

# Option pricing with Markov-modulated dynamics.

A. Jobert\*

University of Cambridge

L.C.G. Rogers†

University of Cambridge

December 24, 2004

## Abstract

Markov-modulated models for equity prices have recently been extensively studied in the literature. In this paper, we apply some old results on the Wiener-Hopf factorisation of Markov processes to a range of option-pricing problems for such models. The first example is the perpetual American put, where the exact (numerical) solution is obtained without discretising any PDE. We then show how the methodology of Rogers & Stapleton [22] can be used to tackle finite-horizon problems, and illustrate the methodology by pricing European, American, single barrier and double barrier options under Markov-modulated dynamics.

## 1 Introduction.

Though outstandingly successful as a leading-order model for an asset price, the familiar log-Brownian paradigm fails to fit observation in various ways, such as the fact that implied volatility is not constant. Among the many attempted variations and extensions, one of the most natural is to allow the dynamics of the underlying process to be a log-Brownian motion whose volatility and rate of return are stochastic in some way. Allowing the volatility to be stochastic is the central theme of the extensive literature on *stochastic volatility modelling*, of which [24, 15, 13, 2, 14] is a small sample. Allowing the rate of return to be stochastic is of relevance to portfolio optimisation, but not to asset pricing<sup>1</sup>, and the literature on *risk-sensitive optimal control* develops this theme in various ways; see, for example [5, 6, 3, 20].

Perhaps the simplest way to introduce additional randomness into the standard log-Brownian model is to let the volatility and rate of return be functions of a finite-state

---

\*Statistical Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK;  
A.Jobert@statslab.cam.ac.uk

†Statistical Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WB, UK;  
L.C.G.Rogers@statslab.cam.ac.uk

<sup>1</sup>Of course, for asset pricing we change measure so that the rate of return becomes the riskless rate.

Markov chain; we can imagine that such a model might describe regime-switching behaviour of some kind, perhaps related to the business cycle, or other economic indicators. The terms ‘regime-switching’ and ‘Markov-modulated dynamics’ are used to describe such models, and there are already interesting contributions here, such as applications to option pricing [12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 4, 26], portfolio optimization [27, 25] and optimal trading strategies [28]. In applications, it is likely that the number of states of the Markov chain will be small (otherwise estimation becomes a problem), and it is then natural to think of such a model as ‘nearly’ a log Brownian motion, with occasional parameter shifts. Some explicit solutions can be found for a two-state Markov chain but as the problems get harder we are soon led into PDE-related numerical methods (smoothed approximation of boundary conditions [26], two-point boundary value problems [28, 8, 10], discretization of associated dynamic programming equations [12]). The coupled PDEs which arise in these models will rarely be soluble in closed form, though finite-difference methods are still quite competitive.

This paper approaches such models from a different direction, by viewing the Markov-modulated asset as ‘nearly’ a Markov chain. This approach relies on some old work on Wiener-Hopf factorisation of Markov processes (and particular Markov chains) dating back to the paper of Barlow, Rogers & Williams [1] from 1980; the focus is on level-crossings of the asset price process. We find a quite different toolkit applies in this approach, namely, linear algebra; this leads to numerical schemes that are very efficient, and quite able to handle moderate-sized problems, which we will illustrate by pricing a perpetual American put<sup>2</sup> on such an asset. Let us emphasise immediately a key difference between the present approach and the traditional PDE approach: here we shall be obtaining (numerically) *exact* solutions to the problem, *not* just approximations. There is no need to solve any dynamic programming equation or discretize any PDE.

Next, we move to a pricing framework with finite time horizon and Markov regimes. The approach here extends the methodology developed by Rogers and Stapleton [22] for the standard log-Brownian model, and is illustrated by pricing the European call, the American put, and finally double barrier options.

## 2 General setup and noisy Wiener-Hopf factorization.

The stock price is modelled as

$$dS_t = S_t[\sigma(\xi_t)dW_t + r(\xi_t)dt], \tag{1}$$

where  $W_t$  is a standard Brownian Motion,  $r$  denotes as usual the risk-free interest rate,  $\sigma$  denotes the Markov-modulated volatility of the stock and  $\xi$  is an irreducible Markov chain with values in the finite set  $I$ ,  $|I| = d$ . Notice that the riskless rate may vary with the

---

<sup>2</sup>This problem was solved for a 2-state chain by Guo and Zhang [12].

underlying Markov chain. The log price  $X_t = \log(S_t)$  then satisfies

$$dX_t = \sigma(\xi_t)dW_t + [r(\xi_t) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma(\xi_t)^2]dt, \quad (2)$$

which can be rewritten as, say:

$$dX_t = \sigma(\xi_t)dW_t + v(\xi_t)dt. \quad (3)$$

The idea of the Wiener-Hopf factorisation approach is to study the crossings back and forth over levels of  $X$ . To help in this, define for  $t \geq 0$ <sup>3</sup>

$$\tau_t^\pm \equiv \inf\{u : \pm X_u > t\} \quad (4)$$

We aim to characterise the distribution of the times  $\tau_t^\pm$  and the law of the chain at these times, and to do this we will seek martingales  $M_t^f$  of the following form:

$$M_t^f = \exp\left(-\int_0^t r(\xi_u)du\right) f(\xi_t, X_t) \quad (5)$$

for some function  $f$ . Itô's formula gives, up to a local martingale part:

$$dM_t^f \doteq \exp\left(-\int_0^t r(\xi_u)du\right) \left[(Q - R)f + \frac{1}{2}\Sigma f_{XX} + V f_X\right] dt \quad (6)$$

where  $R$  is the diagonal matrix whose  $i$ th diagonal element is equal to  $r(i)$ ,  $\Sigma$  is the diagonal matrix whose  $i$ th diagonal element is equal to  $\sigma(i)^2$  and  $V = R - \frac{1}{2}\Sigma$ . We therefore require

$$(Q - R)f + \frac{1}{2}\Sigma f_{XX} + V f_X = 0 \quad (7)$$

Seeking separable  $f$  of the form  $f(\xi_t, X_t) = g(\xi_t) \exp(-\lambda X_t)$  gives rise to the following equation to be solved in  $\lambda$  and  $g$ :

$$(Q - R)g + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \Sigma g - \lambda V g = 0 \quad (8)$$

Now this is just the ‘‘quadratic eigenvalue’’ problem considered by Kennedy and Williams [17], which can be reduced to a standard eigenvalue problem as follows. Premultiplying the above equation by  $2\Sigma^{-1}$  gives

$$2\Sigma^{-1}(Q - R)g + \lambda^2 g - 2\lambda \Sigma^{-1}Vg = 0. \quad (9)$$

This can be reformulated as a system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda g &= h \\ \lambda h &= 2\Sigma^{-1}Vh - 2\Sigma^{-1}(Q - R)g \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>With the usual convention that  $\inf(\emptyset) = \infty$ .

which can be rewritten as the following (standard) eigenvalue problem:

$$A \begin{pmatrix} g \\ h \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -2\Sigma^{-1}(Q - R) & 2\Sigma^{-1}R - I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g \\ h \end{pmatrix} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} g \\ h \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

If  $(g, \lambda)$  solve (11) then

$$M_t^f = \exp \left( - \int_0^t r(\xi_u) du - \lambda X_t \right) g(\xi_t) \quad (12)$$

is a martingale. The argument given in [1] serves to show that there are exactly  $d$  eigenvalues of  $A$  in the left open half plane, and  $d$  in the right open half plane, a fact that will be needed later.

### 3 Markov-modulated perpetual American put.

Our goal in this section is to compute the value

$$v(j, x) \equiv \sup_{\tau} E \left[ \exp \left( - \int_0^{\tau} r(\xi_s) ds \right) (K - e^{X_{\tau}})^+ \mid \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x \right] \quad (13)$$

of the perpetual American put with Markov-modulated dynamics. The special case of the problem where there is no Markov modulation (that is,  $|I| = 1$ ) is well known<sup>4</sup>: the optimal rule is to wait until the price of the asset falls below some critical boundary value  $L^*$ , and then immediately exercise. Standard first passage time calculations for Brownian Motion lead to the following closed-form expression for the perpetual American put:

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} K - \exp(x) & \text{if } x \leq \log(L^*), \\ (K - L^*)(L^*)^{\gamma} \exp(-\gamma x) & \text{if } x > \log(L^*), \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where  $\gamma = 2r/\sigma^2$ ,  $L^* = \gamma K/(\gamma + 1)$ .

When  $|I| > 1$ , the optimal rule is to exercise when the price of the asset falls below some critical level which depends on the current state of the modulating Markov chain  $\xi$ . This intuitively-obvious form of the solution follows immediately from the next simple result.

**Proposition 1** *If  $\varphi(x) \equiv (K - e^x)^+$ , then for each  $j \in I$  the function*

$$x \mapsto v(j, x) - \varphi(x)$$

*is non-decreasing in  $(0, \log(K))$ .*

---

<sup>4</sup>See the original solution of McKean [19], and Karatzas [16] for a discussion in a more general setting.

PROOF. Pick  $0 < x < x + \delta < \log(K)$ , and let  $\tau^*$  denote the optimal stopping time to be used if  $X_0 = x$ . We consider instead what would happen if we were to use the stopping rule  $\tau^*$  but with initial log-price  $x + \delta$ . Using the elementary inequality  $(a - b)^+ \geq a^+ - b^+$ , we get<sup>5</sup>

$$\begin{aligned}
v(j, x + \delta) &\equiv \sup_{\tau} E[e^{-R(\tau)} \varphi(X_{\tau}) | \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x + \delta] \\
&\geq E[e^{-R(\tau^*)} \varphi(X_{\tau^*}) | \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x + \delta] \\
&= E[e^{-R(\tau^*)} \varphi(X_{\tau^*} + \delta) | \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x] \\
&= E[e^{-R(\tau^*)} (K - e^{X(\tau^*) + \delta})^+ | \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x] \\
&= E[e^{-R(\tau^*)} (K - e^{X(\tau^*)} - (e^{\delta} - 1)e^{X(\tau^*)})^+ | \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x] \\
&\geq E[e^{-R(\tau^*)} \{ (K - e^{X(\tau^*)})^+ - (e^{\delta} - 1)e^{X(\tau^*)} \} | \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x] \\
&= v(j, x) - (e^{\delta} - 1)E[e^{-R(\tau^*)} e^{X(\tau^*)} | \xi_0 = j, X_0 = x] \\
&\geq v(j, x) - (e^{\delta} - 1)e^x \\
&= v(j, x) - \varphi(x) + \varphi(x + \delta),
\end{aligned}$$

using the fact that  $e^{-R(t)+X(t)}$  is a martingale, and therefore a supermartingale. ■

Immediately from Proposition 1, the optimal stopping time is of the form

$$\tau = \inf\{t : X_t < b(\xi_t)\}, \quad (15)$$

where the constants  $(b_i)_{i \in I}$  must be found.

This problem was solved by Guo and Zhang [12] in the simple case of two states, where a closed-form expression can be derived for the price. Note that -1 is always an eigenvalue of  $A$ , which is a key observation which makes the two-state problem tractable. However, the current methodology will work for any number of states.

The time-0 value of the stopping rule (15) defined by the levels  $(b_i)_{i \in I}$  is

$$v(j, x) = \mathbf{E} \left[ \exp \left( - \int_0^{\tau} r(\xi_t) dt \right) (K - \exp(b(\xi_{\tau}))^+ | S_0 = \exp(x); \xi_0 = j \right] \quad (16)$$

There are thus two problems:

- 1) given some thresholds  $b_i$ , derive the value function;
- 2) find the optimal  $b_i$ .

PROBLEM 1: Let us suppose given  $(b_i)_{i \in I}$ , where without loss of generality<sup>6</sup>  $b_1 > b_2 > \dots > b_d$ ; our goal is to compute the value function associated to this set of threshold levels.

Let us start with  $x$  in the interval  $[b_1, \infty)$ . Here, the value function is larger than the payoff function whatever the initial state. Recall that we are looking for a martingale  $M_t^f$  of the form of (5), for some function  $f$  which satisfies (7) and which will be represented as a weighted sum

$$f(\xi, x) = \sum_{i=1}^d w_i g_i(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_i x) \quad (17)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>We use the abbreviation  $R(t) \equiv \int_0^t r(\xi_s) ds$ .

<sup>6</sup>This assumption amounts to an inessential relabelling of the states.

where for each  $i$ ,  $(\lambda_i, g_i)$  satisfies (8), with  $\lambda_i > 0$ . We restrict to the  $d$  eigenvalues with positive real part, because this means that the martingale

$$M_t \equiv \exp\left(-\int_0^t r(\xi_u) du\right) \sum_i w_i g_i(\xi_t) \exp(-\lambda_i X_t)$$

is bounded on  $[0, \tau_1]$ , where  $\tau_1 \equiv \inf\{t : X_t < b_1\}$ . Therefore we may apply the Optional Sampling Theorem to obtain

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_1} r(\xi_u) du\right) \sum_i w_i g_i(\xi_{\tau_1}) \exp(-\lambda_i X_{\tau_1}) \mid X_0 = x, \xi_0 = j \right] = \sum_i w_i g_i(j) \exp(-\lambda_i x) \quad (18)$$

This is the expression for the value function over the interval  $[b_1, \infty)$ . In particular, for  $j = 1$ , this completes the determination of the time-0 price when the underlying chain is initially in state 1, provided we impose:

$$(K - \exp(b_1))^+ = \sum_i w_i g_i(1) \exp(-\lambda_i b_1) \quad (19)$$

This gives us a first equation satisfied by the  $d$  unknown weights  $w$ , and

$$v(1, x) = \begin{cases} K - \exp(x) & \text{if } x \leq b_1 \\ \sum_i w_i g_i(1) \exp(-\lambda_i x) & \text{if } x \geq b_1 \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where  $w$  still needs to be determined. Continuity at  $b_1$  (19) restricts  $w$  to a  $(d-1)$ -dimensional subspace; to go further, we must look at the next interval  $I_2 = [b_2, b_1]$  and match values and slopes of  $V$  across  $b_1$ .

When  $x \in I_2$ ,  $\xi$  can jump to state 1, causing exercise to happen. So we now need to modify slightly the Wiener-Hopf argument and the equation for  $f$ . Let  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ ,  $\tilde{R}$ ,  $\tilde{V}$  be the diagonal matrices defined in the following way: for every  $i = 2 \dots d$ ,  $\tilde{\Sigma}(i, i) = \sigma(i)^2$ ,  $\tilde{R}(i, i) = r(i)$  and  $\tilde{V} = \tilde{R} - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Sigma}$ . Let  $\tilde{Q}$  be the submatrix derived from  $Q$  by removing its first row and first column.

We still seek a martingale  $M_t^f$  of the form of (5) for some function  $f$ , which now satisfies the following modified equation:

$$(\tilde{Q} - \tilde{R})f + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Sigma}f_{XX} + \tilde{V}f_X + \tilde{K} = 0 \quad (21)$$

where  $\tilde{K}$  is defined so that it accounts for jumps to the payoff function in state 1:  $\tilde{K} = \tilde{q}(K - \exp(x))$ , where  $\tilde{q}$  denotes a  $(d-1)$ -dimensional vector, such that  $\tilde{q}(i) = q_{i1}$  for every  $i = 2 \dots d$ . The value function over the interval  $[b_2, b_1]$  is characterized by (21).

A particular solution to (21) is easily obtained and is of the form  $B + C \exp(x)$ . The homogeneous equation

$$(\tilde{Q} - \tilde{R})f + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\Sigma}f_{XX} + \tilde{V}f_X = 0 \quad (22)$$

is structurally similar to (7) and is solved similarly. Let  $\tilde{\lambda}_i$  and  $\tilde{g}_i$  denote the  $2(d-1)$  corresponding eigenvalues and eigenvectors for this new problem. For any scalars  $\tilde{w}_i$ ,

$$\exp\left(-\int_0^t r(\xi_u)du\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2(d-1)} \tilde{w}_i \exp(-\tilde{\lambda}_i X_t) \tilde{g}_i(\xi_t) + B + C \exp(X_t)\right) \quad (23)$$

is a martingale, at least if we stop at first exit from  $I_2$ , and is bounded up to that time. Provided that we ensure that  $v(j, \cdot)$  joins in a  $C^1$  fashion across  $b_1$ , for  $j = 2, \dots, d$ , we therefore have for any  $x \in I_2$ , any  $j = 2 \dots d$ ,

$$\mathbf{E}^{x,j} \left[ \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau_2} r(\xi_u)du\right) \left(\sum_i \tilde{w}_i \tilde{g}_i(\xi_{\tau_2}) \exp(-\tilde{\lambda}_i X_{\tau_2}) + B_j + C_j \exp(X_{\tau_2})\right) \right] = \quad (24)$$

$$\sum_i \tilde{w}_i \tilde{g}_i(j) \exp(-\tilde{\lambda}_i x) + B_j + C_j \exp(x)$$

where  $\tau_2 = \min\{t : X_t \leq b_2\}$ , and  $\mathbf{E}^{x,j}$  denotes the usual expectation conditional upon  $X_0 = x$ ,  $\xi_0 = j$ . This is the expression for the value function in the interval  $I_2$ ; in particular, for  $j = 2$ , this completes the determination of the time-0 price when the underlying chain is initially in state 2, provided we impose continuity at  $b_2$ .

Notice that at the end of the first step, we were left with  $d-1$  degrees of freedom. Once we have solved the problem over the interval  $[b_2, b_1]$ , matching the values and the slopes of  $v(j, \cdot)$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, d$  across  $b_1$ , we have  $2 \times (d-1)$  new linear equations, for the  $2(d-1)$  new unknowns  $\tilde{w}_i$ . Continuity across  $b_2$  of  $v(2, \cdot)$  provides us with another equation, so that at the end of our second step, we are left with  $d-2$  degrees of freedom.

From the above, it is now clear that we can proceed recursively, from  $b_1$  to  $b_d$ , by solving  $d$  successive problems of this type and considering the standard eigenvalue problem associated with our modified setup and our updated generator for the underlying Markov chain. At the end of the  $d$ th problem over the interval  $[b_d, b_{d-1}]$ , we no longer have any degree of freedom, once we have imposed the continuity of  $v(d, x)$  across  $b_d$ . Finally, over  $[0, b_d]$ , we have:  $v(1, x) = \dots = v(d, x) = K - \exp(x)$ .

This deals with the first problem, namely, given thresholds to compute the value function<sup>7</sup>.

**PROBLEM 2.** The method just presented shows how for any given sequence of threshold values we may compute the value. For optimality, we need to make  $v(j, \cdot)$  to be  $C^1$  at  $b_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . This gives us  $d$  non-linear equations to be solved in  $d$  unknowns, which can be solved by standard numerical techniques; we used Sequential Quadratic Programming

---

<sup>7</sup>The above procedure leaves us in fact with a linear system to solve in order to determine the unknown weights on every subinterval:  $d$  weights on  $[b_1, \infty)$ ,  $2 \times (d-1)$  weights on  $[b_2, b_1]$ ,  $2 \times (d-2)$  weights on  $[b_3, b_2]$ ,  $\dots$  and finally 2 weights on  $[b_d, b_{d-1}]$ . This gives rise to a linear system with  $d^2$  unknowns and  $d^2$  equations.

(CFSQP). The latter optimization routine is converging efficiently towards a set of  $b$  values which make  $v$  to be  $C^1$ ; we finally check numerically that

$$(Q - R)v + \frac{1}{2}\Sigma v_{XX} + Vv_X \leq 0$$

everywhere. The inequality is satisfied by construction in the continuation region, and we just need to check this for  $(j, x)$  such that  $x < b(j)$ . Once this is confirmed, the fact that the constructed  $v$  is  $C^1$  allows us to verify easily that the solution we have found is optimal.

As a check, take the case  $d = 1$ , which is the standard perpetual American put problem mentioned earlier; we have  $R = r$ ,  $\Sigma = \sigma^2$ ,  $V = r - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2$ ,  $Q = 0$  and set  $\gamma = 2r/\sigma^2$ . Now the matrix  $A$  defined at (11) is simply

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \gamma & \gamma - 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

with eigenvalues  $\gamma$  and  $-1$ , so the solution is of the form

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} K - \exp(x) & \text{if } x \leq b, \\ w \exp(-\gamma x) & \text{if } x > b, \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where the critical level  $b$  and the weight  $w$  are to be determined. The  $C^1$  condition for  $v$  at  $b$  becomes

$$\begin{cases} K - \exp(b) & = w \exp(-\gamma b) \\ \exp(b) & = \gamma w \exp(-\gamma b) \end{cases}$$

from which we easily deduce the form given at (14).

## 3.1 Numerical results.

### 3.1.1 Two states.

First, we check that we recover Guo and Zhang [12]'s results for the simple case of two states. The strike  $K$  is taken to be equal to 5,

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0.03 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.03 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.81 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This gives optimal thresholds:  $\exp(b) = (0.612, 0.441)$ , which is close to Guo and Zhang's solution  $(0.614, 0.441)$ . Figure 1 plots the price of the Markov-modulated perpetual American



put in every state of the chain and enables us to visualize the corresponding smooth pasting conditions. Above the optimal thresholds, where smooth pasting occurs, the upper curve is the value function for the perpetual American put and and the lower curve is the reward function. Below the optimal thresholds, the value function is equal to the reward function represented by the lower curve. We keep drawing the upper curve below the optimal thresholds for the sole purpose of assessing the quality of smooth pasting. All the plots below are drawn using a logarithmic scale for the stock price.




Figure 1: Perpetual American put with two states (value function against log price).

Decreasing the volatility in the second state,

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.49 \end{pmatrix},$$

leads to higher optimal thresholds  $\exp(b) = (0.801, 0.646)$ . On the other hand, increasing the jump intensity from state 2 to state 1, where  $\sigma_2^2 = 0.81$  and  $\sigma_1^2 = 0.25$ , decreases the average volatility and we expect therefore our optimal thresholds to be bigger, which turns out to be the case:  $\exp(b) = (0.633, 0.455)$ .

### 3.1.2 Three states.

Consider now the case of an underlying Markov chain with three states (high, low, intermediate level for the volatility):

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0.03 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.03 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.03 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.50 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.81 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This gives the following thresholds:  $\exp(b) = (0.600, 0.544, 0.455)$ . Figure 2 plots the results.




Figure 2: Perpetual American put with three states (value function against log price).

### 3.1.3 More states.

The methodology specified above enables us to deal with a moderately large number of states; in this example, there are eight. In each of the states,  $r$  is taken to be equal to 0.03. The jump intensities from one state to another are taken to be equal to 1, the volatility matrix is given by a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries:  $(0.35, 0.4, 0.6, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9)$ , and in Figure 3, we plot the value functions for the eight states of the chain, with the corresponding optimal thresholds:

$$\exp(b) = (0.290, 0.239, 0.238, 0.227, 0.220, 0.169, 0.155, 0.140).$$

As one would expect, the less volatile a state is, the bigger is the corresponding threshold.




Figure 3: Perpetual American put with eight states (value function against log price).

## 4 Binomial pricing with Markov regimes.

The standard binomial pricing method approximates the log-price process by a random walk, which jumps at the times  $\Delta t, 2\Delta t \dots$  and at each jump, moves either up or down. The probability of an up step and the size of the jump are chosen to match the drift and variance to the Black-Scholes asset. In this section, we will extend the alternative random walk approximation introduced by Rogers and Stapleton [22] to the case of Markov regimes.

With  $X$  still denoting the Markov-modulated log price (2), the idea of [22] was to fix some  $\Delta x > 0$  and view  $X$  only at the discrete set of times at which it has moved by  $\Delta x$  from where we last observed it. Formally, if

$$\begin{cases} \tau_0 = 0 \\ \tau_{n+1} \equiv \inf\{t > \tau_n : |X(t) - X(\tau_n)| > \Delta x\} \quad \text{if } n \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

then we take  $(X(\tau_n))$  as the discrete approximation to  $X$ , observed for  $\nu$  steps, where  $\nu \equiv \sup\{n : \tau_n < T\}$  ( $T$  is the expiry of the option). We need to compute the distribution of  $(X(\tau_1), \xi(\tau_1))$ . Take  $X_0 = 0$ ,  $\tau \equiv \tau_1$  for notational simplicity.

Let  $\lambda_i$  and  $g_i$  denote the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of the eigenvalue problem (11):

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ -2\Sigma^{-1}(Q - R) & 2\Sigma^{-1}R - I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g \\ h \end{pmatrix} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} g \\ h \end{pmatrix}$$

There are  $d$  negative and  $d$  positive eigenvalues. For any scalars  $w_i$ ,

$$\exp\left(-\int_0^t r(\xi_u) du\right) \sum_{i=1}^{2d} w_i g_i(\xi_t) \exp(-\lambda_i X_t)$$

is a martingale, so by the Optional Sampling Theorem

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \exp \left( - \int_0^\tau r(\xi_u) du \right) \sum_i w_i g_i(\xi_\tau) \exp(-\lambda_i X_\tau) | X_0 = 0, \xi_0 = j \right] = \sum_i w_i g_i(j) \quad (27)$$

The discounted probability of an upwards step from state  $j$  to state  $k$  is given by:

$$P_{j,k}^+ = \mathbf{E} \left[ \exp \left( - \int_0^\tau r(\xi_u) du \right) \mathbf{I}\{X_\tau = \Delta x, \xi_\tau = k\} | \xi_0 = j \right] \quad (28)$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes the indicator function. Therefore, in order to find  $P_{j,k}^+$  we need to solve the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_i w_i g_i(\xi) \exp(-\lambda_i \Delta x) = \mathbf{I}\{\xi = k\} & \forall \xi = 1 \dots d \\ \sum_i w_i g_i(\xi) \exp(+\lambda_i \Delta x) = 0 & \forall \xi = 1 \dots d \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

This leaves us with  $2d$  equations for the  $2d$  unknown weights, from which we calculate the discounted probability of an upwards step. Similarly, we can compute the probability of a downwards step from state  $j$  to state  $k$  by replacing in the above system  $\Delta x$  with  $-\Delta x$ . When the initial logarithmic price is equal to  $x$ , the price of a standard European call option in this Markov-modulated framework is now computed using the following dynamic programming equation, written using vector notations:

$$\begin{cases} V_0(x) = (\exp(x) - K)^+ \\ V_{n+1}(x) = P^+ V_n(x + \Delta x) + P^- V_n(x - \Delta x) \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

where  $n$  is the number of time steps to go before expiry  $T$  and  $P^+$  and  $P^-$  are defined above and denote respectively the up and down transition matrices for the underlying Markov chain.

Observe that (as in Rogers and Stapleton [22]) this approximation is well suited to pricing barrier options; we merely change appropriately the matrices  $P^\pm$  at the vertices adjacent to the barrier(s).

Once we have computed the discounted probabilities of an upwards and a downwards step, it remains to deal with the fact that the number  $\nu$  of time steps is random. One solution to this problem is to match bond prices so that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \exp \left( - \int_0^T r(\xi_u) du \right) 1 \right] \simeq \mathbf{E} \left[ \exp \left( - \int_0^{\tau_\nu} r(\xi_u) du \right) 1 \right] \quad (31)$$

Let  $\bar{P} = P^+ + P^-$ . From the above, it is enough to find  $\nu$  so that:

$$\pi \bar{P}^\nu 1 = \pi \exp [T(Q - R)1] \quad (32)$$

where  $\pi$  denotes the invariant distribution of the underlying Markov chain. This simple approximation turns out to give very satisfactory results for the Markov-modulated setup.

Notice finally that for the case of the American put, the dynamic programming equation for the value function now becomes:

$$\begin{cases} V_0(x) = (\exp(x) - K)^+ \\ V_{n+1}(x) = \max\{(K - \exp(x))^+, P^+V_n(x + \Delta x) + P^-V_n(x - \Delta x)\} \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

The case of the finite expiry Markov-modulated American Put was tackled by Buffington and Elliott [4] but only in the case of a two-state Markov chain and by extending the Barone-Adesi and Whaley analytic approximation.

## 4.1 Numerical results.

### 4.1.1 Markov-modulated European call.

One way of checking our results is to consider the case when the chain switches between two identical states for the volatility. The price in each state should then be equal approximately to the Black-Scholes price for this given volatility. The expiry time is taken to be equal to one year; the initial stock price is  $S_0 = 95$ . The strike is  $K = 100$ . Finally, the size of the space grid is taken to be  $\Delta x = 0.022$ .

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.03 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.03 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Q &= \begin{pmatrix} -0.01 & 0.01 \\ 0.01 & -0.01 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Sigma &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.25 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The price in each state of the chain is found to be equal to 17.9667, compared to the Black-Scholes value of 17.9506 (relative error: 0.0009).

### 4.1.2 Markov-modulated American put.

Here we compare with the prices tabulated in [21].

(i) Let us first consider the case of two identical states, with:  $T = 0.5$ ,  $\Delta x = 0.022$ ,  $X_0 = \log(85)$ ,  $K = 100$ .

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.06 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.06 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Q &= \begin{pmatrix} -0.01 & 0.01 \\ 0.01 & -0.01 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Sigma &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.16 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.16 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The price in each of the two states is found to be equal to 18.0285, which needs to be compared with the value found by Rogers [21]: 18.0374 (relative error: 0.0005).

(ii) Let us now decrease the volatility in the second state.

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.16 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.10 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The prices in each of the two states are now found to be: (17.3070, 16.7677). Decreasing the volatility decreases the price in the two states, as is to be expected. Correspondingly, increasing the volatility in one of the states increases the price in the two states, as shown by the following example

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.40 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.16 \end{pmatrix}.$$

where the price is now given by: (20.3454, 19.1986).

(iii) Taking the example (i) above and changing just the start value  $X_0$  to  $\log(100)$  allows us to compare with other values in [22]. We find the price is (9.9279, 9.9279), to be compared with 9.9458 (relative error: 0.00192). Taking  $X_0 = \log(115)$ , the price is (5.1109, 5.1109), to be compared with 5.1265 (relative error: 0.00304).

It therefore turns out that the random walk approximation provides an accurate and very quick method for Markov-modulated asset dynamics.

The solution for the finite expiry American put should provide us with a way of checking the results of the preceding section for the perpetual American put, by letting  $T$  tend to  $\infty$ . For Guo and Zhang [12]'s example, where  $\exp(b) = (0.616, 0.441)$ , the time-0 price of the Markov-modulated perpetual American put: (4.2239, 4.2758) compares well with our results for the finite expiry American put when  $T = 40$ : (4.2180, 4.2692) (relative errors: 0.00139, 0.00155).

A similar check can be made for the perpetual American put example with three states, where the price is found to be (4.2278, 4.2486, 4.2706), to be compared with (4.2244, 4.2439, 4.2631) for the finite expiry case, where  $T = 40$  (relative errors: 0.0008, 0.0011, 0.0017).

### 4.1.3 Markov-modulated barrier options.

In this section, we price a number of double knockout barrier options in a Markov-modulated setup.

(i) Let us first consider the case of constant barriers, where we compare with the results of Geman and Yor [7]. With two identical states, taking  $T = 1$ ,  $X_0 = \log(100)$ ,  $K = 100$ ,  $\Delta x = 0.022$ ,  $b^* = \log(150)$  and  $b_* = \log(75)$ , and

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0.05 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.05 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -0.01 & 0.01 \\ 0.01 & -0.01 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.25 \end{pmatrix}.$$

the price of the double knockout is then found to be (0.8994, 0.8994), to be compared with the value 0.89 computed by Geman and Yor [7] (relative error: 0.01061).

(ii) Changing  $K$  to 87.5 and  $b_*$  to  $\log(50)$ , the price becomes: (3.8274, 3.8274), to be compared with 3.8075 from Geman and Yor (relative error: 0.00519).

(iii) The next example is the same as the previous one, but now we have two different volatility levels:

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.50 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.25 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The price of the double-knockout is now equal to: (2.6055, 2.5882).

(iv) We finally consider the case of a double-knockout with moving barriers, which are linear for the log-price:  $b^* = \log(U) + \Delta x_1 t$  and  $b_* = \log(L) + \Delta x_2 t$ . We compare our results with Kunitomo and Ikeda [18]. Let us take:  $T = 0.5$ ,  $X_0 = \log(1000)$ ,  $K = 1000$ ,  $\Delta x_1 = 0.1$ ,  $\Delta x_2 = -0.1$ ,  $L = 500$  and  $U = 1500$ .

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0.05 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.05 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -0.01 & 0.01 \\ 0.01 & -0.01 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0.04 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.04 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The price of the double knockout in this Markov-modulated setup is found to be (67.2596, 67.2596), to be compared with 67.78 from Kunitomo and Ikeda [18] and 67.7834 from Rogers and Zane [23] (relative error: 0.00773).

## 5 Conclusions.

We have shown how to use classical results from the Wiener-Hopf factorisation of Markov processes to price options on a Markov-modulated asset. Such a model can accommodate “bull” and “bear” markets, as well as changes in the interest rate and the volatility. This method has been applied to the optimal stopping problem of the Markov-modulated perpetual American put. It yields a very efficient and accurate numerical method, which amounts to computing the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of some particular matrices. There is no dynamic programming, nor discretization of any PDE. Finally, with finite time horizon, the approach

can be used to construct a modified binomial lattice methodology, which has been applied to the European call, the American put and double-barrier options in a Markov-modulated setup. This modified binomial method turns out to provide an efficient numerical scheme for Markov-modulated option pricing.

## References

- [1] M.T. Barlow, L.C.G. Rogers, and D. Williams. Wiener-Hopf factorization for matrices. *Séminaire de Probabilités XIV. Lecture Notes in Math.*, 784:324–331, 1980.
- [2] O. Barndorff-Nielsen and N. Shepard. Non-Gaussian Ornstein-Uhlenbeck-based models and some of their uses in financial economics. *J. Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 63:1–42, 2000.
- [3] T.R. Bielecki and S.R. Pliska. Risk-sensitive dynamic asset management. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 39:337–360, 1999.
- [4] J. Buffington and R.J. Elliott. American options with regime switching. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 5:497–514, 2002.
- [5] W.H. Fleming and S.J. Sheu. Risk-sensitive control and an optimal investment model. *Mathematical Finance*, 10:197–213, 2000.
- [6] W.H. Fleming and S.J. Sheu. Risk-sensitive control and an optimal investment model (ii). *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 12:730–767, 2002.
- [7] H. Geman and M. Yor. Pricing and hedging double-barrier options: a probabilistic approach. *Mathematical Finance*, 6:365–378, 1996.
- [8] X. Guo. Inside information and stock fluctuations. *PhD Thesis, Rutgers University*, 1999.
- [9] X. Guo. An explicit solution to an optimal stopping problem with regime switching. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 38:464–481, 2001.
- [10] X. Guo. Information and Option pricing. *Quantitative Finance*, 1:38–44, 2001.
- [11] X. Guo and L. Shepp. Some optimal stopping problem with non-trivial boundaries for pricing exotic options. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 38:1–12, 2001.
- [12] X. Guo and Q. Zhang. Closed-form solutions for perpetual American put options with regime switching. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 64:2034–2049, 2004.
- [13] S.L. Heston. A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility and applications to bond and currency options. *Review of Financial Studies*, 6:327–343, 1993.
- [14] D.G. Hobson and L.C.G. Rogers. Complete models with stochastic volatility. *Mathematical Finance*, 8:27–48, 1998.
- [15] J. Hull and A. White. The pricing of options on assets with stochastic volatility. *Journal of Finance*, 42:281–299, 1987.
- [16] I. Karatzas. On the pricing of American options. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 17:37–60, 1988.



- [17] J.E. Kennedy and D. Williams. Probabilistic factorization of a quadratic matrix polynomial. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 107:591–600, 1990.
- [18] N. Kunitomo and M. Ikeda. Pricing options with curved boundaries. *Mathematical Finance*, 2:275–298, 1992.
- [19] H.P. McKean. Appendix: A free boundary problem for the heat equation arising from a problem in mathematical economics. *Industrial Management Review*, 6:32–39, 1965.
- [20] H. Nagai. Optimal strategies for risk-sensitive portfolio optimization problems for general factor models. *SIAM, Journal of Control and Optimization.*, 41:1779–1800, 2003.
- [21] L.C.G. Rogers. Monte Carlo valuation of American options. *Mathematical Finance*, 12:271–286, 2002.
- [22] L.C.G. Rogers and E.J. Stapleton. Fast accurate binomial pricing. *Finance and Stochastics*, 1997.
- [23] L.C.G. Rogers and O. Zane. Valuing moving barrier options. *Journal of Computational Finance*, 1, 1997.
- [24] E.M. Stein and J.C. Stein. Stock-price distributions with stochastic volatility: an analytic approach. *Review of Financial Studies*, 4:727–752, 1991.
- [25] R. Stockbridge. Portfolio optimization in markets having stochastic rates. *Stochastic Theory and Control*, 280:447–458, 2002.
- [26] D. Yao, Q. Zhang, and X. Zhou. A regime-switching model for European Option pricing. *Working Paper*, 2003.
- [27] G. Yin and X.Y. Zhou. Markowitz’s mean-variance portfolio selection with regime switching: from discrete-time models to their continuous-time limits. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2003.
- [28] Q. Zhang. Stock trading: an optimal selling rule. *SIAM, Journal of Control and Optimisation*, 40:64–87, 2001.