

**Global hedging through post-decision
state variables**

M. Breton,
F. Godin

G-2017-52

June 2017

Cette version est mise à votre disposition conformément à la politique de libre accès aux publications des organismes subventionnaires canadiens et québécois.

Avant de citer ce rapport, veuillez visiter notre site Web (<https://www.gerad.ca/fr/papers/G-2017-52>) afin de mettre à jour vos données de référence, s'il a été publié dans une revue scientifique.

This version is available to you under the open access policy of Canadian and Quebec funding agencies.

Before citing this report, please visit our website (<https://www.gerad.ca/en/papers/G-2017-52>) to update your reference data, if it has been published in a scientific journal.

Les textes publiés dans la série des rapports de recherche *Les Cahiers du GERAD* n'engagent que la responsabilité de leurs auteurs.

La publication de ces rapports de recherche est rendue possible grâce au soutien de HEC Montréal, Polytechnique Montréal, Université McGill, Université du Québec à Montréal, ainsi que du Fonds de recherche du Québec – Nature et technologies.

Dépôt légal – Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, 2017
– Bibliothèque et Archives Canada, 2017

The authors are exclusively responsible for the content of their research papers published in the series *Les Cahiers du GERAD*.

The publication of these research reports is made possible thanks to the support of HEC Montréal, Polytechnique Montréal, McGill University, Université du Québec à Montréal, as well as the Fonds de recherche du Québec – Nature et technologies.

Legal deposit – Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, 2017
– Library and Archives Canada, 2017

Global hedging through post-decision state variables

Michèle Breton^a
Frédéric Godin^b

^a GERAD & Department of Decision Science, HEC
Montréal, Montréal (Québec), Canada, H3T 2A7

^b Concordia University, Department of Mathematics and
Statistics, Montréal (Québec), Canada, H3G 1M8

michele.breton@hec.ca
frederic.godin@concordia.ca

June 2017

Les Cahiers du GERAD
G-2017-52

Copyright © 2017 GERAD

Abstract: Unlike delta-hedging or similar methods based on Greeks, global hedging is an approach optimizing some terminal criterion that depends on the difference between the value of a derivative security and that of its hedging portfolio at maturity or exercise. Global hedging methods in discrete time can be implemented using dynamic programming. They provide optimal strategies at all rebalancing dates for all possible states of the world, and can easily accommodate transaction fees and other frictions. However, considering transaction fees in the dynamic programming model requires the inclusion of an additional state variable, which translates into a significant increase of the computational burden. In this short note, we show how a decomposition technique based on the concept of post-decision state variables can be used to reduce the complexity of the computations to the level of a problem without transaction fees.

Keywords: Hedging, transaction costs, dynamic programming, risk management, post-decision state variable

Résumé: À la différence des méthodes de couverture de type delta-neutre, la couverture globale vise à optimiser un critère terminal relié à la différence entre la valeur, à l'échéance ou à la date d'exercice, d'un instrument dérivé et celle du portefeuille de couverture qui lui est associé. Les méthodes de couverture globale en temps discret peuvent être caractérisées par la programmation dynamique. Ces méthodes déterminent des stratégies optimales pour toutes les dates de rééquilibrage et pour tous les états du monde, et peuvent facilement tenir compte de frais de transactions ou d'autres frictions. Toutefois, l'inclusion de frais de transaction dans le modèle de programmation dynamique requiert une variable d'état additionnelle, ce qui se traduit par une augmentation significative du temps de calcul. Dans cette courte note, nous montrons comment une technique de décomposition basée sur le concept de variable d'état post-décision peut être utilisée pour réduire la complexité des calculs au niveau d'un problème sans frais de transaction.

Mots clés: Couverture, coûts de transaction, programmation dynamique, gestion des risques, variable d'état post-décision

Acknowledgments: Financial support from FRQNT (Godin, 2017-NC-197517) and NSERC (Breton, RGPIN/06402-2015, and Godin, RGPIN-2017-06837) is gratefully acknowledged.

1 Introduction

In general, hedging designates a variety of trading strategies designed to reduce the risk related to the price movements of certain assets. Hedging strategies often involve trading securities that are closely related; in particular, derivative securities are predominantly used as hedges against their underlying assets.

In this note, we specifically consider the risk related to writing an option contract. It is interesting to recall that one of the basic models for the evaluation of option contracts is based on an hedging argument: in a complete market, the value of an option is equal to the capital required to set up a portfolio providing a perfect hedge, meaning one that produces the same payoff for all possible realizations of the price of the underlying asset. This is the rationale behind the so-called *delta-neutral* option hedging strategy. Assuming that trading can be done in continuous time and that there are no transaction costs, under the delta-neutral hedging strategy, the value of the hedging portfolio is equal to the value of the option at all times.

In practice, it is not possible to adjust hedging positions continuously. Under many market models where the number of traded securities is finite and the number of possible asset price transitions is infinite, it is not possible to eliminate risk completely, that is, to replicate the derivatives' payoff exactly, by using a discrete-time hedging strategy. The cost associated with a complete removal of risk through super-replication is often prohibitive (see [13]). Finally, when trading involves transaction costs, continuous-time hedging strategies may result in infinite costs. It then becomes necessary to design discrete-time hedging strategies that incorporate transaction costs. There are multiple papers studying the impact of transaction costs in hedging schemes, including the following: [8], [1], [7], [14], [3], [9], [15], and [16].

In the context of an incomplete market, global hedging approaches aim at finding hedging strategies that optimize a criterion based on the terminal payoff at maturity. In other words, instead of trying to track the option value at all times, global hedging approaches consider only the end result of successive trades. Global hedging approaches are particularly interesting when risk cannot be completely eliminated or when transaction costs are present. The criterion considered may be a combination of risk and return considerations. For instance, assuming that the option is exercised at date T , and denoting the option payoff and the value of the hedging portfolio at T by C_T and V_T , respectively, the following criteria, among others, have been proposed in the literature (see for instance [12], [4], [5], [8] and [10]):

- Expected shortfall: $E \left[(C_T - V_T)^+ \right]$,
- Quadratic risk: $E \left[(C_T - V_T)^2 \right]$,
- Semi-quadratic risk: $E \left[\left((C_T - V_T)^+ \right)^2 \right]$,
- Risk-return utility: $E \left[C_T - V_T + \lambda (C_T - V_T)^2 \right]$, $\lambda \geq 0$,
- Exponential utility: $E \left[-e^{\lambda(C_T - V_T)} \right]$, $\lambda \geq 0$.

2 Discrete-time global hedging model

Consider a set $\mathcal{T} := \{0, \dots, T\}$ of discrete dates and a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T, \mathbb{P})$ endowed with a filtration $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ satisfying the usual conditions. Two assets are traded in an arbitrage-free market. Asset B is risk-free and its deterministic price at date t is denoted by B_t . Asset S is risky; its price process $\{S_t\}$ is \mathcal{F} -adapted and has the Markov property with respect to \mathcal{F} . An agent is hedging a short position on a simple contingent claim $C_T = C(S_T)$ with a self-financing portfolio.

In a hedging context, \mathcal{T} is the set of rebalancing dates. For $t \in \mathcal{T}$, let $\theta_t := (x_t, y_t)$ represent the number of shares of assets B and S , respectively, within the portfolio at date t , before the rebalancing decision. A trading strategy $\theta = \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is an \mathcal{F} -predictable process.¹ The portfolio value at date t associated with the trading strategy θ is defined as

$$V_t^\theta := B_t x_t + S_t y_t.$$

¹ θ being \mathcal{F} -predictable means that θ_0 is \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable and that for all $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, θ_t is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable.

When there are no transaction costs, a trading strategy is said to be self-financing if, for all $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$,

$$B_t x_t + S_t y_t = B_t x_{t+1} + S_t y_{t+1}.$$

The global hedging problem that is solved by the agent is then

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E} [g(C_T - V_T^\theta)] \quad (1)$$

where $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called the penalty function and Θ is the set of admissible self-financing trading strategies. Under mild conditions on functions C and g and on the process $\{S_t\}$, it can be shown that Problem (1) has a solution.

At date $t \in \mathcal{T}$, define the value function:

$w_t(s, v)$: expected minimal global hedging penalty at date t if the current price of the underlying asset is s and the current portfolio value is v .

The global hedging problem can then be characterized by the following discrete-time dynamic program.

$$w_T(s, v) = g(C(s) - v) \quad (2)$$

$$w_t(s, v) = \min_{d \in D_t(s, v)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[w_{t+1} \left(S_{t+1}, B_{t+1} \frac{(v - sd)}{B_t} + S_{t+1} d \right) \right], \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1 \quad (3)$$

$$\delta_t(s, v) \in \arg \min_{d \in D_t(s, v)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[w_{t+1} \left(S_{t+1}, B_{t+1} \frac{(v - sd)}{B_t} + S_{t+1} d \right) \right], \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1 \quad (4)$$

where, at each date $t < T$, a rebalancing decision $y_{t+1} = d$ is taken; $\mathbb{E}_t[\bullet]$ represents the expectation, conditional to $(S_t, V_t) = (s, v)$, which is information available at t ; and $D_t(s, v)$ contains any constraint or limitation on the number of shares of asset S that can be held at t after the rebalancing, given that $(S_t, V_t) = (s, v)$.

The portfolio value at $t+1$ reflects the self-financing constraint

$$v = B_t x_{t+1} + sd$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{t+1} &= B_{t+1} x_{t+1} + S_{t+1} d \\ &= B_{t+1} \frac{(v - sd)}{B_t} + S_{t+1} d. \end{aligned}$$

Given any initial portfolio $\theta_0 = (x_0, y_0)$, setting

$$\theta_{t+1} = \left(\frac{V_t - S_t \delta_t(S_t, V_t)}{B_t}, \delta_t(S_t, V_t) \right)$$

for $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ yields a hedging strategy solving Problem (1).

Notice that the solution of the dynamic program (2)–(4) characterizes the optimal hedging strategy at all rebalancing dates, for all possible instances of the underlying asset price and portfolio value. The method is general and can be applied to any derivative characterized by a payoff function that depends on the price of the underlying asset at maturity or exercise,² to any penalty function g , and to any market model, in all cases provided that the conditional expectation in (3) can be computed or approximated.

Since in many market models asset prices are continuous and possibly unbounded, some form of approximation is needed for the computation of the value function (see for instance [2]). Assume that M discrete

²The adaptation of the recursion for Bermudan instruments where early exercise is allowed at discrete dates is straightforward.

possible values are considered for each of the three variables s , v and d . The complexity of the recursion (2)–(4) is $\mathcal{O}(M^4)$ for each time-step iteration of the dynamic program since it involves looping over all discretized values for state variables s and v , all decisions d and all transitions S_{t+1} , at each rebalancing date. Typically, finding the optimal hedging strategy for 12 time steps using a cubic splines interpolation scheme with 100 discretized values for each variable requires around one minute of computing time on a standard personal workstation.

3 Transaction fees and post-decision variables

Under most market specifications, uncertainty about asset prices decreases with the frequency of observation dates. As a result, when there are no transaction costs, the expected hedging penalty can often be reduced by increasing the number of rebalancing dates. For instance, when trading is continuous, one can obtain a perfect hedge in the geometrical Brownian motion model by applying the delta-hedging strategy at an infinite number of rebalancing dates. This observation raises the issue of transaction costs, which should normally be considered when setting up a hedging strategy.

Where there are transaction costs, the self-financing constraint becomes, for all $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$,

$$B_t x_t + S_t y_t = B_t x_{t+1} + S_t y_{t+1} + K_t$$

where $K_t = \kappa(S_t, y_t, y_{t+1})$ are transaction costs. Various types of costs can be considered, for instance,

$$K_t = \begin{cases} c \mathbb{I}_{\{y_{t+1} \neq y_t\}} & \text{fixed} \\ c |y_{t+1} - y_t| & \text{proportional to traded number of shares} \\ c |y_{t+1} - y_t| S_t & \text{proportional to traded market value} \end{cases}$$

for some constant c . The inclusion of transaction costs in the DP model requires an additional state variable because the composition of the portfolio is needed to compute the costs associated to a rebalancing decision.

At date $t \in \mathcal{T}$, define the value function:

$\omega_t(s, x, y)$: expected minimal global hedging penalty at date t if the current price of the underlying asset is s and the current portfolio composition is (x, y) .

The global hedging problem can then be characterized by the dynamic program

$$\omega_T(s, x, y) = g(C(s) - (xB_T + ys)) \quad (5)$$

$$\omega_t(s, x, y) = \min_{d \in D_t(s, x, y)} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\omega_{t+1} \left(S_{t+1}, \frac{B_t x + s(y-d) - \kappa(s, y, d)}{B_t}, d \right) \right], \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1 \quad (6)$$

and the optimal hedging strategy by a function $\delta_t(s, x, y)$ achieving the minimum in (6). This approach to solving the global hedging problem is followed for instance in [6]. Note that when the length of time steps is small, the DP model endogenously decides the optimal rebalancing frequency, as it would choose not to rebalance when it is not optimal to do so.

Assuming again that M discrete possible values are considered for each of the variables s, x, y and d , the complexity of the recursion becomes $\mathcal{O}(M^5)$ because of the additional state variable. Finding the optimal hedging strategy for 12 time steps using a cubic splines interpolation scheme with 100 discretized values for each variable, using the recursion (5)–(6), would now require roughly one hour of computing time on a standard personal workstation.

It is however possible to reduce the complexity of the algorithm to solve (1) to $\mathcal{O}(M^4)$, using a decomposition technique relying on the concept of post-decision state variables, as discussed in [11].

For $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, define an auxiliary post-decision value function through

$$\varphi_t(s, q, d) := \mathbb{E}_t [\omega_{t+1}(S_{t+1}, q, d)] \quad (7)$$

and set

$$h_t(s, x, y, d) = \frac{B_t x + s(y - d) - \kappa(s, y, d)}{B_t}.$$

The dynamic program becomes

$$\omega_T(s, x, y) = g(C(s) - (xB_T + ys)) \quad (8)$$

$$\varphi_t(s, q, d) = \mathbb{E}_t[\omega_{t+1}(S_{t+1}, q, d)], \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1 \quad (9)$$

$$\omega_t(s, x, y) = \min_{d \in D_t(s, x, y)} \varphi_t(s, h(s, x, y, d), d), \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1. \quad (10)$$

Equation (9) considers all possible transitions from the tri-dimensional state variable, while Equation (10) considers all possible rebalancing decisions at each state, so that the complexity is reduced to $\mathcal{O}(M^4)$ by performing the computations (9)–(10) sequentially instead of simultaneously.

The reason why using post-decision state variables makes it possible to reduce the complexity of the dynamic programming algorithm in the current framework is that the evolution of the asset price does not depend on the hedging decisions, and the post-decision state variable (the portfolio composition) does not depend on the transition of the exogenous asset price variable. Therefore, the dimension of the post-decision state variable is no greater than that of the state variable. This decomposition technique would work for any dynamic program where the evolution of endogenous and exogenous variable values at a given time step are independent. This is not the case for the global hedging problem without transaction fees presented in Section 2, where the endogenous state variable (the value of the portfolio) depends on the evolution of the underlying asset price.

4 Conclusion

An efficient method for obtaining the solution of a global hedging problem in the presence of transaction costs is presented. The method relies on a modification of the usual dynamic programming algorithm in order to incorporate post-decision state variables. This makes it possible to reduce the computational complexity from $\mathcal{O}(M^5)$ to $\mathcal{O}(M^4)$. This technique is shown to be applicable in the presented framework since endogenous variable transitions are not impacted by exogenous variable movements.

In finance, the ability to perform computations quickly is crucial for the timely execution of trades. Therefore, obtaining the hedging policy in less than a minute through the method presented in this paper, rather than in roughly an hour with the usual method, represents an appreciable improvement.

References

- [1] Boyle, P. P., Vorst, T. (1992). Option replication in discrete time with transaction costs. *The Journal of Finance*. 47(1) 271–293.
- [2] Breton, M., & de Frutos, J. (2012). Approximation of Dynamic Programs. In *Handbook of Computational Finance*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 633–649.
- [3] Clewlow, L., Hodges, S. (1997). Optimal delta-hedging under transactions costs. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*. 21(8) 1353–1376.
- [4] Fllmer, H., Leukert, P. (2000). Efficient hedging: cost versus shortfall risk. *Finance and Stochastics*. 4(2) 117–146.
- [5] Franois, P., Gauthier, G., Godin, F. (2014). Optimal hedging when the underlying asset follows a regime-switching Markov process. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 237(1) 312–322.
- [6] Godin, F. (2016). Minimizing CVaR in global dynamic hedging with transaction costs. *Quantitative Finance*. 16(3) 461–475.
- [7] Grannan, E. R., Swindle, G. H. (1996). Minimizing transaction costs of option hedging strategies. *Mathematical finance*. 6(4) 341–364.

-
- [8] Hodges, S. D., Neuberger, A. (1989). Optimal replication of contingent claims under transaction costs. *Review of futures markets*. 8(2) 222–239.
- [9] Martellini, L., Priaulet, P. (2002). Competing methods for option hedging in the presence of transaction costs. *The Journal of Derivatives*. 9(3) 26–38.
- [10] Ni, J., Chu, L. K., Wu, F., Sculli, D., Shi, Y. (2012). A multi-stage financial hedging approach for the procurement of manufacturing materials. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 221(2) 424–431.
- [11] Powell, W. B. (2007). *Approximate Dynamic Programming: Solving the curses of dimensionality* (Vol. 703). John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] Schweizer, M. (1995). Variance-optimal hedging in discrete time. *Mathematics of Operations Research*. 20(1) 1–32.
- [13] Soner, H. M., Shreve, S. E., Cvitanić, J. (1995). There is no nontrivial hedging portfolio for option pricing with transaction costs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*. 5(2) 327–355.
- [14] Toft, K. B. (1996). On the mean-variance tradeoff in option replication with transactions costs. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 31(2) 233–263.
- [15] Zakamouline, V. I. (2006). Efficient analytic approximation of the optimal hedging strategy for a European call option with transaction costs. *Quantitative Finance*. 6(5) 435–445.
- [16] Zhao, Y., Ziemba, W. T. (2007). Hedging errors with Leland’s option model in the presence of transaction costs. *Finance Research Letters*. 4(1) 49–58.