

Optimal retirement in presence of stochastic labor income: a free boundary approach in presence of an incomplete market.

Daniele Marazzina*
Politecnico di Milano, Milano, Italy

July 30, 2024

Abstract

In this note, we show how to solve an optimal retirement problem in presence of a stochastic wage dealing with a free boundary problem. In particular, we show how to deal with an incomplete market case, where the wage cannot be fully hedged investing in the risk-free and the risky asset describing the financial market.

1 Introduction

In this note, we extend the work of [Barucci and Marazzina (2011)], where a stochastic wage perfectly correlated to the risky asset is considered, assuming that the wage may not be perfectly hedged exploiting the financial market, and we show how the free boundary problem is modified due to the incomplete market assumption, exploiting the theoretical framework in [Tepla (2000)].

More precisely, we study a stochastic control problem involving the consumption-portfolio-leisure policy and the optimal stopping time of retirement. Relating to the leisure rate, the agent earns the labour income with a stochastic wage rate. The sum of labour and leisure rates is assumed to be constant. As the complement, the labour rate is lower bounded by a positive constant for the consideration of retaining the employment state before retirement, and then the agent realizes the full leisure rate after declaring retirement.

The problem is solved exploiting the duality method, which can be summarized into four critical procedures. We first tackle the post-stopping time problem to deduce a closed form of the corresponding value function. Then we apply the Legendre-Fenchel transform to the utility function and the value function of post-stopping time problem obtained in the first step. Afterwards, we construct the duality between the optimal control problem with the individual's shadow prices problem, by the aid of the liquidity and budget constraints and the dual transforms acquired before. Finally, we cast the dual shadow price problem as a free boundary problem. We refer to [Barucci and Marazzina (2011), Choi et al. (2008), Ding and Marazzina (2022), Ding and Marazzina (2024), Dybvig and Liu (2010)] for related works. The obtained free boundary problem can not be solved analytically, but only numerically, e.g., exploiting a finite difference scheme as in [Barucci and Marazzina (2011)].

The note is organized as follows: in Section 2 we deal with the considered problem, in Section 3 we show how the duality approach is applied, finally Section 4 contains the result of the article, that is the partial differential equation (pde) of the related free boundary problem.

2 The Optimal Consumption-Investment Problem

We consider a continuous time economy. The infinite horizon life of the agent is divided in two parts: before retirement and after retirement. In the first part of his life the agent consumes, invests in financial markets and chooses the labor supply rate earning an exogenous stochastic income, after retirement he does not work, he only consumes and invests his wealth in financial markets. After retirement the agent cannot go back to work.

The labor income process $Y(t)$ (wage) is exogenous and stochastic. More specifically, we assume

$$dY(t) = \mu_1 Y(t)dt + \boldsymbol{\mu}_2^\top Y(t)d\mathbf{B}(t), \quad Y(0) = Y_0 > 0, \quad (1)$$

*daniele.marazzina@polimi.it

where μ_1 is a scalar function, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ is a 2-vector of functions, such that $Y(t) > 0, \forall t > 0$ and $\mathbf{B}(t)$ is a 2-vector of Brownian motions.

We assume that there are 2 assets: the risk-free asset with a constant instantaneous interest rate r and a risky assets. Asset price $S(t)$ evolve as

$$dS(t) = S(t) (bdt + \sigma dB_1(t)), \quad S(0) = S_0, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{b} is the constant drift of the risky asset price, σ is the volatility matrix. Notice that (2) can be re-written as

$$dS(t) = S(t) (bdt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top d\mathbf{B}(t)), \quad S(0) = S_0, \quad (3)$$

with $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = [\sigma; 0]$. Since the kernel of the vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is not empty, the market is incomplete: we are not able to perfectly hedge/insurance the wage just using the market assets. As in [Tepla (2000)], let us define the space

$$K(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top \mathbf{v} = 0 \right\}. \quad (4)$$

We denote by $c(t)$, $\theta(t)$ and $l(t)$ consumption, risky asset portfolio and leisure processes, respectively. We make the following assumptions on these processes:

- $c(t)$ is a non negative progressively process measurable with respect to \mathcal{F} , such that $\int_0^t c(s)ds < \infty, \forall t \geq 0$ a.s.,
- $\theta(t)$ represents the amount of wealth invested in the risky asset at time t , it is a progressively adapted process with respect to \mathcal{F} , such that $\int_0^t \theta^2(s)ds < \infty, \forall t \geq 0$ a.s.,
- $l(t) \in [0, 1]$ is the rate of leisure at time t , $l(t)$ is a process measurable with respect to \mathcal{F} .

Let $\tau \geq 0$ be the retirement date chosen by the agent, i.e., $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$, where \mathcal{S} denotes the set of all \mathcal{F} -stopping time. The retirement decision is irreversible: during his working life the agent chooses the leisure rate, after retirement he fully enjoys leisure. At time t the agent is endowed with one unit of "time", before retirement he allocates his time between labor ($1 - l(t)$) and leisure ($l(t)$) with the constraint that he has to work at least $1 - L$, after retirement he only enjoys leisure:

$$0 \leq l(t) \leq L < 1 \text{ if } 0 \leq t < \tau, \quad l(t) = 1 \text{ if } t \geq \tau.$$

Let $W(0) = W_0$ be the initial wealth. The consumption-investment-leisure strategy (c, l, θ) is admissible if it satisfies the above technical conditions and the wealth process $W(t)$ satisfies the dynamic budget constraint

$$dW(t) = [(1 - l(t))Y(t) - c(t)] dt + \theta(t) (b dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top d\mathbf{B}(t)) + (W(t) - \theta(t))rdt \quad (5)$$

where $(1 - l(t))Y(t)dt$ is the labor income received before retirement, i.e., for $0 \leq t < \tau$, $\theta(t) (b dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top d\mathbf{B}(t))$ refers to the financial wealth evolution and $(W(t) - \theta(t))rdt$ to the wealth invested in the money market (risk-free bond).

We impose a no borrowing condition

$$W(t) \geq 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad (6)$$

that is the agent cannot borrow money in the risk-free market against future income.

The agent maximizes the expected utility over the infinite horizon: preferences are time separable with exponential discounting. The instantaneous utility at time t is a function of consumption and leisure, i.e., $u(c(t), l(t))$. Therefore, given the initial wealth W_0 and the labor income process $Y(t)$, we look for an admissible process triplet (c, l, θ) and a stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ that maximize

$$E \left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta t} u(c(t), l(t)) dt \right], \quad (7)$$

subject to the budget constraint (5) and the no borrowing condition (6). β is the subjective discount rate and the utility function is given by

$$u(c, l) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{(l^{1-\alpha} c^\alpha)^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma}, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1. \quad (8)$$

The infinite horizon is a strong assumption that allows us to handle analytically the problem; to make the setting more plausible, we may allow for an hazard rate of mortality as in [Dybvig and Liu (2010)] adding a positive coefficient to the discount factor β .

Given the initial wealth W_0 and the labor income Y_0 , the agent maximizes the expected utility (7):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}(W_0, Y_0; c, l, \theta, \tau) &:= E \left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\beta t} u(c(t), l(t)) dt \right] \\ &= E \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\beta t} u(c(t), l(t)) dt + \int_\tau^{+\infty} e^{-\beta t} u(c(t), 1) dt \right]\end{aligned}$$

acting on (c, l, θ, τ) with $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ and subject to the budget constraint (5) and the no borrowing condition (6). The value function is defined as

$$\mathcal{V}(W_0, Y_0) := \sup_{(c, l, \theta, \tau) \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{J}(W_0, Y_0; c, l, \theta, \tau), \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{A} denotes the set of admissible strategies, i.e., processes (c, l, θ, τ) that satisfy (5) and (6), $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$, such that $\mathcal{J}(W_0, Y_0; c, l, \theta, \tau) < +\infty$.

3 A dual approach

As in [Tepla (2000)], considering (4) let us define the market price of risk

$$\Theta(\mathbf{v}) := \sigma (\sigma^\top \sigma)^{-1} (b - r) + \mathbf{v}, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma),$$

the state-price-density process (or pricing kernel)

$$H(t, \mathbf{v}) := e^{-(r + \frac{1}{2} |\Theta(\mathbf{v})|^2)t - \Theta^\top(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{B}(t)}$$

and, for a given $t > 0$, the equivalent risk neutral martingale measure

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}}(A) := E \left[e^{-\Theta^\top(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{B}(t) - \frac{1}{2} |\Theta(\mathbf{v})|^2 t} \mathbf{1}_A \right] \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_t.$$

Under the (non-unique) risk neutral density we can redefine the budget and the no borrowing constraint as static constraints. Following [Choi et al. (2008)], by the optional sampling theorem we have that the budget constraint becomes

$$E \left[\int_0^\tau H(t, \mathbf{v}) (c(t) + Y(t)(l(t) - 1)) dt + H(\tau, \mathbf{v}) W(\tau) \right] \leq W_0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma) \quad (10)$$

and the no borrowing constraint ($W(t) \geq 0$, $\forall t$, $0 \leq t \leq \tau$) is equivalent to

$$E_t \left[\int_t^\tau \frac{H(s, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} (c(s) + Y(s)(l(s) - 1)) ds + \frac{H(\tau, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} W(\tau) \right] \geq 0 \quad (11)$$

$\forall t : 0 \leq t \leq \tau$, $\forall \mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)$. Note that the no borrowing constraint is never binding after retirement. The objective function can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}(W_0, Y_0; c, l, \theta, \tau) &= E \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\beta t} u(c(t), l(t)) dt + e^{-\beta \tau} \int_\tau^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(t-\tau)} u(c(t), 1) dt \right] \\ &= E \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\beta t} u(c(t), l(t)) dt + e^{-\beta \tau} U(W(\tau)) \right],\end{aligned}$$

where

$$U(W(\tau)) := \sup_{(c, \theta)} E \left[\int_\tau^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(t-\tau)} u(c(t), 1) dt \right] \quad (12)$$

is the optimal expected utility attainable at time τ with wealth $W(\tau)$: for $t \geq \tau$ the agent solves the classical optimal consumption-portfolio problem with initial wealth $W(\tau)$ subject to the budget constraint. $U(W(\tau))$ is the indirect utility function associated with the maximization problem at time τ .

We define the convex conjugate of the utility function $u(c, l)$:

$$\tilde{u}(z, Y) := \max_{\substack{c \geq 0 \\ 0 \leq l \leq L}} u(c, l) - (c + Yl)z. \quad (13)$$

In a similar way, we also define the convex conjugate of U :

$$\tilde{U}(z) := \sup_{w \geq 0} U(w) - wz. \quad (14)$$

If I denotes the inverse of U' , i.e., $I(z) = \inf\{w : U'(w) = z\}$, then we also have $\tilde{U}(z) = U(I(z)) - zI(z)$.

Let \hat{c} and \hat{l} be the pair of processes that provides a solution to (13), then the following proposition holds true.

Proposition 3.1. *Let*

$$\tilde{z} = \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} Y \right)^{\alpha(1-\gamma)-1} L^{-\gamma}. \quad (15)$$

If $z \geq \tilde{z}$, then

$$\tilde{u}(z, Y) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{(\hat{l}^{1-\alpha} \hat{c}^\alpha)^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} - (\hat{c} + Y\hat{l})z, \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{c} = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} Y \hat{l}$ and $\hat{l} = z^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}} \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} Y \right)^{\frac{\alpha(1-\gamma)-1}{\gamma}}$.

If $z < \tilde{z}$, then

$$\tilde{u}(z, Y) = \frac{(\hat{c}^\alpha L^{1-\alpha})^{(1-\gamma)}}{\alpha(1-\gamma)} - (\hat{c} + YL)z, \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{c} = (zL^{(\alpha-1)(1-\gamma)})^{\frac{1}{\alpha(1-\gamma)-1}}$.

Proof. See [Barucci and Marazzina (2011), Proposition 3.1]. \square

Let $\lambda > 0$ be a Lagrange Multiplier. We consider a non-increasing process $D(t) > 0$ with $D(0) = 1$ to take into account the no bankruptcy constraint, as in [Choi et al. (2008), He and Pages (1993)], i.e., $D(t)$ is the integral of the shadow price of the no bankruptcy constraint. Then, the following proposition holds.

Proposition 3.2. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}(\lambda, D, \tau, Y_0, \mathbf{v}) := & E \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\beta t} (\tilde{u}(\lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}), Y(t)) + \lambda Y(t) D(t) e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v})) dt \right. \\ & \left. + e^{-\beta \tau} \tilde{U}(\lambda D(\tau) e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v})) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

then

$$\mathcal{J}(W_0, Y_0; c, l, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \tau) \leq \tilde{V}(\lambda, D, \tau, Y_0, \mathbf{v}) + \lambda W_0. \quad (19)$$

Proof. Considering (13) and (14), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(W_0, Y_0; c, l, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \tau) = & E \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\beta t} \{u(c(t), l(t)) - \lambda D(t) e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v})(c(t) + Y(t)l(t))\} dt \right. \\ & \left. + e^{-\beta \tau} \{U(W(\tau)) - \lambda D(\tau) e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau)\} \right] \\ & + \lambda E \left[\int_0^\tau D(t) H(t, \mathbf{v})(c(t) + Y(t)l(t)) dt + D(\tau) H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau) \right] \\ \leq & E \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\beta t} \tilde{u}(\lambda D(t) e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}), Y(t)) dt + e^{-\beta \tau} \tilde{U}(\lambda D(\tau) e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v})) \right] \\ & + \lambda E \left[\int_0^\tau D(t) H(t, \mathbf{v})(c(t) + Y(t)l(t)) dt + D(\tau) H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Exploiting the constraints (10), (11) and being $D(t)$ non increasing such that $D(0) = 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[\int_0^\tau D(t)H(t, \mathbf{v})(c(t) + Y(t)l(t))dt + D(\tau)H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau) \right] \\
&= E \left[\int_0^\tau D(t)H(t, \mathbf{v})(c(t) + (l(t) - 1)Y(t))dt + D(\tau)H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau) + \int_0^\tau Y(t)D(t)H(t, \mathbf{v})dt \right] \\
&= E \left[\int_0^\tau Y(t)D(t)H(t, \mathbf{v})dt \right] + E \left[H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau) + \int_0^\tau H(t, \mathbf{v})(c(t) + (l(t) - 1)Y(t))dt \right] \\
&+ E \left[\int_0^\tau H(t, \mathbf{v})E_t \left[\frac{H(\tau, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} W(\tau) + \int_t^\tau \frac{H(s, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} (c(s) + (l(s) - 1)Y(s))ds \right] dD(t) \right] \\
&\leq E \left[\int_0^\tau Y(t)D(t)H(t, \mathbf{v})dt \right] + W_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Thus inequality (19) holds true. \square

For a fixed stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ and initial wealth W_0 , we denote by \mathcal{A}_τ the set of admissible processes $(c, l, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Thus we define

$$V_\tau(W_0, Y_0) := \sup_{(c, l, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} \mathcal{J}(W_0, Y_0; c, l, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \tau). \tag{22}$$

From Proposition 3.2, we obtain

$$V_\tau(W_0, Y_0) \leq \inf_{\lambda > 0, D(t) > 0, \mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)} \left[\tilde{V}(\lambda, D, \tau, Y_0, \mathbf{v}) + \lambda W_0 \right]. \tag{23}$$

and the following result holds true.

Proposition 3.3. *Equality in (23) holds if all the following conditions are satisfied:*
- for $0 \leq t < \tau$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial c}(c(t), l(t)) = \lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial l}(c(t), l(t)) = \lambda Y(t)D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}) \tag{24}$$

if $l(t) \leq L$, otherwise

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial c}(c(t), L) = \lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}) \quad \text{and} \quad l(t) = L; \tag{25}$$

- it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
W(\tau) &= I(\lambda D(\tau)e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v})), \\
E \left[\int_0^\tau H(s, \mathbf{v})(c(s) + (l(s) - 1)Y(s))ds + H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau) \right] &= W_0;
\end{aligned}$$

- for any $t \in [0, \tau)$ such that $D(t)$ is not constant, i.e., $dD(t) \neq 0$,

$$E_t \left[\int_t^\tau \frac{H(s, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} (c(s) + (l(s) - 1)Y(s))ds + \frac{H(\tau, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} W(\tau) \right] = 0. \tag{26}$$

Proof. Equality in (23) holds if and only if equalities in (20) and (21) hold true.

Let us start with (20): this equality holds if

$$\begin{aligned}
u(c(t), l(t)) - \lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v})(c(t) + Y(t)l(t)) &= \tilde{u}(\lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}), Y(t)) \\
U(W(\tau)) - \lambda D(\tau)e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v})W(\tau) &= \tilde{U}(\lambda D(\tau)e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v})).
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.1, this is equivalent to set for $0 \leq t < \tau$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial c}(c(t), l(t)) = \lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial l}(c(t), l(t)) = \lambda Y(t)D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v})$$

if $l(t) \leq L$, otherwise

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial c}(c(t), L) = \lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}) \quad \text{and} \quad l(t) = L;$$

and, reasoning as above for the utility function U , to impose

$$U'(W(\tau)) = \lambda D(\tau)e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v}),$$

i.e., $W(\tau) = I(\lambda D(\tau)e^{\beta \tau} H(\tau, \mathbf{v}))$.

Now we deal with inequality (21): it becomes an equality if

$$E \left[H(\tau, \mathbf{v}) W(\tau) + \int_0^\tau H(t, \mathbf{v}) (c(t) + (l(t) - 1)Y(t)) dt \right] = W_0, \quad (27)$$

$$E \left[\int_0^\tau H(t, \mathbf{v}) E_t \left[\frac{H(\tau, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} W(\tau) + \int_t^\tau \frac{H(s, \mathbf{v})}{H(t, \mathbf{v})} (c(s) + (l(s) - 1)Y(s)) ds \right] dD(t) \right] = 0, \quad (28)$$

and the last condition is equivalent to (26).

Notice that (27) and (28) imply (10) and (11), respectively. See [Choi et al. (2008)] for further details. \square

Optimality conditions in (24-25) provide a relation between the optimal consumption, the leisure process and the triple $(\lambda, D(t), v)$. As described in [He and Pearson (1991), Section 3.2], we deal with the dual Arrow-Debreu state price problem, which corresponds to minimize over $\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)$ the maximum expected utility that the agent could obtain in a complete market with state price density $\Theta(\mathbf{v})$, defining the minimax local martingale measure. Thus \mathbf{v}^* is chosen in such a way to minimize the agent wealth. Once \mathbf{v}^* , the optimal multiplier λ^* and the non-increasing process $D^*(t)$ are computed, we can use these conditions to obtain the optimal processes $c^*(t)$ and $l^*(t)$, as discussed in [Barucci and Marazzina (2011), Appendix].

In order to compute the triple $(\lambda^*, D^*(t), \mathbf{v}^*)$, we proceed as follows. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}(\lambda, Y_0) &:= \sup_{\tau \in [0, +\infty]} \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma), D(t) > 0} \tilde{V}(\lambda, D, \tau, Y_0, \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \sup_{\tau \in [0, +\infty]} \inf_{D(t) > 0} \tilde{V}(\lambda, D, \tau, Y_0, \mathbf{v}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Since (9) and (22) imply

$$\mathcal{V}(W_0, Y_0) = \sup_{\tau \in [0, +\infty]} V_\tau(W_0, Y_0),$$

then, under the conditions of Proposition 3.3, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(W_0, Y_0) &= \sup_{\tau \in [0, +\infty]} \inf_{\lambda > 0, D(t) > 0} \left[\tilde{V}(\lambda, D, \tau, Y_0, \mathbf{v}^*) + \lambda W_0 \right] \\ &= \inf_{\lambda > 0} \left[\tilde{V}(\lambda, Y_0) + \lambda W_0 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Notice that this formulation is related to [He and Pearson (1991), Problem (D') page 277].

Let us define the process

$$z(t, \mathbf{v}) = \lambda D(t)e^{\beta t} H(t, \mathbf{v}), \quad z(0, \mathbf{v}) = \lambda \quad (30)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(t, z, y) &:= \sup_{\tau > t} \inf_{\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma), D(t) > 0} E \left[\int_t^\tau e^{-\beta s} \{ \tilde{u}(z(s, \mathbf{v}), Y(s)) + Y(s)z(s, \mathbf{v}) \} ds + e^{-\beta \tau} \tilde{U}(z(\tau, \mathbf{v})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mid z(t, \mathbf{v}) = z, Y(t) = y \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Since $\phi(0, \lambda, Y_0) = \tilde{V}(\lambda, Y_0)$, once ϕ is computed, we can use (29) to obtain the value function $\mathcal{V}(W_0, Y_0)$ and thus the optimal couple $(\lambda^*, D^*(t))$ and the optimal strategies, as shown in [Barucci and Marazzina (2011), Appendix].

4 The Bellman equation and the free boundary problem

To address the optimization problem and to find out $\phi(\cdot)$ and the function \mathbf{v}^* , we start from the dual function \tilde{U} . After retirement the optimal consumption-investment problem is a classical Merton problem, considering the utility function (8), we have

$$U(W(\tau)) = \sup_{(c, \theta)} E \left[\int_{\tau}^{+\infty} e^{-\beta(t-\tau)} \frac{c^{\alpha(1-\gamma)}}{\alpha(1-\gamma)} dt \right],$$

subject to the dynamic budget constraint (5) without labor income, i.e., $l(t) = 1 \forall t \geq \tau$.

It follows from standard results (see [Karatzas and Shreve (1998), Chapter 3]) that

$$U(w) = \left(\frac{1}{\xi} \right)^{\Gamma} \frac{w^{1-\Gamma}}{1-\Gamma}$$

where $\Gamma = 1 - \alpha(1 - \gamma)$ and $\xi = \frac{\Gamma-1}{\Gamma} \left(r + \frac{\Theta^2(\mathbf{v}^*)}{2\Gamma} \right) + \frac{\beta}{\Gamma}$. In order to guarantee that the function U is well defined, we assume $\xi > 0$. Thus, since U is known analytically, we can also compute \tilde{U} in (14):

$$\tilde{U}(z) = \frac{\Gamma}{\xi(1-\Gamma)} z^{\frac{\Gamma-1}{\Gamma}}.$$

Since by Itô's formula we have, for any $\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)$

$$\frac{dz(t, \mathbf{v})}{z(t, \mathbf{v})} = \frac{dD(t)}{D(t)} + (\beta - r)dt - \Theta^{\top}(\mathbf{v})d\mathbf{B}(t), \quad z(0) = \lambda,$$

in order to derive the Bellman equation, we follow [He and Pages (1993)] controlling the decreasing process D . Assume that D is absolutely continuous with respect to t , i.e., there exists $\psi \geq 0$ such that $dD(t) = -D(t)\psi(t)dt$. If ϕ is twice differentiable with respect to z and y , then the Bellman equation becomes

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma), \psi \geq 0} \left\{ e^{-\beta t}(\tilde{u}(z, y) + zy) - \psi(t)z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \mathcal{L}_t^0 \phi \right\} = 0, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_t^0 \phi = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + (\beta - r)z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \mu_1 y \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{2} \Theta^2(\mathbf{v}) z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} + \frac{1}{2} \mu_2^2 y^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} - \Theta^{\top}(\mathbf{v}) \mu_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y}$$

is the differential operator for the dual indirect utility function. Condition (32) can be rewritten compactly as

$$\min \left\{ e^{-\beta t}(\tilde{u}(z, y) + zy) + \mathcal{L}_t \phi, -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} \right\} = 0, \quad (33)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_t \phi = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \mu_1 y \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{2} \mu_2^2 y^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} + (\beta - r)z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \min_{\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)} \left[\frac{1}{2} \Theta^2(\mathbf{v}) z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} - \Theta^{\top}(\mathbf{v}) \mu_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y} \right]$$

is the differential operator for the dual indirect utility function, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_t \phi = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \mu_1 y \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{2} \mu_2^2 y^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} + (\beta - r)z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{2} \Theta^2(\mathbf{v}^*) z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} - \Theta^{\top}(\mathbf{v}^*) \mu_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y} \quad (34)$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)} \frac{1}{2} \Theta^2(\mathbf{v}) z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} - \Theta^{\top}(\mathbf{v}) \mu_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y}.$$

Notice that the minimum over $\mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)$ comes from the minimax local martingale measure [He and Pearson (1991), Page 275]. Moreover, since $\Theta(\mathbf{v})$ is a monotonic function with respect to \mathbf{v} , it holds

$$\mathcal{L}_t \phi = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \mu_1 y \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{2} \mu_2^2 y^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} + (\beta - r)z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \min_{\Theta(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{v} \in K(\sigma)} \left[\frac{1}{2} \Theta^2(\mathbf{v}) z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} - \Theta^{\top}(\mathbf{v}) \mu_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y} \right]$$

is the differential operator for the dual indirect utility function. Furthermore, we recall that the space $K(\sigma)$ consists of vectors $[0; x]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, thus it holds

$$[\Theta]_1(\mathbf{v}^*) = \frac{b-r}{\sigma} \quad [\Theta]_2(\mathbf{v}^*) = \frac{[\mu_2]_2 y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y}}{z \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2}} = [\mathbf{v}^*]_2, \quad (35)$$

where we denote with $[\cdot]_i$ the i -th component of a vector.

4.1 Correlated Wage

If the wage is given by

$$dY(t) = M_1 Y(t) dt + \rho M_2 Y(t) dB_1(t) + M_2 \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} dB_2(t),$$

i.e., $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2$ is equal to the vector $[\rho M_2, \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} M_2]$, ρ being the correlation between the wage and the risky asset, then the above pde becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_t \phi = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + M_1 y \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{2} M_2^2 y^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} + (\beta - r) z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{2} \Theta^2 z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} - \rho \Theta M_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y} + \frac{1}{2} (\Theta^*)^2 z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} - \Theta^* \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} M_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y},$$

where

$$\Theta = \sigma^{-1}(b - r), \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta^* = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2} M_2 y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y}}{z \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2}},$$

i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_t \phi = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + M_1 y \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{2} M_2^2 y^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} + (\beta - r) z \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{2} \Theta^2 z^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} - \rho \Theta M_2 z y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y} - \frac{1}{2} (1 - \rho^2) M_2^2 y^2 \frac{\left(\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z \partial y} \right)^2}{\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2}}.$$

Notice that if $\rho = \pm 1$ we move back to the complete market case, and, if $\rho = 1$, we get the pde in [Barucci and Marazzina (2011) Section 5].

References

- [Barucci and Marazzina (2011)] Barucci, Emilio, and Marazzina, Daniele (2011) Optimal investment, stochastic labor income and retirement. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 218-9, 5588-5604.
- [Choi et al. (2008)] Choi, Kyoung Jin, Gyocheol Shim and Yong Hyun Shin (2008) Optimal portfolio, consumption-leisure and retirement choice problem with CES utility. *Mathematical Finance* 18, 445-472.
- [Ding and Marazzina (2022)] Ding, Guodong, and Daniele Marazzina (2022) The impact of liquidity constraints and cashflows on the optimal retirement problem. *Finance Research Letters* 49, 103159.
- [Ding and Marazzina (2024)] Ding, Guodong, and Daniele Marazzina (2024) Effect of labour income on the optimal bankruptcy problem. *Annals of Operations Research* 336, 773-795.
- [Dybvig and Liu (2010)] Dybvig, Philip H., and Hong Liu (2010) Lifetime consumption and investment: retirement and constrained borrowing. *Journal of Economic Theory* 145-3, 885-907.
- [He and Pages (1993)] He, Hua, and Henri F. Pages (1993) Labor income, borrowing constraints, and equilibrium asset prices. *Economic Theory* 3, 663-696.
- [He and Pearson (1991)] He, Hua, and Neil D. Pearson (1991) Consumption and portfolio policies with incomplete market and short-sale constraints: the infinite dimensional case. *Journal of Economic Theory* 54, 259-304.
- [Karatzas and Shreve (1998)] Karatzas, Ioannis, and Steven E. Shreve (1998) *Methods of Mathematical Finance*. Series on Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, Vol. 39, Springer-Verlag.
- [Tepla (2000)] Tepla, Lucie (2000) Optimal hedging and valuation of nontraded assets. *European Finance Review* 4, 231-251.