / Muschiol, Andrea Portfoliooptimierung mit Hedgefonds unter Berücksichtigung höherer Momente der Verteilung	2007
76.	Jobe, Clemens J. / Ockens, Klaas / Safran, Robert / Schalast, Christoph Work-Out und Servicing von notleidenden Krediten – Berichte und Referate des HfB-NPL Servicing Forums 2006	2006
75.	Abrar, Kamyar / Schalast, Christoph Fusionskontrolle in dynamischen Netzsektoren am Beispiel des Breitbandkabelsektors	2006
74.	Schalast, Christoph / Schanz, Kay-Michael Wertpapierprospekte: Markteinführungspublizität nach EU-Prospektverordnung und Wertpapierprospektgesetz 2005	2006
73.	Dickler, Robert A. / Schalast, Christoph Distressed Debt in Germany: What's Next? Possible Innovative Exit Strategies	2006
72.	Belke, Ansgar / Polleit, Thorsten How the ECB and the US Fed set interest rates	2006
71.	Heidorn, Thomas / Hoppe, Christian / Kaiser, Dieter G. Heterogenität von Hedgefondsindizes	2006
70.	Baumann, Stefan / Löchel, Horst The Endogeneity Approach of the Theory of Optimum Currency Areas - What does it mean for ASEAN + 3?	2006
69.	Heidorn, Thomas / Trautmann, Alexandra Niederschlagsderivate	2005
68.	Heidorn, Thomas / Hoppe, Christian / Kaiser, Dieter G. Möglichkeiten der Strukturierung von Hedgefondsportfolios	2005
67.	Belke, Ansgar / Polleit, Thorsten (How) Do Stock Market Returns React to Monetary Policy ? An ARDL Cointegration Analysis for Germany	2005
66.	Daynes, Christian / Schalast, Christoph Aktuelle Rechtsfragen des Bank- und Kapitalmarktsrechts II: Distressed Debt - Investing in Deutschland	2005
65.	Gerdemeier, Dieter / Polleit, Thorsten Measures of excess liquidity	2005
64.	Becker, Gernot M. / Harding, Perham / Hölscher, Luise Financing the Embedded Value of Life Insurance Portfolios	2005
63.	Schalast, Christoph Modernisierung der Wasserwirtschaft im Spannungsfeld von Umweltschutz und Wettbewerb – Braucht Deutschland eine Rechtsgrundlage für die Vergabe von Wasserversorgungskonzessionen? –	2005
62.	Bayer, Marcus / Cremers, Heinz / Kluß, Norbert Wertsicherungsstrategien für das Asset Management	2005
61.	Löchel, Horst / Polleit, Thorsten A case for money in the ECB monetary policy strategy	2005
60.	Richard, Jörg / Schalast, Christoph / Schanz, Kay-Michael Unternehmen im Prime Standard - „Staying Public“ oder „Going Private“? - Nutzenanalyse der Börsennotiz -	2004
59.	Heun, Michael / Schlink, Torsten Early Warning Systems of Financial Crises - Implementation of a currency crisis model for Uganda	2004
58.	Heimer, Thomas / Köhler, Thomas Auswirkungen des Basel II Akkords auf österreichische KMU	2004
57.	Heidorn, Thomas / Meyer, Bernd / Pietrowiak, Alexander Performanceeffekte nach Directors Dealings in Deutschland, Italien und den Niederlanden	2004
56.	Gerdemeier, Dieter / Roffia, Barbara The Relevance of real-time data in estimating reaction functions for the euro area	2004



55.	Barthel, Erich / Gierig, Rauno / Kühn, Ilmhart-Wolfram Unterschiedliche Ansätze zur Messung des Humankapitals	2004
54.	Anders, Dietmar / Binder, Andreas / Hesdahl, Ralf / Schalast, Christoph / Thöne, Thomas Aktuelle Rechtsfragen des Bank- und Kapitalmarktrechts I : Non-Performing-Loans / Faule Kredite - Handel, Work-Out, Outsourcing und Securitisation	2004
53.	Polleit, Thorsten The Slowdown in German Bank Lending – Revisited	2004
52.	Heidorn, Thomas / Siragusano, Tindaro Die Anwendbarkeit der Behavioral Finance im Devisenmarkt	2004
51.	Schütze, Daniel / Schalast, Christoph (Hrsg.) Wider die Verschleuderung von Unternehmen durch Pfandversteigerung	2004
50.	Gerhold, Mirko / Heidorn, Thomas Investitionen und Emissionen von Convertible Bonds (Wandelanleihen)	2004
49.	Chevalier, Pierre / Heidorn, Thomas / Krieger, Christian Temperaturderivate zur strategischen Absicherung von Beschaffungs- und Absatzrisiken	2003
48.	Becker, Gernot M. / Seeger, Norbert Internationale Cash Flow-Rechnungen aus Eigner- und Gläubigersicht	2003
47.	Boenkost, Wolfram / Schmidt, Wolfgang M. Notes on convexity and quanto adjustments for interest rates and related options	2003
46.	Hess, Dieter Determinants of the relative price impact of unanticipated information in U.S. macroeconomic releases	2003
45.	Cremers, Heinz / Kluß, Norbert / König, Markus Incentive Fees. Erfolgsabhängige Vergütungsmodelle deutscher Publikumsfonds	2003
44.	Heidorn, Thomas / König, Lars Investitionen in Collateralized Debt Obligations	2003
43.	Kahlert, Holger / Seeger, Norbert Bilanzierung von Unternehmenszusammenschlüssen nach US-GAAP	2003
42.	Beiträge von Studierenden des Studiengangs BBA 012 unter Begleitung von Prof. Dr. Norbert Seeger Rechnungslegung im Umbruch - HGB-Bilanzierung im Wettbewerb mit den internationalen Standards nach IAS und US-GAAP	2003
41.	Overbeck, Ludger / Schmidt, Wolfgang Modeling Default Dependence with Threshold Models	2003
40.	Balthasar, Daniel / Cremers, Heinz / Schmidt, Michael Portfoliooptimierung mit Hedge Fonds unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Risikokomponente	2002
39.	Heidorn, Thomas / Kantwill, Jens Eine empirische Analyse der Spreadunterschiede von Festsatzanleihen zu Floatern im Euroraum und deren Zusammenhang zum Preis eines Credit Default Swaps	2002
38.	Böttcher, Henner / Seeger, Norbert Bilanzierung von Finanzderivaten nach HGB, EstG, IAS und US-GAAP	2003
37.	Moormann, Jürgen Terminologie und Glossar der Bankinformatik	2002
36.	Heidorn, Thomas Bewertung von Kreditprodukten und Credit Default Swaps	2001
35.	Heidorn, Thomas / Weier, Sven Einführung in die fundamentale Aktienanalyse	2001
34.	Seeger, Norbert International Accounting Standards (IAS)	2001
33.	Moormann, Jürgen / Stehling, Frank Strategic Positioning of E-Commerce Business Models in the Portfolio of Corporate Banking	2001
32.	Sokolovsky, Zbynek / Strohhecker, Jürgen Fit für den Euro, Simulationsbasierte Euro-Maßnahmenplanung für Dresdner-Bank-Geschäftsstellen	2001
31.	Roßbach, Peter Behavioral Finance - Eine Alternative zur vorherrschenden Kapitalmarkttheorie?	2001
30.	Heidorn, Thomas / Jaster, Oliver / Willeitner, Ulrich Event Risk Covenants	2001
29.	Biswas, Rita / Löchel, Horst Recent Trends in U.S. and German Banking: Convergence or Divergence?	2001

28.	Eberle, Günter Georg / Löchel, Horst Die Auswirkungen des Übergangs zum Kapitaldeckungsverfahren in der Rentenversicherung auf die Kapitalmärkte	2001
27.	Heidorn, Thomas / Klein, Hans-Dieter / Siebrecht, Frank Economic Value Added zur Prognose der Performance europäischer Aktien	2000
26.	Cremers, Heinz Konvergenz der binomialen Optionspreismodelle gegen das Modell von Black/Scholes/Merton	2000
25.	Löchel, Horst Die ökonomischen Dimensionen der ‚New Economy‘	2000
24.	Frank, Axel / Moormann, Jürgen Grenzen des Outsourcing: Eine Exploration am Beispiel von Direktbanken	2000
23.	Heidorn, Thomas / Schmidt, Peter / Seiler, Stefan Neue Möglichkeiten durch die Namensaktie	2000
22.	Böger, Andreas / Heidorn, Thomas / Graf Waldstein, Philipp Hybrides Kernkapital für Kreditinstitute	2000
21.	Heidorn, Thomas Entscheidungsorientierte Mindestmargenkalkulation	2000
20.	Wolf, Birgit Die Eigenmittelkonzeption des § 10 KWG	2000
19.	Cremers, Heinz / Robé, Sophie / Thiele, Dirk Beta als Risikomaß - Eine Untersuchung am europäischen Aktienmarkt	2000
18.	Cremers, Heinz Optionspreisbestimmung	1999
17.	Cremers, Heinz Value at Risk-Konzepte für Marktrisiken	1999
16.	Chevalier, Pierre / Heidorn, Thomas / Rütze, Merle Gründung einer deutschen Strombörse für Elektrizitätsderivate	1999
15.	Deister, Daniel / Ehrlicher, Sven / Heidorn, Thomas CatBonds	1999
14.	Jochum, Eduard Hoshin Kanri / Management by Policy (MBP)	1999
13.	Heidorn, Thomas Kreditderivate	1999
12.	Heidorn, Thomas Kreditrisiko (CreditMetrics)	1999
11.	Moormann, Jürgen Terminologie und Glossar der Bankinformatik	1999
10.	Löchel, Horst The EMU and the Theory of Optimum Currency Areas	1998
09.	Löchel, Horst Die Geldpolitik im Währungsraum des Euro	1998
08.	Heidorn, Thomas / Hund, Jürgen Die Umstellung auf die Stückaktie für deutsche Aktiengesellschaften	1998
07.	Moormann, Jürgen Stand und Perspektiven der Informationsverarbeitung in Banken	1998
06.	Heidorn, Thomas / Schmidt, Wolfgang LIBOR in Arrears	1998
05.	Jahresbericht 1997	1998
04.	Ecker, Thomas / Moormann, Jürgen Die Bank als Betreiberin einer elektronischen Shopping-Mall	1997
03.	Jahresbericht 1996	1997
02.	Cremers, Heinz / Schwarz, Willi Interpolation of Discount Factors	1996
01.	Moormann, Jürgen Lean Reporting und Führungsinformationssysteme bei deutschen Finanzdienstleistern	1995

**FRANKFURT SCHOOL / HFB – WORKING PAPER SERIES  
CENTRE FOR PRACTICAL QUANTITATIVE FINANCE**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Author/Title</b>	<b>Year</b>
23.	Esquivel, Manuel L. / Veiga, Carlos / Wystup, Uwe Unifying Exotic Option Closed Formulas	2010
22.	Packham, Natalie / Schlögl, Lutz / Schmidt, Wolfgang M. Credit gap risk in a first passage time model with jumps	2009
21.	Packham, Natalie / Schlögl, Lutz / Schmidt, Wolfgang M. Credit dynamics in a first passage time model with jumps	2009
20.	Reiswich, Dimitri / Wystup, Uwe FX Volatility Smile Construction	2009
19.	Reiswich, Dimitri / Tompkins, Robert Potential PCA Interpretation Problems for Volatility Smile Dynamics	2009
18.	Keller-Ressel, Martin / Kilin, Fiodar Forward-Start Options in the Barndorff-Nielsen-Shephard Model	2008
17.	Griebsch, Susanne / Wystup, Uwe On the Valuation of Fader and Discrete Barrier Options in Heston's Stochastic Volatility Model	2008
16.	Veiga, Carlos / Wystup, Uwe Closed Formula for Options with Discrete Dividends and its Derivatives	2008
15.	Packham, Natalie / Schmidt, Wolfgang Latin hypercube sampling with dependence and applications in finance	2008
14.	Hakala, Jürgen / Wystup, Uwe FX Basket Options	2008
13.	Weber, Andreas / Wystup, Uwe Vergleich von Anlagestrategien bei Riesterrechten ohne Berücksichtigung von Gebühren. Eine Simulationsstudie zur Verteilung der Renditen	2008
12.	Weber, Andreas / Wystup, Uwe Riesterrechte im Vergleich. Eine Simulationsstudie zur Verteilung der Renditen	2008
11.	Wystup, Uwe Vanna-Volga Pricing	2008
10.	Wystup, Uwe Foreign Exchange Quanto Options	2008
09.	Wystup, Uwe Foreign Exchange Symmetries	2008
08.	Becker, Christoph / Wystup, Uwe Was kostet eine Garantie? Ein statistischer Vergleich der Rendite von langfristigen Anlagen	2008
07.	Schmidt, Wolfgang Default Swaps and Hedging Credit Baskets	2007
06.	Kilin, Fiodor Accelerating the Calibration of Stochastic Volatility Models	2007
05.	Griebsch, Susanne/ Kühn, Christoph / Wystup, Uwe Instalment Options: A Closed-Form Solution and the Limiting Case	2007
04.	Boenkost, Wolfram / Schmidt, Wolfgang M. Interest Rate Convexity and the Volatility Smile	2006
03.	Becker, Christoph/ Wystup, Uwe On the Cost of Delayed Currency Fixing	2005
02.	Boenkost, Wolfram / Schmidt, Wolfgang M. Cross currency swap valuation	2004
01.	Wallner, Christian / Wystup, Uwe Efficient Computation of Option Price Sensitivities for Options of American Style	2004

**HFB – SONDERARBEITSBERICHTE DER HFB - BUSINESS SCHOOL OF FINANCE & MANAGEMENT**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Author/Title</b>	<b>Year</b>
01.	Nicole Kahmer / Jürgen Moormann Studie zur Ausrichtung von Banken an Kundenprozessen am Beispiel des Internet (Preis: € 120,-)	2003

Printed edition: € 25.00 + € 2.50 shipping

Download:

Working Paper: [http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/de/research/Publications/list\\_of\\_publication0.html](http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/de/research/Publications/list_of_publication0.html)

CPQF: [http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/de/research/quantitative\\_Finance/research\\_publications.html](http://www.frankfurt-school.de/content/de/research/quantitative_Finance/research_publications.html)

**Order address / contact**

Frankfurt School of Finance & Management

Sonnemannstr. 9–11 ▪ D–60314 Frankfurt/M. ▪ Germany

Phone: +49 (0) 69 154 008–734 ▪ Fax: +49 (0) 69 154 008–728

eMail: [m.biemer@frankfurt-school.de](mailto:m.biemer@frankfurt-school.de)

Further information about Frankfurt School of Finance & Management  
may be obtained at: <http://www.frankfurt-school.de>