

# Optimal Insurance under Endogenous Default and Background Risk

Zongxia Liang\*      Zhaojie Ren†      Bin Zou‡

This version: January 13, 2025

## Abstract

This paper studies an optimal insurance problem for a utility-maximizing buyer of insurance, subject to the seller’s endogenous default and background risk. An endogenous default occurs when the buyer’s contractual indemnity exceeds the seller’s available reserve, which is random due to the background risk. We obtain an analytical solution to the optimal contract for two types of insurance contracts, differentiated by whether their indemnity functions depend on the seller’s background risk. The results shed light on the joint effect of the seller’s default and background risk on the buyer’s insurance demand.

**Keywords:** Optimal insurance, counterparty default, background risk, utility maximization

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background and Motivation

A typical insurance contract involves two parties, a *buyer* (they) and a *seller* (it), in risk sharing.<sup>1</sup> The buyer is exposed to a loss  $X$  and purchases an insurance contract with indemnity  $I$  from the seller to cover the loss  $X$ . The seller charges a premium  $\pi$  for the insurance contract and agrees to indemnify the buyer an amount of  $I(x)$  in the event of a covered loss with size  $x > 0$ . The design of optimal insurance contracts aims to identify the optimal indemnity function under a chosen criterion and has long been a pivotal topic in insurance economics and actuarial science (see [Arrow \(1963\)](#)). The goal of this paper is to derive an optimal insurance contract for a utility-maximizing buyer, subject to the seller’s endogenous default and background risk.

The classical literature on optimal insurance makes an *implicit* assumption that the seller can always fulfill its promised contract payment, specified by  $I$ , to the buyer. However, this assumption is challenged in real-world insurance markets because many factors, such as catastrophic

---

\*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. Email: liang-zongxia@tsinghua.edu.cn.

†Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. Email: rzj20@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn.

‡Department of Mathematics, University of Connecticut, USA. Email: bin.zou@uconn.edu.

<sup>1</sup>Other common names for the buyer of insurance include policyholders and insureds; the seller of insurance is frequently called insurers or insurance companies. Reinsurance is a secondary-level insurance contract, with the buyer being an insurer and the seller a reinsurer ([Albrecher et al. \(2017\)](#)). Our setup also applies to the study of optimal reinsurance problems, and, to avoid potential confusion, we use the terms, buyer and seller.

climate events or systemic risk in the financial markets, could lead to the partial (or even no) payment on covered losses from the seller (Cummins and Mahul (2003)). The failure to pay the contractual indemnity  $I$  from the seller of insurance is a particular case of *contract nonperformance* (Doherty and Schlesinger (1990)) and, as one would expect, has a significant impact on the buyer’s insurance demand (Peter and Ying (2020)). According to data from the National Organization of Life and Health Insurance Guaranty Association, there are a total of 94 liquidations of major insurance companies in the USA between 1988 and 2023, with the highest annual number of 13 in 1994.<sup>2</sup>

There are two main contributors to the failure of insurance companies. The first one is a catastrophic event that results in a large realization of insured losses. In a recent example, Hurricanes Helene and Milton hit Florida within a two-week period, together causing insured losses estimated between \$30 billion and \$50 billion,<sup>3</sup> and put several small, Florida-based insurance companies under huge financial stress. The second contributor comes from the seller’s *background risk*, broadly defined as random sources that impact the seller’s reserve for settling claims. One particular source of background risk is the seller’s exposure to financial risks, but it can also include, for instance, geopolitical and social risks, and even pandemic risk. A prime example is the failure of AIG in 2008, which led to the largest government bailout in the USA surpassing \$182 billion. Sjostrom Jr (2009) concludes that “AIG’s collapse was largely due to its \$526 billion portfolio of credit default swaps,” a type of financial derivatives. Indeed, the insurance industry is heavily exposed to financial risks; in the USA alone, the insurance industry reported \$8.5 trillion in total cash and invested assets by the end of 2023.<sup>4</sup> To understand the nonperformance of insurance contracts in theory, note that contractual indemnity  $I$  is often an increasing function of the buyer’s loss, and there exists a threshold  $\bar{x}$ , potentially depending on the seller’s background risk, such that for all  $x > \bar{x}$ , the contractual indemnity  $I(x)$  exceeds the seller’s available reserve, resulting in an *endogenous* default. To summarize, both empirical and theoretical evidence motivate us to incorporate the seller’s endogenous default and background risk in the study of optimal insurance.

## 1.2 Summary and Contributions of the Paper

We study an optimal insurance problem in a one-period model for a utility-maximizing buyer who is exposed to an insurable loss  $X$ . For an insurance contract (with indemnity)  $I$ , the seller applies the expected-value principle, with a nonnegative loading  $\eta$ , to calculate the premium by  $\pi(I) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I]$ . The seller’s terminal reserve is  $R = (S + \pi(I))^+$ , in which  $S$  is a random variable and captures the seller’s (additive) background risk. As argued in Section 1.1, we consider the seller’s endogenous default and define it as an event whenever the indemnity  $I$  exceeds the seller’s reserve  $R$ . As such, for a contract  $I$ , the indemnity payment received by the buyer changes from “contractual amount”  $I$  to “actual amount”  $\mathbb{I} = I \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \leq R\}} + \tau R \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I > R\}}$ , in which  $\tau \in [0, 1]$

---

<sup>2</sup>See <https://nolhga.com/policyholders/insolvent-insurance-companies>.

<sup>3</sup>See the report from Moody’s RMS Event Response at <https://www.rms.com/newsroom/announcement/2024-10-17/moodys-rms-ev>

<sup>4</sup>See a special report from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners at <https://content.naic.org/sites/default/files/capital-markets-special-reports-asset-mix-ye2023.pdf>.

is the recovery ratio in case of an endogenous default. The buyer is aware that their insurance contract may be nonperforming (i.e., receiving  $\mathbb{I}$  instead of  $I$ ) and seeks an optimal contract  $I^*$  to maximize the expected utility of their terminal wealth, as formulated in Section 2.

In Section 3, the buyer is allowed to choose contracts in the form of  $I := I(X, S)$ ; i.e., the indemnity  $I$  can be a function of both the buyer's loss  $X$  and the seller's background risk (random reserve)  $S$ . We follow a two-step approach to obtain the buyer's *globally* optimal contract  $I^*$ . In the first step, we fix the contract premium at a given level  $a$  (restricting to  $\{I : \pi(I) = a\}$ ) and obtain the *locally* optimal contract  $I_a^*$  (see Theorem 3.3). In the second step, we optimize over all feasible  $a$  and identify the optimal premium level  $a^*$ . The globally optimal contract is then given by  $I^* = I_{a^*}^*$  (see Theorem 3.5). We obtain  $I^*$  in a semiclosed form and show that it is a single deductible insurance with policy limit; in addition, the seller will never default under contract  $I^*$ . These results (in Theorem 3.5) are obtained over the *largest* possible set of admissible indemnities (see Remark 3.1) and require only mild conditions on  $X$  and  $S$  (Assumption 1); to the best of our knowledge, they are new to the optimal insurance literature. We also derive *analytical* results on the comparative statics of the optimal contract, including its deductible, policy limit, and premium (see Proposition 3.7), while the existing literature obtains limited results, mostly relying on numerical analysis. In particular, we show that the optimal deductible decreases with respect to the seller's reserve and the buyer's risk aversion, but increases with respect to the buyer's initial wealth.

In Section 4, the buyer can only choose contracts in the form of  $I := I(X)$ , a subclass of the contracts considered in Section 3. However, the resulting optimal insurance problem is extremely challenging to solve, and the two-approach approach in Section 3 *cannot* be applied here. To our awareness, such an optimal insurance problem has not been studied previously in the literature. By imposing the incentive compatible (IC) condition on  $I$  and assuming that the discrete  $S$  is independent of  $X$ , we characterize the (locally) optimal contract  $I_S^* := I_S^*(X)$  in a parametric form (see Theorem 4.3). We show that  $I_S^*$  is a *multi-layer* insurance contract, and each layer involves a deductible and a policy limit, both depending on a free parameter  $l_i$ . With additional conditions (e.g.,  $I_S^*$  has two layers), we can further obtain the optimal parameters,  $l_1^*$  and  $l_2^*$ , and fully identify the optimal contract  $I_S^*$  (see Proposition 4.4). We remark that endogenous default may occur under  $I_S^*$  in Section 4, but  $I^*$  obtained in Section 3 is a *default-free* contract. This striking difference highlights the impact of the seller's background risk and the choice of contracts on decision making.

### 1.3 Related Literature

The seminal work of Arrow (1963) considers a one-period insurance model without the counterparty default and background risk, and it shows that the optimal contract is a deductible insurance for a utility-maximizing buyer under the expected-value premium principle. A significant body of the literature on optimal insurance (or reinsurance) aims to extend Arrow's model by exploring different optimization criteria or premium principles (see, e.g., Bernard et al. (2015) for rank-dependent utility (RDU) and Birghila et al. (2023) for maximin expected utility; Asimit et al. (2013) for

distortion premium principles); we refer to [Gollier \(2013\)](#) and [Cai and Chi \(2020\)](#) for an overview of these studies.<sup>5</sup> This paper, on the other hand, incorporates the counterparty default risk and background risk into Arrow’s model and studies the buyer’s optimal insurance problem accordingly. As such, we focus on reviewing related works that consider default or background risk.

In terms of modeling default risk, there are two main approaches. The first approach models the seller’s default as an *exogenous* event, often by a binary random variable independent of the buyer’s loss. [Doherty and Schlesinger \(1990\)](#) follow this approach in their model and are among the earliest to study insurance demand under default risk (restricting to proportional contracts). In addition, they assume that the default probability is known to both parties, and when default occurs, *no* indemnity payment is made to the buyer (i.e., the recovery rate is  $\tau = 0$ ). As they write, “A nonzero probability of default renders most of the standard insurance results invalid” (p.244), and their findings demonstrate the profound impact of default risk on insurance demand. There are substantial extensions to [Doherty and Schlesinger \(1990\)](#) in the literature by now.<sup>6</sup>

The second approach, adopted by this paper, models the seller’s default as an *endogenous* event which occurs when the seller’s reserve is less than the contractual indemnity. This approach is arguably more realistic than the first one but in the meantime, leads to a challenging optimal insurance problem, which may explain why there is only limited study under endogenous default. To save space, we mainly focus on papers that are closely related to our paper.<sup>7</sup> In an early attempt, [Biffis and Millosovich \(2012\)](#) study a Pareto optimal insurance problem under endogenous default (and background risk) for a risk-averse buyer and a risk-neutral seller. They derive several properties of the optimal insurance, should it exist, but fail to find an analytical solution to the optimal contract. [Asimit et al. \(2013\)](#) consider a more concrete setup (but without background risk) in which the seller’s reserve is based on the Value-at-Risk (VaR) rule, and insurance contracts are priced by the distortion premium principle. When the buyer aims to minimize their risk (measured by either VaR or a distortion risk measure), they obtain the optimal contract in (semi)closed form. [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#) conduct a similar study as [Asimit et al. \(2013\)](#) but assume the expected-value premium principle and no bankruptcy costs ( $\tau = 1$ ); they find an analytical solution for the optimal contract that maximizes the buyer’s expected utility or minimizes the VaR. Note that neither [Asimit et al. \(2013\)](#) nor [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#) consider the seller’s background risk. We discuss the key differences between our paper and [Biffis and Millosovich \(2012\)](#), [Asimit et al. \(2013\)](#), and [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#) in the main paper; see Remark 3.1 on admissible indemnities, Remark 3.3 on model assumptions, and Remarks 3.2 and 3.4 on optimal contracts.

Next, we discuss existing research on optimal insurance problems that considers background

---

<sup>5</sup>Another direction is to extend [Arrow \(1963\)](#) to (dynamic) continuous-time models. For this, see [Tan et al. \(2020\)](#), [Guan et al. \(2023\)](#), [Jin et al. \(2024\)](#), and the references therein.

<sup>6</sup>In the model of [Cummins and Mahul \(2003\)](#), the buyer and the seller have different beliefs about the probability of (exogenous) default; [Peter and Ying \(2020\)](#) further introduce ambiguity (on contract nonperformance) into the buyer’s preferences. Recently, [Reichel et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Chi et al. \(2023\)](#) assume that the buyer of insurance has access to a hedging instrument and invests in it to (partially) hedge the default risk from the seller.

<sup>7</sup>There are certainly other papers that feature endogenous default in their insurance models. For instance, [Chen et al. \(2024\)](#) seek a Bowley solution (Stackelberg equilibrium) to a reinsurance game with default risk.

risk. The wealth of an individual, either the buyer or seller of insurance, is exposed to various risks. Here, we broadly define *background risk* as random risks that impact the individual’s wealth but are either uninsurable or not insured.<sup>8</sup> Recall that the buyer’s initial wealth is a constant in the classical models (see [Borch \(1962\)](#) and [Arrow \(1963\)](#)); much of the effort is devoted to incorporating the *buyer’s* background risk into the model. [Doherty and Schlesinger \(1983\)](#) study optimal deductible insurance when the buyer’s initial wealth is random (due to background risk). [Mayers and Smith Jr \(1983\)](#) consider a particular case in which the buyer’s background risk comes from the financial market and study the optimal demand for quota share (proportional) insurance and financial assets. [Dana and Scarsini \(2007\)](#) and [Chi and Wei \(2020\)](#) explore the risk sharing or optimal insurance problem under a general dependence structure between the buyer’s insurable and background risks. However, as supported by the evidence in [Section 1.1](#), the *seller’s* background risk is at least as important as the buyer’s background risk, if not more so; however, related research is quite limited. The model in [Biffis and Millossovich \(2012\)](#) is a rare example and considers *both* the buyer’s and seller’s background risk; but they do not obtain an explicit optimal contract. [Filipović et al. \(2015\)](#) consider the seller’s background risk (financial risk) and allow it to invest in a risky asset, while [Boonen \(2019\)](#) extends to an equilibrium model with multiple buyers.

This paper also relates to the literature on risk sharing, which concerns the redistribution of risks among multiple participants under a suitable criterion.<sup>9</sup> In a classical work, [Borch \(1962\)](#) studies a (cooperative) risk-sharing game under Pareto optimality in reinsurance markets and applies the standard expected utility theory (EUT) to model insurers’ individual preferences. Recent studies often adopt the risk minimization criterion under a particular choice of risk measure, such as quantile-based risk measures ([Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Embrechts et al. \(2020\)](#)) and Lambda VaR ([Liu \(2024\)](#)), or consider alternative preferences to EUT, such as RDU ([Beißner et al. \(2024\)](#)).

## 2 Model

We consider a one-period model and study the optimal insurance problem for a buyer of insurance. We fix a complete probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and denote by  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  the expectation taken under  $\mathbb{P}$ . The buyer’s insurable loss (risk) is modeled by a nonnegative  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable random variable  $X$ . We assume that  $X$  is bounded from above,  $0 < M := \text{ess sup } X < \infty$ .<sup>10</sup> To mitigate the risk exposure, the buyer purchases insurance from the insurance market, and we denote the *indemnity* function of an insurance contract by  $I$  and the set of all admissible (feasible) indemnity functions by  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ , which we specify later when solving the problem. Given the one-to-one relation between an insurance contract and its indemnity function  $I$ , we often call  $I$  a contract. We assume that

---

<sup>8</sup>The background risk is treated as an *additive* risk to the buyer’s or seller’s wealth, unless stated otherwise. For *multiplicative* background risk, see [Franke et al. \(2006\)](#) and [Bernard and Ludkovski \(2012\)](#).

<sup>9</sup>Optimal insurance problem is a special case of risk sharing with two participants, one buyer and one seller.

<sup>10</sup>This assumption is not restrictive because the upper bound  $M$  can be arbitrarily large, and it is a common assumption in the literature (see, e.g., [Biffis and Millossovich \(2012\)](#) and [Chi et al. \(2023\)](#)). In addition, we remark that, by imposing certain integrability conditions (see [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#)), the main results can be readily extended to the case of  $M = \infty$ . Note that if  $M = 0$ , then  $X \equiv 0$  almost surely, and the problem becomes trivial.

the seller of insurance applies the expected-value premium principle (see [Arrow \(1963\)](#), [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#), and [Jin et al. \(2024\)](#) among many others) to calculate the contract premium by

$$\pi(I) = (1 + \eta) \mathbb{E}[I], \quad (2.1)$$

in which  $\eta \geq 0$  is the premium loading factor, accounting for the expenses and profits of the seller.

Once a contract  $I$  is chosen by the buyer, the seller's terminal available reserve,  $R$ , for settling claims is given by

$$R = (S + \pi(I))^+, \quad (2.2)$$

in which  $S$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable random variable due to the seller's background risk, and  $y^+ := \max\{0, y\}$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ . The rationale is that the seller sets aside an initial reserve of amount  $r$  at time 0, which consists of both "cash" and "risky assets," and thus its value at time 1,  $S$ , is random. In that regard, one can also call  $S$  the seller's *random reserve* (excluding premium), and the difference  $S - r$  captures the seller's additive background risk. But for the simplicity reason, we call  $S$  the seller's background risk in the sequel.

An *endogenous* default from the seller occurs if (and only if)  $R < I$ ,<sup>11</sup> namely when the seller's terminal reserve falls short of the buyer's contractual indemnity. We assume that in case of an endogenous default, the buyer receives a fraction,  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ , of the seller's available reserve. Note that our setup allows for large negative shocks of  $S$  that result in a negative value of  $S + \pi(I)$ , which is why we take the positive part in (2.2). Mathematically, we introduce a binary variable,  $D := D(I)$ , to track the seller's solvency status by

$$D = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ (default)}, & \text{if } R < I, \\ 0 \text{ (solvent)}, & \text{if } R \geq I. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

$D$  depends not only on the buyer's loss  $X$  and contract  $I$ , but also the seller's background risk  $S$ .

Because insurance contracts may be nonperforming due to the seller's endogenous default, the *actual* indemnity payment,  $\mathbb{I}$ , that the buyer receives from a contract  $I$  is given by

$$\mathbb{I}(I) = I \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{D=0\}} + \tau R \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{D=1\}}, \quad (2.4)$$

in which  $\mathbf{1}$  denotes an indicator function, and  $R$  and  $D$  are defined by (2.2) and (2.3). Therefore, for a chosen contract  $I$ , the buyer's terminal wealth,  $W$ , equals

$$W(I) = w - X - \pi(I) + \mathbb{I}(I), \quad (2.5)$$

in which  $w$  is the buyer's initial wealth,  $\pi(I)$  is given by (2.1), and  $\mathbb{I}$  is the actual indemnity defined in (2.4). Following the classical literature on insurance economics (see [Arrow \(1963\)](#) and [Mossin \(1968\)](#)), we assume that the buyer's preferences are modeled by the standard EUT with a twice differentiable utility function  $u$  that is strictly increasing and strictly concave (i.e.,  $u' > 0$  and  $u'' < 0$ ). We formulate the main problem of the paper as follows.

---

<sup>11</sup>All (in)equalities involving random variables should be understood in the  $\mathbb{P}$  almost surely sense.

**Problem 1.** *The buyer seeks an optimal insurance contract  $I^*$  to maximize the expected utility of their terminal wealth under the seller's endogenous default and background risk, i.e.,*

$$I^* = \operatorname{argsup}_{I \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))],$$

in which  $W(I)$  is given by (2.5).

By definition, the seller defaults if  $(S + \pi(I))^+ < I$ , suggesting that  $S$  plays a key role in its solvency. Because  $I \geq 0$ , we first consider an extreme scenario of  $S \leq 0$  and show that the optimal strategy is to *not* purchase any insurance from the seller.

**Proposition 2.1.** *If  $S \leq 0$ , then the optimal strategy to Problem 1 is no insurance with  $I^* \equiv 0$ .*

*Proof.* For the buyer's wealth  $W$  in (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} W(I) &= w - X - \pi(I) + I \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I \leq (S + \pi(I))^+\}} + \tau(S + \pi(I))^+ \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I > (S + \pi(I))^+\}} \\ &\leq w - X - \pi(I) + (S + \pi(I))^+ \\ &\leq w - X - \pi(I) + \pi(I) = w - X = W(0), \end{aligned}$$

which holds for all  $I \geq 0$ . Because  $u' > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[u(W(I))] \leq \mathbb{E}[u(W(0))]$ , and the result follows.  $\square$

The result in Proposition 2.1 already showcases the important impact of counterparty default on decision making. We know from, for instance, Arrow (1963) that, if the seller's default risk is *ignored*, the optimal contract is a deductible insurance. However, as Proposition 2.1 shows, when the buyer is aware of the counterparty default risk, and the seller's reserve is nonpositive, the optimal decision is to *not* purchase any insurance but to fully rely on self-insurance. Because the case of  $S \leq 0$  is solved by Proposition 2.1 and likely in contradiction to practice in real markets, we study Problem 1 under the standing assumption that  $\mathbb{P}(S > 0) > 0$  in the rest of the paper.

Because there are two random sources,  $X$  and  $S$ , in the model, we consider two types of indemnity functions in the analysis:

1. Loss- and background-risk-dependent indemnities  $I := I(X, S)$ .
2. Loss-dependent indemnities  $I := I(X)$ .

Insurance contracts with indemnities in the form of  $I(X, S)$  are examples of the so-called *randomized* contracts in the insurance literature. Similar randomized (re)insurance contracts are considered in Albrecher and Cani (2019) with an independent Bernoulli random variable and also in Asimit et al. (2021) within multiple indemnity environments. The implementation of such randomized contracts implicitly assumes that the buyer has full knowledge on the seller's random reserve *and* can base their contractual indemnity on  $S$ . Such an assumption may be too strong, and this is why we also consider the second type of contracts with indemnity  $I(X)$  only depending on the buyer's own loss  $X$ , but independent of  $S$ . Note that the second type is the more conventional contract form and a subclass of the first type  $I(X, S)$ , and the two types coincide when there is no background risk ( $S$  reduces to a constant). In either type of contracts, the seller's endogenous default is induced by large losses from the buyer or negative shocks from its background risk.

### 3 Optimal Loss- and Background-Risk-Dependent Indemnities

In this section, we consider loss- and background-risk-dependent indemnities in the form of  $I = I(X, S)$ ; i.e., the buyer is allowed to choose insurance contracts that depend on both its own loss  $X$  and the seller's background risk  $S$ . We impose the minimum condition—the so-called “*principle of indemnity*”—on the indemnity function  $I$ , which leads to the following *admissible* set  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}$ :

$$\mathcal{A} := \{I : [0, M] \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ \mid 0 \leq I(x, s) \leq x \text{ for all } x \geq 0 \text{ and all } s \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (3.1)$$

For every  $I \in \mathcal{A}$ , noting  $R = (S + \pi(I))^+$ , the buyer's terminal wealth  $W$  is given by

$$W(I) = w - X - \pi(I) + I(X, S) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{R \geq I(X, S)\}} + \tau R \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{R < I(X, S)\}}. \quad (3.2)$$

We state the first concrete version of Problem 1 as follows.

**Problem 2.** *The buyer seeks an optimal loss- and background-risk-dependent insurance contract  $I^* := I^*(X, S) \in \mathcal{A}$  to maximize the expected utility of their terminal wealth under the seller's endogenous default and background risk, i.e.,*

$$I^* = \operatorname{argsup}_{I \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))],$$

in which the admissible set  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined in (3.1), and  $W(I)$  is given by (3.2).

**Remark 3.1.** *The admissible set  $\mathcal{A}$  in (3.1) can be seen as an extension to the one,  $\{I : [0, M] \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ \mid 0 \leq I(x) \leq x \text{ for all } x \geq 0\}$ , used in the classical literature (see Arrow (1963) and Mossin (1968)) and is likely the largest admissible set one can consider for a meaningful optimal insurance problem. Indeed, related research often imposes further conditions on admissible indemnities. A prime example is the so-called incentive compatibility (IC) condition, which reads as  $0 \leq I(x) - I(x') \leq x - x'$  for all  $x \geq x' \geq 0$ , and is imposed to rule out certain ex post moral hazard (see Huberman et al. (1983)). Under the IC condition, both the indemnity function  $I$  and the retained loss function  $x - I$  are nondecreasing and satisfy the 1-Lipschitz condition (implying that they are differentiable almost everywhere with the first-order derivatives bounded between 0 and 1). These desirable properties often help simplify the analysis and may even be necessary to obtain an optimal contract in analytical form. For instance, Asimit et al. (2013) and Cai et al. (2014), both of which also consider the default risk from the seller of (re)insurance, rely on the IC condition to derive the optimal contract. We choose to work with  $\mathcal{A}$  in (3.1) to formulate Problem 2 for at least two reasons. First, our method differs from those in Asimit et al. (2013) and Cai et al. (2014) and does not need the extra properties on  $I$  derived from the IC condition. Second, the optimal contract  $I^* \in \mathcal{A}$  we obtain automatically satisfies the IC condition (see Theorem 3.5), therefore there is no need to impose it a priori.*

#### 3.1 Optimal Contract

The goal of this section is to solve Problem 2, and obtain the optimal insurance contract in semi-closed form in Theorem 3.5. We explain the key methodology of solving Problem 2 in a two-step



procedure as follows (see [Reichel et al. \(2022\)](#) for a similar idea, but with major technical differences). For ease of presentation, denote by  $\pi_f$  the premium of a *full* insurance contract, which, according to [\(2.1\)](#), equals

$$\pi_f = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[X]. \quad (3.3)$$

By the definition of admissible indemnities in [\(3.1\)](#), the premium of an admissible contract must be between 0 (no insurance) and  $\pi_f$  (full insurance).

1. In the first step, we fix a premium level  $a \in [0, \pi_f]$  and only consider admissible insurance contracts whose premium is equal to  $a$ . This leads to a reduced admissible set

$$\mathcal{A}_a := \{I \in \mathcal{A} \mid \pi(I) = a\}, \quad a \in [0, \pi_f]. \quad (3.4)$$

We solve [Problem 2](#) over  $\mathcal{A}_a$  and call the solution

$$I_a^* = \operatorname{argsup}_{I \in \mathcal{A}_a} \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))] \quad (3.5)$$

a *locally* optimal insurance contract.

2. In the second step, we search over all premium levels  $a \in [0, \pi_f]$  to find the optimal premium level  $a^*$ , defined by

$$a^* = \operatorname{argsup}_{a \in [0, \pi_f]} \mathbb{E}[u(W(I_a^*))]. \quad (3.6)$$

We call  $I^* = I_{a^*}^*$  a *globally* optimal insurance contract because it solves [Problem 2](#) over  $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{a \in [0, \pi_f]} \mathcal{A}_a$ .

**Step 1.** We first identify a key threshold  $\bar{a}$  for the premium level and show that the optimal premium  $a^*$  lies in the interval  $[0, \bar{a}]$ . As such, we only need to solve [\(3.5\)](#) over all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$  in [Step 1](#). To begin, we present a technical lemma for finding  $\bar{a}$ . Recall that  $\pi_f$  is defined in [\(3.3\)](#).

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $g : [0, \pi_f] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  be defined by*

$$g(a) := (1 + \eta) \mathbb{E} [X - (X - (S + a)^+)^+] - a, \quad (3.7)$$

and define

$$\bar{a} := \inf \{a \in [0, \pi_f] \mid g(a) \leq 0\}. \quad (3.8)$$

*Then,  $g(\bar{a}) = 0$  and  $g(a) > 0$  for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a})$ . In addition, if  $X \wedge S := \min\{X, S\} \leq 0$ , then  $\bar{a} = 0$ . If  $S \geq 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X \wedge S] > 0$ , then  $\bar{a}$  is the unique solution to  $g(a) = 0$ , and  $g(a) < 0$  for all  $a \in (\bar{a}, \pi_f]$ .*

*Proof.* See [Appendix A.1](#). □

Recall that once the buyer chooses an admissible contract  $I \in \mathcal{A}_a$ , the total available reserve from the seller is  $R = (S + a)^+$  by (2.2). As such,  $X - (X - (S + a)^+)^+ = X \wedge (S + a)^+$  is the upper bound on the insurance indemnity, implying that the actual indemnity satisfies  $\mathbb{I}(X, S; I) \leq X \wedge (S + a)^+$  for all  $I \in \mathcal{A}_a$ . This motivates us to consider an insurance contract with the following indemnity function:

$$\bar{I}(x, s) = x - (x - (s + \bar{a})^+)^+, \quad (3.9)$$

in which  $\bar{a}$  is defined in (3.8). The premium of contract  $\bar{I}$  is  $\pi(\bar{I}) = \bar{a}$  because  $g(\bar{a}) = 0$ . Furthermore, as  $\bar{I}(x, s) \leq (s + \bar{a})^+$  for all  $x \geq 0$ , we have  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot; \bar{I}) \equiv \bar{I}$  and  $D(\bar{I}) \equiv 0$  for contract  $\bar{I}$ , implying that  $\bar{I}$  in (3.9) is a *default-free* contract.<sup>12</sup> The discussion so far suggests that contract  $\bar{I}$  in (3.9) serves as a “threshold” on the admissible indemnities, which is confirmed by the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** *For all  $a \in [\bar{a}, \pi_f]$  and all  $I \in \mathcal{A}_a$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[u(W(\bar{I}))] \geq \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))], \quad (3.10)$$

in which  $\bar{I} \in \mathcal{A}_{\bar{a}}$  is defined by (3.9). In addition, if  $X \wedge S \leq 0$ , then  $I^* \equiv 0$  is the globally optimal insurance contract to Problem 2. If  $S \geq 0$  and  $\eta = 0$ , then  $\bar{I} = I^*$  is the globally optimal insurance contract to Problem 2.

*Proof.* See Appendix A.2 . □

Proposition 3.2 offers two important insights. First, consider the case of  $S \geq 0$  and  $\eta = 0$ ; the proposition shows that the optimal insurance is  $\bar{I}$ , a contract with *partial* coverage. If the seller’s default is otherwise ignored in the model, Mossin (1968) shows that the optimal contract when  $\eta = 0$  is full coverage ( $I^*(x) = x$ ). As such, Proposition 3.2 extends Mossin’s result by incorporating the counterparty default risk. Note that the default risk does not impact the deductible choice, as  $\bar{I}$  has a zero deductible (noting  $\bar{I}(x, s) = x$  for all  $x < (s + \bar{a})^+$ ), the same as in Mossin (1968). However, because of the possible default from the seller, the buyer will not seek full coverage even when the loading  $\eta$  is zero. Instead, the optimal contract has a policy limit of  $(S + \bar{a})^+$ , which equals the seller’s reserve. Second, as  $\bar{I}$  dominates all admissible  $I$  with premiums greater than  $\bar{a}$ , the optimal premium level  $a^*$  defined in (3.6) is achieved in  $[0, \bar{a}]$ . As such, the remaining task in Step 1 is to solve (3.5) for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , and the next theorem completes this task.

**Theorem 3.3.** *For every  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , the locally optimal insurance contract  $I_a^*$  to Problem 2 over the constrained set  $\mathcal{A}_a$  in (3.4) is given by*

$$I_a^*(x, s) = (x - d(a))^+ - (x - d(a) - (s + a)^+)^+, \quad (3.11)$$

in which the deductible amount  $d(a) \in [0, M]$  solves the equation

$$g_a(y) := (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - y)^+ - (X - y - (S + a)^+)^+] - a = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix A.3. □




Figure 1: Optimal contract  $I_a^*$  in (3.11).

Several remarks on Theorem 3.3 are due as follows. The optimal contract  $I_a^*$  is obtained in semiclosed form in (3.11), and the only unknown  $d(a)$  can be easily computed by a numerical method. As easily seen from Figure 1,  $I_a^*$  is a deductible insurance contract with policy limit; the deductible amount is  $d(a)$ , and the maximum covered loss is  $d(a) + (s + a)^+$ , yielding a cap of  $(s + a)^+$  on the contractual indemnity. Such a contract structure is economically justifiable and commonly used in practice. On the one hand, the deductible is present due to the cost of risk transferring and indeed vanishes when  $\eta = 0$ . On the other hand, the policy limit is the direct consequence of the seller's default risk. We observe from Figure 1 that  $I_a^*(x, s) \leq (s + a)^+$  for all  $x \geq 0$ , and thus  $I_a^*$  is a default-free contract (i.e.,  $D(I_a^*) \equiv 0$  in (2.3)). Thanks to Theorem 3.3, we can reduce Problem 2, an infinite-dimensional optimization problem, into a one-dimensional scalar optimization problem in (3.6), which we study in the next step. Additional technical remarks on Theorem 3.3 are collected in Remark 3.2

**Remark 3.2.** *Biffis and Millossovich (2012) study a similar optimal insurance problem as the “local version” of Problem 2 in (3.5), and their numerical results show that the optimal contract retains both small and large losses and only insures medium-sized losses, consistent with the optimal contract  $I_a^*$  in (3.11). However, Biffis and Millossovich (2012) do not provide an analytical result on the existence of the deductible amount and policy limit; in contrast, our Theorem 3.3 analytically characterizes the deductible  $d(a)$  as a solution to (3.12) and further obtains the policy limit explicitly as  $d(a) + (s + a)^+$ .*

*Cai et al. (2014) consider an optimal reinsurance problem under endogenous default, similar to our formulation in (3.5); a main difference is that the seller's (reinsurer's) reserve in Cai et al. (2014) is the VaR (at a given level  $\alpha$ ) of the buyer's (insurer's) chosen indemnity (i.e.,  $S = \text{VaR}_\alpha(I(X))$ ). They obtain the optimal reinsurance contract case by case via a lengthy analysis (see Cai et al. (2014), Theorem 2.2). In comparison, we obtain the optimal contract as  $\bar{I}$  in (3.9) for all  $a \geq \bar{a}$  and as  $I_a^*$  in (3.11) for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , both in a simple, unified form, and the proof is concise by a construction method. In addition, the results in Cai et al. (2014) suggest that a policy limit may not exist. But we can employ a method from the proof of Theorem 4.3 to refine their results and show that a policy limit always exists, as indicated by  $I_a^*$  in (3.11).*

*Last, the solution  $d(a)$  to (3.12) may not be unique in general. However, with mild assumptions imposed on the buyer's loss  $X$  (see Corollary 3.4), the uniqueness of  $d(a)$  is gained.*

<sup>12</sup>We call  $I$  a default-free contract if the seller will not default when the buyer chooses contract  $I$  (i.e.,  $D(I) \equiv 0$ ).

**Step 2.** We solve (3.6) to obtain the optimal premium level  $a^*$  and identify the globally optimal insurance contract to Problem 2 as  $I^* = I_{a^*}^*$ . To that end, we make rather mild assumptions on the buyer's loss  $X$  and the seller's background risk  $S$ , and discuss them in Remark 3.3.

**Assumption 1.** *The buyer's loss  $X$  and the seller's background risk  $S$  satisfy the following conditions: (1)  $S \geq 0$ ; (2) both  $X$  and  $X - S$  have a finite number of jump points on  $[0, M]$ ; (3)  $\mathbb{P}(X \leq x)$  strictly increases with respect to  $x \in [0, M]$ ; (4)  $\mathbb{E}[(X - y)^+ - (X - y - S)^+] > 0$  holds for all  $y \in [0, M]$ .*

**Remark 3.3.** *The seller of insurance is required to set aside a strictly positive initial reserve at time 0 (the inception time of a contract), then Condition (1) in Assumption 1, also imposed in Biffis and Millossovich (2012), simply means that risky investments in the seller's reserve, such as equities, have limited liabilities, consistent with most real-life scenarios. By Condition (2), both  $X$  and  $X - S$  can have jumps at any point, but the total number of jumps must be finite. In the literature, similar, but stronger, assumptions are often imposed in the study of optimal (re)insurance problems. For instance, Bernard et al. (2015) assume that  $X$  has no atom, while Cai et al. (2014) assume that  $X$  only has a jump at 0. Condition (3) is also imposed in Asimit et al. (2013) and Cai et al. (2014). Condition (4) is a rather mild condition and holds in real markets, because Condition (3), along with  $S > 0$ , implies Condition (4).*

*On the technical side, because of  $S \geq 0$ , we have  $(S + a)^+ = (S + a)$  for all  $a \geq 0$ , and it helps avoid discontinuities when taking derivatives with respect to  $a$ . Condition (2) is used to show that certain functions are continuously differentiable, except for a finite set. Conditions (3) and (4) ensure the uniqueness of some solutions. These properties are used in the proofs of Corollary 3.4, Theorem 3.5, and Proposition 3.7.*

*In the special case without the seller's background risk, we have  $S \equiv r > 0$ , the initial reserve; recall that  $S \leq 0$  is already analyzed in Proposition 2.1. In this case, we can further remove the conditions on  $S$  in Assumption 1.*

Recall that for a fixed  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , the deductible  $d(a)$  that solves  $g_a(t) = 0$  in Theorem 3.3 may not be unique. However, under Assumption 1, the next corollary shows that  $d(a)$  is unique.

**Corollary 3.4.** *Let Assumption 1 hold. For every  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , there exists a unique solution  $d(a) \in [0, M]$  to  $g_a(y) = 0$  in (3.12).*

*Proof.* See Appendix A.4. □

We now solve for the optimal premium level  $a^*$  and obtain a full solution to the buyer's optimal insurance problem (see Problem 2). Note that when  $S \geq 0$  and  $\eta = 0$ , Proposition 3.2 shows that  $\bar{I}$  in (3.9) is the optimal contract to Problem 2. Also, recall that  $\bar{a}$  is defined by (3.8).

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let Assumption 1 hold. The globally optimal insurance contract  $I^*$  to Problem 2 is*

given by

$$I^*(x, s) = \begin{cases} x - (x - (s + \bar{a}))^+, & \text{if } \eta = 0, \\ (x - d(a^*))^+ - (x - (d(a^*) + s + a^*))^+, & \text{if } 0 < \eta < \frac{u'(w - M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X)]} - 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } \eta \geq \frac{u'(w - M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X)]} - 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

in which  $M = \text{ess sup } X < \infty$ ,  $d(a)$  is established in Corollary 3.4 for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , and  $a^* \in (0, \bar{a})$  is the unique solution to

$$\mathbb{E}[u'(w - (X \wedge d(a)) - a)] - \frac{u'(w - d(a) - a)}{1 + \eta} = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix A.5. □

Theorem 3.5 presents the optimal contract  $I^*$  case by case based on the value of the premium loading  $\eta$ . Alternatively, we can write  $I^*$  in the following uniform expression:

$$I^*(x, s) = (x - d(a^*))^+ - (x - (d(a^*) + s + a^*))^+,$$

because we have

$$\begin{cases} a^* = \bar{a} \text{ and } d(\bar{a}) = 0, & \text{if } \eta = 0, \\ a^* = 0 \text{ and } d(0) = M, & \text{if } \eta \geq \frac{u'(w - M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X)]} - 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

As suggested by the uniform expression, the optimal contract  $I^*$  is a deductible insurance with policy limit, just as  $I_a^*$  in (3.11) (see Figure 1). We remark that the presence of policy limit in  $I^*$  reflects the impact of counterparty default on the buyer's decision making; the policy limit vanishes when the seller's reserve is sufficiently large (so that default never occurs). The first case in (3.13) shows that the deductible in  $I^*$  vanishes when the premium loading  $\eta$  equals zero. From the last case in (3.13), we see that if the premium loading  $\eta$  is too high, the buyer is better off with 100% self-insurance than purchasing insurance from the seller. If insurance is reasonably priced as in the second case of (3.13), endogenous default may occur if the buyer chooses an arbitrary contract among all admissible choices in (3.1). However, if the buyer chooses the optimal contract  $I^*$ , we always have  $D(I^*) \equiv 0$ , and the seller will never default on  $I^*$ . On a technical note, for the second case, we need to solve a nonlinear equation (3.14) to get the optimal premium  $a^*$ , which may seem to be a challenging task. Luckily, we can show that both  $g_a$  in (3.12) and the left-hand side of (3.14) are strictly decreasing functions, which allows us to efficiently compute  $a^*$  and  $d(a^*)$  (see Example 3.1 below). Last, we observe that the optimal contract  $I^*$  satisfies the IC constraint automatically (i.e.,  $0 \leq I^*(x, s) - I^*(x', s) \leq x - x'$  for all  $0 \leq x' \leq x \leq M$ ), which is why we do not impose the IC constraint upfront in defining the admissible set  $\mathcal{A}$  in (3.1).

**Remark 3.4.** As discussed in Remark 3.2, Biffis and Millossovich (2012) and Cai et al. (2014) study similar optimal (re)insurance problems under endogenous default. In the Pareto-optimal

setting, [Biffis and Millossovich \(2012\)](#) solve for the optimal premium and indemnity schedule but do not obtain an analytical solution. Similar to us, [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#) maximize the expected utility of the buyer's terminal wealth, and only complete Step 1; however, they do not make an attempt to tackle Step 2. To be precise, they obtain the optimal contract for a fixed premium level  $a$  (i.e., finding  $I_a^*$  over  $\mathcal{A}_a$  in our terminology), which can be seen as a local optimality result over  $\mathcal{A}_a$ . In contrast, [Theorem 3.5](#) completes Step 2 and finds a globally optimal contract  $I^*$  over  $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{a \in [0, \pi_f]} \mathcal{A}_a$  and thus provides a complete solution to [Problem 2](#). The proof of [Theorem 3.5](#) (in [Section A](#)) clearly showcases the technical difficulty of Step 2. Once the premium loading  $\eta$  is given, we obtain the optimal contract  $I^*$  by [\(3.13\)](#) in semiclosed form, subject to solving a nonlinear equation with a unique solution for  $\bar{a}$  or  $a^*$ . Furthermore, neither of them study the comparative statics of the optimal contract, which we conduct in [Section 3.2](#).

Due to the presence of endogenous default, we cannot establish the *strict* concavity of the functional  $\mathcal{J}(I) := \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))]$ . Fortunately, we can show that under [Assumption 1](#),  $I^*$  in [\(3.13\)](#) is the unique globally optimal insurance contract, i.e.,

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let [Assumption 1](#) hold. Then  $I^*$  in [\(3.13\)](#) is the unique globally optimal insurance contract to [Problem 2](#).*

*Proof.* See [Appendix A.6](#). □

## 3.2 Comparative Statics

In this section, we conduct a comparative statics analysis on the optimal insurance contract  $I^*$  obtained in [Theorem 3.5](#). This goal can be easily achieved by a *numerical* method once the model is given, but it is challenging to obtain *analytical* results, which we are able to achieve under mild conditions (see [Proposition 3.7](#)). Note that certain, but *not* all, results in [Proposition 3.7](#) require a condition on the buyer's utility function, as stated below.

**Assumption 2.** *The buyer's utility function  $u$  satisfies the decreasing absolute risk aversion (DARA) condition; i.e., the Arrow-Pratt coefficient of absolute risk aversion, defined by  $\mathbb{A}_u = -\frac{u''}{u'}$ , is a decreasing function.*

By definition, agents with DARA risk preferences have reduced risk aversion when their wealth increases. This result is mostly consistent with empirical findings (see [Levy \(1994\)](#)). A prominent example of DARA risk preferences is the family of power utility functions  $u(x) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} x^{1-\gamma}$ , in which  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\gamma \neq 1$ .

Before we present the key results on comparative statics, we introduce the following notations: let  $a^*$  denote the optimal premium level for all  $\eta \geq 0$  (as defined in [\(3.6\)](#) and calculated by [\(3.14\)](#) or [\(3.15\)](#)); for the optimal insurance contract,  $d^* := d(a^*)$  is the deductible amount, and  $U^* := a^* + d^* + S$  is the policy limit (maximum covered loss). The following proposition summarizes the *analytical* results on how the specifications of the buyer's optimal contract ( $a^*$ ,  $d^*$ , and  $U^*$ ) are affected by model inputs. Because we allow discontinuities in the distribution of the buyer's loss  $X$ , the proof is technical and lengthy, and thus we defer it to [Online Companion](#).

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let Assumption 1 hold. Then we have the following comparative statics results on the optimal insurance contract  $I^*$  in (3.13).*

1. *The optimal premium level  $a^*$  increases with respect to the seller's background risk  $S$  (in the pointwise sense), so is  $a^* + d^*$ . Furthermore, if Assumption 2 holds, then the optimal deductible  $d^*$  decreases with respect to  $S$ .*
2. *If Assumption 2 holds, then the optimal premium level  $a^*$  decreases with respect to the buyer's initial wealth  $w$ , but both the optimal deductible  $d^*$  and  $a^* + d^*$  increase with respect to  $w$ .*
3. *The optimal premium level  $a^*$  increases with respect to the buyer's (Arrow-Pratt) degree of risk aversion  $\mathbb{A}_u$ , but both the optimal deductible  $d^*$  and  $a^* + d^*$  decrease with respect to  $\mathbb{A}_u$ .*

*Proof.* See Online Companion II. □

In the first item of Proposition 3.7, we analyze the impact of the seller's background risk  $S$  on the optimal contract, and the impact is in the pointwise sense (i.e., if  $S_1$  increases to  $S_2$ , we have  $S_2(\omega) \geq S_1(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , except for a negligible set). Recall that  $S + \pi(I)$  is the total available reserve for settling claims at time 1, thus the larger the  $S$ , the lower the default possibility. As such, when  $S$  increases, we expect the buyer to seek more coverage for their risk exposure, which is confirmed by the decrease of the deductible  $d^*$  and the increase of the policy limit  $U^*$  (recall  $U^* = a^* + d^* + S$ ); the increase of coverage naturally means a higher premium paid to the seller.

Next, we study how the buyer's initial wealth  $w$  affects the optimal contract. As implied by the very definition of DARA risk preferences, when  $w$  increases, the buyer's risk aversion decreases, and thus their demand for insurance coverage reduces, leading to a higher deductible and a lower premium, both of which are consistent with the results in Mossin (1968) and Schlesinger (1981). In addition, the impact of  $w$  on  $d^*$  is more significant than that on  $a^*$ , which is why the policy limit  $U^* = a^* + d^* + r$  changes in the same direction as  $d^*$  when  $w$  changes.

Last, to investigate the impact of risk aversion on insurance decision, consider two buyers with different utility functions,  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , and call them Buyer 1 and Buyer 2, respectively. We say that Buyer 1 has a higher (Arrow-Pratt) degree of risk aversion than Buyer 2 if

$$\mathbb{A}_{u_1}(x) = -\frac{u_1''(x)}{u_1'(x)} \geq \mathbb{A}_{u_2}(x) = -\frac{u_2''(x)}{u_2'(x)},$$

and assume, without loss of generality, that this is the case. Because risk aversion is a key driver for insurance, we anticipate that Buyer 1 chooses a contract with a lower deductible and is willing to spend more on insurance than Buyer 2 does, as confirmed by Item 3 of Proposition 3.7.

We close this section with a numerical example, and it serves two purposes. First, we demonstrate that finding the optimal contract  $I^*$  is an easy task once the model parameters are given. Second, we use the example to visualize the analytical results obtained in Proposition 3.7.

**Example 3.1.** *Consider a buyer with a power utility function  $u(x) = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} x^{1-\gamma}$ , in which  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\gamma \neq 1$ . Assume that the buyer's loss distribution has a probability mass of 10% at 0 and 10%*

at 10 (i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}(X = 0) = \mathbb{P}(X = 10) = 10\%$ ) and a continuous density function over  $(0, 10)$ , which takes the form of a truncated Pareto density,

$$f_X(x) = \frac{96}{35} \frac{10^3}{(x + 10)^4} \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in (0, 10)\}}.$$

We also assume that there is no background risk, then  $S$  equals the seller's initial reserve  $r > 0$ .

First, we fix  $\gamma = 1/2$ ,  $w = 15$ , and  $S = r = 5$ . The threshold value of the premium loading  $\eta$  in (3.13) is calculated by  $\frac{u'(w-M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w-X)]} - 1 = 0.4669$ . We plot the optimal premium  $a^*$  and the optimal deductible  $d^* = d(a^*)$  as a function of  $\eta$ , the premium loading, over  $[0, 0.5]$  in Figure 2. When  $\eta \geq 0.4669$ , Figure 2 shows that  $d^* = M$ , or equivalently  $I^* \equiv 0$ , which confirms Case 3 in (3.13). When  $0 < \eta < 0.4669$ , we numerically solve  $a^*$  from (3.14), and the left panel of Figure 2 shows that  $a^*$  is a strictly decreasing function of  $\eta$  in this range. Because insurance contracts become more expensive when  $\eta$  increases, the buyer reacts to the price increase by choosing a higher deductible, which is confirmed by the right panel of Figure 2.




Figure 2: Optimal premium  $a^*$  (left) and deductible  $d^*$  (right) with respect to  $\eta$

Next, we investigate the impact of  $\gamma$ , the buyer's risk aversion, on the optimal contract. In this study, we fix the premium loading  $\eta = 0.2$  and the buyer's initial wealth  $w = 15$ , but consider two different levels for the seller's reserve  $r$ ,  $r = 2$  (low reserve case) and  $r = 8$  (high reserve case). With those parameters, we plot the optimal premium  $a^*$  and the optimal deductible  $d^* = d(a^*)$  as a function of  $\gamma$  over  $(0.2, 3)$  ( $1 - \gamma$  over  $(-2, 0.8)$ ) in Figure 3. For both the low and high reserve cases, we observe the same sensitivity results: when the risk aversion  $\gamma$  increases, the optimal premium level  $a^*$  increases, but the optimal deductible  $d^*$  decreases, both of which confirm the results in Item 3 of Proposition 3.7. As shown in the right panel of Figure 3, the two optimal deductible  $d^*$  curves are really close because  $d^*$  is somehow insensitive to  $r$ , but we still observe that  $d^*|_{r=2} > d^*|_{r=8}$ , which confirms Item 1 of Proposition 3.7. The left panel of Figure 3 demonstrates the significant impact of endogenous default on the optimal contract: in the high reserve case of  $r = 8$ , the seller will never default, thus we can treat  $a^*$  under  $r = 8$  (dotted line) as the optimal premium level in a model without default risk. However, in the low reserve case of  $r = 2$ , the seller's default risk becomes a major concern to the buyer; in response, the buyer chooses a much lower policy limit, resulting in a sharp decrease in the optimal premium  $a^*$ , compared to the high reserve case.






Figure 3: Optimal premium  $a^*$  (left) and deductible  $d^*$  (right) with respect to  $\gamma$

## 4 Optimal Loss-Dependent Indemnities

In this section, we consider loss-dependent indemnities in the form of  $I = I(X)$ , then the buyer is only allowed to choose contracts that depend on the loss  $X$  itself, but *not* on the seller’s background risk  $S$ . The method that we use to solve Problem 2 in the previous section no longer applies here; in particular, we do not have a proper “upper” bound on the default-free indemnities for the problem in this section as  $\bar{I}$  in (3.9) for Problem 2. We will develop a different approach to obtain the optimal loss-dependent insurance contract.

Recall from Problem 2 that admissible indemnities there only need to satisfy the “principle of indemnity” condition, and it yields the most general (largest) set  $\mathcal{A}$  in (3.1) (see Remark 3.1). But in this section, we further impose the IC condition on admissible indemnities, and this leads to the following admissible set  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ :

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}} := \{I : [0, M] \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ \mid I(0) = 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq I(x) - I(x') \leq x - x' \text{ for all } x \geq x' \geq 0\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Note that the IC condition helps rule out certain *ex post* moral hazard (see, e.g., Huberman et al. (1983), Xu et al. (2019), and Jin et al. (2024)) and is also imposed in several related works (see Asimit et al. (2013) and Cai et al. (2014)). In the proofs, we use the IC condition to handle contractual indemnity in a piecewise way and to get the monotonicity of  $X$  and  $X - I(X)$ , as well as to establish a up-crossing property.

For every  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ , denote its actual indemnity by  $\mathbb{I}_S$ .<sup>13</sup> By (2.4) and  $I \geq 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{I}_S(X; I) = I(X) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I(X) \leq (S + \pi(I))^+\}} + \tau(S + \pi(I))^+ \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{I(X) > (S + \pi(I))^+\}}, \quad (4.2)$$

in which  $\tau \in [0, 1]$  is the recovery rate. As such, for a chosen contract  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ , the buyer’s terminal wealth,  $W_S(I)$ , equals

$$W_S(I) = w - X + \mathbb{I}_S(X; I) - \pi(I). \quad (4.3)$$

We now formulate the second concrete version of Problem 1 as follows.

<sup>13</sup>In Section 3, indemnity  $I = I(X, S)$  is a function of both  $X$  and  $S$ , and we denote the corresponding actual indemnity by  $\mathbb{I}(X, S; I)$ . But in this section, indemnity functions take the form of  $I(X)$ , and we use the notation  $\mathbb{I}_S(X; I)$  to emphasize that the seller’s background risk  $S$  affects the actual indemnity, but it is *not* an argument in the functional form. Similarly,  $W_S$  and  $I_S^*(X)$  below denote the buyer’s wealth and the optimal contract.

**Problem 3.** *The buyer seeks an optimal loss-dependent insurance contract  $I_S^* := I_S^*(X) \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$  to maximize the expected utility of their terminal wealth under the seller's endogenous default risk and background risk, i.e.,*

$$I_S^* = \operatorname{argsup}_{I \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}} \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I))],$$

in which the admissible set  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$  is defined in (4.1), and  $W_S(I)$  is given by (4.3).

Even with the additional IC condition imposed in (4.1), solving Problem 3 for a general  $S$  is still unlikely. In comparison, Theorem 3.3 solves Problem 2 (with  $I = I(X, S)$ ) over  $\mathcal{A}_a$  without imposing any assumption on the distribution of  $S$ , and Theorem 3.5 finds the global solution to Problem 2 over  $\mathcal{A}$  with mild assumptions ( $S \geq 0$  and  $S$  has finite jumps by Assumption 1). In order to obtain an analytical solution to Problem 3, we assume that  $S$  is a discrete random variable, independent of  $X$ . Recall that  $S$  can be interpreted as random shocks (from the financial markets) to the seller's reserve, thus the independence assumption is overall reasonable.

**Assumption 3.** *The seller's background risk  $S$  is independent of the buyer's loss  $X$  and follows an  $N$ -point discrete distribution*

$$\mathbb{P}(S = s_i) = p_i > 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

in which  $N$  is an arbitrary positive integer,  $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_N$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^N p_i = 1$ . Denote  $\mathcal{S} := \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}$ .

Under Assumption 3, we rewrite the buyer's objective as

$$\mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I))] = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \mathbb{E}[u(w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_i}(X; I) - \pi(I))],$$

where  $\mathbb{I}_{s_i}$  is defined by (4.2) with  $S = s_i \in \mathcal{S}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . An application of Proposition 2.1 directly yields the following result, and thus we omit its proof.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Let Assumption 3 hold and recall  $s_N = \max S$ . If  $s_N \leq 0$ , then the optimal contract to Problem 3 is no insurance,  $I_S^* \equiv 0$ .*

Thanks to Corollary 4.1, we focus on Problem 3 when  $s_N > 0$  in the rest of the section. The next lemma identifies an upper bound on the optimal premium, and we omit its proof because it is similar to that of Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose  $s_N > 0$ . Then there exists a unique solution  $\bar{a}_N$  over  $[0, \pi_f]$  to the equation*

$$g_N(a) := (1 + \eta) \mathbb{E}[X - (X - (s_N + a))^+] - a = 0.$$

Moreover,  $g_N(a) > 0$  for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}_N)$ , and  $g_N(a) < 0$  for all  $a \in (\bar{a}_N, \pi_f]$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let Assumption 3 hold. Then the optimal insurance contract  $I_S^*$  to Problem 3 over  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$  is of the following parametric form:*

$$I_S^*(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (x - l_i - (\pi(I_S^*) + s_{i-1})^+)^+ - (x - l_i - (\pi(I_S^*) + s_i)^+)^+ \right], \quad (4.4)$$

in which  $s_0 := -r - \pi(I_S^*)$ , and the constants  $\{l_i\}_{i=1, \dots, N}$  are free parameters satisfying the constraints  $0 \leq l_i \leq l_{i+1} \leq M$ . Moreover, if  $s_N > 0$ , then  $\pi(I_S^*) \in [0, \bar{a}_N]$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix B.1. □

**Remark 4.1.** *In this technical remark, we explain the essential idea that helps us obtain Theorem 4.3. For every  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ , there exists a critical point  $x_i$  corresponding to each realization of the background risk  $S = s_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , so that the seller defaults if the loss  $X$  exceeds this critical value  $x_i$ , given  $S = s_i$ . These  $N$  critical points, along with  $x_0 := 0$  and  $x_{N+1} = M$ , partition the loss domain  $[0, M]$  into  $N + 1$  sub-intervals,  $A_1 = [0, x_1]$  and  $A_i = (x_{i-1}, x_i]$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, N + 1$ . We prove Theorem 4.3 in the following two steps:*

1. *For every  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ , we construct a new indemnity  $I_1$  satisfying two key conditions:*
  - (i)  $\mathbb{E}[I_1 \mathbf{1}_{X \in A_i}] = \mathbb{E}[I \mathbf{1}_{X \in A_i}]$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, N + 1$ , and each equation determines one parameter in the proposed form of  $I_1$ ; combining all  $N + 1$  equations yields  $\mathbb{E}[I] = \mathbb{E}[I_1]$ .
  - (ii)  $I_1$  “up-crosses”  $I$  in each  $A_i$ , so that  $\mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_1)) \mathbf{1}_{X \in A_i}] \geq \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I)) \mathbf{1}_{X \in A_i}]$ .

As such, we have  $\pi(I_1) = \pi(I)$  and  $\mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_1))] \geq \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I))]$ .

2. *Next, based on  $I_1$  from Step 1, we construct an indemnity  $I_2$ , which takes the form in (4.4) and involves  $N$  parameters (recall that  $I_1$  contains  $N + 1$  parameters). We show that  $\mathbb{I}_S(X; I_1) - \mathbb{I}_S(X; I_2) \leq \pi(I_1) - \pi(I_2)$  and, by recalling the definition of  $W_S$  in (4.3),  $W_S(I_2) \geq W_S(I_1)$ , verifying the optimality of  $I_S^*$  in (4.4) to Problem 3.*

Although both Problems 2 and 3 take into account the seller’s background risk, they are largely different from the mathematical viewpoint, as seen from Remark 4.1 and the proofs (in the appendix). Upon examining their (local) solutions  $I_a^*(X, S)$  in Theorem 3.3 and  $I_S^*(X)$  in Theorem 4.3, we notice that  $I_a^*$  in (3.11) is a single deductible insurance contract with policy limit, but  $I_S^*$  in (4.4) consists of  $N$  such contracts. We plot the optimal contract  $I_S^*$  when  $N = 2$  in Figure 4, and it shows that  $I_S^*$  is a *multi-layer* insurance contract (see Example 4.2 in Jin et al. (2024) for a similar result), and  $(I_S^*)'$  is either 0 or 1. More importantly,  $I_a^*(X, S) \leq (a + S)^+ = R$ , implying that  $I_a^*$  is a default-free contract. However, an endogenous default from the seller is possible if the buyer chooses contract  $I_S^*$ . To see this, consider the case of  $N = 2$  in Figure 4 and assume  $S = s_1$ ; the cap on the seller’s reserve is  $R = (\pi(I_S^*) + s_1)^+$ , but for all  $X > l_2 + (\pi(I_S^*) + s_1)^+$ , we easily see from Figure 4 that  $I_S^*(X) > R$ , under which an endogenous default occurs. Also, we obtain Theorem 3.3 without imposing the IC constraint on indemnities or any assumption on the background risk  $S$ ; in contrast, Theorem 4.3 requires the IC condition (see  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$  in (4.1)) and Assumption 3 on  $S$ .

Suppose that  $S = r \in \mathbb{R}$  (i.e., there is no background risk), and note that this case is covered under both Theorems 3.3 and 4.3. For  $N = 1$  in Assumption 3, under which  $I_S^*$  becomes a single




Figure 4: Optimal contract  $I_S^*$  in (4.4) when  $N = 2$ .

deductible insurance contract with policy limit. In addition, we observe that  $l_1$  is the deductible amount of contract  $I_S^*$ , and the policy limit is  $l_1 + r + \pi(I_S^*)$ . Correspondingly, in Theorem 3.3, when  $S = r$ ,  $d(a)$  is the deductible amount, and the policy limit is  $d(a) + r + a$ , as shown in (3.11). Note that  $\pi(I_S^*) = a$  is the premium level. Thus, for the special case of  $S = r$ , the results of Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 3.3 coincide, as one would expect. However, the two theorems are obtained under *different* admissible sets: Theorem 4.3 finds the optimal contract over  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$  defined in (4.1) (with the IC condition imposed), whereas Theorem 3.3 finds the optimal contract over  $\mathcal{A}$  defined in (3.1). Because  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}} \subset \mathcal{A}$  the result of Theorem 3.3 is stronger than those of Theorem 4.3 when  $N = 1$ . Also, the proof of Theorem 3.3 is much simpler than that of Theorem 4.3.

As implied by the method in Remark 4.1, for every  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ , we can find an  $I_S^* \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$  in the form of (4.4) satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_S^*))] \geq \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I))]$ ; as such, (4.4) provides an *analytical* characterization of the optimal contract. In consequence, Theorem 4.3 reduces Problem 3, an infinite-dimensional optimization problem over  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ , into an  $N$ -dimensional optimization problem over  $0 \leq l_1 \leq l_2 \leq \dots \leq l_N \leq M$ . Denoting  $\vec{l} = \{l_i\}_{i=1, \dots, N}$  and  $I_S^*$  in (4.4) by  $I_S^*(\cdot; \vec{l})$ , our next agenda is to solve for the optimal parameters  $\vec{l}^*$  defined by

$$\vec{l}^* = \underset{0 \leq l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_N \leq M}{\text{argsup}} \mathbb{E} \left[ u \left( W_S(I_S^*(X; \vec{l})) \right) \right].$$

However, there is no hope finding  $\vec{l}^*$  in a general setup. Below, we consider a special case with  $N = 2$  and  $\tau = 1$  and obtain semi-explicit expressions for the *optimal* parameters  $l_1^*$  and  $l_2^*$  under a given premium level. The detailed results are summarized in Proposition 4.4. Applying Theorem 4.3 to the case of  $N = 2$ , we first obtain the optimal contract in a parametric form by

$$\begin{aligned} I_S^*(x; l_1, l_2) &= (x - l_1)^+ - (x - l_1 - (a + s_1)^+)^+ \\ &\quad + (x - l_2 - (a + s_1)^+)^+ - (x - l_2 - (a + s_2)^+)^+, \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

in which  $a = \pi(I_S^*) \in [0, \bar{a}_N]$  denotes the premium level, and  $0 \leq l_1 \leq l_2 \leq M$  are free parameters.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let Assumption 3 and Conditions (2) and (3) of Assumption 1 hold and further assume  $s_N > 0$ ,  $N = 2$  and  $\tau = 1$ . For a given premium level  $a \in [0, \bar{a}_N]$ , the optimal insurance*

contract to Problem 3 is given by  $I_S^*(\cdot; l_1^*, l_2^*)$  in (4.5), in which the optimal parameters  $l_1^*$  and  $l_2^*$  are determined by one of the following cases.

**Case 1:** If  $a + s_1 \leq 0$ , then  $l_1^* = l_2^*$  and  $l_2^* \in [0, M]$  uniquely solves the following equation:

$$(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - l_2)^+ - (X - l_2 - (a + s_2))^+] - a = 0.$$

**Case 2:** If  $a + s_1 > 0$  and  $p_2 \leq \frac{u'(w-l_1-a)}{u'(w-l_2-a)}$ , in which

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{l}_1 &= \inf\{l_1 \in [0, M] \mid (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - l_1)^+ - (X - l_1 - (a + s_1))^+] - a \leq 0\}, \\ \overline{l}_2 &= \inf\{l_2 \in [\underline{l}_1, M] \mid (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_S^*(X; \underline{l}_1, l_2)] - a \geq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

then  $l_1^* = \underline{l}_1$  and  $l_2^* = \overline{l}_2$ .

**Case 3:** If  $a + s_1 > 0$  and  $p_2 > \frac{u'(w-l_1-a)}{u'(w-l_2-a)}$ , then  $(l_1^*, l_2^*) \in [0, M - r - a - s_1] \times [l_1, M - r - a - s_1]$  uniquely solves the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} u'(w - l_1 - a) = p_2 u'(w - l_2 - a), \\ (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_S^*(X; l_1, l_2)] = a. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* See Online Companion III. □

To summarize, Theorem 4.3 shows that the locally optimal contract to Problem 3 must be in the parametric form of  $I_S^*(x; \vec{l})$  in (4.4), in which  $\vec{l} = \{l_i\}_{i=1, \dots, N}$  is a vector of  $N$  free parameters. With additional conditions, Proposition 4.4 finds the optimal parameters  $\vec{l}^*$  and thus fully determines the locally optimal contract as  $I_S^*(x; \vec{l}^*)$ . Recall that a local solution is obtained for a fixed contract premium  $a$ . For Problem 2, we go on an extra mile to solve for the optimal premium  $a^*$  in Theorem 3.5, which leads to the *globally* optimal contracts  $I^* = I_{a^*}^*$ . Regarding Problem 3, we can not obtain a similar characterization for  $a^*$ , at least not without strong assumptions. Nevertheless, assuming a particular distribution for  $S$ , we can numerically solve for the optimal premium  $a^*$ , leading to a complete solution to Problem 3. We provide one such example below.

**Example 4.1.** Consider a buyer with power utility  $u(x) = x^{1/2}$  and set  $\eta = 0.1$  (premium loading),  $w = 15$  (buyer's initial wealth), and  $\tau = 1$  (recovery ratio). The buyer's loss  $X$  follows the same distribution as in Example 3.1. In addition, the distribution of the seller's background risk  $S$  is given by  $\mathbb{P}(S = s_1 = 2) = 10\%$  and  $\mathbb{P}(S = s_2 = 8) = 90\%$  (with  $N = 2$ ).

For Problem 2, we use Theorem 3.5 to compute the optimal premium and deductible, yielding  $a^* = \pi(I^*) = 1.00$  and  $d(a^*) = 4.53$ . For Problem 3, we numerically compute the optimal premium and parameters, resulting in  $a^* = \pi(I_S^*) = 0.74$ ,  $l_1^* = 4.60$ , and  $l_2^* = 6.44$ . Recall that the seller's total available reserve is the summation of  $S$  and the contract premium  $a^*$ . The optimal contract  $I^*$  to Problem 2 is a function of two arguments, loss  $x$  and background risk  $s$ , and has two realizations,  $I^*(x, s_1)$  and  $I^*(x, s_2)$ , so does its actual indemnity  $\mathbb{I}(x, s_i; I^*)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . The optimal

contract  $I_S^*$  to Problem 3 is a function of loss  $x$  only, but the realization of  $S$  affects the actual indemnity  $\mathbb{I}_S$ , which also has two realizations,  $\mathbb{I}_{s_1}(x; I_S^*)$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{s_2}(x; I_S^*)$ , by its definition in (4.2). For  $(x, s) \in [0, 10] \times \{2, 8\}$ , we obtain the optimal contracts  $I^*$  and  $I_S^*$  by

$$\begin{aligned} I^*(x, s) &= (x - 4.53)^+ - (x - (5.53 + s))^+, & (\text{solution to Problem 2}), \\ I_S^*(x) &= (x - 4.6)^+ - (x - 7.34)^+ + (x - 9.18)^+, & (\text{solution to Problem 3}). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that  $I^*(x, s) = \mathbb{I}(x, s; I^*)$  for both  $s = 2, 8$ , as such,  $I^*$  is a default-free contract. However, when  $S = s_1 = 2$ ,  $\mathbb{I}_{s_1}(x; I_S^*) = (x - 4.6)^+ - (x - 7.34)^+$ , and we have  $\mathbb{I}_{s_1}(x; I_S^*) = 2.74 = S + a^* < I_S^*(x)$  for all  $x > 9.18$ , a scenario corresponding to the seller's endogenous default. The strikingly different behavior between the two optimal contracts  $I^*$  and  $I_S^*$  highlights on the critical impact of feasible contracts on the buyer's insurance decision.

## 5 Conclusion

In a one-period economic model, a buyer of insurance faces an insurable loss  $X$  and purchases insurance contracts to cover the loss  $X$  from a representative seller who applies the expected-value principle to determine premiums. Motivated by both empirical and theoretical evidence, we model the seller's reserve by a random variable  $S$ , referred to as the *background risk*, and take into account the impact of the seller's *endogenous default* on the buyer's insurance demand. The buyer seeks an optimal contract (with indemnity)  $I^*$  that maximizes their expected utility of terminal wealth, subject to the seller's endogenous default and background risk. First, we consider contracts in the form of  $I(X, S)$  and study the buyer's optimal insurance problem in a general setup. We obtain the (globally) optimal contract in semiclosed form and show that it is a single deductible insurance with policy limit. Next, we consider contracts in the form of  $I(X)$  and revisit the problem, imposing the IC condition on  $I(X)$  and assuming the discrete  $S$  is independent of  $X$ . We obtain an analytical characterization of the (locally) optimal contract, for a fixed premium, and show that it is a multi-layer insurance contract.

## Acknowledgement

The first author acknowledges the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.12271290).

## A Proofs of Section 3

### A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

*Proof.* By the definition in (3.7),  $g$  is continuous; in addition,  $g(0) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[X - (X - S^+)^+] \geq 0$  and  $g(\pi_f) \leq -(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (S + \pi_f)^+)^+] \leq 0$ . Denote  $\mathcal{P} := \{a \in [0, \pi_f] \mid g(a) \leq 0\} \neq \emptyset$ . Recall from (3.8) that  $\bar{a} = \inf \mathcal{P}$ , and we immediately have  $g(a) > 0$  for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a})$ . By the continuity

of  $g$  and the boundary results, we must have  $g(\bar{a}) = 0$ . To see this, assume that  $g(\bar{a}) < 0$ , which implies  $\bar{a} > 0$ . By continuity, there exists an  $a < \bar{a}$  such that  $g(a) < 0$ , contradicting  $\bar{a} = \inf \mathcal{P}$ . By using a similar argument,  $g(\bar{a}) > 0$  is not true either.

If  $X \wedge S \leq 0$ , then  $g(0) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[X \wedge S^+] = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X \wedge S)^+] = 0$ , and  $\bar{a} = 0$ .

If  $S \geq 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X \wedge S] > 0$ , then  $(S + a)^+ = S + a$  and  $g(0) > 0$ . For all  $a_1 \leq a_2$  and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , using the inequality  $(a + b)^+ \leq a^+ + b^+$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\alpha a_1 + (1 - \alpha)a_2) &= (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E} [X - (X - (S + (\alpha a_1 + (1 - \alpha)a_2)))^+] - (\alpha a_1 + (1 - \alpha)a_2) \\ &= (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E} [X - (\alpha(X - (S + a_1)) + (1 - \alpha)(X - (S + a_2)))^+] - (\alpha a_1 + (1 - \alpha)a_2) \\ &\geq (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E} [X - \alpha(X - (S + a_1))^+ - (1 - \alpha)(X - (S + a_2))^+] - (\alpha a_1 + (1 - \alpha)a_2) \\ &= \alpha g(a_1) + (1 - \alpha)g(a_2). \end{aligned}$$

As a result,  $g$  is a concave function, and thus, for all  $a \in (\bar{a}, \pi_f]$ ,

$$0 = g(\bar{a}) = g\left(\left(1 - \frac{\bar{a}}{a}\right)0 + \frac{\bar{a}}{a}a\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\bar{a}}{a}\right)g(0) + \frac{\bar{a}}{a}g(a) > \frac{\bar{a}}{a}g(a),$$

which implies  $g(a) < 0$ . Therefore,  $\bar{a}$  is the unique solution to  $g(a) = 0$  over  $[0, \pi_f]$ .  $\square$

## A.2 Proof of Proposition 3.2

*Proof.* By definition,  $\bar{I}(x, s) = x - (x - (s + \bar{a})^+)^+$  and  $\mathbb{I}(x, s; \bar{I}) = \bar{I}(x)$  for all  $x \geq 0$  (i.e.,  $\bar{I}$  is a default-free insurance contract). For all  $a \in [\bar{a}, \pi_f]$  and  $I \in \mathcal{A}_a$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[u(W(\bar{I}))] - \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))] \geq \mathbb{E}[u'(w - X + \bar{I}(X, S) - \bar{a})(\bar{I}(X, S) - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I) + a - \bar{a})] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [u'(w - \bar{a})(\bar{I}(X, S) - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I) + a - \bar{a}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X < (S + \bar{a})^+\}}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} [u'(w - X + (S + \bar{a})^+ - \bar{a})((S + \bar{a})^+ + a - \bar{a} - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I)) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \geq (S + \bar{a})^+\}}] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[u'(w - \bar{a})(\bar{I}(X, S) - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I) + a - \bar{a})] \geq u'(w - \bar{a})\frac{\eta}{1 + \eta}(a - \bar{a}). \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

The first inequality is due to  $u'' < 0$ , and the next line is obtained by recalling the definition of  $\bar{I}$ . The second inequality arises from the fact that  $u'(w - x + (s + \bar{a})^+ - \bar{a})$  is an increasing function of  $x$ . Additionally, for  $a \geq \bar{a}$ ,  $(s + \bar{a})^+ + a - \bar{a} \geq (s + a)^+$ , and  $\mathbb{I}(x, s; I) \leq (s + a)^+$  because  $(s + a)^+$  is the maximum reserve of the seller for all  $I \in \mathcal{A}_a$ . To get the third inequality, note that  $\mathbb{E}[\bar{I}(X, S)] = \frac{\bar{a}}{1 + \eta}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(X, S; I)] \leq \frac{a}{1 + \eta}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{E}[u(W(\bar{I}))] \geq \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))]$ .

If  $X \wedge S \leq 0$ , then by Lemma 3.1,  $\bar{a} = 0$ . If  $S \geq 0$  and  $\eta = 0$ , then in the second inequality, for all  $a \in [0, \pi_f]$ ,  $(s + \bar{a})^+ + a - \bar{a} = (s + a)^+$ . Finally, Proposition 3.2 follows.  $\square$

## A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

*Proof.* First, we show that for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , there exists a solution  $d = d(a)$  to the equation  $g_a(y) = 0$  over  $y \in [0, M]$ , in which  $g_a(y) := (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - y)^+ - (X - y - (S + a)^+)^+] - a$ . We deduce  $g_a(0) \geq 0$  from Lemma 3.1 and  $g_a(M) = -a \leq 0$  as  $M = \text{ess sup } X$ . These results, along with the continuity of  $g_a$ , imply the existence of a solution to  $g_a(d) = 0$  over  $[0, M]$ .

Motivated by the desirable properties of contract  $\bar{I}$ , we construct an admissible indemnity  $\tilde{I} \in \mathcal{A}_a$  in the following form:

$$\tilde{I}(x, s) = (x - d(a))^+ - (x - d(a) - (s + a))^+.$$

Because  $g_a(d(a)) = 0$ ,  $\pi(\tilde{I}) = a$  and  $\tilde{I} \in \mathcal{A}_a$ . Using the above definition and (2.3), we easily see that  $D(\tilde{I}) \equiv 0$ , and  $\tilde{I}$  is a default-free insurance contract (i.e.,  $\mathbb{I}(x, s; \tilde{I}) = \tilde{I}(x)$ ).

For all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$  and  $I \in \mathcal{A}_a$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[u(W(\tilde{I}))] - \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ u'(w - X + \tilde{I}(X, S) - a)(\tilde{I}(X, S) - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I)) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[ u'(w - X - a)(-\mathbb{I}(X, S; I)) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq d(a)\}} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ u'(w - d(a) - a)(\tilde{I}(X, S) - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I)) \mathbf{1}_{\{d(a) < X < d(a) + (S + a)\}} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ u'(w - X + (S + a)^+ - a)((S + a)^+ - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I)) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \geq d(a) + (S + a)\}} \right] \\ & \geq u'(w - d(a) - a) \mathbb{E}[\tilde{I}(X, S) - \mathbb{I}(X, S; I)] \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

in which all (in)equalities follow from similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.2, except the last inequality, which is due to  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{I}(X, S)] = \mathbb{E}[I(X, S)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(X, S; I)]$ . Therefore, we conclude that  $\tilde{I} = I_a^*$  is the optimal insurance contract over the admissible set  $\mathcal{A}_a$  for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ .  $\square$

#### A.4 Proof of Corollary 3.4

*Proof.* For all  $0 \leq y_1 < y_2 \leq M$  and  $a > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_a(y_1) - g_a(y_2) &= (1 + \eta) \{ \mathbb{E}[(X - y_1)^+ - (X - y_1 - (S + a))^+] - \mathbb{E}[(X - y_2)^+ - (X - y_2 - (S + a))^+] \} \\ &= (1 + \eta) \mathbb{E} \left[ ((X - y_1) \wedge (S + a) \wedge (y_2 - y_1) \wedge (S + a + y_2 - X)) \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1 < X < y_2 + S + a\}} \right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On  $\{y_1 < X < y_2 + S + a\}$ , we have  $(X - y_1) \wedge (S + a) \wedge (y_2 - y_1) \wedge (S + a + y_2 - X) > 0$ . By Condition (3) of Assumption 1, we have  $\mathbb{P}(y_1 < X < y_2 + S + a) \geq \mathbb{P}(y_1 < X \leq y_2) > 0$ . Thus, the above inequality is strict ( $g_a$  is strictly increasing for all  $a > 0$ ), and the uniqueness result follows. By Condition (4) of Assumption 1, when  $a = 0$ ,  $d(0) = M$  is the only solution to  $g_a(y) = 0$ .  $\square$

#### A.5 Proof of Theorem 3.5

To show Theorem 3.5, we first present a technical Lemma below.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let Assumption 1 hold. For every  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ , denote  $d(a)$  the unique solution to  $g_a(y) = 0$  in (3.12). Define a set  $B_0$  by  $B_0 = \{(a, y) \in [0, \bar{a}] \times [0, M] \mid y \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta \text{ or } y + a \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta\}$ , and a set  $B$  by  $B = \{a \in [0, \bar{a}] \mid (a, d(a)) \in B_0\}$ , in which sets  $\mathcal{X}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_\Delta$  includes all the jump points of  $X$  and  $X - S$  on  $[0, M]$ . The following two assertions hold:*



1. The solution  $d(a)$ , as a function of  $a$ , is continuous on  $[0, \bar{a}]$  and continuously differentiable on  $(0, \bar{a}] \setminus B$ , with the first-order derivative given by

$$d'(a) = \frac{(1 + \eta) \mathbb{P}(X > d(a) + S + a) - 1}{(1 + \eta) \mathbb{P}(d(a) < X \leq d(a) + S + a)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

2.  $B$  is a finite set.

*Proof.* See Online Companion I. □

*Proof. Proof of Theorem 3.5.* From Proposition 3.2, we have  $I^*(x) = \bar{I}(x) = x - (x - (S + \bar{a}))^+$  in the case of  $\eta = 0$ . Also, the same proposition implies that the optimal premium level  $a^*$  is achieved on  $[0, \bar{a}]$  for all  $\eta > 0$ . As such, we fix an arbitrary  $\eta > 0$  in the rest of the proof.

From Theorem 3.3, we know that  $I_a^*$  given by (3.11) is the optimal contract over set  $\mathcal{A}_a$  and  $\pi(I_a^*) = a$ , for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}]$ . To find the optimal premium level  $a^*$ , we consider the objective value of contract  $I_a^*$ , and it equals  $\hat{J}(a) := J(a, d(a))$ , in which

$$J(a, y) := \mathbb{E} [u(w - X + (X - y)^+ - (X - (y + S + a))^+ - a)].$$

Based on Lemma A.1, the function  $\hat{J}$  is continuous on  $[0, \bar{a}]$ . We decompose  $J$  into  $J = J_1 + J_2 + J_3$ , in which  $J_1 = \mathbb{E}[u(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq y\}}]$ ,  $J_2 = \mathbb{E}[u(w - y - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{y < X \leq y + S + a\}}] = u(w - y - a) \mathbb{P}(y < X \leq y + S + a)$ , and  $J_3 = \mathbb{E}[u(w - X + S) \mathbf{1}_{\{X > y + S + a\}}]$ . Denote the distribution functions of  $X$  and  $X - S$  by  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , respectively. Using Fubini's theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \int_{x \leq y} u(w - x - a) dF_1(x) = \int_{x \leq y} \left[ \int_{t \in [x, y]} u'(w - t - a) dt + u(w - y - a) \right] dF_1(x) \\ &= \int_{t \leq y} u'(w - t - a) \mathbb{P}[X \leq t] dt + u(w - y - a) \mathbb{P}[X \leq y]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,  $J_3 = - \int_{t > y + a} u'(w - t) \mathbb{P}[X - S > t] dt + u(w - y - a) \mathbb{P}[X - S > y + a]$ . Thus, we obtain two equivalent expressions of  $J$  by

$$J(a, y) = \int_{t \leq y} u'(w - t - a) \mathbb{P}[X \leq t] dt - \int_{t > y + a} u'(w - t) \mathbb{P}[X - S > t] dt + u(w - y - a) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and

$$J(a, y) = \mathbb{E}[u(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq y\}}] - \int_{t > y + a} u'(w - t) \mathbb{P}[X - S > t] dt + u(w - y - a) \mathbb{P}[X > y]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

For all  $(a, y) \in [0, \bar{a}] \times [0, M] \setminus B_0$ , we obtain  $\frac{\partial J}{\partial y}$  from (A.4) and  $\frac{\partial J}{\partial a}$  from (A.5) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial J}{\partial y}(a, y) &= -u'(w - y - a) \mathbb{P}[y < X \leq y + S + a], \\ \frac{\partial J}{\partial a}(a, y) &= -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq y\}}] - u'(w - y - a) \mathbb{P}[y < X \leq y + S + a]. \end{aligned}$$

For all  $a \in (0, \bar{a}] \setminus B$ , taking the derivatives of  $\hat{J}$  and using (A.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{J}'(a) &= -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq d(a)\}}] + (-d'(a) - 1)u'(w - d(a) - a)\mathbb{P}[d(a) < X \leq d(a) + S + a] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq d(a)\}}] + u'(w - d(a) - a) \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \eta} - \mathbb{P}(X > d(a)) \right] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - (X \wedge d(a)) - a)] + \frac{u'(w - d(a) - a)}{1 + \eta}.\end{aligned}$$

Define a new function  $\bar{J}$  by

$$\bar{J}(a, y) := -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - (X \wedge y) - a)] + \frac{u'(w - y - a)}{1 + \eta}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and let  $\tilde{J}(a) := \bar{J}(a, d(a))$ . Note that  $\tilde{J} = \hat{J}'$  on  $(0, \bar{a}] \setminus B$ , and  $\tilde{J}$  is continuous on  $[0, \bar{a}]$ . Similarly, using Fubini's theorem, we get

$$\bar{J}(a, y) = -\int_{t \leq y} u''(w - t - a)\mathbb{P}[X \leq t]dt - \frac{\eta}{1 + \eta}u'(w - y - a) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

for all  $(a, y) \in [0, \bar{a}] \times ([0, M] \setminus \mathcal{X}_\Delta)$ . We compute  $\frac{\partial \bar{J}}{\partial y}$  from (A.7) and  $\frac{\partial \bar{J}}{\partial a}$  from (A.6), which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \bar{J}}{\partial y}(a, y) &= u''(w - y - a)\mathbb{P}(X > y) - \frac{1}{1 + \eta}u''(w - y - a), \\ \frac{\partial \bar{J}}{\partial a}(a, y) &= \mathbb{E}[u''(w - (X \wedge y) - a)] - \frac{u''(w - y - a)}{1 + \eta}.\end{aligned}$$

For all  $a \in (0, \bar{a}] \setminus B$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{J}'(a) &= \mathbb{E}[u''(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq d(a)\}}] + (d'(a) + 1)u''(w - d(a) - a) \left( \mathbb{P}(X > d(a)) - \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[u''(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq d(a)\}}] + \frac{u''(w - d(a) - a)[1 - (1 + \eta)\mathbb{P}(X > d(a))]^2}{(1 + \eta)^2 \mathbb{P}(d(a) < X \leq d(a) + S + a)}.\end{aligned}$$

From  $u'' < 0$ , we deduce  $\tilde{J}'(a) < 0$  for  $a \in (0, \bar{a}] \setminus B$ . Additionally, as  $B$  is a finite set,  $\tilde{J}$  is a strictly decreasing function. On the two boundary points 0 and  $\bar{a}$ , we compute

$$\tilde{J}(0) = -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X)] + \frac{u'(w - M)}{1 + \eta} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{J}(\bar{a}) = \frac{-\eta}{1 + \eta}u'(w - \bar{a}) < 0,$$

in which the inequality is due to  $\eta > 0$ . Note that if we take  $\eta = 0$ ,  $\tilde{J}(\bar{a}) = 0$ ,  $J'(a) > 0$  for  $a \in (0, \bar{a}) \setminus B$ , and thus  $J$  is strictly increasing and reaches its maximum value at  $\bar{a}$  (i.e.,  $a^* = \bar{a}$ ); in such a case, we easily see that  $I^* = \bar{I}$ , recovering the result in Proposition 3.2.

With the above results in hand, we discuss two distinctive cases based on the sign of  $\tilde{J}(0)$  and derive the optimal premium  $a^*$  in each case accordingly. If  $\tilde{J}(0) \leq 0$  or equivalently  $\eta \geq \frac{u'(w - M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X)]} - 1$ , then  $J'(a) < 0$  for  $a \in (0, \bar{a}] \setminus B$ , and thus  $J$  strictly decreases and reaches its maximum at  $a^* = 0$ . In this case, we easily obtain  $I^* \equiv 0$ . If  $\tilde{J}(0) > 0$  or equivalently  $0 < \eta < \frac{u'(w - M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X)]} - 1$ , then there exists a unique  $a^* \in (0, \bar{a})$  such that  $\tilde{J}(a^*) = 0$  (i.e.,  $a^*$  is the unique solution to (3.14)), and  $J$  achieves its maximum at  $a^*$ . In this case, we have  $I^* = I_{a^*}^*$ . Thus, the proof is complete.  $\square$

## A.6 Proof of Proposition 3.6

*Proof.* First, we show that the inequality in (3.10) is strict. Assume to the contrary that there exists a constant  $a > \bar{a}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[u(W(\bar{I}))] = \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))]$ . From (A.1) in the proof of Proposition 3.2,  $\mathbb{E}[u(W(\bar{I}))] = \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))]$  holds if and only if  $\mathbb{I}(X, S; I) = I(X, S)$  (the last inequality) and  $\bar{I}(X, S) - \bar{a} = \mathbb{I}(X, S; I) - a$  (the first inequality). From the definition of  $\bar{I}$  in (3.9), for  $X < (S+a)^+$ , we have  $\bar{I}(X, S) - \bar{a} + a > X$  and thus  $\mathbb{P}[X \geq (S+a)^+] = 1$ , which contradicts Conditions (1) and (3) of Assumption 1. As such, it follows that  $\mathbb{E}[u(W(\bar{I}))] > \mathbb{E}[u(W(I))]$  for all  $a > \bar{a}$ .

Next, we prove the uniqueness in Theorem 3.3. That is, for all  $a \leq \bar{a}$ , and for all  $I \in \mathcal{A}_a$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[u(W(I))] = \mathbb{E}[u(W(I_a^*))]$ , it must hold that  $I(X, S) = I_a^*(X, S)$ . Recalling the proof of Theorem 3.3, the inequalities in (A.2) become equal if and only if  $\mathbb{I}(X, S; I) = I(X, S)$  (the last inequality) and  $I_a^*(X, S) = \mathbb{I}(X, S; I)$  (the first inequality).

Finally, from the proof of Theorem 3.5, under Assumption 1, for all  $a \leq \bar{a}$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[u(W(I^*))] > \mathbb{E}[u(W(I_a^*))]$ . □

## B Proofs of Section 4

### B.1 Proof of Theorem 4.3

*Proof.* Denote the buyer's objective function by  $\mathcal{J}(\cdot) := \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(\cdot))]$ , in which  $W_S$  is given by (4.3). The goal is to show that for all  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{IC}$ , there exists an  $I_S^*$  in the form of (4.4) such that  $\mathcal{J}(I_S^*) \geq \mathcal{J}(I)$ . To that end, we fix an arbitrary admissible indemnity  $I \in \mathcal{A}_{IC}$  and denote its premium  $a := \pi(I) \in [0, \pi_f]$  in the rest of the proof.

We outline the key ideas behind the proof as follows. Recall from Assumption 3 that the seller's background risk  $S$  takes values from  $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$ , and thus the seller's available reserve  $R_S$  takes values from  $\{(a + s_i)^+ \mid s_i \in \mathcal{S}\}$ . These  $N$  values of  $R_S$  help partition the loss domain  $[0, M]$  into (a maximum of)  $N + 1$  sub-intervals  $A_i$ . We then proceed to complete the proof in two steps. In Step 1, we construct a new indemnity  $I_1$  such that, on each sub-interval  $A_i$  (i.e.,  $X \in A_i$ ),  $I_1$  and  $I$  have the same mean, but  $I_1$  dominates  $I$  in terms of  $\mathcal{J}$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{J}(I_1 \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}}) \geq \mathcal{J}(I \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}})$ ). This construction, if indeed achieved, immediately shows that  $I_1$  is an improvement over  $I$  to the buyer. We note that the equal mean constraint helps identify a parameter  $l_i$  in  $I_1$  for each sub-interval  $A_i$ , and there are possibly  $N + 1$  parameters yet to be determined in the construction of  $I_1$ . In Step 2, we construct  $I_2$  based on  $I_1$  from Step 1, which is of the form (4.4), and show that  $I_2$  dominates  $I_1$ . As such, the optimal contract to Problem 3 must be in the form of  $I_2$  in (4.4). We remark that there are up to  $N$  parameters in  $I_2 (= I_S^*)$ , but up to  $N + 1$  parameters in  $I_1$ .

**Step 1.** As briefly explained above, when  $S = s_i$ , we have  $R = (a + s_i)^+$ , and any realization of loss  $X$  such that  $I(X) > R$  leads to an endogenous default event. This motivates us to define critical points  $x_i$  by (we set  $\inf \emptyset = \infty$  by convention)

$$x_i := \inf\{x \in [0, M] \mid I(x) > (a + s_i)^+\} \wedge M, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Because  $s_i > s_{i-1}$  (see Assumption 3), we have  $x_i \geq x_{i-1}$ . By  $I(0) = 0$  and the continuity of  $I$ , we have  $I(x_i) = (a + s_i)^+$  for all  $x_i < M$ . We denote  $x_0 := 0$  and  $x_{N+1} := M$  and define

$$N_0 := \inf\{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N+1\} \mid x_i = M\}.$$

By definition,  $x_{N_0} = M$  holds. Because we do not make any assumptions on the value of each  $s_i$ , it is possible that  $N_0 \leq N$ , under which  $x_{N_0} = x_{N_0+1} = \dots = x_{N+1} = M$ . For all  $i \leq N_0 - 1$ , we have  $x_i < M$  and  $I(x_i) = (a + s_i)^+$ .

Using the points  $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_N, x_{N+1}\}$ , define  $N+1$  sub-intervals  $A_i$  by

$$A_1 = [x_0, x_1] \quad \text{and} \quad A_i = (x_{i-1}, x_i], \quad i = 2, \dots, N+1.$$

(If  $N_0 \leq N$ ,  $A_{N_0+1}, \dots, A_{N+1}$  are empty sets.) Then, we can partition  $[0, M]$  into  $\cup_{i=1}^{N_0} A_i$ .

We now construct an alternative admissible indemnity  $I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{IC}$  with the same premium as  $I$  (i.e.,  $\pi(I_1) = a$ ) and show that the buyer prefers  $I_1$  to  $I$ . Denoting  $s_0 := -a$  and  $s_{N+1} := -a + M$  and recalling that  $S \in \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}$ , we define  $I_1$  by

$$I_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} \left[ \left( x - l_i^{(1)} - (a + s_{i-1})^+ \right)^+ - \left( x - l_i^{(1)} - (a + s_i)^+ \right)^+ \right], \quad (\text{B.1})$$

in which  $l_i^{(1)}$ s are constants yet to be determined, but they satisfy  $l_i^{(1)} \in [x_{i-1} - (a + s_{i-1})^+, x_i - (a + s_i)^+]$  for  $i \leq N_0 - 1$ ,  $l_{N_0}^{(1)} \in [x_{N_0-1} - (a + s_{N_0-1})^+, x_{N_0} - (a + s_{N_0-1})^+]$ . For  $i \leq N_0 - 1$ , we have  $x_i - x_{i-1} \geq I(x_i) - I(x_{i-1}) = (a + s_i)^+ - (a + s_{i-1})^+$ . Thus, the intervals  $[x_{i-1} - (a + s_{i-1})^+, x_i - (a + s_i)^+]$  (and  $[x_{N_0-1} - (a + s_{N_0-1})^+, x_{N_0} - (a + s_{N_0-1})^+]$ ) are non-empty subsets of  $[0, M]$ . We select constants  $l_i^{(1)} \in [x_{i-1} - (a + s_{i-1})^+, x_i - (a + s_i)^+]$  for  $i \leq N_0 - 1$  (or  $l_{N_0}^{(1)} \in [x_{N_0-1} - (a + s_{N_0-1})^+, x_{N_0} - (a + s_{N_0-1})^+]$ ) so that

$$\mathbb{E} [I_1(X) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}}] = \mathbb{E} [I(X) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}}], \quad i = 1, \dots, N_0, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

which in turn implies that  $\mathbb{E}[I_1(X)] = \mathbb{E}[I(X)]$  and  $\pi(I_1) = a$ .

With the construction of  $I_1$  above, Step 1 boils down to the following two tasks:

- (i) Show that there exist constants  $l_i^{(1)}$  such that (B.2) holds for all  $i = 1, \dots, N_0$ .
- (ii) Show that  $I_1$  dominates  $I$  in terms of  $\mathcal{J}(\cdot)$  when  $X \in A_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N_0$ .

In the rest of Step 1, we fix an  $i = 1, \dots, N_0$  and focus on the losses that fall in  $A_i$  (i.e.,  $X \in A_i$ ).

**Task (i).** Because  $l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_i)^+ \leq x_i \leq l_{i+1}^{(1)} + (a + s_i)^+$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N_0 - 1$ , we obtain, for all  $x \in A_i = (x_{i-1}, x_i]$ ,  $2 \leq i \leq N_0$  (or  $A_1 = [0, x_1]$ ), that (see the definition of  $I_1$  in (B.1))

$$I_1(x) = (a + s_{i-1})^+ + \left( x - l_i^{(1)} - (a + s_{i-1})^+ \right)^+ - \left( x - l_i^{(1)} - (a + s_i)^+ \right)^+. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

We plot  $I_1(x)$  over  $x \in A_i = (x_{i-1}, x_i]$  ( $2 \leq i \leq N_0 - 1$ ) in Figure 5 to visualize  $I_1$ .




Figure 5: Indemnity  $I_1$  in (B.1) on  $X \in (x_{i-1}, x_i]$ .

Based on the definition of  $x_i$  and the continuity and monotonicity of  $I$ , for  $x \in (x_{i-1}, x_i]$  (or  $x \in [0, x_1]$ ), we have  $(a + s_{i-1})^+ < I(x) \leq (a + s_i)^+$  (or  $0 \leq I(x) \leq (a + s_1)^+$ ). On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) &\leq \{I(x_{i-1}) + (x - x_{i-1})\} \wedge (a + s_i)^+ \\ &= (a + s_{i-1})^+ + (x - x_{i-1}) - (x - x_{i-1} + (a + s_{i-1})^+ - (a + s_i)^+)^+. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for all  $i \leq N_0 - 1$ ,

$$I(x) \geq (a + s_{i-1})^+ \vee (x - x_i + I(x_i)) = (a + s_{i-1})^+ + (x - x_i + (a + s_i)^+ - (a + s_{i-1})^+)^+,$$

while for  $i = N_0$ ,  $I(x) \geq (a + s_{i-1})^+$ . Thus, the existence of such an  $l_i^{(1)}$  to (B.2) is established for all  $i = 1, \dots, N_0$ .

**Task (ii).** For losses  $x \in A_i$ , the actual indemnity  $\mathbb{I}_S(\cdot; I)$  of contract  $I$  (see its definition in (4.2)) is given by

$$\mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I) = \tau(a + s_j)^+, \quad j = 1, \dots, i - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I) = I(x), \quad j = i, \dots, N,$$

in which  $s_j$  is the realized value of the background risk  $S$ . Similarly, the actual indemnity  $\mathbb{I}_S(\cdot; I_1)$  of contract  $I_1$  in (B.3) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) &= \tau(a + s_j)^+, & j &= 1, \dots, i - 2, \\ \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) &= (a + s_{i-1})^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in (x_{i-1}, l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_{i-1})^+)\}} \\ &\quad + \tau(a + s_{i-1})^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in (l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_{i-1})^+, x_i]\}}, & j &= i - 1, \\ \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) &= I_1(x), & j &= i, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing  $\mathbb{I}_S(\cdot; I)$  and  $\mathbb{I}_S(\cdot; I_1)$ , we easily see that

$$\mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I) = \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, i - 2, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{I}_{s_{i-1}}(x; I) \leq \mathbb{I}_{s_{i-1}}(x; I_1).$$

It then follows that, for all  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ u \left( w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) - a \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ u \left( w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I) - a \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right].$$

Next, we consider the cases when  $j = i, \dots, N$ . By the above results on  $\mathbb{I}_{s_j}$  and the construction of  $l_i^{(1)}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ I_1(X) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ I(X) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right].$$

In addition, the following (in)equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) &= (a + s_{i-1})^+ \leq \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I), & \text{if } x \in (x_{i-1}, l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_{i-1})^+], \\ \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) &= x - l_i^{(1)}, & \text{if } x \in (l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_{i-1})^+, (l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_i)^+) \wedge x_i], \\ \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) &= (a + s_i)^+ \geq \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I), & \text{if } x \in ((l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_i)^+) \wedge x_i, x_i]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $x_i < l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_i)^+$  can only possibly hold when  $i = N_0$ . Following a similar argument in the proof of Theorem 3.3 and using above results, we obtain, for all  $j = i, \dots, N$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ u \left( w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) - a \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ u \left( w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I) - a \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ u' \left( w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) - a \right) \cdot (\mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) - \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I)) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[ u' \left( w - X + (a + s_{i-1})^+ - a \right) \cdot ((a + s_{i-1})^+ - \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I)) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in (x_{i-1}, l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_{i-1})^+)\}} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ u' \left( w - l_i - a \right) \cdot (\mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) - \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I)) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in (l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_{i-1})^+, (l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_i)^+) \wedge x_i\}} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ u' \left( w - X + (a + s_i)^+ - a \right) \cdot ((a + s_i)^+ - \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I)) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in ((l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_i)^+) \wedge x_i, x_i\}} \right] \\ & \geq u' \left( w - l_i - a \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) - \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I)) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}} \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining the results for  $j \leq i-1$  and  $j \geq i$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_1))] &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{P}(S = s_j) \mathbb{E}[u(w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I_1) - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}}] \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{N_0} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{P}(S = s_j) \mathbb{E}[u(w - X + \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(X; I) - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \in A_i\}}] = \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I))]. \end{aligned}$$

With the completion of both Tasks (i) and (ii), we complete Step 1 of the proof.

**Step 2.** We show that  $I_S^*$  in (4.4) outperforms  $I_1$  in (B.1) in terms of the buyer's objective  $\mathcal{J}(\cdot)$ .

Note that there are up to  $N$  constants,  $l_1, \dots, l_N$ , in  $I_S^*$ , but up to  $N+1$  constants in  $I_1$ . Indeed, if  $N_0 < N+1$ , we can set  $l_{N_0+1}^{(1)} = \dots = l_{N+1}^{(1)} = M$ . In this way, we can remove the “unknown”  $N_0$  in (B.1) and write  $I_1$  as

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(x) &= \left( x - l_1^{(1)} \right)^+ - \left( x - l_1^{(1)} - (a + s_1)^+ \right)^+ + \left( x - l_{N+1}^{(1)} - (a + s_N)^+ \right)^+ \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^N \left[ \left( x - l_i^{(1)} - (a + s_{i-1})^+ \right)^+ - \left( x - l_i^{(1)} - (a + s_i)^+ \right)^+ \right], \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

in which  $a = \pi(I_1)$  denotes the premium of contract  $I_1$ . Recall that  $\pi(I_1) = \pi(I) = a$ , and the parameters  $l_i^{(1)}$  are determined in the first step based on  $I$ .

Next, we define a new indemnity function  $I_2$  by

$$I_2(x) = \left(x - l_1^{(2)}\right)^+ - \left(x - l_1^{(2)} - (a_2 + s_1)\right)^+ + \sum_{i=2}^N \left[ \left(x - l_i^{(2)} - (a_2 + s_{i-1})\right)^+ - \left(x - l_i^{(2)} - (a_2 + s_i)\right)^+ \right], \quad (\text{B.5})$$

in which the constants  $l_i^{(2)}$ s are defined by

$$l_1^{(2)} = l_1^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad l_i^{(2)} = l_i^{(1)} + (a + s_{i-1})^+ - (a_2 + s_{i-1})^+, \quad i = 2, \dots, N,$$

and  $a_2 = \pi(I_2)$  is the premium of contract  $I_2$  and takes values in  $[0, a]$ . Given that  $a_2 \leq a$  and  $s_{i-1} \leq s_i$ , we have  $(a + s_{i-1})^+ - (a_2 + s_{i-1})^+ \leq (a + s_i)^+ - (a_2 + s_i)^+$ . It follows that  $l_i^{(2)} \leq l_{i+1}^{(2)}$ , implying  $I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{IC}}$ . The definition of  $I_2$  in (B.5) is *not* complete yet because it is in a parametric form of  $a_2$ , a *free* parameter in  $[0, a]$ ; this is largely different from the definition of  $I_1$  in (B.4), in which  $a \in [0, \pi_f]$  is a *given* constant and equals the premium  $\pi(I)$ . Denote  $I_2(\cdot)$  in (B.5) by  $I_2(\cdot; a_2)$ ; the particular  $a_2$  we need in (B.5) should solve  $a_2 = \pi(I_2(X; a_2)) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_2(X; a_2)]$ . It is easy to verify that  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_2(X; 0)] \geq 0$  and  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_2(X; a)] \leq a$ , which establishes the existence of a solution  $a_2$  to  $a_2 = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_2(X; a_2)]$ . By now,  $I_2$  in (B.5) is well defined.

Note that by setting  $l_i = l_i^{(2)}$  and  $s_0 = -r - a_2 (= -r - \pi(I_S^*))$ ,  $I_S^*$  in (4.4) is identical to  $I_2$  defined in (B.5). We proceed to show that  $I_2$  dominates  $I_1$ . To that end, for every  $s_j (= S)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, N$ , we use (4.2) to derive the actual indemnity of  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  and, by noting  $(a + s_j)^+ - (a_2 + s_j)^+ \leq a - a_2$ , obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_1) - \mathbb{I}_{s_j}(x; I_2) &= (I_1(x) - I_2(x))\mathbf{1}_{\{x \leq l_{j+1} + (a + s_j)^+\}} \\ &\quad + (\tau(a + s_j)^+ - \tau(a_2 + s_j)^+)\mathbf{1}_{\{x > l_{j+1} + (a + s_j)^+\}} \leq a - a_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, recalling (4.3), we have  $W_S(I_2) - W_S(I_1) = \mathbb{I}_S(X; I_2) - \mathbb{I}_S(X; I_1) - a_2 + a \geq 0$ , implying that  $\mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_2))] \geq \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_1))]$  as claimed.

Finally, combining the results from Steps 1 and 2, we conclude that the optimal insurance contract to Problem 3 is in the form of  $I_S^*$  in (4.4). Moreover, for each  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , treating  $I_S^*$  as a function of  $l_i$ , it follows that  $I_S^*$  is decreasing in  $l_i$ , and thus

$$\pi(I_S^*) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_S^*(X)] \leq (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[X - (X - (\pi(I_S^*) + s_N))].$$

Recalling Lemma 4.2, it follows that  $\pi(I_S^*) \in [0, \bar{a}_N]$ . □

## References

Albrecher, H., Beirlant, J., and Teugels, J. L. (2017). *Reinsurance: Actuarial and Statistical Aspects*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Albrecher, H. and Cani, A. (2019). On randomized reinsurance contracts. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 84:67–78.
- Arrow, K. J. (1963). Uncertainty and the welfare economics of medical care. *American Economic Review*, 53(5):941–973.
- Asimit, A. V., Badescu, A. M., and Cheung, K. C. (2013). Optimal reinsurance in the presence of counterparty default risk. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 53(3):690–697.
- Asimit, A. V., Boonen, T. J., Chi, Y., and Chong, W. F. (2021). Risk sharing with multiple indemnity environments. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 295(2):587–603.
- Beißner, P., Boonen, T., and Ghossoub, M. (2024). (No-)Betting pareto optima under rank-dependent utility. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 49(3):1452–1471.
- Bernard, C., He, X., Yan, J.-A., and Zhou, X. Y. (2015). Optimal insurance design under rank-dependent expected utility. *Mathematical Finance*, 25(1):154–186.
- Bernard, C. and Ludkovski, M. (2012). Impact of counterparty risk on the reinsurance market. *North American Actuarial Journal*, 16(1):87–111.
- Biffis, E. and Millossovich, P. (2012). Optimal insurance with counterparty default risk. *Available at SSRN 1634883*.
- Birghila, C., Boonen, T. J., and Ghossoub, M. (2023). Optimal insurance under maxmin expected utility. *Finance and Stochastics*, 27(2):467–501.
- Boonen, T. J. (2019). Equilibrium recoveries in insurance markets with limited liability. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 85:38–45.
- Borch, K. (1962). Equilibrium in a reinsurance market. *Econometrica*, 30(3):424–444.
- Cai, J. and Chi, Y. (2020). Optimal reinsurance designs based on risk measures: A review. *Statistical Theory and Related Fields*, 4(1):1–13.
- Cai, J., Lemieux, C., and Liu, F. (2014). Optimal reinsurance with regulatory initial capital and default risk. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 57:13–24.
- Chen, Y., Cheung, K. C., and Zhang, Y. (2024). Bowley solution under the reinsurer’s default risk. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 115:36–61.
- Chi, Y., Hu, T., and Huang, Y. (2023). Optimal risk management with reinsurance and its counterparty risk hedging. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 113:274–292.
- Chi, Y. and Wei, W. (2020). Optimal insurance with background risk: An analysis of general dependence structures. *Finance and Stochastics*, 24(4):903–937.
- Cummins, J. D. and Mahul, O. (2003). Optimal insurance with divergent beliefs about insurer total default risk. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 27:121–138.
- Dana, R.-A. and Scarsini, M. (2007). Optimal risk sharing with background risk. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 133(1):152–176.
- Doherty, N. A. and Schlesinger, H. (1983). The optimal deductible for an insurance policy when initial wealth is random. *Journal of Business*, 56(4):555–565.
- Doherty, N. A. and Schlesinger, H. (1990). Rational insurance purchasing: Consideration of contract nonperformance. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 105(1):243–253.



- Embrechts, P., Liu, H., Mao, T., and Wang, R. (2020). Quantile-based risk sharing with heterogeneous beliefs. *Mathematical Programming*, 181:319–347.
- Embrechts, P., Liu, H., and Wang, R. (2018). Quantile-based risk sharing. *Operations Research*, 66(4):936–949.
- Filipović, D., Kremlehner, R., and Muermann, A. (2015). Optimal investment and premium policies under risk shifting and solvency regulation. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 82(2):261–288.
- Franke, G., Schlesinger, H., and Stapleton, R. C. (2006). Multiplicative background risk. *Management Science*, 52(1):146–153.
- Gollier, C. (2013). The economics of optimal insurance design. In Dionne, G., editor, *Handbook of Insurance*, pages 107–122. Springer, New York.
- Guan, C., Xu, Z. Q., and Zhou, R. (2023). Dynamic optimal reinsurance and dividend payout in finite time horizon. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(1):544–568.
- Huberman, G., Mayers, D., and Smith Jr, C. W. (1983). Optimal insurance policy indemnity schedules. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 14(2):415–426.
- Jin, Z., Xu, Z. Q., and Zou, B. (2024). Optimal moral-hazard-free reinsurance under extended distortion premium principles. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 62(3):1390–1416.
- Levy, H. (1994). Absolute and relative risk aversion: An experimental study. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 8:289–307.
- Liu, P. (2024). Risk sharing with lambda value at risk. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, forthcoming.
- Mayers, D. and Smith Jr, C. W. (1983). The interdependence of individual portfolio decisions and the demand for insurance. *Journal of Political Economy*, 91(2):304–311.
- Mossin, J. (1968). Aspects of rational insurance purchasing. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(4, Part 1):553–568.
- Peter, R. and Ying, J. (2020). Do you trust your insurer? Ambiguity about contract nonperformance and optimal insurance demand. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 180:938–954.
- Reichel, L., Schmeiser, H., and Schreiber, F. (2022). On the optimal management of counterparty risk in reinsurance contracts. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 201:374–394.
- Schlesinger, H. (1981). The optimal level of deductibility in insurance contracts. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 48(3):465–481.
- Sjostrom Jr, W. K. (2009). The AIG bailout. *Washington and Lee Law Review*, 66:943–991.
- Tan, K. S., Wei, P., Wei, W., and Zhuang, S. C. (2020). Optimal dynamic reinsurance policies under a generalized Denneberg’s absolute deviation principle. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 282(1):345–362.
- Xu, Z. Q., Zhou, X. Y., and Zhuang, S. C. (2019). Optimal insurance under rank-dependent utility and incentive compatibility. *Mathematical Finance*, 29(2):659–692.

Online Companion for  
“Optimal Insurance under Endogenous Default and Background Risk”  
Zongxia Liang, Zhaojie Ren, and Bin Zou

In this Online Companion, we provide technical proofs to Lemma A.1, Proposition 3.7, and Proposition 4.4 in the main paper. Recall that we define  $d(a)$  as the solution to (3.12), for a given premium  $a$ , in Theorem 3.3. In this companion, to avoid potential confusion, we write such a solution by  $d(\cdot)$  to emphasize that it is a function defined over  $[0, \bar{a}]$ , and use  $d$  as a generic constant or argument.

## I Proof of Lemma A.1.

Proof of Item 1. Let  $G : [0, \bar{a}] \times [0, M] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by

$$G(a, y) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - y)^+ - (X - (y + S + a))^+] - a.$$

The function  $G$  is continuous on  $[0, \bar{a}] \times [0, M]$ . Denote the distribution functions of  $X$  and  $X - S$  by  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , respectively. Using Fubini’s Theorem, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[(X - y)^+] = \int_{x>y} (x - y)dF_1(x) = \int_{x>y} \int_{y<t<x} dt dF_1(x) = \int_{t>y} \mathbb{P}(X > t)dt.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(X - S - y - a)^+] = \int_{t>y+a} \mathbb{P}(X - S > t)dt.$$

Thus,

$$G(a, y) = (1 + \eta) \left[ \int_{t>y} \mathbb{P}(X > t)dt + \int_{t>y+a} \mathbb{P}(X - S > t)dt \right] - a. \quad (\text{I.1})$$

Recall that  $B_0 = \{(a, y) \in [0, \bar{a}] \times [0, M] \mid y \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta \text{ or } y + a \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta\}$ . From (I.1),  $G$  has the following partial derivatives on  $[0, \bar{a}] \times [0, M] \setminus B_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial G}{\partial a}(a, y) &= (1 + \eta)\mathbb{P}(X > y + S + a) - 1, \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial y}(a, y) &= -(1 + \eta)\mathbb{P}(y < X \leq y + S + a). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $a_0$  be an arbitrary fixed point in  $[0, \bar{a}]$  and recall that  $d(a_0)$  is the unique solution to  $G(a_0, d(a_0)) = 0$ . In particular,  $d(0) = M$ , and if  $d(a) = M$ , then  $a = 0$ . For  $a_0 \in (0, \bar{a}]$ , by the strict decrease in  $y$  and continuity of  $G$ , for  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough (say  $\epsilon < \min\{d(a_0), M - d(a_0)\}$ ), we have

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow a_0} G(a, d(a_0) - \epsilon) = G(a_0, d(a_0) - \epsilon) > 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow a_0} G(a, d(a_0) + \epsilon) = G(a_0, d(a_0) + \epsilon) < 0.$$

If  $d(a_0) = 0$ , we only need to consider the second limit with  $\epsilon < M$ . As such, there exists a positive  $\delta$  such that for all  $a$  satisfying  $|a - a_0| < \delta$ , we have  $G(a, d(a_0) - \epsilon) > 0$  and  $G(a, d(a_0) + \epsilon) < 0$ . From the definition of  $d(\cdot)$ , it follows that  $d(a) \in (d(a_0) - \epsilon, d(a_0) + \epsilon)$ , implying the continuity of  $d(\cdot)$  at  $a_0$ . If  $a_0 = 0$ , for  $0 < \epsilon < M$ , using Condition (4) in Assumption 1,  $G(0, M - \epsilon) > 0$ . A similar argument shows that  $d$  is continuous at 0. Therefore,  $d(\cdot)$  is continuous on  $[0, \bar{a}]$ .

Recall that  $B = \{a \in [0, \bar{a}] \mid (a, d(a)) \in B_0\}$ . For all  $(a, d) \in (0, \bar{a}] \times [0, M] \setminus B_0$ , we have  $\frac{\partial G(a, y)}{\partial y} < 0$  using Condition (3) in of Assumption 1. By the implicit function theorem,  $d(\cdot)$  is a continuously differentiable function on  $(0, \bar{a}] \setminus B$ , and its derivative is given by (A.3) as claimed.

Proof of Item 2. For every  $a \in B$ , we discuss the following two cases:  $d(a) \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta$  or  $d(a) + a \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta$ .

**Case 1:** Let  $a$  be such that  $d(a) = y \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta$ . Define a function  $G_1$  by

$$G_1(\tilde{a}) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - y)^+ - (X - (y + S + \tilde{a}))^+] - \tilde{a}.$$

If  $y = M$ , then  $a = 0$ . We only need to consider  $y < M$ . By the definition of  $d(\cdot)$ , we have  $G_1(a) = 0$ . Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1, we can show that  $G_1$  is a continuous and concave function. In addition,  $G_1(0) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - y)^+ - (X - (y + S))^+] > 0$  and  $G_1(\pi_f) \leq 0$ . Hence,  $a$  is identified as the unique zero of  $G_1$ .

**Case 2:** Let  $a$  be such that  $d(a) + a = y \in \mathcal{Z}_\Delta$ . Define a function  $G_2$  by

$$G_2(\tilde{a}) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (y - \tilde{a}))^+ - (X - (y + S))^+] - \tilde{a}.$$

Using the definition of  $d(\cdot)$ , we identify  $a$  as a solution to  $G_2(a) = 0$ , and our remaining task is to show that there are finitely many such solutions. Recall the function  $d(\cdot)$  takes values over  $[0, M]$ , the solutions  $a$  are in the interval  $[0, y]$ . For all  $0 \leq \tilde{a}_1 < \tilde{a}_2 \leq y$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_2(\alpha \cdot \tilde{a}_1 + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \tilde{a}_2) - \alpha \cdot G_2(\tilde{a}_1) - (1 - \alpha) \cdot G_2(\tilde{a}_2) &= (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{1}_{\{X \in (y - \tilde{a}_2, y - \tilde{a}_1)\}} \\ &\cdot [(\alpha(X - y + \tilde{a}_1) + (1 - \alpha)(X - y + \tilde{a}_2))^+ - (1 - \alpha)(X - y + \tilde{a}_2)]\} < 0, \end{aligned}$$

Under Condition (3) in Assumption 1, the last inequality holds because  $y - \tilde{a}_1 > 0$  and  $y - \tilde{a}_2 < M$ . Therefore,  $G_2$  is a strictly convex function. Consequently, the equation  $G_2(a) = 0$  on  $[0, y]$  has at most two solutions.

Combining the above cases and using Condition (2) in Assumption 1, we conclude that  $B$  is a finite set.

## II Proof of Proposition 3.7.

In Proposition 3.7, we state the comparative statics results of  $a^*$ ,  $d^*$ , and  $U^* = d^* + S + a^*$  in the optimal contract with respect to three model inputs,  $S$ ,  $w$ , and  $\mathbb{A}_u$ . Recall that  $a^* = \pi(I^*)$  is the contract premium,  $d^* = d(a^*)$  is the deductible amount, and  $U^*$  is the maximum covered loss;  $S$  is the seller's random reserve (background risk),  $w$  is the buyer's initial wealth, and  $\mathbb{A}_u = -\frac{u''}{u'}$  is the buyer's Arrow-Pratt coefficient of absolute risk aversion.

By Theorem 3.5, when  $\eta \geq \frac{u'(w-M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w-X)]} - 1$ , we have  $a^* = 0$ ,  $d^* = M$ , and  $a^* + d^* = M$ . If  $\mathbb{A}_u(x)$  is a decreasing function (as in Assumption 2), taking the first-order derivative shows that  $\frac{u'(w-M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w-X)]}$  decreases with respect to (w.r.t.)  $w$ , the buyer's initial wealth. Given two utility functions  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  such that  $\mathbb{A}_{u_1}(x) \leq \mathbb{A}_{u_2}(x)$  for all  $x$ , we find that  $\frac{u'_1(x)}{u'_2(x)}$  increases w.r.t.  $x$  and then  $\frac{u'_1(w-M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'_1(w-X)]} \leq \frac{u'_2(w-M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'_2(w-X)]}$ . Therefore, all Items in Proposition 3.7 hold when  $\eta \geq \frac{u'(w-M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w-X)]} - 1$ . In the rest of the proof, we only consider the opposite case and make the standing assumption:

$$\eta < \frac{u'(w-M)}{\mathbb{E}[u'(w-X)]} - 1.$$

We study each of the three contract specifications  $a^*$ ,  $d^*$ , and  $U^*$ , instead of focusing on the three model inputs, one by one. We first study the optimal premium  $a^*$  which is the solution to the optimization problem in (3.6) over all  $a \in [0, \pi_f]$ . Then, based on the properties of the optimal premium  $a^*$ , we derive the corresponding properties of optimal deductible  $d^* = d(a^*)$  and policy limit  $U^* = a^* + d^* + S$ .

By Theorem 3.5,  $(a^*, d^* := d(a^*))$  are determined by jointly solving (3.12) and (3.14) over  $(a, d) \in [0, \pi_f] \times [0, M]$ . By rewriting (3.12) and (3.14),  $(a^*, d^*)$  is the solution to the following system of equations over  $(a, d) \in [0, \pi_f] \times [0, M]$ :

$$\tilde{J}_1(a, d; S) := (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - d)^+ - (X - (d + S + a))^+] - a = 0, \quad (\text{II.1})$$

$$\tilde{J}_2(a, d; w, u) := -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq d\}}] + u'(w - d - a) \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \eta} - \mathbb{P}[X > d] \right] = 0. \quad (\text{II.2})$$

Let  $\tilde{J}_3 = \frac{\tilde{J}_2}{u'(w-d-a)}$ , or equivalently

$$\tilde{J}_3(a, d; w, u) := -\frac{\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X \wedge d - a)]}{u'(w - d - a)} + \frac{1}{1 + \eta}. \quad (\text{II.3})$$

When the relationship between  $\tilde{J}_1$  and  $S$  is not emphasized, we denote  $\tilde{J}_1(a, d; S)$  simply as  $\tilde{J}_1(a, d)$ ; similar abbreviations on  $\tilde{J}_2$  and  $\tilde{J}_3$  will also be used.

Our first objective is to establish some monotonicity results for  $\tilde{J}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . To that end, define a constant  $\underline{x}_0$  by

$$\underline{x}_0 := \inf \left\{ x \in [0, M] \mid \mathbb{P}(X > x) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \right\}.$$

By the definition of  $\underline{x}_0$ , the right-continuity of  $\mathbb{P}(X > \cdot)$ , and the strict monotonicity of the distribution function of  $X$  in Assumption 1, we can conclude that for all  $x < \underline{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) > \frac{1}{1 + \eta}$ , for  $x = \underline{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \eta}$ , and for all  $x > \underline{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) < \frac{1}{1 + \eta}$ . The results are summarized below.

**Lemma II.1.** *Let  $\tilde{J}_1$ ,  $\tilde{J}_2$ , and  $\tilde{J}_3$  be defined by (II.1), (II.2), and (II.3), respectively. Then*

1. *For every fixed  $d \in [\underline{x}_0, M]$ ,  $\tilde{J}_1(a, d)$  strictly decreases w.r.t.  $a$ .*
2. *For every fixed  $a$ ,  $\tilde{J}_1(a, d)$  decreases w.r.t.  $d$ , and there exists a unique  $d(a)$  such that  $\tilde{J}_1(a, d(a)) = 0$ .*

3. For every fixed  $(a, d)$ ,  $\tilde{J}_1(a, d; S)$  increases w.r.t.  $S$ .
4. For every fixed  $a$ ,  $\tilde{J}_2(a, d)$  strictly decreases w.r.t.  $d$  on  $[\underline{x}_0, M]$ .
5. Under Assumption 2, for every fixed  $(a, d)$ ,  $\tilde{J}_3(a, d; w)$  decreases w.r.t.  $w$ .
6. Under Assumption 2, for every fixed  $d$ ,  $\tilde{J}_3(a, d)$  increases w.r.t.  $a$ .

*Proof.* Differentiating  $\tilde{J}_1$  with respect to  $a$ , as shown in the proof of Lemma A.1, proves Item 1. Item 2 follows from Corollary 3.4. Item 3 is clearly true. Differentiating  $\tilde{J}_2$  with respect to  $d$ , as in the proof of Theorem 3.5, verifies Item 4. For Item 5, differentiating  $\tilde{J}_3$  w.r.t.  $w$  gives

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{J}_3}{\partial w} = \frac{-\mathbb{E}[u''(w - X \wedge d - a)]}{u'(w - d - a)} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X \wedge d - a)]u''(w - d - a)}{(u'(w - d - a))^2}.$$

As  $-\frac{u''}{u'}$  is a decreasing function by Assumption 2, we have

$$-\frac{u''(w - d - a)}{u'(w - d - a)} \geq -\frac{u''(w - X \wedge d - a)}{u'(w - X \wedge d - a)},$$

which implies  $\frac{\partial \tilde{J}_3}{\partial w} \leq 0$ . By a similar argument, Item 6 follows.  $\square$

*Proof. Proof of Proposition 3.7.* From (II.2), we know that  $\frac{1}{1+\eta} - \mathbb{P}(X > d^*) \geq 0$ , in which  $d^* = d(a^*)$  is the deductible of the optimal contract  $I^*$ , and this inequality implies that  $d^* \geq \underline{x}_0$ . Recalling (II.1) and Item 1 of Lemma II.1, there exists a unique solution to  $\tilde{J}_1(a, \underline{x}_0) = 0$ , which we denote by  $\hat{a}$ . By Item 1 and Item 2 of Lemma II.1, it follows that  $a^* \leq \hat{a}$ . The discussion so far allows us to restrict the feasible domain of  $(a, d)$  from  $[0, \pi_f] \times [0, M]$  to  $[0, \hat{a}] \times [\underline{x}_0, M]$  in the rest of the proof when we study the properties of the optimal contract.

*Property 1:  $a^*$  increases w.r.t.  $S$ .* Consider two arbitrary background risks,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , that satisfy Assumption 1 and  $S_1 \leq S_2$ . Let  $\hat{a}_i := \hat{a}(S_i)$  denote the unique solution to  $\tilde{J}_1(a, \underline{x}_0; S_i) = 0$  when  $S = S_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . It follows from Items 1 and 3 of Lemma II.1 that  $\hat{a}_2 \geq \hat{a}_1$ . Recalling (II.2),  $a = a_i^* \in [0, \hat{a}_i]$  is the unique solution to  $\tilde{J}_2(a, d_i(a)) = 0$ . By Item 4 of Lemma II.1, we get  $\tilde{J}_2(a_1^*, d_2(a_1^*)) \geq \tilde{J}_2(a_1^*, d_1(a_1^*)) = 0$ . From the proof of Theorem 3.5, we know that  $\tilde{J}_2(a, d_2(a))$  strictly decreases w.r.t.  $a$  on  $[0, \hat{a}_2]$ . As such, we conclude that  $a_2^* \geq a_1^*$  and Property 1 holds.

*Property 2:  $a^*$  decreases w.r.t.  $w$ .* Let two arbitrary initial wealth levels,  $w_1 < w_2$ , be given, and we denote the corresponding optimal premiums by  $a_i^*$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Note that  $a_i^* \in [0, \hat{a}]$  is the unique solution to  $\tilde{J}_2(a, d(a); w_i) = 0$  when  $w = w_i$ . Using Item 5 of Lemma II.1, we obtain  $\tilde{J}_3(a_1^*, d(a_1^*); w_2) \leq \tilde{J}_3(a_1^*, d(a_1^*); w_1) = 0$ , implying  $\tilde{J}_2(a_1^*, d(a_1^*); w_2) \leq 0$ . Because  $\tilde{J}_2(a, d(a); w_2)$  strictly decreases w.r.t.  $a$ , we conclude that  $a_2^* \leq a_1^*$ , which proves Property 2.

*Property 3:  $a^*$  increases w.r.t.  $\mathbb{A}_u$ .* Let two arbitrary utility functions  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  be given such that  $\mathbb{A}_{u_1}(x) \leq \mathbb{A}_{u_2}(x)$  for all  $x$ , and we denote the corresponding optimal premiums by  $a_i^*$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Note that  $a_i^* \in [0, \hat{a}]$  is the unique solution to  $\tilde{J}_2(a, d(a); u_i) = 0$  when the utility function is  $u = u_i$ . Since  $\frac{u'_i(x)}{u_2'(x)}$  increases w.r.t.  $x$ , we have

$$\frac{u'_1(w - d(a_1^*) - a_1^*)}{u'_2(w - d(a_1^*) - a_1^*)} \leq \frac{u'_1(w - X \wedge d(a_1^*) - a_1^*)}{u'_2(w - X \wedge d(a_1^*) - a_1^*)},$$

which implies  $\tilde{J}_2(a_1^*, d(a_1^*); u_2) \geq 0$ . Because  $\tilde{J}_2(a, d(a); u_2)$  strictly decreases w.r.t.  $a$ , it follows that  $a_2^* \geq a_1^*$  and Property 3 holds.

*Property 4:  $d^*$  decreases w.r.t.  $S$ .* Recalling (II.2) and using Item 4 of Lemma II.1,  $d^* \in [\underline{x}_0, M]$  is the unique solution to  $\tilde{J}_2(a^*, d) = 0$ . By Items 4 and 6 of Lemma II.1, the impact of  $S$  on  $d^*$  is exactly the opposite of that on  $a^*$ , which together with Property 1, confirms Property 4.

*Properties 5 and 6:  $d^*$  increases w.r.t.  $w$  and decreases w.r.t.  $\mathbb{A}_u$ .* The argument above, together with Items 1 and 2 of Lemma II.1, prove these two properties.

Finally, we focus on the policy limit (maximum covered loss)  $U^*$  of the optimal contract. Because  $U^* = a^* + d^* + S$ , we study the properties of  $a^* + d^*$ . We perform a change of variable from  $(a, d)$  to  $(a, v) := (a, a + d)$  and denote  $v^* := a^* + d^*$ . Recalling Lemma A.1, for all  $a \in (0, \hat{a}] \setminus B$ ,

$$d'(a) + 1 = \frac{(1 + \eta)\mathbb{P}(X > d(a)) - 1}{(1 + \eta)\mathbb{P}(d(a) < X \leq d(a) + S + a)} \leq 0.$$

Therefore,  $v^* \in [\hat{a} + \underline{x}_0, M]$ . By rewriting (II.1) and (II.2),  $(a^*, v^*)$  is the solution to the following system of equations over  $(a, v) \in [0, \hat{a}] \times [\hat{a} + \underline{x}_0, M]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_4(a, v) &:= (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (v - a))^+ - (X - (v + S))^+] - a = 0, \\ \tilde{J}_5(a, v) &:= -\mathbb{E}[u'(w - X \wedge (v - a) - a)] + \frac{u'(w - v)}{1 + \eta} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

*Property 7:  $a^* + d^*$  increases w.r.t.  $S$ .* For all  $(a, v) \in \{(a, v) \in [0, \hat{a}] \times [\hat{a} + d_0, M] \mid v - a \notin \mathcal{X}_\Delta\}$ , differentiating the function  $\tilde{J}_5$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{J}_5}{\partial a}(a, v) &= \mathbb{E}[u''(w - X - a) \mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq v - a\}}] \leq 0, \\ \frac{\partial \tilde{J}_5}{\partial v}(a, v) &= u''(w - v) \left[ \mathbb{P}(X > v - a) - \frac{1}{1 + \eta} \right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Given the optimal premium  $a^*$ ,  $v^*$  is the solution to  $\tilde{J}_5(a^*, v) = 0$ . Therefore,  $v^*$  reacts to the change of  $S$  in the same direction as  $a^*$ , which, combining with Property 1, proves this property.

*Properties 8 and 9:  $a^* + d^*$  increases w.r.t.  $w$  and decreases w.r.t.  $\mathbb{A}_u$ .* We directly compute  $\partial \tilde{J}_4 / \partial a$  and  $\partial \tilde{J}_4 / \partial v$ . The argument above then proves these two properties.

Proof of Proposition 3.7 is then complete by Properties 1-9.  $\square$

### III Proof of Proposition 4.4

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{a}_2$  be defined as  $\bar{a}_N$  in Lemma 4.2 when  $N = 2$ . By Theorem 4.3, for all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}_2]$ , the optimal insurance contract must be in the form of

$$I_S^*(x; l_1, l_2) = (x - l_1)^+ - (x - l_1 - (a + s_1))^+ + (x - l_2 - (a + s_1))^+ - (x - l_2 - (a + s_2))^+,$$

in which  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  satisfy  $0 \leq l_1 \leq l_2 \leq M$  and  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_1(X; l_1, l_2)] - a = 0$ . Define  $\phi$  by

$$\phi(l_1, l_2) = (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[I_S^*(X; l_1, l_2)] - a, \quad (l_1, l_2) \in [0, M] \times [l_1, M]. \quad (\text{III.1})$$

For all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}_2]$ , the optimization problem that yields the optimal parameters  $(l_1^*, l_2^*)$  is

$$(l_1^*, l_2^*) = \underset{(l_1, l_2) \in \mathcal{L}}{\operatorname{argsup}} \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_S^*(X; l_1, l_2)))], \quad (\text{III.2})$$

in which  $\mathcal{L} := \{(l_1, l_2) \in [0, M] \times [l_1, M] \mid \phi(l_1, l_2) = 0\} \neq \emptyset$ . In other words,  $I_S^*(x; l_1^*, l_2^*)$  is the (locally) optimal contract to Problem 3 for a given premium  $a = \pi(I_S^*) \in [0, \bar{a}_2]$ .

We prove Proposition 4.4 under three exclusive and exhaustive conditions.

**Condition 1:**  $a + s_1 \leq 0$ . Under this condition,  $I_S^*$  is independent of  $l_1$ , and  $\mathcal{L} = [0, \tilde{l}_2] \times \{\tilde{l}_2\}$ , in which  $\tilde{l}_2 \in [0, M]$  is the unique solution to  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - l_2)^+ - (X - l_2 - (a + s_2))^+] - a = 0$ . Naturally,  $l_2^* = \tilde{l}_2$  and  $l_1^*$  can take any value in  $[0, l_2^*]$ . Without loss of generality, we set  $l_1^* = l_2^*$ . This proves Case 1 in the proposition.

**Condition 2:**  $a + s_1 > 0$  and  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (M - (a + s_1))^+)^+] - a \geq 0$ . Under this condition, for all  $(l_1, l_2) \in [0, (M - (a + s_1))^+] \times [l_1, M]$ , we have

$$\phi(l_1, l_2) \geq \phi(l_1, M) > (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (M - (a + s_1))^+)^+] \geq 0.$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{L} \subset [(M - (a + s_1))^+, M] \times [l_1, M]$ . For all  $(l_1, l_2) \in [(M - (a + s_1))^+, M] \times [l_1, M]$ ,  $I_S^*$  is independent of  $l_2$ , and so  $\mathcal{L} = \{\tilde{l}_1\} \times [0, \tilde{l}_1]$ , in which  $l_1 = \tilde{l}_1 \in [(M - (a + s_1))^+, M]$  is the unique solution to  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - l_1)^+] - a = 0$ . Therefore,  $l_1^* = \tilde{l}_1$  and  $l_2^* \in [\tilde{l}_1, M]$ . Without loss of generality, we set  $l_2^* = \tilde{l}_1$ . Recalling the definition of  $\underline{l}_1$  and  $\bar{l}_2$ , we have  $\underline{l}_1 = \tilde{l}_1$  and  $\bar{l}_2 = \tilde{l}_1$ . This proves Case 2 in the proposition when  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (M - (a + s_1))^+)^+] - a \geq 0$  holds.

**Condition 3:**  $0 < a + s_1 < M$ ,  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (M - (a + s_1))^+)^+] - a < 0$ . By the definition of  $\phi$  in (III.1), we have  $\phi(l_1, M) \leq \phi(l_1, l_2) \leq \phi(l_1, l_1)$ , in which

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(l_1, l_1) &= (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - l_1)^+ - (X - l_1 - (a + s_2))^+] - a, \\ \phi(l_1, M) &= (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - l_1)^+ - (X - l_1 - (a + s_1))^+] - a. \end{aligned}$$

For all  $a \in [0, \bar{a}_2]$ ,  $\phi(l_1, l_1) = 0$  has a unique solution  $l_1 = \bar{l}_1 \in [0, M]$ ; recall  $\underline{l}_1 = \inf\{l_1 \in [0, M] \mid \phi(l_1, M) \leq 0\} \leq \bar{l}_1$ . If  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[X - (X - (a + s_1))^+] - a \leq 0$ , then  $\underline{l}_1 = 0$ . If  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[X - (X - (a + s_1))^+] - a > 0$ , then  $\phi(\underline{l}_1, M) = 0$ . Thus,

$$\mathcal{L} \subset \{(l_1, l_2) \in [0, M] \times [l_1, M] \mid \phi(l_1, M) \leq 0 \leq \phi(l_1, l_1)\} = [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \times [l_1, M].$$

From  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (M - (a + s_1))^+)^+] - a < 0$ , we have  $\bar{l}_1 < M - (a + s_1)$ , and then  $\mathcal{L}$  can be restricted to  $[\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \times [l_1, M - (a + s_1)]$ . Actually, for all  $(l_1, l_2) \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \times [M - (a + s_1), M]$ , both  $I_S^*$  and  $\phi$  are independent of  $l_2$ . Furthermore, for all  $l_1 \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1]$ , there exists a unique  $l_2(l_1) \in [l_1, M - (a + s_1)]$  such that  $\phi(l_1, l_2(l_1)) = 0$ . The optimization problem in (III.2) reduces to

$$l_1^* = \underset{l_1 \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1]}{\operatorname{argsup}} \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_S^*(X; l_1, l_2(l_1))))]. \quad (\text{III.3})$$

Denote  $C_0 = \{(l_1, l_2) \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \times [l_1, M - (a + s_1)] \mid l_1 \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta \text{ or } l_1 + a + s_1 \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta \text{ or } l_2 + a + s_1 \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta \text{ or } l_2 + a + s_2 \in \mathcal{X}_\Delta\}$ . The function  $\phi$  is continuously differentiable on  $[\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \times [l_1, M - (a + s_1)] \setminus C_0$ ,

with the partial derivatives given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\phi(l_1, l_2)}{\partial l_1} &= -(1 + \eta)\mathbb{P}(l_1 < X \leq l_1 + a + s_1), \\ \frac{\partial\phi(l_1, l_2)}{\partial l_2} &= -(1 + \eta)\mathbb{P}(l_2 + a + s_1 < X \leq l_2 + a + s_2).\end{aligned}$$

Denote  $C_1 = \{l_1 \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \mid (l_1, l_2(l_1)) \in C_0 \text{ or } l_2(l_1) = M - (a + s_1)\}$ . Since  $\phi(l_1, l_2)$  strictly decreases w.r.t.  $l_1$  on  $[0, M]$  and w.r.t.  $l_2$  on  $[0, M - (a + s_1)]$ , and  $\phi$  is continuous, it follows that  $C_1$  is a finite set, and  $l_2(l_1)$  is continuous on  $[\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1]$ . For  $(l_1, l_2) \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \times [l_1, M - (a + s_1)] \setminus C_0$ , we have  $\frac{\partial\phi(l_1, l_2)}{\partial l_2} < 0$ . By the implicit function theorem,  $l_2(l_1)$  is a continuously differentiable function on  $[\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \setminus C_1$ , with the first-order derivative given by

$$l_2'(l_1) = -\frac{\mathbb{P}(l_1 < X \leq l_1 + a + s_1)}{\mathbb{P}(l_2(l_1) + a + s_1 < X \leq l_2(l_1) + a + s_2)}.$$

Recalling (III.3), the objective function of the buyer is

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(l_1) &= \mathbb{E}[u(W_S(I_S^*))] = p_1\mathbb{E}[u(w - X + (X - l_1)^+ - (X - l_1 - (a + s_1))^+ - a)] \\ &\quad + p_2\mathbb{E}[u(w - X + (X - l_1)^+ - (X - l_1 - (a + s_1))^+ \\ &\quad + (X - l_2(l_1) - (a + s_1))^+ + (X - l_2(l_1) - (a + s_2))^+ - a)],\end{aligned}$$

which is continuous on  $[\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1]$ . For  $l_1 \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \setminus C_1$ , taking the derivative, we obtain

$$\psi'(l_1) = [-u'(w - l_1 - a) + p_2u'(w - l_2(l_1) - a)]\mathbb{P}(l_2 + a + s_1 < X \leq l_2 + a + s_2).$$

Let  $\tilde{\psi} : [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by

$$\tilde{\psi}(l_1) = -u'(w - l_1 - a) + p_2u'(w - l_2(l_1) - a),$$

and note that  $\tilde{\psi}$  is continuous on  $[\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1]$ . For  $l_1 \in [\underline{l}_1, \bar{l}_1] \setminus C_1$ ,

$$\tilde{\psi}'(l_1) = [u''(w - l_1 - a) - p_2u''(w - l_2(l_1) - a)l_2'(l_1)] < 0.$$

Furthermore, the boundary conditions are

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\psi}(\underline{l}_1) &= -u'(w - \underline{l}_1 - a) + p_2u'(w - l_2(\underline{l}_1) - a), \\ \tilde{\psi}(\bar{l}_1) &= -p_1u'(w - \bar{l}_1 - a) < 0.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of  $\bar{l}_2$ , we have  $\bar{l}_2 = l_2(\underline{l}_1)$ . Therefore, this proves Case 2 when  $(1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[(X - (M - (a + s_1)))^+] - a < 0$ , and Case 3 in the proposition.

The proof is now complete, and the results in Cases 1 to 3 in Proposition 4.4 hold.  $\square$