

STOCHASTIC EXIT-TIME CONTROL ON THE HALF-LINE OVER A FINITE HORIZON [†]

DARIUSZ ZAWISZA

ABSTRACT. We consider a finite-time stochastic drift control problem with the assumption that the control is bounded and the system is controlled until the state process leaves the half-line. Assuming general conditions, it is proved that the resulting parabolic Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equation has a classical solution. In fact, we consider an even more general family of semilinear equations, which might be helpful in solving other control or game problems. Not only is the existence result proved, but also a recursive procedure for finding a solution resulting from a fixed-point argument is provided. An application to the dividend optimization problem is presented.

1. INTRODUCTION

The fundamental challenge in exit-time stochastic control theory lies in designing an optimal strategy by maximizing (or minimizing) a certain functional up to the point where a certain event occurs. The times of these exit events are usually defined by the time that the controlled process exits a certain domain.

We consider a one-dimensional controlled process and define an exit domain as the half-line (this is an unbounded domain). In this case, the exit time can be interpreted, for example, as a time of ruin (in actuarial problems), a default (in the credit risk), an extinction time (in the optimal harvesting problem) or finally the ending of the epidemy (in epidemiological studies). In our study, we concentrate on the Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equation and the Markov feedback policies. There are still not many research papers dedicated to this equation on an unbounded domain.

The most popular method in finding a solution to the HJB equation is the viscosity theory (e.g. Fleming and Soner [17, Chapter V]). However, it is well-known that the viscosity theory is not useful for determining optimal strategies for the stochastic control functional. Therefore, the main objective of the paper is to prove (under very general conditions) that the associated equation admits a classical solution (class $\mathcal{C}^{2,1}$). The existence of such a solution facilitates many numerical methods and allows one to prove that the Markov feedback policies are indeed optimal. We stress the fact that to prove the main theorem, we use a fixed point type method and present a recursive algorithm, which in the stochastic control framework is usually called the gradient iteration algorithm (it is the continuous-time analogue of the value iteration algorithm), which allows us to prove the uniform convergence of the approximating sequence together with the first derivative on the entire space $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$. This is meaningful from the point of view of the feedback strategy convergence because the uniform convergence maintains stability of the algorithm, and consequently is important from the practitioners' point of view, especially in the financial and actuarial industry.

More precisely our paper uses contractive arguments with exponential time-weighted norms (Bielecki's method [7]), which have recently gained a lot of attention in the stochastic control

Date: 25.03.2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 93E20; 35K58; 60H30; 91G80; 49N90.

Key words and phrases. Exit-time control, Cauchy-Dirichlet problem, Hamilton Jacobi Bellman equation, optimal dividend problem, uncertain time horizon.

[†]This paper supersedes arXiv:1703.07339.

theory (and its applications). We present a reasoning which extracts inspiration from: Becherer and Schweizer [5], Bychowska and Leszczyński [9], Ph.D. thesis (in Polish) of Zawisza [35], Zawisza [34]. In all these papers a fixed time horizon case (the whole \mathbb{R}^n as a domain for the equation) was considered. There are already other papers which address the existence result for semi-linear or HJB equations on entire \mathbb{R}^n with the conditions similar to ours (e.g. Addona [1], Addona et al. [2], Pardoux and Peng [27], Rubio [30]) and even using similar methods. However, we should stress the fact that the extension of the method from the fixed time horizon to the random exit time is not trivial because the estimates of the hitting time have to be proved and the boundary behaviour of a diffusion has to be revealed. In addition, our solution is tailor-made for the one-dimensional case only and is not easily extendable to the multidimensional case.

When it comes to the literature on exit-time stochastic control, it is focused more on exit from a bounded domain and on an infinite-horizon framework and integrates elliptic equations with a BSDE perspective (see, for example, Buckdahn and Nie [8] or Royer [29] and references therein). We recommend also the books of Fleming and Rishel [17] and Krylov [25] for the classical approach to bounded domain problems. In the unbounded domain parabolic case, we are aware of a recent result of Calvia et al. [11] who solve a stochastic control problem on the half-space of a general Hilbert space. As the primary instrument, they use mild and strong \mathcal{K} -solutions. Our result is merely one-dimensional, but at the same time contains topics and cases that are not included in [11]:

- (1) First, we show how to handle a one-dimensional model with a non-trivial in-homogeneous boundary condition and a non-trivial diffusion coefficient, which cannot be done under the framework presented in [11]. Note that in-homogeneous boundary condition is crucial for solving many practical problems (for instance, risk sensitive problems).
- (2) Secondly, we focus on the classical solutions, which is the more restricted class of functions in comparison to the mild solutions and to achieve our main result, we introduce a different approach from the one suggested in [11] which allows us to prove the uniform convergence of the recursive sequence throughout the entire space $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$.
- (3) Third, we link the problem to major applications of the theory and comment how our general theory solve the open problems related to them.

The most important application that we want to highlight is a dividend optimization problem. The reader can find an overview of these problems formulated under a diffusion framework in De Angelis and Ekström [13] who solve an unrestricted dividend problem with simple diffusion model and a finite horizon. Differently from the aforementioned paper, our approach allows only to solve restricted dividend papers but in more general diffusion model and has a potential to be extended for a singular control with unrestricted dividend payments. To our knowledge, our paper is the first with a gradient iteration approach to the issue.

There is also a branch of literature connected with so-called finite fuel problem (e.g. Rokhlin and Mironenko [28]) where the framework is sufficiently comprehensive to encompass the formulation of our problem as well. However, we are not aware of any findings concerning classical solutions or the fixed point iteration methods.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 contains a description of the problem. Section 3 provides an introductory example of a general control problem. The main result (Theorem 4.1) and its proof are presented in Section 4. Section 5 discusses the approach to dealing with the Lipschitz continuity of the expected terminated hitting time for diffusions, which is significant in terms of applications. Section 6 demonstrates an application of our result to stochastic control problems, and presents an extension of our theory to some particular problems with unbounded drift.

2. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

It is high time to briefly describe the main problem in which we are interested. We consider the HJB equation of the form

$$(2.1) \quad D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + \max_{\alpha \in A} (b(x, t, \alpha) D_x u + h(x, t, \alpha) u + f(x, t, \alpha)) = 0, \\ (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$$

with the boundary condition $u(x, t) = \beta(x, t)$, for $(x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$, where ∂_p denotes the parabolic boundary. In our case

$$\partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]) = ([0, +\infty) \times \{T\}) \cup (\{0\} \times [0, T]).$$

It is assumed that $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a compact set and is interpreted as a set of actions. This HJB equation is naturally linked with a stochastic control objective of the form

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t) := \mathbb{E}_{x, t} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x, t)} e^{\int_t^s h(X_k^\alpha, k, \alpha_k)} dk f(X_s^\alpha, s, \alpha_s) ds \right. \\ \left. + e^{\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x, t)} h(X_k^\alpha, k, \alpha_k)} dk \beta(X_{T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x, t)}^\alpha, T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x, t)) \right],$$

where

$$\tau^\alpha(x, t) := \inf\{k \geq t \mid X_k^\alpha(x, t) \leq 0\}, \quad x \geq 0$$

and

$$b, h, f : \mathbb{R} \times [0, T] \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \sigma : \mathbb{R} \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \beta : \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

are continuous functions with further regularity assumptions to be specified later on. Finally, the process X^α is defined by the SDE

$$dX_t^\alpha = b(X_t^\alpha, t, \alpha_t) dt + \sigma(X_t^\alpha, t) dW_t,$$

where $(W_t, t \geq 0)$ is a one-dimensional Brownian motion defined on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . The probability space is considered together with the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, which is the P -augmented filtration generated by the process W .

The symbol $\mathbb{E}_{x, t} f(X_s)$ is used to denote the expected value when the system starts at time t from the state $x \geq 0$. For the ease of notation, we sometimes use $\mathbb{E}f(X_s(x, t))$ or just $\mathbb{E}f(X_s)$ when there is no possibility of confusion.

The controller's aim is to maximize $\mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t)$ with respect to an admissible control set \mathcal{A} , that is, the set of all progressively measurable processes α taking values in the compact set A . Let the function V denote the controller value function, that is, $V(x, t) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t)$. Once we prove that (2.1) admits a bounded classical solution u , it is only a matter of applying the standard verification results (e.g. Fleming and Soner [17, Theorem 3.1, Chapter IV]) to find a solution to the above stochastic control problem and prove that $u(x, t) = V(x, t)$.

In our paper, we treat equation (2.1) even in greater generality. Namely, we are interested in the problem of finding a classical solution to

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + H(D_x u, u, x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T], \\ u(x, t) = \beta(x, t), & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]), \end{cases}$$

where

$$\sigma : \mathbb{R} \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad H : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \beta : \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

are general functions with the following regularity assumptions.

Assumption 2.1.

A1) The function σ is, bounded, bounded away from zero and Lipschitz continuous i.e. there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that for all $x, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}$, $t, \bar{t} \in [0, T]$

$$|\sigma(x, t) - \sigma(\bar{x}, t)| \leq L (|x - \bar{x}| + |t - \bar{t}|).$$

A2) The function β is bounded and Lipschitz continuous in $(x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$.

A3) The function H is Lipschitz continuous in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T]$. Moreover, let there exists $K > 0$ such that for all $(p, u, x, t), (\bar{p}, \bar{u}, x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, T]$ we have

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |H(p, u, x, t)| &\leq K (1 + |u| + |p|), \\ |H(p, u, x, t) - H(\bar{p}, \bar{u}, x, t)| &\leq K (|u - \bar{u}| + |p - \bar{p}|). \end{aligned}$$

A4) There exists a constant $L > 0$ such that for all $(x, t), (\bar{x}, t) \in [0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$

$$(2.5) \quad |\mathbb{E}(\tau(x, t) \wedge T) - \mathbb{E}(\tau(\bar{x}, t) \wedge T)| \leq L|x - \bar{x}|,$$

where

$$\tau(x, t) := \inf\{k \geq t \mid X_k(x, t) \leq 0\}$$

and X is an auxiliary stochastic process determined by the SDE

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t, t) dW_t.$$

Remark 2.1.

- (1) It is important not to confuse the controlled process X^α with the auxiliary diffusion X and similarly the hitting time τ^α with the auxiliary hitting time τ .
- (2) Sufficient conditions for point **A4)** are provided in Section 5. Note that assuming the existence of a bounded classical solution to the problem

$$\begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + 1 = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ u(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)), \end{cases}$$

point **A4)** is equivalent to the boundedness of the derivative of this solution $D_x u$.

- (3) In the homogeneous case ($\sigma(x, t) = \sigma(x)$) it is well known (e.g Bertoldi and Lorenzi [6, Theorem 11.3.6]) that under the assumption **A1)** (with few further regularity conditions) there exists a constant $K_T > 0$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad |D_x \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(x, t) > s\}}| \leq \frac{K_T}{\sqrt{s-t}}, \quad s > t, x > 0.$$

Now, to guarantee condition **A4)** it is sufficient to note that for fixed $x, \bar{x} > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}(\tau(x, t) \wedge T) - \mathbb{E}(\tau(\bar{x}, t) \wedge T)| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(x, t) > s\}} ds - \mathbb{E} \int_t^T \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(\bar{x}, t) > s\}} ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_t^T |\mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(x, t) > s\}} - \mathbb{E} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(\bar{x}, t) > s\}}| ds \\ &\leq |x - \bar{x}| \int_t^T \frac{K_T}{\sqrt{s-t}} ds = 2K_T \sqrt{T-t} |x - \bar{x}|. \end{aligned}$$

Nevertheless, in Section 5 we present an independent proof of the implication **A1)** \Rightarrow **A4)**, without any other regularity assumptions.

(4) Furthermore, in the homogeneous case, by using estimates for

$$|D_x \mathbb{E}_{x,t} [f(X_s) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(x,t) > s\}}]|$$

from Bertoldi and Lorenzi [6, Theorem 11.3.6] or Fornaro et al. [18] or finally Hieber et al. [22], it is possible to extend the current results for the equations of the form

$$D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x) D_x^2 u + b(x) D_x u + H(D_x u, u, x, t) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$$

and associated diffusion

$$dX_t = b(X_t) dt + \sigma(X_t) dW_t$$

with σ and b unbounded, but the cost we have to pay is a higher regularity assumptions for coefficients b and σ and rather long list of additional and hardly verifiable other conditions. Instead, in Subsection 6.2 we discuss the case of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type dynamics, which is the most important from the perspective of applications.

(5) In Subsection 6.1 we provide conditions for the functions b, h, f to ensure that the stochastic control Hamiltonian H defined by

$$H(p, u, x, t) := \max_{\alpha \in A} (b(x, t, \alpha)p + h(x, t, \alpha)u + f(x, t, \alpha))$$

satisfies the conditions of Assumption 2.1.

As was mentioned in the Introduction, an additional advantage of our work is the constructive approach to the existence issue. In subsequent pages, we use a fixed-point approach, which ensures relatively fast uniform convergence on the entire space.

3. PRACTICAL MOTIVATION

The existence of a solution of a semi-linear equation is interesting in its own right, but to give further motivation, we consider a dividend optimization problem. For example, consider an insurance company with a surplus process given by

$$dX_t^c = [\mu(X_t^c) - c_t] dt + a(X_t^c) dW_t,$$

where $\mu, a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are Lipschitz continuous and bounded, $a(x) \geq M > 0$ and $0 \leq c_t \leq D$ is a progressively measurable process that signifies a dividend intensity. Note that the restricted dividend process is accepted in the actuarial literature (see, for example, Asmussen and Taksar [3], Eisenberg and Krühner [15], Strini and Thonhauser [33] or Zhu [36]) and might sometimes be used to approximate the unrestricted problem (see, for example, Schmidli [32, Lemma 2.38]). The aim of insurance company owners is to maximize their objective function

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{J}_N^c(x, t) := \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)} e^{-\delta(s-t)} U_1(c_s) ds + e^{-\delta[(T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)) - t]} \left(U_2 \left(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)}^c \right) - \mathcal{P}(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)) \right) \right],$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a discount rate, $U_1, U_2 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are interpreted as utility functions (U_1 is assumed to be continuous while U_2 is locally Lipschitz continuous), $\mathcal{P} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function (serving as a penalty function), the horizon $T > 0$ is supposed to denote the liquidation time of the insurance fund, the number N is the maximal possible reserve than can be observed (theoretically it might not have sense but practically can often be calculated).

The functions H and β associated with this control problem (3.1) have the form

$$H(p, u, x, t) := \max_{c \in [0, D]} ([\mu(x) - c]p - \delta u + U_1(c)), \quad \beta(x, t) := U_2(N \wedge x) - \mathcal{P}(t).$$

The use of a utility function in the dividend optimization problem is relatively rare. An overview of these problems can be found in Baran et al. [4]. Due to our knowledge we are the first one who compile utility model with such a general diffusion setting. We should stress again that our paper offers a constructive fixed-point approach to the issue.

Note also that the use in the objective function $U_2(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c)$ instead of simply $U_2(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c)$ is not a serious problem since

- (1) in practice the surplus process X^c is usually bounded;
- (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_2(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c) &= U_2(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c \leq N\}} + U_2(N) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c > N\}} \\ &= U_2(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c) + \left(U_2(N) - U_2(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c > N\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that U is positive and increasing and that U has a polynomial growth and setting

$$\mathcal{E}(x, t, N) := \left(U_2(N) - U_2(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c > N\}},$$

we get

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}(x, t, N)| \leq \mathbb{E}U_2(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}^c > N\}}.$$

Finally, by Hölder's and Chebyshev's inequalities and by standard estimates for diffusion processes for a given compact set $K \subset [0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we find a sufficiently large constant $N > 0$ such that for all $(x, t) \in K$, we have $\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{E}(x, t, N)| \leq \varepsilon$ and consequently

$$\left| \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}_N^\alpha(x, t) - \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t) \right| \leq \varepsilon,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_N^\alpha(x, t) := & \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)} e^{-\delta(s-t)} U_1(c_s) ds \right. \\ & \left. + e^{-\delta[(T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)) - t]} \left(U_2 \left(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)}^c - \mathcal{P}(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)) \right) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Generally speaking, the solution for $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}_N^\alpha(x, t)$ is ε -optimal for $\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t)$.

Note that in our framework we can consider as well a finite time risk-sensitive criterion with the objective function defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{I}^c(x, t)_N := \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \exp \left\{ \gamma e^{\delta t} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)} e^{-\delta s} U_1(c_s) ds \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + e^{-\delta(T \wedge \tau^c(x,t))} \left(U_2 \left(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)}^d - \mathcal{P}(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)) \right) \right) \right] \right\}, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note, that term $\gamma e^{\delta t}$ in the exponent introduce time-inconsistency of the problem, but it still can be solved by considering the whole family of problems

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_N^c(x, t) := & \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \exp \left\{ \tilde{\gamma} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)} e^{-\delta s} U_1(c_s) ds \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + e^{-\delta(T \wedge \tau^c(x,t))} \left(U_2 \left(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau^c(x,t)}^d - \mathcal{P}(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)) \right) \right) \right] \right\}, \quad \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}$$

and choosing the right $\tilde{\gamma}$ for a proper t .

The risk-sensitive criterion in the dividend optimization problem was originated in Grandits et al. [20] (a continuous simple diffusion type framework under a linear utility and an unrestricted control) and continued by Eisenberg and Krühner [15] by measuring the suboptimality

of dividend controls. We believe that our results on existence of classical solutions are crucial for the development of the theory.

Further possible specifications of the objective functional will be presented during the discussion in Subsection 6.3, together with a dividend problem in an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck–type framework.

Other applications may include a finite horizon and a bounded control analog of the following problems:

- (1) an optimal harvesting problem (e.g., Hening and Tran [21]);
- (2) a robust dividend optimization problem (e.g. Chakraborty et al. [12]);
- (3) a portfolio optimization under default or other timing (e.g. Kraft and Steffensen [24]).

4. MAIN RESULT

We start this section by formulating our main theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that all conditions of Assumption 2.1 are satisfied. Then there exists a classical solution $u \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$ to (4.1), which in addition is bounded together with $D_x u$.*

The proof of the above-mentioned theorem is left to the end of this section. It is conducted by applying the fixed point method which involves constructing a recursive sequence consisting of solutions to an appropriate linear equation of the form

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + f(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T], \\ u(x, t) = \beta(x, t), & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]). \end{cases}$$

So, first, we present some preparatory results on the solutions to (4.1).

Let $C_b^{1,0}$ be the space of all bounded and continuous functions on the set $[0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$ for which the first derivative wrt. the variable x exists on the set $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$ and is continuous and bounded. The space is endowed with the family of norms

$$\|u\|_\kappa := \sup_{(x,t) \in [0, +\infty) \times [0, T]} e^{-\kappa(T-t)} |u(x, t)| + \sup_{(x,t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T]} e^{-\kappa(T-t)} |D_x u(x, t)|.$$

Note that the space $C_b^{1,0}$ together with $\|\cdot\|_\kappa$ forms a Banach space. We also introduce the subspace $C_{b,loc}^{1+l,0} \subset C_b^{1,0}$ consisting of all functions $u \in C_b^{1,0}$ for which the function $D_x u(x, t)$ is Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$ and bounded. There is no need to introduce a separate norm for $C_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$. Furthermore, we use the space C_b^0 consisting of all functions that are continuous on the set $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$ and bounded. This space is considered together with the norms

$$\|u\|^0 := \sup_{(x,t) \in [0, +\infty) \times [0, T]} |u(x, t)|, \quad \|u\|_\kappa^0 := \sup_{(x,t) \in [0, +\infty) \times [0, T]} e^{-\kappa(T-t)} |u(x, t)|.$$

If the function u is continuous and bounded throughout the set $\mathbb{R} \times [0, T]$ we use the following notation

$$\|u\|^{0,\mathbb{R}} := \sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, T]} |u(x, t)|, \quad \|u\|_\kappa^{0,\mathbb{R}} := \sup_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, T]} e^{-\kappa(T-t)} |u(x, t)|.$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let conditions A1) and A2) be satisfied and let the function f be Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$ and bounded. Then there exists a bounded classical solution $u \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$ to (4.1).*

Proof. We would like to use already existing results on linear equations provided by Rubio [31]. To do that, we should first approximate f using a sequence of Lipschitz continuous functions. Let us consider first a test function

$$(4.2) \quad \eta(x, t) := \begin{cases} C e^{\frac{1}{|(x,t)|^2-1}}, & \text{if } |(x, t)| < 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the constant C is such that

$$(4.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta(z) dz = 1, \quad (z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ is a shorthand notation for } (x, t)).$$

We may define a family

$$\eta_\varepsilon(x, t) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \eta\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

The definition of the function f can be extended in the following way $f(x, t) := f(x, 0)$, $t \in [-K, T)$, $K > 0$ and $f = 0$ outside of the set $(0, +\infty) \times [-K, T)$. Now, we choose an increasing sequence $(R_n, n \in \mathbb{N})$, $R_n \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and define

$$\psi_n(x, t) := \begin{cases} f(x, t), & \text{if } (x, t) \in (0, R_n) \times [-K, T), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(z) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_{\varepsilon_n}(z - \zeta) \psi_n(\zeta) d\zeta = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_{\varepsilon_n}(\zeta) \psi_n(z - \zeta) d\zeta \\ &= \int_{(0, R_n) \times [-K, T)} \eta_{\varepsilon_n}(z - \zeta) \psi_n(\zeta) d\zeta = \int_{B(0, \varepsilon_n)} \eta_{\varepsilon_n}(\zeta) \psi_n(z - \zeta) d\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

- i) f_n is uniformly bounded (because f is bounded and condition (4.3) holds),
- ii) f_n is globally Lipschitz continuous in (x, t) on the set $[0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$ (because η_{ε_n} is globally Lipschitz continuous and ψ_n is integrable),
- iii) f_n is Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$ uniformly with respect to n ,
- iv) $f_n \rightarrow f$ (locally uniformly on the set $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$) (by the continuity of f on the set $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$ and standard arguments, Evans [14, Appendix C.5]).

By Rubio [31, Theorem 3.1] there exists $u_n \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty) \times [0, T))$ a classical solution to

$$\begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + f_n(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ u(x, t) = \beta(x, t), & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)). \end{cases}$$

In addition, we have the Feynman-Kac formula i.e.

$$(4.4) \quad u_n(x, t) = \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \left[\beta(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}, T \wedge \tau(x,t)) + \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f_n(X_s, s) ds \right].$$

By Schauder estimates (see Ladyzhenskaja et al. [26, Chapter IV, Theorem 10.1]) there exists a uniform estimate in n for the Hölder norm $\|u_n\|^{2+l}$ on each set $[a, b] \times [0, T'] \subset (0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$. By the Arzela-Ascoli lemma and the standard diagonal argument, there exists a subsequence $(\varepsilon_{n_k}, k \in \mathbb{N})$ such that $u_{\varepsilon_{n_k}}$ converges to u together with all relevant derivatives uniformly in each compact subset of $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$ and consequently u is a solution to (4.1). The boundedness of u follows from (4.4).

Finally, we need to show continuity at the boundary of the function u . By Feynman-Kac, we have

$$u_{\varepsilon_{n_k}}(x, t) = \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \left[\beta(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}, T \wedge \tau(x,t)) + \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f_{n_k}(X_s, s) ds \right].$$

The family $(f_n, n \in \mathbb{N})$ is uniformly bounded, therefore, using the dominated convergence theorem and passing to the limit (as $k \rightarrow +\infty$), we get

$$u(x, t) = \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \left[\beta(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}, T \wedge \tau(x,t)) + \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s, s) ds \right].$$

The function β is Lipschitz continuous, while f is bounded, which means that for all $(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x, t) - \beta(\bar{x}, \bar{t})| &\leq Lip_\beta \left(\mathbb{E}_{x,t} |X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} - \bar{x}| + \mathbb{E}_{x,t} |T \wedge \tau(x,t) - \bar{t}| \right) \\ &\quad + \|f\|^0 \mathbb{E}_{x,t} |T \wedge \tau(x,t) - t|. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,t} |(T \wedge \tau(x,t)) - \bar{t}| \leq \mathbb{E}_{x,t} |(T \wedge \tau(x,t)) - t| + |t - \bar{t}|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,t} |X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} - \bar{x}| &\leq |x - \bar{x}| + \left[\mathbb{E}_{x,t} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} [\sigma(X_s, s)]^2 ds \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq |x - \bar{x}| + \|\sigma\|^0 [\mathbb{E}_{x,t} (T \wedge \tau(x,t)) - t]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, convergence $\mathbb{E}_{x,t} ((T \wedge \tau(x,t)) - t) \rightarrow 0$ as $(x, t) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{t})$ ensures continuity of the function u at the boundary. But this convergence follows easily from the continuity of the Cauchy–Dirichlet problem of the form

$$\begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + 1 = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ u(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)), \end{cases}$$

which was proved by Rubio [31, Theorem 3.1]. □

The second step in our reasoning is to prove estimates for $\|u\|_\kappa$ where u is a solution to (4.1). For the proof we need first to find a proper estimate for the standard Cauchy problem

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} D_t v + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 v + f(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, T), \\ v(x, T) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

By v_f we denote the unique bounded classical (class $C^{2,1}$) solution to (4.5) (if it exists). We have the following Proposition.

Proposition 4.3. *Under A1) there exists a constant M such that for all $\kappa > 0$ and all f being Hölder continuous in compact subsets of $\mathbb{R} \times [0, T)$ and bounded we have*

$$\|D_x v_f\|_\kappa^{0, \mathbb{R}} \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f\|_\kappa^{0, \mathbb{R}}.$$

Proof. In the proof, we use the theory of fundamental solutions for parabolic equations. The fundamental solution is denoted by $\Gamma(x, t, z, s)$. Recall that there exist $c, C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma(x, t, y, s)| &\leq \frac{C}{(s-t)^{1/2}} \exp\left(-c \frac{|y-x|^2}{(s-t)}\right), \\ |D_x \Gamma(x, t, y, s)| &\leq \frac{C}{(s-t)} \exp\left(-c \frac{|y-x|^2}{(s-t)}\right), \quad s > t, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R} \end{aligned}$$

(see Friedman [19, Chapter 1, Theorem 11]).

Instead of estimating $D_x v_f$ itself, we find a bound by estimating the Lipschitz constant in x for v_f . First, we fix $x, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}$, $x < \bar{x}$, and $t \in [0, T)$. Using elementary facts from the linear parabolic equation theory, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |v_f(x, t) - v_f(\bar{x}, t)| &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \int_t^T f(X_s, s) ds - \mathbb{E}_{\bar{x},t} \int_t^T f(X_s, s) ds \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_t^T \mathbb{E}[f(X_s(x, t), s) - f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s)] ds \right| \\ &= \left| \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(z, s) (\Gamma(x, t, z, s) - \Gamma(\bar{x}, t, z, s)) dz ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(z, s)| |\Gamma(x, t, z, s) - \Gamma(\bar{x}, t, z, s)| dz ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(z, s)| |\Gamma(x, t, z, s) - \Gamma(\bar{x}, t, z, s)| dz &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus (x, \bar{x})} |f(z, s)| |\Gamma(x, t, z, s) - \Gamma(\bar{x}, t, z, s)| dz \\ &\quad + \int_x^{\bar{x}} |f(z, s)| |\Gamma(x, t, z, s) + \Gamma(\bar{x}, t, z, s)| dz. \end{aligned}$$

According to the mean value theorem, there exists $x^*(t, z, s) \in (x, \bar{x})$ such that

$$\Gamma(x, t, z, s) - \Gamma(\bar{x}, t, z, s) = D_x \Gamma(x^*(t, z, s), t, z, s)(x - \bar{x}).$$

Furthermore, we already know that there exist $c, C > 0$ such that

$$|D_x \Gamma(x^*(t, z, s), t, z, s)| \leq \frac{C}{(s-t)} \exp\left(-c \frac{|z - x^*(t, z, s)|^2}{(s-t)}\right).$$

We have $x^*(t, z, s) \in [x, \bar{x}]$ and thus

$$\exp\left(-c \frac{|z - x^*(t, z, s)|^2}{(s-t)}\right) \leq \exp\left(-c \frac{|z - x|^2}{(s-t)}\right) + \exp\left(-c \frac{|z - \bar{x}|^2}{(s-t)}\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (x, \bar{x}).$$

We can also use the fact

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{s-t}} \exp\left(-c \frac{|z-x|^2}{(s-t)}\right) dz = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{2c}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In summary, we have the following

$$|v_f(x, t) - v_f(\bar{x}, t)| \leq 2C \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{2c}} + 1 \right) \left[\int_t^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{s-t}} e^{\kappa(T-s)} ds \right] \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} |x - \bar{x}|.$$

Multiplying both sides by $e^{-\kappa(T-t)}$ and using the Hölder inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\kappa(T-t)}|v_f(x, t) - v_f(\bar{x}, t)| &\leq \frac{2C\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{2c}} \left[\int_t^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{t-s}} e^{\kappa(t-s)} ds \right] \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} |x - \bar{x}| \\ &\leq \frac{2C\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{2c}} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} \left(\int_t^T (s-t)^{-\frac{3}{4}} ds \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(\int_t^T e^{3\kappa(t-s)} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} |x - \bar{x}|. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, we have

$$\left[\int_t^T e^{3\kappa(t-s)} ds \right]^{\frac{1}{3}} = \left[\frac{1}{3\kappa} \left[1 - e^{3\kappa(t-T)} \right] \right]^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt[3]{3\kappa}},$$

which completes the proof. \square

Let $u_f \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$ denote the classical solution (if exists) to

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + f(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ u(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)). \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.4. *Assume that conditions A1) and A4) are satisfied. Then there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that for all $\kappa > 1$ and for all functions f being Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R} \times [0, T)$ and bounded, we have*

$$\|u_f\|_{\kappa} \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}}.$$

Proof. Due to the Feynman - Kac representation we have

$$u_f(x, t) = \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s, s) ds.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\kappa(T-t)} u_f(x, t) &= \mathbb{E}_{x,t} e^{-\kappa(T-t)} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} e^{\kappa(T-s)} e^{-\kappa(T-s)} f(X_s, s) ds \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\kappa}^0 e^{-\kappa(T-t)} \int_t^T e^{\kappa(T-s)} ds = \frac{1}{\kappa} \|f\|_{\kappa}^0 e^{-\kappa(T-t)} (e^{\kappa(T-t)} - 1) \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}}. \end{aligned}$$

Once again, a bound for the derivative $D_x u_f$ is determined by estimating the Lipschitz constant. Fix $x, \bar{x} \in [0, +\infty]$ and assume $x > \bar{x}$. In particular, this assumption implies $\tau(x, t) \geq \tau(\bar{x}, t)$ a.s. (because of the monotonicity of the stochastic flow). We have

$$\begin{aligned} |u_f(x, t) - u_f(\bar{x}, t)| &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s(x, t), s) ds - \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s) ds \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s) ds - \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(\bar{x}, t)} f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s) ds \right| \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

First, to estimate I_1 , consider the Cauchy problem (4.5). Note that for the solution v_f we have obtained (Proposition 4.3) the inequality

$$(4.7) \quad \|D_x v_f\|_{\kappa}^0 \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}}.$$

Additionally, the Itô formula yields

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) = v_f(x, t) + \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s(x, t), s) ds$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) = v_f(\bar{x}, t) + \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s) ds.$$

Using (4.8) and (4.9), we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned} 2I_1 &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s(x, t), s) ds - \mathbb{E} \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s) ds \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) - \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + v_f(\bar{x}, t) - v_f(x, t) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) - \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) \right| \\ &\quad + |v_f(\bar{x}, t) - v_f(x, t)|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the function v_f satisfies (4.7) and therefore

$$|v_f(\bar{x}, t) - v_f(x, t)| \leq e^{\kappa(T-t)} \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} |x - \bar{x}|.$$

In addition

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) - \mathbb{E}v_f(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} e^{\kappa(T-T \wedge \tau(x,t))} |X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) - X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t)|. \end{aligned}$$

The condition $x > \bar{x}$ implies

$$X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) \geq X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t) \quad (\text{monotonicity of the stochastic flow})$$

and consequently

$$\mathbb{E}|X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) - X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t)| = \mathbb{E}X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) - \mathbb{E}X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(\bar{x}, t) = x - \bar{x} = |x - \bar{x}|.$$

In summary, we get

$$e^{-\kappa(T-t)} I_1 \leq \frac{2M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} |x - \bar{x}|.$$

For the second ingredient I_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau(\bar{x}, t) \wedge T}^{\tau(x, t) \wedge T} f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s) ds \right| = \left| \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau(\bar{x}, t) \wedge T}^{\tau(x, t) \wedge T} e^{\kappa(T-s)} e^{-\kappa(T-s)} f(X_s(\bar{x}, t), s) ds \right| \\ &\leq \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{\tau(\bar{x}, t) \wedge T}^{\tau(x, t) \wedge T} e^{\kappa(T-s)} ds \right| = \frac{1}{\kappa} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left| e^{\kappa(T-T \wedge \tau(\bar{x}, t))} - e^{\kappa(T-T \wedge \tau(x, t))} \right| \end{aligned}$$

and finally,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\kappa(T-t)} I_2 &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\kappa(t-T \wedge \tau(\bar{x}, t))} - e^{\kappa(t-T \wedge \tau(x, t))} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} |(T \wedge \tau(\bar{x}, t)) - (T \wedge \tau(x, t))| \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \|f\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} |x - \bar{x}|, \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof. \square

Remark 4.5. The assertion of Proposition 4.4 is valid not only for functions f , which are Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R} \times [0, T)$ and bounded, but also for functions that are Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$ and bounded. To show this, it is sufficient to approximate the function f by the sequence $(f_n, n \in \mathbb{N})$ defined in the proof of Proposition 4.2. Then, we have

$$\|u_{f_n}\|_{\kappa} \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f_n\|_{\kappa}^{0, \mathbb{R}} \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|f\|_{\kappa}^0.$$

We end the proof using Ladyzhenskaja et al. [26, Chapter IV, Theorem 10.1] and passing to the limit on the left-hand side.

For $u \in \mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$, we can define the mapping

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{T}u(x, t) := \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \left[\beta(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}, T \wedge \tau(x, t)) + \int_t^{T \wedge \tau(x,t)} H(D_x u(X_s, s), u(X_s, s), X_s, s) ds \right].$$

Proposition 4.6. *If all conditions of Assumption 2.1 are satisfied, then the operator \mathcal{T} maps $\mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$ into $\mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$ and there exists a constant $\kappa > 1$ such that mapping (4.10) is a contraction with respect to the norm $\|u\|_{\kappa}$.*

Proof. We have to prove that the operator \mathcal{T} maps $\mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$ to $\mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$. We fix the function $u \in \mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$ and define

$$w(x, t) := \mathcal{T}u(x, t).$$

The function w is bounded since u , $D_x u$, β are bounded and the Hamiltonian H satisfies a linear growth condition. The function β is uniformly Lipschitz continuous, which implies that there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |\beta(X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t), T \wedge \tau(x, t)) - \beta(X_{T \wedge \tau(\bar{x},t)}(\bar{x}, t), T \wedge \tau(\bar{x}, t))| \\ \leq K \mathbb{E} |X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) - X_{T \wedge \tau(\bar{x},t)}(\bar{x}, t)| + K \mathbb{E} |(T \wedge \tau(x, t)) - (T \wedge \tau(\bar{x}, t))|. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since $X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) \geq X_{T \wedge \tau(\bar{x},t)}(\bar{x}, t)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) - X_{T \wedge \tau(\bar{x},t)}(\bar{x}, t)| = \mathbb{E} X_{T \wedge \tau(x,t)}(x, t) - \mathbb{E} X_{T \wedge \tau(\bar{x},t)}(\bar{x}, t) = x - \bar{x}.$$

It is now easy to notice that the function w is Lipschitz continuous in x uniformly with respect to t , and consequently the function $D_x w$ is bounded. Moreover, w is a classical solution to parabolic differential equation of the form

$$\begin{cases} D_t w + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 w + f(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ w(x, t) = \beta(x, t), & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)), \end{cases}$$

which guarantees that $D_x w$ is Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$ (see Ladyzhenskaja et al. [26, Chapter IV, Theorem 10.1]) and consequently \mathcal{T} maps $\mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$ into $\mathcal{C}_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$.

Now, our objective is to prove that \mathcal{T} is a contraction for sufficiently large κ . Fix $u, v \in C_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$ and define

$$\hat{w}(x, t) := \mathcal{T}u(x, t) - \mathcal{T}v(x, t).$$

Note that \hat{w} is a classical solution to

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{cases} D_t \hat{w} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 \hat{w} + f(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ \hat{w}(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)), \end{cases}$$

where $f(x, t) := H(D_x u, u, x, t) - H(D_x v, v, x, t)$. By applying Proposition 4.4 we get that there exists a constant $M > 0$ independent of u and v , such that

$$\|\hat{w}\|_\kappa \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|H(D_x u, u, x, t) - H(D_x v, v, x, t)\|_\kappa^0 \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt[3]{\kappa}} \|u - v\|_\kappa, \quad \kappa > 1.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. The rest of the proof is analogous to the proof of Zawisza [34, Theorem 2.2], but we repeat it for the reader's convenience. Reasoning is based on a fixed-point type argument for the mapping \mathcal{T} . We take any $u_1 \in C_{b,h}^{1,0}$ and define recursively the sequence

$$u_{n+1} = \mathcal{T}u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

There exists $\kappa > 0$ such that the mapping \mathcal{T} is a contraction in $\|\cdot\|_\kappa$ and this implies that the sequence u_n converges to some fixed point u . But u belongs to $C_b^{1,0}$ and we have to prove that u also belongs to class $C_{b,loc}^{1+l,0}$. First, let us note that the functions u_n and $D_x u_n$ are convergent in $\|\cdot\|_\kappa^0$ (for κ large enough), so they are bounded uniformly with respect to n . We can now exploit (E8), (E9), (E10) of Fleming and Rishel [16] (together with the localization procedure to (E8) described therein) and prove the uniform bound on compact subsets for Hölder norm of $D_x u_n$. Therefore, $D_x u$ is Hölder continuous on compact subsets of $(0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$. Proposition 4.4 and Remark 4.5 confirm that the fixed point u belongs to class $\mathcal{C}^{2,1}((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$ and satisfies equation (4.1). \square

Remark. Note that we might consider another half-line (not starting at 0) as a domain of equation (4.1). Let us choose, for example, the interval $[x_0, +\infty)$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, then simple translation $u(x - x_0)$ will reduce the problem to the domain $[0, +\infty)$, and consequently Theorem 4.1 will still be valid for a Dirichlet problem in the domain $[x_0, +\infty)$.

Remark. The fixed point iteration method ensures exponential speed of convergence i.e. there exist constants $C(T) > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\|u - u_n\|^0 + \|D_x u - D_x u_n\|^0 \leq C(T)q^n,$$

which additionally in a stochastic control context and under certain circumstances imply exponential convergence for the control sequence α_n (cf Kermikulov et al. [23, Assumption 2.4]).

5. LIPSCHITZ CONTINUITY FOR EXPECTED TERMINATED HITTING TIME

Now, we would like to provide any sufficient condition for point A4). We have the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Let the function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded, bounded away from zero and uniformly Lipschitz continuous. Then the hitting time $\tau(x, t) := \{k \geq t \mid X_k(x, t) \leq 0\}$, where*

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t) dW_t,$$

satisfies condition (2.5).

Proof. The proof consists of four steps.

Step I First, we consider a trivial dynamics of the form

$$dX_t = dW_t.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tau(x, t) \wedge T) &= \int_t^T P(\tau(x, t) > s) ds = \int_t^T [1 - P(\tau(x, t) \leq s)] ds \\ &= \int_t^T [1 - 2P(W_s - W_t > -x)] ds, \quad x \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is guaranteed by the reflection principle. Therefore, for $x > \bar{x} \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(\tau(x, t) \wedge T) - \mathbb{E}(\tau(\bar{x}, t) \wedge T)| &= \int_t^T \int_{\bar{x}}^x \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{s-t}} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2(s-t)}} dz ds \\ &\leq |x - \bar{x}| \int_t^T \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{s-t}} ds \leq \frac{\sqrt{T}}{\sqrt{\pi}} |x - \bar{x}|. \end{aligned}$$

Step II Consider now a SDE of the form

$$dX_t = b(X_t) dt + dW_t,$$

where the function b is Lipschitz continuous on compact subsets of \mathbb{R} and bounded. In Theorem 4.1 we proved that the equation

$$\begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} D_x^2 u + b(x) D_x u + 1 = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ u(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)) \end{cases}$$

admits a bounded classical solution u with a bounded derivative $D_x u$. The standard Feynman–Kac representation ensures that $u(x, t) = \mathbb{E}(\tau(x, t) \wedge T) - t$.

Step III Suppose $\sigma \in C_{b,loc}^{1+1}$ and consider the dynamics

$$dY_t = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{D_x \sigma(\zeta(Y_t))}{\sigma(\zeta(Y_t))} dt + dW_t,$$

where

$$\zeta(x) := \int_0^x \sigma(z) dz.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that σ is positive. Obviously, $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^2((0, +\infty))$ and $\zeta(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$. By the Itô formula we infer that $X_t = \zeta(Y_t)$ is a unique strong solution to

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t) dW_t.$$

Furthermore,

$$\{k \geq t \mid Y_k(\zeta^{-1}(x), t) = 0\} = \{k \geq t \mid X_k(x, t) = 0\}.$$

Condition (2.5) is satisfied for the process Y_t and using the fact that ζ^{-1} is a Lipschitz continuous function we get the same for the process X .

Step IV Finally, we consider σ Lipschitz continuous, bounded, and bounded away from zero together with the sequence of test functions $(\eta_{\varepsilon_n}, n \in \mathbb{N})$ defined in (4.2). We consider as well the mollification

$$\sigma_n(x) = (\eta_{\varepsilon_n} * \sigma)(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and the sequence of diffusions

$$dX_t^n = \sigma_n(X_t^n) dW_t$$

and finally the sequence of stopping times

$$\tau_n(x, t) = \inf\{k \geq t \mid X_k^n(x, t) \leq 0\}.$$

Note that $\|\sigma_n\|^0$ and $\|D_x \sigma_n\|^0$ are bounded by the same constant as $\|\sigma\|^0$ and the Lipschitz norm of σ . Therefore, based on the proof of Theorem 4.1 and step II, we infer there exists a constant $K' > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(5.1) \quad |\mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) - \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(\bar{x}, t))| \leq K'|x - \bar{x}|, \quad x, \bar{x} \in [0, +\infty), t \in [0, T].$$

Before we claim $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) = \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau(x, t))$, we must verify that u is continuous at the boundary. We consider two separate cases.

Case 1: $\bar{x} = 0, \bar{t} \in [0, T]$.

From (5.1) we get for $x > \bar{x} = 0$ and $t \in [0, T]$

$$|u_n(x, t)| = |\mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) - t| = |\mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) - \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(\bar{x}, t))| \leq K'|x|,$$

which means that

$$|u(x, t)| \leq K'|x|.$$

Passing to the limit $(x, t) \rightarrow (\bar{x} = 0, \bar{t})$, we get $u(x, t) \rightarrow 0$.

Case 2: $\bar{x} \in (0, \infty), \bar{t} = T$.

We have $u_n(x, t) = \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) - t \geq 0$, so consequently $u(x, t) \geq 0$. On the other hand $\mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) \leq T$ and $u(x, t) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) - t$, which yields

$$\limsup_{(x,t) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{t})} u(x, t) \leq \limsup_{(x,t) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{t})} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) - T \leq 0$$

and consequently

$$\limsup_{(x,t) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{t})} u(x, t) = \liminf_{(x,t) \rightarrow (\bar{x}, \bar{t})} u(x, t) = 0.$$

Now, by Feynman-Kac we know that $u(x, t) = \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau(x, t)) - t$ and consequently

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_n(x, t)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n(x, t) + t = u(x, t) + t = \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau(x, t)).$$

Passing to the limit in (5.1) we finally get

$$|\mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau(x, t)) - \mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau(\bar{x}, t))| \leq K'|x - \bar{x}|, \quad x, \bar{x} \in [0, +\infty).$$

□

Proposition 5.2. *In addition to assumptions of Proposition 5.1 suppose that the function $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and bounded away from zero. Then the stopping time $\tau(x, t) := \inf\{k \geq t \mid X_k(x, t) \leq 0\}$, where*

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t)\gamma_t dW_t,$$

satisfies condition (2.5).

Proof. It is sufficient to consider first the dynamics

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t) dW_t$$

and the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)D_x^2 u + \frac{1}{\gamma_t} = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [T_0, T), \\ u(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [T_0, T)). \end{cases}$$

with sufficiently large T_0 . Let u denote the unique classical solution to the above equation and define a new function of the form

$$v(x, t) = u\left(x, T - \int_t^T \gamma_s^2 ds\right).$$

The function v satisfies the equation

$$\begin{cases} D_t v + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x) \gamma_t^2 D_x^2 v + 1 = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T), \\ v(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)). \end{cases}$$

and inherits the Lipschitz continuity condition from u . \square

6. EXTENSIONS AND STOCHASTIC CONTROL APPLICATIONS

6.1. Exit-time stochastic control. As was mentioned in Introduction, our primary concern is the control objective

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t) := \mathbb{E}_{x,t} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x,t)} e^{\int_t^s h(X_k^\alpha, k, \alpha_k) dk} f(X_s^\alpha, s, \alpha_s) ds + e^{\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x,t)} h(X_k^\alpha, k, \alpha_k) dk} \beta(X_{T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x,t)}^\alpha, T \wedge \tau^\alpha(x, t)) \right]$$

and the value function $V(x, t) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t)$. Here, the HJB equation has a form

$$(6.2) \quad D_t + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(x, t) D_x^2 u + H(D_x u, u, x, t) = 0, \quad (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T)$$

with the boundary condition $u(x, t) = \beta(x, t)$, for $(x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T))$ and

$$H(p, u, x, t) := \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (b(x, t, \alpha)p + h(x, t, \alpha)u + f(x, t, \alpha)).$$

To ensure that all the conditions of Assumption 1 are fulfilled, we need the following assumptions.

Assumption 6.1.

- B1)** The coefficient σ is bounded, bounded away from zero and Lipschitz continuous in (x, t) .
- B2)** The functions f, h, b are continuous and bounded and there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that for all $\zeta = f, h, b$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, $(x, t), (\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, T]$

$$|\zeta(x, t, \alpha) - \zeta(\bar{x}, \bar{t}, \alpha)| \leq L(|x - \bar{x}| + |t - \bar{t}|).$$

- B3)** The function β is bounded and Lipschitz continuous.
- B4)** There exists a constant $L > 0$ such that for all $(x, t), (\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \in [0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$

$$|\mathbb{E}(\tau(x, t) \wedge T) - \mathbb{E}(\tau(\bar{x}, \bar{t}) \wedge T)| \leq L|x - \bar{x}|,$$

where

$$\tau(x, t) := \inf\{k \geq t \mid X_k(x, t) \leq 0\}$$

and X is an auxiliary stochastic process determined by the SDE

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t, t) dW_t.$$

Now we can give an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume that all conditions of Assumption 6.1 are satisfied. Then there exists a classical solution $u \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}((0, +\infty) \times [0, T)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$ to (6.2), which is bounded together with $D_x u$.*

To complete the task of finding the solution to the control problem

$$V(x, t) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}^\alpha(x, t)$$

it is now sufficient to find any Borel measurable selector (the existence is guaranteed by the standard measurable selection theorem) and apply the standard verification result.

6.2. Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type dynamics. Now, we would like to present an extension of our results to the important family of models with unbounded drift.

Consider a controlled process of the form

$$dX_t = [b(X_t, t, \alpha_t) + \delta_t X_t] dt + \gamma_t dW_t,$$

where

$$b : \mathbb{R} \times [0, T] \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \delta, \gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

We consider the above process together with the objective function (6.1). The associated HJB equation has the following form

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{cases} D_t u + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_t^2 D_x^2 u + \delta_t x D_x u + H(D_x u, u, x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T], \\ u(x, t) = \beta(x, t), & (x, t) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]), \end{cases}$$

where

$$H(p, u, x, t) := \max_{\alpha \in A} (b(x, t, \alpha)p + h(x, t, \alpha)u + f(x, t, \alpha)).$$

Theorem 6.2. *Assume that conditions B2) and B3) hold, that the function $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T])$ is bounded away from zero, and that the function $\delta \in \mathcal{C}([0, T])$. Then there exists a classical solution $u \in \mathcal{C}^{2,1}((0, +\infty) \times [0, T]) \cap \mathcal{C}([0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$ to (6.3). Furthermore, there exists a positive constant K such that for all $x \in (0, +\infty)$, $t \in [0, T]$*

$$|u(x, t)| + |D_x u(x, t)| \leq K.$$

Proof. Let us define

$$\mu_t := e^{-\int_t^T \delta_s ds}$$

and note that μ is bounded away from zero, $\mu \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T])$, $\mu_T = 1$ and

$$\frac{\mu'_t}{\mu_t} = \delta_t.$$

Consequently, the problem might be solved by first considering the problem

$$(6.4) \quad D_t v + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_t^2 \mu_t^2 D_z^2 u + H\left(\mu_t D_z u, u, \frac{z}{\mu_t}, t\right) = 0, \quad (z, t) \in (0, +\infty) \times [0, T]$$

with the boundary equation $v(z, t) = \beta\left(\frac{z}{\mu_t}, t\right)$ and defining the function u by the formula

$$u(x, t) := v(\mu_t x, t).$$

But first we need to prove that there exists a classical solution to (6.4). Going further, we have to check all the conditions of Assumption 2.1. The first **A1)** is a direct consequence of the fact $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, T])$. In light of Proposition 5.2, the condition **A4)** is also satisfied. The proof of **A3)** – properties of the Hamiltonian

$$\overline{H}(p, u, z, t) := H\left(\mu_t p, u, \frac{z}{\mu_t}, t\right)$$

are left to the reader. We focus on proving **A2)** – Lipschitz regularity for $\overline{\beta}(z, t) := \beta\left(\frac{z}{\mu_t}, t\right)$. In the proof, we use special properties of the boundary $\partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$. That is, if $(z, t), (\bar{z}, \bar{t}) \in \partial_p((0, +\infty) \times [0, T])$, then we have two cases.

- (1) $z, \bar{z} \in (0, +\infty)$ and $t = \bar{t} = T$,
- (2) $z = 0$ or $\bar{z} = 0$.

In the first case, we have

$$|\bar{\beta}(z, t) - \bar{\beta}(\bar{z}, t)| \leq Lip_{\beta} \left(\left| \frac{z}{\mu_t} - \frac{\bar{z}}{\mu_{\bar{t}}} \right| + |t - \bar{t}| \right) = Lip_{\beta} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_T} |z - \bar{z}| + |t - \bar{t}| \right).$$

In the second case suppose that $\bar{z} = 0$. Then

$$(6.5) \quad |\bar{\beta}(z, t) - \bar{\beta}(\bar{z}, t)| \leq Lip_{\beta} \left(\left| \frac{z}{\mu_t} - \frac{\bar{z}}{\mu_{\bar{t}}} \right| + |t - \bar{t}| \right) = Lip_{\beta} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_t} |z| + |t - \bar{t}| \right) \\ \leq Lip_{\beta} \left(\max_{t \in [0, T]} \frac{1}{\mu_t} \right) (|z - 0| + |t - \bar{t}|) = Lip_{\beta} \left(\max_{t \in [0, T]} \frac{1}{\mu_t} \right) (|z - \bar{z}| + |t - \bar{t}|).$$

□

6.3. The dividend control problem. Here we consider a more specific surplus process of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck form

$$dX_t^c = [(r - \iota)X_t^c + \mu - c_t] dt + \sigma dW_t,$$

where $r > 0$ is a reinvestment rate, $\iota > 0$ is a constant responsible for a mean reversion, $\mu > 0$ partially is responsible for premium intensity and partially it is used to cover the expected value of negative outcomes, $\sigma > 0$ is a volatility. A progressively measurable process $0 \leq c_t \leq D$ denotes a dividend intensity. A discussion of the importance of a mean-reverting surplus process is given, for example, in Cadenillas et al. [10].

Together with the control process X^c , we can consider the objective function

$$\mathcal{J}_N^c(x, t) = \mathbb{E}_{x, t} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)} e^{-\delta(s-t)} U_1(c_s) ds \right. \\ \left. + e^{-\delta[(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)) - t]} \left(U_2 \left(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)}^c \right) - \mathcal{P}(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)) \right) \right],$$

or

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_N^c(x, t) = \mathbb{E}_{x, t} \exp \left\{ \tilde{\gamma} \left[\int_t^{T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)} e^{-\delta s} U_1(c_s) ds \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + e^{-\delta(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t))} \left(U_2 \left(N \wedge X_{T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)}^d \right) - \mathcal{P}(T \wedge \tau^c(x, t)) \right) \right] \right\}, \quad \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R},$$

where U_1 is a continuous function, U_2, \mathcal{P} is locally Lipschitz continuous. Note that the applicability of our theorem is rather broad. As a utility function, we may choose

- (1) $U_1(c) = U_2(c) = \frac{(Kc+k)^\gamma}{\gamma}$, $\gamma \in (-\infty, 1]$, $K, k > 0$,
- (2) $U_1(c) = U_2(c) = \frac{1}{\gamma}(1 - e^{-\gamma c})$, $\gamma > 0$,
- (3) $U_1(c) = c - \theta(c_0 - c)^+$, $U_2(x) = x + \nu$, $c_0 \geq 0$, $\theta \geq 0$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$.

A ruin time can be set as

$$\tau_a^c(x, t) := \inf\{k \geq t \mid X_k^c(x, t) \leq a\}.$$

The case $a < 0$ assumes that the ruin appears when the surplus process spent some time below 0, while $a > 0$ means that there exists a minimal surplus requirement (see also the discussion in Cadenillas et al. [10]).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Addona, *A semi-linear backward parabolic Cauchy problem with unbounded coefficients of Hamilton Jacobi Bellman type and applications to optimal control*, Appl. Math. Optim. 72 (2014), 1–28.
- [2] D. Addona, L. Angiuli and L. Lorenzi, *Hypercontractivity, supercontractivity, ultraboundedness and stability in semilinear problems*, Adv. Nonlinear Anal. 8 (2017), 225–252.
- [3] S. Asmussen and M. Taksar, *Controlled diffusion models for optimal dividend pay-out*, Insur Math. Econ. 20 (1997), 1–15.
- [4] S. Baran, C. Constantinescu and Z. Palmowski, *Asymptotic Expected Utility of Dividend Payments in a Classical Collective Risk Process*, Risks 11 (2023), 64.
- [5] D. Becherer and M. Schweizer, *Classical solutions to reaction–diffusion systems for hedging problems with interacting Ito and point processes*, Ann. Appl. Probab. 15 (2005), 1111–1144.
- [6] F. Bertoldi and R. Lorenzi, *Analytical Methods for Markov Semigroups*, Berlin, Germany: Springer, 2023.
- [7] A. Bielecki, *Une remarque sur la methode de Banach–Cacciopoli–Tikhonov dans la theorie des equations differentielles ordinaires*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. 4 (1956), 261–264.
- [8] R. Buckdahn and T. Y. Nie, *Generalized Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations with Dirichlet boundary condition and stochastic exit time optimal control problem*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 54 (2016), 602–631.
- [9] A. Bychowska and H. Leszczyński, *Parabolic equations with functional dependence*, Zeit. Anal. Anw. 20 (2001), 115–130.
- [10] A. Cadenillas, S. Sarkar and F. Zapatero, *Optimal dividend policy with mean–reverting cash reservoir*, Math. Finance, 17 (2007), 81–109.
- [11] A. Calvia, G. Cappa, F. Gozzi and E. Priola, *HJB Equations and Stochastic Control on Half–Spaces of Hilbert Spaces*, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 198 (2023), 710–744.
- [12] P. Chakraborty, A. Cohen and V. R. Young, *Optimal Dividends Under Model Uncertainty*, SIAM J. Financial Math. 14 (2023), 497–524.
- [13] T. De Angelis and E. Ekström, *The dividend problem with a finite horizon*, Ann. Appl. Probab. 27 (2017), 3525–3546.
- [14] L. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [15] J. Eisenberg and P. Krühner, *Measuring the suboptimality of dividend controls in a Brownian risk model*, Advances in Applied Probability 55 (2023), 1442–1472.
- [16] W. H. Fleming and R. W. Rishel, *Deterministic and stochastic optimal control*, Springer, New York (1975).
- [17] W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner, *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Springer–Verlag, 2006.
- [18] S. Fornaro, G. Metafune and E. Priola, *Gradient estimates for Dirichlet parabolic problems in unbounded domains*, J. Differ. Equ. 205 (2004), 329–353.
- [19] A. Friedman, *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type*, Prentice–Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964.
- [20] G. Grandits, P. Hubalek, F. Schachermayer and M. Zigo, *Optimal expected exponential utility of dividend payments in a brownian risk model*, Scand. Actuar. J. (2007), 73–107.
- [21] A. Hening and K. Q. Tran, *Harvesting and seeding of stochastic populations: Analysis and numerical approximation*, J. Math. Biol. 81 (2020), 65–112.
- [22] M. Hieber, L. Lorenzi and A. Rhandi, *Second-order parabolic equations with unbounded coefficients in exterior domains*, Differ. Integral Equ. 20 (2007), 1253–1284.
- [23] B. Kerimkulov, D. Šiška and L. Szpruch, *Exponential Convergence and Stability of Howard’s Policy Improvement Algorithm for Controlled Diffusions*, SIAM J. Control Optim. 58 (2020), 1314–1340.
- [24] H. Kraft and M. Steffensen, *Portfolio Problems Stopping at First Hitting Time with Application to Default Risk*, Math. Method. Oper. Res. 63 (2004), 123–150.
- [25] N. V. Krylov, *Controlled diffusion processes*, Berlin, Germany: Springer–Verlag.
- [26] O. A. Ladyzhenskaja, V. A. Solonnikov and N. N. Uralceva, *Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type*, Nauka, Moscow, 1967 English transl.: American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1968.
- [27] E. Pardoux and S. Peng, *Backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations*, in Stochastic Partial Differential Equations and Their Applications: Proceedings of IFIP WG 7/1 International Conference, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer (2005), 200–217.
- [28] D. B. Rokhlin and G. Mironenko, *Regular finite fuel stochastic control problems with exit time*, Math. Method. Oper. Res. 84 (2016), 105–127.
- [29] M. Royer, *BSDEs with a random terminal time driven by a monotone generator and their links with PDEs*, Stoch. Stoch. Rep. 76 (2004), 281–307.

- [30] G. Rubio, *Existence and uniqueness to the Cauchy problem for linear and semilinear parabolic equations with local conditions*, ESAIM: Proc. 31 (2011), 73–100.
- [31] G. Rubio, *The Cauchy–Dirichlet Problem for a Class of Linear Parabolic Differential Equations with Unbounded Coefficients in an Unbounded Domain*, Int. J. Stoch. Anal. 2011, 1–35.
- [32] H. Schmidli, *Stochastic control in insurance*, London: Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [33] J. Strini and S. Thonhauser, *Time-inconsistent view on a dividend problem with penalty*, Scand. Actuar. J. 8 (2023), 811–833.
- [34] D. Zawisza, *Existence results for Isaacs equations with local conditions and related semilinear Cauchy problems*, Ann. Polon. Math. 121 (2018), 175–196.
- [35] D. Zawisza, *Optymalne strategie inwestycyjne wobec ryzyka modelu*, PhD thesis, Jagiellonian University, 2010 (In Polish).
- [36] J. Zhu, *Dividend Optimization for General Diffusions with Restricted Dividend Payment Rates*, Scand. Actuar. J. 7 (2015), 592–615.

DARIUSZ ZAWISZA,
JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS
ŁOJASIEWICZA 6
30-348 KRAKÓW, POLAND
Email address: `dariusz.zawisza@uj.edu.pl`