

[Source](#) | [Model](#) | [Option](#)
[Model_Option](#) | [Help on mc methods](#) | [Archived Tests](#)

mc_baldi_out

This algorithm is taken from [1] and allows to numerically compute the price and the delta of single Knock-Out Barrier Options with a Monte Carlo method. The issue, as it is discussed in [there](#), is to provide a good approximation of the first time τ at which the price of the underlying stock reaches the barrier. If such a time is observed to be less or equal to the maturity, the option is nullified, being equal to a pre-specified rebate, and is activated otherwise. One could numerically determine the first time at which the stock price is observed to cross the barrier by a crude simulation, i.e. through $k^* \cdot h$, where h stands for the time step increment and k^* denotes the first step the underlying asset price has been outside the boundary (here, it is supposed that 0 is the starting time). Numerical tests show that this method does not perform well because the stock price is checked at discrete instants through simulations and the barrier might have been hit without being detected, giving rise to an over-estimation of the exit time and thus to a non trivial error for the estimate of the option price.

The algorithm ([there](#)) from [1] allows to improve the performance of the crude Monte Carlo method, by giving a careful estimation of τ as follows. When the stock price is observed to stay inside the boundary either at step $k - 1$ and k , an accurate approximation p_k^h of the probability that the underlying asset price crosses the barrier during the time interval $((k - 1)h, kh)$ is computed and a bernoulli r.v. with parameter p_k^h is generated: if it is observed to be equal to 1, then the process is supposed to have gone out, so that the exit time can be approximated by kh , otherwise the $(k + 1)^{\text{th}}$ step is considered, unless $k = N$, i.e. the maturity has been reached.

/*Initialisation*/

The variables giving the price, the delta and the corresponding variances are initialised. The coefficients `rloc`, `sigmaloc` and `sigmat` are used in order to generate the the underlying asset prices starting at s and $s + \varepsilon$, at the discretisation times.

*/*Coefficient for the computation of the exit probability*/*
 The constant **rap** is used to compute the local probability of exit from the barrier.

*/*MC sampling*/*
 In this cicle, at step i the paths $\ln S^{(i)}(s)$ and $\ln S^{(i)}(s + \varepsilon)$, starting at s and $s + \varepsilon$, are simulated. Thus, it starts by initialising the variable **time** giving the current value of the discretization time. Since the paths really simulated are given by the logarithm of the underlying asset price starting at s and $s + \varepsilon$, their current values are set in the variables **lnspot** and **lnspot_increment**. Notice that the process starting at $\ln(s + \varepsilon)$ is equal to the process starting at $\ln s$ added by $\ln(1 + \varepsilon/s)$, which is a constant denoted as **increment**.

*/*Barrier at time */*
 Since the paths really simulated are given by the logarithm of the underlying asset price, the considered barrier is the logarithm of the starting barrier 1.

*/*Inside = 0 if the path reaches the barrier*/*
inside and **inside_increment** are boolean variables initialised to 1, switching to 0 when the corresponding path is observed to exit from the barrier.

*/*Simulation of the i-th path until its exit if it does*/*
 In this cicle, the processes are both simulated at the discretisation times kh , whose current name is **time**, until $k = N$ or the corresponding value of the flag is changed, i.e. until **inside**= 0 or **inside_increment**= 0. At each step k , a variable, called **correction_active**, is introduced in order to ensure that both paths are generated by means of the same sample. **correction_active** is firstly equal to 0 and its value switches to 1 whenever a path is observed to exit whereas the other one does not behave in the same way.

The value of the old and new simulated points and of the barrier are put in the variables **lastlnspot**, **lnspot**, **lastlnspot_increment**, **lnspot_increment**, **lastbarrier**, **barrier** respectively .

*/*Check if the i-th path has reached the barrier at time*/*
 The variable **upordown** is defined to be equal to 0 if the considered barrier is an upper one, **upordown** being equal to 1 in the case of a lower barrier. First of all, **lnspot** and **lnspot_increment** are compared with **barrier**: if the path is outside the barrier, the corresponding value of **inside** and

`inside_increment` is set equal to 0 and the exit times turns out to be equal to `time`. Moreover, in such a case the corresponding price of the sample, `price_sample` and `price_sample_increment`, is set equal to `rebate`, discounted by $\exp(-r \cdot \text{time})$.

Otherwise, the exit time is estimated by making use of `check_barrierout`, which works as follows.

Suppose `upordown=0`, i.e. an upper barrier framework.

If the condition “If (`*inside`)” is true, then `inside=1`, i.e. the path has never gone out, so that in particular `lnspot` and `lastlnspot` are both below the upper barrier. Thus the local exit probability p_k^h is computed, `correction_active` is set equal to 1 and a bernoulli r.v. with parameter p_k^h is considered: a uniform r.v. `uniform` is generated and if (`uniform < p_k^h`) then (the path has gone out, so that) `inside` is set equal to 0, the exit time estimated through `time` and `price_sample` set equal to `rebate`, discounted by $\exp(-r \cdot \text{time})$.

The same procedure is applied to the path starting at $s + \varepsilon$: if

`inside_increment=1`, then `lnspot_increment` and `lastlnspot_increment` are both observed to stay below the barrier and a uniform r.v. is needed; since the paths have to be simulated by means of the same sample, such a uniform r.v. must be taken as the same `uniform` previously used, if it has been generated. Thus, if the condition

“`!*correction_active`” is true, which means that `correction_active ≠ 1`, a new uniform r.v. is considered; whereas if it is false, i.e. the correction has been yet activated, `uniform` does not change and turns out to be the same one which has been previously generated.

Finally, notice that, since $\varepsilon > 0$, `lnspot < lnspot_increment` and `lastlnspot < lastlnspot_increment`, so that `correction_active` has to be firstly activated to the path starting at s .

If `upordown=1`, `correction_active` has to be firstly activated to the path starting at $s + \varepsilon$, so that `check_barrierout` is applied by changing the role to `inside`, `lnspot` and `lastlnspot` and to `inside_increment`,

`lnspot_increment` and `lastlnspot_increment` respectively.

At the end of the `while`-cicle, if `inside` and/or `inside_increment` are not changed, then the path has not reached the boundary: the option is activated and `price_sample` and/or `price_sample_increment` can be computed as usual.

/*Delta*/

The delta of the sample is computed (recall that `increment = ln(1 + ε/s)`) so that $\varepsilon \sim \text{increment} \cdot s$: that is why the variation of the price sample is divided by `increment*s`).

/*Sum*/

The partial sums of the observed `price_sample` and `delta_sample` are computed.

/*Sum of Squares*/

The partial sums of the squares of the observed `price_sample` and `delta_sample` are computed and will be used to evaluate the empirical variances.

/*Price*/

The price is numerically computed by averaging over the M observed `price_sample`. The variable `pterror_price` is such that the interval $(ptprice - pterror_price, ptprice + pterror_price)$ represents the 95% confidence interval for `ptprice`.

/*Delta*/

The delta is computed according to the case of a put or call option. The variable `pterror_delta` is such that the interval $(ptdelta - pterror_delta, ptdelta + pterror_delta)$ represents the 95% confidence interval for `ptdelta`.

References

- [1] P.BALDI L.CARAMELLINO M.G.IOVINO. Pricing general barrier options: a numerical approach using sharp large deviations. *To appear in Mathematical Finance (1999)*, 1999. 1