

# PDE approach to valuation and hedging of credit derivatives

TOMASZ R. BIELECKI<sup>†</sup>, MONIQUE JEANBLANC<sup>\*‡</sup>  
and MAREK RUTKOWSKI<sup>§¶</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL 60616, USA

<sup>‡</sup>Département de Mathématiques, Université d'Évry Val d'Essonne, 91025 Évry Cedex, France

<sup>§</sup>School of Mathematics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

<sup>¶</sup>Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science, Warsaw University of Technology,  
00-661 Warszawa, Poland

(Received 27 December 2004; in final form 11 April 2005)

This paper presents a PDE approach in a Markovian setting to hedge defaultable derivatives. The arbitrage price and the hedging strategy for an attainable contingent claim are described in terms of solutions of a pair of coupled PDEs. For some standard examples of defaultable claims, we provide explicit formulae for prices and hedging strategies.

*Keywords:* Credit derivatives; Hedging; Valuation; PDE approach

## 1. Introduction

Our aim is to examine the PDE approach to the valuation and hedging of a defaultable claim in various settings; this allows us to emphasize the importance of the choice of the traded assets. We start with a general model for the dynamics of the traded primary assets. Subsequently, we specify particular models and we deal with particular defaultable claims such as, for instance, survival claims. For the sake of notational simplicity, we deal throughout with a model with only three primary traded assets. The generalization to the case of  $k$  primary assets is rather straightforward, although notationally more cumbersome.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we examine the no-arbitrage property of a model in terms of a martingale measure. The next section is devoted to the study of the PDE approach to the valuation of defaultable claims and we give the hedging strategies of a contingent claim under the assumption that prices of primary assets are strictly positive. Section 4 shows how to adapt the valuation PDE and replicating strategies if one of the primary assets is a defaultable security with zero recovery, so that its price vanishes after default.

In section 5, we modify the original market model by replacing the fixed horizon date for trading activities by a random time horizon determined by the default time. Finally, in section 6, we examine briefly the possible extensions to the case of several default times. We refer to the companion works of Bielecki *et al.* (2004a–d) for notation and related results.

## 2. Martingale measures

In this section, we start, as is standard, with the historical dynamics of the traded assets. For ease of computation, we restrict our attention to the case of three traded assets and two sources of noise: a Brownian motion and a random default time. Our goal is to derive the PDE satisfied by the price of a defaultable claim in a general model under market completeness. Subsequently, we examine some examples corresponding to specific choices of the underlying assets.

### 2.1. Default time

Let  $\tau$  be a strictly positive random variable on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{Q})$ , referred to as a *default time*. Note that  $\mathbb{Q}$  is the real-life (or statistical) probability measure.

\*Corresponding author. Email: monique.jeanblanc@maths.univ-evry.fr

In order to exclude trivial cases, we assume that  $\mathbb{Q}\{\tau > 0\} = 1$  and  $\mathbb{Q}\{\tau \leq T\} > 0$ . Let us introduce the jump process  $H_t = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau \leq t\}}$  and denote by  $\mathbb{H}$  the filtration generated by this process.

Assume that we are given, in addition, a *reference filtration*  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$  and the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is trivial. We set  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{F} \vee \mathbb{H}$  so that  $\mathcal{G}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \vee \mathcal{H}_t = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_t, \mathcal{H}_t)$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . The filtration  $\mathbb{G}$  is referred to as the *full filtration*; it includes the observations of default events. We assume that any  $\mathbb{F}$ -martingale is also a  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingale. Such an assumption is sometimes called *Hypothesis H*. For more details on this assumption, we refer to Bielecki *et al.* (2004a).

We write  $F_t = \mathbb{Q}\{\tau \leq t | \mathcal{F}_t\}$ , so that  $G_t = 1 - F_t = \mathbb{Q}\{\tau > t | \mathcal{F}_t\}$  is the *survival process* with respect to  $\mathbb{F}$ . It is easily seen that  $F$  is a bounded, non-negative,  $\mathbb{F}$ -submartingale. It is well known that, under Hypothesis H, we have  $F_t = \mathbb{Q}\{\tau \leq t | \mathcal{F}_\infty\}$ , and thus the process  $F$  is increasing. Assume, in addition, that  $F_t < 1$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . The  $\mathbb{F}$ -hazard process  $\Gamma$  of a random time  $\tau$  with respect to a filtration  $\mathbb{F}$  is defined through the equality  $1 - F_t = e^{-\Gamma_t}$ , that is  $\Gamma_t = -\ln G_t$ .

It is well known that if the  $\mathbb{F}$ -hazard process  $\Gamma$  of  $\tau$  is a continuous, increasing process, then the process  $M_t = H_t - \Gamma_{t \wedge \tau}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , is a  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingale. The process  $M$  is referred to as the compensated martingale of the default process  $H$ . If the hazard process is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, so that  $\Gamma_t = \int_0^t \gamma_u du$  for some  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable process  $\gamma$ , then  $\gamma$  is called the  $\mathbb{F}$ -intensity of  $\tau$ . In the following, we work mainly with a constant or deterministic intensity  $\gamma$ , in order to give the main ideas, which, somewhat surprisingly, do not seem to be commonly known.

We assume throughout that the  $\mathbb{F}$ -hazard process is absolutely continuous. Hence, the process

$$M_t = H_t - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \gamma_u du = H_t - \int_0^t \gamma_u (1 - H_u) du = H_t - \int_0^t \xi_u du, \quad (1)$$

where  $\xi_t = \gamma_t \mathbb{1}_{\{t < \tau\}}$ , is a  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingale under  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Also, let us recall that if the representation theorem holds for the filtration  $\mathbb{F}$  and a finite family  $Z^i$ ,  $i \leq n$ , of  $\mathbb{F}$ -martingales then, under Hypothesis H, it holds also for the filtration  $\mathbb{G}$  and with respect to the  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingales  $Z^i$ ,  $i \leq n$ , and  $M$ .

**2.2. Primary traded assets**

We assume that we are given a family  $Y^1, Y^2, Y^3$  of semi-martingales defined on the filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{G}, \mathbb{Q})$ . We interpret  $Y_t^i$  as the cash price at time  $t$  of the  $i$ th primary traded asset, and we examine a market model  $\mathcal{M} = (Y^1, Y^2, Y^3; \Phi)$ , where  $\Phi$  is the class of all self-financing trading strategies. In order to get more explicit valuation formulae, we postulate that the process  $Y^i$  is governed by the SDE

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i (\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t + \kappa_i dM_t), \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2)$$

with the initial condition  $Y_0^i > 0$ . Here  $W$  is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion and the process  $M$ , given by (1), is the compensated martingale of the default process  $H$ . Note that, in view of Hypothesis H, the process  $W$  follows a Brownian motion not only with respect to its natural filtration  $\mathbb{F}^W$ , but also with respect to the enlarged filtration  $\mathbb{G}$ . In Bielecki *et al.* (2005), we extend this model to more general dynamics, involving also a Poisson process.

In the present paper, we deliberately restrict our attention to the case where the coefficients  $\mu_i, \sigma_i, \kappa_i$  and the default intensity  $\gamma > 0$  are constant (or at least deterministic). We assume that  $\kappa_i \geq -1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  in order to ensure that the price processes  $Y^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , are non-negative. Note that the equality  $\kappa_i = 0$  corresponds to the case where the  $i$ th asset is *default-free*, while the inequality  $\kappa_i \neq 0$  means that the  $i$ th asset is formally classified as a *defaultable* security. In particular, the equality  $\kappa_i = -1$  corresponds to the case where the price  $Y^i$  vanishes after default, i.e. the  $i$ th asset is *defaultable* and exhibits *zero recovery* (or *total default*). It should be stressed that most (but not all) of our results can be extended to the case of coefficients with a Markovian-type dependence on the underlying stochastic processes, as made precise by assumption A below. The crucial observation is that, under assumption A, the process  $(Y^1, Y^2, Y^3, H)$ , taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0, 1\}$ , possesses the Markov property under the statistical probability  $\mathbb{Q}$ . It is also worth noting that the triple  $(Y^1, Y^2, Y^3)$  does not follow a Markov process under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , in general.

**Assumption A:** *The coefficients  $\mu_i, \sigma_i, \kappa_i$  in dynamics (2) and the intensity  $\gamma$  are given by some functions on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0, 1\}$ , so that  $\mu_i = \mu_i(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, H_{t-})$ ,  $\sigma_i = \sigma_i(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, H_{t-})$ ,  $\kappa_i = \kappa_i(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3)$  and  $\gamma = \gamma(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3)$ . Moreover, the coefficients are regular so that the SDE (2) admits a unique strong solution for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .*

**2.2.1. Recovery schemes.** The case where the  $i$ th asset pays a pre-determined recovery at default is covered by the present setup. For instance, the case of a constant recovery payoff  $\delta_i \geq 0$  at default time  $\tau$  corresponds to the coefficient  $\kappa_i(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3) = \delta_i (Y_{t-}^i)^{-1} - 1$  and the following the dynamics of the  $i$ th asset:

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i (\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t + (\delta_i (Y_{t-}^i)^{-1} - 1) dM_t).$$

If the recovery is proportional to the pre-default value and is paid at default time  $\tau$  (i.e. under the *fractional recovery of market value*), we deal with the constant coefficient  $\kappa_i = \delta_i - 1$ , and thus the dynamics of  $Y^i$  become

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i (\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t + (\delta_i - 1) dM_t).$$

If the  $i$ th asset is no longer traded after the default time, we may assume that the price process is stopped at time  $\tau$  and thus the coefficients in the dynamics of the  $i$ th asset vanish after time  $\tau$ .

### 2.3. Change of numeraire

We assume throughout that  $Y^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , are governed by (2) and that  $\kappa_1 > -1$  so that  $Y_t^1 > 0$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . This assumption allows us to take the first asset as a numeraire. Let us recall that the constant coefficient  $\kappa_1 > -1$  in dynamics (2) corresponds to a fractional recovery of market value for the first asset.

In general, we do not refer to the theory involving the risk-neutral probability associated with the choice of a risk-free asset (a savings account) as a numeraire. In fact, we do not make the assumption that a risk-free security exists. We shall instead use an equivalent martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ , such that under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  the asset prices expressed in units of the numeraire  $Y^1$  are martingales. In other words, the martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  is characterized by the property that the relative prices  $Y^i(Y^1)^{-1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , are  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ -martingales.

We first derive the dynamics of the process  $Y^{i,1} = Y^i(Y^1)^{-1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . From Itô's formula, we obtain the dynamics of the process  $(Y^1)^{-1}$ :

$$d\left(\frac{1}{Y_t^1}\right) = \frac{1}{Y_{t-}^1} \left\{ \left( -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 + \xi_t \left( \frac{1}{1 + \kappa_1} - 1 + \kappa_1 \right) \right) dt - \sigma_1 dW_t - \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} dM_t \right\}. \tag{3}$$

Consequently, the integration by parts formula yields the following dynamics for the processes  $Y^{i,1}$ :

$$dY_t^{i,1} = Y_{t-}^{i,1} \left\{ \left( \mu_i - \mu_1 - \sigma_1(\sigma_i - \sigma_1) - \xi_t(\kappa_i - \kappa_1) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} \right) dt + (\sigma_i - \sigma_1) dW_t + \frac{\kappa_i - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} dM_t \right\}.$$

As a partial check, we can verify that the jump of  $Y_t^{i,1}$  equals

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Y_t^{i,1} &= Y_t^{i,1} - Y_{t-}^{i,1} \\ &= Y_{t-}^{i,1} \left( \frac{1 + \kappa_i}{1 + \kappa_1} - 1 \right) \Delta H_t = Y_{t-}^{i,1} \frac{\kappa_i - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} \Delta H_t. \end{aligned}$$

**Remarks:** Giesecke and Goldberg (2003) examine in detail the case of a particular example of a structural model with incomplete information in which the default time does not admit intensity, but the hazard process is still continuous. They postulate that the risk-free bond is traded, and the interest rate is constant. Finally, they assume the fractional recovery of market value for all defaultable claims.

### 2.4. Equivalent martingale measure

We now search for a probability measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ , equivalent to the real-life probability  $\mathbb{Q}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}_T)$ , and such that the processes  $Y^{i,1}$ ,  $i = 2, 3$ , follow martingales under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . From Kusuoka (1999), we know that any probability equivalent to  $\mathbb{Q}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}_T)$  is defined by means of its Radon–Nikodým density process  $\eta$  satisfying the SDE

$$d\eta_t = \eta_{t-}(\theta_t dW_t + \zeta_t dM_t), \quad \eta_0 = 1, \tag{4}$$

where  $\theta$  and  $\zeta$  are  $\mathbb{G}$ -predictable processes satisfying mild technical conditions (in particular,  $\zeta_t > -1$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ). Since the martingale  $M$  is stopped at  $\tau$ , we may, and do, assume in the following that the process  $\zeta$  is stopped at  $\tau$ . Moreover, the processes  $\widehat{W}$  and  $\widehat{M}$  given by, for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{W}_t &= W_t - \int_0^t \theta_u du, \\ \widehat{M}_t &= M_t - \int_0^t \xi_u \zeta_u du = H_t - \int_0^t \xi_u(1 + \zeta_u) du \\ &= H_t - \int_0^t \widehat{\xi}_u du, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\xi}_u = \xi_u(1 + \zeta_u)$ , are  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingales under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . The relative prices  $Y^{i,1}$ ,  $i = 2, 3$ , follow  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ -martingales if and only if the drift term in their dynamics expressed in terms of  $\widehat{W}$  and  $\widehat{M}$  vanishes. This in turn means that the following equality holds, for  $i = 2, 3$  and every  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$Y_{t-}^{i,1} \left\{ \mu_i - \mu_1 + (\sigma_1 - \sigma_i)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) + \xi_t(\kappa_i - \kappa_1) \frac{\zeta_t - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} \right\} = 0. \tag{5}$$

Equivalently, we have, on the set  $Y_{t-}^{i,1} \neq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i - \mu_1 + (\sigma_1 - \sigma_i)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) \\ + \xi_t(\kappa_i - \kappa_1) \frac{\zeta_t - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} = 0, \quad i = 2, 3. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

**Remarks:** In the case  $\kappa_1 = \sigma_1 = 0$  and  $\mu_1 = r$ , the dynamics of  $Y^1$  are  $dY_t^1 = rY_t^1 dt$ , where  $r$  is the short-term interest rate. Of course, in this case the process  $Y^1$  represents the savings account and the martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  is the usual risk-neutral probability.

**2.4.1. Case of strictly positive primary assets.** We work under the standing assumption that  $\kappa_1 > -1$  so that  $Y_t^1 > 0$  for every  $t$ . We assume, in addition, that  $\kappa_i > -1$  for  $i = 2, 3$ , so that the price processes  $Y^2$  and  $Y^3$  are strictly positive as well. From the general theory of arbitrage pricing, it follows that the market model  $\mathcal{M}$  is complete and arbitrage-free provided that there exists a unique solution  $(\theta, \zeta)$  of (5) such that the process  $\zeta$  is strictly greater than  $-1$ . Since  $Y^{i,1} > 0$ , we seek a pair of processes  $(\theta, \zeta)$  for which we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t(\sigma_1 - \sigma_i) + \zeta_t \xi_t \frac{\kappa_1 - \kappa_i}{1 + \kappa_1} = \mu_i - \mu_1 + \sigma_1(\sigma_1 - \sigma_i) \\ + \xi_t(\kappa_1 - \kappa_i) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1}, \quad i = 2, 3. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Recall that  $\xi_t = \gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \tau\}}$ , so that we deal here with four linear equations, specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) + \zeta_t \gamma \frac{\kappa_1 - \kappa_2}{1 + \kappa_1} = \mu_2 - \mu_1 + \sigma_1(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) \\ + \gamma(\kappa_1 - \kappa_2) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1}, \quad \text{for } t \leq \tau, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) + \zeta_t \gamma \frac{\kappa_1 - \kappa_3}{1 + \kappa_1} &= \mu_3 - \mu_1 + \sigma_1(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \\ &+ \gamma(\kappa_1 - \kappa_3) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1}, \quad \text{for } t \leq \tau, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$\theta_t(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) = \mu_2 - \mu_1 + \sigma_1(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2), \quad \text{for } t > \tau, \tag{10}$$

$$\theta_t(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) = \mu_3 - \mu_1 + \sigma_1(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3), \quad \text{for } t > \tau. \tag{11}$$

Equations (8) and (9) (equations (10) and (11), respectively) are referred to as the *pre-default* (*post-default*, respectively) no-arbitrage restrictions. To solve these equations explicitly, we find it convenient to write  $a = \det A$ ,  $b = \det B$ , and  $c = \det C$ , where  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  are the following matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 - \sigma_2 \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 \\ \sigma_1 - \sigma_3 \kappa_1 - \kappa_3 \end{bmatrix}, & B &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 - \sigma_2 \mu_1 - \mu_2 \\ \sigma_1 - \sigma_3 \mu_1 - \mu_3 \end{bmatrix}, \\ C &= \begin{bmatrix} \kappa_1 - \kappa_2 \mu_1 - \mu_2 \\ \kappa_1 - \kappa_3 \mu_1 - \mu_3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma follows from (7) by simple algebra.

**Lemma 2.1:** *The pair  $(\theta, \zeta)$  satisfies the following equations:*

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t a &= \sigma_1 a + c, \\ \zeta_t \xi_t a &= \kappa_1 \xi_t a - (1 + \kappa_1) b. \end{aligned}$$

To ensure the validity of the second equation in lemma 2.1 not only prior to, but also after, the default time  $\tau$  (i.e. on the set  $\{\xi_t = 0\}$ ), we need to impose an additional condition,  $b = 0$ , or more explicitly,

$$(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)(\mu_1 - \mu_3) - (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)(\mu_1 - \mu_2) = 0. \tag{12}$$

If (12) holds, we arrive at the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t a &= \sigma_1 a + c, \\ \zeta_t \xi_t a &= \kappa_1 \xi_t a. \end{aligned}$$

We are thus in the position to formulate an auxiliary result.

**Proposition 2.2:** *Assume that the processes  $Y^1, Y^2, Y^3$  satisfy with  $\kappa_i > -1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .*

- (i) *If  $a \neq 0$  and  $b = 0$  then the unique martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  has the Radon–Nikodým density of the form*

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^1}{d\mathbb{Q}} = \varepsilon_T(\theta W) \varepsilon_T(\zeta M), \tag{13}$$

where the constants  $\theta$  and  $\zeta$  are given by

$$\theta = \sigma_1 + \frac{c}{a}, \quad \zeta = \kappa_1 > -1, \tag{14}$$

and where we write, for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\varepsilon_t(\theta W) = \exp\left(\theta W_t - \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 t\right) \tag{15}$$

and

$$\varepsilon_t(\zeta M) = (1 + \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau \leq t\}} \zeta) \exp(-\zeta \gamma(t \wedge \tau)). \tag{16}$$

The model  $\mathcal{M} = (Y^1, Y^2, Y^3; \Phi)$  is arbitrage-free and complete. Moreover, the process  $(Y^1, Y^2, Y^3, H)$  has the Markov property under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ .

- (ii) *If  $a = 0$  and  $b = 0$  then a solution  $(\theta, \zeta)$  exists provided that  $c = 0$  and the uniqueness of a martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  fails to hold. In this case, the model  $\mathcal{M} = (Y^1, Y^2, Y^3; \Phi)$  is arbitrage-free, but it is not complete.*
- (iii) *If  $b \neq 0$  then a martingale measure does not exist and the model  $\mathcal{M} = (Y^1, Y^2, Y^3; \Phi)$  is not arbitrage-free.*

**Proof:** All statements in part (i) are rather obvious, except for the last one. The Markov property of the process  $(Y^1, Y^2, Y^3, H)$  under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  can be easily deduced by observing that the dynamics of  $Y^{i,1}$ ,  $i = 2, 3$ , under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  are

$$dY_t^{i,1} = Y_{t-}^{i,1} \left( (\sigma_i - \sigma_1) d\widehat{W}_t + \frac{\kappa_i - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} d\widehat{M}_t \right), \tag{17}$$

and by combining this observation with the fact that the default intensity  $\widehat{\gamma}$  under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  is deterministic, specifically  $\widehat{\gamma} = \gamma(1 + \zeta) = \gamma(1 + \kappa_1)$ . It is interesting to note that the default intensity under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  coincides with the default intensity under the real-life probability  $\mathbb{Q}$  if and only if the process  $Y^1$  is continuous. Parts (ii) and (iii) are also easy to check. Let us only observe that, under the assumptions of part (ii), the logarithmic returns on relative prices  $Y^{2,1}$  and  $Y^{3,1}$  are proportional.  $\square$

From now on, we work under the assumptions of part (i) of the proposition. Recall that the processes  $\varepsilon(\theta W)$  and  $\varepsilon(\zeta M)$  given by (15) and (16) are unique solutions to the SDEs

$$d\varepsilon_t(\theta W) = \theta \varepsilon_t(\theta W) dW_t,$$

$$d\varepsilon_t(\zeta M) = \zeta \varepsilon_{t-}(\zeta M) dM_t,$$

with the initial condition  $\varepsilon_0(\theta W) = \varepsilon_0(\zeta M) = 1$ . Hence, the product  $\eta = \varepsilon(\theta W) \varepsilon(\zeta M)$  satisfies, as expected, the SDE (4) with constant processes  $\theta$  and  $\zeta$ , specifically

$$d\eta_t = \eta_{t-} \left\{ \left( \sigma_1 + \frac{c}{a} \right) dW_t + \kappa_1 dM_t \right\}.$$

**Example 2.3:** Assume that the asset  $Y^1$  is risk-free, the asset  $Y^2 \neq Y^1$  is default-free, and  $Y^3$  is a defaultable asset with non-zero recovery, so that

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^1 &= r Y_t^1 dt, \\ dY_t^2 &= Y_t^2 (\mu_2 dt + \sigma_2 dW_t), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

$$dY_t^3 = Y_t^3 - (\mu_3 dt + \sigma_3 dW_t + \kappa_3 dM_t).$$

We thus have  $\sigma_1 = \kappa_1 = 0$ ,  $\mu_1 = r$ ,  $\sigma_2 \neq 0$ ,  $\kappa_2 = 0$ , and  $\kappa_3 \neq 0$ ,  $\kappa_3 > -1$ . Therefore,

$$a = \sigma_2 \kappa_3 \neq 0, \quad c = \kappa_3 (r - \mu_2),$$

and the equality  $b = 0$  holds if and only if  $\sigma_2 (r - \mu_3) = \sigma_3 (r - \mu_2)$ . It is easy to check that

$$\theta = \frac{r - \mu_2}{\sigma_2}, \quad \zeta = 0, \tag{19}$$

and thus under the martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  we have (irrespective of whether  $\sigma_3 > 0$  or  $\sigma_3 = 0$ )

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^1 &= rY_t^1 dt, \\ dY_t^2 &= Y_t^2 (rdt + \sigma_2 d\widehat{W}_t), \\ dY_t^3 &= Y_t^3 - (rdt + \sigma_3 d\widehat{W}_t + \kappa_3 dM_t). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the risk-neutral default intensity  $\widehat{\gamma}$  coincides here with the real-life intensity  $\gamma$ .

**2.4.2. Case of a defaultable asset with zero recovery.** In this section, we postulate that  $\kappa_i > -1$  for  $i=1,2$  and  $\kappa_3 = -1$ . This implies that the price of a defaultable asset  $Y^3$  vanishes after  $\tau$ , and thus the findings of the previous section are no longer valid. Indeed, since the process  $Y^3$  jumps to zero after  $\tau$ , the first equality in (6), that is

$$\mu_2 - \mu_1 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) + \xi_t(\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) \frac{\zeta_t - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} = 0,$$

should still be satisfied for every  $t \in [0, T]$ , but the second equality in (6), namely

$$\mu_3 - \mu_1 + (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) + \xi_t(\kappa_3 - \kappa_1) \frac{\zeta_t - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} = 0,$$

is required to hold on the set  $\{\tau > t\}$  only (i.e. when  $\xi_t = \gamma$ ). Thus, the unknown processes  $\theta$  and  $\zeta$  satisfy the following equations:

$$\mu_2 - \mu_1 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) = 0, \quad \text{for } t > \tau, \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_2 - \mu_1 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) \\ + \gamma(\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) \frac{\zeta_t - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} = 0, \quad \text{for } t \leq \tau, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_3 - \mu_1 + (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) \\ + \gamma(-1 - \kappa_1) \frac{\zeta_t - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} = 0, \quad \text{for } t \leq \tau. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

This leads to the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4:** *The pair  $(\theta, \zeta)$  satisfies the following equations, for  $t \leq \tau$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t a &= \sigma_1 a + c, \\ \zeta_t \gamma a &= \kappa_1 \gamma a - (1 + \kappa_1) b. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for  $t > \tau$ ,

$$\mu_2 - \mu_1 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)(\theta_t - \sigma_1) = 0.$$

Assume that  $a \neq 0$ ,  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$  and  $\gamma > b/a$ . Then the unique solution  $(\theta, \zeta)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_t &= \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq \tau\}} \left( \sigma_1 + \frac{c}{a} \right) + \mathbb{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} \left( \sigma_1 - \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\sigma_1 - \sigma_2} \right), \\ \zeta_t &= \kappa_1 - \frac{(1 + \kappa_1)b}{\gamma a} > -1, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and the unique martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  is given by the formula

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^1}{d\mathbb{Q}} = \varepsilon_T(\theta W) \varepsilon_T(\zeta M).$$

The model  $\mathcal{M} = (Y^1, Y^2, Y^3; \Phi)$  is arbitrage-free, complete, and has the Markov property under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ .

**Example 2.5:** Assume that the asset  $Y^1$  is risk-free, the asset  $Y^2 \neq Y^1$  is default-free, and  $Y^3$  is a defaultable asset with zero recovery (see (18)). This corresponds to the following conditions:  $\sigma_1 = \kappa_1 = 0$ ,  $\mu_1 = r$ ,  $\sigma_2 \neq 0$ ,  $\kappa_2 = 0$ , and  $\kappa_3 = -1$ . Hence  $a = -\sigma_2 \neq 0$  and assuming, in addition, that

$$\gamma > \frac{b}{a} = r - \mu_3 - \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_2}(r - \mu_2),$$

we obtain

$$\theta = \frac{r - \mu_2}{\sigma_2}, \quad \zeta = -\frac{b}{\gamma a} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \mu_3 - r - \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_2}(\mu_2 - r) \right) > -1. \quad (24)$$

Consequently, we have, under the martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^1 &= rY_t^1 dt, \\ dY_t^2 &= Y_t^2 (rdt + \sigma_2 d\widehat{W}_t), \\ dY_t^3 &= Y_t^3 - (rdt + \sigma_3 d\widehat{W}_t - d\widehat{M}_t). \end{aligned}$$

We do not assume here that the equality  $b=0$  holds; when it does then  $\zeta=0$ , as in example 2.3. In general, the risk-neutral default intensity  $\widehat{\gamma}$  and the real-life intensity  $\gamma$  are different.

**Remarks:** If we assume that  $\kappa_2 = \kappa_3 = -1$  then the pair  $(\theta, \zeta)$  satisfies (21) and (22), so that we have, for  $t \leq \tau$  (see (26)),

$$\theta_t = \sigma_1 + \frac{c}{a}, \quad \zeta_t = \kappa_1 - \frac{(1 + \kappa_1)b}{\gamma a} > -1, \quad (25)$$

provided that  $a \neq 0$  and  $\gamma > b/a$ . The solution of (21) and (22) is not uniquely determined for  $t > \tau$ .

**2.4.3. Case of a stopped trading.** In some circumstances, the recovery payoff at the time of default is exogenously specified in terms of some economic factors related to the prices of traded assets (e.g. credit spreads). In such a case, the valuation problem for a defaultable claim is reduced to finding its pre-default value, and it is natural to seek a replicating strategy up to the default time (default time included), but not after this random time. Hence, it suffices to focus on features of the *stopped* model, that is, a model in which asset prices and all trading activities are assumed to be frozen at time  $\tau$  (see section 5). In this case, we search for a pair  $(\theta, \zeta)$  of real numbers satisfying (8) and (9) (or (21) and (22)). Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta a &= \sigma_1 a + c, \\ \zeta \gamma a &= \kappa_1 \gamma a - (1 + \kappa_1) b. \end{aligned}$$

We no longer postulate that condition (12) is satisfied. It is clear that if  $a \neq 0$  then the unique solution  $(\theta, \zeta)$  to the above pair of equations is

$$\theta = \sigma_1 + \frac{c}{a}, \quad \zeta = \kappa_1 - \frac{(1 + \kappa_1)b}{\gamma a} > -1, \quad (26)$$

where the last inequality holds provided that  $\gamma > b/a$ . As expected, in a stopped model, we obtain the same representation (26) of the unique martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  for any choice of  $\kappa_2$  and  $\kappa_3$ . Let us repeat that condition (12) (or equality (20)) is needed only if we wish to use the same model (2) to value claims on defaultable and non-defaultable assets. Indeed, according to (2), after time  $\tau$  the processes  $Y^1$ ,  $Y^2$  and  $Y^3$  represent the prices of three assets in a model driven by a single source of randomness (a Brownian motion  $W$ ), and thus condition (12) (or equality (20)) is necessary to exclude arbitrage opportunities when trading is continued up to time  $T$ . These conditions are spurious when trading is stopped at default, so that the effective horizon date becomes  $\tau \wedge T$ .

**3. PDE approach for strictly positive traded assets**

We shall first examine the PDE approach in a model in which the prices of all three primary assets are non-vanishing. In this case, it is natural to focus on the case when the market model  $\mathcal{M} = (Y^1, Y^2, Y^3; \Phi)$  is complete and arbitrage-free. To this end, we shall work under the assumptions of part (i) of proposition 2.2.

**3.1. Valuation PDE**

We are interested in the valuation and hedging of a generic contingent claim with maturity  $T$  and the terminal payoff  $Y = G(Y_T^1, Y_T^2, Y_T^3, H_T)$ . As we shall see in the following, the technique derived for this case can easily be applied to a defaultable claim that is subject to a fairly general recovery scheme (including, of course, the zero recovery scheme).

We assume that  $a \neq 0$  and  $b = 0$ , and we work under the unique martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  corresponding to the choice of  $Y^1$  as a numeraire. Recall that we have

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^1}{d\mathbb{Q}} = \varepsilon_T(\theta W)\varepsilon_T(\zeta M),$$

where the pair  $(\theta, \zeta)$  is given by (14). If the random variable  $Y(Y_T^1)^{-1}$  is  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ -integrable then the arbitrage price of a claim  $Y$  can be represented as follows, for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t(Y) &= Y_t^1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^1}((Y_T^1)^{-1} Y | \mathcal{G}_t) = Y_t^1 \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^1}((Y_T^1)^{-1} G(Y_T^1, Y_T^2, Y_T^3, H_T) | Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, H_t), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is a consequence of the Markov property of  $(Y^1, Y^2, Y^3, H)$  under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . Let  $C: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function such that  $\pi_t(Y) = C(t, Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, H_t)$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$ . It is clear that we have, for  $h=0$  and  $h=1$ ,

$$C(T, y_1, y_2, y_3, h) = G(y_1, y_2, y_3, h), \quad \forall (y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Moreover, the process  $\tilde{C}_t, t \in [0, T]$ , given by the formula

$$\tilde{C}_t = (Y_t^1)^{-1} C(t, Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, H_t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

is a  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingale under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . As expected, our next goal is to use this property in order to derive the equation

satisfied by the valuation function  $C$ . To this end, we shall apply Itô's formula to the process  $\tilde{C}$ . For brevity, we write  $\partial_i C = \partial_{y_i} C, \partial_{ij} C = \partial_{y_i} \partial_{y_j} C$ . Also, we denote (it is easy to check that if  $b = 0$  then the right-hand side of the formula below does not depend on  $i$ )

$$\alpha = \mu_i + \sigma_i \frac{c}{a}.$$

**Proposition 3.1:** *Let the price processes  $Y^i, i = 1, 2, 3$ , satisfy*

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i (\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t + \kappa_i dM_t),$$

*with  $\kappa_i > -1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Assume that  $a \neq 0$  and  $b = 0$ . Then the arbitrage price of a contingent claim  $Y$  with the terminal payoff  $G(Y_T^1, Y_T^2, Y_T^3, H_T)$  equals*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t(Y) &= C(t, Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, H_t) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{t < \tau\}} C(t, Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, 0) + \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq \tau\}} C(t, Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, 1) \end{aligned}$$

*for some function  $C: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Assume that for  $h=0$  and  $h=1$  the auxiliary function  $C(\cdot, h): [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  belongs to the class  $C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3, \mathbb{R})$ . Then the functions  $C(\cdot, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 1)$  solve the following PDEs:*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 0) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (\alpha - \gamma \kappa_i) y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 0) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 0) - \alpha C(\cdot, 0) \\ + \gamma [C(t, y_1(1 + \kappa_1), y_2(1 + \kappa_2), y_3(1 + \kappa_3), 1) \\ - C(t, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0)] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 1) + \alpha \sum_{i=1}^3 y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 1) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 1) - \alpha C(\cdot, 1) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

subject to the terminal conditions

$$\begin{aligned} C(T, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0) &= G(y_1, y_2, y_3, 0), \\ C(T, y_1, y_2, y_3, 1) &= G(y_1, y_2, y_3, 1). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof:** The first statement is an immediate consequence of the Markov property of the process  $(Y^1, Y^2, Y^3, H)$  under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta C(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3) \\ = C(t, Y_{t-}^1(1 + \kappa_1), Y_{t-}^2(1 + \kappa_2), Y_{t-}^3(1 + \kappa_3), 1) \\ - C(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0). \end{aligned}$$

We write  $C_t = C(t, Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, H_t)$ , and we typically omit the variables  $(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, H_{t-})$  in expressions  $\partial_i C$ ,

$\partial_i C$ ,  $\Delta C$ , etc. An application of Itô's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} dC_t &= \partial_t C dt + \sum_{i=1}^3 \partial_i C dY_t^i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C dt \\ &\quad + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) dH_t \\ &= \partial_t C dt + \sum_{i=1}^3 \partial_i C dY_t^i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C dt \\ &\quad + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) (dM_t + \xi_t dt) \\ &= \partial_t C dt + \sum_{i=1}^3 Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C (\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C dt + (\Delta C) dM_t \\ &\quad + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t dt \\ &= \left\{ \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t \right\} dt \\ &\quad + \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) dW_t + \Delta C dM_t. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the integration by parts formula together with (3) to obtain an SDE for  $\tilde{C}$ . Since  $d[M]_t = dH_t = dM_t + \xi_t dt$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{C}_t &= \tilde{C}_{t-} \left\{ \left[ -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 + \xi_t \left( \frac{1}{1+\kappa_1} - 1 + \kappa_1 \right) \right] dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sigma_1 dW_t - \frac{\kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} dM_t \right\} \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \left\{ \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t \right\} dt \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C dW_t \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \Delta C dM_t - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sigma_1 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C dt \\ &\quad - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{\kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} \Delta C (dM_t + \xi_t dt) \\ &= \tilde{C}_{t-} \left\{ -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 + \xi_t \left( \frac{1}{1+\kappa_1} - 1 + \kappa_1 \right) \right\} dt \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_{t-} \left\{ -\sigma_1 d\widehat{W}_t - \sigma_1 \theta dt - \frac{\kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} d\widehat{M}_t - \frac{\xi_t \kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} dt \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \left\{ \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t \right\} dt \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C d\widehat{W}_t \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \theta \partial_i C dt \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \Delta C d\widehat{M}_t + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \xi_t \Delta C dt \\ &\quad - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sigma_1 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C dt - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{\kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} \\ &\quad \quad \times \Delta C (d\widehat{M}_t + \xi_t (1 + \zeta) dt) \\ &= C_{t-} \left\{ -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 + \xi_t \left( \frac{1}{1+\kappa_1} - 1 + \kappa_1 \right) \right\} dt \\ &\quad + \tilde{C}_{t-} \times \left\{ -\sigma_1 \theta - \frac{\xi_t \kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} \right\} dt \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \left\{ \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t \right\} dt \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \theta \partial_i C dt + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \xi_t \Delta C dt \\ &\quad - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sigma_1 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C dt \\ &\quad - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{\kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} \xi_t (1 + \zeta) \Delta C dt \\ &\quad + \text{a martingale under } \mathbb{Q}^1. \end{aligned}$$

Since the process  $\tilde{C}$  follows a martingale under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ , the finite variation part in its canonical decomposition necessarily vanishes, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= C_{t-} (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \left\{ -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 + \xi_t \left( \frac{1}{1+\kappa_1} - 1 + \kappa_1 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sigma_1 \theta - \frac{\xi_t \kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} \right\} \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \left\{ \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t \right\} \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \theta \partial_i C + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \xi_t \Delta C \\ &\quad - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \sigma_1 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{\kappa_1}{1+\kappa_1} \xi_t (1 + \zeta) \Delta C. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 = & C_{t-} \left\{ -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 - \sigma_1\theta + \xi_t\kappa_1 - \xi_t(1 + \zeta) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} \right\} \\
 & + \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \\
 & + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t \\
 & + \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \theta \partial_i C + \zeta \xi_t \Delta C \\
 & - \sigma_1 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - \xi_t(1 + \zeta) \Delta C \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since, in view of (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 - \sigma_1\theta + \xi_t\kappa_1 - \xi_t(1 + \zeta) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} &= -\alpha, \\
 \mu_i + \sigma_i(\theta - \sigma_1) - \kappa_i \xi_t &= \alpha - \kappa_i \xi_t,
 \end{aligned}$$

we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 (\alpha - \kappa_i \xi_t) Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \\
 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C - \alpha C_{t-} + \xi_t \Delta C = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\xi_t = \gamma \mathbb{1}_{\{t < \tau\}}$ . We conclude that the price of a contingent claim  $Y$  with the terminal payoff  $G(Y_T^1, Y_T^2, Y_T^3, H_T)$  can be represented as  $C(t, Y_t^1, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, H_t)$  where, for  $h=0$  and  $h=1$ ,

$$C(T, y_1, y_2, y_3, h) = G(y_1, y_2, y_3, h), \quad \forall (y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3,$$

and the auxiliary functions  $C(\cdot, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 1)$  satisfy the PDEs given in the statement of the proposition.  $\square$

**Remarks:** Note that the valuation problem splits in a natural way into two pricing PDEs that can be solved recursively. In the first step, we solve the PDE satisfied by the *post-default pricing function*  $C(\cdot, 1)$ . Next, we substitute this function into the first PDE, and we solve it for the *pre-default pricing function*  $C(\cdot, 0)$ . The assumption that we deal with only three primary assets and the coefficients are constant can be easily relaxed, but a general result is too heavy to be stated here. It is also interesting to observe that the real-life default intensity  $\gamma$ , rather than the intensity  $\widehat{\gamma}$  under the martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ , enters the valuation PDE. This shows once again that the martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  is merely a technical tool, and the properties of the default time under the real-life probability are essential for valuation and hedging of a defaultable claim through the PDE approach in a complete market model.

**Example 3.2:** (*Black and Scholes PDE*). Let us place ourselves within the setup of example 2.3 (with  $a \neq 0$  and  $b=0$ ). Assume that a contingent claim  $Y = G(Y_T^2)$  for some function  $G: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $Y(Y_T^1)^{-1}$  is integrable under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . Since, by definition, the valuation function  $C$  depends on  $t$ , we may, and do, assume, without loss

of generality, that it does not depend explicitly on the variable  $y_1$ . In fact, it is possible to show that it does not depend on  $y_3$  either, so that  $\pi_t(Y) = C(t, Y_t^2)$ . Since now  $\mu_1 = r$  and  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0$ , it is easy to check that the two valuation PDEs of proposition 3.1 reduce here to a single PDE:

$$\partial_t C + (\mu_2 - \sigma_2\theta)y_2 \partial_2 C + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2^2 y_2^2 \partial_{22} C - (\mu_2 - \sigma_2\theta)C = 0,$$

with  $\theta = -(\mu_2 - r)/\sigma_2$ . After simplifications, we obtain the following equation:

$$\partial_t C + ry_2 \partial_2 C + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2^2 y_2^2 \partial_{22} C - rC = 0,$$

so that we arrive, as expected, at the classic Black and Scholes PDE.

### 3.2. Replicating strategies

Our next goal is to derive a universal representation for a replicating strategy of a generic claim. Recall that  $\phi = (\phi^1, \phi^2, \phi^3)$  is a *self-financing strategy* if the processes  $\phi^1, \phi^2, \phi^3$  are  $\mathbb{G}$ -predictable and the wealth process

$$V_t(\phi) = \phi_t^1 Y_t^1 + \phi_t^2 Y_t^2 + \phi_t^3 Y_t^3$$

satisfies

$$dV_t(\phi) = \phi_t^1 dY_t^1 + \phi_t^2 dY_t^2 + \phi_t^3 dY_t^3.$$

We say that  $\phi$  replicates a contingent claim  $Y$  if  $V_T(\phi) = Y$ . If  $\phi$  is a replicating strategy for a claim  $Y$  then we have, for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\pi_t(Y) = \phi_t^1 Y_t^1 + \phi_t^2 Y_t^2 + \phi_t^3 Y_t^3.$$

The next result shows that, in order to find a replicating strategy, it suffices, as in the classical case, to make use of sensitivities of the valuation function  $C$  with respect to prices of primary assets, and to take into account the jump  $\Delta C$  associated with the default event. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta C &= \Delta C(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3) \\
 &= C(t, Y_{t-}^1(1 + \kappa_1), Y_{t-}^2(1 + \kappa_2), Y_{t-}^3(1 + \kappa_3), 1) \\
 &\quad - C(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0).
 \end{aligned}$$

As before, for the sake of easier readability, the variables in  $C, \partial_i C$  and  $\Delta C$  are suppressed. Note, however, that we deal here with the two functions  $C(\cdot, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 1)$  depending on whether a replicating portfolio is examined prior to or after default.

**Proposition 3.3:** *Under the assumptions of proposition 3.1, the replicating strategy for a claim  $G(Y_T^1, Y_T^2, Y_T^3, H_T)$  is  $\phi = (\phi^1, \phi^2, \phi^3)$ , where the components  $\phi^i, i=2,3$ , are given in terms of the valuation*

functions  $C(\cdot, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 1)$  by the following expressions:

$$\phi_t^2 = \frac{1}{aY_{t-}^2} \left( (\kappa_3 - \kappa_1) \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - s_1 C \right) - (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1)(\Delta C - \kappa_1 C) \right), \quad (27)$$

$$\phi_t^3 = \frac{-1}{aY_{t-}^3} \left( (\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - s_1 C \right) - (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)(\Delta C - \kappa_1 C) \right). \quad (28)$$

Moreover, the component  $\phi^1$  satisfies

$$\phi_t^1 = (Y_t^1)^{-1} \left( C_t - \sum_{i=2}^3 \phi_t^i Y_t^i \right). \quad (29)$$

**Proof:** Using the dynamics (see equation (17))

$$dY_t^{i,1} = Y_{t-}^{i,1} \left( (\sigma_i - \sigma_1) d\widehat{W}_t + \frac{\kappa_i - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} d\widehat{M}_t \right),$$

and setting

$$D = (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1) \frac{\kappa_3 - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} - (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1) \frac{\kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} = \frac{a}{1 + \kappa_1},$$

we get (note that obviously  $(Y_t^{2,1})^{-1} = Y_t^{1,2}$ )

$$d\widehat{W}_t = \frac{1}{D} \left( \frac{\kappa_3 - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} Y_{t-}^{1,2} dY_t^{2,1} - \frac{\kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} Y_{t-}^{1,3} dY_t^{3,1} \right),$$

$$d\widehat{M}_t = -\frac{1}{D} \left( (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1) Y_{t-}^{1,2} dY_t^{2,1} - (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1) Y_{t-}^{1,3} dY_t^{3,1} \right).$$

Consequently, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{C}_t &= (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - s_1 C \right) d\widehat{W}_t \\ &\quad + (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{\Delta C - \kappa_1 C}{1 + \kappa_1} d\widehat{M}_t \\ &= (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - s_1 C \right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{D} \left( \frac{\kappa_3 - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} Y_{t-}^{1,2} dY_t^{2,1} - \frac{\kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} Y_{t-}^{1,3} dY_t^{3,1} \right) \\ &\quad - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{\Delta C - \kappa_1 C}{(1 + \kappa_1)D} \\ &\quad \times \left( (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1) Y_{t-}^{1,2} dY_t^{2,1} - (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1) Y_{t-}^{1,3} dY_t^{3,1} \right) \\ &= (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{1}{a} \left\{ (\kappa_3 - \kappa_1) \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - s_1 C \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1)(\Delta C - \kappa_1 C) \right\} Y_{t-}^{1,2} dY_t^{2,1} \\ &\quad - (Y_{t-}^1)^{-1} \frac{1}{a} \left\{ (\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - s_1 C \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)(\Delta C - \kappa_1 C) \right\} Y_{t-}^{1,3} dY_t^{3,1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the derivation of equalities (27) and (28). Relationship (29) is also clear.  $\square$

Assume that  $Y^1$  is the savings account, so that  $\mu_1 = r$  and  $\sigma_1 = \kappa_1 = 0$ . Then, under the assumption that  $a = \sigma_2 \kappa_3 - \sigma_3 \kappa_2 \neq 0$ , expressions (27) and (28) simplify as follows:

$$\phi_t^2 = \frac{1}{aY_{t-}^2} \left( \kappa_3 \sum_{i=2}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - \sigma_3 \Delta C \right), \quad (30)$$

$$\phi_t^3 = \frac{-1}{aY_{t-}^3} \left( \kappa_2 \sum_{i=2}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - \sigma_2 \Delta C \right). \quad (31)$$

### 3.3. Case: $Y^1$ risk-free, $Y^2$ default-free, $Y^3$ defaultable

We now study a particular case, where  $Y_t^1 = e^{rt}$  is a risk-free asset,  $Y^2 \neq Y^1$  is a default-free asset, i.e.  $\sigma_2 \neq 0$ ,  $\kappa_2 = 0$ . Finally, we assume that  $\kappa_3 \neq 0$  and  $\kappa_3 > -1$  (see example 2.3). As already mentioned, we may assume, without loss of generality, that  $C$  does not depend explicitly on the variable  $y_1$ . The following result combines and adapts propositions 3.1 and 3.3 to the present situation. Note that we now assume that  $a = \sigma_2 \kappa_3 \neq 0$ .

**Proposition 3.4:** *Let the price processes  $Y^1, Y^2, Y^3$  satisfy (18) with  $\sigma_2 \neq 0$ . Assume that the relationship  $\sigma_2(r - \mu_3) = \sigma_3(r - \mu_2)$  holds and  $\kappa_3 \neq 0$ ,  $\kappa_3 > -1$ . Then the price of a contingent claim  $Y = G(Y_T^2, Y_T^3, H_T)$  can be represented as  $\pi_t(Y) = C(t, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, H_t)$ , where the pricing functions  $C(\cdot, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 1)$  satisfy the following PDEs:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) + ry_2 \partial_2 C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) \\ &\quad + y_3(r - \kappa_3 \gamma) \partial_3 C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) - rC(t, y_2, y_3, 0) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) \\ &\quad + \gamma(C(t, y_2, y_3(1 + \kappa_3), 1) - C(t, y_2, y_3, 0)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t C(t, y_2, y_3, 1) + ry_2 \partial_2 C(t, y_2, y_3, 1) + ry_3 \partial_3 C(t, y_2, y_3, 1) \\ &\quad - rC(t, y_2, y_3, 1) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(t, y_2, y_3, 1) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

subject to the terminal conditions

$$\begin{aligned} C(T, y_2, y_3, 0) &= G(y_2, y_3, 0), \\ C(T, y_2, y_3, 1) &= G(y_2, y_3, 1). \end{aligned}$$

The replicating strategy equals  $\phi = (\phi^1, \phi^2, \phi^3)$ , where  $\phi^1$  is given by (29) and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t^2 &= \frac{1}{\sigma_2 \kappa_3 Y_{t-}^2} \left( \kappa_3 \sum_{i=2}^3 \sigma_i y_i \partial_i C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, H_{t-}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sigma_3 (C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3(1 + \kappa_3), 1) - C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0)) \right), \\ \phi_t^3 &= \frac{1}{\kappa_3 Y_{t-}^3} (C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3(1 + \kappa_3), 1) - C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

**3.3.1. Replication of a survival claim.** By a *survival claim* we mean a contingent claim of the form  $Y = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}}X$ , where a  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable  $X$  represents the *promised payoff*. We assume that the promised payoff has the form  $X = G(Y_T^2, Y_T^3)$ , where  $Y_T^i$  is the (pre-default) value of the  $i$ th asset at time  $T$ . It is obvious that the pricing function  $C(\cdot, 1)$  is now equal to zero, and thus we are only interested in the pre-default pricing function  $C(\cdot, 0)$ .

**Corollary 3.5:** *Under the assumptions of proposition 3.4, the pre-default pricing function  $C(\cdot, 0)$  of a survival claim  $Y = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}}G(Y_T^2, Y_T^3)$  is a solution of the following PDE*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 0) + ry_2 \partial_2 C(\cdot, 0) + y_3(r - \kappa_3 \gamma) \partial_3 C(\cdot, 0) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 0) - (r + \gamma)C(\cdot, 0) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

with the terminal condition  $C(T, y_2, y_3, 0) = G(y_2, y_3)$ . The components  $\phi^2$  and  $\phi^3$  of a replicating strategy  $\phi$  are given by the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t^2 &= \frac{1}{\kappa_3 \sigma_2 Y_{t-}^2} \left( \kappa_3 \sum_{i=2}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C(\cdot, 0) - \sigma_3 C(\cdot, 0) \right), \\ \phi_t^3 &= -\frac{C(\cdot, 0)}{\kappa_3 Y_{t-}^3}. \end{aligned}$$

**4. PDE approach: case of zero recovery**

In this section, we assume that the prices  $Y^1$  and  $Y^2$  are strictly positive, but  $\kappa_3 = -1$  so that  $Y^3$  is a defaultable asset with zero recovery. Of course, the price  $Y_t^3$  vanishes after default, that is, on the set  $\{t \geq \tau\}$ . We assume here that  $a \neq 0$  and  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$  (see lemma 2.4), but we no longer postulate that  $b=0$ . We still assume that  $\gamma > b/a$ , however. Let us denote

$$\alpha_i = \mu_i + \sigma_i \frac{c}{a}, \quad \beta_i = \mu_i - \sigma_i \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\sigma_1 - \sigma_2}.$$

**Proposition 4.1:** *Let the price processes  $Y^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , satisfy*

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i (\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t + \kappa_i dM_t),$$

with  $\kappa_i > -1$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $\kappa_3 = -1$ . Assume that  $a \neq 0$ ,  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$  and  $\gamma > b/a$ . Consider a contingent claim  $Y$  with maturity  $T$  and the terminal payoff  $G(Y_T^1, Y_T^2, Y_T^3, H_T)$ . If the pricing functions  $C(\cdot, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 1)$  belong to the class  $C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3, \mathbb{R})$ , then the function  $C(t, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0)$  satisfies the pre-default PDE

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 0) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (\alpha_i - \gamma \kappa_i) y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 0) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 0) \\ - \left( \alpha_1 + \kappa_1 \frac{b}{a} \right) C(\cdot, 0) \\ + \left( \gamma - \frac{b}{a} \right) [C(t, y_1(1 + \kappa_1), y_2(1 + \kappa_2), 0, 1) \\ - C(t, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0)] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and the function  $C(t, y_1, y_2, 1)$  solves the post-default PDE

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 1) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_i y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 1) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 1) - \beta_1 C(\cdot, 1) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

subject to the terminal conditions

$$\begin{aligned} C(T, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0) &= G(y_1, y_2, y_3, 0), \\ C(T, y_1, y_2, 1) &= G(y_1, y_2, 0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

The replicating strategy  $\phi$  for  $Y$  is given by formulae (27)–(29).

**Proof:** Since the proof is analogous to the proof of proposition 3.1, we do not give details. We are interested in the martingale property of relative price  $\tilde{C} = C(Y^1)^{-1}$  under the unique martingale measure  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  of lemma 2.4. Using the same computations as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we arrive at the following condition:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = C_{t-} \left\{ -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 - \sigma_1 \theta + \xi_t \kappa_1 - \xi_t (1 + \zeta) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} \right\} \\ + \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 \mu_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \\ + \left( \Delta C - \sum_{i=1}^3 \kappa_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C \right) \xi_t + \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \theta \partial_i C + \zeta \xi_t \Delta C \\ - \sigma_1 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C - \xi_t (1 + \zeta) \Delta C \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (23), we obtain, for  $t \leq \tau$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 - \sigma_1 \theta + \xi_t \kappa_1 - \xi_t (1 + \zeta) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} &= -\alpha_1 - \kappa_1 \frac{b}{a}, \\ \mu_i + \sigma_i (\theta - \sigma_1) - \kappa_i \xi_t &= \alpha_i - \gamma \kappa_i. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for  $t \leq \tau$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^3 (\alpha_i - \gamma \kappa_i) Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \\ - \left( \alpha_1 + \kappa_1 \frac{b}{a} \right) C_{t-} + \left( \gamma - \frac{b}{a} \right) \Delta C = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using (23) again, we obtain, for  $t > \tau$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu_1 + \sigma_1^2 - \sigma_1 \theta + \xi_t \kappa_1 - \xi_t (1 + \zeta) \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \kappa_1} &= -\beta_1, \\ \mu_i + \sigma_i (\theta - \sigma_1) - \kappa_i \xi_t &= \beta_i, \end{aligned}$$

and thus on this set the pricing function satisfies

$$\partial_t C + \sum_{i=1}^2 \beta_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C - \beta_1 C_{t-} = 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

**Remarks:** The pre-default valuation PDE of proposition 4.1 can be seen as an extension of the pre-default valuation PDE established in proposition 3.1 to the case where  $b \neq 0$ . In particular, both PDEs are identical if  $b = 0$ .

**4.1. Case:  $Y^1$  risk-free,  $Y^2$  default-free,  $Y^3$  defaultable** for  $t < \tau$ ,

We assume that the processes  $Y^1, Y^2, Y^3$  satisfy (see example 2.5)

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^1 &= rY_t^1 dt, \\ dY_t^2 &= Y_t^2(\mu_2 dt + \sigma_2 dW_t), \\ dY_t^3 &= Y_t^3(\mu_3 dt + \sigma_3 dW_t - dM_t). \end{aligned}$$

Let us write  $\widehat{r} = r + \widehat{\gamma}$ , where

$$\widehat{\gamma} = \gamma(1 + \zeta) = \gamma - \frac{b}{a} = \gamma + \mu_3 - r + \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_2}(r - \mu_2) > 0$$

stands for the default intensity under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . The number  $\widehat{r}$  is interpreted as the *credit-risk adjusted short-term rate*. Straightforward calculations show that the following corollary to proposition 4.1 is valid.

**Corollary 4.2:** Assume that  $\sigma_1 = \kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0$ ,  $\kappa_3 = -1$  and

$$\gamma > b/a = r - \mu_3 - \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_2}(r - \mu_2).$$

Then the pricing functions  $C(\cdot, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 1)$  satisfy the following PDEs:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) + ry_2 \partial_2 C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) \\ &+ \widehat{r}y_3 \partial_3 C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) - \widehat{r}C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) \\ &+ \widehat{\gamma}C(t, y_2, 1) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t C(t, y_2, 1) + ry_2 \partial_2 C(t, y_2, 1) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2^2 y_2^2 \partial_{22} C(t, y_2, 1) \\ &- rC(t, y_2, 1) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

with the terminal conditions

$$C(T, y_2, y_3, 0) = G(y_2, y_3, 0), \quad C(T, y_2, 1) = G(y_2, 0, 1).$$

**4.1.1. Replication of a survival claim.** In the special case of a survival claim, we have  $C(\cdot, 1) = 0$ , and thus the following result can easily be established.

**Corollary 4.3:** Under the assumptions of corollary 4.2, the pre-default pricing function  $C(\cdot, 0)$  of a survival claim  $Y = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}} G(Y_T^2, Y_T^3)$  is a solution of the following PDE:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) + ry_2 \partial_2 C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) + \widehat{r}y_3 \partial_3 C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) - \widehat{r}C(t, y_2, y_3, 0) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

with the terminal condition  $C(T, y_2, y_3, 0) = G(y_2, y_3)$ . The components  $\phi^2$  and  $\phi^3$  of the replicating strategy are,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t^2 &= \frac{1}{\sigma_2 Y_{t-}^2} \\ &\times \left( \sum_{i=2}^3 \sigma_i Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0) + \sigma_3 C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0) \right), \\ \phi_t^3 &= \frac{1}{Y_{t-}^3} C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have  $\phi_t^3 Y_{t-}^3 = C(t, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0)$  for every  $t \in [0, T]$ . Hence, the following relationships holds, for every  $t < \tau$ :

$$\phi_t^3 Y_t^3 = C(t, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, 0), \quad \phi_t^1 Y_t^1 + \phi_t^2 Y_t^2 = 0.$$

The last equality is a special case of a *balance condition* that was introduced by Bielecki *et al.* (2004d) in a general semimartingale setup. Clearly, it ensures that the wealth of a replicating portfolio falls to 0 at the default time.

**Example 4.4:** Let us first consider a survival claim  $Y = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}} G(Y_T^2)$ , that is, a *vulnerable claim* with default-free underlying asset. It is possible to show that, under the present assumptions, its pre-default pricing function  $C(\cdot, 0)$  does not depend on  $y_3$ . Consequently, in view of corollary 4.3, it satisfies the following PDE:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t C(t, y_2, 0) + ry_2 \partial_2 C(t, y_2, 0) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_2^2 y_2^2 \partial_{22} C(t, y_2, 0) - \widehat{r}C(t, y_2, 0) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

with the terminal condition  $C(T, y_2, 0) = G(y_2)$ . The present setup covers the case of a vulnerable option written on a default-free asset  $Y^2$ . For examples of explicit pricing formulae for vulnerable options, see section 5.1 of Bielecki *et al.* (2004b).

**Example 4.5:** Let us now consider a survival claim  $Y = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}} G(Y_T^3)$ , where  $G(0) = 0$  so that  $Y$  can also be represented as  $Y = G(Y_T^3)$ . One can show that its pre-default price is equal to  $C(t, Y_t^3, 0)$ , where the function  $C(t, y_3, 0)$  is such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t C(t, y_3, 0) + \widehat{r}y_3 \partial_3 C(t, y_3, 0) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_3^2 y_3^2 \partial_{33} C(t, y_3, 0) - \widehat{r}C(t, y_3, 0) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

and  $C(T, y_3, 0) = G(y_3)$ . We conclude that, in this case, the pre-default value of a survival claim formally coincides with the price of a claim  $G(\widehat{Y}_T^3)$  computed in a default-free model

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{Y}_t^1 &= \widehat{r}\widehat{Y}_t^1 dt, \\ d\widehat{Y}_t^3 &= \widehat{Y}_t^3(\mu_3 dt + \sigma_3 dW_t), \end{aligned}$$

with the risk-free interest rate  $\widehat{r} = r + \widehat{\gamma} = r + \gamma(1 + \zeta)$ . This example covers, in particular, the case of a call option written on a defaultable asset with zero recovery. Explicit pricing formulae for such options can be found in section 5.2 of Bielecki *et al.* (2004b).

**Remarks:** It is important to stress that, in both particular cases considered in example 4.4, all three primary assets are needed to perfectly hedge a survival claim.

The minor, but important, difference between the PDEs (32) and (33) shows that it is essential to examine in detail all assumptions underpinning a credit risk model used for valuation and hedging of a defaultable claim. Let us finally mention that equation (33) coincides with equation (3.8) in the paper of Ayache *et al.* (2003), in which the authors examine valuation and hedging of convertible bonds with credit risk.

**5. Stopped trading strategies**

In this section, we adopt a more practical convention regarding the specification of a defaultable claim. Although formally equivalent to the previous one, it is more convenient, since it allows us to directly specify the post-default pricing function  $C(\cdot, 1)$  (at least at time  $\tau$ ) in terms of the so-called recovery process. This approach has the following advantages. First, in some circumstances the recovery payoff at default time is exogenously given, and thus the study of a claim after default is unnecessary. Second, since a market model is no longer used after the default time, some technical assumptions regarding the behaviour of prices  $Y^1, Y^2, Y^3$  can be relaxed. We can thus cover different cases regarding the behaviour after default of primary defaultable assets by a common result.

**5.1. Generic defaultable claim**

According to our convention (see, for instance, Bielecki et al. (2004a)), a generic defaultable claim is determined by a default time  $\tau$ , a  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable  $X$ , interpreted as the *promised payoff* at maturity  $T$ , and a  $\mathbb{F}$ -predictable process  $Z$  interpreted as the *recovery payoff* at the time of default. Formally, a generic defaultable claim can thus be represented as a triple  $(X, Z, \tau)$ . The *dividend process*  $D$  of a claim  $(X, Z, \tau)$ , which settles at time  $T$ , equals

$$D_t = X\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq T\}} + \int_{[0, t]} Z_u dH_u = X\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > T\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq T\}} + Z_\tau\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau \leq t\}}.$$

The *ex-dividend price* of a defaultable claim  $Y = (X, Z, \tau)$  is given as (all necessary integrability conditions are implicitly assumed to hold with regard to  $X$  and  $Z$ )

$$\pi_t(Y) = Y_t^1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}^1} \left( \int_{]t, T]} (Y_u^1)^{-1} dD_u \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right). \tag{34}$$

Note that, by definition, the ex-dividend price equals 0 at default time  $\tau$  and after this date. Hence, we are only interested in the value prior to default, that is, the pre-default value. We denote by  $\tilde{U}(Y)$  the pre-default value  $Y$ , so that  $\pi_t(Y) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau > t\}} \tilde{U}_t(Y)$ . It is rather clear that  $\tilde{U}(Y) = \tilde{U}(X) + \tilde{U}(Z)$ . For computations of  $\tilde{U}(X)$  and  $\tilde{U}(Z)$  in terms of the intensity of  $\tau$ , see Bielecki *et al.* (2004a).

Within the present setup, it is convenient to assume that  $X$  satisfies  $X = G(Y_T^1, Y_T^2, Y_T^3)$  and the recovery process  $Z$  is given as  $Z_t = z(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3)$  for some

function  $z: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Under these assumptions, the pre-default value is given by the pre-default pricing function  $C(\cdot, 0)$ .

The proof of the next result is almost identical to the proof of proposition 4.1. Note, however, that we now work in the setup described in section 2.4.3, so that we do need to assume that  $\kappa_2 > -1$ . Although we assume here that  $\kappa_1 > -1$ , it is plausible that this result remains valid also in the case when  $\kappa_1 = -1$  (for instance, when  $Y^1, Y^2, Y^3$  are defaultable assets with zero recovery).

**Proposition 5.1:** *Let the price processes  $Y^i, i = 1, 2, 3$ , satisfy*

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i(\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t + \kappa_i dM_t),$$

with  $\kappa_1 > -1$ . Assume that  $a \neq 0$ . If the pre-default pricing function  $C(t, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0)$  belongs to the class  $C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+^3, \mathbb{R})$ , then it satisfies the PDE

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 0) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (\alpha_i - \gamma \kappa_i) y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 0) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 0) \\ - \left( \alpha_1 + \kappa_1 \frac{b}{a} \right) C(\cdot, 0) + \left( \gamma - \frac{b}{a} \right) \\ \times [z(t, y_1(1 + \kappa_1), y_2(1 + \kappa_2), y_3(1 + \kappa_3)) \\ - C(t, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0)] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

subject to the terminal condition  $C(T, y_1, y_2, y_3, 0) = G(y_1, y_2, y_3)$ .

**Example 5.2:** An important special case is when a defaultable claim is subject to the fractional recovery of the (pre-default) market value. Under the assumption that the recovery is proportional to the pre-default market value, the value of the claim at the moment of default is equal to  $\delta$  times the value just before the default. Hence,  $z(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3) = \delta C(t, Y_{t-}^1, Y_{t-}^2, Y_{t-}^3, 0)$ , and the valuation PDE becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 0) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (\alpha_i - \gamma \kappa_i) y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 0) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 0) \\ + \left[ (\delta - 1) \left( \gamma - \frac{b}{a} \right) - \left( \alpha_1 + \kappa_1 \frac{b}{a} \right) \right] C(\cdot, 0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

**6. Extension to the case of multiple defaults**

We place ourselves within the framework introduced by Kusuoka (1999) (see also Bielecki and Rutkowski (2003)). Let  $\tau^1$  and  $\tau^2$  be strictly positive random variables on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{Q})$ . We introduce the corresponding jump processes  $H_t^i = \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau^i \leq t\}}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and we denote by  $\mathbb{H}^i$  the filtration generated by the process  $H^i$ . Finally, we set  $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{F} \vee \mathbb{H}^1 \vee \mathbb{H}^2$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is generated by a Brownian motion  $W$ .

For the sake of simplicity, we assume that  $Y_t^1 = 1$ , so that  $Y^1$  represents the savings account corresponding to the short-term rate  $r = 0$ . We postulate that the asset price

$Y^i$  satisfies, for  $i = 2, 3, 4$ ,

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i(\mu_i dt + \sigma_i dW_t + \kappa_i dM_t^1 + \psi_i dM_t^2), \quad (35)$$

where  $M^i$  is the martingale associated with the default process  $H^i$ , that is,

$$M_t^i = H_t^i - \int_0^t \gamma_u^i(1 - H_u^i) du.$$

In order to ensure the Markov property, we assume that  $\gamma_u^i = g_i(u, H_u^1, H_u^2)$ . We assume that the coefficients in (35) are such that the market model  $\mathcal{M} = (Y^1, Y^2, Y^3, Y^4, \Phi)$  is arbitrage-free and complete. As before, we denote by  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  the unique martingale measure for processes  $Y^i = Y^i(Y^1)^{-1}$ ,  $i = 2, 3, 4$ .

Consider a contingent claim of the form  $Y = G(Y_T^2, Y_T^3, Y_T^4, H_T^1, H_T^2)$ . Its arbitrage price can be represented as a function  $C(t, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, Y_t^4, H_t^1, H_t^2)$ , or, equivalently, as a quadruplet of functions  $C(\cdot, 1, 1)$  (when  $t$  is after the two default times),  $C(\cdot, 0, 1)$ ,  $C(\cdot, 1, 0)$  and  $C(\cdot, 0, 0)$ . The pricing functions satisfy the terminal condition

$$C(T, y_2, y_3, y_4, h_1, h_2) = G(y_2, y_3, y_4, h_1, h_2).$$

The process  $C_t = C(t, Y_t^2, Y_t^3, Y_t^4, H_t^1, H_t^2)$  follows a  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingale under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ . The dynamics of  $Y^i$  under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$  are

$$dY_t^i = Y_{t-}^i(\sigma_i d\widehat{W}_t + \kappa_i d\widehat{M}_t^1 + \psi_i d\widehat{M}_t^2), \quad i = 2, 3, 4,$$

where  $\widehat{W}$  is a Brownian motion under  $\mathbb{Q}^1$ , and the processes

$$\widehat{M}_t^i = H_t^i - \int_0^t \widehat{\xi}_u^i du = H_t^i - \int_0^t \widehat{\gamma}_u^i(1 - H_u^i) du, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

are  $\mathbb{G}$ -martingales. An application of Itô's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} dC_t &= \partial_t C dt + \sum_{i=2}^4 Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C (\sigma_i d\widehat{W}_t - (\kappa_i \widehat{\xi}_t^1 + \psi_i \widehat{\xi}_t^2) dt) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C dt \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 1, 0) - C(\cdot, 0, 0))(1 - H_t^2) \Delta H_t^1 \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 0, 1) - C(\cdot, 0, 0))(1 - H_t^1) \Delta H_t^2 \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 1, 1) - C(\cdot, 0, 1)) H_t^2 \Delta H_t^1 \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 1, 1) - C(\cdot, 1, 0)) H_t^1 \Delta H_t^2 \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 1, 1) - C(\cdot, 0, 0)) \Delta H_t^1 \Delta H_t^2. \end{aligned}$$

If defaults cannot occur simultaneously (so that  $\Delta H_t^1 \Delta H_t^2 = 0$ ), we obtain the following martingale condition:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_t C - \sum_{i=2}^4 (\kappa_i \widehat{\xi}_t^1 + \psi_i \widehat{\xi}_t^2) Y_{t-}^i \partial_i C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j Y_{t-}^i Y_{t-}^j \partial_{ij} C \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 1, 0) - C(\cdot, 0, 0))(1 - H_t^2) \widehat{\xi}_t^1 \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 0, 1) - C(\cdot, 0, 0))(1 - H_t^1) \widehat{\xi}_t^2 \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 1, 1) - C(\cdot, 0, 1)) H_t^2 \widehat{\xi}_t^1 \\ &+ (C(\cdot, 1, 1) - C(\cdot, 1, 0)) H_t^1 \widehat{\xi}_t^2. \end{aligned}$$

This condition leads to the four valuation PDEs:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 0, 0) - \sum_{i=2}^4 (\kappa_i \widehat{\gamma}_0^1 + \psi_i \widehat{\gamma}_0^2) y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 0, 0) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 0, 0) + \widehat{\gamma}_0^1 (C(\cdot, 1, 0) \\ - C(\cdot, 0, 0)) + \widehat{\gamma}_0^2 (C(\cdot, 0, 1) - C(\cdot, 0, 0)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 1, 0) - \sum_{i=2}^4 \psi_i \widehat{\gamma}_1^2 y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 1, 0) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 1, 0) \\ + \widehat{\gamma}_1^1 (C(\cdot, 1, 1) - C(\cdot, 1, 0)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t C(\cdot, 0, 1) - \sum_{i=2}^4 \kappa_i \widehat{\gamma}_1^1 y_i \partial_i C(\cdot, 0, 1) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 0, 1) + \widehat{\gamma}_2^1 (C(\cdot, 1, 0) - C(\cdot, 0, 0)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_t C(\cdot, 1, 1) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=2}^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j y_i y_j \partial_{ij} C(\cdot, 1, 1) = 0.$$

Here,  $\widehat{\gamma}_0^1$  and  $\widehat{\gamma}_0^2$  are (possibly time-dependent) intensities of  $\tau^1$  and  $\tau^2$  prior to the first default, and  $\widehat{\gamma}_2^1$  ( $\widehat{\gamma}_1^2$ , respectively) is the intensity of the default time  $\tau^1$  on the set  $\tau^2 \leq t < \tau^1$  (the intensity of the default time  $\tau^2$  on the set  $\tau^1 \leq t < \tau^2$ , respectively).

## Acknowledgements

The research of T.R. Bielecki was supported by NSF grant 0202851 and Moody's Corporation grant 5-55411. The research of M. Jeanblanc was supported by Zéliade, Itô33, and Moody's Corporation grant 5-55411. The research of M. Rutkowski was supported by the 2005 Faculty Research grant PS06987.

## References

- Ayache, E., Forsyth, P.A. and Vetzal, K.R., Valuation of convertible bonds with credit risk. *Journal of Derivatives*, 2003, **11**, 9–29.
- Bielecki, T.R., Jeanblanc, M. and Rutkowski, M., Modeling and valuation of credit risk. In *Stochastic Methods in Finance*, edited by M. Frittelli and W. Runggaldier, pp. 27–126, 2004a (Springer: Berlin).
- Bielecki, T.R., Jeanblanc, M. and Rutkowski, M., Hedging of defaultable claims. In *Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance 2003*, edited by R.A. Carmona, E. Çinlar, I. Ekeland, E. Jouini, J.E. Scheinkman and N. Touzi, pp. 1–132, 2004b (Springer: Berlin).
- Bielecki, T.R., Jeanblanc, M. and Rutkowski, M., Completeness of a general semimartingale market under constrained trading. To appear in *Proceedings of Stochastic Finance*, 2004c (Springer: Lisbon).

- Bielecki, T.R., Jeanblanc, M. and Rutkowski, M., Completeness of a reduced-form credit risk model with discontinuous asset prices. Working paper, 2004d.
- Bielecki, T.R., Jeanblanc, M. and Rutkowski, M., PIDE Approach to pricing and replication of credit derivatives. Work in progress, 2005.
- Bielecki, T.R and Rutkowski, M., Dependent defaults and credit migrations. *Applicaciones Mathematicae*, 2003, **30**, 121–145.
- Giesecke, K. and Goldberg, L., The market price of credit risk. Working paper, Cornell University, 2003.
- Kusuoka, S., A remark on default risk models. *Advances in Mathematical Economics*, 1999, **1**, 69–82.