

Mean-Reverting SABR Models: Closed-form Implied Volatilities and Application to Stock Indices

Vlad Perederiy*

December 2024, revised February 2025

Abstract

In this paper, we consider three stochastic-volatility models, each characterized by distinct dynamics of the instantaneous volatility: (1) a CIR process for squared volatility (i.e., the classical Heston model); (2) a mean-reverting lognormal process for volatility; and (3) a CIR process for volatility. Previous research has provided semi-analytical approximations for these models in the form of simple (non-mean-reverting) SABR models, each suitably parameterized for a given expiry.

First, using symbolic integration packages, we derive closed-form expressions for these semi-analytical approximations, under the assumption that all parameters remain constant (but without the constraint of constant expected volatility). Although the resulting formulae are considerably lengthier than those in simpler SABR models, they remain tractable and are easily implementable even in Excel.

Second, employing these closed-form expressions, we calibrate the three models to empirical volatility surfaces observed in EuroStoxx index options. The calibration is well-behaved and achieves excellent fits for the observed equity-volatility surfaces with only five parameters per surface. Consequently, these approximate models offer a simpler, faster, and (numerically) more reliable alternative to the classical Heston model or to more advanced models, which lack closed-form solutions and can be numerically challenging, particularly in less sophisticated implementation settings.

Third, we examine the stability and correlations of our parameter estimates. In this analysis, we identify certain issues with the models — one of which appears to stem from the sub-lognormal behavior of the actual equity-volatility process. Notably, the CIR-volatility model (3), as opposed to the CIR-variance Heston model (1), seems to best capture this behavior, and also results in more stable parameters.

Keywords: Volatility Smiles, Volatility Surfaces, Stochastic Volatility, Mean Reversion, SABR, Heston, Implied Volatilities, Closed-Form Approximation, Equity Options, Index Options

JEL Classification: C01, C02, C13, C52, C53, C58, G12, G13

* Perederiy Consulting (founder and senior consultant), PhD (Frankfurt/Oder University), FRM (GARP)
research@perederiy-consulting.de

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the inspirational advice from *Patrick Hagan* (Gorilla Science, XBTO), *Jan-Philipp Hoffmann* (Darmstadt University of Applied Sciences), *Joerg Kienitz* (University of Wuppertal) and *Mirko Bono* (DJE Investment).

Contents

1. Introduction: stylized facts for equity volatilities	3
2. Heston model	5
3. Standard SABR model	7
4. Heston-SABR and its semi-analytical solution (hSABR)	9
5. Mean-reverting SABR and its semi-analytical solution (mrSABR).....	11
6. Mean-reverting ZABR and its semi-analytical solution (mrZABR)	13
7. Closed-form solutions: special case of constant expected volatility	15
8. Derivation of closed-form solutions without restrictions	16
9. Calibration to equity volatility surfaces	19
10. Conclusions and areas of application.....	24
11. References	25
Appendix A: Closed-form expressions for <i>hSABR</i>	26
Appendix B: Closed-form expressions for <i>mrSABR</i>	27
Appendix C: Closed-form expressions for <i>CIR-ZABR</i>	28

1. Introduction: stylized facts for equity volatilities

Stock and index returns exhibit a high degree of volatility clustering and mean reversion. Another typical feature is the strong negative correlation between returns and changes in volatility (especially for index options). To illustrate these characteristics, Figure 1 below shows the dynamics of the EuroStoxx index, along with short-term and mid-term implied volatilities of the index options.




Figure 1: Dynamics of EuroStoxx50 Index and its implied volatilities

These features are also reflected in equity derivatives, particularly in implied volatility surfaces. First, implied volatilities often exhibit a pronounced term structure: during periods of high volatility, shorter-term at-the-money (ATM) options typically show implied volatilities that are considerably higher than those of longer-term options (and vice versa). Second, because of the negative correlation, volatility smiles are generally skewed around the forward, resulting in so-called “volatility smirks.” Third, due to the mean reversion, the volatility smiles tend to flatten quickly for longer-term options.

Besides these features, typical trading and exchange standards mean that the relevant market quotes (option prices and/or implied volatilities) are directly observable only for a few strikes and maturities, with the availability and liquidity of the instruments varying over time. This makes the interpolation and extrapolation of observed market quotes—and their aggregation into volatility surfaces (across moneyness and expiry)—a critically important task in many applications, such as market risk management and the valuation of complex derivatives.

Given these characteristics, simple interpolation/extrapolation methods (e.g., parabola fitting of implied volatilities against strike) are less suitable for equities than for, say, FX markets, where such approaches often suffice. Advanced fitting techniques—such as additional parametrization and strike/moneyness normalization (see, e.g., *Klassen, 2016*)—have been proposed. However, the resulting parameters tend to become increasingly mechanical (lacking clear economic interpretation) and still may not perform well in all situations. Figure 2 demonstrates this challenge by depicting the volatility smiles for a rarely observed scenario of a nearly flat term structure of volatility. Even after moneyness normalization, the shape of the volatility smiles clearly differs across maturities.




Figure 2: Volatility smiles for EuroStoxx Index Options, an observation from August 2023 with nearly equal ATM volatilities for different expiries

Consequently, the industry standard for equities is typically to employ an underlying stochastic-volatility model that fits the observed implied volatilities for available strikes and maturities and predicts those for unobserved ones. The Heston model (*Heston, 1993*) has long been the model of choice, as it captures the key characteristics of equity markets. More advanced models, such as local-stochastic volatility (LSV) models, have also been introduced.

A common drawback of these models is the lack of closed-form solutions. This necessitates advanced numerical methods for calibrating their parameters to empirical volatility surfaces, thereby limiting their use in many settings. In contrast, this paper discusses the application of recently developed mean-reverting SABR-based models, which capture the major characteristics of equity markets while still offering closed-form solutions.

2. Heston model

The Heston model can be specified as the following SDE system:

$$\begin{aligned}
 dF &= F \sqrt{V} dW_1 \\
 dV &= \lambda (\theta^2 - V) + \sqrt{V} v dW_2 \\
 f &\equiv F_0 \\
 \alpha &\equiv \sqrt{V_0} \\
 dW_1 dW_2 &= \rho dt
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with following five parameters:

θ^2 : average/equilibrium variance (with $\theta \geq 0$ being the corresponding volatility)

α^2 : initial instantaneous variance (with $\alpha \geq 0$ being the corresponding volatility)

λ : speed of mean-reversion of variance, $\lambda \geq 0$

v : CIR volatility of variance, $v \geq 0$

ρ : correlation between the forward-price and variance processes, $-1 < \rho < 1$

Compared to the original *Heston (1993)* specification, we changed in (1) the parameter notations to those typically used in SABR models (which we discuss later), to make the models better comparable. With the same purpose in mind, we draw on a zero-drift forward process F instead of the (drifted) spot process in the original Heston model¹. Finally, we exclude the original Heston risk-premium parameter, as it is dispensable in the context of the market-implied measures

Note that that the Heston model models the variance V which follows a CIR process as specified in (1). The process for the volatility $A = \sqrt{V}$ in Heston is, upon applying the Ito's lemma:

$$dA = \left(\frac{0.5 \lambda \theta^2 - 0.125 v^2}{A} - 0.5 \lambda A \right) dt + \frac{1}{2} v dW_2 \tag{2}$$

¹ In the equity context, this requires the derivation of forward prices for stocks/indices, which are, typically, not directly observable on the equity markets. However, the forwards can be easily inferred from spot prices using assumptions for dividends (where applicable) and interest rates. Quite often, the forwards can also be extracted from prices of several call and put pairs, using the call-put parity.

which is a variant of *Ornstein-Uhlenbeck* process, with normal diffusion and a non-linear mean-reverting drift term².

For the above SDE framework (1), *Heston (1993)*, using the techniques of characteristic functions and Fourier transforms, derived the seminal solution in terms of option prices. The solution is exact but semi-analytical, requiring numerical integration. Unfortunately, due to peculiarities, this often leads to numerical issues³, and in some cases even results in negative values for option prices.

That makes the Heston model and its solution less reliable and less suitable for simple environments, such as in Excel, or in unsupervised settings, such as in Monte-Carlo simulations, even for calculating option prices from its five parameters given. The issues aggravate where the parameters are unknown and have yet to be calibrated to best fit some market data (such as a volatility surface).

Apart from the problematic numerical estimation, another issue with the Heston model is the so-called Feller condition:

$$2 \lambda \theta^2 > \nu^2 \tag{3}$$

If (3) is violated, the variance process in (1) might, in theory, degenerate. However, market fits often do not satisfy this condition. This makes extrapolations of volatility surfaces (across expiry or across strikes) using a Heston-fit model quite risky, as that can possibly result in implausible degenerative implied volatilities for the regions (strikes and expiries) situated far from the data points used for the surface calibration.

Finally, as already mentioned, the Heston (1993) solution is the form of option prices. When calibrating to surfaces, these prices have yet to be converted to Black-implied volatilities, resulting in additional computational expense and sometimes also in additional numerical-precision issues.

² Also note that the equilibrium volatility A_{eq} in Heston is calculated as follows: $A_{eq} = \sqrt{\theta^2 - 0.25 \nu^2 / \lambda}$.

³ The integrals involved are over oscillating functions using logarithms of complex numbers, and are subject to branching/discontinuity issues. See *Cui et al. (2017)* for details and possible remedies.

3. Standard SABR model

The standard SABR model draws on the following SDE system:

$$\begin{aligned}
 dF &= F^\beta A dW_1 \\
 dA &= A v dW_2 \\
 f &\equiv F_0 \\
 \alpha &\equiv A_0 \\
 dW_1 dW_2 &= \rho dt
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with the parameters as follows:

β : so-called backbone parameter, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$

α : initial instantaneous volatility, $\alpha \geq 0$

v : lognormal volatility of volatility, $v \geq 0$

ρ : correlation between the forward-price and volatility processes, $-1 < \rho < 1$

f signifies the initial forward price and is normally not considered a parameter (as it is either directly observable on the market or can be derived from an observed spot price). Also, the backbone parameter β is normally set beforehand, using market standards/beliefs, effectively making the standard SABR a model with **three-parameters** α, v, ρ .

Using perturbation techniques, *Hagan et al. (2002)* derived a simple approximative closed-form solution for option pricing given the SDE system (4). The solution is specified in terms of implied volatilities of a European option, either Bachelier (normal) or Black (lognormal) ones. In particular, for Black implied volatilities σ_B (which is the current standard for equity market quotations), we have the following approximation:

$$\sigma_B = \frac{z}{x(z)} \frac{\alpha}{f_{av}^{1-\beta}} \frac{1 + \left(\frac{(1-\beta)^2}{24} \frac{\alpha^2}{f_{av}^{2-2\beta}} + \frac{\beta}{4} \rho v \frac{\alpha}{f_{av}^{1-\beta}} + \frac{2-3\rho^2}{24} v^2 \right) T_{ex}}{1 + \frac{(1-\beta)^2}{24} \log^2 \frac{f}{K} + \frac{(1-\beta)^4}{1920} \log^4 \frac{f}{K}} \tag{5}$$

with:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_{av} &= \sqrt{fK} \\
 z &= \frac{v}{\alpha} f_{av}^{1-\beta} \log \frac{f}{K}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$x(z) = \log\left(\frac{\sqrt{1 - 2\rho z + z^2} + z - \rho}{1 - \rho}\right)$$

where K signifies the strike of the option and T_{ex} its expiry (maturity).

In the special case $K = f$ (forward-ATM options) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{z}{x(z)} &\rightarrow 1 \\ \sigma_{B,ATM} &= \frac{\alpha \left\{ 1 + \left(\frac{(1-\beta)^2}{24} \frac{\alpha^2}{f^{2-2\beta}} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{\rho\beta v\alpha}{f^{1-\beta}} + \frac{2-3\rho^2}{24} v^2 \right) T_{ex} \right\}}{f^{1-\beta}} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The above original *Hagan et al. (2002)* approximations are probably still most widely used, due to their simplicity. Several other closed-form variants, with improved approximative precision, have been proposed later. All of them remain of the same order $O(2)$, however. For an example, see e.g. *Hagan et al. (2016)*.

For equities, the special case of so-called lognormal-SABR with $\beta = 1$ is the most natural, as it corresponds to the widely accepted assumption of (approximative) lognormality in asset prices. In this case, the implied Black volatilities in (5) and (6) conveniently reduce to:

$$\sigma_B = \frac{z}{x(z)} \alpha \left\{ 1 + \left(\frac{1}{4} \rho v \alpha + \frac{2-3\rho^2}{24} v^2 \right) T_{ex} \right\} \quad (7)$$

with:

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{v}{\alpha} \log \frac{f}{K} \\ x(z) &= \log\left(\frac{\sqrt{1 - 2\rho z + z^2} + z - \rho}{1 - \rho}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and $\frac{z}{x(z)} \equiv 1$ for ATM options (where $K = f$).

As stated in *Hagan et al. (2002)*, (7) actually happens to provide a more exact $O(4)$ approximation for the special case of lognormal-SABR model.

In principle, the standard SABR model (4), with $\beta = 1$ and approximative closed-form solution such as in (7), can be easily calibrated to a given equity volatility smile of a certain maturity. In particular, the negative correlation will be adequately captured by the ρ coefficient.

However, a SABR calibration to a whole equity volatility surface (across the additional expiry dimension) would be highly problematic, as the term structure and mean-reverting in volatility are not captured in the standard SABR model. This leads to the situation where the standard SABR model, despite its concise closed-form solution and its huge popularity in certain other markets (in particular, IR), is rarely used by equity practitioners.

In principle, the standard-SABR can still be applied for equity surface calibration, if separately estimated for different maturities. This would typically lead to highly maturity-dependent parameter estimates in (4), in particular:

- ν would generally strongly diminish with increasing maturity/expiry, due to the model assuming unrestricted diffusion of volatility, whereas, for equities, there is strong evidence for the quite rapid mean reversion of volatility (as shown above)
- α would generally differ considerably across expiries, also reflecting the mean reversion

The separately estimated standard-SABR models could then be combined into surfaces using some additional heuristic techniques, such as interpolating parameter estimates across expiries. However, a more consistent model, which would explicitly account for the mean reversion in volatility, should clearly be the preferred solution for equities.

4. Heston-SABR and its semi-analytical solution (hSABR)

Given the computational challenges with the exact solution of the Heston model as depicted above, its simpler closed-form approximations will be preferable in many settings.

Hagan et al. (2018) considered the classical Heston model (1) with its five parameters as given, and derived an approximation using advanced techniques of effective forward equations in combination with singular perturbation and effective media theory. The approximation in the form of a standard SABR model (4) with suitable three parameters which depend on the five Heston parameters and on the expiry T_{ex} . Given these standard-SABR parameters, the already mentioned closed-form approximations (7) can be used to infer the implied Black volatilities.

The derivation in *Hagan et al. (2018)* is a multi-step procedure resulting in a semi-analytical solution through nested integrals. We re-iterate and somewhat simplify this solution (which we call *hSABR*) below.

Starting point is the function $V(T)$ of the expected value for the variance at a future time point T , which can be obtained from (1) as follows:

$$V(T) = E(V(T) | V_0 = \alpha^2) = \alpha^2 e^{-\lambda T} + \theta^2 (1 - e^{-\lambda T}) \quad (8)$$

Then, the intermediate integrals are defined as follows:

$$I_2(T) = \rho v \int_0^T V(T_1) \int_{T_1}^T e^{-\lambda(T_2 - T_1)} dT_2 dT_1 \quad (9)$$

$$I_4(T) = \rho^2 v^2 \int_0^T V(T_1) e^{-\lambda(T - T_1)} dT_1$$

$$D(T) = \int_T^{T_{ex}} e^{-\lambda(T_1 - T)} dT_2 dT_1$$

Note that we used in (9) the original numbering/denominations for integrals from *Hagan et al (2018)* but skipped some intermediate integrals not used in the final results. Also, we simplified the integrals by making the parameters constant (as in the original Heston model), thus refraining from their generalizations to time-dependent functions as in *Hagan et al. (2018)*⁴.

The next step in *Hagan et al (2018)* is the calculation of the three so-called **effective coefficients** which are defined as follows for an option's expiry T_{ex} :

$$\tau_{ex} = \int_{T_1}^{T_{ex}} V(T_1) dT_1 \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{b} = \frac{I_2(T_{ex})}{\tau_{ex}^2}$$

$$\bar{c} = \frac{3}{4 \tau_{ex}^3} v^2 \int_0^{T_{ex}} 2V(T) D^2(T) dT + \frac{3}{\tau_{ex}^3} v^2 \int_0^{T_{ex}} I_4(T) dT - 3\bar{b}^2$$

Finally, the three standard SABR coefficients are calculated as follows from the three effective coefficients:

$$\alpha_{std} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{ex}}{T_{ex}}} e^{-\frac{\bar{c}}{4} \tau_{ex}} \quad (11)$$

⁴ Also, we omitted the σ parameter from *Hagan et al. (2018)* (which is redundant in the case of constant parameters).

$$\rho_{std} = \frac{\bar{b}}{\sqrt{\bar{c}}}$$

$$v_{std} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{ex}}{T_{ex}} \bar{c}}$$

Summarizing, *Hagan et al (2018)* showed that the standard SABR model (4) with the three parameter α , ρ and v calculated as in (11) approximates well, to the order $O(2)$, the original five-parameter *Heston* model (1) for a given expiry T_{ex} . This latter dependency on the expiry T_{ex} accounts for the mean-reverting volatility in the Heston model.

5. Mean-reverting SABR and its semi-analytical solution (mrSABR)

The mean-reverting SABR model as in *Hagan et al (2020)* is no more based directly on the Heston model. Instead, it adds a mean-reverting term directly to the standard SABR model (4), with the SDEs now becoming:

$$\begin{aligned} dF &= F^\beta A dW_1 & (12) \\ dA &= \lambda (\theta - A) + A v dW_2 \\ f &\equiv F_0 \\ \alpha &\equiv A_0 \\ dW_1 dW_2 &= \rho dt \end{aligned}$$

with following five parameters:

θ : average/equilibrium volatility, $\theta \geq 0$

α : initial instantaneous volatility, $\alpha \geq 0$

λ : speed of mean-reversion of volatility, $\lambda \geq 0$

v : lognormal volatility of volatility, $v \geq 0$

ρ : correlation between the forward-price and volatility processes, $-1 < \rho < 1$

and the backbone parameter β (which can be set to 1 for equities, as argued above).

Note the similarity (but not identity) of (12) to the classical Heston model (1). Most importantly, as can be seen from (2), the diffusion process for volatility is nearly mean-reverting normal under Heston, whereas it is mean-reverting lognormal in (12). Thus, even from the theoretical point of view, we can expect some differences in the behavior of the two models.

Besides, the volatility process can be shown to remain non-degenerating for **(12)** if the following condition is satisfied:

$$\lambda > \frac{1}{2}v^2 \quad (13)$$

Note the difference to the Feller condition **(3)** in Heston.

Proceeding analogously to *hSABR* (see section 4), *Hagan et al. (2020)* derive a semi-analytical $O(2)$ approximation (which we call *mrSABR*) for the specification **(12)** in terms of a standard three-parameter SABR model. We re-iterate this solution below.

The starting point is the function $\alpha(T)$ of expected value of future volatility at a time point T :

$$\alpha(T) = E(A(T) | A_0 = \alpha) = \alpha e^{-\lambda T} + \theta (1 - e^{-\lambda T}) = \theta + (\alpha - \theta) e^{-\lambda T} \quad (14)$$

Then, the five intermediate integral functions $I_1(T)$ - $I_5(T)$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(T) &= \rho v \int_0^T \alpha^2(T_1) e^{-\lambda(T-T_1)} dT_1 \\ I_2(T) &= v^2 \int_0^T \alpha^2(T_1) e^{-\lambda(T-T_1)} \int_{T_1}^T \alpha(T_2) e^{-\lambda(T_2-T_1)} dT_2 dT_1 \\ I_3(T) &= \rho v \int_0^T \alpha^2(T_1) \int_{T_1}^T \alpha(T_2) e^{-\lambda(T_2-T_1)} dT_2 dT_1 \\ I_4(T) &= \rho^2 v^2 \int_0^T \alpha^2(T_1) e^{-\lambda(T-T_1)} \int_{T_1}^T \alpha(T_2) dT_2 dT_1 \\ I_5(T) &= v^2 \int_0^T \alpha^2(T_1) e^{-2\lambda(T-T_1)} dT_1 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Again, when specifying **(15)** we made some simplifications compared to the original *Hagan et al. (2020)* paper (see section 4). Analogous to *hSABR*, the next step in the *mrSABR* approach is calculating the effective coefficients for the option's expiry T_{ex} :

$$\tau_{ex} = \int_0^{T_{ex}} \alpha^2(T) dT \quad (16)$$

$$\bar{b} = \frac{2}{\tau_{ex}^2} I_3(T_{ex})$$

$$\bar{c} = \frac{3}{\tau_{ex}^3} \int_0^{T_{ex}} 2\alpha(T) I_2(T) + I_1^2(T) + 4\alpha(T) I_4(T) dT - 3\bar{b}^2$$

$$G_{int} = \int_0^{T_{ex}} I_5(T) dT$$

Finally, the three so-called standard SABR coefficients are calculated from the four effective coefficients:

$$\alpha_{std} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{ex}}{T_{ex}}} e^{-\frac{\bar{c}}{4}\tau_{ex} + \frac{G_{int}}{2\tau_{ex}}} \quad (17)$$

$$\rho_{std} = \frac{\bar{b}}{\sqrt{\bar{c}}}$$

$$v_{std} = \sqrt{\frac{\tau_{ex}}{T_{ex}} \bar{c}}$$

Again, *Hagan et al. (2020)* showed that the standard SABR model (4) with the three parameter α , ρ and v calculated as in (17) approximates well, to the order $O(2)$, the five-parameter model specified by (12), for a given expiry T_{ex} .

Intuitively, despite formally the same approximating order $O(2)$, the goodness of the *mrSABR* approximation might be better than in the case of *hSABR*, as the approximating standard-SABR model (4) seems somewhat closer to the target mean-reverting SABR model (12) than to the target Heston model (1).

6. Mean-reverting ZABR and its semi-analytical solution (mrZABR)

Felpel et al (2020) investigated the model with a generalization of the diffusion process of volatility:

$$dF = F^\beta A dW_1 \quad (18)$$

$$dA = \lambda (\theta - A) + v(A) dW_2$$

$$f \equiv F_0$$

$$\alpha \equiv A_0$$

$$dW_1 dW_2 = \rho dt$$

for some function $v(A)$. *Felpel et al (2020)* provided the derivation of a semi-analytical solution analogous to *mrSABR*. We first reiterate this solution, focusing on its differences to *mrSABR*.

First, with an additionally defined function $\psi(A) = v(A) A$ and the expected volatility function $\alpha(T)$ remaining as in **(14)**, the intermediate integrals are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(T) &= \rho \int_0^T \psi(\alpha(T_1)) e^{-\lambda(T-T_1)} dT_1 \\ I_2(T) &= 2 \int_0^T v^2(\alpha(T_1)) e^{-2\lambda(T-T_1)} \int_{T_1}^T \alpha(T_2) e^{\lambda(T-T_2)} dT_2 dT_1 \\ I_3(T) &= \rho \int_0^T \psi(\alpha(T_1)) e^{-\lambda(T-T_1)} \int_{T_1}^T \alpha(T_2) e^{\lambda(T-T_2)} dT_2 dT_1 \\ I_4(T) &= \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 \int_0^T \psi(\alpha(T_1)) e^{-\lambda(T-T_1)} \int_{T_1}^T \psi'(\alpha(T_2)) dT_2 dT_1 \\ I_5(T) &= \int_0^T v^2(\alpha(T_1)) e^{-2\lambda(T-T_1)} dT_1 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Note that, in order to simplify the notations, we slightly redefined ψ compared to *Felpel et al (2020)* and also multiplied the integrals $I_2(T)$ and $I_4(T)$ by a factor of $1/2$.

Now, the effective coefficients and the standard SABR coefficients can then be calculated analogously to *mrSABR* as in **(16)** and **(17)**. *Felpel et al (2020)* showed that the resulting standard SABR model approximates well, to the order $O(2)$, the model specified by **(18)** for a given expiry T_{ex} .

The so-called mean-reverting ZABR model (*mrZABR*) is a special case of the above model with

$$\begin{aligned} v(A) &= \nu A^\gamma \\ \psi(A) &= \nu A^{\gamma+1} \\ \psi'(A) &= (\gamma + 1) \nu A^\gamma \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Here, the volatility follows a mean-reverting CEV process. Note the identity of volatility diffusion to *mrSABR* in (12) if $\gamma = 1$. Not surprisingly, for $\gamma = 1$ the integrals in (19) can be shown to be equivalent to the *mrSABR* integrals (15), and the model reduces to *mrSABR*. Note also the similarity to the Heston diffusion in (2) if $\gamma = 0$. For $\gamma = 0.5$, a CIR process is assumed for the volatility (unlike for variance as in Heston), with the Feller condition now:

$$2 \lambda \theta > \nu^2 \quad (21)$$

7. Closed-form solutions: special case of constant expected volatility

Apart from the semi-analytical solutions in terms of nested integrals, as in (9)-(10) for *hSABR* and (15)-(16) for *mrSABR*, *Hagan et al (2018)* and *Hagan et al (2020)* derive explicit closed-form formulae for all-constant parameters with the additional restriction $\alpha = \theta = \sigma$, i.e. with both the initial instantaneous volatility and the long-term volatility equal to some common value σ . In this special case, the expected variance $V(T)$ in (8) in *hSABR* reduces to σ^2 , and the expected volatility $\alpha(T)$ in (14) in *mrSABR* reduces to σ , for all future time points T . This considerably simplifies the integrals mentioned.

The resulting closed-form expressions for the effective coefficients in (9), in this special case, reduce then for *hSABR* to⁵:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{ex} &= \sigma^2 T_{ex} \quad (22) \\ \bar{b} &= \frac{\rho \nu}{\sigma^2} \frac{\lambda T_{ex} - 1 + e^{-\lambda T_{ex}}}{\lambda^2 T_{ex}^2} \\ \bar{c} &= \frac{3\nu^2}{\sigma^4} \frac{1 + 2\lambda T_{ex} - (2 - e^{-\lambda T_{ex}})^2}{8 \lambda^3 T_{ex}^3} + 3 \frac{\rho^2 \nu^2}{\sigma^4} \frac{\lambda^2 T_{ex}^2 e^{-\lambda T_{ex}} - (1 - e^{-\lambda T_{ex}})^2}{\lambda^4 T_{ex}^4} \end{aligned}$$

For *mrSABR*, the corresponding effective coefficients in (16) are, in the special case:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{ex} &= \sigma^2 T_{ex} \quad (23) \\ \bar{b} &= \frac{2\rho \nu}{\sigma} \frac{\lambda T_{ex} - 1 + e^{-\lambda T_{ex}}}{\lambda^2 T_{ex}^2} \end{aligned}$$

⁵ Please note that the corresponding formula in *Hagan et al (2018)* differs in the power of σ . This is due to a different usage of the parameter σ in *Hagan et al (2018)* where it is defined as a scaling coefficient σ in the forward process $F = \sigma F \sqrt{V} dW_1$, with the $\alpha = \theta$ restriction being then implemented there via $\alpha = \theta = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{c} &= \frac{3v^2}{\sigma^2} (1 + \rho^2) \frac{1 + 2\lambda T_{ex} - (2 - e^{-\lambda T_{ex}})^2}{2 \lambda^3 T_{ex}^3} \\ &\quad + 12 \frac{\rho^2 v^2}{\sigma^2} \frac{\lambda^2 T_{ex}^2 e^{-\lambda T_{ex}} - (1 - e^{-\lambda T_{ex}})^2}{\lambda^4 T_{ex}^4} \\ G_{int} &= \frac{v^2 \sigma^2 (2\lambda T_{ex} - 1 + e^{-2\lambda T_{ex}})}{4 \lambda^2}\end{aligned}$$

The standardized SABR coefficients can then be calculated, as before, via the simple logic in (11) and (17).

Felpel et al (2020) also derived the corresponding effective coefficients for the *mrZABR* model in the special case $\alpha = \theta = \sigma$ as⁶:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{b} &= 2\rho v \sigma^{\gamma-2} \frac{\lambda T_{ex} - 1 + e^{-\lambda T_{ex}}}{\lambda^2 T_{ex}^2} \tag{24} \\ \bar{c} &= \frac{3(1 + \rho^2)v^2 \sigma^{2(\gamma-1)-2}}{2 \lambda^3 T_{ex}^3} (2\lambda T_{ex} + 4e^{-\lambda T_{ex}} - 3 - e^{-2\lambda T_{ex}}) \\ &\quad + 6 \frac{(1 + \gamma)\rho^2 v^2 \sigma^{2(\gamma-1)-2}}{\lambda^3 T_{ex}^3} (\lambda T_{ex} + 2e^{-\lambda T_{ex}} - 2 + \lambda T_{ex} e^{-\lambda T_{ex}}) \\ &\quad - 12\rho^2 v^2 \sigma^{2(\gamma-1)-2} \left(\frac{\lambda T_{ex} - 1 + e^{-\lambda T_{ex}}}{\lambda^4 T_{ex}^4} \right)^2\end{aligned}$$

As expected, the expressions (24) reduce to (23) for $\gamma = 1$.

8. Derivation of closed-form solutions without restrictions

Although useful as a simplification, the restriction $\alpha = \theta$ the previous research makes the model less suitable for the calibration to surfaces in equity markets, because of the market specifics mentioned above. We now return to the semi-analytical solutions as in the sections 4, 5 and 6 above, **refrain from the restriction $\alpha = \theta$** and show below that the solutions can still be reduced to closed-form expressions.

⁶ Note that the definition of \bar{b} and \bar{c} slightly differs in *Felpel et al (2020)* compared to the *mrSABR* notations which we follow. In the particular case of constant expected volatility, we had to divide the expressions in *Felpel et al (2020)* by a factor of σ for \bar{b} by a factor of σ^2 for \bar{c} . Also note that we corrected a typo (missing exponent of 2) in *Felpel et al (2020)*.

At the first sight, the derivation of analytical expressions for the effective coefficients τ_{ex} , \bar{b} , \bar{c} as in (10) (in the case of *hSABR*) and τ_{ex} , G_{int} , \bar{b} , \bar{c} as in (16) (in the case of *mrSABR*) from the original parameters $(\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \rho, \nu)$, via all the further nested integrals (9) and (15) respectively, looks very challenging, and, especially in the case of \bar{c} for *mrSABR*, even barely possible.

However, all of them do result in closed-form expressions without any further approximations. The derivation itself is quite straightforward, via common integration rules, but very tedious. Especially in the case of \bar{c} for *mrSABR*, the derivation is barely doable without computer assistance. We resorted to the **automatic symbolic integration** routines (using python *sympy* module) and obtained the results as follows. Each of the effective coefficients τ_{ex} , G_{int} , \bar{b} , \bar{c} , both for *hSABR* and *mrSABR*, eventually reduces to a simple **ratio of two multivariate polynomials** over the following 7 variables:

- The 5 original parameters $\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \rho, \nu$
- Maturity/expiry T_{ex}
- The exponential term $z \equiv e^{\lambda T_{ex}}$

Appendix A and B to this paper contains the resulting closed-form expressions for *hSABR* and *mrSABR* in the Excel-formula format, with the polynomials expressed in clustered/factorized form, as optimized by *sympy*. These expressions are easily implementable in Excel⁷. When expanded, the polynomials get very lengthy (e.g. over 200 members in the nominator of \bar{c} for *mrSABR*) and run up to the degree 8 of the variables mentioned.

For the more general *mrZABR* model, the integral expressions (19) with the specification (20) cannot be reduced to closed-form expressions in terms of elementary functions. For this reason, we resorted to further approximations via Taylor series expansions of all (outer) integrands in (19), prior to symbolic integration. In particular, we used the expansion of the instantaneous volatility α around the long-term volatility θ . As an example, for the simplest integral from (19) in the case of *mrZABR* we have:

⁷ An implementation via direct (cell-inserted) Excel formulas might be easier than via VBA, as each Excel cell formula allows for up to 8192 characters, whereas a line of VBA code only allows for around 1023 symbols at a time (which is surpassed e.g. in case of \bar{c} for *mrSABR*).

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(T) &= \rho \int_0^T \psi(\alpha(x)) e^{-\lambda(T-x)} dx = \rho \int_0^T v \alpha(x)^{\gamma+1} e^{-\lambda(T-x)} dx \\
&= \rho v e^{-\lambda T} \int_0^T (\theta + (\alpha - \theta) e^{-\lambda x})^{\gamma+1} e^{\lambda x} dx
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

which is not solvable in elementary functions. Now, we define the integrand as a function of α :

$$f(\alpha) = (\theta + (\alpha - \theta) e^{-\lambda x})^{\gamma+1} e^{\lambda x}$$

and apply its Taylor-expansion approximation around $\alpha = \theta$, treating all other variables (including the integrating variable x) as constants. In the exemplary case of a second-order expansion, we have: $f(\alpha) \approx f(\alpha = \theta) + f'(\alpha = \theta)(\alpha - \theta) + \frac{1}{2}f''(\alpha = \theta)(\alpha - \theta)^2$

with:

$$f(\alpha = \theta) = \theta^{\gamma+1} e^{\lambda x}$$

$$f'(\alpha) = \frac{df}{d\alpha} = (\gamma + 1) (\theta + (\alpha - \theta) e^{-\lambda x})^\gamma \Rightarrow f'(\alpha = \theta) = (\gamma + 1) \theta^\gamma$$

$$f''(\alpha) = \gamma (\gamma + 1) (\theta + (\alpha - \theta) e^{-\lambda x})^{\gamma-1} e^{-\lambda x} \Rightarrow f''(\alpha = \theta) = \gamma (\gamma + 1) \theta^{\gamma-1} e^{-\lambda x}$$

Summarizing, we obtain following approximation in this example:

$$f(\alpha) \approx \theta^{\gamma+1} e^{\lambda x} + (\gamma + 1) \theta^\gamma (\alpha - \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma (\gamma + 1) \theta^{\gamma-1} e^{-\lambda x} (\alpha - \theta)^2$$

The approximated $f(\alpha)$ can now be easily integrated in closed-form with respect to x .

Technically, we retorted again to *sympy* for the expansion of all (outer) integrands in (19), and as before, for the subsequent symbolic integration. We found that the expansions resulted in reliable and acceptable precision levels only starting with the expansion order of 4 and above.

That said, the described expansion approach does work for γ specified as a parameter (as in the example above), but results, beyond the expansion order of 2, in very lengthy expressions. However, if γ is preset as a constant, the length of the resulting expressions is comparable to those derived for *mrSABR* (where no approximative expansions were used).

Appendix C to this paper contains the resulting closed-form expressions for *mrZABR* with the expansion order of 5, and with γ preset to 0.5 (which places the model between *hSABR* and *mrSABR*). The expressions are still simple ratios of multivariate polynomials with, when

expanded, powers up to the degree 13 of the variables. We use this particular specification for empirical analyses in the following section referring to it as *CIR-ZABR*.

Note that for the special case $\alpha = \theta = \sigma$, the expressions in Appendix reduce for *mrSABR* and *hSABR* to the closed-form formulae (22) and (23) already derived in the Hagan papers. Moreover, in that special case, the *CIR-ZABR* expressions also reduce to (24) with $\gamma = 0.5$, as the Taylor expansions applied are around $\alpha = \theta$ and thus are exact at $\alpha = \theta$.

The closed-form expressions for the three models in Appendix are our main theoretical result. Drawing on these expressions, in the following section we elaborate on the practical usage of the *hSABR*, *mrSABR* and *CIR-ZABR* models for calibrations to equity market data.

9. Calibration to equity volatility surfaces

With the closed-form expressions for the effective coefficients as in the Appendix, and the ensuing simple logic for the standard SABR coefficients as in (11) for *hSABR*, and (17) both for *mrSABR* and *CIR-ZABR*, the five parameters $\alpha, \theta, \lambda, \rho, \nu$ can be easily calibrated to market-implied volatility surfaces. We tested this calibration on a sequence of historical index surfaces of EuroStoxx index options, as observed at monthly intervals in 2021-2024 according to Bloomberg. For parameter estimation, we used the standard Excel Solver, minimizing the root mean squared error (RMSE) with respect to these market-implied volatility quotes, with predictions being the implied volatilities from the standardized SABR models (which approximate the mean reversion models). First, we did so separately per observation date / surface (5 strikes x 3 maturities). The calibration was numerically unproblematic in all cases, resulting in plausible time-dependent estimates $\hat{\alpha}_t, \hat{\theta}_t, \hat{\lambda}_t, \hat{\nu}_t, \hat{\rho}_t$, as depicted in Figure 1 below against (monthly) observation dates t .

Generally, the fit was good for all models and all surfaces fitted: the average (or, alternatively, maximum) RMSE was only 0.8% (or 1.0%) for *mrSABR*, 0.7% (or 1%) for *hSABR* and 0.7% (or 0.9%) for *CIR-ZABR* (in units of the implied volatilities). Also, the fit resulted in around 99% of the original variance in the implied volatilities across the 15 data points explained by the models (with only 5 parameters per surface). The RMSE increased by 0.4.-0.5% (and up to 4-5% for some surfaces) when the constant-expected-volatility restriction $\hat{\alpha}_t = \hat{\theta}_t$ was applied during the estimation, confirming its inadequacy for equity markets.

That said, a closer inspection of the parameter estimates reveals some issues. Table 1 through Table 3 below report the descriptive statistics for the parameter estimates.






Figure 3: Parameter estimates for the mean-reverting models (ra=right axis, la=left axis)

	<i>lambda</i>	<i>rho</i>	<i>alpha</i>	<i>theta</i>	<i>nu</i>
Min	2.26	-0.66	0.09	0.17	1.12
Median	6.64	-0.57	0.16	0.23	1.47
Max	9.96	-0.50	0.43	0.31	2.54
StdDev / Avg	29.13%	5.97%	40.87%	17.82%	22.90%
Correlations:		<i>rho</i>	<i>alpha</i>	<i>theta</i>	<i>nu</i>
	<i>alpha</i>	-0.18			
	<i>theta</i>	-0.40	0.79		
	<i>nu</i>	-0.54	0.45	0.42	
	<i>lambda</i>	0.05	-0.39	-0.71	0.24

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for hSABR parameter estimates (across time)

	<i>lambda</i>	<i>rho</i>	<i>alpha</i>	<i>theta</i>	<i>nu</i>
Min	3.07	-0.90	0.08	0.12	1.83
Median	9.82	-0.69	0.15	0.15	3.58
Max	17.69	-0.57	0.42	0.21	4.92
StdDev / Avg	37.02%	9.75%	42.70%	18.63%	23.53%
Correlations:		<i>rho</i>	<i>alpha</i>	<i>theta</i>	<i>nu</i>
	<i>alpha</i>	-0.26			
	<i>theta</i>	-0.27	0.89		
	<i>nu</i>	0.00	-0.83	-0.85	
	<i>lambda</i>	0.13	-0.79	-0.86	0.91

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for mrSABR parameter estimates (across time)

	<i>lambda</i>	<i>rho</i>	<i>alpha</i>	<i>theta</i>	<i>nu</i>
Min	3.67	-0.70	0.07	0.11	1.09
Median	9.67	-0.61	0.14	0.12	1.46
Max	16.83	-0.52	0.43	0.19	2.01
StdDev / Avg	31.58%	7.04%	45.53%	17.34%	14.50%
Correlations:		<i>rho</i>	<i>alpha</i>	<i>theta</i>	<i>nu</i>
	<i>alpha</i>	-0.31			
	<i>theta</i>	-0.04	0.54		
	<i>nu</i>	-0.33	-0.06	-0.52	
	<i>lambda</i>	0.21	-0.56	-0.71	0.65

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for CIR-ZABR parameter estimates (across time)

First, in all three models, the estimates $\hat{\theta}_t$ (long-term volatility) correlate positively with the estimates $\hat{\alpha}_t$ (initial volatility). Also, the estimates $\hat{\lambda}_t$ (mean-reverting speed) correlate negatively to both $\hat{\theta}_t$ and $\hat{\alpha}_t$. This might indicate a rather non-linear mean-reverting pattern implied in the market data: during the periods of strongly above-average instantaneous volatility, the market seems to project a reversion to a higher long-term volatility and with at a slower (linearly specified) speed. The positive correlation and interplay between the estimates

$\hat{\lambda}_t$ (mean-reverting speed) and $\hat{\nu}_t$ (volatility of volatility) is, to a certain extent, theoretically expected, as both parameters influence the convexity (deepness) of the smile⁸.

Finally, the correlation between the estimates $\hat{\alpha}_t$ (initial volatility) and $\hat{\nu}_t$ (volatility of volatility) is quite outstanding: it is strongly negative in the *mrSABR* case, moderately positive in the *hSABR* case, and close to 0 in the *CIR-ZABR* case. Most probably, this is due to the true volatility process being closer to CIR as specified in *CIR-ZABR*. Remember that the volatility is modelled with lognormal diffusion in *mrSABR*, and with approximately normal diffusion in *hSABR*. The correlations observed would be actually expected if the true volatility diffusion were between normal and lognormal (e.g. of a CIR-type)⁹.

The above correlations in parameter estimates are generally benign for the purposes of interpolation and/or extrapolation of the surfaces. However, they need to be accounted for if some historically estimated parameters should be applied to new market data. Note that the only formally time-dependent factors in the analyzed mean-reverting models are the forward price and the instantaneous volatility. Thus, f and α need to be determined anew for a new market situation (or simulated e.g. via increments of their last known values). On the opposite, the parameters $\theta, \lambda, \nu, \rho$ are formally specified as constant / non-stochastic. However, because of the correlations mentioned above, if the latter parameters are applied unchanged (e.g. estimated from old data) with a new α , the generated smiles / prices might be biased, especially if the correlations between the estimate for α vs $\theta, \lambda, \nu, \rho$ are significant¹⁰. In this sense, the *CIR-ZABR* model appears least problematic, with only moderate or vanishing correlations to α .

⁸ In particular, a higher estimate for ν may be offset by a higher estimate for λ , resulting in a similar convexity (as already reported for the original Heston model e.g. in *Cui et al. (2017)*). Thus, this positive correlation seems to reflect the (moderate) redundancy immanently present in the mean-reverting models. Continuing the example, the higher resulting estimate for λ would also influence, apart from the convexity, the term structure of volatilities. And this latter effect can itself be offset by a parameter θ being estimated closer to α . This latter effect might contribute to the correlations between the estimates $\alpha_t, \theta_t, \lambda_t$ described above.

⁹ In particular, in that case the *hSABR* model would be expected to estimate a higher ν_t for those surfaces where the initial instantaneous volatility α_t happens to be higher (and vice versa), in order to compensate for the misspecification. For the *mrSABR* model, the opposite would be the case.

¹⁰ The correlation between ν and α seems of a particular concern for equity markets. As an example, in a stress scenario of significant negative stock returns along with sharply rising instantaneous volatility α , and if the old (or average) ν estimate is used unchanged, *mrSABR* would estimate a smile which is too pronounced, and *hSABR* - too flat. Of course, the correlation can be accounted for using technical means, e.g. via a regression of $\hat{\nu}_t$ on $\hat{\alpha}_t$

Another way to verify the stability and consistency of the parameter estimates is to inspect the prediction errors (see Table 4 and Table 5 below) when the models are re-estimated per observation date, with a different $\hat{\alpha}_t$ per observation date t as before, but when some (or all) of the other parameters $\theta_t, \lambda_t, \nu_t, \rho_t$ are instead either fixed at the level of their previous-period estimates $\hat{\theta}_{t-1}, \hat{\lambda}_{t-1}, \hat{\nu}_{t-1}, \hat{\rho}_{t-1}$, or estimated as overall (time-independent) estimates $\hat{\theta}, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\nu}, \hat{\rho}$.

time-independent parameters, except:	hSABR	mrSABR	CIR-ZABR
alpha	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%
alpha = theta	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%
alpha & theta	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
alpha & lambda	1.3%	1.4%	1.1%
alpha & nu	1.3%	1.4%	1.2%
alpha & rho	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%

Table 4: Root mean squared error with time-independent parameters

previous-period parameters, except:	hSABR	mrSABR	CIR-ZABR
alpha	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%
alpha = theta	1.6%	1.3%	1.4%
alpha & theta	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%
alpha & lambda	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%
alpha & nu	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%
alpha & rho	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%

Table 5: Root mean squared error with previous-period parameters

In particular, when all coefficients, except the explicitly stochastic $\hat{\alpha}$, are estimated as time-independent (or, alternatively, previous-period) parameters, the RMSE increases quite materially from the above mentioned 0.7-0.8%: to 1.4-1.5% (or 1.1-1.2%). This might advocate an inclusion of additional stochastic factors, apart from $\hat{\alpha}_t$, in the model: With two parameters re-estimated per surface, the RMSE improves by up to 0.4%. Overall, an additional inclusion of the long-term volatility θ_t seems to improve the RMSE most.

Lastly, we note that, for *hSABR*, the Feller non-degeneracy condition $\theta^2 \lambda > \frac{1}{2} \nu^2$ was significantly violated in all inspected surfaces, as is also often the case with calibrations of the original Heston model to market volatility quotes. On the opposite, for *CIR-ZABR*, the

and usage of regression predictions for ν in the above scenario. However, it would be preferable if the model itself accounts for the correlation patterns.

corresponding condition $\theta\lambda > \frac{1}{2}\nu^2$ was satisfied in most but not all cases, with only a few mild violations. For *mrSABR*, the non-degeneracy condition $\lambda > \frac{1}{2}\nu^2$ was satisfied in all estimates.

10. Conclusions and areas of application

In this paper, we have shown that equity volatility surfaces can be easily modeled using mean-reverting SABR-based models with only five parameters, via closed-form expressions for implied volatilities, as derived above.

These SABR-based models can serve as a viable, simple and fast alternative to modelling the surfaces with the classical Heston model, or with even more complicated local/stochastic volatility models. They may be particularly advantageous in unsupervised, automated, or high-performance-requirement settings (e.g., Monte Carlo simulations) or in scenarios where advanced numerical integration is problematic (such as in Excel-based tools).

However, the three investigated SABR-based models—and likely the original Heston model as well—yielded high correlations among some parameter estimates over time. In particular, a significant correlation between the parameter estimates for instantaneous volatility and volatility-of-volatility is observed in both the mean-reverting SABR (*mrSABR*) and approximated Heston (*hSABR*) models, but not in the mean-reverting ZABR (*CIR-ZABR*) model. This suggests that the true volatility process for equities is more accurately described by a CIR diffusion rather than the lognormal diffusion assumed in SABR or the normal diffusion implicitly assumed in Heston, which has important implications for risk management. Empirically, all three SABR-based mean-reverting models produced similarly high-quality fits to the volatility surfaces across all observation dates. While the *hSABR* model requires shorter closed-form expressions, it often violates the non-degeneracy Feller condition, making it better suited for surface interpolation or valuation based on recently estimated parameters, or in situations where the classical Heston model is preferred. For the purposes of extrapolating and simulating volatility surfaces, the *CIR-ZABR* model appears to be the preferable solution. Its parameter estimates exhibit only modest correlations and typically satisfy non-degeneracy conditions, making it potentially more reliable for these applications.

Finally, the parameter estimates indicate a nonlinear mean-reverting pattern of instantaneous volatility (or a reverting to a time-varying long-term volatility) inherent in the market data, which warrants further research.

11. References

- Cui, Y., S. Del Baño Rollin, G. Germano (2017). Full and fast calibration of the Heston stochastic volatility model. *Europ. Journal of Operational Research*, 263(2): p. 625–638
- Felpel, M. , J. Kienitz, T.A. McWalter (2020). Effective Stochastic Volatility: Applications to ZABR-type Models. Working Paper, SSRN
- Hagan, P.S. , D. Kumar, A. Lesniewski, D. Woodward (2002). Managing Smile Risk. *Wilmott Magazine*, September 2002, p. 84-108
- Hagan, P.S. , D. Kumar, A. Lesniewski, D. Woodward, Universal Smiles. *Wilmott Magazine*, July 2016, p. 40-55
- Hagan, P.S. , A. Lesniewski, D. Woodward (2018). Implied Volatility Formulas for Heston Models. *Wilmott Magazine*, November 2018, p. 44-57
- Hagan, P.S. , A. Lesniewski, D. Woodward (2020). Implied Volatilities for Mean Reverting SABR Models. *Wilmott Magazine*, July 2020, p. 62-77
- Heston, S.L. (1993). A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility with applications to bond and currency options. *Review of Financial Studies*, 6 (2): 327–343.
- Klassen, T.R. (2016). Necessary and Sufficient No-Arbitrage Conditions for the SSVI/S3 Volatility Curve. Working Paper, SSRN

Appendix A: Closed-form expressions for *hSABR*

The following formulae for *hSABR* are in Excel format and use notations as follows:

alphas: parameter α^2 (initial instantaneous variance)

thetas: parameter θ^2 (long-term variance)

lambda: parameter λ (speed of mean reversion of variance)

nu: parameter ν (CIR volatility of variance)

rho: parameter ρ (correlation)

T_ex: maturity/expiry of option

z: exponential term calculated as $\text{EXP}(\lambda * T_{\text{ex}})$

Formula for τ_{ex} in *hSABR*

```
(T_ex*lambda*thetas*z - alphas + thetas + z*(alphas - thetas))
/
(lambda*z)
```

Formula for \bar{b} in *hSABR*

```
nu*rho*z*(T_ex*lambda*( - 1*alphas + thetas*z + thetas) + alphas*z - alphas - 2*thetas*z + 2*thetas)
/
(T_ex*lambda*thetas*z - alphas + thetas + z*(alphas - thetas))^2
```

Formula for \bar{c} in *hSABR*

```
- 3*nu^2*z*(8*rho^2*z*(T_ex*lambda*( - 1*alphas + thetas*z + thetas) + alphas*z - alphas - 2*thetas*z +
2*thetas)^2 - (T_ex*lambda*thetas*z - alphas + thetas + z*(alphas -
thetas))*(2*T_ex*lambda*thetas*z^2*(4*rho^2 + 1) - 2*alphas + 8*rho^2*z^2*(alphas - 3*thetas) -
4*rho^2*z*(T_ex^2*alphas*lambda^2 - T_ex^2*lambda^2*thetas + 2*T_ex*alphas*lambda - 4*T_ex*lambda*thetas +
2*alphas - 6*thetas) + thetas + z^2*(2*alphas - 5*thetas) + 4*z*( - 1*T_ex*alphas*lambda +
T_ex*lambda*thetas + thetas)))
/
(8*(T_ex*lambda*thetas*z - alphas + thetas + z*(alphas - thetas))^4)
```

Appendix B: Closed-form expressions for *mrSABR*

The following formulae for *mrSABR* are in Excel format and use notations as follows:

alpha: parameter α (initial instantaneous volatility)

theta: parameter θ (long-term volatility)

lambda: parameter λ (speed of mean reversion of volatility)

nu: parameter ν (lognormal volatility of volatility)

rho: parameter ρ (correlation)

T_ex: maturity/expiry of option

z: exponential term calculated as EXP ($\lambda * T_{ex}$)

Formula for τ_{ex} in *mrSABR*

$$\frac{(2 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - \alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - \theta^2 - 4 * \theta * z * (\alpha - \theta) + z^2 * (\alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - 3 * \theta^2))}{(2 * \lambda * z^2)}$$

Formula for G_{int} in *mrSABR*

$$\frac{\nu^2 * (-2 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda + 4 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \theta + 2 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - 2 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^3 * z - \alpha^3 * z^3 + 3 * \alpha^3 * z - 2 * \alpha^3 - 3 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z^3 + 6 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z^2 - 9 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z + 6 * \alpha^2 * \theta - 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z^3 + 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z^2 + 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z - 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 + 16 * \theta^3 * z^3 - 18 * \theta^3 * z^2 + 2 * \theta^3)}{(4 * \lambda^2 * z^2)}$$

Formula for \bar{b} in *mrSABR*

$$\frac{-4 * \nu * \rho * z * (6 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \theta * z + 12 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - 12 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \theta^3 * z^3 - 6 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^3 * z^2 + 6 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^3 * z - \alpha^3 * z^3 + 3 * \alpha^3 * z - 2 * \alpha^3 - 3 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z^3 + 6 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z^2 - 9 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z + 6 * \alpha^2 * \theta - 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z^3 + 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z^2 + 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z - 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 + 16 * \theta^3 * z^3 - 18 * \theta^3 * z^2 + 2 * \theta^3)}{(3 * (2 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - \alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - \theta^2 - 4 * \theta * z * (\alpha - \theta) + z^2 * (\alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - 3 * \theta^2)))^2)}$$

Formula for \bar{c} in *mrSABR*

$$\frac{\nu^2 * z^2 * (-32 * \rho^2 * (6 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \theta * z + 12 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - 12 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \theta^3 * z^3 - 6 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^3 * z^2 + 6 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^3 * z - \alpha^3 * z^3 + 3 * \alpha^3 * z - 2 * \alpha^3 - 3 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z^3 + 6 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z^2 - 9 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z + 6 * \alpha^2 * \theta - 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z^3 + 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z^2 + 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z - 6 * \alpha * \theta^2 + 16 * \theta^3 * z^3 - 18 * \theta^3 * z^2 + 2 * \theta^3)^2 + 9 * (2 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - \alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - \theta^2) * (4 * T_{ex} * \alpha^4 * \lambda - 16 * T_{ex} * \alpha^3 * \lambda * \theta + 24 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \theta^2 - 16 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \theta^3 + 16 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^4 * z^4 * (5 * \rho^2 + 1) + 4 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^4 - 12 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 + 3 * \alpha^4 + 48 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta - 20 * \alpha^3 * \theta - 72 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 + 40 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 + 48 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^3 - 32 * \alpha * \theta^3 - 12 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 9 * \theta^4 - 8 * \theta * z^3 * (8 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 8 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 8 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta + 16 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^2 + 10 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta - 32 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^3 - 10 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^3 + 4 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 + \alpha^3 + 8 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta + 5 * \alpha^2 * \theta + 4 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 10 * \alpha * \theta^2 - 36 * \rho^2 * \theta^3) + z^4 * (4 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 + \alpha^4 + 16 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta + 4 * \alpha^3 * \theta + 40 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 + 8 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 + 80 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 16 * \alpha * \theta^3 - 292 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - 53 * \theta^4) + 4 * z^2 * (-16 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^2 + 32 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^3 - 16 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - 16 * T_{ex} * \alpha^3 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta + 40 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 6 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta - 16 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 12 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - 8 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^5 + 8 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 - 6 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 * \theta - 32 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 60 * \alpha^3 * \theta^3 + 12 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 27 * \theta^4) + 8 * z * (8 * T_{ex} * \alpha^3 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta + 2 * T_{ex} * \alpha^3 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta - 24 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 6 * T_{ex} * \alpha^2 * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 24 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 6 * T_{ex} * \alpha * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^5 - 8 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^6 + 4 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 - 12 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta + 5 * \alpha^3 * \theta + 8 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 19 * \alpha^2 * \theta^3 + 4 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 22 * \alpha * \theta^5 - 4 * \rho^2 * \theta^6 - 8 * \theta^7))}{(6 * (2 * T_{ex} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - \alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - \theta^2 - 4 * \theta * z * (\alpha - \theta) + z^2 * (\alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - 3 * \theta^2)))^4)}$$

Appendix C: Closed-form expressions for *CIR-ZABR*

The following formulae for *mrSABR* are in Excel format and use notations as follows:

alpha: parameter α (initial instantaneous volatility)

theta: parameter θ (long-term volatility)

lambda: parameter λ (speed of mean reversion of volatility)

nu: parameter ν (lognormal volatility of volatility)

rho: parameter ρ (correlation)

T_ex: maturity/expiry of option

z: exponential term calculated as $\text{EXP}(\lambda * T_{\text{ex}})$

Parameter γ (CEV-parameter in volatility process) is preset to $\frac{1}{2}$

With Taylor expansion of order 5 for the integrands of the integrals I1-I5

Formula for τ_{ex} in *CIR-ZABR*

```
(2*T_ex*lambda*theta^2*z^2 - alpha^2 + 2*alpha*theta - theta^2 - 4*theta*z*(alpha - theta) + z^2*(alpha^2 + 2*alpha*theta - 3*theta^2)) / (2*lambda*z^2)
```

Formula for G_{int} in *CIR-ZABR*

```
nu^2*(2*T_ex*lambda*theta*z^2 + 2*alpha - theta + z^2*(2*alpha - 3*theta) - 4*z*(alpha - theta)) / (4*lambda^2*z^2)
```

Formula for \bar{b} in *CIR-ZABR*

```
nu*rho*( - 384*T_ex*lambda*theta^2*z^2*(3*alpha^2 + 6*alpha*theta*z - 6*alpha*theta - 4*theta^2*z^2 - 6*theta^2*z + 3*theta^2) - 9*alpha^4 - 112*alpha^3*theta*z + 36*alpha^3*theta - 864*alpha^2*theta^2*z^2 + 336*alpha^2*theta^2*z - 54*alpha^2*theta^2 + 1728*alpha*theta^3*z^2 - 336*alpha*theta^3*z + 36*alpha*theta^3 - 864*theta^4*z^2 + 112*theta^4*z - 9*theta^4 + 768*theta^3*z^3*(- 1*alpha - 2*theta*z + theta) + 96*theta*z*(3*alpha^3 + 6*alpha^2*theta*z - 9*alpha^2*theta - 32*alpha*theta^2*z^2 - 12*alpha*theta^2*z + 9*alpha*theta^2 + 32*theta^3*z^2 + 6*theta^3*z - 3*theta^3) + z^2*(- 3*alpha^4*z^2 - 12*alpha^4*z + 24*alpha^4 + 76*alpha^3*theta*z^2 + 96*alpha^3*theta*z - 384*alpha^3*theta + 654*alpha^2*theta^2*z^2 - 792*alpha^2*theta^2*z + 1008*alpha^2*theta^2 + 1548*alpha*theta^3*z^2 + 1344*alpha*theta^3*z - 192*alpha*theta^3 - 2275*theta^4*z^2 + 900*theta^4*z - 456*theta^4)) / (192*theta^(3/2)*(2*T_ex*lambda*theta^2*z^2 - alpha^2 + 2*alpha*theta - theta^2 - 4*theta*z*(alpha - theta) + z^2*(alpha^2 + 2*alpha*theta - 3*theta^2))^2)
```

Appendix C: Closed-form expressions for CIR-ZABR (cont.)

Formula for \bar{c} in CIR-ZABR

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^2 * (- 1 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 * z^2 * (- 384 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 * (3 * \alpha^2 + 6 * \alpha * \theta * z - 6 * \alpha * \theta - \\ & 4 * \theta^2 * z^2 - 6 * \theta^2 * z + 3 * \theta^2) - 9 * \alpha^4 - 112 * \alpha^3 * \theta * z + 36 * \alpha^3 * \theta - \\ & 864 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 * z^2 + 336 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 * z - 54 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 + 1728 * \alpha * \theta^3 * z^2 - \\ & 336 * \alpha * \theta^3 * z + 36 * \alpha * \theta^3 - 864 * \theta^4 * z^2 + 112 * \theta^4 * z - 9 * \theta^4 - \\ & 768 * \theta^3 * z^3 * (\alpha + 2 * \theta * z - \theta) + 96 * \theta * z * (3 * \alpha^3 + 6 * \alpha^2 * \theta * z - 9 * \alpha^2 * \theta - \\ & 32 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z^2 - 12 * \alpha * \theta^2 * z + 9 * \alpha * \theta^2 + 32 * \theta^3 * z^2 + 6 * \theta^3 * z - 3 * \theta^3) + \\ & z^2 * (- 3 * \alpha^4 * z^2 - 12 * \alpha^4 * z + 24 * \alpha^4 + 76 * \alpha^3 * \theta * z^2 + 96 * \alpha^3 * \theta * z - \\ & 384 * \alpha^3 * \theta + 654 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 * z^2 - 792 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 * z + 1008 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 + \\ & 1548 * \alpha * \theta^3 * z^2 + 1344 * \alpha * \theta^3 * z - 192 * \alpha * \theta^3 - 2275 * \theta^4 * z^2 + 900 * \theta^4 * z - \\ & 456 * \theta^4)^2 / 12288 + (2 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - \alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - \theta^2 - 4 * \theta * z * (\alpha - \\ & \theta) + z^2 * (\alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - 3 * \theta^2)) * (68812800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \theta^8 * (4 * \rho^2 + 1) + \\ & \rho^2 * \theta^2 * z^2 * (- 78400 * \alpha^6 + 470400 * \alpha^5 * \theta - 1176000 * \alpha^4 * \theta^2 + \\ & 1568000 * \alpha^3 * \theta^3 - 1176000 * \alpha^2 * \theta^4 + 470400 * \alpha * \theta^5 - 78400 * \theta^6) + \\ & 4800 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 * z * (\alpha^7 - 7 * \alpha^6 * \theta + 21 * \alpha^5 * \theta^2 - 35 * \alpha^4 * \theta^3 + \\ & 35 * \alpha^3 * \theta^4 - 21 * \alpha^2 * \theta^5 + 7 * \alpha * \theta^6 - \theta^7) + \\ & \rho^2 * z^3 * (322560 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^5 * \theta^3 - 1612800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^4 * \theta^4 + \\ & 3225600 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^3 * \theta^5 - 3225600 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \theta^6 + \\ & 1612800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \theta^7 - 322560 * T_{\text{ex}} * \theta^8 + 1680 * \alpha^8 - 20160 * \alpha^7 * \theta + \\ & 174720 * \alpha^6 * \theta^2 - 224448 * \alpha^5 * \theta^3 - 1125600 * \alpha^4 * \theta^4 + 3864000 * \alpha^3 * \theta^5 - \\ & 4838400 * \alpha^2 * \theta^6 + 2788800 * \alpha * \theta^7 - 620592 * \theta^8) + \rho^2 * (- 525 * \alpha^8 + \\ & 4200 * \alpha^7 * \theta - 14700 * \alpha^6 * \theta^2 + 29400 * \alpha^5 * \theta^3 - 36750 * \alpha^4 * \theta^4 + \\ & 29400 * \alpha^3 * \theta^5 - 14700 * \alpha^2 * \theta^6 + 4200 * \alpha * \theta^7 - 525 * \theta^8) + \theta^4 * z^7 * (- \\ & 154828800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \theta^2 * \rho^2 + 154828800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - \\ & 1612800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^4 * \rho^2 + 12902400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^3 * \rho^2 * \theta - \\ & 106444800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 438681600 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^3 - \\ & 206438400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 206438400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - \\ & 11827200 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta - 170956800 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 68812800 * \alpha^2 * \theta^2 - \\ & 345139200 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 34406400 * \alpha * \theta^3 + 1078425600 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 172032000 * \theta^4) + \\ & \theta^2 * z^5 * (77414400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^3 - 232243200 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + \\ & 232243200 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^5 - 77414400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \rho^2 * \theta^6 + 134400 * \alpha^6 * \rho^2 - \\ & 2419200 * \alpha^5 * \rho^2 * \theta + 29433600 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - 51430400 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + \\ & 45875200 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - 51744000 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^5 - 206438400 * \alpha^2 * \theta^4 + \\ & 151334400 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^5 + 240844800 * \alpha * \theta^5 - 75308800 * \rho^2 * \theta^6 - 80281600 * \theta^6) + \\ & 8400 * \theta^2 * z^4 * (- 192 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^4 * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 768 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - \\ & 1152 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^5 + 768 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^6 - \\ & 192 * T_{\text{ex}} * \rho^2 * \theta^7 - \alpha^7 * \rho^2 + 11 * \alpha^6 * \rho^2 * \theta - 93 * \alpha^5 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - \\ & 433 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 2605 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - 2048 * \alpha^3 * \theta^4 - 4431 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^5 + \\ & 5120 * \alpha^2 * \theta^5 + 3185 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^6 - 4096 * \alpha * \theta^6 - 843 * \rho^2 * \theta^7 + 1024 * \theta^7) + \\ & z^8 * (945 * \alpha^8 * \rho^2 - 14040 * \alpha^7 * \rho^2 * \theta + 136780 * \alpha^6 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 - \\ & 401352 * \alpha^5 * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + 1670550 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 21197400 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^5 + \\ & 5734400 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^6 + 109248300 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^7 + 25804800 * \alpha^2 * \theta^6 + \\ & 280211400 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^7 + 68812800 * \alpha * \theta^7 - 928145983 * \rho^2 * \theta^8 - 203571200 * \theta^8) + \\ & z^6 * (- 154828800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^6 + 309657600 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^7 - \\ & 154828800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^8 - 1612800 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^5 * \rho^2 * \theta^3 + \\ & 14515200 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^4 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 - 119347200 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^5 + \\ & 158054400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^6 - 103219200 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^7 + \\ & 198374400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^8 + 206438400 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \rho^2 * \theta^7 - \\ & 249984000 * T_{\text{ex}} * \rho^2 * \theta^8 - 103219200 * T_{\text{ex}} * \rho^2 * \theta^8 - 2100 * \alpha^8 * \rho^2 + \\ & 33600 * \alpha^7 * \rho^2 * \theta - 411600 * \alpha^6 * \rho^2 * \theta^2 + 3225600 * \alpha^5 * \rho^2 * \theta^3 - \\ & 24960600 * \alpha^4 * \rho^2 * \theta^4 + 14548800 * \alpha^3 * \rho^2 * \theta^5 - 34406400 * \alpha^2 * \rho^2 * \theta^6 + \\ & 156802800 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^7 + 206438400 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^8 - 116457600 * \alpha * \rho^2 * \theta^7 - \\ & 309657600 * \alpha * \theta^7 - 67185300 * \rho^2 * \theta^8 + 103219200 * \theta^8) / 2867200) \\ & / \\ & (\theta^5 * z^2 * (2 * T_{\text{ex}} * \lambda * \theta^2 * z^2 - \alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - \theta^2 - 4 * \theta * z * (\alpha - \theta) + \\ & z^2 * (\alpha^2 + 2 * \alpha * \theta - 3 * \theta^2))^4) \end{aligned}$$