

Implementing Quasi-Monte Carlo Simulations with Linear Transformations

Piergiacomo Sabino
Dipartimento di Matematica
Università degli Studi di Bari
sabino@dm.uniba.it
Rapporto 41/07

Abstract

Pricing exotic multi-asset path-dependent options requires extensive Monte Carlo simulations. In the recent years the interest to the Quasi-Monte Carlo technique has been renewed and several results have been proposed in order to improve its efficiency with the notion of effective dimension. To this aim, Imai and Tan introduced a general variance reduction technique in order to minimize the nominal dimension of the Monte Carlo method. Taking into account these advantages, we investigate this approach in detail in order to make it faster from the computational point of view. Indeed, we realize the linear transformation decomposition relying on a fast ad hoc QR decomposition that considerably reduces the computational burden. This setting makes the linear transformation method even more convenient from the computational point of view. We implement a high-dimensional (2500) Quasi-Monte Carlo simulation combined with the linear transformation in order to price Asian basket options with same set of parameters published by Imai and Tan. For the simulation of the high-dimensional random sample, we use a 50-dimensional scrambled Sobol sequence for the first 50 components, determined by the linear transformation method, and pad the remaining ones out by the Latin Hypercube Sampling. The aim of this numerical setting is to investigate the accuracy of the estimation by giving a higher convergence rate only to those components selected by the linear transformation technique. We launch our simulation experiment also using the standard Cholesky and the principal component decomposition methods with pseudo-random and Latin Hypercube sampling generators. Finally, we compare our results and computational times, with those presented in Imai and Tan [8].

Key Words: Effective dimensions. Path-generation techniques. Linear transformations. Quasi-Monte Carlo simulations.

1 Introduction

The Monte Carlo method (MC) is a computational intensive technique whose purpose is to estimate integrals numerically. It is characterized by a rate of convergence of order $O(1/\sqrt{n})$, where n is the number of simulations, and it is independent of the problem dimension d . This last feature makes the MC method appealing and applicable to several financial high-dimensional situations such as options pricing. Furthermore, the estimation error (RMSE), that can be easily computed statistically, depends only on the convergence rate and on an intrinsic constant.

Based on probabilistic considerations, standard reduction techniques can only reduce the constant but cannot improve the convergence rate.

In contrast, Quasi-Monte Carlo methods (QMC) aim to enhance the convergence rate by means of low-discrepancy sequences. These sequences provide better stratification and a convergence rate of order $O\left(\frac{\ln^d n}{n}\right)$ (see Niederreiter [10]). The rate is

faster than the previous one but depends on the problem dimensions. These sequences are purely deterministic, meaning that the estimation error cannot be estimated statistically. In the Randomized Quasi-Monte Carlo (RQMC) method some randomness is introduced in the low-discrepancy sequences while preserving their better convergence rate. This technique is called scrambling.

Several numerical investigations conclude that QMC and RQMC simulations do not give substantial advantage for $d > 10/20$.

Some approaches have been proposed in order to extend the QMC superiority to high-dimensional estimations. Caflisch *et al* [1] address the problem using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the integrand function and defining two notions of effective dimension: the effective dimension in truncation and superposition sense. Briefly, the truncation dimension reflects that, for some integrand functions, only a small number of inputs really matter. The definition of effective dimension in superposition sense takes into account that for some integrands the inputs might influence the outcome through their joint action within small groups.

Imai and Tan [6] proposed a general linear transformation construction (LT) to reduce the effective dimension of the problem in superposition sense, focusing on the particular payoff function. The authors show that this approach offers a considerable advantage with respect to the principal component analysis (PCA) in terms of accuracy and versatility.

Moreover, their simulation procedure relies on the complete Latin Supercube Sampling generation (see Owen [11] for more on this topic) in order to generate a high-dimensional low discrepancy sequence with good properties.

Here we investigate the accuracy of the LT method in detail and implement the construction fast by an efficient QR decomposition. We run our simulation procedure with the same set of parameters as in Imai and Tan [8] and are thus able to directly compare the respective results.

We will demonstrate, that our implementation makes the LT considerably faster and maintain its versatility.

We test the efficiency of the LT construction by launching a MC simulation in a more extreme setting. We use scrambled low-discrepancy sequences only to those components the LT considers as optimal, while simulating the others with the Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) that has lower convergence rate.

The LHS is supposed to give good accuracy when the target function is a sum of one-dimensional ones. If the LT accomplishes this task optimally it would give a good improvement in this setting too. Our experiment is intended to test if the LT gives the same results as in Imai and Tan [8], in terms of RMSEs, in this partial RQMC setting. This means, that if the LT with RQMC provides considerable advantage with respect to the pure LHS generation it reduces the effective dimension in superposition sense really optimally.

As a comparison, we launch the MC simulation using a standard pseudo-random generator and build the random path with standard Cholesky and PCA decompositions too.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the financial setting and formulates the Asian basket option pricing problem as an integral explicitly. Section 3 introduces the MC and the QMC methods and the notion of effective dimensions of the problem. Section 4 describes the LT construction introduced by Imai and Tan and how it applies to several financial situations. Section 5 presents the main steps of our MC simulation. Section 6 illustrates the numerical results we obtain and discuss the efficiency of the LT and its fast implementation. Section 7 concludes the paper and the Appendix describes the *ad hoc* QR decomposition used.

2 Problem Statement

We consider the problem of estimating the fair price of a contract in a standard financial market \mathfrak{M} in a Black-Scholes framework, with a constant risk-free rate r and time-

dependent volatilities. There are $M + 1$ assets in the market, one risk free asset and M risky assets. The price processes of the assets in this market are driven by a set of stochastic differential equations.

Suppose we have already applied the Girsanov theorem and found the (unique) risk-neutral probability, the model for the risky assets is the so called multi-dimensional geometric brownian motion:

$$S_0(t) = e^{rt} \quad (1)$$

$$dS_i(t) = rS_i(t) dt + \sigma_i(t) S_i(t) dW_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, M. \quad (2)$$

Here $S_i(t)$ denotes the i -th asset price at time t , $\sigma_i(t)$ represents the instantaneous time-dependent volatility of the i -th asset return, r is the continuously compounded risk-free interest rate, and $\mathbf{W}(t) = (W_1(t), \dots, W_M(t))$ is an M -dimensional Brownian motion. Time t can vary in \mathbb{R}_+^* , that is, we can consider any maturity $T \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ for all financial contracts.

The multi-dimensional brownian motion $\mathbf{W}(t)$ is a martingale, each component is a martingale, and satisfies the following properties:

$$\mathbb{E}[W_i(t)] = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, M.$$

$$[W_i, W_k](t) = \rho_{ik}t, \quad i, k = 1, \dots, M.$$

where $[\cdot, \cdot](t)$ represents the quadratic variation up to time t and ρ_{ik} the constant instantaneous correlation between W_i and W_k .

Applying the risk-neutral pricing formula, the value at time t of any European T -maturing derivative contract is:

$$V(t) = \exp(r(T-t)) \mathbb{E}[\phi(T) | \mathcal{F}_t]. \quad (3)$$

\mathbb{E} denotes the expectation under the risk neutral probability measure and $\phi(T)$ is a generic \mathcal{F}_T measurable function, with $\mathcal{F}_T = \sigma\{0 < t \leq T; \mathbf{W}(t)\}$, that determines the payoff of the contract. Although not explicitly written, the function $\phi(T)$ depends on the entire multi-dimensional brownian path up to time T .

We will restrict our analysis to Asian options that are exotic derivative contracts that can be written both on a single security and on a basket of underlying securities. Hereafter we will consider European-style Asian options whose underlying securities coincide with the $M + 1$ assets on the market. This is the most general case we can tackle in the market \mathfrak{M} because it is complete in the sense that we can hedge any financial instrument by finding a portfolio that is a combination of this $M + 1$ assets.

2.1 Asian Options Payoff

The theoretical price for a discretely monitored Asian option is:

$$a_i(t) = \exp(r(T-t)) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^N S_i(t_j)}{N} - K \right)^+ \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \quad \text{Option on a Single Asset} \quad (4)$$

$$a(t) = \exp(r(T-t)) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} S_i(t_j) - K \right)^+ \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \quad \text{Option on a Basket} \quad (5)$$

where $t_1 < t_2 \dots < t_N = T$ and the coefficients w_{ij} satisfy $\sum_{i,j} w_{ij} = 1$.

European options with payoff functions (4) and (5) are called arithmetic weighted average options or simply arithmetic Asian options. When $M > 0$ and $N = 1$ the payoff only depends on the terminal price of the basket of M underlying assets and the option is known as basket option.

2.2 Problem Formulation as an Integral

The model \mathfrak{M} , presented in the first section, consists of the risk-free money market account and M assets driven by M geometric brownian motion described by equation (2) whose solution is:

$$S_i(t) = S_i(0) \exp \left[\int_0^t \left(r - \frac{\sigma_i^2(s)}{2} \right) ds + \int_0^t \sigma_i(s) dW_i(s) \right], i = 1, \dots, M. \quad (6)$$

The quantity $\int_0^t \frac{\sigma_i^2(s)}{2} ds$ is the total volatility for the i -th asset. The solution (6) is a multi-dimensional geometric brownian motion, written $\text{GBM} \left(r, \int_0^t \frac{\sigma_i^2(s)}{2} ds \right)$.

Under the assumption of constant volatility the solution is still a multi-dimensional geometric brownian motion with the following form:

$$S_i(t) = S_i(0) \exp \left[\left(r - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2} \right) t + \sigma_i W_i(t) \right], i = 1, \dots, M. \quad (7)$$

In compacted notation the solution (7) is $\text{GBM} \left(r, \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2} t \right)$.

Pricing Asian option requires to monitor the solutions (6) and (7) at a finite set of points in time $\{t_1, \dots, t_N\}$. This sampling procedure yields to the following expressions for time-depending and constant volatilities:

$$S_i(t_j) = S_i(0) \exp \left[\int_0^{t_j} \left(r - \frac{\sigma_i^2(t)}{2} \right) dt + Z_i(t_j) \right] \quad (8)$$

$$S_i(t_j) = S_i(0) \exp \left[\left(r - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2} \right) t_j + Z_i(t_j) \right] \quad (9)$$

where the components of the vector $(Z_1(t_1), \dots, Z_1(t_N), Z_2(t_1), \dots, Z_M(t_N))$ are $M \times N$ normal random variables with zero mean vector and the following covariance matrix:

$$\Sigma_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma(t_1) & \Sigma(t_1) & \dots & \Sigma(t_1) \\ \Sigma(t_1) & \Sigma(t_2) & \dots & \Sigma(t_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Sigma(t_1) & \Sigma(t_2) & \dots & \Sigma(t_N) \end{pmatrix} \text{ for time-dependent volatilities,} \quad (10)$$

or

$$\Sigma_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \Sigma & t_1 \Sigma & \dots & t_1 \Sigma \\ t_1 \Sigma & t_2 \Sigma & \dots & t_2 \Sigma \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_1 \Sigma & t_2 \Sigma & \dots & t_N \Sigma \end{pmatrix} \text{ for constant volatilities.} \quad (11)$$

Each element depends on four indexes:

$$\left((\Sigma_{MN})_{ik} \right)_{lm} = \int_0^{t_l \wedge t_m} \sigma_i(t) \sigma_k(t) \rho_{ik} dt \quad (12)$$

with $i, k = 1, \dots, M$ and $l, m = 1, \dots, N$.

The payoff at maturity T of the arithmetic average Asian option is then:

$$p_a(T) = (g(\mathbf{Z}) - K)^+ \quad (13)$$

where

$$g(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{k=1}^{M \times N} \exp(\mu_k + Z_k) \quad (14)$$

and

$$\mu_k = \ln(w_{k_1 k_2} S_{k_1}(0)) + \left(r - \frac{\sigma_{k_1}^2}{2} \right) t_{k_2} \quad (15)$$

for constant volatilities or

$$\mu_k = \ln(w_{k_1 k_2} S_{k_1}(0)) + rt_{k_2} - \frac{\int_0^{t_{k_2}} \sigma_{k_1}^2(t) dt}{2} \quad (16)$$

for time-dependent volatilities. The indexes k_1 and k_2 are respectively $k_1 = (k - 1) \bmod M, k_2 = [(k - 1)/M] + 1$, where \bmod denotes the modulus and $[\cdot]$ the greatest integer less than or equal to x .

The calculation of the price $a(t)$ in equation (5) can be formulated as an integral on $[0, 1]^{NM}$ in the following way (see Dahl and Benth [2] and [3]):

$$a(t) = \exp(r(T - t)) \int_{[0, 1]^{NM}} (g(\mathbf{u}) - K)^+ F_{\mathbf{Z}}^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \quad (17)$$

3 Problem Dimension

The main purpose of the standard MC method is to numerically estimate the following integral:

$$I = \int_{[0, 1]^d} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}. \quad (18)$$

I can be seen as $\mathbb{E}[f(U)]$, the expected value of a function $f(\cdot)$ of the random vector \mathbf{U} that is uniformly distributed in hypercube $[0, 1]^d$.

MC methods simply estimate I by drawing a sample of n independent replicates U_1, \dots, U_n of \mathbf{U} and then computing the arithmetic average:

$$\hat{I} = \hat{I}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(U_i). \quad (19)$$

The Law of Large Numbers ensures that \hat{I}_n converges to I in probability almost surely and the Central Limit Theorem states that $I - \hat{I}_n$ converges in distribution to a normal with mean 0 and standard deviation σ/\sqrt{n} with $\sigma = \sqrt{\int_0^1 (f(\mathbf{x}) - I)^2 d\mathbf{x}}$. The convergence rate is than $O(1/n)$ for all dimensions d . The parameter σ is generally unknown in a setting in which I is unknown, but it can be estimated using the sampled standard deviation or root mean square error (RMSE):

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(U_i) - \hat{I}_n)^2}. \quad (20)$$

When the nominal dimension d of the problem of estimating the integral (18) is one, there are standard numerical techniques that give a good accuracy when f is smooth. Considerable problems arise when d is high.

We aim to estimate the fair value of the Asian option of equation (17) with an high-dimensional Quasi MC simulation as formulated in (18).

QMC method relies on the construction of deterministic sequences, also known as low-discrepancy sequences, that cover the hypercube $[0, 1]^d$ uniformly. We define the quantity $D_n^* = D_n^*(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ as the star discrepancy. It is a measure of the uniformity of the sequence $\{P_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \in [0, 1]^d$ and it must be stressed that it is an analytical quantity and not a statistical one.

A sequence $\{P_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is called low-discrepancy sequence if:

$$D_n^*(P_1, \dots, P_n) = O\left(\frac{(\ln n)^d}{n}\right). \quad (21)$$

The following inequality, attributed to Koksma and Hlawka, provides an upper bound to the estimation error of the unknown integral with the QMC method in terms of the star discrepancy:

$$|I - \hat{I}| \leq D_n^* V_{HK}(f). \quad (22)$$

$V_{HK}(f)$ is the variation in the sense of Hardy and Krause. Consequently, if f has a finite variation and n is large enough, the QMC approach gives an error smaller than the error obtained by the crude MC method for low dimensions d .

It is well known that QMC methods lose the better accuracy in high dimension. It is then fundamental to capture the most important (in statistical sense) components or to reduce the nominal dimension of the problem by means of ANOVA considerations.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, d\}$ denote the set of the independent variables for f on $[0, 1]^d$. f could be written into the sum of orthogonal functions each of them defined in a different subset of \mathcal{A} , that is depending only on the variables in each of these subsets:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{u \subseteq \mathcal{A}} f_u(\mathbf{x}) \quad (23)$$

Now let $|u|$ denote the cardinality of u and $\sigma^2 = \int (f(\mathbf{x}) - I)^2 d\mathbf{x}$, $\sigma_u^2 = \int f_u(\mathbf{x})^2 d\mathbf{x}$, $\sigma_0^2 = 0$, supposing $\sigma < +\infty$ and $|u| > 0$ it holds:

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{u \subseteq \mathcal{A}} \sigma_u^2 \quad (24)$$

Equation (24) partitions the total variance into parts corresponding to each subset $u \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. The f_u enjoys some nice properties: if $j \in u$ the line integral $\int_{[0,1]} f_u(\mathbf{x}) dx_j = 0$ for any x_k with $k \neq j$, and if $u \neq v$ $\int f_u(x)f_v(x) dx = 0$.

Exploiting the ANOVA decomposition, the definition of effective dimension can be given in the following ways:

Definition 1. *The effective dimension of f , in the superposition sense, is the smallest integer d_S such that $\sum_{0 < |u| \leq d_S} \sigma_u^2 \geq p\sigma^2$.*

The value d_S depends on the order in which the input variables are indexed.

Definition 2. *The effective dimension of f , in the truncation sense, is the smallest integer d_T such that $\sum_{u \subseteq \{1, \dots, d_T\}} \sigma_u^2 \geq p\sigma^2$.*

$0 < p < 1$ is an arbitrary level; the usual choice is $p = 99\%$.

The definition of effective dimension in truncation sense reflects that for some integrands, only a small number of the inputs might really matter. The definition of effective dimension in superposition sense takes into account that for some integrands, the inputs might influence the outcome through their joint action within small groups. Direct computation leads to: $d_S \leq d_T \leq d$.

4 Linear Transform Construction

Imai and Tan [6] proposed a general LT method for path generation with main purpose to minimize the effective dimension in truncation sense of a simulation problem.

The LT approach provides the same results as the PCA-based one, moreover proves to be more accurate and versatile in certain situations.

Many studies demonstrate that the QMC pricing of certain specific derivative contracts is not substantially improved by the brownian bridge construction. This suggests to focus the attention onto the particular payoff function while even the PCA approach is applicable only for multi-dimensional normal random variables. In contrast, the LT generation focuses on the particular payoff function instead of the multi-dimensional brownian path.

This method provides the best results for linear combinations of normal random variables. Imai and Tan [6], [7] and [8] investigated the practical improvement of the LT method by running very high-dimensional simulations for European options, bonds pricing in different dynamics (see the cited references for more on this topic).

A n -dimensional random vector \mathbf{Y} with covariance matrix Σ_y can be characterized starting from a vector of independent standard normal variables ϵ by the following

transformation: $y = C\epsilon$, with $CC^T = \Sigma_y$. Imai and Tan consider the following class of LT as solution of the previous general problem:

$$C^{LT} = C^{Ch} A \quad (25)$$

where C^{Ch} is the Cholesky matrix associated to the covariance matrix of the normal random vector to be generated and A is an orthogonal matrix, i.e. $AA^T = I$.

The optimum C^{LT} is obtained by optimally choosing A so that the effective dimension in the truncation sense of the problem of interest is minimized.

Maximizing the explanatory variability of a normal vector with covariance matrix Σ consists in finding the optimum orthogonal matrix A^* by iteratively solving the following optimization problem:

$$\max \|\mathbf{C}_{\cdot k}^{LT}\|^2 = \max_{\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k} \in \mathbb{R}^{NM}} \sum_{p=1}^{MN} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{p}}^{Ch} \mathbf{A}_{\cdot k} \quad (26)$$

subject to $\|\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k}\| = 1$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\cdot i}^* = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ and $k \leq n$ ($\mathbf{A}_{\cdot i}^*$ indicates the columns that have been already calculated)

$\mathbf{C}_{\cdot k}^{LT}$ represents the k -th column vector and $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{k}}^{LT}$ the k -th row vector of C^{LT} ; the same notation holds for all the matrices. Imai and Tan [8] proves that this procedure achieves the same results, in terms of explained variability, of the PCA decomposition of Σ_{MN} . Indeed:

$$\max \|\mathbf{C}_{\cdot k}^{LT}\|^2 = (\mathbf{C}^{Ch} \mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})^T \mathbf{C}^{Ch} \mathbf{A}_{\cdot k} = \mathbf{A}_{\cdot k}^T \Sigma \mathbf{A}_{\cdot k} \quad (27)$$

Hence the optimization problem is similar to seeking the k -th principal component.

Finding the optimal matrix A is equivalent of finding the optimal QR transformation of C with $CC^T = \Sigma$ where $R = (C^{Ch})^T$ and $Q = A$ in the sense described before.

The PCA decomposition provides the best solution for normal random vectors with $Q = V^T$ and $R = \Lambda^{1/2}$ with V and Λ the orthogonal matrix of the eigenvectors and Λ the diagonal matrix of all the eigenvalues in decreasing order respectively.

4.1 Special Cases

As for linear combinations of normal random variables the LT approach minimizes the effective dimension in truncation sense. It is established from standard statistics that a linear combination of normal random variables is still a normal random variable with mean and variance that depend on the linear combination. It is then trivial that an integral problem with the nominal dimension d that involves a linear combination of d normal random variables has an effective dimension in superposition sense equal to one. The LT procedure returns this results in truncation sense as an optimization procedure.

Let $f(\mathbf{z})$ be a linear combination of d normal random variables $f(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^d w_i z_i$, with $\mathbf{z} \sim N(\mu; \Sigma)$ and constants w_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$. If C denotes the generic decomposed matrix of Σ then the above function can be expressed as:

$$f(\epsilon) = \sum_{k=1}^d \alpha_k \epsilon_k + \mu \cdot \mathbf{w} \quad (28)$$

where $\alpha_k = \mathbf{C}_{\cdot k} \cdot \mathbf{w}$ and ϵ is a d -dimensional vector of standard and independent normal random variables. Furthermore the total variance of f is:

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=k}^d \alpha_k^2 \quad (29)$$

The truncation dimension is the smallest integer d_T that satisfies:

$$\sum_{i=k}^{d_T} \alpha_k^2 \geq p\sigma^2 \quad (30)$$

As with the LT approach the optimal C is $C^{LT} = C^{Ch}A$ that leads to:

$$\alpha_k = \mathbf{A}_{\cdot k} \cdot \mathbf{B} \quad k = 1 \dots, d \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbf{B} = (C^{Ch})^T \mathbf{w}$. Consequently, minimizing the effective dimension in the truncation sense is equivalent to maximizing the variance contribution due to the first component α_1^2 and obtaining $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot 1}$. Iterating this procedure and imposing the orthogonality condition we get the optimal matrix A . It can be proven, see Imai Tan [6] or [8], that the optimal solution for $k = 1$ is:

$$\mathbf{A}_{\cdot 1}^* = \pm \frac{\mathbf{B}}{\|\mathbf{B}\|} \quad (32)$$

while for $k = 1, \dots, d$ the column vectors can be arbitrary but must satisfy the orthogonality condition. Substituting this results into equation (30) we are left with $\alpha_1 = \pm \|\mathbf{B}\|$ and $\alpha_k = 0$ for $k = 2, \dots, d$. The original function f can be written as:

$$f(\epsilon) = \mu \cdot \mathbf{w} \pm \|\mathbf{B}\| \epsilon_1 \quad (33)$$

This is the best possible scenario for the dimension reduction. The LT approach reduces any nominal d -dimensional problem involving a linear combination of normal random variables into a one-dimensional problem in truncation sense. This means that the LT method rearranges the linear structure of the function for the best possible reduction.

Let us now consider the following function:

$$f(\epsilon) = \exp\left(\mu + \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \epsilon_k\right) - K \quad (34)$$

with μ , α_k and K constant.

$f(x)^+$ can be considered the payoff function of a geometric average Asian option with strike price K and:

$$\mu = \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N w_{ij} \left[\log S_i(0) + \left(r - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2}\right) t_j \right], \quad \alpha_k = \mathbf{C}_{\cdot k} \cdot \mathbf{w} \quad (35)$$

Such a derivative contract is not traded but nevertheless serves to understand the computational problem. Indeed, performing the logarithm $\log(f(\epsilon) - K)$, we obtain a new function which is a linear combination of normal variates. Applying the results of the LT method for the previous example we showed that the nominal dimension MN of the new problem shrinks to one. Again this is not surprising because we know that the product of log-normal variates is still a log-normal variate.

These examples highlight the main differences between the PCA decomposition and the LT methods. The former returns the best decomposition of the covariance matrix of a normal random vector in terms of variability of each component. The latter reduces the effective dimension of the problem focusing on the particular payoff function. It provides the best solution for linear combinations of normal variates.

4.2 General Case

General payoff functions for European style options are neither linear combinations of normal random variables nor they can be obtained by monotone transformations as for the case of the geometric average Asian options. To address the problem Imai and Tan propose to approximate an arbitrary function g , such that g^+ is the payoff function of a European derivative contract, with its first order Taylor expansion:

$$g(\epsilon) = g(\hat{\epsilon}) + \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{\partial g}{\partial \epsilon_l} \Big|_{\epsilon=\hat{\epsilon}} \Delta \epsilon_l \quad (36)$$

The approximated function is linear in the standard normal random vector $\Delta \epsilon$ and we can rely on the same results obtained in the previous subsection. By considering

an arbitrary point of expansion, such as $\hat{\epsilon} = \mathbf{0}$, we can derive the first column of the optimal orthogonal matrix A^* . We can find the complete matrix by expanding g at different points and then run the optimization algorithm.

Summarizing the optimization can be formulated as follow:

$$\max_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{R}^n} \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \epsilon_l} \Big|_{\epsilon = \hat{\epsilon}} \right)^2 \quad (37)$$

subject to $\|\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{k}}\| = 1$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{j}}^* \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{k}} = 0, j = 1, \dots, k-1, k \leq n$.

Although equation (32) provides an easy solution at each step, the correct procedure requires that $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{k}}$ must be orthonormal to all the previous (and future) columns. This feature can be easily obtained by the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization or even better by the QR method that is numerically stabler. As for the latter we must note that the QR method might return opposite matrices at different time steps (cosmetic sign adjustment). This does not affect the problem because the solution in equation (32) can be either with a positive and negative sign. Furthermore, we stress that it is not necessary to run the complete QR method at each step. Indeed, all the columns already calculated are orthogonal and we should use a "partial" QR method that considerably reduces the computational burden as it will be shown in the appendix.

Imai and Tan set $\hat{\epsilon}_1 = \mathbf{0}, \hat{\epsilon}_2 = (1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_k = (1, 1, 1, \dots, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_n = (1, \dots, 1, 0)'$, the k -th point has $k-1$ leading ones.

The choice is arbitrary and a different set can be used that would return different optimal orthogonal matrices.

Moreover the computational cost can be reduced by only seeking a suboptimal matrix with optimal columns up to $k^* < n$. This approximation is reasonable since in practice only a few components are of relevance as will be shown in the numerical examples.

4.3 Asian Options Case

We consider the function $\bar{g} = g - K$ in equation (14), it is then, easy to verify that its variance can be expressed as:

$$\sigma^2(\bar{g}(\epsilon)) = \sum_{i=1}^{MN} \sum_{j=1}^{MN} \exp\left(\mu_i + \mu_j + (1/2) \sum_{l=1}^{MN} (C_{il}^2 + C_{jl}^2)\right) \left[\exp\left(\sum_{l=1}^{MN} C_{il} C_{jl}\right) - 1 \right] \quad (38)$$

Due to the tractability of the function above, Imai and Tan provide some implementations of the LT construction. We only show two of them.

The variance contribution for the first p dimensions can be defined as:

$$\sigma_p^2(\bar{g}(\epsilon)) = \sum_{i=1}^{MN} \sum_{j=1}^{MN} \exp\left(\mu_i + \mu_j + (1/2) \sum_{l=1}^p (C_{il}^2 + C_{jl}^2)\right) \left[\exp\left(\sum_{l=1}^p C_{il} C_{jl}\right) - 1 \right] \quad (39)$$

Working with algebra and approximating the exponential in the square bracket up to the first order, we can obtain the first formulation for the optimal matrix A :

$$\max_{\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathbf{R}^{MN}} = \sum_{i=1}^{MN} \sum_{j=1}^{MN} \exp\left(\mu_i + \mu_j + (1/2) \sum_{l=1}^p ((C_{il}^*)^2 + (C_{jl}^*)^2)\right) C_{il} C_{jl} \quad (40)$$

subject to $\|\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{p}}\| = 1$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{j}} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{p}}^* = 0$ for $j < k$.

The second formulation consists in applying the general approach by expanding the function of equation (14) up to the first order:

$$g(\epsilon) = g(\hat{\epsilon}) + \sum_{l=1}^{NM} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{NM} \exp\left(\mu_i + \sum_{k=1}^{NM} C_{ik} \hat{\epsilon}_k\right) C_{il} \right) \Delta \epsilon_l \quad (41)$$

We start the optimization procedure by finding the first column of the optimal matrix A :

$$g(\epsilon) = g(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{l=1}^{NM} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{NM} \exp(\mu_i) C_{il} \right) \Delta \epsilon_l \quad (42)$$

we set $\alpha_i = \left(\sum_{l=1}^{NM} \exp(\mu_i) C_{il} \right) = \sum_{m=1}^{NM} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{NM} \exp(\mu_i) C_{im}^{Ch} \right) A_{ml}$ in order to formulate equation (39) as (28). Set $\mathbf{d}^{(1)} = (e^{\mu_1}, \dots, e^{\mu_{MN}})^T$ and $\mathbf{B}^{(1)} = (\mathbf{d}^{(1)})^T C^{Ch}$ we know from the linear combination case that $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot 1}^* = \pm \frac{\mathbf{B}^{(1)}}{\|\mathbf{B}^{(1)}\|}$.

The p -th optimal column can be found considering the p -th starting point of the Imai and Tan's strategy. This results in:

$$g(\epsilon) = g(\hat{\epsilon}_{\mathbf{p}}) + \sum_{l=1}^{NM} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{NM} \exp \left(\mu_i + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} C_{ik}^* \right) C_{il} \right) \Delta \epsilon_l \quad (43)$$

where C_{ik}^* , $k < p$ have been already found at the $p - 1$ previous steps and $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{p}}$ must be orthogonal to all the other columns. As for the first step we define $\mathbf{d}^{(\mathbf{p})} = \left(\exp \left(\mu_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} C_{1k}^* \right), \dots, \exp \left(\mu_{MN} + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} C_{MNk}^* \right) \right)^T$ and $\mathbf{B}^{(\mathbf{p})} = (\mathbf{d}^{(\mathbf{p})})^T C^{Ch}$ the solution is $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{p}}^* = \pm \frac{\mathbf{B}^{(\mathbf{p})}}{\|\mathbf{B}^{(\mathbf{p})}\|}$.

Alternatively, the optimal $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot \mathbf{p}}^*$ can be equivalently obtained by calculating the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalues of the following matrix:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{NM} \sum_{j=1}^{NM} \exp \left(\mu_i + \mu_j + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} (C_{ik}^* + C_{kj}^*) \right) \mathbf{C}_{i \cdot}^{Ch} \mathbf{C}_{\cdot j}^{Ch} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(\mathbf{p})}) \Sigma_{MN} \text{diag}(\mathbf{d}^{(\mathbf{p})}) \quad (44)$$

and after imposing the orthonormality condition by the QR method.

5 Simulation Framework

We consider the constant volatility case only, and run our simulation with different combinations of path-generation techniques and different random number generators.

As far as path-generation methods are concerned we use the standard Cholesky, the PCA and the two LT decompositions for Asian options introduced in the previous subsections. In particular for the first two approaches we rely on the properties of the Kronecker product in order to compute the decomposition fast (see Dahl, Benth [2] and [3] and Sabino [13] for further details).

LT methods require the iterative calculations of orthogonal matrices. We attain the task implementing an *ad hoc* QR factorization, as described in Appendix, that does not require high computational cost. For the LT decomposition the total computational time is than the sum of the time to compute the Cholesky and the optimal orthogonal matrix A .

The numerical test consists of three main steps:

1. Random number generation by standard MC, LHS or RQMC.
2. Path generation with Cholesky, PCA, and the two LT algorithm discussed above (LT1 and LT2, respectively).
3. MC estimation.

As RQMC generator we use a Faure-Tezuka scrambled version of the 50-dimensional Sobol sequence satisfying Sobols property A (see Glasserman [4], Jäckel [9] and Owen [12] for further details). We pad the remaining random components out with LHS. This strategy is intended to investigate the effective improvement of the LT methods when coupled with QMC. Indeed, it can be proven that the LHS gives good variance reductions when the target function is sum of one-dimensional functions (see Glasserman [4]

$S_i(0)$	=	100
K	=	90, 100 and 110
r	=	4%
T	=	1
σ_i	=	$10\% + \frac{i-1}{9}40\%$ for $i = 1, \dots, 10$
ρ_{ij}	=	0 and 40% for $i, j = 1, \dots, 10$

Table 1: Input Parameters.

and Owen [11]). On the other hand, the LT method is conceived to capture the lower effective dimension in superposition sense for linear combinations. As a consequence, we should already observe a high accuracy when running the simulation with LHS and LT. Our setting is thought to test how large is the improvement given by the LT factorization. We compute a suboptimal A up to dimension 50 in order to be coherent with the choice of the 50-dimensional Sobol sequence.

Stratification introduces correlation among random drawings so that the hypothesis of the Central Limit Theorem are not satisfied and we cannot compute the RMSE straightforward. We rely on the batch methods that consists of repeating N_B simulations for B times (batches).

6 Numerical Investigations

We develop our simulation procedure in order to test the computational burden and the efficiency of the Linear Transform method. We compare its results with those obtained with standard techniques like Cholesky and PCA decompositions. Furthermore, we use several random number generators, in particular, we adopt a Faure-Tezuka scrambled version of the 50-dimensional Sobol' sequence satisfying the Sobol's property A.

As a numerical example, we estimate the fair price of an Asian option on a basket of $M = 10$ underlying assets with $N = 250$ sampled points.

The chosen parameters are those in the original paper of Imai and Tan [8] and are shown in Table 1.

The nominal dimension of the problem is $M \times N = 2500$ equal to the number of rows and columns of the global correlation matrix Σ_{MN} .

We perform the path-generation by computing the Cholesky, the PCA and two versions of the LT decompositions of the global correlation matrix Σ_{MN} . We label LT2 for the general case and LT1 for the method described for Asian options only. As far as the first two generations are concerned, we rely on the properties of the Kronecker product in order to reduce the computational burden as described in Dahl, Benth [2] and [3] and Sabino [13].

As far as the implementation of the two LT methods proposed by Imai and Tan is concerned, we apply the fast version of the QR decomposition described in the appendix.

The simulation procedure is implemented in MATLAB running on a laptop with an Intel Pentium M, processor 1.60 GHz and 1 GB RAM.

Table 2 shows the percentage of the cumulative contribution of the variance for the first 10 components both for the zero and positive correlation cases, this is the ratio between equation (39) and (38) with p up to 10. All results up to $p = 5$ are consistent with those presented by Imai and Tan [8]. It can be noticed that the LT is the best performing path-generation technique in the statistical sense specified above, where the first specification is a bit better. The PCA decomposition is almost as accurate as the LT approach for the correlation case only.

The effective dimensions found with each method are reported in Table 3. The advantage of the PCA and LT methods with respect to the Cholesky decomposition is evident both for the correlation and uncorrelation cases. The Cholesky decomposition collects 98.58% and 98.70% of the total variance for $p = 2000$ for the uncorrelation and

Dimension	Uncorrelation				Correlation			
	Cholesky	PCA	LT1	LT2	Cholesky	PCA	LT1	LT2
1	0.01	23.15	88.41	88.41	0.41	91.40	94.41	94.41
2	0.03	42.24	90.68	90.24	0.60	93.04	95.27	95.17
3	0.07	57.69	93.53	92.20	0.71	94.32	96.25	95.91
4	0.13	69.91	95.10	94.11	0.79	95.28	97.02	96.58
5	0.21	79.30	96.69	95.45	0.85	95.99	97.59	97.25
6	0.31	86.25	97.83	96.68	0.91	97.42	97.93	97.58
7	0.45	91.14	98.32	97.53	0.95	97.93	98.34	98.04
8	0.61	94.33	98.60	98.10	1.00	98.28	98.61	98.24
9	0.81	94.87	98.85	98.45	1.04	98.51	98.75	98.45
10	1.05	95.28	98.97	98.64	1.08	98.78	98.92	98.61

Table 2: Percentage of Variance Contribution up to dimension 10.

Uncorrelation				Correlation			
Cholesky	PCA	LT1	LT2	Cholesky	PCA	LT1	LT2
$d_T > 2000$	$d_T = 18$	$d_T = 11$	$d_T = 13$	$d_T > 2000$	$d_T = 12$	$d_T = 12$	$d_T = 12$

Table 3: Effective Dimensions.

correlation cases, respectively.

We compute the computational times elapsed to decompose the global covariance matrix with each method so that we can compare the efficiency of all the methods; we compute only 50 optimal columns for the LT technique. Table 4 shows the estimated times in seconds.

The computational times we found are a lot lower than those presented by Imai and Tan [8] despite the fact that are computed with a slower computer. In particular, the implementation of the LT method with the QR approach presented in the appendix (up to 50 columns) is more efficient of a factor tirthy. Furthermore, the LT methods has the versatility to allow the computation of a suboptimal matrix that is statistically justified by ANOVA considerations. In contrast, the PCA decomposition lacks this possibility without losing information.

In the case of time-dependent volatilities we could not rely on the properties of the Kronecker products in order to reduce the computational costs to run the PCA decomposition of the global covariance matrix. In contrast, the *ad hoc* QR approach for the LT method is preserved and needs a computational time of the same order as we will present in future studies.

In the case of time-dependent volatilities it is fundamental to implement a fast Cholesky decomposition to be coupled with the QR method (see Sabino [13] for further details of this type of Cholesky algorithm).

As a final step, we launch a MC simulation in order to estimate the fair price of the Asian basket option with 8192 generations and 10 replications.

As already mentioned, we use a standard pseudo-random generator, the LHS method and a 50-dimensional Faure-Tezuka scrambled version of the Sobol' sequence satisfying the Sobol's property A.

	Uncorrelation				Correlation			
	Cholesky	PCA	LT1	LT2	Cholesky	PCA	LT1	LT2
<i>time</i>	0.60	25.77	53.14	53.21	0.59	25.55	53.02	53.20

Table 4: Computational Times.

	Standard MC					
	K=90		K=100		K=110	
	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE
Cholesky	12.257	0.038	5.604	0.029	2.007	0.018
PCA	12.291	0.038	5.648	0.029	2.040	0.018
LT1=50	12.240	0.038	5.681	0.029	2.004	0.018
LT2=50	12.256	0.038	5.687	0.029	2.007	0.018
	LHS					
	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE
Cholesky	12.3320	0.0097	5.670	0.013	2.0394	0.0084
PCA	12.3292	0.0025	5.6655	0.0032	2.0389	0.0034
LT1=50	12.3291	0.0015	5.5968	0.0019	2.0332	0.0022
LT2=50	12.2468	0.0022	5.6015	0.0017	2.0348	0.0017
	RQMC					
	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE
Cholesky	12.3410	0.0094	5.631	0.014	2.021	0.012
PCA	12.32900	0.00060	5.65770	0.00039	2.03360	0.00041
LT1=50	12.32800	0.00036	5.65720	0.00040	2.03400	0.00021
LT2=50	12.32800	0.00025	5.65690	0.00019	2.03420	0.00039

Table 5: Correlation Case: Estimated Prices and Errors.

It is known that (R)QMC simulations do not yield any improvements with respect to standard MC ones when the problem dimension is high (generally $d \geq 20/30$). Owen [11] proposes mainly two approaches to extend the better convergence of the (R)QMC in high dimensions: the Latin Super Cube method and the padding with LHS.

Briefly, the former consists of grouping the input variables and rearranging their order with a random permutation. The latter consists in fixing the more important variables and then pad the remaining ones out with the LHS.

Even if this last method requires more computational costs, it can give further insight into the LT method. Indeed, it can test if the LT really selects the best variables in statistical sense and reduces the effective dimension. For the presented case we compare its results with those obtained with the pure LHS generator. We then, choose a 50-dimensional Sobol' sequence, coherent with the suboptimal matrix A , and pad the remaining 2450 dimensions out.

Tables 5 and 6 show the results of our numerical experiment. All values are statistically consistent, but exhibit a different accuracy.

As expected, standard Cholesky decomposition is almost not sensitive to the used random generation technique and gives the worst results.

LT and PCA decompositions provide good improvements for the RMSEs for both the RQMC and LHS generations. As far as the last method is concerned, we note that it is sensitive to the decomposition used and returns lower RMSEs when the LT decomposition is applied. This means that the LT approach is really reducing the effective dimension in superposition sense, "splitting" the integrand function into a sum of linear functions.

As already mentioned, the LHS should reduce the RMSE in the case the integrand function is the sum of one-dimensional functions. This is best accomplished by the LT as evident from the above results.

The RQMC simulation and the LT decompositions confirm their superior performance.

It can be noted that the RQMC is sensitive to the used decomposition approach and does not have any advantage over the LHS when we use the Cholesky decomposition.

Our evaluations return RMSEs with the same accuracy as Imai and Tan [8] when

	Standard MC					
	K=90		K=100		K=110	
	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE
Cholesky	11.560	0.021	3.426	0.015	0.3625	0.0051
PCA	11.553	0.021	3.414	0.015	0.3591	0.0052
LT1=50	11.454	0.021	3.356	0.015	0.3525	0.0051
LT2=50	11.454	0.021	3.357	0.015	0.3523	0.0051
LHS						
	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE
Cholesky	11.5915	0.0037	3.432	0.007	0.3605	0.0038
PCA	11.5913	0.0064	3.4546	0.0054	0.3686	0.0030
LT1=50	11.4754	0.0013	3.3666	0.0023	0.3662	0.0021
LT2=50	11.4779	0.0030	3.3693	0.0022	0.3662	0.0015
RQMC						
	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE	Price	RMSE
Cholesky	11.5890	0.0033	3.4351	0.0049	0.3605	0.0035
PCA	11.59000	0.00039	3.4444	0.0015	0.3662	0.0011
LT1=50	11.59100	0.00025	3.44360	0.00039	0.36673	0.00034
LT2=50	11.59200	0.00036	3.44440	0.00033	0.36599	0.00034

Table 6: Uncorrelation Case: Estimated Prices and Errors.

we only consider a 50-dimensional Sobol' sequence without using the complete LSS.

Our framework is more extreme and the LT provides the same efficiency for all the strike prices and all correlations considered. In contrast, the PCA approach gives high improvements only in the correlation case.

The general and the Asian options settings of the LT decompositions are almost equally performing with the latter one giving slightly better results.

We can conclude that the LT is the best decomposition method and tremendously enhances QMC simulations because it optimally reduces the effective dimension of the problem.

The LT construction can be made faster from the computational point of view, provided we implement the QR decomposition described in the appendix.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we investigate the accuracy of the LT, introduced by Imai and Tan, both from the computational and the accuracy points of view. In particular, we implement a numerical procedure based on the QR factorization that realize the LT decomposition fast. Moreover, we extensively investigate the improvements the LT gives to QMC methods that is sensitive to the effective dimension of the problem.

As a numerical test we launch a high-dimensional simulation with the same set of parameters as in Imai and Tan [8] in order to price Asian basket options.

Our setting is more extreme than the one discussed in the cited references. We do not rely on the complete LSS high-dimensional extension of the features of the QMC but we use a lower dimensional scrambled Sobol' sequence only, and pad the remaining ones out with LHS.

We compare these results with those published by Imai and Tan [8] and those we found when using different decompositions and different random number generators.

The LT construction provides the best accuracy with respect to the standard Cholesky approach and the PCA decomposition.

It provides considerable improvements even when simulations are carried out with a partial RQMC method. The LT accuracy is still notably better than the one we found

with the complete LHS. In particular, we attain RMSEs of the same order as those presented by Imai and Tan.

Moreover, the fast QR decomposition we implement gives an improvement of a factor 30 in terms of computational time compared to the results presented in Imai and Tan [8] calculated with a slower computer.

PCA decomposition enhances QMC simulations but still requires a high computational burden when time-dependent volatilities are considered and does not give the versatility to find a suboptimal matrix without introducing bias (see Sabino [13] for details) .

Our QR-implementation makes the LT more efficient and computationally more convenient while maintaining its versatility for different problems.

8 Appendix

8.1 The QR Method

The QR factorization of an m -by- n matrix A is given by:

$$A = QR \quad (45)$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is orthogonal and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is upper triangular. A fundamental result is that if A has full column rank, then the first n columns of Q form an orthonormal basis of $\text{ran}(A)$. As a consequence, the QR factorization provides a way to return an orthonormal basis for a set of (independent) vectors. Different approaches can be chosen to calculate the QR decomposition such as the Householder and Givens transformations (see Golub, Van Loan [5] as a fundamental reference).

The former transformations are rank-two corrections of the identity of the form:

$$G(i, k, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots & 0 & \vdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \cos \theta & \cdots & \sin \theta & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & -\sin \theta & \cdots & \cos \theta & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} i \\ \\ k \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{matrix} \quad (46)$$

$$i \quad k \quad (47)$$

$G(i, k, \theta)$ performs a counterclockwise rotation of θ radians in the (i, k) plane.

Householder and Givens transformations are orthogonal transformations constructed in order to introduce zeros in a vector. Indeed, suppose we are given with $\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we can find H and G , the Householder and Given Rotation, respectively, that annihilate the k -th component of \mathbf{x} :

$$H^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}, y_k = 0 \quad (48)$$

$$G^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}, y_k = 0 \quad (49)$$

The following scheme illustrates the idea for QR factorization with Givens rotations:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} x & x & x \\ 0 & x & x \\ 0 & x & x \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{(2,3)G_1^T} A = \begin{bmatrix} x & x & x \\ 0 & x & x \\ 0 & 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 & x \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{(3,4)G_2^T} G_1^T A = R$$

Here we have highlighted the 2-vectors that define the underlying Given rotations. Generally $Q = G_1 \cdots G_n$ where n is the total number of rotations and $R = Q^T A$.

Consider $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, its QR decomposition $A = Q_A R_A$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n+1)}$ with the first n columns equal to A , Q_B and R_B . The QR decomposition of B can be easily obtained from Q_A and R_A .

Denote \mathbf{b} the last column of B , so that $B = [A \ \mathbf{b}]$ it leads to $Q_A^T B = [R_A \ Q_A^T \mathbf{b}] = \tilde{R}_B$. \tilde{R}_B has the following form:

$$\tilde{R}_B = \begin{bmatrix} x & x & x & x \\ 0 & x & x & x \\ 0 & 0 & x & x \\ 0 & 0 & x & x \\ 0 & 0 & x & x \end{bmatrix}. \quad (50)$$

In order to obtain the complete QR factorization of B we only need to find t Givens transformations G_1, \dots, G_t that introduce zeros in the n -th column making $R_B = G_t^T, \dots, G_1^T \tilde{R}_B$ upper triangular.

Summarizing $Q_B = G_1, \dots, G_t Q_A$ and $R_B = G_t^T, \dots, G_1^T Q_A B$.

References

- [1] R. Caflisch, W. Morokoff, and A. Owen. 1997. Valuation of mortgage-backed securities using Brownian bridges to reduce effective dimension. *Journal of Computational Finance* 1 (1):2746.
- [2] L.O. Dahl, F.E. Benth. 2001. Valuation of the Asian Basket Option with Quasi-Monte Carlo Techniques and Singular Value Decomposition. *Pure Mathematics*. 5.
- [3] L.O. Dahl, F.E. Benth. 2002. Fast Evaluation of the Asian Option by Singular Value Decomposition. *Proceedings of the Conference: Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2000*. K.-T. Fang, F.J.Hickernell, H. Niederreiter, ed.s. 201-214, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2002.
- [4] P. Glasserman. 2004. Monte Carlo Methods in Financial Engineering. Springer-Verlag New York. 2004.
- [5] G.H. Golub, C.F. Van Loan. 1996. Matrix Computations 3rd Ed. *The Johns Hopkins University Press* 1996.
- [6] J. Imai, K.S. Tan. 2002. Enhanced Quasi-Monte Carlo Method with Dimension Reduction. *Proceedings of the 2002 Winter Simulation Conference*. D.J. Medeiros, E. Ycesan, C.-H. Chen, J.L. Snowdon and J.M. Charnes, ed.s.
- [7] J. Imai, K.S. Tan. 2005. Minimizing Effective Dimension using Linear Transformation. *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2004*. H. Niederreiter editor, Springer-Verlag 2005.
- [8] J. Imai, K.S. Tan. 2007. A General Dimension Reduction Technique for Derivative Pricing. *Journal of Computational Finance*. Vol. 10/Number 2, Winter 2006/2007.
- [9] P. Jäckel. 2003. Monte Carlo Methods in Finance. *John Wiley & Sons* 2003.
- [10] H. Niederreiter. 1992. Random Number Generation and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods. *S.I.A.M., Philadelphia* 1992.
- [11] A. Owen. 1998. Latin Supercube Sampling for Very High-dimensional Simulations. *ACM Transaction on Modelling and Computer Simulation*. 8: 71-102.
- [12] A. Owen. 2002. Variance and Discrepancy with Alternative Scramblings. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic, Vol V*.
- [13] P. Sabino. 2007. Monte Carlo Methods and Path-Generation techniques for Pricing Multi-asset Path-dependent Options. *Internal Report. Rapporto 36/07. Dipartimento di Matematica. Università degli studi di Bari*.