Are stylized facts irrelevant in option-pricing?

Kyiv, June 19-23, 2006

Tommi Sottinen, University of Helsinki

Based on a joint work

No-arbitrage pricing beyond semimartingales

with

C. Bender, Weierstrass Institute of Applied Analysis and Stochastics E. Valkeila, Helsinki University of Technology

1. Market models, and self-financing strategies



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models
- 6. Forward integration



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models
- 6. Forward integration
- 7. Allowed strategies



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models
- 6. Forward integration
- 7. Allowed strategies
- 8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models
- 6. Forward integration
- 7. Allowed strategies
- 8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result
- 9. Mixed models with stylized facts



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models
- 6. Forward integration
- 7. Allowed strategies
- 8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result
- 9. Mixed models with stylized facts
- 10. A Message: Quadratic variation and volatility



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models
- 6. Forward integration
- 7. Allowed strategies
- 8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result
- 9. Mixed models with stylized facts
- 10. A Message: Quadratic variation and volatility
- 11. Robustness beyond Black and Scholes



- 1. Market models, and self-financing strategies
- 2. Pricing with replication, and arbitrage
- 3. Classical Black-Scholes pricing model
- 4. Stylized facts
- 5. Robust pricing models
- 6. Forward integration
- 7. Allowed strategies
- 8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result
- 9. Mixed models with stylized facts
- 10. A Message: Quadratic variation and volatility
- 11. Robustness beyond Black and Scholes
- 12. References



1. Market models, and self-financing strategies

- Let $\mathcal{C}_{s_0,+}$ be the space of continuous positive paths $\eta:[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ with $\eta(0)=s_0$.
 - A discounted market model is five-tuple $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (S_t), (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$ where the stock-price process S takes values in $\mathcal{C}_{s_0,+}$.



1. Market models, and self-financing strategies

- Let $\mathcal{C}_{s_0,+}$ be the space of continuous positive paths $\eta:[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ with $\eta(0)=s_0$.
 - A discounted market model is five-tuple $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (S_t), (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$ where the stock-price process S takes values in $\mathcal{C}_{s_0,+}$.
- Non-anticipating trading strategy Φ is self-financing if its wealth satisfies

$$V_t(\Phi, v_0; S) = v_0 + \int_0^t \Phi_r \, \mathrm{d}S_r, \quad t \in [0, T].$$
 (1)

Here the economic notion 'self-financing' is captured by the 'forward' construction of the pathwise integral in (1).



• An option is a mapping $G: \mathcal{C}_{s_0,+} \to \mathbb{R}_+$.



- An option is a mapping $G: \mathcal{C}_{s_0,+} \to \mathbb{R}_+$.
- The fair price of an option G is the capital v_0 of a hedging strategy Φ :

$$G(S) = V_T(\Phi, v_0; S).$$



- An option is a mapping $G: \mathcal{C}_{s_0,+} \to \mathbb{R}_+$.
- The fair price of an option G is the capital v_0 of a hedging strategy Φ :

$$G(S) = V_T(\Phi, v_0; S).$$

A strategy Φ is arbitrage (free lunch) if

$$P[V_T(\Phi, 0; S) \ge 0] = 1$$
 and $P[V_T(\Phi, 0; S) > 0] > 0$.



- An option is a mapping $G: \mathcal{C}_{s_0,+} \to \mathbb{R}_+$.
- The fair price of an option G is the capital v_0 of a hedging strategy Φ :

$$G(S) = V_T(\Phi, v_0; S).$$

A strategy Φ is arbitrage (free lunch) if

$$\mathbf{P}\left[V_{\mathcal{T}}(\Phi,0;S)\geq 0\right]=1\quad\text{and}\quad\mathbf{P}\left[V_{\mathcal{T}}(\Phi,0;S)>0\right]>0.$$

• If the hedging capital v_0 is not unique them there is strong arbitrage. Also, note that replication and arbitrage are kind of opposite notions.



• The Stock-price process is a geometric Brownian motion

$$S_t = s_0 e^{\mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}t}.$$



• The Stock-price process is a geometric Brownian motion

$$S_t = s_0 e^{\mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}t}.$$

 With 'admissible' strategies there is no arbitrage, and practically all options can be hedged.



• The Stock-price process is a geometric Brownian motion

$$S_t = s_0 e^{\mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}t}.$$

- With 'admissible' strategies there is no arbitrage, and practically all options can be hedged.
- Let R_t be the log-return

$$R_t = \log S_t - \log S_{t-1} = \sigma \Delta W_t + \left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) \Delta t.$$

So, the log-returns are



• The Stock-price process is a geometric Brownian motion

$$S_t = s_0 e^{\mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}t}.$$

- With 'admissible' strategies there is no arbitrage, and practically all options can be hedged.
- Let R_t be the log-return

$$R_t = \log S_t - \log S_{t-1} = \sigma \Delta W_t + \left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) \Delta t.$$

So, the log-returns are

independent,



• The Stock-price process is a geometric Brownian motion

$$S_t = s_0 e^{\mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}t}.$$

- With 'admissible' strategies there is no arbitrage, and practically all options can be hedged.
- Let R_t be the log-return

$$R_t = \log S_t - \log S_{t-1} = \sigma \Delta W_t + \left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) \Delta t.$$

So, the log-returns are

- independent,
- Gaussian.



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.

Some less-disputed stylized facts of log-returns R_t :

1 Long-range dependence: **Cor**[R_1 , R_t] $\sim t^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < 1$.



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.

- **1** Long-range dependence: **Cor**[R_1 , R_t] $\sim t^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < 1$.
- **②** Heavy tails: $\mathbf{P}[-R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_1}$, and maybe also $\mathbf{P}[R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_2}$.



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.

- **1** Long-range dependence: $\mathbf{Cor}[R_1, R_t] \sim t^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < 1$.
- **leavy** tails: $\mathbf{P}[-R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_1}$, and maybe also $\mathbf{P}[R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_2}$.
- **3** Gain/Loss asymmetry: $P[-R_t > x] >> P[R_t > x]$ (does not apply FX-rates, obviously).



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.

- Long-range dependence: $\mathbf{Cor}[R_1,R_t] \sim t^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < 1$.
- **leavy** tails: $\mathbf{P}[-R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_1}$, and maybe also $\mathbf{P}[R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_2}$.
- **3** Gain/Loss asymmetry: $P[-R_t > x] >> P[R_t > x]$ (does not apply FX-rates, obviously).
- Jumps.



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.

- Long-range dependence: $\mathbf{Cor}[R_1, R_t] \sim t^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < 1$.
- **②** Heavy tails: $\mathbf{P}[-R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_1}$, and maybe also $\mathbf{P}[R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_2}$.
- **3** Gain/Loss asymmetry: $P[-R_t > x] >> P[R_t > x]$ (does not apply FX-rates, obviously).
- Jumps.
- Volatility clustering.



Dictionary definition: Stylized facts are observations that have been made in so many contexts that they are widely understood to be empirical truths, to which theories must fit.

Some less-disputed stylized facts of log-returns R_t :

- Long-range dependence: $\mathbf{Cor}[R_1, R_t] \sim t^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta < 1$.
- **9** Heavy tails: $\mathbf{P}[-R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_1}$, and maybe also $\mathbf{P}[R_t > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_2}$.
- **3** Gain/Loss asymmetry: $P[-R_t > x] >> P[R_t > x]$ (does not apply FX-rates, obviously).
- 4 Jumps.
- Volatility clustering.

All of these stylized facts are in conflict with the Black–Scholes model, and they are ill suited for semimartingale models.

We introduce a class of pricing models that is invariant to the Black–Scholes model as long as option-pricing is considered. The class includes models with different stylized facts.



We introduce a class of pricing models that is invariant to the Black–Scholes model as long as option-pricing is considered. The class includes models with different stylized facts.

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (S_t), (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$$
 is in the model class \mathcal{M}_{σ} if



We introduce a class of pricing models that is invariant to the Black–Scholes model as long as option-pricing is considered. The class includes models with different stylized facts.

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (S_t), (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$$
 is in the model class \mathcal{M}_{σ} if

1 S takes values in $C_{s_0,+}$,



We introduce a class of pricing models that is invariant to the Black–Scholes model as long as option-pricing is considered. The class includes models with different stylized facts.

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (S_t), (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$$
 is in the model class \mathcal{M}_{σ} if

- **1** S takes values in $C_{s_0,+}$,
- ② the pathwise quadratic variation $\langle S \rangle$ of S is of the form

$$\mathrm{d}\langle S\rangle_t = \sigma^2 S_t^2 \,\mathrm{d}t,$$



5. Robust pricing models

We introduce a class of pricing models that is invariant to the Black–Scholes model as long as option-pricing is considered. The class includes models with different stylized facts.

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (S_t), (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathbf{P})$$
 is in the model class \mathcal{M}_{σ} if

- **1** S takes values in $C_{s_0,+}$,
- ② the pathwise quadratic variation $\langle S \rangle$ of S is of the form

$$\mathrm{d} \langle S \rangle_t \ = \ \sigma^2 S_t^2 \, \mathrm{d} t,$$

ullet for all arepsilon>0 and $\eta\in\mathcal{C}_{s_0,+}$ we have the small ball property

$$\mathbf{P}\left[\|S-\eta\|_{\infty}<\varepsilon\right]>0.$$



6. Forward integration

 \mathcal{M}_{σ} contains non-semimartingale models. So, we cannot use Itô integrals. However, the forward integral is economically meaningful:



6. Forward integration

 \mathcal{M}_{σ} contains non-semimartingale models. So, we cannot use Itô integrals. However, the forward integral is economically meaningful:

• $\int_0^t \Phi_r dS_r$ is the **P**-a.s. forward-sum limit

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{\substack{t_k \in \pi_n \\ t_k \le t}} \Phi_{t_{k-1}} \left(S_{t_k} - S_{t_{k-1}} \right).$$



6. Forward integration

 \mathcal{M}_{σ} contains non-semimartingale models. So, we cannot use Itô integrals. However, the forward integral is economically meaningful:

• $\int_0^t \Phi_r dS_r$ is the **P**-a.s. forward-sum limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{\substack{t_k\in\pi_n\\t_k\leq t}}\Phi_{t_{k-1}}\left(S_{t_k}-S_{t_{k-1}}\right).$$

• Let $u \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2,1}([0,T],\mathbb{R}_+,\mathbb{R}^m)$ and Y^1,\ldots,Y^m be bounded variation processes. If S has pathwise quadratic variation then we have the Itô formula for $u(t,S_t,Y_t^1,\ldots,Y_t^m)$:

$$du = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} dt + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} dS + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} d\langle S \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\partial u}{\partial y_i} dY^i.$$

This implies that the forward integral on the right hand side exists and has a continuous modification.

7. Allowed strategies

Even in the classical Black–Scholes model one restricts to 'admissible' strategies to exclude arbitrage. We shall restrict the 'admissible' strategies a little more.



7. Allowed strategies

Even in the classical Black–Scholes model one restricts to 'admissible' strategies to exclude arbitrage. We shall restrict the 'admissible' strategies a little more.

A strategy Φ is allowed if it is admissible and of the form

$$\Phi_t = \varphi(t, S_t, g_1(t, S), \ldots, g_m(t, S)),$$

where $\varphi \in C^1([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^m)$ and g_k 's are hindsight factors:



7. Allowed strategies

Even in the classical Black–Scholes model one restricts to 'admissible' strategies to exclude arbitrage. We shall restrict the 'admissible' strategies a little more.

A strategy Φ is allowed if it is admissible and of the form

$$\Phi_t = \varphi(t, S_t, g_1(t, S), \ldots, g_m(t, S)),$$

where $\varphi \in C^1([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^m)$ and g_k 's are hindsight factors:

- **1** $g(t,\eta)=g(t,\tilde{\eta})$ whenever $\eta(r)=\tilde{\eta}(r)$ on $r\in[0,t]$,
- $g(\cdot, \eta)$ is of bounded variation and continuous,



8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result

Theorem NA There is no arbitrage with allowed strategies.



8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result

Theorem NA There is no arbitrage with allowed strategies.

Theorem RH Suppose a continuous option $G: \mathcal{C}_{s_0,+} \to \mathbb{R}$. If $G(\tilde{S})$ can be hedged in one model $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma}$ with an allowed strategy then G(S) can be hedged in any model $S \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma}$.

Moreover, the hedges are – as strategies of the stock-path – independent of the model.

Moreover still, if φ is a 'functional hedge' in one model then it is a 'functional hedge' in all models.



8. A no-arbitrage and robust-hedging result

Theorem NA There is no arbitrage with allowed strategies.

Theorem RH Suppose a continuous option $G: \mathcal{C}_{s_0,+} \to \mathbb{R}$. If $G(\tilde{S})$ can be hedged in one model $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma}$ with an allowed strategy then G(S) can be hedged in any model $S \in \mathcal{M}_{\sigma}$.

Moreover, the hedges are – as strategies of the stock-path – independent of the model.

Moreover still, if φ is a 'functional hedge' in one model then it is a 'functional hedge' in all models.

Corollary PDE In the Black–Scholes model hedges for European, Asian, and lookback-options can be constructed by using the Black–Scholes partial differential equation. These hedges hold for any model that is continuous, satisfies the small ball property, and has the same quadratic variation as the Black–Scholes model.

Consider a mixed model

$$S_t = s_0 \exp \left\{ \mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma}{2} t + \delta B_t^H - I_t^{\alpha_1} + I_t^{\alpha_2} \right\},$$

where

• B^H is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index H > 0.5.



Consider a mixed model

$$S_t = s_0 \exp \left\{ \mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma}{2} t + \delta B_t^H - I_t^{\alpha_1} + I_t^{\alpha_2} \right\},$$

where

- B^H is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index H > 0.5.
- I^{α_i} 's are integrated compound Poisson processes with positive heavy-tailed jumps:

$$I_t^{\alpha_i} = \int_0^t \sum_{k: \tau_i^i < s} U_k^i \, \mathrm{d}s,$$

 au_k^i 's are Poisson arrivals and $\mathbf{P}[U_k^i > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_i}$.



Consider a mixed model

$$S_t = s_0 \exp \left\{ \mu t + \sigma W_t - \frac{\sigma}{2} t + \delta B_t^H - I_t^{\alpha_1} + I_t^{\alpha_2} \right\},$$

where

- B^H is a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst index H > 0.5.
- I^{α_i} 's are integrated compound Poisson processes with positive heavy-tailed jumps:

$$I_t^{\alpha_i} = \int_0^t \sum_{k: \tau_t^i < s} U_k^i \, \mathrm{d} s,$$

 τ_{ν}^{i} 's are Poisson arrivals and $\mathbf{P}[U_{\nu}^{i} > x] \sim x^{-\alpha_{i}}$.

• W, B^H , I^{α_1} , and I^{α_2} are independent.



$$Cor[R_1, R_t] \sim \delta^2 H(2H-1)t^{2H-2}.$$



1 Long-range dependence: If I^{α_i} 's are in L^2 then

$$Cor[R_1, R_t] \sim \delta^2 H(2H-1)t^{2H-2}.$$

2 Heavy tails: $P[-R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_1}$ and $P[R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_2}$.



$$Cor[R_1, R_t] \sim \delta^2 H(2H-1)t^{2H-2}.$$

- **2** Heavy tails: $P[-R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_1}$ and $P[R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_2}$.
- **3** Gain/Loss asymmetry: Obvious if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$.



$$Cor[R_1, R_t] \sim \delta^2 H(2H-1)t^{2H-2}.$$

- **2** Heavy tails: $P[-R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_1}$ and $P[R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_2}$.
- **3** Gain/Loss asymmetry: Obvious if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$.
- Jumps: No, but can you tell the difference between jumps and heavy tails from a discrete data?



$$Cor[R_1, R_t] \sim \delta^2 H(2H-1)t^{2H-2}.$$

- **2** Heavy tails: $P[-R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_1}$ and $P[R_t > x] \gtrsim x^{-\alpha_2}$.
- **3** Gain/Loss asymmetry: Obvious if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$.
- Jumps: No, but can you tell the difference between jumps and heavy tails from a discrete data?
- Volatility clustering: What is volatility? If volatility is standard deviation, we can have any kind of volatility structure: E.g. change the Poisson arrivals to clustered arrivals. If volatility (squared) is the quadratic variation then it is fixed to constant σ^2 .

• The hedges depend only on the quadratic variation.



- The hedges depend only on the quadratic variation.
- The quadratic variation is a path property. It tells nothing about the
 probabilistic structure of the stock-price (Black and Scholes tell us
 the mean return is irrelevant. We boldly suggest that probability is
 irrelevant, as far as option-pricing is concerned).



- The hedges depend only on the quadratic variation.
- The quadratic variation is a path property. It tells nothing about the probabilistic structure of the stock-price (Black and Scholes tell us the mean return is irrelevant. We boldly suggest that probability is irrelevant, as far as option-pricing is concerned).
- Don't be surprised if the implied and historical volatility do not agree: The latter is an estimate of the variance and the former is an estimate of the quadratic variation. In the Black–Scholes model these notions coincide. But that is just luck! Indeed, consider a mixed fractional Black–Scholes model $R_t = \sigma \Delta W_t + \delta \Delta B_t^H$. Then quadratic variation or R_t is σ^2 , but the variance of R_t is $\sigma^2 + \delta^2$.



- The hedges depend only on the quadratic variation.
- The quadratic variation is a path property. It tells nothing about the probabilistic structure of the stock-price (Black and Scholes tell us the mean return is irrelevant. We boldly suggest that probability is irrelevant, as far as option-pricing is concerned).
- Don't be surprised if the implied and historical volatility do not agree: The latter is an estimate of the variance and the former is an estimate of the quadratic variation. In the Black–Scholes model these notions coincide. But that is just luck! Indeed, consider a mixed fractional Black–Scholes model $R_t = \sigma \Delta W_t + \delta \Delta B_t^H$. Then quadratic variation or R_t is σ^2 , but the variance of R_t is $\sigma^2 + \delta^2$.
- Don't use the historical volatility! Instead, use either implied volatility or estimate the quadratic variation (which may be difficult).

11. Robustness beyond Black and Scholes

 Instead of taking the Black–Scholes model as reference we can consider models

$$\tilde{S}_t = s_0 \exp \tilde{X}_t,$$

where \tilde{X} is continuous semimartingale with $\tilde{X}_0=0$.



11. Robustness beyond Black and Scholes

 Instead of taking the Black-Scholes model as reference we can consider models

$$\tilde{S}_t = s_0 \exp \tilde{X}_t,$$

where \tilde{X} is continuous semimartingale with $\tilde{X}_0=0$.

• We can extend our robustness results to models

$$S_t = s_0 \exp X_t$$

where X is continuous $X_0=0$, X and \tilde{X} have the same pathwise quadratic variation, and the support of $\mathbf{P}\circ X^{-1}$ is the same as the support of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\circ \tilde{X}^{-1}$.



11. Robustness beyond Black and Scholes

 Instead of taking the Black–Scholes model as reference we can consider models

$$\tilde{S}_t = s_0 \exp \tilde{X}_t,$$

where \tilde{X} is continuous semimartingale with $\tilde{X}_0=0$.

• We can extend our robustness results to models

$$S_t = s_0 \exp X_t$$

where X is continuous $X_0=0$, X and \tilde{X} have the same pathwise quadratic variation, and the support of $\mathbf{P}\circ X^{-1}$ is the same as the support of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\circ \tilde{X}^{-1}$.

• So, when option pricing is considered it does not matter whether \tilde{S} or S is the model.

12. References

Cont (2001): Empirical properties of asset returns: stylized facts and statistical issues.

Föllmer (1981): Calcul d'Itô sans probabilités.

Schoenmakers, Kloeden (1999): Robust Option Replication for a Black-Scholes Model Extended with Nondeterministic Trends.

Russo, Vallois (1993): Forward, backward and symmetric stochastic integration.

Sottinen, Valkeila (2003): On arbitrage and replication in the Fractional Black–Scholes pricing model.

This talk: Bender, Sottinen, Valkeila (2006): No-arbitrage pricing beyond semimartingales.

