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When estimated volatilities are not in perfect agreement with reality, delta-hedged option portfolios will incur a non-zero profit-and-loss over time. However, there is a surprisingly simple formula for the resulting hedge error, which has been known since the late 1990s. We call this The Fundamental Theorem of Derivative Trading. This paper is a survey with twists on that result. We prove a more general version of it and discuss various extensions and applications, from incorporating a multi-dimensional jump framework to deriving the Dupire–Gyöngy–Derman–Kani formula. We also consider its practical consequences, both in simulation experiments and on empirical data, thus demonstrating the benefits of hedging with implied volatility.
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1. A meditation on the art of derivative hedging

1.1. Introduction

Of all possible concepts within the field mathematical finance, that of continuous time derivative hedging indubitably emerges as the central pillar. First used in the seminal work by Black and Scholes (1973),† it has become the cornerstone in the determination of no-arbitrage prices for new financial products. Yet a disconnect between this body of abstract mathematical theory and real-world practice prevails. Specifically, successful hedging relies crucially on us having near-perfect information about the model that drives the underlying asset. Even if we boldly adopt the standard stochastic differential equation paradigm of asset pricing, it remains to make exact specifications for the degree to which the price process reacts to market fluctuations (i.e. to specify the diffusion term, the volatility). Alas, volatility blatantly transcends direct human observation, being, as it were, a Kantian Ding an sich‡ of which we only have approximate knowledge.

One such source supervenes upon historical realizations of the underlying price process: for example, assuming that the governing model can at least locally be approximated as a geometric Brownian motion, one can proceed to measure the standard deviation of past log returns over time. Yet this procedure raises uncomfortable questions pertaining to statistical measurement: under ordinary circumstances, increasing the sample space should narrow the confidence interval around our sample parameter. Only here, there is no a priori way of telling if and when a model undergoes a structural change. § Inevitably, this implies that extending the time series of log returns too far into the past might lead to a less accurate estimator as we might end up sampling from a governing dynamics that is no longer valid. Of course, we may take some measures against this issue by trying our luck with ever more intricate time series analyses, until we stumble upon a model, the parameters of which satisfy our arbitrary tolerance for statistical significance. Nevertheless, in practice this procedure invariably boils down to checking some finite basket of models and selecting the best one from the lot. Furthermore, unknown structural breaks continue to pose a problem no matter what.

Alternatively, we might try to extract an implied volatility from the market by fitting our model to observed option prices.

*Corresponding author. Email: rolf@math.ku.dk
†That Black and Scholes along with Merton were the first is the general consensus, although the paper by Haug and Taleb (2011) shows that the view is not universal.
‡Literally, thing in itself or the noumenon. Kant held that there is a distinction between the way things appear to observers (phenomena) and the way reality actually is construed (noumena).
§This scenario is not at all implausible. Unlike the physical sciences where the fundamental laws are assumed to have no sufficient reason to change (in the Leibnizian or Occamian sense), this philosophical principle would hardly withstand scrutiny in a social science context. Asset price processes are fundamentally governed by market agents and their reactions to various events (be they self-induced or exogenous). There is really no reason to assume that these market players will not drastically change their opinions at some point (for one reason or the other).
Nevertheless, the inadequacy of this methodology quickly becomes apparent: first, implied volatility might be ill-defined as it is the case for certain exotic products such as barrier options. Secondly, it is quite clear that the market hysteria which drives the prices of traded options need not capture the market hysteria which drives the corresponding market for the underlying asset. Fair pricing ultimately boils down to understanding the true nature of the underlying product: to not mimic the collective madness of option traders.

Whilst volatility at its core remains elusive to us, the situation is perhaps not as dire as one might think. Specifically, we can develop a formal understanding of the profit-&-loss we incur upon hedging a portfolio with an erroneous volatility—at least insofar as we make some moderate assumptions of the dynamical form of the underlying assets. To give a concrete example of this, consider the simple interest rate free framework presented in Andreasen (2003) where the price process of a single non-dividend paying asset is assumed to follow the real dynamics

\[ dX_t = X_t [\mu_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t]. \]

Let \( V^i_t \) be the value of an option that trades in the market at a certain implied volatility \( \sigma^i_t \)—possibly quite different from the epistemically inaccessible \( \sigma_t \). Now if we were to set up a hedge of a long position on such an option, using \( \sigma_t \) as our hedge volatility, an application of Itô’s formula, coupled with the Black–Scholes equation, shows that the infinitesimal value change in the hedge portfolio \( \Pi_t = V^i_t - \partial_s V^i_t \times X_t \), is of the form

\[ \Pi_t = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma^i_t - \sigma_t^2) X_t^2 \partial_s^2 V^i_t dt, \quad (1) \]

which generally is non-zero unless \( \sigma^i_t = \sigma_t \). For reasons that will become clearer below, the importance of this result is of such magnitude that Andreasen dubs it the Fundamental Theorem of Derivative Trading. Indeed, a more abstract variation of it will be the central object of study in this paper.

To the best of our knowledge, quantitative studies into the effect of hedging with an erroneous volatility first appeared in a paper on the robustness of the Black–Scholes formula by El Karoui et al. (1998). They viewed the result as a largely negative one: unless volatility is bounded (which it is not in any stochastic volatility model) then there is no simple super-replication strategy. Easier derivations of the Fundamental Theorem are encountered in the papers by Gibson et al. (1999), Mahayni et al. (2001), and Rasmussen (2001). Indeed, there seems to be an added awareness of the result being a positive one: a decent forecast of volatility gives rise to a small hedge error. Jointly, what characterizes these papers is their binary partition of volatility into a ‘wrong’ and ‘right’ category. Somewhat subtler treatments can be found in the unpublished works by Carr (2002) and Henrard (2001) in which the partition becomes tripartite: concretely, these papers explicitly differentiate between a true governing volatility of the underlying asset, an implied volatility characterizing market consensus and a hedge volatility which captures the personal belief of the option hedger. The benefits of this three-part structure are clearly enunciated in Ahmad and Wilmott (2005) and Wilmott (2007) in which the associated P&L paths under the various choices of volatility are exhibited, alongside mathematical (non-analytic) expressions for the mean implied P&L and its variance.

The Fundamental Theorem has in other works received extensive treatment in the academic literature, yet it has never quite reached the ‘textbook’ status we reckon it deserves (in particular, it rarely finds its way into the curriculum of aspiring financial engineers). To end this regrettable situation, we here provide a thorough exposition. Taking our vantage point in the tripartite philosophy of Henrard and Carr, we endeavour to provide a simple proof of the Fundamental Theorem, whilst simultaneously spicing up the result by considering a more general dynamics in a full-fledged multi-asset framework. Specifically, the structure of this paper is as follows: in section 2, we state and prove a generalized version of the Fundamental Theorem of Derivative Trading for basket options and discuss its various implications for hedging strategies and applications. Key insights here include the benefit of hedging with the implied volatility with regards to attaining ‘smooth’ P&L paths, and a somewhat surprising connection to Dupire’s local volatility formula. In section 3, we expose the implications of adding a multi-dimensional jump process to the dynamics, thus emphasizing the relative ease with which the original proof can be adapted. In particular, we argue that long option positions with convex pay-out profiles profit from a discontinuous movement in one of the underlying stocks. Finally, section 4 presents an empirical investigation into what actually happens to our portfolio when we hedge using various volatilities. In particular, using actual quotes for stocks and call options, we demonstrate that self-financing portfolios hedged at the implied volatility indeed give rise to a smoother P&L over time, whilst allowing for some amount of volatility arbitrage to be picked up in the process.

2. The Fundamental Theorem of Derivative Trading

2.1. Model set-up

Consider a financial market comprised of a risk-free money account as well as \( n \) risky assets, each of which pays out a continuous dividend yield. We assume all assets to be infinitely divisible as to the amount which may be held, that trading takes place continuously in time, and that no trade is subject to financial friction. Formally, we imagine the information flow of this world to be captured by the stochastic basis \( (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \), where \( \Omega \) represents all possible states of the economy, \( \mathbb{P} \) is the physical probability measure and \( \mathcal{F} = \{ \mathcal{F}_t \}_{t \geq 0} \) is a filtration which satisfies the usual conditions.† The price processes of the risky assets, \( X_t = (X_{1t}, X_{2t}, \ldots, X_{nt})^T \), are assumed to follow the real dynamics‡

\[ dX_t = D_X \mu_t (t, \widetilde{X}_t) dt + \sigma_t (t, \widetilde{X}_t) dW_t, \quad (2) \]

where \( D_X \) is the \( n \times n \) diagonal matrix diag \( (X_{1t}, X_{2t}, \ldots, X_{nt}) \), and \( W_t = (W_{1t}, W_{2t}, \ldots, W_{nt})^T \) is an \( n \)-dimensional standard Brownian motion adapted to \( \mathbb{P} \). Furthermore, \( \mu_t : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \sigma : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) are deterministic functions, sufficiently well-behaved for the SDE to have a

†Specifically, it satisfies right-continuity, \( \cap_{t \geq s} \mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_s, \forall t \geq 0 \) (if we move incrementally forward in time there will be no jump in information), and completeness, i.e. \( \mathcal{F}_0 \) contains all \( \mathbb{P} \) null sets.
‡The nomenclature ‘real dynamics’ is ripe with unfortunate connotations of Platonic realism (ontological significance of mathematical objects). Strictly speaking, this is not what we require, but rather the expressive adequacy of a model: i.e. it’s ability to adequately capture the financial events unfolding.
unique strong solution (in particular, we assume the regularity conditions
\[ \int_0^s |D_{x_i} \mu_r(u, \tilde{X}_n)| du < \infty, \quad \int_0^s |D_{x_i} \sigma_r(u, \tilde{X}_n)|^2 du < \infty, \]
hold a.s. \( \forall t \leq s \), where the first norm is to be understood in the
Euclidian sense, whilst the latter should be construed in the matrical
sense). Finally, we define \( X_t \) as the \( n+m \) dimensional vector \((X_t; \tilde{X}_t)\) where \( X_t = (X_{t1}, X_{t2}, \ldots, X_{tn})^\top \) has
the interpretation of an \( m \)-dimensional state variable, the exact
dynamical nature of which is not integral to what follows.\[4\]

In what we consider the scenario of what happens when we
hedge an option on \( X_t \), ignorant of the existence of the state
variable \( \tilde{X}_t \), as well as the form of \( \mu_r(\cdot, \cdot) \) and \( \sigma_r(\cdot, \cdot) \).
Specifically, we shall imagine that we are misguided to the extent
that we would model the dynamics of \( X_t \) as a local volatility
model with diffusion matrix \( \sigma_r(t, X_t) \).

Similar assumptions pertain to the market, although here we label the 'implied'
diffusion matrix \( \sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) \) to distinguish it from our personal
belief. Irrespective of which dynamical specification is being
made, we maintain that regularity conditions analogous to (3)
remain satisfied. Finally, a cautionary remark: throughout these
pages we use \( r \) and \( i \) to emphasize that the volatility is real
and implied, respectively, whilst \( h \) refers to an arbitrary hedge
volatility. For a comprehensible reading, it is incumbent that
the reader keeps these definitions in mind.

2.2. Derivation and theorem

Theorem 1 The Fundamental Theorem of Derivative Trading
Let \( V_t = V(t, X_t) \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n) \) be the
price process of a European option with terminal pay-off \( \tilde{V}_T =
g(X_T) \), the underlying of which follows the real dynamics (2).

We assume the option trades in the market at \( (\text{not nec-
essarily uniquely determined}) \) implied volatility \( \sigma_r(t, X_t) \). Now
suppose we at time \( t = 0 \) acquire such an option for
the implied price \( V^i_t \) and set out to \( \Delta \)-hedge our position.
Said hedge is performed under the notion that the volatility function
ought, in fact, to be of the form \( \sigma_r(t, X_t) = \sigma_h(t, X_t) \),
leading to the fair price process \( V^h_t \). Then the present value of
the profit-& loss we incur from holding such a portfolio over the interval
\( T = [0, T] \) is
\[ P^\text{RL}_T = V^h_T - V^i_T + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sum_{j=1}^d |r_a| r_a d\sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_{\tilde{X}_t}^2 V^h_t |d\tilde{X}_t|, \] (4)
where \( r_a = r(u, X_u) \) is the locally risk free rate, \( \nabla^2 \)
\( \text{xx} \) is the Hessian operator, and
\[ \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) \equiv \sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) \sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) - \sigma_h(t, X_t) \sigma_h(t, X_t). \] (5)

\[\text{Proof}\]

Let \( \{\Pi^h_t\}_{t \in [0, T]} \) be the value process of the hedge port-
folio long one option valued according to the implied market con-
ception, \( \{V^i_t\}_{t \in [0, T]} \), and short \( \{\Delta^h_t = \nabla_x V^h_t\}_{t \in [0, T]} \) units of the underlying with value process \( \{X_t\}_{t \in [0, T]} \),
where \( \nabla_x \) is the gradient operator. We suppose the money account \( B \)
chosen such that the net value of the position is zero:
\[ \Pi^h_t = V^i_t + B_t - \nabla_x V^h_t \cdot X_t = 0, \]
where \( B \) is the dot product. Now consider the infinitesimal change
to the value of this portfolio over the interval \([t, t + dt]\),
where \( t \in [0, T] \). From the self-financing condition we have that
\[ d\Pi^h_t = dV^i_t + r_t B_t dt - \nabla_x V^h_t \cdot (dX_t + q_t \sigma_h dt), \]
where \( q_t = (q_1(t, X_t), q_2(t, X_t), \ldots, q_n(t, X_n))^\top \) codifies
the continuous dividend yields, and \( \sigma_h \) is the Hadamard product.\[6\]

Jointly, the two previous equations entail
\[ d\Pi^h_t = dV^i_t - \nabla_x V^h_t \cdot (dX_t - (r_t - q_t) \sigma_h dt) - r_t V^i_t dt, \] (6)
where \( t = (1, \ldots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

Now consider the option valued under \( \sigma_h(t, X_t) \);
from the multi-dimensional Ito formula we have that
\[ dV^i_t = \{ \partial_t V^h_t + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(q_r(t, X_t) D_{X_t}^2 V^h_t \sigma_h(t, X_t)) \} dt + \nabla_x V^h_t \cdot dX_t, \] (7)
where we have used the fact that \( X_t \) is governed by (2). Meanwhile,
\( V^h_t \) satisfies the multi-dimensional Black–Scholes
equation for dividend paying underlyings.\[\|\]
\[ r_t V^h_t = \partial_t V^h_t + \nabla_x V^h_t \cdot (r_t - q_t) \sigma_h \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(q_r(t, X_t) D_{X_t}^2 V^h_t \sigma_h(t, X_t)). \] (8)

Combining this expression with the Ito expansion we obtain,
\[ 0 = -dV^h_t + r_t V^h_t dt + \nabla_x V^h_t \cdot (dX_t - (r_t - q_t) \sigma_h dt) \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(D_{X_t} \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_{X_t}^2 V^h_t \sigma_h(t, X_t)). \] (9)

where we have used the fact that the trace is invariant under
cylic permutations of its constituent matrices. Finally, defining
\( \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) \) as in (5), and adding (9) to (6) we obtain
\[ d\Pi^h_t = dV^i_t - dV^h_t - r_t (V^i_t - V^h_t) dt \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(D_{X_t} \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_{X_t}^2 V^h_t dt) = \epsilon^h_t r_a d\sigma_r(t, X_t) \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(D_{X_t} \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_{X_t}^2 V^h_t dt). \] (10)

Whilst a perfect hedge would render this infinitesimal value-
change in the portfolio zero, this is clearly not the case here.
In fact, upon discounting (10) back to the present \( t = 0 \) and
integrating up the infinitesimal components, we find that net
profit-& loss incurred over the lifetime of the portfolio is
\[ P^\text{RL}_T = \int_0^T d(e^{-\int_0^t r_a d\sigma_r(V^i_t - V^h_t)}). \]
\[+
\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t r_s ds} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[D_X, \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_X, \nabla_{xx}^2 V_r^h] dt \]
\[= V_0^h - V_0^i + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t r_s ds} \times \text{tr}[D_X, \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_X, \nabla_{xx}^2 V_r^h] dt \]
where \(P&L^h \equiv \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t r_s ds} d\Pi^h\), and the last line makes use of the fact that \(V^h_t = V^h = g(\tilde{X}_T)\). This is the desired result. □

Remark 1 A few observations on this proof are in order: first, the relative simplicity of (4) clearly boils down to the assumption that the market is perceived to be driven by a local volatility model. If this assumption is dropped, equation (8) no longer holds. Secondly, it should be clear that the value of the P&L changes sign if we are short on the derivative and long on the underlying. Thirdly, the market price of the derivative enters only though the initial price \(V_0\). That is because we look at the profit-&-loss accrued over the entire lifetime of the portfolio. The case of marking-to-market requires further analysis and/or assumption. We will elaborate on this in the following subsection.

Remark 2 From a generalist’s perspective, theorem 1 suffers from a number of glaring limitations: for instance, the governing asset price dynamics only considers Brownian stochasticity, the hedge is assumed to be a workaday \(\Delta\)-hedge, and the option type is vanilla European in the sense that the term related to the underlying assets. Fortunately, the Fundamental Theorem can readily be extended in various directions: e.g. it can be shown that if \(V_i = V(t, X_t, A_t)\) is an Asian option written on the continuous average \(A_t\) of the underlying process \(X_t\), then the Fundamental Theorem remains form invariant. In section 3, we consider one particularly topical dynamical modification viz. the incorporation of possible market crashes through jump diffusion.

2.3. The implications for \(\Delta\)-hedging
From a first inspection, the Fundamental Theorem quite clearly demonstrates that reasonably successful hedging is possible even under significant model uncertainty. Indeed, as Davis (2010) puts it ‘without some robustness property of this kind, it is hard to imagine that the derivatives industry could exist at all’. In this section, we dive further into the implications of what happens to our portfolio, by considering the case where we hedge with (a) the real volatility, and (b) the implied volatility. It is a standing assumption in this subsection that whatever is used as hedge volatility is of the form that allows the use of theorem 1 (see the discussion in remark 1 above). The reader can think of the cases of constant volatility.

2.3.1. Hedging with the real volatility. Suppose we happen to be hang on our estimate of the real volatility matrix in our \(\Delta\)-hedge, i.e. let \(\sigma_h(t, X_t) = \sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t)\) a.s. \(\forall t \in [0, T]\), then \(\Sigma_r(t, X_t) = 0\) and the present valued profit-&-loss amounts to
\[P&L^h = V_0^h - V_0^i,\]
which is manifestly deterministic.† However, we observe that this relies crucially on us holding the portfolio until expiry of the option. Day-to-day fluctuations of the profit-&-loss still vary stochastically (erratically) as it is vividly demonstrated by combining equation (9) (where \(h = i\)) with equation (6) (where \(h = r\)):
\[d\Pi'_r = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[D_X, \Sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_X, \nabla_{xx}^2 V_r^i] dt \]
\[+ \nabla_x (V_r^i - V_r^i) \cdot (\mu_r' - r_t) + q_r \circ X_t dt + D_X, \sigma_r(t, \tilde{X}_t) dW_r,\]
cf. the explicit dependence of the Brownian increment. As for the profitability of the \(\Delta\)-hedging strategy, this is a complex issue which ultimately must be studied on a case-by-case basis. However, for options with positive vega,‡ it suffices to require that the real volatility everywhere exceeds the implied volatility.

2.3.2. Hedging with the implied volatility. Suppose instead we hedge the portfolio using the implied volatility matrix \(\sigma_i(t, X_t) \forall t \in [0, T]\), then the associated present-valued profit-&-loss is of the form
\[P&L^i = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t r_s ds} \text{tr}[D_X, \Sigma_i(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_X, \nabla_{xx}^2 V_i^i] dt \]
As we find ourselves integrating over the stochastic process \(X_t\), this profit-&-loss is manifestly stochastic. Notice though that \(d\Pi'_i\) here does not depend explicitly on the Brownian increment (the daily profit-and-loss is \(O(dt)\) which gives rise to point that ‘bad models cause bleeding—not blow-ups’. As for the profitability of the strategy, again this is a complex issue: however, insofar as \(\Sigma_i(t, \tilde{X}_t) \circ \nabla_{xx}^2 V_i^i\) is positive definite a.s. for all \(t \in [0, T]\), then we are making a profit with probability one. To see this, recall that the trace can be written as§
\[\text{tr}[D_X, \Sigma_i(t, \tilde{X}_t) D_X, \nabla_{xx}^2 V_i^i] = X_i^T (\Sigma_i(t, \tilde{X}_t) \circ \nabla_{xx}^2 V_i^i) X_t,\]
In particular, if \(\Sigma_i(t, \tilde{X}_t) \circ \nabla_{xx}^2 V_i^i\) is positive definite at all times, i.e.
\[\forall t \in [0, T] \forall X_t \in \mathbb{R}^n : X_i^T (\Sigma_i(t, \tilde{X}_t) \circ \nabla_{xx}^2 V_i^i) X_t > 0,\]
then \(P&L^i > 0\). A sufficient condition for this to be the case is that \(\Sigma_i(t, \tilde{X}_t)\) and \(\nabla_{xx}^2 V_i^i\) individually are positive definite \(\forall t,\) as demonstrated by the Schur Product Theorem.

2.3.3. Wilmott’s hedge experiment. The points imbued in the previous two paragraphs are forcefully demonstrated in the event that there is only one risky asset in existence, the

†Obviously, this can only be the case if there is no underlying state variable.
‡A clear example of vega being manifestly positive would be European calls and puts, which satisfy the assumptions needed to derive the Black–Scholes formula. Explicitly, \(\phi \equiv \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial d_1} = Se^{-\delta(T-t)} \phi(d_1) \sqrt{T-t} > 0\) where \(\phi\) is the standard normal pdf and \(d_1\) has the usual definition.
§This follows from the general identity for matrices \(\mathbf{A}\) and \(\mathbf{B}\) of corresponding dimensions: \(\mathbf{x}^T (\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{y} = \text{tr}[\mathbf{D}_x \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}_y \mathbf{B}]\) where \(\mathbf{x}\) and \(\mathbf{y}\) are vectors.
derivative is a European call option and all volatilities are assumed constant. Based on Wilmott and Ahmad, Figure 1 clearly illustrates the behaviour of the profit-&-loss paths insofar as we hedge with (a) the real volatility, and (b) the implied volatility. Again, the main insights are as follows: hedging \( V^r_t \) with the real volatility causes the P&L of the portfolio to fluctuate erratically over time, only to land at a deterministic value at maturity. On the other hand, hedging \( V^i_t \) with the implied volatility yields smoother (albeit still stochastic) P&L curves. Nonetheless, here, there is no way of telling what the P&L actually amounts to at maturity.

Rather perturbingly, both strategies blatantly suggest the relative ease with which we can make volatility arbitrage. Specifically, assuming that the historical volatility is a reasonable proxy for the real volatility, \( \sigma_{\text{hist}} \approx \sigma_r \), and that \( \sigma_{\text{hist}} > \sigma_i \), it would suffice to go long (short) on the hedge portfolio for \( \mathbb{P}(P&L_T \geq 0) = 1 \) and \( \mathbb{P}(P&L_T > 0) > 0 \).

The Wilmott experiment reflects theconcerting approach (Hull and White 2016) of traders: Hedge with market implied parameters/quantities. For the experiment’s strong smoothness property of implied volatility hedging P&L to hold it is important that implied volatility is assumed constant, or at least that it does not diffuse randomly as it would in, e.g. the Heston model. Were the latter the case, then anything might happen. However, since implied volatility is intricately linked to (conditional expectation of) time-integrated real volatility (squared), \( \int_0^T \sigma_r^2 dt \), it is likely to be quantitatively smoother than real volatility, so there is hope that the conclusion of the idealized experiment carries over to empirical analysis. In section 4, we will see that this is indeed the case.

**Remark 3** It is tempting to think of an option trade as a zero-sum game (up to a risk-premium) between the buyer and the seller; if one wins the other loses. That, however, is not true. Imagine a stock dynamics which is described by geometric Brownian motion with 15% volatility. A buyer is strongly bullish and makes a directional bet by buying an at-the-money call-option, which he is willing to pay 20% implied volatility on. The buyer does not hedge his position, the market rallies, and he makes a nice profit. Meanwhile, the seller is right in her 15%-volatility forecast. \( \Delta \)-hedges and makes a nice (arbitrage) profit too. Needless to say, option writing can also imply losses for both the buyer and the seller as we saw it during the financial crisis.\(^\dagger\)

### 2.4. Applications

Due to the presence of the real volatility, the exact nature of which transcends our epistemic domain, one might reasonably ponder whether the Fundamental Theorem conveys any practical points besides those of the preceding subsection. Using two poignant (even if somewhat eccentric) examples, we will argue that the gravity of the Fundamental Theorem propagates well into risk management and volatility surface calibration. Zero rates and dividends will be assumed throughout.

**Example 1** Let \( V_t(T, K) \) be the price process of a European strike \( K \) maturity \( T \) call or put option, written on an underlying which obeys geometric Brownian motion, \( dX_t = \mu X_t dt + \sigma X_t dW_t \), where \( \mu, \sigma \) are constants. Suppose we \( \Delta \)-hedge a long position on \( V_t \) at the implied volatility, \( \sigma_h = \sigma_i \), then the Fundamental Theorem implies that

\[
P&L_t^\Delta = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (\sigma_i^2 - \sigma_r^2) X_t^2 \Gamma^\Delta_t dt.
\]

\(\dagger\)Think of the Black–Scholes model with time-dependent volatility or see Romano and Touzi’s Proposition 4.1 (Romano and Touzi 1997).

\(\ddagger\)This observation is inspired by Antoine Savine.
where
\[ \Gamma_i^j = \frac{\phi(d_i^1)}{X_i \sigma_i \sqrt{t - i}} \]
is the option’s gamma, \( \phi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ \) is the standard normal pdf and
\[ d_i^j = \frac{1}{\sigma_j \sqrt{t - i}} \left\{ \ln(X_i / K) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_i^2 (T - i) \right\} . \]

Since \( \forall \tau \Gamma_i^j > 0 \) the strategy is profitable if and only if \( \sigma_j^2 > \sigma_i^2 \). Furthermore, by maximizing the integrand with respect to \( X_t \), we find that the \( P & L^j_i \) is maximal when
\[ X_t^j = \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ \sigma_j^2 \right] (T - i) . \]
Specifically, upon evaluating the integral explicitly it can be shown that \( \dagger \)
\[ \max_{X_t} P & L^j_i = \sqrt{\frac{T}{2 \pi \sigma_i}} (\sigma_i^2 - \sigma_j^2) . \]

From a risk management point of view, the important point is that we can compute a confidence interval for the real volatility based on historical observations. Hence, we can compute a confidence interval for the maximal profit-&-loss we might face upon holding the hedge portfolio till expiry.

**EXAMPLE 2** Let \( V_t = C_i(T, K) \) be the price process of a European strike \( K \) maturity \( T \) call option written on an underlying price process \( X \). As in (2), we assume the fundamental dynamics to be of the form
\[ dX_t = \mu(t, X_t) dt + \sigma(t, X_t) dW_t, \]
where \( X_t \) is defined as the \((1 + m)\)-dimensional vector \((X_t, \xi_t)\) and \( \xi \) is a scalar variable. Also, we suppose the integrability condition \( \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \sigma^2(t, X_t) X_t^2 dt < \infty \), and that there exists an equivalent martingale measure, \( Q \), which renders \( X_t \) a martingale (recall the risk-free rate is assumed zero) \( \Sigma \):
\[ dX_t = \sigma(t, X_t) dW_t ^Q . \]

Now consider the admittedly somewhat contrived scenario of a \( \Delta \)-hedged portfolio, long one unit of the call, for which \( \sigma_b \) and \( \sigma_i \) are both zero. \( \Sigma \) The associated value process is
\[ \Pi^j_i = C_i^j(T, K) + B_i - \partial^i K C^j_b(T, K) \cdot X_t \]
\[ = (X_t - K)^+ + B_i - \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} X_t, \]
where \( \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \) is the indicator function. The important point here is that \( (X_t - K)^+ \) may be reinterpreted as the terminal pay-off of a strike \( K \) maturity \( t \) call option (obviously, the specification \( \sigma_b = \sigma_i = 0 \) is paramount here). Substituting (11) into the infinitesimal form of the Fundamental Theorem,
\[ d\Pi^j_i = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sigma^2_t (t, \tilde{X}_t) - \sigma^2_i \right) X_t^2 \tilde{\theta}_{X_t}^2 C_i^j(T, K) dt , \]
we find that
\[ d((X_t - K)^+ + B_i - \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} X_t) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2_t (t, \tilde{X}_t) X_t^2 \delta(X_t - K) dt , \]
\[ \text{(12)} \]
\[ \text{where we once again have made use of } \sigma_i = 0, \text{ alongside the fact that } \partial^i \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \text{ is the Dirac delta-function } \delta(X_t - K). \]
Taking the risk neutral expectation of (12), conditional on \( \mathcal{F}_0 \), the left-hand side reduces to
\[ \mathbb{E}^Q [\text{LHS}] = \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ d(X_t - K)^+ \right] + \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ dB_i - \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} dX_t \right] = \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ X_t - K \right] - \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} X_t \right] = \mathbb{E}^Q \left( K - \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ dX_t | \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \right) = \mathbb{E}^Q \left( \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ dX_t | \mathcal{F}_0 \right] \right) = \mathbb{E}^Q \left( C_i^j(t, K) \right) . \]
\[ \text{(13)} \]
where the second line uses \( dB_i = 0 \), whilst the third line uses the law of iterated expectations and the fact that \( \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ (X_t - K)^+ \right] \) is the time zero price of a strike \( K \) maturity \( t \) call option. Finally, the fourth line follows from the \( \mathcal{F}_0 \)-measurability of \( \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \), whilst the fifth line exploits the martingale property \( \mathbb{E}^Q [dX_t] = 0 \).

As for the right-hand side, define the joint density
\[ f_{\sigma_i^2, \sigma_j^2, X_t} (\sigma^2, x) d\sigma^2 dx \]
\[ \equiv \mathbb{P} (\sigma^2 \leq \sigma_j^2 \leq \sigma^2 + d\sigma^2) \cap \{ x \leq X_t \leq x + dx \} , \]
then
\[ \mathbb{E}^Q [\text{RHS}] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \sigma^2 x^2 \delta(x - K) f_{\sigma_i^2, X_t} (\sigma^2, x) d\sigma^2 dx dt \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \sigma^2 x^2 \delta(x - K) f_{\sigma_i^2} (x) dx \right\} \]
\[ \times (\sigma^2 X_t = x) \mathbb{P} (X_t = x) d\sigma^2 dx dt \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} x^2 \delta(x - K) f_{\sigma_i^2} (x) dx \]
\[ \times \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \sigma^2 f_{\sigma_i^2} (\sigma^2, x) dx \right\} \mathbb{P} (X_t = x) d\sigma^2 dx dt \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} K^2 \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \right] \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ \sigma_i^2 (t, \tilde{X}_t) | X_t = K \right] dK . \]
\[ \text{(14)} \]
Recalling that \( \partial^i \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ (X_t - K) \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \right] = -\mathbb{E}^Q \left[ \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \right] \), and \( -\partial^i \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ \mathbb{I}_{(X_t > K)} \right] = -\mathbb{E}^Q \left[ \delta(X_t - K) \right] \), we arrive at the Breeden–Litzenberger formula
\[ f_{\sigma_i^2} (K) = \partial^2_{K} C_0^j (t, K) . \]
\[ \text{(15)} \]
Combining equations (13), (14) and (15), we thus have that
\[ \frac{dC_0^j (t, K) = \frac{1}{2} \partial^2_{K} C_0^j (t, K) K^2 \mathbb{E}^Q [\sigma_i^2 (t, \tilde{X}_t) | X_t = K] ,} \]
which using the change of notation $t = T$ amounts to the celebrated Dupire–Gyöngy–Derman–Kani formula

$$E^Q[\sigma^2_r(T, \bar{X}_T)|X_T = K] = \frac{\partial T}{2} K^2 \sigma^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial K} C^0(T, K),$$ (16)


Conceptually, the important point here is that the right-hand side, modulo some amount of interpolation, is empirically measurable, whereas (16) provides a way of calibrating the volatility surface to observed call option prices in the market. Specifically, the formula enables us to square a local diffusion model with the infamous skew/smile effect of implied volatilities across different values for the strike and time to maturity, whilst delicately sidestepping the deeper issue as to why this phenomenon prevails.

**Remark 4** In Wittgensteinian terms, we must 'throw away the ladder' to arrive at this final conclusion, Wittgenstein (1922), prop. 6.54. Hitherto, we have assumed that the real parameters ($r$) are fundamentally unobservable, whilst the implied parameters ($i$) are those we are exposed to in the market. Yet, no such distinction exists in the works of Dupire et al., whence the $r$ superscript in (16) really ought to be dropped.

**Remark 5** The above derivation is arguably unconventional and neither rigorous nor the quickest way to demonstrate (16).

In fact, the entire point of setting $\sigma_t = 0$ is essentially to extract the Ito-(Tanaka) formula applied to $(X_t - K)^+$, from which Derman et al.’s derivation takes its starting point. We keep the derivation here, as it provides a curious glimpse into how two philosophically quite distinct theorems can be interconnected.

3. The Gospel of the Jump

Following remark 2, it is worthwhile exploring how the Fundamental Theorem can be adapted to new terrain. For instance, it is well known that Brownian motion in itself does not admit only one solution, we would require that either (i) $\lambda_h = \lambda_{h_0} = 0$ (there are no jumps), in which case we recover the standard Girsanov hedge error is further complicated under the model error framework of the Fundamental Theorem. Stepping stones towards answering this question are found in Andreasen (2003) and Davis (2010) both of whom consider a mono-dimensional implied-hedge scenario with perfect information about the jump diffusion component. Our contribution is to generalize their results to a multi-dimensional framework with arbitrary (mis-)specifications for the volatility and jump distribution. For an overview of multi-dimensional jump-diffusion theory, we refer the reader to the appendix.

Suppose the real dynamics of the underlying price process obeys

$$dX_t = D_X [\mu_t(t, \bar{X}_t)dt + \sigma_t(t, \bar{X}_t)dW_t] + D_{X_\mathbb{Q}}dY_t,$$ (17)

where $\{Y_{t\geq 0}\}$ is an $n$-dimensional vector of independent compound Poisson processes. Specifically, the $j$th component is given by

$$Y_{t,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{N^j_t} Z_{k,j},$$

where $\{N^j_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is an intensity-$\lambda_j$ Poisson process, and $\{Z^j_{t}\}_{t\geq 1}$ is a sequence of relative jump sizes, assumed to be i.i.d. square-integrable random variables with cumulative distribution function (cdf) $v_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. For shorthand, we shall refer to the vectors $X = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n)^T$ and $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_n)^T$ as the intensity and cdf of $Y_j$.

Obvious to the true nature of (17), we imagine that pricing and hedging should be performed (with obvious notation) under the tuple $(\phi, \lambda_h, v_h, \sigma_h(t, X_t), \mathbb{Q})$, where $\mathbb{Q}$ is the risk neutral measure

$$\mathbb{E} [\cdot] = \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q} [\cdot|\mathbb{X}_T],$$

with the underlying supposedly driven by

$$dX_t = D_X [\mu_h(t, X_t)dt + \sigma_h(t, X_t)dW^\mathbb{Q}_t] + D_{X_\mathbb{Q}}dY_t - \lambda_h \circ \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}[Z_1].$$

with $Z_1 = (Z^1_{t_1}, Z^2_{t_2}, \ldots, Z^n_{t_n})^T$, and $\mathbb{Q}$ has been specified such that

$$\mu_h(t, X_t) + \lambda_h \circ \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}[Z_1] + \sigma_h(t, X_t)\phi_t = r_t,$$ (19)

is satisfied almost everywhere. $$\square$$

†We do this to emphasize that $t$ is the maturity of the option (not its value at time $t$).

‡Exactly how to do this extrapolation has turned out to be sufficiently non-trivial to spur numerous papers and successive quant-of-the-year awards a-decade-and-a-half later, see Andreasen and Huge (2011) (pure local volatility), Guyon and Henry-Labordère (2012) (decorated stochastic volatility models).

§Our motivation for establishing this curious connection stems from Andreasen (2003) who declares the Dupire–Gyöngy–Derman–Kani formula to be a corollary of the Fundamental Theorem (without proof). Whether this take on the situation ultimately stems from Dupire himself is perhaps dubious, but it is interesting to note that a variant of the Fundamental Theorem has appeared in his work at least since early 2003 (Dupire 2003).
Remark 6 We emphasize that (18) is a risk neutral measure transformation of the hedge dynamics with the associated measure \( \mathbb{P}^h \). This is to be contrasted with example 2 in section 2.4 in which \( \mathbb{Q} \) is the risk neutral measure of the real dynamics.

Theorem 2 The Fundamental Theorem of Derivative Trading with Jumps Let \( V_t = V(t, X_t) \in C^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d) \) be the price process of a European option with terminal payoff \( V_T = g(X_T) \), the underlying of which follows the real dynamics (17). We assume the option trades in the market at the (not necessarily uniquely determined) implied volatility \( \sigma_i = \sigma_i(t, X_t) \). Now suppose we at time \( t = 0 \) acquire such an option for the implied price \( V_0^h \) and set out to \( \Delta \)-hedge our position. Said hedge is performed under the notion \( \langle \phi, \lambda_h^Q, \nu_h^Q, \sigma_h(t, X_t), \rangle_m \), leading to the fair price process \( V_t^h \). Then the present value of the profit-&-loss we incur from holding such a portfolio over the interval \( T = [0, T] \) is

\[
P&L_T = \mathbb{E}^h \left[ V_T^h - V_0^h + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T e^{-\int_0^t r_s \mathrm{d}s} \mathrm{d}r_t^h \right]
\]

\[
\times \left\{ \frac{\partial_t}{\partial_t} \left[ \int _0^T \sum _{j=1}^n e^{-\int_0^s r_u \mathrm{d}u} \left( \Delta_j V^h_t(t, X_{t-}) - X_{j,t-Z_N^j} \partial_j \nu^h_t \right) \mathrm{d}N^j_t \right] - \lambda_{h,j} \left( \mathbb{E}^Q[T_j | X_{t-} = x_{t-}] \lambda_{h,j} - X_{j,t-E_{X_{t-}}(Z^j_t)} \right) \right\} \mathrm{d}N^j_t
\]

where

\[
\Delta_j V^h_t(t, X_{t-}) = V^h(t, X_{t-} \circ (t + \mathbf{\hat{e}}_j Z_j^T)) - V^h(t, X_{t-})
\]

represents the change in value of the option when the underlying jumps in the \( j \)th component, and \( \mathbf{\hat{e}}_j \) is a unit vector in \( \mathbb{R}^d \).

Sketch Proof The proof runs in parallel with that of theorem 1. Specifically, the analogue of expression (6) is

\[
d\Pi_t^h = d V_t^h \bullet \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ (\sigma_t^2 \mathbf{X}_t) \right] \mathbf{X}_t \right) \mathrm{d}t - \mathbb{E}^Q[V_t^h] \bullet dY_t - r_t V_t^h \mathrm{d}t,
\]

where \( dX_t^\text{cont} \) is the continuous part of (17) i.e.

\[
dX_t^\text{cont} = \mathbb{D}_X \left[ \mu_t(t, X_t) \right] \mathrm{d}t + \sigma_t(t, X_t) \mathrm{d}W_t.
\]

Furthermore, in analogy with (7) and (8) we have the Ito formula

\[
dV_t^h = \left[ \partial_t V_t^h + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^Q \left[ (\sigma_t^2 \mathbf{X}_t) \right] \mathbf{X}_t \right] \mathrm{d}t - \mathbb{E}^Q[V_t^h] \bullet dY_t - r_t V_t^h \mathrm{d}t,
\]

and the partial integro-differential equation for pricing purposes

\[
\text{theorem with } \phi_i = \sigma_i^{-1} (r t - \mu_i), \text{or (ii) when } \sigma_h = 0 \text{ (there are only jumps) and } \lambda^Q = \delta_1 \text{ (the simple Poisson process case) in which case } \lambda^Q_h = r t - \mu_h.
\]
4. Insights from empirics: on arbitrage and erraticism

Inspired by Wilmott’s theoretical hedge experiment, we now look into the empirical performance of Δ-hedging strategies based on (I) forecasted implied volatilities and (II) forecasted actual (i.e. historical) volatilities. Specifically, we are interested in the properties of the accumulated P&L, insofar as we Δ-hedge, till expiry, a three-month call-option on the S&P500 index, initially purchased at-the-money. We investigate a total of 36 such portfolios over disjoint intervals between July 2004 and July 2013. This involves market data on both the underlying index and on options. Daily data on the S&P500 index are readily and freely available. For option data, we combine a 2004–2009 data-set from a major commercial bank‡ with more recent prices from OptionMetrics obtained via the Wharton Financial Database.

Whilst ATM call option prices straightforwardly are obtained from the data-set, the (forecasted) implied and actual volatilities require a bit of manipulation. In case of the former, we define the daily implied volatility, over the lifetime of 36 such portfolios over disjoint intervals between July 2004 and July 2013. This involves market data on both the underlying index and on options. Daily data on the S&P500 index are readily and freely available. For option data, we combine a 2004–2009 data-set from a major commercial bank‡ with more recent prices from OptionMetrics obtained via the Wharton Financial Database.

Whilst ATM call option prices straightforwardly are obtained from the data-set, the (forecasted) implied and actual volatilities require a bit of manipulation. In case of the former, we define the daily implied volatility, over the lifetime of the portfolio, as the ATM implied volatility of corresponding tenor obtained at the portfolio purchasing date (the resulting volatility process is illustrated by the black curve in figure 3). In case of the latter, we require a suitable volatility model fitted to historical data in order to predict the ‘actual’ volatility process. Specifically, we define the daily actual volatility, over the lifetime of the portfolio, as the conditional expectation of a volatility model which has been fitted to market data from the previous portfolio period. In this context, we observe that models with lognormal volatility dynamics generally have more empirical support than, say, Heston’s model. The Exponential General Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity model (EGARCH(1,1)) has proven particularly felicitous in the context of S&P 500 forecasting—a result we assume applies universally for each of the 36 portfolios investigated. Thus, we hold it to be the case that daily log returns, \( r_t \), can be modelled as \( r_t = \mu + \varepsilon_t \), where \( \mu \) is the mean return, and \( \varepsilon_t \) has the interpretation of a heteroskedastic error. In particular, \( \varepsilon_t \) is construed to be the product between a white noise process, \( \varepsilon_t \sim N(0, 1) \) and a daily standard deviation, \( \sigma_t \), which obeys the relation

\[
\log \sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \alpha_2 \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{t-1}}{\sigma_{t-1}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right) + \alpha_3 \varepsilon_{t-1},
\]

(23)

where \( \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \) and \( \alpha_3 \) are constants. The resulting volatility process is illustrated by the light grey curve in figure 3.

A few remarks on the estimated volatility processes are in order. First, we clearly see that volatility can change dramatically during the lifetime of a portfolio. We also see that implied volatility typically is higher than actual volatility. This often-reported result can be explained theoretically by the stochastic volatility having a market price of risk attached, see for instance Henderson et al. (2005). Finally, there is a clear negative correlation between stock returns and volatility during the financial turmoil which followed the Lehman default in September 2008. All in all, reality unsurprisingly turns out to be a bit more complicated than the set-up in Wilmott’s experiment. Still and all, do its main messages carry over? To test this, we perform a hedge experiment with the following design:

- For any given portfolio, we compute the daily implied volatilities \( \{\sigma_{imp, t}^2\}_{t=1}^{63} \) and the daily actual volatilities \( \{\sigma_{act, t}^2\}_{t=1}^{63} \) as outlined above. We assume there are 63 trading days over a three months period (labelled by \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, 63 \)) and let \( S_t, r_t \) denote the time \( t \) value of the index, interest rate and dividend yield.
- For each of the two hedging strategies \( x \in \{\sigma_{imp}, \sigma_{act}\} \) we do the following: If \( \sigma_{act, t} < \sigma_{imp, t} \) we short the call (\( \gamma = -1 \)); otherwise, we go along the call (\( \gamma = +1 \)) in accordance with the remark made in the section on Wilmott’s hedge experiment. Then, we set up the delta neutral portfolio \( \Pi_t = B_t - \gamma \Delta_{BS}^t(x_t)S_t + \gamma C^BS_{\sigma_{imp}}(\sigma_{act, t}) \) s.t. \( \Pi_t = 0 \), where \( \Delta_{BS}^t(x_t) \) is the well-known Black–Scholes delta.
- For \( t = 2, 3, \ldots, 63 \) we do the following: compute the time \( t \) value of the portfolio set up the previous day: \( \Pi_t = B_{t-1}\Delta_{BS}^{t-1}(x_{t-1})S_t + \gamma C_{\sigma_{imp}}^BS_{\sigma_{act, t}} \). The quantity \( q_{imp} = \gamma C_{\sigma_{imp}}^BS_{\sigma_{act, t}} \) defines the profit- & loss accrued over the interval \([t - 1, t]\). Next, we rebalance the portfolio such that it, once again, is delta-neutral, \( \Pi_t = B_t - \gamma \Delta_{BS}^t(x_t)S_t + \gamma C^BS_{\sigma_{imp}}(\sigma_{act, t}) \), where \( B_t \) is chosen in accordance with the self-financing condition: \( \Pi_t = \Pi_t \).
- Finally, at the option expiry, we compute the terminal P&L, as well as its lifetime quadratic variation, \( \sum_{t=1}^{63} |dP&L_t|^2 / 63 \).

The 36 hedge error (or R&L) paths and the distributions of the quadratic variation of the two methods are shown in figure 4. Table 1 reports descriptive statistics and statistical tests of various hypotheses.

First, we note (top panels figure 4) that even though implied volatility typically is above actual volatility, this far from creates arbitrage. Hedge errors for the two methods readily become negative. A primary explanation for this is the randomness of volatility. Our Δ-hedged strategy only makes us
Figure 3. The top grey curve is the S&P500 Index plotted from July 2004 to July 2013 [units on right hand axis]. The tic-dates on the time axis have deliberately been chosen to match the purchasing dates \( \{ t_i \}_{i=1}^{36} \) of the 36 delta-hedged portfolios under investigation (each of which is of three months’ duration). The light grey curve is the actual (stochastic) volatility estimated from a lognormal volatility model. Specifically, every time segment between purchasing dates \([ t_i, t_{i+1} )\) reflects a mean Monte Carlo simulated forecast based upon an E-GARCH(1,1) fitted to market data from the previous time segment \([ t_{i-1}, t_i )\). Finally, the black curve is the three-month ATM implied volatility. Specifically, every time segment between purchasing dates \([ t_i, t_{i+1} )\) is a static forecast based upon ATM implied volatility data from the purchasing date \( t_i \). Both volatility curves have their units on the left hand axis.

Figure 4. Panels (a) (actual) and (b) (implied) show the path-for-path hedge error behaviour for the 36 non-overlapping three-month hedges. Dotted paths correspond to cases where we initially take a long position in the option.

a profit if realized volatility ends up ‘on the right side’ of initial implied volatility. And that we don’t know for sure until after the hedging period is over; we have to base our decisions on forecasts; initial forecasts even, for the fundamental theorem to apply. Notice though that the averages for both hedge errors are significantly positive. This shows that there is a risk premium that can be picked up, most often by selling options and \( \Delta \)-hedging them. Because the hedge is not perfect, this compensation is anticipated. The question is, is it financially significant? In theory, the hedged portfolio has an initial cost of zero, so it is not obvious how to define a rate of return, but the initial option price would seem a reasonable (possibly conservative) benchmark for the collateral that would need to be posted on a hedged short call option position. From column three in table C1 the average option price is $49.2. Comparing this to the means (\( \sim 7.7 \); remember this is over a three-month horizon) and standard deviations (\( \sim 15.5 \); ditto) of the hedge errors in table 1 shows that the gains are also significant in economic terms. Put differently, the crude calculation \( (4 \cdot 7.7 - 0.02)/(\sqrt{4 \cdot 15.5}) \) gives annualized Sharpe-ratios around 1.

If we look just at the terminal hedge errors, then the difference in riskiness (as measured by standard deviation) between hedging with actual and hedging with implied volatility is in no way statistically significant (the \( p \)-value for equality of
The mean hedge error is statistically greater than zero (p-value = 1%) when we hedge with the actual vol. forecast.

The mean hedge error is statistically greater than zero (p-value = 1%) when we hedge with the implied vol. forecast.

We cannot reject the hypothesis that the standard deviations \(sd_{act} = sd_{imp}\) are equal (p-value = 55%).

The mean quadratic variation of the hedge error when we hedge with the actual vol. forecast is statistically less than the quadratic variation when we hedge with the implied vol. forecast (p-value = 1.4%).

### 5. Conclusion

In the world of finance, no issue is more pressing than that of hedging our risks, yet remarkably little attention has been paid to the risk brought about by the possibility that our models might be wrong. To remedy this deplorable situation, we have in this paper derived a meta-theorem that quantifies the P&L of a \(\Delta\)-hedged portfolio with an erroneous volatility specification. 

**Meta-** to the extent that one of the constituent parameters (the real volatility) is transcendental; yet, also a theorem with some very concrete ‘real world’ corollaries. For instance, a specific case was investigated in which the implied volatility gives rise to smooth (i.e. \(O(dr)\)) P&L-paths, whilst any other hedge volatility yields erratic (i.e. \(O(dW_t)\)) P&L-paths. In a somewhat quirkiest context, the Dupire–Gyöngy–Derman–Kani formula for volatility surface calibration was shown to be a corollary.

Whilst the theorem proved in section 2 is more general than the versions typically found in the literature, it does not go far enough. Extensive empirical support has been added to the case of discontinuities in the stock price process: thus, in the Gospel of the Jump we extended the Fundamental Theorem to include compound Poisson processes, which came with the revelation that jumps unambiguously hurt you when you try to hedge short put and call option positions.

One of the most conspicuous implications of the Fundamental Theorem is undoubtedly the apparent ease with which arbitrage can be made: e.g. in the constant parameter framework of Wilmott’s experiment, a free lunch is guaranteed insofar as we can establish \(\max(\sigma_r, \sigma_t)\) (in case of the former, we go long on the option—otherwise, we short it). Studying this strategy empirically, we find that the mean P&L indeed is in the positive; nonetheless, qua a significant dispersion the profit readily turns negative: the statistical arbitrage accordingly relies on us being willing to take some significant hits along the way. Indeed, this is without even factoring in the non-negligible role of transaction costs. On the other hand, there is strong evidence that hedging at the implied volatility does yield smoother P&L paths.

One final remark: this paper can be seen as an exhaustive exposition of which volatility to use when delta hedging. To keep the length manageable and the presentation self-contained we have ignored an aspect that is of both theoretical and practical importance. It can be posed thus: Which delta should I use? In models where the underlying and the volatility are correlated a strong case can be made for using the so-called risk-minimizing delta, which is in broad terms is the usual delta plus the (underlying, volatility)-correlation times the volatility of volatility times the Vega of the target option, see for instance Poulsen et al. (2009), Andreasen (2013), or Hull and White (2016). We leave the connection of this theory to the Fundamental Theorem of Derivative Trading, theoretically as well empirically, to future research.
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Appendix 1. Multi-dimensional jumps

In this section, we establish Girsanov’s Theorem and a pricing PDE for multi-dimensional jump-diffusion models. The equivalent results for 1-dimensional models are ubiquitous—see for instance Cont (2004), Privault (2013) or Runggaldier (2003).

A.1. The Radon–Nikodym derivative

**Theorem 3** A generalized Girsanov Theorem for jump-diffusion processes Let \( \{W_t\}_{t \in [0,T]} \) be a \( d \)-dimensional vector of independent Wiener processes on the filtered probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}_t)_{t \in [0,T]}\). One the same space, let \( \{Y_t\}_{t \in [0,T]} \) be a \( d \)-dimensional vector of independent compound Poisson processes, the \( i \)th component of which is

\[
Y^i_t = \sum_{k=1}^{N^i_t} Z^i_k,
\]

where \( N^i_t \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda^i_t) \), \( \lambda^i_t > 0 \) is an intensity parameter, and \( \{Z^i_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with jump distribution \( d\nu^i(x) \). Finally, let \( \{\phi_t\}_{t \in [0,T]} \) be a \( d \times d \)-dimensional Girsanov kernel (some bounded, adapted process), then the processes

\[
\left\{ W^Q_t := W_t - \int_0^t \phi_s \, ds \right\}_{t \in [0,T]}, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ Y^Q_t := Y_t - \int_0^t \lambda^Q_s \circ d\nu^Q_s \, dZ^Q_s \right\}_{t \in [0,T]}
\]

are martingales under the probability measure \( Q \) defined as

\[
dQ_{\phi, \lambda, \nu} \circ \nu = e^{\phi(W) - W(T)} \times e^{-\sum_{i=1}^d (\lambda^i - \lambda^i_T) \int_0^T \int_0^\infty \frac{d\nu^i_s}{\lambda^i_s} \, dW^Q_s} \prod_{i=1}^d \prod_{k=1}^{N^i_t} \frac{d\nu^i_s \, dZ^i_k}{\lambda^i_s \, dZ^Q_s},
\]

where \( e^{\phi(W) - W(T)} = e^{\int_0^T \phi_s \, ds} \bigg( W_T - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T |\phi_s|^2 \, ds \bigg) \) is the Doobian exponential with respect to \( W_t \), and we have defined \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_d) \), and \( \nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_d) \).

**Proof** The diffusion part is well known from Girsanov’s theorem and will not be treated here. Instead we will show that for any bounded measurable function \( f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \), the following equivalence obtains

\[
E^Q_{\phi, \lambda, \nu}[f(Y_T)] = E^\mathbb{P}[f(Y_T) \bigg| \mathcal{F}_T].
\]
for the defined measure \( \mathbb{Q} \). To this end, define \( Y^\nu_i \) as the vector \( Y_i \) with the upper limit of the summation, \( N^\nu_i \), replaced by some fixed number \( h^\nu_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) for all \( i \). Then the RHS can be written as

\[
e^{-\sum_{h=0}^{h^\nu_i} \lambda_i^\nu \tau_{hi} T} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i} \left[ f(Y^\nu_i) \prod_{i=1}^{d_i} \prod_{k=1}^{N^\nu_i} \frac{\lambda_i^\nu dY_{hi}^\nu(Z^\nu_{hi})}{\lambda_i \tilde{d}Y_{hi} (Z^\nu_{hi})} \right]
\]

\[
e^{-\sum_{h=0}^{h^\nu_i} \lambda_i^\nu \tau_{hi} T} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i} \left[ f(Y^\nu_i) \prod_{i=1}^{d_i} \prod_{k=1}^{N^\nu_i} \frac{\lambda_i^\nu dY_{hi}^\nu(Z^\nu_{hi})}{\lambda_i \tilde{d}Y_{hi} (Z^\nu_{hi})} \right] = e^{-\sum_{h=0}^{h^\nu_i} \lambda_i^\nu \tau_{hi} T} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i} \left[ f(Y^\nu_i) \right]
\]

\[
ev^{\nu}_i := e^{-\sum_{h=0}^{h^\nu_i} \lambda_i^\nu \tau_{hi} T} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i} \left[ f(Y^\nu_i) \right]
\]

**A.2. Measure changes in jump-diffusion dynamics**

To appreciate the gravity of this result, consider the jump-diffusion dynamics of the \( n \)-dimensional stock price process

\[
dX_t = D_{X_{t-}} \left[ \mu(t, X_t) \, dt + \sigma(t, X_t) \, dW_t \right] + D_X(t, X_{t-}) \, dY_t
\]

(A1)

where \( D_{X_{t-}} := \text{diag}(X_{1,t-}, X_{2,t-}, \ldots, X_{n,t-}) \), \( \mu : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \), \( \sigma : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_1} \), \( \theta : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \).

For the purposes of no-arbitrage pricing we want to determine the measure \( \mathbb{Q} \) such that the discounted process

\[
X^\nu_t := e^{-\sum_{h=0}^{h^\nu_t} \lambda_i^\nu \tau_{hi} T} X_t,
\]

is a martingale. From Itô’s lemma, it can easily be deduced that

\[
dX^\nu_t = D_{X^\nu_{t-}} \left[ \mu(t, X_t) \right] \, dt + \sigma(t, X_t) \, dW^\nu_t
\]

(A2)

almost everywhere. Needless to say, the infinite number of tuples which satisfies the no-arbitrage condition (A2) ruins our chances of establishing unique prices for financial derivatives depending on the underlying jump diffusion dynamics. This is obvious by recalling that the discounted price process of \( V \) also should be a martingale, whence:

\[
V(t, X_t) = E_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i} \left[ e^{-\sum_{h=0}^{h^\nu_t} \lambda_i^\nu \tau_{hi} T} g(X^\nu_t) \right],
\]

(A3)

where \( g(X^\nu_T) \) is the terminal pay-off.

**Appendix 2. PIDE methods**

**THEOREM 4** The Partial Integro-Differential Pricing Equation (PIDE)

\[
\text{Consider a jump-diffusion dynamics of the form (A1), and let } V_t = V(t, X_t) \text{ be a derivative the value of which is contingent upon it. Let } (\phi_i, \lambda^\nu, \nu^\nu_i, \xi^\nu_i) \text{ be a tuple such that the no-arbitrage condition (A2) is satisfied. Then}
\]

\[
dX_t = D_{X_{t-}} \left[ \mu(t, X_t) \, dt + \sigma(t, X_t) \, dW^\nu_t \right] + D_{X_{t-}} \left[ \theta(t, X_{t-}) \right] \, dY_t,
\]

and \( V_t = V(t, x) \) satisfies the PIDE

\[
r_t V_t = \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + r_t x \cdot \nabla_x V_t + \frac{1}{2} \sigma(T, x) D_x \nabla_x^2 V_t D_x \sigma(T, x) + \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{d_i} \lambda_i^\nu \left( V(t, x \circ (t + \theta_{i,j}(t, x) Z^\nu_{ij}) \right) - V(x) \right] - \left( D_x \theta(t, x) \right) \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \xi_{ij} \mathbb{I}_{Z^\nu_{ij}} \right] \cdot \nabla_x V(t, x),
\]

which by the law of total probability corresponds to the LHS, \( E_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i}[f(Y^\nu_T)] \) as desired. To show independence of increments under \( \mathbb{Q} \), let \( \xi_t = d\mathbb{Q}/dp(x) \), and let \( f \) and \( g \) be two bounded measurable functions. Suppose \( s < t \leq T \) then

\[
E_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i}[f(Y^\nu_s)g(Y^\nu_T - Y^\nu_s)] = E_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i}[f(Y^\nu_T)g(Y^\nu_T - Y^\nu_s)\xi_t] = E_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i}[f(Y^\nu_T)\xi_t] = E_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i}[f(Y^\nu_T)] \cdot E_{\mathbb{Q}, \nu_i}[g(Y^\nu_T - Y^\nu_s)].
\]
Suppose a jump occurs in the $i$th component of the compound Poisson process $Y_t^i = Y_t^{i,-} + Z_t^i$. From the governing dynamics (A1), this means that the stock price process jumps by $\Delta X_t^i = X_{t^-} + (\theta_{t,-}(t, X_{t^-}) Z_t^i)$. Defining the continuous SDE

$$dX_t^i := D_{X_t^i} [r_t dt + \sigma(t, X_t) dW_t^Q] - D_{X_{t-}} \theta(t, X_{t-}) \lambda^Q \circ \mathbb{E}_0[Z^i_1] dt,$$

we find by Itô’s lemma,

$$dV(t, X_t) = \partial_t V(t, X_t) dt + \nabla_x V(t, X_t) \cdot dX_t^i + \frac{1}{2} \tr [\sigma(t, X_t) D_{X_t} \nabla_x^2 V(t, X_t) \sigma(t, X_t)] dt$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^Q_i \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \left( V(t, x) - \mathbb{E}_0[V(t, x) | Z^i_1] \right) dt \right]$$

where $\nabla_x$ is the gradient operator; $\nabla_x^2$ is the Hessian operator, $r := (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\theta_{t,-}(t, x)$ denotes the $i$th column of the matrix $\theta(t, x)$. Particularly, when $n = d$ and $\theta$ is the identity matrix then

$$r_t V_t = \partial_t V_t + r_t x \cdot \nabla_x V_t + \frac{1}{2} \tr [\sigma(t, x) D_x \nabla_x^2 V(t, x) D_x \sigma(t, x)]$$

where $\hat{e}_i$ is a unit vector in the $i$th direction.

**Proof.** Suppose a jump occurs in the $i$th component of the compound Poisson process $Y_t^i = Y_t^{i,-} + Z_t^i$. From the governing dynamics (A1), this means that the stock price process jumps by $\Delta X_t^i = X_{t^-} + (1 + \theta_{t,-}(t, X_{t^-}) Z_t^i)$. Defining the continuous SDE

$$dX_t^i := D_{X_t^i} [r_t dt + \sigma(t, X_t) dW_t^Q] - D_{X_{t-}} \theta(t, X_{t-}) \lambda^Q \circ \mathbb{E}_0[Z^i_1] dt,$$

we find by Itô’s lemma,

$$dV(t, X_t) = \partial_t V(t, X_t) dt + \nabla_x V(t, X_t) \cdot dX_t^i + \frac{1}{2} \tr [\sigma(t, X_t) D_{X_t} \nabla_x^2 V(t, X_t) \sigma(t, X_t)] dt$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^Q_i \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \left( V(t, x) - \mathbb{E}_0[V(t, x) | Z^i_1] \right) dt \right]$$

Under $\mathbb{Q}$, the expectations of the diffusion term and the compensated jump terms (the last three lines) vanish. Furthermore, since

$$V_t^+ := e^{-\int_0^t r_u du} V(t, X_t),$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}$ martingale; $dV_t^+$ should be driftless. These facts jointly imply that

$$- r_t V(t, X_t) + \partial_t V(t, X_t) + r_t D_{X_t} \cdot \nabla_x V(t, X_t)$$

$$- \nabla_x V(t, X_t) \cdot (D_{X_{t-}} \theta(t, X_{t-}) \lambda^Q \circ \mathbb{E}_0[Z^i_1])$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \tr [\sigma(t, X_t) D_{X_t} \nabla_x^2 V(t, X_t) \sigma(t, X_t)]$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^Q_i \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \left( V(t, x) - \mathbb{E}_0[V(t, x) | Z^i_1] \right) dt \right]$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^Q_i \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \left( V(t, x) - \mathbb{E}_0[V(t, x) | Z^i_1] \right) dt \right]$$

$$= \partial_t V(t, X_t) + \nabla_x V(t, X_t) \cdot (D_{X_t} \theta(t, X_t) \lambda^Q \circ \mathbb{E}_0[Z^i_1])$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \tr [\sigma(t, X_t) D_{X_t} \nabla_x^2 V(t, X_t) \sigma(t, X_t)]$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^Q_i \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \left( V(t, x) - \mathbb{E}_0[V(t, x) | Z^i_1] \right) dt \right]$$

which essentially is what we wanted to show. \(\square\)
### Appendix 3. Data

Table C1. The first column lists the purchasing dates of the 36 contracts. Column two shows the ATM strikes at which the contracts are purchased and column three show the prices at which this happens. The fourth column gives the terminal P&L for each contract, when the hedge is performed with an 'actual' (EGARCH(1,1)) volatility forecast. Column five likewise but when the hedge is with the implied volatilities. Finally, columns six and seven give the quadratic variation, defined as $\sum_{i=1}^{N} |dP&L_i|^2/N$, where $N = 63$ is the number of trading days, for the entire actual and implied paths, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>ATM strike</th>
<th>Option price</th>
<th>$P&amp;L_{T}^{\text{actual}}$</th>
<th>$P&amp;L_{T}^{\text{implied}}$</th>
<th>Q.V. actual</th>
<th>Q.V. implied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-Jul-2004</td>
<td>1118.3</td>
<td>36.5852</td>
<td>12.2045</td>
<td>15.1591</td>
<td>0.5269</td>
<td>0.2615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Oct-2004</td>
<td>1134.5</td>
<td>33.0392</td>
<td>5.8372</td>
<td>5.0520</td>
<td>0.1683</td>
<td>0.1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Jan-2005</td>
<td>1183.7</td>
<td>34.7050</td>
<td>11.4080</td>
<td>13.6705</td>
<td>0.1975</td>
<td>0.1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Apr-2005</td>
<td>1184.1</td>
<td>34.9985</td>
<td>7.3072</td>
<td>9.0917</td>
<td>0.3162</td>
<td>0.1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Jul-2005</td>
<td>1194.9</td>
<td>34.4864</td>
<td>11.9818</td>
<td>10.5282</td>
<td>0.2974</td>
<td>0.0894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-Oct-2005</td>
<td>1214.5</td>
<td>37.8141</td>
<td>7.2779</td>
<td>7.4261</td>
<td>0.5384</td>
<td>0.1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Jan-2006</td>
<td>1285.4</td>
<td>37.1621</td>
<td>12.6952</td>
<td>12.4934</td>
<td>0.1539</td>
<td>0.1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Apr-2006</td>
<td>1295.5</td>
<td>38.2703</td>
<td>0.0765</td>
<td>0.5022</td>
<td>0.2827</td>
<td>0.2444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Jul-2006</td>
<td>1265.5</td>
<td>45.5356</td>
<td>15.3714</td>
<td>13.7452</td>
<td>0.3655</td>
<td>0.1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Oct-2006</td>
<td>1353.2</td>
<td>42.7682</td>
<td>12.6179</td>
<td>12.6400</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.0945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-Jan-2007</td>
<td>1412.8</td>
<td>45.4682</td>
<td>5.0096</td>
<td>2.1741</td>
<td>2.4476</td>
<td>1.0569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Apr-2007</td>
<td>1444.6</td>
<td>47.0689</td>
<td>19.4885</td>
<td>7.4564</td>
<td>0.7699</td>
<td>0.0865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jul-2007</td>
<td>1531.8</td>
<td>55.8378</td>
<td>11.9476</td>
<td>7.5524</td>
<td>1.8603</td>
<td>1.1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Oct-2007</td>
<td>1557.6</td>
<td>63.1625</td>
<td>1.6451</td>
<td>1.2115</td>
<td>1.2330</td>
<td>0.4542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jan-2008</td>
<td>1409.1</td>
<td>74.2874</td>
<td>9.6117</td>
<td>9.6158</td>
<td>1.1975</td>
<td>0.6555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Apr-2008</td>
<td>1354.5</td>
<td>66.2276</td>
<td>17.3617</td>
<td>19.0049</td>
<td>0.8019</td>
<td>0.6270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jul-2008</td>
<td>1244.7</td>
<td>62.8179</td>
<td>56.9636</td>
<td>47.0345</td>
<td>8.0872</td>
<td>10.4193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Oct-2008</td>
<td>996.2</td>
<td>83.8510</td>
<td>55.3847</td>
<td>51.8900</td>
<td>9.7721</td>
<td>6.1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jan-2009</td>
<td>890.3</td>
<td>69.9489</td>
<td>14.1892</td>
<td>3.2637</td>
<td>3.0947</td>
<td>0.4083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Apr-2009</td>
<td>856.6</td>
<td>62.9702</td>
<td>30.2400</td>
<td>27.2551</td>
<td>0.5701</td>
<td>0.4336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jul-2009</td>
<td>882.7</td>
<td>49.8464</td>
<td>12.4499</td>
<td>9.8467</td>
<td>0.1245</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Oct-2009</td>
<td>1057.6</td>
<td>49.0640</td>
<td>17.0496</td>
<td>18.0507</td>
<td>0.2944</td>
<td>0.2135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Jan-2010</td>
<td>1141.7</td>
<td>42.2410</td>
<td>16.4989</td>
<td>16.4106</td>
<td>0.2595</td>
<td>0.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Apr-2010</td>
<td>1194.4</td>
<td>36.6784</td>
<td>10.3121</td>
<td>9.5031</td>
<td>0.5463</td>
<td>0.5578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jul-2010</td>
<td>1078.0</td>
<td>52.2001</td>
<td>15.6833</td>
<td>17.6455</td>
<td>3.0501</td>
<td>0.3326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Oct-2010</td>
<td>1158.1</td>
<td>50.6050</td>
<td>20.7394</td>
<td>19.8607</td>
<td>0.1926</td>
<td>0.2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Jan-2011</td>
<td>1273.8</td>
<td>43.6970</td>
<td>9.4015</td>
<td>11.7384</td>
<td>0.3762</td>
<td>0.2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Apr-2011</td>
<td>1335.3</td>
<td>44.7866</td>
<td>13.3942</td>
<td>13.8116</td>
<td>0.3490</td>
<td>0.3055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-Jul-2011</td>
<td>1343.8</td>
<td>43.0900</td>
<td>3.8722</td>
<td>3.8883</td>
<td>0.1692</td>
<td>0.3196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Oct-2011</td>
<td>1165.0</td>
<td>73.4417</td>
<td>14.3245</td>
<td>16.8015</td>
<td>0.8601</td>
<td>0.7112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Jan-2012</td>
<td>1277.8</td>
<td>53.9770</td>
<td>17.4158</td>
<td>21.6739</td>
<td>0.3472</td>
<td>0.1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Apr-2012</td>
<td>1382.2</td>
<td>48.9735</td>
<td>9.7517</td>
<td>9.9641</td>
<td>0.4760</td>
<td>0.4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jul-2012</td>
<td>1352.5</td>
<td>47.5814</td>
<td>15.8417</td>
<td>15.4475</td>
<td>0.3181</td>
<td>0.3184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Oct-2012</td>
<td>1460.9</td>
<td>42.9608</td>
<td>11.2648</td>
<td>9.0422</td>
<td>3.0925</td>
<td>0.8156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Jan-2013</td>
<td>1461.0</td>
<td>43.7355</td>
<td>17.6935</td>
<td>14.7094</td>
<td>0.2747</td>
<td>0.1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Apr-2013</td>
<td>1593.4</td>
<td>39.2535</td>
<td>9.4000</td>
<td>6.6261</td>
<td>1.0037</td>
<td>0.7546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>