

# Optimal Investment with Stopping in Finite Horizon\*

Xiongfei Jian<sup>a</sup>, Xun Li<sup>b</sup> and Fahuai Yi<sup>a†</sup>

<sup>a</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, South China Normal University, Guangzhou, China

<sup>b</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong

## Abstract

In this paper, we investigate dynamic optimization problems featuring both stochastic control and optimal stopping in a finite time horizon. The paper aims to develop new methodologies, which are significantly different from those of mixed dynamic optimal control and stopping problems in the existing literature, to study a manager's decision. We formulate our model to a free boundary problem of a fully *nonlinear* equation. Furthermore, by means of a dual transformation for the above problem, we convert the above problem to a new free boundary problem of a *linear* equation. Finally, we apply the theoretical results to challenging, yet practically relevant and important, risk-sensitive problems in wealth management to obtain the properties of the optimal strategy and the right time to achieve a certain level over a finite time investment horizon.

**Keywords:** Optimal investment; Optimal stopping; Dual transformation; Free boundary.  
**MSC Classification(2010):** 35R35; 91B28; 93E20.

## 1 Introduction

Optimal stopping problems, a variant of optimization problems allowing investors freely to stop before or at the maturity in order to maximize their profits, have been implemented in practice and given rise to investigation in academic areas such as science, engineering, economics and, particularly, finance. For instance, pricing American-style derivatives is a conventional optimal stopping time problem where the stopping time is adapted to the information generated over time. The underlying dynamic system is usually described by stochastic differential equations (SDEs). The research on optimal stopping, consequently, has mainly focused on the underlying dynamic system itself. In the field of financial investment, however, an investor frequently runs into investment decisions where investors stop investing in risky assets so as to maximize their expected utilities with respect to their wealth over a finite time investment horizon. These optimal stopping problems depend on underlying dynamic systems as well as investors' optimization decisions (controls). This naturally results in a mixed

---

\*The project is supported by NNSF of China (No.11271143 and No.11371155), University Special Research Fund for Ph.D. Program of China (20124407110001 and 20114407120008), and Research Grants Council of Hong Kong under grants 521610 and 519913.

†Corresponding author. fhyi@scnu.edu.cn. Tel: 86-20-85216655-8214. Fax: 86-20-85212131.

optimal control and stopping problem, and Ceci-Bassan (2004) is one of the typical representatives along this line of research. In the general formulation of such models, the control is mixed, composed of a control and a stopping time. The theory has also been studied in Bensoussan-Lions (1984), Elliott-Kopp (1999), Yong-Zhou (1999) and Fleming-Soner (2006), and applied in finance in Dayanik-Karatzas (2003), Henderson-Hobson (2008), Li-Zhou (2006), Li-Wu (2008, 2009) and Shiryaev-Xu-Zhou (2008).

In the finance field, finding an optimal stopping time point has been extensively studied for pricing American-style options, which allow option holders to exercise the options before or at the maturity. Typical examples that are applicable include, but are not limited to, those presented in Chang-Pang-Yong (2009), Dayanik-Karatzas (2003) and Rüschenendorf-Urusov (2008). In the mathematical finance literature, choosing an optimal stopping time point is often related to a free boundary problem for a class of diffusions (see Fleming-Soner (2006) and Peskir-Shiryaev (2006)). In many applied areas, especially in more extensive investment problems, however, one often encounters more general controlled diffusion processes. In real financial markets, the situation is even more complicated when investors expect to choose as little time as possible to stop portfolio selection over a given investment horizon so as to maximize their profits (see Samuelson (1965), Karatzas-Kou (1998), Karatzas-Sudderth (1999), Karatzas-Wang (2000), Karatzas-Ocone (2002), Ceci-Bassan (2004), Henderson (2007), Li-Zhou (2006) and Li-Wu (2008, 2009)).

The initial motivation of this paper comes from our recent studies on choosing an optimal point at which an investor stops investing and/or sells all his risky assets (see Choi-Koo-Kwak (2004) and Henderson-Hobson (2008)). The objective is to find an optimization process and stopping time so as to meet certain investment criteria, such as, the maximum of an expected utility value before or at the maturity. This is a typical problem in the area of financial investment. However, there are fundamental difficulties in handling such optimization problems. Firstly, our investment problems, which are different from the classical American-style options, involve optimization process over the entire time horizon. Secondly, it involves the portfolio in the drift and volatility terms so that the problem including multi-dimensional financial assets is more realistic than those addressed in finance literature (see Carpenter (2000)). Therefore, it is difficult to solve these problems either analytically or numerically using current methods developed in the framework of studying American-style options. In our model, the corresponding HJB equation of the problem is formulated into a variational inequality of a fully nonlinear equation. We make a dual transformation for the problem to obtain a new free boundary problem with a linear equation. Tackling this new free boundary problem, we establish the properties of the free boundary and optimal strategy for the original problem.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the mathematical formulation of the model is presented, and the corresponding HJB equation is posed. In Section 3, a dual transformation converts the free boundary problem of a fully *nonlinear* PDE to a new free boundary problem of a *linear* equation *but* with a complicated constraint (3.15). In Section 4, it is a further idea that we simplify the constraint condition in (3.15) to obtain a new free boundary problem with a *simple* condition (4.5). Moreover, we show that the solution of problem (4.5) must be the solution of problem (3.15). Section 5 devotes to the study for the free boundary of problem (4.5). In Section 6, we go back to the original problem (2.6) to show that its free boundary is decreasing and differentiable. Moreover we present its financial meanings. Section 7 concludes the paper.



Suppose that  $V(x)$  is strictly increasing and strictly concave, i.e.,  $\partial_x V > 0$ ,  $\partial_{xx} V < 0$ . Note that the gradient of  $\pi' \Sigma \pi$  with respect to  $\pi$

$$\nabla_{\pi}(\pi' \Sigma \pi) = 2 \Sigma \pi,$$

then

$$\pi^* = -\Sigma^{-1} \mu \frac{\partial_x V(x, t)}{\partial_{xx} V(x, t)}. \quad (2.5)$$

Thus (2.4) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \min \left\{ -\partial_t V + \frac{1}{2} a^2 \frac{(\partial_x V)^2}{\partial_{xx} V} - r x \partial_x V + r V, V - \frac{1}{\gamma} (x + K)^\gamma \right\} = 0, & x > 0, 0 < t < T, \\ V(0, t) = \frac{1}{\gamma} K^\gamma, & 0 < t < T, \\ V(x, T) = \frac{1}{\gamma} (x + K)^\gamma, & x > 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

where  $a^2 = \mu' \Sigma^{-1} \mu$ . Now we find a condition under which the free boundary exists. A simple calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} U(x + K) &= \frac{1}{\gamma} (x + K)^\gamma, \\ \partial_x U(x + K) &= (x + K)^{\gamma-1}, \\ \partial_{xx} U(x + K) &= -(1 - \gamma)(x + K)^{\gamma-2}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_t U(x + K) + \frac{1}{2} a^2 \frac{(\partial_x U(x + K))^2}{\partial_{xx} U(x + K)} - r x \partial_x U(x + K) + r U(x + K) \\ &= -\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1 - \gamma} (x + K)^\gamma - r x (x + K)^{\gamma-1} + \frac{r}{\gamma} (x + K)^\gamma \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Eliminating  $\frac{1}{\gamma} (x + K)^{\gamma-1}$  yields

$$-\frac{a^2 \gamma}{2(1 - \gamma)} (x + K) - r \gamma x + r(x + K) \geq 0,$$

i.e.,

$$\left( \frac{a^2 \gamma}{2(1 - \gamma)} - r + r \gamma \right) x \leq \left( -\frac{a^2 \gamma}{2(1 - \gamma)} + r \right) K. \quad (2.7)$$

If

$$\frac{a^2 \gamma}{2(1 - \gamma)} - r \leq -r \gamma, \quad (2.8)$$

then (2.7) holds for any  $x > 0$ , the solution to problem (2.6) is  $U(x + K)$  at all.

If

$$\frac{a^2 \gamma}{2(1 - \gamma)} - r \geq 0, \quad (2.9)$$

then (2.7) is impossible for any  $x > 0$ . Therefore, in this case, the solution to problem (2.6) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\partial_t V + \frac{a^2}{2} \frac{(\partial_x V)^2}{\partial_{xx} V} - rx\partial_x V + rV = 0, & x > 0, 0 < t < T, \\ V(0, t) = \frac{1}{\gamma} K^\gamma, & 0 < t < T, \\ \partial_x V(+\infty, t) = 0, & 0 < t < T, \\ V(x, T) = \frac{1}{\gamma} (x + K)^\gamma, & x > 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

We summarize the above results into the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.1** *In the following cases, problem (2.6) has trivial solution.*

- (1) *If (2.8) holds, the solution to problem (2.6) is  $U(x + K)$ .*
- (2) *If (2.9) holds, the solution to problem (2.10) is the solution to problem (2.6) as well.*

Recalling (2.8) and (2.9), in the following we always assume that

$$-r\gamma < \frac{a^2\gamma}{2(1-\gamma)} - r < 0. \quad (2.11)$$

In the case of (2.11), there exists the free boundary.

### 3 Dual transformation

Define a dual transformation of  $V(x, t)$  (see Pham (2009))

$$v(y, t) := \max_{x>0} (V(x, t) - xy), \quad 0 \leq y \leq y_0. \quad (3.1)$$

If  $\partial_x V(\cdot, t)$  is strictly decreasing, which is equivalent to the strict concavity of  $V(\cdot, t)$  (We will show this fact in Section 7), then the maximum in (3.1) will be attained at just one point

$$x = I(y, t), \quad (3.2)$$

which is the unique solution of

$$y = \partial_x V(x, t). \quad (3.3)$$

Using the coordinate transformation (3.2) yields

$$v(y, t) = [V(x, t) - x\partial_x V(x, t)] \Big|_{x=I(y, t)} = V(I(y, t), t) - yI(y, t). \quad (3.4)$$

Differentiating with respect to  $y$  and  $t$ , we get

$$\partial_y v(y, t) = \partial_x V(I(y, t), t) \partial_y I(y, t) - y \partial_y I(y, t) - I(y, t) = -I(y, t), \quad (3.5)$$

$$\partial_{yy} v(y, t) = -\partial_y I(y, t) = -\frac{1}{\partial_{xx} V(I(y, t), t)}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\partial_t v(y, t) = \partial_t V(I(y, t), t) + \partial_x V(I(y, t), t) \partial_t I(y, t) - y \partial_t I(y, t) = \partial_t V(I(y, t), t). \quad (3.7)$$



## 4 Simplifying the complicated constraint condition

Note that in the domain  $\{(x, t) | V(x, t) = \frac{1}{\gamma}(x + K)^\gamma\}$ , we have

$$\partial_x V(x, t) = (x + K)^{\gamma-1}, \quad \text{if } V(x, t) = \frac{1}{\gamma}(x + K)^\gamma. \quad (4.1)$$

By the  $y$  coordinate,

$$y = (K - \partial_y v)^{\gamma-1}, \quad \text{if } v - y\partial_y v = \frac{1}{\gamma}(K - \partial_y v)^\gamma. \quad (4.2)$$

Deriving  $\partial_y v$  from the first equality in (4.2) yields

$$\partial_y v = K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad (4.3)$$

and then substituting (4.3) into (3.16), we have

$$v \geq \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky. \quad (4.4)$$

This is the simplified constraint condition. We assume that  $u(y, t)$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \min \left\{ -\partial_t u - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} y^2 \partial_{yy} u + ru, \quad u - \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} - Ky \right\} = 0, & (y, t) \in Q_y, \\ u(K^{\gamma-1}, t) = \frac{1}{\gamma} K^\gamma, & 0 < t < T, \\ u(y, T) = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky, & 0 < y < K^{\gamma-1}, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$Q_y = (0, K^{\gamma-1}) \times (0, T).$$

Moreover, we split the domain  $Q_y$  into two parts, denote (see Fig. 1)

$$\mathcal{ER}_y = \left\{ u(y, t) = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky \right\}, \quad \text{exercise region}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\mathcal{CR}_y = \left\{ u(y, t) > \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky \right\}, \quad \text{continuation region}. \quad (4.7)$$




Fig. 1.  $\mathcal{CR}_y$  and  $\mathcal{ER}_y$

**Theorem 4.1** *The solution  $u(x, t)$  to problem (4.5) is the solution to problem (3.15) as well.*

In order to prove this theorem, we first show the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1** *For any  $(y, t) \in Q_y$ , we have*

$$\partial_y u = K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{ER}_y, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\partial_y u \leq K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y. \quad (4.9)$$

**Proof:** Equation (4.8) follows from the definition (4.6) directly. Also, in  $\mathcal{CR}_y$

$$-\partial_t u - \frac{a^2}{2} y^2 \partial_{yy} u + ru = 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y. \quad (4.10)$$

Differentiating (4.10) to  $y$  yields

$$-\partial_t(\partial_y u) - \frac{a^2}{2} y^2 \partial_{yy}(\partial_y u) - a^2 y \partial_y(\partial_y u) + r(\partial_y u) = 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y. \quad (4.11)$$

Note that

$$\partial_y u(y, T) = K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad 0 < y < K^{\gamma-1}, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\partial_y u(y, t) = K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad (y, t) \in \partial(\mathcal{CR}_y) \cap Q_y, \quad (4.13)$$

where  $\partial(\mathcal{CR}_y)$  is the boundary of  $\mathcal{CR}_y$ .

Denote  $w = k - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}$ , we further show that  $w$  is a supersolution to problem (4.11)-(4.13) by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_y w &= \frac{1}{1-\gamma} y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}-1} = \frac{1}{1-\gamma} y^{\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \\ \partial_{yy} w &= -\frac{2-\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2} y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}-2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_t w - \frac{a^2}{2} y^2 \partial_{yy} w - a^2 y \partial_y w + rw \\ &= \frac{a^2}{2} \frac{2-\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2} y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} - a^2 \frac{1}{1-\gamma} y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} + r(K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}) \\ &= rK + \left( \frac{a^2 \gamma}{2(1-\gamma)^2} - r \right) y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} > 0, \quad (\text{by the first inequality in (2.11)}). \end{aligned}$$

So  $w$  is a supersolution of (4.11)-(4.13). This means that (4.9) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2** *The function*

$$y \partial_y u + \frac{1}{\gamma} (K - \partial_y u)^\gamma$$

*is increasing with respect to  $\partial_y u$  if  $\partial_y u \leq K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}$ .*



**Proof:** Define a function

$$f(z) = yz + \frac{1}{\gamma}(K - z)^\gamma, \quad z \leq K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Then

$$f'(z) = y - (K - z)^{\gamma-1} \geq 0$$

if  $z \leq K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}$ . □

**Proof of Theorem 4.1:** Note that, from (4.5),

$$-\partial_t u - \frac{a^2}{2} y^2 \partial_{yy} u + ru \geq 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{ER}_y, \quad (4.14)$$

$$u = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{ER}_y. \quad (4.15)$$

Rewrite (4.15) as

$$u = y \left( K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( K - [K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}] \right)^\gamma, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{ER}_y. \quad (4.16)$$

Applying (4.8) to (4.16), we have

$$u = y \partial_y u + \frac{1}{\gamma} (K - \partial_y u)^\gamma, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{ER}_y. \quad (4.17)$$

On the other hand, from (4.5), in  $\mathcal{CR}_y$

$$-\partial_t u - \frac{a^2}{2} y^2 \partial_{yy} u + ru = 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y, \quad (4.18)$$

$$u \geq \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y. \quad (4.19)$$

We rewrite (4.19) as

$$u \geq y \left( K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( K - [K - y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}] \right)^\gamma, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y. \quad (4.20)$$

Applying (4.9) and Lemma 4.2, we get

$$u \geq y \partial_y u + \frac{1}{\gamma} (K - \partial_y u)^\gamma, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y.$$

□

## 5 The free boundary of Problem (4.5)

Denote

$$W_{p,loc}^{2,1}(Q_y) = \left\{ u(y, t) : u, \partial_y u, \partial_{yy} u, \partial_t u \in L^p(Q), \forall Q \subset\subset Q_y \right\}.$$

**Theorem 5.1** *The Problem (4.5) has a unique solution  $u \in W_{p,loc}^{2,1}(Q_y) \cap (\overline{Q_y} \setminus \{y = 0\})$ , and*

$$\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky \leq u(y, t) \leq e^{A(T-t)}\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky\right), \quad (5.1)$$

$$\partial_y\left(u - \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} - Ky\right) \leq 0, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\partial_t\left(u - \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} - Ky\right) \leq 0, \quad (5.3)$$

where  $A = \frac{a^2}{2} \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2}$ .

**Proof:** According to the existence and uniqueness of  $W_{p,loc}^{2,1}(Q_y) \cap (\overline{Q_y} \setminus \{y = 0\})$ , the solution for system (4.5) can be proved by a standard penalty method (see Friedman (1975)). Here, we omit the details. The first inequality in (5.1) follows from (4.5) directly, and now we prove the second inequality in (5.1). Denote

$$W(y, t) := e^{A(T-t)}\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky\right),$$

where  $A > 0$  to be determined later on. We first show that  $W(y, t)$  is a supersolution to problem (4.5). In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_t W - \frac{a^2}{2}y^2\partial_{yy}W + rW \\ &= Ae^{A(T-t)}\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky\right) + e^{A(T-t)}\left[\left(-\frac{a^2}{2}\frac{1}{1-\gamma} + r\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}\right)y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + rKy\right] \\ &\geq e^{A(T-t)}\left(A\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} - \frac{a^2}{2}\frac{1}{1-\gamma}\right)y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

if

$$A = \frac{a^2}{2} \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)^2}.$$

So,  $W(y, t)$  is a supersolution to problem (4.5). Hence, the second inequality in (5.1) holds.

In addition, equation (5.2) follows from (4.8) and (4.9). In order to prove (5.3), we define

$$w(y, t) = u(y, t - \delta) \quad \text{for small } \delta > 0.$$

From (4.5), we know that  $w(x, t)$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \min\left\{-\partial_t w - \frac{a^2}{2}y^2\partial_{yy}w + rw, w - \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} - Ky\right\} = 0, & y > 0, \delta < t < T, \\ w(K^{\gamma-1}, t) = \frac{1}{\gamma}K^\gamma, & \delta < t < T, \\ w(y, T) = u(y, T - \delta) \geq \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky, & 0 < y < K^{\gamma-1}. \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

Applying comparison principle to variational inequalities (4.5) and (5.4) with respect to terminal values (see Friedman (1982)), we obtain

$$u(y, t) \leq w(y, t) = u(y, t - \delta), \quad y > 0, \delta < t < T.$$

Thus  $\partial_t u \leq 0$  and (5.3) holds.  $\square$

Based on (5.2), we define the free boundary

$$h(t) := \min\left\{y \mid u(y, t) = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky\right\}, \quad 0 \leq t < T.$$

**Theorem 5.2** The free boundary function  $h(t)$  is monotonic decreasing (Fig.2) with

$$h(T) := \lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} h(t) = \left( \frac{rK}{\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} - r \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \right)^{\gamma-1}. \quad (5.5)$$

Moreover,  $h(t) \in C[0, T] \cap C^\infty[0, T)$ .

**Proof:** First, from (5.3),  $h(t)$  is monotonic decreasing. Denote

$$\varphi(y) := \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky.$$

In  $\mathcal{ER}_y$ ,

$$-\partial_t \varphi - \frac{a^2}{2} y^2 \partial_{yy} \varphi + r\varphi = \left( -\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} + r \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} \right) y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + rKy \geq 0,$$

so

$$h(t) \geq \left( \frac{rK}{\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} - r \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \right)^{\gamma-1}, \quad 0 \leq t < T.$$

Hence,

$$h(T) \geq \left( \frac{rK}{\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} - r \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \right)^{\gamma-1}.$$

In order to prove (5.5), we suppose

$$h(T) > \left( \frac{rK}{\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} - r \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \right)^{\gamma-1}, \quad (5.6)$$

then it is not hard to get

$$\partial_t u(y, T) > 0, \quad \text{for } h(T) < y < \left( \frac{rK}{\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} - r \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \right)^{\gamma-1},$$

which is a contradiction to (5.3). Therefore, the desired result (5.5) holds.

Finally, the proof of  $h(t) \in C[0, T] \cap C^\infty[0, T)$  is similar to the result in Friedman (1975). Here, we omit the details.  $\square$




Fig. 2.  $y = h(t)$ ,  $\varphi(y) = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky$

**Theorem 5.3** For any  $(y, t) \in Q_y$ , we have

$$\partial_{yy}u(y, t) > 0. \quad (5.7)$$

**Proof:** If  $(y, t) \in \mathcal{ER}_y$ , then  $u = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky$ . Thus,

$$\partial_{yy}u = \frac{1}{1-\gamma}y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}-1} > 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{ER}_y.$$

If  $(y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y$ , then

$$-\partial_t u - \frac{a^2}{2}y^2\partial_{yy}u + ru = 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y. \quad (5.8)$$

Differentiating (5.8) with respect to  $y$  twice yields

$$-\partial_t(\partial_{yy}u) - \frac{a^2}{2}y^2\partial_{yy}(\partial_{yy}u) - a^2y\partial_y(\partial_{yy}u) + (r - a^2)(\partial_{yy}u) = 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y. \quad (5.9)$$

Note that

$$\partial_{yy}u(y, t) > 0, \quad t = T \text{ or } y = h(t).$$

Applying the minimum principle, we obtain

$$\partial_{yy}u = \frac{1}{1-\gamma}y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}-1} > 0, \quad (y, t) \in \mathcal{CR}_y.$$

□

**Remark:** From (3.6), we have  $\partial_{xx}V < 0$ , which means  $V$  is strict concave to  $x$ .

## 6 The free boundary of original problem (2.6)

Recalling on the free boundary  $y = h(t)$

$$u(y, t) = \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}y^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + Ky, \quad y = h(t), \quad (6.1)$$

$$\partial_y u(y, t) = -y^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} + K, \quad y = h(t). \quad (6.2)$$

From dual transformation (3.2) and (3.5), we know

$$x = -\partial_y u(y, t). \quad (6.3)$$

Denote the free boundary of (2.6) by  $x = g(t)$ . Applying (6.2) and (6.3) yields

$$g(t) = -\partial_y u(h(t), t) = h(t)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} - K. \quad (6.4)$$

Moreover,

$$g'(t) = \frac{1}{\gamma-1}h(t)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}-1}h'(t) > 0, \quad (6.5)$$

$$g(T) = h(T)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} - K = \frac{rK}{\frac{a^2}{2} \frac{1}{1-\gamma} - r \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} - K, \quad (\text{by (5.5)}). \quad (6.6)$$

Thus, we have following theorem.

**Theorem 6.1** *The free boundary  $x = g(t)$  of problem (2.6) is monotonic increasing (Fig 3) and  $g(T)$  is determined by (6.6). Moreover,  $g(t) \in C[0, T] \cap C^\infty[0, T)$ .*




Fig. 3.  $x = g(t)$

**Financial meanings:** At time  $t$ , the manager should continue to invest according to (2.5) if  $x > g(t)$ , while the investor should stop investment if  $x < g(t)$ .

## 7 Concluding remark

We explore a class of optimal investment problems mixed with optimal stopping in the financial investment. The corresponding HJB equation, a free boundary problem of a fully nonlinear equation, is posed. By means of a dual transformation, we obtain a new free boundary problem with a linear equation under a complicated constraint condition. The key step is to simplify this complicated constraint condition. In this way we study the properties of the free boundary and optimal strategy for investors.

## References

- [1] BENSOUSSAN, A., AND LIONS, J.L. (1984): *Impulse Control and Quasi-Variational Inequalities*. Gauthier-Villars.
- [2] CAPENTER, J.N. (2000): Does option compensation increase managerial risk appetite? *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 50, pp. 2311-2331.
- [3] CECI, C. AND BASSAN, B. (2004): Mixed optimal stopping and stochastic control problems with semi-continuous final reward for diffusion processes. *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports*, Vol. 76, pp. 323-337.
- [4] CHANG, M.H., PANG, T. AND YONG, J. (2009): Optimal stopping problem for stochastic differential equations with random coefficients. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, Vol. 48, pp. 941-971.
- [5] CHOI, K.J., KOO, H.K. AND KWAK, D.Y. (2004): Optimal stopping of active portfolio management. *Annals of Economics and Finance*, Vol. 5, pp. 93-126.
- [6] DAYANIK, S. AND KARATZAS, I. (2003): On the optimal stopping problem for one-dimensional diffusions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, Vol. 107, pp. 173-212.

- [7] ELLIOTT, R.J. AND KOPP, P.E. (1999): *Mathematics of Financial Markets*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [8] FLEMING, W. AND SONER, H. (2006): *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, 2nd edition. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [9] FRIEDMAN, A. (1975): Parabolic variational inequalities in one space dimension and smoothness of the free boundary. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, Vol. 18, pp. 151-176.
- [10] FRIEDMAN, A. (1982): *Variational Principles and Free-Boundary Problems*. Wiley, New York.
- [11] HENDERSON, V. (2007): Valuing the option to invest in an incomplete market. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, Vol. 1, pp. 103-128.
- [12] HENDERSON, V. AND HOBSON, D. (2008): An explicit solution for an optimal stopping/optimal control problem which models an asset sale. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, Vol. 18, pp. 1681-1705.
- [13] KARATZAS I. AND KOU S. G. (1998): Hedging American contingent claims with constrained portfolios. *Finance and Stochastics*, Vol. 2, pp. 215-258.
- [14] KARATZAS I. AND OCONE D. (2002): A leavable bounded-velocity stochastic control problem. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, Vol. 99, pp. 31-51.
- [15] KARATZAS I. AND SUDDERTH W. D. (1999): Control and stopping of a diffusion process on an interval. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, Vol. 9, pp. 188-196.
- [16] KARATZAS I. AND WANG H. (2000): Utility maximization with discretionary stopping. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, Vol. 39, pp. 306-229.
- [17] LI, X. AND WU, Z.Y. (2008): Reputation entrenchment or risk minimization? Early stop and investor-manager agency conflict in fund management, *Journal of Risk Finance*, Vol. 9, pp. 125-150.
- [18] LI, X. AND WU, Z.Y. (2009): Corporate risk management and investment decisions, *Journal of Risk Finance*, Vol. 10, pp. 155-168.
- [19] LI, X. AND ZHOU, X.Y. (2006): Continuous-time mean-variance efficiency: The 80% rule, *The Annals of Applied Probability*, Vol. 16, pp. 1751-1763.
- [20] OLEINIK, O.A. AND RADKEVIE, E.V. (1973): Second Order Equations with Nonnegative Characteristic Form, American Mathematical Society. *Rhode Island and Plenum Press, New York*.
- [21] PESKIR, G. AND SHIRYAEV, A. (2006): *Optimal Stopping and Free-Boundary Problems*, 2nd edition. Birkhäuser Verlag, Berlin.
- [22] PHAM, H. (2009): *Continuous-time Stochastic Control and Optimization with Financial Applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [23] SAMUELSON, P. A. (1965): Rational theory of warrant pricing. With an appendix by H. P. McKean, A free boundary problem for the heat equation arising from a problem in mathematical economics. *Industrial Management Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 13-31.
- [24] SHIRYAEV, A., XU, Z.Q. AND ZHOU, X.Y. (2008): Thou shalt buy and hold. *Quantitative Finance*, Vol. 8, pp. 765-776.
- [25] YONG, J. AND ZHOU, X.Y. (1999): *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*. Springer-Verlag, New York.