

Benchmark-Neutral Pricing

Eckhard Platen¹

July 3, 2024

The paper introduces benchmark-neutral pricing and hedging for long-term contingent claims. It employs the growth optimal portfolio of the stocks as numéraire and the new benchmark-neutral pricing measure for pricing. For a realistic parsimonious model, this pricing measure turns out to be an equivalent probability measure, which is not the case for the risk-neutral pricing measure. Many risk-neutral prices of long-term contracts are more expensive than necessary. Benchmark-neutral pricing identifies the minimal possible prices of contingent claims, which is illustrated with remarkable accuracy for a long-term zero-coupon bond.

JEL Classification: G10, G11

Mathematics Subject Classification: 62P05, 60G35, 62P20

Key words and phrases: long-term pricing, benchmark approach, change of numéraire, activity time, squared Bessel process, hedging.

¹University of Technology Sydney, School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences

1 Introduction

Risk-neutral pricing employs the savings account as numéraire and represents the preferred pricing method of the classical finance theory, see, e.g., Merton (1992), Cochrane (2001), and Jarrow (2022). By employing realistic long-term dynamics of the *growth optimal portfolio* (GOP) of stocks, see, e.g., Kelly (1956) and Merton (1992), the current paper shows that the putative risk-neutral measure is unlikely to constitute an equivalent probability measure. These findings are not in line with the *No Free Lunch with Vanishing Risk* (NFLVR) no-arbitrage condition of Delbaen & Schachermayer (1998), which is equivalent to the assumption about the existence of an equivalent risk-neutral probability measure. In Loewenstein & Willard (2000) and Platen (2001) it was pointed out that perfectly acceptable financial market models exist where the NFLVR condition fails. Under the more general benchmark approach, see Platen (2006) and Platen & Heath (2006), which removes a restrictive assumption of the classical finance theory, the failure of the NFLVR condition does not represent a problem. The benchmark approach only requires the existence of the GOP and not the existence of an equivalent risk-neutral probability measure. This matters because when the putative risk-neutral measure is not an equivalent probability measure, it is shown in Platen (2002) and Platen (2006) that risk-neutral pricing leads to more expensive prices and hedges than necessary.

The existence of the GOP is an extremely weak and easily verifiable *no-arbitrage condition* because Karatzas & Kardaras (2007) and Karatzas & Kardaras (2021) have shown that the existence of the GOP is equivalent to their *No Unbounded Profit with Bounded Risk* (NUPBR) condition. This no-arbitrage condition is weaker than the NFLVR condition. The current paper will employ a realistic long-term model of the *stock GOP*, which is the GOP of the investment universe formed only by the stocks (without the savings account). For this realistic model the NUPBR condition holds but the NFLVR condition fails.

The benchmark approach provides the pricing concept of real-world pricing, where the GOP of the entire market is taken as the numéraire and the real-world probability measure acts as the pricing measure; see Platen & Heath (2006). Real-world pricing avoids the additional assumptions that a change of the GOP of the entire market as numéraire would require.

For a typical market that consists of stocks and the savings account, the GOP of the entire market is a highly leveraged portfolio that goes short in the savings account and long in a portfolio of stocks; see Filipović & Platen (2009). Unfortunately, this GOP does not represent a suitable numéraire or even a desirable investment portfolio; see e.g., Samuelson (1979). To generate it physically one must go short in the savings account. Since only discrete-time dynamic asset allocation is feasible, one could obtain as a proxy of the GOP of the entire market a negative portfolio, which would fail as a numéraire for pricing and hedging.

As a feasible alternative to real-world pricing, which provides the minimal possible prices, the current paper proposes employing the stock GOP as a numéraire.

As shown in Platen & Rendek (2020), the stock GOP can be approximated by a well-diversified, guaranteed strictly positive portfolio of stocks. For instance, the MSCI-Total Return Stock Index (MSCI) of the developed markets could serve as a reasonable proxy of the stock GOP. However, better proxies are available, as shown in Platen & Rendek (2020).

The proposed new pricing method is called *benchmark-neutral* (BN) *pricing*. It has wider applicability than risk-neutral pricing and can be conveniently implemented, as will be demonstrated in the current paper. It provides the minimal possible prices of nonnegative contingent claims when the ratio of the stock GOP over the GOP of the entire market is a martingale. This ratio represents the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the respective *BN pricing measure* and is theoretically a supermartingale. This means, its current value is greater than or equal to its expected future values given the current information. When appropriate dynamics of the stock GOP are assumed, as will be suggested in the current paper, the above-mentioned ratio turns out to be a martingale, and the BN prices of contingent claims coincide with the respective minimal possible prices obtained via the real-world pricing formula; see Du & Platen (2016).

Motivated by the structure of the stochastic differential equation (SDE) of the stock GOP of a continuous market, the *minimal market model* (MMM) was proposed in Platen (2001) as a potential model for the stock GOP. The current paper points out that the stock GOP value under the MMM can be interpreted as the continuous time limit of the population size of a birth-and-death process, see Feller (1971), where independently wealth units give birth to new ones or die.

As the paper will demonstrate, the MMM evolving in some *activity time* captures remarkably well the ‘natural’ evolution of well-diversified stock indexes. It models parsimoniously the volatility of the normalized stock GOP as a scalar diffusion process that is evolving in some activity time. The latter is reflecting the trading activity and can be observed but only its linear average needs to be modeled for the pricing and hedging of long-term zero-coupon bonds. This circumvents the need to observe and model all parts of the volatility, which seems to be extremely difficult as pointed out by the ‘leverage effect puzzle’ of Ait-Sahalia, Fan & Li (2012).

The current paper points in a direction where this puzzle, and more general stochastic volatility modeling, could find solutions. It applies the MMM in some activity time for the stock GOP, and illustrates the fitting of its parameters, as well as the BN pricing and accurate hedging of a long-term zero-coupon bond that pays one unit of the savings account at maturity.

In previous works, long-term zero-coupon bonds and other derivatives have been priced and hedged using the MMM when it evolves in calendar time and by applying real-world pricing assuming that the GOP of the entire market equals the stock GOP; see, e.g., Platen & Heath (2006), Fergusson & Platen (2022) and Barone Adesi & Sala (2024). The novelty of the current paper is that the GOP of the entire market is allowed to be different from the stock GOP. Furthermore, the stock GOP dynamics are far more realistically modeled by introducing some

flexible stochastic activity time for the MMM. The activity time is observable and only its trendline needs to be estimated for the pricing and hedging of long-term zero-coupon bonds. This is important for implementations of BN pricing and hedging in the financial services industry because long-term zero coupon bonds can serve as the building blocks of long-term annuities, pensions, green bonds, and life insurance contracts.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the market setting and real-world pricing under the benchmark approach. The new concept of benchmark-neutral pricing is presented in Section 3. The model of the stock GOP is introduced in Section 4. Section 5 illustrates the BN pricing and hedging of a long-term zero-coupon bond.

2 Market Setting

2.1 Primary Security Accounts

The modeling is performed on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \underline{\mathcal{F}}, P)$, satisfying the usual conditions; see, e.g., Karatzas & Shreve (1991) and Karatzas & Shreve (1998). The filtration $\underline{\mathcal{F}} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [t_0, \infty)}$ describes the evolution of market information over time. In the given continuous market we model $d \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ adapted, nonnegative *primary security accounts*, denoted by $S_t^1, S_t^2, \dots, S_t^d$, where all dividends or other payments are reinvested. We interpret the d primary security accounts as stocks, which are above denominated in units of the savings account $S_t^0 = 1$. We assume for the investment universe consisting of the d stocks that a *growth optimal portfolio* (GOP) S_t^* exists, which is the strictly positive stock portfolio with maximum growth rate; see Kelly (1956) and Merton (1992). This portfolio we call the *stock GOP*. The j -th primary security account $\tilde{S}_t^j = \frac{S_t^j}{S_t^*}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, when denominated in units of the stock GOP S_t^* , forms a continuous, integrable driftless stochastic process, which is a $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -local martingale and, thus, a $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -supermartingale; see equation (10.3.2) in Platen & Heath (2006). It has to be emphasized that it has not to be a martingale where its current value would equal its expected future values under the current information. We emphasize that the savings account S_t^0 is not included in the investment universe of the stock GOP S_t^* .

The stock GOP S_t^* in savings account denomination is continuous and satisfies according to Theorem 3.1 in Filipović & Platen (2009) the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$\frac{dS_t^*}{S_t^*} = \lambda_t^* dt + \theta_t(\theta_t dt + dW_t) \quad (2.1)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ with $S_{t_0}^* > 0$. Here, λ_t^* denotes the *net risk-adjusted return* of S_t^* and θ_t its *volatility*. The real-valued $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -Brownian motion $W = \{W_t, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$ models in calendar time the non-diversifiable randomness of the stocks

in savings account denomination.

We extend the above market of stocks by adding the savings account $S_t^0 = 1$ as an additional primary security account and assume that the GOP S_t^{**} of the extended market exists. In line with Theorem 7.1 in Filipović & Platen (2009), we assume that the GOP S_t^{**} of the extended market satisfies the SDE

$$\frac{dS_t^{**}}{S_t^{**}} = \sigma_t^{**}(\sigma_t^{**} dt + dW_t) \quad (2.2)$$

with initial value $S_{t_0}^{**} = 1$ and *market price of risk*

$$\sigma_t^{**} = \frac{\lambda_t^* + (\theta_t)^2}{\theta_t} \quad (2.3)$$

with respect to W for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

2.2 Real-World Pricing

Consider a bounded stopping time $T > t_0$, and let $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ denote the set of integrable, \mathcal{F}_T -measurable random variables in the given filtered probability space.

Definition 2.1 *For a bounded stopping time $T \in (t_0, \infty)$, a nonnegative payoff H_T , denominated in units of the savings account, is called a contingent claim if $\frac{H_T}{S_T^{**}} \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$.*

We denote by $\mathbf{E}^P(\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t)$ the conditional expectation under the real-world probability measure P , conditional on the information \mathcal{F}_t available at time t . As shown in Platen & Heath (2006) and Du & Platen (2016), for a contingent claim H_T with maturity at a bounded stopping time T the *real-world pricing formula*

$$H_t = S_t^{**} \mathbf{E}^P\left(\frac{H_T}{S_T^{**}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right) \quad (2.4)$$

determines its, so called, *fair price* H_t for all $t \in [t_0, T]$. The ratio $\frac{H_t}{S_t^{**}}$ forms a $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale, which is P -almost surely unique for the given value $\frac{H_T}{S_T^{**}}$ at the maturity T . The real-world pricing formula uses the GOP S_t^{**} of the extended market as numéraire and the real-world probability measure P as pricing measure. It has been shown by Du & Platen (2016) that, when a contingent claim is replicable, its fair price process coincides with the value process of the minimal possible self-financing hedge portfolio that replicates its payoff.

The Law of One Price of the classical finance theory does no longer hold because there exist other pricing rules that can be applied to pricing and hedging, including the popular risk-neutral pricing rule. However, these pricing rules never provide lower prices for nonnegative replicable contingent claims than the real-world pricing formula because all self-financing portfolios that hedge a given contingent claim form $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -supermartingales when denominated in S_t^{**} . The

$(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale among these $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -supermartingales coincides with the fair hedge portfolio value process in the denomination of the GOP S^{**} of the extended market. It is the least expensive hedge portfolio that replicates the contingent claim; see Lemma A.1 in Du & Platen (2016). More expensive self-financing hedge portfolios can exist that replicate the contingent claim. Since these replicate the contingent claim, one may not even realize that they are more expensive than necessary.

3 Benchmark-Neutral Pricing

3.1 Change of Numéraire

The numéraire for real-world pricing is the GOP S_t^{**} of the extended market, which is, in reality, a highly leveraged portfolio that goes long in the stock GOP S_t^* and short in the savings account S_t^0 . When hedging contingent claims, one needs to be able to trade the numéraire that one is using for pricing and hedging. For instance, when hedging a zero-coupon bond that pays one unit of the savings account at maturity, the hedging requires the trading of the numéraire and the savings account, as will be shown later.

A tradeable proxy of the highly leveraged GOP S_t^{**} of the extended market cannot be easily constructed as a guaranteed strictly positive, self-financing portfolio because such a highly leveraged portfolio can only be traded at discrete times and, therefore, faces the possibility of becoming negative.

To avoid the above difficulties, the paper suggests employing the stock GOP S_t^* as a numéraire. As shown in Platen & Rendek (2020), a well-diversified total return stock index can be a reasonable proxy for the stock GOP and is, by construction, strictly positive. Total return stock indexes have been used traditionally as benchmarks in fund management. The current paper suggests employing such a benchmark as a numéraire for pricing and hedging. It calls the new pricing method *benchmark-neutral pricing* (BN pricing) and the proxy for the stock GOP the *benchmark*. Intuitively, in the denomination of the benchmark and under the respective pricing measure the expected returns of portfolios are zero and, in this sense, ‘neutral’ to the randomness that drives the market.

The stock GOP has, in the long run, a trajectory that is almost surely pathwise outperforming any other strictly positive stock portfolio; see Theorem 10.5.1 in Platen & Heath (2006). Intuitively, BN pricing centers the risk management around the long-run best-performing strictly positive stock portfolio, whereas risk-neutral pricing centers it around the rather poorly performing savings account.

By application of the Itô formula it follows that the stock GOP S_t^* , when denominated in units of the GOP S_t^{**} , satisfies a driftless SDE and is, therefore, a $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -local martingale. We make throughout the paper the following assumption, which we verify later for the realistic stock GOP model that we will employ:

Assumption 3.1 *The stock GOP S_t^* , when denominated in units of the GOP S_t^{**} , forms the $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale $\frac{S_t^*}{S_t^{**}} = \{\frac{S_t^*}{S_t^{**}}, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$.*

Under this assumption, the proposed change of numéraire permits the application of the Change of Numéraire Theorem by Geman, El Karoui & Rochet (1995). This leads to the Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\Lambda_{S^*}(t) = \frac{dQ_{S^*}}{dP} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \frac{\frac{S_t^*}{S_t^{**}}}{\frac{S_{t_0}^*}{S_{t_0}^{**}}}, \quad (3.1)$$

which characterizes for the numéraire S_t^* the respective *benchmark-neutral pricing measure* Q_{S^*} . By application of the Itô formula we obtain from (2.1) and (2.2) the SDE

$$\frac{d\Lambda_{S^*}(t)}{\Lambda_{S^*}(t)} = -\sigma^{S^*}(t)dW_t \quad (3.2)$$

with

$$\sigma^{S^*}(t) = \frac{\lambda_t^*}{\theta_t} \quad (3.3)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. As a self-financing portfolio that is denominated in units of the GOP S_t^{**} of the extended market, the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\Lambda_{S^*}(t)$ forms in any case a $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -local martingale. Under Assumption 3.1 it is assumed to be a true martingale. Let $\mathbf{E}^{Q_{S^*}}(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t)$ denote the conditional expectation with respect to the benchmark-neutral pricing measure Q_{S^*} under the information available at time $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. We obtain directly from Geman, El Karoui & Rochet (1995) and Girsanov's Theorem, given in, e.g., Karatzas & Shreve (1991) and Karatzas & Shreve (1998), the following result:

Theorem 3.2 (Benchmark-Neutral Pricing Formula) *Under the Assumption 3.1, the benchmark-neutral pricing measure Q_{S^*} is an equivalent probability measure, and the fair price H_t , which the real-world pricing formula identifies for a contingent claim H_T , is obtained via the benchmark-neutral pricing formula*

$$H_t = S_t^* \mathbf{E}^{Q_{S^*}} \left(\frac{H_T}{S_T^*} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \right) \quad (3.4)$$

for $t \in [t_0, T]$. The process $W^0 = \{W_t^0, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$, satisfying the SDE

$$dW_t^0 = \sigma^{S^*}(t)dt + dW_t \quad (3.5)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ with $W_{t_0}^0 = 0$, is under Q_{S^*} a Brownian motion with respect to calendar time, and the primary security accounts $\tilde{S}_t^0, \dots, \tilde{S}_t^d$, denominated in the stock GOP S_t^* , represent $(Q_{S^*}, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -local martingales.

This result is of practical importance because it allows one to use the stock GOP as a numéraire for pricing and hedging under the benchmark-neutral pricing measure Q_{S^*} . Since the process W^0 can be interpreted as a Brownian motion

under this measure, the respective SDE for the stock GOP S_t^* takes by (2.1), (3.3), and (3.5) the form

$$dS_t^* = S_t^* \theta_t (\theta_t dt + dW_t^0) \quad (3.6)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ with $S_{t_0}^* > 0$. The stock GOP-denominated savings account $\tilde{S}_t^0 = \frac{S_t^0}{S_t^*} = \frac{1}{S_t^*}$ satisfies, by application of the Itô formula, the SDE

$$d\tilde{S}_t^0 = -\tilde{S}_t^0 \theta_t dW_t^0 \quad (3.7)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ with $\tilde{S}_{t_0}^0 > 0$, which confirms that \tilde{S}_t^0 forms a $(Q_{S^*}, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -local martingale.

BN pricing is capturing the dynamics under Q_{S^*} as if under P the net risk-adjusted return λ_t^* were zero. Consequently, there is no need to model or estimate the risk-adjusted return, which simplifies significantly the modeling and pricing. Only the real-world Brownian motion W , which models the nondiversifiable randomness, attracts in the denomination of the savings account a risk premium. The other randomness in the market evolves under Q_{S^*} as it does under the real-world probability measure P . For this reason we focus below in our illustration on a long-term zero-coupon bond that has as contingent claim a function of the stock GOP.

3.2 Portfolios

The market participants can combine primary security accounts to form portfolios. Denote by $\delta = \{\delta_t = (\delta_t^0, \delta_t^1, \dots, \delta_t^d)^\top, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$ the strategy, where δ_t^j , $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, represents the number of units of the j -th primary security account that are held at time $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ in a corresponding portfolio S_t^δ . When denominated in units of the stock GOP S_t^* , this portfolio is captured by the process $\tilde{S}^\delta = \{\tilde{S}_t^\delta = \frac{S_t^\delta}{S_t^*}, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$, where

$$\tilde{S}_t^\delta = (\delta_t)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t \quad (3.8)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t = (\tilde{S}_t^0, \dots, \tilde{S}_t^d)^\top$. If changes in the value of a portfolio are only due to changes in the values of the primary security accounts, then no extra funds flow in or out of the portfolio, and the corresponding portfolio and strategy are called *self-financing*. The self-financing property of a portfolio is expressed by the equation

$$\tilde{S}_t^\delta = \tilde{S}_{t_0}^\delta + \int_{t_0}^t (\delta_s)^\top d\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_s \quad (3.9)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ with $\tilde{S}_{t_0}^\delta = (\delta_{t_0})^\top \tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{t_0}$, where the stochastic integral in (3.9) is assumed to be a vector-Itô integral; see Shiryaev & Cherny (2002).

To introduce a class of admissible strategies for forming portfolios, denote by $[\tilde{\mathbf{S}}]_t = ([\tilde{S}^i, \tilde{S}^j]_t)_{i,j=0}^d$ the matrix-valued optional covariation of the vector of stock GOP-denominated primary security accounts $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t$ for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

Definition 3.3 An admissible self-financing strategy $\delta = \{\delta_t = (\delta_t^0, \dots, \delta_t^d)^\top, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$, initiated at the time t_0 , is an \mathbf{R}^{d+1} -valued, predictable stochastic process, satisfying the condition

$$\int_{t_0}^t \delta_u^\top [\tilde{\mathbf{S}}]_u \delta_u du < \infty \quad (3.10)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

An admissible self-financing strategy generates the stock GOP-denominated gains from trade

$$\int_{t_0}^t \delta_s^\top d\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_s = \int_{t_0}^t d\tilde{S}_s^\delta = \tilde{S}_t^\delta - \tilde{S}_{t_0}^\delta \quad (3.11)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. It does this without requiring outside funds or generating extra funds. The predictability of the integrand in the above stock GOP-denominated gains from trade expresses the real informational constraint that the allocation of units of primary security accounts in the admissible self-financing strategy δ is not allowed to anticipate the movements of the stock GOP-denominated primary security account vector $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t$.

3.3 Contingent Claims

In the following, we consider contingent claims that can be replicated by using self-financing portfolios under BN pricing. Let for a bounded stopping time T the set $\mathcal{L}_{Q_{S^*}}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ denote the set of \mathcal{F}_T -measurable and Q_{S^*} -integrable random variables in the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \underline{\mathcal{F}}, Q_{S^*})$.

Definition 3.4 We call for a bounded stopping time $T \in [t_0, \infty)$ a stock GOP-denominated contingent claim $\tilde{H}_T = \frac{H_T}{S_T^*} \in \mathcal{L}_{Q_{S^*}}^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ BN-replicable if it has for all $t \in [t_0, T]$ a representation of the form

$$\tilde{H}_T = \mathbf{E}^{Q_{S^*}}(\tilde{H}_T | \mathcal{F}_t) + \int_t^T \delta_{\tilde{H}_T}(s)^\top d\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_s \quad (3.12)$$

Q_{S^*} -almost surely, involving some predictable vector process $\delta_{\tilde{H}_T} = \{\delta_{\tilde{H}_T}(t) = (\delta_{\tilde{H}_T}^0(t), \dots, \delta_{\tilde{H}_T}^d(t))^\top, t \in [t_0, T]\}$ satisfying the condition (3.10).

To capture the replication of a targeted contingent claim we introduce the following notion:

Definition 3.5 We say, an admissible self-financing strategy $\delta = \{\delta_t = (\delta_t^0, \dots, \delta_t^d)^\top, t \in [t_0, T]\}$ delivers the stock GOP-denominated BN-replicable contingent claim \tilde{H}_T at a bounded stopping time T if the equality

$$\tilde{S}_T^\delta = \tilde{H}_T \quad (3.13)$$

holds Q_{S^*} -almost surely.

Combining Definition 3.3, Definition 3.4, Definition 3.5, and the SDE (3.9), leads directly to the following statement:

Corollary 3.6 *For a BN-replicable stock GOP-denominated contingent claim \tilde{H}_T with representation (3.12), there exists an admissible self-financing strategy $\delta_{\tilde{H}_T} = \{\delta_{\tilde{H}_T}(t) = (\delta_{\tilde{H}_T}^0(t), \dots, \delta_{\tilde{H}_T}^d(t))^\top, t \in [t_0, T]\}$ with corresponding stock GOP-denominated price process $\tilde{S}_t^{\delta_{\tilde{H}_T}} = \tilde{H}_t$ given by the benchmark-neutral pricing formula*

$$\tilde{H}_t = \mathbf{E}^{Q_{S^*}}(\tilde{H}_T | \mathcal{F}_t), \quad (3.14)$$

which delivers the stock GOP-denominated contingent claim

$$\tilde{H}_T = \tilde{S}_T^\delta \quad (3.15)$$

Q_{S^} -almost surely.*

The stock GOP-denominated price \tilde{H}_t at time $t \in [t_0, T]$ yields, within the set of admissible self-financing strategies, the minimal possible self-financing portfolio process that delivers the stock GOP-denominated contingent claim \tilde{H}_T .

3.4 Hedging Strategy

Recall that the j -th $\hat{\text{stock}}$ GOP-denominated primary security account process \tilde{S}_t^j , $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$, is a (Q_{S^*}, \mathcal{F}) -local martingale under the benchmark-neutral pricing measure Q_{S^*} . Consequently, a stock GOP-denominated self-financing portfolio \tilde{S}_t^δ is a (Q_{S^*}, \mathcal{F}) -local martingale.

Consider a stock GOP-denominated BN-replicable contingent claim \tilde{H}_T with a bounded stopping time T as maturity, where its entire randomness is driven by the (Q_{S^*}, \mathcal{F}) -local martingales W^0, W^1, \dots, W^{d-1} . These local martingales are assumed to be Q_{S^*} -orthogonal to each other in the sense that their pairwise products form (Q_{S^*}, \mathcal{F}) -local martingales. Furthermore, each stock GOP-denominated primary security account value \tilde{S}_t^j , $j \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, is assumed to satisfy an SDE of the form

$$\frac{d\tilde{S}_t^j}{\tilde{S}_t^j} = - \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \theta_t^{j,k} dW_t^k \quad (3.16)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ with $\tilde{S}_{t_0}^j > 0$. We assume that $\theta^{j,k} = \{\theta_t^{j,k}, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$ forms for each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$ a predictable process such that the above stochastic differentials are well defined, see Karatzas & Shreve (1998). Note that W^0 is the (Q_{S^*}, \mathcal{F}) Brownian motion introduced in (3.5), and by (4.4) we have $\theta_t^{0,0} = \theta_t^0$ and $\theta_t^{0,k} = 0$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

For $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ we denote by $\Phi_t = [\Phi_t^{j,k}]_{j,k=0}^{d,d}$ the matrix with elements

$$\Phi_t^{j,k} = \theta_t^{j,k} \quad (3.17)$$

for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$, and

$$\Phi_t^{j,d} = 1 \quad (3.18)$$

for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$.

Let us make the following assumption:

Assumption 3.7 *We assume that a BN-replicable stock GOP-denominated contingent claim \tilde{H}_T has for its fair stock GOP-denominated price at time $t \in [t_0, T]$ under Q_{S^*} a unique martingale representation of the form*

$$\tilde{H}_t = \tilde{H}_{t_0} + \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \int_{t_0}^t x_s^k dW_s^k, \quad (3.19)$$

where x^0, x^1, \dots, x^{d-1} are predictable and the integrals

$$\int_{t_0}^t (x_s^k)^2 ds < \infty \quad (3.20)$$

are Q_{S^*} -almost surely finite for every $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$ and $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

As in the proof of Proposition 7.1 in Du & Platen (2016), it follows:

Theorem 3.8 *If the matrix Φ_t is Lebesgue-almost everywhere invertible, then the strategy $\delta_{\tilde{H}_T}$ is given by the vector*

$$\delta_{\tilde{H}_T}(t) = \text{diag}(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_t)^{-1} (\Phi_t^\top)^{-1} \xi_t \quad (3.21)$$

with

$$\xi_t = (-x_t^0, -x_t^1, \dots, -x_t^{d-1}, \tilde{H}_t)^\top \quad (3.22)$$

for all $t \in [t_0, T)$.

Here $\text{diag}(\mathbf{S})$ denotes the diagonal matrix with the elements of a vector \mathbf{S} as its diagonal. In the case when the dynamics of the extended market are modeled using state variables that satisfy the SDEs of a Markovian system of diffusions, one can systematically identify for a given stock GOP-denominated BN-replicable contingent claim \tilde{H}_T the respective representation (3.12). The price \tilde{H}_t at the time t can be obtained, e.g., by explicit calculation of the conditional expectation, by application of the Feynman-Kac formula, or via some numerical method. The price results as a function of the state variables that satisfies a respective partial differential equation (PDE).

The integrands in the representation (3.19) and the predictable vector ξ_t emerge when applying the Itô formula to the price function and matching the respective terms in the martingale part of the resulting SDE. The PDE operator follows by setting the drift part in the resulting SDE for the price function to zero. Consequently, the price function satisfies a Kolmogorov-backward PDE.

The boundary conditions of the PDE need to be specified such that the solution

of the PDE, as a function of the evolving state variables, becomes a $(Q_{S^*}, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale. When only fixing the PDE operator and the boundary conditions that are determined by the payoff structure of the contingent claim, there may exist several price functions that solve the PDE. All these solutions yield nonnegative $(Q_{S^*}, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -local martingales. Since these processes form $(Q_{S^*}, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -supermartingales that deliver the targeted contingent claim, they yield price processes that are larger than or equal to the one that forms the *fair* price process, which is the $(Q_{S^*}, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale. We emphasize, it is the fair price process that delivers at time T the stock GOP-denominated contingent claim \tilde{H}_T by starting from the most economical minimal possible stock GOP-denominated initial price \tilde{H}_{t_0} .

4 Stock GOP Dynamics

4.1 Leverage Effect and Equivalent BN Pricing Measure

The question arises whether Assumption 3.1, which provides the martingale property of the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the BN pricing measure, is realistic. This means whether it is realistic for existing stock markets to model the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\Lambda_{S^*}(t)$ of the putative BN pricing measure Q_{S^*} as a true $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale. The answer to this question is closely related to the boundary behavior of the volatility $\sigma^{S^*}(t) = \frac{\lambda_t^*}{\theta_t}$, see (3.3), of the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\Lambda_{S^*}(t)$; see, e.g., Andersen & Piterbarg (2007), Hulley & Platen (2012), and Hulley & Ruf (2012).

Intuitively, the numéraire S_t^* , when denominated in the GOP S_t^{**} of the extended market, is a martingale when its volatility $\sigma^{S^*}(t)$ remains finite for finite values of S_t^* , including its asymptotic value at the boundary where it approaches zero. The stock GOP S_t^* can be approximated by a well-diversified stock index; see, e.g., Platen & Rendek (2020). Furthermore, for a stock index it is well-known that it exhibits the *leverage effect*; see Black (1976) and Ait-Sahalia, Fan & Li (2012). This effect captures in an idealized manner the fact that the volatility of a stock index becomes asymptotically infinite when the stock index value converges to zero. The net risk-adjusted return λ_t^* models an average of the expected returns of the savings account-denominated stocks minus the squared volatility of the stock GOP, see, e.g., Theorem 3.1 in Filipović & Platen (2009). When the value of the stock index converges to zero, which is the extreme of a stock market crash, the expected returns of the savings account-denominated stocks, which cause the crash, seem unlikely to converge to infinity and likely to remain finite for economic reasons. Therefore, it seems unlikely that the net risk-adjusted return becomes infinite when the stock GOP value converges to zero and its squared volatility converges, due to the leverage effect, to infinity. Consequently, the volatility $\sigma^{S^*}(t) = \frac{\lambda_t^*}{\theta_t}$, see (3.3), of the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the BN pricing measure remains most likely finite when the stock GOP value converges to zero. Otherwise, the net risk-adjusted return would have to converge to infinity

when the stock GOP would converge to zero, which seems unlikely. This intuition indicates that stock GOP dynamics, which exhibit the empirically well-observed leverage effect, are likely to yield an equivalent BN pricing measure. We confirm below that this is the case for the realistic stock GOP model we will assume.

4.2 Minimal Market Model in Activity Time

To illustrate BN pricing, the current paper assumes a model where the stock GOP evolves in some *activity time* $\tau = \{\tau_t, t \in [t_0, \infty)\}$ with *activity* $a_t \in (0, \infty)$ for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$ starting with the *initial activity time* τ_{t_0} , where

$$\tau_t = \tau_{t_0} + \int_{t_0}^t a_s ds. \quad (4.1)$$

Intuitively, the activity reflects the trading activity, which can be expected to show seasonal and behavioral effects. The net risk-adjusted return λ_t^* is a Lagrange multiplier, see Theorem 3.1 in Filipović & Platen (2009), and does not need to be modeled under BN pricing because it becomes removed from the stock GOP dynamics under Q_{S^*} . Therefore, the current paper makes the simplifying assumption, which could be substituted by more elaborate assumptions without changing the proposed BN pricing and hedging, that the net risk-adjusted return is proportional to the activity, which means

$$\lambda_t^* = \bar{\lambda}^* a_t \quad (4.2)$$

with $\bar{\lambda}^* > 0$ for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. Since the values of the net risk-adjusted return are almost impossible to estimate, the fact that they do not matter when applying BN pricing is of practical importance and simplifies the implementation. Another simplification for the implementation of the BN pricing and hedging of long-term contingent claims, like long-term zero-coupon bonds, will arise from the fact that one will not have to model the random behavior of the activity time. Still, the activity time has to be observed and its average linear evolution estimated.

The *minimal market model* (MMM) has been suggested by Platen (2001) as a realistic model for the long-term stock GOP dynamics. Under the MMM, the volatility of the stock GOP dynamics in calendar time has the form

$$\theta_t = \sqrt{\frac{4e^{\tau_t} a_t}{S_t^*}} \quad (4.3)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. By applying this model, the stock GOP satisfies according to (3.6) under the BN pricing measure the SDE

$$dS_t^* = 4e^{\tau_t} d\tau_t + \sqrt{S_t^* 4e^{\tau_t}} d\bar{W}_{\tau_t}^0 \quad (4.4)$$

with $S_{t_0}^* > 0$ for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. Here $\bar{W}_{\tau_t}^0$ represents a Brownian motion under Q_{S^*} in activity time with stochastic differential

$$d\bar{W}_{\tau_t}^0 = \sqrt{a_t} dW_t^0 \quad (4.5)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. The SDE (4.4) shows that S_t^* represents a time-transformed squared Bessel process of dimension four; see Revuz & Yor (1999) or equation (8.7.1) in Platen & Heath (2006). One notes that its volatility in activity time exhibits a leverage effect and is, as a 3/2 volatility model, a constant elasticity of variance model, see, e.g., Cox (1975), Platen (1997), Heston (1997), and Lewis (2000).

The MMM diffusion dynamics of a squared Bessel process of dimension four, see Revuz & Yor (1999), for the stock GOP seems to capture its ‘natural’ dynamics. Critical is the diffusion coefficient in the SDE (4.4), which is proportional to the square root of the stock GOP value. Such a diffusion coefficient arises in the SDE for the limit of the population size of a birth-and-death process; see Feller (1971). The current paper suggests that the ‘natural’ evolution of diversified wealth can be interpreted as that of a birth-and-death process where independently wealth units give birth to new ones or die. This interpretation provides a basis for the understanding of the ‘natural’ dynamics of the stock GOP. The trading activity, which we reflect in the derivative of the activity time, provides the ‘speed’ at which the stock GOP dynamics evolve under the MMM. Furthermore, in Platen (2023) it has been shown that the stock GOP dynamics of the MMM maximizes the entropy of the stationary density of the normalized stock GOP, which characterizes its most likely dynamics. These facts provide intuitive, mathematically founded arguments for the choice of the MMM in activity time as the model for the stock GOP.

4.3 Observed Activity Time

To observe the activity time, we consider the square root of the stock GOP $\sqrt{S_t^*}$ and obtain by application of the Itô formula, (4.4), (4.5) and (3.5) the SDE

$$d\sqrt{S_t^*} = \frac{3e^{\tau t}}{2\sqrt{S_t^*}}d\tau_t + \sqrt{e^{\tau t}}d\bar{W}_{\tau_t}^0 \quad (4.6)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. Therefore, the quadratic variation of $\sqrt{S_t^*}$ becomes

$$[\sqrt{S^*}]_{t_0,t} = \int_{\tau_{t_0}}^{\tau_t} e^s ds = e^{\tau t} - e^{\tau t_0} \quad (4.7)$$

and the activity time results in the form

$$\tau_t = \ln \left([\sqrt{S^*}]_{t_0,t} + e^{\tau t_0} \right) \quad (4.8)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$.

For illustration, we use the same data as in Platen & Rendek (2020), where the market capitalization-weighted total return stock index (MCI) was constructed that is displayed in Figure 4.1. The MCI was in Platen & Rendek (2020) from the stock data directly generated as a match of the daily observed US Dollar savings account-denominated MSCI-Total Return Stock Index for the developed

markets. As shown in Platen & Rendek (2020) one can interpret the MCI as a reasonable proxy for the stock GOP.

For some tentative initial activity time, one can observe the trajectory of the resulting respective activity time, which turns out to evolve approximately linearly. Only at the beginning of its trajectory, one notices some deviation from its approximate linearity, which changes with the choice of the tentative value of the initial activity time. This leads to the assumption that the average of the activity time is a linear function of calendar time. Therefore, one can search by standard linear regression for the initial activity time that yields the activity time that is as close as possible to a straight line. The resulting estimated *trendline*

$$\bar{\tau}_t = \bar{\tau}_{t_0} + \bar{a}t \quad (4.9)$$

is exhibited in Figure 4.2 together with the MCI for the period from $t_0 = 2$ January 1984 until $T = 1$ November 2014. We observe for the trendline its *slope* $\bar{a} \approx 0.053$ and *initial value* $\bar{\tau}_{t_0} \approx 2.15$. The R^2 -value of 0.98 confirms that the observed activity time evolves approximately linearly. Because of this finding, the current paper employs first the trendline $\bar{\tau}_t$ as a substitute for the activity time in BN pricing and hedging and later an enhanced way of pricing and hedging. When approximating maturity dates and other times in activity time, the two parameters $\bar{\tau}_{t_0} \approx -103.86$ and $\bar{a} \approx 0.053$ are assumed to remain the same also in the future.




Figure 4.1: US Dollar savings account-denominated MCI.

4.4 BN Pricing Measure

When using the trendline $\bar{\tau}_t$ with constant slope $\bar{a} \in (0, \infty)$ as model for the activity time, it follows by (3.3) and (4.3) that the volatility $\sigma^{S^*}(t)$ of the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the BN pricing measure equals

$$\sigma^{S^*}(t) = \bar{\lambda}^* \sqrt{\frac{\bar{a}S_t^*}{4e^{\bar{\tau}_t}}} \quad (4.10)$$




Figure 4.2: Activity time τ_t and trendline $\bar{\tau}_t$.

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. This allows us to prove the following result:

Theorem 4.1 *Under the above assumptions and the model that employs the trendline $\bar{\tau}_t$ as a proxy for the activity time, the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the BN pricing measure Q_{S^*} is a $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale and Q_{S^*} an equivalent probability measure.*

Proof: Under the above assumptions it follows from (2.1) that S_t^* is the product of a time-transformed squared Bessel process with value

$$\bar{S}_t^* = S_t^* e^{-\bar{\lambda}^* a t} \quad (4.11)$$

and the deterministic exponential function of time $e^{\bar{\lambda}^* a t}$. Therefore, by (4.10) the squared volatility $(\sigma^{S^*}(t))^2$ of the Radon-Nikodym derivative Λ_{S^*} of the BN pricing measure Q_{S^*} equals the product of the deterministic exponential function of time

$$(\bar{\lambda}^*)^2 \frac{\bar{a}}{4e^{\bar{\tau}_{t_0} + \bar{a}(1-\bar{\lambda}^*)t}} \quad (4.12)$$

and the time-transformed squared Bessel process of dimension four \bar{S}_t^* .

When the squared volatility of a local martingale is the product of a time-transformed squared Bessel process of dimension greater than two and a deterministic function of time, it follows directly that the local martingale Λ_{S^*} is a $(P, \underline{\mathcal{F}})$ -martingale by using the argument from the proof of Proposition 2.5 in Andersen & Piterbarg (2007), which is given in their Lemma 2.3. According to the Change of Numéraire Theorem in Geman, El Karoui & Rochet (1995), it follows that Q_{S^*} is an equivalent probability measure, which proves the statement of Theorem 4.1.

4.5 Putative Risk-Neutral Pricing Measure

Risk-neutral pricing employs the savings account $S_t^0 = 1$ as numéraire and the classical finance theory postulates that the putative risk-neutral pricing measure

Q_{S^0} is an equivalent probability measure, see Cochrane (2001) and Delbaen & Schachermayer (1998). The following result shows that Q_{S^0} is not an equivalent probability measure under the above-described model:

Theorem 4.2 *Under the above assumptions, the Radon-Nikodym derivative Λ_{S^0} of the putative risk-neutral pricing measure Q_{S^0} is a strict (P, \mathcal{F}) -supermartingale and Q_{S^0} is not an equivalent probability measure.*

Proof: The Radon-Nikodym derivative of the putative risk-neutral pricing measure Q_{S^0} equals

$$\Lambda_{S^0}(t) = \frac{dQ_{S^0}}{dP} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \frac{S_t^0}{S_t^{**}} = \frac{1}{S_t^{**}} \quad (4.13)$$

for $t \in [t_0, \infty)$. It follows by Theorem 4.1 that

$$\mathbf{E}^P(\Lambda_{S^0}(s) | \mathcal{F}_t) = \mathbf{E}^P\left(\frac{1}{S_s^{**}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t\right) = \frac{S_t^*}{S_t^{**}} \mathbf{E}^{Q_{S^*}}\left(\frac{1}{S_s^*} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t\right) \quad (4.14)$$

for $t_0 \leq t < s < \infty$. Under Q_{S^*} the savings account-denominated stock GOP S_t^* is a time-transformed squared Bessel process of dimension four satisfying the SDE (3.6). Its inverse $\frac{1}{S_t^*}$ is a strict (Q_{S^*}, \mathcal{F}) -supermartingale; see Revuz & Yor (1999). Therefore, we have

$$\mathbf{E}^P(\Lambda_{S^0}(s) | \mathcal{F}_t) < \frac{S_t^*}{S_t^{**} S_t^*} = \frac{1}{S_t^{**}} = \Lambda_{S^0}(t) \quad (4.15)$$

for $t_0 \leq t \leq s < \infty$, which shows that Λ_{S^0} is a strict (P, \mathcal{F}) -supermartingale. By application of the Change of Numéraire Theorem in Geman, El Karoui & Rochet (1995), the putative risk-neutral measure is not an equivalent probability measure, which proves Theorem 4.2.

Recall that the leverage effect provided the intuition that the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the BN-pricing measure is a true martingale. Therefore, Theorem 4.2 provides the intuition that the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the putative risk-neutral pricing measure is unlikely a martingale. This intuition seems to come close to reality, as we will see below.

5 Pricing and Hedging of a Zero-Coupon Bond

5.1 BN Pricing of a Zero-Coupon Bond

Under the above model, which employs the trendline of the activity time as model for the activity time, the transition probability density for the stock GOP S^* under Q_{S^*} has, by following Revuz & Yor (1999) or equation (8.7.9) in Platen & Heath (2006), the form

$$p(\bar{\tau}_t, S_0^*; \bar{\tau}_s, S_s^*) = \frac{1}{2(e^{\bar{\tau}_s} - e^{\bar{\tau}_t})} \left(\frac{S_s^*}{S_t^*}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{S_t^* + S_s^*}{2(s^{\bar{\tau}_s} - e^{\bar{\tau}_t})}\right\} I_1\left(\frac{\sqrt{S_t^* S_s^*}}{e^{\bar{\tau}_s} - e^{\bar{\tau}_t}}\right) \quad (5.1)$$

for $t_0 \leq t \leq s < \infty$, where $I_1(\cdot)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind with index 1; see, e.g., Abramowitz & Stegun (1972). Consequently, we know the transition probability density of the stock GOP under the BN pricing measure, where its key characteristic, the trendline of the activity time, is observable. To illustrate BN pricing and hedging, we consider a zero-coupon bond with fixed maturity $T \in (t_0, \infty)$ and contingent claim $H_T = 1$. The respective fair zero-coupon bond

$$P(t, T) = \tilde{P}(t, T) S_t^* \quad (5.2)$$

pays at maturity one unit of the savings account $H_T = S_T^0 = 1$. Its value, obtained via the BN pricing formula (3.4), is given in the denomination of the savings account by the explicit formula

$$P(t, T) = S_t^* \mathbf{E}^{Q_{S^*}} \left(\frac{1}{S_T^*} \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right) = 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{S_t^*}{2(e^{\bar{r}T} - e^{\bar{r}t})} \right\} \quad (5.3)$$

for $t \in [t_0, T)$; see Platen (2002) or equation (13.3.5) in Platen & Heath (2006). We display in Figure 5.1 the zero-coupon bond price with maturity at the end




Figure 5.1: Zero-coupon bond $P(t, T)$ with MCI as the benchmark.

of our observation period that emerges when using the MCI as a proxy for the stock GOP. One notes that there exist at least two self-financing portfolios that hedge the payment of one unit of the savings account at the maturity T . The classical hedge portfolio would simply purchase one unit of the savings account at the initial time and hold it until maturity. The one that the proposed BN pricing with the MCI as benchmark suggests is less expensive, as Figure 5.1 shows. It requests only about three-quarters of the risk-neutral price.

5.2 BN Hedging of a Zero-Coupon Bond

The payoff of the zero-coupon bond can be replicated through hedging: We have for the zero-coupon bond $\tilde{P}(t, T)$, when denominated in the stock GOP, the SDE

$$d\tilde{P}(t, T) = \delta_t^{S^0} d\tilde{S}_t^0 \quad (5.4)$$

with the hedge ratio

$$\delta_t^{S^0} = \frac{\partial \tilde{P}(t, T)}{\partial \tilde{S}_t^0} = 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{S_t^*}{2(e^{\bar{r}T} - e^{\bar{r}t})} \right\} \left(1 + \frac{S_t^*}{2(e^{\bar{r}T} - e^{\bar{r}t})} \right) \quad (5.5)$$

for the investment in the savings account $\tilde{S}_t^0 = \frac{1}{S_t^*}$, when denominated in the stock GOP, at time $t \in [0, T)$. Figure 5.2 shows the fraction

$$\pi_t^{S^*} = 1 - \pi_t^{S^0} = 1 - \frac{\delta_t^{S^0} \tilde{S}_t^0}{\tilde{P}(t, T)} = \left(\frac{1}{P(t, T)} - 1 \right) \frac{S_t^*}{2(e^{\bar{r}T} - e^{\bar{r}t})} \quad (5.6)$$

of the value of the hedge portfolio invested in the stock GOP. One notes that when




Figure 5.2: Fraction $\pi_t^{S^*}$ invested in the stock GOP.

the time to maturity is long, the fraction invested in the stock GOP is relatively high. This fraction declines over time according to the prescribed strategy and becomes finally zero at maturity. One could interpret its trajectory as a rigorous description of the glide path for the common financial planning strategy when it targets at maturity one unit of the savings account and one invests when young in stocks and closer to retirement more and more in the savings account.

Note in equation (5.5) that the strategy sells units of the savings account and buys units of the stock GOP when the stock GOP value declines. Since the normalized stock index is under the MMM mean-reverting, this strategy is rational. However, the reaction of many investors who invest for retirement appears to be different in situations when the stock market crashes. The above rational strategy, when widely implemented, e.g., by pension funds and life insurance companies, could potentially help to stabilize a stock market in times of a major market drawdown.

One can only trade at discrete times, which creates hedge errors. According to the above-described hedging strategy, the hedge portfolio process $V = \{V_t, t \in [t_0, T]\}$

reallocates daily the holdings in the savings account and the stock GOP in a self-financing manner. The difference between the BN price and the hedge portfolio value is shown in Figure 5.3, which we call the *profit and loss*

$$C_t = V_t - P(t, T), \quad (5.7)$$

of the hedge portfolio V_t formed when replicating the zero-coupon bond which was initiated on $t_0 = 1$ January 1984, reallocated daily in a self-financing manner, and matured at $T = 1$ November 2014. The absolute value of the profit and loss turns




Figure 5.3: Profit and loss C_t for the hedge of a zero-coupon bond.

out to be rather small, which indicates that the dynamics of the MMM model well the volatility dynamics of the MCI. The absolute value of the profit and loss remains in Figure 5.3 always below 1.5% of one unit of the savings account value, which is a small hedge error for a hedging period of 30 years.

5.3 Enhanced Pricing and Hedging of Zero-Coupon Bond

The current paper proposes a new method that allows to reduce significantly the hedge error when pricing and hedging a zero-coupon bond. As can be seen in Figure 4.2, the observed activity time τ_t is different from its trendline $\bar{\tau}_t$. We introduce for the case $\tau_{t_0} < \bar{\tau}_T$ the stopping time

$$\rho = \sup\{t \in (t_0, T] : \tau_t < \bar{\tau}_t\} \quad (5.8)$$

as the supremum of all times t where the activity time τ_t is still smaller than the value $\bar{\tau}_T$ of the trendline at maturity. During hedging, one can exploit the information that becomes available through the evolving observed activity time τ_t and one knows when one has reached the stopping time ρ . For $t \in [t_0, \rho)$, the current paper proposes an approximate formula for the *enhanced zero-coupon bond price* $\bar{P}(t, T)$ in the form

$$\bar{P}(t, T) = 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{S_t^*}{2(e^{\bar{\tau}_T} - e^{\tau_t})}\right\}, \quad (5.9)$$

which yields the *enhanced fraction*

$$\bar{\pi}_t^{S^*} = \left(\frac{1}{\bar{P}(t, T)} - 1 \right) \frac{S_t^*}{2(e^{\bar{\tau}_T} - e^{\tau_t})} \quad (5.10)$$

to be invested in the stock GOP. One stops the hedge at the time ρ , where one exchanges all the wealth in the hedge portfolio into units of the savings account. The latter value can be expected to be close to 1.0 when the time step size of the hedge was sufficiently small. We denote the resulting hedge portfolio process by $\bar{V} = \{\bar{V}_t, t \in [0, T]\}$. In comparison to the previous formulas (5.3) and (5.5), in the above two formulas, (5.9) and (5.10), we substituted the trendline of the activity time $\bar{\tau}_t$ by the observed current activity time τ_t , as long as we have $t < \rho$. The profit and loss

$$\bar{C}_t = \bar{V}_t - \bar{P}(t, T) \quad (5.11)$$

of the enhanced hedge portfolio \bar{V}_t is shown in Figure 5.4. The maximum of its




Figure 5.4: Profit and loss \bar{C}_t for the enhanced hedge with MCI.

absolute value remains smaller than 0.0018 of one unit of the savings account for the 30-year daily hedge. The enhanced hedge provides a remarkably accurate replication of the payout of the zero-coupon bond. Only during the 1987 stock market crash, where days of data were missing, there is a sudden increase in the absolute value of the hedge error observable. The otherwise almost perfect hedge indicates that the MMM in activity time models extremely well the volatility dynamics of the MCI.

The risk-neutral price before maturity for the above zero-coupon bond, which pays at maturity one unit of the savings account, equals always one unit of the savings account. Formula (5.3) shows that when there is some strictly positive time to maturity, its BN price is lower than the risk-neutral price. The respective risk-neutral hedging portfolio is self-financing and delivers the targeted payoff of one unit of the savings account at maturity. However, due to the strict supermartingale property of the Radon-Nikodym derivative process Λ_{S^0} of the putative

risk-neutral measure Q_{S^0} , the respective risk-neutral price is higher than the BN price.

There exists no economic reason to produce the zero-coupon bond payoff more expensively than necessary by following the popular risk-neutral pricing rule. The BN price and hedge offer a more economical way of replicating the targeted long-term payoff, as illustrated in Figure 5.1.

It will be separately demonstrated by employing faster-growing stock portfolios as benchmark and considering zero-coupon bonds with longer terms to maturity, the price of a zero coupon can become a rather small fraction of one unit of the savings account and the zero-coupon bonds can still be hedged as accurately as shown above.

Conclusion

The paper proposes the new method of benchmark-neutral pricing and hedging, which employs as numéraire the growth optimal portfolio of the investment universe formed by the stocks that can be approximated by a well-diversified stock portfolio. For a realistic model and a long-term zero-coupon bond, it is demonstrated that the proposed benchmark-neutral price can be significantly lower than the risk-neutral price and the payoff can be accurately hedged over several decades. By applying and extending the proposed benchmark-neutral methodology, it should be possible to develop accurate quantitative methods for a wide range of long-term contracts like the risk-neutral quantitative methods that serve short-term derivative pricing and hedging. These new quantitative methods are urgently needed to reduce the costs of pension and insurance contracts. The next steps toward the wider application of benchmark-neutral pricing and hedging could target a wide range of long-term contingent claims, including nonreplicable claims. One could also revisit the pricing and hedging of short-term derivatives, currently performed under the putative risk-neutral pricing measure, which may provide interesting insights.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express his gratitude for receiving valuable suggestions on the paper by Kevin Fergusson, Len Garces, and Stefan Tappe.

Data

The EXCEL file that generates the figures of the paper is available at Harvard Dataverse <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/R9I0AB>.

References

- Abramowitz, M. & I. A. Stegun (Eds.) (1972). *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. Dover, New York.
- Ait-Sahalia, Y., J. Fan, & Y. Li (2012). The leverage effect puzzle: Disentangling sources of bias at high frequency. *Working Paper*.
- Andersen, L. & V. Piterbarg (2007). Moment explosions in stochastic volatility models. *Finance Stoch.* **11**(1), 29–50.
- Barone Adesi, G. Platen, E. & C. Sala (2024). Managing the shortfall risk of target date funds by overfunding. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance*, 1–25.
- Black, F. (1976). Studies in stock price volatility changes. In *Proceedings of the 1976 Business Meeting of the Business and Economic Statistics Section, American Statistical Association*, pp. 177–181.
- Cochrane, J. H. (2001). *Asset Pricing*. Princeton University Press.
- Cox, J. C. (1975). Notes on option pricing I: constant elasticity of variance diffusions. Stanford University, (working paper, unpublished).
- Delbaen, F. & W. Schachermayer (1998). The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes. *Math. Ann.* **312**, 215–250.
- Du, K. & E. Platen (2016). Benchmarked risk minimization. *Math. Finance* **26**(3), 617–637.
- Feller, W. (1971). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications* (2nd ed.), Volume 2. Wiley, New York.
- Fergusson, K. & E. Platen (2022). Less-expensive valuation of long-term annuities linked to mortality, cash and equity. *Annals of Actuarial Science*, 1–38.
- Filipović, D. & E. Platen (2009). Consistent market extensions under the benchmark approach. *Mathematical Finance* **19**(1), 41–52.
- Geman, S., N. El Karoui, & J. C. Rochet (1995). Changes of numeraire, changes of probability measures and pricing of options. *J. Appl. Probab.* **32**, 443–458.
- Heston, S. L. (1997). A simple new formula for options with stochastic volatility. Technical report, Washington University of St. Louis.
- Hulley, H. & E. Platen (2012). Hedging for the long run. *Mathematics and Financial Economics* **6**, 105–124.
- Hulley, H. & J. Ruf (2012). Weak tail conditions for local martingales. *Annals of Probability* **47**(3), 1811–1825.
- Jarrow, R. (2022). *Continuous-Time Asset Pricing Theory*. Springer-Finance, Second Edition.

- Karatzas, I. & C. Kardaras (2007). The numeraire portfolio in semimartingale financial models. *Finance and Stochastics* **11**(4), 447–493.
- Karatzas, I. & C. Kardaras (2021). *Portfolio Theory and Arbitrage*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island.
- Karatzas, I. & S. E. Shreve (1991). *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus* (2nd ed.). Springer.
- Karatzas, I. & S. E. Shreve (1998). *Methods of Mathematical Finance*. Springer.
- Kelly, J. R. (1956). A new interpretation of information rate. *Bell Systems Technology Journal* **35**, 917–926.
- Lewis, A. L. (2000). *Option Valuation Under Stochastic Volatility*. Finance Press, Newport Beach.
- Loewenstein, M. & G. A. Willard (2000). Local martingales, arbitrage, and viability: Free snacks and cheap thrills. *Econometric Theory* **16**(1), 135–161.
- Merton, R. C. (1992). *Continuous-Time Finance*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Platen, E. (1997). A non-linear stochastic volatility model. Technical report, Australian National University, Canberra, Financial Mathematics Research Reports. FMRR 005-97.
- Platen, E. (2001). A minimal financial market model. In *Trends in Mathematics*, pp. 293–301. Birkhäuser.
- Platen, E. (2002). Arbitrage in continuous complete markets. *Advances in Applied Probability* **34**(3), 540–558.
- Platen, E. (2006). A benchmark approach to finance. *Math. Finance* **16**(1), 131–151.
- Platen, E. (2023). Entropy-maximizing dynamics of continuous markets. Technical report. Research Paper, SSRN 4675048.
- Platen, E. & D. Heath (2006). *A Benchmark Approach to Quantitative Finance*. Springer Finance. Springer.
- Platen, E. & R. Rendek (2020). Approximating the growth optimal portfolio and stock price bubbles. *Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance* **23**(7), 2050048.
- Revuz, D. & M. Yor (1999). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion* (3rd ed.). Springer.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1979). Why we should not make mean log of wealth big though years to act are long. *J. Banking and Finance* **3**, 305–307.
- Shiryaev, A. N. & A. S. Cherny (2002). Vector stochastic integrals and the fundamental theorems of asset pricing. *Proceedings of the Steklov Mathematical Institute Moscow* **237**, 6–49.