ACHIEVING DECORRELATION AND SPEED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN THE LIBOR MARKET MODEL

MARK S. JOSHI

Abstract. An algorithm for computing the drift in the LIBOR market model with additional idiosynchratic terms is introduced. This algorithm achieves a computational complexity of order equal to the number of common factors times the number of rates. It is demonstrated that this allows better matching of correlation matrices in reduced-factor models.

1. Introduction

The LIBOR market model is a popular model for pricing exotic interest rate derivatives as it allows easy calibration to market observable prices of vanilla derivatives including caplets and swaptions. There is, however, a perception in some parts of the market that it is too slow, and for this reason it is often not used or used with a small number of driving factors. This then forces rates to be highly correlated with each other. In this note, we see how to achieve an arbitrary amount of decorrelation between rates whilst retaining the speed given by using a low-factor model.

We recall the basics of the LIBOR market model. For more detail see any of [1], [2], [3] or [5]. The basis of the model is that forward interest rates are taken to be the state variables, and are assumed to be log-normal, (or some similar process in extensions.) We fix notation. We are evolving a set of forward rates associated to a set of times $0 < t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_n$. We let $f_j(s)$ denote the forward rate from time $t_j$ to time $t_{j+1}$, as observed at time $s$. We set $\tau_k = t_{k+1} - t_k$. We denote the zero-coupon bond maturing at $t_j$ by $P_j(s)$. The volatility of the rate $f_j$ is denoted by $\sigma_j(s)$.

Martingale pricing is based on picking a measure in which discounted asset price processes are martingales. Discounting is done by picking a fixed zero-coupon bond, $P_N$, as numeraire. We therefore have that for any asset $O$, that $O/P_N$ is a martingale and therefore has zero drift. However, forward rates are not assets, nor necessarily the ratio
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of an asset to the numeraire. This means that their drifts can be, and generally are, non-zero.

The drifts are not just non-zero but state-dependent, and are given by quite complicated expressions. As these computations are state-dependent, these must be done at every step of a Monte Carlo simulation, and they can easily become a computational bottleneck.

The model supposes that in the pricing measure

\[
\frac{df_j}{f_j} = \mu_j dt + \sigma_j(s) dt,
\]

where \(\mu_j\) is possibly a function of time and the rates. These rates are then evolved across a number, typically \(n\), of time steps.

If we take the martingale measure associated to the numeraire \(P_n\), then we have the following drifts expressions,

\[
\mu_j = -\sum_{k>j} \tilde{C}_{jk} \frac{f_k \tau_k}{1 + f_k \tau_k},
\]

where \(\tilde{C}\) is the instantaneous covariance between rate \(j\) and rate \(k\).

In what follows for simplicity we assume that \(N = n\). However, our approach is not restricted to that case. When evolving the rates from time \(s\) to time \(t\), we perform a deterministic integral across the time step to obtain the covariance matrix, \(C\), of the logs of the rates, and set

\[
C_{jk}(s, t) = \int_s^t \tilde{C}_{jk}(r) dr.
\]

This yields an approximation to the total drift across the step

\[
\mu_j = -\sum_{k>j} C_{jk} \frac{f_k \tau_k}{1 + f_k \tau_k}.
\]

Note that if \(j = n - 1\), the sum is empty, and we take the value to be zero. In practical terms, it is only the quantities \(C_{jk}\) that affect the dynamics of the implemented model.

It was shown in [4] that if the covariance matrix is of rank \(F\), all the terms \(\mu_j\) for a single step could be computed with order \(nF\) computations. The other main computation for each step is the effect of Brownian increments. If we write

\[
C = AA^t
\]
with $A$ an $n \times F$ matrix, then we need to compute

$$\log f_j(t) = \log f_j(s) + \mu_j - 0.5 C_{jj} + \sum_{k=1}^{F} a_{jk} Z_k,$$

(1.5)

which will require order $F$ computations for each $j$ and is therefore order $nF$. Various additional book-keeping computations will need to be performed but these vary linearly with the number of rates and will not be affected by the number of factors. This means that the computational order of a single step in the LIBOR market model is $nF$. (This is, of course, an upper bound but it seems unlikely that one could do better without making additional assumptions.)

We will often want to do $n$ steps and our computational complexity will therefore be $n^2F$. For the LIBOR market, it is normal for a one-factor model to mean that the covariance matrix is of rank 1, and so has a pseudo-square root of size $n \times 1$, whereas in the credit literature, see, e.g., [6], it is taken to mean that there is one common factor. It is our purpose here to demonstrate that a model with $F$ common factors can be implemented to run almost as quickly as a model with $F$ total factors. In particular, we show that the computational order is still $nF$ per step. The key observation is that drift arises from covariance between rates and so adding in idiosyncratic factors will not affect the drifts.

We discuss the model’s set-up in Section 2. We examine the drift computation in Section 3. We look at how better approximations to correlation matrices can be obtained in Section 4. We conclude in Section 5.

2. The model set-up

We use the LIBOR market model as described in the introduction but assume that each rate is driven by its exposure to $F$ common factors and one idiosyncratic factor. There are a number of ways to express this. The usual way to do so is to write

$$\frac{df_j}{f_j} = \mu_j(f,t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^{F} \sigma_{jk}(t) dW_t^{(k)} + \sigma_j(t) dZ_t^{(j)},$$

(2.1)

with the Brownian motions $W_t^{(k)}$ and $Z_t^{(j)}$ all independent. The term $\sigma_j$ expresses exposure to the idiosyncratic factor and the $\sigma_{jk}$ to the common factors.

When evolving in a computer, we will do discrete time-steps and it will therefore generally be more useful to adapt equation (1.5). Our
discretized equation is

$$\log f_j(t) = \log f_j(s) + \mu_j - 0.5C_{jj} + \sum_{k=1}^{F} a_{jk}W_k + a_jZ_j,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

with $W_k$ and $Z_j$ all independent standard $N(0,1)$ random variables.

Given the drifts $\mu_j$, the increment will clearly still take order $F$ computations per rate, since we have only added on a single extra term.

Thus if we can compute the drifts with order $nF$ computations, our entire step will take order $nF$ computations.

3. Computing the drift

We define an $n \times (n + F)$ matrix, $A$, by

$$A_{jk} = \begin{cases} a_j & \text{for } j = k, \\ 0 & \text{for } j \neq k, k \leq n, \\ a_{j,k-n} & \text{for } k > n, \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

with $a_j$ and $a_{jk}$ as in (1.5). We have that $A$ is a pseudo-square root of the covariance matrix. The drift $\mu_j$ is therefore given by

$$\mu_j = -\sum_{k>j}^{n+F} \sum_{r=1}^{n+1} A_{jr}A_{kr}g_k,$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

where

$$g_k = \frac{f_k\tau_k}{1 + f_k\tau_k}.$$  

Since $A_{ij}$ is zero for $i \neq j$ and $j \leq n$, we have

$$\mu_j = -\sum_{k>j}^{n+F} \sum_{r=n+1}^{r+1} A_{jr}A_{kr}g_k.$$  

Changing the order of summation,

$$\mu_j = -\sum_{r=n+1}^{n+F} A_{jr} \sum_{k>j} A_{kr}g_k.$$  

Let

$$e_{j,r} = \sum_{k>j} A_{kr}g_k.$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

We then have the relations

$$e_{j,r} = e_{j+1,r} + A_{j+1,r}g_{j+1},$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.4)
and

$$\mu_j = -\sum_{r=n+1}^{n+F} A_{jr} e_{j,r}.$$  (3.5)

The number of additional operations for each $j$ is therefore of order $F$. We conclude that the total number of operations is of order $nF$.

4. Correlation Matrices

We have seen that we can add an idiosyncratic factor to each rate in the LIBOR market at a small additional cost. What sort of correlation matrices are now possible with small factors? In a one-common-factor model, the simplest example is to take every rate to have exposure to the common factor of magnitude $\sqrt{\rho}$, and obtain a correlation matrix which is constant off the diagonal with correlation $\rho$. For $\rho < 1$, this matrix will be of rank $n$ and therefore be of order $n^2$ to compute if traditional methods are used.

We could also take a one-factor model where the exposure to the common factor varies with the index. Rate $i$ would have exposure $a_i$, and the correlation between rates $i$ and $j$ will be $a_ia_j$ if $i \neq j$. This could allow us to have rates with greater time to maturity to be more highly correlated than those close to expiry.

More generally, given a correlation matrix we can perform factor reduction on it and then add use the idiosynchratic terms to reduce the correlations to make the new correlation matrix closer to the original one. We do a worked example. Suppose rate $j$ runs from time $2j$ to $2(j+1)$, with $j = 1, \ldots, 7$, and the correlation between rates $i$ and $j$ is

$$(1 - L)e^{-|t_i - t_j|} + L$$

where $L = 0.5$ and $\beta = 0.1$. (We are taking forward rates with larger than usual tenor to stop the example becoming unwieldy.) The correlation matrix is then as in Table 1. We work with a two-factor model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.0000</th>
<th>0.9094</th>
<th>0.8352</th>
<th>0.7744</th>
<th>0.7247</th>
<th>0.6839</th>
<th>0.6506</th>
<th>0.6233</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.6839</td>
<td>0.6506</td>
<td>0.6233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.6839</td>
<td>0.6506</td>
<td>0.6233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.6839</td>
<td>0.6233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.6839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6839</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6506</td>
<td>0.6839</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6233</td>
<td>0.6506</td>
<td>0.6839</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
<td>0.7744</td>
<td>0.8352</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The correlation matrix before truncation.
Table 2. The correlation matrix after two-factor truncation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.0000</th>
<th>0.9993</th>
<th>0.9887</th>
<th>0.9471</th>
<th>0.8632</th>
<th>0.7611</th>
<th>0.6826</th>
<th>0.6554</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.9993</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9935</td>
<td>0.9582</td>
<td>0.8810</td>
<td>0.7843</td>
<td>0.7088</td>
<td>0.6826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9887</td>
<td>0.9935</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9845</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>0.8496</td>
<td>0.7843</td>
<td>0.7611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9471</td>
<td>0.9582</td>
<td>0.9845</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9796</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>0.8810</td>
<td>0.8632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8632</td>
<td>0.8810</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>0.9796</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9845</td>
<td>0.9582</td>
<td>0.9471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7611</td>
<td>0.7843</td>
<td>0.8496</td>
<td>0.9290</td>
<td>0.9845</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9935</td>
<td>0.9887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6826</td>
<td>0.7088</td>
<td>0.7843</td>
<td>0.8810</td>
<td>0.9582</td>
<td>0.9935</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.9993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6554</td>
<td>0.6826</td>
<td>0.7611</td>
<td>0.8632</td>
<td>0.9471</td>
<td>0.9887</td>
<td>0.9993</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The correlation matrix after two-factor truncation with idiosyncratic factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.0000</th>
<th>0.8920</th>
<th>0.8816</th>
<th>0.8427</th>
<th>0.7680</th>
<th>0.6786</th>
<th>0.6093</th>
<th>0.5831</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.8920</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8888</td>
<td>0.8554</td>
<td>0.7865</td>
<td>0.7016</td>
<td>0.6348</td>
<td>0.6093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8816</td>
<td>0.8888</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8779</td>
<td>0.8285</td>
<td>0.7592</td>
<td>0.7016</td>
<td>0.6786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8427</td>
<td>0.8554</td>
<td>0.8779</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8717</td>
<td>0.8285</td>
<td>0.7865</td>
<td>0.7680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7680</td>
<td>0.7865</td>
<td>0.8285</td>
<td>0.8717</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8779</td>
<td>0.8554</td>
<td>0.8427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6786</td>
<td>0.7016</td>
<td>0.7592</td>
<td>0.8285</td>
<td>0.8779</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8888</td>
<td>0.8816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6093</td>
<td>0.6348</td>
<td>0.7016</td>
<td>0.7865</td>
<td>0.8554</td>
<td>0.8888</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.8920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5831</td>
<td>0.6093</td>
<td>0.6786</td>
<td>0.7680</td>
<td>0.8427</td>
<td>0.8816</td>
<td>0.8920</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and obtain a correlation matrix by taking the two largest eigenvalues. We then obtain the correlation matrix in Table 2. Not surprisingly, the correlation numbers have increased and the maximum difference is 0.1723. The sum of squares error is 0.5815.

We can reduce the difference by introducing idiosyncratic factors. A quick numerical search shows that a weight of 0.1098 for all rates minimizes the sum of squares error. The new correlation matrix is shown in Table 3. Our errors now range from −0.0683 to 0.0492, and the sum of squares error is 0.0645. We have achieved a correlation matrix much closer to the original with little extra computational cost.

5. Conclusion

We have shown that by introducing idiosyncratic rates in the LIBOR market model, greater decorrelation can be achieved between rates without sacrificing speed. In particular, we have achieved an algorithm of order \( nF \) where \( n \) is number of rates and \( F \) is the number of common factors.
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