ABSTRACT. We consider a basic model of two-stage optimal decision making involving pure information learning beforehand and dynamic consumption afterwards: in stage-1 from initial time to a chosen stopping time, the individual investor has access to full market information and simply updates the underlying stock and mean-reverting drift processes by paying information costs; in stage-2 starting from the chosen stopping time, the investor terminates the costly information acquisition while the public stock prices are still available and free. Therefore, during stage-2, the investor starts the investment and consumption based on previous full information and the dynamic partial observations after the stopping time. Moreover, the investor adopts the habit formation preference, in which the past consumption affects his current decisions. Mathematically speaking, we formulate a composite optimal starting and control problem, in which the exterior problem is to determine the best time to initiate the investment-consumption decisions and the interior problem becomes a finite time stochastic control problem with partial information. The value function of the composite problem is characterized as the unique viscosity solution of some variational inequalities.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In the recent data-driven decision making, information acquisition becomes more influential in investment performance especially after the vibrant development in technology of data storage and information processing. Data analytics have been taken as important components in the dynamic investment procedure for companies and individuals in nowadays. In practice, the implementation of stochastic models relies crucially on parameter estimations. Preliminary model calibrations are usually conducted before the investment decisions and it has been observed that information acquisition costs sometimes can be relatively high. Some pioneer work have illustrated that information costs should not be neglected, which may have high impacts on the final investment outcomes. For instance, it has been shown in [13] and [23] empirically that foreign equity portfolios are tilted towards the equities of large firms and information costs heavily determine cross-border equity transactions. Later, [1] investigated the home bias and provided an analysis of U.S. holdings of foreign equities based on information costs. In particular, [15] recently examined the impact of information costs on the future single period portfolio allocation.
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In the present paper, we further consider a basic optimal starting-control model to incorporate information costs in the continuous time portfolio-consumption choice problem. To be precise, we formulate a simple two-stage composite problem under complete and incomplete information filtration sequentially. During the first step, we envision an investor who pays certain full market information costs to update the knowledge of the underlying price process and decide the optimal time to terminate the payment and start the dynamic investment-consumption afterwards. To characterize the impact from the costs, the information fees are subtracted from his initial wealth. In this step, the mathematical problem corresponds to an optimal stopping problem under full market information filtration. The second stage starts from the chosen stopping time and the full information learning is terminated. The investor starts to dynamically choose the investment and consumption policy based on the prior data results before the stopping time and also the free partial observations of public stock prices. Therefore, the second stage problem becomes an optimal control problem under incomplete information filtration generated by stock prices. The value function of the interior control problem in our setting can be solved explicitly as a functional depending on the stopping time, the initial data inputs of the wealth and the drift process at the chosen stopping time. Therefore, the exterior problem can be understood as to choose the values of inputs to maximize the interior functional.

On the other hand, to match with some empirical observations in the economics literature that the investor tends to smooth out his consumption stream, we adopt the popular habit formation preference for the interior control problem. The habit formation has become a new paradigm for modeling preferences on consumption rate in recent years, which can potentially shed a better light on some empirical observations, for instance, the equity premium puzzle. (See [8, 18]). The literature suggests that the past consumption pattern may enforce a continuing impact on individual’s current consumption decisions and therefore the preference should depend on the consumption path. In particular, the linear habit formation preference has been widely accepted, in which there exists an index part that stands for the accumulative consumption history. The utility function is decreasing in habit level because an increase in consumption today increases current utility but depresses all future utilities through the induced increase in future standards of living.

In complete market models, the optimal consumption with habit formation has been well studied by [9, 10, 20] and etc. In incomplete markets, the same problem is solved in the semimartingale framework by [27] and in the market with transaction costs and random endowments by [28]. On the other hand, portfolio optimization under partial observations using Kalman-Bucy filtering also attracted active research in the past decades, see a few examples among [6, 7, 17, 19, 26] with different financial motivations. In this paper, for the interior control problem, we combine the partial observations together with the addictive habit formation and derive the explicit value function and associated optimal strategies. The main contribution of this paper is to introduce the exterior problem, which is to determine the best time to start the control policy, or equivalently, to maximize over all possible inputs of stopping times and the corresponding values of drift process for the interior Kalman-Bucy filtering. As information costs will reduce the initial wealth continuously, the investor needs to decide the optimal time to switch from the full information model to partial information model.
We can characterize the value function of the composite problem as the unique viscosity solution to some variational inequalities using the stochastic Perron’s method. We can further upgrade the regularity of the solution in the continuation region using some PDE theories. For some related literature on optimal stopping using viscosity solution, we refer to \cite{24} and \cite{21}. Recently, the stochastic Perron’s method has been actively studied to avoid the technical proof of dynamic programming principle, see \cite{2, 3, 4, 5, 25} and etc. As an important step to complete the loop of stochastic Perron’s method, the comparison principle in our framework is also established.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the market model and the habit formation preference and formulates the 2-stage optimization problem. Section 3 gives the main results of the interior optimal starting problem with information costs. Using the stochastic Perron’s method, we show that the composite value function is the unique viscosity solution of some variational inequalities. The fully explicit solutions of auxiliary ODEs and the proof of the verification theorem of the interior control problem are reported in Appendix.

2. MATHEMATICAL MODEL AND PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Market Model. Given the probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) with full market information \(\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\) that satisfies the usual conditions, we consider the market with one risk-free bond and one risky asset over a finite time horizon \([0, T]\). It is assumed that the bond process satisfies \(S^0_t \equiv 1\), for \(t \in [0, T]\), which amounts to the standard change of numéraire.

The stock price \(S_t\) satisfies

\[
dS_t = \mu_t S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,
\]

with \(S_0 = s > 0\). It is assumed that the investor starts with initial wealth \(x(0) = x_0 > 0\) at time \(t = 0\) and the acquisition of the full market information \(\mathcal{F}_t\) incurs the cost \(f(t)\) as a deterministic function of time \(t\). In this paper, the cost function \(f(t)\) is assumed to be an increasing and convex \(C^1\)-function with \(f(0) = 0\). Some typical examples can be \(f(t) = t\) and \(f(t) = t^2\). Before the investor starts his investment and consumption, the wealth process at time \(t\) is simply given by a deterministic function \(x(t) = x_0 - f(t)\).

Similar to \cite{7, 20}, we assume that the drift process \(\mu_t\) satisfies the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck SDE as

\[
d\mu_t = -\lambda (\mu_t - \bar{\mu}) dt + \sigma \mu dB_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.
\]

Here, \((W_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\) and \((B_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\) are \((\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}\)-adapted Brownian motions with correlation coefficient \(\rho \in [-1, 1]\). For simplicity, the initial value of the drift process \(\mu_0\) is a given constant. We also assume that market coefficients \(\sigma, \lambda, \bar{\mu}\) and \(\sigma \mu\) are all nonnegative constants.

Under the full market filtration, the investor first needs to choose a \(\mathcal{F}_t\)-adapted stopping time \(\tau\) to terminate the information acquisition and payment of information costs. For the chosen starting time \(\tau\) and any \(t \geq \tau\), he chooses to switch to the partial observations filtration \(\mathcal{F}^S_t = \mathcal{F}_t \vee \sigma(S_u : \tau \leq u \leq t)\), which is the union of the sigma algebra \(\mathcal{F}_\tau\) and the natural filtration generated by the stock price \(S\) up to time \(t\). For any time \(t \in [\tau, T]\), the investor chooses a dynamic consumption rate \(c_t \geq 0\) and decides the amounts \(\pi_t\) of his
wealth to invest in the risky asset and the rest in the bond. Without paying the information acquisition cost, the drift process \( \mu_t \) and Brownian motions \( W_t \) and \( B_t \) are no longer observable for \( t \geq \tau \). Therefore, the investment-consumption strategy \((\pi_t, c_t)\) is assumed to be only adapted to the partial observation filtration \( \mathcal{F}^\tau_t \) for \( \tau \leq t \leq T \).

At the starting time \( \tau \), it is known that the investor has cash wealth \( x(\tau) = x_0 - f(\tau) \) left. Under the incomplete filtration \( \mathcal{F}^\tau_t \), the investor’s total wealth process \( X_t \) can be written as

\[
(2.3) \quad dX_t = (\pi_t \mu_t - c_t)dt + \sigma_S \pi_t dW_t, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T,
\]

with the initial wealth \( X_\tau = x(\tau) = x_0 - f(\tau) > 0 \). Because \( W_t \) is not a Brownian motion under \( \mathcal{F}^\tau_t \), we need to apply the Kalman-Bucy filtering and consider the Innovation Process defined by

\[
(2.4) \quad d\hat{\mu}_t := \frac{1}{\sigma_S} (\mu_t - \hat{\mu}_t) dt + \sigma_S dW_t
\]

with \( \hat{\mu}_t = \mu_t \) and the conditional variance \( \hat{\Omega}(t) = \mathbb{E}[ (\mu_t - \hat{\mu}_t)^2 ] \) satisfies the deterministic Riccati ODE

\[
(2.5) \quad \frac{d\hat{\Omega}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2_s} \hat{\Omega}^2(t) + \left( -\frac{2\sigma_s \rho}{\sigma_S} - 2\lambda \right) \hat{\Omega}(t) + (1 - \rho^2) \sigma^2_\mu, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T,
\]

with the initial value \( \hat{\Omega}(\tau) = 0 \), which has an explicit solution

\[
\hat{\Omega}(t) = \sqrt{k} \frac{k_1 \exp(2(\sqrt{\sigma^2_s} \sigma^2_\mu) t)}{k_1 \exp(2(\sqrt{\sigma^2_s} \sigma^2_\mu) t) - 2k_2} \frac{\sigma^2_\mu}{\sigma^2_S}, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T,
\]

where \( k = \lambda^2 \sigma^2_S + 2\sigma_S \sigma_\mu \lambda \rho + \sigma^2_\mu \), \( k_1 = \sqrt{k} \sigma_S + (\lambda \sigma^2_S + \sigma_S \sigma_\mu) \) and \( k_2 = -\sqrt{k} \sigma_S + (\lambda \sigma^2_S + \sigma_S \sigma_\mu) \).

**Remark 2.1.** It is easy to see that \( \hat{\Omega}(t) \) converges to the value

\[
\theta^* = \sigma_S \sqrt{\lambda^2 \sigma^2_S + 2\sigma_S \sigma_\mu \lambda \rho + \sigma^2_\mu - (\lambda \sigma^2_S + \sigma_S \sigma_\mu)} > 0,
\]

as time \( t \to +\infty \). This convergence property of \( \hat{\Omega}(t) \) tells us the precision of the drift estimate goes from an initial condition to a steady state in a long time horizon. By the Riccati ODE (2.5), it follows that the solution \( \hat{\Omega}(t) \) has the bounds \( 0 \leq \hat{\Omega}(t) \leq \theta^* \) for \( \tau \leq t \).
In this paper, we denote $Z_t := Z(c_t)$ as “habit formation” process or “the standard of living” process, which describes the consumption habits level. It is assumed conventionally that the accumulative reference $Z_t$ satisfies the recursive equation (see [9])

$$dZ_t = (\delta(t) c_t - \alpha(t) Z_t) dt, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T,$$

where $Z_\tau = z_0 \geq 0$ is called the initial habit, which remains constant from the initial time $t = 0$ to the stopping time $\tau$. Equivalently, we have

$$Z_t = z_0 e^{-\int_0^t \alpha(u) du} + \int_\tau^t \delta(u) e^{-\int_u^t \alpha(s) ds} c_u du, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T,$$

which is the exponentially weighted average of the initial habit and the past consumption. It is assumed that $\alpha(t)$ and $\delta(t)$ are nonnegative continuous functions of time $t$. We are only interested in the case of addictive habits, namely it is required that the investor’s current consumption strategies shall never fall below the standard of living level, $c_t \geq Z_t, \tau \leq t \leq T$, a.s.

Under the partial observation filtration $(F^S_t)_{\tau \leq t \leq T}$, the stock price dynamics (2.1) can be rewritten by

$$dS_t = \hat{\mu}_t S_t dt + \sigma S_t d\hat{W}_t, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T.$$ 

The wealth process dynamics (2.3) can also be rewritten as

$$d\hat{X}_t = (\pi_t \hat{\mu}_t - c_t) dt + \sigma \pi_t d\hat{W}_t, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T.$$ 

To facilitate the formulation of the stochastic control problem and the derivation of the dynamic programming equation, for any $t \in [0, T]$, we denote $A_t(y)$ the time-modulated admissible set of the pair of investment and consumption process $(\pi_s, c_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}$ with the initial wealth $X_t = y$, which is $F^S_t$-progressively measurable and satisfies the integrability conditions $\int_t^T \pi^2_s ds < +\infty$, a.s. and $\int_0^T c_s ds < +\infty$, a.s. with the addictive habit formation constraint that $c_s \geq Z_s, t \leq s \leq T$. Moreover, no bankruptcy is allowed, i.e., the investor’s wealth remains nonnegative, i.e. $\hat{X}_s \geq 0, t \leq s \leq T$.

**Assumption 2.1.** By Remark 3.1, it is required that $x_0 - f(T) > z_0 \max_{0 \leq s \leq T} m(s)$ so that the interior control problem is always well defined for any $t \in [0, T]$.

2.2. **Problem Formulation.** The composite optimal stopping and optimal control problem is to solve

$$\hat{V}(0, \mu_0; x_0, z_0) = \sup_{\tau} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left. \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_\tau^T U(c_s - Z_s) ds \right| F^S_\tau \right] \right],$$

and its dynamic counterpart is defined as

$$\hat{V}(t, \mu_t; x_0 - f(t), z_0) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left. \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_\tau^T U(c_s - Z_s) ds \right| F^S_\tau \right] \right].$$

(2.6)

Note that the investor only observes the return process $\mu_t$ between time 0 and time $\tau$ and does not make any investment and consumption. His wealth process is simply a deterministic function $x(t) = x_0 - f(t)$ and his habit remains unchanged up to stopping time $\tau$. Therefore, in the above problem (2.6), we regard $x(t)$ and $z_0$ as parameters instead of underlying state processes.
Moreover, the process $\tilde{V}$ is interpreted as the Snell envelope of $\tilde{V}$, where

$$\tilde{V}(t, x_0 - f(t), z_0, t; 0) = \esssup_{(\pi, c) \in A_t(x_0 - f(t))} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T U(c_s - Z_s) ds \big| \mathcal{F}_t^S \right]$$

$$= \esssup_{(\pi, c) \in A_t(x_0 - f(t))} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T U(c_s - Z_s) ds \big| \tilde{X}_t = x_0 - f(t), \tilde{\mu}_t = \mu_t, Z_t = z_0; \tilde{\Omega}(t) = 0 \right].$$

Here the interior value function $\tilde{V}$ is defined in (3.1) and has the explicit form given in (3.8). Therefore, $\tilde{V}$ satisfies

$$\tilde{V}(t, \eta, x_0 - f(t), z_0) = \esssup_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{V}(\tau, x_0 - f(\tau), z_0, \mu_\tau) \big| \mathcal{F}_t \right]$$

$$= \esssup_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{V}(\tau, x_0 - f(\tau), z_0, \mu_\tau) \big| \mu_\tau = \eta \right].$$

The continuation region is $\mathcal{C} = \{(t, \eta) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R} : \tilde{V}(t, \eta, x_0 - f(t), z_0) > \tilde{V}(t, x_0 - f(t), z_0, \eta) \}$ and the free boundary is $\partial \mathcal{C} = \{(t, \eta) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R} : \tilde{V}(t, \eta, x_0 - f(t), z_0) = \tilde{V}(t, x_0 - f(t), z_0, \eta) \}$. Let us denote $\tilde{V}(t, \eta, x_0 - f(t), z_0)$ by $\tilde{V}(t, \eta)$ for short. By some heuristic arguments, we can write the dynamic programming variational inequalities as

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{V}(t, \eta) - \tilde{V}(t, x_0 - f(t), z_0, \eta), -\frac{\partial \tilde{V}(t, \eta)}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L}\tilde{V}(t, \eta) \right\} = 0,$$

where $\mathcal{L}\tilde{V}(t, \eta) = -\lambda(\eta - \tilde{\mu}) \frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial \eta}(t, \eta) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{V}}{\partial \eta^2}(t, \eta)$. Equivalently,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
F(t, \eta, v, v_t, v_\eta, v_{\eta\eta}) = 0, \text{ on } [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}, \\
v(T, \eta) = \tilde{V}(T, \eta) = 0, \text{ for any } \eta \in \mathbb{R},
\end{array} \right.$$

where $F(t, \eta, v, v_t, v_\eta, v_{\eta\eta}) := \min \left\{ v - \tilde{V}, -\frac{\partial v}{\partial \eta} - \mathcal{L}v \right\}$.

**Remark 2.2.** The second term $-\frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L}\tilde{V}$ in (2.7) is linear parabolic PDE and does not depend on the interior control $(\pi, c)$. The comparison part $\tilde{V} - \tilde{V}$ in (2.7) depends on $(\pi, c)$ as the $\tilde{V}$ is the value function of the interior control problem provided the input $\tilde{X}_t = x_0 - f(t), \tilde{Z}_t = z_0$ and $\tilde{\mu}_t = \mu_t = \eta$.

3. **Interior Utility Maximization under Partial Observations**

In this section, we first solve the interior dynamic investment and consumption under habit formation preference. In particular, we are restricted to the partial observation filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^S$. To apply the heuristic dynamic programming arguments, we will consider the stochastic control problem starting from some fixed time $0 \leq k \leq T$ and derive the corresponding HJB equation. And then, we will give our main result, the verification theorem.
3.1. **Optimal Consumption with Kalman-Bucy Filtering.** The dynamic value function of the interior stochastic control problem under consumption habit formation is defined by

\[
\hat{V}(k, x, z, \eta; \theta) := \sup_{(\pi, c) \in \mathcal{A}_k(x)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_k^T \frac{(c_s - Z_s)^p}{p} ds \right. \\
\left. \mid \hat{X}_k = x, Z_k = z, \mu_k = \eta; \hat{\Omega}(k) = \theta \right],
\]

(3.1)

where \(\mathcal{A}_k(x)\) denotes the admissible control space starting from time \(k\). Here, as the conditional variance \(\hat{\Omega}(t)\) is a deterministic function of time, we set \(\theta\) as a parameter instead of a state variable. To simplify the presentation, it is assumed in this paper that the risk aversion coefficient \(p < 0\).

By using the optimality principle and Itô’s formula, we can heuristically obtain the HJB equation as

\[
V_t - \alpha(t)zV_z - \lambda(\eta - \bar{\mu})V_\eta + \left( \hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma_s \sigma_\mu \rho \right)^2 \frac{2}{\sigma_s^2} V_{\eta\eta} \\
+ \max_{(\pi, c) \in \mathcal{A}} \left[ -eV_x + c\delta(t)V_z + \frac{(c - z)^p}{p} \right] \\
+ \max_{(\pi, c) \in \mathcal{A}} \left[ \pi \eta V_x + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_s^2 \pi^2 V_{xx} + V_{x\eta} \left( \hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma_s \sigma_\mu \rho \right) \pi \right] = 0, \ k \leq t \leq T,
\]

(3.2)

with the terminal condition \(V(T, x, z, \eta) = 0\).

3.2. **The Decoupled Form Solution and Main Results.** If \(V(t, x, z, \eta)\) is smooth enough, the first order condition gives

\[
\pi^*(t, x, z, \eta) = -\eta V_x - \left( \hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma_s \sigma_\mu \rho \right) V_{x\eta},
\]

\[
c^*(t, x, z, \eta) = z + \left( V_x - \delta(t)V_z \right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.
\]

Due to the homogeneity property of the power utility function and the linearity of dynamics, we can conjecture the value function in the form as

\[
V(t, x, z, \eta) = \left[ \frac{(x - m(t, \eta) z)}{p} \right]^p N^{1-p}(t, \eta),
\]

for some unknown functions \(m(t, \eta)\) and \(N(t, \eta)\) to be determined. By the virtue of \(V(T) = 0\), we will require \(m(T, \eta) = 0\) and \(N(T, \eta) = 0\).

After the direct substitution, we can set \(m(t, \eta) = m(t)\) with the terminal condition \(m(T) = 0\), which is equivalent to

\[
m(t) = \int_t^T \exp \left( \int_t^s (\delta(v) - \alpha(v)) dv \right) ds. \ k \leq t \leq T.
\]

(3.3)
The HJB equation reduces to the linear parabolic PDE for $N(t, \eta)$ as

$$N_t + \frac{pm^2}{2(1-p)^2} N(t, \eta) + \left( \frac{\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma \sigma \mu \rho}{2\sigma^2} \right)^2 N_{\eta\eta} + \left( 1 + \delta(t)m(t) \right) \frac{p}{p-1}$$

$$+ \left[ -\lambda(\eta - \bar{\mu}) + \frac{\eta(\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma \sigma \mu \rho)}{(1-p)\sigma^2} \right] N_{\eta}(t, \eta) = 0,$$

with $N(T, \eta) = 0$. We can further solve the linear PDE explicitly by

$$(3.4) \quad N(t, \eta) = \int_t^T \left( 1 + \delta(s)m(s) \right) \frac{p}{p-1} \exp \left( A(t, s)\eta^2 + B(t, s)\eta + C(t, s) \right) \, ds,$$

where for $k \leq t \leq s \leq T$. $A(t, s), B(t, s)$ and $C(t, s)$ satisfy the following ODEs:

$$(3.5) \quad A_t(t, s) + \frac{p}{2(1-p)^2} + 2 \left[ -\lambda + \frac{p(\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma \sigma \mu \rho)}{\sigma^2(1-p)} \right] A(t, s)$$

$$+ \frac{2(\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma \sigma \mu \rho)^2}{\sigma^2} A^2(t, s) = 0;$$

$$B_t(t, s) + \left[ -\lambda + \frac{p(\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma \sigma \mu \rho)}{\sigma^2(1-p)} \right] B(t, s)$$

$$+ 2\lambda \bar{\mu} A(t, s) + \frac{2(\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma \sigma \mu \rho)^2}{\sigma^2} A(t, s)B(t, s) = 0;$$

$$C_t(t, s) + \lambda \bar{\mu} B(t, s) + \frac{(\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma \sigma \mu \rho)^2}{2\sigma^2} \left( B^2(t, s) + 2A(t, s) \right) = 0.$$

The explicit solutions of ODEs (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) are presented in Appendix A. For fixed $t \in [k, T]$, we can define the effective domain for the pair $(x, z)$ by $D_t := \{(x', z') \in (0, +\infty) \times (0, +\infty); \ x' \geq m(t)z'\}$, where $k \leq t \leq T$. The function (3.8) below is well defined on $[k, T] \times D_t \times \mathbb{R}$ and it is the classical solution of the HJB equation (3.2):

$$(3.8) \quad V(t, x, z, \eta) = \left[ \int_t^T \left( 1 + \delta(s)m(s) \right) \frac{p}{p-1} \exp \left( A(t, s)\eta^2 + B(t, s)\eta + C(t, s) \right) ds \right]^{1-p}$$

$$\times \frac{[(x - m(t)z)]^p}{p}.$$ 

**Remark 3.1.** The effective domain of $V(t, x, z, \eta)$ motivates some constraints on the optimal wealth process $X_t^*$ and habit formation process $Z_t^*$ such that $X_t^* \geq m(t)Z_t^*$ for $t \in [k, T]$. In particular, at the initial time $t = k$, we have to enforce the initial wealth-habit budget constraint that $X_k = \hat{x} \geq m(k)\hat{z}$, where $Z_k = \hat{z}$.

**Theorem 1.** (The Verification Theorem) If the initial wealth-habit budget constraint $\hat{x} > m(k)\hat{z}$ holds at time $k$, the unique solution (3.8) of HJB equation equals the value function defined in (3.1), i.e., $V(k, x, z, \eta; \theta) = \ldots$
\[ \hat{V}(k, x, z, \eta; \theta). \] Moreover, the optimal investment policy \( \pi^*_t \) and optimal consumption policy \( c^*_t \) are given in the feedback form by \( \pi^*_t = \pi^*(t, \hat{X}^*_t, Z_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t) \) and \( c^*_t = c^*(t, \hat{X}^*_t, Z_t^*, \hat{\mu}_t), k \leq t \leq T. \) The function \( \pi^*(t, x, z, \eta) : [k, T] \times \mathbb{D}_t \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is given by

\[
\pi^*(t, x, z, \eta) = \left[ \frac{\eta}{(1-p)\sigma^2_S} + \frac{\hat{\Omega}(t) + \sigma_S \sigma_p \rho \delta(t)m(t)}{\sigma^2_S} \right] (x - m(t)z),
\]

and the function \( c^*(t, x, z, \eta) : [k, T] \times \mathbb{D}_t \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) is given by

\[
c^*(t, x, z, \eta) = z + \frac{(x - m(t)z)}{(1 + \delta(t)m(t))^{1/\gamma} N(t, \eta)}.
\]

The optimal wealth process \( \hat{X}^*_t, \) \( k \leq t \leq T, \) is given by

\[
\hat{X}^*_t = (x - m(k)z) \frac{N(t, \hat{\mu}_t)}{N(k, \eta)}
\]

\[
\times \exp \left( \int_k^t \frac{\hat{\mu}_u^2}{2(1-p)\sigma^2_S} du + \int_k^t \frac{\hat{\mu}_u}{(1-p)\sigma_S} d\hat{W}_u \right) + m(t)Z_t^*.
\]

4. Exterior Optimal Staring Problem

After we obtain the explicit interior value function, this section aims to solve the exterior optimal starting problem. To determine the optimal stopping time, we need to maximize over the inputs of values \( \tau, \hat{X}_\tau, Z_\tau \) and \( \hat{\mu}_\tau \) and the parameter \( \hat{\Omega}(\tau). \) Let us recall that the investor does not manage his investment and consumption before \( \tau, \) it follows that \( \hat{X}_\tau = x_0 - f(\tau), \ Z_\tau = z_0 \) and \( \hat{\Omega}(\tau) = 0 \) can all be taken as parameters. The mathematical problem corresponds to an optimal starting problem in which \( \mu_t \) becomes the only underlying state process. Therefore, we need to choose \( \mu_\tau \) under the full information filtration to decide the optimal starting time and we will show that the value function of the exterior problem is the unique classical solution to some variational inequalities. To this end, we first prove that the exterior value function is the unique viscosity solution to some variational inequalities using stochastic Perron's method. This approach allows us to check the verification without regularity condition and dynamic programming arguments can be avoided. Second, we will use the test function from the definition of the viscosity solution and some existing PDE theories to upgrade the regularity of solution in the continuation region.

The procedure to show that \( \hat{V} \) is a viscosity solution is as follows: we first introduce sets of stochastic semi-solutions \( \mathcal{V}^+ \) and \( \mathcal{V}^- \) respectively and show that \( v^- \leq \hat{V} \leq v^+ \), where \( v^- \) and \( v^+ \) are defined later in (4.1) and (4.2). By using the stochastic Perron's method, we can get that \( v^+ \) is the viscosity subsolution and \( v^- \) is the viscosity supersolution. At last, we prove the comparison principle, namely if we have bounded u.s.c viscosity subsolution \( u \) and bounded l.s.c viscosity supersolution \( v \) of (2.8), we can derive \( u \leq v \). It clearly follows that \( v^- \leq \hat{V} \leq v^- \) which leads to our desired conclusion.

Let us first give the following definitions similar to [2, 4].

**Definition 4.1.** The set of stochastic super-solutions for the PDE (2.8), denoted by \( \mathcal{V}^+ \), is the set of functions \( v : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) which have the following properties:
We define Definition 4.3. We have $v(T, \eta) = \sup_{\eta < \eta_0} \eta_0 \geq 0$ for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v(t, \eta) \geq \tilde{V}(t, \eta)$ for any $(t, \eta) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$. 

(i) for each $(t, \eta) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ and any stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, the function $v$ along the solution of SDE is a sub-martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \leq \tau}$, that is to say, $v(s, \mu_s) \geq \mathbb{E}(v(\tau, \mu_\tau) | \mathcal{F}_s) - \mathbb{P}$ a.s. 

(ii) for each $(t, \eta) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$, the function $v$ along the solution of the SDE is a super-martingale with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \leq \tau}$, that is to say, $v(s, \mu_s) \leq \mathbb{E}(v(\tau, \mu_\tau) | \mathcal{F}_s) - \mathbb{P}$ a.s.

Lemma 4.4. $\hat{V}(t, x_0 - f(t), z_0, \eta; 0)$ is bounded and continuous for $(t, \eta) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, $\hat{V}$ has an explicit form as 
\[
\hat{V}(t, x_0 - f(t), z_0, \eta) = \frac{[x_0 - f(t) - m(t)z_0]^p}{p} \times \left[ \int_t^T \left( 1 + \delta(u)m(u) \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \exp \left( A(t, u)\eta^2 + B(t, u)\eta + C(t, u) \right) du \right]^{1-p}.
\]

For fixed $x_0$ and $z_0$, it is clear that $\hat{V}(t, \eta)$ is continuous and $\hat{V}(t, \eta) \leq 0$. So we only show that $\hat{V}$ is lower bounded. By Appendix A, we know that functions $A(u) \leq 0$, $B(u) \leq 0$, and $C(u) \leq K$ for some $K \geq 0$ by using $p < 0$. We deduce that $\left( A(u)\eta^2 + B(u)\eta + C(u) \right) \leq K_1$ for some $K_1 > 0$ and it follows that $\hat{V}(t, \eta)$ is lower bounded by some constant for $(t, \eta) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ as $p < 0$. 

As it is trivial to see that $0 \in \mathcal{V}^-$ and $0 \in \mathcal{V}^+$, we have the following result.

Lemma 4.2. $\mathcal{V}^+$ and $\mathcal{V}^-$ are nonempty.

Definition 4.3. We define 
\[
v^- := \sup_{p \in \mathcal{V}^-} p; \quad v^+ := \inf_{q \in \mathcal{V}^+} q.
\]

By the same argument as in [2], we have the next result.

Lemma 4.3. We have $v^- \in \mathcal{V}^-$ and $v^+ \in \mathcal{V}^+$.

Next, we have the following comparison result.

Lemma 4.4. We have $v^- \leq \hat{V} \leq v^+$.

Proof. For each $v \in \mathcal{V}^+$, we have $v(t, \eta) \geq \mathbb{E}(v(\tau, \mu_\tau) | \mathcal{F}_t) \geq \mathbb{E}(\hat{V}(\tau, \mu_\tau) | \mathcal{F}_t)$ because of the submartingale property in Definition 4.1. It follows that $v(t, \eta) \geq \text{esssup}_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E}(\hat{V}(\tau, \mu_\tau) | \mathcal{F}_t)$, which implies that $v(t, \eta) \geq \hat{V}(t, \eta)$ and hence $\hat{V} \leq v^+$ by the definition of $v^+$. On the other hand, for each $v \in \mathcal{V}^-$,
we have \( v(t, \eta) \leq \mathbb{E}[v(\tau, \mu_\tau)|\mathcal{F}_t] \) because of the sub-martingale property in Definition 4.2. In particular, \( v(t, \eta) \leq \mathbb{E}[v(T, \mu_T)|\mathcal{F}_t] \leq \mathbb{E}[\bar{V}(\tau, \mu_\tau)|\mathcal{F}_t] = \bar{V}(t, \eta) \). Thus, it follows that \( \bar{V} \geq v^- \) because of (4.1). In conclusion, \( v^- \leq \bar{V} \leq v^+ \). \( \square \)

**Theorem 4.1.** *(Stochastic Perron’s Method)* \( v^- \) in Definition 4.3 is a bounded and lower semi-continuous viscosity super-solution of

\[
(4.3) \quad \begin{cases}
F(t, \eta, v, v_t, \eta_t) \geq 0, & \text{on } [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}, \\
v(T, \eta) \geq \bar{V}(T, \eta), & \text{for any } \eta \in \mathbb{R},
\end{cases}
\]

and \( v^+ \) in Definition 4.3 is a bounded and upper semi-continuous viscosity sub-solution of

\[
(4.4) \quad \begin{cases}
F(t, \eta, v, v_t, \eta_t) \leq 0, & \text{on } [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}, \\
v(T, \eta) \leq \bar{V}(T, \eta), & \text{for any } \eta \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** We follow similar arguments as in [2, 4].

(i) The sub-solution property of \( v^+ \). First, definition in (4.2) and Lemma 4.3 imply that \( v^+ \) is bounded and upper semi-continuous. Let \( \varphi : [0, T) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be a \( C^{1,2} \)-test function and \( v^- - \varphi \) attains a strict local maximum that is equal to zero at some interior point \((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}\). Suppose that \( v^+ \) is not a viscosity sub-solution, we will show a contradiction. As \( \mathcal{F}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) > 0 \), it follows that

\[
\begin{cases}
v^+(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) - \bar{V}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) > 0, \\
-\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) - \mathcal{L} \varphi(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

As coefficients of the variational inequality are continuous, there exists a ball \( B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \) small enough that

\[
\begin{cases}
-\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L} \varphi > 0 \text{ on } B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon), \\
\varphi > v^+ \text{ on } B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) - (\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}).
\end{cases}
\]

In addition, as \( \varphi(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) = v^+(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) > \bar{V}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \), \( \varphi \) is continuous and \( \bar{V} \) is continuous, we can derive that for some \( \varepsilon < \delta \wedge \varepsilon \), we have \( \varphi - \varepsilon \geq \bar{V} \) on \( B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \). Because \( v^+ - \varphi \) is upper semi-continuous and \( B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \cap B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \) is compact, it then follows that there exists a \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( \varphi - \delta \geq v^+ \) on \( B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \cap B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \).

If we choose \( 0 < \xi < \delta \wedge \varepsilon \), the function \( \varphi^\xi = \varphi - \xi \) will satisfy the following properties:

\[
\begin{cases}
-\frac{\partial \varphi^\xi}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L} \varphi^\xi > 0 \text{ on } B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon), \\
\varphi^\xi > v^+ \text{ on } B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \setminus B(t, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}), \\
\varphi^\xi \geq \bar{V} \text{ on } B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon),
\end{cases}
\]

and \( \varphi^\xi(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) = v^+(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) - \xi \).

Let us define another auxiliary function by

\[
v^\xi = \begin{cases}
v^+ \wedge \varphi^\xi \text{ on } B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon), \\
v^+ \text{ outside } B(t, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon).
\end{cases}
\]

It is easy to check that \( v^\xi \) is upper semi-continuous and \( v^\xi(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) = \varphi^\xi(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) < v^+ + (\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \). We claim that \( v^\xi \) satisfies the condition \( v^\xi \geq \bar{V} \). To see this, let us pick some positive \( \varepsilon \) that satisfies \( t > \bar{t} + \varepsilon \), then \( v^\xi = v^+ \).
It follows that \( v^\xi \) satisfies the claim by observing that \( v^+ \geq \hat{V} \). We then continue to show that \( v^\xi \in \mathcal{V}^+ \) to deduce a contradiction.

Let us fix \((t, \eta)\) and recall that \(((\mu_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}, (W_s, B_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}, \Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}) \in \mathcal{X}'\). We need to show that the process \((v^\xi(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\) is a super-martingale on \((\Omega, \mathbb{P})\) with respect to \((\mathcal{F}_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}\). We first consider a special case that \((v^+(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\) has right continuous paths. In this case, \(v^\xi\) is a super-martingale locally in the region \([t, T] \times \mathbb{R} \setminus B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\) because it equals the right continuous super-martingale \((v^+(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\). As the process \((v^\xi(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\) is the minimum between two local super-martingales in the region \(B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon)\), it is a local super-martingale. As two regions \([t, T] \times \mathbb{R} \setminus B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\) and \(B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon)\) overlap over an open region, \((v^\xi(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\) is actually a super-martingale.

In the general case when the process \((v^+(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\) is not right continuous, we can consider its right continuous limit over rational times to transform it to the special case discussed above. In particular, for fixed \(0 \leq t \leq r \leq s \leq T\) and \(\eta \in \mathbb{R}\), it remains to show the super-martingale property of the process \((Y_u)_{t \leq u \leq T} := (v^\xi(u, \mu_u))_{t \leq u \leq T}, r \leq u \leq s\), which is equivalent to show \(Y_r \geq \mathbb{E}[Y_s|\mathcal{F}_r]\).

Let us denote \(G_u := v^+(u, \mu_u), r \leq u \leq s\) and stop the process \(G\) after time \(s\), i.e. \(G_u := v^+(s, \mu_s), s \leq u \leq T\). As \((G_u)_{r \leq u \leq T}\) may not be right continuous, by Proposition 3.14 in [14], we can define its right continuous modification as

\[
G_u^+(\omega) := \lim_{u' \to u, u' > u, u' \in \mathbb{Q}} G_{u'}(\omega), \quad r \leq u \leq T.
\]

Note that \(G^+\) is a right continuous super-martingale with respect to \(\mathcal{F}\) which satisfies the usual conditions. Because \(v^+\) is upper semi-continuous and the process remains the same after \(s\), we conclude that \(G_r \geq G_r^+, G_s = G_s^+\). Recall that \(v^+ < \varphi - \delta\) in the open region \(B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \setminus B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\), if we take right limits inside this region and use continuous function \(\varphi\), we have

\[
G_u^+ < \varphi^\xi(u, \mu_u), \text{ if } (u, \mu_u) \in B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \setminus B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}).
\]

Thus, if we consider the process

\[
Y_u^+ := \begin{cases}
G_u^+, (u, \mu_u) \notin \overline{B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})}, \\
G_u^+ \land \varphi^\xi(u, \mu_u), (u, \mu_u) \in B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon),
\end{cases}
\]

we also have \(Y_r \geq Y_r^+, Y_s = Y_s^+\).

Because \(G^+\) has right continuous paths, we can conclude that \(Y\) is a super-martingale such that

\[
Y_r \geq Y_r^+ \geq \mathbb{E}[Y_s^+|\mathcal{F}_r] = \mathbb{E}[Y_s|\mathcal{F}_r].
\]

(ii) The terminal condition of \(v^+\).

For some \(\eta_0 \in \mathbb{R}\), we assume that \(v^+(T, \eta_0) > \hat{V}(T, \eta_0)\) and will show a contradiction. As \(\hat{V}\) is continuous on \(\mathbb{R}\), we can choose an \(\varepsilon > 0\) such that

\[
\hat{V}(T, \eta) \leq v^+(T, \eta_0) - \varepsilon, \quad |\eta - \eta_0| \leq \varepsilon.
\]
\(v^+\) is bounded above on the compact set \((B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon) \setminus B(T, \eta_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})) \cap ([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})\) because of the upper semi-continuous property of \(v^+\). Then, we can find \(\delta > 0\) small enough so that

\[
(4.5) \quad v^+(T, \eta_0) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4\delta} \geq \varepsilon + \sup_{(t, \eta) \in (B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon) \setminus B(T, \eta_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})) \cap ([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})} v^+(t, \eta).
\]

Next, we set a function for \(k > 0\)

\[
\varphi_{\delta, \varepsilon, k}(t, \eta) = v^+(T, \eta_0) + \frac{|\eta - \eta_0|^2}{\delta} + k(T - t).
\]

For \(k\) large enough, we derive that \(-\varphi_{\delta, \varepsilon, k}^t - \mathcal{L}\varphi_{\delta, \varepsilon, k} > 0\) on \(B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon)\). Besides, we have the following function due to \((4.5)\)

\[
\varphi_{\delta, \varepsilon, k}(T, \eta_0) \geq v^+(T, \eta_0) \geq \hat{V}(T, \eta_0) + \varepsilon \text{ for } |\eta - \eta_0| \leq \varepsilon.
\]

Now, we can find \(\xi < \varepsilon\) and define the function as follows,

\[
v_{\delta, \varepsilon, k}(t, \eta) = \begin{cases} 
v^+ \wedge (\varphi_{\delta, \varepsilon, k} - \xi) & \text{on } B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon), \\
v^+ \text{ outside on } B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon). & \end{cases}
\]

Similar to \((i)\), we can prove that \(v_{\delta, \varepsilon, k}(T, \eta_0) = v^+(T, \eta_0) - \xi\), which leads to a contradiction.

\((iii)\) The super-solution property of \(v^-\). We only provide a sketch of the proof as it is similar to Step \((i)\). For some interior point \((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}\), let \(\psi : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) be a \(C^{1,2}\)-test function such that \(v^- - \psi\) attains a strict local minimum equal to zero at \((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta})\). Suppose we have \(F(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) < 0\) and we will show contradictions. There are two cases to consider.

\(\text{case}(i)\) \(v^-((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) - \hat{V}((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta})) < 0\). This already leads to a contradiction with \(v^-((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \geq \hat{V}((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}))\) by the definition of \(v^-\).

\(\text{case}(ii)\) \(-\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) - \mathcal{L}\psi(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) < 0\). We can find a small enough ball \(B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon)\) such that \(-\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L}\psi < 0\) on \(B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon)\). Moreover, as \(v^- - \psi\) is lower semi-continuous and \(B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \setminus B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\) is compact, there exists \(\delta > 0\) such that \(\psi + \delta \leq v^-\) on \(B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon) \setminus B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\). We can then choose \(\xi \in (0, \frac{\delta}{2})\) small such that \(v^\xi = \psi + \xi\) satisfies the following three properties: First, \(-\frac{\partial v^\xi}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L}v^\xi < 0\) on \(B(t, \eta, \varepsilon)\); Second, we have \(v^- \geq \psi + \delta > \psi + \xi = v^\xi\) on \(B(t, \eta, \varepsilon) \setminus B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})\); Third, \(v^\xi((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) = \psi((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) + \xi = v^-((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) + \xi > v^-((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta})).\)

Thus, we can define another auxiliary function as

\[
v^\xi = \begin{cases} 
v^- \vee v^\xi & \text{on } B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon), \\
v^- \text{ outside on } B(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}, \varepsilon). & \end{cases}
\]

By repeating essentially the same argument as in Step \((i)\), we can show that \(v^\xi \in \mathcal{V}^-\) by showing that \((v^\xi(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\) is a sub-martingale. If \(v^-\) has right continuous paths, then the proof is trivial. If not, we ask help for the Proposition 3.14 in [14] to define our right continuous sub-martingale \(G^+_u(\omega) := \lim_{u' \to u, u' > u, u' \in Q} G^w_u(\omega), \omega \in \Omega^*, \ r \leq u \leq T, \) where \(G_u := v^-(u, \mu_u), \ r \leq u \leq s\) and we stop it at time \(t\), that is to say, \(G_u := v^-(s, \mu_s), \ s \leq u \leq T,\) given fixed \(0 \leq t \leq r \leq s \leq T\) and \(\eta \in \mathbb{R}\.}
Following the same idea in step (i), we note that $G^+$ is the right continuous sub-martingale and therefore $G_r \leq G^+_r$, $G_s = G^+_s$. As $G^+_u > \psi^s(u, \mu_u)$, if $(u, \mu_u) \in B(t, \eta, \varepsilon) \setminus \overline{B(t, \eta, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})}$, we can define the process

$$Y^+_u := \begin{cases} 
G^+_u, (u, \mu_u) \notin \overline{B(t, \eta, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})}, \\
G^+_u \lor \psi^s(u, \mu_u), (u, \mu_u) \in \overline{B(t, \eta, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})}.
\end{cases}$$

We can conclude that $Y_r \leq Y^+_r$, $Y_s = Y^+_s$ and $Y$ is a sub-martingale such that

$$Y_r \leq Y^+_r \leq \mathbb{E}[Y^+_r | \mathcal{F}_r] = \mathbb{E}[Y_s | \mathcal{F}_r],$$

which completes the proof.

(iv) The terminal condition of $v^-$. 
For some $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose that $v^-(T, \eta_0) < \hat{V}(T, \eta_0)$ and we will show a contradiction. As $\hat{V}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{R}$, we can choose an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\hat{V}(T, \eta) \geq v^-(T, \eta_0) + \varepsilon, \quad |\eta - \eta_0| \leq \varepsilon.$$

In a similar way to (iii), we can find $\delta > 0$ small enough so that

$$v^-(T, \eta_0) - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4\delta} \leq \inf_{(t, \eta) \in (B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon) \setminus \overline{B(T, \eta_0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})}) \cap ([0, T] \times \mathbb{R})} v^-(t, \eta) - \varepsilon. \tag{4.6}$$

Then, we set a function for $k > 0$

$$\psi^{\delta, \varepsilon, k}(t, \eta) = v^-(T, \eta_0) - \frac{|\eta - \eta_0|^2}{\delta} - k(T - t).$$

For $k$ large enough, we derive that $-\psi^{\delta, \varepsilon, k}_t - \mathcal{L}\psi^{\delta, \varepsilon, k} < 0$ on $B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon)$. Besides, we have the following function due to (4.6)

$$\psi^{\delta, \varepsilon, k}(T, \eta_0) \leq v^-(T, \eta_0) \leq \hat{V}(T, \eta_0) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for} \quad |\eta - \eta_0| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Next, we can find $\xi < \varepsilon$ and define the function as follows,

$$v^{\delta, \varepsilon, k, \xi} = \begin{cases} 
v^-(\psi^{\delta, \varepsilon, k} + \xi) \quad \text{on} \quad \overline{B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon)}, \\
v^- \quad \text{outside} \quad \overline{B(T, \eta_0, \varepsilon)}.
\end{cases}$$

Follow the same argument as in step (iii), we can prove that $v^{\delta, \varepsilon, k, \xi} \in \mathcal{V}^-$, but $v^{\delta, \varepsilon, k, \xi}(T, \eta_0) = v^-(T, \eta_0) + \xi$, which gives a contradiction.

Let us then reverse the time and consider $s := T - t$. However, for the simplicity of presentation, let us continue to use $t$ in the place of $s$ if there is no confusion. The variational inequalities can be rewritten as

$$\min \left\{ \hat{V}(t, \eta; x_0 - f(T - t), z_0) - \hat{V}(t, x_0 - f(T - t), z_0, \eta), \quad \frac{\partial \hat{V}(t, \eta)}{\partial t} - \mathcal{L}\hat{V}(t, \eta) \right\} = 0, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\mathcal{L}\hat{V}(t, \eta) = -\lambda(\eta - \hat{\mu})\frac{\partial \hat{V}(t, \eta)}{\partial \eta} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma \eta \frac{\partial^2 \hat{V}(t, \eta)}{\partial \eta^2}$ and also $\hat{V}(0, \eta) = 0$. 

Let us denote it equivalently as

\[(4.8)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
F(t, \eta, v, v_t, v_{\eta}, v_{\eta \eta}) &= 0, \text{ on } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}, \\
v(0, \eta) &= \hat{V}(0, \eta), \text{ for any } \eta \in \mathbb{R},
\end{align*}
\]

where \(F(t, \eta, v, v_t, v_{\eta}, v_{\eta \eta}) := \min \left\{ v - \hat{V}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} - Lv \right\} \). Here, we also rewrite the continuation region is \( \mathcal{C} = \{(t, \eta) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R} : \hat{V}(t, \eta; x_0 - f(T - t), z_0) > \hat{V}(t, x_0 - f(T - t), z_0, \eta) \} \).

**Theorem 4.2.** (Comparison Principle) Let \( u, v \) be u.s.c viscosity subsolution and l.s.c. viscosity supersolution of (4.8), respectively. If \( u(0, \eta) \leq v(0, \eta) \) on \( \mathbb{R} \), then we have \( u \leq v \) on \( (0, T) \times \mathbb{R} \).

**Proof.** We will follow similar arguments in [5, 22] with modifications to fit into our framework. We suppose that \( u(0, \eta) \leq v(0, \eta) \) on \( \mathbb{R} \), then, we try to prove that \( u \leq v \) on \( [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \). We first construct the strict supersolution to the system (4.8) with suitable perturbations of \( v \). We recall that \( A \leq 0 \), \( B \leq 0 \) and \( C \) is bounded above by some constant and \( \hat{V}(t, \eta) \leq 0 \). Let us fix a constant \( C_2 > 0 \) small enough such that \( \lambda > C_2 \sigma^2_{\mu} \) and set \( \psi(t, \eta) = C_0 e^{C_1 t} + e^{C_2 \eta^2} \) with some \( C_0 > 0 \), \( C_1 > 0 \). Thus, we have the following inequality:

\[(4.9)\]
\[
\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - L\psi = C_0 C_1 e^{C_1 t} + C_2 \left[ 2(\lambda - C_2 \sigma^2_{\mu}) \eta^2 - 2\mu \eta - \sigma^2_{\mu} \right] e^{C_2 \eta^2} \\
\geq C_0 C_1 e^{C_1 t} + C_2 \frac{-2(\lambda - C_2 \sigma^2_{\mu}) \sigma^2_{\mu} - \lambda^2 \mu^2}{2(\lambda - \sigma^2_{\mu})} \\
\geq C_0 C_1 + C_2 \frac{-2(\lambda - C_2 \sigma^2_{\mu}) \sigma^2_{\mu} - \lambda^2 \mu^2}{2(\lambda - \sigma^2_{\mu})}.
\]

Therefore, we can choose \( C_0 > 0 \) and \( C_1 > 0 \) large enough such that \( C_0 C_1 + C_2 \frac{-2(\lambda - C_2 \sigma^2_{\mu}) \sigma^2_{\mu} - \lambda^2 \mu^2}{2(\lambda - \sigma^2_{\mu})} > 1 \).

We then define the u.s.c. function on \([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}\) by \( v^A = (1 - \Lambda)v + \Lambda \psi \) for all \( \Lambda \in (0, 1) \). It follows that

\[(4.10)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
v^A - \hat{V} &= (1 - \Lambda)v + \Lambda \psi - \hat{V} \\
&= (1 - \Lambda)v + \Lambda \left( C_0 e^{C_1 t} + e^{C_2 \eta^2} \right) - \hat{V} \\
&\geq (1 - \Lambda)v + \Lambda \left( C_0 e^{C_1 t} + e^{C_2 \eta^2} \right) + \Lambda \hat{V} - \hat{V} \\
&\geq (1 - \Lambda)(v - \hat{V}) \\
&:= (1 - \Lambda)\underline{\nu} > 0, \text{ by } (4.3),
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \underline{\nu} := v - \hat{V} \) and we used \( \hat{V} \leq 0 \). From (4.9) and (4.10), we can deduce that for \( \Lambda \in (0, 1) \), \( v^A \) is a supersolution to

\[(4.11)\]
\[
\min \left\{ v^A - \hat{V}, \frac{\partial v^A}{\partial t} - Lv^A \right\} \geq (1 - \Lambda)\delta,
\]

on \([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}\) where the function \( \delta = \underline{\nu} \wedge 1 > 0 \).
In order to prove the comparison principle, it suffices to show the claim that $\sup(u - v^\Lambda) \leq 0$ for all $\Lambda \in (0, 1)$, as the required result is obtained by letting $\Lambda$ go to 0. To this end, we will prove the claim by showing a contradiction and suppose that there exists some $\Lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that $M := \sup(u - v^\Lambda) > 0$.

It is clear that $u$, $v$ and $\tilde{V}$ have the same growth conditions: by the explicit forms of $A$, $B$, $C$ and $\tilde{V}$, it is clear that $\tilde{V}$ has growth condition in $t$ as $e^{e^{K_1t}}$ for some $K_1 < 0$ and has growth condition in $\eta$ as $e^{e^{C_2\eta^2}}$ for some $K_2 < 0$; on the other hand, $\psi$ has growth condition in $t$ as $e^{e^{C_1t}}$ and has growth condition in $\eta$ as $e^{e^{C_2\eta^2}}$. Thus, it follows that $u(t, \eta) - v^\Lambda(t, \eta) = (u - (1 - \Lambda)v - \Lambda\psi)(t, \eta)$ goes to $-\infty$ as $t \to T, \eta \to \infty$.

Hence, the u.s.c. function $(u - v^\Lambda)$ attains its maximum $M$.

Let us consider the u.s.c. function $\Phi_\varepsilon(t, t', \eta, \eta') = u(t, \eta) - v^\Lambda(t', \eta') - \phi_\varepsilon(t, t', \eta, \eta')$, where $\phi_\varepsilon(t, t', \eta, \eta') = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}((t - t')^2 + (\eta - \eta')^2)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(t_\varepsilon, t'_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon)$ attains the maximum of $\Phi_\varepsilon$. By standard arguments, we have $M_\varepsilon = \max \Phi_\varepsilon = \Phi_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon, t'_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon) \to M$ and $\phi_\varepsilon(t, t', \eta, \eta') \to 0$ when $\varepsilon \to 0$.

We give an equivalent definition of viscosity solutions in terms of superjets and subjets. In particular, we define $\mathcal{P}^{2,+} u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\eta})$ as the set of elements $\{\tilde{q}, \tilde{k}, \tilde{M}\} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $u(t, \eta) \leq u(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\eta}) + \tilde{q} (t - \tilde{t}) + \tilde{k} (\eta - \tilde{\eta}) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{M} (\eta - \tilde{\eta})^2 + o((t - \tilde{t})^2 + (\eta - \tilde{\eta})^2)$. We define $\mathcal{P}^{2,-} u^\Lambda(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\eta})$ similarly.

From Crandall-Ishii’s lemma, we can find $A_\varepsilon, B_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left(\frac{t_\varepsilon - t'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, A_\varepsilon\right) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,+} u(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon); \\
&\left(\frac{t_\varepsilon - t'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}, B_\varepsilon\right) \in \mathcal{P}^{2,-} v^\Lambda(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon); \\
&\sigma^2(\eta_\varepsilon) A_\varepsilon - \sigma^2(\eta'_\varepsilon) B_\varepsilon \leq \frac{3}{\varepsilon} (\sigma(\eta_\varepsilon) - \sigma(\eta'_\varepsilon))^2.
\end{align*}
\]

By combining the viscosity subsolution property (4.4) of $u$ and the viscosity strict supersolution property (4.11) of $v^\Lambda$, we have the following inequalities

\[
\begin{align}
&\min\{u(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) - \tilde{V}(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon), \frac{t_\varepsilon - t'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} b(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(\eta_\varepsilon) A_\varepsilon\} \leq 0, \\
&\min\{v^\Lambda(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon) - \tilde{V}(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon), \frac{t_\varepsilon - t'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} b(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(\eta'_\varepsilon) B_\varepsilon\} \geq (1 - \Lambda)\delta,
\end{align}
\]

where $b(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) = -\lambda(\eta_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mu}), \sigma^2(\eta_\varepsilon) = \sigma^2_{\tilde{\mu}}, b(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon) = -\lambda(\eta'_\varepsilon - \tilde{\mu})$, and $\sigma^2(\eta'_\varepsilon) = \sigma^2_{\tilde{\mu}}$.

If $u - \tilde{V} \leq 0$ in (4.12), then since $v^\Lambda - \tilde{V} \geq (1 - \Lambda)\delta$ in (4.13), we obtain that $u - v^\Lambda \leq -(1 - \Lambda)\delta < 0$ by contradiction with $\sup(u - v^\Lambda) = M > 0$. On the other hand, if $u - \tilde{V} > 0$ in (4.12), then we have

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\frac{t_\varepsilon - t'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} b(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(\eta_\varepsilon) A_\varepsilon \leq 0, \\
\frac{t_\varepsilon - t'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} b(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2(\eta'_\varepsilon) B_\varepsilon \geq (1 - \Lambda)\delta (t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon).
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]

Furthermore, after mixing these two inequalities above, we derive that

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon (b(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) - b(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon)) + \frac{3}{2\varepsilon} (\sigma(\eta_\varepsilon) - \sigma(\eta'_\varepsilon))^2 \\
\leq \eta_\varepsilon - \eta'_\varepsilon (b(t_\varepsilon, \eta_\varepsilon) - b(t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon)) + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma^2(\eta_\varepsilon) A_\varepsilon - \sigma^2(\eta'_\varepsilon) B_\varepsilon) \\
\geq (1 - \Lambda)\delta (t'_\varepsilon, \eta'_\varepsilon).
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]
Because the solution \( \tilde{w} \) we have the following sensitivity properties of the value function.

**Theorem 4.3.** \( \tilde{V} \) defined in (2.6) is the unique bounded and continuous viscosity solution \( v \) to variational inequalities (4.7). In addition, the process \((\tilde{V}(s, \mu_s))_{t \leq s \leq T}\) is a martingale on \((\Omega, \mathbb{P})\) with respect to the filtration \((\mathcal{F}_s)_{t \leq s \leq T}\).

**Proof.** We have shown that \( v^- = \sup_{p \in \mathcal{V}^-} p \leq \tilde{V} \leq \inf_{q \in \mathcal{V}^+} q \). By comparison principle, we have \( v^- \leq v^+ \). Moreover, \( v^- \) satisfies the sub-martingale property and \( v^+ \) satisfies the super-martingale property. Putting all pieces together, we conclude that the theorem holds.

**Theorem 4.4.** For all \((t, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}, \tilde{V} \) in (2.6) has Hölder continuous derivatives.

**Proof.** The proof follows closely the argument in Section 6.3 of [11]. First, let us recall that

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial t}(t, \eta) + \lambda(\eta - \bar{\mu}) \frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial \eta}(t, \eta) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{V}}{\partial \eta^2}(t, \eta) = 0 \text{ on } C.
\]

The definition of viscosity solution of \( \tilde{V} \) to (4.7) gives that \( \tilde{V} \) is a supersolution to (4.14). On the other hand, for any \((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \in \mathcal{C}, \) let \( \varphi \) be a \( C^2 \) test function such that \((\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \) is a maximum of \( \tilde{V} - \varphi \) with \( \tilde{V}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) = \varphi(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \).

By definition of \( \mathcal{C} \), we have \( \tilde{V}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \geq \tilde{V}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}), \) so that

\[
\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) + \lambda(\eta - \bar{\mu}) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \eta}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial \eta^2}(\bar{t}, \bar{\eta}) \leq 0,
\]

due to the viscosity sub-solution property of \( \tilde{V} \) to (4.7). It follows that \( \tilde{V} \) is a viscosity subsolution and therefore viscosity solution to (4.14).

Let us consider an initial boundary value problem:

\[
-\frac{\partial w}{\partial t}(t, \eta) - \lambda(\eta - \bar{\mu}) \frac{\partial w}{\partial \eta}(t, \eta) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial \eta^2}(t, \eta) = 0 \text{ on } Q \cup B_T, \tag{4.15}
\]

\[
w(0, \eta) = 0 \text{ on } B, \quad w(t, \eta) = \tilde{V}(t, \eta) \text{ on } S.
\]

Here, \( Q \) is an arbitrary bounded open region in \( C \), \( Q \) lies in the strip \( 0 < t < T \). \( \tilde{B} = \tilde{Q} \cap \{t = 0\}, \)

\( \tilde{B}_T = \tilde{Q} \cap \{t = T\}, \)

\( B_T \) denotes the interior of \( \tilde{B}_T \), \( B \) denotes the interior of \( \tilde{B} \), \( S_0 \) denotes the boundary of \( Q \) lying in the strip \( 0 \leq t \leq T \) and \( S = S_0 \setminus B_T \).

Theorem 3.6 in [11] provides the existence and uniqueness of a solution \( w \) on \( Q \cup B_T \) to (4.15), and the solution \( w \) has Hölder continuous derivatives \( w_t, w_\eta \) and \( w_{\eta\eta} \). Because the solution \( w \) is a viscosity solution to (4.14) on \( Q \cup B_T \), from standard uniqueness results on viscosity solution, we know that \( \tilde{V} = w \) on \( Q \cup B_T \). As \( Q \subset C \) is arbitrary, it follows that \( \tilde{V} \) has the same property in the continuation region \( C \). Therefore, \( \tilde{V} \) has Hölder continuous derivatives \( \tilde{V}_t, \tilde{V}_\eta \) and \( \tilde{V}_{\eta\eta} \).

**Corollary 4.1.** We have the following sensitivity properties of the value function \( \tilde{V}(t, \eta) \):

(i) Suppose that \( \alpha > \) and \( \delta > 0 \) are both constants in the definition of habit formation process such that \( \delta > \alpha \). We have that \( \tilde{V}(t, \eta; \alpha, \delta) \) is decreasing in \( \delta \) and increasing in \( \alpha \).
Lemma A.1. For $k \leq t \leq s \leq T$, the solutions of ODEs (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) are given by

\[
A(t, s) := \frac{a(t, s)}{(1 - p) \left(1 - 2a(t, s)\hat{\Omega}(t)\right)},
\]

\[
B(t, s) := \frac{b(t, s)}{(1 - p) \left(1 - 2a(t, s)\hat{\Omega}(t)\right)},
\]

\[
C(t, s) := \frac{1}{1 - p} \left[l(t, s) + \frac{\hat{\Omega}(t)}{1 - 2a(t, s)\hat{\Omega}(t)}b^2(t, s) - \frac{1 - p}{2} \log \left(1 - 2a(t, s)\hat{\Omega}(t)\right)\right]
\]

\[
- \frac{p}{2} \log \left(1 - 2w(t, s)\hat{\Omega}(t)\right) - pg(t, s),
\]

in which we have

\[
a(t, s) = \frac{p(1 - e^{2\xi(t-s)})}{2(1 - p)\sigma_S^2 \left[2\xi - (\xi + \gamma_2)(1 - e^{2\xi(t-s)})\right]},
\]

\[
b(t, s) = \frac{p\lambda \hat{\mu}(1 - e^{\xi(t-s)})^2}{(1 - p)\sigma_S^2 \xi \left[2\xi - (\xi + \gamma_2)(1 - e^{2\xi(t-s)})\right]},
\]

\[
l(t, s) = \frac{p}{2(1 - p)\sigma_S^2} \left(\frac{\lambda^2 \hat{\mu}^2}{\xi^2} - \frac{\sigma_S^2 \gamma_2}{\gamma_2^2 - \xi^2}\right)(s - t)
\]

\[
+ \frac{p\lambda^2 \hat{\mu}^2 \left[(\xi + 2\gamma_2)e^{2\xi(t-s)} - 4\gamma_2 e^{\xi(t-s)} + 2\gamma_2 - \xi\right]}{2(1 - p)\sigma_S^2 \xi^3 \left[2\xi - (\xi + \gamma_2)(1 - e^{2\xi(t-s)})\right]}
\]

\[
+ \frac{p\sigma_S^2 \hat{\mu}}{2(1 - p)\sigma_S^2 (\xi^2 - \gamma_2^2)} \log \left\{\left[2\xi - (\xi + \gamma_2)(1 - e^{2\xi(t-s)})\right]/\left[2\xi e^{\xi(t-s)}\right]\right\},
\]

\[
w(t, s) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma_S} \left(\sigma_S \xi_1 + \lambda \sigma_S + \rho \sigma_\mu\right) + \left(\sigma_S \xi_1 - \lambda \sigma_S - \rho \sigma_\mu\right)e^{2\xi_1(t-s)}.
\]
\[ g(t, s) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{(\sigma S \xi_1 + \lambda \sigma S + \rho \sigma \mu) + (\sigma S \xi_1 - \lambda \sigma S - \rho \sigma \mu) e^{2\xi_1 (t-s)}}{2\sigma S \xi_1 e^{\xi_1 (t-s)}} \right) \]
\[ - \frac{(1 - p)(1 - p^2)}{2(1 - p + pp^2)} \log \left( \frac{(\sigma S \xi + \lambda \sigma S - \frac{\rho \sigma \mu p}{1 - p}) + (\sigma S \xi - \lambda \sigma S + \frac{\rho \sigma \mu p}{1 - p}) e^{2\xi(t-s)}}{2\sigma S \xi e^{\xi (t-s)}} \right) \]
\[ - \frac{\rho^2 \lambda (s - t)}{2(1 - p + pp^2)} - \frac{\rho \sigma \mu (s - t)}{2(1 - p + pp^2) \sigma S}, \]

where

\[ \Delta := \lambda^2 - \frac{2\lambda p \rho \sigma \mu}{(1 - p) \sigma S} - \frac{p \rho^2}{(1 - p) \sigma S^2} > 0, \]

and

\[ \xi := \sqrt{\Delta} = \sqrt{\gamma_2^2 - \gamma_1 \gamma_3}, \quad \xi_1 := \frac{\sqrt{(1 - p^2) \sigma^2_\mu + (\lambda \sigma S + \rho \sigma \mu)^2}}{\sigma S}, \]
\[ \gamma_1 := \frac{(1 - p + pp^2)}{1 - p} \sigma^2_\mu, \quad \gamma_2 := -\lambda + \frac{pp \sigma \mu}{(1 - p) \sigma S}, \quad \gamma_3 := \frac{p}{(1 - p) \sigma^2 S}. \]

The condition for the bounded Normal solution is

\[ \gamma_3 > 0, \text{ or } \gamma_1 > 0, \text{ or } \gamma_2 < 0. \]

**Remark A.1.** If \( p < 0, \) (A.1) and (A.2) clearly hold, and we have \( a(t, s) \leq 0 \) is a bounded solution as well as \( 1 - 2a(t, s) \hat{\Omega}(t) > 1 \) and \( 1 - w(t, s) \hat{\Omega}(t) > 1. \) Hence solutions of ODEs (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) are bounded on \( k \leq t \leq s \leq T. \) We also note that \( A(t, s) = o(t, s) \hat{\Omega}(t)) \leq 0, \) on \( k \leq t \leq s \leq T. \)

**Appendix B. Proof of The Verification Theorem**

We first show that the consumption constraint \( c_t \geq Z_t \) implies the constraint on the controlled wealth process by the following lemma.

**Lemma B.1.** The admissible space \( A \) is not empty if and only if the initial budget constraint \( x \geq m(k) z \) is fulfilled. Moreover, for each pair \( (\pi, c) \in A, \) the controlled wealth process \( \hat{X}^{\pi, c}_t \) satisfies the constraint

\[ \hat{X}^{\pi, c}_t \geq m(t) Z_t, \quad k \leq t \leq T, \]

where the deterministic function \( m(t) \) is defined in (3.3) and refers to the cost of subsistence consumption per unit of standard of living at time \( t. \)

**Proof.** Let’s first assume that \( x \geq m(k) z, \) we can always take \( \pi_t \equiv 0, \) and \( c_t = z \int_t^k (\delta(v) - \alpha(v)) dv \) for \( t \in [k, T]. \) It is easy to verify \( \hat{X}^{\pi, c}_t \geq 0 \) and \( c_t \equiv Z_t \) so that \( (\pi, c) \in A, \) and hence \( A \) is not empty.

On the other hand, starting from \( t = k \) with the wealth \( x \) and the standard of living \( z, \) the addictive habits constraint \( c_t \geq Z_t, k \leq t \leq T \) implies that the consumption must always exceed the subsistence consumption \( c_t = Z(t; c) \) which satisfies

\[ d\bar{c}_t = (\delta(t) - \alpha(t)) \bar{c}_t dt, \quad \bar{c}_k = z, \quad k \leq t \leq T. \]
Indeed, since $Z_t$ satisfies $dZ_t = (\delta_t c_t - \alpha_t Z_t)dt$ with $Z_k = z \geq 0$, the constraint $c_t \geq Z_t$ implies that

$$(B.3) \quad dZ_t \geq (\delta_t Z_t - \alpha_t Z_t)dt, \quad Z_k = z.$$ 

By (B.2) and (B.3), one can get $d(Z_t - \tilde{c}_t) \geq (\delta_t - \alpha_t)(Z_t - \tilde{c}_t)dt$ and $Z_k - \tilde{c}_k = 0$, from which we can derive that $e^{\int_0^t (\delta_s - \alpha_s) ds} (Z_t - \tilde{c}_t) \geq 0, k \leq t \leq T$. It follows that $c_t \geq \tilde{c}_t$, which is equivalent to

$$(B.4) \quad c_t \geq z e^{\int_0^t (\delta(u) - \alpha(u)) du}, \quad k \leq t \leq T.$$ 

Define the exponential local martingale $\tilde{H}_t = \exp \left( - \int_k^t \frac{\tilde{\mu}_u \tilde{\sigma}}{\tilde{\sigma}_u^2} d\tilde{W}_u - \frac{1}{2} \int_k^t \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_u^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_u^2} du \right), k \leq t \leq T$. As $\tilde{\mu}_t$ follows the dynamics (2.4), we derive that

$$\tilde{\mu}_t = e^{-t\lambda \eta} \bar{\mu} + \bar{\mu}(1 - e^{-t\lambda}) + \int_0^t e^{\lambda(u-t)} \left( \dot{\tilde{\mu}}(u) + \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma} \dot{\rho} \right) \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_u \tilde{\sigma}_v}{\tilde{\sigma}_u^2} d\tilde{W}_u.$$ 

Similar to the proof of Corollary 3.5.14 and Corollary 3.5.16 in [14], Beneš’ condition implies that $\tilde{H}$ is a true martingale with respect to $(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}_t^S, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$.

Now, define the probability measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ as $d\tilde{\mathbb{P}} = \tilde{H}_T$. Girsanov theorem states that $\tilde{W}_t := \tilde{W}_t + \int_k^T \tilde{\sigma}_u d\tilde{W}_u$, $k \leq t \leq T$ is a Brownian Motion under $(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, (\mathcal{F}_t^S)_{k \leq t \leq T})$. We can rewrite the wealth process as $X_T = \int_k^T \tilde{\sigma}_u d\tilde{W}_u$. As we have $X_T \geq 0$, it is easy to see that $\int_k^T \tilde{\sigma}_u d\tilde{W}_u$ is a supermartingale under $(\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{F}_t^S, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$. By taking the expectation under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$, we have $x \geq \tilde{E} \left[ \int_k^T \tilde{\sigma}_u d\tilde{W}_u \right]$. Following the inequality (B.4), we will further have $x \geq z \tilde{E} \left[ \int_k^T \exp \left( \int_k^u (\delta(u) - \alpha(u)) du \right) d\tilde{W}_u \right]$. Because $\delta(t)$ and $\alpha(t)$ are deterministic functions, we obtain that $x \geq m(k)z$.

In general, for $\forall t \in [k, T]$, following the same procedure, we can take conditional expectation under filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^S$, and get

$$X_t \geq Z_t \tilde{E} \left[ \int_k^T \exp \left( \int_k^v (\delta(u) - \alpha(u)) du \right) d\tilde{W}_u \right].$$

Again as $\delta(t), \alpha(t)$ are deterministic, we get $X_t \geq m(t)Z_t, k \leq t \leq T$. \qed

Proof. (PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1)

For any pair of admissible control $(\pi_t, c_t) \in \mathcal{A}$, Itô’s lemma gives

$$(B.5) \quad d \left[ V(t, X_t, Z_t, \tilde{\mu}_t) \right] = \left[ G^{\pi_t, c_t} V(t, X_t, Z_t, \tilde{\mu}_t) \right] dt + \left[ V_{x} \tilde{\sigma} \pi_t + V_{\eta} \frac{\left( \dot{\pi}(t) + \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma} \dot{\rho} \right)}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right] d\tilde{W}_t,$$

where we define the process $G^{\pi_t, c_t} V(t, X_t, Z_t, \tilde{\mu}_t)$ by

$$G^{\pi_t, c_t} V(t, X_t, Z_t, \tilde{\mu}_t) = V_t - \alpha(t) Z_t V_t - \lambda(\tilde{\mu}_t - \bar{\mu}) V_{\eta} + \frac{\left( \dot{\pi}(t) + \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma} \dot{\rho} \right)^2}{2 \tilde{\sigma}^2} V_{\eta\eta} - c_t V_x$$

$$+ c_t \delta(t) V_x + \left( c_t - Z_t \right)^p + \pi_t \bar{\mu}_t V_x + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}^2 \pi \tilde{\sigma}^2 V_{xx} + V_{\eta\eta} \left( \dot{\pi}(t) + \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\sigma} \dot{\rho} \right) \tilde{\pi}.$$
For any localizing sequence \( \tau_n \), by integrating the equation (B.5) on \([k, \tau_n \wedge T]\) and taking the expectation, we have

\[
V(k, x, z, \eta) \geq E \left[ \int_k^{\tau_n \wedge T} \left( \frac{c_s - Z_s}{p} \right)^p ds \right] + E \left[ V(\tau_n \wedge T, \hat{X}_{\tau_n \wedge T}, Z_{\tau_n \wedge T}, \hat{\mu}_{\tau_n \wedge T}) \right].
\]

(B.6)

Similar to the argument in [12], let us consider a fixed pair of control \((\pi_t, c_t) \in A = A_x\), where we denote \( A_x \) as the admissible space with initial endowment \( x \). For \( \forall \varepsilon > 0 \), it is clear that \( A_x \subseteq A_{x+\varepsilon} \), and \((\pi_t, c_t) \in A_{x+\varepsilon}\). Also it is easy to see that \( \hat{X}_t^{\pi, \varepsilon} = \hat{X}_t + \varepsilon = \hat{X}_t + \varepsilon, k \leq t \leq T \). As the process \( Z_t \) is defined using this consumption policy \( c_t \), under the probability measure \( P_{x,\varepsilon,z,\eta} \), we can obtain

\[
V(k, x + \varepsilon, z, \eta) \geq E \left[ \int_k^{\tau_n \wedge T} \left( \frac{c_s - Z_s}{p} \right)^p ds \right] + E \left[ V(\tau_n \wedge T, \hat{X}_{\tau_n \wedge T} + \varepsilon, Z_{\tau_n \wedge T}, \hat{\mu}_{\tau_n \wedge T}) \right].
\]

Monotone Convergence Theorem first leads to

\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} E \left[ \int_k^{\tau_n \wedge T} \left( \frac{c_s - Z_s}{p} \right)^p ds \right] = E \left[ \int_k^{T} \left( \frac{c_s - Z_s}{p} \right)^p ds \right].
\]

For simplicity, let’s denote \( Y_t = \left( \hat{X}_t - m(t)Z_t \right) \). The definition (3.8) implies that: \( V(\tau_n \wedge T, \hat{X}_{\tau_n \wedge T} + \varepsilon, Z_{\tau_n \wedge T}, \hat{\mu}_{\tau_n \wedge T}) = \frac{1}{p} (Y_{\tau_n \wedge T} + \varepsilon)^p N_{\tau_n \wedge T}^{1-p} \). Lemma B.1 gives \( \hat{X}_t \geq m(t)Z_t \) for \( k \leq t \leq T \) under any admissible control \((\pi_t, c_t)\), we get that \( Y_{\tau_n \wedge T} + \varepsilon \geq 0, \forall k \leq t \leq T \). Since also \( p < 0 \), it follows that

\[
\sup_n (Y_{\tau_n \wedge T} + \varepsilon)^p < \varepsilon^p < +\infty.
\]

Remark A.1 states that \( A(t, s) \leq 0, \forall k \leq t \leq s \leq T \). Also \( m(s), \delta(s) \) are continuous functions and hence bounded on \([k, T]\), moreover, when \( p < 0 \), we have \( 1 - a(t, s)\hat{\Omega}(t) > 0 \) and \( 1 - f(t, s)\hat{\Omega}(t) > 0 \) as well as \( a(t, s), b(t, s), l(t, s), w(t, s) \) and \( g(t, s) \) are all bounded for \( k \leq t \leq s \leq T \). We deduce that the explicit solutions \( B(t, s) \) and \( C(t, s) \) are both bounded on \( k \leq t \leq s \leq T \) and hence \( N(k, \eta) \leq k_1 \exp(k_2\eta) \), for some large constants \( k_2, k_1 > 1 \). It follows that there exist some constants \( \bar{k}_2, \bar{k}_1 > 1 \) such that

\[
\sup_n N_{\tau_n \wedge T}^{1-p} \leq \sup_{t \in [k, T]} \left( k_1 \exp(k_2\hat{\mu}_t) \right)^{1-p} \leq \bar{k}_1 \exp \left( \bar{k}_2 \sup_{t \in [k, T]} \hat{\mu}_t \right).
\]

The Ornstein Uhlenbeck diffusion \( \hat{\mu}_t \) satisfies (2.4), which is equivalent to

\[
\hat{\mu}_t = e^{-t\lambda}\eta + \hat{\mu}(1 - e^{-t\lambda}) + \int_k^t e^{\lambda(t-u)} \frac{\tilde{\Omega}(u) + \sigma_s\sigma_{\mu}\hat{\mu}_t}{\sigma_s} d\tilde{W}_u.
\]

Hence, there exists positive constants \( l \) and \( l_1 > 1 \) large enough, such that \( \sup_{t \in [k, T]} \hat{\mu}_t \leq l + \sup_{t \in [k, T]} l_1\tilde{W}_t, t \in [k, T] \). Using the distribution of running maximum of the Brownian Motion, there exist some positive constants \( \bar{l} > 1 \) and \( \bar{l}_1 \) such that

\[
E \left[ \sup_n N_{\tau_n \wedge T}^{1-p} \right] \leq \bar{l}_1 E \left[ \exp(\sup_{t \in [k, T]} \bar{l}\tilde{B}_t) \right] < +\infty.
\]

(B.9)
At last, by (B.8) and (B.9), we can conclude that $\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_n V(\tau_n \land T, \dot{X}_{\tau_n \land T} + \epsilon, Z_{\tau_n \land T}, \dot{\mu}_{\tau_n \land T}) \right] < +\infty$. Dominated Convergence Theorem gives

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[V(\tau_n \land T, \dot{X}_{\tau_n \land T} + \epsilon, Z_{\tau_n \land T}, \dot{\mu}_{\tau_n \land T})\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{p}(Y_T + \epsilon)^p N^{1-p}(T, \dot{\mu}_T)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(\dot{X}_T + \epsilon)^p}{p}\right] > \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\dot{X}_T^p}{p}\right].
$$

Combining this with equation (B.7) and since $(\pi_t, c_t) \in \mathcal{A}$, it follows that

$$
V(k, x + \epsilon, z, \eta, \theta) \geq \sup_{\pi, c, \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \frac{(c_s - Z_s)^p}{p} ds + \frac{\dot{X}_T^p}{p} \right] = v(k, x, z, \eta, \theta).
$$

Notice $V(t, x, z, \eta, \theta)$ is continuous in variable $x$, and since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we can take the limit and deduce that

$$
V(k, x, z, \eta, \theta) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} V(k, x + \epsilon, z, \eta) \geq \hat{V}(k, x, z, \eta, \theta).
$$

On the other hand, for $\pi_t^*$ and $c_t^*$ defined by (3.9) and (3.10) respectively, we first need to show that the SDE for wealth process:

$$
d\dot{X}_t^* = (\pi_t^* \mu_t - c_t^*) dt + \sigma_S \pi_t^* d\hat{W}_t, \quad k \leq t \leq T,
$$

with initial condition $x > m(k)z$ admits a unique strong solution which satisfies the constraint $\dot{X}_t^* > m(t)Z_t^*$, $\forall k \leq t \leq T$.

Denote $Y_t^* = \dot{X}_t^* - m(t)Z_t^*$, Itô’s lemma and substitution of $c_t^*$ using (3.10), we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{dY_t^*}{Y_t^*} & = \left[ -\frac{1 + \delta(t)m(t)}{N} + \frac{\dot{\mu}_t^2}{(1 - p)\sigma_S^2} + \frac{\left(\frac{\Omega(t) + \sigma_S \sigma_{\mu T}}{\sigma_S} \right) N_{\eta \pi} \dot{\mu}_t}{N} \right] dt \\
& \quad + \left[ \frac{\dot{\mu}_t}{(1 - p)\sigma_S} + \frac{\left(\frac{\Omega(t) + \sigma_S \sigma_{\mu T}}{\sigma_S} \right) N_{\eta \pi}}{N} \right] Y_t^* d\hat{W}_t.
\end{align*}
$$

In order to solve $X_t^*$ in a more explicit formula, we define the auxiliary process by $\Gamma_t := \frac{N(\hat{\mu}_t^*)}{Y_t^*}$, for $k \leq t \leq T$. Itô’s lemma implies that

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\Gamma_t}{\Gamma_t} & = \frac{\Gamma_t}{N} \left[ N_t - \lambda(\hat{\mu}_t - \bar{\mu}) N_{\eta \pi} + \frac{\left(\frac{\Omega(t) + \sigma_S \sigma_{\mu T}}{\sigma_S} \right)^2}{2\sigma_S^2} N_{\eta \pi} + \frac{\dot{\mu}_t \left(\frac{\Omega(t) + \sigma_S \sigma_{\mu T}}{\sigma_S} \right)^p}{(1 - p)\sigma_S^2} N_{\eta \pi} \right] dt \quad \text{and} \quad \\
& \quad + \left(1 + \delta(t)m(t)\right) \frac{p \dot{\mu}_t^2}{(1 - p)^2\sigma_S^2} dt + \Gamma_t \left\{ \frac{-\dot{\mu}_t}{(1 - p)\sigma_S} \right\} d\hat{W}_t.
\end{align*}
$$

Because $N(t, \eta)$ satisfies the linear PDE (3.4), (B.11) is simplified as

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\Gamma_t}{\Gamma_t} & = \Gamma_t \left\{ \frac{p \dot{\mu}_t^2}{2(1 - p)^2\sigma_S^2} \right\} dt + \Gamma_t \left\{ \frac{-\dot{\mu}_t}{(1 - p)\sigma_S} \right\} d\hat{W}_t.
\end{align*}
$$
Hence, the existence of the unique strong solution of the above SDE is guaranteed and \( \Gamma_k = \frac{N(k, \eta)}{x - m(k)} > 0 \) implies that \( \Gamma_t > 0, \forall k \leq t \leq T \). Therefore, we finally proved that the SDE (B.10) has a unique strong solution defined by (3.11) and the solution \( \hat{X}_t \) satisfies the wealth process constraint (B.1).

Next, we proceed to verify the pair \((\pi_t^*, c_t^*)\) is indeed in the admissible space \(\mathcal{A}\). First, by the definition (3.9) and (3.10), it is clear that \(\pi_t^*\) and \(c_t^*\) are \(\mathcal{F}_t^S\) progressively measurable, and by the path continuity of \(Y_t^* = \hat{X}_t^* - m(t)Z_t^*\), hence, of \(\pi_t^*\) and \(c_t^*\), it is easy to show that \(\int_k^T (\pi_t^*)^2 dt < +\infty\) and \(\int_k^T c_t^* dt < +\infty\), a.s. Also, because \(\hat{X}_t^* > m(t)Z_t^*, \forall t \in [k, T]\), by the definition of \(c_t^*\), the consumption constraint \(c_t^* > Z_t^*, \forall t \in [k, T]\) is satisfied. It follows that \((\pi_t^*, c_t^*) \in \mathcal{A}\).

Given the pair of control policy \((\pi_t^*, c_t^*)\) as above, instead of (B.6), the equality is verified
\[
V(k, x, z; \theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_k^{\tau_n \wedge T} \left( \frac{c_t^* - Z_t^*}{p} \right) dt \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ V(\tau_n \wedge T, \hat{X}_{\tau_n \wedge T}; Z_{\tau_n \wedge T}; \hat{\mu}_{\tau_n \wedge T}) \right].
\]

Monotone Convergence Theorem implies
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_k^{\tau_n \wedge T} \left( \frac{c_t^* - Z_t^*}{p} \right) dt \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_k^T \left( \frac{c_t^* - Z_t^*}{p} \right) dt \right].
\]
Moreover, for \(p < 0\), we have \(V(t, x, z, \eta) < 0\) by its definition. Fatou’s lemma gives that
\[
\limsup_{n \to +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ V(\tau_n \wedge T, \hat{X}_{\tau_n \wedge T}; Z_{\tau_n \wedge T}; \hat{\mu}_{\tau_n \wedge T}) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ V(T, \hat{X}_T; Z_T; \hat{\mu}_T) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{\hat{X}_T^*}{p} \right)^p \right].
\]

Therefore, it follows that
\[
V(k, x, z, \eta; \theta) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_k^T \left( \frac{c_t^* - Z_t^*}{p} \right) dt + \left( \frac{\hat{X}_T^*}{p} \right)^p \right] \leq \hat{V}(k, x, z, \eta).
\]
which completes the proof.

\[\square\]
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