

Errata and Additions to Pricing Derivative Securities

T. W. Epps

January 2003

1. p. 27, last line before (2.7): “be a monotone sequence, and let μ be a measure on (Ω, \mathcal{C}) such that $\mu(A_1) < \infty$ if $\{A_n\} \downarrow$.”
2. p. 30, eqn. (2.8): $\int_a^x f(t) \cdot dt$.
3. p. 36, Theorem 2, second integral: $\int \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(\omega) \cdot d\mu(\omega)$.
4. p. 47, line 2: page 36.
5. p. 59, last line: holds if μ'_k exists.
6. p. 61, line 2: $a + bEX$
7. p. 63, lines 5-6: while the derivatives evaluated at $\zeta = 0$ are proportional to the probabilities, as $\Pi^{(k)}(0)/k! = f(k)$.
8. p. 80, fourth line from bottom: $P(V = \sigma_j^2) = p^{2-j}(1-p)^{j-1}$.
9. p. 87, line -1: $X_s + b_s E_s Y_{s+1} + \dots + E_s [b_{t-1} (E_{t-1} Y_t)]$
10. p. 88, Example 34: $E_s X_t = E_s (E_t Z) = E_s (Z) = X_s$.
11. p. 89, line 8: that simply....
12. p. 94, para. 2, line 4: The process thus has time-stationary and independent increments.
13. p. 97, line 1: as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
14. p. 104 property #1 of the integral: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |b_t(W_{t+1/n} - W_t)| = 0$.
15. p. 108, para. 3, lines 1-2: quadratic variation of Brownian motion itself is....
16. p. 109. 1st line should be: Approximating $X_{t_j} - X_{t_{j-1}} = \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} a_s \cdot ds + \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} b_s \cdot dW_s$ as $a_{t_{j-1}}(t_j - t_{j-1}) + b_{t_{j-1}}(W_{t_j} - W_{t_{j-1}})$, the quadratic variation of $\{X_t\}$ on the grid $\{t_j\}$ is approximately
17. p. 109, line 4: Again setting $t_j = jT/n, \dots$

18. p. 113, second limit: $\sum_{j=1}^n f_{XX}(X_{t_j^*}) a_{t_{j-1}} b_{t_{j-1}} (t_j - t_{j-1}) (W_{t_j} - W_{t_{j-1}}) :$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sqrt{tn^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n f_{XX}(X_{t_j^*})^2 a_{t_{j-1}}^2 b_{t_{j-1}}^2 (t_j - t_{j-1}) \sum_{j=1}^n (W_{t_j} - W_{t_{j-1}})^2} \\ &= \sqrt{tn^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n f_{XX}(X_{t_j^*})^2 a_{t_{j-1}}^2 b_{t_{j-1}}^2 (t_j - t_{j-1}) \cdot tn^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n Z_j^2} \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

19. p. 115, Example 49, line 8: $W_t \cdot dW_t = dW_t^2/2 - dt/2$.

20. p. 159, line 2 of text: Let....

21. p. 160, para. 2, line 8: so that the normalized value....

22. p. 161, last line of text: and $p, c \in \mathfrak{R}$.

23. p. 164, line 7: underlying is a futures price or a no-dividend stock....

24. p. 168, line 3: $S_t + K$ worth of stock and invest the dividends in stock as received.

25. p. 168, line -11: $S_t e^{-\delta(T-t)}$ worth of stock, financing the dividends by selling more.

26. p. 170, col. 3 line 1 of table: $C^E(S_t, T - t) = S_t + K$.

27. p. 171, line 4 of para. headed "Variation with Term": ...plus a T_2 -expiring call that kicks in at T_1 if the first call was not exercised.

28. p. 175, FALSE Theorem, line 1: $S_t \geq 0$.

29. p. 194 line 5, add after "risk-neutral" pricing: when the money fund is numeraire.

30. p. 194 lines 9-10: as well as an "equivalent-martingale" measure.

31. p. 196, line 13: ...violating both conditions.

32. p. 197, add just before section “Complete Markets”: However, one sees immediately that the measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ is not a risk-neutral measure, in that $s_0 \neq b(0, n)\tilde{E}s_n$.

33. p. 198 change first two expressions to

$$\hat{v}_0(A_j) \equiv s_{00} \cdot \hat{E} (1_{A_j}/s_{0j}) = s_{00} \int_{A_j} s_{0j}(\omega)^{-1} \cdot d\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\omega)$$

or

$$\tilde{v}_0(A_j) \equiv s_{00} \cdot \tilde{E} (1_{A_j}/s_{0j}) = s_{00} \int_{A_j} s_{0j}(\omega)^{-1} \cdot d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\omega).$$

34. p. 213, last line: $P^A(s_0, n) = X - s_0$.

35. p. 219, line -3: From k onward

36. p. 220, replace second line as: At $k - 1$, the critical stage just before the ex date, one compares the derivative’s current exercise value, which is based on the cum-dividend price, with its value if held until the stock price reacts to the dividend: .

37. p. 220, expression at line 3 should be

$$D_{k-1}(s_{k-1}) = \frac{1}{1+r} \hat{E}_{k-1} D_k[s_k^c(1-\delta)] \vee D_{k-1}^X(s_{k-1}^c).$$

38. p. 222, 2 lines above expression, replace “thereafter” with “from k onward”.

39. p. 223, 2d. line after (5.40): $R_{j+1} \in \{d, u\}$.

40. p. 225, replace first 4 lines with: ... and off the ex-dividend price from k onward, as

$$D_j(s_j) = \frac{1}{1+r} \hat{E}_j D_{j+1}(s_{j+1}) \vee D_j^X(s_j);$$

while at $k - 1$

$$D_{k-1}(s_{k-1}) = \frac{1}{1+r} \hat{E}_j D_k(s_k^c - \Delta) \vee D_{k-1}^X(s_{k-1}^c).$$

41. p. 228, line 9: Since $e^{\bar{r}_j T/n}$ corresponds to $(1+r_j)$

42. p. 231 last 2 lines of 2d para: so that $\hat{E}_0 S_T = S_0 e^{r(0,T)} = S_0 B(0, T)^{-1}$ and $S_0 = B(0, T) \hat{E}_0 S_T$.
43. p. 247, 6th line from bottom: section 5.6.1.
44. p. 261, line 2: first expression should be $D(S_t, T - t) = p_t S_t^c + q_t M_t$
45. p. 264, line 7: page 117.
46. p. 265, add after 1st para: Just as was seen to be true in the Bernoulli setting, a different measure is required to turn normalized prices into martingales if S_t^c replaces M_t as numeraire. Letting $M_t^{**} = M_t/S_t^c$ and applying Itô gives

$$dM_t^{**} = (r_t - \delta_t + \sigma_t^2 - \mu_t) \cdot dt - \sigma_t \cdot dW_t.$$

With

$$Q'_T = \exp \left[\int_0^T \sigma_t^{-1} (r_t - \delta_t + \sigma_t^2 - \mu_t) \cdot dW_t - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sigma_t^{-2} (r_t - \delta_t + \sigma_t^2 - \mu_t)^2 \cdot dt \right]$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(A) = E 1_A Q'_T = \int_A Q'_T(\omega) \cdot d\mathbb{P}(\omega), \quad A \in \mathcal{F},$$

we have a measure under which $\tilde{W}_t = W_t - \int_0^t \sigma_u^{-1} (r_u - \delta_u + \sigma_u^2 - \mu_u) \cdot du$ is a Brownian motion and M_t^{**} becomes trendless, with $dM_t^{**} = -\sigma_t \cdot d\tilde{W}_t$. However, although $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ does make $\{M_t^{**}\}$ a martingale, it is no longer a “risk-neutral” measure; for example,

$$\tilde{E}_t S_T^c = S_t^c \exp \int_t^T (r_u + \sigma_u^2) \cdot du$$

47. p. 265, line -9: represented as an Itô process...
48. p. 267, first line after (6.15): where $\hat{Z} \sim N(0, 1)$.
49. pp. 267-8, replace entire section headed “Futures Prices under the Martingale Measure” as:

Modeling the evolution of a futures price over some interval $[0, T]$ as geometric Brownian motion under the canonical measure \mathbb{P} ,

$$dF_t = \mu_t F_t \cdot dt + \sigma_t F_t \cdot dW_t, \quad (1)$$

let us consider the implications for the stochastic behavior of F_t , the value of a futures position that was initiated at $t = 0$. Supposing this to have been marked to market at times $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n \leq t$, with gains (losses) being invested in (financed by) shares of the money fund, we have

$$F_t = (F_{t_1} - F_0) \frac{M_t}{M_{t_1}} + (F_{t_2} - F_{t_1}) \frac{M_t}{M_{t_2}} + \dots + (F_{t_n} - F_{t_{n-1}}) \frac{M_t}{M_{t_n}} + (F_t - F_{t_n}).$$

Now, as an approximation, imagine that the marking to market has taken place continuously. Taking limits in the above as $\max(t_j - t_{j-1}) \rightarrow 0$ gives

$$F_t \doteq M_t \int_0^t M_s^{-1} \cdot dF_s$$

and, upon normalizing by dividing by M_t ,

$$dF_t^* = d(F_t/M_t) = M_t^{-1} \cdot dF_t = \mu_t F_t^* \cdot dt + \sigma_t F_t^* \cdot dW_t.$$

Since it is the futures position rather than the futures price that has the status of an asset, it is F_t^* rather than F_t that should be a martingale under appropriate change of measure. Applying Girsanov's theorem with

$$Q_T = \exp \left[- \int_0^T \sigma_t^{-1} \mu_t \cdot dW_t - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sigma_t^{-2} \mu_t^2 \cdot dt \right]$$

produces the measure \widehat{P} that makes $\widehat{W}_t = W_t + \int_0^t \sigma_u^{-1} \mu_u \cdot du$ a Brownian motion and thereby removes the trend in F_t^* , as $dF_t^* = \sigma_t F_t^* \cdot d\widehat{W}_t$. Referring to (1), we see that under this measure

$$dF_t = \sigma_t F_t \cdot d\widehat{W}_t,$$

so that the unnormalized futures price is itself a trendless geometric Brownian motion, and hence a martingale. Accordingly, the time- T futures price has the following distribution conditional on what is known at $t \leq T$:

$$F_T \sim F_t \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_t^T \sigma_u^2 \cdot du + Z \sqrt{\int_t^T \sigma_u^2 \cdot du} \right), Z \sim N(0, 1).$$

With this result valuing European options or other European-style derivatives on the futures is again reduced to finding the discounted expectation of a function of a lognormally distributed random variable.

50. p. 269, 7th line from bottom: page 153.
51. p. 302, caption for fig 7.1: replace δ with Δ .
52. p. 312, line 3: infinite-horizon version of (7.4).
53. p. 386, last line: European call is then $C^E(S_t, T-t) = B(t, T)\hat{E}_t(S_t - X)^+$, where the expectation is given by...
54. p. 397, line 7: ...that solve (8.19) and (8.20) also solve (8.18)
55. p. 400, change first sentence as:

Therefore, the current value of the option under stochastic volatility is simply the mathematical expectation of $P^E(S_0, T; \bar{\sigma}_T)$, or

$$P^E(S_0, T) = \hat{E}P^E(S_0, T; \bar{\sigma}_T).$$

56. p. 401, lines 2-3: evaluating $\bar{\sigma}_T$ for each path, and averaging $P^E(S_0, T; \bar{\sigma}_T)$ over the replications.
57. p. 404, line 9: $1_{(-\infty, x)}(s_T)$
58. p. 420, 4th line after (9.10): $d \ln S_t = (\alpha - \theta\nu - \sigma^2/2) \cdot dt + \sigma \cdot dW_t + (\ln S_t - \ln S_{t-})$.
59. p. 420, 7th line after (9.10): Replace two lines of expression with

$$\ln S_T - \ln S_t = (\alpha - \theta\nu - \sigma^2/2)(T-t) + \sigma(W_T - W_t) + \sum_{j=0}^{N_T - N_t} \ln(1 + U_j)$$

with $U_0 \equiv 0$.

60. p. 420, lines -7,-8: A convenient assumption is that $\{1 + U_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ are i.i.d. as lognormal, ...
61. p. 434, line 11: $N[\mu, \sigma^2(\nu - 1)/U]$.
62. p. 438, line 2:

$$f_{R_0, t}(R) = \frac{2e^{\gamma(R-\mu t)/\sigma^2}}{\nu^{t/\nu} \sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2} \Gamma(t/\nu)} \left(\frac{|R - \mu t|}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{t}{\nu} - \frac{1}{2}} K_{\frac{t}{\nu} - \frac{1}{2}} \left(\rho \frac{|R - \mu t|}{\sigma^2} \right)$$

63. p. 516, line 7:

$$d_s^\pm(s, t) = \frac{\pm d(s \pm \Delta s, t) \mp d(s, t)}{\Delta s}$$

64. p. 518, line -8:

$$+ \frac{d(s + \Delta s, t + \Delta t) + d(s - \Delta s, t + \Delta t) - 2d(s, t + \Delta t)}{\Delta s^2} \cdot q.$$

65. p. 524, equation (12.15):

$$l_i = b - a \cdot \frac{c}{l_{i-1}}$$

66. p. 524, line -2: $k_1 = e_1 - a \cdot d_0$.

67. p. 666, reference [64]: Bernoulli 1, 281-299.

68. p. 668, reference [88]: pub. date (1979).