

Is (independent) subordination relevant in option pricing?

Michele Azzone* & Roberto Baviera*

October 10, 2023

* Politecnico di Milano, Department of Mathematics, Italy.

Abstract

Monroe (1978) demonstrates that any local semimartingale can be represented as a time-changed Brownian Motion (BM). A natural question arises: does this representation theorem hold when the BM and the time-change are independent? We prove that a local semimartingale is not equivalent to a BM with a time-change that is independent from the BM.

Our result is obtained utilizing a class of additive processes: the additive normal tempered stable (ATS). This class of processes exhibits an exceptional ability to accurately calibrate the equity volatility surface. We notice that the sub-class of additive processes that can be obtained with an independent additive subordination is incompatible with market data and shows significantly worse calibration performances than the ATS, especially on short time maturities. These results have been observed every business day in a semester on a dataset of S&P 500 and EURO STOXX 50 options.

Keywords: Option Pricing; Independent time-change; Representation theorem; Additive processes.

Address for correspondence:

Roberto Baviera

Department of Mathematics
Politecnico di Milano
32 p.zza Leonardo da Vinci
I-20133 Milano, Italy
Tel. +39-02-2399 4575
roberto.baviera@polimi.it

Michele Azzone

Department of Mathematics
Politecnico di Milano
32 p.zza Leonardo da Vinci
I-20133 Milano, Italy
Tel. +39-338-2464 527
michele.azzone@polimi.it

1 Introduction

A class of additive processes, the additive normal tempered stable processes (ATS), has recently shown excellent calibration properties of the implied volatility surface of equity derivatives (Azzone and Baviera 2022a). This study investigates whether it is possible to obtain this process by (independent) additive subordination. The technique of embedding a process in a Brownian motion (BM) is frequently employed in the literature to introduce new (tractable) models (see e.g., Cont and Tankov 2003, Ch.4 and references therein). Monroe (1978) proves a well known representation theorem: any local semimartingale can be represented as a time-changed BM. Nonetheless, in general, the time-change and the BM are not independent: we prove that a local semimartingale is not equivalent to a BM with a time-change *independent* from the BM.

Specifically, our findings establish the nonexistence of *any pair* comprising a time change and an independent BM, where the resulting time-changed BM is equal in law to the ATS. Additive processes (an extension of Lévy processes) are characterized by independent but not necessarily stationary increments (for a detailed description see Sato 1999). In recent years, these processes emerge as a new frontier in the quantitative finance literature, with several contributions exploring their properties and applications to financial markets (see e.g., Madan and Wang 2020, Carr and Torricelli 2021, Azzone and Baviera 2022a, Madan and Wang 2023).

Time-change or subordination is a well-established technique for building statistically relevant models. As is customary in the literature, we refer to a positive and non-decreasing process that is zero a.s. at time $t=0$ as a subordinator. Subordination finds most of its financial applications in the stationary Lévy framework (see e.g., Cont and Tankov 2003). Additive subordination is introduced by Galloway and Nolder (2008) and later formalized by Mijatović and Pistorius (2010). In particular, a subordinated BM has a well-known financial interpretability. The time-change models economic time: the more intense the market activity, the faster economic time runs compared to calendar time (see e.g., Madan *et al.* 1998, Geman *et al.* 2001).

It is worth noting a standard assumption in the financial literature: the stochastic time-change and the subordinated process (e.g. the BM) are independent. This independence is particularly useful in the applications: the independence between the BM and the subordinator enables straightforward simulation of the process (see e.g., Cont and Tankov 2003, Ch.6 and references therein) and allows an efficient extension to the multivariate case (see e.g., Linders and Stassen 2016, Luciano *et al.* 2016). Hereinafter, following Barndorff-Nielsen *et al.* (2006), when we refer to a subordinator, we intend a subordinator independent from the BM.

Three are the main contributions of this paper.

First, we prove that, in general, an additive process $\{f_t\}$ is not always equivalent to a subordinated BM $\{W(aZ_t) + bZ_t + c_t\}$ with $\{Z_t\}$ a subordinator independent from the BM $\{W(t)\}$.¹ Thus, the Monroe representation theorem does not hold when we require the additional hypothesis that the BM and the time-change are independent.

Second, we demonstrate that an additive process $\{f_t\}$ cannot be expressed as $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$, where a_t and b_t are non-constant functions of time.

Finally, we design a statistical test to reject the null hypothesis that the additive process calibrated on market data can be written as a subordinated BM with the additive subordinator independent from the BM. The test is conducted on derivative prices of the two most liquid equity indexes:

¹We follow the notation of Sato (1999) and indicate a stochastic process on \mathbb{R} , $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$, with $\{X_t\}$. When we write X_t without brackets we are referring to the process at time t .

the S&P 500 and the EURO STOXX 50. The null hypothesis is rejected for all business days in a six-month time interval with p-values always below 1%.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we prove the main theoretical results: in general, an additive process is not always equivalent to a subordinated BM and cannot be expressed as $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$. In section 3, we describe the dataset, the calibration method and we implement the statistical test that rejects the null hypothesis that the additive process calibrated on market data can be written as a subordinated BM. Section 4 concludes. Moreover, in appendix A, we report additional calibration results; we enlighten why an additive process written as a subordinated BM does not replicate market data.

2 Can additive processes be represented with additive subordinators?

In this section, we derive the main theoretical results. In **Theorem 2.1**, we prove that, an additive process $\{f_t\}$ cannot be always represented as a subordinated BM $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$ with subordinator $\{Z_t\}$. The process $\{f_t\}$, which we consider as a counterexample, is relevant in the financial literature. Moreover, in **Theorem 2.6**, we demonstrate that $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$, where a_t and b_t are deterministic functions of time, is an additive process if and only if a_t and b_t are constant. In the next section, we show that the class of additive processes that accurately describes market data falls within this set of processes that cannot be represented with additive subordination.

In the following, we consider the usual definition of subordinated BM

$$\{W(aZ_t) + bZ_t + c_t : t \geq 0\} , \quad (2.1)$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ are respectively the squared volatility and the drift of the BM (see e.g., Madan *et al.* 1998, p.82). We also consider the standard definition of additive process on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ (see e.g., Cont and Tankov 2003, Def.14.1, p.455). A càdlàg stochastic process on \mathbb{R} $\{X_t\}$, $X_0 = 0$ a.s. is an additive process if and only if it has independent increments and is continuous in probability. An additive process $\{X_t\}$ is fully characterized by a family of generating triplets (A_t, ν_t, γ_t) , see Sato (1999, pp.38-39). The triplet consists of the diffusion term A_t , the Lévy measure ν_t , and the drift term γ_t .

As discussed in the introduction, in recent years, several market models based on additive processes have been developed for derivative pricing. Among these models, the class of additive normal tempered stable processes (ATS) emerges as a promising choice for modeling equity options. The ATS present excellent calibration properties –being parsimonious in terms of parameters– and have the correct short time behavior (see Azzone and Baviera 2022b). The ATS class has been introduced through its characteristic function (cf. Azzone and Baviera 2022a, eq.4):

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{iu f_t}] = \mathcal{L}_t \left(iu \left(\frac{1}{2} + \eta_t \right) \sigma_t^2 + \frac{u^2 \sigma_t^2}{2}; k_t, \alpha \right) e^{iu \varphi_t t} , \quad (2.2)$$

where σ_t, k_t are continuous on $[0, \infty)$ and η_t, φ_t are continuous on $(0, \infty)$ with $\sigma_t > 0, k_t \geq 0$ and

$\varphi_t t$ goes to zero as t goes to zero. $\ln \mathcal{L}_t$ is defined as

$$\ln \mathcal{L}_t(u; k, \alpha) := \begin{cases} \frac{t}{k} \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \left\{ 1 - \left(1 + \frac{u k}{1-\alpha} \right)^\alpha \right\} & \text{if } 0 < \alpha < 1 \\ -\frac{t}{k} \ln(1 + u k) & \text{if } \alpha = 0 \end{cases},$$

with $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. We observe that the characteristic function of the ATS process (2.2) is of bounded variation. The Monroe (1978) representation theorem can be applied to the ATS because any additive process with a characteristic function of bounded variation over finite intervals is a semi-martingale (see e.g., Jacod and Shiryaev 2013, Th.4.14, p.106).

In the next theorem, we demonstrate that we cannot obtain a class of additive processes (the ATS), for which the representation theorem in Monroe (1978) holds, by time-changing a BM with *any* independent subordinator.

Theorem 2.1. *An additive process is not equivalent to a subordinated BM.*

Proof. We prove the thesis with a counterexample. We demonstrate that it does not exist a subordinated BM $\{W(aZ_t) + bZ_t + c_t\}$ identical in law to the ATS, the additive process with characteristic function (2.2), if η_t is non-constant.

We compute the characteristic function of a subordinated BM by conditioning to the filtration of the subordinator,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{iuW(aZ_t)+bZ_t+c_t} \right] = \mathcal{M}_t \left(iu b + \frac{u^2 a}{2} \right) e^{iu c_t},$$

where \mathcal{M}_t is the Laplace transform of the subordinator. To obtain the same characteristic function of (2.2) the following relation should hold

$$\ln \mathcal{M}_t(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{d_t}{\alpha} \{1 - (1 + u e_t)^\alpha\} & \text{if } 0 < \alpha < 1 \\ -d_t \ln(1 + u e_t) & \text{if } \alpha = 0 \end{cases},$$

where $d_t = \frac{t}{k_t}(1-\alpha)$, $e_t b = (1/2 + \eta_t)\sigma_t^2 \frac{k_t}{1-\alpha}$ and $e_t a = \frac{\sigma_t^2}{2} \frac{k_t}{1-\alpha}$.

We show that, if η_t is not constant in t , we cannot match the characteristic function of the ATS. By solving $e_t b = (1/2 + \eta_t)\sigma_t^2 \frac{k_t}{1-\alpha}$ and $e_t a = \frac{\sigma_t^2}{2} \frac{k_t}{1-\alpha}$ for e_t we get

$$\frac{b}{a} = (1/2 + \eta_t),$$

which is absurd if η_t is non-constant. The statement holds because we have verified the identity in law □

Let us point out the main result of **Theorem 2.1**. We have presented a counterexample utilizing the ATS with a non-constant η_t , proving that –if η_t is non-constant– it is impossible to construct an ATS as a subordinated BM. What does happen if η_t is constant? In the following, we prove by construction that, if η_t is constant, it is possible to build the ATS as a subordinated BM.

To substantiate this claim on the ATS with constant η_t , we introduce an additive subordinator.² We call this subordinator the additive tempered stable subordinator (TSS). It is a natural extension of the Lévy tempered stable subordinator (see e.g., Cont and Tankov 2003, p.127) when considering time-dependent k_t and σ_t . We define below its family of generating triplets.³

Definition 2.2. The TSS $\{Z_t\}$ is characterized by the family of triplets $(0, \mathcal{V}_t, \Gamma_t)$

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{V}_t(x) & := \frac{t\sigma_t^{2\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{k_t}\right)^{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{e^{-(1-\alpha)x/(\sigma_t^2 k_t)}}{x^{1+\alpha}}\right) \mathbb{1}_{x>0} \\ \Gamma_t & := \int_0^1 x \mathcal{V}_t(x) dx \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. σ_t and k_t are positive continuous functions of time such that

1. $t \sigma_t^2$ is $o(1)$ for small t ;
2. $\frac{t}{k_t^{1-\alpha}} \sigma_t^{2\alpha}$ is $o(1)$ for small t and non-decreasing;
3. $\sigma_t^2 k_t$ is non-decreasing.

In **Definition 2.2**, we have introduced a family of triplets; we need to demonstrate the existence of an additive subordinator characterized by these triplets. In order to accomplish this task, we first derive certain sufficient conditions under which an additive process is an additive subordinator. Then, we employ these conditions to prove that the TSS is indeed an additive subordinator.

Proposition 2.3. *An additive process $\{Z_t\}$ is an additive subordinator if its family of generating triplets is such that, for every fixed time t , $A_t = 0$, $b_t := \gamma_t - \int_{0 \leq x \leq 1} x \nu_t(dx)$ non-decreasing and ν_t such that i) $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (|x| \wedge 1) \nu_t(dx) < \infty$, ii) $\nu_t((-\infty, 0]) = 0$. Moreover, an additive subordinator $\{Z_t\}$ has a characteristic function with exponent*

$$\ln \mathbb{E} [e^{iuZ_t}] = ib_t u + \int_{x>0} (e^{iux} - 1) \nu_t(x) dx \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. This proof extends to additive subordination a known property of Lévy subordination (see e.g., Cont and Tankov 2003, Prop.3.10, p.100).

First, we prove that, given the conditions on the characteristic triplets, equation (2.4) holds. Define $L_t(x) := \mathbb{1}_{|x| \leq 1} x \nu_t(x)$ and $M_t(x) := (e^{iux} - 1) \nu_t(x)$. We have that

$$\ln \mathbb{E} [e^{iuZ_t}] = i\gamma_t u + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iux} - 1 - \mathbb{1}_{|x| \leq 1} iux) \nu_t(x) dx = i\gamma_t u + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (iuL_t(x) + M_t(x)) dx \quad .$$

The first equality is due to the definition of the characteristic function of an additive process with no diffusion (cf. Sato 1999, Th.8.1, p.37). $L_t(x)$ is integrable with respect to x thanks to the

²We recall that the additive subordinator is an additive process which is a subordinator, see e.g., Mijatović and Pistorius (2010).

³In line with the prevailing conventions in the literature (see e.g., Cont and Tankov 2003, Ch.3), we identify ν_t , a Lévy measure on \mathbb{R} , with the Lévy density $\nu_t(x)$ such that $\int_B \nu_t(x) dx = \nu_t(B) \forall B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R})$ and $B \subset \{x : |x| > \epsilon > 0\}$.

conditions on ν_t . The sum of $iuL_t(x)$ and $M_t(x)$ is integrable, because $\mathbb{E}[e^{iuZ_t}]$ is a well defined characteristic function, thus $M_t(x)$ is integrable too. We can split the integral and check the thesis defining $b_t := \gamma_t - \int_{0 \leq x \leq 1} x\nu_t(dx)$. This proves equation (2.4).

Second, $\forall s, t$ such that $0 \leq s < t$, we prove that the increment $Z_t - Z_s$ is a non-negative random variable almost surely. By definition of additive process, we get the characteristic function of $Z_t - Z_s$

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{iu(Z_t - Z_s)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{iuZ_t}] / \mathbb{E}[e^{iuZ_s}]$$

and, using (2.4), we obtain an explicit formula for its exponent

$$\ln \mathbb{E}[e^{iu(Z_t - Z_s)}] = i(b_t - b_s)u + \int_{x>0} (e^{iux} - 1) (\nu_t(x) - \nu_s(x)) dx .$$

We observe that $b_t - b_s$ is non-negative, because b_t is non-decreasing by hypothesis⁴, and that $\nu_t(x) - \nu_s(x)$ is a jump measure with non-negative jumps; $\nu_t(x) - \nu_s(x)$ is a non-negative function thanks to Sato (1999, Th.9.8, p.52) and with value on $[0, \infty)$ by hypothesis. Thus, the increment $Z_t - Z_s$ is positive a.s. having a positive drift and a positive jump measure. Summing up, a non-decreasing additive process with $Z_{t=0}=0$ a.s. is an additive subordinator \square

In the next proposition, we prove that the TSS exists by checking that it is an additive process (i.e. that the triplet of the TSS satisfies the conditions of Sato 1999, Th.9.8, p.52) and that it is an additive subordinator (showing that it verifies the sufficient conditions of **Proposition 2.3**).

Proposition 2.4. *The additive tempered stable subordinator (TSS) exists and has $b_t = 0$.*

Proof. First, we prove that $\{Z_t\}$ in **Definition 2.2** is an additive process using Sato (1999, Th.9.8, p.52); that is, we check whether the triplet introduced in (2.3) satisfies the theorem conditions.

1. The triplet has no diffusion term.
2. \mathcal{V}_t is not decreasing in t because both $\sigma_t^{2\alpha}t/k_t^{1-\alpha}$ and $\sigma_t k_t$ are non-decreasing in t .
3. For $t > 0$, the continuity of $\mathcal{V}_t(B)$, where $B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $B \subset \{x : |x| > \epsilon > 0\}$, is due to the composition of continuous functions. For $t = 0$ we can extend $\mathcal{V}_t(B)$ and Γ_t to 0 since both converge to 0 as $t \rightarrow 0$. The convergence of Γ_t to 0 is due to Γ_t positiveness and to

$$\Gamma_t \leq \int_0^\infty (|x| \wedge 1) \mathcal{V}_t(x) dx \leq \int_0^\infty x \mathcal{V}_t(x) dx = t\sigma_t^2 . \quad (2.5)$$

The convergence of $\mathcal{V}_t(B)$ to 0 is due to the dominated convergence theorem. We observe that, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $|x| > \epsilon > 0$, $\mathcal{V}_t(x)$ is finite and a decreasing function of t .

Second, we verify that the conditions of **Proposition 2.3** on the generating triplet of an additive subordinator are satisfied by $\{Z_t\}$. Let us observe that there is no diffusion term and, accordingly to (2.5), $\int_0^\infty (|x| \wedge 1) \mathcal{V}_t(x) dx < \infty$.

Moreover, $\mathcal{V}_t((-\infty, 0]) = 0$ and b_t is null by direct substitution of Γ_t in the formula of **Proposition 2.3**. Thus, $\{Z_t\}$ is an additive subordinator \square

⁴We point out that if $s = 0$ then $b_t \geq 0 \forall t$ because b_t is non decreasing and $b_0 = 0$. The latter is true because for any additive process $\gamma_0 = 0$ and $\nu_0 = 0$.

In the next proposition, we utilize the TSS to construct the ATS –with η_t constant– via additive subordination.

Proposition 2.5. *It is possible to construct via additive subordination an additive process with characteristic function (2.2) if and only if η_t is constant.*

Proof. We prove the only if using the results in **Theorem 2.1**. In particular, we have shown that is impossible to construct via independent subordination the ATS, an additive process with characteristic function (2.2), if η_t is non-constant.

We prove the if. Notice that the conditions for the existence of the TSS are satisfied by any couple k_t, σ_t that satisfies the condition of existence of the ATS (cf. Azzone and Baviera 2022a, Th.2.1, p.503) with η_t constant. Hence, for any ATS with η_t constant, we can define the TSS. Thanks to Mijatović and Pistorius (2010), Prop.1, p.2, the process $W(Z_t) + (1/2 + \eta)Z_t$ is an additive process, where $\{Z_t\}$ is the TSS in (2.3) independent from the BM and η is a positive constant. Adding the deterministic continuous function $\varphi_t t$ to $W(Z_t) + (1/2 + \eta)Z_t$ preserves the additivity property. Moreover, thanks to the tower property of expectations, it is possible to verify that $W(Z_t) - (1/2 + \eta)Z_t + \varphi_t t$ has the same characteristic function of the ATS \square

Let us comment on this proposition. A subcase of the ATS –when η_t is constant– can be obtained through additive subordination. Interestingly, the parameter η_t is connected with the model implied volatility skew; i.e. is the at-the-money derivative of the implied volatility with respect to the strike price (for a definition see e.g., Gatheral 2011, Ch.3, p.35). It is well established, in the equity case, that the short time skew is proportionally inverse to the square root of the time to maturity.

In Figure 2, we present an example of the short time implied volatility skew for the EURO STOXX 50 at a given date, the 21st of March 2019. We plot the market skew with respect to the time to maturity t : it appears to be well described by a fit $O\left(\sqrt{1/t}\right)$.




Figure 1: Example of the EURO STOXX 50 short-time implied volatility skew on the 21st of March 2019. We plot the market skew with respect to the time t and an $O(\sqrt{1/t})$ curve.

It has been proven that the ATS reproduces this feature of the equity market implied volatility if and only if η_t is non constant and is proportional to $t^{-1/2}$ (Azzone and Baviera 2022b). In the upcoming section, we propose a statistical test to provide evidence of a non-constant η_t in the S&P 500 and EURO STOXX 50 derivative markets.

In **Proposition 2.5**, we have established that it is possible to construct via additive subordination the ATS if and only if η_t is constant. In the following, we demonstrate that it is not possible to construct the ATS with non-constant η_t even with a generalization of additive subordination: processes within the class $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$. Notice that this structure is more general than the subordinated BM (2.1) because a_t and b_t are functions of time. The generalization stems naturally from Lévy subordination. Let us explain why. The ATS is an extension of the well-known Lévy normal tempered stable (LTS) process (see Cont and Tankov 2003, Ch.4). The LTS $\{g_t\}$ is usually built through Lévy subordination as

$$g_t = - \left(\eta + \frac{1}{2} \right) Z_t + W_{Z_t} + \varphi t \quad , \quad (2.6)$$

where η is a real parameter while φ is obtained by imposing the martingale condition on the forward price. $\{Z_t\}$ is a Lévy tempered stable subordinator with mean $\sigma^2 t$ and variance $\sigma^4 k t$. The most common example of LTS are NIG (Barndorff-Nielsen 1997) and VG (Madan *et al.* 1998). The former is built with an Inverse Gaussian Lévy subordinator ($\alpha = 1/2$) while the latter with a Gamma Lévy subordinator ($\alpha = 0$).

Can we build the ATS in a similar manner to equation (2.6) but with time-dependent parameters and an additive subordinator? We consider the process $\{g_t\}$ such that

$$g_t = - \left(\eta_t + \frac{1}{2} \right) Z_t + W_{Z_t} + \varphi_t t \quad , \quad (2.7)$$

where $\{Z_t\}$ is an additive subordinator. We point out that $\{g_t\}$ in (2.7) is not a subordinated BM as in (2.1) because it depends on η_t (a function of t). Let us notice that, if $\{Z_t\}$ is the TSS of **Definition 2.2** the process $\{g_t\}$ at time t has the same characteristic function of the ATS (2.2). Consequently, if a process in the form $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$ is an additive process for a_t positive, increasing and continuous, and b_t and c_t real and continuous, we would obtain that the process in (2.7) is identical in law to the ATS. However, in the next theorem, we demonstrate that a process in the form $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$ is an additive process if and only if a_t and b_t are constant; i.e. it corresponds to a subordinated BM (2.1).

Theorem 2.6. *The process $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$, with a_t positive, increasing and continuous and b_t real and continuous, is an additive process if and only if a_t and b_t are constant in time.*

Proof. First, let us prove the only if part. We define $f_t := W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t$. We show that, if it exists $t > s$ such that $a_t \neq a_s$ or $b_t \neq b_s$ then the increment $f_t - f_s$ is not independent from f_s ; thus, $\{f_t\}$ is not an additive process. We use the fact that two random variables Y_1 and Y_2 are independent if and only if, for any $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1 Y_1 + iu_2 Y_2}] = \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1 Y_1}] \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_2 Y_2}] \quad . \quad (2.8)$$

We need to show that it exists a couple $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1(f_t - f_s) + iu_2 f_s}] \neq \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1(f_t - f_s)}] \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_2 f_s}] \quad . \quad (2.9)$$

The left hand side of (2.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1(f_t - f_s) + iu_2 f_s}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{iu_1(b_t Z_t - b_s Z_s) - \frac{1}{2} u_1^2 (a_t Z_t - a_s Z_s) + iu_2 b_s Z_s - \frac{1}{2} u_2^2 (a_s Z_s)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{iu_1 b_t (Z_t - Z_s) - \frac{1}{2} u_1^2 a_t (Z_t - Z_s)} \right] \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left[e^{iu_1 (b_t - b_s) Z_s - \frac{1}{2} u_1^2 (a_t - a_s) Z_s + iu_2 b_s Z_s - \frac{1}{2} u_2^2 (a_s Z_s)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{iu_1 b_t (Z_t - Z_s) - \frac{1}{2} u_1^2 a_t (Z_t - Z_s)} \right] \mathbb{E} [e^{i\hat{u}_1 Z_s + i\hat{u}_2 Z_s}] \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where $i\hat{u}_1 := iu_1(b_t - b_s) - \frac{1}{2} u_1^2 (a_t - a_s)$ and $i\hat{u}_2 := iu_2 b_s - \frac{1}{2} u_2^2 (a_s)$. We obtain the first equality by tower property of the expected value by conditioning with respect to the filtration of $\{Z_t\}$ and because $a_s Z_s$ is non-decreasing. The second equality follows by the fact that the increment $Z_t - Z_s$ is independent from Z_s .

The right hand side of (2.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1(f_t - f_s)}] \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_2 f_s}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{iu_1(b_t Z_t - b_s Z_s) - \frac{1}{2} u_1^2 (a_t Z_t - a_s Z_s)} \right] \mathbb{E} [e^{i\hat{u}_2 Z_s}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{iu_1 b_t (Z_t - Z_s) - \frac{1}{2} u_1^2 a_t (Z_t - Z_s)} \right] \mathbb{E} [e^{i\hat{u}_1 Z_s}] \mathbb{E} [e^{i\hat{u}_2 Z_s}] \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

As above, the second equality follows by the fact that the increment $Z_t - Z_s$ is independent from Z_s .

We show that (2.9) is true by contradiction. Let us assume that (2.9) holds with the equality:

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1(f_t - f_s) + iu_2 f_s}] = \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_1(f_t - f_s)}] \mathbb{E} [e^{iu_2 f_s}] \quad .$$

By substituting (2.10) and (2.11) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{(i\hat{u}_1+i\hat{u}_2)Z_s}] = \mathbb{E} [e^{i\hat{u}_1Z_s}] \mathbb{E} [e^{i\hat{u}_2Z_s}] \quad , \quad (2.12)$$

where the process $\{Z_t\}$ appears on both sides of the equality. The last equation is absurd for any couple of \hat{u}_1 and \hat{u}_2 because $\{Z_t\}$ is not deterministic. This proves the only if part.

We prove the if part using Proposition 1 of Mijatović and Pistorius (2010). If $a_t = a$ and $b_t = b$ are constant in time $W(at) + bt$ is a Lévy process with diffusion term a and drift term b . Then, $\{W(aZ_t) + bZ_t\}$ is an additive process \square

In this section, we have proven two main results regarding additive subordination and its limitations. First, in **Theorem 2.1**, we establish that an additive process is not always identical in law to a subordinated BM whatever the choice of the subordinator. Second, in **Theorem 2.6**, we demonstrate that also considering a natural extension of additive subordination we cannot construct a process identical in law to an additive process. These results have been proven considering as a counterexample the class of ATS processes with non-constant η_t . In the next section, we provide statistical evidence, on a large dataset of options, that only a non-constant η_t is consistent with market prices. In light of these findings, we can tentatively answer the question posed in the title. For a large class of additive processes, subordination (i.e. the case with constant η_t) is irrelevant for applications in the derivative market.

3 Dataset & Numerical experiments

In this section, we present the dataset, and propose a statistical test to verify whether the ATS with constant η_t can calibrate the equity derivatives' implied volatility surface. In the previous section, we have proven that this is the unique subcase of the ATS which can be constructed through additive subordination. We find, in all business days in a six-month time horizon, strong statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis of a constant η_t ; hence, additive subordination cannot describe adequately the equity market prices.

We consider all closing prices for S&P 500 and EURO STOXX 50 options⁵ each business day in the first semester of 2019 from the 1st of January 2019 to the 30th of June 2019. For every business day, we observe option prices not only on several strikes but also on several expiries: the third Friday of the first six months after the considered business day and then on March, June, September, and December in the front year and June and December in the next year. For the EURO STOXX 50, options expiring in December of the following years are also available. Financial data are provided by Eikon Reuters. We obtain interest rates and future prices following the methodology introduced in Azzone and Baviera (2021). Moreover, we consider options within the (10%, 90%) Black and Scholes delta interval.

A brief description of the numerical methodology follows. We consider the ATS NIG ($\alpha = 1/2$) and the ATS VG ($\alpha = 0$). Similar results hold for any choice of $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. The methodology is divided into two steps.

First, for every business day, the ATS (NIG or VG) parameters are calibrated following the same procedure described in Cont and Tankov (2003, Ch.14, pp.464-465): we consider the options

⁵We consider the CBOE European options on the S&P 500 and EUREX European options for the EURO STOXX 50. The Eikon Reuters option chains are $0\#SPX^*.U$ for the S&P 500 and $0\#STXE^*.EX$ for the EURO STOXX 50.

maturity by maturity and obtain, for every maturity T , the three time-dependent parameters k_T , σ_T and η_T .

Second, we define $\theta := T\sigma_T^2$ and the ATS process \hat{f}_θ with parameters $\hat{k}_\theta := k_T\sigma_T^2$, $\hat{\eta}_\theta := \eta_T$ and $\hat{\sigma}_\theta := 1$. This new process, which is defined with respect to the new time θ , has the same characteristic function of the calibrated ATS for every maturity. Then, testing the null hypothesis that $\hat{\eta}_\theta$ is constant with respect to time θ is equivalent to testing that η_T is constant with respect to the original time T . When considering a power scaling behavior of $\hat{\eta}_\theta$

$$\hat{\eta}_\theta = \eta\theta^\delta, \quad (3.1)$$

where η is positive and δ is real. In all days analyzed, this self-similar $\hat{\eta}_\theta$ appears to describe accurately market data for all available maturities –from a few days up to some years– for both markets and both the NIG and VG ATS. In figure 2, we plot a representative example. We consider the VG ATS calibrated values of $\hat{\eta}_\theta$ in log-log scale, for the S&P 500 on the 21st of March 2019. We also report confidence intervals and a weighted regression line. The methodology is described in detail by Azzone and Baviera (2022a), appendix B. We estimate δ as the slope coefficient of the regression and we test whether it is non-zero. Notice that, if $\delta \neq 0$, $\hat{\eta}_\theta$ is non-constant.




Figure 2: Weighted regression line and observed $\ln \hat{\eta}_\theta$ with respect to $\ln \theta$ for the VG calibrated model on the 21st of March 2019 for the S&P 500 index. We plot confidence intervals equal to two times the corresponding standard deviations. In the analysis, we consider all available times to maturity that span from a few days to almost three years. Similar results hold for both indexes in all business days of the observed period.

We test whether δ is non-zero for the NIG and the VG ATS in the six-month dataset described at the beginning of this section: we calibrate the ATS on option prices for each day of the dataset and repeat the statistical test on δ each day. The mean and maximum p-values of the statistical tests are reported in table 1.

In all cases, we reject the null hypothesis of $\delta = 0$ with a 1‰ threshold. Hence, for both indexes and both models (ATS VG and NIG), and in all considered days of the semester, there is statistical evidence that $\hat{\eta}_\theta$ is non-constant.

Model	Index	Mean	Maximum
NIG	S&P 500	$5 * 10^{-6}$	$5 * 10^{-4}$
VG	S&P 500	10^{-152}	10^{-150}
NIG	EURO STOXX 50	$2 * 10^{-19}$	$2 * 10^{-17}$
VG	EURO STOXX 50	$3 * 10^{-6}$	$4 * 10^{-4}$

Table 1: Mean and maximum values of the statistical tests. We refuse the null hypothesis of $\delta = 0$ for the NIG and the VG model for every business day from the 1st of January 2019 to the 30th of June 2019.

From the results in the table, we reject the null hypothesis with a 1‰ threshold in all cases. Let us also underline that all p-values, in all days and for both models and indexes, are below 10^{-4} with two exceptions.

In appendix A, we provide additional calibration result that shows why the ATS with constant η_t is not consistent with market data. We compare the calibration performances of an ATS and an ATS with constant η_t . While for long maturity both reproduce accurately the smile, for shorter maturities the latter deviates considerably. This fact is in line with the theoretical results on the short time implied volatility skew: the ATS reproduces the power scaling skew if and only if η_t is non constant.

4 Conclusions

In financial applications, the independence between the BM and the time change is a standard assumption. This paper presents three interesting results on independent time changes of Brownian motions.

First, our pivotal observation is that a local semimartingale, in general, is not equivalent to a BM with a time-change *independent* from the BM. In **Theorem 2.5**, we have utilized the additive normal tempered stable process (ATS) –a class of processes that calibrates accurately equity option markets– as an example of additive process that cannot be represented with an independent time-change. This class of processes presents a deterministic function of time η_t that plays a key role in reproducing accurately the equity volatility surface. Specifically, we have established the nonexistence of any pair comprising a time change and an independent BM, where the resulting time-changed BM is equal in law to an ATS with a non-constant η_t . Hence, a representation theorem equivalent to the one of Monroe (1978) does not hold when we assume independent subordination.

Second, we have established in **Theorem 2.6** that an additive process cannot even be expressed as the natural generalization of additive subordination: a process in the form $\{W(a_t Z_t) + b_t Z_t + c_t\}$, where a_t and b_t are non-constant functions of time and Z_t is an additive subordinator. Once again, we have utilized the ATS as a counterexample to prove the theorem. Furthermore, we prove that only a specific subcase of the ATS, characterized by a constant η_t , can be obtained through independent (additive) subordination (**Proposition 2.5**).

Thus, a natural question arises for a practitioner’s perspective. Can the aforementioned subcase of the ATS adequately replicate market data? We devise a statistical test to address this question. We have provided strong statistical evidence that the ATS with a constant parameter η_t is inconsistent with the two most liquid equity derivative markets; we have considered all closing prices

for S&P 500 and EURO STOXX 50 options each business day in the first semester of 2019. We report the results in table 1: for every day within this period, we reject the null hypothesis of a constant η_t with a 1% threshold. Thus, independent subordination does not adequately replicate market data.

References

- Azzone, M. and Baviera, R., 2021. Synthetic forwards and cost of funding in the equity derivative market, *Finance Research Letters*, 41, 101841.
- Azzone, M. and Baviera, R., 2022a. Additive normal tempered stable processes for equity derivatives and power-law scaling, *Quantitative Finance*, 22 (3), 501–518.
- Azzone, M. and Baviera, R., 2022b. Short-time implied volatility of additive normal tempered stable processes, *Annals of Operations Research*, 1–34.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E., 1997. Normal Inverse Gaussian distributions and stochastic volatility modelling, *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 24 (1), 1–13.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E., Maejima, M., and Sato, K.I., 2006. Infinite divisibility for stochastic processes and time change, *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 19, 411–446.
- Carr, P. and Torricelli, L., 2021. Additive logistic processes in option pricing, *Finance and Stochastics*, 25 (4), 689–724.
- Cont, R. and Tankov, P., 2003. *Financial Modelling with jump processes*, Chapman and Hall/CRC Financial Mathematics Series.
- Galloway, M.L. and Nolder, C.A., 2008. Subordination, self-similarity, and option pricing, *Journal of Applied Mathematics & Decision Sciences*, 2008 (1).
- Gatheral, J., 2011. *The volatility surface: a practitioner's guide*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Geman, H., Madan, D.B., and Yor, M., 2001. Time changes for Lévy processes, *Mathematical Finance*, 11 (1), 79–96.
- Jacod, J. and Shiryaev, A., 2013. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, vol. 288, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Linders, D. and Stassen, B., 2016. The multivariate Variance Gamma model: basket option pricing and calibration, *Quantitative Finance*, 16 (4), 555–572.
- Luciano, E., Marena, M., and Semeraro, P., 2016. Dependence calibration and portfolio fit with factor-based subordinators, *Quantitative Finance*, 16 (7), 1037–1052.
- Madan, D.B., Carr, P., and Chang, E.C., 1998. The Variance Gamma process and option pricing, *Review of Finance*, 2 (1), 79–105.
- Madan, D.B. and Wang, K., 2020. Additive processes with bilateral Gamma marginals, *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 27 (3), 171–188.
- Madan, D.B. and Wang, K., 2023. The economics of time as it is embedded in the prices of options, *Quantitative Finance*, 23 (4), 579–593.
- Mijatović, A. and Pistorius, M., 2010. On additive time-changes of Feller processes, *in: Progress in Analysis and its Applications*, World Scientific, 431–437.

Monroe, I., 1978. Processes that can be embedded in Brownian motion, *The Annals of Probability*, 42–56.

Sato, K.I., 1999. *Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions*, Cambridge University Press.

Acknowledgments

We thank G. Callegaro, G. Guatteri, E. Scalas, L. Torricelli for their useful comments and P. Carr for enlightening discussions on the topic.

A Calibration Results

In this appendix, we report some additional calibration results to highlight that an ATS with constant η_t lacks the capacity to calibrate adequately market data; this is the unique subcase of ATS that can be represented via additive subordination (see **Proposition 2.5**). In the following, we utilize the dataset described in section 3: for every day in a six-month time horizon, all closing prices of S&P 500 and EURO STOXX 50 options within the range (10%, 90%) of Black and Scholes delta.

We calibrate the ATS and the ATS with constant η_t on the same implied volatility surface and compare the results. In figure 3, we report the volatility smile reproduced by the ATS NIG on the 21st of March 2019 on the S&P 500 implied volatility surface. The calibrated ATS implied volatility (blue dots) closely aligns with the market smile (green diamonds) both on the one month (on the left) and the one year (on the right) maturity. In contrast, the ATS with constant η_t (red triangles) conspicuously fails to capture both the level and the skew of the short time implied volatility. In figure 4, we present analogous findings for the EURO STOXX 50 volatility surface when calibrating the ATS VG. Once again, it is evident that the ATS with constant η_t fails to replicate market data.




Figure 3: ATS NIG (blue dots), ATS NIG with constant η_t (red triangles) and market (green diamond) implied volatility on the S&P 500 surface on the 21st of March 2019. The calibrated ATS fits very well the market implied volatility both on the one month (on the left) and the one year (on the right) maturity while the ATS with constant η_t is unable to match the short time smile.




Figure 4: ATS VG (blue dots), ATS VG with constant η_t (red triangles) and market (green diamond) implied volatility on the EURO STOXX 50 surface on the 21st of March 2019. The ATS fits very well the market implied volatility both on the 1 month (on the left) and the one year (on the right) maturity. As in the case of the S&P 500 the ATS with constant η_t is unable to match the short time smile.

In figure 5, we report the ATS NIG (blue dots) and ATS NIG with constant η_t (red triangles) mean squared error (MSE) with respect to different times to maturity in log-scale. While for long maturities the MSE are similar, for short maturities the ATS with constant η_t has a MSE more than two orders of magnitude above the ATS.




Figure 5: ATS NIG (blue dots) and ATS NIG with constant η_t (red triangles) mean squared error (MSE) with respect to different times to maturity in log-scale on the 21st of March 2019. Let us notice that, while for long maturities the MSE are similar, for short maturities the ATS with constant η_t has a MSE more than two orders of magnitude above the ATS.

These results are in line with the discussion in section 2: the theoretical skew of the ATS matches the short time power scaling behavior observed in the market if and only η_t is not constant. We can understand from figures 3-5 how much this constraint on η_t affects the capability of the ATS to match the market implied volatility for short maturities.

In figure 6, we report the calibrated δ for the ATS NIG (on the left) and the ATS VG (on the right) for every day in the semester for the EURO STOXX 50 surface. We recall that $\delta = 0$ is equivalent to a constant η_t (see equation (3.1)). In both cases, δ is far from zero.




Figure 6: Estimated δ for the ATS NIG (on the left) and the VG (on the right) for all business days of the first semester of 2019 for the EURO STOXX 50 index. We observe that in all business days and for both models the estimated δ (red dot) is far from zero (the dashed blue line).

In section 3, we have performed a statistical test with null hypothesis $\delta = 0$ for all business days of the semester. In figure 7, we report the p-values of the statistical tests for the S&P 500 index. Let us notice that all p-values are below 0.1% with two exceptions in the NIG case and no exceptions in the VG case.




Figure 7: P-values (blue dots) of the statistical tests with null hypothesis $\delta = 0$ for the ATS NIG (on the left) and the VG (on the right) for all business days of the semester for the S&P 500 index. The continuous red line is the 1‰ threshold of the test. In all business days, and for both models, we reject the null hypothesis with a 1‰ threshold. Let us notice that all p-values are below 0.1‰ with two exceptions (identified with the red diamonds) in the NIG case and no exceptions in the VG case.