arXiv:2008.05576v1 [math.OC] 12 Aug 2020

Ergodic singular stochastic control motivated by the optimal sustainable exploitation of an ecosystem*

Gechun Liang† and Mihail Zervos‡

Abstract

We derive the explicit solution to a singular stochastic control problem of the monotone follower type with an expected ergodic criterion as well as to its counterpart with a pathwise ergodic criterion. These problems have been motivated by the optimal sustainable exploitation of an ecosystem, such as a natural fishery. Under general assumptions on the diffusion coefficients and the running payoff function, we show that both performance criteria give rise to the same optimal long-term average rate as well as to the same optimal strategy, which is of a threshold type. We solve the two problems by first constructing a suitable solution to their associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, which takes the form of a quasi-variational inequality with a gradient constraint.

Keywords: Ergodic singular stochastic control, sustainable harvesting, HJB equation, quasi-variational inequality.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 93E20, 60H30.

1 Introduction

We consider a stochastic dynamical system with a positive state process that satisfies the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = b(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \mathrm{d}\zeta_t + \sigma(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}W_t, \quad X_0 = x > 0, \tag{1}$$

where W is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion and ζ is a controlled increasing process. With each controlled process ζ, we associate the expected long-term average

*Research supported by the LMS Grant Scheme 4: Research in Pairs (Ref: 41920).

†Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK, g.liang@warwick.ac.uk.

‡Department of Mathematics, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK, mihalis.zervos@gmail.com.

performance index

$$J_x^{\mathrm{e}}(\zeta) = \limsup_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathsf{E}\left[\int_0^T h(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T\right], \tag{2}$$

as well as the pathwise long-term average performance criterion

$$J_x^{\mathrm{p}}(\zeta) = \limsup_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{T}\left[\int_0^T h(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T\right]. \tag{3}$$

The objective of the resulting ergodic singular stochastic control problems is to maximise (2) as well as (3) over all admissible controlled processes ζ.

The control problems defined by (1)–(3) have been motivated by the sustainable exploitation of an ecosystem, such as a forest or a natural fishery. In such a context, X models the population level process of a harvested species, while ζ_t is the total amount of the species that has been harvested by time t. The constant $K > 0$ in (2) and (3) models the profit made from each unit of the harvested species. On the other hand, the function h models the utility arising from having a population level X_t of the harvested species at time t, which could reflect the role that the species plays in the stability of the overall ecosystem. Alternatively, the function h can be used to model running costs.

Motivated by applications to the optimal harvesting of stochastically fluctuating populations, similar singular stochastic control problems with $h = 0$ and with a discounted rather than an ergodic performance criterion have been studied by Alvarez [1, 2], Alvarez and Shepp [5], and Lungu and Øksendal [12]. Extensions of these earlier works have been studied by Framstad [7], who considers a state process X with jumps, Song, Stockbridge and Zhu [17], who consider a state process X with regime switching, Morimoto [14], who considers the finite time horizon case, as well as Alvarez, Lungu and Øksendal [4], Lungu and Øksendal [13], and Hening, Tran, Phan and Yin [9], who consider multidimensional state processes X that allow for the modelling of both seeding and harvesting. Several other closely related contributions can be found in the literature of these papers as well as in the recent paper by Ferrari [6], who also considers other applications, such as the optimal dividend distribution policy that a firm should adopt or the optimal scheduling in queues with heavy traffic.

In the references discussed in the previous paragraph, discounting (a) guarantees the well-posedness of the control problems studied in the sense that the corresponding value functions are finite, and (b) respects the time-value of payoffs, which is a cornerstone of traditional economics and finance: a reward received today is preferable to the same reward received at some future time. However, to the best of our understanding, there is no solid economic theory on how to determine a discounting rate that is suitable for applications arising in the context of optimal harvesting. Furthermore, performance criteria that involve discounting can be viewed as "unfair" if one considers the utilities enjoyed by successive generations because they assign weights to payoffs arising from inter-temporal choices that are exponentially decreasing over time.

On the other hand, ergodic criteria assign the same weight to the payoffs received by any generation, which makes them preferable when considering sustainable optimisation. From this perspective, the pathwise criterion is of particular interest because humanity will ever experience only one sample path. Mindful of such considerations, Hening, Nguyen, Ungureanu and Wong [8], and Alvarez and Hening [3] introduce and solve the special cases of the problems we study here that arise if $h = 0$. In particular, Alvarez and Hening [3] followed the approach of Karatzas [11] and solved the problems they consider by constructing a suitable solution to the problems' associated HJB equation. We solve the more general problems we consider here by following the same approach. In generalising the special cases arising when $h = 0$, our main contributions include (a) the determination of sufficiently general assumptions on h that give rise to threshold optimal strategies without making extra assumptions on the data b and σ of the underlying diffusion, and (b) the derivation of an explicit solution to the problems' HJB equation that is way more complicated than the one associated with the special case arising when $h = 0$ because, e.g., it involves the integral equation (23) instead of an algebraic equation (see also Remark 2 below). Relative to the problem involving a pathwise performance criterion, the analysis presented in Alvarez and Hening [3] as well as here, which is in the so-called monotone follower singular stochastic control setting, has been influenced by Jack and Zervos [10] who consider a fundamentally different setting that involves two-sided rather than one-sided control action.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the ergodic singular stochastic control problem that we solve and present three examples satisfying the assumptions that we make. In Section 3, we derive the solution to the problems' HJB equation that characterises the optimal strategy by solving a suitable free-boundary problem. Finally, we fully characterise the solution to both of the ergodic control problems in Section 4.

2 Problem formulation

Fix a filtered probability space $\big(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), \mathsf{P}\big)$ satisfying the usual conditions and carrying a standard one-dimensional $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-Brownian motion W. We consider a biological system, the uncontrolled stochastic dynamics of which are modelled by the SDE

$$\mathrm{d}\overline{X}_t = b(\overline{X}_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(\overline{X}_t)\,\mathrm{d}W_t, \quad \overline{X}_0 = x > 0, \tag{4}$$

for some deterministic functions $b, \sigma :]0, \infty[\to \mathbb{R}$.

Assumption 1 The function b is C^1 and the limit $b(0) := \lim_{x \downarrow 0} b(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, the function σ is locally Lipschitz continuous, the limit $\sigma(0) := \lim_{x \downarrow 0} \sigma(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$ and

$$0 < \sigma^2(x) \leq C(1 + x^k) \quad \text{for all } x > 0, \tag{5}$$

for some constant $C, k > 0$.

Given any $\beta > 0$ fixed, this assumption implies that the scale function p_β and the speed measure m_β of the diffusion associated with the SDE (4), which are given by

$$p_\beta(\beta) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad p'_\beta(x) = \exp\left(-2\int_\beta^x \frac{b(s)}{\sigma^2(s)}\,\mathrm{d}s\right), \quad \text{for } x > 0, \tag{6}$$

and

$$m_\beta(\mathrm{d}x) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2(x)p'_\beta(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{7}$$

are well-defined. We also make the following assumption, which, together with Assumption 1, implies that the SDE (4) has a unique non-explosive strong solution.

Assumption 2 The scale function p_β and the speed measure m_β defined by (6) and (7) satisfy

$$\lim_{x\downarrow 0} p_\beta(x) = -\infty, \quad \lim_{x\uparrow\infty} p_\beta(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad m_\beta\big(]0,1[\big) < \infty.$$

For the solution to the version of the control problem that involves the pathwise performance criterion, we need the following additional assumption. In particular, this assumption implies that the diffusion associated with the SDE (4) is ergodic.

Assumption 3 The function σ is Hölder continuous of order greater than or equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ and the integrability condition

$$\int_0^\infty s^k\, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s) < \infty$$

holds true, where $k > 0$ is as in (5). Furthemore, $m_\beta\big(]0,\infty[\big) < \infty$.

If the system is subject to harvesting, then its state process X satisfies the controlled one-dimensional SDE (1).

Definition 1 An *admissible harvesting strategy* is any $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-adapted process ζ with càglàd increasing sample paths such that $\zeta_0 = 0$ and the SDE (1) has a unique non-explosive strong solution. We denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the family of all admissible strategies.

With each admissible harvesting strategy $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$, we associate the expected performance index J_x^{e} given by (2) as well as the pathwise performance criterion J_x^{p} given by (3). The objective of the control problem that we consider is to maximise J_x^{e} as well as J_x^{p} over all $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$.

Assumption 4 The following conditions hold:
(i) The function h is C^1 as well as bounded from below and the limit $h(0) := \lim_{x\downarrow 0} h(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$.
(ii) The following integrability condition is satisfied:

$$\int_0^\infty |h(s)|\, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s) < \infty.$$

(iii) There exists a constant $\xi \in]0, \infty[$ such that

$$Kb'(x) + h'(x) \begin{cases} > 0, & \text{for } x \in]0, \xi[, \\ < 0, & \text{for } x \in]\xi, \infty[, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x\uparrow\infty} Kb(x) + h(x) < Kb(0) + h(0).$$

(iv) $K > 0$.

Remark 1 In view of Assumption 4.(iii), we define

$$\underline{\lambda} = \lim_{x\uparrow\infty} Kb(x) + h(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\lambda} = Kb(\xi) + h(\xi), \tag{8}$$

and we note that the equation $Kb(x) + h(x) - \lambda = 0$ has
- no strictly positive solutions if $\lambda > \overline{\lambda}$,
- two strictly positive solutions if $\lambda \in \big]Kb(0) + h(0),\, \overline{\lambda}\big[$, and
- one strictly positive solution if $\lambda \in \big]\underline{\lambda},\, Kb(0) + h(0)\big]$ or $\lambda = \overline{\lambda}$

(see also Figure 1). In particular, there exists a unique function ϱ such that

$$\xi < \varrho(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad Kb\big(\varrho(\lambda)\big) + h\big(\varrho(\lambda)\big) - \lambda = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in]\underline{\lambda}, \overline{\lambda}[. \tag{9}$$

Furthermore, this function is such that

$$Kb(x) + h(x) - \lambda < 0 \quad \text{for all } x > \varrho(\lambda) \tag{10}$$

and

$$Kb'\big(\varrho(\lambda)\big) + h'\big(\varrho(\lambda)\big) < 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in]\underline{\lambda}, \overline{\lambda}[. \tag{11}$$

On the other hand, there is a unique function ρ such that

$$0 < \rho(\lambda) < \xi \quad \text{and} \quad Kb\big(\rho(\lambda)\big) + h\big(\rho(\lambda)\big) - \lambda = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \big]Kb(0) + h(0),\, \overline{\lambda}\big[. \tag{12}$$

Given any $\lambda \in \big]Kb(0) + h(0),\, \overline{\lambda}\big[$, this function is such that

$$Kb(x) + h(x) - \lambda < 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \big]0, \rho(\lambda)\big[. \tag{13}$$




Figure 1. Notation associated with the graph of the function $Kb(\cdot)+h(\cdot)$.

We conclude this section with the following three examples.

Example 1 Suppose that the uncontrolled dynamics of the state process are modelled by the SDE

$$\mathrm{d}\overline{X}_t = \kappa(\gamma - \overline{X}_t)\overline{X}_t\,\mathrm{d}t + \sigma\overline{X}_t^{\ell}\,\mathrm{d}W_t, \quad \overline{X}_0 = x > 0,$$

for some strictly positive constants κ, γ, σ and $\ell \in [1, \frac{3}{2}]$. Note that the celebrated stochastic Verhulst-Pearl logistic model of population growth arises in the special case $\ell = 1$. The derivative of the scale function admits the expression

$$p'_\beta(x) = \exp\left(\frac{2\kappa\gamma}{2(\ell-1)\sigma^2}\left[x^{-2(\ell-1)} - \beta^{-2(\ell-1)}\right] + \frac{2\kappa}{(3-2\ell)\sigma^2}\left[x^{3-2\ell} - \beta^{3-2\ell}\right]\right),$$

if $\ell \in]1, \frac{3}{2}[$,

$$p'_\beta(x) = \left(\frac{\beta}{x}\right)^{\frac{2\kappa\gamma}{\sigma^2}} \exp\left(\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}(x-\beta)\right),$$

if $\ell = 1$, and

$$p'_\beta(x) = \left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}} \exp\left(\frac{2\kappa\gamma}{\sigma^2}(x^{-1} - \beta^{-1})\right),$$

if $\ell = \frac{3}{2}$. Assumptions 1–3 hold true if $\ell \in]1, \frac{3}{2}]$ or if $\ell = 1$ and $k\gamma - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 > 0$. Furthermore, if either $h = 0$ or h is any strictly concave function satisfying the Inada conditions

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} h(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \uparrow \infty} h(x) = 0,$$

then the conditions (i)–(iii) in Assumption 4 are satisfied.

Example 2 Suppose that the uncontrolled dynamics of the state process are modelled by the SDE

$$\mathrm{d}\overline{X}_t = \left(\kappa\gamma + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 - \kappa \ln(\overline{X}_t)\right) \overline{X}_t \, \mathrm{d}t + \sigma \overline{X}_t \, \mathrm{d}W_t, \quad \overline{X}_0 = x > 0,$$

for some constants $\kappa, \gamma, \sigma > 0$, namely, the logarithm of the uncontrolled state process is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process given by

$$\mathrm{d} \ln(\overline{X}_t) = \kappa\big(\gamma - \ln(\overline{X}_t)\big) \, \mathrm{d}t + \sigma \, \mathrm{d}W_t, \quad \ln(\overline{X}_0) = \ln(x) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In this case, the derivative of scale function admits the expression

$$p'_\beta(x) = \beta^{-\frac{\kappa}{\sigma^2} \ln(\beta) + \frac{2\kappa\gamma}{\sigma^2} + 1} x^{\frac{\kappa}{\sigma^2} \ln(x) - \frac{2\kappa\gamma}{\sigma^2} - 1}$$

and all of Assumptions 1–3 hold true. Furthermore, if either $h = 0$ or h is any strictly concave function satisfying the Inada conditions (14), then the conditions (i)–(iii) in Assumption 4 are satisfied.

Example 3 Suppose that the uncontrolled dynamics of the state process are modelled by the SDE

$$\mathrm{d}\overline{X}_t = \kappa(\gamma - \overline{X}_t) \, \mathrm{d}t + \sigma \overline{X}_t^{\ell} \, \mathrm{d}W_t, \quad \overline{X}_0 = x > 0,$$

for some strictly positive constants κ, γ, σ and $\ell \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Note that, in the special case that arises for $\ell = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\kappa\gamma - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 > 0$, the process $\overline{X}$ identifies with the short rate process in the Cox-Ingersoll-Ross interest rate model. The derivative of the scale function admits the expression

$$p'_\beta(x) = \exp\left(\frac{2\kappa\gamma}{(2\ell - 1)\sigma^2}\big[x^{-(2\ell-1)} - \beta^{-(2\ell-1)}\big] + \frac{2\kappa}{(1-\ell)\sigma^2}\big[x^{2(1-\ell)} - \beta^{2(1-\ell)}\big]\right),$$

if $\ell \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1[$,

$$p'_\beta(x) = \left(\frac{\beta}{x}\right)^{\frac{2\kappa\gamma}{\sigma^2}} \exp\left(\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}(x - \beta)\right),$$

if $\ell = \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$p'_\beta(x) = \left(\frac{x}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{2\kappa}{\sigma^2}} \exp\left(\frac{2\kappa\gamma}{\sigma^2}(x^{-1} - \beta^{-1})\right),$$

if $\ell = 1$. Assumptions 1–3 hold true if $\ell \in]\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ or if $\ell = \frac{1}{2}$ and $k\gamma - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 > 0$. Furthermore, if h is any strictly concave function satisfying the Inada conditions (14), then the conditions (i)–(iii) in Assumption 4 are satisfied.

3 The solution to the problem's HJB equation

In light of standard stochastic control theory, we will solve the optimisation problem that we consider by constructing a C^2 function w and finding a constant λ such that the HJB equation

$$\max\left\{\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)w''(x) + b(x)w'(x) + h(x) - \lambda,\ K - w'(x)\right\} = 0 \tag{14}$$

holds true for all $x > 0$. Assuming that we can construct such a solution, we expect that, given any initial condition $x > 0$,

$$\sup_{\zeta\in\mathcal{A}} J^{\mathrm{e}}(\zeta) = \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\zeta\in\mathcal{A}} J^{\mathrm{p}}(\zeta) = \lambda.$$

Furthermore, given such a solution, an optimal strategy can be characterised as follows. The controller should wait and take no action for as long as the state process X takes values in the interior of the set in which the ODE

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)w''(x) + b(x)w'(x) + h(x) - \lambda = 0 \tag{15}$$

is satisfied and should take the minimal action required so that the state process is kept outside the interior of the set defined by $w'(x) = K$ at all times.

We conjecture that the optimal strategy takes the following qualitative form. There exists a point β in the state space $]0,\infty[$ such that it is optimal to push in an impulsive way the state process down to level β if the initial state x is strictly greater than β and otherwise take minimal action so that the state process X is kept inside the set $]0,\beta]$ at all times, which amounts at reflecting X at β in the negative direction. In view of the discussion in the previous section, the optimality of such a strategy is associated with a solution (w,λ) to the HJB equation (14) such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)w''(x) + b(x)w'(x) + h(x) - \lambda = 0, \quad \text{for } x \in]0,\beta[, \tag{16}$$

$$w'(x) = K, \quad \text{for } x \in [\beta,\infty[. \tag{17}$$

To proceed further, we consider the so-called "smooth pasting condition" of singular stochastic control, which requires that w should be C^2, in particular, at the free-boundary point β. This condition suggests the free-boundary equations

$$\lim_{x\uparrow\beta} w'(x) = K \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x\uparrow\beta} w''(x) = 0. \tag{18}$$

In view of the definitions (6) and (7) of the scale function and the speed measure of the uncontrolled diffusion, we can check that

$$\int_x^\beta b(s)\, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s) = \int_x^\beta \left(\frac{1}{p'_\beta}\right)'(s)\,\mathrm{d}s = 1 - \frac{1}{p'_\beta(x)}, \tag{19}$$

and verify that the unique solution to the ODE (15) that satisfies $w'(\beta) = K$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} w'(x) \equiv w'(x;\lambda) &= p'_\beta(x)\left(K + \int_x^\beta \big[h(s) - \lambda\big]\, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s)\right) \\ &= K + p'_\beta(x)\int_x^\beta \big[Kb(s) + h(s) - \lambda\big]\, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

This function satisfies the additional boundary condition $w''(\beta) = 0$ if and only if

$$Kb(\beta) + h(\beta) - \lambda = 0. \tag{21}$$

In view of Remark 1, this equation is satisfied by uncountably many pairs (β, λ). We therefore need an extra boundary condition to identify a pair (β, λ) that characterises the solution to the control problem. It turns out that

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} \frac{w'(x)}{p'_\beta(x)} = 0 \tag{22}$$

provides a suitable such boundary condition. In view of the expressions for w' given by (20) and the fact that $\lim_{x\downarrow 0} p'_\beta(x) = \infty$ (see Assumption 2), we are thus faced with the additional equation

$$\Theta(\beta, \lambda) := \int_0^\beta \big[Kb(s) + h(s) - \lambda\big]\, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s) = 0. \tag{23}$$

Proposition 1 *In the presence of Assumptions 1, 2 and 4, the following statements hold true:*

(I) *There exists a unique pair $(\beta^\star, \lambda^\star)$ with $\beta^\star > 0$ satisfying (21) and (23). This pair is such that*

$$Kb(0) + h(0) < \lambda^\star < \overline{\lambda}, \tag{24}$$

where $\overline{\lambda}$ is defined by (8).

(II) *The unique, modulo an additive constant, function w that is defined by*

$$w'(x) = \begin{cases} K + p'_{\beta^\star}(x)\int_x^{\beta^\star} \big[Kb(s) + h(s) - \lambda^\star\big]\, m_{\beta^\star}(\mathrm{d}s), & \text{for } x \in]0, \beta^\star], \\ K, & \text{for } x > \beta^\star, \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

is a C^2 solution to the HJB equation (14) such that

$$\big|w'(x)\big| \le C_1 \quad \text{for all } x > 0, \tag{26}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$.

Proof. We develop the proof in three main steps.

Preliminary results. We start by deriving a first order ODE for the function $\Theta(\cdot,\lambda)$ that we will need later in the proof. To this end, we first note that the definition (6) of the scale function implies that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\frac{1}{p'_z(x)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\exp\left(2\int_z^x \frac{b(s)}{\sigma^2(s)}\,\mathrm{d}s\right) = -\frac{2b(z)}{\sigma^2(z)}\frac{1}{p'_z(x)}.$$

Using this expression and the definition (7) of the speed measure, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\Theta(z,\lambda) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\int_0^z \frac{2\big[Kb(s)+h(s)-\lambda\big]}{\sigma^2(s)p'_z(s)}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &= -\frac{2b(z)}{\sigma^2(z)}\Theta(z,\lambda) + \frac{2}{\sigma^2(z)}\big[Kb(z)+h(z)-\lambda\big],\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(z)\frac{\partial\Theta(z,\lambda)}{\partial z} + b(z)\Theta(z,\lambda) - [Kb(z)+h(z)-\lambda] = 0. \tag{27}$$

Given any $\beta > 0$, the definition of Θ implies that

$$\Lambda(\beta) = \frac{1}{m_\beta\big(]0,\beta[\big)}\int_0^\beta \big[Kb(s)+h(s)\big]\,m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s)$$

is the unique solution to equation (23). In light of Assumption 4.(iii) (see also Figure 1), a straightforward inspection of the definition of Θ reveals that this solution is such that one of the following two cases holds true:

$$\text{(i) } Kb(0)+h(0) < \Lambda(\beta) < \overline{\lambda} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{(ii) } \underline{\lambda} < \Lambda(\beta) < Kb(0)+h(0) \text{ and } \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big) < \beta, \tag{28}$$

where $\underline{\lambda} < \overline{\lambda}$ are defined by (8) and ϱ is introduced by (9). In particular, we note that $\Lambda(\beta) \in]\underline{\lambda},\overline{\lambda}[$, which is the domain of the function ϱ.

Differentiating the identity

$$\Theta\big(\beta,\Lambda(\beta)\big) = 0, \quad \beta > 0, \tag{29}$$

which defines Λ, with respect to β and using (27), we calculate

$$\Lambda'(\beta) = \frac{2}{\sigma^2(\beta)m_\beta\big(]0,\beta[\big)}\big[Kb(\beta)+h(\beta)-\Lambda(\beta)\big].$$

On the other hand, differentiating the identity

$$Kb\big(\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\big) + h\big(\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\big) - \Lambda(\beta) = 0,$$

which follows from (9), with respect to β, we derive the expression

$$\Lambda'(\beta) = \Big[Kb'\big(\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\big) + h'\big(\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\big)\Big]\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\beta}\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big).$$

Combining these calculations, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\beta}\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big) = \frac{2\big[Kb(\beta) + h(\beta) - \Lambda(\beta)\big]}{\sigma^2(\beta)m_\beta\big(]0,\beta[\big)\big[Kb'\big(\varrho(\Lambda(\beta))\big) + h'\big(\varrho(\Lambda(\beta))\big)\big]}.$$

In view of this result and the inequatity

$$Kb'\big(\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\big) + h'\big(\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\big) < 0 \quad \text{for all } \beta > 0,$$

which follows from (11), we can see that

$$\operatorname{sgn}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\beta}\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\right) = -\operatorname{sgn}\Big(Kb(\beta) + h(\beta) - \Lambda(\beta)\Big) \quad \text{for all } \beta > 0, \tag{30}$$

where sgn is the sign function defined by

$$\operatorname{sgn}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{|x|}, & \text{for } x \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{for } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof of (I). In view of (29), we can see that there exists a pair $(\beta^\star, \lambda^\star)$ with $\beta^\star > 0$ satisfying (21) and (23) if and only if

$$Kb(\beta^\star) + h(\beta^\star) - \lambda^\star = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^\star = \Lambda(\beta^\star) \tag{31}$$

The structure of the function $Kb(\cdot) + h(\cdot)$, which have discussed in Remark 1 (see also Figure 1), implies that there exists no $\beta^\star$ satisfying (31) if $\Lambda(\beta^\star)$ is as in case (ii) of (28). We therefore need to show that there exists $\beta^\star > 0$ such that, if we define $\lambda^\star = \Lambda(\beta^\star)$, then $\lambda^\star$ satisfies the inequalities (24), and

$$\text{either} \quad \beta^\star = \mathsf{\rho}\big(\Lambda(\beta^\star)\big) \quad \text{or} \quad \beta^\star = \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta^\star)\big), \tag{32}$$

where ϱ, $\mathsf{\rho}$ are as in (9), (12). Furthermore, the resulting solution $(\beta^\star, \lambda^\star)$ to the system of equations (21) and (23) is unique if and only if only one of the two equations in (32) has a unique solution and the other one has no solution.

If the equation $\beta = \mathsf{\rho}\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)$ had a solution $\beta^\star > 0$, then (13) would imply that

$$Kb(s) + h(s) - \Lambda(\beta^\star) < 0 \quad \text{for all } s < \mathsf{\rho}\big(\Lambda(\beta^\star)\big) = \beta^\star,$$

which would contradict the identity

$$\Theta\big(\beta^\star, \Lambda(\beta^\star)\big) \equiv \int_0^{\beta^\star} \big[Kb(s) + h(s) - \Lambda(\beta^\star)\big]\, m_{\beta^\star}(\mathrm{d}s) = 0.$$

To establish part (I) of the theorem, we therefore have to prove that there exists a unique point $\beta^\star > 0$ such that

$$\Lambda(\beta^\star) \in \big]Kb(0) + h(0), \overline{\lambda}\big[\quad \text{and} \quad \beta^\star = \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta^\star)\big). \tag{33}$$

To prove that there exists a unique $\beta^\star > 0$ satisfying (33), we first observe that the inequality in (9) implies that

$$\beta < \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big) \quad \text{for all } \beta \leq \xi. \tag{34}$$

We next argue by contradiction and we assume that there is no $\beta^\star > 0$ satisfying the equation in (33). In view of (34) and the continuity of the functions ϱ, Λ, we can see that such an assumption implies that

$$\beta < \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big) \quad \text{for all } \beta > \xi. \tag{35}$$

In turn, this inequality and (10) imply that

$$Kb(\beta) + h(\beta) - \Lambda(\beta) > 0 \quad \text{for all } \beta > \xi.$$

Combining this observation with (30), we obtain $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\beta}\varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big) < 0$ for all $\beta > \xi$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\beta}\Big[\beta - \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)\Big] > 1 \quad \text{for all } \beta > \xi,$$

which contradicts (35). It follows that there exists $\beta^\star > 0$ satisfying the equation in (33).

To see that the solution $\beta^\star > \xi$ to the equation in (33) is indeed unique, we note that (9) implies that $Kb(\beta) + h(\beta) - \Lambda(\beta) = 0$ for all $\beta > \xi$ such that $\beta = \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big)$. This observation and (30) imply

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\beta}\big[\beta - \varrho(\beta)\big] = 1 \quad \text{for all } \beta > \xi \text{ such that } \beta = \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta)\big).$$

Based on this result, we can develop a simple contradiction argument to show that the equation in (33) has at most one solution $\beta^\star > \xi$.

We conclude this part of the proof by noting that the first statement in (33) can be seen by a straightforward inspection of the equation (23) that $\big(\beta^\star, \Lambda(\beta^\star)\big)$ satisfies in the light of the identity in (33) and Figure 1.

Proof of (II). By construction, we will show that the function w given by (25) is a C^2 solution to the HJB equation (14) if we prove that

$$w'(x) \geq K \quad \text{for all } x \in \,]0, \beta^\star[$$
$$\text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)w''(x) + b(x)w'(x) + h(x) - \lambda^\star \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \,]\beta^\star, \infty[,$$

In view of the identities $\lambda^\star = \Lambda(\beta^\star)$ and $\beta^\star = \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta^\star)\big)$, the second of these inequalities is equivalent to

$$Kb(x) + h(x) - \Lambda(\beta^\star) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } x > \beta^\star = \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta^\star)\big),$$

which is true thanks to (10). On the other hand, the first of these inequalities follows immediately from the expression of w' in (25) and the inequalities

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\int_x^{\beta^\star} \big[Kb(s) + h(s) - \lambda^\star\big]\, m_{\beta^\star}(\mathrm{d}s) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{for all } x \in \big]0, \mathsf{p}(\lambda^\star)\big[, \\ < 0 & \text{for all } x \in \big]\mathsf{p}(\lambda^\star), \beta^\star\big[, \end{cases}$$

which hold true thanks to the identities $\lambda^\star = \Lambda(\beta^\star)$ and $\beta^\star = \varrho\big(\Lambda(\beta^\star)\big)$, the inequalities in (24) and Assumption 4.(iii) (see also Figure 1).

Finally, we use L'Hôpital's formula to calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x\downarrow 0} w'(x) &= K + \lim_{x\downarrow 0} \frac{\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\int_x^{\beta^\star} \big[Kb(s) + h(s) - \lambda^\star\big]\, m_{\beta^\star}(\mathrm{d}s)}{\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}(p'_{\beta^\star})^{-1}(x)} \\ &= K + \lim_{x\downarrow 0} \frac{\lambda^\star - Kb(x) - h(x)}{b(x)} = \frac{\lambda^\star - h(0)}{b(0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this result with the continuity of w' and (17), we obtain (26). □

Remark 2 The model studied by Alvarez and Hening [3] is the special case that arises when $h = 0$ and $K = 1$. In this case, the assumption that $\lim_{x\downarrow 0} p'_\beta(x) = \infty$ and (19) yield

$$\int_0^\beta b(s)\, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s) = 1.$$

In view of this identity and (19), we can see that the system of equations (21) and (23), which determines $(\beta^\star, \lambda^\star)$, reduces to

$$\lambda^\star = b(\beta^\star) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^\star = \frac{1}{m_\beta\big(]0, \beta[\big)},$$

while (25) reduces to

$$w'(x) = \begin{cases} \lambda^\star p'_{\beta^\star}(x) m_\beta\big(]0, x[\big), & \text{for } x \in]0, \beta^\star], \\ 1, & \text{for } x > \beta^\star, \end{cases}$$

which are precisely the expressions (8) and (9) in Alvarez and Hening [3].

4 The solution to the optimal harvesting problem

We can now prove the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2 and 4 hold, and let $(\beta^\star, \lambda^\star)$ be as in Proposition 1. Given any initial condition $x > 0$, the following statements hold true:*
(I) *$J_x^{\mathrm{e}}(\zeta) \leq \lambda^\star$ for all admissible harvesting strategies $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$.*
(II) *If $\zeta^\star \in \mathcal{A}$ is the harvesting strategy that has a jump of size $\Delta\zeta_0^\star = (x - \beta^\star)^+$ at time 0 and then reflects the state process $X^\star$ at the level $\beta^\star$ in the negative direction, then*

$$J_x^{\mathrm{e}}(\zeta^\star) \equiv \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{T}\,\mathsf{E}\left[\int_0^T h(X_t^\star)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T^\star\right] = \lambda^\star$$
$$\textit{and} \quad J_x^{\mathrm{p}}(\zeta^\star) \equiv \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{T}\left[\int_0^T h(X_t^\star)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T^\star\right] = \lambda^\star.$$

(III) *If Assumption 3 also holds true, then $J_x^{\mathrm{p}}(\zeta) \leq \lambda^\star$ for all admissible harvesting strategies $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Fix any initial state $x > 0$, let $\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$ be any admissible harvesting strategy and let X be the associated solution to the SDE (1). Also, consider the function w defined by (25) in Proposition 1. Using Itô's formula, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} w(X_{T+}) = w(x) &+ \int_0^T \left[\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(X_t)w''(X_t) + b(X_t)w'(X_t)\right]\mathrm{d}t - \int_{[0,T]} w'(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}\zeta_t \\ &+ \sum_{0\leq t\leq T}\big[w(X_{t+}) - w(X_t) - w'(X_t)\,\Delta X_t\big] + M_T, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_T = \int_0^T \sigma(X_t)w'(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}W_t.$$

Since $\Delta X_t \equiv X_{t+} - X_t = -\Delta\zeta_t \leq 0$ and

$$w(X_{t+}) - w(X_t) - K\,\Delta X_t = \int_{X_{t+}}^{X_t}\big[K - w'(s)\big]\,\mathrm{d}s,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T h(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T \\ &\quad= \lambda^\star T + w(x) - w(X_{T+}) + \int_0^T \left[\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(X_t)w''(X_t) + b(X_t)w'(X_t) + h(X_t) - \lambda^\star\right]\mathrm{d}t \\ &\qquad+ \int_0^T \big[K - w'(X_t)\big]\,\mathrm{d}\zeta_t^{\mathrm{c}} + \sum_{0\leq t\leq T}\int_{X_{t+}}^{X_t}[K - w'(s)]\,\mathrm{d}s + M_T, \end{aligned}$$

where ζ^{c} is the continuous part of the stochastic process ζ. Since ζ^c is an increasing process, $X_{t+} < X_t$ and the pair (w, λ) satisfy the HJB equation (14), we can see that

$$\int_0^T h(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T \leq \lambda^\star T + w(x) - w(X_{T+}) + M_T. \tag{36}$$

Proof of (I). Let (τ_n) be a sequence of localising times for the local martingale M. Recalling the assumption that h is bounded from below and the fact that w is bounded from below, we take expectations in (36) and we use Fatou's lemma and the dominated convergence theorem to calculate

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\,\mathsf{E}\left[\int_0^T h(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T\right] &\leq \frac{1}{T}\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\mathsf{E}\left[\int_0^{\tau_n\wedge T} h(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_{\tau_n\wedge T}\right]\\ &\leq \frac{1}{T}\lim_{n\uparrow\infty}\mathsf{E}\Big[\lambda^\star(\tau_n\wedge T) + w(x) + w^-(X_{\tau_n\wedge T+})\Big]\\ &= \lambda^\star + \frac{w(x)}{T} + \frac{1}{T}\,\mathsf{E}\Big[w^-(X_{T+})\Big],\end{aligned}$$

where $w^-(x) = -\min\big\{w(x), 0\big\}$. Using the fact that w^- is bounded once again, we can pass to the limit as $T\uparrow\infty$ to obtain the required inequality $J_x^{\mathrm{e}}(\zeta) \leq \lambda^\star$.

Proof of (II). Let the harvesting strategy $\zeta^\star \in \mathcal{A}$ be as in the statement of the theorem: such a strategy indeed exists (see Tanaka [18, Theorem 4.1]). For this strategy, (36) holds with equality, namely,

$$\int_0^T h(X_t^\star)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T^\star = \lambda^\star T + w(x) - w(X_{T+}^\star) + M_T^\star. \tag{37}$$

Since the process $X^\star$ takes values in $]0, \beta^\star]$ at all times, the assumption that σ is bounded in any bounded neighbourhood of 0 and (26) imply that

$$\langle M^\star\rangle_T = \int_0^T \big[\sigma(X_t^\star)w'(X_t^\star)\big]^2\,\mathrm{d}t \leq \max_{s\in[0,\beta^\star]}\big[\sigma(s)w'(s)\big]^2\,T < \infty. \tag{38}$$

This observation implies that the stochastic integral is a square integrable martingale. Therefore, we can take expectations in (37) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{T}\,\mathsf{E}\left[\int_0^T h(X_t^\star)\,\mathrm{d}t + K\zeta_T^\star\right] = \lambda^\star + \frac{w(x)}{T} - \frac{1}{T}\,\mathsf{E}\Big[w(X_{T+}^\star)\Big].$$

Since the process $\big(w(X_t^\star)\big)$ is bounded, we can pass to the limit as $T\uparrow\infty$ to obtain the identity $J_x^{\mathrm{e}}(\zeta^\star) = \lambda^\star$.

To establish the identity $J_x^{\mathrm{p}}(\zeta) = \lambda^\star$, we first note that the Dambis, Dubins and Schwarz theorem (e.g., see Revuz and Yor [15, Theorem V.1.7]) asserts that there exists a standard Brownian motion B, which may be defined on a possible enlargement of the probability

space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$, such that $M^\star = B_{\langle M^\star \rangle}$. Using this representation, (38) and the fact that $\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} B_T/T = 0$, we can see that

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{|M^\star_T|}{T} \mathbf{1}_{\{\langle M^\star\rangle_\infty = \infty\}} \leq \max_{s\in[0,\beta^\star]} \big[\sigma(s)w'(s)\big]^2 \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{|B_{\langle M^\star\rangle_T}|}{\langle M^\star\rangle_T} \mathbf{1}_{\{\langle M^\star\rangle_\infty = \infty\}} = 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{|M^\star_T|}{T} \mathbf{1}_{\{\langle M^\star\rangle_\infty < \infty\}} = 0$$

because $M^\star$ converges in $\mathbb{R}$ on the event $\{\langle M^\star\rangle_\infty < \infty\}$. In view of these results, we can pass to the limit as $T \uparrow \infty$ in (37) to obtain

$$J^{\mathrm{p}}_x(\zeta^\star) = \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \left(\lambda^\star + \frac{w(x)}{T} - \frac{w(X^\star_{T+})}{T} + \frac{M^\star_T}{T} \right) = \lambda^\star,$$

where we have also used the fact that the process $\big(w(X^\star_t)\big)$ is bounded.

Proof of (III). In this part of the theorem, we assume that the conditions of Assumption 3 also hold true so that we can use a suitable comparison theorem as well as a suitable ergodic theorem. Making a slight modification of the proof of the comparison Theorem V.43 in Rogers and Williams [16], we can show that $X_t \leq \overline{X}_t$ for all $t \geq 0$, P-a.s., where $\overline{X}$ is the solution to the SDE (4). In view of this observation, we can see that

$$\langle M\rangle_T = \int_0^T \big[\sigma(X_t)w'(X_t)\big]^2 \,\mathrm{d}t \leq CC_1^2 \int_0^T (1 + X^k_t)\,\mathrm{d}t \leq CC_1^2 \left(T + \int_0^T \overline{X}^k_t \,\mathrm{d}t \right),$$

where C, k and C_1 are the constants in (5) and (26). Furthermore, the ergodic Theorem V.53 in Rogers and Williams [16] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{\langle M\rangle_T}{T} &\leq CC_1^2 \left(1 + \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \overline{X}^k_t \,\mathrm{d}t \right) \\ &= CC_1^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{m_\beta\big(]0,\infty[\big)} \int_0^\infty s^k \, m_\beta(\mathrm{d}s) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using this estimate instead of the one in (38), we can make exactly the same reasoning as in the proof of (II) above to show that

$$\lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \frac{|M_T|}{T} = 0.$$

Passing to the limit as $T \uparrow \infty$ in (36), we therefore obtain

$$J^{\mathrm{p}}_x(\zeta) \leq \lim_{T\uparrow\infty} \left(\lambda^\star + \frac{w(x)}{T} + \frac{w^-(X_{T+})}{T} + \frac{M_T}{T} \right) = \lambda^\star,$$

where we have also used the fact that the function $w^- = -(w \wedge 0)$ is bounded. □

References

[1] L. H. R. Alvarez (2000), On the option interpretation of rational harvesting planning, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, **40**, pp. 383-405.

[2] L. H. R. Alvarez (2001), Singular stochastic control, linear diffusions, and optimal stopping: A class of solvable problems, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, **39**, pp. 1697-1710.

[3] L. H. R. Alvarez and A. Hening (2019), Optimal sustainable harvesting of populations in random environments, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2019.02.008.

[4] L. H. R. Alvarez, E. Lungu and B. Øksendal (2016), Optimal multi-dimensional stochastic harvesting with density-dependent prices, *Afrika Matematika*, **27**, pp. 427–442.

[5] L. H. R. Alvarez and L. A. Shepp (1998), Optimal harvesting of stochastically fluctuating populations, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, **37**, pp. 155–177.

[6] G. Ferrari (2019), On a class of singular stochastic control problems for reflected diffusions, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, **473**, pp. 952–979.

[7] N. C. Framstad (2003), Optimal harvesting of a jump diffusion population and the effect of jump uncertainty, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, **42**, pp. 1451–1465.

[8] A. Hening, D. H. Nguyen, S. C. Ungureanu and T. K. Wong (2019), Asymptotic harvesting of populations in random environments, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, **78**, pp. 293–329.

[9] A. Hening, K. Q. Tran, T. T. Phan and G. Yin (2019), Harvesting of interacting stochastic populations, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, **79**, pp. 533–570.

[10] A. Jack and M. Zervos (2006), A singular control problem with an expected and a pathwise ergodic performance criterion, *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Stochastic Analysis*, **Article ID 82538**, pp. 1–19.

[11] I. Karatzas (1983), A class of singular stochastic control problems, *Advances in Applied Probability*, **15**, pp. 225–254.

[12] E. Lungu and B. Øksendal (1997), Optimal Harvesting from a Population in a Stochastic Crowded Environment, *Mathematical Biosciences*, **145**, pp. 47–75.

[13] E. Lungu and B. Øksendal (2001), Optimal harvesting from interacting populations in a stochastic environment, *Bernoulli*, **7**, pp. 527–539.

[14] H. Morimoto (2013), Optimal harvesting in the stochastic logistic growth model with finite horizon, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, **51**, pp. 2335–2355.

[15] D. Revuz and M. Yor (1999), *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*, 3rd edition, Springer.

[16] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams (2000), *Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales*, volume 2, Cambridge University Press.

[17] Q. Song, R. H. Stockbridge and C. Zhu (2011), On optimal harvesting problems in random environments, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, **49**, pp. 859–889.

[18] H. Tanaka (1979), Stochastic differential equations with reflecting boundary condition in convex regions, *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal*, **9**, pp. 163177.