

OPTIMAL STRATEGIES FOR ROUND-TRIP PAIRS TRADING UNDER GEOMETRIC BROWNIAN MOTIONS

E. CRAWFORD DAS, J. TIE, AND Q. ZHANG

ABSTRACT. This paper is concerned with an optimal strategy for simultaneously trading a pair of stocks. The idea of pairs trading is to monitor their price movements and compare their relative strength over time. A pairs trade is triggered by the divergence of their prices and consists of a pair of positions to short the strong stock and to long the weak one. Such a strategy bets on the reversal of their price strengths. A round-trip trading strategy refers to opening and closing such a pair of security positions. Typical pairs-trading models usually assume a difference of the stock prices satisfies a mean-reversion equation. However, we consider the optimal pairs-trading problem by allowing the stock prices to follow general geometric Brownian motions. The objective is to trade the pairs over time to maximize an overall return with a fixed commission cost for each transaction. Initially, we allow the initial pairs position to be either long or flat. We then consider the problem when the initial pairs position may be long, flat, or short. In each case, the optimal policy is characterized by threshold curves obtained by solving the associated HJB equations.

arXiv:2310.15803v1 [math.OC] 24 Oct 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with an optimal strategy for simultaneously trading a pair of stocks. The purpose of pairs trading is to hedge the risk associated with buying and holding shares of one stock by selling shares of a related stock. The idea of pairs trading is to track the prices of the two stocks that follow roughly the same trajectory over time. A pairs trade is triggered by the divergence of their prices and consists of a pair of positions to short the strong stock and to long the weak one. Such a strategy bets on the reversal of their price strengths. Pairs trading, which was pioneered by quantitative researchers at brokerage firms in the 1980s, is beneficial, because it can be profitable under any market circumstances [2]. A round-trip trading strategy refers to opening and closing such a pair of security positions. Typical pairs-trading models usually assume a difference of the stock prices satisfies a mean-reversion equation. However, we consider the optimal pairs-trading problem by allowing the stock prices to follow general geometric Brownian motions as in [5]. One benefit of this model is that it does not specify any relationship between the pairs of stocks or require them to satisfy any measure of correlation, thus allowing for greater possibilities in the choice of pairs. The Brownian motion, whose sample path is a random walk, encodes the assumption that it is impossible to accurately predict the change in the price of a stock from day to day. Our objective is to trade the pairs over time to maximize an overall return with a fixed commission cost for each transaction. Initially, we allow the initial pairs position to be either long or flat. We then consider the problem when the initial pairs position may be long, flat, or short. In each case, the optimal policy is characterized by threshold curves obtained by solving the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equations.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider two stocks, \mathbf{S}^1 and \mathbf{S}^2 . Let $\{X_t^1, t \geq 0\}$ denote the prices of the stock \mathbf{S}^1 , and let $\{X_t^2, t \geq 0\}$ denote the prices of the stock \mathbf{S}^2 . They satisfy the following stochastic differential equation:

$$(1) \quad d \begin{pmatrix} X_t^1 \\ X_t^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X_t^1 & \\ & X_t^2 \end{pmatrix} \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix} dt + \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} d \begin{pmatrix} W_t^1 \\ W_t^2 \end{pmatrix} \right]$$

where μ_i , $i = 1, 2$ are the return rates, σ_{ij} , $i, j = 1, 2$ are the volatility constants, and (W_t^1, W_t^2) is a 2-dimensional standard Brownian motion.

In this paper, we consider a round-trip pairs trading strategy. Initially, we assume the pairs position, which we will denote \mathbf{Z} , consists of a one-share long position in stock \mathbf{S}^1 and a one-share short position in stock \mathbf{S}^2 . We consider the case that the net position may initially be long (with one share of \mathbf{Z}) or flat (with no stock holdings of either \mathbf{S}^1 or \mathbf{S}^2). Let $i = 0, 1$ denote the initial net positions of long and flat, respectively. If initially we are long ($i = 1$), we will close the pairs position \mathbf{Z} at some time τ_0 and conclude our trading activity. Otherwise, if initially we are flat ($i = 0$), we will first obtain one share of \mathbf{Z} at some time τ_1 , and then close pairs position \mathbf{Z} at some time $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1$, thus concluding our trading activity.

Let K denote the fixed percentage of transaction costs associate with buying or selling of stocks. Then given the initial state (x_1, x_2) , the initial net position $i = 0, 1$, and the decision sequences $\Lambda_1 = (\tau_0)$ and $\Lambda_0 = (\tau_1, \tau_2)$, the resulting reward functions are

$$(2) \quad J_0(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_0) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right]$$

$$(3) \quad J_1(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_1) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right].$$

Let $V_0(x_1, x_2) = \sup_{\Lambda_0} J_0(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_0)$ and $V_1(x_1, x_2) = \sup_{\Lambda_1} J_1(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_1)$ be the associated value functions.

3. PROPERTIES OF THE VALUE FUNCTIONS

In this section, we establish basic properties of the value functions.

Lemma 1. *For all $x_1, x_2 > 0$, we have*

$$(4) \quad 0 \leq V_0(x_1, x_2) \leq 2x_1 + 2x_2,$$

$$(5) \quad \beta_s x_1 - \beta_b x_2 \leq V_1(x_1, x_2) \leq x_1.$$

Proof. Note that for all $x_1, x_2 > 0$, $V_1(x_1, x_2) \geq J_1(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_1) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right]$.

In particular,

$$V_1(x_1, x_2) \geq J_1(x_1, x_2, 0) = \beta_s x_1 - \beta_b x_2.$$

For all $\tau_0 > 0$, $J_1(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_1)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0} (X_{\tau_0}^1 - X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&= x_1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] - x_2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq x_1 - x_2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq x_1 - x_2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\infty} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \right] \\
&= x_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Also, for all $x_1, x_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_0(x_1, x_2) &\geq J_0(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_0) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $V_0(x_2, x_2) \geq 0$ by definition and taking $\tau_1 = \infty$. Now, for all $0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, $J_0(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} X_{\tau_2}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} X_{\tau_2}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} X_{\tau_1}^1 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} X_{\tau_1}^2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq x_1 - \mathbb{E} \left[x_2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_2} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\quad + x_2 - \mathbb{E} \left[x_1 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_1} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_1} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\infty} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \right] \\
&= (\rho - \mu_1) \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} x_1 e^{\mu_1 t} dt \\
&= x_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_2} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right] \leq x_2$$

Thus, $J_0(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_0) \leq 2x_1 + 2x_2$. □

4. HJB EQUATIONS

In this section, we study the associated HJB equations. To the above stochastic differential equation (1), we assign the following partial differential operator

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ a_{11} x_1^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1^2} + 2a_{12} x_1 x_2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2} + a_{22} x_2^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_2^2} \right\} + \mu_1 x_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + \mu_2 x_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2},$$

where $a_{11} = \sigma_{11}^2 + \sigma_{21}^2$, $a_{12} = \sigma_{11}\sigma_{21} + \sigma_{12}\sigma_{22}$, and $a_{22} = \sigma_{21}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2$ [4]. The associated HJB equations have the form: For $x_1, x_2 > 0$,

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} \min \left\{ \rho v_0(x_1, x_2) - \mathcal{A}v_0(x_1, x_2), v_0(x_1, x_2) - v_1(x_1, x_2) + \beta_b x_1 - \beta_s x_2 \right\} = 0, \\ \min \left\{ \rho v_1(x_1, x_2) - \mathcal{A}v_1(x_1, x_2), v_1(x_1, x_2) - \beta_s x_1 + \beta_b x_2 \right\} = 0. \end{cases}$$

To solve the above HJB equations, we first convert them into single variable equations. Let $y = x_2/x_1$ and $v_i(x_1, x_2) = x_1 w_i(x_2/x_1)$, for some function $w_i(y)$ and $i = 0, 1$. Then write $\mathcal{A}v_i$ in terms of w_i to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}v_i &= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ a_{11} x_1^2 \left(\frac{y^2 w_i''(y)}{x_1} \right) + 2a_{12} x_1 x_2 \left(-\frac{y w_i''(y)}{x_1} \right) + a_{22} x_2^2 \left(\frac{w_i''(y)}{x_1} \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + \mu_1 x_1 (w_i(y) - y w_i'(y)) + \mu_2 x_2 (w_i'(y)) \\ &= x_1 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} [a_{11} - 2a_{12} + a_{22}] y^2 w_i''(y) + (\mu_2 - \mu_1) y w_i'(y) + \mu_1 w_i(y) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{L}w_i(y) = \lambda y^2 w_i''(y) + (\mu_2 - \mu_1) y w_i'(y) + \mu_1 w_i(y)$, where $\lambda = \frac{a_{11} - 2a_{12} + a_{22}}{2}$.

So $\mathcal{A}v_i = x_1 \mathcal{L}w_i$. Note that $\lambda \geq 0$ since

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} [(\sigma_{11} - \sigma_{21})^2 + (\sigma_{12} - \sigma_{22})^2].$$

Here we only consider the case when $\lambda \neq 0$. If $\lambda = 0$, the problem reduces to a first order case and can be treated accordingly. The HJB equations can be given in terms of y and w_i

as follows:

$$(8) \quad \begin{cases} \min \{(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y), w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y\} = 0, \\ \min \{(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y), w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y\} = 0. \end{cases}$$

To solve the above HJB equations, we first consider the equations $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_i(y) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$, which can be rewritten as

$$-\lambda y^2 w_i''(y) - (\mu_2 - \mu_1) y w_i'(y) + (\rho - \mu_1) w_i(y) = 0.$$

Clearly, these are the Euler equations and their solutions are of the form y^δ , for some δ . Substitute this into the equation $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_i = 0$ to obtain

$$\delta^2 - \left(1 + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\lambda}\right) \delta - \frac{\rho - \mu_1}{\lambda} = 0.$$

This equation has two roots, δ_1 and δ_2 , given by

$$(9) \quad \delta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\lambda} + \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\lambda}\right)^2 + \frac{4\rho - 4\mu_1}{\lambda}}\right),$$

$$(10) \quad \delta_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\lambda} - \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\lambda}\right)^2 + \frac{4\rho - 4\mu_1}{\lambda}}\right).$$

These roots are both real since we assume $\rho > \mu_1$. We also assume $\rho > \mu_2$, and together these assumptions lead to $\delta_1 > 1$ and $\delta_2 < 0$.

We conclude that the general solution of $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_i(y) = 0$ should be of the form: $w_i(y) = c_{i1}y^{\delta_1} + c_{i2}y^{\delta_2}$, for some constants c_{i1} and c_{i2} , $i = 0, 1$. Note that as $y \rightarrow 0$, $y^{\delta_2} \rightarrow \infty$, and as $y \rightarrow \infty$, $y^{\delta_1} \rightarrow \infty$. Also note the following identities in δ_1 and δ_2 :

$$(11) \quad -\delta_1 \delta_2 = \frac{\rho - \mu_1}{\lambda},$$

$$(12) \quad \delta_1 + \delta_2 = 1 + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\lambda},$$

$$(13) \quad (\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2) = \frac{\rho - \mu_2}{\lambda},$$

$$(14) \quad \frac{-\delta_1 \delta_2}{(\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2)} = \frac{\rho - \mu_1}{\rho - \mu_2}.$$




FIGURE 1. Thresholds for buying and selling regions

Now, the second part of the HJB equation

$$\min \left\{ (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y), w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \right\} = 0$$

is independent of w_0 and can be solved first. We must find thresholds k_1 and k_2 for buying and selling, as in [5].

First, we need to find k_1 so that on the interval $[0, k_1]$, $w_1(y) = \beta_s - \beta_b y$, and on the interval $[k_1, \infty)$, $w_1(y) = C_2 y^{\delta_2}$. Then the smooth-fit conditions determine k_1 and C_2 . Necessarily, the continuity of w_1 and its first order derivative at $y = k_1$ imply

$$\beta_s - \beta_b k_1 = C_2 k_1^{\delta_2} \quad \text{and} \quad -\beta_b = C_2 \delta_2 k_1^{\delta_2 - 1}.$$

From this system of equations, we can see

$$(15) \quad k_1 = \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \cdot \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2}.$$

and

$$(16) \quad C_2 = \frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \cdot \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \right)^{1 - \delta_2} = \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1 - \delta_2} \right)^{1 - \delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \right)^{\delta_2}.$$

We obtain the function

$$(17) \quad w_1(y) = \begin{cases} \beta_s - \beta_b y, & \text{if } y < k_1 \\ C_2 y^{\delta_2}, & \text{if } y \geq k_1 \end{cases}$$

with k_1 and C_2 given above. Next we need to solve the first part of HJB equation:

$$\min \left\{ (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y), w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \right\} = 0.$$

We need to find k_2 so that on the interval $[0, k_2]$, $w_0(y) = C_1 y^{\delta_1}$, and on the interval $[k_2, \infty)$, $w_0(y) = w_1(y) - \beta_b + \beta_s y = C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y$. Then the continuity of w_0 and its first order derivative at $y = k_2$ yield

$$C_1 k_2^{\delta_1} = C_2 k_2^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s k_2 \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 \delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1 - 1} = C_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2 - 1} + \beta_s.$$

Take the ratio of the above two equations and get

$$\frac{k_2}{\delta_1} = \frac{C_2 k_2^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s k_2}{C_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2 - 1} + \beta_s}.$$

This implies

$$C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)k_2^{\delta_2} + \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)k_2 - \beta_b\delta_1 = 0.$$

This is an equation of k_2 :

$$(18) \quad f(k_2) := C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)k_2^{\delta_2} + \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)k_2 - \beta_b\delta_1 = 0.$$

Consider

$$f(y) := C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2} + \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)y - \beta_b\delta_1.$$

Note that as $y \rightarrow \infty$, $f(y) \rightarrow \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)y - \beta_b\delta_1$, since $\delta_2 < 0$. That is, as $y \rightarrow \infty$, $f(y) \rightarrow \infty$, since $\beta_s > 0$, $\delta_1 - 1 > 0$. Also, as $y \rightarrow 0^+$, $f(y) \rightarrow C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b\delta_1$. That is, as $y \rightarrow 0^+$, $f(y) \rightarrow \infty$, since $C_2 > 0$, $\delta_1 - \delta_2 > 0$, and $\delta_2 < 0$. Now,

$$f'(y) = C_2\delta_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)$$

$$f''(y) = C_2\delta_2(\delta_2 - 1)(\delta_1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2-2} = C_2(-\delta_2)(1 - \delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2-2}.$$

Note then that $f''(y) > 0$ for all $y > 0$ since $C_2 > 0$, $(-\delta_2) > 0$, $(1 - \delta_2) > 0$, and $(\delta_1 - \delta_2) > 0$. Hence f is convex for all $y > 0$. Also note that

$$f'(y) = 0 \iff y = \left[\frac{\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)}{C_2(-\delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{\delta_2-1}}.$$

Hence f attains its global minimum at $y_c = \left[\frac{\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)}{C_2(-\delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{\delta_2-1}} > 0$. We will show that $f(y) = 0$ has two solutions and take the larger one to be k_2 . Since we already know C_2 , once we find k_2 , we can express C_1 using the relationship above:

$$(19) \quad C_1 = \frac{C_2\delta_2k_2^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s}{\delta_1k_2^{\delta_1-1}} = \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \cdot \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \right)^{1-\delta_2} \frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \frac{\delta_2k_2^{\delta_2-1}}{\delta_1k_2^{\delta_1-1}} + \frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1k_2^{\delta_1-1}}$$

$$= \left[1 - \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \right)^{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \right)^{1-\delta_2} k_2^{\delta_2-1} \right] \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1} \right) k_2^{1-\delta_1}.$$

We show that $f(y_c) < 0$, thus implying the existence of k_2 . We compute $f(y_c)$:

$$f(y_c) = C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)y_c^{\delta_2} + \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)y_c - \beta_b\delta_1$$

$$= C_2^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_2}}(\delta_1 - \delta_2)^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_2}}[\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)]^{\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_2-1}}[(-\delta_2)^{-\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_2-1}} + (-\delta_2)^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_2}}] - \beta_b\delta_1.$$

Next we insert $C_2 = \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1 - \delta_2} \right)^{1-\delta_2} \cdot \left(\frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \right)^{\delta_2}$ into $f(y_c)$ to get

$$f(y_c) = \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1 - \delta_2} \right) \left(\frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \right)^{\frac{\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}} (\delta_1 - \delta_2)^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_2}} [\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)]^{\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_2-1}} [(-\delta_2)^{-\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_2-1}} + (-\delta_2)^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_2}}] - \beta_b\delta_1$$

$$= \beta_b \left[\left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \right)^{1+\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}} (\delta_1 - \delta_2)^{\frac{1}{1-\delta_2}} (\delta_1 - 1)^{\frac{\delta_2}{\delta_2-1}} - \delta_1 \right].$$

Since $\delta_2 < 0$, we let $\delta_2 = -r$ with $r > 0$ and $\beta = \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s} > 1$. This will imply

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_c) &= \beta_b \left[\left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \right)^{1+\frac{r}{1+r}} (\delta_1 + r)^{\frac{1}{1+r}} (\delta_1 - 1)^{\frac{r}{1+r}} - \delta_1 \right] \\ &= \beta_b \delta_1 \left[\beta^{-1-\frac{r}{1+r}} \left(1 + \frac{r}{\delta_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+r}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta_1} \right)^{\frac{r}{1+r}} - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of k_2 is $f(y_c) \leq 0$, and this is equivalent to

$$\left(1 + \frac{r}{\delta_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+r}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta_1} \right)^{\frac{r}{1+r}} \leq \beta^{\frac{1+2r}{1+r}}.$$

We apply the geometric-arithmetic mean inequality

$$A^\theta B^{1-\theta} \leq \theta A + (1-\theta)B \text{ with } \theta = \frac{1}{1+r}, A = 1 + \frac{r}{\delta_1} \text{ and } B = 1 - \frac{1}{\delta_1}$$

to the left hand side of the above inequality to get

$$\left(1 + \frac{r}{\delta_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+r}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta_1} \right)^{\frac{r}{1+r}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{r}{\delta_1} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{1+r} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta_1} \right) \cdot \frac{r}{1+r} = 1.$$

This implies $f(y_c) \leq 0$ if

$$1 < \beta^{\frac{1+2r}{1+r}} \iff 1 < \beta.$$

This obviously holds since $\beta > 1$. So we establish the existence of k_2 .

Note that it is clear that $C_2 > 0$. We also wish to establish $C_1 > 0$. Consider,

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 > 0 &\iff C_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s > 0 \\ &\iff \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \cdot \frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2} \right)^{1-\delta_2} \frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s > 0 \\ &\iff k_2 > \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \right)^{\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}} \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note then that if $f\left(\left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}\right)^{\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}}\left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}\right)\right) < 0$, we establish $C_1 > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} & f\left(\left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}\right)^{\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}}\left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}\right)\right) \\ &= C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2) \left[\left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}\right)^{\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}} \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}\right) \right]^{\delta_2} + \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1) \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}\right)^{\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}} \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}\right) - \beta_b\delta_1 \\ &= \beta_b\delta_1 \left[\left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}\right)^{1+\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}} - 1 \right] \\ &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}\right)^{1+\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}} < \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} < 1$. Hence we have shown that $C_1 > 0$. Now we consider the following regions:

$$\Gamma_1 = (0, k_1]$$

$$\Gamma_2 = (k_1, k_2)$$

$$\Gamma_3 = [k_2, \infty)$$

We have chosen k_1, k_2 such that we establish the following equalities

$$\Gamma_1 : w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y = 0 ,$$

$$(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) = 0$$

$$\Gamma_2 : (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) = 0 ,$$

$$(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) = 0$$

$$\Gamma_3 : (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) = 0 ,$$

$$w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y = 0$$

for solutions of the form

$$w_0(y) = \begin{cases} C_1 y^{\delta_1} & y \in \Gamma_1 \\ C_1 y^{\delta_1} & y \in \Gamma_2, \\ C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y & y \in \Gamma_3 \end{cases}$$

$$w_1(y) = \begin{cases} \beta_s - \beta_b y & y \in \Gamma_1 \\ C_2 y^{\delta_2} & y \in \Gamma_2. \\ C_2 y^{\delta_2} & y \in \Gamma_3 \end{cases}$$

We now proceed to establish the following variational inequalities, thus confirming that we have solved the HJB equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1 : \quad & (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) \geq 0, \\ & w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_2 : \quad & w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0, \\ & w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_3 : \quad & w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0, \\ & (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

$y \in \Gamma_1$: Using $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) = 0$ and $w_1(y) = \beta_s - \beta_b y$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y &= C_1 y^{\delta_1} - \beta_s + \beta_b y + \beta_b - \beta_s y \\ &= C_1 y^{\delta_1} + (\beta_b - \beta_s)(y + 1) \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $C_1 > 0$, $\beta_b > \beta_s$, and $y > 0$.

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) &= (\rho - \mathcal{L})(\beta_s - \beta_b y) \\
&= (\rho - \mu_1)\beta_s - (\rho - \mu_2)\beta_b y \\
\implies (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) \geq 0 &\iff (\rho - \mu_1)\beta_s - (\rho - \mu_2)\beta_b y \geq 0 \\
&\iff \frac{(\rho - \mu_1)\beta_s}{(\rho - \mu_2)\beta_b} \geq y \\
&\iff \frac{(\rho - \mu_1)\beta_s}{(\rho - \mu_2)\beta_b} \geq k_1
\end{aligned}$$

since $k_1 \geq y$ for all $y \in \Gamma_1$. But note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{(\rho - \mu_1)\beta_s}{(\rho - \mu_2)\beta_b} \geq k_1 &\iff \frac{-\delta_1 \delta_2}{(\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \geq k_1 \\
&\iff \frac{\delta_1}{(\delta_1 - 1)} \cdot k_1 \geq k_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which obviously holds since $\delta_1 > \delta_1 - 1 > 0$. Thus we have established the variational inequalities for the region Γ_1 .

$y \in \Gamma_3$: Using $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) = 0$ and $w_1(y) = w_0(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y &= w_0(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y - \beta_s + \beta_b y \\
&= C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y + \beta_b - \beta_s y - \beta_s + \beta_b y \\
&= C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b y - \beta_s
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the continuity of w_1 and w'_1 at k_1 ensure that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_2 k_1^{\delta_2} + \beta_b k_1 - \beta_s &= 0 \\
C_2 \delta_2 k_1^{\delta_2 - 1} + \beta_b &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $g(y) = C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b y - \beta_s$. Then $g'(y) = C_2 \delta_2 y^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_b$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} g'(y) \geq 0 &\iff C_2 \delta_2 y^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_b \geq 0 \iff \frac{C_2(-\delta_2)}{\beta_b} \leq y^{1-\delta_2} \\ &\iff k_1^{1-\delta_2} \leq y^{1-\delta_2} \\ &\iff k_1 \leq y. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $g(y) = C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b y - \beta_s$ is increasing for all $y \geq k_1$. In particular, since $C_2 k_1^{\delta_2} + \beta_b k_1 - \beta_s = 0$, we must have $C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b y - \beta_s \geq 0$ for all $y \geq k_1$. Thus $C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b y - \beta_s = w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$.

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) &= (\rho - \mathcal{L})(w_1(y)) + (\rho - \mathcal{L})(\beta_s y - \beta_b) \\ &= \rho \beta_s y - \rho \beta_b + \mu_1 \beta_b - \mu_2 \beta_s y \\ &= (\rho - \mu_2) \beta_s y - (\rho - \mu_1) \beta_b. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) \geq 0 &\iff (\rho - \mu_2) \beta_s y - (\rho - \mu_1) \beta_b \geq 0 \\ &\iff y \geq \frac{(\rho - \mu_1) \beta_b}{(\rho - \mu_2) \beta_s} \\ &\iff k_2 \geq \frac{(\rho - \mu_1) \beta_b}{(\rho - \mu_2) \beta_s} \end{aligned}$$

since $k_2 \leq y$ for all $y \in \Gamma_3$. Note that $\frac{(\rho - \mu_1) \beta_b}{(\rho - \mu_2) \beta_s} = \frac{-\delta_1 \delta_2}{(\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}$ and consider

$$\begin{aligned} &f\left(\frac{-\delta_1 \delta_2}{(\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}\right) \\ &= C_2 (\delta_1 - \delta_2) \left(\frac{-\delta_1 \delta_2}{(\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}\right)^{\delta_2} + \beta_s (\delta_1 - 1) \left(\frac{-\delta_1 \delta_2}{(\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}\right) - \beta_b \delta_1 \\ &= \frac{\delta_1 - \delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \left(\frac{\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1}\right)^{\delta_2} \beta^{2\delta_2-1} \beta_b + \beta_b \delta_1 \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\delta_2 = -r$ with $r > 0$. Then

$$f\left(\frac{-\delta_1 \delta_2}{(\delta_1 - 1)(1 - \delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}\right) = \left(\frac{\delta_1 + r}{1 + r}\right) \left(\frac{\delta_1 - 1}{\delta_1}\right)^r \beta^{-2r-1} \beta_b + \beta_b \delta_1 \left(\frac{r}{1 + r} - 1\right).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} f\left(\frac{-\delta_1\delta_2}{(\delta_1-1)(1-\delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}\right) < 0 &\iff \left(\frac{\delta_1+r}{1+r}\right)\left(\frac{\delta_1-1}{\delta_1}\right)^r \beta^{-2r-1}\beta_b < \beta_b\delta_1\left(\frac{-r+1+r}{1+r}\right) \\ &\iff \left(1+\frac{r}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{r+1}}\left(1-\frac{1}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{r}{r+1}} < \beta^{\frac{2r+1}{r+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality to the left-hand side yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1+\frac{r}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{r+1}}\left(1-\frac{1}{\delta_1}\right)^{\frac{r}{r+1}} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{r+1}\right)\left(1+\frac{r}{\delta_1}\right) + \left(\frac{r}{r+1}\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{\delta_1}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r+1} + \frac{r}{r+1} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta_1} + \frac{r}{r+1} - \frac{r}{r+1} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta+1} \\ &= \frac{r+1}{r+1} = 1 < \beta < \beta^{\frac{2r+1}{r+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

So $f\left(\frac{-\delta_1\delta_2}{(\delta_1-1)(1-\delta_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}\right) < 0$ holds. That is, $k_2 > \frac{(\rho-\mu_1)}{(\rho-\mu_2)} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}$, which establishes $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) \geq 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_3$.

$y \in \Gamma_2$: On Γ_2 , we have $w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y = C_2 y_2^\delta - \beta_s + \beta_b y$. Note that we have already shown that $C_2 y_2^\delta - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$. Hence, $w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_2$.

We also have $w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y = C_1 y_1^\delta - C_2 y_2^\delta + \beta_b - \beta_s y$. Let

$$\phi(y) = C_1 y^{\delta_1} - C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b - \beta_s y.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(y) &= C_1 \delta_1 y^{\delta_1-1} + C_2 (-\delta_2) y^{\delta_2-1} - \beta_s \\ \phi''(y) &= C_1 \delta_1 (\delta_1 - 1) y^{\delta_1-2} - C_2 (-\delta_2) (1 - \delta_2) y^{\delta_2-2}. \end{aligned}$$

By continuity of w_0 , we know $C_1 k_2^{\delta_1} - C_2 k_2^{\delta_2} + \beta_b - \beta_s k_2 = 0$. That is, we know $\phi(k_2) = 0$.

By continuity of w'_0 , we know $C_1 \delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1} + C_2 (-\delta_2) k_2^{\delta_2-1} - \beta_s = 0$. That is, we know $\phi'(k_2) = 0$.

By continuity of w_1 , we know $C_2 k_1^{\delta_2} = \beta_s - \beta_b k_1$. Hence, $C_1 k_1^{\delta_1} - C_2 k_1^{\delta_2} + \beta_b - \beta_s k_1 = C_1 k_1^{\delta_1} - \beta_s + \beta_b k_1 + \beta_b - \beta_s k_1 = C_1 k_1^{\delta_1} + (k_1 + 1)(\beta_b - \beta_s) \geq 0$. That is, we know $\phi(k_1) \geq 0$.

By continuity of w'_1 , we know $-C_2 (-\delta_2) k_1^{\delta_2-1} = -\beta_b$. Hence, $C_1 \delta_1 k_1^{\delta_1-1} + C_2 (-\delta_2) k_1^{\delta_2-1} - \beta_s =$

$C_1\delta_1k_1^{\delta_1-1} + \beta_b - \beta_s \geq 0$. That is, we know $\phi'(k_1) \geq 0$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi''(y) &= C_1\delta_1(\delta_1 - 1)y^{\delta_1-2} - C_2(-\delta_2)(1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2-2} \\ &= \left(\frac{C_2\delta_2k_2^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s}{\delta_1k_2^{\delta_1-1}} \right) \delta_1(\delta_1 - 1)y^{\delta_1-2} - C_2(-\delta_2)(1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2-2} \\ &= -C_2(-\delta_2)k_2^{\delta_2-2} \left[(\delta_1 - 1) \left(\frac{y}{k_2} \right)^{\delta_1-2} + (1 - \delta_2) \left(\frac{y}{k_2} \right)^{\delta_2-2} \right] + \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)k_2^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{k_2} \right)^{\delta_1-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\phi''(k_2) = \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)k_2^{-1} - C_2(-\delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2)k_2^{\delta_2-2}$. Then note that

$$k_2 > \left[\frac{\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)}{C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)(-\delta_2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{\delta_2-1}} \implies k_2^{\delta_2-1} < \frac{\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)}{C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)(-\delta_2)}$$

since $\delta_2 - 1 < 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}(k_2^{\delta_2-1})k_2^{-1}(-C_2)(-\delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2) &> \left(\frac{\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)}{C_2(\delta_1 - \delta_2)(-\delta_2)} \right) k_2^{-1}(-C_2)(-\delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2) \\ \implies (k_2^{\delta_2-2})(-C_2)(-\delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2) &> -\beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)k_2^{-1} \\ \implies \beta_s(\delta_1 - 1)k_2^{-1} - C_2(-\delta_2)(\delta_1 - \delta_2)k_2^{\delta_2-2} &> 0\end{aligned}$$


That is, $\phi''(k_2) > 0$.

Consider the equation $\phi''(y) = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\phi''(y) = 0 &\iff C_1\delta_1(\delta_1 - 1)y^{\delta_1-2} - C_2(-\delta_2)(1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2-2} = 0 \\ &\iff C_1\delta_1(\delta_1 - 1)y^{\delta_1-2} = C_2(-\delta_2)(1 - \delta_2)y^{\delta_2-2} \\ &\iff y^{\delta_1-\delta_2} = \frac{C_2(-\delta_2)(1 - \delta_2)}{C_1\delta_1(\delta_1 - 1)} \\ &\iff y = \left(\frac{C_2(-\delta_2)(1 - \delta_2)}{C_1\delta_1(\delta_1 - 1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_1-\delta_2}}\end{aligned}$$

Note then that $\phi''(y) = 0$ has a unique solution in $[k_1, k_2]$.

Observe that ϕ , ϕ' , and ϕ'' are continuous on $[k_1, k_2]$. Since $\phi(k_2) = \phi'(k_2) = 0$ and $\phi''(k_2) > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that ϕ is nonnegative, decreasing, and convex over the

FIGURE 2. Example of solution to $f(k_1) = 0$.

interval $(k_2 - \varepsilon_1, k_2)$. Since $\phi(k_1) \geq 0$ and $\phi'(k_1) \geq 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that ϕ is nonnegative and increasing on $(k_1, k_1 + \varepsilon_2)$; moreover, $k_1 + \varepsilon_2 < k_2 - \varepsilon_1$. Suppose, if possible, there exists $y \in (k_1 + \varepsilon_2, k_2 - \varepsilon_1)$ such that $\phi(y) < 0$.

Note that $\phi(k_1 + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}) > 0$. Then by Intermediate Value Theorem, there exists $y_1 \in (k_1 + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}, y)$ such that $\phi(y_1) = 0$. Similarly, since $\phi(k_2 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}) > 0$, there exists $y_2 \in (y, k_2 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2})$ such that $\phi(y_2) = 0$. Note also that $\phi'(k_1 + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}) > 0$ and $\phi'(y_1) < 0$. So, by Intermediate Value Theorem, there exists $\tilde{y}_1 \in (k_1 + \frac{\varepsilon_2}{2}, y_1)$ such that $\phi'(\tilde{y}_1) = 0$. Similarly, since $\phi'(y_2) > 0$, there exists $\tilde{y}_2 \in (y_1, y_2)$ such that $\phi'(\tilde{y}_2) = 0$. Also, since $\phi'(k_2 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}) < 0$, there exists $\tilde{y}_3 \in (y_2, k_2 - \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2})$ such that $\phi'(\tilde{y}_3) = 0$.

Finally, since $\phi'(\tilde{y}_1) = \phi'(\tilde{y}_2) = 0$, by Rolle's Theorem, there exists $y_1^* \in (\tilde{y}_1, \tilde{y}_2)$ such that $\phi''(y_1^*) = 0$. Similarly, since $\phi'(\tilde{y}_3) = 0$, there exists $y_2^* \in (\tilde{y}_2, \tilde{y}_3)$ such that $\phi''(y_2^*) = 0$. But this is a contradiction, because $y_1^* \in [k_1, k_2]$, $y_2^* \in [k_1, k_2]$, but $y_1^* \neq y_2^*$; whereas the equation $\phi''(y) = 0$ has exactly one solution in the interval $[k_1, k_2]$.

Hence, $\phi(y) = C_1 y^{\delta_1} - C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0$ on Γ_2 . That is, $w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_2$.

The solutions of the HJB equations have the form:

$$(20) \quad w_0(y) = \begin{cases} \beta_s - \beta_b y, & \text{if } 0 < y < k_2 \\ \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1-\delta_2}\right)^{1-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2}\right)^{\delta_2} y^{\delta_2}, & \text{if } y \geq k_2 \end{cases}$$

$$(21) \quad w_1(y) = \begin{cases} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}\right)^{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{1-\delta_2}\right)^{1-\delta_2} k_1^{\delta_2-1}\right] \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1}\right) k_1^{1-\delta_1} y^{\delta_1}, & \text{if } 0 < y < k_1 \\ \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1-\delta_2}\right)^{1-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2}\right)^{\delta_2} y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y, & \text{if } y \geq k_1 \end{cases}$$

5. VERIFICATION THEOREM

Theorem 1. *We have $v_i(x_1, x_2) = x_1 w_i\left(\frac{x_1}{x_2}\right) = V_i(x_1, x_2)$, $i = 0, 1$. Moreover, if initially $i = 0$, let $\Lambda_0^* = (\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*)$ such that*

$$\tau_1^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_3\}, \quad \tau_2^* = \inf\{t \geq \tau_1^* \mid (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_1\}.$$

Similarly, if initially $i = 1$, let $\Lambda_1^ = (\tau_0^*)$ such that*

$$\tau_0^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_1\}.$$

Then Λ_0^ and Λ_1^* are optimal.*

Proof. The proof is divided into 4 steps.

Step 1: $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$, $v_0(x_1, x_2) \geq 0$.

Clearly $C_2 = \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1-\delta_2}\right)^{1-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2}\right)^{\delta_2} > 0$. Also, $C_1 = \frac{C_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s}{\delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1}} > 0$ has previously been established. Now,

$$v_0(x_1, x_2) = x_1 w_0\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1}\right) = \begin{cases} C_1 x_2^{\delta_1} x_1^{1-\delta_1}, & \text{on } \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \\ C_2 x_2^{\delta_2} x_1^{1-\delta_2} - \beta_b x_1 + \beta_s x_2, & \text{on } \Gamma_3 \end{cases}$$

Hence to show $v_0(x_1, x_2) \geq 0$, it suffices to show $w_0(y) \geq 0$ on Γ_3 . The continuity of w_0 and w'_0 yield $w_0(k_2) = C_2 k_2^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s k_2 = C_1 k_2^{\delta_1} > 0$ and $w'_0(k_2) = C_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s = C_1 \delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1} > 0$. Also, $w''_0(y) = C_2 \delta_2 (\delta_2 - 1) y^{\delta_2-2} > 0$ for all $y > 0$. In particular, since $w''_0(y) > 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_3$, we know $w'_0(y)$ is increasing on Γ_3 . And since $w'_0(k_2) > 0$, it must be that $w'_0(y) > 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_3$. This in turn implies that $w_0(y)$ is increasing on Γ_3 . Since we know $w_0(k_2) > 0$, it must be that $w_0(y) > 0$ for all $y \in \Gamma_3$.

Step 2: $-Ax_1 - Bx_2 \leq v_i(x_1, x_2) \leq Ax_1 + Bx_2$, $i = 0, 1$.

Let $i = 0$. On $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, we have $0 \leq v_0(x_1, x_2) = C_1 x_1^{1-\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_1} \leq C_1 x_1 k_2^{\delta_1}$. On Γ_3 , $-\beta_b x_1 + \beta_s x_2 \leq v_0(x_1, x_2) = C_2 x_1^{1-\delta_2} x_2^{\delta_2} - \beta_b x_1 + \beta_s x_2 \leq C_2 x_1 k_1^{\delta_2} - \beta_b x_1 + \beta_s x_2$. Hence we can choose suitable A and B so the inequalities hold when $i = 0$.

Let $i = 1$. On $\Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$, we have $0 \leq v_1(x_1, x_2) = C_2 x_1^{1-\delta_2} x_2^{\delta_2} \leq C_2 x_1 k_1^{\delta_2}$. On Γ_1 , $-\beta_b x_2 \leq v_1(x_1, x_2) = \beta_s x_1 - \beta_b x_2 \leq \beta_s x_1$. So again we can choose suitable A and B so the inequalities hold when $i = 1$.

Step 3: $v_i(x_1, x_2) \geq J_i(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_i)$.

The functions v_0 and v_1 are continuously differentiable on the entire region $\{x_1 > 0, x_2 > 0\}$ and twice continuously differentiable on the interior of Γ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$. In addition, they satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) \\ 0 &\leq (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) \\ -\beta_b + \beta_s y &\leq w_0(y) - w_1(y) \leq w_0(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\rho v_i(x) - \mathcal{A}v_i(x) \geq 0$, $i = 0, 1$, whenever they are twice continuously differentiable. Using these inequalities, Dynkin's formula, and Fatou's Lemma, as in Øksendal, we have $\mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho(\theta_1 \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_1 \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_1 \wedge N}^2)] \geq \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho(\theta_2 \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_2 \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_2 \wedge N}^2)]$ for any stopping times $0 \leq \theta_1 \leq \theta_2$, almost surely, and any N .

For each $j = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_j < \infty\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_j = \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_j < \infty\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho N} v_i(X_N^1, X_N^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_j = \infty\}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

In view of Step 2, the second term on the right hand side converges to zero because both $\mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho N} X_N^1]$ and $\mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho N} X_N^2]$ go to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Also, $e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_j < \infty\}} \rightarrow e^{-\rho \theta_j} v_i(X_{\theta_j}^1, X_{\theta_j}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_j < \infty\}}$ almost surely as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

By showing the existence of γ_i , $i = 1, 2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1 \right)^{\gamma_1} \right] &< \infty, \\ \sup_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2 \right)^{\gamma_2} \right] &< \infty, \end{aligned}$$

we can show that both $\left\{ e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1 \right\}$ and $\left\{ e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2 \right\}$ are uniformly integrable. Hence we obtain the uniform integrability of $\left\{ e^{-\rho(\theta_j \wedge N)} v_i(X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^1, X_{\theta_j \wedge N}^2) \right\}$ and send N to ∞ to obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\theta_1} v_i(X_{\theta_1}^1, X_{\theta_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_1 < \infty\}} \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\theta_2} v_i(X_{\theta_2}^1, X_{\theta_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\theta_2 < \infty\}} \right],$$

for $i = 0, 1$.

Given $\Lambda_0 = (\tau_1, \tau_2)$, $\Lambda_1 = (\tau_0)$

$$\begin{aligned} v_0(x_1, x_2) &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} v_0(X_{\tau_1}^1, X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} \left(v_1(X_{\tau_1}^1, X_{\tau_1}^2) - \beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} v_1(X_{\tau_1}^1, X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_1} \left(\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} v_1(X_{\tau_2}^1, X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_1} \left(\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_1} \left(\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= J_0(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_0) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(x_1, x_2) &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} v_1(X_{\tau_0}^1, X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= J_1(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_1) \end{aligned}$$

Step 4: $v_i(x_1, x_2) = J_i(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_i^*)$.

Let $i = 0$. Define $\tau_1^* = \inf \{t \geq 0 \mid (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_3\}$, $\tau_2^* = \inf \{t \geq \tau_1^* \mid (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_1\}$. We apply Dynkin's formula and notice that, for each n , $v_0(x_1, x_2) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\tau_1^* \wedge n)} v_0(X_{\tau_1^* \wedge n}^1, X_{\tau_1^* \wedge n}^2) \right]$. Note also that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\tau_1^* \wedge n)} v_0(X_{\tau_1^* \wedge n}^1, X_{\tau_1^* \wedge n}^2) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} v_0(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right]$. It follows

that

$$\begin{aligned} v_0(x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} v_0(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} \left(v_1(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) - \beta_b X_{\tau_1^*}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We have also

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} v_1(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2^*} v_1(X_{\tau_2^*}^1, X_{\tau_2^*}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2^*} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_2^*}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2^* < \infty\}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Combine these to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_0(x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2^*} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_2^*}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2^* < \infty\}} - \left(\beta_b X_{\tau_1^*}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= J_0(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_0^*). \end{aligned}$$

Let $i = 1$. Define $\tau_0^* = \inf \{t \geq 0 \mid (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_1\}$. We apply Dynkin's formula and notice that, for each n , $v_1(x_1, x_2) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\tau_0^* \wedge n)} v_1(X_{\tau_0^* \wedge n}^1, X_{\tau_0^* \wedge n}^2) \right]$. Note also that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho(\tau_0^* \wedge n)} v_1(X_{\tau_0^* \wedge n}^1, X_{\tau_0^* \wedge n}^2) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} v_1(X_{\tau_0^*}^1, X_{\tau_0^*}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right]$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} v_1(X_{\tau_0^*}^1, X_{\tau_0^*}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_0^*}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= J_1(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_1^*). \end{aligned}$$

□

6. A NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

We consider adjusted closing price data for Walmart (WMT) and Target (TGT) from 2010 to 2020. The first half of the data is used to calibrate the model, and the second half is used to test the results. Using a least-squares method, we obtain the following parameters: $\mu_1 = 0.09696$, $\mu_2 = 0.14347$, $\sigma_{11} = 0.19082$, $\sigma_{12} = 0.04036$, $\sigma_{21} = 0.04036$, and $\sigma_{22} = 0.13988$. We specify $K = 0.001$ and $\rho = 0.5$. Then we find $k_1 = 0.85527$, and $k_2 = 1.28061$.



FIGURE 3. Closing Prices of TGT and WMT

Next we examine the dependence of k_1 and k_2 on the parameters by varying each. We see that k_1 and k_2 both decrease in μ_1 . This leads to a larger buying region, Γ_3 . On the other hand, both k_1 and k_2 increase in μ_2 . This creates a larger Γ_1 and, hence, encourages early exit. When varying σ_{11} and σ_{22} , we find that k_2 increases while k_1 decreases, in both σ_{11} and σ_{22} . This leads to a smaller buying zone, Γ_1 , due to the increased risk, as well as a smaller selling zone, Γ_3 , because there is more price movement overall. However, as $\sigma_{12} = \sigma_{21}$ increases, we find that k_2 decreases, while k_1 increases. The greater correlation leads to a larger Γ_1 , and hence more opportunity for buying, as well as a larger Γ_3 , and hence more opportunity for selling. Since r represents the rate at which money loses value over time, k_2 decreases in r , while k_1 increases in r , reflecting the fact that we are less likely to want to hold in this case. Finally, larger transaction costs discourage trading. Naturally, as K increases, k_2 increases and k_1 decreases.

μ_1	-0.00304	0.04696	0.09696	0.14696	0.19696
k_1	0.91380	0.89057	0.85527	0.80194	0.72644
k_2	1.54188	1.41541	1.28061	1.12891	0.96334

TABLE 1. k_1 and k_2 with varying μ_1

μ_2	0.04347	0.09347	0.14347	0.19347	0.24347
k_1	0.76457	0.81341	0.85527	0.88736	0.91037
k_2	0.98771	1.12128	1.28061	1.47155	1.72474

TABLE 2. k_1 and k_2 with varying μ_2

σ_{11}	0.09082	0.14082	0.19082	0.24082	0.29082
k_1	0.92069	0.89220	0.85527	0.81532	0.77497
k_2	1.21691	1.24468	1.28061	1.32066	1.36327

TABLE 3. k_1 and k_2 with varying σ_{11}

σ_{22}	0.03988	0.08988	0.13988	0.18988	0.23988
k_1	0.88356	0.87601	0.85527	0.82593	0.79206
k_2	1.25304	1.26036	1.28061	1.30985	1.34491

TABLE 4. k_1 and k_2 with varying σ_{22}

σ_{12}	-0.05964	-0.00964	0.04036	0.09036	0.14036
k_1	0.73242	0.79189	0.85527	0.92029	0.97527
k_2	1.41132	1.34509	1.28061	1.21730	1.15901

TABLE 5. k_1 and k_2 with varying $\sigma_{12} = \sigma_{21}$

r	0.4	0.45	0.5	0.55	0.6
k_1	0.84068	0.84858	0.85527	0.86105	0.86611
k_2	1.36281	1.31541	1.28061	1.25387	1.23262

TABLE 6. k_1 and k_2 with varying r

K	0.0000	0.0005	0.0010	0.0015	0.0020
k_1	0.85698	0.85613	0.85527	0.85442	0.85356
k_2	1.27670	1.27866	1.28061	1.28254	1.28447

TABLE 7. k_1 and k_2 with varying K

7. A SECOND APPROACH TO FORMULATING THE PROBLEM

Having previously allowed the initial pairs position to be long or flat, a natural next question to consider is the short side of pairs trading. So, we begin again with the same stochastic differential equation as in (1) and the same partial differential operator as in (6), but now we allow our initial pairs position to be flat ($i = 0$), long ($i = 1$), or short ($i = -1$). If initially we are short in \mathbf{Z} , we will buy one share of \mathbf{Z} , i.e. buy one share of \mathbf{S}^1 and sell one share of \mathbf{S}^2 , at some time τ_0 , which will conclude our trading activity. If initially we are long in \mathbf{Z} , we will sell one share of \mathbf{Z} , i.e. sell \mathbf{S}^1 and buy \mathbf{S}^2 at some time τ_0 , which will conclude our trading activity. Otherwise, if initially we are flat, we can either go long or short one share in \mathbf{Z} at some time τ_1 . Depending on our activity at time τ_1 , we would then either sell \mathbf{S}^1 and buy \mathbf{S}^2 (if long) or buy \mathbf{S}^1 and sell \mathbf{S}^2 (if short) at some time $\tau_2 \geq \tau_1$, thus concluding our trading activity. Hence, for $x_1, x_2 > 0$, the HJB equations become

We seek thresholds k_1, k_2, k_3 , and k_4 for buying and selling \mathbf{Z} . Let k_1 indicate the price at which we will sell one share of \mathbf{Z} when the net position is flat. Let k_2 indicate the price at which we will sell one share of \mathbf{Z} when the net position is long. Let k_3 indicate the price at which we will buy one share of \mathbf{Z} when the net position is short. Let k_4 indicate the price at which we will buy one share of \mathbf{Z} when the net position is flat. Then define the following

function:

$$(22) \quad u(x_1, x_2, i) = \begin{cases} -1 & i = 0 \text{ and } x_2 \leq x_1 k_1 \\ -1 & i = 1 \text{ and } x_2 \leq x_1 k_2 \\ 1 & i = -1 \text{ and } x_2 \geq x_1 k_3 \\ 1 & i = 0 \text{ and } x_2 \geq x_1 k_4 \end{cases}$$

Let K denote the fixed percentage of transaction costs associate with buying or selling of stocks. Then given the initial state (x_1, x_2) , the initial net position $i = -1, 0, 1$, and the decision sequences $\Lambda_{-1} = (\tau_0)$, $\Lambda_1 = (\tau_0)$ and $\Lambda_0 = (\tau_1, \tau_2)$, the resulting reward functions are

$$(23) \quad J_{-1}(x_1, x_2, \tau_0) = \mathbb{E} \left[-e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_b X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right]$$

$$(24) \quad J_0(x_1, x_2, \tau_1, \tau_2, u) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right. \\ \left. + \left\{ e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_s X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_b X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right]$$

$$(25) \quad J_1(x_1, x_2, \tau_0) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right]$$

For $i = -1, 0, 1$, let $V_i(x_1, x_2)$ denote the value functions with initial state $(X_0^1, X_0^2) = (x_1, x_2)$ and initial net positions $i = -1, 0, 1$. That is, $V_i(x_1, x_2) = \sup_{\Lambda_i} J_i(x_1, x_2, \Lambda_i)$.

8. PROPERTIES OF THE VALUE FUNCTIONS

In this section, we establish basic properties of the value functions.

Lemma 2. *For all $x_1, x_2 > 0$, we have*

$$\beta_s x_1 - \beta_b x_2 \leq V_1(x_1, x_2) \leq x_1,$$

$$\beta_s x_2 - \beta_b x_1 \leq V_{-1}(x_1, x_2) \leq x_2, \text{ and}$$

$$0 \leq V_0(x_1, x_2) \leq 4x_1 + 4x_2.$$

Proof. Note that for all $x_1, x_2 > 0$, $V_1(x_1, x_2) \geq J_1(x_1, x_2, \tau_0) = \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}}]$.

In particular,

$$V_1(x_1, x_2) \geq J_1(x_1, x_2, 0) = \beta_s x_1 - \beta_b x_2.$$

Similarly, $V_{-1}(x_1, x_2) \geq J_{-1}(x_1, x_2, \tau_0) = \mathbb{E} [-e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_b X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}}]$. In particular,

$$V_{-1}(x_1, x_2) \geq J_{-1}(x_1, x_2, 0) = \beta_s x_2 - \beta_b x_1.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} V_0(x_1, x_2) &\geq J_0(x_1, x_2, \tau_1, \tau_2, u) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\{ e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_s X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} - e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_b X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $V_0(x_2, x_2) \geq 0$ by definition and taking $\tau_1 = \infty$. Now, for all $\tau_0 > 0$, $J_1(x_1, x_2, \tau_0)$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} [e^{-\rho\tau_0} (X_{\tau_0}^1 - X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}}] \\ &= x_1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] - x_2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &\leq x_1 - x_2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\ &\leq x_1 - x_2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\infty} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \right] \\ &= x_1. \end{aligned}$$

Also, for all $\tau_0 > 0$, $J_{-1}(x_1, x_2, \tau_0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[-e^{-\rho\tau_0} (\beta_b X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[-e^{-\rho\tau_0} (X_{\tau_0}^1 - X_{\tau_0}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&= x_2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] - x_1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq x_2 - x_1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_0} (-\rho + \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq x_2 - x_1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\infty} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \right] \\
&= x_2.
\end{aligned}$$

And, for all $0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, $J_0(x_1, x_2, \tau_1, \tau_2, u)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1} (\beta_s X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_1}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2} (\beta_b X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_2}^2) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right] \\
&\leq x_1 - \mathbb{E} \left[x_2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_2} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] \\
&\quad + x_2 - \mathbb{E} \left[x_1 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_1} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] \\
&\quad + x_1 - \mathbb{E} \left[x_2 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_1} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right] \\
&\quad + x_2 - \mathbb{E} \left[x_1 \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_2} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_1} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_1} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\infty} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \right] \\
&= (\rho - \mu_1) \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} x_1 e^{\mu_1 t} dt \\
&= x_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_2} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}} \right] \leq x_2, \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_1} (\rho - \mu_2) e^{-\rho t} X_t^2 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right] \leq x_2, \text{ and} \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau_2} (\rho - \mu_1) e^{-\rho t} X_t^1 dt \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}} \right] \leq x_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $J_0(x_1, x_2, \tau_1, \tau_2, u) \leq 4x_1 + 4x_2$. □

9. HJB EQUATIONS

In this section, we study the associated HJB equations, which have the form, for $x_1, x_2 > 0$,

$$(26) \quad \begin{cases} \min \left\{ \rho v_1(x_1, x_2) - \mathcal{A}v_1(x_1, x_2), v_1(x_1, x_2) - \beta_s x_1 + \beta_b x_2 \right\} = 0, \\ \min \left\{ \rho v_{-1}(x_1, x_2) - \mathcal{A}v_{-1}(x_1, x_2), v_{-1}(x_1, x_2) + \beta_b x_1 - \beta_s x_2 \right\} = 0, \\ \min \left\{ \rho v_0(x_1, x_2) - \mathcal{A}v_0(x_1, x_2), v_0(x_1, x_2) - v_1(x_1, x_2) + \beta_b x_1 - \beta_s x_2, \right. \\ \left. v_0(x_1, x_2) - v_{-1}(x_1, x_2) - \beta_s x_1 + \beta_b x_2 \right\} = 0. \end{cases}$$

As above, the HJB equations can be reduced to an ODE problem by applying the following substitution. Let $y = x_2/x_1$ and $v_i(x_1, x_2) = x_1 w_i(x_2/x_1)$, for some function $w_i(y)$ and $i = -1, 0, 1$. The HJB equations can be given in terms of y and w_i as follows:

$$(27) \quad \begin{cases} \min \left\{ \rho w_1(y) - \mathcal{L}w_1(y), w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \right\} = 0, \\ \min \left\{ \rho w_{-1}(y) - \mathcal{L}w_{-1}(y), w_{-1}(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \right\} = 0, \\ \min \left\{ \rho w_0(y) - \mathcal{L}w_0(y), w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y, w_0(y) - w_{-1}(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \right\} = 0, \end{cases}$$

As above, $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_i(y) = 0$, $i = -1, 0, 1$ can be rewritten as Euler-type equations with solutions of the form y^δ for δ_1, δ_2 as in (9), (10).

Now, we would like to open pairs position \mathbf{Z} when the price of \mathbf{S}^2 is large relative to the price of \mathbf{S}^1 (k_3 and k_4) and close pairs position \mathbf{Z} when the price of \mathbf{S}^2 is small relative to the price of \mathbf{S}^1 (k_1 and k_2). Additionally, we would be more willing to open pairs position \mathbf{Z} when the net position is short than when the net position is flat, since when the net position is short we experience the risk of holding one share of \mathbf{S}^2 while borrowing one share of \mathbf{S}^1 .




FIGURE 4. Thresholds for buying and selling regions

Similarly, we would be more willing to close pairs position \mathbf{Z} when the net position is long than when the net position is flat, since when the net position is long we experience the risk of borrowing one share of \mathbf{S}^2 while holding one share of \mathbf{S}^1 . This suggests that we should expect $k_1 \leq k_2 \leq k_3 \leq k_4$.

Suppose we can find k_1, k_4, k_2 and k_3 with $k_1 < k_2 < k_3 < k_4$ so that the first equation

$$\min \left\{ \rho w_1(y) - \mathcal{L}w_1(y), w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \right\} = 0$$

has solution

$$(28) \quad w_1(y) = \begin{cases} \beta_s - \beta_b y, & \text{if } 0 \leq y \leq k_1 \\ C_2 y^{\delta_2}, & \text{if } y \geq k_1. \end{cases}$$

Then the smooth-fitting conditions yield

$$\beta_s - \beta_b k_1 = C_2 k_1^{\delta_2} \quad \text{and} \quad -\beta_b = C_2 \delta_2 k_1^{\delta_2-1}$$

This will imply

$$(29) \quad k_1 = \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \cdot \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b}$$

and

$$(30) \quad C_2 = \frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \cdot k_1^{1-\delta_2} = \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{\beta_b} \right)^{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1 - \delta_2} \right)^{1-\delta_2}.$$

The second equation

$$\min \left\{ \rho w_{-1}(y) - \mathcal{L}w_{-1}(y), w_{-1}(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \right\} = 0$$

has solution

$$(31) \quad w_{-1}(y) = \begin{cases} C_1 y^{\delta_1}, & \text{if } 0 \leq y \leq k_4 \\ \beta_s y - \beta_b, & \text{if } y \geq k_4. \end{cases}$$

Then the smooth-fitting conditions yield

$$C_1 k_4^{\delta_1} = \beta_s k_4 - \beta_b \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 \delta_1 k_4^{\delta_1-1} = \beta_s$$

This will imply

$$(32) \quad k_4 = \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}$$

and

$$(33) \quad C_1 = \frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1} \cdot k_4^{1-\delta_1} = \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1} \right)^{\delta_1} \left(\frac{\delta_1 - 1}{\beta_b} \right)^{\delta_1-1}.$$

The third equation

$$\min \left\{ \rho w_0(y) - \mathcal{L}w_0(y), w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y, w_0(y) - w_{-1}(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \right\} = 0$$

has solution

$$(34) \quad w_0(y) = \begin{cases} C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_s - \beta_b y, & \text{if } 0 \leq y \leq k_2 \\ B_1 y^{\delta_1} + B_2 y^{\delta_2}, & \text{if } k_2 \leq y \leq k_3 \\ C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y, & \text{if } y \geq k_3. \end{cases}$$

Then the smooth-fitting conditions yield

$$C_1 k_2^{\delta_1} + \beta_s - \beta_b k_2 = B_1 k_2^{\delta_1} + B_2 k_2^{\delta_2}$$

$$C_1 \delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1} - \beta_b = B_1 \delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1} + B_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1}$$

$$B_1 k_3^{\delta_1} + B_2 k_3^{\delta_2} = C_2 k_3^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s k_3$$

$$B_1 \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_1-1} + B_2 \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2-1} = C_2 \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2-1} + \beta_s$$

There are four equations and four parameters, B_1 , B_2 , k_2 , and k_4 , that need to be found.

These equations can be written in the matrix form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} k_2^{\delta_1} & k_2^{\delta_2} \\ \delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1} & \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 - C_1 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -k_2 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} k_3^{\delta_1} & k_3^{\delta_2} \\ \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_1-1} & \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 - C_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} k_3 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix}.$$

We introduce a new matrix

$$\Phi(r) = \begin{pmatrix} r^{\delta_1} & r^{\delta_2} \\ \delta_1 r^{\delta_1-1} & \delta_2 r^{\delta_2-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and its inverse} \quad \Phi(r)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \begin{pmatrix} -\delta_2 r^{-\delta_1} & r^{1-\delta_1} \\ \delta_1 r^{-\delta_2} & -r^{1-\delta_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

for $r \neq 0$. Returning to the smooth-fit conditions above, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 - C_1 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix} = \Phi(k_2)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -k_2 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 - C_2 \end{pmatrix} = \Phi(k_3)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} k_3 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix}$$

This implies

$$\begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \Phi(k_2)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -k_2 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ C_2 \end{pmatrix} + \Phi(k_3)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} k_3 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix}.$$

The second equality yields two equations of k_2 and k_3 , we can rewrite it as

$$\left[\Phi(k_3)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} k_3 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \Phi(k_2)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -k_2 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_1 \\ -C_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

The matrix in $[\cdot]$ is

$$\frac{1}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \delta_2)k_3^{1-\delta_1} + \delta_2 k_2^{-\delta_1} & \delta_2 k_3^{-\delta_1} + (1 - \delta_2)k_2^{1-\delta_1} \\ -(1 - \delta_1)k_3^{1-\delta_2} - \delta_1 k_2^{-\delta_2} & -\delta_1 k_3^{-\delta_2} - (1 - \delta_1)k_2^{1-\delta_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

The two equations involving k_2 and k_3 are

$$\frac{1}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \delta_2)k_3^{1-\delta_1} + \delta_2 k_2^{-\delta_1} & \delta_2 k_3^{-\delta_1} + (1 - \delta_2)k_2^{1-\delta_1} \\ (1 - \delta_1)k_3^{1-\delta_2} + \delta_1 k_2^{-\delta_2} & \delta_1 k_3^{-\delta_2} + (1 - \delta_1)k_2^{1-\delta_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_s \\ \beta_b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_1 \\ C_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Recall that

$$C_1 = \frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1} \cdot k_4^{1-\delta_1} = \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1} \right)^{\delta_1} \left(\frac{\delta_1 - 1}{\beta_b} \right)^{\delta_1 - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad C_2 = \frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \cdot k_1^{1-\delta_2} = \left(\frac{-\delta_2}{\beta_b} \right)^{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1 - \delta_2} \right)^{1-\delta_2}.$$

The system of equations for k_2 and k_3 are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1 - \delta_2)k_3^{1-\delta_1} + \delta_2 k_2^{-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \beta_s + \frac{\delta_2 k_3^{-\delta_1} + (1 - \delta_2)k_2^{1-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \beta_b &= \frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1} \cdot k_4^{1-\delta_1} \\ \frac{(1 - \delta_1)k_3^{1-\delta_2} + \delta_1 k_2^{-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \beta_s + \frac{\delta_1 k_3^{-\delta_2} + (1 - \delta_1)k_2^{1-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \beta_b &= \frac{\beta_b}{-\delta_2} \cdot k_1^{1-\delta_2}. \end{aligned}$$

We are looking for solutions (k_2, k_3) in the triangular region

$$T = \{(r, s) : k_1 \leq r < s \leq k_4\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2.$$

Let $\gamma = \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s}$. Then we can reduce the system to

$$(35) \quad F_1(k_2, k_3) := \frac{(1 - \delta_2)k_3^{1-\delta_1} + \delta_2 k_2^{-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} + \frac{\delta_2 k_3^{-\delta_1} + (1 - \delta_2)k_2^{1-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \gamma - \frac{k_4^{1-\delta_1}}{\delta_1} = 0$$

$$(36) \quad F_2(k_2, k_3) := \frac{(1 - \delta_1)k_3^{1-\delta_2} + \delta_1 k_2^{-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} + \frac{\delta_1 k_3^{-\delta_2} + (1 - \delta_1)k_2^{1-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \gamma - \frac{\gamma k_1^{1-\delta_2}}{-\delta_2} = 0.$$




FIGURE 5. Numerical solution to system of equations in (35) and (36).

Note that (k_1, k_4) is a solution to the system, since:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(k_1, k_4) &= \frac{(1 - \delta_2)k_4^{1-\delta_1} + \delta_2 k_1^{-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} + \frac{\delta_2 k_1^{-\delta_1} + (1 - \delta_2)k_4^{1-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \gamma - \frac{k_4^{1-\delta_1}}{\delta_1} \\ &= \frac{k_4^{-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \left[\frac{(1 - \delta_2)\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1} \gamma - \frac{\delta_1 - \delta_2}{\delta_1 - 1} \gamma + \delta_2 \gamma \right] + \frac{k_1^{-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} [\delta_2 + (-\delta_2)] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_2(k_1, k_4) &= \frac{(1 - \delta_1)k_4^{1-\delta_2} + \delta_1 k_1^{-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} + \frac{\delta_1 k_4^{-\delta_2} + (1 - \delta_1)k_1^{1-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \gamma - \frac{\gamma k_1^{1-\delta_2}}{-\delta_2} \\
&= \frac{k_4^{-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} [-\delta_1 \gamma + \delta_1 \gamma] + \frac{k_1^{-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \left[\delta_1 + \frac{(1 - \delta_1)(-\delta_2)}{1 - \delta_2} - \frac{\delta_1 - \delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \right] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, recall that the smooth-fit conditions for w_0 can be written as:

$$\begin{cases} (B_1 - C_1)k_2^{\delta_1} + B_2 k_2^{\delta_2} = \beta_s - \beta_b k_2 \\ (B_1 - C_1)\delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1} + B_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1} = -\beta_b \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} B_1 k_3^{\delta_1} + (B_2 - C_2)k_3^{\delta_2} = \beta_s k_3 - \beta_b \\ B_1 \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_1-1} + (B_2 - C_2)\delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2-1} = \beta_s \end{cases}$$

From these we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(B_1 - C_1)k_2^{\delta_1}}{(B_1 - C_1)\delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1}} = \frac{\beta_s - \beta_b k_2 - B_2 k_2^{\delta_2}}{-\beta_b - B_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1}} \\
\implies \frac{k_2}{\delta_1} &= \frac{\beta_s - \beta_b k_2 - B_2 k_2^{\delta_2}}{-\beta_b - B_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1}} \\
\implies \beta_s \delta_1 - \beta_b \delta_1 k_2 - B_2 \delta_1 k_2^{\delta_2} &= -\beta_b k_2 - B_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2} \\
(37) \quad \implies B_2 &= \frac{\beta_s \delta_1 k_2^{-\delta_2} - \beta_b (\delta_1 - 1) k_2^{1-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2}
\end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{B_2 k_2^{\delta_2}}{B_2 \delta_2 k_2^{\delta_2-1}} = \frac{\beta_s - \beta_b k_2 - (B_1 - C_1)k_2^{\delta_1}}{-\beta_b - (B_1 - C_1)\delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1}} \\
\implies \frac{k_2}{\delta_2} &= \frac{\beta_s - \beta_b k_2 - (B_1 - C_1)k_2^{\delta_1}}{-\beta_b - (B_1 - C_1)\delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1-1}} \\
\implies \beta_s \delta_2 - \beta_b \delta_2 k_2 - (B_1 - C_1)\delta_2 k_2^{\delta_1} &= -\beta_b k_2 - (B_1 - C_1)\delta_1 k_2^{\delta_1} \\
(38) \quad \implies B_1 - C_1 &= \frac{\beta_s (-\delta_2) k_2^{-\delta_1} - \beta_b (1 - \delta_2) k_2^{1-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{B_1 k_3^{\delta_1}}{B_1 \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_1 - 1}} = \frac{\beta_s k_3 - \beta_b - (B_2 - C_2) k_3^{\delta_2}}{\beta_s - (B_2 - C_2) \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2 - 1}} \\
\implies \frac{k_3}{\delta_1} &= \frac{\beta_s k_3 - \beta_b - (B_2 - C_2) k_3^{\delta_2}}{\beta_s - (B_2 - C_2) \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2 - 1}} \\
\implies \beta_s \delta_1 k_3 - \beta_b \delta_1 - (B_2 - C_2) \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_2} &= \beta_s k_3 - (B_2 - C_2) \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2} \\
(39) \quad \implies B_2 - C_2 &= \frac{\beta_s (\delta_1 - 1) k_3^{1 - \delta_2} - \beta_b \delta_1 k_3^{-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(B_2 - C_2) k_3^{\delta_2}}{(B_2 - C_2) \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_2 - 1}} = \frac{\beta_s k_3 - \beta_b - B_1 k_3^{\delta_1}}{\beta_s - B_1 \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_1 - 1}} \\
\implies \frac{k_3}{\delta_2} &= \frac{\beta_s k_3 - \beta_b - B_1 k_3^{\delta_1}}{\beta_s - B_1 \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_1 - 1}} \\
\implies \beta_s \delta_2 k_3 - \beta_b \delta_2 - B_1 \delta_2 k_3^{\delta_1} &= \beta_s k_3 - B_1 \delta_1 k_3^{\delta_1} \\
(40) \quad \implies B_1 &= \frac{\beta_s (1 - \delta_2) k_3^{1 - \delta_1} - \beta_b (-\delta_2) k_3^{-\delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2}
\end{aligned}$$

Note then that since $k_2 = k_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
k_2 &= \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \cdot \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \\
\implies \beta_s (-\delta_2) &= \beta_b (1 - \delta_2) k_2 \\
\implies \beta_s (-\delta_2) k_2^{-\delta_1} &= \beta_b (1 - \delta_2) k_2^{1 - \delta_1} \\
\implies \frac{\beta_s (-\delta_2) k_2^{-\delta_1} - \beta_b (1 - \delta_2) k_2^{1 - \delta_1}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} &= 0 \\
\implies B_1 - C_1 &= 0 \\
\implies B_1 &= C_1
\end{aligned}$$

Also, since $k_3 = k_4$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
k_3 &= \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s} \cdot \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1} \\
\implies \beta_b \delta_1 &= \beta_s (\delta_1 - 1) k_3 \\
\implies \beta_b \delta_1 k_3^{-\delta_2} &= \beta_s (\delta_1 - 1) k_3^{1-\delta_2} \\
\implies \frac{\beta_s (\delta_1 - 1) k_3^{1-\delta_2} - \beta_b \delta_1 k_3^{-\delta_2}}{\delta_1 - \delta_2} &= 0 \\
\implies B_2 - C_2 &= 0 \\
\implies B_2 &= C_2
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, in this case

$$(41) \quad w_0(y) = \begin{cases} C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_s - \beta_b y & 0 \leq y \leq k_1, \\ C_1 y^{\delta_1} + C_2 y^{\delta_2} & k_1 \leq y \leq k_4, \\ C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y & y \geq k_4. \end{cases}$$

Let us relabel these thresholds as

$$(42) \quad k_1^* = k_1 = k_2$$

$$(43) \quad k_2^* = k_3 = k_4.$$

Then we have the following.

Theorem 2. *Let δ_i be given by (9), (10) and k_i be given by (42), (43). Then the following functions w_1 , w_{-1} , and w_0 satisfy the HJB equations (27):*

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(y) &= \begin{cases} \beta_s - \beta_b y, & \text{if } 0 \leq y \leq k_1^*, \\ \left(-\frac{\delta_2}{\beta_b}\right)^{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1-\delta_2}\right)^{1-\delta_2} y^{\delta_2}, & \text{if } y \geq k_1^*. \end{cases} \\
w_{-1}(y) &= \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1}\right)^{\delta_1} \left(\frac{\delta_1-1}{\beta_b}\right)^{\delta_1-1} y^{\delta_1}, & \text{if } 0 \leq y \leq k_2^*, \\ \beta_s y - \beta_b, & \text{if } y \geq k_2^*. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

$$w_0(y) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1}\right)^{\delta_1} \left(\frac{\delta_1 - 1}{\beta_b}\right)^{\delta_1 - 1} y^{\delta_1} + \beta_s - \beta_b y, & \text{if } 0 \leq y \leq k_1^*, \\ \left(\frac{\beta_s}{\delta_1}\right)^{\delta_1} \left(\frac{\delta_1 - 1}{\beta_b}\right)^{\delta_1 - 1} y^{\delta_1} + \left(-\frac{\delta_2}{\beta_b}\right)^{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1 - \delta_2}\right)^{1 - \delta_2} y^{\delta_2}, & \text{if } k_1^* \leq y \leq k_2^*, \\ \left(-\frac{\delta_2}{\beta_b}\right)^{-\delta_2} \left(\frac{\beta_s}{1 - \delta_2}\right)^{1 - \delta_2} y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y, & \text{if } y \geq k_2^*. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We divide the first quadrant of the plane into 3 regions,

$$\Gamma_1 : 0 < y \leq k_1^*, \quad \Gamma_2 : k_1^* < y \leq k_2^*, \quad \Gamma_3 : k_2^* < y$$

Thus, to establish that we have found a solution to the HJB equations, we must establish the following list of variational inequalities:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) \geq 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_1 \\ w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3 \\ w_{-1}(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \\ (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_{-1}(y) \geq 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_3 \\ (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) \geq 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_3 \\ w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \\ w_0(y) - w_{-1}(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0 & \text{on } \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3 \end{array} \right.$$

On Γ_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) &= (\rho - \mathcal{L})(\beta_s - \beta_b y) \\ &= \rho\beta_s - \mu_1\beta_s + \mu_1\beta_b y + (\mu_2 - \mu_1)\beta_b y - \rho\beta_b y \\ &= (\rho - \mu_1)\beta_s - (\rho - \mu_2)\beta_b y \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) \geq 0 &\iff (\rho - \mu_1)\beta_s \geq (\rho - \mu_2)\beta_b y \\
&\iff y \leq \frac{\rho - \mu_1}{\rho - \mu_2} \cdot \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \\
&\iff y \leq \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1} \cdot \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \cdot \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_b} \\
&\iff y \leq \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1} \cdot k_1^*,
\end{aligned}$$

which holds, since $y \leq k_1^* \leq \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1} \cdot k_1^*$.

On $\Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$,

$$w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0 \iff C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0.$$

Let $f(y) = C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_s + \beta_b y$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
f'(y) \geq 0 &\iff C_2 \delta_2 y^{\delta_2 - 1} + \beta_b \geq 0 \\
&\iff C_2 (-\delta_2) y^{\delta_2 - 1} \leq \beta_b \\
&\iff y^{\delta_2 - 1} \leq \frac{\beta_b}{C_2 (-\delta_2)} = k_1^{\delta_2 - 1} \\
&\iff y^{1 - \delta_2} \geq k_1^{*1 - \delta_2} \\
&\iff y \geq k_1^*,
\end{aligned}$$

which clearly holds. Hence $f(y)$ is increasing for $y \geq k_1^*$. Since $f(k_1^*) = 0$, it must be that $w_1(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0$ on $\Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$.

On $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$,

$$w_{-1}(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0 \iff C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0.$$

Let $g(y) = C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_b - \beta_s y$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
g'(y) \leq 0 &\iff C_1 \delta_1 y^{\delta_1-1} - \beta_s \leq 0 \\
&\iff C_1 \delta_1 y^{\delta_1-1} \leq \beta_s \\
&\iff y^{\delta_1-1} \leq \frac{\beta_s}{C_1 \delta_1} = k_2^{*\delta_1-1} \\
&\iff y \leq k_2^*,
\end{aligned}$$

which clearly holds. Hence $g(y)$ is decreasing for $y \leq k_2^*$. Since $g(k_2^*) = 0$, it must be that $w_{-1}(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0$ on $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$.

On Γ_3 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_{-1}(y) &= (\rho - \mathcal{L})(\beta_s y - \beta_b) \\
&= \rho \beta_s y - \mu_2 \beta_s y + \mu_1 \beta_b - \rho \beta_b \\
&= (\rho - \mu_2) \beta_s y - (\rho - \mu_1) \beta_b
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_{-1}(y) \geq 0 &\iff (\rho - \mu_2) \beta_s y \geq (\rho - \mu_1) \beta_b \\
&\iff y \geq \frac{\rho - \mu_1}{\rho - \mu_2} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s} \\
&\iff y \geq \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \cdot \frac{\delta_1}{\delta_1 - 1} \cdot \frac{\beta_b}{\beta_s} \\
&\iff y \geq \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \cdot k_2^*,
\end{aligned}$$

which holds, since $y \geq k_2^* \geq \frac{-\delta_2}{1 - \delta_2} \cdot k_2^*$.

On Γ_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) &= (\rho - \mathcal{L})(w_{-1}(y) + w_1(y)) \\
&= 0 + (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y),
\end{aligned}$$

and we have already established that $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) \geq 0$ on Γ_1 .

On Γ_3 ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_0(y) &= (\rho - \mathcal{L})(w_1(y) + w_{-1}(y)) \\ &= (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_1(y) + (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_{-1}(y) \\ &= 0 + (\rho - \mathcal{L})w_{-1}(y), \end{aligned}$$

and we have already established that $(\rho - \mathcal{L})w_{-1}(y) \geq 0$ on Γ_3 .

On Γ_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y &= C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_s - \beta_b y - \beta_s + \beta_b y + \beta_b - \beta_s y \\ &= C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_b - \beta_s y, \end{aligned}$$

and we have already established that $C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0$ on Γ_1 .

On Γ_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(y) - w_1(y) + \beta_b - \beta_s y &= C_1 y^{\delta_1} + C_2 y^{\delta_2} - C_2 y^{\delta_2} + \beta_b - \beta_s y \\ &= C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_b - \beta_s y, \end{aligned}$$

and we have already established that $C_1 y^{\delta_1} + \beta_b - \beta_s y \geq 0$ on Γ_2 .

On Γ_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(y) - w_{-1}(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y &= C_1 y^{\delta_1} + C_2 y^{\delta_2} - C_1 y^{\delta_1} - \beta_s + \beta_b y \\ &= C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_s + \beta_b y, \end{aligned}$$

and we have already established that $C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0$ on Γ_2 .

On Γ_3 ,

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(y) - w_{-1}(y) - \beta_s + \beta_b y &= C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_b + \beta_s y - \beta_s y + \beta_b - \beta_s + \beta_b y \\ &= C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_s + \beta_b y, \end{aligned}$$

and we have already established that $C_2 y^{\delta_2} - \beta_s + \beta_b y \geq 0$ on Γ_3 .

□

10. VERIFICATION THEOREM

Theorem 3. *We have $v_i(x_1, x_2) = x_1 w_i\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1}\right) = V_i(x_1, x_2)$, $i = -1, 0, 1$. If initially $i = -1$, let $\tau_0^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_3\}$. If initially $i = 1$, let $\tau_0^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_1\}$. Finally, if initially $i = 0$, let $\tau_1^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \notin \Gamma_2\}$. If $(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) \in \Gamma_1$, then $u^* = -1$ and $\tau_2^* = \inf\{t \geq \tau_1^* : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_3\}$. Otherwise, if $(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) \in \Gamma_3$, then $u^* = 1$ and $\tau_2^* = \inf\{t \geq \tau_1^* : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_1\}$.*

Proof. Given $(\rho - \mathcal{A})v_i(x_1, x_2) \geq 0$, $i = -1, 0, 1$, and applying Dynkin's formula and Fatou's Lemma as in Øksendal [4], we have for any stopping times $0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, almost surely, $\mathbb{E}e^{-\rho\tau_1}v_i(X_{\tau_1}^1, X_{\tau_1}^2) \geq \mathbb{E}e^{-\rho\tau_2}v_i(X_{\tau_2}^1, X_{\tau_2}^2)$.

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_0(x_1, x_2) &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_1}v_0(X_{\tau_1}^1, X_{\tau_1}^2)\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_1}\left(v_1(X_{\tau_1}^1, X_{\tau_1}^2) - \beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}}\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_1}\left(v_{-1}(X_{\tau_1}^1, X_{\tau_1}^2) + \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_1}^2\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}}\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_2}\left(\beta_s X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2}^2\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_2}\left(\beta_b X_{\tau_2}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_2}^2\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2 < \infty\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}}\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_1}\left(\beta_s X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_1}^2\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{u=-1\}}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_1}\left(\beta_b X_{\tau_1}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1}^2\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1 < \infty\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{u=1\}}\right] \\
&= J_0(x_1, x_2, \tau_1, \tau_2, u),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $0 \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2$. This implies $v_0(x_1, x_2) \geq V_0(x_1, x_2)$. Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_1(x_1, x_2) &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_0}v_1(X_{\tau_0}^1, X_{\tau_0}^2)\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_0}v_1(X_{\tau_0}^1, X_{\tau_0}^2)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}}\right] \\
&= J_1(x_1, x_2, \tau_0), \\
v_{-1}(x_1, x_2) &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_0}v_{-1}(X_{\tau_0}^1, X_{\tau_0}^2)\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\rho\tau_0}\left(\beta_s X_{\tau_0}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0}^2\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0 < \infty\}}\right] \\
&= J_{-1}(x_1, x_2, \tau_0),
\end{aligned}$$

for all $0 \leq \tau_0$. Hence $v_1(x_1, x_2) \geq V_1(x_1, x_2)$ and $v_{-1}(x_1, x_2) \geq V_{-1}(x_1, x_2)$.

Now define $\tau_1^* = \inf \{t \geq 0 : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \notin \Gamma_2\}$. If $(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) \in \Gamma_1$, then $\tau_2^* = \inf \{t \geq \tau_1^* : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_3\}$. Otherwise, if $(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2) \in \Gamma_3$, then $\tau_2^* = \inf \{t \geq \tau_1^* : (X_t^1, X_t^2) \in \Gamma_1\}$. Using Dynkin's formula, we obtain

$$v_0(x_1, x_2) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} v_0 \left(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right],$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} v_1 \left(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2^*} v_1 \left(X_{\tau_2^*}^1, X_{\tau_2^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2^* < \infty\}} \right],$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} v_{-1} \left(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2^*} v_{-1} \left(X_{\tau_2^*}^1, X_{\tau_2^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2^* < \infty\}} \right].$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} v_0(x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} v_0 \left(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} \left(v_1 \left(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) - \beta_b X_{\tau_1^*}^1 + \beta_s X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u^* = 1\}} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} \left(v_{-1} \left(X_{\tau_1^*}^1, X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) + \beta_s X_{\tau_1^*}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u^* = -1\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2^*} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_2^*}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_2^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2^* < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u^* = 1\}} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_2^*} \left(\beta_b X_{\tau_2^*}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_2^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_2^* < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u^* = -1\}} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_1^*}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u^* = -1\}} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_1^*} \left(\beta_b X_{\tau_1^*}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_1^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_1^* < \infty\}} \mathbb{I}_{\{u^* = 1\}} \right] \\ &= J_0(x_1, x_2, \tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, u^*). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} v_1 \left(X_{\tau_0^*}^1, X_{\tau_0^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_0^*}^2 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0^*}^1 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[-e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} \left(\beta_b X_{\tau_0^*}^1 - \beta_s X_{\tau_0^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right] \\ &= J_1(x_1, x_2, \tau_0^*), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{-1}(x_1, x_2) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} v_{-1} \left(X_{\tau_0^*}^1, X_{\tau_0^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\rho\tau_0^*} \left(\beta_s X_{\tau_0^*}^1 - \beta_b X_{\tau_0^*}^2 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_0^* < \infty\}} \right] \\
&= J_{-1}(x_1, x_2, \tau_0^*).
\end{aligned}$$

□

11. A NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

As in Section 6 above, we consider adjusted closing price data for Walmart (WMT) and Target (TGT) from 2010 to 2020. The first half of the data is used to calibrate the model, and the second half is used to test the results. Using a least-squares method, we obtain the following parameters: $\mu_1 = 0.09696$, $\mu_2 = 0.14347$, $\sigma_{11} = 0.19082$, $\sigma_{12} = 0.04036$, $\sigma_{21} = 0.04036$, and $\sigma_{22} = 0.13988$. We specify $K = 0.001$ and $\rho = 0.5$. Then we find $k_1^* = 0.85527$, and $k_2^* = 1.32175$.

Next we examine the dependence of k_1^* and k_2^* on the parameters by varying each. We see that k_1^* and k_2^* both decrease in μ_1 . This leads to a larger buying region, Γ_3 . On the other hand, both k_1^* and k_2^* increase in μ_2 . This creates a larger Γ_1 and, hence, encourages early exit. When varying σ_{11} and σ_{22} , we find that k_1^* decreases while k_2^* increases, in both σ_{11} and σ_{22} . This leads to a smaller buying zone, Γ_1 , due to the increased risk, as well as a smaller selling zone, Γ_3 , because there is more price movement overall. However, as $\sigma_{12} = \sigma_{21}$ increases, we find that k_1^* increases, while k_2^* decreases. The greater correlation leads to a larger Γ_1 , and hence more opportunity for buying, as well as a larger Γ_3 , and hence more opportunity for selling. Since r represents the rate at which money loses value over time, k_1^* increases in r , while k_2^* decreases in r , reflecting the fact that we are less likely to want to hold in this case. Finally, larger transaction costs discourage trading. Naturally, as K increases, k_1^* decreases and k_2^* increases.

μ_1	-0.00304	0.04696	0.09696	0.14696	0.19696
k_1^*	0.91380	0.89057	0.85527	0.80194	0.72644
k_2^*	1.54402	1.42682	1.32175	1.23477	1.17006

TABLE 8. k_1^* and k_2^* with varying μ_1

μ_2	0.04347	0.09347	0.14347	0.19347	0.24347
k_1^*	0.76457	0.81341	0.85527	0.88736	0.91037
k_2^*	1.15468	1.21883	1.32175	1.48176	1.72581

TABLE 9. k_1^* and k_2^* with varying μ_2

σ_{11}	0.09082	0.14082	0.19082	0.24082	0.29082
k_1^*	0.92069	0.89220	0.85527	0.81532	0.77497
k_2^*	1.22784	1.26704	1.32175	1.38652	1.45871

TABLE 10. k_1^* and k_2^* with varying σ_{11}

σ_{22}	0.03988	0.08988	0.13988	0.18988	0.23988
k_1^*	0.88356	0.87601	0.85527	0.82593	0.79206
k_2^*	1.27943	1.29045	1.32175	1.36871	1.42724

TABLE 11. k_1^* and k_2^* with varying σ_{22}

σ_{12}	-0.05964	-0.00964	0.04036	0.09036	0.14036
k_1^*	0.73242	0.79189	0.85527	0.92029	0.97527
k_2^*	1.54345	1.42754	1.32175	1.22837	1.15911

TABLE 12. k_1^* and k_2^* with varying $\sigma_{12} = \sigma_{21}$

r	0.4	0.45	0.5	0.55	0.6
k_1^*	0.84068	0.84858	0.85527	0.86105	0.86611
k_2^*	1.40518	1.35725	1.32175	1.29425	1.27222

TABLE 13. k_1^* and k_2^* with varying r

K	0.0000	0.0005	0.0010	0.0015	0.0020
k_1^*	0.85698	0.85613	0.85527	0.85442	0.85356
k_2^*	1.31911	1.32043	1.32175	1.32307	1.32439

TABLE 14. k_1^* and k_2^* with varying K

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Eloe, R.H. Liu, M. Yatsuki, G. Yin, and Q. Zhang, Optimal selling rules in a regime-switching exponential Gaussian diffusion model, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, **69**, 810-829, (2008).
- [2] Gatev, E., Goetzmann, W.N., Rouwenhorst, K.G., Pairs trading: performance of a relative-value arbitrage rule, *Revi. Finance. Stud.* **19**, 797-827, (2006).
- [3] Marsden, J. and Tromba, A.: *Vector Calculus*, 2nd edn. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York (1981).
- [4] Øksendal, B.: *Stochastic Differential Equations*, 6th edn. Springer-Verlag, New York (2003).
- [5] Tie, J., Zhang H., and Zhang Q.: An Optimal Strategy for Pairs Trading Under Geometric Brownian Motions, *Journal of Optimization Thoery and Applications.* **179**, 654 - 675 (2018)
- [6] Vidyamurthy, G., Pairs Trading: Quantitative Methods and Analysis, Wiley, Hoboken (2004)

(E. Crawford Das) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602, USA, EMILY.CRAWFORD@UGA.EDU

(J. Tie) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602, USA, JTIE@UGA.EDU

(Q. Zhang) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602, USA, QZ@UGA.EDU