



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Majewski, A. A., Bormetti, G. & Corsi, F. (2013). Smile from the Past: A general option pricing framework with multiple volatility and leverage components (13/11). London, UK: Department of Economics, City University London.

This is the unspecified version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/2925/>

**Link to published version:**

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

---

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---



**School of Social Sciences**  
CITY UNIVERSITY LONDON

## **Department of Economics**

### Smile from the Past: A general option pricing framework with multiple volatility and leverage components

Adam A. Majewski<sup>1</sup>  
Scuola Normale Superiore

Giacomo Borgetti  
Scuola Normale Superiore, QUANTLab

Fulvio Corsi  
City University London, Ca' Foscari University of Venice

**Department of Economics**  
**Discussion Paper Series**  
**No. 13/11**

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: Tel.: +39 05050 9094, E-mail address: adam.majewski@sns.it

# Smile from the Past: A general option pricing framework with multiple volatility and leverage components

Adam A. Majewski<sup>a,\*</sup>, Giacomo Bormetti<sup>a,b</sup>, and Fulvio Corsi<sup>c,d</sup>

September 2013

<sup>a</sup> *Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, Pisa, 56126, Italy*

<sup>b</sup> *QUANTLab<sup>1</sup>, via Pietrasantina 123, Pisa, 56122, Italy*

<sup>c</sup> *Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Fondamenta San Giobbe 873, Venezia, 30121, Italy*

<sup>d</sup> *City University London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom*

## Abstract

In the current literature, the analytical tractability of discrete time option pricing models is guaranteed only for rather specific type of models and pricing kernels. We propose a very general and fully analytical option pricing framework encompassing a wide class of discrete time models featuring multiple components structure in both volatility and leverage and a flexible pricing kernel with multiple risk premia. Although the proposed framework is general enough to include either GARCH-type volatility, Realized Volatility or a combination of the two, in this paper we focus on realized volatility option pricing models by extending the Heterogeneous Autoregressive Gamma (HARG) model of Corsi et al. (2012) to incorporate heterogeneous leverage structures with multiple components, while preserving closed-form solutions for option prices. Applying our analytically tractable asymmetric HARG model to a large sample of S&P 500 index options, we evidence its superior ability to price out-of-the-money options compared to existing benchmarks.

---

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 05050 9094, *E-mail address*: adam.majewski@sns.it

<sup>1</sup>[www.quantlab.it](http://www.quantlab.it)

# 1 Introduction

Due primarily to mathematical tractability and flexibility of incorporating various types of risk premia, the literature on option pricing has been traditionally dominated by continuous-time processes.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, models for the asset dynamics under the physical measure  $\mathbb{P}$  have been primarily developed in discrete-time. The time-varying volatility models of the ARCH-GARCH families (Engle, 1982; Bollerslev, 1996; Glosten et al., 1993; Nelson, 1991) have led the field in estimating and predicting the volatility dynamics. More recently, thanks to the availability of intra-day data, the so called Realized Volatility (RV) approach also became a prominent approach for measuring and forecasting volatility. The key advantage of the RV is that it provides a precise nonparametric measure of daily volatility<sup>3</sup> (i.e., making it observable) which leads to simplicity in model estimation and superior forecasting performance.

Discrete time models present the key advantage of being easy to be filtered and estimated even in presence of complex dynamical features such as long memory, multiple components and asymmetric effects, which turns out to be crucial in improving volatility forecast and option pricing performances. A growing strand of literature advocates the presence of a multi-factors volatility structure both under the physical measure (Muller et al., 1997; Engle and Lee, 1999; Bollerslev and Wright, 2001; Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard, 2001a; Calvet and Fisher, 2004) and the risk neutral one (Bates, 2000, 2012; Li and Zhang, 2010; Christoffersen et al., 2008; Adrian and Rosenberg, 2007). In the discrete time option pricing literature, multiple components have been incorporated into both GARCH-type (Christoffersen et al., 2008) and realized volatility models (Corsi et al., 2012), and both approaches have shown that short-run and long-run components are necessary to capture the term structure of the option implied volatility surface. Also in the modelling of the so called leverage effect (the asymmetric impact of positive and negative past returns on future volatility), recent papers advocates the need for a multi-component leverage structure in volatility forecasting (Scharth and Medeiros, 2009; Corsi and Renò,

---

<sup>2</sup>Heston (1993), Duan (1995), Heston and Nandi (2000), Merton (1976), Bates (1996), Bates (2000), Pan (2002), Huang (2004), Bates (2006), Eraker (2004), Eraker et al. (2003) and Broadie et al. (2007)

<sup>3</sup>This idea trace back to Merton (1980) and has been recently formalized and generalized in a series of papers that apply the quadratic variation theory to the class of  $L_2$  semi-martingales; See, e.g., Comte and Renault (1998), Andersen et al. (2001) Andersen et al. (2003), Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard (2001b), Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard (2002a), Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard (2002b), Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard (2005).

2012). Finally, the need for a flexible pricing kernel incorporating variance-dependent risk premia, in addition to the common equity risk premium, has been forcefully shown by Christoffersen et al. (2011). However, in the current literature, the analytical tractability of discrete time option pricing models is guarantee only for rather specific types of models and pricing kernels.

The purpose of this paper is to propose a very general framework encompassing a wide class of discrete time multi-factor asymmetric volatility models for which we show how to derive (using conditional moment-generating functions) closed-form option valuation formulas under very general and flexible state-dependent pricing kernel. This general framework allows for a wide range of interesting applications. For instance, it permits a straightforward generalizations of both the multi-component GARCH-type model of Christoffersen et al. (2008) as well as of the Heterogeneous Autoregressive Gamma (HARG) model for realized volatility of Corsi et al. (2012). In this paper we focus our attention on the applications of the general framework to the realized volatility class of model while its applications to the GARCH type of models will be the subject of a separate companion paper.

More in details, this paper provides several theoretical results for both the general framework and the specific application to realized volatility models which can be summarized as follows. For the general framework we show: (i) the recursive formula for the analytical Moment Generating Function (MGF) under  $\mathbb{P}$ , (ii) the general characterization of the analytical no-arbitrage conditions, (iii) the formal change of measure obtained using a general and flexible exponentially affine Stochastic Discount Factor (SDF) which features both equity risk premium and multi-factor variance risk premia (i.e. a risk premium for each volatility component, although, for the sake of simplicity, we will consider later all volatility factor having the same risk premium), (iv) the recursive formula for the analytical MGF under  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

In addition, by applying the general framework to the specific class of model featuring HARG type of dynamics for realized volatility we are able to: (i) introduce various flexible types of leverage having heterogeneous structures analogous to the one specified by HARG model for volatility, by preserving the full analytical tractability of the model, (ii) have flexible skewness and kurtosis term structure

under both  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$ , (iii) have an explicit one-to-one mapping between the parameters of the volatility dynamics under  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$ , (iv) have closed-form option prices for model with heterogeneous realized volatility and leverage dynamics. Finally, by applying our fully analytically tractable HARG model with heterogeneous leverage on a large sample of S&P 500 index options, we evidence the superior ability of the model in pricing out-of-the-money (OTM) options compared to existing benchmarks.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we propose general framework for option pricing with multi-factor volatility models. Section 3 defines a family of HARG model for realized volatility with leverage (LHARG), presents two particular models belonging to the family, describes the estimation of the models and analyzes their statistical properties. Section 4 reports the option pricing performance of LHARG models, comparing them with benchmark models. Finally, in Section 5 we summarize the results.

## 2 The multi-factor volatility models

### 2.1 General framework

The main goal of introducing a multi-factor structure in volatility modeling is to account for dependencies among volatilities at different time-scales. As today, there are two alternative approaches in the literature. The first one is to decompose the daily volatility into several factors and model the dynamics of each factor independently, as done by Christoffersen et al. (2008) or Fouque and Lorig (2011) in terms of short-run and long-run volatility components. The other approach is to define factors as an average of past volatilities over different time horizons, for instance the daily, weekly and monthly components in Corsi (2009). In this section we propose a general framework including both approaches.

We consider a risky asset with price  $S_t$  and geometric return

$$y_{t+1} = \log \left( \frac{S_{t+1}}{S_t} \right).$$

To model the dynamics of log-returns we define the  $k$ -dimensional vector of factors  $f_t^1, \dots, f_t^k$  which we shortly denote as  $\mathbf{f}_t$ . The volatility on day  $t$  is defined as a linear function of factors  $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

and the daily log-returns on day  $t + 1$  are modeled by equation

$$y_{t+1} = r + \lambda \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{f}_{t+1}) + \sqrt{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{f}_{t+1})} \epsilon_{t+1}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $r$  is the risk-free rate,  $\lambda$  is the market price of risk, and  $\epsilon_t$  are i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . We model  $\mathbf{f}_{t+1}$  as

$$\mathbf{f}_{t+1} | \mathbf{F}_t, \mathbf{L}_t \sim \mathcal{D}(\Theta_0, \Theta(\mathbf{F}_t, \mathbf{L}_t)), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}$  denotes a generic distribution depending on the vector of parameters  $\Theta$  which is a  $k$ -dimensional function of the matrices  $\mathbf{F}_t = (\mathbf{f}_t, \dots, \mathbf{f}_{t-p+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times p}$  and  $\mathbf{L}_t = (\boldsymbol{\ell}_t, \dots, \boldsymbol{\ell}_{t-q+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times q}$  for  $p > 0$  and  $q > 0$ , respectively. We consider the case of a linear dependence of  $\Theta$  on  $\mathbf{F}$  and  $\mathbf{L}$

$$\Theta(\mathbf{F}_t, \mathbf{L}_t) = \mathbf{d} + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{M}_i \mathbf{f}_{t+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{N}_j \boldsymbol{\ell}_{t+1-j}, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\mathbf{M}_i, \mathbf{N}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q$ ,  $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , and vectors  $\boldsymbol{\ell}_{t-j}$  are of the form

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_{t+1-j} = \begin{bmatrix} (\epsilon_{t+1-j} - \gamma_1 \sqrt{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{f}_{t+1-j})})^2 \\ \vdots \\ (\epsilon_{t+1-j} - \gamma_k \sqrt{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{f}_{t+1-j})})^2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2.4)$$

The vector  $\Theta_0$  collects all the parameters of the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  which do not depend on the past history of the factors and of the leverage.

The results presented in this paper are derived under the general assumption

**Assumption 1.** *The following relation holds true*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{zy_{s+1} + \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1} + \mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{s+1}} | \mathcal{F}_s \right] = e^{\mathcal{A}(z, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{B}_i(z, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathcal{C}_j(z, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{s+1-j}} \quad (2.5)$$

for some functions  $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_j : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ , where  $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $\cdot$  stands for the scalar product in  $\mathbb{R}^k$ .

Our framework is suited to include both GARCH-like models and realized volatility models. As far as



the former class is concerned, we encompass the family of multiple component GARCH models with parabolic leverage pioneered in Heston and Nandi (2000) and later extended to the two Component GARCH (CGARCH) by Christoffersen et al. (2008). For instance, the latter model corresponds to the following dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} y_{t+1} &= r + \lambda h_{t+1} + \sqrt{h_{t+1}} \epsilon_{t+1}, \\ h_{t+1} &= q_{t+1} + \beta_1 (h_t - q_t) + \alpha_1 \left( \epsilon_t^2 - 1 - 2\gamma_1 \epsilon_t \sqrt{h_t} \right), \\ q_{t+1} &= \omega + \beta_2 q_t + \alpha_2 \left( \epsilon_t^2 - 1 - 2\gamma_2 \epsilon_t \sqrt{h_t} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Setting  $k = 2$ , we define  $f_{t+1}^1 = h_{t+1} - q_{t+1}$  and  $f_{t+1}^2 = q_{t+1}$  and rewrite the model as

$$\begin{bmatrix} f_{t+1}^1 \\ f_{t+1}^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha_1 \\ \omega - \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 - \alpha_1 \gamma_1^2 & -\alpha_1 \gamma_1^2 \\ -\alpha_2 \gamma_2^2 & \beta_2 - \alpha_2 \gamma_2^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f_t^1 \\ f_t^2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \left( \epsilon_t - \gamma_1 \sqrt{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{f}_t)} \right)^2 \\ \left( \epsilon_t - \gamma_2 \sqrt{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{f}_t)} \right)^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{f}_t) = f_t^1 + f_t^2 = h_t$ . If we now specify for  $\mathcal{D}$  in eq. (2.2) the form of a Dirac delta distribution, define  $\mathbf{d} = (-\alpha_1, \omega - \alpha_2)^t$  and identify the matrices  $\mathbf{M}_1$  and  $\mathbf{N}_1$  in a natural way from the right term side of eq. (2.7), the model by Christoffersen *et al.* fits the general formula (2.2). It is worth mentioning that for the CGARCH model it is not possible to ensure the non-negative definiteness of both  $h_t$  and  $q_t$  for all  $t$ . Nonetheless, for realistic values of the parameters the probability to obtain negative volatility factors is extremely low and this drawback is largely compensated by the effectiveness of the model in capturing real time series empirical features. We discuss this issue in Section 3.3.

The second example that we discuss is the class of realized volatility models known as Autoregressive Gamma Processes (ARG) introduced in Gouriou and Jasiak (2006), to whom the Heterogeneous Autoregressive Gamma (HARG) model presented in Corsi et al. (2012) belongs. The process  $\text{RV}_t$  is an ARG( $p$ ) if and only if its conditional distribution given  $(\text{RV}_{t-1}, \dots, \text{RV}_{t-p})$  is a noncentred gamma distribution  $\bar{\gamma}(\delta, \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \text{RV}_{t-i}, \theta)$ , where  $\delta$  is the shape,  $\sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \text{RV}_{t-i}$  the non-centrality, and  $\theta$  the scale. Then, the model described by eq.s (2.2)-(2.3) reduces to an ARG( $p$ ) if we fix  $k = 1$ ,  $f_t = \text{RV}_t$ ,

$\mathcal{D} = \bar{\gamma}(\Theta_0, \Theta(\mathbf{F}_{t-1}))$  with

$$\Theta_0 = (\delta, \theta)^t, \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta(\mathbf{F}_{t-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \mathbf{f}_{t-i}.$$

## 2.2 Physical and risk-neutral worlds

The general framework defined by eq.s (2.1)-(2.4) combined with the assumption (2.5) allows us to completely characterize the MGF of the log-returns under the physical measure.

**Proposition 2.** *Under the physical measure  $\mathbb{P}$  the MGF of the log-returns  $y_{t,T} = \log(S_T/S_t)$  conditional on the information available at time  $t$  is of the form*

$$\varphi^{\mathbb{P}}(t, T, z) = e^{\mathbf{a}_t + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{b}_{t,i} \cdot \mathbf{f}_{t+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{c}_{t,j} \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{t+1-j}}, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_s &= \mathbf{a}_{s+1} + \mathcal{A}(z, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}) \\ \mathbf{b}_{s,i} &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{b}_{s+1,i+1} + \mathcal{B}_i(z, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq p-1 \\ \mathcal{B}_i(z, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}) & \text{if } i = p \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{c}_{s,j} &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{c}_{s+1,j+1} + \mathcal{C}_j(z, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}) & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq q-1 \\ \mathcal{C}_j(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}) & \text{if } j = q \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

and  $\mathbf{a}_T = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_{T,i} = \mathbf{c}_{T,j} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q$ .

Proof: See Appendix A.

By specifying the Stochastic Discount Factor (SDF) within the family of the exponential-affine factors, we are able to compute analogous recursions under  $\mathbb{Q}$ . The need for a variance-dependent risk premia in SDF, in addition to the common equity risk premium, has been shown by Christoffersen et al. (2011), Gagliardini et al. (2011) and Corsi et al. (2012) to be crucial to reconcile the time series properties of stock returns with the cross-section of option prices. Our framework permits to adopt a very general and flexible pricing kernel incorporating, in addition to the common equity risk premium,

multiple factor-dependent risk premia. The most general SDF that we might consider in our framework corresponds to the following

$$M_{s,s+1} = \frac{e^{-\boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1} - \nu_2 y_{s+1}}}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [e^{-\boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1} - \nu_2 y_{s+1}} | \mathcal{F}_s]}, \quad (2.10)$$

with  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Although the general framework allows us to introduce  $k + 1$  risk premia, in this paper (following the same approach as in Corsi et al. (2012)) we consider the simpler case in which all the variance risk premia are the same (as it will be clear later, this considerably simplify the model calibration), thus fixing  $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \boldsymbol{\nu}_1 = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_1)^t$ .

**Proposition 3.** *Under the risk-neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  the MGF of the log-returns  $y_{t,T} = \log(S_T/S_t)$  conditional on the information available at time  $t$  is of the form*

$$\varphi_{\nu_1 \nu_2}^{\mathbb{Q}}(t, T, z) = e^{a_t^* + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{b}_{t,i}^* \cdot \mathbf{f}_{t+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{c}_{t,j}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{t+1-j}}, \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_s^* &= a_{s+1}^* + \mathcal{A}(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathcal{A}(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \\ \mathbf{b}_{s,i}^* &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{b}_{s+1,i+1}^* + \mathcal{B}_i(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathcal{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq p-1 \\ \mathcal{B}_i(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathcal{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } i = p \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{c}_{s,j}^* &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{c}_{s+1,j+1}^* + \mathcal{C}_j(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathcal{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq q-1 \\ \mathcal{C}_j(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathcal{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } j = q \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

and  $a_T^* = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_{T,i}^* = \mathbf{c}_{T,j}^* = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q$ .

Proof: See Appendix A.

The notation  $\varphi_{\nu_1 \nu_2}^{\mathbb{Q}}$  stresses the dependence of the risk-neutral log-return distribution on the values of  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$ . Both the equity and variance risk premia have to satisfy the no arbitrage constraints specified by the following relations:

**Proposition 4.** *Under the assumption (2.5) the SDF (2.10) is compatible with the no arbitrage*

restriction if the following conditions are satisfied

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(1 - \nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) &= r + \mathcal{A}(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \\
\mathcal{B}_i(1 - \nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) &= \mathcal{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, p \\
\mathcal{C}_j(1 - \nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) &= \mathcal{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, q.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Proof: See Appendix B.

### 3 LHARG-RV

#### 3.1 The model

HAR-RV processes are introduced to financial literature in Corsi (2009) and are characterized by the different impact that past realized variances aggregated on a daily, weekly and monthly basis have on today's realized variance. Lagged terms are collected in three different non-overlapping factors:  $\text{RV}_t$  (short-term volatility factor),  $\text{RV}_t^{(w)}$  (medium-term volatility factor), and  $\text{RV}_t^{(m)}$  (long-term volatility factor). Corsi et al. (2012) presents the application of HAR-RV models to option pricing discussing an extension of the HAR-RV which includes a daily binary Leverage component (HARGL). However, in Corsi and Renò (2012) the authors stress the importance of a heterogeneous structure for the leverage. Thus we develop an Autoregressive Gamma model with Heterogeneous parabolic Leverage and we name it LHARG-RV model.

LHARG-RV belongs to the family of models described by (2.1)-(2.4) setting  $k = 1$  and  $f_t = \text{RV}_t$ . Thus, log-returns evolve according to the equation

$$y_{t+1} = r + \lambda \text{RV}_{t+1} + \sqrt{\text{RV}_{t+1}} \epsilon_{t+1}, \tag{3.1}$$

while the realized variance at time  $t + 1$  conditioned on information at day  $t$  is sampled from a noncentred gamma distribution

$$\text{RV}_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t \sim \bar{\gamma}(\delta, \Theta(\text{RV}_t, \mathbf{L}_t), \theta) \tag{3.2}$$

with

$$\Theta(\mathbf{RV}_t, \mathbf{L}_t) = d + \beta_d \mathbf{RV}_t^{(d)} + \beta_w \mathbf{RV}_t^{(w)} + \beta_m \mathbf{RV}_t^{(m)} + \alpha_d \ell_t^{(d)} + \alpha_w \ell_t^{(w)} + \alpha_m \ell_t^{(m)}. \quad (3.3)$$

In previous equation  $d \in \mathbb{R}$  is a constant and the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{RV}_t^{(d)} &= \mathbf{RV}_t, & \ell_t^{(d)} &= (\epsilon_t - \gamma \sqrt{\mathbf{RV}_t})^2, \\ \mathbf{RV}_t^{(w)} &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathbf{RV}_{t-i}, & \ell_t^{(w)} &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 (\epsilon_{t-i} - \gamma \sqrt{\mathbf{RV}_{t-i}})^2, \\ \mathbf{RV}_t^{(m)} &= \frac{1}{17} \sum_{i=5}^{21} \mathbf{RV}_{t-i}, & \ell_t^{(m)} &= \frac{1}{17} \sum_{i=5}^{21} (\epsilon_{t-i} - \gamma \sqrt{\mathbf{RV}_{t-i}})^2, \end{aligned}$$

correspond to the heterogeneous components associated to the short-term (daily), medium-term (weekly), and long-term (monthly) volatility and leverage factors, on the left and right column respectively. In order to adjust eq. (3.3) to our framework we rewrite  $\Theta(\mathbf{RV}_t, \mathbf{L}_t)$  as

$$d + \sum_{i=1}^{22} \beta_i \mathbf{RV}_{t+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^{22} \alpha_j \left( \epsilon_{t+1-j} - \gamma \sqrt{\mathbf{RV}_{t+1-j}} \right)^2, \quad (3.4)$$

with

$$\beta_i = \begin{cases} \beta_d & \text{for } i = 1 \\ \beta_w/4 & \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq 5 \\ \beta_m/17 & \text{for } 6 \leq i \leq 22 \end{cases} \quad \alpha_j = \begin{cases} \alpha_d & \text{for } j = 1 \\ \alpha_w/4 & \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq 5 \\ \alpha_m/17 & \text{for } 6 \leq j \leq 22 \end{cases}. \quad (3.5)$$

We show in Appendix A that LHARG models satisfy Assumption 1 and we explicitly derive the  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_i$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_j$  functions. Then, the general results presented in Section 2.2 read

**Proposition 5.** *Under  $\mathbb{P}$ , the MGF for LHARG model has the following form*

$$\varphi^{\mathbb{P}}(t, T, z) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [e^{zyt, T} | \mathcal{F}_t] = \exp \left( \mathbf{a}_t + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{b}_{t,i} \mathbf{RV}_{t+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{c}_{t,j} \ell_{t+1-j} \right) \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a_s &= a_{s+1} + zr - \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - 2c_{s+1,1}) - \delta\mathcal{W}(x_{s+1}, \theta) + d\mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}, \theta) \\
b_{s,i} &= \begin{cases} b_{s+1,i+1} + \mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}, \theta)\beta_i & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq p-1 \\ \mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}, \theta)\beta_i & \text{for } i = p \end{cases} \\
c_{s,j} &= \begin{cases} c_{s+1,j+1} + \mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}, \theta)\alpha_j & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq q-1 \\ \mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}, \theta)\alpha_j & \text{for } j = q \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$x_{s+1} = z\lambda + b_{s+1,1} + \frac{\frac{1}{2}z^2 + \gamma^2 c_{s+1,1} - 2c_{s+1,1}\gamma z}{1 - 2c_{s+1,1}}.$$

The functions  $\mathcal{V}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}$  are defined as follows

$$\mathcal{V}(x, \theta) = \frac{\theta x}{1 - \theta x} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W}(x, \theta) = \ln(1 - x\theta), \tag{3.8}$$

and the terminal conditions read  $a_T = b_{T,i} = c_{T,j} = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q$ .

Proof: See Appendix C.

The proof of the previous proposition provides us with the explicit form of the functions  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_i$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_j$  for the general class of LHARG models. Employing the SDF suggested in (2.10), which for LHARG takes the form

$$M_{s,s+1} = \frac{e^{-\nu_1 RV_{s+1} - \nu_2 y_{s+1}}}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [e^{-\nu_1 RV_{s+1} - \nu_2 y_{s+1}} | \mathcal{F}_s]}, \tag{3.9}$$

and plugging the  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  functions in eq. (2.9) we readily obtain the risk-neutral MGF.

**Corollary 6.** *Under the risk-neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  the MGF for LHARG has the form*

$$\varphi_{\nu_1 \nu_2}^{\mathbb{Q}}(t, T, z) = \exp \left( a_t^* + \sum_{i=1}^p b_{t,i}^* RV_{t+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q c_{t,j}^* \ell_{t+1-j} \right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a_s^* &= a_{s+1}^* + zr - \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - 2c_{s+1,1}^*) - \delta\mathcal{W}(x_{s+1}^*, \theta) + \delta\mathcal{W}(y_{s+1}^*, \theta) \\
&\quad + d\mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}^*, \theta) - d\mathcal{V}(y_{s+1}^*, \theta) \\
b_{s,i}^* &= \begin{cases} b_{s+1,i+1}^* + (\mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{V}(y_{s+1}^*, \theta)) \beta_i & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq p-1 \\ (\mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{V}(y_{s+1}^*, \theta)) \beta_i & \text{for } i = p \end{cases} \\
c_{s,i}^* &= \begin{cases} c_{s+1,i+1}^* + (\mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{V}(y_{s+1}^*, \theta)) \alpha_i & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq q-1 \\ (\mathcal{V}(x_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{V}(y_{s+1}^*, \theta)) \alpha_i & \text{for } i = q, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{s+1}^* &= (z - \nu_2)\lambda + b_{s+1,1}^* - \nu_1 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}(z - \nu_2)^2 + \gamma^2 c_{s+1,1}^* - 2c_{s+1,1}^* \gamma(z - \nu_2)}{1 - 2c_{s+1,1}^*}, \\
y_{s+1}^* &= -\nu_2\lambda - \nu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\nu_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and terminal conditions  $a_T^* = b_{T,i}^* = c_{T,j}^* = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q$ .

Proof: See Appendix C.

The derivation of the no-arbitrage condition for LHARG readily follows from the Proposition 4.

**Corollary 7.** *The LHARG model defined by eq.s (3.1) and (3.3) with SDF specified as in (3.9) satisfies the no-arbitrage condition if, and only if*

$$\nu_2 = \lambda + \frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.11}$$

Proof: See Appendix C.

To derive the price of vanilla options it is sufficient to know the MGF under the risk-neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  which has been given in Corollary 6. However, for exotic instruments it is essential to know the log-return dynamics under  $\mathbb{Q}$ . The comparison of the physical and risk-neutral MGFs provides us the one-to-one mapping among the parameters which transforms the dynamics under  $\mathbb{Q}$  into the dynamics

under  $\mathbb{P}$ .

**Proposition 8.** *Under the risk-neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  the realized variance still follows a LHARG process with parameters*

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_d^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} \beta_d, & \beta_w^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} \beta_w, & \beta_m^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} \beta_m, \\
\alpha_d^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} \alpha_d, & \alpha_w^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} \alpha_w, & \alpha_m^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} \alpha_m, \\
\theta^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} \theta, & \delta^* &= \delta, & \gamma^* &= \gamma + \lambda + \frac{1}{2}, \\
d^* &= \frac{1}{1-\theta y^*} d,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where  $y^* = -\lambda^2/2 - \nu_1 + \frac{1}{8}$ .

Proof: See Appendix D.

From the previous results we can write the simplified risk-neutral MGF which allows us to reduce the computational burden when computing the backward recurrences.

**Corollary 9.** *Under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the MGF for the LHARG model has the same form as in (3.6)-(3.7) with equity risk premium  $\lambda^* = -0.5$  and  $d^*$ ,  $\delta^*$ ,  $\theta^*$ ,  $\gamma^*$ ,  $\alpha_l^*$ ,  $\beta_l^*$  for  $l = d, w, m$  as in (3.12).*

### 3.2 Particular cases

We now discuss two special cases of the model presented in the previous section. The first instance is the HARG model with Parabolic Leverage (P-LHARG) that we obtain setting  $d = 0$  in (3.3), while the second model is a LHARG with zero-mean leverage (ZM-LHARG). The shape of the leverage in the latter has been inspired by the model of Christoffersen et al. (2008) but in the present context it is enriched by an heterogeneous structure

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\ell}_t^{(d)} &= \epsilon_t^2 - 1 - 2\epsilon_t \gamma \sqrt{\text{RV}_t}, \\
\bar{\ell}_t^{(w)} &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^4 \left( \epsilon_{t-i}^2 - 1 - 2\epsilon_{t-i} \gamma \sqrt{\text{RV}_{t-i}} \right), \\
\bar{\ell}_t^{(m)} &= \frac{1}{17} \sum_{i=5}^{21} \left( \epsilon_{t-i}^2 - 1 - 2\epsilon_{t-i} \gamma \sqrt{\text{RV}_{t-i}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$



The linear  $\Theta(\mathbf{RV}_t, \mathbf{L}_t)$  in this case reads

$$\beta_d \mathbf{RV}_t^{(d)} + \beta_w \mathbf{RV}_t^{(w)} + \beta_m \mathbf{RV}_t^{(m)} + \alpha_d \bar{\ell}_t^{(d)} + \alpha_w \bar{\ell}_t^{(w)} + \alpha_m \bar{\ell}_t^{(m)}, \quad (3.13)$$

which can be reduced to the form (3.3) setting  $d = -(\alpha_d + \alpha_w + \alpha_m)$ ,  $\beta_l = \beta_l - \alpha_l \gamma^2$  for  $l = d, w, m$ . As it will be more clear in the next section, the introduction of the less constrained leverage allows the process to explain a larger fraction of the skewness and kurtosis observed on real data. However, similarly to what has been discussed in Section 2 about Christoffersen et al. (2008), it is no more guaranteed that the non centrality parameter of the gamma distribution is positive definite. Nonetheless, in the next section we will provide numerical evidence of the effectiveness of our analytical results in describing a regularized version of this model.

### 3.3 Estimation and statistical properties

The estimation of the parameters characterizing the LHARG-RV family is greatly simplified by the use of Realized Volatility, which permits to avoid any filtering procedure related to latent volatility processes. We compute the RV from tick-by-tick data for the S&P 500 Futures, from January 1, 1990 to December 31, 2007. As pointed out in Corsi et al. (2012), the choice of an adequate RV estimator is mandatory to reconcile the properties of LHARG-RV models with the realized volatility dynamics. In order to exclude from the empirical analysis the effects of jumps in volatility and log-returns, two features which our models can not capture, we employ the same methodology adopted by Corsi and colleagues: i) we estimate the total variation of the log-prices using the Two-Scale estimator proposed by Zhang et al. (2005); ii) purify it from the jump component in prices by means of the Threshold Bipower variation method introduced in Corsi et al. (2010); iii) remove the most extreme observations (jumps) in the volatility series. Finally, to overcome the problem of neglecting the contribution to the volatility due to the overnight effect we rescale our RV estimator to match the unconditional mean of the squared close-to-close daily returns. Further details about the construction of the RV measure are given in Corsi et al. (2012).

The use of a RV proxy for the unobservable volatility allows us to simply employ a Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE) on historical data. Arguing as in Gouriéroux and Jasiak (2006) the conditional

transition density for the LHARG-RV family is available in closed-form and so the log-likelihood reads

$$l_t^T(\delta, \theta, d, \beta_d, \beta_w, \beta_m, \alpha_d, \alpha_w, \alpha_m, \gamma) = - \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\text{RV}_t}{\theta} + \Theta(\mathbf{RV}_{t-1}, \mathbf{L}_{t-1}) \right) + \sum_{t=1}^T \log \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{RV}_t^{\delta+k-1}}{\theta^{\delta+k} \Gamma(\delta+k)} \frac{\Theta(\mathbf{RV}_{t-1}, \mathbf{L}_{t-1})^k}{k!} \right)$$

where  $\Theta(\mathbf{RV}_{t-1}, \mathbf{L}_{t-1})$  is given in eq. (3.3). To implement the MLE, we truncate the infinite sum in the right hand side to the 90th order as done in Corsi et al. (2012). Finally, the estimation of the market price of risk  $\lambda$  in the log-return eq. (3.2) is performed regressing the centred and normalized log-returns on the realized volatility, in a similar way to eq. (18) in Corsi et al. (2012). As a proxy for the risk-free rate  $r$  we employ the FED Fund rate.

#### TABLE ONE ABOUT HERE

In Table 1 we report the parameter values estimated via maximum likelihood for four different models, HARG, HARGL, P-LHARG, and ZM-LHARG<sup>4</sup>. We also show the parameter standard deviations (in parenthesis), and the value of the log-likelihood. All parameters are statistically significant but the monthly leverage component of P-LHARG. As already documented in Corsi (2009) and Corsi et al. (2012) the RV coefficients show a decreasing impact of the past lags on the present value of the RV. As far as the leverage components are concerned there is no evidence of a clear relation among different lags. Finally, it is worth to notice that the inclusion of leverage with heterogeneous structure improves upon the value of the likelihood of competitor HARG and HARGL models.

At this point we provide the numerical evidence that, even though (3.13) cannot be prevented from obtaining negative values, nonetheless the ZM-LHARG is worth to be considered as a reliable model. We compare an extensive Monte Carlo (MC) simulation of the ZM-LHARG dynamics where the non centrality parameter is artificially bounded from below by zero with the analytical MGF computed according to Proposition 5. As far as the probability to obtain a negative value for the non centrality of the gamma distribution is small (given the parameter values in Table 1), we can assess that the analytical MGF is a good approximation of the unknown MGF of the regularized ZM-LHARG. We fix the number of MC to  $0.5 \times 10^6$  and consider six relevant maturities, one day ( $T = 1$ ), one week

---

<sup>4</sup>In Corsi et al. (2012) log-returns were expressed on a daily and percentage basis, whilst the realized volatility was on a yearly and percentage basis. Here, both log-returns and volatilities are on a daily and decimal basis.

( $T = 5$ ), one month ( $T = 22$ ), one quarter ( $T = 63$ ), six months ( $T = 126$ ), and one year ( $T = 256$ ).

FIGURE ONE ABOUT HERE

In the left column from top to bottom of Figure 1 we plot the MGF, the real and imaginary parts of the characteristic function under the physical measure, respectively, while in the right column we show the same quantities under the risk-neutral measure. The lines correspond to the analytical MGFs while the MC expectations are represented by points whose size is larger than the associated error bars. The quality of the agreement is extremely good. Moreover, the MC estimate of the probability associated to the event  $\Theta(\mathbf{RV}_{t-1}, \mathbf{L}_{t-1}) < 0$  is  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ , and  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , confirming once more the reliability of the approximation.

FIGURE TWO ABOUT HERE

Crucial ingredients for reproducing the shape of the implied volatility surface are the term structure of skewness and kurtosis generated by a given option pricing model. Therefore, in Figure 2 we compare the skewness and excess kurtosis associated to the four models HARG, HARGL, P-LHARG, and ZM-LHARG. We do not show the skewness for the HARG case under  $\mathbb{P}$  since this model is not designed to explain the negative skewness, which, indeed, is strictly positive. When moving to  $\mathbb{Q}$  the genuine effect of the calibration of  $\nu_1$  is to induce a small negative skewness. It is worth noticing that for the LHARG-RV models adding the heterogeneous components not only improves the skewness upon the HARGL model, but also considerably increase the excess kurtosis. As far as under the  $\mathbb{Q}$  measure is concerned, the HARGL process catches up the P-LHARG model both in terms of skewness and kurtosis, while the ZM-LHARG always overperforms all the competitor models.

## 4 Valuation performance

### 4.1 Option pricing methodology

We apply the same option pricing procedure for both LHARG models, based on change of measure described by (3.9) and MGF formula given by (3.6)-(3.7). To derive risk-neutral dynamics we need to fix parameters of SDF,  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$ . While the latter is determined by the no-arbitrage condition (Proposition 7), the former has to be calibrated on option prices. Following the same reasoning as

in Corsi et al. (2012), we perform the unconditional calibration of  $\nu_1$  such that the model generated and the average market IV for an one-year time to maturity at-the-money maturity option coincide.

We employ the option pricing numerical method named COS introduced by (Fang and Oosterlee (2008)) which has been proven to be efficient. The method is based on Fourier-cosine expansions and is available as long as the characteristic function of log-returns is known. The numerical algorithm exploits the close relation of the characteristic function with the series coefficients of the Fourier-cosine expansion of the density function.

To sum up we proceed pricing options following four steps: (i) estimation under the physical measure  $\mathbb{P}$ , (ii) unconditional calibration of the parameter  $\nu_1$  (iii) mapping of the parameters of the model estimated under  $\mathbb{P}$  into the parameters under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and (iv) approximation of option prices by COS method using the MGF formula in (3.6)-(3.7) with parameters under measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

## 4.2 Results

In this section we present empirical results for option pricing with LHARG models. For the sake of completeness we also compare LHARG models with the HARG model with no leverage and with the HARGL presented in Corsi et al. (2012). Since the functional form of the leverage of the latter model is not consistent with the current general framework, closed-form formulae for the MGF and for option pricing are not available. Thus, we resort to numerical methodologies such as extensive Monte Carlo scenario generation.

We perform our analysis on European options, written on S&P 500 index. The time series of option prices range from January 1, 1996 to December 31, 2004 and the data are downloaded from Option-Metrics. As it is customary in the literature (see Barone-Adesi et al. (2008)), we filter out options with time to maturity less than 10 days or more than 365 days, implied volatility larger than 70%, or prices less than 5 cents. Following Corsi et al. (2012) we consider only out-of-money (OTM) put and call options for each Wednesday. Moreover we discard deep out-of-money options (moneyness larger

than 1.2 for call options and less than 0.8 for put options). The procedure yields a total number of 41536 observations.

As a measure of the option pricing performance we use the percentage Implied Volatility Root Mean Square Error ( $RMSE_{IV}$ ) put forward by Renault (1997) and computed as

$$RMSE_{IV} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (IV_i^{mkt} - IV_i^{mod})^2} \times 100,$$

where  $N$  is the number of options,  $IV^{mkt}$  and  $IV^{mod}$  represent the market and model implied volatilities, respectively. An alternative performance measure corresponds to the Price Root Mean Square Error ( $RMSE_P$ ) defined in a similar way as  $RMSE_{IV}$  but with implied volatilities replaced by relative prices. We employ the  $RMSE_{IV}$  measure since it tends to put more weight on OTM options, whilst the  $RMSE_P$  emphasizes the importance of ATM options.

#### TABLE TWO ABOUT HERE

The result of our empirical analysis is that both LHARG models outperform competing RV-based stochastic volatility models (HARG, HARGL). Table 2 shows that P-LHARG outperforms HARG and HARGL by about 11% and 4%, respectively in range of moneyness  $0.9 < m < 1.1$  and by about 35% and 17%, respectively in range of moneyness  $0.8 < m < 1.2$ . ZM-LHARG outperforms HARG and HARGL by about 14% and 7%, respectively in range of moneyness  $0.9 < m < 1.1$  and by about 30% and 22%, respectively in range of moneyness  $0.8 < m < 1.2$ . ZM-LHARG improves P-LHARG by about 3% and 6% in range of moneyness  $0.9 < m < 1.1$  and  $0.8 < m < 1.2$ , respectively.

The detailed analysis in Table 3 confirms that the main advantage of LHARG models is its ability to capture the volatility smile. While performance of all model in the at-the-money region is similar, both LHARG models outperform significantly HARG and HARGL in the range of moneyness  $1.1 < m < 1.2$  and even more at the put side region  $0.8 < m < 0.9$ . This improvement stems from the higher flexibility of the model obtained with the multi-component leverage structure.

TABLE THREE ABOUT HERE

Panel B of Table 3 compares the performance of HARGL and P-LHARG. It shows the advantage of heterogeneous leverage compared to one-day binary leverage. Improvement for short maturities and moneyness  $0.8 < m < 0.9$  reaches about 30%. For longer maturities and moneyness below 0.9, P-LHARG still outperforms HARGL, obtaining 3–8% smaller  $RMSE_{IV}$ . While in the other moneyness regions the two models perform very similarly.

Ratio between  $RMSE_{IV}$  of HARGL and ZM-LHARG is displayed in Panel C of Table 3. The advantage of zero-mean heterogeneous leverage over one-day binary leverage is even stronger than in the case of P-LHARG. For all deep out-of-money options, error of ZM-LHARG generated implied volatility is smaller than in the case of HARGL. For short maturities and moneyness less than 0.9 we obtain about 35% improvement. ZM-LHARG performs also better for deep out-of-money options on call side ( $1.1 < m < 1.2$ ), where improvement varies from 3% to 22%.

Comparing model HARG without leverage with P-LHARG and ZM-LHARG in Panel D and Panel E, respectively, the superiority of the latter is even more apparent. While the performance for the ATM options is comparable, for the OTM options models with heterogeneous leverage generate considerable improvement over model without leverage. In the extreme case of OTM short maturity put options P-LHARG and ZM-LHARG produces errors which are 38% - 42% smaller, respectively.

Last Panel (F) of Table 3 compares ZM-LHARG with P-LHARG. It shows that the ability of ZM-LHARG model to reproduce higher level of skewness and kurtosis, permits this more flexible model to outperform the more constrained P-LHARG model. The outperformance is systematic, from ATM options, where  $RMSE_{IV}$  is essentially the same, to deep out-of-money ( $m > 1.1$  or  $m < 0.9$ ) where  $RMSE_{IV}$  is smaller by about 10%.

Summarizing, the proposed LHARG models are able to better reproduce the IV level for OTM options, improving upon the considered HARG and HARGL models. The heterogeneous structure of the leverage thus appears to be a necessary ingredient for having more accurate modeling of the IV smile.

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose a very general framework which includes a wide class of discrete time models featuring multiple components structure in both volatility and leverage and a flexible pricing kernel with multiple risk premia. Within this framework we characterise the recursive formulae for the analytical MGF under  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the change of measure obtained using a flexible exponentially affine SDF, and the analytical no-arbitrage conditions. Then, we focus on a specific new class of realized volatility models, named LHARG, which extend the HARGL model of Corsi et al. (2012) to incorporate analytically tractable heterogeneous leverage structures with multiple components. This feature allows to induce higher skewness and kurtosis which enables LHARG models to outperform other RV-based stochastic volatility models (HARG, HARGL) in pricing out-of-money options.

## Acknowledgements

All authors warmly thank Nicola Fusari for helpful comments and fruitful discussions.

## References

- Adrian, T., Rosenberg, J., 2007. Stock returns and volatility: Pricing the long-run and short-run components of market risk. *Journal of Finance*, forthcoming.
- Andersen, T. G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F., Labys, P., 2001. The distribution of realized exchange rate volatility. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96, 42–55.
- Andersen, T. G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F., Labys, P., 2003. Modeling and forecasting realized volatility. *Econometrica* 71, 579–625.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O., Shephard, N., 2001a. Non-Gaussian Ornstein–Uhlenbeck-based models and some of their uses in financial economics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 63 (2), 167–241.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O., Shephard, N., 2002a. Econometric analysis of realized volatility and its use in estimating stochastic volatility models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 64, 253–280.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Shephard, N., 2001b. Non-gaussian ornstein-uhlenbeck-based models and some of their uses in financial economics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* (63), 167–241.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Shephard, N., 2002b. Estimating quadratic variation using realized variance. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 17, 457–477.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Shephard, N., 2005. How accurate is the asymptotic approximation to the distribution of realized volatility? In: Andrews, D. W. F., Stock, J. H. (Eds.), *Identification and Inference for Econometric Models. A Festschrift in Honour of T.J. Rothenberg*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 306–331.
- Barone-Adesi, G., Engle, R., Mancini, L., 2008. A garch option pricing with filtered historical simulation. *Review of Financial Studies* 21, 1223–1258.

- Bates, D., 1996. Jmps and stochastic volatility: exchange rate processes implicit in deutshe mark options. *Review of Financial Studies* 9, 69–107.
- Bates, D., 2000. Post-'87 crash fears in the s&p 500 futures option market. *Journal of Econometrics* 94 (1-2), 181–238.
- Bates, D., 2006. Maximum likelihood estimation of latent affine processes. *Review of Financial Studies* 19, 909–965.
- Bates, D. S., 2012. Us stock market crash risk, 1926–2010. *Journal of Financial Economics* 105 (2), 229–259.
- Bollerslev, T., 1996. Generalize autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* 31, 307–327.
- Bollerslev, T., Wright, J., 2001. Volatility forecasting, high-frequency data, and frequency domain inference. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 83, 596–602.
- Broadie, M., Chernov, M., Johannes, M., 2007. Model specification and risk premia: evidence from futures options. *Journal of Finance* 62, 1453–1490.
- Calvet, L., Fisher, A., 2004. How to forecast long-run volatility: Regime switching and the estimation of multifractal processes. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 2 (1), 49–83.
- Christoffersen, P., Jacobs, K., Heston, S., 2011. A garch option model with variance-dependent pricing kernel, working paper.
- Christoffersen, P., Jacobs, K., Ornathanalai, C., Wang, Y., 2008. Option valuation with long-run and short-run volatility components. *Journal of Financial Economics* 90 (3), 272–297.
- Comte, F., Renault, E., 1998. Long memory in continuous time stochastic volatility models. *Mathematical Finance* 8, 291–323.
- Corsi, F., 2009. A simple approximate long-memory model of realized-volatility. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 7, 174–196.
- Corsi, F., Fusari, N., La Vecchia, D., 2012. Realizing smiles: Options pricing with realized volatility. *Journal of Financial Economics*.
- Corsi, F., Pirino, D., Renò, R., 2010. Threshold bipower variation and the impact of jumps on volatility forecasting. *Journal of Econometrics* 159 (2), 276 – 288.
- Corsi, F., Renò, R., 2012. Discrete-time volatility forecasting with persistent leverage effect and the link with continuous-time volatility modeling. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 30 (3), 368–380.
- Duan, J. C., 1995. The garch option pricing model. *Mathematical Finance* 5, 13–32.
- Engle, R., 1982. Autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity with estimation of the variance of uk inflation. *Econometrica* 50, 987–1008.
- Engle, R., Lee, G., 1999. A permanent and transitory component model of stock return volatility, in ed. R. Engle and H. White *Cointegration, Causality, and Forecasting: A Festschrift in Honor of Clive W. J. Granger*.
- Eraker, B., 2004. Do stock prices and volatility jump? reconciling evidence from spot and option prices. *Journal of Finance* 59, 1367–1403.
- Eraker, B., Johannes, M., Polson, N., 2003. The impact of jumps in volatility and returns. *Journal of Finance* 58, 1269–1300.
- Fang, F., Oosterlee, C. W., 2008. A novel pricing method for european options based on fourier-cosine series expansions. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 31, 826–848.



- Fouque, J.-P., Lorig, M. J., 2011. A fast mean-reverting correction to heston's stochastic volatility model. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* 2 (1), 221–254.
- Gagliardini, P., Gouriéroux, C., Renault, 2011. Efficient derivative pricing by extended method of moments. *Econometrica* Forthcoming.
- Glosten, L. R., Jagannathan, R., Runkle, D., 1993. On the relation between the expected value and the volatility of the nominal excess return on stocks. *Journal of Finance* 48, 1779–1801.
- Gourieroux, C., Jasiak, J., 2006. Autoregressive gamma process. *Journal of Forecasting* 25, 129–152.
- Heston, L. S., 1993. Options with stochastic volatility with applications to bond and currency options. *The Review of Financial Studies* 6, 327–343.
- Heston, S., Nandi, S., 2000. A closed-form garch option valuation model. *Review Financial Studies* 13 (3), 585–625.
- Huang, X. Wu, L., 2004. Specification analysis of option pricing model s base on time-changed levy processes. *Journal of Finance* 59, 1405–1439.
- Li, G., Zhang, C., 2010. On the number of state variables in options pricing. *Management Science* 56 (11), 2058.
- Merton, R. C., 1976. Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous. *Journal of Financial Economics* 3, 125–144.
- Merton, R. C., 1980. On estimating the expected return on the market: an exploratory investigation. *Journal of Financial Economics* 8, 323–61.
- Muller, U., Dacorogna, M., Davé, R., Olsen, R., Pictet, O., von Weizsacker, J., 1997. Volatilities of different time resolutions - analyzing the dynamics of market components. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 4, 213–239.
- Nelson, D. B., 1991. Conditional heteroskedasticity in asset returns: a new approach. *Econometrica* 59, 347–370.
- Pan, J., 2002. The jump-risk premia implicit in options: evidence from an integrated time-series study. *Journal of Financial Economics* 63, 3–50.
- Renault, E., 1997. Econometric models of option pricing errors. *Econometric Society Monographs* 28, 223–278.
- Scharth, M., Medeiros, M. C., 2009. Asymmetric effects and long memory in the volatility of dow jones stocks. *International Journal of Forecasting* 25 (2), 304–327.
- Zhang, L., Ait-Sahalia, Y., Mykland, P. A., 2005. A tale of two time scales: determining integrated volatility with noisy high frequency data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100, 1394–1411.

## A Computation of MGF

We start computing the MGF under the risk-neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Using the expression for the SDF given in (B.3) and using repeatedly the tower law of conditional expectation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_{\nu_1\nu_2}^{\mathbb{Q}}(t, T, z) \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} [e^{zy_{t,T}} | \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [M_{t,t+1} \dots M_{T-1,T} e^{zy_{t,T}} | \mathcal{F}_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ M_{t,t+1} \dots M_{T-2,T-1} e^{zy_{t,T-1}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [M_{T-1,T} e^{zy_T} | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}] | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ M_{t,t+1} \dots M_{T-2,T-1} e^{zy_{t,T-1} - \mathcal{A}(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) - \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{f}_{T-i}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times e^{-\sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{T-i}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{-\nu_1 \cdot \mathbf{f}_{T-1} + (z - \nu_2) y_T} | \mathcal{F}_{T-1} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ M_{t,t+1} \dots M_{T-2,T-1} e^{zy_{t,T-1} + \mathcal{A}(z - \nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) - \mathcal{A}(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0})} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times e^{\sum_{i=1}^p [\mathbf{B}_i(z - \nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) - \mathbf{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0})] \cdot \mathbf{f}_{T-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q [\mathbf{C}_j(z - \nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) - \mathbf{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0})] \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{T-j}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ M_{t,t+1} \dots M_{T-2,T-1} e^{zy_{t,T-1} + \mathbf{a}_{T-1}^* + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{b}_{T-1,i}^* \cdot \mathbf{f}_{T-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{c}_{T-1,j}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{T-j}} | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ M_{t,t+1} \dots M_{T-3,T-2} e^{zy_{t,T-2} + \mathbf{a}_{T-1}^*} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ M_{T-2,T-1} e^{zy_{T-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{b}_{T-1,i}^* \cdot \mathbf{f}_{T-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{c}_{T-1,j}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{T-j}} | \mathcal{F}_{T-2} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= \dots \\
&= e^{\mathbf{a}_t^* + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{b}_{t,i}^* \cdot \mathbf{f}_{t+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathbf{c}_{t,j}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{t+1-j}},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{a}_s^* &= \mathbf{a}_{s+1}^* + \mathcal{A}(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \nu_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathcal{A}(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) \\
\mathbf{b}_{s,i}^* &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{b}_{s+1,i+1}^* + \mathbf{B}_i(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \nu_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathbf{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq p-1 \\ \mathbf{B}_i(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \nu_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathbf{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } i = p \end{cases} \\
\mathbf{c}_{s,j}^* &= \begin{cases} \mathbf{c}_{s+1,j+1}^* + \mathbf{C}_j(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \nu_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathbf{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq q-1 \\ \mathbf{C}_j(z - \nu_2, \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* - \nu_1, \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*) - \mathbf{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, \mathbf{0}) & \text{if } j = q \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

and  $\mathbf{a}_T^* = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_{T,i}^* = \mathbf{c}_{T,j}^* = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $j = 1, \dots, q$ . Finally, the MGF under  $\mathbb{P}$  readily follows by noticing that for  $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0$  the SDF reduces to one, therefore  $\varphi^{\mathbb{P}}(t, T, z) = \varphi_{00}^{\mathbb{Q}}(t, T, z)$ . Moreover, from relation (2.5) we conclude that  $\mathcal{A}(0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = 0$  and  $\mathbf{B}_i(0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{C}_j(0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$  and the thesis follows.

## B No arbitrage condition

The no-arbitrage conditions are

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [M_{s,s+1} | \mathcal{F}_s] = 1 \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [M_{s,s+1} e^{y_{s+1}} | \mathcal{F}_s] = e^r \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The first condition is satisfied by definition of  $M_{s,s+1}$ . Before moving to the second condition, let us rewrite the SDF as

$$\begin{aligned} M_{s,s+1} &= \frac{e^{-\boldsymbol{\nu}_1 \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1} - \nu_2 y_{s+1}}}{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [e^{-\boldsymbol{\nu}_1 \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1} - \nu_2 y_{s+1}} | \mathcal{F}_s]} \\ &= \exp \left( \begin{aligned} & -\mathcal{A}(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) - \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1-i} \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^q \mathcal{C}_i(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{s+1-i} - \boldsymbol{\nu}_1 \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1} - \nu_2 y_{s+1} \end{aligned} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_1 = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_1)^t \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and functions  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_i$  and  $\mathcal{C}_j$  are defined in (2.5). Finally, the condition (B.2) reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\exp(-\boldsymbol{\nu}_1 \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1} + (1 - \nu_2) y_{s+1}) | \mathcal{F}_s] \\ &= \exp \left( r + \mathcal{A}(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) + \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{B}_i(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{f}_{s+1-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \mathcal{C}_j(-\nu_2, -\boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \mathbf{0}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\ell}_{s+1-j} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Using once again the relation (2.5) we obtain the no-arbitrage conditions.

## C MGF computation for LHARG and no-arbitrage conditions

Firstly, we derive the explicit form of the scalar functions  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_i$  and  $\mathcal{C}_j$ . In the case of LHARG we have  $f_t = RV_t$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{zy_s + bRV_s + c\ell_s} | \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] \\
&= e^{zr} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{(z\lambda + b)RV_s} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{z\sqrt{RV_s}\epsilon_s + c(\epsilon_s - \gamma\sqrt{RV_s})^2} | RV_s \right] | \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] \\
&= e^{zr} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{\left(z\lambda + b - \frac{z^2}{4c} + \gamma z\right)RV_s} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{c(\epsilon_s - (\gamma - \frac{z}{2c})\sqrt{RV_s})^2} | RV_s \right] | \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] \\
&= e^{zr - \frac{1}{2} \ln(1-2c)} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{\left(z\lambda + b + \frac{\frac{1}{2}z^2 + \gamma^2c - 2c\gamma z}{1-2c}\right)RV_s} | \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

In the last equality we have used the fact that if  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( x(Z + y)^2 \right) \right] = \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - 2x) + \frac{xy^2}{1 - 2x} \right). \tag{C.2}$$

Using eq.s (8)-(9) from Gourieroux and Jasiak (2006) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ e^{zy_s + bRV_s + c\ell_s} | \mathcal{F}_{s-1} \right] \\
&= \exp \left[ zr - \delta\mathcal{W}(x, \theta) + \mathcal{V}(x, \theta) \left( d + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i RV_{s-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \alpha_j \ell_{s-j} \right) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}(x, \theta) = \frac{\theta x}{1 - \theta x}, \quad \mathcal{W}(x, \theta) = \ln(1 - x\theta),$$

and

$$x(z, b, c) = z\lambda + b + \frac{\frac{1}{2}z^2 + \gamma^2c - 2c\gamma z}{1 - 2c}.$$

From direct inspection of the relation (2.5), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(z, b, c) &= zr - \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - 2c) - \delta\mathcal{W}(x, \theta) + d\mathcal{V}(x, \theta), \\
\mathcal{B}_i(z, b, c) &= \mathcal{V}(x, \theta)\beta_i, \\
\mathcal{C}_j(z, b, c) &= \mathcal{V}(x, \theta)\alpha_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.4}$$

Finally, plugging the above expressions for  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_i$  and  $\mathcal{C}_j$  in eq. (2.9) and (2.12) we readily obtain the recurrence relations under the physical and risk-neutral measures, respectively. The no-arbitrage condition similarly follows from formulae (C.4) and relations (2.13) noticing that it is sufficient to

impose

$$x(1 - \nu_2, -\nu_1, 0) = x(-\nu_2, -\nu_1, 0).$$

## D Risk-neutral dynamics

To derive the mapping of the parameters under which the risk-neutral MGF is formally equivalent to the physical MGF, we need to compare eq. (3.10) to eq. (3.7). In particular we have to find a set of starred parameters for which the recursions under  $\mathbb{P}$  correspond to the expressions under  $\mathbb{Q}$ . More precisely, after defining

$$\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**} = z\lambda^* + \mathbf{b}_{s+1,1}^* + \frac{\frac{1}{2}z^2 + (\gamma^*)^2 \mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^* - 2\mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^* \gamma^* z}{1 - 2\mathbf{c}_{s+1,1}^*},$$

the following relations have to hold

$$\delta (\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{W}(y^*, \theta)) = \delta^* \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}, \theta^*), \quad (\text{D.1})$$

$$\beta_i (\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{V}(y^*, \theta)) = \beta_i^* \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}, \theta^*), \quad (\text{D.2})$$

$$\alpha_j (\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{V}(y^*, \theta)) = \alpha_j^* \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}, \theta^*), \quad (\text{D.3})$$

$$d (\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^*, \theta) - \mathcal{V}(y^*, \theta)) = d^* \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}, \theta^*), \quad (\text{D.4})$$

with  $y^* = -\lambda^2/2 - \nu_1 + \frac{1}{8}$ . Eq. (D.1) can be rewritten as

$$\delta \log \left[ 1 - \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta y^*} (\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^* - y^*) \right] = \delta^* \log (1 - \theta^* \mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}),$$

from which we obtain the sufficient conditions  $\delta^* = \delta$ ,  $\theta^* = \theta/(1 - \theta y^*)$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^* - y^* = \mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}$ . It is possible to verify by substitution that the latter relation is satisfied posing  $\lambda^* = -1/2$  and  $\gamma^* = \gamma + \lambda + 1/2$ . The relation (D.2) is equivalent to

$$\frac{\beta_i}{1 - \theta y^*} \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta y^*} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^* - y^*}{[1 - \theta/(1 - \theta y^*) (\mathbf{x}_{s+1}^* - y^*)]} = \beta_i^* \frac{\theta^* \mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}}{1 - \theta^* \mathbf{x}_{s+1}^{**}},$$

which implies  $\beta_i^* = \beta_i/(1 - \theta y^*)$ . Similar reasoning applies for eq.s (D.3) and (D.4).

Parameter	Model			
	HARG	HARGL	P-LHARG	ZM-LHARG
$\lambda$			2.005 (1.489)	
$c$	1.149e-005 (1.036e-007)	1.116e-005 (9.864e-008)	1.068e-005 (9.466e-008)	1.117e-005 (9.484e-008)
$\delta$	1.358 (0.04566)	1.395 (0.04646)	1.243 (0.0482)	1.78 (0.04319)
$\beta_d$	3.959e+004 (619.9)	2.993e+004 (1037)	2.429e+004 (439.4)	3.382e+004 (180.1)
$\beta_w$	2.451e+004 (1770)	2.796e+004 (1247)	2.317e+004 (1199)	2.542e+004 (225)
$\beta_m$	1.012e+004 (1644)	1.132e+004 (897)	1.322e+004 (1690)	1.338e+004 (142.7)
$\alpha_d$	-	1.389e+004 (1235)	0.2376 (0.00113)	0.3991 (0.007164)
$\alpha_w$	-	-	0.1194 (0.002058)	0.3446 (0.01162)
$\alpha_m$	-	-	3.85e-006 (3.649e-006)	0.4034 (0.02082)
$\gamma$	-	-	223.7 (5.122)	134.8 (9.525)
$\nu_1$	-2794	-3119	-3069	-3375
Log-likelihood	-25344	-25279	-25234	-25172
Persistence	0.8532	0.8495	0.8391	0.8116

Table 1: Maximum likelihood estimates, robust standard errors, and models performance. The historical data for the HARG, HARGL, P-LHARG and ZM-LHARG models are given by the daily RV measure computed on tick-by-tick data for the S&P500 Futures (see Section 3.3). For all three models, the estimation period ranges from the period 1990-2005. The parameter  $\nu_1$  for each model has been fitted on option prices.

### Implied Volatility RMSE

Model	Moneyness	
	$0.9 < m < 1.1$	$0.8 < m < 1.2$
HARGL	3.817	6.103
P-LHARG/HARGL	0.960	0.824
ZM-LHARG/HARGL	0.927	0.775
P-LHARG/HARG	0.891	0.746
ZM-LHARG/HARG	0.861	0.702
ZM-LHARG/P-LHARG	0.966	0.942

Table 2: Global option pricing performance on S&P500 out-of-the-money options from January 1, 1996 to December 31, 2004, computed with the RV measure estimated from 1990 to 2007.

We use the maximum likelihood parameter estimates from Table 1. First row: percentage implied volatility root mean squared error ( $RMSE_{IV}$ ) of the HARGL model (benchmark) for different moneyness range. Second and subsequent rows: relative  $RMSE_{IV}$  of the selected models.

Moneyiness	Maturity			
	$\tau \leq 50$	$50 < \tau \leq 90$	$90 < \tau \leq 160$	$160 < \tau$
Panel A HARGL Implied Volatility RMSE				
$0.8 \leq m \leq 0.9$	16.140	8.267	6.803	5.516
$0.9 < m \leq 0.98$	5.598	4.411	3.939	3.872
$0.98 < m \leq 1.02$	2.681	2.780	2.872	3.261
$1.02 < m \leq 1.1$	3.061	2.783	2.789	3.070
$1.1 < m \leq 1.2$	5.412	3.262	3.217	3.206
Panel B P-LHARG/HARGL Implied Volatility RMSE				
$0.8 \leq m \leq 0.9$	0.691	0.917	0.939	0.973
$0.9 < m \leq 0.98$	0.892	0.925	0.975	1.020
$0.98 < m \leq 1.02$	0.988	1.025	1.071	1.087
$1.02 < m \leq 1.1$	0.975	1.069	1.120	1.114
$1.1 < m \leq 1.2$	0.799	0.949	0.975	1.048
Panel C ZM-LHARG/HARGL Implied Volatility RMSE				
$0.8 \leq m \leq 0.9$	0.648	0.824	0.844	0.902
$0.9 < m \leq 0.98$	0.841	0.870	0.928	1.001
$0.98 < m \leq 1.02$	0.988	1.035	1.073	1.096
$1.02 < m \leq 1.1$	0.961	1.041	1.089	1.101
$1.1 < m \leq 1.2$	0.784	0.849	0.854	0.972
Panel D P-LHARG/HARG Implied Volatility RMSE				
$0.8 \leq m \leq 0.9$	0.616	0.825	0.847	0.890
$0.9 < m \leq 0.98$	0.802	0.852	0.909	0.972
$0.98 < m \leq 1.02$	0.965	1.003	1.045	1.062
$1.02 < m \leq 1.1$	0.934	1.007	1.060	1.065
$1.1 < m \leq 1.2$	0.836	0.831	0.857	0.942
Panel E ZM-LHARG/HARG Implied Volatility RMSE				
$0.8 \leq m \leq 0.9$	0.577	0.741	0.761	0.825
$0.9 < m \leq 0.98$	0.757	0.801	0.865	0.954
$0.98 < m \leq 1.02$	0.965	1.013	1.047	1.070
$1.02 < m \leq 1.1$	0.920	0.981	1.030	1.052
$1.1 < m \leq 1.2$	0.821	0.743	0.751	0.874
Panel F ZM-LHARG/P-LHARG Implied Volatility RMSE				
$0.8 \leq m \leq 0.9$	0.937	0.898	0.899	0.927
$0.9 < m \leq 0.98$	0.943	0.940	0.952	0.981
$0.98 < m \leq 1.02$	1.000	1.010	1.002	1.008
$1.02 < m \leq 1.1$	0.986	0.974	0.972	0.989
$1.1 < m \leq 1.2$	0.982	0.894	0.876	0.927

Table 3: Option pricing performance on S&P500 out-of-the-money options from January 1, 1996 to December 31, 2004, computed with the RV measure estimated from 1990 to 2007.

We use the maximum likelihood parameter estimates from Table 1. Panel A: percentage implied volatility root mean squared error ( $RMSE_{IV}$ ) of the HARGL model sorted by moneyiness and maturity. Panels B to F: relative  $RMSE_{IV}$  sorted by moneyiness and maturity.






Figure 1: Left column, from top to bottom: MGF, real and imaginary parts of the characteristic function of the ZM-LHARG process under the physical measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . Right column, form top to bottom: MGF, real and imaginary parts of the Characteristic Function of the ZM-LHARG process under the risk-neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ . The lines correspond to different maturities  $T = 1, 5, 22, 63, 126, 252$ , while points to Monte Carlo expected values; Monte Carlo error bars are smaller than the point size.




Figure 2: Left column, from top to bottom: skewness and excess kurtosis of the HARG, HARGL, P-LHARG, and ZM-LHARG processes under the physical measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . Right column: as for the left column but under the risk-neutral measure.