

Deep Hedging Bermudan Swaptions

Kenjiro Oya*

Abstract

This paper proposes a novel approach to Bermudan swaption hedging by applying the deep hedging framework to address limitations of traditional arbitrage-free methods. Conventional methods assume ideal conditions, such as zero transaction costs, perfect liquidity, and continuous-time hedging, which often differ from real market environments. This discrepancy can lead to residual profit and loss (P&L), resulting in two primary issues. First, residual P&L may prevent achieving the initial model price, especially with improper parameter settings, potentially causing a negative P&L trend and significant financial impacts. Second, controlling the distribution of residual P&L to mitigate downside risk is challenging, as hedged positions may become curve gamma-short, making them vulnerable to large interest rate movements. The deep hedging approach enables flexible selection of convex risk measures and hedge strategies, allowing for improved residual P&L management. This study also addresses challenges in applying the deep hedging approach to Bermudan swaptions, such as efficient arbitrage-free market scenario generation and managing early exercise conditions. Additionally, we introduce a unique "Option Spread Hedge" strategy, which allows for robust hedging and provides intuitive interpretability. Numerical analysis results demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation for Applying the Deep Hedging Approach to Bermudan Swaptions

Bermudan Swaptions are a popular type of interest rate derivative. However, existing methods of managing these positions using arbitrage-free theory have notable limitations. This paper seeks to address these limitations by applying the deep hedging approach.

The main issues with arbitrage-free theory are its unrealistic assumptions, including zero transaction costs, continuous-time hedging, and unlimited market liquidity. In reality, financial markets do not operate under such idealized conditions, and market dynamics often differ from the theoretical models. As a result, residual profit and loss (P&L) can accumulate in real-world trading, leading to the two main issues.

The first issue is the risk of not achieving the initial model price due to this residual P&L. This problem is particularly pronounced when the model parameters are improperly set, which can lead to a negative P&L trend with significant financial impact. Unfortunately, arbitrage-free models offer limited guidance on selecting model parameters. While they can offer break-even levels at specific times [1], they lack a systematic way to prevent negative P&L trends over the long term.

The second issue is the challenge of controlling the distribution of residual P&L to limit downside risk. For example, after hedging a Bermudan swaption with swaptions using arbitrage-free theory, the position may become curve gamma-short, making it vulnerable to large interest rate movements. Even if traders want to mitigate this risk, it remains unclear how to adjust model assumptions to create a more favorable gamma-long position¹. This complexity arises because the hedge size is linked to model price sensitivity to market changes, making it hard to predict and control.

Recent advances in machine learning have opened up new possibilities in derivative risk management (e.g., [2, 3]). In this paper, we use the deep hedging approach [2], which enables more flexible risk management by allowing customization of risk measures and hedging strategies. By adjusting the parameters of the risk measure function, specifically Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR), it becomes possible to monitor and manage the distribution of P&L drawdowns from the initial model price. This provides a structured approach to handling P&L drawdown risk. Furthermore, as CVaR parameters change, so does the risk profile of the hedged position, allowing unwanted downside risks to be mitigated.

*Nomura Securities Co., Ltd.

¹[1] provides a specific example where performing a hedge with swaptions results in a curve gamma-short position.

Furthermore, we explore a new method for mitigating downside risks by applying constraints to the weights of assets in the hedge portfolio, preventing over-hedging with the swaption. By combining this method with CVaR parameter adjustments, we create a more flexible and effective approach to position management.

1.2 Key Considerations for Applying Deep Hedging to Bermudan Swaptions

Applying the deep hedging approach to Bermudan swaptions presents several technical challenges that must be addressed. These challenges include: (1) generating training scenarios, and (2) managing early exercise conditions. Below, we summarize the approaches used to tackle these challenges.

Market Scenario Generation for Training

First, let us clarify the requirements for training scenarios. As discussed in [4], when applying the deep hedging approach to exotic derivatives using options as hedge assets, it is crucial to ensure that scenarios are both static and statistically arbitrage-free to achieve stable training results. Additionally, the scenario generator must be flexible enough to capture the realistic dynamics of the hedge assets and computationally efficient. In practical applications, the deep hedging approach requires recalculating model values and hedged P&L distributions daily based on current market conditions, requiring the daily regeneration of scenarios. Therefore, a scenario generation process capable of operating within realistic time constraints is essential for practical use.

To meet these requirements, this paper proposes using the Swap Market Bergomi Model (SMBM) for scenario generation [1]. The SMBM ensures that scenarios are both static and statistically arbitrage-free, satisfying the first requirement. Furthermore, the SMBM provides flexibility in modeling the dynamics of interest rate and swaption processes in a practical way. The model includes the same number of state variables as the number of hedge assets, allowing users to define correlation coefficients between these variables. Additionally, the function that calculates hedge asset prices from the state variables is a low-dimensional function, making it suitable for pre-training methods. This enables scenario generation that is both fast and accurate.

Early Exercise Conditions

For Bermudan swaptions, where the holder has the right to exercise early², it is essential not only to model the hedging strategy but also to accurately represent the early exercise strategy. In this paper, we propose a recursive model training strategy to train the early exercise strategy in a stable manner.

Specifically, for a Bermudan swaption with N possible exercise dates, the training process is broken down recursively. Instead of training hedging and early exercise strategies for all N exercise dates at once, the model focuses on each exercise right individually. The process begins by building a hedging model for a Bermudan swaption with only the final exercise right. Once this model is trained, it forms the foundation for developing a model that considers both the second-to-last and final exercise rights. This recursive approach is repeated for each earlier exercise right. By isolating the early exercise strategy for each date, the training process remains stable and manageable.

In a related study, the application of machine learning to American-style options has been explored in [6], where continuation values are calculated using deep learning regression based on arbitrage-free prices, and exercise decisions are made accordingly. Since our aim is to evaluate risk-adjusted prices, we propose a method that incorporates exercise decision model training within the deep hedging framework.

1.3 Structure of the Paper and Our Contributions

The structure of this paper is as follows:

- **Section 2** provides a detailed explanation of the market scenario generation process. A unique contribution of this research is our approach to creating arbitrage-free scenarios for Bermudan swaptions using the Swap Market Bergomi Model combined with pre-training techniques.
- **Section 3** describes the methodology for applying the deep hedging approach to Bermudan swaptions, with particular attention to handling early exercise features. In this chapter, we introduce a decomposition technique for Bermudan swaptions and iteratively construct the hedging model. Additionally, we present a robust hedging strategy that utilizes swaption spreads as hedging assets. To our knowledge, this decomposition training approach for Bermudan swaptions and the robust hedging method are both original contributions.

²This paper limits the discussion to position management from the perspective of the Bermudan swaption holder.

- **Section 4** presents the results of the numerical analysis based on the proposed approach, providing insights into strategy effectiveness.
- **Section 5** concludes the paper, summarizing the findings and discussing potential directions for future research.

2 Market Scenario Generation

2.1 Bermudan Swaptions and Hedge Assets

The goal of scenario generation for Bermudan swaption hedging is to construct a joint distribution for interest rate swaps and European swaptions (referred to as "swaptions" from here on). First, we define the hedge assets and Bermudan swaption prices using equations. Asset prices are used to represent the assets themselves where there is no ambiguity.

Let $U_t^{i,j,K}$ represent the price of a receivers interest rate swap at time t , which starts at T_i and matures at T_j with a strike of K . The following assumes that an interest rate swap will always refer to a receivers swap. The swap value can be expressed using the discount factor P_t^i at time t for maturity T_i as follows:

$$U_t^{i,j,K} = A_t^{i,j}(K - S_t^{i,j}) \quad (1)$$

$$A_t^{i,j} \triangleq \sum_{u=i+1}^j \delta_{u-1} P_t^u \quad (2)$$

$$S_t^{i,j} \triangleq \frac{P_t^i - P_t^j}{A_t^{i,j}} \quad (3)$$

Here we use discrete time grids $T_i = \sum_{u=0}^{i-1} \delta_u$ with $T_0 = 0$ and accrual factors $\{\delta_u | u = 0, \dots, e-1\}$. Additionally, A , and S represent annuity factor and swap rate, respectively.

A Bermudan swaption, denoted as B^i , can be exercised at discrete times $\{T_u | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$. In this study, we focus on a trade in which, if exercised at T_u , the holder enters into a swap $U^{u,e,K}$.³ Thus, the underlying swap for the Bermudan swaption is assumed to have a common maturity of T_e , and such swaps that share the same maturity are referred to as coterminal swaps.

For hedging B^i , we consider coterminal swaps and swaptions as the hedge assets. The coterminal swaps are represented by $\{U^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$. A swaption $O^{u,j,K}$ is a European option with an underlying swap $U^{u,j,K}$, where the exercise date aligns with the start date of the underlying swap. Specifically, the set of swaptions with coterminal underlying swaps, $\{O^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$, is referred to as coterminal swaptions. Together, these coterminal swaps and swaptions provide a basis for hedging the Bermudan swaption.

Henceforth, all assets are considered in terms of their relative prices with respect to the discount factor at maturity P_t^e . Specifically, we define the relative price of an asset X_t as $\tilde{X}_t = \frac{X_t}{P_t^e}$, and, to simplify notation, we denote this relative price as X_t . In this paper, we construct arbitrage-free scenarios using a pricing measure that takes P_t^e as the numéraire. This choice simplifies the approach discussed in the paper, though other numéraires can be used within this framework. For hedging strategy P&L, this approach effectively holds the P&L generated in each period in a discount bond P_t^e .

2.2 Overview of Scenario Generation Process

As mentioned earlier, this paper adopts the Swap Market Bergomi Model (SMBM) for arbitrage-free scenario generation. The process involves the following steps:

1. Determine the exogenous model parameters of the SMBM: This step involves defining parameters such as the initial forward variance swap rate, correlation coefficients among state variable processes, volatility-of-volatility factors, and mean-reversion parameters for the variance swap rate process. These parameters can be estimated from the historical dynamics of hedge assets or set according to the market outlook of the position manager. A detailed discussion of this parameter estimation is outside the scope of this paper. Once this step is completed, it does not need to be repeated unless there is a significant change in the assumptions used for estimation of the parameters.

³For simplicity, we assume that the exercise time and the swap start time are the same. Extending this to cases where the exercise time and swap start time differ is expected to be straightforward.

2. Calculate the current state variables of the SMBM: The state variables are derived from the current market prices of the hedge assets so that the arbitrage-free model prices align with market prices. To ensure accurate and feasible calculation, the number of state variables is chosen to match the number of hedge assets. This step and all subsequent steps will be performed daily.
3. Simulate future paths: Using the parameters and state variables obtained in steps 1 and 2, we simulate future paths of the state variables. This step can be executed using established Monte Carlo simulation methods.
4. Calculate the prices of hedge assets: For each simulated path, we compute the prices of hedge assets using the future values of the state variables. The price of an interest rate swap can be calculated analytically using the state variables. For swaptions, calculating the conditional expectation is required, though pre-training techniques can accelerate this computation for coterminal swaption valuation.

In the next section, we discuss the dynamics of the SMBM and the price calculation process for the hedge assets.

2.3 Swap Market Bergomi Model

The Swap Market Bergomi Model [1] is a term structure model for interest rates that uses both the swap rate and its variance swap rate as state variables. Swap market models typically offer flexibility in choosing which set of swap rates to model, such as coterminal or costart swap rates. In this paper, we define the joint dynamics of coterminal swap rates and their associated variance swap rates.

The SMBM approach begins by modeling two-factor process for each swap rate $S^{i,e}$, comprising the swap rate itself and its variance swap rate under its own annuity measure $\mathcal{A}^{i,e}$. A change of measure operation is then applied to construct the joint distribution of the coterminal swap rates and variance swap rates. Let \mathcal{M}^i represent the two-factor model for the swap rate $S^{i,e}$, and let \mathcal{M}^{Joint} denote the model for the joint distribution. This setup allows efficient calculation of a coterminal swaption price on $S^{i,e}$ from given state variables, as the computation depends only on the dynamics of \mathcal{M}^i .

Moreover, for valuing coterminal swaptions, if pre-training is applied using a regression model, the problem can be approached as a regression task involving three parameters: the swap rate, the state variable for variance swap rate, and the time to maturity, assuming the other model parameters of \mathcal{M}^i are fixed. Given this relatively low dimensionality, high-precision regression methods, such as tensor splines, can be effectively applied for accurate valuation.

Joint Dynamics of State Variables of the SMBM

Following [1], we outline the method used to construct the dynamics. For detailed definitions and properties, please refer to [1]. The SMBM construction begins with the formulation of the stochastic differential equation (SDE) for \mathcal{M}^i . Under the annuity measure $\mathcal{A}^{i,e}$, which is linked to the annuity factor $A^{i,e}$, the swap rate process $S_t^{i,e}$ and the infinitesimal variance swap rate $\xi_t^{i,e,T}$ follow these dynamics:

$$dS_t^{i,e} = \sqrt{\xi_t^{i,e,t}} dW_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{A}^{i,e}} \quad (4)$$

$$dX_t^{i,e} = -\kappa^{i,e} X_t^{i,e} dt + dZ_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{A}^{i,e}} \quad (5)$$

$$\xi_t^{i,e,T} = \xi_0^{i,e,T} \exp \left[\omega^{i,e} e^{-\kappa^{i,e}(T-t)} X_t^{i,e} - \frac{1}{2} (\omega^{i,e})^2 e^{-2\kappa^{i,e}(T-t)} E_0^{\mathcal{A}^{i,e}} \left[(X_t^{i,e})^2 \right] \right] \quad (6)$$

Here $X_t^{i,e}$ is the state variable process for the variance swap rate. $\omega^{i,e}$ and $\kappa^{i,e}$ are static model parameters, representing the volatility-of-volatility factor and the mean-reversion parameter for the variance swap rate process. $W_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{A}^{i,e}}$ and $Z_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{A}^{i,e}}$ represent correlated Brownian motions under the annuity measure $\mathcal{A}^{i,e}$.

After constructing \mathcal{M}^i for each $i = 1, \dots, e-1$, the joint dynamics \mathcal{M}^{Joint} is constructed through the following steps:

1. Specify the pricing measure for \mathcal{M}^{Joint} : This paper uses the terminal measure \mathcal{P}^e , which is associated with the discount factor P_t^e .
2. Specify the local correlation coefficients: Define the local correlation coefficients for the following combinations: (a) between $dW_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{A}^{i,e}}$ for different i , (b) between $dZ_t^{(j,e),\mathcal{A}^{j,e}}$ for different j , and (c) between $dW_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{A}^{i,e}}$ and $dZ_t^{(j,e),\mathcal{A}^{j,e}}$ for all combinations of i and j , except for $i = j$, which is defined during the construction of \mathcal{M}^i .

3. Replace the Brownian motions: Replace $W_t^{(i,e),A^{i,e}}$ and $Z_t^{(i,e),A^{i,e}}$ with the Brownian motions under the measure \mathcal{P}^e , denoted as $W_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{P}^e}$ and $Z_t^{(i,e),\mathcal{P}^e}$, by calculating the arbitrage-free drift. Details on the drift term expressions can be found in [1].

Mapping from State Variables of the SMBM to Hedge Asset Prices

The arbitrage-free value of coterminal interest rate swap is given by $A^{i,e}(K - S^{i,e})$. Since both $A^{i,e}$ and $S^{i,e}$ are defined as functions of the discount factors $\{P^u|u = i, \dots, e - 1\}$, it is possible to calculate the sets of $\{P^u|u = i, \dots, e - 1\}$ and $\{A^{u,e}|u = i, \dots, e - 1\}$ from the given set of $\{S^{u,e}|u = i, \dots, e - 1\}$ as state variables, determining the value of the interest rate swap analytically⁴.

A swaption $O^{i,e,K}$, modeled by \mathcal{M}^i , is a European option with a payoff of $A^{i,e}(K - S^{i,e})^+$ at maturity T_i . Its arbitrage-free value is given by $A_t^{i,e} E_t^{A^{i,e}}[(K - S_{T_i}^{i,e})^+]$ for $t \leq T_i$. Using the dynamics of the \mathcal{M}^i , this expectation value can be calculated⁵. Thus, the price of the swaption at any time $t \leq T_i$ can be obtained as a function of three variables: $S_t^{i,e}$, $X_t^{i,e}$, and t .

Once a regression model of the swaption price $O^{i,e,K}$ with respect to $S_t^{i,e}$, $X_t^{i,e}$, and t is constructed, mapping from state variables to the swaption price $O^{i,e,K}$ becomes very efficient in the market scenario path generation. Given the low dimensionality of the input (only three variables), a high-accuracy regression model, such as tensor splines, can be used.

3 Deep Hedging Bermudan Swaptions

3.1 Deep Hedging Approach

In the deep hedging approach [2], the optimal hedging and pricing problem is formulated as a minimization problem, where the objective is to minimize a given convex risk measure function ρ applied to the distribution of the hedged P&L. More specifically, the optimal hedging strategy w^* is defined as:

$$w^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \rho(\text{PL}(w, Z)) \quad (7)$$

Here, \mathcal{H} denotes the set of possible hedging strategies, and PL represents the distribution of hedged P&L, which is calculated as follows⁶:

$$\text{PL}(w, Z) = Z + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k \cdot (I_{k+1} - I_k) - \sum_{k=0}^n c_k (w_k - w_{k-1}) \quad (8)$$

In this equation, Z represents the payoff value distribution of the trade being hedged, while w , I and c denote the hedge quantity vector, the price vector of the hedge assets, and the hedging cost function, respectively. Trading days span from $t_0 = 0$ to t_n , where t_n is the maturity date of the trade. It is also assumed that $w_{-1} = w_n = 0$.

In this approach, the price V of the derivative payoff Z is determined as the indifference price. Specifically, if we denote $\rho(\text{PL}(w, Z))$ with the optimal hedging strategy as $\pi(Z) = \min_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \rho(\text{PL}(w, Z))$, the price V is calculated as the value satisfying $\pi(Z - V) = \pi(0)$. This represents the fair cash amount that the hedger considers appropriate to pay to enter the position, accounting for risk. By using the cash-invariance property of the convex risk measure function, this condition can be reformulated as:

$$V = -\pi(Z) + \pi(0) \quad (9)$$

Here, $\pi(0)$ is a term associated with the value of statistical arbitrage strategy. Since this study uses an arbitrage-free scenario generator, this value is theoretically expected to be zero. Therefore, in numerical calculations below, we proceed with the assumption $\pi(0) = 0$.

In the deep hedging approach, the optimization problem in (7) is solved by approximating w with an artificial neural network (ANN) and using a neural network optimization framework.

⁴Note that all asset prices are considered in terms of relative prices to P^e .

⁵For an efficient computational method using one-dimensional Monte Carlo simulations, see [1].

⁶In this paper, we consider a case where a trader holds the Bermudan swaption instead of selling it. Therefore, the discussion here reverses the sign of the payoff compared to the original paper [2].

3.2 Deep Hedging Approach for Bermudan Swaptions by Component Decomposition

3.2.1 Construction of Deep Hedging Model Using Decomposition Formula

The Bermudan swaption considered in this paper grants the holder the right to enter into a coterminal interest rate swap $U^{i,e,K}$ at the exercise time T_i . Replacing the underlying asset $U^{i,e,K}$ at the i -th exercise of the Bermudan swaption with $O^{i,e,K}$ does not change its economic properties. While this replacement is mathematically straightforward, rewriting the payoff of the Bermudan swaption in this form allows us to explicitly represent it as a type of exchange option between swaptions.

To construct the deep hedging model for this Bermudan swaption, we follow the known decomposition method [5]. We first decompose the Bermudan swaption B^1 into components $\{C^i | i = 1, \dots, e-1\}$ with the following definitions:

1. The right to receive $O^{e-1,e,K}$ at T_{e-1} is defined as C^{e-1} .
2. The right to receive $O^{i,e,K}$ and pay B^{i+1} (in other words, the right to receive option spread $O^{i,e,K} - B^{i+1}$) at T_i is defined as C^i for $i \in \{1, \dots, e-2\}$.

Then, we can express B^i as the sum of C^i from i to $e-1$, that is, $B^i = \sum_{u=i}^{e-1} C^u$.

In this study, we construct the hedging model for B^i in a reverse order from $i = e-1$ to $i = 1$. Assuming that the hedging model for B^{i+1} has already been constructed, we then use this model as a component of the hedging strategy model for B^i . Since $B^i = B^{i+1} + C^i$, constructing the hedging model for B^i , given the hedging model for B^{i+1} , effectively involves constructing the hedging model for C^i .

C^i is a European option that grants the right to receive $O^{i,e,K}$ and pay B^{i+1} at maturity T^i . To determine the value of B^{i+1} at T_i , we need to use the deep hedging pricing framework again. However, a straightforward approach would require market simulations based on the every state variables at T_i , which is impractical. To address this, we use an ANN to model the exercise decision.

3.2.2 Hedging Models and Early Exercise Decision Models

Building on the previous discussion, we now construct a concrete deep hedging method for the Bermudan swaption, introducing both the hedging model and the early exercise decision model. We assume that the hedging model for B^i for $t < T_i$ is defined as:

$$\mathcal{N}^{BH,i} = \mathcal{N}^{CH,i} + \mathcal{N}^{BH,i+1} \quad (10)$$

Also, the hedging model for $t \geq T_i$ is set as $\mathcal{N}^{BH,i} = \mathcal{N}^{BH,i+1}$, which is used if B^i is not exercised at $t = T_i$. Additionally, we assume $\mathcal{N}^{BH,e} = 0$. Furthermore, at $t = T_i$, we define the early exercise decision model as $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$. Here, $\mathcal{N}^{BH,i}$, $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$, and $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$ represent the ANN models for the hedging strategy for B^i , C^i , and early exercise decision, respectively.

$\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ outputs the hedge amounts for the hedge assets, which will be described in Section 3.2.5. $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$ outputs the probability of exercising at time T_i . A sigmoid activation function is applied to the output layer of $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$ to ensure values fall between 0 and 1.

The input features for the hedging model $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ include the time t and the prices of the coterminal swaps, $\{U_t^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$. Additionally, for strategies other than \mathcal{S}^I (described below), the input features include the prices of the coterminal swaptions, $\{O_t^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$. For the exercise decision model $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$, the input features consist of the prices of the coterminal swaps at T_i , $\{U_{T_i}^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$, and, for strategies other than \mathcal{S}^I , the coterminal swaptions, $\{O_{T_i}^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$.

As described earlier, during the training of the hedging model for B^i , $\mathcal{N}^{BH,i+1}$ is assumed to be available. Therefore, during the training process for B^i , the models $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ and $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$ are optimized.

3.2.3 Training Payoff for B^i

In the context of hedging for B^i , the P&L components controlled by $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ and $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$ are relevant only up to T_i . Therefore, B^i can be trained as if it were a European option with a payoff at T_i , which is calculated as the sum of the following two terms:

- $\mathcal{N}^{E,i} \cdot O^{i,e,K}$: This term represents the expected exercise value, weighted by the exercise probability.
- $(1 - \mathcal{N}^{E,i}) \cdot V^{Cont,i}$: This term represents the pathwise continuation value, weighted by the non-exercise probability.

Here, $V^{Cont,i}$ refers to the hedged P&L defined in (8) generated for $t \geq T_i$ by using each simulated path of the state variables and the hedging strategy based on $\mathcal{N}^{BH,i+1}$, with $V^{Cont,e-1} = 0$. Specifically, $V^{Cont,i}$ satisfies the following recursive equation:

$$V^{Cont,i} = \mathcal{N}^{E,i+1} \cdot O^{i+1,e,K} + (1 - \mathcal{N}^{E,i+1}) \cdot V^{Cont,i+1} + \sum_k w_k^* \cdot (I_{k+1} - I_k) \quad (11)$$

In the equation, w_k^* represents the optimized hedge amounts obtained from $\mathcal{N}^{BH,i+1}$, $\{I_k\}$ denotes the price vector of the hedge assets, and the summation over k spans the time grid $t \in [T_i, T_{i+1})$. Note that $V^{Cont,i}$ is calculated using information from only that single path.

The payoff can also be rewritten as $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}(O^{i,e,K} - V^{Cont,i}) + V^{Cont,i}$. Here, the first term corresponds to the payoff $(O^{i,e,K} - B^{i+1})^+$ of C^i , and the second term corresponds to B^{i+1} , where B^{i+1} is approximated by the single-path calculation $V^{Cont,i}$.

3.2.4 Hedging Cost

In this paper, we simplify the analysis by excluding hedging costs. However, in principle, incorporating hedging costs into this framework is feasible. Note that, while each individual hedging model is trained separately, it is essential to properly account for the netting effect of hedging costs across the components' individual models during the training process.

3.2.5 Hedging Strategies

This section describes the hedging strategies analyzed in this study. In this paper, a "hedging strategy" refers to the selection of hedge assets and the constraints on hedge amounts. The primary strategies proposed in this paper are the Option Spread Strategy \mathcal{S}^{OS} and the Trade Strike Interest Rate Swap and Swaption Hedge Strategy \mathcal{S}^{I+S} . For \mathcal{S}^{OS} , we also explore an interesting subset strategy, \mathcal{S}^{Max} . Additionally, we include $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$ and \mathcal{S}^I as reference strategies in the numerical analysis.

Option Spread Strategy \mathcal{S}^{OS} In this strategy, the hedge asset for $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ is a single asset, $G^i = O^{i,e,K} - H^{i+1}$. Here, $H^i = \sum_{u=i}^{e-1} w_u^* G^u$ represents the optimal hedging portfolio for B^i , where $H^e = 0$ and w_u^* is the optimal hedge amount to short determined through the training of $\mathcal{N}^{CH,u}$.

According to this definition, $H^i = \sum_{u=i}^{e-1} q_u^i O^{u,e,K}$, where $q_u^i = w_u^* \prod_{k=i}^{u-1} (1 - w_k^*)^7$. A key observation here is that $\sum_{u=i}^{e-1} q_u^i = 1$, meaning that H^i is a portfolio of swaptions with a total weight of 1⁸. Furthermore, by applying the constraint $0 \leq w_u^* \leq 1$, $0 \leq q_u \leq 1$ consequently holds. This constraint is enforced only after training, allowing unrestricted values for the hedge amounts during training. However, after training is complete, the amounts are clipped to ensure they fall within the range of 0 to 1.

Economic Implications of the \mathcal{S}^{OS} Hedging Strategy Constructing the hedging model for B^i , given the hedging model for B^{i+1} , essentially involves creating the hedging model for C^i , which is a European option that expires at T_i with a payoff of $(O^{i,e,K} - B^{i+1})^+$. Letting $X^i = O^{i,e,K} - B^{i+1}$, the resulting payoff $(X^i)^+$ represents a European option on the single asset X^i . Thus, we can interpret \mathcal{S}^{OS} as a form of "delta hedging" a European option on X^i by using X^i itself. Since B^{i+1} is not directly tradable, we substitute its hedging portfolio H^{i+1} for B^{i+1} in X^i , resulting in $G^i = O^{i,e,K} - H^{i+1}$ as the hedge asset.

Economic Meaning of "Delta Hedging" a European Option on X^i The option being hedged in this case is essentially an option on an option spread, or an "option on an option." This type of option has two different types of optionality: (1) the optionality of the underlying asset (an option), and (2) the optionality of the option on the underlying option. The \mathcal{S}^{OS} strategy hedges only the first type of optionality—the optionality of the underlying option—while leaving the second type unhedged.

In Bermudan swaption model analysis, this second type of optionality is often referred to as a "switch option" or "Bermudanality"[5]. Using this terminology, the \mathcal{S}^{OS} strategy can thus be described as hedging only the underlying swaption's optionality, leaving the switch option unhedged.

⁷The value of an empty product is defined as 1.

⁸Note that $w_{e-1}^* = 1$.

Rationale for Not Hedging the Switch Option Theoretically, avoiding hedging the switch option may appear sub-optimal since \mathcal{S}^{OS} is a subset of more flexible strategies like \mathcal{S}^{I+S} , discussed below. However, this choice is motivated by the goal of limiting downside risk. As previously mentioned, the \mathcal{S}^{OS} strategy resembles delta hedging a European option. A long position in delta-hedged European options typically results in a gamma-long position, thereby limiting downside risk.

Intuitive Economic Interpretation Another advantage of the \mathcal{S}^{OS} strategy is that the hedge weights produced by the trained model offer an intuitive economic interpretation. The hedging portfolio is a combination of European swaptions with positive weights that sum to 1. This allows us to view the Bermudan swaption as a weighted combination of swaptions, where the weights reflect an ‘‘exercise probability’’ under a specific probability measure. This interpretation provides a useful means of intuitively validating hedging model outputs.

Option Spread Max Strategy \mathcal{S}^{Max} We would also like to introduce the \mathcal{S}^{Max} strategy as an interesting subset of the \mathcal{S}^{OS} strategy. In other words, the \mathcal{S}^{OS} strategy can be seen as an extension of this simple approach, enhanced by deep hedging techniques.

In the \mathcal{S}^{Max} strategy, the hedge amount to short G^i is restricted to either 0 or 1, depending solely on the sign of G^i . Specifically, $w_i^* = \Theta(G^i)$, where Θ is the Heaviside function. This hedging model can be implemented analytically and no training processes.

The Bermudan hedge portfolio to short is given as $H^i = \sum_{u=i}^{e-1} q_u^i O^{u,e,K}$, where $q_u^i = 1$ for $u = \arg \max_{j \in \{i, \dots, e-1\}} O^{j,e,K}$ and otherwise 0. Essentially, this strategy shorts the swaption with the highest value at each step. It serves as a simple yet effective benchmark hedging model for comparison with more sophisticated strategies.

In this approach, we also adopt a straightforward exercise strategy: the option is exercised at time T_i only if $O^{i,e,K}$ has the highest option value in $\{O^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$. This exercise strategy can also be implemented analytically.

Trade Strike Interest Rate Swap and Swaption Hedge Strategy \mathcal{S}^{I+S} In this strategy, the hedge assets for $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ consist of a set of single-strike coterminal interest rate swaps $\{U^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$ and swaptions $\{O^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$, allowing unrestricted hedge amounts. Economically, this strategy hedges the optionals of both the underlying and the switch options.

Multiple Strikes Interest Rate Swap and Swaption Hedge Strategy $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$ In this strategy, the hedge assets for $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ consist of a set of single-strike coterminal interest rate swaps $\{U^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$ and multiple-strike coterminal swaptions $\{O^{u,e,k} | u = i, \dots, e-1, k = K_1, K_2, \dots\}$, allowing unrestricted hedge amounts. While it is possible to compute the hedge assets on the generated state space, the state space does not fully capture the dynamics of multiple-strike swaptions, specifically as it lacks the dynamics of swaption skew. Therefore, this strategy is considered only as a reference in this study, aimed at understanding the change in hedge performance when increasing the number of strikes for hedge swaptions.

Interest Rate Swap Only Hedge Strategy \mathcal{S}^I In this strategy, the hedge assets for $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ consist of a set of single-strike coterminal interest rate swaps $\{U^{u,e,K} | u = i, \dots, e-1\}$, allowing unrestricted hedge amounts. This strategy corresponds to situations where swaptions are not available for trading in the market as hedge assets. It serves as a reference to assess the effectiveness of swaption hedging.

3.2.6 Training and Daily Operation Using the Trained Model

During training, both the hedging model $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ and the exercise decision model $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$ are optimized simultaneously. To prevent over-fitting $\mathcal{N}^{CH,i}$ and $\mathcal{N}^{E,i}$ to the training paths, several common machine learning regularization techniques are applied, including dropout, stochastic batch sampling, and splitting data into distinct training and evaluation sets.

Once the model has been trained, as long as the state variables remain within the training set’s range and there are no significant changes to the model assumptions of the SMBM used for generating the training set, daily retraining of the model is not necessary. Instead, we proceed from Step 2 in Section 2.2, generating scenarios based on the current market prices of the hedge assets. This allows us to calculate hedge quantities, revise estimates of the hedged P&L distribution, and update the model indifference price.

4 Numerical Experiment

4.1 Calculation Assumptions

4.1.1 The Trade Under Consideration

The trade under consideration is a Bermudan swaption with a fixed strike rate of 2%. There are five exercise opportunities, with the first exercise occurring four years after the initial trade date $t = 0$, followed by annual exercise opportunities. Specifically, the exercise dates are at $T_i = i + 3$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. The underlying swap has a common maturity of $T_6 = T_e = 9$, and both the funding leg and the coupon leg of the swaps have an annual coupon frequency.

4.1.2 Model Parameters for the SMBM for Scenario Generation

The parameters for the SMBM scenario generation model are as follows. $S_0^{i,e,K}$, $X_0^{i,e}$, $\kappa^{i,e}$, and $\omega^{i,e}$ are constant for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ with $S_0^{i,e,K} = 0.02$, $X_0^{i,e} = 0$, $\kappa^{i,e} = 0$, and $\omega^{i,e} = 0.8403$. $\xi_0^{i,e,T}$ is assumed to be independent of T , meaning $\xi_0^{i,e,T} = \xi_0^{i,e}$, with $\xi_0^{i,e}$ values as:

$$\{\xi_0^{i,e}\}_{i=1,2,3,4,5} = [1.132e - 04, 1.228e - 04, 1.287e - 04, 1.344e - 04, 1.451e - 04] \quad (12)$$

For correlation, distinct correlation matrices were applied for each diffusion period, with the specific values provided in the Appendix.

4.1.3 Scenario Generation Simulation Parameters

The time grid interval is set to $1/32$, and both the training and test sets consist of 4096 paths.

4.1.4 Deep Hedging Training and Evaluation Setup

The neural network structure is shared between the hedging and exercise decision models, with the output layer of the exercise decision model using a sigmoid function. Each model is a fully connected network with four hidden layers, each containing 32 units. Batch normalization and dropout (with a rate of 0.5) are applied to each hidden layer. The Adam optimizer is used. The Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR) is used as the convex risk measure, defined as:

$$\text{CVaR}_\alpha(X) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int_0^{1-\alpha} \text{VaR}_\gamma(X) d\gamma \quad (13)$$

$$\text{VaR}_\gamma(X) = \inf\{m \in \mathbb{R} : P(X < -m) \leq \gamma\} \quad (14)$$

The confidence level α is set to 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, and 0.8, and the hedging strategies used include the five strategies discussed in Chapter 3: \mathcal{S}^{OS} , \mathcal{S}^{Max} , \mathcal{S}^{I+S} , \mathcal{S}^I , and $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$. For $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$, hedge swaption strikes of 0.01, 0.015, and 0.02 are used, while in all other cases, the hedge asset strikes are set to 0.02, the same as the Bermudan swaption strike. This setup yields 20 distinct models for training and evaluation.

4.2 Results

The values in this section are expressed as a ratio to the notional amount and shown in basis points.

4.2.1 Hedged P&L Distribution

Table 1 presents the evaluation metrics and related indicators for the valuation results of the 20 different settings at $t = 0$, based on the test set paths. Key columns include:

- **Model Value:** The indifferent price calculated using (9).
- **NonArb Value:** The expected value of the unhedged P&L, corresponding to the arbitrage-free price when the trained exercise decision model is used.
- **Hedge PnL Mean:** The average P&L from the hedge position.

- **Model Switch Value** and **NonArb Switch Value**: Calculated by subtracting the maximum swaption value at $t = 0$ from the **Model Value** and **NonArb Value**, representing the model value metric of the switch option in the Bermudan swaption. Here, the maximum swaption value at $t = 0$ is $O_0^{u,e,K}$ with $u = \arg \max_{j \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}} O_0^{j,e,K}$.

Table 2 provides details on the distribution of P&L drawdowns, defined as the differences between **Model Value** and the hedged P&L. Key columns include:

- **P25**, **P50**, and **P75**: The 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles of the P&L drawdown distribution.
- **IQR**: The interquartile range, calculated as the difference between P75 and P25.
- **Loss Prob**: The probability that the P&L drawdown is negative
- **Expected Loss**: The average loss when a loss occurs.
- **CVaR95** and **CVaR99**: CVaR at $\alpha = 0.95$ and $\alpha = 0.99$, providing measures of downside risk.

In the following, "the swaption hedging strategies" refers to \mathcal{S}^{OS} , \mathcal{S}^{Max} , \mathcal{S}^{I+S} , and $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$.

Key Insights from the Results

Impact of Confidence Level α on Evaluation: Across all strategies, increasing the confidence level α leads to more conservative evaluations. For the swaption hedging strategies, as α approaches 1, the Switch Value decreases toward zero. Conversely, as α decreases, the evaluation approaches an arbitrage-free valuation. Thus, in this framework, α acts as a parameter controlling the degree of recognition of the switch value of the arbitrage-free pricing.

Reduction in Downside Risk: A higher confidence level α tends to reduce downside risks, as shown by CVaR95 and CVaR99, particularly for the \mathcal{S}^{I+S} and $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$ strategies. For \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} , the increase in downside risk with a lower α is less pronounced. This demonstrates that α can be used to manage downside risk, and that \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} strategies are more effective in reducing downside risk across a wide range of α values.

Reduction in P&L Volatility: The ability of each strategy to reduce P&L volatility through hedging can be assessed using the IQR values. Strategies \mathcal{S}^{I+S} and $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$ generally perform better than \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} as expected, because \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} are subset strategies of \mathcal{S}^{I+S} and $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$. Meanwhile, the IQR for \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} significantly improves upon \mathcal{S}^I , confirming that the hedging performance for the Bermudan swaption improves substantially with the introduction of swaptions as hedge assets, even in strategies with restrictions on hedge amounts, like \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} .

Martingale Condition for Hedge Assets: The Hedge PnL Mean represents the expected P&L obtained from the hedging position and is generally a slightly positive across the swaption hedging strategies. Scenarios generated by an arbitrage-free scenario generator are used for training and evaluation alike. However, due to numerical errors in SDE discretization and the limited number of paths, ideal arbitrage-free conditions are not fully achieved in these scenarios. As a result, some distributional bias remains in the evaluations result, though its quantitative impact is minor.

Framework's Value for Risk Management: This framework enables position managers to compare loss probabilities and distributions across different model configurations, facilitating more informed decision-making based on their risk tolerance.

4.2.2 Cross-Parameter Validation of Hedging Model Resilience

In this section, we assess the robustness of the hedging model trained in the previous section by testing it on scenarios generated with modified parameter sets of the SMBM. Specifically, we create 4096-path reference scenarios where the signs of all rate-volatility correlations—namely, those between $S^{i,e}$ and $X^{j,e}$ —are reversed, and the volatility-of-volatility (vol-vol) factors $\{\omega^{i,e} | i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ are reduced to half of their original values. The values of $\{X_0^{i,e} | i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ are adjusted so that the coterminal swaption prices $\{O^{i,e,K} | i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ at $t = 0$

Table 1: Model Values and Model Risk Metrics (unit: basis points)

Strategy	α	Model Value	NonArb Value	Hedge PnL Mean	Model Switch Value	NonArb Switch Value
\mathcal{S}^I	0.2	345.2	456.2	-1.7	-51.8	59.1
	0.4	290.9	452.9	-1.2	-106.2	55.8
	0.6	245.0	452.3	-3.1	-152.0	55.2
	0.8	189.2	451.0	-1.2	-207.9	54.0
\mathcal{S}^{Max}	0.2	429.6	455.8	5.2	32.5	58.8
	0.4	415.9	455.8	5.2	18.8	58.8
	0.6	405.8	455.8	5.2	8.8	58.8
	0.8	397.8	455.8	5.2	0.7	58.8
\mathcal{S}^{OS}	0.2	434.1	456.3	4.5	37.1	59.3
	0.4	422.9	456.1	4.8	25.8	59.0
	0.6	414.7	455.6	5.4	17.6	58.6
	0.8	407.2	456.3	4.4	10.1	59.3
\mathcal{S}^{I+S}	0.2	444.1	456.5	6.3	47.0	59.5
	0.4	434.9	456.5	4.7	37.9	59.5
	0.6	420.9	456.5	3.1	23.9	59.5
	0.8	405.6	455.8	2.3	8.6	58.7
$\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$	0.2	447.2	456.7	8.7	50.1	59.6
	0.4	436.0	456.2	5.6	39.0	59.2
	0.6	420.1	456.0	2.5	23.1	59.0
	0.8	405.6	455.5	0.8	8.5	58.4

Table 2: Distribution Metrics for Initial Model Value and Realized PnL Differences (unit: basis points, excluding Loss Prob)

Strategy	α	P25	P50	P75	IQR	Loss Prob	Expected Loss	CVaR95	CVaR99
\mathcal{S}^I	0.2	-73.7	46.3	215.4	289.1	0.405	110.3	260.0	334.0
	0.4	-16.0	92.4	254.8	270.8	0.284	77.3	172.3	243.2
	0.6	32.8	138.8	301.6	268.8	0.180	61.0	123.8	184.9
	0.8	86.4	192.0	358.8	272.3	0.083	44.3	65.2	123.4
\mathcal{S}^{Max}	0.2	-20.8	5.9	52.2	73.0	0.449	21.5	32.5	32.5
	0.4	-7.1	19.6	65.9	73.0	0.320	13.5	18.8	18.8
	0.6	2.9	29.6	75.9	73.0	0.219	7.4	8.8	8.8
	0.8	11.0	37.7	84.0	73.0	0.166	0.7	0.7	0.7
\mathcal{S}^{OS}	0.2	-18.3	7.5	49.2	67.5	0.434	21.8	42.5	48.9
	0.4	-4.8	19.2	55.2	60.0	0.302	14.2	28.8	34.7
	0.6	4.5	22.4	61.3	56.7	0.187	8.5	16.1	20.9
	0.8	11.1	28.5	68.2	57.2	0.089	5.3	8.0	12.2
\mathcal{S}^{I+S}	0.2	-2.9	24.7	48.4	51.3	0.270	54.3	173.0	362.2
	0.4	4.4	21.7	43.4	39.1	0.208	28.6	77.9	155.2
	0.6	9.7	23.5	47.8	38.1	0.131	20.7	43.3	93.5
	0.8	9.7	23.0	55.7	46.1	0.074	6.9	9.8	21.0
$\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$	0.2	-3.0	24.4	48.2	51.1	0.271	53.3	173.1	355.0
	0.4	4.7	21.9	41.0	36.4	0.201	29.8	81.3	168.3
	0.6	9.1	20.8	42.8	33.7	0.135	18.6	39.4	83.8
	0.8	8.8	21.0	54.2	45.5	0.067	8.4	10.8	25.9

Table 3: Model Values and Model Risk Metrics under low vol-vol and reversed rate-vol correlation(unit: basis points)

Strategy	α	Model Value	NonArb Value	Hedge PnL Mean	Model Switch Value	NonArb Switch Value
\mathcal{S}^I	0.2	387.4	456.1	-2.2	-9.7	59.1
	0.4	344.0	455.7	-3.4	-53.0	58.7
	0.6	299.0	454.4	-1.7	-98.1	57.4
	0.8	240.8	453.9	-1.8	-156.3	56.8
\mathcal{S}^{Max}	0.2	426.5	456.9	-4.5	29.4	59.9
	0.4	413.3	456.9	-4.5	16.3	59.9
	0.6	403.8	456.9	-4.5	6.8	59.9
	0.8	397.2	456.9	-4.5	0.1	59.9
\mathcal{S}^{OS}	0.2	433.3	456.3	-2.8	36.2	59.2
	0.4	422.4	456.9	-3.6	25.4	59.9
	0.6	412.5	457.2	-4.2	15.5	60.1
	0.8	405.4	456.7	-4.1	8.4	59.7
\mathcal{S}^{I+S}	0.2	437.1	455.5	-3.2	40.0	58.5
	0.4	431.0	456.0	-2.1	34.0	59.0
	0.6	419.6	456.8	-2.4	22.6	59.8
	0.8	406.6	456.8	-1.8	9.6	59.8
$\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$	0.2	436.5	456.6	-4.9	39.4	59.5
	0.4	432.0	457.0	-3.2	34.9	59.9
	0.6	422.3	456.7	-0.9	25.2	59.6
	0.8	410.2	457.1	-0.4	13.2	60.1

align with the original scenario. All other state variables and model parameters are kept at their previously used values. Subsequently, using the model trained in the previous section, we conducted calculations using the reference scenarios only for the evaluation step.

Table 3 presents the evaluation metrics and related indicators, while Table 4 shows the information on the distribution of P&L drawdowns.

Key Insights from the Results

Valuation Result Comparison to the Original Setting: Overall, the swaption hedging strategies show little change in results, indicating that the learned model demonstrates robustness. A closer look reveals the following:

- **Model Value:** The Model Values in swaption hedging strategies remain stable, particularly in cases with high α values. Specifically, \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} yield similar values across a wide range of α , indicating strong robustness.
- **IQR:** \mathcal{S}^{I+S} and $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$ still generally outperform \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} , though the gap in performance has narrowed.
- **Downside Risk:** Represented by CVaR95 and CVaR99, downside risk decreases with \mathcal{S}^{I+S} and $\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$ as $\omega^{i,e}$ values are reduced, whereas it remains largely unchanged for \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} .

Martingale Condition for Hedge Assets: When comparing the Hedge PnL Mean between the original result and the cross-parameter validation result, the latter shows a negative sign in all test cases. Here, looking at \mathcal{S}^{OS} and \mathcal{S}^{Max} , there is little impact on the Model Value across a wide range of α , suggesting that these strategies are robust against slight deviations from arbitrage-free conditions in scenarios caused by numerical errors.

Table 4: Distribution Metrics for Initial Model Value and Realized PnL Differences under low vol-vol and reversed rate-vol correlation(unit: basis points, excluding Loss Prob)

		P25	P50	P75	IQR	Loss Prob	Expected Loss	CVaR95	CVaR99
Strategy	α								
\mathcal{S}^I	0.2	-57.0	49.5	172.8	229.8	0.377	104.7	256.6	347.9
	0.4	-8.6	88.9	202.8	211.4	0.269	78.8	184.8	272.2
	0.6	36.2	133.9	251.8	215.6	0.175	64.5	136.5	222.7
	0.8	91.5	189.9	311.7	220.2	0.081	54.0	79.0	162.7
\mathcal{S}^{Max}	0.2	-20.6	5.7	49.9	70.5	0.454	20.4	29.4	29.4
	0.4	-7.5	18.8	63.0	70.5	0.331	12.2	16.3	16.3
	0.6	2.0	28.3	72.5	70.5	0.232	6.0	6.8	6.8
	0.8	8.7	35.0	79.2	70.5	0.185	0.1	0.1	0.1
\mathcal{S}^{OS}	0.2	-11.9	8.6	36.5	48.4	0.384	20.2	42.5	47.6
	0.4	-0.9	13.6	47.8	48.7	0.270	12.4	26.2	31.0
	0.6	3.2	19.8	60.1	56.9	0.176	6.5	13.4	18.0
	0.8	8.0	25.8	67.6	59.6	0.081	4.7	6.8	11.6
\mathcal{S}^{I+S}	0.2	-7.4	20.1	44.0	51.4	0.308	40.0	120.5	193.5
	0.4	2.8	21.8	41.6	38.8	0.222	26.2	68.9	114.4
	0.6	10.0	24.6	45.7	35.7	0.135	20.6	42.3	74.3
	0.8	10.9	24.2	56.0	45.1	0.068	8.8	11.6	28.9
$\mathcal{S}^{I+S,M}$	0.2	-6.6	20.7	45.2	51.8	0.300	42.8	126.3	197.2
	0.4	3.3	20.4	38.8	35.5	0.219	25.0	65.9	111.4
	0.6	8.2	21.3	42.0	33.8	0.146	15.6	33.9	64.0
	0.8	8.3	24.4	57.7	49.4	0.069	6.2	8.4	20.4

5 Conclusion and Future Research Directions

In this paper, we demonstrate how applying the deep hedging approach to the management of Bermudan swaptions can address practical challenges, including negative P&L trends due to improper model parameters and downside risk with swaption hedging, and provides an enhanced management framework. Additionally, we propose practical solutions to challenges in applying the deep hedging approach to Bermudan swaptions, establishing a viable framework for real-world applications. This approach is expected to improve the overall position management environment for Bermudan swaptions.

As for future research directions, advancing market scenario generation models presents a promising area for further study:

1. Improving Hedging Model Performance with Realistic Market Scenarios: Increasing the realism of market scenarios to better reflect actual dynamics is essential for enhancing hedging model performance. While the SMBM demonstrates flexibility and robustness to parameter changes in our numerical examples, it remains a relatively simple parametric model. More sophisticated models could improve the accuracy and adaptability of hedging strategies.
2. Expanding the Range of Hedge assets: In this study, we limited the hedge assets to coterminal swaptions. However, extending this methodology to more complex trades, such as callable inverse floaters or callable spread options, will require a broader range of swaptions as hedge assets. Additionally, using a wider variety of swaptions could enhance hedging efficiency for Bermudan swaptions. This expansion would likely require more advanced scenario generation methods. Drift-removal techniques to eliminate statistical arbitrage, using static arbitrage-free scenario sets, could be especially beneficial for such advanced scenario generation [4].

6 Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this article are the author's own and do not reflect the view of Nomura Securities Co., Ltd. All errors are the author's responsibility.

References

- [1] Kenjiro, Oya. (2019) The swap market Bergomi model. Risk magazine, December.
- [2] Buehler, H., Gonon, L., Teichmann, J., & Wood, B. (2019). Deep hedging. Quantitative Finance, 19(8), 1271-1291.
- [3] Chen, J., Fu, Y., Hull, J. C., Poulos, Z., Wang, Z., & Yuan, J. (2023). Hedging Barrier Options Using Reinforcement Learning. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4566384> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4566384>
- [4] Buehler, H., Murray, P., Pakkanen, M. S., & Wood, B. (2022). Deep hedging: learning to remove the drift. Risk.net, March.
- [5] Andersen, L.B.G. & Piterbarg, V.V. (2010) Interest Rate Modeling. Atlantic Financial Press.
- [6] Becker, S., Cheridito, P., & Jentzen, A. (2020). Pricing and hedging American-style options with deep learning. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 13(7), 158.

Appendix: Local Correlation Matrices

Correlation Matrix for $0 \leq t < 4$

	$S^{1,e}$	$S^{2,e}$	$S^{3,e}$	$S^{4,e}$	$S^{5,e}$	$X^{1,e}$	$X^{2,e}$	$X^{3,e}$	$X^{4,e}$	$X^{5,e}$
$S^{1,e}$	1.000	0.992	0.964	0.923	0.878	-0.114	-0.074	-0.014	0.005	0.017
$S^{2,e}$	0.992	1.000	0.986	0.952	0.910	-0.101	-0.062	-0.001	0.021	0.035
$S^{3,e}$	0.964	0.986	1.000	0.986	0.957	-0.083	-0.049	0.012	0.038	0.053
$S^{4,e}$	0.923	0.952	0.986	1.000	0.991	-0.073	-0.040	0.020	0.049	0.067
$S^{5,e}$	0.878	0.910	0.957	0.991	1.000	-0.068	-0.035	0.023	0.056	0.077
$X^{1,e}$	-0.114	-0.101	-0.083	-0.073	-0.068	1.000	0.987	0.954	0.912	0.862
$X^{2,e}$	-0.074	-0.062	-0.049	-0.040	-0.035	0.987	1.000	0.986	0.951	0.907
$X^{3,e}$	-0.014	-0.001	0.012	0.020	0.023	0.954	0.986	1.000	0.983	0.949
$X^{4,e}$	0.005	0.021	0.038	0.049	0.056	0.912	0.951	0.983	1.000	0.988
$X^{5,e}$	0.017	0.035	0.053	0.067	0.077	0.862	0.907	0.949	0.988	1.000

Correlation Matrix for $4 \leq t < 5$

	$S^{2,e}$	$S^{3,e}$	$S^{4,e}$	$S^{5,e}$	$X^{2,e}$	$X^{3,e}$	$X^{4,e}$	$X^{5,e}$
$S^{2,e}$	1.000	0.990	0.956	0.910	-0.147	-0.105	-0.033	-0.017
$S^{3,e}$	0.990	1.000	0.983	0.943	-0.134	-0.094	-0.021	-0.002
$S^{4,e}$	0.956	0.983	1.000	0.982	-0.115	-0.080	-0.007	0.016
$S^{5,e}$	0.910	0.943	0.982	1.000	-0.106	-0.073	-0.002	0.026
$X^{2,e}$	-0.147	-0.134	-0.115	-0.106	1.000	0.982	0.938	0.891
$X^{3,e}$	-0.105	-0.094	-0.080	-0.073	0.982	1.000	0.981	0.939
$X^{4,e}$	-0.033	-0.021	-0.007	-0.002	0.938	0.981	1.000	0.977
$X^{5,e}$	-0.017	-0.002	0.016	0.026	0.891	0.939	0.977	1.000

Correlation Matrix for $5 \leq t < 6$

	$S^{3,e}$	$S^{4,e}$	$S^{5,e}$	$X^{3,e}$	$X^{4,e}$	$X^{5,e}$
$S^{3,e}$	1.000	0.985	0.939	-0.187	-0.144	-0.050
$S^{4,e}$	0.985	1.000	0.975	-0.174	-0.134	-0.038
$S^{5,e}$	0.939	0.975	1.000	-0.150	-0.121	-0.027
$X^{3,e}$	-0.187	-0.174	-0.150	1.000	0.973	0.902
$X^{4,e}$	-0.144	-0.134	-0.121	0.973	1.000	0.966
$X^{5,e}$	-0.050	-0.038	-0.027	0.902	0.966	1.000

Correlation Matrix for $6 \leq t < 7$

	$S^{4,e}$	$S^{5,e}$	$X^{4,e}$	$X^{5,e}$
$S^{4,e}$	1.000	0.974	-0.250	-0.221
$S^{5,e}$	0.974	1.000	-0.240	-0.215
$X^{4,e}$	-0.250	-0.240	1.000	0.956
$X^{5,e}$	-0.221	-0.215	0.956	1.000

Correlation Matrix for $7 \leq t < 8$

	$S^{5,e}$	$X^{5,e}$
$S^{5,e}$	1.000	-0.259
$X^{5,e}$	-0.259	1.000