

An Extended Merton Problem with Relaxed Benchmark Tracking

Lijun Bo *

Yijie Huang †

Xiang Yu ‡

Abstract

This paper studies a Merton's optimal consumption problem in an extended formulation incorporating the tracking of a benchmark process described by a geometric Brownian motion. We consider a relaxed tracking formulation such that the wealth process compensated by a fictitious capital injection outperforms the benchmark at all times. The fund manager aims to maximize the expected utility of consumption deducted by the cost of the capital injection, where the latter term can also be regarded as the expected largest shortfall of the wealth with reference to the benchmark. By introducing an auxiliary state process with reflection, we formulate and tackle an equivalent stochastic control problem by means of the dual transform and probabilistic representation, where the dual PDE can be solved explicitly. On the strength of the closed-form results, we can derive and verify the optimal feedback control for the primal control problem, allowing us to discuss some new and interesting financial implications induced by the additional risk-taking from the capital injection and the goal of tracking.

Keywords: Benchmark tracking, capital injection, expected largest shortfall, consumption and portfolio choice, Neumann boundary condition.

1 Introduction

Since the pioneer studies of Merton (1969, 1971), the optimal portfolio and consumption problem via utility maximization has attracted tremendous generalizations to address various new demands and challenges coming from more realistic market models, performance measures, trading constraints, and among others. In the present paper, we consider a new type of extended Merton problem in the setting of fund management when the fund manager is also concerned about the relative performance with respect to a stochastic benchmark. It has been well documented that, in order to enhance client's confidence or to attract more new clients, tracking or outperforming a benchmark has become common in practice in fund management. Some typical benchmark processes that fund managers may consider are S&P500 Index, Goldman Sachs Commodity Index, Hang Seng Index, and etc. Other popular examples of benchmark processes in fund and investment management may refer to inflation rates, exchange rates, liability or education cost indices, etc.

*Email: lijunbo@ustc.edu.cn, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xidian University, Xi'an, 710126, China.

†huang1@mail.ustc.edu.cn, School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, China.

‡Email: xiang.yu@polyu.edu.hk, Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China.

To examine the trade-off between the utility maximization and the goal of benchmark tracking, we consider a relaxed benchmark tracking formulation as in [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#). It is assumed that the fund manager can strategically inject some fictitious capital into the fund account such that the total capital outperforms the targeted benchmark process at all times. The capital injection, also called the bail-out strategy, has been extensively studied in the setting of the De Finetti's optimal dividend problems, see e.g. [Lokka and Zervos \(2008\)](#), [Eisenberg and Schmidli \(2009\)](#), [Eisenberg and Schmidli \(2011\)](#) and [Ferrari and Meziou \(2019\)](#). In this context, the beneficiary of the dividends may strategically inject capital in order to avoid bankruptcy of firms. In the present paper, mathematically speaking, to encode the benchmark tracking procedure into the optimal consumption problem, we impose a dynamic floor constraint for the controlled wealth process compensated by the fictitious singular control of capital injection. The aim of the fund manager is to maximize the expected utility of consumption and meanwhile to minimize the cost of total capital injection (see the primal stochastic control problem (2.4)). As a result, the fund manager will attain the ultimate satisfaction in dynamic portfolio and consumption choices and will steer the controlled wealth process as close as possible to the targeted benchmark. Moreover, due to the explicit structure of the optimal singular control of capital injection, the total capital injection can record the largest shortfall when the wealth falls below the benchmark process. Therefore, the cost term can also be interpreted as the expected largest shortfall of the wealth process falling below the benchmark level, i.e., our equivalent problem (2.6) can be viewed as an extended Merton problem amended by the minimization of the benchmark-moderated shortfall risk, see Remark 4.5.

Portfolio management with benchmark tracking has been an important research topic in quantitative finance, which is often used to assess the performance of fund management and may directly affect the fund manager's performance-based incentives. Various benchmark tracking formulations have been considered in the existing literature. For example, in [Browne \(1999a\)](#), [Browne \(1999b\)](#), and [Browne \(2000\)](#), several active portfolio management objectives are considered including: maximizing the probability that the agent's wealth achieves a performance goal relative to the benchmark before falling below it to a predetermined shortfall; minimizing the expected time to reach the performance goal; the mixture of these two objectives, and some further extensions by considering the expected reward or expected penalty. Another conventional way to measure and optimize the tracking error is to minimize the variance or downside variance relative to the index value or return, see for instance [Gaivoronski et al. \(2005\)](#), [Yao et al. \(2006\)](#) and [Ni et al. \(2022\)](#), which leads to the linear-quadratic stochastic control problem. In [Strub and Baumann \(2018\)](#), another objective function is introduced to measure the similarity between the normalized historical trajectories of the tracking portfolio and the index where the rebalancing transaction costs can also be taken into account. Recently, to address the optimal tracking of the non-decreasing benchmark process, a new tracking formulation using the fictitious capital injection is studied in [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#) for absolutely continuous monotone benchmark process. With the help of an equivalent auxiliary control problem based on an auxiliary state process with reflection, the dual transform and some probabilistic representations of the dual value function, the existence of optimal control can be established in [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#). However, as a price to pay for some technical aspects from the monotone benchmark, we are not capable to conclude satisfactory structures and quantitative properties of the optimal portfolio and consumption strategies, leaving the financial implications therein inadequate and vague.

In the present paper, we consider the same tracking formulation using the capital injection such that the total capital dynamically dominates the benchmark process. In contrast to [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#), the stochastic benchmark process is described by a geometric Brownian motion, which is commonly used to model some market index processes and other benchmark processes, see [Browne \(2000\)](#), [Guasoni et al. \(2011\)](#) and references therein. We mainly follow the problem transform and methodology developed in [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#). However, in contrast to [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#) that only focuses on the portfolio optimization, we are now interested in the optimal decision making on both consumption and portfolio management, where the classical Merton’s problem can be embedded as a special case in our optimal relaxed tracking problem. As another distinction comparing with [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Bo et al. \(2023\)](#), the benchmark process in the present paper follows a geometric Brownian motion, hence the classical solution of the dual two dimensional PDE can be obtained explicitly such that the technical arguments for the regularity of the solution using stochastic flow analysis in [Bo et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Bo et al. \(2023\)](#) can be completely avoided. More importantly, we can further derive the optimal portfolio and consumption control in the semi-analytical feedback form in terms of the primal state variables, see [Corollary 4.2](#). Consequently, we are able to analyze some new and notable quantitative properties of the optimal portfolio and consumption strategies in the present paper induced by the trade-off between the utility maximization and the goal of tracking (or the minimization of expected shortfall of the wealth with reference to the benchmark). In particular, we first highlight that the feedback optimal portfolio and optimal consumption strategies exhibit convex (concave) property with respect to the wealth level when the fund manager is more (less) risk averse (see [Proposition 4.8](#) and [Remark 4.9](#)), which differs significantly from the classical Merton’s solution. Moreover, some numerical examples and discussions on their financial implications are presented in [Section 5](#). Secondly, due to the extra risk-taking from the capital injection, the optimal portfolio and consumption behavior will become more aggressive than their counterparts in the Merton problem, and it is interesting to see from our main result that the optimal portfolio and consumption are both positive at the instant when the capital is injected (see [Remark 4.3](#)). Even when there is no benchmark, the allowance of fictitious capital injection already enlarges the space of admissible controls as the no-bankruptcy constraint is relaxed and our credit line is captured by the controlled capital injection. A detailed comparison result with the Merton solution are summarized in [Remark 4.7](#), and a brief description of financial implications on the adjustment impact by the capital injection are provided in [Section 5](#) through numerical examples. Moreover, we also note that the optimal control in our formulation is no longer monotone in the risk aversion parameter comparing with other existing studies, see [Figure 10](#) and discussions therein. At last, to verify that our problem formulation is well defined and financially sound, it is shown in [Lemma 4.4](#) and [Remark 4.5](#) that the expected discounted total capital injection is both bounded below and above. The lower bound indicates the necessity of capital injection to meet the dynamic benchmark floor constraint, and the upper bound implies the finite risk measured by the expected largest shortfall when wealth process falls below the benchmark.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we introduce the market model and the relaxed benchmark tracking formulation using the fictitious capital injection. In [Section 3](#), by introducing an auxiliary state process with reflection, we formulate an equivalent auxiliary stochastic control problem and derive the associated HJB equation with a Neumann boundary condition. Therein, the dual HJB equation can be solved fully explicitly with aid of the probabilistic representations. The verification theorem on optimal feedback control in semi-

analytical form is presented in Section 4 together with some quantitative properties of the optimal portfolio and consumption strategies as well as the expected discounted total capital injection. Some numerical examples and empirical analysis are reported in Section 5. Appendix A contains proofs of some auxiliary results and the verification theorem in previous sections.

2 Market Model and Problem Formulation

Consider a financial market model consisting of d risky assets under a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with the filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions. We introduce the following Black-Scholes model where the price process vector $S = (S^1, \dots, S^d)^\top = (S_t^1, \dots, S_t^d)_{t \geq 0}^\top$ of d risky assets is described by

$$dS_t = \text{diag}(S_t)(\mu dt + \sigma dW_t), \quad S_0 \in (0, \infty)^d, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Here, $\text{diag}(S_t)$ denotes the diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements given by S_t , and $W = (W^1, \dots, W^d)^\top = (W_t^1, \dots, W_t^d)_{t \geq 0}^\top$ is a d -dimensional \mathbb{F} -adapted Brownian motion, and $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the vector of return rate and $\sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{d \times d}$ is the volatility matrix which is invertible. It is assumed that the riskless interest rate $r = 0$, which amounts to the change of numéraire. From this point onwards, all processes including the wealth process and the benchmark process are defined after the change of numéraire.

At time $t \geq 0$, let θ_t^i be the amount of wealth that the fund manager allocates in asset $S^i = (S_t^i)_{t \geq 0}$, and let c_t be the non-negative consumption rate. The self-financing wealth process under the control $\theta = (\theta_t^1, \dots, \theta_t^d)_{t \geq 0}^\top$ and the control $c = (c_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is given by

$$dV_t^{\theta, c} = \theta_t^\top \mu dt + \theta_t^\top \sigma dW_t - c_t dt, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where $V_0^{\theta, c} = v \geq 0$ denotes the initial wealth of the fund manager.

In the present paper, it is also considered that the fund manager has concern on the relative performance with respect to an external benchmark process. The benchmark process $Z = (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is described by a geometric Brownian motion (GBM) that

$$dZ_t = \mu_Z Z_t dt + \sigma_Z Z_t dW_t^\gamma, \quad Z_0 = z \geq 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where the return rate $\mu_Z \in \mathbb{R}$, the volatility $\sigma_Z \geq 0$, and the Brownian motion $W_t^\gamma := \gamma^\top W_t$ for $t \geq 0$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $|\gamma| = 1$, i.e., the Brownian motion $W^\gamma = (W_t^\gamma)_{t \geq 0}$ is a linear combination of W with weights γ .

Given the benchmark process $Z = (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$, we consider the relaxed benchmark tracking formulation in Bo et al. (2021) in the sense that the fund manager strategically chooses the dynamic portfolio and consumption as well as the fictitious capital injection such that the total capital outperforms the benchmark process at all times. That is, the fund manager optimally chooses the regular control θ as the dynamic portfolio in risky assets, the regular control c as the consumption rate and the singular control $A = (A_t)_{t \geq 0}$ as the cumulative capital injection such that

$A_t + V_t^{\theta,c} \geq Z_t$ at any time $t \geq 0$. As an extended Merton problem, the agent aims to maximize that, for all $(v, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ with $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} w(v, z) := \sup_{(\theta, c, A) \in \mathbb{U}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t) dt - \beta \left(A_0 + \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t \right) \right], \\ \text{subject to } Z_t \leq A_t + V_t^{\theta,c} \text{ for all } t \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

Here, the admissible control set \mathbb{U} is defined as:

$\mathbb{U} := \{(\theta, c, A) = (\theta_t, c_t, A_t)_{t \geq 0} : (\theta, c) \text{ is } \mathbb{F}\text{-adapted processes taking values on } \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+, A \text{ is a non-negative, non-decreasing process with r.c.l.l. paths and initial value } A_0 = a \geq 0\}$.

The constant $\rho > 0$ is the subjective discount rate, and the parameter $\beta > 0$ describes the cost of capital injection. We consider the CRRA utility function in this paper that

$$U(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{p} x^p, & p < 1 \text{ and } p \neq 0, \\ \ln x, & p = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

where the risk averse level of the fund manager is given by $1 - p \in (0, +\infty)$.

We stress that when $\mu_Z = \sigma_Z = z = 0$ (constant zero benchmark) and the cost parameter $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$, the problem (2.4) degenerates to the classical Merton's problem in Merton (1971) as the capital injection is prohibited. However, when the benchmark process keeps constant zero that $Z_t \equiv 0$, but the capital injection is allowed with finite cost parameter $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, our problem formulation in (2.4) actually motivates the fund manager to strategically inject capital from time to time to achieve the more aggressive portfolio and consumption behavior. That is, for the optimal solution (θ^*, c^*) in the Merton's problem, the control triplet $(\theta_t^*, c_t^*, A_t^* \equiv 0)$ without capital injection does not attain the optimality in (2.4) even when $Z_t \equiv 0$. Hence, the allowance of capital injection significantly affects the optimal decision making. These interesting observations are rigorously verified later in items (i) and (ii) in Remark 4.7.

Remark 2.1. *If the actual capital injection is allowed from external resources, we can equivalently consider the actual wealth process including the capital injection that $V^{\theta,c,A} = V^{\theta,c} + A$ that*

$$dV_t^{\theta,c,A} = \theta_t^\top \mu dt + \theta_t^\top \sigma dW_t - c_t dt + dA_t, \quad V_t^{\theta,c,A} = v.$$

The constraint $V^{\theta,c,A} \geq Z_t$ for all $t \geq 0$ guarantees the actual wealth $V^{\theta,c,A}$ to be non-negative.

Stochastic control problems with minimum floor constraints have been studied in different contexts, see among El Karoui et al. (2005), El Karoui and Meziou (2006), Di Giacinto et al. (2011), Sekine (2012), and Chow et al. (2020) and references therein. In previous studies, the minimum guaranteed level is usually chosen as constant or deterministic level and some typical techniques to handle the floor constraints are to introduce the option based portfolio or the insured portfolio allocation. When there exists a stochastic benchmark Z_t , it is actually observed in this paper that one can not find any admissible control $(\theta_t, c_t, A_t \equiv 0)$ such that the constraint $Z_t \leq V_t^{\theta,c}$ is satisfied, i.e., the classical Merton problem under the benchmark constraint $Z_t \leq V_t^{\theta,c}$

is actually not well defined. To dynamically outperform the stochastic benchmark, the capital injection is crucially needed and our problem formulation in (2.4) is a reasonable and tractable one. The detailed elaboration of this observation is given in item (iii) of Remark 4.7.

To tackle the problem (2.4) with the floor constraint, we first reformulate the problem based on the observation that, for a fixed control (θ, c) , the optimal A is always the smallest adapted right-continuous and non-decreasing process that dominates $Z - V^{\theta, c}$. It follows from Lemma 2.4 in Bo et al. (2021) that, for fixed regular control θ and c , the optimal singular control $A^{(\theta, c),*} = (A_t^{(\theta, c),*})_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies that $A_t^{(\theta, c),*} = 0 \vee \sup_{s \leq t} (Z_s - V_s^{\theta, c})$, $\forall t \geq 0$. Thus, the control problem (2.4) admits the equivalent formulation as an unconstrained control problem with a running maximum cost that

$$w(v, z) = -\beta(z - v)^+ + \sup_{(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{U}^r} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t) dt - \beta \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d \left(0 \vee \sup_{s \leq t} (Z_s - V_s^{\theta, c}) \right) \right], \quad (2.6)$$

where \mathbb{U}^r denotes the admissible control set of pairs $(\theta, c) = (\theta_t, c_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that will be specified later.

Remark 2.2. Note that we can equivalently write $A_t^* = \sup_{s \leq t} (V_s^{\theta^*, c^*} - Z_s)^-$, thus the process A_t^* can be interpreted as a record of the largest (in time) shortfall when the wealth falls below the benchmark, and $\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d \sup_{s \leq t} (V_s^{\theta^*, c^*} - Z_s)^- \right]$ can be regarded as a risk measure of the expected largest shortfall with reference to the benchmark, see also the conventional definition of expected shortfall with respect to a random variable at the terminal time in Pham (2002) and references therein. In reality, the fund manager may not be able to inject extra capital from external resources into the fund account. We then can interpret the capital injection A_t as a fictitious control in (2.4), using which we are able to arrive at the equivalent problem formulation (2.6). In particular, using the fictitious singular control A_t helps us to enlarge the set of admissible portfolio and consumption control pair (θ_t, c_t) because the wealth process $V_t^{\theta, c}$ is allowed to fall below the benchmark Z_t and is even permitted to be negative (the bankruptcy requirement on $V_t^{\theta, c}$ is relaxed). As a result, the expected utility of consumption can be achieved at a higher level from the enlarged admissible set. Meanwhile, the fund manager needs to strategically choose the portfolio-consumption control to minimize the expected largest shortfall, see Remark 4.5 for its quantitative bounds.

We also note that some previous studies on stochastic control problems with the running maximum cost can be found in Barron and Ishii (1989), Barles et al. (1994), Bokanowski et al. (2015), Weerasinghe and Zhu (2016) and Kröner et al. (2018), where the viscosity solution approach usually plays the key role. We will adopt the methodology developed in Bo et al. (2021) and study an equivalent stochastic control problem with state-reflection.

3 Equivalent Control Problem

In this section, we formulate and study a more tractable auxiliary stochastic control problem, which is mathematically equivalent to the unconstrained optimal control problem (2.6).

To formulate the auxiliary stochastic control problem, we will introduce a new controlled state process to replace the process $V^{\theta, c} = (V_t^{\theta, c})_{t \geq 0}$ given in (2.2). To this end, let us first define the

difference process by $D_t := Z_t - V_t^{\theta, c} + v - z$, $\forall t \geq 0$ with $D_0 = 0$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, introduce the running maximum process of $D = (D_t)_{t \geq 0}$ given by $L_t := x \vee \sup_{s \leq t} D_s - x \geq 0$ for $t \geq 0$, and $L_0 = 0$. We then propose a new controlled state process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ taking values on \mathbb{R}_+ , which is defined as the reflected process $X_t := x + L_t - D_t$ for $t \geq 0$ that satisfies the following SDE with reflection:

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \mu ds + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \sigma dW_s - \int_0^t c_s ds - \int_0^t \mu_Z Z_s ds - \int_0^t \sigma_Z Z_s dW_s^\gamma + L_t \quad (3.1)$$

with the initial value $X_0 = x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For the notational convenience, we have omitted the dependence of $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the control (θ, c) . In particular, the process $L = (L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ which is referred to as the local time of X , it increases at time t if and only if $X_t = 0$, i.e., $x + L_t = D_t$. We will change the notation from L_t to L_t^X from this point on wards to emphasize its dependence on the new state process X given in (3.1).

With the above preparations, let us consider the following stochastic control problem given by, for $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\begin{cases} v(x, z) := \sup_{(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{U}^r} J(x, z; \theta, c) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t) dt - \beta \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dL_t^X \mid X_0 = x, Z_0 = z \right], \\ \text{subject to the state process } (X, Z) \text{ satisfies the dynamics (3.1) and (2.3).} \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Here, the admissible control set \mathbb{U}^r is specified as the set of \mathbb{F} -adapted control processes $(\theta, c) = (\theta_t, c_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that the reflected SDE (3.1) has a unique strong solution. It is not difficult to observe the equivalence between (2.6) and (3.2) in the following sense:

Lemma 3.1. *For value functions w defined in (2.6) and v defined in (3.2), we have $w(v, z) = v((v - z)^+, z) - \beta(z - v)^+$ for all $(v, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.*

Applying the dynamic programming principle, we derive the HJB equation formally satisfied by the value function. Then, the Legendre-Fenchel (LF) transform can help us transform the HJB equation into a linear dual PDE.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that the value function $v \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ with $v_{xx} < 0$ and $v_x > 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . Then, it satisfies the following HJB equation:*

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[\theta^\top \mu v_x + \frac{1}{2} \theta^\top \sigma \sigma^\top \theta v_{xx} + \theta^\top \sigma \gamma \sigma_Z z (v_{xz} - v_{xx}) \right] + \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}_+} (U(c) - cv_x) \\ \quad - \sigma_Z^2 z^2 v_{xz} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 z^2 (v_{xx} + v_{zz}) + \mu_Z z (v_z - v_x) = \rho v, \\ v_x(0, z) = \beta, \quad \forall z \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Here, the boundary condition $v_x(0, z) = \beta$ means that $v_x(0, z) = \lim_{x \downarrow 0} v_x(x, z) = \beta$. Moreover, consider the LF transform of v with respect to the variable x only that $\hat{v}(y, z) := \sup_{x > 0} (v(x, z) - xy)$ for $(y, z) \in (0, \beta] \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, it satisfies the linear dual PDE on $(0, \beta] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ that

$$\begin{cases} -\rho \hat{v}(y, z) + \rho y \hat{v}_y(y, z) + \alpha y^2 \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) + \mu_Z z \hat{v}_z(y, z) + \frac{\sigma_Z^2}{2} z^2 \hat{v}_{zz}(y, z) \\ \quad - \eta z y \hat{v}_{yz}(y, z) - (\mu_Z - \eta) z y + \Phi(y) = 0, \\ \hat{v}_y(\beta, z) = 0, \quad \forall z \geq 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where the coefficients $\alpha := \frac{1}{2}\mu^\top(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\mu$ and $\eta := \sigma_Z\gamma^\top\sigma^{-1}\mu$; while the function $x \rightarrow \Phi(x)$ is the LF transform of the utility function U , which is given by $\Phi(x) := \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}_+} (U(c) - cx)$ for $x > 0$.

Proof. Based on the dynamic programming principle, the value function v defined by (3.2) formally satisfies the following HJB equation given by, on \mathbb{R}_+^2 ,

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[\theta^\top \mu v_x + \frac{1}{2} \theta^\top \sigma \sigma^\top \theta v_{xx} + \theta^\top \sigma \gamma \sigma_Z z (v_{xz} - v_{xx}) \right] + \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}_+} (U(c) - cv_x) \\ \quad - \sigma_Z^2 z^2 v_{xz} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 z^2 (v_{xx} + v_{zz}) + \mu_Z z (v_z - v_x) = \rho v, \\ v_x(0, z) = \beta, \quad \forall z \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

The Neumann boundary condition stems from the martingale optimality condition because the process L_t^X increases whenever the process X_t visits the value 0 for $t \geq 0$.

Since $v \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ with $v_{xx} < 0$ and $v_x > 0$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 , the feedback optimal control determined by (3.5) is obtained by, for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\theta^*(x, z) = - \left(\sigma \sigma^\top \right)^{-1} \frac{v_x(x, z) \mu + (v_{xz} - v_{xx})(x, z) z \sigma_Z \sigma \gamma}{v_{xx}(x, z)}, \quad c^*(x, z) = (U')^{-1}(v_x(x, z)). \quad (3.6)$$

Plugging (3.6) into the above HJB equation (3.5), we arrive at, on $[0, \infty)^2$,

$$\begin{cases} -\alpha \frac{v_x^2}{v_{xx}} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 z^2 \left(v_{zz} - \frac{v_{xz}^2}{v_{xx}} \right) - \eta z \frac{v_x v_{xz}}{v_{xx}} + (\eta - \mu_Z) z v_x + \Phi(v_x) + \mu_Z z v_z = \rho v, \\ v_x(0, z) = \beta, \quad \forall z \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Here, the coefficients $\alpha := \frac{1}{2}\mu^\top(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\mu$ and $\eta := \sigma_Z\gamma^\top\sigma^{-1}\mu$, while the function $x \rightarrow \Phi(x)$ is the Legendre-Fenchel (LF) transform of the utility function U given by

$$\Phi(x) := \sup_{c \in \mathbb{R}_+} (U(c) - cx), \quad \forall x > 0. \quad (3.8)$$

It follows that $\Phi(v_x) = U((U')^{-1}(v_x)) - (U')^{-1}(v_x)v_x$. As a direct result of Lemma A.1, we have that $|v_x(x, z)| = v_x(x, z) \leq \beta$ and $|v_z(x, z)| = -v_z(x, z) \leq \beta \left(\sigma_Z^2 + \frac{|\mu_Z|}{\rho - \mu_Z} + \frac{3}{\rho - 2\mu_Z - \sigma_Z^2} \right)$. We consider the LF transform of v only with respect to x that

$$\hat{v}(y, z) := \sup_{x > 0} (v(x, z) - xy), \quad \forall (y, z) \in (0, \beta] \times [0, \infty). \quad (3.9)$$

Then $v(x, z) = \inf_{y \in (0, \beta]} (\hat{v}(y, z) + xy)$ for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Define $x^*(y, z) = v_x(\cdot, z)^{-1}(y)$ with $y \rightarrow v_x(\cdot, z)^{-1}(y)$ being the inverse function of $x \rightarrow v_x(x, z)$. Thus $x^* = x^*(y, z)$ satisfies the equation $v_x(x^*, z) = y$ for all $z \geq 0$. We can obtain from a direct calculation that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}(y, z) &= v(x^*, z) - x^* y, & \hat{v}_y(y, z) &= -x^*, & \hat{v}_z(y, z) &= v_z(x^*, z), & \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) &= -\frac{1}{v_{xx}(x^*, z)}, \\ \hat{v}_{yz}(y, z) &= \frac{v_{xz}(x^*, z)}{v_{xx}(x^*, z)}, & \hat{v}_{zz}(y, z) &= v_{zz}(x^*, z) - \frac{v_{xz}(x^*, z)^2}{v_{xx}(x^*, z)}. \end{aligned}$$

We then get the following dual PDE of Eq. (3.7) that, on $(0, \beta] \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} -\rho\hat{v}(y, z) + \rho y\hat{v}_y(y, z) + \alpha y^2\hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) + \mu_Z z\hat{v}_z(y, z) + \frac{\sigma_Z^2}{2}z^2\hat{v}_{zz}(y, z) \\ \quad -\eta zy\hat{v}_{yz}(y, z) - (\mu_Z - \eta)zy + \Phi(y) = 0, \\ \hat{v}_y(\beta, z) = 0, \quad \forall z \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

This is just PDE (3.4). Thus, we complete the proof of the lemma. \square

To establish the explicit form of the classical solution to the HJB equation and prove the verification result (see Theorem 4.1 in the next section) accordingly, let us introduce the transform $u(r, h) = \hat{v}(\beta e^{-r}, h)$. Then, Eq. (3.4) becomes that, on \mathbb{R}_+^2 ,

$$\begin{cases} -\rho u(r, h) + (\alpha - \rho)u_r(r, h) + \alpha u_{rr}(r, h) + \mu_Z h u_h(r, h) + \frac{\sigma_Z^2}{2}h^2 u_{hh}(r, h) \\ \quad + \eta h u_{rh}(r, h) - (\mu_Z - \eta)\beta h e^{-r} + \Phi(\beta e^{-r}) = 0, \\ u_r(0, h) = 0, \quad \forall h > 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Note that Eq. (3.10) is a linear PDE with a Neumann boundary condition, which has the probabilistic representation that, for all $(r, h) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$u(r, h) := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} \Phi(\beta e^{-R_s^r}) ds \right] - (\mu_Z - \eta)\beta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s - R_s^r} H_s^h ds \right]. \quad (3.11)$$

Here, the processes $R^r = (R_t^r)_{t \geq 0}$ with $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a drifted-Brownian motion with reflection, and $H^h = (H_t^h)_{t \geq 0}$ with $h \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a GBM. In other words, they satisfy the dynamics, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{cases} R_t^r = r + (\alpha - \rho)t + \sqrt{2\alpha}B_t^1 + L_t^r \geq 0, \\ H_t^h = h + \int_0^t \mu_Z H_s^h ds + \varrho \int_0^t \sigma_Z H_s^h dB_s^1 + \sqrt{1 - \varrho^2} \int_0^t \sigma_Z H_s^h dB_s^0, \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

where $B^1 = (B_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $B^0 = (B_t^0)_{t \geq 0}$ are two independent scalar Brownian motions. Here, $L^r = (L_t^r)_{t \geq 0}$ is a continuous and non-decreasing process that increases only on the time set $\{t \geq 0; R_t^r = 0\}$ with $L_0^r = 0$, and the correlative coefficient is given by $\varrho := \frac{(\sigma^{-1}\mu)^\top}{|(\sigma^{-1}\mu)^\top|} \gamma$.

In lieu of the probabilistic representation (3.11), the following proposition shows that Eq. (3.10) has a closed-form classical solution.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that the discount rate $\rho > (2\mu_Z + \sigma_Z^2) \vee \frac{\alpha p}{1-p}$. Let κ denote the positive root of the quadratic equation*

$$\alpha\kappa^2 + (\rho - \eta - \alpha)\kappa + \mu_Z - \rho = 0, \quad (3.13)$$

which is given by

$$\kappa = \frac{-(\rho - \eta - \alpha) + \sqrt{(\rho - \eta - \alpha)^2 + 4\alpha(\rho - \mu_Z)}}{2\alpha} > 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Here, recall that $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\mu^\top(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\mu$ and $\eta = \sigma_Z\gamma^\top\sigma^{-1}\mu$. Then, for all $(r, h) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $p \in (-\infty, 1)$, the function

$$u(r, h) = \begin{cases} \frac{(1-p)^3}{p(\rho(1-p) - \alpha p)}\beta^{-\frac{p}{1-p}}e^{\frac{p}{1-p}r} + \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p}\beta^{-\frac{p}{1-p}}e^{-r} \\ \quad + \left(\beta e^{-r} - \frac{\beta}{\kappa}e^{-\kappa r}\right)h, & p \neq 0, \\ \frac{1}{\rho}r - \frac{\ln\beta + 2}{\rho} + \frac{\alpha}{\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho}e^{-r} + \left(\beta e^{-r} - \frac{\beta}{\kappa}e^{-\kappa r}\right)h, & p = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

is a classical solution to Eq. (3.10).

Proof. Using the probabilistic representation (3.11), we consider the candidate solution admitting the form $u(r, h) = l(r) + h\psi(r)$ for Eq. (3.10). In particular, the functions $r \rightarrow l(r)$ and $r \rightarrow \psi(r)$ satisfy the following equations, respectively:

$$-\rho l(r) + (\alpha - \rho)l_r(r) + \alpha l_{rr}(r) + \Phi(\beta e^{-r}) = 0, \quad (3.16)$$

$$(\mu_Z - \rho)\psi(r) + (\alpha + \eta - \rho)\psi_r(r, h) + \alpha\psi_{rr}(r, h) - (\mu_Z - \eta)\beta e^{-r} = 0. \quad (3.17)$$

By solving Eq.s (3.16) and (3.17), we obtain, for $p \in (-\infty, 1)$,

$$l(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{(1-p)^3}{p(\rho(1-p) - \alpha p)}\beta^{-\frac{p}{1-p}}e^{\frac{p}{1-p}r} + C_1e^{-r} + C_2e^{\frac{\rho}{\alpha}r}, & p \neq 0, \\ \frac{1}{\rho}r - \frac{\ln\beta + 2}{\rho} + \frac{\alpha}{\rho^2} + C_1e^{-r} + C_2e^{\frac{\rho}{\alpha}r}, & p = 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\psi(r) = \beta e^{-r} + C_3e^{-\kappa r} + C_4e^{-\hat{\kappa}r},$$

where C_i with $i = 1, \dots, 4$ are unknown real constants which will be determined later. Above, the constant $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ is specified by (3.14), and the constant $\hat{\kappa}$ is given by

$$\hat{\kappa} := \frac{-(\rho - \eta - \alpha) - \sqrt{(\rho - \eta - \alpha)^2 + 4\alpha(\rho - \mu_Z)}}{2\alpha} < 0.$$

Using the probability representation (3.11), we look for such functions $l(r)$ and $\psi(r)$ with $C_2 = C_4 = 0$ and such that the Neumann boundary conditions $l'(r) = 0$ and $\psi'(r) = 0$ holds. This implies that

$$C_1 = \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p}\beta^{-\frac{p}{1-p}}, \quad C_3 = -\frac{\beta}{\kappa}.$$

With the above specified constants C_i with $i = 1, \dots, 4$, we can easily verify that $u(r, h) = l(r) + h\psi(r)$ given by (3.15) satisfies Eq. (3.10). Thus, we complete the proof of the proposition. \square

The explicit expression (3.15) of the dual equation (3.10) can assist us to obtain a closed-form representation of the classical solution to the duality of the prime HJB equation (3.5) with the Neumann boundary condition. This can further help us to prove the corresponding verification and characterize the optimal portfolio-consumption strategy in Theorem 4.1 the forthcoming section.

4 Main Results

We are ready to present the next result on verification theorem of the optimal control for the primal auxiliary control problem (3.2).

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that $\mu_Z \geq \eta$. Let ρ_0 be the constant defined by*

$$\rho_0 := \frac{\alpha|p| + 1}{1 - p} + 3|\mu_Z| + 4\sigma_Z^2 + 4M_\theta|\mu| + 2M_\theta^2|\sigma\sigma^\top| + 4M_\theta|\sigma_Z\sigma\gamma| + 1. \quad (4.1)$$

Here, the positive constant M_θ is defined by

$$M_\theta := |(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\mu| \left[\left(\frac{\beta}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} + (1 - \kappa)2^{1-\kappa} + \frac{1}{(1-p)(1 - 2^{-\frac{1}{1-p}})} + \frac{1 - \kappa}{1 - 2^{\kappa-1}} \right] + 2|\sigma_Z\gamma^\top\sigma^{-1}|$$

with $\kappa := \frac{-(\rho - \eta - \alpha) + \sqrt{(\rho - \eta - \alpha)^2 + 4\alpha(\rho - \mu_Z)}}{2\alpha} > 0$. Then, for any $\rho > \rho_0$, it holds that

- (i) *The dual HJB equation (3.4) admits a classical solution $\hat{v}(y, z)$ given by, for all $(y, z) \in (0, \beta] \times \mathbb{R}_+$,*

$$\hat{v}(y, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{(1-p)^3}{p(\rho(1-p) - \alpha p)} y^{-\frac{p}{1-p}} + \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} y + z \left(y - \frac{\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}}{\kappa} y^\kappa \right), & p \neq 0, \\ -\frac{1}{\rho} \ln y - \frac{2}{\rho} + \frac{\alpha}{\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho\beta} y + z \left(y - \frac{\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}}{\kappa} y^\kappa \right), & p = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Consider the inverse transform that $v(x, z) = \inf_{y \in (0, \beta]} (\hat{v}(y, z) + yx)$ for $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Then, the function v is a classical solution to the HJB equation (3.3) with Neumann boundary conditions.

- (ii) *Define the following optimal feedback control functions by, for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,*

$$\theta^*(x, z) := -(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1} \frac{\mu v_x(x, z) + \sigma_Z\sigma\gamma z(v_{xz}(x, z) - v_{xx}(x, z))}{v_{xx}(x, z)}, \quad c^*(x, z) := v_x(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}. \quad (4.3)$$

Consider the controlled state process $(X^*, Z) = (X_t^*, Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with feedback controls $\theta^* = (\theta^*(X_t^*, Z_t))_{t \geq 0}$ and $c^* = (c^*(X_t^*, Z_t))_{t \geq 0}$. Then, the pair $(\theta^*, c^*) = (\theta_t^*, c_t^*)_{t \geq 0} \in \mathbb{U}^r$ is an optimal investment-consumption strategy. That is, for all admissible $(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{U}^r$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t) dt - \beta \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dL_t^X \right] \leq v(x, z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

where the equality holds when $(\theta, c) = (\theta^*, c^*)$.

The proof of the above verification theorem is reported in Appendix A. Similar to Corollary 3.7 in Deng et al. (2022), the value function v of the primal problem (3.2) can be recovered via the inverse LF transform, which admits a semi-analytical expression involving an implicit function. It follows that $v(x, z) = \inf_{y \in (0, \beta]} (\hat{v}(y, z) + yx)$. Then $x = g(y, z) := -\hat{v}_y(y, z)$. Let us define $f(\cdot, z)$ as the inverse of $g(\cdot, z)$, and hence $v(x, z) = \hat{v}(f(x, z), z) + xf(x, z)$. Here, for $p < 1$ with $p \neq 0$, we have that $f(x, z)$ can be uniquely determined by

$$x = \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \left(f(x, z)^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} \right) + z \left(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} f(x, z)^{\kappa-1} - 1 \right). \quad (4.4)$$

On the other hand, in the case where $p = 0$, the function $f(x, z)$ can be uniquely determined by

$$x = \frac{1}{\rho f(x, z)} - \frac{1}{\rho \beta} + z \left(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} f(x, z)^{\kappa-1} - 1 \right). \quad (4.5)$$

We then have the following result whose proof is reported in Appendix A.

Corollary 4.2. *Assume that $\rho > \rho_0$ with ρ_0 given by (4.1). Then, the value function v of the primal problem (3.2) is given by, for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,*

$$v(x, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{(1-p)^3}{p(\rho(1-p) - \alpha p)} f(x, z)^{-\frac{p}{1-p}} + \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} f(x, z) \\ \quad + z \left(f(x, z) - \frac{\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}}{\kappa} f(x, z)^\kappa \right) + xf(x, z), & p < 1, p \neq 0, \\ -\frac{1}{\rho} \ln f(x, z) - \frac{2}{\rho} + \frac{\alpha}{\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho \beta} f(x, z) + z \left(f(x, z) - \frac{\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}}{\kappa} f(x, z)^\kappa \right) \\ \quad + xf(x, z), & p = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

Furthermore, the optimal feedback control function is given by, for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\theta^*(x, z) = (\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \mu \left(\frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} f(x, z)^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} + (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z f(x, z)^{\kappa-1} \right) \\ + (\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \sigma_Z \sigma \gamma z \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} f(x, z)^{\kappa-1}, \quad (4.7)$$

$$c^*(x, z) = f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}. \quad (4.8)$$

In the special case when $p = -\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}$, where κ is given in Theorem 4.1, the optimal feedback control functions admit the following explicit expressions: for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\theta^*(x, z) = \left[(\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \mu \left(\frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} + (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z \right) + (\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \sigma_Z \sigma \gamma z \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} \right] \\ \times \frac{(\rho(1-p) - \alpha p)(x+z) + (1-p)^2 \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}{(1-p)^2 + (\rho(1-p) - \alpha p) \beta^{\frac{1}{1-p}} z}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$c^*(x, z) = \frac{(\rho(1-p) - \alpha p)(x+z) + (1-p)^2 \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}{(1-p)^2 + (\rho(1-p) - \alpha p) \beta^{\frac{1}{1-p}} z}. \quad (4.10)$$

Remark 4.3. In view of (4.4) and (4.5), when $x = 0$, we have $f(0, z) = \beta$ for all $z \geq 0$. Consequently, in the case when $d = 1$, Corollary 4.2 with the setting of $\gamma = 1$ and $\mu > 0$ yields that

$$c^*(0, z) = \beta^{\frac{1}{p-1}} > 0, \quad \theta^*(0, z) = \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \beta^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + (1-\kappa)z \right) + \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma} z > 0. \quad (4.11)$$

This implies that, when the state level $X_t^* = 0$ (described as in Theorem 4.1) at time $t > 0$, both the optimal portfolio θ_t^* and the optimal consumption c_t^* are strictly positive. That is, at the extreme case when the wealth process V_t^* equals the benchmark Z_t , the allowance of capital injection motivates the fund manager to be more risk seeking by strategically choosing positive consumption to attain a higher expected utility.

The following lemma (whose proof is delegated into Appendix A) shows that the expectation of the total optimal discounted capital injection is always finite and positive.

Lemma 4.4. Consider the optimal investment-consumption strategy $(\theta^*, c^*) = (\theta_t^*, c_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$ provided in Theorem 4.1. Then, we have

- (i) The expectation of the discounted capital injection under the optimal strategy (θ^*, c^*) is finite. Namely, for $\rho > \rho_0$ with $\rho_0 > 0$ being given in (4.1), it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^* \right] \leq M(1+x+z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2, \quad (4.12)$$

for some constant $M > 0$ depending on $(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z, \gamma, p, \beta)$ only.

- (ii) The expectation of the discounted capital injection under the optimal strategy (θ^*, c^*) is positive. Namely, for $\rho > \rho_0$ with $\rho_0 > 0$ being given in (4.1), it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^* \right] \geq z \frac{1-\kappa}{\kappa} \left(1 + \frac{x}{z} \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{\kappa-1}} > 0, \quad \forall (x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty). \quad (4.13)$$

Here, the optimal capital injection under the optimal strategy (θ^*, c^*) is given by $A_t^* = 0 \vee \sup_{s \leq t} (Z_s - V_s^{\theta^*, c^*})$ for $t \geq 0$.

Remark 4.5. First, Lemma 4.4-(i) provides an upper bound of the expected optimal capital injection, i.e. the expectation of the discounted total capital injection is always finite, which is an important fact to support that our problem formulation in (2.4) is well defined as it excludes the possibility of requiring the injection of infinite capital. Recall from Remark 2.2 that $A_t^* = \sup_{s \leq t} (V_s^{\theta^*, c^*} - Z_s)^-$ can also be understood as the largest shortfall of the wealth below the benchmark process, Lemma 4.4-(i) shows that the expected largest shortfall is finite when there is no actual capital injection in the fund management.

On the other hand, Lemma 4.4-(ii) provides a positive lower bound of the expected optimal capital injection, which implies that the capital injection is always necessary to meet the dynamic benchmark floor constraint $Z_t \leq A_t^* + V_t^{\theta^*, c^*}$ for all $t \geq 0$. As the capital injection is needed, the admissible control space of the portfolio and consumption pair (θ, c) is enlarged from the admissible control space in Merton (1971) under no-bankruptcy constraint. Indeed, due to the




Figure 1: Sample paths of $t \rightarrow V_t^*$, $t \rightarrow Z_t$ and $t \rightarrow A_t^*$ via Monte Carlo simulation. The model parameters are set to be $(v, z) = (2, 0.8)$, $\rho = 4$, $\mu = 1.5$, $\sigma = 2$, $\mu_Z = 1.7$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\beta = 2$, $p = -2.6357$.

positive capital injection, we note that the controlled wealth process V^{θ^*, c^*} may become negative as the fund manager is more risk-taking. To further elaborate that our problem formulation is well defined in the sense that the wealth process V^{θ^*, c^*} will remain at a reasonable level, we can show that the expectation of the discounted wealth process is always bounded below by a constant. Indeed, we have $V_t^{\theta^*, c^*} \geq Z_t - A_t^* \geq -A_t^*$, $\forall t > 0$. Integration by parts yields that, for all $t > 0$, $\int_0^t e^{-\rho s} dA_s^* = e^{-\rho t} A_t^* - x + \rho \int_0^t e^{-\rho s} A_s^* ds$. It follows from Lemma 4.4 that

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho t} A_t^*] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t e^{-\rho s} dA_s^* \right] + x \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} dA_s^* \right] + x \leq M(1 + x + z) + x.$$

This also implies that, for all $t > 0$ and $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, $\mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho t} V_t^{\theta^*, c^*}] \geq -M(1 + x + z) - x$. That is, the expectation of the discounted wealth has a finite credit line although $V_t^{\theta^*, c^*}$ may become negative.

Based on the feedback control functions in Corollary 4.2, we can plot in Figure 1 the simulated sample paths of the benchmark process $t \rightarrow Z_t$, the optimal wealth process $t \rightarrow V_t^*$ and the optimal capital injection process $t \rightarrow A_t^*$, illustrating that the resulting wealth process V_t^* in problem (2.4) is close to the targeted benchmark $t \rightarrow Z_t$ under the relaxed tracking formulation.

We observe from Figure 1 that $V_t^* > A_t^*$ when $t \leq 0.48$ and no capital injection is needed. Later, during $0.48 \leq t \leq 0.55$, the wealth falls below the benchmark that $V_t^* < Z_t$ and the funder manager implements the optimal capital injection such that the floor constraint is fulfilled. In particular, at time $t = 0.55$, the shortfall $Z_t - V_t^*$ attains the maximum value, which is the largest value of A_t^* . After that, for time $t \in (0.55, 1]$, the optimal total capital injection A_t^* keeps the constant. There is no need of new capital injection during this period, as the tracking constraint $V_t^* + A_t^* \geq Z_t^*$ can still be maintained because although the wealth process V_t^* sometimes falls below the benchmark Z_t , the shortfall $Z_t - V_t^*$ during $t \in (0.55, 1]$ does not exceed the previous largest record at time $t = 0.55$. This, again, can help to explain why $\mathbb{E} [\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^*]$ can be viewed as the expected largest (in time) shortfall for the benchmark tracking procedure.

We next present some structural properties of the optimal pair $(\theta^*, c^*) = (\theta_t^*, c_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$, and we shall consider the case when $d = 1$ and the return rate $\mu > r = 0$. The next result characterizes the asymptotic behavior of the optimal portfolio-wealth ratio and the consumption-wealth ratio obtained in Theorem 4.1 when the initial wealth level tends to infinity. The proof of the next lemma is provided in Appendix A.

Lemma 4.6. *Consider the optimal feedback control functions $\theta^*(x, z)$ and $c^*(x, z)$ for $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ provided in Theorem 4.1. Then, for any $z > 0$ fixed, and $\rho > \rho_0$ with $\rho_0 > 0$ given by (4.1), we have*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\theta^*(x, z)}{x} = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p)}, & p > p_1, \\ \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p_1)} + \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma} \frac{C^*(p_1)\beta^{\frac{1}{1-p_1}}z}{1 + C^*(p_1)\beta^{\frac{1}{1-p_1}}z}, & p = p_1, \\ \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p_1)} + \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma}, & p < p_1, \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{c^*(x, z)}{x} = \begin{cases} C^*(p), & p > p_1, \\ \frac{C^*(p_1)}{1 + C^*(p_1)\beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p_1}}z}, & p = p_1, \\ 0, & p < p_1. \end{cases} \quad (4.15)$$

Here, the constant $C^*(p) := \frac{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p}{(1-p)^2}$ coincides with the constant limit in the Merton solution as in Merton (1971), and $p_1 \in (-\infty, 0)$ is defined by $p_1 := -\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}$.

Remark 4.7. *Based on Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.6, we have some further comparison discussions between our optimal tracking problem (2.4) and the main result in Merton (1971):*

- (i) *In the case $v \geq z \geq 0$, $\mu_Z = \sigma_Z = 0$ and $\beta = +\infty$, (i.e., the benchmark process is always zero and the cost of capital injection is infinity), then the optimal tracking problem (2.4) degenerates into the classical Merton's problem. Indeed, in this degenerate case, the equation $\alpha\kappa^2 + (\rho - \eta - \alpha)\kappa + \mu_Z - \rho = 0$ in Proposition 3.3 reduces to $\alpha\kappa^2 + (\rho - \alpha)\kappa - \rho = 0$, which yields that $\kappa = 1$. As $\kappa = 1$ and $\beta = +\infty$ in Eq. (4.4), we can see that, for all $x \geq 0$,*

$$x = \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} f(x, z)^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}. \quad (4.16)$$

Then, it follows from (4.16) and Corollary 4.2 that

$$\theta^*(x, z) = \theta^{\text{Mer}}(x) := \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p)}x, \quad c^*(x, z) = c^{\text{Mer}}(x) := \frac{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p}{(1-p)^2}x, \quad (4.17)$$

which is exactly the optimal solution of the classical Merton's problem. Moreover, using (4.17), we can easily see that the local time $L_t = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, thus there is no capital injection in this case.

(ii) In the case $v \geq z \geq 0$, $\mu_Z = \sigma_Z = 0$ and $\beta \in (0, +\infty)$, the benchmark is constant z , but the fund manager is still allowed to inject capital and the cost of capital injection is finite, we find that the optimal portfolio and consumption strategies differ from those in the classical Merton's problem. In fact, as in the above case (i), we still have $\kappa = 1$ in Eq. (4.4). Hence, for all $x \geq 0$,

$$x = \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \left(f(x, z)^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} \right). \quad (4.18)$$

Then, it follows from (4.16) and Corollary 4.2 that

$$\begin{cases} \theta^*(x, z) = \theta^{\text{Mer}}(x) + \underbrace{\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}_{\text{positive adjustment by capital injection}}, \\ c^*(x, z) = c^{\text{Mer}}(x) + \underbrace{\beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}_{\text{positive adjustment by capital injection}}. \end{cases} \quad (4.19)$$

Although both the Merton problem without capital injection and our problem in (2.4) are solvable, due to the encouragement of risk-taking from the capital injection, the fund manager in our problem (2.4) adopts more aggressive optimal portfolio and consumption strategies with additional positive adjustment terms as shown in (4.17) and (4.19). It is also observed that these positive adjustments are independent of the wealth level x . In particular, the adjustment terms are decreasing w.r.t. the cost parameter β . When β tends to infinity, it is clear that both adjustment terms of capital injection will be vanishing and we have $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \theta^*(x, z) = \theta^{\text{Mer}}(x)$ and $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} c^*(x, z) = c^{\text{Mer}}(x)$, $\forall x \geq 0$. See further discussions on their financial implications in Section 5.

(iii) In the case $v \geq z > 0$ and $\mu_Z > \eta$, the capital injection is indeed necessary for the agent in our optimal tracking problem (2.4). Lemma 4.4 shows this fact under the optimal strategy. For the general case, let us show it by contradiction. Assume that there exists a pair $(\theta^M, c^M) \in \mathbb{U}^r$ such that $V_t^{\theta^M, c^M} \geq Z_t$, a.s., for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, we also have that $A^{\theta^M, c^M} = 0$ a.s., for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Consider $(\tilde{V}^\theta, \tilde{A}_t^\theta)$ and $\tilde{w}(v, z)$ defined by (A.51) and (A.52) respectively in Appendix A. Note that $c_t^M > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Thus, it follows from (2.2) and (A.51) that $\tilde{V}_t^{\theta^M} \geq V_t^{\theta^M, c^M}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and by Lemma A.2 in Appendix A, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \tilde{w}(v, z) &= \inf_{\theta} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d\tilde{A}_t^\theta \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d\tilde{A}_t^{\theta^M} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^{\theta^M, c^M} \right] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

which yields the contradiction. That is, if we consider the classical Merton's problem by requiring the strict benchmark outperforming constraint $V_t \geq Z_t$, a.s., for all $t \geq 0$, the admissible set of Merton problem under the outperforming constraint is empty. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the relaxed benchmark outperforming constraint using the strategic capital injection such that the wealth process is allowed to be negative from time to time.

Proposition 4.8. Consider the optimal feedback control functions $\theta^*(x, z)$ and $c^*(x, z)$ for $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ provided in Theorem 4.1. Then, for any $z > 0$ fixed, and $\rho > \rho_0$ with $\rho_0 > 0$ given by (4.1), we have

- (i) $x \rightarrow c^*(x, z)$ is increasing;
- (ii) If $p \in (p_1, 1)$, $x \rightarrow c^*(x, z)$ is strictly convex; if $p \in (-\infty, p_1)$, $x \rightarrow c^*(x, z)$ is strictly concave; and, if $p = p_1$, then $c^*(x, z)$ is linear in x ;
- (iii) For the correlative coefficient $\gamma = 1$, $x \rightarrow \theta^*(x, z)$ is increasing;
- (iv) For the correlative coefficient $\gamma = 1$, if $p \in (-\infty, p_1) \cup (p_2, 1)$, $x \rightarrow \theta^*(x, z)$ is strictly convex; if $p \in (p_1, p_2)$, $x \rightarrow \theta^*(x, z)$ is strictly concave; and, if $p = p_1$ or $p = p_2$, $\theta^*(x, z)$ is linear in x .

Here, p_1 is given in Lemma 4.6 and the critical point $p_2 > p_1$ is given by $p_2 := \frac{\sigma\sigma_z - \mu\kappa}{\mu(1-\kappa) + \sigma\sigma_z} \in (-\infty, 1)$.

Proof. We first prove the item (i). For $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, recall that $f(x, z) \in (0, \beta]$ satisfying the following equation:

$$\hat{v}_y(f(x, z), z) = -x. \quad (4.21)$$

Taking the derivative with respect to x on the both sides of (4.21), we deduce that

$$f_x(x, z) = -\frac{1}{\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)}. \quad (4.22)$$

Then, it follows from (3.11) and (4.22) that

$$\frac{\partial c^*(x, z)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{p-1} f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1} f_x(x, z) = \frac{f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1}}{(1-p)\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)} > 0. \quad (4.23)$$

This implies that $x \rightarrow c^*(x, z)$ is increasing.

Next, we deal with the item (ii). Taking the derivative with respect to x on the both sides of (4.22) again, we obtain

$$f_{xx}(x, z) = \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{yy}^2(f(x, z), z)} \hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z) f_x(x, z) = -\frac{\hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z)}{\hat{v}_{yy}^3(f(x, z), z)}. \quad (4.24)$$

Hence, it follows from (3.11), (4.23) and (4.24) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 c^*(x, z)}{\partial x^2} &= \frac{1}{p-1} f(x, z)^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}} f_{xx}(x, z) + \frac{2-p}{(p-1)^2} f(x, z)^{\frac{3-2p}{p-1}} f_x(x, z)^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{p-1} f(x, z)^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}} \frac{\hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z)}{\hat{v}_{yy}^3(f(x, z), z)} + \frac{2-p}{(p-1)^2} f(x, z)^{\frac{3-2p}{p-1}} \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{yy}^2(f(x, z), z)} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-p} \frac{f(x, z)^{\frac{3-2p}{p-1}}}{\hat{v}_{yy}^3(f(x, z), z)} \left[f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z) + \frac{2-p}{1-p} \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

We then obtain from (4.2) and (4.25) that

$$\frac{\partial^2 c^*(x, z)}{\partial x^2} = \frac{1 - \kappa}{1 - p} \frac{f(x, z)^{\frac{3-2p}{p-1} + \kappa - 1}}{\hat{v}_{yy}^3(f(x, z), z)} \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z \left(\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p} \right), \quad (4.26)$$

which implies the desired item (ii).

Toward this end, we move to the proof of the item (iii). By applying Theorem 4.1, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^*(x, z) &= -\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{v_x}{v_{xx}}(x, z) - \frac{\sigma Z}{\sigma} \left(\frac{z v_{xz}}{v_{xx}}(x, z) - z \right) \\ &= \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) - \frac{\sigma Z}{\sigma} (z \hat{v}_{yz}(f(x, z), z) - z). \end{aligned}$$

This yields that

$$\frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial x} = f_x(x, z) \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} (\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) + f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z)) - \frac{\sigma Z}{\sigma} z \hat{v}_{yyz}(f(x, z), z)) \right). \quad (4.27)$$

In lieu of (4.2), we can see that

$$(\hat{v}_{yy} + y \hat{v}_{yyy})(y, z) = -\frac{1}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} y^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}} - z(1-\kappa)^2 \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-2}, \quad (4.28)$$

$$\hat{v}_{yyz}(y, z) = (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-2}. \quad (4.29)$$

Then, from (4.27), (4.28) and (4.29), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial x} &= \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{f(x, z)^{\kappa-2}}{\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} f(x, z)^{-\left(\frac{p}{1-p} + \kappa\right)} + (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z \left(1 - \kappa + \frac{\sigma Z \sigma}{\mu} \right) \right]. \quad (4.30) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial x} > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, we obtain that $x \rightarrow \theta^*(x, z)$ is increasing.

Finally, it remains to prove the item (iv). In fact, it follows from (4.30) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial x^2} &= -\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{yy}^2(f(x, z), z)} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \frac{2-p}{p-1} f(x, z)^{\frac{3-2p}{p-1}} + f(x, z)^{\kappa-3} (1-\kappa)(\kappa-2) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z \left(1 - \kappa + \frac{\sigma Z \sigma}{\mu} \right) \right] \\ &+ \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{\hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z)}{\hat{v}_{yy}^3(f(x, z), z)} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} f(x, z)^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}} + f(x, z)^{\kappa-2} (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z \left(1 - \kappa + \frac{\sigma Z \sigma}{\mu} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{yy}^3(f(x, z), z)} \left[\frac{1}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} f(x, z)^{\frac{3-2p}{p-1}} \left(\frac{2-p}{1-p} \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) + f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z) \right) \right. \\ &+ \left. f(x, z)^{\kappa-3} (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z \left(1 - \kappa + \frac{\sigma Z \sigma}{\mu} \right) \left((2-\kappa) \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) + f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} (1-\kappa) z}{\hat{v}_{yy}^3(f(x, z), z)} \frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} f(x, z)^{-\frac{5-4p}{p-1} + \kappa} \left(\frac{p}{1-p} + \kappa \right) \left(\frac{p}{1-p} + \kappa - \frac{\sigma Z \sigma}{\mu} \right). \quad (4.31) \end{aligned}$$

Note that, it holds that

$$\left(\frac{p}{1-p} + \kappa\right) \left(\frac{p}{1-p} + \kappa - \frac{\sigma\sigma_Z}{\mu}\right) \begin{cases} > 0, & \text{if } p \in (\infty, p_1) \cup (p_2, 1); \\ = 0, & \text{if } p = p_1 \text{ or } p = p_2; \\ < 0, & \text{if } p \in (p_1, p_2). \end{cases} \quad (4.32)$$

The desired result (iv) follows from (4.31) and (4.32). Thus, we complete the proof of the proposition. \square

We then have the following remarks on the results in Proposition 4.8.

Remark 4.9. *In the setting of utility maximization of consumption without benchmark tracking, Carroll and Kimball (1996) has discussed the concavity of the optimal feedback consumption function in terms of the wealth level induced by the income uncertainty. It was pointed out therein that the concavity of consumption can imply several interesting economic insights including the real-life observations that the financial risk-taking is often strongly related to wealth. However, it has also been shown in various extended models that the optimal consumption function may turn out to be convex within some wealth intervals when the consumption performance and risk-taking are affected by the past-average dependent habit formation (see Liu and Li (2023)), the consumption drawdown constraint (see Angoshtari et al. (2019) and Li et al. (2023)) or the possible negative terminal debt (see Chen and Vellekoop (2017)).*

In our extended Merton problem, the risk aversion level from the utility function has been distorted by the relaxed benchmark tracking constraint. Indeed, the allowance of strategic capital injection not only enlarges the set of admissible controls, but also incentivizes the fund manager to be more risk-taking in choosing aggressive portfolio and consumption plans. From Proposition 4.8, one can observe that when the fund manager is very risk averse such that $p \leq p_1$, the risk aversion attitude from the utility function plays the dominant role and hence the optimal consumption functions exhibits concavity as observed in Carroll and Kimball (1996); when the fund manager is much less risk averse or close to risk neutral, i.e., $p > p_1$, the risk-taking component from the capital injection starts to distort the fund manager's decision making, leading to convex optimal consumption function. In this case, when the wealth increases, the fund manager is willing to inject more capital to achieve the increasing marginal consumption. Some illustrative figures of different convexity results with respect to the wealth variable x are reported in the next section.

5 Numerical Examples and Empirical Analysis

In this section, we present some numerical examples and empirical analysis to illustrate some other quantitative properties and financial implications of the optimal feedback control functions and the expectation of the discounted total capital injection. To ease the discussions, we only consider the case $d = 1$ of the underlying stock in all examples.

We first discuss some financial implications of the adjustment impact by capital injection in Remark 4.7 through the next few numerical examples. Let us take the cost parameter $\beta = 1$ for simplicity. Firstly, let us consider the case when $\mu_Z = \sigma_Z = 0$, i.e., the benchmark is constant

$z \in \mathbb{R}_+$. It follows from (4.18) that, the optimal portfolio-wealth ratio and the consumption-wealth ratio $(\frac{\theta^*(x,z)}{x}, \frac{c^*(x,z)}{x})$ admit the following expression that, for $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\theta^*(x, z)}{x} = \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p)} + x^{-1} \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p}, \\ \frac{c^*(x, z)}{x} = C^*(\mu, \sigma, p) + x^{-1}. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

We can see from (5.1) that the portfolio-wealth ratio and consumption-wealth ratio are no-longer constant comparing with the classical Merton's solution. Instead, the adjustment impacts by capital injection per wealth are decreasing in wealth and they are independent of the constant benchmark level $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We also have from (5.1) the following financial implications:

- The wealth level has adverse effect on the adjustment impact. When the wealth level is sufficiently high, the adjustment impact becomes negligible. This can be explained by the fact that, for the constant benchmark $Z_t \equiv z \geq 0$ (i.e., $\mu_Z = \sigma_Z = 0$), the relaxed tracking constraint can be easily achieved with a higher wealth level without requesting frequent capital injection. In the extreme case, it also holds that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (\frac{\theta^*(x,z)}{x}, \frac{c^*(x,z)}{x}) = (\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p)}, C^*(\mu, \sigma, p))$, and $w(x, z) = w^{\text{Mer}}(x, z) - w^{\text{cost}}(x, z) \approx w^{\text{Mer}}(x, z)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, where $w^{\text{Mer}}(x, z) := \mathbb{E} [\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c^*(X_t^*, z)) dt]$ and $w^{\text{cost}}(x, z) := \mathbb{E} [\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^*]$ (see Figure 2-(a)). In addition, for any constant benchmark $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the optimal portfolio and consumption strategies are independent of z , leading to the same expected utility of consumption.
- When the wealth level x is low, a reasonable amount of capital injection is needed to fulfill the tracking constraint with respect to the constant benchmark. The fund manager needs to balance the trade-off between the utility of consumption ($w^{\text{Mer}}(x, z)$) and the cost of capital injection ($w^{\text{cost}}(x, z)$) to obtain an optimal profit ($w(x, z)$) (see Figure 2-(b)). Moreover, the adjustment term raised by the capital injection in (5.1) is positive, indicating that the fund manager behaves more aggressively in both portfolio and consumption plans comparing with the Merton solution under no bankruptcy constraint. This can be explained by the fact that the possible capital injection (or the tolerance of the positive shortfall when the wealth falls below the constant benchmark) can significantly incentivize the fund manager to attain a higher expected utility as long as the cost of capital injection (or the expected largest shortfall) stays relatively small comparing with the increment in expected utility.

When the benchmark process $Z = (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a GBM (i.e., $\mu_Z > 0$ and $\sigma_Z > 0$), the trade-off between the utility maximization and the goal of tracking becomes much more sophisticated, which may considerably rely on the current wealth level, the performance of the benchmark as well as the risk aversion level of the fund manager. In view of the complicated expression of the optimal feedback functions in (4.7), we are not able to conduct any clean quantitative comparison between our solution and the Merton's solution.

In order to conclude some interpretable financial implications from the optimal feedback controls, we next only consider and discuss the asymptotic case when the wealth level tends to infinity. As stated in Lemma 4.6, as the wealth level x goes extremely large, the asymptotic optimal portfolio-wealth ratio and the consumption-wealth ratio $(\frac{\theta^*(x,z)}{x}, \frac{c^*(x,z)}{x})$ admit the expressions




Figure 2: The optimal value function $x \rightarrow w(x, z)$, the utility of consumption $x \rightarrow w^{\text{Mer}}(x, z)$ and the cost of capital injection $x \rightarrow w^{\text{cost}}(x, z)$. The model parameters are set to be $z = 1, \rho = 1, \mu = 0.5, \sigma = 1, \mu_Z = 0, \sigma_Z = 0, p = 0.5, \gamma = 1, \beta = 1$.

that

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p)}, C^*(\mu, \sigma, p) \right), & 1-p < \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z), \\ \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p_1)} + \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma} \frac{C^*(\mu, \sigma, p_1)z}{1+C^*(\mu, \sigma, p_1)z}, \frac{C^*(\mu, \sigma, p_1)}{1+C^*(\mu, \sigma, p_1)z} \right), & 1-p = \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z), \\ \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p_1)} + \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma}, 0 \right), & 1-p > \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z), \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

where the critical risk averse (CRA) level $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$ is defined by

$$\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z) := 1 - p_1 = \frac{1}{1 - \kappa} > 1 \quad (5.3)$$

with $\kappa := \frac{\sqrt{(\rho - \eta - \alpha)^2 + 4\alpha(\rho - \mu_Z)} - (\rho - \eta - \alpha)}{2\alpha} \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha := \frac{\mu^2}{2\sigma^2}$, and $\eta := \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma} \gamma \mu$.

We first examine some quantitative properties of the CRA level $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$ w.r.t. the return rate μ_Z and the volatility σ_Z of benchmark process. Note that the mapping $\mu_Z \rightarrow \kappa := \frac{\sqrt{(\rho - \eta - \alpha)^2 + 4\alpha(\rho - \mu_Z)} - (\rho - \eta - \alpha)}{2\alpha}$ is decreasing. Therefore, the CRA level $\mu_Z \rightarrow \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$ is decreasing for any $\sigma_Z \geq 0$ fixed (see Figure 3-(a)). In other words, the higher the return rate of benchmark index, the lower the CRA level. For any $\mu_Z \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed, $\sigma_Z \rightarrow \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$ is non-decreasing (see Figure 3-(b)). We next check the extreme case when $\mu_Z = \sigma_Z = 0$ (i.e., the constant benchmark case) and find that the resulting CRA level $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$ tends to $+\infty$ as $\mu_Z, \sigma_Z \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, when $\mu_Z = \sigma_Z = 0$, we have the parameter $\kappa = 1$ as the parameter $\eta = 0$. Then, in lieu of the definition of CRA level, it obviously holds that $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, 0, 0) = \frac{1}{1-1} = +\infty$. This is consistent with our previous discussion that when the wealth level is sufficiently high, the impact by the capital injection becomes negligible for the constant benchmark.




Figure 3: (a): The CRA level $\mu_Z \rightarrow \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$. (b): The CRA level $\sigma_Z \rightarrow \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$. The model parameters are set to be $\rho = 5$, $\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $p = -1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\beta = 1$.

Moreover, a key observation here is that the asymptotic behavior in (5.2) depends purely on the risk aversion parameter and the performance of the benchmark. We now summarize the detailed financial implications as below:

- (i) If the fund manager is less risk averse such that her risk averse parameter $1-p < \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$, the fund manager's optimal portfolio-wealth ratio and the consumption-wealth ratio coincide with the classical Merton's limit $\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p)}, C^*(\mu, \sigma, p)\right)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. This can be explained by the fact that the fund manager with a low risk aversion, being aware of the extremely large wealth level, will be more aggressive in investing in the risky asset. In turn, the resulting large wealth process from the financial market can stably outperform the benchmark process most of the time, yielding the capital injection almost negligible. As a consequence, the fund manager's asymptotic consumption plan also behaves like the counterpart in the Merton's solution without benchmark tracking.
- (ii) When the fund manager's risk averse level $1-p$ equals or is higher than the CRA level $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$, she will withhold the asymptotic consumption plan comparing with the case of low risk aversion or the Merton's asymptotic consumption. At the same time, it is interesting to see that the fund manager actually chooses a more aggressive asymptotic investment plan comparing with the case of low risk aversion, which is almost counter-intuitive. However, we note that the trade-off becomes more severe for the high risk averse fund manager, who would concern more on the cost of capital injection that drives her to invest more and consume less, as a way to avoid a large amount of capital injection. In this way, the high risk averse fund manager would hope that the resulting wealth process can stay at a high level outperforming the benchmark so that the expected capital injection can be maintained at a low level. As the high risk averse fund manager would put more wealth into the risky asset, the associated optimal consumption-wealth ratio is also restrained and smaller than the counterpart in the Merton's solution.




Figure 4: The sensitivity of the asymptotic optimal portfolio-wealth ratio w.r.t. $1 - p$. The model parameters are set to be $(x, z) = (5, 1)$, $\rho = 3$, $\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $\mu_Z = 2$, $\sigma_Z = 0.5$, $\gamma = 1$.

- (iii) For a fixed return rate of benchmark index, the volatility σ_Z of benchmark index has a significant impact on the optimal asymptotic portfolio-wealth ratio when the fund manager has higher risk aversion than the CRA level $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$. The higher the volatility σ_Z of benchmark process, the more the fund manager invests in the risky asset (see Figure 4), hoping the wealth process from the financial market can outperform the more fluctuating benchmark. On the other hand, we note that the higher the return rate μ_z of the benchmark, the smaller the CRA level, which yields that the high risk averse fund manager will be more likely to increase her investment in the risky asset, again hoping the gain from the risky asset to beat the high benchmark return.
- (iv) When the benchmark process is deterministic (i.e., $\sigma_Z = 0$), the optimal asymptotic portfolio-wealth ratio and consumption-wealth ratio $(\frac{\theta^*(x, z)}{x}, \frac{c^*(x, z)}{x})$ are decreasing in terms of the risk averse parameter $1 - p$. In fact, when $\sigma_Z = 0$, the limit of $(\frac{\theta^*(x, z)}{x}, \frac{c^*(x, z)}{x})$ admit the simplified expressions that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p)}, C^*(\mu, \sigma, p) \right), & 1-p < \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0), \\ \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p_1)}, \frac{C^*(\mu, \sigma, p_1)}{1 + C^*(\mu, \sigma, p_1)z} \right), & 1-p = \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0), \\ \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p_1)}, 0 \right), & 1-p > \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0), \end{array} \right. \quad (5.4)$$

where we recall that $1 - p_1 = \text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0)$. The left panel (a) (resp. the right panel (b)) of Figure 5 displays the optimal portfolio-wealth ratio (resp. consumption-wealth ratio) w.r.t. the risk averse parameter $1 - p$ for a fixed large initial wealth level x under the different return rates of benchmark $\mu_Z = 0.3, 0.4$ and 0.8 . It is observed that, for each fixed return rate μ_Z of the benchmark, the optimal portfolio-wealth ratio is continuously decreasing w.r.t. $1 - p$; while the optimal consumption-wealth ratio is strictly decreasing (it jumps down at the CRA level $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0)$). This observation is similar to that in the Merton's case: the fund manager invests less in the risky asset and consumes less if she is




Figure 5: (a): The sensitivity of the asymptotic optimal portfolio-wealth ratio w.r.t. $1 - p$. (b): The sensitivity of the asymptotic optimal consumption-wealth ratio w.r.t. $1 - p$. The model parameters are set to be $(x, z) = (20, 1)$, $\rho = 5$, $\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $\sigma_Z = 0$, $\gamma = 1$.

more risk averse. Moreover, the fund manager will implement a Merton's portfolio strategy *locked at* the CRA level $CRA(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0)$ once she is more risk averse than the CRA level. However, when the fund manager is less risk averse than the CRA level, she will execute the classical Merton's strategy depending on her current risk averse level $1 - p$. Note that the CRA level $\mu_Z \rightarrow CRA(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0)$ is decreasing. Therefore, the higher the return rate of the benchmark process, the lower the CRA level. This implies that, if the return rate of the benchmark process is very high, it is more likely that the high risk averse fund manager would follow the asymptotic behavior $(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2(1-p_1)}, 0)$ in the Merton's solution with the locked risk aversion level $1 - p_1$ (regardless of the true risk aversion level $1 - p$ from the fund manager's utility function) and the asymptotic portfolio-wealth ratio also becomes larger as $1 - p_1 = CRA(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, 0)$ is smaller.

We also conduct some additional numerical examples on sensitivity analysis of the optimal feedback portfolio and consumption w.r.t. the return parameter μ_Z of the benchmark process and the cost parameter of capital injection β . First, to numerically illustrate the convexity or concavity of the optimal feedback portfolio and consumption functions under different risk aversion in Proposition 4.8, we plot different cases in Figures 6 and 7 respectively. More precisely, Figure 6 displays the optimal portfolio w.r.t. the wealth level x under different choices of p in which the return rate of the risky asset is set to be low (resp. high) when $\mu = 0.1$ (resp. $\mu = 1$) in the left panel (a) (resp. the right panel (b)) of Figure 6. In both panels of Figure 6, the optimal portfolio is increasing in wealth for all risk aversion parameters $1 - p$ chosen, similar to the classical Merton solution. However, as a contrast, due to the capital injection and the goal of benchmark tracking, our optimal feedback portfolio $\theta^*(x, 1)$ is only linear in wealth at two critical risk aversion parameters $1 - p_1$ and $1 - p_2$ ($p_2 > p_1$). In particular, when the risk aversion parameter $1 - p$ falls between $1 - p_2$ and $1 - p_1$, our optimal portfolio feedback function is concave in x (see the left panel (a) of Figure 6); while for the risk aversion parameter $1 - p$ falls outside of the risk aversion interval $[1 - p_2, 1 - p_1]$, the optimal portfolio feedback function is strictly convex

in x (see the left panel (b) of Figure 6). This is precisely reflected in the claim (iv) of Proposition 4.8.

Figure 7 plots the optimal consumption w.r.t. the wealth level x under different risk aversion parameter $1 - p$ in which the return rate of benchmark process is set to be high (resp. low) when $\mu_Z = 6.5$ (resp. $\mu_Z = 2$) in left panel (a) (resp. the right panel (b)) of Figure 7. The monotonicity of the optimal feedback consumption with respect to wealth is the same as in the Merton's solution. However, our optimal consumption is only linear in wealth when the risk averse level of the fund manager equals the critical risk averse (CRA) level $\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z)$, which is defined by

$$\text{CRA}(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z) := 1 - p_1 = \frac{1}{1 - \kappa} > 1 \quad (5.5)$$

with $\kappa := \frac{\sqrt{(\rho - \eta - \alpha)^2 + 4\alpha(\rho - \mu_Z)} - (\rho - \eta - \alpha)}{2\alpha} \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha := \frac{\mu^2}{2\sigma^2}$, and $\eta := \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma} \gamma \mu$.

When the fund manager has a risk aversion level $1 - p > \text{CRA}$, her optimal consumption feedback function is strictly concave in x (see the panel (a) of Figure 7); while when the fund manager has a risk aversion level $1 - p < \text{CRA}$, her optimal consumption feedback function is strictly convex in x (see the panel (b) of Figure 7). These observations are consistent with the theoretical findings in the claim (ii) of Proposition 4.8.




Figure 6: The optimal portfolio $x \rightarrow \theta^*(x, 1)$. The model parameters are set to be $\rho = 7$, $\sigma = 1$, $\mu_Z = 1$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\beta = 3$ and $\mu = 0.1$ in Figure (a), $\mu = 1$ in Figure (b).

We also present the sensitivity analysis of the optimal feedback strategy of investment and consumption w.r.t. the return parameter μ_Z and the cost parameter β . We illustrate in Figures 8 the sensitivity of the optimal feedback portfolio and consumption as well as the expectation of the discounted capital injection with respect to the return parameter μ_Z in the benchmark dynamics. As expected, the expectation of the discounted capital injection is a decreasing function of the wealth variable x . More importantly, being consistent with the intuition, it is shown in Figure 8 that when the benchmark process has a higher return, the fund manager will invest more in the risky asset and inject more capital to outperform the targeted benchmark, and meanwhile will




Figure 7: The optimal consumption $x \rightarrow c^*(x, 1)$. The model parameters are set to be $\rho = 7$, $\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\beta = 3$ and $\mu_Z = 6.5$ in Figure (a), $\mu_Z = 2$ in Figure (b).

strategically reduce the consumption amount due to the pressure of fulfilling the benchmark floor constraint.




Figure 8: (a): The expectation of the total optimal discounted capital injection. (b): The optimal portfolio $x \rightarrow \theta^*(x, 1)$. (c): The optimal consumption $x \rightarrow c^*(x, 1)$. The model parameters are set to be $z = 1$, $\rho = 8$, $\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $p = 0.5$, $\beta = 2$.

We then plot in Figure 9 the sensitivity of the optimal feedback portfolio and consumption and the expectation of the discounted capital injection with respect to the cost parameter of capital injection β . As β increases, the fund manager is more hindered to inject capital and hence will strategically suppress the consumption plan to fulfil the benchmark constraint. Meanwhile, from panel (b) of Figure 9, it is observed that the fund manager will also reduce the investment in the risky asset, which can be explained by the reduced volatility of the controlled wealth process that may help to avoid unnecessary capital injection in the tracking of the benchmark. More importantly, panel (a) of Figure 9 shows that there is no monotonicity of the expected capital injection with respect to the cost parameter β even when the wealth level is large. From a different perspective, it is possible to design the best choice of the cost parameter β in our model such that

the resulting expectation of discount capital injection can be minimized.




Figure 9: (a): The expectation of the total optimal discounted capital injection. (b): The optimal portfolio $x \rightarrow \theta^*(x, 1)$. (c): The optimal consumption $x \rightarrow c^*(x, 1)$. The model parameters are set to be $z = 1$, $\rho = 5$, $\mu = 0.5$, $\sigma = 1$, $\mu_Z = 2$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $p = 0.4$.

Next, we mainly discuss the impact of the risk aversion attitude on the optimal investment and consumption strategies via both numerical and empirical analysis. For our empirical results, we choose the S&P 500 index as the benchmark process and select the Sony Group Corporation (SONY) as the risky asset¹. Based on the historical data, we calibrate the return rate and volatility parameters in both our Black-Scholes stock price model (2.1) and the Black-Scholes benchmark process (2.3) by using the approach of maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) (c.f. Brigo et al. 2009). Here, we use the daily returns from January 1, 2023 through December 31, 2023. Denote respectively by S_0, S_1, \dots, S_n and Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n , with $n = 249$ (note that there were 250 trading days during the time period). Then, we can define the sequence $(Y_i)_{i \geq 1}$ on the log stock prices as follows:

$$Y_i := \ln(S_i) - \ln(S_{i-1}), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

For the sample average of the log stock price sequence $(Y_i)_{i \geq 1}$ given by $\bar{Y} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$, we estimate the return parameter μ and the volatility parameter σ of the stock by using the following estimators with $\Delta t = 1$ (day):

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\bar{Y}}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}^2, \quad \hat{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n \Delta t} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}.$$

In a similar fashion, we can estimate the return rate parameter μ_Z and the volatility parameter σ_Z of the benchmark process by using the following estimators with $\Delta t = 1$ (day):

$$\hat{\mu}_Z = \frac{\bar{Y}^Z}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}_Z^2, \quad \hat{\sigma}_Z = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n \Delta t} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i^Z - \bar{Y}^Z)^2}.$$

¹The data is retrieved from <https://finance.yahoo.com> with the period of January 1, 2023 to January 2, 2024.

Here, the sample average $\bar{Y}^Z := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i^Z$, where $(Y_i^Z)_{i \geq 1}$ is the log benchmark sequence defined by

$$Y_i^Z := \ln(Z_i) - \ln(Z_{i-1}), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

By implementing the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) (c.f. [Brigo et al. 2009](#)) with the historical data, we then obtain the estimated values of the parameters as shown in [Table 1](#): With

Table 1: Estimated parameters of the risky asset and benchmark process using MLE.

Estimated parameters	Estimated values
$\hat{\mu}$	9.7399×10^{-4}
$\hat{\sigma}$	0.0158
$\hat{\mu}_Z$	9.2137×10^{-4}
$\hat{\sigma}_Z$	0.0082

the estimated parameters above, [Table 2](#) then presents the implied optimal portfolio strategy on January 2, 2024 (the first trading day in 2024) and [Table 3](#) shows the implied optimal consumption strategy, where the price of the initial level of benchmark process $z = 4742.83$, the risk aversion level $1 - p$ varies in the set $\{5, 4, 3, 2, 0.9, 0.85, 0.8, 0.75\}$ and the initial wealth level $x \in \{1, 4, 10\}$. We set the discount rate $\rho = 1$ and the cost parameter of capital injection $\beta = 5$.

Table 2: The optimal (feedback) portfolio strategy $\theta^*(x, z)$ ($\times 10^3$).

$1 - p$	5	4	3	2	0.9	0.85	0.8	0.75
$x = 10$	2.4820	2.4822	2.4825	2.4837	2.5032	2.5093	2.5183	2.5324
$x = 4$	2.4815	2.4814	2.4813	2.4813	2.4822	2.4824	2.4825	2.4828
$x = 1$	2.4800	2.4798	2.4795	2.4790	2.4779	2.4779	2.4778	2.4777

Table 3: The optimal (feedback) consumption rate strategy $c^*(x, z)$.

$1 - p$	5	4	3	2	0.9	0.85	0.8	0.75
$x = 10$	1.0120	1.0319	1.0874	1.3088	6.0504	7.5809	9.8646	13.4391
$x = 4$	0.9492	0.9354	0.9170	0.9022	1.0621	1.0937	1.1319	1.1783
$x = 1$	0.8011	0.7558	0.6843	0.5601	0.2773	0.2578	0.2375	0.2166

Recall that the solution in [Merton \(1971\)](#) suggests that a more risk-averse agent would invest less in the risky asset, see also [Borell \(2007\)](#) and [Xia \(2011\)](#) for their theoretical conclusions under general utilities. However, the empirical study in [Wang and Wang \(2021\)](#) illustrates that a larger risk aversion may induce higher investment if the proportion of less risk-averse investors in the population is sufficiently small. Empirical results in [Chacko and Viceira \(2005\)](#) also reveal that the consumption can either increase or decrease with respect to risk aversion, depending on the elasticity of intertemporal substitution of consumption. In the present paper, we can show by




Figure 10: (a): The optimal (feedback) portfolio $p \rightarrow \theta^*(x, 1.2)$ as the risk aversion parameter p varies. The model parameters are set to be $\rho = 5$, $\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $\mu_Z = 3$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\beta = 2$. (b): The optimal (feedback) consumption rate $p \rightarrow c^*(x, 0.8)$ as the risk aversion parameter p varies. The model parameters are set to be $\rho = 5$, $\mu = 1$, $\sigma = 1$, $\mu_Z = 2$, $\sigma_Z = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\beta = 4$.

Figure 10 on various plots of optimal feedback functions that the risk taking induced by the capital injection also leads to the similar phenomenon that the optimal (feedback) portfolio $\theta^*(x, z)$ and the optimal (feedback) consumption rate $c^*(x, z)$ are not necessarily monotone in the risk aversion parameter $1 - p$, which actually depend on different wealth regimes. From our empirical results in Table 2 and Table 3, we have the consistent observations that the optimal portfolio and optimal consumption might be increasing or decreasing in $1 - p$ depending on different wealth levels.

Indeed, in our proposed new formulation, the risk aversion is distorted by the incentivized risk-taking from the possible capital injection to fulfil the benchmark constraint. When the wealth level is relatively large (but not too large), the less risk averse (i.e. as p tends to 1) fund manager would invest and consume more than the highly risk averse fund manager. This can be explained by the fact that the low risk averse fund manager would take more risk by investing in the risky asset when the wealth level is healthy, which in turn leads to a higher consumption when the benchmark tracking can be maintained. However, when the wealth level is very low, the less risk averse fund manager will put more concern on the cost of capital injection from its trade-off with the expected utility. To avoid high capital injection, the low risk averse fund manager will strategically reduce the portfolio and consumption plan to maintain the benchmark tracking.

To echo with the previous interesting observations, we also simulate the mean value of the optimal portfolio $t \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\theta_t^*]$, the mean value of the optimal consumption rate $t \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[c_t^*]$ and the mean value of wealth process $t \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[X_t^*]$ as functions of time t via the Monte Carlo method (see Figure 11). The model parameters are set to be the empirically estimated values in Table 1 and we focus on the case with a low initial wealth level $x = 1$. The panel *c* of Figures 11 shows that the expected wealth level is increasing along the time t . From panels *a* and *b*, at the early stage of the investment horizon, both mean values of the optimal portfolio and consumption are increasing in the risk aversion parameter $1 - p$, due to the fact the expected wealth level is relatively low. Later on, when time t is sufficiently large and the accumulated expected wealth becomes large,




Figure 11: (a): The mean value of optimal portfolio $t \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\theta_t^*]$. (b): The mean value of optimal consumption $t \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[c_t^*]$ under different choices of risk aversion level $1 - p$. (c): The mean value of wealth process $t \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[X_t^*]$. The model parameters are set to be $\rho = 1$, $\mu = 9.7398 \times 10^{-4}$, $\sigma = 0.0158$, $\mu_Z = 9.2137 \times 10^{-4}$, $\sigma_Z = 0.0082$, $\gamma = 1$, $\beta = 5$. The initial level of wealth process and benchmark process are set to be $(x, z) = (1, 4742.83)$.

the monotonicity of the mean values of the optimal portfolio and consumption with respect to the risk aversion parameter $1 - p$ overturns, which perfectly matches with previous observations in Table 2 and Table 3 as well as the plots of optimal feedback functions in Figure 10.

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank Martin Larsson and Johannes Ruf for proposing the relaxed benchmark tracking using the capital injection during their visit to the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in 2018. L. Bo and Y. Huang are supported by Natural Science Basic Research Program of Shaanxi (No. 2023-JC-JQ-05), Shaanxi Fundamental Science Research Project for Mathematics and Physics (No. 23JSZ010) and Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (No. 20199235177). X. Yu is supported by the Hong Kong RGC General Research Fund (GRF) under grant no. 15304122 and the Hong Kong Polytechnic University research grant under no. P0039251.

References

- Angoshtari B, Bayraktar E, Young VR (2019) Optimal dividend distribution under drawdown and ratcheting constraints on dividend rates. *SIAM J. Financial Math.* 10(2): 547-577.
- Barles G, Daher C, Romano M (1994) Optimal control on the L^∞ norm of a diffusion process. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 32(3): 612-634.
- Barron EN, Ishii H (1989) The Bellman equation for minimizing the maximum cost. *Nonlinear Anal. TMA* 13(9): 1067-1090.
- Brigo D, Dalessandro A, Neugebauer M and Triki F (2009) A stochastic processes toolkit for risk management: Geometric Brownian motion, jumps, GARCH and variance gamma models. *J. Risk. Manag. Financial Institutions* 2(4): 365-393.
- Bo L, Liao H, Yu X (2021) Optimal tracking portfolio with a ratcheting capital benchmark. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 59(3): 2346-2380.

- Bo L, Huang Y, Yu X (2023) Stochastic control problems with state-reflections arising from relaxed benchmark tracking. *Preprint*, available at: arXiv:2302.08302.
- Bokanowski O, Picarelli A, Zidani H (2015) Dynamic programming and error estimates for stochastic control problems with maximum cost. *Appl. Math. Optim.* 71: 125-163.
- Borell C (2007) Monotonicity properties of optimal investment strategies for log-Brownian asset prices. *Math. Finance* 17(1): 143-153.
- Boyle P, Tian W (2007) Portfolio management with constraints. *Math. Finance* 17(3): 319-343.
- Browne S (1999a) Reaching goals by a deadline: Digital options and continuous-time active portfolio management. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* 31: 551-577.
- Browne S (1999b) Beating a moving target: Optimal portfolio strategies for outperforming a stochastic benchmark. *Finan. Stoch.* 3: 275-294.
- Browne S (2000) Risk-constrained dynamic active portfolio management *Manag. Sci.* 46(9): 1188-1199.
- Carroll CD, and Kimball MS (1996) On the concavity of the consumption function. *Econometrica* 64(4): 981-992.
- Chacko G, Viceira LM (2005) Dynamic consumption and portfolio choice with stochastic volatility in incomplete markets. *Rev. Finan. Stud.* 18(4): 1369-1402.
- Chen A, Vellekoop M (2017) Optimal investment and consumption when allowing terminal debt. *Euro. J. Oper. Res.* 258: 385-397.
- Chow Y, Yu X, Zhou C (2020) On dynamic programming principle for stochastic control under expectation constraints. *J. Optim. Theor. Appl.* 185(3): 803-818.
- Deng S, Li X, Pham H, Yu X (2022) Optimal consumption with reference to past spending maximum. *Finan. Stoch.* 26: 217-266.
- Di Giacinto M, Federico S, Gozzi F (2011) Pension funds with a minimum guarantee: a stochastic control approach. *Finan. Stoch.* 15: 297-342.
- Eisenberg J, Schmidli H (2009) Optimal control of capital injections by reinsurance in a diffusion approximation. *Blätter der DGVMF* 30(1): 1-13.
- Eisenberg J, Schmidli H (2011) Optimal control of capital injections by reinsurance with a constant rate of interest. *J. Appl. Probab.* 48(3): 733-748.
- El Karoui N, Jeanblanc M, Lacoste V (2005) Optimal portfolio management with American capital guarantee. *J. Econ. Dyn. Contr.* 29: 449-468.
- El Karoui N, Meziou A (2006) Constrained optimization with respect to stochastic dominance: application to portfolio insurance. *Math. Finance* 16(1): 103-117.
- Ferrari G, Schuhmann P (2019) An optimal dividend problem with capital injections over a finite horizon. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.*, 57(4): 2686-2719.
- Gaivoronski A, Krylov S, Wijst N (2005) Optimal portfolio selection and dynamic benchmark tracking. *Euro. J. Oper. Res.* 163: 115-131.
- Guasoni P, Huberman G, Wang ZY (2011) Performance maximization of actively managed funds. *J. Finan. Econ.* 101: 574-595.

- Kröner A, Picarelli A, Zidani H (2018) Infinite horizon stochastic optimal control problems with running maximum cost. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 56(5): 3296-3319.
- Li X, Yu X, Zhang Q (2023) Optimal consumption and life insurance under shortfall aversion and a drawdown constraint. *Insur. Math. Econ.* 108: 25-45.
- Liu H, Li L (2023) On the concavity of consumption function under habit formation. *J. Math. Econ.* 106: 102829.
- Lokka A, Zervos M (2008) Optimal dividend and issuance of equity policies in the presence of proportional costs. *Insur. Math. Econ.* 42(3): 954-961.
- Merton RC (1969) Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: the continuous time case. *Rev. Econ. Stats.* 51(3): 247-257.
- Merton RC (1971) Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous-time model. *J. Econ. Theor.* 3(4): 373-413.
- Ni C, Li Y, Forsyth P, Carroll R (2022) Optimal asset allocation for outperforming a stochastic benchmark target. *Quant. Finance* 22(9): 1595-1626.
- Pham H (2002) Minimizing shortfall risk and applications to finance and insurance problems. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 12(1): 143-172.
- Sekine J (2012) Long-term optimal portfolios with floor. *Finan. Stoch.* 16: 369-401.
- Strub O, Baumann P (2018) Optimal construction and rebalancing of index-tracking portfolios. *Euro. J. Oper. Res.* 264: 370-387.
- Wang L, Wang S (2021) Unusual investor behavior under tacit and endogenous market signals. *Int. Rev. Econ. Finan.* 73: 76-97.
- Weerasinghe A, Zhu C (2016) Optimal inventory control with path-dependent cost criteria. *Stoch. Processes. Appl.* 126: 1585-1621.
- Xia J (2011) Risk aversion and portfolio selection in a continuous-time model. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 49(5): 1916-1937.
- Yao D, Zhang S, Zhou XY (2006) Tracking a financial benchmark using a few assets. *Oper. Res.* 54(2): 232-246.

A Proofs

This appendix collects proofs of main results in the previous sections.

To prove Lemma 3.2, we need the following auxiliary result:

Lemma A.1. *Assume that the discount factor $\rho > 2\mu_Z + \sigma_Z^2$ (if $2\mu_Z + \sigma_Z^2 \leq 0$, this condition is automatically satisfied). Then, $x \rightarrow v(x, z)$ is non-decreasing. Furthermore, for all (x_1, z_1) and (x_2, z_2) in \mathbb{R}_+^2 , we have*

$$|v(x_1, z_1) - v(x_2, z_2)| \leq \beta|x_1 - x_2| + \beta \left(\sigma_Z^2 + \frac{|\mu_Z|}{\rho - \mu_Z} + \frac{3}{\rho - 2\mu_Z - \sigma_Z^2} \right) |z_1 - z_2|. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Here, we recall that $\beta > 0$ is the parameter describing the relative importance between the consumption performance and the cost of capital injection in (2.4).

Proof. For $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, let $L^{x,z,\theta,c} = (L_t^{x,z,\theta,c})_{t \geq 0}$ be the local time process of X^x with $(X_0^x, Z_0^z) = (x, z)$ and $L_0^{x,z,\theta,c} = 0$ under the control strategy $(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{U}^r$. Using the solution representation of “the Skorokhod problem”, we obtain that, for all $s \geq 0$,

$$\begin{cases} L_s^{x,z,\theta,c} = \sup_{\ell \in [0,s]} \left(x + \int_0^\ell \theta_r^\top \mu dr + \int_0^\ell \theta_r^\top \sigma dW_r - \int_0^\ell c_r dr - \int_0^\ell \mu_Z Z_\ell^z d\ell - \int_0^\ell \sigma_Z Z_\ell^z dW_\ell^\gamma \right)^-, \\ Z_s^z = z \exp \left[\left(\mu_Z - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 \right) s + \sigma_Z W_s^\gamma \right]. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

By this, we have $x \rightarrow L_s^{x,\epsilon}$ is non-increasing. Moreover, it holds that, \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\sup_{s \geq 0} \left| L_s^{x_1,z,\theta,c} - L_s^{x_2,z,\theta,c} \right| \leq |x_1 - x_2|, \quad \forall (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, denote by $(\theta^\epsilon(x, z), c^\epsilon(x, z)) \in \mathbb{U}^r$ the ϵ -optimal control strategy for (3.15) with the initial state (x, z) . In other words, it holds that

$$v(x, z) \leq J(x, z; \theta^\epsilon(x, z), c^\epsilon(x, z)) + \epsilon. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then, for any $x_1 > x_2 \geq 0$, we have from (A.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x_1, z) - v(x_2, z) &\geq J(x_1, z; \theta^\epsilon(x_2, z), c^\epsilon(x_2, z)) - J(x_2, z; \theta^\epsilon(x_2, z), c^\epsilon(x_2, z)) - \epsilon \\ &= -\beta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} d(L_s^{x_1,z,\epsilon} - L_s^{x_2,z,\epsilon}) \right] - \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $L_s^{x,z,\epsilon}$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the local time process with $X_0^x = x$, $Z_0^z = z$ and $L_0^{x,z,\epsilon} = 0$ under the ϵ -optimal control strategy $(\theta^\epsilon(x, z), c^\epsilon(x, z))$. Thus, integration by parts yields that, for any $T > 0$,

$$\int_0^T e^{-\rho s} dL_s^{x,\epsilon} = e^{-\rho T} L_T^{x,\epsilon} + \rho \int_0^T L_s^{x,\epsilon} e^{-\rho s} ds.$$

Using the fact $L_s^{x_1,z,\epsilon} - L_s^{x_2,z,\epsilon} \leq 0$ whenever $x_1 > x_2 \geq 0$, it follows from Monotone Convergence Theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} d(L_s^{x_1,z,\epsilon} - L_s^{x_2,z,\epsilon}) \right] &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\rho s} d(L_s^{x_1,z,\epsilon} - L_s^{x_2,z,\epsilon}) \right] \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho T} (L_T^{x_1,z,\epsilon} - L_T^{x_2,z,\epsilon})] + \rho \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\rho s} (L_s^{x_1,z,\epsilon} - L_s^{x_2,z,\epsilon}) ds \right] \right\} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Hence, we have from (A.5) that $v(x_1, z) - v(x_2, z) \geq -\epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we get $v(x_1, z) \geq v(x_2, z)$. This conclude that $x \rightarrow v(x, z)$ is non-decreasing. On the other hand, it follows from (A.3) and (A.6) that

$$|v(x_1, z) - v(x_2, z)| \leq \beta \sup_{(\theta,c) \in \mathbb{U}^r} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} d(L_s^{x_2,z,\theta,c} - L_s^{x_1,z,\theta,c}) \right] \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \beta \sup_{(\theta,c) \in \mathbb{U}^r} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} |L_T^{x_2, z, \theta, c} - L_T^{x_1, z, \theta, c}| + \rho \int_0^T e^{-\rho s} |L_s^{x_2, z, \theta, c} - L_s^{x_1, z, \theta, c}| ds \right] \\
&\leq \beta \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} |x_1 - x_2| + \rho |x_1 - x_2| \int_0^T e^{-\rho s} ds \right] \\
&= \beta |x_1 - x_2|.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

Next, we fix $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. For any $z_1, z_2 \geq 0$, by using (A.2) and Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and Jensen equality, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[|L_s^{x, z_1, \theta, c} - L_s^{x, z_2, \theta, c}| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\ell \in [0, s]} \left| \int_0^\ell \mu_Z (Z_r^1 - Z_r^2) dr \right| \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\ell \in [0, s]} \left| \int_0^\ell \sigma_Z (Z_r^1 - Z_r^2) dW_r^\gamma \right| \right] \\
&\leq |z_1 - z_2| |e^{\mu_Z s} - 1| + 3\sigma_Z \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^s (Z_r^1 - Z_r^2)^2 dr \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\
&\leq |z_1 - z_2| |e^{\mu_Z s} - 1| + 3\sigma_Z \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^s (Z_r^1 - Z_r^2)^2 dr \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \left[|e^{\mu_Z s} - 1| + 3\sigma_Z \left(\frac{e^{(2\mu_Z + \sigma_Z^2)s} - 1}{2\mu_Z + \sigma_Z^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] |z_1 - z_2|.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

Then, in a similar fashion, we can also show that, for all $(x, z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|v(x, z_1) - v(x, z_2)| &\leq \beta \sup_{(\theta,c) \in \mathbb{U}^r} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} d(L_s^{x, z_1, \theta, c} - L_s^{x, z_2, \theta, c}) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \beta \sup_{(\theta,c) \in \mathbb{U}^r} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} |L_T^{x, z_1, \theta, c} - L_T^{x, z_2, \theta, c}| + \rho \int_0^T e^{-\rho s} |L_s^{x, z_1, \theta, c} - L_s^{x, z_2, \theta, c}| ds \right] \\
&\leq \beta \left(\sigma_Z^2 + \frac{|\mu_Z|}{\rho - \mu_Z} + \frac{3}{\rho - 2\mu_Z - \sigma_Z^2} \right) |z_1 - z_2|.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

Therefore, we deduce from (A.7) and (A.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|v(x_1, z_1) - v(x_2, z_2)| &\leq |v(x_1, z_1) - v(x_2, z_1)| + |v(x_2, z_1) - v(x_2, z_2)| \\
&\leq \beta |x_1 - x_2| + \beta \left(\sigma_Z^2 + \frac{|\mu_Z|}{\rho - \mu_Z} + \frac{3}{\rho - 2\mu_Z - \sigma_Z^2} \right) |z_1 - z_2|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof of the lemma. \square

The explicit form (3.15) of the solution to the dual equation (3.10) can assist us to obtain a closed-form representation of the classical solution to the duality of the prime HJB equation (3.5) with Neumann boundary conditions. Based on the above discussion and Proposition 3.3, we are now in a position to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We first prove the item (i). By using Proposition 3.3 and $\hat{v}(y, z) = u(\ln \frac{y}{\beta}, z)$, we can obtain that $\hat{v}(y, z)$ is a classical solution to the dual HJB equation (3.4). For $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, let $f(x, z) \in (0, \beta]$ satisfy $\hat{v}_y(f(x, z), z) = -x$. Then, we have

$$v(x, z) = \inf_{y \in (0, \beta]} (\hat{v}(y, z) + yx) = \hat{v}(f(x, z), z) + xf(x, z). \tag{A.10}$$

Under the assumption that $\mu_Z \geq \eta$ and the quadratic equation (3.13) of κ , it is easy to see that $\mathcal{K}(1) = \mu_Z - \eta \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{K}(0) = \mu_Z - \rho < 0$, where defined the mapping $\mathcal{K}(x) := \alpha x^2 + (\rho - \eta - \alpha)x + \mu_Z - \rho$. Hence, it follows that the root in (3.14) satisfies $\kappa \in (0, 1]$. By applying the closed-form representation (4.2) of \hat{v} , we have, for the case $p \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}_y(y, z) &= \frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} \left(\beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} \right) + z \left(1 - \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-2} \right) \leq 0, \quad \forall y \in (0, \beta], \\ \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) &= \frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}-1} + z(1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-2} > 0, \quad \forall y \in (0, \beta],\end{aligned}$$

that is, the function $\hat{v}(y, z)$ is indeed convex in $y \in (0, \beta]$. On the other hand, for the case $p = 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}_y(y, z) &= -\frac{1}{\rho y} + \frac{1}{\rho \beta} + z \left(1 - \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} \right) \leq 0, \quad \forall y \in (0, \beta], \\ \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) &= \frac{1}{\rho y^2} + z(1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} > 0, \quad \forall y \in (0, \beta].\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have verified that $(0, \beta] \ni y \rightarrow \hat{v}(y, z)$ is indeed decreasing and strictly convex for any $z > 0$ fixed. Moreover, since $\hat{v}_y(\beta, z) = 0$, one has $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \hat{v}_y(y, z) = -\infty$. Thus, f and v defined by (A.10) are well-defined on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . Therefore, using (A.10), a direct calculation yields that v solves the primal HJB equation (3.3).

We next prove the item (ii). Note that the feedback control functions $(x, z) \rightarrow \theta^*(x, z)$ and $(x, z) \rightarrow c^*(x, z)$ given by (4.3) are continuous on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . We then claim that, there exists a pair of positive constants (M_θ, M_c) such that, for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$|\theta^*(x, z)| \leq M_\theta(1 + x + z), \quad |c^*(x, z)| \leq M_c(1 + x + z). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

In view of the duality transform, we arrive at $|c^*(x, z)| = f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}|\theta^*(x, z)| &\leq |(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\mu| \left| \frac{v_x}{v_{xx}}(x, z) \right| + |\sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1}| \left| \frac{z v_{xz}}{v_{xx}}(x, z) \right| + |\sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1}| z \\ &= |(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\mu| f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) + |\sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1}| |z \hat{v}_{yz}(f(x, z), z)| + |\sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1}| z.\end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Moreover, it follows from the dual relationship (A.10) that $x = -v_y(f(x, z), z)$. For the case $p < 1$ with $p \neq 0$, we have

$$y \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) = \frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} + (1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z y^{\kappa-1}, \quad z \hat{v}_{yz}(y, z) = z(1 - \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1}).$$

Thus, for all $y \in (\frac{\beta}{2}, \beta]$ and $z > 0$, it holds that $|f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}| \leq (\frac{\beta}{2})^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$ and

$$y \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} + (1-\kappa)2^{1-\kappa} z, \quad |\hat{v}_{yz}(y, z)z| \leq (2^{1-\kappa} - 1)z \leq z. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

For the case $y \in (0, \frac{\beta}{2}]$ and $z > 0$, we have

$$-\frac{y \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z)}{v_y(y, z)} = \frac{\frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} + (1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z y^{\kappa-1}}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z (\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{\frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}})} + \frac{(1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z y^{\kappa-1}}{z(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(1-p)(1-2^{-\frac{1}{1-p}})} + \frac{1-\kappa}{1-2^{\kappa-1}}, \tag{A.14}
\end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{|z\hat{v}_{yz}(y, z)|}{v_y(y, z)} = \frac{(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)z}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \leq 1, \tag{A.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}{v_y(y, z)} &= \frac{y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (1 - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} y^{\frac{1}{1-p}})} \leq \frac{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p}{(1-p)^2} \frac{1}{1 - 2^{\frac{1}{1-p}}}. \tag{A.16}
\end{aligned}$$

For the case where $p = 0$, we deduce that

$$y\hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) = \frac{1}{\rho y} + z(1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1}, \quad \hat{v}_{yz}(y, z) = 1 - \beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1}.$$

Then, for all $y \in (\frac{\beta}{2}, \beta]$ and $z > 0$, it follows that $|f(x, z)^{-1}| \leq (\frac{\beta}{2})^{-1}$ and

$$y\hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) \leq \frac{2}{\rho\beta} + (1-\kappa)2^{1-\kappa}z, \quad |\hat{v}_{yz}(y, z)z| \leq (2^{1-\kappa} - 1)z \leq z. \tag{A.17}$$

For $y \in (0, \frac{\beta}{2}]$ and $z > 0$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{y\hat{v}_{yy}(y, z)}{v_y(y, z)} &= \frac{\frac{1}{\rho y} + z(1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1}}{\frac{1}{\rho y} - \frac{1}{\rho\beta} + z(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} = \frac{\beta}{\beta - y} + \frac{(1-\kappa)\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}}{\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} - y^{1-\kappa}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1-\kappa}{1-2^{\kappa-1}}, \tag{A.18}
\end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{|z\hat{v}_{yz}(y, z)|}{v_y(y, z)} = \frac{(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1} - 1)z}{\frac{1}{\rho y} - \frac{1}{\rho\beta} + z(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \leq 1, \tag{A.19}$$

$$-\frac{|z\hat{v}_{yz}(y, z)|}{v_y(y, z)} = \frac{(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1} - 1)z}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \leq 1, \tag{A.20}$$

$$-\frac{y^{-1}}{v_y(y, z)} = \frac{y^{-1}}{\frac{1}{\rho y} - \frac{1}{\rho\beta} + z(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)}y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \leq \frac{y^{-1}}{\frac{1}{\rho y} - \frac{1}{\rho\beta}} \leq 2\rho. \tag{A.21}$$

Therefore, by applying (A.12)-(A.21), we deduce that $|\theta^*(x, z)| \leq M_\theta(1+x+z)$ and $c^*(x, z) \leq M_c(1+x+z)$, where the positive constants M_θ and M_c are defined respectively as

$$M_\theta := |(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\mu| \left[\left(\frac{\beta}{2} \right)^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} + (1-\kappa)2^{1-\kappa} + \frac{1}{(1-p)(1-2^{-\frac{1}{1-p}})} + \frac{1-\kappa}{1-2^{\kappa-1}} \right] + 2|\sigma_Z\gamma^\top\sigma^{-1}|, \tag{A.22}$$

$$M_c := \left(\frac{\beta}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \frac{\rho(1-p) - \alpha p}{(1-p)^2} \frac{1}{1 - 2^{\frac{1}{1-p}}}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

We next prove that the feedback control functions $(x, z) \rightarrow \theta^*(x, z)$ and $(x, z) \rightarrow c^*(x, z)$ given by (4.3) are locally Lipschitz continuous, that is, for any $R > 0$, there exists a positive constants L_R depending on R such that, for all $(x_1, x_2, z_1, z_2) \in [0, R]^2 \times [0, R]^2$,

$$|\theta^*(x_1, z_1) - \theta^*(x_2, z_2)| + |c^*(x_1, z_1) - c^*(x_2, z_2)| \leq L_R(|x_1 - x_2| + |z_1 - z_2|). \quad (\text{A.24})$$

A direct calculation yields that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial c^*(x, z)}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{p-1} f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1} f_x(x, z) = \frac{f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1}}{(1-p)\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)}, \\ \frac{\partial c^*(x, z)}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{p-1} f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1} f_z(x, z) = \frac{f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{p-1}-1} \hat{v}_{yz}(f(x, z), z)}{(1-p)\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial x} = -\frac{1}{\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)} ((\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1} \mu (\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) + f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z)) - \sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1} z \hat{v}_{yyz}(f(x, z), z)), \\ \frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial z} = (\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1} \mu \left(-\frac{1}{\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)} (f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yyy}(f(x, z), z) + \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)) + f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yyz}(f(x, z), z) \right) \\ \quad + \sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1} \left(\hat{v}_{yz}(f(x, z), z) - 1 + z \hat{v}_{yyz}(f(x, z), z) - \frac{z \hat{v}_{yz}(f(x, z), z)}{\hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z)} \hat{v}_{yyz}(f(x, z), z) \right). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

It follows from (A.25) and (A.26) that the functions $\frac{\partial c^*(x, z)}{\partial x}$, $\frac{\partial c^*(x, z)}{\partial z}$, $\frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial z}$ are all continuous with respect to variables x and z . Thus, for $R > 0$, denote by

$$L_R := \frac{1}{2} \max_{(x, z) \in [0, R]^2} \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial c^*(x, z)}{\partial x} \right| \vee \left| \frac{\partial c^*(x, z)}{\partial z} \right| \vee \left| \frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial x} \right| \vee \left| \frac{\partial \theta^*(x, z)}{\partial z} \right| \right\} < \infty.$$

Then, we can deduce that, for all $(x_1, x_2, z_1, z_2) \in [0, R]^4$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\theta^*(x_1, z_1) - \theta^*(x_2, z_2)| + |c^*(x_1, z_1) - c^*(x_2, z_2)| \\ & \leq |\theta^*(x_1, z_1) - \theta^*(x_2, z_1)| + |\theta^*(x_2, z_1) - \theta^*(x_2, z_2)| + |c^*(x_1, z_1) - c^*(x_2, z_1)| + |c^*(x_2, z_1) - c^*(x_2, z_2)| \\ & \leq L_R(|x_1 - x_2| + |z_1 - z_2|). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows from (A.11) and (A.24) that, for any $T > 0$, SDE satisfied by $X^* = (X_t^*)_{t \in [0, T]}$ admits a unique strong solution on $[0, T]$, which yields that $(\theta^*, c^*) \in \mathbb{U}^T$.

On the other hand, fix $(T, x, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{U}^T$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the following stopping time by

$$\tau_n := \inf \left\{ t \geq 0; \int_0^t |\sigma_Z Z_s (v_z - v_x)(X_s, Z_s)|^2 ds \geq n \text{ or } \int_0^t |v_x(X_s, Z_s) \theta_s^\top \sigma|^2 ds \geq n \right\}.$$

In terms of (4.2) and (A.10), we have $|v_x(x, z)| \leq \beta$ and $|v_z(x, z)| \leq (\frac{1}{\kappa} - 1)\beta$ for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Thus, we can deduce that $\tau_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By applying Itô's formula to $e^{-\rho(T \wedge \tau_n)} v(X_{T \wedge \tau_n}, Z_{T \wedge \tau_n})$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\rho(T \wedge \tau_n)} v(X_{T \wedge \tau_n}, Z_{T \wedge \tau_n}) + \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} U(c_s) ds \\ &= v(x, z) + \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} v_x(X_s, Z_s) \theta_s^\top \sigma dW_s + \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} \sigma_Z Z_s (v_z - v_x)(X_s, Z_s) dW_s^\gamma \\ &+ \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} v_x(X_s, Z_s) dL_s^X + \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} (\mathcal{L}^{\theta_s, c_s} v - \rho v)(X_s, Z_s) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

where, for any $(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$, the operator $\mathcal{L}^{\theta, c}$ acting on $C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{\theta, c} g &:= \theta^\top \mu g_x + \frac{1}{2} \theta^\top \sigma \sigma^\top \theta g_{xx} + \theta^\top \sigma \gamma \sigma_Z z (g_{xz} - g_{xx}) + U(c) - c g_x \\ &- \sigma_Z^2 z^2 g_{xz} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 z^2 (g_{xx} + g_{zz}) + \mu_Z z (g_z - g_x), \quad \forall g \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the following stopped processes

$$\left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} v_x(X_s, Z_s) \theta_s^\top \sigma dW_s \right)_{t \geq 0} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} \sigma_Z Z_s (v_z - v_x)(X_s, Z_s) dW_s^\gamma \right)_{t \geq 0}$$

are both martingales. Then, taking the expectation on both sides of (A.27), we deduce from the Neumann boundary condition $v_x(0, z) = \beta$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} U(c_s) ds - \beta \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} dL_s \right] = v(x, z) - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(T \wedge \tau_n)} v(X_{T \wedge \tau_n}, Z_{T \wedge \tau_n}) \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau_n} e^{-\rho s} (\mathcal{L}^{\theta_s, c_s} v - \rho v)(X_s, Z_s) ds \right] \leq v(x, z) - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(T \wedge \tau_n)} v(X_{T \wedge \tau_n}, Z_{T \wedge \tau_n}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

Here, the last inequality in (A.28) holds true due to $(\mathcal{L}^{\theta, c} v - \rho v)(x, z) \leq 0$ for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, letting n goes to infinity on both side of (A.29), we deduce from Dominated Convergence Theorem and Monotone Convergence Theorem that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\rho s} U(c_s) ds - \beta \int_0^T e^{-\rho s} dL_s \right] \leq v(x, z) - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} v(X_T, Z_T) \right]. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

We next show the validity of the following transversality condition:

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} v(X_T, Z_T) \right] \geq 0, \quad (\text{A.30})$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} v(X_T^*, Z_T) \right] = 0. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

In view of (4.2), it follows that $x \rightarrow v(x, z)$ is non-decreasing. Thus, we get

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} v(X_T, Z_T) \right] \geq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho T} v(0, Z_T) \right]. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Using (4.2) again, it holds that $|v_z(x, z)| \leq (\frac{1}{\kappa} - 1)\beta$ for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Therefore, for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$|v(0, z)| \leq |v(0, z) - v(0, 0)| + |v(0, 0)| \leq \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} - 1\right)\beta z + |v(0, 0)|. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Note that $\rho > \mu_Z$. Then, we can obtain

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho T} |v(0, Z_T)|] \leq \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} - 1\right)\beta \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\rho T} \mathbb{E} [Z_T] = \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} - 1\right)\beta \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} e^{-(\rho - \mu_Z)T} = 0. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

As a result, the desired result (A.30) follows from (A.32) and (A.34). In terms of (4.2), one has $|v_x(x, z)| \leq \beta$ for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Thus, for all $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$|v(x, z)| \leq |v(x, z) - v(x, 0)| + |v(x, 0) - v(0, 0)| + |v(0, 0)| \leq \frac{\beta}{\kappa}(x + z) + |v(0, 0)|. \quad (\text{A.35})$$

For any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, by applying Itô's rule to $|X_t^*|^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [|X_t^*|^2] &= x^2 + 2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)^\top \mu X_s^*] ds + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)^\top \sigma \sigma^\top \theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)] ds \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [c^*(X_s^*, Z_s) X_s^*] ds - \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [2\mu_Z Z_s X_s^*] ds + \sigma_Z^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t |Z_s|^2 ds \right] \\ &\quad - 2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)^\top \sigma_Z \sigma \gamma Z_s] ds \\ &\leq x^2 + 2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)^\top \mu X_s^*] ds + \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)^\top \sigma \sigma^\top \theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)] ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [2\mu_Z Z_s X_s^*] ds + \sigma_Z^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t |Z_s|^2 ds \right] - 2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\theta^*(X_s^*, Z_s)^\top \sigma_Z \sigma \gamma Z_s] ds \\ &\leq x^2 + (4M_\theta |\mu| + 2M_\theta^2 |\sigma \sigma^\top| + |\mu_Z| + \sigma_Z^2 + 4M_\theta |\sigma_Z \sigma \gamma|) \int_0^t (1 + \mathbb{E}[|X_s^*|^2] + \mathbb{E}[|Z_s|^2]) ds \\ &\leq x^2 + 2Kt(1 + z^2 e^{(2|\mu_Z| + 3\sigma_Z^2)t}) + K \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[|X_s^*|^2] ds, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

where the positive constant K is specified as

$$K := 4M_\theta |\mu| + 2M_\theta^2 |\sigma \sigma^\top| + |\mu_Z| + \sigma_Z^2 + 4M_\theta |\sigma_Z \sigma \gamma|. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

We then have from Gronwall's inequality that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\mathbb{E} [|X_t^*|^2] \leq x^2 + 2Kt \left[1 + Ke^{Kt} + z^2 e^{(2|\mu_Z| + 3\sigma_Z^2)t} \left(1 + \frac{Ke^{Kt}}{2|\mu_Z| + 3\sigma_Z^2} \right) \right] (1 + x^2). \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Let us define the following constant given by

$$\rho_0 := \frac{\alpha|p| + 1}{1 - p} + 2|\mu_Z| + 3\sigma_Z^2 + K + 1. \quad (\text{A.39})$$

Then, using the estimates (A.35), (A.36) and (A.38), it follows that, for the discount rate $\rho > \rho_0$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho T} v(X_T^*, Z_T)] \leq \frac{\beta}{\kappa} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho T} (X_T^* + Z_T)] = 0.$$

Toward this end, letting $T \rightarrow \infty$ in (A.29), we obtain from (A.30), (A.31) and Dominated Convergence Theorem that, for all $(\theta, c) \in \mathbb{U}^r$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} U(c_s) ds - \beta \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho s} dL_s^X \right] \leq v(x, z), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2,$$

where the equality holds when $(\theta, c) = (\theta^*, c^*)$, and the proof of the theorem is completed. \square

We next focus on the proof of Lemma 4.4. Before presenting the proof, we need the following auxiliary result:

Lemma A.2. *Assume $\rho > \mu_Z$ and $\mu_Z > \eta$. Consider the stochastic control problem given by*

$$\tilde{w}(v, z) := \inf_{\theta \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d\tilde{A}_t^\theta \middle| V_0 = v, Z_0 = z \right], \quad (v, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty) \quad (\text{A.40})$$

subject to the state processes $(\tilde{V}^\theta, Z, \tilde{A}^\theta) = (\tilde{V}_t^\theta, Z_t, \tilde{A}_t^\theta)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{V}_t^\theta = v + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \mu ds + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \sigma dW_s, & Z_t = z + \int_0^t \mu_Z Z_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_Z Z_s dW_s^\gamma, \\ \tilde{A}_t^\theta = 0 \vee \sup_{s \leq t} (Z_s - \tilde{V}_s^\theta). \end{cases}$$

Here, the admissible control set is defined as $\mathbb{U} := \{\theta = (\theta_t)_{t \geq 0} : \theta \text{ is } \mathbb{F}\text{-adapted processes taking values on } \mathbb{R}^d\}$. Then, the value function defined by (A.40) admits the following closed-form expression:

$$\tilde{w}(v, z) = z \frac{1 - \kappa}{\kappa} \left(1 + \frac{(v - z)^+}{z} \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{\kappa - 1}} > 0, \quad (v, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty), \quad (\text{A.41})$$

where $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ given by

$$\kappa = \frac{-(\rho - \eta - \alpha) + \sqrt{(\rho - \eta - \alpha)^2 + 4\alpha(\rho - \mu_Z)}}{2\alpha} \quad (\text{A.42})$$

with $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \mu^\top (\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \mu$ and $\eta = \sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1} \mu$.

Proof. Let us consider the stochastic control problem given by, for $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}(x, z) := \sup_{\theta \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}} \mathbb{E} \left[-\beta \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d\tilde{L}_t^X \middle| \tilde{X}_0 = x, Z_0 = z \right], \\ \tilde{X}_t = x + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \mu ds + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \sigma dW_s - \int_0^t \mu_Z Z_s ds - \int_0^t \sigma_Z Z_s dW_s^\gamma + \tilde{L}_t, \\ Z_t = z + \int_0^t \mu_Z Z_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_Z Z_s dW_s^\gamma. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.43})$$

It is not difficult to observe the equivalence between (A.40) and (A.43) in the sense that

$$\tilde{w}(v, z) = \tilde{v}((v - z)^+, z), \quad \forall z > 0. \quad (\text{A.44})$$

Using the dynamic program, the value function \tilde{v} defined by (A.43) formally satisfies the following HJB equation given by, on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[\theta^\top \mu \tilde{v}_x + \frac{1}{2} \theta^\top \sigma \sigma^\top \theta \tilde{v}_{xx} + \theta^\top \sigma \gamma \sigma_Z z (\tilde{v}_{xz} - \tilde{v}_{xx}) \right] - \sigma_Z^2 z^2 \tilde{v}_{xz} \\ \quad + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 z^2 (\tilde{v}_{xx} + \tilde{v}_{zz}) + \mu_Z z (\tilde{v}_z - \tilde{v}_x) = \rho \tilde{v}, \\ \tilde{v}_x(0, z) = \beta, \quad \forall z > 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.45})$$

Applying the first-order condition, we arrive at, on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} -\alpha \frac{\tilde{v}_x^2}{\tilde{v}_{xx}} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 z^2 \left(\tilde{v}_{zz} - \frac{\tilde{v}_{xz}^2}{\tilde{v}_{xx}} \right) - \eta z \frac{\tilde{v}_x \tilde{v}_{xz}}{\tilde{v}_{xx}} + (\eta - \mu_Z) z \tilde{v}_x + \mu_Z z \tilde{v}_z = \rho v, \\ v_x(0, z) = \beta, \quad \forall z > 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.46})$$

Here, the coefficients $\alpha := \frac{1}{2} \mu^\top (\sigma \sigma^\top)^{-1} \mu$ and $\eta := \sigma_Z \gamma^\top \sigma^{-1} \mu$. It can be directly verified that

$$\tilde{v}(x, z) = z \frac{1 - \kappa}{\kappa} \left(1 + \frac{x}{z} \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{\kappa - 1}} \quad (\text{A.47})$$

is a classical solution to HJB equation (A.46) with κ being the constant defined by (A.42). Then, a straightforward application of the verification argument yields that the function \tilde{v} given by (A.47) is indeed the value function, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We now in a position to prove Lemma 4.4. We first prove the item (i). For $(v, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have from (2.4) and Lemma A.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^* \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t^*) dt \right] - w(v, z) - \beta(z - v)^+ \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t^*) dt \right] - v(x, z) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t^*) dt \right] + M(1 + x + z), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.48})$$

where $M > 0$ is a real constant depending on $(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z, \gamma, p, \beta)$. In the sequel, we let $M > 0$ be a generic positive constant dependent on $(\mu, \sigma, \mu_Z, \sigma_Z, \gamma, p, \beta)$, which may be different from line to line. Thus, in order to prove (4.12), it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t^*) dt \right] < M(1 + x + z). \quad (\text{A.49})$$

In fact, by using (A.48), $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t^*) dt]$ can be not equal to $-\infty$ since $w(v, z)$ is finite and $\beta \mathbb{E}[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^*]$ is nonnegative. The estimate (A.49) obviously holds for the case $p < 0$ since

$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} U(c_t^*) dt \right]$ is negative in this case. Hence, we only focus on the case with $p \in [0, 1)$. For $p \in (0, 1)$, it follows from (A.11), (A.38) and the condition $\rho > \rho_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} \frac{(c_t^*)^p}{p} dt \right] &\leq \frac{M_c^p}{p} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} (1 + |X_t^*| + |Z_t|)^p dt \right] \\
&\leq \frac{M_c^p}{p} \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} (1 + \mathbb{E}[|X_t^*|] + \mathbb{E}[|Z_t|]) dt \leq \frac{1}{p} (M_c)^p \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} [1 + \mu_Z t z + \mathbb{E}[|X_t^*|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}] dt \\
&\leq \frac{M_c^p}{p} \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ 2 + \mu_Z z t + \left(x^2 + 2Kt \left[1 + Ke^{Kt} + z^2 e^{(2|\mu_Z| + 3\sigma_Z^2)t} \left(1 + \frac{Ke^{Kt}}{2|\mu_Z| + 3\sigma_Z^2} \right) \right] (1 + x^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} dt \\
&< M(1 + x + z). \tag{A.50}
\end{aligned}$$

Here $M_c > 0$ is the constant given by (A.23). For the case with $p = 0$, by using $\ln(x) < x$ for all $x > 0$, and a similar discussion as (A.50), we can also get the estimate (A.49).

Next, we prove the item (ii). For any admissible portfolio $\theta = (\theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$, let us introduce that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\tilde{V}_t^\theta = v + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \mu ds + \int_0^t \theta_s^\top \sigma dW_s, \quad \tilde{A}_t^\theta = 0 \vee \sup_{s \leq t} (Z_s - \tilde{V}_s^\theta). \tag{A.51}$$

Recall the optimal pair of investment and consumption $(\theta^*, c^*) = (\theta_t^*, c_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$ given by Theorem 4.1. Note that $c_t^* > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, it follows from (2.2) and (A.51) that $\tilde{V}_t^{\theta^*} \geq V_t^{\theta^*, c^*}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^* \right] > \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d\tilde{A}_t^{\theta^*} \right] \geq \inf_{\theta} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} d\tilde{A}_t^\theta \right] = \tilde{w}(v, z). \tag{A.52}$$

By using Lemma A.2, we have that, for all $(v, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty)$,

$$\tilde{w}(v, z) = z \frac{1 - \kappa}{\kappa} \left(1 + \frac{(v - z)^+}{z} \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{\kappa - 1}} > 0, \tag{A.53}$$

where the constant $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ is given by (3.14). Thus, we deduce from (A.52) and (A.53) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} dA_t^* \right] \geq z \frac{1 - \kappa}{\kappa} \left(1 + \frac{(v - z)^+}{z} \right)^{\frac{\kappa}{\kappa - 1}} > 0, \tag{A.54}$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. It follows from the duality relationship that $x = -\hat{v}_y(y, z)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta^*(x, z) &= -\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} \frac{v_x}{v_{xx}}(x, z) - \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma} \left(\frac{z v_{xz}}{v_{xx}}(x, z) - z \right) \\
&= \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) - \frac{\sigma_Z}{\sigma} (z \hat{v}_{yz}(f(x, z), z) - z). \tag{A.55}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have from (A.55) that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\theta^*(x, z)}{x} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mu f(x, z) \hat{v}_{yy}(f(x, z), z) - \sigma_Z \sigma(z \hat{v}_{yz}(f(x, z), z) - z)}{-\sigma^2 \hat{v}_y(f(x, z), z)} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu y \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z) - \sigma_Z \sigma z \hat{v}_{yz}(y, z)}{-\sigma^2 \hat{v}_y(y, z)}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.56}$$

By using (4.2), for $p < 1$ with $p \neq 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{y \hat{v}_{yy}(y, z)}{-v_y(y, z)} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} + (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z y^{\kappa-1}}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z (\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\frac{1-p}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} + (1-\kappa) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z y^{\kappa-1 + \frac{1}{1-p}}}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (1 - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} y^{\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z (\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1 + \frac{1}{1-p}} - y^{\frac{1}{1-p}})} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-p} \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 + C^* (1-\kappa) (1-p) \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} z y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}}}{1 + z C^* \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}}},\end{aligned}\tag{A.57}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{z \hat{v}_{yz}(y, z)}{-v_y(y, z)} &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1) z}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z (\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}} - y^{\frac{1}{1-p}}) z}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (1 - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} y^{\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z (\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}} - y^{\frac{1}{1-p}})} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{C^* \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}} z}{1 + C^* \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}} z}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.58}$$

By discussing the three cases of $p > p_1$, $p = p_1$ and $p < p_1$, respectively, we can deduce the desired result (4.14) following from (A.57) and (A.58). Furthermore, we can easily verify that the limit (4.14) also holds true for the case with $p = 0$.

Next, it follows from the relationship $x = -\hat{u}_y(y, z)$ and (4.2) that, for $p < 1$ with $p \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{c^*(x, z)}{x} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(x, z)^{\frac{1}{1-p}}}{-\hat{v}_y(f(x, z), z)} = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{y^{\frac{1}{1-p}}}{-\hat{v}_y(y, z)} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}}{\frac{(1-p)^2}{\rho(1-p)-\alpha p} (y^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z (\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa-1} - 1)} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{C^*}{(1 - \beta^{-\frac{1}{1-p}} y^{\frac{1}{1-p}}) + z C^* (\beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}} - y^{\frac{1}{1-p}})} \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{C^*}{1 + C^* \beta^{-(\kappa-1)} y^{\kappa + \frac{p}{1-p}} z}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.59}$$

Thanks to (A.59), we can obtain the desired result (4.15) via a direct calculation, which also holds for the case $p = 0$. \square