Strictly monotone mean-variance preferences with dynamic portfolio management

Yike $Wang^1$ and Yusha $Chen^2$

¹School of Finance, Chongqing Technology and Business University,

Chongqing 400067, China.

²School of Finance, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics,

Chengdu 611130, China.

Abstract

This paper is devoted to extending the monotone mean-variance (MMV) preference to a large class of strictly monotone mean-variance (SMMV) preferences, and illustrating its application to single-period/continuous-time portfolio selection problems. The properties and equivalent representations of the SMMV preference are also studied. To illustrate applications, we provide the gradient condition for the single-period portfolio problem with SMMV preferences, and investigate its association with the optimal mean-variance static strategy. For the continuous-time portfolio problem with SMMV preferences and continuous price processes, we show the condition that the solution is the same as the corresponding optimal mean-variance strategy. When this consistency condition is not satisfied, the primal problems are unbounded, and we turn to study a sequence of approximate linear-quadratic problems generated by penalty function method. The solution can be characterized by stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equation, but it is still difficult to derive a closed-form expression. We take a joint adoption of embedding method and convex duality method to derive an analytical solution. In particular, if the parameter that characterizes the strict monotonicity of SMMV preference is a constant, the solution can be given by two equations in the form of Black-Scholes formula.

Keywords: monotone mean-variance preference, portfolio selection, Fenchel conjugate, dynamic programming, stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equation

AMS2010 classification: Primary: 91G10, 49N10; Secondary: 91B05, 49N90

Correspondence: Yike Wang, School of Finance, Chongqing Technology and Business University, Chongqing 400067, China. Email: wangyike7246@hotmail.com

Funding information: National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12401611 and CTBU Research Projects under Grant 2355010.

1 Introduction

The modern mean-variance (MV) analysis pioneered by Markowitz (1952) has been widely applied to many scopes in the theory and practice of mathematical finance for decades. For portfolio selection, an agent with MV preference try to improve the mean of the investment return and reduce its variance, since the mean and variance stand for average yield and risk, respectively. However, unlike aiming to reduce errors for improving the accuracy of an automatic control system, where any deviation is undesired, a positive deviation of random return on investments means there are opportunities for excess earnings. It is not always appropriate to use variance as a penalty term for an objective functional, due to a lack of monotonicity of MV preference. See Dybvig and Ingersoll (1982); Jarrow and Madan (1997).

As the example given by Maccheroni, Marinacci, Rustichini, and Taboga (2009) shows, the lack of monotonicity of MV preference may yield a counterintuitive result. That is, as the objective function is given by the net value that the mean exceeds the variance, an agent will choose prospect f according to the following Table 1. However, any rational agent should choose g, because it is obvious that the payoff of g statewise dominates over that of f and the reverse is not true.

State of nature	s_1	s_2	s_3	s_4
Probabilities	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Payoff of f	1	2	3	4
Payoff of g	1	2	3	5

Table 1: Example given by Maccheroni et al. (2009) with $\mathbb{E}[f] - \operatorname{Var}[f] > \mathbb{E}[g] - \operatorname{Var}[g]$.

For general MV preferences, the economic rationality principle is also violated for some selection problems, see Remark 2.1 and our example illustrated with Table 2. To overcome the lack of monotonicity of MV preferences, Maccheroni et al. (2009) proposed a class of monotone mean-variance (MMV) preferences, based on the variational representation of MV preferences (see Maccheroni, Marinacci, and Rustichini (2006)) with a minor modification. In short, using the MMV preference to evaluate a random variable f is equivalent to using the corresponding MV preference to evaluate some truncated random variable $f \wedge \lambda_f$. Intuitively speaking, it is rational to employ the MV preferences for portfolio selection, only if those sufficiently large positive deviations of total return are not taken into account.

In the past few years, MMV preference has attracted much attention of researchers, and acts as the objective function for dynamic portfolio selection. For example, Trybuła and Zawisza (2019) studied the continuous-time portfolio problems with MMV preferences, where a stochastic factor is incorporated in the model dynamics, and found that its solution is identical to the problem with MV preferences. Černý (2020) investigated these problems in a general semi-martingale model, where the seemly unusual objective function is exactly equivalent to the commonly employed form. It is also mentioned in Corollary 5.5 therein that a continuous price process will result in the consistency of optimized MV and MMV objective functions. Besides, Strub and Li (2020) provided a theoretical proof for the consistency of optimal MV and MMV portfolio strategies for continuous semi-martingale price processes. Even though there exist some convex cone trading constraints in the market, the consistency of optimal MV and MMV portfolio strategies remains, see Shen and Zou (2022) for the deterministic coefficient case and Hu, Shi, and Xu (2023) for the random coefficient case.

Recently, researchers considered the dynamic portfolio problems with MMV preferences in jumpdiffusion models, and obtained some new results different from the optimal MV portfolio strategies. For seeking optimal investment-reinsurance strategies, B. H. Li, Guo, and Tian (2023) extended their previous work B. H. Li and Guo (2021), where the claim process is a diffusion approximation, to the case with the classical Cramér-Lundberg model. Apart from that, Y. C. Li, Liang, and Pang (2022) made detailed comparisons between the optimal MMV and MV portfolio strategies in a jump-diffusion model, as well as validating the two-fund separation and establishing the monotone capital asset pricing model. Y. C. Li, Liang, and Pang (2023) compared the optimal MMV and MV portfolio strategies in a Lévy market, and found the condition that make these two strategies the same. In line with Strub and Li (2020), it was found that the discontinuity of market results in the difference between MMV and MV portfolio selections. Despite so many excellent studies, there is still a fundamental flaw that are overlooked. That is, due to the lack of strict monotonicity of MMV preferences, a counterintuitive result arises. Let us return to the abovementioned example given by Maccheroni et al. (2009); see also Table 1. Applying Maccheroni et al. (2009, Theorem B.1) that gives the abovementioned truncation level (λ_f, λ_g) corresponding to (f, g), one can find that the selection problem is reduced to choosing between $f \wedge 2.5$ and $g \wedge 2.5$ with the abovementioned MV preference; see also (8) and (10) with $\theta = 2$ and $\zeta \equiv 0$. Obviously, $f \wedge 2.5 = g \wedge 2.5$ for every state of nature. Thus, the agents with the given MMV preference could freely choose either of the two. However, if there are plenty of rational agents faced with this problem, or a rational agent is supposed to address this problem many times, the answers will always be choosing g! In other words, MMV preferences do not stand up repeated tests.

To tackle this drawback of MMV preferences, we make a minor modification in the Fenchel conjugate for generating the MMV preference, inspired by the celebrated envelope theorem. This inspiration can also be found in Maccheroni et al. (2006) for the variational representation of preferences. As a result, we obtain a class of strictly monotone mean-variance (SMMV) preferences. See (7) for the definition and Theorem 2.5 for the strict monotonicity. As Theorem 2.5 says, our SMMV preferences gives different evaluation results for any non-identical prospects that one statewise dominates over the other.

Apart from that, for the continuous-time portfolio problem with our SMMV preferences, the optimal SMMV and MV dynamic portfolio strategies are not necessarily the same, even though the dynamic model without any discontinuity of market is conventional and simple. The consistency of the optimal SMMV and MV portfolio strategies depends on a random variable (denoted by ζ) that one can artificially choose to characterize the strict monotonicity. In fact, the consistency holds if and only if ζ is almost surely less than the Radon-Nikodým derivative for the risk-neutral measure.

In this paper, we systematically study the SMMV preferences and the related portfolio selection problems. The main contributions of this paper are as follows. *Firstly*, we propose a class of SMMV preferences and show the inspiration to facilitate the understanding and inspire future research. The properties and equivalent expressions of SMMV preferences are investigated, which are parallel to those in Maccheroni et al. (2009). For example, a SMMV preference can also be represented as truncated quadratic utility (see Theorem 2.10) and as the minimum/maximum of some class of MV utility (see Propositions 2.11 and 2.12). Secondly, we study the single-period static portfolio problems with SMMV preferences. We investigate the existence and uniqueness for the optimal SMMV static strategy without the finiteness of probability space as assumed in Maccheroni et al. (2009), and compare the optimal SMMV and MV static strategies, between which the gap can be briefly represented by a Lagrange multiplier. Thirdly, we study the continuous-time dynamic portfolio problems with SMMV preferences. We take the portfolio replicating method, instead of dynamic programming, to show under which condition the optimal SMMV and MV dynamic strategies are the same. Unless this condition is satisfied, we reduce the problems to stochastic differential games between the investor and the incarnation of market. and find that the reduced problems are unbounded. We employ the penalty function method and consider a sequence of approximate linear-quadratic problems without the abovementioned unboundedness. However, distinct from the literature, e.g., Trybuła and Zawisza (2019), it is still difficult to derive the explicit solution of those approximate problems via dynamic programming. We take a joint adoption of the embedding method (pioneered by D. Li and Ng (2000); Zhou and Li (2000)) and the convex duality method to express the solution by martingale representation.

In particular, we consider the case with constant parameter that characterizes the strict monotonicity. For expressing the solution, it is supposed to solve a system of two equations that like the Black-Scholes formula. *Notably*, since the abovementioned monotonicity parameter is allowed to be random, we are supposed to solve backward stochastic partial differential equations (BSPDEs) as Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs (HJBI) equations when employing the dynamic programming principle. The existence and uniqueness of their solution is obvious, since our method is straightforward derivation rather than testing some construction.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we display the definition and properties of SMMV preferences. To illustrate the application of SMMV preferences, we study the single-period portfolio selection problem with SMMV preferences in Section 3 and the continuous-time portfolio selection problem in Section 4. In Section 5, we make a brief concluding remark. The proofs of lemmas, theorems and propositions for this work are collected in Appendix A.

2 Strictly monotone mean-variance preference

2.1 MMV preference revisited

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space, and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ and $\operatorname{Var}[\cdot]$ respectively denote the expectation operator and variance operator under the probability measure \mathbb{P} . For the sake of brevity, we denote by $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ the collection of all \mathcal{F} -measurable and square-integrable random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, which is equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} := (\mathbb{E}[|\cdot|^2])^{1/2}$, and introduce the subsets $\mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}) = \{f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) : f \geq 0, \mathbb{P} - a.s.\}$, $\mathbb{L}^2_{++}(\mathbb{P}) = \{f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) : f > 0, \mathbb{P} - a.s.\}$ and $\mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}) := \{f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) : f \geq \zeta, \mathbb{P} - a.s.\}$ for $\zeta \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P})$.

The conventional MV objective function $U_{\theta} : \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$U_{\theta}(f) := \mathbb{E}[f] - \frac{\theta}{2} \operatorname{Var}[f] = \int_{\Omega} \left(f - \frac{\theta}{2} (f - \mathbb{E}[f])^2 \right) d\mathbb{P},$$
(1)

where the preassigned $\theta > 0$ represents the risk aversion to variance (see also Maccheroni et al. (2009)). In view that

$$\left| U_{\theta}(f+g) - U_{\theta}(f) - \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1 - \theta(f - \mathbb{E}[f]) \right) g \right] \right| = \frac{\theta}{2} \operatorname{Var}[g] \le \frac{\theta}{2} \mathbb{E}[|g|^{2}] = o(||g||_{\mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})}), \quad \forall f, g \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}),$$

 U_{θ} is Fréchet differentiable, and hence Gâteaux differentiable. Hereafter, with a slight abuse of notation, we denote by $dU_{\theta}(f) = 1 - \theta(f - \mathbb{E}[f])$ the Gâteaux derivative of dU_{θ} at f, as

$$dU_{\theta}(f)(g) := \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{U_{\theta}(f + \varepsilon g) - U_{\theta}(f)}{\varepsilon} = \mathbb{E}\big[\big(1 - \theta(f - \mathbb{E}[f])\big)g\big]$$

gives a continuous linear functional $dU_{\theta}(f)(\cdot) \in (\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))^*$ in a rigorous sense. According to Phelps (1993, Proposition 1.8, p. 5), U_{θ} is Gâteaux differentiable at f, iff the superdifferential $\partial U_{\theta}(f) := \{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) : U_{\theta}(g) \leq U_{\theta}(f) + \mathbb{E}[Y(g-f)], \forall g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})\}$ is a singleton. As a result, $\partial U_{\theta}(f) = \{1 - \theta(f - \mathbb{E}[f])\}.$

Remark 2.1. Maccheroni et al. (2009) introduced the domain of monotonicity of U_{θ} as the following:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\theta} := \{ f \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}) : \partial U_{\theta}(f) \cap \mathbb{L}^{2}_{+}(\mathbb{P}) \neq \emptyset \} = \Big\{ f \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}) : f - \mathbb{E}[f] \leq \frac{1}{\theta}, \ \mathbb{P} - a.s. \Big\}.$$

This is the convex and closed subset of $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ where the Gâteaux derivative of U_θ is non-nagetive. For any $f, g \in \mathcal{G}_\theta$ with $f \leq g$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., $U_\theta(f) \leq U_\theta(g)$ follows. However, for any $f \notin \mathcal{G}_\theta$, there exists $g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ that is ε -close to f such that g > f but $U_\theta(f) > U_\theta(g)$. See Maccheroni et al. (2009, Lemma 2.1). This exactly shows the drawback of the conventional MV objective functions. Apart from that, the following

outcome of a single coin toss with 50/50 probability of heads and tails could intuitively illustrate this drawback in monotonicity.

$h(\text{head}) = \frac{1}{\theta}$	$h(\text{tail}) = -\frac{1}{\theta}$	$\operatorname{esssup} h - \mathbb{E}[h] = \frac{1}{\theta}$	$U_{\theta}(h) = -\frac{1}{2\theta}$
$g(\text{head}) = \frac{1}{\theta} + \varepsilon$	$g(\text{tail}) = -\frac{1}{\theta}$	$\operatorname{esssup} g - \mathbb{E}[g] = \frac{1}{\theta} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$	$U_{\theta}(g) = -\frac{1}{2\theta} - \frac{\theta}{8}\varepsilon^2$
$f(\text{head}) = \frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{\theta}{9}\varepsilon^2$	$f(\text{tail}) = -\frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{\theta}{9}\varepsilon^2$	$\operatorname{esssup} f - \mathbb{E}[f] = \frac{1}{\theta}$	$U_{\theta}(f) = -\frac{1}{2\theta} - \frac{\theta}{9}\varepsilon^2$

Table 2: For any $\theta, \varepsilon > 0, g \notin \mathcal{G}_{\theta}$ statewise dominates over $f \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta}$, but $U_{\theta}(g) < U_{\theta}(f)$.

Now we turn to consider the Fenchel conjugate of U_{θ} as the following:

$$U_{\theta}^{*}(Y) := \inf_{f \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})} \{ \mathbb{E}[Yf] - U_{\theta}(f) \}, \quad Y \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}).$$

$$(2)$$

As a point-wise infimum of some affine functions of Y, U_{θ}^* is concave. If there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that f = c, \mathbb{P} -a.s., then $\mathbb{E}[Yf] - U_{\theta}(f) = c(\mathbb{E}^{P}[Y] - 1)$. Consequently,

$$U_{\theta}^{*}(Y) \leq \inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} c(\mathbb{E}[Y] - 1) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \mathbb{E}[Y] = 1; \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This implies that $U_{\theta}^{*}(Y) = -\infty$ if $\mathbb{E}[Y] \neq 1$. In the case with $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 1$, we conclude that the minimizer \hat{f} for the right-hand side of (2) fulfills $Y = 1 - \theta(\hat{f} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}])$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., by the first-order derivative condition for optimality $0 = \mathbb{E}[Y1_A] - \mathbb{E}[1_A dU_{\theta}(\hat{f})] \equiv \mathbb{E}[1_A(Y - 1 + \theta(\hat{f} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}]))]$ for any $A \in \mathcal{F}$, or the Gâteaux derivative condition for optimality $Y = dU_{\theta}(\hat{f})$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Therefore, in this case,

$$U_{\theta}^{*}(Y) = \mathbb{E}[Y\hat{f}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}] + \frac{\theta}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[(\hat{f} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}])^{2}\right] = -\frac{1}{2\theta}(\mathbb{E}[Y^{2}] - 1).$$
(3)

Fenchel-Moreau theorem (for Hilbert spaces, see Bauschke and Combettes (2017, Theorem 13.37)) indicates that the concave function U_{θ} exactly equals to the Fenchel conjugate of U_{θ}^* , which is also known as the variational representation of MV preference, see Maccheroni et al. (2006). That is,

$$U_{\theta}(f) = \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})} \{\mathbb{E}[Yf] - U_{\theta}^{*}(Y)\} \equiv \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Y]=1} \left\{\mathbb{E}[Yf] + \frac{1}{2\theta}(\mathbb{E}[Y^{2}] - 1)\right\};$$
(4)

while the envelope theorem (see, e.g., Milgrom and Segal (2002)) gives the fact that $dU_{\theta}(f)$ realizes the minimum. (Maccheroni et al., 2009) made a minor modification on the second Fenchel conjugate and obtained the following MMV preference:

$$V_{\theta}(f) := \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P})} \{ \mathbb{E}[Yf] - U^*_{\theta}(Y) \}.$$

$$(5)$$

As a point-wise infimum of some affine functions of f, V_{θ} is concave. Moreover, if V_{θ} is Gâteaux differentiable, then $dV_{\theta}(f)$ is the minimizer on the right-hand side of (5). Consequently,

$$V_{\theta}(g) \leq \mathbb{E}[gdV_{\theta}(f)] - U_{\theta}^{*}(dV_{\theta}(f)) = V_{\theta}(f) + \mathbb{E}[(g-f)dV_{\theta}(f)] \leq V_{\theta}(f)$$

for any $f, g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ with $g \leq f$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., which shows the monotonicity of V_{θ} . However, if $dV_{\theta}(f)$ vanishes on some non-trivial $A \in \mathcal{F}$, then $V_{\theta}(f + \varepsilon 1_A) \leq V_{\theta}(f) + \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[1_A dV_{\theta}(f)] = V_{\theta}(f)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ due to the concavity of V_{θ} , and hence $V_{\theta}(f + \varepsilon 1_A) = V_{\theta}(f)$. In other words, V_{θ} is not strictly monotone.

Remark 2.2. Since $Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P})$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 1$, one can define the probability measure $\mathbb{Q} \ll \mathbb{P}$ on (Ω, \mathcal{F})

by $\mathbb{Q}(A) = \int_A Y d\mathbb{P}$. Thus, $Y = d\mathbb{Q}/d\mathbb{P}$ is the Radon-Nikodým derivative, and

$$\mathbb{E}[Yf] + \frac{1}{2\theta}(\mathbb{E}[Y^2] - 1) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[f] + \frac{1}{2\theta} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right)^2 \right] - 1 \right),$$

where $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ denotes the expectation operator under \mathbb{Q} . Conversely, for $\mathbb{Q} \ll \mathbb{P}$, according to Radon-Nikodým theorem, there exists a Radon-Nikodým derivative $Y = d\mathbb{Q}/d\mathbb{P}$. Therefore, (5) can be re-expressed as

$$V_{\theta}(f) = \inf_{\mathbb{Q} \ll \mathbb{P}, \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})} \left\{ \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[f] + \frac{1}{2\theta} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right)^{2} \right] - 1 \right) \right\} = \inf_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})} \left\{ \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[f] + \frac{1}{2\theta} C(\mathbb{Q} \| \mathbb{P}) \right\}, \tag{6}$$

where $C(\mathbb{Q}||\mathbb{P})$ is the so-called "relative Gini concentration index" given by

$$C(\mathbb{Q}||\mathbb{P}) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}\right)^2\right] - 1, & if \ \mathbb{Q} \ll \mathbb{P}; \\ +\infty, & otherwise. \end{cases}$$

The expression (6) can be also found in, e.g., Maccheroni et al. (2009); Trybuła and Zawisza (2019); Strub and Li (2020); B. H. Li and Guo (2021).

2.2 SMMV preferences

As a straightforward solution to the abovementioned non-strict monotonicity, with an artificially chosen $\zeta \in \mathbb{L}^2_{++}(\mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbb{E}[\zeta] < 1$, we introduce the following concave function defined on $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$:

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) := \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})} \{ \mathbb{E}[Yf] - U^*_{\theta}(Y) \},\tag{7}$$

of which the lower and upper bounds are given by $U_{\theta}(f) \leq V_{\theta}(f) \leq V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \leq \mathbb{E}[\zeta f]/\mathbb{E}[\zeta] - U_{\theta}^*(\zeta/\mathbb{E}[\zeta]).$

Remark 2.3. If $\mathbb{E}[\zeta] = 1$, then $Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$ and $U^*_{\theta}(Y) \neq -\infty$ lead to $Y = \zeta$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. This implies that $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \mathbb{E}[f\zeta] - U^*_{\theta}(\zeta)$, which is an affine function of f. In addition, if $\mathbb{E}[\zeta] > 1$, then $U^*_{\theta}(Y) = -\infty$ for any $Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$, which leads to an improper $V_{\theta,\zeta}$.

Remark 2.4. Since (7) can be re-expressed by

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Y]=1} \Big\{ \mathbb{E}[Yf] + \frac{1}{2\theta} \operatorname{Var}[Y] \Big\},$$

one can conclude that $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ is decreasing in θ . Moreover, for any $\hat{\zeta} \geq \zeta$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., $\mathbb{L}^2_{\hat{\zeta}+}(\mathbb{P}) \subseteq \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$ gives $V_{\theta,\hat{\zeta}}(f) \geq V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$. Roughly speaking, $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ is increasing in ζ .

Theorem 2.5. $V_{\theta,\zeta}(g) \leq V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) - \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] < V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ for any non-identical $f,g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ with $g \leq f$.

Proof. Given the quadratic function (3), it is easy to see that the minimum on the right-hand side of (7) can be realized, and the minimizer (denoted by \hat{Y}_f) is unique. Detailed results can be found in Appendix A.2. Since $\hat{Y}_f \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta^+}(\mathbb{P})$, then

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(g) \le \mathbb{E}[g\hat{Y}_f] - U_{\theta}^*(\hat{Y}_f) = V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) - \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\hat{Y}_f] \le V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) - \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] < V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$$

for any non-identical $f, g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ with $g \leq f$. So the proof is completed.

Remark 2.6. If Y is another minimizer for (7), then the convexity of $\mathbb{E}[Yf] + \operatorname{Var}[Y]/(2\theta)$ in Y ensures that $\mathbb{E}[(\varepsilon Y + (1 - \varepsilon)\hat{Y}_f)f] + \operatorname{Var}[\varepsilon Y + (1 - \varepsilon)\hat{Y}_f]/(2\theta)$ is a constant function for ε on [0, 1], of which the

second derivative gives $\mathbb{E}[|Y - \hat{Y}_f|^2] = 0$. This method is also suitable to show the uniqueness of solution for linear-quadratic optimization problems in the sequel.

By virtue of Theorem 2.5, we can say that $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ is strictly monotone. Moreover, as ζ could vary, we have indeed constructed a class of strictly monotone mean-variance preferences $V_{\theta,\zeta}$, and the essential lower bound of their Gâteaux derivative $dV_{\theta,\zeta}$ can be controlled by ζ . If ζ is allowed to vanish, then $V_{\theta,0} = V_{\theta}$. In the sequel, we are able to take ζ in $\mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbb{E}[\zeta] < 1$ to include the conventional MMV case and our SMMV cases, although we still call $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ the SMMV preference to avoid additional names such as "generalized MMV preference".

Remark 2.7. In the same manner as in Remark 2.2, by employing the dummy variable replacement $Z = (Y - \zeta)/(1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta])$ and writing $\kappa := 1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]$ for the sake of brevity, we have

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \mathbb{E}[f\zeta] + \inf_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \ \mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \left\{ \kappa \mathbb{E}\left[\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) Z \right] + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \right\} + \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[\zeta^2] - \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb$$

which gives the same (total) order over all $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ as the following statement does:

$$\mathbb{E}[f\zeta] + \inf_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \ \mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \bigg\{ \kappa \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)Z\Big] + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \bigg\}.$$

2.3 Properties and equivalent expressions of SMMV preference

Let us begin with showing the domain where the SMMV, MMV and MV preferences are identical with the related truncation results.

Lemma 2.8. Fix $(\theta, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbb{E}[\zeta] < 1$.

• $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = U_{\theta}(f)$, if and only if

$$f \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta} := \{ f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) : \partial U_{\theta}(f) \cap \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}) \neq \varnothing \}$$
$$= \left\{ f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) : f - \mathbb{E}[f] \le \frac{1-\zeta}{\theta}, \ \mathbb{P} - a.s. \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\theta}.$$

• $f \wedge (\lambda - \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ for any $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ and $\lambda \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, where $\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \in (\text{ess inf}\{f + \zeta/\theta\}, \mathbb{E}[f] + 1/\theta]$ uniquely fulfills

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} = \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds \equiv \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \mathbb{E}\left[\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right) \land \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\right].$$
(8)

• $f \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, if and only if $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ and $f + \zeta/\theta \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. In other words,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta} = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) : \operatorname{ess\,sup}\left\{ f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right\} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} = \mathbb{E}[f] + \frac{1}{\theta} \right\}$$

• $f \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, if and only if $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ and $f \wedge (\lambda - \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ for some or every $\lambda > \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$. That is,

$$\sup\{\lambda: f \land (\lambda - \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}\} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}, & if \ f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}; \\ +\infty, & otherwise. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.9. $\lambda_{f \wedge (\lambda - \zeta/\theta), \theta, \zeta} \leq \lambda_{f, \theta, \zeta}$, and it holds with equality for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_{f, \theta, \zeta}$, since

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} = \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\}} ds\right] \\ \le \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{\{(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}) \land \lambda \le s \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\}} ds\right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\left(f \land \left(\lambda - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right) + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds$$

with equality for $\lambda \geq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$. Intuitively speaking, when $\lambda \geq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, $f \wedge (\lambda - \zeta/\theta) + \zeta/\theta$ and $f + \zeta/\theta$ have the same distribution on $(-\infty, \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}]$, and hence the solution of (8) remains unchanged even if f is replaced by $f \wedge (\lambda - \zeta/\theta)$ therein.

The proof of Lemma 2.8 is left to Appendix A.1. This first assertion of Lemma 2.8 with its proof provides the following comparison results for $\zeta \in \mathbb{L}^2_{++}(\mathbb{P})$:

- $V_{\theta,\zeta} = V_{\theta} = U_{\theta}$ on $\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$;
- $V_{\theta,\zeta} > V_{\theta} = U_{\theta}$ on $\mathcal{G}_{\theta} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$;
- $V_{\theta,\zeta} > V_{\theta} > U_{\theta}$ on $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\theta}$.

Apart from that, $c1_{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ and $V_{\theta,\zeta}(c1_{\Omega}) = U_{\theta}(c1_{\Omega}) = c$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. The other assertions of Lemma 2.8 show how to truncate $f \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})$ so that the truncation result falls into the domain $\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ where $V_{\theta,\zeta} = U_{\theta}$, as listed below.

- $f \wedge (\lambda \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ for $\lambda \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$ is always true.
- $f \wedge (\lambda \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ for $\lambda > \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$ is equivalent to $f \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, or namely, $f + \zeta/\theta \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.

Given (8), we can roughly show how the critical truncation level $\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$ varies as a perturbation $\varepsilon 1_A$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$ is added to f. In fact, since

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} = \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \varepsilon 1_A + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \begin{cases} \le \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds; \\ \ge \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s - \varepsilon\Big) ds, \end{cases}$$

we have $\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta} - \varepsilon \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \leq \lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta}$, or namely, $\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \leq \lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta} \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} + \varepsilon$. Interested reader can find more precise perturbation results in Appendix **B**.

Now we show the Gâteaux differentiability and some explicit expressions of $V_{\theta,\zeta}$. For the sake of brevity, we omit the statement $(\theta,\zeta) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbb{E}[\zeta] < 1$ in the sequel, unless otherwise noted. **Theorem 2.10.** For any $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$, $dV_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \zeta + \theta(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - f - \zeta/\theta)_+$, which realizes the minimum

Theorem 2.10. For any $f \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})$, $dV_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \zeta + \theta(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - f - \zeta/\theta)_{+}$, which realizes the minimum on the right-hand side of (7), and

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} s\mathbb{P}\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds + \mathbb{E}[f\zeta] + \frac{1}{2\theta}\mathbb{E}[\zeta^2] - \frac{1}{2\theta}$$
(9)
$$= U_{\theta}\left(\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right) \land \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\right) + \mathbb{E}[(f - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta})\zeta] + \frac{1}{2\theta}\operatorname{Var}[\zeta]$$
$$= U_{\theta}\left(f \land \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\right) + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(f - f \land \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\right)\zeta\right]$$
(10)
$$= U_{\theta}\left(f \land \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\right) + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\right)_{+}\zeta\right].$$

The proof of Theorem 2.10 is left to Appendix A.2. Combining Lemma 2.8 and the expression (10), we can characterize the SMMV preference $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ by MV preference $U_{\theta,\zeta}$ with a truncation approach. It has been shown in Lemma 2.8 that $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = U_{\theta}(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$. For $f \notin \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ equals to the sum of

- the MV preference for the truncated random variable $f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$
- and the linear modification term for the gap $f f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \zeta/\theta)$, of which the "growth speed" is exactly ζ .

This implies that $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ is the minimum over all functions that are identical to U_{θ} on $\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ and whose Gâteaux derivatives belong to $\mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$. More generally, replacing the Gâteaux derivative by supergradient delivers the following proposition, of the proof is left to Appendix A.3.

$\textbf{Proposition 2.11. } V_{\theta,\zeta}(\cdot) = \min\{V(\cdot): V|_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}} = U_{\theta}|_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}}, \ \partial V(f) \cap \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}) \neq \varnothing, \ \forall f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \}.$

Heuristically, fixing the "basis" $U_{\theta}(f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \zeta/\theta))$ and arbitrarily choosing Y for the "growth" $\mathbb{E}[(f - f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \zeta/\theta))Y]$ delivers the minimality of $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ as shown in Proposition 2.11. Conversely, if we arbitrarily choose g for the basis $U_{\theta}(g)$ but fix the growth $\mathbb{E}[(f - g)\zeta]$, then the following proposition for the maximality of $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ arises, of which the rigorous proof can be found in Appendix A.4.

Proposition 2.12.
$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}, g \leq f} \{ U_{\theta}(g) + \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] \} = \max_{g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}), g \leq f} \{ U_{\theta}(g) + \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] \}.$$

Applying Proposition 2.12 can deliver the following proposition, which is an analog to Maccheroni et al. (2009, Proposition 2.1) for a reflexive relation named "more uncertainty averse". To keep the main body of this paper focused, we left its proof to Appendix A.5.

Proposition 2.13. $\theta \geq \hat{\theta}$, if and only if

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \ge V_{\theta,\zeta}(c1_{\Omega}) \implies V_{\hat{\theta},\zeta}(f) \ge V_{\hat{\theta},\zeta}(c1_{\Omega}) \quad \forall (f,c) \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{R}.$$

To end this section, we extend the result given by Maccheroni et al. (2009, Theorem 2.3) that $V_{\theta}(f) \ge V_{\theta}(g)$ is a necessary condition for second-order stochastic dominance of f over g.

Proposition 2.14. If $f + \zeta/\theta$ is second-order stochastically dominant over $g + \zeta/\theta$, namely,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathbb{P}\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds \le \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathbb{P}\left(g + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$
(11)

then $\lambda_{g,\theta,\zeta} \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$ and $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \geq V_{\theta,\zeta}(g) + \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta].$

The proof of Proposition 2.14 is left to Appendix A.6, which is much more readable than that for Maccheroni et al. (2009, Theorem 2.3). In particular, if ζ is independent of f and g (including the case that ζ reduces to a constant), $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \geq V_{\theta,\zeta}(g) + \mathbb{E}[f-g]\mathbb{E}[\zeta]$ is a necessary condition for second-order stochastic dominance of f over g.

3 Single-period static portfolio selection

In this section, we study the single period portfolio selection problems with the SMMV preference $V_{\theta,\zeta}$. In particular, we find that the existence of solution relies on the market parameters. Later on, we will show how to properly choose ζ such that the solution for a given no-arbitrage financial market exists. More generally, the no-arbitrage condition can be replaced by the condition of no free lunch, according to Kreps-Yan Theorem (see Delbaen and Schachermayer (2006, Theorem 5.2.2, p. 77)).

3.1 Model and problem formulation

Let r be the risk-free yield rate, \vec{R} the vector of the yield rates of n risky assets with the variancecovariance matrix $\operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}]$ under \mathbb{P} , and $\vec{\alpha}$ the ratio of wealth invested on the n risky assets without any constraint. Assume that the market has no arbitrage, and $\operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}]$ is invertible so that any asset cannot be replicated by others. For a unit initial wealth, the terminal wealth corresponding to portfolio strategy $\vec{\alpha}$ is

$$X_{\vec{\alpha}} := r(1 - \langle \vec{\alpha}, \vec{1} \rangle) + \langle \vec{\alpha}, \vec{R} \rangle = r + \langle \vec{\alpha}, \vec{R} - r\vec{1} \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\vec{1}$ is the vector whose components are all 1.

For initial wealth x > 0, the agent with MV preference U_{θ} aims to maximize

$$\mathbb{E}[xX_{\vec{\alpha}}] - \frac{\theta}{2} \operatorname{Var}[xX_{\vec{\alpha}}] = xr + x \Big(\langle \vec{\alpha}, \mathbb{E}[\vec{R} - r\vec{1}] \rangle - \frac{x\theta}{2} \langle \vec{\alpha}, \operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}]\vec{\alpha} \rangle \Big),$$

subject to $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Denote by $\vec{\alpha}_{mv}^*(x)$ the maximizer for this classical linear-quadratic optimization problem. It is easy to arrive at $\mathbb{E}[\vec{R} - r\vec{1}] = x\theta \operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}]\vec{\alpha}_{mv}^*(x)$, or equivalently,

$$\vec{\alpha}_{mv}^*(x) = \frac{1}{x\theta} (\operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}])^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\vec{R} - r\vec{1}], \qquad (12)$$

which implies that the optimal investment amount $x \vec{\alpha}_{mv}^*(x)$ is independent of the initial wealth x. Moreover, the problem with initial wealth x > 0 and risk aversion parameter θ is equivalent to that with unit initial wealth and risk aversion parameter $x\theta$. In terms of the SMMV preference $V_{\theta,\zeta}$,

$$\sup_{\vec{\alpha}\in\mathbb{R}^n} V_{\theta,\zeta}(xX_{\vec{\alpha}}) = x \sup_{\vec{\alpha}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \inf_{Z\in\mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \ \mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_{\vec{\alpha}}(\zeta+\kappa Z)] + \frac{1}{2x\theta} \mathbb{E}[(\zeta+\kappa Z)^2] - \frac{1}{2x\theta} \right\} = x \sup_{\vec{\alpha}\in\mathbb{R}^n} V_{x\theta,\zeta}(X_{\vec{\alpha}}),$$

for an arbitrarily fixed initial wealth x > 0. Thus, the SMMV problem with initial wealth x > 0 and risk aversion parameter θ can also be reduced to that with unit initial wealth and risk aversion parameter $x\theta$. Hence, we only consider the problems with unit initial wealth, and

$$\sup_{\vec{\alpha}\in\mathbb{R}^n} V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_{\vec{\alpha}}) = r + \sup_{\vec{\alpha}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \inf_{Z\in\mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}),\mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \left\{ \langle \vec{\alpha}, \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})(\kappa Z+\zeta)] \rangle + \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z+\zeta)^2] \right\} - \frac{1}{2\theta}, \quad (13)$$

for which the maximizer is denoted by $\vec{\alpha}^*$ if it exists.

3.2 The property of solution

Define $\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}} := \lambda_{X_{\vec{\alpha}},\theta,\zeta}$ for the sake of brevity. At first, we derive the gradient condition, or namely, the first-order derivative condition necessary and sufficient for maximality. The results are collected in the following theorem, the proof of which is left to Appendix A.7.

Theorem 3.1. If the maximizer $\vec{\alpha}^*$ for (13) exists, then it fulfills the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})\zeta] + \kappa \mathbb{E}\Big[\vec{R} - r\vec{1}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big] \\ - \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big) \operatorname{Cov}\Big[\vec{R}, \zeta\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big] \\ = \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big) \operatorname{Var}\Big[\vec{R}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big]\theta\vec{\alpha}^*, \\ \frac{\kappa}{\theta} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)_+\Big], \end{cases}$$
(14)

where $\operatorname{Cov}[\cdot, \cdot|\cdot]$ denotes the conditional covariance vector under \mathbb{P} . Conversely, if (14) as a system of n+1 equations for n+1 variables admits a solution $(\vec{\alpha}^*, \lambda_{\vec{\sigma}^*})$, then $\vec{\alpha}^*$ realizes the maximum in (13).

Remark 3.2. For $\hat{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{\theta\}$, $\hat{\theta}\vec{\alpha}^{**} = \theta\vec{\alpha}^*$ and $\hat{\theta}\hat{\lambda} = \theta\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + (\hat{\theta} - \theta)r$ lead to $\hat{\theta}X_{\vec{\alpha}^{**}} = \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + (\hat{\theta} - \theta)r$ and $\theta(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^*}) = \hat{\theta}(\hat{\lambda} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^{**}})$. This implies that $(\vec{\alpha}^*, \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*})$ solves (14), if and only if $(\vec{\alpha}^{**}, \hat{\lambda})$ solves (14) with all θ therein replaced by $\hat{\theta}$. In view of the arbitrariness of $\hat{\theta}$ and the identity $\hat{\theta}\vec{\alpha}^{**} = \theta\vec{\alpha}^*$, one can find that $\theta\vec{\alpha}^*$ is indeed independent of θ .

Combine (13) with Theorem 2.10, we conclude that the pair $(\vec{\alpha}^*, (\theta/\kappa)(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - \zeta/\theta)_+)$, if exists, solves the linear-quadratic max-min problem represented by

$$\max_{\vec{\alpha}\in\mathbb{R}^n}\min_{Z\in\mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}),\mathbb{E}[Z]=1}\Big\{\langle\theta\vec{\alpha},\mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})(\kappa Z+\zeta)]\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z+\zeta)^2]-\frac{1}{2}\Big\}.$$
(15)

In particular, taking $\vec{\alpha} = 0$ provides the lower bound of (15) as the following:

$$\min_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Z] = 1} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z + \zeta)^2] - \frac{1}{2} \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \min_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Z] = 1} \operatorname{Var}[\kappa Z + \zeta] = 0.$$

Consequently, taking $\vec{\alpha} = \vec{\alpha}^*$ and $Z = (1 - \zeta)/\kappa$ yields $\langle \vec{\alpha}^*, \mathbb{E}[\vec{R}] - r\vec{1} \rangle \geq 0$. Furthermore, for the minimization problem corresponding to the maximizer $\vec{\alpha}^*$, the minimizer

$$Z_* := \frac{\theta}{\kappa} \Big(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \Big)_+ \in \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Z] = 1} \Big\{ \mathbb{E}[\langle \theta \vec{\alpha}^*, \vec{R} \rangle Z] + \frac{\kappa}{2} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(Z + \frac{\zeta}{\kappa} \Big)^2 \Big] \Big\}.$$

For this constrained minimization problem, we can define the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_1 : \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{L}_1(Z,\beta,\mu) := \frac{\kappa}{2} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(Z + \frac{\zeta}{\kappa}\Big)^2\Big] + \mathbb{E}[\langle\theta\vec{\alpha}^*,\vec{R}\rangle Z] - \mathbb{E}[\beta Z] + \mu(\mathbb{E}[Z] - 1),$$

which leads to the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) condition

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \kappa Z_* + \zeta + \langle \theta \vec{\alpha}^*, \vec{R} \rangle - \beta + \mu, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.; \\ \mathbb{E}[Z_*] = 1; \\ \beta \ge 0, \ Z_* \ge 0, \ \beta Z_* = 0, \ \mathbb{P} - a.s. \end{cases}$$
(16)

Then, the following proposition, the proof of which is left to Appendix A.8, provides the expressions for $\vec{\alpha}^*$ in terms of the Lagrange multiplier β and the MV optimal portfolio $\vec{\alpha}^*_{mv}(1)$ given by (12).

Proposition 3.3. Assume that $\vec{\alpha}^*$ realizes the maximum in (13), and $(Z_*, \beta, \mu) \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{R}$ solves the KKT condition (16). Then,

$$\vec{\alpha}^* = \vec{\alpha}_{mv}^* (1) + \frac{1}{\theta} (\operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}])^{-1} \operatorname{Cov}[\vec{R}, \beta],$$
(17)

$$\langle \theta \vec{\alpha}^*, \operatorname{Cov}[\vec{R}, \beta] \rangle = \operatorname{Var}[\beta] + \mathbb{E}[\beta(1-\zeta)].$$
 (18)

Furthermore, $\operatorname{Var}[\beta] = 0$, if and only if $X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$.

However, the Lagrange multiplier β is implicit, even though given the KKT condition (16). We purpose to compare $\vec{\alpha}^*$ and $\vec{\alpha}_{mv}^*(1)$ by the sign of $\vec{\alpha}^*$, like Maccheroni et al. (2009, Proposition 4.1). The results are collected in the following Proposition 3.4.

Proposition 3.4. Assume that $\zeta \leq 1$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., and there is only one risky asset, that is, $(\vec{R}, \vec{\alpha}^*, \vec{\alpha}_{mv}^*)$ reduces to $(R, \alpha^*, \alpha_{mv}^*) \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$\alpha^* = \alpha^*_{mv}(1) + \frac{\operatorname{Cov}[R,\beta]}{\theta \operatorname{Var}[R]}, \quad \alpha^* \operatorname{Cov}[R,\beta] = \frac{1}{\theta} \big(\operatorname{Var}[\beta] + \mathbb{E}[\beta(1-\zeta)] \big) \ge 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{cases} \alpha^* > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{E}[R] \ge r, \ \operatorname{Cov}[R,\beta] \ge 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha^* \ge \alpha^*_{mv}(1) \ge 0; \\ \alpha^* < 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{E}[R] \le r, \ \operatorname{Cov}[R,\beta] \le 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha^* \le \alpha^*_{mv}(1) \le 0; \\ \alpha^* = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad X_{\alpha^*} \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \operatorname{Var}[\beta] = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \operatorname{Cov}[R,\beta] = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha^* = \alpha^*_{mv}(1). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $\mathbb{P}(X_{\alpha^*} + \zeta/\theta > \lambda_{\alpha^*}) > 0$, or namely, $X_{\alpha^*} \notin \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, then

$$\begin{cases} \alpha^* > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \operatorname{Cov}[R,\beta] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha^* > \alpha_{mv}^*(1); \\ \alpha^* < 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \operatorname{Cov}[R,\beta] < 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha^* < \alpha_{mv}^*(1). \end{cases}$$

Given Proposition 3.3 with (12) and $\alpha^*(\mathbb{E}[\vec{R}] - r\vec{1}) \ge 0$, the proof of Proposition 3.4 is straightforward, so we omit it. Notably, for MMV preference, i.e. $\zeta = 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., our condition to arrive at the abovementioned results is weaker than Maccheroni et al. (2009, Proposition 4.1) that requires the finiteness of Ω .

To end this section, we provide some discussions on the existence of solution $(\vec{\alpha}^*, Z_*)$ for (15). Let us proceed with the following theorem, the proof of which is left to Appendix A.9.

Theorem 3.5. $(\vec{\alpha}^*, Z_*)$ solves the max-min problem given by (15), if and only if $(\vec{\alpha}^*, Z_*)$ is the saddle point for (15). Furthermore, if Z_* (uniquely) solves the minimization problem:

minimizing
$$\mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z + \zeta)^2]$$
 subject to $Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \ \mathbb{E}[Z] = 1, \ \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})(\kappa Z + \zeta)] = \vec{0},$ (19)

then $\kappa Z_* = (\theta \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}} - \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} - \zeta)_+$ for some $\vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the maximization problem given by (13) admits the solution

$$\vec{\alpha}^* = \frac{1}{\theta} (\operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}|Z_* > 0])^{-1} \bigg(\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(Z_* > 0)} \big(\mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})\zeta] + \kappa \mathbb{E}[\vec{R} - r\vec{1}|Z_* > 0] \big) - \operatorname{Cov}[\vec{R}, \zeta|Z_* > 0] \bigg).$$

From the proof of Theorem 3.5, we conclude that $\vec{\alpha}^*$ realizes the maximum in (13), only if

$$Y_* := \zeta + \theta \left(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right)_+ = \kappa Z_* + \zeta \in \underset{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}), \ \mathbb{E}[Y] = 1, \ \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})Y] = \vec{0}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \mathbb{E}[Y^2].$$
(20)

Conversely, if one can find $Y_* \in \mathbb{Y} := \{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Y] = 1, \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})Y] = \vec{0}\}$ to minimize $\mathbb{E}[Y^2]$, then applying the second assertion of Theorem 3.5 to $Z_* = (Y_* - \zeta)/\kappa$ gives the maximizer for (13). By

Lagrange multiplier method, it is easy to arrive at

$$1 - \langle \vec{R} - \mathbb{E}[\vec{R}], (\operatorname{Var}[R])^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\vec{R} - r\vec{1}] \rangle \in \underset{Y \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}), \ \mathbb{E}[Y] = 1, \ \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})Y] = \vec{0}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \mathbb{E}[Y^{2}],$$

which is the desired Y_* if and only if it statewise dominates over ζ , \mathbb{P} -a.s.

Let us treat Y as a Radon-Nikodým derivative of the risk-neutral measure \mathbb{Q} with respect to \mathbb{P} , as $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\vec{R}] = r\vec{1}$. According to the first fundamental theorem of asset pricing (or namely, Dalang-Morton-Willinger theorem, see Delbaen and Schachermayer (2006, Theorem 6.5.1)), the no-arbitrage condition ensures that $\mathbb{Y}_0 := \{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Y] = 1, \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})Y] = \vec{0}\}$ is not empty. However, if $\mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}) \cap \mathbb{Y}_0 = \emptyset$, e.g., the complete market where the unique risk-neutral measure \mathbb{Q} (see Shreve (2004, Theorem 5.4.9) for the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing) satisfies $\mathbb{P}(d\mathbb{Q}/d\mathbb{P} < \zeta) > 0$, then $\mathbb{Y} = \emptyset$, and hence the maximization problem given by (13) has no solution.

Suppose that $\mathbb{Y} \neq \emptyset$. If \mathcal{F} is generated by a finite partition of Ω , including the case with finite Ω , one can find Y_* by solving such a typical constrained problem:

minimizing
$$\sum_i y_i^2 p_i$$
 subject to $y_i \ge \zeta_i$, $\sum_i y_i p_i = 1$, $\sum_{\vec{h},i} (\vec{h} - r\vec{1}) y_i p_{\vec{h},i} = \vec{0}$.

The existence of minimizer is a straightforward result of Weierstrass Theorem. Interested readers can refer to Appendix C for the case that \mathcal{F} is generated by a countably infinite partition of Ω . There provides some sufficient conditions for reducing the infinite-dimensional problem to a finite-dimensional problem. In general, observing that the minimization problem given by (20) is defined on a (weakly) closed convex subset of reflexive Hilbert space $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$, and thus $\mathbb{Y} \cap \{Y : \mathbb{E}[Y^2] \leq t\}$ for some t is weakly compact (according to Kakutani's Theorem), we can refer to the infinite-dimensional version of the Weierstrass Theorems, e.g., Bobylev, Emel'yanov, and Korovin (1999, Theorems 2.3.4 and 2.3.5, p. 56), to conclude the existence of solution.

4 Continuous-time dynamic portfolio management

4.1 Model and problem formulation

In this section, we study the portfolio selection problem in a continuous-time stochastic control framework with a preassigned finite time-horizon T and the SMMV preference $V_{\theta,\zeta}$. Let us proceed with the complete filtered probability basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathbb{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0,T]}$ is the right-continuous, completed natural filtration generated by a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion $\{W_t\}_{t \in [0,T]}$. Without any loss of generality, we assume that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_T = \mathcal{F}$. For $t \in [0,T)$, denote by $\mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ the set of all \mathbb{F} -adapted processes $f : [t,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int_t^T \|f(s,\cdot)\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} ds < \infty$. For the sake of brevity, hereafter we omit the statement of sample path ω and " \mathbb{P} -a.s." unless otherwise mentioned, and write $f_t = f(t,\omega), f(t,x) = f(t,\omega,x)$ and $f(t,x,z) = f(t,\omega,x,z)$.

We consider the conventional Black-Scholes market as in Yong and Zhou (1999, Section 6.8) (see also Zhou and Li (2000)) and Shreve (2004, Section 4.5.1), which includes a risk-free asset (e.g. bond) and a risky asset (e.g. stock). For epoch t, let r_t denote the instantaneous yield rate of the risk-free asset, and (σ_t, ϑ_t) respectively denote the volatility rate and the market price of risk for the risky asset. In other words, the price processes of the two assets satisfy

$$\begin{cases} dB_t = B_t r_t dt, & B_0 > 0 \quad (\text{for the risk-free asset}), \\ dS_t = S_t (r_t + \sigma_t \vartheta_t) dt + S_t \sigma_t dW_t, & S_0 > 0 \quad (\text{for the risky asset}). \end{cases}$$

Assume that $\{(r_t, \sigma_t, \vartheta_t)\}_{t \in [0,T]}$ is $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ -valued, continuous and deterministic. The market is complete and has the unique risk-neutral probability measurable $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ given by the Radon-Nikodým derivative

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}{d\mathbb{P}}\Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \Lambda_t := e^{-\int_0^T \vartheta_v dW_v - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}.$$

Moreover, $\{W_t + \int_0^t \vartheta_s ds\}_{t \in [0,T]}$ is a standard Brownian motion under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ with respect to \mathbb{F} .

In terms of SMMV portfolio selection problem, it is supposed to maximize $V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T)$ by choosing an appropriate dynamic portfolio strategy $\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$, subject to the following stochastic differential equation (SDE) for the wealth process $\{X_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$:

$$dX_{t} = (X_{t} - \pi_{t})\frac{dB_{t}}{B_{t}} + \pi_{t}\frac{dS_{t}}{S_{t}} = X_{t}r_{t}dt + \pi_{t}\sigma_{t}(dW_{t} + \vartheta_{t}dt), \quad X_{0} = x_{0}.$$
(21)

Here π_t is the instantaneous amount of wealth invested in the risky asset. Next, we show that the SMMV and MV portfolio selection problems have the same solution if $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) = 1$.

4.2 An innovative approach for SMMV problem with $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) = 1$

At first, we revisit the continuous-time MV portfolio selection problem:

maximizing
$$\mathbb{E}[X_T] - \frac{\theta}{2} \operatorname{Var}[X_T]$$
, subject to (X, π) satisfies (21), $\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$. (22)

Rather than applying the embedding method (pioneered by D. Li and Ng (2000), see also Yong and Zhou (1999, Theorem 6.8.2) and Zhou and Li (2000, Theorem 3.1)) or Lagrange multiplier method, we begin with the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_T] - \frac{\theta}{2} \operatorname{Var}[X_T] \right\} &= \max_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_T] - \frac{\theta}{2} \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[(X_T - c)^2] \right\} \\ &= \max_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} \max_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}\left[c + \frac{1}{2\theta} - \frac{\theta}{2} \left(X_T - c - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\theta} + \max_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ c - \min_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\theta}{2} \left(X_T - c - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2\right] \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that c^* realizes the maximum in the last line, then $c^* = \mathbb{E}[X_T^{c^*}]$ with X^c corresponding to the minimizer π^c that minimizes $\mathbb{E}[(X_T - c - 1/\theta)^2]$. Hence, we turn to solve the following problem:

minimizing
$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\theta}{2}\left(X_T - c - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)^2\right]$$
, subject to (X, π) satisfies (21), $\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$. (23)

By dynamic programming principle, this auxiliary minimization problem is reduced to solving the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation

$$0 = \min_{\pi \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \mathcal{V}_t(t, x) + \mathcal{V}_x(t, x)(r_t x + \pi \sigma_t \vartheta_t) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}_{xx}(t, x)(\pi \sigma_t)^2 \right\},\tag{24}$$

subject to the terminal condition

$$\mathcal{V}(T,x) = \frac{\theta}{2} \left(x - c - \frac{1}{\theta} \right)^2.$$
(25)

By verification theorem (cf. Yong and Zhou (1999, Theorem 5.3.1)), we conclude that the classical solution \mathcal{V}^c of (24) with (25) gives

$$\mathcal{V}^{c}(t, X_{t}) = \operatorname*{ess \, inf}_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(t, T; \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))} \mathbb{E}\bigg[\frac{\theta}{2}\Big(X_{T} - c - \frac{1}{\theta}\Big)^{2}\bigg|\mathcal{F}_{t}\bigg],$$

while $\pi_t^c = -(\vartheta_t/\sigma_t)\mathcal{V}_x^c(t, X_t^c)/\mathcal{V}_{xx}^c(t, X_t^c)$ gives the optimal portfolio strategy for (23). We list the main results in the following lemma, the proof of which is left to Appendix A.10.

Lemma 4.1. For the auxiliary minimization problem (23), the minimizer π^c is given by

$$\pi_t^c = -\frac{\vartheta_t}{\sigma_t} \Big(X_t^c e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} - c - \frac{1}{\theta} \Big) e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv}.$$
(26)

Furthermore, for the primal MV problem (22), the maximizer is given by (26) with

$$c^* = x_0 e^{\int_0^T r_v dv} + \frac{1}{\theta} \Big(e^{\int_0^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} - 1 \Big).$$
(27)

Write $X_T^* := X_T^{c^*}$, as the terminal wealth corresponding to the optimal MV portfolio strategy. Sending t to zero in (63) and (64), with applying (27) for rearrangement, yields

$$X_T^* - \mathbb{E}[X_T^*] - \frac{1}{\theta} = \frac{\Lambda_T}{\theta} \mathcal{V}_x^c(0, x_0) e^{-\int_0^T r_v dv} = -\frac{\Lambda_T}{\theta}.$$

Comparing this result with the first assertion of Lemma 2.8, we immediately arrive at the following proposition. The proof is straightforward, so we omit it.

Proposition 4.2. $X_T^* \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) = 1$.

Then, we show that the SMMV and MV portfolio problems has the same solution if $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) = 1$, and isolate the results in the following theorem, the proof of which is left to Appendix A.11.

Theorem 4.3. Assume that $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) = 1$. Then, π^{c^*} given by (26) and (27) maximizes $V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T)$ over all $\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$, and the maximum $V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T^*) = U_{\theta}(X_T^*)$.

However, $V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T^*)$ has much more complicate expressions unless $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) = 1$, according to Lemma 2.8, Theorem 2.10 and Proposition 4.2. As a consequence, we cannot easily compare $V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T)$ with $V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T^*)$. In the next subsections, we will show that there does not exist regular solution in this case, and solve a sequence of approximate differential game problems by stochastic control.

4.3 Problem reduction for $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) < 1$

In the sequel, we consider the situation with $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) < 1$, unless otherwise mentioned. According to Remark 2.7, we are supposed to find the maximum point π^* for

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} \inf_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}),\mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_T\zeta] + \kappa \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(X_T + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)Z\Big] + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[Z^2] \right\},\tag{28}$$

subject to (21). In general, we have the inequality chain for the above max-min problem:

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))} \inf_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}),\mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_{T}\zeta] + \kappa \mathbb{E}\left[\left(X_{T} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)Z\right] + \frac{\kappa^{2}}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[Z^{2}] \right\}$$

$$\leq \sup_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))} \inf_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{+}(\mathbb{P}),\mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_{T}\zeta] + \kappa \mathbb{E}\left[\left(X_{T} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)Z\right] + \frac{\kappa^{2}}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[Z^{2}]\right\}$$

$$\leq \sup_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_{T}\zeta] + \kappa \mathbb{E}\left[\left(X_{T} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\Lambda_{T}\right] + \frac{\kappa^{2}}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[|\Lambda_{T}|^{2}]\right\}$$

$$= \sup_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))} \mathbb{E}[X_{T}\zeta] + \kappa \left(x_{0}e^{\int_{0}^{T}r_{v}dv} + \frac{1}{\theta}\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta]\right) + \frac{\kappa^{2}}{2\theta}e^{\int_{0}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv},$$

of which the last line is boundless unless ζ is propositional to Λ_T .

Inspired by Trybuła and Zawisza (2019) and B. H. Li and Guo (2021), we denote by $(X^{t,x,\pi}, Z^{t,z,\gamma})$ the \mathbb{F} -adapted solution of the following controlled SDEs corresponding to the control pair (π, γ) :

$$\begin{cases} dX_s = X_s r_s ds + \pi_s \sigma_s (dW_s + \vartheta_s ds), \\ dZ_s = \gamma_s dW_s, \\ (X_t, Z_t) = (x, z), \end{cases}$$
(29)

to formulate all the abovementioned max-min problems in the framework of stochastic control. Obviously, $Z^{t,z,\gamma}$ is a square-integrable (\mathbb{F},\mathbb{P}) -martingale if and only if $\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$. Corresponding to the initial condition $(X_t, Z_t) = (x, z)$, we denote by $\Pi^{t,x}$ the set of all the admissible $\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{s \in [t,T]} |X_s^{t,x,\pi}|^2] < \infty$, and by $\Gamma^{t,z}$ the set of all the admissible $\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ such that $Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbb{P})$. In addition, we introduce the objective function

$$J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) := \mathbb{E}\bigg[X_T^{t,x,\pi}\zeta + \kappa \Big(X_T^{t,x,\pi} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta}|Z_T^{t,z,\gamma}|^2\Big|\mathcal{F}_t\bigg]$$
(30)

with the terminal condition

$$J^{\pi,\gamma}(T,x,z) = x\zeta + \kappa \left(x + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)z + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta}z^2,$$
(31)

so that $J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) = \mathbb{E}[J^{\pi,\gamma}(T,X_T^{t,x,\pi},Z_T^{t,z,\gamma})|\mathcal{F}_t]$. Then, the max-min problem given by (28) is reduced to finding the maximizer π^* for

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi^{0,x_0}} \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{0,1}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(0,x_0,1).$$

By dynamic programming principle, we aim to find a saddle point $(\pi^*, \gamma^*) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$ for

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup\,ess\,inf}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \eta \in \Gamma^{t,z} (t, x, z), \tag{32}$$

that is, $J^{\pi,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) \leq J^{\pi^*,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) \leq J^{\pi^*,\gamma}(t,x,z)$, P-a.s., for all $(\pi,\gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$. Notably, (32) formulates a sequence of stochastic differential games indexed by (t,x,z), where one player (e.g., an investor) aims to maximize $J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z)$ with its strategy π over $\Pi^{t,x}$ and the other player (e.g., an incarnation of the market) aims to minimize $J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z)$ with its strategy γ over $\Gamma^{t,z}$ at almost every epoch t. Notably, due to the presence of ζ , $J^{\pi,\gamma}$ may be a random field rather than a deterministic function. So we take essential supremum and essential infimum for dynamic programming, and call the mapping that maps (t,x,z) to (32) the value random field (rather than the conventional name "value function") associated with (32).

Remark 4.4. In general, the following max-min inequality holds:

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup\,ess\,inf}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) \leq \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z).$$

If there exists a saddle point $(\pi^*, \gamma^*) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$, then we have the inverse inequality

$$\underset{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}}{\operatorname{ess \, snp}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) \leq \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess \, snp}} J^{\pi,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) \leq J^{\pi^*,\gamma^*}(t,x,z)$$

$$\leq \underset{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}}{\operatorname{ess \, snp}} J^{\pi^*,\gamma}(t,x,z) \leq \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess \, snp}} \underset{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}}{\operatorname{ess \, snp}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z)$$

and hence obtain the max-min equality

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup\,ess\,inf}_{\pi\in\Pi^{t,x}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) = J^{\pi^*,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{t,z}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi\in\Pi^{t,x}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z).$$

Moreover, it can be seen from the above inverse inequality that the saddle point $(\pi^*, \gamma^*) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$ is a Nash equilibrium of the stochastic differential game corresponding to (t, x, z).

4.4 Unconstrained control problem and implication for divergence

In this subsection, we investigate the following unconstrained max-min problem:

maximizing
$$\underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))}{\operatorname{ess inf}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z)$$
 subject to $\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}$, (33)

with the controlled SDEs (29). Notably, setting $(t, x, z) = (0, x_0, 1)$ results in the solution of MV problem as in Lemma 4.1, by virtue of (4) with dummy variable replacement $Y = \zeta + \kappa Z^{0,1,\gamma}$. Moreover, the value random field associated with (33) gives a lower bound for (32).

For the sake of brevity, we introduce two infinitesimal operators for $(\pi, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and \mathbb{R} -valued function f(t, x, z) twice continuously differentiable in (x, z):

$$\mathcal{D}_{1}^{\pi,\gamma} f(t,x,z) = f_{x}(t,x,z)(xr_{t} + \pi\sigma_{t}\vartheta_{t}) + \frac{1}{2}f_{xx}(t,x,z)(\pi\sigma_{t})^{2} + f_{xz}(t,x,z)\pi\sigma_{t}\gamma + \frac{1}{2}f_{zz}(t,x,z)\gamma^{2},$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{2}^{\pi,\gamma} f(t,x,z) = f_{x}(t,x,z)\pi\sigma_{t} + f_{z}(t,x,z)\gamma.$$

Since the terminal condition (31) is a random variable, we shall reduce the problem (33) to solving a BSPDE, or namely, a stochastic HJBI equation. In addition, we denote by $\mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega;C^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})))$ the set of all random fields $f:[0,T]\times\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\cdot,x,z)$ is \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable with $\int_0^T \|f(t,x,z)\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})}dt < \infty$ and p (resp. q) times continuously differentiable in x (resp. z). Let $C_{\mathbb{F}}([0,T];\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega;C^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})))$ be the set of all random fields $f \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega;C^{p,q}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})))$ such that f(t,x,z) is continuous in t. Then, referring to Fleming and Soner (2006, Sections XI.3, XI.4 and Theorem XI.5.1, pp. 377–383), we collect the results of problem reduction into the following verification theorem, the proof of which can be found in Appendix A.12.

Theorem 4.5 (verification theorem). Suppose that there exists a random field pair

$$(\mathcal{V}, \Phi) \in C_{\mathbb{F}}\Big([0, T]; \mathbb{L}^2\big(\Omega; C^{2,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})\big)\Big) \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}\Big(0, T; \mathbb{L}^2\big(\Omega; C^{2,2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}; \mathbb{R})\big)\Big)$$

fulfilling the lower Isaacs BSPDE on $[0,T) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$:

$$-d\mathcal{V}(t,x,z) = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\pi\in\mathbb{R}} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\gamma\in\mathbb{R}} \{\mathcal{D}_{1}^{\pi,\gamma}\mathcal{V}(t,x,z) + \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\pi,\gamma}\Phi(t,x,z)\}dt - \Phi(t,x,z)dW_{t}$$
(34)

with the terminal condition on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathcal{V}(T, x, z) = x(\zeta + \kappa z) + \frac{\kappa}{\theta} \zeta z + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta} z^2, \qquad (35)$$

and the integrability condition for any $(t, x, z) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $(\pi, \gamma) \in \Pi^{t, x} \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t, T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$:

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg[\sup_{s\in[t,T]} |\mathcal{V}(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma})| + \int_t^T \big(|\Phi(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma})|^2 + |\mathcal{D}_2^{\pi_s,\gamma_s}\mathcal{V}(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma})|^2\big)ds\bigg] < \infty.$$
(36)

If there exists a Markovian control pair $(\pi^*, \gamma^*) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t, T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\pi_{s},\gamma_{s}^{*}}\mathcal{V}(s,X_{s}^{t,x,\pi},Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma^{*}}) + \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\pi_{s},\gamma_{s}^{*}}\Phi(s,X_{s}^{t,x,\pi},Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma^{*}}) \leq \mathbb{H}^{\mathcal{V},\Phi}(s,X_{s}^{t,x,\pi},Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma^{*}}), \\ \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\pi_{s}^{*},\gamma_{s}}\mathcal{V}(s,X_{s}^{t,x,\pi^{*}},Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma}) + \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\pi_{s}^{*},\gamma_{s}}\Phi(s,X_{s}^{t,x,\pi^{*}},Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma}) \geq \mathbb{H}^{\mathcal{V},\Phi}(s,X_{s}^{t,x,\pi^{*}},Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma}) \end{cases}$$
(37)

for any $(\pi, \gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ and

$$\mathbb{H}^{\mathcal{V},\Phi}(t,x,z) := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \mathbb{R}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \{\mathcal{D}_1^{\pi,\gamma} \mathcal{V}(t,x,z) + \mathcal{D}_2^{\pi,\gamma} \Phi(t,x,z)\},$$

then, $J^{\pi,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) \leq \mathcal{V}(t,x,z) \leq J^{\pi^*,\gamma}(t,x,z)$, and hence

$$\mathcal{V}(t,x,z) = J^{\pi^*,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z).$$

Remark 4.6. If $\mathcal{V}_{xx} < 0$ and $\mathcal{V}_{zz} > 0$, then

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{H}^{\mathcal{V},\Phi}(t,x,z) &= \mathcal{V}_x x r_t - \frac{1}{2} \binom{\mathcal{V}_x \vartheta_t + \Phi_x}{\Phi_z}^\top \binom{\mathcal{V}_{xx} & \mathcal{V}_{xz}}{\mathcal{V}_{xz} & \mathcal{V}_{zz}}^{-1} \binom{\mathcal{V}_x \vartheta_t + \Phi_x}{\Phi_z} \\ &= \operatorname*{essinf}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \mathcal{D}_1^{\pi,\gamma} \mathcal{V}(t,x,z) + \mathcal{D}_2^{\pi,\gamma} \Phi(t,x,z) \} \end{split}$$

with a slight abuse of notation, which implies that Isaacs minimax condition holds and (34) is both the upper and lower Isaacs BSPDE. However, we cannot assume that $\mathcal{V}_{xx} < 0$ or the interchange of order of maximization for π and minimization for γ holds, since the terminal condition (35) is affine in x. Instead, we assume that $\mathcal{V}_{xx} = 0$, $\mathcal{V}_{xz} \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{V}_{zz} > 0$, which can be verified later by the explicit expression of \mathcal{V} . It follows that

$$\mathbb{H}^{\mathcal{V},\Phi}(t,x,z) = \mathcal{V}_x x r_t + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ (\mathcal{V}_x \vartheta_t + \Phi_x) \pi \sigma_t - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\mathcal{V}_{xz} \pi \sigma_t + \Phi_z)^2}{\mathcal{V}_{zz}} \right\}$$
$$= \mathcal{V}_x x r_t + \frac{\mathcal{V}_{zz} (\mathcal{V}_x \vartheta_t + \Phi_x)^2 - 2\mathcal{V}_{xz} (\mathcal{V}_x \vartheta_t + \Phi_x) \Phi_z}{2\mathcal{V}_{xz}^2}.$$

Moreover, if and only if $\mathcal{V}_{zz}(\mathcal{V}_x\vartheta_t + \Phi_x) + \mathcal{V}_{xz}\Phi_z = 0$, we have

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma\in\mathbb{R}}\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi\in\mathbb{R}}\{\mathcal{D}_{1}^{\pi,\gamma}\mathcal{V}(t,x,z)+\mathcal{D}_{2}^{\pi,\gamma}\Phi(t,x,z)\}=\mathcal{V}_{x}xr_{t}+\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_{zz}\gamma^{2}+\Phi_{z}\gamma\right\}=\mathbb{H}^{\mathcal{V},\Phi}(t,x,z).$$

Otherwise, for the upper Isaacs BSPDE, $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma\in\mathbb{R}}\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi\in\mathbb{R}}\{\mathcal{D}_1^{\pi,\gamma}\mathcal{V}(t,x,z)+\mathcal{D}_2^{\pi,\gamma}\Phi(t,x,z)\}=+\infty.$

From Theorem 4.5 and Remark 4.6, we conclude that the saddle point $(\pi^*, \gamma^*) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t, T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ has the feedback form $\pi_s^* = \hat{\pi}(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*})$ and $\gamma_s^* = \hat{\gamma}(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*})$, where the feedback random fields $\hat{\pi}, \hat{\gamma} : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the optimality condition

$$\vec{0} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{xx}(t,x,z) & \mathcal{V}_{xz}(t,x,z) \\ \mathcal{V}_{xz}(t,x,z) & \mathcal{V}_{zz}(t,x,z) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\pi}(t,x,z)\sigma_t \\ \hat{\gamma}(t,x,z) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_x(t,x,z)\vartheta_t + \Phi_x(t,x,z) \\ \Phi_z(t,x,z) \end{pmatrix},$$
(38)

or equivalently,

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\hat{\pi}(t,x,z),\hat{\gamma}(t,x,z)} \mathcal{V}_{x}(t,x,z) + \mathcal{V}_{x}(t,x,z) \vartheta_{t} + \Phi_{x}(t,x,z), \\ 0 = \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\hat{\pi}(t,x,z),\hat{\gamma}(t,x,z)} \mathcal{V}_{z}(t,x,z) + \Phi_{z}(t,x,z). \end{cases}$$
(39)

On the other hand, we suppose that the (\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}) -martingale $\{\mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\}_{t \in [0,T]}$ has the representation

$$\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}[\zeta] + \int_0^t \eta_s dW_s \tag{40}$$

Then, the solution of the unconstrained control problem can be summarized in the following theorem, the proof of which can be found in Appendix A.13.

Theorem 4.7. For the max-min problem given by (33), the saddle point (π^*, γ^*) has the feedback form

$$\begin{cases} \pi_s^* = \frac{\vartheta_s}{\theta \sigma_s} (\mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_s] + \kappa Z_s^{t, z, \gamma^*}) e^{-\int_s^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv}, \\ \gamma_s^* = -\frac{1}{\kappa} (\mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_s] \vartheta_s + \eta_s) - Z_s^{t, z, \gamma^*} \vartheta_s, \end{cases}$$
(41)

corresponding to which the value random field

$$\mathcal{V}(t,x,z) = x(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z)e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \frac{1}{2\theta}(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z)^2 e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} - \frac{1}{2\theta}\mathbb{E}[\zeta^2|\mathcal{F}_t].$$
(42)

Moreover, Z^{t,z,γ^*} with z > 0 has a positive probability under \mathbb{P} of downwards crossing the threshold Z = 0.

Remark 4.8. Sending (t, x, z) to $(0, x_0, 1)$, and noting that $\mathbb{E}[\zeta] + \kappa = 1$, we obtain the following openloop representation of the solution of MV portfolio problem (22):

$$\pi^*_t = \frac{\Lambda_t \vartheta_t}{\theta \sigma_t} e^{-\int_t^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv}$$

which can be re-expressed by the following SDE:

$$d\frac{\pi_t^*\sigma_t}{\vartheta_t} = \frac{\pi_t^*\sigma_t}{\vartheta_t} \big((r_t - |\vartheta_t|^2) dt - \vartheta_t dW_t \big), \quad \frac{\pi_0^*\sigma_0}{\vartheta_0} = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{-\int_0^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv}$$

In comparison, from (26) and (27) we have the same results as the following:

$$d\frac{\pi_{t}^{c}\sigma_{t}}{\vartheta_{t}} = \frac{\pi_{t}^{c}\sigma_{t}}{\vartheta_{t}}r_{t}dt - e^{-\int_{t}^{T}r_{v}dv}d\left(X_{t}^{c}e^{\int_{t}^{T}r_{v}dv}\right) = \frac{\pi_{t}^{c}\sigma_{t}}{\vartheta_{t}}\left((r_{t} - |\vartheta_{t}|^{2})dt - \vartheta_{t}dW_{t}\right),$$
$$\frac{\pi_{0}^{c^{*}}\sigma_{0}}{\vartheta_{0}} = -\left(x_{0}e^{\int_{0}^{T}r_{v}dv} - c^{*} - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)e^{-\int_{0}^{T}r_{v}dv} = \frac{1}{\theta}e^{-\int_{0}^{T}(r_{v} - |\vartheta_{v}|^{2})dv}.$$

Furthermore, by $\kappa Z_t^{0,1,\gamma^*} = \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T - \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, we conclude that $\mathbb{P}(Z_t^{0,1,\gamma^*} \ge 0) = 1$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \le \Lambda_T) = 1$.

In particular, if $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) = 1$, then $Z^{0,1,\gamma^*}$ almost surely vanishes after hitting the level Z = 0, since

 $\{\kappa Z_t^{0,1,\gamma^*} = \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T - \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\}_{t \in [0,T]} \text{ is a non-negative continuous } (\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})\text{-martingale. Thus, } \zeta = \Lambda_T \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e.}$ on $\{Z_t^{0,1,\gamma^*} = 0, \exists t \in [0,T]\}$. Consequently, for (30),

$$1_{\{Z_t^{0,1,\gamma^*}=0\}}J^{\pi,\gamma^*}(t,x,0) = 1_{\{Z_t^{0,1,\gamma^*}=0\}}\mathbb{E}[X_T^{t,x,\pi}\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t] = 1_{\{Z_t^{0,1,\gamma^*}=0\}}x\Lambda_t e^{\int_t^T r_v dv}$$

is indeed independent of the control π .

When $\mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq \Lambda_T) < 1$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}$ are considered, Z = 0 is also the absorbing state for $Z^{t,z,\gamma}$ as it is a non-negative continuous (\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}) -martingale; however, $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T - \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] = 0$ cannot provide $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T - \zeta | \mathcal{F}_s] = 0$ for $s \in (t,T]$. It follows from (29) and (40) with applying Itô's rule to $\exp(-\int_t^s r_v dv) X_s^{t,x,\pi} \mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_s]$ that

$$\begin{split} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,0) &= e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} \mathbb{E}\Big[e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} X_T^{t,x,\pi} \zeta |\mathcal{F}_t \Big] \\ &= x \mathbb{E}[\zeta |\mathcal{F}_t] e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_t^T e^{\int_s^T r_v dv} \pi_s \sigma_s(\eta_s + \vartheta_s \mathbb{E}[\zeta |\mathcal{F}_s]) ds \bigg| \mathcal{F}_t \bigg]. \end{split}$$

Let $\tau := \inf\{s : Z_s^{t,z,\gamma} = 0\}$ with $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. Obviously, given that $\{\tau < T\}$ is not a \mathbb{P} -null set, $1_{\{\tau < T\}}J^{\pi,\gamma}(\tau,x,0)$ is indeed independent of π , if and only if $\eta_s + \vartheta_s \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s] = 0$ for a.e. $s \in [\tau,T]$ and \mathbb{P} -a.e. on $\{\tau < T\}$, which leads to

$$1_{\{\tau < T\}}\zeta = 1_{\{\tau < T\}} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{\tau}]}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_{\tau}]} \Lambda_T, \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s.$$

$$\tag{43}$$

Let (π^{**}, γ^{**}) be the solution (that might not be a saddle point) for

$$\begin{cases} \text{maximizing} & \text{ess inf } J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) & \text{subject to} & \pi \in \Pi^{t,x}; \\ & & \gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z} \\ \text{minimizing} & J^{\pi^{**},\gamma}(t,x,z) & \text{subject to} & \gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}, \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

and hereafter τ be the corresponding first time of $Z^{t,z,\gamma^{**}}$ hitting zero with a slight abuse of notation. The following lemma, the proof of which is left to Appendix A.14, implies that for the initial pair (t,z) = (0,1) of major concern in this study, ess $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} J^{\pi,\gamma^{**}}(\tau,x,0)$ tends to infinity on some set of positive probability measure.

Lemma 4.9. Let (t, z) = (0, 1). Then, $\mathbb{P}(\tau < T) > 0$, and $\tau < T$ does not necessarily provide a π -independent $J^{\pi, \gamma^{**}}(\tau, x, 0)$.

In general, for any $(t, z) \in [0, T) \in [0, +\infty)$, from (43) and (65) we have

$$\tau = \inf \left\{ s \in [t,T] : \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t]} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_s] \right\},$$

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < s\}} \mathbb{E}\left[\zeta - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t]} \Lambda_T \Big| \mathcal{F}_s\right] = \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < s\}} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_s]}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_\tau]} \left(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_\tau] - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t]} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_\tau]\right) = 0.$$

with the initial value

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\zeta - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t]} \Lambda_T \Big| \mathcal{F}_t\Big] = -\kappa z \le 0.$$

In the same manner as in Appendix A.14, we conclude that $\zeta \leq \Lambda_T(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z)/\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t]$, P-a.s. As a consequence, the steps for proof by contradiction in Appendix A.14 cannot be straightforwardly applied to the case with an arbitrarily fixed initial pair (t, z).

4.5 Approximate problems with HJBI equations

In the previous subsection, we have shown that corresponding to the saddle point for the dynamic programming problem (32), $Z^{t,z,\gamma}$ has a positive probability of hitting the absorbing state Z = 0, and may generate an improper boundary condition $|\mathcal{V}(t,x,0)| = +\infty$ somewhere in Ω . To tackle this issue, we turn to address the following approximate problems indexed by $(t,x,z,\rho,c) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R} \times [0,+\infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$:

maximizing
$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{t,z}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \text{ subject to } \pi\in\Pi^{t,x}.$$
 (44)

Obviously, the above objective function to be maximized approaches that for (32) as ρ tends to zero, and the value random field associated with (44) gives a lower bound for (32). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ess\,sup\,ess\,sup}_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\} \\ &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\} \\ &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - \mathbb{E}[X_T^{t,x,\pi} | \mathcal{F}_t])^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be regarded as a portfolio problem with a mixed SMMV-MV objective function.

Remark 4.10. In the perspective of penalty function method, the additional quadratic term is employed to avoid the investment amount tending to infinity and leading to an extreme terminal wealth, especially after $Z^{t,z,\gamma}$ hits the threshold Z = 0. The flexible constant c therein may mitigate the penalty for positive deviation. Intuitively and roughly speaking, after taking a sufficiently large c such that $\mathbb{P}(X_T^{t,x,\pi} > c)$ becomes sufficiently small, we can treat $-\mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t]$ as a quadratic penalty function for the negative part $(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)_{-}$.

For the sake of brevity, we omit the statement of the preassigned pair (ρ, c) in the notation of random fields. As an analog to Theorems 4.5 and 4.7, we isolate the results for (44) with $\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}$ being replaced by $\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ in the following theorem, and leave its proof to Appendix A.15. Notably, unless otherwise mentioned, hereafter we omit the statement of the integrability condition like (36), as it is automatically satisfied for the given quadratic value random field.

Theorem 4.11. For the (value) random field

$$\mathcal{V}^{\dagger}(t,x,z) = x(\kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}])e^{\int_{t}^{T}r_{v}dv} + \frac{1}{2\theta}(\kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}])^{2}e^{\int_{t}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv} - \frac{1}{2\theta}\mathbb{E}[\zeta^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}] - \frac{\rho}{2}e^{-\int_{t}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv}\left(c - xe^{\int_{t}^{T}r_{v}dv}\right)^{2} - \frac{\rho}{2}\frac{1 - e^{-\int_{t}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv}}{1 + \frac{\rho}{\theta}e^{\int_{t}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv}}\left(c - xe^{\int_{t}^{T}r_{v}dv} - \frac{1}{\theta}(\kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}])e^{\int_{t}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv}\right)^{2},$$
(45)

there exists a random field $\Phi^{\dagger} \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\Omega;C^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})))$ such that $(\mathcal{V}^{\dagger},\Phi^{\dagger})$ fulfills (34) on $[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$ with the following terminal condition on $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathcal{V}^{\dagger}(T,x,z) = x(\zeta + \kappa z) + \frac{\kappa}{\theta}\zeta z + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta}z^2 - \frac{\rho}{2}(x-c)^2.$$
(46)

Moreover, the saddle point $(\pi^{\dagger}, \gamma^{\dagger}) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(t, T; \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))$ given by

$$\begin{cases} \pi_{s}^{\dagger} = \frac{\vartheta_{s}e^{-\int_{s}^{T}(r_{v}-|\vartheta_{v}|^{2})dv}}{\theta\sigma_{s}\left(1+\frac{\rho}{\theta}e^{\int_{s}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv}\right)} \left(\rho c - \rho X_{s}^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}e^{\int_{s}^{T}r_{v}dv} + \kappa Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}} + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{s}]\right), \\ \gamma_{s}^{\dagger} = -\frac{\vartheta_{s}}{\kappa\left(1+\frac{\rho}{\theta}e^{\int_{s}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv}\right)} \left(\rho c - \rho X_{s}^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}e^{\int_{s}^{T}r_{v}dv} + \kappa Z_{s}^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}} + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{s}]\right) - \frac{\eta_{s}}{\kappa}, \end{cases}$$
(47)

satisfies (37) for any $(\pi, \gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$. Therefore,

$$J^{\pi,\gamma^{\dagger}}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \le \mathcal{V}^{\dagger}(t,x,z) \le J^{\pi^{\dagger},\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t],$$

and hence

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{V}^{\dagger}(t,x,z) &= J^{\pi^{\dagger},\gamma^{\dagger}}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}-c)^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}] \\ &= \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ \operatorname*{ess\,suf}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^{2}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi}-c)^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}] \right\} \\ &= \operatorname*{ess\,suf}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^{2}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P}))} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi}-c)^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}] \right\}. \end{split}$$

Remark 4.12. Setting $c = \rho^{\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > -1/2$ and then sending ρ to zero, one can find that the triplet $(\mathcal{V}^{\dagger}, \pi^{\dagger}, \gamma^{\dagger})$ given by (45) and (47) approaches $(\mathcal{V}, \pi^*, \gamma^*)$ given by (42) and (41). If $\varepsilon = -1/2$, then $\mathcal{V}^{\dagger}(t, x, z) = \mathcal{V}(t, x, z) - 1/2$, but $(\pi^{\dagger}, \gamma^{\dagger})$ still approaches (π^*, γ^*) . Moreover, corresponding to (47), for $\mathbb{V}_s^{t,x,z} := \rho c - \rho X_s^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}} \exp(\int_s^T r_v dv) + \kappa Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}} + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s]$ we have

$$d\mathbb{V}_{s}^{t,x,z} = -\mathbb{V}_{s}^{t,x,z} \bigg(\vartheta_{s} dW_{s} + \frac{\frac{\rho}{\theta} e^{\int_{s}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} |\vartheta_{s}|^{2}}{1 + \frac{\rho}{\theta} e^{\int_{s}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}} ds \bigg), \quad i.e. \quad \mathbb{V}_{s}^{t,x,z} = \mathbb{V}_{t}^{t,x,z} \frac{\left(1 + \frac{\rho}{\theta} e^{\int_{s}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}\right) \Lambda_{s}}{\left(1 + \frac{\rho}{\theta} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}\right) \Lambda_{t}}$$

Consequently, (47) has the following open-loop representation

$$\begin{cases} \pi_s^{\dagger} = \frac{\vartheta_s e^{-\int_s^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv} \Lambda_s}{\sigma_s \left(\theta + \rho e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}\right) \Lambda_t} \left(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\right), \\ \gamma_s^{\dagger} = -\frac{\theta \vartheta_s \Lambda_s}{\kappa \left(\theta + \rho e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}\right) \Lambda_t} \left(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\right) - \frac{\eta_s}{\kappa}. \end{cases}$$

Incorporating a penalty term into the objective function does not necessarily result in $Z^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}} > 0$, but addresses the question of convergence in the situation that $Z^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}}$ hits zero. For this boundary, we isolate the results in the following lemma, and leave its proof to Appendix A.16.

Lemma 4.13. For the (value) random field

$$\mathcal{V}^{\flat}(t,x) = c\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \frac{1}{2\rho}\mathbb{E}[\zeta^2|\mathcal{F}_t] - \frac{1}{2\rho}e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]\Big)^2,\tag{48}$$

there exists a random field $\Phi^{\flat} \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^{2}(\Omega;C^{2}(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})))$ such that $(\mathcal{V}^{\flat},\Phi^{\flat})$ fulfills

$$-d\mathcal{V}^{\flat}(t,x) = \underset{\pi \in \mathbb{R}}{\mathrm{ess}} \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}^{\flat}_{xx}(t,x) |\pi\sigma_{t}|^{2} + \mathcal{V}^{\flat}_{x}(t,x) (xr_{t} + \pi\sigma_{t}\vartheta_{t}) + \Phi^{\flat}_{x}(t,x)\pi\sigma_{t} \right\} dt - \Phi^{\flat}(t,x) dW_{t}$$
(49)

on $[0,T) \times \mathbb{R}$ with the terminal condition $\mathcal{V}^{\flat}(T,x) = x\zeta - \rho(x-c)^2/2$ on \mathbb{R} . Moreover,

$$\mathcal{V}^{\flat}(t,x) = \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_T^{t,x,\pi}\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\}$$
$$= \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}} \left\{ J^{\pi,0}(t,x,0) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\}.$$

From (48) and (49), the feedback random field for optimal π in the case with $Z^{t,z,\gamma} \equiv 0$ arises; that is

$$\pi^{\flat}(s,x) = -\frac{1}{\sigma_s} \frac{\mathcal{V}_x^{\flat}(s,x)\vartheta_s + \Phi_x^{\flat}(s,x)}{\mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\flat}(s,x)} = \frac{1}{\rho\sigma_s} e^{-\int_s^T r_v dv} \bigg(\bigg(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_s^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s] \bigg) \vartheta_s + \tilde{\eta}_s \bigg),$$

where $\tilde{\eta}$ is given by the martingale representation $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta] + \int_0^t \tilde{\eta}_s (dW_s + \vartheta_s ds)$. In particular, as ρ approaches zero, $\pi^{\flat} \in \Pi^{t,x}$ remains finite a.e. on $[t,T) \times \Omega$, if and only if $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s]\vartheta_s + \tilde{\eta}_s = 0$ for a.e. $s \in [t,T)$, or namely, $\zeta = \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] \exp(-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv) \Lambda_T / \Lambda_t$, which is not necessarily true in general. Let us return to the problem (44). From now on, we can characterize its value random field and the saddle point by lower Isaacs BSPDE. The main results are summarized in the following verification theorem, which is analogous to Theorem 4.5. Its proof is also parallel to Appendix A.12, so we omit it.

Theorem 4.14 (verification theorem). Suppose that there exists a random field pair

$$(\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}, \Phi^{\ddagger}) \in C_{\mathbb{F}}\left([0, T]; \mathbb{L}^{2}\left(\Omega; C^{2, 2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{+}; \mathbb{R})\right)\right) \times \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\mathbb{F}}\left(0, T; \mathbb{L}^{2}\left(\Omega; C^{2, 2}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{+}; \mathbb{R})\right)\right)$$

fulfilling the lower Isaacs BSPDE (34) on $[0,T) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ with

- the terminal condition $\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}(T, x, z)$ given by the right-hand side of (46) on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$,
- the boundary condition $\lim_{z\downarrow 0} \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}(t,x,z) = \mathcal{V}^{\flat}(t,x)$ on $[0,T) \times \mathbb{R}$,
- and the integrability condition (36) with $(\mathcal{V}, \Phi) = (\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}, \Phi^{\ddagger})$ therein for any $(t, x, z) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty)$ and $(\pi, \gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$.

If there exists a Markovian control pair $(\pi^{\ddagger}, \gamma^{\ddagger}) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$ such that (37) with $(\mathcal{V}, \Phi, \pi^*, \gamma^*) = (\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}, \Phi^{\ddagger}, \pi^{\ddagger}, \gamma^{\ddagger})$ therein holds for any $(\pi, \gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$, then,

$$J^{\pi,\gamma^{\ddagger}}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2}\mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi} - c)^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}] \le \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}(t,x,z) \le J^{\pi^{\ddagger},\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2}\mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi^{\ddagger}} - c)^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}],$$

and hence for $(t, x, z) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}(t,x,z) &= J^{\pi^{\ddagger},\gamma^{\ddagger}}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\ddagger}} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \operatorname*{ess\,sup\,ess\,inf}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\} \\ &= \operatorname*{ess\,inf\,ess\,sup}_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\} \end{split}$$

Unfortunately, the solution for the lower Isaacs BSPDE (34) with those conditions stated in the above Theorem 4.14 is not of the quadratic form like $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}^{\dagger})$. To keep the main body of this paper focused, we leave the detailed derivation to Appendix D.1. This implies that it is difficult to derive the explicit expression of \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger} and the saddle point $(\pi^{\ddagger}, \gamma^{\ddagger})$.

4.6 Embedding and convex duality method

The previous section shows that the constraint $Z^{t,z,\gamma} \geq 0$ negates the quadratic form of the value random field \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger} . Nevertheless, Theorem 4.14 implies that $(\pi^{\ddagger}, \gamma^{\ddagger}) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}$ is a saddle point for (44) if it is a saddle point for

minimizing
$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\pi\in\Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}, \tag{50}$$

where the objective function to be minimized is quadratic in x. Let us introduce the functions

$$G(x,y) := xy + \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta\rho}x^2, \quad F_j^{\gamma}(t,x,z) := \frac{1}{\rho}e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \frac{j}{2}\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta |\mathcal{F}_t]\Big)$$

for j = 1, 2. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}} \left\{ J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\} \\ &= \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[X_T^{t,x,\pi}(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta) | \mathcal{F}_t] - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_T^{t,x,\pi} - c)^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \right\} + \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta)^2 - \zeta^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t] - F_1^{\gamma}(t,x,z) \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] - \frac{\rho}{2} e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \left(c - x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[\zeta^2 | \mathcal{F}_t], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from applying Lemma 4.13 with ζ being replaced by $\zeta + \kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma}$, the minimization problem (50) is reduced to

minimizing
$$\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c)|\mathcal{F}_t] - F_1^{\gamma}(t,x,z)\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]$$
 subject to $\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}$. (51)

Let γ^{\S} denote the solution of (51), and $\overline{\Gamma}^{t,z}(w)$ be the set of all solutions to

minimizing
$$\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c)|\mathcal{F}_t] - w\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]$$
 subject to $\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}$.

Notably, this problem is trivial for z = 0, as $\Gamma^{t,0}$ is a singleton that only contains a zero process. Hereafter we consider the case with z > 0, unless otherwise mentioned. Then, we have the following lemma as an analog to the embedding method pioneered by D. Li and Ng (2000); Zhou and Li (2000); see also Yong and Zhou (1999, Theorem 6.8.2, p. 338). Interested readers can find our proof in Appendix A.17.

Lemma 4.15. $\gamma^{\S} \in \overline{\Gamma}^{t,z}(w^{\S})$ with $w^{\S} = F_2^{\gamma^{\S}}(t, x, z)$.

Furthermore, in view that

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t] - w \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}\left[G\left(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c - w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t}\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right].$$

without any additional difficulty, we investigate the following minimization problem:

minimizing
$$\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, Y) | \mathcal{F}_t]$$
 subject to $\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}$, (52)

for an arbitrarily fixed $Y \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$. This problem can reduced to solving

$$\begin{cases} -d\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(t,z) = \operatorname*{essinf}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}_{zz}^{\sharp}(t,z) \gamma^{2} + \Phi_{z}^{\sharp}(t,z) \gamma \right\} dt - \Phi^{\sharp}(t,z) dW_{t}, \quad (t,z) \in [0,T) \in \mathbb{R}_{+}; \\ \mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(T,z) = G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y) = \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta\rho} (\kappa z + \zeta)^{2} + Y(\kappa z + \zeta), \qquad z \in [0,+\infty); \\ \mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(t,0) = \mathbb{E}[G(\zeta,Y)|\mathcal{F}_{t}] = \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta\rho} \mathbb{E}[\zeta^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}] + \mathbb{E}[Y\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}], \qquad t \in [0,T]. \end{cases}$$

In general, like the result in Appendix D.1, $\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(t, \cdot)$ cannot be a quadratic function. Interested readers can find the detailed derivation in Appendix D.2. In summary, it is still difficult to solve the stochastic HJB equation associated with (52).

Remark 4.16. The problem (52) with the feasible control set $\Gamma^{t,z}$ being replaced by $\mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ is reduced to solving

$$\begin{cases} -d\mathcal{V}^{\natural}(t,z) = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}_{zz}^{\natural}(t,z) \gamma^{2} + \Phi_{z}^{\natural}(t,z) \gamma \right\} dt - \Phi^{\natural}(t,z) dW_{t}, \quad (t,z) \in [0,T) \in \mathbb{R}; \\ \mathcal{V}^{\natural}(T,z) = G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y) = \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta\rho} (\kappa z + \zeta)^{2} + Y(\kappa z + \zeta), \qquad z \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

Denote by γ^{\natural} the solution of this problem. Referring to the method in Appendix A.10, one can obtain $d\mathcal{V}_z^{\natural}(s, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^{\natural}}) = 0$, and hence

$$\frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} (\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\natural}} + \zeta) + \kappa Y = \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathcal{V}_z^{\natural}(T, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\natural}}) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathcal{V}_z^{\natural}(t,z) = \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} (\kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]) + \kappa \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

Furthermore, when applying Lemma 4.15 to the problem (51) with $\Gamma^{t,z}$ being replaced by $\mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$, we are supposed to solve the system

$$\begin{cases} w^{\natural} = \frac{1}{\rho} e^{-\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv} + \frac{j}{2} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} [\kappa Z_{T}^{t,z,\gamma^{\natural}} + \zeta |\mathcal{F}_{t}] \Big), \\ \kappa Z_{T}^{t,z,\gamma^{\natural}} + \zeta = \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta |\mathcal{F}_{t}] + \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} (\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{F}_{t}] - Y), \\ Y = c - w^{\natural} \frac{\Lambda_{T}}{\Lambda_{t}}. \end{cases}$$

As a result,

$$w^{\natural} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta + \rho e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_{t}] \Big).$$

Interested readers can try to derive other related results and solve the abovementioned unconstrained problems completely. The results must be identical to those in Theorem 4.11. Here we only display the closed-form expression of w^{\natural} that will be involved in the following discussion.

Now we turn to adopt the convex duality method (as an modified application of Fenchel conjugate) to solve the problem (52) with $(t, z) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Applying Legendre-Fenchel transform to the convex function $g(z) = G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y)$, we introduce

$$\tilde{G}(h,Y) := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{z \ge 0} \{hz - G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y)\}, \quad h \in \mathbb{R},$$
(53)

which is convex in h. Moreover, since $\tilde{G}(h) \geq hz - G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y)$ for any $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z \geq 0$, we have

 $\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma}+\zeta,Y)|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq \mathbb{E}[hZ_T^{t,z,\gamma}-\tilde{G}(h,Y)|\mathcal{F}_t] \text{ for any } \gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z} \text{ and } h \in \mathbb{R}. \text{ Therefore,}$

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{t,z}} \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, Y)|\mathcal{F}_t] \ge \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{h\in\mathbb{R}} \{hz - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}(h,Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]\}.$$
(54)

The following theorem, the proof of which is left to Appendix A.18, provides two sufficient conditions for the equality in (54).

Lemma 4.17. Fix $(t,z) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Assume that there exists a pair $(\gamma^{\sharp}, h^{\sharp}) \in \Gamma^{t,z} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} = \frac{\theta\rho}{\theta+\rho} \left(\frac{h^{\sharp}}{\kappa} - Y - \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta\right)_+,\tag{55}$$

$$\kappa z = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{h^{\sharp}}{\kappa} - Y - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta \right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right].$$
(56)

Then, $(\gamma^{\sharp}, h^{\sharp})$ is the unique saddle point, for which (54) becomes an equality.

Remark 4.18. In Appendix A.18, we do not take advantage of the link between (55) and (56). It is obvious that (56) immediately follows from (55). Conversely, given (56), applying martingale representation theorem yields (55) as well as the unique γ^{\sharp} . Summing up, the problem (52) with $(t, z) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ is reduced to solving the algebraic equation (56). Notably, the solution h^{\sharp} always exists, because the right-hand side of (56) continuously maps $h \in \mathbb{R}$ onto \mathbb{R}_+ .

Now we return to the case with $Y = c - w\Lambda_T / \Lambda_t$ of our major concern. Moreover, applying Lemma 4.15 to derive the solution of (51) with $(t, z) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ fixed, we are supposed to solve

$$\begin{cases} \kappa z = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \mathbb{E} \Big[\left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta + w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} \right)_+ \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \Big], \\ w \rho e^{\int_t^T \left| \vartheta_v \right|^2 dv} - \rho \Big(c - x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} \Big) - \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} [\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \Big[\left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta + w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} \right)_+ \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \Big], \end{cases}$$
(57)

for the solution pair (h^{\S}, w^{\S}) . If $h^{\S}/\kappa - c \ge \zeta(\theta + \rho)/(\theta \rho) - w^{\S}\Lambda_T/\Lambda_t$, P-a.s., then (57) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c + w \right), \\ \frac{\rho}{\theta + \rho} w e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} - \left(c - x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} \right) = \frac{\theta}{\theta + \rho} \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c \right), \end{cases}$$

which admits the solution

$$w = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta + \rho e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] \Big) = w^{\natural},$$

see also Remark 4.16. This implies that in this case, following the steps in Remark 4.16 without considering the constraint $\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}$ could provide the solution of the constrained problem (51). Moreover, plugging the explicit expression of $w^{\$}$ back into $h^{\$}/\kappa - c \ge \zeta(\theta + \rho)/(\theta\rho) - w^{\$}\Lambda_T/\Lambda_t$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., yields

$$\kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] \ge \zeta - \frac{\theta\left(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]\right)}{\theta + \rho e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}} \left(\frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} - 1\right), \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s.$$
(58)

In particular, sending ρ to zero and setting (t, z) = (0, 1), (58) immediately gives $\Lambda_T \geq \zeta$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., in which case the SMMV and MV portfolio selection problems has the same solution and $\gamma \in \Gamma^{0,1}$ is not

an effective constraint. See also Section 4.2 and Remark 4.8. In other situations, we may not be able to rewrite (57) as a system of linear equations, but can still show the existence and uniqueness of its solution. We summarize the results in the following theorem, and leave the proof to Appendix A.19.

Theorem 4.19. For a fixed $(t, z) \in [0, T) \in \mathbb{R}_+$, (57) admits a unique solution (h^{\S}, w^{\S}) with

$$w^{\S} \geq \frac{1}{\rho} e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] \Big).$$

So far, we have derived the analytical solution of (50) and (51). That is, according to Lemmas 4.15 and 4.17 with the dummy variable replacement $(h, w) = (\rho h^{\S}, \rho w^{\S})$, the solution $\gamma^{\S} \in \Gamma^{t,z}$ is given by the martingale representation

$$\frac{\theta}{\kappa(\theta+\rho)} \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - \rho c - \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta}\zeta + w\frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t}\right)_+ = z + \int_t^T \gamma_s dW_s$$

where (h, w) is the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} \kappa z = \frac{\theta}{\theta + \rho} \mathbb{E} \bigg[\bigg(\frac{h}{\kappa} - \rho c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta} \zeta + w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} \bigg)_+ \bigg| \mathcal{F}_t \bigg], \\ w e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} - \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} [\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] = \frac{\theta}{\theta + \rho} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \bigg[\bigg(\frac{h}{\kappa} - \rho c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta} \zeta + w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} \bigg)_+ \bigg| \mathcal{F}_t \bigg], \end{cases}$$

due to Theorem 4.19 and (57). Notably, by sending ρ to zero, the analytical expression of the limiting triplet (γ^{\S}, h, w) arises. Furthermore, as we have mentioned for reducing (50) to (51), applying Lemma 4.13 with ζ being replaced by $\zeta + \kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\S}}$ yields a maximizer $\pi^{\S} \in \Pi^{t,x}$ with

$$\pi_s^{\S} = \frac{1}{\rho\sigma_s} e^{-\int_s^T r_v dv} \bigg(\Big(\rho c - \rho X_s^{t,x,\pi^{\S}} e^{\int_s^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} [\zeta + \kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\S}} | \mathcal{F}_s] \Big) \vartheta_s + \tilde{\eta}_s + \kappa \tilde{\eta}_s^{\S} \bigg),$$

where $\tilde{\eta}^{\S}$ arises from the martingale representation $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\S}}|\mathcal{F}_s] = z + \int_t^T \tilde{\eta}_s^{\S}(dW_s + \vartheta_s ds)$. Hence, (π^{\S}, γ^{\S}) is the saddle point for (50), as

$$\begin{split} J^{\pi,\gamma^{\$}}(t,x,z) &- \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi} - c)^{2} | \mathcal{F}_{t}] \leq \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}} \left\{ J^{\pi,\gamma^{\$}}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi} - c)^{2} | \mathcal{F}_{t}] \right\} \\ &= J^{\pi^{\$},\gamma^{\$}}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi^{\$}} - c)^{2} | \mathcal{F}_{t}] \\ &= \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}} \left\{ J^{\pi^{\$},\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi^{\$}} - c)^{2} | \mathcal{F}_{t}] \right\} \\ &\leq J^{\pi^{\$},\gamma}(t,x,z) - \frac{\rho}{2} \mathbb{E}[(X_{T}^{t,x,\pi^{\$}} - c)^{2} | \mathcal{F}_{t}], \quad \forall (\pi,\gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \Gamma^{t,z}. \end{split}$$

4.7 Semi-closed-form solution for constant $\zeta \in (0, 1)$

In the sequel, we let ζ be a constant in the interval (0, 1), so that the right-hand side of each of (57) can be re-expressed in a closed form, sometimes analogous to Black-Scholes formula. For the sake of brevity, we assume that $c \ge x \exp(\int_0^T |r_v| dv)$. So $w^{\S} > 0$ according to Theorem 4.19. Otherwise, we sometimes need to consider the case with $w^{\S} \le 0$, for which the results are parallel to the follows.

Suppose that $h^{\$}/\kappa - c - \zeta(\theta + \rho)/(\theta \rho) \ge 0$. Consequently, (57) gives

$$\begin{cases} \kappa z + \zeta = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \left(\frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa} - c + w^{\S} \right), \\ w^{\S} \rho e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} - \rho \left(c - x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv} \right) = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \left(\frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa} - c + w^{\S} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} \right), \end{cases}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{h^{\$}}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta = -\frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta + \rho e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}} \Big(c - x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv} - \frac{\kappa z}{\theta} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} + \frac{\zeta}{\rho} \Big), \\ w^{\$} = \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta + \rho e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}} \Big(c - x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv} + \frac{1}{\rho} (\kappa z + \zeta) \Big). \end{cases}$$

Notably, the right-hand side of the above first line in this situation should be non-negative, i.e.

$$\frac{\kappa z}{\theta} e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \ge c - x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \frac{\zeta}{\rho},\tag{59}$$

which holds true for some small c and large ρ . However, in the spirit of our approximate problems (44) indexed by (ρ, c) , sufficiently large c and small ρ are of our major concern.

Theorem 4.20. Assume that (ρ, c) does not satisfy (59). Then, (h^{\S}, w^{\S}) as the unique solution of (57) fulfills $h^{\S} < \kappa c + \kappa \zeta(\theta + \rho)/(\theta \rho)$ and

$$\begin{cases} \kappa z = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} w^{\S} N \left(d_{+} \left(t, w^{\S}, c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta - \frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa} \right) \right) \\ - \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \left(c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta - \frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa} \right) N \left(d_{-} \left(t, w^{\S}, c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta - \frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa} \right) \right), \\ w^{\$} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} - \left(c - x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv} + \frac{\zeta}{\rho} \right) \\ = \frac{\theta}{\theta + \rho} w^{\$} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} N \left(d_{+} \left(t, w^{\$} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}, c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta - \frac{h^{\$}}{\kappa} \right) \right) \\ - \frac{\theta}{\theta + \rho} \left(c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta - \frac{h^{\$}}{\kappa} \right) N \left(d_{-} \left(t, w^{\$} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}, c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta - \frac{h^{\$}}{\kappa} \right) \right), \end{cases}$$

where $N(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of standard normal distribution and

$$d_{\pm}(t, x, K) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}} \bigg(\ln \frac{x}{K} \pm \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv \bigg)$$

Given (57), the proof of Theorem 4.20 is straightforward and in line with deriving Black-Scholes formula. In fact, for any fixed $x, K \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(x\frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} - K\Big)_+\Big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big] &= \int_{-\infty}^{d_-(t,x,K)} \Big(xe^{-y\sqrt{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} - \frac{1}{2}\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} - K\Big)dN(y) \\ &= xN\Big(d_+(t,x,K)\Big) + KN\Big(d_-(t,x,K)\Big). \end{split}$$

Since $h^{\S} < \kappa c + \kappa \zeta(\theta + \rho)/(\theta \rho)$ has been shown by contradiction, applying the above statement to

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta + w^{\S}\frac{\Lambda_{T}}{\Lambda_{t}}\right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(w^{\S}\frac{\Lambda_{T}}{\Lambda_{t}} - \left(c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta - \frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa}\right)\right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t}\right], \\ \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[\left(\frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta + w^{\S}\frac{\Lambda_{T}}{\Lambda_{t}}\right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(w^{\S}e^{\int_{t}^{T} \left|\vartheta_{v}\right|^{2}dv}\frac{\Lambda_{T}}{\Lambda_{t}} - \left(c + \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta - \frac{h^{\S}}{\kappa}\right)\right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t}\right] \end{cases}$$

immediately yields our desired system of equations.

5 Concluding remark

We have studied the strictly monotone mean-variance preferences and the corresponding portfolio selection problems. To tackle the drawback of conventional MMV preference, we have modified the application of Fenchel conjugate and obtained a class of SMMV preferences. The properties of SMMV preferences, including monotonicity, equivalent expressions and Gâteaux differentiability are parallel to those of MMV preference. In the static portfolio selection problem with SMMV preferences, we have provided the gradient condition that is sufficient and necessary for optimality, and studied the existence and uniqueness of its solution. Moreover, we compared the solutions of static MMV problem and of static SMMV problem, and found that the sign of the optimal SMMV portfolio strategy can be determined due to the sign of the optimal MV portfolio strategy in the case with only one risky asset.

We have also investigated the dynamic portfolio selection problem with SMMV preference, and found the condition that the solutions of dynamic MMV problem and of dynamic SMMV problem are the same. When this condition is not satisfied, the optimized objective function for the SMMV problem will approach infinity once a state process hits a threshold. By employing the penalty function method, we considered some approximate problems without the abovementioned unboundedness. However, it is difficult to solve the HJBI equation associated with the dynamic SMMV problem, due to the abovementioned threshold. This difficulty does not appear in solving conventional MMV problems by dynamic programming. We have turned to take a joint adoption of embedding method and convex duality method, and have arrived at an analytical solution of those approximate problems. The solution is represented by a martingale representation, for which there are two parameters are given by a system of two algebraic equations like Black-Scholes formula.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledges financial support from National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12401611 and CTBU Research Projects under Grant 2355010.

Data availability statement

The article describes entirely theoretical research. Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Conflict of interest statement

None of the authors have a conflict of interest to disclose.

References

- Bauschke, H. H., & Combettes, P. L. (2017). Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in hilbert spaces (2nd ed.). Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-46077-0
- Bobylev, N. A., Emel'yanov, S. V., & Korovin, S. K. (1999). Geometrical methods in variational problems. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media. doi: 10.1007/978-94-011-4629-6
- Delbaen, F., & Schachermayer, W. (2006). The mathematics of arbitrage. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-31299-4
- Dybvig, P. H., & Ingersoll, J. E. (1982). Mean-variance theory in complete markets. The Journal of Business, 55(2), 233-251. doi: 10.1086/296162
- Fleming, W. H., & Soner, M. (2006). Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions (2nd ed., Vol. 25). New York: Springer. doi: 10.1007/0-387-31071-1
- Hu, Y., Shi, X. M., & Xu, Z. Q. (2023). Constrained monotone mean-variance problem with random coefficients. SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, 14(3), 838-854. doi: 10.1137/22m154418x
- Jarrow, R. A., & Madan, D. B. (1997). Is mean-variance analysis vacuous: Or was beta still born? Review of Finance, 1(1), 15-30. doi: 10.1023/A:1009779113922
- Jeanblanc, M., Yor, M., & Shesney, M. (2009). Mathematical methods for financial market. London: Springer-Verlag. doi: 10.1007/978-1-84628-737-4
- Li, B. H., & Guo, J. Y. (2021). Optimal reinsurance and investment strategies for an insurer under monotone mean-variance criterion. *Rairo-Operations Research*, 55(4), 2469-2489. doi: 10.1051/ro/ 2021114
- Li, B. H., Guo, J. Y., & Tian, L. L. (2023). Optimal investment and reinsurance policies for the cramérlundberg risk model under monotone mean-variance preference. *International Journal of Control*, 97(6), 1296-1310. doi: 10.1080/00207179.2023.2204384
- Li, D., & Ng, W. (2000). Optimal dynamic portfolio selection: Multi-period mean-variance formulation. Mathematical Finance, 10(3), 387-406. doi: 10.1111/1467-9965.00100
- Li, Y. C., Liang, Z. X., & Pang, S. Z. (2022). Continuous-time monotone mean-variance portfolio selection. arXiv:2211.12168v5. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2211.12168
- Li, Y. C., Liang, Z. X., & Pang, S. Z. (2023). Comparison between mean-variance and monotone meanvariance preferences under jump diffusion and stochastic factor model. arXiv:2211.14473v2. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2211.14473
- Maccheroni, F., Marinacci, M., & Rustichini, A. (2006). Ambiguity aversion, robustness, and the variational representation of preferences. *Econometrica*, 74(6), 1447-1498. doi: 10.1111/J.1468 -0262.2006.00716.X
- Maccheroni, F., Marinacci, M., Rustichini, A., & Taboga, M. (2009). Portfolio selection with monotone mean-variance preferences. *Mathematical Finance*, 19(3), 487-521. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9965.2009 .00376.x
- Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio selection. J. Finance, 7(1), 77-91. doi: 10.2307/2975974
- Milgrom, P., & Segal, I. (2002). Envelope theorems for arbitrary choice sets. *Econometrica*, 70(2), 583-601. doi: 10.1111/1468-0262.00296
- Phelps, G. (1993). Convex functions, monotone operators and differentiability (2nd ed.). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-46077-0

- Shen, Y., & Zou, B. (2022). Cone-constrained monotone mean-variance portfolio selection under diffusion models. arXiv:2205.15905. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2205.15905
- Shreve, S. E. (2004). Stochastic calculus for finance II: continuous-time model. New York: Springer-Verlag. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-22527-2
- Strub, M. S., & Li, D. (2020). A note on monotone mean-variance preferences for continuous processes. Operations Research Letters, 48(4), 397-400. doi: 10.1016/j.orl.2020.05.003
- Trybuła, J., & Zawisza, D. (2019). Continuous-time portfolio choice under monotone mean-variance preferences-stochastic factor case. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(3), 966-987. doi: 10 .1287/MOOR.2018.0952
- Černý, A. (2020). Semimartingale theory of monotone mean-variance portfolio allocation. *Mathematical Finance*, 30(3), 1168-1178. doi: 10.1111/mafi.12241
- Yong, J. M., & Zhou, X. Y. (1999). Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations. New York: Springer-Verlag. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-1466-3
- Zhou, X. Y., & Li, D. (2000). Continuous-time mean-variance portfolio selection: a stochastic LQ framework. Applied Mathematics and Optimization, 42(1), 19-33. doi: 10.1007/s002450010003

A Proof of lemmas, theorems and propositions

A.1 Proof of Lemma 2.8

At first, combining the properties of U_{θ} mentioned in Section 2.1, we obtain

$$\partial U_{\theta}(f) = \{1 - \theta(f - \mathbb{E}[f])\} = \underset{Y \in \mathbb{L}^{2}(\mathbb{P})}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \{\mathbb{E}[Yf] - U_{\theta}^{*}(Y)\}.$$

Given the strict concavity of U_{θ}^* , the minimizer for on the right-hand side of (7) must be unique. Consequently, if and only if the minimizer $1 - \theta(f - \mathbb{E}[f]) \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$, it also realizes the minimum on the right-hand side of (7), which is equivalent to the equality $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = U_{\theta}(f)$. This proves the first assertion. Then, as

$$\lambda - \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big) \wedge \lambda\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\lambda - f - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)_+\Big] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\Big(\lambda - f - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \ge s\Big)ds = \int_{-\infty}^\lambda \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big)ds$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the second assertion arises from

$$\frac{1-\zeta}{\theta} \ge \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \ge f \land \Big(\lambda - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big) - \mathbb{E}\Big[f \land \Big(\lambda - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)\Big], \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s., \quad \forall \lambda \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta},$$

where the first inequality is given by (8), and

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} = \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \mathbb{E}\left[\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right) \wedge \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\right] \ge \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \mathbb{E}\left[f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right].$$

The "if" part of the third assertion also follows. Next, in terms of the "only if" part, since $f + \zeta/\theta \leq \mathbb{E}[f] + 1/\theta$, P-a.s., we have

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} \ge \operatorname{ess\,sup}\left\{f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right\} - \int_{-\infty}^{\operatorname{ess\,sup}\left\{f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right\}} t d\mathbb{P}\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le t\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\operatorname{ess\,sup}\left\{f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right\}} \mathbb{P}\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds.$$

This inequality combined with (8) implies that $\operatorname{ess} \sup\{f + \zeta/\theta\} \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, which leads to $f + \zeta/\theta \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. The "only if" part of the last assertion immediately emerges. Finally, we assume that $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ and $f \wedge (\lambda - \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ for some $\lambda > \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$. It follows from the third assertion and Remark 2.9 that $\operatorname{ess} \sup\{(f + \zeta/\theta) \wedge \lambda\} \leq \lambda_{f \wedge (\lambda - \zeta/\theta), \theta, \zeta} = \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} < \lambda$. As a consequence, $\operatorname{ess} \sup\{f + \zeta/\theta\} \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, which proves the "if" part of the last assertion.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2.10

Since $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ as a point-wise infimum of some affine functions is concave and upper semi-continuous, we conclude that the Fenchel conjugate of $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ is also concave and upper semi-continuous. It follows from $V_{\theta,\zeta} \ge U_{\theta}$ that

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y) := \inf_{f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \{ \mathbb{E}[Yf] - V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \} \le \inf_{f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \{ \mathbb{E}^P[Yf] - U_{\theta}(f) \} = U_{\theta}^*(Y), \quad \forall Y \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}),$$

which implies that $V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y) = -\infty$ for $\mathbb{E}[Y] \neq 1$. For $Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$, the converse inequality $V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y) \geq U_{\theta}^*(Y)$ follows from $\mathbb{E}[Yf] - V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \geq U_{\theta}^*(Y) > -\infty$ given by (7) for any $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$. Otherwise, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(Y \leq \zeta - \varepsilon) > 0$, and then for $f = c1_{\{Y \leq \zeta - \varepsilon\}} \geq 01_{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}_{\zeta,\theta}$ with $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[(Y-\zeta)f] \le -c\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(Y \le \zeta - \varepsilon) \downarrow -\infty, & as \quad c \uparrow \infty; \\ V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) - \mathbb{E}[\zeta f] \ge V_{\theta,\zeta}(01_{\Omega}) = U_{\theta}(01_{\Omega}) = 0, \end{cases}$$

which implies that $V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y) = -\infty$. In summary, we have

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2\theta} (\mathbb{E}[Y^2] - 1), & \text{if } Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}) \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[Y] = 1; \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Applying Fenchel-Moreau theorem (cf. Bauschke and Combettes (2017, Theorem 13.37)) to $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ with its biconjugate yields

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \{\mathbb{E}[Yf] - V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y)\}, \quad \forall f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}).$$

Notably, the above result also arises from assigning $U^*_{\theta}(Y) = -\infty$ for any $Y \notin \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$ in (7); however, the Fenchel conjugation of $(V_{\theta,\zeta}, V^*_{\theta,\zeta})$ gives some additional information about superdifferential $\partial V_{\theta,\zeta}$ as follows. In fact, $Y \in \partial V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ is equivalent to the following statements

- $V_{\theta,\zeta}(g) \le V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) + \mathbb{E}[Y(g-f)]$ for any $g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$;
- $\mathbb{E}[Yf] V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \le \inf_{g \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \{\mathbb{E}[Yg] V_{\theta,\zeta}(g)\} \equiv V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y);$

•
$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \mathbb{E}[Yf] - V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y)$$

Consequently,

$$\partial V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \{ \mathbb{E}[Yf] - V_{\theta,\zeta}^*(Y) \} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}),\mathbb{E}^P[Y]=1} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[Yf] + \frac{1}{2\theta} (\mathbb{E}[Y^2] - 1) \right\}$$
(60)

is at most a singleton. If the minimizer exists, then $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ is Gâteaux differentiable according to Phelps (1993, Proposition 1.8, p. 5), and $dV_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ realizes the minimum on the right-hand side of (7), which meets the result of heuristically applying envelope theorem.

Now we solve the minimization problem for (60) by Lagrange duality method (noting that Lagrange multiplier method is also feasible). Let us proceed with the following min-max inequality:

$$\inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Y]=1} \mathbb{E}\Big[fY + \frac{1}{2\theta}Y^2\Big] = \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})} \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\Big[fY + \frac{1}{2\theta}Y^2 - \lambda Y\Big] + \lambda \right\}$$
$$\geq \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})} \mathbb{E}\Big[fY + \frac{1}{2\theta}Y^2 - \lambda Y\Big] + \lambda \right\}$$
$$= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\Big[\inf_{Y \ge \zeta} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\theta}Y^2 + (f - \lambda)Y \right\}\Big] + \lambda \right\},$$

for which the unique minimizer $Y = \zeta + \theta(\lambda - f - \zeta/\theta)_+ \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P})$ can be easily seen from

$$\inf_{Y \ge \zeta} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\theta} Y^2 + (f - \lambda)Y \right\} = \inf_{Y - \zeta \ge 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\theta} (Y - \zeta)^2 - \left(\lambda - f - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right) (Y - \zeta) \right\} + \zeta^2 - \zeta(\lambda - f).$$

Consequently,

$$\underset{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{arg\,max}} \left\{ \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta +}(\mathbb{P})} \mathbb{E} \Big[fY + \frac{1}{2\theta} Y^2 - \lambda Y \Big] + \lambda \right\}$$

$$\begin{split} &= \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \lambda (1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]) - \frac{\theta}{2} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\lambda - f - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda\}} \Big] \right\} \\ &= \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \lambda (1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]) - \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} (\lambda - s)^2 d\mathbb{P} \Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s \Big) \right\} \\ &= \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \lambda (1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]) - \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} (\lambda - s) \mathbb{P} \Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s \Big) ds \right\}. \end{split}$$

Notably, the last equality arises from

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} (\lambda-t)^2 d\mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le t\Big) = \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} d\mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le t\Big) \int_{t}^{\lambda} (\lambda-s)ds = \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} (\lambda-s)ds \int_{-\infty}^{s} d\mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le t\Big).$$

By the first-order derivative conditions $0 = 1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta] - \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} \mathbb{P}(f + \zeta/\theta \le s) ds$, of which the right-hand side is decreasing in λ and strictly decreasing on $(\text{ess}\inf\{f + \zeta/\theta\}, +\infty)$, we arrive at the unique maximizer $\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$ given by (8). Therefore, by

$$\begin{cases} \inf_{Y \in \mathbb{L}^{2}_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Y]=1} \mathbb{E}\Big[fY + \frac{1}{2\theta}Y^{2}\Big] \geq \mathbb{E}\Big[fY + \frac{1}{2\theta}Y^{2}\Big]\Big|_{Y=\zeta+\theta(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - f - \frac{\zeta}{\theta})_{+}},\\ \mathbb{E}\Big[\zeta + \theta\Big(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - f - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)_{+}\Big] = \mathbb{E}[\zeta] + \theta\Big(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big) \wedge \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big]\Big) = 1,\end{cases}$$

we conclude that $Y = \zeta + \theta(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - f - \zeta/\theta)_+$ is the unique minimizer for (60), and hence $dV_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \zeta + \theta(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - f - \zeta/\theta)_+$. Furthermore, one can obtain

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \lambda (1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]) - \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda} (\lambda - s) \mathbb{P}\left(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\right) ds \right\} + \mathbb{E}[f\zeta] + \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}[\zeta^2] - \frac{1}{2\theta},$$

and then immediately arrive at (9). Then, the second line of our desired expression for $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ follows, as

$$\begin{split} \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} s\mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds &= \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} sds \int_{-\infty}^{s} d\mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le t\Big) \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}^2 - s^2) d\mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}^2 - \frac{\theta}{2} \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}^2 \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big) - \frac{\theta}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} s^2 d\mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \Big(\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} + \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big) \land \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big]\Big)^2 - \frac{\theta}{2} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big) \land \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big|^2\Big] \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2} \Big(\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta}\Big)^2 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]\Big(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta}\Big) + U_{\theta}\Big(\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big) \land \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big) \\ &= \frac{1 - |\mathbb{E}[\zeta]|^2}{2\theta} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \mathbb{E}[\zeta] + U_{\theta}\Big(\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big) \land \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big), \end{split}$$

where the fourth and fifth equalities both arise from (8). Alternatively, proceeding with the above fourth equality, we substitute

$$\theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} s \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds = \frac{\theta}{2} \Big(\frac{1}{\theta} + \mathbb{E}\Big[f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\Big]\Big)^2 - \frac{\theta}{2} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big|f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right) + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big|^2\Big] \\ = \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta^2]}{2\theta} + U_\theta \Big(f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\Big) - \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\Big)\zeta\Big]$$

into the right-hand side of (9) and then obtain (10), which leads to the last line of our desired result.

A.3 Proof of Proposition 2.11

Assume by contradiction that $V(f) < V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ and $\partial V(f) \cap \mathbb{L}^2_{\zeta+}(\mathbb{P}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $f \notin \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$. Then, it follows from the expression (10) that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\theta}\bigg(f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\bigg) &= V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) - \mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(f - f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\bigg)\zeta\bigg] \\ &> V(f) - \mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(f - f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\bigg)\zeta\bigg] \\ &\geq V(f) - \mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(f - f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\bigg)dV_{\theta,\zeta}(f)\bigg] \\ &\geq V\bigg(f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\right)\bigg), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $V|_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}} = U_{\theta}|_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}}$.

A.4 Proof of Proposition 2.12

On the one hand, by (10) and $f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, we have

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) \le \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}, g \le f} \{ U_{\theta}(g) + \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] \}.$$

On the other hand, since $dU_{\theta}(f) \in \partial U_{\theta}(f)$, $dU_{\theta}|_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}} = dV_{\theta,\zeta}|_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}}$ and $\lambda_{f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \zeta/\theta), \theta,\zeta} = \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\theta}(g) &\leq U_{\theta} \left(f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(g - f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) \left(\zeta + \theta \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - f - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right)_{+} \right) \right] \\ &\leq U_{\theta} \left(f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(g - f \wedge \left(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) \zeta \right] \end{aligned}$$

for any $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ with $g \leq f$. Abstracting $\mathbb{E}[(g-f)\zeta]$ from both sides of the above inequality, then applying (10) for the right-hand side and taking supremum on the left-hand side over all $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$ with $g \leq f$, we obtain

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}, g \le f} \{ U_{\theta}(g) + \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] \} \le V_{\theta,\zeta}(f).$$

In summary, the first desired equality is proved. Moreover, the previous proof is also valid, if we extend the domain for g to $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ with $g \leq f$. Therefore, the second desired equality holds.

A.5 Proof of Proposition 2.13

The "only if" part is obvious, due to the monotonicity of $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$ in θ (see Remark 2.4). To see the "if" part, we firstly take $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ arbitrarily and $c = V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$. The identity $V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) = V_{\theta,\zeta}(V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)\mathbf{1}_{\Omega})$ gives $V_{\hat{\theta},\zeta}(f) \ge V_{\hat{\theta},\zeta}(V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)\mathbf{1}_{\Omega}) = V_{\theta,\zeta}(f)$. Then, we assume by contradiction that $\theta < \hat{\theta}$. Moreover, assume that $f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \zeta/\hat{\theta}) = c$ P-a.s. for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that f = c P-a.e. on $\{f \le \lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \zeta/\hat{\theta}\}$. If $\{f > \lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \zeta/\hat{\theta}\}$ were not a P-null set, then $\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \zeta/\hat{\theta} = c$ P-a.e. on this set would give $(\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - c)\hat{\theta} = \zeta_0$ and $\zeta = \zeta_0$ P-a.e. on this set, and hence result in $\mathbb{P}(f \le \lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \zeta/\hat{\theta}) = \mathbb{P}(c+\zeta/\hat{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta}) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta \le \zeta_0) = 1$. Therefore, $\operatorname{Var}[f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \zeta/\hat{\theta})] = 0$ is equivalent to $f = c \mathbb{P} - a.s.$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. So we can find $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ such that $\operatorname{Var}[f \wedge (\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \zeta/\hat{\theta})] > 0$, as \mathcal{F} is non-trivial. As a consequence, a contradiction

arises from

$$\begin{split} V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) &\geq U_{\theta} \bigg(f \wedge \Big(\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \Big) \bigg) + \mathbb{E} \bigg[\bigg(f - f \wedge \Big(\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \Big) \bigg) \zeta \bigg] \\ &> U_{\hat{\theta}} \bigg(f \wedge \Big(\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \Big) \bigg) + \mathbb{E} \bigg[\bigg(f - f \wedge \Big(\lambda_{f,\hat{\theta},\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \Big) \bigg) \zeta \bigg] \\ &= V_{\hat{\theta},\zeta}(f), \end{split}$$

where the first inequality and the last equality follow from Proposition 2.12 and (10), respectively. Therefore, $\theta \ge \hat{\theta}$, and we complete the proof.

A.6 Proof of Proposition 2.14

On the one hand, $\lambda_{g,\theta,\zeta} \leq \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$ can be seen from

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{g,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(g + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds = \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \le \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(g + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds$$

where the first equality follows from (8) and the last inequality follows from (11) with $t = \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$. On the other hand, since it also follows from (8) that

$$\begin{split} \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} s \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds &= \theta \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds - \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \int_{s}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} dt \\ &= \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} (1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]) - \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} dt \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds, \end{split}$$

then, given the expression (9) and the second-order stochastic dominance condition (11), we have

$$\begin{split} V_{\theta,\zeta}(f) - V_{\theta,\zeta}(g) &= \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] + (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} - \lambda_{g,\theta,\zeta})(1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]) - \theta \int_{\lambda_{g,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} dt \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \\ &+ \theta \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{g,\theta,\zeta}} \bigg(\int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathbb{P}\Big(g + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds - \int_{-\infty}^{t} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \bigg) dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta] + \theta \int_{\lambda_{g,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} dt \int_{t}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[(f-g)\zeta]. \end{split}$$

A.7 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Since $V_{\theta,\zeta}$ is concave and $X_{\vec{\alpha}}$ is affine in $\vec{\alpha}$, one can arrive at $V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_{\vec{\alpha}})$ is jointly concave in $\vec{\alpha}$. It follows from Theorem 2.10 that

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(\vec{X}_{\vec{\alpha}} + \varepsilon \vec{h}) - V_{\theta,\zeta}(\vec{X}_{\vec{\alpha}}) = \left\langle \vec{h}, \mathbb{E} \left[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1}) \left(\zeta + \theta \left(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}} - X_{\vec{\alpha}} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right)_{+} \right) \right] \right\rangle \varepsilon + o(\varepsilon)$$

for any $(\varepsilon, \vec{h}) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^n$, so the following gradient condition,

$$\vec{0} = \mathbb{E}\left[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1}) \left(\zeta + \theta \left(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right)_+ \right) \right]$$
$$\equiv \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})\zeta] + \theta \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \mathbb{P}\left(X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \right) \mathbb{E}\left[\vec{R} - r\vec{1} \middle| X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \right]$$

$$-\theta \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big) \mathbb{E}\Big[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big],\tag{61}$$

is necessary and sufficient to realize the maximum in (13). Notably, the second equation in (14) is a re-expression of (8), so the rest of this proof is to show the equivalence between (61) and the first equation in (14). Applying the iterated conditioning to (8) with $f = \vec{X}_{\vec{\alpha}^*}$ yields

$$\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big) = \frac{\kappa}{\theta} + \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big) \mathbb{E}\Big[X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\Big].$$

Substituting it back into (61), together with rearrangement, we obtain

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})\zeta] + \kappa \mathbb{E}\Big[\vec{R}-r\vec{1}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big] \\ &= \theta \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big) \mathbb{E}\Big[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big)\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big] \\ &\quad - \theta \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big) \mathbb{E}\Big[X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big] \mathbb{E}\Big[\vec{R}-r\vec{1}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big] \\ &= \theta \mathbb{P}\Big(X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big) \operatorname{Cov}\Big[\vec{R}-r\vec{1}, X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\Big]. \end{split}$$

As $X_{\vec{\alpha}} = r + \langle \vec{\alpha}, \vec{R} - r\vec{1} \rangle$, we have

$$\operatorname{Cov}\left[\vec{R}-r\vec{1}, X_{\vec{\alpha}}+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}}+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}<\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\right] = \operatorname{Var}\left[\vec{R}\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}}+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}<\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\right]\vec{\alpha} + \operatorname{Cov}\left[\vec{R}, \zeta\Big|X_{\vec{\alpha}}+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}<\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}\right].$$

Hence, (61) gives the first equation in (14), and vice versa.

A.8 Proof of Proposition 3.3

In order to remove the real number μ , we centralized the first equation in (16) and arrive at

$$0 = \kappa Z_* + \zeta - 1 + \langle \theta \vec{\alpha}^*, \vec{R} - \mathbb{E}[R] \rangle - (\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$
(62)

Substituting (62) into the first line of the gradient condition (61) yields

$$\mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})] = \theta \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})(\vec{R}-\mathbb{E}[\vec{R}])^{\top}]\alpha^* - \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})(\beta-\mathbb{E}[\beta])] = \theta \operatorname{Var}[\vec{R}]\alpha^* - \operatorname{Cov}[\vec{R},\beta],$$

which results in (18). Multiplying β and then taking expectation on both sides of (62), with applying the third line in (16), we obtain $0 = \mathbb{E}[\beta(\zeta - 1)] + \langle \theta \vec{\alpha}^*, \operatorname{Cov}[\vec{R}, \beta] \rangle - \operatorname{Var}[\beta]$ that is equivalent to (18): Furthermore, as the first equation of (16) gives $\beta = \kappa Z_* + (\theta X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta) - r\theta(1 - \langle \vec{\alpha}^*, \vec{1} \rangle) + \mu$, we have $\operatorname{Var}[\beta] = \operatorname{Var}[\kappa Z_* + (\theta X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta)] = \theta^2 \operatorname{Var}[\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \vee (X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta)]$. If $X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, or namely, $X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta \leq \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}$, \mathbb{P} a.s., then $\operatorname{Var}[\beta] = \theta^2 \operatorname{Var}[\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}] = 0$. Conversely, we suppose that $\operatorname{Var}[\beta] = 0$, and assume by contradiction that $\mathbb{P}(X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta > \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}) \in (0, 1)$ (noting that $\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} > \operatorname{ess\,inf}(X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta)$, see the second assertion of Lemma 2.8). By iterated conditioning formula, we have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}[\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \lor (X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{Var}[\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \lor (X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta)|1_{\{X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta > \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\}}]\right] \\ &+ \operatorname{Var}\left[\mathbb{E}[\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \lor (X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta)|1_{\{X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta > \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\}}]\right],\end{aligned}$$

of which each term on the right-hand side vanishes. Since the first term vanishes, there must exist some constant $c > \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}$ such that $X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta = c$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Then, in terms of the second term,

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \vee (X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta) | 1_{\{X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta > \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\}}] = \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} 1_{\{X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta \le \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\}} + c 1_{\{X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta > \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}\}}$$

has a positive variance, which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, $X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta/\theta \leq \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*}$, or equivalently, $X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, follows from $\operatorname{Var}[\beta] = 0$. So we are done.

A.9 Proof of Theorem 3.5

The "if" part is obvious according to the definition of saddle point. So the rest of this proof is showing the "only if" part. Denote by M the value of (15). By comparing (13) with the expression (10), together with the identities $X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} \wedge (\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - \zeta/\theta) = \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*} - \zeta/\theta - \kappa Z_*/\theta$ and $(\theta X_{\vec{\alpha}^*} + \zeta + \kappa Z_* - \theta \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^*})Z_* = 0$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{M} = \theta U_{\theta} \left(X_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} \wedge \left(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) + \theta \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} - X_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} \wedge \left(\lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) \zeta \right] - \theta r$$

$$= \mathbb{E} [\theta \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} - \zeta - \kappa Z_{*}] - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Var}[\kappa Z_{*} + \zeta] + \mathbb{E} [(\theta X_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} + \zeta + \kappa Z_{*} - \theta \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}})\zeta] - \theta r$$

$$= \kappa \theta \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [(\kappa Z_{*} + \zeta)^{2}] + \mathbb{E} [(\theta X_{\vec{\alpha}^{*}} + \zeta + \kappa Z_{*})\zeta] - \theta r$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [(\kappa Z_{*} + \zeta)^{2}] - \frac{1}{2} + \theta \langle \vec{\alpha}^{*}, \mathbb{E} [(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})(\kappa Z_{*} + \zeta)] \rangle.$$

According to the gradient condition (61), i.e., $\mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})(\kappa Z_* + \zeta)] = 0$, we further arrive at $2\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z_* + \zeta)^2] - 1$. Consequently, the max-min inequality

$$2\mathcal{M} \leq \min_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Z]=1} \max_{\vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{2\langle \theta \vec{\alpha}, \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})(\kappa Z+\zeta)] \rangle + \mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z+\zeta)^2] - 1\}$$
$$\equiv \min_{Z \in \mathbb{L}^2_+(\mathbb{P}), \mathbb{E}[Z]=1, \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R}-r\vec{1})(\kappa Z+\zeta)]=\vec{0}} \{\mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z+\zeta)^2] - 1\}$$

for (15) holds with equality. Therefore, $(\vec{\alpha}^*, Z_*)$ is the saddle point for (15).

For the minimization problem (19), we define the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_2 : \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ with modified Lagrange multipliers by

$$\mathcal{L}_2(Z,\beta,\mu,\vec{\alpha}) := \frac{1}{2\kappa} \mathbb{E}[(\kappa Z + \zeta)^2] - \mathbb{E}[\beta Z] + (\theta r - \mu)(\mathbb{E}[Z] - 1) + \frac{\theta}{\kappa} \langle \vec{\alpha}, \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})(\kappa Z + \zeta)] \rangle,$$

and then arrive at the KKT condition

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \kappa Z_* + \zeta - \beta - \mu + \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}}, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s.; \\ \mathbb{E}[Z_*] = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}[(\vec{R} - r\vec{1})(\kappa Z_* + \zeta)] = \vec{0}; \\ \beta \ge 0, \ Z_* \ge 0, \ \beta Z_* = 0, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying κZ_* on both sides of the first equation yields, with applying the third line, yields $0 = \kappa Z_*(\kappa Z_* - \mu + \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \zeta)$, P-a.s.

- On $\{\mu \leq \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \zeta\}, \kappa Z_* = 0, \mathbb{P}$ -a.s.
- On $\{\mu > \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \zeta\}$, if $\kappa Z_* = 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., then the first equation in the KKT condition gives $\beta = \zeta + \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} \mu < 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. This implies that $\kappa Z_* = \mu \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} \zeta$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., unless $\{\mu > \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \zeta\}$ is a \mathbb{P} -null set.

In summary, we obtain $\kappa Z_* = (\mu - \theta X_{\vec{\alpha}} - \zeta)_+$, and hence $\mu = \theta \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}$ due to the second equation and (8). Therefore, $Z_* > 0$ is equivalent to $X_{\vec{\alpha}} + \zeta/\theta < \lambda_{\vec{\alpha}}$, and hence the final assertion arises from Theorem 3.1.

A.10 Proof of Lemma 4.1

Suppose that $\mathcal{V}^{c}(t, \cdot)$ is three times continuously differentiable, which can be verified by (26). Differentiating both sides of (24), with applying envelope theorem or straightforward rearrangement, yields

$$0 = \mathcal{V}_{x}(s, X_{s}^{c})r_{s} + \mathcal{V}_{tx}(s, X_{s}^{c}) + \mathcal{V}_{xx}(s, X_{s}^{c})(r_{s}X_{s}^{c} + \pi_{s}^{c}\sigma_{s}\vartheta_{s}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_{xxx}(s, X_{s}^{c})(\pi_{s}^{c}\sigma_{s})^{2}.$$

By Itô's rule and the terminal condition $\mathcal{V}_x(T, X_T^c) = \theta(X_T^c - c) - 1$ arising from (25), we obtain

$$\theta(X_T^c - c) - 1 = \mathcal{V}_x^c(t, X_t^c) e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv - \int_t^T \vartheta_v dW_v - \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}.$$
(63)

Taking conditional expectation under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ on both sides results in

$$\theta\left(X_t^c e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} - c\right) - 1 = \mathcal{V}_x^c(t, X_t^c) e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv + \int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv},\tag{64}$$

which immediately leads to (26). In order to derive the maximizer c^* , let us plug π_t^c with $c = \mathbb{E}[X_T^c]$ back into (21) to arrive at the mean-field SDE

$$dX_t^c = r_t X_t^c dt - e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} \left(X_t^c e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} - \mathbb{E}[X_T^c] - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \vartheta_t (dW_t + \vartheta_t dt).$$

As a result,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^c] = X_0 e^{\int_0^t (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv} + \left(\frac{1}{\theta} + \mathbb{E}[X_T^c]\right) e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} \left(1 - e^{-\int_0^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}\right)$$

In particular, sending t to T yields $\mathbb{E}[X_T^c] = X_0 \exp(\int_0^T r_v dv) + (\exp(\int_0^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv) - 1)/\theta$. So we are done.

A.11 Proof of Theorem 4.3

Consider X_T corresponding to an arbitrarily fixed $\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$. Obviously, if $X_T \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$, then

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T) = U_{\theta}(X_T) \le \max_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))} U_{\theta}(X_T) = U_{\theta}(X_T^*) = V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T^*).$$

Otherwise, we purpose to seek the replicating portfolio for $X_T \wedge (\lambda_{X_T,\theta,\zeta} - \zeta/\theta) \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta}$. Let us introduce $\mathbb{X}_t := \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[(X_T \wedge (\lambda_{X_T,\theta,\zeta} - \zeta/\theta)) \exp(-\int_t^T r_v dv) | \mathcal{F}_t]$ so that $\mathbb{X}_T = X_T \wedge (\lambda_{X_T,\theta,\zeta} - \zeta/\theta)$ and $\mathbb{X}_0 \leq X_0$. Applying martingale representation theorem to $\{\mathbb{X}_t \exp(-\int_0^t r_v dv)\}_{t \in [0,T]}$, together with variable replacement, we conclude that there exists $\mathfrak{X} \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$ such that

$$\mathbb{X}_t e^{-\int_0^t r_v dv} = \mathbb{X}_0 + \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^s r_v dv} \mathfrak{X}_s \sigma_s (dW_s + \vartheta_s ds).$$

Thus, \mathfrak{X} gives the replicating portfolio for $X_T \wedge \lambda_{X_T,\theta,\zeta}$. Moreover, since

$$X_T^{\mathfrak{X}} = X_0 e^{\int_0^T r_v dv} + \int_0^T e^{-\int_s^T r_v dv} \mathfrak{X}_s \sigma_s(dW_s + \vartheta_s ds) = (X_0 - \mathbb{X}_0) e^{\int_0^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{X}_T \in \mathcal{G}_{\theta,\zeta},$$

where the superscript \mathfrak{X} is introduced to indicate the dependence and to distinguish $X_T^{\mathfrak{X}}$ from the primal X_T corresponding to some π , we have $U_{\theta}(X_T^{\mathfrak{X}}) \leq U_{\theta}(X_T^{\mathfrak{X}})$, and hence

$$V_{\theta,\zeta}(X_T) = U_{\theta} \left(X_T \wedge \left(\lambda_{X_T,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X_T - X_T \wedge \left(\lambda_{X_T,\theta,\zeta} - \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \right) \right) \zeta \right]$$

$$\leq U_{\theta}(X_T^{\mathfrak{X}}) - (X_0 - \mathbb{X}_0) e^{\int_0^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E} [(X_T - \mathbb{X}_T) \Lambda_T]$$

$$\leq U_{\theta}(X_T^*).$$

A.12 Proof of Theorem 4.5

Given (34) and an arbitrarily fixed $(\pi, \gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T; \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$, applying the Itô-Kunita-Ventzel formula (as a generalized version of Itô's rule, see Jeanblanc, Yor, and Shesney (2009, Theorem 1.5.3.2)) to $\mathcal{V}(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma})$ yields

$$\begin{split} d\mathcal{V}(s, X_s^{t, x, \pi}, Z_s^{t, z, \gamma}) &= \left(\mathcal{D}_1^{\pi, \gamma} \mathcal{V}(s, X_s^{t, x, \pi}, Z_s^{t, z, \gamma}) + \mathcal{D}_2^{\pi, \gamma} \Phi(s, X_s^{t, x, \pi}, Z_s^{t, z, \gamma}) - \mathbb{H}(s, X_s^{t, x, \pi}, Z_s^{t, z, \gamma})\right) dt \\ &+ \left(\Phi(s, X_s^{t, x, \pi}, Z_s^{t, z, \gamma}) + \mathcal{D}_2^{\pi_s, \gamma_s} \mathcal{V}(s, X_s^{t, x, \pi}, Z_s^{t, z, \gamma})\right) dW_s. \end{split}$$

Integrate both sides of the above SDE from t to T, and take expectation conditioned on \mathcal{F}_t under \mathbb{P} . For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))$, combining the second line of (37) with the terminal condition (35), we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}(t,x,z) \le \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{V}(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma}) | \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}[J^{\pi^*,\gamma}(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma}) | \mathcal{F}_t] = J^{\pi^*,\gamma}(t,x,z)$$

In the same manner, one can arrive at $\mathcal{V}(t, x, z) \geq J^{\pi, \gamma^*}(t, x, z)$ for any $\pi \in \Pi^{t, x}$. Therefore,

$$J^{\pi,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) \le \mathcal{V}(t,x,z) = J^{\pi^*,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) \le J^{\pi^*,\gamma}(t,x,z), \quad \forall (\pi,\gamma) \in \Pi^{t,x} \times \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})).$$

This implies that (π^*, γ^*) is the desired saddle point, which leads to the max-min equality

$$J^{\pi^*,\gamma^*}(t,x,z) = \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess \,sup}} \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))}{\operatorname{ess \,sup}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z) = \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathbb{F}}(t,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P}))}{\operatorname{ess \,sup}} \underset{\pi \in \Pi^{t,x}}{\operatorname{ess \,sup}} J^{\pi,\gamma}(t,x,z).$$

So the proof is completed.

A.13 Proof of Theorem 4.7

Following the same line as in Appendix A.10, by applying envelope theorem or straightforward calculation, differentiating both sides of (34) with respect to x under additional differentiability assumptions (which can be verified by the solution) yields

$$-d\mathcal{V}_{x}(t,x,z) = \left(\mathcal{V}_{x}(t,x,z)r_{t} + \mathcal{D}_{1}^{\hat{\pi}(t,x,z),\hat{\gamma}(t,x,z)}\mathcal{V}_{x}(t,x,z) + \mathcal{D}_{2}^{\hat{\pi}(t,x,z),\hat{\gamma}(t,x,z)}\Phi_{x}(t,x,z)\right)dt - \Phi_{x}(t,x,z)dW_{t},$$

which by Itô-Kunita-Ventzel formula and the first equation in (39) results in

$$\begin{split} d\mathcal{V}_x(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) &= -\mathcal{V}_x(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) r_s ds \\ &+ \left(\Phi_x(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) + \mathcal{D}_2^{\pi^*_s,\gamma^*_s} \mathcal{V}_x(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) \right) dW_s \\ &= -\mathcal{V}_x(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) (r_s ds + \vartheta_s dW_s). \end{split}$$

So $\mathcal{V}_x(t, x, z) \exp(-\int_t^T r_v dv) \Lambda_T / \Lambda_t = \zeta + \kappa Z_T^{t, z, \gamma^*}$, as (35) gives $\mathcal{V}_x(T, X_T^{t, x, \pi^*}, Z_T^{t, z, \gamma^*}) = \zeta + \kappa Z_T^{t, z, \gamma^*}$. Taking conditional expectation under \mathbb{P} on both sides yields $\mathcal{V}_x(t, x, z) = (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z) \exp(\int_t^T r_v dv)$, which implies that $\Phi_x(t, x, z) = \eta_t \exp(\int_t^T r_v dv)$. In the same manner, one can arrive at

$$\mathcal{V}_{z}(t,x,z) = \frac{\kappa}{\theta} (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}] + \kappa z) e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} + \kappa x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv}, \quad \Phi_{z}(t,x,z) = \frac{\kappa}{\theta} \eta_{t} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}$$

via

$$\begin{cases} d\mathcal{V}_z(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) = \left(\Phi_z(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) + \mathcal{D}_2^{\pi_s^*,\gamma_s^*} V_z(s, X_s^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*}) \right) dW_s = 0\\ \mathcal{V}_z(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*}) = \frac{\kappa}{\theta} \mathcal{V}_x(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^*}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*}) + \kappa X_T^{t,x,\pi^*}, \end{cases}$$

and taking conditional expectation under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ on both sides of

$$\mathcal{V}_z(t, x, z) = \frac{\kappa}{\theta} V_x(t, x, z) \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} + \kappa X_T^{t, x, \pi^*}.$$

Consequently, $\mathcal{V}_{xx}(t, x, z) = 0$, $\mathcal{V}_{xz}(t, x, z) = \kappa e^{\int_t^T r_v dv}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{zz}(t, x, z) = (\kappa^2/\theta) \exp(\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv)$. Substituting the above partial derivatives of (\mathcal{V}, Φ) back into (39) yields the feedback random fields

$$\hat{\pi}(t,x,z) = \frac{\vartheta_t}{\theta\sigma_t} (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z) e^{-\int_t^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv}, \quad \hat{\gamma}(t,x,z) = -\frac{1}{\kappa} (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]\vartheta_t + \eta_t) - z\vartheta_t,$$

which immediately lead to the desired saddle point (41).

Furthermore, by substituting the above partial derivatives of (\mathcal{V}, Φ) and the feedback random fields $(\hat{\pi}, \hat{\gamma})$ back into (34), together with rearrangement, we obtain

$$-d\mathcal{V}(t,x,z) = \left(x(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z)r_t e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \frac{1}{2\theta}(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z)^2 |\vartheta_t|^2 e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} - \frac{1}{2\theta} |\eta_t|^2 e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}\right) dt$$
$$-\Phi(t,x,z) dW_t.$$

As the terminal condition has been given by (35), by Itô's rule and the martingale representation (40), one can arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t,x,z) &= x(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z) e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \left(\frac{\kappa}{\theta} \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] z + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta} z^2\right) e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \\ &- \frac{1}{2\theta} \mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_t^T \Big(|\eta_s|^2 - (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s])^2 |\vartheta_s|^2 \Big) e^{\int_s^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} ds \bigg|\mathcal{F}_t\bigg]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, applying Itô's rule to $(\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s])^2 \exp(\int_s^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv)$ provides

$$\mathbb{E}[\zeta^2|\mathcal{F}_t] - (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t])^2 e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} = \mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_t^T \left(|\eta_s|^2 - (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s])^2 |\vartheta_s|^2\right) e^{\int_s^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} ds \bigg|\mathcal{F}_t\bigg].$$

Summing up with rearranging the terms in the expression of \mathcal{V} .

To show that Z^{t,z,γ^*} with z > 0 has a positive probability under \mathbb{P} of downwards crossing the threshold Z = 0, it suffices to derive $\mathbb{P}(Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*} < 0) > 0$ due to the continuous path of Z^{t,z,γ^*} . In fact, from the second line of (41), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s] + \kappa Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^*} = \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z - \int_t^s (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_v] + \kappa Z_v^{t,z,\gamma^*}) \vartheta_v dW_v = (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z) \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_s]}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t]}$$

Thus, $\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*} = (\Lambda_T - \zeta) + (\mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z)\Lambda_T / \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t]$. If $\mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z \leq 0$, then we have $\mathbb{P}(Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*} < 0) \geq \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_T < \zeta) > 0$. Otherwise, we assume by contradiction that $Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*} \geq 0$, which leads to

$$0 \le \kappa \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_A Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_A (\Lambda_T - \zeta)] + \mathbb{E}\left[(\mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z) \frac{\Lambda_T \mathbf{1}_A}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t]} \right]$$

for any $A \in \mathcal{F}_T$. As a consequence, for $0 < \varepsilon < \operatorname{ess\,sup}(\zeta - \Lambda_T)$, on the set

$$A = \{\Lambda_T \leq \zeta - \varepsilon\} \cap \left\{\Lambda_T \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t]}{\mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z}\right\} \in \mathcal{F}_T$$

we get $0 \leq \kappa \mathbb{E}[1_A Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^*}] \leq -\mathbb{P}(A)\varepsilon/2$, a contradiction. So this proof has been completed.

A.14 Proof of Lemma 4.9

Assume by contradiction that $\tau < T$ results in a π -independent $J^{\pi,\gamma^{**}}(\tau,x,0)$. Notably, (43) also follows. As an analog to the results in Theorem 4.5, the feedback form of (π^{**},γ^{**}) can be found by solving (34) on $[0,T) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ with the terminal condition (35) on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty)$ and the regular boundary condition $1_{\{\tau \leq t\}} \mathcal{V}(t,x,0) = 1_{\{\tau \leq t\}} x \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] \exp(\int_t^T r_v dv)$ on $[0,T) \times \mathbb{R}$. Since (43) gives

$$1_{\{\tau \le t\}} \mathbb{E}[\zeta^{2} | \mathcal{F}_{t}] = 1_{\{\tau \le t\}} (\mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_{t}])^{2} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|\Lambda_{T}|^{2} | \mathcal{F}_{t}]}{(\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{T} | \mathcal{F}_{t}])^{2}} = 1_{\{\tau \le t\}} (\mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_{t}])^{2} e^{\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv}$$

under the abovementioned assumption, we conclude that (42) is the desired solution, and $(\pi_s^{**}, \gamma_s^{**}) = (\pi_s^*, \gamma_s^* \mathbf{1}_{\{s \leq \tau\}})$ given by (41), which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_s] + Z_s^{t,z,\gamma^{**}} = (\mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] + \kappa z) \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_s]}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T|\mathcal{F}_t]}, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad \forall s \in [t,\tau].$$
(65)

Now let us consider the case (t, z) = (0, 1). If $\{\tau < T\}$ is a P-null set, then $(\pi^{**}, \gamma^{**}) = (\pi^*, \gamma^*)$ immediately follows and results in $Z_T^{0,1,\gamma^{**}} = \Lambda_T - \zeta \ge 0$ P-a.s., a contradiction. Hence, $\mathbb{P}(\tau < T) > 0$. It is obvious that $1_{\{\tau < T\}} \mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_{\tau}] = 0$ P-a.s., and hence due to (43),

$$1_{\{\tau < s\}} \mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_s] = 1_{\{\tau < s\}} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_s]}{\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_\tau]} \mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_\tau] = 0, \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad \forall s \in (0, T]$$

Conversely, according to the definition of τ , one can obtain $\tau = \inf\{s : \mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_s] = 0\}$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. In other words, the continuous (\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P}) -martingale $\{\mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_t]\}_{t \in [0,T]}$ vanishes after it hits zero. However, $\mathbb{E}[\zeta - \Lambda_T | \mathcal{F}_0] = \mathbb{E}[\zeta] - 1 < 0$ implies that this martingale never crosses above zero almost surely; that is, $\zeta \leq \Lambda_T \mathbb{P}$ -a.s., a contradiction as well.

A.15 Proof of Theorem 4.11

In fact, Theorem 4.11 consists of the verification technic and the explicit expression of value random field and saddle point. The proof for verification is parallel to Appendix A.12, so we omit it. To derive the value random field (45) and the saddle point (47), we refer to the same line as in Appendix A.13. By applying envelope theorem or straightforward calculation to differentiate both sides of (34) with respect to x, with using Itô-Kunita-Ventzel formula and the optimality condition (39), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}}) = \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(t,x,z) \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv}, \\ \mathcal{V}_z^{\dagger}(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}}) = \mathcal{V}_z^{\dagger}(t,x,z). \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, it follows from the terminal condition (46) that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}}) \\ \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathcal{V}_z^{\dagger}(T, X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}, Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}}) - c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho & 1 \\ \theta + \rho & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}} - c \\ \kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}} + \zeta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta+\rho} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\theta} \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} & 1\\ \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} & \rho \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(t,x,z)e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} \\ \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathcal{V}_z^{\dagger}(t,x,z) - c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}} - c\\ \kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}} + \zeta \end{pmatrix}.$$

In view that $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[X_T^{t,x,\pi^{\dagger}}|\mathcal{F}_t] = x \exp(\int_t^T r_v dv)$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\dagger}}|\mathcal{F}_t] = z$, by multiplying the diagonal metrix diag $(\Lambda_T/\Lambda_t, 1)$ on both sides of the above equation and then taking conditional expectation under \mathbb{P} , we obtain

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta+\rho} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\theta} e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} & 1\\ 1 & \rho \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(t,x,z) e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv}\\ \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathcal{V}_z^{\dagger}(t,x,z) - c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} - c\\ \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] \end{pmatrix},$$

which gives

$$\frac{\theta + \rho e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}}{\theta + \rho} \binom{\mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(t, x, z) e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv}}{\frac{1}{\kappa} \mathcal{V}_z^{\dagger}(t, x, z) - c} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho & 1\\ 1 & \frac{1}{\theta} e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \end{pmatrix} \binom{x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} - c}{\kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]}.$$

Hence, with writing $\mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\dagger} = \mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\dagger}(t,x,z)$ and so on for short, we have

$$\frac{\theta + \rho e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}}{\theta + \rho} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0\\ 0 & \frac{1}{\kappa} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\dagger} & \mathcal{V}_{xz}^{\dagger}\\ \mathcal{V}_{xz}^{\dagger} & \mathcal{V}_{zz}^{\dagger} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho & 1\\ 1 & \frac{1}{\theta} e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0\\ 0 & \kappa \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\frac{\theta + \rho e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}}{\theta + \rho} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0\\ 0 & \frac{1}{\kappa} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_x^{\dagger}\\ \Phi_z^{\dagger} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho & 1\\ 1 & \frac{1}{\theta} e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ \eta_t \end{pmatrix} = \eta_t \begin{pmatrix} 1\\ \frac{1}{\theta} e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We employ $(\hat{\pi}^{\dagger}, \hat{\gamma}^{\dagger})$ to represent the feedback random fields for $(\pi^{\dagger}, \gamma^{\dagger})$. Substituting the above partial derivatives back into the first-order derivative optimality condition like (38) yields

$$\vec{0} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho & 1\\ 1 & \frac{1}{\theta} e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\pi}^{\dagger}(t, x, z) \sigma_t e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} \\ \kappa \hat{\gamma}^{\dagger}(t, x, z) + \eta_t \end{pmatrix} + \left(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] \right) \vartheta_t \begin{pmatrix} 1\\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, (47) immediately follows.

Furthermore, combining (34), (38) and (46), we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}^{\dagger}(t,x,z) = \mathbb{E}\left[x(\zeta+\kappa z) + \frac{\kappa}{\theta}\zeta z + \frac{\kappa^2}{2\theta}z^2 - \frac{\rho}{2}(x-c)^2 + \int_t^T \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(s,x,z)xr_s ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_t^T \left(\mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\hat{\pi}(s,x,z)\sigma_s\vartheta_s - \Phi_z^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\frac{\eta_s}{\kappa}\right)ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_t^T \left(\frac{\hat{\pi}^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\sigma_s e^{\int_s^T r_v dv}}{\kappa\hat{\gamma}^{\dagger}(s,x,z) + \eta_s}\right)^\top \left(\frac{\Phi_x^{\dagger}(s,x,z)e^{-\int_s^T r_v dv}}{\frac{1}{\kappa}\Phi_z^{\dagger}(s,x,z)}\right)ds \Big|\mathcal{F}_t\right].$$
(66)

Let

$$K_m(t,x,z) := \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} + \rho} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]\Big)^m, \quad m = 0, 1, 2$$

Then, $\mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(s, x, z) = K_1(s, x, z) \exp(\int_s^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv),$

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\hat{\pi}^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\sigma_s\vartheta_s &= K_2(s,x,z)\frac{|\vartheta_s|^2}{\theta + \rho e^{\int_s^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}},\\ \Phi_z^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\frac{\eta_s}{\kappa} &= \frac{1}{\theta}K_0(s,x,z)|\eta_s|^2,\\ \left(\hat{\pi}^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\sigma_s e^{\int_s^T r_v dv}\right)^{\top} \left(\frac{\Phi_x^{\dagger}(s,x,z)e^{-\int_s^T r_v dv}}{\frac{1}{\kappa}\Phi_z^{\dagger}(s,x,z)}\right) &= -K_1(s,x,z)\vartheta_s e^{-\int_s^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ \eta_s \end{pmatrix}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} 1\\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0. \end{split}$$

Noting that

$$dK_2(s,x,z) = -K_2(s,x,z) \frac{\theta |\vartheta_s|^2}{\theta + \rho e^{\int_s^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv}} ds + 2K_1(s,x,z) \Big(\rho x r_s e^{\int_s^T r_v dv} ds + \eta_s dW_s\Big) + K_0(s,x,z) |\eta_s|^2 ds,$$

we have

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_{t}^{T} \mathcal{V}_{x}^{\dagger}(s,x,z)xr_{s}ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_{t}^{T} \left(\mathcal{V}_{x}^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\hat{\pi}^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\sigma_{s}\vartheta_{s} - \Phi_{z}^{\dagger}(s,x,z)\frac{\eta_{s}}{\kappa}\right)ds\bigg|\mathcal{F}_{t}\bigg] \\ &= \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta}\mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_{t}^{T} \left(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_{s}^{T} r_{v}dv} + \kappa z + \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{s}]\right)xr_{s}e^{\int_{s}^{T} r_{v}dv}ds\bigg|\mathcal{F}_{t}\bigg] \\ &- \frac{1}{2\theta}\mathbb{E}[K_{2}(T,x,z) - K_{2}(t,x,z)|\mathcal{F}_{t}] \\ &= \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta}\bigg(\frac{\rho}{2}(c-x)^{2} - \frac{\rho}{2}\Big(c-xe^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v}dv}\Big)^{2} + x\big(\kappa z + \mathbb{E}^{P}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}]\big)\Big(e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v}dv} - 1\Big)\Big) \\ &- \frac{1}{2\theta}\mathbb{E}\big[\big(\rho(c-x) + \kappa z + \zeta\big)^{2}\big|\mathcal{F}_{t}\big] + K_{2}(t,x,z). \end{split}$$

Plugging the above results back into (66), with rearranging the terms, yields the desired expression (45).

A.16 Proof of Lemma 4.13

Like Appendix A.15, we omit the proof for verification, since it is also parallel to Appendix A.12. The rest of this proof is to show that (48) with a proper Φ^{\flat} fulfills (49). Following the same line as in Appendix A.10, one can obtain

$$\mathcal{V}_x^{\flat}(t,x)e^{-\int_t^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2)dv} = \rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

By martingale representation theorem, we write $\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta] + \int_0^t \tilde{\eta}_s(dW_s + \vartheta_s ds)$. Then, it follows that $\Phi_x^{\flat}(t, x) = \tilde{\eta}_t \exp(\int_t^T (r_v - |\vartheta_v|^2) dv)$. Plugging these results into the first-order derivative optimality condition for (49) yields the feedback random field of optimal control

$$\hat{\pi}^{\flat}(t,x) = \frac{1}{\rho\sigma_t} e^{-\int_t^T r_v dv} \bigg(\Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] \Big) \vartheta_t + \tilde{\eta}_t \bigg).$$

Moreover, it follows from

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\pi \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\flat}(t,x) |\pi\sigma_{t}|^{2} + \mathcal{V}_{x}^{\flat}(t,x) (xr_{t} + \pi\sigma_{t}\vartheta_{t}) + \Phi_{x}^{\flat}(t,x)\pi\sigma_{t} \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{V}_{x}^{\flat}(t,x) xr_{t} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\flat}(t,x) \left(\hat{\pi}^{\flat}(t,x)\sigma_{t} \right)^{2} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\rho} \Big(\rho x r_t e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \tilde{\eta}_t \vartheta_t \Big) e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] \Big) \\ + \frac{1}{2\rho} |\tilde{\eta}_t|^2 e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} + \frac{1}{2\rho} |\vartheta_t|^2 e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] \Big)^2$$

that

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{V}^{\flat}(t,x) &= \mathbb{E}\bigg[\mathcal{V}^{\flat}(T,x) + \frac{1}{2\rho} \int_{t}^{T} d\bigg(e^{-\int_{s}^{T} \left|\vartheta_{v}\right|^{2} dv} \Big(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_{s}^{T} r_{v} dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{s}]\Big)^{2}\bigg)\bigg|\mathcal{F}_{t}\bigg] \\ &= x \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}] - \frac{\rho}{2}(c-x)^{2} + \frac{1}{2\rho} \mathbb{E}\big[\big(\rho(c-x) + \zeta\big)^{2}\big|\mathcal{F}_{t}\big] \\ &- \frac{1}{2\rho} e^{-\int_{t}^{T} \left|\vartheta_{v}\right|^{2} dv} \bigg(\rho\Big(c-x e^{\int_{t}^{T} r_{v} dv}\Big) + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}]\bigg)^{2}. \end{split}$$

By rearranging the terms on the right-hand side, (48) arises. As $\Phi^{\flat}(t, x)$ is given by the diffusion term in the semi-martingale decomposition of $\mathcal{V}^{\flat}(t, x)$, this proof is complete.

A.17 Proof of Lemma 4.15

Assume by contradiction that $\gamma^{\S} \notin \overline{\Gamma}^{t,z}(w^{\S})$. Thus, there exists some $\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c)|\mathcal{F}_t] - \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\$}} + \zeta, c)|\mathcal{F}_t] < w^{\$}(\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta|\mathcal{F}_t] - \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\$}} + \zeta|\mathcal{F}_t]).$$

As a consequence, for the jointly concave auxiliary function

$$F(x,y) = x - e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \Big(c - x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} \Big) y - \frac{1}{2\rho} e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} y^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t] - F_1^{\gamma}(t,x,z) \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= F\left(\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t], \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\right) \\ &\leq F\left(\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\hat{\mathbb{S}}}} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t], \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\hat{\mathbb{S}}}} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\right) \\ &+ \left(\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t] - \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\hat{\mathbb{S}}}} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t]\right) \\ &- w^{\hat{\mathbb{S}}}(\mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] - \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\hat{\mathbb{S}}}} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]) \\ &< F\left(\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\hat{\mathbb{S}}}} + \zeta, c) | \mathcal{F}_t], \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\hat{\mathbb{S}}}} + \zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\right), \end{split}$$

which contradicts the minimality of γ^{\S} . Hence, $\gamma^{\S} \in \overline{\Gamma}^{t,z}(w^{\S})$.

A.18 Proof of Lemma 4.17

On the one hand, (55) is equivalent to

$$Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} \in \underset{z \ge 0}{\operatorname{arg\,max}} \{h^{\sharp}z - G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y)\} = \underset{z \ge 0}{\operatorname{arg\,max}} \left\{ \left(\frac{h^{\sharp}}{\kappa} - Y - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta\right) z - \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta\rho}\kappa z^2 \right\}.$$

which implies that $\tilde{G}(h^{\sharp}, Y) = h^{\sharp} Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} - G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} + \zeta, Y)$. Therefore, (55) gives

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{h\in\mathbb{R}}\{hz - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}(h,Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]\} \ge \mathbb{E}[h^{\sharp}Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} - \tilde{G}(h^{\sharp},Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} + \zeta, Y) | \mathcal{F}_t] \ge \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}} \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta, Y) | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

On the other hand, by straightforward calculation,

$$\begin{split} \tilde{G}(h,Y) &= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{z\geq 0} \left\{ \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - Y - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta \right) \kappa z - \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta \rho} \kappa^2 z^2 \right\} - Y\zeta - \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta \rho} \zeta^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \left| \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - Y - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta \right)_+ \right|^2 - Y\zeta - \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta \rho} \zeta^2, \end{split}$$

and hence the first-order derivative optimality condition for maximizing $hz - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}(h, Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]$ is

$$z = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \frac{\theta\rho}{\theta+\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \left(h - \kappa Y - \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho} \kappa \zeta \right)_+ \right|^2 \right| \mathcal{F}_t \right]$$

For $X = kY + k\zeta(\theta + \rho)/(\theta\rho) \in \mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$, since

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\big[|(h-X)_{+}|^{2}\big|\mathcal{F}_{t}\big] = \mathbb{E}\bigg[\int_{-\infty}^{h} d\mathbf{1}_{\{X\leq x\}}\int_{x}^{h}(h-y)dy\bigg|\mathcal{F}_{t}\bigg] = \int_{-\infty}^{h}(h-y)\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{X\leq y\}}|\mathcal{F}_{t}]dy,$$

we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial h}\mathbb{E}\big[|(h-X)_+|^2\big|\mathcal{F}_t\big] = \int_{-\infty}^h \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{X \le y\}}|\mathcal{F}_t]dy = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{h-X \ge y\}}|\mathcal{F}_t]dy = \mathbb{E}[(h-X)_+|\mathcal{F}_t]dy = \mathbb{E}[(h-X)_+|\mathcal{F}$$

Consequently, it follows from (56) that

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{h \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}} \{hz - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}(h,Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]\} &= \mathbb{E}[h^{\sharp}Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} - \tilde{G}(h^{\sharp},Y)|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma^{\sharp}} + \zeta,Y)|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq \underset{\gamma \in \Gamma^{t,z}}{\operatorname{ess\,inf}} \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa Z_T^{t,z,\gamma} + \zeta,Y)|\mathcal{F}_t].\end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we conclude that $(\gamma^{\sharp}, h^{\sharp}) \in \Gamma^{t,z} \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (55) or (56) is a saddle point.

Conversely, if $(\gamma^{\sharp}, h^{\sharp}) \in \Gamma^{t,z} \times \mathbb{R}$ is a saddle point, then all the above inequalities hold as equalities. Obviously, h^{\sharp} maximizes $hz - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{G}(h, Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]$. Given the first-order derivative optimality condition, h^{\sharp} must be unique as z > 0. Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}[G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]$ is strictly convex in z, one can obtain the uniqueness of the minimizer γ^{\sharp} .

A.19 Proof of Theorem 4.19

Let us introduce the random function $a(h, w) = h/\kappa - c + w\Lambda_T/\Lambda_t$, and treat the first equation in (57) as an equation for h indexed by w. The dependence of w for the solution h is captured by some continuous function $\hat{h}(w)$. Fix $w \in \mathbb{R}$. Noting that

$$\left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho}\right)_+ \le \left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho}\zeta\right)_+ \le \left(a(h,w)\right)_+,$$

we denote by h^+ and h^- the solutions of

$$kz = \frac{\theta\rho}{\theta+\rho} \mathbb{E}\bigg[\left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho} \right)_+ \bigg| \mathcal{F}_t \bigg] \quad \text{and} \quad kz = \frac{\theta\rho}{\theta+\rho} \mathbb{E}\big[\left(a(h,w) \right)_+ \big| \mathcal{F}_t \big],$$

respectively. In fact, for w = 0, h^+ is given by $h^+/\kappa - c = (1 + \kappa z)(\theta + \rho)/(\theta \rho)$. For w > 0, the existence of h^+ arises from

$$\begin{split} &\lim_{h \to +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right] \geq \liminf_{h \to +\infty} \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right) = +\infty, \\ &\lim_{h \to -\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\limsup_{h \to -\infty} \left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right] = 0. \end{split}$$

For w < 0, the existence of h^+ arises from

$$\begin{split} &\lim_{h \to -\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right] \leq \limsup_{h \to -\infty} \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right) = -\infty, \\ &\lim_{h \to +\infty} \inf_{h \to +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\liminf_{h \to +\infty} \left(a(h,w) - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \right)_{+} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t} \right] = +\infty. \end{split}$$

Due to the strict monotonicity of $a(\cdot, w)$, h^+ is unique. In the same manner, we can show the existence and uniqueness of h^- . Since a(h, w) is increasing in h, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(a(h^{-},w)\right)_{+}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{t}\right] = \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\kappa z = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(a(h^{+},w)-\frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\right)_{+}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{t}\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\left(a(h^{+},w)\right)_{+}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{t}\right],$$

which gives $h^+ \ge h^-$. Furthermore, from the strict monotonicity of a and

$$\begin{split} &\frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\kappa z = \mathbb{E}\Big[\left(a(h^+,w) - \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\right)_+ \Big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\left(a(h^+,w) - \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta\right)_+ \Big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big],\\ &\frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\kappa z = \mathbb{E}\big[\left(a(h^-,w)\right)_+ \Big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big] \geq \mathbb{E}\Big[\left(a(h^-,w) - \frac{\theta+\rho}{\theta\rho}\zeta\right)_+ \Big|\mathcal{F}_t\Big],\end{split}$$

we conclude that the unique solution $h = \hat{h}(w)$ of the first equation in (57) locates in the interval $[h^-, h^+]$ and must be strictly decreasing in w.

In terms of the second equation in (57), which can be re-expressed as

$$\rho\left(c - x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv}\right) + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t] = \frac{\theta \rho}{\theta + \rho} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[w \frac{\rho \Lambda_T}{\theta \Lambda_t} + w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} \wedge \left(\frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta + c - \frac{h}{\kappa}\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right],$$

we fix $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and treat it as an equation for w. Obviously, the right-hand side of the above equation is strictly increasing in w and approaches $+\infty$ (resp. $-\infty$) as $w \to +\infty$ (resp. $w \to -\infty$). Hence, the solution $w = \hat{w}(h)$ exists and must be unique and non-decreasing in h.

Finally, we combine the two equations in (57), or equivalently, $h = \hat{h}(w)$ and $w = \hat{w}(h)$. The uniqueness of solution arises from the monotonicity of (\hat{h}, \hat{w}) . Since

$$\limsup_{h \to -\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \left[\left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta + w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} \right)_+ \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \le \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} \left[\limsup_{h \to -\infty} \left(\frac{h}{\kappa} - c - \frac{\theta + \rho}{\theta \rho} \zeta + w \frac{\Lambda_T}{\Lambda_t} \right)_+ \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = 0$$

for the right-hand side of the second equation in (57), we obtain

$$\hat{w}(-\infty) := \lim_{h \to -\infty} \hat{w}(h) = \frac{1}{\rho} e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \left(\rho c - \rho x e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t]\right)$$

In the same manner, $\hat{w}(h) \to +\infty$ as $h \to \infty$. On the other hand, for the first equation in (57), we have $\hat{h}(\hat{w}(-\infty)) > -\infty$ and $\hat{h}(w) \to -\infty$ as $w \to +\infty$. Summing up, we conclude that the system of $h = \hat{h}(w)$ and $w = \hat{w}(h)$ admits a solution (h^{\S}, w^{\S}) satisfying $w^{\S} \ge \hat{w}(-\infty)$, and so does (57).

B Perturbation results for $\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}$

Arbitrarily fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. From (8), we have

$$\begin{split} 0 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta} \mathbb{P}\Big(f+\varepsilon 1_{A}+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq s\Big)ds - \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq s\Big)ds \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{0}^{\infty} 1_{\{f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}+s\leq\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta-\varepsilon 1_{A}\}}ds\Big] - \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{0}^{\infty} 1_{\{f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}+s\leq\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\}}ds\Big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{0}^{\infty} ds \int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta-\varepsilon 1_{A}} d1_{\{f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq z-s\}}\Big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta-\varepsilon 1_{A}} 1_{\{f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq z\}}dz\Big] \\ &\in \Big[\int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta-\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq s\Big)ds, \int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta} \mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq s\Big)ds\Big] \\ &\subseteq \Big[(\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta-\varepsilon-\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta})\mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big), (\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta-\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta})\mathbb{P}\Big(f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta}\leq\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_{A}},\theta,\zeta}\Big)\Big], \end{split}$$

which leads to $0 \leq \lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \leq \varepsilon$. However, we cannot conclude that $\lambda_{f+\varepsilon 1_A,\theta,\zeta}$ is necessarily differentiable w.r.t. ε . In the same manner, we obtain

$$\begin{split} -\frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} \mathbb{P}(A) &= \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}]}{\theta} - \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds - \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} \mathbf{1}_{A}} \mathbf{1}_{\{f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\}} dz\Big] \\ &\in \Big[\int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\theta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds, \int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds\Big] \\ &\subseteq \Big[\Big(\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big) \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big), (\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}) \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{A}}\Big)\Big] \end{split}$$

and

$$\begin{split} -\frac{1-\mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta}\varepsilon &= \frac{1-\mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta+\varepsilon} - \frac{1-\mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\theta} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta+\varepsilon,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} - \frac{\zeta\varepsilon}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta} \le s\Big) ds - \int_{-\infty}^{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds \\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta+\varepsilon,\zeta} + \frac{\zeta\varepsilon}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta}} \mathbf{1}_{\{f+\frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\}} dz\Big] \\ &\in \Big[\int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta+\varepsilon,\zeta} + \frac{\varepsilon\operatorname{ess\,inf}\zeta}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds, \int_{\lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}}^{\lambda_{f,\theta+\varepsilon,\zeta} + \frac{\varepsilon\operatorname{ess\,sup}\zeta}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta}} \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le s\Big) ds\Big] \\ &\subseteq \Big[\Big(\lambda_{f,\theta+\varepsilon,\zeta} + \frac{\varepsilon\operatorname{ess\,inf}\zeta}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta}\Big) \mathbb{P}\Big(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} + \frac{\varepsilon\operatorname{ess\,sup}\zeta}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta}\Big)\Big] \end{split}$$

which respectively lead to

$$-\frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} \frac{\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_A})} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_A} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} \le \frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta})}\right) \le \frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} \mathbb{P}(\Omega \setminus A)$$

and

$$\begin{split} \lambda_{f,\theta+\varepsilon,\zeta} - \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} &\in \bigg[-\frac{\varepsilon}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta} \bigg(\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\mathbb{P}(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta} + \frac{\varepsilon \operatorname{ess\,sup\,}\zeta}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta})} + \operatorname{ess\,sup\,}\zeta \bigg), \\ &\quad -\frac{\varepsilon}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta} \bigg(\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\mathbb{P}(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta})} + \operatorname{ess\,sup\,}\zeta \bigg) \bigg] \\ &\subseteq \bigg[-\frac{\varepsilon}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta} \bigg(\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]}{\mathbb{P}(f + \frac{\zeta}{\theta} \le \lambda_{f,\theta,\zeta})} + \operatorname{ess\,sup\,}\zeta \bigg), -\frac{\varepsilon}{(\theta+\varepsilon)\theta} (1 - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]) \bigg]. \end{split}$$

C Supplementary note for the static problem

For the case with \mathcal{F} generated by a countably infinite partition of Ω , we assume, without any loss of generality, that $\Omega = \mathbb{N}_+$, $\mathcal{F} = 2^{\Omega}$ and $\mathbb{P}(\omega) > 0$ for any $\omega \in \Omega$. For the sake of brevity, we let n = 1 and $\zeta = 0$, and note that the following method is also suitable for general (n, ζ) . To express the value of random variables corresponding to each sample ω , let us employ the following representations (inspired by Parseval's theorem):

$$R - r = \sum_{\omega=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega\}} \big(\mathbb{P}(\omega) \big)^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\omega}, \quad 1 = \sum_{\omega=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega\}} \big(\mathbb{P}(\omega) \big)^{-\frac{1}{2}} q_{\omega}, \quad Y = \sum_{\omega=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega\}} \big(\mathbb{P}(\omega) \big)^{-\frac{1}{2}} y_{\omega},$$

with $q_{\omega} > 0$ for any ω . Write $\vec{y} = (y_1, y_2, \ldots)$, etc., so that the minimization problem given by (20) is reduced to

minimizing $\|\vec{y}\|^2$ subject to $\vec{y} \ge \vec{0}, \ \langle \vec{y}, \vec{q} \rangle = 1, \ \langle \vec{y}, \vec{b} \rangle = 0.$ (67)

Notably, $\|\vec{q}\| = 1$, $\|b\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2 = \operatorname{Var}[R] > 0$, and $\vec{y} = \vec{q}$ is the minimizer if and only if $\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle = 0$. Assume that $\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle \neq 0$ in what follows. For the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_3(\vec{y}, \vec{\beta}, \mu, \nu) = \|\vec{y}\|^2 / 2 - \langle \vec{y}, \vec{\beta} \rangle + \mu \langle \vec{y}, \vec{b} \rangle - \nu(\langle \vec{y}, \vec{q} \rangle - 1)$, we have the following KKT condition:

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \vec{y} - \vec{\beta} + \mu \vec{b} - \nu \vec{q}, \\ \langle \vec{y}, \vec{b} \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \vec{y}, \vec{q} \rangle = 1, \\ \langle \vec{y}, \vec{\beta} \rangle = 0, \quad \vec{\beta} \ge \vec{0}, \quad \vec{y} \ge \vec{0} \end{cases}$$

With a slight abuse of notation, we let \vec{y} be the minimizer for (67). Referring to the steps as in Appendices A.8 and A.9, one can obtain

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \|\vec{y}\|^2 - \nu, \quad i.e. \quad \nu = \|\nu\|^2 > 1; \\ 0 = -\langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{b} \rangle + \mu \|\vec{b}\|^2 - \nu \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle, \\ 0 = 1 - \langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{q} \rangle + \mu \langle \vec{b}, \vec{q} \rangle - \nu, \end{cases}$$

and the component-wise equalities $\vec{y} = (\nu \vec{q} - \mu \vec{b})_+$ and $\vec{\beta} = (\mu \vec{b} - \nu \vec{q})_+$. Since

$$\mu \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle = \nu - 1 + \langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{q} \rangle > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \vec{y} = \left(\|\vec{y}\|^2 \vec{q} - \frac{\nu - 1 + \langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{q} \rangle}{\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle} \vec{b} \right)_+,$$

we conclude that $\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle b_k \leq 0$ is sufficient for $y_k > 0$. In particular, $y_k = ||y||^2 q_k$ for all k that $b_k = 0$. This implies that the minimizer $Y \equiv \mathbb{E}[Y^2]$ on $\{k : b_k = 0\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, if there exists some positive integer K such that $b_k = 0$ for all $k \geq K$, or namely, there are only finitely many states such that $R \neq r$, then one can solve the problem given by given by (20) on the σ -field generated by the finite partition $(\{1\}, \{2\}, \ldots, \{K-1\}, \{K, K+1, \ldots\})$ of Ω , which should result in $Y|_{\{K, K+1, \ldots\}} \equiv \mathbb{E}[Y^2]$. If $\vec{\beta} = 0$, then substituting $\mu = \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle / (\|\vec{b}\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2)$ and $\nu = \|\vec{b}\|^2 / (\|\vec{b}\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2)$ back into the first line of the KKT condition yields

$$\vec{0} \le \vec{y} = \frac{\|\vec{b}\|^2}{\|\vec{b}\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2} \vec{q} - \frac{\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle}{\|\vec{b}\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2} \vec{b} = \frac{\|\vec{b}\|^2}{\|\vec{b}\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2} \left(\vec{q} - \frac{\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle}{\|\vec{b}\|^2} \vec{b} \right).$$

The converse of this proposition is also true. Consequently, $\vec{q} - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle \vec{b} / \|\vec{b}\|^2 \ge \vec{0}$ if and only if its normalization is the minimizer for (67). Let us assume that there is at least one

$$m_k := \frac{\|\vec{b}\|^2}{\|\vec{b}\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2} \left(q_k - \frac{\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle}{\|\vec{b}\|^2} b_k \right) < 0.$$

Given $\|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\| > 0$ arising from $\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle \neq 0$, let us introduce

$$\vec{p} := \frac{1}{\|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\|} (\vec{m} - \vec{q}) = \frac{\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2}{\|\vec{b}\|^2 - \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle^2} \left(\vec{q} - \frac{1}{\langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle} \vec{b} \right)$$

so that $\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\}$ contributes an orthonormal basis for span $\{\vec{q}, \vec{b}\}$, and $\vec{m} = \|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\|\vec{p} + \vec{q}$ conversely. Since $\langle \vec{m}, \vec{b} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \vec{m}, \vec{q} \rangle = 1$ lead to $\langle \vec{y} - \vec{m}, \vec{b} \rangle = \langle \vec{y}, \vec{b} \rangle$ and $\langle \vec{y} - \vec{m}, \vec{q} \rangle = \langle \vec{y}, \vec{q} \rangle - 1$, respectively, (67) can be reduced to minimizing the distance $\|\vec{y} - \vec{m}\|^2$ subject to $\vec{y} \ge \vec{0}$, $\langle \vec{y} - \vec{m}, \vec{p} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \vec{y} - \vec{m}, \vec{q} \rangle = 0$.

By dummy variable replacement, it is supposed to minimize $\|\vec{y}\|^2$ subject to $\vec{y} + \vec{m} \ge \vec{0}$ and $\vec{y} \in \ker\{\vec{p}, \vec{q}\}$. So we introduce the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_4(\vec{y}, \vec{\beta}, \mu, \nu) = \|\vec{y}\|^2/2 - \langle \vec{y} + \vec{m}, \vec{\beta} + \vec{m} \rangle + \mu \langle \vec{y}, \vec{p} \rangle + \nu \langle \vec{y}, \vec{q} \rangle$, and then arrive at the following KKT condition:

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \vec{y} - \vec{\beta} - \vec{m} + \mu \vec{p} + \nu \vec{q}, \\ \langle \vec{y}, \vec{p} \rangle = \langle \vec{y}, \vec{q} \rangle = 0, \\ \langle \vec{y} + \vec{m}, \vec{\beta} + \vec{m} \rangle = 0, \quad \vec{\beta} + \vec{m} \ge 0, \quad \vec{y} + \vec{m} \ge \vec{0} \end{cases}$$

Consequently, $\mu = \langle \vec{\beta} + \vec{m}, \vec{p} \rangle$, $\nu = \langle \vec{\beta} + \vec{m}, \vec{q} \rangle$ and

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \|\vec{y}\|^2 - \langle \vec{y}, \vec{\beta} + \vec{m} \rangle = \|\vec{y}\|^2 + \langle \vec{m}, \vec{\beta} + \vec{m} \rangle = \|\vec{y}\|^2 + \|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\|\mu + \nu_{\vec{q}} \\ \vec{y} + \vec{m} = (\mu \vec{p} + \nu \vec{q} - \vec{m})_- = (\langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{p} \rangle \vec{p} + \langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{q} \rangle \vec{q})_-, \\ \vec{\beta} + \vec{m} = (\mu \vec{p} + \nu \vec{q} - \vec{m})_+ = (\langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{p} \rangle \vec{p} + \langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{q} \rangle \vec{q})_+. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, $\vec{\beta} + \vec{m} = \vec{0}$ would lead to $\vec{y} = 0$, which contradicts $\vec{y} \ge -\vec{m}$ with some $m_k < 0$. Then, $\nu > 0$ follows due to $\vec{q} > 0$, and hence, $\mu = -(\nu + \|\vec{y}\|^2)/\|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\| < -\nu/\|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\| < 0$. In view of

$$\langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{p} \rangle \vec{p} + \langle \vec{\beta}, \vec{q} \rangle \vec{q} = \mu \vec{p} + \nu \vec{q} - \vec{m} = \left(\nu - \frac{\mu}{\|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\|}\right) \vec{q} - \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\|\vec{m} - \vec{q}\|}\right) \vec{m},$$

we conclude that $y_k = -m_k$ for such k that $m_k \leq 0$, or namely, $q_k \leq \langle \vec{q}, \vec{b} \rangle b_k / \|\vec{b}\|^2$. This implies that if there are only finitely many $m_k > 0$, then the problem is further reduced to

$$\begin{cases} \text{minimizing} & \left\|(y_1, \dots, y_K)\right\|^2 \\ \text{subject to} & y_j \ge -m_j, \ \sum_{j=1}^K y_j p_j = \sum_{j=K+1}^\infty m_j p_j, \ \sum_{j=1}^K y_j q_j = \sum_{j=K+1}^\infty m_j q_j. \end{cases}$$

where $K = \max\{k : m_k > 0\}.$

D No quadratic expression

D.1 For \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger} in Theorem 4.14

Below we show that a quadratic \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger} must lead to a contradiction. Given the boundary condition (48), the degree of freedom for the quadratic $\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is three. For the sake of brevity, we write the column vector $\vec{y} := (\rho c - \rho x \exp(\int_t^T r_v dv) + \mathbb{E}^{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t], \kappa z)^{\top}$ and f = f(t, x, z) for $f = \mathcal{V}^{\ddagger}, \Phi$ and their partial derivatives, and assume that for all $(t, x, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty)$,

$$\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger} = \frac{1}{2} \vec{y}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho} e^{-\int_{t}^{T} |\vartheta_{v}|^{2} dv} & A_{t} \\ A_{t} & B_{t} \end{pmatrix} \vec{y} + \vec{y}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ C_{t} \end{pmatrix} + c \mathbb{E}[\zeta|\mathcal{F}_{t}] + \frac{1}{2\rho} \mathbb{E}[\zeta^{2}|\mathcal{F}_{t}],$$

where the parameters (A_t, B_t, C_t) are to be determined later. Write $df_t = \mathcal{L}_t^f dt + \mathcal{I}_t^f dW_t$ for semimartingale decomposition of f = A, B, C. It follows that

$$d\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger} = \frac{1}{2}\vec{y}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho} |\vartheta_t|^2 e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} & \mathcal{L}_t^A \\ \mathcal{L}_t^A & \mathcal{L}_t^B \end{pmatrix} \vec{y} dt + \vec{y}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho} e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} & A_t \\ A_t & B_t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \rho x r_t e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} dt \\ + \vec{y}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{I}_t^A \tilde{\eta}_t + \mathcal{L}_t^C \end{pmatrix} dt - \frac{1}{2\rho} |\tilde{\eta}_t|^2 e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} dt + \Phi^{\ddagger} dW_t.$$
(68)

On the other hand, plugging the optimality condition (38) into (34), with changing the corresponding notation, we obtain

$$d\mathcal{V}^{\ddagger} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_x^{\ddagger} \vartheta_t + \Phi_x^{\ddagger} \\ \Phi_z^{\ddagger} \end{pmatrix}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\ddagger} & \mathcal{V}_{xz}^{\ddagger} \\ \mathcal{V}_{xz}^{\ddagger} & \mathcal{V}_{zz}^{\ddagger} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_x^{\ddagger} \vartheta_t + \Phi_x^{\ddagger} \\ \Phi_z^{\ddagger} \end{pmatrix} dt - \mathcal{V}_x^{\ddagger} x r_t dt + \Phi dW_t,$$
(69)

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Phi_x + \mathcal{V}_x^{\dagger} \vartheta_t \\ \Phi_z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho} \vartheta_t e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} & \vartheta_t A_t + \mathcal{I}_t^A \\ \mathcal{I}_t^A & \mathcal{I}_t^B \end{pmatrix} \vec{y} \\ + \begin{pmatrix} -\rho e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho} \tilde{\eta}_t e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \\ A_t \tilde{\eta}_t + \mathcal{I}_t^C \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{xx}^{\dagger} & \mathcal{V}_{xz}^{\dagger} \\ \mathcal{V}_{xz}^{\dagger} & \mathcal{V}_{zz}^{\dagger} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho} e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} & A_t \\ A_t & B_t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\rho e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_{x}^{\dagger}xr_{t} = -\vec{y}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho}e^{-\int_{t}^{T}\left|\vartheta_{v}\right|^{2}dv} & A_{t} \\ A_{t} & B_{t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \rho xr_{t}e^{\int_{t}^{T}r_{v}dv} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

arise from

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_x^{\ddagger} \\ \mathcal{V}_z^{\ddagger} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho e^{\int_t^T r_v dv} & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho} e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} & A_t \\ A_t & B_t \end{pmatrix} \vec{y} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \kappa C_t \end{pmatrix}.$$

By comparing the coefficients in (68) and (69), especially those of $x^2 dt$ and xzdt, we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{\rho}|\vartheta_t|^2 e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho}\vartheta_t e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \\ \mathcal{I}_t^A \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho}e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} & A_t \\ A_t & B_t \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho}\vartheta_t e^{-\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} \\ \mathcal{I}_t^A \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{t}^{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_{t}A_{t} + \mathcal{I}_{t}^{A} \\ \mathcal{I}_{t}^{B} \end{pmatrix}^{\top} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\rho}e^{-\int_{t}^{T}|\vartheta_{v}|^{2}dv} & A_{t} \\ A_{t} & B_{t} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_{t}A_{t} + \mathcal{I}_{t}^{A} \\ \mathcal{I}_{t}^{B} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the first equation gives $\vartheta_t A_t = \mathcal{I}_t^A$. Consequently,

$$dA_t = \mathcal{L}_t^A dt + \mathcal{I}_t^A dW_t = 2|\vartheta_t|^2 A_t dt + \mathcal{I}_t^A \bigg(dW_t + \frac{\mathcal{I}_t^A - \mathcal{I}_t^B}{\rho |A_t|^2 e^{\int_t^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv} + B_t} dt \bigg).$$

However, subject to $A_T = -1/\rho$ from the terminal condition (46), the above SDE has no solution satisfying $\vartheta_t A_t = \mathcal{I}_t^A$. Otherwise, one can introduce some probability measure \mathbb{P}^{\ddagger} such that $\{W_t^{\ddagger}\}_{t \in [0,T]}$ is the one-dimensional standard Brownian motion and $dA_t = 2A_t |\vartheta_t|^2 dt + \mathcal{I}_t^A dW_t^{\ddagger}$, which gives $d\mathbb{E}[A_s|\mathcal{F}_t] = 2|\vartheta_s|^2 \mathbb{E}[A_s|\mathcal{F}_t] ds$, or equivalently, $\mathbb{E}[A_s|\mathcal{F}_t] = -\exp(2\int_s^T |\vartheta_v|^2 dv)/\rho$. Sending *s* to *t* yields a deterministic $A_t \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{I}^A \equiv 0$, which leads to a contradiction.

D.2 For \mathcal{V}^{\sharp} as the value random field associated with Problem (52)

With a slight abuse of notation (A_t, B_t) , we try

$$\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(t,z) = \frac{1}{2}A_t z^2 + B_t z + \frac{\theta + \rho}{2\theta\rho} \mathbb{E}[\zeta^2 | \mathcal{F}_t] + \mathbb{E}[Y\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t],$$

with $A_T = \kappa^2(\theta + \rho)/(\theta \rho)$ and $B_T = \kappa \zeta(\theta + \rho)/(\theta \rho) + \kappa Y$. Consequently,

$$\mathcal{V}_{z}^{\sharp}(t,z) = A_{t}z + B_{t}, \quad \Phi_{z}^{\sharp}(t,z) = \mathcal{I}_{t}^{A}z + \mathcal{I}_{t}^{B}, \quad d\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(t,z) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{t}^{A}z^{2} + \mathcal{L}_{t}^{B}z\right)dt + \Phi^{\sharp}(t,z)dW_{t}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\operatorname{essinf}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{V}_{zz}^{\sharp}(t,z) \gamma^{2} + \Phi_{z}^{\sharp}(t,z) \gamma \right\} = -\frac{|\Phi_{z}^{\sharp}(t,z)|^{2}}{2 \mathcal{V}_{zz}^{\sharp}(t,z)} = -\frac{1}{2A_{t}} (\mathcal{I}_{t}^{A} z + \mathcal{I}_{t}^{B})^{2}.$$

By comparing the above different expressions for the drift term of $d\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(t,z)$, we conclude that $(\mathcal{L}^{B}, \mathcal{I}^{B})$ both vanish, that is $dB_{t} = 0$. Besides, we have

$$dA_t = -\frac{1}{A_t} |\mathcal{I}_t^A|^2 dt + \mathcal{I}_t^A dW_t = \mathcal{I}_t^A \Big(dW_t - \frac{\mathcal{I}_t^A}{A_t} dt \Big),$$

which implies that $dA_t = 0$, and hence $\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(t, z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{V}^{\sharp}(T, z)|\mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}[G(\kappa z + \zeta, Y)|\mathcal{F}_t]$. This leads to a contradiction, unless B_T is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable with t being the initial epoch of (52).