## Homework 5 (Sol)

## March 10, 2016

**1.** Let W be a Brownian motion and let  $\{\mathcal{F}(t); t \geq 0\}$  be filtration for W. We claimed in class that if  $Y(t) = \int_0^t \alpha(s) \, dW(s)$ , and if  $\tau$  is a stopping time with respect to  $\{\mathcal{F}(t); t \geq 0\}$ , then  $Y(t \wedge \tau) = \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s)\alpha(s) \, dW(s)$ .

In this problem we want to show a special case of this. Assume that  $\tau(\omega) \leq T$  for all  $\omega$  where T is positive constant. We want to show

$$W(\tau) = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s) \, dW(s)$$
 (1)

a) Case (i): The stopping time  $\tau$  takes values in a discrete set  $t_0 = 0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_n = T$ . In this case, identify random variables  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}$  such that  $\alpha_k$  is  $\mathcal{F}(t_k)$ -measurable for each k, and

$$\mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \alpha_k \mathbf{1}_{[t_k, t_{k+1})}(s).$$

This shows that  $\mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s)$  is a simple process as defined in Shreve, section 4.2.1. (What we call  $\alpha_k$  here is what is denoted by  $\Delta(t_k)$ 

Ans:

Note that

$$\{0 \le s < \tau\} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} \{0 \le s < \tau, t_k \le s < t_{k+1}\} \\ = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} \{\tau > t_k, t_k \le s < t_{k+1}\}.$$

Indeed, if  $t_k \leq s < t_{k+1}$  and  $s < \tau$  then it must be the case that  $\tau > t_k$ . Conversely, if  $t_k \leq s < t_{k+1}$  and  $\tau > t_k$  then since  $\tau$  takes values only in  $t_k$ 's, it must be that  $\tau \geq t_{k+1}$  and thus  $s < \tau$ . So  $\alpha_k = \mathbf{1}_{\tau > t_k}$ . Note that  $\alpha_k \in \mathcal{F}(t_k)$  as the requirement for simple function for definition of stochastic integral as well. Thus

$$\int_{0}^{T} \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s) dW(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\tau > t_{k}} \mathbf{1}_{[t_{k},t_{k+1})}(s) dW(s)$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\tau > t_{k}} W(t_{k+1}) - W(t_{k})$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} \mathbf{1}_{\tau > t_{k}} W(t_{k+1}) - W(t_{k})$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} W(t_{k+1}) - W(t_{k})$$
$$= W(\tau).$$

b) Case (ii). The general case. Let  $\tau$  be any stopping time with  $\tau(\omega) \leq T$  for all  $\omega$ . Let  $\tau^{(n)}$  be the approximation to  $\tau$  constructed in part (a) of exercise 3. Since  $\tau^{(n)}$  takes values in a discrete set, equation (1) is true when  $\tau$  is replace by  $\tau^{(n)}$ , for each n. Argue that  $\lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_n(\omega) = \tau(\omega)$  for all  $\omega$ , and conclude that (1) is true for  $\tau$ .

Ans:

It is clear that

$$|\tau_n - \tau| \le \frac{1}{n}.$$

Thus  $\tau_n \to \tau$  as  $n \to \infty$ . Because W(t) is continuous, it follows that

$$W(\tau_n) \to W(\tau).$$

Also

$$E(\int_0^T |\mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau_n)}(s) - \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s)|^2 ds) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Thus

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau_n)}(s) dW(s) \to \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s) dW(s).$$

By identifying the limits, it follows that

$$W(\tau) = \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau)}(s) dW(s).$$

2. Consider the two asset, risk-neutral model

$$dS_1(t) = rS_1(t) dt + \sigma_1(S_1(t), S_2(t))S_1(t) d\widetilde{W}_1(t)$$
  

$$dS_2(t) = rS_2(t) dt + \sigma_2(S_1(t), S_2(t))S_2(t) d\widetilde{W}_2(t)$$

where  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{W}_2$  are independent Brownian motions and  $\sigma_1(x_1, x_2)$  and  $\sigma_2(x_1, x_2)$ are strictly positive, bounded, differentiable functions. You may take as known that, given  $S_1(0)$  and  $S_2(0)$ , this system has a unique solution which is a Markov process. Let  $\tau$  be the first time that  $S_1(t)$  hits the level B > 0, and let  $\rho$  be the first time  $S_2(t)$ hits B. Consider an option which knocks out if either  $S_1(t)$  hits B or  $S_2(t)$  hits B, and otherwise pays  $(S_1(T)S_2(T) - K)^+$  at time T. Denote its price by V(t).

a) Show that  $V(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \land \rho > t\}} v(t, S_1(t), S_2(t))$ , where  $v(t, x_1, x_2) = 0$  if  $x_1 \ge B$  or  $x_2 \ge B$ , and otherwise,

$$v(t, x_1, x_2) = e^{-r(T-t)} \tilde{E} \Big[ \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_1(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_2(u) < B} \Big( S_1(T) S_2(T) - K \Big)^+ \Big| S_1(t) = x_1, S_2(t) = x_2 \Big].$$

Ans: We have

$$V(T) = \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,T]} S_1(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,T]} S_2(u) < B} \left( S_1(T) S_2(T) - K \right)^+.$$

Thus

$$V(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,t]} S_1(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,t]} S_2(u) < B} \tilde{E} \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_1(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_2(u) < B} \\ \left( S_1(T) S_2(T) - K \right)^+ |\mathcal{F}(t) \right)$$

or

$$V(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,t]} S_1(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,t]} S_2(u) < B} E \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_1(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_2(u) < B} \\ \left( S_1(T) S_2(T) - K \right)^+ |S_1(t), S_2(t) \rangle, \end{array} \right)$$

by Markov property of  $S_1, S_2$ . Note that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,t]}S_1(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[0,t]}S_2(u) < B} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \land \rho > t\}}.$$

Indeed, if the LHS = 1 then neither  $S_1$  nor  $S_2$  has hit *B* before or at time *t*. Thus the minimum of the hitting time to *b* of  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  must be > *t* and so the RHS = 1. On the other hand, if LHS = 0, then either  $S_1$  or  $S_2$  has hit *B* before or at time *t*. But then either  $\rho$  or  $\tau$  is  $\leq t$  thus the RHS is also 0. b) Show that  $e^{-r(t\wedge\tau\wedge\rho)}v(t, S_1(t\wedge\tau\wedge\rho), S_2(t\wedge\tau\wedge\rho))$  is a martingale and derive a partial differential equation for  $v(t, x_1, x_2)$ . Specify the domain in  $(x_1, x_2)$ -space on which this equation is valid and all boundary and terminal conditions.

Ans: We need to show

$$v(t, S_1(t \wedge \tau \wedge \rho), S_2(t \wedge \tau \wedge \rho)) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau \wedge \rho > t\}} v(t, S_1(t), S_2(t))$$

If  $\tau \wedge \rho > t$  then RHS =  $v(t, S_1(t), S_2(t))$  and it is clear that the LHS =  $v(t, S_1(t), S_2(t))$  as well.

If  $\tau \wedge \rho < t$  then RHS = 0 and either

$$S_1(t \wedge \tau \wedge \rho) = S_1(\tau \wedge \rho) = B$$

or

$$S_2(t \wedge \tau \wedge \rho) = S_2(\tau \wedge \rho) = B.$$

Suppose the first case is true. By the immediate crossing property of  $S_1$  we have

$$v(t, S_{1}(t \wedge \tau \wedge \rho), S_{2}(t \wedge \tau \wedge \rho)) = e^{-r(T-t)} \tilde{E} \Big[ \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_{1}(u) < B} \mathbf{1}_{\max_{[t,T]} S_{2}(u) < B} \Big( S_{1}(T) S_{2}(T) - K \Big)^{+} \\ \Big| S_{1}(t) = B, S_{2}(t) = x_{2} \Big] \Big|_{x_{2} = S_{2}(\tau \wedge \rho)} \\ = 0.$$

The other case is similar. So we also have the LHS = 0.

Now denote  $\rho \wedge \tau := \overline{\tau}$  to simplify notation and apply Itos' formula, we have

$$\begin{split} e^{-r(t\wedge\bar{\tau})}v(t\wedge\bar{\tau},S_{1}(t\wedge\bar{\tau}),S_{2}(t\wedge\bar{\tau})) &= v(t,S_{1}(0),S_{2}(0)) \\ &+ \int_{0}^{t\wedge\bar{\tau}} e^{-ru}v_{x_{1}}(u,S_{1}(u),S_{2}(u))\,\sigma_{1}(S_{1}(u),S_{2}(u))S_{1}(u)\,d\widetilde{W}_{1}(u) \\ &+ \int_{0}^{t\wedge\bar{\tau}} e^{-ru}v_{x_{1}}(u,S_{1}(u),S_{2}(u))\,\sigma_{1}(S_{1}(u),S_{2}(u))S_{1}(u)\,d\widetilde{W}_{2}(u) \\ &+ \int_{0}^{t\wedge\bar{\tau}} e^{-ru}\mathcal{L}v(u,S_{1}(u),S_{2}(u))\,du, \end{split}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}v(t,x_1,x_2) = -rv(t,x_1,x_2) + v_t(t,x_1,x_2) + rx_1v_{x_1}(t,x_1,x_2) + rx_2v_{x_2}(t,x_1,x_2) + [\sigma_1^2(x_1,x_2)x_1^2/2]v_{x_1x_1}(t,x_1,x_2) + [\sigma_2^2(x_1,x_2)x_2^2/2]v_{x_2x_2}(t,x_1,x_2).$$

In order that the previous expression be a martingale, the ordinary integral should be identically 0, and this can be achieved by setting

$$\mathcal{L}v(t, x_1, x_2) = 0$$
 for  $0 \le t < T, \ 0 \le x_1 < B, \ 0 \le x_2 < B$ .

The domain is important. In the integral  $\int_0^{t\wedge\bar{\tau}} \mathcal{L}v(u, S_1(u), S_2(u)) du$ , the process  $(S_1(u), S_2(u))$  remains in  $\{0 < x_1 < B, 0 < x_2 < B\}$  until  $t \wedge \bar{\tau}$ , so we want and only need to assume the existence and continuity of first and second derivatives of v in this region.

The boundary and terminal conditions are  $v(t, 0, x_2) = v(t, x_1, 0) = 0$  for  $0 \le t < T$ ;  $v(t, x_1, B) = v(t, B, x_2) = 0$  for  $0 \le x_1, x_2 \le B$  and  $t \le T$ , and  $v(T, x_1, x_2) = (x_1x_2 - K)^+$  for  $0 \le x_1, x_2 < B$ .