

# Optimizing Venture Capital Investments in a Jump Diffusion Model

Erhan Bayraktar

Masahiko Egami \*

## Abstract

We study a practical optimization problems for venture capital investments and/or Research and Development (R&D) investments. The first problem is that, given the amount of the initial investment and the reward function at the initial public offering (IPO) market, the venture capitalist wants to maximize overall discounted cash flows after subtracting subsequent (if needed) investments. We describe this problem as a mixture of singular stochastic control and optimal stopping problems and give an explicit solution. The former corresponds to finding an optimal subsequent investment policy for the purpose that the value of the investee company stays away from zero. The latter corresponds to finding an optimal stopping rule in order to maximize the harvest of their investments. The second kind problem is concerned about optimal dividend policy. Rather than selling the holding stock, the investor may extract dividends when it is appropriate. We will find a quasi-explicit optimal solution to this problem and prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution and the optimality of the proposed strategy.

Key words: Venture capital investments, R&D, IPO, optimal stopping, singular stochastic control.

JEL Classification: O32, O33, C61.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) : Primary: 49N25, Secondary: 60G40.

## 1 Introduction

In accordance with the recent theoretical and practical development in the area of real options, modeling venture capital investment and R&D has become increasingly an important topic. Davis et al. (3) reviews the literature of this area. One of the most important issues is modeling the dynamics of the value process of start-up companies and/or R&D projects. Among many approaches, one approach is to use jump models with Poisson arrivals. For example, Willner (11) uses a deterministic drift component and stochastic jumps whose size follows a gamma distribution. A similar model is presented by Pennings and Lint (8), who also model with a deterministic drift and

---

\*E. Bayraktar and M. Egami are with Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-1043, USA. Email:{erhan, egami}@umich.edu. We thank Savas Dayanik for valuable comments and also thank Ikumi Koseki, Tōru Masuda, Akihiko Yasuda, and Anthea A. Yeung for giving good memories and insights through helpful and enjoyable conversations.

a jump part whose size follows a Weibull distribution with scale parameter two. In the spirit of these papers, we will model the value of the process with a jump diffusion. More specifically, we are assuming that the company or the R&D project has (unproven) innovative technologies and hence the appreciation of the company value occurs in a discrete fashion when there is some technological breakthrough or discovery of innovative methods.

Let  $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}\}$  be a probability space hosting a Poisson random measure  $N(dt, dy)$  on  $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ , adapted to some filtration  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  satisfying the usual conditions. The mean measure of  $N$  is  $\nu(dt, dy) \triangleq \lambda dt F(dy)$ , where  $\lambda > 0$  is constant, and  $F(dy)$  is the common distribution of the jump sizes. The (uncontrolled) value process  $X^0$  is described as follows:

$$dX_t^0 = \mu(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t + \int_0^\infty yN(dt, dy). \quad (1.1)$$

In this set up the jumps of  $X$  come from a compound Poisson process whose jump size distribution is  $F$ . To obtain explicit results we will take this distribution to be exponential.

We shall consider the following problem for the venture capitalist. In practice, investments in promising start-up companies are made through venture capital funds (often called “private equity fund” as well) that raises capital from institutional investors such as banks, insurance companies, university endowment funds, and pension/retirement funds. Venture capital funds screen out those start-up companies and select several companies to invest in. In many cases, the venture capital funds actively help and advise by taking a seat on the board of the invested companies. When there is a technological breakthrough, this jump is materialized in the following way: the company and the venture capital fund reevaluate the value of the company stock by using expected cash flow methods supposing that the company is successful in manufacturing real products or using comparable transactions in the past. As a result, some new investors may become willing to invest in the company at the re-evaluated price in this “second round” funding. Hence the appreciation of the stock value can be modelled by an arrival of jumps. The size and arrival rate of jumps can be estimated by track records of the venture capital funds. The final objective of these venture capital investments is, in many cases, to make the company public through initial public offerings (IPO’s) or to sell to a third party at a premium. However, in due course, there are times when the start-up company faces the necessities to solicit new (additional) capital. In turn, the venture capitalist has to make decisions on whether to make additional investments.

Let us mention some advantages of using a jump diffusion model rather than a piecewise deterministic Markov model as in other works. As we discussed in the previous paragraph, until going public in the IPO market, the start-up company evolves while proving their technology and applicability. At an early stage, the company’s growth mostly depends on the timing and magnitude of jump part in (1.1). At the time when the company invites “second and third round” investors, it may generate some cash flow from their operation and jumps of great magnitude are not necessarily expected. At these stages, the diffusion part of (1.1) is becoming increasingly influential. Hence the jump diffusion model can represent start-up companies of various stages by appropriately modifying the parameters of the model.

To address the issues of subsequent investments and IPO, we solve a mixture of singular stochastic control and optimal stopping problem. The former part (singular control) is how the venture capital exercises controls or interventions in terms of additional capital infusions. The latter part (optimal stopping) is, given a certain reward function at the IPO market, to find an optimal stopping rule for this whole project, either making the company public or giving up and walking away. Accordingly, we characterize the initial and subsequent investments as a perpetual American-type call option, which fits business practice well. In summary, while making decisions with respect to additional investments, the venture capitalist seeks to find an optimal stopping rule in order to maximizing her return, after subtracting the present value of her intermediate investments.

## 2 The IPO Problem

### 2.1 Problem Description

Let us consider the problem of the venture capitalist now. The dynamics of the value of the start-up company is described as (1.1). After making the initial investment in the amount of  $x$ , the venture capitalist can make interventions in the form of additional investments. Hence the controlled process  $X$  is written as follows:

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t + \int_0^\infty yN(dt, dy) + dZ_t, \quad X_0 = x, \quad (2.1)$$

in which  $Z = (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a continuous, non-decreasing (except at  $t = 0$ )  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process. Such a control  $Z$  is said to be admissible. We will write  $Z \in \mathcal{V}$ , if  $Z$  is admissible.

The venture capitalist's purpose is to find the best  $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping time to make the company public through an IPO to maximize the present value of the discounted future cash-flow. We will denote the set of all  $\mathbb{F}$  stopping times by  $\mathcal{S}$ . The discounted future cash-flow of the venture capitalist if he applies the control  $Z$ , and makes an initial public offering at time  $\tau$  is

$$J^{\tau, Z}(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}^x \left[ e^{-\alpha(\tau \wedge \tau_0)} h(X_{\tau \wedge \tau_0}) - \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau_0} e^{-\alpha s} dZ_s \right] \quad \tau \in \mathcal{S}, \quad Z \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (2.2)$$

in which

$$\tau_0 \triangleq \inf\{t > 0; X_t < 0\}, \quad (2.3)$$

is the time of bankruptcy of the company,

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} dZ_t = Z_0 + \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\alpha t} dZ_t, \quad (2.4)$$

and  $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  has the following form:

$$h(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} x, & 0 \leq x < K, \\ rx, & K \leq x. \end{cases}$$

with  $r > 1$ .  $K$  is the initial public offering (IPO) threshold value over which the investment made by the venture capitalist receives premium at the time the company becomes public. In our model,  $K$  as well as  $r$  is treated as an exogenous variable, both of which are determined at the IPO market.

Let us discuss some rationale of our model specification. First of all, valuation of IPOs is itself a very challenging subject and, to our knowledge, no complete solutions have yet been obtained. The pricing mechanism at the IPO market is complex, involving uncertainties with respect to the future of the newly publicized companies. A widely observed and recommended procedure both by academics and market practitioners is using comparable firm "multiples": The subject company's operational and financial information is compared with those of publicly-owned comparable companies, especially with ones newly made public. For example, the price-earning (P/E) ratio and/or market-to-book (M/B) ratio are multiplied by a certain number called "multiples" (that may vary from industry to industry) to calculate the IPO value. These numbers of the comparable firms serve as benchmarks. Kim and Ritter (7) found that "P/E multiples using forecasted earnings result in much more accurate valuations" than using historical earnings. In this pricing process, the role of investment banks (they often serve underwriters as well) is critical. They, together with the firm, evaluate the current operational performance, analyze the comparable

firm “multiples”, project future earnings, assess the market demand for IPO stocks and set the timing of IPO (including determination of our  $K$ , which Herbst et al. (4), for example, called the “critical IPO value”). This procedure inherently involves significant degree of variation on prices and introduces “discontinuity” of the post-IPO value from the pre-IPO value, since post-IPO value is, to a certain extent, market driven, while pre-IPO value is mostly company specific. To account for these we use a discontinuous reward function.

Further evidence of this discontinuity can be obtained by the literature about initial stock returns on IPO markets. Johnston and Madura (6) examined the initial (i.e. first day trading) returns of IPOs (both Internet firms and non-Internet firms) during January 1, 1996 to December 31, 2000. They found that the average initial returns of Internet firms IPOs was 78.50%. They also reviewed the papers by Ibbotson and Jaffe (5), Reilly (9) and Ritter (10) and tabulated those authors’ findings. Ritter (10), for example, found average initial returns as high as 48.4% for IPOs that occurred during 1980-1981. Thus, it is widely observed that the IPO companies are priced at a premium and that these premia are the most important sources of income to the venture capitalist. This phenomenon of abnormal initial returns is incorporated in our model with  $r > 1$  on  $x \geq K$ .

## 2.2 Optimal Stopping of a Reflected Jump Diffusion

In this section we will assume that  $Z$  in (2.1) has the following form

$$Z_t^a = (a - x)1_{\{x < a\}} + L_t, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (2.5)$$

in which  $L_t$  is the solution of

$$L_t = \int_0^t 1_{\{X_s = a\}} dL_s, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.6)$$

The process  $L$  is a local time of the process  $X$  at point  $a \geq 0$ . The point  $a$  is a reflecting barrier for the process  $X$ . In this problem, the venture capitalist does not allow the company’s value to go down below a predetermined value  $a$ , and expects the company’s value to grow by a breakthrough innovation and is looking forward to make a public offering to maximize the discounted expected cash-flow. The purpose of the venture capitalist is to determine  $\tau^* \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$V(x; a) \triangleq \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}} J^{\tau, Z^a}(x) = J^{\tau^*, Z^a}(x), \quad x \geq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

if such a  $\tau^*$  exists.

### 2.2.1 Verification Lemma

**Lemma 2.1.** *If a bounded non-negative function  $v \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  with a bounded derivative is also twice continuously differentiable except at countably many points, and satisfies*

$$(i) \quad (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) \leq 0, \quad x \in (a, \infty),$$

$$(ii) \quad v(x) \geq h(x), \quad x \in (a, \infty),$$

$$(iii) \quad v'(a) = 1,$$

in which the integro-differential operator  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}f(x) = \mu(x)f'(x) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(x)f''(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty (f(x+y) - f(y))F(dy), \quad (2.8)$$

$$\text{then } v(x) \geq J^{\tau, Z^a}(x), \quad \tau \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (2.9)$$

Moreover, if there exists a point  $b(a)$  such that

$$(iv) \quad (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) = 0 \text{ and for all } x \in [a, b(a)), v(x) > h(x) \text{ for all } x \in (a, b(a)),$$

$$(v) \quad (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) < 0 \text{ for all } x \in (b(a), \infty), v(x) = h(x) \text{ for all } x \in [b(a), \infty),$$

then  $v(x) = V(x; a)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , and  $\tau_{b(a)} \triangleq \inf\{t \geq 0; X_t \geq b(a)\}$  is optimal.

*Proof.* Let us define  $\tau(n) \triangleq \inf\{t \geq 0; X_t \geq n\}$ . Let  $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ . When we apply Itô's formula to the semimartingale  $X$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\alpha(\tau \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0)} v(X_{\tau \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0}) &= v(x) + \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0} e^{-\alpha s} (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(X_s) ds + 1_{\{x < a\}}(a - x) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0} e^{-\alpha s} v'(X_s) dL_s + \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0} e^{-\alpha s} \sigma(X_s) dW_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0} \int_0^\infty (v(X_{s-} + y) - v(X_{s-})) (N(ds, dy) - \nu(ds, dy)) \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Rearranging this equation and after taking expectations we get

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= \mathbb{E}^x \left[ e^{-\alpha(\tau \wedge \tau(n))} v(X_{\tau \wedge \tau(n)}) - \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau(n)} e^{-\alpha s} v'(X_s) dZ_s - \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau(n)} e^{-\alpha s} (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(X_s) ds \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}^x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_0 \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0} e^{-\alpha s} (v(X_{s-} + y) - v(X_{s-})) (N(ds, dy) - \nu(ds, dy)) - \int_0^{\tau_0 \wedge \tau(n) \wedge \tau_0} e^{-\alpha s} \sigma(X_s) v'(X_s) dW_s \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Since the functions  $\sigma(\cdot)$ ,  $v(\cdot)$  and  $v'(\cdot)$  are bounded the stochastic integral terms vanish. Now, using assumptions (i) and (iii) we get

$$v(x) \geq \mathbb{E}^x \left[ e^{-\alpha(\tau \wedge \tau(n))} v(X_{\tau \wedge \tau(n)}) - \int_0^{\tau \wedge \tau(n)} e^{-\alpha s} dZ_s \right].$$

Equation (2.9) follows from the bounded and monotone convergence theorems and assumption (ii).

On the other hand, if substitute  $\tau$  with  $\tau_{b(a)}$  in the above equations and use assumptions (iv) and (v), we get that  $v(\cdot) = J^{\tau_{b(a)}, Z^a}(\cdot)$ , which proves that  $v(\cdot) = V(\cdot)$  and that  $\tau_{b(a)}$  is optimal, i.e.,  $J^{\tau_{b(a)}, Z^a}(\cdot) \geq J^{\tau, Z^a}(\cdot)$  for any  $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

## 2.2.2 Construction of a Candidate Solution

We will assume that the mean measure of the Poisson random measure  $N$  is given by  $\nu(dt, dy) = \lambda dt \eta e^{-\eta y} dy$ . In other words, we consider the case in which the jumps come from a compound Poisson process with exponentially distributed jump sizes. We also assume that  $\mu(x) = -\mu$  where  $\mu > 0$  and  $\sigma(x) = \sigma$ . Then the action of the infinitesimal generator of  $X^0$  on a test function  $f$  is given by

$$\mathcal{A}f(x) = -\mu f'(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 f''(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty (f(x+y) - f(x)) \eta e^{-\eta y} dy. \quad (2.12)$$

Let us define

$$G(\gamma) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\gamma^2 - \mu\gamma + \frac{\lambda\eta}{\eta - \gamma} - \lambda. \quad (2.13)$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}^x \left[ e^{\gamma X_t^0} \right] = \exp(G(\gamma)t). \quad (2.14)$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *The equation  $G(\gamma) = \alpha$  has two positive roots  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  and one negative root  $-\gamma_3$  satisfying*

$$0 < \gamma_1 < \eta < \gamma_2, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_3 > 0. \quad (2.15)$$

*Proof.* Let us denote

$$A(\gamma) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\gamma^2 - \mu\gamma - (\lambda + \alpha), \quad B(\gamma) \triangleq \frac{\lambda\eta}{\gamma - \eta}. \quad (2.16)$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{\gamma \downarrow \eta} B(\gamma) = \infty, \quad \lim_{\gamma \uparrow \eta} B(\gamma) = -\infty, \quad \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow -\infty} B(\gamma) = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow -\infty} A(\gamma) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} A(\gamma) = \infty, \quad (2.18)$$

and that

$$A(0) = -(\lambda + \alpha) < B(0) = -\lambda. \quad (2.19)$$

Moreover,  $A$  is strictly decreasing on  $(-\infty, 0)$  and strictly increasing on  $(0, \infty)$ ;  $B$  is strictly increasing on  $(-\infty, \eta)$  and strictly decreasing on  $(\eta, \infty)$ . The claim is a direct consequence of these observations.  $\square$

We set the candidate value function as

$$v(x; a) \triangleq \begin{cases} a - x + v(a; a), & x \in [0, a], \\ v_0(x; a) \triangleq A_1 e^{\gamma_1 x} + A_2 e^{\gamma_2 x} + A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 x}, & x \in [a, b], \\ rx, & x \in [b, \infty), \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

for some  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $b > a$ . Our aim is to determine these constants so that  $v(\cdot; a)$  satisfies the conditions of the verification lemma.

We will choose  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $b > a$  to satisfy

$$A_1 e^{\gamma_1 b} + A_2 e^{\gamma_2 b} + A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 b} = rb, \quad (2.21a)$$

$$\frac{A_1 \eta}{\gamma_1 - \eta} e^{\gamma_1 b} + \frac{A_2 \eta}{\gamma_2 - \eta} e^{\gamma_2 b} + \frac{A_3 \eta}{-\gamma_3 - \eta} e^{-\gamma_3 b} + r \left( b + \frac{1}{\eta} \right) = 0, \quad (2.21b)$$

$$\gamma_1 A_1 e^{\gamma_1 a} + \gamma_2 A_2 e^{\gamma_2 a} - \gamma_3 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 a} = 1, \quad (2.21c)$$

$$\gamma_1 A_1 e^{\gamma_1 b} + \gamma_2 A_2 e^{\gamma_2 b} - \gamma_3 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 b} = r. \quad (2.21d)$$

For the function  $v$  in (2.20) to be well-defined, we need to verify that this set of equations have a unique solution. But before let us point how we came up with these equations. The expressions (2.21a), (2.21c) and (2.21d) come from *continuous pasting* at  $b$ , *first-order smooth pasting* at  $a$  and *first order smooth pasting* at  $b$ , respectively. Equation (2.21b) on the other hand comes from evaluating

$$(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x; a) = -\mu v_0'(x) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 v_0''(x) + \lambda \left( \int_0^{b-x} v_0(x+y)\eta e^{-\eta y} dy + \int_{b-x}^{\infty} r \cdot (x+y)\eta e^{-\eta y} dy \right) - (\lambda + \alpha)v_0(x) = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

**Lemma 2.3.** For any given  $a$ , there is a unique  $(A_1, A_2, A_3, b) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (a, \infty)$  that solves the system of equations (2.21a)-(2.21d). Moreover,  $b > \max\{a, b^*\}$ , in which

$$b^* \triangleq \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\eta} - \mu \right) \quad (2.23)$$

and  $A_1 > 0, A_2 > 0$ .

*Proof.* Using (2.21a), (2.21a) and (2.21a) we can determine  $A_1, A_2$  and  $A_3$  as functions of  $b$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(b) &= \frac{r}{\eta^2} \frac{(\eta - \gamma_1)[\gamma_2\gamma_3(\eta b + 1) + \eta(\gamma_2 - \gamma_3)]}{(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1)(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)} e^{-\gamma_1 b} =: D_1(b)e^{-\gamma_1 b}, \\ A_2(b) &= \frac{r}{\eta^2} \frac{(\gamma_2 - \eta)[\gamma_1\gamma_3(\eta b + 1) + \eta(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3)]}{(\gamma_3 + \gamma_2)(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)} e^{-\gamma_2 b} =: D_2(b)e^{-\gamma_1 b}, \\ A_3(b) &= \frac{r}{\eta^2} \frac{(\eta + \gamma_3)[\gamma_2\gamma_1(\eta b + 1) - \eta(\gamma_2 + \gamma_1)]}{(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1)(\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)} e^{\gamma_3 b} =: D_3(b)e^{\gamma_3 b}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

Let us define

$$R(b) \triangleq \gamma_1 A_1(b)e^{\gamma_1 a} + \gamma_2 A_2(b)e^{\gamma_2 a} - \gamma_3 A_3(b)e^{-\gamma_3 a}. \quad (2.25)$$

To verify our claim we only need to show that the function  $b \rightarrow R(b)$  intersects  $R = 1$ , and it does so only once.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} R(a) &= \gamma_1 A_1(a)e^{\gamma_1 a} + \gamma_2 A_2(a)e^{\gamma_2 a} - \gamma_3 A_3(a)e^{-\gamma_3 a} = \gamma_1 D_1(b) + \gamma_2 D_2(b) - \gamma_3 D_3(b) \\ &= \gamma_1 A_1 e^{\gamma_1 b} + \gamma_2 A_2 e^{-\gamma_2 b} - \gamma_3 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 b} = r > 1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

and that

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} R(b) = -\infty. \quad (2.27)$$

The derivative of  $b \rightarrow R(b)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} R'(b) &= \gamma_1 A_1'(b)e^{\gamma_1 a} + \gamma_2 A_2'(b)e^{\gamma_2 a} - \gamma_3 A_3'(b)e^{-\gamma_3 a} \\ &= \left[ \gamma_1 C_1 e^{-\gamma_1(b-a)} + \gamma_2 C_2 e^{-\gamma_2(b-a)} + \gamma_3 C_3 e^{\gamma_3(b-a)} \right] (-\eta\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3 b + Y), \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

in which

$$C_1 \triangleq \frac{r}{\eta^2} \frac{\eta - \gamma_1}{(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1)(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)} > 0, \quad C_2 \triangleq \frac{r}{\eta^2} \frac{\gamma_2 - \eta}{(\gamma_3 + \gamma_2)(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)} > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad C_3 \triangleq \frac{r}{\eta^2} \frac{\eta + \gamma_3}{(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1)(\gamma_3 + \gamma_2)} > 0, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\text{and} \quad Y \triangleq -\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3 + \eta(-\gamma_1\gamma_2 + \gamma_2\gamma_3 + \gamma_1\gamma_3). \quad (2.30)$$

Observe that

$$\frac{Y}{\eta\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3} = b^*. \quad (2.31)$$

From (2.28) it follows that on  $(-\infty, b^*]$  the function  $b \rightarrow R(b)$  is increasing, and on  $[b^*, \infty)$  it is decreasing. If  $b^* \leq a$ , then it follows directly from  $R(a) = r > 1$  and  $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} R(b) = -\infty$  that there exists a unique  $b > a$  such that  $R(b) = 1$ . On the other hand, if  $b^* > a$ , then  $R(x) > 1$  on  $x \in [a, b^*]$ . Again, since  $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} R(b) = -\infty$ , there exists a unique  $b > b^*$  such that  $R(b) = 1$ .

Let us show that  $A_1(b) > 0$  for the unique root of  $R(b) = 1$ . Observe that  $A_1'(b^*) = 0$  and  $A_1(b^*) > 0$ . Moreover,  $b^*$  is the only local extremum of the function  $b \rightarrow A_1(b)$ , and  $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} A_1(b) = 0$ . Since this function is decreasing on  $[b^*, \infty)$ ,  $A_1(b) > 0$ . Similarly,  $A_2(b) > 0$ .

□

### 2.2.3 Verification of Optimality

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let us denote the unique  $b$  in Lemma 2.3 by  $b(a)$  to emphasize its dependence on  $a$ . If  $b(a) \geq K$ , then  $v(\cdot; a)$  defined in (2.20) is equal to  $V(\cdot; a)$  of (2.7).*

*Proof.* The function  $v$  in (2.20) already satisfies

$$(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x; a) = 0, \quad x \in (a, b(a)), \quad v(x; a) = rx, \quad x \in [b(a), \infty), \quad v'(a; a) = 1. \quad (2.32)$$

Therefore, we only need to show that

$$(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x; a) < 0, \quad x \in (b(a), \infty), \quad \text{and that} \quad v(x; a) > rx, \quad x \in (a, b(a)), \quad (2.33)$$

Let us prove the first inequality.

$$(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x; a) = -\mu r + \frac{\lambda r}{\eta} - \alpha r x, \quad x > b(a). \quad (2.34)$$

So,  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x; a) < 0$ , for  $x > b(a)$  if and only if

$$b(a) > \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\eta} - \mu \right) = b^*. \quad (2.35)$$

However, we already know from Lemma 2.3 that (2.35) holds.

Let us prove the second inequality in (2.33). The first and the second derivative of  $v_0(\cdot; a)$  (defined in (2.20)) are

$$v_0'(x; a) = A_1 \gamma_1 e^{\gamma_1 x} + A_2 \gamma_2 e^{\gamma_2 x} - \gamma_3 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 x}, \quad v_0''(x; a) = A_1 \gamma_1^2 e^{\gamma_1 x} + A_2 \gamma_2^2 e^{\gamma_2 x} + \gamma_3^2 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 x}. \quad (2.36)$$

It follows from (2.21a), (2.21c) and (2.21d) that

$$v(b; a) = rb, \quad v'(a; a) = 1 < v'(b(a); a) = r. \quad (2.37)$$

Moreover, from Lemma 2.3 we have that

$$A_1 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 > 0. \quad (2.38)$$

If  $A_3 \geq 0$ , then (2.36) and (2.37) imply that  $v''(x; a) > 0$ ,  $x \in [a, b(a)]$ , i.e.,  $v(\cdot; a)$  is convex on  $[a, b(a)]$ . Therefore  $v'(\cdot; a)$  is increasing on  $[a, b(a)]$  and  $v'(x; a) \in [1, r)$  on  $[a, b)$ . Since  $x \rightarrow v(x; a)$  intersects the function  $x \rightarrow rx$  at  $b(a)$ ,  $v(x; a) > rx$ ,  $x \in [a, b(a))$ . Otherwise there would exist a point  $x^* \in [a, b)$  such that  $v'(x^*; a) > r$ .

Let us analyze the case when  $A_3 < 0$ . In this case the functions  $x \rightarrow A_1 \gamma_1^2 e^{\gamma_1 x} + A_2 \gamma_2^2 e^{\gamma_2 x}$  and  $x \rightarrow -\gamma_3^2 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 x}$  intersect at a unique point  $\tilde{x} > 0$ . The function  $v_0'(\cdot; a)$  (defined in (2.20)) decreases on  $[0, \tilde{x})$  and increases on  $[\tilde{x}, \infty)$ . Since  $v(\cdot; a)$  and  $v_0(\cdot; a)$  coincide on  $[a, b(a)]$ , from (2.37) it follows that  $\tilde{x} < b(a)$ . If  $\tilde{x} \geq a$ , then  $v'(x; a) < r$  for  $x \in [a, b(a))$  since  $v'(a; a) = 1$ ,  $v'(x; a) < 1$  for  $x \in (a, \tilde{x}]$  and  $v'(x; a) < r$  for  $x \in (\tilde{x}, b(a))$ . On the other hand if  $\tilde{x} < a$ , then  $v'(x; a) \in [1, r)$  for  $x \in [a, b(a))$  since  $v'(\cdot; a)$  is increasing on this interval and  $v'(b; a) = r$ . So in any case  $v'(x; a) < r$  on  $[a, b(a))$ . Since  $v(b; a) = rb$ , then  $v(x) > rx$ ,  $x \in [a, b)$ . Otherwise there would exist a point  $x^* \in [a, b)$  such that  $v'(x^*; a) > r$ .

□

Figure 1 shows the value function and their derivatives with certain parameters.




Figure 1: The IPO problem with parameters  $(\mu, \lambda, \eta, \sigma, \alpha, r) = (-0.05, 0.75, 1.5, 0.25, 0.1, 1.25)$  and  $a = 1$ : (a) The value function  $v(x)$  with  $b(a) = 4.7641$ . (b)  $v'(x)$  is also continuous in  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

## 2.3 Mixed Optimal Stopping and Singular Control

In this section, we will analyze a scenario in which the venture capitalist controls the value of the company, by pumping in extra cash, besides deciding when the company should go public. We will assume that the set of controls available to the venture capitalist are of local time type. The venture capitalist will maximize the expected value of her discounted future income. The goal of the venture capitalist is to find an  $a^* \geq 0$  and  $\tau^* \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$V(x) \triangleq \sup_{a \in [0, B]} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}} J^{\tau, Z^a}(x) = \sup_{a \in [0, B]} V(x; a) = J^{\tau^*, Z^{a^*}}(x), \quad x \geq 0, \quad (2.39)$$

if  $(a^*, \tau^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{S}$  exists. Here, for any point  $a$  the control  $Z^a$  is given by (2.5). In this optimization problem, we impose a budget constraint  $a \leq B$ , which is due to the finiteness of the cash reserves of the venture capitalist.

### 2.3.1 The Local Extremums of the Function $a \rightarrow V(x; a)$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Recall the definition of the function  $v_0(\cdot; a)$  from (2.20). If  $\tilde{a} \geq 0$  is a local extremum of the function  $a \rightarrow v_0(x; a)$ , for any  $x \geq 0$ , then  $v_0''(\tilde{a}; \tilde{a}) = 0$ . Also,  $b'(\tilde{a}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let us denote

$$\tilde{A}_1(a) \triangleq A_1(b(a)), \quad \tilde{A}_2(a) \triangleq A_2(b(a)), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A}_3(a) \triangleq A_3(b(a)), \quad (2.40)$$

in which the functions  $A_1(\cdot)$ ,  $A_2(\cdot)$  and  $A_3(\cdot)$  are given by (2.24). The derivative

$$\frac{dv}{da}(x; \tilde{a}) = \tilde{A}'_1(\tilde{a})e^{\gamma_1 x} + \tilde{A}'_2(\tilde{a})e^{\gamma_2 x} + \tilde{A}'_3(\tilde{a})e^{-\gamma_3 x} = 0 \quad (2.41)$$

for all  $x \geq 0$  if and only if

$$\tilde{A}'_1(\tilde{a}) = \tilde{A}'_2(\tilde{a}) = \tilde{A}'_3(\tilde{a}) = 0, \quad (2.42)$$

since the functions  $x \rightarrow e^{\gamma_1 x}$ ,  $x \rightarrow e^{\gamma_2 x}$  and  $x \rightarrow e^{-\gamma_3 x}$ ,  $x \geq 0$ , are linearly independent. Since

$$\tilde{A}'_1(\tilde{a}) = \frac{d}{db} A_1(b(\tilde{a}))b'(\tilde{a}) = 0, \quad (2.43)$$

and for any  $a$ ,  $b(a) > b^*$ , which is the unique local extremum of the function  $b \rightarrow A_1(b)$ , it follows that  $b'(\tilde{a}) = 0$ .

It follows from (2.21c) that for any  $a \geq 0$

$$\gamma_1 \tilde{A}_1(a)e^{\gamma_1 a} + \gamma_2 \tilde{A}_2(a)e^{\gamma_2 a} - \gamma_3 \tilde{A}_3(a)e^{-\gamma_3 a} = 1. \quad (2.44)$$

Taking the derivative with respect to  $a$  we get

$$(\gamma_1^2 \tilde{A}_1(a) + \gamma_1 \tilde{A}'_1(a))e^{\gamma_1 a} + (\gamma_2^2 \tilde{A}_2(a) + \tilde{A}'_2(a))e^{\gamma_2 a} + (\gamma_3^2 \tilde{A}_3(a) - \gamma_3 \tilde{A}'_3(a))e^{-\gamma_3 a} = 0. \quad (2.45)$$

Evaluating this last expression at  $a = \tilde{a}$  we obtain

$$\gamma_1^2 \tilde{A}_1(\tilde{a})e^{\gamma_1 \tilde{a}} + \gamma_2^2 \tilde{A}_2(\tilde{a})e^{\gamma_2 \tilde{a}} + \gamma_3^2 \tilde{A}_3(\tilde{a})e^{-\gamma_3 \tilde{a}} = v_0''(\tilde{a}; \tilde{a}) = 0, \quad (2.46)$$

where we used (2.42).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let the functions  $\tilde{A}_1(\cdot)$ ,  $\tilde{A}_2(\cdot)$  and  $\tilde{A}_3(\cdot)$  be defined by (2.40). And let  $a \rightarrow b(a)$  denote the unique  $b$  (for a given  $a$ ) in Lemma 2.3. Then there exist a unique  $\tilde{a} \geq 0$  that satisfies*

$$v_0''(\tilde{a}; \tilde{a}) = \gamma_1^2 \tilde{A}_1(\tilde{a})e^{\gamma_1 \tilde{a}} + \gamma_2^2 \tilde{A}_2(\tilde{a})e^{\gamma_2 \tilde{a}} + \gamma_3^2 \tilde{A}_3(\tilde{a})e^{-\gamma_3 \tilde{a}} = 0. \quad (2.47)$$

Moreover, if we define  $v(\cdot; \tilde{a})$  as in (2.20), then this function is convex and  $v'(x; \tilde{a}) \geq 1$ ,  $x \geq \tilde{a}$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *If a bounded non-negative function  $v \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  with a bounded derivative is also twice continuously differentiable except at countably many points, and satisfies*

- (i)  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) \leq 0$ ,  $x \in [0, \infty)$ ,
- (ii)  $v(x) \geq h(x)$ ,  $x \in [0, \infty)$ ,
- (iii)  $v'(x) \geq 1$ ,  $x \in [0, \infty)$ ,
- (iv)  $v$  is convex,

in which the integro-differential operator  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined by (2.12).

$$\text{then } v(x) \leq J^{\tau, Z}(x), \quad \tau \in \mathcal{S}, Z \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (2.48)$$

Before ending this section, we provide some results from the sensitivity analysis to the parameters. We use the parameter sets  $(\mu, \lambda, \eta, \sigma, \alpha) = (-0.05, 0.75, 1.5, 0.25, 0.1)$  with  $r = 1.25$  and  $a = 0$  and vary one parameter with the others fixed at the base case. Figure 2 shows the results. In fact, all the graphs show monotone relationship between  $b(a)$  and the parameters, which is intuitive. Larger  $\eta$  (that means smaller  $1/\eta$ ) leads to a smaller threshold value since the mean jump size is small (Graph (a)). Similarly, larger  $\lambda$  leads to a larger threshold value since the frequency of jumps is greater and the investor can expect higher revenue. (Graph (b)). In the same token, if the absolute value of  $\mu$  is greater, the process inclines to return to zero more frequently. Hence the investor cannot expect high revenue due to the time value of money. (Graph (c)). The result of the larger volatility (Graph (d)) is consistent with the fact that the continuation region of the optimal stopping problem expands in optimal stopping problems: The process has a greater probability to reach further out within a fixed amount of time. Hence the investor can expect the process to reach a higher return level.

## 3 The Harvesting Problem

### 3.1 Problem Description

In this section, the investor wants to extract the value out of the company intermittently (i.e., receives dividends from the company) when there are opportunities to do so. This problem might fit better the case of R&D investments rather than the venture capital investments. Namely, the company or R&D project has a large technology




Figure 2: Sensitivity analysis of the harvesting (dividend payout) problem to the parameters. The basis parameters are  $(\mu, \lambda, \eta, \sigma, \alpha) = (-0.05, 0.75, 1.5, 0.25, 0.1)$ : (a) jump size parameter  $\eta$ , (b) arrival rate  $\lambda$ , (c) drift rate  $\mu$  and (d) volatility  $\sigma$ .

platform, based on which applications are made and products are materialized from time to time. Each time it occurs, the investor tries to sell these products or applications and in turn receives dividends. There are many papers about dividend payout problems consider continuous diffusion processes. See, for example, Bayraktar and Egami (1) and the references therein. One of the exceptions, to our knowledge, is Dassios and Embrechts (2) that analyze, using the Laplace transform method, the downward jump case. The absolute value of the jumps are exponentially distributed. In (2), the investor extracts dividends every time when a *piecewise deterministic Markov process* hits a certain boundary (i.e., singular control). In what follows, the dividend payments are triggered by sporadic jumps of the process as well as the diffusion part. Whenever the value of the company exceed a certain value, which may occur continuously or via jumps, dividends are paid out. So the investor applies a mixture of singular and impulse controls.

Again, we consider the jump diffusion model (1.1) for the intrinsic value of the company. Accounting for the dividend payments the value of the company follos:

$$dX_t = \mu(X_t)dt + \sigma(X_t)dW_t + \int_0^\infty yN(dt, dy) - dZ_t \quad (3.1)$$

where  $Z = (Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a continuous non-decreasing (expect at  $t = 0$ )  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process.

We consider the following dividend policy: the investor sets a certain threshold level, say  $b$ , and each time the company value reaches *at or beyond* this level, she takes out dividend:

$$Z_t - Z_0 = \int_{(0,t)} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_s \geq b\}} dZ_s$$

As can be seen from the above equation, due to the existence of jumps caused by Poisson arrival time  $\tau_i$ ,  $Z$  process may increase by the amount  $X_{\tau_i-} + Y_{\tau_i} - b$  if this quantity is positive.

A dividend payment policy  $\pi$  is a double stochastic sequence

$$\pi = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_m, \dots; \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m, \dots)$$

in which  $\{\theta_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an increasing sequence of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -stopping times and  $\{\xi_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of non-negative random variables. We assume that  $\xi_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\tau_i}$  for all  $i$ . We will denote  $\Pi$  the set of all such dividend policies.

The investor wants to find the optimal dividend payments. We define the performance measure.

$$J^\pi(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}^x \left[ \int_{(0, \tau_0)} e^{-\alpha t} dZ_t \right] \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\tau_0 = \inf\{t \geq 0; X_t = 0\}$$

denotes the time of insolvency. We call the value function  $V(x)$  and the optimal strategy  $\pi^* = (\theta_m^*, \xi_m^*)_{m \geq 0}$ , where

$$V(x) \triangleq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} J^\pi(x) = J^{\pi^*}(x), \quad (3.3)$$

and  $\Pi$  is the set of admissible strategies.

## 3.2 A Mixed Singular and Impulse Control Problem

### 3.2.1 Verification Lemma

For solving this problem, let us consider a candidate  $v(x)$  of class  $C^1$  on  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and the strategy that the moments of dividend payment coincide with the jump times of the process.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If a bounded non-negative function  $v \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$  with a bounded derivative is also twice continuously differentiable except at countably many points and satisfies*

- (i)  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) \leq 0, x \geq 0,$
- (ii)  $v'(x) \geq 1, x \geq 0,$
- (iii)  $v''(x) \geq 0$  (i.e.  $v$  is concave),

then

$$v(x) \geq V(x), \quad x \geq 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, if there exists point  $b^* \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $v \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{b^*\})$  such that

- (iv)  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) = 0, v'(x) > 1,$  for all  $x \in (0, b^*),$
- (v)  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) < 0, v'(x) = 1, x \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus [0, b^*],$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{R},$

in which the integro-differential operator  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined by (2.8), then

$$v(x) = V(x) \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \text{and}, \quad (3.5)$$

$$Z_t^* = (X_t - b^*)1_{\{X_t > b^*\}} + L_t^*, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.6)$$

in which

$$L_t^* = \int_0^t 1_{\{X_s=b\}} dL_s^*, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3.7)$$

is optimal.

*Proof.* Let  $\tau(n)$  be as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. Using Itô's formula for semi-martingales

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\alpha(\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0)}v(X_{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0}) &= v(x) + \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(X_s)ds - \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}v'(X_s)dZ_s \\ &+ \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}\sigma(X_s)dW_s + \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} \int_0^\infty (v(X_{s-} + y) - v(X_{s-}))(N(ds, dy) - \nu(ds, dy)) \\ &+ \sum_{0 \leq \theta_k \leq \tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha\theta_k} (v(X_{\theta_k}) - v(\theta_{k-}) - v'(X_{\theta_{k-}})\Delta X_{\theta_k}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

in which  $\{\theta_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an increasing sequence of  $\mathbb{F}$  stopping times that are the times the process  $X$  jump due to a jump in  $Z$ . Since  $v$  and  $v'$  are bounded after taking expectations the stochastic integral terms vanish. Hence it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= \mathbb{E}^x \left[ e^{-\alpha(\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0)}v(X_{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0}) + \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}dZ_s + \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}(v'(X_s) - 1)dZ_s \right] \\ &- \mathbb{E}^x \left[ \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(X_s)ds - \sum_{0 \leq \theta_k \leq \tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha\theta_k} (v(X_{\theta_k}) - v(\theta_{k-}) - v'(X_{\theta_{k-}})\Delta X_{\theta_k}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

The concavity of  $v$  implies that

$$v(y) - v(x) - v'(x)(y - x) \leq 0, \quad \text{for any } y > x, \quad (3.10)$$

therefore the sum term in (3.9) is less than or equal to 0. Moreover, Assumptions (i), (ii), (iii) imply that

$$v(x) \geq \mathbb{E}^x \left[ e^{-\alpha(\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0)}v(X_{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0}) + \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}dZ_s \right].$$

Equation (3.4) follows from the bounded and monotone convergence theorems.

When the control  $Z^*$  defined in (3.6) is applied

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\alpha(\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0)}v(X_{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0}) &= v(x) + \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(X_s)ds - \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}v'(X_s)dZ_s \\ &+ \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}\sigma(X_s)dW_s + \int_0^{\tau(n)\wedge\tau_0} \int_0^\infty (v(X_s) - v(X_{s-}))(N(ds, dy) - \nu(ds, dy)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

After taking expectations and then using assumptions (iv) and (v), monotone and bounded convergence theorems we obtain

$$v(x) = \mathbb{E}^x \left[ \int_0^{\tau_0} e^{-\alpha s}dZ_s^* \right], \quad (3.12)$$

which proves the optimality of  $Z^*$  and  $v(\cdot) = V(\cdot)$ .

□

### 3.2.2 Exponential Jump Size

To obtain an explicit solution, we consider the case of exponential jump size again. As in the IPO problem, by using the three fundamental solutions of  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) = 0$ , we set the candidate value function in the continuation region as  $v_0(x) \triangleq A_1 e^{\gamma_1 x} + A_2 e^{\gamma_2 x} + A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 x}$  with some constants  $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The verification lemma suggests the value function is of the form

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} v_0(x) = A_1 e^{\gamma_1 x} + A_2 e^{\gamma_2 x} + A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 x}, & x \in [0, b^*), \\ x - b^* + v_0(b^*), & x \in [b^*, \infty). \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

We impose appropriate boundary conditions on 0 and  $b$  to obtain the following equations:

$$(\hat{\mathcal{A}} - \alpha)v(x) = 0, \quad 0 < x < b, \quad (3.14)$$

$$v(x) = v(b) + (x - b), \quad b \leq x, \quad (3.15)$$

$$v(0) = 0. \quad (3.16)$$

in which

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}v(x) = -\mu v'(x) + \lambda \left( \int_0^{b-x} v(x+y)F(dy) + \int_{b-x}^{\infty} (v(b) + (x+y-b))F(dy) \right) - \lambda v(x)$$

with  $F(dy) = \eta e^{-\eta y} dy$ . Note that the integration part is split into two parts, depending on the size of jumps. Since, above the level of  $b$ , we extract value in the form of  $v(b) + (x - b)$  on  $x \in [b, \infty)$ , if the post jump position  $x + y$  is greater than  $b$ , we should have the second integral term. One can compute this integral explicitly and (3.14) results in the following form,

$$\frac{A_1 \eta}{\gamma_1 - \eta} e^{\gamma_1 b} + \frac{A_2 \eta}{\gamma_2 - \eta} e^{\gamma_2 b} + \frac{A_3 \eta}{-\gamma_3 - \eta} e^{-\gamma_3 b} + v(b) + \frac{1}{\eta} = 0.$$

independent of  $x$ . By imposing continuity of  $v(x)$  at  $b$ , it becomes

$$\frac{A_1 \eta}{\gamma_1 - \eta} e^{\gamma_1 b} - \frac{A_2 \eta}{\gamma_2 + \eta} e^{-\gamma_2 b} + A_1 e^{\gamma_1 b} + A_2 e^{-\gamma_2 b} + A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 b} + \frac{1}{\eta} = 0. \quad (3.17)$$

To find the optimal  $b^*$ , imposing the first order and second order *smooth-fit principle* at  $b$  to obtain from (3.15),

$$\gamma_1 A_1 e^{\gamma_1 b} + \gamma_2 A_2 e^{\gamma_2 b} - \gamma_3 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 b} = 1, \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$\gamma_1^2 A_1 e^{\gamma_1 b} + \gamma_2^2 A_2 e^{\gamma_2 b} + \gamma_3^2 A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 b} = 0, \quad (3.19)$$

respectively. Lastly, (3.16) becomes

$$A_1 + A_2 + A_3 = 0. \quad (3.20)$$

Hence the problem reduces to find the (unique) solution to the non-linear system of equations (3.17), (3.18), (3.19), and (3.20).

**Lemma 3.2.** *There exists unique solution  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  and  $b$  to the system of equations (3.17), (3.18), (3.19), and (3.20) if and only if the quantity  $\mu + \lambda/\eta > 0$ .*

*Proof.* By using the first three equations, we can express  $A_i$  as functions of  $b$ : For all  $b > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(b) &= \frac{e^{-\gamma_1 b}}{\eta} \frac{\gamma_2 \gamma_3 (\eta - \gamma_1)}{\gamma_1 (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) (\gamma_1 + \gamma_3)} > 0, \\ A_2(b) &= \frac{e^{-\gamma_2 b}}{\eta} \frac{\gamma_3 \gamma_1 (\gamma_2 - \eta)}{\gamma_2 (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3) (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)} > 0, \\ A_3(b) &= \frac{e^{\gamma_3 b}}{\eta} \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 (\eta + \gamma_3)}{(-\gamma_3) (\gamma_1 + \gamma_3) (\gamma_2 + \gamma_3)} < 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Let us define  $R(b) \triangleq A_1(b) + A_2(b) + A_3(b)$  and take the derivative with respect to  $b$ . Since, from (3.21),  $A_1'(b) < 0$ ,  $A_2'(b) < 0$ , and  $A_3'(b) < 0$ , we can conclude that  $R(b)$  is decreasing in  $b > 0$ . Hence in view of (3.20), we have unique solution if and only if there exists  $b$  such that  $R(b) = 0$ . It is equivalent to saying (due to the monotonicity of  $R(b)$ ) that  $R(0) > 0$ . By explicitly computing  $R(0)$  in (3.21), we obtain

$$R(0) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{\eta \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3} \left( -\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 + \eta (-\gamma_1 \gamma_2 + \gamma_2 \gamma_3 + \gamma_3 \gamma_1) \right) = \frac{\mu + \lambda/\eta}{\alpha} > 0.$$

□

Now we move on to the proof of the optimality of  $v(x)$  given by (3.13):

**Lemma 3.3.** *For the function given by (3.13) and  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  and  $b$  as the unique set of solutions of (3.17), (3.18), (3.19), and (3.20), we have (i)  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) < 0$  for  $x \in (b, \infty)$ , (ii)  $v'(x) > 1$  on  $x \in [0, b)$ , (iii)  $v''(x) < 0$  on  $x \in [0, b)$ .*

*Proof.* (i): On  $x \in (b, \infty)$ ,  $v(x) = (x - b) + v_0(b)$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) &= \mu + \lambda/\eta - \alpha(x - b^*) - \alpha v_0(b^*) < \mu + \lambda/\eta - \alpha v_0(b^*) \\ &= \lim_{x \downarrow b^*} (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) = \lim_{x \uparrow b^*} (\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the continuity of  $v(x)$ ,  $v'(x)$  and  $v''(x)$  at  $x = b$ .

(ii) and (iii): Since  $A_1(b), A_2(b), A_3(b) < 0$ , we have know  $v_0''(x)$  is monotonically increasing in  $x$  on  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, we set  $v_0''(b) = 0$ , which implies that  $v_0''(x) < 0$  on  $x \in [0, b)$ . This proves (iii). Since  $v_0''(x) < 0$  implies that  $v_0'(x)$  is decreasing on  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, we set  $v_0'(x) = 1$ , which implies that  $v_0'(x) > 1$  on  $x \in [0, b)$ . This proves (ii). □

These results allow us to state the main result in this section:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Suppose that  $\mu + \frac{\lambda}{\eta} > 0$ . The value function  $V(x)$  described in (3.3) is*

$$V(x) = \begin{cases} v_0(x) = A_1 e^{\gamma_1 x} + A_2 e^{\gamma_2 x} + A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 x}, & x \in [0, b^*), \\ x - b^* + v_0(b^*), & x \in [b^*, \infty). \end{cases} \tag{3.22}$$

in which  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  and  $b^*$  are unique solution to the system of equations (3.17), (3.18), (3.19), and (3.20). If  $x > b^*$ , then one makes an immediate payment in the amount of  $\xi_1^* = x - b^*$  and the controlled process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  starts at  $b^*$ . If  $x \leq b^*$ , then no payment is made at  $t = 0$  and dividend is paid when the controlled process attains at  $b^*$  or goes beyond  $b^*$ , that is  $\theta_i^* = \inf\{t > \theta_{i-1}^* : X_{t \wedge \tau_0} \geq b^*\}$ . If  $\mu + \frac{\lambda}{\eta} \leq 0$ , there is no solution; No dividend policy is undertaken ( $\theta_1 = \infty$ ).

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.2, the existence and uniqueness of  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $A_3$  and  $b^*$  are proved. It is obvious that  $v(x)$  defined in (3.13) satisfies  $(\mathcal{A} - \alpha)v(x) = 0$  on  $x \in (0, b^*)$  and  $v'(x) = 1$  and  $v(x) - v(y) - v'(x)(x - y) = 0$  on  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus [0, b^*]$ . Hence these facts together with Lemma 3.3 prove that all the conditions in Lemma 3.1 are satisfied. It follows that  $V(x) = v(x)$ .  $\square$

Figure 3 shows the value function and their derivatives with certain parameters. Finally, we perform some




Figure 3: The harvesting (dividend payout) problem with parameters  $(\mu, \lambda, \eta, \sigma, \alpha) = (-0.05, 0.75, 1.5, 0.25, 0.1)$ : (a) The value function  $v(x)$  with  $b^* = 1.276$ . (b)  $v'(x)$  and  $v''(x)$  to show that the optimality conditions are satisfied.

sensitivity analysis to the parameters. Fig 4 shows the results. **Graph (a):** The first graph shows that as the expected value of jump size  $1/\eta$  decreases, so does the threshold level  $b^*$ . This makes sense since the value  $1/\eta$  sets practical restrictions; that is, one cannot set a high level of threshold when the average jump size is small. **Graph (b):** It is interesting to observe that  $b^*$  increases first and start decreasing when  $\lambda$  reaches a certain level, say  $\lambda_{\max}$ . A possible interpretation is as follows: In the range of  $(0, \lambda_{\max})$ , for a small  $\lambda$ , one wants to extract a large amount of cash whenever jumps occur since the opportunities are limited. As  $\lambda$  gets larger, one starts to be willing to let the process live longer by extracting smaller amounts each time. This causes the increasing  $b^*$  in this range. On the other hand, after  $\lambda$  reaches a large enough, one becomes comfortable with receiving more dividends, causing the declining trend of  $b^*$  in the range of  $(\lambda_{\max}, \infty)$ . Of course, we need more research to make a firm statement of this phenomenon. **Graph (c):** The small  $\mu$  in the absolute value sense implies that it takes more time to hit the absorbing state. Accordingly, it is safe to extract a large amount of dividend. However, when the cost increases up to a certain level, say  $\mu^*$ , it becomes risky to extract and hence  $b^*$  increases. It is observed that after the cost level is beyond  $\mu^*$ , one would become more desperate to take a large dividend at one time in the fear of imminent insolvency caused by a large  $\mu$  (in the absolute value sense). This is the downward trend of  $b^*$  on the left side of  $\mu^*$ . **Graph (d):** As the volatility goes up, then the process tends to spend more time away from zero in both the positive and negative real line. Accordingly, the threshold level increases to follow the process. This is consistent with the results in the case of optimal stopping problems; that is, a higher volatility leads to a larger continuation region.

## References

- [1] E. Bayraktar and M. Egami. Optimal dividend payments under fixed cost and implementation delays for various models. *Submitted*, 2006.
- [2] A. Dassios and P. Embrechts. Martingales and insurance risk. *Comm. Stat. Stoch. Models*, 5:181–217, 1989.




Figure 4: Sensitivity analysis of the harvesting (dividend payout) problem to the parameters. The basis parameters are  $(\mu, \lambda, \eta, \sigma, \alpha) = (-0.05, 0.75, 1.5, 0.25, 0.1)$ : (a) jump size parameter  $\eta$ , (b) arrival rate  $\lambda$ , (c) drift rate  $\mu$  and (d) volatility  $\sigma$ .

- [3] M. Davis, W. Schachermayer, and R. Tompkins. The evaluation of venture capital as an instalment option. *Preprint*, 2002.
- [4] A. F. Herbst, J. B. Lin, and C. Pantzalis. Valuation of pre-IPO startup business using real options approach. *Presented at the 8th Annual Conference of the Global Financial Association, Los Angeles*, 2001.
- [5] J. Ibbotson and J. Jaffe. Hot issues markets. *J. Finance*, 30:1027–1042, 1975.
- [6] J. Johnston and J. Madura. The performance of internet firms following their ininitial public offering. *The Financial Review*, 37:525–550, 2002.
- [7] M. Kim and J. Ritter. Valuing IPOs. *J. of Financial Economics*, 53:409–437, 1999.
- [8] E. Pennings and O. Lint. The option value of advanced R&D. *Euro. J. Operational Research*, 103:83–94, 1997.
- [9] F. Reilly. New issues revisited. *Financial Management*, 6:28–42, 1977.
- [10] J. Ritter. The hot issue market of 1980. *J. Business*, 57:215–240, 1984.
- [11] R. Willner. *Valuing Start-Up Venture Growth Options in Real Options in Capital Investments*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1995.