

# Tracking of historical volatility

**Goldentayer, L.**

Electrical Engineering Systems, Tel Aviv University, 69978 - Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv,  
Israel  
(e-mail: goldlev@hotmail.com)

**Klebaner F.**

School of Mathematical Sciences, Building 28M, Monash University, Clayton Campus,  
Victoria 3800, Australia.  
(e-mail: fima.klebaner@sci.monash.edu.au)

**Liptser, R.**

Electrical Engineering Systems, Tel Aviv University, 69978 - Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv,  
Israel  
(e-mail: liptser@eng.tau.ac.il)

**Abstract.** We propose an adaptive algorithm for tracking of historical volatility. The algorithm is built under the assumption that the historical volatility function belongs to the Stone-Ibragimov-Khasminskii class of  $k$  times differentiable functions with bounded highest derivative and its subclass of functions satisfying a differential inequalities. We construct an estimator of the Kalman filter type and show optimality of the estimator's convergence rate to zero as sample size  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This estimator is in the framework of GARCH design, but a tuning procedure of its parameters is faster than with traditional GARCH techniques.

**Key words:** GARCH, Historical volatility, Volatility estimation, On-line tracking estimator, Global adaptation

**JEL Classification:** C13

Mathematics	Subject	Classification	(1991):
60G35,60G51,62G05,62M20,91B70			

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1

In the classical Black-Scholes model for financial markets, the stock price  $S(t)$  is modelled as a Geometric Brownian motion with the diffusion coefficient “ $\sqrt{v}S(t)$ ”, where *volatility*  $v$  is assumed to be constant. This assumption is convenient for the option price “prediction”. Contrary to this assumption, the traders treat the volatility as a parameter that changes with time and whose future values have to be evaluated (predicted) for a given period of interest. In this connection, many researchers would rather interpret the volatility as a random process,  $v(t)$ , and study, so-called, *stochastic* volatility models. It is natural to verify how the volatility  $v(t)$  changes in time for real stock prices and attempt to select a suitable stochastic volatility model. Traditionally it is proposed to apply *Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroscedasticity* tracking algorithms (shortly GARCH, see, e.g. [1]-[5], [8], [9], [13]) for tracking  $v(t)$  from the stock prices. It is known from [13] (p.109) that GARCH algorithm operates satisfactory under relatively stable market conditions but fails when highly unanticipated events that lead to a significant structural change occur. Nevertheless, in many realistic settings, the simplest GARCH(p,q), p,q=1,2, algorithms are adequate for tracking volatilities even over long periods (see Bollerslev, Chou, and Kroner [6], pages 10 and 22). The main difficulty in implementation of GARCH comes from the multivariate minimization procedure of its parameters even for small values of p,q=1,2.

In this paper, we propose a new approach for tuning the GARCH parameters. Our approach uses ideas from Nonparametric Statistics combined with the Kalman-Bucy filter representation of a GARCH model. This representation enables us to select a GARCH model with only one parameter, that practically achieves tracking accuracy of GARCH(1,1). Moreover, the Kalman-Bucy version of GARCH(p,q) allows for a considerable simplification of the minimization procedure in the GARCH parameters.

## 1.2

Let  $S(t_i)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$  be the sample, with  $t_i - t_{i-1} \equiv: \Delta$ , of asset prices  $S(t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , from the Black-Scholes model (see [3], [4])

$$dS(t) = \mu(t)S(t)dt + \sqrt{v(t)}S(t)dB_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (1)$$

where  $B_t$  is a Brownian motion,  $S(0)$  is the initial stock price,  $\mu(t)$  and  $v(t)$  are strictly positive deterministic functions, respectively. Denote by

$$X_i = \frac{1}{\Delta} \ln^2 \left( \frac{S(t_i)}{S(t_{i-1})} \right).$$

the observed heteroscedasticity. Since

$$\ln \left( \frac{S(t_i)}{S(t_{i-1})} \right) = \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} 0.5(2\mu(s) - v(s))ds + \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sqrt{v(s)}dB_s,$$

By Itô's formula we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
X_i &= \frac{1}{\Delta} \left( \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} 0.5(2\mu(s) - v(s)) ds + \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sqrt{v(s)} dB_s \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{\Delta} \left( \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sqrt{v(s)} dB_s \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\Delta} \left( \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} 0.5(2\mu(s) - v(s)) ds \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} 0.5(2\mu(s) - v(s)) ds \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sqrt{v(s)} dB_s.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The parameter  $\Delta$  is usually small (for example, if the stock prices are measured once a day for three consecutive years, then  $\Delta \simeq 0.001$ ). For sufficiently small  $\Delta$ , the dominating term in  $X_i$  is  $\frac{1}{\Delta} \left( \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sqrt{v(s)} dB_s \right)^2$ , with the mean

$$v_{i-1} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} v(s) ds$$

and, under some smoothness assumptions, the error  $\frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (v(s) - v_{i-1}) ds$  is sufficiently small and can be ignored.

Following Bollerslev [5] and Engle [10], the GARCH(p,q) provides estimates  $\widehat{v}_i$  of  $v_i$  by the recursion

$$\widehat{v}_i = K + \sum_{j=1}^p g_j \widehat{v}_{i-j} + \sum_{m=1}^q a_m X_{(i+1)-m}, \tag{3}$$

subject to some initial conditions, where parameters  $K, g_1, \dots, g_p, a_1, \dots, a_q$ , as well as  $p, q$ , have to be chosen with the help of minimizing the observed sum of squares (here  $n = \frac{T}{\Delta}$ )

$$S_n(K, g_1, \dots, g_p, a_1, \dots, a_q) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1})^2.$$

In contrast to (3), we propose an alternative tracking algorithm borrowed, from Khasminskii - Liptser, [16], and Goldentayer - Liptser [12], with the univariate minimizing parameter  $\gamma$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}_i &= \widehat{v}_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n} \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(1)} + \frac{q_0(\gamma)}{n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}} (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}) \\
\widehat{v}_i^{(j)} &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j)} + \frac{1}{n} \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j+1)} + \frac{q_j(\gamma)}{n^{(2(k+1)-j)/(2k+3)}} (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}) \\
j &= 1, \dots, k-1 \\
\widehat{v}_i^{(k)} &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(k)} + \frac{q_k(\gamma)}{n^{(k+2)/(2k+3)}} (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

subject to some initial conditions, where  $q_i(\gamma)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$  are some prescribed functions and  $\gamma$  is chosen to minimize

$$S_n(\gamma) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1})^2.$$

A choice of the parameter  $k$  is imposed by the smoothness of  $v(t)$ :  $k = 0$  when  $v(t)$  is Lipschitz continuous (with a global Lipschitz constant) while other positive values of  $k$  are used when  $v(t)$  has a bounded  $k$ -th derivative.

It should be noted that the estimator, given in (4), is also of GARCH type. In Section 3, we give modification of (4) which is compatible with GARCH(p,q).

The proposed estimator admits a fast optimization procedure and enables to avoid local minima quite easily. Moreover, its GARCH(p,q) modifications are always stable and possess faster minimization than classical GARCH.

## 2 Description of estimator. Quality of estimation

### 2.1 Assumptions on preliminaries

We assume that  $v(t)$  is a smooth function. If  $v(t)$  is a paths of random process we assume that this random process and the Brownian motion  $B(t)$  are independent.

We use Nonparametric Statistics ideas for estimating a smooth function observed in the presence of white noise. Although we use some adaptive techniques, our method is different to that of Spokoiny and Mercurio [17], where the volatility is approximated by a piecewise constant function.

**Assumption 2.1** *The volatility  $v(t)$  is a strictly positive bounded function and belongs to the Ibragimov - Khasminskii - Stone subclass of functions (see, [14], [15] and [18]) namely,  $k$  times differentiable ( $k = 0$  included) with Lipschitz continuous  $k$ -th derivative.*

In the accordance with this assumption, there exists a positive number  $L$  such that for any  $i$

$$|v(t_i) - v(t_{i-1})| \leq L \frac{\Delta^{1+k}}{(1+k)!}. \quad (5)$$

**Assumption 2.2**  *$\mu(t)$  is a positive and bounded function.*

Set

$$\mu_{i-1} = \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \mu(s) ds. \quad (6)$$

Introduce

$$\xi_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{v_{i-1}\Delta}} \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \sqrt{v(s)} dB_s, \quad i \geq 1$$

and notice that then  $(\xi_i)_{i \geq 1}$  forms an i.i.d. sequence of  $(0, 1)$ -Gaussian random variables. From (2), it follows that

$$X_i = 0.25(2\mu_{i-1} - v_{i-1})^2 \Delta + 2\sqrt{\Delta v_{i-1}}(\mu_{i-1} - \frac{1}{2}v_{i-1})\xi_i + v_{i-1}\xi_i^2.$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_i &= \sqrt{\Delta v_{i-1}}(2\mu_{i-1} + v_{i-1})\xi_i + v_{i-1}(\xi_i^2 - 1), \\ \theta_i(\Delta) &= 0.25\Delta(2\mu_{i-1} + v_{i-1})^2.\end{aligned}$$

By Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2,  $\theta_i(\Delta) = O(\Delta)$  and  $(\eta_i)_{i \geq 1}$  forms a sequence of zero mean uncorrelated random variables with

$$E\eta_i^2 = \Delta v_{i-1}(2\mu_{i-1} + v_{i-1})^2 + 2v_{i-1}^2 =: \sigma_i^2 \quad (7)$$

with  $\sigma_i^2$ 's the strictly positive and bounded numbers. Thus  $X_i$  possesses the following structure:

$$X_i = v_{i-1} + \eta_i + \theta_i(\Delta). \quad (8)$$

## 2.2 A reductive model for $\mathbf{X}_i$

We replace (8) by a simpler model:

$$X_i = v_{i-1} + \eta_i \quad (9)$$

For this model, it follows from Ibragimov, Khasminskii [14], [15] (see also Stone [18]), that there exists a kernel type estimate  $\widehat{v}_i$  of  $v_i$ , generated by  $(X_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ , such that for any  $i$

$$E(v_i - \widehat{v}_i)^2 \leq O(n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)}). \quad (10)$$

It is also known from Khasminskii and Liptser [16] that the rate in  $n$ , given in (10), remains valid for the on-line estimate obtained with the help of recurrent algorithm given below

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{v}_i &= \widehat{v}_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(1)} + \frac{q_0}{n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}) \\ \widehat{v}_i^{(j)} &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j)} + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j+1)} + \frac{q_j}{n^{2(k+1-j)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}) \\ j &= 1, \dots, k-1 \\ \widehat{v}_i^{(k)} &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(k)} + \frac{q_k}{n^{(k+2)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}).\end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

More exactly, the above-mentioned rate in  $n$  is preserved out of the boundary layer  $i \geq O(n^{-1/(2k+3)} \log n)$ , resulting from uncertainty in the initial conditions for (11), provided that (see [16])

**Assumption 2.3** *All roots of the characteristic polynomial*

$$p^k(\lambda, \mathbf{q}) = \lambda^{k+1} + q_0\lambda^k + q_1\lambda^{k-1} + \dots + q_{k-1}\lambda + q_k \quad (12)$$

*are different and have negative real parts.*

### 2.3 Adaptive estimator design

Out of the above-mentioned boundary layer  $i \geq O(n^{-1/(2k+3)} \log n)$  estimates  $(\widehat{v}_i)_{i \geq 1}$  obey the following property (see, (10)):

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{v_i} E(v_i - \widehat{v}_i)^2 n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)} \leq C(\mathbf{q}), \quad (13)$$

where the supremum is taken over all  $v_i$ 's satisfying Assumption 2.1. The parameter  $C(\mathbf{q})$  depends on a filter gain  $\mathbf{q}$ , the vector with entries  $q_0, q_1, \dots, q_k$ . So, preserving the rate in  $n$ , the asymptotic estimation accuracy depends on  $\mathbf{q}$  chosen in the framework of Assumption 2.3. It is clear that a direct minimization of  $C(\mathbf{q})$  in  $\mathbf{q}$  may contradict Assumption 2.3. Goldentayer and Liptser, [12], proposed an approach, based on the Kalman-Bucy filtering theory, for minimization of  $C(\mathbf{q})$  while preserving Assumption 2.3. However, for this approach the assumption  $E\eta_i^2 \equiv \sigma^2$  was used. Although in the case considered here  $E\eta_i^2 \neq \sigma^2$ , we shall still follow this methodology. For a known  $\sigma^2$  and a free parameter  $\gamma$ , set

$$\vartheta = \frac{\gamma}{\sigma}. \quad (14)$$

This parameter was introduced in [12] and plays a crucial role in creating the filtering gain  $\mathbf{q}$  entries:

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(\vartheta) &= U_{00}\vartheta^{1/k+1} \\ q_1(\vartheta) &= U_{01}\vartheta^{2/k+1} \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ q_k(\vartheta) &= U_{0k}\vartheta^{k/k+1} \\ q_k(\vartheta) &= U_{0k}\vartheta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $U_{0j}$ 's are entries of the first column of  $U$  the positive definite matrix, which is the unique solution of the algebraic Riccati equation (\* is the transposition symbol)  $aU + Ua^* + B - UA^*AU = 0$  with matrices

$$A = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0), \quad a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

of sizes  $1 \times (1+k)$ ,  $(1+k) \times (1+k)$ ,  $(1+k) \times 1$  respectively. It is known from [12] that

k	$U_{00}$	$U_{01}$	$U_{02}$	$U_{03}$	$U_{04}$
0	1	NA	NA	NA	NA
1	$\sqrt{2}$	1	NA	NA	NA
2	2	2	1	NA	NA
3	$\sqrt{4 + \sqrt{8}}$	$2 + \sqrt{2}$	$\sqrt{4 + \sqrt{8}}$	1	NA
4	$1 + \sqrt{5}$	$3 + \sqrt{5}$	$3 + \sqrt{5}$	$1 + \sqrt{5}$	1

So in [12], we deal with the estimator

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{v}_i(\vartheta) &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta) + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(1)}(\vartheta) + \frac{U_{00}\vartheta^{1/k+1}}{n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta)) \\
\widehat{v}_i^{(j)}(\vartheta) &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j)}(\vartheta) + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j+1)}(\vartheta) + \frac{U_{0j}\vartheta^{(j+1)/k+1}}{n^{(2(k+1)-j)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta)) \\
& j = 1, \dots, k-1 \\
\widehat{v}_i^{(k)}(\vartheta) &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(k)}(\vartheta) + \frac{U_{0k}\vartheta^k}{n^{(k+2)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta)).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

## 2.4 Global Adaptation

We propose to use the estimator (15) for tracking  $v_i$ 's when the  $X_i$ 's are defined in the accordance with (8), i.e.

$$X_i = v_{i-1} + \eta_i + \theta_i(\Delta).$$

The univariate minimization with the help of  $\vartheta$  guarantees Assumption 2.3. However, since the variance of the noise is not constant and, moreover, unknown, an evaluation of  $C(q(\vartheta))$ , as in [12], would be difficult. Therefore, we follow GARCH-technique adaptive method (see, e.g., [2]) and evaluate  $V_n(\vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (v_{i-1} - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta))^2$  via  $S_n(\vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta))^2$ . We show that for  $\Delta$  sufficiently small with probability close to one

$$S_n(\vartheta') > S_n(\vartheta'') \Rightarrow V_n(\vartheta') > V_n(\vartheta'').$$

A crucial role in proving this implication plays the above-mentioned asymptotical estimate  $E(v_i - \widehat{v}_i)^2 \leq O(n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)})$ ,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which is valid not only for  $\theta_i(\Delta) \equiv 0$  but also when  $\theta_i(\Delta) = O(\Delta)$  (see Lemma A.1 in Appendix A).

**Theorem 2.1** *For sufficiently large  $n$  and any  $\vartheta' \neq \vartheta''$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\left|[S_n(\vartheta') - S_n(\vartheta'')] - [V_n(\vartheta') - V_n(\vartheta'')]\right| > \varepsilon\right) \\
\leq \varepsilon^{-2} O(n^{-(4k+5)/(2k+3)}). \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Taking into account  $\theta_i(\Delta) = O(\Delta) = O(n^{-1})$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_n(\vartheta) &= V_n(\vartheta) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i^2 + \frac{2O(n^{-1})}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (v_{i-1} - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta)) \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [(v_{i-1} - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta)) + O(n^{-1})] \eta_i + O(n^{-2})
\end{aligned}$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& [S_n(\vartheta') - S_n(\vartheta'')] - [V_n(\vartheta') - V_n(\vartheta'')] \\
&= \frac{2O(n^{-1})}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [(v_{i-1} - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta')) - (v_{i-1} - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta''))] \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [(\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'')) + O(n^{-1})] \eta_i + O(n^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For notational convenience, set

$$\begin{aligned}
r^2 := E \left( \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [(\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'')) + O(n^{-1})] \eta_i \right. \\
\left. + \frac{2O(n^{-1})}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'')) + O(n^{-2}) \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The use of  $(\sum_{\ell=1}^3 r_\ell)^2 \leq 3 \sum_{\ell=1}^3 r_\ell^2$  provides

$$\begin{aligned}
r^2 \leq 3 \left( \frac{4}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n E [(\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'')) + O(n^{-1})]^2 E \eta_i^2 \right. \\
\left. + \frac{4O(n^{-2})}{n^4} E \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'')) \right)^2 + O(n^{-4}) \right) \equiv 3 \sum_{\ell=1}^3 r_\ell^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying obvious estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
& E(\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'))^2 \leq 2E(v_{i-1} - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'))^2 + 2E(v_{i-1} - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta''))^2 \\
&= \begin{cases} O(1), & i \leq O(n^{-1/n^{2k+3}} \log n) \\ O(n^{-(2(k+1)/(2k+3)}), & i > O(n^{-1/n^{2k+3}} \log n), \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

we get the following upper bounds for  $r_\ell^2$ ,  $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1^2 &\leq O(n^{-1}) \left( O(n^{-2}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E(\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta''))^2 \right), \\
r_2^2 &= \frac{12O(n^{-2})}{n^4} E \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta') - \widehat{v}_{i-1}(\vartheta'')) \right)^2, \\
r_3^2 &= O(n^{-2}) \leq O(n^{-(4k+5)/(2k+3)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, with the help of Chebyshev's inequality we find that for sufficiently large  $n$ , any  $\vartheta' \neq \vartheta''$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  the desired statement holds true.  $\square$

**Remark 1** Theorem 2.1 enables a meaningful comparison between estimators corresponding to various values of  $\vartheta$ . For notational convenience, the filter for  $k = 0$  with the best parameter  $\vartheta$  is called Filter 0.

### 3 Filters controlled by multiple parameters

We restrict ourselves by consideration of GARCH(1,1) and GARCH(2,2) in the form of (15). To distinguish these filters from classical GARCH's we denote them, by an analogy with Filter 0, by Filter 1 and Filter 2, respectively. The structure of these filters and the motivation for their applicability is given in Appendix B. So, due to (15) and (29), we have

**Filter 1**

$$\widehat{v}_i = \widehat{v}_{i-1} \left(1 - \frac{a_1}{n}\right) + \frac{a_1 K}{n} + \frac{\vartheta}{n^{2/3}} (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}); \quad (17)$$

**Filter 2**

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{v}_i &= \widehat{v}_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n} \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(1)} + \frac{\sqrt{2\vartheta}}{n^{4/5}} (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}) \\ \widehat{v}_i^{(1)} &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(1)} \left(1 - \frac{a_1}{n}\right) - \frac{a_2}{n} \widehat{v}_{i-1} + \frac{a_2 K}{n} \\ &\quad + \frac{\vartheta}{n^{3/5}} (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It is assumed that  $0 < a_1, a_2 \ll n$  and  $|K| \ll n$ . The estimates generated by Filters 1 and 2 possess the optimal rate in  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , while for fixed  $n$  the presence of additional parameters  $a_1, K$  and  $a_1, a_2 K$ , respectively, enables slightly to improve (about 10%) the best value of

$$S_n(\vartheta, K, a_1, a_2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1} (X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1})^2.$$

The main adaptive parameter remains  $\vartheta$ . A contribution of  $a_1, K$  or  $a_1, a_2, K$  is not essential. This fact enables to simplify the tuning parameters procedure, particularly to avoid local minima, in comparison with the standard tuning procedure for classical GARCH(1,1), GARCH(2,2) (see MATLAB GARCH Toolbox: <http://www.mathworks.com/access/helpdesk/help/toolbox/garch/garch.shtml>)

### 4 Computer implementation and simulations

The volatility dynamics may differ widely between various types of assets. For example, the volatility changes for stocks and risky assets are too fast and the volatility values are relatively high. The composite indexes and exchange rates characterized by slow changes and smaller volatility values. This remark points out the difficulty of finding the best filter simultaneously for all assets.

In simulations, we compare the results of Filter 0, Filter 1 and Filter 2, as well as the GARCH(1,1) and GARCH(2,2), provided by MATLAB. Though Filter 1 and Filter 2 are equivalent to GARCH(1,1) and GARCH(2,2) respectively, the comparison of the numerical results show some advantage of Filters 1 and 2 due to different tuning procedures (see comment at the end of Section 3).

## 4.1 Tuning procedure for Filters 1 and 2

The univariate minimization process required for Filter 0 is straightforward. For Filter 1 and Filter 2 we used unconstrained minimization, as given below.

### Filter 1

1. Set  $a_1 = 0$ ,  $K = 0$  and find  $\vartheta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\vartheta} S_n(\vartheta, 0, 0)$ .
2. Find  $K^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ .
3. Find  $a_1^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{a_1} S_n(\vartheta^*, K^*, a_1)$ .
4. Local minimization of  $S_n(\vartheta, K, a_1)$  in vicinity of  $(\vartheta^*, K^*, a_1^*)$ .

### Filter 2

1. Set  $a_1 = 0$ ,  $a_2 = 0$ ,  $K = 0$  and find  $\vartheta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\vartheta} S_n(\vartheta, 0, 0, 0)$ .
2. Find  $K^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ .
3. Find  $(a_1^*, a_2^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{a_1, a_2} S_n(\vartheta^*, K^*, a_1, a_2)$ .
4. Local minimization of  $S_n(\vartheta, K, a_1, a_2)$  in vicinity of  $(\vartheta^*, K^*, a_1^*, a_2^*)$ .

The tuning procedures above consist in the univariate minimization over  $\vartheta$ , the computation of  $K$  and the minimization over  $a_1, a_2$ . These steps are supposed to provide some  $(\vartheta^*, K^*, a_1^*, a_2^*)$  in the vicinity on the minimum point, where the multidimensional minimization procedure is applied.

The simulation results demonstrate that in the vicinity of  $(\vartheta^*, K^*, a_1^*, a_2^*)$  the function  $S_n(\vartheta, K, a_1, a_2)$  behaves as a concave function and this property is preserved in a wide range around of  $(\vartheta^*, K^*, a_1^*, a_2^*)$ . Moreover, the minimum is not sharp, so that the minimization procedure does not require high 'resolution'. The corresponding marginal projections of  $S_n(\vartheta, K, a_1, a_2)$  are given on Figures 1 and 2.

## 4.2 Exchange rates

The USD exchange rates we used for historical volatility estimation were taken for the period between 01-Dec-01 and 18-Jan-04, e.g.  $n = 1466$ . Filter 1 and Filter 2 provide estimation error similar to GARCH(1,1) and GARCH(2,2). The tracking accuracy in terms of  $S_n(\vartheta, K, a_1, a_2)$  is given the Table 1.

Table 1: Average one-step prediction error for the exchange rates volatility

Currency		Filter type				
From	To	Garch(1,1)	Garch(2,2)	Filter 0	Filter 1	Filter 2
AUD	\$	9.096e-006	9.090e-006	9.117e-006	9.092e-006	9.092e-006
EUR	\$	5.857e-006	5.848e-006	5.869e-006	5.856e-006	5.856e-006
NIS	\$	1.830e-006	1.827e-006	1.839e-006	1.827e-006	1.826e-006
RUB	\$	5.026e-007	4.915e-007	5.026e-007	4.935e-007	4.880e-007
YEN	\$	5.388e-006	5.372e-006	5.389e-006	5.376e-006	5.367e-006




Figure 1: Filter 1 coefficients behavior in the minima for IBM stock.

### 4.3 Stocks

We considered some stocks of large computer manufacturers and toy and entertainment companies. The information (adjusted close prices) for the period: 24-Feb-99 to 28-Oct-03,  $n = 1176$ , was collected using Yahoo. The numerical results for  $S_n(\vartheta, K, a_1, a_2)$ , corresponding the best tuning parameters, show serious differences in filters behavior (see Table 2). A different quality of Filters 1, 2 and GARCH(1,1), (2,2) is provided by different tuning procedures. Filter 1 provides the best quality.

Table 2: Average one-step prediction error for the filter

Asset name	Filter type				
	Garch(1,1)	Garch(2,2)	Filter 0	Filter 1	Filter 2
DIS	4.309e-003	4.314e-003	4.329e-003	4.284e-003	4.285e-003
HPQ	3.741e-002	3.771e-002	3.615e-002	3.608e-002	3.608e-002
IBM	3.229e-003	3.228e-003	3.217e-003	3.199e-003	3.200e-003
INTC	1.232e-002	1.230e-002	1.235e-002	1.223e-002	1.232e-002
MAT	1.899e-002	1.879e-002	1.850e-002	1.817e-002	1.847e-002
SUN	5.144e-004	5.131e-004	5.143e-004	5.135e-004	5.138e-004
TOY	6.134e-003	6.128e-003	6.158e-003	6.098e-003	6.082e-003




Figure 2: Filter 2 coefficients behavior in the minima for IBM stock.

#### 4.4 Discussion of the numerical results

The univariate minimization of Filter 0 proves empirically to be very fast. The tuned parameter  $\vartheta^*$  for Filter 0 gives a hint for Filters 1 and 2 tuning procedures. The multivariate designs of Filters 1 and 2 provide slightly better tracking accuracy than GARCH(1,1) and (2,2), respectively, especially for stock options. We attribute this effect to difficulties in tuning procedure of the filter parameters, especially for GARCH(2,2), which leads to local minima more often than tuning of for Filter 1 and 2.

### 5 Conclusions

The volatility estimation designs introduced in this paper are similar to the widely used GARCH algorithms. The presented designs allow simple adaptation and filter structure preserving estimation accuracy similar to GARCH. The filter structure of the presented design allows performance accuracy evaluation and enforces the stability of the estimator.




Figure 3: Historical volatility estimation for exchange rates of USD vs EUR.

## A Auxiliary Lemma

**Lemma A.1** *The rate in  $n$  given in (10) is preserved in the presence of  $\theta_i(\Delta) \neq 0$  in (10).*

*Proof.* Let  $\widehat{v}_i$  and  $\widetilde{u}_i$  be two estimates created by (15) with and without nuisance parameter respectively. We prove below that

$$E(\widehat{v}_i - \widetilde{u}_i)^2 \leq O(n^{-2}). \quad (19)$$

Since

$$\frac{n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}}{n^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

the nuisance parameter  $\theta_i(\Delta)$  does not change the rate (10) in  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .




Figure 4: Historical volatility estimation for IBM stock.

For the notational convenience write  $\theta_i$ , instead of  $\theta_i(\Delta)$ , and set  $\delta_i^{(0)} = \widehat{v}_i - \widetilde{u}_i$ ,  $\delta_i^{(j)} = \widehat{v}_i^{(j)} - \widetilde{u}_i^{(j)}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_i &= \delta_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_{i-1}^{(1)} + \frac{U_{00} \vartheta^{1/k+1}}{n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}} (\theta_i - \delta_{i-1}) \\
 \delta_i^{(j)} &= \delta_{i-1}^{(j)} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_{i-1}^{(j+1)} + \frac{U_{0j} \vartheta^{(j+1)/k+1}}{n^{(2(k+1)-j)/(2k+3)}} (\theta_i - \delta_{i-1}) \\
 & \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1 \\
 \delta_i^{(k)} &= \delta_{i-1}^{(k)} + \frac{U_{0k} \vartheta}{n^{(k+2)/(2k+2)}} (\theta_i - \delta_{i-1})
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

subject to the initial conditions  $\delta(0) = 0$ ,  $\delta^{(j)}(0) = 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .

Set

$$\mathbf{q}_n = \begin{pmatrix} U_{00}\vartheta^{1/(1+k)}n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)} \\ U_{01}\vartheta^{2/(1+k)}n^{-(2(1+k)-1)/(2k+3)} \\ \vdots \\ U_{0k}\vartheta n^{-(2(1+k)-k)/(2k+3)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{q} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{00}\vartheta^{1/(1+k)} \\ U_{01}\vartheta^{2/(1+k)} \\ \vdots \\ U_{0k}\vartheta \end{pmatrix}$$

and  $F_i = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_i \\ \delta_i^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ \delta_i^{(k)} \end{pmatrix}$  and recall that matrices  $a$  and  $A$  are defined in (2.3). We

rewrite (20) to the vector-matrix form

$$F_i = F_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n}aF_{i-1} + \mathbf{q}_n\theta_i - \mathbf{q}_nAF_{i-1}$$

where  $F_0 = 0$ . Set  $G_i = C_nF_i$ , where  $C_n$  is the diagonal  $(1+k) \times (1+k)$ -matrix:

$$C_n = \begin{pmatrix} n^{(1+k)/(2k+3)} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & n^{k/(2k+3)} & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & n^{2/(2k+3)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & n^{1/(2k+3)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then,  $G_0 = 0$  and

$$G_i = G_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n}C_n a F_{i-1} + C_n \mathbf{q}_n \theta_i - C_n \mathbf{q}_n A F_{i-1}. \quad (21)$$

By directly verifying identities  $C_n a = n^{\frac{1}{2k+3}} a C_n$ ,  $C_n \mathbf{q}_n = n^{-(1+k)/(2k+3)} \mathbf{q}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}C_n a F_{i-1} &= n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)} a G_{i-1} \\ C_n \mathbf{q}_n \theta_i &= n^{-(1+k)/(2k+3)} \mathbf{q} \theta_i. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The structure of matrix  $A$  provides  $n^{(1+k)/(2k+1)} A = A C_n$ . Hence and from  $C_n \mathbf{q}_n = n^{-(1+k)/(2k+3)} \mathbf{q}$ , it holds

$$C_n \mathbf{q}_n A F_{i-1} = n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)} \mathbf{q} A G_{i-1}. \quad (23)$$

Gathering now (21), (22), (23), we find the recurrent equation for  $G_i$ 's:

$$G_i = G_{i-1} + n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)} (a - \mathbf{q}A) G_{i-1} + n^{-(1+k)/(2k+3)} \mathbf{q} \theta_i.$$

With the matrix  $D_n = I + n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)} (a - \mathbf{q}A)$ , this recurrent equation is transformed into  $G_i = D_n G_{i-1} + n^{-(1+k)/(2k+3)} \mathbf{q} \theta_i$ . Hence, due to  $G_0 = 0$ , we have  $G_i = \sum_{p=1}^i D_n^{i+1-p} n^{-(1+k)/(2k+3)} \mathbf{q} \theta_p$ . The latter and  $|\theta_i| = O(n^{-1})$  provide

$$\|G_i\| \leq O(n^{-1}) n^{-(1+k)/(2k+3)} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \|D_n^p\| = O(n^{-(3k+4)/(2k+3)}) \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \|D_n^p\|.$$

On the other hand, by Statement 2 in [16], for some positive constants  $c_o$  and  $C$  and any  $p$  the following estimate for  $\|D_n^p\|$  is valid:

$$\|D_n^p\| \leq C \exp\left(-c_o n^{-2p(1+k)/(2k+3)}\right).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_i\| &\leq O\left(n^{-(3k+4)/(2k+3)}\right) \left(1 - e^{-c_o n^{-2(1+k)/(2k+3)}}\right)^{-1} \\ &= O\left(n^{-(k+2)/(2k+3)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by  $F_i = C_n^{-1}G_i$ , we find that

$$|\delta_i^{(j)}| \leq n^{-(1+k-j)/(2k+3)} \|G_i\| \leq O\left(n^{-1+j/(2k+3)}\right), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, k.$$

Hence,  $\delta_i^{(0)} \leq O(n^{-2})$  and (19) holds true.  $\square$

## B GARCH in the form of (15)

The filter of (4) type was proposed in [16] for tracking of functions from the Ibragimov - Khasminskii - Stone (IKS) class (see, [14], [15] and [18]). A further implementation of this filter compatible with IKS(k)-subclasses,  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ , was developed in [12] (*function  $f \in (\text{IKS})(k)$  if it is  $k$ -times differentiable having Lipschitz continuous  $k$ -th derivative*).

An analysis of GARCH filter structure enables us to claim that GARCH filter is compatible even with further subclass of (IKS)(k)'s. For fixed  $k$ , function  $f$  from the subclass of (IKS)(k) satisfies a differential inequality (see, Goldenshluger and Nemirovski, [11]):

$$|f^{(k)}(t) + a_1 f^{(k-1)}(t) + a_2 f^{(k-2)}(t) + \dots + a_{k-1} f^{(1)}(t) + a_k f(t) + a_k| \leq L,$$

where  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k$  are such that the roots of polynomial

$$P(x) = x^k + a_1 x^{k-1} + a_2 x^{k-2} + \dots + a_k$$

have negative real parts.

By an analogy to Chow, Khasminskii and Liptser, [7], we propose the following estimator for  $f(t)$  and its derivatives  $f^{(j)}(t)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k$  via the observations of the process  $X_t$  with  $X_0 = 0$  and  $dX_t = f(t)dt + \varepsilon dW_t$ :

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{f}(t) &= \hat{f}^{(1)}(t)dt + \frac{q_0}{\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)}} (dX_t - \hat{f}(t)dt), \\ d\hat{f}^{(j)}(t) &= \hat{f}^{(j+1)}(t)dt + \frac{q_j}{\varepsilon^{2j/(2k+3)}} (dX_t - \hat{f}(t)dt), \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1, \\ d\hat{f}^{(k)}(t) &= -(a_1 \hat{f}^{(k-1)}(t) + a_2 \hat{f}^{(k-2)}(t) + \dots + a_{k-1} \hat{f}^{(1)}(t) + a_k \hat{f}(t) \\ &\quad + a_k K)dt + \frac{q_k}{\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+3)}} (dX_t - \hat{f}(t)dt). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Now we show that

$$\begin{aligned} E(f(t) - \widehat{f}(t))^2 &\asymp \varepsilon^{4k/(2k+3)} \\ E(f^{(j)}(t) - \widehat{f}^{(j)}(t))^2 &\asymp \varepsilon^{4(k-j)/(2k+3)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Set  $\Delta(t) = f(t) - \widehat{f}(t)$  and  $\Delta^{(j)}(t) = f^{(j)}(t) - \widehat{f}^{(j)}(t)$ . From (24) and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{f}(t) &= f^{(1)}(t) \\ \dot{f}^{(j)}(t) &= f^{(j+1)}(t), \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1, \\ \dot{f}^{(k)}(t) &= -(a_1 f^{(k-1)}(t) + a_2 f^{(k-2)}(t) + \dots + a_{k-1} f^{(1)}(t) + a_k f(t) + a_k K), \end{aligned}$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned} d\Delta(t) &= \Delta^{(1)}(t)dt - \frac{q_0}{\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)}}(\varepsilon dW_t + \Delta(t)dt), \\ d\Delta^{(j)}(t) &= \Delta^{(j+1)}(t)dt - \frac{q_j}{\varepsilon^{2j/(2k+3)}}(\varepsilon dW_t + \Delta(t)dt), \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1, \\ d\Delta^{(k)}(t) &= -\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} a_\ell \Delta^{(k-\ell)}(t) + a_k \Delta(t) + u(t)\right)dt \\ &\quad - \frac{q_k}{\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+3)}}(\varepsilon dW_t + \Delta(t)dt). \end{aligned}$$

Following [7], we introduce

$$\delta(t) = \frac{\Delta(t\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)})}{\varepsilon^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}}, \quad \delta^{(j)}(t) = \frac{\Delta^{(j)}(t\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)})}{\varepsilon^{2(k+1-j)/(2k+3)}}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k \quad (26)$$

and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} d\delta(t) &= [\delta^{(1)}(t) - q_0 \delta(t)]dt - q_0 dW_t^\varepsilon, \\ d\delta^{(j)}(t) &= [\delta^{(j+1)}(t) - q_j \delta(t)]dt - q_j dW_t^\varepsilon, \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1, \\ d\delta^{(k)}(t) &= -\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} \varepsilon^{2\ell/(2k+3)} a_\ell \delta^{(k-\ell)}(t) + \varepsilon^{2k/(2k+3)} a_k \delta(t)\right)dt \\ &\quad - u(t\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)})dt - q_k \delta(t)dt - q_k dW_t^\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where  $W_t^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/(2k+3)}}W_{t\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)}}$  is the standard Wiener process.

Set

$$D(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta(t) \\ \delta^{(1)}(t) \\ \vdots \\ \delta^{(k)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad U(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ u(t\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{pmatrix} q_0 \\ q_1 \\ \vdots \\ q_k \end{pmatrix}$$

and introduce matrices  $a_\varepsilon$  and  $A$  of sizes  $(k+1) \times (k+1)$  and  $1 \times k+1$ , respectively,

$$a_\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 1 \\ -\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+3)}a_k & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & -\varepsilon^{2/(2k+3)}a_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and  $A = (1 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0)$ . With the help of the introduced matrices, we rewrite (27) into the vector-matrix form:

$$dD(t) = (a_\varepsilon - QA)D(t)dt + U(t)dt - QdW_t^\varepsilon.$$

It is known from [7] that the vector  $Q$  may be chosen such that the eigenvalues of the matrix  $a_0 - QA$  have negative real parts. This property is preserved for  $a_\varepsilon - QA$ , at least for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon$ . Henceforth, we assume this property for  $a_\varepsilon - QA$  too. Consider now the Lyapunov equation (here  $I$  is a unit matrix)

$$(a_\varepsilon - QA)P_\varepsilon + P_\varepsilon(a_\varepsilon - QA)^* + I = 0. \quad (28)$$

It is clear that  $P_\varepsilon$  is the unique positive definite matrix and  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P_\varepsilon = P_0$ , where  $P_0$  is the unique matrix solving the Lyapunov equation

$$(a_0 - QA)P_0 + P_0(a_0 - QA)^* + I = 0.$$

Denote  $\|D(t)\|_{P_\varepsilon}^2 := \langle D^*(t)P_\varepsilon D(t) \rangle$ . With the help of the Itô formula and (28) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} d\|D(t)\|_{P_\varepsilon}^2 &= \left( -\|D(t)\|^2 + 2\langle D(t), P_\varepsilon U(t) \rangle + \langle Q, P_\varepsilon Q \rangle \right) dt \\ &\quad + 2\langle D(t), P_\varepsilon Q dW_t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the function  $V(t) = E\|D(t)\|_{P_\varepsilon}^2$  is differentiable and

$$\dot{V}(t) = E \left( -\|D(t)\|^2 + 2\langle D(t), P_\varepsilon U(t) \rangle + \langle Q, P_\varepsilon Q \rangle \right).$$

It is obvious that for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon$  positive constant  $c_1, c_2, c_3$ , can be found such that  $E\|D(t)\|^2 \geq c_1 V(t)$ ,  $2E\langle D(t), P_\varepsilon U(t) \rangle \leq c_2 \sqrt{V(t)}$ ,  $\langle Q, P_\varepsilon Q \rangle \leq c_3$ . Hence,  $\dot{V}(t) \leq -c_1 V(t) + c_2 \sqrt{V(t)} + c_3$ . The use of the inequality  $\sqrt{x} \leq \alpha^{-1} + \alpha x$ ,  $\alpha \geq 0, x \geq 0$ , with  $\alpha = \frac{c_1}{2c_2}$ , provides

$$\dot{V}(t) \leq -0.5c_1 V(t) + \frac{2c_2^2}{c_1} + c_3.$$

Hence, for any  $t \geq 0$  we have  $V(t) \leq V(0) + \frac{2c_2^2 + c_1 c_3}{0.5c_1}$ .

Obviously, this property and (26) provide (25).

For the discrete time setting with  $\sqrt{t_i - t_{i-1}} \equiv \varepsilon$ , adapted to the framework of [16], we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{f}_i &= \widehat{f}_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(1)} + \frac{q_0}{n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{f}_{i-1}) \\ \widehat{f}_i^{(j)} &= \widehat{f}_{i-1}^{(j)} + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{f}_{i-1}^{(j+1)} + \frac{q_1}{n^{(2(k+1)-j)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{f}_{i-1}) \\ & j = 1, \dots, k-1 \\ \widehat{f}_i^{(k)} &= \widehat{f}_{i-1}^{(k)} \left(1 - \frac{a_1}{n}\right) - \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{\ell=2}^{k-1} a_\ell \widehat{f}_{i-1}^{(k-\ell)} + a_k \widehat{f}_{i-1} + a_k K \right) \\ & + \frac{q_k}{n^{(k+2)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{f}_{i-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, in the framework of this paper, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{v}_i &= \widehat{v}_{i-1} + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(1)} + \frac{U_{00}\vartheta^{1/k+1}}{n^{2(k+1)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}) \\ \widehat{v}_i^{(j)} &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j)} + \frac{1}{n}\widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(j+1)} + \frac{U_{0j}\vartheta^{(j+1)/k+1}}{n^{(2(k+1)-j)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}) \\ & j = 1, \dots, k-1 \\ \widehat{v}_i^{(k)} &= \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(k)} \left(1 - \frac{a_1}{n}\right) - \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{\ell=2}^{k-1} a_\ell \widehat{v}_{i-1}^{(k-\ell)} + a_k \widehat{v}_{i-1} + a_k K \right) \\ & + \frac{U_{0k}\vartheta}{n^{(k+2)/(2k+3)}}(X_i - \widehat{v}_{i-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

## References

- [1] Andersen, T., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F.X. and Labys, P. *Exchange Rate Returns Standardized by Realized Volatility are (Nearly) Gaussian.*, *Multi-national Finance Journal*, **4**, 2000, pp. 159–179.
- [2] Baillie, R.T., T, Bollerslev, *Prediction in Dynamic Models with Time-Dependent Conditional Variances*, *Journal of Econometrics*, **52**, 1992, pp. 91-113.
- [3] Black, F. *The Pricing of Commodity Contracts.* *Journal of Financial Economics*, **9**, 1976, pp. 167-179.
- [4] Black, F. and M. Scholes, *The Pricing of Options and Coporate Liabilities*, *Journal of Political Economics*, **81**, 1973, pp. 637-659.
- [5] Bollerslev, T., *Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity*, *Journal of Econometrics*, **31**, pp. 307-327, 1986.
- [6] Bollerslev, T., R.Y. Chou, K.F. Kroner, *ARCH Modeling in Finance: A Review of the Theory and Empirical Evidence*, *Journal of Econometrics*, **52**, pp. 5-59, 1992.

- [7] Chow, P.L., Khasminskii, R. and Liptser, R. (1997) Tracking of signal and its derivatives in the Gaussian White noise, *Stoc. Proc. Appl.* **69**, 2, 259-273.
- [8] Day, T.E. and C.M. Lewis . *Forecasting Futures Market Volatility*, Journal of Derivatives, Winter 1993.
- [9] Duan, J. C. *The GARCH Option Pricing Model. Mathematical Finance.* **5** (1), 1995, pp. 13-32.
- [10] Engle, Robert, *Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity with Estimates of the Variance of United Kingdom Inflation*, *Econometrica*, **50**, pp. 987-1007, 1982.
- [11] Goldenshluger, A. and Nemirovski, A. *Adaptive de-noising of signals satisfying differential inequalities.* *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **43**, 3, pp. 873-889, 1997
- [12] Goldentayer, L. and Liptser, R. *On-line tracking of a smooth regression function*, *Statistic Inference for Stochastic Processes*, to appear in 2003.
- [13] Hamilton, J.D., *Time Series Analysis*, Princeton University Press, 1994.
- [14] Ibragimov, I. and Khasminskii, R., *On nonparametric estimation of regression*, *Soviet Math.Dokl.*,**21**, 1980, pp. 810–814.
- [15] Ibragimov, I. and Khasminskii, R. *Statistical estimation: Asymptotic theory.* Springer Verlag, 1981 (Russian ed.1979).
- [16] Khasminskii, R. and Liptser, R. On-line estimation of a smooth regression function. *Theory of Probability and its Applications.* **3** (2002).
- [17] Mercurio, Danilo and Spokoiny, Vladimir, *em Statistical inference for time-inhomogeneous volatility models.*, **583**, 2000, [www.wias-berlin.de/publications/preprints/index-2000.html](http://www.wias-berlin.de/publications/preprints/index-2000.html)
- [18] Stone, C. *Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression*, *Ann. Statist.*, **10**, 1982, pp.1040–1053.