

# OPTIMAL DIVIDENDS AND CAPITAL INJECTION: A GENERAL LÉVY MODEL WITH EXTENSIONS TO REGIME-SWITCHING MODELS

DANTE MATA LÓPEZ\*, KEI NOBA†, JOSÉ-LUIS PÉREZ\*, AND KAZUTOSHI YAMAZAKI‡

**ABSTRACT.** This paper studies a general Lévy process model of the bail-out optimal dividend problem with an exponential time horizon, and further extends it to the regime-switching model. We first show the optimality of a double barrier strategy in the single-regime setting with a concave terminal payoff function. This is then applied to show the optimality of a Markov-modulated double barrier strategy in the regime-switching model via contraction mapping arguments. We solve these for a general Lévy model with both positive and negative jumps, greatly generalizing the existing results on spectrally one-sided models.

MSC 2020: 60G51 93E20 91G80

**Keywords:** optimal dividends, Lévy processes, singular control, regime switching

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The bail-out optimal dividend problem is one important extension of de Finetti's optimal dividend problem. Given a surplus process of a company, the objective is to derive an optimal combination of dividend and capital injection strategies that maximizes the expected *net present value* (NPV) of dividend payments minus capital injections. Unlike the classical formulation without bail-out, a strategy must be selected so that the surplus process must be kept non-negative to avoid bankruptcy. A majority of the existing results in this subject focus on the analysis of the so-called *double-barrier* strategy. It pays dividends whenever the surplus attempts to go above a certain upper barrier, say  $b^*$ , and injects capital when it attempts to go below zero, so that the resulting surplus process stays on the interval  $[0, b^*]$ . This is indeed a natural candidate of optimal strategy and a number of existing results have successfully verified this conjecture [2, 16, 19, 20, 21].

The inclusion of a random termination time is another crucial extension of de Finetti's problem, which is important on its own and also provides a direct connection with a generalization with regime-switching. In the regime-switching model, also known as the Markov additive model [11, 13, 14, 10, 22], the dynamics of the surplus process change depending on the macroeconomic conditions modeled in terms of

---

This version: June 22, 2023.

\* Department of Probability and Statistics, Centro de Investigación en Matemáticas A.C. Calle Jalisco s/n. C.P. 36240, Guanajuato, Mexico. Email: dante.mata@cimat.mx, jluis.garmendia@cimat.mx.

† School of Statistical Thinking, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, 10-3 Midori-cho, Tachikawa-shi, Tokyo 190-8562, Japan. Email: knoba@ism.ac.jp.

‡ School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia. Email: k.yamazaki@uq.edu.au.

a continuous-time Markov chain. The optimal strategy needs to be modulated according to the underlying state; it is therefore of importance to pursue the optimality of a Markov-modulated version of the double-barrier strategy. To tackle this, robust results/analysis on a single-regime model with an exponential termination time are particularly important. This is because the regime-switching model, where the transition of the Markov chain occurs at (state-dependent) exponential times, can be written in terms of a collection of multiple single-regime models with exponential termination times. By taking advantage of this and contraction mapping arguments, Jiang and Pistorius [11] successfully showed the existence of a barrier-type strategy that is optimal, focusing on the Brownian motion model in the classical de Finetti's problem. Recently, it has been extended to more general spectrally one-sided Lévy models by [13, 14].

Despite these progress of the theory related to the bail-out optimal dividend problem and also its extensions, a majority of the existing results assume spectrally one-sided Lévy processes (i.e. Lévy processes with only negative or positive jumps as their underlying processes). The spectrally one-sided model in de Finetti's optimal dividend problem has been studied extensively in the last couple of decades, mainly due to the existence of the so-called *scale function* (see [3, 9]). This is because it allows us to express – very concisely – the NPV of dividends and capital injections for a general spectrally one-sided Lévy process and hence to solve the optimal bail-out dividend problem directly.

In this paper, we study a general Lévy process model, allowing both positive and negative jumps, for which the scale-function approach is no longer available. We consider the case with an exponential termination time, so that it can be applied to solve the regime-switching extension. The spectrally one-sided assumption is often not realistic in practical applications. Asset prices are empirically shown to have both positive and negative jumps (see, e.g., [5]). In actuarial science, while a majority of the existing papers focus on the spectrally negative case, a more realistic perturbation model can be realized by allowing it to have (possibly infinite number of) positive jumps, alternative to the classical Brownian perturbation model. The case for a general Lévy model is significantly more challenging than the spectrally one-sided case and thus established results on the bail-out dividend problem for a general Lévy process are extremely limited. However, the recent works by [12] and [15] have provided us with a framework to deal with control problems driven by a general Lévy process (with minor conditions), without relying on the scale function. In particular, Noba [12] solved the infinite-time-horizon single-regime bail-out optimal dividend problem for a general Lévy process and showed the optimality of a double-barrier strategy.

Our methodologies and contributions (in particular beyond [12]) are summarized as follows:

- (1) We first consider the (single-regime) problem with an independent exponential time horizon driven by a general Lévy process with two-sided jumps. In order to prove the optimality of a double barrier strategy, we first obtain a probabilistic expression for the derivatives of the NPV associated with a double reflection strategy, to analyze the concavity and smoothness of the associated (candidate) value function. This is done by performing an analysis of how the sample paths of the controlled Lévy process change when we add a small perturbation to the initial value or the value of the reflection barrier. Although this analysis follows a similar line of reasoning as

in [12], our problem requires extensive techniques not provided in [12] because we also need to analyze the terminal payoff term.

Despite that the scale function is not available in our problem, our expression of the derivative of the NPV allows us to follow the *guess and verify* procedure in order to find a suitable candidate for the optimal barrier strategy. It is chosen by using the conjecture that the slope of the value function at the barrier becomes one. For this, it is essential to incorporate the effect of the termination time and the terminal payoff. The optimality of our candidate double barrier strategy is then verified rigorously by showing that the candidate value function satisfies the proper variational inequalities.

- (2) We then show how our problem with exponential termination is applied in order to deal with the more complex bailout dividend problem driven by a regime-switching Lévy process, also known as *Markov Additive Process* (MAP) (see, e.g., [1, 8]), with two-sided jumps. This analysis relies on using the dynamic programming principle in order to reduce the dimension of the general problem into a collection of bailout dividend problems with termination driven by a single Lévy process, where we have already proven that a double reflection strategy is optimal. In addition, we use the dynamic programming equation in order to define a recursive operator, and prove that both the value function and the NPV associated with our candidate barrier strategy are solutions of a functional equation associated with said recursive operator. This allows us to use iterative arguments to show that the expected NPV associated with our candidate optimal strategy agrees with the value function.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we provide the setting of the bailout dividend problem with exponential termination, and driven by a Lévy process with two-sided jumps. We also introduce the set of double barrier strategies, and we also propose and select our candidate optimal strategy. In Section 3, we provide a verification lemma and we perform a rigorous verification of optimality of our candidate barrier strategy, by showing that its associated NPV solves the proper variational inequalities and satisfies the conditions of the verification lemma. Finally, in Section 4, we apply the obtained results to solve the regime-switching case, driven by a MAP with two-sided jumps. We introduce the definition of a MAP, as well as the class of regime-modulated double barrier strategies. We then conclude the section by proving the existence and optimality of a regime-modulated double barrier strategy via iterative operators. The proofs of some technical lemmas can be found in Appendix A. For the rest of paper, we will distinguish the two notations  $f'(x)$  and  $f'_+(x)$  for a given function  $f(x)$ ; the former denotes its standard derivative and the latter denotes its right derivative. In addition, almost everywhere (a.e.) is understood in the sense of Lebesgue measure, unless stated otherwise.

## 2. BAIL-OUT DIVIDEND PROBLEM WITH TERMINATION AT AN EXPONENTIAL TIME

We will introduce and study a modification of the bail-out optimal dividend problem driven by a general Lévy process, where we add a final payoff (or cost) at an independent exponential terminal time. Our main result for a general Lévy model is new to the literature.

**2.1. Preliminaries.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space hosting a one-dimensional Lévy process  $X = \{X(t) : t \geq 0\}$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}(t) : t \geq 0)$  the filtration generated by  $X$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $\mathbb{P}_x$  the law of  $X$  when it starts at  $x$  and by  $\mathbb{E}_x$  its corresponding expectation operator. In particular, we use the notation  $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_0$  and  $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_0$ . Throughout the paper, let  $\psi$  be the characteristic exponent of  $X$  that satisfies

$$e^{-t\psi(\lambda)} = \mathbb{E} [e^{i\lambda X(t)}], \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0.$$

The characteristic exponent  $\psi$  is known to take the form

$$\psi(\lambda) := -i\gamma\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\lambda^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} (1 - e^{i\lambda x} + i\lambda x \mathbb{I}_{\{|x| < 1\}}) \nu(dx), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Here,  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma \geq 0$ , and  $\nu$  is a Lévy measure on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} (1 \wedge x^2) \nu(dx) < \infty.$$

Recall that the process  $X$  has bounded variation paths if and only if  $\sigma = 0$  and  $\int_{|x| < 1} |x| \nu(dx) < \infty$ . When this holds, we can write

$$\psi(\lambda) := -i\delta + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} (1 - e^{i\lambda x}) \nu(dx),$$

where

$$(2.1) \quad \delta := \gamma - \int_{|x| < 1} x \nu(dx).$$

**2.2. Bail-out optimal dividend problem with exponential terminal time.** A dividend/capital injection strategy  $\pi = \{(L^\pi(t), R^\pi(t)) : t \geq 0\}$  is a pair of non-decreasing, right-continuous and  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted processes such that  $L^\pi(0-) = R^\pi(0-) = 0$ , where  $L^\pi$  models the cumulative amount of dividends and  $R^\pi$  models that of injected capital.

Given a strategy  $\pi$ , its corresponding risk process is given by  $U^\pi(0-) := x$  under  $\mathbb{P}_x$  and

$$(2.2) \quad U^\pi(t) := X(t) - L^\pi(t) + R^\pi(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

It is required that  $U^\pi(t) \geq 0$  a.s. uniformly in  $t \geq 0$ .

Let  $\zeta$  be an independent exponential random variable with parameter  $r > 0$  (mean  $1/r$ ) independent of  $X$ . It models a random termination time, upon which a final payoff (or cost)  $w(U^\pi(\zeta))$  is collected. The function  $w(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is assumed to satisfy Assumption 2.1 below. It is worth noting that the independence between  $X$  and  $\zeta$  implies that  $X$  does not jump at  $\zeta$  and hence  $U^\pi(\zeta-) = U^\pi(\zeta)$  a.s.

Let  $\beta > 1$  be the cost per unit of injected capital and  $q > 0$  be the discount factor. Associated with a strategy  $\pi$  with initial capital  $x \geq 0$ , the expected net present value (NPV) of the dividend payments and the terminal payoff/cost minus the cost of capital injection is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} v_\pi(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{[0, \zeta)} e^{-qt} dL^\pi(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \zeta)} e^{-qt} dR^\pi(t) + e^{-q\zeta} w(U^\pi(\zeta)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\alpha t} dL^\pi(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\alpha t} dR^\pi(t) + r \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} w(U^\pi(t)) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(2.3) \quad \alpha := q + r.$$

For the terminal payoff function  $w$ , we also require the following conditions. These are slightly weaker than those assumed in the literature, in particular, [14, Assumption 4.3] and [13, Assumption 4.2].

**Assumption 2.1.** *It is assumed that  $w$  is non-decreasing, continuous and concave on  $[0, \infty)$ . In addition,  $w'_+(0+) \leq \beta\alpha/r$  and  $w'_+(\infty) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} w'_+(x) \in [0, \alpha/r)$ , where we use  $w'_+(x)$  to represent the right derivative of the concave function  $w(x)$ .*

Assumption 2.1 ensures the optimality of a barrier strategy (see Theorem 3.1). Importantly, this is satisfied in the application of the regime-switching case we describe in Section 4.

The value function for the stochastic control problem is given by

$$(2.4) \quad v(x) := \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} v_\pi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where  $\Pi$  denotes the set of all admissible strategies that satisfy

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{[0, \zeta)} e^{-qt} dR^\pi(t) \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\alpha t} dR^\pi(t) \right] < \infty.$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}_x [e^{-q\zeta} w(U^\pi(\zeta))] \geq w(0) > -\infty$  by Assumption 2.1.

We aim in characterizing the value function of the problem and obtaining the optimal dividend-capital injection strategy  $\pi^*$  which achieves the value function in (2.4), if it exists.

Throughout this and next sections, we will make the next standard assumption on the Lévy process  $X$ .

**Assumption 2.2.** *We assume that  $\mathbb{E}[|X(1)|] < \infty$ . This is equivalent to the condition  $\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-1, 1]} |x| \nu(dx) < \infty$  by [9, Theorem 3.8].*

**Assumption 2.3.** *We assume that  $X$  is not a driftless compound Poisson process. In other words, we assume that  $X$  has bounded variation paths and satisfies  $\delta \neq 0$  (see (2.1)) or  $\nu(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) = \infty$ , or has unbounded variation paths.*

**2.3. Double barrier strategies for Lévy processes.** We introduce our candidate optimal strategy, which we call a double reflection strategy  $\pi^{(0,b)} = \{(L^{(0,b)}(t), R^{(0,b)}(t)) : t \geq 0\}$  with an upper reflection barrier  $b \geq 0$  and a lower reflection barrier 0. Under this strategy, the process is pushed downward by paying dividends whenever the process attempts to upcross above  $b$ , while the process is pushed upward by injecting capital whenever the process attempts to downcross below 0. The resulting surplus process

$$U^{(0,b)}(t) = X(t) - L^{(0,b)}(t) + R^{(0,b)}(t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

is the so-called doubly reflected Lévy process (for the definition, see, e.g., [2, Section 4] or [12, Section 3]).

**Remark 2.1.** *With  $b = 0$ , the strategy  $\pi^{(0,0)}$  controls the process to stay at 0 uniformly in time. This makes sense only when  $X$  is of bounded variation. Otherwise, it is not achievable (violating (2.5)). Hence we only consider  $\pi^{(0,0)}$  for the case of bounded variation.*

For  $b \geq 0$ , we denote the corresponding expected NPV by

$$v_b(x) := v_{\pi^{(0,b)}}(x) = v_b^L(x) - \beta v_b^R(x) + r v_b^w(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v_b^L(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{[0,\infty)} e^{-\alpha t} dL^{(0,b)}(t) \right], & v_b^R(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{[0,\infty)} e^{-\alpha t} dR^{(0,b)}(t) \right], \\ v_b^w(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} w(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This decomposition makes sense by the following lemma, for  $b \geq 0$  in the bounded variation case and  $b > 0$  in the unbounded variation case (recall Remark 2.1). This decomposition will simplify the subsequent analysis of the problem.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For  $b > 0$ ,  $v_b^L(x) < \infty$ ,  $v_b^R(x) < \infty$  and  $|v_b^w(x)| < \infty$  and hence the double barrier strategy  $\pi^{(0,b)}$  is admissible. When  $b = 0$  and  $X$  has paths of bounded variation, then  $\pi^{(0,0)}$  is admissible.*

*Proof.* From Assumption 2.2 together with [12, Lemma 3.2], we obtain that  $v_b^L(x) < \infty$  and  $v_b^R(x) < \infty$  for  $b > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Additionally, using [12, Lemma 3.3] we obtain that this fact is true for  $b = 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  when  $X$  has paths of bounded variation. Because  $w$  is locally bounded and  $0 \leq U^{(0,b)}(t) \leq b$  for all  $t \geq 0$  a.s., we also have  $|v_b^w(x)| < \infty$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

Our main objective is to show the optimality of a double-barrier strategy with a suitable (upper) barrier  $b^*$ . We will show this in two steps. We first show its optimality over the set of barrier strategies i.e.  $\tilde{\Pi} := (\pi^{(0,b)}; b \geq 0) \subset \Pi$  (resp.  $\tilde{\Pi} := (\pi^{(0,b)}; b > 0) \subset \Pi$ ) when  $X$  is of bounded (resp. unbounded variation) in Lemma 2.2. This version of optimality will be strengthened to the optimality over all admissible strategies  $\Pi$  in Section 3.

**2.4. Selection of the candidate threshold.** First, we define our candidate barrier, which we call  $b^*$ , in terms of a (single-sided) reflected Lévy process  $Y^b = \{Y^b(t) : t \geq 0\}$  with an upper barrier  $b$ , with

$$(2.6) \quad Y^b(t) = X(t) - \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} (X(s) - b) \vee 0 \right\}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

and also its first passage time

$$(2.7) \quad \kappa_a^{b,-} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y^b(t) < a\}, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Our candidate upper barrier is the inverse

$$(2.8) \quad b^* := \inf\{b \geq 0 : g(b) < 1\},$$

of a function

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} g(b) &:= \beta \mathbb{E}_b \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{b,-}} \right] + r \mathbb{E}_b \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b,-}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(Y^b(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_b \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l(Y^b(t)) dt \right] = \beta - \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_{-b}^{0,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l(Y^0(t) + b) dt \right], \quad b \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we define

$$l(y) := \beta \alpha - r w'_+(y), \quad y \geq 0,$$

which satisfies the properties summarized in the following remark.

**Remark 2.2.** By Assumption 2.1, the function  $l$  is non-decreasing with  $l(0) = \beta \alpha - r w'_+(0) \geq 0$  and  $l(\infty) = \beta \alpha - r w'_+(\infty) > (\beta - 1)\alpha$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** The function  $g$  is non-increasing and

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} g(b) = \frac{r}{\alpha} w'_+(\infty) < 1.$$

*Proof.* By Remark 2.2, the mapping  $b \mapsto l(Y^0(t) + b)$  is non-negative and non-decreasing. In addition,  $b \mapsto \kappa_{-b}^{0,-}$  is non-decreasing. This shows in view of the last expression of (2.9) that  $g$  is non-increasing.

For the second claim, dominated convergence, together with  $\kappa_{-b}^{0,-} \xrightarrow{b \uparrow \infty} \infty$ , gives  $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} g(b) = \beta - \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} l(\infty) dt \right] = \frac{r}{\alpha} w'_+(\infty)$  (see Remark 2.2), which is less than 1 by Assumption 2.1.  $\square$

By Lemma 2.2, our candidate barrier  $b^*$  is well-defined and finite. On the other hand, it may take the value 0 depending on the path variation of  $X$ , as remarked below.

**Remark 2.3.** If  $b^* = 0$ , then  $g(0) \leq 1$  where

$$g(0) = \beta - \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{0,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l(0) dt \right] = \beta - \left( \beta - \frac{r w'_+(0)}{\alpha} \right) \left( 1 - \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{0,-}} \right] \right).$$

- (1) When  $X$  is of unbounded variation or of bounded variation with negative drift or  $\nu(-\infty, 0) = \infty$ , we have  $\kappa_0^{0,-} = 0$  a.s. and hence  $g(0) = \beta > 1$ , showing  $b^* > 0$ .
- (2) Otherwise (i.e.  $X$  is of bounded variation with non-negative drift and  $\nu(-\infty, 0) < \infty$ ),  $\kappa_0^{0,-} > 0$  a.s. and  $b^*$  may take value 0.

In this case,  $\kappa_0^{0,-}$  is the first downward jump time of  $X$ , which is exponentially distributed with parameter  $\nu(-\infty, 0)$ , and thus we can write

$$g(0) = \beta - \left( \beta - \frac{rw'_+(0)}{\alpha} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\nu(-\infty, 0)}{\alpha + \nu(-\infty, 0)} \right).$$

Therefore, if  $b^* = 0$  then

$$(2.10) \quad \nu(-\infty, 0)(\beta - 1) - \alpha + rw'_+(0) \leq 0.$$

Note that,  $g(0) \xrightarrow{\alpha \uparrow \infty} 0 < 1$  and hence  $b^* = 0$  for large enough  $r$  or  $q$  (recall (2.3)).

In the next result we will show that the function  $g$  is right-continuous. The proof is given in Appendix A.1.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The function  $g$  is right-continuous on  $\mathbb{R}$ . In addition, if the point 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$  (i.e.  $\mathbb{P}(T_{(-\infty, 0)} = 0) = 1$ , where  $T_{(-\infty, 0)} := \inf\{t > 0 : X(t) \in (-\infty, 0)\}$ ), then it is also left-continuous (and thus continuous).*

We conclude this section by confirming its optimality over all double reflection strategies  $\tilde{\Pi}$ . This will be used to show the optimality over all admissible strategies  $\Pi$  (see the proof of Lemma 3.8).

**Lemma 2.4.** *For  $b > 0$  (resp.,  $b \geq 0$ ), we have*

$$(2.11) \quad v_{b^*}(x) \geq v_b(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

when  $X$  has unbounded (resp., bounded) variation paths.

*Proof.* To show this lemma, we compute the derivative of  $v_b(x)$  with respect to  $b$  and verify that  $b^*$  is the maximizer.

We first suppose  $b > 0$ . We define a sequence of hitting times

$$0 =: \rho_0^{b,(0)} < \rho_b^{b,(1)} < \rho_0^{b,(1)} < \dots < \rho_b^{b,(n)} < \rho_0^{b,(n)} < \dots$$

recursively defined by

$$\rho_0^{b,(n)} := \inf\{t > \rho_b^{b,(n)} : R^{(0,b)}(t) > R^{(0,b)}(\rho_b^{b,(n)})\}, \quad \rho_b^{b,(n)} := \inf\{t > \rho_0^{b,(n-1)} : L^{(0,b)}(t) > L^{(0,b)}(\rho_0^{b,(n-1)})\},$$

for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular,  $\rho_b^{b,(1)} := \inf\{t > 0 : L^{(0,b)}(t) > 0\}$  is the first upper reflection time above. Note that, because reflection from above (resp. below) happens at  $\rho_b^{b,(n)}$  (resp.  $\rho_0^{b,(n)}$ ), we must have

$$(2.12) \quad U^{(0,b)}(\rho_b^{b,(n)}) = b \quad \text{and} \quad U^{(0,b)}(\rho_0^{b,(n)}) = 0, \quad b > 0, n \geq 1.$$



For  $b > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have by [12, Lemma 4.2]

$$(2.13) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{v_{b+\varepsilon}^L(x) - v_b^L(x)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{-\mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b, (1)}} \right]}{1 - \mathbb{E}_b \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{b, -}} \right] \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b, (1)}} \right]},$$

$$(2.14) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{v_{b+\varepsilon}^R(x) - v_b^R(x)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{-\mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b, (1)}} \right] \mathbb{E}_b \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{b, -}} \right]}{1 - \mathbb{E}_b \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{b, -}} \right] \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b, (1)}} \right]}.$$

We fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . From [12, Section A], we know

$$(2.15) \quad 0 \leq U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(t) - U^{(0, b)}(t) \leq \varepsilon, \quad t \geq 0.$$

We define, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_b^{b, (n)} &:= \inf \{ t > \rho_0^{b+\varepsilon, (n-1)} : L^{(0, b)}(t) > L^{(0, b)}(\rho_0^{b+\varepsilon, (n-1)}) \}, \\ \bar{\rho}_0^{b, (n)} &:= \inf \{ t > \rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)} : R^{(0, b)}(t) > R^{(0, b)}(\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}) \}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , by (2.15) and since  $U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}) = b + \varepsilon$  (see (2.12)) and  $U^{(0, b)} \leq b$  uniformly in time,

$$(2.16) \quad U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}) - U^{(0, b)}(\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}) = \varepsilon.$$

On  $[\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}, \bar{\rho}_0^{b, (n)})$ , before  $U^{(0, b)}$  (and hence  $U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}$  as well) is reflected from below, by (2.16) and the definitions of  $U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}$  and  $U^{(0, b)}$ , the difference stays the same, i.e.,

$$U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(t) - U^{(0, b)}(t) = \varepsilon, \quad t \in [\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}, \bar{\rho}_0^{b, (n)}).$$

This implies, with  $A_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}, \bar{\rho}_0^{b, (n)})$ ,

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} &v_{b+\varepsilon}^w(x) - v_b^w(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{A_\varepsilon} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0, b)}(t) + \varepsilon) - w(U^{(0, b)}(t))) dt \right] + \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{A_\varepsilon^c} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(t)) - w(U^{(0, b)}(t))) dt \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{A_\varepsilon} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0, b)}(t) + \varepsilon) - w(U^{(0, b)}(t))) dt \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by (2.15) and the assumption that  $w$  is non-decreasing.

Similarly, by (2.15) and since  $U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(\rho_0^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}) = 0$  (see (2.12)) and  $U^{(0, b)} \geq 0$  uniformly in time,

$$U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(\rho_0^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}) - U^{(0, b)}(\rho_0^{b+\varepsilon, (n)}) = 0,$$

which implies

$$(2.18) \quad U^{(0, b+\varepsilon)}(t) - U^{(0, b)}(t) = 0, \quad t \in [\rho_0^{b+\varepsilon, (n-1)}, \bar{\rho}_b^{b, (n)}).$$

By (2.15) and (2.18), we have, with  $B_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [\bar{\rho}_b^{b,(n)}, \rho_0^{b+\varepsilon,(n)}]$ ,

$$(2.19) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{b+\varepsilon}^w(x) - v_b^w(x) &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{B_\varepsilon} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0,b+\varepsilon)}(t)) - w(U^{(0,b)}(t))) dt \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_{B_\varepsilon} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0,b)}(t) + \varepsilon) - w(U^{(0,b)}(t))) dt \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\rho_{b+\varepsilon}^{b+\varepsilon,(n)} \rightarrow \rho_b^{b,(n)}$ ,  $\bar{\rho}_0^{b,(n)} \rightarrow \rho_0^{b,(n)}$ ,  $\bar{\rho}_b^{b,(n)} \rightarrow \rho_b^{b,(n)}$ ,  $\rho_0^{b+\varepsilon,(n)} \rightarrow \rho_0^{b,(n)}$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$  a.s. by a similar argument to that of the proof of [15, Lemma 1] and by induction.

Because  $w$  is concave,

$$\frac{w(U^{(0,b)}(t) + \varepsilon) - w(U^{(0,b)}(t))}{\varepsilon} \leq w'_+(0), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Hence, using (2.17) and (2.19), the fact that  $\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(0) dt \right] < \infty$ , and dominated convergence gives, by taking the limit as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ ,

$$(2.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{v_{b+\varepsilon}^w(x) - v_b^w(x)}{\varepsilon} &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\rho_b^{b,(n)}}^{\rho_0^{b,(n)}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b,(n)}} \right] \mathbb{E}_b \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b,-}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b,(1)}} \right] \left( \mathbb{E}_b \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{b,-}} \right] \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b,(1)}} \right] \right)^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_b \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b,-}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b,(1)}} \right] \mathbb{E}_b \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b,-}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right]}{1 - \mathbb{E}_b \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{b,-}} \right] \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b,(1)}} \right]}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the second equation holds by (2.12) and the strong Markov property. By summing (2.13), (2.14) and (2.20), and the fact that  $Y^b(t) = U^{(0,b)}(t)$  for  $t \in [0, \kappa_0^{b,-})$  we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{v_{b+\varepsilon}(x) - v_b(x)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b,(1)}} \right]}{1 - \mathbb{E}_b \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{b,-}} \right] \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ e^{-\alpha \rho_b^{b,(1)}} \right]} (g(b) - 1), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, b > 0.$$

This also shows that the mapping  $b \mapsto v_b(x)$  is right-continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ . By the same argument as that of the proofs of (2.13), (2.14) and (2.20), it is easy to check that  $b \mapsto v_b(x)$  is left continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ .

Since the mapping  $b \mapsto g(b)$  is non-increasing and using the definition of  $b^*$  as in (2.8), we obtain that

$$(2.21) \quad g(x) \begin{cases} \geq 1, & x < b^*, \\ \leq 1, & x \geq b^*. \end{cases}$$

Therefore by the continuity of the mapping  $b \mapsto v_b(x)$ , identity (2.21), and the same argument as that of the proof of [15, Theorem 3.1], the inequality (2.11) holds over all  $b > 0$ .

It is now left to show that the result extends to  $b = 0$  for the case of bounded variation. As in the proof of [12, Lemma 4.3], we have  $v_b^R(x) \rightarrow v_0^R(x)$  and  $v_b^L(x) \rightarrow v_0^L(x)$  as  $b \downarrow 0$  for each  $x \geq 0$ . In addition, because  $U^{(0,b)}(t) \xrightarrow{b \downarrow 0} U^{(0,0)}(t)$  a.s. for each  $t \geq 0$  (again by [12, Lemma 4.3]) dominated convergence gives  $v_b^w(x) \rightarrow v_0^w(x)$  as well. Hence  $v_{b^*}(x) \geq v_b(x) \xrightarrow{b \downarrow 0} v_0(x)$ .  $\square$

### 3. VERIFICATION OF OPTIMALITY

In this section, we upgrade the optimality given in Lemma 2.4 by showing that it is indeed optimal over all admissible strategies  $\Pi$ . The proof is via Ito's formula, which requires smoothness of the candidate value function. To this end, we assume the following in addition to Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2. It is noted that this is only assumed for the unbounded variation case and is not restrictive in view of Lemma 3.1, whose proof is deferred to Appendix A.2.

**Assumption 3.1.** *When  $X$  has unbounded variation paths, we assume, for any locally bounded measurable function  $f$ ,  $\theta > 0$  and  $b > 0$ , that the function  $H_f^{(b,\theta)}$ , given by*

$$H_f^{(b,\theta)}(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b,-}} e^{-\theta t} f(Y^b(t)) dt \right], \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

*has an a.e.-continuous Radon–Nikodym density locally bounded on  $(0, b]$ , where  $Y^b$  denotes the reflected Lévy process defined in (2.6).*

**Lemma 3.1.** *If the Lévy measure satisfies  $\nu(0, \infty) < \infty$  or  $\nu(-\infty, 0) < \infty$ , Assumption 3.1 is satisfied.*

**Remark 3.1.** *From Assumption 3.1 and by the fact that  $H_1^{(b,\theta)}(x) = \frac{1}{\theta} \left( 1 - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \exp(-\theta \kappa_0^{b,-}) \right] \right)$ ,  $\theta > 0$ , the function  $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \exp(-\theta \kappa_0^{b,-}) \right]$  has a.e.-continuous Radon–Nikodym density locally bounded on  $(0, b]$ , when  $X$  has unbounded variation paths.*

We now state the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, and 3.1, the double barrier strategy  $\pi^{(0,b^*)}$ , with  $b^*$  given by (2.8), is optimal and the value function is given by  $v(x) = v_{b^*}(x) = v_{\pi^*}(x)$  for all  $x \geq 0$ .*

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 3.1.

**3.1. Verification lemma.** We first state a verification lemma, which provides sufficient conditions for a strategy to be optimal.

First, let  $C_{\text{line}}^{(1)}$  be the set of continuous functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of at most linear growth and admits a continuous derivative on  $(0, \infty)$ , i.e.,

- (1) There exist  $a_1, a_2 > 0$  such that  $|f(x)| < a_1 + a_2|x|$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ;

$$(2) f \in C^1(0, \infty).$$

Second, let  $C_{\text{line}}^{(2)}$  be a subset of  $C_{\text{line}}^{(1)}$  such that the (continuous) derivative  $f'$  admits, on the positive half line, an a.e.-continuous and uniformly bounded density function  $f'' : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfying  $f'(0) + \int_0^x f''(y)dy = f'(x)$  for  $x > 0$ .

For  $f \in C_{\text{line}}^{(1)}$  (resp.  $C_{\text{line}}^{(2)}$ ) (we fix the density  $f''$  of  $f'$  on  $(0, \infty)$  when  $X$  has unbounded variation paths), define the operator

$$\mathcal{L}f(x) := \gamma f'(x) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 f''(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} (f(x+z) - f(x) - f'(x)z\mathbb{I}_{\{|z|<1\}})\nu(dz), \quad x \in (0, \infty).$$

A verification lemma is given as follows. We omit the proof because it is similar to that of [12, Proposition 5.2].

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $v : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  belonging to  $C_{\text{line}}^{(1)}$  when  $X$  is of bounded variation and  $C_{\text{line}}^{(2)}$  otherwise and satisfies*

$$(3.1) \quad (\mathcal{L} - \alpha)v(x) + rw(x) \leq 0, \quad x \in (0, \infty),$$

$$(3.2) \quad 0 \leq v'(x) \leq \beta, \quad x \in (0, \infty).$$

*Then we have  $v(x) \geq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} v_{\pi}(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

**3.2. Derivative of  $v_{b^*}$ .** For the next result, we define the hitting times to half-lines of the Lévy process  $X$  as

$$\tau_x^- = \inf\{t > 0 : X(t) < x\}, \quad \tau_x^+ = \inf\{t > 0 : X(t) > x\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Fix  $b > 0$  (resp.,  $b \geq 0$ ) when  $X$  has unbounded (resp., bounded) variation paths. The function  $x \mapsto v_b(x)$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{R}$  and continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, b\}$ , with*

$$(3.3) \quad v_b'(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha\tau_b^+}; \tau_b^+ < \tau_0^- \right] + \beta \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha\tau_0^-}; \tau_0^- < \tau_b^+ \right] + r \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(X(t)) dt \right],$$

*which also holds when the last expectation is replaced with  $\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_-(X(t)) dt \right]$  where  $w'_-$  is the left derivative of  $w$ .*

*Proof.* On  $(-\infty, 0) \cup (b, \infty)$ ,  $v_b$  is differentiable and the derivative is

$$(3.4) \quad v_b'(x) = \begin{cases} \beta, & x < 0, \\ 1 & x > b, \end{cases}$$

which agrees with (3.3).

We now focus on  $(0, b)$ . By Remark 3.1 and the proof of [12, Lemma 5.3] with [15, Lemma 1] (thanks to Assumption 2.3),  $v_b^L$  and  $v_b^R$  are differentiable on  $(0, b)$  with their derivatives, respectively, by

$$(3.5) \quad v_b^{L,\prime}(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha\tau_b^+}; \tau_b^+ < \tau_0^- \right], \quad v_b^{R,\prime}(x) := -\mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha\tau_0^-}; \tau_0^- < \tau_b^+ \right].$$

In addition,  $v_b^L$  and  $v_b^R$  are continuous on  $\mathbb{R}$  by the proof of [12, Lemma 5.4].

We now compute the derivative of  $v_b^w$  on  $(0, b)$ . For  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $t \geq 0$ , we write  $X^{(\varepsilon)}(t) = X(t) + \varepsilon$ . We write  $U^{(\varepsilon)}$  for the doubly reflected process with boundaries 0 and  $b$  driven by  $X^{(\varepsilon)}$ . Additionally, we write  $\tau_0^{(\varepsilon),-} := \inf\{t > 0 : X^{(\varepsilon)}(t) < 0\}$  and  $\tau_b^{(\varepsilon),+} := \inf\{t > 0 : X^{(\varepsilon)}(t) > b\}$ . We note, for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{v_b^w(x + \varepsilon) - v_b^w(x)}{\varepsilon} = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} \frac{w(U^{(\varepsilon)}(t)) - w(U^{(0)}(t))}{\varepsilon} dt \right].$$

From [12, Section C], we have

$$(3.7) \quad U^{(\varepsilon)}(t) - U^{(0)}(t) \in [0, \varepsilon], \quad t \geq 0,$$

and in particular

$$U^{(\varepsilon)}(t) - U^{(0)}(t) = \varepsilon, \quad t \in [0, \tau_b^{(\varepsilon),+} \wedge \tau_0^{(0),-}],$$

and, so using the fact that  $w$  is non-decreasing, we have

$$(3.8) \quad v_b^w(x + \varepsilon) - v_b^w(x) \geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^{(\varepsilon),+} \wedge \tau_0^{(0),-}} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0,b)}(t) + \varepsilon) - w(U^{(0,b)}(t))) dt \right].$$

On the other hand, from [12, Section C], we have

$$(3.9) \quad U^{(\varepsilon)}(t) - U^{(0)}(t) = 0, \quad t \geq \tau_b^{(0),+} \wedge \tau_0^{(\varepsilon),-}.$$

From (3.7) and (3.9), we have

$$(3.10) \quad v_b^w(x + \varepsilon) - v_b^w(x) \leq \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^{(0),+} \wedge \tau_0^{(\varepsilon),-}} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0,b)}(t) + \varepsilon) - w(U^{(0,b)}(t))) dt \right].$$

From (3.6), (3.8) and (3.10), and by taking limit as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ , dominated convergence gives for  $x \in (0, b)$

$$(v_b^w)'_+(x) := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{v_b^w(x + \varepsilon) - v_b^w(x)}{\varepsilon} = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(X(t)) dt \right],$$

because  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \tau_0^{(\varepsilon),-} = \tau_0^-$  and  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \tau_b^{(\varepsilon),+} = \tau_b^+$   $\mathbb{P}_x$ -a.s. for  $x \in (0, b)$  by [15, Lemma 1(iii)].

By changing from 0 to  $-\varepsilon$  and from  $\varepsilon$  to 0 in (3.6), (3.8) and (3.10), we have

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^{(0),+} \wedge \tau_0^{(-\varepsilon),-}} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0,b)}(t)) - w(U^{(0,b)}(t) - \varepsilon)) dt \right] \\ & \leq v_b^w(x) - v_b^w(x - \varepsilon) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0)}(t)) - w(U^{(-\varepsilon)}(t))) dt \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^{(-\varepsilon),+} \wedge \tau_0^{(0),-}} e^{-\alpha t} (w(U^{(0,b)}(t)) - w(U^{(0,b)}(t) - \varepsilon)) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

and thus we obtain, for  $x \in (0, b)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(v_b^w)'_-(x) &:= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{v_b^w(x) - v_b^w(x - \varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} \frac{w(U^{(0)}(t)) - w(U^{(-\varepsilon)}(t))}{\varepsilon} dt \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_-(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_-(X(t)) dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the inequalities (3.8), (3.10) and (3.11) hold for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  (also at 0 and  $b$ ), and hence  $v_b^w$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{R}$  by the dominated convergence theorem.

Since the potential measure of  $X$  does not have a mass by Assumption 2.3 and [3, Proposition I.15], we have, for  $x \in (0, b)$ , that  $v_b^w$  is differentiable with

$$(3.12) \quad v_b^{w, \prime}(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(X(t)) dt \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_b^+ \wedge \tau_0^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_-(X(t)) dt \right].$$

From (3.5), (3.12), the dominated convergence theorem and [15, Lemma 1(ii)], we have, for  $x \in (0, b)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_b^{L, \prime}(x+) &= v_b^{L, \prime}(x-) = \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_{b-x}^+}; \tau_{b-x}^+ < \tau_{-x}^- \right] = v_b^{L, \prime}(x), \\
v_b^{R, \prime}(x+) &= v_b^{R, \prime}(x-) = -\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_{-x}^-}; \tau_{-x}^- < \tau_{b-x}^+ \right] = v_b^{R, \prime}(x), \\
v_b^{w, \prime}(x+) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{\tau_{b-x}^+ \wedge \tau_{-x}^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_+(X(t) + x) dt \right], \\
v_b^{w, \prime}(x-) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{\tau_{b-x}^+ \wedge \tau_{-x}^-} e^{-\alpha t} w'_-(X(t) + x) dt \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last two equations hold by (3.12). Therefore, the continuity of  $v_b'$  on  $(0, b)$  is obtained.  $\square$

In the following lemma, we show that the function  $v_{b^*}$  with our selection of  $b^*$  is smooth also at  $b^*$ . Because we consider a general Lévy process  $X$  and the function  $w$  is allowed to be non-differentiable, we use the following technique to obtain an useful expression of the derivative  $v_{b^*}'$ . This is only a technicality and for instance, it is not required for the case  $X$  is of unbounded variation and  $w$  is continuously differentiable, and Lemma 3.5 below holds with  $w'$ .

Fix  $p \in [0, 1]$ . We define a Bernoulli random variable  $A_p$ , with

$$A_p = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{with probability } p, \\ 1, & \text{with probability } 1 - p, \end{cases}$$

independent of  $X$ . For the single-sided reflected process  $Y^{b^*}$ , we define  $\kappa_0^{[p]}$ , parameterized by  $p \in [0, 1]$  as a modification of  $\kappa_0^{b^*, -}$  (see (2.7)) as follows (recall the definition of regularity in Lemma 2.3):

- (1) When 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$ , we set  $\kappa_0^{[p]} := \kappa_0^{b^*, -}$ ;

(2) When 0 is irregular for  $(-\infty, 0)$ , which occurs in the case that  $X$  has bounded variation paths and a non-negative drift, we set

$$\kappa_0^{[p]} := \kappa_0^{b^*, -} \mathbb{I}_{\{A_p=1\}} + K_0^{b^*, -} \mathbb{I}_{\{A_p=0\}},$$

where  $K_0^{b^*, -} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y^{b^*}(t) \leq 0\}$ .

We also define

$$w'_p(x) := (1-p)w'_+(x) + pw'_-(x), \quad x > 0.$$

Let

$$g_p(b^*) := \beta \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p]}} \right] + r \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_p(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] = \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_p(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right],$$

where  $l_p(y) := \beta\alpha - rw'_p(y)$  for  $y > 0$ .

Then we have the following result whose proof is deferred to Appendix A.3.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Suppose that  $b^* > 0$ . There exists  $p^* \in [0, 1]$  which satisfies*

$$(3.13) \quad g_{p^*}(b^*) = 1.$$

**Lemma 3.5.** *The function  $v_{b^*}$  is continuously differentiable on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . In addition, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ ,*

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} v'_{b^*}(x) &= \beta \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} \right] + r \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $p^*$  is given in Lemma 3.4.

*Proof.* We define

$$\tau_0^{[p^*]} := \tau_0^- \mathbb{I}_{\{A_{p^*}=1\}} + T_0^- \mathbb{I}_{\{A_{p^*}=0\}} \quad \text{where } T_0^- := \inf\{t > 0 : X(t) \leq 0\}.$$

Additionally, consider

$$(3.15) \quad A(x) := a_1(x) + \beta a_2(x) + r a_3(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_{b^*}^+}; \tau_{b^*}^+ < \tau_0^{[p^*]} \right], \\ a_2(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_0^{[p^*]}}; \tau_0^{[p^*]} < \tau_{b^*}^+ \right], \\ a_3(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_{b^*}^+ \wedge \tau_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(X(t)) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $T_0^- \leq \tau_0^{[p^*]} \leq \tau_0^-$  and by [15, Lemma 1(i)], we have

$$\tau_0^- = T_0^- = \tau_0^{[p^*]} \quad \mathbb{P}_x - a.s., \text{ for } x > 0.$$

Therefore, as a corollary of Lemma 3.3, for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, b^*\}$ ,

$$(3.16) \quad v'_{b^*}(x) = A(x).$$

By the definition of the single reflected Lévy processes, we have  $\{Y_t^{b^*} : t < \tau_{b^*}^+\} = \{X_t : t < \tau_{b^*}^+\}$ , and so we have  $\tau_0^{[p^*]} = \kappa_0^{[p^*]}$  on  $\{\tau_0^{[p^*]} < \tau_{b^*}^+\}$ , which is equal to  $\{\kappa_0^{[p^*]} < \tau_{b^*}^+\}$ .

By these and the strong Markov property (noting  $Y^{b^*}(\tau_{b^*}^+) = b^*$  on  $\{\tau_{b^*}^+ < \infty\}$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_2(x) &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} ; \kappa_0^{[p^*]} < \tau_{b^*}^+ \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} \right] - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} ; \kappa_0^{[p^*]} > \tau_{b^*}^+ \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} \right] - a_1(x) \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} a_3(x) &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_{b^*}^+ < \kappa_0^{[p^*]}\}} \int_{\tau_{b^*}^+}^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - a_1(x) \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these in (3.15), for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A(x) &= a_1(x) + \beta \left( \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} \right] - a_1(x) \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} \right] \right) \\ &\quad + r \left( \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - a_1(x) \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \right) \\ &= a_1(x) + \left( \beta - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \right) - a_1(x) \left( \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \right) \\ &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \end{aligned}$$

by the definition of  $b^*$  as a solution to (3.13). On the other hand, the equation (3.16) implies that  $v'_{b^*}(x) = A(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, b^*\}$ . Hence, (3.14) holds true on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, b^*\}$ .

Since  $v_{b^*}$  is continuous on  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $v'_{b^*}(x) = A(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, b^*\}$ , the function  $A$  is a density of the function  $v_{b^*}$ . By Lemma 3.3 and (3.16), the function  $v'_{b^*}(x) = A(x)$  is continuous on  $(0, b^*) \cap (b^*, \infty)$ , and so it is enough to prove the continuity of  $x \mapsto A(x)$  at  $b^*$  when  $b^* > 0$ . Indeed, this readily shows the existence of  $v'_{b^*}(b^*)$  and it coincides with  $A(b^*)$ .

By (3.4) and since  $A(b^*) = 1$  by Lemma 3.4, the function  $x \mapsto A(x)$  is right continuous at  $b^*$ . Thus, it remains to confirm the left continuity at  $b^*$  (i.e.  $A(b^*-) = A(b^*) = 1$ ). Since  $X$  is not a driftless



compound Poisson process, 0 is regular for  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  – meaning at least one of the following holds: (1) 0 is regular for  $(0, \infty)$  and/or (2) 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$ .

(1) If 0 is regular for  $(0, \infty)$  for  $X$ , we have, for  $x \in (0, b^*)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A(x) &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_{b^*}^+ \wedge \tau_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(X(t)) dt \right] + \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_{b^*}^+}; \tau_{b^*}^+ < \tau_0^{[p^*]} \right] \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\tau_{2b^*-x}^+ \wedge \tau_{b^*-x}^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(X(t) - b^* + x) dt \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_{b^*}^+}; \tau_{b^*}^+ < \tau_0^{[p^*]} \right] \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &\xrightarrow{x \uparrow b^*} \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] = 1 = A(b^*) \end{aligned}$$

where we used [15, Lemma 1(ii), (iii)] with  $\mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_{b^*}^+} \right] = 1$  (because 0 is regular for  $(0, \infty)$  and by the spatial homogeneity of  $X$ ) in the limit.

(2) If 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$  for  $X$ , we have, for  $x \in (0, b^*)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = A(b^*) &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_x^-} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_x^-} \mathbb{E}_{Y^{b^*}(\kappa_x^-)} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \right] \\ &\geq \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_x^-} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_x^-} \right] \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &\xrightarrow{x \uparrow b^*} \beta - \lim_{x \uparrow b^*} \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] = \lim_{x \uparrow b^*} A(x) \end{aligned}$$

where we used [15, Lemma 1(ii)] with  $e^{-\alpha \kappa_x^-} \geq e^{-\alpha \tau_x^-}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ e^{-\alpha \tau_{b^*}^-} \right] = 1$  (because 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$  and by the spatial homogeneity of  $X$ ) in the limit. Since  $A(x)$  is non-increasing (because  $Y^{b^*}(t)$  is monotone in the starting value), we have  $A(b^*) \geq \lim_{x \uparrow b^*} A(x) \geq A(b^*)$ , showing the left-continuity.

Therefore, the function  $x \mapsto A(x)$  is continuous on  $(0, \infty)$  in each case and it is the derivative of  $v_{b^*}$  on  $(0, \infty)$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**3.3. Proof of optimality.** From Lemma 3.5, we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.6.** (1) *The function  $v_{b^*}$  is concave on  $\mathbb{R}$  and belongs to  $C_{\text{line}}^{(1)}$ , with its derivative  $v'_{b^*}$  satisfying  $1 \leq v'_{b^*}(x) \leq \beta$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ .*

(2) When  $X$  has unbounded variation paths,  $v_{b^*}$  belongs to  $C_{\text{line}}^{(2)}$ .

*Proof.* (1) Since  $v_{b^*}$  has a continuous derivative  $v'_{b^*}$  on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  (by Lemma 3.5),  $v_{b^*}$  belongs to  $C_{\text{line}}^1$ . By (3.4), it suffices to prove that  $v'_{b^*}$  is decreasing on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

From Lemma 3.5, the fact that  $l_{p^*}$  is non-negative and non-decreasing, and because  $Y^{b^*}$  and  $\kappa_0^{[p^*]}$  are monotone in the starting value  $x$ , the mapping  $x \mapsto v'_{b^*}(x) = \beta - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} l_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right]$  is non-increasing on  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

(2) In addition,  $v_{b^*}$  belongs to  $C_{\text{line}}^{(2)}$  when  $X$  has unbounded variation paths by Lemma 3.5, [12, Lemma 5.6] and Assumption 3.1 and since  $\kappa_0^{[p^*]} = \kappa_0^{b^*, -}$  when 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$ . □

We take  $v''_{b^*}$ , which is the density of  $v'_{b^*}$ , on  $(-\infty, 0] \cup (b^*, \infty)$ , as 0.

**Lemma 3.7.** *When  $X$  has bounded variation paths, we have*

$$(3.17) \quad (\mathcal{L} - \alpha)v_{b^*}(x) + rw(x) = 0, \quad x \in (0, b^*].$$

*When  $X$  has unbounded variation paths, we can take  $v''_{b^*}$  on  $(0, b^*]$  such that (3.17) is satisfied.*

*Proof.* We write

$$v_{b^*}^{LR}(x) := v_{b^*}^L(x) - \beta v_{b^*}^R(x). \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where, by Lemma 3.5, we can write

$$v_{b^*}^{LR, \prime}(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha \kappa_0^{[p^*]}} \right], \quad v_{b^*}^{w, \prime}(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{[p^*]}} e^{-\alpha t} w'_{p^*}(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right], \quad x \in (0, b^*).$$

By the proofs of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, the functions  $v_{b^*}^{LR, \prime}$  and  $v_{b^*}^{w, \prime}$  are the derivatives of  $v_{b^*}^{LR}$  and  $v_{b^*}^w$  on  $(0, b^*)$ , respectively. Proceeding as in the proof of [12, Lemma 5.7], we have

$$(3.18) \quad (\mathcal{L} - \alpha)v_{b^*}^{LR}(x) = 0, \quad x \in (0, b^*),$$

when  $X$  has bounded variation paths. In addition, when  $X$  has paths of unbounded variation, we can take the density  $v_{b^*}^{LR, \prime\prime}$  of  $v_{b^*}^{LR, \prime}$  to satisfy (3.18) by [12, Lemma 5.7].

On the other hand, we define the process  $M^w = \{M^w(t) : t \geq 0\}$  as

$$M^w(t) := \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+} e^{-\alpha s} w(U^{(0, b^*)}(u)) du + e^{-\alpha(t \wedge \tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+)} v_{b^*}^w(X(t \wedge \tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+)), \quad t \geq 0.$$

The process  $M^w$  is an  $(\mathcal{F}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ -martingale since for  $s, t \geq 0$  with  $s \leq t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x [M^w(t) | \mathcal{F}(s)] &= \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+ \leq s\}} \left( \int_0^{\tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+} e^{-\alpha s} w(U^{(0, b^*)}(u)) du + e^{-\alpha(\tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+)} v_{b^*}^w(X(\tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+)) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^- \wedge \tau_{b^*}^+ > s\}} \left( \int_0^s e^{-\alpha s} w(U^{(0, b^*)}(s)) ds + e^{-\alpha s} v_{b^*}^w(X(s)) \right) = M^w(s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Assumption 3.1 and the same argument as in the proof of [4, (12)] and [12, Lemma 5.7], we have

$$(3.19) \quad (\mathcal{L} - \alpha)v_{b^*}^w(x) + rw(x) = 0, \quad x \in (0, b^*),$$

when  $X$  has bounded variation paths. In addition, we can take the density  $v_{b^*}^{w, \prime\prime}$  of  $v_{b^*}^{w, \prime}$  to satisfy (3.19) as in the proof of [12, Lemma 5.7]. From (3.18) and (3.19), we obtain (3.17) on  $(0, b^*)$ .

Since  $v_{b^*} \in C^1(0, \infty)$  by Lemma 3.5 and [12, Remark 2.5], the map  $x \mapsto (\mathcal{L} - \alpha)v_{b^*}(x) + rw(x) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 v_{b^*}^{\prime\prime}(x)$  is continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ . Thus, (3.17) holds when  $X$  has bounded variation paths. In addition, we can take  $v_{b^*}^{\prime\prime}(b^*)$  to satisfy (3.17). Here, since  $\{b^*\}$  is a null set of the Lebesgue measure, we can assign any value at  $b^*$  of  $v_{b^*}^{\prime\prime}$ . Thus, we can take  $v_{b^*}^{\prime\prime}(b^*)$  to satisfy (3.17). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *When  $X$  has bounded variation paths, we have*

$$(3.20) \quad (\mathcal{L} - \alpha)v_{b^*}(x) + rw(x) \leq 0, \quad x > b^*.$$

*When  $X$  has unbounded variation paths, we can take  $v_{b^*}^{\prime\prime}$  on  $(b^*, \infty)$  such that (3.20) is satisfied.*

*Proof.* By following the same procedure as [12, Lemma 5.8], it can be shown that, for all  $b > b^*$ ,

$$v_b(x) - v_{b^*}(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} h(U^{(0,b)}(t)) \mathbb{I}_{(b^*, \infty)}(U^{(0,b)}(t)) dt \right],$$

where for  $x \geq b^*$

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &:= (\mathcal{L} - \alpha)v_{b^*}(x) + rw(x) \\ &= \gamma + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} (v_{b^*}(x+z) - (x+\hat{b}) - z\mathbb{I}_{\{|z|<1\}}) \nu(dz) - \alpha(x+\hat{b}) + rw(x), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{b} := v_{b^*}(b^*) - b^*$ . By Lemma 3.6 and Assumption 2.1,  $h$  is concave. Note that  $h(b^*) = 0$  by Lemma 3.7 when  $b^* > 0$ .

Suppose (to derive a contradiction),  $b^* > 0$  and there exists  $a > b^*$  such that  $h(a) > 0$ . Setting  $b = a$  and by Lemma 2.4,

$$(3.21) \quad 0 \geq v_a(x) - v_{b^*}(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} h(U^{(0,a)}(t)) \mathbb{I}_{(b^*, \infty)}(U^{(0,a)}(t)) dt \right].$$

Then, by the above properties of  $h$  (concavity,  $h(b^*) = 0$  and  $h(a) > 0$ ), necessarily  $h(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in (b^*, a)$ . On the other hand, because  $U^{(0,a)} \leq a$  a.s. and Lemma 3.7,  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} h(U^{(0,a)}(t)) \mathbb{I}_{(b^*, \infty)}(U^{(0,a)}(t)) dt \geq 0$  (and strictly positive with a positive probability), which contradicts (3.21). Hence  $h(b) \leq 0$  for all  $b > b^*$  when  $b^* > 0$ . Thus, (3.20) holds.

Suppose that  $b^* = 0$ . Then  $X$  has bounded variation paths with non-negative drift and  $\nu(-\infty, 0) < \infty$  by Remark 2.3 and thus we have using (3.4), for  $x \geq 0$ ,

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} h'_+(x) &= \nu(-\infty, x)(\beta - 1) - \alpha + rw'_+(x) \\ &\leq \nu(-\infty, 0)(\beta - 1) - \alpha + rw'_+(0) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from (2.10). Suppose that  $h(0) > 0$ . Then there exists  $a > 0$  such that  $h(b) > 0$  for  $b \in [0, a]$ . We have  $\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} h(U^{(0,a)}(t)) \mathbb{I}_{[b^*, \infty)}(U^{(0,a)}(t)) dt > 0$  a.s. This contradicts with (3.21) with  $b^* = 0$  (which holds by Lemma 2.4). Thus, it holds  $h(0) \leq 0$ . By (3.22), we obtain  $h(b) \leq 0$  for all  $b > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* From Lemma 3.6, the function  $v_{b^*}$  is sufficiently smooth to apply the operator  $\mathcal{L}$ . In addition, by Lemma 3.6, Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8, the function  $v_{b^*}$  satisfies (3.1) and (3.2). Therefore, by Lemma 3.2, the strategy  $\pi^{b^*}$  is optimal and the proof is complete.  $\square$

#### 4. AN APPLICATION: BAIL-OUT OPTIMAL DIVIDEND PROBLEM WITH REGIME SWITCHING

In this section, as a direct application of the results from previous sections, we consider the bailout dividend problem driven by a Markov additive process (MAP) with two-sided jumps. We will prove the optimality of double barrier strategies, and will also present a way to obtain the optimal barriers through a combination of the results of previous sections and some recursive operators.

**4.1. Markov additive processes.** Let us consider a bivariate process  $(X, H) = \{(X(t), H(t)) : t \geq 0\}$ , where the component  $H$  is a continuous-time Markov chain with finite state space  $E$  and the generator matrix  $Q = (q_{ij})_{i,j \in E}$ . When the Markov chain  $H$  is in the state  $i \in E$ , the process  $X$  behaves as a Lévy process  $X^i$ . At the  $n$ -th jump of  $H$  and if the state of  $H$  changes from  $i$  to  $j$ , the process  $X$  jumps with size  $J_{i,j}^{(n)}$ , having a common distribution function  $F_{ij} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . The components  $(X^i)_{i \in E}$ ,  $H$ , and  $(J_{i,j}^{(n)})_{i,j \in E, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are assumed to be independent and are defined on some filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$  where  $\mathbf{F} := \{\mathcal{F}(t), t \geq 0\}$  denotes the right-continuous complete filtration jointly generated by the processes  $(X, H)$ . We will denote by  $\mathbb{P}_{(x,i)}$  the law of the process conditioned on the event  $\{X(0) = x, H(0) = i\}$  and by  $\mathbb{E}_{(x,i)}$  its associated expectation operator.

For  $i \in E$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $\mathbf{P}_x^i$  the law of  $X^i$  when it starts at  $x$  and by  $\mathbf{E}_x^i$  its corresponding expectation operator. In particular, we use the notation  $\mathbf{P}^i = \mathbf{P}_0^i$  and  $\mathbf{E}^i = \mathbf{E}_0^i$ . Additionally, we denote the Lévy measure of  $X^i$  by  $\nu(i, \cdot)$ , that satisfies  $\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} (1 \wedge x^2) \nu(i, dx) < \infty$ ,  $i \in E$ .

**4.2. Bail-out optimal dividend problem with Markov-switching regimes.** Similar to the single-regime model studied in previous sections, a strategy is a pair  $\pi := (L^\pi(t), R^\pi(t); t \geq 0)$  of non-decreasing, right-continuous, and adapted processes (with respect to the filtration  $\mathbf{F}$ ) starting at zero where  $L^\pi$  is the cumulative amount of dividends and  $R^\pi$  is that of injected capital. The corresponding controlled process starts at  $U^\pi(0-) := x$  and follows  $U^\pi(t) := X(t) - L^\pi(t) + R^\pi(t)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{q} : E \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  be the Markov-modulated rate of discounting and let

$$\Lambda(t) = \int_0^t \mathfrak{q}(H(s)) ds, \quad t \geq 0,$$

be the cumulative discount.

Given  $\beta > 1$ , representing the cost per unit of injected capital, we want to maximize

$$V_\pi(x, i) := \mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\Lambda(t)} dL^\pi(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\Lambda(t)} dR^\pi(t) \right], \quad x \geq 0, \quad i \in E,$$

over all admissible strategies  $\Pi$  such that  $U^\pi(t) \geq 0$  a.s. uniformly in  $t$  and

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\Lambda(t)} dR^\pi(t) \right] < \infty.$$

Hence our aim is to find the value function of the problem, i.e.,

$$(4.1) \quad V(x, i) := \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} V_\pi(x, i), \quad x \geq 0 \quad i \in E.$$

For the problem with regime-switching in this section, the following assumptions are mandated.

**Assumption 4.1.** We assume that  $(X^j, P^j)$  satisfies Assumption 2.2 and 2.3 for all  $j \in E$ .

**Assumption 4.2.** For all  $i, j \in E$  with  $i \neq j$ , we assume that  $\mathbb{E}[|J_{ij}^{(1)}|] < \infty$ .

**Remark 4.1.** By Lemma 3.1, Assumption 4.1 is satisfied if  $\nu(j, (0, \infty)) < \infty$  or  $\nu(j, (-\infty, 0)) < \infty$ , and  $\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-1, 1]} |x| \nu_j(dx) < \infty$  for all  $j \in E$ .

Let

$$\zeta := \min\{t > 0 : H(t) \neq H(t-)\}$$

be the epoch of the first regime switch, which is exponentially distributed with parameter  $q_i := \sum_{j \neq i} q_{ij}$  under  $\mathbb{E}_{(x, i)}$ .

We define an operator  $\Gamma$  applied to  $f : [0, \infty) \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$(4.2) \quad (\Gamma f)(x, i) := \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \zeta)} e^{-q(i)t} dL^\pi(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \zeta)} e^{-q(i)t} dR^\pi(t) + e^{-q(i)\zeta} \widehat{f}(U^\pi(\zeta-), i) \right],$$

where

$$(4.3) \quad \widehat{f}(x, i) := \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} [(\beta(x+y) + f(0, j)) \mathbb{I}_{\{x+y \leq 0\}} + f(x+y, j) \mathbb{I}_{\{x+y > 0\}}] dF_{ij}(y),$$

where we recall  $F_{ij}$  is the distribution function of the random variables  $J_{ij}^{(n)}$ . Here, the supremum is over admissible (single-regime) strategies  $\Pi$  in the sense defined in Section 2.2. That is, (4.2) is the value function of a single-regime version as studied in previous sections (see (2.4)) driven by  $X^i$  with the terminal time given by the first jump time of  $H$  and the final payoff given by  $\widehat{f}$ .

As shown in, for example [13, 14], the value function is a fixed point of the maximization operator  $\Gamma$  defined in (4.2). The proof is omitted as it follows verbatim from the proof of Proposition 3.4 in [14] (see also the proof of Proposition 3.1 in [13]).

**Proposition 4.1.** *For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $i \in E$ , we have*

$$(4.4) \quad V(x, i) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \zeta]} e^{-q(i)t} dL^\pi(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \zeta]} e^{-q(i)t} dR^\pi(t) + e^{-q(i)\zeta} V(U^\pi(\zeta), H(\zeta)) \right].$$

*In other words,  $V$  is a fixed point of  $V = \Gamma V$ .*

**4.3. Optimal Strategies with Regime Switching.** The Markov-modulated double barrier strategy  $\pi^{(0, \mathfrak{b})} = \{(L^{(0, \mathfrak{b})}(t), R^{(0, \mathfrak{b})}(t)) : t \geq 0\}$  with a set of upper barriers  $\mathfrak{b} = (\mathfrak{b}(i))_{i \in E}$  is a strategy that pushes the process  $X$  downward by paying dividends whenever the process  $X$  attempts to upcross above  $\mathfrak{b}(i)$  when the current regime is  $i$ , while pushing it upward by injecting capital whenever the process  $X$  attempts to downcross below 0. The corresponding controlled process  $U^{(0, \mathfrak{b})} := X - L^{(0, \mathfrak{b})} + R^{(0, \mathfrak{b})}$  can be constructed in an obvious way; it is nothing but the concatenation of the doubly-reflected Lévy process of Section 2.3. We denote its expected NPV by

$$V_{\mathfrak{b}}(x, i) := V_{\pi^{(0, \mathfrak{b})}}(x, i) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\Lambda(t)} dL^{(0, \mathfrak{b})}(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\Lambda(t)} dR^{(0, \mathfrak{b})}(t) \right], \quad x \geq 0, \quad i \in E.$$

The main theorem is the following.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Under Assumptions 4.1, and 4.2, there exists a Markov-modulated double barrier strategy which is optimal and achieves (4.1).*

We proceed with the proof of Theorem 4.1 as follows. We introduce in (4.6) the operator  $T_{\mathfrak{b}}$ , acting on the space  $\mathcal{B}$  given in (4.5), associated with the expected NPV of a Markov-modulated double barrier strategy at  $\mathfrak{b} = (\mathfrak{b}(i))_{i \in E}$ . We show that the expected NPV of the Markov-modulated double barrier strategy,  $V_{\mathfrak{b}}$ , is a fixed point of the operator  $T_{\mathfrak{b}}$  (see Proposition 4.2) and that  $T_{\mathfrak{b}}$  is a contraction mapping. In the next step we show that the value function  $V$  belongs to in the class  $\mathcal{D}$  defined in (4.8), which is the content of Proposition 4.4. This fact allows us to apply Theorem 3.1 to show that there exists  $\mathfrak{b}^* = (\mathfrak{b}^*(i))_{i \in E}$  such that the right hand-side of (4.4) is given by the expected NPV of a double barrier strategy at  $\mathfrak{b}^*(i)$  for each  $i \in E$ . Hence, an application of the dynamic programming principle (Proposition 4.1), gives that  $\Gamma V = T_{\mathfrak{b}^*} V = V$  where  $\Gamma$  is the operator defined in (4.2). Finally using that both  $V_{\mathfrak{b}^*}$  and  $V$  are fixed points of the contraction mapping  $T_{\mathfrak{b}^*}$  implies that  $V = V_{\mathfrak{b}^*}$ .

**Remark 4.2.** *In the proof of Theorem 4.1 we used a fixed point argument, hence we cannot obtain explicitly the optimal barrier of a Markov-modulated double barrier strategy as in Theorem 3.1. However, we can obtain it by approximation procedure. For more details, see the proof of Proposition 4.4.*

First, we show that the NPV,  $V_{\mathfrak{b}}$  under a double barrier strategy solves a recursive functional equation for any  $\mathfrak{b} = (\mathfrak{b}(i))_{i \in E}$ .

We consider the space of functions

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{B} := \{f : f(\cdot, i) \in C([0, \infty)), x \mapsto f(x, i)/(1 + |x|) \text{ is bounded for all } i \in E\},$$

endowed with the norm  $\|f\| := \max_{i \in E} \sup_{x \geq 0} \frac{|f(x, i)|}{(1 + |x|)}$ .

**Remark 4.3.** *Unlike the case of absolutely continuous dividend payments where the value function is bounded (see [14, Section 5]), here the value function  $V$  has linear growth. Therefore we introduce the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  since  $\|V\| < \infty$ .*

**Remark 4.4.** *Note that, for  $(x, i) \in [0, \infty) \times E$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta(x+y) + f(0, j)}{1 + |x|} \mathbb{I}_{\{x+y \leq 0\}} + \frac{f(x+y, j)}{1 + |x|} \mathbb{I}_{\{x+y > 0\}} &\leq \beta \frac{(|x| + |y|)}{1 + |x|} + \frac{|f((x+y) \vee 0, j)|}{1 + |(x+y) \vee 0|} \frac{1 + |(x+y) \vee 0|}{1 + |x|} \\ &\leq \beta(1 + |y|) + \|f\|(1 + |y|). \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 4.2, for  $(x, i) \in [0, \infty) \times E$ , we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} [\beta(1 + |y|) + \|f\|(1 + |y|)] dF_{ij}(y) = (\beta + \|f\|) \left(1 + \mathbb{E} \left[|J_{ij}^{(1)}|\right]\right) < \infty.$$

Hence, (4.3) and dominated convergence implies that the mapping  $x \mapsto \frac{\widehat{f}(x, i)}{1 + |x|}$  is continuous on  $[0, \infty)$  and therefore, so is the mapping  $x \mapsto \widehat{f}(x, i)$ . Additionally,

$$\frac{|\widehat{f}(x, i)|}{1 + |x|} \leq \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} (1 + \mathbb{E} [|J_{ij}|]) (\beta + \|f\|).$$

Hence, if  $f \in \mathcal{B}$ , we have that  $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{B}$  as well.

Given  $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}(i))_{i \in E}$  we define the following operator acting on  $\mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{aligned} (T_{\mathbf{b}}f)(x, i) &:= \mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \zeta]} e^{-q(i)t} dL_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \zeta]} e^{-q(i)t} dR_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}(t) + e^{-q(i)\zeta} \widehat{f}(U_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}(\zeta-), i) \right] \\ (4.6) \quad &= \mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\alpha(i)t} dL_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\alpha(i)t} dR_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}(t) + q_i \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha(i)t} \widehat{f}(U_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}(t), i) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the processes  $(U_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}, L_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))}, R_i^{(0, \mathbf{b}(i))} : i \in E)$  are those under the double-barrier strategy with upper barrier  $\mathbf{b}(i)$  driven by  $X^i$  and

$$\alpha(i) := q(i) + q_i, \quad i \in E.$$

The proofs of the following two results are omitted as they follow verbatim from the proofs of Proposition 5.3 and Corollary 5.4 in [14], respectively.

**Proposition 4.2.** *For  $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}(i))_{i \in E}$ , we have, for  $(x, i) \in [0, \infty) \times E$ ,*

$$V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i) = (T_{\mathbf{b}}V_{\mathbf{b}})(x, i).$$

Define  $\|h\|_\infty := \max_{i \in E} \sup_{x \geq 0} |h(x, i)|$  for any  $h : [0, \infty) \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Corollary 4.1.** *For any  $f, g \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\|f - g\|_\infty < \infty$ , we have*

$$\|T_{\mathfrak{b}}f - T_{\mathfrak{b}}g\|_\infty < K\|f - g\|_\infty,$$

where

$$(4.7) \quad K := \max_{i \in E} \mathbb{E}_{(0,i)} [e^{-\mathfrak{q}(i)\zeta}] \in (0, 1).$$

**4.4. Verification of barrier strategies.** We define the space of functions

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{D} := \{f \in \mathcal{B} : \widehat{f}(\cdot, i) \text{ is concave and satisfies that } (\widehat{f})'_+(0, i) \leq \beta \\ \text{and } (\widehat{f})'_+(\infty, i) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (\widehat{f})'_+(x, i) \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } i \in E\}.$$

The proof of the next result follows closely that of Proposition 5.5 in [14], and so we omit it.

**Proposition 4.3.** *If  $f \in \mathcal{B}$  is such that, for all  $i \in E$ ,  $f(\cdot, i) \in C^1([0, \infty))$ , is concave and nondecreasing, and satisfies that  $f'_+(\cdot, i) \leq \beta$  and  $f'_+(\infty, i) \leq 1$ , then  $f \in \mathcal{D}$ .*

**Remark 4.5.** *If  $f \in \mathcal{D}$ , then (4.2) has the same form as the single-regime problem with exponential horizon with terminal payoff  $\widehat{f}$  studied in Section 2.1. Then, from the results of Subsection 2.4, the supremum of (4.2) is attained by a double reflection strategy at the barrier for some upper barrier, say  $b_i^*$  for each  $i \in E$ . By setting  $\mathfrak{b}^f = (\mathfrak{b}^f(i))_{i \in E}$  where  $\mathfrak{b}^f(i) = b_i^*$  for each  $i \in E$ , we get  $\Gamma f = T_{\mathfrak{b}^f} f$ .*

*In addition, from the verification results of Subsection 3.1 it follows that  $(\Gamma f)(\cdot, i) \in C_{\text{line}}^{(1)}$  for all  $i \in E$  and satisfies Assumption 2.1, hence by Proposition 4.3,  $\Gamma f \in \mathcal{D}$ .*

The following result follows the same line of reasoning as in Proposition 5.7 in Noba et al. [14].

**Proposition 4.4.** *Suppose  $v_0^-, v_0^+ \in \mathcal{D}$  are such that  $v_0^- \leq V \leq v_0^+$  and  $\|v_0^+ - v_0^-\|_\infty < \infty$ . We define recursively  $v_n^- := \Gamma v_{n-1}^-$  and  $v_n^+ := \Gamma v_{n-1}^+$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Then, we have  $v_n^- \leq V \leq v_n^+$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Moreover, we have*

$$V = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n^- = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n^+,$$

where the convergence is in the  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm. In particular,  $V \in \mathcal{D}$ .

*Proof.* First, from the definition of  $\Gamma$  we have that if  $v_{n-1}^- \leq V \leq v_{n-1}^+$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , then

$$(4.9) \quad v_n^- \leq \Gamma V \leq v_n^+.$$

Moreover, due to Proposition 4.1 we have  $V = \Gamma V$ , hence the first claim follows.

Following Remark 4.5, for any  $f \in \mathcal{D}$  there exists a vector  $\mathfrak{b}^f$  such that  $\Gamma f = \sup_{\mathfrak{b}} T_{\mathfrak{b}} f = T_{\mathfrak{b}^f} f$ . Hence, for  $f, g \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\|f - g\|_\infty < \infty$ ,

$$\|\Gamma f - \Gamma g\|_\infty = \|T_{\mathfrak{b}^f} f - T_{\mathfrak{b}^g} g\|_\infty \leq \sup_{\mathfrak{b}} \|T_{\mathfrak{b}} f - T_{\mathfrak{b}} g\|_\infty \leq K\|f - g\|_\infty,$$



with  $K$  as in (4.7). To see how the first inequality holds, for any  $(x, i) \in [0, \infty) \times E$ , if  $(T_{\mathfrak{b}f}f)(x, i) \geq (T_{\mathfrak{b}g}g)(x, i)$ ,

$$0 \leq (T_{\mathfrak{b}f}f)(x, i) - (T_{\mathfrak{b}g}g)(x, i) \leq (T_{\mathfrak{b}f}f)(x, i) - (T_{\mathfrak{b}f}g)(x, i) \leq \sup_{\mathfrak{b}} \|T_{\mathfrak{b}f} - T_{\mathfrak{b}g}\|_{\infty};$$

similarly, if  $(T_{\mathfrak{b}f}f)(x, i) \leq (T_{\mathfrak{b}g}g)(x, i)$ , we obtain the same bound by symmetry. Taking the supremum of their absolute values, we obtain the inequality. Thus, by iterating the previous identity and the definition of  $v_n^+$  and  $v_n^-$ , we obtain

$$\|v_n^+ - v_n^-\|_{\infty} \leq K^n \|v_0^+ - v_0^-\|_{\infty} \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since  $K \in (0, 1)$  it follows that  $\|v_n^+ - v_n^-\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, using (4.9) together with Proposition 4.1 gives

$$(4.10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n^+ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n^- = \Gamma V = V,$$

in the  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ -norm.

Following Remark 4.5 we have that the functions  $v_n^+$ ,  $v_n^-$  belong to  $\mathcal{D}$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Hence, by (4.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{V} - \widehat{v}_n^{\pm}\|_{\infty} \\ & \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}, i \in E} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} \left( \int_{(-x, \infty)} |V(x+y, j) - v_n^{\pm}(x+y, j)| dF_{ij}(y) + |V(0, j) - v_n^{\pm}(0, j)| F_{ij}(-x) \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}, i \in E} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|V - v_n^{\pm}\|_{\infty} dF_{ij}(y) = \|V - v_n^{\pm}\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (4.10) shows

$$(4.11) \quad \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \|\widehat{V} - \widehat{v}_n^{\pm}\|_{\infty} = 0.$$

The uniform convergence of  $(\widehat{v}_n^{\pm})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  to  $V$  as in (4.11), and the fact that  $(v_n^{\pm})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}$  implies that the concavity, as well as the properties of the right-hand derivative are inherited by  $\widehat{V}$ . Thus,  $V \in \mathcal{D}$ .  $\square$

We will provide two auxiliary results that will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.1. The first result guarantees the existence of functions  $v_0^-, v_0^+ \in \mathcal{D}$  that satisfy the conditions of Proposition 4.4, and its proof is deferred to Appendix A.4.

**Lemma 4.1.** *There exist  $V_-, V_+ \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\|V_- - V_+\|_{\infty} < \infty$  and*

$$V_-(x, i) \leq V(x, i) \leq V_+(x, i), \quad (x, i) \in [0, \infty) \times E.$$

We now provide the second auxiliary result and defer its proof to Appendix A.5.

**Lemma 4.2.** *For any  $\mathfrak{b} = (\mathfrak{b}(i))_{i \in E}$ , we have that  $\|V - V_{\mathfrak{b}}\|_{\infty} < \infty$ .*

Using Lemma 4.1 together with Proposition 4.4, we provide an iterative construction of the value function as follows: Initialize by  $n = 0$  and  $v = v_0$  for some  $v_0 \in \mathcal{D}$  that satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4.4, we can operate the iteration scheme as in Section 4.1 in [11] by

- (1) Find the barriers  $\mathfrak{b}^v = (\mathfrak{b}^v(i); i \in E)$  as in Remark 4.5;
- (2) Set  $T_{\mathfrak{b}^v} v \rightarrow v$  and return to step (1).

By Proposition 4.4, this algorithm produces a sequence that converges to the true value function  $V$ .

**4.5. Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Proposition 4.4 gives that  $V \in \mathcal{D}$ . Hence Proposition 4.1, together with Remark 4.5, implies that there exists  $\mathfrak{b}^* := (\mathfrak{b}^*(i))_{i \in E}$  such that  $V = \Gamma V = T_{\mathfrak{b}^*} V$ . Finally, an application of Proposition 4.2 together with Corollary 4.1 concludes that

$$(4.12) \quad \|V - V_{\mathfrak{b}^*}\|_\infty = \|T_{\mathfrak{b}^*}^n V - T_{\mathfrak{b}^*}^n V_{\mathfrak{b}^*}\|_\infty \leq K^n \|V - V_{\mathfrak{b}^*}\|_\infty, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By Lemma 4.2 we have that  $\|V - V_{\mathfrak{b}^*}\|_\infty < \infty$ . This together with (4.12) implies that  $V(x, i) = V_{\mathfrak{b}^*}(x, i)$  for  $(x, i) \in [0, \infty) \times E$ .  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. PROOFS

**A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.3.** (i) Fix  $b \geq 0$ . We first prove

$$(A.1) \quad \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \kappa_{-b-\delta}^{0,-} = \kappa_{-b}^{0,-} \quad \text{a.s. on } \{\kappa_{-b}^{0,-} < \infty\}.$$

Suppose  $\kappa_{-b}^{0,-} < \infty$ . Because  $\delta \mapsto \kappa_{-b-\delta}^{0,-}$  is non-decreasing,  $\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \kappa_{-b-\delta}^{0,-}$  exists a.s.; for (A.1) it suffices to show it coincides with  $\kappa_{-b}^{0,-}$ . To derive a contradiction, suppose otherwise, i.e.,  $\bar{\epsilon} := \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \kappa_{-b-\delta}^{0,-} - \kappa_{-b}^{0,-} > 0$ , which implies, thanks to the monotonicity of  $\delta \mapsto \kappa_{-b-\delta}^{0,-}$ ,

$$(A.2) \quad \kappa_{-b-\delta}^{0,-} > \kappa_{-b}^{0,-} + \bar{\epsilon}, \quad \delta > 0.$$

Now, take  $\underline{\epsilon} := \bar{\epsilon}/2 > 0$ . From the definition of  $\kappa_{-b}^{0,-}$ , there exists  $\tilde{\delta} > 0$  such that  $\inf_{s \in [0, \kappa_{-b}^{0,-} + \underline{\epsilon}]} Y^0(s) < -b - \tilde{\delta}$ , which implies that  $\kappa_{-b}^{0,-} + \bar{\epsilon} > \kappa_{-b}^{0,-} + \underline{\epsilon} \geq \kappa_{-b-\tilde{\delta}}^{0,-} \geq \kappa_{-b}^{0,-}$ . This contradicts with (A.2). Hence, (A.1) holds.

By (A.1) and since  $w'_+$  is right-continuous, we have by dominated convergence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} (\beta - g(b + \varepsilon)) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_{-(b+\varepsilon)}^{0,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l(Y^0(t) + b + \varepsilon) dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_{-b}^{0,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l(Y^0(t) + b) dt \right] = \beta - g(b), \end{aligned}$$

showing the right-continuity.

(ii) By the quasi-left-continuity of the Lévy process (see, e.g., Lemma 3.2 in [9]), we obtain

$$Y^0(\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \kappa_{-(b-\varepsilon)}^{0,-}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} Y^0(\kappa_{-(b-\varepsilon)}^{0,-}) \leq -b.$$

If the point 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$  then  $Y^0$  hits  $(-\infty, -b)$  immediately after time  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \kappa_{-(b-\varepsilon)}^{0,-}$ . Therefore,  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \kappa_{-(b-\varepsilon)}^{0,-} = \kappa_{-b}^{0,-}$ . Since  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} w'_+(x - \varepsilon) = w'_-(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  by [18, Proposition 3.1 in the Appendix],

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} (\beta - g(b - \varepsilon)) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_{-(b-\varepsilon)}^{0,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l(Y^0(t) + b - \varepsilon) dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^\infty \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{I}_{\{t < \kappa_{-(b-\varepsilon)}^{0,-}\}} e^{-\alpha t} l(Y^0(t) + b - \varepsilon) dt \right] = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_{-b}^{0,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l_-(Y^0(t) + b) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

with  $l_-(y) := \beta\alpha - rw'_-(y)$ . By the proof of [15, Lemma 3.5] and by our assumption, the potential density of  $Y^0$  does not have mass, and since  $w'_- \neq w'_+$  at most countably many points by [18, Proposition 3.1, Appendix],  $l_-(\cdot)$  can be replaced with  $l(\cdot)$  in the last expectation, showing  $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} g(b - \varepsilon) = g(b)$  when 0 is regular for  $(-\infty, 0)$ , as desired.

**A.2. Proof of Lemma 3.1.** In this section, we provide an example of a Lévy process  $X$  which has unbounded variation paths and satisfies Assumption 3.1.

Assume that  $X$  satisfies that  $\nu(0, \infty) < \infty$ . Then we can write the process  $X$  as follows:

$$X(t) = X^{SN}(t) + \sum_{n=1}^{N^\nu(t)} J_n$$

where  $X^{SN}(t) = \{X^{SN}(t) : t \geq 0\}$  is a spectrally negative Lévy process with unbounded variation paths,  $N^\nu = \{N^\nu(t) : t \geq 0\}$  is an independent Poisson process with intensity  $\nu(0, \infty)$  and  $\{J_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with distribution  $\nu(\cdot \cap (0, \infty)) / \nu(0, \infty)$ . For  $\theta \geq 0$ , let  $W^{(\theta)}$  denote the  $\theta$ -scale function of  $X^{SN}$ . For the definition of the scale functions, see, e.g., [9, Section 8]. For  $b > 0$ , let  $Y^{SN,b} = \{Y^{SN,b}(t) : t \geq 0\}$  with  $b > 0$  the associated reflected Lévy process of  $X^{SN}$  at  $b$ , i.e.  $Y^{SN,b}(t) = X^{SN}(t) - \sup_{s \in [0,t]} (X^{SN}(s) - b) \wedge 0$ . In addition, we define  $\kappa_0^{SN,b} := \inf\{t > 0 : Y^{SN,b}(t) < 0\}$  and

$$H_f^{SN,(b,\theta)}(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{SN,b}} e^{-\theta t} f(Y^{SN,b}(t)) dt \right], \quad \theta > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

From [9, Theorem 8.11] and by our assumption that  $X$  is of unbounded variation, we have, for  $\theta \geq 0$  and  $x \in (0, b)$  and a non-negative measurable function  $f$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{SN,b}} e^{-\theta t} f(Y^{SN,b}(t)) dt \right] = \int_0^b f(y) \left( W^{(\theta)}(x) \frac{W^{(\theta)'(b-y)} - W^{(\theta)}(x-y)}{W^{(\theta)'(b)}} \right) dy.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_f^{(b,\alpha)}(x) &= H_f^{SN,(b,\alpha)}(x) - \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha T^{N^\nu}} H_f^{SN,(b,\alpha)}(Y_{T^{N^\nu}}^{SN,b}); T^{N^\nu} < \kappa_0^{SN,b} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_x \left[ e^{-\alpha T^{N^\nu}} H_f^{(b,\alpha)}(Y_{T^{N^\nu}}^{SN,b} + J_1); T^{N^\nu} < \kappa_0^{SN,b} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$= H_f^{SN,(b,\alpha)}(x) - \nu(0, \infty) H_{H_f^{SN,(b,\alpha)}}^{SN,(b,\hat{\alpha})}(x) + \int_{(0,\infty)} H_{H_f^{(b,\alpha)}(\cdot+u)}^{SN,(b,\hat{\alpha})}(x) \nu(du),$$

where  $T^{N^\nu}$  is the first jump time of  $N^\nu$  and  $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha + \nu(0, \infty)$ . Since the process  $X^{SN}$  is of unbounded variation, it is known that  $W^{(\theta)}(0+) = 0$ , hence for a function  $g \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$H_g^{SN,(b,\theta)}(x) = \int_0^x \int_0^b g(y) \left( W^{(\theta)'}(z) \frac{W^{(\theta)'}(b-y)}{W^{(\theta)'}(b)} - W^{(\theta)'}(z-y) \right) dy dz,$$

the function  $H_f^{(b,\alpha)}$  has the density

$$\begin{aligned} H_f^{(b,\alpha)'}(z) &:= \int_0^b f(y) \left( W^{(\alpha)'}(z) \frac{W^{(\alpha)'}(b-y)}{W^{(\alpha)'}(b)} - W^{(\alpha)'}(z-y) \right) dy \\ &\quad - \nu(0, \infty) \int_0^b H_f^{SN,(b,\alpha)}(y) \left( W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(z) \frac{W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(b-y)}{W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(b)} - W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(z-y) \right) dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^b \int_{(0,\infty)} H_f^{(b,\alpha)}(y+u) \nu(du) \left( W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(z) \frac{W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(b-y)}{W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(b)} - W^{(\hat{\alpha})'}(z-y) \right) dy, \quad z \in (0, b]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f$  is bounded on  $[0, b]$  and

$$\sup_{x \geq 0} |H_f^{(b,\alpha)}(x)| \vee \sup_{x \geq 0} |H_f^{SN,(b,\alpha)}(x)| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \sup_{x \in [0, b]} |f(x)|,$$

the density  $H_f^{(b,\alpha)'}$  is bounded on any compact intervals in  $(0, b]$ . In addition, it is not difficult to prove the continuity of  $H_f^{(b,\alpha)'}$ .

In the same way, we can prove that the case with  $\nu(-\infty, 0) < \infty$  satisfies Assumption 3.1.

**A.3. Proof of Lemma 3.4.** First, we have

$$(A.3) \quad g_0(b^*) = g(b^*) \leq 1,$$

where the inequality holds by the definition of  $b^*$  and since  $g$  is right-continuous.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \lim_{b \uparrow b^*} g(b) = \lim_{b \uparrow b^*} \left( \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_{b^*-b}^{0,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l(Y^{b^*}(t) + b - b^*) dt \right] \right) \\ (A.4) \quad &= \beta - \mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{K_0^{b^*,-}} e^{-\alpha t} l_-(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] = g_1(b^*), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds by the definition of  $g$  (and by shifting vertically the process  $Y^{b^*}$ ) and the limit holds because  $\kappa_{b^*-b}^{0,-} \xrightarrow{b \uparrow b^*} K_0^{b^*,-}$  a.s.

For  $b \in [0, 1]$ , denoting  $l_{\pm}(y) := \beta\alpha - rw'_{\pm}(y)$  for  $y > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g_p(b^*) &= \beta - p\mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{K_0^{b^*, -}} e^{-\alpha t} l_p(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - (1-p)\mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b^*, -}} e^{-\alpha t} l_p(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &= \beta - p(1-p)\mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{K_0^{b^*, -}} e^{-\alpha t} l_+(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - (1-p)^2\mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b^*, -}} e^{-\alpha t} l_+(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] \\ &\quad - p^2\mathbb{E}_0 \left[ \int_0^{K_0^{b^*, -}} e^{-\alpha t} l_-(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right] - p(1-p)\mathbb{E}_{b^*} \left[ \int_0^{\kappa_0^{b^*, -}} e^{-\alpha t} l_-(Y^{b^*}(t)) dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is a continuous function of  $p$ . By this continuity together with the values of the end points as in (A.3) and (A.4), there exists  $p^* \in [0, 1]$  satisfying (3.13) and the proof is complete.

**A.4. Proof of Lemma 4.1.** We define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A.5)} \quad V_-(x, i) &= x + V(0, i) \quad \text{and} \\ V_+(x, i) &= \mathbb{E}_{(x, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-q(H(t))} d\bar{X}(t) \right] = x + \mathbb{E}_{(0, i)} \left[ \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-q(H(t))} d\bar{X}(t) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{X}(t) := \sup_{s \leq t} X(s)$ . First, we have

$$V_-(x, i) \leq V(x, i), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, i \in E.$$

This is immediate by considering a subset of admissible strategies with an extra condition that the process must be moved instantaneously to 0 at time 0. The function  $V_-$  is precisely the value function of this version with more constraints and thus is bounded from above by the value function  $V$  of the original formulation.

Now, we prove that

$$\text{(A.6)} \quad V_+(x, i) \geq V(x, i), \quad x \geq 0, i \in E.$$

We fix  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$ . We have, for  $x > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\int_0^t q(H(s)) ds} d\bar{X}(t) - \left( \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\int_0^t q(H(s)) ds} dL^\pi(t) - \beta \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\int_0^t q(H(s)) ds} dR^\pi(t) \right) \\ &= \int_0^\infty q(H(u)) e^{-\int_0^u q(H(s)) ds} (\bar{X}(u) - L^\pi(u) + \beta R^\pi(u)) du \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the equality, we used integration by parts and in the inequality, we used condition (2.2) for admissible strategies. By taking the expectation, we obtain (A.6).

**A.5. Proof of Lemma 4.2.** By Lemma 4.1 and the triangle inequality, it suffices to show  $\|V_{\mathbf{b}} - V_{-}\|_{\infty} < \infty$ , where  $V_{-}$  is the function defined in (A.5).

By the definition of  $\pi^{(0,\mathbf{b})}$ , we have

$$V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i) = V_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{b}_M, i) + (x - \mathbf{b}_M), \quad x \geq \mathbf{b}_M,$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_M := \max_{i \in E} \mathbf{b}(i)$ , and is continuous by the same proof as [12, Lemma 5.4]. Thus, for  $x \geq \mathbf{b}_M$  and  $i \in E$ ,

$$(A.7) \quad V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i) - V_{-}(x, i) = V_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{b}_M, i) + (x - \mathbf{b}_M) - x - V(0, i) = V_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{b}_M, i) - \mathbf{b}_M - V(0, i),$$

as desired. From (A.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_{\mathbf{b}} - V_{-}\|_{\infty} &\leq \sup_{i \in E, x \geq \mathbf{b}_M} |V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i) - V_{-}(x, i)| + \sup_{i \in E, x \in [0, \mathbf{b}_M]} |V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i) - V_{-}(x, i)| \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in E, x \geq \mathbf{b}_M} |V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i) - V_{-}(x, i)| + \sup_{i \in E, x \in [0, \mathbf{b}_M]} |V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i)| + \sup_{i \in E, x \in [0, \mathbf{b}_M]} |V_{-}(x, i)| \\ &\leq \max_{i \in E} |V_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{b}_M, i) - \mathbf{b}_M - V(0, i)| + \sup_{i \in E, x \in [0, \mathbf{b}_M]} |V_{\mathbf{b}}(x, i)| + (\max_{i \in E} |V(0, i)| + \mathbf{b}_M) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

K. Noba was supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant no. JP21K13807. In addition, K. Noba stayed at Centro de Investigación en Matemáticas in Mexico as a JSPS Overseas Research Fellow and received support regarding the research environment there. K. Noba is grateful for their support during his visit. K. Yamazaki was supported by the start-up grant by the School of Mathematics and Physics of the University of Queensland. Both authors were supported by JSPS Open Partnership Joint Research Projects grant no. JPJSBP120209921.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Asmussen, S., Kella, O. A multi-dimensional martingale for Markov additive processes and its applications. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 32(2), 376-393, (2000).
- [2] AVRAM, F., PALMOWSKI, Z., AND PISTORIUS, M.R. On the optimal dividend problem for a spectrally negative Lévy process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **17**, 156-180, (2007).
- [3] BERTOIN, J. *Lévy processes* Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, (1997).
- [4] BIFFIS, E., AND KYPRIANOU, A.E. A note on scale functions and the time value of ruin for Lévy insurance risk processes. *Insurance Math. Econom.* , **46** (1), 85–91, (2010).
- [5] CARR, P., GEMAN, H., MADAN, D. B., YOR, M. The fine structure of asset returns: An empirical investigation. *The Journal of Business*, **75**(2), 305–332, (2002).
- [6] GRANATA, A. A geometric characterization of  $n$ th order convex functions. *Pac. J. Appl. Math.* **98** (1), 91–98, (1982).
- [7] HIRIART-URRUTY, J.B., AND LEMARÉCHAL, C. *Fundamentals of convex analysis* Grundlehren Text Editions, Springer- Verlag, Berlin, (2001).
- [8] Ivanovs, J., Palmowski, Z. Occupation densities in solving exit problems for Markov additive processes and their reflections. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 122(9), 3342-3360, (2012).

- [9] KYPRIANOU, A.E. *Fluctuations of Lévy processes with applications. 2nd Edition* Springer, Heidelberg, (2014).
- [10] LU, Y., LI, S. The Markovian regime-switching risk model with a threshold dividend strategy. *Insurance Math. Econom.*, **44**(2), 296-303, (2009).
- [11] JIANG, Z. AND PISTORIUS, M. Optimal dividend distribution under Markov regime switching. *Finance Stoch.*, **16**, 449–476, (2012).
- [12] NOBA, K. On the optimality of double barrier strategies for Lévy processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **131**, 73–102 (2021).
- [13] MATA, D., MORENO-FRANCO, H., NOBA, K., AND PÉREZ, J.L. On the bailout dividend problem with periodic dividend payments for spectrally negative Markov additive processes. *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems*, **48**, 101332, (2023).
- [14] NOBA, K., PÉREZ, J.L., AND YU, X. On the bailout dividend problem for spectrally negative Markov additive models. *SIAM J. on Control and Optimization*, **58**(2), 1049–1076, (2020).
- [15] NOBA, K. AND YAMAZAKI, K. Singular control for Lévy processes. *Math. Oper. Res.*, published online, (2022).
- [16] PÉREZ, J. L., YAMAZAKI, K., YU, X. On the bail-out optimal dividend problem. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **179**(2), 553-568, (2018).
- [17] PROTTER, P. *Stochastic integration and differential equations. 2nd Edition*, SPRINGER, BERLIN, (2005).
- [18] REVUZ, D., YOR, M.: *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion. 3rd Edition*, SPRINGER, BERLIN, (2005).
- [19] WANG, W., WANG, Y., CHEN, P., WU, X. Dividend and capital injection optimization with transaction cost for Lévy risk processes. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **194**(3), 924-965, (2022).
- [20] ZHAO, Y., CHEN, P., YANG, H. Optimal periodic dividend and capital injection problem for spectrally positive Lévy processes. *Insurance Math. Econom.*, **74**, 135-146, (2017).
- [21] ZHAO, Y., WANG, R., YAO, D., CHEN, P. Optimal dividends and capital injections in the dual model with a random time horizon. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **167**(1), 272-295, (2015).
- [22] ZHU, J., YANG, H. Ruin theory for a Markov regime-switching model under a threshold dividend strategy. *Insurance Math. Econom.*, **42**(1), 311-318, (2008).