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ABSTRACT. This paper proposes a paradigm shift in the valuation of long term annuities, away from classical no-arbitrage valuation towards valuation under the real world probability measure. Furthermore, we apply this valuation method to two examples of annuity products, one having annual payments linked to a mortality index and the savings account and the other having annual payments linked to a mortality index and an equity index with a guarantee that is linked to the same mortality index and the savings account. Out-of-sample hedge simulations demonstrate the effectiveness of real world valuation.

In contrast to risk neutral valuation, which is a form of relative valuation, the long term average excess return of the equity market comes into play. Instead of the savings account, the numéraire portfolio is employed as the fundamental unit of value in the analysis. The numéraire portfolio is the strictly positive, tradable portfolio that when used as benchmark makes all benchmarked nonnegative portfolios supermartingales. The benchmarked real world value of a benchmarked contingent claim equals its real world conditional expectation. This yields the minimal possible value for its hedgeable part and minimizes the fluctuations for its benchmarked hedge error. Under classical assumptions, actuarial and risk neutral valuation emerge as special cases of the proposed real world valuation. In long term liability and asset valuation, the proposed real world valuation can lead to significantly lower values than suggested by classical approaches when an equivalent risk neutral probability measure does not exist.

1. INTRODUCTION

Long dated contingent claims are relevant in insurance, pension fund management and derivative valuation. This paper proposes a paradigm shift in the valuation of long term contracts, away from classical no-arbitrage valuation, towards valuation under the real world probability measure. In contrast to risk neutral valuation, which is a form of relative valuation, the long term average trend of the equity market above the fixed income money market, known as the equity premium, is coming into play in the proposed real world valuation. A benchmark, the numéraire portfolio, is employed as the fundamental unit of value in the analysis, replacing the savings account. The numéraire portfolio is the strictly positive,
tradable portfolio that when used as benchmark makes all benchmarked nonnegative portfolios supermartingales. This means, their current benchmarked values are greater than, or equal to, their expected future benchmarked values. Furthermore, the benchmarked real world value of a benchmarked contingent claim is proposed to equal its real world conditional expectation. This yields the minimal possible value for its hedgeable part of the benchmarked contingent claim and minimizes the fluctuation of its benchmarked hedge error. It turns out that the pooled total benchmarked hedge error of a well diversified book of contracts issued by an insurance company can practically vanish due to diversification when the number of contracts becomes large. Classical actuarial and risk neutral valuation emerge as special cases of the proposed real world valuation methodology when classical modeling assumptions are imposed. In long term asset and liability valuation, real world valuation can lead to significantly lower values than suggested by classical valuation arguments when the existence of some equivalent risk neutral probability measure is not requested. A wider and more realistic modeling framework then becomes available which allows this phenomenon to be exploited.

The benchmark approach, described in Platen and Heath [2010], proposes such a framework. Instead of relying on the domestic savings account as the reference unit, a benchmark in form of the best performing, tradable strictly positive portfolio is chosen as numéraire. More precisely, it is proposed to employ the numéraire portfolio as benchmark, whose origin can be traced back to Long [1990], and which is equal to, in general, the growth optimal portfolio; see Kelly [1956].

In recent years the problem of accurately valuing long term assets and liabilities, held by insurance companies, banks and pension funds, has become increasingly important. How these institutions perform such valuations often remains unclear. However, the recent experience with low interest rate environments suggests that some major changes are due in these industries. One possible explanation, to be explored in this article, is that the risk neutral valuation paradigm itself may be inherently flawed, especially when it is applied to the valuation of long term contracts. It leads to a more expensive production method than necessary, as will be explained in the current paper.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 gives a brief survey on the literature about valuation methods in insurance and finance. Section 3 introduces the benchmark approach. Real world valuation is described in Section 4. Two examples on real world valuation and hedging of long term annuities, with annual payments linked to a mortality index and either a savings account or an equity index, are illustrated in Section 5. Section 6 concludes.

2. Valuation Methods for Long Term Contracts

One of the most dynamic areas in the current risk management literature is the valuation of long term contracts, including variable annuities. The latter represent long term contracts with payoffs that depend on insured events and on underlying assets that are traded in financial markets. The valuation methods can be categorized into three main types: actuarial valuation or expected present value, risk neutral valuation and utility maximization valuation.

Actuarial Valuation (Expected Present Value)

One of the pioneers of calculating present values of contingent claims for life insurance companies was James Dodson, whose work is described in the historical
accounts of Campbell [2016] and Dodson [1995]. The application of such methods to with-profits policies ensued. In the late 1960s US life insurers entered the variable annuity market, as mentioned in Sloane [1970], where such products required assumptions on the long term behaviour of equity markets. Many authors have analyzed various actuarial models of the long term evolution of stochastic equity markets, such as Wise [1984a] and Wilkie [1985] study contracts when a perfect match is not possible.

Risk Neutral Valuation

The main stream of research, however, follows the concept of no-arbitrage valuation in the sense of Ross [1976] and Harrison and Kreps [1979]. This approach has been widely used in finance, where it appears in the guise of risk neutral valuation. The earliest applications of no-arbitrage valuation to variable annuities are in the papers by Brennan and Schwartz [1976, 1979] and Boyle and Schwartz [1977], which extend the Black-Scholes-Merton option valuation (see Black and Scholes [1973] and Merton [1973]) to the case of equity-linked insurance contracts.

The Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing, in its most general form formulated by Delbaen and Schachermayer [1998], establishes a correspondence between the “no free lunch with vanishing risk” no-arbitrage concept and the existence of an equivalent risk neutral probability measure. This important result demonstrates that theoretically founded classical no-arbitrage pricing requires the restrictive assumption that an equivalent risk neutral probability measure must exist. In such a setting, the effect of stochastic interest rates on the risk neutral value of a guarantee has been discussed by many authors, such as Bacinello and Ortu [1993, 1996], Aase and Persson [1994], Huang and Cairns [2004, 2005], and others.

Risk Neutral Valuation for Incomplete Markets

In reality, one has to deal with the fact that markets are incomplete and insurance payments are not fully hedgeable. The choice of a risk neutral pricing measure is, therefore, not unique, as pointed out by Föllmer and Sondermann [1986] and Föllmer and Schweizer [1991], for example. Hofmann et al. [1992], Gerber and Shiu [1994], Gerber [1997] and Jaimungal and Young [2005], Duffie and Richardson [1991] and Schweizer [1992] address this issue by suggesting certain mean-variance hedging methods based on a form of variance- or risk-minimizing objective, assuming the existence of a particular risk neutral measure. In the latter case, the so-called minimal equivalent martingale measure, due to Föllmer and Schweizer [1991], emerges as the pricing measure. This valuation method is also known as local risk minimization and was considered by Möller [1998, 2001], Schweizer [2001] and Dahl and Möller [2006] for the valuation of insurance products.

Expected Utility Maximization

Another approach involves the maximization of expected terminal utility, see Karatzas et al. [1991], Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] and Delbaen et al. [2002]. In this case the valuation is based on a particular form of utility indifference pricing. This form of valuation has been applied by Hodges and Neuberger [1989] and later by Davis [1997]. It has been used to value equity-linked insurance products by Young and Zariphopoulou [2002a,b], Young [2003] and Moore and Young [2003].
Typically in the context of some expected utility maximization there is an ongo-
ing debate on the links between the valuation of insurance liabilities and financial
economics for which the reader can be refered to Reitano [1997], Longley-Cook
2000, Lane [2000] and Wang [2000, 2002]. Equilibrium modeling from a macro-
economic perspective has been the focus of a line of research that can be traced
back to Debreu [1982], Starr [1997] and Duffie [2001].

Stochastic Mortality Rates

Note that stochastic mortality rates are easily incorporated in the pricing of
insurance products as demonstrated by Milevsky and Promislow [2001], Dahl [2004],
Kirch and Melnikov [2005], Cairns et al. [2006a, b] 2008, Biffis 2005, Melnikov and
Romanik [2006, 2008] and Jalen and Mamon [2008]. Most of these authors assume
that the market is complete with respect to mortality risk, which means that it can
be removed by diversification.

Stochastic Discount Factors

Several no-arbitrage pricing concepts have been popular in finance that are equiv-
alent to the risk neutral approach. For instance, Cochrane [2001] employs the no-
tion of a stochastic discount factor. The use of a state-price density, a deflator or a
pricing kernel have been considered by Constantinides [1992], Cochrane [2001] and
Duffie 2001, respectively. Another way of describing classical no-arbitrage pric-
ing was pioneered by Long [1990] and further developed in Bajeux-Besnainou and
Portait [1997] and Becherer [2001], who use the numéraire portfolio as numéraire
instead of the savings account, and employ the real world probability measure as
pricing measure to recover risk neutral prices.

Real World Pricing under the Benchmark Approach

The previous line of research involving the numéraire portfolio comes closest
to the form of real world valuation proposed under the benchmark approach in
Platen [2002] and Platen and Heath 2010. The primary difference is that the
benchmark approach does no longer assume the existence of an equivalent risk
neutral probability measure. In so doing it allows for a much richer class of models
to be available for consideration and permits several self-financing portfolios to
replicate the same contingent claim, where it can select the least expensive one as
corresponding value process.

The benchmark approach employs the best performing, strictly positive, tradable
portfolio as benchmark and makes it the central reference unit for modeling, pricing
and hedging.

All valuations are performed under the real world probability measure and, there-
fore, labelled “real world pricing”. In a complete market where an equivalent risk
neutral probability measure exists real world pricing yields the same price as risk
neutral pricing. When there is no equivalent risk neutral probability measure in
the market model, then risk neutral prices can still be employed without generating
any economically meaningful arbitrage but these may be more expensive than the
respective real world prices.

In Du and Platen [2016] the concept of benchmarked risk minimization has been
introduced, which yields via the real world price the minimal value for the hedge-
able part of a not fully hedgeable contingent claim and minimizes the fluctuations
of the profit and losses when denominated in units of the numéraire portfolio. Risk
minimization that is close to the previously mentioned concept of local risk minimization of Föllmer and Schweizer [1991] and Föllmer and Sondermann [1986] was studied under the benchmark approach in Biagini et al. [2014].

3. Benchmark Approach

Within this and the following section we give a brief survey about the benchmark approach, which goes beyond results presented in Platen and Heath [2010] and underpins our findings. Consider a market comprising a finite number $J + 1$ of primary security accounts. An example of such a security could be an account containing shares of a company with all dividends reinvested in that stock. A savings account held in some currency is another example of a primary security account. In reality, time is continuous and this paper considers continuous time models. These can provide compact and elegant mathematical descriptions of asset value dynamics. We work on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, P)$ with filtration $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions, as in Karatzas and Shreve [1991].

This section introduces the benchmark approach with its concept of real world pricing. The key assumption is that there exists a best performing, strictly positive, tradable portfolio in the given investment universe, which we specify later on as the numéraire portfolio. This benchmark portfolio can be interpreted as a universal currency. Its existence turns out to be sufficient for the formulation of powerful results concerning diversification, portfolio optimization and valuation.

The benchmarked value of a security represents its value denominated in units of the benchmark portfolio. Denote by $\hat{S}_j^t$ the benchmarked value of the $j$th primary security account, $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, J\}$, at time $t \geq 0$. The 0-th primary security account is chosen to be the savings account of the domestic currency. The particular dynamics of the primary security accounts are not important for the formulation of several statements presented below. For simplicity, taxes and transaction costs are neglected in the paper.

The market participants can form self-financing portfolios with primary security accounts as constituents. A portfolio at time $t$ is characterized by the number $\delta_j^t$ of units held in the $j$th primary security account, $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, J\}$, $t \geq 0$. Assume for any given strategy $\delta = \{\delta_t = (\delta_0^t, \delta_1^t, \ldots, \delta_J^t)^\top, t \geq 0\}$ that the values $\delta_0^t, \delta_1^t, \ldots, \delta_J^t$ depend only on information available at the time $t$. The value of the benchmarked portfolio, which means its value denominated in units of the benchmark, is given at time $t$ by the sum

$$\hat{S}_t^\delta = \sum_{j=0}^J \delta_j^t \hat{S}_j^t,$$

for $t \geq 0$. Since there is only finite total wealth available in the market, the paper considers only strategies whose associated benchmarked portfolio values remain finite at all times.

Let $E_t(X) = E(X|\mathcal{F}_t)$ denote the expectation of a random variable $X$ under the real world probability measure $P$, conditioned on the information available at time $t$ captured by $\mathcal{F}_t$ (for example, see Section 8 of Chapter 1 of Shiryaev [1984]). This allows us to formulate the main assumption of the benchmark approach as follows:

**Assumption 1.** There exists a strictly positive benchmark portfolio, called the numéraire portfolio, such that each benchmarked nonnegative portfolio $\hat{S}_t^\delta$ forms a
supermartingale, which means that

\[ \hat{S}_t^\delta \geq E_t(\hat{S}_s^\delta) \]

for all \(0 \leq t \leq s < \infty\).

Inequality (2) can be referred to as the supermartingale property of benchmarked securities. It is obvious that the benchmark represents in the sense of Inequality (2) the best performing portfolio, forcing all benchmarked nonnegative portfolios in the mean downward or having no trend. In general the assumed numéraire portfolio coincides with the growth optimal portfolio, which is the portfolio that maximizes expected logarithmic utility, see Kelly [1956]. Since only the existence of the numéraire portfolio is requested, the benchmark approach reaches beyond the classical no-arbitrage modeling world.

According to Assumption 1 the current benchmarked value of a nonnegative portfolio is greater than or equal to its expected future benchmarked values. Assumption 1 guarantees several essential properties of a financial market model without assuming a particular dynamics for the asset values. For example, it implies the absence of economically meaningful arbitrage by ensuring that any strictly positive portfolio remains finite at any finite time because the best performing portfolio has this property. As a consequence of the supermartingale property (2) and because a nonnegative supermartingale that reaches zero is absorbed at zero, no wealth can be created from zero initial capital under limited liability.

For the classical risk neutral valuation, the corresponding no-arbitrage concept is formalised as “no free lunch with vanishing risk” (NFLVR), see Delbaen and Schachermayer [1994]. The benchmark approach assumes that the portfolio cannot explode, which is equivalent to the “no unbounded profits with bounded risk” (NUPBR) concept, see Karatzas and Kardaras [2007]. An equivalent martingale measure is not required to exist and, therefore, benchmarked portfolio strategies are permitted to form strict supermartingales, a phenomenon which we exploit in the current paper.

Another fundamental property that follows directly from the supermartingale property (2) is that the benchmark portfolio is unique. To see this, consider two strictly positive portfolios that are supposed to represent the benchmark. The first portfolio, when expressed in units of the second one, must satisfy the supermartingale property (2). By the same argument, the second portfolio, when expressed in units of the first one, must also satisfy the supermartingale property. Consequently, by Jensen’s inequality both portfolios must be identical. Thus, the value process of the benchmark that starts with given strictly positive initial capital is unique. Due to possible redundancies in the set of primary security accounts, this does not imply uniqueness for the trading strategy generating the benchmark portfolio.

Assumption 1 is satisfied for most reasonable financial market models. It simply asserts the existence of a best performing portfolio that does not “explode”. This requirement can be interpreted as the absence of economically meaningful arbitrage. In Theorem 14.1.7 of Chapter 14 of Platen and Heath [2010], Assumption 1 has been verified for jump diffusion markets, which cover a wide range of possible market dynamics. Karatzas and Kardaras [2007] show that Assumption 1 is satisfied for any reasonable semimartingale model. Note that Assumption 1 permits us to model benchmarked primary security accounts that are not martingales. This is necessary for realistic long term market modeling, as will be demonstrated in Section 5.
By referring to results in Platen [2005], Le and Platen [2006], Platen and Rendek [2012] and Platen and Rendek [2017], one can say that the benchmark portfolio is not only a theoretical construct, but can be approximated by well diversified portfolios, e.g. by the MSCI world stock index for the global equity market or the S&P500 total return index for the US equity market.

A special type of security emerges when equality holds in relation (2).

**Definition 1.** A security is called** fair** if its benchmarked value \( \hat{V}_t \) forms a martingale, that is, the current value of the process \( \hat{V} \) is the best forecast of its future values, which means that,

\[
\hat{V}_t = E_t (\hat{V}_s)
\]

for all \( 0 \leq t \leq s < \infty \).

Note that the above notion of a fair security is employing the best performing portfolio, the benchmark. The benchmark approach allows us to consider securities that are not fair. This important flexibility is missing in the classical no-arbitrage approach and will be required when modeling the market realistically over long time periods.

### 4. Real World Pricing

As stated earlier, the most obvious difference between the benchmark approach and the classical risk neutral approach is the choice of pricing measure. The former uses the real world probability measure with the numéraire portfolio as reference unit for valuation, while the savings account is the chosen numéraire under the risk neutral approach, which assumes the existence of an equivalent risk neutral probability measure. The assumption is additionally imposed to our Assumption and, therefore, reduces significantly the class of models and phenomena considered. The supermartingale property (2) ensures that the expected return of a benchmarked nonnegative portfolio can be at most zero. In the case of a fair benchmarked portfolio, the expected return is precisely zero. The current benchmarked value of such a portfolio is, therefore, the best forecast of its benchmarked future values. The risk neutral approach assumes that the savings account is fair, which seems to be at odds with evidence; see for example Baldeaux et al. [2015] and Baldeaux et al.

Under the benchmark approach, there can be many supermartingales that approach the same future random value. Within a family of nonnegative supermartingales, the supermartingale with the smallest initial value turns out to be the corresponding martingale; see Proposition 3.3 in Du and Platen [2016]. This basic fact allows us to deduce directly the following **Law of the Minimal Price**:

**Theorem 1.** (Law of the Minimal Price) If a fair portfolio replicates a given nonnegative payoff at some future time, then this portfolio represents the minimal replicating portfolio among all nonnegative portfolios that replicate this payoff.

For a given payoff there may exist self-financing hedge portfolios that are not fair. Consequently, the classical Law of One Price (see, for example, Taylor [2002]) does no longer hold under the benchmark approach. However, the above Law of the Minimal Price provides instead a consistent, unique value system for all hedgeable contracts with finite expected benchmarked payoffs.
It follows for a given hedgeable payoff that the corresponding fair hedge portfolio represents the least expensive hedge portfolio. From an economic point of view investors prefer more to less and this is, therefore, also the correct value in a liquid, competitive market. As will be demonstrated in Section 5, there may exist several self-financing portfolios that hedge one and the same payoff. It is the fair portfolio that hedges the payoff at minimal cost. We emphasize that risk neutral valuation based purely on hedging via classical no-arbitrage arguments, see [Ross 1976] and [Harrison and Kreps 1979], may lead to more expensive values than those given by the corresponding fair value.

Now, consider the problem of valuing a given payoff to be delivered at a maturity date \( T \in (0, \infty) \). Define a benchmarked contingent claim \( \hat{H}_T \) as a nonnegative payoff denominated in units of the benchmark portfolio with finite expectation

\[ (4) \quad E_0 \left( \hat{H}_T \right) < \infty. \]

If for a benchmarked contingent claim \( \hat{H}_T, T \in (0, \infty) \), there exists a benchmarked fair portfolio \( \hat{S}^\hat{H}_T \), which replicates this claim at maturity \( T \), that is \( \hat{H}_T = \hat{S}^\hat{H}_T \), then, by the above Law of the Minimal Price, its minimal replicating value process is at time \( t \in [0, T] \) given by the real world conditional expectation

\[ (5) \quad \hat{S}^\hat{H}_t = E_t \left( \hat{H}_T \right). \]

Multiplying both sides of equation (5) by the value of the benchmark portfolio in domestic currency at time \( t \), denoted by \( S^*_t \), one obtains the real world valuation formula

\[ (6) \quad S^*_t = \hat{S}^\hat{H}_t S^*_t = S^*_t E_t \left( \frac{H_T}{S_T} \right), \]

where \( H_T = \hat{H}_T S^*_T \) is the payoff denominated in domestic currency and \( S^*_t \) the fair value at time \( t \in [0, T] \) denominated in domestic currency. Note that the benchmark portfolio can be obtained by the product \( S^*_t = (\hat{S}^*_t)^{-1} S^0_t \) of the inverse of the benchmarked savings account \( \hat{S}^*_0 \) and the value \( S^0_t \) of this savings account denominated in domestic currency.

Formula (6) is called the real world valuation formula because it involves the conditional expectation \( E_t \) with respect to the real world probability measure \( P \). It only requires the existence of the numé raire portfolio and the finiteness of the expectation in (4). These two conditions can hardly be weakened. By introducing the concept of benchmarked risk minimization in [Du and Platen 2016] it has been shown that the above real world valuation formula also provides the natural valuation for nonhedgeable contingent claims when one aims to diversify as much as possible nonhedgeable parts of contingent claims.

An important application for the real world pricing formula (6) arises when \( H_T \) is independent of \( S^*_T \), which leads to the actuarial valuation formula

\[ (7) \quad S^\hat{H}_t = E_t(H_T). \]

The derivation of (7) from (6) exploits the simple fact that the expectation of a product of independent random variables equals the product of their expectations. One discounts in (7) by multiplying the real world expectation \( E_t(H_T) \) with the
fair zero coupon bond value

\begin{equation}
P(t, T) = S_t^* E_t \left( (S_T^{-1}) \right).
\end{equation}

The actuarial valuation formula (7) has been used as a valuation rule by actuaries for centuries to determine the net present value of a claim. This important formula follows here as a direct consequence of real world pricing, confirming actuarial intuition and experience.

The following discussion aims to highlight the link between real world valuation and risk neutral valuation. Risk neutral valuation uses as its numéraire the domestic savings account process \( S^0 = \{S^0_t, t \geq 0\} \), denominated in units of the domestic currency. Under certain assumptions, which will be described below, one can derive risk neutral values from real world values by rewriting the real world valuation formula (6) in the form

\begin{equation}
S^\delta \hat{H}_t = E_t \left( \Lambda_T \Lambda_t S^0_t S^0_T H_T \right),
\end{equation}

employing the benchmarked, normalized savings account \( \Lambda_t = \frac{S^0_t S^0_T}{S^0_T} \) for \( t \in [0, T] \).

Note that \( \Lambda_0 = 1 \) and that when assuming that the putative risk neutral measure \( Q \) is an equivalent probability measure we get

\begin{equation}
E_t \left( \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} S^0_t S^0_T H_T \right) = E^Q_t \left( \frac{S^0_t S^0_T}{S^0_T} H_T \right),
\end{equation}

where \( \Lambda_t \) represents in a complete market the respective (Radon-Nikodym derivative) density at time \( t \) and \( E^Q_t \) denotes conditional expectation under \( Q \). We remark that \( Q \) is an equivalent probability measure if and only if \( \Lambda_t \) forms a true martingale, which means that the benchmarked savings account \( S^0_t \) forms a true martingale.

For illustration, let us interpret throughout this paper the S&P500 total return index as the benchmark and numéraire portfolio for the US equity market. Its monthly observations in units of the US dollar savings account are displayed in Figure 1 for the period from January 1871 until March 2017. The logarithms of the S&P500 and the US dollar saving account are exhibited in Figure 2. One clearly notes the higher long term growth rate of the S&P500 when compared with that of the savings account, a stylized empirical fact which is essential for the existence of the stock market.

The normalized inverse of the discounted S&P500 allows us to plot in Figure 3 the resulting density process \( \Lambda = \{\Lambda_t, t \in [0, T]\} \) of the putative risk neutral measure \( Q \) as it appears in (9). Although one only has one sample path to work with, it seems unlikely that the path displayed in Figure 3 is the realization of a true martingale. Due to its obvious systematic downward trend it seems more likely to be the trajectory of a strict supermartingale. In this case the density process would not describe a probability measure and one could expect substantial overpricing to occur in risk neutral valuations of long term contracts when simply assuming that the density process is a true martingale. Note that this martingale condition is the key assumption of the theoretical foundation of classical risk neutral valuation, see Delbaen and Schachermayer 1998. In current industry practice and most theoretical work this assumption is typically made. Instead of working on the filtered probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)\) one works on the filtered probability space
Figure 1. Discounted S&P500 total return index.

Figure 2. Logarithms of S&P500 and savings account.
Figure 3. Radon-Nikodym derivative of the putative risk neutral measure in dependence on time $T$. 

(\(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}, Q\)) assuming that there exists an equivalent risk neutral probability measure $Q$ without ensuring that this is indeed the case. In the case of a complete market we have seen that the benchmarked savings account has to be a martingale to ensure that risk neutral prices are theoretically founded as intended. We observed in (9) and (10) that in this case the real world and the risk neutral valuation coincide. In the case when the benchmarked savings account is not a true martingale one can still perform formally risk neutral pricing. For a hedgeable nonnegative contingent claim one obtains then a self-financing hedge portfolio with values that represent the formally obtained risk neutral value. This portfolio when benchmarked is a supermartingale as a consequence of Assumption $\Box$. Therefore, employing formally obtained risk neutral prices by the market does not generate any economically meaningful arbitrage in the sense as previously discussed. However, this may generate some classical form of arbitrage, as discussed in Loewenstein and Willard [2000] and Platen [2002]. Under the benchmark approach such classical forms of arbitrage are allowed to exist and can be systematically exploited, as we will demonstrate later on for the case of long dated bonds and similar contracts. The best performing portfolio is then still the benchmark or numéraire portfolio which remains finite at any finite time.

Finally, consider the valuation of nonhedgeable contingent claims. Recall that the conditional expectation of a square integrable random variable can be interpreted as a least squares projection; see Shiryaev [1984]. Consequently, the real world valuation formula (6) provides with its conditional expectation, the least squares projection of a given square integrable benchmarked payoff into the set
of possible current benchmarked values. It is well-known that in a least squares projection the forecasting error has mean zero and minimal variance, see Shiryaev [1984]. Therefore, the benchmarked hedge error has mean zero and minimal variance. More precisely, as shown in Du and Platen [2016], under benchmark risk minimization the Law of the Minimal Price ensures through its real world valuation that the value of the contingent claim is the minimal possible value and the benchmarked profit and loss has minimal fluctuations and is a local martingale orthogonal to all benchmarked traded wealth.

In an insurance company the benchmarked profits and losses of diversified benchmarked contingent claims are pooled. If these benchmarked profits and losses are generated by sufficiently independent sources of uncertainty, then it follows intuitively via the Law of Large Numbers that the total benchmarked profit and loss for an increasing number of benchmarked contingent claims is not only a local martingale starting at zero, but also a process with an asymptotically vanishing quadratic variation or variance. In this manner, insurance companies can theoretically complete asymptotically the market by pooling benchmarked profits and losses. This shows that real world valuation makes perfect sense from the perspective of a financial institution with a large pool of sufficiently different contingent claims.

5. Valuation of Long Term Annuities

This section illustrates the real world valuation methodology in the context of simple long term contracts, which we call here basic annuities. More complicated annuities, life insurance products, pensions and also equity linked long term contracts can be treated similarly. All show, in general, a similar effect where real world prices become significantly lower than prices formed under classical risk neutral valuation. The most important building blocks of annuities, and also many other contracts, are zero coupon bonds. This section will, therefore, study first in detail the valuation and hedging of zero coupon bonds. It will then apply these findings to some basic annuity and compare its real world price with its classical risk neutral price.

5.1. Savings Bond. To make the illustrations reasonably realistic, the following study considers the US equity market as investment universe. It uses the US one-year cash deposit rate as short rate when constructing the savings account. The S&P500 total return index is chosen as proxy for the numéraire portfolio, the benchmark. Monthly S&P500 total return data is sourced from Robert Shiller’s website (http://www.econ.yale.edu/~shiller/data.htm) for the period from January 1871 until March 2017. The savings account discounted S&P500 total return index has been already displayed in Figure 1.

For simplicity, and to make the core effect very clear, assume that the short rate is deterministic. By making the short rate random one would complicate the exposition, and would obtain very similar and even slightly more pronounced differences between real world and risk neutral valuation, due to the effect of stochastic interest rates on bond prices as a consequence of Jensen’s inequality. A similar comment applies to the choice of the S&P500 total return index as proxy for the numéraire portfolio or benchmark. Very likely there exist better proxies for the numéraire portfolio, see e.g. Le and Platen [2006] or Platen and Rendek [2017]. As
will become clear, their larger long term growth rates would make the effects to be demonstrated even more pronounced.

The first aim of this section is to illustrate the fact that under the benchmark approach there may exist several self-financing portfolios that replicate the payoff of one dollar of a zero coupon bond. Let

\[ D(t, T) = \frac{S^0_t}{S^0_T} \]

denote the price at time \( t \in [0, T] \), of the, so-called, savings bond with maturity \( T \), where \( S^0_t \) denotes the value of the savings account at time \( t \). Consequently, the savings bond price is the price of a zero coupon bond under risk neutral valuation and other classical valuation approaches. The upper graph in Figure 4 exhibits the logarithm of the saving bond price, with maturity in March 2017 valued at the time shown on the x-axis. The benchmarked value of this savings bond, which equals its value denominated in units of the S&P500, is displayed as the upper graph in Figure 5.

As pointed out previously, an equivalent risk neutral probability measure is unlikely to exist for any realistic complete market model. Financial planning recommends to invest at young age in the equity market and to shift wealth into fixed income securities closer to retirement. This type of strategy is widely acknowledged to be more efficient than investing all wealth in a savings bond, which represents the classical risk neutral strategy for obtaining bond payoffs at maturity. Based on the absence of an equivalent risk neutral probability measure, this paper provides
Figure 5. Values of benchmarked savings bond and benchmarked fair zero coupon bond.

A theoretical reasoning for such a long term investment strategy. Moreover, it will quantify rigorously such a strategy under the assumption of a stylized model for the benchmark dynamics.

5.2. Fair Zero Coupon Bond. Under real world valuation, the time $t$ value of the *fair zero coupon bond price* with maturity date $T$ is denoted by

$$P(t, T) = S_t^* E_t \left( \frac{1}{S_T^*} \right),$$

and results from the real world valuation formula (6), see also (8). It provides the minimal possible price for a self-financing portfolio that replicates $1$ at maturity $T$. Note that under real world valuation the fair zero coupon bond becomes an index derivative, with the index as benchmark. The underlying assets involved, are the benchmark (here the S&P500 total return index) and the savings account of the domestic currency, here the US dollar. Both securities will appear in the corresponding hedge portfolio, which shall replicate at maturity the payoff of one dollar.

To calculate the price of a fair zero coupon bond, one has to compute the real world conditional expectation in (12). For this calculation one needs to employ a model for the real world distribution of the random variable $(S_T^*)^{-1}$. To be realistic and different from the formally obtained risk neutral valuation, such a model must reflect the fact that the benchmarked savings account should be a strict supermartingale. Any model that models the benchmarked savings account as a strict supermartingale, will value the above benchmarked fair zero coupon bond
less expensively than the corresponding benchmarked savings bond. Figure 5 displays, additionally to the benchmarked savings bond, the value of a benchmarked fair zero coupon bond, which will be derived below, under a respective model. One notes the significantly lower initial value of the benchmarked fair zero coupon bond. Also visually, its benchmarked value seems to appear as the best forecast of its future benchmarked values. In Figure 4 the logarithm of the fair zero coupon bond is shown together with the logarithm of the savings bond value. One notes that the fair zero coupon bond appears to follow essentially the benchmark for many years. The strategy that delivers this hedging portfolio will be discussed in detail below.

We interpret the value of the savings bond as the one obtained by formal risk neutral valuation. As shown in relation (10), this value is greater than or equal to that of the fair zero coupon bond. For readers who want to have some economic explanation for the observed value difference one could argue that the savings bond gives the holder the right to liquidate the contract at any time without costs. On the other hand, a fair zero coupon bond is akin to a term deposit without the right to access the assets before maturity. One could say that the savings bond carries a “liquidity premium” on top of the value for the fair zero coupon bond. Under the classical no-arbitrage paradigm, with its Law of One Price (see e.g. Taylor [2002]), there is only one and the same price process possible for both instruments, which is that of the savings bond. The benchmark approach opens with its real world valuation concept the possibility to model costs for early liquidation of financial instruments. The fair zero coupon bond is the least liquid instrument that delivers the bond payoff and, therefore, the least expensive zero coupon bond. The savings bond is more liquid and, therefore, more expensive.

5.3. Fair Zero Coupon Bond for the Minimal Market Model. The benchmarked fair zero coupon value at time $t \in [0, T]$ is the best forecast of its benchmarked payoff $\hat{S}_0^T = (S_T^*)^{-1}$. It provides the minimal self-financing portfolio value process that hedges this benchmarked contingent claim. To facilitate a tractable evaluation of a fair zero coupon bond, one has to employ a continuous time model for the benchmarked savings account that represents a strict supermartingale. The inverse of the benchmarked savings account is the discounted numéraire portfolio $\bar{S}_t^* = S_t^* S_t^0 = (\hat{S}_0^T)^{-1}$. In the illustrative example we present, it is the discounted S&P500, which, as discounted numéraire portfolio, satisfies in a continuous market model the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$d\bar{S}_t^* = \alpha_t dt + \sqrt{\bar{S}_t^*} \alpha_t dW_t,$$

for $t \geq 0$ with $\bar{S}_0^* > 0$, see Platen and Heath [2010] Formula (13.1.6). Here $W = \{W_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a Wiener process, and $\alpha = \{\alpha_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a strictly positive process, which models the trend $\alpha_t = \bar{S}_t^* \theta_t^2$ of $\bar{S}_t^*$, with $\theta_t$ denoting the market price of risk. For constant market price of risk one would obtain the Black-Scholes model, which has been the standard market model. In the long term it yields benchmarked savings accounts that are martingales and is, therefore, not suitable for our study. Since in (13) $\alpha_t$ can be a rather general stochastic process, the parametrization of the SDE (13) does so far not constitute a model.

The trend or drift in the SDE (13) can be interpreted economically as a measure for the discounted average value of wealth generated per unit of time by the underlying economy. To construct in a first approximation a respective model, we assume
now that the drift of the discounted S&P500 total return index grows exponentially with a net growth rate $\eta > 0$. At time $t$ the drift of the discounted S&P500 total return index $\bar{S}_t$ is then modeled by the exponential function

\begin{equation}
\alpha_t = \alpha \exp \{ \eta t \}.
\end{equation}

This yields the stylized version of the minimal market model (MMM), see \cite{Platen2001, Platen2002}, which emerges from \cite{Platen2013} and is the ‘workhorse’ of the benchmark approach. We know explicitly the transition density of the resulting time-transformed squared Bessel process of dimension four, $\bar{S}^*$, see \cite{Revuz1999}.

The transition density function of the discounted numéraire portfolio $\bar{S}^*$ equals

\begin{equation}
p_{\bar{S}^*}(t, x_t, \bar{T}, x_{\bar{T}}) = \frac{1}{2(\varphi_{\bar{T}} - \varphi_t)} \sqrt{\frac{x_{\bar{T}}}{x_t}} \exp \left( - \frac{x_t + x_{\bar{T}}}{2(\varphi_{\bar{T}} - \varphi_t)} \right) I_1 \left( \sqrt{x_t x_{\bar{T}}} \frac{\varphi_{\bar{T}} - \varphi_t}{\varphi_{\bar{T}} - \varphi_t} \right),
\end{equation}

where $\varphi_t = \frac{1}{\alpha} (\exp(\eta t) - 1)$ is also the quadratic variation of $\sqrt{S^*}$. The corresponding distribution function is that of a non-central chi-squared random variable with four degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $x_t/(\varphi_{\bar{T}} - \varphi_t)$. Using the above transition density function we apply standard maximum likelihood estimation to monthly data for the discounted S&P500 total return index over the period from January 1871 to January 1932, giving the following estimates of the parameters $\alpha$ and $\eta$,

\begin{equation}
\alpha = 0.005860 (0.000613),
\eta = 0.049496 (0.002968),
\end{equation}

where the standard errors are shown in brackets. In Appendix A we explain the estimation used in this paper.

These estimates for the net growth rate $\eta$ are consistent with estimates from various other sources in the literature, where the net growth rate of the US equity market during the last century has been estimated at about 5%, see for instance \cite{Dimson2002}.

Under the stylized MMM the explicitly known transition density of the discounted numéraire portfolio $\bar{S}^*$ yields for the fair zero coupon bond price by (12) the explicit formula

\begin{equation}
P(t, T) = D(t, T) \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ - \frac{2 \eta \bar{S}^*_t}{\alpha (\exp(\eta T) - \exp(\eta t))} \right\} \right)
\end{equation}

for $t \in [0, T)$, which has been first pointed out in \cite{Platen2010} Section 13.3. Figure 5 displays with the lower graph the trajectory of the benchmarked fair zero coupon bond price with maturity $T$ in March 2017. By (17) the price of the benchmarked fair zero coupon bond remains always below that of the benchmarked savings bond, where the latter we interpret as the formally taken risk neutral zero coupon bond price. The fair zero coupon bond value provides the minimal portfolio process for hedging the given payoff under the assumed MMM. Other benchmarked replicating portfolios need to form strict supermartingales and, therefore, yield higher price processes. One such example is given by the benchmarked savings bond, which pays one dollar at maturity. Recall that the benchmarked fair zero coupon bond is a martingale. It is minimal among the supermartingales that represent benchmarked replicating self-financing portfolios and pay one dollar at maturity.
Figure 6. Values of savings bond and fair zero coupon bond.

Figure 6 exhibits with its upper graph the trajectory of the savings bond and with its lower graph that of the fair zero coupon bond in US dollar denomination. Closer to maturity the fair zero coupon bond price merges with the savings bond price. Both self-financing portfolios replicate the payoff at maturity. Most important is the observation that they start with significantly different initial prices. The fair zero coupon bond exploits the presence of the strict supermartingale property of the benchmarked savings account, whereas the savings bond ignores it totally. Two self-financing replicating portfolios are displayed in Figure 6. Such a situation, where two self-financing portfolios replicate the same contingent claim, is impossible to model under the classical no-arbitrage paradigm. However, under the benchmark approach this is a natural situation.

In the above example for the parameters estimated during the period from January 1871 to January 1932, the savings bond with maturity in March 2017 has in January 1932 a price of \( D(0, T) \approx 0.026596 \). The fair zero coupon bond is far less expensive and priced at only \( P(0, T) \approx 0.000709 \). The fair zero coupon bond with term to maturity of more than 80 years costs here less than 3% of the savings bond. This reveals a substantial premium in the value of the savings bond.

We repeated with the estimated parameters the study for all possible zero coupon bonds that cover a period of 10, 15, 20 and 25 years from initiation until maturity that fall into the period starting in January 1932 and ending in March 2017. Table 1 displays the average difference in US dollars between the risk neutral and the fair bond. One clearly notes that for a 25-year bond one saves about 27% of the risk neutral price, which is a typical time to maturity for many pension products.
Table 1. Mean values of zero coupon bonds of prescribed terms to maturity whose start and end dates lie between January 1932 and March 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years to Maturity</th>
<th>Mean of $D(t,T)$</th>
<th>Mean of $P(t,T)$</th>
<th>Mean of ${D(t,T)-P(t,T)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6534</td>
<td>0.6468</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5219</td>
<td>0.4931</td>
<td>0.0287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.4084</td>
<td>0.3479</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.3130</td>
<td>0.2294</td>
<td>0.0836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By demonstrating explicitly the valuation methodology we suggest a realistic way of changing from the classical risk neutral production strategy to the less expensive benchmark production strategy.

5.4. Hedging of a Fair Zero Coupon Bond. The benefits of the proposed benchmark production methodology can only be harvested if the respective hedging strategy would allow to replicate the hedge portfolio values as theoretically predicted.

The hedging strategy by which this is theoretically achieved follows under the MMM from the explicit fair zero coupon bond pricing formula (13). At the time $t \in [0, T]$ the corresponding theoretical number of units of the S&P500 to be held in the hedge portfolio follows, similar to the well-known Black-Scholes delta hedge ratio, as a partial derivative with respect to the underlying, and is given by the formula

$$
\delta^*_t = \frac{\partial \bar{P}(t,T)}{\partial S^*_t} = D(0,T) \exp \left\{ \frac{-2\eta \bar{S}^*_t}{\alpha (\exp{\eta T} - \exp{\eta t})} \right\} \frac{2\eta}{\alpha (\exp{\eta T} - \exp{\eta t})}.
$$

(18)

Here $D(0,T)$ is the respective value of the formally obtained risk neutral bond, the savings bond.

The resulting fraction of wealth to be held at time $t$ in the S&P500, as it evolves for the given example of zero coupon bond valuation from January 1932 to maturity, shown in Figure 7. The remaining wealth is always invested in the savings account.

To demonstrate how realistic the hedge of the fair zero coupon bond payoff is for the given delta under the stylized MMM under monthly reallocation, a self-financing hedge portfolio is formed. The delta hedge is performed similarly to the well known one for options under the Black-Scholes model. The self-financing hedge portfolio starts in January 1932, which ensures that the hedge simulations employing the fitted parameters in (16) are out-of-sample. Each month the fraction invested in the S&P500 is adjusted in a self-financing manner according to the above prescription. The resulting benchmarked profit and loss for this delta hedge turns out to be very small and is visualized in Figure 8. The maximum absolute benchmarked profit and loss amounts only to about 0.00000061. This benchmarked profit and loss is so small that the resulting hedge portfolio, when plotted additionally in Figure 8, would be visually indistinguishable from the path of the already displayed fair zero coupon bond price process. Dollar values of the self-financing hedge portfolio, the fair zero coupon bond and the savings bond are shown in Figure 9, where it is evident that the self-financing portfolio replicates 95% of the face value of the bond but
Table 2. Means and standard deviations of profits and losses on hedge at maturities of zero coupon bonds having various terms to maturity. (Negative P&Ls indicate losses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years to Maturity</th>
<th>Mean P&amp;L</th>
<th>Std. Dev. P&amp;L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.0057</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.0144</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-0.0226</td>
<td>0.0168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above example and hedge simulations demonstrate the principle that a hedge portfolio can generate a fair zero coupon bond value process by investing long only in a dynamic hedge in the S&P500 and the savings account. The resulting hedge portfolio is for long term maturities significantly less expensive than the corresponding saving bond. Moreover, as can be seen in Figure 4, the hedge portfolio can initially significantly fluctuate, as it did around 1930 during the Great Depression. However, close to maturity, the hedge portfolio cannot be significantly affected by any equity market meltdown, as was the case in our illustrative example during the 2007-2008 financial crisis.

As we will describe later on, in a similar manner as above described, one can value and produce less expensively other long term contingent claims including equity linked payoffs that are typical for variable annuities or life insurance and pension payoffs.

In summary, one can say that by shifting the valuation paradigm from classical risk neutral to real world valuation, we suggest to replicate more cost efficiently long term payoffs. In particular, it follows from (9) that one can expect significant savings to arise for payoffs that do not vanish when the benchmark approaches zero. This production methodology applies to a range of payoffs that are embedded in various insurance and pension contracts, where we aim below to provide some indications.

5.5. Long Term Mortality and Cash-Linked Annuities. Consider now a stylized example that aims to illustrate valuation and hedging under the benchmark approach in the context of basic annuities. Consider annuities sold to $K$ policy holders that pay an indexed number of units of the savings account per year at the beginning of each year where they provide a payoff. Here we assume that the savings account and total return index account commence with $1$ at the date $t_0$ of purchasing the annuity and the indexed number of units at time $T$ is prescribed as

$$MI_T = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K} 1_{r^k > T}},$$
Figure 7. Fraction of wealth invested in the S&P500.

Figure 8. Benchmarked profit and loss.
Figure 9. Comparison of values of zero coupon bonds with hedge portfolio, also showing the profit and loss.

where $\tau^{(k)}$ is a random variable equal to the time at which the $k$-th policy holder dies, for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, K$. Therefore, the payoff at time $T$ in respect of the $k$-th policy holder is

$$MI_T \times \frac{S^0_T}{S^0_{t_0}} \times 1_{\tau^{(k)} > T}.$$  

Additionally, we assume that there is an asset management fee payable as an annuity whose payoff at time $T$ equals $MI_T \times \frac{S^0_T}{S^0_{t_0}}$. This type of payoff is likely to account well in the long run for the effect of inflation because the average US interest rate was during the last century on average about 1% above the US average inflation rate, see Dimson et al. [2002]. Since in our evaluation the interest rate will not play any role, we can now assume that the interest rate is stochastic. Also, since the portfolio of annuities has at time $T$ the aggregate payoff

$$MI_T \times \frac{S^0_T}{S^0_{t_0}} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \left( MI_T \times \frac{S^0_T}{S^0_{t_0}} \times 1_{\tau^{(k)} > T} \right) = \frac{S^0_T}{S^0_{t_0}},$$

the mortality rate plays no role and we can assume that the mortality rate is stochastic.

To use the available historical data efficiently, let us place our discussion in the past and consider a person who reached the age of 25 in January 1932. The subset of the monthly S&P500 time series used for fitting the parameters in (16) starts at January 1871 and ends at this date. The person may have considered purchasing some annuity which pays, from the age of 65 to the beginning of the age of 110,
at the beginning of the year $T$ an indexed number of units $MI_T$ of the savings account. In the case when the person may have passed away before reaching the age of 110 in 2017 the payments that would have otherwise been made revert to the asset pool backing the annuity portfolio. Since in this setting there is no mortality risk or interest rate risk involved in the given payoff stream, classical risk neutral pricing would value this annuity portfolio as

$$V_{t}^{RN} = \sum_{T \in G} S_0^T E_t \left( \frac{S_0^T / S_0^T}{S_T^* / S_T^*} \right) = 45 \times \frac{S_0^T}{S_0^T}$$

for the set of payment dates $G = \{\text{Jan 1972, Jan 1973, \ldots, Jan 2016}\}$. Thus for any date $t$ during the period from January 1932 until December 1971 classical risk neutral pricing would always value this annuity as being equal to 45 units of the savings account. This is exactly the number of units of the savings account that have to be paid out by the annuity over the 45 years from 1972 until 2017. This means, the annuity has the discounted risk neutral value

$$\bar{V}_t^{RN} = \frac{V_t^{RN}}{S_0^T} = 45$$

for all $t \in \{\text{Jan 1932, Feb 1932, \ldots, Dec 1971}\}$.

As shown in the previous section, when valuing such an annuity under the benchmark approach it will be less expensive than suggested by the above classical risk neutral price. This example aims to illustrate that significant amounts can be saved. The real world valuation formula, given in (6), captures at time $t$ the fair value of one unit of the savings account at time $T$, see (11) and (13), via the expression

$$S_t^* E_t \left( \frac{S_0^T}{S_T^*} \right) = S_0^T \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{2 \eta S_t^*}{\alpha (\exp{\eta T} - \exp{\eta t})} \right\} \right).$$

Consequently, the discounted real world value of the annuity at the time $t \in \{\text{Jan 1932, Feb 1932, \ldots, Dec 1971}\}$ equals

$$\bar{V}_t^{RW} = \sum_{T \in G} \frac{S_T^*}{S_T^*} E_t \left( \frac{S_0^T}{S_T^*} \right) = \sum_{T \in G} \left( 1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{2 \eta S_t^*}{\alpha (\exp{\eta T} - \exp{\eta t})} \right\} \right)$$

for the set of payment dates $G = \{\text{Jan 1972, Jan 1973, \ldots, Jan 2016}\}$. For the previously fitted parameters of the MMM, Figure 10 shows the discounted price of the fair annuity (denominated in units of the savings account) according to formula (25), as a function of the purchasing time $t$. One notes that the time of purchase plays a significant role. Over the years the discounted fair annuity becomes more expensive. The value of the fair annuity remains always below that of the corresponding risk neutral value. It is ranging from about 10% of the risk neutral value in January 1932 to about 89% of the risk neutral value in December 1971. This means, someone who starts at the beginning of her or his working life to prepare for retirement can enjoy benefits about eight times greater than those delivered from a later start which is close to retirement. Note that the typical compounding effect in a savings account does not matter in this example, because the value of the annuity and its payments are denominated in units of the savings account. It is the exploitation of the strict supermartingale property of the benchmarked savings account that creates the remarkable effect. The payoff stream of the fair annuity needs to be hedged, generating only a small benchmarked profit and loss or hedge error of similar size as demonstrated in the previous section, where we considered a
Table 3. Comparison of discounted values of deferred annuities paying one dollar per annum for forty-five years, commencing in 40 years’ time, over all monthly start dates in the period January 1871 to January 1932.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discounted Risk Neutral Value</th>
<th>Discounted Real World Value</th>
<th>Percentage Saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.672484</td>
<td>69.616702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.540818</td>
<td>12.312929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Savings account discounted price of the annuity during the period from January 1932 until December 1971 which provides annual payments from January 1972 until January 2016.

single fair zero coupon bond. Now we have a portfolio of bonds that pays units of the savings account at their maturities. To demonstrate that the above effect holds independently from the period entered, we repeat with the same parameters for the MMM and similar contracts the calculations for all possible start dates within the period from January 1871 until January 1932. We show in Table 3 the mean percentage saving by using the proposed benchmark methodology and the standard deviation for this estimate.

5.6. Long Term Mortality and Equity-Linked Annuities with Mortality and Cash-Linked Guarantees. Consider now a stylized example that aims to illustrate valuation and hedging under the benchmark approach in the context of annuities that offer optional guarantees. We may assume also here that interest
rates are stochastic because this will not affect our valuation of the product. Consider an annuity that pays to a policy holder at times $T \in G$ until maturity the greater value of $MI_T \times \exp(\eta(T - t_0))$ units of the savings account and $MI_T$ units of the S&P500 total return index account per year at the beginning of each year while the policy holder is alive. Here we assume that the potential savings account or the total return index account payments commence with $1$ at the date $t_0$ of purchasing the annuity. As in the previous example, we assume that there is an asset management fee payable as annuity whose payoff at time $T$ is the same as for a living policy holder. This type of payoff is likely to account well in the long run for the effect of inflation and equity returns.

The real world value at time $t$ of a portfolio of payments at the future time $T$ is given by

$$V_{t,T}^{RW} = S_t E_t \left( \frac{1}{S_T} \max \left( \frac{S_T^*}{S_{t_0}^*}, \frac{S_T^0 \exp(\eta(T - t_0))}{S_{t_0}^0} \right) \right)$$

which rearranges as

$$V_{t,T}^{RW} = \frac{S_T^0}{S_{t_0}^0} E_t \left( \max \left( \frac{S_T^*}{S_{t_0}^*}, \frac{S_t^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))}{S_T^*} \right) \right)$$

$$= \frac{S_t^*}{S_{t_0}^*} + \frac{S_T^0}{S_{t_0}^0} \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) E_t \left( \frac{S_t^* - \frac{S_t^0 \exp(\eta(T - t_0))}{S_{t_0}^0}}{S_T^*} \right)^+.\]

This rearrangement shows that today’s value is the sum of an equity-linked component and an equity index put option component, where the discounted index value is non-central chi-squared distributed. As in the previous example, neither the interest rate nor the mortality rate plays a role in the valuation formula.

We use the following lemma to compute the price of a guarantee.

**Lemma 1.** Let $U$ be a non-central chi-squared random variable with four degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\lambda > 0$. Then the following expectations hold:

$$E \left( \frac{\lambda}{U} \right) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda/2)$$

$$E \left( \frac{\lambda}{U} \mathbb{1}_{U < x} \right) = \chi^2_{0,\lambda}(x) - \exp(-\lambda/2)$$

$$E \left( \frac{\lambda}{U} \mathbb{1}_{U \geq x} \right) = 1 - \chi^2_{0,\lambda}(x),$$

where $\chi^2_{0,\lambda}(x)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of a non-central chi-squared random variable having $\nu$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\lambda$.

The proof of this result is given in Appendix B.

Furthermore, we mention the following result which we prove in Appendix C.
Corollary 1. For a discounted numéraire portfolio $\tilde{S}_t^*$ obeying the SDE [13] we have the expectations

\begin{align*}
E_t \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\tilde{S}_T^*} \right) &= 1 - \exp(-\lambda/2)
\left. \right| \quad (31) \\
E_t \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\tilde{S}_T^*} I_{\tilde{S}_T^* < x} \right) &= \chi^2_{\tilde{S}_t^*,\lambda} \left( \frac{x}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t} \right) - \exp(-\lambda/2)
\left. \right| \quad (32) \\
E_t \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\tilde{S}_T^*} I_{\tilde{S}_T^* \geq x} \right) &= 1 - \chi^2_{0,\lambda} \left( \frac{x}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t} \right),
\left. \right| \quad (33)
\end{align*}

where $\chi^2_{\nu,\lambda}(x)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of a non-central chi-squared random variable having $\nu$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\lambda$ given by

\begin{align*}
\lambda &= \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t}
\left. \right| \quad (34)
\end{align*}

and $\varphi_t = \frac{1}{4\eta} \alpha(\exp(\eta t) - 1)$.

This leads us to the following result, which we prove in Appendix D.

Theorem 2. For a discounted numéraire portfolio $\tilde{S}_t^*$, obeying the SDE [13], we have

\begin{align*}
E_t \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\tilde{S}_T^*} - \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\tilde{S}_t^*_0 \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} \right)^+ \\
= \chi^2_{0,\lambda} \left( \kappa \right) - \exp(-\lambda/2) - \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\tilde{S}_t^*_0 \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} \right) \chi^2_{4,\lambda}(\kappa),
\left. \right| \quad (35)
\end{align*}

where $\chi^2_{\nu,\lambda}(x)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of a non-central chi-squared random variable having $\nu$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\lambda$ given by

\begin{align*}
\lambda &= \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t}
\left. \right| \quad (36)
\end{align*}

and

\begin{align*}
\kappa &= \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*_0 \exp(\eta(T - t_0))}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t}
\left. \right| \quad (37) \\
\varphi_t &= \frac{1}{4\eta} \alpha(\exp(\eta t) - 1)
\left. \right| \quad (38)
\end{align*}

Therefore, we can calculate $V_{t,T}^{RW}$ in [27] as

\begin{align*}
V_{t,T}^{RW} = \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*}{\tilde{S}_t^*_0} \left( 1 - \chi^2_{2,\lambda(t,T)}(\kappa(t,T)) \right) \\
+ \frac{\tilde{S}_t^*_0 \exp(\eta(T - t_0))}{\tilde{S}_t^*_0} \left( \chi^2_{0,\lambda(t,T)}(\kappa(t,T)) - \exp(-\lambda(t,T)/2) \right),
\left. \right| \quad (39)
\end{align*}
where

\begin{align}
\lambda(t, T) &= \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t} \\
\kappa(t, T) &= \frac{\bar{S}_0^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t} \\
\varphi_t &= \frac{1}{4\eta} \alpha(\exp(\eta t) - 1).
\end{align}

Summing over all payment dates \( T \in G \) gives the value of the annuity

\begin{equation}
V_{t, T}^{RW} = \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_0^*} \sum_{T \in G} \left( 1 - \chi_2^2 \lambda(t, T)(\kappa(t, T)) \right) \\
+ \frac{\bar{S}_0^*}{\bar{S}_0^*} \sum_{T \in G} \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) \left( \chi_0^2 \lambda(0, t, T)(\kappa(t, T)) - \exp(-\lambda(t, T)/2) \right).
\end{equation}

For the previously fitted parameters of the MMM, Figure 11 shows the discounted price of the fair annuity (denominated in units of the savings account) according to the formula

\begin{equation}
\bar{V}_t^{RW} = \frac{V_t^{RW}}{\bar{S}_t^*}
\end{equation}

in dependence on the purchasing time \( t \).

Also, for the sake of comparison, the discounted price of the annuity is shown in Figure 11 under the assumption of geometric Brownian motion of the discounted numéraire portfolio \( \bar{S}^* \), that is, a Black-Scholes dynamics with SDE

\begin{equation}
d\bar{S}_t^* = \theta^2 \bar{S}_t^* dt + \theta \bar{S}_t^* dW_t,
\end{equation}

where \( \theta \) is estimated using maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) as 0.130386814 with standard error 0.003405 and log-likelihood 1019.842904 (see, for example, Fergusson [2017]). We can use (9) to price the annuity because under (43) the Radon-Nikodym derivative \( \Lambda_t = \frac{S_t^*}{S_t^*} \) is a martingale. We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** For a discounted numéraire portfolio \( \bar{S}_t^* \) obeying the SDE (43) we have

\begin{equation}
E_t \left( \left( \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_T^*} - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_0^*} \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) \right)^+ \right) \\
= N(d_1) - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_0^*} \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) N(d_2),
\end{equation}

where \( N(x) \) denotes the cumulative distribution function of a standard normal random variable and \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \) are given by

\begin{align}
d_1 &= \frac{\log \left( \frac{\bar{S}_0^* \exp(\eta(T-t_0))}{\bar{S}_t^*} \right) + 0.5 \theta^2 (T - t)}{\theta \sqrt{T - t}} \\
d_2 &= d_1 - \theta \sqrt{T - t}.
\end{align}

See Appendix E for a proof of this theorem.
Thus the value of the annuity under Black-Scholes dynamics has the formula

\[ V^\text{RN}_t = \sum_{T \in G} \left( \frac{S^*_t}{S^*_t} (1 - N(d_2(t, T))) + \frac{S^0_t}{S^*_t} \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) N(d_1(t, T)) \right) \]

and the discounted value of the annuity has the formula

\[ \bar{V}^\text{RN}_t = \frac{1}{S^0_t} \sum_{T \in G} \left( \frac{\bar{S}^*_t}{S^*_t} (1 - N(d_2(t, T))) + \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) N(d_1(t, T)) \right) \]

where

\[ d_1(t, T) = (\log(\bar{S}^*_t \exp(\eta(T - t_0))/\bar{S}^*_t) + \frac{1}{2} \theta^2(T - t))/\sqrt{\theta^2(T - t)} \]

\[ d_2(t, T) = d_1(t, T) - \sqrt{\theta^2(T - t)}. \]

Here \( N(x) \) is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. The discounted real world price of the annuity under the MMM has the initial value 88.853 which makes it significantly less expensive than the initial value 1181.076 for the discounted price of the annuity when assuming the Black-Scholes model for the index dynamics.

The above examples are deliberately designed to illustrate the cost effectiveness of real world valuation of long term contracts under the MMM compared to
valuation under the classical market model and paradigm. It is obvious that the intro-
duction of mortality risk and more refined models for the index dynamics would
not materially change the principal message provided by these preceding examples:
There are less expensive ways to transfer wealth into payoff streams than classical
modeling and valuation approaches can provide.

6. Conclusion

The paper proposes to move away from classical risk neutral valuation towards
a more general real world valuation methodology under the benchmark approach.
The resulting production methodology does not assume the existence of an equiva-
 lent risk neutral probability measure and offers, therefore, a much wider modeling
world. As a consequence, the better long term performance of the equity market
compared to that of the fixed income market can be systematically exploited to
produce less expensively pension and insurance products. Real world valuation
allows one to generate hedge portfolios with prices for long term contracts that
can be significantly lower than those obtained under classical pricing paradigms.
The proposed real world valuation methodology uses the best performing portfolio,
the numéraire portfolio, as numéraire and the real world probability measure as
pricing measure when taking expectations. Real world valuation identifies the min-
imal possible value for a replicable contingent claim. Real world pricing generalizes
classical risk neutral pricing and also actuarial pricing.

Appendix A. Maximum Likelihood Estimation of MMM Parameters

Given a series of observations of the discounted index

\( \bar{S}^*_t, \bar{S}^*_1, \ldots, \bar{S}^*_n \)

at the times \( t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_n \) we seek the values of the parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \eta \) of the
SDE

\( d \bar{S}^*_t = \alpha_t \, dt + \sqrt{\bar{S}^*_t} \, \alpha_t \, dW_t, \)

which maximize the likelihood of the occurrence of the observations under the
hypothesis that the stylized version of the MMM holds. Here we have \( t \geq 0, \)
\( \bar{S}^*_0 > 0, W = \{W_t, t \geq 0\} \) being a Wiener process and \( \alpha_t \) modeled by the exponential
function

\( \alpha_t = \alpha \exp(\eta t). \)

The transition density of the discounted numéraire portfolio \( \bar{S}^* \) is given in (15).
Using this transition density function the logarithm of the likelihood function, which
we seek to maximize, is found to be

\[ \ell(\alpha, \eta) \]
\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left( \frac{1}{2(\varphi_{t_{i}} - \varphi_{t_{i-1}})} \sqrt{\frac{S_{t_{i}}^{*}}{S_{t_{i-1}}^{*}}} \exp \left( \frac{-\tilde{S}_{t_{i-1}}^{*} + \tilde{S}_{t_{i}}^{*}}{2(\varphi_{t_{i}} - \varphi_{t_{i-1}})} \right) \right) \]
\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \log \left( \frac{1}{2(\varphi_{t_{i}} - \varphi_{t_{i-1}})} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\tilde{S}_{t_{i}}^{*}}{\tilde{S}_{t_{i-1}}^{*}} \right) + \left( -\frac{\tilde{S}_{t_{i-1}}^{*} + \tilde{S}_{t_{i}}^{*}}{2(\varphi_{t_{i}} - \varphi_{t_{i-1}})} \right) \right\} \]
\[ + \log \left( I_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{\tilde{S}_{t_{i-1}}^{*} \tilde{S}_{t_{i}}^{*}}}{\varphi_{t_{i}} - \varphi_{t_{i-1}}} \right) \right). \]

Initial estimates of \( \alpha \) and \( \eta \) can be found by equating the empirically calculated quadratic variation of \( \sqrt{\bar{S}^{*}} \), that is

\[ \langle \sqrt{\bar{S}^{*}} \rangle_{t_{j}} = \sum_{i=1}^{j} (\sqrt{\bar{S}_{t_{i}}^{*}} - \sqrt{\bar{S}_{t_{i-1}}^{*}})^2, \]

to the theoretical quadratic variation of \( \sqrt{\bar{S}^{*}} \), that is

\[ \langle \sqrt{\bar{S}^{*}} \rangle_{t_{j}} = \frac{\alpha}{4\eta} (\exp(\eta t_{j}) - 1), \]
at the times \( t = t_{k} \) and \( t = t_{2k} \) where \( k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \). The initial estimates are found straightforwardly to be

\[ \alpha_0 = \langle \sqrt{\bar{S}^{*}} \rangle_{t_{k}} \frac{4\eta}{\exp(\eta t_{k}) - 1}, \]
\[ \eta_0 = \log \left( \frac{\langle \sqrt{\bar{S}^{*}} \rangle_{t_{2k}}}{\langle \sqrt{\bar{S}^{*}} \rangle_{t_{k}}} - 1 \right) / t_{k} - t_{0}. \]

With these initial estimates we calculate the logarithm of the likelihood function at points \( \alpha_0 + i\delta\alpha \) and \( \eta_0 + j\delta\eta \) for \( i, j = -2, -1, 0, 1, 2 \), \( \delta\alpha = \alpha_0/4 \) and \( \delta\eta = \eta_0/4 \) and fit a quadratic form

\[ Q(x) = x^{T}Ax - 2b^{T}x + c, \]

where \( x = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \) is a 2-by-1 vector, \( A \) is a negative definite 2-by-2 matrix, \( b \) is a 2-by-1 vector and \( c \) is a scalar. Subsequent estimates \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \eta_1 \) are obtained as the matrix expression \( A^{-1}b \) corresponding to the maximum of the quadratic form \( Q \). Iteratively applying this estimation method gives the maximum likelihood estimates of the parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \eta \):

\[ \alpha = 0.005860 (0.000613), \]
\[ \eta = 0.002968 (0.002968), \]

where the standard errors are shown in brackets. The maximum log likelihood is \( \ell(\alpha, \eta) = 1028.776695 \). The Cramér-Rao inequality for the covariance matrix of the
Parameter estimates is
\[ \text{VAR}(\alpha, \eta) \geq \frac{1}{\nabla^2(\alpha, \eta)} \]
and as the number of observations becomes large the covariance matrix approaches the lower bound, which we use to calculate the standard errors.

**Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 1**

**Proof** (of Lemma 1). If \( U \) is a non-central chi-squared random variable having \( \nu \) degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter \( \lambda \), then it can be written as a chi-squared random variable \( X_N \) having a random number of degrees of freedom \( N = \nu + 2P \) with \( P \) being a Poisson random variable with mean \( \lambda/2 \), see e.g. Johnson *et al.* [1995]. It follows that

\[ E \left( \frac{\lambda}{U} 1_{U < x} \right) = E \left( \frac{\lambda}{X_N} 1_{X_N < x} \right) = E \left( E \left( \frac{\lambda}{X_N} 1_{X_N < x} \mid N \right) \right). \]

Because \( X_N \) is conditionally chi-squared distributed we have that

\[ E \left( \frac{1}{X_N} 1_{X_N < x} \mid N \right) = \frac{1}{N - 2} E(1_{X_{N-2} < x} \mid N) \]
for a conditionally chi-squared random variable \( X_{N-2} \) with \( N - 2 \) degrees of freedom. Therefore

\[ E \left( \frac{\lambda}{U} 1_{U < x} \right) = E \left( \frac{\lambda}{N - 2} E(1_{X_{N-2} < x} \mid N) \right) \]
and substituting \( \nu + 2P \), with \( \nu = 4 \), for \( N \) gives

\[ E \left( \frac{\lambda}{U} 1_{U < x} \right) = \frac{1}{2} E \left( \frac{\lambda}{P + 1} E(1_{X_{2+2P} < x} \mid P) \right). \]

We observe that for any Poisson random variable \( P \) with mean \( \mu \),

\[ E \left( \frac{1}{1 + P} f(P) \right) = \frac{1}{\mu} E(f(P - 1)) - \frac{1}{\mu} \exp(-\mu)f(-1) \]
and making use of this, \((63)\) becomes, with \( \mu = \lambda/2 \) and \( f(P) = E(1_{X_{2+2P} < x} \mid P) \),

\[ E \left( \frac{\lambda}{U} 1_{U < x} \right) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\mu} E(f(P - 1)) - \frac{1}{\mu} \exp(-\mu)f(-1) \right) = E(E(1_{X_{2P} < x} \mid P)) - \exp(-\lambda/2) \]
\[ = \lambda^2_0 \lambda(x) - \exp(-\lambda/2), \]
which is the second expectation formula. Letting \( x \to \infty \) in \((65)\) gives the first expectation formula. The third expectation formula follows straightforwardly by subtracting the second formula from the first formula.
Appendix C. Proof of Corollary 1

Proof (of Corollary 1). Letting

\[ \lambda = \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t} \]

we know that the distribution of the random variable

\[ U = \frac{\bar{S}_T^*}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t} \]

conditional upon \( \bar{S}_t^* \) is a non-central chi-squared distribution with four degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter \( \lambda \). Applying Lemma 1 gives the result.

Appendix D. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof (of Theorem 2). Since

\[ \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_T^*} - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{S_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} > 0 \]

if and only if

\[ \bar{S}_T^* < \bar{S}_t^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) \]

we can write

\[ E_t \left( \left( \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_T^*} - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{S_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} \right)^+ \right) \]

\[ = E_t \left( \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{S_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} 1_{\bar{S}_T^* < \bar{S}_t^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} \right) \]

Applying Corollary 1 and the fact that \( \bar{S}_T^* \) is non-central chi-squared distributed with four degrees of freedom gives

\[ E_t \left( \left( \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_T^*} - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{S_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} \right)^+ \right) \]

\[ = \chi^2_{0, \lambda}(\kappa) - \exp(-\lambda/2) - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{S_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} \chi^2_{4, \lambda}(\kappa) \]

where

\[ \kappa = \frac{\bar{S}_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))}{\varphi_T - \varphi_t} \]

which is the requested result.

Appendix E. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof (of Theorem 3). The proof is analogous to that of the Black-Scholes European call option formula. We can write \( \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_T^*} \) as

\[ \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_T^*} = \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \theta^2(T - t) + \theta \sqrt{T - t} Z) \]
for a standard normally distributed random variable $Z$. Thus the condition

\[
\frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_T} - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} > 0
\]

is equivalent to the condition

\[
Z > \log \left( \frac{\bar{S}_t^* \exp(\eta(T - t))}{\bar{S}_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} \right) \theta \sqrt{T - t} = -d_2.
\]

We can rewrite the expectation as

\[
E_t \left( \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \theta^2(T - t) + \theta \sqrt{T - t}Z \right) 1_{Z > -d_2} - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} 1_{Z > -d_2} \right)
\]

\[
= \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \theta^2(T - t)) E_t \left( \exp(\theta \sqrt{T - t}Z) 1_{Z > -d_2} \right)
\]

\[
- \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0))} E_t (1_{Z > -d_2}).
\]

We note that $E_t(\exp(\alpha Z) 1_{Z > -d_2}) = \exp(\frac{1}{2} \alpha^2)(1 - N(-d_2 - \alpha))$ so that the expectation becomes

\[
(1 - N(-d_2 - \theta \sqrt{T - t})) - \frac{\bar{S}_t^*}{\bar{S}_{t_0}^* \exp(\eta(T - t_0)) (1 - N(-d_2)),}
\]

which simplifies to the result.
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