




A copula-based approach for generating lattices

Tianyang Wang¹  · James S. Dyer² ·
Warren J. Hahn³

© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2015

Abstract Discrete approximations such as binomial and trinomial lattices have been developed to model the intertemporal dynamics of variables in a way that also allows contingent decisions to be included at the appropriate increments in time. In this paper we present an approach for developing these types of models based on copulas. In addition to ease of implementation, a primary benefit of this approach is its generality, and we show that various binomial and trinomial approximation methods for valuing contingent claim securities in the literature are special cases of this approach, each based on a choice of a particular set of probability and/or branching parameters. Because this approach encompasses these and other cases as feasible solutions, we also show how it can be used to optimize the construction of lattices so that discretization error is minimized, and we demonstrate its application for an option pricing example.

Keywords Stochastic processes · Discrete models · Option pricing · Copulas

✉ Tianyang Wang
Tianyang.Wang@business.colostate.edu

James S. Dyer
Jim.Dyer@mcombs.utexas.edu

Warren J. Hahn
Joe.Hahn@mcombs.utexas.edu

¹ Department of Finance and Real Estate, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

² Department of Information, Risk, and Operations Management, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA

³ Department of Finance, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA



1 Introduction

Many types of dynamic optimization problems are constructed over an underlying model of an uncertain state variable stochastic process, such as problems related to the valuation of financial options. Various approaches to modeling stochastic process in continuous time have been developed and implemented, such as the partial differential equation approach based on extensions of the classic work of [Black and Scholes \(1973\)](#). Our focus in this paper, however, is on lattice- or tree-based methods that provide a discrete approximation of the stochastic process. Lattice-based methods are well established as a tool for option valuation and other applications because of their robustness to a wide variety of contingent decisions, their ease of implementation and their intuitive appeal.

Several approaches have been developed for constructing a discrete approximation of an underlying stochastic process. The first example of this approach was a binomial lattice model that converges weakly to a geometric Brownian motion diffusion process, or GBM ([Cox et al. 1979](#)) (hereafter, CRR). This binomial model can be used to accurately approximate solutions from the Black–Scholes–Merton (hereafter, BSM) continuous-time option valuation model, but it can also be used to solve for the value of early-exercise American options, whereas the BSM model can only value European options. Various extensions to the original CRR binomial model have been proposed, including contributions by [Jarrow and Rudd \(1983\)](#), [Tian \(1993, 1999\)](#), [Chen and Yang \(1999\)](#), [Hilliard and Schwartz \(2005\)](#), and [Chung and Shih \(2007\)](#). The motivations for these subsequent lattice models are improving the rate of convergence or generalizing the model for more complex stochastic processes or pricing more complex derivatives.

Trinomial lattice methods have also been proposed as a generalization of binomial lattice models, and to improve approximation accuracy. Examples include models proposed by [Boyle \(1988\)](#), [Omberg \(1988\)](#), [Parkinson \(1977\)](#), [Derman et al. \(1996\)](#), [Clewlow and Strickland \(1998\)](#), [Figlewski and Gao \(1999\)](#), and [Hull \(2006\)](#). Some recent articles that include applications of lattice models are [Baule and Wilkens \(2004\)](#), [Broadie and Kaya \(2007\)](#), [Ji and Brorsen \(2011\)](#), [Costabile et al. \(2011\)](#), and [Ji and Brorsen \(2011\)](#).

While binomial lattices are generally considered to be simpler conceptually, trinomial lattices are computationally more flexible because the asset price in a trinomial tree moves in three directions compared with only two for a binomial lattice. As a result the number of time-steps in the time horizon can be reduced in a trinomial lattice to attain the same accuracy obtained by a binomial lattice ([Widdicks et al. 2002](#)). Furthermore, trinomial lattice methods can also be viewed as an explicit finite difference method, which offers considerable flexibility in the choices of grids for the time and space dimensions, and is useful for dealing with discrete dividends, barriers, and other common features ([Hull 2006](#); [Broadie and Detemple 2004](#); [Barone-Adesi et al. 2008](#)). Recent articles that include applications of lattice models for contingent claim asset pricing are [Bizid and Jouini \(2005\)](#), [Chambers and Lu \(2007\)](#), [Jabbour et al. \(2010\)](#), and [Dumas and Lyasoff \(2012\)](#).

The basic objective of a lattice- or tree-based method is to use discrete-time and discrete-state increments to approximate a continuous stochastic differential equation, with the accuracy of the approximation governed by the length of the time increment

59 and with convergence to the continuous process guaranteed as the time increment
60 in the discrete model approaches zero. Convergence is typically established through
61 the use of a specification of state space increments and branching probabilities in the
62 discrete model that is derived by matching the moments of the discrete process with
63 the moments of the continuous process. The literature has focused on discretization
64 of the underlying variable, such as an asset price or the log-transformed underlying
65 variable, to construct the binomial or trinomial model.

66 Our framework is in the same spirit; however, we break down the approximation
67 a step further and focus on the discretization of the Wiener process, or the standard
68 Brownian motion component, of the underlying GBM stochastic process. We believe
69 that this new approach to the construction of lattices provides an important synthesis
70 of previous work that offers conceptual and practical value regarding increased
71 transparency for this important family of computational tools. The approach leads to
72 contributions in three areas. First, this is the first work to construct a binomial or trinomial
73 lattice model based on copulas, a technique which allows a GBM to be represented
74 as a series of dependent discrete probability distributions (Wang and Dyer 2012) so that
75 lattices can be constructed in a more flexible manner than with the existing methods.
76 Second, we show that this flexible approach is very general, and that it encompasses
77 many of the various binomial and trinomial tree methods in the literature as special
78 cases determined by the choices of particular sets of parameters. Third, we demonstrate
79 how the generality of this approach allows lattice construction to be optimized,
80 which expands the modeling possibilities beyond the discrete set of existing methods,
81 including those mentioned above. This eliminates the need for an a-priori choice or
82 a trial-and-error selection of a modeling method, and also supports improved computational
83 efficiency, because tree or lattice construction can be specified under defined
84 criteria, such as fit to the continuous distribution implied by the stochastic process.

85 We do acknowledge that there may be other motivations for choosing the parameters
86 of a trinomial tree or lattice that are not included within this framework, and do not
87 claim that every useful approximation will be a special case of our general approach.
88 Nevertheless, this framework does provide a unifying theory that includes many of
89 the most popular trinomial trees in the literature, that can be made into a standard
90 algorithm which is intuitive and easy to program, and that may also enhance the
91 abilities of students and practitioners to understand the common threads among many
92 of the different models that have been proposed and implemented.

93 The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Sect. 2, we review the two basic
94 types of discrete approximations, both of which we will generalize in this paper.
95 In Sect. 3, we present the general copulas-based lattice framework and discuss its
96 relationship with various binomial and trinomial tree methods in the literature. In
97 Sect. 4 we present numerical examples to illustrate the generality of the proposed
98 lattice method and show how it can be optimized under two different criteria. In
99 Sect. 5 we conclude the paper and discuss future research.

100 2 Basic types of discrete approximations

101 For a given probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , we consider an asset with price $S(t)$ that
102 follows a GBM:

$$\frac{dS(t)}{S(t)} = (r - \delta)dt + \sigma dW(t),$$

where r is the interest rate, δ is the dividend yield, σ is the volatility of the asset price process, and $dW(t)$ represents a Wiener process, $W(t) \sim N(0, t)$, at time t . Given this process, there are generally two choices for constructing a discrete approximation: (1) model $S(t)$ directly, and (2) model the log of $S(t)$.

2.1 Discretization of GBM for $S(t)$

The approximation developed by Boyle (1988) is an example of a discretized description of a GBM for the asset price $S(t)$. This method uses a trinomial framework, which was intended to improve upon binomial approaches, to model an underlying asset price as a recombining tree, where the price at each node has three possible paths: up, down or a stationary middle path.

The endpoint values for each path are found by multiplying the starting value in the node by the appropriate factor: u , d or m . Given the common assumption that $m = 1$, the endpoint values are $S_u = Su$, $S_m = S$, $S_d = Sd$. The corresponding probabilities of reaching those endpoints are derived by matching the first two moments of the continuous distribution of the given GBM and requiring that they sum to one:

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 + p_2 + p_3 &= 1 \\ p_1 Sd + p_2 S + p_3 Su &= S e^{(r-\delta)\Delta t} \\ p_1 (Sd)^2 + p_2 S^2 + p_3 (Su)^2 &= S^2 e^{(r-\delta)^2 \Delta t^2} \left(e^{\sigma^2 \Delta t} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $u = e^{\lambda\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}$, $m = 1$, and $d = e^{-\lambda\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}} = \frac{1}{u}$ so that the structure is recombining, and solving the above system of three equations yields the three branching probabilities:

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} - \frac{\nu\sqrt{\Delta t}}{2\lambda\sigma}; \quad p_2 = 1 - \frac{1}{\lambda^2}; \quad p_3 = \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} + \frac{\nu\sqrt{\Delta t}}{2\lambda\sigma},$$

where $\nu = r - \delta - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2$ and λ is greater than 1. By using different values of λ , a range of values of u may be obtained. The parameter λ can be used to adjust a particular asset node to a convenient level; e.g., to coincide with a strike or barrier in an option valuation problem. As an example, Hull (2006) specifies a value $\lambda = \sqrt{3}$ so that $u = e^{\sigma\sqrt{3\Delta t}}$, $m = 1$, $d = e^{-\sigma\sqrt{3\Delta t}} = \frac{1}{u}$ and

$$p_1 = -\sqrt{\frac{\Delta t}{12\sigma^2}}\nu + \frac{1}{6}; \quad p_2 = \frac{2}{3}; \quad p_3 = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta t}{12\sigma^2}}\nu + \frac{1}{6}.$$

2.2 Discretization of $\ln(S(t))$

If $S(t)$ follows the GBM described above, Ito's lemma can be applied to obtain the process for $x(t) = \ln(S(t))$: $\frac{dx(t)}{x(t)} = \nu dt + \sigma dW(t)$. Therefore, the natural log-

135 arithm of $S(t)$ is normally distributed with the following parameters: $\ln(S(t)) \sim$
 136 $N(\ln(S(0)) + vt, \sigma^2 t)$.

137 As an alternative to the approximation scheme discussed above, a trinomial approx-
 138 imation to $n(S(t))$ can be constructed. An example of this approach is the trinomial
 139 lattice model proposed by Clewlow and Strickland (1998). In this model, over a small
 140 time increment Δt , the log of asset price can go down by Δx (the state variable incre-
 141 ment), stay the same, or go up by Δx , with probabilities $p_1, p_2,$ and p_3 respectively.

142 The drift and volatility parameters of the continuous time process in this devel-
 143 opment are captured by $\Delta x, p_1, p_2,$ and p_3 . The increment Δx cannot be chosen
 144 independently and was specified in this case as $\Delta x = \sigma\sqrt{3\Delta t}$. As in the previous
 145 example, the relationship between the parameters of the continuous time process and
 146 the discrete trinomial approximation are obtained by matching the first two moments
 147 of x and requiring that the probabilities sum to one. Solving these equations yields:

$$148 \quad p_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \Delta t + v^2 \Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2} - \frac{v \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right); \quad p_2 = 1 - \frac{\sigma^2 \Delta t + v^2 \Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2};$$

$$149 \quad p_3 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \Delta t + v^2 \Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{v \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right).$$

150 3 A general trinomial discretization approach

151 Given these two types of basic discretization approaches, we propose a general dis-
 152 cretization scheme for modeling a GBM process. We will show that this scheme
 153 includes various binomial and trinomial tree methods in the literature as special cases
 154 with particular specifications of the parameters of this model.

155 Our approach to modeling the process for a variable $S(t)$ can use the form $S(t) =$
 156 $S(0) e^{vt + \sigma W(t)}$ or the form $x(t) = \ln(S(t)) = \ln(S(0)) + vt + \sigma W(t)$, and starts
 157 with the Wiener process term $W(t) \sim N(0, t)$. This approach is justified by the
 158 following Theorem.

159 **Theorem 1** *A trinomial lattice constructed by moment matching of the GBM or log*
 160 *transformed GBM is equivalent to moment matching of the underlying Wiener process.*

161 *a. The moments of the asset price $S(t)$ are a function of the corresponding moments*
 162 *of the Wiener process:*

$$163 \quad E(S(t)^n) = S(0)^n e^{vtn} \times (M_{W(t)}(z))^{\sigma^2},$$

164 *where $M_{W(t)}(z)$ is the moment generating function of $W(t)$.*

165 *b. The moments of the log transformed asset price $x(t) = \ln(S(t))$ are a function*
 166 *of the corresponding moments of the Wiener process:*

$$167 \quad E(x(t)^n) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt]^n + \sigma^n E((W(t))^n).$$

168 The proof of this Theorem is provided in ‘‘Appendix 1’’.

This theorem suggests the following strategy for constructing a trinomial lattice. If the discrete approximation of the Wiener process is constructed so that the first n moments are matched in a trinomial lattice, then a trinomial lattice can be constructed to match the corresponding first n moments for the process for $S(t)$ or the log-transformed process $x(t) = \ln(S(t))$.

We now discuss the details of how to construct a trinomial lattice for a Wiener process which we represent by $(W_{t_1}, \dots, W_{t_n})$ where $W_{t_i}, i \in (1, \dots, n)$ represents the lattice representation of the distribution of the Wiener process in period i . Since this process is auto-correlated, the covariance matrix for any discrete times t_i and $t_j, 0 < t_i < t_j < T$ is $Cov(W_{t_i}, W_{t_j}) = t_i$. As shown by Glasserman (2003), the covariance matrix C of $(W_{t_1}, \dots, W_{t_n})$ is then defined by $C_{i,j} = \min(t_i, t_j)$. The correlation matrix Σ of $(W_{t_1}, \dots, W_{t_n})$ is therefore $\Sigma_{i,j} = \frac{\min(t_i, t_j)}{\sqrt{t_i} \sqrt{t_j}}$.

The vector $(W_{t_1}, \dots, W_{t_n})$ has the distribution $N(0, C)$, so the Wiener process can be constructed as a multivariate normal distribution. We do this by utilizing multivariate normal copulas, $C_N(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \Phi_\Sigma(\Phi^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \Phi^{-1}(u_n))$, where u_1, \dots, u_n are simple uniform variables on $[0,1]$ and Φ is the Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) of a standard normal distribution. These copulas are convenient, since they define the underlying dependency structure of the multivariate normal distribution in terms of a Pearson product moment correlation matrix Σ .

This approach can be implemented through the normal-copula based dependent tree method (Wang and Dyer 2012) which uses the unified underlying normal copula with the uniform variables as an auxiliary step for transforming arbitrary marginal distributions, and then transforms the underlying copulas into a desired decision tree model. The uniform variables associated with the normal copula based dependent tree are:

$$u_i = \Phi\left(A_{i1}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + \dots + A_{i(i-1)}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_{i-1}) + A_{i(i)}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i)\right),$$

where A_{ij} is the element of the Cholesky factorization that decomposes the covariance matrix Σ as $\Sigma = AA^T$ to give the lower triangular matrix $A = (A_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ and α_i is the percentile of the conditional distribution $X_i|X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}$.

For $\Sigma_{i,j} = \frac{\min(t_i, t_j)}{\sqrt{t_i} \sqrt{t_j}}$, the Cholesky factor is given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_1}} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_2}} & \frac{\sqrt{t_2-t_1}}{\sqrt{t_2}} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_n}} & \frac{\sqrt{t_2-t_1}}{\sqrt{t_n}} & \dots & \frac{\sqrt{t_n-t_{n-1}}}{\sqrt{t_n}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Using the same time increment in the trinomial tree structure, $\sqrt{t_1} = \sqrt{t_i - t_{i-1}} = \sqrt{t_j - t_{j-1}} = \Delta t$ for all i, j , the Cholesky decomposition A of the Wiener process has a special structure: the decomposition factor will be a constant $\frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_i}}$ for each row. This special feature can be used in constructing the trinomial lattice of the Wiener process.




Fig. 1 Two step discretization of Wiener process

204 Implementing the Cholesky decomposition using the uniform variables formula
 205 gives the following expression for the underlying uniform variables:

$$206 \quad u_i = \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_i}} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + \dots + \frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_i}} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_{i-1}) + \frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_i}} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \right).$$

207 Applying the marginal transformation ($W_{t_i} \sim N(0, t_i)$) to the underlying uniform
 208 variables u_i results in the following representation of the Wiener process:

$$209 \quad W_{t_i} = \sqrt{t_i} \Phi^{-1}(u_i) = \sqrt{t_i} \frac{\sqrt{t_1}}{\sqrt{t_i}} \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + \dots + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_{i-1}) + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \right)$$

$$210 \quad = \sqrt{t_1} \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + \dots + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_{i-1}) + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \right).$$

211 This discretization is illustrated in Fig. 1.

212 In this structure, $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1$, and the combination of $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ and $p_1, p_2,$
 213 p_3 should be selected to represent a good discretization of a normal distribution by
 214 matching the first two moments for example.

215 This tree structure could be naturally extended to include W_{t_2} , the Wiener process
 216 for time increment 2, as shown in Fig. 1. Because the dependent tree structure is a
 217 sequence of conditional probability distributions of W_{t_1} and W_{t_2} , it grows in a non-
 218 recombining manner with 3 branches of W_{t_2} for each realization of W_{t_1} . Therefore,
 219 there are a total of 9 branches for W_{t_2} with the endpoint values calculated as shown
 220 in Equations (1) to (9) in Fig. 1. However, because of the special structure of the
 221 Cholesky decomposition of the Wiener process, some of the branches are automati-
 222 cally recombining; i.e. (2)=(4), (3)=(7), and (6)=(8). Thus, the tree structure will
 223 become a trinomial lattice if the missing link is also connected, (3)=(5)=(7), as shown

224 in the following equation $\sqrt{t_1}(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + (\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3))) = \sqrt{t_1}(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) + (\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2)))$
 225 which implies that:

$$2\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) = \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3). \quad (10)$$

227 The conditional distribution of W_{t_2} is just a normal distribution conditional on the
 228 realization of W_{t_1} . The combination of $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ and p_1, p_2, p_3 are selected for W_{t_2} to
 229 provide a good discretization of a standard normal distribution, which is the same
 230 requirement for W_{t_1} , namely:

$$231 \quad p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1 \quad (11)$$

$$232 \quad p_1\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + p_2\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) + p_3\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) = 0 \quad (12)$$

$$233 \quad p_1\left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1)\right)^2 + p_2\left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2)\right)^2 + p_3\left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3)\right)^2 = 1 \quad (13)$$

$$234 \quad 2\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) = \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3). \quad (14)$$

235 This specification includes four equations and six variables, which leaves two
 236 degrees of freedom for choosing the parameters. This also implies that there are infi-
 237 nitely many choices of six parameters to approximate the Wiener process using the
 238 trinomial lattice model. It is possible to make a unique choice from six parameters if
 239 restrictions are added. Many existing trinomial lattice approaches are specific cases
 240 of this general framework distinguished by the strategies for imposing restrictions on
 241 the values of these parameters.

242 While the approach in this paper is built on Wang and Dyer (2012) and both
 243 approaches are based on the use of copulas to capture dependence, it is important
 244 to highlight the differences between these two methods. First, the approach in Wang
 245 and Dyer (2012) is developed in a non-recombining tree structure for dependent con-
 246 tinuous uncertainties and therefore is subject to the curse of dimensionality, as the tree
 247 size will grow exponentially with the number of uncertainties. In this paper, we develop
 248 and prove certain conditions for constructing a recombining tree/lattice which signif-
 249 icantly extends the Wang and Dyer (2012) approach and improves its efficiency when
 250 the underlying uncertainty follows a GBM stochastic process. Second, the approach
 251 in Wang and Dyer (2012) relies on the arbitrary choice of a discretization method for
 252 each continuous uncertainty, such as extended Pearson–Tukey (EPT) method (Keefer
 253 and Bodily 1983), to choose the conditional percentile and conditional probabilities. In
 254 this work we develop the functional relationships between the conditioning percentiles
 255 and the conditional probabilities to match the moments of the underlying uncertainties.
 256 Finally, the Wang and Dyer (2012) approach was not developed to choose among alter-
 257 native discretization models, whereas in this paper we demonstrate how our approach
 258 allows a lattice construction to be optimized to minimize the error in both the option
 259 price and the Greeks, which enhances the modeling possibilities.

260 3.1 Symmetric Wiener lattice

261 If we impose the restriction that the tree structure for the Wiener process is symmetric,
 262 since the normal distribution is symmetric, then

263
$$\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) = -\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3). \tag{15}$$

264 In that case, $2\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) = \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) = 0$, therefore

265
$$\alpha_1 = 1 - \alpha_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 = 0.5. \tag{16}$$

266 Substituting these values into Eqs. (12) and (13) gives the following branching probabilities:
267

268
$$p_1 = p_3, \quad \text{and} \quad p_1 = \frac{1}{2(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1))^2}. \tag{17}$$

269 Since $p_2 \geq 0$, $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{2(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1))^2} \leq 0.5$, which implies $\alpha_1 \leq \Phi(-1) = 0.1587$
270 to guarantee positive probabilities. Using these parameters, the constructed trinomial
271 tree for a Wiener process is recombining, symmetric and centered at 0, and could be
272 written as a recombining trinomial lattice.

273 Now, let $W_{i,j}$ denote the value of the Wiener process in period (column) i and
274 state (row) j , $i = 0, \dots, n$, $j = 0, \dots, 2i + 1$, ($j = 0$ is the lowest state). Then
275 $W_{i,1} = iW_{1,1}$, and

276
$$W_{i,j} = \begin{cases} W_{i,j-1} & j \leq 2i \\ 0 & j = 2i + 1 \\ -W_{i,2(i+1)-j} & j > 2i + 1 \end{cases}$$


277 As a result, the calculations in the trinomial tree or lattice are greatly simplified,
278 because only $W_{1,1}$ the first node in period 1 of the tree, must be calculated, and the rest
279 of the tree is simply some multiple of this value. This approach has the computational
280 advantage of maintaining a symmetric structure for the Wiener tree through time, so
281 the number of distinct Wiener process levels is linear in the number of time increments,
282 t . This is due to the up and down moves leading back to the same level. The two period
283 case is illustrated in Fig. 2.

284 Equations (16) and (17) imply that there is a unique solution for all six parameters
285 given the specification of either α_1 or p_1 . This symmetric Wiener tree has the advantage
286 that the probabilities are always constant regardless of the values of the drift and the
287 volatility and the number of time increments.

288 We now show some popular discretizations from the literature that are special
289 cases of this general framework in Table 1. The first two cases (3.1.1 and 3.1.2) are
290 simple three-point discretizations of the normal distribution that have appeared in the
291 literature. These two discretizations follow immediately from specifying α_1 and from
292 the use of Eqs. (16) and (17).

293 However, neither of these two discrete approximation methods was developed to
294 match higher (i.e., beyond first and second) moments of the normal distribution. If
295 the following two restrictions are added to match the third and fourth moments of the
296 normal distribution;

Fig. 2 Symmetric discretization as a function of $W_{1,1}$



297
$$p_1 \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right)^3 + p_2 \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right)^3 + p_3 \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right)^3 = 0 \quad (18)$$

298
$$p_1 \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right)^4 + p_2 \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right)^4 + p_3 \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right)^4 = 3, \quad (19)$$

299 then there is a unique solution set for the parameters in case 3.1.3 in Table 1:
 300 $\alpha_1 = \Phi(-\sqrt{3})$, $\alpha_2 = 0.5$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi(\sqrt{3})$, $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{6}$, and $p_2 = \frac{2}{3}$. These
 301 parameter values are used for the trinomial lattice methods proposed by [Omberg](#)
 302 [\(1988\)](#), [Figlewski and Gao \(1999\)](#) and [Derman et al. \(1996\)](#). Subsequently, [Bickel](#)
 303 [et al. \(2011\)](#) have shown that this approximation will match the first six moments of
 304 the normal distribution. The additional cases 3.1.4 through 3.1.8 were developed in
 305 a similar manner, as summarized in Table 1. It is important to emphasize that this
 306 ability to represent these familiar models as special cases of a general formulation is
 307 an important and unique benefit of the copula-based approach to developing lattice
 308 models.

309 In addition to showing that these discretization methods are a special case of our
 310 general framework, since it also matches higher moments we can illustrate how Theorem 1
 311 applies to the trinomial lattice developed in Case 3.1.3. That is, we will show
 312 how discretizations of $W(t)$ using this special case lead to two popular discretization
 313 approaches for $\ln(S(t))$ in the literature, in accordance with the Theorem.

314 First, we show that the first four moments of the underlying Wiener process are
 315 matched in the Wiener lattice structure. It is easy to see that the first moment is matched
 316 because of the symmetry:

317
$$p_1 \sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) + p_2 \sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) + p_3 \sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) = 0.$$

Author Proof

Table 1 Summary of trinomial/binomial lattices based on the symmetric Wiener lattice

Case	α_1	$p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{2(\phi^{-1}(\alpha_1))^2}$	Observations
<i>Identify the value of α_1</i>			
3.1.1	0.05	0.185	Pearson and Tukey (1965) three-point discretization. $p_1 = p_3 = 0.185$, $p_2 = 0.630$ assigned to the 5th, 50th and 95th percentiles respectively using (16) and (17), by specifying $\alpha_1 = 0.05$ we obtain this result
3.1.2	0.1	0.304	Swanson (Megill 1984) three-point discretization. $p_1 = p_3 = 0.3$, $p_2 = 0.4$ assigned to the 10th, 50th and 90th percentiles. Equation (17) provides the exact probabilities implied by the choice of $\alpha_1 = 0.1$ as $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{2(\phi^{-1}(\alpha_1))^2} = 0.304$, and $p_2 = 0.391$
3.1.3	$\Phi(-\sqrt{3})$	$\frac{1}{6}$	Ombreg (1988), Figlewski and Gao (1999) and Derman et al. (1996) . Matching the third and fourth moments of the normal distribution we have the unique solution $\alpha_1 = \Phi(-\sqrt{3}) = 0.0416$, $\alpha_2 = 0.5$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi(\sqrt{3}) = 0.9584$, $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{6}$, $p_2 = \frac{2}{3}$
<i>Identify the value of p_1</i>			
3.1.4	$\Phi(-\sqrt{3/2})$	$\frac{1}{3}$	He (1990) equal probability trinomial lattice. Adding the restriction that $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{3}$ implies the unique solution $\alpha_1 = \Phi(-\sqrt{3/2})$, $\alpha_2 = 0.5$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi(\sqrt{3/2})$, and $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 1/3$ Same as Case 3.1.3
3.1.5	$\Phi(-\sqrt{3})$	$\frac{1}{6}$	Ombreg (1988) Sharpened trinomial lattice method. $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{6}$ implies the unique solution $\alpha_1 = \Phi(-\sqrt{\pi/2})$, $\alpha_2 = 0.5$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi(\sqrt{\pi/2})$, $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{6}$, $p_2 = 1 - \frac{2}{6}$
3.1.6	$\Phi(-\sqrt{\pi/2})$	$\frac{1}{\pi}$	Jarrow and Rudd (1983) binomial lattice. Add the restrictions $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{\pi}$, $p_1 = p_2 = 0$ and trinomial lattice degenerates into a binomial lattice: $\alpha_1 = \Phi(-1)$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi(1)$, $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{2}$, $p_2 = 0$
3.1.7	$\Phi(-1)$	$\frac{1}{2}$	
3.1.8	$\Phi(-\sqrt{2})$	$\frac{1}{4}$	Parkinson (1977) trinomial lattice. Results from the combination of a two-step binomial lattice. Specify $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{4}$ which implies the unique solution $\alpha_1 = \Phi(-\sqrt{2})$, $\alpha_2 = 0.5$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi(\sqrt{2})$, $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{4}$, $p_2 = \frac{1}{2}$

318 The second moment is matched by substituting the respective values for α_i and p_i as
 319 follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & p_1 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right)^2 + p_2 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right)^2 + p_3 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right)^2 \\
 &= p_1 t \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(-\sqrt{3} \right) \right) \right)^2 + p_2 t \left(\Phi^{-1}(0.5) \right)^2 + p_3 t \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(\sqrt{3} \right) \right) \right)^2 \\
 &= (p_1 + p_3) t \left(\Phi^{-1} \left(\Phi \left(-\sqrt{3} \right) \right) \right)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{6} \right) t \left(\sqrt{3} \right)^2 = t.
 \end{aligned}$$

323 The third and fourth moments are matched from the constraint Eqs. (18) and (19)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & p_1 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right)^3 + p_2 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right)^3 + p_3 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right)^3 = 0 \\
 & p_1 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right)^4 + p_2 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right)^4 + p_3 \left(\sqrt{t} \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right)^4 = 3t^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

326 Therefore, according to Theorem 1, the first four moments of the log transformed asset
 327 price are also matched in the lattice structure, as shown in each of the following four
 328 expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E(x(t)) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt] + \sigma E(W(t)) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt] + 0 \\
 & E(x(t)^2) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt]^2 + \sigma^2 E(W(t)^2) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt]^2 + \sigma^2 t \\
 & E(x(t)^3) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt]^3 + \sigma^3 E(W(t)^3) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt]^3 + 0 \\
 & E(x(t)^4) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt]^4 + \sigma^4 E(W(t)^4) = [\ln(S(0)) + vt]^4 + 3\sigma^2 t^2.
 \end{aligned}$$


333 Similarly, according to Theorem 1, we can show that the first four moments of the
 334 underlying variables are also matched. These results can be observed in both the Hull
 335 (2006) and Clewlow and Strickland (1998) trinomial lattice approaches for discretizing
 336 $\ln(S(t))$. In both cases, we show that the branching probabilities converge to the same
 337 set as above when the time increment goes to zero:

338 First, for Hull (2006),

$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} p_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta t}{12\sigma^2}} v + \frac{1}{6} = \frac{1}{6}; \quad \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} p_3 = -\sqrt{\frac{\Delta t}{12\sigma^2}} v + \frac{1}{6} = \frac{1}{6}; \quad p_2 = \frac{2}{3}.$$

340 For Clewlow and Strickland (1998), the drift and volatility parameters of the contin-
 341 uous time process are captured by Δx , p_1 , p_2 , and p_3 . The state space increment Δx
 342 cannot be chosen independently, and was suggested to be $\Delta x = \sigma \sqrt{3\Delta t}$. This choice
 343 of Δx leads to probabilities which converge to $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{6}$, and $p_2 = \frac{2}{3}$ when the
 344 time increment goes to zero:

Fig. 3 Asymmetric discretization as a function of $W_{1,1}$



345
$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} p_1 = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \Delta t + v^2 \Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2} - \frac{v \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right) = \frac{1}{6}$$

346
$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} p_2 = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} 1 - \frac{\sigma^2 \Delta t + v^2 \Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2} = \frac{2}{3}$$

347
$$\lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} p_3 = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \Delta t + v^2 \Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{v \Delta t}{\Delta x} \right) = \frac{1}{6}.$$

348 **3.2 Asymmetric Wiener lattice**

349 If an asymmetric Wiener tree is assumed and additional restrictions are specified to reach a unique solution, then the general framework will also include some other popular trinomial lattice approaches in the literature. The differences in the structures can be seen by comparing the endpoint values in Fig. 3 with those in Fig. 2.

353 Although not as simple as the case where the Wiener process approximation is symmetric, the asymmetric case still only requires the three levels of the Wiener process calculated in period one. The subsequent Wiener process levels will then be a linear function of these three levels. Again, there is a system of four equations (Eqs. 11–14) and six variables chosen to match the first two moments of the Wiener process, which leaves two degrees of freedom for choosing the parameters. This also implies that there are infinitely many choices for the six parameters to approximate the Wiener process.

361 Again, using Theorem 1, by constructing the discrete approximation of a Wiener process matching the first n moments, an asymmetric trinomial lattice can be con-

363 structured to match the corresponding first n moments for the process for $S(t)$ or the
364 log-transformed process $x(t) = \ln(S(t))$.

365 In some cases, it may be desirable to set a stationary middle path instead of specifying
366 a symmetric Wiener process lattice. As before, a combination of $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ and $p_1,$
367 p_2, p_3 should be selected to represent an accurate discretization of a standard normal
368 distribution, which is the same condition as W_1 . The system of matching equations in
369 this case is:

$$370 \quad p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = 1 \quad (20)$$

$$371 \quad p_1 \left(v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right) + p_2 \left(v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right) + \dots \\ 372 \quad \dots + p_3 \left(v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right) = v\Delta t \quad (21)$$

$$373 \quad p_1 \left(\left[v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right]^2 \right) + p_2 \left(\left[v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right]^2 \right) + \dots \\ 374 \quad \dots + p_3 \left[v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right]^2 = \sigma^2\Delta t + v^2\Delta t^2 \quad (22)$$

$$375 \quad 2 \left[v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) \right] = \left[v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right] + \dots \\ 376 \quad \dots + \left[v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3) \right] \quad (23)$$

$$377 \quad v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2) = 0. \quad (24)$$

378 After some algebra, Eqs. (21), (22) and (23) can be reduced to the same form of Eqs.
379 (12–14). Equation (24) specifies the stationary middle path which leads directly to
380 the expression $\alpha_2 = \Phi\left(-\frac{v\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma}\right)$. This leaves one degree of freedom, which can be
381 utilized in the following ways:

382 Case 3.2.1: Matching the log-transformed moments

383 If the step size Δx for the log of $S(t)$ or the factor u for $S(t)$ is chosen, then since
384 $\Delta x = \ln u$,

385 $[v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1)] - [v\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2)] = \Delta x = \ln(u)$, which
386 simplifies to $\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}[\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) - \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_2)] = \Delta x = \ln(u)$. This leads to the
387 following expressions for the percentiles: $\alpha_1 = \Phi\left(-\frac{v\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma} - \frac{\Delta x}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right)$, $\alpha_3 =$
388 $\Phi\left(-\frac{v\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma} + \frac{\Delta x}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right)$, and for the branching probabilities:

$$389 \quad p_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma^2\Delta t + v^2\Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2} - \frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x} \right); \quad p_2 = 1 - \frac{\sigma^2\Delta t + v^2\Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2}; \quad p_3 \\ 390 \quad = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma^2\Delta t + v^2\Delta t^2}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{v\Delta t}{\Delta x} \right).$$

391 This set of specifications is equivalent to the Clewlow and Strickland trinomial lattice
392 method (Clewlow and Strickland (1998), pp. 52–53) discussed in Sect. 3.1.

Case 3.2.2: Matching the first moments of the underlying asset

If $p_2 = 0$, $u = e^{\lambda\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}$ and only the first moment of the underlying asset is matched, then the trinomial lattice degenerates to the Generalized Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial model. Making these substitutions into Eqs. (20) to (24) and simplifying yields the following expressions for α_1 and α_3 : $\alpha_1 = \Phi\left(-\lambda - \frac{v\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma}\right)$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi\left(\lambda - \frac{v\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma}\right)$. The branching probabilities are then implied by Eqs. (20) and (21):

$$p_1 = \frac{e^{(r-\delta)\Delta t} - u}{d - u}; p_3 = \frac{e^{(r-\delta)\Delta t} - d}{u - d}.$$

This is the Generalized Cox-Ross-Rubinstein Binomial Model (Chung and Shih 2007). If $\lambda = 1$, then this simplifies to the well-known CRR binomial model as a special case.

Case 3.2.3: Matching the first log-transformed moments

Our general framework can also lead to some new lattice methods. We next present such an example, which follows logic similar to the CRR model. If the same conditions as in the previous model ($p_2 = 0$, $u = e^{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}$) are imposed, but the first moment of the *log transformed* underlying asset is matched instead, then the trinomial lattice decomposes to a binomial lattice which is analogous to the CRR tree. Substituting into Eqs. (20) to (24) gives: $\alpha_1 = \Phi\left(-1 - \frac{v\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma}\right)$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi\left(1 - \frac{v\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma}\right)$ and the branching probabilities are: $p_1 = \frac{1}{2}[\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3)]$, $p_3 = -\frac{1}{2}[\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1)]$.

Case 3.2.4: Matching the first two log-transformed moments

We conclude with another example of a new approximation scheme. In this case, instead of only matching the first moment of the log transformed underlying asset as in the previous case, p_2 is chosen to be zero and the first *two moments* of the log transformed underlying asset are matched. This might be expected to result in a more accurate fit to the continuous distribution to be approximated. Starting with the system of matching equations and applying some algebra to Eqs. (22) and (23) leads to these expressions for the percentiles and branching probabilities: $\alpha_1 = \Phi\left(-\frac{\ln(u)+v\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right)$, $\alpha_3 = \Phi\left(\frac{\ln(u)-v\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right)$, $p_1 = \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3)}{\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3)-\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1)}$ and $p_3 = \frac{-\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1)}{\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_3)-\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1)}$, where $\ln(u) = \sqrt{(v\Delta t)^2 + (\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t})^2}$.

4 Numerical examples of Wiener process lattice models

To illustrate the application of our general discrete approximation based on the Wiener process, we consider the common problem of valuing financial options on underlying assets which follow GBM price processes. First, we consider a relatively simple option pricing example. This example provides an illustration of the calculations used by this approach and allows the validation of our solutions using the BSM formula. In addition, this example will be used to illustrate how this general approximation scheme facilitates the optimal construction of lattice models for specific option pricing problems and for continuous distribution fitting.

Table 2 Correlation matrix

$\Sigma_{i,j}$	$t_1 = 0.33$	$t_2 = 0.67$	$t_3 = 1.00$
$t_1 = 0.33$	1	0.7071	0.5774
$t_2 = 0.67$	0.7071	1	0.8165
$t_3 = 1.00$	0.5774	0.8165	1

Table 3 Cholesky decomposition

A_{ij}	$t_1 = 0.33$	$t_2 = 0.67$	$t_3 = 1.00$
$t_1 = 0.33$	1	0	0
$t_2 = 0.67$	0.7071	0.7071	0
$t_3 = 1.00$	0.5774	0.5774	0.5774

4.1 Calibration of Wiener process lattice models

We begin by considering a one-year maturity at the money European call option with the current underlying asset price S_0 of \$100. To illustrate the computational approach, we assume that we will construct a trinomial tree that has three time steps, so $T = 1$, $N = 3$ and $\Delta t = 1/3$. We also assume that the continuously compounded risk-free discount rate is 6 % per annum, that the asset pays a continuous dividend yield of 3 % per annum, and that the volatility of the asset price, σ , is 20 %.

The techniques for estimating the parameters in the Black–Scholes framework have been extensively examined in the literature (e.g. [Steele 2010](#); [Hull 2006](#); [Khaled and Samia 2010](#)). Volatility is the only parameter required in the Black–Scholes framework which is not directly observable in the market and substantial effort has been devoted to the search for reliable volatility forecasting models (c.f. [Grundy 1991](#); [Britten-Johne and Neuberger 2000](#); [Poon 2005](#); [Hansen and Lunde 2006](#); [Andersen and Bondarenko 2007](#)). For this illustrative problem, we assume that at least one of these approaches has been applied to obtain the 20 % estimate for the volatility.

4.2 Application of the Wiener process lattice model and demonstration of convergence

The first step in applying our approach of constructing a lattice is to calculate the correlation matrix for the Wiener Process $(W_{t_1}, \dots, W_{t_n})$ and the corresponding Cholesky decomposition as discussed in Sect. 3. The results are shown below in Tables 2 and 3. Notice that the non-zero row values are constants in Table 2, so the Cholesky decomposition only requires the simple calculations in column 1.

To demonstrate the construction of a symmetric Wiener process tree, we arbitrarily set $\alpha_1 = 0.05$ which implies that $\alpha_2 = 0.50$, $\alpha_3 = 0.95$, $p_1 = p_3 = \frac{1}{2(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1))^2} = 0.185$, and $p_2 = 0.63$. The trinomial tree structure generates the resulting values for the Wiener process at each of 3^3 endpoints. For example, the lower value for W_{t_1} in the first node is:

$$\sqrt{t_1} \left(\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_1) \right) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\Phi^{-1}(0.05) \right) = -0.95.$$




Fig. 4 Lattice for Wiener process, underlying asset price, and option price

457 However, this tree is symmetric and some values are recurring, so it can be recon-
 458 structed as a simple recombining lattice as shown in Fig. 4. As indicated by the key
 459 shown at the upper left of the figure, the top numbers in the outcome nodes in the
 460 lattice represent the Wiener process values, W_t .

461 The value of the underlying asset S_t is then calculated as a function of the Wiener
 462 process values, using the relationship $S(t) = S(0) e^{\nu t + \sigma W(t)}$. Finally, the call
 463 option values at maturity are calculated and then the current option value is obtained
 464 by working backward through the structure in Fig. 4, taking discounted expectations at
 465 each node. As shown in Fig. 4 using the bottom numbers in each outcome node, the
 466 resulting European call option price is \$8.71. For comparison, the analytic solution
 467 from the BSM formula is \$9.135, where the difference is due to the relatively large
 468 time steps ($\Delta t = 1/3$ year) which were used for simplicity in this approximation.
 469 This model converges to the BSM price as the time increments are reduced; at monthly
 470 ($\Delta t = 1/12$ year) increments, the difference between prices is less than five cents.

471 4.3 Optimization of the Wiener process lattice models

472 There are many approaches for constructing binomial/trinomial approximations of
 473 GBM stochastic processes. It is natural to ask “Which of these approaches is the best
 474 one under certain conditions?” While the literature has shown that these lattice meth-
 475 ods are asymptotically equivalent to the Black–Sholes model when pricing European
 476 options, and all trinomial lattices are found to be more accurate than binomial lattices
 477 (Tian 1993), there has been little discussion of the selection of a lattice approach due
 478 to the lack of a unified framework that could be used for the analysis. An important
 479 contribution of this work is that we can optimize the tree/lattice construction in a con-
 480 venient manner. Furthermore, rather than being bound by the existing alternatives, we
 481 can find the exact specifications of state-space increments and branching probabilities
 482 that optimize the trinomial approximation for a specific application.

483 To establish the framework for the optimization of the tree/lattice construction, we
 484 first determine the decision variable. For a symmetric tree, as noted in Sect. 3.1 we
 485 can fully specify the tree/lattice structure by choosing α_1 , and it is thus our decision
 486 variable. There is a single constraint for this optimization, $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \Phi(-1) =$
 487 0.1587 .

488 We now consider two criteria that might be used for the optimization of a trinomial
 489 lattice approximation, although we recognize that there may be other criteria that would
 490 be appropriate in specific applications. The first criterion we consider is minimization
 491 of the overall distribution fit, as measured by the root mean squared error. We then
 492 consider minimization of the option pricing and/or Greek approximation error.

493 4.3.1 Selection of Wiener process lattice model by root mean square error (RMSE)

494 We use root mean square error (RMSE) as a goodness-of-fit measure for the Cumulative
 495 Distribution Function (CDF) of the constructed trinomial lattice at the final stage
 496 in comparison to the theoretical underlying distribution. We define the optimal lattice
 497 as the lattice approximation with the minimum RMSE between the discrete approxi-
 498 mation provided by the lattice and the continuous distribution available in analytical
 499 form from the stochastic process for the underlying asset in the final time period T .

500 As we state more formally below, we can show that for an overall distribution fit
 501 based on optimization of RMSE, the optimal α_1 and therefore the lattice structure
 502 is independent of parameters of the underlying GBM process. The intuition is based
 503 on the following observations. The lattice is constructed based upon the underlying
 504 Wiener process which is independent of parameters of the GBM process. The optimal
 505 lattice structure is therefore independent of parameters of the underlying GBM process.

506 **Theorem 2** *The optimal RMSE fit for the CDF of the constructed lattice structure is*
 507 *independent of the parameters of the underlying GBM process.*

508 The proof is provided in “Appendix 2”.

509 Figure 5 shows the results of optimizing the lattice construction by minimizing the
 510 RMSE between the discrete approximation and the continuous distribution given in
 511 analytic form by the stochastic process for the underlying asset, using the example
 512 from Sect. 4.2.




Fig. 5 Overall distribution fit optimization

As expected, as the number of time steps, N , increases, the accuracy of the approximation improves, as shown in Fig. 5 by the downward progression of the curves in the figure. We also observe that as N increases and more endpoints are modeled along the distribution, it is less important to extend the up and down branches of the trinomial approximation in each step out into the tails of the distribution. This results in optimized α_1 values progressing toward the maximum end of the range.

4.3.2 Selection of Wiener process lattice model by Greek approximation error

The second criterion is the minimization of the error in approximating a particular value or price which can be calculated by other means, so that a benchmark can be established for optimizing the lattice construction. For example, benchmarks for simple option prices and basic option price sensitivities ('Greeks') could be calculated using the BSM option pricing model or Monte Carlo simulation. One could then apply the optimized trinomial lattice to more complex problems than the simple ones used for benchmarking.

As we state more formally in Theorem 3, the RMSE fit for the option price and the Greeks of a simple option depends on the parameters of the underlying GBM process, as well as the choice of the parameters for the lattice approximation. This is intuitive since the benchmark option price or option price sensitivities are functions of the parameters of the underlying GBM process. Therefore the optimal lattice structure is also dependent on the parameters of the underlying GBM.

Theorem 3 *The optimal RMSE approximation for option price or option price sensitivity ('Greeks') from the constructed trinomial lattice is dependent on the parameters of the underlying GBM process.*

The proof is provided in "Appendix 3".




Fig. 6 Percent error in approximating option price error minimization (*left*), Δ (*right*)

Again using the example from Sect. 4.1, for a given volatility we can show numerically that the value of α_1 that minimizes the error in both the option price and the Greeks varies with the relation of the current price to the strike price. The optimal value α_1^* versus the strike price for Delta, as well as Gamma (second-order sensitivity to underlying asset price) and the option price itself, are shown on the left panel of the Fig. 6. The shapes of the curves for α_1 in this panel can be explained in the context of fitting the distribution for the underlying asset. Intuitively, the explanation for the curve showing the optimal value of α_1 for approximating option price is based on the observation that option prices are best approximated when the distribution of the underlying is most accurately modeled in the tails of the distribution, especially when there is some distance between the current value and the exercise price, as demonstrated by the lower values for α_1^* at the right and left extremes of the dotted curve.

The solid curve showing the optimal α_1 for approximating Delta illustrates Delta's dependence on the values of both the option price and the underlying asset value at the upper and lower boundaries of the discrete approximation. Specifically, as the option becomes deeper into the money, the difference between the boundary values for the option increase, while the difference between boundary values for the underlying asset do not change significantly, and the result is that Delta values increase. Because this is primarily caused by changes in the option price, the effect on α_1 is similar to the effect of the option price on the in-the-money side of the plot (left side where strike price is below current price). However for out of the money cases, the differences between boundary values for the option are smaller, while the underlying asset boundary values are again similar, so the optimal values of α_1 in those cases indicate that it is less important to place discrete points in the extreme regions of the distribution.

We can infer from the dashed curve showing the optimal α_1 for approximating Gamma that it is most important to model values in the tails of the distribution of the underlying asset value when the value is near the strike price. This result is somewhat intuitive, since the magnitude of Gamma is highest for an at the money option.

The right panel of Fig. 6 shows the values for α_1 that minimize the percent error in estimating the option price sensitivity to the underlying asset price (the Greek Delta),




Fig. 7 Effects of volatility and number of periods on α_1^*

567 as also shown in the solid blue curve in the left panel, but this panel also shows the
 568 percent error in estimating Delta with non-optimal values for α_1 , by tracing up or down
 569 each curve from the dot at the zero percent error point and reading the corresponding
 570 values on the left axis. These errors could be resolved by increasing the number of time
 571 periods, but this graphic illustrates how a modeler could instead choose to optimize
 572 construction of the lattice to improve accuracy.

573 We also might expect there to be some dependence of the optimal tree construction
 574 based on the volatility of the underlying process and the number of time increments
 575 used in the model. These two relationships, for in, at, and out of the money option
 576 cases, are shown in the left and right panels of Fig. 7, respectively.

577 The volatility curves in the left panel have similar starting points for low (10 %)
 578 volatility, but then vary widely and differently for the three cases. The optimal value
 579 of α_1 is least sensitive to volatility for an out of the money option, where lower
 580 α_1 values and more accurate modeling of values in the tails of the distribution are
 581 optimal over the entire range of volatility values. The curves for the number of periods
 582 modeled again begin from similar points for $N = 1$ time periods, but for in- and
 583 out-of the money cases, as N increases, it is optimal to reduce α_1 and increase the
 584 number of lattice endpoints in the tails. This result is due to option value being most
 585 significantly affected in those cases by asset value realizations on the opposite sides
 586 of the distribution, such as high price realizations for an out of the money option.

587 5 Conclusions

588 In this paper, we have developed a general discrete approximation method based on
 589 copulas. In order to construct trinomial trees or lattices using this method, we first
 590 develop a trinomial model of the underlying Wiener process, $W(t)$. In this approach,
 591 the specifications for this model are derived by simultaneously solving for a set of
 592 six parameters for the underlying Wiener process tree. We show that this procedure
 593 provides a very general trinomial method for modeling variables $S(t)$ or $\ln(S(t))$, and
 594 that various binomial and trinomial tree methods in the literature are special cases of
 595 this approach obtained simply by the choice of the particular values of the param-
 596 eters. This procedure has the potential benefit of significantly reducing computational

597 costs, since it decomposes the lattice structure in such a way that all future time steps
 598 are simple multiples of values in the first time increment. This property also makes
 599 our approach very easy to implement. We have illustrated these properties and their
 600 practical implications through a set of numerical examples.

601 The Black–Scholes differential equation for option pricing and the previously dis-
 602 cussed literature of parametric binomial/trinomial lattice approaches assume that the
 603 log-returns are normally distributed under the underlying GBM stochastic process.
 604 Future research in this area might include a further generalization of this framework
 605 to include other types of stochastic processes. For example, empirical studies have
 606 shown that stock returns often have fat tails and that t-distributions fit these returns
 607 better than normal distributions (e.g., Fama 1965; Praetz 1972; Zhu and Galbraith
 608 2010). Therefore, it would be useful to extend the copula-based approach to model
 609 the stock returns as a Lévy-Student process, as discussed in Petroni et al. (2006) and
 610 Grigelionis (2013),

$$611 \quad \frac{dS(t)}{S(t)} = (r - \delta)dt + \sigma dL(t)$$

612 where $dL(t)$ represents a Lévy-Student process.

613 To model the process for a variable $S(t)$ as a tree structure, parallel to our
 614 previous discussion on normal copulas, we could focus on the Lévy-Student
 615 process $L(t)$ as a multivariate t-distribution with underlying multivariate t-copulas.
 616 More specifically, we could utilize the multivariate t-copulas, $C_T(u_1, \dots, u_n) =$
 617 $t_{\Sigma, \nu}(t_\nu^{-1}(u_1), \dots, t_\nu^{-1}(u_n))$ where t_ν is the univariate student's t distribution func-
 618 tion, with ν degrees of freedom, and $t_{\Sigma, \nu}$ the multivariate distribution corresponding
 619 to t_ν . The t-copula based dependent tree method can be used to construct the general
 620 tree structure for the Lévy-Student process following the steps discussed in details
 621 in Wang and Dyer (2012). Unlike the normal copulas case for the GBM process,
 622 however, there is no analytical solution to make this tree structure recombining by
 623 choosing values for a subset of the parameters. Future research in this area might also
 624 include further generalization of this framework to include path dependent stochas-
 625 tic processes such as mean reverting processes, jump diffusion processes, stochastic
 626 volatility processes, and multivariate stochastic processes.

627 Appendix 1

628 For convenience, we will prove Part b of Theorem 1 first:

629 We can show the moments of $x(t) = \ln(S(t))$ are a function of the moments
 630 of $W(t)$ by using moment generating functions. The moment generating function of
 631 the normal distribution $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ is given as $M_X(z) = \exp(\mu z + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 z^2)$. If
 632 $W(t) \sim N(0, t)$, then $\sigma W(t) \sim N(0, \sigma^2 t)$, and therefore, $M_{W(t)}(z) = \exp(\frac{1}{2}tz^2)$,
 633 and $M_{\sigma W(t)}(z) = \exp(\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 tz^2)$

634 We now focus on the log-transformed asset price. For $x(t) = \ln(S(t)) \sim$
 635 $N(\ln(S(0)) + \nu t, \sigma^2 t)$, we will provide the derivation of its moment generating func-
 636 tion.

$$\begin{aligned}
 637 \quad M_{x(t)}(z) &= e^{(\ln(S(0))+\nu t)z + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t z^2} = e^{(\ln(S(0))+\nu)z} e^{\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t z^2} \\
 638 \quad &= e^{(\ln(S(0))+\nu)z} e^{\left(\frac{1}{2}t z^2\right)\sigma^2} = e^{(\ln(S(0))+\nu)z} \left(M_{W(t)}(z)\right)^{\sigma^2} \\
 639 \quad &= e^{(\ln(S(0))+\nu)z} M_{\sigma W(t)}(z)
 \end{aligned}$$

640 The following equation can be obtained using the Taylor expansion operation on
 641 $e^{[\ln(S(0))+\nu t]z}$:

$$642 \quad e^{(\ln(S(0))+\nu)z} = 1 + (\ln(S(0)) + \nu)z + \frac{((\ln(S(0)) + \nu)z)^2}{2!} + \dots$$

643 which simplifies to

$$644 \quad M_{x(t)}(z) = \left[1 + (\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)z + \frac{(\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)^2 z^2}{2!} + \dots \right] \times M_{\sigma W(t)}(z)$$

645 If the moment generating function exists on an open interval around $t = 0$, then it is
 646 the exponential generating function of the moments of the probability distribution:

$$647 \quad E(X^n) = M_X^{(n)}(0) = \frac{d^n M_X}{dz^n}(0)$$

648 Performing the n th derivatives on the moment generating function of $x(t)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 649 \quad E(x(t)^n) &= M_{x(t)}^{(n)}(0) \\
 650 \quad &= \frac{d^n \left[1 + (\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)z + \frac{(\ln(S(0))+\nu t)^2 z^2}{2!} + \dots \right]}{dz^n} * M_{\sigma W(t)}(z) \Big|_{z=0} \\
 651 \quad &+ \dots + \left[1 + (\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)z + \frac{(\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)^2 z^2}{2!} + \dots \right] \Big|_{z=0} \\
 652 \quad &\times M_{\sigma W(t)}^{(n)}(0) \\
 653 \quad &= c E((\sigma W(t))^n) \\
 654 \quad &= (\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)^n + [1 + (\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)z \\
 655 \quad &+ \frac{(\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)^2 z^2}{2!} + \dots] \Big|_{z=0} \\
 656 \quad &\times M_{\sigma W(t)}^{(n)}(0) = (\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)^n + E((\sigma W(t))^n) \\
 657 \quad &= (\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)^n + \sigma^n E((W(t))^n)
 \end{aligned}$$

658 Notice that the Taylor expansion only serves as an auxiliary step in the proof. The
 659 equation is exact and no approximation is required.

660 *Proof of Part a:* By the definition of a moment generating function, $M_{x(t)}(z) =$
 661 $E(e^{x(t)z})$. Since $x(t) = \ln(S(t))$, $M_{x(t)}(z) = E(e^{x(t)z}) = E(e^{\ln(S(t))z}) =$

662 $E(S(t)^z)$. Therefore, $E(S(t)^n) = M_{x(t)}(n)$. From the proof of Part b, we know
663 that

$$\begin{aligned} 664 \quad E(S(t)^n) &= M_{x(t)}(n) = e^{(\ln(S(0)) + \nu t)n} M_{\sigma W(t)}(n) = S(0)^n e^{\nu n t} \times M_{\sigma W(t)}(n) \\ 665 \quad &= S(0)^n e^{\nu n t} \times (M_{W(t)}(z))^{\sigma^2} \end{aligned}$$

666 □

667 Appendix 2

668 RMSE is used as a goodness-of-fit measure for the CDF of the constructed trinomial
669 lattice at the final stage in comparison to the theoretical underlying distributions. In
670 this case, it can be shown that for overall distribution fit based on optimization of
671 RMSE, the optimal α_1 and thence the lattice structure is independent of parameters of
672 the underlying GBM process.

$$673 \quad \text{RMSE} = (\text{MSE})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$674 \quad \text{MSE} = \sum_j p_{T,j} \left(CDF^{\text{lattice}}(S_{T,j}) - CDF^{\text{theoretical}}(S_{T,j}) \right)^2, \quad j = 0, \dots, 2T$$

675 Since the lattice of the GBM process is transferred from the underlying Wiener process,
676 $CDF^{\text{lattice}}(S_{T,j}) = CDF^{\text{lattice}}(W_{T,j}) = \sum_i^{W_{T,i} \leq W_{T,j}} p_{T,i}$.

677 Therefore, either $p_{T,j}$ or $CDF^{\text{lattice}}(S_{T,j})$ is a function of parameters of the under-
678 lying GBM process. If $CDF^{\text{theoretical}}(S_{T,j})$ is also independent of parameters of the
679 underlying GBM process, then MSE hence RMSE is independent of parameters of
680 the underlying GBM process.

681 Since the CDF of the lognormal distribution is the same as the CDF of the normal
682 distribution, with $\log x$ substituted for x ,

$$683 \quad CDF_{\text{lognormal}}(x) = CDF_{\text{normal}}(\log x)$$

$$684 \quad CDF^{\text{theoretical}}(S_{T,j}) = CDF^{\text{theoretical}}(\ln(S_{T,j}))$$

$$685 \quad \ln(S(T)) \sim N(\ln(S(0)) + \nu T, \sigma^2 T), \text{ and}$$

$$686 \quad \ln(S_{T,j}) = S(0) + \nu T + \sigma \sqrt{T} W_{T,j}$$

$$687 \quad CDF^{\text{theoretical}}(S_{T,j}) = CDF^{\text{theoretical}}(\ln(S_{T,j}))$$

$$688 \quad = CDF^{\text{theoretical}}\left(\frac{S(0) + \nu T + \sigma \sqrt{T} W_{T,j} - (S(0) + \nu T)}{\sigma \sqrt{T}}\right)$$

$$689 \quad = CDF^{\text{theoretical}}(W_{T,j}).$$

690 Therefore, RMSE of the CDF of the constructed trinomial lattice at the final stage
691 in comparison to the theoretical underlying distributions is independent of param-
692 eters of the underlying GBM process, so is the optimal α_1 for overall distribution fit
693 optimization of RMSE.

694 **Appendix 3**

695 If RMSE is used as a goodness-of-fit measure for option price (e.g, call option price)
 696 from the constructed trinomial lattice at the final stage in comparison to the theoret-
 697 ical BSM model, the optimal lattice structure is dependent on the parameters of the
 698 underlying GBM process.

699 $RMSE = (MSE)^{\frac{1}{2}}$
 700 $MSE = \sum_j p_{T,j} (Max(0, S_{T,j} - K) - BS(S_0, K, r, \delta, \sigma, T))^2, j = 0, \dots, 2T,$

701 and,

702
$$S_{T,j} = e^{S(0)+vT+\sigma\sqrt{T}W_{T,j}}$$

703 Similarly, if $RMSE_{\Delta}$ is used as a goodness-of-fit measure for Greeks of option price
 704 (e.g, Delta) from the constructed trinomial lattice at the final stage in comparison to the
 705 theoretical BSM model, the optimal lattice structure is dependent on the parameters
 706 of the underlying GBM process.

707 $RMSE_{\Delta} = (MSE_{\Delta})^{\frac{1}{2}}$
 708 $MSE_{\Delta} = \frac{C_{T,2T} - C_{T,0}}{S_{T,2T} - S_{T,0}} - e^{-\delta T} N(d_1)$
 709 $= \left(\frac{Max(0, S_{T,2T} - K) - Max(0, S_{T,0} - K)}{S_{T,2T} - S_{T,0}} - \Delta_{BS}(S_0, K, r, \delta, \sigma, T) \right)^2$

710 and,

711 $d_1 = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{S_0}{K}\right) + vT}{\sigma\sqrt{T}}, S_{T,j} = e^{S(0)+vT+\sigma\sqrt{T}W_{T,j}}, j = 0, \dots, 2T,$

712 Therefore, we know that $RMSE$ ($RMSE_{\Delta}$) will be a function of the parameters of the
 713 underlying GBM process. The relationship between the optimal $RMSE$ ($RMSE_{\Delta}$) and
 714 the parameters of the underlying GBM process are complex as illustrated in Sect. 4.

715 **References**

716 Andersen, T. G., & Bondarenko, O. (2007). Construction and interpretation of model-free implied volatility.
 717 In I. Nelken (Ed.), *Volatility as an asset class* (pp. 141–181). London: Risk Books.
 718 Barone-Adesi, G., Fusari, N., & Theal, J. (2008). Barrier Option pricing using adjusted transition probabili-
 719 ties. *Journal of Derivatives*, 16(2), 36–53.
 720 Baule, R., & Wilkens, M. (2004). Lean trees—a general approach for improving performance of lattice
 721 models for option pricing. *Review of Derivatives Research*, 7(1), 53–72.
 722 Britten-Johne, M., & Neuberer, A. (2000). Option prices, implied price processes, and stochastic volatility.
 723 *Journal of Finance*, 55, 839–866.

Author Proof

- 724 Black, F., & Scholes, M. (1973). The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of Political*
 725 *Economy*, 81, 637–659.
- 726 Bickel, J. Eric, Lake, L. W., & Lehman, J. (2011). Discretization, simulation, and Swanson's (Inaccurate)
 727 mean. *SPE Economics and Management*, 3(3), 128–140.
- 728 Bizid, A., & Jouini, E. (2005). Equilibrium pricing in incomplete markets. *The Journal of Financial and*
 729 *Quantitative Analysis*, 40, 833–848.
- 730 Boyle, P. P. (1988). A lattice framework for option pricing with two state variables. *The Journal of Financial*
 731 *and Quantitative Analysis*, 35, 1–12.
- 732 Broadie, M., & Detemple, J. B. (2004). Option pricing: Valuation models and applications. *Management*
 733 *Science*, 50(9), 1145–1177.
- 734 Broadie, M., & Kaya, Ö. (2007). A binomial lattice method for pricing corporate debt and modeling chapter
 735 11 proceedings. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 42(02), 279–312.
- 736 Chambers, D. R., & Lu, Q. (2007). A tree model for pricing convertible bonds with equity, interest rate,
 737 and default risk. *Journal of Derivatives*, 14(4), 25–46.
- 738 Chen, R., & Yang, T. (1999). A universal lattice. *Review of Derivatives Research*, 3, 115–133.
- 739 Chung, S., & Shih, P. (2007). Generalized Cox-Ross-Rubinstein binomial model. *Management Science*,
 740 53(3), 508–520.
- 741 Clewlow, L., & Strickland, C. (1998). *Implementing derivative models*. New York: Wiley.
- 742 Costabile, M., Massabó, I., & Russo, E. (2011). A binomial approximation for two-state Markovian HJM
 743 models. *Review of Derivatives Research*, 14(1), 37–65.
- 744 Cox, J. C., Ross, S. A., & Rubinstein, M. (1979). Option pricing: A simplified approach. *Journal of Financial*
 745 *Economics*, 7, 229–264.
- 746 Derman, E., Kani, I., & Chriss, N. (1996). *Implied trinomial trees of the volatility smile*. Quantitative
 747 Strategies Research Notes, Goldman-Sachs.
- 748 Dumas, B., & Lyasoff, A. (2012). Incomplete-market equilibria solved recursively on an event tree. *The*
 749 *Journal of Finance*, 67, 1897–1941.
- 750 Fama, E. F. (1965). The behaviour of stock market prices. *The Journal of Business*, 38, 34–105.
- 751 Figlewski, S., & Gao, B. (1999). The adaptive mesh model: A new approach to efficient option pricing.
 752 *Journal of Financial Economics*, 53, 313–351.
- 753 Glasserman, P. (2003). *Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering*. Berlin: Springer.
- 754 Grigelionis, B. (2013). *Student's T-distribution and related stochastic processes*. Berlin: Springer.
- 755 Grundy, B. D. (1991). Option prices and the underlying asset's return distribution. *Journal of Finance*, 46,
 756 1045–1069.
- 757 Hansen, P. R., & Lunde, A. (2006). Consistent ranking of volatility models. *Journal of Econometrics*,
 758 131(1), 97–121.
- 759 He, H. (1990). Convergence from discrete- to continuous-time contingent claims prices. *The Review of*
 760 *Financial Studies*, 3, 523–546.
- 761 Hilliard, J. E., & Schwartz, A. (2005). Pricing European and American derivatives under a jump-diffusion
 762 process: A bivariate tree approach. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 40(3), 671–
 763 691.
- 764 Hull, J. (2006). *Options futures and other derivatives* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- 765 Hull, J. C., & White, A. (1990). Valuing Derivative securities using the explicit finite difference method.
 766 *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 25, 87–100.
- 767 Jabbour, G. M., Kramin, M. V., & Young, S. D. (2010). Structural default modeling: A lattice-based approach.
 768 *Journal of Derivatives*, 17(4), 44–53.
- 769 Jarrow, R., & Rudd, A. (1983). *Option pricing*. Homewood: R.D. Irwin.
- 770 Ji, D., & Brorsen, B. W. (2011). A recombining lattice option pricing model that relaxes the assumption of
 771 lognormality. *Review of Derivatives Research*, 14(3), 349–367.
- 772 Keefer, D., & Bodily, S. E. (1983). Three-point approximations for continuous random variables. *Manage-*
 773 *ment Science*, 29, 595–609.
- 774 Khaled, K., & Samia, M. (2010). Estimation of the parameters of the stochastic differential equations
 775 Black–Scholes model share price of gold. *Journal of Mathematics and Statistics*, 6(4), 421.
- 776 Megill, R. E. (1984). *An introduction to risk analysis* (2nd ed.). Tulsa: PennWell.
- 777 Omberg, E. (1988). Efficient discrete time jump process models in option pricing. *The Journal of Financial*
 778 *and Quantitative Analysis*, 23, 161–174.
- 779 Parkinson, M. (1977). Option pricing: The American put. *Journal of Business*, 50, 21–36.

- 780 Pearson, E. S., & Tukey, J. W. (1965). Approximate means and standard deviations based on distances
781 between percentage points of frequency curves. *Biometrika*, 52(3/4), 546–553.
- 782 Praetz, P. D. (1972). The distribution of share price changes. *The Journal of Business*, 45, 49–55.
- 783 Petroni, N. C., De Martino, S., De Siena, S., & Illuminati, F. (2006). Lévy-Student processes for a Stochastic
784 model of Beam Halos. *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators,*
785 *Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*, 561(2), 237–243.
- 786 Poon, S. (2005). *A practical guide to forecasting financial market volatility*. London: John Wiley.
- 787 Steele, J. M. (2010). *Stochastic calculus and financial applications* (Vol. 45). New York: Springer Science
788 & Business Media.
- 789 Tian, Y. (1993). A modified lattice approach to option pricing. *Journal of Futures Markets*, 13, 563–577.
- 790 Tian, Y. (1999). A flexible binomial option pricing model. *Journal of Futures Markets*, 19, 817–843.
- 791 Wang, T., & Dyer, J. (2012). A Copulas-based approach to modeling dependence in decision trees. *Opera-*
792 *tions Research*, 60, 225–242.
- 793 Widdicks, M., Andricopoulos, A. D., Newton, D. P., & Duck, P. W. (2002). On the enhanced convergence
794 of lattice methods for option pricing. *Journal of Futures Markets*, 22(4), 315–338.
- 795 Zhu, D., & Galbraith, J. W. (2010). A generalized asymmetric student-t distribution with application to
796 financial econometrics. *Journal of Econometrics*, 157(2), 297–305.

uncorrected proof

Journal: 11147
Article: 9111

Author Query Form

**Please ensure you fill out your response to the queries raised below
and return this form along with your corrections**

Dear Author

During the process of typesetting your article, the following queries have arisen. Please check your typeset proof carefully against the queries listed below and mark the necessary changes either directly on the proof/online grid or in the 'Author's response' area provided below

Query	Details required	Author's response
1.	Please provide JEL codes. For more details, please visit http://www.aeaweb.org/journal/jel_class_system.html .	G13, C10
2.	Glasserman (2000) has been changed as Glasserman (2003). Please check and confirm.	Confirmed. Glasserman (2003) is correct.
3.	Reference Hull and White (1990) is given in list but not cited in text. Please check and provide citation in text.	Please delete Hull and White (1990) from the list