The Dynamic Covenant Capital Structure (DCCS) Model: Integrating Covenants into Capital Structure Theory

Vladimir Manaev

This version: 24th of October 2024

Abstract

This paper presents the Dynamic Covenant Capital Structure (DCCS) model, an innovative extension of the Leland (1994) framework that incorporates Debt/EBITDA covenants into capital structure decisions.

Covenants are modeled as embedded real options, where the firm is effectively short a put option on its own assets, facing penalties if a covenant is breached. The model introduces a "downgrade asset level" V_g, enabling firms to optimize leverage and financial flexibility while accounting for the costs of covenant violations. The DCCS model unifies key theories—trade-off, pecking order, and agency theory—offering fresh insights into how covenants shape corporate finance policies. Importantly, the model's parameters are straightforward to calibrate using real-world data, enhancing its practical applicability. Numerical results demonstrate that firms can optimize debt levels by managing covenant risks, redefining modern capital structure theory.

1 Introduction

In the classic Leland (1994) model, the corporation defines its optimal debt level by balancing bankruptcy costs and tax benefits of debt within a continuous-time framework. Despite the elegance of the model, it does not account for key financial metrics, such as covenants, which are prevalent in modern debt contracts. Our paper addresses this gap by explicitly modeling Debt/EBITDA covenants within the classic dynamic capital structure framework of Leland (1994). Covenants are critical mechanisms for protecting creditor rights and managing both agency and credit risks.

Recent empirical evidence, such as Graham (2022), shows that the majority of CFOs rely heavily on metrics like Debt/EBITDA, interest coverage, and credit ratings when making capital structure decisions. This underscores the practical importance of incorporating covenants into theoretical capital structure models.

Furthermore, this paper integrates real options theory by treating covenants as embedded options, where the firm effectively writes a short put option on its own assets. This novel perspective allows us to model debt with covenants more accurately, considering the contingent nature of covenant violations.

This paper proposes a model that integrates covenants into the traditional capital structure framework, which allows for the joint study of financial flexibility and optimal capital structure decisions.

2 Key Contributions

The paper makes five main contributions:

1. Incorporates covenants into the classic Leland (1994) capital structure model.
2. Generalizes classic capital structure theories into a unified framework.
3. Develops a novel approach to debt pricing using real options theory.
4. Provides a dynamic perspective on capital structure management.
5. Integrates risk management into capital structure decisions, focusing on covenant risks.

First, the DCCS model builds on a robust body of empirical research that highlights the crucial role of covenants in corporate policies. Chava and Roberts (2008) demonstrated that covenant violations negatively impact corporate investment, while Roberts and Sufi (2009) showed how these violations affect firms' debt policies. Bräuning et al. (2022) further provided evidence on the importance of maintenance and incurrence covenants in shaping corporate decisions.

Despite the extensive empirical evidence on covenants, traditional theoretical models have largely overlooked their integration. As Roberts and Sufi (2009, p. 1691) noted, "we believe that considering contractual restrictions and creditor rights outside of bankruptcy may help explain observed capital structure." The DCCS model addresses this gap by incorporating Debt/EBITDA covenants into the theoretical framework, reflecting their prevalence in corporate debt agreements Bräuning et al. (2022).

Second, the DCCS model unifies classic capital structure models by integrating covenants, offering a more comprehensive framework. This broader approach improves our understanding of capital structure decisions. (For more details, see "Relation to the Classic Capital Structure Models.")

Third, the DCCS model redefines debt contracts by treating covenants as embedded options, providing a more robust framework for debt pricing. The model introduces a downgrade asset level V_g, strategically set to manage the risk of covenant violations. Financial flexibility is measured as the distance between the firm's current value and this threshold, with covenants acting as "short put" options on the firm's assets. By explicitly considering Debt/EBITDA covenants and the risks of covenant breaches, the DCCS model offers a more precise method for pricing debt.

Fourth, the model updates capital structure policy by moving beyond the traditional trade-off between the tax benefits of debt and bankruptcy costs. Instead, it incorporates strategic management of covenant violations to optimize the firm's D/V ratio. Covenant violation penalties are easier to estimate—Roberts and Sufi (2009) found that over 25% of debt contracts experienced violations—while bankruptcy events are relatively rare.

Fifth, the DCCS model integrates risk management by addressing covenant violation risks, with financial flexibility as a core factor in capital structure decisions.

3 Relation to the Classic Capital Structure Theories

3.1 Tradeoff Theory

The Modigliani and Miller (1958) provides a foundation for understanding the tax benefits of debt, where higher taxes lead to a greater tax shield and, consequently, an increase in the firm's D/V ratio. The DCCS model also incorporates this positive relationship between taxes and debt, acknowledging the tax advantages of leverage.

In addition to modeling the tax benefits of debt, the DCCS model provides a more granular analysis by examining the effect of taxes on the optimal covenant threshold. Specifically, the model studies how an increase in the effective tax rate affects the V_g/V ratio, which reflects the firm's financial flexibility. A higher V_g/V ratio means the firm has less financial flexibility, as its asset value is closer to the covenant violation threshold. As taxes increase, the firm adjusts by raising the V_g/V ratio, which results in a higher optimal D/V ratio. Therefore, the DCCS model goes beyond the MM framework by incorporating covenants and offering a more detailed view of how taxes influence both leverage and the firm's financial flexibility decisions.

3.2 Pecking Order Theory

Myers and Majluf (1984) proposed the pecking order theory, which suggests that firms prefer internal funds over external financing due to information asymmetry between the firm and external investors. High information asymmetry increases adverse selection costs, making external financing less attractive. The theory predicts that firms facing greater information asymmetry will have lower debt-to-value (D/V) ratios but does not specify the optimal D/V.

In the DCCS model, we incorporate the assumption that industries with high information asymmetry experience:

1. **Stricter covenants** (lower covenant level K): Creditors impose tighter restrictions to protect themselves against the increased risk associated with information asymmetry.

2. **Higher covenant negotiation costs** (higher k): Negotiating looser covenants becomes more expensive because creditors demand additional compensation for the heightened risk.

According to the financial flexibility model:

- **High information asymmetry leads to stricter covenants ($\downarrow K$)**, which directly reduces the optimal D/V ratio since the optimal debt level D^* is proportional to K (i.e., $D^* = \alpha K V_g^*$).
- **Higher covenant negotiation costs ($\uparrow k$)** increase the optimal covenant threshold V_g^*, reducing financial flexibility. While a higher V_g^* might suggest an increase in D^*, the dominating effect of stricter covenants (lower K) leads to a net decrease in the optimal D/V ratio.

Therefore, the DCCS model not only aligns with the pecking order theory but also provides a specific mechanism to understand how high information asymmetry affects the optimal D/V ratio through covenant strictness and negotiation costs.

3.3 Agency Theory

Agency theory, as discussed by Jensen and Meckling (1976) and Jensen (1986), focuses on conflicts of interest between managers and shareholders, as well as between debt holders and equity holders. While the DCCS model does not study conflicts between managers and shareholders, it captures agency conflicts between debt holders and equity holders through the covenant negotiation cost (k) and the covenant strictness parameter (K). Increased agency conflicts are modeled by higher covenant negotiation costs (higher k) and stricter covenants (lower K), similar to what mentioned in the previous paragraphs. This demonstrates how the DCCS model incorporates agency theory by showing that agency conflicts influence the firm's optimal capital structure via changes in covenant terms and associated costs.

3.4 Signalling Theory

Signalling theory, introduced by Ross (1977), postulates that high-quality firms use more debt to signal their type to the market. Firms with strong prospects can afford higher leverage, demonstrating confidence in their ability to meet debt obligations. This theory can be examined using the DCCS model by considering the EBITDA/V ratio as a proxy for firm quality.

High EBITDA/V values indicate strong cash flow generation and operational efficiency— characteristics of high-quality firms. According to signalling theory, these firms should exhibit higher debt-to-value (D/V) ratios. This aligns with the predictions in the DCCS model, which shows that increasing EBITDA/V leads to higher optimal D/V ratios.

Furthermore, empirical analysis at the industry level provides moderate support for this relationship. The EBITDA/V variable is statistically significant at the 90% confidence level in the D/V regression. This suggests that the DCCS model effectively incorporates elements of signalling theory to explain capital structure decisions, demonstrating that high-quality firms use higher leverage as a signal of their strength.

3.5 Life Cycle Theory of Debt

The life cycle theory of debt, as proposed by DeAngelo et al. (2010), predicts that younger firms rely more on equity financing and have lower optimal debt-to-value (D/V) ratios. In the context of the DCCS model, this theory can be aligned by considering the typical characteristics of younger firms. Younger firms often face higher borrowing costs (C) due to their limited credit histories, higher asset volatility (σ) because of uncertain future prospects, and slightly lower EBITDA-to-value ratios (α) reflecting lower profitability or cash flows relative to firm value.

In the DCCS model, the partial derivatives of the optimal D/V ratio with respect to C, σ are negative, while for α the derivative is positive. This means that increases in borrowing costs or asset volatility, or decreases in the EBITDA-to-value ratio, lead to a lower optimal D/V ratio. Therefore, the DCCS model supports the life cycle theory by showing that younger firms, characterized by higher r and σ and lower α, would optimally choose lower leverage levels.

3.6 Market Timing

Baker and Wurgler (2002) suggest that firms issue debt when interest rates are low and issue equity when equity valuations are high. While we can specifically test the first part of the statement by looking at borrowing rates, equity valuations are not explicitly included in my model.

According to market timing theory, low interest rates are related to higher D/V ratios, which the DCCS model also suggests when we look at the partial derivative of D/V with respect to r. The model shows that $\frac{\partial D/V}{\partial r} < 0$, meaning that as interest rates decrease, the optimal debt-to-value ratio increases.

However, since equity valuations are not explicitly modeled, this alignment is more tentative. Overall, the DCCS model supports the market timing theory in terms of debt issuance when interest rates are low, but does not fully capture the theory's implications regarding equity issuance when valuations are high.

3.7 Comparison with the Leland (1994) Model

This section compares the classic Leland (1994) model with the Dynamic Covenant Capital Structure (DCCS) model on several key aspects.

Endogenous Default vs. Downgrade Level

The Leland (1994) model features endogenous default as a real option. In this model, equity holders have a **long call option** on the firm's assets. They choose the optimal default boundary to maximize equity value, deciding when to default based on the firm's asset value.

In contrast, the DCCS model introduces an endogenous downgrade level V_g, representing the covenant violation threshold. Equity holders effectively have a **short put option** on the firm's assets. They face costs if the asset value falls below V_g, modeling the risk and penalties associated with covenant breaches.

Tax Benefits vs. Costs/Losses

In the classic model, the firm balances the tax benefits of debt against default (bankruptcy) costs. The optimal capital structure is determined by weighing the tax shield from debt against expected bankruptcy costs.

The DCCS model balances the tax benefits of debt against downgrade losses, which are the penalties for covenant violations. This model focuses on the costs incurred when covenants are breached rather than on bankruptcy costs.

Default Boundary Dependency

In the classic model, the default boundary is determined endogenously but is generally independent of the magnitude of default costs. Equity holders decide when to default based on maximizing equity value, but the default boundary does not directly depend on default costs.

In the DCCS model, the downgrade boundary V_g depends on the penalty for covenant violation. Firms set the covenant threshold by balancing the benefits of financial flexibility against the costs of covenant breaches.

Equity Value Maximization

In the classic model, firms maximize equity value by choosing the coupon C and the debt level D. The focus is on optimizing the capital structure through debt issuance decisions.

In the DCCS model, firms maximize equity value by first choosing the level of financial flexibility (the covenant threshold V_g/V) and then determining the leverage ratio D/V. This approach emphasizes the management of covenants and financial flexibility in capital structure decisions.

4 Assumptions

Assumption 1: The firm's asset value V follows a Geometric Brownian Motion (GBM):

$$\frac{dV}{V} = \mu\, dt + \sigma\, dW \tag{1}$$

where:

- μ is the expected continuous return on the firm's assets.
- σ is the volatility of the asset returns.
- dW is a standard Wiener process (Brownian motion), representing the stochastic component.

Assumption 2: The covenant violation threshold V_g is the level of firm assets at which the Debt-to-EBITDA (D/EBITDA) covenant is violated. The firm strategically chooses V_g to maximize equity value. The distance between the firm's current asset value V and the covenant threshold V_g measures financial flexibility; a larger gap indicates greater flexibility to absorb adverse shocks without violating covenants.

Assumption 3: When the firm's asset value V falls below the covenant threshold V_g, indicating a covenant violation, the firm incurs a penalty modeled

as an increase in the coupon payment on its debt. Specifically, the coupon payment increases from C to $C(1+s)$, where s is the proportional increase representing the covenant violation penalty.

This penalty s can be approximately estimated using yield data from credit ratings. For example, as of October 4th, 2023, the average yield for BBB-rated corporate bonds was approximately 5.00%, and for BB-rated corporate bonds, it was approximately 5.6%. Using these yields, the proportional increase s is calculated as follows:

$$s = \frac{\text{New Coupon} - \text{Original Coupon}}{\text{Original Coupon}} = \frac{5.6\% - 5\%}{5\%} = \frac{0.6\%}{5\%} = 0.12$$

This means that upon covenant violation, the firm's coupon payment increases by 12%. Data on average yields for different credit ratings can be obtained from the Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED) website. For BBB-rated corporate bond yields, see:

https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/BAMLC0A4CBBBEY

For BB-rated corporate bond yields, see:

https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/BAMLH0A1HYBBEY

Assumption 4: The firm benefits from tax shields, estimated as the present value of the tax shield on debt. The tax shield depends on the coupon payments, which change based on whether the covenant is violated.

- **For $V > V_g$ (no covenant violation):**

  The firm pays a continuous coupon C, so the tax shield value is:

$$TB(V) = \frac{C\tau}{r} \tag{2}$$

- **At $V \leq V_g$ (covenant violation):**

  The coupon payment increases proportionally to $C(1+s)$, reflecting the higher cost of debt due to the violation. The tax shield value is then:

$$TB(V_g) = \frac{C(1+s)\tau}{r} \tag{3}$$

Assumption 5 : The firm incurs an additional cost $\frac{k}{V_g}$, representing the increasing difficulty of negotiating looser covenants, and as a result having more financial flexibility. The lower the threshold V_g, the higher the cost incurred by the firm. This cost reflects the compensation required by creditors for accepting looser terms, discouraging excessively loose covenant thresholds.

5 Debt Covenants and Real Options Approach

Debt covenants can be viewed as positioning firms in a short put option on their own assets: if no violation occurs, there are no additional costs, but if breached, the firm faces fixed costs similar to bankruptcy costs in the Leland model. These costs, modeled as a percentage of firm assets, include increased interest rates, renegotiation expenses, and reputational damage.

Empirical studies, such as those by Ivashina et al. (2009) and Roberts and Sufi (2009), show that covenant violations lead to increased financing costs and tighter constraints on the firm. Brockman and Unlu (2009) show that creditors impose higher costs as covenants loosen. While covenant violations and credit rating downgrades are not the same, there is a strong link between them because rating agencies often use financial metrics like Debt/EBITDA in their quantitative assessment of ratings.

As a result, covenant violations, particularly those involving Debt/EBITDA ratios, are often associated with higher probabilities of rating downgrades, as they signal increased financial risk. Kisgen (2006) empirically demonstrates that rating downgrades are costly for firms, increasing borrowing costs and restricting financial flexibility. This highlights the significant economic impact of covenant violation risks.

The firm naturally prefers looser covenants to maximize its financial flexibility, but this increases agency problems and conflicts with the interests of creditors. From a real options perspective, the cost of covenant flexibility can be quantified under the standard GBM assumption as the difference between the prices of two put options with different strikes. In this context, the covenant violation threshold V_g acts as the strike price. Looser covenants allow the firm to lower its violation threshold V_g, effectively shifting the strike price lower.

Thus, the financial flexibility cost can be expressed as the difference in prices between two put options, $\text{Put}(K_2) - \text{Put}(K_1)$, where $K_1 > K_2$, capturing the economic cost of more lenient covenants.

It is natural to model these options as cash-or-nothing American put options, especially when the cost of violation is approximately constant. The American option framework reflects the fact that covenant violations can occur at any time before maturity. Although the debt is assumed to have infinite maturity for simplicity, using a finite maturity provides a more realistic estimate of financial flexibility costs and simplifies the mathematical derivations. This approach allows for a more accurate assessment of the economic impact of looser covenants on the firm's value.

Thus, the derivative of the American put option price with respect to the strike can be approximated as:

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{put}}}{\partial X} \approx \frac{k}{X},$$

where k is treated as a constant, justifying the analytical form of the financial flexibility cost.

This approximation reflects that the sensitivity of the option price to changes in the strike price diminishes inversely with X, with k encapsulating factors like volatility, covenant violation costs, and time to maturity.

While the analytical derivation is complex, Appendix B provides a least squares approximation (LSM algorithm) following Longstaff and Schwartz (2001), including the numerical estimation of the k parameter, which typically ranges from 1% to 10%. Additionally, Appendix C offers a simplified mathematical intuition using a European cash-or-nothing put option, serving illustrative and educational purposes.

By modeling covenant flexibility through this real options framework, we gain valuable insights into the trade-offs firms face between enhancing financial flexibility and incurring additional economic costs.

6 Contracts Pricing with Covenant Costs

Following Leland (1994), the firm's asset process is modeled using a Geometric Brownian Motion (GBM). The firm's assets satisfy the following partial differential equation (PDE):

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 V^2 \frac{d^2F}{dV^2} + rV\frac{dF}{dV} - rF + C = 0$$

where $F(V)$ denotes the contract value on the firm's assets. Since the contract does not depend on time in a steady state, the PDE reduces to an ordinary differential equation (ODE). The general solution to this ODE is:

$$F(V) = AV^1 + BV^{-x} + \frac{C}{r}$$

where A and B are constants, and $x = \frac{2r}{\sigma^2}$.

6.1 Debt and Tax Shield Value

Using the general solution, the value of the firm's debt and the associated tax shield, respectively, can be written as:

Debt Value for $V > V_g$:

$$D(V) = \frac{C}{r} + \frac{Cs}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x$$

Tax Shield Value for $V > V_g$:

$$TB(V) = \frac{C\tau}{r} + \frac{Cs\tau}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x$$

Here, C is the coupon payment, s is the proportional increase in the coupon upon covenant violation, τ is the corporate tax rate, and V_g is the covenant threshold.

The firm's equity value is defined as:

$$E(V) = V + TB(V) - D(V) - \frac{k}{V_g}$$

where k represents the cost of negotiating looser covenants.

6.2 Covenant Negotiation Cost Term $\frac{k}{V_g}$

In this model, we introduce an additional term $\frac{k}{V_g}$, which represents the **cost of negotiating looser covenants**. As the threshold V_g decreases (i.e., the covenant becomes looser), it becomes more difficult for the firm to negotiate these terms with creditors. Creditors demand higher compensation due to the increased risk.

Thus, the modified equity equation is:

$$E(V) = V + TB(V) - D(V) - \frac{k}{V_g}$$

This additional term $\frac{k}{V_g}$ penalizes excessively loose covenants, ensuring that the firm does not set V_g too low without accounting for the increased cost of compensating creditors for the risk of looser covenants.

6.3 Mathematical Justification for $\frac{k}{V_g}$

The inclusion of $\frac{k}{V_g}$ does not directly affect the PDE governing the value of the firm's contracts because this term is a function of the covenant threshold V_g, which is a **boundary condition** rather than a variable within the asset dynamics. The PDE for the contract value $F(V)$ remains:

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 V^2 \frac{d^2F}{dV^2} + rV\frac{dF}{dV} - rF + C = 0$$

This PDE describes the firm's asset dynamics under the assumption that the asset value follows a GBM. The inclusion of $\frac{k}{V_g}$ affects the **optimization of the threshold** V_g, which is set by the firm based on the trade-off between the benefits of debt and the costs of looser covenants. The boundary condition for V_g is adjusted through the penalty term $\frac{k}{V_g}$.

Thus, the $\frac{k}{V_g}$ term influences the firm's choice of V_g, but it does not interfere with the asset process itself, meaning the PDE governing $F(V)$ remains mathematically valid.

By introducing the term $\frac{k}{V_g}$, we account for the increasing cost of negotiating looser covenants, which ensures that the firm optimally balances its leverage decisions with the costs of financial flexibility. This adjustment reflects the economic reality that as covenants loosen, creditors demand higher compensation, and the firm must consider this cost when setting its covenant threshold.

7 Maximization of Equity

The firm's equity value $E(V)$ is given by:

$$E(V) = V + TB(V_g) - D(V_g) - \frac{k}{V_g}$$

where:

- V is the firm's asset value.
- $TB(V_g)$ is the tax benefit of debt, depending on the covenant threshold V_g.
- $D(V_g)$ is the value of the firm's debt, also depending on V_g.
- $\frac{k}{V_g}$ represents the cost associated with covenant flexibility.

7.1 Expressions for Debt Value and Tax Benefit

Debt Value:

$$D(V_g) = \frac{C}{r} + \frac{Cs}{r(1+x)} \left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x$$

Tax Benefit of Debt:

$$TB(V_g) = \frac{C\tau}{r} + \frac{Cs\tau}{r(1+x)} \left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x$$

where:

- C is the coupon payment.
- r is the risk-free interest rate.
- s is the proportional increase in the coupon rate upon covenant violation.
- τ is the corporate tax rate.
- $x = \frac{2r}{\sigma^2}$, with σ being the asset volatility.

7.2 Substituting into the Equity Equation

Substituting $D(V_g)$ and $TB(V_g)$ into $E(V)$:

$$E(V) = V - \frac{C}{r} + \frac{C\tau}{r} - \frac{Cs(1-\tau)}{r(1+x)} \left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x - \frac{k}{V_g}$$

7.3 Maximizing Equity with Respect to V_g

To find the optimal covenant threshold V_g^* that maximizes $E(V)$, we set the derivative of $E(V)$ with respect to V_g to zero:

$$\frac{dE}{dV_g} = -\frac{Cs(1-\tau)x}{r(1+x)V^x}V_g^{x-1} + \frac{k}{V_g^2} = 0$$

Solving for V_g^*:

$$V_g^* = V^{\frac{x}{x+1}}\left(\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x}\right)^{\frac{1}{x+1}}$$

7.4 Second Derivative Analysis

To confirm that V_g^* maximizes $E(V)$, we compute the second derivative:

$$\frac{d^2E}{dV_g^2} = -\frac{Cs(1-\tau)x(x-1)}{r(1+x)V^x}V_g^{x-2} - \frac{2k}{V_g^3}$$

Since all parameters are positive and $x > 1$, both terms are negative. This indicates that $E(V)$ is concave with respect to V_g, and V_g^* corresponds to a maximum.

7.5 Condition for $V_g^* < 1$ (Normalized Case)

We want to ensure that the optimal covenant threshold V_g^* is less than 1 after normalizing the firm's asset value $V = 1$. The expression for V_g^* is:

$$V_g^* = \left(\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x}\right)^{\frac{1}{x+1}}$$

where $x = \frac{2r}{\sigma^2}$.

To guarantee that $V_g^* < 1$, the following condition must hold:

$$\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x} < 1$$

This implies that the firm's coupon payment C, penalty s, tax rate τ, and asset volatility σ^2 must be sufficiently large relative to the risk-free rate r and the cost of covenant relaxation k.

8 Optimal Leverage Ratio D^*

8.1 Assumption 6: Relationship Between EBITDA and Firm Value

We assume that the firm's EBITDA is proportional to its asset value V. Specifically, we define:

$$\text{EBITDA} = \alpha V$$

where:

- α represents EBITDA as a fixed percentage of firm value V. This parameter captures the firm's profitability relative to its asset base.

This assumption simplifies the relationship between the firm's earnings and its asset value, allowing us to model the Debt/EBITDA covenant constraint as a function of the firm's leverage.

8.2 Optimal Leverage Ratio D^*

We start with the Debt/EBITDA covenant condition:

$$\frac{D^*}{V_g^*} = \alpha K$$

where:

- α represents EBITDA as a percentage of firm value (as defined in Assumption 6),
- K is the Debt/EBITDA covenant ratio.

Substituting the correct expression for V_g^*:

$$V_g^* = \left(\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x} \right)^{\frac{1}{x+1}}$$

where $x = \frac{2r}{\sigma^2}$.

The optimal debt level D^* is given by:

$$D^* = \alpha K \cdot V_g^*$$

Thus, the optimal debt level D^*, or equivalently the leverage ratio, is:

$$D^* = \alpha K \cdot \left(\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x} \right)^{\frac{1}{x+1}}$$

8.3 Normalization $V = 1$

By setting $V = 1$, the leverage ratio simplifies to:

$$D^* = \alpha K \cdot \left(\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x} \right)^{\frac{1}{x+1}}$$

Thus, the optimal debt level D^* directly represents the optimal leverage ratio, showing how the leverage depends on the firm's covenant ratio K, profitability α, and other model parameters such as the cost of negotiating looser covenants k, the risk-free rate r, the coupon payment C, the penalty s, and the corporate tax rate τ.

9 Sensitivity of V_g^* Covenant Threshold

To understand how the optimal covenant threshold V_g^* responds to changes in key parameters, we compute the partial derivatives with respect to each parameter, normalizing the firm value $V = 1$ for simplicity.

The expression for V_g^* is:

$$V_g^* = \left(\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x} \right)^{\frac{1}{x+1}}$$

where $x = \dfrac{2r}{\sigma^2}$.

We calculate the derivatives with respect to k, σ^2, r, s, C, and τ. The table below summarizes the partial derivatives and their signs:

Parameter	Partial Derivative $\dfrac{\partial V_g^*}{\partial \theta}$	Sign
k	$\dfrac{1}{(x+1)k} \cdot V_g^*$	Positive
σ^2	$V_g^* \left(\dfrac{x}{(x+1)^2\sigma^2} \left(\ln V_g^* + \dfrac{1}{x} \right) \right)$	Negative (under typical conditions)
r	$V_g^* \left(\dfrac{1}{(x+1)r} - \dfrac{2}{(x+1)^2(2r+\sigma^2)} \ln V_g^* \right)$	Positive (when $V_g^* < 1$)
s	$-\dfrac{1}{(x+1)s} \cdot V_g^*$	Negative
C	$-\dfrac{1}{(x+1)C} \cdot V_g^*$	Negative
τ	$\dfrac{1}{(x+1)(1-\tau)} \cdot V_g^*$	Positive

Economic Interpretation of Sensitivity Results

- **Covenant Cost** k: Higher k increases V_g^*. Firms set a higher threshold to justify the increased cost of negotiating looser covenants.
- **Asset Volatility** σ^2: Increasing σ^2 decreases V_g^*. Higher volatility raises the risk of covenant violation, so firms lower the threshold to reduce this risk.
- **Interest Rate** r: Higher r raises V_g^*. Increased borrowing costs lead firms to set a higher threshold, tightening financial flexibility.
- **Penalty for Covenant Violation** s: A higher penalty s lowers V_g^*. Firms set a lower threshold to avoid costly covenant breaches.
- **Debt Coupon Payment** C: Higher C decreases V_g^*. Firms become more conservative to manage higher debt obligations.

- **Corporate Tax Rate** τ: Increasing τ raises V_g^*. Enhanced tax benefits of debt encourage firms to set a higher threshold.

10 Numerical Example and Sensitivity Analysis

In this chapter, we apply the Dynamic Covenant Capital Structure (DCCS) model to a BBB-rated U.S. corporation to analyze the optimal leverage ratio and downgrade boundary using realistic market parameters. The parameters used in this example reflect a typical BBB-rated firm, and they provide valuable insights into how the firm should balance debt and financial flexibility.

10.1 Baseline Case

We begin by establishing the following baseline parameters for a BBB-rated firm:

Parameter	**Value**
Normalized firm value (V)	1.0
Risk-free rate (r)	0.04
Corporate tax rate (τ)	0.21
Asset volatility (σ)	0.22
EBITDA/Firm value ratio (α)	0.10
Debt/EBITDA covenant ratio (K)	4
Coupon payment (C)	0.05
Penalty for covenant violation (s)	0.12
Covenant negotiation cost (k)	0.05

Using these baseline inputs, the model calculates the optimal leverage ratio and downgrade boundary. Specifically:

- The optimal debt-to-value ratio D/V is calculated to be approximately 34.53%, meaning the firm should maintain this level of leverage to balance the tax benefits of debt with the risks of covenant violations.
- The model predicts that the firm can sustain a 13.66% decline in asset value before triggering a covenant violation, at which point penalties would be imposed.

Output	**Value**
Optimal covenant threshold (V_g/V)	0.8634
Optimal leverage ratio (D/V)	0.3453

10.2 Scenario Analysis

We now compare the optimal debt-to-value ratio D^* for a series of scenarios against the baseline D^*. The baseline D^* is calculated to be 0.3453 (34.53%). In

each scenario, one parameter is varied, while all others remain at their baseline values.

Scenario	**New $\hat{D^*}$**	**Change (%)**
Baseline $\hat{D^*}$	0.3453	0.0
Scenario 1: r increases to 5%	0.3693	+6.93
Scenario 2: r decreases to 3%	0.3116	-9.76
Scenario 3: Tax rate increases to 30%	0.3615	+4.66
Scenario 4: σ increases to 25%	0.3529	+2.19
Scenario 5: σ decreases to 20%	0.3434	-0.55
Scenario 6: α decreases to 0.08	0.2763	-20.00
Scenario 7: α increases to 0.12	0.4144	+20.00
Scenario 8: K increases to 5	0.4317	+25.00
Scenario 9: K decreases to 3	0.2590	-25.00
Scenario 10: C increases to 0.06	0.3224	-6.64
Scenario 11: C decreases to 0.04	0.3756	+8.78
Scenario 12: s increases to 0.2	0.2849	-17.52
Scenario 13: s decreases to 0.1	0.3699	+7.11
Scenario 14: k decreases to 0.02	0.2445	-29.21
Scenario 15: k increases to 0.07	0.3920	+13.52

Table 1: Changes in Optimal Debt-to-Value Ratio D^* for Different Scenarios

10.2.1 Discussion of Results

- **Interest Rate (r):** An increase in the risk-free rate to 5% raises the optimal debt-to-value ratio by 6.93%, while a decrease to 3% lowers it by 9.76%.
- **Corporate Tax Rate (τ):** Increasing the corporate tax rate to 30% results in a 4.66% rise in the optimal debt ratio.
- **Asset Volatility (σ):** A higher volatility (25%) slightly increases D^* by 2.19%, while reducing volatility to 20% leads to a small decrease of 0.55%.
- **EBITDA/Firm Value Ratio (α):** Lowering α to 0.08 causes a 20% reduction in the optimal debt ratio, while increasing α to 0.12 leads to a 20% rise.
- **Debt/EBITDA Covenant Ratio (K):** Increasing K to 5 raises the optimal debt-to-value ratio by 25%, while decreasing it to 3 reduces it by 25%.
- **Coupon Payment (C):** A rise in coupon payments to 0.06 lowers D^* by 6.64%, while reducing C to 0.04 increases the debt ratio by 8.78%.

- **Penalty for Covenant Violation (s):** Increasing s to 0.2 reduces the optimal debt ratio by 17.52%, while lowering it to 0.1 raises D^* by 7.11%.
- **Covenant Negotiation Cost (k):** A decrease in k to 0.02 results in a sharp 29.21% reduction in D^*, while an increase to 0.07 leads to a 13.52% rise.

11 Conclusion

This paper introduces the Dynamic Covenant Capital Structure (DCCS) model, offering a significant extension to traditional capital structure theory by incorporating Debt/EBITDA covenants. The model's treatment of covenants as embedded real options, where firms effectively hold a short put position on their assets, provides a novel and practical approach to understanding the financial flexibility and risks associated with covenant breaches. By integrating the "downgrade asset level" V_g, the DCCS model allows firms to optimize their leverage while managing the cost of covenant violations.

The DCCS model not only unifies key capital structure theories—such as trade-off, pecking order, and agency theory—but also brings them into the realm of real-world applicability by using parameters that are straightforward to calibrate from market data. The numerical results demonstrate that managing covenant risks allows firms to optimize debt levels more effectively, redefining the traditional boundaries of capital structure decisions.

Future research could extend this framework by applying it to bond pricing, using covenants as real options to better assess the impact of covenant violations on debt valuations. By explicitly modeling how covenant breaches influence bond prices and yields, this approach could provide more accurate pricing tools for both issuers and investors. Additionally, empirical validation across different industries and market conditions would further enhance the model's practical applicability. Ultimately, the DCCS model not only deepens theoretical understanding but also offers a robust foundation for more precise debt pricing and capital structure decisions in the presence of covenants.

References

Baker, M., & Wurgler, J. (2002). Market timing and capital structure. *The Journal of Finance*, *57*(1), 1–32.

Bräuning, F., Ivashina, V., & Ozdagli, A. (2022). High-yield debt covenants and their real effects. *NBER Working Paper No. 29888*. https://doi.org/10.3386/w29888

Brockman, P., & Unlu, E. (2009). Dividend policy, creditor rights, and the agency costs of debt. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *92*, 276–299.

Chava, S., & Roberts, M. R. (2008). How does financing impact investment? the role of debt covenants. *The Journal of Finance*, *63*(5), 2085–2121.

DeAngelo, H., DeAngelo, L., & Stulz, R. M. (2010). Seasoned equity offerings, market timing, and the corporate life cycle. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *95*(3), 275–295.

Graham, J. R. (2022). Presidential address: Corporate finance and reality. *The Journal of Finance*, *77*(4), 1975–2049.

Hull, J. C. (2021). *Options, futures, and other derivatives* (11th). Pearson.

Ivashina, V., Roberts, M., & Sufi, A. (2009). Why do firms use covenants? evidence from debt contracts. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *93*, 300–325.

Jensen, M. C. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers. *The American Economic Review*, *76*(2), 323–329.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *3*, 305–360.

Kisgen, D. J. (2006). Credit ratings and capital structure. *The Journal of Finance*, *61*(3), 1035–1072.

Leland, H. E. (1994). Corporate debt value, bond covenants, and optimal capital structure. *The Journal of Finance*, *49*(4), 1213–1252.

Longstaff, F. A., & Schwartz, E. S. (2001). Valuing american options by simulation: A simple least-squares approach. *The Review of Financial Studies*, *14*(1), 113–147.

Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1958). The cost of capital, corporation finance, and the theory of investment. *The American Economic Review*, *48*, 261–297.

Myers, S. C., & Majluf, N. S. (1984). Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information that investors do not have. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *13*, 187–221.

Roberts, M. R., & Sufi, A. (2009). Control rights and capital structure: The role of debt covenants. *The Journal of Finance*, *64*(5), 1657–1695.

Ross, S. A. (1977). The determination of financial structure: The incentive-signalling approach. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, *8*(1), 23–40.

Appendix A: Detailed Derivation of optimal Vg

Step 1: Simplify the PDEs

We model the firm's asset value V using a Geometric Brownian Motion (GBM). The value of the firm's debt $D(V)$ satisfies the following partial differential equations (PDEs):

- **For $V > V_g$ (no covenant violation):**

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 V^2 D''(V) + rVD'(V) - rD(V) + C = 0 \tag{4}$$

- **For $V \leq V_g$ (covenant violation):**

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 V^2 D''(V) + rVD'(V) - rD(V) + C(1+s) = 0 \tag{5}$$

Here:

- $D(V)$ is the value of the firm's debt.
- σ is the volatility of the firm's assets.
- r is the risk-free rate.
- C is the coupon payment.
- s is the proportional increase in the coupon payment upon covenant violation.

Since the problem is time-independent (steady state), the PDEs reduce to ordinary differential equations (ODEs) in terms of V.

Step 2: Transform the ODEs

Divide each term by $\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 V^2$ to simplify the equations:

$$D''(V) + \frac{2r}{\sigma^2 V}D'(V) - \frac{2r}{\sigma^2 V^2}D(V) + \frac{2C}{\sigma^2 V^2} = 0 \tag{6}$$

For $V \leq V_g$, replace C with $C(1+s)$ in the last term.

Step 3: Solve the Homogeneous Equation

Consider the homogeneous part of the equation:

$$D''(V) + \frac{2r}{\sigma^2 V}D'(V) - \frac{2r}{\sigma^2 V^2}D(V) = 0 \tag{7}$$

Assume a solution of the form $D(V) = V^\beta$. Compute the derivatives:

$$D'(V) = \beta V^{\beta-1} \tag{8}$$

$$D''(V) = \beta(\beta-1)V^{\beta-2} \tag{9}$$

Substitute into the homogeneous equation:

$$\beta(\beta-1)V^{\beta-2}+\frac{2r}{\sigma^2 V}\beta V^{\beta-1}-\frac{2r}{\sigma^2 V^2}V^{\beta}=0 \tag{10}$$

Simplify:

$$\left[\beta(\beta-1)+\frac{2r\beta}{\sigma^2}-\frac{2r}{\sigma^2}\right]V^{\beta-2}=0 \tag{11}$$

Set the coefficient to zero:

$$\beta^2-\beta+\frac{2r\beta}{\sigma^2}-\frac{2r}{\sigma^2}=0 \tag{12}$$

Multiply both sides by σ^2:

$$\sigma^2\beta^2+(2r-\sigma^2)\beta-2r=0 \tag{13}$$

Let $x=\dfrac{2r}{\sigma^2}$, then the equation becomes:

$$\beta^2+(x-1)\beta-x=0 \tag{14}$$

Solve for β using the quadratic formula:

$$\beta=\frac{-(x-1)\pm\sqrt{(x-1)^2+4x}}{2} \tag{15}$$

Compute the discriminant:

$$\Delta=(x-1)^2+4x=x^2-2x+1+4x=x^2+2x+1=(x+1)^2 \tag{16}$$

Therefore, $\sqrt{\Delta}=x+1$. The roots are:

$$\beta_1=\frac{-(x-1)+(x+1)}{2}=1 \tag{17}$$

$$\beta_2=\frac{-(x-1)-(x+1)}{2}=-x \tag{18}$$

Step 4: Write the Homogeneous Solution
The general solution to the homogeneous equation is:

$$D_{\text{hom}}(V)=AV^1+BV^{-x} \tag{19}$$

where A and B are constants.
Step 5: Find Particular Solutions
For $V > V_g$:
Assume a constant particular solution:

$$D_{\text{part}}=\frac{C}{r} \tag{20}$$

Verify by substituting into the ODE:

$$-r\left(\frac{C}{r}\right)+C=0 \tag{21}$$

For $V \leq V_g$:
Assume:

$$D_{\text{part}}=\frac{C(1+s)}{r} \tag{22}$$

Verify:

$$-r\left(\frac{C(1+s)}{r}\right)+C(1+s)=0 \tag{23}$$

Step 6: Write the General Solutions
For $V > V_g$:

$$D_1(V)=A_1V^1+B_1V^{-x}+\frac{C}{r} \tag{24}$$

To ensure $D_1(V)$ remains finite as $V \to \infty$, set $A_1 = 0$:

$$D_1(V)=B_1V^{-x}+\frac{C}{r} \tag{25}$$

For $V \leq V_g$:

$$D_2(V)=A_2V^1+B_2V^{-x}+\frac{C(1+s)}{r} \tag{26}$$

To ensure $D_2(V)$ remains finite as $V \to 0$, set $B_2 = 0$:

$$D_2(V)=A_2V+\frac{C(1+s)}{r} \tag{27}$$

Step 7: Apply Boundary Conditions
At $V = V_g$, apply:

1. **Value Matching:**
$$D_1(V_g)=D_2(V_g) \tag{28}$$

2. **Smooth Pasting:**
$$D_1'(V_g)=D_2'(V_g) \tag{29}$$

Compute derivatives:

$$D_1'(V)=-xB_1V^{-x-1} \tag{30}$$
$$D_2'(V)=A_2 \tag{31}$$

Step 8: Solve for Constants

From smooth pasting:

$$A_2 = -xB_1V_g^{-x-1} \tag{32}$$

Substitute A_2 into value matching:

$$B_1V_g^{-x} + \frac{C}{r} = \left(-xB_1V_g^{-x-1}\right)V_g + \frac{C(1+s)}{r} \tag{33}$$

Simplify $V_g^{-x-1}V_g = V_g^{-x}$:

$$B_1V_g^{-x} + \frac{C}{r} = -xB_1V_g^{-x} + \frac{C(1+s)}{r} \tag{34}$$

Combine terms:

$$(1+x)B_1V_g^{-x} = \frac{Cs}{r} \tag{35}$$

Solve for B_1:

$$B_1 = \frac{Cs}{r(1+x)}V_g^x \tag{36}$$

Compute A_2:

$$A_2 = -xB_1V_g^{-x-1} = -\frac{Csx}{r(1+x)}V_g^{-1} \tag{37}$$

Step 9: Final Debt Value Functions
For $V > V_g$:

$$D(V) = \frac{C}{r} + \frac{Cs}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x \tag{38}$$

For $V \leq V_g$:

$$D(V) = \frac{C(1+s)}{r} - \frac{Csx}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V}{V_g}\right) \tag{39}$$

Step 10: Compute Tax Shield Value
The tax shield $TB(V)$ is proportional to the interest payments.
For $V > V_g$:

$$TB(V) = \frac{C\tau}{r} + \frac{Cs\tau}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x \tag{40}$$

For $V \leq V_g$:

$$TB(V) = \frac{C(1+s)\tau}{r} - \frac{Csx\tau}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V}{V_g}\right) \tag{41}$$

Step 11: Equity Value
The equity value is:

$$E(V) = V + TB(V) - D(V) - \frac{k}{V_g} \tag{42}$$

For $V > V_g$:
Substitute $D(V)$ and $TB(V)$:

$$E(V) = V + \left(\frac{C\tau}{r} + \frac{Cs\tau}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x\right) - \left(\frac{C}{r} + \frac{Cs}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x\right) - \frac{k}{V_g} \tag{43}$$

$$= V - \frac{C}{r} + \frac{C\tau}{r} - \frac{Cs(1-\tau)}{r(1+x)}\left(\frac{V_g}{V}\right)^x - \frac{k}{V_g} \tag{44}$$

Step 12: Optimize Equity Value

To find the optimal V_g that maximizes $E(V)$, take the derivative of $E(V)$ with respect to V_g and set it to zero:

$$\frac{dE}{dV_g} = -\frac{Cs(1-\tau)x}{r(1+x)}V^{-x}V_g^{x-1} + \frac{k}{V_g^2} = 0 \tag{45}$$

Solve for V_g:

$$\frac{Cs(1-\tau)x}{r(1+x)}V^{-x}V_g^{x+1} = k \tag{46}$$

Therefore:

$$V_g = V^{\frac{x}{x+1}}\left(\frac{kr(1+x)}{Cs(1-\tau)x}\right)^{\frac{1}{x+1}} \tag{47}$$

Step 13: Second Derivative Test

Compute the second derivative to confirm that V_g maximizes $E(V)$:

$$\frac{d^2E}{dV_g^2} = -\frac{Cs(1-\tau)x(x-1)}{r(1+x)}V^{-x}V_g^{x-2} - \frac{2k}{V_g^3} \tag{48}$$

Since $x > 1$ (assuming $\sigma^2 < 2r$), both terms are negative, confirming that V_g corresponds to a maximum of $E(V)$.

Appendix B: Numerical Estimation of the k Parameter Using the Least Squares Monte Carlo Method

In the context of American cash-or-nothing put options, deriving an analytical expression for the $\frac{k}{V_g}$ cost term is challenging due to the option's early exercise feature. While Appendix C provides an analytical justification using European options, substituting an American option with a European one in our model has limited validity because it neglects the possibility of early exercise, which is central to the valuation of American options.

To address this limitation, we employ the Least Squares Monte Carlo (LSM) method introduced by Longstaff and Schwartz (2001) to numerically estimate the k parameter. The LSM method is a powerful technique for valuing American options by simulating optimal exercise strategies and estimating option prices through regression.

Overview of the LSM Method

The LSM method operates as follows:

1. **Simulate Asset Price Paths:** Generate a large number of possible future paths for the asset price S_t using Monte Carlo simulation based on the geometric Brownian motion model.
2. **Set Up Payoffs:** At each time step, determine if the option is in the money (i.e., $S_t \leq V_g$). If so, record the immediate exercise payoff Q.
3. **Backward Induction:** Starting from the penultimate time step and moving backward:
   (a) For paths where the option is in the money, regress the discounted future payoffs on functions of S_t to estimate the continuation value.
   (b) Decide whether to exercise the option by comparing the immediate exercise payoff with the estimated continuation value.
   (c) Update the option value based on the optimal decision.
4. **Estimate Option Prices:** Calculate the expected option price as the average of the discounted payoffs across all simulated paths.

Estimation of the k Parameter

To estimate the k parameter:

1. **Vary Strike Prices:** Compute option prices V_{put} for a range of strike prices X around V_g.

2. **Calculate Derivatives:** Estimate $\frac{\partial V_{\text{put}}}{\partial X}$ numerically using finite differences.

3. **Linear Regression:** Fit a linear model to approximate the relationship:

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{put}}}{\partial X} \approx \frac{k}{X}.$$

4. **Determine k:** Extract the k parameter from the regression.

Using the LSM method, we calibrated k by pricing American cash-or-nothing put options with strikes from 0.50 to 0.90. Baseline inputs included $r = 0.04$, $\sigma = 0.2$, $T = 5$, and a cash payout $Q = 0.05$, which represents the penalty for covenant violation, expressed as a percentage of the initial firm value. A linear regression of $\frac{dV_{\text{put}}}{dX}$ against $1/X$ produced an estimated k of -0.0887, with an R^2 of 0.977, validating the approximation.

In the calibration exercise, we fixed the initial asset price $S_0 = 1$, the risk-free interest rate $r = 0.04$, and the asset volatility $\sigma = 0.2$. These values represent typical conditions for modeling medium-term corporate debt, allowing us to focus on the impact of varying the cash payout Q and the time to maturity T on the estimated k values.

Q\T	**5**	**7**	**10**
0.01	0.018	0.014	0.010
0.03	0.053	0.042	0.033
0.05	0.089	0.069	0.054

Table 2: Estimated k values for different combinations of Q and T

Appendix C: Analytical Justification of the $\frac{k}{V_g}$ Cost Term Using European Cash-or-Nothing Options

From option pricing theory, we know that the price of an American put option can be expressed as the sum of the price of a European put option and the value of the early exercise feature. Therefore, the difference between the prices of two American put options can be written as:

$$P_A(K_2) - P_A(K_1) = [P_E(K_2) - P_E(K_1)] + [\mathrm{EE}(K_2) - \mathrm{EE}(K_1)]\,.$$

For simplicity, we assume the second term in RHS to be approximately zero for very small changes in the strike price, which simplifies the mathematics behind the analytical derivations. However, it is always possible to estimate the entire difference numerically using Monte Carlo simulations. Our goal is to justify the cost term in the model, and the simplification to European-type options makes the analysis clearer and less complex.

To justify the $\frac{k}{V_g}$ cost term, we employ the European cash-or-nothing put option framework, as discussed in Hull (2021) , Chapter 25.9. The price of a European cash-or-nothing put option can be expressed as:

$$V_{\text{put}} = Qe^{-rT}N(-d_2),$$

where:

$$d_2 = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{S}{X}\right) + \left(r - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)T}{\sigma\sqrt{T}}.$$

For small changes in the strike price X, the change in the option value can be approximated by the derivative of the put option price with respect to X. This derivative provides an estimation of the marginal cost of looser covenants.

The derivative of the option price with respect to the strike is:

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{put}}}{\partial X} = Qe^{-rT}\frac{\phi(-d_2)}{X\sigma\sqrt{T}},$$

where $\phi(-d_2)$ is the probability density function of the standard normal distribution. This expression quantifies how the value of the put option changes as the strike price varies.

For simplicity, we assume that $\phi(-d_2)$ is approximately constant and does not vary significantly with the strike, as it is less sensitive to strike changes compared to the $\frac{1}{X}$ term. Next, all the other terms except $\frac{1}{X}$ can be treated as constants. This allows us to approximate the derivative of the put price with respect to the strike as a constant of the form $\frac{k}{X}$, thereby analytically justifying the choice of the financial flexibility cost function $\frac{k}{V_g}$.

This approach simplifies the model while capturing the essential economic interpretation of the cost associated with looser covenants. Thus, the derivative of the put price with respect to the strike can be approximated as:

$$\frac{\partial V_{\text{put}}}{\partial X} \approx \frac{k}{X},$$

where k is treated as a constant, justifying the analytical form of the financial flexibility cost.

Appendix D: Estimating the Penalty Parameter s from Credit Rating Spreads

The penalty parameter s represents the proportional increase in the coupon payment upon a covenant violation, reflecting the higher borrowing costs faced by firms after such events. To estimate s empirically, we utilize the most recent yields of corporate bonds across different credit ratings, focusing on the spreads that are indicative of covenant violations.

We use the following formula to calculate s for each downgrade from a higher credit rating to the next lower rating:

$$s = \frac{\text{Yield}_{\text{lower rating}} - \text{Yield}_{\text{higher rating}}}{\text{Yield}_{\text{higher rating}}}$$

The most recent yield data for U.S. corporate bonds across different credit ratings are obtained from the Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED) database as of October 22, 2024.

Table 3: Yields and Parameter s by Credit Rating

Credit Rating	**Yield (%)**	**Parameter** s
AAA	4.61	0.02
AA	4.71	0.05
A	4.94	0.07
BBB	5.27	0.11
BB	5.85	0.18
B	6.88	0.70
CCC	11.67	—

These s values can be used to calibrate the DCCS model, allowing for more precise modeling of the financial impact of covenant violations on firms with different credit ratings.

The yield data are sourced from the Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED) database: https://fred.stlouisfed.org/