

Options are also options on options: how to smile with Black-Scholes

Claude Martini^{*2} and Arianna Mingone^{†1, 2}

¹Centre de Mathématiques Appliquées (CMAP), CNRS, Ecole Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris

²Zeliade Systems, 56 rue Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Paris, France

2023-08-04

Abstract

We observe that a European Call option with strike $L > K$ can be seen as a Call option with strike $L - K$ on a Call option with strike K . Under no arbitrage assumptions, this yields immediately that the prices of the two contracts are the same, in full generality. We study in detail the relative pricing function which gives the price of the Call on Call option as a function of its underlying Call option, and provide quasi-closed formula for those new pricing functions in the Carr-Pelts-Tehranchi family [Carr and Pelts, Duality, Deltas, and Derivatives Pricing, 2015] and [Tehranchi, A Black-Scholes inequality: applications and generalisations, Finance Stoch, 2020] that includes the Black-Scholes model as a particular case. We also study the properties of the function that maps the price normalized by the underlier, viewed as a function of the moneyness, to the normalized relative price, which allows us to produce several new closed formulas. In connection to the symmetry transformation of a smile, we build a lift of the relative pricing function in the case of an underlier that does not vanish. We finally provide some properties of the implied volatility smiles of Calls on Calls and lifted Calls on Calls in the Black-Scholes model.

1 Introduction

In the early days of equity-to-credit, the *price* of a stock was modeled as a *Call option* on the value of the underlying company. This led in turn to the fact that Calls on the stock can be valued with an option-on-option formula, as obtained by Merton in [8]. With no relation to this fundamental approach, we exploit in this note the remark that a (European-type) Call option with a strike $L > K$ can be also seen as a Call option with a strike $L - K$ on the Call option with strike K and the same maturity T ; indeed when $L > K$ it holds for every value of the underlier $S(T)$ at maturity:

$$(S(T) - L)_+ = ((S(T) - K)_+ - (L - K))_+.$$

Under assumptions of perfect market (so that every asset has a single price, with no bid-asks) and no static arbitrage, this entails that the *price* (say, at time 0) of the two assets is the same. Denoting by $C(S, M)$ the price of standard Calls with strike M (the maturity T is the same for all the contracts), and $\hat{C}_K(\cdot, \star)$ the *relative* pricing function on the Call on Call contract, it means that the following equality holds:

$$C(S, L) = \hat{C}_K(C(S, K), L - K)$$

since the underlier price of the latter contract is the price of the Call with strike K .

*cmartini@zeliade.com

†arianna.mingone@polytechnique.edu

In section 2, we foster this option on option point of view and obtain, in full generality, relationships between the price of options on options and the initial Call or Put prices at other strikes: Calls are Calls on Calls, and Puts are Calls on Puts.

In section 2.2 we define rigorously the *relative* Call on Call pricing function \hat{C}_K and obtain useful properties in section 2.3 in the case of homogeneous pricing function where the option price normalized by the underlier value does depend only of the moneyness.

In section 2.4 we show that the relative Call on Call pricing function leads to a natural transformation on the space of normalized (by the value of the underlier) Call prices as functions of the moneyness, that we call the *Tehranchi space*, given by

$$\mathbb{T}_k c(x) := \frac{c(k + c(k)x)}{c(k)}$$

where $k = \frac{K}{S}$ and c is the normalized Call price. We provide interesting properties of the transformations \mathbb{T}_k , and show that they naturally extend, in some sense, to 2-parameter transformations. In particular, the derivative at zero with respect to the moneyness of $\mathbb{T}_k c$ is in general strictly larger than -1 , which corresponds to the fact that the underlier $C(S, K)$ vanishes with a positive probability at maturity; the 2-parameter extension allows to get a derivative at zero equal to -1 .

Section 3 is devoted to the computation of new closed formulas either for pricing functions or for normalized ones. We provide a quasi-closed formula when the initial pricing function belongs to the Carr-Peltis-Tehranchi family, which generalizes the Black-Scholes formula, obtaining along the way an expression for the underlier value viewed as a function of the option price for this family.

In relation to the inversion of the volatility smile in the moneyness space, there is a generic pricing function transformation which consists in working in the numeraire of the underlier. We investigate in detail in section 4 this transformation in the case where the underlier may vanish at maturity, and show that iterating it twice provides a pricing function on an underlier which does not vanish at maturity. We provide a quasi-closed formula for the so lifted pricing function in the case of the Black-Scholes model.

Eventually we provide basic properties of the volatility smiles associated to the Black-Scholes relative function and to the lifted relative one in section 5.

We thank Mehdi El-Amrani for stimulating discussions.

2 Pricing functions

We consider general *pricing functions* which give the price $C(S, K)$ of a Call option as a function of the underlier price S and of its strike K . Of course, the option price may depend on other variables as well (like the instantaneous variance in stochastic volatility models as the Heston model), but we will be only interested in this partial dependency in this case.

The partial function $K \rightarrow C(S, K)$ gives the Call prices when the strike varies for the current value of the underlier S , and typically will aim at *calibrating* the market quotes, whereas the function $S \rightarrow C(S, K)$ is more interesting in a risk and/or sensitivity context, e.g. to get an insight of the order of magnitude of the tail risk of an option portfolio at horizon one day for margining purposes.

2.1 Options are options on options

In this section we use the notation $X(T)$ for the value of the contract X at time T . We will drop this notation in the following sections where T will not play any role.

2.1.1 Calls are Calls on Calls

Consider $0 < K < L$ and a *European Call on Call contract*, with strike $L - K$, which delivers at maturity T a Call contract with strike K . The payoff at T of this contract will be $(C(S, K)(T) - (L - K))_+$.

Observe now that $C(S, K)(T) = (S(T) - K)_+$ so that the payoff of the contract is equal to $((S(T) - K)_+ - (L - K))_+$. Now this latter quantity is 0 if $S(T) \leq L$ and $S(T) - L$ otherwise, so it is equal to $(S(T) - L)_+ = C(S, L)(T)$, i.e.

$$\forall 0 < K < L, \quad C(S, L)(T) = (C(S, K)(T) - (L - K))_+.$$

So in full generality under perfect market assumptions for the underlier and the options $C(S, K)$ and $C(S, L)$, the price of a Call option with strike $L - K$ on a Call option with strike K is the price of a Call option with strike L .

What happens if L is smaller than K ? There is no hope to get any relation in this case, since the option price $C(S, K)(T)$ will vanish in the range $[L, K]$ where the Call $C(S, L)(T)$ will not. So, in terms of smiles, for a fixed value of K , only the part of the smile *on the right of K* will give rise to a new smile.

What happens for Put prices?

2.1.2 Put-Call-Parity and the Put price

Let us denote $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ and $\hat{P}_K(X, M)$ the Call and Put pricing functions for Calls and Puts with a strike M on a Call option $X = C(S, K)$ with strike K . The Put-Call-Parity reads

$$\hat{C}_K(X, L - K) - \hat{P}_K(X, L - K) = C(S, K) - (L - K).$$

Now $\hat{C}_K(X, L - K) = C(S, L)$ and using the classic Put-Call-Parity at strikes K and L yields, taking the difference: $C(S, L) - C(S, K) = P(S, L) - P(S, K) - (L - K)$. This implies that

$$\hat{P}_K(X, L - K) = P(S, L) - P(S, K).$$

This relation clarifies what the price of the Put is in the new world where the underlier is the option with strike K , but also provides insights on the properties of the difference $P(S, L) - P(S, K)$. Can we prove it directly? Yes, indeed if we look at the difference $(L - S(T))_+ - (K - S(T))_+$, it is constantly equal to $L - K$ below K , and then goes to 0 linearly at point L , where it remains. This can be viewed also as a function of $(S(T) - K)_+$, which is exactly a Put payoff with strike $L - K$. In other words, it holds that

$$(L - S(T))_+ - (K - S(T))_+ = ((L - K) - (S(T) - K)_+)_+,$$

which gives another proof of the relation $\hat{P}_K(X, L - K) = P(S, L) - P(S, K)$.

Eventually, summarizing the Call and Put computations we have the property that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_K(X, L - K) &= C(S, L) \\ \hat{P}_K(X, L - K) &= P(S, L) - P(S, K)\end{aligned}$$

or yet for any $M \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_K(X, M) &= C(S, K + M) \\ \hat{P}_K(X, M) &= P(S, K + M) - P(S, K).\end{aligned}$$

Calls on Calls: further iterations Considering now a Call option with strike N written on a Call $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$, from the above equation this is equivalent to a Call of the form $\hat{C}_{K+M}(X, N)$. The latter quantity again is equivalent to $C(S, K + M + N)$. Similarly, a Put option with strike N written on a Call $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is a Put option written on $C(S, K + M)$, so it equals $\hat{P}_{K+M}(X, N)$, or $P(S, K + M + N) - P(S, K + M)$.

We have therefore a semigroup property, and iterating further does not yield new pricing functions.

2.1.3 Puts are Calls on Puts

Consider now $Y = P(S, K)$ as an underlier. Can we mimic the above approach using Puts as underliers? Observe first that Put prices are bounded by the strike, so that we have an underlier with values in $[0, K]$.

Take now any strike $0 \leq L < K$. Then

$$((K - S(T))_+ - L)_+ = ((K - L) - S(T))_+$$

which gives that a Call on $P(S, K)$ with strike L is a Put on S with strike $K - L$.

This entails, if we denote by $\tilde{C}_K(Y, L)$ the price of this Call, that $\tilde{C}_K(Y, L) = P(S, K - L)$. To get the price $\tilde{P}_K(Y, L)$ of the corresponding Put, let us use the Put-Call-Parity as above: $\tilde{C}_K(Y, L) - \tilde{P}_K(Y, L) = P(S, K) - L$. Using the classic Put-Call-Parity at the strikes $K - L$ and K , we find

$$\tilde{P}_K(Y, L) = P(S, K - L) - P(S, K) + L = C(S, K - L) - C(S, K).$$

We get eventually another pair transform:

$$\forall 0 \leq L < K,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{C}_K(Y, L) &= P(S, K - L) \\ \tilde{P}_K(Y, L) &= C(S, K - L) - C(S, K).\end{aligned}$$

Puts on Puts: further iterations Consider now a Call option with strike $N < L < K$ written on $\tilde{P}_K(Y, L)$. Looking at the payoff function, it can be easily shown that

$$((L - (K - S(T)))_+ - N)_+ = (S(T) - (K - (L - N)))_+ - (S(T) - K)_+.$$

In other words, such a Call has the same value as the portfolio $C(S, K - (L - N)) - C(S, K)$, which in turn we have shown to be equal to $\tilde{P}_K(Y, L - N)$. Again, using the Put-Call-Parity, we find that a Put with strike N on $\tilde{P}_K(Y, L)$ is equivalent to the portfolio $P(S, K - (L - N)) - P(S, K - L)$, i.e. to $\tilde{C}_K(Y, L - N) - \tilde{C}_K(Y, L)$.

Summarizing, we get the following relationships:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Call on } \tilde{P}_K(Y, L)(N) &= C(S, K - (L - N)) - C(S, K) \\ \text{Put on } \tilde{P}_K(Y, L)(N) &= P(S, K - (L - N)) - P(S, K - L).\end{aligned}$$

2.2 The Call on Call pricing function

In order to define rigorously the *relative* function \hat{C}_K of Calls on Calls, we need to assume for a while that the function $S \rightarrow C(S, K)$ is invertible (it is the case in the Black-Scholes model and many other ones).

Definition 2.1. Let $X = C(S, K)$ and $M > 0$. We denote with $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ the Call option with strike M on the Call option with strike K . Then $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is the price of a Call option with strike $K + M$ and underlier X . In particular, if the function $S \rightarrow C(S, K)$ is invertible it holds

$$\hat{C}_K(X, M) := C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M). \quad (1)$$

K is called the *relative underlying strike* of $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ and X the *underlier* of $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$.

Equation (1) gives a first representation of \hat{C}_K . It is of little practical interest though, since we are not aware of any model where both C^{-1} and C can be computed explicitly. Nevertheless, we will see in section 3.1 that in the vast class of pricing functions of the Carr-Pelts-Tehranchi family a convenient representation formula for the inverse function is available.

We investigate below general properties of the Call on Call pricing function.

2.2.1 Properties of the Call on Call pricing function

From the arguments of section 2.1.1, we can deduce some first properties of the function \hat{C}_K . In particular, Calls on Calls satisfy the usual arbitrage bounds for Call prices, i.e. they are always larger than their intrinsic value and smaller than the underlier. Furthermore, they are convex and non-increasing as function of the strike. We already expect these properties to hold true for arbitrage arguments, and we show them rigorously in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.2 (Relative pricing function: strike dependence). *The function $M \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ satisfies*

$$(X - M)_+ \leq \hat{C}_K(X, M) \leq X$$

and it is convex, non-increasing, with a slope strictly larger than -1 .

Proof. The function $M \rightarrow C(S, K + M)$ is convex and non-increasing, and so is $M \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$. This can be proved also observing that the basic relations $(S - K)_+ \leq C(S, K) \leq S$ translate into $(C(S, K) - M)_+ \leq C(S, K + M) \leq C(S, K)$, which gives in particular that the function $M \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is non-increasing. Furthermore, from eq. (1), $\frac{d}{dM} \hat{C}_K(X, M) = \partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, M), K + M) \geq \partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, M), K)$ which is strictly larger than -1 . □

Observe that the above inequality implies $(S - (K + M))_+ \leq \hat{C}_K(X, M) \leq S$ since $(S - (K + M))_+ \leq (C(S, K) - M)_+$ and $S \geq C(S, K) = X$.

Remark 2.3. Proposition 2.2 implies in particular that the slope of Calls on Calls in 0 is strictly larger than -1 . This is not a problem in terms of arbitrageable prices, but it is an uncommon feature since it is linked to the presence of a positive mass of the underlier in 0 (see Theorem 2.1.2. of [11]). This is expected indeed, since the new underlier is a Call option, which has a whole region of null payoff. We will target this point in section 4 where we will define lifted Calls on Calls' prices with derivative equal to -1 at 0.

In the following we identify the necessary and sufficient conditions that the Call on Call pricing function must satisfy in order to be monotone as a function of the relative underlying strike and convex as a function of the underlier, i.e. the original Call price.

Lemma 2.4 (Monotonicity with respect to the relative underlying strike). *Assuming the C^1 smoothness of $C(\cdot, K)$ and $C(S, \cdot)$, the function $K \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is non-decreasing if and only if the function*

$$L \rightarrow \frac{\partial_K C(S, L)}{\partial_S C(S, L)}$$

is non-decreasing for every S .

Proof. Firstly observe that $C(C^{-1}(X, K), K) = X$, so that taking the derivative with respect to K we find

$$0 = \partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K) \partial_K C^{-1}(X, K) + \partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)$$

or

$$\partial_K C^{-1}(X, K) = -\frac{\partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)}{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)}.$$

We can now consider the relation $\hat{C}_K(X, M) = C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)$ and develop the derivative with respect to K :

$$\frac{d}{dK} \hat{C}_K(X, M) = -\frac{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M) \partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)}{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)} + \partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M).$$

Then, $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is non-decreasing as a function of K iff

$$\frac{\partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)}{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)} \leq \frac{\partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)}{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)},$$

or equivalently iff the function

$$L \rightarrow \frac{\partial_K C(S, L)}{\partial_S C(S, L)}$$

is non-decreasing for every S . □

Lemma 2.5 (Convexity with respect to the underlier). *Assuming the C^2 smoothness of $C(\cdot, K)$, the function $X \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is convex if and only if the function*

$$K \rightarrow \frac{\partial_S^2 C(S, K)}{\partial_S C(S, K)}$$

is non-decreasing for every S .

Proof. Let us restart from $\hat{C}_K(X, M) = C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)$. Assuming the C^2 smoothness of $C(\cdot, K)$ we get

$$\frac{d}{dX} \hat{C}_K(X, M) = \frac{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)}{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)},$$

so that $\frac{d^2}{dX^2} \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ has the sign of the quantity

$$\partial_S^2 C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M) \partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K) - \partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M) \partial_S^2 C(C^{-1}(X, K), K).$$

As a consequence, the function $X \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is convex for any K, M iff the function

$$L \rightarrow \frac{\partial_S^2 C(C^{-1}(X, K), L)}{\partial_S C(C^{-1}(X, K), L)}$$

is non-decreasing for any X , which is equivalent to state the same property for the function

$$K \rightarrow \frac{\partial_S^2 C(S, K)}{\partial_S C(S, K)}$$

at any point S .

□

In the next section we will apply lemmas 2.4 and 2.5 to the case of homogeneous pricing functions, and in particular to the Black-Scholes case for which the properties of monotonicity with respect to the relative underlying strike and of convexity with respect to the underlier are always satisfied.

2.3 Normalized Call prices

We now switch from the strike space to the moneyness $k = \frac{K}{S}$ space and consider *normalized* Call pricing functions, i.e. Call prices divided by their underlier.

Definition 2.6. Let $k = \frac{K}{S}$ the moneyness of the Call option $C(S, K)$, and $m = \frac{M}{C(S, K)}$ the moneyness of the Call option $\hat{C}_K(C(S, K), M)$. We denote with

$$C_S(k) := \frac{C(S, Sk)}{S}$$

the normalization of C with respect to k , and with

$$\hat{C}_{K,S}(m) := \frac{\hat{C}_K(C(S, K), C(S, K)m)}{C(S, K)}$$

the normalization of \hat{C}_K with respect to m .

Furthermore, we say that C is homogeneous if C_S does not depend on S and define the normalized pricing function c by the relation $c(k) := C_1(k)$ for every k .

Normalized Call prices are particularly interesting when Call prices are homogeneous, since they satisfy key properties as we will show in section 2.3.1. Furthermore, the most notorious models such as the Black-Scholes, the Heston and the implied volatility models are homogeneous. In this case the function C can be recovered from c through the formula $C(S, K) = Sc(\frac{K}{S})$. Not all models are homogeneous: examples of inhomogeneous models include local volatility or local stochastic volatility (except in very few cases).

In order to work with Black-Scholes prices, throughout the rest of the paper we denote with ϕ the standard normal probability density function and with Φ its cumulative density function. Furthermore, we denote with $\text{BS}(S, K, v)$ the traditional Black-Scholes function for Call prices with implied total volatility $v = \sigma\sqrt{T}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BS}(S, K, v) &= S\Phi(d_1(S, K, v)) - K\Phi(d_2(S, K, v)) \\ d_{1,2}(S, K, v) &= -\frac{\log \frac{K}{S}}{v} \pm \frac{v}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We will sometimes drop the dependency in v for notation simplicity. When considering normalized Black-Scholes prices, we use the notation

$$\text{BS}(S, K) = S \text{bs}\left(\frac{K}{S}\right).$$

Reconstructed prices obtained from $\text{bs}(k)$ in the Black-Scholes case correspond to the perspective function of section 3.2.6. of [1].

In the following lemma we show that the normalization $C_S(k)$ as a function of the moneyness k has the same properties as the original price $C(S, K)$ as a function of the strike K .

Lemma 2.7. *Normalized prices $C_S(k)$ are non-increasing and convex functions of k , and satisfy*

$$(1 - k)_+ \leq C_S(k) \leq 1.$$

Proof. It holds $C'_S(k) = \frac{d}{dK}C(S, Sk)$ and $C''_S(k) = S \frac{d^2}{dK^2}C(S, Sk)$, so that $C_S(k)$ is non-increasing and convex in k . Also, since Call prices satisfy $(S - K)_+ \leq C(S, K) \leq S$, then dividing by S it holds $(1 - k)_+ \leq C_S(k) \leq 1$. \square

It turns out that there is a convenient relationship between the initial normalized Call pricing function and the (normalized) relative Call on Call one. Indeed, observe that $\hat{C}_K(C(S, K), M) = C(S, K + M)$, so that $\hat{C}_K(C(S, K), C(S, K)m) = C(S, S \frac{K + C(S, K)m}{S})$. Now from definition 2.6 it holds

$$C_S(k + C_S(k)m) = \frac{C(S, S(k + C_S(k)m))}{S}$$

and consequently

$$\hat{C}_{Sk, S}(m) = \frac{C_S(k + C_S(k)m)}{C_S(k)}.$$

In particular, in case C is homogeneous,

$$\hat{C}_{Sk, S}(m) = \frac{c(k + c(k)m)}{c(k)}. \quad (3)$$

We will further exploit the relationship in eq. (3) in section 2.4 where we work in the space of normalized homogeneous Call prices, and define transformations in such space.

As in remark 2.3, observe that by the chain rule it holds that $\frac{d}{dm}\hat{C}_{Sk, S}(0_+) = C'_S(k) = \partial_K C(S, Sk)$, which will be in general (for strictly convex functions) strictly larger than -1 .

2.3.1 Homogeneous Call prices

We now look at the properties of the Call on Call pricing functions in section 2.2.1 in the case of homogeneous Call prices. It turns out that Calls on Calls with homogeneous pricing function are non-decreasing functions of the relative underlying strike and that Black-Scholes Calls on Calls are convex with respect to the underlier. As a consequence, when calibrating Calls on Calls, one should design an algorithm such to satisfy these necessary properties.

In the following proposition we consider conditions of lemma 2.4 in the case of homogeneous Call prices and show that they are always satisfied, i.e. that Calls on Calls with homogeneous pricing function are non-decreasing with respect to the relative underlying strike.

Proposition 2.8 (Monotonicity of Calls on Calls with respect to the relative underlying strike: the homogeneous case). *Let $C(S, K)$ homogeneous and C^1 in both variables. Then the function $K \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is non-decreasing.*

Proof. From lemma 2.4, we shall prove that the function

$$L \rightarrow \frac{\partial_K C(S, L)}{\partial_S C(S, L)}$$

is non-decreasing for every S . In the homogeneous case this can be simplified writing $C(S, L) = c(\frac{L}{S})S$ and considering that a function is monotone in L iff it is monotone in $l = \frac{L}{S}$. We then find that the function $K \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is non-decreasing iff the function

$$l \rightarrow \frac{c'(l)}{c(l) - lc'(l)}$$

is non-decreasing. This is actually the case since the derivative of the latter function is $\frac{c(l)c''(l)}{(c(l) - lc'(l))^2}$, which is always positive for convex prices. □

Consider now a fixed value of X . This property gives that at a fixed moneyness $\frac{M}{X}$, the map $K \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is non-decreasing and so, for any continuous increasing function Y with $Y(0) = 0$, the map $t \rightarrow \hat{C}_{Y(t)}(X, M)$ is non-decreasing as well, meaning there is no calendar-spread arbitrage for the price surface $(t, M) \rightarrow C_{Y(t)}(X, M)$. Since there is no Butterfly arbitrage in the strike dimension for any t , we have built an arbitrage-free *forward extrapolation* of the pricing function $C_0(X, M) = C(X, M)$. One can see that we treat the strike K here as a shadow parameter, completely forgetting its role in the design of the relative pricing function.

We now pass to the study of lemma 2.5. Conditions for the convexity of Calls on Calls with respect to the underlier can be re-written in the homogeneous case. Differently from the property of monotonicity with respect to the relative underlying strike, here we do not achieve to show the convexity property for all homogeneous pricing function. However, we prove it for the Black-Scholes case.

Proposition 2.9 (Convexity of Calls on Calls with respect to the underlier: the homogeneous case). *Let $C(S, K)$ homogeneous and C^2 in the first variable. Then the function $X \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is convex if and only if the function*

$$k \rightarrow \frac{k^2 c''(k)}{c(k) - kc'(k)}$$

is non-decreasing. In particular this holds true in the Black-Scholes case.

Proof. From lemma 2.5 we shall prove that the function

$$K \rightarrow \frac{\partial_S^2 C(S, K)}{\partial_S C(S, K)}$$

is non-decreasing for every S . We can write $C(S, K) = c(\frac{K}{S})S$, develop the derivatives and consider that a function is monotone in K iff it is monotone in $\frac{K}{S}$. We find that in the homogeneous case, $X \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(X, M)$ is convex for any K, M iff the function

$$k \rightarrow \frac{k^2 c''(k)}{S(c(k) - kc'(k))}$$

is non-decreasing for any S . We can drop S at the denominator and conclude.

In the Black-Scholes case, $bs''(k) = \frac{\phi(d_2)}{kv}$ where $d_{1,2} = -\frac{\log k}{v} \pm \frac{v}{2}$. Then the above requirement is that

$$k \rightarrow \frac{k\phi(d_2)}{v\Phi(d_1)}$$

is non-decreasing. This holds true iff, taking the derivative, the quantity

$$\frac{\phi(d_2)}{v\Phi(d_1)^2} \left(\Phi(d_1) + \frac{\Phi(d_1)d_2 + \phi(d_1)}{v} \right)$$

is positive. Observe that $d_2 = d_1 - v$, so that we are asking the quantity $\Phi(d_1)d_1 + \phi(d_1)$ to be positive. When d_1 is positive this is gained. Otherwise, we can use the upper bound of the Mill's ratio $\frac{1 - \Phi(x)}{\phi(x)} < \frac{1}{x}$ for every $x > 0$ with $x = -d_1$ and obtain the desired property. □

The convexity in the underlier of the option price is a key property from a risk analysis perspective, and allows to study the behavior of the option price dynamic as being locally Black-Scholes-like, with a positive Gamma for Calls and Puts. Combined with the previous proposition and the discussion that follows it, we get a forward extrapolation scheme with nice properties when the convexity property is fulfilled.

Remark 2.10. *It is interesting to observe that the function $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ cannot be homogeneous when $C(S, K)$ is. Indeed, in order to satisfy such a property, its normalized function $\hat{C}_{K,S}(m) = \frac{\hat{C}_K(X, Xm)}{X}$ where S is recovered from $X = C(S, K)$ should not depend on X , i.e. it should be a function of the form $g(m)$. From eq. (3), it should hold $g(m) = \frac{c(\frac{K}{S} + c(\frac{K}{S})m)}{c(\frac{K}{S})}$. However the right term depends on X in the S term, so that the equality cannot hold for all X . Indeed, for X moving from its lowest values to ∞ , S moves from 0 to ∞ , so that $g(m) = \frac{c(\infty)}{c(\infty)} = 1$ and $g(m) = c(m)$ respectively. In non-degenerate cases, normalized prices are not constantly equal to 1 so that Calls on Calls with homogeneous pricing function cannot be homogeneous.*

2.4 A transformation in the Tehranchi space

In lemma 2.7 we have pointed out some necessary properties that normalized Call prices satisfy: monotonicity and convexity with respect to the moneyness, and upper and lower bounds corresponding to the constant function $\mathbb{1}$ and the normalized intrinsic value function $(1 - k)_+$. Note that the property of monotonicity is actually implied by the two other properties.

A crucial point here is that the underlier is considered to be frozen (and, given the normalization, with unit value): in other words we only consider the partial dependency in the normalized strike (the moneyness) of the pricing function.

As Tehranchi has deeply studied normalized Call prices in [11], we will name *Tehranchi space* the space \mathbb{C} of such normalized Call prices:

$$\mathbb{C} = \left\{ c : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid c \text{ convex}, \forall m, (1 - m)_+ \leq c(m) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

As an immediate consequence, functions in \mathbb{C} are non-increasing and satisfy $c(0) = 1$. Also, from lemma 2.7, functions obtained by the normalization $c(k)$ of homogeneous prices defined in definition 2.6 belong to the Tehranchi space.

Equation (3) suggests to define the following transformation on \mathbb{C} .

Definition 2.11. *For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \geq 0$ with $c(k) > 0$ we define the transformation*

$$\mathbb{T}_k c(\cdot) := \frac{c(k + c(k)\cdot)}{c(k)}.$$

k is called the relative underlying moneyness of \mathbb{T}_k .

Observe that functions in \mathbb{C} are either positive, or positive before a threshold a and null beyond a . It is natural if needed to extend the definition of \mathbb{T}_k for $k \geq a$ by $\mathbb{T}_k \equiv \mathbb{1}$, the constant function equal to the normalized underlier.

In relation to eq. (3), the transformation \mathbb{T}_k corresponds to the normalization of Calls on Calls with homogeneous pricing function, i.e. $\mathbb{T}_k c(m) = \hat{C}_{S_k, S}(m)$. Also, for a given S and a function $\mathbb{T}_k c(\cdot)$, it is always possible to reconstruct the corresponding non-normalized Call on Call. In particular, the original underlier Call written on S has strike $K = S_k$, and the Call on Call with strike M is

$$\hat{C}_K(C(S, K), M) = \hat{C}_K(S c(k), M) = \mathbb{T}_k c\left(\frac{M}{S c(k)}\right) S c(k).$$

2.4.1 Properties of the transformation \mathbb{T}_k

The following lemma lists important properties of the transformations \mathbb{T}_k . In particular, it states that the new function $\mathbb{T}_k c$ still lives in \mathbb{C} and that it has a derivative in 0 which is larger than -1 . Furthermore the lemma gives the limits of the transformation \mathbb{T}_k with respect to k .

Lemma 2.12 (Properties of \mathbb{T}_k). *For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \geq 0$ with $c(k) > 0$ it holds:*

1. $\mathbb{T}_k c \in \mathbb{C}$;
2. $\frac{d}{dm} \mathbb{T}_k c(0_+) = c'(k)$;
3. $\mathbb{T}_k c(\infty) = \frac{c(\infty)}{c(k)}$;
4. $\mathbb{T}_0 c = c$;
5. $\mathbb{T}_\infty c \equiv \mathbb{1}$.

Proof. The only difficult point is the last one. Observe that at fixed k , m , it holds $c(k + c(k)m) = c(k) + c'(k + uc(k))c(k)m$ for some u in $]0, m[$. Whence $\mathbb{T}_k c(m) = 1 + c'(k + uc(k))m$ and since c' goes uniformly to 0 at infinity this yields $\mathbb{T}_k c(\cdot) \rightarrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. \square

At this point, one can consider the family $\{\mathbb{T}_k c : k \geq 0\}$, as a (one-dimensional) *enrichment* of the price curve c , given that $\mathbb{T}_0 c = c$. The initial forward moneyness k should be considered here as a plain parameter; all the price curves $\mathbb{T}_k c$ are arbitrage-free in the sense that they belong to \mathbb{C} .

In relation to this latter point, one can wonder about the *composition* of the above enrichment/extensions, like $\mathbb{T}_{k_n} \cdots \mathbb{T}_{k_2} \mathbb{T}_{k_1}$. The following property corresponds to the image of the semigroup property in the normalized space:

Lemma 2.13 (Iterates of \mathbb{T}_k). *It holds $\mathbb{T}_b \mathbb{T}_a c = \mathbb{T}_{a+c(a)b} c$.*

Proof. The following relations hold

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{T}_b \mathbb{T}_a c(m) &= \frac{\mathbb{T}_a c(b + \mathbb{T}_a c(b)m)}{\mathbb{T}_a c(b)} \\
&= \mathbb{T}_a c\left(b + \frac{c(a + c(a)b)}{c(a)} m\right) \frac{c(a)}{c(a + c(a)b)} \\
&= \frac{c\left(a + c(a)\left(b + \frac{c(a + c(a)b)}{c(a)} m\right)\right)}{c(a)} \frac{c(a)}{c(a + c(a)b)} \\
&= \frac{c(a + c(a)b + c(a + c(a)b)m)}{c(a + c(a)b)} \\
&= \mathbb{T}_{a+c(a)b} c(m).
\end{aligned}$$

\square

This means that the range of \mathbb{T} is the same as the range of its iterates, and there is no *additional* enrichment to hope for from performing those iterations.

We shall now consider proposition 2.8 where we proved that Calls on Calls with homogeneous pricing function are non-decreasing with respect to the relative underlying strike. We expect to find a similar property for $k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_k c(m) = \hat{C}_{Sk,S}(m)$.

Proposition 2.14 (Monotonicity of \mathbb{T}_k with respect to the relative underlying moneyness). *For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $m \geq 0$, the map $k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_k c(m)$ is non-decreasing.*

Proof. It holds

$$\frac{d}{dk} \mathbb{T}_k c(m) = \frac{c'(k + c(k)m)(1 + c'(k)m)c(k) - c(k + c(k)m)c'(k)}{c(k)^2}.$$

Doing the derivative with respect to m , one finds $\frac{d}{dm} \frac{d}{dk} \mathbb{T}_k c(m) = c''(k + c(k)m)(1 + c'(k)m)$ which is positive iff $m < -\frac{1}{c'(k)}$. Then, the function $\frac{d}{dk} \mathbb{T}_k c(m)$ with variable m is increasing up to $-\frac{1}{c'(k)}$ and then starts decreasing. To show that it is non-negative for every k and m , it is enough to show that it is non-negative for every k and $m \in \{0, \infty\}$.

At $m = 0$, it is easy to see $\frac{d}{dk}\mathbb{T}_k c(0) = 0$. From Theorem 2.1.2 of [11], there exists a random variable S such that $c(y) = 1 - E[S \wedge y]$ and $-c'(y) = P(S > y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} c(y) - yc'(y) &= 1 - E[S \wedge y] + yP(S > y) \\ &= 1 - \int_0^y (s \wedge y) f_S(s) ds + y \int_y^\infty f_S(s) ds \\ &= 1 - \int_0^y s f_S(s) ds - y \int_y^\infty f_S(s) ds + y \int_y^\infty f_S(s) ds \\ &= 1 - \int_0^y s f_S(s) ds \end{aligned}$$

and this goes to $1 - E[S] = c(\infty) \geq 1$ as y goes to ∞ . As a consequence, $yc'(y)$ goes to 0 and the result holds. □

Note that the above proposition implies in particular

$$c(m) = \mathbb{T}_0 c(m) \leq \mathbb{T}_k c(m) = \frac{c(k + c(k)m)}{c(k)}.$$

In fig. 1 we plot the function $\mathbb{T}_k c(m)$ with respect to k for different fixed m s. The function c is a normalized Black-Scholes Call function with implied total volatility equal to 0.2. It can be seen that $\mathbb{T}_k c(m)$ is non-decreasing in k (as shown in proposition 2.14) and non-increasing in m , as expected since c is a non-increasing function.




Figure 1: Function $k \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_k c(m)$ for different levels of m . The original Black-Scholes implied total volatility is set at 0.2.

2.4.2 A slight generalization

From lemma 2.12, the function $m \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_k c(m)$ has a particular feature at 0. Indeed, its right derivative is $\frac{d}{dm}\mathbb{T}_k c(0_+) = c'(k)$ which for $k > 0$ is in general larger than -1 . As already seen in remark 2.3, this feature might be annoying since it implies the presence of a mass in 0 of the probability density function associated to the underlier of prices.

We are then interested in generalizing suitably the transformation \mathbb{T}_k in order to get rid of this mass at 0 phenomenon. This generalization is formulated on the Tehranchi space here. In section 4.1 we will see how to change the probability measure in order to lift Calls on Calls to Calls on Calls with no mass in 0, and will provide the connection with the generalized transformation of this section.

To introduce the generalized transformation, firstly consider $\alpha \geq 0$ and the quantity $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ defined as follows.

Definition 2.15. For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\alpha, k \geq 0$ with $c(k) > 0$, we define the transformation

$$\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(\cdot) := \frac{c(k + \alpha \cdot)}{c(k)}.$$

The transformation \mathbb{T}_k can be written as a function of $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ in the sense that $\mathbb{T}_k c = \mathbb{V}_{k,c(k)}c$.

It is easy to see that functions $m \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(\cdot)$ are convex and bounded by 1. Adding the requirement that $\alpha(k) \leq -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}$ also guarantees the lower bound $(1 - m)_+$, so that the transformations $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ can be viewed as operating on the Tehranchi space.

Lemma 2.16 (Properties of $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$). For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $\alpha, k \geq 0$ with $c(k) > 0$ and $\alpha \leq -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}$, it holds

1. $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c \in \mathbb{C}$;
2. $\frac{d}{dm}\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(0_+) = \frac{c'(k)}{c(k)}\alpha \geq 1$;
3. $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(\infty) = \frac{c(\infty)}{c(k)}$;
4. $\mathbb{V}_{0,1}c = c$.

Proof. The derivative and second derivative of $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(m)$ with respect to m are respectively $\frac{c'(k+\alpha m)}{c(k)}\alpha$ and $\frac{c'(k+\alpha m)}{c(k)}\alpha^2$. Then $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(m)$ is convex in m . Since $c \in \mathbb{C}$, it is non-increasing and $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(m) \leq 1$. The inequality $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(m) \geq (1 - m)_+$ amounts to $c(k + \alpha m) - c(k) \geq -c(k)m$ for $m < 1$; by the mean value theorem the LHS writes $\alpha c'(k + \alpha u)m$ for some u in $]0, m[$ where the derivative is negative. Since c is convex, the latter quantity is larger than $\alpha c'(k)m$ and $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(m) \geq (1 - m)_+$ holds true as soon as $\alpha \leq -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}$.

The other points follow immediately. □

As the transformation \mathbb{T}_k , also its generalization $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ satisfies a semigroup property and, as a consequence, iterations of this transformation do not further enrich the family $\{\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha} : k \geq 0, \alpha \geq 0\}$:

Lemma 2.17 (Iterates of $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$). It holds $\mathbb{V}_{b,\beta}\mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha}c = \mathbb{V}_{a+\alpha b,\alpha\beta}c$.

Furthermore, if $\alpha \leq -\frac{c(a)}{c'(a)}$ and $\beta \leq -\frac{\mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha}c(b)}{\frac{d}{dm}\mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha}c(b)}$ then $\alpha\beta \leq -\frac{c(a+\alpha b)}{c'(a+\alpha b)}$.

Proof. The proof of the first statement is similar to the proof of lemma 2.13.

Since $\frac{d}{dm}\mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha}c(b) = \frac{c'(a+\alpha b)}{c(a)}\alpha$, if $\beta \leq -\frac{\mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha}c(b)}{\frac{d}{dm}\mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha}c(b)}$ then $\beta \leq -\frac{c(a+\alpha b)}{\alpha c'(a+\alpha b)}$ and the second statement follows. □

The second statement of lemma 2.17 implies that the family $\{\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c : c \in \mathbb{C}, k \geq 0, 0 \leq \alpha \leq -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}\}$ (where $c \in \mathbb{C}$ is also a parameter) is closed under iterations.

From lemma 2.16, we see that the critical case $\alpha = -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}$ is of particular interest since it will entail the property $\frac{d}{dm}\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c(0_+) = -1$. This gives rise to a new transform on the Tehranchi space:

Definition 2.18. For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \geq 0$ with $c(k) > 0$ and $c'(k) \neq 0$ we define the transformation

$$\mathbb{U}_k c(\cdot) := \frac{c(k - \frac{c(k)}{c'(k)} \cdot)}{c(k)}.$$

The transformation \mathbb{U}_k can be written as a function of $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ in the sense that $\mathbb{U}_k c = \mathbb{V}_{k, -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}}c$, so properties of the latter transformation (for fixed c) still hold for the former one.

Lemma 2.19 (Properties of \mathbb{U}_k). For any $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \geq 0$ with $c(k) > 0$ and $c'(k) \neq 0$, it holds:

1. $\mathbb{U}_k c \in \mathbb{C}$;
2. $\frac{d}{dm}\mathbb{U}_k c(0_+) = -1$;

$$3. \mathbb{U}_k c(\infty) = \frac{c(\infty)}{c(k)};$$

4. If $c'(0_+) = -1$, then $\mathbb{U}_0 c = c$.

Lemma 2.17 can be applied to \mathbb{U}_k but it does not automatically guarantee that iterates of \mathbb{U}_k are still functions in the family $\{\mathbb{U}_k c : k \geq 0\}$, even though they certainly live in $\{\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha} : k \geq 0, \alpha \geq 0\}$. In the following lemma we prove this point.

Lemma 2.20 (Iterates of \mathbb{U}_k). *It holds $\mathbb{U}_b \mathbb{U}_a c = \mathbb{U}_{a - \frac{c(a)}{c'(a)}} b c$.*

Proof. The proof can be shown directly as in lemma 2.13. Alternatively, applying lemma 2.17, we have $\mathbb{U}_b \mathbb{U}_a c = \mathbb{V}_{b,\beta} \mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha} c$ where $\alpha = -\frac{c(a)}{c'(a)}$ and $\beta = -\frac{\mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha} c(b)}{\frac{d}{dm} \mathbb{V}_{a,\alpha} c(b)} = -\frac{c(a+\alpha b)}{\alpha c'(a+\alpha b)}$. Then $a + \alpha b = a - \frac{c(a)}{c'(a)} b$ and $\alpha \beta = -\frac{c(a+\alpha b)}{c'(a+\alpha b)}$, so $\mathbb{V}_{a+\alpha b, \alpha \beta} c = \mathbb{U}_{a - \frac{c(a)}{c'(a)}} b c$. □

The transformation \mathbb{U}_k has a derivative in 0_+ equal to -1 and is then linked to probabilities with no mass in 0. This will allow us to define new closed pricing formulas in section 4, that we will call lifted Calls on Calls.

3 New closed formulas

In this section, we provide a quasi-closed formula for the pricing function within the Carr-Pelts-Tehranchi family (see [2, 11]), which generalizes the Black-Scholes pricing function associated to the standard normal density to any log-concave (and even, unimodal, as shown by Vladimir Lucic in [5]) density function. This includes the Black-Scholes case as a particular case. Those pricing functions are the pricing functions of options on option, where the price of the latter option is viewed as the underlier.

The reason to work with this family of pricing function is that a variational formula for the option price, reminiscent of a dual transform, is available, and it turns out that this variational formula can be inverted to get an expression for the underlier value in terms of the option price and the other parameters.

In the second section below, we derive new closed formulas from the normalized price transformations - these formulas will yield (new) homogeneous pricing functions when de-normalized.

3.1 The Carr-Pelts-Tehranchi family

Knowing the expression of the underlier S as a function of the option price $X := C(S, K)$ yields a closed formula for the option price which is given by $C(S, K + M)$, as a pricing function of X and M . In general, such an expression is unavailable, even if one can resort to straightforward numerical procedures like a basic dichotomy to compute it numerically, given the monotonicity of the map $S \rightarrow C(S, K)$.

It turns out that one can say more in the case of the Carr-Pelts-Tehranchi family, due to the availability of a particular variational formulation for the option price.

We dub Carr-Pelts-Tehranchi (CPT) model the explicit arbitrage-free parametrization for FX option prices introduced by Carr and Pelts in 2015 at a conference in honor of Steven Shreve at Purdue university (see [2]). The model has then been independently rediscovered by Tehranchi in [11] while studying advanced properties of the Black-Scholes formula.

In the CPT model, the family of Call prices is indexed by log-concave densities $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty[$ and increasing functions $y : [0, \infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (which correspond to the total implied volatility in the Black-Scholes framework). The Black-Scholes model is a special case of CPT choosing f to be the standard normal probability density function ϕ and $y(t) = v = \sigma \sqrt{t}$ with reference to eq. (2).

Similarly to Black-Scholes, the CPT model has the nice feature that option prices have a closed quasi-explicit formula. Indeed, the CPT Call price is

$$C^{\text{CPT}}(S, K; f, y(t)) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(S f(z + y(t)) - K f(z) \right)_+ dz. \quad (4)$$

Tehranchi shows in section 3.2 of [11] that if f is log-concave and y is increasing, then prices in eq. (4) represent a Call price surface of the form $E[(S_T - K)_+]$ for a certain non-negative supermartingale S_t such that $E[S_T] = S$. Equivalently, Call prices are non-decreasing in t , convex in K and equal to $(S - K)_+$ for $t = 0$.

Remarkably, prices in eq. (4) can actually be represented with a formulation very close to the Black-Scholes one as

$$C^{\text{CPT}}(S, K; f, y(t)) = SF(d(K, y(t); f) + y(t)) - KF(d(K, y(t); f))$$

where

$$d(K, y; f) := \sup \left\{ z : \frac{f(z + y)}{f(z)} \geq K \right\}$$

and z lives in the support of f , and F is the cumulative density function associated with f . In the Black-Scholes case, the function $d(K, y(t); f)$ can be obtained explicitly and is given by the classical expression $d_2(S, K, v) = -\frac{\log \frac{K}{S}}{v} - \frac{v}{2}$.

Note that the CPT pricing functions are homogeneous ones.

Furthermore, Lucic has shown in [5] that under the more general hypothesis that f is unimodal, i.e. it has a single peak (point of maximum), and y is increasing, prices in eq. (4) are still a Call price surface.

Since in the present article we are considering smiles of the Call surface, i.e. for fixed time-to-maturity, we will drop the dependence to t of y .

One of the important properties of the CPT family is the availability of a variational formula for the option price (Theorem 4.1.2 of [11]):

$$C^{\text{CPT}}(S, K; f, y(t)) = \sup_{p \in]0, 1[} SF(F^{-1}(p) + y) - pK.$$

This formula is the key of the following result.

Lemma 3.1 (Inversion of the CPT formula). *Let f a unimodal probability density function and F its cumulative density function. For $K, y \geq 0$ let $X = C^{\text{CPT}}(S, K; f, y)$, then it holds*

$$S = K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, y; F\right)$$

where

$$\psi(a, y; F) := \inf_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{a + F(r - y)}{F(r)}.$$

Proof. It holds

$$X = \sup_{p \in]0, 1[} SF(F^{-1}(p) + y) - pK$$

so that for every p , $X \geq SF(F^{-1}(p) + y) - pK$ or yet $S \leq \frac{X + pK}{F(F^{-1}(p) + y)}$, and also

$$S = \inf_{p \in]0, 1[} \frac{X + pK}{F(F^{-1}(p) + y)}.$$

Set $r := F^{-1}(p) + y$, then $p = F(r - y)$ and, given that the range of r when p runs into $]0, 1[$ is \mathbb{R} irrespective of y , the conclusion follows. □

We can easily apply the result from this lemma to the relation $\hat{C}_K(C(S, K), M) = C(S, K + M)$ and obtain the following.

Proposition 3.2 (Quasi-closed formula for the Call on Call pricing function in the CPT family). *Let f a unimodal probability density function. For $K, M, y \geq 0$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_K(X, M) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, y; F\right) f(z + y) - (K + M)f(z) \right)_+ dz \\ &= K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, y; F\right) F(d(K + M, y; f) + y) - (K + M)F(d(K + M, y; f)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, in the Black-Scholes case with $v = \sigma\sqrt{T}$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_K(X, M) &= K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right)\Phi\left(d_1\left(K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right), K + M, v\right)\right) + \\ &\quad - (K + M)\Phi\left(d_2\left(K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right), K + M, v\right)\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $d_{1,2}(a, b, v) = -\frac{\log \frac{b}{a}}{v} \pm \frac{v}{2}$.

Observe that in the Black-Scholes case of the above proposition, choosing $M = 0$, we find the expression

$$\hat{C}_K(X, 0) = K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right)\Phi\left(d_1\left(K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right), K, v\right)\right) - K\Phi\left(d_2\left(K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right), K, v\right)\right)$$

which is the classic Black-Scholes formula for the Call $C(\tilde{S}, K)$ where $\tilde{S} = K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right)$. This was indeed expected since Call prices with null strike coincide with the value of their underlier. Furthermore, by the definition of ψ in lemma 3.1, the underlier of the Call option X with strike K is $S = K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right)$, so that $\tilde{S} = S$ and the above expression is the Call price of an option with strike K and underlier S , i.e. it coincides with X :

$$X = K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right)\Phi\left(d_1\left(K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right), K, v\right)\right) - K\Phi\left(d_2\left(K\psi\left(\frac{X}{K}, v; \Phi\right), K, v\right)\right).$$

3.1.1 Numerical computation of ψ

The function ψ in lemma 3.1 is still not explicit. However, one can study more precisely ψ in the case of a strictly log-concave f , which covers the Black-Scholes case in particular.

Indeed, let us look at the function $\psi(a, y)$. We consider $a > 0$ and call

$$\gamma(r; a, y) := \frac{a + F(r - y)}{F(r)}$$

the argument of the infimum. Then $\gamma(\infty; a, y) = 1 + a$ and γ is non-increasing iff $\gamma'(r; a, y) = \frac{F(r)f(r-y) - f(r)(a+F(r-y))}{F(r)^2} \leq 0$, or iff $a \geq \delta(r; y)$ where

$$\delta(r; y) := \frac{f(r-y)}{f(r)}F(r) - F(r-y).$$

We have the following:

Lemma 3.3. *Let f a strictly log-concave probability density function and F its cumulative density function, and let $a, y > 0$. Then $\delta(r; y)$ is strictly increasing in r and:*

- If $\delta(\infty; y) \leq a$ then $\psi(a, y) = 1 + a$;
- If $\delta(\infty; y) > a$ then $\psi(a, y) = \frac{a + F(r^* - y)}{F(r^*)} = \frac{f(r^* - y)}{f(r^*)}$ where $r^* := \delta^{-1}(a; y)$.
- In the Black-Scholes case $\delta(\infty; v) = \infty$ for every v .

Proof. Observe that if γ has a finite limit at $-\infty$, then $\delta(r; y) = F(r)\left(\frac{f(r-y)}{f(r)} - \frac{F(r-y)}{F(r)}\right)$ has a limit equal to 0 due to l'Hôpital's rule. Also, if γ explodes at $-\infty$, then its derivative must be non-positive at $-\infty$, i.e. a is always larger or equal than $\delta(-\infty; y)$, which does not depend on a . As a consequence, $\delta(-\infty; y) = 0$ in any case.

If $\delta(r; y)$ is increasing, two scenarios are possible:

- $\delta(\infty; y) > a$, then a cannot be always larger than $\delta(r, y)$ and the function γ has at least one point of minimum. Also, since δ is monotonous in r , there is a unique r^* such that $a = \delta(r^*; y)$ and this point is also the point of minimum of γ , i.e. $\psi(a, y) = \frac{a + F(r^* - y)}{F(r^*)} = \frac{f(r^* - y)}{f(r^*)}$;

- $\delta(\infty; y) \leq a$ (in particular δ is not surjective), then γ is decreasing and therefore $\psi(a, y) = 1 + a$.

Now since f is strictly log-concave, then the function $\frac{f'}{f}$ is decreasing. The derivative of δ with respect to r is $\frac{F(r)}{f(r)^2}(f(r)f'(r-y) - f(r-y)f'(r))$ and this is positive iff $\frac{f'(r-y)}{f(r-y)} > \frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}$, which holds true.

Then, if $\delta(\infty; y) > a$ there exists a unique $r^* := \delta^{-1}(a; y)$ and $\psi(a, y) = \frac{a+F(r^*-y)}{F(r^*)}$. Otherwise, if $\delta(\infty; y) \leq a$, it holds $\psi(a, y) = 1 + a$.

In the Black-Scholes case, f is strictly log-concave and $\frac{f(r-v)}{f(r)} = \exp(-\frac{(r-v)^2-r^2}{2}) = \exp(\frac{v(2r-v)}{2})$ which explodes for r going to ∞ . Then $\delta(\infty; v) = \infty > a$. □

We can actually give more details on the bounds of the point of minimum r^* of the function γ , when it exists (i.e. when $\delta(\infty; y) > a$). In the following lemma we find a lower bound r^l and an upper bound r^u for r^* under the hypothesis of surjectivity of the function $\frac{f'}{f}$, and in the successive corollary we study the Black-Scholes case, where the bounds are actually explicit. In this way, the point r^* can be numerically computed in a very quick way inverting the function δ in the interval $[r^l, r^u]$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let f a strictly log-concave probability density function and F its cumulative density function, and let $a, y > 0$. Then $\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}$ is decreasing and f is unimodal. Let s the unique point of maximum of f .*

In the case $\delta(\infty; y) > a$, if $\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}$ is surjective, it holds

- *If $\delta(s; y) \geq a$ then $\tilde{r} < r^* \leq s$, where \tilde{r} is the unique $r \leq s$ solving $a = F(r) - F(r-y)$.*
- *If $\delta(s; y) < a$ and $\delta(s+y; y) \geq a$ then $s < r^* \leq s+y$.*
- *If $\delta(s+y; y) < a$ then $s+y < r^* < \hat{r}$, where \hat{r} is the unique r solving $\frac{f(r-y)}{f(r)} = \frac{a}{F(s)} + 1$.*

Proof. Firstly observe that since f is strictly log-concave, then the function $r \rightarrow \frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}$ is decreasing while the function $r \rightarrow \frac{f(r-y)}{f(r)}$ is increasing, given that its derivative is $\frac{f'(r-y)f(r)-f(r-y)f'(r)}{f(r)^2}$. Secondly, from the proof of Theorem 4.1.6. of [11], it holds

$$\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} \leq \frac{1}{y} \log \frac{f(r)}{f(r-y)} \leq \frac{f'(r-y)}{f(r-y)}.$$

Then if $\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}$ goes to $-\infty$ at ∞ , the function $\frac{f(r-y)}{f(r)}$ explodes at ∞ , while if $\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}$ goes to ∞ at $-\infty$, then $\frac{f(r-y)}{f(r)}$ goes to 0 at $-\infty$.

In the case $\delta(\infty; y) > a$, from lemma 3.3 there exists a unique r^* such that $a = \delta(r^*; y)$. Since $F(r) > F(r-y)$, it holds

$$a = \delta(r^*; y) > \left(\frac{f(r^*-y)}{f(r^*)} - 1 \right) F(r^*-y).$$

If $\delta(s; y) \geq a$ then $r^* \leq s$. Otherwise $r^* > s$. If $\delta(s+y; y) \geq a$ then $r^* \leq s+y$. Otherwise $r^* > s+y$, so $F(r^*-y) > F(s)$, $\frac{f(r^*-y)}{f(r^*)} > 1$ and $\frac{a}{F(s)} + 1 > \frac{f(r^*-y)}{f(r^*)}$. Since the function $r \rightarrow \frac{f(r-y)}{f(r)}$ is increasing and explodes at ∞ under the hypothesis that $\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)}$ goes to $-\infty$, then there exists a unique \hat{r} such that $\frac{f(\hat{r}-y)}{f(\hat{r})} = \frac{a}{F(s)} + 1$. Furthermore, $r^* < \hat{r}$.

In the previous step we have already found a lower bound (either s or $s+y$) in the case $\delta(s; y) < a$. If $\delta(s; y) \geq a$, then $r^* \leq s$ and $\frac{f(r^*-y)}{f(r^*)} < 1$, so

$$a = \delta(r^*; y) < F(r^*) - F(r^*-y).$$

The function $r \rightarrow F(r) - F(r-y)$ has derivative $f(r) - f(r-y)$, which is positive for $r \leq s$. Then there is a unique $\tilde{r} \leq s$ solving $a = F(\tilde{r}) - F(\tilde{r}-y)$ and $\tilde{r} < r^*$. □

Lemma 3.4 can be further exploit in the Black-Scholes case. It turns out that the bounds for r^* are explicit and do not need any inversion algorithm.

Corollary 3.5 (Explicit bounds for r^* in the Black-Scholes case). *In the Black-Scholes case:*

- If $a \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\phi(v) + \Phi(v) - 1$ then $-\sqrt{-2\log\left(\frac{a}{v}\sqrt{2\pi}\right)} < r^* \leq 0$.
- If $\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\phi(v) + \Phi(v) - 1 < a \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{\Phi(v)}{\phi(v)} - \frac{1}{2}$ then $0 < r^* \leq v$.
- If $a > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{\Phi(v)}{\phi(v)} - \frac{1}{2}$ then $v < r^* < \frac{1}{2}\left(v + \frac{2}{v}\log(2a + 1)\right)$.

Proof. In the Black-Scholes case, $f = \phi$, $s = 0$ and $\phi'(r) = -r\phi(r)$, so that $\frac{\phi'(r)}{\phi(r)} = -r$ which is surjective. In lemma 3.3 we showed that $\delta(\infty; v) = \infty > a$, so three scenarios are possible applying lemma 3.4.

In the first scenario, the condition $\delta(s; v) \geq a$ reads $\frac{\phi(-v)}{\phi(0)}\Phi(0) - \Phi(-v) \geq a$. Since $\Phi(-v) = 1 - \Phi(v)$, $\phi(-v) = \phi(v)$, $\Phi(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\phi(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$, the condition is equivalent to $a \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\phi(v) + \Phi(v) - 1$. In this case the point $\tilde{r} \leq 0$ is the only r satisfying $a = \int_{r-v}^r \phi(z) dz$ and it holds $r^* > \tilde{r}$. Since $\tilde{r} \leq 0$, it holds $\int_{r-v}^r \phi(z) dz < \int_{r-v}^r \phi(\tilde{r}) dz = \phi(\tilde{r})v$, so that $\frac{a}{v}\sqrt{2\pi} < \exp(-\frac{\tilde{r}^2}{2})$. As a consequence, the LHS is smaller than 1 and we can solve $\tilde{r}^2 < -2\log\left(\frac{a}{v}\sqrt{2\pi}\right)$, which implies in particular $\tilde{r} > -\sqrt{-2\log\left(\frac{a}{v}\sqrt{2\pi}\right)}$.

In the second scenario, the condition $\delta(s+v; v) \geq a$ is $\frac{\phi(0)}{\phi(v)}\Phi(v) - \Phi(0) \geq a$, or equivalently $a \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{\Phi(v)}{\phi(v)} - \frac{1}{2}$.

In the last scenario, the point \hat{r} solves $\frac{\phi(\hat{r}-v)}{\phi(\hat{r})} = 2a + 1$. The LHS is $\exp\left(\frac{v(2r-v)}{2}\right)$ and solving we find $\hat{r} = \frac{1}{2}\left(v + \frac{2}{v}\log(2a + 1)\right)$. □

Thanks to lemma 3.4 and corollary 3.5 we have found specific bounds for r^* . Then extremely fast numerical implementations based on standard methods such as the `brentq` function of the `scipy.optimize` library in Python can be obtained using these bounds.

3.2 Formulas from normalized transformations

The transformation $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ of section 2.4.2, and so \mathbb{T}_k and \mathbb{U}_k , allow to generate new pricing formulas using the following recipe: start from a Call pricing function with closed formula, normalize it, apply the transformation and de-normalize to get another closed formula. This allows to extend any closed formula to a 2-parameter family of closed formulas.

In other words, we look at the pricing formula in the new world, but consider eventually applying it to the usual world: we take a financial engineer point of view here, where any pricing function depending on some parameters is a useful candidate to calibrate the current state of the market (in the usual world).

So we go through the following pipeline of transformations:

1. Start from any arbitrage-free Call pricing function $K \rightarrow C(S, K)$;
2. Normalize it and get a function $c \in \mathbb{C}$ defined as $c(k) := \frac{C(S, kS)}{S}$;
3. Apply, for any $k, \alpha \geq 0$ such that $c(k) > 0$ and $\alpha \leq -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}$, the transformation $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ to c ;
4. Get a new arbitrage-free Call pricing function given by the formula $M \rightarrow X\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}c\left(\frac{M}{X}\right)$, where $X > 0$ represents the value of the new underlier.

The above steps can be applied in particular for the two special choices of α defining \mathbb{T}_k and \mathbb{U}_k : $\alpha = c(k)$ and $\alpha = -\frac{c(k)}{c'(k)}$.

Observe that if we choose $k = \frac{K}{S}$ and $X = C(S, K)$ the new Call pricing function obtained using the transformation $\mathbb{V}_{k,c(k)} = \mathbb{T}_k$ coincides with $M \rightarrow \hat{C}_K(C(S, K), M) = C(S, K + M)$.

Let us compute the new closed formulas we obtain implementing the above pipeline for the known families of Black-Scholes, SVI (composed with the Black-Scholes pricing function), and CPT, that all provide closed-form formulas.

3.2.1 A 2-parameter enrichment of the Black-Scholes formula

Let $BS(S, K)$ the Black-Scholes function defined in eq. (2). Then $BS(S, K) = Sbs(\frac{K}{S})$ where the normalized Black-Scholes pricing function bs belongs to the Tehranchi space. We can therefore consider the two families of functions indexed by k

$$\begin{aligned} bs_k^{\mathbb{T}}\left(\frac{M}{X}\right) &:= \frac{bs\left(k + bs(k)\frac{M}{X}\right)}{bs(k)} \\ bs_k^{\mathbb{U}}\left(\frac{M}{X}\right) &:= \frac{bs\left(k - \frac{bs(k)}{bs'(k)}\frac{M}{X}\right)}{bs(k)} \end{aligned}$$

leading to the *enriched Black-Scholes models*

$$\begin{aligned} BS_k^{\mathbb{T}}(X, M) &:= Xbs_k^{\mathbb{T}}\left(\frac{M}{X}\right) = X\frac{bs\left(k + bs(k)\frac{M}{X}\right)}{bs(k)} \\ BS_k^{\mathbb{U}}(X, M) &:= Xbs_k^{\mathbb{U}}\left(\frac{M}{X}\right) = X\frac{bs\left(k - \frac{bs(k)}{bs'(k)}\frac{M}{X}\right)}{bs(k)}. \end{aligned}$$

In fig. 2 we plot the $BS_k^{\mathbb{T}}(X, M)$ and $BS_k^{\mathbb{U}}(X, M)$ prices (for fixed maturity) for different values of k and a fixed value of $X = 1$. The original implied total volatility is fixed at 0.2.




Figure 2: Prices $BS_k^{\mathbb{T}}(X, M)$ and $BS_k^{\mathbb{U}}(X, M)$ obtained from Black-Scholes formula applying transformations \mathbb{T}_k and \mathbb{U}_k respectively. The original Black-Scholes implied total volatility is set at 0.2.

In order to define the 2-parameter enrichment of the Black-Scholes formula $BS_{k,z}^{\mathbb{V}}$ as suggested in the introduction of this section, let us make explicit the second parameter of the function bs , the total implied volatility $v = \sigma\sqrt{T}$. As seen in section 2.4.2, the families $BS_k^{\mathbb{T}}$ and $BS_k^{\mathbb{U}}$ are a particular choice in the more generic set of families $X\frac{bs\left(k+\alpha\frac{M}{X}, v\right)}{bs(k, v)}$. In particular, $BS_k^{\mathbb{T}}$ corresponds to the choice $\alpha = bs(k)$ and $BS_k^{\mathbb{U}}$ to the choice $\alpha = -\frac{bs(k)}{bs'(k)}$.

More generally, we can represent α as the value of a normalized Black-Scholes pricing function at k : $\alpha = bs(k, z)$ where the variability is given by the choice of the implied total volatility z . We have then identified a *2-parameters enrichment* of the Black-Scholes pricing function that satisfies properties of proposition 2.2:

Proposition 3.6 (2-parameter enrichment of the Black-Scholes formula from the normalized pricing function). *For any $k \geq 0$ and $z > 0$ we define the 2-parameter enrichment of the Black-Scholes pricing function with $v = \sigma_1\sqrt{T}$ and $z = \sigma_2\sqrt{T}$*

$$BS_{k,z}^{\mathbb{V}}(X, M, v) := X\frac{bs\left(k + bs(k, z)\frac{M}{X}, v\right)}{bs(k, v)}.$$

Then $BS_{k,z}^{\nabla}(X, M, v)$ is a non-increasing and convex function of M with $BS_{k,z}^{\nabla}(X, M, v) \leq X$. If $z \leq v$, then $(X - M)_+ \leq BS_{k,z}^{\nabla}(X, M, v)$.

In the case $z = v$, the function $k \rightarrow BS_{k,v}^{\nabla}(X, M, v)$ is non-decreasing.

In particular $BS_{0,z}^{\nabla}(X, M, v) = X \text{bs}\left(\frac{M}{X}, v\right) = BS(X, M, v)$.

Proof. The monotonicity and convexity with respect to M are easy to be proved. Since $k + \text{bs}(k, z) \frac{M}{X} \geq k$ and the function $\text{bs}(k, v)$ is decreasing in k , we obtain the first inequality. If $z \leq v$, then $\text{bs}(k, z) \leq \text{bs}(k, v)$ and $BS_{k,z}^{\nabla}(X, M, v) \geq X \frac{\text{bs}\left(k + \text{bs}(k, v) \frac{M}{X}, v\right)}{\text{bs}(k, v)}$ which is larger than $(X - M)_+$ from lemma 2.12.

Finally if $z = v$ we apply proposition 2.14. □

3.2.2 The enriched SVI models

The Stochastic Volatility Inspired model (SVI) is a model for the implied total variance with formulation

$$\text{SVI}(h) = a + b(\rho(h - m) + \sqrt{(h - m)^2 + \sigma^2})$$

where $h = \log \frac{K}{S}$ is the log-forward moneyness. It was firstly proposed by Jim Gatheral in 2004 at the Global Derivatives and Risk Management Madrid conference [4].

In this model, Call prices at moneyness k are Black-Scholes prices with implied total variance $\sqrt{\text{SVI}(\log k)}$. We denote these prices with

$$BS^{\text{SVI}}(S, K) := BS\left(S, K, \sqrt{\text{SVI}\left(\log \frac{K}{S}\right)}\right).$$

Applying \mathbb{T}_k and \mathbb{U}_k , we obtain the *enriched SVI models*

$$BS_k^{\text{SVI}, \mathbb{T}}(X, M) := X \frac{\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}\left(k + \text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}(k) \frac{M}{X}\right)}{\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}(k)}$$

$$BS_k^{\text{SVI}, \mathbb{U}}(X, M) := X \frac{\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}\left(k - \frac{\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}(k)}{(\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}})'(k)} \frac{M}{X}\right)}{\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}(k)}.$$

We plot prices $BS_k^{\text{SVI}, \mathbb{T}}(X, M)$ and $BS_k^{\text{SVI}, \mathbb{U}}(X, M)$ of the enriched SVI models in fig. 3, where we choose as initial arbitrage-free parameters for the SVI smile $a = 0.01$, $b = 0.1$, $\rho = -0.6$, $m = -0.05$, and $\sigma = 0.1$ (see Table 2 of [7]). We take a fixed value $X = 1$.




Figure 3: Prices $BS_k^{\text{SVI}, \mathbb{T}}(X, M)$ and $BS_k^{\text{SVI}, \mathbb{U}}(X, M)$ obtained from SVI prices applying transformations \mathbb{T}_k and \mathbb{U}_k respectively. The original arbitrage-free SVI parameters are $a = 0.01$, $b = 0.1$, $\rho = -0.6$, $m = -0.05$, and $\sigma = 0.1$.

Again, we can enrich also the SVI model to a 2-parameter family indexed by k and α :

$$\text{BS}_{k,\alpha}^{\text{SVI},\mathbb{V}}(X, M) := X \frac{\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}(k + \alpha \frac{M}{X})}{\text{bs}^{\text{SVI}}(k)}.$$

3.2.3 The enriched CPT models

The CPT prices are defined in eq. (4) and have corresponding normalized prices

$$c^{\text{CPT}}(k; f, y) := \frac{C^{\text{CPT}}(S, Sk; f, y)}{S} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (f(z + y) - kf(z))_+ dz.$$

Even the CPT model can be extended via \mathbb{T}_k and \mathbb{U}_k to get the *enriched CPT models*

$$C_k^{\text{CPT},\mathbb{T}}(X, M) := X \frac{c^{\text{CPT}}(k + c^{\text{CPT}}(k; f, y) \frac{M}{X}; f, y)}{c^{\text{CPT}}(k; f, y)}$$

$$C_k^{\text{CPT},\mathbb{U}}(X, M) := X \frac{c^{\text{CPT}}(k - \frac{c^{\text{CPT}}(k; f, y)}{(c^{\text{CPT}})'(k; f, y)} \frac{M}{X}; f, y)}{c^{\text{CPT}}(k; f, y)}$$

and via $\mathbb{V}_{k,\alpha}$ to get the 2-parameter extension of the CPT model:

$$C_{k,\alpha}^{\text{CPT},\mathbb{V}}(X, M) := X \frac{c^{\text{CPT}}(k + \alpha \frac{M}{X}; f, y)}{c^{\text{CPT}}(k; f, y)}.$$

4 Smile symmetry and a lift of the relative pricing function

As already pointed out in remark 2.3, Calls on Calls are contracts written on underliers with a positive mass in 0, i.e. that can become null with positive probability. This implies some unusual features such as a derivative of the pricing function with respect to the strike which is larger than -1 at the origin. However, it is possible to change the probability measure in order to obtain new contracts that do not present this feature anymore. Moreover, here is a tight relationship with the symmetry operation applied to the smile, as is well-known and detailed in section 2.2 of [6]. An analogous transformation is performed in section 2.2 of [11] with the involution of Call prices.

4.1 The change of probability with a mass at 0

We firstly start with the definition of the probability P^* associated to a non-negative non-constantly zero random variable X_T . Note that we re-introduce the maturity T here, in order to convey some financial context, on one hand, and also to distinguish those random variables from constant quantities known at the current time (assumed to be time 0).

Definition 4.1. *Let X_T a non-negative non-constantly zero random variable on the probability space (P, Ω) , with finite expectation $E[X_T]$. We define*

$$P^*(A) := \frac{E[\mathbb{1}_A X_T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > 0\}}]}{E[X_T]}$$

for every $A \in \Omega$. We also denote $X := E[X_T]$ and $P_0 := P(X_T = 0)$.

An immediate consequence of the above definition is that P^* is actually a probability measure on a subset of the original Ω . The proof of the following lemma is elementary and so omitted.

Lemma 4.2. *P^* is a probability measure on $\Omega^* = \{X_T > 0\}$. Any random variable Z on (P, Ω) can be restricted to a random variable on (P^*, Ω^*) (that we still denote with Z). Then $E^*[Z] = \frac{1}{X} E[Z X_T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > 0\}}]$.*

Let $X_T^* := \frac{1}{X_T}$. Then

$$E^*[X_T^*] = \frac{1 - P_0}{X}.$$

This lemma suggests to consider contracts under the probability P^* on the underlier $X_T^* = \frac{1}{X_T}$. Indeed, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} E^* \left[\left(\frac{1}{X_T} - \frac{1}{K} \right)_+ \right] &= \frac{E[(K - X_T)_+ \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > 0\}}]}{XK} \\ E^* \left[\left(\frac{1}{K} - \frac{1}{X_T} \right)_+ \right] &= \frac{E[(X_T - K)_+]}{XK} \end{aligned}$$

which suggests that a Call price under P is also a Put price on the underlier X_T^* under the new probability P^* . Furthermore $E[(K - X_T)_+] = E[(K - X_T)_+ \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > 0\}} + K \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T = 0\}}] = E[(K - X_T)_+ \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > 0\}}] + KP_0$ so that the Put-Call-Parity

$$\frac{1 - P_0}{X} - \frac{1}{K} = E^* \left[\left(\frac{1}{X_T} - \frac{1}{K} \right)_+ \right] - E^* \left[\left(\frac{1}{K} - \frac{1}{X_T} \right)_+ \right]$$

allows us to express the price of Calls on $\frac{1}{X_T}$ with strike $\frac{1}{K}$ under P^* with respect to the original Call prices as

$$\begin{aligned} E^* \left[\left(\frac{1}{X_T} - \frac{1}{K} \right)_+ \right] &= E^* \left[\left(\frac{1}{K} - \frac{1}{X_T} \right)_+ \right] + \frac{1 - P_0}{X} - \frac{1}{K} \\ &= \frac{E[(X_T - K)_+]}{XK} + \frac{1 - P_0}{X} - \frac{1}{K}. \end{aligned}$$

We can re-apply the same procedure to the underlier X_T^* under P^* , defining a probability measure P^{**} and an underlier X_T^{**} .

Definition 4.3. Let X_T a non-negative non-constantly zero random variable on the probability space (P, Ω) , with finite expectation $E[X_T]$. We define

$$P^{**}(A) := \frac{E^*[\mathbb{1}_A X_T^*]}{E^*[X_T^*]}$$

for every $A \in \Omega^*$.

The random variable $\frac{1}{X_T^*}$ is well defined and does not vanish under P^* since it is defined on the space Ω^* , so that the corresponding of lemma 4.2 for the function P^{**} becomes the following.

Lemma 4.4. P^{**} is a probability measure on $\Omega^* = \{X_T > 0\}$. Any random variable Z on (P, Ω) can be restricted to a random variable on (P^{**}, Ω^*) (that we still denote with Z). Then $E^{**}[Z] = \frac{X}{1 - P_0} E^*[Z] = \frac{1}{1 - P_0} E[Z \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > 0\}}]$.

Let $X_T^{**} := \frac{1}{X_T^*}$. Then

$$E^{**}[X_T^{**}] = \frac{X}{1 - P_0}.$$

We can now consider Call prices written on X_T^{**} using again the Put-Call-Parity:

$$\begin{aligned} E^{**} \left[\left(\frac{1}{X_T^*} - \frac{1}{K} \right)_+ \right] &= E^{**} \left[\left(\frac{1}{K} - \frac{1}{X_T^*} \right)_+ \right] + \frac{X}{1 - P_0} - \frac{1}{K} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - P_0} E \left[\left(\frac{1}{K} - X_T \right)_+ \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > 0\}} \right] + \frac{X}{1 - P_0} - \frac{1}{K} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - P_0} \left(E \left[\left(X_T - \frac{1}{K} \right)_+ \right] - X + \frac{1 - P_0}{K} \right) + \frac{X}{1 - P_0} - \frac{1}{K} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - P_0} E \left[\left(X_T - \frac{1}{K} \right)_+ \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, Calls on X_T^{**} are still Calls on X_T , with an apposite rescaling. The main difference between the two type of Calls is that while Calls on X_T might have a derivative larger than -1 in 0 because of the non-null probability of X_T to nullify, the derived Calls on X_T^{**} will anyways have a derivative in 0 strictly equal to -1 .

4.2 In terms of pricing functions

We have introduced the change of probability measure to avoid mass in zero, now we can consider contracts written in the new probability spaces. From the previous discussion in section 4.1 we get the following.

Lemma 4.5. *Assume there is a function C of two variables such that $C(X, K) = E[(X_T - K)_+]$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} E^*[(X_T^* - K)_+] &= \frac{K}{X} C\left(X, \frac{1}{K}\right) + \frac{1 - P_0}{X} - K \\ E^{**}[(X_T^{**} - K)_+] &= \frac{1}{1 - P_0} C(X, K). \end{aligned}$$

We are interested by necessary and sufficient conditions on C such that there exist functions C^* and C^{**} satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} C^*(X^*, K) &= E^*[(X_T^* - K)_+] \\ C^{**}(X^{**}, K) &= E^{**}[(X_T^{**} - K)_+] \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $X^* := \frac{1 - P_0}{X}$ and $X^{**} := \frac{X}{1 - P_0}$.

The usual situation where $P_0 = 0$ constantly leads, given that $X^* = \frac{1}{X}$ and $X^{**} = X$, to the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} C^*(X^*, K) &= K X^* C\left(\frac{1}{X^*}, \frac{1}{K}\right) + X^* - K \\ C^{**}(X^{**}, K) &= C(X^{**}, K). \end{aligned}$$

which are described in Theorem 2.2.2. of [11].

Note that in the degenerate case where $C(X, K) = (X - (1 - P_0)K)_+$, it holds $\frac{K}{X} C\left(X, \frac{1}{K}\right) + \frac{1 - P_0}{X} - K = (K - X^*)_+ + X^* - K = (X^* - K)_+$ and $\frac{1}{1 - P_0} C(X, K) = (X^{**} - K)_+$, so that the required property in eq. (5) holds.

Going back to the general case, the following lemma finds a sufficient condition for the existence of the functions C^* and C^{**} in case P_0 is given by some function $\hat{P}_0(X) = P_0$.

Lemma 4.6. *A sufficient condition for the existence of functions C^* and C^{**} satisfying eq. (5) is the existence of a function f such that $X = f\left(\frac{X}{1 - P_0}\right)$ where $P_0 = \hat{P}_0(X)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} C^*(X^*, K) &:= \frac{K}{f\left(\frac{1}{X^*}\right)} C\left(f\left(\frac{1}{X^*}\right), \frac{1}{K}\right) + X^* - K \\ C^{**}(X^{**}, K) &:= \frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} C(f(X^{**}), K). \end{aligned}$$

This lemma generalizes the no-mass at 0 situation where f is the identity function.

4.2.1 In terms of normalized pricing functions

It is also interesting to look at the normalized partial pricing functions (for a fixed pair X, P_0) where the strike is replaced by the moneyness m , and the price is scaled by the underlier as in section 2.3.

Lemma 4.7. *It holds*

$$\begin{aligned} c^*(m) &= m c\left(\frac{1}{-c'(0_+)m}\right) + 1 - m \\ c^{**}(m) &= c\left(\frac{m}{-c'(0_+)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular

$$\begin{aligned} c^{*'}(0_+) &= c(\infty) - 1 \\ c^{**'}(0_+) &= -1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From definitions, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} c^*(m) &= \frac{m}{X} C\left(X, \frac{X}{(1-P_0)m}\right) + 1 - m \\ c^{**}(m) &= \frac{1}{X} C\left(X, \frac{X}{1-P_0}m\right). \end{aligned}$$

The first conclusion follows from the definition of $c(m) = \frac{C(X, Xm)}{X}$ and from the fact that $P_0 = P(X_T = 0) = 1 + c'(0_+)$.

It is easy to show that the derivative of c^{**} in 0_+ is -1 , while the derivative of c^* in 0_+ is $c(\infty) - 1 + \lim_{m \rightarrow 0_+} \frac{c'(\frac{1}{-c'(0_+)m})}{-c'(0_+)m}$. Now by Fubini, $\frac{d}{dK}C(X, K) = -P(X_T > K) = -E[\mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > K\}}]$ and it holds

$$\begin{aligned} X &= E[X_T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > K\}}] + E[X_T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T \leq K\}}] \\ &\geq KE[\mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > K\}}] + E[X_T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T \leq K\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting K to ∞ , the term $E[X_T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_T \leq K\}}]$ goes to $E[X_T] = X$, so that the term $KE[\mathbb{1}_{\{X_T > K\}}] = -K \frac{d}{dK}C(X, K)$ must go to 0. As a consequence, $kc'(k) = \frac{K}{X} \frac{d}{dK}C(X, K)$ goes to 0 as $k = \frac{1}{-c'(0_+)m}$ goes to ∞ . □

4.3 The lifted Calls on Calls

Let us go back now to the case of the relative Call on Call pricing function which satisfies

$$C(S, K + M) = \hat{C}_K(C(S, K), M).$$

This means that we set the random variable X_T in definition 4.1 to be $(S_T - K)_+$, so that $X_T = 0$ iff $S_T \leq K$.

In this contest, the random variables X_T^* and X_T^{**} correspond to $\frac{1}{(S_T - K)_+}$ and $(S_T - K)_+$ seen as random variables in the set $\{S_T > K\}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} X &= C(S, K) \\ X^* &= \frac{1 - P(S_T \leq K)}{C(S, K)} \\ X^{**} &= \frac{C(S, K)}{1 - P(S_T \leq K)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we want to find functions \hat{C}_K^* and \hat{C}_K^{**} such that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_K^*(X^*, M) &= \frac{M}{C(S, L)} \hat{C}_K\left(C(S, K), \frac{1}{M}\right) + \frac{1 - P(S_T \leq K)}{C(S, L)} - M \\ \hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) &= \frac{1}{1 - P(S_T \leq K)} \hat{C}_K(C(S, K), M) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

and we call *lifted* Calls on Calls the prices \hat{C}_K^{**} .

In the following proposition we reconsider lemma 4.6 and state a sufficient condition for the existence of such functions \hat{C}_K^* and \hat{C}_K^{**} .

Proposition 4.8 (Sufficient condition for the existence of \hat{C}_K^* and \hat{C}_K^{**}). *A sufficient condition for the existence of functions \hat{C}_K^* and \hat{C}_K^{**} satisfying eq. (6) is that the function*

$$S \rightarrow -\frac{d}{dS}C(S, K)\frac{d}{dK}C(S, K) + C(S, K)\frac{d^2}{dSdK}C(S, K)$$

has constant sign for fixed K .

In the homogeneous case this is equivalent to the condition that the function

$$kc'(k)^2 - c(k)c'(k) - kc(k)c''(k) \tag{7}$$

has constant sign.

In the Black-Scholes case, the condition holds true.

Proof. From lemma 4.6, a sufficient condition for the existence of \hat{C}_K^* and \hat{C}_K^{**} is the existence of a function f such that $f\left(\frac{C(S, K)}{1-P(S_T \leq K)}\right) = C(S, K)$. This condition is one to one with the fact that the function $g(S) = \frac{C(S, K)}{1-P(S_T \leq K)}$ is monotone. Indeed, if $g(S^1) = g(S^2)$, then $f(g(S^1)) = f(g(S^2))$, i.e. $C(S^1, K) = C(S^2, K)$ and $S^1 = S^2$ since $C(\cdot, K)$ is a monotone function. On the other hand, if g is monotone, then the function $f(x) = C(g^{-1}(x), K)$ is the required function.

Observe that $1 - P(S_T \leq K) = -\frac{d}{dK}C(S, K)$. Then we should prove that $g(S) = \frac{C(S, K)}{-\frac{d}{dK}C(S, K)}$ is monotone. The derivative of g has the sign of

$$-\frac{d}{dS}C(S, K)\frac{d}{dK}C(S, K) + C(S, K)\frac{d^2}{dSdK}C(S, K).$$

In the homogeneous case

$$g(S) = \frac{c(k)S}{-c'(k)}$$

and it is monotone iff eq. (7) has constant sign.

In the Black-Scholes case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bs}(k) &= \Phi(d_1) - k\Phi(d_2) \\ \text{bs}'(k) &= -\Phi(d_2) \\ \text{bs}''(k) &= \frac{\phi(d_2)}{kv} \end{aligned}$$

where $d_{1,2} = -\frac{\log k}{v} \pm \frac{v}{2}$ and $v = \sigma\sqrt{T}$. The expression in eq. (7) becomes $\Phi(d_1)\Phi(d_2) - (\Phi(d_1) - k\Phi(d_2))\frac{\phi(d_2)}{v}$ and, using the equality $k\phi(d_2) = \phi(d_1)$, the latter expression becomes $\frac{1}{v}(\phi(d_1)\Phi(d_2) + v\Phi(d_1)\Phi(d_2) - \phi(d_2)\Phi(d_1))$. Since $d_1 = d_2 + v$, we shall study the sign of $\phi(x+v)\Phi(x) + v\Phi(x+v)\Phi(x) - \phi(x)\Phi(x+v)$ for $v > 0$. Dividing by $\phi(x+v)\phi(x)$, this reduces to study

$$R(x) + vR(x+v)R(x) - R(x+v) \tag{8}$$

where $R(x) = \frac{\Phi(x)}{\phi(x)}$. Let us consider the function $\mathcal{R}_x(v) = \frac{R(x+v)}{1+vR(x+v)}$ for a fixed x . Its derivative can be simplified to $\frac{R'(x+v) - R^2(x+v)}{(1+vR(x+v))^2}$, which has the sign of $\phi(z)^2 + z\Phi(z)n(z) - \Phi(z)^2 = \phi(z)^2(1 + zR(z) - R(z)^2)$ where $z = x + v$.

Observe now that $R(z) = r(-z)$ where r denotes the Mill's ratio, whence $1 + zR(z) - R(z)^2 = 1 - tr(t) - r(t)^2$ with $t = -z$. We know that $1 - tr(t) = -r'(t)$, and also from Sampford [10] that $1 > \frac{1}{r} = \frac{r'}{r^2}$, which proves that $1 + zR(z) - R(z)^2 < 0$.

Therefore $\mathcal{R}_x(v)$ attains its maximum for v going to 0, where $\mathcal{R}_x(0) = R(x)$. As a consequence the expression eq. (8) is always positive and so is eq. (7). □

Proposition 4.8 is of particular interest since it shows that in the Black-Scholes case there exist functions \hat{C}_K^* and \hat{C}_K^{**} satisfying eq. (6). In particular, in the Black-Scholes case it is possible to define lifted Call on Call pricing functions, i.e. Calls on Calls with the property of a derivative equal to -1 at 0. In particular, we have proved that in the Black-Scholes case the function $g(X) = \frac{X}{\Phi(d_2(C^{-1}(X, K), K, v))}$ where $d_2(a, b, v) = -\frac{\log \frac{b}{a}}{v} - \frac{v}{2}$ is invertible in the variable X and its inverse is $f(X^{**}) := g^{-1}(X^{**})$ which satisfies

$$f\left(\frac{X}{\Phi(d_2(C^{-1}(X, K), K, v))}\right) = X.$$

The function f , however, does not present an explicit form.

Using proposition 3.2 we can write the formula for the lifted Call on Call pricing function in the Black-Scholes case:

Proposition 4.9 (Formula for the lifted Call on Call pricing function in the Black-Scholes model). *For $K, M, v = \sigma\sqrt{T} \geq 0$, let $\psi(a, v; \Phi) = \inf_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{a + \Phi(r - v)}{\Phi(r)}$. Call $\tilde{f}(\cdot, v)$ the inverse of the function*

$$z \rightarrow \frac{z}{\Phi(d_2(\psi(z, v; \Phi), 1, v))}.$$

Then for Black-Scholes prices it holds

$$\hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) = \frac{1}{\Phi(d_2(\hat{s}, 1, v))} \left(K \hat{s} \Phi(d_1(K \hat{s}, K + M, v)) - (K + M) \Phi(d_2(K \hat{s}, K + M, v)) \right)$$

where $d_{1,2}(a, b, v) = -\frac{\log \frac{b}{a}}{v} \pm \frac{v}{2}$ and $\hat{s} = \psi(\tilde{f}(\frac{X^{**}}{K}, v), v; \Phi)$.

4.3.1 Relation with the transformation \mathbb{U}_k

Let us consider the lifted Call on Call $\hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M)$ and its normalized function

$$\hat{c}_K^{**}(m) = \frac{\hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, X^{**}m)}{X^{**}}$$

where $X^{**} = \frac{X}{1 - P(X_T = 0)}$. Then in turn it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c}_K^{**}(m) &= \frac{1}{X} \hat{C}_K \left(X, \frac{X}{1 - P(X_T = 0)} m \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{X} C \left(C^{-1}(X, K), K + \frac{X}{1 - P(X_T = 0)} m \right). \end{aligned}$$

We write $k = \frac{K}{C^{-1}(X, K)}$ and define the function $c(l) := \frac{C(C^{-1}(X, K), lC^{-1}(X, K))}{C^{-1}(X, K)}$, then $X = c(k)C^{-1}(X, K)$ and

$$\hat{c}_K^{**}(m) = \frac{c\left(k + \frac{c(k)}{1 - P(X_T = 0)} m\right)}{c(k)}$$

where $1 - P(X_T = 0) = -\partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K) = -c'(k)$. Then

$$\hat{c}_K^{**}(m) = \mathbb{U}_{k(X, K)} c(m)$$

where $k(X, K) = \frac{K}{C^{-1}(X, K)}$.

While in section 2.4 we have proved that the transformation \mathbb{T}_k corresponds to the normalization of the relative Call on Call \hat{C}_K , here we showed that the transformation \mathbb{U}_k actually corresponds to the normalization of the lifted Call on Call \hat{C}_K^{**} . In other words we showed the following.

Lemma 4.10. *The transformations \mathbb{T}_k and \mathbb{U}_k are linked to relative Calls on Calls \hat{C}_K and lifted Calls on Calls \hat{C}_K^{**} via*

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_K(X, M) &= \mathbb{T}_{k(X, K)} c\left(\frac{M}{X}\right) X \\ \hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) &= \mathbb{U}_{k(X, K)} c\left(\frac{M}{X^{**}}\right) X^{**}\end{aligned}$$

where $k(X, K) = \frac{K}{C^{-1}(X, K)}$.

5 Implied volatility of the relative pricing functions

The Calls on Calls prices and their lifted prices can be studied from an implied volatility point of view. It is of extreme interest that, even in the case of underlying Black-Scholes Calls, the relative prices actually hide smile shapes which are not constant. Also, we can state something more on these smiles, as we will see that they always explode for small strikes while behave as the original smiles at ∞ .

We define the implied total volatility $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ of the relative Call on Call $\hat{C}_K(X, M)$ and the implied total volatility $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M)$ of the lifted Call on Call $\hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M)$ to be the value of $v = \sigma\sqrt{T}$ satisfying

$$\hat{C}_K(X, M) = \text{BS}(X, M, v)$$

and

$$\hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) = \text{BS}(X^{**}, M, v)$$

respectively, where BS is defined in eq. (2).

We are interested in the functions $M \rightarrow \hat{v}_K(X, M)$ and $M \rightarrow \hat{v}_K^{**}(X, M)$ and in particular to their asymptotics for M going to ∞ and 0. We can look at the limits of this function studying the relations

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{C}_K(X, M) &= C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M) \\ \hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) &= \frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} \hat{C}_K(f(X^{**}), M)\end{aligned}$$

where we suppose that there exists f such that $f(X^{**}) = X$.

We denote with $v(S, L)$ the implied total volatility of the Call option with strike L and underlier S , so that we shall study the relation between $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ (or $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M)$) and $v(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)$. We will also denote $\hat{d}_{1,2}(X, M) := d_{1,2}(X, M, \hat{v}_K(X, M))$ and $\hat{d}_{1,2}^{**}(X^{**}, M) := d_{1,2}(X^{**}, M, \hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M))$. When it is clear, we will drop the dependence to X and X^{**} .

Remark 5.1. *In the framework of arbitrage-free prices the functions d_1 and d_2 are monotone for the results found by Fukasawa in [3]. The condition of surjectivity is not granted a priori. In general, it always holds that the function d_1 goes at $+\infty$ for small strikes and the function d_2 goes at $-\infty$ for large strikes. However, the function d_1 goes to $-\infty$ for large strikes iff Call prices vanish at ∞ , and d_2 goes to ∞ for small strikes iff there is no mass at 0, i.e. the derivative of Call prices is -1 in 0.*

Furthermore, Proposition 2.1 in [9] shows that if d_1 is surjective, then the Lee right wing condition holds: $v(S, K) < \sqrt{2 \log \frac{K}{S}}$ for K large enough; while if d_2 is surjective, then the Lee left wing condition holds: $v(S, K) < \sqrt{-2 \log \frac{K}{S}}$ for K small enough.

Remark 5.2. *For two functions f and g we write $f \sim g$ iff $\lim_x \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 1$, where the limit of x will depend on the situation.*

Integrating by parts the expression for $1 - \Phi(x)$ we find

$$1 - \Phi(x) = \frac{\phi(x)}{x} - \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{t^2} dt = \frac{\phi(x)}{x} - \frac{\phi(x)}{x^3} + \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{t^4} dt$$

so that for $x > 0$

$$\frac{\phi(x)}{x} - \frac{\phi(x)}{x^3} < 1 - \Phi(x) < \frac{\phi(x)}{x}.$$

Then, for x going to ∞ , $\Phi(-x) \sim \frac{\phi(x)}{x}$.

5.1 Calls on Calls' implied volatility

In this section we prove that the Calls on Calls' smiles behave as the original smiles at ∞ , while at small strikes they always explode with a rate of $\sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X}}$.

Lemma 5.3 (Asymptotic behavior of the Calls on Calls' total implied volatility). *The Calls on Calls' total implied volatility $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ behaves asymptotically as*

- $\sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X}} - \hat{d}_2(X, 0)$ for small strikes;
- the underlying total implied volatility $v(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)$ for large strike. If it exists, the limit of $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ is equal to the limit of $v(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)$.

Proof. Firstly, we observe that $-\frac{d}{dM} \hat{C}_K(X, M) = -\partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)$. In $M = 0$, this means that Calls on Calls' prices have a derivative in 0 equal to $-\partial_K C(C^{-1}(X, K), K)$ which, for $K > 0$, is strictly larger than -1 . Then, the function $\hat{d}_2(M)$ is not surjective and $\hat{v}_K \sim \sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X}}$. More precisely, we can write $\hat{v}_K = \gamma \sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X}}$ where $\gamma \sim 1$ at ∞ . Substituting in the expression for $\hat{d}_2(M)$, we find

$$\hat{d}_2(M) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sqrt{-\log \frac{M}{X}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - \gamma \right) \sim \hat{d}_2(0) \quad (9)$$

where $\hat{d}_2(0)$ is the finite limit of \hat{d}_2 for $M = 0$. Observe that $\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} = 1 - \varepsilon + o(\varepsilon)$ so that $\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} - (1-\varepsilon) = 2\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon)$. Setting $\gamma = 1 - \varepsilon$, we find from eq. (9) that it must hold $\varepsilon \sim \frac{\hat{d}_2(0)}{\sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X}}}$, or $\gamma \sim 1 - \frac{\hat{d}_2(0)}{\sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X}}}$. All in all, we find $\hat{v}_K \sim \sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X}} - \hat{d}_2(0)$.

Secondly, from the definition of Calls on Calls' prices, it follows that Calls on Calls vanish at increasing strikes iff the underlying Calls vanish. In particular, if d_1 has finite limit, then its implied total volatility must explode at ∞ , and similarly for \hat{d}_1 and \hat{v}_K . Otherwise, if d_1 is surjective, then \hat{d}_1 is surjective and in particular for remark 5.1 the Lee right wing condition holds, i.e. $v(C^{-1}(X, K), M), \hat{v}_K(X, M) < \sqrt{2 \log \frac{M}{X}}$ for large M . We can then write the asymptotics of the Call on Call price using remark 5.2 as

$$C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, \hat{v}_K) \sim X \frac{\phi(\hat{d}_1(M))}{-\hat{d}_1(M)} - M \frac{\phi(\hat{d}_2(M))}{-\hat{d}_2(M)}$$

and since $M\phi(\hat{d}_2(M)) = X\phi(\hat{d}_1(M))$, developing the expressions for $\hat{d}_1(M)$ and $\hat{d}_2(M)$, the right hand side becomes

$$C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, \hat{v}_K) \sim X\phi(\hat{d}_1(M)) \frac{\hat{v}_K^3}{(\log \frac{M}{X})^2 - \frac{\hat{v}_K^4}{4}}.$$

Taking the logarithm in the above expression and looking at the dominating terms, we find

$$\log C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, \hat{v}_K) \sim -\frac{\hat{d}_1(M)^2}{2}.$$

If $\hat{v}_K \in o(\sqrt{\log \frac{M}{X}})$ (this includes the case where it goes to a finite limit) then

$$\log C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, \hat{v}_K) \sim -\frac{1}{2\hat{v}_K^2} \left(\log \frac{M}{X} \right)^2,$$

otherwise, if $\hat{v}_K \sim \hat{c} \sqrt{\log \frac{M}{X}}$ with $0 < \hat{c} < \sqrt{2}$, then

$$\log C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, \hat{v}_K) \sim -\frac{\log \frac{M}{X}}{8\hat{c}^2} (2 - \hat{c}^2)^2.$$

Similarly, we develop the asymptotics of the logarithm of $C_{\text{BS}}(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M, v)$ and get that if $v \in o(\sqrt{\log \frac{K+M}{C^{-1}(X, K)}})$ these coincide with

$$\log C_{\text{BS}}(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M, v) \sim -\frac{1}{2v^2} \left(\log \frac{K+M}{C^{-1}(X, K)} \right)^2.$$

Then, also the logarithm of Call on Call prices must have a similar behavior, so that since $\log \frac{M}{X} \sim \log \frac{K+M}{C^{-1}(X, K)}$ the only possible case is $\hat{v}_K \in o(\sqrt{\log \frac{M}{X}})$ and equating the asymptotic behaviors it follows $\hat{v}_K \sim v$. In particular, if it exists, the limit of $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ at ∞ is equal to the limit of $v(C^{-1}(X, K), K + M)$.

Otherwise, if $v \sim c\sqrt{\log \frac{K+M}{C^{-1}(X, K)}}$ with $0 < c < \sqrt{2}$, then

$$\log C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, \hat{v}_K) \sim -\frac{\log \frac{K+M}{C^{-1}(X, K)}}{8c^2} (2 - c^2)^2.$$

Now in order to have equivalent asymptotic behaviors, then there must be a positive $\hat{c} < \sqrt{2}$ such that $\hat{v}_K \sim \hat{c}\sqrt{\log \frac{M}{X}}$ and $\frac{(2-\hat{c}^2)^2}{\hat{c}^2} = \frac{(2-c^2)^2}{c^2}$. Solving, the only positive solution is $\hat{c} = c$, so that again $\hat{v}_K \sim v$. \square

5.1.1 Relation with the underlying implied volatility

In lemma 2.4 we show that, in the homogeneous case, Calls on Calls' prices are increasing as functions of the relative underlying strike. Then, $\hat{C}_{K_1}(X, M) < \hat{C}_{K_2}(X, M)$ for every $K_1 < K_2$, which implies $\hat{v}_{K_1}(X, M) < \hat{v}_{K_2}(X, M)$. In particular, for $K_1 = 0$ and $K_2 = K$, it holds $\hat{C}_0(X, M) = C(X, M) = C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, v(X, M))$ and $\hat{C}_K(X, M) = C_{\text{BS}}(X, M, \hat{v}_K(X, M))$, so that looking at the implied total volatilities it follows $v(X, M) < \hat{v}(X, M)$. This means that the Calls on Calls's implied total volatility is always larger than the original implied total volatility for fixed moneyness.

5.2 Lifted Calls on Calls' implied volatility

We now look at the behavior of the smiles of lifted Calls on Calls. In this case, we expect \hat{d}_2^{**} to be surjective since prices have derivative equal to -1 in 0. However, we will show that the smiles still explode for small strikes, while the behavior at ∞ is as for the original smile.

Lemma 5.4 (Asymptotic behavior of the lifted Calls on Calls' total implied volatility). *The lifted Calls on Calls' total implied volatility $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M)$ behaves asymptotically as*

- $(2 - \sqrt{2})\sqrt{-\log \frac{M}{X^{**}}}$ for small strikes;
- the underlying total implied volatility $v(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K + M)$ for large strike. If it exists, the limit of $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M)$ is equal to the limit of $v(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K + M)$.

Proof. It holds $-\partial_M \hat{C}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) = -\frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} \partial_M \hat{C}_K(f(X^{**}), M)$ and $-\partial_M \hat{C}_K(f(X^{**}), M) = 1 - P(f(X^{**}) = 0) = \frac{f(X^{**})}{X^{**}}$, then lifted Calls on Calls' prices have derivative equal to -1 at null strikes.

In particular, the Lee left wing condition holds: $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) < \sqrt{-2 \log \frac{M}{X^{**}}}$ for small strikes.

From the Put-Call-Parity, it holds

$$P_{\text{BS}}^{**}(X^{**}, M, \hat{v}_K^{**}) = \frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} C(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K + M) - X^{**} + M \quad (10)$$

where we dropped the dependence of the implied total variance from the underlier and the strike for notation

simplicity. For M going to 0, since both \hat{d}_1^{**} and \hat{d}_2^{**} go to ∞ , the left hand side behaves as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{BS}}^{**}(X^{**}, M, \hat{v}_K^{**}) &\sim -X^{**} \frac{\phi(\hat{d}_1^{**})}{\hat{d}_1^{**}} + M \frac{\phi(\hat{d}_2^{**})}{\hat{d}_2^{**}} \\ &= X^{**} \phi(\hat{d}_1^{**}) \frac{\hat{v}_K^{**3}}{\left(\log \frac{M}{X^{**}}\right)^2 - \frac{\hat{v}_K^{**4}}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of lemma 5.3, we take the logarithm and consider the dominant terms, so that

$$\log P_{\text{BS}}^{**}(X^{**}, M, \hat{v}_K^{**}) \sim -\frac{\hat{d}_1^{**2}}{2}.$$

On the other hand, the right hand side in eq. (10) is equal to

$$\frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} (C(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K + M) - f(X^{**})) + M$$

and, since $C(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K) = f(X^{**})$, for M going to 0 the above expression behaves as

$$\frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} (\partial_K C(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K)M + \partial_K^2 C(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K)M^2) + M.$$

Observe that $\frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} = \frac{1}{-\partial_K C(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K)}$ so that the above expression reduces to

$$\frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} \partial_K^2 C(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K)M^2$$

where the term multiplying M^2 is a positive constant. Then, taking the logarithm, this behaves as $2 \log M$.

Now, if $\hat{v}_K^{**} \in o(\sqrt{-\log \frac{M}{X^{**}}})$ then

$$\log P_{\text{BS}}^{**}(X^{**}, M, \hat{v}_K^{**}) \sim -\frac{1}{2\hat{v}_K^{**2}} \left(\log \frac{M}{X^{**}} \right)^2.$$

and equating this with $2 \log M$ we find $\hat{v}_K^{**} \sim \frac{\sqrt{-\log \frac{M}{X^{**}}}}{2}$, which implies $\hat{v}_K^{**} \notin o(\sqrt{-\log \frac{M}{X^{**}}})$, so that this solution cannot be accepted. If $\hat{v}_K^{**} \sim c^{**} \sqrt{-\log \frac{M}{X^{**}}}$ with $c^{**} < \sqrt{2}$ then

$$\log P_{\text{BS}}^{**}(X^{**}, M, \hat{v}_K^{**}) \sim \frac{\log \frac{M}{X^{**}}}{8c^{**2}} (2 + c^{**2})^2$$

and equating with $2 \log M$ we find that the only admissible solution is $c^{**} = 2 - \sqrt{2}$.

Regarding the limit for large strikes, the definition of \hat{C}_K^{**} implies that lifted Calls on Calls vanish at ∞ iff the underlying Calls do. Then, d_1^{**} is surjective iff d_1 is. So that if d_1 has a finite limit at ∞ , then \hat{v}_K^{**} must explode. Otherwise, as in the relative Calls on Calls' case, the Lee right wing condition must hold: $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M) < \sqrt{2 \log \frac{M}{X^{**}}}$ for large enough M . Similarly to the previous section, considering the relation

$$C_{\text{BS}}(X^{**}, M, \hat{v}_K^{**}) = \frac{X^{**}}{f(X^{**})} C_{\text{BS}}(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K + M, v)$$

and developing for large M , we obtain that $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X^{**}, M)$ at ∞ behaves as $v(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K + M)$. In particular, if the limit exists, this is equal to the limit of $v(C^{-1}(f(X^{**}), K), K + M)$ at ∞ . \square

5.3 Examples

5.3.1 Black-Scholes Calls on Calls' implied volatility

In the Black-Scholes case, the implied total volatility is constant. In lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 we showed that both the Calls on Calls' implied total volatility and the lifted Calls on Calls' implied total volatility explode for $M = 0$ and go to the original Black-Scholes total implied volatility at $M = \infty$.

On the left of fig. 4 we plot the total implied volatilities $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ and $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X, M)$ as functions of M . We take $X = \text{BS}(S, K, v)$ where $S = 100$, $K = 110$ and $v = 0.2$.

5.3.2 SVI Calls on Calls' implied volatility

We consider now the SVI model as in section 3.2.2. For K going to 0, the corresponding implied total volatility $\sqrt{\text{SVI}(\log \frac{K}{S})}$ behaves as $\sqrt{b(1 - \rho)|\log \frac{K}{S}|}$. Except for a constant, this is equivalent to the behavior of $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ and $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X, M)$ in 0. Also, for M going to ∞ , the three total implied volatilities behave similarly, exploding with a speed of $\sqrt{b(1 + \rho) \log \frac{K+M}{S}}$.

We show on the right of fig. 4 the total implied volatilities $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ and $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X, M)$ as functions of M . We set $X = \text{BS}(S, K, \text{SVI}(\log \frac{K}{S}))$ where $S = 100$, $K = 110$ and the SVI parameters $a = 0.01$, $b = 0.1$, $\rho = -0.6$, $m = -0.5$, $\sigma = 0.1$ are taken as in section 3.2.2 in order to guarantee arbitrage-free prices.




Figure 4: The hidden smiles $\hat{v}_K(X, M)$ and $\hat{v}_K^{**}(X, M)$ of the Black-Scholes model (left) and the smiles obtained from SVI prices (right). The current underlier has value 100, the original strike is set at 110, the original Black-Scholes implied total volatility at 0.2, and the original SVI parameters at $a = 0.01$, $b = 0.1$, $\rho = -0.6$, $m = -0.5$, $\sigma = 0.1$.

References

- [1] Stephen P Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [2] Peter Carr and Gregory Pelts. Duality, Deltas, and Derivatives Pricing. *Presented at the conference dedicated to Steve Shreve's 65th birthday*, June 2015.
- [3] Masaaki Fukasawa. The normalizing transformation of the implied volatility smile. *Mathematical Finance: An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics*, 22(4):753–762, 2012.
- [4] Jim Gatheral. A Parsimonious Arbitrage-Free Implied Volatility Parameterization with Applications to the Valuation of Volatility Derivatives. *Proceeding of the Global Derivatives and Risk Management Madrid conference*, 2004.
- [5] Vladimir Lucic. Lecture notes on volatility modelling. *Imperial College London*, 2020.
- [6] Claude Martini and Arianna Mingone. Explicit no arbitrage domain for sub-SVIs via reparametrization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.02418*, 2021.
- [7] Claude Martini and Arianna Mingone. No arbitrage SVI. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 13(1):227–261, 2022.
- [8] Robert C Merton. On the pricing of corporate debt: The risk structure of interest rates. *The Journal of finance*, 29(2):449–470, 1974.
- [9] Arianna Mingone. Smiles in delta. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00406*, 2022.
- [10] Michael R Sampford. Some inequalities on Mill's ratio and related functions. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24(1):130–132, 1953.
- [11] Michael R Tehranchi. A Black–Scholes inequality: applications and generalisations. *Finance and Stochastics*, 24(1):1–38, 2020.