Option pricing model based on a Markov-modulated diffusion with jumps

Nikita Ratanov

University of Rosario

Abstract. The paper proposes a class of financial market models which are based on inhomogeneous telegraph processes and jump diffusions with alternating volatilities. It is assumed that the jumps occur when the tendencies and volatilities are switching. Such a model captures well the stock price dynamics under periodic financial cycles. The distribution of this process is described in detail. We also provide a closed form of the structure of risk-neutral measures. This incomplete model can be completed by adding another asset based on the same sources of randomness. For completed market model we obtain explicit formulae for call prices.

1 Introduction

Beginning with the works of Mandelbrot (1963), Mandelbrot and Taylor (1967), and Clark (1973), it is widely recognized that the market dynamics cannot be described by geometric Brownian motion with constant parameters of drift and volatility. A lot of sophisticated constructions have been exploited to capture the features that help to express the reality better than Black–Scholes–Merton model. First, Merton (1976) proposed a jump diffusion model for the asset pricing. Later on the constructions with random drift and random volatility parameters appeared. Although it would be difficult to improve these theoretical findings in terms of structural generality, the efforts to calculate exact theoretically and practically significant formulas for option pricing have been successful only for those models of financial markets, in which the increments of underlying random processes are independent (Wiener, Poisson, Lévy processes etc.).

Another approach utilizes Markovian dependence on the past and the technique of Markov random processes [see, e.g., Elliott and van der Hoek (1997)]. We deal mainly with this direction. More precisely, the model is based on a standard Brownian motion $w = w(t)$, $t \geq 0$ and on a Markov process $\varepsilon(t)$, $t \geq 0$ with two states 0, 1 and with transition probability intensities λ_0 and λ_1.

Let us define processes $c_{\varepsilon(t)}$, $\sigma_{\varepsilon(t)}$ and $r_{\varepsilon(t)}$, $t \geq 0$, where $c_0 \geq c_1$, $r_0, r_1 > 0$. Then, we introduce $\mathcal{T}(t) = \int_0^t c_{\varepsilon(\tau)} \, d\tau$, $\mathcal{D}(t) = \int_0^t \sigma_{\varepsilon(\tau)} \, dw(\tau)$ and a pure jump process $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(t)$ with alternating jumps of sizes h_0 and h_1, $h_0, h_1 > -1$.

The continuous time random motion $\mathcal{T}(t) = \int_0^t c_{\varepsilon(\tau)} \, d\tau, t \geq 0$ with alternating velocities is known as telegraph process. This type of processes have been used before in various probabilistic aspects [see, e.g., Goldstein (1951), Kac (1974) and Zacks (2004)]. These processes have been exploited for stochastic volatility modeling [Di Masi, Kabanov and Runggaldier (1994)], as well as for obtaining a "telegraph analog" of the Black–Scholes model [Di Crescenzo and Pellerey (2002)]. The option pricing models based on continuous-time random walks are widely presented in the physics literature [see Masoliver et al. (2006) or Montero (2008)]. Recently the telegraph processes was applied to actuarial problems, Mazza and Rullière (2004). Markov-modulated telegraph-diffusion process $\mathcal{T}(t) + \mathcal{D}(t), t \geq 0$ (or more general regime switching Lévy process) was exploited for financial market modeling [see Guo (2001), Jobert and Rogers (2006), Asmussen, Avram and Pistorius (2004)], as well as in insurance [see Bäuerle and Kötter (2007)] or in theory of queueing networks [see Ren and Kobayashi (1998)].

In this paper we presume the evolution of risky asset $S(t)$ to be given by the stochastic exponential of the sum $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{T}(t) + \mathcal{D}(t) + \mathcal{J}(t)$. The bond price is the usual exponential of the process $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}(t) = \int_0^t r_{\varepsilon(\tau)} \, d\tau, t \geq 0$ with alternating interest rates r_0 and r_1.

This model generalizes the classic Black–Scholes–Merton model based on geometric Brownian motion ($c_0 = c_1, r_0 = r_1, \sigma_0 = \sigma_1 \neq 0, h_0 = h_1 = 0$), Black and Scholes (1973), Merton (1973). Other particular versions of this model was also discussed before:

1. $c_0 = c_1, \sigma_0 = \sigma_1 = 0, h_0 = h_1 \neq 0$: *Cox–Ross model*, Cox and Ross (1976);
2. $c_0 \neq c_1, \sigma_0 = \sigma_1 = 0, h_0 \neq h_1$: *jump-telegraph model*, Ratanov (2007a);
3. $c_0 \neq c_1, \sigma_0 \neq \sigma_1, h_0 = h_1 = 0$: *Markov-modulated dynamics*, Guo (2001), Jobert and Rogers (2006).

The jump-telegraph model, as well as Black–Scholes and Cox–Ross model, is free of arbitrage opportunities, and it is complete. Moreover it permits explicit standard option pricing formulae similar to the classic Black–Scholes formula. Under suitable rescaling this model converges to the Black–Scholes [see Ratanov (2007a)]. First calibration results of the parameters of the telegraph model have been presented in De Gregorio and Iacus (2007). These estimations have been based on the data of Dow–Jones industrial average (July 1971–August 1974). However, a presence of jumps and/or diffusion components has not been estimated. Nevertheless, an implied volatility with respect to a moneyness variable in stochastic volatility models of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type [see Nicolato and Venardos (2003)] looks very similar to the volatility smile in jump telegraph model [see Ratanov (2007b)].

In this paper we extend the jump-telegraph market model, presented in Ratanov (2007a, 2007b), by adding the diffusion component with an alternating volatility coefficients.

The jump-telegraph model equipped with the diffusion term becomes more realistic. Indeed, the alternating velocities of the telegraph process describe long-term financial trends, and the diffusion summand introduces an uncertainty of current prices. This uncertainty may have different volatilities in different market trends $(\sigma_0 \neq \sigma_1)$.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we present the detailed definitions and the description of underlying processes and their distributions. The explicit construction of a measure change is given by the Girsanov theorem for jump telegraph-diffusion processes.

In Section 3 we describe the set of risk-neutral measures for the incomplete jump telegraph-diffusion model. Also we consider a completion of the model by adding another asset driven by the same sources of randomness. For the completed market model we obtain explicit option pricing formulae of the standard call option. These formulae are based on a mix of Black–Scholes function and densities of spending times of the driving Markov flow.

2 Jump telegraph processes and jump diffusions with Markov switching

Let $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Denote $\varepsilon_i(t), t \geq 0, i = 0, 1$ a pair of Markov processes with two states $\{0, 1\}$ and with rates $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}\{\varepsilon_i(t + \Delta t) = j \mid \varepsilon_i(t) = j\} = 1 - \lambda_j \Delta t + o(\Delta t), \qquad \Delta t \to 0, i, j = 0, 1.$$

Subscript i indicates the initial state $\varepsilon_i(0) = i$.

Let $\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots$ be switching times. The time intervals $\tau_j - \tau_{j-1}, j = 1, 2, \ldots$ ($\tau_0 = 0$), separated by moments of value changes $\tau_j = \tau_j^i$ are independent and exponentially distributed. We denote by $\mathbb{P}_i$ the conditional probability with respect to the initial state $i = 0, 1$, and by $\mathbb{E}_i$ the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_i$.

Denote by $N_i(t) = \max\{j : \tau_j \leq t\}, t \geq 0$ a number of switchings of ε_i till time $t, t \geq 0$. It is clear that $N_i, i = 0, 1$ are the counting Poisson processes with alternating intensities $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 > 0$. It is easy to see that the distributions $\pi_i(t; n) := \mathbb{P}_i\{N_i(t) = n\}, n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, i = 0, 1, t \geq 0$ of the processes $N_i = N_i(t)$ satisfy the following system:

$$\frac{d\pi_i(t; n)}{dt} = -\lambda_i \pi_i(t; n) + \lambda_i \pi_{1-i}(t; n - 1), \qquad i = 0, 1, n \geq 1,$$

$$\pi_i(t; 0) = e^{-\lambda_i t}. \tag{2.1}$$

To prove it notice that conditioning on the Poisson event on the time interval $(0, \Delta t)$ one can obtain

$$\pi_i(t + \Delta t; n) = (1 - \lambda_i \Delta t)\pi_i(t; n) + \lambda_i \Delta t \pi_{1-i}(t; n - 1) + o(\Delta t), \qquad \Delta t \to 0,$$

which immediately leads to (2.1).

Let $c_0, c_1, c_0 > c_1; h_0, h_1; \sigma_0, \sigma_1$ be real numbers. Let $w = w(t), t \geq 0$ be a standard Brownian motion independent of ε_i. We consider

$$\mathcal{T}_i(t) = \mathcal{T}_i(t; c_0, c_1) = \int_0^t c_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)} \, \mathrm{d}\tau,$$

$$\mathcal{J}_i(t) = \mathcal{J}_i(t; h_0, h_1) = \int_0^t h_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)} \, \mathrm{d}N_i(\tau) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_i(t)} h_{\varepsilon_i(\tau_j-)},$$

$$\mathcal{D}_i(t) = \mathcal{D}_i(t; \sigma_0, \sigma_1) = \int_0^t \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)} \, \mathrm{d}w(\tau). \tag{2.2}$$

Processes $\mathcal{T}_0, \mathcal{T}_1$ are telegraph processes with the states $\langle c_0, \lambda_0 \rangle$ and $\langle c_1, \lambda_1 \rangle$, $\mathcal{J}_0, \mathcal{J}_1$ have a sense of pure jump processes, and $\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1$ are Markov-modulated diffusions. Thus the sum $\mathcal{X}_i := \mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{J}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t), t \geq 0, i = 0, 1$ is naturally called jump telegraph-diffusion (JTD) process with two states, $\langle c_0, h_0, \sigma_0, \lambda_0 \rangle$ and $\langle c_1, h_1, \sigma_1, \lambda_1 \rangle$.

Further, we will assume all processes to be adapted to the natural filtration $\mathfrak{F}^i = (\mathfrak{F}_t^i)_{t \geq 0}$ $(\mathfrak{F}_0^i = \{\varnothing, \Omega\})$, generated by $\varepsilon_i(t), t \geq 0$, and $w(t), t \geq 0$. We suppose that the filtration satisfies the "usual conditions" [see, e.g., Karatzas and Schreve (1998)].

The distribution of $\mathcal{X}_i(t)$ can be found exactly. First, we denote by $p_i(x, t; n)$ (generalized) probability densities with respect to the measure $\mathbb{P}_i$ of the jump telegraph-diffusion variable $\mathcal{X}_i(t)$, which has n turns up to time t:

$$\mathbb{P}_i\{\mathcal{X}_i(t) \in \Delta, N_i(t) = n\} = \int_\Delta p_i(x, t; n) \, \mathrm{d}x, \tag{2.3}$$

$$i = 0, 1, t \geq 0, n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots.$$

The PDEs which describe the densities $p_i(x, t; n)$ have the following form.

Theorem 2.1. *Densities $p_i, i = 0, 1$ satisfy the following PDE-system*

$$\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial t}(x, t; n) + c_i \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x}(x, t; n) - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 p_i}{\partial x^2}(x, t; n)$$

$$= -\lambda_i p_i(x, t; n) + \lambda_i p_{1-i}(x - h_i, t; n - 1), \tag{2.4}$$

$$t > 0, i = 0, 1, n \geq 1.$$

Moreover

$$p_i(x, t; 0) = \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_i t} \psi_i(x, t), \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\psi_i(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sigma_i \sqrt{2\pi t}} \mathrm{e}^{-(x - c_i t)^2 / (2\sigma_i^2 t)}, \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$p_i(x, t; n)|_{t \downarrow 0} = 0, \qquad n \geq 1, i = 0, 1.$$

Proof. The equality (2.5) follows from definitions (2.2) and (2.3).

To derive (2.4) note that from the properties of Poisson and Wiener processes [see, e.g., Protter (1990)] for any $t_2 > t_1$ it follows that

$$\mathcal{X}_i(t_2) = \mathcal{X}_i(t_1) + \mathcal{X}'_{\varepsilon_i(t_1)}(t_2 - t_1), \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathcal{X}'_i$ is a copy of the process $\mathcal{X}_i$, $i = 0, 1$ which is independent of the original.

Let $\Delta t > 0$. From (2.7) it follows that $\mathcal{X}_i(t + \Delta t) = \mathcal{X}_i(\Delta t) + \mathcal{X}'_i(t)$. Let τ is the random variable uniformly distributed on $[0, \Delta t]$ and independent of $\mathcal{X}_i$. Notice that $\mathcal{X}_i(\Delta t) = c_i \Delta t + \sigma_i w(\Delta t)$, if $N_i(\Delta t) = 0$, and $\mathcal{X}_i(\Delta t) \overset{d}{=} c_i \tau + c_{1-i}(\Delta t - \tau) + \sigma_i w(\tau) + \sigma_{1-i} w(\Delta t - \tau) + h_i$, if $N_i(\Delta t) = 1$.

Since $\mathbb{P}_i(N_i(\Delta t) > 1) = o(\Delta t)$ as $\Delta t \to 0$, then conditioning on a jump in $(0, \Delta t)$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_i(x, t + \Delta t; n) &= (1 - \lambda_i \Delta t) p_i(\cdot, t; n) * \psi_i(\cdot, \Delta t)(x) \\
&\quad + \lambda_i \Delta t p_{1-i}(\cdot, t; n - 1) * \tilde{\psi}_i(\cdot, \Delta t)(x - h_i) + o(\Delta t),
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.8}
$$

$i = 0, 1, \Delta t \to 0$. Here $\psi_i(\cdot, \Delta t)$, the distribution density of $c_i \Delta t + \sigma_i w(\Delta t)$, is defined in (2.6), and $\tilde{\psi}_i(\cdot, \Delta t)$ is the distribution density of $c_i \tau + c_{1-i}(\Delta t - \tau) + \sigma_i w(\tau) + \sigma_{1-i} w(\Delta t - \tau)$; the notation $*$ is used for the convolution in spacial variables.

It is easy to see, that $\psi_i(x, \Delta t), \tilde{\psi}_i(x, \Delta t) \to \delta(x)$ as $\Delta t \to 0$. Hence

$$p_i(\cdot, t; n) * \psi_i(\cdot, \Delta t)(x) \to p_i(x, t; n),$$

$$p_{1-i}(\cdot, t; n - 1) * \tilde{\psi}_i(\cdot, \Delta t)(x - h_i) \to p_{1-i}(x - h_i, t; n - 1) \tag{2.9}$$

as $\Delta t \to 0$.

Then,

$$
\frac{1}{\Delta t}[p_i(\cdot, t; n) * \psi_i(\cdot, \Delta t)(x) - p_i(x, t; n)]
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\Delta t}\left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p_i(x - y, t; n)\psi_i(y, \Delta t)\, \mathrm{d}y - p_i(x, t; n)\right]
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [p_i(x - c_i\Delta t - y\sigma_i\sqrt{\Delta t}, t; n) - p_i(x, t; n)]\psi(y)\, \mathrm{d}y,
$$

where $\psi = \psi(\cdot)$ is $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$-density. The latter value equals to

$$
\frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi(y)\left[\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x}(x, t; n)(-c_i\Delta t - y\sigma_i\sqrt{\Delta t})\right.
$$

$$
\left. + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 p_i}{\partial x^2}(x, t; n)(-c_i\Delta t - y\sigma_i\sqrt{\Delta t})^2 + o(\Delta t)\right] \mathrm{d}y
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi(y)\left[\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x}(x, t; n)(-c_i\Delta t)\right.
$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 p_i}{\partial x^2}(x, t; n) y^2 \sigma_i^2 \Delta t + o(\Delta t) \bigg] dy$$

$$\rightarrow -c_i \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x}(x, t; n) + \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 p_i}{\partial x^2}(x, t; n),$$

so system (2.4) follows from (2.8) and (2.9). $\qquad\qquad\square$

To express the solution of system (2.4) we use functions $q_i = q_i(x, t; n)$ which are defined as follows. For $n \geq 1$

$$q_0(x, t; 2n) = \frac{\lambda_0^n \lambda_1^n}{(c_0 - c_1)^{2n}} \cdot \frac{(c_0 t - x)^{n-1}(x - c_1 t)^n}{(n-1)! n!} \theta(x, t),$$

$$q_1(x, t; 2n) = \frac{\lambda_0^n \lambda_1^n}{(c_0 - c_1)^{2n}} \cdot \frac{(c_0 t - x)^n (x - c_1 t)^{n-1}}{n!(n-1)!} \theta(x, t), \qquad (2.10)$$

and for $n \geq 0$

$$q_0(x, t; 2n+1) = \frac{\lambda_0^{n+1} \lambda_1^n}{(c_0 - c_1)^{2n+1}} \cdot \frac{(c_0 t - x)^n (x - c_1 t)^n}{(n!)^2} \theta(x, t),$$

$$q_1(x, t; 2n+1) = \frac{\lambda_0^n \lambda_1^{n+1}}{(c_0 - c_1)^{2n+1}} \cdot \frac{(c_0 t - x)^n (x - c_1 t)^n}{(n!)^2} \theta(x, t). \qquad (2.11)$$

Here $\theta(x, t) = \exp\{-\frac{\lambda_1}{c_0 - c_1}(c_0 t - x) - \frac{\lambda_0}{c_0 - c_1}(x - c_1 t)\} \mathbf{1}_{\{c_1 t < x < c_0 t\}}$.

In the particular case of jump telegraph process without a diffusion term the distribution densities $p_i^{(0)}$ can be found from equation (2.4) with $\sigma_0 = \sigma_1 = 0$. It is easy to see [Ratanov (2007a)] that

$$p_i^{(0)}(x, t; n) = q_i(x - j_i(n), t; n), \qquad (2.12)$$

where $j_i(n) = [(n+1)/2]h_i + [n/2]h_{1-i}, n = 0, 1, \ldots$. Equation (2.5) now means that $p_0^{(0)}(x, t; 0) = e^{-\lambda_0 t} \delta(x - c_0 t)$, $p_1^{(0)}(x, t; 0) = e^{-\lambda_1 t} \delta(x - c_1 t)$.

Conditioning on the number of switches we get the probability density of the jump telegraph process which is described by parameters $\langle c_0, \lambda_0, h_0 \rangle$ and $\langle c_1, \lambda_1, h_1 \rangle$:

$$p_i^{(0)}(x, t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_i^{(0)}(x, t; n). \qquad (2.13)$$

Remark 2.1. Formula (2.13) in particular case $B = h_0 + h_1 = 0$ becomes

$$p_i^{(0)}(x, t) = e^{-\lambda_i t} \cdot \delta(x - c_i t)$$
$$+ \frac{\theta(x, t)}{c_0 - c_1} \bigg[\lambda_i \exp\bigg(\frac{\lambda_0 - \lambda_1}{c_0 - c_1} h_i \bigg)$$

$$\times I_0 \left(2 \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1 (c_0 t - x + h_i)(x - h_i - c_1 t)}}{c_0 - c_1} \right)$$

$$+ \sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1} \left(\frac{x - c_1 t}{c_0 t - x} \right)^{1/2 - i} I_1 \left(2 \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1 (c_0 t - x)(x - c_1 t)}}{c_0 - c_1} \right) \right],$$

where $I_0(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(z/2)^{2n}}{(n!)^2}$ and $I_1(z) = I_0'(z)$ are modified Bessel functions. Compare with Beghin, Nieddu and Orsingher (2001).

We apply previous results to obtain the distributions of times which the process ε_i spends in the certain state.

Let $T_i = T_i(t) = \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon_i(\tau)=0\}} \, d\tau$, $i = 0, 1$ be the total time between 0 and t spending by the process ε_i in the state 0 starting form the state i.

If we consider a standard telegraph processes with velocities $c_0 = 1, c_1 = -1$, $\overline{T_0}(t) = \int_0^t (-1)^{N_0(\tau)} \, d\tau$ and $\overline{T_1}(t) = -\int_0^t (-1)^{N_1(\tau)} \, d\tau$, then

$$\overline{T_0}(t) = T_0 - (t - T_0) = 2T_0 - t \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{T_1}(t) = 2T_1 - t. \qquad (2.14)$$

Let $f_i(\tau, t; n)$, $0 \le \tau \le t$ denote the density of T_i: for all measurable $\Upsilon \subset [0, t]$

$$\int_{\Upsilon} f_i(\tau, t; n) \, d\tau = \mathbb{P}_i \{ T_i \in \Upsilon, N_i(t) = n \}. \qquad (2.15)$$

Applying (2.14) we can notice that

$$f_0(\tau, t; n) = 2\bar{p}_0(2\tau - t, t; n), \qquad f_1(\tau, t; n) = 2\bar{p}_1(2\tau - t, t; n), \qquad (2.16)$$

where $\bar{p}_0$ and $\bar{p}_1$ are the densities of the standard telegraph process $\overline{T_0}$ and $\overline{T_1}$. Functions $\bar{p}_0$ and $\bar{p}_1$ are defined in (2.10)–(2.12) with $c_0 = 1$, $c_1 = -1$ and $h_0 = h_1 = 0$.

Using formulae for densities $\bar{p}_i$, which are obtained in (2.10)–(2.12), from (2.16) we have

$$f_0(\tau, t; 0) = e^{-\lambda_0 t} \delta(\tau - t), \qquad f_1(\tau, t; 0) = e^{-\lambda_1 t} \delta(\tau).$$

For $n \ge 1$

$$f_0(\tau, t; 2n) = \lambda_0^n \lambda_1^n \frac{(t - \tau)^{n-1} \tau^n}{(n-1)! n!} e^{-\lambda_0 \tau - \lambda_1 (t - \tau)} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \le \tau \le t\}}, \qquad (2.17)$$

$$f_1(\tau, t; 2n) = \lambda_0^n \lambda_1^n \frac{(t - \tau)^n \tau^{n-1}}{(n-1)! n!} e^{-\lambda_0 \tau - \lambda_1 (t - \tau)} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \le \tau \le t\}}, \qquad (2.18)$$

and for $n \ge 0$

$$f_0(\tau, t; 2n + 1) = \lambda_0^{n+1} \lambda_1^n \frac{(t - \tau)^n \tau^n}{(n!)^2} e^{-\lambda_0 \tau - \lambda_1 (t - \tau)} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \le \tau \le t\}}, \qquad (2.19)$$

$$f_1(\tau, t; 2n + 1) = \lambda_0^n \lambda_1^{n+1} \frac{(t - \tau)^n \tau^n}{(n!)^2} e^{-\lambda_0 \tau - \lambda_1 (t - \tau)} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \le \tau \le t\}}. \qquad (2.20)$$

Summarizing we have the following expressions for the densities $f_i(\tau, t)$ of the spending time of the the process $\varepsilon_i(\tau), 0 \leq \tau \leq t$ in state 0:

$$f_0(\tau, t) = e^{-\lambda_0 t} \delta(\tau - t)$$

$$+ e^{-\lambda_0 \tau - \lambda_1(t - \tau)} \left[\lambda_0 I_0 \big(2\sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1 \tau(t - \tau)} \big) + \sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1} \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{t - \tau}} \right.$$

$$\left. \times I_1 \big(2\sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1 \tau(t - \tau)} \big) \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq \tau \leq t\}}, \qquad (2.21)$$

$$f_1(\tau, t) = e^{-\lambda_1 t} \delta(\tau)$$

$$+ e^{-\lambda_0 \tau - \lambda_1(t - \tau)} \left[\lambda_1 I_0 \big(2\sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1 \tau(t - \tau)} \big) + \sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1} \sqrt{\frac{t - \tau}{\tau}} \right.$$

$$\left. \times I_1 \big(2\sqrt{\lambda_0 \lambda_1 \tau(t - \tau)} \big) \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq \tau \leq t\}}. \qquad (2.22)$$

In terms of $f_i(\tau, t)$ it is possible to express the distribution of the telegraph-diffusion process. If $T_i(t) = \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon_i(\tau)=0\}} \, d\tau$, then $\mathcal{T}_i(t) = c_0 T_i(t) + c_1(t - T_i(t))$ and $\mathcal{D}_i(t) \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma_0 w(T_i(t)) + \sigma_1 w'(t - T_i(t))$, where w and w' are independent.

Let $a_\tau = c_0 \tau + c_1(t - \tau)$ and $\Sigma_\tau^2 = \sigma_0^2 \tau + \sigma_1^2(t - \tau)$. The distribution densities of telegraph-diffusion process $\mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t), t \geq 0$ can be expressed as follows:

$$p_i(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{f_i(\tau, t)}{\Sigma_\tau} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2\Sigma_\tau^2}(x - a_\tau)^2 \right\} d\tau.$$

Next, we describe in this framework martingales and martingale measures. The following theorem could be considered as a version of the Doob–Meyer decomposition for telegraph-diffusion processes with alternating intensities.

Theorem 2.2. *Jump telegraph-diffusion process* $\mathcal{T}_i + \mathcal{J}_i + \mathcal{D}_i, i = 0, 1$ *is a martingale if and only if* $c_0 = -\lambda_0 h_0$ *and* $c_1 = -\lambda_1 h_1$.

Proof. The processes $\sigma_{\varepsilon_i(t)}, t \geq 0, i = 0, 1$ are $\mathfrak{F}_t$-measurable. Hence the processes $\mathcal{D}_i = \mathcal{D}_i(t) = \int_0^t \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)} \, dw(\tau), t \geq 0, i = 0, 1$ are $\mathfrak{F}_t$-martingales. Now, the result follows from Theorem 2.1 of Ratanov (2007a). □

Let $h_0, h_1 > -1$. Denote

$$\kappa_i(t) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_i(t)} \big(1 + h_{\varepsilon_i(\tau_k-)} \big). \qquad (2.23)$$

Corollary 2.1. *The process* $\exp\{\mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t)\}\kappa_i(t)$ *is a martingale if and only if* $c_i + \sigma_i^2/2 = -\lambda_i h_i, i = 0, 1$.

Proof. It is sufficient to notice that $\exp\{\mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t)\}\kappa_i(t) = \mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{T}_i + \mathcal{J}_i + \mathcal{D}_i + 1/2\int_0^t \sigma^2_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau)$, where $\mathcal{E}_t(\cdot)$ denote a stochastic exponential [see Protter (1990)]. The corollary follows from Theorem 2.2. $\qquad\square$

Now we study the properties of jump telegraph-diffusion processes under a change of measure. Let $\mathcal{T}_i^*$, $i = 0, 1$ be the telegraph processes with states $\langle c_0^*, \lambda_0 \rangle$ and $\langle c_1^*, \lambda_1 \rangle$, and $J_i^* = -\sum_{j=1}^{N_i(t)} c^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau_j-)}/\lambda_{\varepsilon_i(\tau_j-)}$, $i = 0, 1$ be the jump processes with jump values $h_i^* = -c_i^*/\lambda_i > -1$, which let the sum $\mathcal{T}_i^* + \mathcal{J}_i^*$ to be a martingale. Let $\mathcal{D}_i^* = \int_0^t \sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}\,\mathrm{d}w(\tau)$ be the diffusion with alternating diffusion coefficients σ_i^*, $i = 0, 1$. Consider a probability measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ with a local density with respect to $\mathbb{P}_i$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z_i(t) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}_i^*}{\mathbb{P}_i}\bigg|_t = \mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{T}_i^* + \mathcal{J}_i^* + \mathcal{D}_i^*) \\
&= \exp\left(\mathcal{T}_i^*(t) + \mathcal{D}_i^*(t) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t (\sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(s)})^2\,\mathrm{d}s\right)\kappa_i^*(t),
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.24}
$$

where $\kappa_i^*(t)$ is defined in (2.23) with h_i^* instead of h_i.

Theorem 2.3 (Girsanov theorem). *Under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$:*

(1) *process $\tilde{w}(t) := w(t) - \int_0^t \sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau$ is a standard Brownian motion;*
(2) *counting Poisson process $N_i(t)$ has intensities $\lambda_i^* := \lambda_i(1 + h_i^*) = \lambda_i - c_i^*$.*

Proof. Let $U_i(t) := \exp\{z\tilde{w}(t)\} = \exp\{z(w(t) - \int_0^t \sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau)\}$. For (1) it is sufficient to show that for any $t_1 < t$

$$
\mathbb{E}_i\{Z_i(t)U_i(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_1}\} = \mathrm{e}^{z^2(t-t_1)/2}Z_i(t_1)U_i(t_1).
$$

We prove it for $t_1 = 0$ [see (2.7)].
Notice that

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z_i(t)U_i(t) &= \exp\bigg\{\mathcal{T}_i^*(t) + \mathcal{D}_i^*(t) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t (\sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)})^2\,\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\qquad + zw(t) - z\int_0^t \sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}\,\mathrm{d}\tau\bigg\}\kappa_i^*(t) \\
&= \exp\bigg\{\int_0^t \left(c_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}{}^2 - z\sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}\right)\mathrm{d}\tau \\
&\qquad + \int_0^t (\sigma^*_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)} + z)\,\mathrm{d}w(\tau)\bigg\}\kappa_i^*(t) \\
&= \mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{T}_i^* + \mathcal{D}_i^* + \mathcal{J}_i^* + zw)\exp(z^2t/2).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}_i(Z_i(t)U_i(t)) = \exp(z^2t/2)$.

To prove the second part of the theorem we denote $\pi_i^*(t; n) = \mathbb{P}_i^*\{N_i(t) = n\} = \mathbb{E}_i(Z_i(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{N_i(t)=n\}}) = \kappa_i^*(n) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^x p_i^*(x, t; n) \, dx$, where $\kappa_i^*(n) = \prod_{k=1}^{n}(1 + h_{\varepsilon_i(\tau_k-)})$, and $p_i^* = p_i^*(x, t; n)$ are (generalized) probability densities of telegraph-diffusion process $X_i^*(t) + D_i^*(t) - \int_0^t (\sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^*)^2 \, d\tau/2$. Notice that functions $p_i^*(x, t; n)$ satisfy system (2.4) with $c_i^* - (\sigma_i^*)^2/2$ and σ_i^* instead of c_i and σ_i, respectively. Therefore

$$\frac{d\pi_i^*(t; n)}{dt} = (c_i^* - \lambda_i)\pi_i^*(t; n) + \lambda_i(1 + h_i^*)\pi_{1-i}^*(t; n - 1).$$

Next notice that $\lambda_i - c_i^* = \lambda_i + \lambda_i h_i^* := \lambda_i^*$ and, thus

$$\frac{d\pi_i^*(t; n)}{dt} = -\lambda_i^*\pi_i^*(t; n) + \lambda_i^*\pi_{1-i}^*(t; n - 1).$$

The second part of the theorem now follows from (2.1). $\square$

3 Jump telegraph-diffusion model

Let $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_i(t) = 0, 1, t \geq 0$ be a Markov switching process defined in Section 2 which indicates the current market state.

Consider $\mathcal{T}_i$, $\mathcal{J}_i$ and $\mathcal{D}_i$, which are defined in (2.2). Assume that $h_0, h_1 > -1$. First, we define the market with one risky asset. Assume that the price of the risky asset which initially is at the state i, follows the equation

$$dS(t) = S(t-) \, d(\mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{J}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t)), \qquad i = 0, 1.$$

As it is observed in Section 2,

$$S(t) = S_0 \mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{T}_i + \mathcal{J}_i + \mathcal{D}_i) = S_0 \exp\left(\mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^2 \, d\tau\right)\kappa_i(t). \quad (3.1)$$

Let $r_i, r_i \geq 0$ is the interest rate of the market which is at the state $i, i = 0, 1$. Let us consider the geometric telegraph process of the form

$$B(t) = \exp\{\mathcal{Y}_i(t)\}, \qquad \mathcal{Y}_i(t) = \int_0^t r_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)} \, d\tau \qquad (3.2)$$

as a numeraire.

The model (3.1)–(3.2) is incomplete. Due to the simplicity of this model the set $\mathcal{M}$ of equivalent risk-neutral measures can be described in detail.

Let us define an equivalent measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ by means of the density $Z_i(t)$ [see (2.24)] with arbitrary c_i^*, σ_i^* and $h_i^* = -c_i^*/\lambda_i > -1$. Due to Theorem 2.3 $c_i^* = \lambda_i - \lambda_i^* < \lambda_i, i = 0, 1$.

Let $\theta_0, \theta_1 > 0$. We denote $c_0^* = \lambda_0 - \theta_0, c_1^* = \lambda_1 - \theta_1, h_0^* = -1 + \theta_0/\lambda_0, h_1^* = -1 + \theta_1/\lambda_1$, and we take arbitrary σ_0^*, σ_1^*. Due to Theorem 2.3, under the measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ the driving Poisson process $N_i(t)$ has intensities $\lambda_i^* = \lambda_i - c_i^* = \theta_i, i = 0, 1$. We argue that the equivalent risk-neutral measures for the model (3.1)–(3.2) depend on two positive parameters θ_0 and θ_1.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\sigma_0 \neq 0$ and $\sigma_1 \neq 0$. Let probability measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ be defined by means of the density $Z_i(t), t \geq 0$, where $Z_i(t), t \geq 0$ is defined in (2.24).*

The process $B(t)^{-1}S(t)$ is a $\mathbb{P}_i^*$-martingale if and only if the measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ is defined by parameters

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_0^* &= \lambda_0 - \theta_0, & c_1^* &= \lambda_1 - \theta_1, \\
h_0^* &= -1 + \theta_0/\lambda_0, & h_1^* &= -1 + \theta_1/\lambda_1, \\
\sigma_0^* &= (r_0 - c_0 - h_0\theta_0)/\sigma_0, & \sigma_1^* &= (r_1 - c_1 - h_1\theta_1)/\sigma_1, \\
\theta_0 &> 0, & \theta_1 &> 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. Indeed,

$$
Z_i(t)B(t)^{-1}S(t) = S_0\exp\{Y_i(t)\}\tilde{\kappa}_i(t),
$$

where

$$
Y_i(t) = \mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{T}_i^*(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i^*(t) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\left(\sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^2 + \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{*\,2}\right)d\tau - \mathcal{Y}_i(t)
$$

and $\tilde{\kappa}_i(t)$ is defined as in (2.23) with $\tilde{h}_i$ instead of h_i. Here $\tilde{h}_i$ satisfies the equation

$$
1 + \tilde{h}_i = (1 + h_i^*)(1 + h_i), \qquad i = 0, 1.
$$

Thus $\tilde{h}_i = h_i + h_i^* + h_i h_i^* = h_i + (-1 + \theta_i/\lambda_i) + h_i(-1 + \theta_i/\lambda_i) = \theta_i(1 + h_i)/\lambda_i - 1, i = 0, 1$. Using Corollary 2.1 we see that $Z_i(t)B(t)^{-1}S(t)$ is the $\mathbb{P}_i$-martingale, if and only if

$$
\begin{cases}
c_0 + c_0^* - r_0 + \sigma_0\sigma_0^* = -\lambda_0\tilde{h}_0, \\
c_1 + c_1^* - r_1 + \sigma_1\sigma_1^* = -\lambda_1\tilde{h}_1.
\end{cases}
$$

Note that $c_i^* = \lambda_i - \theta_i$ and $\lambda_i\tilde{h}_i = \theta_i(1 + h_i) - \lambda_i$, so

$$
\begin{cases}
c_0 + (\lambda_0 - \theta_0) - r_0 + \sigma_0\sigma_0^* = -\theta_0(1 + h_0) + \lambda_0, \\
c_1 + (\lambda_1 - \theta_1) - r_1 + \sigma_1\sigma_1^* = -\theta_1(1 + h_1) + \lambda_1,
\end{cases}
$$

and then

$$
\begin{cases}
c_0 - r_0 + \sigma_0\sigma_0^* = -\theta_0 h_0, \\
c_1 - r_1 + \sigma_1\sigma_1^* = -\theta_1 h_1.
\end{cases}
\tag{3.3}
$$

Therefore $\sigma_i^* = (r_i - c_i - h_i\theta_i)/\sigma_i, i = 0, 1$. $\qquad\square$

Remark 3.1. The case of $\sigma_0 = \sigma_1 = 0$ is called a jump-telegraph model, and it is complete. In this case the martingale measure is defined by $c_i^* = \lambda_i - \lambda_i^*$ and $\lambda_i^* = \frac{r_i - c_i}{h_i}$ as the new intensities of switchings. See Ratanov (2007a) for details.

The Black–Scholes model respects to $h_0 = h_1 = 0, \sigma_0 = \sigma_1 := \sigma, c_0 = c_1 := c, r_0 = r_1 = r$. In this case system (3.3) has the unique solution $\sigma_0^* = \sigma_1^* = \sigma^* =$

$\frac{r-c}{\sigma}$. It means that the martingale measure is unique. Due to Girsanov Theorem 2.3 the process $w(t) - \sigma^* t$ is Brownian motion under the new measure, which repeats the classic result.

To complete the model we add a new asset. Consider the market of two risky assets which are driven by common Brownian motion w and counting Poisson processes N_i:

$$dS^{(1)}(t) = S^{(1)}(t-)\,d\big(\mathcal{T}_i^{(1)}(t) + \mathcal{J}_i^{(1)}(t) + \mathcal{D}_i^{(1)}(t)\big), \qquad (3.4)$$

$$dS^{(2)}(t) = S^{(2)}(t-)\,d\big(\mathcal{T}_i^{(2)}(t) + \mathcal{J}_i^{(2)}(t) + \mathcal{D}_i^{(2)}(t)\big). \qquad (3.5)$$

As usual, $i = 0, 1$ denotes the initial market state.

Denote

$$\Delta_0^{(h)} = \begin{vmatrix} \sigma_0^{(1)} & h_0^{(1)} \\ \sigma_0^{(2)} & h_0^{(2)} \end{vmatrix} = \sigma_0^{(1)} h_0^{(2)} - \sigma_0^{(2)} h_0^{(1)},$$

$$\Delta_1^{(h)} = \begin{vmatrix} \sigma_1^{(1)} & h_1^{(1)} \\ \sigma_1^{(2)} & h_1^{(2)} \end{vmatrix} = \sigma_1^{(1)} h_1^{(2)} - \sigma_1^{(2)} h_1^{(1)}. \qquad (3.6)$$

Let $\Delta_0^{(h)} \neq 0$, $\Delta_1^{(h)} \neq 0$. We assume that

$$\lambda_i^* := \frac{\Delta_i^{(r-c)}}{\Delta_i^{(h)}} > 0, \qquad (3.7)$$

where $\Delta_i^{(r-c)}$, $i = 0, 1$ are defined as in (3.6) with $r_i - c_i^{(1)}$, $r_i - c_i^{(2)}$ instead of $h_i^{(1)}$, $h_i^{(2)}$, $i = 0, 1$.

Theorem 3.2. *Both processes* $B(t)^{-1} S^{(m)}(t)$, $t \geq 0$, $m = 1, 2$ *are* $\mathbb{P}_i^*$-*martingales if and only if the measure* $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ *is defined by* (2.24) *with the following parameters*:

$$\sigma_0^* = \frac{(r_0 - c_0^{(1)}) h_0^{(2)} - (r_0 - c_0^{(2)}) h_0^{(1)}}{\Delta_0^{(h)}},$$

$$\sigma_1^* = \frac{(r_1 - c_1^{(1)}) h_1^{(2)} - (r_1 - c_1^{(2)}) h_1^{(1)}}{\Delta_1^{(h)}}, \qquad (3.8)$$

$$c_0^* = \lambda_0 - \frac{\Delta_0^{(r-c)}}{\Delta_0^{(h)}}, \qquad c_1^* = \lambda_1 - \frac{\Delta_1^{(r-c)}}{\Delta_1^{(h)}} \qquad (3.9)$$

and

$$h_0^* = -c_0^*/\lambda_0, \qquad h_1^* = -c_1^*/\lambda_1.$$

Under the measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ *the rate of leaving the state* i *equals to* λ_i^* *defined in* (3.7).

Proof. First notice

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z_i(t)B(t)^{-1}S^{(m)}(t) &= S^{(m)}(0)\mathcal{E}_t \exp(\mathcal{T}_i^* + \mathcal{J}_i^* + \mathcal{D}_i^*) \\
&\quad \times \exp(-Y_i(t))\mathcal{E}_t\big(\mathcal{T}_i^{(m)} + \mathcal{J}_i^{(m)} + \mathcal{D}_i^{(m)}\big) \\
&= \exp\bigg(\mathcal{T}_i^*(t) + \mathcal{D}_i^*(t) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t {\sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^*}^2 \, d\tau \bigg)\kappa_i^*(t) \\
&\quad \times \exp\bigg(\mathcal{T}_i^{(m)}(t) + \mathcal{D}_i^{(m)}(t) - Y_i(t) \\
&\qquad\qquad - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t {\sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(m)}}^2 \, d\tau \bigg)\kappa_i^{(m)}(t) \\
&= \mathcal{E}_t\bigg(\mathcal{T}_i^{(m)} + \mathcal{T}_i^* + \mathcal{D}_i^{(m)} + \mathcal{D}_i^* \\
&\qquad\qquad - Y_i + \int_0^t \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(m)}\sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^* \, d\tau \bigg)\kappa_i^{(m)}(t)\kappa_i^*(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $Z_i(t)B(t)^{-1}S^{(m)}(t)$ is a martingale if and only if (Theorem 2.2)

$$
\begin{cases}
c_i^{(1)} + c_i^* - r_i + \sigma_i^{(1)}\sigma_i^* = -\lambda_i\big(h_i^{(1)} + h_i^* + h_i^{(1)}h_i^*\big), \\
c_i^{(2)} + c_i^* - r_i + \sigma_i^{(2)}\sigma_i^* = -\lambda_i\big(h_i^{(2)} + h_i^* + h_i^{(2)}h_i^*\big).
\end{cases} \tag{3.10}
$$

Now using the identities $c_i^* = -\lambda_i h_i^*$, $i = 0, 1$ we simplify the system (3.10) to

$$
\begin{cases}
\sigma_i^{(1)}\sigma_i^* - h_i^{(1)}c_i^* = r_i - c_i^{(1)} - \lambda_i h_i^{(1)}, \\
\sigma_i^{(2)}\sigma_i^* - h_i^{(2)}c_i^* = r_i - c_i^{(2)} - \lambda_i h_i^{(2)}.
\end{cases} \tag{3.11}
$$

Systems (3.11) have the solutions described in (3.8)–(3.9).

Note that as it follows from Girsanov theorem, the intensity parameters under measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$, λ_0^* and λ_1^* are defined in (3.7). $\qquad\square$

Corollary 3.1. *Let* $\Delta_0^{(h)} \neq 0$, $\Delta_1^{(h)} \neq 0$ *and* (3.7) *is fulfilled. If the prices* $S_i^{(1)}$ *and* $S_i^{(2)}$ *of both risky assets are defined in* (3.4) *and* (3.5) *with nonzero jumps,* $h_0^{(m)} \neq 0$, $h_1^{(m)} \neq 0$, $m = 1, 2$, *then*

$$
\sigma_0^* = \frac{\alpha_0^{(1)} - \alpha_0^{(2)}}{\beta_0^{(1)} - \beta_0^{(2)}}, \qquad \sigma_1^* = \frac{\alpha_1^{(1)} - \alpha_1^{(2)}}{\beta_1^{(1)} - \beta_1^{(2)}}
$$

and

$$
c_0^* = \lambda_0 - \frac{\beta_0^{(1)}\alpha_0^{(2)} - \beta_0^{(2)}\alpha_0^{(1)}}{\beta_0^{(1)} - \beta_0^{(2)}}, \qquad c_1^* = \lambda_1 - \frac{\beta_1^{(1)}\alpha_1^{(2)} - \beta_1^{(2)}\alpha_1^{(1)}}{\beta_1^{(1)} - \beta_1^{(2)}},
$$

where

$$\alpha_0^{(m)} = \frac{r_0 - c_0^{(m)}}{h_0^{(m)}}, \qquad \alpha_1^{(m)} = \frac{r_1 - c_1^{(m)}}{h_1^{(m)}},$$

$$\beta_0^{(m)} = \frac{\sigma_0^{(m)}}{h_0^{(m)}}, \qquad \beta_1^{(m)} = \frac{\sigma_1^{(m)}}{h_1^{(m)}}, \qquad m = 1, 2.$$

In the completed market model (3.4)–(3.5) consider a European option with maturity time T and payoff function $f(S^{(1)}(T))$. The price of this option can be calculated using the expectation $\mathbb{E}_i^*$ with respect to the unique martingale measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ which is constructed by Theorem 3.2:

$$\mathfrak{c}_i = \mathbb{E}_i^* \{ B(T)^{-1} f(S^{(1)}(T)) \}, \qquad i = 0, 1. \tag{3.12}$$

Remark 3.2. If $\Delta_0^{(h)} = \Delta_1^{(h)} = 0$, then the system (3.11) does not have a solution (if $\Delta_0^{(r-c)} \neq 0$, $\Delta_1^{(r-c)} \neq 0$) or it has infinitely many solutions (if $\Delta_0^{(r-c)} = \Delta_1^{(r-c)} = 0$). It means arbitrage or incompleteness, respectively.

In particular case of the market model without jumps, that is, $h_i^{(1)} = h_i^{(2)} = 0, i = 0, 1$, the market of two assets is arbitrage-free (respectively, the system (3.11) has solutions) if and only if the assets are similar:

$$\frac{r_i - c_i^{(1)}}{\sigma_i^{(1)}} = \frac{r_i - c_i^{(2)}}{\sigma_i^{(2)}} = \sigma_i^*, \qquad i = 0, 1.$$

In this case the model still to be incomplete.

Remark 3.3. The incomplete market model (3.1) with $h_0, h_1 = 0$ (i.e., without jump component),

$$S^{(1)}(t) = S^{(1)}(0) \exp \left\{ \mathcal{T}_i(t) + \mathcal{D}_i(t) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^2 \, d\tau \right\} \tag{3.13}$$

is known as hidden Markov model with information [see Guo (2001)] or Markov-modulated dynamics [see Jobert and Rogers (2006)]. This model can be completed not only by using Theorem 3.2, but by another way. Suppose that at each time t, there is a market for a security that pays one unit of bond at the next time τ_i that the Markov chain $\varepsilon_i(t)$ changes state [see Guo (2001)]. That change-of-state contract then becomes worthless and a new contract is issued that pays at the next change of state, and so on. It is natural to propose that the current change-of-state contract takes a price of

$$V_i = \mathbb{E}_i \{ e^{-(r_i + k_i)\tau_i} \} = \frac{\lambda_i}{r_i + k_i + \lambda_i}. \tag{3.14}$$

Here k_i is given, and can be thought as a risk-premium coefficient.

Assuming that the price V_i is calculated as expectation under the martingale measure [see (3.12)] we get

$$V_i = \mathbb{E}_i^* \{B(\tau_i)^{-1} \times 1\} = \frac{\lambda_i^*}{r_i + \lambda_i^*}, \tag{3.15}$$

where λ_i^* is defined in (3.7). From (3.14) and (3.15) we have

$$\lambda_i^* = \frac{r_i \lambda_i}{r_i + k_i}, \qquad i = 0, 1.$$

According to Theorem 3.1 the martingale measure is given by the density (2.24) with

$$c_i^* = \lambda_i - \lambda_i^* = \frac{\lambda_i k_i}{r_i + k_i}, \qquad h_i^* = -1 + \frac{\lambda_i^*}{\lambda_i} = -\frac{k_i}{r_i + k_i},$$

$$\sigma_i^* = \frac{r_i - c_i}{\sigma_i}, \qquad i = 0, 1.$$

In our framework the stock (3.13) and the bond $B(t)$ defined in (3.2) (with $r_i > 0$) can be naturally accompanied with the security which magnifies its value with the fixed rate at each moment of the change of state:

$$S^{(2)}(t) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_i(t)} \left(1 + h_{\varepsilon_i(\tau_k-)}\right), \qquad h_0, h_1 > 0. \tag{3.16}$$

This security can be considered as an insurance contract that compensates losses provoked by state changes and helps to hedge the option with payoff function $f(S^{(1)}(T))$. In contrast with Guo (2001) the security (3.16) which completes the market model (3.13) is perpetual, that is, it does not become worthless at the switching times.

In the denominations of Theorem 3.2 $c_i^{(1)} = c_i, c_i^{(2)} = 0, \sigma_i^{(1)} = \sigma_i, \sigma_i^{(2)} = 0,$ $h_i^{(1)} = 0, h_i^{(2)} = h_i$. Hence $\Delta_i^{(h)} = \sigma_i h_i, \Delta_i^{(r-c)} = \sigma_i r_i$ [see (3.6)] and Theorem 3.2 gives $\lambda_i^* = r_i / h_i$ and

$$c_i^* = \lambda_i - \frac{r_i}{h_i}, \qquad h_i^* = -1 + \frac{r_i}{\lambda_i h_i}, \qquad \sigma_i^* = \frac{r_i - c_i}{\sigma_i}, \qquad i = 0, 1.$$

Let us present the pricing formula of standard call option in the market, completed by Theorem 3.2. Assume that $\Delta_0^{(h)} \neq 0$ and $\Delta_1^{(h)} \neq 0$, and condition (3.7) is fulfilled.

Let Z be a r.v. with normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. We denote

$$\varphi(x, K, \sigma) := \mathbb{E}[x e^{Z - \sigma^2/2} - K]^+$$
$$= x F\left(\frac{\ln(x/K) + \sigma^2/2}{\sigma}\right) - K F\left(\frac{\ln(x/K) - \sigma^2/2}{\sigma}\right), \tag{3.17}$$

where $F(x)$ is the distribution function of standard normal law:

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-y^2/2}\, dy.$$

Let the market contains two risky assets (3.4) and (3.5). Consider the standard call option on the first asset with the claim $(S^{(1)}(T) - K)^+$. Therefore the call-price is

$$\mathfrak{c}_i = \mathbb{E}_i^* \{ B(T)^{-1}(S_i^{(1)}(T) - K)^+ \}, \tag{3.18}$$

if the market is starting with the state i. Here $\mathbb{E}_i^*$ is the expectation with respect to the martingale measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$ which is constructed in Theorem 3.2.

By Girsanov Theorem 2.3 the process $\tilde{w}(t) = w(t) - \int_0^t \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^*\, d\tau$ is the Brownian motion under new measure $\mathbb{P}_i^*$. Hence

$$B(T)^{-1} S^{(1)}(T) = S^{(1)}(0) \exp\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^{(1)}(T) + \int_0^T \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(1)}\, dw(\tau) \right.$$
$$\left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(1)}{}^2\, d\tau - \mathcal{Y}_i(T) \right\} \kappa_i^{(1)}(T)$$
$$= S^{(1)}(0) \exp\left\{ \mathcal{T}_i^{(1)}(T) + \int_0^T \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(1)}\, d\tilde{w}(\tau) + \int_0^T \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(1)} \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^*\, d\tau \right.$$
$$\left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(1)}{}^2\, d\tau - \mathcal{Y}_i(T) \right\} \kappa_i^{(1)}(T).$$

Notice that the first equation of (3.11) can be transformed to $c_i^{(1)} - r_i + \sigma_i^{(1)}\sigma_i^* = h_i^{(1)}(c_i^* - \lambda_i)$, and from Girsanov Theorem 2.3 we have $c_i^* - \lambda_i = -\lambda_i^*$. Let us introduce the telegraph process $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_i^{(1)}$ independent of $\tilde{w}$ which is driven by Poisson process with parameters λ_i^* and with the velocities $\tilde{c}_i = c_i^{(1)} - r_i + \sigma_i^{(1)}\sigma_i^* = -\lambda_i^* h_i^{(1)}$, $i = 0, 1$. So the martingale $B(T)^{-1} S^{(1)}(T)$ takes the form

$$B(T)^{-1} S^{(1)}(T) = S^{(1)}(0) \exp\left\{ \overline{\mathcal{T}_i^{(1)}}(T) + \int_0^T \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(1)}\, d\tilde{w}(\tau) \right.$$
$$\left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sigma_{\varepsilon_i(\tau)}^{(1)}{}^2\, d\tau \right\} \kappa_i^{(1)}(T).$$

Again applying the property (2.7), from (3.18) we obtain

$$\mathfrak{c}_i = \int_0^T \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_i(t, T; n) \varphi\big(x_i(t, T, n), K e^{-r_0 t - r_1 (T-t)},$$
$$\sqrt{\sigma_0^2 t + \sigma_1^2 (T - t)} \big)\, dt, \qquad i = 0, 1. \tag{3.19}$$

Here $x_i(t, T, n) = S^{(1)}(0)\kappa_{i,n}e^{\tilde{c}_0 t + \tilde{c}_1(T-t)}$ and

$$\kappa_{i,2n} = (1 + h_0^{(1)})^n (1 + h_1^{(1)})^n, \qquad i = 0, 1,$$

$$\kappa_{0,2n+1} = (1 + h_0^{(1)})^{n+1} (1 + h_1^{(1)})^n, \qquad \kappa_{1,2n+1} = (1 + h_1^{(1)})^{n+1} (1 + h_0^{(1)})^n,$$

$$n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots;$$

$f_i(t, T; n)$ are defined in (2.17)–(2.20) with $\lambda_0^* = \Delta_0^{(r-c)}/\Delta_0^{(h)}$, and $\lambda_1^* = \Delta_1^{(r-c)}/\Delta_1^{(h)}$ instead of λ_0 and λ_1; $\varphi(x, K, \sigma)$ is defined in (3.17). Notice that as in the jump-telegraph model [see Ratanov (2007a)] the option price (3.19) does not depend on λ_0 and λ_1.

In particular, if $h_0^{(1)} = h_1^{(1)} = 0$ and, nevertheless, $\Delta_0^{(h)} \neq 0$, $\Delta_1^{(h)} \neq 0$ [see, e.g., model (3.13), (3.16)], we can summarize in (3.19) applying (2.17)–(2.20):

$$\mathfrak{c}_i = \int_0^T f_i(t, T)\varphi\big(S_0, Ke^{-r_0 t - r_1(T-t)}, \sqrt{\sigma_0^2 t + \sigma_1^2(T - t)}\big) \, dt, \qquad i = 0, 1,$$

where $f_i(t, T)$ are defined in (2.21) and (2.22) [cf. Guo (2001)].

Remark 3.4. The stock and the bond prices are modeled in (3.1)–(3.2) using the Markov process $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(t), t \geq 0$, which can be interpreted as information-based feature of market movements. In the paper we assume that $\varepsilon(t)$ is actually observable, and thus predictable. This assumption is reasonable, if $c_0 \neq c_1$ and (or) $\sigma_0 \neq \sigma_1$, $h_0 \neq h_1$. Hence, the option price $\mathfrak{c}_i$ (in completed market) is defined depending on initial state $i = \varepsilon(0)$.

Contrarily, if the market state $\varepsilon(t)$ is not observable then at each time t the option with claim X has the current price

$$\mathfrak{c}(t) = \mathbb{E}\big\{(B(T)/B(t))^{-1} X | \mathfrak{F}_t\big\}$$

which is random (with two possible values depending on the future infinitesimal direction of risky asset movement).

The main cause of this peculiarity is that the price process $S(t), t \geq 0$ which is defined in (3.1), as well as its components $\mathcal{T}(t)$, $\mathcal{J}(t)$ and $\mathcal{D}(t), t \geq 0$ are not Markovian. Nevertheless, the pair $\{S(t), \varepsilon(t)\}, t \geq 0$ forms jointly a Markov process.

Acknowledgments

References

Asmussen, S., Avram, F. and Pistorius, R. (2004). Russian and American put options under exponential phase-type Lévy models. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* **109** 79–111. MR2024845

Bäuerle, N. and Kötter, M. (2007). Markov-modulated diffusion risk models. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **2007** 34–52. MR2347212

Beghin, L., Nieddu, L. and Orsingher, E. (2001). Probabilistic analysis of the telegrapher's process with drift by mean of relativistic transformations. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Stochastic Analysis* **14** 11–25. MR1825098

Black, F. and Scholes, M. (1973). The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy* **81** 637–654.

Cox, J. C. and Ross, S. (1976). The valuation of options for alternative stochastic processes. *The Journal of Financial Economics* **3** 145–166.

Clark, P. K. (1973). A subordinated stochastic process model with finite variance for speculative prices. *Econometrica* **41** 135–155. MR0415944

De Gregorio, A. and Iacus, S. M. (2007). Change point estimation for the telegraph process observed at discrete time. Working paper, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Aziendali e Statistiche, Univ. Milan.

Di Crescenzo, A. and Pellerey, F. (2002). On prices' evolutions based on geometric telegrapher's process. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry* **18** 171–184. MR1907356

Di Masi, G., Kabanov, Y. and Runggaldier, W. (1994). Mean-variance hedging of options on stocks with Markov volatilities. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications* **39** 211–222. MR1348196

Elliott, R. and van der Hoek, J. (1997). An application of hidden Markov models to asset allocation problems. *Finance and Stochastics* **1** 229–238.

Goldstein, S. (1951). On diffusion by discontinuous movements and on telegraph equation. *The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics* **4** 129–156. MR0047963

Guo, X. (2001). Information and option pricings. *Quantitative Finance* **1** 38–44. MR1810015

Jobert, A. and Rogers, L. C. G. (2006). Option pricing with Markov-modulated dynamics. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **6** 2063–2078. MR2248175

Kac, M. (1974). A stochastic model related to the telegraph equation. *The Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics* **4** 497–509. MR0510166

Karatzas, I. and Shreve, S. E. (1998). *Methods of Mathematical Finance. Applications of Mathematics* **39**. Springer, New York. MR1640352

Mandelbrot, B. (1963). The variation of certain speculative prices. *The Journal of Business* **36** 394–419.

Mandelbrot, B. and Taylor, H. (1967). On the distribution of stock price differences. *Operations Research* **15** 1057–1062.

Masoliver, J., Montero, M., Perelló, J. and Weiss, G. H. (2006). The CTRW in finance: Direct and inverse problems. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **61** 577–598.

Mazza, C. and Rullière, D. (2004). A link between wave governed random motions and ruin processes. *Insurance: Mathematics & Economics* **35** 205–222. MR2095886

Merton, R. C. (1973). Theory of rational option pricing. *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science* **4** 141–183. MR0496534

Merton, R. C. (1976). Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous. *The Journal of Financial Economics* **3** 125–144.

Montero, M. (2008). Renewal equations for option pricing. *Europ. Phys. J.* **65** 295–306.

Nicolato, E. and Venardos, E. (2003). Option pricing in stochastic volatility models of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type. *Mathematical Finance* **13** 445–466. MR2003131

Protter, P. (1990). *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations. A New Approach. Applications of Mathematics* **21**. Springer, Berlin. MR1037262

Ratanov, N. (2007a). A jump telegraph model for option pricing. *Quantitative Finance* **7** 575–583. MR2358921

Ratanov, N. (2007b). An option pricing model based on jump telegraph processes. *PAMM* **7** 2080009–2080010.

Ren, Q. and Kobayashi, H. (1998). Diffusion approximation modeling for Markov modulated bursty traffic and its applications to bandwidth allocation in ATM networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications* **16** 679–691.

Zacks, S. (2004). Generalized integrated telegraph processes and the distribution of related stopping times. *Journal of Applied Probability* **41** 497–507. MR2052587

University of Rosario
Calle 14, No. 6-25
Bogotá
Colombia
E-mail: nratanov@urosario.edu.co