

SFB 649 Discussion Paper 2006-059

Discounted Optimal Stopping for Maxima of some Jump-Diffusion Processes

Pavel V. Gapeev*



* Weierstrass Institute for Applied Analysis and Stochastics,
Berlin, Germany
and
Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Control Sciences,
Moscow, Russia

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".

<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>
ISSN 1860-5664

SFB 649, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin



SFB 649 ECONOMIC RISK BERLIN

Discounted optimal stopping for maxima of some jump-diffusion processes*

Pavel V. Gapeev

We present solutions to some discounted optimal stopping problems for the maximum process in a model driven by a Brownian motion and a compound Poisson process with exponential jumps. The method of proof is based on reducing the initial problems to integro-differential free-boundary problems where the normal reflection and smooth fit may break down and the latter then be replaced by the continuous fit. The results can be interpreted as pricing perpetual American lookback options with fixed and floating strikes in a jump-diffusion model.

1. Introduction

The main aim of this paper is to present solutions to the discounted optimal stopping problems (2.4) and (5.1) for the maximum associated with the process X defined in (2.1) that solves the stochastic differential equation (2.2) driven by a Brownian motion and a compound Poisson process with exponentially distributed jumps. These problems are related to the option pricing theory in mathematical finance, where the process X can describe the price of a risky asset (e.g., a stock) on a financial market. In that case the values (2.4) and (5.1) can be formally interpreted as *fair prices* of *perpetual lookback options* of American type with *fixed* and *floating strikes* in a jump-diffusion market model, respectively. For a continuous model the problems (2.4) and (5.1) were solved by Pedersen [21], Guo and Shepp [13], and Beibel and Lerche [4].

Observe that when $K = 0$ the problems (2.4) and (5.1) turn into the classical Russian option problem introduced and explicitly solved by Shepp and Shiryaev [30] by means of reducing the initial problem to an optimal stopping problem for a (continuous) two-dimensional Markov process and solving the latter problem using the smooth-fit and normal-reflection conditions. It was further observed in [31] that the change-of-measure theorem allows to reduce the Russian option problem to a one-dimensional optimal stopping problem that explained the simplicity of the solution in [30]. Building on the optimal stopping analysis of Shepp and Shiryaev [30]-[31], Duffie and Harrison [7] derived a rational economic value for the Russian option and

*This research was supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 Economic Risk.
Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: Primary 60G40, 34K10, 91B70. Secondary 60J60, 60J75, 91B28.
Journal of Economic Literature Classification: G13.

Key words and phrases: Discounted optimal stopping problem, Brownian motion, compound Poisson process, maximum process, integro-differential free-boundary problem, continuous and smooth fit, normal reflection, a change-of-variable formula with local time on surfaces, perpetual lookback American options.

then extended their arbitrage arguments to perpetual lookback options. More recently, Shepp, Shiryaev and Sulem [32] proposed a barrier version of the Russian option where the decision about stopping should be taken before the price process reaches a 'dangerous' positive level. Peskir [24] presented a solution to the Russian option problem in the finite horizon case (see also [8] for a numeric algorithm for solving the corresponding free-boundary problem and [10] for a study of asymptotic behavior of the optimal stopping boundary near expiration).

In the recent years, the Russian option problem in models with jumps was studied quite extensively. Gerber, Michaud and Shiu [12] and then Mordecki and Moreira [20] obtained closed form solutions to the perpetual Russian option problems for diffusions with negative exponential jumps. Asmussen, Avram and Pistorius [2] derived explicit expressions for the prices of perpetual Russian options in the dense class of Lévy processes with phase-type jumps in both directions by reducing the initial problem to the first passage time problem and solving the latter by martingale stopping and Wiener-Hopf factorization. Avram, Kyprianou and Pistorius [3] studied exit problems for spectrally negative Lévy processes and applied the results to solving optimal stopping problems associated with perpetual Russian and American put options.

In contrast to the Russian option problem, the problem (2.4) is necessarily *two-dimensional* in the sense that it cannot be reduced to an optimal stopping problem for a one-dimensional (time-homogeneous) Markov process. Some other two-dimensional optimal stopping problems for continuous processes were earlier considered in [6] and [22]. The main feature of the optimal stopping problems for the maximum process in continuous models is that the normal-reflection condition at the diagonal holds and the optimal boundary can be characterized as a unique solution of a (first-order) nonlinear ordinary differential equation (see, e.g., [6], [30]-[31], [22], [21] and [13]). The key point in solving optimal stopping problems for jump processes established in [25]-[26] is that the smooth fit at the optimal boundary may break down and then be replaced by the continuous fit (see also [1] for necessary and sufficient conditions for the occurrence of smooth-fit condition and references to the related literature and [27] for an extensive overview).

In the present paper we derive solutions to the problems (2.4) and (5.1) in a jump-diffusion model driven by a Brownian motion and a compound Poisson process with exponential jumps. Such model was considered in [18]-[19], [15]-[17] and [11] where the optimal stopping problems related to pricing American call and put options and convertible bonds were solved, respectively. We show that under some relationships on the parameters of the model the optimal stopping boundary can be uniquely determined as a component of a *two-dimensional system* of (first-order) nonlinear ordinary differential equations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate the optimal stopping problem for a two-dimensional Markov process related to the perpetual American *fixed-strike* lookback option problem and reduce it to an equivalent integro-differential free-boundary problem. In Section 3, we present a solution to the free-boundary problem and derive (first-order) nonlinear ordinary differential equations for the optimal stopping boundary under different relationships on the parameters of the model as well as specify the asymptotic behavior of the boundary. In Section 4, we verify that the solution of the free-boundary problem turns out to be a solution of the initial optimal stopping problem. In Section 5, we give some concluding remarks as well as present an *explicit solution* to the optimal stopping problem related to the perpetual American *floating-strike* lookback option problem. The main results of the paper are stated in Theorems 4.1 and 5.1.

2. Formulation of the problem

In this section we introduce the setting and notation of the two-dimensional optimal stopping problem which is related to the perpetual American fixed-strike lookback option problem and formulate an equivalent integro-differential free-boundary problem.

2.1. For a precise formulation of the problem let us consider a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with a standard Brownian motion $B = (B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and a jump process $J = (J_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} Y_i$, where $N = (N_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Poisson process of the intensity λ and $(Y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent random variables exponentially distributed with parameter 1 (B , N and $(Y_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are supposed to be independent). Assume that there exists a process $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ given by:

$$X_t = x \exp \left((r - \sigma^2/2 - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta)) t + \sigma B_t + \theta J_t \right) \quad (2.1)$$

and hence solving the stochastic differential equation:

$$dX_t = rX_{t-} dt + \sigma X_{t-} dB_t + X_{t-} \int_0^\infty \left(e^{\theta y} - 1 \right) (\mu(dt, dy) - \nu(dt, dy)) \quad (X_0 = x) \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mu(dt, dy)$ is the measure of jumps of the process J with the compensator $\nu(dt, dy) = \lambda dt I(y > 0) e^{-y} dy$, and $x > 0$ is given and fixed. It can be assumed that the process X describes a stock price on a financial market, where $r > 0$ is the interest rate, and $\sigma \geq 0$ and $\theta < 1$, $\theta \neq 0$, are the volatilities of continuous and jump part, respectively. Note that the assumption $\theta < 1$ guarantees that the jumps of X are integrable and that is not a restriction. With the process X let us associate the *maximum* process $S = (S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by:

$$S_t = \left(\max_{0 \leq u \leq t} X_u \right) \vee s \quad (2.3)$$

for an arbitrary $s \geq x > 0$. The main purpose of the present paper is to derive a solution to the optimal stopping problem for the time-homogeneous (strong) Markov process $(X, S) = (X_t, S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ given by:

$$V_*(x, s) = \sup_{\tau} E_{x,s} \left[e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} (S_\tau - K)^+ \right] \quad (2.4)$$

where the supremum is taken over all stopping times τ of the process X (i.e., stopping times with respect to the natural filtration of X), and $P_{x,s}$ is a probability measure under which the (two-dimensional) process (X, S) defined in (2.1)-(2.3) starts at $(x, s) \in E$. Here by $E = \{(x, s) \mid 0 < x \leq s\}$ we denote the state space of the process (X, S) . The value (2.4) coincides with an *arbitrage-free price* of a fixed-strike lookback American option with the strike price $K > 0$ and the discounting rate $\delta > 0$ (see, e.g., [34]). Note that in the continuous case $\sigma > 0$ and $\theta = 0$ the problem (2.4) was solved in [21] and [13]. It is also seen that if $\sigma = 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ with $r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) \geq 0$, then the optimal stopping time in (2.4) is infinite.

2.2. Let us first determine the structure of the optimal stopping time in the problem (2.4).

Applying the arguments from [6; Subsection 3.2] and [22; Proposition 2.1] to the optimal stopping problem (2.4) we see that it is never optimal to stop when $X_t = S_t$ for $t \geq 0$ (this fact will be also proved independently below). It follows directly from the structure of (2.4) that it is never optimal to stop when $S_t \leq K$ for $t \geq 0$. In other words, this shows that all

points (x, s) from the set:

$$C' = \{(x, s) \in E \mid 0 < x \leq s \leq K\} \quad (2.5)$$

and from the diagonal $\{(x, s) \in E \mid x = s\}$ belong to the continuation region:

$$C_* = \{(x, s) \in E \mid V_*(x, s) > (s - K)^+\}. \quad (2.6)$$

Let us fix $(x, s) \in C_*$ and let $\tau_* = \tau_*(x, s)$ denote the optimal stopping time in (2.4). Then, taking some point (y, s) such that $0 < y \leq s$, by virtue of the structure of optimal stopping problem (2.4) and (2.3) with (2.1) we get:

$$V_*(y, s) \geq E_{y,s}[e^{-\lambda\tau_*}(S_{\tau_*} - K)^+] \geq E_{x,s}[e^{-\lambda\tau_*}(S_{\tau_*} - K)^+] = V_*(x, s) > (s - K)^+. \quad (2.7)$$

These arguments together with the comments in [6; Subsection 3.3] and [22; Subsection 3.3] as well as the assumption that $V_*(x, s)$ is continuous show that there exists a function $g_*(s)$ for $s > K$ such that the continuation region (2.6) is an open set consisting of (2.5) and of the set:

$$C_*'' = \{(x, s) \in E \mid g_*(s) < x \leq s, s > K\} \quad (2.8)$$

while the stopping region is the closure of the set:

$$D_* = \{(x, s) \in E \mid 0 < x < g_*(s), s > K\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Let us now show that in (2.8)-(2.9) the function $g_*(s)$ is increasing on (K, ∞) (this fact will be also proved independently below). Since in (2.4) the function $s - K$ is linear in s on (K, ∞) , by means of standard arguments it is shown that $V_*(x, s) - (s - K)$ is decreasing in s on (K, ∞) . Hence, if for given $(x, s) \in C_*''$ we take s' such that $K < s' < s$, then $V_*(x, s') - (s' - K) \geq V_*(x, s) - (s - K) > 0$ so that $(x, s') \in C_*''$, and thus the desired assertion follows.

Let us denote by $W_*(x, s)$ and a_*s the value function and the boundary of the optimal stopping problem related to the Russian option problem. It is easily seen that in case $K = 0$ the function $W_*(x, s)$ coincides with (2.4) and (5.1), while under different relationships on the parameters of the model $a_* < 1$ can be uniquely determined by (5.11), (5.13), (5.15) and (5.17), respectively. Suppose that $g_*(s) > a_*s$ for some $s > K$. Then for any $x \in (a_*s, g_*(s))$ given and fixed we have $W_*(x, s) - K > s - K = V_*(x, s)$ contradicting the obvious fact that $W_*(x, s) - K \leq V_*(x, s)$ for all $(x, s) \in E$ with $s > K$ as it is clearly seen from (2.4). Thus, we may conclude that $g_*(s) \leq a_*s < s$ for all $s > K$.

2.3. Standard arguments imply that in this case the infinitesimal operator \mathbb{L} of the process (X, S) acts on a function $F \in C^{2,1}(E)$ (or $F \in C^{1,1}(E)$ when $\sigma = 0$) according to the rule:

$$(\mathbb{L}F)(x, s) = (r + \zeta)x F_x(x, s) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}x^2 F_{xx}(x, s) + \int_0^\infty \left(F(xe^{\theta y}, xe^{\theta y} \vee s) - F(x, s) \right) \lambda e^{-y} dy \quad (2.10)$$

for all $0 < x < s$ with $\zeta = -\lambda\theta/(1 - \theta)$. Using standard arguments based on the strong Markov property it follows that $V_* \in C^{2,1}(C_* \equiv C' \cup C_*'')$ (or $V_* \in C^{1,1}(C_* \equiv C' \cup C_*'')$ when $\sigma = 0$). In order to find analytic expressions for the unknown value function $V_*(x, s)$ from

(2.4) and the unknown boundary $g_*(s)$ from (2.8)-(2.9) using the results of general theory of optimal stopping problems for Markov processes (see, e.g., [33; Chapter III, Section 8]) we can formulate the following *integro-differential free-boundary problem*:

$$(\mathbb{L}V)(x, s) = (r + \delta)V(x, s) \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in C \equiv C' \cup C'' \quad (2.11)$$

$$V(x, s)|_{x=g(s)_+} = s - K \quad (\text{continuous fit}) \quad (2.12)$$

$$V(x, s) = (s - K)^+ \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in D \quad (2.13)$$

$$V(x, s) > (s - K)^+ \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in C \quad (2.14)$$

where C'' and D are defined as C''_* and D_* in (2.8) and (2.9) with $g(s)$ instead of $g_*(s)$, respectively, and (2.12) playing the role of instantaneous-stopping condition is satisfied for all $s > K$. Observe that the superharmonic characterization of the value function (see [9] and [33]) implies that $V_*(x, s)$ is the smallest function satisfying (2.11)-(2.13) with the boundary $g_*(s)$. Moreover, under some relationships on the parameters of the model which are specified below, the following conditions can be satisfied or break down:

$$V_x(x, s)|_{x=g(s)_+} = 0 \quad (\text{smooth fit}) \quad (2.15)$$

$$V_s(x, s)|_{x=s-} = 0 \quad (\text{normal reflection}) \quad (2.16)$$

for all $s > K$. Note that in the case $\sigma > 0$ and $\theta = 0$ the free-boundary problem (2.11)-(2.16) was solved in [21] and [13].

2.4. In order to specify the boundary $g_*(s)$ as a solution of the free-boundary problem (2.11)-(2.14) and (2.15)-(2.16), for further considerations we need to observe that from (2.4) it follows that the inequalities:

$$0 \leq \sup_{\tau} E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} S_{\tau}] - K \leq \sup_{\tau} E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} (S_{\tau} - K)^+] \leq \sup_{\tau} E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} S_{\tau}] \quad (2.17)$$

which are equivalent to:

$$0 \leq W_*(x, s) - K \leq V_*(x, s) \leq W_*(x, s) \quad (2.18)$$

hold for all $(x, s) \in E$ with $s > K$. Thus, setting $x = s$ in (2.18) we get:

$$0 \leq \frac{W_*(s, s)}{s} - \frac{K}{s} \leq \frac{V_*(s, s)}{s} \leq \frac{W_*(s, s)}{s} \quad (2.19)$$

for all $s > K$ so that letting s go to infinity in (2.19) we obtain:

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_*(s, s)}{s} = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_*(s, s)}{s} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W_*(s, s)}{s}. \quad (2.20)$$

3 Solution of the free-boundary problem

In this section we obtain solutions to the free-boundary problem (2.11)-(2.16) and derive ordinary differential equations for the optimal boundary under different relationships on the parameters of the model (2.1)-(2.2).

3.1. By means of straightforward calculations we reduce equation (2.11) to the form:

$$(r + \zeta)x V_x(x, s) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}x^2 V_{xx}(x, s) - \alpha\lambda x^\alpha G(x, s) = (r + \delta + \lambda)V(x, s) \quad (3.1)$$

with $\alpha = 1/\theta$ and $\zeta = -\lambda\theta/(1 - \theta)$, where taking into account conditions (2.12)-(2.13) we set:

$$G(x, s) = - \int_x^s V(z, s) \frac{dz}{z^{\alpha+1}} - \int_s^\infty V(z, z) \frac{dz}{z^{\alpha+1}} \quad \text{if } \alpha = 1/\theta > 1 \quad (3.2)$$

$$G(x, s) = \int_{g(s)}^x V(z, s) \frac{dz}{z^{\alpha+1}} - \frac{s - K}{\alpha g(s)^\alpha} \quad \text{if } \alpha = 1/\theta < 0 \quad (3.3)$$

for all $0 < x < g(s)$ and $s > K$. Then from (3.1) and (3.2)-(3.3) it follows that the function $G(x, s)$ solves the following (third-order) ordinary differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sigma^2}{2}x^3 G_{xxx}(x, s) + [\sigma^2(\alpha + 1) + r + \zeta]x^2 G_{xx}(x, s) \\ & + \left[(\alpha + 1) \left(\frac{\sigma^2\alpha}{2} + r + \zeta \right) - (r + \delta + \lambda) \right] x G_x(x, s) - \alpha\lambda G(x, s) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

for $0 < x < g(s)$ and $s > K$, which has the following general solution:

$$G(x, s) = C_1(s) \frac{x^{\beta_1}}{\beta_1} + C_2(s) \frac{x^{\beta_2}}{\beta_2} + C_3(s) \frac{x^{\beta_3}}{\beta_3} \quad (3.5)$$

where $C_1(s)$, $C_2(s)$ and $C_3(s)$ are some arbitrary functions and $\beta_3 < \beta_2 < \beta_1$ are the real roots of the corresponding (characteristic) equation:

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \beta^3 + \left[\sigma^2 \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \right) + r + \zeta \right] \beta^2 + \left[\alpha \left(\frac{\sigma^2(\alpha - 1)}{2} + r + \zeta \right) - (r + \delta + \lambda) \right] \beta - \alpha\lambda = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, differentiating both sides of the formulas (3.2)-(3.3) we get that the integro-differential equation (3.1) has the general solution:

$$V(x, s) = C_1(s) x^{\gamma_1} + C_2(s) x^{\gamma_2} + C_3(s) x^{\gamma_3} \quad (3.7)$$

where we set $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Further we assume that the functions $C_1(s)$, $C_2(s)$ and $C_3(s)$ as well as the boundary $g(s)$ are continuously differentiable for $s > K$. Observe that if $\sigma = 0$ and $r + \zeta < 0$ then it is seen that (3.4) degenerates into a second-order ordinary differential equation, and in that case we can set $C_3(s) \equiv 0$ in (3.5) as well as in (3.7), while the roots of equation (3.6) are explicitly given by:

$$\beta_i = \frac{r + \delta + \lambda}{2(r + \zeta)} - \frac{\alpha}{2} - (-1)^i \sqrt{\left(\frac{r + \delta + \lambda}{2(r + \zeta)} - \frac{\alpha}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{\alpha\lambda}{r + \zeta}} \quad (3.8)$$

for $i = 1, 2$.

3.2. Let us first determine the boundary $g_*(s)$ for the case $\sigma > 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta < 0$. Then we have $\beta_3 < 0 < \beta_2 < -\alpha < 1 - \alpha < \beta_1$ so that $\gamma_3 < \alpha < \gamma_2 < 0 < 1 < \gamma_1$ with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$,

where β_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the roots of equation (3.6). Since in this case the process X can leave the part of continuation region $g_*(s) < x \leq s$ and hits the diagonal $\{(x, s) \in E \mid x = s\}$ only continuously, we may assume that both the smooth-fit and normal-reflection conditions (2.15) and (2.16) are satisfied. Hence, applying conditions (3.3), (2.12) and (2.15) to the functions (3.5) and (3.7), we get that the following equalities hold:

$$C_1(s) \frac{g(s)^{\gamma_1}}{\beta_1} + C_2(s) \frac{g(s)^{\gamma_2}}{\beta_2} + C_3(s) \frac{g(s)^{\gamma_3}}{\beta_3} = -\frac{s-K}{\alpha} \quad (3.9)$$

$$C_1(s) g(s)^{\gamma_1} + C_2(s) g(s)^{\gamma_2} + C_3(s) g(s)^{\gamma_3} = s - K \quad (3.10)$$

$$\gamma_1 C_1(s) g(s)^{\gamma_1} + \gamma_2 C_2(s) g(s)^{\gamma_2} + \gamma_3 C_3(s) g(s)^{\gamma_3} = 0 \quad (3.11)$$

for $s > K$. Thus, by means of straightforward calculations, from (3.9)-(3.11) we obtain that the solution of system (2.11)-(2.13)+(2.15) takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} V(x, s; g(s)) & \quad (3.12) \\ &= \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 (s-K)/\alpha}{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)}\right)^{\gamma_1} + \frac{\beta_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_3 (s-K)/\alpha}{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)(\gamma_3 - \gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)}\right)^{\gamma_2} + \frac{\beta_3 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 (s-K)/\alpha}{(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(\gamma_3 - \gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)}\right)^{\gamma_3} \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < x < g(s)$ and $s > K$. Then applying condition (2.16) to the function (3.7) we get:

$$C_1'(s) s^{\gamma_1} + C_2'(s) s^{\gamma_2} + C_3'(s) s^{\gamma_3} = 0 \quad (3.13)$$

from where using the solution of system (3.9)-(3.11) it follows that the function $g(s)$ solves the following (first-order) ordinary differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} g'(s) &= \frac{g(s)}{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 (s-K)} \quad (3.14) \\ &\times \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 (\gamma_2 - \gamma_3) (s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_3 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_3) (s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_3 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) (s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}}{\beta_1 (\gamma_2 - \gamma_3) (s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_2 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_3) (s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_3 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) (s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}} \end{aligned}$$

for $s > K$ with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$, where β_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the roots of equation (3.6). By means of standard arguments it can be shown that the right-hand side of equation (3.14) is positive so that the function $g(s)$ is strictly increasing on (K, ∞) .

Let us denote $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s$ for all $s > K$ and set $\bar{h} = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$ and $\underline{h} = \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$. In order to specify the solution of equation (3.14) which coincides with the optimal stopping boundary $g_*(s)$, we observe that from the expression (3.12) it follows that (2.20) directly implies:

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 (\gamma_3 - \gamma_2) \underline{h}^{-\gamma_1} + \beta_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_3 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_3) \bar{h}^{-\gamma_2} + \beta_3 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \bar{h}^{-\gamma_3} \quad (3.15) \\ &= \beta_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 (\gamma_3 - \gamma_2) \bar{h}^{-\gamma_1} + \beta_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_3 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_3) \underline{h}^{-\gamma_2} + \beta_3 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \underline{h}^{-\gamma_3} \\ &= \beta_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 (\gamma_3 - \gamma_2) a_*^{-\gamma_1} + \beta_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_3 (\gamma_1 - \gamma_3) a_*^{-\gamma_2} + \beta_3 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) a_*^{-\gamma_3} \end{aligned}$$

where a_* is uniquely determined by (5.11) under $K = 0$. Then, using the fact that $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s \leq a_*$ for $s > K$ and thus $\underline{h} \leq \bar{h} \leq a_* < 1$, from (3.15) we get that $\underline{h} = \bar{h} = a_*$. Hence, we obtain that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ should satisfy the property:

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_*(s)}{s} = a_* \quad (3.16)$$

which gives a condition on the infinity for the equation (3.14). By virtue of the results on the existence and uniqueness of solutions for first-order ordinary differential equations, we may therefore conclude that condition (3.16) uniquely specifies the solution of equation (3.14) that corresponds to the problem (2.4). Taking into account the expression (3.12), we also note that from inequalities (2.18) it follows that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ satisfies the properties:

$$g_*(K+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g_*(s) \sim A_*(s - K)^{1/\gamma_1} \quad \text{under} \quad s \downarrow K \quad (3.17)$$

for some constant $A_* > 0$ which can be also determined by means of condition (3.16) above.

3.3. Let us now determine the boundary $g_*(s)$ for the case $\sigma = 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta < 0$. Then we have $0 < \beta_2 < -\alpha < 1 - \alpha < \beta_1$ so that $\alpha < \gamma_2 < 0 < 1 < \gamma_1$ with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$, where β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.6). In this case, applying conditions (3.3) and (2.12) to the functions (3.5) and (3.7) with $C_3(s) \equiv 0$, we get that the following equalities hold:

$$C_1(s) \frac{g(s)^{\gamma_1}}{\beta_1} + C_2(s) \frac{g(s)^{\gamma_2}}{\beta_2} = -\frac{s - K}{\alpha} \quad (3.18)$$

$$C_1(s) g(s)^{\gamma_1} + C_2(s) g(s)^{\gamma_2} = s - K \quad (3.19)$$

for $s > K$. Thus, by means of straightforward calculations, from (3.18)-(3.19) we obtain that the solution of system (2.11)-(2.13) takes the form:

$$V(x, s; g(s)) = \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_2 (s - K)}{\alpha(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)} \right)^{\gamma_1} - \frac{\beta_2 \gamma_1 (s - K)}{\alpha(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)} \right)^{\gamma_2} \quad (3.20)$$

for $0 < x < g(s)$ and $s > K$. Since in this case $r + \zeta > 0$ so that the process X hits the diagonal $\{(x, s) \in E \mid x = s\}$ only continuously, we may assume that the normal-reflection condition (2.16) holds. Hence, applying condition (2.16) to the function (3.7) with $C_3(s) \equiv 0$, we get:

$$C_1'(s) s^{\gamma_1} + C_2'(s) s^{\gamma_2} = 0 \quad (3.21)$$

from where using the solution of system (3.18)-(3.19) it follows that the function $g(s)$ solves the differential equation:

$$g'(s) = \frac{g(s)}{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 (s - K)} \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_2 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_2 \gamma_1 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_2}}{\beta_1 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_2 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_2}} \quad (3.22)$$

for $s > K$ with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$, where β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.8). By means of standard arguments it can be shown that the right-hand side of equation (3.22) is positive so that the function $g(s)$ is strictly increasing on (K, ∞) . Note that in this case the smooth-fit condition (2.15) fails to hold, that can be explained by the fact that leaving the part of continuation region $g_*(s) < x \leq s$ the process X can pass through the boundary $g_*(s)$ only by jumping. Such an effect was earlier observed in [25]-[26] by solving some other optimal stopping problems for jump processes. According to the results in [1] we may conclude that this property appears because of finite intensity of jumps and exponential distribution of jump sizes of the compound Poisson process J .

Let us recall that $\bar{h} = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$ and $\underline{h} = \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$ with $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s$ for all $s > K$. In order to specify the solution of equation (3.22) which coincides with the

optimal stopping boundary $g_*(s)$, we observe that from the expression (3.20) it follows that (2.20) directly implies:

$$\beta_1\gamma_2\bar{h}^{-\gamma_1} - \beta_2\gamma_1\underline{h}^{-\gamma_2} = \beta_1\gamma_2\underline{h}^{-\gamma_1} - \beta_2\gamma_1\bar{h}^{-\gamma_2} = \beta_1\gamma_2a_*^{-\gamma_1} - \beta_2\gamma_1a_*^{-\gamma_2} \quad (3.23)$$

where a_* is uniquely determined by (5.13) under $K = 0$. Then, using the fact that $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s \leq a_*$ for $s > K$ and thus $\underline{h} \leq \bar{h} \leq a_* < 1$, from (3.23) we get that $\underline{h} = \bar{h} = a_*$. Hence, we obtain that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ should satisfy the property (3.16) which gives a condition on the infinity for the equation (3.22). By virtue of the results on the existence and uniqueness of solutions for first-order ordinary differential equations, we may therefore conclude that condition (3.16) uniquely specifies the solution of equation (3.22) that corresponds to the problem (2.4). Taking into account the expression (3.20), we also note that from inequalities (2.18) it follows that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ satisfies the properties (3.17) for some constant $A_* > 0$ which can be also determined by means of condition (3.16) above.

3.4. Let us now determine the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ for the case $\sigma > 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta > 1$. Then we have $\beta_3 < -\alpha < 1 - \alpha < \beta_2 < 0 < \beta_1$ so that $\gamma_3 < 0 < 1 < \gamma_2 < \alpha < \gamma_1$ with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$, where β_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the roots of equation (3.6). By virtue of the same arguments as mentioned above, in this case we may also assume that both the smooth-fit and normal-reflection conditions (2.15) and (2.16) hold. Hence, applying conditions (3.3), (2.12) and (2.15) to the functions (3.5) and (3.7), respectively, we get that the following equalities hold:

$$C_1(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_1}}{\beta_1} + C_2(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_2}}{\beta_2} + C_3(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_3}}{\beta_3} = f(s)s^\alpha(s - K) \quad (3.24)$$

$$C_1(s)g(s)^{\gamma_1} + C_2(s)g(s)^{\gamma_2} + C_3(s)g(s)^{\gamma_3} = s - K \quad (3.25)$$

$$\gamma_1 C_1(s)g(s)^{\gamma_1} + \gamma_2 C_2(s)g(s)^{\gamma_2} + \gamma_3 C_3(s)g(s)^{\gamma_3} = 0 \quad (3.26)$$

where we set:

$$f(s) = -\frac{1}{s - K} \int_s^\infty V(z, z) \frac{dz}{z^{\alpha+1}} \quad (3.27)$$

for $s > K$. Thus, by means of straightforward calculations, from (3.24)-(3.26) we obtain that the solution of system (2.11)-(2.13)+(2.15) takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} V(x, s; g(s)) & \quad (3.28) \\ &= \frac{\beta_1(s - K)[\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)s^\alpha f(s) + \beta_3\gamma_3(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} - \beta_2\gamma_2(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}]}{\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)}\right)^{\gamma_1} \\ &+ \frac{\beta_2(s - K)[\beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_3 - \gamma_1)s^\alpha f(s) - \beta_3\gamma_3(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} + \beta_1\gamma_1(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}]}{\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)}\right)^{\gamma_2} \\ &+ \frac{\beta_3(s - K)[\beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)s^\alpha f(s) + \beta_2\gamma_2(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1\gamma_1(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2}]}{\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)}\right)^{\gamma_3} \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < x < g(s)$ and $s > K$. Inserting the expressions (3.5) and (3.7) into the formula (3.2), letting $x = s$ and differentiating the both sides of the obtained equality, we get:

$$C'_1(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_1}}{\beta_1} + C'_2(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_2}}{\beta_2} + C'_3(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_3}}{\beta_3} = 0 \quad (3.29)$$

from where using the solution of system (3.24)-(3.26) it follows that the function $f(s)$ solves the differential equation:

$$f'(s) = -\frac{f(s)}{s-K} + \frac{\beta_1\beta_2\beta_3 f(s)[(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - (\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}]}{s[\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}]} + \frac{\beta_3\gamma_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1+\gamma_2} - \beta_2\gamma_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1+\gamma_3} + \beta_1\gamma_1(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2+\gamma_3}}{s^{\alpha+1}[\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}]} \quad (3.30)$$

for $s > K$. Applying the condition (2.16) to the function (3.7), we get that the equality (3.13) holds, from where it follows that the function $g(s)$ solves the differential equation:

$$g'(s) = \frac{g(s)}{s-K} \times \frac{\beta_3\gamma_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1+\gamma_2} - \beta_2\gamma_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1+\gamma_3} + \beta_1\gamma_1(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2+\gamma_3}}{\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1+\gamma_2} - \beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1+\gamma_3} + \beta_1(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2+\gamma_3}} \times \frac{\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3}}{\eta_2\eta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \eta_1\eta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_2} + \eta_1\eta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(s/g(s))^{\gamma_3} - \rho f(s)s^\alpha} \quad (3.31)$$

for $s > K$ with $\eta_i = \beta_i\gamma_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $\rho = \beta_1\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)$.

In order to specify the solution of equation (3.30) let us define the function:

$$f_*(s) = -\frac{1}{s-K} \int_s^\infty V_*(z, z) \frac{dz}{z^{\alpha+1}} \quad (3.32)$$

for all $s > K$. Then by virtue of the inequalities (2.18), using the expression (5.14) we obtain the function (3.32) is well-defined and should satisfy the property:

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} f_*(s) s^\alpha = \gamma_2(\gamma_3 - 1)/[(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)(\beta_1(\gamma_3 - 1)a_*^{\gamma_1} - \beta_3(\gamma_1 - 1)a_*^{\gamma_3})] + \gamma_3(\gamma_1 - 1)/[(\gamma_3 - \gamma_2)(\beta_2(\gamma_1 - 1)a_*^{\gamma_2} - \beta_1(\gamma_2 - 1)a_*^{\gamma_1})] + \gamma_1(\gamma_2 - 1)/[(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)(\beta_3(\gamma_2 - 1)a_*^{\gamma_3} - \beta_2(\gamma_3 - 1)a_*^{\gamma_2})] \quad (3.33)$$

where a_* is uniquely determined by (5.15) under $K = 0$. From (3.27) and (3.32) it therefore follows that (3.33) gives a condition on the infinity for the equation (3.30).

Let us recall that $\bar{h} = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$ and $\underline{h} = \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$ with $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s$ for all $s > K$. In order to specify the solution of equation (3.31) which coincides with the optimal stopping boundary $g_*(s)$, we observe that from the expressions (3.28) and (3.33) it follows that (2.20) directly implies:

$$\frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)\bar{h}^{-\gamma_1} + (\gamma_3 - \gamma_1)\underline{h}^{-\gamma_2} + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\underline{h}^{-\gamma_3}}{\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)\underline{h}^{-\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)\underline{h}^{-\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\underline{h}^{-\gamma_3}} = \frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)\underline{h}^{-\gamma_1} + (\gamma_3 - \gamma_1)\bar{h}^{-\gamma_2} + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\bar{h}^{-\gamma_3}}{\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)\bar{h}^{-\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)\bar{h}^{-\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\bar{h}^{-\gamma_3}} = \frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)a_*^{-\gamma_1} + (\gamma_3 - \gamma_1)a_*^{-\gamma_2} + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)a_*^{-\gamma_3}}{\beta_2\beta_3(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)a_*^{-\gamma_1} - \beta_1\beta_3(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)a_*^{-\gamma_2} + \beta_1\beta_2(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)a_*^{-\gamma_3}}. \quad (3.34)$$

Then, using the fact that $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s \leq a_*$ for $s > K$ and thus $\underline{h} \leq \bar{h} \leq a_* < 1$, from (3.34) we get that $\underline{h} = \bar{h} = a_*$. Hence, we obtain that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ should satisfy the property (3.16) which gives a condition on the infinity for the equation (3.31). By virtue of the results on the existence and uniqueness of solutions for systems of first-order ordinary differential equations, we may therefore conclude that conditions (3.33) and (3.16) uniquely specifies the solution of system (3.30)+(3.31) that corresponds to the problem (2.4). Taking into account the expression (3.28), we also note that from inequalities (2.18) it follows that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ satisfies the properties (3.17) for some constant $A_* > 0$ which can be also determined by means of the condition (3.16) above.

3.5. Let us finally determine the boundary $g_*(s)$ for the case $\sigma = 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta > 1$ with $r + \zeta = r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) < 0$. Then we have $\beta_2 < -\alpha < 1 - \alpha < \beta_1 < 0$ so that $\gamma_2 < 0 < 1 < \gamma_1$ with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$, where β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.6). Since in this case the process X can leave the continuation region $g_*(s) < x \leq s$ only continuously, we may assume that the smooth-fit condition (2.15) holds. Hence, applying conditions (2.12) and (2.15) to the function (3.7), we get that the following equalities hold:

$$C_1(s)g(s)^{\gamma_1} + C_2(s)g(s)^{\gamma_2} = s - K \quad (3.35)$$

$$\gamma_1 C_1(s)g(s)^{\gamma_1} + \gamma_2 C_2(s)g(s)^{\gamma_2} = 0 \quad (3.36)$$

for $s > K$. Thus, by means of straightforward calculations, from (3.35)-(3.36) we obtain that the solution of system (2.11)-(2.13)+(2.15) takes the form:

$$V(x, s; g(s)) = \frac{\gamma_2(s - K)}{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)} \right)^{\gamma_1} - \frac{\gamma_1(s - K)}{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1} \left(\frac{x}{g(s)} \right)^{\gamma_2} \quad (3.37)$$

for $0 < x < g(s)$ and $s > K$. Inserting the expressions (3.5) and (3.7) with $C_3(s) \equiv 0$ into the formula (3.2), letting $x = s$ and differentiating the both sides of the obtained equality, we get:

$$C_1'(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_1}}{\beta_1} + C_2'(s) \frac{s^{\gamma_2}}{\beta_2} = 0 \quad (3.38)$$

from where using the solution of system (3.35)-(3.36) it follows that the function $g(s)$ satisfies the differential equation:

$$g'(s) = \frac{g(s)}{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 (s - K)} \frac{\beta_2 \gamma_2 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1 \gamma_1 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_2}}{\beta_2 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_1} - \beta_1 (s/g(s))^{\gamma_2}} \quad (3.39)$$

for $s > K$ with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$, where β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.8). By means of standard arguments it can be shown that the right-hand side of equation (3.39) is positive so that the function $g(s)$ is strictly increasing on (K, ∞) . Note that in this case the normal-reflection condition (2.16) fails to hold, that can be explained by the fact that the process X can hit the diagonal $\{(x, s) \in E \mid x = s\}$ only by jumping.

Let us recall that $\bar{h} = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$ and $\underline{h} = \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_*(s)$ with $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s$ for all $s > K$. In order to specify the solution of equation (3.39) which coincides with the optimal stopping boundary $g_*(s)$, we observe that from the expression (3.37) it follows that (2.20) directly implies:

$$\gamma_2 \bar{h}^{-\gamma_1} - \gamma_1 \underline{h}^{-\gamma_2} = \gamma_2 \underline{h}^{-\gamma_1} - \gamma_1 \bar{h}^{-\gamma_2} = \gamma_2 a_*^{-\gamma_1} - \gamma_1 a_*^{-\gamma_2} \quad (3.40)$$




Figure 1. A computer drawing of the optimal stopping boundary $g_*(s)$.

where a_* is uniquely determined by (5.17) under $K = 0$. Then, using the fact that $h_*(s) = g_*(s)/s \leq a_*$ for $s > K$ and thus $\underline{h} \leq \bar{h} \leq a_* < 1$, from (3.40) we get that $\underline{h} = \bar{h} = a_*$. Hence, we obtain that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ should satisfy the property (3.16) which gives a condition on the infinity for the equation (3.39). By virtue of the results on the existence and uniqueness of solutions for first-order ordinary differential equations, we may therefore conclude that condition (3.16) uniquely specifies the solution of equation (3.39) that corresponds to the problem (2.4). Taking into account the expression (3.37), we also note that from inequalities (2.18) it follows that the optimal boundary $g_*(s)$ satisfies the properties (3.17) for some constant $A_* > 0$ which can be also determined by means of the condition (3.16) above.

3.6. Observe that the arguments above show that if we start at the point $(x, s) \in C'$ then it is easily seen that the process (X, S) can be stopped optimally after it passes through the point (K, K) . Thus, using standard arguments based on the strong Markov property it follows that:

$$V_*(x, s) = U(x; K) V_*(K, K) \quad (3.41)$$

for all $(x, s) \in C'$ with $V_*(K, K) = \lim_{s \downarrow K} V_*(K, s)$, where we set:

$$U(x; K) = E_x[e^{-(r+\delta)\sigma_*}] \quad (3.42)$$

and

$$\sigma_* = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid X_t \geq K\}. \quad (3.43)$$

Here E_x denotes the expectation under the assumption that $X_0 = x$ for some $0 < x \leq K$.

By means of straightforward calculations based on solving the corresponding boundary value problem (see also [2]-[3] and [17]) it follows that when $\alpha = 1/\theta < 0$ holds, we have:

$$U(x; K) = \left(\frac{x}{K}\right)^{\gamma_1} \quad (3.44)$$

with $\gamma_1 = \beta_1 + \alpha$, where if $\sigma > 0$ then β_1 is the largest root of equation (3.6), while if $\sigma = 0$ then β_1 is given by (3.8). It also follows that when $\alpha = 1/\theta > 1$ holds, then we have:

$$U(x; K) = \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_2}{\alpha(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{K}\right)^{\gamma_1} - \frac{\beta_2 \gamma_1}{\alpha(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{K}\right)^{\gamma_2} \quad (3.45)$$

with $\gamma_i = \beta_i + \alpha$, where if $\sigma > 0$ then β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are the two largest roots of equation (3.6), while if $\sigma = 0$ and $r + \zeta = r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) < 0$ then β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.8).

4. Main result and proof

In this section using the facts proved above we formulate and prove the main result of the paper.

Theorem 4.1. *Let the process (X, S) be defined in (2.1)-(2.3). Then the value function of the problem (2.4) takes the expression:*

$$V_*(x, s) = \begin{cases} V(x, s; g_*(s)), & \text{if } g_*(s) < x < s \text{ and } s > K \\ U(x; K)V_*(K, K), & \text{if } 0 < x \leq s \leq K \\ s - K, & \text{if } 0 < x \leq g_*(s) \text{ and } s > K \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

[with $V_*(K, K) = \lim_{s \downarrow K} V_*(K, s)$] and the optimal stopping time is explicitly given by:

$$\tau_* = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid X_t \leq g_*(S_t)\} \quad (4.2)$$

where the functions $V(x, s; g(s))$ and $U(x; K)$ as well as the increasing boundary $g_*(s) \leq a_* s < s$ for $s > K$ satisfying $g_*(K+) = 0$ and $g_*(s) \sim A_*(s - K)^{1/\gamma}$ under $s \downarrow K$ [see Figure 1 above] are specified as follows:

(i): if $\sigma > 0$ and $\theta < 0$ then $V(x, s; g(s))$ is given by (3.12), $U(x; K)$ is given by (3.44), and $g_*(s)$ is uniquely determined from the differential equation (3.14) and the condition (3.16), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the roots of equation (3.6), while a_* is found from equation (5.11) under $K = 0$;

(ii): if $\sigma = 0$ and $\theta < 0$ then $V(x, s; g(s))$ is given by (3.20), $U(x; K)$ is given by (3.44), and $g_*(s)$ is uniquely determined from the differential equation (3.22) and the condition (3.16), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.8), while a_* is found from equation (5.13) under $K = 0$;

(iii): if $\sigma > 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ then $V(x, s; g(s))$ is given by (3.28), $U(x; K)$ is given by (3.45), and $g_*(s)$ is uniquely determined from the system of differential equations (3.30)+(3.31) and the conditions (3.33)+(3.16), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the roots of equation (3.6), while a_* is found from equation (5.15) under $K = 0$;

(iv): if $\sigma = 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ with $r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) < 0$ then $V(x, s; g(s))$ is given by (3.37), $U(x; K)$ is given by (3.45), and $g_*(s)$ is uniquely determined from the differential equation (3.39) and the condition (3.16), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.8), while a_* is found from equation (5.17) under $K = 0$.

Proof. In order to verify the assertions stated above, it remains us to show that the function (4.1) coincides with the value function (2.4) and the stopping time τ_* from (4.2) with the boundary $g_*(s)$ specified above is optimal. For this, let us denote by $V(x, s)$ the right-hand side of the expression (4.1). In this case, by means of straightforward calculations and the assumptions above it follows that the function $V(x, s)$ solves the system (2.11)-(2.13), and condition (2.15) is satisfied when either $\sigma > 0$ or $r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) < 0$ holds, while condition (2.16) is satisfied when either $\sigma > 0$ or $\theta < 0$ holds. Then taking into account the fact that the boundary $g_*(s)$ is assumed to be continuously differentiable for $s > K$ and applying the change-of-variable formula from [23; Theorem 3.1] to $e^{-(r+\delta)t}V(X_t, S_t)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-(r+\delta)t} V(X_t, S_t) &= V(x, s) + \int_0^t e^{-(r+\delta)u} (\mathbb{L}V - (r + \delta)V)(X_u, S_u) I(X_u \neq g_*(S_u)) du \quad (4.3) \\ &+ \int_0^t e^{-(r+\delta)u} V_s(X_{u-}, S_{u-}) dS_u - \sum_{0 < u \leq t} e^{-(r+\delta)u} V_s(X_{u-}, S_{u-}) \Delta S_u + M_t \end{aligned}$$

where the process $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &= \int_0^t e^{-(r+\delta)u} V_x(X_{u-}, S_{u-}) \sigma X_{u-} dB_u \quad (4.4) \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_0^\infty e^{-(r+\delta)u} \left(V(X_{u-}e^{\theta y}, X_{u-}e^{\theta y} \vee S_{u-}) - V(X_{u-}, S_{u-}) \right) (\mu(du, dy) - \nu(du, dy)) \end{aligned}$$

is a local martingale under $P_{x,s}$. Observe that when either $\sigma > 0$ or $0 < \theta < 1$, the time spent by the process X at the diagonal $\{(x, s) \in E \mid 0 < x \leq s\}$ is of Lebesgue measure zero that allows to extend $(\mathbb{L}V - (r + \delta)V)(x, s)$ arbitrarily to $x = s$. When either $\sigma > 0$ or $\theta < 0$, the time spent by the process X at the boundary $g_*(S)$ is of Lebesgue measure zero that allows to extend $(\mathbb{L}V - (r + \delta)V)(x, s)$ to $x = g_*(s)$ and set the indicator in the formula (4.3) to one. Note that when either $\sigma > 0$ or $\theta < 0$, the process S increases only continuously, and hence in (4.3) the sum with respect to ΔS_u is zero and the same is the integral with respect to dS_u , since at the diagonal $\{(x, s) \in E \mid x = s\}$ we assume (2.16). When $\sigma = 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$, the process S increases only by jumping, and thus in (4.3) the integral with respect to dS_u is compensated by the sum with respect to ΔS_u .

By virtue of the arguments from the previous section we may conclude that $(\mathbb{L}V - (r + \delta)V)(x, s) \leq 0$ for all $(x, s) \in E$. Moreover, by means of straightforward calculations it can be shown that the property (2.14) also holds that together with (2.12)-(2.13) yields $V(x, s) \geq (s - K)^+$ for all $(x, s) \in E$. From the expression (4.3) it therefore follows that the inequalities:

$$e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} (S_\tau - K)^+ \leq e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} V(X_\tau, S_\tau) \leq V(x, s) + M_\tau \quad (4.5)$$

hold for any finite stopping time τ of the process X .

Let $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an arbitrary localizing sequence of stopping times for the process $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Then taking in (4.5) expectation with respect to $P_{x,s}$, by means of the optional sampling theorem we get:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)(\tau \wedge \sigma_n)} (S_{\tau \wedge \sigma_n} - K)^+] &\leq E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)(\tau \wedge \sigma_n)} V(X_{\tau \wedge \sigma_n}, S_{\tau \wedge \sigma_n})] \\ &\leq V(x, s) + E_{x,s} [M_{\tau \wedge \sigma_n}] = V(x, s) \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

for all $(x, s) \in E$. Hence, letting n go to infinity and using Fatou's lemma, we obtain that for any finite stopping time τ the inequalities:

$$E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} (S_\tau - K)^+] \leq E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} V(X_\tau, S_\tau)] \leq V(x, s) \quad (4.7)$$

are satisfied for all $(x, s) \in E$.

By virtue of the fact that the function $V(x, s)$ together with the boundary $g_*(s)$ satisfy the system (2.11)-(2.14), by the structure of stopping time τ_* in (4.2) and the expression (4.3) it follows that the equality:

$$e^{-(r+\delta)(\tau_* \wedge \sigma_n)} V(X_{\tau_* \wedge \sigma_n}, S_{\tau_* \wedge \sigma_n}) = V(x, s) + M_{\tau_* \wedge \sigma_n} \quad (4.8)$$

holds. Then, using the expression (4.5), by virtue of the fact that the function $V(x, s)$ is increasing, we may conclude that the inequalities:

$$-V(x, s) \leq M_{\tau_* \wedge \sigma_n} \leq V(g_*(S_{\tau_* \wedge \sigma_n}), S_{\tau_* \wedge \sigma_n}) - V(x, s) \quad (4.9)$$

are satisfied for all $(x, s) \in E$, where $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a localizing sequence for $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Taking into account conditions (3.16) and (3.33), from the structure of the functions (3.12), (3.20), (3.28) and (3.37) it follows that:

$$V(g_*(S_t), S_t) \leq K' S_t \quad (4.10)$$

for some $K' > 0$. Hence, letting n go to infinity in the expression (4.8) and using the conditions (2.12)-(2.13) as well as the property:

$$E_{x,s} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} e^{-(r+\delta)t} S_t \right] = E_{x,s} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} e^{-(r+\delta)t} X_t \right] < \infty \quad (4.11)$$

(the latter can be proved by means of the same arguments as in [31] and using the fact that the processes B and J are independent and the jumps of J are integrable), by means of the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem we obtain the equality:

$$E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)\tau_*} (S_{\tau_*} - K)^+] = V(x, s) \quad (4.12)$$

for all $(x, s) \in E$, from where the desired assertion follows directly. \square

5. Conclusions

In this section we give some concluding remarks and present an explicit solution to the optimal stopping problem which is related to the perpetual American fixed-strike lookback option problem.

5.1. We have considered the perpetual fixed-strike lookback American option optimal stopping problem in a jump-diffusion model. In order to be able to derive (first-order) nonlinear differential equations for the optimal boundary that separates the continuation and stopping regions, we have let the jumps of the driving compound Poisson process be exponentially distributed. It was shown that not only the smooth-fit condition at the optimal boundary, but also the normal-reflection condition at the diagonal may break down because of the occurrence of jumps in the model. We have seen that under some relationships on the parameters of the model the optimal boundary can be found as a component of the solution of a two-dimensional system of ordinary differential equations that shows the difference of the jump-diffusion case from the continuous case. We have also derived special conditions that specify in the family of solutions of the system of nonlinear differential equations the unique solution that corresponds to the initial optimal stopping problem. The existence and uniqueness of such a solution can be obtained by standard methods of first-order ordinary differential equations.

In the rest of the paper we derive a solution to the floating-strike lookback American option problem in the jumps-diffusion model (2.1)-(2.3). In contrast to the fixed-strike case, by means of the change-of-measure theorem, the related two-dimensional optimal stopping problem can be reduced to an optimal stopping problem for a one-dimensional strong Markov process $(S_t/X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that explains the simplicity of the structure of the solution in (5.18)-(5.19) (see [31] and [4]).

5.2. Let us now consider the following optimal stopping problem:

$$\tilde{V}_*(x, s) = \sup_{\tau} E_{x,s} [e^{-(r+\delta)\tau} (S_{\tau} - KX_{\tau})^+] \quad (5.1)$$

where the supremum is taken over all stopping times τ of the process X . The value (2.4) coincides with an *arbitrage-free price* of a floating-strike lookback American option (or 'partial lookback' as it is called in [5]) with $K > 0$ and the discounting rate $\delta > 0$. Note that in the continuous case $\sigma > 0$ and $\theta = 0$ the problem (5.1) was solved in [4]. It is also seen that if $\sigma = 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ with $r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) \geq 0$, then the optimal stopping time in (5.1) is infinite in case $K < 1$ and equals zero in case $K \geq 1$.

Using the same arguments as in [4] it can be shown that the continuation region for the problem (5.1) is an open set of the form:

$$\tilde{C}_* = \{(x, s) \in E \mid b_*s < x \leq s\} \quad (5.2)$$

while the stopping region is the closure of the set:

$$\tilde{D}_* = \{(x, s) \in E \mid 0 < x < b_*s\}. \quad (5.3)$$

From (5.1) it is easily seen that $b_* \leq 1/K$ in (5.2)-(5.3).

In order to find analytic expressions for the unknown value function $\tilde{V}_*(x, s)$ from (5.1) and the unknown boundary b_*s from (5.2)-(5.3), we can formulate the following *integro-differential free-boundary problem*:

$$(\mathbb{L}\tilde{V})(x, s) = (r + \delta)\tilde{V}(x, s) \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in \tilde{C} \quad (5.4)$$

$$\tilde{V}(x, s)|_{x=b_*s+} = s(1 - Kb) \quad (\text{continuous fit}) \quad (5.5)$$

$$\tilde{V}(x, s) = (s - Kx)^+ \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in \tilde{D} \quad (5.6)$$

$$\tilde{V}(x, s) > (s - Kx)^+ \quad \text{for } (x, s) \in \tilde{C} \quad (5.7)$$

where \tilde{C} and \tilde{D} are defined as \tilde{C}_* and \tilde{D}_* in (5.2) and (5.3) with b instead of b_* , respectively, and (5.5) playing the role of instantaneous-stopping condition is satisfied for all $s > 0$. Moreover, under some relations on the parameters of the model which are specified below, the following conditions can be satisfied or break down:

$$\tilde{V}_x(x, s)|_{x=bs+} = -K \quad (\text{smooth fit}) \quad (5.8)$$

$$\tilde{V}_s(x, s)|_{x=s-} = 0 \quad (\text{normal reflection}) \quad (5.9)$$

for all $s > 0$. Note that in the case $\sigma > 0$ and $\theta = 0$ the free-boundary problem (5.4)-(5.9) was solved in [4].

Following the schema of arguments from the previous section, by means of straightforward calculations it can be shown that in case $\sigma > 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta < 0$ the solution of system (5.4)-(5.7)+(5.8) takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}(x, s; bs) = & \frac{\beta_1[(1-\alpha)\gamma_2\gamma_3 + \alpha(\gamma_2-1)(\gamma_3-1)Kb]s}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(\gamma_2-\gamma_1)(\gamma_1-\gamma_3)} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_1} \\ & + \frac{\beta_2[(1-\alpha)\gamma_1\gamma_3 + \alpha(\gamma_1-1)(\gamma_3-1)Kb]s}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(\gamma_2-\gamma_1)(\gamma_3-\gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_2} \\ & + \frac{\beta_3[(1-\alpha)\gamma_1\gamma_2 + \alpha(\gamma_1-1)(\gamma_2-1)Kb]s}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(\gamma_1-\gamma_3)(\gamma_3-\gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_3} \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

and from condition (5.9) it follows that b solves the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta_1(\gamma_1-1)[(1-\alpha)\gamma_2\gamma_3 + \alpha(\gamma_2-1)(\gamma_3-1)Kb]}{(\gamma_2-\gamma_1)(\gamma_1-\gamma_3)b^{\gamma_1}} \\ & + \frac{\beta_2(\gamma_2-1)[(1-\alpha)\gamma_1\gamma_3 + \alpha(\gamma_1-1)(\gamma_3-1)Kb]}{(\gamma_2-\gamma_1)(\gamma_3-\gamma_2)b^{\gamma_2}} \\ & = \frac{\beta_3(\gamma_3-1)[(1-\alpha)\gamma_1\gamma_2 + \alpha(\gamma_1-1)(\gamma_2-1)Kb]}{(\gamma_3-\gamma_1)(\gamma_3-\gamma_2)b^{\gamma_3}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

in case $\sigma = 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta < 0$ the solution of system (5.4)-(5.7) takes the form:

$$\tilde{V}(x, s; bs) = \frac{\beta_1[(1-\alpha)\gamma_2 + \alpha(\gamma_2-1)Kb]s}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(\gamma_1-\gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_1} - \frac{\beta_2[(1-\alpha)\gamma_1 + \alpha(\gamma_1-1)Kb]s}{\alpha(1-\alpha)(\gamma_1-\gamma_2)} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_2} \quad (5.12)$$

and from condition (5.9) it follows that b solves the equation:

$$b^{\gamma_1-\gamma_2} = \frac{\beta_2(\gamma_2-1)}{\beta_1(\gamma_1-1)} \frac{(1-\alpha)\gamma_1 + \alpha(\gamma_1-1)Kb}{(1-\alpha)\gamma_2 + \alpha(\gamma_2-1)Kb}; \quad (5.13)$$

in case $\sigma > 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta > 1$ the solution of system (5.4)-(5.7)+(5.9) takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}(x, s; bs) = & \frac{\beta_1(\gamma_3-1)[\gamma_2 - (\gamma_2-1)Kb]b^{\gamma_1}s}{(\gamma_2-\gamma_1)[\beta_1(\gamma_3-1)b^{\gamma_1} - \beta_3(\gamma_1-1)b^{\gamma_3}]} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_1} \\ & + \frac{\beta_2(\gamma_1-1)[\gamma_3 - (\gamma_3-1)Kb]b^{\gamma_2}s}{(\gamma_3-\gamma_2)[\beta_2(\gamma_1-1)b^{\gamma_2} - \beta_1(\gamma_2-1)b^{\gamma_1}]} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_2} \\ & + \frac{\beta_3(\gamma_2-1)[\gamma_1 - (\gamma_1-1)Kb]b^{\gamma_3}s}{(\gamma_1-\gamma_3)[\beta_3(\gamma_2-1)b^{\gamma_3} - \beta_2(\gamma_3-1)b^{\gamma_2}]} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_3} \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

and from condition (5.8) it follows that b solves the equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta_1(\gamma_1 - 1)(\gamma_3 - 1)[\gamma_2 - (\gamma_2 - 1)Kb]}{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)[\beta_1(\gamma_3 - 1)b^{\gamma_1} - \beta_3(\gamma_1 - 1)b^{\gamma_3}]} \\ & + \frac{\beta_2(\gamma_1 - 1)(\gamma_2 - 1)[\gamma_3 - (\gamma_3 - 1)Kb]}{(\gamma_3 - \gamma_2)[\beta_2(\gamma_1 - 1)b^{\gamma_2} - \beta_1(\gamma_2 - 1)b^{\gamma_1}]} \\ & = \frac{\beta_3(\gamma_2 - 1)(\gamma_3 - 1)[\gamma_1 - (\gamma_1 - 1)Kb]}{(\gamma_3 - \gamma_1)[\beta_3(\gamma_2 - 1)b^{\gamma_3} - \beta_2(\gamma_3 - 1)b^{\gamma_2}]}; \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

while in case $\sigma = 0$ and $\alpha = 1/\theta > 1$ with $r + \zeta = r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) < 0$ the solution of system (5.4)-(5.7) takes the form:

$$\tilde{V}(x, s; bs) = \frac{[\gamma_2 - (\gamma_2 - 1)Kb]s}{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_1} - \frac{[\gamma_1 - (\gamma_1 - 1)Kb]s}{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1} \left(\frac{x}{bs}\right)^{\gamma_2} \quad (5.16)$$

and from condition (5.8) it follows that b solves the equation:

$$b^{\gamma_1 - \gamma_2} = \frac{\beta_2}{\beta_1} \frac{\gamma_2(\gamma_1 - 1) + [\gamma_1 - \gamma_2(\gamma_1 - 1)]Kb}{\gamma_1(\gamma_2 - 1) + [\gamma_2 - \gamma_1(\gamma_2 - 1)]Kb}. \quad (5.17)$$

Summarizing the facts proved above we formulate the following assertion.

Theorem 5.1. *Let the process (X, S) be defined in (2.1)-(2.3). Then the value function of the problem (5.1) takes the expression:*

$$\tilde{V}_*(x, s) = \begin{cases} \tilde{V}(x, s; b_*s), & \text{if } b_*s < x < s \\ s - Kx, & \text{if } 0 < x \leq b_*s \end{cases} \quad (5.18)$$

and the optimal stopping time is explicitly given by:

$$\tilde{\tau}_* = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid X_t \leq b_*S_t\} \quad (5.19)$$

where the function $\tilde{V}(x, s; bs)$ and the boundary $b_*s \leq s/K$ for $s > 0$ are specified as follows:

(i): if $\sigma > 0$ and $\theta < 0$ then $\tilde{V}(x, s; bs)$ is given by (5.10) and b_* is uniquely determined from equation (5.11), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the roots of equation (3.6);

(ii): if $\sigma = 0$ and $\theta < 0$ then $\tilde{V}(x, s; bs)$ is given by (5.12) and b_* is uniquely determined from equation (5.13), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.8);

(iii): if $\sigma > 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ then $\tilde{V}(x, s; bs)$ is given by (5.14) and b_* is uniquely determined from equation (5.15), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the roots of equation (3.6);

(iv): if $\sigma = 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ with $r - \lambda\theta/(1 - \theta) < 0$ then $\tilde{V}(x, s; bs)$ is given by (5.16) and b_* is uniquely determined from equation (5.17), where $\gamma_i = \beta_i + 1/\theta$ and β_i for $i = 1, 2$ are given by (3.8).

These assertions can be proved by means of the same arguments as in Theorem 4.1 above.

References

- [1] ALILI, L. and KYPRIANOU, A. E. (2004). Some remarks on first passage of Lévy processes, the American put and pasting principles. *Annals of Applied Probability* **15** (2062–2080).
- [2] ASMUSSEN, S., AVRAM, F. and PISTORIUS, M. (2003). Russian and American put options under exponential phase-type Lévy models. *Stochastic Processes and Applications* **109** (79–111).
- [3] AVRAM, F., KYPRIANOU, A. E. and PISTORIUS, M. (2004). *Annals of Applied Probability* **14**(1) (215–238).
- [4] BEIBEL, M. and LERCHE, H. R. (1997). A new look at warrant pricing and related optimal stopping problems. Empirical Bayes, sequential analysis and related topics in statistics and probability (New Brunswick, NJ, 1995). *Statistica Sinica* **7** (93–108).
- [5] CONZE, A. and VISWANATHAN, R. (1991). Path dependent options: The case of lookback options. *Journal of Finance* **46** (1893–1907).
- [6] DUBINS, L., SHEPP, L. A. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (1993). Optimal stopping rules and maximal inequalities for Bessel processes. *Theory of Probability and Applications* **38**(2) (226–261).
- [7] DUFFIE, J. D. and HARRISON, J. M. (1993). Arbitrage pricing of Russian options and perpetual lookback options. *Annals of Applied Probability* **3**(3) (641–651).
- [8] DUISTERMAAT, J. J., KYPRIANOU, A. E. and VAN SCHAIK, K. (2005). Finite expiry Russian options. *Stochastic Processes and Applications* **115**(4) (609–638).
- [9] DYNKIN, E. B. (1963). The optimum choice of the instant for stopping a Markov process. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **4** (627–629).
- [10] EKSTRÖM, E. (2004). Russian options with a finite time horizon. *Journal of Applied Probability* **41**(2) (313–326).
- [11] GAPEEV, P. V. and KÜHN, C. (2005). Perpetual convertible bonds in jump-diffusion models. *Statistics and Decisions* **23** (15–31).
- [12] GERBER, H. U., MICHAUD, F. and SHIU, E. S. W. (1995). Pricing Russian options with the compound Poisson process. *Transactions of the XXV International Congress of Actuaries* **3**.
- [13] GUO, X. and SHEPP, L. A. (2001). Some optimal stopping problems with nontrivial boundaries for pricing exotic options. *Journal of Applied Probability* **38**(3) (647–658).
- [14] JACOD, J. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (1987). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Springer, Berlin.
- [15] KOU, S. G. (2002). A jump diffusion model for option pricing. *Management Science* **48** (1086–1101).

- [16] KOU, S. G. and WANG, H. (2003). First passage times for a jump diffusion process. *Advances in Applied Probability* **35** (504–531).
- [17] KOU, S. G. and WANG, H. (2004). Option pricing under a double exponential jump diffusion model. *Management Science* **50** (1178–1192).
- [18] MORDECKI, E. (1999). Optimal stopping for a diffusion with jumps. *Finance and Stochastics* **3** (227–236).
- [19] MORDECKI, E. (2002). Optimal stopping for a diffusion with jumps. *Finance and Stochastics* **6**(4) (473–493).
- [20] MORDECKI, E. and MOREIRA, W. (2001). Russian Options for a Diffusion with Negative Jumps. *Publicaciones Matemáticas del Uruguay* **9** (37–51).
- [21] PEDERSEN, J. L. (2000) Discounted optimal stopping problems for the maximum process. *Journal of Applied Probability* **37**(4) (972–983).
- [22] PESKIR, G. (1998). Optimal stopping of the maximum process: The maximality principle. *Annals of Probability* **26**(4) (1614–1640).
- [23] PESKIR, G. (2004). A change-of-variable formula with local time on surfaces. *Research Report No. 437*, Dept. Theoret. Statist. Aarhus (23 pp). To appear in *Séminaire de Probabilité* (Lecture Notes in Mathematics) Springer.
- [24] PESKIR, G. (2005). The Russian option: finite horizon. *Finance and Stochastics* **9** (251–267).
- [25] PESKIR, G. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (2000). Sequential testing problems for Poisson processes. *Annals of Statistics* **28** (837–859).
- [26] PESKIR, G. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (2002). Solving the Poisson disorder problem. *Advances in Finance and Stochastics*. Essays in Honour of Dieter Sondermann. Sandmann, K. and Schönbucher, P. eds. Springer (295–312).
- [27] PESKIR, G. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (2006). *Optimal Stopping and Free-Boundary Problems*. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- [28] PROTTER, PH. (1990). *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*. Springer, New York.
- [29] REVUZ, D. and YOR, M. (1999). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. Springer, Berlin.
- [30] SHEPP, L. A. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (1993). The Russian option: reduced regret. *Annals of Applied Probability* **3**(3) (631–640).
- [31] SHEPP, L. A. and SHIRYAEV, A. N. (1994). A new look at the pricing of Russian options. *Theory Probability and Applications* **39**(1) (103–119).

- [32] SHEPP, L. A., SHIRYAEV A. N. and SULEM, A. (2002). A barrier version of the Russian option. *Advances in Finance and Stochastics*. Essays in Honour of Dieter Sondermann. Sandmann, K. and Schönbucher, P. eds. Springer. (271–284).
- [33] SHIRYAEV, A. N. (1978). *Optimal Stopping Rules*. Springer, Berlin.
- [34] SHIRYAEV, A. N. (1999). *Essentials of Stochastic Finance*. World Scientific, Singapore.

Pavel V. Gapeev
Weierstraß Institute
for Applied Analysis and Stochastics (WIAS)
Mohrenstr. 39, D-10117 Berlin, Germany
e-mail: gapeev@wias-berlin.de

(Russian Academy of Sciences
Institute of Control Sciences
Profsoyuznaya Str. 65
117997 Moscow, Russia)


SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2006

For a complete list of Discussion Papers published by the SFB 649, please visit <http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>.

- 001 "Calibration Risk for Exotic Options" by Kai Detlefsen and Wolfgang K. Härdle, January 2006.
- 002 "Calibration Design of Implied Volatility Surfaces" by Kai Detlefsen and Wolfgang K. Härdle, January 2006.
- 003 "On the Appropriateness of Inappropriate VaR Models" by Wolfgang Härdle, Zdeněk Hlávka and Gerhard Stahl, January 2006.
- 004 "Regional Labor Markets, Network Externalities and Migration: The Case of German Reunification" by Harald Uhlig, January/February 2006.
- 005 "British Interest Rate Convergence between the US and Europe: A Recursive Cointegration Analysis" by Enzo Weber, January 2006.
- 006 "A Combined Approach for Segment-Specific Analysis of Market Basket Data" by Yasemin Boztuğ and Thomas Reutterer, January 2006.
- 007 "Robust utility maximization in a stochastic factor model" by Daniel Hernández-Hernández and Alexander Schied, January 2006.
- 008 "Economic Growth of Agglomerations and Geographic Concentration of Industries - Evidence for Germany" by Kurt Geppert, Martin Gornig and Axel Werwatz, January 2006.
- 009 "Institutions, Bargaining Power and Labor Shares" by Benjamin Bental and Dominique Demougin, January 2006.
- 010 "Common Functional Principal Components" by Michal Benko, Wolfgang Härdle and Alois Kneip, January 2006.
- 011 "VAR Modeling for Dynamic Semiparametric Factors of Volatility Strings" by Ralf Brüggemann, Wolfgang Härdle, Julius Mungo and Carsten Trenkler, February 2006.
- 012 "Bootstrapping Systems Cointegration Tests with a Prior Adjustment for Deterministic Terms" by Carsten Trenkler, February 2006.
- 013 "Penalties and Optimality in Financial Contracts: Taking Stock" by Michel A. Robe, Eva-Maria Steiger and Pierre-Armand Michel, February 2006.
- 014 "Core Labour Standards and FDI: Friends or Foes? The Case of Child Labour" by Sebastian Braun, February 2006.
- 015 "Graphical Data Representation in Bankruptcy Analysis" by Wolfgang Härdle, Rouslan Moro and Dorothea Schäfer, February 2006.
- 016 "Fiscal Policy Effects in the European Union" by Andreas Thams, February 2006.
- 017 "Estimation with the Nested Logit Model: Specifications and Software Particularities" by Nadja Silberhorn, Yasemin Boztuğ and Lutz Hildebrandt, March 2006.
- 018 "The Bologna Process: How student mobility affects multi-cultural skills and educational quality" by Lydia Mechtenberg and Roland Strausz, March 2006.
- 019 "Cheap Talk in the Classroom" by Lydia Mechtenberg, March 2006.
- 020 "Time Dependent Relative Risk Aversion" by Enzo Giacomini, Michael Handel and Wolfgang Härdle, March 2006.
- 021 "Finite Sample Properties of Impulse Response Intervals in SVECMs with Long-Run Identifying Restrictions" by Ralf Brüggemann, March 2006.
- 022 "Barrier Option Hedging under Constraints: A Viscosity Approach" by Imen Bentahar and Bruno Bouchard, March 2006.

SFB 649, Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin
<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".



- 023 "How Far Are We From The Slippery Slope? The Laffer Curve Revisited" by Mathias Trabandt and Harald Uhlig, April 2006.
- 024 "e-Learning Statistics – A Selective Review" by Wolfgang Härdle, Sigbert Klinke and Uwe Ziegenhagen, April 2006.
- 025 "Macroeconomic Regime Switches and Speculative Attacks" by Bartosz Maćkowiak, April 2006.
- 026 "External Shocks, U.S. Monetary Policy and Macroeconomic Fluctuations in Emerging Markets" by Bartosz Maćkowiak, April 2006.
- 027 "Institutional Competition, Political Process and Holdup" by Bruno Deffains and Dominique Demougin, April 2006.
- 028 "Technological Choice under Organizational Diseconomies of Scale" by Dominique Demougin and Anja Schöttner, April 2006.
- 029 "Tail Conditional Expectation for vector-valued Risks" by Imen Bentahar, April 2006.
- 030 "Approximate Solutions to Dynamic Models – Linear Methods" by Harald Uhlig, April 2006.
- 031 "Exploratory Graphics of a Financial Dataset" by Antony Unwin, Martin Theus and Wolfgang Härdle, April 2006.
- 032 "When did the 2001 recession *really* start?" by Jörg Polzehl, Vladimir Spokoiny and Cătălin Stărică, April 2006.
- 033 "Varying coefficient GARCH versus local constant volatility modeling. Comparison of the predictive power" by Jörg Polzehl and Vladimir Spokoiny, April 2006.
- 034 "Spectral calibration of exponential Lévy Models [1]" by Denis Belomestny and Markus Reiß, April 2006.
- 035 "Spectral calibration of exponential Lévy Models [2]" by Denis Belomestny and Markus Reiß, April 2006.
- 036 "Spatial aggregation of local likelihood estimates with applications to classification" by Denis Belomestny and Vladimir Spokoiny, April 2006.
- 037 "A jump-diffusion Libor model and its robust calibration" by Denis Belomestny and John Schoenmakers, April 2006.
- 038 "Adaptive Simulation Algorithms for Pricing American and Bermudan Options by Local Analysis of Financial Market" by Denis Belomestny and Grigori N. Milstein, April 2006.
- 039 "Macroeconomic Integration in Asia Pacific: Common Stochastic Trends and Business Cycle Coherence" by Enzo Weber, May 2006.
- 040 "In Search of Non-Gaussian Components of a High-Dimensional Distribution" by Gilles Blanchard, Motoaki Kawanabe, Masashi Sugiyama, Vladimir Spokoiny and Klaus-Robert Müller, May 2006.
- 041 "Forward and reverse representations for Markov chains" by Grigori N. Milstein, John G. M. Schoenmakers and Vladimir Spokoiny, May 2006.
- 042 "Discussion of 'The Source of Historical Economic Fluctuations: An Analysis using Long-Run Restrictions' by Neville Francis and Valerie A. Ramey" by Harald Uhlig, May 2006.
- 043 "An Iteration Procedure for Solving Integral Equations Related to Optimal Stopping Problems" by Denis Belomestny and Pavel V. Gapeev, May 2006.
- 044 "East Germany's Wage Gap: A non-parametric decomposition based on establishment characteristics" by Bernd Görzig, Martin Gornig and Axel Werwatz, May 2006.
- 045 "Firm Specific Wage Spread in Germany - Decomposition of regional differences in inter firm wage dispersion" by Bernd Görzig, Martin Gornig and Axel Werwatz, May 2006.

SFB 649, Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin
<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

This research was supported by the Deutsche
 Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".



- 046 "Produktdiversifizierung: Haben die ostdeutschen Unternehmen den Anschluss an den Westen geschafft? – Eine vergleichende Analyse mit Mikrodaten der amtlichen Statistik" by Bernd Görzig, Martin Gornig and Axel Werwatz, May 2006.
- 047 "The Division of Ownership in New Ventures" by Dominique Demougin and Oliver Fabel, June 2006.
- 048 "The Anglo-German Industrial Productivity Paradox, 1895-1938: A Restatement and a Possible Resolution" by Albrecht Ritschl, May 2006.
- 049 "The Influence of Information Costs on the Integration of Financial Markets: Northern Europe, 1350-1560" by Oliver Volckart, May 2006.
- 050 "Robust Econometrics" by Pavel Čížek and Wolfgang Härdle, June 2006.
- 051 "Regression methods in pricing American and Bermudan options using consumption processes" by Denis Belomestny, Grigori N. Milstein and Vladimir Spokoiny, July 2006.
- 052 "Forecasting the Term Structure of Variance Swaps" by Kai Detlefsen and Wolfgang Härdle, July 2006.
- 053 "Governance: Who Controls Matters" by Bruno Deffains and Dominique Demougin, July 2006.
- 054 "On the Coexistence of Banks and Markets" by Hans Gersbach and Harald Uhlig, August 2006.
- 055 "Reassessing Intergenerational Mobility in Germany and the United States: The Impact of Differences in Lifecycle Earnings Patterns" by Thorsten Vogel, September 2006.
- 056 "The Euro and the Transatlantic Capital Market Leadership: A Recursive Cointegration Analysis" by Enzo Weber, September 2006.
- 057 "Discounted Optimal Stopping for Maxima in Diffusion Models with Finite Horizon" by Pavel V. Gapeev, September 2006.
- 058 "Perpetual Barrier Options in Jump-Diffusion Models" by Pavel V. Gapeev, September 2006.
- 059 "Discounted Optimal Stopping for Maxima of some Jump-Diffusion Processes" by Pavel V. Gapeev, September 2006.

SFB 649, Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin
<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".

