

ROBUST DIVIDEND POLICY: EQUIVALENCE OF EPSTEIN-ZIN AND MAENHOUT PREFERENCES

KEXIN CHEN, KYUNGHYUN PARK, AND HOI YING WONG

ABSTRACT. In a continuous-time economy, this study formulates the Epstein-Zin (EZ) preference for the discounted dividend (or cash payouts) of stockholders as an EZ singular control utility. We show that such a problem is well-defined and equivalent to the robust dividend policy set by the firm's executive in the sense of Maenhout's ambiguity-averse preference. While the firm's executive announces the expected future earnings in financial reports, they also signal the firm's confidence in the expected earnings through dividend or cash payouts. The robust dividend policy can then be characterized by a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) variational inequality (VI). By constructing a novel shooting method for the HJB-VI, we theoretically prove that the robust dividend policy is a threshold strategy on the firm's surplus process. Therefore, dividend-caring investors can choose firms that match their preferences by examining stock's dividend policies and financial statements, whereas executives can make use of dividend to signal their confidence, in the form of ambiguity aversion, on realizing the earnings implied by their financial statements.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dividend (or cash payout) policy is an important topic in both corporate finance and asset pricing. The Miller-Modigliani [49] dividend irrelevance theory suggests that a firm's dividend policy does not affect its value and stock prices in a perfect market. However, the underlying incentives for stockholders to receive dividends and for the firm's executives to pay dividends are largely unknown in reality. For instance, a stockholder can liquidate some of his stocks for consumption instead of receiving cash dividend, which is subject to a higher tax rate in the USA. Hence, Black [13] proposes the dividend puzzle which has generated a great of attentions in the literature.

A school of thought is the dividend signaling theory (DST) [12, 38, 50] that a firm's executive passes signals about the firm's information to the public through dividends. Black [14] wrote,

“The idea that dividends convey information beyond that conveyed by the firm's financial statements and public announcements stretches the imagination.... I think we must assume that investors care about dividends directly. We must put dividends into the utility functions.”

Date: June 19, 2024.

JEL Classification. C61, G35, G33.

Key words. dividend policy; Epstein-Zin preference; Maenhout's ambiguity-aversion; robust singular control; backward stochastic differential equations; variational inequality; shooting method.

Funding: The work described in this paper is substantially supported by grants from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No. GRF15305422, GRF15224923 RMG8601495 and GRF14308422). K. Chen is also financially supported by a research grant from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Project No. PolyU P0038553). K. Park acknowledges support of the Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship of Nanyang Technological University.

Although most empirical studies support DST, the survey in [17] shows that executives viewed the mechanism behind DST as broadly misguided. However, dividend changes do contain information about future earnings [31]. Additionally, payout announcements signal changes in cash flow volatility (in the opposite direction) but not stock volatility, which the authors refer to as ‘signaling safety’ [48]. A firm’s cashflow is related to its earnings so that the cashflow volatility indicates the earnings’ volatility. By modelling the firm’s surplus process as diffusion models with a stochastic drift, when there is no dividend, there is a mathematical toolkit [60] to compute the optimal dividend policy under a random profitability.

In this paper, we consider the suggestions by Black [14]. We assume that the firm’s financial reports contain information on the firm’s expected earnings and risk. Thus, we model the firm’s surplus by Itô process with known parameters if there is no dividend payment. We put dividends into the utility functions for investors. Investors who care directly about dividends have a value function that considers the short-term cash inflow from discounted cash dividends and the certainty equivalence of long-term stock holdings subject to bankruptcy risk. This consideration requires us to separate risk aversion from elasticity of intertemporal substitutions (EIS) in the decision making process. The Epstein-Zin (EZ) [25] preference is a natural candidate designed for this purpose in the economic literature. In our formulation, we increase the degree of risk aversion of intertemporal preference ordering via a positive parameter R , without affecting “certainty preferences” of a dividend payment policy. We also follow the continuous-time dividend models that the discounted dividend stream is paid in a singular control manner [19, 36, 60, 65]. This problem formulation turns out to be a singular control problem with recursive utilities for which we have to develop the well-definedness that there exists a unique value function for the EZ investor within the recursion in singular control setting.

Alternatively, the firm’s executive aims to maximize the expected discounted dividend stream subject to the bankruptcy cost. Although the financial reports indicate the firm’s expected earnings and risk, the executive encounters uncertainty in the predicted earnings. We view this uncertainty as model ambiguity so that the executive’s value function is postulated as the Maenhout [44] robust preference. Specifically, the executive specifies ambiguity aversion on the expected earnings, such that the robust dividend decision is made within a maximin singular control problem subject to bankruptcy risk and Maenhout’s regularity.

Our study has four key contributions. The first one is the proof for the well-definedness of the EZ singular control utility. We prove the existence and uniqueness of the value function satisfying the recursion by using backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) in Theorem 2.3. The proof is non-trivial because our BSDE possesses a *non-decreasing* process (i.e., singular control) in a *non-Lipschitz* aggregator together with the bankruptcy stopping time. As the EZ preference model is based on a power function defined by a positive parameter R , the analysis of the existence and uniqueness of results diverges into two cases: when $R > 1$ and when $R < 1$. This paper concentrates on the latter case, where, unlike the case of $R > 1$, we cannot leverage the advantage of priori bounds for the solution of classical BSDEs (see e.g. [3, 58]). Despite this challenge, our research brings new insights into the feasibility of the EZ singular control utility. In addition, we characterize some important properties of the associated BSDEs. In other words, our problem formulation is shown to be well-defined.

By those properties of such BSDEs, our second contribution establishes the equivalence between EZ singular control utility for dividends and the Maenhout’s counterpart once the

parameter R of the former is equal to the ambiguity aversion parameter of the latter (Theorem 3.3). Although the equivalence between EZ and Maenhout preferences has been addressed in [67] under a regular control setting, we are the first one developing this equivalence under a singular control setting, to the best of our knowledge, even considering the bankruptcy stopping time. Unlike the regular control situation in [44], our BSDE reveals that the singular control problem with the Maenhout preference cannot be reduced to a classic utility maximization with a singular control. Consequently, we cannot rely on existing methods to solve our problem.

Fortunately, we find that the Maenhout’s singular control problem is more tractable. Our third contribution develops a novel shooting method to theoretically show that under certain regularities on the reference parameters of the firm’s surplus process, the robust dividend policy is a threshold strategy. When the firm’s surplus hits the upside threshold, the dividend is paid. The threshold depends on the expected earnings, volatility and the ambiguity aversion of the executive. However, the development of this result is highly non-trivial. We first show that the Maenhout’s singular control problem with bankruptcy can be transformed into a Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) variational inequality (VI) subject to the bankruptcy boundary condition. The nonlinear HJB differential operator appears in the VI formulation because the robust control problem considers worst-case scenarios. When there is no bankruptcy, the shooting method is shown useful in solving the HJB-VI in [21] through searching for a suitable threshold to fit the condition of the HJB-VI. The bankruptcy consideration in our problem complicates the analysis because the bankruptcy time interacts with the dividend decision. Specifically, we have to prove that there is a single threshold on the firm’s surplus process that can shoot two targets on the boundary condition and the HJB-VI, simultaneously.

Our fourth contribution is attributed to insightful economic interpretations for DST. While investors are informed with the firm’s expected earnings from the firm’s financial statements, executives set dividend threshold to showcase their confidence on realizing the expected earnings. The level of confidence is reflected by the ambiguity aversion parameter in our model. Therefore, our model predicts that dividend policy conveys information about earnings uncertainty or, equivalently, the executive’s confidence in realizing the expected earnings. We call this notion ‘signaling confidence’.

Related literature. In the context of *regular* stochastic control, most of the fundamental and often technically demanding mathematical questions in recursive utility maximization problems are understood fairly well by now. For general background, we refer to [24, 32–34, 41, 46, 47, 51, 64, 69]. While the dominant mathematical framework therein is the BSDE approach, it does not involve a non-decreasing process in the aggregator. Although certain proof techniques in the present article bear similarities to those in the above references, our choice of singular control with random terminal time makes certain BSDE’s arguments intricate.

On the other hand, considerable efforts have been made to characterize classical (i.e., *non-robust*) singular optimal control from both dynamic programming and probabilistic perspectives. Specifically, we refer to [23, 26, 29, 66, 68] for corresponding free boundary problems and to [4–7] for stochastic representation theorem approach. Recently, there has been an intensive interest in robust analogue of the above references (e.g., [20, 21, 27, 28, 55]). Moreover, we also refer to [8–10, 53, 56, 57, 62] for relations to optimal stopping time under ambiguity.

Finally, for completeness, let us mention that the Maenhout preference, which can be viewed as a form of relative entropy deriving ambiguity-aversion (e.g., [2, 11, 22, 43]), has been utilized in robust optimization problems in finance and economics [16, 30, 37, 45, 70].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the EZ singular control utility process along with its BSDE representation and presents corresponding well-definedness results. Section 3 formulates Maenhout's robust dividend-value utility process and establishes its equivalence with the EZ singular control utility. Section 4 is dedicated to the characterization of the robust dividend policy, with the detailed proof based on the shooting method provided in Section 5. The verification theorem for the robust dividend policy is provided in Section 6. Other preliminaries and auxiliary proofs for Sections 2 and 4 are given in Appendices A and B.

2. STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL UTILITY ON SINGULAR DIVIDEND FLOWS

2.1. Formulation. Following the suggestion of Black [13], we put dividends into investors' utility functions through recursive utilities in this section. We first lay out the setup of a stochastic differential utility (SDU) on singular dividend flows, and then show that it is not only mathematically well-defined, but also leads to economically meaningful interpretations.

Consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ that supports a one-dimensional Brownian motion $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Let $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the augmented filtration generated by W . We assume that \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial. We write $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ for the expectation under \mathbb{P} , while for every $t \geq 0$ the conditional expectations denoted by $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t]$. \mathcal{P} is the set of all real-valued \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes, and \mathcal{P}_+ the restrictions of \mathcal{P} to processes that take nonnegative values. $L^p(\mathcal{F}_t)$ is the space of \mathcal{F}_t -measurable random variable with norm $\|X\|_{L^p}^p := \mathbb{E}[|X|^p] < \infty$ for every $p \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$. The following notations are useful in the rest of the paper.

$$\mathcal{T} := \{\tau : \tau \text{ is a } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. finite } \mathbb{F}\text{-stopping time}\},$$

$$\mathcal{A} := \{D : (D_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ is } \mathbb{F}\text{-progressively measurable and } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. continuous, non-decreasing, with } D_{0-} = 0\}.$$

In the definitions above, we use $D_{0-} = 0$ to indicate that $D_0 > 0$ can only be achieved by a jump of the process at time zero, followed by a continuous path for all $t \geq 0$.

For the classical optimal dividend problem [1], the dividend-value objective function $K = (K_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined as

$$(2.1) \quad K_t := \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} e^{-\rho s} dD_s + \xi_{\tau}^K \right], \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the constant discount rate. Here, $D = (D_t)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{A}$ represents the *accumulated dividend flows* and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is the *ruin time*, which potentially depends on either D or certain surplus process driven by D . One usually makes the convention that for $t \geq \tau$, $D_t = D_{\tau}$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. The term $\xi_{\tau}^K \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_{\tau})$ represents a lump-sum payment at the ruin time and is conventionally assumed the form of $\xi_{\tau}^K = e^{-\rho \tau} \xi_0$, for some constant ξ_0 , as the time value of ruin; cf. [71].

In preparation, we introduce integrals of the form

$$\int_0^{\tau} g_t dD_t = g_0 D_0 + \int_{(0, \tau]} g_t dD_t,$$

where $g := (g_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable and locally bounded, so the above stochastic integral exists in the Stieltjes sense; cf. [59, Theorem IV.15]. In this context, the jump of D at zero is accounted and therefore $\int_0^t dD_s = D_t$ for $t \geq 0$.

We incorporate an intertemporal aggregator, denoted as g , to define a dividend-value utility $V^D = (V_t^D)_{t \geq 0}$ by

$$(2.2) \quad V_t^D = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} g(s, V_s^D) dD_s + \xi_\tau \right], \quad t \geq 0,$$

where the term $\xi_\tau \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$ is different from ξ_τ^K appears in (2.1) in general.

Definition 2.1. Given $(\tau, D) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{A}$ and $\xi_\tau \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$, denote by $\mathbb{I}(g, D)$ the set of all processes $V \in \mathcal{P}$ such that stochastic integral $\int g(t, V_t) dD_t$ exists and $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^\tau |g(s, V_s)| dD_s] < \infty$.

- (i) $V \in \mathbb{I}(g, D)$ is a utility process associated to (g, D) if it satisfies (2.2);
- (ii) Denote by $\mathbb{UI}(g, D)$ the subset of all utility processes V that are uniformly integrable.

This formulation is inspired by the concept of SDU from regular control problems [24, 25, 64], which creates a feedback effect such that the dividend-value utility at time t may depend in a nonlinear way on its value at future times. To proceed further, we introduce the *Epstein–Zin (EZ)* [24, 25] aggregator:

$$(2.3) \quad g_{EZ}(s, v) := (1 - R)e^{-\rho s} v^{\frac{-R}{1-R}}.$$

Throughout the paper, we focus on the case where $\rho > 0$ and $R \in (0, 1)$. It is straightforward that when $R = 0$, V defined in (2.4) below reduces to K in (2.1). In this context, we define the utility process $V = V^D = (V_t)_{t \geq 0}$ as the EZ singular control utility that solves

$$(2.4) \quad V_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} e^{-\rho s} (1 - R) (V_s)^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} dD_s + \xi_\tau \right], \quad t \geq 0.$$

We remark that the above definition takes a normalized or the ordinal equivalent utility form [24], which implies that the economic meaningful one should be $V^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$. As a result, in accordance to the terminal condition ξ_τ^K in (2.1), we have $\xi_\tau = (\xi_\tau^K)^{1-R}$. In our formulation, we increase the degree of risk aversion of intertemporal preference ordering, that is $R > 0$, without affecting ‘‘certainty preferences’’.

Although the EZ singular control utility is similar to the EZ preference for regular consumption, it distinctively focuses on the risk of ruin rather than just cash flow utility. Our formulation emphasizes the timing of ruin, which happens in a finite time, generating key difficulties in our analysis. This is in a sharp contrast to the ergodic harvesting problem [21], which assumes that the population does not go extinct in a finite time. The ruin risk results in the set of dividend strategies that are constant after ruin is nonconvex. This nonconvexity, in turn, contributes to the lack of concavity in our new EZ singular control utility.

2.2. Well-definedness of EZ singular control utility. We aim to establish the existence and uniqueness of the EZ singular control utility (2.4) in this subsection. In other words, we want to show that given $(\tau, D) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{A}$ and $\xi_\tau \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$ satisfying certain reasonable conditions, there is a unique solution (Y, Z) of the following BSDE involving the non-decreasing process D in the EZ aggregator:

$$(2.5) \quad Y_t = \xi_\tau + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} g_{EZ}(s, Y_s) dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} Z_s dW_s, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Referring to the definition of a solution of classical BSDE with random terminal times (see, e.g., [18, 58]), we give the following definition.

Definition 2.2. Let $(\tau, D) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{A}$ and $\xi_\tau \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$. A solution of the BSDE (2.5) is a pair $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{P}_+ \times \mathcal{P}$ satisfying the following conditions \mathbb{P} -a.s.:

- (i) $Y_t = \xi_\tau$ and $Z_t = 0$ on $\{t \geq \tau\}$;
- (ii) $t \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{t \leq \tau} g_{EZ}(t, Y_t)$ belongs to $L^1_{\text{loc}}(0, \infty)$, and $t \mapsto Z_t$ belongs to $L^2_{\text{loc}}(0, \infty)$;¹
- (iii) For every $T \geq 0$, it holds that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$Y_{t \wedge \tau} = Y_{T \wedge \tau} + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} g_{EZ}(s, Y_s) dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} Z_s dW_s.$$

We call the solution $(Y, Z) = (Y_t, Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of (2.5) an L^2 -solution if

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} |Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 + \int_0^\tau |Z_t|^2 dt \right] < \infty$$

holds. It worth noting that L^2 -solution particularly implies that Y is of class $\text{UII}(g_{EZ}, D)$ (see Definition 2.1).

Condition A. Let $(\tau, D) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{A}$ and $\xi_\tau \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$. The triplet (τ, ξ_τ, D) satisfies that $\mathbb{E}[(\int_0^\tau e^{-\rho s} dD_s)^2] < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}[(\xi_\tau)^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] < \infty$, and $\xi_\tau > 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s..

Theorem 2.3. Let $g_{EZ}(\cdot, \cdot)$ be given in (2.3) and (τ, ξ_τ, D) satisfy Condition A. Then the following statements hold:

- (i) There exists a unique utility process $V \in \text{UII}(g_{EZ}, D)$ which has continuous paths and is strictly positive, with $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} (V_t)^2] < \infty$. In particular, there exists $Z \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\int_0^\tau Z_t^2 dt < \infty$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and (V, Z) solves the BSDE given in (2.5).
- (ii) Let us further assume that there is a real constant $C > 0$ such that $\xi_\tau > C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.. Then there exists a unique L^2 -solution $(V, Z) \in \mathcal{P}_+ \times \mathcal{P}$ of the BSDE given in (2.5). In particular, V has continuous paths and satisfies that $V_t \geq C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for every $t \geq 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} V_t^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] < \infty$. Therefore, V is in $\text{UII}(g_{EZ}, D)$ and is the unique utility process associated to (g_{EZ}, D) .

Theorem 2.3.(ii) is collected in Theorem A.10 with a stand-alone proof presented in Appendix A. While the BSDE given in (2.5) is closely related to EZ SDU for regular control problems, its existence and uniqueness result is intricate. This is because the finite-variation part of (2.5) is integrated with respect to a non-decreasing process, and we are dealing with a non-Lipschitz aggregator g_{EZ} and a random horizon setting.

Proof of Theorem 2.3.(i). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\xi_\tau^n := \frac{1}{n} \vee \xi_\tau$. By Theorem A.10, there exists a unique L^2 -solution $(Y^n, Z^n) \in \mathcal{P}_+ \times \mathcal{P}$ of the BSDE (2.5) (with ξ_τ replaced by ξ_τ^n) such that

$$Y_t^n = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{-\rho s} (1-R)(Y_s^n)^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} dD_s + \xi_\tau^n \right], \quad t \geq 0.$$

Note that Y_t^n is non-increasing in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for every $t \geq 0$ (see Proposition A.5) and $Y_t^n > 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for every $t \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $V_t := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_t^n$ for $t \geq 0$ is well-defined. Moreover,

¹For each $p \geq 1$, $L^p_{\text{loc}}(0, \infty)$ denotes the class of locally p -integrable functions on $(0, \infty)$.

the monotone convergence theorem ensures that for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_t &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} e^{-\rho s} (1 - R) (Y_s^n)^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} dD_s + \xi_\tau^n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} e^{-\rho s} (1 - R) (V_s)^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} dD_s + \xi_\tau \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\xi_\tau > 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., $V_t \geq \mathbb{E}_t[\xi_\tau] > 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for every $t \geq 0$.

We claim that $V \in \text{UI}(g_{\text{EZ}}, D)$. Indeed, since Y_0^n is non-increasing in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $V_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_0^n$, we have that $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^\tau e^{-\rho s} (1 - R) (V_s)^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} dD_s] < V_0 \leq Y_0^n < \infty$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly, we have $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} (Y_t)^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} (Y_t^n)^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] < \infty$. It particularly ensures that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} (V_t)^2] < \infty$ by Jensen's inequality with exponent $\frac{1}{1-R} > 1$. Hence, this concludes that V is uniformly integrable and therefore is of class $\text{UI}(g_{\text{EZ}}, D)$.

It remains to show that V is the unique utility process. By the martingale representation theorem, there exists $Z \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\int_0^\tau Z_t^2 dt < \infty$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and (V, Z) solves (2.5). Let V' be another utility process of class $\text{UI}(g_{\text{EZ}}, D)$ and $Z' \in \mathcal{P}$ be such that $\int_0^\tau (Z'_t)^2 dt < \infty$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and (V', Z') solves (2.5). Note that $V_t = V'_t = \xi_\tau$ on $\{t \geq \tau\}$.

Set $(\Delta V, \Delta Z) := (V - V', Z - Z')$. Then $(\Delta V, \Delta Z)$ solves for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\Delta V_t = \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} \frac{g_{\text{EZ}}(s, V_s) - g_{\text{EZ}}(s, V'_s)}{\Delta V_s} \Delta V_s \mathbb{1}_{\Delta V_s \neq 0} dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} \Delta Z_s dW_s.$$

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_s)_{s \geq 0}$ be defined by $\alpha_s := \mathbb{1}_{\Delta V_s \neq 0} (g_{\text{EZ}}(s, V_s) - g_{\text{EZ}}(s, V'_s)) / \Delta V_s$. Since $y \mapsto g_{\text{EZ}}(\cdot, y)$ is decreasing, we have $\alpha \leq 0$. It then follows that for every $t \geq 0$

$$e^{\int_0^t \alpha_u du} \Delta V_t = - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} e^{\int_0^s \alpha_u du} \Delta Z_s dW_s.$$

Since $\alpha \leq 0$ and $V, V' \in \text{UI}(g_{\text{EZ}}, D)$, the local martingale $\int_0^t e^{\int_0^s \alpha_u du} \Delta Z_s dW_s$ is a martingale. Hence, $\Delta V_t = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for every $t \geq 0$. This completes the proof. \square

3. ROBUST FORMULATION OF DIVIDEND FLOWS

In this section, we stand at the perspective of the firm's executives. We consider that the executives (the agent) do not work on a particular utility function but aim to maximize the expected discounted dividend payout subject to the bankruptcy cost. However, executives have insider information on the possibility to realize the earnings implied by the firm's financial statements. Actually, executives encounter uncertainty on earnings or on the drift estimate of the diffusion model for the firm's surplus. We aim to link an investor's EZ singular control utility to the robust dividend policy of the firm's executives, establishing an equilibrium condition that both parties are satisfied with the dividend policy.

To introduce the robust singular control criterion analyzed in the main part of the paper, let us recall the risk neutral utility K defined in (2.1), where the expectation is taken with respect to the underlying probability measure \mathbb{P} . In the context of model ambiguity, the agent prefers a family of unspecified alternative models that are in close proximity to the reference model and do not deviate too far from it. With the aim of introducing the family of alternative measures, we start with defining a collection of processes that serves as the Girsanov kernels. **Throughout this section**, we fix a constant $\mathcal{R} \in (0, 1)$ as the *ambiguity-averse parameter* in the robust singular control criterion.

Definition 3.1. A Girsanov kernel process $(\theta_t)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{P}$ is said to be admissible if the stochastic exponential $(\eta_t^\theta)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ defined as

$$(3.1) \quad \eta_t^\theta = \exp \left(\int_0^t \theta_s dW_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \theta_s^2 ds \right), \quad t \in [0, \infty)$$

is a martingale. We denote by Θ the set that collects all admissible Girsanov kernels θ .

We introduce a new probability measure \mathbb{Q}^θ defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F})$ by

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^\theta}{d\mathbb{P}} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_T} = \eta_T^\theta$$

for each $T > 0$. Under the new measure \mathbb{Q}^θ , we have that

$$(3.3) \quad W_t^\theta := W_t - \int_0^t \theta_s ds, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

is a Brownian motion. Let $\mathbb{E}_t^\theta[\cdot]$ denote the conditional expectation under \mathbb{Q}^θ given \mathcal{F}_t , it follows [67, Propositions 2 & 4] that the discounted relative entropy process associated to \mathbb{Q}^θ is well-defined and \mathbb{P} -a.s. valued in $[0, \infty]$, taking the form $\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_t^\theta[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{-\rho(s-t)} \theta_s^2 ds]$ for $t > 0$.

Consider (τ, ξ_τ, D) that satisfy Condition A. According to Maenhout's ambiguity-averse preference [44], we define the robust singular control criterion $(V_t^{\text{rob}})_{t \geq 0}$ as

$$(3.4) \quad V_t^{\text{rob}} := \text{ess inf} \{ V_t^\theta : \theta \in \Theta^D \}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where

$$(3.5) \quad V_t^\theta := \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{-\rho s} dD_s + (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa}} \right] + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau V_s^\theta \theta_s^2 ds \right],$$

$$(3.6) \quad \Theta^D := \left\{ \theta \in \Theta : \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^\tau \eta_t^\theta e^{\int_0^t \frac{\theta_s^2}{2\kappa} ds - \rho t} dD_t \right)^2 + (\eta_\tau^\theta)^2 e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\kappa} du} ((\xi_\tau)^{\frac{2}{1-\kappa}} \vee 1) \right] < \infty \right\},$$

and η^θ is the stochastic exponential defined in (3.1). The objective function V^θ consists of two expected terms: i. present value of the future dividend payments under alternative probability measure \mathbb{Q}^θ and ii. a penalty term reflecting the agent's ambiguity aversion, scaled with respect to the objective function. The agent considers the worst-case scenario by choosing θ and thus the measure \mathbb{Q}^θ by minimizing the objective function V^θ , resulting in the robust criterion V^{rob} . The ambiguity aversion of the agent is thus increasing in \mathcal{R} .

Proposition 3.2. *Let (τ, ξ_τ, D) satisfy Condition A. For arbitrary $\theta \in \Theta^D$, there exists a utility process V^θ that satisfies (3.5) and is unique in the class $\{Y \in \mathcal{P} : \mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} Y_{t \wedge \tau}^2] < \infty\}$. Hence, V^{rob} in (3.4) is well-defined. Furthermore, V^θ admits the representation as*

$$(3.7) \quad V_t^\theta = \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{\int_t^s \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\kappa} du - \rho s} dD_s + e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\kappa} du} (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa}} \right], \quad t \geq 0.$$

Proof. We start with the construction of V^θ given in (3.7) and show that it also satisfies (3.5). Since $\theta \in \Theta^D$, by Hölder's inequality (with exponent 2),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\eta_\tau^\theta e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\kappa} du} (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-\kappa}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[(\eta_\tau^\theta)^2 e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\kappa} du} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\xi_\tau)^{\frac{2}{1-\kappa}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Furthermore, Jensen's inequality (with exponent 2) ensures that $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^\tau \eta_s^\theta e^{\int_0^s \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\mathcal{R}} du - \rho s} dD_s] < \infty$. Hence, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^\tau e^{\int_0^s \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\mathcal{R}} du - \rho s} dD_s + e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2\mathcal{R}} du} (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-\mathcal{R}}} \right] < \infty.$$

As a result, V_t^θ constructed via (3.7) is a well-defined utility process.

By Jensen's inequality, we have $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} (V_{t \wedge \tau}^\theta)^2] < \infty$. It further implies that there exists $\iota \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\int_0^\infty \iota_t^2 dt < \infty$, \mathbb{Q}^θ -a.s. and (V^θ, ι) solves

$$(3.8) \quad V_t^\theta = (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-\mathcal{R}}} + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{-\rho s} dD_s + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} V_s^\theta \theta_s^2 ds - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \iota_s dW_s^\theta.$$

Since $(M_t)_{t \geq 0} = (\int_0^t \iota_s dW_s^\theta)_{t \geq 0}$ is a local martingale under \mathbb{Q}^θ , we shall find an increasing sequence of stopping times $\{T_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $T_n \geq t$, $\mathbb{Q}^\theta(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = \infty) = 1$ and the stopped process $(M_{t \wedge T_n})_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale under \mathbb{Q}^θ . Applying \mathbb{E}_t^θ to both sides of (3.8), we have

$$V_t^\theta = \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right] + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} V_s^\theta \theta_s^2 ds \right] + \mathbb{E}_t^\theta [V_{T_n \wedge \tau}^\theta].$$

By sending $n \rightarrow \infty$, the first two terms on the right-hand side converge by monotone convergence theorem, while the last term converges by the dominated convergence theorem. We conclude that V_t^θ defined via (3.7) satisfies (3.5). The uniqueness follows from standard localization arguments, and we omit it here. \square

The main result of this section is stated below, which extends [67, Theorem 5, Sect. 6] to a random-horizon singular control problem.

Theorem 3.3. *Let g_{EZ} be given in (2.3) with a fixed $R \in (0, 1)$ and (τ, ξ_τ, D) satisfy Condition A. Set $\mathcal{R} = R$ and $\theta \in \Theta^D$, and let V^{rob} and V^θ be defined in (3.4) and (3.5) respectively. Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *Let V^D be the unique utility process associated with (g_{EZ}, D) given by Theorem 2.3 (i), then $(V^D)^{\frac{1}{1-R}} = V^{\text{rob}}$.*
- (ii) *Let us further assume that there is a real constant $C > 0$ such that $\xi_\tau > C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. Let (V^D, Z) be the unique L^2 -solution to the BSDE with parameter $(\tau, \xi_\tau, g_{EZ}, D)$ given by Theorem 2.3 (ii), and set $\mathbb{Y} := (V^D)^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$ and $\mathbb{Z} := (\mathbb{Y})^R Z / (1-R)$. Then it holds*

$$(3.9) \quad V_t^\theta = \mathbb{Y}_t + \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{R}{2\mathbb{Y}_s} \left(\mathbb{Z}_s + \frac{\mathbb{Y}_s}{R} \theta_s \right)^2 e^{\frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_t^s \theta_u^2 du} ds \right].$$

Hence $V^{\text{rob}} \geq \mathbb{Y}$. In addition, we have $\theta^* := (-R\mathbb{Z}_t/\mathbb{Y}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)} \in \Theta^D$ hence $V^{\text{rob}} = V^{\theta^*} = \mathbb{Y} = (V^D)^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. We first prove Theorem 3.3 (ii) with the restrictive condition on ξ_τ . By Theorem 2.3 (ii) and Itô's lemma, (\mathbb{Y}, \mathbb{Z}) solves

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_t &= (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-R}} + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{-\rho s} dD_s - \frac{R}{2} \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{(\mathbb{Z}_s)^2}{\mathbb{Y}_s} ds - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \mathbb{Z}_s dW_s \\ &= (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-R}} + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{-\rho s} dD_s - \frac{R}{2} \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{(\mathbb{Z}_s)^2}{\mathbb{Y}_s} ds - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \mathbb{Z}_s \theta_s ds - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \mathbb{Z}_s dW_s^\theta, \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $\theta \in \Theta^D$, denote by (V^θ, ι) a solution of (3.8). We obtain

$$V_t^\theta - \mathbb{Y}_t = \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \left(\frac{R}{2\mathbb{Y}_s} \left(\mathbb{Z}_s + \frac{\mathbb{Y}_s}{R} \theta_s \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2R} \theta_t^2 (V_t^\theta - \mathbb{Y}_t) \right) ds - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau (\iota_s - \mathbb{Z}_s) dW_s^\theta.$$

Let $\beta_t := \exp(\frac{1}{2R} \int_0^t \theta_s^2 ds)$. Then Itô's lemma gives

$$(3.10) \quad \beta_t (V_t^\theta - \mathbb{Y}_t) = \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \beta_s \frac{R}{2\mathbb{Y}_s} \left(\mathbb{Z}_s + \frac{\mathbb{Y}_s}{R} \theta_s \right)^2 ds - (M_\tau - M_{t \wedge \tau}),$$

where $M_t := \int_0^t \beta_s (\iota_s - \mathbb{Z}_s) dW_s^\theta$. Since $(M_s)_{s \in [0, \infty)}$ is a local martingale under \mathbb{Q}^θ , we shall find an increasing sequence of stopping times $\{T_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $T_n \geq t$, $\mathbb{Q}^\theta(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = \infty) = 1$ and the stopped process $(M_{s \wedge T_n})_{s \in [t, \infty)}$ is a martingale under \mathbb{Q}^θ . Applying \mathbb{E}_t^θ to both sides of (3.10), we have for $t \geq 0$

$$(3.11) \quad V_t^\theta - \mathbb{Y}_t = \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} \frac{R}{2\mathbb{Y}_s} \left(\mathbb{Z}_s + \frac{\mathbb{Y}_s}{R} \theta_s \right)^2 e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^s \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} ds + e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} (V_{T_n \wedge \tau}^\theta - \mathbb{Y}_{T_n \wedge \tau}) \right].$$

In order to pass the limit of $n \rightarrow \infty$ under the expectation, we check that each terms of the right-hand side of above equation converges. The first expectation converges by the monotone convergence since the integrand is nonnegative. For the second term, we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_t^\theta [e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} V_{T_n \wedge \tau}^\theta] = \mathbb{E}_t^\theta \left[\int_{T_n \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^s \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du - \rho s} dD_s + e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-R}} \right].$$

The r.h.s of the above equation converges by the monotone convergence theorem since the integrand is nonnegative. It then follows that $\mathbb{E}_t^\theta [e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} V_{T_n \wedge \tau}^\theta]$ converges to $\mathbb{E}_t^\theta [e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} \xi_\tau]$ a.s. Lastly, we show that the term $\mathbb{E}_t^\theta [e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} \mathbb{Y}_{T_n \wedge \tau}]$ converges to $\mathbb{E}_t^\theta [e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} \xi_\tau]$. Under the conditions $\theta \in \Theta^D$ and $\xi_\tau \geq C$ a.s., we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\eta_\tau^\theta e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} \xi_\tau^{\frac{1}{1-R}} \sup_{t \geq 0} \left(\mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau} \xi_\tau^{-\frac{1}{1-R}} \right) \right] \\ &\leq C^{-\frac{1}{1-R}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\eta_\tau^\theta)^2 e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{R} du} \xi_\tau^{\frac{2}{1-R}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $\mathbb{E}_t^\theta [e^{\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T_n \wedge \tau} \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} \mathbb{Y}_{T_n \wedge \tau}]$ is dominated by $\mathbb{E}_t^\theta [e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{\theta_u^2}{2R} du} \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau}]$ which is finite from above analysis. The claimed equation (3.9) then follows by taking limit of $n \rightarrow \infty$ of (3.11) under the expectation. (3.9) implies that $V_t^\theta \geq \mathbb{Y}_t = (V_t^D)^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$ and equality holds for $\theta^* = -RZ/\mathbb{Y}$ if $\theta^* \in \Theta^D$.

It remains to prove that $\theta^* = -RZ/\mathbb{Y} \in \Theta^D$. We first show that $\eta_t^{\theta^*}$ is a martingale for $t \in [0, \infty)$. Applying Itô's lemma to $\ln(\mathbb{Y})$, we have

$$(3.12) \quad \ln(\mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau}) - \ln(\mathbb{Y}_0) = - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_s} e^{-\rho s} dD_s + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \frac{R-1}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbb{Z}_s}{\mathbb{Y}_s} \right)^2 ds + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \frac{\mathbb{Z}_s}{\mathbb{Y}_s} dW_s.$$

(Note that since $(\mathbb{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is continuous and never 0, $1/\mathbb{Y}$ is locally bounded.) Further note that $\theta^* = 0$ on $\{t \geq \tau\}$ by Definition 2.2 (i), we have for $t \geq 0$,

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \theta_s^* ds + \int_0^t \theta_s^* dW_s = R \left(\ln(\mathbb{Y}_0) - \ln(\mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau}) - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_s} e^{-\rho s} dD_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \left(\frac{\mathbb{Z}_s}{\mathbb{Y}_s} \right)^2 ds \right).$$

By definition of η^{θ^*} in (3.1), we have for $t \geq 0$,

$$(3.13) \quad \eta_t^{\theta^*} = \left(\frac{\mathbb{Y}_0}{\mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau}} \right)^R e^{-R \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_s} e^{-\rho s} dD_s - R \int_0^t \left(\frac{\theta_s^*}{\mathbb{Y}_s} \right)^2 ds} \leq \mathbb{Y}_0^R C^{-\frac{R}{1-R}}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Here we have used the condition that $\xi_\tau > C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and hence $V^D \geq C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. (see Theorem 2.3 (ii)). For $t \in [0, \infty)$, we know that η_t is a local martingale, the uniform bound (3.13) further implies that η_t is a martingale.

Next we verify $\theta^* \in \Theta^D$ by condition (3.6). From (3.12), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(\eta_\tau^{\theta^*})^2 e^{\int_0^\tau \frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{R} ds} (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{2}{1-R}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-2R \int_0^\tau \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_s} e^{-\rho s} dD_s} \mathbb{Y}_\tau^{2(1-R)} \mathbb{Y}_0^{2R} \right] \leq (V_0^D)^{\frac{2R}{1-R}} \mathbb{E}[\xi_\tau^2] < \infty,$$

where we have used the fact that \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial (see Section 2.1) in the inequality.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^\tau e^{\int_0^t \frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{2R} ds - \rho t} \eta_t^{\theta^*} dD_t \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^\tau e^{R \left(\ln(\mathbb{Y}_0) - \ln(\mathbb{Y}_t) - \int_0^t \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_s} e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right) - \rho t} dD_t \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{Y}_0^{2R} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{Y}_{t \wedge \tau}^{1-R} \int_0^\tau e^{-R \int_0^t \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_s} e^{-\rho s} dD_s} \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_t} e^{-\rho t} dD_t \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{Y}_0^{2R} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} (V_{t \wedge \tau}^D)^2 \frac{1}{R} (1 - e^{-R \int_0^\tau \frac{1}{\mathbb{Y}_s} e^{-\rho s} dD_s})^2 \right] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof for Theorem 3.3 (ii). Theorem 3.3 (i) follows by considering a non-increasing sequence $\xi_\tau^n = \frac{1}{n} \vee \xi_\tau$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and by the monotone convergence theorem. \square

4. A CLASS OF SOLVABLE DIVIDEND OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS

In the preceding sections, we show that EZ singular control utility is well-defined and its equivalence to Meanhout's robust dividend criterion. Now, we turn our attention to determining a robust dividend policy amidst ambiguity in earning ability. We propose a set of conditions that can characterize the optimal dividend policy for a wide range of diffusion models for the underlying surplus dynamic.

4.1. Dynamics, controls and the objective function. We start with the state space $\mathcal{X} := (\ell, \infty)$, $-\infty \leq \ell < 0$, and model the uncontrolled surplus process as \mathcal{X} -valued diffusion $X^x = (X_t^x)_{t \geq 0}$ denote the solution of the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$(4.1) \quad X_t^x = x + \int_0^t \mu(X_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s) dW_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad X_0 = x \in \mathcal{X},$$

where functions $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\{0\}$ are Borel functions. The value $\mu(X_t)/X_t$ is the expected per surplus growth rate and $\sigma(X_t)/X_t$ stands for infinitesimal volatility of fluctuations in the per surplus growth rate.

Condition B. The SDE (4.1) admits a unique in law weak solution, which is a regular diffusion with unattainable boundaries $\{\ell, \infty\}$. Moreover, there is a constant $\bar{\mu}$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad \sup_{x \geq 0} \mu(x) - \rho x \leq \bar{\mu}.$$

Financially speaking, Condition B asserts that the net appreciation rate of the surplus is uniformly bounded for all $x \geq 0$. This condition plays a crucial role in deriving several fundamental properties for the value function of the robust dividend problem. Specifically, it leads to a priori continuity of the optimal value function on $[0, \infty)$, particularly at 0 (see Proposition 4.1 below). This continuity is essential when characterizing our problem as a VI, as it provides a boundary condition at bankruptcy, i.e., when $x = 0$, that guarantees the uniqueness of our solution (see (4.9) below). Condition B also implies that the uncontrolled surplus process will not explode at ∞ and that the point $\{0\}$ is a regular point. This is consistent with our emphasis on the ruin risk, that is, the bankruptcy happens in our model.

For each $D \in \mathcal{A}$, the dynamics of the controlled surplus process $X^{x,D} := (X_t^{x,D})_{t \geq 0}$ is governed by

$$(4.3) \quad X_t^{x,D} = x + \int_0^t \mu(X_s^{x,D}) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s^{x,D}) dW_t - D_t, \quad X_{0-}^{x,D} = x.$$

By the definition of \mathcal{A} introduced in Section 2.1, the above condition implies that a dividend distribution may take place at the initial time, hence X_{0-}^D denotes the initial surplus level before such a distribution has ever occurred. We also define the stopping time $\tau^{x,D} \in \mathcal{T}$ as the time of bankruptcy as

$$(4.4) \quad \tau^{x,D} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^{x,D} \leq 0\}.$$

Moreover, we make the convention that $X_t^{x,D} = 0$ on $\{t \geq \tau^{x,D}\}$. At bankruptcy, we assume there is a lump-sum payment given by a positive constant ξ_0 . We further require that the $D_t - D_{t-} \leq X_{t-}^{x,D}$, for any $t \geq 0$, so that the controlled surplus cannot be a negative value even at the time of bankruptcy. We denote by $\mathcal{A}^x \subset \mathcal{A}$, which may depend on the initial surplus level, the admissible set of D that fulfills the above requirements and that $(\tau^{x,D}, e^{-\rho\tau^{x,D}}\xi_0, D)$ satisfies Condition A.

Following definitions (3.4) and (3.5) in Sect. 3, the value function J^* of the robust dividend problem is defined as

$$(4.5) \quad J^*(x) := \sup_{D \in \mathcal{A}^x} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta^D} J^\theta(x; D),$$

$$(4.6) \quad J^\theta(x; D) := \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} e^{-\rho t} J^\theta(X_t^{x,D}; D) \theta_t^2 dt + e^{-\rho\tau^{x,D}} \xi_0 \right].$$

By Proposition 3.2, J^θ admits the representation as

$$J^\theta(x; D) := \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} e^{\frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^t \theta_s^2 ds - \rho t} dD_t + e^{\frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} \theta_s^2 ds - \rho\tau^{x,D}} \xi_0 \right].$$

Priori properties of the optimal value function J^* are summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. *Under Condition B, it holds that $\xi_0 \leq J^*(x) \leq x + \xi_0 + \bar{\mu}/\rho$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $\bar{\mu}$ is the constant that dominates function $\mu(x) - \rho x$ in Condition B. In addition, J^* is continuous and nondecreasing subject to*

$$(4.7) \quad J^*(0+) = \xi_0.$$

The proof is technical and we collect it in Appendix B.

In the rest of the paper, we focus on candidate controls which are *threshold dividend strategies*. In the classical dividend-paying problems, the optimal strategy has always been of the

threshold type (see e.g. [1]). Our main result shows that these types of controls are also optimal in the more general setting including more general diffusion processes and Maenhout's type of ambiguity, hence also for EZ singular control utility.

Following [20, 21], we first provide a rigorous definition of threshold dividend strategies by *Skorokhod map on an interval*. Denote by $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ the space of right-continuous functions with left limits mapping \mathbb{R}_+ into \mathbb{R} . Fix $\beta > 0$. Given $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ there exists a unique pair of functions $(\phi, \eta) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)^2$ that satisfy the following two properties:

- (i) For every $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\phi(t) = \psi(t) + \eta(t)$;
- (ii) $\eta(0-) = 0$, η is nondecreasing, and

$$\int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{\{\phi(s) < \beta\}} d\eta(s) = 0.$$

We define the map $\Gamma_\beta[\psi] = (\Gamma_\beta^1, \Gamma_\beta^2)[\psi] := (\phi, \eta)$. See [42] for the existence and uniqueness of solutions, as well as the continuity property of the map.

Definition 4.2 (threshold dividend strategies). Fix $x, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We call $D = D^{(b)}$ a b -threshold dividend strategy if for every continuous $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)$, one has $(X^D, D)(\psi) = \Gamma_b[\psi]$.

One can easily verify that any b -threshold control is admissible in the sense of $D^{(b)} \in \mathcal{A}^x$.

4.2. The free-boundary problem. We aim to show that for any fixed $\mathcal{R} \in (0, 1)$, there is positive constant b such that, for any initial state $x > 0$,

$$J^*(x) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta^{D^{(b)}}} J^\theta(x; D^{(b)}).$$

Since the value function has been proved to be continuous, this suggests that the threshold level b can be characterized by an HJB equation by dynamic programming principle. Motivated by the robust structure of objective function, together with the dynamic given in (4.3), let \mathcal{L} be the nonlinear operator with Hamiltonian over $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ which acts on $v \in C^2([0, \infty))$ as

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}v(x) &:= \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2} v''(x) + (\mu(x) + \sigma(x)\theta) v'(x) + \frac{\theta^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v(x) - \rho v(x) \right\} \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2} v''(x) + \mu(x) v'(x) - \mathcal{R} \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2} \frac{(v'(x))^2}{v(x)} - \rho v(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is valid provided that $v > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$.

Next, we present the relevant HJB equation. J^* defined in (4.5) is expected to be a solution of the following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Variational Inequality (HJB-VI)

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{cases} \max\{\mathcal{L}v(x), 1 - v'(x)\} = 0 & \text{on } (0, \infty); \\ v(0) = \xi_0. \end{cases}$$

Technically speaking, the boundary condition in (4.9) should be $v(0+) = \xi_0$ as (4.7) shows, rather than $v(0) = \xi_0$. Here and in what follows, we always adopt a convention that the solution of the HJB-VI equation is extended to 0 by continuity and the value of v at 0 is its limit from the right.

Following our educated guess that the optimal control is a threshold control, we choose to work with the following more explicit free-boundary ODE. Namely, we are looking for a

constant $b > 0$ for which there exists $v \in C^2([0, \infty))$ such that

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}v(x) = 0, & v'(x) \geq 1 & \text{on } (0, b); \\ \mathcal{L}v(x) \leq 0, & v'(x) = 1 & \text{on } (b, \infty); \\ v(0) = \xi_0, \end{cases}$$

as well as $v''(b) = 0$ and $v'(b) = 1$. The rationale behind this is as follows: when the initial surplus is $X_0^{x,D} = x \in (b, \infty)$, then in order to keep the process $X^{x,D}$ between 0 and b , there is an instantaneous dividend payment of size $x - b$. When $x \in (0, b)$, no action is being taken. When $X^{x,D}$ hits the boundary b , the threshold policy is taking action, leading to the Neumann boundary condition at b . The surplus level will be kept in $(0, b)$, with an initial payment $0 \wedge (X_0^{x,D} - b)$ and then pay out dividend only when the surplus $X^{x,D}$ is at level b .

4.3. Further assumptions and the main result.

Assumption 4.3. $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable on $[0, \infty)$ with $\mu(0) > 0$. Furthermore, $\sigma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is non-decreasing and continuously differentiable on $[0, \infty)$. There exist $\underline{b}, \bar{b} \in [0, \infty]$ with $\underline{b} < \bar{b}$ and the following conditions hold.

- (i) $\mu(x)^2 \geq 3\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma(x)^2$ on $x \in [0, \underline{b}]$ and there is $\bar{b} = \inf\{x \in (\underline{b}, \infty) : \mu(x)^2 = 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma(x)^2\}$, with the usual convention $\inf\{\emptyset\} := \infty$. In addition, $\mu(x)^2 < 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma(x)^2$ for $x > \bar{b}$.
- (ii) Define functions $\psi^\pm : [0, \bar{b}] \ni x \rightarrow \psi^\pm(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\psi^\pm(x) := \frac{\mu(x) \pm \sqrt{\mu^2(x) - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)}}{2\rho},$$

in particular, ψ^\pm are roots of the quadratic equation $Q(\psi; x) := \rho\psi^2 - \mu(x)\psi + \frac{\mathcal{R}}{2}\sigma^2(x)$. The function $\psi^+(x) - x$ increases on $[0, \underline{b}]$ and decreases on $[\underline{b}, \bar{b}]$.

- (iii) $\sup_{x \in [0, \bar{b}]} \{\psi^-(x) - x\} < \xi_0 < \psi^+(\underline{b}) - \underline{b}$ and there is $\hat{b} := \inf\{x \in (\underline{b}, \bar{b}) : \psi^+(x) - x = \xi_0\}$.

Before discussing the assumption, we validate it within a standard mean-reverting surplus model, an extension of Brownian motion with constant drift, which aligns with substantial empirical support (see [19]).

Example 4.4. *In mean-reverting surplus mode, the dynamic (4.1) of the uncontrolled surplus is given by*

$$dX_t = \bar{\gamma}(\bar{\mu} - X_t)dt + \bar{\sigma}dW_t,$$

where $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\bar{\mu} > 0$ and $\bar{\sigma} > 0$ are constants. The $\bar{\gamma}$ is the speed of mean-reversion, $\bar{\mu}$ is the long-term mean of the process, and $\bar{\sigma}$ is the volatility. Suppose the following conditions hold:

$$(\bar{\gamma}\bar{\mu})^2 > 3\mathcal{R}\rho\bar{\sigma}^2, \quad \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}}{2\rho}} < \xi_0 < \frac{\bar{\gamma}\bar{\mu} + \sqrt{(\bar{\gamma}\bar{\mu})^2 - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\bar{\sigma}^2}}{2\rho}.$$

Then Assumption 4.3 is satisfied with $\underline{b} = 0$ and $\bar{b} = \bar{\mu} - \bar{\sigma}\sqrt{2\mathcal{R}\rho/\bar{\gamma}}$.

Assumption 4.3 is the generalization of [1, Lemma 3.1.(ii)] to the setting that includes ambiguity. We note that when $\mathcal{R} = 0$ and $\xi_0 = 0$, conditions in Assumption 4.3 are reduced to those in [1, Lemma 3.1.(ii)]. Indeed, when $\mathcal{R} = 0$, functions $\psi_0^+(x) = \mu(x)/\rho$ and $\psi_0^- = 0$ by our assumption that $\mu(0) > 0$. Assumption 4.3 (ii) imply that there exists $\underline{b} \geq 0$ such that $\mu(x) - \rho x$ is increasing on $[0, \underline{b}]$ and decreasing on (\underline{b}, ∞) with $\bar{b} = \infty$. When $\xi_0 = 0$, Assumption 4.3 (iii)

is equivalent to $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mu(x) - \rho x < 0$ in [1, Lemma 3.1.(ii)], so that there exists $\hat{b} > \underline{b}$ such that $\mu(\hat{b}) - \rho \hat{b} = 0$.

We end this section by concluding our main results in the following theorems. We prove that an optimal dividend strategy exists and that it is a threshold control. Moreover, we show that the threshold level and the value function J^* are characterized by the free-boundary problem (4.10). The proof of the main results is presented in the subsequent sections.

Theorem 4.5 (Existence). *Suppose that Condition B and Assumption 4.3 hold. Then there exists a solution $v^* : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ of the free boundary problem (4.10) such that it is in $C^2([0, \infty))$ and the corresponding free boundary b^* takes value in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) (with \underline{b}, \hat{b} appearing in Assumption 4.3).*

Theorem 4.6 (Verification). *Suppose that Condition B and Assumption 4.3 hold. Let $v^* : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a solution of the free boundary problem (4.10) with the corresponding free boundary $b^* \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b})$ (ensured by Theorem 4.5) and $J^* : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be defined in (4.5). Furthermore, let $D^* := D^{(b^*)}$ be the b^* -threshold dividend strategy (see Definition 4.2). Then, v^* coincides with J^* and D^* is the robust dividend strategy of J^* , i.e., for every $x \in [0, \infty)$,*

$$v^*(x) = J^*(x) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta^{D^*}} J^\theta(x; D^*).$$

In addition, $J^*(x) = v^*(x)$ satisfies

$$v^*(x) = \sup_{D \in \mathcal{A}^x} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_D} \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} e^{-\rho t} \theta_t^2 v^*(X_t^{x,D}) dt + e^{-\rho \tau^{x,D}} \xi_0 \right].$$

We note that while we have restricted the admissible set \mathcal{A}^x to dividend policies with continuous paths, it is straightforward to confirm that our derived D^* remains optimal, even when considering a broader admissible set that permits right continuous left limit processes.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.5: SHOOTING METHOD

The proof of Theorem 4.5 adopts the shooting method. This is a method that allows us to solve boundary value problems by reducing them to initial value problems. We adapt it to our free-boundary problem. In our case, we set up a parameter the boundary point $x = b$ such that (4.10) holds true. Our approach requires some preliminary ODE results that stem from (4.10).

Recall the function ψ^+ (see Assumption 4.3), we claim that for every $b > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ that there is a function $v_{b,\gamma} \in C^2((0, b) \cup (b, \infty)) \cap C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (when $\gamma = 0$, $v_{b,0} \in C^2((0, \infty))$) solving the following nonlinear ODE

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2} v_{b,\gamma}''(x) + \mu(x) v_{b,\gamma}'(x) - \mathcal{R} \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{2} \frac{(v_{b,\gamma}'(x))^2}{v_{b,\gamma}(x)} = (\rho + \gamma) v_{b,\gamma}(x) & \text{on } (0, \infty), \\ v_{b,\gamma}'(b) = 1, \quad v_{b,\gamma}(b) = \psi^+(b). \end{cases}$$

Indeed, for any given $b > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, one-to-one correspondence

$$(5.2) \quad h_{b,\gamma} := (v_{b,\gamma})^{1-\mathcal{R}}$$

enables to consider the following linear ODE (which is equivalent to (5.1)) given by

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x) h_{b,\gamma}''(x) + \mu(x) h_{b,\gamma}'(x) = (1 - \mathcal{R})(\rho + \gamma) h_{b,\gamma}(x) & \text{on } [a_1, a_2], \\ h_{b,\gamma}'(b) = (1 - \mathcal{R})(\psi^+(b))^{-\mathcal{R}}, \quad h_{b,\gamma}(b) = (\psi^+(b))^{1-\mathcal{R}}, \end{cases}$$

with an interval $[a_1, a_2] \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $a_1 < b < a_2$. Since the linear ODE (5.3) admits a unique solution $h_{b,\gamma} \in C^2([a_1, b] \cup (b, a_2]) \cap C^1([a_1, a_2])$ ($h_{b,0} \in C^2([a_1, a_2])$ when $\gamma = 0$) for any $[a_1, a_2] \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $a_1 < b < a_2$ (The Picard-Lindelöf's Existence and Uniqueness Theorem, see e.g., [52, Chapter 13, Section 2, Theorem 3]), this ensures our claim to hold.

To facilitate the analysis, define $g_{b,\gamma} : \mathbb{R}_+ \ni x \rightarrow g_{b,\gamma}(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ for every $b > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(5.4) \quad g_{b,\gamma}(x) := \frac{v'_{b,\gamma}(x)}{v_{b,\gamma}(x)}.$$

Since $v_{b,\gamma} \in C^2((0, b) \cup (b, \infty)) \cap C^1((0, \infty))$ (when $\gamma = 0$, $v_{b,0} \in C^2((0, \infty))$) is the solution of (5.1) and satisfies

$$(5.5) \quad v_{b,\gamma}(x) = \psi^+(b) \exp\left(\int_b^x g_{b,\gamma}(u) du\right),$$

it follows that $g_{b,\gamma}$ is of $C^1((0, b) \cup (b, \infty)) \cap C(\mathbb{R}_+)$ (when $\gamma = 0$, $g_{b,0} \in C^1((0, \infty))$) solves the following ODE

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)g'_{b,\gamma}(x) + \mu(x)g_{b,\gamma}(x) + \frac{(1-\mathcal{R})}{2}\sigma^2(x)g_{b,\gamma}^2(x) = \rho + \gamma & \text{on } (0, \infty), \\ g_{b,\gamma}(b) = 1/\psi^+(b). \end{cases}$$

For notational simplicity, we set $v_b := v_{b,0}$, $h_b := h_{b,0}$, and $g_b := g_{b,0}$ for every $b > 0$. Targeting at proving Theorem 4.5, our main task is to show the following proposition. The proof of this result is based on a sequence of preliminary lemmas (Lemmas 5.2-5.6), which we will discuss in the subsequent subsection.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. For every $b > 0$, let $v_b \in C^2((0, \infty))$ be the solution of the nonlinear ODE given in (5.1) (when $\gamma = 0$). Then there exists $b^* \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b})$ such that*

$$v_{b^*}(0) = \xi_0, \quad v'_{b^*}(x) \geq 1 \quad \text{on } (0, b^*],$$

with \underline{b}, \hat{b} appearing in Assumption 4.3.

At this point, we see that $v^*(x) = v_{b^*}(x)$ to the left of b^* satisfies the first line and the third line of (4.10). Setting up $v^*(x) = 1$ on (b^*, ∞) , it remains to show the second line of (4.10) holds. We will present this final piece of the proof for Theorem 4.5 here.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. From Proposition 5.1, define $v^* : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(5.7) \quad v^*(x) := \begin{cases} v_{b^*}(x) & \text{if } x \in [0, b^*]; \\ x - b^* + \psi^+(b^*) & \text{if } x \in (b^*, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Then, since v_{b^*} is in $C^2((0, \infty))$ and satisfies (5.1) (when $\gamma = 0$), by the definition given in (5.7) and v^* is in $C^2([0, \infty))$ and satisfies the free boundary problem (4.10) to the left of b^* . For $x \in (b^*, \bar{b})$, $\psi^+(x) - x$ is decreasing by Assumption 4.3 (ii), hence $v^*(x) = x - b^* + \psi^+(b^*) \geq \psi^+(x)$. Therefore $\mathcal{L}v^*(x) = -\frac{Q(v^*(x); x)}{v^*(x)} \leq 0$ by recalling $Q(\psi; x)$ defined in Assumption 4.3 (ii). If $\bar{b} = \infty$, the proof ends. Otherwise, for $x \in [\bar{b}, \infty)$, we have $Q(v^*(x); x) < 0$, hence $\mathcal{L}v^*(x) < 0$. We conclude that $v^*(x)$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}v^* \leq 0$ on (b^*, ∞) , so it solves the free boundary problem (4.10) with free boundary $b^* \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b})$. This completes the proof. \square

The above analysis indicates that most of our efforts should be focused on selecting a point b that satisfies the boundary condition $v_b(0)$. Concurrently, it is also necessary to demonstrate that the challenging bound $v'_b \geq 1$ holds on the interval $[0, b]$.

5.1. Preliminary lemmas for shooting method. In what follows, we often make use of the following elementary properties that are based on [21, Lemma 1].

Lemma 5.2. *Let $(a_1, a_2) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $a_3 \in (a_1, a_2)$, and let $f : (a_1, a_2) \ni x \rightarrow f(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ be a function of class $C^1((a_1, a_2))$. Then the following hold:*

(i) *If $f(a_3) > c$ (resp. $< c$) with some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and there exist $y_1 := \sup\{y \in (a_1, a_3) : f(y) = c\}$ and $y_2 := \inf\{y \in (a_3, a_2) : f(y) = c\}$, then*

$$f'(y_1) \geq 0 \text{ (resp. } \leq 0), \quad f'(y_2) \leq 0 \text{ (resp. } \geq 0).$$

(ii) *If $f'(a_3) > 0$ (resp., < 0) and there exist $y_3 := \sup\{y \in (a_1, a_3) : f(y) = f(a_3)\}$ and $y_4 := \inf\{y \in (a_3, a_2) : f(y) = f(a_3)\}$, then*

$$f'(y_3) \leq 0 \text{ (resp. } \geq 0), \quad f'(y_4) \leq 0 \text{ (resp. } \geq 0).$$

We start with a perturbation result that enables us to get estimations for g_b via the estimates of $g_{b,\gamma}$.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. For every $b > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, let $v_{b,\gamma} \in C^2((0, b) \cup (b, \infty)) \cap C^1((0, \infty))$ ($v_b = v_{b,0} \in C^2((0, \infty))$ when $\gamma = 0$) be the solution of (5.1) and $g_{b,\gamma} \in C^1((0, b) \cup (b, \infty)) \cap C((0, \infty))$ ($g_b = g_{b,0} \in C^1((0, \infty))$ when $\gamma = 0$) be the solution of (5.6). Then, the followings hold for every $b > 0$:*

(i) *Let $b \in (\underline{b}, \bar{b})$ and $\gamma < 0$ (with \underline{b}, \bar{b} appearing in Assumption 4.3). Define $y_{b,\gamma}$ by*

$$y_{b,\gamma} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g_{b,\gamma}(x) > 1/\psi^+(x) \text{ for every } x \in (0, b); \\ \sup\{x \in (0, b) : g_{b,\gamma}(x) \leq 1/\psi^+(x)\} & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then $y_{b,\gamma} \in [0, \underline{b}]$, and for every $x \in (y_{b,\gamma}, b)$, $g_{b,\gamma}(x) > 1/\psi^+(x)$.

(ii) *Let $b_1, b_2 \in (\underline{b}, \bar{b})$ with $b_1 \leq b_2$ and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (-\infty, 0]$ with $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2$. Then the following holds: for every $x \in (0, b_1)$,*

$$g_{b_1,\gamma_1}(x) < g_{b_2,\gamma_2}(x).$$

(iii) *As $\gamma \rightarrow 0$*

$$\sup_{x \in [0, b]} |g_{b,\gamma}(x) - g_b(x)| = O(\gamma),$$

where $O(\cdot)$ denotes the Landau symbol. Moreover, for every $x \in [0, b]$,

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} |v_{b,\gamma}(x) - v_b(x)| = 0, \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} |v'_{b,\gamma}(x) - v'_b(x)| = 0.$$

Proof. We start by proving (i). We first note that since $g_{b,\gamma}$ is the solution of (5.6), the following inequality holds:

$$(5.8) \quad g'_{b,\gamma}(b) = \frac{2}{(\sigma(b)\psi^+(b))^2} Q(\psi^+(b)) + \frac{2\gamma}{(\sigma(b))^2} - \frac{1}{(\psi^+(b))^2} < -\frac{1}{(\psi^+(b))^2},$$

where we have used that $Q(\psi^+(b)) = 0$ (see Assumption 4.3 (ii)) and $\gamma < 0$.

Define $\phi_{b,\gamma} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\phi_{b,\gamma}(x) := g_{b,\gamma}(x) - 1/\psi^+(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $g_{b,\gamma}(b) = 1/\psi^+(b)$ and $(\psi^+)'(b) \leq 1$ (because $\psi^+(x) - x$ is decreasing on $[\underline{b}, \bar{b}]$ and b is in (\underline{b}, \bar{b}) ; see Assumption 4.3 (ii)), the inequality given in (5.8) ensures the following properties to hold:

$$(5.9) \quad \phi_{b,\gamma}(b) = g_{b,\gamma}(b) - \frac{1}{\psi^+(b)} = 0, \quad \phi'_{b,\gamma}(b) = g'_{b,\gamma}(b) + \frac{(\psi^+)'(b)}{(\psi^+(b))^2} < \frac{(\psi^+)'(b) - 1}{(\psi^+(b))^2} \leq 0.$$

We claim that $y_{b,\gamma} \leq \underline{b}$. Since the case with $y_{b,\gamma} = 0$ is trivial, we can and do consider only the case with $y_{b,\gamma} = \sup\{x \in (0, b) : \phi_{b,\gamma}(x) = 0\}$. Arguing by contradiction, assume that $y_{b,\gamma} > \underline{b}$. Then by the continuity of $\phi_{b,\gamma}$ (due to that of $g_{b,\gamma}$ and ψ^+), we have that $\phi_{b,\gamma}(y_{b,\gamma}) = g_{b,\gamma}(y_{b,\gamma}) - 1/\psi^+(y_{b,\gamma}) = 0$. Furthermore, using the same arguments devoted for the second property given in (5.9) (along with $y_{b,\gamma} > \underline{b}$), we have $(\phi_{b,\gamma})'(y_{b,\gamma}) = g'_{b,\gamma}(y_{b,\gamma}) + \frac{(\psi^+)'(y_{b,\gamma})}{(\psi^+(y_{b,\gamma}))^2} < 0$, which contradicts Lemma 5.2 (ii). Hence, the claim holds true.

Furthermore, from the definition of $y_{b,\gamma}$ and the fact that $(\phi_{b,\gamma})'(b) = (g_{b,\gamma} - 1/\psi^+)'(b) < 0$ (see (5.9)), this completes the proof.

Now let us prove (ii). To that end, let y_{b_2,γ_2} be defined as Lemma 5.3 (i) (by assigning $b = b_2$ and $\gamma = \gamma_2$). Define $\Delta g : [0, b] \ni x \rightarrow \Delta g(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ by $\Delta g(x) := g_{b_1,\gamma_1}(x) - g_{b_2,\gamma_2}(x)$ for $x \in [0, b_1]$. Since g_{b_i,γ_i} , $i = 1, 2$, is the solution of (5.6) (when $b = b_i$, $\gamma = \gamma_i$), the following holds: for every $x \in [0, b_1]$,

$$(5.10) \quad \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)(\Delta g)'(x) + \Delta g(x) \left(\mu(x) + (1 - \mathcal{R})\sigma^2(x) \left(\frac{\Delta g(x)}{2} + g_{b_2,\gamma_2}(x) \right) \right) = \gamma_1 - \gamma_2,$$

and $\Delta g(b_1) = 1/\psi^+(b_1) - g_{b_2,\gamma_2}(b_1) < 0$ which follows from Lemma 5.3 (i) with fact that $b_1 \in (y_{b_2,\gamma_2}, b_2)$ and $g_{b_1,\gamma_1}(b_1) = 1/\psi^+(b_1)$.

Here, we claim that $\Delta g(x) < 0$ on $(0, b_1)$. Arguing by contradiction, assume it does not hold; then there exists $y_3 := \sup\{x \in (0, b_1) : \Delta g(x) = 0\}$. Since $\Delta g(y_3) = 0$ (by its continuity) and $y_3 \in [0, b_1]$, assigning $x = y_3$ into (5.10) ensures that $\Delta g'(y_3) = 2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)/\sigma^2(y_3) > 0$. This together with the fact that $\Delta g(b_1) < 0$ contradicts Lemma 5.2 (i). This completes the proof.

The proof for Lemma 5.3 (iii) is similar to the one given in [21, Lemma 2], so we omit the details here. \square

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. For every $b > 0$, let $v_b \in C^2((0, \infty))$ be the solution of (5.1) (when $\gamma = 0$) and $g_b \in C^1((0, \infty))$ be the solution of (5.6) (when $\gamma = 0$). Then the following hold:*

(i) *Let $b \in (\underline{b}, \bar{b})$. Then there exists $y_b^* \in [0, \underline{b}]$ satisfying that for every $x \in [y_b^*, b]$,*

$$g_b(x) \geq 1/\psi^+(x),$$

with \underline{b} appearing in Assumption 4.3.

(ii) *Let $b_1, b_2 \in (\underline{b}, \bar{b})$ with $b_1 < b_2$. Then the following holds: for every $x \in (0, b_1]$,*

$$g_{b_1}(x) \leq g_{b_2}(x).$$

(iii) *Let $b \in (\underline{b}, \bar{b})$ and $\gamma \leq 0$. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$*

$$\sup_{x \in [0, b]} |g_{b+\varepsilon,\gamma}(x) - g_{b,\gamma}(x)| = O(\varepsilon).$$

Furthermore, the following also hold: for every $x \in [0, b]$,

$$(5.11) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |v_{b+\varepsilon,\gamma}(x) - v_b(x)| = 0, \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |v'_{b+\varepsilon,\gamma}(x) - v'_{b,\gamma}(x)| = 0.$$

Proof. We start by proving (i). Let $y_{b,\gamma} \in [0, \underline{b}]$ for every $\gamma < 0$ be defined as in Lemma 5.3 (i). Then $y_{b,\gamma}$ increases in $\gamma < 0$. Indeed, Lemma 5.3 (ii) ensures that for any $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (-\infty, 0)$ such that $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2$, the following holds that $g_{b,\gamma_1}(x) < g_{b,\gamma_2}(x)$ for every $x \in (0, b)$. Combining this with the definition of y_{b,γ_i} , $i = 1, 2$, (see Lemma 5.3 (i)), we have $y_{b,\gamma_1} > y_{b,\gamma_2}$. This ensures that the (increasing) monotonicity of $y_{b,\gamma}$ with respect to $\gamma < 0$.

Consider an increasing sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (-\infty, 0)$ such that $\gamma_n \uparrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then the monotonicity of $(y_{b,\gamma_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ together with uniformly boundedness within $[0, \underline{b}]$ ensures that there exists $y_b^* := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_{b,\gamma_n}$ satisfying $y_b^* \in [0, \underline{b}]$ and $y_b^* \geq y_{b,\gamma_n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Combined with Lemma 5.3 (i), this ensures that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $x \in [y_b^*, b)$, $g_{b,\gamma_n}(x) \geq 1/\psi^+(x)$. Therefore combined with Lemma 5.3 (iii) and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, this completes the proof.

Now let us prove (ii). Lemma 5.3 (ii) ensures that for every $\gamma < 0$ and every $x \in (0, b_1]$, $g_{b_1,0}(x) = g_{b_1}(x) < g_{b_2,\gamma}(x)$. Combined with Lemma 5.3 (iii) and letting $\gamma \uparrow 0$, this completes the proof.

Lastly, we prove (iii). We establish proof for the case where $\gamma = 0$, as the analysis can be readily extended to accommodate the case where $\gamma \neq 0$. We start with proving the first convergence therein. Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1 \wedge (\bar{b} - b))$. Since $g_{b+\varepsilon} \in C^2((0, \infty))$ (resp. $g_b \in C^2((0, \infty))$) is the solution of (5.6) (when $\gamma = 0$ with $b + \varepsilon$ (resp. b)), the following holds: for every $x \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{b+\varepsilon}(x) - g_b(x) - (g_{b+\varepsilon}(b) - g_b(b)) &= - \int_x^b (g'_{b+\varepsilon}(y) - g'_b(y)) dy \\ &= \int_x^b \left((1 - \mathcal{R})\sigma^2(x)(g_{b+\varepsilon}(y) + g_b(y)) + \frac{2\mu(x)}{\sigma^2(x)} \right) (g_{b+\varepsilon}(y) - g_b(y)) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.4 (ii) ensures that $g_b(x) \leq g_{b+\varepsilon}(x) \leq g_{b+1}(x) \leq C_0$ for every $x \in [0, b]$, where $C_0 > 0$ is a constant (that depends on $1 \wedge (\bar{b} - b)$ but not on ε). Furthermore, σ and μ are uniformly bounded on $[0, b]$ (see Assumption 4.3). Hence, combined with (5.12) these properties ensure that there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ (that depends on C_0 but not on ε) such that for every $x \in [0, b)$, $0 \leq g_{b+\varepsilon}(x) - g_b(x) \leq g_{b+\varepsilon}(b) - g_b(b) + C_1 \int_b^x (g_{b+\varepsilon}(y) - g_b(y)) dy$. An application of Grönwall's inequality with this guarantees that there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ (that depends on C_1, C_0 but not on ε) satisfying

$$(5.13) \quad 0 \leq \sup_{x \in [0, b]} (g_{b+\varepsilon}(x) - g_b(x)) \leq C_2 (g_{b+\varepsilon}(b) - g_b(b)).$$

Furthermore, we claim that there is a constant C_3 (that depends on $1 \wedge (\bar{b} - b)$ but not on ε) such that $0 \leq g_{b+\varepsilon}(b) - g_b(b) \leq C_3 \cdot \varepsilon$. Indeed, we use the similar arguments devoted for (5.12) with the fact that $g_{b+\varepsilon}(b + \varepsilon) = 1/\psi^+(b + \varepsilon)$ and $g_b(b) = 1/\psi^+(b)$ to have that

$$\begin{aligned} &|g_{b+\varepsilon}(b) - g_b(b)| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{\psi^+(b + \varepsilon)} - \frac{1}{\psi^+(b)} \right| + \left| \int_b^{b+\varepsilon} \left(\frac{2}{\sigma^2(x)} (\mu(x)g_{b+\varepsilon}(x) - \rho) + (1 - \mathcal{R})g_{b+\varepsilon}^2(x) \right) dx \right| \\ &\leq \varepsilon \cdot \left(\sup_{x \in [b, b+\varepsilon]} \left| \frac{(\psi^+)'(x)}{(\psi^+)^2(x)} \right| + \sup_{x \in [b, b+\varepsilon]} \left| \frac{2\mu(x) + \rho}{\sigma^2(x)} \right| \sup_{x \in [b, b+\varepsilon]} |g_{b+\varepsilon}(x)| \vee 1 + \sup_{x \in [b, b+\varepsilon]} |g_{b+\varepsilon}(x)|^2 \right) \\ &\leq C_3 \cdot \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\mu, \sigma \in C^1((0, \infty))$ and hence $\psi^+ \in C^1([0, \bar{b}])$ (see Assumption 4.3 (ii), (iii)) and that $1 - \mathcal{R} \in (0, 1)$. Combined with (5.13), this ensures that

$$(5.14) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in [0, b]} (g_{b+\varepsilon}(x) - g_b(x)) = 0.$$

(5.11) follows by the transformations $v_b(x) = \psi^+(b) \exp(\int_b^x g_b(u) du)$ and $v'_b(x) = v_b(x) g_b(x)$.

The proof in the case $\varepsilon \uparrow 0$ is similar therefore we omit it. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. Let $b \in (0, \underline{b}]$ and $v_b \in C^2((0, \infty))$ be the solution of (5.1) (when $\gamma = 0$), with \underline{b} appearing in Assumption 4.3. Then for every $x \in (0, \underline{b}]$,*

$$v'_b(x) \leq 1.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma > 0$ and $v_{b,\gamma}$ be the solution of (5.1). Since $v'_{b,\gamma}(b) = 1$ and $v_{b,\gamma}(b) = \psi^+(b)$, the nonlinear ODE given in (5.1) ensures that $v''_{b,\gamma}(b) = 2\gamma\psi^+(b)/\sigma^2(b) > 0$.

We claim that for every $x \in (0, b)$, $v'_{b,\gamma}(x) < 1$. Arguing by contradiction, we assume that it does not hold. Then together with $v'_{b,\gamma}(b) = 1$, the following supremum is attained: $x_1 := \sup\{x \in (0, b) : v'_{b,\gamma}(x) = 1\}$. By definition of this, it is clear that for every $x \in [x_1, b]$, $v'_{b,\gamma}(x) \leq 1$, which ensures that $v_{b,\gamma}(x) - v_{b,\gamma}(b) \geq x - b$ for every $x \in [x_1, b]$.

Furthermore, from Assumption 4.3 (ii) (with $b < \underline{b}$) and $v_{b,\gamma} = \psi^+(b)$, it follows that for every $x \in [x_1, b]$, $v_{b,\gamma}(x_1) \geq \psi^+(b) - (b - x_1) \geq \psi^+(x_1)$. This implies that $Q(v_{b,\gamma}(x_1)) \geq Q(\psi^+(x_1)) = 0$ (see Assumption 4.3 (ii)). From the nonlinear ODE (5.1), it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x_1)v''_{b,\gamma}(x_1) = Q(v_{b,\gamma}(x_1))\frac{1}{v_{b,\gamma}(x_1)} + \gamma v_{b,\gamma}(x_1) \geq \gamma\psi^+(x_1) > 0.$$

Combining this with the fact that $v''_{b,\gamma}(b) > 0$ contradicts Lemma 5.2 (ii). Hence we have shown that the claim holds.

The proof is completed by combining the claim with Lemma 5.3 (iii) and letting $\gamma \downarrow 0$. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose that Assumption 4.3 holds. For every $b > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, let $v_{b,\gamma} \in C^2((0, b) \cup (b, \infty)) \cap C^1((0, \infty))$ ($v_b = v_{b,0} \in C^2((0, \infty))$ when $\gamma = 0$) be the solution of (5.1). Then the following hold:*

- (i) *Let $b \leq \hat{b}$ (with \underline{b}, \hat{b} appearing in Assumption 4.3) and $\gamma \leq 0$. If $v_{b,\gamma}(0) \geq \xi_0$, then for every $x \in [0, b]$,*

$$v_{b,\gamma}(x) \geq x + \xi_0.$$

- (ii) *Let $\gamma < 0$, then there exists $b^*(\gamma)$ defined by*

$$b^*(\gamma) := \inf\{b \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) : v_{b,\gamma}(0) = \xi_0\}.$$

Furthermore, $b^(\gamma)$ increases in $\gamma < 0$, which hence ensures that $b^* := \lim_{\gamma \uparrow 0} b^*(\gamma)$ is well-defined, and the limit b^* satisfies that*

$$b^* \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}], \quad v_{b^*}(0) = \xi_0.$$

Proof. We start by proving (i). Arguing by contradiction, we assume that it does not hold. Recalling the one-to-one correspondence $h_{b,\gamma} = (v_{b,\gamma})^{1-\mathcal{R}}$ (see (5.2)), we obtain that

$$\max_{x \in [0, b]} \{(x + \xi_0)^{1-\mathcal{R}} - h_{b,\gamma}(x)\} > 0.$$

We note that from Assumption 4.3 (iii) (with $b \leq \hat{b}$) and the condition $v_{b,\gamma}(0) \geq \xi_0$, it follows that $h_{b,\gamma}(x) \geq (x + \xi_0)^{1-\mathcal{R}}$ when $x = 0$ and $x = b$. Hence this implies that $(x + \xi_0)^{1-\epsilon} - h_{b,\gamma}(x)$ takes its maximum at $x_0 \in (0, b)$.

Furthermore, since $h_{b,\gamma} \in C^2((0, b) \cup (b, \infty))$ and the maximality of x_0 , the following hold:

$$(5.15) \quad -\mathcal{R}(1 - \mathcal{R})(x_0 + \xi)^{-1-\mathcal{R}} - h''_{b,\gamma}(x_0) \leq 0, \quad (1 - \mathcal{R})(x_0 + \xi)^{-\mathcal{R}} - h'_{b,\gamma}(x_0) = 0.$$

From the linear ODE given in (5.3), we get to a contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x_0)h''_{b,\gamma}(x_0) + \mu(x_0)h'_{b,\gamma}(x_0) - (1 - \mathcal{R})(\rho + \gamma)h_{b,\gamma}(x_0) \\ &> (1 - \mathcal{R})(x_0 + \xi_0)^{-1-\mathcal{R}} \left(-\frac{\mathcal{R}}{2}\sigma^2(x_0) + \mu(x_0)(x_0 + \xi) - (\rho + \gamma)(x_0 + \xi)^2 \right) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (5.15) and the fact that $h_{b,\gamma}(x_0) < (x_0 + \xi)^{1-\mathcal{R}}$, and the second inequality follows from Assumption 4.3 (ii) and $\gamma \leq 0$. This completes the proof.

We now prove (ii). That will be achieved in three steps.

Step 1. We claim that $v_{\underline{b},\gamma}(0) > \xi_0$ and $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(0) < \xi_0$.

Lemma 5.5 (when $b = \underline{b}$) ensures that $v_{\underline{b},\gamma}(0) \geq v_{\underline{b},\gamma}(\underline{b}) - (\underline{b} - x)$ for every $x \in [0, \underline{b}]$. In particular, $v_{\underline{b},\gamma}(0) > v_{\underline{b},\gamma}(\underline{b}) - \underline{b}$ because it cannot be the case that $v'_{\underline{b},\gamma}(x) \equiv 0$ for $x \in [0, \underline{b}]$. Furthermore, from the fact that $v_{\underline{b},\gamma}(\underline{b}) = \psi^+(\underline{b})$ and Assumption 4.3 (ii) (iii) (with $\underline{b} < \hat{b}$), it follows that $v_{\underline{b},\gamma}(0) > \psi^+(\underline{b}) - \underline{b} > \psi^+(\hat{b}) - \hat{b} = \xi_0$.

It remains to show $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(0) < \xi_0$. Arguing by contradiction, we assume that it does not hold. From Lemma 5.6 (i), it follows that $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x) \geq x + \xi_0$ for every $x \in [0, \hat{b}]$. Since $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}$ is the solution of (5.1), assigning $b = \hat{b}$ into (5.1) ensures that $v''_{\hat{b},\gamma}(\hat{b}) = 2\gamma\sigma^2(\hat{b})\psi^+(\hat{b}) < 0$.

Here we claim that $v'_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x) > 1$ for every $x \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b})$. Arguing by contradiction, we assume that it does not hold. Then from the fact that $v'_{\hat{b},\gamma}(\hat{b}) = 1$ and $v''_{\hat{b},\gamma}(\hat{b}) < 0$, the following supremum is attained: $x_1 := \sup\{x \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) : v'_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x) = 1\}$. Furthermore, since $v'_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x_1) = 1$ (noting that $v_{\hat{b},\gamma} \in C((0, \infty))$), we have $v'_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x) > 1$ on (x_1, \hat{b}) . Combined with the fact that $\psi^+(x) - x$ is decreasing on (x_1, \hat{b}) (see Assumption 4.3 (ii) and $\hat{b} \in [\underline{b}, \bar{b}]$) and $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(\hat{b}) = \psi^+(\hat{b})$, this guarantees that

$$(5.16) \quad v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x_1) \leq \psi^+(\hat{b}) - (\hat{b} - x_1) \leq \psi^+(x_1).$$

On the other hand, Lemma 5.6 (i) (together with our assumption that $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(0) \geq \xi_0$) ensures that $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x_1) \geq x_1 + \xi_0$. Hence, combined with (5.16), this ensures that

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x_1)v''_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x_1) = (\rho + \gamma)v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x_1) - \mu(x_1) + \frac{\mathcal{R}}{2} \frac{\sigma^2(x_1)}{v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(x_1)} \leq \gamma(x_1 + \xi_0) < 0.$$

This together with the fact that $v''_{\hat{b},\gamma}(\hat{b}) < 0$ contradicts Lemma 5.2 (ii). We hence have shown the claim that $v'_{\hat{b},\gamma} > 1$ on (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) .

From the claim, the fact that $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(\hat{b}) = \psi^+(\hat{b})$, and Assumption 4.3 (ii) (with $\hat{b} \in [\underline{b}, \bar{b}]$), it follows that $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(\underline{b}) < \psi^+(\hat{b}) - (\hat{b} - \underline{b}) = \xi_0 + \underline{b}$. This contradicts with Lemma 5.6 (i). Therefore, we conclude that $v_{\hat{b},\gamma}(0) < \xi_0$.

Step 2. We claim that there exists $b^*(\gamma)$ defined by $b^*(\gamma) := \inf\{b \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) : v_{b,\gamma}(0) = \xi_0\}$ and that the following holds: $v_{b,\gamma}(0) < \xi_0$ for every $b \in (b^*(\gamma), \hat{b})$.

By Lemma 5.4 (iii), we have the continuity of $b \mapsto v_{b,\gamma}(0)$ with fixed $\gamma \leq 0$. There $b^*(\gamma) := \inf\{b \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) : v_{b,\gamma}(0) = \xi_0\}$ is well-defined.

Now we claim that $v_{b,\gamma}(0) < \xi_0$ for every $b \in (b^*(\gamma), \hat{b})$. From Lemma 5.4 (i) together with $b^*(\gamma) > \underline{b}$, it follows that $g_{b,\gamma}(x) \geq 1/\psi^+(x)$ for every $x \in [b^*(\gamma), b]$. Combining this with the fact that $(\psi^+)'(x) < 1$ for every $x \in [b^*(\gamma), b]$ (see Assumption 4.3 (ii)) ensures that $g_{b,\gamma}(x) > (\psi^+)'(x)\psi^+(x)$ for every $x \in [b^*(\gamma), b]$.

Furthermore, since $b > b^*(\gamma)$, Lemma 5.4 (ii) ensures that $g_{b,\gamma}(x) > g_{b^*(\gamma),\gamma}(x)$ for $x \in (0, b^*(\gamma)]$. Hence we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} v_{b,\gamma}(0) &= \psi^+(b) \exp\left(\int_b^{b^*(\gamma)} g_{b,\gamma}(y)dy + \int_{b^*(\gamma)}^0 g_{b,\gamma}(y)dy\right) \\ &< \psi^+(b^*(\gamma)) \exp\left(\int_{b^*(\gamma)}^0 g_{b^*(\gamma),\gamma}(y)dy\right) = v_{b^*(\gamma),\gamma}(0) = \xi_0. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. We claim that $b^*(\gamma)$ increases in $\gamma < 0$, which ensures that $b^* := \lim_{\gamma \uparrow 0} b^*(\gamma)$ is well-defined by monotone convergence. Furthermore, we also claim that $b^* \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b})$ and $v_{b^*}(0) = \xi_0$.

Let $b \in (\underline{b}, \bar{b})$ and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (-\infty, 0]$ with $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$. Then Lemma 5.3 (ii) ensures that $g_{b,\gamma_1}(x) < g_{b,\gamma_2}(x)$ for every $x \in [0, b]$. From this and the relationship given in (5.5), it follows that $v_{b,\gamma_1}(x) \geq v_{b,\gamma_2}(x)$ on $[0, b]$. In particular, since it cannot be the case that $g_{b,\gamma_1} \equiv v_{b,\gamma_2}$ for $x \in [0, b]$, it follows that $v_{b,\gamma_1}(0) > v_{b,\gamma_2}(0)$.

From this and the fact that $b^*(\gamma_1) = \inf\{b \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) : v_{b,\gamma_1}(0) = \xi_0\}$, it follows that $\xi_0 = v_{b^*(\gamma_1),\gamma_1}(0) > v_{b^*(\gamma_1),\gamma_2}(0)$. Furthermore, Step 2. ensures that $v_{b,\gamma_2}(0) < \xi_0$ for every $b \in (b^*(\gamma_2), \hat{b})$. We hence have $b^*(\gamma_1) > b^*(\gamma_2)$.

From the monotonicity of $b^*(\gamma)$ and its uniform boundedness, we can apply the monotone convergence theorem to have the existence of $\lim_{\gamma \uparrow 0} b^*(\gamma) =: b^*$.

It remains to show that $v_{b^*}(0) = \xi_0$ and $b^* \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b})$. To that end, consider an increasing sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\gamma_n \in (-\infty, 0)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n = 0$.

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b^*(\gamma_n) = b^*$, Lemma 5.4 (iii) ensures that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying that for every $n \geq N_\varepsilon$, $|v_{b^*}(0) - v_{b^*(\gamma_n)}(0)| < \varepsilon$. Furthermore Lemma 5.3 (iii) ensures that there exists $\tilde{N}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying that for every $n \geq \tilde{N}_\varepsilon$, $|v_{b^*(\gamma_n),\gamma_n}(0) - v_{b^*(\gamma_n)}(0)| < \varepsilon$. Since $v_{b^*(\gamma_n),\gamma_n}(0) = \xi_0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Step 2.), we hence obtain that for every $n \geq \tilde{N}_\varepsilon \vee N_\varepsilon$,

$$|v_{b^*}(0) - \xi_0| \leq |v_{b^*}(0) - v_{b^*(\gamma_n)}(0)| + |v_{b^*(\gamma_n),\gamma_n}(0) - v_{b^*(\gamma_n)}(0)| < 2\varepsilon.$$

By letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we show $v_{b^*}(0) = \xi_0$. Finally, we know that $\underline{b} < b^*(\gamma) < \hat{b}$ for every $\gamma < 0$ by Step 1, therefore $\underline{b} \leq \lim_{\gamma \uparrow 0} b^*(\gamma) = b^* \leq \hat{b}$. The strict inequality $\underline{b} < b^*$ follows by the increasing monotonicity of $b^*(\gamma)$.

This completes the proof. \square

5.2. Proof of Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Given the existence of $b^* \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}]$ satisfying $v_{b^*}(0) = \xi_0$ by Lemma 5.6 (ii), we first prove that $v'_{b^*}(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in [0, b^*]$.

From Lemma 5.6 (ii), define b^γ for every $\gamma < 0$ by

$$(5.17) \quad b^\gamma := b^*(\gamma) = \inf\{b \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b}) : v_{b,\gamma}(0) = \xi_0\}.$$

Furthermore, denote by $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma} \in C^2((l, b^\gamma) \cup (b^\gamma, \infty)) \cap C^1((0, \infty))$ the solution of (5.1) (when $b = b^\gamma$).

The proof will be achieved in two steps.

Step 1. We start with perturbation analysis with a fixed $\gamma \in (-\rho, 0)$. We aim to show that

$$(5.18) \quad v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma)(x) \geq 1, \forall x \in (0, b^\gamma].$$

From the boundary conditions $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) = 1$ and $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) = \psi^+(b^\gamma)$, the C^2 property of $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}$ and nonlinear ODE (5.1) gives $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) = 2\gamma\sigma^2(b^\gamma)\psi^+(b^\gamma) < 0$. Argue by contradiction, assume (5.18) doesn't hold. Then combined with the fact that $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) = 1$, we have the existence of

$$x_1 := \sup\{x \in (0, b^\gamma) : v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x) = 1\}.$$

In the following, we prove that the existence of x_1 leads to a contradiction, which proves that (5.18) holds.

First, we consider the case $x_1 \in (\underline{b}, b^\gamma)$. Then since $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) = 1$ (noting that $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma} \in C^1((0, \infty))$), it follows that $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x) > 1$ for every $x \in (x_1, b^\gamma)$. Furthermore, since $\psi^+(x) - x$ decreases on $[x_1, b^\gamma] \subset [\underline{b}, \hat{b}]$ (see Assumption 4.3 (ii) and $x_1 \in (\underline{b}, b^\gamma)$) and $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) = \psi^+(b^\gamma)$, we hence have that

$$(5.19) \quad v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \leq \psi^+(b^\gamma) - (b^\gamma - x_1) \leq \psi^+(x_1).$$

Furthermore, since $x_1 \in (\underline{b}, \hat{b})$ and $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(0) = \xi_0$ (by definition of b^γ), Lemma 5.6 (i) ensures that $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \geq x_1 + \xi_0 \geq \psi^-(x_1)$, so that $Q(v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1); x_1) \leq 0$ by recalling that $Q(\cdot; x_1)$ defined in Assumption 4.3 (ii). This implies that

$$v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2(x_1)} \left(\gamma v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) + \frac{1}{v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1)} Q(v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1); x_1) \right) \leq \frac{2}{\sigma^2(x_1)} \gamma (x_1 + \xi_0) < 0.$$

This together with the fact that $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) < 0$ contradicts Lemma 5.2 (ii).

Now it remains to check the other case when $x_1 \in (0, \underline{b}]$. Here we will also verify a contradiction. Recalling $x_1 = \sup\{x \in (0, b^\gamma) : v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x) = 1\}$ and the fact that $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) = 1$ and $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) < 0$, we employ Lemma 5.2 (ii) to obtain that $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \geq 0$, which can be rewritten by

$$(5.20) \quad v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2(x_1)} \frac{1}{v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1)} \tilde{Q}_\gamma(v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1); x_1) \geq 0,$$

where $\tilde{Q}_\gamma(\psi; x_1) := (\rho + \gamma)\psi^2 - \mu(x_1)\psi + \frac{\mathcal{R}}{2}\sigma^2(x_1)$ (which is well-defined by Assumption 4.3 (ii) with the fact that $\rho > \rho + \gamma > 0$) and we have used the nonlinear ODE of $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}$ given in (5.1).

Lemma 5.6 (i) together with Assumption 4.3 (iii) (and $x_1 \in (0, \underline{b}] \subset [0, \hat{b}]$) ensures that $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \geq x_1 + \xi_0 \geq \psi^-(x_1)$. Furthermore, recalling that γ satisfies $\rho > \rho + \gamma > 0$, we have

$$(5.21) \quad v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \geq \frac{\mu(x_1) - \sqrt{\mu^2(x_1) - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x_1)}}{2\rho} > \frac{\mu(x_1) - \sqrt{\mu^2(x_1) - 2\mathcal{R}(\rho + \gamma)\sigma^2(x_1)}}{2(\rho + \gamma)} := \tilde{\psi}^-(x),$$

where we note that the second term equals $\psi^-(x_1)$ and that the last term $\tilde{\psi}^-(x_1)$ is the smaller one among two roots of the quadratic function $\tilde{Q}_\gamma(\cdot; x_1)$.

Since $\tilde{Q}_\gamma(v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1); x_1) \geq 0$ (see (5.20)), from (5.21) it follows that

$$(5.22) \quad v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \geq \frac{\mu(x_1) + \sqrt{\mu^2(x_1) - 2\mathcal{R}(\rho + \gamma)\sigma^2(x_1)}}{2(\rho + \gamma)} := \tilde{\psi}^+(x_1),$$

where the right-hand side $\widetilde{\psi}^+(x_1)$ is the other (larger) root of $\widetilde{Q}_\gamma(\cdot; x_1)$.

Now we claim that for x fixed, if $(\psi^+)'(x) \geq 1$ then $(\widetilde{\psi}^+)'(x) \geq 1$. By taking derivative of $\psi^+(x)$ w.r.t. x , we have

$$(\psi^+)'(x) = \frac{1}{2\rho}\mu'(x) + \frac{\mu(x)\mu'(x)}{2\rho\sqrt{\mu(x)^2 - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)}} - \frac{\mathcal{R}\sigma(x)\sigma'(x)}{\sqrt{\mu(x)^2 - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)}}.$$

When $(\psi^+)'(x) \geq 1$, it is clear that $\mu'(x) > 0$ since $\sigma'(x) \geq 0$ by Assumption 4.3. Therefore both the terms $\frac{1}{2\rho}\mu'(x)$ and $-\frac{\mathcal{R}\sigma(x)\sigma'(x)}{\sqrt{\mu(x)^2 - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)}}$ are decreasing w.r.t. ρ . It remains to show the same monotonicity for the second term in $(\psi^+)'(x)$. Take derivative of the function $h(\rho; x) := \rho\sqrt{\mu(x)^2 - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)}$ w.r.t. ρ , we have

$$\partial_\rho h(\rho; x) = \sqrt{\mu(x)^2 - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)} - \frac{\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)}{\sqrt{\mu(x)^2 - 2\mathcal{R}\rho\sigma^2(x)}} \geq 0,$$

where the inequality is followed by Assumption 4.3 (i) with $(x_2, x_1) \subset [0, \underline{b}]$. As a result, we show that $1 \leq (\psi^+)'(x) \leq (\widetilde{\psi}^+)'(x)$ since $\rho + \gamma < \rho$ for $\gamma < 0$. Combined with Assumption 4.3 (ii), which says that $\psi^+(x) - x$ increases on $[0, \underline{b}]$, we have $\widetilde{\psi}^+(x) - x$ increases on $[0, \underline{b}]$.

To proceed, recalling that $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) = 1$ and $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \geq 0$ (see (5.20)), we claim that there exists

$$x_2 := \sup\{x \in (0, x_1) : v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x) = 1\}.$$

Arguing by contradiction, we assume that this does not hold. This implies that $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x) < 1$ for every $x \in (0, x_1)$. Furthermore, since $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma} \in C((0, \infty))$ and $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(0) = \xi_0$ (by definition of b^γ), $v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) < x_1 + v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(0) = x_1 + \xi_0$, which contradicts Lemma 5.6 (i). Hence, the existence is guaranteed.

Since $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x) < 1$ for every $x \in (x_2, x_1)$ (from the definition of x_2 and the fact that $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) = 1$ and $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) \geq 0$), the following hold: $v'_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_2) = 1$ and

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_2) &> v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) - (x_1 - x_2) \geq \frac{\mu(x_1) + \sqrt{\mu^2(x_1) - 2\mathcal{R}(\rho + \gamma)\sigma^2(x_1)}}{2(\rho + \gamma)} - (x_1 - x_2) \\ &\geq \frac{\mu(x_2) + \sqrt{\mu^2(x_2) - 2\mathcal{R}(\rho + \gamma)\sigma^2(x_2)}}{2(\rho + \gamma)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (5.22) and the last inequality follows from the fact that $\widetilde{\psi}^+(x) - x$ increases on (x_2, x_1) since $(x_2, x_1) \subset [0, \underline{b}]$.

Recalling the nonlinear ODE (5.1), the inequality given in (5.23) ensures that

$$v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_2) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2(x_2)} \frac{1}{v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_2)} \widetilde{Q}_\gamma(v_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_2); x_2) > 0.$$

This together with (5.20) contradicts Lemma 5.2. (Lemma 2.2 (ii) requires $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) > 0$, but we can see it cannot be the case that $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_2) > 0$, $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(x_1) = 0$ and $v''_{b^\gamma, \gamma}(b^\gamma) < 0$)

Therefore, x_1 is not well-defined, we conclude that (5.18) holds.

Step 2. Recall b^γ for every $\gamma < 0$ given in (5.17) and let b^* be defined by $b^* = \lim_{\gamma \uparrow 0} b^\gamma$ (see Lemma 5.6 (ii)). We claim that $v'_{b^*}(x) \geq 1$ for every $x \in (0, b^*]$.

To that end, let us consider an increasing sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $-\rho < \gamma_n < 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n = 0$. Since $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} b^{\gamma_n} = b^*$ and $(b^{\gamma_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a increasing sequence (see Lemma 5.6 (ii)), the following hold: $b^* \geq b^{\gamma_n} \geq b^{\gamma_0}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Combining this with Step 1. (along with $v_{b^{\gamma_n}, \gamma_n} \in C^1((0, \infty))$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$) ensures that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $x \in (0, b^*]$,

$$(5.24) \quad v'_{b^{\gamma_n}, \gamma_n}(x) \geq 1.$$

Fix $y \in (0, b^{\gamma_0}] \subset (0, b^*]$. For arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, then Lemma 5.3 (iii) ensures that there exists $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|v'_{b^{\gamma_n}, \gamma_n}(x) - v'_{b^{\gamma_n}}(x)| < \varepsilon$ for every $n \geq N_\varepsilon$. Furthermore, Lemma 5.4 (iii) ensures that there exists $\tilde{N}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|v_{b^*}(x) - v'_{b^{\gamma_n}}(x)| < \varepsilon$ for every $n \geq \tilde{N}_\varepsilon$. Therefore, from (5.24), it follows that for every $n \geq \tilde{N}_\varepsilon \vee N_\varepsilon$,

$$v'_{b^*}(x) > v'_{b^{\gamma_n}}(x) - \varepsilon > v'_{b^{\gamma_n}, \gamma_n}(x) - 2\varepsilon \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon.$$

By letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that $v'_{b^*}(x) \geq 1$ for $y \in (0, b^{\gamma_0}]$.

It remains to show $v'_{b^*}(y) \geq 1$ on $(b^{\gamma_0}, b^*]$. Assume the contrary, we have $\min_{y \in [b^{\gamma_0}, b^*]} v'_{b^*}(y) - 1 < 0$. Then $v'_{b^*}(y) - 1$ takes its minimum at $x_0 \in (b^{\gamma_0}, b^*)$ because $v'_{b^*}(b^*) = 1$ and $v'_{b^*}(b^{\gamma_0}) \geq 1$ by above analysis. Then we have that $v''_{b^*}(x_0) = 0$ and $v'_{b^*}(x_0) < 1$. By the continuity of v'_{b^*} , let $\epsilon = (1 - v'_{b^*}(x_0))/2$ there exists x'_0 in a local neighborhood of x_0 such that $v''_{b^*}(x'_0) > 0$ and $v'_{b^*}(x'_0) < v'_{b^*}(x_0) + \epsilon < 1$.

Hence

$$g_{b^*}(x'_0) = \frac{v'_{b^*}(x'_0)}{v_{b^*}(x'_0)} < \frac{1}{x'_0 + \xi} < \frac{1}{\psi^-(x'_0)},$$

where the first inequality follows Lemma 5.6 (i) that $v_{b^*}(x'_0) \geq x'_0 + \xi$ since $v_{b^*}(0) = \xi$, while the last inequality follows Assumption 4.3 (iii). Recall the ODE (5.1) of v_{b^*} , we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x_0)v''_{b^*}(x'_0) = \frac{1}{v_{b^*}(x'_0)}Q(v_{b^*}(x'_0); x'_0) > 0.$$

Combined with the above arguments, we conclude that $g_{b^*}(x'_0) < 1/\psi^+(x'_0)$. This contradicts with Lemma 5.4 (i) which gives $g_{b^*}(x'_0) \geq 1/\psi^+(x'_0)$ as $x_0 > b^{\gamma_0} > \underline{b}$. As a result, we see $v'_{b^*}(y) \geq 1$ on $(b^{\gamma_0}, b^*]$.

This completes the proof for the statement $v'_{b^*}(x) \geq 1$ on $[0, b^*]$.

Finally, we show that $b^* < \hat{b}$, where \hat{b} defined in Assumption 4.3 (iii). We only need to show $b^* \neq \hat{b}$ since $b^* \leq \hat{b}$ by Lemma 5.6 (ii). When $b^* = \hat{b}$, by definition of \hat{b} , we have $v_{b^*}(0) = \xi_0$ while $v_{b^*}(b^*) = \psi^+(b^*) = b^* + \xi_0$. Together with our previous result that $v'_{b^*}(x) \geq 1$ on $(0, b^*]$, we conclude $v'_{b^*}(x) \equiv 1$ on $(0, b^*]$, which cannot be the case due to the structure of ODE (5.1). Therefore, we have $b^* < \hat{b}$. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.6

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Step 1. We claim that for every $x \in [0, \infty)$,

$$(6.1) \quad v^*(x) \geq \sup_{D \in \mathcal{A}^x} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_D} \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^{\tau^{x,D}} e^{-\rho t} \theta_t^2 v^*(X_t^{x,D}) dt + e^{-\rho \tau^{x,D}} \xi_0 \right],$$

and

$$(6.2) \quad v^*(x) \geq J^*(x),$$

where J^* is defined in (4.5). As the proof for the case $x = 0$ is obvious, we assume $x \in (0, \infty)$. For simplicity, we will omit the superscript x in $X^{x,D}$ and $\tau^{x,D}$, as defined in (4.3) and (4.4), respectively.

Set an arbitrary $D \in \mathcal{A}^x$ and define the stopping times $(\hat{\tau}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by

$$(6.3) \quad \hat{\tau}_n := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^D \notin [1/n, n]\} \wedge n.$$

Recall the structure of the operator \mathcal{L} from (4.8), and define the measure \mathbb{Q}^* via (3.2) with the Girsanov kernel $\theta^* := (\theta^*(D)_s)_{s \geq 0}$ given by

$$(6.4) \quad \theta_s^* := -\mathcal{R} \frac{\sigma(X_s^D)(v^*)'(X_s^D)}{v^*(X_s^D)}.$$

Note that by (5.7) and Proposition 5.1, $(v^*)'$ is bounded on $[0, b^*]$ and is identical to 1 on (b^*, ∞) while v^* is bounded below by ξ_0 on $[0, \infty)$. Following similar arguments of in Theorem 3.3, it follows that $\theta^* \in \Theta^D$. From this, we can denote by \mathbb{Q}^* the corresponding probability measure obtained from θ^* .

An application of Dynkin formula into the process $e^{-\rho t} v^*(X_t^D)$ on the random time interval $[0, \tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n]$ under \mathbb{Q}^* (corresponding to θ^*) ensures that

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} e^{-\rho(\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n)} v^*(X_{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n}^D) - v^*(x) &= \int_0^{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s} \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{\theta^*} v^*(X_s^D) ds \\ &+ \int_0^{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s} \sigma(X_s^D)(v^*)'(X_s^D) dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}^*} - \int_0^{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s} (v^*)'(X_s^D) dD_s, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{\theta^*}$ is the infinitesimal operator under \mathbb{Q}^* , i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{\theta^*} v^*(X_s^D) := \frac{\sigma^2(X_s^D)}{2} (v^*)''(X_s^D) + (\mu(X_s^D) + \sigma(X_s^D)\theta_s^*)(v^*)'(X_s^D) - \rho v^*(X_s^D),$$

and D^C denotes the continuous part of D and $W^{\mathbb{Q}^*}$ is the \mathbb{Q}^* -Brownian motion. Here, we note that the summation term in the last line is non-zero only for at mostly countably many times s such that $D_s - D_{s-} > 0$;

By similiary arguments, an application of Dynkin formula to the process $e^{-\rho t} \int_0^t (\theta_s^*)^2 / 2\mathcal{R} ds v^*(X_t^D)$ on the random time interval $[0, \tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n]$ gives

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} e^{-\rho(\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n) + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} (\theta_s^*)^2 ds} v^*(X_{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n}^D) - v^*(x) &= \int_0^{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^s (\theta_u^*)^2 du} \mathcal{L} v^*(X_s^D) ds \\ &+ \int_0^{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^s (\theta_u^*)^2 du} \sigma(X_s^D)(v^*)'(X_s^D) dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}^*} - \int_0^{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^s (\theta_u^*)^2 du} (v^*)'(X_s^D) dD_s, \end{aligned}$$

where recall that \mathcal{L} is defined in (4.8).

Based on the definitions of the nonlinear operator \mathcal{L} in (4.8), the process θ^* in (6.4), and given that $v^*(X_s^D) > 0$ for $s \in [0, \tau^D]$ and v^* solves (4.10), it follows that for every $s \in [0, \tau^D]$:

$$(6.7) \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{\theta^*} v^*(X_s^D) = \mathcal{L} v^*(X_s^D) - \frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^D) \leq -\frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^D).$$

Furthermore, Since $v^* \in C^2([0, \infty))$ (see Theorem 4.5), $\sigma \in C^1((0, \infty))$ (see Assumption 4.3 (i)) and X^D is bounded in $[0, \tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n]$ (see (6.3)), the Brownian local martingale terms given in (6.5) and (6.6) are martingales. Lastly, since $(v^*)'(x) \geq 1$ for $x \in [0, \infty)$ and $v^*(0) = \xi_0$, it follows that $v^*(X_{\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n}^D) \geq \xi_0$. Taking the expectation over (6.5) under \mathbb{Q}^* gives

$$v^*(x) \geq \mathbb{E}^{\theta^*} \left[\int_0^{(\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n)} e^{-\rho s} dD_s + \int_0^{(\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n)} \frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^D) ds + e^{-\rho(\tau^D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n)} \xi_0 \right].$$

Since $\tau_D \wedge \hat{\tau}_n \rightarrow \tau_D$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (see (6.3)), an application of Fatou's lemma together with $\theta^* \in \Theta^D$ (see (6.4)) ensures that

$$\begin{aligned} v^*(x) &\geq \mathbb{E}^{\theta^*} \left[\int_0^{\tau_D} e^{-\rho s} dD_s + \int_0^{\tau_D} e^{-\rho s} \frac{(\theta_s^*)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^D) ds + e^{-\rho\tau_D} \xi_0 \right] \\ &\geq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta^D} \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau_D} e^{-\rho s} dD_s + \int_0^{\tau_D} e^{-\rho s} \frac{\theta_s^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^D) ds + e^{-\rho\tau_D} \xi_0 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As the inequality holds for every $D \in \mathcal{A}^x$, the claim (6.1) holds. With similar arguments applied to (6.6), we obtain that

$$v^*(x) \geq \mathbb{E}^{\theta^*} \left[\int_0^{\tau_D} e^{-\rho s + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^s (\theta_u^*)^2 du} dD_s + e^{-\rho\tau_D + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R}} \int_0^{\tau_D} (\theta_u^*)^2 du} \xi_0 \right] \geq J^{\theta^*}(x; D) \geq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta^D} J^\theta(x; D),$$

where J^θ is defined in (4.6). We obtain (6.2) by taking supreme over $D \in \mathcal{A}^x$ on both sides of the above equation.

Step 2. Let $D^* = D(b^*)$ be the b^* -threshold strategy. We show that for every $x \in [0, \infty)$,

$$(6.8) \quad v^*(x) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_{D^*}} \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{D^*}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t^* + \int_0^{\tau^{D^*}} e^{-\rho t} \frac{\theta_t^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_t^{D^*}) dt + e^{-\rho\tau^{D^*}} \xi_0 \right],$$

and

$$(6.9) \quad v^*(x) \leq J^*(x).$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $x \in (0, \infty)$ which will be divided into two cases (i.e., $x \in (0, b^*]$ or $x \in (b^*, \infty)$). Before starting the proof, we first note that from the definition of b^* -threshold strategy (see Definition 4.2), the following properties hold for every $s \in (0, \tau^{D^*}]$:

$$(6.10) \quad X_s^{D^*} \in [0, b^*], \quad dD_s^* > 0 \quad \text{only when } X_s^{D^*} = b^*.$$

Furthermore, if $x \in (0, b^*]$, the above properties hold for every $s \in [0, \tau^{D^*}]$.

We first consider the case $x \in (0, b^*]$. Let $\theta \in \Theta(D^*)$ and \mathbb{Q} be the corresponding probability measure induced by the kernel θ . Furthermore, as in (6.3), we define for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $\hat{\tau}_n := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^{D^*} \notin [1/n, n]\}$. An application of Dynkin formula to the process $e^{-\rho t} v^*(X_t^{D^*})$ on the random time interval $[0, \tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n]$ under \mathbb{Q} gives that

$$(6.11) \quad v^*(x) = \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[e^{-\rho(\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n)} v^*(X_{\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n}^{D^*}) - \int_0^{\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s} \left(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta v^*(X_s^{D^*}) ds - dD_s^* \right) \right],$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta$ is the infinitesimal operator under \mathbb{Q}^* , i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta v^*(X_s^{D^*}) := \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(X_s^{D^*}) (v^*)''(X_s^{D^*}) + (\mu(X_s^{D^*}) + \sigma(X_s^{D^*}) \theta_s) (v^*)'(X_s^{D^*}) - \rho v^*(X_s^{D^*}),$$

and we use the fact that $\mathbb{E}^\theta[\int_0^{\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s} \sigma(X_s^{D^*}) (v^*)'(X_s^{D^*}) dW_s^{\mathbb{Q}}] = 0$ and that $dD_s^* > 0$ only when $(v^*)'(X_s^{D^*}) = 1$ for $s \in [0, \tau^{D^*}]$. From (6.10) and the fact that $\mathcal{L}v^*(x) = 0$ for every $x \in (0, b^*]$ (see (4.10) with the free boundary b^*), it follows that for every $s \in [0, \tau^{D^*}]$, $\mathcal{L}v^*(X_s^{D^*}) = 0$. Recall the definition of \mathcal{L} in (4.8), we obtain that for every $s \in [0, \tau^{D^*}]$

$$(6.12) \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta v^*(X_s^{D^*}) \geq \mathcal{L}v^*(X_s^{D^*}) - \frac{(\theta_s)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^{D^*}) = -\frac{(\theta_s)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^{D^*}).$$

By (6.12) and (6.11), we hence obtain that

$$(6.13) \quad v^*(x) \leq \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n} e^{-\rho s} \left(\frac{(\theta_s)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^{D^*}) ds + dD_s^* \right) + e^{-\rho(\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n)} v^*(X_{\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n}^{D^*}) \right].$$

From $v^* \in C^2([0, \infty))$ and the fact that $X_s^{D^*} \in [0, b^*]$ for every $s \in [0, \tau^{D^*}]$ (see (6.10)), it follows that $\sup_{s \in [0, \tau^{D^*}]} |v^*(X_s^{D^*})| < \infty$. Hence, an application of the dominated convergence theorem (applicable to the last term of right-hand side of (6.13)) and monotone convergence theorem (applicable to the first term of right-hand side of (6.13)), together with $\tau^{D^*} \wedge \hat{\tau}_n \rightarrow \tau^{D^*}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ into (6.13) ensures that

$$(6.14) \quad v^*(x) \leq \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{D^*}} e^{-\rho s} \left(\frac{(\theta_s)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^{D^*}) ds + dD_s^* \right) + e^{-\rho\tau^{D^*}} \xi_0 \right],$$

where we have used that $v^*(X_{\tau^{D^*}}^{D^*}) = v^*(0) = \xi_0$ (see (4.10)). As the inequality holds for every $\theta \in \Theta_{D^*}$, the claim (6.8) holds for every $x \in (0, b^*]$.

It remains to prove the case $x \in (b^*, \infty)$. Note that for every $x \in (b^*, \infty)$, $v^*(x) = x - b^* + \psi^+(b^*)$ (see (5.7)). Furthermore, since the strategy $D^* = D(b^*)$ starts with an instantaneous increase with amount $x - b^*$, it follows that for every $\theta \in \Theta_{D^*}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{D^*}} e^{-\rho s} \left(\frac{(\theta_s)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^{x, D^*}) ds + dD_s^* \right) + e^{-\rho\tau^{D^*}} \xi_0 \right] \\ &= x - b^* + \mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{D^*}} e^{-\rho s} \left(\frac{(\theta_s)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^{b^*, D^*}) ds + dD_s^* \right) + e^{-\rho\tau^{D^*}} \xi_0 \right] \geq x - b^* + v^*(b^*) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the inequality (6.14) (since it holds when $x = b^*$), which ensures

$$\mathbb{E}^\theta \left[\int_0^{\tau^{D^*}} e^{-\rho s} \left(\frac{(\theta_s)^2}{2\mathcal{R}} v^*(X_s^{x, D^*}) ds + dD_s^* \right) + e^{-\rho\tau^{D^*}} \xi_0 \right] \geq x - b^* + v^*(b^*) = v^*(x),$$

where we have used that $v^*(b^*) = \psi^+(b^*)$ with $v^* \in C^2([0, \infty))$. As the inequality holds for every $\theta \in \Theta_{D^*}$, the claim (6.8) holds for every $x \in (b^*, \infty)$.

To show (6.9), similar to the analysis in *Step 1*, an application of Dynkin formula to the process $e^{-\rho t} \int_0^t (\theta_s)^2 / 2\mathcal{R} ds v^*(X_t^{D^*})$ gives

$$v^*(x) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_D^*} J^\theta(x; D^*) \leq \sup_{D \in \mathcal{A}^x} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta_D} J^\theta(x; D) \leq J^*(x), \quad x \in [0, \infty).$$

This completes the proof. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF FOR SECTION 2

Let us introduce the following sets that are used throughout the appendices: for every $p \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$,

- \mathcal{S}_p is the set of the set of all real-valued, \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes Y such that $\|Y\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p := \mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} |Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^p] < \infty$;
- \mathcal{S}_∞ is the set of all real-valued, \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes Y such that $\|Y\|_{\mathcal{S}_\infty} := \inf\{C \geq 0 : |Y_t| \leq C \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}$;
- \mathcal{M}_p is the set of all real-valued, \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes Z such that $\|Z\|_{\mathcal{M}_p}^p := \mathbb{E}[(\int_0^\tau |Z_t|^2 dt)^{p/2}] < \infty$.

· Denote by $\mathcal{B}_p := \mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{M}_p$ the product space equipped with the norm $\|(Y, Z)\|_{\mathcal{B}_p}^p := \|Y\|_{\mathcal{S}_p}^p + \|Z\|_{\mathcal{M}_p}^p$ for every $(Y, Z) \in \mathcal{B}_p$.

A.1. An overview of arguments. We first demonstrate the existence of a solution for BSDEs with any bounded $D \in \mathcal{A}$ and a Lipschitz aggregator. We then present a comparison theorem for these BSDEs, establishing that any subsolution always lies below any supersolution, provided the aggregator is nonincreasing in its second argument. Uniqueness of BSDE solutions follows by a standard argument, i.e., any solution is both a subsolution and a supersolution. Additionally, we establish a priori lower and upper bounds for a candidate BSDE solution with an (non-Lipschitz) EZ aggregator. Progressing further, we construct a sequence of Lipschitz aggregators that converges to the EZ aggregator. The a priori bounds allow us to prove that the sequence of the BSDE solutions with Lipschitz aggregators converges in \mathcal{B}_2 space. Finally, for general unbounded $D \in \mathcal{A}$, we adopt a technique motivated by [3].

A.2. Step 1. Lipschitz aggregator: fixed horizon and bounded controls. For any $0 < T < \infty$, we define the spaces $\mathcal{S}_2([0, T])$, $\mathcal{M}_2([0, T])$, and $\mathcal{B}_2([0, T])$ similarly, with τ replaced by T in the definition of \mathcal{S}_2 , \mathcal{M}_2 , and \mathcal{B}_2 .

Lemma A.1. *Let $T < \infty$ and $(Y_t, Z_t) \in \mathcal{B}_2([0, T])$. Then the continuous local martingale $(\int_0^t Y_s Z_s dW_s)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a uniformly integrable martingale.*

Proof. This is exactly [3, Lemma A.1], we omit the proof here. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let $T < \infty$. Let $A \in \mathcal{S}_2([0, T])$ and $D \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $D_T \leq K$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for some constant K , and both A and D have continuous paths. If the following holds for every $\zeta \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfying that $\zeta \leq T$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.,*

$$(A.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[A_\zeta] \leq \alpha + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_\zeta^T A_s dD_s\right],$$

with some constant α , then it holds that $\mathbb{E}[A_t] \leq \alpha e^K$ for every $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. For fixed $t \in [0, T]$ and $0 \leq k \leq K$, set $\zeta_k = \inf\{s \geq t : D_s \geq k\} \wedge T$. Then each ζ_k is a stopping time bounded by T . Moreover, since $\{\zeta_k \leq s\} = \{D_s \geq k\}$ for $s \geq t$ and $\zeta_K = T$ holds \mathbb{P} -a.s., it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[A_{\zeta_k}] &\leq \alpha + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\zeta_k}^T A_s dD_s\right] = \alpha + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^T A_s \mathbb{1}_{s \geq \zeta_k} dD_s\right] \\ &\leq \alpha + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^T A_s \mathbb{1}_{\zeta_k \leq s \leq \zeta_K} dD_s\right] = \alpha + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_k^K A_{\zeta_s} ds\right] = \alpha + \int_k^K \mathbb{E}[A_{\zeta_s}] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now set $u_s := \mathbb{E}[A_{\zeta_s}]$ for $k \in [0, K]$. Then since $u_k \leq \alpha + \int_k^K u_s ds$, for $k \in [0, K]$, the standard (backward) Grönwall's inequality ensures that $u_k \leq \alpha e^{K-k}$ for $k \in [0, K]$. We complete the proof by letting $k = 0$. \square

Theorem A.3 (Lipschitz aggregator). *For fixed horizon $0 < T < \infty$ and $D \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\int_0^T e^{-\rho t} dD_t \leq K$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for some real constant K , and $\xi_T \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ assume that g satisfies the following conditions:*

- (A1) *There exists $C_g > 0$ such that $|g(t, y_1) - g(t, y_2)| \leq C_g e^{-\rho t} |y_1 - y_2|$ for all y_1, y_2 .*
- (A2) $\mathbb{E}[(\int_0^T |g(t, 0)| dD_t)^2] < \infty$.

Then the BSDE with parameter (T, ξ_T, g, D) has a unique solution in \mathcal{B}_2 .

Proof. The solution is constructed by modifying the proof of [54, Proposition 2.2]. The idea is constructing an approximating sequence by a kind of Picard iteration, and we show that it is a Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{B}_2 . Let $y^0 = 0$, and $\{(y_t^n, z_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence in \mathcal{B}_2 define recursively by

$$y_t^{n+1} = \xi_T + \int_t^T g(s, y_s^n) dD_s - \int_t^T z_s^n dW_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

For any $y^n \in \mathcal{S}_2$, we construct y^{n+1} and z^n as follows. From (A1) and (A2), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\xi_T + \int_0^T g(s, y_s^n) dD_s \right)^2 \right] &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\xi_T^2 + \left(\int_0^T (|g(s, 0)| + C_g e^{-\rho s} |y_s^n|) dD_s \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[\xi_T^2] + 4\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |g(s, 0)| dD_s \right)^2 + C_g \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |y_t^n|^2 \right) K^2 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\{\mathbb{E}_t[\xi_T + \int_0^T g(s, y_s^n) dD_s]\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a square integrable martingale. By the martingale representation theorem, we construct a unique $z^n \in \mathcal{M}_2$ and $y^{n+1} \in \mathcal{S}_2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t z_s^n dW_s &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[\xi_T + \int_0^T g(s, y_s^n) dD_s \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_T + \int_0^T g(s, y_s^n) dD_s \right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T; \\ \text{(A.2)} \quad \text{and } y_t^{n+1} &:= \mathbb{E}_t \left[\xi_T + \int_t^T g(s, y_s^n) dD_s \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, it follows from Itô's lemma applied to $(u_{s \wedge \tau}^{n+1})^2 := |y_{s \wedge \tau}^{n+1} - y_{s \wedge \tau}^n|^2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} (u_{t \wedge \tau}^{n+1})^2 + \int_{s \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} |z_s^n - z_s^{n-1}|^2 ds \\ = 2 \int_{s \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} (g(s, y_s^n) - g(s, y_s^{n-1})) u_s^{n+1} dD_s - 2 \int_{s \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} u_s^{n+1} (z_s^n - z_s^{n-1}) dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear by Lemma A.1 that the above stochastic integral is a uniformly integrable martingale and has zero expectation. By taking expectations on both sides, together with condition (A1) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(u_{t \wedge \tau}^{n+1})^2] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} |z_s^n - z_s^{n-1}|^2 ds \right] \\ \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} C_g u_s^n u_s^{n+1} e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right] \leq C_g \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} (u_s^n)^2 e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right] + C_g \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{t \wedge \tau}^{T \wedge \tau} (u_s^{n+1})^2 e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.2 implies

$$\text{(A.3)} \quad \mathbb{E}[(u_t^{n+1})^2] \leq C_g e^{C_g K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T (u_s^n)^2 e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right], \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Now we introduce sequence of bounded stopping time in \mathcal{T} as $\zeta_s := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \int_0^t e^{-\rho \tau} D_\tau \geq s\} \wedge T$ for $s \in [0, K]$. From the proof of Lemma A.2, it is obvious that the inequality

$$\text{(A.4)} \quad \mathbb{E}[(u_{\zeta_t}^{n+1})^2] \leq C_g e^{C_g K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\zeta_t}^T (u_s^n)^2 e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right]$$

holds for $t \in [0, K]$. Iterating (A.3) and (A.4) gives for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(u_t^{n+1})^2] &\leq C_g e^{C_g K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^T (u_s^n)^2 e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right] \leq C_g e^{C_g K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (u_s^n)^2 e^{-\rho s} \mathbf{1}_{\zeta_0 \leq s \leq \zeta_K} dD_s \right] \\
&= C_g e^{C_g K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^K (u_{\zeta_s}^n)^2 ds \right] = C_g e^{C_g K} \int_0^K \mathbb{E}[(u_{\zeta_s}^n)^2] ds \\
&\leq (C_g e^{C_g K})^2 \int_0^K \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\zeta_s}^T (u_t^{n-1})^2 e^{-\rho t} dD_t \right] ds = (C_g e^{C_g K})^2 \int_0^K \int_{t_1}^K \mathbb{E}[(u_{\zeta_{t_2}}^{n-1})^2] dt_2 dt_1 \\
&\dots \\
&\leq (C_g e^{C_g K})^n \int_0^K \int_{t_1}^K \dots \int_{t_{n-1}}^K \mathbb{E}[(u_{\zeta_{t_n}}^1)^2] dt_n dt_{n-1} \dots dt_1 \leq (C_g e^{C_g K})^n \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (u_t^1)^2 \right] \frac{K^n}{n!}.
\end{aligned}$$

The above estimate implies that $\{(y^n, z^n)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2$, due to the fact that $y^1 \in \mathcal{S}_2$ and so $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} (u_t^1)^2]$ is finite. It follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (y^n, z^n) = (y, z) \in \mathcal{B}_2$. By standard arguments, we show that (y, z) solves BSDE (2.5) with parameter (T, ξ_T, g, D) . The uniqueness of (y, z) follows standard arguments with comparison theorem (see Proposition A.5 below). \square

A.3. Step 2. Comparison theorem under general condition and priori bounds. We introduce the notion of subsolutions and supersolutions under the general condition.

Definition A.4. For (τ, ξ_τ, D) that satisfies Condition A, an adapted process $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is called a supersolution (resp. a subsolution) for BSDE with parameter (τ, ξ_τ, g, D) if

$$Y_t = \xi_\tau + \int_t^\tau g(s, Y_s) dD_s - \int_t^\tau Z_s dW_s + \int_t^\tau dA_s \left(\text{resp. } - \int_t^\tau dA_s \right),$$

where $(A_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a right continuous left limit process in \mathcal{P} ; equivalently, $(Y_t + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} g(s, Y_s) dD_s)_{t \geq 0}$ is a local supermartingale (resp. a local submartingale). A solution of BSDE with parameter (τ, ξ_τ, g, D) is both a supersolution and a subsolution.

The following result shows a comparison result for BSDE (2.5) without restricting ourselves to the conditions given by Theorem A.3.

Proposition A.5. *Let (Y, Z) (resp. (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z})) be a supersolution (resp. subsolution) to BSDE (2.5) with parameter (τ, ξ_τ, g, D) (resp. $(\tau, \tilde{\xi}_\tau, \tilde{g}, D)$). Assuming that both (Y, Z) and (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}) are of class \mathcal{B}_2 and one of the following conditions hold:*

- (i) $\tilde{g}(t, Y_t) \leq g(t, Y_t)$ and $\tilde{g}(t, y)$ is nonincreasing in y , $d\mathbb{P} \times dt$ -a.e., or
- (ii) $\tilde{g}(t, \tilde{Y}_t) \leq g(t, \tilde{Y}_t)$ and $g(t, y)$ is nonincreasing in y , $d\mathbb{P} \times dt$ -a.e.;

if $\xi_\tau \geq \tilde{\xi}_\tau$, then $\tilde{Y}_t \leq Y_t$ for any $t \geq 0$ a.s.

Proof. The proof can be straightforwardly generalized from the approach presented in [40, Theorem 2.6]; hence, we chose to omit the details here. \square

We introduce two auxiliary utility processes that act as lower and upper bounds for the solutions of our target BSDE. The well-defined nature of these processes is established in the following lemmas.

Lemma A.6. For (τ, ξ_τ, D) that satisfies Condition A, there exists a process $Y \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} \bar{Y}_t^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] < \infty$ (in particular $(\bar{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{S}_2$) given by

$$(A.5) \quad \bar{Y}_t := \left(\mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_t^\tau e^{-\rho s} dD_s + (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-R}} \right] \right)^{1-R}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where recall that $R \in (0, 1)$ is the risk-aversion coefficient in g_{EZ} defined in (2.3).

Proof. Observe that $(\bar{Y})^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$ is the classical dividend-paying utility process, it follows directly that $(\bar{Y})^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$ is the unique solution to BSDE with parameter $(\tau, (\xi_\tau)^{\frac{1}{1-R}}, \bar{g}, D)$, with $\bar{g}(t, v) = e^{-\rho t}$. Since (τ, ξ_τ, D) satisfies Condition A, $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} \bar{Y}_t^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] < \infty$ by Doob's maximal inequality. $\bar{Y} \in \mathcal{S}_2$ follows as a consequence of Jensen's inequality. \square

The triplet (T, ξ_T, D) satisfying conditions in Theorem A.3 is a special case of the above Lemma.

Lemma A.7. For the triplet (T, ξ_T, D) satisfying conditions in Theorem A.3, there exists $(\underline{Y}_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}_2$ satisfying

$$(A.6) \quad \underline{Y}_t := \mathbb{E}_t \left[\int_t^T \underline{g}(s, \underline{Y}_s) dD_s + \xi_T \right], \quad \underline{g}(t, v) = e^{-\rho t}(1 - Rv), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

In addition, $\underline{Y}_t \geq e^{-R\| \int_0^T e^{-\rho s} dD_s \|_\infty} \mathbb{E}_t[\xi_T]$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ a.s.

Proof. Since aggregator $\underline{g}(\cdot, y)$ satisfies condition in Theorem A.3, we obtain the existence and uniqueness of the solution to BSDE (2.5) with parameters $(\xi, \underline{g}, T, D)$. It follows from the comparison theorem (Proposition A.5) that $\underline{Y}_t \geq \tilde{Y}_t$, where (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}) is the unique solution to BSDE

$$(A.7) \quad \tilde{Y}_t = \xi_T - \int_t^T e^{-\rho s} R \tilde{Y}_s dD_s - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s dW_s.$$

It follows that $\underline{Y}_t \geq \tilde{Y}_t = \mathbb{E}_t[e^{-R \int_t^T e^{-\rho s} dD_s} \xi_T] \geq e^{-R\| \int_0^T e^{-\rho s} dD_s \|_\infty} \mathbb{E}_t[\xi_T]$, $t \in [0, T]$ a.s. \square

A.4. Step 3. EZ aggregator: fixed horizon and bounded controls. We start by approximating the EZ aggregator g_{EZ} in (2.3) using Lipschitz aggregators that satisfy conditions (A1) and (A2). The proof of the construction of approximation is straightforward with direct calculation, so we omit it in the following lemma.

Lemma A.8. The sequence of aggregators

$$(A.8) \quad g_n(\omega, t, y) = \inf_{x > 0} \{g_{EZ}(\omega, t, x) + nRe^{-\rho t}(x - y)\}$$

is well-defined for each $n \geq 1$, satisfying (A2) and $d\mathbb{P} \times dt$ -a.s.:

- (i) Monotonicity in n : $\forall y \geq 0$, $g_n(\omega, t, y)$ increase in n .
- (ii) Lipschitz condition (A1): $\forall y_1, y_2 \geq 0$, $|g_n(\omega, t, y_1) - g_n(\omega, t, y_2)| \leq nRe^{-\rho t}|y_1 - y_2|$.
- (iii) Monotonicity in y : g_n is nonincreasing in y .

Theorem A.9. For (T, D) satisfying conditions in Theorem A.3 and $\mathbb{E}[(\xi_T)^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] < \infty$ and there is a real constant $C > 0$ such that $\xi_T > C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. Then the BSDE (2.5) with parameter (T, ξ_T, g_{EZ}, D) has a unique solution $(y_t, z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{B}_2$.

Proof. For fixed (ω, t) , consider the sequence $g_n(\omega, t, y)$ associated to g_{EZ} in (2.3) constructed by Lemma A.8. It follows by Theorem A.3 that, for each $n \geq 1$, the BSDE with parameter (T, ξ_T, g_n, D) has a unique solution $(y_t^n, z_t^n)_{t \in [0, \tau]} \in \mathcal{B}_2$. Lemma A.8 (i) and (iii), Proposition A.5 yield that for $n \geq 1$, $y_t^1(\omega) \leq y_t^n(\omega) \leq y_t^{n+1}$, $d\mathbb{P} \times dt$ -a.s. Note that y^1 is identical to \underline{Y} defined in Lemma A.7 (with current triplet (T, ξ_T, D)), since g_1 and \underline{g} are identical. Under the condition that $\xi_T \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)_+$ and $\int_0^T e^{-\rho s} dD_s \leq K$ a.s., by Lemma A.7, there is a real constant C_ξ such that $y_t^1 = \underline{Y}_t \geq e^{-RK} \mathbb{E}_t[\xi_T] \geq C_\xi$ for $t \in [0, T]$ a.s.

We now show that the sequence y^n is bounded from above by \bar{Y} as defined in Lemma A.6 (with current triplet (T, ξ_T, D)). For $n \geq 1$, a direct application of Itô's formula (cf. [35, Theorem I.4.57]) to $\psi := (y^n)^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$ yields

$$d\psi_t = -\frac{1}{1-R} \psi_t^R g_n(t, \psi_t^{1-R}) dD_t + \frac{1}{1-R} (\psi_t)^R z_t^n dW_t + \frac{R}{2(1-R)^2} (\psi_t)^{2R-1} |z_t^n|^2 dt.$$

Note that the term $\int_0^t \frac{R}{2(1-R)^2} (\psi_s)^{2R-1} |z_s^n|^2 ds$ is an increasing process, so ψ is a subsolution of BSDE (2.5) with parameters $(T, (\xi_T)^{\frac{1}{1-R}}, h, D)$, where $h(t, y) = y^R g_n(t, y^{1-R}) / (1-R)$. Recall that $g_n \leq g_{EZ}$, we have $y^R g_n(t, y^{1-R}) / (1-R) \leq y^R g_{EZ}(t, y^{1-R}) / (1-R) = e^{-\rho t}$. Proposition A.5 yields that $\psi \leq (\bar{Y})^{\frac{1}{1-R}}$ so that $y^n \leq \bar{Y}$.

Now for each $n \geq 1$, $C_\xi \leq y_t^1(\omega) \leq y_t^n(\omega) \leq y_t^{n+1} \leq \bar{Y}_t$, $d\mathbb{P} \times dt$ -a.s., there must exist an \mathcal{F}_t -progressively measurable process y satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_t^n(\omega) = y_t(\omega), \quad d\mathbb{P} \times dt\text{-a.s.}$$

We have $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |y_s|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |y_s^n|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\bar{Y}_s|^2] < \infty$. In order to take limit of $(z_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$, we derive the following estimate by applying Itô's lemma to $(y_t^n)^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |z_s^n|^2 ds \right] &= \mathbb{E}[\xi_T^2] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T y_s^n g^n(s, y_s^n) dD_s \right] \leq \mathbb{E}[\xi_T^2] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T y_s^n g_{EZ}(s, y_s^1) dD_s \right] \\ (A.9) \quad &\leq \mathbb{E}[\xi_T^2] + 2C_\xi^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |\bar{Y}_s|^2 \right] \left\| \int_0^T e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right\|_\infty < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $0 \leq g^n(t, y^n) \leq g_{EZ}(t, y^n) \leq g_{EZ}(t, y^1) \leq C_\xi^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} e^{-\rho t}$ for any n and $t \in [0, T]$. Therefore, there exists $z \in \mathcal{M}_2$ and a sub sequence $(z^{n_j})_j$ of $(z^n)_n$ such that

$$(A.10) \quad z^{n_j} \rightharpoonup z \text{ weakly in } \mathcal{M}_2.$$

Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can show that the whole sequence $(z^n)_n$ converges strongly to z in \mathcal{M}_2 by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Moreover, y is a continuous process because y^n has continuous paths by construction. We can now pass the limit in

$$y_t^n = \xi_T + \int_t^T g_n(s, y_s^n) dD_s - \int_t^T z_s^n dW_s,$$

obtaining that $(y_t, z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{B}_2$ is a solution to BSDE with parameters (T, ξ_T, g_{EZ}, D) . \square

A.5. Step 4. EZ aggregator: random horizon and unbounded controls.

Theorem A.10. *For (τ, ξ_τ, D) satisfying Condition A, assume that there is a real constant $C > 0$ such that $\xi_\tau > C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. Then the BSDE (2.5) with parameter $(\tau, \xi_\tau, g_{EZ}, D)$ has a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{B}_2$. In addition, it holds that Y is continuous, $Y \geq C$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \geq 0} (Y_t)^{\frac{2}{1-R}}] < \infty$.*

Proof. The techniques are motivated by [3], but here we aim to extend the result in Theorem A.9 to the case with both random horizon and unbounded controls. We utilize previous results on fixed horizon and a sequence of stopping times to construct a sequence of solutions that is Cauchy in \mathcal{B}_2 , and show that its limit solves (2.5) with parameter $(\tau, \xi_\tau, g_{EZ}, D)$. The structure of the proof parallels that occurs in Theorem A.9, but the details are more delicate since the previous estimates derived from bounded controls (such as (A.9)) are no longer valid for unbounded controls.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we first construct a solution $(Y_t^n, Z_t^n)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{B}_2$ to the BSDE

$$(A.11) \quad Y_t^n = \xi_\tau + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \mathbf{1}_{s \in [0, n \wedge \tau^n]} g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n) dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau Z_s^n dW_s, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\tau^n \in \mathcal{T}$ is defined as $\tau^n := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \int_0^t e^{-\rho s} dD_s \geq n\}$. We denote by $\bar{\tau}^n := \tau \wedge \tau^n$. To construct $(Y_t^n, Z_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$, we use Theorem A.9 which implies that there exists a unique solution $(y_t, z_t)_{t \in [0, n]} \in \mathcal{B}_2$ for fixed horizon $[0, n]$ BSDE

$$y_t = \mathbb{E}_n[\xi_\tau] + \int_t^n \mathbf{1}_{s \in [0, \bar{\tau}^n]} g_{EZ}(s, y_s) dD_s - \int_t^n z_s dW_s.$$

The conditions in Theorem A.9 are justified by the fact that $\int_0^n \mathbf{1}_{s \in [0, \bar{\tau}^n]} e^{-\rho s} dD_s \leq n$ a.s. On the other hand, under the condition that $\xi_\tau \in L_+^2(\mathcal{F}_\tau)$, martingale representation theorem implies that there exists $(\eta_t)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{M}_2$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\xi_\tau] = \xi_\tau - \int_t^\tau \eta_s dW_s, \quad \text{on } \{t < \tau\}; \quad \eta_t = 0 \quad \text{on } \{t > \tau\}.$$

So we construct $(Y_t^n, Z_t^n)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{B}_2$ as

$$Y_t^n = y_t \mathbf{1}_{t \in [0, n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n]} + \mathbb{E}_t[\xi_\tau] \mathbf{1}_{t \in (n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n, \infty)}, \quad Z_t^n = z_t \mathbf{1}_{t \in [0, n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n]} + \eta_t \mathbf{1}_{t \in (n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n, \infty)}.$$

Next, we aim to show that $(Y^n, Z^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy in \mathcal{B}_2 . For any $m > n$, let $\Delta Y_t := Y_t^m - Y_t^n$, $\Delta Z_t := Z_t^m - Z_t^n$. The target is to show that $|(\Delta Y, \Delta Z)|_{\mathcal{B}_2} \rightarrow 0$ as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$.

For $0 \leq t \leq n$, by (A.11) and the fact that $\tau^n(\omega) \leq \tau^m(\omega)$ we have

$$\Delta Y_t = \Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau} + \int_{t \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} (g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) - g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n)) dD_s + \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{n \wedge \tau} \Delta Z_s dW_s.$$

It follows from Itô's lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{n \wedge \tau} |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds &= |\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2 + 2 \int_{t \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s (g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) - g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n)) dD_s \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) dD_s - 2 \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{n \wedge \tau} \Delta Y_s \Delta Z_s dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

By the fact that g_{EZ} is non-increasing in its second argument, so that $g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) - g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n)$ should have opposite sign of ΔY_s . This, together with the non-decreasing property of D , gives that $\int_{t \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s (g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) - g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n)) dD_s \leq 0$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) dD_s &= \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s (g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) - g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n) + g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n)) dD_s \\ &\leq \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^n) dD_s = \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s g_{EZ}(s, \mathbb{E}_s[\xi]) dD_s \leq 2 \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |\bar{Y}_t| C_4^{-\frac{R}{1-R}} \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} e^{-\rho s} dD_s, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows by the construction that $Y_s^n = \mathbb{E}_s[\xi]$ for $s > n \wedge \tau^n$, the last line follows by the fact that $\xi_\tau \geq C_4$ a.s. for some constant $C_4 > 0$, as well as the priory bound $Y^m, Y^n \leq \bar{Y}$ given in Lemma A.6. We then conclude

$$|\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{n \wedge \tau} |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds \leq |\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2 + 2 \sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |\bar{Y}_t| C_4^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} e^{-\rho s} dD_s - 2 \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{n \wedge \tau} \Delta Y_s \Delta Z_s dW_s,$$

where the above stochastic integral is a uniformly integrable martingale. Therefore, we obtain the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{n \wedge \tau} |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + 4 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |\bar{Y}_t| C_4^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} \int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + 4 C_4^{\frac{-R}{1-R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, \tau]} |\bar{Y}_t|^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} e^{-\rho s} dD_s \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + 4 C_5 (m - n); \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, n]} |\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, n]} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} \Delta Y_s \Delta Z_s dW_s \right] + 4 C_5 (m - n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + 2 C_6 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^{n \wedge \tau} |\Delta Y_s|^2 |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \right] + 4 C_5 (m - n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, n]} |\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 \right] + 2 C_6^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{n \wedge \tau} |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds \right] + 4 C_5 (m - n) \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants C_5 and C_6 not depending on $m, n, \Delta Y$ or ΔZ . The existence of C_5 follows the fact that $D \in \mathcal{A}$ has continuous path. The existence of C_6 follows by Burkholder-Davis-Gundy's inequality. To summarize, there exists $C_7 > 0$ independent of m, n such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 + \int_0^{n \wedge \tau} |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds \right] \leq C_7 \left(\mathbb{E}[|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + (m - n) \right).$$

Next, for $n < t \leq m$, we have

$$\Delta Y_t = \int_{t \wedge \bar{\tau}^m}^{m \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{\tau} \Delta Z_s dW_s = \int_{t \wedge \bar{\tau}^n}^{m \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{m \wedge \tau} \Delta Z_s dW_s,$$

where the second equality follows by the fact that $\Delta Z_s = 0$ on $s > m$ since $Z_s^m = Z_s^n = \eta_s$ for $s > m \wedge \tau \geq m \wedge \bar{\tau}^m$. It then follows from Itô's lemma and similar arguments as above that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{m \wedge \tau} |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds &= 2 \int_{t \wedge \bar{\tau}^m}^{m \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} \Delta Y_s g_{EZ}(s, Y_s^m) dD_s - 2 \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{m \wedge \tau} \Delta Y_s \Delta Z_s dW_s \\ &\leq 2 \int_{t \wedge \bar{\tau}^m}^{m \wedge \bar{\tau}^m} |\Delta Y_s| g_{EZ}(s, \mathbb{E}_s[\xi_\tau]) dD_s - 2 \int_{t \wedge \tau}^{m \wedge \tau} \Delta Y_s \Delta Z_s dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $n \wedge \bar{\tau}^m \leq t \wedge \bar{\tau}^m \leq m \wedge \bar{\tau}^m$, therefore similar argument as for the case $0 \leq t \leq n$ gives the existence of $C_8 > 0$ independent of m, n such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{n \leq t \leq m} |\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 + \int_{n \wedge \tau}^{m \wedge \tau} |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds \right] \leq C_8 (m - n).$$

Finally, recalling that $Y_t^m = Y_t^n = \mathbb{E}_{t \wedge \tau}[\xi_\tau]$ and $Z_t^m = Z_t^n = \eta_t$ for $t > m \wedge \tau \geq m \wedge \bar{\tau}^m$, we have

$$(A.12) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} |\Delta Y_{t \wedge \tau}|^2 + \int_0^\tau |\Delta Z_s|^2 ds \right] \leq C_7 \mathbb{E} [|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] + (C_7 + C_8)(m - n).$$

By dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [|\Delta Y_{n \wedge \tau}|^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} |Y_{n \wedge \tau}^m - Y_{n \wedge \tau}^n|^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |Y_{n \wedge \tau} - Y_{n \wedge \tau}^n|^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} [|\xi_\tau - \xi_\tau|^2] = 0.$$

Since the second term in (A.12) vanishes as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $\|(\Delta Y, \Delta Z)\|_{\mathcal{B}_2} \rightarrow 0$ as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., $(Y^n, Z^n)_n$ is Cauchy in \mathcal{B}_2 . Since \mathcal{B}_2 is complete, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (Y^n, Z^n) = (Y, Z) \in \mathcal{B}_2$ exists. Finally, we show the limit $(Y, Z) \in \mathcal{B}_2$ solves BSDE (2.5) with parameter $(\tau, \xi_\tau, g_{\text{EZ}}, D)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(Y_t^n, Z_t^n)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{B}_2$ solves the BSDE (A.11),

$$Y_t^n = \xi_\tau + \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau \mathbb{1}_{s \in [0, n \wedge \tau^n]} g_{\text{EZ}}(s, Y_s^n) dD_s - \int_{t \wedge \tau}^\tau Z_s^n dW_s, \quad t \geq 0.$$

It is not difficult to pass the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the above equation and show that each term of it converges to a corresponding term in (2.5) for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$ uniformly in $t \geq 0$, thus we omit the details here. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOF FOR SECTION 4

The proof of Proposition 4.1 is built on several lemmas. We start by showing that the value function is bounded.

Lemma B.1. *Under Condition B, we have $\xi_0 \leq J^*(x) \leq x + \xi_0 + \bar{\mu}/\rho$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $\bar{\mu}$ is the constant that dominates function $\mu(x) - \rho x$ in Condition B.*

Proof. Define the process $\theta^0 := (\theta^0(t) \equiv 0)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$. It is easy to verify that $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ and the induced measure \mathbb{Q}^{θ^0} coincides with the reference measure \mathbb{P} . It then follows by definition of J^* in (4.5) that

$$J^*(x) \leq \sup_{D \in \mathcal{A}_x} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{\theta^0}} \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x, D}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t \right] + \xi_0.$$

Moreover, we observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x, D}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t \right] = x + \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau_N} e^{-\rho t} (\mu(X_t^D) - \rho X_t^D) dt \right] - \mathbb{E}_x [e^{-\rho \tau_N} X_{\tau_N}^D],$$

where $\tau_N := \tau^{x, D} \wedge N \wedge \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^D \geq N\}$ is an almost surely finite stopping time. Further invoking the requirement that admissible D keep the controlled process X^D non-negative, we get the following inequality of V^ϵ by letting N goes to infinity and the monotone convergence theorem

$$J^*(x) \leq x + \xi_0 + \sup_{D \in \mathcal{A}_x} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x, D}} e^{-\rho t} (\mu(X_t^D) - \rho X_t^D)^+ dt \right] \leq x + \xi_0 + \frac{\bar{\mu}}{\rho},$$

where $(y)^+ = \max(y, 0)$. The proof is complete. \square

Next, we present a technical result for uncontrolled diffusion X in (4.1) in order to establish the boundary condition (4.7) for optimal value function. Formally we define the following stopping time for $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$(B.1) \quad \zeta_{y|x} = \inf\{t \geq 0, X_t^x = y\}, \quad y \in \mathcal{X} \cup \{-\ell, \infty\}.$$

Condition B guarantees

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{0|0} = 0) = 1 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{0|x} < \infty) = 1, \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{\infty|x} < \infty) = 0, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}/\{0\}.$$

Lemma B.2. *Under Condition B, for any $\delta > 0$, we have*

$$(B.2) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow h} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{h|x} < \delta) = 1,$$

where stopping time $\zeta_{y|x}$ is defined in (B.1). In particular, for fixed $y > 0$,

$$(B.3) \quad \lim_{x \downarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{0|x} < \delta) = 1,$$

$$(B.4) \quad \lim_{x \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{0 \leq s \leq \delta \wedge \zeta_{0|x} \wedge \zeta_{y|x}} X_s^x \right] = 0.$$

Proof. The proof involves a transformed process U_t of X_t , which is a time-changed Brownian motion. The goal is to demonstrate that auxiliary versions of (B.2)-(B.4) hold with the process U_t . To proceed, we introduce the *scale function* of X given by (4.1) as

$$(B.5) \quad \mathfrak{s}(x) := \int_0^x \exp \left(-2 \int_0^z \frac{\mu(y)}{\sigma^2(y)} dy \right) dz,$$

which is strictly increasing, continuously differentiable bijection of the interval \mathcal{X} onto the interval $I = (\iota_l, \iota_\infty)$ with endpoints $\iota_l := \mathfrak{s}(\ell+)$ and $\iota_\infty := \mathfrak{s}(\infty-)$; see, e.g. [15, II.1.4]. We denote by \mathfrak{s}^{-1} the inverse mapping of \mathfrak{s} . We define $U_t := \mathfrak{s}(X_t)$, with state space I , and its dynamic is given by

$$(B.6) \quad U_t = \mathfrak{s}(X_0) + \int_0^t \varsigma(U_s) dW_s,$$

where the dispersion function $\varsigma(u) := (\mathfrak{s}' \cdot \sigma)(\mathfrak{s}^{-1}(u))$; see e.g., [39, Sect. 5.5B]. To further remove the dependency on the function ς in (B.6), we consider a time change for transformation. According to the Dambis–Dubins–Schwarz theorem [61, Thm.V.1.6], one can rewrite the stochastic integral $\int_0^t \varsigma(U_s) dW_s$ of Brownian motion W as a time-changed Brownian motion on (an extension of) the probability space, i.e., $\hat{W}_{\Lambda^U(\cdot)}$ that we define as follows. Define a time scale $\Gamma^U(r)$ for $r \in [0, \infty)$ as

$$\Gamma^U(r) := \int_0^r \frac{dt}{\varsigma^2(\mathfrak{s}(X_0) + \hat{W}_t)}$$

in terms of a standard Brownian motion \hat{W} , and denote by Λ^U the inverse mapping of Γ^U , i.e. $\Lambda^U(t) := \inf\{r \geq 0 : \Gamma^U(r) > t\}$. we have the representation

$$(B.7) \quad U_t = \mathfrak{s}(X_0) + \hat{W}_{\Lambda^U(t)}.$$

Due to the strict monotonicity of the scale function \mathfrak{s} , it is sufficient to prove auxiliary properties of (B.2)-(B.4) for the process U given by (B.7). For convenience of presentation, we adopt the notation

$$\zeta_{y|x}^U := \inf\{t \geq 0 : U_t = \mathfrak{s}(y) \text{ given } U_0 = \mathfrak{s}(x)\}.$$

From the continuous path properties of standard Brownian motion together with the fact that $\Lambda^U(t) > 0$ holds for all $t > 0$, it can be proved ([63, V.46.Lemma]) that for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\{\omega \in \Omega : \exists \epsilon(\omega) > 0 \text{ s.t. } U_t \leq \mathfrak{s}(x), \forall t \in [0, \epsilon(\omega)]\} \mid X_0 = x\right) &= 0, \\ \mathbb{P}\left(\{\omega \in \Omega : \exists \epsilon(\omega) > 0 \text{ s.t. } U_t \geq \mathfrak{s}(x), \forall t \in [0, \epsilon(\omega)]\} \mid X_0 = x\right) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Given the above statements, we have for any fixed $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{a|x}^U \geq \delta) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t \in [0, \delta]} U_t \geq \mathfrak{s}(a) \mid X_0 = x\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{t \in [0, \delta]} U_t > \mathfrak{s}(x) \mid X_0 = x\right) = 0, \text{ as } a \uparrow x; \\ \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{b|x}^U \geq \delta) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} U_t \geq \mathfrak{s}(b) \mid X_0 = x\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t \in [0, \delta]} U_t < \mathfrak{s}(x) \mid X_0 = x\right) = 0, \text{ as } b \downarrow x.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude (B.2).

To show (B.4), we recognize from the time change property that

$$(B.8) \quad \max_{0 \leq s \leq \delta \wedge \zeta_{0|x}^U \wedge \zeta_{y|x}^U} U_s = \max_{0 \leq r \leq \Lambda^U(\delta) \wedge \Lambda^U(\zeta_{0|x}^U) \wedge \Lambda^U(\zeta_{y|x}^U)} \mathfrak{s}(x) + \hat{W}_r = \max_{0 \leq r \leq \Lambda^U(\delta) \wedge \hat{\zeta}_{0|x} \wedge \hat{\zeta}_{y|x}} \mathfrak{s}(x) + \hat{W}_r,$$

where $\hat{\zeta}_{y|x} = \inf\{r \geq 0 : B_x(r) = \mathfrak{s}(y)\}$, with $B_x(r) := \mathfrak{s}(x) + \hat{W}_r$. It is clear that by the monotonicity of \mathfrak{s} , $B_x(t, \omega)$ decreases as $x \downarrow 0$. By the law of iterated logarithm (see e.g., [61, Chapt. II Theorem. 19]), we have $\hat{\zeta}_{0|x} \rightarrow 0$ as $x \downarrow 0$. By definition, $\Lambda^\Upsilon(\delta)$ is finite a.s. for $0 \leq \delta < \infty$. Since $B_x(r)$ has continuous path, considering a decreasing sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $x_n < y$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{0 \leq r \leq \Lambda^U(\delta) \wedge \hat{\zeta}_{0|x_n} \wedge \hat{\zeta}_{y|x_n}} B_{x_n}(r) = \mathfrak{s}(0),$$

and this maximum is dominated by $\max_{0 \leq r \leq \Lambda^U(\delta) \wedge \hat{\zeta}_{y|x}} B_x(r) \leq \mathfrak{s}(y)$; hence (B.4) holds. \square

Now we turn to the proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The boundedness of J^* follows by Lemma B.1. We first show the non-decreasing property of J^* . If $y > x$, then for any admissible pair $(D, \theta) \in \mathcal{A}^x \times \Theta^D$, we can put $\hat{D}_t = D_t + y - x$, corresponding to immediately paying dividends in the amount of $y - x$, thereby instantly changing the initial reserve from y to x and then following strategy D . Obviously, $\hat{D} \in \mathcal{A}_y$, and that $J^\theta(x; \hat{D}) = J^\theta(x; D) + (y - x)$, it follows that

$$J^*(y) \geq J^*(x) + (y - x),$$

thus, J^* is nondecreasing.

Next, we prove (4.7). Fix $\delta > 0$ and $y > 0$, in view of Lemma B.2, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, choose $x > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{0|x} < \delta) \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}_x\left[\max_{0 \leq s \leq \delta \wedge \zeta_{0|x} \wedge \zeta_{y|x}} X_s\right] \leq \epsilon.$$

Let $\hat{\tau} = \tau^{x,D} \wedge \zeta_{y|x} \wedge \delta$, where $\tau^{x,D}$ defined in (4.4). Since $0 \leq X^D \leq X$, we have $\tau^{x,D} \leq \zeta_0$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tau^{x,D} < \zeta_{y|x} \wedge \delta) \geq \mathbb{P}(\zeta_{0|x} < \zeta_{y|x} \wedge \delta) \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Due to the requirement that $-X_t^D \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, we have and $D_{\hat{\tau}} \leq X_{\hat{\tau}} \leq \max_{0 \leq s \leq \hat{\tau}} X_s \leq \max_{0 \leq s \leq \delta \wedge \zeta_{0|x} \wedge \zeta_{y|x}} X_s$. Therefore $\mathbb{E}_x[D_{\hat{\tau}}] \leq \epsilon$. As

a result, consider the objective function $J^{\theta^0}(x; D)$ defined in (4.6) with $\theta^0 = (\theta^0(t) \equiv 0)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\theta^0}(x; D) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\hat{\tau}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t + \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\tau} < \tau^{x, D}} \int_{\hat{\tau}}^{\tau^{x, D}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t + \xi e^{-\rho \tau^{x, D}} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[D_{\hat{\tau}}] + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\hat{\tau} < \tau^{x, D}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\hat{\tau}}^{\tau^{x, D}} e^{-\rho t} dD_t \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\hat{\tau}} \right] \right] + \xi \\ &\leq \epsilon + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\hat{\tau} < \tau^{x, D}} J^*(y) \right] + \xi \leq \epsilon + J^*(y) \mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau} < \tau^{x, D}) + \xi \leq \xi + (1 + J^*(y))\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the arbitrariness of ϵ , we have $\inf_{\theta} J^{\theta}(0+; \hat{D}) \leq J^{\theta^0}(0+; \hat{D}) \leq \xi$, thus by arbitrariness of D , $J^*(0+) \leq \xi$; together with $J^*(0+) \geq \xi$ by Lemma B.1, we conclude the validity of (4.7).

Lastly, we prove that J^* is continuous at any $x > 0$. For arbitrary $\theta \in \Theta$, let the measure \mathbb{Q}^{θ} be defined in (3.2) and Brownian motion W^{θ} under measure \mathbb{Q}^{θ} be defined in (3.3). Under \mathbb{Q}^{θ} , the uncontrolled surplus dynamic X satisfies

$$dX_t = (\mu(X_t) + \sigma(X_t)\theta(X_t))dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t^{\theta}, X_0 = x.$$

For arbitrary $x > 0$, define the stopping time $\zeta_{0, y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \notin (0, y)\}$ under measure \mathbb{Q} . It is well-known from the classical theory of diffusion that

$$(B.9) \quad \mathbb{Q}(X_{\zeta_{0, y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} = y) = \frac{\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) - \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{Q}}(0)}{\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{Q}}(y) - \mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{Q}}(0)},$$

where $\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the *scale function* of X_t under measure \mathbb{Q} , that is,

$$\mathfrak{s}^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) := \int_0^x \exp\left(-2 \int_0^z \frac{\mu(y) + \sigma(y)\theta(y)}{\sigma^2(y)} dy\right) dz.$$

(B.9) implies that for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $y(\epsilon) > x$ such that $\mathbb{Q}(X_{\zeta_{0, y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} = y) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for $x < y < y(\epsilon)$. Then, following similar arguments for proving (B.2), we have for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $y'(\epsilon) > x$ such that $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} < \zeta_{0|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} \wedge \epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for $x < y < y'(\epsilon)$. For arbitrary $D \in \mathcal{A}_y$ with $x < y < y'(\epsilon)$, we construct a dividend strategy for surplus process X with $X_0 = x$ as follows: $D'_t = 0$ when $t < \zeta_{0, y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} \wedge \epsilon$ and for $t \geq \zeta_{0, y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} \wedge \epsilon$, $D'_t = X_{\epsilon}$ on $\{\epsilon < \zeta_{0, y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}\}$, $D'_t = D_{t - \zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}}$ on $\{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} < \epsilon \wedge \zeta_{0|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}\}$, $D_t \equiv 0$ otherwise.

We have for $x < y < y'(\epsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\theta}(x, D') &= \mathbb{E}^{\theta} \left[\int_0^{\tau^{x, D'}} e^{\int_0^s \frac{\theta^2}{2\kappa} du - \rho s} dD'_s + e^{\int_0^{\tau^{x, D'}} \frac{\theta^2}{2\kappa} - \rho du} \xi_{\tau^{x, D'}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}^{\theta} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} < \zeta_{0|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} \left(\int_0^{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} e^{\int_0^s \frac{\theta^2}{2\kappa} du - \rho s} dD_s + \int_{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}}^{\zeta_{0|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} e^{\int_0^s \frac{\theta^2}{2\kappa} du - \rho s} dD_s + e^{\int_0^{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} \frac{\theta^2}{2\kappa} du} \xi_{\tau^{x, D'}} \right) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}^{\theta} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} < \zeta_{0|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} \mathbb{E}^{\theta} \left[\int_{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}}^{\zeta_{0|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} e^{\int_0^s \frac{\theta^2}{2\kappa} du - \rho s} dD_s + e^{\int_0^{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} \frac{\theta^2}{2\kappa} du} \xi_{\tau^{x, D'}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}}} \right] \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{y|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} < \zeta_{0|x}^{\mathbb{Q}} \wedge \epsilon) e^{-\rho \epsilon} J^{\theta}(y, D) \geq (1 - \epsilon) e^{-\rho \epsilon} J^{\theta}(y, D). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\theta} J^{\theta}(y, D) - J^*(x) &\leq \inf_{\theta} J^{\theta}(y, D) - \inf_{\theta} J^{\theta}(x; D') \leq \inf_{\theta} J^{\theta}(y, D) - \inf_{\theta} (1 - \epsilon) e^{-\rho \epsilon} J^{\theta}(y, D) \\ &\leq (1 - (1 - \epsilon) e^{-\rho \epsilon}) \inf_{\theta} J^{\theta}(y, D) \leq (1 - (1 - \epsilon) e^{-\rho \epsilon}) J^*(h), \end{aligned}$$

for some fixed $h > y$ sufficiently large. Therefore $J^*(y) - J^*(x) \leq (1 - (1 - \epsilon)e^{-\rho\epsilon})J^*(h)$, for $x < y < y'(\epsilon)$, this shows the continuity of $J^*(x)$ at $x > 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] L. H. Alvarez and J. Virtanen. A class of solvable stochastic dividend optimization problems: on the general impact of flexibility on valuation. *Economic Theory*, pages 373–398, 2006.
- [2] E. W. Anderson, L. P. Hansen, and T. J. Sargent. A quartet of semigroups for model specification, robustness, prices of risk, and model detection. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1(1):68–123, 2003.
- [3] J. Aurand and Y.-J. Huang. Epstein-Zin utility maximization on a random horizon. *Mathematical Finance*, 33(4):1370–1411, 2023.
- [4] P. Bank. Optimal control under a dynamic fuel constraint. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 44(4):1529–1541, 2005.
- [5] P. Bank and N. El Karoui. A stochastic representation theorem with applications to optimization and obstacle problems. *The Annals of Probability*, 32(1B):1030–1067, 2004.
- [6] P. Bank and H. Kauppila. Convex duality for stochastic singular control problems. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 485–516, 2017.
- [7] P. Bank and F. Riedel. Optimal consumption choice with intertemporal substitution. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 11(3):750–788, 2001.
- [8] E. Bayraktar and Y.-J. Huang. On the multidimensional controller-and-stopper games. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(2):1263–1297, 2013.
- [9] E. Bayraktar and S. Yao. Optimal stopping for non-linear expectations—Part I. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 121(2):185–211, 2011.
- [10] E. Bayraktar and S. Yao. Optimal stopping for non-linear expectations—Part II. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 121(2):212–264, 2011.
- [11] A. Ben-Tal. The entropic penalty approach to stochastic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10(2):263–279, 1985.
- [12] S. Bhattacharya. Imperfect information, dividend policy, and “the bird in the hand” fallacy. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 10(1):259–270, 1979.
- [13] F. Black. The dividend puzzle. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 2(2):5–8, 1976.
- [14] F. Black. Noise. *The Journal of Finance*, 41(3):528–543, 1986.
- [15] A. Borodin and P. Salminen. *Handbook of Brownian Motion – Facts And Formulae*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2015.
- [16] N. Branger and L. S. Larsen. Robust portfolio choice with uncertainty about jump and diffusion risk. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 37(12):5036–5047, 2013.
- [17] A. Brav, J. Graham, C. Harvey, and R. Michaely. Payout policy in the 21st century. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 77(3):483–527, 2005.
- [18] P. Briand, B. Delyon, Y. Hu, E. Pardoux, and L. Stoica. L^p solutions of backward stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 108(1):109–129, 2003.
- [19] A. Cadenillas, S. Sarkar, and F. Zapatero. Optimal dividend policy with mean-reverting cash reservoir. *Mathematical Finance*, 17(1):81–109, 2007.
- [20] P. Chakraborty, A. Cohen, and V. R. Young. Optimal dividends under model uncertainty. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 14(2):497–524, 2023.
- [21] A. Cohen, A. Hening, and C. Sun. Optimal ergodic harvesting under ambiguity. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 60(2):1039–1063, 2022.
- [22] I. Csiszár. I -divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 146–158, 1975.
- [23] T. De Angelis, S. Federico, and G. Ferrari. Optimal boundary surface for irreversible investment with stochastic costs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 42(4):1135–1161, 2017.
- [24] D. Duffie and L. G. Epstein. Stochastic differential utility. *Econometrica*, 60(2):353–394, 1992.
- [25] L. G. Epstein and S. E. Zin. Substitution, risk aversion, and the temporal behavior of consumption and asset returns: A theoretical framework. *Econometrica*, 57(4):937–969, 1989.

- [26] G. Ferrari. On an integral equation for the free-boundary of stochastic, irreversible investment problems. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(1), 2015.
- [27] G. Ferrari, H. Li, and F. Riedel. A knightian irreversible investment problem. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 507(1):125744, 2022.
- [28] G. Ferrari, H. Li, and F. Riedel. Optimal consumption with Hindy–Huang–Kreps preferences under non-linear expectations. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 54(4):1222–1251, 2022.
- [29] W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner. *Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions*, volume 25. Springer New York, NY, 2006.
- [30] A. Gu, F. G. Viens, and Y. Shen. Optimal excess-of-loss reinsurance contract with ambiguity aversion in the principal-agent model. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, 2020(4):342–375, 2020.
- [31] C. Ham, Z. Kaplan, and R. Leary. Do dividends convey information about future earnings? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 136(2):547–570, 2020.
- [32] M. Herdegen, D. Hobson, and J. Jerome. Proper solutions for Epstein–Zin stochastic differential utility. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.06708*, 2021.
- [33] M. Herdegen, D. Hobson, and J. Jerome. The infinite-horizon investment–consumption problem for Epstein–Zin stochastic differential utility. I: Foundations. *Finance and Stochastics*, 27(1):127–158, 2023.
- [34] M. Herdegen, D. Hobson, and J. Jerome. The infinite-horizon investment–consumption problem for Epstein–Zin stochastic differential utility. II: Existence, uniqueness and verification for $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$. *Finance and Stochastics*, 27(1):159–188, 2023.
- [35] J. Jacod and A. Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*, volume 288. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [36] M. Jeanblanc-Picqué and A. N. Shiryaev. Optimization of the flow of dividends. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 50(2):25–46, 1995.
- [37] X. Jin, D. Luo, and X. Zeng. Dynamic asset allocation with uncertain jump risks: a pathwise optimization approach. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 43(2):347–376, 2018.
- [38] K. John and J. Williams. Dividends, dilution, and taxes: A signalling equilibrium. *The Journal of Finance*, 40(4):1053–1070, 1985.
- [39] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve. *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [40] M. Kobylanski. Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth. *The Annals of Probability*, 28(2):558 – 602, 2000.
- [41] H. Kraft, T. Seiferling, and F. T. Seifried. Optimal consumption and investment with Epstein–Zin recursive utility. *Finance and Stochastics*, 21:187–226, 2017.
- [42] L. Kruk, J. Lehoczyk, K. Ramanan, and S. Shreve. An explicit formula for the Skorokhod map on $[0, a]$. *The Annals of Probability*, 35(5):1740–1768, 2007.
- [43] R. J. Laeven and M. Stadje. Robust portfolio choice and indifference valuation. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(4):1109–1141, 2014.
- [44] P. J. Maenhout. Robust portfolio rules and asset pricing. *Review of Financial Studies*, 17(4):951–983, 2004.
- [45] P. J. Maenhout. Robust portfolio rules and detection-error probabilities for a mean-reverting risk premium. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 128(1):136–163, 2006.
- [46] A. Matoussi and H. Xing. Convex duality for epstein–zin stochastic differential utility. *Mathematical Finance*, 28(4):991–1019, 2018.
- [47] Y. Melnyk, J. Muhle-Karbe, and F. T. Seifried. Lifetime investment and consumption with recursive preferences and small transaction costs. *Mathematical Finance*, 30(3):1135–1167, 2020.
- [48] R. Michaely, S. Rossi, and M. Weber. Signaling safety. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 139(2):405–427, 2021.
- [49] M. Miller and F. Modigliani. Dividend policy, growth, and the valuation of shares. *The Journal of Business*, 34(4):411–433, 1961.
- [50] M. Miller and K. Rock. Dividend Policy under Asymmetric Information. *The Journal of Finance*, 40(4):1031–1051, 1985.
- [51] M. Monoyios and O. Mostovyi. Stability of the Epstein–Zin problem. *Mathematical Finance*, 2024.
- [52] R. K. Nagle, E. B. Saff, and A. D. Snider. *Fundamentals of Differential Equations And Boundary Value Problems*. Pearson, 7 edition, 2017.

- [53] M. Nutz and J. Zhang. Optimal stopping under adverse nonlinear expectation and related games. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(5):2503–2534, 2015.
- [54] E. Pardoux and S. Peng. Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Systems & control letters*, 14(1):55–61, 1990.
- [55] K. Park, K. Chen, and H. Y. Wong. Irreversible consumption habit under ambiguity: Singular control and optimal G -stopping time. *Available at SSRN 4384326*, 2023.
- [56] K. Park and H. Y. Wong. Robust retirement with return ambiguity: Optimal G -stopping time in dual space. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 61(3):1009–1037, 2023.
- [57] K. Park, H. Y. Wong, and T. Yan. Robust retirement and life insurance with inflation risk and model ambiguity. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 110:1–30, 2023.
- [58] A. Popier. Backward stochastic differential equations with random stopping time and singular final condition. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1071–1117, 2007.
- [59] P. Protter. *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2 edition, 2003.
- [60] A. Reppen, J. Rochet, and H. Soner. Optimal dividend policies with random profitability. *Mathematical Finance*, 30:228–259, 2020.
- [61] D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [62] F. Riedel. Optimal stopping with multiple priors. *Econometrica*, 77(3):857–908, 2009.
- [63] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams. *Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales*, volume 2 of *Cambridge Mathematical Library*. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2000.
- [64] M. Schroder and C. Skiadas. Optimal consumption and portfolio selection with stochastic differential utility. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 89(1):68–126, 1999.
- [65] S. E. Shreve, J. P. Lehoczyk, and D. P. Gaver. Optimal consumption for general diffusions with absorbing and reflecting barriers. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 22(1):55–75, 1984.
- [66] S. E. Shreve and H. M. Soner. A free boundary problem related to singular stochastic control. *Applied stochastic analysis (London, 1989)*, 5:265–301, 1991.
- [67] C. Skiadas. Robust control and recursive utility. *Finance and Stochastics*, 7:475–489, 2003.
- [68] H. M. Soner, S. E. Shreve, and N. El Karoui. A free boundary problem related to singular stochastic control: the parabolic case. *Communications in partial differential equations*, 16(2-3):373–424, 1991.
- [69] H. Xing. Consumption–investment optimization with Epstein–Zin utility in incomplete markets. *Finance and Stochastics*, 21:227–262, 2017.
- [70] B. Yi, Z. Li, F. G. Viens, and Y. Zeng. Robust optimal control for an insurer with reinsurance and investment under heston’s stochastic volatility model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 53(3):601–614, 2013.
- [71] C. Yin and Y. Wen. Optimal dividend problem with a terminal value for spectrally positive Lévy processes. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 53(3):769–773, 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, THE HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, HUNG HOM, HONG KONG

Email address: `kexinchen@polyu.edu.hk`

DIVISION OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, SINGAPORE

Email address: `kyunghyun.park@ntu.edu.sg`

(CORRESPONDING AUTHOR) DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SHATIN, N.T., HONG KONG

Email address: `hywong@cuhk.edu.hk`