Proceedings of ICFTBA 2025 Symposium: Data-Driven Decision Making in Business and Economics
DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.BL31108

Pricing Financial Derivatives in Collateralized Markets: Foundations, Models, and Valuation Adjustments

Lifu Zhou

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, University of Illinois Urbana–Champaign (UIUC), Urbana–Champaign, USA
zhoulifu6688@163.com

Abstract. Financial derivatives facilitate precise risk transfer yet are contingent upon robust pricing. This paper explores the conditions under which derivative prices can remain economically coherent when real markets deviate from textbook assumptions. An integrated framework is developed that begins with the no-arbitrage principle and risk-neutral valuation, and then links these foundations to canonical pricing models—Black–Scholes–Merton, binomial lattices, local and stochastic volatility, jump-diffusion specifications, and interest-rate and credit-risk models—showing how replication, martingale measures, and Greeks structure valuation and hedging . Building on this theoretical base, the analysis examines market realities—liquidity, funding, collateral, and central clearing—and the resulting XVA ecosystem, calibration instability, and numerical error. The paper synthesizes these elements into a practice-oriented perspective: accurate pricing requires simultaneous (i) model selection calibrated to salient risks, (ii) liquidity- and funding-aware adjustments, and (iii) governance and validation to mitigate model risk. The conclusion is that a coherent, end-to-end approach—linking front-office quoting to collateral and treasury constraints and risk control—can turn derivative prices into reliable guides for hedging and capital allocation, while also identifying limitations (limited empirics and literature coverage) and future avenues (empirical validation, richer dynamics, and machine-learning surrogates).

Keywords: derivative pricing, risk-neutral valuation, stochastic volatility, XVA, collateralized discounting

1. Introduction

Derivatives—options, futures, swaps, and credit instruments—are indispensable tools for risk mitigation and the expression of speculative positions. Their market prices embed expectations about future states and the cost of bearing uncertainty. Mispricing undermines hedging effectiveness and can amplify systemic risk, as funding and collateral interact with leverage and liquidity [1].

This study develops a theory-to-practice integration framework for derivative pricing. Part II formalizes core principles—law of one price, no-arbitrage, and risk-neutral valuation—and shows how replication underpins pricing and Greeks [2,3]. Part III consolidates drivers and models into coherent narrative paragraphs rather than bullet points, integrating volatility, interest rates, dividends/carry, credit, and market microstructure with canonical models [4-8]. Part IV (embedded

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.BL31108

within our discussion) links theory to practice: collateral choice, OIS discounting, central clearing, funding and margin, and XVA [9,1]. We close with a structured conclusion.

How do no-arbitrage and risk-neutral valuation guide pricing when markets exhibit frictions? Which model families best align with observed smiles/skews, interest-rate term structures, and credit dynamics? How should funding, collateral, clearing, and capital costs be integrated into "price"?

The paper systematically summarizes theoretical foundations, elaborates on model choices and limitations, and integrates market frictions into a practical pricing stack. It thereby provides a consolidated analytical framework for students and practitioners to produce prices that are both internally consistent and operationally relevant. This contributes to better hedging, risk control, and capital allocation in modern markets.

2. Theoretical foundations of derivative pricing

Derivative pricing is anchored in the no-arbitrage principle and the fundamental theorem of asset pricing: in arbitrage-free markets, there exists an equivalent martingale measure under which discounted asset prices are martingales; derivative values are discounted expectations of payoffs under this measure [2,3]. In continuous-time diffusion settings, dynamic replication operationalizes this theoretical construct: a European option's payoff can be matched by trading the underlying and a risk-free asset; the cost of the replicating portfolio determines the option price [8,10]. The associated Greeks—delta, gamma, vega, theta, rho—quantify marginal sensitivities and guide hedging.

Risk-neutral valuation is not a statement about investor beliefs; it is a probability measure transformation that simplifies pricing by setting the expected drift of all tradable assets to the risk-free rate, leaving the state-price density to reflect risk premia. In incomplete markets (e.g., stochastic volatility with unhedgeable factors), replication may be approximate; then prices reflect preferences or auxiliary hedging instruments [11]. The economics of funding and collateralization further complicate discounting: the move from LIBOR to OIS discounting for collateralized trades altered present-value conventions, aligning discount rates with collateral remuneration [9]. For standardized products, central clearing mitigates bilateral counterparty risk but introduces initial/variation margin, making XVAadjustments an integral part of the pricing stack [4]. These institutional details ensure that theoretical frameworks remain grounded in the constraints of actual trading environments.

3. Pricing drivers and canonical models

3.1. Pricing drivers as a coherent narrative

Derivative prices are shaped by a joint configuration of the underlying's dynamics, the volatility surface, the interest-rate and funding environment, income/carry on the underlying (dividends for equities, convenience yield for commodities), time to maturity and moneyness, counterparty credit and collateral terms, and market microstructure (liquidity, transaction costs, and hedging feasibility).

First, volatility is the primary determinant of option valuations, but in practice implied volatility varies across maturities and strikes, producing smiles and skews that any model must match both cross-sectionally and over time [11,12]. Second, the term structure of interest rates governs discounting and forward measures; multi-curve construction after the financial crisis separated projection curves from discount curves, with OIS typically used for collateralized discounting [9]. Third, funding constraints, collateral arrangements, and clearing mandates redefine the economic

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.BL31108

meaning of "price": margin requirements and balance-sheet usage feed into FVA/MVA/KVA, linking valuation to treasury costs and regulatory capital [4,13]. Fourth, credit risk impacts both the underlying (for credit derivatives) and the counterparty, entering prices via CVA/DVA or via structural models that tie default to firm-value dynamics [14]. Finally, liquidity and microstructure matter critically: wide bid-ask spreads, discrete hedging, and inventory constraints invalidate frictionless assumptions and can create persistent pricing wedges that fast models must accommodate through robust risk limits and conservative adjustments. Collectively, these drivers imply that the "correct" price is not a single closed form but the outcome of consistent modeling paradigms + market convention adherence + balance-sheet cost integration, all aligned with hedging feasibility.

3.2. Canonical models in practice-aligned prose

The Black–Scholes–Merton (BSM) model assumes geometric Brownian motion with constant volatility and rates, yielding closed-form European option prices and tractable Greeks [8,10]. Its simplicity establishes it as the industry standard quoting framework, with the market communicating prices via implied volatility. The binomial/CRR lattice discretizes diffusion dynamics to capture early exercise features and path-dependent payoffs, converging to the BSM solution under fine grid limits [4].

To match smiles/skews, local-volatility frameworks exactly fit today's surface but can misstate smile dynamics out of sample [12] Stochastic-volatility models, such as Heston, introduce a volatility factor; these capture the time evolution of the surface more plausibly but require careful calibration and may generate parameter instability. Jump-diffusions [5] and more general Lévy processes accommodate discontinuities and heavy tails, improving the fit for short-dated options and gap-risk management.

For rates derivatives, short-rate models [6] supply analytic tractability and intuition, while HJMand LIBOR Market Models align directly with observed tenor structures used in swaps/caps/floors. In credit, reduced-form (intensity) models price CDS via hazard rates [15], and structural models relate default to asset dynamics [14]. For exotics and high-dimensional payoffs, Monte Carlo (with variance-reduction and adjoint differentiation for Greeks) and PDE/finite-difference methods are indispensable computational workhorses [16].

Crucially, model choice follows a hierarchical structure: fast BSM/trees support quoting and hedging intuition; local/stochastic-volatility and jump models improve surface fit; interest-rate/credit frameworks handle term structures and default; and numerical engines deliver prices for path-dependent features. This hierarchy aligns with front-office speed requirements while anchoring risk in richer engines for end-of-day and stress workflows.

4. Practical challenges and responses

4.1. Market-level challenges

Liquidity and fragmentation affect both price formation and hedging costs. In stressed conditions, bid-ask spreads widen and correlations spike, undermining assumptions about continuous hedging and normal market depth. Collateral and funding conventions exhibit material impacts: the paradigm shift from LIBOR to overnight collateralized discounting (e.g., OIS) redefined discount rates and hence valuations. Central clearing has reduced bilateral counterparty credit risk for standardized products but introduced margin and funding considerations that permeate the pricing process.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.BL31108

Response: Use liquidity-aware models and risk limits, incorporate funding value adjustments (FVA), and stress-test Greeks under realistic trading constraints. Alignment between front-office quoting, treasury funding, and collateral management is critical to consistent prices.

4.2. Model-level challenges

Calibration endeavors to reconcile the scarcity of market quotes with model flexibility constraints. Over-fitting an implied surface can produce unstable parameters; under-fitting misses key risk features. Numerical error (discretization, simulation variance) and convergence issues can distort valuation outputs and Greek sensitivities. For exotics, path-dependence and early exercise features escalate computational complexity.

Response: Adopt robust calibration (regularization, cross-validation across maturities/strikes), maintain model hierarchies (from fast quoting models to risk engines), and validate with out-of-sample tests. Leverage adjoint algorithmic differentiation (AAD) or pathwise/likelihood-ratio methodologies to generate stable Greek sensitivities. Maintain model risk governance with independent validation, benchmarking against alternatives, and conservative reserves where uncertainty is high.

4.3. Regulatory-level challenges

Post-crisis reforms—central clearing mandates, uncleared margin rules (UMR), and capital requirements—shape pricing via collateral, margin, and capital costs. Balance-sheet constraints and XVA adjustments (CVA/DVA/FVA/MVA/KVA) inextricably link derivative prices to counterparty credit risk, own-credit risk, funding costs, margin requirements, and regulatory capital consumption. Accounting standards can further constrain model choices and netting assumptions.

Response: Integrate XVA frameworks into front-to-back systems so quotes reflect genuine economic costs. Establish consistent curve construction methodologies (e.g., OIS discounting, collateral currency) and legal clarity around netting sets and close-out provisions.

5. Frontiers and future directions

Hybrids that couple rates, credit, and equity; rough-volatility capturing term-structure of skew; regime-switching for macro turning points.

Neural PDE solvers and deep surrogate models approximate complex pricing maps and accelerate risk. They demand explainability and robust validation to avoid hidden arbitrage or brittle behavior.

Real-time valuation on HPC/cloud with AAD-enabled Greeks and full XVA alongside price blurs the line between “valuation” and “cost of risk transfer,” reflecting true balance-sheet economics.

6. Conclusion

This paper synthesizes theoretical first principles with real-world market practices to address the core question of how derivative prices retain economic coherence in friction-laden markets. The no-arbitrage and risk-neutral framework, operationalized through replication and martingale measures, provides the conceptual backbone for valuation and hedging. The analysis then consolidates key pricing drivers—volatility surfaces, rate and funding structures, dividends/carry, maturity/moneyness, credit/collateral, and microstructure—into a single, coherent narrative and maps these to canonical models: BSM and CRR for baselines and early exercise; local/stochastic-

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.BL31108

volatility and jump-diffusion models for smiles/skews and discontinuities; short-rate/HJM/LMM models for term-structure products; and structural/reduced-form frameworks for credit . For derivatives with complex payoff structures, Monte Carlo simulation and PDE solvers are identified as indispensable computational workhorses, with AAD enabling scalable Greek sensitivity calculations .

The discussion demonstrates that funding constraints, collateral arrangements, and central clearing mandates redefine the economic meaning of “derivative price,” thereby necessitating robust XVA integration and consistent curve construction methodologies. In practice, accurate pricing emerges from an integrated stack: (i) models that capture material risks, (ii) liquidity- and funding-aware adjustments, and (iii) governance structures that contain model risk. When these elements cohere—front-office quoting aligned with treasury and collateral management—prices can guide hedging, risk transfer, and capital allocation in a reliable manner.

This paper retains a conceptual and synthetic orientation rather than an empirical focus; no novel datasets or formal back-testing analyses are presented. Coverage of the vast literature is necessarily selective, and certain asset classes (e.g., inflation, longevity, crypto derivatives) are only treated implicitly. Computational comparisons (Monte Carlo vs. PDE vs. neural surrogates) are not benchmarked in this study. Future work may (i) embed empirics, testing calibration stability and P&L explainability against live markets; (ii) expand literature coverage, especially rough-volatility models, multi-curve dynamics beyond OIS, and cutting-edge XVA methodologies; (iii) benchmark numerical engines, including AAD and machine-learning surrogates under stress; and (iv) examine liquidity-aware hedging and execution frictions using microstructure data. Such extensions would evolve this integrated analytical framework into a validated, operationally deployable pricing playbook for derivatives trading desks and risk management practitioners.

References

[1] CPMI-IOSCO. (2012). Principles for Financial Market Infrastructures (PFMI). https: //www.bis.org/cpmi/publ/d101a.pdf?.com

[2] Harrison, J. M., & Pliska, S. R. (1981). Martingales and stochastic integrals in the theory of continuous trading. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 11(3), 215–260. https: //www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304414981900260

[3] Harrison, J. M., & Kreps, D. M. (1979). Martingales and arbitrage in multi-period securities markets. Journal of Economic Theory, 20(3), 381–408. https: //www.sfu.ca/~kkasa/HarrisonKreps_79.pdf

[4] Cox, J. C., Ross, S. A., & Rubinstein, M. (1979). Option pricing: A simplified approach. Journal of Financial Economics, 7(3), 229–263. https: //www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304405X79900151?.com

[5] Merton, R. C. (1976). Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(1–2), 125–144. https: //www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304405X76900222?.com

[6] Vasicek, O. (1977). An equilibrium characterization of the term structure of interest rates. Journal of Financial Economics, 5(2), 177–188. https: //www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304405X77900162?.com

[7] Cox, J. C., Ingersoll, J. E., & Ross, S. A. (1985). A theory of the term structure of interest rates. Econometrica, 53(2), 385–407. https: //pages.stern.nyu.edu/~dbackus/BCZ/discrete_time/CIR_Econometrica_85.pdf?.com

[8] Black, F., & Scholes, M. (1973). The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. Journal of Political Economy, 81(3), 637–654. https: //www.jstor.org/stable/1831029

[9] Fujii, M., Shimada, Y., & Takahashi, A. (2010). A note on construction of multiple swap curves with and without collateral. SSRN Working Paper. https: //papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1440633& .com

[10] Merton, R. C. (1973). Theory of rational option pricing. Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science, 4(1), 141–183. https: //www.jstor.org/stable/3003143

[11] Heston, S. L. (1993). A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility. Review of Financial Studies, 6(2), 327–343. https: //academic.oup.com/rfs/article/6/2/327/1574747?login=true.com

[12] Derman, E., & Kani, I. (1994). Riding on a smile. Risk Magazine, February issue. https: //www.cmat.edu.uy/~mordecki/hk/derman-kani.pdf?.com

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.BL31108

[13] Burgard, C., & Kjaer, M. (2013). Funding strategies, funding costs. Risk Magazine, December. https: //www.risk.net/derivatives/2310207/funding-strategies-funding-costs
[14] Merton, R. C. (1974). On the pricing of corporate debt: The risk structure of interest rates. Journal of Finance, 29(2), 449–470. https: //www.jstor.org/stable/2978814
[15] Duffie, D., & Singleton, K. (1999). Modeling term structures of defaultable bonds. Review of Financial Studies, 12(4), 687–720. https: //academic.oup.com/rfs/article-abstract/12/4/687/1578719?redirectedFrom=fulltext
[16] Glasserman, P. (2004). Monte Carlo Methods in Financial Engineering. Springer Nature Link. https: //link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-0-387-21617-1?.com