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#### Abstract

In this paper we propose some moment matching pricing methods for European-style discrete arithmetic Asian basket options in a Black \& Scholes framework. We generalize the approach of [5] and of [8] in several ways. We create a framework that allows for a whole class of conditioning random variables which are normally distributed. We moment match not only with a lognormal random variable but also with a log-extended-skew-normal random variable. We also improve the bounds of [9]. Numerical results are included and on the basis of our numerical tests, we explain which method we recommend depending on moneyness and time-to-maturity.
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## 1. Introduction

In this paper we propose pricing methods for European-style discrete arithmetic Asian basket options in a Black \& Scholes framework.
We consider a basket consisting of $n$ assets with prices $S_{i}(t), i=1, \ldots, n$, which are described, under the risk neutral measure $\mathbb{Q}$ and with $r$ some risk-neutral interest rate, by

$$
d S_{i}(t)=r S_{i}(t) d t+\sigma_{i} S_{i}(t) d W_{i}(t)
$$

where $\left\{W_{i}(t), t>0\right\}$ are standard Brownian motions associated with the price of asset $i$. Further, we assume that the different asset prices are instantaneously correlated in a constant way i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{corr}\left(d W_{i}, d W_{j}\right)=\rho_{i j} d t . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

An Asian basket option is a path-dependent multi-asset option whose payoff combines the payoff structure of an Asian option with that of a basket option. The current time $t=0$ price of a discrete arithmetic Asian basket call option with a fixed strike $K$, maturity $T$ and $m$ averaging dates is determined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{ABC}(n, m, K, T)=e^{-r T} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[(\mathbb{S}-K)_{+}\right] \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]with
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{S}=\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) e^{\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\ell}^{2}\right)(T-j)+\sigma_{\ell} W_{\ell}(T-j)} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

where $a_{\ell}$ and $b_{j}$ are positive coefficients which both sum up to 1 , and where $(x)_{+}=\max \{x, 0\}$. For $T \leq m-1$, the Asian basket call option is said to be in progress and for $T>m-1$, we call it forward starting. Throughout the paper we consider forward starting Asian basket call options but the methods apply in general. The prices of Asian basket put options follow from the call option prices by the call-put parity relation. Indeed, if the price of an Asian basket put option with a fixed strike $K$, maturity $T$ and $m$ averaging dates is denoted by $\operatorname{ABP}(n, m, K, T)$, static arbitrage arguments lead to the following call-put parity relation:

$$
\operatorname{ABC}(n, m, K, T)-\operatorname{ABP}(n, m, K, T)=\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) e^{-r j}-e^{-r T} K
$$

Determining the price of the Asian basket option is not a trivial task, because we do not have an explicit analytical expression for the distribution of the weighted sum of the assets. Dahl and Benth value such options in [6] and [7] by quasi-Monte Carlo techniques and singular value decomposition. In [9] we derived lower and upper bounds based on stop-loss premia for non-independent random variables as in [12] or [10], [11] and on conditioning variables as in [5], [16] or [14]. We also derived upper bounds for Asian basket options applying techniques as in [17] and [13]. A natural extension is to use approximation techniques which are easier to treat mathematically, as discussed in [4] and references therein. Indeed those working in financial institutions prefer an approximate analytical solution above a more accurate solution involving lengthy numerical calculations. In the case of a basket option Deelstra et al. [8] combine the conditioning approach as in [5] with some moment matching methods to derive an approximation. Zhou and Wang approximate in [20] the underlying portfolio by some log-extended-skew-normal variates, whose parameters are determined by moment matching methods and derive a closed form approximation formulae for pricing both Asian and basket options.

In this paper we focus on approximations for pricing Asian basket options. We review and extend approximation methods of [8] and [20] to the Asian basket case. The main innovation of this paper is to show how to extend the approximation methods of [5] and [8] to a broad class of normal conditioning random variables and to improve the upper bounds based on the Rogers and Shi approach reported in [9].

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we use methods of Curran [5] and we decompose the price of the Asian basket option in two parts; one of which is computed exactly. In section 3 we determine the class of normal conditioning random variables and corresponding integration bound to split the integral in the expression of the Asian basket option price. The remaining part of the integral is approximated using moment matching methods with a lognormal approximating random variable in section 4 . In section 5 we generalize the approach of [20] based on a moment matching log-extended-skew-normal approximation. Further we adapt this approach to the extended Curran methods of section 4. In section 6 we consider some numerical results and discuss the qualitative behaviour of these approximations.

## 2. Splitting the price by conditioning

In this section we follow the lines of [8] based on the method of conditioning as in [5] and [16]. The price of the Asian basket option can be decomposed in two parts, one of which is computed exactly while the remaining part in the decomposition is approximated using moment matching methods. We will show how to improve the exact part found in [8]. At the same time we obtain an extension of the method of [5] to more general conditioning random variables and an improvement of the upper bound based on the Rogers and Shi approach.

Apply the tower property with a conditioning random variable $\Lambda$ and suppose that there exists a $d_{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Lambda \geq d_{\Lambda}$ implies that $\mathbb{S} \geq K$, then the option price (2) can be split in two parts:

$$
\operatorname{ABC}(n, m, K, T):=I_{1}+I_{2}
$$

with

$$
\begin{align*}
& I_{1}=e^{-r T} \int_{d_{\Lambda}}^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]-K\right) d F_{\Lambda}(\lambda)=e^{-r T} \int_{d_{\Lambda}}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda] d F_{\Lambda}(\lambda)-e^{-r T} K\left(1-F_{\Lambda}\left(d_{\Lambda}\right)\right)  \tag{4}\\
& I_{2}=e^{-r T} \int_{-\infty}^{d_{\Lambda}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[(\mathbb{S}-K)_{+} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right] d F_{\Lambda}(\lambda) \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Theorem 1 The first term $I_{1}$ (4) of the Asian basket option price $A B C(n, m, K, T)$ in (2) with $\mathbb{S}$ (3) as underlying can be written explicitly if for all $\ell$ and $j,\left(W_{\ell}(T-j), \Lambda\right)$ is bivariate normally distributed with $\Lambda \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Lambda], \sigma_{\Lambda}\right)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{1}=\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) e^{-r j} \Phi\left[r_{\ell, j} \sigma_{\ell} \sqrt{T-j}-d_{\Lambda}^{*}\right]-e^{-r T} K \Phi\left(-d_{\Lambda}^{*}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function, $d_{\Lambda}^{*}=\frac{d_{\Lambda}-\mathbb{E}^{\varrho}[\Lambda]}{\sigma_{\Lambda}}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{\ell, j}=\frac{\operatorname{cov}\left(W_{\ell}(T-j), \Lambda\right)}{\sigma_{\Lambda} \sqrt{T-j}} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof The conditional expectation in (6) is easily seen to be:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]=\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) e^{\left(r-\frac{1}{2} r_{\ell, j}^{2} \sigma_{\ell}^{2}\right)(T-j)+r_{\ell, j} \sigma_{\ell} \sqrt{T-j} \frac{\lambda-\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Lambda]}{\sigma_{\Lambda}}} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Elementary integral calculation and normalization of the random variable $\Lambda$ lead to the required result.
We will in the next section focus on the choice of $\Lambda$ and the integration bound $d_{\Lambda}$.

## 3. Choice of $\Lambda$ and $d_{\Lambda}$

In this section we treat the problem in a more general setting of sums of non-independent lognormal random variables. Indeed, the double sum (3) is a special case of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{S}=\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_{i} \alpha_{i} e^{\beta_{i}+\gamma_{i} Y_{i}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the weights $w_{i}$ sum up to one, the coefficients $\alpha_{i}(>0), \beta_{i}, \gamma_{i}$ are deterministic and the normally distributed random variables $Y_{i}$ have mean zero, variance $\sigma_{Y_{i}}^{2}$ and are correlated with $\rho_{i j}=\operatorname{corr}\left(Y_{i}, Y_{j}\right)$.

In order to generalize the approach of [5] and of [8], we transform the sum $\mathbb{S}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{S}=F \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i} e^{\beta_{i}-\ln \delta_{i}+\gamma_{i} Y_{i}}:=F \mathbb{S}_{F}, \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\tilde{w}_{i}=\frac{w_{i} \alpha_{i} \delta_{i}}{F}, \quad F=\sum_{i=1}^{N} w_{i} \alpha_{i} \delta_{i}, \quad \delta_{i}>0, \quad i=1, \ldots, N
$$

The coefficients $\delta_{i}$ can be chosen arbitrarily. Different choices will be discussed below.
According to the approach of [8] we choose the conditioning random variable $\Lambda$ as a linear combination of the random variables $Y_{i}$ obtained as a linear transformation of a first order approximation of $\mathbb{S}(10)$. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{S} \geq F \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i}\left(1+\beta_{i}-\ln \delta_{i}+\gamma_{i} Y_{i}\right)=F+F \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\ln \delta_{i}\right)+F \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i} \gamma_{i} Y_{i} \geq K:=F K_{F} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

provides

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda:=F \Lambda_{F}=F \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i} \gamma_{i} Y_{i} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the integration bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{\Lambda}=K-F-F \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\ln \delta_{i}\right)=F\left[K_{F}-1-\sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\ln \delta_{i}\right)\right]:=F d_{\Lambda_{F}} . \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand applying the approach of [5] we approximate the arithmetic average $\mathbb{S}_{F}$ by its corresponding geometric average $\mathbb{G}_{F}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{S}=F \mathbb{S}_{F} \geq F \mathbb{G}_{F}=F \prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(e^{\beta_{i}-\ln \delta_{i}+\gamma_{i} Y_{i}}\right)^{\tilde{w}_{i}} \geq K=F K_{F} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Taking the logarithm and noting that in view of (13)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{F}=\ln \mathbb{G}_{F}-\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\ln \mathbb{G}_{F}\right], \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

this reasoning leads to the integration bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{\Lambda}=F d_{\Lambda_{F}}=F\left[\ln K_{F}-\sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_{i}\left(\beta_{i}-\ln \delta_{i}\right)\right] . \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The two approaches lead to the same expression for the conditioning random variable but to two different integration bounds $d_{\Lambda}$.
Since the function $f(x)=\ln x-(x-1)$ reaches its maximum value zero for $x=1$, it is negative in $] 0,+\infty[$ and the expression (16) for $d_{\Lambda}$ will be smaller than the expression (13). Thus using (16) as integration bound when splitting the integral in (4) and (5) will provide an improvement compared to the use of (13) for $d_{\Lambda}$ as was the case in [8].

This also implies that the upper bounds based on the Rogers and Shi approach, referred to UBRS in [9] calculated with (16) will give better results than using (13). Indeed, from theorem 3 in [9] one can see that UBRS $\Lambda$ is an increasing function of $d_{\Lambda}$. From the numerical results in Table 4 in section 6, we can conclude that the so-called partially/exact comonotonic upper bound denoted by PECUB is also considerably improved when determined by (16).

For the Asian basket case (2)-(3), we list five conditioning random variables $\Lambda$ (12) with corresponding integration bound $d_{\Lambda}$ (16) based on the choices for $\Lambda$ that can be found in literature, see e.g. [18] and [19]:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{FA} k=\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) \delta_{k}(\ell, j) \sigma_{\ell} W_{\ell}(T-j),  \tag{17}\\
& d_{\mathrm{FA} k}=F \ln K_{F}-\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) \delta_{k}(\ell, j)\left[\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\ell}^{2}\right)(T-j)-\ln \delta_{k}(\ell, j)\right], \tag{18}
\end{align*} \quad k=1, \ldots, 5,
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) \delta_{k}(\ell, j), \quad k=1, \ldots, 5 \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

and with

$$
\begin{gather*}
\delta_{1}(\ell, j)=e^{\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\ell}^{2}\right)(T-j)}, \quad \delta_{2}(\ell, j)=1, \quad \delta_{3}(\ell, j)=e^{r(T-j)}, \quad \delta_{4}(\ell, j)=S_{\ell}(0)^{-1}  \tag{20}\\
\delta_{5}(\ell, j)=e^{r(T-j)-\frac{1}{2}\left(r_{\ell, j}^{\mathrm{FA} 3} \sigma_{\ell} \sqrt{T-j}-\Phi^{-1}(p)\right)^{2}}, \tag{21}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $r_{\ell, j}^{\mathrm{FA} 3}$ is the correlation (7) for $\Lambda=\mathrm{FA} 3$ and $\left.p \in\right] 0,1[$ is the level of the conditional tail expectation used to locally optimize the choice of $\Lambda$ (see [18]).
The integration bound of the form (13) equals the expression in (18) but with the first term $F \ln K_{F}$ replaced by $K-F$ and was used in [8] and [9].

## 4. Moment matching lognormal approximation

In this section we discuss approximations of the second part $I_{2}$ (5) based on the moment matching technique. First we note that the following expressions for this part $I_{2}$ are equivalent and can be used to start from for the moment matching approximation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{2} & =e^{-r T} \int_{-\infty}^{d_{\Lambda}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[(\mathbb{S}-K)_{+} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right] d F_{\Lambda}(\lambda) \\
& =e^{-r T} F \int_{-\infty}^{d_{\Lambda_{F}}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\left(\mathbb{S}_{F}-K_{F}\right)_{+} \mid \Lambda_{F}=\lambda\right] d F_{\Lambda_{F}}(\lambda) \\
& =e^{-r T} F \int_{0}^{K_{F}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\left(\mathbb{S}_{F}-K_{F}\right)_{+} \mid \mathbb{G}_{F}=g\right] d F_{\mathbb{G}_{F}}(g) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We will further work with the first expression and transform it into:

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{2}=e^{-r T} \int_{-\infty}^{d_{\Lambda}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\left(\left(\mathbb{S}-f_{s}(\Lambda)\right)-\left(K-f_{s}(\Lambda)\right)\right)_{+} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right] d F_{\Lambda}(\lambda) \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we will study three cases for $s=1,2,3$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1}(\Lambda)=0, \quad f_{2}(\Lambda)=F\left(1+\ln \mathbb{G}_{F}\right), \quad f_{3}(\Lambda)=F \mathbb{G}_{F} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we recall that by relation (12) and (15) the dependence on $\Lambda$ is equivalent to the dependence on $\mathbb{G}_{F}$. These choices for $f_{s}(\Lambda)$ are inspired by the approximations derived in (11) and in (14). These two cases were considered for basket options in [8] but with an integration bound $d_{\Lambda}$ of the form (13) instead of (18) and only for the conditioning random variables FA1 and FA2 for the case $s=2$ and FA4 for the case $s=3$. The present approach allows for a broader class of conditioning random variables of the form (12).

We will approximate the conditioned random variable $\mathbb{S}-f_{s}(\Lambda) \mid \Lambda=\lambda$ by a lognormal random variable with parameters $\mu_{s}(\lambda)$ and $\sigma_{s}(\lambda)$ and with the same first two moments as $\mathbb{S}-f_{s}(\Lambda) \mid \Lambda=\lambda, s=1,2,3$. Then the expression for the expectation in the integrand of (22) is well known and is similar to the Black-Scholes formula.
This reasoning leads to the following result:
Theorem 2 A moment matching lognormal approximation to the part $I_{2}$ (22)-(23) of the Asian basket option price $A B C(n, m, K, T)$ in (2) written on $\mathbb{S}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{-r T} \int_{-\infty}^{d_{\Lambda}}\left[e^{\mu_{s}(\lambda)+\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{s}^{2}(\lambda)} \Phi\left(d_{1}(\lambda)\right)-\left(K-f_{s}(\lambda)\right) \Phi\left(d_{2}(\lambda)\right)\right] d F_{\Lambda}(\lambda), \quad s=1,2,3, \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
d_{1}(\lambda)=\frac{\mu_{s}(\lambda)+\sigma_{s}^{2}(\lambda)-\ln \left(K-f_{s}(\lambda)\right)}{\sigma_{s}(\lambda)}, \quad d_{2}(\lambda)=d_{1}(\lambda)-\sigma_{s}(\lambda)
$$

$f_{s}(\lambda)$ defined in (23) and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{s}(\lambda)+\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{s}^{2}(\lambda) & =\ln \left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]-f_{s}(\lambda)\right) \\
\mu_{s}(\lambda)+\sigma_{s}^{2}(\lambda) & =\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{2} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right]-2 f_{s}(\lambda) \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]+f_{s}^{2}(\lambda)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

For the Asian basket case with the underlying $\mathbb{S}$ given by (3), the conditional expectations above can be written out explicitly. $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]$ was given in (8) while for $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{2} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right]$ we find:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{2} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right] \\
& =\sum_{\ell, u=1}^{n} \sum_{j, p=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} a_{u} b_{j} b_{p} S_{\ell}(0) S_{u}(0) e^{\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\ell}^{2}\right)(T-j)+\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{u}^{2}\right)(T-p)+\frac{1}{2}\left(1-r_{\ell j, u p}^{2}\right) \sigma_{\ell j, u_{p}}^{2}+r_{\ell j, u p} \sigma_{\ell j, u p} \frac{\lambda-\mathbb{E}_{\Lambda}[\Lambda]}{\sigma_{\Lambda}}} \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\ell j, u p}^{2} & =\sigma_{\ell}^{2}(T-j)+\sigma_{u}^{2}(T-p)+2 \sigma_{\ell} \sigma_{u} \rho_{\ell u} \min (T-j, T-p) \\
r_{\ell j, u p} \sigma_{\ell j, u p} & =r_{\ell, j} \sigma_{\ell} \sqrt{T-j}+r_{u, p} \sigma_{u} \sqrt{T-p}
\end{aligned}
$$

and the correlations $\rho_{\ell u}$ and $r_{\ell, j}, r_{u, p}$ defined in (1) and (7). When $\Lambda$ is one of the $\mathrm{FA} k$ (17) then we moreover have for $k=1, \ldots, 5$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{\Lambda}^{2} & =\sum_{\ell, u=1}^{n} \sum_{j, p=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} a_{u} b_{j} b_{p} S_{\ell}(0) S_{u}(0) \delta_{k}(\ell, j) \delta_{k}(u, p) \sigma_{\ell} \sigma_{u} \rho_{\ell u} \min (T-j, T-p)  \tag{26}\\
r_{\ell, j} & =\frac{1}{\sigma_{\Lambda} \sqrt{T-j}} \sum_{u=1}^{n} \sum_{p=0}^{m-1} a_{u} b_{p} S_{u}(0) \delta_{k}(u, p) \sigma_{u} \rho_{\ell u} \min (T-j, T-p) \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

## 5. Moment matching log-extended-skew-normal approximation

In the case of an Asian option and a basket option Zhou and Wang approximate in [20] the underlying portfolio by some log-extended-skew-normal (LESN) variates whose parameters are determined by the moment matching method, and derive certain closed form approximation formulae related to the standard extended-skew-normal distributions. In this section we first follow their idea and generalize this method to the Asian basket case (2). Second we extend their idea to the conditioning approach as in the previous section by following the idea of [5] and [8].

### 5.1. Log-extended-skew-normal random variable

The univariate skew normal distribution was introduced by Azzalini in [2]. In conjunction with coauthors, he extended this class to include the multivariate analog of the skew-normal. A survey of such models is given by Arnold and Beaver in [1]. For a recent discussion and applications of the skew-normal distribution see for example [3] or [15].
Definition 3 A random variable $Z$ is said to be standard extended-skew-normal distributed with the skewness parameters $\alpha$ and $\tau$, denoted by $Z \sim \operatorname{ESN}(\alpha, \tau)$, if $Z$ has the distribution function

$$
\Psi(x, \alpha, \tau)=\int_{-\infty}^{x} \phi(z) \frac{\Phi\left(\tau \sqrt{1+\alpha^{2}}+\alpha z\right)}{\Phi(\tau)} d z, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}
$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ denotes the density function and $\Phi(\cdot)$ the standard normal cumulative distribution function. If $\tau=0$, then we say that $Z$ has a standard skew-normal distribution with the skewness parameter $\alpha$, denoted by $Z \sim \operatorname{SN}(\alpha)$. The standard extended-skew-normal distribution has the following property

$$
1-\Psi(x, \alpha, \tau)=\Psi(-x,-\alpha, \tau), \quad \forall x, \alpha, \tau \in \mathbb{R}
$$

A more general form of a skew normal distribution is obtained by introducing a location parameter $\mu$ and a positive scale parameter $\sigma$ :
Definition 4 A random variable, $Y$, defined by $Y=\mu+\sigma Z$ with $Z \sim \operatorname{ESN}(\alpha, \tau)$, is said to be extended-skewnormally distributed and denoted by $Y \sim \operatorname{ESN}(\mu, \sigma, \alpha, \tau)$. The random variable, $X$, defined by $X:=e^{Y}$ is then said to be log-extended-skew-normally distributed and we denote $X \sim \operatorname{LESN}(\mu, \sigma, \alpha, \tau)$.
Proposition 5 The moment generating function of a random variable $Y \sim \operatorname{ESN}(\mu, \sigma, \alpha, \tau)$ is given by

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[e^{Y t}\right]=\frac{\Phi(\tau+\gamma t)}{\Phi(\tau)} \exp \left[\mu t+\frac{1}{2} \sigma^{2} t^{2}\right], \quad \text { with } \gamma=\frac{\sigma \alpha}{\sqrt{1+\alpha^{2}}}
$$

and provides the moments of the corresponding random variable $X=e^{Y} \sim \operatorname{LESN}(\mu, \sigma, \alpha, \tau)$.

### 5.2. Log-extended-skew-normal approximation of the underlying portfolio

As suggested by Zhou and Wang in [20] we rewrite $\mathbb{S}(3)$ as $F \mathbb{S}_{F}$ cfr. (10) and approximate the sum $\mathbb{S}_{F}$ by some log-extended-skew-normal random variable, since the LESN distribution is not only close to the lognormal distribution, but also has the capability to capture the skew and kurtosis, besides the mean and variance.
Thus we approximate the sum $\mathbb{S}_{F}$ by assuming that it is log-extended-skew-normally distributed with parameters $\mu$, $\sigma, \alpha$ and $\tau$, and having the same four moments as the sum itself:

Theorem 6 A moment matching LESN approximation to the Asian basket option price $A B C(n, m, K, T)(2)$ written on the underlying $\mathbb{S}$ given by (3) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
F e^{-r T} M(1) \Psi\left(d_{1},-\alpha, \tau+\gamma\right)-K e^{-r T} \Psi\left(d_{2},-\alpha, \tau\right) \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{1}=\frac{\mu+\sigma^{2}-\ln \frac{K}{F}}{\sigma}, \quad d_{2}=d_{1}-\sigma \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $F$ defined in (19), (20) and (21), and where the parameters $\mu, \sigma, \gamma$ and $\tau$ are solutions to the following system of equations

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+4 \gamma)}{M(4)}-6 \ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+2 \gamma)}{M(2)}+8 \ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+\gamma)}{M(1)}-3 \ln \Phi(\tau)=0  \tag{30}\\
\ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+3 \gamma)}{M(3)}-3 \ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+2 \gamma)}{M(2)}+3 \ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+\gamma)}{M(1)}-\ln \Phi(\tau)=0 \\
\mu=\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+2 \gamma)}{M(2)}-2 \ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+\gamma)}{M(1)}+\frac{3}{2} \ln \Phi(\tau) \\
\sigma^{2}=-\ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+2 \gamma)}{M(2)}+2 \ln \frac{\Phi(\tau+\gamma)}{M(1)}-\ln \Phi(\tau)
\end{array}\right.
$$

with $M(i), t=i, \ldots, 4$ the first four moments of $\mathbb{S} / F$.
Proof Analogous to the proof given by Zhou and Wang [20].
For pricing Asian options and basket options, Zhou and Wang only considered the case that $F$ in (19) is determined by $\delta_{3}(\ell, j)=e^{r(T-j)}$ from (20).
In fact any choice of $F$ will provide the same result, since relation (28) for the approximate Asian basket option price is independent of $F$. Indeed the terms $\ln F$ disappear in the last relation of (30) providing $\sigma^{2}$. Also the terms $\ln F$ cancel out in the first two equations of (30) which determine the parameters $\tau$ and $\gamma$, and therefore also $\alpha=\frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\sigma^{2}-\gamma^{2}}}$. Only in the expression for $\mu$ remains a term $-\ln F$ which however cancels out with the $+\ln F$ from $-\ln \frac{K}{F}$ in $d_{1}$ (29). Hence $d_{1}$ and $d_{2}$ are also independent of the factor $F$. Finally noting that $F M(1)=\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S}]$ proves our claim.

### 5.3. Log-extended-skew-normal approximation after splitting and conditioning

We return to the case that we have split the option price in an exact part $I_{1}(4)$ and a part $I_{2}$ (22) that we approximate by a moment matching technique but now using a log-extended-skew-normal random variable with parameters $\mu, \sigma$, $\alpha$ and $\tau$ that will depend on the conditioning random variable and on $f_{s}, s=1,2,3$. We will not write this dependence explicitly in the notations of these parameters.
Theorem 7 A moment matching LESN approximation to the part $I_{2}$ (22)-(23) of the Asian basket option price ABC $(n, m, K, T)$ in (2) written on $\mathbb{S}$ given by (3) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{-r T} \int_{-\infty}^{d_{\Lambda}}\left[\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}-f_{s}(\Lambda) \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right] \Psi\left(d_{1}(\lambda),-\alpha, \gamma+\tau\right)-\left(K-f_{s}(\lambda)\right) \Psi\left(d_{2}(\lambda),-\alpha, \tau\right)\right] d F_{\Lambda}(\lambda), \quad s=1,2,3 \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
d_{1}(\lambda)=\frac{\mu+\sigma^{2}-\ln \frac{K-f_{s}(\lambda)}{F}}{\sigma}, \quad d_{2}(\lambda)=d_{1}(\lambda)-\sigma
$$

and $F$ defined in (19), (20) and (21). The parameters $\mu, \sigma, \gamma$ and $\tau$ are solutions to the system (30) of equations where the moments $M(i), i=1, \ldots, 4$, are the first four moments of $\left.\frac{1}{F}\left(\mathbb{S}-f_{s}(\Lambda)\right) \right\rvert\, \Lambda=\lambda$.
Proof Analogous to the proof of Theorem 6 but starting from (22).
In numerical experiments we set $\tau$ equal to zero to simplify and speed up the calculations of the parameters. The system (30) of equations reduces in that case to the last three equations. The three moments $M(i), i=1,2,3$, are

|  | initial <br> stock price | weight <br> (in \%) | volatility <br> (in $\%$ ) | dividend yield <br> (in \%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stock | 42.55 | 25 | 33.34 | 2.59 |
| BASF | 48.21 | 20 | 31.13 | 2.63 |
| Bayer | 34.30 | 30 | 33.27 | 3.32 |
| Degussa-Hüls | 100.00 | 10 | 35.12 | 0.69 |
| FMC | 66.19 | 15 | 36.36 | 1.24 |
| Schering |  |  |  |  |

Table 1
Stock characteristics

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M(1)=\frac{1}{F}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]-f_{s}(\lambda)\right) \\
& M(2)=\frac{1}{F^{2}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{2} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right]-2 f_{s}(\lambda) \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]+f_{s}^{2}(\lambda)\right) \\
& M(3)=\frac{1}{F^{3}}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{3} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right]-3 f_{s}(\lambda) \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{2} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right]+3 f_{s}^{2}(\lambda) \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]-f_{s}^{3}(\lambda)\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{S} \mid \Lambda=\lambda]$ and $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{2} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right]$ given by (8) and (25) and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\mathbb{S}^{3} \mid \Lambda=\lambda\right]= & \sum_{\ell, u, i=1}^{n} \sum_{j, p, h=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} a_{u} a_{i} b_{j} b_{p} b_{h} S_{\ell}(0) S_{u}(0) S_{i}(0) e^{\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\ell}^{2}\right)(T-j)+\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{u}^{2}\right)(T-p)+\left(r-\frac{1}{2} \sigma_{i}^{2}\right)(T-h)} \\
& \times e^{\frac{1}{2}\left(1-r_{\ell j, u p, i h}^{2}\right) \sigma_{\ell j, u p, i h}^{2}+r_{\ell j, u p, i h} \sigma_{\ell j, u p, i h} \frac{\lambda-\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Lambda]}{\sigma_{\Lambda}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\sigma_{\Lambda}^{2}$ is given by (26) and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\ell j, u p, i h}^{2}= & \sigma_{\ell}^{2}(T-j)+\sigma_{k}^{2}(T-p)+\sigma_{i}^{2}(T-h)+2 \sigma_{\ell} \sigma_{u} \rho_{\ell u} \min (T-j, T-p) \\
& +2 \sigma_{\ell} \sigma_{i} \rho_{\ell i} \min (T-j, T-h)+2 \sigma_{i} \sigma_{u} \rho_{i u} \min (T-h, T-p), \\
r_{\ell j, u p, i h} \sigma_{\ell j, u p, i h}= & r_{\ell, j} \sigma_{\ell} \sqrt{T-j}+r_{u, p} \sigma_{u} \sqrt{T-p}+r_{i, h} \sigma_{i} \sqrt{T-h},
\end{aligned}
$$

with the correlations $\rho_{\ell u}, \rho_{i u}, \rho_{\ell i}$ defined in (1) and $r_{\ell, j}, r_{u, p}, r_{i, h}$ defined in (27).
Further, we only consider the case that $s=3$ but for all conditioning random variables $\mathrm{FA} k(17), k=1, \ldots, 5$. When testing the two other cases for $s$ we end up with non-real values for $\alpha$.

Another possibility to deal with the cumbersome calculations in solving the system (30) of the four equations is to fix $\lambda$ in the parameters instead of putting $\tau=0$. Following the suggestion of [5] we make the moments constant by fixing $\lambda$ on $d_{\Lambda}$ which is equivalent to fixing the value of $\mathbb{G}_{F}$ on $K_{F}$. However in this way the quality of the approximation is much worse than the approach with putting $\tau=0$ and keeping the parameters dependent on $\lambda$.

## 6. Numerical results

In this section we consider a numerical example for an Asian basket option in the Black \& Scholes setting. In order to compare the approximations and upper bounds for the Asian basket option prices, we take a set of input data from [4] which are also used in [9]. The Asian basket option with monthly averaging is written on a fictitious chemistry-pharma basket that consists of the five German DAX stocks listed in Tables 1 and 2.

The annual risk-free interest rate $r$ is equal to $6 \%$ and we compute approximations for options with three different maturity dates (half a year, one year and five years). The exercise prices are chosen in such a way that Tables 3 and 4 show results for in-the-money, at-the-money and out-of-the money options. The moneyness of the option is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{K}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} a_{\ell} b_{j} S_{\ell}(0) e^{r(T-j)}}-1 . \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

The averaging period of all options is five months and starts five months before maturity.

|  | BASF | Bayer | Degussa-Hüls | FMC | Schering |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASF | 1.00 | 0.84 | -0.07 | 0.45 | 0.43 |
| Bayer | 0.84 | 1.00 | 0.08 | 0.62 | 0.57 |
| Degussa-Hüls | -0.07 | 0.08 | 1.00 | -0.54 | -0.59 |
| FMC | 0.45 | 0.62 | -0.54 | 1.00 | 0.86 |
| Schering | 0.43 | 0.57 | -0.59 | 0.86 | 1.00 |

Table 2
Correlation structure

In Table 3 we list moment matching approximated option prices composed as the sum of (6) and (24) for the three cases (23) and for all five conditioning random variables FA $k$ (17), where for FA5 we put $p=0.95$. For the log-extended-skew-normal approximations based on Theorem 6 we only report one result since (28) is independent of the choice of $F$. The LESN approximations composed as the sum of (6) and (31) are computed for the case $f_{3}(\lambda)(23)$ the other cases lead to complex values for $\alpha$ - but for all five conditioning random variables FA $k$. We reduced the computations by putting either $\tau=0$ or by fixing $\lambda$ in the moments.

From Table 3 we conclude that for short maturities the results are very similar for lognormal and for LESN approximations for the first three conditioning random variables. The results for FA4 are much worse while those for FA5 are slightly worse. It is also clear that the LESN approach with constant moments is not recommended for any maturity or moneyness. For long maturities the LESN approximations with $\tau=0$ and with conditioning random variables FA1, FA2 and FA3 outperform all other approximations.

The values for the upper bounds UBRS $\Lambda$ and PECUB $\Lambda$ in Table 4 are clearly better when using the integration bounds $d_{\mathrm{FA} k}$ (18) than when using the corresponding integration bounds with $F \ln K_{F}$ replaced by $K-F$, cfr. (13), of [9]. We also added the column of the lower bound LB $\Lambda$ (as explained in [9]) to show that the lower bound is a very precise bound, but that the approximations of Table 3 are much closer to the Monte Carlo simulations than the bounds.

In Fig. 1 - Fig. 3 we plot the pricing error of an approximation with respect to the moneyness (32) for different maturities $T$, by choosing in each figure the conditioning variable which leads to the best results. The pricing error expressed in basis points (bp) is defined as

$$
\frac{\text { approximation }- \text { MC value }}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} a_{\ell} S_{\ell}(0)} 10000
$$

where the denominator equals here 50.498 according to the data in Table 1. The log-extended-skew-normal approximations for $f_{3}$ are only given for $\tau=0$ since fixing $\lambda=d_{\Lambda}$ in the moments does not lead to good results.

From the Fig. 1 - Fig. 3, we see that the approximations sometimes overestimate and sometimes underestimate the price. The log-extended-skew-normal approximations are less fluctuating, certainly for long-term maturities. However, notice that the pricing-error scale is different in the different figures. The log-extended-skew-normal approximations based on $f_{3}$ clearly outperform the other approximations.

## 7. Conclusions

We derived moment matching pricing approximation methods for the price of European-style discrete arithmetic Asian basket call options by decomposing the option price into an exact and an approximating part. We generalized the results of [5], [8] and [20] in several ways: by considering a quite large class of normally distributed conditioning variables, by looking at better integration bounds, by moment matching several conditioned random variables not only by using the lognormal law, but also the log-extended-skew-normal law. These techniques can be applied to evaluating other instruments based on a sum of dependent random variables.

Based on our numerical tests, we recommend the reader to use the log-extended-skew-normal approximations based on $f_{3}$, especially for long-term maturities.

| T | K <br> (moneyness) | MC \& SE <br> To compare | lognormal |  |  | LESN |  |  | FA $k$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathbb{S}-f_{s}(\Lambda) \mid \Lambda=\lambda$ |  |  | S | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \mathbb{S}-f_{3}(\Lambda) \\ & \tau=0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} \Lambda & =\lambda \\ \lambda & =d_{\Lambda} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | $s=1$ | $s=2$ | $s=3$ |  |  |  | $k$ |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (-0.2181) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MC:10.8462 } \\ \text { SE:0.0007 } \end{gathered}$ | 10.8464 | 10.8463 | 10.8462 | 10.8466 | 10.8462 | 10.8457 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 10.8464 | 10.8463 | 10.8462 |  | 10.8462 | 10.8458 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 10.8462 | 10.8460 | 10.8466 |  | 10.8462 | 10.8457 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 10.8478 | 10.8478 | 10.8460 |  | 10.8463 | 10.8496 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 10.8467 | 10.8467 | 10.8461 |  | 10.8462 | 10.8440 | 5 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (-0.0227) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MC:2.7865 } \\ \text { SE:0.0005 } \end{gathered}$ | 2.7861 | 2.7863 | 2.7864 | 2.7854 | 2.7864 | 2.7864 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 2.7862 | 2.7862 | 2.7864 |  | 2.7864 | 2.7865 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 2.7861 | 2.7862 | 2.7864 |  | 2.7864 | 2.7864 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 2.7923 | 2.7922 | 2.7811 |  | 2.7863 | 2.8823 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 2.7856 | 2.7857 | 2.7865 |  | 2.7864 | 2.7831 | 5 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (0.1728) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MC:0.2342 } \\ \text { SE:0.0001 } \end{gathered}$ | 0.2338 | 0.2341 | 0.2341 | 0.2347 | 0.2341 | 0.2360 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 0.2338 | 0.2341 | 0.2341 |  | 0.2341 | 0.2361 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 0.2338 | 0.2341 | 0.2344 |  | 0.2341 | 0.2359 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 0.2269 | 0.2270 | 0.2375 |  | 0.2340 | 0.3211 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 0.2339 | 0.2339 | 0.2341 |  | 0.2341 | 0.2342 | 5 |
| 1 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (-0.2332) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { MC:11.7167 } \\ \text { SE:0.0008 } \end{gathered}$ | 11.7177 | 11.7171 | 11.7158 | 11.7177 | 11.7166 | 11.7123 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 11.7177 | 11.7172 | 11.7158 |  | 11.7166 | 11.7125 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 11.7178 | 11.7174 | 11.7147 |  | 11.7166 | 11.7122 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 11.7307 | 11.7306 | 11.7132 |  | 11.7174 | 11.7433 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 11.7214 | 11.7216 | 11.7151 |  | 11.7167 | 11.6983 | 5 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (-0.0415) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MC:4.7362 } \\ \text { SE:0.0006 } \end{gathered}$ | 4.7345 | 4.7348 | 4.7364 | 4.7341 | 4.7365 | 4.7371 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 4.7347 | 4.7346 | 4.7363 |  | 4.7365 | 4.7375 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 4.7344 | 4.7344 | 4.7366 |  | 4.7365 | 4.7368 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 4.7529 | 4.7528 | 4.7193 |  | 4.7364 | 4.8874 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 4.7318 | 4.7334 | 4.7366 |  | 4.7363 | 4.7229 | 5 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (0.1502) \end{gathered}$ | MC:1.4118 <br> SE:0.0003 | 1.4099 | 1.4126 | 1.4113 | 1.4113 | 1.4113 | 1.4214 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 1.4099 | 1.4125 | 1.4113 |  | 1.4113 | 1.4222 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 1.4099 | 1.4121 | 1.4126 |  | 1.4113 | 1.4210 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 1.3978 | 1.3982 | 1.4035 |  | 1.4102 | 1.6530 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 1.4078 | 1.4080 | 1.4121 |  | 1.4113 | 1.4093 | 5 |
| 5 | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (-0.3346) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { MC:17.3142 } \\ \text { SE:0.0010 } \end{gathered}$ | 17.3192 | 17.3191 | 17.2935 | 17.3208 | 17.3166 | 17.2876 | 1 |
|  |  |  | $17.3949$ | 17.3304 | 17.2946 |  | 17.3162 | 17.3104 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 17.4026 | 17.3602 | 17.2787 |  | 17.3170 | 17.2735 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 17.4937 | 17.4896 | 17.2782 |  | 17.3249 | 17.7599 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 17.4562 | 17.3018 | 17.2934 |  | 17.3190 | 17.0853 | 5 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (-0.1807) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MC:12.6063 } \\ \text { SE:0.0009 } \end{gathered}$ | 12.6250 | 12.5672 | 12.5846 | 12.6065 | 12.6035 | 12.6700 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 12.6287 | 12.5676 | 12.5843 |  | 12.6041 | 12.7088 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 12.6232 | 12.5785 | 12.5890 |  | 12.6033 | 12.6490 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 12.5347 | 12.8179 | 12.8205 |  | 12.6161 | 13.5507 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 12.6449 | 12.6046 | 12.5848 |  | 12.6039 | 12.4303 | 5 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (-0.0168) \end{gathered}$ | MC:9.1438 <br> SE:0.0008 | 9.1228 | 9.1117 | 9.1284 | 9.1420 | 9.1431 | 9.3520 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 9.1325 | 9.0989 | 9.1269 |  | 9.1440 | 9.4135 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 9.1168 | 9.0851 | 9.1513 |  | 9.1426 | 9.3230 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 9.0517 | 9.3349 | 9.3351 |  | 9.1520 | 10.6943 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 9.1310 | 9.1656 | 9.0927 |  | 9.1407 | 9.0478 | 5 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ (0.1470) \end{gathered}$ | MC:6.6678 <br> SE:0.0008 | 6.6347 | 6.6567 | 6.6549 | 6.6617 | 6.6656 | 7.0425 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 6.6447 | 6.6404 | 6.6530 |  | 6.6662 | 7.1321 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 6.6282 | 6.6121 | 6.6913 |  | 6.6652 | 7.0048 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 6.7980 | 6.7999 | 6.5679 |  | 6.6684 | 8.8520 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 6.5807 | 6.6867 | 6.6596 |  | 6.6625 | 6.6399 | 5 |

Table 3
Comparing Approximations for Asian basket call option prices

|  | $K$(moneyness) | MC \& SE <br> To compare | LB $\Lambda$ | UBRS $\Lambda$ with $d_{\Lambda}$ |  | PECUB $\Lambda$ with $d_{\Lambda}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{FA} k \\ k \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $T$ |  |  |  | (18) | [9] | (18) | [9] |  |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | 40 | MC:10.8462 | 10.8448 | 10.8517 | 10.8556 | 10.8821 | 10.9042 | 1 |
|  | (-0.2181) | SE:0.0007 | 10.8448 | 10.8516 | 10.8558 | 10.8820 | 10.9054 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 10.8448 | 10.8518 | 10.8566 | 10.8824 | 10.9087 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 10.8433 | 10.8578 | 11.1429 | 10.8974 | 11.1100 | 5 |
|  | 50 | MC:2.7865 | 2.7801 | 2.8939 | 2.8939 | 3.4911 | 3.4912 | 1 |
|  | (-0.0227) | SE:0.0005 | 2.7801 | 2.8932 | 2.8932 | 3.4915 | 3.4919 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 2.7800 | 2.8947 | 2.8949 | 3.4911 | 3.4934 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 2.7737 | 2.9488 | 3.0736 | 3.5180 | 4.0501 | 5 |
|  | 60 | MC:0.2342 | 0.2299 | 0.4556 | 0.4617 | 0.8908 | 0.9288 | 1 |
|  | (0.1728) | SE:0.0001 | 0.2299 | 0.4557 | 0.4613 | 0.8915 | 0.9272 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 0.2300 | 0.4555 | 0.4599 | 0.8897 | 0.9212 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 0.2320 | 0.5163 | 0.5319 | 0.8533 | 0.9626 | 5 |
| 1 | 40 | MC:11.7167 | 11.6984 | 11.7857 | 11.8013 | 11.9971 | 12.0623 | 1 |
|  | (-0.2332) | SE:0.0008 | 11.6989 | 11.7846 | 11.8025 | 11.9964 | 12.0710 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 11.6980 | 11.7864 | 11.8103 | 11.9973 | 12.0927 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 11.6783 | 11.8340 | 12.3240 | 12.0563 | 12.5306 | 5 |
|  | 50 | MC:4.7362 | 4.7094 | 5.0154 | 5.0155 | 5.7643 | 5.7644 | 1 |
|  | (-0.0415) | SE:0.0006 | 4.7095 | 5.0127 | 5.0127 | 5.7661 | 5.7664 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 4.7093 | 5.0175 | 5.0186 | 5.7636 | 5.7700 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 4.6873 | 5.1353 | 5.4376 | 5.7811 | 6.4161 | 5 |
|  |  |  | 1.3882 | 1.8935 | 1.9106 | 2.6327 | 2.7179 | 1 |
|  | (0.1502) | SE:0.0003 | $1.3875$ | 1.8927 | 1.9080 | 2.6366 | 2.7092 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 1.3887 | 1.8945 | 1.9038 | 2.6311 | 2.6800 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 1.3911 | 2.0334 | 2.1417 | 2.5516 | 2.9013 | 5 |
| 5 | 40 | MC:17.3142 | 16.9863 | 18.1377 | 18.1608 | 18.5559 | 18.5893 | 1 |
|  | (-0.3346) | SE:0.0010 | 17.0031 | 18.1194 | 18.1698 | 18.5676 | 18.6527 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 16.9727 | 18.1508 | 18.3305 | 18.5464 | 18.7903 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 16.7462 | 18.4094 | 18.4818 | 18.5481 | 18.6231 | 5 |
|  | 50 | MC:12.6063 | 12.2353 | 13.9176 | 13.9249 | 14.5404 | 14.5541 | 1 |
|  | (-0.1807) | SE:0.0009 | 12.2421 | 13.9031 | 13.9032 | 14.5676 | 14.5678 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 12.2283 | 13.9336 | 13.9787 | 14.5276 | 14.6051 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 12.0441 | 14.2167 | 14.4801 | 14.4048 | 14.7463 | 5 |
|  |  | $\text { MC:9. } 1438$ | 8.7834 | 10.9200 | 11.0153 | 11.5385 | 11.6879 | 1 |
|  | $(-0.0168)$ | SE:0.0008 | 8.7775 | 10.9175 | 10.9485 | 11.5779 | 11.6439 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 8.7854 | $10.9327$ | $10.9330$ | $11.5237$ | $11.5243$ | 3 |
|  |  |  | 8.6873 | 11.2343 | 11.6669 | 11.2745 | 11.8449 | 5 |
|  | 70 | MC:6.6678 | 6.3285 | 8.8451 | 9.0801 | 9.2663 | 9.5618 | 1 |
|  | (0.1470) | SE:0.0008 | 6.3127 | 8.8601 | 9.0051 | 9.3117 | 9.5048 | 2 |
|  |  |  | 6.3376 | 8.8493 | 8.8720 | 9.2508 | 9.2873 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 6.3166 | 9.1348 | 9.6583 | 8.9129 | 9.5241 | 5 |

Table 4
Comparing lower and upper bounds for Asian basket call option prices
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