

Finite Difference Solution Ansatz approach in Least-Squares Monte Carlo

Jiawei Huo*

Nov. 20, 2023

Abstract

This article presents a simple but effective and efficient approach to improve the accuracy and stability of Least-Squares Monte Carlo for American-style option pricing as well as expected exposure calculation in valuation adjustments. The key idea is to construct the ansatz of conditional expected continuation payoff using the exact solution from low dimensional finite difference methods, to be used in linear regression. This approach bridges between solving backward partial differential equations and Monte Carlo simulation, aiming at achieving the best of both worlds. We illustrate the technique with realistic examples including Bermudan options, worst of issuer callable notes and expected positive exposure on European options. The method can be considered as a generic numerical scheme across various asset classes, in particular, as an accurate method for pricing and risk-managing American-style derivatives under arbitrary dimensions.

Key Words: Least-squares regression, finite difference method, partial differential equations, Bermudan option, worst of issuer callable note, credit value adjustment, high-dimensional derivative pricing

Contents

1 Introduction

2

*wayne.huo@citi.com. We thank Andrei N. Soklakov for useful discussion and review. The views expressed herein should not be considered as investment advice or promotion. They represent personal research of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of his employers, or their associates or affiliates.

2	Theoretical Framework	4
2.1	Multi-variate Black-Scholes model	4
2.2	Option Pricing with American-style exercise	4
2.3	Credit Value Adjustment and Expected Positive Exposure	5
2.4	Least-Squares Monte Carlo method	6
2.4.1	Basis function and Limitations	7
2.5	Finite difference approach in PDE	8
2.6	FD Solution Ansatz based Least-Squares Monte Carlo	8
3	Numerical Results	10
3.1	Bermudan Option with $d = 1$	10
3.2	Bermudan Option with $d = 2$ and $d = 4$	13
3.3	EPE for European option in $d = 4$	14
3.4	WIC from $d = 5$ to $d = 50$	15
4	Conclusion	17
	Appendix	19
A.1	Bermudan option	19
A.2	Worst Of Issuer Callable Note	19
A.3	Regression Approach in Monte Carlo framework	21
A.4	FD PDE Solution	21
A.5	Optimized Exercise Boundaries (Opt-EB)	22

1 Introduction

Solving partial differential equations (PDE) with finite difference methods and Monte Carlo simulation are two major advanced numerical methods for exotic derivative pricing among partitioners. As the dimensionality of the problem increases, the PDE approach becomes less feasible due to implementation complexity and the numerical burden; specifically, there is no efficient and accurate implementation widely accepted in the industry with dimension greater than two. On the

other hand, the Monte Carlo method is widely used in high-dimensional derivative pricing without suffering from the ‘curse of dimensionality’ as PDE does.

Derivatives with American-style early exercise features are especially difficult to price within Monte Carlo framework. The major challenge is the determination of the conditional expectation future payoff for an optimal exercise strategy, without further additional numerical procedures which cannot be obtained in a simple forward simulation. With this regard, a backward PDE solver seems outwit Monte Carlo method in low dimensions, as the former effectively stores conditional expectation payoff within the PDE grids when marching backward.

Among pioneers to tackle the problem introduced by American-style early exercise features (Barraquand & Martineau (1995); Broadie & Glasserman (2004); Longstaff & Schwartz (2001)), the least-squares Monte Carlo approach (Longstaff & Schwartz (2001)), is the most popular algorithm (Stentoft (2001)). There have been giving rise to interesting proposals recently, e.g. forward (Fujii & Takahashi (2019)) and backward (Jian Liang & Li (2021)) deep neural network (DNN) methods. However, none of these studies were able to provide convincing evidence that DNN methods outperform the least-squares method in terms of accuracy, stability and efficiency. For instance in the context of pricing Bermudan option with 5-10 underlyings, DNN approach is 5 time slower than least-squares Monte Carlo while achieving similar accuracy; it is only when beyond 20 underlyings that the DNN approach has the edge over simulation methods in terms of memory efficiency (Jian Liang & Li (2021)).

Going beyond American-style derivatives pricing, the least-squares Monte Carlo approach is also widely used in the context of Credit Valuation Adjustment (CVA), which has been imposed under the Basel III framework as risk capital charge. For CVA, as well as other related value adjustments such Debt Value Adjustment (DVA), Funding Value Adjustment (FVA) and Capital Value Adjustment (KVA), all of which are now categorized as Valuation Adjustments (XVA) in a general term, the major challenge is the determination of uncertain future exposures of a given transaction. Instead of a brute-force approach to re-evaluate the entire portfolio in each simulated scenario, a practically prevalent approach in the industry is to approximate the financial product values using regression functions via the celebrated least-squares Monte Carlo approach. As we can see later, the call for stability, on top of accuracy, on the regression method, plays an important role in this application within this regard.

In this paper, we propose an enhanced least-squares regression based method for pricing American-style derivatives, in particular, which aims at improving the projection of conditional expectations by constructing an ansatz from a finite difference PDE solver, to be used in the linear regression. To the best of our knowledge, there has not been any previous attempt by integrating a PDE solver into Monte Carlo framework, to aid conditional expectation evaluation within simulation. Going beyond American-style derivatives pricing, the new method is also readily applicable in the context of future exposures calculation in CVA.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec.2, we introduce basic background knowledge for option pricing under Black-Scholes world in the context of American-style exercise derivatives,

e.g., Bermudan options and worst of issuer callable note, and the Expected Positive Exposure calculation in XVA. Then we outline prevailing numerical methods for the American-style option pricing and CVA computation, including the least-squares Monte Carlo approach in Sec.2.4, and finite difference PDE method in Sec.2.5. With such foundation, we will proceed to introduce our novel approach in Sec.2.6. Numerical results for Bermudan options and worst of issuer callable notes are presented in Sec.3, which examines the accuracy of various available methods. The EPE calculation on European option is also presented. Finally, concluding remarks are given in Sec.4.

2 Theoretical Framework

First of all, we assume that throughout a given terminal expiry T , there is a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{Q})$ satisfying the usual conditions with respect to which all processes are defined under risk-neutral measure \mathbb{Q} , relevant for derivative valuation as well as regulatory CVA computations.

2.1 Multi-variate Black-Scholes model

Let us consider a market of d stocks, and the price of i -th stock at time $t \geq 0$ is denoted by $S_i(t)$. We assume that the risk-neutral stock price $\vec{S}(t) = (S_1(t), \dots, S_d(t))^T$ process follows the stochastic differential equation with the annualized risk-free rate r to be deterministic and constant over time

$$\frac{dS_i(t)}{S_i(t)} = (r - q_i)dt + \sigma_i dB_i(t) \quad (2.1)$$

for $i = 1 \dots d$, where q_i and σ_i are the constant continuous dividend yield and volatility of the i -th stock's motion, respectively; and $\{B_i(t) | i = 1 \dots d\}$ is a correlated d -dimensional Brownian motion, with $\mathbb{E}[dB_i(t)dB_j(t)] = \rho_{ij} := [\delta_{ij} + \rho(1 - \delta_{ij})]dt$ using Kronecker delta notation δ_{ij} and ρ denoting single correlation between stocks. Since we only consider continuous, rather than discrete, dividends, we assume $\vec{S}(0) = (1, \dots, 1)^T$ for simplicity without loss of generality.

2.2 Option Pricing with American-style exercise

We assume that the American-style option is exercisable after (excluding) $t = 0$ and up to (including) the final expiry T for every time interval ΔT . We define the set of exercise times on or after t as $\pi(t) := \{t_k \geq t | t_k = k\Delta T, 1 \leq k \leq M = \frac{T}{\Delta T}\}$. The exercisability is either on the option holder side or on the issuer side.

Associated the stochastic process under Eqn.2.1 with the complete probability space, there exists a discrete filtration $\{\mathcal{F}(t_k) | 1 \leq k \leq M\}$ on $\pi(0)$. Under such filtration, the states variables are denoted by $X(\omega, t_k)$ with $\omega \in \Omega$.

To unambiguously describe an American-style option, we define $Z(\omega, t_k) \equiv Z(X(\omega, t_k), t_k)$ and $\tilde{V}(\omega, t, \tilde{\tau})$ as the exercise payoff and the sum of discounted future cash flows after t conditional on exercising on $\tilde{\tau}$, respectively. For single cash flow derivative, the two quantities are related to each other as $\tilde{V}(\omega, t, \tilde{\tau}) = e^{-r(\tilde{\tau}-t)}Z(X(\omega, \tilde{\tau}), \tilde{\tau})$.

Now then one can define the present value (PV), as main result of the option pricing problem, as

$$PV = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\tilde{\tau} \in \pi(0)} \tilde{V}(\omega, 0, \tilde{\tau})], & \text{for holder exercise;} \\ \mathbb{E}[\inf_{\tilde{\tau} \in \pi(0)} \tilde{V}(\omega, 0, \tilde{\tau})], & \text{for issuer exercise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

In this article, we take equally weighted basket Bermudan options on $S_B(t) = \sum_{i=1}^d w_i S_i(t)$ with $w_i = \frac{1}{d}$ (see Appendix A.1), and worst of issuer callable notes (WIC) on $S_W(t) = \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} S_i(t)$ (see Appendix A.2), respectively, as concrete examples of numerical results.

2.3 Credit Value Adjustment and Expected Positive Exposure

We define the Credit value adjustment (CVA) on a financial transaction as the expected loss resulting from the potential future default of the counterparty, given by:

$$CVA = (1 - R_{ctpy}) \int_0^T \mathbb{E}[e^{-r \cdot t} \cdot \max(0, \tilde{V}(\omega, t, T)) | \mathcal{F}_0] dPD(t) \quad (2.3)$$

$$= (1 - R_{ctpy}) \int_0^T e^{-r \cdot t} \cdot EPE(t) dPD(t), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\approx (1 - R_{ctpy}) \sum_{k=1}^M e^{-r \cdot t_k} \cdot EPE(t_k) \cdot (PD(t_{k+1}) - PD(t_k)), \quad (2.5)$$

where R_{ctpy} is the recovery rate, $PD(t)$ denotes the default probability of the counterparty at t , and EPE is the Expected Positive Exposure. For the ease of illustration without loss generality, we have assumed that the product doesn't have early termination features, eg. European Option on d stocks. We define the EPE , as well as its discounted version EPE^* , as:

$$EPE(t_k) = \mathbb{E}[\max(0, \tilde{V}(\omega, t_k, T)) | \mathcal{F}_0] \quad (2.6)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\max(0, \mathbb{E}[\tilde{V}(\omega, t_k, T) | \mathcal{F}_{t_k}]) | \mathcal{F}_0], \quad (2.7)$$

$$EPE^*(t_k) = e^{-r \cdot t_k} EPE(t_k). \quad (2.8)$$

In above, we have assumed independence between EPE and $PD(t)$, which makes computations easier as the expectation operator becomes distributive across functions of independent variables, reflecting to a degree the lack of available information regarding the counterparty.

In this paper, we focus solely on the computation of EPE and/or EPE^* , as they are of prime importance in the calculation of CVA and other XVA's. The main difficulty in computing EPE in practice arises from the lack of analytical tractability in many cases.

2.4 Least-Squares Monte Carlo method

A preferable way to solve the problem in Eqn.2.2 is to find out the strategy for $\{\tau(t_k) \in \pi(t_k) | 1 \leq k \leq M\}$, where $\tau(t_k)$ is defined as the optimal stopping time starting from t_k (inclusively).

For better further explanation, let's define the so-called continuation value, as

$$F(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1})) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{V}(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1})) | X(\omega, t_k)] \quad (2.9)$$

representing the conditional expectation value of discounted option value as of t_k and stopping at $\tau(t_{k+1})$.

The formal solution of the optimal stopping times problem can be written as, via a dynamic programming fashion (together with terminal condition $\tau(t_M) = T$), $\tau(t_k) = t_k \cdot I(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1})) + \tau(t_{k+1}) \cdot [1 - I(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1}))]$, where we define the exercise indicator function, with the help of Heaviside step function $\Theta(x)$, as $I(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1})) := \Theta(\pm[Z(\omega, t_k) - F(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1}))])$ where '+' and '-' are for holder and issuer exercise, respectively.

As can be seen from above, once Eqn.2.9 can be efficiently crystallized into a functional form $\hat{F}_k(X(\omega, t_k))$, the optimal stopping times in American style option pricing and EPE calculation in CVA, can be determined in a path-by-path manner independently. The core idea of regression based Least-Squares approach (LSM) by Longstaff & Schwartz (2001) is to assume this functional form can be decomposed as a linear combination of a set of R basis functions $\{\phi_r(x) | r = 1, \dots, R\}$, where the linear coefficients are obtained via regression using the cross-sectional information computed in the simulation. This least-squares estimator $\hat{F}(\omega, t_k)$ is also called regressed continuation value.

This F_{t_k} -measurable quantity also lies in the core of EPE calculation as it is the kernel of the call option calculation in Eqn.2.6. The merit of the approach is to isolate the EPE functional form determination at a product level within its own isolated sub probability space, and to evaluate the EPE at portfolio level, it can be aggregated by the EPE calculated by plugging in simulated paths generated with all risk factors at the portfolio into individual regressed functional forms. Note that we are aware of alternative hybrid approach to calculate EPE, by making use of both the simulated cash flows and regressed function (Joshi & Kwon (2016)). The drawback of this an interesting proposal is that one has to generate all the cash flows at given individual product level, without being decoupled from the path generation at upper portfolio level. This results in an aggregation of contractual timelines, rather than simple algorithmic operation upon regressed functions at product level when it comes to portfolio aggregation.

Mathematically, we have

$$\hat{F}(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1})) = \hat{F}_k(X(\omega, t_k)) = \sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{k,r} \phi_r(X(\omega, t_k)) \quad (2.10)$$

where $\vec{\beta}_k = (\beta_{k,1}, \dots, \beta_{k,R})^T$ are to be obtained via regression using the cross-sectional information computed in the simulation as described in Appendix A.3.

After solving $\vec{\beta}_k$ for all t_k recursively backward in time from maturity, $\hat{F}_k(X(\omega, t_k))$ are fully determined. Then with a forward pricing Monte Carlo, one can then compute PV, in the American style option pricing, as

$$PV = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} V^{(i)}(\{X^{(i)}\}, 0, \tau^{(i)})$$

and the EPE in the CVA problem as:

$$EPE(t) = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \max(0, F^{(i)}(\{X^{(i)}\}, t, T)),$$

where the superscript (i) indicates that the variable is under i^{th} of the total N_p pricing paths; and the optimal stopping rule is to only exercise the option at

$$\tau^{(i)} = \inf\{t_k \in \pi(0) | I^{(i)}(\omega, t_k) > 0\}. \quad (2.11)$$

To have a better convergence and calculation efficiency, one usually draws a different set of Monte Carlo paths in this pricing stage more than the previous regression stage to determine the continuation value, i.e., $N_p > N_R$. This is so-called *out-of-sample* implementation (Boire *et al.* (2022)).

2.4.1 Basis function and Limitations

The basis functions $\{\phi_r(x) | r = 1, \dots, R\}$, also known as regressors, are the main source of approximation within LSM. Based on the original study, the LSM is remarkably robust to the choice of basis functions (Longstaff & Schwartz (2001)). However, in a further analysis, it is concluded that for complex options, the robustness does not seem to be guaranteed. Nevertheless, there is no golden rule provided by the author as an optimal choice for any given product, and different choices of popular regressors can merely affect option prices slightly (Moreno (2003)).

In practice, it is not worth using special functions involving exponential calculation, such as Laguerre, or Hermite polynomials, as they introduces unnecessary computational burden without actual benefit. Thus, simple monomials are widely used in LSM as regressors, i.e., $\phi_r(x) = x^{r-1}$. There are several limitations as follows:

- With increasing the cutoff R for the sake of regression accuracy, it becomes more susceptible to overfitting.
- The fitting accuracy is poor away from at-the-money (ATM), as those regions are effectively out of scope in the objective function to be minimized.
- As a solution of backward recursive optimization, $\hat{F}(\omega, t_k)$ would depend on the solution of the counterpart at t_{k+1} , which was obtained by another regression. That said, the numerical error propagates and accumulates from iteration to iteration.

2.5 Finite difference approach in PDE

Alternative approach to solve the d -dimensional American-style option pricing is the finite difference (FD) method. Under Black-Scholes setting in Eq.2.1, the option price $V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S}, t)$ satisfies the following PDE:

$$\frac{\partial V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}^d(\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}) V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d := -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} \sigma_i \sigma_j \rho_{i,j} S_i S_j \frac{\partial^2 V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d}{\partial S_i \partial S_j} - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} (r - q_i) S_i \frac{\partial V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d}{\partial S_i} + r V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d, \quad (2.12)$$

After solving the PDE via Appendix A.4, we will denote, from now on, $V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S}, t_k^+)$ as $f_{k, \vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S})$ under d -dimension when solving the backward propagating PDE, as the exact solution of continuation value that are defined previously, i.e.,

$$F_k(\vec{S}(t_k)) = f_{k, \vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S}). \quad (2.13)$$

2.6 FD Solution Ansatz based Least-Squares Monte Carlo

Before proceeding, we introduce below proposition followed by a model-independent proof:

Proposition 1. *In a generalized LSM formulism, the continuation value estimator is exact if the exact continuation value is used as the only regressor.*

Proof. Mathematically, if $\{F_k(X)\}$ is used as the only regressor, we have

$$\hat{F}_k(X) = \beta \cdot F_k(X), \quad (2.14)$$

where β is determined via minimization of the least square error:

$$\beta = \arg_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \min \mathbb{E} \left[[\tilde{V}(\omega, t_k, \tau(t_{k+1})) - a \cdot F_k(X(\omega, t_k))]^2 \right].$$

We proceed by applying the law of total expectation and direction calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \arg_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \min \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[[\tilde{V} - a \cdot F_k(X)]^2 | X \right] \right] \\ &= \arg_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \min \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} [\tilde{V}^2 | X] - 2a \cdot \mathbb{E} [\tilde{V} | X] \cdot F_k(X) + a^2 \cdot F_k^2(X) \right] \\ &= \arg_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \min \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var}_X[\tilde{V}] + \mathbb{E}^2[\tilde{V} | X] - 2a \cdot F_k(X) \cdot \mathbb{E} [\tilde{V} | X] + a^2 \cdot F_k^2(X) \right] \\ &= \arg_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \min \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var}_X[\tilde{V}] + F_k^2(X) \cdot (1 - a)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we have substituted the definition of $\mathbb{E} [\tilde{V} | X]$ via Eqn.2.9 and $\text{Var}_X[\tilde{V}]$ denotes the variance of \tilde{V} conditional on X .

Until now, it is straightforward to see $\beta = 1$ from above, and substituting this into Eqn.2.14 we have

$$\hat{F}_k(X) = F_k(X),$$

i.e., the regressed continuation value is exact. ■

Inspired by Sec.2.5, together with Prop.1, a natural idea to improve LSM algorithm would be to construct an ansatz, with the help of exact PDE FD solution as shown in Eqn.2.13, to start with as one of the basis functions in linear regression.

To apply this idea to arbitrary dimensions with best computational efficiency, we focus on low dimensional FD solutions with $d = 1$ to formulate the ansatz only. As higher dimension deduction, we do not aim at exact decomposition of $f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S})$ into $d = 1$ counterparts via sophisticated techniques because the weight of this ansatz (in company with other common regressors, i.e., monomials) will be calibrated via regression achieving a best fit against the original d dimension problem of interest. In practice, we apply a generalized moment matching technique up to 2^{nd} order for a basket asset as dimension deduction into $d = 1$. Let $V_{\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1}(x,t)$ satisfy below PDE:

$$\frac{\partial V_{\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{L}^{d=1}(\bar{q}, \bar{\sigma}) V_{\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1}, \quad (2.15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{q} &:= -\frac{1}{T} \ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial X}{\partial S_i} e^{-q_i T} \right), \\ \bar{\sigma}^2 &:= \frac{1}{T} \ln \left(\frac{\sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial X}{\partial S_i} \frac{\partial X}{\partial S_j} e^{(-q_i - q_j + \rho_{i,j} \sigma_i \sigma_j) T}}{(\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial X}{\partial S_i} e^{-q_i T})^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and let $f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1}(x) := V_{\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1}(x, t_k^+)$ denote the continuation value at t_k .

For constant weighted basket with $X = S_B(t)$, it is straightforward to solve the 1d problem as $\frac{\partial X}{\partial S_i} = \frac{1}{d}$, and $f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1,B}(x)$ is obtained right away with the superscript B representing ‘constant weighted basket’. In the case of worst of basket where $X = S_W(t)$, the solution will be more involved as we have non-linear weighting $\frac{\partial X}{\partial S_i} = \delta_{i, \arg_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \min S_j}$. However, observing that $(\bar{q}, \bar{\sigma}) = (q_i, \sigma_i) \delta_{i, \arg_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \min S_j}$, we would first solve all set of uncorrelated 1d PDE on original underlyings individually to obtain corresponding $\{f_{k,q_i,\sigma_i}^{d=1}(x) | 1 \leq i \leq d\}$, and then construct the ansatz as $f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1,W}(x) = f_{k,q_{i^*},\sigma_{i^*}}^{d=1}(x) = \sum_i \delta_{i,i^*} f_{k,q_i,\sigma_i}^{d=1}(x)$ (the superscript W representing ‘worst of assets’) where $i^*(\{S_i(t_k)\}) = \arg_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \min S_i(t_k)$ ¹.

With this ansatz in place, let’s define a new set of regressors as

$$\phi'_{k,r}(x, \{S_i(t_k)\}) = \begin{cases} f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1,B(W)}(x) & \text{for } r = 1, \\ x^{r-2} & \text{for } r \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

¹In practice when the basis function is used, i^* is determined pathwise based on simulated spots, and the correlation effect is wired-in via statistical average over different trajectories.

In practice, to be used in the simulation, $f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1,B(W)}(x)$ is approximated as an interpolation function using a cubic spline on $V_{\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1}(x, t_k^+)$ along the x -direction in the PDE grid subjected to natural boundary condition; outside the PDE grid, a linear extrapolation is used instead. In the case of worst of basket, one needs to build all individual underlying cubic splines $\{f_{k,q_i,\sigma_i}^{d=1}(x) | 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ for a given t_k ; and then for a given pathwise input $\{S_i(t_k)\}$ later, we use the calculated i^* -th spline to do interpolation on $\min S_i(t_k)$.

Expanding the continuation value least-squares estimator, we have

$$\hat{F}_k(X) = \sum_{r=1}^R \beta'_r \phi'_{k,r}(X) = \beta'_1 f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1,B(W)}(X) + \sum_{r=2}^R \beta'_r X^{r-2}, \quad (2.17)$$

where the monomials in $r \geq 2$, serving as auxiliary perturbation terms, are expected to capture and compensate the difference between the exact continuation value and the main regressor ($r = 1$) upon optimizing all β'_r in the cross-section regression.

From now on, we call this new method as *FD Solution Ansatz based Least-Squares Monte Carlo* (FD-LSM), with following procedures:

1. Convert the original d -dimension problem into 1d, and then construct the series of 1d PDE's in Eqn.2.15 up to d assets. With a backward solver on each PDE, for each early exercise date t_k within one sweep, we retrieve either $f_{k,\bar{q},\bar{\sigma}}^{d=1,B}(x)$ for $X = S_B(t)$, or $\{f_{k,q_i,\sigma_i}^{d=1}(x) | 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ for $X = S_W(t)$.
2. Construct the interpolation/extrapolation function for $r = 1$ in Eqn.2.16 on each t_k (in addition to monomials for $r \geq 2$) to be used in the regression and pricing stages.
3. Follow the usual regression based procedures in LSM in Sec.2.4 to calculate the product PV.

3 Numerical Results

We performed our numerical experiments on a desktop, equipped with Intel(R) Xeon(R) E-2276G 3.80 GHz CPU, 6 cores/12 threads and 64GB RAM.

3.1 Bermudan Option with $d = 1$

In Eqn.2.1, we use $r = 3.96\%$ for numerical experiments in Bermudan options. Unless specified otherwise, the option maturity is set as $T = 5$ with monthly exercise, i.e., $\Delta T = \frac{1}{12}$. In the simulation, we use $N_R = 2^{13}$ and $N_P = 2^{16}$ paths for regression and pricing stages, respectively, with weekly discretization steps. Sobol sequence is used in random number generation, which is shown as one of the most important variance reduction techniques (Areal & Armada (2008)).

Now we present the results for the mono underlying case with $\sigma_1 = 30\%$ and $q_1 = 0$. From previous literature, this case has been discussed primarily on put options under LSM framework with relatively short tenor, e.g., $T \leq 2$ (Longstaff & Schwartz (2001); Frank J. Fabozzi (2017)). In this study, we focus on both put and call options with longer maturity ($T = 5$), such as to expose methodological limitations as much as possible. Especially for a call option on a non-dividend paying stock, it is not optimal to exercise the option before maturity due to its time value. Nevertheless, pricing American or Bermudan call options with exercise boundary at infinity, i.e., away from the ATM region, would be a very stringent test with respect to the accuracy and stability of the numerical algorithm.

We will compare the option PV under different approaches: PDE1D, LSM, LSM^{CV}, FD-LSM and FD-LSM^{CV} as discussed in Sec.2. The superscript (CV) indicates the use of 1d analytic European option values as the control variates (Tian & Burrage (2003)).

In the light of the fact that PDE ansatz is approximated with cubic splines, we first FD-LSM with main regressor only against LSM using the same degree of highest polynomial power, i.e., $R = 4$. The results are shown in Tab.3.1, for the LSM ($R = 4$) (with or without CV), the PV error against PDE1D benchmark is around 1% and 2%+ for put and call options, respectively; the CV toolset merely helps reduce the standard errors (s.e.) with negligible impact on PV. On the other hand, under the new FD-LSM ($R = 1$), PV error is reduced to no more than few basis points, much smaller than s.e.; also, the effect of variance reduction with CV is more prominent than LSM, giving rise to minimal s.e. among all simulation methods. Given the improvement due to CV is mainly on reducing s.e., we will not apply this technique anymore for $d > 1$ where the analytic solution for European option is absent anyway.

P/C	K	PDE1D		LSM ($R = 4$)			FD-LSM ($R = 1$)			LSM ^{CV} ($R = 4$)			FD-LSM ^{CV} ($R = 1$)		
		PV	c.t.	Error	s.e.	c.t.	Error	s.e.	c.t.	Error	s.e.	c.t.	Error	s.e.	c.t.
P	100%	18.46%	0.03	-1.08%	0.07%	1.7	0.05%	0.07%	2.0	-1.08%	0.05%	1.8	0.05%	0.05%	2.0
P	80%	9.58%	0.02	-0.97%	0.05%	1.7	0.03%	0.05%	1.9	-0.97%	0.03%	1.8	0.03%	0.03%	2.0
P	120%	30.19%	0.03	-0.96%	0.09%	1.7	0.03%	0.09%	1.9	-0.96%	0.07%	2.1	0.03%	0.06%	2.2
C	100%	33.85%	0.02	-2.47%	0.19%	1.7	-0.05%	0.25%	1.8	-2.46%	0.12%	1.9	-0.03%	0.06%	2.0
C	80%	42.84%	0.03	-2.29%	0.20%	1.7	0.02%	0.27%	1.8	-2.28%	0.13%	1.8	0.04%	0.04%	2.0
C	120%	26.83%	0.03	-2.13%	0.18%	1.6	-0.04%	0.23%	1.8	-2.12%	0.11%	1.8	-0.02%	0.05%	1.8

Table 3.1: For call (C) and put (P) options with different strikes (K), we calculate the PV for various methods as comparison. The PV Error is calculated against the PDE1D benchmark. We also show the calculation time (c.t.) in seconds.

In retrospect of large pricing error in LSM for call options as seen in Tab.3.1, we plot the regressed continuation value $\hat{F}(S)$ for both LSM ($R = 4$) and FD-LSM ($R = 1 \dots 4$) in Fig.3.1 at $t_k = \frac{T}{2}$. Note that the exact result $f(S)$ from PDE1D is also shown as benchmark, and the inner figure shows the absolute differences of various regression methods against this benchmark. First of all, for $R = 1$, using the exact solution as the only regressor, the regressed value does converge to this exact basis function within numerical errors between 10^{-7} and 10^{-5} . Secondly, FD-LSM shows excellent agreement against benchmark, with maximum absolute differences ~ 10 basis points even with

$R = 4$ as monomials regressors are introduced as correction.

However, the traditional LSM is showing poor agreement with discrepancy up to 10%+ for high spot; for low spots below 55% and high spots above 135%, the fitted curve is even below the exercise payoff $Z(S)$ and thus arbitragable, which mistakenly instructs the option holder to exercise immediately. Apart from mis-fitting away from ATM, another cause of poor results is that at $t_{k=30} = \frac{T}{2}$ the numerical errors have been accumulated after 29 LSM iterations from maturity. Nevertheless, FD-LSM doesn't suffer from these two issues thanks to the use of the exact solution as the ansatz to be regressed on.




Figure 3.1: The continuation value after regression as a function of underlying spot S at $t = \frac{T}{2}$ for a call option striking at $K = 100\%$. The dash line depicts the exercise payoff $Z(S)$ as reference. The inner figure on the upper left shows the absolute errors of various regression methods against $f(S)$ in PDE1D.

As a further examination on the stability of the regression method, we show the PV with arbitrary cutoff R in Fig.3.2. Moving from low number of R to medium level, e.g., $R = 10$, we can see a significant improvement in terms of accuracy in LSM, where the PV is more or less monotonically converging towards benchmark, largely and qualitatively consistent with previous literature (Frank J. Fabozzi (2017)) focusing on put options, except the minor deterioration from $R = 7$ to $R = 8$ in the call option case; However, beyond $R = 12$, the results deviate clearly away from benchmark in the call case, which is a clear sign of overfitting. On the other hand, for FD-LSM, the PV error against benchmark is bounded at 50 bps even up to $R = 14$ for the call case. Although in this example the new regression method is exhibiting amazing robustness against overfitting, it is not advisable to performance linear regression with high number of polynomial terms in practice. From now on, we restrict and cap the cutoff to 5, unless specified otherwise.




Figure 3.2: Option PV with increasing cutoff R for Bermudan put (upper panel) and call (lower panel) options, respectively. The s.e. is shown as error bar in the graph.

3.2 Bermudan Option with $d = 2$ and $d = 4$

Next, we further look at the case of $d = 2$, where $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 30\%$ and $q_1 = q_2 = 0$. For a fair comparison between FD-LSM and LSM, we use the same number of regressors with $R = 4$ fixed: LSM make uses of full monoimials up to cubic terms, whereas FD-LSM only uses perturbational monomials up to quadratic term, apart form the main FD regressor. Looking at PV results as seen in Tab.3.2, the maximum of difference in FD-LSM against PDE2D benchmark is merely 17 bps, whereas the counterpart in LSM is more than 2%, well beyond the simulation standard errors. Also, the computational overhead to achieve such accuracy is moderate as shown in the c.t. comparison. Last but not least, the Optimized Exercise Boundaries method (Opt-EB), as mentioned in Appendix A.5, can provide independent check, although it tends to slightly underprice the option due to partially convergence in the external optimization.

Moving to $d = 4$, where $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 30\%$, $\sigma_3 = \sigma_4 = 20\%$, and $q_1 = q_2 = q_3 = q_4 = 0$, The PV's and c.t.'s under each various methods are shown in Tab.3.3. Different from low dimensions, full FD PDE result is no longer available; fortunately, we still have Opt-EB as an independent lower bound estimate.

Similar to lower dimensions, the new FD-LSM exhibits excellent agreement against benchmark consistently in terms of PV difference, outperforming traditional LSM for various put/call and ρ settings: the maximum of differences between LSM and Opt-EB are 0.62% and 1.56% for put and call, respectively, and LSM underprices all test cases; whereas FD-LSM outperforms Opt-EB by up to 20 bps for put options and only underprices call options by 5 bps as maximum. For computational efficiency, as we can see from the c.t. columns between the two methods, the overhead due to additional PDE1D solver and cubic spline interpolation is insignificant.

P/C	ρ	PDE2D		LSM (R=4)				FD-LSM (R=4)				Opt-EB	
		PV	c.t.	PV	s.e.	Diff	c.t.	PV	s.e.	Diff	c.t.	PV	Diff
P	90%	17.94%	0.5	17.02%	0.07%	-0.91%	2.5	17.94%	0.07%	0.01%	2.8	17.85%	-0.09%
P	50%	15.59%	0.4	14.81%	0.06%	-0.77%	2.6	15.56%	0.06%	-0.03%	2.8	15.48%	-0.11%
P	10%	13.06%	0.4	12.42%	0.05%	-0.64%	2.5	13.05%	0.05%	-0.01%	2.7	12.92%	-0.14%
C	90%	33.35%	0.4	31.22%	0.19%	-2.13%	2.4	33.17%	0.23%	-0.17%	2.7	33.32%	-0.03%
C	50%	31.10%	0.5	29.10%	0.17%	-2.00%	2.5	30.98%	0.21%	-0.12%	2.9	31.08%	-0.02%
C	10%	28.72%	0.5	26.98%	0.15%	-1.74%	2.6	28.56%	0.18%	-0.16%	2.9	28.71%	-0.01%

Table 3.2: For call (C) and put (P) options striking at $K = 100\%$ with different correlation ρ , we calculate the PV for various methods as comparison. For LSM and FD-LSM, we also show the s.e. in the simulation as reference. The PV difference (diff) is calculated between LSM/FD-LSM/Opt-EB and the PDE2D benchmark. For PDE2D/LSM/FD-LSM, we also show the calculation time (c.t.) in seconds.

PC	ρ	Opt-EB	LSM (R=4)				FD-LSM (R=4)			
			PV	s.e.	Diff	c.t.	PV	s.e.	Diff	c.t.
P	90%	13.80%	13.18%	0.06%	-0.62%	4.0	13.84%	0.05%	0.04%	4.5
P	50%	10.68%	10.23%	0.05%	-0.45%	4.0	10.77%	0.04%	0.09%	4.4
P	10%	6.86%	6.57%	0.03%	-0.29%	4.2	7.06%	0.03%	0.20%	4.7
C	90%	29.30%	27.74%	0.16%	-1.56%	4.5	29.29%	0.19%	-0.01%	4.6
C	50%	26.33%	24.92%	0.14%	-1.41%	4.1	26.28%	0.15%	-0.05%	4.6
C	10%	22.91%	21.56%	0.10%	-1.35%	4.2	22.87%	0.12%	-0.04%	4.5

Table 3.3: For call (C) and put (P) options striking at $K = 100\%$ with different correlation ρ , we calculate the PV various methods as comparison. For LSM and FD-LSM, we also show the s.e. and c.t., respectively. The PV difference (diff) is calculated between LSM/FD-LSM and Opt-EB.

3.3 EPE for European option in $d = 4$

In this section, we evaluate the performance of FD-LSM in the context of EPE calculation for European options. Assuming we (the party) is long an uncollateralized European call option issued

by the counterparty, we apply the same market parameters as Sec.3.2 with $d = 4$. The option is struck at 100% with $T = 5$, and the EPE is evaluated with monthly discretized steps.

Since the portfolio has only one positive payoff to the party, it follows that its discounted option value under \mathbb{Q} measure is a martingale, hence its expected value, i.e. EPE^* , is constant over time:

$$EPE^* = \mathbb{E}[\exp^{-rt} V_t] = V_0,$$

where V_0 is the option PV that can be computed exactly with usual simulation approach as benchmark.

In Fig.3.3, we plot the EPE^* profile using various cutoff R under LSM and FD-LSM, where the s.e. is shown as error bar for indication. For LSM, EPE^* deviates away from benchmark by up to 10 s.e. especially near the terminal end, with low level of $R = 3$; by increasing R , the discrepancy is reduced in the longer end; however, at the same time, in the short end, there are spikes with abnormally sizable error bar arising around $t = 1$ for $R = 10$, indicting some kind of numerical instability.

On the other hand, for FD-LSM, we see very accurate agreement between calculated EPE^* against theoretical benchmark for various R in general. It is worth noticing that even with $R = 10$, the profile is much smoother with less angularities in terms of both frequency and intensity, than the LSM counterpart. Nevertheless, in both regression methods, the case with $R = 10$ exhibits noticeable instability due to overfitting with too many features to be regressed on, as mentioned and shown in Bermuda option pricing previously; thus in practice, it is inadvisable to use such high number of cutoff.

In this context of EPE calculation, we not only further showcased the accuracy of FD-LSM over LSM, but also demonstrated the stability of the new method over time direction, i.e., time span between the regression variables and realized cash flows.

3.4 WIC from $d = 5$ to $d = 50$

As a final numerical example, we will look at a WIC with 5-50 underlyings in the basket. For contractual parameters, we use coupon barrier $B_c = 70\%$, knock-in barrier $B_p = 50\%$ and strike $K = 100\%$. Unless specified otherwise, underlying market data used are shown in Tab.3.4. In the simulation, we use $N_R = 2^{13}$ and $N_P = 2^{17}$ paths for regression and pricing, respectively, with weekly discretization steps.

Stock tag i with $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$	$1 + 5j$	$2 + 5j$	$3 + 5j$	$4 + 5j$	$5 + 5j$
Dividend rate q_i	3%	2%	5%	0%	4%
Volatility σ_i	20%	30%	25%	24%	15%

Table 3.4: Underlying market data.




Figure 3.3: EPE* profiles with various cutoff R as a function of time, calculated using LSM (upper panel) and FD-LSM (lower panel), respectively. The s.e. is shown as error bar in the graph.

As presented in Tab.3.5, we show the PV and expected life $\mathbb{E}[\tau]$ between LSM and FD-LSM on WIC for various underlying market data and contractual parameters. In $(1 + 14n)$ -th ($n = 0, 1, 2, 3$) rows of Tab.3.5 the same parameters as Liang et al in their Tab. 5.5 (Jian Liang & Li (2021)) are used and our LSM results are perfectly in-line², although FD-LSM gives marginally lower PV. However, in these cases, the coupon rate $c = 20\%$ is too high, in particular compared to $r = 1\%$, and thus the issuer will almost surely call the product on 1-st exercise date as indicated by $\mathbb{E}[\tau] = 0.29$ for $d = 5$. If we stress c to 1% in $(2 + 14n)$ -th rows of Tab.3.5, the FD-LSM gives much lower PV than LSM by up to 3.3 times of s.e.. Moreover, if we change to $\rho = 90\%$, $c = 1\%$, $r = 5\%$, the difference ratio becomes 10+ as seen in $(3 + 14n)$ -th rows, which is significant for a short dated option with few exercise dates.

As a more comprehensive experiment to examine the accuracy of regression schemes, we use a much wider range of parameter sets by varying $\rho, c, r, T, \Delta T$ as well as the dimension d (number of assets) in Tab.3.5. Since the optimal stopping strategy is a result of equilibrium due to competition

²We do not suffer from any memory issues up to 50 dimension under x64 system as experienced by Liang et al.

among all these factors, with a wide range of parameter sets, it is expected to drive the change of exercise boundary, generating various testing scenarios. Going through all rows in Tab. 3.5, FD-LSM always outperforms LSM by achieving a lower PV, and thus better results due to the nature of minimization problem using the same simulation paths, with difference ratio ranging from 0.2 to 28.8; and the outperformance is consistent from moderate ($d = 5$) to high ($d = 50$) dimensions. In practice, apart from achieving more accurate PV, we expect that the new method would naturally suppress the instability due to hopping between sub-optimal states in the scheme of bumping market factors and re-evaluation for greeks calculation.

Finally, we also check the calculation time in last column of Tab. 3.5. In general, there is expected mild deterioration when switching to the new method, contributed by the additional PDE1D solvers and the cubic spline interpolation. However, the relative impacts are merely in single-digit range; thus we don't expect this amount of impact would become a "showstopper" when applying the new regression scheme for generic option pricing and risk management from practitioners' point of view.

4 Conclusion

In this manuscript, we presented a novel regression based approach for American-style option pricing. The formulism is to construct the ansatz to be regressed on using the FD solution obtained from a backward PDE solver. Numerical tests on Bermudan options and WIC indicate that FD-LSM produces accurate option prices benchmarking against FD-based full PDE approach in low dimensions ($d \leq 2$), and consistently overshadows classical LSM from high dimensions (up to 50). By stressing the market and contractual parameters, we showed that the combination of the ad-hoc FD-based ansatz and perturbational monomials as regressors, gives rise to stable results especially with exercise frontiers far away from the ATM region. At the same time, there has not been noticeable degradation in terms of the computational efficiency with the additional calculation in PDE solver and spline interpolation. This effective and efficient method can be implemented as a generic framework for pricing and risk management on structure derivative products with American-style exercise features. Going beyond option pricing, since LSM is also widely used to approximate the future exposure for products that cannot be valued analytically in the context of XVA, the new method is applicable for the sake of accuracy and numerical stability.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank his team members and fellow quants for stimulating discussions on the subject and is particularly grateful to Andrei N. Soklakov. The author reports no conflicts of interest. The author alone is responsible for the content and writing of the paper. The views

#	d	ρ	T	$\frac{1}{\Delta T}$	c	r	LSM ($R=4$)			FD-LSM ($R=4$)			PV Diff s.e.	c.t. Diff%
							PV(%)	s.e.(%)	$\mathbb{E}[\tau]$	PV(%)	s.e.(%)	$\mathbb{E}[\tau]$		
1	5	30%	1	4	20%	1%	104.43	0.01	0.29	104.43	0.01	0.29	0.4	8%
2	5	30%	1	4	1%	1%	98.57	0.02	0.80	98.49	0.02	0.99	3.3	5%
3	5	90%	1	4	1%	5%	95.56	0.02	0.96	95.39	0.02	1.01	10.3	6%
4	5	30%	5	4	1%	5%	63.59	0.07	4.79	62.88	0.07	5.00	10.2	2%
5	5	90%	5	4	1%	5%	71.33	0.06	4.64	70.16	0.06	5.00	18.8	5%
6	5	30%	10	4	1%	5%	41.30	0.07	9.76	40.65	0.06	10.01	9.8	3%
7	5	90%	10	4	1%	5%	51.80	0.07	9.43	50.30	0.06	10.01	22.7	4%
8	5	30%	1	12	20%	1%	101.54	0.01	0.13	101.52	0.01	0.14	1.7	5%
9	5	30%	1	12	1%	1%	98.17	0.02	0.82	98.01	0.02	1.01	6.9	6%
10	5	90%	1	12	1%	5%	95.11	0.02	0.95	94.89	0.02	1.01	13.7	6%
11	5	30%	5	12	1%	5%	62.06	0.07	4.81	61.35	0.07	5.00	10.4	4%
12	5	90%	5	12	1%	5%	69.39	0.06	4.67	68.16	0.06	5.00	20.3	4%
13	5	30%	10	12	1%	5%	39.16	0.06	9.78	38.46	0.06	10.00	11.0	6%
14	5	90%	10	12	1%	5%	48.74	0.06	9.47	47.15	0.06	10.01	25.3	4%
15	10	30%	1	4	20%	1%	103.93	0.02	0.35	103.92	0.02	0.35	0.6	6%
16	10	30%	1	4	1%	1%	97.32	0.03	0.89	97.24	0.03	0.98	2.5	4%
17	10	90%	1	4	1%	5%	95.34	0.02	0.94	95.09	0.02	1.01	12.9	4%
18	10	30%	5	4	1%	5%	54.31	0.07	4.85	53.84	0.07	4.98	6.3	4%
19	10	90%	5	4	1%	5%	68.77	0.07	4.68	67.71	0.06	5.00	16.0	3%
20	10	30%	10	4	1%	5%	31.68	0.06	9.88	31.36	0.06	9.98	5.2	4%
21	10	90%	10	4	1%	5%	48.67	0.07	9.50	47.37	0.06	10.01	19.1	2%
22	10	30%	1	12	20%	1%	101.58	0.01	0.10	101.58	0.01	0.09	0.2	9%
23	10	30%	1	12	1%	1%	97.46	0.03	0.76	97.29	0.03	0.86	5.4	7%
24	10	90%	1	12	1%	5%	95.69	0.02	0.86	95.12	0.02	1.01	28.8	7%
25	10	30%	5	12	1%	5%	54.61	0.07	4.80	53.95	0.07	4.96	8.8	5%
26	10	90%	5	12	1%	5%	69.27	0.07	4.55	67.77	0.06	5.00	22.3	4%
27	10	30%	10	12	1%	5%	31.92	0.06	9.84	31.49	0.06	9.98	7.0	7%
28	10	90%	10	12	1%	5%	49.22	0.07	9.36	47.50	0.06	10.01	24.8	3%
29	20	30%	1	4	20%	1%	102.43	0.04	0.50	102.42	0.04	0.50	0.2	5%
30	20	30%	1	4	1%	1%	95.13	0.04	0.92	95.07	0.04	0.94	1.3	4%
31	20	90%	1	4	1%	5%	95.00	0.02	0.94	94.73	0.02	1.01	11.8	2%
32	20	30%	5	4	1%	5%	44.53	0.07	4.93	44.35	0.07	4.98	2.5	5%
33	20	90%	5	4	1%	5%	66.17	0.07	4.73	65.30	0.07	5.00	12.5	3%
34	20	30%	10	4	1%	5%	23.45	0.05	9.96	23.39	0.05	9.98	1.3	1%
35	20	90%	10	4	1%	5%	45.66	0.07	9.62	44.66	0.07	10.01	14.4	4%
36	20	30%	1	12	20%	1%	101.31	0.02	0.17	101.29	0.02	0.17	0.9	7%
37	20	30%	1	12	1%	1%	95.29	0.04	0.84	95.20	0.04	0.87	2.1	3%
38	20	90%	1	12	1%	5%	95.39	0.02	0.85	94.77	0.02	1.01	27.2	4%
39	20	30%	5	12	1%	5%	44.79	0.07	4.90	44.48	0.07	4.96	4.3	4%
40	20	90%	5	12	1%	5%	66.64	0.07	4.62	65.38	0.07	5.00	17.9	6%
41	20	30%	10	12	1%	5%	23.63	0.05	9.95	23.55	0.05	9.97	1.6	2%
42	20	90%	10	12	1%	5%	45.99	0.07	9.54	44.76	0.07	10.01	17.6	7%
43	50	30%	1	4	20%	1%	97.62	0.06	0.74	97.59	0.06	0.76	0.4	4%
44	50	30%	1	4	1%	1%	90.43	0.06	0.92	90.37	0.06	0.95	1.1	3%
45	50	90%	1	4	1%	5%	94.51	0.03	0.93	94.21	0.03	1.01	11.2	4%
46	50	30%	5	4	1%	5%	33.34	0.06	4.98	33.31	0.06	4.99	0.5	1%
47	50	90%	5	4	1%	5%	62.91	0.07	4.80	62.26	0.07	5.00	8.9	3%
48	50	30%	10	4	1%	5%	16.09	0.03	10.00	16.08	0.03	10.00	0.4	2%
49	50	90%	10	4	1%	5%	42.03	0.07	9.75	41.39	0.07	10.01	9.4	2%
50	50	30%	1	12	20%	1%	98.25	0.05	0.60	98.23	0.05	0.61	0.3	4%
51	50	30%	1	12	1%	1%	90.65	0.06	0.87	90.54	0.06	0.91	1.9	5%
52	50	90%	1	12	1%	5%	94.84	0.03	0.85	94.22	0.03	1.01	23.0	4%
53	50	30%	5	12	1%	5%	33.52	0.06	4.97	33.43	0.06	4.98	1.5	1%
54	50	90%	5	12	1%	5%	63.43	0.07	4.68	62.35	0.07	5.00	14.5	3%
55	50	30%	10	12	1%	5%	16.21	0.04	9.99	16.17	0.03	10.00	0.9	3%
56	50	90%	10	12	1%	5%	42.48	0.07	9.63	41.49	0.07	10.01	14.0	3%

Table 3.5: PV and expected life $\mathbb{E}[\tau]$ of WIC under LSM and FD-LSM under various dimensions d , correlation ρ , tenor T (in year), coupon rate c and risk-free interest rate r . We also show the s.e. in the simulation as reference. In the last but one column, we show the ratio of PV difference (LSM less FD-LSM) against s.e. of LSM. And the last column shows the relative difference (FD-LSM less LSM in percentage of LSM) of computation time (c.t.).

expressed in this article are those of the author alone and do not necessarily represent those of Citigroup. All errors are the author's responsibility.

Appendix

A.1 Bermudan option

A Bermudan option is an American-style option that are written on the spot price of a stock basket $S_B(t)$, expressed as a weighted average of these d individual stocks. Note that for mono-underlying structure, $S_B(t)$ is just simply $S(t)$, where we ignore the subscript. It is exercisable by the holder on $\pi(0)$.

The exercise payoff $Z(\omega, t_k)$ is given by

$$Z(\omega, t_k) = \begin{cases} \max(K - S_B(t_k), 0), & \text{for put option;} \\ \max(S_B(t_k) - K, 0), & \text{for call option.} \end{cases}$$

The state variables $X(\omega, t_k)$ can be reduced to $S_B(t_k)$ as the only explanatory independent variable, considering the functional dependence of the payoff $Z(\omega, t_k)$.

Finally, $\tilde{V}(\omega, t, \tilde{\tau})$ is given by

$$\tilde{V}(\omega, t, \tilde{\tau}) = e^{-r(\tilde{\tau}-t)} Z(S_B(\tilde{\tau})).$$

A.2 Worst Of Issuer Callable Note

The worst of issuer callable note (WIC) is one of the most popular yield enhancement products in retail structured note market. On one hand, the investment performance of this product is capped by a equity dependent coupon rate; one the other hand, the issuer has the right to call the product with a return of principal, at his or her discretion, on exercise dates $\pi(0)$ on or before maturity T , i.e., the exercisability is on the issuer side. The performance is liked to a worst-of function on d underlying stocks $S_W(t)$.

There are a series of asset-dependent coupon announced on record dates in-line exactly with early exercise dates $\pi(0)$, and the coupon payments are in digital form with amount $c \cdot \Delta T$ subjected to a coupon barrier B_c :

$$\mathcal{C}(S_W(t_k), t_i) = c \cdot \Delta T \cdot \Theta(S_W(t_k) - B_c)$$

, where c is annualized coupon rate per unit notional and $\frac{1}{\Delta T}$ is the annual coupon frequency, as well as the exercise frequency; the Heaviside step function is denoted by $\Theta(x)$.

At maturity T only, which is also the last coupon announcement date, there is a return of principal, as well as a short put option striking at K with knocked-in barrier B_P embedded:

$$\mathcal{P}(S_W(T), T) = -\Theta(B_P - S_W(T)) \max(K - S_W(T), 0)$$

where we have assumed the notional of the WIC is 1 for simplicity.

Different from a simple Bermudan option discussed previously, WIC is a much more complex product. There are several competing driving factors for the optimal stopping strategy to achieve a minimization of PV:

- On the upside, there are digital coupons whose amounts are linked to underlying asset performance.
- On the downside, the chance of being knocked in as a put option is against early termination by issuer.
- The interest rate is also playing a vital role as it impacts the PV of the returned principal.

It is expected to pose much more challenge on the numerical approach in terms of accuracy of derivative pricing, due to presence of discontinuity (e.g. the knocked-in and coupon digital barrier) in the payoff.

In this problem, the worst of performance $S_W(t_k)$ is the explanatory variable $X(\omega, t_k)$, which is the only driver for both the coupon performance and value of the knock in put option. Mathematically, the exercise payoff and option value are given by

$$Z(\omega, t_k) = \mathcal{C}(t_k) + 1$$

and

$$\tilde{V}(\omega, t, \tilde{\tau}) = \sum_{t_i = \inf \pi(t)}^{\tilde{\tau}} e^{-r(t_i - t)} \mathcal{C}(t_i) + 1 \cdot e^{-r(\tilde{\tau} - t)} + \delta_{\tilde{\tau} = T} \mathcal{P}(T),$$

respectively.

A.3 Regression Approach in Monte Carlo framework

The objective function to be minimized is the expected squared error in Eqn.2.10 w.r.t. the coefficients $\vec{\beta}_k$ is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left[V^{(j)}(t_k, \tau^{(j)}(t_{k+1})) - \sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{k,r} \phi_r(X^{(j)}(t_k)) \right]^2 \right].$$

Translating this into the language within Monte Carlo framework, we have

$$\frac{1}{N_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_R} \left[V^{(j)}(t_k, \tau^{(j)}(t_{k+1})) - \sum_{r=1}^R \beta_{k,r} \phi_r(X^{(j)}(t_k)) \right]^2,$$

where the superscript (j) indicates that the variable is under j^{th} of total N_R regression Monte Carlo paths.

After some algebra, the minimization problem is equivalent to solving the linear system:

$$\mathbf{M}_k \vec{\beta}_k = \vec{c}_k \quad (4.1)$$

where the matrix \mathbf{M}_k and \vec{c}_k are defined as:

$$(\mathbf{M}_k)_{r,s} = \frac{1}{N_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_R} \phi_r(X^{(j)}(t_k)) \phi_s(X^{(j)}(t_k))$$

and

$$(\vec{c}_k)_r = e^{-r\Delta T} \frac{1}{N_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_R} V^{(j)}(t_k, \tau^{(j)}(t_{k+1})) \phi_r(X^{(j)}(t_k))$$

respectively.

A.4 FD PDE Solution

To solve the PDE for American-style option in Eqn.2.12, we need to consider the continuity equation around $t_k \in \pi(0)$:

$$V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S}, t_k^-) = \max(Z(\vec{S}(t_k), t_k), V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S}, t_k^+))$$

for holder's exercise; and

$$V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S}, t_k^-) = \min(Z(\vec{S}(t_k), t_k), V_{\vec{q}, \vec{\sigma}}^d(\vec{S}, t_k^+))$$

for issuer's exercise, respectively.

For $d \leq 2$, we have accurate and efficient methods to solve PDE. The elegance of finite difference method to solve American exercise option pricing is that it marches from maturity to present, which naturally fits into the requirement of backward recursive optimization in stopping time problems.

While we don't intend to dig into details of in-depth on the implementation of solving Eqn.2.12 with $d \leq 2$, to the best of our knowledge, we would like to stress here that there is no stable, accurate and efficient finite difference methods for $d > 2$. Even for $d = 2$, it is not trivial at all, which requires more advanced routes than Crank-Nicolson method that works well in one dimension³. Please refer to previous literature for in-depth discussion.

A.5 Optimized Exercise Boundaries (Opt-EB)

As alternative independent check for the PV of American-style options, we introduce a brute force method within simulation framework. For ease of illustration but without loss of generality, we focus on Bermudan option only, although this method will work as expected given the continuation payoff is monotonic.

First of all, we define the variational stopping time $\tilde{\tau}$, in light of Eqn.2.11, as

$$\tilde{\tau}(\vec{EB}) := \begin{cases} \inf\{t_k | S_B(t_k) \geq EB_{t_k}\} & \text{for call option;} \\ \inf\{t_k | S_B(t_k) \leq EB_{t_k}\} & \text{for put option,} \end{cases}$$

which depends on $\vec{EB} = \{EB_{t_k} | 1 \leq k \leq M\}$ defining the exercise boundaries on all exercise dates.

For a given \vec{EB} , the option PV can be obtained by standard Monte Carlo method with ease as $V(\vec{EB}) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-r\tilde{\tau}}g(S_B(\tilde{\tau}))]$.

Then the Bermudan option PV can be computed via external optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} PV &= \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\tau} [e^{-r\tau}g(S_B(\tau))]] \\ &= \sup_{\vec{EB}} \mathbb{E}[e^{-r\tilde{\tau}(\vec{EB})}g(S_B(\tilde{\tau}(\vec{EB})))] \\ &= \sup_{\vec{EB}} V(\vec{EB}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

In practice, the result is obtain by optimizing the exercise boundary levels \vec{EB} to achieve a maximum PV as much as possible⁴.

This brute-force variational method is a very time consuming approach, which can take many (up to 100+) iterations before achieving convergent results. However, it would be serving as one of few available benchmarks, or at lease lower (upper) bound estimates for holder (issuer) exercise, especially when full PDE FD solution is unavailable under higher dimensions with $d > 2$.

³See for example the alternating direction implicit method (McKee & Mitchell (1970)) for $d = 2$.

⁴In our implementation, a multi-dimensional Simplex algorithm is used.

References

- AREAL, N., RODRIGUES A., & ARMADA, M.R. 2008. On improving the least squares Monte Carlo option valuation method. *Review of Derivatives Research*, **11**, 119–151.
- BARRAQUAND, J., & MARTINEAU, D. 1995. Numerical valuation of high dimensional multivariate american securities. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, **30**(3), 342–351.
- BOIRE, FRANCOIS-MICHEL, REESOR, R. MARK, & STENTOFT, LARS. 2022. Bias Correction in the Least-Squares Monte Carlo Algorithm. *SSRN*.
- BROADIE, M., & GLASSERMAN, P. 2004. A stochastic mesh method for pricing high-dimensional american options. *Journal of Computational Finance*, **7**(4), 35–72.
- FRANK J. FABOZZI, TOMMASO PALETTA, RADU TUNARU. 2017. An improved least squares Monte Carlo valuation method based on heteroscedasticity. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **263**(2), 698–706.
- FUJII, M., TAKAHASHI A., & TAKAHASHI, M. 2019. Asymptotic expansion as prior knowledge in deep learning method for high dimensional BSDEs. *Asia-Pacific Financial Markets*, **26**(3), 391–408.
- JIAN LIANG, ZHE XU, & LI, PETER. 2021. Deep learning-based least squares forward-backward stochastic differential equation solver for high-dimensional derivative pricing. *Quantitative Finance*, **21**(8), 1309–1323.
- JOSHI, MARK, & KWON, OH KANG. 2016. Least Squares Monte Carlo Credit Value Adjustment with Small and Unidirectional Bias. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, **19**(08), 1650048.
- LONGSTAFF, F., & SCHWARTZ, E. 2001. Valuing American options by simulation: a simple least-squares approach. *The Review of Financial Studies*, **14**(1), 113–147.
- MCKEE, S., & MITCHELL, A. R. 1970. Alternating direction methods for parabolic equations in two space dimensions with a mixed derivative. *The Computer Journal*, **13**(1), 81–86.
- MORENO, M., NAVAS J.F. 2003. On the Robustness of Least-Squares Monte Carlo (LSM) for Pricing American Derivatives. *Review of Derivatives Research*, **6**, 107–128.
- STENTOFT, L. 2001. Assessing the least squares Monte-Carlo approach to American option valuation. *Review of Derivatives Research*, **7**(2), 129–168.
- TIAN, TIANHAI, & BURRAGE, KEVIN. 2003. Accuracy issues of Monte-Carlo methods for valuing American options. *ANZIAM J.*, **44**(C), 739–758.