

On ruin probabilities with risky investments in a stock with stochastic volatility

Anastasiya Ellanskaya · Yuri Kabanov

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract We investigate the asymptotic of ruin probabilities when the company combines the life- and non-life insurance businesses and invests its reserve into a risky asset with stochastic volatility and drift driven by a two-state Markov process. Using the technique of the implicit renewal theory we obtain the rate of convergence to zero of the ruin probabilities.

Keywords Ruin probabilities · Stochastic volatility · Telegraph signal · Hidden Markov model · Regime switching · Implicit renewal theory

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) 60G44

JEL Classification G22 · G23

1 Introduction

In the classical collective risk theory initiated by Filip Lundberg in 1903 and further developed by Harald Cramér in the thirties it was usually assumed that an insurance company does not invest its reserve. This assumption leads to a good news: if claims are not heavy-tailed, then the ruin probabilities are exponentially decreasing when the initial capital tends to infinity. For quite a long period of time studies of ruin probabilities did not suppose investments in spite that such an assumption is clearly non realistic: in the modern world insurance companies operate in a financial environment and invests their reserves into risky assets. Studies of mathematical models with risky investments started in the nineties. To the date there is an ample literature dedicated to the asymptotic of ruin probabilities under various assumptions on the price processes on the business activity. The fundamental discovery is that the risky investments change radically the asymptotic behavior of the ruin probabilities. For example, in the papers Frolova, Kabanov and Pergamenshchikov [5], Kabanov and Pergamenshchikov [9], and Kabanov and Pukhlyakov [11] there were studied

Lomonosov Moscow State University

E-mail: ellanskaya@gmail.com

E-mail: ykabanov@univ-fcomte.fr

Lundberg type models with investments having, respectively, the downward jumps (non-life insurance), downward jumps (annuity model), and two-side jumps. In the cited paper it was supposed that an insurance company invests in an asset whose price process $S = (S_t)$ is a geometric Brownian motion (gBm) given by the equality $dS_t/S_t = a dt + \sigma W_t$. It was shown that if the parameter $\beta := 2a/\sigma^2 - 1$ is strictly positive then the ruin probability has the asymptotic behavior $Cu^{-\beta}$ as the initial capital u tends to infinity. For the large volatility, when $\beta \leq 0$, the ruin is imminent.

A much more general setting, that of the generalized Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, covering the case of investments with the price following a geometric Lévy process, was introduced by Paulsen in 1993, [12], and studied, using the techniques of implicit renewal theory, in the series of his papers, [13, 14, 15]. For the recent results in this direction and further references see [10].

To our knowledge, the ruin problem with risky investments in the asset with price with stochastic volatility was never studied. In the present note we obtain the asymptotic of ruin probabilities for the Lundberg–Cramér type model with investments and two-side jumps. We assume that the price process is a conditional geometric Brownian motion with volatility and drift modulated by a telegraph signal, that is, by a two-state Markov process, see the paper by Di Masi, Kabanov, and Runggaldier [4]. Such models are usually referred to as the hidden Markov models or models with regime switching. In economics two-state Markov processes are used to model business cycles and we believe that it is relevant to the situation with long term investments typical in insurance.

As in the paper [10], in our study we use the approach based on the recent progress in the implicit renewal theory.

2 The model

We are given by a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbf{P})$ with a Wiener process $W = (W_t)$, a Poisson random measure $\pi(dt, dx)$ with the compensator $\bar{\pi}(dt, dx) = \Pi(dx)dt$, and a piecewise constant right-continuous Markov process $\theta = (\theta_t)$ taking values in $\{0, 1\}$ with transition intensity matrix $A = (\lambda^{ij})$ where $\lambda^{10} > 0$, $\lambda^{01} > 0$, $\lambda^{00} = -\lambda^{01}$, $\lambda^{11} = -\lambda^{10}$ and the initial value $\theta_0 = i$. The σ -algebras generated by W , π , and θ are independent.

Let T_n be the successive jumps of the Poisson process N with $N_t = p([0, t], \mathbb{R})$ and let τ_n be the successive jumps of θ with the convention that $T_0 = 0$ and $\tau_0 = 0$.

Recall that the length between consecutive jumps of θ are independent random variables having exponential laws with parameters λ^{01} and λ^{10} which are intensity of jumping from 0 to 1 and vice versa. So, if $\theta_0 = 0$, then the random variable τ_1 has the exponential law with parameter λ^{01} , the random variable $\tau_2 - \tau_1$ is independent on τ_1 and has the exponential law with parameter λ^{10} .

We consider the dynamics of the reserve $X = X^{u,i}$ of an insurance company where the business activity is as in the classical Lundberg–Cramér model but the reserve is fully invested in a risky asset whose price S follows a geometric Brownian motion with stochastic volatility and drift. We have that

$$dS_t = S_t(a_{\theta_t} dt + \sigma_{\theta_t} dW_t), \quad S_0 = 1,$$

where $a_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma_k > 0$, $k = 0, 1$. In this case, X is of the form

$$X_t = u + \int_0^t X_s dR_s + dP_t \quad (1)$$

where $R_t = R_0 + a\theta_t t + \sigma\theta_t W_t$ is the relative price process and

$$P_t = ct + \int_0^t \int x\pi(dt, dx) = ct + x * \pi_t \quad (2)$$

is the process describing the business activity of the company.

So, the model is described by the two-dimensional process $(X^{u,i}, \theta^i)$ where $u > 0$ is the initial capital and $i \in \{0, 1\}$ is the initial value of θ .

We assume that the process P is not increasing: otherwise the probability of ruin is zero.

We also assume that $\tilde{\pi}(dt, dx) = dt\Pi(dx)$ with $\Pi(dx) = \alpha_1 F_1(dx) + \alpha_2 F_2(dx)$ where $F_1(dx)$ is a probability distribution on $] - \infty, 0[$ and $F_2(dx)$ is a probability distribution on $]0, \infty[$. In this case the integral with respect to the jump measure is simply a difference of two independent compound Poisson processes with intensities α_1, α_2 for the jumps downwards and upwards and whose absolute values have the distributions $F_1(dx)$ and $F_2(dx)$ respectively.

The solution of the linear equation (1) can be represented by the following stochastic version of the Cauchy formula

$$X_t^{u,i} := \mathcal{E}_t(R)(u - Y_t^i) \quad (3)$$

where

$$Y_t^i := - \int_{[0,t]} \mathcal{E}_s^{-1}(R) dP_s = - \int_{[0,t]} e^{-V_s} dP_s. \quad (4)$$

The log price process $V = \ln \mathcal{E}(R)$, that is $V_s = \sigma\theta_s W_s + (a\theta_s - (1/2)\sigma\theta_s^2)s$. The process Y^i does not depend on u . It will play the central role in our analysis.

Let $\tau^{u,i} := \inf\{t : X_t^{u,i} \leq 0\}$ (the instant of ruin), $\Psi_i(u) := P(\tau^{u,i} < \infty)$ (the ruin probability), and $\Phi_i(u) := 1 - \Psi_i(u)$ (the survival probability). It is easily seen that $\tau^{u,i} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t^i \geq u\}$.

Recall that the constant parameter values $a = 0, \sigma = 0$, correspond to the Lundberg–Cramér model for which the process $X^{u,i} = u + P_t$. In the actuarial literature the compound Poisson process P is usually written in the form

$$P_t = ct - \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} \xi_k \quad (5)$$

where either $\xi_k \geq 0, c > 0$ (i.e. $F_2 = 0$ — jumps only downwards — the case of non-life insurance) or $\xi_k \leq 0, c < 0$ (i.e. $F_1 = 0$ — jumps only upwards — the case of life insurance or annuity payments). Models with both kinds of jumps are frequently considered in the modern literature, see, e.g., [1] and references therein. For the classical models with a positive average trend and F having a “non-heavy” tail, the Lundberg inequality asserts that the ruin probability decreases exponentially as the initial capital of the company u tends to infinity. For the exponentially distributed claims the ruin probability admits an explicit expression, see [2], Ch. IV.3b, or [7], Section 1.1.

For the models with exponentially distributed jumps with the investment in a risky asset with price following a geometric Brownian motion with the drift coefficient a and the volatility $\sigma > 0$ the answer is completely different: if $2a/\sigma^2 - 1 > 0$ the ruin probability as a function of the initial capital u behaves as Cu^{1-2a/σ^2} as $u \rightarrow \infty$. In the case where $2a/\sigma^2 - 1 \leq 0$ the ruin happens with probability one, see [5], [9], [16], [11].

To formulate our result for the model where the volatility and drift are modulated by a telegraph process we introduce some notations.

Define the random variable $M_1 := e^{-V_{\tau_2}}$ and consider on \mathbb{R}_+ the moment generating function $f : q \mapsto \mathbf{E}M_1^q$. Put $\beta_i := 2a_i/\sigma_i^2 - 1$, $i = 0, 1$. It is easily seen that

$$f(q) := \mathbf{E}M_1^q = \mathbf{E}e^{-qV_{\tau_2}} = \mathbf{E}e^{-qV_{\tau_1}} \mathbf{E}e^{-q(V_{\tau_2}-V_{\tau_1})} = f_0(q)f_1(q)$$

where

$$f_0(q) := \frac{\lambda^{01}}{\lambda^{01} + q(a_0 - \sigma_0^2/2) - q^2\sigma_0^2/2} = \frac{\lambda^{01}}{\lambda^{01} + (1/2)\sigma_0^2q(\beta_0 - q)}, \quad (6)$$

$$f_1(q) := \frac{\lambda^{10}}{\lambda^{10} + q(a - \sigma_1^2/2) - q^2\sigma_1^2/2} = \frac{\lambda^{10}}{\lambda^{10} + (1/2)\sigma_1^2q(\beta_1 - q)} \quad (7)$$

on the set $\text{dom } f := \{q \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \mathbf{E}M_1^q < \infty\}$.

Note that $f''(q) = q(q+1)\mathbf{E}V_{\tau_2}^2 e^{-qV_{\tau_2}} > 0$, i.e. f is strictly convex on its effective domain.

Suppose that $0 < \beta_0 < \beta_1$. Then $f_0(\beta_0) = 1$, $f_1(\beta_0) < 1$, hence, $f(\beta_0) < 1$. If $\beta_1 \in \text{dom } f$, then $f_0(\beta_1) > 1$, $f_1(\beta_1) = 1$, and $f(\beta_1) > 1$. If $\beta_1 \notin \text{dom } f$, then there is $\bar{\beta} \in]\beta_0, \beta_1[$ such that $f_0(q) \rightarrow \infty$ as $q \uparrow \bar{\beta}$. Since f_0 is bounded away from zero on the interval $[\beta_0, \bar{\beta}]$ we have that also $f(q) \rightarrow \infty$ as $q \uparrow \bar{\beta}$. It follows that in all cases the convex function f with $f(0) = 1$ crosses the level 1 also on the interval $]\beta_0, \beta_1[$, so that there is a unique $\beta \in]\beta_0, \beta_1[$ such that $f(\beta) = 1$. In other words β is the root of the equation $f(q) = 1$ which can be written in the detailed form as

$$\sigma_0^2\sigma_1^2q(\beta_0 - q)(\beta_1 - q) + 2\sigma_0^2(\beta_0 - q)\lambda^{10} + 2\sigma_1^2(\beta_1 - q)\lambda^{01} = 0. \quad (8)$$

It follows that

$$(1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta(\beta_0 - \beta) + \lambda^{01} = -\frac{\sigma_0^2(\beta_0 - \beta)}{\sigma_1^2(\beta_1 - \beta)}\lambda^{10} > 0, \quad (9)$$

$$(1/2)\sigma_1^2\beta(\beta_1 - \beta) + \lambda^{10} = -\frac{\sigma_1^2(\beta_1 - \beta)}{\sigma_0^2(\beta_0 - \beta)}\lambda^{01} > 0. \quad (10)$$

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that $0 < \beta_0 < \beta_1$. Let $\beta \in]\beta_0, \beta_1[$ be the solution of the equation (8). Suppose that $\Pi(|x|^\beta) := \int |x|^\beta \Pi(dx) < \infty$. Then for $i = 0, 1$*

$$0 < \liminf_{u \rightarrow \infty} u^\beta \Psi_i(u) \leq \limsup_{u \rightarrow \infty} u^\beta \Psi_i(u) < \infty.$$

The proof uses the techniques of the implicit renewal theory. To apply it, we verify that the random variables $Q^i = Q_1^i := -e^{-V^i} \cdot P_{\tau_2}$, $i = 0, 1$, belong to $L^\beta(\Omega)$, the process Y^i has at infinity a finite limit Y_∞^i which is a random variable unbounded from above and has the same law as $Q^i + MY_\infty^i$ where $M = M_1$. We already know that $\mathbf{E}M^\beta = 1$ and $\mathbf{E}M^\beta + \varepsilon > 0$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, and, of course, the law of $\ln M$ is not arithmetic. Moreover, we prove that $\bar{G}_i(u) \leq \Psi_i(u) \leq C\bar{G}_i(u)$ where a constant $C > 0$ and $\bar{G}_i(u) = \mathbf{P}(Y^i > u)$, Lemma 4.

With such facts Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 2 below which is the Kesten–Goldie theorem, see Th. 4.1 in [6], augmented by a statement on strict positivity of C_+ due to Guivarc’h and Le Page, [3] (for a simpler proof of the latter see the paper [3] by Buraczewski and Damek and an extended discussion in Kabanov and Pergamenschikov, [10]).

Theorem 2 Let Y_∞ has the same law as $Q + MY_\infty$ where $M > 0$. Suppose that (M, Q) is such that the law of $\ln M$ is non-arithmetic and, for some $\beta > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}M^\beta = 1, \quad \mathbf{E}M^\beta (\ln M)^+ < \infty, \quad \mathbf{E}|Q|^\beta < \infty. \quad (11)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} u^\beta \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty > u) &= C_+ < \infty, \\ \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} u^\beta \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty < -u) &= C_- < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_+ + C_- > 0$.

If the random variable Y_∞ is unbounded from above, then $C_+ > 0$.

3 Study of the process Y

We consider the case where $\theta_0 = 0$ and omit $i = 0$ in the notation. The case $\theta_0 = 1$ is treated similarly, with the same results.

The following identity is obvious:

$$Y_{\tau_{2n}} = - \sum_{k=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} e^{-(V_{\tau_{2j}} - V_{\tau_{2j-2}})} \int_{] \tau_{2k-2}, \tau_{2k}]} e^{-(V_s - V_{\tau_{2k-2}})} dP_s.$$

Using the abbreviations

$$Q_k := - \int_{] \tau_{2k-2}, \tau_{2k}]} e^{-(V_s - V_{\tau_{2k-2}})} dP_s, \quad M_j := e^{-(V_{\tau_{2j}} - V_{\tau_{2j-2}})}$$

we rewrite it in a more transparent form as

$$Y_{\tau_{2n}} = Q_1 + M_1 Q_2 + M_1 M_2 Q_3 + \dots + M_1 \dots M_{n-1} Q_n. \quad (12)$$

The random variables (Q_k, M_k) have the same law and are independent on the σ -algebra $\sigma\{(M_1, Q_1), \dots, (M_{k-1}, Q_{k-1})\}$.

Lemma 1 Let $\beta \in]\beta_0, \beta_1[$ be the root of the equation (8). Then

$$\mathbf{E} \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\beta V_s} ds < \infty, \quad \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta < \infty. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Using the independence of τ_1 and V we get that

$$\mathbf{E} \int_0^{\tau_1} e^{-\beta V_s} ds = \mathbf{E} \int_0^{\tau_1} e^{(1/2)\sigma_0^2 \beta (\beta - \beta_0) s} ds = \lambda^{01} \int_0^\infty e^{-[(1/2)\sigma_0^2 \beta (\beta_0 - \beta) + \lambda^{01}] t} dt < \infty$$

in virtue of the inequality (9). Also,

$$\mathbf{E} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} e^{-\beta V_s} ds = \mathbf{E} e^{-\beta V_{\tau_1}} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} e^{-\beta (V_s - V_{\tau_1})} ds = \mathbf{E} e^{-\beta V_{\tau_1}} \mathbf{E} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} e^{-\beta (V_s - V_{\tau_1})} ds.$$

Recall that $\mathbf{E}e^{-\beta V_{\tau_1}} = f_0(\beta) < \infty$. Taking into account that on the interval $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ the process $V_s - V_{\tau_1}$ is a Wiener process with variance σ_1^2 and drift $(1/2)\sigma_1^2\beta_1$, we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} e^{-\beta(V_s - V_{\tau_1})} dt = \lambda^{10} \int_0^\infty e^{-[(1/2)\sigma_1^2\beta(\beta_1 - \beta) + \lambda^{10}]t} dt < \infty$$

since both terms in the square brackets are strictly positive (and we have no need to use the representation in (10)). This gives us the first property in (13).

Take $p > 1$ such that $(\beta/p - \beta_0) > 0$ and define the constant $\kappa := (1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta/p$ and martingale $L = (L_s)$ with $L_s = e^{(-\sigma_0\beta W_s - \kappa\beta s)/p}$. Then

$$\left(\int_0^t e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta = \left(\int_0^t e^{-\sigma_0 W_s - \kappa s} e^{\kappa s - (1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta_0 s} ds \right)^\beta \leq L_t^{*p} \left(\int_0^t e^{\kappa s - (1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta_0 s} ds \right)^\beta$$

where $L_t^* := \sup_{s \leq t} L_s$. By the Doob inequality

$$\mathbf{E}L_t^{*p} \leq C_p \mathbf{E}L_t^p = C_p e^{(1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta^2(1-1/p)t}.$$

where $C_p := (p/(p-1))^p$. Integrating the exponential we get that

$$\left(\int_0^t e^{\kappa s - (1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta_0 s} ds \right)^\beta = \left(\int_0^t e^{(1/2)\sigma_0^2(\beta/p - \beta_0)s} ds \right)^\beta \leq (1/c_p) e^{c_p t}$$

where $c_p := (1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta(\beta/p - \beta_0)$.

Combining two estimates we get that

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^t e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta \leq (C_p/c_p) e^{(1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta(\beta - \beta_0)t} < \infty$$

and

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_1} e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta \leq \lambda^{01} (C_p/c_p) \int_0^\infty e^{-[(1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta(\beta_0 - \beta) + \lambda^{01}]t} dt < \infty$$

in virtue of (9). Using again the factorization

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta = \mathbf{E} e^{-\beta V_{\tau_1}} \mathbf{E} \left(\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} e^{-(V_s - V_{\tau_1})} ds \right)^\beta$$

and observing that

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta \leq \lambda^{10} (C_p/c_p) \int_0^\infty e^{-[(1/2)\sigma_0^2\beta(\beta_1 - \beta) + \lambda^{10}]t} dt < \infty.$$

we get the second property in (13). \square

The following lemma that our conditions imply that $Q_1 \in L^\beta(\Omega)$.

Lemma 2 *Suppose that $\Pi(|x|^\beta) := \int |x|^\beta \Pi(dx) < \infty$. Then $\mathbf{E}|Q_1|^\beta < \infty$.*

Proof. Case where $\beta \leq 1$. The inequality $(|x| + |y|)^\beta \leq |x|^\beta + |y|^\beta$ allows us to consider the integrability of summands separately. In particular, for the jump component of the process P whose jump measure $\pi(dt, dx)$ has the compensator $\tilde{\pi}(dt, dx) = \Pi(dx)dt$, we get that

$$\mathbf{E}(e^{-V} x * \pi_{\tau_2})^\beta \leq \mathbf{E}e^{-\beta V} |x|^\beta * \pi_{\tau_2} = \mathbf{E}e^{-\beta V} |x|^\beta * \tilde{\pi}_{\tau_2} \leq \Pi(|x|^\beta) \mathbf{E} \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\beta V_s} ds.$$

The claim follows from here and Lemma 1.

Case where $\beta > 1$. Now we shall split summands using the elementary inequality

$$(|x| + |y|)^\beta \leq 2^{\beta-1}(|x|^\beta + |y|^\beta).$$

Because of Lemma 1 we need to consider only the integral with respect to the jump component of P . Note that $e^{-V} |x| * \tilde{\pi}_{\tau_2} < \infty$. Then

$$\mathbf{E}(e^{-V} |x| * \pi_{\tau_2})^\beta \leq 2^{\beta-1} (\mathbf{E}(e^{-V} |x| * (\pi - \tilde{\pi})_{\tau_2})^\beta + \mathbf{E}(e^{-V} |x| * \tilde{\pi}_{\tau_2})^\beta).$$

Due to (13)

$$\mathbf{E}(e^{-V} |x| * \tilde{\pi}_{\tau_2})^\beta \leq (\Pi(|x|))^\beta \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta < \infty.$$

Let $I_s := e^{-V} |x| * (\pi - \tilde{\pi})_s$. According to the Novikov inequalities (with $\alpha = 1$) the moment of the order $\beta > 1$ of $I_t^* := \sup_{s \leq t} |I_s|$ admits the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}I_{\tau_2}^{*\beta} &\leq C_{\beta,1} (\mathbf{E}(e^{-V} |x| * \tilde{\pi}_{\tau_2})^\beta + \mathbf{E}e^{-\beta V} |x|^\beta * \tilde{\pi}_{\tau_2}) \\ &\leq C'_{\beta,1} \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds \right)^\beta + \mathbf{E}C''_{\beta,1} \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\beta V_s} ds \end{aligned}$$

where $C'_{\beta,1} := C_{\beta,1}(\Pi(|x|))^\beta < \infty$, $C''_{\beta,1} := C_{\beta,1}\Pi(|x|^\beta) < \infty$ due to our assumption. The both integrals in the right-hand side as we proved are finite. \square

Lemma 3 *The process Y has the following properties:*

- (i) Y_t converges almost surely as $t \rightarrow \infty$ to a finite random variable Y_∞ .
- (ii) $Y_\infty = Q_1 + M_1 Y_{1,\infty}$ where $Y_{1,\infty}$ is a random variable independent on (Q_1, M_1) and having the same law as Y_∞ .
- (iii) Y_∞ is unbounded from above.

Proof. (i) Take $p \in]0, \beta \wedge 1[$. Then $r := EM_1^p < 1$ and, by virtue of Lemma 2, $\mathbf{E}|Q_1|^p < \infty$. It follows that $\mathbf{E}|Y_{\tau_{2n+2}} - Y_{\tau_{2n}}|^p = \mathbf{E}M_1^p \dots M_n^p Q_{n+1}^p = r^n \mathbf{E}|Q_1|^p$ and, therefore,

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} |Y_{\tau_{2n+2}} - Y_{\tau_{2n}}| \right)^p \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{E}|Y_{\tau_{2n+2}} - Y_{\tau_{2n}}|^p < \infty.$$

Thus, $\sum_n |Y_{\tau_{2n+2}} - Y_{\tau_{2n}}| < \infty$ a.s. implying that $Y_{\tau_{2n}}$ converges a.s. to some finite random variable we shall denote Y_∞ .

Let $Y_t^* := \sup_{s \leq t} |Y_s|$. Then

$$\mathbf{E}Y_{\tau_2}^{*p} \leq c^p \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-V_t} dt \right)^p + (\Pi(|x|))^p \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-pV_t} dt \right)^p < \infty.$$

Put

$$\Delta_n = \sup_{v \in [\tau_{2n}, \tau_{2n+2}]} \left| \int_{\tau_{2n}}^v e^{-V_s} dP_s \right|.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{E}\Delta_n^p = \mathbf{E}M_1^p \dots M_n^p \sup_{v \in [\tau_{2n}, \tau_{2n+2}]} \left| \int_{\tau_{2n}}^v e^{-(V_s - V_{\tau_{2n}})} dP_s \right|^p \leq r^p \mathbf{E}Y_{\tau_2}^{*p}$$

and, therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{P}(\Delta_n \geq \varepsilon) \leq e^{-p} \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{E}\Delta_n^p < \infty.$$

By the Borel–Cantelli lemma for all ω except a null-set $\Delta_n(\omega) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq n(\omega)$. This implies that Y_t converges a.s. to the same limit as the sequence Y_{τ_n} .

(ii) Rewriting (12) in the form

$$Y_{\tau_{2n}} = Q_1 + M_1(Q_2 + M_2Q_3 + \dots + M_2 \dots M_{n-1}Q_n)$$

and observing that the sequence of random variables in the parentheses converges as to a random variable with same law as Y_∞ and independent on (Q_1, M_1) we get the needed assertion.

(iii) In virtue of (ii) it is sufficient to check that the set $\{Q_1 \geq N, M_1 \leq 1/N\}$ is non-null whatever is $N \geq 0$. We consider several cases.

1) $c < 0$. On the set $\{T_1 > \tau_2\}$ we have $Q_1 = -c \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds$. For every $t > 0$ the set

$$B_N(t) := \left\{ -c \int_0^t e^{-V_s} ds \geq N, e^{-V_t} \leq 1/N \right\}$$

is non-null and so is $B_N(\tau_2)$. Note that

$$\Gamma_N := \{Q_1 \geq N, M_1 \leq 1/N, T_1 > \tau_2\} = B_N(\tau_2) \cap \{T_1 > \tau_2\}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbf{P}(\Gamma_N) := \mathbf{E}I_{B_N(\tau_2)} I_{\{T_1 > \tau_2\}} = \mathbf{E}I_{B_N(\tau_2)} e^{-(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\tau_2} > 0.$$

2) $c \geq 0$. Since P is not increasing, $\Pi(-\infty, 0] > 0$. Let $r_N := \delta + \ln N$. We consider the set

$$\Delta_N := \{-\delta + \gamma < V_s < \delta + \gamma s, \forall s \leq r_N + 1\} \cap \{r_N \leq \tau_2 \leq r_N + 1\}$$

The set Δ_N is non-null and on this set $e^{-V_{\tau_2}} \leq e^{\delta - r_N} \leq 1/N$ and

$$c \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds \geq \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-V_s} ds$$

Note that the set

$$\left\{ e^{-V} * x_{\{x < 0\}} \pi_{r_N} \geq C_N + N, x_{\{x > 0\}} * \pi_{\tau_2} = 0 \right\}$$

is non-null and so non-null is its intersection with Δ_N . But this intersection is a subset of the set $\{Q_1 \geq N, M_1 \leq 1/N\}$. \square

Lemma 4 For all $u > 0$

$$\bar{G}_i(u) \leq \Psi_i(u) = \frac{\bar{G}_i(u)}{\mathbf{E}(\bar{G}_{\theta_{\tau, u, i}}(0) | \tau^{u, i} < \infty)} \leq \frac{\bar{G}_i(u)}{\bar{G}_0(0) \wedge \bar{G}_1(0)}, \quad (14)$$

where $\bar{G}_i(u) := \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^i > u)$.

Proof. Let τ be an arbitrary stopping time with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^{P,R,\theta})$. As the finite limit Y_∞^i exists, the random variable

$$Y_{\tau,\infty}^i := \begin{cases} -\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{] \tau, \tau+N]} e^{-(V_s - V_\tau)} dP_s, & \tau < \infty, \\ 0, & \tau = \infty, \end{cases}$$

is well defined. On the set $\{\tau < \infty\}$

$$Y_{\tau,\infty}^i = e^{V_\tau} (Y_\infty^i - Y_\tau^i) = X_\tau^u + e^{V_\tau} (Y_\infty^i - u). \quad (15)$$

Let ξ be a $\mathcal{F}_\tau^{P,R,\theta}$ -measurable random variable. Note that the conditional distribution of $Y_{\tau,\infty}^i$ given $(\tau, \xi, \theta_\tau) = (t, x, j) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}$ is the same as the distribution of Y_∞^j . It follows that

$$\mathbf{P}(Y_{\tau,\infty}^i > \xi, \tau < \infty, \theta_\tau = j) = \mathbf{E} \bar{G}_j(\xi) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < \infty, \theta_\tau = j\}}.$$

Thus, if $\mathbf{P}(\tau < \infty) > 0$, then

$$\mathbf{P}(Y_{\tau,\infty}^i > \xi, \tau < \infty) = \mathbf{E}(\bar{G}_{\theta_\tau}(\xi) | \tau < \infty) \mathbf{P}(\tau < \infty).$$

Noting that $\Psi_i(u) := \mathbf{P}(\tau^{u,i} < \infty) \geq \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^i > u) = \bar{G}_i(u) > 0$, we deduce from here using (15) that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{G}_i(u) &= \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^i > u, \tau^{u,i} < \infty) = \mathbf{P}(Y_{\tau^{u,i},\infty}^i > X_{\tau^{u,i}}^{u,i}, \tau^{u,i} < \infty) \\ &= \mathbf{E}(\bar{G}_{\theta_{\tau^{u,i},i}}(X_{\tau^{u,i}}^{u,i}) | \tau^{u,i} < \infty) \mathbf{P}(\tau^{u,i} < \infty) \end{aligned}$$

implying the equality in (14). Also,

$$\mathbf{E}(\bar{G}_{\theta_{\tau^{u,i},i}}(0) | \tau^{u,i} < \infty) = \bar{G}_0(0) \mathbf{P}(\theta_{\tau^{u,i},i} = 0 | \tau^{u,i} < \infty) + \bar{G}_1(0) \mathbf{P}(\theta_{\tau^{u,i},i} = 1 | \tau^{u,i} < \infty).$$

The result follows since $X_{\tau^{u,i}}^{u,i} \leq 0$ on $\{\tau^{u,i} < \infty\}$ and, in the case with only upward jumps that is when $\Pi(] - \infty, 0]) = 0$, the process $X^{u,i}$ crosses zero in a continuous way, i.e. $X_{\tau^{u,i}}^{u,i} = 0$ on this set. \square

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant 20-68-47030.

References

1. Albrecher H., Gerber H., Yang H. A direct approach to the discounted penalty function. *North American Actuarial Journal*, **14** (2010), 4, 420–434.
2. Asmussen S., Albrecher H. *Ruin Probabilities*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2010.
3. Buraczewski D., Damek E., A simple proof of heavy tail estimates for affine type Lipschitz recursions, Stochastic processes and their applications, 127, 657 – 668 (2017)
4. Di Masi G.B., Kabanov Yu.M., Runggaldier W.J. Mean-square hedging of options on a stock with Markov volatilities. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 39 (1994), 1, 172–182.
5. Frolova A., Kabanov Yu., Pergamenschikov S. In the insurance business risky investments are dangerous. *Finance and Stochastics*, **6** (2002), 2, 227–235.
6. Goldie C.M. Implicit renewal theory and tails of solutions of random equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, **1** (1991), 1, 126–166.
7. Grandell I. *Aspects of Risk Theory*. Springer, Berlin, 1990.
8. Guivarc’h Y., Le Page E., On the homogeneity at infinity of the stationary probability for affine random walk, In: Bhattacharya S., Das T., Ghosh A., Shah R. (eds). “Recent trends in ergodic theory and dynamical systems” Contemporary Mathematics AMS, 119–130 (2015)

9. Kabanov Yu., Pergamenshchikov S. In the insurance business risky investments are dangerous: the case of negative risk sums. *Finance and Stochastics*, **20** (2020), 2, 355 – 379.
10. Kabanov Yu., Pergamenshchikov S. Ruin probabilities for a Lévy-driven generalized Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process. *Finance and Stochastics*, **24** (2020), 1, 39 – 69.
11. Kabanov Yu., Pukhlyakov N., Ruin probabilities with investments: smoothness, IDE and ODE, asymptotic behavior. Preprint (2020). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.07828>
12. Paulsen J., Risk theory in stochastic economic environment, *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 46, 327–361 (1993)
13. Paulsen J., Sharp conditions for certain ruin in a risk process with stochastic return on investments, *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 75, 135 – 148 (1998)
14. Paulsen J., On Cramér-like asymptotics for risk processes with stochastic return on investments, *Annals of Applied Probability*, 12, 1247 – 1260 (2002)
15. Paulsen J., Gjessing H. K., Ruin theory with stochastic return on investments, *Advances in Applied Probability*, 29, 965 – 985 (1997)
16. Pergamenshchikov S., Zeitouni O. Ruin probability in the presence of risky investments. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, **116** (2006), 267–278.