

Chapter Fourteen. Implied volatility

Outline Solutions to odd-numbered exercises from the book:

An Introduction to Financial Option Valuation:

Mathematics, Stochastics and Computation,

by Desmond J. Higham, Cambridge University Press, 2004

ISBN 0521 83884 3 (hardback)

ISBN 0521 54757 1 (paperback)

This document is © D.J. Higham, 2004

14.1 We know that $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma}$ has a turning point when $\frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial \sigma^2} = 0$. Using (14.4), this gives $d_1 = 0$ or $d_2 = 0$. Now, using $\frac{\partial d_1}{\partial \sigma} = -\frac{d_2}{\sigma}$ and the analogous identity $\frac{\partial d_2}{\partial \sigma} = -\frac{d_1}{\sigma}$, we have, from (14.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^3 C}{\partial \sigma^3} &= \frac{\partial d_1}{\partial \sigma} \frac{d_2}{\sigma} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma} + \frac{\partial d_2}{\partial \sigma} \frac{d_1}{\sigma} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma} + \frac{d_1 d_2}{\sigma} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial \sigma^2} - \frac{d_1 d_2}{\sigma^2} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma} \\ &= -\frac{d_2^2}{\sigma} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma} - \frac{d_1^2}{\sigma} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma} + \frac{d_1 d_2}{\sigma} \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial \sigma^2} - \frac{d_1 d_2}{\sigma^2} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma} > 0$ it follows that $\frac{\partial^3 C}{\partial \sigma^3} < 0$ at $d_1 = 0$ and at $d_2 = 0$.

Hence $d_1 = 0$ and $d_2 = 0$ give max. values.

Solving $d_1 = 0$ for σ gives $\sigma^2 = -2 \left[\frac{\log(S/E) + r(T-t)}{T-t} \right]$.

Solving $d_2 = 0$ for σ gives $\sigma^2 = 2 \left[\frac{\log(S/E) + r(T-t)}{T-t} \right]$.

Since $\sigma^2 \geq 0$, we conclude that $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \sigma}$ has a unique max. over $(0, \infty)$ given by $\sigma = \hat{\sigma}$ in (10).

14.3 We have $\hat{\sigma} > \sigma^*$ and (for $\sigma_0 = \hat{\sigma}$)

$$0 < \frac{\sigma_1 - \sigma^*}{\sigma_0 - \sigma^*} < 1.$$

This tells us that $\sigma_0 > \sigma_1 > \sigma^*$.

Now, we know that $F''(\sigma) > 0$ for all $\sigma < \sigma_0 = \hat{\sigma}$, hence $0 < F'(\xi_1) < F'(\sigma_1)$. (It might help to draw a picture.)

So, in (14.8),

$$0 < \frac{\sigma_2 - \sigma^*}{\sigma_1 - \sigma^*} < 1.$$

The same argument now applies for $n = 2, 3, \dots$ and hence (14.10) holds.