Numerical Methods for Mathematical Models on Warrant Pricing

Author: Mukhethwa Londani
University of the Western Cape, Department of mathematics
Private Bag X17
Bellville, South Africa
Email: 2720105@uwc.ac.za

ABSTRACT

Warrant pricing has become very crucial in the present market scenario. For example, Hanke and Potzelberger (2002), indicate that warrants issuance affects the stock price process of the issuing company. This change in the stock price process leads to subsequent changes in the prices of options written on the issuing company's stocks. Zhang, Xiao and He (2009) constructed equity warrants pricing model under Fractional Brownian motion and deduce the European options pricing formula with a simple method. The warrant pricing can be affected by the supply and demand for its underlying asset such as stock price, volatility of the stock price, remaining time to expiry, interest rate and the expected dividend payments on stock. Noreen and Wolfson (1981) used stock prices in companies with warrants to approximate the standard deviation of the return rate, since the volatility of the warrant pricing is higher than the assets of the company; the volatility of the equity in such company is lower than that of its assets. Different statistical and mathematical models have been developed in this paper, to take the price effects and probabilities into consideration to decide the fair value of warrants. Mathematical models are also applied on warrant pricing by using the Black-Scholes framework. The relationship between the price of the warrants and the price of the call accounts for the dilution effect is also studied mathematically in this paper. Finally some numerical simulations are used to derive the value of warrants.

Keywords: Warrant Pricing, fractional Brownian motion, Black-Scholes model, Option-pricing model, Dilution effects, Volatility, Mathematical analysis, Numerical simulations.

0.1 introduction

Warrant is a kind of stock option which gives the holder the right but not the obligation to buy (if it is a call warrant) or to sell (if it is a put warrant) the stock or underlying asset by a certain date (for a European style warrant) or up until the expiry date (for an American style warrant) at a specified price (or strike price).

Warrants are classified as special options and can be divided into covered warrants and equity warrants according to the way they are issued. Covered warrants operate like options, only with a longer time frame and they are of American type. Covered warrants are typically issued by the traders and financial sectors and are for those who do not raise the company's stock after the day of expiration. Equity warrants are different from covered warrants because only the listed companies are recommended to issue them and the underlying assets are the issued stock of their company.

Black and Scholes (1973) state that their model can be used in many cases as an approximation to estimate the warrant pricing value and they used warrant pricing commonly as it was an extension of their call option model.

There are many complications in warrant pricing model. Black and Scholes (1973) mentioned that not only warrant pricing models have complications but also there are limitations inherent in the option pricing models. They investigated the error occurring when warrants are mistakenly priced as standard options ignoring the dilution effects. Therefore, it was very crucial to modify Black-Scholes call option model, because warrants are not written by other traders, they are provided by the company. Merton (1973) showed and proved that the Black-Scholes model can be modified to incorporate stochastic interest rates.

The volatility of warrant is described by the warrant pricing models, but under the framework of the existing pricing warrants analysis, the model based on stochastic volatility does not have an analytical solution. To this end, numerical methods such as Monte Carlo simulation or those based on fractional Brownian motion can be used to calculate the warrant pricing.

0.2 History of warrants

The long history of warrant pricing began very early. Warrant pricing was not usually the financial theory property. Lot of researchers were focusing on the option pricing because warrant pricing was complicated than option pricing.

Sidney (1949) released a warrant survey book which was regarded as the first book to reveal the common stock warrants which turn in the most spectacular performance of any group of securities and this common stock warrants are very huge.

McKean (1965) showed the warrant valuation which consider the non-negative value to the warrants holder who has the right to exercise a warrants at any time (being an American warrant) before its maturity.

Chen (1970) gave the equation of warrants expected value on its exercising date and derived an equation to value warrants by making use of dynamic programming technique. His work aligned with Sidney's work by comparing the perpetual warrants (warrants with indefinite length of life) with common stocks. Chen affirmed that the perpetual warrants cannot be worth more than the common stocks because the company which owns the perpetual warrants are exercisable at zero exercise price which is the same as owning common stocks.

The most popular method for valuing options are based on the Black and Scholes (1973) and Merton (1973) models. Their models for pricing options have been taken into consideration to many different commodities and payoff structures and they have become the most popular method for valuing options and warrants.

Black and Scholes derived their formulas and assumed that the option price is the function of the stock price. It is noted that the changes in the option price are completely correlated with the changes in the stock price. Black and

Scholes (1973) showed how their formulas can be modified to value European warrants. Merton's model is the same as Black-Sholes model despite that the maturity for default free bond which matures at the same time as the options' expiration date is used for the interest rate.

Galai and Schneller (1978) derived the value of the warrants and the value of the company that issues warrants by discussing the equality between the value of the warrants and the value of the call options on a share of the company which warrants hold for any other financial or investment decisions of the company. Several studies on warrants have ignored the dilution effects and equated the warrants to the call options. Researchers measured warrant's life comparing with option's life and found that warrants have a long life. Kremer and Roenfeldt (1993) used jump-diffusion more often to price warrants. There is a high possibility that the stock price might jump during the life of warrants. These diffusions of the stock returns are more relevant for warrant pricing than for option pricing.

Schulz and Trautmann (1994) compared the warrants value resulting from their valuation model with the value obtained by using the Black-Scholes formula and affirm that when warrants are exercised there is dilution of equity and dividend.

Hanke and Potzelberger (2002) investigated the effects of warrants issuance on the prices of traded options bought and sold by third parties which are already outstanding at the time of warrants issuance. Zhang et al. (2009) used the data of Changdian warrants collected from 25 May 2006 to 29 January 2007 (the expiration date) and considered the probability distribution. They found that the yield series distribution of Changdian warrants are greater than zero, which implies that the yield series distribution of Changdian warrants are not normally distributed. They developed the fractional Browian motion considering the mathematical models of strong correlated stochastic processes.

0.3 Warrant pricing vs. Option pricing

Warrant pricing and option pricing carry the right to buy the shares of an underlying asset at a certain price and can be exercised anytime during their life (if they are of American style) or on expiration date (if they are of European style). While the call options are issued by an individual, the warrants are issued by a company. Warrants proceeds increase the company's equity and when it is time to exercise them, new shares are always issued and the payment of cash increases the assets of the issuing company because of the dilution of equity and dividend. When options are exercised, the shares can come from another investor or public exchange.

In warrant pricing, many researchers ignored the dilution effects and valued warrants as the call options on common stocks of the company. The valuation of warrants and call options involves making assumptions about the capital structure of the company and future dividend policy.

The call options can uniquely be priced and the price can be independent in the amount of written call options, given the fact that all call options can be exercised simultaneously, each call option is a separate stake. Nevertheless, when warrants are exceptional, they can be exercised and new shares can be formed and the changes in the capital structure of the company and dividend policy can occur. Warrant and option pricing are based on the underlying asset such as stocks and bonds. Researchers have used the following formulas for pricing options and warrants and to study the dilution effects.

0.3.1 Formula for pricing options

The Black and Scholes (1973) option pricing model specifies the following price for a call and put option on a nondividend-paying stock

$$C = SN(d_1) - Xe^{-r(T-t)}N(d_2), \tag{1}$$

$$P = Ke^{-r(T-t)}N(-d_2) - SN(-d_1), \tag{2}$$

where

$$d_1 = \frac{\ln(S/X) + (r + \sigma^2/2)(T-t)}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}},$$

$$d_2 = d_1 - \sigma\sqrt{T-t},$$

C is the value of the call option, P is the value of the put option, S is the price of the underlying stock, X is the exercise price of the call and put option, r is the annualized risk-free interest rate, $T-t$ is the time until expiration, σ is the annualized standard deviation of the logarithmic stock return, and $N(\cdot)$ is the probability from the cumulative standard normal distribution.

0.3.2 Formula for pricing warrants

Galai and Schneller (1978) presented the first solution for the warrant pricing problem in which they incorporated the dilution effect by deriving the following equation:

$$W = \frac{N}{N+n} C_w, \tag{3}$$

where

W is the value of the warrant, N is the number of shares outstanding, n is the number of new shares to be issued if warrants are exercised, C_w is the value of a call option written on the stock of a firm without warrants.
The equation (3) is based on the assumption that the company with capital structure consists only equity warrants and it is defined as

$$V = NS + nW, \tag{4}$$

where

V is the value of the company's equity and S is the stock price.
It is assumed in Equation (4) that not only the value of the company's stock follows the diffusion process, but also the value of the company's equity (V).

Schulz and Trautmann (1994) have compared the outcomes of the original Black-Sholes model with the outcomes of the correct warrant valuation model and they concluded that although the high dilution effects are assumed, the Black-Sholes models produce small biases. Crouhy and Galai (1991) note that warrant prices are always calculated by multiplying the outcome from the option pricing model (such as the Black-Scholes model) by the dilution effects $\left(\frac{N}{N+n}\right)$.

If the standard deviation of the return in the company's equity is constant, it leads to the following equation:

$$C_w = \widehat{N}[\widehat{S}N(d_1) - Xe^{r(T-t)}N(d_2)], \tag{5}$$

where
$d_1 = \frac{\left[\ln\left(\frac{\widehat{S}}{X}\right)+(T-t)(r+\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\right]}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}}$,

$d_2 = d_1 - \sigma\sqrt{T-t}$,

$\widehat{N} = \frac{N}{\left[\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)+M\right]}$,

$\widehat{S} = S + (\frac{M}{N})W - PV_D$,

W is the value warrant price, N is the number of outstanding shares, k is the number of shares that can be purchased with each warrant, M is the number of outstanding warrants, S is the stock price, PV_D is the present value of dividends expected over the life of the warrant, X is the warrant exercise price, r is the risk-free interest rate, σ is the firm-value process volatility, T is the time to expiration on the option, and $N(d)$ is the probability that a standard normal variable will take on a value less than equal to d.

0.4 Mathematics models on warrant pricing

Zhang et al. (2009) priced equity warrants using fractional Brownian motion. They denoted company's equity by V_T at time T, saying that the company will receive a cash inflow from the payment of the exercise price of MlX. If warrant holders exercise the warrants, the value of the company's equity will increase to $V_T + MlX$. This value is distributed among $N + Ml$ shares so that the price of share after exercise becomes

$$\frac{V_T + MlX}{N + Ml},$$

where
N is the number of shares of outstanding stocks, M is the number of warrants issued, l is the number of shares of stock that can be bought with each warrant, and X is the strike price of option.

The warrants can be exercised only if the payoff is greater than minimum guarantee provision, i.e.,

$$l\left(\frac{V_T + MlX}{N + Ml} - X\right) > B, \tag{6}$$

where B is the minimum guarantee provision. This shows that the warrants value at expiration time satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} W_T &= l \max\left[\frac{V_T + MlX}{N + Ml} - \left(X + \frac{B}{l}\right), 0\right] + B, \\ &= \frac{Nl}{N + Ml} \max\left[\frac{V_T}{N} - X - \frac{N + Ml}{Nl} B, 0\right] + B. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\alpha = \frac{M}{N}$ and $\hat{X} = X + \frac{N+Ml}{Nl} B$, above implies

$$W_T = \frac{l}{1 + \alpha l} \max\left(\frac{V_T}{N} - \hat{X}, 0\right) + B. \tag{7}$$

Since V_T denotes the company's equity (including the warrants) at time T. Then, $V_T = NS_T + MW_T = NS_T + \alpha N W_T$. Setting $\hat{S_T} = S_T + \alpha W_T$, equation (7) implies

$$W_T = \frac{l}{1 + \alpha l} \max(\hat{S_T} - \hat{X}, 0) + B. \tag{8}$$

In the fractional Brownian motion and risk-neutral world, the price at every $t (t \in [0, T])$ of an equity warrant with strike price X and maturity T is given by

$$W_t = \frac{l}{1+\alpha l}[\hat{S}_t N(d_1) - \hat{X}e^{-r(T-t)}N(d_2)] + Be^{-r(T-t)}, \tag{9}$$

where

$$d_1 = \frac{\ln \frac{S_t}{X} + r(T-t) + \frac{\sigma_V^2}{2}(T^{2H} - t^{2H})}{\sigma_V \sqrt{T^{2H} - t^{2H}}},$$

and

$$d_2 = \frac{\ln \frac{S_t}{X} + r(T-t) - \frac{\sigma_V^2}{2}(T^{2H} - t^{2H})}{\sigma_V \sqrt{T^{2H} - t^{2H}}},$$

where
r is the risk-free interest rate, $T - t$ is the time to expiration of warrant, σ_V is the firm-value process volatility, H is the Hurst parameter, α denotes the percentage of warrants issued in shares of stock outstanding, and $N(\cdot)$ is the cumulative probability distribution function of a standard normal distribution.

0.5 Numerical Methods for warrant pricing

0.5.1 Warrant pricing using fractional Brownian motion

Many authors used fractional Brownian motion to avoid independence on warrant pricing. The assumptions which are used to derive the warrant pricing formula in fractional Brownian motion are as follows:

(i) The warrant price is the function of the time and underlying stock's price,

(ii) The shorting of assets with all use of proceeds is allowed,

(iii) There are no transactions costs or taxes and all securities are perfectly divisible,

(iv) Risk less arbitrage opportunities are controlled,

(v) The trading of the asset is continuous,

(vi) The risk-free rate of interest and all the maturities is constant,

(vii) The price of the stock follows fractional Brownian motion process and the dynamics of the risk adjusted process $(S_t, t \geq 0)$ are defined as

$$dS_t = S_t(\mu dt) + \sigma_v dB^{(H)}(t), 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{10}$$

where

$B^{(H)} = B^{(H)}(t, x), t > 0$ is the Fractional Brownian motion, μ is the expectation of the yield rate, σ_v is the firm-value process volatility, T is the option expiration time, S_t is the stock price at time t.

0.5.2 Warrant pricing using Monte Carlo simulation

Monte Carlo simulation was first introduced by Boyle (1976) to value options and warrants. The main purpose of Monte Carlo simulation was to provide a method of obtaining numerical solutions to option valuation problems. It has been used widely to price European-style claims. Only recently have there been endeavours to extend the method to price American-style claims.

Monte Carlo simulation is different from other methods because its pricing region remains continuous which is the advantage of this simulation over the other pricing methods to produce very accurate results. E.g. If generated a simulation of 200 paths and compared to a binomial method, the simulation has an advantage as it has 200 possible pricing nodes in the first period (when comparing this to two nodes in the first period of the binomial method there is an enormous difference). It is straightforward that a Monte Carlo simulation has an advantage looking at the computational costs effort when comparing the accuracy.

Longstaff and Schwartz (2001) introduced the least-squares method which unravel the backward-looking simulation to value warrants and options of American type.

Computations in the method of Tilley (1993) demand a lot of memory and grows in order of $O(MN)$ for stock prices at all simulation times and paths where M represent the number of paths and N represent the number of time periods, and it was limiting the accuracy of this simulation because of storage requirement. Chan et al. (2003) and Longstaff and Schwartz (2001) attempted to reduce the large amount of storage required in Tilley's model by replacing the forward path simulation of a given method with the backward one. Their solution reduced the memory storage to $O(M)$ by not storing all the intermediate asset prices and by generating each random number twice instead of once. The method had biases like other methods for pricing American options in terms of achieving high accuracy, because of not using large M and N.

In general, Monte Carlo simulation generates M pricing paths of an underlying asset, using the traditional valuing system to calculate the increase of that path (depending on the warrant you have, whether a call or a put), it then finds the anticipated warrant value discounted to the initial time steps. The discounted present value is therefore the estimated price associated with the warrant. When generating M paths and finding the mean warrant value of these paths, Monte Carlo simulation uses a stochastic sampling technique to create the expected value.

Chan et al. (2003) used an algorithm which was very similar to that of Longstaff and Schwartz (2001). They generated paths in the time decreasing direction which follow the geometric Brownian motion. Their algorithm reads:

$$S_1 = S_0 e^{([r-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2]\delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\delta t}\epsilon_N)},$$

$$S_i = S_0 e^{(i[r-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2]\delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\delta t}(\epsilon_N+\epsilon_{N-1}+\ldots+\epsilon_{N-i+1}))},$$

$$S_N = S_0 e^{(N[r-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2]\delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\delta t}(\epsilon_N+\epsilon_{N-1}+\ldots+\epsilon_1))}$$

where $\epsilon \approx N(0,1)$ and
S_0 is the initial stock price, r is the risk-free interest rate, σ is the volatility of the stock, N is the number of time periods, M is the number of paths, δt is the length of each time period, and ϵ_i are independent identically distributed from $N(0,1)$ for $i = 1, 2, ..., N$.

In this algorithm the benefit is that the initial starting seed value can provide each random number required during the simulation, and this allows the initial seed value to generate the random number set. In such cases each random number is generated twice, but it does not affect memory storage needed to carry out the simulation because these random numbers are not required to be stored.

0.6 Numerical results

In this section some results that are calculated for warrant pricing are illustrated.

Table 1 shows the Changdian stock price which was left out when simulating warrant pricing by Zhang et al. (2009). This is to compare the descriptive statistics of stock price and warrant price using the same Changdian market. The logarithmic returns is defined as

$$x_t = \ln \frac{y_{t+1}}{y_t} = \ln y_{t+1} - \ln y_t,$$

where y_t is the closing quotation of Changdian stocks and warrants at time t.

Table 1: The yield series of Changdian stocks' descriptive statistics

Observations	Mean	Standard deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Jarque-Bera
168	0.0030	0.0197	0.4393	2.2126	9.7436

The average of Changdian warrants is 0.0042 and that of the Changdian stocks is 0.003. This implies that in Changdian stocks the gaps between the data are close to each other than in Changdian warrants. The standard deviation for Changdian warrants is 0.0490 and for Changdian stocks is 0.0197. It is known that the smaller the standard deviation the closer they are. For skewness, Kurtosis and Jarque-Bera, Table 1 is compared with Table 2. Table 1 is the yield series of Changdian stocks' descriptive statistics and Table 2 is the yield series of Changdian warrants' descriptive statistics.

Table 2: The yield series of Changdian warrants' descriptive statistics

Observations	Mean	Standard deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Jarque-Bera
168	0.0042	0.0490	0.5773	8.6698	234.3679

The yield distribution of Changdian stocks is greater than zero, which implies that the yield distribution of Changdian stocks is not normal distribution like in Changdian warrants. It performs skew distribution and its Kurtosis is greater than three obviously, which implies that the yield of Changdian stocks is also leptokurtic. The value of Jarque-Bera in Changdian stocks implies that the yield distribution is less probability group near the starting point and in the tails. While the value of Jarque-Bera in changdian warrants implies that the yield distribution of Changdian warrants have more probability group near the starting point and in the tails.

It is crucial to expanded the descriptive statistics of Changdian warrants and Changdian stocks and calculate regression analysis and Anova. Letting Changdian warrants to be dependent variables (Y) and Changdian stocks to be independent variables (X) Table 3 is computed. It shows the multiple regression of 0.8762 which is a strong correlation coefficient. R^2 is equals to 0.7677 which means that 77% of the variance is shared between Changdian warrants and stocks.

Table 3: Results of regression analysis and statistical testing for the Changdian warrants and stocks

Observations	Multiple R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Standard error
168	0.8762	0.7677	0.7663	0.4335

Table 4 is the analysis of variance (ANOVA) obtained from the data of Changdian warrants and Changdian stocks. It is crucial to analyse the ANOVA statistically. The test statistic in ANOVA is the F-value of 548.59. Since the test statistic is much larger than the critical value, we reject the null hypothesis of two means (Changdian warrants and Changdian stocks) and conclude that there is a statistically significant difference among these means.

Table 4: ANOVA results for the Changdian warrants and stocks

	df	SS	MS	F
Regression	1	103.09	103.09	548.59
Residual	166	31.20	0.19	–
Total	167	134.29	–	–

where df is the degree of freedom, SS is the sum of squares, MS is the mean square and F is the F-value

0.7 Conclutions

Different methods are shown for pricing warrants. The warrant pricing models are based on the variables used in the Black-Scholes option pricing formula. The warrant pricing has been compared with option pricing theoretically and practically, showing the similarities and how they differ. The results have shown that the Black-Scholes model associated for dilution as the stock price (S) are replaced by the value of the company (V). The standard deviation of the stock's return (σ) is replaced by the standard deviation of the value (σ_v) and the outcome model is multiplied by the dilution factor ($1/(1+q)$).

In order to generate the initial approximation to the warrant pricing, certain numerical methods were also used, like *fractional Brownian motion*, which is used by many authors to avoid independency. To derive warrant pricing formulas in fractional Brownian motion the assumptions and fractional Black-Scholes formula were taken into consideration. The warrant pricing in fractional Brownian motion is similar to the European call option.

It is shown that if warrant prices are calculated twice using the Black-Scholes model, they give the same results, but if using fractional Brownian motion they give different results because of the long memory property.

Another method used to price warrants is *Monte Carlo simulation*. The purpose of this simulation is to provide a method obtaining numerical solutions to warrant valuation problems. Monte Carlo simulation calculates much higher prices for the American option.Some of the methods discussed above are purely for options but after necessary modifications, they can be used to price warrants. Such a modification is being done but due to time limitations, I would explore them further in the near future.

References

1. Black, F. and Scholes, M. The pricing of options and corporate liabilities,

Journal of Political Economics **8** (1973) 647-654.

2. Boyle, P.P. Options: A Monte Carlo approach, *Journal of Financial Economics* **4** (1976) 323-338.

3. Chan,R.H, Chen, Y. and Yeung, K.M. A memory reduction method in pricing American options, *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **74** (2003) 501-511.

4. Chen, H.Y. A model of warrant pricing in a dynamic market, *The Journal of Finance* **25** (1970) 1041-1059.

5. Crouhy, M. and Galai, D. Common errors in the valuation of warrants and options on firms with warrants, *Financial Analysts Journal* (1991) 89-90.

6. Galai, D. and Schneller, M.I. Pricing of warrants and value of the firm, *The Journal of Finance* **33** (1978) 1333-1342.

7. Hanke, M. and Potzelberger, K. Consistent pricing of warrants and traded option, *Review of Financial Economics* **11** (1) (2002) 63-77.

8. Kremer, J.W. and Roenfeldt, R.L. Warrant pricing: Jump-Diffusion vs. Black-Scholes, *The Journal of Finance and Quantitative Analysis* **28** (1993) 255-272.

9. Longstaff, F.A. and Schwartz, E.S. Valuing American options by simulation: A simple Least-Squares approach, *The Review of Financial Studies* **14** (2001) 113-147.

10. Mandelbrot, B.B. and Taylor, H.W. The distributions of stock price differences, *Operations Research* **15** (1967) 1057-1062.

11. McKean, H.P. A free boundary problem for the heat equation arising from a problem of mathematical economics, *Industrial Management Review* **6** (1965) 32-39.

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

13. Noreen, E. and Wolfson, M. Equilibrium warrant pricing model and accounting for executive stock options, *Journal of Accounting Research* (1981) 384-398.

14. Samuelson, P.A. Rational theory of warrant pricing, *Industrial Management Review* **6** (1965) 13-31.

15. Schulz, G.U. and Trautmann, S. Robustness of option-like warrant valuation,*Journal of Banking and Finance* **18** (1994) 841-859.

16. Sidney, F. *The Speculative Merits of Common Stock Warrants*, R.H.M. Associates, New York, 1949.

17. Tilley, J. Valuing American options in a path simulation model, *Transactions of the Society of Actuaries* **45** (1993) 83-104.

18. Zhang, W.G. Xiao, W.L. and He, C.X. Equity warrant pricing model under fractional Brownian motion and an empirical study, *Expert Systems with Applications* **36** (2009) 3056-3065.