

# DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

„Extraktion quantifizierbarer Information aus komplexen Systemen“

## Multilevel dual approach for pricing American style derivatives

D. Belomestny, J. Schoenmakers

Preprint 111



Edited by

AG Numerik/Optimierung  
Fachbereich 12 - Mathematik und Informatik  
Philipps-Universität Marburg  
Hans-Meerwein-Str.  
35032 Marburg

# DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm 1324

„Extraktion quantifizierbarer Information aus komplexen Systemen“

## Multilevel dual approach for pricing American style derivatives

D. Belomestny, J. Schoenmakers

Preprint 111



The consecutive numbering of the publications is determined by their chronological order.

The aim of this preprint series is to make new research rapidly available for scientific discussion. Therefore, the responsibility for the contents is solely due to the authors. The publications will be distributed by the authors.

# Multilevel dual approach for pricing American style derivatives

Denis Belomestny<sup>a</sup> and John Schoenmakers<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Duisburg-Essen University, Duisburg, Germany [denis.belomestny@uni-due.de](mailto:denis.belomestny@uni-due.de)

<sup>b</sup> Weierstraß Institute (WIAS), Berlin, Germany [schoenma@wias-berlin.de](mailto:schoenma@wias-berlin.de), J. S. acknowledges the financial support by the DFG Research Center MATHEON “Mathematics for Key Technologies” in Berlin.

In this article we propose a novel approach to reduce the computational complexity of the dual method for pricing American options. We consider a sequence of martingales that converges to a given target martingale and decompose the original dual representation into a sum of representations that correspond to different levels of approximation to the target martingale. By next replacing in each representation true conditional expectations with their Monte Carlo estimates, we arrive at what one may call a multilevel dual Monte Carlo algorithm. The analysis of this algorithm reveals that the computational complexity of getting the corresponding target upper bound, due to the target martingale, can be significantly reduced. In particular, it turns out that using our new approach, we may construct a multilevel version of the well-known nested Monte Carlo algorithm of Andersen and Broadie (2004) that is, regarding complexity, virtually equivalent to a non-nested algorithm. The performance of this multilevel algorithm is illustrated by a numerical example.

**Keywords:** optimal stopping, dual approach, multilevel Monte Carlo

**AMS Subject Classification:** 62L15, 65C05, 91B28

## 1 Introduction

Efficient methods for pricing high-dimensional American options have been a challenge for decades. While for a low or moderate dimensional underlying process, deterministic (PDE) based methods may be applicable, for higher dimensions Monte Carlo simulation based methods are virtually the only way out. Besides the absence of curse of dimensionality, Monte Carlo methods are quite popular because of their genericity. In the nineties a number of regression methods for constructing “good” exercise policies, hence price lower bounds, were introduced and studied in the literature (see Carriere (1996), Longstaff and Schwartz (2001), and Tsitsiklis and Van Roy (1999)). Among various other developments, we mention the stochastic mesh method of Broadie and Glasserman (2004), the quantization method by Bally and Pages (2003), and the policy iteration method by Kolodko and Schoenmakers (2006). The later method may

be effectively combined with the Longstaff-Schwartz approach as presented in Bender et al. (2008).

The aforementioned methods have in common that they provide an exercise policy for the American product. Based on this policy one may simulate a lower bound for its price. This is what is called the primal approach. A new direction in Monte Carlo simulation of American options was the dual approach, developed by Rogers (2002) and independently by Haugh and Kogan (2004), related to earlier ideas in Davis and Karatzas (1994). In this approach one looks for a “good” martingale rather than a “good” stopping time. Based on this martingale the price of an American derivative may be bounded from above. In fact, this price upper bound may be represented by a “look-back” option due to the difference of the cash-flow and the martingale. Meanwhile, several numerical algorithms for computing dual upper bounds have appeared in the literature. Probably one of the most popular ones is the method of Andersen and Broadie (2004) (see also Kolodko and Schoenmakers (2004) for an extension). A drawback of this method is its computational complexity due to the need of nested Monte Carlo simulation however. As a remedy to this issue, Belomestny et al. (2009) proposed a dual simulation algorithm which does not require nested simulation and uses regression to approximate the integrand in a martingale representation. Kohler et al. (2010) proposed a regression based variance reduction method for the nested dual approach. Another non-nested regression based dual algorithm was proposed in Schoenmakers and Huang (2011) in the context of a study of optimal dual martingales (approximated by “low variance” martingales). Furthermore, in Belomestny (2011) an efficient dual algorithm is constructed which is based on convex optimization and empirical variance penalization. The main goal of this paper is to enhance the efficiency of dual algorithms by using a “multi-level” idea in the spirit of Giles (2008). In Giles (2008) a multilevel Monte Carlo estimator is presented, which is based on approximate solutions of a stochastic differential equation given a sequence of different time discretisation steps. For instance, by this method the complexity of simulating a European option can be significantly reduced. In this paper we apply the multilevel idea to a sequence of martingales (rather than time discretisation steps). Based on this sequence of martingales we will construct a new multilevel dual estimator for the American option. As a special case we so obtain a multilevel version of the Andersen-Broadie algorithm. Under some assumptions we will prove that the complexity of this algorithm is (almost) equivalent to a non-nested Monte Carlo algorithm. As a byproduct of our complexity analysis we derive, to our knowledge for the first time, convergence rates of the Andersen-Broadie algorithm. In particular, our analysis reveals that, under some assumptions, the upper bias induced by inner simulations converges to zero at rate  $O(1/k)$ , with  $k$  being the number of inner simulations. The latter feature was observed empirically in the early literature (see, e.g., Kolodko and Schoenmakers (2004)), but has not yet got theoretical explanation.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we recap the primal and dual approaches for optimal stopping in the context of American options. The main setup and prerequisites including a key Theorem 5 are presented in Section 3. After a complexity analysis of the standard dual approach in Section 4 we present and analyze the multi-level dual estimator in Section 5. Section 6 concludes with a detailed numerical study of the multilevel version of the Andersen-Broadie algorithm.

## 2 Primal and Dual valuation of American options

Let  $(Z_j)_{j \geq 0}$  be a nonnegative adapted process on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_j)_{j \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$  representing the discounted payoff of an American option, so that the holder of the option receives  $Z_j$  if the option is exercised at time  $j \in \{0, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}$  with  $\mathcal{J} \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . The pricing of American options can be formulated as a primal-dual problem. Let  $Y_j$  denote the time  $j$  solution to this problem. The primal representation corresponds to the following optimal stopping problems:

$$Y_j^* = \max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}[j, \dots, \mathcal{J}]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_j}[Z_\tau], \quad j = 0, \dots, \mathcal{J},$$

where  $\mathcal{T}[j, \dots, \mathcal{J}]$  is the set of  $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping times taking values in  $\{j, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}$ . During the nineties the primal approach was the only method available. More recently a quite different “dual” approach has been discovered by Rogers (2002) and Haugh and Kogan (2004). The next theorem summarizes their results.

**Theorem 1** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the space of adapted martingales, then we have the following dual representation for the value process  $Y_j^*$*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_j^* &= \inf_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_j} \left[ \max_{s \in \{j, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}} (Z_s - M_s + M_j) \right] \\ &= \max_{s \in \{j, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}} (Z_s - M_s^* + M_j^*) \quad a.s., \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(1) \quad Y_j^* = Y_0^* + M_j^* - A_j^*$$

is the (unique) Doob decomposition of the supermartingale  $Y_j^*$ . That is,  $M^*$  is a martingale and  $A^*$  is an increasing process with  $M_0 = A_0 = 0$  such that (1) holds.

**Remark 2** *In Schoenmakers and Huang (2011) it is shown that in general there are infinitely many martingales  $M^\circ$  such that*

$$Y_j^* = \max_{s \in \{j, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}} (Z_s - M_s^\circ + M_j^\circ) \quad a.s.$$

Theorem 1 implies that, for an arbitrarily chosen martingale  $M$  with  $M_0 = 0$ , the value

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{s \in \{0, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}} (Z_s - M_s) \right]$$

defines an upper bound for the price of American option  $Y_0^*$ , and the upper bound will be tight if the chosen martingale  $M$  is close to the Doob martingale part  $M^*$  of the discounted true value process  $Y_j^*$ , which we shall refer to as the “optimal” martingale. Not surprisingly, finding such an optimal martingale is no easier than solving the original stopping problem. The so-called martingale duality approach aims at finding a martingale that approximates the “optimal” martingale and then use this approximation to compute an upper bound for the price of the American option by Monte Carlo. There are several methods known for approximating the “optimal” martingale  $M^*$ . In Andersen and Broadie (2004) the Doob martingale part of a given approximation to the Snell envelope is constructed by sub-simulations. In this way quite tight lower and upper bounds for a number of test examples were obtained. However, as we will see later on, the complexity of this method can be rather high, especially if a high precision of calculation is required. Therefore the complexity reduction of the dual algorithms is of primal importance and is one of the main aims of this paper.

### 3 Main setup and prerequisites

Let  $(M^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of martingales starting at 0 ( $M_0^k = 0$ ) with respect to an enlarged probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{F}'_j)_{j \geq 0}, P)$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_j \subset \mathcal{F}'_j$  for each  $j$ . It is supposed that the sequence  $(M^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges in some sense to a target martingale  $M$  which is  $\mathcal{F}$ -adapted. We assume that

**(AC)** the numerical complexity of obtaining a single realization of  $M_j^k$  is of order  $O(k)$  for each  $j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{J}$ ,

**(AA)** there exists an  $\mathcal{F}$ -adapted martingale  $M$  such that

$$\max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ M_j^k - M_j \right] \right| \leq Ak^{-\alpha}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j^k - M_j)^2 \right] \leq Bk^{-\beta},$$

almost surely for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , some  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\beta > 0$ ,  $A > 0$  and  $B > 0$ .

**Remark 3** If  $\mathcal{J}$  is finite, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j^k - M_j)^2 \right] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ (M_j^k - M_j)^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{J} \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ (M_j^k - M_j)^2 \right]$$

and the second condition in (AA) can be formulated in terms of expectations  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ (M_j^k - M_j)^2 \right]$ .

Our aim is to approximate the target upper bound

$$Y(M) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (Z_j - M_j) \right] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}(M)]$$

with

$$\mathcal{Z}(M) = \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (Z_j - M_j).$$

Note that any  $\mathcal{F}$ -stopping time  $\tau$  is also an  $\mathcal{F}'$ -stopping time, so by Doob's sampling theorem  $\mathbb{E} \left[ M_{\tau}^k \right] = 0$ , and we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0^* &= \sup_{\mathcal{F}\text{-stopping times } \tau} \mathbb{E} [Z_{\tau}] \\ &= \sup_{\mathcal{F}\text{-stopping times } \tau} \mathbb{E} \left[ Z_{\tau} - M_{\tau}^k \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (Z_j - M_j^k) \right] = Y(M^k), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $Y(M^k)$  is an upper bound for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that  $\widetilde{M}_j^k := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_j} \left[ M_j^k \right]$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, \mathcal{J}$ , is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -martingale, and if  $M^k$  satisfies for each  $j$ ,

$$\widetilde{M}_j^k = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ M_j^k \right],$$



then  $Y(M^k)$  is upper biased with respect to  $Y(\widetilde{M}^k)$ . Indeed, by Jensen's inequality, we then have

$$Y(M^k) \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \left( Z_j - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ M_j^k \right] \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \left( Z_j - \widetilde{M}_j^k \right) \right] = Y(\widetilde{M}^k).$$

Introduce the random sets

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{j : Z_j - M_j = \mathcal{Z}(M)\}, \quad \mathcal{Q}^k = \{j : Z_j - M_j^k = \mathcal{Z}(M^k)\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and define the  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable random variable

$$\Lambda := \min_{j \notin \mathcal{Q}} (\mathcal{Z}(M) - Z_j + M_j),$$

with  $\Lambda := +\infty$  if  $\mathcal{Q} = \{0, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}$ . Let us introduce the following two conditions.

**(AL)**  $\Lambda$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda^{-1}] < \infty$ ,

**(AQ)**  $\#\mathcal{Q} = 1$  a.s.

**Remark 4** If  $M = M^*$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &= \min_{j \notin \mathcal{Q}} (Y_0^* - Z_j + M_j) \\ &= \min_{j \notin \mathcal{Q}} (Y_j^* - Z_j + A_j) \\ &\geq \min_{j \notin \mathcal{Q}} (Y_j^* - Z_j) \geq \min_{\{j: Y_j^* > Z_j\}} (Y_j^* - Z_j). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the condition (AL) is fulfilled if

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{P}(Y_j^* - Z_j < \delta | Y_j^* > Z_j) \lesssim \delta^{q+1}, \quad \delta \rightarrow 0$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{J}$  and some  $q > 0$ . The condition (2) bounds the probability of staying in the  $\delta$ -vicinity of the exercise boundary  $\{Y_j^* \leq Z_j\}$  in the case of continuation and is similar to the so-called margin condition in Belomestny (2011). As we will see, (2) leads to faster convergence rates of the standard Andersen-Broadie dual algorithm. It is easy to construct examples showing that the assumption (AL) is not always fulfilled. Take  $\mathcal{J} = 1$ ,  $Z_0 = 0$ ,  $Z_1 = \zeta$  for some random variable  $\zeta$  with absolutely continuous density, and  $M_0 = M_1 = 0$ . Then, obviously,  $\Lambda = |\zeta|$  and  $\#\mathcal{Q} = 1$  a.s., hence (AQ) holds. Now, if  $\zeta$  has a density not vanishing at 0, then (AL) does not hold. If, on the contrary, the density of  $\zeta$  behaves like  $O(|z|^q)$  for some  $q > 0$  as  $|z| \rightarrow 0$ , then (AL) holds (cf. (2)).

**Theorem 5** Under assumption (AA) it holds

$$(3) \quad |\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M)]| \leq Ck^{-\gamma}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left( \mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M) \right)^2 \leq Bk^{-\beta}$$

with  $\gamma = \beta/2$  and some  $C > 0$ . If additionally the assumptions (AL) and (AQ) are satisfied, then (3) holds true with  $\gamma = \min\{\alpha, \beta\}$ .

**Proof.** On the one hand, it holds for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $j_k^{\max} := \min \mathcal{Q}^k$

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M) &= \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (Z_j - M_j^k) - \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (Z_j - M_j) \\ &\leq M_{j_k^{\max}} - M_{j_k^{\max}}^k, \quad \text{a.s.,} \end{aligned}$$

and on the other hand, we get for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{Q} =: \{j^{\max}\}$ ,

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M) \geq M_{j^{\max}} - M_{j^{\max}}^k.$$

By (4) and (5) we thus have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M) \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \left( M_j - M_j^k \right)^2 \right] \leq Bk^{-\beta}.$$

Further, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have similarly,

$$|\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M)]| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \left( M_j - M_j^k \right)^2 \right] \right\}^{1/2} \right] \leq \sqrt{B} \cdot k^{-\beta/2}.$$

Let us now turn to the case where assumptions (AL) and (AQ) are fulfilled. From (4) we obtain for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[\mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M)] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ M_{j_k^{\max}} - M_{j_k^{\max}}^k \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ \left( M_{j_k^{\max}} - M_{j_k^{\max}}^k \right) 1_{j_k^{\max} \neq j^{\max}} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ M_{j^{\max}} - M_{j^{\max}}^k \right] =: (I) + (II). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $Z_{j_k^{\max}} - M_{j_k^{\max}}^k \geq Z_{j^{\max}} - M_{j^{\max}}^k$  and hence

$$\{j_k^{\max} \neq j^{\max}\} \subset \left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j - M_j^k + M_{j^{\max}}^k - M_{j^{\max}}) \geq \Lambda \right\}.$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(j_k^{\max} \neq j^{\max}) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left( \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j - M_j^k + M_{j^{\max}}^k - M_{j^{\max}}) \geq \Lambda \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left( \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j - M_j^k) \geq \Lambda/2 \right) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left( M_{j^{\max}}^k - M_{j^{\max}} \geq \Lambda/2 \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left( \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j - M_j^k) \geq \Lambda/2 \right) + \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left( \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j^k - M_j) \geq \Lambda/2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

By (AA) and the conditional Markov inequality it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left( \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j - M_j^k) \geq \Lambda/2 \right) \leq \frac{4B}{\Lambda^2} k^{-\beta}, \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}} \left( \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (M_j^k - M_j) \geq \Lambda/2 \right) \leq \frac{4B}{\Lambda^2} k^{-\beta}.$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(j_k^{\max} \neq j^{\max}) \leq \frac{8B}{\Lambda^2} k^{-\beta}$$

for all  $k$ . Furthermore, we have by (AA) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ \left( M_{j_k^{\max}} - M_{j_k^{\max}}^k \right) 1_{j_k^{\max} \neq j^{\max}} \right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(j_k^{\max} \neq j^{\max})} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left[ \max_{j=1, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \left( M_j - M_j^k \right)^2 \right]} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}B}{\Lambda} k^{-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4) with (5) and using assumption (AA) again for the term (II), we arrive at the inequality

$$-Ak^{-\alpha} \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}(M^k) - \mathcal{Z}(M)] \leq 2\sqrt{2}B \mathbb{E}[\Lambda^{-1}]k^{-\beta} + Ak^{-\alpha} \leq Ck^{-\gamma}$$

with  $\gamma = \min\{\alpha, \beta\}$  and some  $C > 0$ . ■

**Remark 6** For the Andersen-Broadie algorithm, where the sequence of martingales  $(M^k)$  is constructed using subsimulations, it is not difficult to show that the assumption (AA) is fulfilled with  $\alpha = \beta = 1$ . Hence, under the additional assumptions (AL) and (AQ) we have by Theorem 5 that the bias of the Andersen-Broadie estimator is of order  $O(1/k)$ . This rate was experimentally found in Kolodko and Schoenmakers (2004), but not proved by now to the best of our knowledge.

## 4 Standard dual approach

Fix some natural numbers  $N$  and  $K$ , and consider the estimator

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{N,K} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} (Z_j^{(n)} - M_j^{K,(n)}) \\ &=: \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathcal{Z}^{(n)}(M^K) \end{aligned}$$

based on a set of trajectories

$$\left\{ (Z_j^{(n)}, M_j^{K,(n)}), n = 1, \dots, N, j = 0, \dots, \mathcal{J} \right\}$$

of the vector process  $(Z, M^K)$ .

### Complexity analysis

By Theorem 5, for some  $C > 0$  it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [Y^{N,K} - Y(M)]^2 &\leq N^{-1} \text{Var}(\mathcal{Z}(M^K)) + CK^{-2\gamma} \\ &=: N^{-1}v_K + CK^{-2\gamma}, \quad K \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In order to get  $\sqrt{\mathbb{E} [Y^{N,K} - Y(M)]^2} \leq \varepsilon$ , we may take

$$K = \frac{(2C)^{1/2\gamma}}{\varepsilon^{1/\gamma}}$$

and then

$$N = \frac{2v_K}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Assuming that  $v_K$  is non-increasing, the required computation time for reaching accuracy  $\varepsilon$ , hence the complexity, is then given, up to a constant, by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{N,K}(\varepsilon) &:= NK = \frac{2v_K}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{(2C)^{1/2\gamma}}{\varepsilon^{1/\gamma}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{v \left\lfloor \frac{(2C)^{1/2\gamma}}{\varepsilon^{1/\gamma}} \right\rfloor}{\varepsilon^{2+1/\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

with  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  denoting the largest integer which is smaller than or equal to  $x$ .

In the usual case, where  $M$  is the Doob martingale of some approximation  $Y$  to the Snell envelope  $Y^*$ , we have that  $\text{Var}(\mathcal{Z}(M)) > 0$  and  $v_K \rightarrow v_\infty \neq 0$  leading to  $\mathcal{C}^{N,K}(\varepsilon)$  of order  $O(1/\varepsilon^{2+1/\gamma})$ .

**Remark 7** *If  $\text{Var}(\mathcal{Z}(M)) = 0$  (e.g., the target martingale  $M$  is the Doob martingale of  $Y^*$ ) we have (under the assumptions of Theorem 5),*

$$v_K = \text{Var}(\mathcal{Z}(M^K)) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{Z}(M^K) - \mathcal{Z}(M))^2 \leq BK^{-\beta},$$

and as a result

$$\mathcal{C}^{N,K}(\varepsilon) \lesssim \frac{B}{(2C)^{\beta/2\gamma}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2+(1-\beta)/\gamma}}.$$

That is, if  $\beta \geq 1$  the complexity is even less than or equal to the complexity of the plain Monte Carlo algorithm !

## 5 Multilevel dual algorithm

Fix some natural number  $L > 0$ . Let  $\mathbf{k} = (k_0, \dots, k_L)$  be a sequence of natural numbers satisfying  $1 \leq k_0 < k_1 < \dots < k_L$ . Write

$$\begin{aligned} (6) \quad Y(M^{k_L}) &= Y(M^{k_0}) + \sum_{l=1}^L [Y(M^{k_l}) - Y(M^{k_{l-1}})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}(M^{k_0})] + \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}})]. \end{aligned}$$

For a given sequence  $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, \dots, n_L)$  with  $1 \leq n_0 < \dots < n_L$ , we first simulate the initial set of trajectories

$$\left\{ \left( Z_j^{(i)}, M_j^{k_0, (i)} \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n_0, \quad j = 0, \dots, \mathcal{J} \right\}$$

of the vector process  $(Z, M^{k_0})$ , and then for each level  $l = 1, \dots, L$  independently a set of trajectories

$$\left\{ \left( Z_j^{(i)}, M_j^{k_{l-1}, (i)}, M_j^{k_l, (i)} \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n_l, \quad j = 0, \dots, \mathcal{J} \right\}$$

of the vector process  $(Z, M^{k_{l-1}}, M^{k_l})$ . Based on these simulations we consider the following approximation of (6)

$$Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}} := \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mathcal{Z}^{(i)}(M^{k_0}) + \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \left[ \mathcal{Z}^{(i)}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}^{(i)}(M^{k_{l-1}}) \right]$$

with  $\mathcal{Z}^{(i)}(M^k) := \max_{j=0, \dots, \mathcal{J}} \left( Z_j^{(i)} - M_j^{k, (i)} \right)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n_l$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $M^{k, (i)}$  denotes the  $i$ -th simulated trajectory of the martingale  $M^k$ .

### Complexity analysis

For the bias of the multilevel estimator we obtain by Theorem 5

$$(7) \quad \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}} \right] - Y(M) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_L}) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{Z}(M) \right] \right| \leq C k_L^{-\gamma}$$

and for the variance we have

$$(8) \quad \text{Var} \left[ Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}} \right] = n_0^{-1} \text{Var} \left[ \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_0}) \right] + \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{1}{n_l} \text{Var} \left[ \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}}) \right].$$

Note that for any  $l > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[ \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}}) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}}) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}}) - \mathcal{Z}(M) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2(Bk_l^{-\beta} + Bk_{l-1}^{-\beta}) \leq 4Bk_l^{-\beta} \leq \tilde{B}k_l^{-\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 5. For notational convenience we assume that  $\tilde{B}$  is such that  $\text{Var}[\mathcal{Z}(M^{k_0})] \leq \tilde{B}k_0^{-\beta}$ .

**Theorem 8** (*complexity theorem*) *Suppose that  $k_l = k_0 \kappa^l$  for some integer  $k_0, \kappa > 1$ , and  $l = 0, \dots, L$ . Assume (AA) and suppose that  $\gamma = \min(\alpha, \beta/2) \geq 1/2$ . Fix some  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  and set*

$$(9) \quad L = \left\lceil \frac{-\ln \frac{k_0^\gamma \varepsilon}{C\sqrt{2}}}{\gamma \ln \kappa} \right\rceil.$$

With  $\lceil x \rceil$  denoting the first integer which is larger than or equal to  $x$ , let

$$n_l = \begin{cases} \left\lceil 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{-\beta} \kappa^{L(1-\beta)/2} (1 - \kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-1} \kappa^{-l(1+\beta)/2} \right\rceil, & \beta < 1, \\ \left\lceil 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} (L+1) k_0^{-1} \kappa^{-l} \right\rceil, & \beta = 1, \\ \left\lceil 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{-\beta} (1 - \kappa^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} \kappa^{-l(1+\beta)/2} \right\rceil, & \beta > 1. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$(10) \quad \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Y^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{k}} - Y(M)]^2} \leq \varepsilon,$$

while the computational complexity of the estimator  $Y^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{k}}$  is, up to a constant, given by

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{k}}(\varepsilon) := \sum_{l=0}^L k_l n_l = \begin{cases} O(\varepsilon^{-2-(1-\beta)/\gamma}), & \beta < 1, \\ O(\varepsilon^{-2} \ln^2 \varepsilon), & \beta = 1, \\ O(\varepsilon^{-2}), & \beta > 1. \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Due to (7) and (9), we have in any case

$$(11) \quad \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ Y^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{k}} \right] - Y(M) \right| \leq C k_0^{-\gamma} \kappa^{-L\gamma} = \varepsilon/\sqrt{2}.$$

i) Case  $\beta < 1$  : We have by (8),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[ Y^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{k}} \right] &\leq \tilde{B} \sum_{l=0}^L \tilde{B}^{-1} 2^{-1} \varepsilon^2 k_0^\beta \kappa^{-L(1-\beta)/2} (1 - \kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2}) \kappa^{l(1+\beta)/2} k_0^{-\beta} \kappa^{-\beta l} \\ &= 2^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^L \varepsilon^2 \kappa^{-L(1-\beta)/2} (1 - \kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2}) \frac{\kappa^{(L+1)(1-\beta)/2} - 1}{\kappa^{(1-\beta)/2} - 1} \frac{\kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2}}{\kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2}} \\ &= 2^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^L \varepsilon^2 \kappa^{-L(1-\beta)/2} \left( \kappa^{(L+1)(1-\beta)/2} - 1 \right) \kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2} \\ &= 2^{-1} \varepsilon^2 \left( 1 - \kappa^{-(L+1)(1-\beta)/2} \right) \leq \varepsilon^2/2, \end{aligned}$$

and (10) straightforwardly follows from (11). The order of  $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{k}}(\varepsilon)$  follows from the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^L k_l n_l &\leq \sum_{l=0}^L k_0 \kappa^l \left( 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{-\beta} \kappa^{L(1-\beta)/2} (1 - \kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-1} \kappa^{-l(1+\beta)/2} + 1 \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^L \kappa^l \left( 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{1-\beta} \kappa^{L(1-\beta)/2} (1 - \kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-1} \kappa^{-l(1+\beta)/2} + k_0 \right) \\ &= k_0^{1-\beta} \left( 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} \kappa^{L(1-\beta)/2} \left( \kappa^{L(1-\beta)/2} - \kappa^{-(1-\beta)/2} \right) + k_0 \frac{\kappa^{L+1} - 1}{\kappa - 1} \right) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{1-\beta} \kappa^{L(1-\beta)} + k_0 \kappa^{L+1} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{1-\beta} \kappa^{\left( \frac{-\ln \frac{k_0^\gamma \varepsilon}{C\sqrt{2}}}{\gamma \ln \kappa} + 1 \right) (1-\beta)} + k_0 \kappa^{\frac{-\ln \frac{k_0^\gamma \varepsilon}{C\sqrt{2}}}{\gamma \ln \kappa} + 2} \\ &= 2\tilde{B} \frac{(C\sqrt{2})^{(1-\beta)/\gamma}}{\varepsilon^{2+(1-\beta)/\gamma}} \kappa^{(1-\beta)} + \frac{(C\sqrt{2})^{1/\gamma}}{\varepsilon^{1/\gamma}} \kappa^2 \\ &= O(\varepsilon^{-2-(1-\beta)/\gamma}), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

(note that  $\gamma \geq 1/2$ ).

ii) Case  $\beta = 1$  : By a straightforward calculation, we obtain again

$$\text{Var} \left[ Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}} \right] \leq \varepsilon^2/2,$$

as well as (10) via (11). For  $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}(\varepsilon)$  we now have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}(\varepsilon) &\leq \sum_{l=0}^L k_0 \kappa^l \left( 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B}(L+1) k_0^{-1} \kappa^{-l} + 1 \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^L \left( 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B}(L+1) + k_0 \kappa^l \right) \\ &= 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B}(L+1)^2 + k_0 \frac{\kappa^{L+1} - 1}{\kappa - 1} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B}(L+1)^2 + k_0 \kappa^{L+1} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} \left( \frac{-\ln \frac{k_0^\gamma \varepsilon}{C\sqrt{2}}}{\gamma \ln \kappa} + 2 \right)^2 + \frac{(C\sqrt{2})^{1/\gamma}}{\varepsilon^{1/\gamma}} \kappa^2 \\ &= O(\varepsilon^{-2} \ln^2 \varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

since  $\gamma \geq 1/2$ .

iii) Case  $\beta > 1$  : For the variance we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[ Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}} \right] &\leq \tilde{B} \sum_{l=0}^L 2^{-1} \varepsilon^2 \tilde{B}^{-1} k_0^\beta (1 - \kappa^{-(\beta-1)/2}) \kappa^{l(1-\beta)/2} k_0^{-\beta} \\ &= 2^{-1} \varepsilon^2 (1 - \kappa^{-(\beta-1)/2}) \frac{1 - \kappa^{(L+1)(1-\beta)/2}}{1 - \kappa^{(1-\beta)/2}} \\ &= 2^{-1} \varepsilon^2 \left( 1 - \kappa^{(L+1)(1-\beta)/2} \right) \leq \varepsilon^2/2 \end{aligned}$$

and (10) holds in view of (11). Finally, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}(\varepsilon) &\leq \sum_{l=0}^L k_0 \kappa^l \left( 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{-\beta} (1 - \kappa^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} \kappa^{-l(1+\beta)/2} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{1-\beta} \sum_{l=0}^L (1 - \kappa^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} \kappa^{l(1-\beta)/2} + k_0 \kappa^{L+1} \\ &= 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{1-\beta} \left( 1 - \kappa^{(L+1)(1-\beta)/2} \right) + k_0 \kappa^{L+1} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{-2} \tilde{B} k_0^{1-\beta} + \frac{(C\sqrt{2})^{1/\gamma}}{\varepsilon^{1/\gamma}} \kappa^2 \\ &= O(\varepsilon^{-2} \ln^2 \varepsilon), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\gamma \geq 1/2$ . ■

## 6 Numerical example: Bermudan max-call

This is a benchmark example studied in Glasserman (2003), Haugh and Kogan (2004) and Rogers (2002) among others. Specifically, a model with  $D$  identical distributed assets is considered where each underlying has dividend yield  $\delta$ . The risk-neutral dynamics of the assets are given by

$$(12) \quad dX_t^d = (r - \delta)X_t^d dt + \sigma X_t^d dW_t^d, \quad d = 1, \dots, D,$$

where  $W_t^d$ ,  $d = 1, \dots, D$ , are independent one dimensional Brownian motions and  $r, \delta, \sigma$  are constants. As in the mentioned literature we take  $r = 0.05$ ,  $\delta = 0.1$ , and  $\sigma = 0.2$ . At any time  $t \in \{T_0, \dots, T_{\mathcal{J}}\}$  the holder of the option may exercise it and receive the payoff

$$Z_j = h(X_{T_j}) = (\max(X_{T_j}^1, \dots, X_{T_j}^D) - \kappa)^+.$$

We consider an example when  $T_j = jT/\mathcal{J}$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, \mathcal{J}$ , with  $T = 3$  and  $\mathcal{J} = 9$ . In our implementation study we first construct a family of stopping rules  $\tau_j : \Omega \rightarrow \{j, \dots, \mathcal{J}\}$  by the Longstaff-Schwartz algorithm. This basically boils down to choosing a basis  $(\phi_k(t, x), k = 1, \dots, K)$  and estimating vectors of regression coefficients  $(\alpha_l \in \mathbb{R}^K, l = 0, \dots, \mathcal{J})$ . Once the coefficients  $\{\alpha_l\}$  are estimated, we can define

$$\tau_j := \min\{j \leq l \leq \mathcal{J} : \alpha_l^\top \phi(T_l, X_{T_l}) \leq Z_l\}$$

and

$$Y_j := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_j}[Z_{\tau_j}], \quad j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{J}.$$

In our example with  $D = 2$  the following  $K = 4$  basis functions are used:

$$\psi_1(t, x) = 1, \quad \psi_2(t, x) = x^1, \quad \psi_3(t, x) = x^2, \quad \psi_4(t, x) = h(x).$$

We stress that stopping rules  $\{\tau_j\}$  are estimated only once and remain fixed thereafter. The target martingale  $M$  is thus defined by  $M_0 = 0$ ,

$$(13) \quad M_j = M_{j-1} + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_j}[Z_{\tau_j}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{j-1}}[Z_{\tau_j}], \quad j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{J},$$

hence, following the description of the Andersen and Broadie (2004) algorithm in Glasserman (2003), we have

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} M_j &= \sum_{p=1}^j (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_p}[Z_{\tau_p}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{p-1}}[Z_{\tau_p}]) \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^j \{1_{\tau_p=p} (Z_p - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{p-1}}[Z_{\tau_p}]) + 1_{\tau_p > p} 1_{p < \mathcal{J}} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_p}[Z_{\tau_{p+1}}] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{p-1}}[Z_{\tau_p}])\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to approximate the target martingale  $M$  corresponding to (an outer) trajectory  $X$  we construct a sequence of martingales  $M^k$ , where each  $M^k$  is a martingale constructed via (14) by replacing the one-step conditional expectations  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_{p-1}}[Z_{\tau_p}]$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, \mathcal{J}$ , with their Monte Carlo approximations based on  $k$  (inner) trajectories. Fix some  $k_0, n_0, L \in \mathbb{N}$ , set  $\kappa = 2$ , and define

$$\begin{aligned} n_l &= n_0 \cdot \kappa^{-l}, \\ k_l &= k_0 \cdot \kappa^l \end{aligned}$$



for any  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the numerical complexity of the multi-level estimate  $Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}$  is given, up to a constant, by

$$\mathcal{C}_{ML} = n_0 k_0 + \sum_{l=1}^L n_l (k_l + k_{l-1}) = n_0 k_0 (1 + L(1 + \kappa^{-1})).$$

Let us compute now the variance of  $Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}] &= n_0^{-1} \text{Var}[\mathcal{Z}(M^{k_0})] + n_l^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^L \text{Var}(\mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}})) \\ &= n_0^{-1} \sigma^2(k_0) + n_0^{-1} k_0^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^L \mathfrak{V}_l, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma^2(k) := \text{Var}[\mathcal{Z}(M^k)]$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathfrak{V}_l := k_l \cdot \text{Var}(\mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}}))$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ . Based on 100000 paths of the process  $\mathcal{Z}(M^{k_l}) - \mathcal{Z}(M^{k_{l-1}})$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ , for different values  $k_0$ , we found  $\mathfrak{V}_l$  to be bounded by  $\mathfrak{V}_\infty = 1000$  for all  $l = 1, \dots, L$ , where  $\mathfrak{V}_\infty$  does not depend on  $k_0$ , but only on  $\kappa$ . Hence

$$\text{Var}[Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}] \leq n_0^{-1} \sigma^2(k_0) + n_0^{-1} k_0^{-1} L \mathfrak{V}_\infty.$$

Fix some  $n > 0$ , then the computational costs of the Andersen-Broadie algorithm based on  $n$  outer simulations and  $k$  inner simulations are proportional to

$$\mathcal{C}_{AB} = nk.$$

The variance of the estimate  $Y^{n, k}$  is given by

$$\text{Var}(Y^{n, k}) = n^{-1} \text{Var}(\mathcal{Z}(M^k)) = n^{-1} \sigma^2(k).$$

We have estimated  $\sigma^2(k)$  using  $10^6$  replications of the r.v.  $\mathcal{Z}(M^k)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, 100$ . As one can see from Figure 1 (right),  $\sigma(k) \rightarrow \sigma_\infty \approx 5.2$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . The bias of  $Y^{n, k}$ , can be written as

$$\mathcal{B}(k) := Y^{\infty, k} - Y^{\infty, \infty}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In Figure 1(left) the values  $\ln \mathcal{B}(k)$  are plotted on the log-scale, where in order to estimate the limit values  $Y^{\infty, k}$  and  $Y^{\infty, \infty} \approx 8.3231$ , we use  $10^6$  outer paths and 1000 inner paths. By fitting a straight line to the data  $(\ln(k), \ln(\mathcal{B}(k)))$ , we obtain

$$0 < \mathcal{B}(k) < \mu_\infty k^{-1}, \quad k > 10,$$

with  $\mu_\infty = \exp(2.5)$ . Note that the multi-level estimate  $Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}$  has, by construction, the same bias as  $Y^{n_L, k_L}$ . Now we choose  $L, n_0, k_0$  and  $n, k$  in such a way that the overall accuracy of both AB and ML dual estimates measured by  $\sqrt{\text{Var}[Y^{n, k}] + \mathcal{B}^2(k)}$  and  $\sqrt{\text{Var}[Y^{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{k}}] + \mathcal{B}^2(k_L)}$ , respectively, is bounded by  $\varepsilon$ . In the case of the AB dual estimate, it is enough to require

$$\left(\frac{\mu_\infty}{k}\right)^2 = n^{-1} \sigma^2(k) = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}$$

which leads to

$$n = \frac{2\sigma_\infty^2}{\varepsilon^2}, \quad k = \frac{\sqrt{2}\mu_\infty}{\varepsilon}$$




Figure 1: The functions  $\ln \mathcal{B}(k)$  and  $\sigma(k)$ .

for  $k$  large enough. For the ML algorithm we assume that

$$(15) \quad n_0^{-1} \sigma^2(k_0) = n_0^{-1} k_0^{-1} L \mathfrak{Y}_\infty = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4},$$

$$(16) \quad \frac{\mu_\infty}{k_L} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

From (15) we have

$$n_0 = 4\varepsilon^{-2} \sigma^2(k_0), \quad k_0 = L \mathfrak{Y}_\infty \sigma^{-2}(k_0)$$

and, due to (16), the parameter  $L$  is to be defined as (approximate) solution of the equation

$$L = \ln \left( \frac{\sqrt{2} \mu_\infty}{\varepsilon k_0} \right) \ln^{-1} \kappa = \ln \left( \frac{\sqrt{2} \mu_\infty \sigma^2(k_0)}{\varepsilon L \mathfrak{Y}_\infty} \right) \ln^{-1} \kappa.$$

Hence we solve

$$(17) \quad L = \ln \left( \frac{\sqrt{2} \theta}{\varepsilon L} \right) \ln^{-1} \kappa$$

with  $\theta = \mu_\infty \sigma_\infty^2 / \mathfrak{Y}_\infty$ , provided  $k_0$  is large enough. We thus have asymptotically,

$$L = L(\varepsilon) \asymp \ln^{-1} \kappa \ln \left( \frac{\sqrt{2} \theta}{\varepsilon} \right), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Let us finally compare the complexities of AB and ML algorithms for  $n_0, k_0, n, k$ , large enough. It holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\varepsilon) &= \frac{\mathcal{C}_{AB}(\varepsilon)}{\mathcal{C}_{ML}(\varepsilon)} = \frac{nk}{n_0 k_0 (1 + L(1 + \kappa^{-1}))} \\ &= \frac{\theta / \sqrt{2}}{L (1 + L(1 + \kappa^{-1})) \varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $L$  solves (17). As can be seen from the above formulas, the quantity  $\theta$  has a big impact on  $\mathcal{R}$ . In our example we have  $\theta \approx 0.3$ . The resulting functions  $L$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are reported in Figure 2.




Figure 2: The values  $L$  and  $R$  as functions of the precision  $\varepsilon$ .

By examining Figure 2 we conclude that (for this example) the use of the ML algorithm with  $L > 0$  is advantageous as soon as  $\varepsilon < 5 * 10^{-3}$ , i.e., in situations where relatively high precision is needed. The efficiency of ML dual approach can be further enhanced by using the same set of  $k_l$  inner trajectories to construct both  $M_j^{k_{l-1},(i)}$  and  $M_j^{k_l,(i)}$ . This modification leads to much smaller values of  $\mathfrak{V}_\infty$  ( $\mathfrak{V}_\infty = 350$  and consequently  $\theta = 0.87$  in our example). The resulting functions  $L(\varepsilon)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon)$  are depicted in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The values  $L$  and  $R$  as functions of the precision  $\varepsilon$ .

Hence the modified version of the ML algorithm can be recommended already if  $\varepsilon < 0.015$ .

**Remark 9** *The max-call example studied above is somehow advantageous for the nested dual algorithm because of the inequality  $\mathcal{B}(k) \leq \mu_\infty k^{-1}$ . In a more general situation where the assumptions (AL) and/or (AQ) do not hold, we have  $\mathcal{B}(k) \leq \mu_\infty k^{-1/2}$  leading to*

$$\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon) = \frac{\theta}{L(1 + L(1 + \kappa^{-1}))\varepsilon^2}$$

with  $\theta = \mu_\infty^2 \sigma_\infty^2 / \mathfrak{V}_\infty$  and  $L$  solving

$$L = \ln \left( \frac{2\theta}{\varepsilon^2 L} \right) \ln^{-1}(\kappa).$$

*As a result, the multilevel dual approach may become superior to the standard dual approach for the values of  $\varepsilon$  much larger than 0.015. For example, if  $\theta = 0.87$  as before, we get that  $\mathcal{R}(\varepsilon) > 1$  for all  $\varepsilon \leq 0.18$ .*

## Concluding remarks

We have presented a multilevel version of the dual approach for valuation of American derivatives. Unlike the multilevel method by Giles (2008) who considers, in the context of pricing European options, different levels of time discretisation for the numerical SDE solution of the underlying process, we consider different levels of approximation to a target martingale in the context of dual pricing of American options. In this respect we underline that, in this paper, the trajectories of the underlying process are assumed to be simulated *exactly*. This assumption is made partially to keep the presentation and the message of the paper as clear as possible. From a practical point of view, by taking the time discretisation step small enough, the additional error due to an approximate solution of the underlying SDE, can be kept much smaller than the typically required Monte Carlo accuracy. Anyway, incorporation and analysis of the time discretisation error in the multilevel approach to dual pricing of American options will be an interesting subject for a subsequent paper.

## References

- L. Andersen and M. Broadie (2004). A primal-dual simulation algorithm for pricing multidimensional American options. *Management Sciences*, **50**(9), 1222-1234.
- V. Bally, G. Pages (2003). A quantization algorithm for solving multidimensional discrete optimal stopping problem. *Bernoulli*, **9**(6), 1003-1049.
- D. Belomestny (2011). Pricing Bermudan options using regression: optimal rates of convergence for lower estimates, to appear in *Finance and Stochastics*.
- D. Belomestny (2011). Solving optimal stopping problems by empirical dual optimization and penalization. Preprint.
- D. Belomestny, C. Bender and J. Schoenmakers (2009). True upper bounds for Bermudan products via non-nested Monte Carlo. *Math. Financ.*, **19**(1), 53–71.

- C. Bender, A. Kolodko, J. Schoenmakers (2008). Enhanced policy iteration for American options via scenario selection. *Quant. Finance* **8**, No. 2, 135–146.
- M. Broadie, P. Glasserman (2004). A stochastic mesh method for pricing high-dimensional American options. *Journal of Computational Finance*, **7**(4), 35–72.
- J. Carriere (1996). Valuation of early-exercise price of options using simulations and nonparametric regression. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **19**, 19–30.
- M.H.A. Davis, I. Karatzas (1994). A Deterministic Approach to Optimal Stopping. In: *Probability, Statistics and Optimisation* (ed. F.P. Kelly). New York Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., pp. 455–466
- M.B. Giles (2008). Multilevel Monte Carlo path simulation. *Operations Research* **56**(3):607-617.
- P. Glasserman (2003). *Monte Carlo Methods in Financial Engineering*. Springer.
- M. Haugh, L. Kogan (2004). Pricing American options: a duality approach. *Operations Research*, **52**(2), 258–270.
- M. Kohler, A. Krzyzak und H. Walk (2010). Upper bounds for Bermudan options on Markovian data using nonparametric regression and a reduced number of nested Monte Carlo steps. *Statistics and Decision*, **26**, 275–288.
- A. Kolodko, J. Schoenmakers (2004). Upper bounds for Bermudan style derivatives. *Monte Carlo Methods and Appl.*, **10**, No. 3–4, 331–343.
- A. Kolodko, J. Schoenmakers (2006). Iterative construction of the optimal Bermudan stopping time. *Finance and Stochastics*, **10**, 27–49.
- F.A. Longstaff, E.S. Schwartz (2001). Valuing American options by simulation: a simple least-squares approach. *Review of Financial Studies*, **14**, 113–147.
- L.C.G. Rogers (2002). Monte Carlo valuation of American options. *Mathematical Finance*, **12**, 271–286.
- J. Schoenmakers, J. Huang (2011). Optimal dual martingales, their analysis and application to new algorithms for Bermudan products. SSRN paper.
- J. Tsitsiklis, B. Van Roy (1999). Regression methods for pricing complex American style options. *IEEE Trans. Neural. Net.*, **12**, 694–703.

# Preprint Series DFG-SPP 1324

<http://www.dfg-spp1324.de>

## Reports

- [1] R. Ramlau, G. Teschke, and M. Zhariy. A Compressive Landweber Iteration for Solving Ill-Posed Inverse Problems. Preprint 1, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.
- [2] G. Plonka. The Easy Path Wavelet Transform: A New Adaptive Wavelet Transform for Sparse Representation of Two-dimensional Data. Preprint 2, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2008.
- [3] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Optimal Order of Convergence and (In-) Tractability of Multivariate Approximation of Smooth Functions. Preprint 3, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.
- [4] M. Espig, L. Grasedyck, and W. Hackbusch. Black Box Low Tensor Rank Approximation Using Fibre-Crosses. Preprint 4, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2008.
- [5] T. Bonesky, S. Dahlke, P. Maass, and T. Raasch. Adaptive Wavelet Methods and Sparsity Reconstruction for Inverse Heat Conduction Problems. Preprint 5, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.
- [6] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. Approximation of Infinitely Differentiable Multivariate Functions Is Intractable. Preprint 6, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2009.
- [7] J. Ma and G. Plonka. A Review of Curvelets and Recent Applications. Preprint 7, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2009.
- [8] L. Denis, D. A. Lorenz, and D. Trede. Greedy Solution of Ill-Posed Problems: Error Bounds and Exact Inversion. Preprint 8, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [9] U. Friedrich. A Two Parameter Generalization of Lions' Nonoverlapping Domain Decomposition Method for Linear Elliptic PDEs. Preprint 9, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [10] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Minimization of Non-smooth, Non-convex Functionals by Iterative Thresholding. Preprint 10, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [11] K. Bredies and D. A. Lorenz. Regularization with Non-convex Separable Constraints. Preprint 11, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.

- [12] M. Döhler, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Nonequispaced Hyperbolic Cross Fast Fourier Transform. Preprint 12, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [13] C. Bender. Dual Pricing of Multi-Exercise Options under Volume Constraints. Preprint 13, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2009.
- [14] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. Variable Subspace Sampling and Multi-level Algorithms. Preprint 14, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.
- [15] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimally Sparse Image Representation by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 15, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2009.
- [16] S. Dahlke, E. Novak, and W. Sickel. Optimal Approximation of Elliptic Problems by Linear and Nonlinear Mappings IV: Errors in  $L_2$  and Other Norms. Preprint 16, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [17] B. Jin, T. Khan, P. Maass, and M. Pidcock. Function Spaces and Optimal Currents in Impedance Tomography. Preprint 17, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [18] G. Plonka and J. Ma. Curvelet-Wavelet Regularized Split Bregman Iteration for Compressed Sensing. Preprint 18, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2009.
- [19] G. Teschke and C. Borries. Accelerated Projected Steepest Descent Method for Nonlinear Inverse Problems with Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 19, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [20] L. Grasedyck. Hierarchical Singular Value Decomposition of Tensors. Preprint 20, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [21] D. Rudolf. Error Bounds for Computing the Expectation by Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Preprint 21, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2009.
- [22] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best  $m$ -term Approximation and Lizorkin-Triebel Spaces. Preprint 22, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [23] F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, B. Niu, and K. Ritter. Multi-level Monte Carlo Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Preprint 23, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [24] S. Dereich and F. Heidenreich. A Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithm for Lévy Driven Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 24, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [25] S. Dahlke, M. Fornasier, and T. Raasch. Multilevel Preconditioning for Adaptive Sparse Optimization. Preprint 25, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.

- [26] S. Dereich. Multilevel Monte Carlo Algorithms for Lévy-driven SDEs with Gaussian Correction. Preprint 26, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2009.
- [27] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and D. Roşca. A New Hybrid Method for Image Approximation using the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 27, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2009.
- [28] O. Koch and C. Lubich. Dynamical Low-rank Approximation of Tensors. Preprint 28, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [29] E. Faou, V. Gradinaru, and C. Lubich. Computing Semi-classical Quantum Dynamics with Hagedorn Wavepackets. Preprint 29, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [30] D. Conte and C. Lubich. An Error Analysis of the Multi-configuration Time-dependent Hartree Method of Quantum Dynamics. Preprint 30, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [31] C. E. Powell and E. Ullmann. Preconditioning Stochastic Galerkin Saddle Point Problems. Preprint 31, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [32] O. G. Ernst and E. Ullmann. Stochastic Galerkin Matrices. Preprint 32, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [33] F. Lindner and R. L. Schilling. Weak Order for the Discretization of the Stochastic Heat Equation Driven by Impulsive Noise. Preprint 33, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2009.
- [34] L. Kämmerer and S. Kunis. On the Stability of the Hyperbolic Cross Discrete Fourier Transform. Preprint 34, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2009.
- [35] P. Cerejeiras, M. Ferreira, U. Kähler, and G. Teschke. Inversion of the noisy Radon transform on  $SO(3)$  by Gabor frames and sparse recovery principles. Preprint 35, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.
- [36] T. Jahnke and T. Udrescu. Solving Chemical Master Equations by Adaptive Wavelet Compression. Preprint 36, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2010.
- [37] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q. Lim. Irregular Shearlet Frames: Geometry and Approximation Properties. Preprint 37, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.
- [38] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q. Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets are Optimally Sparse. Preprint 38, DFG-SPP 1324, February 2010.



- [39] M. Hansen and W. Sickel. Best  $m$ -Term Approximation and Tensor Products of Sobolev and Besov Spaces – the Case of Non-compact Embeddings. Preprint 39, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [40] B. Niu, F.J. Hickernell, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. Deterministic Multi-level Algorithms for Infinite-dimensional Integration on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Preprint 40, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [41] P. Kittipoom, G. Kutyniok, and W.-Q Lim. Construction of Compactly Supported Shearlet Frames. Preprint 41, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2010.
- [42] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Error Criteria for Numerical Solutions of Backward SDEs. Preprint 42, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [43] L. Grasedyck. Polynomial Approximation in Hierarchical Tucker Format by Vector-Tensorization. Preprint 43, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [44] M. Hansen und W. Sickel. Best  $m$ -Term Approximation and Sobolev-Besov Spaces of Dominating Mixed Smoothness - the Case of Compact Embeddings. Preprint 44, DFG-SPP 1324, April 2010.
- [45] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, and P. Lamby. Fast High-Dimensional Approximation with Sparse Occupancy Trees. Preprint 45, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [46] J. Ballani and L. Grasedyck. A Projection Method to Solve Linear Systems in Tensor Format. Preprint 46, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [47] P. Binev, A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, G. Petrova, and P. Wojtaszczyk. Convergence Rates for Greedy Algorithms in Reduced Basis Methods. Preprint 47, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2010.
- [48] S. Kestler and K. Urban. Adaptive Wavelet Methods on Unbounded Domains. Preprint 48, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [49] H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions Multiplied by Explicit Correlation Factors. Preprint 49, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [50] H. Yserentant. On the Complexity of the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 50, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [51] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. Curvature Analysis of Frequency Modulated Manifolds in Dimensionality Reduction. Preprint 51, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2010.
- [52] E. Herrholz and G. Teschke. Compressive Sensing Principles and Iterative Sparse Recovery for Inverse and Ill-Posed Problems. Preprint 52, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.

- [53] L. Kämmerer, S. Kunis, and D. Potts. Interpolation Lattices for Hyperbolic Cross Trigonometric Polynomials. Preprint 53, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [54] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q Lim. Shearlets on Bounded Domains. Preprint 54, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [55] A. Zeiser. Wavelet Approximation in Weighted Sobolev Spaces of Mixed Order with Applications to the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 55, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [56] G. Kutyniok, J. Lemvig, and W.-Q Lim. Compactly Supported Shearlets. Preprint 56, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [57] A. Zeiser. On the Optimality of the Inexact Inverse Iteration Coupled with Adaptive Finite Element Methods. Preprint 57, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2010.
- [58] S. Jokar. Sparse Recovery and Kronecker Products. Preprint 58, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [59] T. Aboiyar, E. H. Georgoulis, and A. Iske. Adaptive ADER Methods Using Kernel-Based Polyharmonic Spline WENO Reconstruction. Preprint 59, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [60] O. G. Ernst, A. Mugler, H.-J. Starkloff, and E. Ullmann. On the Convergence of Generalized Polynomial Chaos Expansions. Preprint 60, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2010.
- [61] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. On Manifolds of Tensors of Fixed TT-Rank. Preprint 61, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2010.
- [62] J. Ballani, L. Grasedyck, and M. Kluge. Black Box Approximation of Tensors in Hierarchical Tucker Format. Preprint 62, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [63] M. Hansen. On Tensor Products of Quasi-Banach Spaces. Preprint 63, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [64] S. Dahlke, G. Steidl, and G. Teschke. Shearlet Coorbit Spaces: Compactly Supported Analyzing Shearlets, Traces and Embeddings. Preprint 64, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2010.
- [65] W. Hackbusch. Tensorisation of Vectors and their Efficient Convolution. Preprint 65, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [66] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Spatial Besov Regularity for Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 66, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.

- [67] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski. On the Power of Function Values for the Approximation Problem in Various Settings. Preprint 67, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [68] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. The Curse of Dimensionality for Monotone and Convex Functions of Many Variables. Preprint 68, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [69] G. Kutyniok and W.-Q. Lim. Image Separation Using Shearlets. Preprint 69, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2010.
- [70] B. Jin and P. Maass. An Analysis of Electrical Impedance Tomography with Applications to Tikhonov Regularization. Preprint 70, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [71] S. Holtz, T. Rohwedder, and R. Schneider. The Alternating Linear Scheme for Tensor Optimisation in the TT Format. Preprint 71, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [72] T. Müller-Gronbach and K. Ritter. A Local Refinement Strategy for Constructive Quantization of Scalar SDEs. Preprint 72, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [73] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. An Analysis for the DIIS Acceleration Method used in Quantum Chemistry Calculations. Preprint 73, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [74] C. Bender and J. Steiner. Least-Squares Monte Carlo for Backward SDEs. Preprint 74, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [75] C. Bender. Primal and Dual Pricing of Multiple Exercise Options in Continuous Time. Preprint 75, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [76] H. Harbrecht, M. Peters, and R. Schneider. On the Low-rank Approximation by the Pivoted Cholesky Decomposition. Preprint 76, DFG-SPP 1324, December 2010.
- [77] P. A. Cioica, S. Dahlke, N. Döhring, S. Kinzel, F. Lindner, T. Raasch, K. Ritter, and R. L. Schilling. Adaptive Wavelet Methods for Elliptic Stochastic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 77, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [78] G. Plonka, S. Tenorth, and A. Iske. Optimal Representation of Piecewise Hölder Smooth Bivariate Functions by the Easy Path Wavelet Transform. Preprint 78, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.

- [79] A. Mugler and H.-J. Starkloff. On Elliptic Partial Differential Equations with Random Coefficients. Preprint 79, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [80] T. Müller-Gronbach, K. Ritter, and L. Yaroslavtseva. A Derandomization of the Euler Scheme for Scalar Stochastic Differential Equations. Preprint 80, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [81] W. Dahmen, C. Huang, C. Schwab, and G. Welper. Adaptive Petrov-Galerkin methods for first order transport equations. Preprint 81, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [82] K. Grella and C. Schwab. Sparse Tensor Spherical Harmonics Approximation in Radiative Transfer. Preprint 82, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [83] D.A. Lorenz, S. Schiffler, and D. Tiede. Beyond Convergence Rates: Exact Inversion With Tikhonov Regularization With Sparsity Constraints. Preprint 83, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [84] S. Dereich, M. Scheutzow, and R. Schottstedt. Constructive quantization: Approximation by empirical measures. Preprint 84, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [85] S. Dahlke and W. Sickel. On Besov Regularity of Solutions to Nonlinear Elliptic Partial Differential Equations. Preprint 85, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [86] S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, P. Maass, T. Raasch, and R.A. Ressel. An adaptive wavelet method for parameter identification problems in parabolic partial differential equations. Preprint 86, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [87] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and G. Welper. Adaptivity and Variational Stabilization for Convection-Diffusion Equations. Preprint 87, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [88] T. Jahnke. On Reduced Models for the Chemical Master Equation. Preprint 88, DFG-SPP 1324, January 2011.
- [89] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, R. DeVore, P. Lamby, D. Savu, and R. Sharpley. Compressed Sensing and Electron Microscopy. Preprint 89, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.
- [90] P. Binev, F. Blanco-Silva, D. Blom, W. Dahmen, P. Lamby, R. Sharpley, and T. Vogt. High Quality Image Formation by Nonlocal Means Applied to High-Angle Annular Dark Field Scanning Transmission Electron Microscopy (HAADF-STEM). Preprint 90, DFG-SPP 1324, March 2011.
- [91] R. A. Ressel. A Parameter Identification Problem for a Nonlinear Parabolic Differential Equation. Preprint 91, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.

- [92] G. Kutyniok. Data Separation by Sparse Representations. Preprint 92, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.
- [93] M. A. Davenport, M. F. Duarte, Y. C. Eldar, and G. Kutyniok. Introduction to Compressed Sensing. Preprint 93, DFG-SPP 1324, May 2011.
- [94] H.-C. Kreuzler and H. Yserentant. The Mixed Regularity of Electronic Wave Functions in Fractional Order and Weighted Sobolev Spaces. Preprint 94, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [95] E. Ullmann, H. C. Elman, and O. G. Ernst. Efficient Iterative Solvers for Stochastic Galerkin Discretizations of Log-Transformed Random Diffusion Problems. Preprint 95, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [96] S. Kunis and I. Melzer. On the Butterfly Sparse Fourier Transform. Preprint 96, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [97] T. Rohwedder. The Continuous Coupled Cluster Formulation for the Electronic Schrödinger Equation. Preprint 97, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [98] T. Rohwedder and R. Schneider. Error Estimates for the Coupled Cluster Method. Preprint 98, DFG-SPP 1324, June 2011.
- [99] P. A. Cioica and S. Dahlke. Spatial Besov Regularity for Semilinear Stochastic Partial Differential Equations on Bounded Lipschitz Domains. Preprint 99, DFG-SPP 1324, July 2011.
- [100] L. Grasedyck and W. Hackbusch. An Introduction to Hierarchical (H-) Rank and TT-Rank of Tensors with Examples. Preprint 100, DFG-SPP 1324, August 2011.
- [101] N. Chegini, S. Dahlke, U. Friedrich, and R. Stevenson. Piecewise Tensor Product Wavelet Bases by Extensions and Approximation Rates. Preprint 101, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [102] S. Dahlke, P. Oswald, and T. Raasch. A Note on Quarkonial Systems and Multi-level Partition of Unity Methods. Preprint 102, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [103] A. Uschmajew. Local Convergence of the Alternating Least Squares Algorithm For Canonical Tensor Approximation. Preprint 103, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [104] S. Kvaal. Multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree method for describing particle loss due to absorbing boundary conditions. Preprint 104, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.

- [105] M. Guillemard and A. Iske. On Groupoid  $C^*$ -Algebras, Persistent Homology and Time-Frequency Analysis. Preprint 105, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [106] A. Hinrichs, E. Novak, and H. Woźniakowski. Discontinuous information in the worst case and randomized settings. Preprint 106, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [107] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, A. Litvinenko, H. Matthies, and E. Zander. Efficient Analysis of High Dimensional Data in Tensor Formats. Preprint 107, DFG-SPP 1324, September 2011.
- [108] M. Espig, W. Hackbusch, S. Handschuh, and R. Schneider. Optimization Problems in Contracted Tensor Networks. Preprint 108, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2011.
- [109] S. Dereich, T. Müller-Gronbach, and K. Ritter. On the Complexity of Computing Quadrature Formulas for SDEs. Preprint 109, DFG-SPP 1324, October 2011.
- [110] D. Belomestny. Solving optimal stopping problems by empirical dual optimization and penalization. Preprint 110, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2011.
- [111] D. Belomestny and J. Schoenmakers. Multilevel dual approach for pricing American style derivatives. Preprint 111, DFG-SPP 1324, November 2011.