

# A Random Field LIBOR Market Model

Tao L. Wu<sup>1</sup> and Shengqiang Xu<sup>2</sup>

1. Illinois Institute of Technology  
565 W. Adams Street, Suite 458  
Chicago, IL 60661, USA  
*E-mail: tw33\_99@yahoo.com*

2. Northern Trust Corporation  
50 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, IL 60603, USA.

August 11, 2013

## Abstract

A random field LIBOR market model is proposed by extending the LIBOR market model with uncertainty modeled via random field. First, closed-form formulas for pricing caplet and swaption are derived. Then the random field LIBOR market model (RFLMM) is integrated with the lognormal-mixture model to capture the implied volatility skew/smile. Finally, the model is calibrated to cap volatility surface and swaption volatilities. Numerical results show that the random field LIBOR market model outperforms LIBOR market model in capturing caplet volatility smile and the pricing of swaptions, in addition to possessing other documented advantages (no need of frequent recalibration or to specify the number of factors in advance).

**Key Words:** LIBOR market model, random field, lognormal-mixture model, volatility smile.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we extend the LIBOR market model (LMM) by describing forward rate uncertainties as random field. The LIBOR market model (LMM) (Brace, Gatarek, and Musiela (BGM)[10], Jamshidian[17], and Miltersen, Sandmann, and Sondermann [31]) is based on the assumption that each forward LIBOR rate follows a driftless Brownian motion under its own forward measure, which justifies the use of Black's formula for the pricing of interest rate options, such as caplets and swaptions. It is very fast to calibrate

the LMM to market data. As a result, it has become very popular among practitioners for interest rate modeling and derivatives pricing.

However, the LMM has several limitations. Firstly, it only generates flat implied volatility curve of caplets and swaptions and thus cannot capture the implied volatility smile as observed in these markets. Several extensions have been proposed to capture the smile/skew of implied volatilities. The first approach is referred to as local volatility models. For example, the constant elasticity of variance (CEV) model by Andersen and Andreasen [1] and the displaced diffusion (DD) model by Joshi and Rebonato [27] generate a monotonic skew, but not smile, of implied volatility. Another approach is the stochastic volatility model, which models volatility itself as a stochastic process. For example, Andersen and Brotherton-Ractliffe [3], Wu and Zhang [46] produce additional curvature to the volatility curve. Hagan et al.[23] propose a stochastic volatility extension of the CEV model, termed the SABR model to capture the smile or skew of caps and swaptions. Secondly, the LMM requires the specification of the number of factors in advance. For any finite-factor models, it is necessary to specify the number of factors prior to the modeling process. However, this may be a difficult problem. Longstaff et. al. [29] shows that using even the best-fitting single-factor model can be suboptimal if the term structure is driven by multi-factors. Finally, frequent re-calibration is needed for the LMM. Like other no-arbitrage models that are consistent with the current term structure at the current point in time, the LMM requires re-calibration of the parameters in order to fit the new term structure the following day (or week).

A new methodology that models interest rate innovation by random field overcomes some of these problems. Kennedy [25, 26] and Goldstein [13] first introduce this methodology. Pang [36], Longstaff et al.[29] and Bester [6] investigate random field model from different aspects such as model calibration and option pricing.

In this paper, we introduce an extended LIBOR market model where the uncertainty term is driven by random field. We therefore refer it as the random field LIBOR market model (RFLMM). Then the RFLMM is integrated with the lognormal-mixture local volatility model to capture implied volatility skews/smiles. It will be shown that this model can generate the implied volatility smile in interest rate caps and is more accurate in calibration. We also demonstrate through our implementation that it is unnecessary to choose the number of factors in advance.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 extends the LIBOR market model to a random field setting. Formulas for caplets and swaptions pricing are provided. Section 3 integrates the model with lognormal-mixture local volatility model. Section 4 calibrates the model to market data. Section 5 concludes the paper.

## 2 Random Fields LIBOR Market Model

In this section we derive an extended LIBOR market model with uncertainties described by random fields. The extended model is therefore referred to as the random field LIBOR market model (RFLMM). Firstly, we introduce random field as a description of uncertainty in Sec.2.1. Secondly, we review the advantages of modeling interest rates as random fields in Sec.2.2. Thirdly, we derive the random fields LIBOR market model in Sec.2.3, and closed-form formulas for pricing European caplets and swaptions in Sec.2.4.

### 2.1 Random Field

A random field is a stochastic process that is indexed by a spatial variable, as well as a time variable. For example, if we would like to measure the temperature at position  $u$  and time  $t$  with  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , the measure can be modeled as a random variable  $W(t, u)$ . The collection of

$$\{W(t, u) : (t, u) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \otimes \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

is a random field.

Random fields are generations of Brownian motions. For fixed maturity  $T$ , random field  $W(t, T)$  is a Brownian motion, i.e.  $dW(t, T) := [dW(t + dt, T) - dW(t, T)]$  follows normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, dt)$ . In addition, the correlation between  $dW(t, T_1)$  and  $dW(t, T_2)$  for any  $t < T_1 \leq T_2$  is specified by

$$c(u, v) = \text{Corr}[dW(t, u), dW(t, v)], \quad (1)$$

with  $\lim_{u \rightarrow v} c(u, v) = 1$ , where the differential notation  $d$  is used to denote the increments in the  $t$ -direction. Given a specification of the correlation structure  $c(u, v)$ , Bester [6] showed the construction of random field as follows. Assume that for a correlation function  $c(u, v)$ , there exists a symmetric function  $g(u, v)$  such that

$$c(u, v) = \int_0^\infty g(u, z)g(v, z)dz,$$

with  $\int_0^\infty |g(u, z)|^2 dz = 1$ . The random field  $W(t, u)$  can be defined as

$$W(t, u) = W(0, 0) + \int_0^\infty \int_0^t g(u, z)\epsilon(s, z)dsdz, \quad (2)$$

or equivalently

$$dW(t, u) = \left[ \int_0^\infty g(u, z)\epsilon(t, z)dz \right] dt \quad (3)$$

From Eq.(3) we can see that the increments of random field are weighted average of white noise at time  $t$ . Here  $g(u, z)$  is the weight of  $\epsilon(t, z)$  at location  $z$  in determining the change of the field at location  $u$ . A formal theoretic definition of random field and other treatments can be found in Adler [49], Gikhman-Skorokhod [50] and Khoshnevisan [24].

## 2.2 Interest Rate Modeling in Random Fields Setting

Modeling interest rates as random fields was introduced by Kennedy [25, 26] and Goldstein [13]. Limiting the scope to Gaussian random fields, Kennedy [25] obtains the form of the drift terms of the instantaneous forward rates processes necessarily to preclude arbitrage under the risk neutral measure. Goldstein [13] extends the work to the case of non-Gaussian random fields. We first provide an overview of the Kennedy-Goldstein Framework.

**Kennedy-Goldstein Framework.** Define zero coupon bond price

$$P(t, T) = e^{-\int_t^T f(t, u) du}, \quad (4)$$

where  $f(t, u)$  is the instantaneous forward rate and  $t, T$  are current time and maturity respectively. According to Goldstein [13], if we require the discounted bond price

$$e^{-\int_0^t r(s) ds} P(t, T), \quad (5)$$

where  $r(t)$  is the instantaneous spot rate, to be a martingale under the risk neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the drift term must be given by  $\sigma(t, T) \int_t^T \sigma(t, u) c(t, T, u) du$ , to rule out arbitrage. Thus the dynamics of the instantaneous forward rates  $f(t, T)$  under the risk neutral measure is given by

$$df(t, T) = \sigma(t, T) \int_t^T \sigma(s, u) c(s, T, u) du ds + \sigma(t, T) d\widetilde{W}(t, T), \quad (6)$$

with the correlation structure

$$\text{Corr}[dW(t, T_1), dW(t, T_2)] = c(t, T_1, T_2), \quad (7)$$

where  $\lim_{\Delta T \rightarrow 0} c(t, T, T + \Delta T) = 1$  and  $\widetilde{W}(t, T)$  is a random field under the risk neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Goldstein [13] and Pang [36] argue that modeling the term structure of interest rates as random fields provides many advantages. First, it is unnecessary to determine the number of factors prior to calibration or estimation. Random fields models are infinite-factor models, since the instantaneous forward rates in random fields models form a continuum. In fact random field models accommodate both finite and infinite-factor models and thus all finite-factor models are special cases of random fields models. It can be shown that the Gaussian random fields can be interpreted as a linear combination of infinite number of Brownian motions indexed by different forward rate maturities,  $T$ , under mild technical conditions. Pang [36] shows that it is possible to reduce Eq.(6) to a  $d$ -factor HJM model

$$df(t, T) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, T) \cdot \int_t^T \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, u) du dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, T) \cdot d\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}(t), \quad (8)$$

by taking

$$d\widetilde{W}(t, T) = \frac{1}{\sigma(t, T)} \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i(t, T) d\widetilde{W}_i(t), \quad (9)$$

where  $\sigma(t, u)$  is a  $d$ -dimension vector and  $\cdot$  is the inner product of two vectors. In fact, for random fields model, the covariance of instantaneous changes of forward rates is given as

$$\text{Cov}[df(t, u), df(t, v)] = \sigma(t, u)\sigma(t, v)c(u, v). \quad (10)$$

While in the HJM framework, we have

$$\text{Cov}[df(t, u), df(t, v)] = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, u) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, v). \quad (11)$$

If  $c(u, v)$  can be written as

$$c(u, v) = \mathbf{e}(t, u) \cdot \mathbf{e}(t, v), \quad (12)$$

with  $|\mathbf{e}(t, T)| = 1$ , we can take

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, T) = \sigma(t, T)\mathbf{e}(t, T). \quad (13)$$

Thus the Gaussian field model Eq.(6) is reduced to HJM model Eq.(8). This suggests that random fields models can be viewed as an infinite-factor generalization of HJM models. This shows the difference when calibrating of HJM and random field models. We can directly specify the correlation structure without specifying the number of factors.

Second, it is unnecessary to frequently recalibrate random fields models. As pointed out in Buraschi and Corielli [5], the finite-factor models completely determines the future trend of the yield curve and thus its possible shapes in the future. For instance, the  $d$ -factor models can at most fit  $d$  points on the yield curve and the volatility curve at a specific date. At the following date, without re-calibration, the same specification will typically miss those points. In practice, the most common solution is to frequently re-calibrate the model by inputting a new term structure. However, as Pang [36] points out, the re-initialization of yield curve at each new date would violate the no-arbitrage constraint, which is the fundamental assumption of the no-arbitrage modeling. In other words, the re-calibration violates the self-financing condition of the replication strategy since it implies a change in the conditional distribution of the process with respect to which the replicating portfolio weights are computed. In  $d$ -factor HJM term structure models, any security can be perfectly hedged by a preferred choice of  $d$  assets. However, in random fields HJM models, the innovation of each instantaneous forward is imperfectly correlated with that of any linear combination of other instantaneous forwards. Thus random fields models

have enough degree of freedom to fit the current yield curve. More discussion of re-calibration can be found in Pang [36], which demonstrate that the calibration of a random fields model permits more stability over time and frequent re-calibration can be avoided, in contrast to a  $d$ -factor HJM model. Pang [36] examines the stability of the covariance function and show that the function maintains similar shapes throughout a long period of time (at least one month). The eigenvalues and corresponding eigenfunctions of the implied zero rate covariance matrix remain mostly the same during the sample period. He also use principle component analysis (PCA) to extract the eigenvalues and eigenvectors to examine the HJM models. He finds that the eigenvalues and eigenvectors in HJM models are very unstable over time.

### 2.3 Random Fields LIBOR Market Model (RFLMM)

In this section, we derive the dynamics of LIBOR rates  $L_k(t)$  with uncertainty terms modeled as random fields, under risk neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and  $T_j$ -forward measure  $\mathbb{Q}^{T_j}$ , for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, N$ .

Let us consider the time structures  $\{T_0, T_1, \dots, T_N\}$  with time intervals  $\delta_k = T_k - T_{k-1}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N$ . For  $t < T_{k-1} < T_k$ , the LIBOR forward rate  $L_k(t)$  is defined as

$$L_k(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_k} \left[ \frac{P(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} - 1 \right], \quad (14)$$

and the zero coupon bond price  $P(t, T)$  is defined in Eq.(4). Given the dynamics of  $f(t, T)$  in Eq.(6), by Itô's formula we can derive that the dynamics of the zero coupon bond price  $P(t, T)$  with random field setting is

$$dP(t, T) = P(t, T)[r(t)dt - \int_t^T \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du]. \quad (15)$$

The dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  is determined by those of zero coupon bonds. By Itô's formula we can derive that under risk neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} dL_k(t) = & \frac{1}{\delta_k} \frac{P(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} \left[ \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du + \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du \right. \\ & \left. \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Now let us derive the dynamic of forward rates under  $T_k$ -forward measure. Suppose that there exists a function  $\theta(t, T_k, u)$  such that  $dW^{T_k}(t, u) := \theta(t, T_k, u)dt + d\widetilde{W}(t, u)$  has normal distribution  $\Phi(0, dt)$  under the  $T_k$ -forward measure. Using the fact that if  $L_k(t)$  is a martingale under the  $T_k$ -forward measure then the drift term should vanish, we can conclude that

$$\theta(t, T_k, u) = \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dv. \quad (17)$$

Thus we have the dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  under the  $T_k$ -forward measure as shown in the following proposition and corollaries.

**Proposition 2.1. (Random fields dynamics under the associated forward measures)** *Under the log-normal assumption, the dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  under the  $T_k$ -forward measure is described by the following equation*

$$dL_k(t) = \frac{1}{\delta_k} \frac{P(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u) dW^{T_k}(t, u) du, \quad (18)$$

where  $W^{T_k}(t, u)$  is a Gaussian random field under the  $T_k$ -forward measure.

See Appendix 1 for the proof of Proposition 2.1.

**Corollary 2.2.** *If  $d\widetilde{W}(t, u)$  is normally distributed according to  $\mathcal{N}(0, dt)$  under the risk neutral measure, then*

$$dW^{T_k}(t, u) := \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, v) c(u, v) dv dt + d\widetilde{W}(t, u)$$

is normally distributed according to  $\mathcal{N}(0, dt)$  under the  $T_k$ -forward measure (using  $P(t, T_k)$  as a numeraire).

**Corollary 2.3.** *If  $\text{corr}[dW^{T_k}(t, u), dW^{T_k}(t, v)] = c(u, v)$ , then  $\int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u) dW^{T_k}(t, u) du$  is normally distributed with mean 0 and variance  $\int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, x) \sigma(t, y) c(x, y) dx dy dt$  under the  $T_k$ -forward measure.*

Proposition 2.1 shows that  $L_k(t)$  is log-normally distributed under the  $T_k$ -forward measure. Corollary 2.2 describes the form of random fields under the  $T_k$ -forward measure and Corollary 2.3 provides the distribution of the integral of random fields, given the correlation structure  $c(u, v)$ . These results are essential for the derivation of RFLMM.

Now we can derive the dynamics of forward rates  $L_k(t)$  under the  $T_j$ -forward measure,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . From Eq.(18) and Corollary 2.2, we can derive the relation of  $dW^{T_k}(t, u)$  and  $dW^{T_{k+1}}(t, u)$  as follows,

$$dW^{T_k}(t, u) = dW^{T_{k+1}}(t, u) - \sum_{i=k+1}^j \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \sigma(t, v) c(u, v) dv dt, \quad (19)$$

for  $j > k$ . As we know,  $L_k(t)$  is a martingale under  $T_k$ -forward measure. By the Martingale representation proposition, there exists a function  $\xi(t, u)$ , such that

$$dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u) dW^{T_k}(t, u) du. \quad (20)$$

Comparing the above equation with Eq.(18), we can simply take

$$\xi_k(t, u) = \frac{\delta_k L_k(t) + 1}{\delta_k L_k(t)} \sigma(t, u), \quad (21)$$

and obtain the dynamics of  $L_k(s)$  under the  $T_k$ -forward measure. The derivation in case  $j < k$  is similar. Thus we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.4. (Random field dynamics under forward measures)**

*Under the log-normal assumptions, the dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  under the  $T_k$ -forward measure, in three cases  $j < k, j = k, j > k$ , are described respectively by the following equations*

$$\begin{cases} dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u) [dW^{T_j}(t, u) + \Lambda_j^k(t, u) dt] du, & j < k; \\ dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u) dW^{T_j}(t, u) du, & j = k; \\ dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u) [dW^{T_j}(t, u) - \Lambda_k^j(t, u) dt] du, & j > k. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

with

$$\Lambda_j^k(t, u) = \sum_{i=j+1}^k \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \frac{\delta_i L_i(t) \xi_i(t, v) c(u, v)}{\delta_i L_i(t) + 1} dv,$$

where  $W^{T_j}(t, u)$  is a Gaussian random field under the  $T_j$ -forward measure. The above equations admit a unique solution if the coefficient  $\xi_k(\cdot, \cdot)$  are locally bounded, locally Lipschitz continuous and predictable.

See Appendix 2 for the proof of Proposition 2.4.

**Proposition 2.5. (Consistency between the LMM and the RFLMM)**

*The HJM framework is a special case of the Kennedy-Goldstein framework, since Eq.(22) in Proposition 2.4 reduces to Eq.(6), if we take  $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ . LMM is a special case of RFLMM, since Eq.(22) in Proposition 2.4 reduces to Eq.(23), if we take the value of  $dW^T(t, u)$  on  $[T_{k-1}, T_k]$  to be  $dW_k^T(t)$ .*

$$\begin{cases} dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \xi_k(t) [dW_k^{T_j}(t) + \sum_{i=j+1}^k \frac{\delta_i \rho_{i,k}(t) L_i(t) \xi_i(t)}{\delta_i L_i(t) + 1} dt], & j < k; \\ dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \xi_k(t) dW_k^{T_j}(t), & j = k; \\ dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \xi_k(t) [dW_k^{T_j}(t) - \sum_{i=k+1}^j \frac{\delta_i \rho_{i,k}(t) L_i(t) \xi_i(t)}{\delta_i L_i(t) + 1} dt], & j > k. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

See Appendix 3 for the proof of Proposition 2.5.

Proposition 2.5 shows that the LIBOR market model Eq.(23) is a special case of random field LIBOR market model.



## 2.4 Option Pricing in the Random Field LIBOR Market Model

In this section we derive the Black-Scholes equation for the pricing of derivatives in random field case and the closed-form formulas for caplets and swaptions. Similar to the Black-Scholes equation for the price of derivatives in the Brownian motion case, we provide and prove a Black-Scholes type equation in the random field case, as shown in the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.6. (The Black-Scholes equation in the random field setting for time dependent parameters)** *Suppose we have an option on some underlying asset  $S$ , which follows dynamics*

$$\frac{dS(t)}{S(t)} = \mu(t)dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \xi(t, u)dW(t, u)du, \quad (24)$$

*with time dependent parameters. Then the price of derivatives  $V$  satisfies the equation:*

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \xi(t, u)\xi(t, v)c(u, v)dudv \right] \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial S^2} + rS \frac{\partial V}{\partial S} - r(t)V = 0. \quad (25)$$

*We can denote it as the Black-Scholes equation for option pricing with random field. For a call option with strike  $K$  and maturity  $T$ , the price is given by*

$$C = S\Phi(\tilde{d}_1) - Ke^{-\int_0^T r(u)du}\Phi(\tilde{d}_2),$$

*where*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\int_0^T \hat{\xi}^2(u, t_1, t_2)du}} \left[ \ln \frac{S}{K} + \int_0^T \left( r(u) + \frac{\hat{\xi}^2(u, t_1, t_2)}{2} \right) du \right]; \\ \tilde{d}_2 &= \tilde{d}_1 - \sqrt{\int_0^T \hat{\xi}^2(u, t_1, t_2)du}; \\ \hat{\xi}^2(t, t_1, t_2) &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \xi(t, u)\xi(t, v)c(u, v)dudv, \end{aligned}$$

*and  $\Phi(d)$  is the normal cumulative distribution function.*

See Appendix 4 for the proof of Proposition 2.6. We can get a Black-type formula for pricing caplets and swaptions from Proposition 2.6.

### 2.4.1 Random field LMM formula for caplets

The payoff of a caplet at time  $T_k$  is

$$\delta_k [L_k(T_{k-1}) - K]^+.$$

The time  $t$  price of caplet is

$$\mathbf{Cplt}(t, K, T_{k-1}, T_k) = \delta_k P(t, T_k) \mathbb{E}^{T_k} [[L_k(T_{k-1}) - K]^+ | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Suppose that  $L_k(t)$  follows dynamics given by Eq.(20) under the  $T_k$ -forward measure. If we assume that  $\xi_k(t, u)$  is deterministic, then by Corollary 2.3,  $L_k(t)$  is log-normally distributed and by Black's formula the time  $t$  price is

$$\mathbf{Cplt}(t, K, T_{k-1}, T_k) = \delta_k P(t, T_k) \mathbf{Black}(K, L_k(t), \sigma_k^{Black, RF} \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t}),$$

where

$$\mathbf{Black}(K, L_k(t), \sigma_k^{Black, RF} \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t}) = L_k(t) \Phi(d_1) - KN \Phi(d_2), \quad (26)$$

$$d_1 = \frac{\log(L_k(t)/K) + (\sigma_k^{Black, RF})^2 (T_{k-1} - t)/2}{\sigma_k^{Black, RF} \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t}},$$

$$d_2 = \frac{\log(L_k(t)/K) - (\sigma_k^{Black, RF})^2 (T_{k-1} - t)/2}{\sigma_k^{Black, RF} \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t}} = d_1 - \sigma_k^{Black, RF} \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t},$$

and

$$\sigma_k^{Black, RF} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{k-1} - t} \int_t^{T_{k-1}} \left[ \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(s, x) \xi_k(s, y) c(x, y) dx dy \right] ds}. \quad (27)$$

We can specify the volatility and correlation structure to get particular forms of the pricing formula. For example, Kennedy [26] demonstrated that for forward rate to be modeled as a Gaussian, Markov, and stationary random field, the volatility must be of the form  $\xi(t, T) = \sigma e^{-\alpha(T-t)}$  and the correlation structure must be  $Corr[dW(t, T_1), dW(t, T_2)] = e^{-\rho|T_2 - T_1|}$ . In this case, the caplet price under random field LMM is given in the above formula, where

$$(\sigma_k^{Black, RF})^2 = \sigma^2 e^{2t} \left[ \frac{\rho - \alpha}{\alpha^2 - \rho^2} (e^{-2\alpha T_k} - e^{-2\alpha T_{k-1}}) - \frac{\delta}{\alpha + \rho} e^{-(\alpha + \rho)T_k} + \frac{\delta}{\alpha - \rho} e^{-(\alpha - \rho)T_{k-1}} \right].$$

#### 2.4.2 Random field LMM formula for swaptions

The payoff of a European swaption at time  $T_k$  is

$$\delta_k [S_{i,j}(T_{k-1}) - K]^+.$$

The time  $t$  price is therefore

$$[S_{i,j}(t) - K]^+ \sum_{k=i+1}^j \delta_k P(t, T_k),$$

where the swap rate

$$S_{i,j}(t) = \frac{\sum_{k=i+1}^j \delta_k P(t, T_k) L_k(t)}{\sum_{k=i+1}^j \delta_k P(t, T_k)} = \frac{P(t, T_i) - P(t, T_j)}{\sum_{k=i+1}^j \delta_k P(t, T_k)}, \quad (28)$$

for  $0 \leq t \leq T_i$ ,  $i < j \leq N$ .

In the swap market model, the swap rates are assumed to follow dynamics

$$dS_{i,j}(t) = S_{i,j}(t) \eta_{i,j}(t) dW^{i,j}(t). \quad (29)$$

The time  $t$  price of a swaption can be computed from the Black's formula as

$$\mathbf{Swaption}(t, K, T_i, T_j) = A \mathbf{Black}(K, S_{i,j}(t), \bar{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Black} \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t}), \quad (30)$$

where  $\bar{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Black} := \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{k-1} - t} \int_t^{T_{k-1}} \|\eta_{i,j}(s)\|^2 ds}$ ,  $A = \sum_{k=i+1}^j \delta_k P(t, T_k)$ .

The simultaneous assumption of log-normally distributed forward LIBOR and log-normally distributed swap rates is inconsistent. As a result, swaptions cannot be priced using Black's formula within the LIBOR market model. Now we shall rewrite the implied volatility of the swaption in terms of forward LIBOR  $L_k(t)$ . Given

$$\frac{P(t, T_k)}{P(t, T_i)} = \prod_{j=i+1}^k \frac{1}{1 + \delta_j L_j(t)},$$

for  $k \geq i + 1$ , by dividing through  $P(t, T_j)$ , the swap rate defined in Eq.(28) can be written as

$$S_{i,j}(t) = \frac{\prod_{l=i+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t)) - 1}{\sum_{k=i+1}^j \delta_k \prod_{l=k+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t))},$$

or equivalently

$$\ln S_{i,j}(t) = \ln \left\{ \prod_{l=i+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t)) - 1 \right\} - \ln \left\{ \sum_{k=i+1}^j \delta_k \prod_{l=k+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t)) \right\},$$

for  $j - 1 \geq k \geq i + 1$ , where  $\prod_m^n = 1$  if  $m > n$ . According to Hull et al.[20] and from Itô's formula, the uncertainty term of swap rates in the LMM model can be written as:

$$\sum_{k=i+1}^j \frac{1}{S_{i,j}(t)} \frac{\partial S_{i,j}(t)}{\partial L_k(t)} dW_k^{T_k}(t) = \sum_{k=i+1}^j \frac{\delta_k L_k(t) \gamma_k^{i,j}(t)}{1 + \delta_k L_k(t)} \xi_k(t) dW_k^{T_k}(t),$$

where

$$\gamma_k^{i,j}(t) = \frac{\prod_{l=i+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t))}{\prod_{l=i+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t)) - 1} - \frac{\sum_{m=i+1}^{k-1} \delta_m \prod_{l=m+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t))}{\sum_{m=i+1}^j \delta_m \prod_{l=m+1}^j (1 + \delta_l L_l(t))}.$$

Using Black's formula the time  $t$  price of swaption is

$$\mathbf{Swaption}(t, K, T_i, T_j) = A \mathbf{Black}(K, S_{i,j}(t), \bar{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Black,RF} \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Black,RF} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_i - t} \int_t^{T_i} \left\| \sum_{k=i+1}^j \frac{\delta_k L_k(s) \gamma_k^{i,j}(s)}{1 + \delta_k L_k(s)} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(s) dW(s, u) \right\|^2 ds} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_i - t} \sum_{k=i+1}^j \sum_{l=i+1}^j \frac{\delta_k L_k(t) \gamma_k^{i,j}(t)}{1 + \delta_k L_k(t)} \frac{\delta_l L_l(t) \gamma_l^{i,j}(t)}{1 + \delta_l L_{l+1}(t)} \times} \\ &\quad \sqrt{\int_t^{T_i} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{l-1}}^{T_l} \xi_k(s, x) \xi_l(s, y) c(x, y) dx dy ds}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The last equation is obtained by using standard freezing approximation techniques, i.e. approximatively evaluating the LIBOR rates  $L_k(s)$ ,  $t \leq s \leq T_i$  appearing in the instantaneous volatility at initial time  $t$ .

**Remark 2.7.** Standard Freezing Approximation Techniques.

*The last equation is obtained by approximatively evaluating the LIBOR rate  $L_k(s)$ ,  $t \leq s \leq T_i$  at initial time  $t$ . This approximation technique is highly accurate according to Hull and White [18]. Hull and White [18] compared the prices of swaptions calculated by the approximation formula above with the price calculated from a Monte Carlo simulation and found the two to be very close. We will use this approximation in several places in this paper.*

In this section we have derived the random fields LIBOR market model (RFLMM) (Eq.(22)) and formulas for the implied volatility for caplets (Eq.(27)) and swaptions (Eq.(31)). These two formulas can be used to calibrate the RFLMM.

### 3 Random Field Lognormal-mixture Volatility Smile Model

In this section, we derive a random field lognormal-mixture volatility smile model. First, we review implied volatility smiles in interest rates options in Sec.3.1. Then we extend the lognormal-mixture model to the random field case in Sec.3.2.

#### 3.1 Volatility Smile

It is well known that the lognormal LMM has the main drawback of producing constant implied volatility for any given maturity. From the Black's formula for caplet price, we can see that the volatility of the forward rate

does not depend on the option strike  $K$ . However, each caplet market price requires its own Black volatility depending on the caplet strike  $K$ . In other terms, there is no a single volatility parameter  $\sigma_k$  such that both

$$\mathbf{Cplt}(t, K_1, T_{k-1}, T_k) = \delta_k P(t, T_k) \mathbf{Black}(K_1, L_k(t), \sigma_k \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t})$$

and

$$\mathbf{Cplt}(t, K_2, T_{k-1}, T_k) = \delta_k P(t, T_k) \mathbf{Black}(K_2, L_k(t), \sigma_k \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t})$$

hold. The market observation shows that we need two different volatilities  $\sigma_k(K_1)$  and  $\sigma_k(K_2)$  to use Black's formula to match market price. The volatility smile or skew of the  $T_k$ -expiry caplet is the curve  $K \rightarrow \sigma_k(K)/\sqrt{T_k - t}$ . The reason that the curve is called volatility 'smile' or 'skew' is that the curve usually displays 'smiley' or 'skewed' shapes. If the volatility has a lower value around the at-the-money derivatives the shape is called smile. If the low-strike implied volatilities are higher than high-strike implied volatilities, the shape is said to be skew.

The model's volatility smile is generated as follows. Given a starting strike  $K$ , we compute the caplet price using

$$\mathbf{Cplt}(K) = \delta_k P(t, T) E^{T_k} [L_k(T_{k-1}) - K]^+ | \mathcal{F}_t],$$

with  $L_k(t)$  following dynamics Eq.(32). Then we invert Black's formula for this strike, i.e., solve

$$\mathbf{Cplt}(K) = \delta_k P(t, T) \mathbf{Black}(K, L_k(t), \sigma_k(K) \sqrt{T_{k-1} - t})$$

in  $\sigma_k(K)$ . Finally we change  $K$  and repeat the process to get a curve  $K \rightarrow \sigma_k(K)$ .

There have been many works dealing with the volatility smiles. One popular adjustment to the above issue is to start from an alternative dynamics, by assuming that under  $T_k$ -forward measure,

$$dL_k(t) = \xi_k(t, L_k(t)) L_k(t) dW^{T_k}(t), \quad (32)$$

where  $\xi_k$  can be either a deterministic or a stochastic function of  $L_k(t)$ . A deterministic  $\xi_k$  leads to so called 'local-volatility model'. For instance, we can take  $\xi_k(t, L_k) = \xi_k(t) L_k(t)^{\beta-1}$ , where  $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$  and  $\xi_k(t)$  is a deterministic function of  $t$ . The latter case leads to so called 'stochastic volatility models'. For example, we can take  $\xi_k(t, L) = \xi_k(t)$ , where  $\xi_k(t)$  follows a stochastic differential equation. In this article, we will use the lognormal-mixture model introduced by Brigo et al.[8] as an example of local volatility models.

Several authors have attempted to modify the LMM to capture the implied volatility smile/skew. Stochastic processes more general than log-normal process have been proposed. For example, constant elasticity of variance model(CEV) by Andersen-Andreasen[1] and displaced diffusion model(DD)

by Joshi-Rebonato[27] generate a monotone skew but not smile of implied volatility. A remedy to the above models has been to extend standard LMM by adopting mean reverting square root process for variance, such as Andersen and Brotherton-Ractliffe[3], Wu and Zhang [46], which produce additional curvature to the volatility curve. One of the main drawbacks of above models is that the volatility dynamics of all forward rates are driven by the same stochastic process, which may have difficulty in capturing different individual smile or skew shape of caps and swaptions. This problem is solved by Hagan et al.[23] by applying the SABR model to LIBOR modeling. However the volatility in the SABR model does not mean-revert. Lastly, for LMM with stochastic volatilities, one needs to decide on the number of factors ex ante.

### 3.2 Random Field Lognormal-mixture Volatility Model

In this section we present a local volatility model to capture the implied volatility smile. We extend the lognormal mixture model derived in Brigo et al. [8] to the random field case. Similar to Eq.(32), we can assume that under the  $T_k$ -forward measure, the dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  in the random field setting is

$$dL_k(t) = \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, L_k(t), u) dW^{T_k}(t, u) du, \quad (33)$$

where  $\xi_k$  is a deterministic function of  $L_k(t)$ . Similar to the random field LIBOR market model, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.1. (Random field local volatility dynamics under forward measures)** *Under the assumption of Eq.(33), the dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  under the  $T_j$ -forward measure, in three cases  $j < k, j = k, j > k$ , are described respectively by the following equations*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dL_k(t)}{L_k(t)} = \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, L_k(t), u) [dW^{T_j}(t, u) + \Lambda_j^k(t, u) dt] du, & j < k; \\ \frac{dL_k(t)}{L_k(t)} = \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, L_k(t), u) dW^{T_j}(t, u) du, & j = k; \\ \frac{dL_k(t)}{L_k(t)} = \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, L_k(t), u) [dW^{T_j}(t, u) + \Lambda_k^j(t, u) dt] du, & j > k. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

$$\Lambda_j^k(t, u) = \sum_{i=j+1}^k \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \frac{\delta_i L_i(t) \xi_i(t, L_k(t), v) c(u, v)}{\delta_i L_i(t) + 1} dv,$$

where  $W^{T_j}(t, u)$  is a Gaussian random field under the  $T_j$ -forward measure. The above equations admit a unique solution if the coefficients  $\xi_k(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$  are locally bounded, locally Lipschitz continuous and predictable.

Brigo and Mercurio [9] provide a class of analytical models based on a given mixture of densities. In this section we will extend them to the random field setting and provide closed-form formulas for caplet pricing and corresponding implied volatility that can be used for calibration.

Let us consider the diffusion process with dynamics

$$dG_i^k(t) = G_i^k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \nu_i^k(t, G_i^k(t), u) dW^{T_k}(t, u) du, \quad (35)$$

with initial value  $G_i^k(0) = L_k(0)$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ , where  $W^{T_k}(t, u)$  is a Gaussian field under the  $T_k$ -forward measure with correlation  $c(t, T_1, T_2)$  as described in Eq.(7). Similarly to Brigo and Mercurio [9], the problem here is to derive the local volatility  $\xi_k(t, u)$  such that the density of  $L_k(t)$  under  $T_k$ -forward measure satisfies, for each time  $t$ :

$$p^k(x, t) = \frac{d}{dx} P^{T_k} \{L_k(t) \leq x\} = \sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i \frac{d}{dx} P^{T_k} \{G_i^k(t) \leq x\} du = \sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i p_i^k(x, t),$$

where  $\omega_i$  is a weighting function with  $\sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i = 1$ . In fact  $p^k(x, t)$  is a proper density function under the  $T_k$ -forward measure since

$$\int_0^{+\infty} x p^k(x, t) dx = \int_0^{+\infty} x \sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i p_i^k(x, t) dx = \sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i G_i^k(0) = L_k(0),$$

if the conditions for exchange of integrals are verified. The last calculation follows from the fact that  $G_i^k(t)$  is a martingale under the  $T_k$ -forward measure. We know that that the local volatility  $\xi_k(t, L_k(t))$  is

$$\int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u) \xi_k(t, v) c(u, v) dv du = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i \left( \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \nu_i^k(t, u) \nu_i^k(t, v) c(u, v) dv du \right) p_i^k(x, t)}{\sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i p_i^k(x, t)}. \quad (36)$$

If we take  $c(x, y) = 1$ , the above formula reduces to

$$\xi_k(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i \nu_i^k(t)^2 p_i^k(x, t)}{\sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i p_i^k(x, t)}}, \quad (37)$$

which is the original lognormal-mixture model derived in Brigo et al.[8]. Since

$$\int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, L_k(t), u) dW^{T_k}(t, u) du$$

is normally distributed with variance

$$\int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, L_k(t), u) \xi_k(t, L_k(t), x) c(u, v) dv du,$$

we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.2. (Random field lognormal-mixture dynamics under forward measures)** *The dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  is given by*

$$dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i \left( \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \nu_i^k(t, u) \nu_i^k(t, v) c(u, v) dv du \right) p_i^k(x, t)}{\sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i p_i^k(x, t)}} dW^{T_k}(t), \quad (38)$$

where  $W^{T_k}(t)$  is a Brownian motion under the  $T_k$ -forward measure.

If we assume that in Eq.(35)

$$\nu_i^k(t, x, u) = \nu_i^k(t, u), \quad (39)$$

i.e., the densities  $p_i^k(x, t)$  are all log-normal, where for all  $k$ ,  $\nu_i^k(t)$  are deterministic and continuous functions of time that are bounded from above and below by strictly positive constants, the marginal density of  $G_i^k(t)$  is then log-normal:

$$p_i^k(x, t) = \frac{1}{x \nu_i^k(t) \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\nu_i^k(t)^2} \left[\ln \frac{x}{L_k(t)} + \frac{1}{2}\nu_i^k(t)\right]^2\right\}, \quad (40)$$

$$\nu_i^k(t) = \sqrt{\int_0^t \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \nu_i^k(s, u) \nu_i^k(s, v) c(s, u, v) du dv ds}. \quad (41)$$

### 3.2.1 Option pricing in a random field local volatility model

In this section, we derive the closed-form pricing formulas for caplets in the random field lognormal-mixture model.

The payoff of a caplet at time  $T_k$  is

$$\delta_k [L_k(T_{k-1}) - K]^+.$$

The time  $t$  price of the caplet is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Cplt}(t, K, T_{k-1}, T_k) &= \delta_k P(t, T_k) E^{T_k} [[L_k(T_{k-1}) - K]^+ | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= P(0, T_k) \int_0^{+\infty} [x - K]^+ p_k(x, t) dx \\ &= P(0, T_k) \sum_{i=1}^M \int_0^{+\infty} [x - K]^+ p_i^k(x, t) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$



Suppose that  $L_k(t)$  follows the dynamics of Eq.(33) under the  $T_k$ -forward measure and Eq.(39) holds, then the caplet price is

$$\mathbf{Cplt}(t, K, T_{k-1}, T_k) = \delta_k P(t, T_k) \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{Black}(K, L_k(t), \nu_i^k(T_{k-1}, u)).$$

Given the above closed-form solution, we can derive an explicit approximation for the caplet implied volatility as a function of the strike price.

**Proposition 3.3. (Implied volatility of the random field lognormal-mixture model)** Define  $m = \ln \frac{L_k(t)}{K}$ . The implied volatility  $\sigma_k^{Black,RF}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_k^{Black,RF}(m) \\ = & \sigma_k^{Black,RF}(0) + \frac{1}{2\sigma_k^{Black,RF}(0)(T_{k-1}-t)} \sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i \left[ \frac{\sigma_k^{Black,RF}(0) \sqrt{T_{k-1}-t}}{\nu_i^k(T_{k-1})} \right. \\ & \left. e^{\frac{1}{8}(\sigma_k^{Black,RF}(0))^2(T_{k-1}-t) - \nu_i^k(T_{k-1})^2} - 1 \right] m^2 + o(m^2), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where the at-the-money caplet implied volatility  $\sigma_k^{Black,RF}(0)$  is

$$\sigma_k^{Black,RF}(0) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{T_{k-1}-t}} \Phi^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^M \omega_i \Phi \left( \frac{1}{2} \nu_i^k(T_{k-1}) \right) \right). \quad (44)$$

Proposition 3.3 can be used to capture the volatility smile when calibrating the random field lognormal-mixture model to caplets.

## 4 Calibration

The models we discuss and derive in this paper require in general three different inputs, the initial forward curve, the instantaneous volatilities of the forward rates, and the correlation structure. The instantaneous volatilities of forward rates are usually assumed to depend on current time  $t$ , forward rate maturity  $T$  and time to maturity  $T-t$ . The most popular assumption is that the volatilities depend only on time to maturity (time-homogenous). There are two ways to specify the volatility function. One is to assume that volatility is piecewise-constant. Another way is to assume some parametric form for the volatility. In this paper we assume that the instantaneous volatility is of a particular parametric form with several time independent parameters. The estimation of the correlation structure can be based on historically estimated correlation matrix or some parametric form. However, the historical matrix is very volatile and is likely to have some outliers. Thus we follow the other approach to assume a parametric functional form for the correlation structure. See Sec.4.1 for details of the specification of model inputs.

## 4.1 Model specification

We need to calibrate the instantaneous volatility functions  $\xi_k(t)$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and the correlation matrix  $\rho_{i,j}(t)$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$  from the data of the initial yield curve  $L_k(0)$  and the caps and swaptions prices observed in the market. Notice that in the random field case, the correlation structure may take the continuum form  $c(u, v)$ . In this paper, we choose to parameterize the instantaneous volatility  $\xi_k(t)$  and the correlation structure  $c(u, v)$ .

Rebonato [39] proposes a time homogenous linear-exponential functional form with four parameters  $\xi_k(t) = f(t, T_k)h(t)g(T_k)$  for the instantaneous volatility, while  $h(t), g(T_k)$  are usually taken to be 1 and

$$f(t, T_k) = [a + b(T_k - t)]e^{-c(T_k - t)} + d; a, b, c, d > 0. \quad (45)$$

This formulation possesses several advantages. First, the function is flexible enough to produce either a humped or monotonically decreasing instantaneous volatility. Second, the function's parameters have clear interpretations. For example, the parameter  $d$  is the volatility when  $\delta = T - t$  is large, while the  $a + d$  is approximately the instantaneous volatility of the forward rate when  $\delta$  is small. And the limit of the function is reached at  $(b - ca)/cb$ . Third, analytical integration of the function's square is possible to allow fast calculation of forward rate variance and covariance.

The correlation structure differs for LMM and random field LMM. For the LMM, one need to specify the functional form of correlation matrix  $\rho_{i,j}$ , while for the random field LMM, one need to specify the correlation function  $c(u, v)$ . The difference of correlation structures for the LMM and the random field LMM is discussed as follows.

For the LMM, given the dynamics in Eq.(23) we know that the instantaneous correlation between forward rates  $L_i(t)$  and  $L_j(t)$  is defined as

$$\frac{Cov(dL_i(t), dL_j(t))}{\sqrt{Var(dL_i(t))Var(dL_j(t))}} = \frac{\xi_i(t)\xi_j(t)dW_i(t)dW_j(t)}{\sqrt{\xi_i^2(t)\xi_j^2(t)}} = dW_i(t)dW_j(t) = \rho_{i,j}(t),$$

which means that the instantaneous correlation of forward rates is exactly the same as the correlation structure of Brownian motion  $W(t)$ . We follow Schoenmakers and Coffey [42], who propose a two-parameter functional form for the correlation:

$$\rho_{i,j} = e^{-\frac{|i-j|}{N-1}(\rho_\infty + \rho_0 \frac{N-i-j+1}{N-2})}, \quad (46)$$

where  $N$  is the size of the matrix  $\rho$  and  $0 \leq \rho_0 \leq \rho_\infty$ . The number of factors in the LIBOR market model depends on the rank of correlation matrix  $\rho$ . A rank- $d$  correlation matrix  $\rho$  with entries defined in Eq.(46) gives rise to a  $d$ -factor LIBOR market model. In this paper we take a full rank correlation matrix and thus the LIBOR market model considered in this paper has the number of factors the same as the number of forward rates considered. Notice that if we specify the correlation directly without parametrization,

we need to calibrate  $K(K + 1)/2$  parameters, where  $K$  is the size of the correlation matrix. The number of parameters becomes very large if  $K$  is large. Thus the techniques of factor reduction will be needed to reduce the rank of the matrix and thus the number of parameters. On the other hand, we parameterize the correlation structure. The parameters needed to be calibrated are just the parameters in the functional form. Thus it is not necessary to reduce the correlation matrix to lower rank.

However, for the random field LMM, given the dynamics in Eq.(22), we know that the instantaneous correlation between forward rates  $L_i(t)$  and  $L_j(t)$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{Cov(dL_i(t), dL_j(t))}{\sqrt{Var(dL_i(t))Var(dL_j(t))}} \\ = & \frac{\int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \int_{T_{j-1}}^{T_j} \xi_i(t, x) \xi_j(t, y) c(x, y) dx dy}{\sqrt{\int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \xi_i(t, x) \xi_i(t, y) c(x, y) dx dy \int_{T_{j-1}}^{T_j} \int_{T_{j-1}}^{T_j} \xi_j(t, x) \xi_j(t, y) c(x, y) dx dy}}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that the instantaneous correlation of forward rates depends on both the correlation structure and the instantaneous volatilities. In other words, the correlation matrix depends the specification of both  $\xi(t, y)$  and  $c(x, y)$ . Thus the choice of the correlation functional form  $c(x, y)$  for random fields LIBOR market model can be simpler than that for LIBOR market model and it turns out that the following simple function form is sufficient:

$$c(x, y) := e^{-\rho_\infty |x-y|}. \quad (47)$$

The correlation is independent of current time  $t$ .

## 4.2 Calibration Procedure

In this section, we provide the closed-form Black implied volatility for caplets and swaptions, as functions of the instantaneous volatility  $\xi(t, T)$  and the correlation structure  $c(u, v)$ . The Black implied volatilities for caplets are derived in Eq.(43), where  $\nu_i^k(t)$  takes different form for the LMM and the RFLMM. For the LMM,

$$\nu_i^k(t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{k-1} - t} \int_t^{T_{k-1}} f_i^2(s, T_k) ds}. \quad (48)$$

For the RFLMM,

$$\nu_i^{k,RF}(t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{k-1} - t} \int_t^{T_{k-1}} \left[ \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} f_i(s, x) f_i(s, y) c(x, y) dx dy \right] ds}.$$

To facilitate calibration and comparison between the LMM and the RFLMM, it is reasonable to set  $f(t, x) = f(t, T_k)$  for  $x \in [T_{k-1}, T_k]$ . Thus the above equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_i^{k,RF}(t) &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{k-1}-t} \int_t^{T_{k-1}} \delta_k^2 f_i^2(s, T_k) ds \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} c(x, y) dx dy} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_{k-1}-t} c_{kk} \int_t^{T_{k-1}} \delta_k^2 f_i^2(s, T_k) ds},\end{aligned}\quad (49)$$

where  $c_{kk} = \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} c(x, y) dx dy$ .

The Black implied volatilities for swaptions are derived as follows. From Eq.(31) and Eq.(47), we know that correlation structure is independent of current time  $t$ , thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \overline{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Black,RF} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_i-t} \int_t^{T_i} \left\| \sum_{k=i+1}^j \frac{\delta_k L_k(s) \gamma_k^{i,j}(s)}{1 + \delta_k L_k(s)} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} f(s, T_k) dW(t, u) \right\|^2 ds} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_i-t} \sum_{k,l=i+1}^j \frac{\delta_k L_k(t) \gamma_k^{i,j}(t)}{1 + \delta_k L_k(t)} \frac{\delta_l L_l(t) \gamma_l^{i,j}(t)}{1 + \delta_l L_l(t)} \int_t^{T_i} c_{kl} \delta_k \delta_l f(s, T_k) f(s, T_l) ds} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_i-t} \sum_{k,l=i+1}^j \frac{\delta_k L_k(t) \gamma_k^{i,j}(t)}{1 + \delta_k L_k(t)} \frac{\delta_l L_l(t) \gamma_l^{i,j}(t)}{1 + \delta_l L_l(t)} \sigma_k^{Black,RF} \sigma_l^{Black,RF} \frac{c_{kl}}{\sqrt{c_{kk} c_{ll}}} \Theta_{l,k}(t)},\end{aligned}\quad (50)$$

where

$$\Theta_{l,k}(t) = \frac{\sqrt{T_l-t} \sqrt{T_k-t} \int_t^{T_i} f(s, T_k) f(s, T_l) ds}{\sqrt{\int_t^{T_k} f^2(s, T_k) ds} \sqrt{\int_t^{T_l} f^2(s, T_l) ds}}.\quad (51)$$

The second equation above is obtained by using standard freezing approximation techniques, i.e. approximately evaluating the LIBOR rates  $L_k(s)$ ,  $t \leq s \leq T_i$ , appearing in the instantaneous volatility at initial time  $t$ .

We conduct two calibrations. The first calibration is for the lognormal mixture models, using caplet volatility surface, by minimizing the root of mean square percentage error

$$RMSPE_{cplt} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{NN_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \frac{\sigma_j^{Black}(m_i) - \sigma_{i,j}^{Market}}{\sigma_j^{Black}(m_i)} \right)^2},\quad (52)$$

where  $N$  is the number of tenor days and  $N_s$  is the number of caplet strike price used in calibration.

The second calibration is for lognormal models, using both at-the-money swaption and cap volatilities, by minimizing the root of mean square percentage error

$$RMSP E_{swpt} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{(2N - M - 1)M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=i+1}^N \left( \frac{\bar{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Black} - \bar{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Market}}{\bar{\sigma}_{i,j}^{Black}} \right)^2}. \quad (53)$$

where  $N$  is the number of tenor days and  $M$  is the number of swaption maturities used in calibration. The second calibration is considered joint-calibration to both swaption and caps because the market quotes of Black's volatility for caps enter into swaption volatility through Eq. (50). Calibration results are shown in Sec.4.3.

### 4.3 Numerical Results

In this section we present the calibration results of LMM and RFLMM. The input of the calibration consists of market closing prices on October 20, 2011 from Bloomberg. The data include annualized initial forward rate curve, annualized caplet volatilities and swaption volatilities.

#### 4.3.1 Parameter calibration

Firstly, we investigate the caps surface calibration using the lognormal-mixture model. The caps considered here have floating leg 6M LIBOR, maturity dates from 1 year to 30 years and strikes from 1% to 10%. Table 1 and 2 show the calibration results on October 20, 2011. The column "RMSPE" represents the root mean squared percentage error of the model volatilities and market quoted volatilities.

Table 1: Calibration Results for LMM(Cap Surface)

$\omega$	a	b	c	d	RMSPE(%)
$\omega_1=0.21$	0.0125	0.0120	0.2035	0.1085	-
$\omega_2=0.23$	0.0313	0.0558	0.2473	0.1523	-
$\omega_3=0.29$	0.0083	0.0328	0.2243	0.1293	-
$\omega_4=0.27$	0.0004	0.0249	0.2164	0.1214	3.52

Table 2: Calibration Results for RFLMM(Cap Surface)

$\omega$	a	b	c	d	$\rho_\infty$	RMSPE(%)
$\omega_1=0.15$	0.0151	0.0396	0.2311	0.1361	2.5341	-
$\omega_2=0.17$	0.0077	0.0322	0.2237	0.1287	2.5267	-
$\omega_3=0.35$	0.0082	0.0327	0.2242	0.1292	2.5272	-
$\omega_4=0.33$	0.0020	0.0225	0.2140	0.1190	2.5170	2.64

From Table 1 and 2, we notice that random field models produce smaller RMSPE, compared to the Brownian motion LMM. The reason is that the






Figure 1: Examples of Caplet Volatility Smile Calibration for Maturity 1 year, 3 years, 15 years.

calibration of cap volatility surface in LMM does not utilize the information from the correlation structure, while the random field model uses correlation structure as one critical input. This makes the cap calibration more accurate in the random field model.

We plot the calibrated volatility smile for maturity 1 year, 3 year and 15 year in Figure 1. From these figures we observe that the random field lognormal-mixture LMM fits the smile/skew better than the original lognormal-mixture LMM.

Secondly, we consider the joint calibration of swaption and caps. The swaptions considered here are based on swaps which have the same tenors as in caps discussed above, with combined option maturity and underlying swap maturity not exceeding 10 years. Table 3 shows the calibration results on Oct. 20, 2011. From Table 3, we observe that the random field model can

Table 3: Calibration Results for LMM and RFLMM(Swaption)

	a	b	c	d	$\rho_\infty$	$\rho_0$	RMSPE(%)
LMM	0.001	0.0255	0.220	0.132	2.54	0.112	5.95
RFLMM	0.001	0.0254	0.219	0.15	2.112	-	4.87

fit the market prices better than the Brownian model even with a simpler correlation specification.

## 5 Conclusions

This paper extends the LIBOR market model by modeling forward rate innovations via Gaussian random fields. Derivatives prices are shown to satisfy a Black-Scholes type partial differential equation, which gives rise to closed-form solutions for caplet and swaption prices. We then derive a local volatility smile model in the random field setting. We use the lognormal-mixture model as an example. Approximation formulas for option implied volatilities are obtained. Finally we discuss the calibration procedure of the random field LIBOR market model. Our calibration results indicate that the random field LIBOR market model is superior in capturing market prices of caps and swaptions, in addition to other documented advantages of random field models (no need of frequent recalibration or to specify the number of factors in advance).

## 6 Appendix

### Appendix 1. Proof of Proposition 2.1:

*Proof.* Given the dynamics of the zero coupon bond price  $P(t, T)$  in Eq.(15), by Itô's formula, we have that

$$d\left(\frac{1}{P(t, T_k)}\right) = -\frac{r(t)dt - \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du + (\int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du)^2}{P(t, T_k)},$$

and

$$dP(t, T_{k-1})d\left(\frac{1}{P(t, T_k)}\right) = \frac{-P(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} \int_t^{T_{k-1}} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du.$$

Thus the dynamics of  $L_k(t)$  under risk neutral measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned} dL_k(t) &= d\left[\frac{1}{\delta_k} \left(\frac{P(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} - 1\right)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta_k} \left[ \frac{dP(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} + P(t, T_{k-1})d\left(\frac{1}{P(t, T_k)}\right) + dP(t, T_{k-1})d\left(\frac{1}{P(t, T_k)}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta_k} \frac{P(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} \left[ \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du + \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)d\widetilde{W}(t, u)du \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we derive the dynamics of forward rates  $L_k(t)$  under  $T_k$ -forward measure. Suppose that there exists a function  $\theta(t, T_k, u)$  such that  $dW^{T_k}(t, u) := \theta(t, T_k, u)dt + d\widetilde{W}(t, u)$  has normal distribution  $\Phi(0, dt)$  under  $T_k$ -forward measure. Replace  $d\widetilde{W}(t, u)$  by  $dW^{T_k}(t, u) - \theta(t, T_k, u)dt$  in above formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} dL_k(t) &= \frac{1}{\delta_k} \frac{P(t, T_{k-1})}{P(t, T_k)} \left\{ \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)[dW^{T_k}(t, u) - \theta(t, T_k, u)dt]du + \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, u) \right. \\ &\quad \left. [dW^{T_k}(t, u) - \theta(t, T_k, u)dt]du \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)[dW^{T_k}(t, u) - \theta(t, T_k, u)dt]du \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $L_k(t)$  is a martingale under  $T_k$ -forward measure, the drift term should vanish, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)\theta(t, T_k, u)dtdu &= \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)dW^{T_k}(t, u)du \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, v)dW^{T_k}(t, v)dv \\ &= \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u) \left[ \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dt dv \right] du, \end{aligned}$$



which means that

$$\theta(t, T_k, u) = \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dv.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## Appendix 2. Proof of Proposition 2.4:

*Proof.* From Eq. (18) and Corollary. 2.2, we know that

$$dW^{T_k}(t, u) - \int_t^{T_k} \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dvdt = dW(t, u) = dW^{T_{k+1}}(t, u) - \int_t^{T_{k+1}} \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dvdt.$$

Thus

$$dW^{T_k}(t, u) = dW^{T_{k+1}}(t, u) - \int_{T_k}^{T_{k+1}} \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dvdt,$$

from which follows that for  $j > k$

$$dW^{T_k}(t, u) = dW^{T_j}(t, u) - \sum_{i=k+1}^j \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dvdt. \quad (54)$$

Plugging Eq. (54) in to Eq. (18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} dL_k(t) &= \frac{1}{\delta_k}(\delta_k L_k + 1) \left[ \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u)dW^{T_j}(t, u)du \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{i=k+1}^j \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \sigma(t, u) \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \delta_k \sigma(t, v)c(u, v)dvdu \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As we know,  $L_k(t)$  is a martingale under  $T_k$ -forward measure. By random field martingale representation proposition, there exists a function  $\xi(t, u)$  such that

$$dL_k(t) = L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u)dW^{T_k}(t, u)du. \quad (55)$$

From Eq.(18), we can simply take

$$\xi_k(t, u) = \frac{\delta L_k(t) + 1}{\delta L_k(t)} \sigma(t, u). \quad (56)$$

Thus Eq.(55) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} dL_k(t) &= L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u)dW^{T_j}(t, u)du \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=k+1}^j L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u) \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \frac{\delta L_i(t)\xi_i(t, v)c(u, v)}{\delta L_i(t) + 1} dvdu \\ &= L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u)[dW^{T_j}(t, u) + \sum_{i=k+1}^j \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \frac{\delta L_i(t)\xi_i(t, v)c(u, v)}{\delta L_i(t) + 1} dvdt]du. \end{aligned}$$

The derivation in case  $j < k$  is perfectly analogous. The existence and uniqueness of solution  $L_k(t)$  is assured by the existence and uniqueness of  $f(t, T)$  in Eq.(8). Thus, given the coefficients satisfying the required conditions, locally bounded, locally Lipschitz continuous and predictable, there exists a unique  $f(t, T)$  for Eq.(8). This completes the proof.  $\square$

### Appendix 3. Proof of Proposition 2.5:

*Proof.* If the value of  $dW^T(t, u)$  on  $[T_{k-1}, T_k]$  is  $dW_k^T(t)$ , then

$$\int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} c(u, v) dv du = \delta_k \delta_i c(t, T_k, T_i),$$

which means that for  $j < k$ , Proposition 2.4 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} dL_k(t) &= L_k(t) \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \xi_k(t, u) [dW^{T_j}(t, u) + \sum_{i=j+1}^k \int_{T_{i-1}}^{T_i} \frac{\delta_i L_i(t) \xi_i(t, v) c(u, v)}{\delta_i L_i(t) + 1} dv dt] du \\ &= L_k(t) \delta_k \xi_k(t, u) [dW^{T_j}(t, u) + \sum_{i=j+1}^k \delta_i \frac{\delta_i L_i(t) \delta_i \xi_i(t, v) c(t, T_i, T_k)}{\delta_i L_i(t) + 1} dt]. \end{aligned}$$

From Eq.(23), we can easily take  $c(t, T_i, T_k) = \rho_{i,k}$  and take  $\delta_k \xi_k(t)$  to be  $\xi_k(t)$ . The derivation for  $j > k$  is analogous. Thus Eq.(22) in Proposition 2.4 will reduce to Eq.(6) and Proposition 2.4 reduces to Eq.(23), which means that Eq.(23) is a discrete case of Proposition 2.4. This completes the proof.  $\square$

### Appendix 4. Proof of Proposition 2.6 (Random fields Black-Scholes equation):

*Proof.* We provide the proof of Black-Scholes equation with random fields for time dependent parameters. Suppose that we have an option  $V$  on some underlying asset  $S$ , which has dynamics

$$\frac{dS(t)}{S(t)} = \mu(t) dt + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sigma(t, u) dW(t, u) du. \quad (57)$$

We create a portfolio  $\Pi$  which consists of long  $\Delta$  number of the asset and short one options, i.e.

$$\Pi = -V + \Delta S.$$

The increment of portfolio value is given by that of option and underlying asset, i.e.

$$d\Pi = -dV + \Delta dS.$$

By Itó's formula for  $dV$  and the dynamics of asset  $S$ , we can have that

$$\begin{aligned}
d\Pi &= -dV + \Delta dS \\
&= -\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} dt - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sigma(t, u) dW(t, u) du \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sigma(t, u) dW(t, u) du \right] S^2 \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial S^2} + \left( \Delta - \frac{\partial V}{\partial S} \right) dS \\
&= \left( -\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sigma(t, u) \sigma(t, v) c(u, v) dudv \right] S^2 \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial S^2} \right) dt + \left( \Delta - \frac{\partial V}{\partial S} \right) dS \\
&= \left( -\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}^2(t, t_1, t_2) S^2 \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial S^2} \right) dt + \left( \Delta - \frac{\partial V}{\partial S} \right) dS,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{\sigma}^2(t, t_1, t_2) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sigma(t, u) \sigma(t, v) c(u, v) dudv. \quad (58)$$

The portfolio will become non-stochastic if we choose  $\Delta = \frac{\partial V}{\partial S}$ , which means that the portfolio will grow in risk free interest rate  $r(t)$ :

$$d\Pi = \left( -\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}^2(t, t_1, t_2) S^2 \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial S^2} \right) dt = r(t) \left( -V + S \frac{\partial V}{\partial S} \right) dt.$$

By rearranging the equation above we can have the Black-Scholes equation with random fields for time dependent parameters:

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}^2(t, t_1, t_2) S^2 \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial S^2} + r(t) S \frac{\partial V}{\partial S} - r(t) V = 0.$$

We can introduce new parameters  $Y = \ln S, \tau = T - t, U = e^{\int_0^\tau r(t) dt} V$  and the above equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial \tau} = \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sigma(t, u) \sigma(t, v) c(u, v) dudv}{2} \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial Y^2} + \left[ r(\tau) - \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \sigma(t, u) \sigma(t, v) c(u, v) dudv}{2} \right] \frac{\partial U}{\partial Y},$$

which has fundamental solution as

$$\Phi(Y, \tau) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \int_0^\tau \hat{\sigma}^2(u, t_1, t_2) du}} e^{-[Y + \int_0^\tau (r(u) - \hat{\sigma}^2(u, t_1, t_2)/2) du]^2 / [2 \int_0^\tau \hat{\sigma}^2(u, t_1, t_2) du]}.$$

Thus the solution of Black-Scholes equation is given by

$$U(Y, \tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} U(v, 0) \Phi(Y - v, \tau) dv.$$

The terminal conditions  $V(S, T) = \max(S_T - K, 0)$  for call option give the price for a call option as

$$C = SN(\tilde{d}_1) - Ke^{-\int_0^\tau r(u) du} N(\tilde{d}_2),$$

where

$$\tilde{d}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\int_0^\tau \hat{\sigma}^2(u, t_1, t_2) du}} \left[ \ln \frac{S}{K} + \int_0^\tau \left( r(u) + \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2(u, t_1, t_2)}{2} \right) du \right], \quad (59)$$

$$\tilde{d}_2 = \tilde{d}_1 - \sqrt{\int_0^\tau \hat{\sigma}^2(u, t_1, t_2) du}. \quad (60)$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [1] L. Andersen and J. Andreasen, Volatility skews and extension of the LIBOR market model, *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 7(1), 1-32, 2000
- [2] L. Andersen and J. Andreasen, Volatile volatilities, *Risk Magazine*, 15(12), 163-168, 2000
- [3] L. Andersen and R. Brotherton-Ratchilffe, Extended LIBOR market model with stochastic volatility, *Journal of Computational Finance*, 9(1), 1-40, 2005
- [4] J. Kerkhof and A. Pelsser, Observational equivalence of discrete string models and market models, *the journal of derivatives*, 10(1), 55-61, 2000
- [5] A. Buraschi and F. Corielli, Risk management implications of time-inconsistency: model updating and recalibration of no-arbitrage models, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 29, 2883-2907, 2005
- [6] C. A. Bester, Random field and affine models for interest rates: an empirical comparison, *Working Paper*, 2004
- [7] F. Black, The Pricing of commodity contracts, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3, 167-179, 1976
- [8] D. Brigo and F. Mercurio and M. Morini, Lognormal-mixture dynamics and calibration to market volatility smiles, *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 5(4), 427-446, 2002
- [9] D. Brigo and F. Mercurio, Interest Rate Models: Theory and practice, with smile, inflation and credit, *Springer Finance*, New York, 2006
- [10] A. Brace and D. Gatarek and M. Musiela, The market model of interest rate dynamics, *Mathematical Finance*, 7, 127-155, 1997
- [11] J. C. Cox and J. E. Ingesoll, and S. A. Ross, A Theory of the term structure of interest rates, *Econometrica*, 53, 385-407, 1985
- [12] J. Duan, A glimpse of stochastic dynamics, *Book Manuscript*, 2012.

- [13] R. S. Goldstein, The term structure of interest rates as a random field, *Review of Financial Studies*,13,365-284,2000
- [14] D. Heath and R. A. Jarrow and A. J. Morton, Bond pricing and the term structure of interest rates, *Econometrica*,60(1),77-105,1992
- [15] P. Henry-labordere, Solvable local and stochastic volatility models: supersymmetric methods in option pricing, *Quantitative Finance*,7(5),525-535, 2007
- [16] S. L. Heston, A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility with applications to bond and currency options, *The Review of Financial Studies*, 6,327-343, 1993
- [17] F. Jamshidian, LIBOR and swap market models and measures, *Finance and Stochastics*,1,293-330,1997
- [18] J. Hull and A. White, Pricing interest rate derivative securities, *The Review of Financial Studies*,3,573-592,1990
- [19] J. Hull and A. White, The pricing of options on assets with stochastic volatilities, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*,3,281-30,1987
- [20] J. Hull and A. White, Forward rate volatilities, swap rate volatilities, and the implementation of the LIBOR market model, *Journal of Fixed Income*,10,46-62,2000
- [21] T. Y. Ho and S. B. Lee, Term structure movements and the pricing of interest rate contingent claims, *The Journal of Finance*,41,1011-1029,1986
- [22] P. Hagan and A. Lesniewski, LIBOR market model with SABR style stochastic volatility, *JP Morgan Chase and Ellington Management Group*, 2008
- [23] P. Hagan and D. Kumar and A. Lesniewski and D. Woodward, Managing smile risk, *Wilmott magazine*,9,84-108, 2002
- [24] D. Khoshnevisan, Multiparameter process: an introduction to random fields, *Springer-Verlag*,New York,2002
- [25] D. P. Kenedy, The term structure of interest rates as a Gaussian random field, *Mathematical Finance*,4,247-258,1994
- [26] D. P. Kenedy, Characterizing Gaussian models of the term structure of interest rates, *Mathematical Finance*,7,107-118,1997

- [27] M. S. Joshi and R. Rebonato, A stochastic volatility displaced-diffusion extension of the LIBOR market model, *Quantitative Finance*,6,458-469,2003
- [28] H. Li and F. Zhao, Unspanned stochastic volatility: evidence from hedging interest rate derivatives, *Journal of Finance*,61,314-378,2006
- [29] F. Longstaff and S-C Pedro and E. Schwartz, The relative valuation of caps and swaptions: theory and evidence, *Journal of Finance*,56,2067-2109,2001
- [30] M. Morini and N. Webber, An EZI method to reduce the rank of a correlation matrix, *Applied Mathematical Finance*,13(4),309-331,2006
- [31] R. K. Miltersen and K. Sandmann and D. Sondermann, Closed form solution for term structure derivatives with lognormal interest rates, *Journal of Finance*,52,409-430,1997
- [32] F. Mercurio, Interest rates and the credit crunch: new formulas and market models, *Bloomberg Portfolio Research*,2010(1) FRONTIERS,February,2009
- [33] B. Oksendal, Stochastic differential equations: an introduction with applications, *Springer*,2005
- [34] V. V. Piterbarg, Stochastic volatility model with time-dependent skew, *Applied Mathematical Finance*,12(2),147-185,2005
- [35] N. D. Pearson and T. S. Sun, Exploiting the conditional density in estimating the term structure: an application to the cox, ingersoll, and ross model, *Journal of Finance*,49,1279-1304,1994
- [36] K. Pang and C. Wharf, Calibration of Gaussian Heath, Jarrow and Morton and random field interest rate term structure models , *Review of Derivatives Research*,2(4),315-345,1998
- [37] R. Rebonato, A time-homogeneous, SABR-consistent extension of the LMM: calibration and numerical results, *Risk Magazine*,102-106,November,2007
- [38] R. Rebonato, Modern pricing of interest rate derivatives: the LIBOR market model and beyond, *Princeton University Press*,2002
- [39] R. Rebonato, Calibrating the BGM model, *Risk Magazine*,12,74-79,1999
- [40] K. R. Miltersen and S. Klaus and S. Didier, Closed form solution for term structure derivatives with lognormal interest rates, *Journal of Finance*,52,409-430,1997

- [41] S. C. Pedro and S. Didier, The dynamics of the forward interest rate curve with stochastic string model shocks, *The Review of Financial Studies*,14 ,149-185,2001
- [42] J. Schoenmakers and C. Coffey, Stable implied calibration of a multi-factor LIBOR model via a semi-parametric correlation structure, *Weierstrass Institute*,2000
- [43] A. B. Trolle and E. S. Schwartz, A general stochastic volatility model for the pricing of interest rate derivatives, *Review of Financial Studies*,22,2007-2057,2009
- [44] P. Vasicek, An equilibrium characterization of the term structure, *Journal of Financial Economics*,5,177-188,1977
- [45] T. Wu, Pricing and hedging the smile with SABR: evidence from the interest rate caps market, *Journal of Futures Markets*,32,773-791,2012
- [46] L. Wu and F. Zhang, LIBOR market model with stochastic volatility, *J. Industrial and Management Optimization*,2(2),199-227,2006
- [47] F. C. Klebaner, Introduction to stochastic calculus with applications, *Imperial College Press*,2012
- [48] S. S. Shreve, Stochastic calculus for finance:continuous time models, *Springer-Verlag*,New York,2012
- [49] R. J. Adler, Geometry of random fields, *John Wiley and Sons Inc*,1981
- [50] I. I. Gikhman and A. V. Skorokhod, Introduction to the theory of random processes, *Dover Publications*,1996
- [51] P. E. Kloeden and E. Platen, Numerical solutions of stochastic differential equations, *Springer Verlag*,2000
- [52] J. Hull, Options, futures, and other derivatives, *Pearson Education*,2007