

# POLYNOMIAL TERM STRUCTURE MODELS

SI CHENG AND MICHAEL R. TEHRANCHI  
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

**ABSTRACT.** In this article, we explore a class of tractable interest rate models that have the property that the price of a zero-coupon bond can be expressed as a polynomial of a state diffusion process. Our results include a classification of all such time-homogeneous single-factor models in the spirit of Filipovic's maximal degree theorem for exponential polynomial models, as well as an explicit characterisation of the set of feasible parameters in the case when the factor process is bounded. Extensions to time-inhomogeneous and multi-factor polynomial models are also considered.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given an integer  $d \geq 1$  and a non-empty open subset  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , a  $d$ -factor arbitrage-free model of the risk-free interest rate term structure can be built from four functions,  $R : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $G : \mathbb{R}_+ \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $a : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , satisfying the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis (PDE).** The function  $G$  is twice-continuously differentiable and satisfies the partial differential equation

$$\partial_\tau G = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} b_i \partial_{z_i} G + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} a_{ij} \partial_{z_i z_j} G - RG \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_+ \times I,$$

with boundary condition

$$G(0, z) = 1 \text{ for all } z \in I;$$

**Hypothesis (SDE).** There exists a function  $\sigma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$  such that  $a = \sigma \sigma^\top$  and such that for all  $z \in I$  the stochastic differential equation

$$dZ_t = b(Z_t)dt + \sigma(Z_t)dW, \quad Z_0 = z$$

has a non-explosive weak solution  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{Q}; Z, W)$  such that the process  $Z$  takes values in  $I$  and where  $W$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^m$ -valued Brownian motion.

Indeed, given such functions  $R, G, b$  and  $a$  satisfying the above hypotheses, one need only fix  $z \in I$ , and let  $Z$  be a solution of the stochastic differential equation with  $Z_0 = z$ , where  $Z_t$  models the time- $t$  value of the economic factor. The time- $t$  spot interest rate is then modelled as

$$r_t = R(Z_t)$$

and the time- $t$  price of a zero-coupon bond of maturity  $T$  is modelled as

$$P_{t,T} = G(T - t, Z_t).$$

---

*Date:* December 24, 2020.

*Keywords and phrases:* term structure, interest rates, polynomial models.

*Mathematics Subject Classification 2010:* 91G30, 91B25, 91G80.

Note that  $P_{T,T} = G(0, Z_T) = 1$  by the boundary condition and by Itô's formula and the partial differential equation the discounted bond prices  $e^{-\int_0^t r_s ds} P_{t,T}$ , are local martingales for all  $T \geq 0$ . In particular, the measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  is a local martingale measure for the model, and hence there is no arbitrage in the bond market.

One usually takes the functions  $R$ ,  $b$  and  $a$  as given, and then solves the partial differential equation for  $G$ . In practice, such an equation could be solved numerically. However, in this paper, we turn things around and assume that the function  $G$  takes a specific form.

The motivation for this study comes from the problem of calibrating the model. Indeed, a practitioner is actually interested in a family of functions  $(R_\theta, G_\theta, b_\theta, a_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$  where  $\theta$  is an unknown parameter or vector of parameters. Given a collection of observed initial bond prices  $P_{0,T}$  for various maturities  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , one then tries to find  $\theta$  to minimise some notion of distance between the observed prices  $(P_{0,T})_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$  and the predicted prices  $(G_\theta(T, z))_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ . It is generally computationally expensive to solve the partial differential equation numerically to generate the values of  $G_\theta(T, z)$  for all, or at least a representative sample of,  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Therefore, there has been continuing interest in developing tractable models, where the function  $G_\theta$  is of a reasonably explicit form.

Perhaps the two most famous tractable factor models are those of Vasicek [19] and Cox, Ingersoll & Ross [5]. In these models the factor is scalar and identified with the spot interest rate, so in the notation above,  $d = 1$  and  $R(z) = z$ , while the functions  $b$  and  $a$  are affine and the function  $G$  is of the exponential affine form

$$G(\tau, z) = e^{h_0(\tau) + h_1(\tau)z}.$$

In the case of exponential affine models, it is well-known that the partial differential equation reduces to a system of coupled Riccati ordinary differential equations for the functions  $h_0$  and  $h_1$  and the boundary condition becomes  $h_0(0) = h_1(0) = 0$ . Furthermore, the corresponding stochastic differential equation always has a unique *local* solution. While the local solution to the Vasicek stochastic differential equation is in fact the unique global solution, the situation with the Cox–Ingersoll–Ross stochastic differential is more delicate: for some values of the parameters, local solutions may explode in finite time by hitting the boundary of the state space. Duffie & Kan [8] studied exponential affine models where the factor process is of arbitrary dimension  $d \geq 1$ , finding conditions under which the corresponding stochastic differential equation has a non-explosive solution. Subsequently, there has been a considerable body of research on the properties of these exponential affine models. A notable contribution to this literature is a general characterisation of exponential affine term structure models by Duffie, Filipović & Schachermayer [7].

An exponential affine model can be considered a special case of the family of exponential quadratic models. An early example of a quadratic model was proposed by Longstaff [16], and has since been developed and generalised by Jamshidian [13], Leippold & Wu [15], and Chen, Filipović & Poor [3] among others.

One may wonder if there exist non-trivial exponential cubic (or higher degree) models. Filipović answered this question in the negative, by showing that the maximal degree for exponential polynomial models is necessarily two. That is to say, the exponential quadratic models are indeed the most general class of exponential polynomial models.

In this article, we consider a related class of bond pricing functions, in which the function  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  itself is a polynomial. We introduce the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis (POLY)** There exists an integer  $n \geq 1$  such that the function  $G$  is of the form

$$G(\tau, z) = \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_d \leq n} g_k(\tau) z^k \text{ for all } (\tau, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times I,$$

where for  $k = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$  and  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the monomial  $z^k$  is defined as

$$z^k = z_1^{k_1} \dots z_d^{k_d},$$

and where the functions  $(g_k)_k$  are differentiable.

We are now ready to define the object of our study:

**Definition 1.1.** *A polynomial term structure model is the collection of functions  $R, G, b, a$  satisfying Hypotheses (PDE), (SDE) and (POLY) along with a family of weak solutions  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{Q}; Z, W)$  indexed by the initial point  $Z_0 = z \in I$ . A polynomial model is non-degenerate if the coefficients  $(g_k)_k$  are linearly independent functions.*

This work is inspired by the interest rate model of Siegel [18]. He showed that for all integers  $d \geq 1$  there exist an explicit affine functions  $R$  and explicit quadratic functions  $b$ , such that Hypothesis (PDE) is satisfied by a function  $G$  such that  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is affine for all  $\tau \geq 0$ . Note that in this case  $\partial_{z_i z_j} G$  vanishes identically, and hence the function  $a = \sigma \sigma^\top$  need not be specified to verify the partial differential equation. Furthermore, it was shown that for a certain choice of  $\sigma$  that the corresponding the stochastic differential equation has a non-explosive solution valued in the bounded state-space

$$I = \left\{ (z_1, \dots, z_d) : z_i > 0 \text{ for all } i \text{ and } \sum_i z_i < 1 \right\}.$$

We mention also the Brody–Hughston rational affine model [2]. Working under the objective measure  $\mathbb{P}$ , the state price density is modelled  $V_t = \alpha(t) + \beta(t)M_t$  where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are deterministic functions and  $M$  is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -martingale. Such rational affine models have been extended by Akahori–Hishida–Teichmann–Tsuchiya [1], Filipović–Larsson–Trolle [11] and Macrina [17] among others. We show in section 6 that the Brody–Hughston model fits in our time-inhomogeneous polynomial framework considered here.

Just as the Brody–Hughston model and the Siegel model described above, most of the polynomial models of this paper (but not all – see section 3.2) have the property that the spot interest rate is *bounded*. This stands in contrast to many familiar models, such as the Vasicek and Cox–Ingersoll–Ross models. Nevertheless, the range of the spot interest rate can be expressed easily in terms of the model parameters, and hence the range can be calibrated to any desired (finite) width.

Finally, a related work is that of Cuchiero, Keller-Ressel & Teichmann [6], who study a class of time-homogeneous Markov process  $Y$  with the property that the  $n$ -th (mixed) moments can be expressed as a polynomial of the initial point  $Y_0$  of degree at most  $n$ . Indeed, consider the  $d = 1$  case and let  $F_n$  be the family of polynomials of degree at most  $n$ :

$$F_n = \left\{ P : P(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n p_k z^k, p_k \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

They study the processes  $Y$  that have the property that for *any* degree  $n$  and *any* polynomial  $P \in F_n$ , for all  $t \geq 0$  there exists a polynomial  $Q \in F_n$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[P(Y_t)|Y_0 = y] = Q(y).$$

In contrast, in this work we study processes  $Z$  that have the property that for a *fixed* degree  $n$  and a *fixed* function  $R$ , for all  $t \geq 0$  there exists a polynomial  $P = G(t, \cdot) \in F_n$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^t R(Z_s)ds}|Z_0 = z] = P(z).$$

In particular, their results do not imply ours, or vice versa. For further existence results for multi-dimensional polynomial preserving processes, consult the recent paper of Filipović and Larsson [10].

In the remainder of this article is arranged as follows. In section 2, we show that the analytic hypothesis that the bond price function  $G$  satisfies a certain partial differential equation and the algebraic hypothesis that  $G$  can be expressed as a polynomial of the factor forces the interest rate function  $R$  and the coefficients of the factor dynamics  $b, a$  to be low-degree polynomials of the factor. Furthermore, we focus on dimension  $d = 1$  to explicitly spell out the linear constraints these two hypotheses place on the coefficients of these polynomials. In section 3 we provide a complete classification scalar polynomial models satisfying the probabilistic assumption that the corresponding stochastic differential equation has a non-explosive solution valued in a bounded interval. In section 4 we present a spectral representation of the bond prices in the context of scalar polynomial models. In section 5 we consider a concrete example of a parametrised family of polynomial models which generalise in a certain sense the exponential affine models. Finally in section 6, we briefly discuss a Hull–White-type extension where the coefficients are allowed to be time dependent. The appendix contains an easy-to-check formulation of Feller’s test of explosion for stochastic differential equations for stochastic differential equations with analytic coefficients, which might have independent interest.

## 2. AN ALGEBRAIC RESULT

This section contains one of the main result of this paper, a classification of models that satisfy the analytic Hypothesis (PDE) that the pricing function  $G$  solves a particular partial differential equation, in addition to having the extra structural property of Hypothesis (POLY) that  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is a polynomial of fixed degree. To more clearly see the structure of the argument we consider only the time-homogeneous case in this section. The time-inhomogeneous case is considered in section 6. The following theorem is of a purely algebraic nature. Indeed, we are waiting until the following Section 3 to enforce the probabilistic Hypothesis (SDE).

**Theorem 2.1.** *Suppose the functions  $R, G, b, a$  satisfy Hypotheses (PDE) and (POLY) where the degree of  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is at most  $n \geq 1$ . Furthermore, suppose the coefficient functions  $(g_k)_k$  are linearly independent.*

*Case  $n = 1$ . The function  $R$  is a polynomial of degree at most one, for each  $i$  the function  $b_i$  is a polynomial of degree at most two, and the function  $a$  is unrestricted.*

*Case  $n \geq 2$ . The function  $R$  is a polynomial of degree at most two, for each  $i$  the function  $b_i$  is a polynomial of degree at most three, and for each  $i, j$  the function  $a_{i,j}$  is a polynomial of degree at most four.*

*Remark 2.2.* In light of Filipović's maximal degree theorem for exponential polynomial models, it might come as a surprise that the degree  $n$  is not constrained for polynomial models.

*Proof.* Fix  $n \geq 1$ , and define the following set of indices

$$K = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d : k_1 + \dots + k_d \leq n\}.$$

Hypothesis (PDE) gives rise to the condition

$$(1) \quad \sum_{k \in K} \dot{g}_k(\tau) z^k = \sum_{k \in K_n} g_k(\tau) A_k(z) \text{ for all } (t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times I$$

where, for  $k \in K$ , the functions  $A_k$  are defined as

$$A_k(z) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} b_i(z) \partial_{z_i} z^k + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} a_{ij}(z) \partial_{z_i z_j} z^k - R(z) z^k.$$

As in the introduction, for  $m \geq 0$  define the notation

$$F_m = \left\{ P : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, P(z) = \sum_{k \in K_m} p_k z^k, \quad p_k \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

to be the family of polynomials in  $d$  variables of total degree less or equal to  $m$ . Since  $I$  is open but not empty, the values of the function  $P \in F_m$  uniquely determines its coefficients  $(p_k)_k$ .

First we show that the functions  $A_k \in F_n$  are polynomials for all  $k \in K_n$ . Let  $N = \binom{n+d}{n}$  be the cardinality of index set  $K$ . Since the functions  $(g_k)_k$  are linearly independent, we can find  $N$  distinct times  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N$  independent of  $z$  such that the matrix with  $i$ -th column formed by vector  $(g_k(\tau_i), k \in K)$  is non-singular. Now fix any  $z$ , we can rewrite condition (1) as a set of  $N$  simultaneous linear equations with  $N$  unknowns  $A_k(z)$ . Therefore the solution exists and is unique and can be written as linear combinations of the monomials  $z^k$ . In particular, all of the  $A_k(z)$  are polynomials in  $d$  variables of total degree less or equal to  $n$ .

In what follows, let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$  be the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , so all the  $i$ th component of the vector  $e_i$  is one and the other components are zero.

*Case  $n = 1$ .* Since we must have  $A_k(z) \in F_1$  for all  $k \in K = \{0, e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ , we can conclude for any  $1 \leq i \leq d$

$$\begin{aligned} A_0(z) &= -R(z) && \in F_1 \\ A_{e_i}(z) &= b_i(z) - z_i R(z) && \in F_1 \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $R$  is affine, and hence  $b_i(z) = A_{e_i}(z) + z_i R(z)$  is quadratic for all  $i$ .

*Case  $n \geq 2$ .* Since we must have  $A_k(z) \in F_n$  for all  $k \in K$ , we can conclude for any  $1 \leq i, j \leq d$

$$\begin{aligned} A_0(z) &= -R(z) && \in F_n \\ A_{e_i}(z) &= b_i(z) - z_i R(z) && \in F_n \\ A_{e_i+e_j}(z) &= b_i(z) z_j + b_j(z) z_i + a_{ij}(z) - z_i z_j R(z) && \in F_n \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we may conclude that  $R \in F_n$  that  $b_i = A_{e_i} + z_i R \in F_{n+1}$  and  $a_{ij} = A_{e_i+e_j} + z_i z_j R - b_i z_j - b_j z_i \in F_{n+2}$ . In particular, the functions  $R(z), b_i, a_{ij}$  are polynomials. On the

other hand since

$$A_{ne_i}(z) = nz_i^{n-1}b_i(z) + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}z_i^{n-2}a_{ii}(z) - z_i^n R(z) \in F_n$$

by cancelling the  $z_i^{n-2}$  factor, we may deduce that

$$(2) \quad nz_i b_i(z) + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_{ii}(z) - z_i^2 R(z) \in F_2$$

Similarly by considering  $A_{(n-1)e_i}$  and  $A_{(n-2)e_i}$ , we get

$$(3) \quad (n-1)z_i b_i(z) + \frac{(n-2)(n-1)}{2}a_{ii}(z) - z_i^2 R(z) \in F_3$$

$$(4) \quad (n-2)z_i b_i(z) + \frac{(n-2)(n-3)}{2}a_{ii}(z) - z_i^2 R(z) \in F_4$$

Subtracting equation (2) from equation (3) and subtracting equation (3) from equation (4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} z_i b_i(z) + (n-1)a_{ii}(z) &\in F_3 \\ z_i b_i(z) + (n-2)a_{ii}(z) &\in F_4 \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting once more yields  $a_{ii} \in F_4$ , and hence  $b_i \in F_3$ . Substituting this into equation (2) yields  $R \in F_2$ .

Finally, considering  $A_{(n-1)e_i+e_j}$  as above yields

$$(n-1)z_i z_j b_i(z) + z_i^2 b_j(z) + \frac{(n-2)(n-1)}{2}z_j a_{ii}(z) + (n-1)z_i a_{ij}(z) - z_i^2 z_j R(z) \in F_3$$

from which the conclusion  $a_{ij} \in F_4$  follows.  $\square$

We now restrict attention to the scalar case to describe explicitly the constraints on the coefficients of the various polynomials appearing in Theorem 2.1:

**Theorem 2.3.** *Suppose the dimension is  $d = 1$  and the function  $G$  satisfies Hypothesis (POLY), where the degree of  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is at most  $n \geq 1$ . Furthermore, assume  $R(z) = R_0 + R_1 z + R_2 z^2$ ,  $b(z) = b_0 + b_1 z + b_2 z^2 + b_3 z^3$  and  $a(z) = a_0 + a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + a_3 z^3 + a_4 z^4$ .*

*Then the functions  $R, G, b, a$  satisfies Hypothesis (PDE) if*

$$(COEF) \quad R_2 = \frac{n}{2}b_3 = -\frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_4 \text{ and } R_1 = nb_2 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_3.$$

and  $(g_0, \dots, g_n)$  solves the system of linear ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g}_k &= \left( (k-2)b_3 + \frac{(k-2)(k-3)}{2}a_4 - R_2 \right) g_{k-2} \\ (ODE) \quad &+ \left( (k-1)b_2 + \frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}a_3 - R_1 \right) g_{k-1} + \left( kb_1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{2}a_2 - R_0 \right) g_k \\ &+ \left( (k+1)b_0 + \frac{k(k+1)}{2}a_1 \right) g_{k+1} + \frac{(k+2)(k+1)}{2}a_0 g_{k+2}, \text{ for } 0 \leq k \leq n, \\ g_k(0) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } k \geq 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where we interpret  $g_{-2} = g_{-1} = g_{n+1} = g_{n+2} = 0$ .

Conversely if the functions  $R, G, b, a$  satisfies Hypothesis (PDE) and the functions  $(g_k)_k$  are linearly independent, then the coefficients of the polynomials  $R, b, a$  satisfy equation (COEF) and the coefficients  $(g_k)_k$  of the polynomial  $G$  satisfy equation (ODE).

To better understand the statement of Theorem 2.3, we introduce some notation that we will use in the proof as well as in the sequel. Fix  $n \geq 1$ , and let  $\mathbf{L} = (L_{i,j})_{i,j=0}^n$  be the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  matrix with entries

$$L_{j+k,j} = jb_{k+1} + \frac{j(j-1)}{2}a_{k+2} - R_k$$

and where  $R_k = b_k = a_k = 0$  when  $k < 0$  and  $R_k = b_{k+1} = a_{k+2} = 0$  when  $k > 2$ . For instance, when  $n \geq 4$ , the matrix has the form

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} -R_0 & b_0 & a_0 & & & & \\ -R_1 & b_1 - R_0 & 2b_0 + a_1 & 3a_0 & & & \\ -R_2 & b_2 - R_1 & 2b_1 + a_2 - R_0 & 3b_0 + 3a_1 & 6a_0 & & \\ & b_3 - R_2 & 2b_2 + a_3 - R_1 & 3b_1 + 3a_2 - R_0 & 4b_0 + 6a_1 & \ddots & \\ & & 2b_3 + a_4 - R_2 & 3b_2 + 3a_3 - R_1 & 4b_1 + 6a_2 - R_0 & \ddots & \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

If we defined the  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  valued function  $g = (g_0, \dots, g_n)^\top$  then equation (ODE) becomes

$$\dot{g} = \mathbf{L}g, \quad g(0) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top.$$

For future reference, let  $\mathbf{I}$  is the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  identity matrix and let  $\mathbf{Z}$  be the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  matrix defined by

$$\mathbf{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & & \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \end{pmatrix},$$

so that  $Z_{ij} = \delta_{i,j+1}$ , where  $\delta$  is the Kronecker delta. Note that if we define the operation  $\hat{\cdot}: \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow F_n$  by the formula

$$\hat{p}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n p_k z^k = (1, z, \dots, z^n)p$$

for a column vector  $p = (p_0, \dots, p_n)^\top$ , then

$$z\hat{p}(z) = \widehat{\mathbf{Z}p}(z) + p_n z^{n+1}.$$

Similarly, let

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & & \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & \ddots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \end{pmatrix}$$

so that  $D_{ij} = i \delta_{i,j-1}$  and in particular

$$\hat{p}'(z) = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}p(z).$$

With this notation, we have the formula

$$\mathbf{L} = b(\mathbf{Z})\mathbf{D} + \frac{1}{2}a(\mathbf{Z})\mathbf{D}^2 - R(\mathbf{Z}).$$

Letting  $\mathcal{L}$  be the differential operator such that

$$\mathcal{L}P(z) = b(z)P'(z) + \frac{1}{2}a(z)P''(z) - R(z)P(z)$$

for a polynomial  $P$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\hat{p}(z) &= \widehat{\mathbf{L}}p(z) + (nb_2 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_3 - R_1)p_n z^{n+1} \\ &\quad + ((n-1)b_3 + \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}a_4 - R_2)p_{n-1} z^{n+1} \\ &\quad + (nb_3 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_4 - R_2)p_n z^{n+2} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $G$  satisfy Hypothesis (POLY) so that

$$G(\tau, z) = \widehat{g}(\tau)(z)$$

in the notation introduced above. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}G - \partial_\tau G &= \widehat{\mathbf{L}}g - \dot{g} + (nb_3 + \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)a_4 - R_2)g_n z^{n+2} \\ &\quad + (nb_2 + \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)a_3 - R_1)g_n z^{n+1} + ((n-1)b_3 + \frac{1}{2}(n-1)(n-2)a_4 - R_2)g_{n-1} z^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, if the equations (COEF) and (ODE) hold, then  $G$  satisfies Hypothesis (PDE).

Conversely, suppose  $\partial_\tau G = \mathcal{L}G$ . The left hand side of the above equation vanishes and the term  $\widehat{\mathbf{L}}g - \dot{g}$  is of degree at most  $n$ . Hence, the coefficient of  $z^{n+2}$  must vanish yielding

$$(5) \quad nb_3 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_4 = R_2$$

Similarly, the linear independence of  $g_{n-1}$  and  $g_n$  implies that the coefficients of each of the two  $z^{n+1}$  terms vanish, yielding

$$nb_2 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_3 = R_1.$$

and

$$(6) \quad (n-1)b_3 + \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}a_4 = R_2$$

Note that equations (5) and (6) together are equivalent to equation (COEF). Finally, we are left with  $\widehat{\mathbf{L}}g = \dot{g}$  identically, implying  $\mathbf{L}g = \dot{g}$  as claimed.  $\square$

### 3. SOME PROBABILISTIC RESULTS

In this section we include some results related to the probabilistic assumption that a certain stochastic differential equation has a non-explosive solution.



**3.1. Bounded state space.** We now argue that there are good reasons to make the further assumption that the state space  $I$  of the factor process  $Z$  in a polynomial model is bounded, at least in the one-dimensional case.

Recall that we aim to model the price  $P_{t,T}$  at time  $t$  of a zero-coupon bond of maturity  $T$  by the formula  $P_{t,T} = G(T - t, Z_t)$  where  $Z_t$  is the economic factor at time  $t$ . Since the payout of the bond is its face value  $P_{T,T} = 1$ , it is reasonable to assume that the bond prices are bounded. Indeed, to avoid a buy-and-hold arbitrage, one must have  $P_{t,T} > 0$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq T$ ; furthermore, assuming the existence of a bank account continuously paying the spot interest rate  $r_t$  and assuming that this interest rate is bounded from below in the sense that  $r_t \geq -C$  for all  $t \geq 0$  for some constant  $C > 0$ , then there would be a buy-and-hold arbitrage unless  $P_{t,T} \leq e^{(T-t)C}$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq T$ .

The above discussion motivates considering the additional hypothesis that the bond prices are bounded:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Consider a non-degenerate polynomial model in dimension  $d = 1$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *The function  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is bounded on  $I$  for all  $\tau \geq 0$ .*
- (2) *The function  $R$  is bounded on  $I$ .*
- (3) *The interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is bounded.*

*If any one (and therefore all) of the statements holds, then*

$$G(\tau, z) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^\tau R(Z_s)ds} | Z_0 = z] \text{ for all } (t, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times I.$$

*Proof.* (1) implies (3). By Hypothesis (POLY) the function  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is a polynomial for all  $\tau \geq 0$ . Furthermore, if it were the case that  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  was a constant for all  $\tau \geq 0$ , then we would have  $g_k(\tau) = 0$  for all  $k \geq 1$  and  $\tau \geq 0$ , contradicting the assumption that the coefficients are linearly independent. Hence, there exists a  $\tau > 0$  such that  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is non-constant. We are done since non-constant polynomials in one real variable are unbounded on unbounded intervals.

(2) implies (3). By Theorem 2.3 the function  $R$  is a polynomial. If it were the case that  $R$  was constant, then one (and therefore the only) solution to the system of linear equations (B) would be  $g_0(\tau) = e^{-R_0\tau}$  and  $g_k(\tau) = 0$  for all  $k \geq 1$  and  $\tau \geq 0$ . Again this would contradict the assumption of linear independence of the functions  $(g_k)_k$ . Hence  $R$  is a non-constant polynomial and we are done.

(3) implies both (1) and (2). This is obvious, since the functions  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  and  $R$  are polynomials.

Fix  $z \in I$ , and let  $Z$  solve the stochastic differential equation with  $Z_0 = z$ . Also fix a time horizon  $\tau > 0$ . As mentioned in the introduction, since  $G$  satisfies the partial differential equation, then by Itô's formula we know that the process  $M = (M_t)_{0 \leq t \leq \tau}$  defined by

$$M_t = e^{-\int_0^t R(Z_s)ds} G(\tau - t, Z_t)$$

is a local martingale. By assumptions (1) and (2), the process  $M$  is bounded by a constant.

In particular, the bounded local martingale  $M$  is a true martingale by the dominated convergence theorem, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} G(\tau, z) &= M_0 = \mathbb{E}[M_\tau] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^\tau R(Z_s)ds}] \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

*Remark 3.2.* Note that in higher dimensions, non-constant polynomials may be bounded on unbounded sets. For instance, consider the polynomial

$$P(z_1, z_2) = z_1 - z_2$$

on the unbounded set

$$I = \{(z_1, z_2) : |z_1 - z_2| \leq 1\}.$$

*Remark 3.3.* Notice that the boundedness of the bond pricing function  $G$  does *not* imply the boundedness of the state space  $I$  in the case of *exponential* polynomial models such as Cox–Ingersoll–Ross.

The following corollary of Proposition 3.1 also serves somewhat as a converse:

**Corollary 3.4.** *Consider a non-degenerate polynomial model in dimension  $d = 1$ , such that the function  $R$  is bounded from below on  $I$  and*

$$G(\tau, z) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^\tau R(Z_s)ds} | Z_0 = z] \text{ for all } t \geq 0, z \in I.$$

*Then the interval  $I$  is bounded and the function  $R$  is bounded from above on  $I$ .*

*Proof.* From the formula, it is clear that the function  $G$  is bounded from below by zero. And since  $R$  is bounded from below, the function  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is bounded from above. The conclusion follows from Proposition 3.1 □

Before closing this section, we consider a consequence of Theorem 2.3 in the context of bounded scalar polynomial models:

**Proposition 3.5.** *Consider a non-degenerate polynomial model in dimension  $d = 1$  where the interval  $I$  is bounded and  $G(\tau, \cdot)$  is of degree at most  $n$ . Let  $P$  is a polynomial at most  $n$  and let*

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^\tau R(Z_s)ds} P(Z_t) | Z_0 = z] = Q(\tau, z) \text{ for } \tau \geq 0, z \in I.$$

*Then for all  $\tau \geq 0$ , the function  $Q(\tau, \cdot)$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $P$  can be written as  $P(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n p_k z^k$ . Let  $q$  be the unique  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  valued solution of

$$\dot{q} = \mathbf{L}q, \quad q(0) = p.$$

Let  $Q(\tau, z) = \widehat{q(\tau)}(z)$  for  $\tau \geq 0$ . Note that  $Q$  solves the partial differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau Q &= \mathcal{L}Q \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_+ \times I \\ Q(0, z) &= P(z) \text{ for } z \in I. \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument of the proof of Proposition 3.1 we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^\tau R(Z_s)ds} P(Z_t) | Z_0 = z] = Q(\tau, z) \text{ for } \tau \geq 0, z \in I.$$

as desired. □

**3.2. An unbounded example.** The message of Proposition 3.1 is that the assumptions that the bond prices are bounded and that the bond prices are polynomials in a scalar factor together imply that the spot interest rate is bounded.

In this section, we show by example that there exists an example of a polynomial model where the spot rate, and therefore the bond prices, are unbounded. The point is not to suggest that this particular model is a good model of real world interest rates, but rather to show that the hypotheses that define polynomial models do not by themselves imply boundedness. That is to say, if one wants to a model to imply bounded bond prices, then it is necessary to add boundedness as an additional assumption.

Let the state space be  $I = (0, \infty)$ , and the degree be  $n = 2$ , the coefficient functions be given by

$$a(z) = z^2, \quad b(z) = -\frac{1}{2}z^2, \quad R(z) = -z,$$

and the bond pricing function be

$$G(\tau, z) = 1 + \tau z + \frac{1}{2}(e^\tau - \tau - 1)z^2.$$

Note that

$$\partial_\tau G = b\partial_z H + \frac{1}{2}a\partial_{zz}G - RG$$

with initial condition

$$G(0, z) = 1$$

so we are in the setting of Theorem 2.3. Finally note that the unique strong solution of the stochastic differential equation

$$dZ_t = -\frac{1}{2}Z_t^2 dt + Z_t dW_t, \quad Z_0 = z$$

is given by the formula

$$Z_t = \frac{ze^{W_t - t/2}}{1 + \frac{z}{2} \int_0^t e^{W_s - s/2} ds}.$$

Therefore, these data constitute a polynomial model according to Definition 1.1 where the spot rate is unbounded.

Finally, notice the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(e^{\int_0^\tau Z_s ds}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{z}{2} \int_0^\tau e^{W_s - s/2} ds \right)^2 \right] \\ &= G(\tau, z) \end{aligned}$$

which can be verified by explicit calculation.

*Remark 3.6.* This example does not violate Corollary 3.4 since in this case, the function  $R$  is bounded *from above* but not from below.

*Remark 3.7.* We mention here an interesting (though a bit tangential) observation regarding the above example. It is easy to see that the process  $Z$  introduced is such that the process  $Y = e^Z$  defines a local martingale with dynamics

$$dY_t = Y_t \log(Y_t) dW_t, \quad Y_0 = e^z.$$

It is slightly less obvious that the process  $Y$  is a strictly local martingale. See, for instance, the paper of Goodman [12] for related results.

**3.3. A form of Feller's test.** As argued in Section 3.1, there are economic reasons to consider polynomial models in which the factor process takes values in a bounded interval. Therefore, in this subsection we consider solutions to the scalar stochastic differential equation

$$dZ_t = b(Z_t)dt + \sigma(Z_t)dW_t,$$

which live in a bounded state space  $I = (z_{\min}, z_{\max})$ . Furthermore, in light of Theorem 2.3, we assume that the coefficients  $b$  and  $\sigma^2$  are polynomials.

To avoid trivial complications, we assume

$$\sigma(z_{\min}) = 0 = \sigma(z_{\max}) \text{ and } \sigma(z) > 0 \text{ for } z_{\min} < z < z_{\max}.$$

Note that the coefficient  $b$  is Lipschitz on the closed interval  $[z_{\min}, z_{\max}]$ , while the coefficient  $\sigma$  is Lipschitz on any interval  $[z_{\min} + 1/N, z_{\max} - 1/N]$  for  $N > 1$  large enough. Therefore, for every  $z \in (z_{\min}, z_{\max})$  the stochastic differential equation has a unique nested family of strong solutions  $(Z_{t,N})_{t \in [0, T_N]}$  with  $Z_{0,N} = z$ , where

$$T_N = \inf\{t > 0 : Z_t \notin (z_{\min} + 1/N, z_{\max} - 1/N)\}.$$

The explosion time  $T$  is then defined as

$$T = \sup_N T_N.$$

We are interested in the case where the solution is non-explosive in the sense that  $T = \infty$  almost surely.

The classical necessary and sufficient conditions on the functions  $b$  and  $\sigma$  is Feller's test of explosion. Motivated by Theorem 2.3 we adapt Feller's test to the case where the functions  $b$  and  $\sigma^2$  are polynomials. It is likely that the following result is well-known, but we were unable to locate a reference in the literature.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $b$  and  $a$  be real analytic. Furthermore, assume*

$$a(z_{\min}) = 0 = a(z_{\max}) \text{ and } a(z) > 0 \text{ for } z_{\min} < z < z_{\max}.$$

*Letting  $\sigma = \sqrt{a}$ , there exists a unique non-explosive strong solution  $Z$  of the stochastic differential equation*

$$dZ_t = b(Z_t)dt + \sigma(Z_t)dW_t$$

*taking values in the interval  $(z_{\min}, z_{\max})$  if and only if*

$$2b(z_{\min}) - a'(z_{\min}) \geq 0 \geq 2b(z_{\max}) - a'(z_{\max}).$$

**3.4. A canonical parametrisation of scalar polynomial models.** We are now in a position to characterise the range of admissible parameters for which there exists a bounded scalar polynomial model.

In light of Theorem 2.1, we may assume the degree of  $b$  is at most three and the degree of  $\sigma^2$  is at most four.

By applying an affine transformation to the state variable, there is no loss of generality in fixing the state space  $I$  to be any finite interval. Therefore, to simplify some calculations, in this section we will set  $I = (-1, 1)$  and will refer to this as the canonical state space in the sequel.

In order to enforce the condition  $\sigma(-1) = 0 = \sigma(1)$  we rewrite  $\sigma^2$  as a product of  $(1 - z^2)$  and polynomial of degree of at most two.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} b(z) &= b_0 + b_1z + b_2z^2 + b_3z^3 \\ \sigma^2(z) &= (1 - z^2)(c_0 + c_1z + c_2z^2). \end{aligned}$$

*The stochastic differential equation*

$$dZ_t = b(Z_t)dt + \sigma(Z_t)dW_t \quad Z_0 = z$$

*has a non-explosive solution valued in the open interval  $(-1, 1)$  for every initial condition  $-1 < z < 1$  if and only if all of the following conditions hold*

- $b_1 + b_3 + c_0 + c_2 \leq -|b_0 + b_2 + c_1|$ ;
- $c_0 > 0$ ; and
- either  $|c_1| - c_0 \leq c_2 \leq c_0$  or  $c_2 > \max\{c_0, \frac{1}{4}c_1^2\}$

We prove this result via two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $a$  and  $b$  be as in Proposition 3.9. We have*

$$2b(-1) - a'(-1) \geq 0 \geq 2b(1) - a'(1)$$

*if and only if*

$$b_1 + b_3 + c_0 + c_2 \leq -|b_0 + b_2 + c_1|.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$2b(z) - a'(z) = 2[b_0 + (b_2 + c_1)z^2] + 2z[b_1 + c_0 + (b_3 + c_2)z^2] - (1 - z^2)(c_1 + 2c_2z)$$

from which the conclusion quickly follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.11.** *We have*

$$c_0 + c_1z + c_2z^2 > 0 \text{ for all } -1 < z < 1$$

*if and only if*

- $c_0 > 0$ ; and
- either  $|c_1| - c_0 \leq c_2 \leq c_0$  or  $c_2 > \max\{c_0, \frac{1}{4}c_1^2\}$

*Proof.* For a fixed triplet  $(c_0, c_1, c_2)$  let  $c(z) = c_0 + c_1z + c_2z^2$ .

To prove necessity, we first suppose that  $c(z) > 0$  for all  $-1 < z < 1$ . Note that  $c(0) = c_0$  implying that  $c_0 > 0$ . Furthermore, by continuity, we have  $c(\pm 1) \geq 0$  implying that  $c_2 \geq |c_1| - c_0$ .

Now consider the case where  $c_2 > c_0$ . Letting

$$z_0 = \sqrt{\frac{c_0}{c_2}}$$

we have  $0 < z_0 < 1$  and

$$c(z_0) = (c_1 + 2\sqrt{c_0c_2})z_0.$$

Hence the condition  $c_1 > -2\sqrt{c_0c_2}$  is necessary. By considering  $c(-z_0)$  we see that the condition  $c_1 < 2\sqrt{c_0c_2}$  is also necessary.

Now to prove sufficiency, first suppose  $c_0 > 0$  and  $|c_1| - c_0 \leq c_2 \leq c_0$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} c(z) &\geq c_0 - |c_1||z| + c_2z^2 \\ &\geq c_0 - (c_0 + c_2)|z| + c_2z^2 \\ &= (c_0 - |z|c_2)(1 - |z|) \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $c(z) > 0$  whenever  $|z| < 1$ .

Finally, suppose  $c_2 > c_0 > 0$  and  $|c_1| < 2\sqrt{c_0c_2}$ . Writing

$$c(z) = c_0 - \frac{c_1^2}{4c_2} + c_2 \left( z - \frac{c_1}{2c_2} \right)^2.$$

we have  $c(z) > 0$  for all  $z$ . □

*Proof of Proposition 3.9.* The claim follows from the two lemmas and the version of Feller's test of Theorem 3.8. □

#### 4. A SPECTRAL REPRESENTATION

We are in the setting of the scalar non-degenerate polynomial model with the factor process taking values in a bounded open interval  $I$ . Recalling the notation  $\mathbf{L}$  from Section 2, we note that the coefficient functions  $g = (g_0, \dots, g_n)^\top$  are the solution of the system of differential equations

$$\dot{g} = \mathbf{L}g, \quad g(0) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$$

or equivalently  $g(\tau) = e^{\mathbf{L}\tau}g(0)$ .

It turns out that the matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  has a nice property:

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let*

$$\mathbf{L} = b(\mathbf{Z})\mathbf{D} + \frac{1}{2}a(\mathbf{Z})\mathbf{D}^2 - R(\mathbf{Z}),$$

where  $R(z) = R_0 + R_1z + R_2z^2$ ,  $b(z) = b_0 + b_1z + b_2z^2 + b_3z^3$  and  $a(z) = (1 - z^2)(c_0 + c_1z + c_2z^2)$  and the coefficients satisfy

- $R_2 = \frac{n}{2}b_3 = -\frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_4$  and  $R_1 = nb_2 + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}a_3$ ;
- $|b_0 + b_2 + c_1| \leq -(b_1 + b_3 + c_0 + c_2)$ ;
- $c_0 > 0$ ; and
- either  $|c_1| - c_0 \leq c_2 \leq c_0$  or  $c_2 > \max\{c_0, \frac{1}{4}c_1^2\}$

The eigenvalues  $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n$  of  $\mathbf{L}$  are real and satisfy

$$\lambda_i \leq -\inf_{z \in I} R(z).$$

for all  $i$ .

To prove Proposition 4.1, we first prove a result on the existence of an invariant measure which may have independent interest.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Suppose the functions  $b, a$  are polynomials, such that*

- $b(-1) > 0 > b(1)$  and
- $a(-1) = 0 = a(1)$  and
- $a'(-1) > 0 > a'(1)$  and  $a(z) > 0$
- $a(z) > 0$  for all  $-1 < z < 1$ .

Then there exists a positive, integrable function  $f$  satisfying the differential equation

$$bf = \frac{1}{2}(af)'$$

with boundary conditions

$$\lim_{z \downarrow -1} a(z)f(z) = 0 = \lim_{z \uparrow 1} a(z)f(z),$$

*Remark 4.3.* If the function  $f$  is normalised so that  $\int_{-1}^1 f(z)dz = 1$ , then  $f$  is the unique invariant density for the diffusion  $Z$  with drift  $b$  and volatility  $\sigma = \sqrt{a}$ . That is, if the initial condition  $Z_0$  is distributed with density  $f$ , then  $Z_t$  has the same distribution for all  $t \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* Now any positive solution to the differential equation is of form

$$f(z) = \frac{C}{a(z)} e^{\int_0^z \frac{2b(s)}{a(s)} ds}.$$

for  $|z| < 1$ , where  $C > 0$  is a constant.

As in the proof of Theorem 3.8 we focus on the left-hand end point  $z = -1$ . We must show that such an  $f$  is integrable and  $a(t-1)f(t-1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \downarrow 0$ . Writing

$$\begin{aligned} b(t-1) &= \beta + O(t) \\ a(t-1) &= \alpha t + O(t^2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta, \alpha > 0$ , a routine calculation shows that

$$f(t-1) = O(t^{\frac{2\beta}{\alpha}-1})$$

from which the conclusion follows. □

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Since  $L$  varies continuously with the model parameters, there is no loss of generality to assume that the parameters satisfy

- $|b_0 + b_2 + c_1| < -(b_1 + b_3 + c_0 + c_2)$ ;
- $c_0 > 0$ ; and
- either  $|c_1| - c_0 < c_2 \leq c_0$  or  $c_2 > \max\{c_0, \frac{1}{4}c_1^2\}$

By Proposition 4.2 there exists an invariant density  $f$ .

Consider the inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p, q \rangle &= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^n p_i q_j \int_{-1}^1 z^{i+j} f(z) dz \\ &= \int_{-1}^1 \hat{p}(z) \hat{q}(z) f(z) dz \end{aligned}$$

where as before  $\hat{\cdot}$  is the linear operator such that

$$\hat{p}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n p_k z^k.$$

Recall that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{L}}p = \frac{1}{2}a\hat{p}'' + b\hat{p}' - R\hat{p}.$$

By integration by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle p, \mathbf{L}q \rangle &= - \int_{-1}^1 [\tfrac{1}{2}a\hat{p}'\hat{q}' + R\hat{p}\hat{q}]f \, dz \\ &= \langle \mathbf{L}p, q \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the boundary condition

$$\lim_{z \downarrow -1} a(z)f(z) = 0 = \lim_{z \uparrow 1} a(z)f(z).$$

In particular, we see that  $\mathbf{L}$  is symmetric with respect to this inner product and hence all eigenvalues are real. The inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\langle p, \mathbf{L}p \rangle &\leq - \int_{-1}^1 R\hat{p}^2 f \, dz \\ &\leq - \inf_{-1 < z < 1} R(z) \langle p, p \rangle\end{aligned}$$

implies the claimed upper bound on the spectrum.  $\square$

*Remark 4.4.* Of course, the eigenvalues of the matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  are the zeros of the characteristic polynomial which has degree  $n + 1$ . Since there exists formulae for the roots of polynomials up to degree four, it is possible, at least in principle, to express explicitly the bond pricing function  $G$  in a scalar polynomial model in terms of the model parameters when  $n \leq 3$ .

When  $n \geq 4$ , there is little hope for explicit formulae for the function  $G$  in terms of the model parameters. However, note that the matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  is sparse, in the sense that there are at most five non-zero matrix entries per row. In particular, the product of the matrix exponential  $e^{\mathbf{L}\tau}$  and the vector  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$  can be computed efficiently, and hence the lack of explicit formulae is not necessarily a prohibitive disadvantage.

The proof of Proposition 4.1 shows that when there exists an invariant density  $f$ , then

$$\mathbf{L}^\top M = M\mathbf{L}$$

where  $M = (M_{ij})_{ij}$  is the  $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$  positive definite matrix with entries

$$M_{ij} = \int_I z^{i+j} f(z) dz.$$

Suppose that the  $n + 1$  real eigenvalues of the matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  are  $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n$ . Then the matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  has the spectral decomposition

$$\mathbf{L} = \sum_{i=0}^n \lambda_i u_i v_i$$

where  $u_i$  is the right-eigenvector and  $v_i$  the left-eigenvector associated to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$ , scaled such that

$$v_i u_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

For convenience, we choose the normalisation

$$u_i^\top M u_i = 1,$$

and note that the left- and right-eigenvectors are related by

$$v_i = u_i^\top M.$$



Now given the  $i$ th right-eigenvector  $u_i$  we can form the polynomial  $\hat{u}_i(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n u_{i,k} z^k$ . Note that  $\hat{u}_i$  is an eigenfunction of the differential operator  $\mathcal{L}$ , and that the  $i$ th left-eigenvector  $v_i$  is related to  $\hat{u}_i$  by the formula

$$v_{i,k} = \int_I z^k \hat{u}_i(z) f(z) dz$$

In particular, the bond pricing function takes the form

$$G(\tau, z) = \sum_{i=0}^n Q_i(z) e^{\lambda_i \tau}$$

where the function  $Q_i$  is the (at most)  $n$  degree polynomial

$$Q_i(z) = \hat{u}_i(z) \int_I \hat{u}_i(s) f(s) ds$$

That is to say, the bond price can be seen to be a linear combination of the bond prices arising from  $n + 1$  models with constant interest rates  $r = -\lambda_i$ , where the coefficients  $Q_i$  of the combination depend on the factor process. Note that by setting  $\tau = 0$  we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^n Q_i(z) = 1$$

so it is tempting to think of the numbers  $(Q_i(z))_i$  as probabilities; however, in general  $Q_i(z) < 0$  for some  $i$  and  $z \in I$ , so such an interpretation is not always valid.

In the general case, where the parameters are such that no invariant density exists, the matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  is not necessarily diagonalisable. In this case, the bond pricing formula must be modified to

$$(7) \quad G(\tau, z) = \sum_{i=0}^n Q_i(\tau, z) e^{\lambda_i \tau}$$

where now the weight functions  $Q_i$  are polynomials in both  $x$  and  $z$  and can be computed from the Jordan decomposition. An example where the matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  is not diagonalisable is discussed in Section 3.2 – though strictly speaking, the setting is slightly different there since the state space for that example is unbounded.

One consequence of formula (7) is that the long maturity interest rate can be calculated as

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\tau} \log G(\tau, z) = -\max_i \lambda_i.$$

for all  $z \in I$ , unless the coefficient  $Q_i(\tau, z)$  of the maximum eigenvalue is identically zero.

## 5. AN EXAMPLE

In this section we explore a concrete realisation of a polynomial model. The purpose of this account is as a proof of concept and is not intended as an endorsement of this particular model over others. In the general polynomial framework, the function  $R : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , mapping the factor process to the spot interest rate, is a quadratic function. In the following example, we assume that  $R$  is affine. By an affine change of variables, we can and will take the spot rate itself as the factor process. Note that this choice of parametrisation differs from the canonical choice introduced in Section 3.4.

The following proposition requires no proof in light of Theorem 2.3, Proposition 3.1 Theorem 3.8.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Given real constants  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , positive constants  $\delta, \varepsilon$ , and a positive integer  $n$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\alpha\delta + \beta\gamma) &\geq (\delta + \gamma\varepsilon)^2 \\ \beta &\geq \alpha\varepsilon \\ n(n-1)\delta\varepsilon^2 &= 2. \end{aligned}$$

For every  $\rho$  in the interval  $I = (-\gamma/\delta, 1/\varepsilon)$  there exists a unique (non-explosive)  $I$ -valued strong solution  $(r_t)_{t \geq 0}$  to the stochastic differential equation

$$dr_t = (\alpha - \beta r_t)dt + \sqrt{\gamma + \delta r_t}(1 - \varepsilon r_t)dW_t, \quad r_0 = \rho$$

with the property that there exist differentiable functions  $g_0, \dots, g_n : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^\tau r_s ds} | r_0 = \rho] = \sum_{k=0}^n g_k(\tau) \rho^k$$

for all  $\rho \in I$  and  $\tau \geq 0$ . Furthermore, the function  $g = (g_0, \dots, g_n)^\top$  is the unique solution to the linear ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{g} = \mathbf{L}g, \quad g(0) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$$

where the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{L} = -\mathbf{Z} + (\alpha\mathbf{Z} - \beta\mathbf{I})\mathbf{D} + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma\mathbf{I} + (\delta - 2\gamma\varepsilon)\mathbf{Z} + (\gamma\varepsilon^2 - 2\varepsilon\delta)\mathbf{Z}^2 + \delta\gamma\mathbf{Z}^3)\mathbf{D}^2$$

The above proposition could be compared to the following proposition on exponential affine term structure models:

**Proposition 5.2.** *Given real constants  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  and a non-negative constant  $\delta$ , such that*

$$2(\alpha\delta + \beta\gamma) \geq \delta^2.$$

For every  $\rho$  in the interval  $I$  defined by

$$I = \begin{cases} (-\gamma/\delta, +\infty) & \text{if } \delta > 0 \\ (-\infty, +\infty) & \text{if } \delta = 0 \end{cases}$$

there exists a unique (non-explosive)  $I$ -valued strong solution  $(r_t)_{t \geq 0}$  to the stochastic differential equation

$$dr_t = (\alpha - \beta r_t)dt + \sqrt{\gamma + \delta r_t}dW_t, \quad r_0 = \rho$$

with the property that there exist differentiable functions  $h_0, h_1 : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\int_0^\tau r_s ds} | r_0 = \rho] = e^{h_0(\tau) + h_1(\tau)\rho}$$

for all  $\rho \in I$  and  $\tau \geq 0$ . Furthermore, the functions  $h_0, h_1$  satisfy the coupled system of Riccati equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{h}_1 &= -1 - \beta h_1 + \frac{1}{2}\delta h_1^2, & h_1(0) &= 0 \\ \dot{h}_0 &= \alpha h_1 + \frac{1}{2}\gamma h_1^2, & h_0(0) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 5.3.* Recall that the Vasicek interest rate model is recovered from the more general affine model of the above proposition by setting  $\delta = 0$ . Similarly, the Cox–Ingersoll–Ross model corresponds to  $\gamma = 0$ .

*Remark 5.4.* Comparing propositions 5.1 and 5.2 we see that the dynamics of a certain class of exponential affine processes popularly used in interest rate modelling can be recovered from a certain class of polynomial models by formally setting  $\varepsilon = 0$  and  $n = \infty$ .

See the recent thesis [4] of Cheng for calibrated examples of scalar polynomial term structure models from the class of examples exhibited in Proposition 5.1.

## 6. HULL–WHITE-TYPE EXTENSION

In this section we consider a Hull–White type extension of the polynomial modelling framework. As usual, by incorporating time-dependent parameters, we can hope to have a better model calibration. We introduce time dependency both in the dynamics of the factor process  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  and the coefficient functions  $(g_k)_k$ . We first establish an algebraic result similar to Theorems 2.3 and 2.1 in this case. We will then show that the Brody–Hughston rational model can be seen as an instance of this framework when the degree is  $n = 1$ .

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $\Delta = \{(t, T) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  and  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a non-empty open set. Suppose the functions  $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $H : \Delta \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $a : \mathbb{R}_+ \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are such that  $G(t, T, \cdot)$  is twice-continuously differentiable for all  $(t, T) \in \Delta$  and  $G(\cdot, T, z)$  is continuously differentiable for all  $(T, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times I$  and satisfies the partial differential equation*

$$\partial_t G + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} b_i \partial_{z_i} G + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} a_{ij} \partial_{z_i z_j} G = RG \text{ on } \Delta \times I$$

with boundary conditions

$$G(T, T, z) = 1 \text{ for all } (T, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times I.$$

Furthermore, suppose that there exists an interger  $n$  and functions  $g_k : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $g(\cdot, T)$  is differentiable for all  $T \geq 0$  and

$$G(t, T, z) = \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_d \leq n} g_k(t, T) z^k$$

and that the functions  $(g_k)_k$  are linearly independent.

Then Case  $n = 1$ . For all  $t > 0$ , the function  $R(t, \cdot)$  is a polynomial of degree at most one, for each  $i$  the function  $b_i(t, \cdot)$  is a polynomial of degree at most two, and  $a(t, \cdot)$  is unrestricted. Case  $n \geq 2$ . For all  $t \geq 0$ , the function  $R(t, \cdot)$  is a polynomial of degree at most two, for each  $i$  the function  $b_i(t, \cdot)$  is a polynomial of degree at most three, and for each  $i, j$  the function  $a_{ij}(t, \cdot)$  is a polynomial of degree at most four.

Additionally, in the case where  $d = 1$ , if  $R(t, z) = R_0(t) + R_1(t)z + R_2(t)z^2$ ,  $b(t, z) = b_0(t) + b_1(t)z + b_2(t)z^2 + b_3(t)z^3$  and  $a(z) = a_0(t) + a_1(t)z + a_2(t)z^2 + a_3(t)z^3 + a_4(t)z^4$ , then the coefficients are such that

$$R_2(t) = \frac{n}{2} b_3(t) = -\frac{n(n-1)}{2} a_4(t) \text{ and } R_1(t) = n b_2(t) + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} a_3(t)$$

and  $(g_0, \dots, g_n)$  solves the system of linear ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{aligned}
-\partial_t g_k &= g_{k-2} \left( (k-2)b_3 + \frac{(k-2)(k-3)}{2}a_4 - R_2 \right) \\
&\quad + g_{k-1} \left( (k-1)b_2 + \frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}a_3 - R_1 \right) + g_k \left( kb_1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{2}a_2 - R_0 \right) \\
&\quad + g_{k+1} \left( (k+1)b_0 + \frac{k(k+1)}{2}a_1 \right) + g_{k+2} \frac{(k+2)(k+1)}{2}a_0 \text{ on } [0, T] \\
g_k(T, T) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } k \geq 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where we interpret  $g_{-2} = g_{-1} = g_{n+1} = g_{n+2} = 0$ .

The proof is essentially the same as that of Theorems 2.3 and 2.1, so is omitted.

**6.1. Brody–Hughston rational model.** In the paper [2] of Brody & Hughston, the following rational model is discussed. Let  $M$  be a positive martingale under the *objective measure*  $\mathbb{P}$ , and suppose  $M_0 = 1$ . Set

$$V_t = \alpha(t) + \beta(t)M_t$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are positive, continuously differentiable, deterministic functions. The idea is that  $V$  is a model for the state price density. Therefore, bond prices are given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{t,T} &= \frac{1}{V_t} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}(V_T | \mathcal{F}_t) \\
&= \frac{\alpha(T) + \beta(T)M_t}{\alpha(t) + \beta(t)M_t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the bond prices are a rational function of the random variable  $M_t$ , giving the model its name. Furthermore, by setting  $\alpha(t) + \beta(t) = P_0(t)$  for  $t \geq 0$ , this model can match the initial term structure of interest rates.

On the other hand, notice that we can write the bond prices as

$$P_{t,T} = g_0(t, T) + g_1(t, T)Z_t$$

where the coefficients are defined by

$$g_0(t, T) = \frac{\beta(T)}{\beta(t)} \text{ and } g_1(t, T) = \frac{\alpha(T)\beta(t) - \beta(T)\alpha(t)}{\beta(t)}$$

and where we let

$$Z_t = \frac{1}{V_t}$$

be the factor process. In particular, this is an affine factor model and hence should be described by Theorem 6.1. We now carry out the verification under the assumption that

$$dM_t = \nu(t, M_t)M_t dB_t$$

where  $B$  is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -Brownian motion and  $\nu$  is bounded.

In this framework, we can define the spot rate as

$$\begin{aligned} r_t &= -\partial_T P_{t,T}|_{T=t} \\ &= -\frac{\dot{\alpha}(t) + \dot{\beta}(t)M_t}{\alpha(t) + \beta(t)M_t} \\ &= R_0(t) + R_1(t)Z_t \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_0(t) = -\frac{\dot{\beta}(t)}{\beta(t)} \text{ and } R_1(t) = \frac{\dot{\beta}(t)\alpha(t) - \dot{\alpha}(t)\beta(t)}{\beta(t)}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} dV_t &= \left( \dot{\alpha}(t) + \dot{\beta}(t)M_t \right) dt + \beta(t)dM_t \\ &= -V_t(r_t dt + \lambda_t dB_t) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda_t$  is the market price of risk defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_t &= -\frac{\beta(t)\nu(t, M_t)M_t}{\alpha(t) + \beta(t)M_t} \\ &= \nu(t, M_t)(\alpha(t)Z_t - 1) \end{aligned}$$

Since the process  $(\lambda_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is bounded, we can define the equivalent risk-neutral pricing measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} &= e^{\int_t^T r_s ds} V_t \\ &= e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \lambda_t dt + \int_0^T \lambda_t dB_t} \end{aligned}$$

to recover the usual pricing formula

$$P_{t,T} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[e^{-\int_t^T r_s ds} | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Finally, we consider the dynamics of the factor process  $Z = V^{-1}$ . By Itô's formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} dZ_t &= Z_t[(r_t + \lambda_t^2)dt + \lambda_t dB_t] \\ &= (b_1(t)Z_t + b_2(t)Z_t^2)dt + \sigma(t, Z_t)dW_t \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_1(t) &= -\frac{\dot{\beta}(t)}{\beta(t)} \\ b_2(t) &= \frac{\dot{\beta}(t)\alpha(t) - \dot{\alpha}(t)\beta(t)}{\beta(t)} \\ \sigma(t, z) &= \nu\left(t, \frac{1 - z\alpha(t)}{z\beta(t)}\right) (\alpha(t)z - 1)z \end{aligned}$$

and where the process  $(W_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  defined by

$$W_t = B_t + \int_0^t \lambda_s ds$$

is a  $\mathbb{Q}$  Brownian motion by Girsanov's theorem. In particular, notice that the drift is quadratic in  $Z$  and  $b_2(t) = R_1(t)$  as predicted by Theorem 6.1, while the volatility is determined by the function  $\nu$ .

## 7. APPENDIX: PROOF OF THE SPECIAL FELLER TEST

Recall that Feller's test is

$$\mathbb{P}(T = \infty) = 1 \Leftrightarrow v(z_{\min}) = \infty = v(z_{\max}),$$

where Feller's test function is defined by

$$v(x) = \int_{z=c}^x \int_{y=z}^x \frac{1}{a(z)} e^{\int_y^z \frac{2b(w)}{a(w)} dw} dy dz, \text{ for } z_{\min} < x < z_{\max},$$

where  $c = \frac{1}{2}(z_{\min} + z_{\max})$ . See for instance Chapter 5 of Karatzas and Shreve's [14] book.

It is enough to consider the behaviour of  $v$  near  $x = z_{\min}$ , as the behaviour near  $x = z_{\max}$  is analogous.

By changing variables, we now study the cases where the integral

$$v(z_{\min}) = \int_{z_{\min}}^c \frac{p(z)}{a(z)p'(z)} dz$$

is finite or infinite, where

$$p(z) = \int_{z_{\min}}^z e^{\int_y^c \frac{2b(u)}{a(u)} du} dy.$$

is related to the scale function. Now, by assumption the functions  $a$  and  $b$  are polynomials, and hence near  $z_{\min}$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} a(t + z_{\min}) &= \alpha t^{A+1} + O(t^{A+2}) \\ b(t + z_{\min}) &= \beta t^B + O(t^{B+1}) \end{aligned}$$

for constants  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\beta \neq 0$  and for integers  $A, B \geq 0$ . Note that with this notation

$$2b(z_{\min}) - a'(z_{\min}) = \beta \mathbf{1}_{\{B=0\}} - \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\{A=0\}}.$$

Hence, we must show that  $v(z_{\min}) = \infty$  on

$$\{A > 0, B = 0, \beta > 0\} \cup \{A > 0, B > 0\} \cup \{A = 0, B = 0, 2\beta \geq \alpha\}$$

and that  $v(0) < \infty$  on the complement

$$\{A > 0, B = 0, \beta < 0\} \cup \{A = 0, B > 0\} \cup \{A = 0, B = 0, 2\beta < \alpha\}.$$

We have the calculation

$$\int_{t+z_{\min}}^c \frac{2b(s)}{a(s)} ds = \begin{cases} \text{const} + O(t) & \text{if } B \geq A + 1 \\ -\frac{2\beta}{\alpha} \log t + \text{const} + O(t) & \text{if } B = A \\ \frac{2\beta}{\alpha(A-B)} t^{-(A-B)} + O(t^{1-A+B}) & \text{if } B \leq A - 1 \end{cases}$$

and hence

$$p'(t + z_{\min}) = \begin{cases} \text{const}(1 + O(t)) & \text{if } B \geq A + 1 \\ t^{-2\beta/\alpha} (\text{const} + O(t)) & \text{if } B = A \\ e^{\frac{2\beta}{\alpha(A-B)} t^{-(A-B)}} (1 + O(t)) & \text{if } B \leq A - 1 \end{cases}$$

and therefore

$$\frac{p(t + z_{\min})}{a(t + z_{\min})p'(t + z_{\min})} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha}t^{-A}(1 + O(t)) & \text{if } B \geq A + 1 \\ \infty & \text{if } B = A, 2\beta \geq \alpha \\ \frac{1}{2\beta}t^{-A}(1 + O(t)) & \text{if } B = A, 2\beta < \alpha \\ \infty & \text{if } B \leq A - 1, \beta > 0 \\ \frac{1}{2\beta}t^{-B}(1 + O(t)) & \text{if } B \leq A - 1, \beta < 0. \end{cases}$$

From this, we see that  $v(z_{\min}) = \infty$  precisely on

$$\begin{aligned} & \{B \geq A + 1, A \geq 1\} \cup \{B = A, 2\beta \geq \alpha\} \cup \{B = A \geq 1, 2\beta < \alpha\} \\ & \cup \{A \geq B + 1, \beta > 0\} \cup \{A \geq B + 1 \geq 2, \beta < 0\} \end{aligned}$$

from which the conclusion follows.

## 8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The SC acknowledges the financial support of the Man Group studentship and MRT that of the Cambridge Endowment for Research in Finance. This work has been presented at the Labex Louis Bachelier - SIAM-SMAI Conference on Financial Mathematics in Paris, the Conference on Stochastic Calculus, Martingales and Financial Modeling in St Petersburg, the Advanced Methods in Mathematical Finance in Angers, and the Eleventh Cambridge–Princeton Conference in Princeton. We would like to thank the participants for useful comments and suggestions. Finally, we would like to thank Dorje Brody and Lane Hughston for a discussion of this work and its relation to their paper [2].

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Akahori, Y. Hishida, J. Teichmann and T. Tsuchiya. A heat kernel approach to interest rate models. *Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics* **31**: 419–439. (2014)
- [2] D.C. Brody and L.P. Hughston. Chaos and coherence: a new framework for interest-rate modelling. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A* **460**: 85–110. (2004)
- [3] L. Chen, D. Filipović and H.V. Poor. Quadratic term structure models for risk-free and defaultable rates. *Mathematical Finance* **14**(4): 515–536 (2004)
- [4] S. Cheng. *Polynomial Models and Extensions in Mathematical Finance*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge. (2016)
- [5] J.C. Cox, J.E. Ingersoll and S.A. Ross. A theory of the term structure of interest rates. *Econometrica* **53**: 385–407 (1985)
- [6] Ch. Cuchiero, M. Keller-Ressel, and J. Teichmann. *Polynomial processes and their applications to mathematical finance*. *Finance and Stochastics* **16**: 711–740 (2012)
- [7] D. Duffie, D. Filipović, and W. Schachermayer. Affine processes and applications in finance. *Annals of Applied Probability* **13**(3): 984–1053 (2003)
- [8] D. Duffie and R. Kan. A yield-factor model of interest rates. *Mathematical Finance* **6**(4): 379–406. (1996)
- [9] D. Filipović. Separable term structures and the maximal degree problem. *Mathematical Finance* **12**(4): 341–349 (2002)
- [10] D. Filipović and M. Larsson. Polynomial preserving diffusions and applications in finance. *Finance and Stochastics*. **20**: 931–972. (2016)
- [11] D. Filipović. M. Larsson, and A. Trolle. Linear-rational term structure models. *Journal of Finance* **72**(2): 655–704. (2017)
- [12] V. Goodman. Brownian super-exponents. *Communications On Stochastic Analysis* **1**(1) 141–149. (2007)
- [13] F. Jamshidian. Bond, futures and option evaluation in the quadratic interest rate model. *Applied Mathematical Finance* **3**: 93–115 (1996)

- [14] I. Karatzas and S.E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*. Second edition. Graduate texts in mathematics. Springer 1998.
- [15] M. Leippold and L. Wu. Asset pricing under the quadratic class. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **37**(2): 271-295 (2002)
- [16] F.A. Longstaff. A nonlinear general equilibrium model of the term structure of interest rates. *Journal of Financial Economics* **23**: 195-224 (1989)
- [17] A. Macrina. Heat kernel models for asset pricing. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance* **17**(7). (2014)
- [18] A.F. Siegel. Price-admissibility conditions for arbitrage-free linear price function models for the term structure of interest rates. *Mathematical Finance* **26**(4) 919–938 (2016)
- [19] O. Vasicek. An equilibrium characterisation of the term structure. *Journal of Financial Economics* **5**(2): 177-188. (1977)

STATISTICAL LABORATORY, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE CB3 0WB, UK

*Email address:* `sc591@cam.ac.uk`, `m.tehranchi@statslab.cam.ac.uk`