

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/cam

A new finite difference method for pricing and hedging fixed income derivatives: Comparative analysis and the case of an Asian option*



Allan Jonathan da Silva^a, Jack Baczynski^{a,*}, José V.M. Vicente^{b,c}

^a National Laboratory for Scientific Computing, LNCC, 25651-075, Petrópolis, RJ, Brazil

^b Central Bank of Brazil, 20071-000, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

^c Ibmec Business School, 20071-000, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 17 August 2015 Received in revised form 21 October 2015

Keywords: Interest rates derivatives Option pricing and hedging PDE Finite difference methods Computational finance

ABSTRACT

We propose a second order accurate numerical finite difference method to replace the classical schemes used to solve PDEs in financial engineering. We name it Modified Fully Implicit method. The motivation for doing so stems from the accuracy loss while trying to stabilize the solution via the up-wind scheme in the convective term as well as the fact that spurious oscillations solutions occur when volatilities are low (this is actually the range that is commonly observed in interest rate markets). Unlike the classical schemes, our method covers the whole spectrum of volatilities in the interest rate dynamics.

We obtain analytical and numerical results for pricing and hedging a zero-coupon bond and an Asian interest rate option. In the case of the Asian option, we compare the realistic discrete compounding interest rate scheme (associated with the Modified Fully Implicit method) with the continuous compounding scheme (often exploited in the literature), obtaining relative discrepancies between prices exceeding 50%. This indicates that the former scheme is more appropriate then the latter to price more complicate derivatives than straight bonds.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Before the 1980s, fixed income markets were composed primarily by vanilla bonds and simple structured financial instruments. Thus, their valuations were easy and direct, done frequently via closed-form mathematical formulas (e.g. [1]). Thenceforth, markets have become sophisticated as more complex products aiming to reduce or share risks appear, complicating the pricing and hedging engines. The fast growth of financial market instruments over recent decades has spawned many challenging mathematical problems to be solved, from the underlying stochastic modeling to solutions through computational methods.

Fixed income derivatives are contracts which have payoff, contingent on the evolution of interest rates. They are traded in the equity, commodity, currency and credit markets along with hybrid derivatives engineered over the counter [2]. The valuation of interest rate derivative contracts is a very important subject in modern financial theory and practice. The

* Corresponding author.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2015.10.025 0377-0427/© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

^{*} We thank useful comments from seminar participants at LNCC (2015), the 14th Brazilian Meeting of Finance (2014) and the 35th National Conference on Computational and Applied Mathematics (2014).

E-mail addresses: allanjs@lncc.br (A.J. da Silva), jack@lncc.br (J. Baczynski), jose.valentim@bcb.gov.br (J.V.M. Vicente).

financial health of banks, governments and industrial companies are very sensitive to changes in the term structure of the interest rates. It has become mandatory nowadays to quantify and control the risk exposure to prices of interest rate associated contracts.

A large amount of academic literature has been dedicated to the pricing and hedging of such instruments. Vasicek [3] has introduced a Gaussian stochastic process to model the spot rate dynamics. He also developed a simple closed-form solution to compute the prices of zero-coupon bonds. Jamshidian [4] has extended the results to options on bonds, which is automatically adapted to price interest rate caps and floors and Hübner [5] used Jamshidian's approach to express the swaption prices. Additionally, closed-form expressions have been developed to price such products based on other stochastic processes (see e.g. [6–8]).

However, it is a hard task to extend the results and find analytical solutions to more complex structures, even in the Gaussian model. The callable bond is an example. It is a financial instrument commonly issued by banks and non-financial companies. Hence, such contracts must be priced by numerical techniques. Several computational approaches, such as Fourier methods [9], Monte Carlo simulation [10] and tree methods [11] can be used to price complex derivatives, but due to its efficiency in computing accurate pricing and hedging values and its flexibility in the modeling process, partial differential equations have become a very popular choice. Some recent developments in the field of financial engineering designed for specific purposes can be found (i) in [12], for pricing discrete double barrier option via PDE transforms, (ii) in [13], for pricing discrete monitored barrier options in the Black–Scholes scenario, where the authors mix the Laplace Transform and the finite difference method, (iii) in [14], where a meshfree method is used to calculate the prices and the greeks of European, Asian and Barrier options, and (vi) in [15], where quadrature methods are applied to price discretely monitored Barrier options.

To improve financial engineering, we propose a new numerical finite difference method to replace the classical schemes used to solve PDEs (see e.g. [16–18]). The motivation for doing so stems from the fact that spurious oscillations solutions occur when volatilities are low (i.e., when the Peclet number is high) and serious collateral matters appear in attempts to correct the problem. Actually, low volatilities are the range observed in interest rate markets, and unlike the classical schemes, our method covers the whole spectrum of volatilities in the interest rate dynamics.

Our method is devised as a version of the Fully Implicit method (see, e.g., [16,18]), and extended to provide hedges along with prices. One of the modifications we introduced is inspired in a technique that appears in [19]. That method adapts to the Black–Scholes dynamics, while ours fit the interest rate derivatives with Vasicek, CIR [7] and other types of short-rate models. Our numerical scheme is first order accurate in time, second order accurate in space and consistent. Moreover, it possesses the quality of being unconditionally stable. We name it Modified Fully Implicit (Interest Rate) Method.

We show the good performance of the method, pricing a zero-coupon bond and another type of interest rate derivative security named IDI (Interbank Deposit Rate Index) option, both in the Vasicek dynamic. Namely, we perform a convergence analysis by considering both continuously compounded and daily compounded rate of interest to model the money market account and the updating of the IDI path.¹

The ID index updating is built up discretely based on the overnight DI rate, which is an annualized rate over one day period. It is calculated and published daily, and represents the average rate of inter-bank overnight transactions [20]. Based on a martingale approach, closed form solutions to price an IDI contract are available in the literature, assuming for mathematical tractability reasons that the updating of the IDI is continuous in time. In this scenario, a one-factor model was developed in [21] to price the IDI option via the short rate dynamics as given in [3]. A multi-factor Gaussian model was developed in [22] to price the IDI option and bond prices. Also, [23] proposed to incorporate the potential changes in the targeting rates via pure jump process.

Carrying on the evaluation of our finite difference scheme, we demonstrate its advantages considering the following approaches on a pricing problem of an IDI call option with the Vasicek dynamic.

- We obtain the estimates of the prices (and hedges) according to the Modified Fully Implicit method, and consider updating the IDI path discretely. This updating rule allow us to track realistically the evolution of the index and to achieve the exact pay-off representation.
- We obtain the prices via the closed form expressions given in [21], assuming a continuously compounded interest rate, which is actually an idealization for mathematical tractability.

So, our approach corresponds to obtaining approximate prices for the exact problem (with respect to the payoff) while that of [21] corresponds to obtaining an exact price for the approximate problem. The results of this comparative analysis corroborate the conjecture of Tankov and Cont [24], which asserts that, typically, the former scenario yields better results than the latter. Indeed, via numerical simulations, we observe meaningful relative discrepancies in the prices for some prescribed examples whose parameters are good representatives of the market. So, using one or other method makes a difference. Now, neither price represents a benchmark. The benchmark should correspond to a framework that models the

¹ IDI is the shorthand of Interbank Deposit Rate Index. The IDI option is a financial option of Asian type and, as such, the payoff depends on the path followed by the short term interest rate. It presents cheaper prices than the standard options and it is less sensitive to extreme market conditions that may prevail close to the expiration day—due to random crashes or outright manipulation. So, it is commonly used by corporations to manage interest rate risk. Actually, it is a standardized derivative product traded at the Securities and Futures Exchange in the Brazilian fixed income market.

IDI discretely and provides the exact solution for the price. However, the Modified Fully Implicit method can be refined to approach the benchmark. On the other hand, all short rate model which adopts the IDI continuously compounded hypothesis (as in [22,23,21]) is obviously inconsistent with refinements with respect to the index updating, so they cannot approach the benchmark. Since the continuous updating procedure for calls produces a more expensive payoff than the discretely updating one, it is reasonable to expect prices to be more expensive in the former than the latter procedure. The simulations indicate more than this in fact. They show that, starting with a reasonable refined mesh, our call prices are cheaper than those of the continuous updating case of [21] and, as the mesh is refined, our prices move further downwards approaching the benchmark—and away from the prices of [21]. Analogous conclusions are obtained with a put option.

In the case of bonds, a comparative study of the continuous versus the discrete compounding interest scheme shows that the relative discrepancies between prices do not exceed 5% (in the typical range of interest rates). This is actually an expected result. However, in the case of the IDI call and put options, we find that the relative discrepancies between prices exceed 50%, when we consider the realistic discrete compound interest rate scheme (associated with the Modified Fully Implicit method) versus the continuous compounding scheme (often exploited in the literature). This immediately suggests that the former scheme is more appropriate then the latter, whenever the interest rate derivatives are more complicated than straight bonds.

Hence, the study carried out in this paper, in conjunction with the numerical simulations performed with the above derivatives, indicate that, in fact, our method is reliable and highly competitive. It straightforwardly adapts to other interest rate derivative securities, e.g., bond options, swaptions, caps and floors, adjusting the appropriate terminal condition. Via minor changes in the functions assigned to the jump conditions, the method fits other types of path-dependent options, as well as coupon bonds, coupon bond options and callable bonds.

We organize the article as follows: In Section 2 we present the motivation of the discrete daily monitoring approach and derive the analytical delta of the IDI call option. In Section 3 we present the partial differential equation that will be used to price the IDI call option and justify a coordinate transformation for the PDE. In Section 4 we revise the standard numerical discretizations commonly applied to such PDE and propose a scheme that is second order accurate and unconditional stable to convective dominant parabolic equations. A convergence study is performed numerically. Section 5 presents the pricing and hedging results, highlighting the discrepancies between the continuous and discrete updating approaches. Section 6 concludes the article.

2. The IDI option pricing problem

We consider the problem of pricing an IDI option, assuming that the ID index y accumulates discretely according to

$$y(t_n) = y(t_0) \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + DI(t_{i-1}))^{\frac{1}{252}}, \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$
(1)

where t_i denotes the end of day *i* and DI(·) assigns the DI rate, i.e., the average of the interbank rate of a one-day-period, calculated daily and expressed as the effective rate per annum. A detailed definition of the DI rate can be found in [20]. Correspondingly, the discretely monitored pay-off for the call option with maturity in $T = t_N$ is given by

$$\max\left(y(t_N) - K, \mathbf{0}\right). \tag{2}$$

We also suppose that the instantaneous short-term interest rate *r*-which shapes the DI rate, in the sense that $DI(t_i) = r(t_i)$ evolves according to Vasicek model (see [3])

$$dr(t) = a(b - r(t))dt + \sigma dW_t.$$
(3)

This Ornstein/Uhlenbeck stochastic process pulls the short rate to a level *b* at a rate *a* against with a normally distributed random term σdW_t , where W_t is a standard Brownian motion.

The discrete updating scheme mentioned above is consistent with reality. An idealization for mathematical tractability is to assume that the IDI index accumulates continuously according to

$$y(t) = y(0)e^{\int_0^t r_u du}, \quad t \in [0, T]$$
⁽⁴⁾

instead of (1). Correspondingly, the continuously monitored pay-off for the call option with maturity in T is given by

$$\max(y(T) - K, 0), \tag{5}$$

which stands as the counterpart of (2). Hence, concerning this important aspect, the framework we adopt here is more realistic than that usually found in the literature. Under the hypothesis of continuous compound interest rate, [21] developed a closed-form solution for the price of an ID call option with maturity in T, where the short rate also follows the Vasicek model.

It is well known that, using the above hypothesis, zero-coupon bond prices are very similar to those of the daily compounded interest. However this is not the case when dealing with assets like Asian interest rate options. The results obtained in this paper corroborate this with respect to pricing theoretical IDI options.

For later use, the price of an IDI call option with maturity in *T* at time *t*, in the continuously compounded hypothesis, is given by

$$C(r(t), y(t), t, T) = y(t)\Phi(h) - KP(r(t), t, T)\Phi(h - k)$$
(6)

where $N(\cdot)$ denotes the cumulative standard normal distribution function, *K* is the strike, P(r(t), t, T) is a zero-coupon bond price, y(t) is the ID index at the current time and

$$h = \frac{\frac{y(t)}{P(r(t),t,T)K} + \frac{k^2}{2}}{k}$$
(7)

$$k^{2} = \sigma^{2} \frac{(4e^{-a\tau} - e^{-2a\tau} + 2a\tau)}{2a^{3}},$$
(8)

where the parameters σ and a are defined in Eq. (3) and $\tau = T - t$. As shown in [3], the price at time t of a zero-coupon bond that pays 1 at time T is

$$P(r(t), t, T) = \alpha(t, T)e^{-\beta(t, T)r(t)},$$
(9)

where,

$$\beta(t,T) = \frac{1 - e^{-a(\tau)}}{a}$$
(10)

and

$$\alpha(t,T) = \exp\left[\frac{(\beta(t,T) - \tau)(a^2b - 0.5\sigma^2)}{a^2} - \frac{\sigma^2 B(t,T)^2}{4a}\right].$$
(11)

2.1. The hedging problem

We now obtain the delta of the IDI call option. Since the IDI is an index and not a physical asset that can be bought and sold, we evaluate the infinitesimal changes in the price of the IDI option with respect to a change in the whole term-structure. That is to say, our replicating portfolio will be composed by zero coupon bonds with maturity at time T and a money market account. By deriving the price C(t, T) of the IDI option (as given by (6)) with respect to the price P(t, T) of the zero coupon bond, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial P(t,T)} = y(t)\frac{\partial \Phi(h)}{\partial P(t,T)} - \left[K\Phi(h-k) + KP(t,T)\frac{\partial \Phi(h-k)}{\partial P(t,T)}\right]$$
$$= -K\Phi(h-k)$$
(12)

where

$$\frac{\partial \Phi(x)}{\partial P(t,T)} = \phi(x) \frac{\partial x}{\partial P(t,T)}$$
 and $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$.

The last equality stems from the fact that

$$\log\left(\frac{\phi(h-k)\frac{\partial(h-k)}{\partial P(t,T)}}{\phi(h)\frac{\partial(h)}{\partial P(t,T)}}\right) = \frac{1}{2}[(h)^{2} - (h-k)^{2}]$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}[(h) + (h-k)][(h) - (h-k)] = h.k - \frac{k^{2}}{2}$$
$$= \log\left(\frac{y(t)}{K.P(t,T)}\right) + \frac{k^{2}}{2} - \frac{k^{2}}{2}.$$
(13)

Hence, the delta hedge of the IDI option in the continuous compound interest scenario is given by

$$\Delta(t) = \frac{\partial C}{\partial P(t,T)} = -K\Phi(h-k).$$
(14)

We also develop a version of (14) to be used in our numerical approach, where the more realistic discrete compound interest is considered. As it ought to be, this version does not require knowledge of the price values *C* given by (6)—which stems from the continuous compound assumption for the interest rate. So, since we intend to use the zero coupon bond to hedge the IDI option, we assume that the price of the IDI option at time *t* depends on the current level y(t) of the index and the price $\breve{P}(t, T)$ of a bond with same maturity as that of the option. Both quantities are obtained via our numerical approach,

assuming the discrete updating status (we recall that very small changes occur in the price of a bond if we switch from the continuous to the discrete updating case, so the zero coupon bond prices could have been taken from [3]). We denote this price by \breve{u} . We have that

$$du = \frac{\partial u}{\partial y(t)} dy(t) + \frac{\partial u}{\partial P(t,T)} dP(t,T),$$
(15)

so the delta hedge is given by

$$\check{\Delta}(t) = \frac{\frac{du}{dr} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y(t)} \frac{dy(t)}{dr}}{\frac{dP(t,T)}{dr}} = \frac{\frac{du}{dr}}{\frac{dP(t,T)}{dr}}.$$
(16)

3. PDE formulation

Our aim is to price a financial contract assuming that the price is a function of three variables, namely, the time t and the current values of the interest rate r and the ID index y. We assume that $u(t, r(t), y(t)) \in C^{1,2,0}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ and that the ID index accumulates daily. Following the steps of [25] and applying Ito's lemma (see e.g. [26]), we set up a portfolio π containing two similar contracts with different maturities, obtaining

$$d\pi_t = \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial t}dt + \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial r}dr + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial r^2}dt - \Delta\left(\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial t}dt + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial r}dr(t) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial r^2}dt\right).$$
(17)

Although we are modeling a path-dependent option, the portfolio (17) exhibits a classical shape. This is so because the stochastic differential equation for the IDI degenerates, in the sense that dy = 0.

We point out that the quantity given by (1) changes only at a set of discrete jump times $\Omega = (t_1, \ldots, t_N)$ that represent the end of the trading days.

Let the market price of risk be $\lambda = 0$. The usual no-arbitrage argument implies that the price of the IDI option u = u(t, r, y) at time $t \notin \Omega$, i.e., when the IDI remains constant, is given by

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + a(b - r(t))\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial r^2} = r(t)u.$$
(18)

Across each $t_n \in \Omega$, absence of arbitrage ensures that the price of the option is continuous [27,28]. This is mathematically represented by the following jump condition:

$$u(t_n - \epsilon, r, y^{-}) = u(t_n + \epsilon, r, y^{+}), \tag{19}$$

where $y^+ = y^-[(1 + r)^{\frac{1}{252}}]$, and $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. We could alternatively derive the PDE (18) by using the Discounted Feynman–Kac Theorem [26].

To ensure uniqueness of solution we prescribed arbitrary functions to describe how the PDE must behave at the extremes of the domain. In the case of the IDI option we chose the following Neumann boundary conditions:

$$\frac{\partial u(-\infty)}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial u(+\infty)}{\partial r} = 0.$$
(20)

We know that the dynamics (3) allows negative and positive infinite values for r with non-zero probabilities. Hence, the conditions given by (20) ensure that an infinitesimal change in r at the boundaries does not change the value of the option. This is intuitive because the IDI option price is actually insensitive to changes in extreme negative or positive values of r. This fact can also be verified in Eq. (6). Latter we will revisit the issue concerning the appropriate value for the right extreme boundary when dealing with a truncated domain.

The terminal condition is the pay-off of the option, which in the case of a call, is

$$u(T, r, y) = \max(y - K, 0),$$
 (21)

and, in the case of a put, is

$$u(T; r; y) = \max(K - y, 0),$$
(22)

where *K* is the strike price and *y* is viewed as (2).

As it happens with the Asian–Parisian stock options [28], we have that away from monitored times the PDE (18) has no y dependence. The terminal condition (21) implies that a set of independent one-dimensional PDEs must be solved. The IDI Option price is calculated via (18) backwards in time from the terminal condition (21) up to the first $t_n \in \Omega$. We apply, in the sequel, the jump condition to find the option value at t_n^- . Using these values as the new terminal condition we repeat the process N + 1 times to meet the current value of the option, where N is the cardinality of the set (Ω).

3.1. Coordinate transformations

Finding a solution to (18) is a well-known problem in physics and finance. Numerically speaking, it is inconvenient if the sign of the convective term changes and the volatility is very low, which are common facts in interest rate derivatives. Financially speaking, it is undesirable to have the same precision for all points in the grid, because we are pricing a product based on the current interest rate. So, in the same lines as in [18], we first propose a change of variable that allows us to retrieve the solution in a nonuniform grid in r, which becomes thinner in some desirable or needed region. Then we appropriately modify a finite difference scheme to overcome the drawbacks of a convective dominant PDE.

The "proximity" of the left nonzero probability boundary to the actual level of interest rates suggests that small errors at the left boundary lead to inaccurate results near the strike price, where a sharp gradient occurs in conditional derivatives. So we specified a new variable $x = \ln(rd + c)$, where d > 0 and c are constants such that $c > -d \min(r)$.

Now, we have that

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\frac{\partial x}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\left(\frac{d}{rd+c}\right)$$
(23)

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial r^2} = \left(\frac{\partial x}{\partial r}\right)^2 \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 x}{\partial r^2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \left[\frac{d^2}{(rd+c)^2}\right] \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} - \left[\frac{d^2}{(rd+c)^2}\right] \frac{\partial u}{\partial x},\tag{24}$$

so we get the transformed PDE in the new coordinate x

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \left[\frac{a(db - e^{x} + c)}{e^{x}} - \frac{\sigma^{2} d^{2}}{2e^{2x}}\right] \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \left(\frac{\sigma^{2} d^{2}}{2e^{2x}}\right) \frac{\partial^{2} u}{\partial x^{2}} = \left(\frac{e^{x} - c}{d}\right) u$$
(25)

with the following boundary conditions:

$$\frac{\partial u(\min(x))}{\partial x} = 0 \tag{26}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u(\max(x))}{\partial x} = \frac{(T-t)}{T} \frac{e^x}{d} \theta.$$
(27)

We emphasize that we could set the derivative of the right boundary in *r* equal to zero, as we said before, except when dealing with a very large domain. For computational cost justifications we appropriately choose $\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = \frac{(T-t)}{T}\theta$ based on some model or market data θ which results in the previous boundary condition (27) in the new variable *x*.

The terminal condition does not depend on r directly and remains the same. The new jump condition is obtained substituting the value of r in the new coordinate system.

4. Finite difference methods

We now address the above problems via finite difference methods. We do so due to (i) uncommon features that appear in problems involving interest rate derivatives, (ii) the huge amount of works using this technique, and (iii) the lower computational effort to price and hedge options in comparison with Monte Carlo simulation methods. Unlike the Monte Carlo, finite difference methods allow us to observe the option prices considering the domain of r as a whole and provide reliable results that can be used as benchmark when there is no closed-form solution [18].

The finite difference method consists of the discretization of the spatial domain *x* over some finite interval $[x_{min}, x_{max}]$ with *J* points and in approximating the derivatives of the PDE by its incremental ratio Δx , which converges to the derivative as $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$. The method consists of replacing the derivatives in (25) by their numerical values at a finite number of points [18,29].

The forward, backward and central first spatial derivative is respectively approximated by

$$\partial_x^+ u_j^n = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x) = \frac{u(x_j + \Delta x, t_n) - u(x_j, t_n)}{\Delta x},$$

$$\partial_x^- u_j^n = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x) = \frac{u(x_j, t_n) - u(x_j - \Delta x, t_n)}{\Delta x} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\partial_x^0 u_j^n = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^2) = \frac{u(x_j + \Delta x, t_n) - u(x_j - \Delta x, t_n)}{2\Delta x}$$

where $u_j^n = u(x_j, t_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}(g(\delta))$ denotes the functions $o(\cdot)$ with the property of having $\frac{o(\delta)}{(g(\delta))} \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$.

The central second spatial derivative is approximated by the second order stencil

$$\partial_x^- \partial_x^+ u_j^n = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta x^2) = \frac{u(x_j + \Delta x, t_n) - 2u(x_j, t_n) + u(x_j - \Delta x, t_n)}{\Delta x^2}.$$

Approximations for the forward and central first temporal derivative are:

$$\partial_t^+ u_j^n = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t) = \frac{u(x_j, t_n + \Delta t) - u(x_j, t_n)}{\Delta t}$$

and

$$\partial_t^0 u_j^n = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2) = \frac{u(x_j, t_n + \Delta t) - u(x_j, t_n - \Delta t)}{2\Delta t}.$$

These simple definitions allow us to construct a variety of finite difference schemes for the PDE (25). Here, Δt means the length of the time lag between *n* and *n* + 1 and Δx is the distance between the spatial grid points *j* and *j* + 1.

In what follows, we present three specific finite difference schemes that are candidates to solve the interest rate derivative pricing problem. We briefly show their limitations and disadvantages, and conclude that the Modified Fully Implicit method we provide in Section 5 eliminates the limitations mentioned above and enables us to use it without parameter restrictions.

4.1. Crank-Nicolson method

The most famous method to solve parabolic PDE is the Crank–Nicolson method, which is of order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2, \Delta r^2)$. The method consists of approximating the spatial derivatives by the average²

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \approx \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_r^0 u_j^{n+1} + \partial_r^0 u_j^n \right)$$

and

$$rac{\partial^2 u}{\partial r^2} pprox rac{1}{2} \left(\partial_r^- \partial_r^+ u_j^{n+1} + \partial_r^- \partial_r^+ u_j^n
ight).$$

We applied the above method to the Vasicek type PDE (18) with terminal condition given by

$$u(r,T) = 1, (28)$$

and boundary conditions given by

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(r_{\min},t) = 0 \tag{29}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}(r_{\max},t) = 0 \tag{30}$$

to solve a bond pricing problem. As can be noted from 1, the method produces an oscillating solution in the most common case of convective dominant PDE. Particularly in this example, we have maturity of the zero-coupon bond equal to five years, and $\sigma = 0.005$, a = 0.8, b = 0.1. We adopt J = 100 and 5 daily steps.

Conceptually, two $(J + 1) \times (J + 1)$ -dimensional matrices, denoted P and L are defined, as well as system

$$Pu^{n+1} = Lu^n \tag{31}$$

where *P* and *L* are $(I + 1) \times (I + 1)$ matrices.

D. Duffy listed in [17] some drawbacks of the Crank–Nicolson methods in finance. An important drawback is that the resulting tridiagonal matrix *P* for the PDE (25) reads as

$$P = \text{tridiag}\left[-\frac{\mu_j}{4\Delta r} + \frac{S_j}{2\Delta r^2}; \quad \frac{1}{\Delta t} - \frac{S_j}{\Delta r^2} - r; \quad \frac{\mu_j}{4\Delta r} + \frac{S_j}{2\Delta r^2}\right],\tag{32}$$

$$L = \text{tridiag} \left[\frac{\mu_j}{4\Delta r} - \frac{S_j}{2\Delta r^2}; \quad \frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{S_j}{\Delta r^2}; \quad -\frac{\mu_j}{4\Delta r} - \frac{S_j}{2\Delta r^2} \right]$$
(33)

where μ and *S*, are respectively

1

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2} \left[a(b - r_j) + a(b - r_{j+1}) \right]$$
(34)

104

² For the sake of simplicity, we chose to deal with the original spatial variable r first rather than the transformed x.



Fig. 1. Zero-coupon bond prices-Crank-Nicolson method.

$$S = \frac{\sigma^2}{2}.$$
(35)

That is to say, the mean-reversion feature of the Vasicek model runs into difficulties in assuring the negativeness of the offdiagonal entries of the matrix P when volatility dominates the convective term or when the short-term rate is lower than the mean b. This implies having some negative entries of P^{-1} , which result in spurious oscillations (see [30]). As a result, we can see that the Crank–Nicolson solution

$$u^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} P^{-1}(Lu^n)$$
(36)

is not positive-preserving. Thus, we see that the method is not adequate to estimate prices in the fixed-income scenario.

4.2. Up-wind method

and

To produce oscillations free solutions, a common way-out is to approximate the first order spatial derivative of the Crank–Nicolson method by the upwind scheme:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = \begin{cases} \partial_r^+ u_j^n & \text{se} \quad \frac{a(b-r)}{2\Delta r} \ge \frac{\sigma^2}{2\Delta r^2} \\ \partial_r^- u_j^n & \text{se} \quad \frac{a(b-r)}{2\Delta r} < \frac{\sigma^2}{2\Delta r^2}, \end{cases}$$

which simply means adding an artificial volatility

$$\pm \frac{a(b-r)\Delta r}{2} \tag{37}$$

to $\frac{\sigma^2}{2}$ -the coefficient of $\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial r^2}$. This technique eliminates possible negative values in the off-diagonal entries from the *P*-matrix. Another numerical treatment based on flux limiters can be found in [31,32].

There are two main problems with this strategy. The first one is that the numerical solution is now first-order accurate in time and space. Consequently it has slower convergence rates. The second one is that the solution would eventually be mischaracterized due to the numerical diffusion introduced above, which is of order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta r)$.

We can compare the solutions to the PDE (25) as given by the Crank–Nicolson method (Fig. 1), the Up-wind strategy (Fig. 2) and analytically (Fig. 2). Fig. 3 shows indeed that the method produces spurious oscillations free solutions for any time to maturity.

However, inspection of Fig. 2 shows that, in order to prevent the spurious scenario, the numerical diffusion introduced in the up-wind scheme mischaracterizes the solution. Again, we see that this approach is not adequate for pricing in the interest-rate market.

4.3. Fully Implicit method

The use of the fully implicit scheme faces identical problems as those of the Crank–Nicolson *P*-matrix. We define μ and *S* in the transformed variable *x* as

$$\mu = \left(\frac{a(db - e^x + c)}{e^x} - \frac{\sigma^2 d^2}{2e^{2x}}\right)$$
(38)



Fig. 2. Zero-coupon bond prices-up wind method.





Fig. 3. Zero-coupon bond prices surface-up wind method.

and

$$S = \frac{\sigma^2 d^2}{2e^{2x}}.$$
(39)

The discretization of the PDE (25) in this case is:

$$\partial_t^{-} u_j^{n+1} + \mu_j \partial_x^0 u_j^{n+1} + S_j \partial_x^{+} \partial_x^{-} u_j^{n+1} = \left(\frac{e^{x_j} - c}{d}\right) u_j^{n+1}.$$
(40)

This leads us to $(J + 1) \times (J + 1)$ -dimensional matrix P that governs the system

$$u^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} P^{-1} (u^n + D).$$
(41)

The vector *D* has (J - 1) zero entries, and is either zero for Neumann boundary conditions or stems from the Dirichlet boundary conditions. The above fully implicit discretization is of order $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t, \Delta x^2)$. Again, the matrix *P* has a tridiagonal form with entries

$$0 \ge \left[\frac{\mu_j}{2\Delta x} - \frac{S_j}{\Delta x^2}\right],\tag{42}$$

$$0 < \left[\frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{2S_j}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{e^{x_j} - c}{d}\right] \quad \text{and}$$
(43)

$$0 \ge \left[-\frac{\mu_j}{2\Delta x} - \frac{S_j}{\Delta x^2} \right],\tag{44}$$

where in (43) are pointed the diagonal elements, and in (42) and (44) respectively the off-diagonal elements of *P*, for any choice of *a*, *b*, $\sigma \ge 0$ and $-\frac{c}{d} < r$.



Fig. 4. Zero-coupon bond prices-fully implicit method.

Fig. 4 exhibits the spurious oscillating solution for a zero-coupon bond price with maturity in two years and parameters a = 0.8, b = 0.1 and $\sigma = 0.005$.

It is now convenient to introduce the following definitions (see [33,30,34]).

Definition 1. A matrix whose off-diagonal entries are less than or equal to zero is called Z-matrix. Formally:

$$\mathbb{Z}^{n \times n} = \{ Q = (q_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : q_{ij} \le 0, \ i \neq j \}$$

Proposition 1. If a matrix $Q \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$, then the following assertions are equivalent to "Q is a non-singular M-matrix".

- Q has all positive diagonal elements and there exists a positive diagonal matrix W such that QW is strictly diagonally dominant;

– Q is inverse-positive, that is, A^{-1} exists and $A^{-1} \ge 0$;

- Q is positive stable, that is, the real part of each eigenvalue of Q is positive.

Therefore, we cannot guarantee that the matrix *P* of the PDE (40) is an M-matrix $\forall \sigma$, *b* and *a*, $\Delta x \ll 1$. In the case of a non-M-matrix, there are some negative entries of P^{-1} leading to an oscillatory solution. So again, as in the cases of the previous methods, the fully implicit scheme does not lead to reliable pricing estimates of interest-rate derivatives.

5. Modified Fully Implicit method

To overcome the restrictions of the fully implicit method, we introduce a function $f = f(\sigma, b, a, c, x, \Delta r)$ appropriately chosen, given by

$$f = \frac{1}{2\delta} \left(\frac{a(b+c+1)}{e^{x}} + \frac{d^{2}\sigma^{2}}{2e^{2x}} + 1 \right),$$
(45)

which, in conjunction with a new reaction term prescribed as

$$G_{j} = \left(\frac{e^{x_{j}} - c}{d}\right) u_{j}^{n+1} + 4fu_{j}^{n+1} - 2f(u_{j-1}^{n+1} + u_{j+1}^{n+1}),$$
(46)

yields the modified version of the PDE (40), namely

 $\partial_t^{-} u_j^{n+1} + \mu_j \partial_x^0 u_j^{n+1} + S_j \partial_x^{+} \partial_x^{-} u_j^{n+1} = G_j$ (47)

and the corresponding system of equations

$$u^{n+1} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \bar{P}^{-1} (u^n + D).$$
(48)

In this case $\overline{P} = (\overline{p}_{ij})$ turns out to be such that

$$\bar{p}_{j,j-1} \le 0, \tag{49}$$

$$\bar{p}_{j,j} > 0$$
 and (50)

$$\bar{p}_{j,j+1} \le 0. \tag{51}$$



Fig. 5. Zero-coupon bond price. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Moreover,

$$\bar{p}_{j,j} > \sum_{j \neq i} |\bar{p}_{i,j}|,\tag{52}$$

so that \overline{P} becomes an M-matrix.

A similar idea is suggested in [19] for the stock-options case. The following proposition shows that the modified version of the fully implicit scheme – given by (40) with its right side replaced by (46) – is in fact free of spurious oscillations.

Theorem 1. The matrix \overline{P} satisfies inequalities (49)–(51) and is strictly diagonally dominant.

Proof. Relying on the modified version of the fully implicit method associated with PDE (25), and bearing in mind that μ and *S* are given by (38) and (39), it follows that

$$0 \ge \left[\frac{\mu_j}{2\Delta x} - \frac{S_j}{\Delta x^2} - 2f_j\right],\tag{53}$$

$$0 < \left[\frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{2S_j}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{e^{x_j} - c}{d} + 4f_j\right] \quad \text{and}$$
(54)

$$0 \ge \left[-\frac{\mu_j}{2\Delta x} - \frac{S_j}{\Delta x^2} - 2f_j \right]; \tag{55}$$

for any choice of $a, b, \sigma \ge 0$, $-\frac{c}{d} < r$ and some $\delta \ll 1$. \Box

From Proposition 1, \overline{P} is an M-matrix, so that $\overline{P}^{-1} \ge 0$. So, the solution *u* provided by the finite difference scheme (47) is positivity-preserving, being the initial conditions a nonnegative vector, hence negative prices are precluded.

5.1. Stability

We show that u is stable and a non-increasing function in $t \in [0, T]$ (simulation results are provided in Figs. 5 and 12). First, let us state an auxiliary lemma and a result of conditional stability.

Lemma 1. Assume that Q is diagonally dominant by rows and set $\alpha = \min_k (|q_{kk}| - \sum_{i \neq k} |q_{kj}|)$. Then $||Q^{-1}||_{\infty} < \frac{1}{\alpha}$.

Proof. See [35]. □

Proposition 2. Under the (very) mild condition

$$0 < \frac{2S}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{e^x - c}{d} + 4f - \frac{\mu}{\Delta x}$$
(56)

the solution u is stable. So, it is spurious oscillations free and we say that u is conditionally stable.

Proof. The left side of

$$\frac{1}{\Delta t} \frac{1}{\left|\frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{2S}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{e^x - c}{d} + 4f - \frac{\mu}{\Delta x}\right|} < 1$$
(57)

is an upper bound for the spectral radius of the iteration matrix $(\frac{1}{\Delta t}\bar{P}^{-1})$. So, (57) suffices to render *u* stable Moreover, (56) implies (57).

We have that (56) expresses no interplay between Δx and Δt . Hence, we can say that the method is unconditionally stable with respect to Δt , whenever Δx satisfies (56). Actually, this fact strongly suggests that the method is unconditionally stable. We performed several computational tests using a variety of parameters and, in all of them, (56) was satisfied by a huge margin. Thus, for all practical means, we can assert that the method is *unconditionally stable*. Additional support for the assertion of unconditional stability is provided by the strong sufficient condition

$$0 < \frac{2S}{\Delta x^2} + r \quad \text{iff min } r \le r < 0.$$
(58)

To see that (58) indeed implies (56), notice that *S* and $4f - \mu/\Delta x$ are nonnegative numbers and (56) is always satisfied whenever $r \ge 0$ (also recall that $r = (e^x - c)/d$). Note that the negative values of r – which typically occur in the Vasicek scenario – are the focus in (58). Expression (58) also writes

$$\frac{\sigma}{\Delta x} > \left(r + \frac{c}{d}\right)\sqrt{-r} \quad \text{iff } \min r \le r < 0, \tag{59}$$

where we use the fact that $S = \frac{\sigma^2}{2(r+\frac{c}{d})^2}$ (see (39)). If we consider the extended range $-\frac{c}{d} \le r < 0$, we can easily derive the point of maximum of the right side of (59) given by $r^* = -\frac{c}{3d}$, so (59) becomes

$$\Delta x < \frac{\sigma}{2\left(\frac{c}{3d}\right)^{3/2}}.\tag{60}$$

This (strong) sufficient condition is very simple and only depends on σ and the parameters used to adjust the negative range of r, namely, c and d. It clearly shows that low volatilities are more difficult to handle. Again, we entered several values of σ , c and d, and the values allowed for Δx were far beyond the usually required ones.

Proposition 3. The solution of (48) satisfies the discrete maximum principle.

Proof. Applying the sup-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$, using Lemma 1 and the conditional stability property of *u*, we have

$$\|u^{n+1}\|_{\infty} = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \|\bar{P}^{-1}u^n\|_{\infty}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\Delta t} \frac{1}{\left|\frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{2S}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{e^x - c}{d} + 4f - \frac{\mu}{\Delta x}\right|} \|u^n\|_{\infty}$$

$$\leq \|u^n\|_{\infty}. \quad \Box$$

5.2. Consistency and convergence

Theorem 2. The Modified Fully Implicit method associated with PDE (47) is of order of accuracy $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t, \Delta x^2)$.

Proof. The term (46) gives

$$\frac{(e^{x_j}-c)}{d}u(t_n,x_j)+\frac{(e^{x_j}-c)}{d}\Delta t\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(\xi_t,x)-f(\Delta x)^2\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,\xi_x')+\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}(t,\xi_x'')\right)$$

where $t_n \leq \xi_t \leq t_{n+\Delta t}$, $x_j \leq \xi'_x \leq x_{j+\Delta x}$ and $x_{j-\Delta x} \leq \xi''_x \leq x_j$. It follows that (46) has order of accuracy $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t, \Delta x^2)$. In turn, relying on the definitions of $\partial_t^{-} u_j^{n+1}$, $\partial_x^0 u_j^{n+1}$ and $\partial_x^{-} \partial_x^{+} u_j^{n+1}$, it follows that the left side of (40) also has order of accuracy $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t, \Delta x^2)$. \Box

The Lax Theorem states that if a finite difference scheme is consistent (e.g., in the sense of Theorem 2) and stable, then it is convergent [18].

6. Numerical results

In this section, we address two pricing problems in the Vasicek dynamic. The first aims to demonstrate the good performance and the properties of the Modified Fully Implicit method as described in Section 5, addressing a zero-coupon bond and the IDI option. The second aims a comparative analysis addressing the prices of the IDI option according to our approach and that of [21].

Modified Fully implicit method spatial convergence rate.				
Ν	Δx	ϵ	$-\log(\Delta x)$	$-\log(\epsilon)$
200	0.02482	0.01295	1.60509	1.88770
400	0.01244	0.00327	1.90504	2.48572
600	0.00830	0.00142	2.08078	2.84924
800	0.00623	0.00078	2.20553	3.10777

Table 1 Modified Fully Implicit method spatial convergence

6.1. Convergence study

Assuming a continuous compound interest rate, we calculate the discrepancy between the price $P(r_j, 0, T)$ of the bond given by the closed-form expression (9) and the price u_j^0 given by the Modified Fully Implicit method with the prescribed terminal condition of a zero-coupon bond. The solutions are respectively represented by the dashed dark line and red line in Fig. 5. The error measure we adopt is

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (u_j^0 - P(r_j, 0, T))^2},$$
(61)

where the subscript *j* assigns the spatial grid of the interest rates.

In the simulations we use $\Delta t = 0.00099206$ (four time-steps per day) and $\delta = 11 \times 10^{-4}$. Table 1 illustrates discrepancies for solutions with 200, 400, 600 and 800 spatial grid points and parameters set as a = 0.1, b = 0.1 and $\sigma = 0.02$ in a 1-year zero-coupon bond price problem. Columns 2 and 3 show that if $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ then $\epsilon x \rightarrow 0$.

To numerically estimate the order of convergence of the method, let us find q such that

$$\epsilon \leq C \Delta x^q, \tag{62}$$

for constant *C*.

The (log × log) plot of Fig. 6 stems from Table 1 and shows that q = 2.03 in the domain of interest $r \in (-0.25, 0.65)$ implied by $x \in (-5, -0.01)$, c = 0.3 and d = 1.1.

We also tested the convergence rate of the method using the IDI option assuming daily updating. Since in this case the limit value of the price is not available, we look at ratios of differences between u_i^0 computed for different J's, given by

$$q = \log_2 \left[\frac{u_j^0 - u_j^0}{u_j^0 - u_j^0} \right].$$
(63)

For $r_j = 0.1$ and starting with J = 1600 grid points we obtained q = 2.02. To confirm the performance of the method for the case where the limit value of the price is not available, we replicated the above procedure for the zero-coupon bond (we did not use the prices given by the closed-form expression (9)). Again, a consistent rate was obtained, namely q = 1.997. All the results above corroborate the early consistency analysis and the method's good performance.

As a lead-in to the next section, where our main results appear, we consider two zero-coupon bond pricing problems, where the sole difference between them is adopting a daily compounded interest in one problem and a continuously compounded interest in the other. Again the Modified Fully Implicit method is applied, now in conjunction with the algorithm described at the end of Section 3. The comparison can be seen in Fig. 5 where the blue line refers to the daily compounded case and the red line (afore-mentioned) stands for the continuously compounded case. In this particular example, the relative discrepancy (defined in the same lines as in Eq. (65)) did not exceed 10% in the whole interest rate domain. In contrast to this, we will see that the prices in the IDI case differ significantly if one adopts the continuous or the discrete updating scheme.

The small discrepancies we found here are in fact a well known result when interest rates are deterministic. However, we believe this is the first time this result is observed for stochastic interest rates following the Vasicek dynamic.

We remind that, in the zero-coupon bond case, the discrete compound yields can be straightforwardly obtained from the continuous compounding case. However, this is not the case when dealing with complex types of interest rate derivatives (e.g., callable bonds). For these types of derivatives, the PDE technique using discretely compounded interest rates can indeed be helpful.

6.2. Pricing

We compare the prices of IDI call options under the Vasicek model, considering the following approaches:

• We obtain the estimates of the prices according to the Modified Fully Implicit method (45) and the coordinate transformation (23)–(25), and consider updating the IDI path discretely. This updating rule allows us to track realistically the evolution of the index and to achieve the exact pay-off representation.



Fig. 6. Convergence rate analysis.



Fig. 7. IDI call option prices. Relative discrepancy = 45.88% at r = 10%.



Fig. 8. IDI call option prices. Relative discrepancy = 50.96% at r = 10%.

• We solve the closed form expressions given in [21] for prices, assuming a continuously compounded interest rate, which is actually an idealization for mathematical tractability.

The numerical results of cases I, II, III and IV are summarized in Fig. 7, 8, 9, 10, respectively, where we set a = 0.1265, b = 0.0802 and $\sigma = 0.0218$ in the Vasicek model. This calibration stemmed from the Brazilian overnight interest rate data from 2002 to 2014 and was produced via the General Method of Moments [36]. The initial value of the IDI is 100.000 points. The Modified Fully Implicit method is used with 800 grid points for the ID index and a spatial mesh of 400 grid points for the interest rate. We use 5 steps per day with a daily jump condition at the last step, which satisfies the mild stability conditions required. Cases I and II (resp. cases III and IV) refer to a call option (resp. put option). Cases I and III (resp. II and



Fig. 9. IDI put option prices. Relative discrepancy = 54.8% at r = 10%.



Fig. 10. IDI call option prices. Relative discrepancy = 38.62% at r = 10%.



Fig. 11. IDI call option prices with meshes of 100, 150, 250, 400 and 600 points: Strike = 100 900, $\sigma = 0.1$, a = 0.2, b = 0.1, T = 20 days.

IV) have maturity in 252 days (resp. 504 days) and strike K = 109.550 points (resp. K = 122.000 points). In the discretely compounding approach, we use the terminal condition given by (22) (the option's payoff) to solve the prices of the put (in lieu of that given by (21) of the call). For the continuous compound approach, we use the put–call parity to produce the prices Π of the put, namely,

$$\Pi(r_i, t, T) = C(r_i, t, T) + K \cdot P(r_i, t, T) - y(0),$$

(64)

where y(0) = 100.00, $P(r_j, t, T)$ is the zero-coupon price given by (9) and $C(r_j, t, T)$ is the IDI call option price given by (6). Case V is summarized in Fig. 11, where we set a = 0.2, b = 0.1 and $\sigma = 0.1$ in the Vasicek model and a short maturity of 20 days. We set several refinements in this case for spatial mesh sizes with 50; 150; 250; 400 and 600 points.



Fig. 12. How the prices of an IDI call option evolve in time (using the Modified Fully Implicit scheme). $IDI(0) = 100\,000$, Strike = 100 900, a = 0.5, b = 0.1, $\sigma = 0.05$, T = 40 days.

The first thing to notice from the numerical data is that, unlike the zero-coupon scenario previously mentioned, the relative discrepancy between prices obtained from the approaches under concern are not negligible at all, even with low volatilities (cases I–IV) and short maturities (case V). The relative discrepancy between prices is here defined as

$$\theta_j = \frac{(\eta(r_j, 0, T) - u_j^0)}{u_j^0},\tag{65}$$

where η stands for *C* or Π . So, for $r_j = 10\%$, we have $\theta_j = 45.88\%$, $\theta_j = 50.96\%$, $\theta_j = 54.8\%$ and $\theta_j = 38.6\%$ for cases I–V, in that order. We recall that in the zero-coupon scenario, such relative difference did not exceed 10%. So, using one or other method makes a difference. Notice that neither price represents a benchmark—which should correspond to a framework that models the IDI discretely and provides the exact solution for the price. However, the Modified Fully Implicit method can be refined to approach the benchmark. On the other hand, any short rate modeling framework which adopts the IDI continuously compounded hypothesis – which is the case of [21] – is obviously inconsistent with refinements with respect to the index updating, so they cannot approach the benchmark. Recalling that the discrete updating procedure for calls (resp. puts) produces a cheaper (resp. more expensive) payoff than the continuous updating one, we expect prices to be cheaper (resp. more expensive) in the former than the latter procedure, for a reasonable mesh refinement. Figs. 7–11 show this indeed. Fig. 11 shows the downward movement of the prices as the spatial mesh sizes are refined in a sequence of 100, 150, 250, 400 and 600 points, leading the solutions towards cheaper call option prices, which actually represent the benchmark. So, even with reasonably refined meshes, our call prices are cheaper than those of the continuous updating case of [21]. As the mesh is refined, our prices move further downwards, approaching the benchmark and simultaneously move further away from the prices of [21].

With a view to showing how prices evolve in time, Fig. 12 provides the prices of an IDI call option considering a sequence of 8 time changes. Again, we change the problem parameters, now to a = 0.5, b = 0.1, $\sigma = 0.05$ and T = 40. We do this to show that the method is not biased toward any specific parametrization. The time sequence starts from t = 0 and ends at t = 40 days—where prices actually coincide with the option's payoff, in this case with strike K = 100.900. As above, the Modified Fully Implicit method is used with 800 grid points for the ID index and a spatial mesh of 400 grid points for the interest rate. The example gives another indication of fitness of the method, in that a sort of rotation of the solution surface is observed as t varies. This is an intrinsic feature of Asian-style options in any market (see [37]).

6.3. Hedging

Before we present the main result of this section, which is summarized in Fig. 16, it is worth addressing some aspects – with respect to a certain replicating portfolio and the hedging error – which are inherent to the interest rate scenario and differ much from those of stock markets. The motivation for doing so is that not much information of this kind is found in the fixed income literature. Also, parallel to the conclusions we obtained in Section 6.2, it gives us a glimpse on how the results may be misleading using the classical approach. In what follows in this section, we set the initial IDI value *IDI*(0) = 100.000, strike K = 109500, the Vasicek parameters a = 0.1265, b = 0.0802 and $\sigma = 0.0218$, and maturity in T = 252 days.

So, we create a discrete (one daily rebalance) self financing delta hedging strategy based on the zero coupon bond, in the short position of the IDI call option. Figs. 13 and 14 address the continuous updating of the ID index. The classical tools are used to build the strategy, namely the prices given by Eq. (6) and the deltas according to (14). Fig. 13 and the left panel of Fig. 14 illustrate one realization of the hedging strategy.

The left panel of Fig. 13 shows that the values of the delta-derived replicating portfolio tracks very well the option prices over time. The right panel shows the delta values while the left panel of Fig. 14 shows the borrowings in the bank account. The delta in the negative field means that the trader must sell $|\Delta|$ bonds whose unit value is P(t, T) and deposit the proceeds



Fig. 13. Continuous updating of the IDI & [21]: Replicating portfolio and delta values.



Fig. 14. Continuous updating of the IDI & [21]: bank account and hedging error.

in a bank account earning the risk-free DI rate. This is the opposite to what occurs in other interest rate derivatives (e.g., bond options), since there the issuer must settle his/her liability by delivering an asset – the bond – while in the IDI option he/she must deliver money in cash.

The right panel of Fig. 14 shows the hedging error, which denotes the difference between the portfolio value at the expiration time and the payoff of the IDI call. This error stems from the discreteness of the hedging strategy. The histogram in the figure was generated from 10.000 Monte Carlo simulations. Its mean is approximately zero and, due to the discreteness of the strategy, the trader will have to deal with gains and losses that have an approximate normal distribution to settle his/her liability. The good performance observed is an expected result, since the closed form expressions of [21] correspond to this exact modeling framework, i.e., the Vasicek model and a continuously compounded ID index. In contrast, the use of the closed form expressions when a discretely updating of the index is adopted – and this is actually the real life situation – produces a relative hedging error around 40% which is in accordance with the experiments of Section 6.2. This is a very large error indeed; traders are usually aware of this and perform some compensations in the option prices. Fig. 15 illustrates these aspects.

Let us now return to the main subject of the section, which refers to the comparison of the deltas obtained according to the modeling frameworks described at the beginning of Section 6.2, i.e.,

- Under the assumption of a discrete updating of the ID index, we use the Modified Fully Implicit method with a spatial
 mesh size of 400 points to obtain the price estimates *u* of the IDI option, in conjunction with Eq. (16) to calculate the delta.
 A fourth order accurate central finite difference scheme was used to obtain numerically the derivatives for Eq. (16).
- We use the closed form expression (Eq. (6)) for the prices and calculate the delta according to (14), in which case a continuous updating scheme is assumed.

Fig. 16 illustrates the analytical and numerical deltas with respect to the short-term rate at time *t*. The discrepancies exhibited strongly suggest that the updating of cumulative interest rate indexes should be treated realistically when pricing and hedging options.



Fig. 15. IDI call option hedging error: discrete updating of the IDI & [21].



Fig. 16. IDI call option deltas.

7. Conclusions

We provide a new numerical finite difference method for pricing and hedging derivatives in the fixed income markets. The Modified Fully Implicit (interest rate) method—as we call it, is unconditionally stable and consistent, and at the same time exhibits high accuracy in obtaining estimates of prices and hedges. These qualities are preserved in the whole spectrum of volatilities that occurs in the interest rate dynamics.

We benefited from the good results that the numerical method gives, allowing the updating procedure of the interest to be discrete – which in fact is the realistic approach – rather than continuous. The results that we have obtained suggest that this scheme, which corresponds to obtaining estimates of prices for the exact' problem (referring to the discrete updating procedure of Asian options), is more efficient than that of obtaining 'exact' prices – via closed form expressions – for the approximate problem (referring to the continuous updating procedure).

We considered the Vasicek model in this work. The method however can be adapted to other types of models (e.g., CIR and Sandmann–Sondermann) with modifications of modest proportions. A complementary study on this subject matter is under way.

Acknowledgment

This work was partially supported by CNPq under the Grant No. 472474/2011.

References

- [1] F. Black, The pricing of commodity contracts, J. Financ. Econ. 3 (1-2) (1976) 167-179.
- [2] J.F. Marshall, V.K. Bansal, Financial Engineering: A Complete Guide to Financial Innovation, New York Institute of Finance, 1991.
- [3] O. Vasicek, An equilibrium characterization of the term structure, J. Financ. Econ. 5 (1977) 177–188.
- [4] F. Jamshidian, An exact bond option formula, J. Finance 44 (1) (1989) 205–209.
- [5] G. Hübner, The pricing of swaptions and caps under the gaussian model of interest rate, Working papers/INSEAD (97/22/FIN).
- [6] F. Black, P. Karasinski, Bond and option pricing when short rates are lognormal, Financ. Anal. J. (1991) 52-59.

- [7] J.C. Cox, J. Ingersoll, S. Ross, A theory of the term structure of interest rates, Econometrica 53 (1986) 385–407.
- [8] D. Sondermann, K. Sandmann, On the estability of log-normal interest rate models and the pricing of eurodollar futures, Sonderforschungsbereich Inf. Koord. Wirtschaftlicher Akt. 1 (B-263) (1995) 1–12.
- [9] M. Bouziane, Pricing Interest-Rate Derivatives: A Fourier-Transform Based Approach, Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [10] P. Glasserman, Monte Carlo Methods in Financial Engineering, in: Applications of Mathematics: Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, Springer, 2004.
- [11] J.C. Hull, Options, Futures and Others Derivatives, seventh ed., Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009.
- [12] R. Farnoosh, A. Sobhani, H. Rezazadeh, M.H. Beheshti, Numerical method for discrete double barrier option pricing with time-dependent parameters, Comput. Math. Appl. 70 (2015) 2006–2013.
- [13] A. Tagliani, M. Milev, Laplace transform and finite difference methods for the Black-Scholes equation, Appl. Math. Comput. 220 (2013) 649-658.
- [14] Y. Kim, H. Bae, H.K. Koo, Option pricing and greeks via a moving least square meshfree method, Quant. Finance 14 (2014) 1753–1764.
- [15] Y. Hong, S. Lee, T. Li, Numerical method of pricing discretely monitored Barrier option, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 278 (2015) 149-161.
- [16] R. Burden, J. Faires, Numerical Analysis, Cengage Learning, 2010.
- [17] D. Duffy, A critique of the Crank-Nicolson strengths and weaknesses for financial instrument pricing, WILMOTT Mag. (2004) 68-76.
- [18] D. Tavella, Quantitative Methods in Derivatives Pricing, John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, 2002.
- [19] M. Milev, A. Tagliani, Efficient implicit scheme with positivity preserving and smoothing properties, J. Comput. Appl. Math. (243) (2013) 1-9.
- [20] A. Brace, Engineering BGM, in: Financial Mathematics Series, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Florida, 2008.
- [21] C. Vieira, P. Pereira, Closed form formula for the price of the options on the 1 day Brazilian interfinancial deposits index IDI1, in: Annals of the XXII Meeting of the Brazilian Econometric Society, Campinas, Brazil, Vol. 2, 2000.
- [22] C. Almeida, J.V.M. Vicente, Term structure movements implicit in Asian option prices, Quant. Finance 12 (2012) 119–134.
- [23] A.D. Genaro, M. Avellaneda, Pricing interest rate derivatives under monetary policy changes, in: Annals of XIII Brazilian Finance Meeting, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2013.
- [24] P. Tankov, R. Cont, Financial Modelling with Jump Processes, in: Financial Mathematics Series, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Florida, 2003.
- [25] N.P.B. Bollen, Derivatives and the price of risk, J. Futures Mark. 17 (7) (1997) 839-854.
- [26] B. Oksendal, Stochastic Differential Equations, sixth ed., Springer, New York, 2007.
- [27] P. Wilmott, Paul Wilmott on Quantitative Finance, second ed., John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 2006.
- [28] R. Zvan, P. Forsyth, K. Vetzal, Discrete Asian barrier options, J. Comput. Finance (3) (1999) 41-68.
- [29] A. Iserles, A First Course in the Numerical Analysis of Differential Equations, second ed., in: Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- [30] G. Windisch, M-matrices in Numerical Analysis, in: Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik, Springer, Leipzig, 1989.
- [31] J.W. Thomas, Numerical Partial Differential Equations, Springer, New York, 1999.
- [32] R. Zvan, P.A. Forsyth, K. Vetzal, Robust numerical methods for PDE models of Asian options, J. Comput. Finance 1 (1998) 39-78.
- [33] A. Berman, R.J. Plemmons, Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences, in: Computer Sciences and Applied Mathematics, Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [34] R.J. Plemmons, M-matrix characterizations, Linear Algebra Appl. (18) (1977) 175-188.
- [35] J.M. Varah, A lower bound for the smallest singular value of a matrix, Linear Algebra Appl. (11) (1975) 3-5.
- [36] K.C. Chan, G.A. Karolyi, F.A. Longstaff, A.B. Sanders, An empirical comparison of alternative models of the short-term interest rate, J. Finance 3 (1992) 1209–1227.
- [37] R.U. Seydel, Tools for Computational Finance, fourth ed., Springer, Berlin, 2009.