

Withdrawal Success Optimization

Hayden Brown ORCID: 0000-0002-2975-2711¹

¹Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Nevada,
Reno, 1664 N. Virginia Street, Reno, 89557, Nevada, USA.

E-mail: haydenb@nevada.unr.edu;

Abstract

For n assets and discrete-time rebalancing, the probability to complete a given schedule of investments and withdrawals is maximized over progressively measurable portfolio weight functions. Applications consider two assets, namely the S&P Composite Index and an inflation-protected bond. The maximum probability and optimal portfolio weight functions are computed for annually rebalanced schedules involving an arbitrary initial investment and then equal annual withdrawals over the remainder of the time period. Applications also consider annually rebalanced schedules that start with dollar cost averaging (equal annual investments) and then shift to equal annual withdrawals. Results indicate noticeable improvements in the probability to complete a given schedule when optimal portfolio weights are used instead of constant portfolio weights like the standard of keeping 90% in the S&P Composite Index and 10% in inflation-protected bonds.

1 Introduction

Suppose an investor wishes to make a particular schedule of investments and withdrawals. Assume the number of investments and withdrawals are finite and completely determined at time 0. Given n assets available for investment, the goal is to maximize the probability to complete the schedule, with the maximization occurring over time-adapted portfolio weights. Assume the set of rebalancing times is finite and contains the set of investment and withdrawal times.

Theoretical results present a recursive formula that computes this maximum probability, providing the optimal time-adapted portfolio weights along

the way. The recursive formula is also generalized to incorporate a mortality distribution. In this case, the goal is to maximize the probability of completing just the scheduled investments and withdrawals that occur while the investor is alive.

Applications focus on two assets: the S&P Composite Index and an inflation protected bond. This combination offers a good balance of high risk - high return and low risk - low return. In particular, the risk and return of the portfolio is increased (decreased) by raising (lowering) the proportion of wealth invested in the S&P Composite Index. Consequently, the optimal portfolio weights indicate the best time-adapted balance of high risk - high return and low risk - low return for the given schedule of investments and withdrawals.

Two general investment schedules are considered in applications. There is the schedule that starts with a lump sum investment and then has equal withdrawals for a specified length of time or until death. There is also the schedule that starts with dollar cost averaging (DCA) and then has equal withdrawals for a specified length of time or until death. Note that in DCA, equal amounts are invested at equidistant times. In applications, all investments and withdrawals are executed on an annual basis. Rebalancing occurs whenever an investment or withdrawal is made.

The maximum probability to complete the schedule is compared to the probability resulting from portfolio weights that are constant over time. Special attention is given to the $p : (1 - p)$ portfolios with $p = .6, .9, 1$, where $p\%$ of wealth is invested in the S&P Composite Index and $(1 - p)\%$ of wealth is invested in the inflation protected bond. $p = 1$ generally gives a probability that is closest to the maximum probability; however, the difference can be several tenths (note that probability is measured here on a scale from 0 to 1).

The following results from applications demonstrate the advantage in using optimal portfolio weights versus constant portfolio weights. Consider the schedule having an initial lump sum investment and then equal annual withdrawals. Suppose the initial investment is 30 times the withdrawal amount. Then an investor can make 50 annual withdrawals with 95% confidence, and a 60 year old can make annual withdrawals until death with 99% confidence. Note that only investing in the S&P Composite Index would result in 90.9% and 97.3% confidence, respectively. Next consider the schedule that starts with DCA and then has equal annual withdrawals. Suppose .5 times the withdrawal amount is invested annually for 30 years. Then the investor can make 50 years of withdrawals with 95% confidence; only investing in the S&P Composite Index would result in 92.4% confidence. Suppose .95 times the withdrawal amount is invested annually for 20 years, starting at age 20. Then starting at age 40, the investor can make annual withdrawals until death, with 95% confidence; only investing in the S&P Composite Index would result in 93% confidence.

1.1 Literature Review

Maximizing the probability that an outcome lies above a particular value is known as the safety first principle, originally considered by Roy (1952). Here,

the outcome in question is the terminal wealth resulting from a given schedule of investments and withdrawals. Under the setup detailed in section 2, a given schedule of investments and withdrawals is successfully executed if and only if terminal wealth is non-negative. Thus, the goal is to maximize the probability that terminal wealth is non-negative. In the parlance of Roy (1952), the disaster level here is 0. The theory presented here also handles other disaster levels, but the primary focus is on 0.

To account for nuances of individual choice that safety first misses, Levy and Levy (2009) proposed the expected utility - safety first (EU-SF) model. In particular, the EU - SF model takes a continuous utility function and seeks to maximize the weighted average of that utility and the probability for the outcome to be greater than or equal to some disaster level. Recently, the EU - SF model has been extended to support a probability distortion function, which addresses further nuances of individual choice like the overestimation of low probability events and underestimation of high probability events (Li and Mi, 2021). Since successful execution of a given schedule of investments and withdrawals is fully characterized by the safety first principle with disaster level 0, there is no need to consider these more complicated extensions here.

The discrete-time portfolio optimization problem is considered in Phelps (1962), with the goal being to maximize the expected lifetime utility of consumption. The focus is on lifetime utility functions of the form

$$U(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha^{i-1} \nu(a_i), \quad 0 < \alpha \leq 1,$$

where a_i is the amount consumed at the beginning of period i and ν is bounded, strictly increasing, strictly concave and continuously differentiable. In words, this lifetime utility function is the separable sum of each period's discounted utility of consumption. Expected lifetime utility of consumption is maximized when there is investment in just one asset that has iid return over each period. The return distribution is assumed to be discrete with a finite number of outcomes. This optimization is generalized in Hakansson (1975) to the multi-asset case with bounded, possibly non-discrete, return distributions. Special attention is given the infinite period case and utilities ν with constant relative or absolute risk aversion index.

The portfolio optimization problem can also be approached from the continuous angle, where stock prices follow stochastic differential equations and portfolios are rebalanced continuously in time. In Karatzas et al (1987), the goal is to maximize expected discounted utility of consumption and terminal wealth over a continuously rebalanced portfolio. The effect of various wealth-based constraints on the maximization of expected utility of terminal wealth is considered in Basak and Shapiro (2001) and Kraft and Steffensen (2013). Here, stock price processes can be generated by stochastic differential equations, but the portfolios are not rebalanced continuously in time. It is advantageous to consider discrete-time rebalancing, since there can be significant error in

results when a strategy that involves continuous rebalancing is discretized for applications.

For a portfolio consisting of the S&P 500 index and US Treasury Bills, [Musumeci and Musumeci \(1999\)](#) use dynamic programming to compute the optimal portfolio weights for an investor looking to maximize his expected utility of wealth $U(W) = -W^{-1} - ae^{-bW}$, where a and b are constants. Results only account for an initial investment that is rebalanced periodically. Additional investments and withdrawals are not considered in the dynamic programming formulation. Here, applications focus on the effect of periodic investments and withdrawals on the optimal portfolio weights, with the goal being to maximize the safety first utility with disaster level 0. Furthermore, this safety first utility is easily understood as the probability to complete a given schedule of investments and withdrawals.

In [Bertsekas and Shreve \(1996\)](#), the discrete-time stochastic dynamic programming problem is generalized to the Borel setting where results are carefully treated with measure theory. Theoretical results presented here follow a similar framework. However, the formulation is slightly different. Here, asset prices and portfolio weights are progressively measurable with respect to a filtration that represents the evolution of information over time.

Results presented here are meant to serve individual investors, ultimately providing an idea of how much retirement income can be reliably generated by an individual account. Maintaining an individual account during retirement can be advantageous because the investor maintains unconditional control over his wealth. Annuities can offer good deals on retirement income, but the purchaser must surrender some control over his wealth. Annuities are also focused on seniors, with many having minimum age requirements that leave out younger investors. Since the results presented here use an individual account, they are more accessible, giving younger investors an annuity-like alternative. For examples of research that considers annuities in the problem of optimizing retirement income, see [Antolín et al \(2010\)](#), [Butt and Khemka \(2015\)](#) and the references therein.

1.2 Organization

Section 2 provides the problem set-up. Theoretical results are given in section 3, with their proofs in Appendix A. Section 4 provides applications of theoretical results using data. Data is described in section 4.1. Closing remarks and a discussion of related future research ideas are given in section 5.

2 Preliminaries

Introduce the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where $\mathbb{F} := \{\mathcal{F}(t)\}_{t \in T}$ denotes a filtration of \mathcal{F} and $T \subset [0, \infty)$, $0 \in T$. Consider n assets available for investment, each denoted by an index from 1 to n . For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, let $X_j : T \times \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be an \mathbb{F} -adapted process. When convenient, write $X_j(t)$

in place of $X_j(t, \omega)$, understanding that $X_j(t)$ is an $\mathcal{F}(t)$ -measurable function on Ω . In this setting, $X_j(t)$ denotes the value of asset j at time t .

Let $\{t_k\}_{k=0}$ be an increasing sequence in T with $t_0 = 0$. Require that for each j and t_k , $\log X_j(t_{k+1}) - \log X_j(t_k)$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}(t_k)$. Suppose c_k is invested or withdrawn at each time step t_k . Positive c_k indicate investments, and negative c_k indicate withdrawals. No other investments or withdrawals are made. Further suppose that rebalancing occurs only at those times t_k . Note that in this set-up, rebalancing can occur at time t_k with $c_k = 0$.

After accounting for c_k , denote the wealth available for investment at time t_k with W_k . At each time t_k , rebalance W_k according to the $\mathcal{F}(t_k)$ -measurable portfolio weight vector $\boldsymbol{\pi}_k : \Omega \rightarrow \Pi$, where $\Pi = \{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n : \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = 1\}$. When convenient, write $\boldsymbol{\pi}_k = (\pi_{k1}, \pi_{k2}, \dots, \pi_{kn})$, understanding that $\boldsymbol{\pi}_k$ and each π_{kj} is an $\mathcal{F}(t_k)$ -measurable function on Ω . In particular, at each time t_k , invest $\pi_{kj}W_k$ in asset j for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

To simplify notation, let $X_{jk} = X_j(t_{k+1})/X_j(t_k)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $k = 0, 1, \dots$. When convenient, write $\mathbf{X}_k = (X_{1k}, X_{2k}, \dots, X_{nk})$. Let $Y_k = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_{kj}X_{jk}$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots$. Then the wealth at time step t_k is given by W_k , where the W_k are computed recursively via

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &= c_0, \\ W_k &= Y_{k-1}W_{k-1} + c_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Again, note that wealth at time step t_k is computed after accounting for the investment or withdrawal of c_k at time step t_k . Furthermore, observe that each $X_{j,k-1}$, Y_{k-1} and W_k is an $\mathcal{F}(t_k)$ -measurable function on Ω . Figure 1 illustrates (1) in the context of a decision tree.

Decision tree for terminal wealth




Fig. 1 Illustrates the decision tree used to compute W_k . Green points indicate decision nodes, and red points indicate chance nodes.

Some additional conditions must be placed on the c_k in order for W_k to make sense. In particular, W_k will make sense if $W_k(\omega) < 0$ implies $W_{k+1}(\omega) < 0$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$. This guarantees that a failure to execute a schedule of investments and withdrawals up to time t_k , indicated by $W_k(\omega) < 0$, will be carried over to time t_{k+1} and indicated by $W_{k+1}(\omega) < 0$. To achieve such propagation of negativity in the W_k , it suffices to require that $c_k < 0$ implies $c_i < 0$ for $i > k$. Observe that if $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_k \geq 0$, then $W_k(\omega) \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. On the other hand, if at least one of the c_i in c_0, c_1, \dots, c_k is negative, then this requirement makes c_{k+1} negative, in which case $W_k(\omega) < 0$ implies $W_{k+1}(\omega) < 0$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$.

Observe that W_k is a function of each π_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. The notation

$$\sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{k-1}} \mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$$

is used to denote the supremum of W_k over all $\mathcal{F}(t_i)$ -measurable portfolio weight vectors π_i , where $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. This kind of abbreviation is used in similar situations where there is a W_k -like function that is constructed using the $\mathcal{F}(t_i)$ -measurable π_i .

Use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ to denote the expectation with respect to $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | Z]$ to denote $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | \sigma(Z)]$, the expectation conditioned on the σ -algebra generated by Z . Use \mathbb{R} to denote the real numbers. Given $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $Z : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, use $u(Z)$ to denote $u \circ Z$. Given sets Ψ, I and $\{(h_i : \Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) : i \in I\}$, use $(\sup_{i \in I} h_i) : \Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to denote the pointwise supremum of the h_i , meaning for each $\psi \in \Psi$, $(\sup_{i \in I} h_i)(\psi) = \sup_{i \in I} (h_i(\psi))$. Let $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ denote the n -dimensional vector of 1s, and use \cdot to indicate the dot product. For a vector \mathbf{a} , use \mathbf{a}_j to denote the j -th component of \mathbf{a} . Let $\mathcal{X}_A : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ denote the indicator function of $A \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 1 (proposition 2.13 of [De Saporta and Zili \(2021\)](#)) *Let $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ be \mathcal{F} -measurable functions, \mathcal{G} a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} and $h : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a Borel measurable function such that $h(X, Y)$ is integrable. If X is independent from \mathcal{G} and Y is \mathcal{G} -measurable, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[h(X, Y) | \mathcal{G}] = H(Y) \quad a.s.,$$

with $H(y) = \mathbb{E}[h(X, y)]$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^q$.

Lemma 2 (lemma 1.13 of [Kallenberg \(2019\)](#)) *Fix two measurable functions f and g from Ω into some measurable spaces (S, \mathcal{S}) and (T, \mathcal{T}) , where the former is Borel. Then f is g -measurable iff there exists some measurable mapping $h : T \rightarrow S$ with $f = h \circ g$.*

3 Theoretical Results

For a given non-negative constant w and positive integer k , the goal is to find the supremum of $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ over the portfolio vectors π_i , where $i =$

$0, 1, \dots, k-1$. That goal is expressed in (2).

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-1}} \mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w) \quad (2)$$

It is unreasonable to compute (2) by testing all possible portfolio vectors $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$, where $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. Instead, a recursive method is presented that allows more reasonable computation of (2).

Before presenting the recursive method used to compute (2), a simpler method is presented that allows computation of $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ for given portfolio vectors $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$. This method is useful in applications because it facilitates comparisons between (2) and the $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ resulting from given portfolio vectors $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$.

3.1 Computing $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ for given $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$

The simpler recursive method arises after expressing $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ in terms of conditional expectations. Define the Borel measurable function $u_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$u_k(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \geq w \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Using lemma 2, let $u_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, denote the Borel measurable functions satisfying

$$u_i(W_i) = \mathbb{E}[u_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4)$$

Note that integrability of $u_{i+1}(W_{i+1})$ follows from induction and the fact that u_k is bounded. Furthermore, W_{i+1} is \mathcal{F} -measurable and $\sigma(W_i)$ is a sub σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} , so the conditional expectation in (4) is a well-defined $\sigma(W_i)$ -measurable function. Next observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w) = \mathbb{E}[u_k(W_k)]. \quad (5)$$

By (4) and the law of total expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}[u_k(W_k)] = \mathbb{E}[u_{k-1}(W_{k-1})] = \dots = \mathbb{E}[u_0(W_0)]. \quad (6)$$

Since $W_0 = c_0$ is deterministic, $\mathbb{E}[u_0(W_0)] = u_0(c_0)$. It follows from (5) and (6) that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w) = u_0(c_0). \quad (7)$$

If the $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$ are $\sigma(W_i)$ -measurable for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, then by lemma 2, there exist Borel measurable $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Pi$ such that $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i = \phi_i(W_i)$ for each i . In this situation, $u_0(c_0)$ can be computed recursively using (4) and the following. Recall from (1) that $W_{i+1} = (\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)W_i + c_{i+1}$. If $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i = \phi_i(W_i)$ for each i , it

follows from lemma 1 that there is an $S \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}(S) = 0$ such that for each $x \in \{W_i(\omega) : \omega \in \Omega \setminus S\}$,

$$u_i(x) = \mathbb{E}[u_{i+1}((\phi_i(x) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})]. \quad (8)$$

For simplicity, compute $u_i(x)$ using (8) for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Next, the above recursion is modified to incorporate the supremum in (2).

3.2 Computing (2)

First define the non-decreasing upper semicontinuous function $v_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

$$v_k(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \geq w \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Let $v_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, denote the non-decreasing upper semicontinuous functions satisfying

$$v_i(x) = \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})] \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, (2) is given by $v_0(c_0)$, which can be computed recursively, starting with (9) and then using (10). Proofs of the previous statements are given in sections A.3 and A.4 of the appendix.

3.3 Computing (2) with stock-bond portfolios

Fix $T = [0, \infty)$ and $n = 2$. Let $X_1(t)$ denote the value of the stock at time t . Assume the X_{1i} are continuous in the sense that $\mathbb{P}(X_{1i} = x) = 0$ for each $x > 0$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. Let $X_2(t) = (1+r)^t$, meaning $X_2(t)$ denotes the value of the bond, with interest $r \geq 0$, at time t . Let \mathbb{F} be the natural filtration generated by $(X_1(t), X_2(t))$. Let $w_k = w$, and for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, let

$$w_i = \frac{w_{i+1} - c_{i+1}}{1+r}. \quad (11)$$

If $w_i \leq 0$, then only investing in the bond would yield $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w) = 1$. So the case where $w_i \leq 0$ is not worth studying. Hence, require that each w_i ($i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$) is positive.

Under the above set-up, each v_i ($i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$) is continuous over $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{w_i\}$ and right continuous at w_i . When $x \geq w_i$,

$$v_i(x) = \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(((0, 1) \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})] = 1.$$

For $x \geq 0$,

$$v_i(x) = \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \int_{A_{\mathbf{r}}} v_{i+1}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1}) d\mathbb{P}, \quad (12)$$

where $A_{\mathbf{r}} = \{\omega : 0 \leq (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1}\}$. See section A.5 in the appendix for proofs of the previous three statements.

It follows from (9) and (12) that for $x \in (0, w_{k-1})$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{k-1}(x) &= \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{1,k-1})x + c_k \geq w) \\ &= \max_{q \in (0,1]} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_{1,k-1}}{1+r} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{q}\left(\frac{w_{k-1}}{x} - 1\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_{1,k-1}}{1+r} \geq \frac{w_{k-1}}{x}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

3.4 Extension to a mortality distribution

Let the Borel measurable function $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ denote the investor's time of death. Require that τ is independent of $X_j(t)$ for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $t \in T$. Assume τ is a continuous random variable so that borderline cases where death occurs at time t_i is not an issue. Let $\tau_d : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots\}$ be such that $\tau(\omega) \in (t_i, t_{i+1}]$ implies $\tau_d(\omega) = i$. By the law of total probability,

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{\tau_d} \geq w) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(W_i \geq w, \tau \in (t_i, t_{i+1}]). \quad (14)$$

If the π_i are $\sigma(W_i)$ -measurable, then τ is independent to each W_i and

$$\mathbb{P}(W_{\tau_d} \geq w) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(W_i \geq w) \mathbb{P}(\tau \in (t_i, t_{i+1}]). \quad (15)$$

Moreover, each $\mathbb{P}(W_i \geq w)$ in (15) can be computed using section 3.1 or direct simulation of the W_i .

Now it is tempting to maximize (14) over π_0, π_1, \dots . First set up the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{W}_0 &= c_0, \\ \bar{W}_i &= (1 - \mathcal{X}_{(0,t_i]}(\tau))(Y_{i-1}\bar{W}_{i-1} + c_i) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{X}_{(0,t_i]}(\tau)\bar{W}_{i-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Observe that

$$\bar{W}_i(\omega) = \begin{cases} W_i(\omega) & \tau(\omega) > t_i, \\ \bar{W}_{i-1}(\omega) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq w) = \mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w, \tau > t_k) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(W_i \geq w, \tau \in (t_i, t_{i+1}]). \quad (18)$$

If $\mathbb{P}(\tau > t_k) = 0$, then (18) and (14) coincide. Otherwise, k can be chosen large enough such that (18) approximates (14). So for k sufficiently large,

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots} \mathbb{P}(W_{\tau_d} \geq w) \approx \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-1}} \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq w). \quad (19)$$

There is also the inequality

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots} \mathbb{P}(W_{\tau_d} \geq w) \geq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-1}} \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq w) - \mathbb{P}(\tau > t_k), \quad (20)$$

which holds for any k . Notice the similarity between (2) and the right side of (19). This similarity is taken advantage of to obtain the following result.

Let $\tau_i : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be independent Bernoulli(p_i) random variables for $i = 0, 1, \dots$, where $p_i \in [0, 1]$. Additionally require that each τ_i is $\mathcal{F}(t_{i+1})$ -measurable and independent of $X_j(t)$ for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $t \in T$. Define τ such that for each $\omega \in \Omega$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots$,

$$\tau(\omega) \in (t_i, t_{i+1}] \iff \sum_{j=0}^i \tau_j(\omega) = 1.$$

Let $\bar{v}_k = v_k$, where v_k is as in (9). For $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, let $\bar{v}_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote the non-decreasing upper semicontinuous functions satisfying

$$\bar{v}_i(x) = (1 - p_i) \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}_{i+1}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})] + p_i v_k(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (21)$$

Then the right side of (19) is given by $\bar{v}_0(c_0)$, which can be computed recursively, starting with (9) (since $\bar{v}_k = v_k$) and using (21) after that. Proof of the previous statements are given in section A.6 of the appendix.

The following details some useful facts about the \bar{v}_i .

- The recursion used to obtain $\bar{v}_0(c_0)$ can be kick-started at $k-1$ by use of v_{k-1} . Taking i to be $k-1$ in (21) yields

$$\bar{v}_{k-1}(x) = (1 - p_{k-1})v_{k-1}(x) + p_{k-1}v_k(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (22)$$

- Observe that if $\mathbb{P}(\tau \leq t_{i+1}) = 0$, then (21) reduces to

$$\bar{v}_i(x) = \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}[\bar{v}_{i+1}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})] \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- Under the set-up of section 3.3, $\bar{v}_i(x) = 1$ for $x \geq w_i$, and for $x \geq 0$ there is

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{v}_{i+1}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})] = \int_{A_{\mathbf{r}}} \bar{v}_{i+1}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1}) d\mathbb{P}.$$

Table 1 Data variable descriptions.

Notation	Description
I	Average monthly close of the S&P composite index
D	Dividend per share of the S&P composite index
C	January consumer price index

4 Applications

Theoretical results are applied to portfolios consisting of the S&P Composite Index and an inflation-protected bond. Applications use a mortality distribution that is based on the 2017 per-age death rates of the US Social Security area population. Section 4.1 describes the S&P Composite Index data and the mortality distribution data. Section 4.2 justifies the treatment of S&P returns as iid and details the set-up needed to apply theoretical results. Algorithms used in applications are described in section 4.2. Results of applications are given in section 4.3.

4.1 Data

Annual data from the S&P Composite Index and Consumer Price Index is taken from <http://www.econ.yale.edu/~shiller/data.htm>, collected for easy access at <https://github.com/HaydenBrown/Investing>. The data spans 1871 to 2020 and is described in table 1. Note that S&P Composite Index refers to Cowles and Associates from 1871 to 1926, Standard & Poor 90 from 1926 to 1957 and Standard & Poor 500 from 1957 to 2020. Cowles and Associates and the S&P 90 are used here as backward extensions of the S&P 500.

The data is transformed so that annual returns incorporate dividends and are adjusted for inflation. In particular, returns are computed using the consumer price index, the S&P Composite Index price and the S&P Composite Index dividend. Use the subscript k to denote the k th year of C , I and D from Table 1. The return for year k is computed as $\frac{I_{k+1}+D_k}{I_k} \cdot \frac{C_k}{C_{k+1}}$.

Death rates are taken from <https://www.ssa.gov>, the official website of the Social Security Administration. In particular, the female per-age death rates of the US Social Security area population are taken from the 2017 period life table. Female death rates are used because they are generally lower than male death rates. The female death rates are illustrated in figure 2. Let d_j denote the 2017 female death rate for age j , and let s denote the starting age for a given schedule of investments and withdrawals. Applications use $k = 120 - s$ and

$$p_i = d_{s+i}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1.$$

4.2 Set-up

In order to apply theoretical results, T , n , $X_j(t)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, \mathbb{F} and $\{t_k\}_{k=0}$ need to be specified. Set $T = [0, \infty)$ and $n = 2$. Let $X_1(t)$ denote the




Fig. 2 2017 female death rates for the US Social Security area population.

Table 2 p-values of Ljung-Box test on annual S&P returns

	returns	log-returns	absolute log-returns
lag = 1	.928	.833	.555
lag = 5	.113	.078	.975

inflation-adjusted value of the S&P Composite Index at time t , and let $X_2(t) = (1 + r)^t$, meaning $X_2(t)$ denotes the inflation-adjusted value of an inflation-protected bond, with interest r , at time t . Set $t_k = k$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots$. When no mortality distribution is present, let \mathbb{F} be the natural filtration generated by $(X_1(t), X_2(t))$. When a mortality distribution is present, adjust the previous \mathbb{F} as follows

$$\mathcal{F}(t) \leftarrow \sigma\left(\mathcal{F}(t) \cup \bigcup_{i-1 \leq t} \sigma(\tau_i)\right), \quad t \in T.$$

Since $X_1(t)$ and $X_2(t)$ are inflation-adjusted, it follows that the c_k and W_k are also inflation-adjusted. For example, if $c_k = -2$ and inflation is 5% from time 0 to time t_k , then the actual amount withdrawn at time t_k is $2 \cdot 1.05$. In other words, 2 is the inflation-adjusted amount withdrawn, and $2 \cdot 1.05$ is the actual amount withdrawn.

Theoretical results also require the \mathbf{X}_k to be independent of $\mathcal{F}(t_k)$. It suffices to have iid \mathbf{X}_k . Observing that $X_2(t)$ is deterministic, it suffices to justify the assumption that annual S&P returns are iid. Table 2 provides p-values from the Ljung-Box test on returns, log-returns and the absolute value of annual log-returns. The p-value of .078 is slightly concerning, but not enough to reject independence with the usual 95% confidence. The autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation functions of annual log-returns are given in figure 3. Overall, the assumption that annual S&P returns are independent appears to be supported by the data. Next, the distribution of the annual returns is fitted.




Fig. 3 Left: The autocorrelation function of annual S&P log-returns. Right: The partial autocorrelation function of annual S&P log-returns.

A simple and effective option is to fit returns to a Normal distribution with mean and standard deviation equal to their corresponding sample values (see figures 4 and 5). This fit works especially well because the mean and standard deviation of its logarithm are approximately equal to their corresponding sample values as well. In particular, if $X_{1k} \sim N(1.083, .1753^2)$, then the mean and standard deviation of $\log X_{1k}$ are approximately equal to the sample mean (.06578) and standard deviation (.1690) of annual S&P log-returns. The mean (.06534) and standard deviation (.1680) of $\log X_{1k}$ were computed as the sample mean and standard deviation of 100,000 samples of $\log X_{1k}$. Note that under this fitted distribution, it is possible to realize a negative return. However, the probability of realizing a negative return is so small (on the order of 10^{-10}), that it is negligible here.

Now fix k and require that $w_i > 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$, where w_i is as in section 3.3.

4.2.1 Simulating $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq w)$

Algorithms 1 and 2 compute $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq w)$, respectively, via simulation. Both algorithms use π_i that are defined using Borel measurable $q_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. In particular, algorithm 1 uses

$$\pi_i = (q_i(W_i), 1 - q_i(W_i)), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1,$$

and algorithm 2 uses

$$\pi_i = (q_i(\overline{W}_i), 1 - q_i(\overline{W}_i)), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1.$$




Fig. 4 Left: Quantiles of annual S&P returns versus $\mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ quantiles. Right: Quantiles of annual S&P log-returns versus $\mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ log-quantiles. The line indicates where points should be if quantiles are identical.




Fig. 5 Probability histogram for the annual S&P return data. The probability density function of $\mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ is superimposed for comparison.

In algorithm 1, N realizations of W_k are simulated, and then $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ is computed as the number of realizations greater than or equal to w , divided by N . Likewise, in algorithm 2, N realizations of \bar{W}_k are simulated, and then $\mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq w)$ is computed as the number of realizations greater than or equal to w , divided by N .

4.2.2 Computing $v_0(c_0)$

Let M be a sufficiently large positive integer. In algorithm 3, $v_i(x)$ is computed recursively for $x \in D_i$, where

$$D_i = \left\{ \frac{mw_i}{M} : m = 1, \dots, 2M \right\}.$$

The following elaborates on the details behind algorithm 3.

Recall that v_k is given by (9). Observe that the set-up detailed at the top of section 4.2 aligns with that of section 3.3. So $v_i(x) = 1$ for $x \geq w_i$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$. Furthermore, $v_{k-1}(x)$ is given by (13) for $x \in (0, w_{k-1})$.

Denote the pdf and cdf of the iid X_{1_i} with f and F , respectively. Then (12) implies that for each $x \in (0, w_i)$, $v_i(x)$ is the maximum of $v_{i+1}((1+r)x + c_{i+1})$ and

$$\max_{q \in (0,1]} \int_a^\infty v_{i+1}((qz + (1-q)(1+r))x + c_{i+1})f(z)dz, \quad (23)$$

where q indicates the proportion invested in the stock at time t_i and

$$a = 1 + r - \frac{1+r}{q} - \frac{c_{i+1}}{qx}.$$

Transforming the integral in (23) with the substitution

$$y = (qz + (1-q)(1+r))x + c_{i+1}$$

yields

$$\frac{1}{qx} \int_0^\infty v_{i+1}(y)f\left(1 + r - \frac{1+r}{q} + \frac{y - c_{i+1}}{qx}\right)dy. \quad (24)$$

Summarizing,

$$v_i(x) = \max \left\{ v_{i+1}((1+r)x + c_{i+1}), \max_{q \in (0,1]} (24) \right\}. \quad (25)$$

Let $\theta = (1+r)x + c_{i+1}$. Algorithm 3 first computes $v_{i+1}(\theta)$, which is needed in (25). If $\theta \leq 0$, then $c_{i+1} < 0$, and it follows that $v_{i+1}(\theta) = 0$. If $0 \leq \theta \leq \min_{y \in D_{i+1}} y$, then a lower bound of $v_{i+1}(\theta)$ is given by 0. If $\min_{y \in D_{i+1}} y \leq \theta < w_{i+1}$, then a lower bound of $v_{i+1}(\theta)$ is given by $v_{i+1}(y^*)$, where y^* is the closest lesser element in D_{i+1} to θ . If $w_{i+1} \leq \theta$, then $v_{i+1}(\theta) = 1$.

Algorithm 3 computes (24) as

$$(1 - F(a)) \cdot \frac{\sum_{y \in D_{i+1}} v_{i+1}(y) f\left(1 + r - \frac{1+r}{q} + \frac{y - c_{i+1}}{qx}\right)}{\sum_{y \in D_{i+1}} f\left(1 + r - \frac{1+r}{q} + \frac{y - c_{i+1}}{qx}\right)}. \quad (26)$$

Note that the fraction in (26) approximates the expectation of $v_{i+1}(Y)$ given $Y > 0$, where Y has pdf

$$\frac{1}{qx} \cdot f\left(1 + r - \frac{1+r}{q} + \frac{y - c_{i+1}}{qx}\right).$$

Furthermore, $\mathbb{P}(Y > 0) = 1 - F(a)$.

The maximum over q in (25) is computed with an iterated grid search, where the grid is refined at each iteration. In particular, the first grid tests q in $G_1 = \{.01, .02, \dots, .99\}$. Let q_1 denote the q in G_1 that produces the maximum of (26). The next grid is $G_2 = \{q_1 \pm .001m : m = 0, 1, \dots, 9\}$. Let q_2 denote the q in G_2 that produces the maximum of (26). The last grid is $G_3 = \{q_2 + .0001m : m = -9, -8, \dots, 10\}$. Let q_3 denote the q in G_2 that produces the maximum of (26). From here, algorithm 3 uses the approximation

$$\max_{q \in (0,1]} (24) \approx (26)|_{q=q_3}.$$

4.2.3 Computing $\widehat{v}_0(c_0)$

Algorithm 4 computes $\bar{v}_0(c_0)$ in a similar fashion to how algorithm 3 computes $v_0(c_0)$. The differences are outlined below.

- $\bar{v}_{k-1}(x)$ is given by

$$(1 - p_{k-1}) \cdot (13) + p_{k-1}v_k(x)$$

for $x \in (0, w_i)$.

- \bar{v}_i is computed using (21) for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 2$. The expectation in (21) is computed via (26) (after replacing v with \bar{v}). Like in algorithm 3, the maximum in (21) is computed by comparing $\mathbf{r} = (0, 1)$ with the optimal $\mathbf{r} = (q, (1 - q))$ coming from the iterated grid search.
- The statements about $v_{i+1}(\theta)$ given in section 4.2.2 also hold after replacing v with \bar{v} .

4.2.4 Simulating (2) and the right side of (19)

First consider simulation of (2). Execute algorithm 3 and return the $q_i^*(x)$ for $x \in D_i$. The values of $q_i^*(x)$ for $x \notin D_i$ are computed via the following linear interpolation. Set

$$q_i^*(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq 0 \\ 0 & x \geq w_i. \end{cases}$$

For $x \in (0, w_i) \setminus D_i$, let y_x denote the largest element of $D_i \cup \{0\}$ that is less than or equal to x , and set

$$q_i^*(x) = q_i^*(y_x) + \frac{x - y_x}{w_i/M} \cdot (q_i^*(y_x + w_i/M) - q_i^*(y_x)).$$

To simulate (2) simply use the q_i^* described above as the q_i in algorithm 1.

The procedure to simulate the right side of (19) is very similar. Follow the above procedure after replacing algorithms 3 and 1 with 4 and 2, respectively.

4.3 Results

First consider the case where a mortality distribution is not present, and a constant annual withdrawal of 1 unit is made for k years, after an initial investment ($c_0 > 0$ and $c_i = -1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$).

Figure 6 illustrates the $v_0(x)$ and $q_i^*(x)$ returned from algorithm 3 for various k . In general, $q_i^*(x)$ is decreasing over x , indicating that the optimal proportion invested in the S&P Composite Index decreases as c_0 increases.

Figure 7 illustrates the minimum x such that $v_0(x) \geq C$ for various C and k . Of note, an initial investment of 30 (or 20) units allows an investor to make 50 (or 25) annual withdrawals of 1 unit with 95% confidence.

Figure 8 shows that the $v_0(x)$ returned from algorithm 3 are reproducible via the Monte Carlo simulation described in section 4.2.4. Furthermore, the optimal portfolio weights coming from algorithm 3 offer a noticeable improvement to $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ over constant portfolio weights.

Figure 9 shows how $v_0(x)$ is affected by μ and σ when $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$. In general, small changes to μ and σ result in noticeable changes to $v_0(x)$. Let π_i^* denote the π_i returned from algorithm 3 using $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$. Interestingly, the $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ returned from algorithm 1 with $\pi_i = \pi_i^*$ and $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ are very close to the $v_0(c_0)$ that use $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$. In other words, the optimal portfolio weights returned from algorithm 3 with $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ can serve as the optimal portfolio weights when instead $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, provided μ and σ are close to 1.083 and .1753, respectively.

Next consider the case where a mortality distribution is not present, and a constant annual withdrawal of 1 unit is made for k_2 years, after executing DCA for k_1 years ($c_0 = c_1 = \dots = c_{k_1-1} > 0$ and $c_i = -1$ for $i = k_1, k_1+1, \dots, k_1+k_2-1$). Table 3 shows the DCA investment amount (c_0) that supports execution of the k_2 years of withdrawals with 95% confidence. For comparison, the numbers in parenthesis indicate $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ ($k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$) when $\pi_i = (1, 0)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$, in which case the portfolio is always fully invested in the S&P Composite Index. In general, the advantage of using optimal portfolio weights instead of $\pi_i = (1, 0)$ decreases as k_1 and k_2 increase. For the k_1 and k_2 considered in Table 3, the improvement in $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ resulting from using optimal portfolio weights ranges from .02 to .05.

Next consider the case where a mortality distribution is present, and a constant annual withdrawal of 1 unit is made until death, after executing DCA for k_1 years ($c_0 = c_1 = \dots = c_{k_1-1} > 0$ and $c_i = -1$ for $i = k_1, k_1 + 1, \dots$). Table 4 shows the DCA investment amount (c_0) that supports execution of the withdrawals until death with 95% confidence. For comparison, the numbers in parenthesis indicate $\mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq 0)$ when $\pi_i = (1, 0)$ for all i , in which case the portfolio is always fully invested in the S&P Composite Index. In general, the advantage of using optimal portfolio weights instead of $\pi_i = (1, 0)$ decreases




Fig. 6 Using algorithm 3 with $M = 300$ and $w = r = 0$, illustrates $v_0(x)$ (thick line) and $q_i^*(x)$ (thick dashed line) for various k , provided $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ and $c_{i+1} = -1$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$. The thin horizontal dotted line indicates the 95% confidence level to compare with $v_0(x)$.

Table 3 Necessary and sufficient x to complete the following schedule with 95% confidence. Invest x annually for 10, 20, ..., 50 years. Then withdrawal 1 unit annually for 30, 40, ..., 70 years. The x were found by trial and error with algorithm 3 and then checked using algorithm 1 with $N = 100,000$ (as described in section 4.2.4). For comparison, the numbers in parenthesis indicate $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ (from algorithm 1) when $\pi_i = (1, 0)$ for all i . Note that $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$ where k_1 is the years of DCA and k_2 is the years of withdrawals. Algorithms use $w = r = 0$, $M = 300$, $N = 100,000$ and $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$.

Years of DCA	Years of Withdrawals				
	30	40	50	60	70
10	1.89 (.896)	2.21 (.906)	2.44 (.913)	2.60 (.919)	2.70 (.922)
20	.76 (.906)	.89 (.916)	.97 (.921)	1.03 (.924)	
30	.39 (.911)	.46 (.921)	.50 (.924)		
40	.23 (.922)	.26 (.924)			
50	.14 (.930)				




Fig. 7 Using algorithm 3 with $w = r = 0$, illustrates the minimum x such that $v_0(x) \geq C$ for various C and k . Note the assumption that $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ and $c_{i+1} = -1$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$.

as the starting age and k_1 increase. For the starting ages and k_1 considered in Table 4, the improvement in $\mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq 0)$ resulting from using optimal portfolio weights ranges from .005 to .02.

Last consider the case where a mortality distribution is present, and a constant annual withdrawal of 1 unit is made until death, after an initial investment ($c_0 > 0$ and $c_i = -1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$).

Figure 10 shows that the $\bar{v}_0(x)$ returned from algorithm 4 are reproducible via the Monte Carlo simulation described in section 4.2.4. For c_0 between 15 and 25, the optimal portfolio weights coming from algorithm 4 offer a small, but noticeable, improvement to $\mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq 0)$ over constant portfolio weights. For other c_0 , the improvement is hardly distinguishable.

Figure 11 illustrates the minimum x such that $\bar{v}_0(x) \geq C$ for various C . Of note, an initial investment of 30 (or 20) units at age 60 allows an investor to make annual withdrawals of 1 unit until death with 99% (or 90%) confidence.




Fig. 8 Using algorithm 3 with $M = 300$ and $w = r = 0$, illustrates $v_0(x)$ for $k = 50$. Note the assumption that $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ and $c_{i+1} = -1$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$. Simulated $v_0(x)$ indicate (2), computed as described in section 4.2.4. The $u_0(x)$ indicate the returned $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ from algorithm 1, with $c_0 = x$ and $\pi_i = (\pi_{i1}, 1 - \pi_{i1})$ constant over i .

Table 4 Necessary and sufficient x to complete the following schedule with 95% confidence. Invest x annually for 10, 20, ..., 50 years. Then withdrawal 1 unit annually until death. The x were found by trial and error with algorithm 4 and then checked using algorithm 2 with $N = 100,000$ (as described in section 4.2.4). For comparison, the numbers in parenthesis indicate $\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq 0)$ (from algorithm 2) when $\pi_i = (1, 0)$ for all i . Note that algorithms use $w = r = 0$, $M = 300$, $N = 100,000$ and $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$.

Years of DCA	Starting age				
	20	30	40	50	60
10	2.58 (.929)	2.42 (.928)	2.19 (.929)	1.91 (.932)	1.54 (.938)
20	.95 (.930)	.86 (.931)	.75 (.934)	.60 (.940)	
30	.45 (.936)	.38 (.936)	.30 (.939)		
40	.22 (.941)	.17 (.942)			
50	.10 (.945)				




Fig. 9 Using algorithm 3 with $M = 300$ and $w = r = 0$, illustrates $v_0(x)$ for $k = 40$ and various combinations of μ and σ . Note the assumption that $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ and $c_{i+1} = -1$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$. Let π_i^* denote the π_i returned from algorithm 3 using $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$. Left: The red + and \times indicate simulated versions of $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ (from algorithm 1) when $\pi_i = \pi_i^*$ and $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ with $(\mu, \sigma) = (1.083, .1553)$ and $(\mu, \sigma) = (1.083, .1953)$, respectively. Right: The red \times and + indicate simulated versions of $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ (from algorithm 1) when $\pi_i = \pi_i^*$ and $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ with $(\mu, \sigma) = (1.093, .1553)$ and $(\mu, \sigma) = (1.073, .1753)$, respectively.

5 Conclusion

In general, maximization of $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq 0)$ over the π_i offers a noticeable, but sometimes small, improvement over the $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq 0)$ produced when the π_i are constant over i . Of the constant portfolio weights, $\pi_i = (1, 0)$ appears to produce $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_k \geq 0)$ that are closest to their maximum versions; however, the difference can be several tenths. So optimal portfolio weights can offer investors a worthwhile improvement in their probability to complete a given schedule of investments and withdrawals.

This kind of optimization can also be used in the context of a guaranteed lifetime withdrawal benefit (GLWB) rider on a variable annuity. In particular, the GLWB rider that precludes any withdrawals outside of the pre-determined $c_i = -1$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) can be priced as follows. Consider the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}_0 &= c_0, \\ \widetilde{W}_i &= [\mathcal{X}_{(0,\infty)}(\widetilde{W}_{i-1})Y_{i-1} + 1 - \mathcal{X}_{(0,\infty)}(\widetilde{W}_{i-1})]\widetilde{W}_{i-1} \\ &\quad + (1 - \mathcal{X}_{(0,t_i]}(\tau))c_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k. \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 10 Using algorithm 4 with $M = 300$ and $w = r = 0$, illustrates $\bar{v}_0(x)$ for a starting age of 65. Note the assumption that $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ and $c_{i+1} = -1$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots$. Simulated $\bar{v}_0(x)$ indicate the right side of (19), computed as described in section 4.2.4. The $\bar{u}_0(x)$ indicate the returned $\mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq 0)$ from algorithm 2, with $c_0 = x$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i = (\pi_{i1}, 1 - \pi_{i1})$ constant over i .

Compute $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f(c_0) = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{W}_k].$$

Provided enough customers, a price of c_0 will let the insurance company generate a profit of approximately $N \cdot f(c_0)$ at time t_k , where N is the number of customers. Moreover, if t_i indicates year i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, then the annual withdrawal percentage of the GLWB is given by $(100/c_0)\%$. Typically, variable annuities do not offer this sort of optimized investment, but it could offer customers a noticeable price reduction without changing the annual withdrawal amount. Performing this optimization in the inflation-adjusted setting is especially appealing, since then withdrawals and expected profits will be inflation

Necessary and sufficient initial investments to withdraw 1 unit, annually, until death with confidence C




Fig. 11 Using algorithm 4 with $w = r = 0$, illustrates the minimum x such that $\bar{v}_0(x) \geq C$ for various C and k . Note the assumption that $X_{1i} \sim \mathcal{N}(1.083, .1753^2)$ and $c_{i+1} = -1$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots$

adjusted. Fortunately, this scheme is easily modified to accommodate a guaranteed death benefit (GDB) rider. If the guaranteed death benefit is z then the expected profit per customer (at time t_k) for the variable annuity with GLWB and GDB riders is $f(c_0) - z$. The author plans to investigate this optimization and compare the resulting prices with current variable annuity prices.

Future research could consider investment and withdrawal amounts c_i that are not pre-determined constants at time 0. At the very least, each $c_i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ would need to be $\mathcal{F}(t_i)$ -measurable. On its own, this basic measurability condition leads to trivial optimization. The optimization is more interesting under the following scheme. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C \in (0, 1)$. At each time t_i , compute $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $g(x) = v_i(W_i)$, where $v_i(W_i)$ is computed using $c_j = x$ for $j = i, i + 1, \dots, k$. Set c_i to be the least x such that $g(x) \geq C$. If there is no such x , set $c_i = 0$. In words this scheme starts with an initial investment of $c_0 > 0$, and then the c_i are non-positive for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, with each c_i being

adapted in time to maximize the probability (given the information up to time t_i) of withdrawing $-c_i$ at each time t_i, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_k . It would be interesting to investigate the distribution of these adapted c_i , meaning look at $\mathbb{P}(c_i \leq -y)$ for a desirable withdrawal amount $y > 0$. Ideally, the $\mathbb{P}(c_i \leq -y)$ should be greater than or equal to some threshold $C \in (0, 1)$. Ultimately, the goal of this scheme would be to achieve increased $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq 0)$ at the cost of having variable withdrawal amounts.

Appendix A Proofs

A.1 Additional notation and definitions

The proofs in section A involve the following notation and definitions, which were not mentioned in section 2. Use \mathbb{R}^* to denote the extended real numbers. If X and Y are sets and $f : X \rightarrow Y$, the graph of f is

$$\text{Gr}(f) = \{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in X\}.$$

Furthermore, the x -section of $D \subset X \times Y$ is given by

$$D_x = \{y : (x, y) \in D\},$$

and the projection of D onto X is given by

$$\text{proj}_X(D) = \{x : (x, y) \in D\}.$$

A.2 Additional lemmas

The proofs in section A involve the following lemmas, which were not mentioned in section 2.

Lemma 3 (simplified version of proposition 7.30 from Bertsekas and Shreve (1996))
Let X and Y be separable metrizable spaces and let μ be a Borel probability measure on the Borel σ -algebra of Y . If $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded and continuous, then the function $\lambda : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\lambda(x) = \int_Y f(x, y) d\mu(y)$$

is continuous.

Lemma 4 (simplified version of proposition 7.31 from Bertsekas and Shreve (1996))
Let X and Y be separable metrizable spaces, let μ be a Borel probability measure on the Borel σ -algebra of Y , and let $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Borel measurable. If f is upper semicontinuous and bounded above, then so is the function $\lambda : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\lambda(x) = \int_Y f(x, y) d\mu(y).$$

Lemma 5 (proposition 7.33 of Bertsekas and Shreve (1996)) *Let X be a metrizable space, Y a compact metrizable space, D a closed subset of $X \times Y$, and let $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$ be upper semicontinuous. Let $f^* : \text{proj}_X(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$ be given by*

$$f^*(x) = \sup_{y \in D_x} f(x, y).$$

Then $\text{proj}_X(D)$ is closed in X , f^ is upper semicontinuous, and there exists a Borel measurable function $\psi : \text{proj}_X(D) \rightarrow Y$ such that $\text{Gr}(\psi) \subset D$ and*

$$f(x, \psi(x)) = f^*(x) \quad \forall x \in \text{proj}_X(D).$$

A.3 Proof that v_i are well-defined

Obviously, v_k is well-defined. It remains to be seen whether the v_i are well-defined for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$. To begin, v_i is given in another representation that (10) will be shown to satisfy. Let $v_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$, denote the non-decreasing upper semicontinuous functions satisfying

$$v_i(W_i) = \sup_{\pi_i} \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A1}$$

Note that the supremum in (A1) indicates the supremum over all $\mathcal{F}(t_i)$ -measurable portfolio weight functions π_i .

In order for the recursion given by (A1) to make sense, the v_i need to be well-defined. This is shown via induction. Suppose that v_{i+1} is well-defined. The goal from here is to show that v_i is well-defined.

Observe that $v_{i+1}(W_{i+1})$ is \mathcal{F} -measurable and integrable because v_{i+1} is bounded and Borel measurable, and W_{i+1} is \mathcal{F} -measurable. So $\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]$ is well-defined.

Since $\sigma(W_i) \subset \mathcal{F}(t_i)$, a property of conditional expectation gives

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}(t_i)] \mid W_i] \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A2}$$

Recall from Section 2 and (1) that $W_{i+1} = (\pi_i \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)W_i + c_{i+1}$. Observe that π_i and W_i are both $\mathcal{F}(t_i)$ -measurable, and \mathbf{X}_i is independent of $\mathcal{F}(t_i)$. By lemma 1,

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}(t_i)] = H(\pi_i, W_i) \quad \text{a.s.}, \tag{A3}$$

where

$$H(\mathbf{p}, x) = \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}((\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})] \tag{A4}$$

for each $\mathbf{p} \in \Pi$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows from (A2) and (A3) that

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] = \mathbb{E}[H(\pi_i, W_i) \mid W_i] \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A5}$$

The next goal is to show that

$$\sup_{\pi_i} \mathbb{E}[H(\pi_i, W_i) \mid W_i] = \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\pi_i} H(\pi_i, W_i) \mid W_i]. \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A6}$$

Observe that

$$H(\boldsymbol{\pi}, W_i) \leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} H(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, W_i) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

for each $\mathcal{F}(t_i)$ -measurable portfolio weight function $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[H(\boldsymbol{\pi}, W_i) \mid W_i] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} H(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, W_i) \mid W_i] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

So (A6) holds when $=$ is replaced with \leq . To show that (A6) holds when $=$ is replaced with \geq , first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} \mathbb{E}[H(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, W_i) \mid W_i] &\geq \sup_{\phi} \mathbb{E}[H(\phi(W_i), W_i) \mid W_i] \\ &= \sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i), W_i) \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

where the supremum is taken over the Borel measurable functions $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Pi$. Because of (A7), it suffices to show

$$\sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i), W_i) = \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} H(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, W_i) \mid W_i]. \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A8}$$

This is done by showing

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} H(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, W_i) = \sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i), W_i) \quad \text{a.s.}, \tag{A9}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i), W_i) \mid W_i] = \sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i), W_i) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A10}$$

The $\phi(W_i)$ in (A9) are $\sigma(W_i)$ -measurable. Since $\sigma(W_i) \subset \mathcal{F}(t_i)$, it follows that (A9) holds when $=$ is replaced with \geq . To show that (A9) holds when $=$ is replaced with \leq , observe that for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} H(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, W_i))(\omega) &= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} H(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i(\omega), W_i(\omega)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, W_i(\omega)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i(\omega)), W_i(\omega)) \\ &= (\sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i), W_i))(\omega). \end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

Moreover, it is now clear from (A11) that

$$\sup_{\phi} H(\phi(W_i), W_i) = \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, W_i) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A12}$$

To show (A10), it suffices to show that the right side of (A10) is $\sigma(W_i)$ -measurable. Let $G : \Pi \times \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)^n$ be such that

$$G(\mathbf{r}, x, \mathbf{X}) = (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X})x + c_{i+1}.$$

Observe that G is continuous. Since v_{i+1} is upper semicontinuous, it follows that $v_{i+1} \circ G$ is upper semicontinuous. Applying lemma 4 reveals that H is upper semicontinuous. To see this, let f, X and Y in lemma 4 be $v_{i+1} \circ G, \Pi \times \mathbb{R}$ and $(0, \infty)^n$, respectively. Next, applying lemma 5 reveals that $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, x)$ is upper semicontinuous over $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and there is a Borel measurable function $\phi^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Pi$ such that

$$H(\phi^*(x), x) = \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{A13}$$

Therefore $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, x)$ is Borel measurable over $x \in \mathbb{R}$, which implies $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, W_i)$ is $\sigma(W_i)$ -measurable. Applying (A12), the right side of (A10) is $\sigma(W_i)$ -measurable. Now it follows from (A1), (A5), (A6), (A8), (A12) and (A13) that

$$v_i(W_i) = \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, W_i) = H(\phi^*(W_i), W_i) \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A14}$$

Looking at (A4), it is not hard to see that $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, x)$ is non-decreasing over $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, the fact that v_{i+1} maps to $[0, 1]$ implies $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, x)$ also maps to $[0, 1]$. It is now clear that the v_i as given in (10) are well-defined and satisfy (A1).

A.4 Proof that (2) is given by $v_0(\mathbf{c}_0)$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w) = \mathbb{E}[v_k(W_k)]. \tag{A15}$$

By the law of total expectation, for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1})] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]]. \tag{A16}$$

Next, the goal is to show

$$\sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_i} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]] = \sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\pi_i} \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]]. \tag{A17}$$

Obviously,

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] \leq \sup_{\pi_i} \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{A18}$$

It follows from (A18) that (A17) holds when $=$ is replaced with \leq . To show that (A17) holds when $=$ is replaced with \geq , first recall from (A5) that

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] = \mathbb{E}[H(\pi_i, W_i) \mid W_i] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]] &\geq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i = \phi(W_i)} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]] \\
&= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i = \phi(W_i)} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[H(\phi(W_i), W_i) \mid W_i]] \\
&= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i = \phi(W_i)} \mathbb{E}[H(\phi(W_i), W_i)] \\
&= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}, \phi} \mathbb{E}[H(\phi(W_i), W_i)].
\end{aligned}$$

Next observe that (A1) and (A.6) imply

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i] = H(\phi^*(W_i), W_i) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

So now it suffices to show

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}, \phi} \mathbb{E}[H(\phi(W_i), W_i)] \geq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[H(\phi^*(W_i), W_i)], \quad (\text{A19})$$

which is clearly true.

Combining (A16), (A17) and (A1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i} \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1})] &= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_i} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]] \\
&= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_i} \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}(W_{i+1}) \mid W_i]] \quad (\text{A20}) \\
&= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}} \mathbb{E}[v_i(W_i)].
\end{aligned}$$

By repeated application of (A20),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}[v_k(W_k)] &= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-2}} \mathbb{E}[v_{k-1}(W_{k-1})] \\
&= \sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-3}} \mathbb{E}[v_{k-2}(W_{k-2})] \quad (\text{A21}) \\
&= \dots \\
&= \mathbb{E}[v_0(W_0)].
\end{aligned}$$

Again, $W_0 = c_0$ is deterministic, so $\mathbb{E}[v_0(W_0)] = v_0(c_0)$. It follows from (A15) and (A21) that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-1}} \mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w) = v_0(c_0). \quad (\text{A22})$$

A.5 Proofs for stock-bond portfolios

Observe that v_k is the indicator function of $[w_k, \infty)$, so v_k is continuous over $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{w_k\}$ and right continuous at w_k . Now proceed by induction. Suppose v_{i+1}

is continuous over $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{w_{i+1}\}$ and right continuous at w_{i+1} . Further suppose that $v_{i+1}(x) = 1$ for $x \geq w_{i+1}$, and if $c_{i+2}, \dots, c_k \leq 0$, suppose that $v_{i+1}(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$.

For $\mathbf{r} \in \Pi$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $A_{\mathbf{r},x} = \{\omega : (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1} = w_{i+1}\}$. Using the notation of section A.3, observe that

$$H(\mathbf{r}, x) = \int_{\Omega \setminus A_{\mathbf{r},x}} (v_{i+1} \circ G)(\mathbf{r}, x, \mathbf{X}_i) d\mathbb{P} + \int_{A_{\mathbf{r},x}} (v_{i+1} \circ G)(\mathbf{r}, x, \mathbf{X}_i) d\mathbb{P}.$$

Under the setting outlined at the beginning of section 3.3, $\mathbb{P}(A_{\mathbf{r},x}) = 0$ for $(\mathbf{r}, x) \neq ((0, 1), w_i)$. Therefore

$$H(\mathbf{r}, x) = \int_{\Omega \setminus A_{\mathbf{r},x}} (v_{i+1} \circ G)(\mathbf{r}, x, \mathbf{X}_i) d\mathbb{P}$$

when $(\mathbf{r}, x) \neq ((0, 1), w_i)$. By assumption, v_{i+1} is continuous over $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{w_{i+1}\}$. Also recall from section A.3 that G is continuous. Therefore $v_{i+1} \circ G$ is continuous over

$$\{(\mathbf{r}, x, \mathbf{X}) \in \Pi \times \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)^2 : (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X})x + c_{i+1} \neq w_{i+1}\}.$$

It follows from lemma 3 that $H(\mathbf{r}, x)$ is continuous over $(\Pi \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus \{((0, 1), w_i)\}$. To see that $v_i(x)$ is continuous at any point $x \in (-\infty, w_i)$, simply take advantage of the uniform continuity of H over $\Pi \times [x - 1, (x + w_i)/2]$.

Observe that

$$H((0, 1), x) = \mathbb{E}[v_{i+1}((1+r)x + c_{i+1})] = v_{i+1}((1+r)x + c_{i+1}).$$

Since $v_{i+1}(x) = 1$ for $x \geq w_{i+1}$, it follows that $H((0, 1), x) = 1$ for $x \geq w_i$. Recall that v_i maps to $[0, 1]$ and $v_i(x) \geq H((0, 1), x)$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore $v_i(x) = 1$ for $x \geq w_i$.

The next goal is to show $v_i(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$, provided $c_{i+1}, \dots, c_k \leq 0$. Since $c_{i+2}, \dots, c_k \leq 0$, it follows from the assumption in the first paragraph of this section that $v_{i+1}(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$. Additionally having $c_{i+1} \leq 0$ implies that for each $\mathbf{r} \in \Pi$ and $x < 0$, $H(\mathbf{r}, x) = 0$. Thus, $v_i(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$.

Showing (12) reduces to showing

$$\int_B v_{i+1}((\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1}) d\mathbb{P} = 0 \tag{A23}$$

for $x \geq 0$, where $B = \{\omega : (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1} < 0\}$. If $c_{i+1} \geq 0$, then $\mathbb{P}(B) = 0$ and (A23) follows. If $c_{i+1} < 0$, then $c_{i+2}, \dots, c_k \leq 0$ as well (see section 2). By the previous paragraph, $v_{i+1}(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$. So (A23) holds when $c_{i+1} < 0$.

A.6 Proof that the right side of (19) is given by $\bar{v}_0(c_0)$

This proof is very similar to that of sections A.3 and A.4, so only an outline with the key differences is presented. First introduce the additional recursion

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\tau}_0 &= 0, \\ \bar{\tau}_i &= \bar{\tau}_{i-1} + \tau_{i-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.\end{aligned}\tag{A24}$$

Next observe that for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$,

$$\mathcal{X}_{(0,t_i]}(\tau) = \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \tau_j\right) = \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}(\bar{\tau}_{i-1} + \tau_{i-1}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{W}_i &= (1 - \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}(\bar{\tau}_{i-1} + \tau_{i-1}))(Y_{i-1}\bar{W}_{i-1} + c_i) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}(\bar{\tau}_{i-1} + \tau_{i-1})\bar{W}_{i-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.\end{aligned}\tag{A25}$$

Like in section A.3, \bar{v}_i is given first in another representation that (21) will be shown to satisfy. Let $\hat{v}_k : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $\hat{v}_k(x, t) = v_k(x)$, where $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, \dots\}$. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, let $\hat{v}_i : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote the functions satisfying

$$\hat{v}_i(\bar{W}_i, \bar{\tau}_i) = \sup_{\pi_i} \mathbb{E}[\hat{v}_{i+1}(\bar{W}_{i+1}, \bar{\tau}_{i+1}) \mid (\bar{W}_i, \bar{\tau}_i)] \quad \text{a.s.},\tag{A26}$$

with

- $\hat{v}_i(x, t)$ upper semicontinuous w.r.t. x for each $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$,
- $\hat{v}_i(x, t) = v_k(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t = 1, 2, \dots$,
- $\hat{v}_i(x, 0)$ non-decreasing and $\hat{v}_i(x, 0) = \bar{v}_i(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose that \hat{v}_{i+1} is well-defined. The goal from here is to show that \bar{v}_i is well-defined. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{v}_{i+1}(\bar{W}_{i+1}, \bar{\tau}_{i+1}) &= \hat{v}_{i+1}\left((1 - \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}(\bar{\tau}_i + \tau_i))(Y_i\bar{W}_i + c_{i+1})\right. \\ &\quad \left.+ \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}(\bar{\tau}_i + \tau_i)\bar{W}_i, \bar{\tau}_i + \tau_i\right) \\ &= (1 - \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}(\bar{\tau}_i + \tau_i))\hat{v}_{i+1}(Y_i\bar{W}_i + c_{i+1}, \bar{\tau}_i + \tau_i) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{X}_{[1,\infty)}(\bar{\tau}_i + \tau_i)\hat{v}_{i+1}(\bar{W}_i, \bar{\tau}_i + \tau_i).\end{aligned}\tag{A27}$$

Since $\sigma((\bar{W}_i, \bar{\tau}_i)) \subset \mathcal{F}(t_i)$, a property of conditional expectation gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\hat{v}_{i+1}(\bar{W}_{i+1}, \bar{\tau}_{i+1}) \mid (\bar{W}_i, \bar{\tau}_i)] \\ = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\hat{v}_{i+1}(\bar{W}_{i+1}, \bar{\tau}_{i+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}(t_i)] \mid (\bar{W}_i, \bar{\tau}_i)] \quad \text{a.s.}\end{aligned}\tag{A28}$$

It follows from (A27) and lemma 1 that

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{v}_{i+1}(\overline{W}_{i+1}, \overline{\tau}_{i+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}(t_i)] = \overline{H}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (\text{A29})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{H}(\mathbf{p}, x, t) = \mathbb{E}[(1 - \mathcal{X}_{[1, \infty)}(t + \tau_i))\widehat{v}_{i+1}((\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1}, t + \tau_i) \\ + \mathcal{X}_{[1, \infty)}(t + \tau_i)\widehat{v}_{i+1}(x, t + \tau_i)] \end{aligned}$$

for each $\mathbf{p} \in \Pi$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By the independence of τ_i to each \mathbf{X}_i , it follows that

$$\overline{H}(\mathbf{p}, x, t) = \begin{cases} (1 - p_i)\mathbb{E}[\widehat{v}_{i+1}((\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1}, 0)] + p_i\widehat{v}_{i+1}(x, 1) & t = 0, \\ (1 - p_i)\widehat{v}_{i+1}(x, t) + p_i\widehat{v}_{i+1}(x, t + 1) & t = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

By the induction assumption, $\widehat{v}_{i+1}(x, t) = v_k(x)$ and $\widehat{v}_{i+1}(x, 0) = \overline{v}_{i+1}(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore

$$\overline{H}(\mathbf{p}, x, t) = \begin{cases} (1 - p_i)\mathbb{E}[\overline{v}_{i+1}((\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{X}_i)x + c_{i+1})] + p_i v_k(x) & t = 0, \\ v_k(x) & t = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

It follows from (A28) and (A29) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{v}_{i+1}(\overline{W}_{i+1}, \overline{\tau}_{i+1}) \mid (\overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\overline{H}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i) \mid (\overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i)] \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (\text{A30})$$

Paralleling the logic of section A.3, the following result is eventually achieved. $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, t)$ is upper semicontinuous over x for each $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and there is a Borel measurable function $\overline{\phi} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \Pi$ such that

$$\widehat{v}_i(\overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i) = \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} H(\mathbf{r}, \overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i) = \overline{H}(\overline{\phi}(\overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i), \overline{W}_i, \overline{\tau}_i) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Moreover, a satisfactory \widehat{v}_i is given by

$$\widehat{v}_i(x, t) = \sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, t), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

\widehat{v}_i is well-defined because \overline{H} is a well-defined mapping to $[0, 1]$ and

- $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, t)$ is upper semicontinuous w.r.t. x for each $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$,
- $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, t) = v_k(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t = 1, 2, \dots$,
- $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, 0)$ is non-decreasing and $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, 0) = \overline{v}_i(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Likewise, \overline{v}_i is well-defined because \overline{H} is a well-defined mapping to $[0, 1]$ and

- $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, 0)$ is upper semicontinuous w.r.t. x ,
- $\sup_{\mathbf{r} \in \Pi} \overline{H}(\mathbf{r}, x, 0)$ is non-decreasing w.r.t. x .

From here, this proof mimics that of section A.4 after making the following changes. Except for $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$, replace each instance of W_j, v_j, H, ϕ^* and c_0 with $(\bar{W}_j, \bar{\tau}_j), \hat{v}_j, \bar{H}, \bar{\phi}$ and $(c_0, 0)$, respectively, for $j = 0, i, i+1, k-2, k-1, k$. Replace each instance of $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ with $\mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq w)$. The final result is

$$\sup_{\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{k-1}} \mathbb{P}(\bar{W}_k \geq w) = \hat{v}_0(c_0, 0) = \bar{v}_0(c_0).$$

Algorithm 1 Compute $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$ given π_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Require: $n = 2, N \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large

Require: X_{1i} are independent for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Require: $X_{2i} = 1 + r, r > -1$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Require: $\pi_i = (q_i(W_i), 1 - q_i(W_i))$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

$m \leftarrow 0$ ▷ initialize m

while $m \leq N$ **do**

$m \leftarrow m + 1$

$i \leftarrow 0$ ▷ initialize i

$W \leftarrow c_0$ ▷ initialize W

while $i \leq k$ **do**

$i \leftarrow i + 1$

X is a realization of $X_{1,i-1}$

$W \leftarrow (q_{i-1}(W)X + (1 - q_{i-1}(W))(1 + r))W + c_i$ ▷ computes W_i

end while

$b_m \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1, & W \geq w \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

end while

$\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w) \leftarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^N b_m$

return $\mathbb{P}(W_k \geq w)$

Algorithm 3 Compute v_i and optimal π_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Require: $n = 2, M \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large**Require:** X_{1i} are iid and continuous with pdf f and cdf F for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ **Require:** $X_{2i} = 1 + r, r \geq 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ **Require:** $G_1 = \{.01, .02, \dots, .99\}$ $i \leftarrow k-1$ ▷ initialize i $D_i \leftarrow \left\{ \frac{mw_i}{M} : m = 1, \dots, 2M \right\}$ ▷ initialize D_i

$$v_i(x) \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1 - F(w_{k-1}(1+r)/x) & x \in D_i \cap (0, w_{k-1}) \\ 1 & x \in D_i \cap [w_{k-1}, \infty) \end{cases}$$
▷ see (13)
while $i > 0$ **do** $i \leftarrow i-1$ $D_i \leftarrow \left\{ \frac{mw_i}{M} : m = 1, \dots, 2M \right\}$ **for** $x \in D_i$ **do** $\theta \leftarrow (1+r)x + c_{i+1}$ ▷ temporary variable $y^* \leftarrow \arg \min_{y \in D_{i+1} \cap (0, \theta)} \theta - y$ $q_i^*(x) \leftarrow 0$ ▷ initial proposal for $q_i^*(x)$

$$v_i(x) \leftarrow \begin{cases} 0 & \theta < \min_{y \in D_{i+1}} y \\ v_{i+1}(y^*) & \min_{y \in D_{i+1}} y \leq \theta < w_{i+1} \\ 1 & w_{i+1} \leq \theta \end{cases}$$
▷ initial proposal for $v_i(x)$
 $q_1 \leftarrow \arg \max_{q \in G_1} (26)$ $G_2 \leftarrow \{q_1 \pm .001m : m = 0, 1, \dots, 9\}$ $q_2 \leftarrow \arg \max_{q \in G_2} (26)$ $G_3 \leftarrow \{q_2 + .0001m : m = -9, -8, \dots, 10\}$ $q_3 \leftarrow \arg \max_{q \in G_3} (26)$ $V \leftarrow (26)|_{q=q_3}$ **if** $v_i(x) < V$ **then** $q_i^*(x) \leftarrow q_3$ $v_i(x) \leftarrow V$ **end if****end for****end while****return** $v_i(W_i), \pi_i = (q_i^*(W_i), 1 - q_i^*(W_i))$ for $W_i \in D_i$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Algorithm 4 Compute \bar{v}_i and optimal π_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Require: $n = 2, M \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large

Require: X_{1_i} are iid and continuous with pdf f and cdf F for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Require: $X_{2_i} = 1 + r, r \geq 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

Require: $G_1 = \{.01, .02, \dots, .99\}$

$i \leftarrow k-1$ ▷ initialize i

$D_i \leftarrow \left\{ \frac{mw_i}{M} : m = 1, \dots, 2M \right\}$ ▷ initialize D_i

$$\bar{v}_i(x) \leftarrow \begin{cases} (1 - p_{k-1})[1 - F(w_{k-1}(1+r)/x)] \\ + p_{k-1}v_k(x) & x \in D_i \cap (0, w_{k-1}) \\ 1 & x \in D_i \cap [w_{k-1}, \infty) \end{cases}$$

while $i > 0$ **do**

$i \leftarrow i-1$

$D_i \leftarrow \left\{ \frac{mw_i}{M} : m = 1, \dots, 2M \right\}$

for $x \in D_i$ **do**

$\theta \leftarrow (1+r)x + c_{i+1}$ ▷ temporary variable

$y^* \leftarrow \arg \min_{y \in D_{i+1} \cap (0, \theta]} \theta - y$

$q_i^*(x) \leftarrow 0$ ▷ initial proposal for $q_i^*(x)$

$$\bar{v}_i(x) \leftarrow \begin{cases} p_i v_k(x) & \theta < \min_{y \in D_{i+1}} y \\ (1 - p_i)\bar{v}_{i+1}(y^*) + p_i v_k(x) & \min_{y \in D_{i+1}} y \leq \theta < w_{i+1} \\ 1 & w_{i+1} \leq \theta \end{cases}$$

$q_1 \leftarrow \arg \max_{q \in G_1} (26)|_{v=\bar{v}}$

$G_2 \leftarrow \{q_1 \pm .001m : m = 0, 1, \dots, 9\}$

$q_2 \leftarrow \arg \max_{q \in G_2} (26)|_{v=\bar{v}}$

$G_3 \leftarrow \{q_2 + .0001m : m = -9, -8, \dots, 10\}$

$q_3 \leftarrow \arg \max_{q \in G_3} (26)|_{v=\bar{v}}$

$V \leftarrow (1 - p_i)(26)|_{v=\bar{v}, q=q_3} + p_i v_k(x)$

if $\bar{v}_i(x) < V$ **then**

$q_i^*(x) \leftarrow q_3$

$\bar{v}_i(x) \leftarrow V$

end if

end for

end while

return $\bar{v}_i(\bar{W}_i), \pi_i = (q_i^*(\bar{W}_i), 1 - q_i^*(\bar{W}_i))$ for $\bar{W}_i \in D_i$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$

References

- Antolín P, Payet S, Yermo J (2010) Assessing default investment strategies in defined contribution pension plans. *OECD Journal: Financial Market Trends* 2010(1):87–115
- Basak S, Shapiro A (2001) Value-at-risk-based risk management: optimal policies and asset prices. *The review of financial studies* 14(2):371–405
- Bertsekas D, Shreve SE (1996) *Stochastic optimal control: the discrete-time case*, vol 5. Athena Scientific
- Butt A, Khemka G (2015) The effect of objective formulation on retirement decision making. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 64:385–395
- De Saporta B, Zili M (2021) *Martingales and Financial Mathematics in Discrete Time*. John Wiley & Sons
- Hakansson NH (1975) Optimal investment and consumption strategies under risk for a class of utility functions. In: *Stochastic Optimization Models in Finance*. Elsevier, p 525–545
- Kallenberg O (2019) *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Probability and its applications, Springer
- Karatzas I, Lehoczky JP, Shreve SE (1987) Optimal portfolio and consumption decisions for a “small investor” on a finite horizon. *SIAM journal on control and optimization* 25(6):1557–1586
- Kraft H, Steffensen M (2013) A dynamic programming approach to constrained portfolios. *European Journal of Operational Research* 229(2):453–461
- Levy H, Levy M (2009) The safety first expected utility model: Experimental evidence and economic implications. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 33(8):1494–1506
- Li Y, Mi H (2021) Portfolio optimization under safety first expected utility with nonlinear probability distortion. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 147:110,917
- Musumeci J, Musumeci J (1999) A dynamic-programming approach to multi-period asset allocation. *Journal of Financial Services Research* 15(1):5–21
- Phelps ES (1962) The accumulation of risky capital: A sequential utility analysis. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* pp 729–743
- Roy AD (1952) Safety first and the holding of assets. *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society* pp 431–449