

On the difference between the volatility swap strike and the zero vanna implied volatility

Elisa Alòs* Frido Rolloos[†] Kenichiro Shiraya[‡]

December 10, 2021

Abstract

In this paper, Malliavin calculus is applied to arrive at exact formulas for the difference between the volatility swap strike and the zero vanna implied volatility for volatilities driven by fractional noise. To the best of our knowledge, our estimate is the first to derive the rigorous relationship between the zero vanna implied volatility and the volatility swap strike. In particular, we will see that the zero vanna implied volatility is a better approximation for the volatility swap strike than the ATMI.

Keywords: Malliavin calculus, fractional volatility models, volatility swaps, zero vanna implied volatility.

AMS subject classification: 91G99

1 Introduction

The pricing and hedging of volatility derivatives is an active and fruitful area of research in quantitative finance. One of the first volatility derivatives to be traded in the over-the-counter market is the variance swap. Another instrument to trade volatility is the volatility swap, which unlike the variance swap has a payoff that is linear in volatility. However, volatility swaps are less liquid than variance swaps. The reason for this is because the price of a volatility swap was for a long time considered to be highly model-dependent.

In their important paper, Carr and Lee (2008) challenged the idea that volatility swaps are highly model-dependent. In the case where the correlation between the volatility and the underlying asset is zero, they proved in their paper that the exact volatility swap strike is in fact model-free, and like the variance swap can be synthesised using a continuous strip of options. The difference is that for volatility swaps the replicating strip of options has to be continuously rebalanced. An elegant derivation of the replicating portfolio for volatility swaps is given by Friz and Gatheral (2005). When correlation deviates from zero, there is indeed model dependence and only model-free approximations are possible. In this paper, when we speak

*Dpt. d'Economia i Empresa, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

[†]Ortec Finance.

[‡]Graduate School of Economics, The University of Tokyo. Kenichiro Shiraya is supported by CARE.

of ‘model-free’ we mean model-independent within the class of fractional stochastic volatility models.

In recent years, the fractional volatility models introduced by Comte and Renault (1998) have led to several papers which explore the valuation of volatility derivatives under the models. For example, Bergomi and Guyon (2011) and El Euch, Fukawasa, Gatheral and Rosenbaum (2019) derive approximation formulas for the variance swap strike by using expansion techniques. Alós and Shiraya (2019) approximate the volatility swap strike by immunising correlation dependence to first order and also provide an estimation method for the Hurst parameter from ATM implied volatilities.

While the aforementioned papers establish relationships between volatility derivatives and the ATM implied volatility, a different approach to model free approximate pricing of volatility swaps has been put forth by Rolloos and Arslan (2017). Using only the generalised Hull-White formula and Taylor expansions, they show that the volatility swap strike is approximately equal to the implied volatility at the strike where the Black-Scholes vanna of a vanilla option is zero. Like the Carr-Lee approximation, the Rolloos-Arslan approximation is to a large extent immune to correlation to first order. Furthermore, although the two are not equal, numerical tests thus far have shown that both are of comparable accuracy.

In addition to being intuitive and straightforward to implement, another feature of the zero vanna implied volatility approximation is that it lends itself to rigorous quantification of the error between the true volatility swap price and the zero vanna implied volatility. This paper extends Rolloos and Arslan (2017) to general fractional volatility models and provides the rigorous relationship between the zero vanna implied volatility and the volatility swap strike for both the uncorrelated and correlated case. We show that the zero vanna implied volatility is a better approximation for the volatility swap strike than both the ATM implied volatility and the approximation formula of Alós and Shiraya (2019) for the cases we consider in this paper.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the relevant concepts and establish notation. Section 3 is devoted to deriving exact expressions for the difference between the volatility swap strike and the zero vanna implied volatility as well as the short time limit of the errors. Due to their length, all proofs of propositions and theorems in Section 3 have been placed in Appendix B. In Section 4 numerical examples are presented for a rough Bergomi model with various values of the Hurst parameter. Section 5 contains concluding remarks.

2 The main problem and notations

Consider a stochastic volatility model for the log-price of a stock under a risk-neutral probability measure P :

$$X_t = X_0 - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sigma_s^2 ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s \left(\rho dW_s + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} dB_s \right), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.1)$$

Here, X_0 is the current log-price, W and B are independent standard Brownian motions defined on a complete probability space (Ω, \mathcal{G}, P) , and σ is a square-integrable and right-continuous stochastic process adapted to the filtration generated by W . We denote by \mathcal{F}^W and \mathcal{F}^B the filtrations generated by W and B and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}^W \vee \mathcal{F}^B$. We assume the interest rate r to be zero for the sake of simplicity. The same arguments in this paper hold for $r \neq 0$.

Under the above model, the price of a European call with strike price K is given by the equality

$$V_t = E_t[(e^{X_T} - K)_+],$$

where E_t is the \mathcal{F}_t -conditional expectation with respect to P (i.e., $E_t[Z] = E[Z|\mathcal{F}_t]$). In the sequel, we make use of the following notation:

- $v_t = \sqrt{\frac{Y_t}{T-t}}$, where $Y_t = \int_t^T \sigma_u^2 du$.

That is, v represents the future average volatility, and it is not an adapted process. Notice that $E_t[v_t]$ is the fair strike of a volatility swap with maturity time T .

- $BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma)$ is the price of a European call option under the classical Black-Scholes model with constant volatility σ , stock price e^x , time to maturity $T - t$, and strike $K = \exp(k)$. Remember that (if $r = 0$)

$$BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma) = e^x N(d_1(k, \sigma)) - e^k N(d_2(k, \sigma)),$$

where N denotes the cumulative probability function of the standard normal law and

$$d_1(k, \sigma) := \frac{x - k}{\sigma \sqrt{T - t}} + \frac{\sigma}{2} \sqrt{T - t}, \quad d_2(k, \sigma) := \frac{x - k}{\sigma \sqrt{T - t}} - \frac{\sigma}{2} \sqrt{T - t}.$$

For the sake of simplicity we make use of the notation $BS(k, \sigma) := BS(t, T, X_t, k, \sigma)$.

- The inverse function $BS^{-1}(t, T, x, k, \cdot)$ of the Black-Scholes formula with respect to the volatility parameter is defined as

$$BS(t, T, x, k, BS^{-1}(t, T, x, k, \lambda)) = \lambda,$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. For the sake of simplicity, we denote $BS^{-1}(k, \lambda) := BS^{-1}(t, T, X_t, k, \lambda)$.

- For any fixed t, T, X_t, k , we define the implied volatility $I(t, T, X_t, k)$ as the quantity such that

$$BS(t, T, X_t, k, I(t, T, X_t, k)) = V_t.$$

Notice that $I(t, T, X_t, k) = BS^{-1}(t, T, X_t, k, V_t)$.

- \hat{k}_t is the *zero vanna strike* at time t . That is, the strike such that

$$d_2(\hat{k}_t, I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t)) = 0.$$

Moreover, we will refer to $I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t)$ as the *zero vanna implied volatility*. We recall that (Black-Scholes) vanna is the partial derivative of the Black-Scholes delta with respect to implied volatility, which is directly proportional to d_2 . The zero vanna strike is therefore the strike where the Black-Scholes vanna of a vanilla option is zero.

- $\Lambda_r := E_r[BS(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t)]$.

- $\Theta_r(k) := BS^{-1}(k, \Lambda_r)$. Notice that $\Theta_t(\hat{k}_t) = I(t, X_t, \hat{k}_t, V_t)$ and $\Theta_T(\hat{k}_T) = v_t$.
- $G(t, T, x, k, \sigma) := (\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x})BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma)$.
- $H(t, T, x, k, \sigma) := (\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2})BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma)$.

In the remaining of this paper $\mathbb{D}_W^{1,2}$ denotes the domain of the Malliavin derivative operator D^W (see Appendix A) with respect to the Brownian motion W . We also consider the iterated derivatives $D^{n,W}$, for $n > 1$, whose domains will be denoted by $\mathbb{D}_W^{n,2}$. We will use the notation $\mathbb{L}_W^{n,2} = L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{D}_W^{n,2})$.

3 Limit theorems for the zero vanna implied volatility

The proofs of Propositions and Theorems of this section are in Appendix B.

3.1 The uncorrelated case

Let us consider the following hypotheses:

(H1) There exist two positive constants a, b such that $a \leq \sigma_t \leq b$, for all $t \in [0, T]$.

(H2) $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{L}_W^{2,2}$ and there exist two constants $\nu > 0$ and $H \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $0 < r, \theta < s < T$,

$$|E_r[D_r^W \sigma_s^2]| \leq \nu(s-r)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |E_r[D_\theta^W D_r^W \sigma_s^2]| \leq \nu^2(s-r)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}(s-\theta)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The key tool in our analysis will be the following relationship between the zero vanna implied volatility and the fair strike of a volatility swap.

Proposition 1. *Consider the model (2.1) with $\rho = 0$ and assume that hypotheses (H1) and (H2) hold. Then the zero vanna implied volatility admits the representation*

$$\begin{aligned} I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) &= E_t[v_t] \\ &\quad + E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))''' (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(iv)} A_r U_r^2 dr \right], \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$A_r := \frac{1}{2} \int_r^T U_s^2 ds, \quad (D^- A)_r := \frac{1}{2} \int_r^T D_r^W U_s^2 ds,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} U_r &:= E_r \left[D_r^W (BS(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t)) \right] \\ &= E_r \left[\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \frac{1}{2v_t(T-t)} \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_s^2 ds \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

In order to prove our limit results, we will need the following hypothesis.

(H2') $\sigma \in \mathbb{L}_{W}^{3,2}$ and there exists two constants $\nu > 0$ and $H \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $0 < r < u, s, \theta < T$

$$|E_r[D_r^W \sigma_s^2]| \leq \nu(s-r)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |E_r[D_\theta^W D_r^W \sigma_s^2]| \leq \nu^2(s-r)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}(s-\theta)^{H-\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$|E_r[D_u^W D_\theta^W D_r^W \sigma_s^2]| \leq \nu^3(s-r)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}(s-\theta)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}(s-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Theorem 2. Consider the model (2.1) and assume that hypotheses (H1) and (H2') hold. Then,

$$I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t] = O(\nu^4(T-t)^{4H+1}).$$

3.2 The correlated case

We will consider the following hypothesis.

(H3) Hypotheses (H1), (H2'), hold and the terms

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(T-t)^{3+2H}} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right], \\ & \frac{1}{(T-t)^{2+2H}} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right], \\ & \frac{1}{(T-t)^{2+2H}} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T \int_r^T D_s^W D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right], \end{aligned}$$

have a finite limit as $T \rightarrow t$.

The following result, that follows from the same arguments as Proposition 4.1 in Alòs and Shiraya (2019), gives us an exact decomposition for the zero vanna implied volatility that will be the main tool in this section.

Proposition 3. Consider the model (2.1) and assume that hypotheses (H1), (H2') and hold for some $H \in (0, 1)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) &= I^0(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) \\ &+ \frac{\rho}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})'(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_s) H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) \zeta_s ds \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where $I^0(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t)$ denotes the zero vanna implied volatility in the uncorrelated case $\rho = 0$,

$$\Gamma_s := E_t[BS(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t)] + \frac{\rho}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^s H(r, T, X_r, \hat{k}_t, v_r) \zeta_r dr \right],$$

and $\zeta_t := \sigma_t \int_t^T D_t^W \sigma_r^2 dr$.

Theorem 2 and Proposition 3 allow us to prove the following result.

Theorem 4. Consider the model (2.1) and assume that hypotheses (H1), (H2') and (H3) hold for some $H \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]}{(T - t)^{2H}} \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{8\sigma_t^3(T - t)^{3+2H}} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right] \\
&\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t^2(T - t)^{2+2H}} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\
&\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t(T - t)^{2+2H}} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T \int_r^T D_s^W D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right]. \tag{3.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Example 5. Let W^H be a Riemann-Liouville fractional Brownian motion (RLfBm) with Hurst parameter $H \in (0, 1)$ defined in a time interval $[0, T]$. That is,

$$W_t^H := \frac{1}{\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2})} \int_0^t (t - s)^{H - \frac{1}{2}} dW_s.$$

Assume that $\sigma_t = f(W_t^H)$, where $f \in C_b^3$ with a range in a compact set of \mathbb{R}^+ and W_t^H is a fBm with Hurst parameter H . Then the above result proves that, in the correlated case

$$I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t] = O((T - t)^{2H}). \tag{3.5}$$

Remark 6. Notice that the term $T_2^{1,2}$ in the proof of Theorem 4 in Appendix B is of the order $(\rho(T - t)^{\frac{1}{2} + 2H})$. When $T - t$ does not tend to zero, this term can not be neglected.

Remark 7. Hypotheses (H1)-(H3) have been chosen for the sake of simplicity. The same results can be extended to other stochastic volatility models (see e.g., Section 5 in Alòs and Shiraya (2019)).

Remark 8. In the case $H = \frac{1}{2}$, Theorem 4.2 in Alòs and Shiraya (2019) gives us that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{I(t, T, X_t, k_t^*) - E_t[v_t]}{(T - t)} \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{8\sigma_t^3(T - t)^4} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right] \\
&\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t^2(T - t)^3} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\
&\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t(T - t)^3} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T \int_r^T D_s^W D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\
&\quad + \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho}{4(T - t)^2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right], a.s.
\end{aligned}$$

where k_t^* denotes the at-the-money strike. This, jointly with Theorem 4 implies that, if $H = \frac{1}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{I(t, T, X_t, k_t^*) - I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t)}{(T - t)} \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho}{4(T - t)^2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right], a.s. \end{aligned}$$

Now, the term in the right-hand side can be written in terms of the short-time limit skew (see Alòs, León and Vives [1]). This allows us to write

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{I(t, T, X_t, k_t^*) - I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t)}{(T - t)} = \frac{\sigma_t^2}{2} \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\partial I}{\partial k}(t, T, X_t, k_t^*)$$

and then we obtain the following model free relationship between the zero vanna implied volatility, the at-the-money implied volatility and the implied volatility skew:

$$I(t, T, X_t, k_t^*) - I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) \approx \frac{I^2(t, T, X_t, k_t^*)(T - t)}{2} \frac{\partial I}{\partial k}(t, T, X_t, k_t^*). \quad (3.6)$$

4 Numerical examples

In this section we confirm the validity of our estimates by using numerical examples, and discuss the potential applications of our results. Let us consider a rough Bergomi model as in Bayer, Friz and Gatheral (2016). That is, assume that the volatility process is given by

$$S_t = \exp \left(X_0 - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sigma_s^2 ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s \left(\rho dW_s + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} dB_s \right) \right), \quad (4.1)$$

$$\sigma_t^2 = \sigma_0^2 \exp \left(\alpha W_t^H - \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 t^{2H} \right), t \in [0, T], \quad (4.2)$$

for some positive real values σ_0^2 and $\alpha, \rho \in [-1, 1]$, $W_t^H := \sqrt{2H} \int_0^t (t-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} dW_s$, and $H \in (0, 1)$. W and B are independent standard Brownian motions.

A direct computation gives us (see Bayer, Friz and Gatheral (2016)) that, for all $s < t$

$$E(W_t^H W_s^H) = s^{2H} \int_0^1 \frac{2H}{(1-x)^{\frac{1}{2}-H} (t/s-x)^{\frac{1}{2}-H}} dx. \quad (4.3)$$

Moreover, for all $s, t \geq 0$

$$E(W_t^H B_s) = \frac{\rho \sqrt{2H}}{H + \frac{1}{2}} \left(t^{H+\frac{1}{2}} - (t - \min(t, s))^{H+\frac{1}{2}} \right). \quad (4.4)$$

Notice that even when this model does not satisfy (H1), (H2) and (H2'), the limit results in Theorem 4 are still valid. To see this we make use of an approximation argument. Let us define $\phi(x) := \sigma_0 \exp(x)$. For every $n > 1$, consider a function $\phi_n \in C_b^2$ such that $\phi_n(x) = \phi(x)$ for any

$x \in [-n, n]$, $\phi_n(x) \in [\phi(-2n) \vee \phi(x), \phi(-n)]$ for $x \leq -n$, and $\phi_n(x) \in [\phi(n), \phi(x) \wedge \phi(2n)]$ for $x \geq n$. Then

$$(\sigma_s^n)^2 := \phi_n \left(\alpha W_t^H - \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 t^{2H} \right).$$

It is easy to see that σ_s^n satisfies (H1), (H2) and (H2'). Then, we can write (we consider $t = 0$ for the sake of simplicity)

$$\begin{aligned} I(0, T, X_0, \hat{k}_0) - E[v_0] \\ &= I(0, T, X_0, \hat{k}_0) - I^n(0, T, X_0, \hat{k}_0) \\ &\quad + I^n(0, T, X_0, \hat{k}_0) - E[v_0^n] \\ &\quad + E[v_0^n] - E[v_0] \\ &=: T_1 + T_2 + T_3, \end{aligned}$$

where I^n and $E[v_0^n]$ denote the implied volatility and the fair price of the volatility swap under the volatility process σ^n , respectively. Now, the proof of Theorem 4 gives us that (in the correlated case $\rho \neq 0$) $T_2 = O(T^{2H})$. On the other hand, following similar arguments as in Alòs and Shiraya (2019), we can see that for n large enough T_1 and T_3 in the proof of Theorem 4 are of a higher order than T_2 .

For the numerical simulations we set $S_0 = e^{X_0} = 100$, $\sigma_0 = 20\%$, $\alpha = 0.8$, correlation values $\rho = 0$ and -0.8 , Hurst parameter values $H = 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.6, 0.9$, and times to maturity $0.25, 0.5, 1, 2$, and 3 years as base settings. In order to calculate the implied volatilities and volatility swap prices, we use Monte Carlo simulation with 500 time steps for one year and twenty million trials.

The discretized fractional Brownian motion W^H and standard Brownian motion B are made by the standard normal random variables Z and the triangular matrix obtained by the Cholesky decomposition of the covariance matrix. In more detail, firstly, we made independent standard normal random variables Z_1, \dots, Z_{2m} (m is the number of time steps) and the $2m \times 2m$ covariance matrix Σ whose (i, j) element $\Sigma_{i,j}$ for $0 < t_1 = t_{m+1} < t_2 = t_{m+2} < \dots < t_m = t_{2m} = T$ is expressed as follows:

$$\Sigma_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \min(t_i, t_j)^{2H} \int_0^1 \frac{2Hdx}{(1-x)^{\frac{1}{2}-H} (\max(t_i, t_j) - \min(t_i, t_j) - x)^{\frac{1}{2}-H}} & \text{if } 0 < i, j \leq m, \\ \rho \frac{\sqrt{2H}}{H+1/2} \left(t_i^{H+\frac{1}{2}} - (t_i - \min(t_i, t_j))^{H+\frac{1}{2}} \right) & \text{if } 0 < i \leq m < j \leq 2m, \\ \rho \frac{\sqrt{2H}}{H+1/2} \left(t_j^{H+\frac{1}{2}} - (t_j - \min(t_i, t_j))^{H+\frac{1}{2}} \right) & \text{if } 0 < j \leq m < i \leq 2m, \\ \min(t_i, t_j) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

Next, we make $2m \times 2m$ triangular matrices C and C^T obtained by the Cholesky decomposition of Σ as $\Sigma = CC^T$. Then, the discretized fractional Brownian motion $W_{t_1}^H, \dots, W_{t_m}^H$ and the standard Brownian motion B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_m} are calculated as $(W_{t_1}^H, \dots, W_{t_m}^H, B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_m})' = C(Z_1, \dots, Z_{2m})'$.

We apply the Euler-Maruyama scheme for the exponent of both the underlying asset price and its volatility processes, and calculate the European put option premium

$$E \left[\left(K - \exp \left(X_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sigma_{t_i}^2 (t_{i+1} - t_i) + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sigma_{t_i} \left(\rho (W_{t_{i+1}} - W_{t_i}) + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} (B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}) \right) \right) \right) \right]_+, \quad (4.6)$$

and the volatility swap strike

$$E \left[\sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sigma_{t_i}^2 (t_{i+1} - t_i)} \right], \quad (4.7)$$

where K is the strike price of the European put option.

To increase accuracy, the Black-Scholes model has been used as the control variate for the Monte Carlo simulations to obtain the option premiums. Once the exact volatility swap strikes and options prices have been calculated, the bisection method is used to infer implied volatilities, including zero vanna implied volatilities. To compare our new results to the approximation formula (4.8) of Alòs-Shiraya (2019), we also calculate the ATM skew ($\frac{\partial I}{\partial k}$) using the difference method on the implied volatilities.

Tables 1 and 2 below show the results of the uncorrelated case and correlated case, respectively. Also, we examine the stressed parameter cases. Tables 3 and 4 show the results of the stressed σ_0 which is twice the size of the base setting (i.e. $\sigma_0 = 40\%$). Tables 5 and 6 show the results of the stressed α which is 2.5 times the size of the base setting (i.e. $\alpha = 2$).

In the tables, “VS” is the simulated volatility swap value, “IV (\hat{k})” and “ATMI” are the implied volatility at respectively the zero vanna strike and ATM strike, and “AS(4.8)” is the value of the formula (4.8) in Alòs and Shiraya (2019). Note that in the uncorrelated case AS(4.8) and ATMI are equal because the ATM skew in the uncorrelated case is 0.

We also show the difference between “VS” and “IV (\hat{k})”, “ATMI”, “AS(4.8)” respectively. The standard deviations of the Monte Carlo simulations have been relegated to tables in Appendix C.

Table 1: Zero-vanna approximation for volatility swaps ($\rho = 0, \sigma_0 = 20\%, \alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI	VS - IV(\hat{k})	VS - ATMI
0.1	0.25	19.70%	19.69%	19.69%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	19.65%	19.65%	19.65%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	19.60%	19.60%	19.59%	0.00%	0.00%
	2.0	19.54%	19.54%	19.53%	0.00%	0.01%
	3.0	19.50%	19.50%	19.49%	0.00%	0.01%
0.3	0.25	19.75%	19.75%	19.75%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	19.63%	19.63%	19.63%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	19.44%	19.44%	19.43%	0.00%	0.00%
	2.0	19.15%	19.15%	19.13%	0.00%	0.02%
	3.0	18.93%	18.92%	18.89%	0.01%	0.03%
0.5	0.25	19.87%	19.87%	19.87%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	19.74%	19.74%	19.74%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	19.48%	19.48%	19.48%	0.00%	0.00%
	2.0	18.98%	18.98%	18.96%	0.01%	0.02%
	3.0	18.51%	18.50%	18.46%	0.02%	0.05%
0.7	0.25	19.94%	19.93%	19.93%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	19.83%	19.83%	19.83%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	19.56%	19.56%	19.55%	0.00%	0.00%
	2.0	18.87%	18.86%	18.84%	0.01%	0.03%
	3.0	18.10%	18.07%	18.03%	0.03%	0.07%
0.9	0.25	19.97%	19.97%	19.97%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	19.89%	19.89%	19.89%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	19.62%	19.63%	19.62%	0.00%	0.00%
	2.0	18.76%	18.75%	18.73%	0.01%	0.03%
	3.0	17.64%	17.58%	17.54%	0.06%	0.09%

Table 2: Zero-vanna approximation for volatility swaps ($\rho = -0.8, \sigma_0 = 20\%, \alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI	AS(4.8)	VS - IV(\hat{k})	VS - ATMI	VS - AS(4.8)
0.1	0.25	19.70%	19.53%	19.41%	19.53%	0.16%	0.28%	0.16%
	0.5	19.65%	19.46%	19.29%	19.46%	0.18%	0.36%	0.19%
	1.0	19.60%	19.39%	19.12%	19.38%	0.21%	0.48%	0.22%
	2.0	19.54%	19.29%	18.89%	19.28%	0.25%	0.64%	0.26%
	3.0	19.50%	19.23%	18.73%	19.21%	0.27%	0.76%	0.29%
0.3	0.25	19.75%	19.63%	19.52%	19.62%	0.13%	0.23%	0.13%
	0.5	19.63%	19.43%	19.25%	19.43%	0.19%	0.37%	0.19%
	1.0	19.44%	19.15%	18.84%	19.14%	0.29%	0.59%	0.30%
	2.0	19.15%	18.71%	18.22%	18.68%	0.44%	0.93%	0.47%
	3.0	18.93%	18.37%	17.73%	18.32%	0.56%	1.20%	0.60%
0.5	0.25	19.87%	19.80%	19.73%	19.80%	0.06%	0.14%	0.06%
	0.5	19.74%	19.61%	19.46%	19.61%	0.13%	0.28%	0.13%
	1.0	19.48%	19.23%	18.94%	19.22%	0.25%	0.54%	0.26%
	2.0	18.98%	18.48%	17.97%	18.45%	0.51%	1.01%	0.54%
	3.0	18.51%	17.77%	17.10%	17.72%	0.75%	1.41%	0.80%
0.7	0.25	19.94%	19.91%	19.85%	19.90%	0.03%	0.08%	0.03%
	0.5	19.83%	19.75%	19.63%	19.75%	0.08%	0.20%	0.08%
	1.0	19.56%	19.35%	19.09%	19.34%	0.21%	0.46%	0.21%
	2.0	18.87%	18.33%	17.83%	18.30%	0.54%	1.04%	0.57%
	3.0	18.10%	17.19%	16.53%	17.14%	0.91%	1.57%	0.96%
0.9	0.25	19.97%	19.95%	19.92%	19.95%	0.01%	0.05%	0.01%
	0.5	19.89%	19.84%	19.75%	19.84%	0.05%	0.14%	0.05%
	1.0	19.62%	19.46%	19.22%	19.45%	0.17%	0.40%	0.17%
	2.0	18.76%	18.19%	17.71%	18.16%	0.57%	1.05%	0.60%
	3.0	17.64%	16.58%	15.97%	16.53%	1.06%	1.67%	1.11%

Table 3: Zero-vanna approximation for volatility swaps ($\rho = 0, \sigma_0 = 40\%, \alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(k)	ATMI	VS-IV(k)	VS-ATMI
0.1	0.25	39.39%	39.39%	39.38%	0.00%	0.01%
	0.5	39.30%	39.30%	39.29%	0.00%	0.01%
	1.0	39.20%	39.19%	39.16%	0.00%	0.03%
	2.0	39.08%	39.07%	39.00%	0.01%	0.08%
	3.0	39.00%	38.99%	38.88%	0.01%	0.12%
0.3	0.25	39.51%	39.50%	39.50%	0.00%	0.01%
	0.5	39.25%	39.25%	39.24%	0.00%	0.01%
	1.0	38.87%	38.87%	38.83%	0.00%	0.04%
	2.0	38.30%	38.27%	38.16%	0.03%	0.14%
	3.0	37.85%	37.80%	37.59%	0.05%	0.26%
0.5	0.25	39.74%	39.74%	39.73%	0.00%	0.01%
	0.5	39.48%	39.48%	39.47%	0.00%	0.01%
	1.0	38.96%	38.96%	38.92%	0.00%	0.04%
	2.0	37.97%	37.92%	37.79%	0.05%	0.17%
	3.0	37.02%	36.90%	36.65%	0.12%	0.37%
0.7	0.25	39.87%	39.87%	39.87%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	39.66%	39.66%	39.65%	0.00%	0.01%
	1.0	39.11%	39.11%	39.08%	0.00%	0.03%
	2.0	37.74%	37.67%	37.54%	0.07%	0.20%
	3.0	36.20%	35.97%	35.71%	0.23%	0.49%
0.9	0.25	39.94%	39.94%	39.94%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	39.78%	39.78%	39.78%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	39.25%	39.25%	39.22%	0.00%	0.03%
	2.0	37.52%	37.43%	37.30%	0.09%	0.22%
	3.0	35.27%	34.90%	34.64%	0.37%	0.63%

Table 4: Zero-vanna approximation for volatility swaps ($\rho = -0.8, \sigma_0 = 40\%, \alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI	AS(4.8)	VS - IV(\hat{k})	VS - ATMI	VS - AS(4.8)
0.1	0.25	39.39%	39.06%	38.59%	39.05%	0.33%	0.80%	0.34%
	0.5	39.30%	38.92%	38.21%	38.90%	0.38%	1.09%	0.40%
	1.0	39.20%	38.75%	37.71%	38.70%	0.44%	1.49%	0.50%
	2.0	39.08%	38.56%	37.01%	38.44%	0.52%	2.07%	0.64%
	3.0	39.00%	38.43%	36.50%	38.25%	0.57%	2.50%	0.75%
0.3	0.25	39.51%	39.25%	38.82%	39.24%	0.26%	0.68%	0.27%
	0.5	39.25%	38.86%	38.14%	38.83%	0.39%	1.11%	0.42%
	1.0	38.87%	38.26%	37.07%	38.19%	0.61%	1.80%	0.68%
	2.0	38.30%	37.35%	35.45%	37.17%	0.95%	2.85%	1.13%
	3.0	37.85%	36.62%	34.17%	36.32%	1.23%	3.68%	1.53%
0.5	0.25	39.74%	39.61%	39.30%	39.60%	0.13%	0.44%	0.13%
	0.5	39.48%	39.21%	38.62%	39.20%	0.26%	0.86%	0.28%
	1.0	38.96%	38.42%	37.31%	38.36%	0.54%	1.65%	0.60%
	2.0	37.97%	36.85%	34.92%	36.65%	1.11%	3.05%	1.31%
	3.0	37.02%	35.35%	32.82%	35.00%	1.68%	4.21%	2.03%
0.7	0.25	39.87%	39.81%	39.60%	39.81%	0.06%	0.27%	0.06%
	0.5	39.66%	39.50%	39.02%	39.49%	0.16%	0.64%	0.17%
	1.0	39.11%	38.67%	37.66%	38.61%	0.44%	1.45%	0.50%
	2.0	37.74%	36.52%	34.61%	36.32%	1.22%	3.13%	1.42%
	3.0	36.20%	34.10%	31.65%	33.75%	2.10%	4.55%	2.45%
0.9	0.25	39.94%	39.91%	39.76%	39.91%	0.03%	0.17%	0.03%
	0.5	39.78%	39.68%	39.31%	39.67%	0.10%	0.47%	0.11%
	1.0	39.25%	38.88%	37.97%	38.84%	0.36%	1.27%	0.41%
	2.0	37.52%	36.21%	34.36%	36.01%	1.31%	3.16%	1.51%
	3.0	35.27%	32.79%	30.52%	32.46%	2.48%	4.75%	2.82%

Table 5: Zero-vanna approximation for volatility swaps ($\rho = 0, \sigma_0 = 20\%, \alpha = 2$)

H	T	VS	IV(k)	ATMI	VS - IV(k)	VS - ATMI
0.1	0.25	18.10%	18.10%	18.09%	0.01%	0.01%
	0.5	17.84%	17.83%	17.82%	0.00%	0.01%
	1.0	17.53%	17.52%	17.50%	0.01%	0.03%
	2.0	17.18%	17.15%	17.12%	0.03%	0.06%
	3.0	16.96%	16.91%	16.85%	0.05%	0.10%
0.3	0.25	18.52%	18.52%	18.51%	0.01%	0.01%
	0.5	17.81%	17.80%	17.80%	0.00%	0.01%
	1.0	16.79%	16.77%	16.75%	0.02%	0.04%
	2.0	15.41%	15.32%	15.28%	0.09%	0.13%
	3.0	14.41%	14.24%	14.18%	0.17%	0.22%
0.5	0.25	19.21%	19.20%	19.20%	0.00%	0.01%
	0.5	18.46%	18.46%	18.45%	0.00%	0.01%
	1.0	17.12%	17.10%	17.09%	0.02%	0.03%
	2.0	14.94%	14.82%	14.79%	0.12%	0.15%
	3.0	13.28%	13.04%	13.01%	0.23%	0.27%
0.7	0.25	19.60%	19.60%	19.60%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	18.98%	18.98%	18.98%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	17.54%	17.53%	17.51%	0.02%	0.03%
	2.0	14.76%	14.62%	14.60%	0.14%	0.17%
	3.0	12.61%	12.37%	12.34%	0.24%	0.27%
0.9	0.25	19.81%	19.80%	19.80%	0.00%	0.00%
	0.5	19.34%	19.34%	19.34%	0.00%	0.00%
	1.0	17.91%	17.90%	17.89%	0.01%	0.02%
	2.0	14.65%	14.50%	14.48%	0.15%	0.17%
	3.0	12.20%	11.99%	11.97%	0.21%	0.23%

Table 6: Zero-vanna approximation for volatility swaps ($\rho = -0.8, \sigma_0 = 20\%, \alpha = 2$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI	AS(4.8)	VS - IV(\hat{k})	VS - ATMI	VS - AS(4.8)
0.1	0.25	18.10%	17.40%	17.19%	17.39%	0.71%	0.91%	0.71%
	0.5	17.84%	17.04%	16.75%	17.03%	0.80%	1.09%	0.81%
	1.0	17.53%	16.63%	16.22%	16.61%	0.90%	1.31%	0.92%
	2.0	17.18%	16.17%	15.60%	16.13%	1.01%	1.58%	1.05%
	3.0	16.96%	15.86%	15.17%	15.80%	1.09%	1.78%	1.16%
0.3	0.25	18.52%	17.83%	17.63%	17.83%	0.69%	0.90%	0.69%
	0.5	17.81%	16.83%	16.52%	16.82%	0.98%	1.29%	0.99%
	1.0	16.79%	15.45%	15.02%	15.43%	1.34%	1.77%	1.37%
	2.0	15.41%	13.65%	13.12%	13.61%	1.75%	2.29%	1.79%
	3.0	14.41%	12.43%	11.85%	12.37%	1.98%	2.55%	2.03%
0.5	0.25	19.21%	18.83%	18.67%	18.83%	0.37%	0.54%	0.38%
	0.5	18.46%	17.76%	17.47%	17.75%	0.70%	0.99%	0.71%
	1.0	17.12%	15.89%	15.47%	15.86%	1.24%	1.65%	1.26%
	2.0	14.94%	13.10%	12.63%	13.06%	1.85%	2.32%	1.88%
	3.0	13.28%	11.21%	10.77%	11.18%	2.07%	2.51%	2.10%
0.7	0.25	19.60%	19.42%	19.30%	19.42%	0.18%	0.30%	0.18%
	0.5	18.98%	18.53%	18.28%	18.52%	0.46%	0.70%	0.46%
	1.0	17.54%	16.50%	16.11%	16.48%	1.05%	1.44%	1.07%
	2.0	14.76%	13.01%	12.59%	12.98%	1.75%	2.17%	1.78%
	3.0	12.61%	10.78%	10.42%	10.75%	1.83%	2.19%	1.86%
0.9	0.25	19.81%	19.72%	19.63%	19.72%	0.09%	0.17%	0.09%
	0.5	19.34%	19.05%	18.85%	19.05%	0.29%	0.49%	0.29%
	1.0	17.91%	17.05%	16.68%	17.03%	0.87%	1.23%	0.89%
	2.0	14.65%	13.08%	12.72%	13.06%	1.57%	1.94%	1.60%
	3.0	12.20%	10.71%	10.41%	10.69%	1.49%	1.79%	1.51%

As we can see from the tables, IV (\hat{k}) approximates the volatility swap strike better than ATMI in all cases. Also, since the error order in the uncorrelated case is higher than that of the correlated case, and the error is always multiplied by the correlation, IV (\hat{k}) is a more accurate approximation of the volatility swap strike when the correlation is small. While the values of AS(4.8) are close to those of IV(\hat{k}), IV(\hat{k}) is better in our settings.

For long term maturities, smaller Hurst parameters result in smaller errors, while for short term maturities, larger Hurst parameters result in smaller errors. Also, for the same Hurst parameter the results are more accurate for short maturities. This is because the order of the error is expressed as T to the power of the Hurst parameter. Moreover, since $D_s \sigma_t = \frac{1}{2} \exp(\frac{1}{2} \alpha (W_t^H - W_s^H) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha^2 (t^{2H} - s^{2H})) \alpha \sigma_t \mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq t\}}$, the errors also depend on the size of σ_0 and α . Thus, as shown in Theorems 2, 4 and Tables 3 - 6, the errors are proportional to σ_0 and α .

The numerical results support our analytical results, and moreover tell us that in the uncorrelated case the zero vanna approximation is highly accurate and for most practical purposes can be taken as the price of the volatility swap. As volatility or volatility of volatility moves away from zero, although the approximation cannot anymore serve as the price of the volatility

swap, it can still be used as a benchmark price against which to validate model specific prices, or even as an indicative bid-price under normal market conditions. This is especially true in foreign exchange (FX) markets where volatility or volatility of volatility values are typically not as extreme as in equity markets.

Furthermore, since the zero vanna approximation can be calculated as frequently as the implied volatility smile is updated, and without added computational costs, it is possible to use the zero vanna implied volatility to monitor market conditions for volatility swaps prices as well as using it as a risk management tool. Deducing volatility swap benchmark prices directly from the observable implied volatility smile is clearly much faster than evaluating an exact model-specific volatility swap strike. The latter will require Monte Carlo or PDE methods as there are almost no models that yield the exact volatility swap strike in closed form. Even when expensive Monte Carlo or PDE methods are used to calculate the ‘exact’ price, numerical and calibration errors cannot be avoided.

5 Conclusion

By using techniques from Malliavin calculus we have extended the validity of the zero vanna implied volatility as an approximation for pricing volatility swaps to fractional stochastic volatility models. Furthermore, we have proved that even though the zero vanna approximation for the volatility swap strike is accurate for zero correlation and for all values of the Hurst parameter, it is not exact. Thus, indirectly it is proved that the Rolloos-Arslan approximation is not equivalent to the Carr-Lee approximation for volatility swaps as the latter is exact for zero correlation. However, in the uncorrelated case and for most practical purposes it can be treated as exact.

It has also been shown that the zero vanna approximation has a higher or equal rate of convergence than the Alòs and Shiraya (2019) model-free result and the ATMI approximation. In the uncorrelated case, the zero vanna approximation has a higher order than the ATM implied volatility for all values of H . When correlation deviates from zero a comparison of the order of convergence is more nuanced: For short maturities and Hurst value $H > 1/2$ the zero vanna implied volatility converges faster to the exact volatility swap price. When $H = 1/2$ the order on time to maturity $T - t$ is the same as for the ATM implied volatility, however the first order of correlation ρ is not present in the leading terms of the zero vanna approximation. If $H < 1/2$ the leading terms of the zero vanna approximation is the same as of the ATM implied volatility, but the order on $T - t$ of the first order of ρ is higher than that of the ATM implied volatility.

References

- [1] Alòs, E., León, J. A., and Vives, J. “On the short-time behavior of the implied volatility for jump-diffusion models with stochastic volatility,” *Finance and Stochastics* 11 (4), (2007): 571-589.
- [2] Alòs, E., and Shiraya, K. “Estimating the Hurst parameter from short term volatility swaps: a Malliavin calculus approach.” *Finance and Stochastics* 23.2 (2019): 423-447.

- [3] Bayer, C., Friz, P. and Gatheral, J. "Pricing under rough volatility." *Quantitative Finance*, 16:6 (2016), pp. 887-904.
- [4] Bergomi, L. and Guyon, J.. The Smile in Stochastic Volatility Models (December 2, 2011). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1967470>
- [5] Carr, P. and Lee, R. "Robust replication of volatility derivatives," PRMIA award for Best Paper in Derivatives, MFA 2008 Annual Meeting, (2008).
- [6] Comte, F. and Renault, E.: "Long memory in continuous-time stochastic volatility models," *Math. Financ.* 8, (1998): 291-323.
- [7] Decreusefond, L. and Ustünel, A. S. . "Stochastic analysis of the fractional Brownian motion". *Potential Anal.* 10, (1999), pp. 177–214.
- [8] El Euch, O. Fukasawa, M., Gatheral, J. and Rosenbaum, M. "Short-Term At-the-Money Asymptotics Under Stochastic Volatility Models," *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* 10.2 (2019): 491-511.
- [9] Friz, P., and Gatheral, J. "Valuation of volatility derivatives as an inverse problem," *Quantitative Finance* 5 (6), (2005): 531-542.
- [10] Nualart, D. "The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics. Second Edition," *Probability and its Applications*. Springer-Verlag, (2006).
- [11] Rolloos, F., and Arslan, M. "Taylor-made volatility swaps," *Wilmott*, (2017).

A Malliavin calculus

In this appendix, we present the basic Malliavin calculus results we use in this paper. The first one is the Clark-Ocone formula, that allows us to compute explicitly the martingale representation of a random variable $F \in \mathbb{D}_W^{1,2}$.

Theorem 9. *Clark-Ocone formula* Consider a Brownian motion $W = \{W_t, t \in [0, T]\}$ and a random variable $F \in \mathbb{D}_W^{1,2}$. Then

$$F = E[F] + \int_0^T E_r[D_r^W F] dW_r.$$

We will also make use of the following anticipating Itô's formula (adapted from Nualart and Pardoux (1998)), that allows us to work with non-adapted processes.

Proposition 10. *Consider a process X of the form $X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t u_s dW_s + \int_0^t u'_s dB_s + \int_0^t v_s ds$, where X_0 is a constant and u, v are square-integrable stochastic processes adapted to the filtration generated by W and B . Consider also a process $Y_t = \int_t^T \theta_s ds$, for some $\theta \in \mathbb{L}_W^{1,2}$ and adapted to the filtration generated by W . Let $F : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function in $C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that there exists a positive constant*

C such that, for all $t \in [0, T]$, F and its partial derivatives evaluated in (t, X_t, Y_t) are bounded by C . Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(t, X_t, Y_t) &= F(0, X_0, Y_0) + \int_0^t \partial_s F(s, X_s, Y_s) ds \\
&+ \int_0^t \partial_x F(s, X_s, Y_s) v_s ds \\
&+ \int_0^t \partial_x F(s, X_s, Y_s) (u_s dW_s + u'_s dB_s) \\
&- \int_0^t \partial_y F(s, X_s, Y_s) \theta_s^2 ds + \int_0^t \partial_{xy}^2 F(s, X_s, Y_s) D^- Y_s u_s ds \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \partial_{xx}^2 F(s, X_s, Y_s) (u_s^2 + (u'_s)^2) ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where $D^- Y_s := \int_s^T D_s \theta_r dr$.

Remark 11. The anticipating Itô's formula also holds for processes of the form $F(s, X_s, Y_s^1, \dots, Y_s^n)$, where $Y^i = \int_t^T \theta_s^i ds$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, just replacing the term

$$\int_0^t \partial_{xy}^2 F(s, X_s, Y_s) D^- Y_s u_s ds, \tag{A.2}$$

by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \partial_{xy^i}^2 F(s, X_s, Y_s^1, \dots, Y_s^n) D^- Y_s^i ds.$$

B Proofs

This section shows the proofs of Propositions and Theorems in Section 3. Firstly, we give some Greeks of Black-Scholes formula.

A direct calculation gives us that $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $u > 0$:

$$(BS^{-1})'(k, u) = \frac{1}{\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u))}.$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(BS^{-1})''(k, u) &= -\frac{1}{\left(\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u))\right)^2} \frac{\partial^2 BS}{\partial \sigma^2}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u)) \frac{1}{\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u))} \\
&= -\frac{1}{\left(\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u))\right)^3} \frac{\partial^2 BS}{\partial \sigma^2}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u)).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

Now, the classical relationship between the *Vomma* and the *Vega*

$$\frac{\partial^2 BS}{\partial \sigma^2}(k, \sigma) = \frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(k, \sigma) \frac{d_1(k, \sigma) d_2(k, \sigma)}{\sigma},$$

allows us to write

$$(BS^{-1})''(k, u) = \frac{1}{(\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u)))^2} \frac{(BS^{-1}(k, u))^4 (T - t)^2 - 4(X_t - k)^2}{4(BS^{-1}(k, u))^3 (T - t)}.$$

Finally, as

$$\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(k, BS^{-1}(k, u)) = \exp(X_t) N'(d_1(k, BS^{-1}(k, u))) \sqrt{T - t},$$

the above equality reduces to

$$(BS^{-1})''(k, u) = \frac{(BS^{-1}(k, u))^4 (T - t)^2 - 4(X_t - k)^2}{4(\exp(X_t) N'(d_1(k, BS^{-1}(k, u))))^2 (T - t)^2 (BS^{-1}(k, u))^3}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

By using these formula, we show the proofs.

Proof of Proposition 1. This proof is decomposed into several steps.

Step 1 First, we will show that

$$I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) = E_t[v_t] + \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) U_r^2 dr \right]. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Observe that, as $\rho = 0$, the Hull and White formula gives us that $V_t = \Lambda_t$. Then, as in the proof of Proposition 3.1 in Alòs and Shiraya (2019) we can write

$$I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) = BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t) = E_t[BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t)]. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Now, (H2) and the Clark-Ocone formula (see Appendix A) give us that Λ admits the martingale representation given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\Lambda_r &= E_r[D_r^W(BS(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t))] \\ &= E_r \left[\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \frac{1}{2v_t(T-t)} \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_s^2 ds \right] dW_r \\ &= U_r dW_r. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Then, a direct application of the classical Itô's formula gives us that, after taking expectations:

$$E_t[BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t)] = E_t[BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_T)] - \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) d\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle_r \right]. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Now, as $\Lambda_T = BS(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t)$, (B.4) and (B.6) imply that

$$I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) = E_t[v_t] - \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) d\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle_r \right]. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

That is,

$$I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) = E_t[v_t] - \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) U_r^2 dr \right].$$

Step 2 Next, let us see that

$$\begin{aligned} & E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) U_r^2 dr \right] \\ &= E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))''' (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(iv)} A_r U_r^2 dr \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (B.8)$$

Towards this end, we apply the anticipating Itô's formula (see Appendix A) to the process

$$(BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) A_r,$$

where we take $F(X_r, Y_r) = (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, X_r) Y_r$, with $X_r = \Lambda_r$ (then $u_r = U_r$ and $u'_r = 0$), and $Y_r = A_r = -\frac{1}{2} \int_r^T U_\theta^2 d\theta$. Notice that, because of (H1) and (H2), F and its derivatives evaluated at (X_r, Y_r) are bounded. Then, taking into account that $dA_r = -\frac{1}{2} U_r^2 dr$ and applying Proposition 10 we get, after taking expectations

$$\begin{aligned} E_t \left[(BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_T) A_T \right] &= E_t \left[(BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t) A_t \right] \\ &- \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) U_r^2 dr \right] \\ &+ E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))''' (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(iv)} A_r U_r^2 dr \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (B.9)$$

Equality (B.2) and the fact that $\Theta_r(k) := BS^{-1}(k, \Lambda_r)$ give us that

$$(BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) = \frac{(\Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))^4 (T-t)^2 - 4(X_t - \hat{k}_t)^2}{4(\exp(X_t) N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_r(\hat{k}_t)))(T-t))^2 (\Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))^3}.$$

In particular, $(BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t) = 0$ and

$$(BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_T) = \frac{(v_t^4 - (\Theta_t(\hat{k}_t))^4)}{4(\exp(X_t) N'(d_1(k_t, v_t)))^2 v_t^3}, \quad (B.10)$$

which implies that $(BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_T)A_T = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) U_r^2 dr \right] &= E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))''' (D^-A)_r U_r dr \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(iv)} A_r U_r^2 dr \right], \end{aligned} \quad (B.11)$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Again, the proof is decomposed into several steps.

Step 1 We start by showing that

$$\begin{aligned} I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) &= E_t[v_t] \\ &\quad + (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))''' E_t \left[\int_t^T (D^-A)_r U_r dr \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))^{(iv)} E_t \left[\int_t^T A_r U_r^2 dr \right] \\ &\quad + T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4, \end{aligned} \quad (B.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(iv)} (D^- \Psi)_r U_r dr \right], \\ T_2 &= \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(v)} \Psi_r U_r^2 dr \right], \\ T_3 &= \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(v)} (D^- \Phi)_r U_r dr \right], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$T_4 = \frac{1}{4} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(vi)} \Phi_r U_r^2 dr \right],$$

with $\Psi_t := \int_t^T (D^-A)_r U_r dr$ and $\Phi_t := \int_t^T A_r U_r^2 dr$. Towards this end we can apply the anticipating Itô's formula (see Remark 11) to the processes

$$(BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_s))''' \int_s^T (D^-A)_r U_r dr =: (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_s))''' \Psi_s,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{4} (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_s))^{(iv)} \int_s^T A_r U_r^2 dr =: \frac{1}{4} (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_s))^{(iv)} \Phi_s.$$

Then, the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 1 allow us to write

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))''' (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right] \\
&= (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))''' E_t \left[\int_t^T (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right] \\
&\quad + E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(iv)} (D^- \Psi)_r U_r dr \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(v)} \Psi_r U_r^2 dr \right] \\
&= (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))''' E_t \left[\int_t^T (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right] + T_1 + T_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(iv)} A_r U_r^2 dr \right] \\
&= (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))^{(iv)} E_t \left[\int_t^T A_r U_r^2 dr \right] \\
&\quad + E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(v)} (D^- \Phi)_r U_r dr \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r))^{(vi)} \Phi_r U_r^2 dr \right] \\
&= (BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))^{(iv)} E_t \left[\int_t^T A_r U_r^2 dr \right] + T_3 + T_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.14}$$

Step 2 Now, let us study the term

$$(BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))''' E_t \left[\int_t^T (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right].$$

On one hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
(BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t))''' &= \frac{-\frac{\partial^3 BS}{\partial \sigma^3}(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_t(\hat{k}_t)) \left(\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_t(\hat{k}_t)) \right)^3 + 3 \left(\frac{\partial^2 BS}{\partial \sigma^2}(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_t(\hat{k}_t)) \right)^2 \left(\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_t(\hat{k}_t)) \right)^2}{\left(\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_t(\hat{k}_t)) \right)^7} \\
&= \frac{-\frac{\partial^3 BS}{\partial \sigma^3}(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_t(\hat{k}_t))}{\left(\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(\hat{k}_t, \Theta_t(\hat{k}_t)) \right)^4} + o\left((T-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\
&= (2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-3X_t + \frac{3}{2}(\Theta_t(\hat{k}_t))^2(T-t)\right)(T-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + o\left((T-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.15}$$

On the other hand,

$$(D^-A)_r = \frac{1}{2} \int_r^T D_r^W U_s^2 ds = \int_r^T U_s D_r^W U_s ds. \quad (\text{B.16})$$

The vega-delta-gamma relationship

$$\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(t, T, x, k, \sigma) \frac{1}{\sigma(T-t)} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma), \quad (\text{B.17})$$

allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} U_s &= E_s \left[\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \frac{1}{2v_t(T-t)} \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} E_s \left[G(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_r^W U_s &= E_s \left[\frac{1}{2} G(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \left(\frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t) d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{2v_t^2(T-t)} - \frac{1}{2v_t^2(T-t)} \right) \left(\int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \left(\int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} G(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \left(\int_s^T D_r^W D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, from the equation for G and (H2') we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (D^-A)_r &= \frac{1}{4} \int_r^T E_s \left[\frac{e^{\hat{k}_t} N'(d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right] \\ &\quad \times E_s \left[\frac{e^{\hat{k}_t} N'(d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \left(\frac{-1}{2v_t^2(T-t)} \left(\int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \left(\int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) + \left(\int_s^T D_r^W D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \right) \right] ds \\ &\quad + O(v^3(T-t)^{3H+\frac{1}{2}}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &E_t \left[\int_t^T (D^-A)_r U_r dr \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{8} E_t \left[\int_t^T \frac{e^{\hat{k}_t} N'(d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \left(\int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \int_r^T E_s \left[\frac{e^{\hat{k}_t} N'(d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times E_s \left[\frac{e^{\hat{k}_t} N'(d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \left(\frac{-1}{2v_t^2(T-t)} \left(\int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \left(\int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) + \left(\int_s^T D_r^W D_s^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \right) \right] ds dr \right] \\ &\quad + o(v^4(T-r)^{4H+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.20})$$

This, jointly with (B.15) and (H2') shows

$$\left(BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t) \right)''' E_t \left[\int_t^T (D^- A)_r U_r dr \right] = O(\nu^4 (T-t)^{4H+1}).$$

Step 3 In order to calculate the term

$$\frac{1}{4} \left(BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) \right)^{(iv)} E_t \left[\int_t^T A_r U_r^2 dr \right].$$

Note that

$$\left(BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t) \right)^{(iv)} = -\frac{3(2\pi)^2}{\Theta_t(\hat{k}_t)} \exp(-4X_t + 2(\Theta_t(\hat{k}_t))^2(T-t)) (T-t)^{-1} + o((T-t)^{-1}). \quad (\text{B.21})$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_t \left[\int_t^T A_r U_r^2 dr \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \left(\int_r^T U_s^2 ds \right) U_r^2 dr \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T U_r^2 dr \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \left(E_r \left[\frac{\partial BS}{\partial \sigma}(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \frac{1}{2v_t(T-t)} \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_s^2 dr \right] ds \right)^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

Together with (B.21) this gives us

$$\left(BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_t) \right)^{(iv)} E_t \left[\int_t^T A_r U_r^2 dr \right] = O(\nu^4 (T-t)^{4H+1})$$

Step 4 Next, let us prove that $T_2 + T_4 = o(\nu^4 (T-t)^{4H+1})$. The computations in Step 2 and Step 3 prove that $\Psi_r = O(\nu^4 (T-t)^{4H+\frac{3}{2}})$ and $\Phi_r = O(\nu^4 (T-t)^{4H+2})$. Moreover, $U_r = O(\nu (T-t)^H)$ and direct computations give us that

$$BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r)^{(v)} \leq C(T-r)^{-\frac{3}{2}},$$

and

$$BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r)^{(vi)} \leq C(T-r)^{-2},$$

for some positive constant C . Then, straightforward computations allow us to check that $T_2 + T_4 = o(\nu^4 (T-t)^{4H+1})$.

Step 5 The final step is to show that $T_1 + T_3 = o(v^4(T-t)^{4H+1})$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} D^-\Psi_t &:= \int_t^T D_t^W((D^-A)_r U_r) dr \\ &= \int_t^T (D_t^W(D^-A)_r) U_r dr + \int_t^T (D^-A)_r D_t^W U_r dr, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.23})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D^-\Phi_t &:= \int_t^T D_t^W(A_r U_r^2) dr \\ &= \int_t^T (D_t^W A_r) U_r^2 dr + 2 \int_t^T U_r A_r D_t^W(U_r) dr. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.24})$$

Notice that $G(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \leq C_t \sqrt{T-t}$ for some $C_t > 0$. Them, from the definition of U_r , and (H2), we directly get that

$$U_r = O(v(T-t)^H).$$

On the other hand, a direct computation gives us that

$$G(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \left(\frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t) d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{2v_t^2(T-t)} - \frac{1}{2v_t^2(T-t)} \right) < C_t(T-t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Then, (B.19), (H2) and straightforward computations lead to

$$D_t U_r = O(v^2(T-t)^{2H-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial v_t} \left[G(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \left(\frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t) d_2(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{2v_t^2(T-t)} - \frac{1}{2v_t^2(T-t)} \right) \right] \frac{1}{2v_t(T-t)} < C_t(T-t)^{-\frac{5}{2}}, \quad (\text{B.25})$$

from where we deduce that

$$D_t D_s U_r = O(v^3(T-t)^{3H-1}).$$

Then we can easily see that, under (H2'),

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^W(D^-A)_r &= \int_r^T D_t^W(U_s D_r^W U_s) ds \\ &= \int_r^T D_t^W U_s D_r^W U_s ds + \int_r^T U_s (D_t^W D_r^W U_s) ds \\ &= O(v^4(T-r)^{4H}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Then we deduce that $D^-\Psi_t = O(v^5(T-t)^{5H+1})$ and $D^-\Phi_t = O(v^5(T-t)^{5H+\frac{3}{2}})$. Again, direct computations allow us to see that for some positive constant C ,

$$BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r)^{(iv)} \leq C(T-r)^{-1},$$

which allows us to see that $T_1 + T_3 = o(v^4(T-t)^{4H+1})$. Now the proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. The proof of this result follows similar ideas as the proof Theorem 2 in Alòs and Shiraya (2019). Notice that Proposition 3 gives us that

$$I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E[v_t] = T_1 + T_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= I^0(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t^0) - E[v_t], \\ T_2 &= \frac{\rho}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})'(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_s) H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) \zeta_s ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let us first see that $T_1 = O((T - t)^{2H+1})$. Notice that

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{2} E_t \left[\int_t^T (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) U_r^2 dr \right].$$

Now, as

$$\begin{aligned} (BS^{-1})''(\hat{k}_t, \Lambda_r) &= \frac{(\Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))^4 (T - t)^2 - 4(X_t - k_t)^2}{4 \left(\exp(X_t) N'(d_1(k_t, \Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))) (T - t) \right)^2 (\Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))^3} \\ &= \frac{(\Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))^4 - (I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t))^4}{4 \left(\exp(X_t) N'(d_1(k_t, \Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))) \right)^2 (\Theta_r(\hat{k}_t))^3}, \end{aligned}$$

and $U_r = O((T - r)^H)$ it follows directly that $T_1 = O((T - t)^{2H+1})$.

Now, let us study T_2 . Towards this end, we apply the anticipating Itô's formula (10) to the process

$$H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) J_s,$$

where $J_s = \int_s^T (BS^{-1})'(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_u) \zeta_u du$. Then, taking conditional expectations we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = & E_t \left[H(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) J_t \right. \\
& + \int_t^T H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) dJ_s \\
& + \int_t^T \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial \sigma} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) J_s \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} (D_s^W Y_s) \sigma_s ds \\
& + \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) (D_s^W J_s) \sigma_s ds \\
& + \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial t} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) J_s ds \\
& + \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} J_s ds \\
& + \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} J_s dY_s \\
& + \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) J_s dX_s \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) J_s d\langle X \rangle_s \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using the relationships

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sigma(T-t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma) &= \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma), \\
\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) BS(t, T, x, k, \sigma) &= 0, \\
D_s^W J_s &= \rho \int_s^T (BS^{-1})'(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_r) D_s^W \zeta_r dr, \\
D_s^W Y_s &= \rho \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= E_t \left[H(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) J_t \right. \\
&\quad - \int_t^T H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) (BS^{-1})'(X_t, \Gamma_s) \zeta_s ds \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho}{2} \int_t^T \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) J_s \zeta_s ds \\
&\quad \left. + \rho \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) \left(\int_s^T (BS^{-1})'(k_t^*, \Gamma_r) (D_s^W \zeta_r) dr \right) \sigma_s ds \right],
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &= E_t \left[\frac{\rho}{2} H(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) J_t \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho^2}{4} \int_t^T \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) J_s \zeta_s ds \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\rho^2}{2} \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) \left(\int_s^T (BS^{-1})'(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_r) (D_s^W \zeta_r) dr \right) \sigma_s ds \right] \\
&= T_2^1 + T_2^2 + T_2^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the study of T_2 is decomposed into two steps.

Step 1 Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
H(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) &= \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \left(1 - \frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \right) \\
&= \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{2v_t^3 \sqrt{T-t}} (I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - v_t^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^1 \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho}{2} E_t \left[\frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{2v_t^3 \sqrt{T-t}} \left((I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t))^2 - v_t^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \int_t^T \frac{1}{e^{X_t} N'(d_+(\hat{k}_t, BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_s))) \sqrt{T-t}} \zeta_s ds \right]. \tag{B.27}
\end{aligned}$$

and the norm of this is of the order $O(\nu(T-t)^{H+\frac{1}{2}})$. Then, as

$$\begin{aligned}
(I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t))^2 - v_t^2 &= (I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t)(I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - v_t) \\
&= (I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) \left((I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]) + (E_t[v_t] - v_t) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^1 \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T-t)} \\
&\quad \times E_t \left[(I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) \left((I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]) + (E_t[v_t] - v_t) \right) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T-t)} E_t \left[(I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) (I(\hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right] \\
&\quad + \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T-t)} E_t \left[(I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) (E_t[v_t] - v_t) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right] \\
&=: \lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^{1,1} + \lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^{1,2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.28}$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2^{1,1} &= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} (I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]) \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T-t)} E_t \left[(I_t(\hat{k}_t) + v_t) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right] \\
&= (I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]) \times O((T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+H}).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.29}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2^{1,2} &\leq \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T-t)} \left(E_t \left[\left((I_t(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left(E_t \left[(E_t[v_t] - v_t)^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.30}$$

Then, as

$$\begin{aligned}
E_t[v_t] - v_t &= - \int_t^T E_r[D_r^W v_t] dW_r \\
&= - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{T-t}} \int_t^T E_r \left[\frac{\int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_s^2 ds}{v_t} \right] dW_r,
\end{aligned}$$

and then, since $I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t < 2b$ (see (H1)),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^{1,2} \\
& \leq \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{b\rho}{\sigma_t^2(T-t)} \left(E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \left(E_t \left[\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{T-t}} \int_t^T E_r \left[\frac{\int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_s^2 ds}{v_t} \right] dW_r \right)^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\
& = \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{b\rho}{4\sigma_t^3(T-t)^2} \left(E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \left(E_t \left[\int_t^T \left(E_r \left[\int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_s^2 ds \right] \right)^2 dr \right] \right)^{1/2} \\
& = O(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+2H}. \tag{B.31}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. In order to see that T_2^2 and T_2^3 are $O(T-t)^{2H}$ we apply again the anticipating Itô's formula to the processes

$$\left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) Z_s,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) R_s,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_s &:= \int_s^T \zeta_u J_u du, \\
R_s &:= \int_s^T \left(\int_u^T (BS^{-1})'(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_r) (D_s^W \zeta_r) dr \right) \sigma_u du.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2^2 &= \frac{\rho^2}{4} E_t \left[\left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) H(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) Z_t \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho}{2} \int_t^T \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right)^2 H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) Z_s \zeta_s ds \\
&\quad \left. + \rho \int_t^T \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) H(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_t, v_s) (D_s^W Z_s) \sigma_s ds \right], \tag{B.32}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2^3 &= \frac{\rho^2}{2} E_t \left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) R_t \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho}{2} \int_t^T \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_s, v_s) R_s \zeta_s ds \\
&\quad + \rho \int_t^T \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^2}(s, T, X_s, \hat{k}_s, v_s) \\
&\quad \times \left(\int_s^T \int_r^T (BS^{-1})'(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_u) (D_s^W D_r^W \zeta_u) dudr \right) \sigma_s ds \Big]. \tag{B.33}
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1 in Alòs, León and Vives (2007) gives us that the last two terms in (B.32) and (B.33) are $O(v^3(T-t)^{3H})$. Now, as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) H(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \right| \\
&= \left| - \frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \left(1 - \frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \right)^3 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(3 - \frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \right) \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{(v_t \sqrt{T-t})^3} \left(1 - \frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \right) + 3 \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{(v_t \sqrt{T-t})^5} \right| \\
&= \frac{3e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t^5} (T-t)^{-\frac{5}{2}} + O((T-t)^{-\frac{3}{2}}),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \left(1 - \frac{d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t)}{v_t \sqrt{T-t}} \right)^2 - \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{(v_t \sqrt{T-t})^3} \right| \\
&= \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t^3} (T-t)^{-\frac{3}{2}} + O((T-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^2 \\
&= \frac{\rho^2}{4} E_t \left[\left(\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) H(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) Z_t \right] \\
&= \frac{\rho^2}{4(T-t)^3} E_t \left[3 \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{v_t^5} \right. \\
&\quad \times \int_t^T \sigma_s \left(\int_t^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr \right) \left(\int_s^T \frac{\zeta_r}{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_r)))} dr \right) ds \Big] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{4\sigma_t^5(T-t)^3} E_t \left[\int_t^T \left(\int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr \right) \left(\int_s^T \zeta_r dr \right) \sigma_s ds \right] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{4\sigma_t^5(T-t)^3} E_t \left[\int_t^T \left(\int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr \right) \left(\int_s^T \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right) \sigma_s ds \right] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{4\sigma_t^3(T-t)^3} E_t \left[\int_t^T \left(\int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr \right) \left(\int_s^T \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_\theta^2 d\theta dr \right) ds \right] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{8\sigma_t^3(T-t)^3} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right], \tag{B.34}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^3 \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2} E_t \left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t, v_t) R_t \right] \\
&= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2} E_t \left[\frac{1}{4} \frac{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, v_t))}{(v_t \sqrt{T-t})^3} (v_t^2(T-t) - 4) \right. \\
&\quad \times \int_t^T \int_s^T \frac{1}{e^{X_t} N'(d_1(\hat{k}_t, BS^{-1}(\hat{k}_t, \Gamma_r))) \sqrt{T-t}} \left(D_s^W \left(\sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du \right) \right) dr \sigma_s ds \Big] \\
&= - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t^2(T-t)^2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_t^T \int_s^T \sigma_r \int_r^T D_s^W D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\
&= - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t^2(T-t)^2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\
&\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t(T-t)^2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T \int_r^T D_s^W D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right]. \tag{B.35}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now summarize the previous computations. We have seen that

$$\begin{aligned} I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t] &= T_1 + T_2 \\ &= T_1 + T_2^{1,1} + T_2^{1,2} + T_2^2 + T_2^3 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.36})$$

where

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow t} (T_1 + T_2^{1,2}) = o(T - t)^{2H},$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^{1,1} = \lim_{T \rightarrow t} (I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]) \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T - t)} E_t \left[(I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right],$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^2 = \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{8\sigma_t^3(T - t)^3} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right] + o(T - t)^{2H},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow t} T_2^3 &= -\lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t^2(T - t)^2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\ &\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t(T - t)^2} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T \int_r^T D_s^W D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\ &\quad + o(T - t)^{2H}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.37})$$

Then, as there is some ϵ such that, if $T - t < \epsilon$

$$\left| \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T - t)} E_t \left((I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right) \right| < 1$$

we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) - E_t[v_t]}{(T - t)^{2H}} &= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{1}{(T - t)^{2H}} \frac{T_1 + T_2^{1,2} + T_2^2 + T_2^3}{1 - \frac{\rho}{4\sigma_t^2(T - t)} E_t \left((I(t, T, X_t, \hat{k}_t) + v_t) \int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)} \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{3\rho^2}{8\sigma_t^3(T - t)^{3+2H}} E_t \left[\left(\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r^2 dr ds \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t^2(T - t)^{2+2H}} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T D_s^W \sigma_r \int_r^T D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right] \\ &\quad - \lim_{T \rightarrow t} \frac{\rho^2}{2\sigma_t(T - t)^{2+2H}} E_t \left[\int_t^T \int_s^T \int_r^T D_s^W D_r^W \sigma_u^2 du dr ds \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.38})$$

as we wanted to prove. \square

C Standard deviations of Monte Carlo simulations

We list the standard deviations of the Monte Carlo method used in Section 4. The standard deviation of the implied volatility cannot be obtained directly. Therefore, we approximate the standard deviation of the implied volatility by that of the option premium divided by the Vega value. Since the standard deviation of “AS(4.8)” is regarded equal to that of “ATMI” in this computation, we summarize them in the correlated cases.

Table 7: Standard deviations of the Monte Carlo simulations ($\rho = 0$, $\sigma_0 = 20\%$, $\alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI
0.1	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	3.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.003%
0.3	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	3.0	0.001%	0.003%	0.003%
0.5	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.003%
	3.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
0.7	0.25	0.000%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.003%	0.003%
	3.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
0.9	0.25	0.000%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.000%	0.001%	0.001%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	3.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%

Table 8: Standard deviations of the Monte Carlo simulations ($\rho = -0.8, \sigma_0 = 20\%, \alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI & AS(4.8)
0.1	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	3.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
0.3	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	3.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
0.5	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	3.0	0.002%	0.002%	0.002%
0.7	0.25	0.000%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	1.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	3.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
0.9	0.25	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
	0.5	0.000%	0.001%	0.001%
	1.0	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	2.0	0.002%	0.002%	0.002%
	3.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%

Table 9: Standard deviations of the Monte Carlo simulations ($\rho = 0, \sigma_0 = 40\%, \alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI
0.1	0.25	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	0.5	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
0.3	0.25	0.001%	0.003%	0.003%
	0.5	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
0.5	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.001%	0.003%	0.003%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
0.7	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.004%	0.005%	0.005%
0.9	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.004%	0.006%	0.006%

Table 10: Standard deviations of the Monte Carlo simulations ($\rho = -0.8, \sigma_0 = 40\%, \alpha = 0.8$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI & AS(4.8)
0.1	0.25	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	0.5	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.004%
0.3	0.25	0.001%	0.003%	0.003%
	0.5	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.003%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.003%	0.004%
0.5	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.003%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
0.7	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.004%	0.004%	0.004%
0.9	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.001%	0.002%
	1.0	0.002%	0.002%	0.002%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.004%	0.005%	0.005%

Table 11: Standard deviations of the Monte Carlo simulations ($\rho = 0, \sigma_0 = 20\%, \alpha = 2$)

H	T	VS	IV(k)	ATMI
0.1	0.25	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	0.5	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	1.0	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	2.0	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
0.3	0.25	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	0.5	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	1.0	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	2.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
0.5	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.003%
	0.5	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
0.7	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.001%	0.003%	0.003%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
0.9	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.003%	0.005%	0.005%

Table 12: Standard deviations of the Monte Carlo simulations ($\rho = -0.8, \sigma_0 = 20\%, \alpha = 2$)

H	T	VS	IV(\hat{k})	ATMI & AS(4.8)
0.1	0.25	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	0.5	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	1.0	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	2.0	0.002%	0.005%	0.005%
	3.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.005%
0.3	0.25	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	0.5	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
0.5	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	1.0	0.002%	0.004%	0.004%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
0.7	0.25	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.003%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
0.9	0.25	0.001%	0.001%	0.001%
	0.5	0.001%	0.002%	0.002%
	1.0	0.002%	0.003%	0.003%
	2.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.004%
	3.0	0.003%	0.004%	0.005%