



**HAL**  
open science

# On the joint survival probability of two collaborating firms

Stefan Ankirchner, Robert Hesse, Maike Klein

► **To cite this version:**

Stefan Ankirchner, Robert Hesse, Maike Klein. On the joint survival probability of two collaborating firms. 2022. hal-03769004

**HAL Id: hal-03769004**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03769004v1>**

Preprint submitted on 5 Sep 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# On the joint survival probability of two collaborating firms

Stefan Ankirchner <sup>\*</sup>      Robert Hesse <sup>†</sup>      Maike Klein <sup>‡</sup>

September 5, 2022

## Abstract

We consider the problem of controlling the drift and diffusion rate of the endowment processes of two firms such that the joint survival probability is maximized. We assume that the endowment processes are continuous diffusions, driven by independent Brownian motions, and that the aggregate endowment is a Brownian motion with constant drift and diffusion rate. Our results reveal that the maximal joint survival probability depends only on the aggregate risk-adjusted return and on the maximal risk-adjusted return that can be implemented in each firm. Here the risk-adjusted return is understood as the drift rate divided by the squared diffusion rate.

*2020 MSC* : Primary 49J20, 35R35, Secondary 91B70.

*Keywords* : Ruin probability, Survival probability, Optimal control, Collaboration, Two-dimensional Brownian motion.

## Introduction

Consider two insurance companies that aim at collaborating so as to maximize their joint survival probability, or equivalently, to minimize the probability that one of the two companies gets ruined. Assume that the two companies can commit themselves to help the other in case of financial distress. To assess the benefit of a collaboration Grandits [4] has set up a model where the endowment processes, also called surplus processes, of both companies are given by two independent Brownian motions with drift and the companies can collaborate by transfer payments. These payments are assumed to be absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and to be bounded in such a way that each company keeps a minimal positive drift rate.

The collaborations considered in [4] are assumed to have an impact only on the drift rates of the companies' endowment processes. There are types of collaboration, however, that also entail a change of the diffusion rates; think, e.g., of mutual reinsurance agreements or agreements to transfer high-risk subsidiaries. In this paper we address the question of how to quantify the maximal benefit if a collaboration has an impact also on the diffusion rate of both endowment processes.

To measure the benefit of collaboration we introduce a control problem, where an agent can continuously allocate a drift and diffusion rate to two diffusion processes representing the endowment processes of the two companies, respectively. The aggregate drift and diffusion rates are assumed to be constant and independent of the allocation plan. Moreover, we assume that the set of implementable drift rates is bounded, and the set of implementable diffusion rates is bounded and bounded away from zero. The agent aims at choosing an allocation plan that

---

<sup>\*</sup>Stefan Ankirchner, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Institute for Mathematics, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07743 Jena, Germany. *Email*: s.ankirchner@uni-jena.de.

<sup>†</sup>Robert Hesse, Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Institute for Mathematics, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07743 Jena, Germany. *Email*: robert.hesse@uni-jena.de.

<sup>‡</sup>Maike Klein, Kiel University, Institute of Mathematics, Heinrich-Hecht-Platz 6, 24118 Kiel, Germany. *Email*: maike.klein@math.uni-kiel.de.

maximizes the joint survival probability of both companies. One can think of the agent as a mediator between the companies suggesting a mutual help contract.

As in [4] the optimal control turns out to be of bang-bang type: it is optimal that the agent implements the highest possible risk-adjusted return, defined as the ratio of the drift rate and the volatility squared, in the endowment dynamics of the company behind. Besides, the formula for the value function reveals that the maximal joint survival probability only depends on the maximal implementable risk-adjusted return and on the risk-adjusted return of the aggregate endowment process. Our assumptions entail that the latter does not depend on the allocation strategy.

We solve the control problem via a classical verification technique. To this end we construct an explicit solution of the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation. We use that the optimal control can be characterized as a bang-bang feedback function jumping at the line bisecting the first quadrant, where the first quadrant is interpreted as the set of non-negative endowment pairs. Since the optimal control is of bang-bang type, the HJB is linear below the bisector and above the bisector. The boundary conditions and a smooth fit condition along the bisector leads to a specific solution of the HJB equation, which can be verified to coincide with the value function. We remark that our construction of the solution of the HJB equation and also the verification bears some similarities with the approach used in [4].

McKean and Shepp [8] and Grandits [4] both consider the problem of maximizing the joint survival probability of two firms whose endowment processes are given by independent Brownian motions with drift and which are allowed to collaborate by transfer payments. In [8] these transfer payments are at most as high as the drift rates whereas in [4] each company keeps a given positive minimal drift rate. In both cases the value function is derived and turns out to be a classical solution to the associated HJB equation. We emphasize that we allow for negative drift rates in our model. Grandits and Klein [5] extend the model of [4, 8] to endowment processes driven by Brownian motions that are *correlated*. In all three articles [4, 5, 8] the derived optimal strategy is of bang-bang type and implements the highest possible risk-adjusted return for the company behind.

In [9] Schmidli deals with maximizing the survival probability of one company by choosing an optimal dynamic proportional reinsurance strategy in the diffusion model. Also in this model the optimal strategy maximizes the risk-adjusted return among all admissible strategies.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we introduce our model and provide the value function and an optimal strategy. We explain how to derive the formula for the value function in Section 2. Finally, we prove our results in Section 3.

## 1 Model and main results

Let  $\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma} \in (0, \infty)$  with  $\underline{\sigma} \leq \bar{\sigma}$  and  $\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\underline{\mu} \leq \bar{\mu}$ . We define

$$M := \underline{\mu} + \bar{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma := \underline{\sigma} + \bar{\sigma}$$

and assume that

$$M > 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Let  $D$  be a measurable, non-empty subset of  $[\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}] \times [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$  such that

$$(\mu, \sigma) \in D \implies (M - \mu, \Sigma - \sigma) \in D. \tag{1.2}$$

We interpret an element  $(\mu, \sigma) \in D$  as an implementable pair of drift and diffusion rate for the endowment process of each company. The set of admissible controls consists of all measurable functions  $(\mu, \sigma) : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow D$  and is denoted by  $\mathcal{M}$ .

We denote the endowment processes of the two companies by  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$  and  $Y = (Y_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ , respectively. Given a control  $(\mu, \sigma)$ , we assume that the dynamics of the pair  $(X, Y)$  satisfy the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= \mu(X_t, Y_t) dt + \sqrt{\sigma(X_t, Y_t)} dW_t^1, & X_0 &= x, \\ dY_t &= (M - \mu(X_t, Y_t)) dt + \sqrt{\Sigma - \sigma(X_t, Y_t)} dW_t^2, & Y_0 &= y, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where  $W = (W^1, W^2)$  denotes a two-dimensional Brownian motion and  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . For every  $(\mu, \sigma) \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  there exists a weak solution of (1.3) satisfying the initial condition  $(X_0, Y_0) = (x, y)$ , and we have uniqueness in law for (1.3) (see [7]). Recall that a weak solution of (1.3) consists of a tuple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}, \mathbb{P}, W, X, Y)$ , where the first 4 components build a filtered probability space,  $W$  is a two-dimensional Brownian motion with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)$  and the processes  $X, Y, W$  satisfy the SDE (1.3) (see, e.g., Section 5.3 in [6]).

Now let  $x, y \in [0, \infty)$  and  $(\mu, \sigma) \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}, \mathbb{P}, W, X, Y)$  be a weak solution of (1.3) with initial condition  $(X_0, Y_0) = (x, y)$ . The probability that both companies survive is given by

$$J(x, y, \mu, \sigma) := \mathbb{P} \left[ \inf_{t \in [0, \infty)} X_t \geq 0, \inf_{t \in [0, \infty)} Y_t \geq 0 \right]. \quad (1.4)$$

We refer to  $J(x, y, \mu, \sigma)$  as the *joint survival probability* of both companies, given initial endowments  $(x, y)$  and a collaboration control  $(\mu, \sigma)$ . The maximal joint survival probability for an initial endowment  $(x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2$  is given by

$$V(x, y) := \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in \mathcal{M}} J(x, y, \mu, \sigma). \quad (1.5)$$

We now comment on the model assumptions. Notice that we allow for Markov controls only. The time homogeneous dynamics (1.3) entails that there exists an optimal control that is a Markov control. To simplify the outline of the model we restrict the control set to Markov controls upfront.

Notice that the volatilities of both processes  $X$  and  $Y$  are bounded away from zero. Hence, the probability in (1.4) does not change if we replace  $\geq$  by the strict inequality symbol  $>$ .

The Assumption (1.1) means that the drift rate of the aggregate endowment process  $X + Y$  is positive. If  $M$  is non-positive, then with probability one the aggregate process hits zero. This further implies that at least one of the two companies gets ruined, and hence the value function (1.5) is constant equal to zero. Thus, the only interesting case is where (1.1) is satisfied.

The Condition (1.2) means that the set of implementable drift and diffusion rate pairs coincide for both companies. The symmetry of  $D$  facilitates the search for the optimal strategy and a closed form formula of the value function that turns out to be symmetric around the line bisecting the first quadrant.

It turns out that the maximal joint survival probability essentially depends only on the two ratios

$$L := L(D) = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \frac{\mu}{\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad S := \frac{\underline{\mu} + \bar{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma} + \bar{\sigma}} = \frac{M}{\Sigma}.$$

Notice that  $L \leq \frac{\bar{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} < \infty$ , because  $D \subseteq [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}] \times [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$ .

Our main result is as follows.

**Theorem 1.1.** *The value function of the optimal control problem (1.5) is given by*

$$V(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 - e^{-2L \min\{x, y\}} - 2L \min\{x, y\} e^{-L(x+y)}, & L = 2S, \\ 1 - e^{-2L \min\{x, y\}} - \frac{L}{L-2S} e^{-2S(x+y)} \left( 1 - e^{-2(L-2S) \min\{x, y\}} \right), & L \neq 2S. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

If  $L$  is attained in  $D$ , say by  $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$ , then an optimal control is given by

$$(\mu^*(x, y), \sigma^*(x, y)) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq y\}}(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma}) + \mathbb{1}_{\{x > y\}}(M - \hat{\mu}, \Sigma - \hat{\sigma}). \quad (1.7)$$

**Remark 1.2.** The value function  $V$  only depends on the ratios  $L$  – the maximal implementable risk-adjusted return – and  $S$  – the risk-adjusted return of the aggregate endowment process. Moreover, one can show that the value function  $V$  is continuous and strictly increasing in  $L$  and  $S$ .

**Remark 1.3.** Observe that we can change the definition of the optimal control  $(\mu^*, \sigma^*)$  on the set  $\{x = y\}$  and obtain indistinguishable processes  $(X_t^*, Y_t^*)$ ,  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , because with probability one the set  $\{t \in [0, \infty) : X_t^* - Y_t^* = 0\}$  has Lebesgue measure zero, for details see Appendix C in [2].

Since we have an explicit formula for the value function, we can quantify the gain of collaboration. To this end, we assume that in the case of no collaboration both endowment processes have a constant drift rate of  $\frac{M}{2}$  and a constant diffusion rate of  $\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma}{2}}$ .

The probability for a Brownian motion with drift rate  $\frac{M}{2}$  and diffusion rate  $\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma}{2}}$  and starting in  $z \in (0, \infty)$  to hit zero is given by  $e^{-2Sz}$  (see, e.g., [1, Chapter V.5, Equation (5.6)]). Thus, in case of no collaboration the joint survival probability is given by

$$V_{nc}(x, y) = (1 - e^{-2Sx})(1 - e^{-2Sy}). \quad (1.8)$$

Notice that (1.8) follows also from (1.6) by restricting  $D$  to the set containing only the element  $(\frac{M}{2}, \frac{\Sigma}{2})$ .

In order to quantify the gain of collaboration we introduce

$$R(x, y) := \frac{V(x, y)}{V_{nc}(x, y)}, \quad x, y > 0.$$

Note that  $R$  is the relative increase of the maximal joint survival probability due to a collaboration.

**Corollary 1.4.**  $R$  is non-increasing in both  $x$  and  $y$ ,

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} R(x, y) = \frac{L}{S}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} R(x, y) = \frac{1 - e^{-2Ly}}{1 - e^{-2Sy}}.$$

Moreover, for every  $a > 0$  we have

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} R(x, ax) = \frac{L}{S} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} R(x, ax) = 1.$$

**Remark 1.5.** For a set  $D$  of implementable drift and diffusion rate satisfying (1.2) and  $L > S$  the relative increase of the maximal joint survival probability also only depends on  $L$  and  $S$ . Corollary 1.4 implies that a risk transfer is of particular interest if one company is (or both companies are) close to ruin.

**Remark 1.6.** Observe that  $L = L(D) \geq S > 0$ . Moreover, we have  $L > S$  if and only if there exists  $(\mu, \sigma) \in D$  with  $\frac{\mu}{\sigma} \neq S$ . To show the claim we distinguish three cases.

- If  $D$  contains an element  $(\mu, \sigma)$  with  $\frac{\mu}{\sigma} > S$ , then also  $L = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \frac{\mu}{\sigma} > S$ .
- If there exists  $(\mu, \sigma) \in D$  with  $\frac{\mu}{\sigma} < S$ , then  $(M - \mu, \Sigma - \sigma) \in D$  by Assumption (1.2) and  $S = \frac{M}{\Sigma} < \frac{M - \mu}{\Sigma - \sigma} \leq L$ .
- Finally, if  $\frac{\mu}{\sigma} = S$  for all  $(\mu, \sigma) \in D$ , then  $L = S$  holds true.

## 2 Deriving the value function

In this section we explain how one can derive a solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation associated to (1.5) and, thus, obtain a candidate for the value function  $V$ . Our approach is based on [4], where a ruin problem for two independent Brownian motions with controllable drift is considered. In our setting this corresponds to  $\underline{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} = 1$  and  $\underline{\mu} > 0$ .

First observe that the HJB equation associated to (1.5) is given by

$$\sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \left\{ \frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v + \frac{\Sigma - \sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v + \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + (M - \mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v \right\} = 0, \quad \text{on } (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \quad (2.1)$$

with boundary conditions

$$v(x, 0) = v(0, y) = 0, \quad x, y \in [0, \infty), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} v(x, y) = 1 - e^{-2Lx}, \quad x \in [0, \infty), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} v(x, y) = 1 - e^{-2Ly}, \quad y \in [0, \infty). \quad (2.4)$$

We now comment on these boundary conditions for the HJB Equation (2.1). Condition (2.2) is due to the fact that if one endowment process is already zero, then the joint survival probability equals zero. If the endowment process of one company attains infinity, then this process is assumed to survive forever. The process behind obtains the highest possible risk-adjusted return to maximize its survival probability, which is given by the right-hand side of Equation (2.3) or (2.4), respectively (see, e.g., [1, Chapter V.5, Equation (5.6)]).

We first consider the case where the set of implementable drift and diffusion rate is given by the rectangle  $D = [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}] \times [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$ . In this case  $L = \frac{\bar{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma}}$ . Moreover, the supremum over  $D$  in (2.1) can be separated and the HJB equation is given by

$$\sup_{\sigma \in [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]} \left\{ \frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v + \frac{\Sigma - \sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v \right\} + \sup_{\mu \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]} \left\{ \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + (M - \mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v \right\} = 0, \quad \text{on } (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty). \quad (2.5)$$

Note that in the HJB Equation (2.5) we maximize a linear function in  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$ , respectively, over a compact interval. Hence, each supremum is attained at the boundary of the corresponding interval. More precisely,

$$\sup_{\sigma \in [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]} \left\{ \frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v + \frac{\Sigma - \sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v \right\} (x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v(x, y) + \frac{\underline{\sigma}}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v(x, y), & \text{if } \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v(x, y) \geq \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v(x, y), \\ \frac{\underline{\sigma}}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v(x, y) + \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v(x, y), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sup_{\mu \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]} \left\{ \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + (M - \mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v \right\} (x, y) = \begin{cases} \bar{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(x, y) + \underline{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(x, y), & \text{if } \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(x, y) \geq \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(x, y), \\ \underline{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(x, y) + \bar{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(x, y), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the following we make several assumptions on the solution  $v$  of the HJB equation. After obtaining the explicit formula given on the right-hand side of (1.6) we can check that all the assumptions are satisfied. Finally, one has to verify that  $v$  is indeed the value function of our problem (1.5).

We assume that  $v$  is a classical solution of the HJB Equation (2.5), i.e.  $v \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$  with boundary conditions (2.2), (2.3), and (2.4). Since our control problem (1.5) is symmetric in the initial values of the endowment processes, every candidate  $v$  for the value function should satisfy  $v(x, y) = v(y, x)$ . Due to this symmetry and the monotonicity of the maximization problem (1.5) we impose that

$$\left\{ (x, y) : \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(x, y) > \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(x, y) \right\} = \left\{ (x, y) : \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v(x, y) < \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v(x, y) \right\} = \{(x, y) : x < y\}$$

and

$$\left\{ (x, y) : \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(x, y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(x, y) \right\} = \left\{ (x, y) : \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v(x, y) \right\} = \{(x, y) : x = y\}.$$

Observe that this implies that the smaller endowment process is assigned the lowest possible volatility and the highest possible drift rate to minimize the risk that this firm is ruined. In other words, the agent chooses the maximal implementable risk-adjusted return for the company behind.

Using  $v(x, y) = v(y, x)$ , we only focus on the set

$$G = \{(x, y) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) : x \leq y\}.$$

In the interior of  $G$  it holds - under our assumptions - that  $v$  has to satisfy

$$\frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v + \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v + \bar{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + \underline{\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} v(0, y) &= 0, \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} v(x, y) &= 1 - e^{-2Lx}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(t, t) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(t, t), \quad t \in (0, \infty), \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v(t, t) &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v(t, t), \quad t \in (0, \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

We make the ansatz

$$v(x, y) = 1 - e^{-2Lx} + f(x)g(y), \quad (x, y) \in G.$$

The function  $(x, y) \mapsto f(x)g(y)$  fulfills (2.6) in the interior of  $G$ . More precisely,

$$\frac{\sigma}{2} f''(x)g(y) + \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} f(x)g''(y) + \bar{\mu} f'(x)g(y) + \underline{\mu} f(x)g'(y) = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

with

$$f(0)g(y) = 0, \quad y \in [0, \infty), \quad (2.9)$$

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} f(x)g(y) = 0, \quad x \in [0, \infty), \quad (2.10)$$

$$f(t)g'(t) - f'(t)g(t) = 2Le^{-2Lt}, \quad t \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.11)$$

Note that we do not impose an additional assumption on  $(x, y) \mapsto f(x)g(y)$  to guarantee (2.7) because it turns out that the solution that we construct for (2.8) satisfying (2.9), (2.10), and (2.11) directly implies that Condition (2.7) for  $v$  is fulfilled, see (2.18) below.

Provided that  $f(x)g(y) \neq 0$  for all  $(x, y)$  in the interior of  $G$ , Equation (2.8) can be reformulated as

$$\left(\frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{f''}{f} + \bar{\mu} \frac{f'}{f}\right)(x) + \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \frac{g''}{g} + \underline{\mu} \frac{g'}{g}\right)(y) = 0.$$

The previous equation can only hold true for all  $(x, y)$  in the interior of  $G$  if

$$\left(\frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{f''}{f} + \bar{\mu} \frac{f'}{f}\right)(x) = \lambda, \quad (2.12)$$

$$\left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2} \frac{g''}{g} + \underline{\mu} \frac{g'}{g}\right)(y) = -\lambda \quad (2.13)$$

for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

First we consider the case  $\boxed{L \neq 2S}$ . This case is a bit more involved than the case  $L = 2S$ . We assume that  $\lambda \in \left(-\frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2\sigma}, \frac{\underline{\mu}^2}{2\bar{\sigma}}\right)$  which guarantees real-valued solutions to (2.12) and (2.13). Later on we have to choose  $\lambda$  in an appropriate way such that the boundary condition (2.11) is fulfilled. By Theorem 1 and Theorem 5 in [3, Chapter 2] we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= C_1 \exp((-L + \vartheta_1)x) + C_2 \exp((-L - \vartheta_1)x), \\ g(y) &= C_3 \exp\left(\left(-\frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} + \vartheta_2\right)y\right) + C_4 \exp\left(\left(-\frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} - \vartheta_2\right)y\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some  $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ , where

$$\vartheta_1 = \vartheta_1(\lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\mu}^2 + 2\sigma\lambda}}{\sigma}, \quad \vartheta_2 = \vartheta_2(\lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{\underline{\mu}^2 - 2\bar{\sigma}\lambda}}{\bar{\sigma}}.$$

From (2.9) we conclude that  $f(0) = 0$  and hence,  $C_2 = -C_1$ . Since we are only interested in the product  $f(x)g(y)$ , we can assume that  $C_1 = 1$  without loss of generality. Note that for  $\lambda \in \left(-\frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2\sigma}, 0\right]$  Condition (2.10) yields  $C_3 = 0$ . Unfortunately, for  $\lambda \in \left(0, \frac{\underline{\mu}^2}{2\bar{\sigma}}\right)$  this does not hold true. Nevertheless, we set  $C_3 = 0$  and hope to obtain a solution. In addition, Condition (2.11) on the diagonal results in

$$\begin{aligned} 2L \exp(-2Lt) &= C_4 \left[L - \vartheta_1 - \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} - \vartheta_2\right] \exp\left(\left(-L + \vartheta_1 - \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} - \vartheta_2\right)t\right) \\ &\quad + C_4 \left[-L - \vartheta_1 + \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} + \vartheta_2\right] \exp\left(\left(-L - \vartheta_1 - \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} - \vartheta_2\right)t\right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

which has to be satisfied for all  $t \in (0, \infty)$ . Therefore, it is necessary that the exponent of one summand coincides with  $-2Lt$ . This directly implies that the coefficient of the other summand vanishes. More precisely, we determine  $\lambda$  such that

$$L - \vartheta_1 + \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} + \vartheta_2 = 2L \quad (2.15)$$

or

$$L + \vartheta_1 + \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} + \vartheta_2 = 2L. \quad (2.16)$$

Some standard but lengthy computations show that  $\lambda^* = -2S \frac{\bar{\mu}\bar{\sigma} - \underline{\mu}\sigma}{\sigma + \bar{\sigma}}$  is the unique  $\lambda \in \left(-\frac{\bar{\mu}^2}{2\sigma}, \frac{\underline{\mu}^2}{2\bar{\sigma}}\right)$  satisfying either (2.15) or (2.16). More precisely, if  $L < 2S$  then (2.15) holds; and (2.16) is fulfilled if  $L > 2S$ .



For  $\lambda = \lambda^*$  and  $L < 2S$  Equation (2.14) is given by

$$2L \exp(-2Lt) = 2C_4 [L - 2S] \exp(-2Lt).$$

Thus,

$$C_4 = \frac{L}{L - 2S}.$$

Similarly, for  $L > 2S$  we conclude that

$$C_4 = -\frac{L}{L - 2S}.$$

To sum up, we have

$$f(x)g(y) = \frac{L}{L - 2S} e^{-2Sy} \left( e^{2(S-L)x} - e^{-2Sx} \right) = -\frac{L}{L - 2S} e^{-2S(x+y)} \left( 1 - e^{-2(L-2S)x} \right). \quad (2.17)$$

Now we use the symmetry of our problem and obtain  $v$  on  $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$  by just mirroring  $1 - e^{-2Lx} + f(x)g(y)$ , where  $(x, y) \mapsto f(x)g(y)$  is given by (2.17), at the line bisecting the first quadrant which yields that  $v$  is given by the right-hand side of (1.6).

It remains to check that the assumptions made on  $v$  are satisfied. Indeed, it holds that  $f(x)g(y) \neq 0$  for all  $x, y \in (0, \infty)$ , the function given on the right-hand side of (1.6) is  $C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(x, y) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(x, y) &= \begin{cases} 2L e^{-2Lx} \left( 1 - e^{-2S(y-x)} \right), & x \leq y, \\ -2L e^{-2Ly} \left( 1 - e^{-2S(x-y)} \right), & x > y, \end{cases} \\ & \begin{cases} > 0, & x < y, \\ = 0, & x = y, \\ < 0, & x > y, \end{cases} \\ \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v(x, y) - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v(x, y) &= \begin{cases} -4L^2 e^{-2Lx} \left( 1 - e^{-2S(y-x)} \right), & x \leq y, \\ 4L^2 e^{-2Ly} \left( 1 - e^{-2S(x-y)} \right), & x > y, \end{cases} \\ & \begin{cases} < 0, & x < y, \\ = 0, & x = y, \\ > 0, & x > y. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Hence, all assumptions made on  $v$  are satisfied.

For the case  $\boxed{L = 2S}$  we also use  $\lambda^* = -2S \frac{\bar{\mu}\bar{\sigma} - \mu\sigma}{\sigma + \bar{\sigma}}$  which in this case simplifies to  $\lambda^* = -S\bar{\mu}$ . Then, the solutions of (2.12) and (2.13) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= (C_1 + C_2 x) \exp(-Lx), \\ g(y) &= C_3 \exp\left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{\bar{\sigma}} y\right) + C_4 \exp(-Ly) \end{aligned}$$

for some constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ , again see Theorem 1 and 5 in [3, Chapter 2]. Using (2.9) we conclude that  $C_1 = 0$  and (2.10) implies that  $C_3 = 0$ . Thus,

$$f(x)g(y) = C_2 C_4 x \exp(-L(x+y)).$$

Using (2.11) results in  $C_2 C_4 = -2L$  and mirroring at the line bisecting the first quadrant yields

$$v(x, y) = 1 - e^{-2L \min\{x, y\}} - 2L \min\{x, y\} e^{-L(x+y)}. \quad (2.19)$$

Finally, one can check that the function in (2.19) satisfies all our assumptions made on  $v$ .

In the next step we explain how to obtain a solution of the HJB equation (2.1) if  $D$  is a proper subset of  $[\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}] \times [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$ . As a candidate  $v$  for the value function we choose the function on the right-hand side of (1.6) which we derived in the case where  $D$  is a rectangle and adjust the maximal risk-adjusted return  $L$  to  $L = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \frac{\mu}{\sigma}$ . Recall that the risk-adjusted return of the aggregate endowment process equals  $S$  and does not have to be changed. Now we want to show that our candidate solves the HJB Equation (2.1). To this end, observe that for  $(\mu, \sigma) \in D$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v + \frac{\Sigma - \sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v + \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + (M - \mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v \right) (x, y) \\ &= \begin{cases} -2\sigma L e^{-2Lx} \left(1 - e^{-2S(y-x)}\right) \left[L - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right], & x \leq y, \\ -2(\Sigma - \sigma) L e^{-2Ly} \left(1 - e^{-2S(x-y)}\right) \left[L - \frac{M - \mu}{\Sigma - \sigma}\right], & x > y. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Since  $D$  satisfies (1.2), we have

$$L = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \frac{\mu}{\sigma} = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \frac{M - \mu}{\Sigma - \sigma}.$$

Hence, for all  $x, y \in (0, \infty)$

$$\sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \left\{ \frac{\sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v + \frac{\Sigma - \sigma}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v + \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + (M - \mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v \right\} (x, y) \leq 0.$$

For simplicity we assume that  $L$  is attained in  $D$ , say by  $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$ . Then  $L = \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\hat{\sigma}}$  and (2.20) equals zero for  $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\sigma})$  if  $x < y$ . If  $x > y$  then (2.20) is zero for  $(M - \hat{\mu}, \Sigma - \hat{\sigma})$ . Therefore, the HJB Equation (2.1) is fulfilled and  $v$  is a candidate for our value function.

Now it remains to verify that the right-hand side of (1.6) is indeed the value function of the optimal control problem (1.5), i.e. to prove Theorem 1.1.

### 3 Proofs

First, we prove our main result, Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Denote by  $v$  the function given by the right-hand side of (1.6). We first show that  $v$  is an upper bound for the joint survival probability. For this purpose let  $(\mu, \sigma) \in \mathcal{M}$  be an arbitrary admissible control for the drift and diffusion rate. Denote the ruin time of the controlled process  $(X_t, Y_t) = (X_t^{x, \mu, \sigma}, Y_t^{y, \mu, \sigma})$  by

$$\tau = \inf \{t \in [0, \infty): X_t \leq 0 \text{ or } Y_t \leq 0\}.$$

Using that  $v \in C^2((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty))$  Itô's Formula implies

$$\begin{aligned} v(X_t, Y_t) &= v(x, y) + \int_0^t \sqrt{\sigma(X_s, Y_s)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v(X_s, Y_s) dW_s^1 + \int_0^t \sqrt{\Sigma - \sigma(X_s, Y_s)} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v(X_s, Y_s) dW_s^2 \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sigma \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} v + \frac{1}{2} (\Sigma - \sigma) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} v + \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + (M - \mu) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} v \right\} (X_s, Y_s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Since  $v$  solves the HJB Equation (2.1), the drift part in (3.1) is non-positive. Hence,  $(v(X_t, Y_t))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$  and, thus,  $(v(X_{t \wedge \tau}, Y_{t \wedge \tau}))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$  are local supermartingales. Moreover, since  $v$  is bounded,  $(v(X_{t \wedge \tau}, Y_{t \wedge \tau}))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$  is a uniformly integrable supermartingale. Therefore, the supermartingale convergence theorem yields that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(X_{t \wedge \tau}, Y_{t \wedge \tau})$$

exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. By dominated convergence we conclude that

$$v(x, y) \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [v(X_{t \wedge \tau}, Y_{t \wedge \tau})] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < \infty\}} v(X_\tau, Y_\tau) + \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau = \infty\}} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(X_t, Y_t) \right]. \quad (3.2)$$

On  $\{\tau < \infty\}$  the boundary conditions (2.2) imply that  $v(X_\tau, Y_\tau) = 0$ . We claim that on  $\{\tau = \infty\}$  we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(X_t, Y_t) = 1$ .

In order to show this first observe that

$$(X + Y)_t = x + y + Mt + \sqrt{\Sigma} W_t, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $W$  is a Brownian motion. Thus, we know that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (X + Y)_t = \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Moreover, the supermartingale convergence theorem guarantees that on  $\{\tau = \infty\}$  we have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(X_t, Y_t)$$

exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Combining this with the particular form of  $v$  yields that on  $\{\tau = \infty\}$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-2L \min\{X_t, Y_t\}}$$

exists and so  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min\{X_t, Y_t\} \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  does  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. We now show that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min\{X_t, Y_t\} < \infty \right] = 0.$$

By (3.3) and the identity

$$2 \min\{X_t, Y_t\} = X_t + Y_t - |X_t - Y_t|$$

it follows that on  $\{\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min\{X_t, Y_t\} < \infty\}$  it holds that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |X_t - Y_t| = \infty$  and, hence, the paths of  $X$  and  $Y$  do not intersect infinitely often. Since the paths are continuous, either  $X_t$  or  $Y_t$  converges for  $t \rightarrow \infty$  on  $\{\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min\{X_t, Y_t\} < \infty\}$ . Thus, we have

$$\left\{ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min\{X_t, Y_t\} < \infty \right\} = \left\{ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t < \infty \right\} \cup \left\{ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t < \infty \right\}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Now, to show that  $\mathbb{P} [\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t < \infty] = 0$  recall that

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t \mu(X_s, Y_s) ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{\sigma(X_s, Y_s)} dW_s^1.$$

Let  $A(t) := \int_0^t \sigma(X_s, Y_s) ds$ . Notice that  $A(t)$  is strictly increasing, hence, we can introduce the time-changed process

$$\tilde{X}_t := X_{A^{-1}(t)} = x + \int_0^{A^{-1}(t)} \mu(X_s, Y_s) ds + \int_0^{A^{-1}(t)} \sqrt{\sigma(X_s, Y_s)} dW_s^1.$$

Note that  $B_t := \int_0^{A^{-1}(t)} \sqrt{\sigma(X_s, Y_s)} dW_s^1$ ,  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , is a Brownian motion since

$$\langle B, B \rangle_t = \int_0^{A^{-1}(t)} \sigma(X_s, Y_s) ds = A(A^{-1}(t)) = t.$$

Further, a simple substitution in the deterministic integral yields

$$\tilde{X}_t = x + \int_0^{A^{-1}(t)} \mu(X_s, Y_s) ds + B_t = x + \int_0^t \frac{\mu}{\sigma}(X_s, Y_s) ds + B_t.$$

We know that  $\frac{\mu}{\sigma}(X_s, Y_s) \leq L$  for all  $s$  by the definition of  $L$ . For the Brownian motion  $B$  it is well known that

$$\mathbb{P}[\{B_{n+1} - B_n < -L - 1\} \text{ infinitely often}] = 1.$$

This directly implies

$$\mathbb{P}[\{\tilde{X}_{n+1} - \tilde{X}_n < -1\} \text{ infinitely often}] = 1.$$

Consequently,  $\mathbb{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_t < \infty] = 0$ . Moreover,  $\underline{\sigma} > 0$  yields  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} A(t) = \infty$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t < \infty] = \mathbb{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_t < \infty] = 0.$$

Similarly, one can show that  $Y$  does not converge with probability one. Hence, we see that  $\mathbb{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min\{X_t, Y_t\} < \infty] = 0$ . Therefore, it follows that on  $\{\tau = \infty\}$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min\{X_t, Y_t\} = \infty] = 1$$

and the particular form of  $v$  implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(X_t, Y_t) = 1] = 1. \quad (3.4)$$

Thus, plugging (3.4) into (3.2) we see

$$v(x, y) \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau = \infty\}}] = \mathbb{P}[\tau = \infty] = J(x, y, \mu, \sigma) \quad (3.5)$$

and hence,  $v \geq V$ .

Now assume that  $L$  is attained in  $D$ . Then the strategy  $(\mu^*, \sigma^*)$  given in (1.7) is admissible, for  $(\mu^*, \sigma^*)$  the drift rate in (3.1) vanishes and thus, the process  $(v(X_{t \wedge \tau}, Y_{t \wedge \tau}))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$  is a uniformly integrable martingale. Hence, equality holds in (3.5) which implies that  $v$  is the value function of the optimal control problem (1.5) and  $(\mu^*, \sigma^*)$  is an optimal control.

So far we have shown that the value function  $V$  is given by the right-hand side of (1.6) if  $L$  is attained in  $D$ . Now we consider the case where  $L$  is not attained in  $D$ , i.e.  $\arg \max_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \frac{\mu}{\sigma} = \emptyset$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(\mu_n, \sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq D$  with  $L_n := \frac{\mu_n}{\sigma_n} \nearrow L$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that  $L_n \geq S$  (see Remark 1.6) and that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n &= \tilde{\mu} \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}], \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n &= \tilde{\sigma} \in [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}], \end{aligned}$$

because  $D \subseteq [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}] \times [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$ . In particular, we have  $\frac{\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} = L$ . Let  $\tilde{D} = D \cup \{(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}), (M - \tilde{\mu}, \Sigma - \tilde{\sigma})\}$ . Then  $\tilde{D} \subseteq [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}] \times [\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}]$ ,  $\tilde{D}$  satisfies (1.2) and

$$L(\tilde{D}) = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in \tilde{D}} \frac{\mu}{\sigma} = \max \left\{ \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D} \frac{\mu}{\sigma}, \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}}, \frac{M - \tilde{\mu}}{\Sigma - \tilde{\sigma}} \right\} = \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} = L,$$

where we use that  $L \geq S = \frac{M}{\Sigma}$  by Remark 1.6 and thus,  $\frac{M - \tilde{\mu}}{\Sigma - \tilde{\sigma}} \leq S \leq L$ . In particular,  $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) \in \arg \max_{(\mu, \sigma) \in \tilde{D}} \frac{\mu}{\sigma}$ . Hence, the value function  $V^{L(\tilde{D})}$  for maximizing the joint survival probability over controls taking values in  $\tilde{D}$  is given by (1.6) with  $L(\tilde{D}) = L$ . Moreover,  $V \leq V^{L(\tilde{D})} = V^L$ .

To derive a lower bound for  $V$  let

$$D_n = \{(\mu_n, \sigma_n), (M - \mu_n, \Sigma - \sigma_n)\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By definition  $D_n$  satisfies (1.2). Since  $(\mu_n, \sigma_n) \in D$ , it holds that  $D_n \subseteq D$ . Moreover,

$$L(D_n) = \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D_n} \frac{\mu}{\sigma} = \max \left\{ \frac{\mu_n}{\sigma_n}, \frac{M - \mu_n}{\Sigma - \sigma_n} \right\} = L_n,$$

since  $\frac{\mu_n}{\sigma_n} = L_n \geq S$  and therefore,  $\frac{M - \mu_n}{\Sigma - \sigma_n} \leq S \leq L_n$ . In particular,  $(\mu_n, \sigma_n) \in \arg \max_{(\mu, \sigma) \in D_n} \frac{\mu}{\sigma}$ . Hence, the value function  $V^{L_n}$  of (1.5) for controls taking values in  $D_n$  is given by (1.6) and  $V^{L_n} \leq V$ . Since the function on the right-hand side of (1.6) is continuous in the parameter  $L$ , we conclude that for all  $x, y \in [0, \infty)$

$$V^L(x, y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V^{L_n} \leq V(x, y) \leq V^L(x, y).$$

Therefore, also in this case the value function is given by (1.6). □

Finally, we prove Corollary 1.4.

*Proof of Corollary 1.4.* We only show that  $R$  is non-increasing. The other results follow by straightforward calculations.

Since  $R$  is symmetric, we only need to consider the part of the domain where  $x \leq y$ . Moreover, we only consider the case  $L > 2S$ . The cases  $L < 2S$  and  $L = 2S$  can be shown similarly.

One can show that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} R$  is non-positive if and only if

$$e^{2Sx} L(L - 2S) + e^{2Lx} LS - e^{4Sx} L(L - S) + e^{2Sy}(L - 2S) [e^{2Sx} L - e^{2Lx} S - (L - S)] \leq 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Since  $L \geq S$ , one can show by using convexity that  $e^{2Sx} L - e^{2Lx} S - (L - S) \leq 0$ . Thus, the left-hand side of (3.6) is non-increasing in  $y$ . Hence, (3.6) is fulfilled for all  $y \geq x$  if and only if it is fulfilled for  $y = x$ . Thus, we need to verify that

$$S \left[ L(e^{2Lx} - e^{4Sx}) - (L - 2S) \left( e^{2(L+S)x} - e^{2Sx} \right) \right] \leq 0. \quad (3.7)$$

The Inequality (3.7) is satisfied if and only if the term in the rectangular bracket on the left-hand side is non-positive, which is equivalent to

$$\frac{e^{2Lx} - e^{4Sx}}{L - 2S} \leq \frac{e^{2(L+S)x} - e^{2Sx}}{L},$$

and hence, equivalent to

$$\frac{\sinh((L - 2S)x)}{(L - 2S)x} \leq \frac{\sinh(Lx)}{Lx}. \quad (3.8)$$

(3.8) holds true, because  $z \mapsto \frac{\sinh(z)}{z}$  is strictly increasing for  $z \geq 0$ . To sum up, we have shown that (3.6) is satisfied and thus,  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} R$  is non-positive.

The partial derivative  $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} R$  can be shown to be non-positive if and only if

$$L(e^{2Lx} - e^{4Sx}) - (L - 2S)(e^{2(L+S)x} - e^{2Sx}) \leq 0.$$

The left-hand side coincides with the bracket terms of (3.7) and thus, is non-positive. □

## References

- [1] S. Asmussen and H. Albrecher. *Ruin Probabilities*, volume 14 of *Advanced Series on Statistical Science & Applied Probability*. World Scientific Publishing, Hackensack, NJ, second edition, 2010.
- [2] V. E. Beneš. Full “bang” to reduce predicted miss is optimal. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 14(1):62–84, 1976.
- [3] E. A. Coddington. *An Introduction to Ordinary Differential Equations*. Prentice-Hall Mathematics Series. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961.
- [4] P. Grandits. On the gain of collaboration in a two dimensional ruin problem. *Eur. Actuar. J.*, 9(2):635–644, 2019.
- [5] P. Grandits and M. Klein. Ruin probability in a two-dimensional model with correlated Brownian motions. *Scand. Actuar. J.*, 2021(5):362–379, 2021.
- [6] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
- [7] N. V. Krylov. On Ito’s Stochastic Integral Equations. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 14(2):330–336, 1969.
- [8] H. P. McKean and L. A. Shepp. The advantage of capitalism vs. socialism depends on the criterion. *J. Math. Sci.*, 139(3):6589–6594, 2006.
- [9] H. Schmidli. Optimal proportional reinsurance policies in a dynamic setting. *Scand. Actuar. J.*, 2001(1):55–68, 2001.