

Equilibrium Investment with Random Risk Aversion: (Non-)uniqueness, Optimality, and Comparative Statics

Weilun Cheng*, Zongxia Liang†, Sheng Wang‡, Jianming Xia§

December 2, 2025

Abstract

This paper investigates infinite-dimensional portfolio selection problem under a general distribution of the risk aversion parameter. We provide a complete characterization of all deterministic equilibrium investment strategies. Our results reveal that the solution structure depends critically on the distribution of risk aversion: the equilibrium is unique whenever it exists in the case of finite expected risk aversion, whereas an infinite expectation can lead to infinitely many equilibria or to a unique trivial one ($\bar{\pi} \equiv \mathbf{0}$). To address this multiplicity, we introduce three optimality criteria—optimal, uniformly optimal, and uniformly strictly optimal—and explicitly characterize the existence and uniqueness of the corresponding equilibria. Under the same necessary and sufficient condition, the optimal and uniformly optimal equilibria exist uniquely and coincide. Furthermore, by additionally assuming that the market price of risk is non-zero near the terminal time, we show that the optimal (and hence uniformly optimal) equilibrium is also uniformly strictly optimal. Finally, we perform comparative statics to demonstrate that a risk aversion distribution dominating another in the reverse hazard rate order leads to a less aggressive equilibrium strategy.

Keywords: Random Risk Aversion; Time-Inconsistency; Portfolio Selection; Intra-Personal Equilibrium; Multiple Equilibria; Comparative Statics

1 Introduction

The classical framework for portfolio selection, pioneered by [Merton \(1969, 1975\)](#) and [Samuelson \(1969\)](#), is based on the assumption that an investor’s risk aversion can be captured by a single known constant. In practice, however, this coefficient is very difficult for an agent to specify with

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. chengwl25@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

†Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. liangzongxia@tsinghua.edu.cn

‡Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong. sheng-wa15@tsinghua.org.cn

§State Key Laboratory of Mathematical Sciences, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. xia@amss.ac.cn

certainty, and a growing body of empirical evidence suggests that it varies dynamically with market conditions, often increasing during financial crises and bear markets, as shown in studies by [Gordon and St-Amour \(2000\)](#); [Chetty \(2006\)](#) and [Guiso et al. \(2018\)](#). These challenges have motivated a move towards models that incorporate random risk aversion. Within this paradigm, a more economically coherent approach, as advanced by [Desmettre and Steffensen \(2023\)](#), is to aggregate certainty equivalents over the distribution of the risk aversion parameter. While the random risk aversion in [Desmettre and Steffensen \(2023\)](#) provides a consistent performance measure in monetary units, it introduces a nonlinearity in expectation that naturally leads to the time inconsistency of the preference.

The first systematic treatment of time inconsistency was given by [Strotz \(1955\)](#), who proposed the notion of consistent planning, laying the foundation for the intra-personal game-theoretic equilibrium framework. Building on this idea, [Ekeland and Lazrak \(2006\)](#) later developed a rigorous continuous-time formalization, which in turn inspired extensive research on continuous-time control with time-inconsistent preferences. For example, [Bjork and Murgoci \(2010\)](#) (published version [Björk et al. \(2017\)](#)) established a general theoretical framework by deriving an extended HJB equation and [Hu, Jin, and Zhou \(2012, 2017\)](#) investigated a time-inconsistent stochastic linear-quadratic control problem. For further discussions and related developments, see [Yan and Yong \(2019\)](#), [He and Jiang \(2021\)](#), [Hernández and Possamai \(2023\)](#), and the references therein.

Within the Black-Scholes market model, [Desmettre and Steffensen \(2023\)](#) provide a verification theorem on the intra-personal equilibrium strategies for a CRRA utility function with a general random risk aversion and, in the case of a binomial random risk aversion, characterize the equilibrium by a three-dimensional ODE system without establishing the existence and uniqueness of the solution.¹ This technical gap is fulfilled by [Liang, Wang, and Xia \(2025\)](#). For a general random risk aversion, [Liang, Wang, and Xia \(2025\)](#) characterize the intra-personal equilibrium strategies by an integral equation. They establish the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the integral equation under the assumptions that the variance of the random risk aversion is finite and that the function h defined in (2.6) below is bounded.

This paper aims to offer more insight into the portfolio selection problem with random risk aversion within the simplest model, in line with [Desmettre and Steffensen \(2023\)](#) and [Liang, Wang, and Xia \(2025\)](#). Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- **Complete characterization under general random risk aversion.** We relax the assumptions in the existing literature and derive a full characterization of all deterministic equilibrium strategies. An important finding is that equilibria may be multiple when the

¹This work has spurred further research extending the model to more complex settings. For example, [Chen, Guan, and Liang \(2025\)](#) incorporate a regime-switching framework in which market dynamics and preferences co-evolve; [Wang and Jia \(2025\)](#) study the management of the DC pension plan, providing semi-explicit solutions for a CRRA utility with a binomial random risk aversion; [He, Jiang, and Xia \(2025\)](#) establish the existence and uniqueness of the solution to an infinite-dimensional Riccati equation which characterizes the equilibrium strategies under Heston's SV model for a CRRA or CARA utility function with a general bounded random risk aversion. For an investigation on the corresponding pre-commitment problem, see [Xia \(2024\)](#).

expectation of the random risk aversion is infinite.

- **Resolution of equilibrium multiplicity via three optimality criteria.** To address the non-uniqueness issue, we introduce three optimality notions—optimal, uniformly optimal, and uniformly strictly optimal. We give the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of optimal equilibria and observe that the optimal equilibrium, if exists, is unique and is also uniformly optimal. Moreover, if the market price of risk remains non-zero near the terminal time, the optimal equilibrium is also uniformly strictly optimal.²
- **Comparative statics on equilibrium strategies.** We examine how the distribution of the random risk aversion influences the equilibrium strategies. In analogy with the comparative statics under the standard expected utility maximization (see Xia (2011) for example), we show that a “larger” random risk aversion—in the sense of reverse hazard rate dominance—leads to a strictly less aggressive equilibrium allocation to the risky assets.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the model and derives the integral equation characterizing the equilibrium. Section 3 analyzes both the finite and infinite expectation cases, providing a complete characterization of all equilibria. Section 4 introduces three optimality criteria for equilibrium selection and establishes the necessary and sufficient conditions for their existence and uniqueness. Section 5 performs comparative statics to investigate the impact of risk aversion distributions on equilibrium strategies, establishing monotonicity under the reverse hazard rate order, and provides numerical illustrations that verify the theoretical results and present a counterexample under first-order stochastic dominance.

2 Time-inconsistent portfolio selection with random risk aversion

Let $T > 0$ be a finite time horizon and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space, where $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is the augmented natural filtration generated by a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion $\{B(t), 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T$. The market consists of one risk-free asset (bond) and d risky assets (stocks). For simplicity, we assume that the interest rate of the bond is zero. The dynamics of the stock price processes S_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$, are given by

$$dS_i(t) = S_i(t)[\mu_i(t)dt + \sigma_i(t)dB(t)], \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where the market coefficients $\mu : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are right-continuous and deterministic (each σ_i denotes the i -th row of σ). We always assume that

$$\int_0^T |\mu(t)|dt + \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^T |\sigma_i(t)|^2 dt < \infty$$

and $\sigma(t)$ is invertible for every $t \in [0, T]$. Let $\lambda(t) \triangleq (\sigma(t))^{-1}\mu(t)$ be the market price of risk. We also assume that $\lambda \in L^2((0, T), \mathbb{R}^d)$.

²Wei, Xia, and Zhao (2024) also observed the non-uniqueness of the equilibrium strategies for rank dependent utilities and discussed the optimal and the uniform optimal equilibria.

For any $m \geq 1$ and $\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $L^0(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{S})$ is the space of \mathbb{S} -valued, \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes. For each $t \in [0, T]$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, $L^p(\mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{S})$ is the set of all L^p -integrable, \mathbb{S} -valued, and \mathcal{F}_t -measurable random variables.

A trading strategy is a process $\pi = \{\pi_t, t \in [0, T]\} \in L^0(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\int_0^T |\pi_t^\top \mu(t)| dt + \int_0^T |\sigma^\top(t) \pi_t|^2 dt < \infty \text{ a.s.},$$

where π_t represents the vector of portfolio weights determining the investment of wealth into the stocks at time t . The self-financing wealth process $\{W_t^\pi, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ associated with a trading strategy π satisfies the following stochastic differential equation (SDE):

$$\begin{cases} dW_t^\pi = W_t^\pi \pi_t^\top \mu(t) dt + W_t^\pi \pi_t^\top \sigma(t) dB(t), \\ W_0^\pi = w_0 > 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

The performance of a trading strategy π at time t is evaluated by the functional $J(t, \pi)$, defined as the expectation of certainty equivalents

$$J(t, \pi) = \int_{(0, \infty)} (u^\gamma)^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E}_t \left[u^\gamma \left(\frac{W_T^\pi}{W_t^\pi} \right) \right] \right) d\Gamma(\gamma), \quad (2.2)$$

where u^γ are the constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) utility functions given by

$$u^\gamma(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma}, & \gamma > 0, \gamma \neq 1, x > 0, \\ \log x, & \gamma = 1, x > 0, \end{cases}$$

and Γ is a distribution function on $(0, \infty)$ corresponding to a random variable \mathbf{R} defined on another independent probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$. For notational convenience, expectations with respect to \mathbf{R} will also be denoted by \mathbb{E} instead of $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}$.

A trading strategy π is called *admissible* if

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\left| u^\gamma \left(\frac{W_T^\pi}{W_t^\pi} \right) \right| \right] < \infty \text{ a.s.}, & \forall t \in [0, T) \text{ and } \forall \gamma \in (0, \infty), \\ \int_{(0, \infty)} \left| (u^\gamma)^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E}_t \left[u^\gamma \left(\frac{W_T^\pi}{W_t^\pi} \right) \right] \right) \right| d\Gamma(\gamma) < \infty \text{ a.s.}, & \forall t \in [0, T). \end{cases}$$

Let Π denote the set of all admissible strategies.

Hereafter, we consider a fixed $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$, which is a candidate equilibrium strategy. For any $t \in [0, T)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, T - t)$ and $k \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{R}^d)$, define $\pi^{t, \varepsilon, k}$ by

$$\pi_s^{t, \varepsilon, k} \triangleq \begin{cases} \bar{\pi}_s + k, & s \in [t, t + \varepsilon), \\ \bar{\pi}_s, & s \notin [t, t + \varepsilon). \end{cases}$$

The strategy $\pi^{t, \varepsilon, k}$ serves as a perturbation of $\bar{\pi}$. Following [Hu, Jin, and Zhou \(2012, 2017\)](#) and [Yan and Yong \(2019\)](#), we introduce the definition of equilibrium strategies as follows.

Definition 2.1. A strategy $\bar{\pi}$ is called an equilibrium strategy if for any $t \in [0, T)$ and $k \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{R}^d)$, whenever $\pi^{t, \varepsilon, k} \in \Pi$ for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have for any positive sequence $\{\varepsilon_n, n \geq 1\}$ satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$ that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J(t, \pi^{t, \varepsilon_n, k}) - J(t, \bar{\pi})}{\varepsilon_n} \leq 0, \quad a.s. \quad (2.3)$$

Remark 2.2. In the literature, the inequality is usually

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{J(t, \pi^{t, \varepsilon, k}) - J(t, \bar{\pi})}{\varepsilon} \leq 0, \quad a.s.$$

However, the left-hand side of the inequality might not be measurable. To ensure measurability, we have modified the definition of equilibrium accordingly.

In our analysis, we follow the approach of [Liang et al. \(2025\)](#) and focus on the equilibrium strategies given by $\bar{\pi} = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a$, where a is deterministic, right-continuous, and belongs to the L^2 space. Let $\Pi_d \subset \Pi$ denote the set of all such strategies. For any $\bar{\pi} = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a \in \Pi_d$, we introduce the following notations for ease of analysis:

$$v_a(t) \triangleq \int_t^T |a(s)|^2 ds, \quad y_a(t) \triangleq \int_t^T a^\top(s) \lambda(s) ds.$$

Since the strategy is deterministic, the conditional distribution of the wealth ratio depends only on the deterministic quantities $v_a(t)$ and $y_a(t)$ and we have

$$J(t, \bar{\pi}) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{R}v_a(t) - 2y_a(t))} \right]. \quad (2.4)$$

Before stating the necessary and sufficient condition for the strategy $\bar{\pi} = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a \in \Pi_d$ to be an equilibrium, we first show that $\pi \equiv \mathbf{0}$ is an equilibrium if $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$.

Theorem 2.3. If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$, then $\bar{\pi} \equiv \mathbf{0}$ is an equilibrium.

Proof. Let $\bar{\pi} = \mathbf{0}$. For any $t \in [0, T)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, T - t)$, and $k \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have $J(t, \bar{\pi}) = 1$ and

$$J(t, \pi^{t, \varepsilon, k}) = e^{\int_t^{t+\varepsilon} \mu^\top(s) k ds} \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \int_t^{t+\varepsilon} |\sigma^\top(s) k|^2 ds} d\Gamma(\gamma) \triangleq \phi(\varepsilon) \times \psi(\varepsilon).$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\psi(\varepsilon) - 1}{\varepsilon} &= -\frac{1}{2} |\sigma^\top(t) k|^2 \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{(0, \infty)} \gamma e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2} \int_t^{t+\varepsilon} |\sigma^\top(s) k|^2 ds} d\Gamma(\gamma) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} |\sigma^\top(t) k|^2 \int_{(0, \infty)} \gamma d\Gamma(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses the mean value theorem and the second the monotone convergence theorem. Thus, for any positive sequence $\{\varepsilon_n, n \geq 1\}$ satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J(t, \pi^{t, \varepsilon_n, k}) - J(t, \bar{\pi})}{\varepsilon_n} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(\varepsilon_n) \psi(\varepsilon_n) - 1}{\varepsilon_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\phi(\varepsilon_n) - 1) \psi(\varepsilon_n) + \psi(\varepsilon_n) - 1}{\varepsilon_n} \\ &= \mu^\top(t) k - \frac{1}{2} |\sigma^\top(t) k|^2 \int_{(0, \infty)} \gamma d\Gamma(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{0}$ is an equilibrium if $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$. □

We now present the theorem that provides the necessary and sufficient condition for

$$\bar{\pi} = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a \in \Pi_d$$

to be an equilibrium.

Theorem 2.4. $\bar{\pi} = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a \in \Pi_d$ is an equilibrium if and only if

$$a(t) = h(v_a(t))\lambda(t) \quad (2.5)$$

for any $t \in [0, T)$, where³

$$h(x) \triangleq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}x} \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{R}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}x} \right]}, \quad x \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. It suffices to show that for any $t \in [0, T)$, (2.3) holds if and only if (2.5) holds.

When $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] < \infty$, we have $h(0) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}]} \in (0, \infty)$ and $h \in C([0, \infty))$. In this case, similar to the proof of (Liang et al., 2025, Theorem 3.4), we know that for any $t \in [0, T)$, (2.3) holds if and only if (2.5) holds.

When $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$, we have $h(0) = 0$. In this case, (2.3) and (2.5) are equivalent for $t \in [0, T_0)$, where

$$T_0 \triangleq \inf\{t \in [0, T] : v_a(t) = 0\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, they are satisfied automatically for $t \in [T_0, T)$, by Theorem 2.3 and $h(0) = 0$. \square

The function $h(\cdot)$ defined in (2.6) plays a central role in our analysis. Here, we simply present two examples in which $h(\cdot)$ can be computed explicitly.

Example 2.5. Let $l : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be defined as $l(y) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\mathbf{R}y}]$. Consider the following two distributions for the risk aversion parameter \mathbf{R} .

- (1) Suppose \mathbf{R} follows a Poisson distribution with parameter $\theta > 0$. Then $l(y) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\mathbf{R}y}] = e^{\theta(e^{-y}-1)}$. According to (2.6), we obtain

$$h(x) = \frac{l(\frac{x}{2})}{-l'(\frac{x}{2})} = \frac{1}{\theta}e^{\frac{x}{2}}.$$

- (2) Suppose \mathbf{R} follows a Gamma distribution with shape parameter $\alpha > 0$ and scale parameter $\beta > 0$, i.e., with density

$$f_{\mathbf{R}}(r) = \frac{r^{\alpha-1}e^{-\frac{r}{\beta}}}{\Gamma(\alpha)\beta^\alpha}, \quad r > 0.$$

In this case, $l(y) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\mathbf{R}y}] = (1 + \beta y)^{-\alpha}$, which gives

$$h(x) = \frac{l(\frac{x}{2})}{-l'(\frac{x}{2})} = \frac{1}{\alpha\beta} \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}x \right).$$

³For the convenience of the analysis that follows, we introduce a slightly different definition from Liang et al. (2025), where the function h corresponds to $h(x^2)$ in our setting. Nevertheless, the relevant functional properties—such as boundedness—remain equivalent under the two formulations.

Based on Example 3.4 in Section 3, explicit equilibrium strategies can be obtained in both cases under certain conditions. Moreover, since $h(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ in these two examples, some assumptions in prior literature—Desmettre and Steffensen (2023), which is restricted to a two-point distribution, and Liang, Wang, and Xia (2025), which assumes h is bounded—may be overly restrictive for standard distributions. This motivates our consideration of general distributions in the subsequent analysis.

According to Theorem 2.4, the equilibrium strategies in Π_d are given by the solutions to the integral equation (2.5) on $[0, T]$, which will be explored in the next section.

3 Equilibrium Analysis and Characterization of Solutions

To analyze the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (2.5), we transform it into an ordinary differential equation (ODE) for $v_a(t)$. Specifically, by differentiating $v_a(t) = \int_t^T |a(s)|^2 ds$ with respect to t and substituting $a(t)$ from (2.5), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} v'_a(t) = -h^2(v_a(t))|\lambda(t)|^2, & t \in [0, T], \\ v_a(T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Note that the ODE (3.1) is an equation for v_a that no longer depends on a . For simplicity, we will therefore omit the subscript in the discussion below.

We then transform the ODE (3.1) into an autonomous equation. To this end, we first define

$$\Psi(t) \triangleq \int_t^T |\lambda(s)|^2 ds, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

In the sequel, we assume $\Psi(0) > 0$. Indeed, the condition $\Psi(0) = 0$ would imply $\lambda(t) \equiv 0$ on $[0, T]$ and, in view of (2.5), lead to a unique equilibrium $\pi \equiv \mathbf{0}$. This is a trivial case and will therefore be excluded. For $\bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(0)]$, we also define the following two mappings:

$$\Phi(\bar{t}) \triangleq \max\{\zeta \in [0, T] \mid \Psi(\zeta) = \bar{t}\}, \quad \varphi(\bar{t}) \triangleq \min\{\zeta \in [0, T] \mid \Psi(\zeta) = \bar{t}\}.$$

By continuity of Ψ , we have

$$\Psi(\Phi(\bar{t})) = \Psi(\varphi(\bar{t})) = \bar{t}, \quad \forall \bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(0)]. \quad (3.2)$$

Now define, for such \bar{t} ,

$$\bar{Y}(\bar{t}) \triangleq v(\Phi(\bar{t})). \quad (3.3)$$

For the same \bar{t} , it holds that

$$\int_{\varphi(\bar{t})}^{\Phi(\bar{t})} |\lambda(s)|^2 ds = \Psi(\varphi(\bar{t})) - \Psi(\Phi(\bar{t})) = \bar{t} - \bar{t} = 0.$$

Since $|\lambda(s)|^2 \geq 0$ and $\lambda(t)$ is right-continuous, we deduce that $|\lambda(s)|^2 = 0$ on $[\varphi(\bar{t}), \Phi(\bar{t})]$. Define $f(\cdot) \triangleq h^2(\cdot)$. It then follows that

$$v'(t) = -f(v(t))|\lambda(t)|^2 = 0 \quad \text{on } [\varphi(\bar{t}), \Phi(\bar{t})].$$

Since $v(t)$ is absolutely continuous and $v'(t) = 0$ on $[\varphi(\bar{t}), \Phi(\bar{t})]$, $v(t)$ must be constant on $[\varphi(\bar{t}), \Phi(\bar{t})]$. Therefore, we obtain

$$v(\varphi(\bar{t})) = v(\Phi(\bar{t})). \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$v(t) = \bar{Y}(\Psi(t)), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.5)$$

We now characterize the differentiability of $\bar{Y}(\cdot)$, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $\bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(0)]$, the derivative $\bar{Y}'(\bar{t})$ exists and satisfies*

$$\bar{Y}'(\bar{t}) = f(\bar{Y}(\bar{t})),$$

where endpoint derivatives are understood in the one-sided sense.

Proof. First, we substitute (2.5) into $v(t) = \int_t^T |a(s)|^2 ds$. Noting that $d\Psi(s) = -|\lambda(s)|^2 ds$, we can rewrite $v(t)$ as

$$v(t) = - \int_t^T h^2(v(s)) d\Psi(s).$$

Using (3.5) and applying the change of variables formula⁴, we transform the integral variable from s to $\bar{s} = \Psi(s)$:

$$\bar{Y}(\Psi(t)) = \int_0^{\Psi(t)} h^2(\bar{Y}(\bar{s})) d\bar{s}.$$

Letting $\bar{t} = \Psi(t)$ and recalling $f(\cdot) = h^2(\cdot)$, this equation becomes $\bar{Y}(\bar{t}) = \int_0^{\bar{t}} f(\bar{Y}(\bar{s})) d\bar{s}$. Since f is continuous, differentiating with respect to \bar{t} yields $\bar{Y}'(\bar{t}) = f(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}))$. \square

Lemma 3.1 shows that any solution $v(t)$ to (3.1) generates a solution $\bar{Y}(\bar{t})$ to

$$\begin{cases} \bar{Y}'(\bar{t}) = f(\bar{Y}(\bar{t})), & \bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(0)], \\ \bar{Y}(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Conversely, assume $\bar{Y}(\bar{t})$ is a solution to (3.6). Differentiating (3.5) yields

$$v'(t) = \bar{Y}'(\Psi(t))\Psi'(t) = -f(v(t))|\lambda(t)|^2.$$

Hence, $v(t)$ satisfies (3.1). Therefore, ODE (3.1) and ODE (3.6) are equivalent in the sense that their solution sets are in one-to-one correspondence: each $v(t)$ uniquely determines a corresponding $\bar{Y}(\bar{t})$, and vice versa. Consequently, it suffices to analyze the solutions of (3.6), for which we obtain the following theorem.

⁴See Proposition 0.4.10 in [Revuz and Yor \(2013\)](#).

Theorem 3.2. Define $F(\cdot) \triangleq \int_0^\cdot \frac{1}{f(s)} ds$. Then the following assertions hold.

- (1) If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] < \infty$, then the ODE (3.6) has a unique solution if and only if $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$;
- (2) If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ and $F(\varepsilon) < \infty$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, then the ODE (3.6) has infinitely many solutions defined by

$$\bar{Y}^{(\eta)}(\bar{t}) = \begin{cases} 0 & 0 \leq \bar{t} \leq \eta, \\ F^{-1}(\bar{t} - \eta) & \eta < \bar{t} \leq \Psi(0), \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

where $\eta \in \mathcal{A} \triangleq [0, \Psi(0)] \cap (\Psi(0) - F(\infty), \Psi(0)]$.

- (3) If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ and there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $F(\varepsilon) = \infty$, then the ODE (3.6) has a unique solution $y \equiv 0$.

Proof. (1) Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] < \infty$. As $f(0) = \left(\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}]}\right)^2 > 0$, it follows that $F(0) = 0$ and $F(\cdot) \in C^1([0, +\infty))$ is strictly increasing. Thus, the inverse function F^{-1} is well-defined, continuous, and strictly increasing on $[0, \Psi(\tau))$, where

$$\tau \triangleq \inf \{t \in [0, T) : F(\infty) > \Psi(t)\}.$$

Consider the function $F(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}))$ on $\bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(\tau))$,

$$(F(\bar{Y}(\bar{t})))' = F'(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}))\bar{Y}'(\bar{t}) = \frac{1}{f(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}))}f(\bar{Y}(\bar{t})) = 1,$$

hence $F(\bar{Y}(\bar{t})) = \bar{t} + C$, where C is a constant. Using $\bar{Y}(0) = 0$ and $F(0) = 0$, we have $C = 0$, thus $F(\bar{Y}(\bar{t})) = \bar{t}$, and $\bar{Y}(\bar{t}) = F^{-1}(\bar{t})$. Therefore, the equation (3.6) has a unique solution $Y(\bar{t}) = F^{-1}(\bar{t})$ on $\bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(\tau))$.

A global solution on $[0, \Psi(0)]$ exists only if the domain of F^{-1} , which is $[0, F(\infty))$, is sufficiently large. If $F(\infty) \leq \Psi(0)$, the solution $\bar{Y}(\cdot)$ diverges to infinity at $\Psi(\tau) \geq 0$. As a result, the interval $[0, \Psi(\tau))$ is the maximal interval of existence for the solution $\bar{Y}(\bar{t})$, because the solution blows up at $\Psi(\tau)$.

(2) Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ and $F(\varepsilon) < \infty$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. This condition ensures that the function $F(y)$ is well-defined for all $y \geq 0$. As in the analysis of assertion (1), we have $F(0) = 0$ and $F(\cdot) \in C^0([0, +\infty)) \cap C^1((0, +\infty))$, and F is strictly increasing. Therefore, a continuous and strictly increasing inverse function F^{-1} exists, satisfying $F^{-1}(0) = 0$.

Assume that $\bar{Y}(\cdot)$ is a solution to (3.6). Define $\eta \triangleq \sup\{\bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(0)] : \bar{Y}(\bar{t}) = 0\}$. For $s > \eta$, we must have $\bar{Y}(s) > 0$ and

$$\bar{Y}'(s) = f(\bar{Y}(s))\bar{Y}(s) \Rightarrow \frac{\bar{Y}'(s)}{f(\bar{Y}(s))} = 1. \quad (3.8)$$

Integrating (3.8) from η to \bar{t} and using $F(0) = 0$, we obtain $F(\bar{Y}(\bar{t})) = \bar{t} - \eta$. Thus, for $\bar{t} > \eta$, the solution must satisfy $\bar{Y}(\bar{t}) = F^{-1}(\bar{t} - \eta)$, which shows that any solution necessarily takes the form of (3.7). For $F^{-1}(\cdot - \eta)$ to be well defined on $[\eta, \Psi(0)]$, it is required that $\Psi(0) - \eta < F(\infty)$. Together

with the constraints inherent in the definition of η , we conclude that $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$. By an argument analogous to the verification in assertion (1), one sees that any function of the form (3.7) indeed solves the equation. Consequently, every solution must take the form (3.7), uniquely determined by the parameter η .

(3) Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ and $F(\varepsilon) = \infty$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Clearly, $\bar{Y} \equiv 0$ is a solution. Suppose, to the contrary, that there exists another solution $\bar{Y}(\bar{t})$ and some $\bar{t}_1 > 0$ such that $\bar{Y}(\bar{t}_1) > 0$. By continuity, there exists $\bar{t}_2 \in [0, \bar{t}_1)$ such that $\bar{Y}(\bar{t}_2) = 0$ and $\bar{Y}(\bar{t}) > 0$ for all $\bar{t} \in (\bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_1]$. On $[\bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_1]$, we have $\bar{Y}'(\bar{t}) = f(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}))$. As such

$$\int_{\bar{t}_2}^{\bar{t}_1} d\bar{t} = \int_{\bar{t}_2}^{\bar{t}_1} \frac{\bar{Y}'(\bar{t})}{f(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}))} d\bar{t} = \int_{\bar{Y}(\bar{t}_2)}^{\bar{Y}(\bar{t}_1)} \frac{1}{f(s)} ds = F(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}_1)).$$

However, by assumption, $F(\bar{Y}(\bar{t}_1)) = \infty$, while $\int_{\bar{t}_2}^{\bar{t}_1} d\bar{t} = \bar{t}_1 - \bar{t}_2 < \infty$, a contradiction. Therefore, the equation admits the unique solution $\bar{Y} \equiv 0$. \square

Below, we use Theorem 3.2 to characterize all solutions to the ODE (3.1), and thereby identify all equilibrium strategies in Π_d .

Theorem 3.3. *The following assertions hold:*

- (1) *If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] < \infty$, the ODE (3.1) admits a unique solution if and only if $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$. Under this condition, the unique solution of (3.1) is given by $v(t) = F^{-1}(\Psi(t))$ and the corresponding unique equilibrium in Π_d is $(\sigma^\top(\cdot))^{-1}h(v(\cdot))\lambda(\cdot)$.*
- (2) *If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ and $F(\varepsilon) < \infty$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the ODE (3.1) admits infinitely many solutions of the form*

$$v^{(T_0)}(t) = \begin{cases} F^{-1}\left(\int_t^{T_0} |\lambda(s)|^2 ds\right), & 0 \leq t < T_0, \\ 0, & T_0 \leq t \leq T, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

where $T_0 \in \mathcal{B} = \{\varphi(\eta) \mid \eta \in \mathcal{A}\}$. The set of all equilibrium strategies in Π_d is therefore

$$\mathcal{J} = \left\{ \pi^{(T_0)}(\cdot) = (\sigma^\top(\cdot))^{-1}h(v^{(T_0)}(\cdot))\lambda(\cdot) : T_0 \in \mathcal{B} \right\}.$$

- (3) *If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ and there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $F(\varepsilon) = \infty$, the ODE (3.1) admits a unique solution $v \equiv 0$, and $\pi \equiv \mathbf{0}$ is the unique equilibrium in Π_d .*

Proof. We focus on assertion (2), as the other two assertions are straightforward. Recalling the relationship in (3.5), for each $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$, define

$$v^{(\eta)}(t) = \bar{Y}^{(\eta)}(\Psi(t)), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.10)$$

From (3.7), we know that

$$\eta = \sup \left\{ \bar{t} \in [0, \Psi(0)] : \bar{Y}^{(\eta)}(\bar{t}) = 0 \right\}.$$

Using the definition of T_0 in (2.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_0 &= \inf\{t \in [0, T] : v(t) = 0\} = \inf\{t \in [0, T] : \bar{Y}(\Psi(t)) = 0\} \\ &= \inf\{t \in [0, T] : \Psi(t) = \eta\} \\ &= \varphi(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Since φ is strictly decreasing on \mathcal{A} , it induces a bijection between $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $T_0 \in \mathcal{B} \triangleq \varphi(\mathcal{A})$. Hence we may relabel the solution $v^{(\eta)}$ as $v^{(T_0)}$, which allows the equilibrium strategies to be characterized directly in terms of the parameter $T_0 \in \mathcal{B}$.

Furthermore, by the definition of Ψ , we have $\eta = \Psi(T_0)$. Substituting this equality into (3.7) yields $v^{(T_0)}(t)$ in the form given in (3.9). Finally, the conclusion regarding the equilibrium strategies follows directly, since we have (2.5). \square

It is worth noting that previous studies, such as Desmettre and Steffensen (2023) and Liang, Wang, and Xia (2025), primarily focus on the specific cases covered by Theorem 3.3 (1), under the additional assumptions that $h(\cdot)$ is bounded and \mathbf{R} is square-integrable. To illustrate the broader applicability of our results, we present three examples below. These examples consider distributions for which: (i) $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}^2] < \infty$ with unbounded $h(\cdot)$, (ii) $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}^2] = \infty$, and (iii) $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ with unbounded $h(\cdot)$. They serve to examine the properties of the corresponding equilibria and verify the conclusions of Theorem 3.3.

Example 3.4. *This example derives the explicit equilibrium strategies for the two distributions discussed in Example 2.5.*

(1) **Poisson distribution:** Recall that $h(x) = \frac{1}{\theta} e^{\frac{x}{\theta}}$. Computing $F(y)$ yields

$$F(y) = \int_0^y \frac{1}{h^2(s)} ds = \theta^2(1 - e^{-y}),$$

with $F(\infty) = \theta^2$. If the condition $\Psi(0) < \theta^2$ holds, solving $v(t) = F^{-1}(\Psi(t))$ gives $v(t) = -\ln(1 - \frac{\Psi(t)}{\theta^2})$. Substituting this back, the equilibrium strategy is explicitly given by

$$\bar{\pi}(t) = (\sigma^\top(t))^{-1} a(t) = (\sigma^\top(t))^{-1} h(v(t)) \lambda(t) = \frac{(\sigma^\top(t))^{-1} \lambda(t)}{\sqrt{\theta^2 - \Psi(t)}}, \quad t \in [0, T]$$

(2) **Gamma distribution:** Recall that $h(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha\beta} (1 + \frac{\beta}{2}x)$. Then, $F(y)$ is derived as

$$F(y) = \int_0^y \frac{\alpha^2 \beta^2}{(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}s)^2} ds = 2\alpha^2 \beta \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\beta}{2}y} \right),$$

with $F(\infty) = 2\alpha^2 \beta$. Provided that $\Psi(0) < 2\alpha^2 \beta$, we obtain $v(t) = \frac{2}{\beta} \left[\left(1 - \frac{\Psi(t)}{2\alpha^2 \beta} \right)^{-1} - 1 \right]$. Therefore, the equilibrium strategy is

$$\bar{\pi}(t) = (\sigma^\top(t))^{-1} a(t) = \frac{(\sigma^\top(t))^{-1} \lambda(t)}{\alpha\beta - \frac{\Psi(t)}{2\alpha}}, \quad t \in [0, T]$$

Example 3.5. This example shows that in Theorem 3.3 (1), when $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] < \infty$, $F(\infty)$ may be finite. Consider a random variable $\mathbf{R} \sim F(m, n)$ with parameters $m > 0$ and $2 < n \leq 4$. Its probability density function is given by

$$f_{\mathbf{R}}(r) = \frac{1}{B(\frac{m}{2}, \frac{n}{2})} \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}} r^{\frac{m}{2}-1} \left(1 + \frac{m}{n}r\right)^{-\frac{m+n}{2}}, \quad r > 0.$$

In this case, the expectation of \mathbf{R} is finite, given by $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \frac{n}{n-2} < \infty$.

We are interested in the convergence of $F(\infty)$, where

$$F(y) = \int_0^y \frac{1}{h^2(s)} ds = 2 \int_0^{\frac{y}{2}} \left(\frac{l'(s)}{l(s)}\right)^2 ds.$$

Since $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{l'(y)}{l(y)} = -\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}]$ is finite, $y = 0$ is not a singular point. Next, we analyze the behavior of $\frac{l'(y)}{l(y)}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$. It is straightforward to see that $f_{\mathbf{R}}(r) \sim Cr^{\frac{m}{2}-1}$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$. According to Watson's Lemma [Watson \(1918\)](#)⁵, the asymptotic behavior of $l(y)$ is determined by the behavior of $f_{\mathbf{R}}(r)$ near the origin. Applying the lemma, we obtain

$$l(y) = \int_0^\infty e^{-ry} f_{\mathbf{R}}(r) dr \sim y^{-\frac{m}{2}} \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.$$

Similarly, for $l'(y) = -\int_0^\infty e^{-ry} r f_{\mathbf{R}}(r) dr$, the integrand behaves as $r f_{\mathbf{R}}(r) \sim Cr^{\frac{m}{2}}$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$. Applying Watson's Lemma again yields

$$l'(y) \sim -y^{-(\frac{m}{2}+1)} \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consequently, $\left(\frac{l'(y)}{l(y)}\right)^2 \sim y^{-2}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\int_1^\infty y^{-2} dy$ converges, we conclude that $F(\infty) < \infty$.

Example 3.6. This example is provided to verify the conclusion in Theorem 3.3 (2) and (3). For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let $\mathbf{R}_\alpha \sim G_\alpha$, where G_α denote the distribution function whose Laplace transform satisfies ⁶

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-vx} dG_\alpha(x) = e^{-v^\alpha}, \quad v \geq 0.$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_\alpha] = \infty$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, h is given by $h(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^{1-\alpha}$. For simplicity, we assume that $\lambda \neq 0$ is a constant in \mathbb{R} . By direct calculation, the solution to the ODE (3.1) for $\alpha \in (0.5, 1)$ takes the form

$$v^{(T_0)}(t) = \begin{cases} \left(2^{2\alpha-2} \frac{1}{\alpha^2} (2\alpha-1) \lambda^2 (T_0 - t)\right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}}, & t \in [0, T_0], \\ 0 & t \in [T_0, T], \end{cases}$$

where $T_0 \in [0, T]$. For $\alpha \in (0, 0.5]$, direct calculation shows that the ODE admits only the trivial solution $v \equiv 0$.

⁵Watson's Lemma states that for a Laplace integral of the form $I(y) = \int_0^\infty e^{-yr} \phi(r) dr$, if $\phi(r) \sim Ar^\alpha$ as $r \rightarrow 0^+$ with $\alpha > -1$, then the asymptotic behavior is given by $I(y) \sim A\Gamma(\alpha+1)y^{-(\alpha+1)}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$.

⁶See [Pollard \(1946\)](#) and [Feller, 1971](#), Section XIII.6).

Below, we recover the above result using Theorem 3.3. Specifically, for any $\alpha \in (0.5, 1)$, we have $F(\varepsilon) < \infty$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. As a result, the ODE (3.1) admits infinitely many solutions. Furthermore, because $F(\infty) = \int_0^\infty \alpha^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}s\right)^{2\alpha-2} ds = \infty$, the parameter η in Theorem 3.2 (2) can take any value in $[0, \lambda^2 T]$, and T_0 in Theorem 3.3 (2) can take any value in $[0, T]$. Moreover, since $F(y) = \frac{\alpha^2 2^{2-2\alpha}}{2\alpha-1} y^{2\alpha-1}$, we obtain its inverse $F^{-1}(z) = \left(\frac{2^{2\alpha-2}(2\alpha-1)}{\alpha^2} z\right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}}$. Using (3.9), we then precisely recover the form of $v^{(T_0)}(t)$. For $\alpha \in (0, 0.5]$, we have $F(\varepsilon) = \infty$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, and therefore the ODE (3.1) admits the unique solution $v \equiv 0$. These results are fully consistent with those obtained by direct calculation.

4 Optimal Equilibrium Selection

According to the discussion in Theorem 3.3 (2), if $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}] = \infty$ and $F(\varepsilon) < \infty$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, then the set Π_d contains infinitely many equilibria, whose collection is denoted by \mathcal{J} . This multiplicity of equilibria naturally raises the question: which equilibrium should the agent choose? In this section, we introduce several criteria for selecting an optimal equilibrium. These criteria compare the functional $J(t, \pi)$, either at the initial time $t = 0$ or at any arbitrary time $t \in [0, T]$. We begin by presenting three definitions of optimal equilibrium.

Definition 4.1. (1) $\hat{\pi} \in \mathcal{J}$ is called optimal if

$$J(0, \hat{\pi}) \geq J(0, \pi^{(T_0)}), \quad \forall \pi^{(T_0)} \in \mathcal{J}.$$

(2) $\hat{\pi} \in \mathcal{J}$ is called uniformly optimal if

$$J(t, \hat{\pi}) \geq J(t, \pi^{(T_0)}), \quad \forall \pi^{(T_0)} \in \mathcal{J} \text{ and } t \in [0, T].$$

(3) $\hat{\pi} \in \mathcal{J}$ is called uniformly strictly optimal if

$$J(t, \hat{\pi}) > J(t, \pi^{(T_0)}), \quad \forall \hat{\pi} \neq \pi^{(T_0)} \in \mathcal{J} \text{ and } t \in [0, T].$$

Theorem 4.2. The optimal strategy exists if and only if $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$. When it exists, it is unique and given by $\pi^{(\varphi(0))}(\cdot) = (\sigma^\top(\cdot))^{-1} h(v^{(\varphi(0))}(\cdot)) \lambda(\cdot)$. Furthermore, $\pi^{(\varphi(0))}$ is also uniformly optimal. It is uniformly strictly optimal if and only if both $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$ and $\Psi(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ hold, in which case $\varphi(0) = T$.

Proof. We first establish a lemma to compare the magnitude relations between different solutions to ODE (3.6).

Lemma 4.3. In the setting of Theorem 3.2 (2), where ODE (3.6) admits infinitely many solutions, $\bar{Y}^{(\eta)}(t)$ is non-increasing in $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$ for any $t \in [0, \Psi(0)]$. Furthermore, if $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$ and $\Psi(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ hold, then the strict inequality $\bar{Y}^{(0)}(\Psi(t)) > \bar{Y}^{(\eta)}(\Psi(t))$ holds for any $\eta \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{0\}$ and any $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Let $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\eta_1 < \eta_2$, we compare $\bar{Y}^{(\eta_1)}(\bar{t})$ and $\bar{Y}^{(\eta_2)}(\bar{t})$.

For $0 \leq \bar{t} \leq \eta_1$, $\bar{Y}^{(\eta_1)}(\bar{t}) = \bar{Y}^{(\eta_2)}(\bar{t}) = 0$. For $\eta_1 < \bar{t} \leq \eta_2$, $\bar{Y}^{(\eta_2)}(\bar{t}) = 0 < \bar{Y}^{(\eta_1)}(\bar{t})$. For $\eta_2 < \bar{t} \leq \Psi(0)$, $\bar{Y}^{(\eta_i)}(\bar{t}) = F^{-1}(\bar{t} - \eta_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Since $\eta_1 < \eta_2$, we have $\bar{t} - \eta_1 > \bar{t} - \eta_2$, and because F^{-1} is strictly increasing, $F^{-1}(\bar{t} - \eta_1) > F^{-1}(\bar{t} - \eta_2)$, hence $\bar{Y}^{(\eta_1)}(\bar{t}) > \bar{Y}^{(\eta_2)}(\bar{t})$.

Finally, assume $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$ and $\Psi(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ hold. For any $\eta \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{0\}$ and $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\bar{Y}^{(0)}(\Psi(t)) = F^{-1}(\Psi(t)) > F^{-1}(\max(0, \Psi(t) - \eta)) = \bar{Y}^{(\eta)}(\Psi(t)),$$

where the inequality follows from the strict monotonicity of F^{-1} . \square

From the above lemma, we see that for any $t \in [0, T]$, $v^{(T_0)}(t)$ in (3.9) is non-decreasing with respect to $T_0 \in \mathcal{B}$. We now proceed to prove the main result. For all $\pi^{(T_0)} \in \mathcal{J}$, we have

$$y^{(T_0)}(0) = \int_0^T (a_s^{(T_0)})^\top \lambda(s) ds = \int_0^T h(v^{(T_0)}(s)) |\lambda(s)|^2 ds,$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} -(\mathbf{R}v^{(T_0)}(0) - 2y^{(T_0)}(0)) &= -\mathbf{R}v^{(T_0)}(0) + 2 \int_0^T h(v^{(T_0)}(s)) |\lambda(s)|^2 ds \\ &= -\mathbf{R}v^{(T_0)}(0) + 2 \int_0^{v^{(T_0)}(0)} \frac{1}{h(y)} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality arises from $y = v^{(T_0)}(s)$, $dy = -h^2(v^{(T_0)}(s)) |\lambda(s)|^2 ds$.

Furthermore, since $F(t) = \int_0^t \frac{1}{h^2(s)} ds < \infty$ for any $t > 0$, and by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\int_0^t \frac{1}{h(s)} ds$ is well-defined for any $t > 0$. Thus, we have

$$J(0, \pi^{(T_0)}) = e^{\int_0^{v^{(T_0)}(0)} \frac{1}{h(y)} dy} l \left(\frac{v^{(T_0)}(0)}{2} \right),$$

where $l : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is defined by $l(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\mathbf{R}x}]$. Let $\mathcal{L}(z) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be defined by $\mathcal{L}(z) = \int_0^z \frac{1}{h(y)} dy + \ln l \left(\frac{z}{2} \right)$. Then

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dz} = \frac{1}{h(z)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}z}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}y}]} = \frac{1}{2h(z)} > 0, \quad \forall z > 0.$$

Hence, \mathcal{L} is strictly increasing in z , and $J(0, \pi^{(T_0)})$ attains its maximum where $v^{(T_0)}(0)$ is maximal. Noting that $v^{(T_0)}(0)$ is non-decreasing in T_0 , it suffices to find a maximal parameter T_0 within \mathcal{B} . Since φ is strictly decreasing, the existence of a maximal element in \mathcal{B} is equivalent to the existence of a minimal element in \mathcal{A} .

If $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$, then $\mathcal{A} = [0, \Psi(0)]$ includes its minimum at 0, so a maximal strategy exists. Conversely, if $F(\infty) \leq \Psi(0)$, then $\mathcal{A} = (\Psi(0) - F(\infty), \Psi(0)]$ is left-open and admits no minimum. Thus, \mathcal{B} has a maximal element if and only if $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$. This establishes that the optimal strategy exists if and only if $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$, and when it exists, it is given by $\pi^{(\varphi(0))}$.

Next, we turn to the uniformly optimal equilibrium. In light of the preceding proof, we restrict attention to the case $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$. Analogous to the derivation at $t = 0$, for any fixed $t \in [0, T]$, we have $J(t, \pi^{(T_0)}) = \exp(\mathcal{L}(v^{(T_0)}(t)))$. Since $\mathcal{L}(z)$ is strictly increasing in z and $v^{(T_0)}(t)$ is non-decreasing in T_0 , we conclude that $J(t, \pi^{(T_0)})$ is non-decreasing with respect to T_0 . Consequently, it also suffices to find a maximal parameter T_0 within \mathcal{B} . Since \mathcal{B} admits a unique maximal element $\varphi(0)$, we immediately obtain that the optimal equilibrium $\pi^{(\varphi(0))}$ is also uniformly optimal.

Finally, we consider the uniformly strictly optimal equilibrium. If $\Psi(t) = 0$ for some $t \in [0, T]$, then $v^{(T_0)}(t) \equiv 0$ for any $T_0 \in \mathcal{B}$, which implies $J(t, \pi^{(T_0)}) \equiv \exp(\mathcal{L}(0)) = 1$ for all $\pi^{(T_0)} \in \mathcal{J}$. Hence, no uniformly strictly optimal equilibrium exists in this case. Conversely, assume $\Psi(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $F(\infty) > \Psi(0)$. Recalling the definition $\varphi(0) = \min\{t \in [0, T] : \Psi(t) = 0\}$, the condition that $\Psi(t) > 0$ for all $t < T$ implies that $\varphi(0) = T$. Let $T_0 \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \{T\}$, then we have $\eta := \Psi(T_0) > 0 = \Psi(T)$. By Lemma 4.3, for any $t \in [0, T]$, it holds that

$$v^{(T)}(t) = \bar{Y}^{(0)}(\Psi(t)) > \bar{Y}^{(\eta)}(\Psi(t)) = v^{(T_0)}(t).$$

Since $\mathcal{L}(z)$ is strictly increasing in z , we obtain $J(t, \pi^{(T)}) > J(t, \pi^{(T_0)})$. Therefore, $\pi^{(\varphi(0))} = \pi^{(T)}$ is the unique uniformly strictly optimal equilibrium. \square

5 Comparative Statics of Equilibrium Strategies

In the previous sections, we fully characterized the equilibrium strategies associated with a given distribution of risk aversion \mathbf{R} and discussed how to select the optimal equilibrium. We now turn to comparative statics and ask a natural economic question: How does a shift in the distribution of risk aversion affect the resulting equilibrium investment behavior?

To formalize such comparisons, we begin by recalling the notion of first-order stochastic dominance, which provides a standard criterion for ranking risk aversion distributions.

Definition 5.1. *Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two random variables. We say that \mathbf{R}_1 dominates \mathbf{R}_2 in the sense of first-order stochastic dominance, denoted as $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_1 \mathbf{R}_2$, if*

$$P(\mathbf{R}_1 \geq x) \geq P(\mathbf{R}_2 \geq x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Intuitively, one might expect that if Investor 1 is “more risk-averse” than Investor 2 in the sense of first-order stochastic dominance, then Investor 1 should take a smaller position in the risky asset at every point in time. Surprisingly, this intuition turns out to be false.




Figure 1: Comparative evolution of $a_i(t)$ under first-order stochastic dominance. The red solid line corresponds to the more risk-averse Investor 1 with distribution $P(\mathbf{R}_1 = 1) = 0.5$, $P(\mathbf{R}_1 = 5) = 0.5$, and the blue dashed line to the less risk-averse Investor 2 with $P(\mathbf{R}_2 = 1) = 0.5$, $P(\mathbf{R}_2 = 2) = 0.5$. The orange shaded region indicates where $|a_1(t)| > |a_2(t)|$. Parameters: $\lambda = 0.4$, horizon $T = 40$.

Figure 1 illustrates the comparative evolution of $|a_i|$, $i = 1, 2$ ⁷ for two investors whose risk aversion distributions are given by $P(\mathbf{R}_1 = 1) = 0.5$, $P(\mathbf{R}_1 = 5) = 0.5$ and $P(\mathbf{R}_2 = 1) = 0.5$, $P(\mathbf{R}_2 = 2) = 0.5$. It is straightforward to verify that $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_1 \mathbf{R}_2$. The orange-shaded Reversal Region highlights that the more risk-averse Investor 1 adopts a strictly more aggressive position than Investor 2 when the time to maturity is sufficiently long. This counterexample shows that even under first-order stochastic dominance, the magnitudes of equilibrium investment strategies need not exhibit monotonicity.

The appearance of this counterexample (Figure 1) may suggest that the search for a general comparative result under first-order stochastic dominance is fundamentally obstructed. In fact, the observed reversal is not an artifact of a particular parameter choice. We show below that such a reversal in investment magnitudes is unavoidable when the investment horizon T is sufficiently large, provided that the risk-aversion distributions satisfy the conditions stated in the following proposition.

In the following proposition, for convenience, we extend the market to an infinite horizon and assume that the market price of risk λ is defined on $[0, \infty)$. For every fixed $T > 0$, we require $\Psi(0, T) \triangleq \int_0^T |\lambda(s)|^2 ds < \infty$. In addition, we assume that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(0, T) = \infty$ and $\lambda(0) \neq 0$. As discussed in the preceding sections, for each fixed T we can define the equilibrium strategy

⁷Since $\bar{\pi} = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a$, in the one-dimensional case the comparison of $|a_i(t)|$ is equivalent to that of $|\pi|_i$.

$\{\pi_i(t, T) : t \in [0, T]\}$ associated with the distribution R_i (as used in the proposition below). The proposition shows that, as long as the distributions R_i satisfy certain conditions, the magnitudes $|\pi_i(0, T)|$ must exhibit a strict and deterministic ordering when the horizon T is sufficiently large.

Proposition 5.2. *Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two non-negative random variables with finite expectations (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_i] < \infty$). Assume the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) *Let $r_0 = \text{essinf } \mathbf{R}_1 = \text{essinf } \mathbf{R}_2 > 0$. There exists a positive probability mass at r_0 , meaning that $p_i = P(\mathbf{R}_i = r_0) \in (0, 1)$ for $i = 1, 2$.*
- (2) *Define the infimum of the first support point of \mathbf{R}_i strictly greater than r_0 as $\tilde{r}_i = \inf\{r \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{R}_i) : r > r_0\}$ and let $\delta_i = \tilde{r}_i - r_0$ satisfies $\delta_1 > \delta_2 > 0$.*

Under these conditions, for a sufficiently large T , we have

$$|\pi_1(0, T)| > |\pi_2(0, T)|.$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

It is important to note that the conditions in Proposition 5.2 are compatible with first-order stochastic dominance. One can construct risk aversion distributions such that $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_1 \mathbf{R}_2$ holds while the conditions in Proposition 5.2 are simultaneously satisfied. For instance, the parameters in Figure 1 satisfy these conditions with $r_0 = 1$, $\delta_1 = 4$ and $\delta_2 = 1$. Consequently, first-order stochastic dominance fails to rule out the reversal of investment magnitudes characterized by $|\pi_1(0, T)| > |\pi_2(0, T)|$ for a sufficiently large T .

However, we demonstrate that the desired monotonicity can be restored under a stronger stochastic order. Specifically, we introduce the concept of reverse hazard rate order and show that if \mathbf{R}_1 dominates \mathbf{R}_2 in this order, the intuition holds, i.e., $|\pi_1(t)| \leq |\pi_2(t)|$.

Definition 5.3. *Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two random variables with cumulative distribution functions $F_{\mathbf{R}_1}$ and $F_{\mathbf{R}_2}$, respectively. We say that \mathbf{R}_1 dominates \mathbf{R}_2 in the reverse hazard rate order, denoted as $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_{rh} \mathbf{R}_2$, if the ratio*

$$\frac{F_{\mathbf{R}_2}(x)}{F_{\mathbf{R}_1}(x)}$$

is non-increasing in x for all x in the union of the supports of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 where $F_{\mathbf{R}_1}(x) > 0$.

The next two lemmas, adapted from Capéraà (1988) and Wang and Lehrer (2024), characterize the reverse hazard rate order via expectation ratios and establish its connection to first-order stochastic dominance under weighted measures.

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two random variables. Then $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_{rh} \mathbf{R}_2$ if and only if*

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[u(\mathbf{R}_1)w(\mathbf{R}_1)]}{\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_1)]} \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[u(\mathbf{R}_2)w(\mathbf{R}_2)]}{\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_2)]},$$

for all functions u and w for which the expectations exist, such that w is positive, continuous, and decreasing, and u is continuous and strictly increasing.

Lemma 5.5. *Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two random variables with cumulative distribution functions $F_{\mathbf{R}_1}$ and $F_{\mathbf{R}_2}$, respectively. Assume that $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_{rh} \mathbf{R}_2$. Let $w(\cdot)$ be a positive, continuous, and strictly decreasing function. Define the weighted probability measures \tilde{F}_i associated with \mathbf{R}_i for $i = 1, 2$ by*

$$d\tilde{F}_i(x) = \frac{w(x)dF_{\mathbf{R}_i}}{\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_i)]}. \quad (5.1)$$

Then, \mathbf{R}_1 dominates \mathbf{R}_2 under the weighted measures in the sense of first-order stochastic dominance, i.e.,

$$\tilde{F}_1 \succeq_1 \tilde{F}_2.$$

Equipped with this characterization, we are now ready to establish the monotonicity of the function h defined in (2.6) with respect to the risk aversion distribution in the sense of the reverse hazard rate order.

Proposition 5.6. *Given the function h defined in (2.6). We know that $h(x)$ is strictly increasing in x . Moreover, fixing x , $h(x)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to \mathbf{R} in the sense of the reverse hazard rate order and distinct distributions. For notational simplicity, in the sequel, let $h_i(\cdot)$ and $F_i(\cdot)$ denote the function $h(\cdot)$ and the function defined in Theorem 3.2 corresponding to the random variable \mathbf{R}_i for $i = 1, 2$, respectively.*

Proof. Fix $x > 0$. Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two non-negative random variables such that $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_{rh} \mathbf{R}_2$ and their distributions are distinct. According to Lemma 5.4, let $u(r) = r$ and $w(r) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}rx)$. Note that $u(r)$ is a strictly increasing function, and for $v > 0$, $w(r)$ is a positive, continuous, and strictly decreasing function of r . Substituting them into this inequality, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_1 \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_1 x)]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_1 x)]} \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_2 \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_2 x)]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_2 x)]}.$$

Moreover, assume that the equality holds. Define the weighted probability measures \tilde{F}_i for $i = 1, 2$ by (5.1). The given condition is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_1}[\mathbf{R}_1] = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{F}_2}[\mathbf{R}_1]$. From Lemma 5.5, we have $\tilde{F}_1 \succeq_1 \tilde{F}_2$ and consequently, $d\tilde{F}_1(r) = d\tilde{F}_2(r)$. Given that $w(r)$ is positive, this implies $\frac{d\tilde{F}_1}{\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_1)]} = \frac{d\tilde{F}_2}{\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_2)]}$. Integrating both sides over the entire support and using the property $\int d\tilde{F}_i(x) = 1$, we obtain $1 = \frac{\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_1)]}{\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_2)]}$, which implies $\mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_1)] = \mathbb{E}[w(\mathbf{R}_2)]$. Substituting this back yields $dF_{\mathbf{R}_1}(r) = dF_{\mathbf{R}_2}(r)$, confirming that $F_{\mathbf{R}_1}(r) = F_{\mathbf{R}_2}(r)$. This contradicts the different distributions of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 . Thus, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_1 \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_1 x)]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_1 x)]} > \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_2 \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_2 x)]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{R}_2 x)]},$$

and equivalently,

$$h_1(x) < h_2(x).$$

□

The following proposition compares the equilibrium strategies of two investors ranked by the reverse hazard rate order.

Proposition 5.7. *Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two non-negative random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_i] < +\infty$ ($i = 1, 2$), such that $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_{rh} \mathbf{R}_2$ and their distributions are distinct. Let $\pi_i(t) = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a_i(t)$ be the corresponding deterministic equilibrium strategies. For any $t \in [0, T)$, the magnitude of $a_i(t)$ satisfies*

$$|a_1(t)| \leq |a_2(t)|.$$

Moreover, if $\lambda(t) \neq 0$, the inequality is strict. As a result, the investor with higher risk aversion adopts a less aggressive equilibrium strategy. i.e., $|\pi_1(t)| \leq |\pi_2(t)|$.

Proof. Since $h_1(x) < h_2(x)$ for all positive s , it follows that $F_1(y) > F_2(y)$ for all $y > 0$. This implies that the inverse functions satisfy $F_1^{-1}(z) < F_2^{-1}(z)$ for all $z > 0$. From Theorem 3.2 (1), we have $v_i(t) = F_i^{-1}(\Psi(t))$, where $\Psi(t) = \int_t^T |\lambda(s)|^2 ds$ and $v_i(t) = \int_t^T |a_i(s)|^2 ds$. Consequently, monotonicity of the inverse functions implies $v_1(t) \leq v_2(t)$. By (2.5), we have $|a_i(t)| = h(v_i(t), \mathbf{R}_i)|\lambda(t)|$. From Proposition 5.6, we know that $h_1(v_1(t)) < h_2(v_1(t))$. Since $v_1(t) \leq v_2(t)$, it holds that $h_2(v_1(t)) \leq h_2(v_2(t))$. Combining these relations yields $h_1(v_1(t)) < h_2(v_2(t))$. Multiplying by $|\lambda(t)|$, we obtain $|a_1(t)| \leq |a_2(t)|$. If $\lambda(t) \neq 0$, the strict inequality $|a_1(t)| < |a_2(t)|$ is preserved. \square

For the case where the expected risk aversion is infinite, assume that the optimal equilibria exist for both \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 . Let $a_i(t)$ denote the deterministic coefficient corresponding to the optimal equilibrium strategy for \mathbf{R}_i ($i = 1, 2$). Note that $\varphi(0) = \min\{t \in [0, T] \mid \Psi(t) = 0\}$ is determined solely by the market parameters and is therefore identical for both investors. Consequently, we can establish the comparative result by examining the magnitudes of $a_i(t)$ on the intervals $[0, \varphi(0))$ and $[\varphi(0), T]$ separately. Specifically, on the interval $[0, \varphi(0))$, the analysis parallels the finite expectation case derived in Proposition 5.7, and thus the monotonicity of the equilibrium strategies is preserved. On the interval $[\varphi(0), T]$, the definition of $\varphi(0)$ implies that $\lambda(t) = 0$ almost everywhere. Consequently, the equilibrium strategies for both investors vanish, trivially satisfying the comparison inequality. Based on this decomposition, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.8. *Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two non-negative random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{R}_i] = \infty$ ($i = 1, 2$), such that $\mathbf{R}_1 \succeq_{rh} \mathbf{R}_2$ and their distributions are distinct. Assume that the optimal equilibria exist for both investors (i.e., $F_i(\infty) > \Psi(0)$, $i = 1, 2$). Let $\pi_i(t)$ be the corresponding deterministic optimal equilibrium strategies. Then, for any $t \in [0, T)$, the magnitude of $\pi_i(t)$ satisfies*

$$|\pi_1(t)| \leq |\pi_2(t)|.$$

Moreover, if $\lambda(t) \neq 0$, the inequality is strict.

Appendix A Proof of Proposition 5.2

We first establish a technical lemma.

Lemma A.1. Let \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 be two non-negative random variables satisfying the conditions in Proposition 5.2. Let $X_i = \mathbf{R}_i - r_0$ and define $Q_i(s) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}X_i s}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{1}{2}X_i s}]}$. Then, the following properties hold:

- (1) As $s \rightarrow \infty$, $Q_i(s) \rightarrow 0$. Specifically, for sufficiently large s , $Q_i(s) \leq M_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_i s}$ for some constant M_i .
- (2) The integral $\int_0^\infty (h_i^{-2}(s) - r_0^2) ds$ converges to a finite constant K_i .
- (3) For any s_1, s_2 and $\varepsilon > 0$, the ratio $Q_i(s_i)$ satisfies $\frac{Q_1(s_1)}{Q_2(s_2)} \leq \frac{C_1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_1 s_1}}{C_2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\delta_2 + \varepsilon)s_2}}$, where C_1 and C_2 are constants.

Proof. We first analyze the asymptotic bounds of $Q_i(s)$. According to (2) in Proposition 5.2, X_i has a probability mass p_i at 0. Using the Dominated Convergence Theorem, the denominator satisfies $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{1}{2}X_i s}] = p_i$. Thus, there exists an $S > 0$ such that for all $s > S$, the denominator is bounded below by $\frac{p_i}{2}$. For the numerator, by (3) in Proposition 5.2, the support of X_i on $(0, \infty)$ is contained in $[\delta_i, \infty)$. Thus, we derive the upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}X_i s}] = \int_{\delta_i}^\infty x e^{-\frac{1}{2}xs} dF_{X_i}(x) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_i s} \int_{\delta_i}^\infty x dF_{X_i}(x) = C'_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_i s},$$

where $C'_i = \mathbb{E}[X_i \mathbb{I}_{\{X_i \geq \delta_i\}}] < \infty$ under the assumption of finite expectation. Combining these, for $s > S$, we have $Q_i(s) \leq \frac{C'_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_i s}}{\frac{p_i}{2}} \triangleq M_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_i s}$. This proves the first property.

Next, we verify the convergence of the integral. We know $h_i^{-2}(s) - r_0^2 = 2r_0 Q_i(s) + Q_i^2(s)$. Using the bound derived above, we have

$$2r_0 Q_i(s) + Q_i^2(s) \leq 2r_0 M_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_i s} + M_i^2 e^{-\delta_i s}.$$

Since $\delta_i > 0$, the exponential functions are integrable on $[S, \infty)$. Furthermore, since $Q_i(s)$ is continuous on the finite interval $[0, S]$, the total integral over $[0, \infty)$ converges. We denote this finite integral by K_i .

Finally, to compare the ratio $\frac{Q_1(s_1)}{Q_2(s_2)}$, we need a lower bound for the numerator of Q_2 . For an arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$, by definition of the support, $p_{\varepsilon,2} \triangleq P(\delta_2 \leq X_2 < \delta_2 + \varepsilon) > 0$. Restricting the integration to this interval yields

$$\mathbb{E}[X_2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}X_2 s}] \geq \int_{\delta_2}^{\delta_2 + \varepsilon} x e^{-\frac{1}{2}xs} dF_{X_2}(x) \geq \delta_2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\delta_2 + \varepsilon)s} p_{\varepsilon,2}.$$

Using the upper bound for Q_1 and this lower bound for Q_2 , we have

$$\frac{Q_1(s_1)}{Q_2(s_2)} \leq \frac{C_1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_1 s_1}}{C_2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\delta_2 + \varepsilon)s_2}},$$

where C_1 and C_2 are constants. □

Now we return to prove Proposition 5.2.

Initially, by noting that $h_i(s) = (r_0 + Q_i(s))^{-1}$ and applying the limit from Lemma A.1 (1), we establish the asymptotic behavior $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} h_i(s) = \frac{1}{r_0}$. Since $r_0 > 0$, this implies that the integrand $h_i^{-2}(s)$ converges to a positive constant r_0^2 . Therefore, the integral $\int_0^\infty h_i^{-2}(s)ds$ diverges, confirming $F_i(\infty) = \infty$. Consequently, Theorem 3.3 (1) guarantees the existence of a unique equilibrium π_i for \mathbf{R}_i .

Based on $\pi_i = (\sigma^\top)^{-1}a_i$, we only need to compare a_i . According to (2.5), we have $|a_i(0, T)| = h_i(v_i(0, T))|\lambda(0)|$. To prove $|a_1(0, T)| > |a_2(0, T)|$, we must establish the asymptotic behavior of $v_i(0, T)$ and then compare the values of $h_i(v_i(0, T))$ based on the distribution properties of \mathbf{R}_i . Based on Lemma A.1, we proceed in two steps.

First, we establish the asymptotic relationship between the state variables $v_1(0, T)$ and $v_2(0, T)$. We have the integral equation $\int_0^{v_i(0, T)} h_i^{-2}(s)ds = \Psi(0)$. Rewrite this as

$$\int_0^{v_i(0, T)} (r_0^2 + (h_i^{-2}(s) - r_0^2))ds = r_0^2 v_i(0, T) + \int_0^{v_i(0, T)} (h_i^{-2}(s) - r_0^2)ds = \Psi(0, T), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and using Lemma A.1 (2), we note that the integral $\int_0^\infty (h_i^{-2}(s) - r_0^2)ds = K_i$ converges. We define the tail integral $R_i(y) \triangleq \int_y^\infty (h_i^{-2}(s) - r_0^2)ds$, which satisfies $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} R_i(y) = 0$. (A.1) becomes

$$\Psi(0, T) = r_0^2 v_i(0, T) + K_i - R_i(v_i(0, T)). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Moreover, since $v_i(0, T) = F_i^{-1}(\Psi(0, T))$, $F_i(\infty) = \infty$ and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(0, T) = \infty$, it follows that $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} v_i(0, T) = \infty$. Equating (A.2) for $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, we obtain

$$v_1(0, T) = v_2(0, T) + \frac{K_2 - K_1}{r_0^2} + \frac{R_2(v_2(0, T)) - R_1(v_1(0, T))}{r_0^2}.$$

Let $\Delta K = \frac{K_2 - K_1}{r_0^2}$ and $\xi(T) = \frac{R_2(v_2(0, T)) - R_1(v_1(0, T))}{r_0^2}$. Since $v_i(0, T) \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, the tail difference term $\xi(T)$ tends to 0. Thus, we have the exact relationship $v_1(0, T) = v_2(0, T) + \Delta K + \xi(T)$.

Second, we compare $h_1(v_1(0, T))$ and $h_2(v_2(0, T))$. Since $h_i(s) = (r_0 + Q_i(s))^{-1}$, this reduces to comparing $Q_1(v_1(0, T))$ and $Q_2(v_2(0, T))$. Using the bounds established in Lemma A.1 (3), we have

$$\frac{Q_1(v_1(0, T))}{Q_2(v_2(0, T))} \leq \frac{C_1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_1 v_1(0, T)}}{C_2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\delta_2 + \varepsilon)v_2(0, T)}}.$$

Substituting $v_1(0, T) = v_2(0, T) + \Delta K + \xi(T)$ into the exponent, we have

$$\frac{Q_1(v_1(0, T))}{Q_2(v_2(0, T))} \leq \frac{C_1}{C_2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_1(\Delta K + \xi(T))} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\delta_1 - \delta_2 - \varepsilon)v_2(0, T)}.$$

Since $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \xi(T) = 0$, the first exponential term converges to a finite positive constant. As shown in the Lemma A.1, we can strictly choose ε such that $\delta_1 - \delta_2 - \varepsilon > 0$. Consequently, as $v_2(0, T) \rightarrow \infty$, the second term tends to 0 and we have $\frac{Q_1(v_1(0, T))}{Q_2(v_2(0, T))} \rightarrow 0$.

This implies for sufficiently large T , $Q_1(v_1(0, T)) < Q_2(v_2(0, T))$. Since $h_i(x) = (r_0 + Q_i(x))^{-1}$ is strictly decreasing in Q_i , we have $h_1(v_1(0, T)) > h_2(v_2(0, T))$. Consequently, $|a_1(0, T)| > |a_2(0, T)|$ since $\lambda(0) \neq 0$, and equivalently, $|\pi_1(0, T)| > |\pi_2(0, T)|$.

References

- T. Bjork and A. Murgoci. A general theory of markovian time inconsistent stochastic control problems. *Available at SSRN 1694759*, 2010.
- T. Björk, M. Khapko, and A. Murgoci. On time-inconsistent stochastic control in continuous time. *Finance and Stochastics*, 21(2):331–360, 2017.
- P. Capéraà. Tail ordering and asymptotic efficiency of rank tests. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 470–478, 1988.
- X. Chen, G. Guan, and Z. Liang. Equilibrium portfolio selection under beliefs-dependent utilities. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2024.0772>, 2025.
- R. Chetty. A new method of estimating risk aversion. *American Economic Review*, 96(5):1821–1834, 2006.
- S. Desmettre and M. Steffensen. Equilibrium investment with random risk aversion. *Mathematical Finance*, 33(3):946–975, 2023.
- I. Ekeland and A. Lazrak. Being serious about non-commitment: Subgame perfect equilibrium in continuous time. *arXiv preprint math/0604264*, 2006.
- W. Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, volume 2. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2nd edition, 1971.
- S. Gordon and P. St-Amour. A preference regime model of bull and bear markets. *American Economic Review*, 90(4):1019–1033, 2000.
- L. Guiso, P. Sapienza, and L. Zingales. Time varying risk aversion. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 128(3):403–421, 2018.
- X. D. He and Z. L. Jiang. On the equilibrium strategies for time-inconsistent problems in continuous time. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(5):3860–3886, 2021.
- X. D. He, Z. Jiang, and J. Xia. Dynamic portfolio selection under monotone additive statistics in the Heston model. *Available at SSRN 5449757*, 2025.
- C. Hernández and D. Possamaï. Me, Myself and I: A general theory of non-Markovian time-inconsistent stochastic control for sophisticated agents. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(2): 1196–1258, 2023.
- Y. Hu, H. Jin, and X. Y. Zhou. Time-inconsistent stochastic linear-quadratic control. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 50(3):1548–1572, 2012.
- Y. Hu, H. Jin, and X. Y. Zhou. Time-inconsistent stochastic linear-quadratic control: Characterization and uniqueness of equilibrium. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(2): 1261–1279, 2017.

- Z. Liang, S. Wang, and J. Xia. Short communication: An integral equation in portfolio selection with time-inconsistent preferences. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 16(1):SC12–SC23, 2025. doi: 10.1137/24M170301X.
- R. C. Merton. Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: The continuous-time case. *The review of Economics and Statistics*, pages 247–257, 1969.
- R. C. Merton. Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous-time model. In *Stochastic optimization models in finance*, pages 621–661. Elsevier, 1975.
- H. Pollard. The representation of e^{-x^λ} as a Laplace integral. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 52(10):908 – 910, 1946.
- D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- P. A. Samuelson. Lifetime portfolio selection by dynamic stochastic programming. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pages 239–246, 1969.
- R. H. Strotz. Myopia and inconsistency in dynamic utility maximization. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 23(3):165–180, 1955.
- L. Wang and B. Jia. Equilibrium investment strategies for a defined contribution pension plan with random risk aversion. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 125:103140, 2025.
- T. Wang and E. Lehrer. Weighted utility and optimism/pessimism: A decision-theoretic foundation of various stochastic dominance orders. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 16(1): 210–223, 2024.
- G. N. Watson. The harmonic functions associated with the parabolic cylinder. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(1):116–148, 1918.
- J. Wei, J. Xia, and Q. Zhao. Time-consistent portfolio selection for rank-dependent utilities in an incomplete market. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19259*, 2024.
- J. Xia. Risk aversion and portfolio selection in a continuous-time model. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 49(5):1916–1937, 2011.
- J. Xia. Optimal investment with risk controlled by weighted entropic risk measures. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 15(1):54–92, 2024.
- W. Yan and J. Yong. Time-inconsistent optimal control problems and related issues. *Modeling, stochastic control, optimization, and applications*, pages 533–569, 2019.