

Unbounded Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equations with one co-dimensional discontinuities

Emmanuel Chasseigne¹, Robson Carlos Reis², Silvia Sastre-Gomez³

¹Université de Tours, France

²Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil

³Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Abstract

The aim of this work is to deal with a discontinuous Hamilton-Jacobi equation in the whole euclidian N -dimensional space, associated to a possibly unbounded optimal control problem. Here, the discontinuities are located on a hyperplane and the typical questions we address concern the existence and uniqueness of solutions, and of course the definition itself of solution. We consider viscosity solutions in the sense of Ishii. The convex Hamiltonians are associated to a control problem with specific cost and dynamics given on each side of the hyperplane. We assume that those are Lipschitz continuous but the main difficulty we deal with is that they are potentially unbounded, as well as the control spaces. Using Bellman's approach we construct two value functions which turn out to be the minimal and maximal solutions in the sense of Ishii. Moreover, we also build a whole family of value functions, which are still solutions in the sense of Ishii and connect continuously the minimal solution to the maximal one.

Keywords— Optimal control, discontinuous dynamic, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman Equation, viscosity solutions, Ishii Problem.

1 Introduction

Inspired by the works of Kruzhkov, *Viscosity Solutions*' theory has been developed and applied to a wide extent since its birth in the early 80's. We refer the reader to [7, 9] for the initial papers on the subject, the famous *User's guide* [8] and the book of Barles [2] for a more complete overview of the theory.

This theory is well-established and now quite stable in the case of continuous Hamiltonians, but dealing with discontinuities has always been difficult due to the pointwise nature of the concept of solution. And apart from several specific cases, even dealing with simple discontinuous problems has not been fully addressed until recently. We refer to the book [6] for a widespread introduction, information and results about discontinuous Hamilton-Jacobi problems.

In [3] G. Barles, A. Briani and E. Chasseigne study discontinuous Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations in \mathbb{R}^N , associated to an infinite horizon control problem where the discontinuities are located on the hyperplane $\mathcal{H} = \{x_N = 0\}$. A more global approach can be found in [5, 6] but here we focus on this hyperplane, stationary situation.

Before presenting the approach in [3], let us already mention that so far, the literature on discontinuous Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations only focuses on bounded control sets, bounded dynamics and costs. One of the main goals of the present paper is to bridge the gap to the unbounded case, using some specific hypotheses.

THE BOUNDED CASE — In order to give a quick overview of the results in [3] and introduce some notations and concepts that we use throughout this work, let us decompose the space into three parts $\mathbb{R}^N = \Omega_1 \cup \mathcal{H} \cup \Omega_2$, where $\Omega_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_N > 0\}$ and $\Omega_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_N < 0\}$, \mathcal{H} being the hyperplane separating Ω_1 and Ω_2 : $\mathcal{H} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid x_N = 0\}$. We will take $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the sets of controls. In each domain Ω_i , a control problem is defined through a dynamic function $b_i : \overline{\Omega}_i \times A_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and a cost function $l_i : \overline{\Omega}_i \times A_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. As in [3], for the moment the reader may assume that each A_i is compact and the (b_i, l_i) are at least continuous and bounded on $\overline{\Omega}_i \times A_i$.

In order to define a value function, it is first necessary to define trajectories that may cross or stay on \mathcal{H} , hence we also need to define the dynamics and cost on \mathcal{H} . Following [3], we set $A := A_1 \times A_2 \times [0, 1]$ and use the control set formed by bounded measurable functions $\mathcal{A} := L^\infty(0, \infty; A)$. Then on \mathcal{H} we introduce a relaxed dynamic $b_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{H} \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ given by a convex combination of b_1 and b_2 through a parameter $\mu \in [0, 1]$, and similarly a cost function $l_{\mathcal{H}} : \mathcal{H} \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by a convex combination of l_1 and l_2 . More precisely, $b_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $l_{\mathcal{H}}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) &= \mu b_1(x, \alpha_1) + (1 - \mu) b_2(x, \alpha_2), \quad x \in \mathcal{H}, \quad a = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \in A, \\ l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) &= \mu l_1(x, \alpha_1) + (1 - \mu) l_2(x, \alpha_2), \quad x \in \mathcal{H}, \quad a = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \in A. \end{aligned}$$

Following this construction, a global formulation of trajectories can be obtained by solving a differential inclusion, we detail this approach in the Preliminaries section below. As shown in [3], any trajectory $X(\cdot)$ solving the differential inclusion can be associated to a control function $a = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \in \mathcal{A} := L^\infty(0, \infty; A)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}(t) &= b_1(X(t), \alpha_1(t)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X(t) \in \Omega_1\}} + b_2(X(t), \alpha_2(t)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X(t) \in \Omega_2\}} \\ &\quad + b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(t), a(t)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X(t) \in \mathcal{H}\}} \quad \text{for a.e. } t > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Denoting by $\tau_A(x)$ the set of such controlled trajectories, (X, a) , starting from $X(0) = x$, it is

natural to introduce the following value function

$$U_A^-(x) := \inf_{(X,a) \in \tau_A(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right) \quad (1.2)$$

where l stands for the global cost: $l = l_1, l_2$ or $l_{\mathcal{H}}$ depending on the location. Introducing in each Ω_i the Hamiltonian

$$H_i(x, u, p) = \sup_{\alpha_i \in A_i} \{ \lambda u - b_i(x, \alpha_i) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha_i) \},$$

it is clear enough that the value function satisfies $H_i(x, u, Du) = 0$ in each Ω_i —in the viscosity sense—, a fact which can be actually obtained by performing the standard analysis through the dynamic programming principle locally inside each Ω_i .

It remains to understand the situation on \mathcal{H} and, as the viscosity theory suggests, it turns out that the value function U_A^- satisfies the Ishii conditions on \mathcal{H} , leading to a full set of (in)equations:

$$\begin{cases} H_1(x, u, Du) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_1, \\ H_2(x, u, Du) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega_2, \\ \min\{H_1(x, u, Du), H_2(x, u, Du)\} \leq 0 & \text{on } \mathcal{H}, \\ \max\{H_1(x, u, Du), H_2(x, u, Du)\} \geq 0 & \text{on } \mathcal{H}. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Notice that on \mathcal{H} , only the min-inequality is required for a subsolution in the sense of Ishii, while only the max-one is required for a supersolution. However, the special solution U_A^- satisfies a complemented $(N - 1)$ -dimensional inequation on \mathcal{H} : $H_T(x, u, Du) \leq 0$, where the tangential Hamiltonian is defined by

$$H_T(x, \phi, D_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) = \sup_{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \in A_0(x)} \left\{ \lambda \phi(x) - b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \cdot D_{\mathcal{H}}\phi(x) - l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \right\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Here, $A_0(x)$ is the set of controls that allow the trajectory to remain on \mathcal{H} , that is, the controls such that $b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) \cdot e_N = 0$ and

$$D_{\mathcal{H}}\phi(x) = \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{n-1}} \right).$$

Adding the tangential subsolution condition $H_T(x, u, Du) \leq 0$ to problem (1.3) allows to prove a comparison result between sub and supersolutions, leading to the fact that U_A^- is the unique Ishii solution satisfying $H_T \leq 0$.

Including the subsolution condition $H_T \leq 0$ leads to the notion of **stratified solutions** which is the good notion of solution for treating (1.3), meaning that a complete comparison result between sub and supersolutions holds in this framework.

REGULAR DYNAMICS, EXTREMAL ISHII SOLUTIONS — The precise analysis of the situation performed in [3] shows that at least two specific value functions can be built, the “natural” one being of course U_A^- . But the authors also build a second solution in the sense of Ishii by introducing the **regular dynamics** on \mathcal{H} , which are defined as $b_{\mathcal{H}} = \mu b_1 + (1 - \mu)b_2$ satisfying

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{H}, \quad b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot e_N \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N \geq 0.$$

Intuitively, such dynamics are maintaining the trajectory on \mathcal{H} by “pushing” from either side of the hyperplane, contrary to singular dynamics which corresponds to an equilibrium obtained by “pulling” from both sides.

Defining the set of **regular trajectories** as

$$\tau_A^{\text{reg}}(x) := \left\{ (X(\cdot), a(\cdot)) \in \tau_A(x) \text{ and for a.e. } t \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}, b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(t), a(t)) \text{ is regular} \right\} \quad (1.5)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}} := \{t : X(t) \in \mathcal{H}\}$, allows to construct a second value function:

$$U_A^+(x) := \inf_{(X,a) \in \tau_A^{\text{reg}}(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right). \quad (1.6)$$

As shown in [3], it turns out that U_A^- is the minimal (super)solution of the Ishii problem (1.3), while U_A^+ is the maximal (sub)solution. Of course, U_A^- is the unique stratified solution.

Let us mention finally that in [4] the authors extend the results in several directions by considering general domains and finite horizon control problems under weaker controllability assumptions. An even more global approach is performed in [6] but the authors always consider mainly bounded control sets, bounded dynamics and costs functions, apart from some remarks on some unbounded cases like KPP-type problems.

MAIN RESULTS OF THE PAPER — As was said above, in [3, 4, 6] the Ishii problem (1.3) is treated in the context of compact control space and bounded cost-dynamics, restricting the study to sublinear Hamiltonians. In this work one of the main objectives is to verify which results of [3], [4] are still valid when dealing with non-compact controls spaces and unbounded cost-dynamics.

The clear motivation for considering non-compact controls spaces is that some important Hamiltonians can only be approached in this context, like the following typical quadratic example

$$H_i(x, u, Du) = \lambda u + c_i |Du|^2 - f_i(x), \quad |f_i(x)| \leq C|x|^2. \quad (1.7)$$

While the literature related to superlinear Hamiltonians is extensive — see for example [1], [10], [11] [12] for control related topics —, dealing with **discontinuities** in non-compact settings is far from being easy.

So, in this work we consider unbounded sets of controls, typically $A_i = \mathbb{R}^d$, and only locally bounded cost-dynamic functions (b_i, l_i) . In this framework, a central hypothesis in our paper is the following:

$$\lim_{|\alpha_i| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{l_i(y, \alpha_i)}{1 + |b_i(y, \alpha_i)|} = \infty, \quad \text{locally uniformly with respect to } y. \quad (1.8)$$

The key idea here is that the cost associated to large dynamics is so big that such strategies are not optimal. This allows to recover some compactness of the trajectories and the associated controls. This type of hypothesis already appears in [1] where the reader will find counter-examples to uniqueness when it is not satisfied. Using (1.8) allows to reduce several arguments to the case of

bounded control sets where we can use the results of [3] even if not all the arguments are so easy to handle. The main results of the paper can be summarized as:

Assuming (1.8), a global comparison result holds for (1.3) between stratified sub and supersolutions. As a consequence, U_A^- is the unique stratified solution of this problem.

We also build a whole family of value functions, which are still solutions in the sense of Ishii and connect continuously the minimal solution to the maximal one. We have already commented that problems with discontinuities, in general, do not have uniqueness. In fact, U_A^+ and U_A^- are viscosity solutions of the Ishii problem, but they are not the only ones. We build a family, U_A^η , of locally Lipschitz Ishii solutions. Under appropriate assumptions we obtain that the limit when η goes to zero is U_A^+ and when η goes to infinite is U_A^- . This family can then be seen as a continuous path connecting U_A^- to U_A^+ . Such solutions are built on the relaxed regular trajectories

$$\tau_A^\eta(x) := \left\{ (X(\cdot), a(\cdot)) \in \tau_A(x) \text{ such that for a.e. } t \in \mathcal{E}_H, \right. \\ \left. b_2(X(t), a(t)) \cdot e_N \geq -\eta, b_1(X(t), a(t)) \cdot e_N \leq \eta \right\}. \quad (1.9)$$

These η -trajectories may not be regular, but they are almost regular if η is close to 0. On the contrary, if η is close to $+\infty$, we recover most of the trajectories. The η -value function is then defined as one can expect:

$$U_A^\eta(x) := \inf_{(X,a) \in \tau_A^\eta(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right). \quad (1.10)$$

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	6
2.1	Main assumptions	7
2.2	The control problem	7
2.3	Hamiltonians	9
2.4	Viscosity solutions	13
3	Value functions	14
3.1	The dynamic programming principle	15

3.2	Regularity	15
3.3	Value functions are solutions of the Ishii problem	16
4	Comparison results	19
4.1	Local comparison result	19
4.2	Global comparison results	21
4.3	Extremal Ishii Solution	22
5	A continuous family of solutions	23
5.1	η -value functions are Ishii solutions	24
5.2	Asymptotics as $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$ of U_A^η	25
5.3	Asymptotics as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ of U_A^η	27
6	Application to a superlinear example	32
6.1	The control problem	32
6.2	Convexifying the problem	33
6.3	Checking (LOC1) and (LOC2)	34
6.4	Filippov approximations of the superlinear example.	35

2 Preliminaries

Let us begin with some basic notation, already introduced in the introduction: throughout this paper, $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ are (non compact) metric spaces which are both closed and convex, and $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ are defined by

$$\Omega_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_N > 0\}, \quad \Omega_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_N < 0\}, \quad \mathcal{H} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_N = 0\}.$$

We assume that for $i = 1, 2$ we are given a pair of dynamic-cost functions b_i, l_i defined on $\overline{\Omega}_i \times A_i$ and given a fixed parameter $\lambda > 0$ (the actualization factor), we define for $x \in \Omega_i$ the Hamiltonian

$$H_i(x, u, p) := \sup_{\alpha_i \in A_i} \{\lambda u - b(x, \alpha_i) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha_i)\}.$$

More precise assumptions on (b_i, l_i) are given below.

2.1 Main assumptions

Many arguments in this paper are based on compact approximations of the control sets A_i . To this end, let us introduce a sequence of compact sets $A_i^1 \subset A_i^2 \subset \dots \subset A_i^m \subset \dots \subset A_i$ such that

$$A_i = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} A_i^m, \quad (2.1)$$

We consider also all the definitions related to the control sets A_i^m : the associated Hamiltonians H_1^m, H_2^m , the Ishii problem, as well as the value functions $U_{A_i^m}^+, U_{A_i^m}^-$ and the tangential Hamiltonian H_T^m which will be defined below.

Let us now state the main hypotheses on the dynamic and cost functions that we use.

- (HA) for $i = 1, 2$, $(x, \alpha_i) \mapsto l_i(x, \alpha_i)$ and $(x, \alpha_i) \mapsto b_i(x, \alpha_i)$ are continuous functions with respect to (x, α_i) ; b_i is Lipschitz continuous with respect to α_i , uniformly for x in compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^N ;
- (HB) for $i = 1, 2$, any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$, the set $\{(b_i(x, \alpha_i), l_i(x, \alpha_i)) : \alpha_i \in A_i^m\}$ is closed and convex. Moreover, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\overline{B_\delta(0)} \subset \mathcal{B}^{A_i^m}(x), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{B}^{A_i^m}(x) := \{b_i(x, \alpha_i) : \alpha_i \in A_i^m\}.$$

- (HC) for $i = 1, 2$, $l_i : \mathbb{R}^N \times A_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_i : \mathbb{R}^N \times A_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfy

$$\lim_{|\alpha_i| \rightarrow \infty} |b_i(x, \alpha_i)| = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{|\alpha_i| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{l_i(x, \alpha_i)}{1 + |b_i(x, \alpha_i)|} = +\infty,$$

uniformly with respect to x in compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^N ;

Hypothesis (HA) is quite natural in this non-compact setting. Notice that the total controllability assumption (HB) is also automatically satisfied by A_i , $i = 1, 2$. More important is hypothesis (HC) which states that if the dynamic grows too much, the associated cost gets very high. Hence, the associated trajectories with high cost are not the ones that are important in the definition of the value function, or the dynamic programming principle.

2.2 The control problem

Following [3], global trajectories of the control problem are defined by solving the following differential inclusion

$$\begin{cases} \dot{X}(t) \in \mathcal{B}(X(t)) \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0, \infty), \\ X(0) = x \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where the dynamic set-valued map is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}(x) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_1(x) := \{b_1(x, \alpha_1) : \alpha_1 \in A_1\}, & \text{if } x_N > 0, \\ \mathcal{B}_2(x) := \{b_2(x, \alpha_2) : \alpha_2 \in A_2\}, & \text{if } x_N < 0, \\ \overline{\text{co}}(\mathcal{B}_1(x) \cup \mathcal{B}_2(x)) & \text{if } x_N = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

$\overline{\text{co}}(\cdot)$ being the convex hull. We then say that $X(\cdot)$ is a **trajectory** if it is a Lipschitz continuous function that satisfies the following differential inclusion

$$\dot{X}(t) \in \mathcal{B}(X(t)) \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.4)$$

To each solution $X(\cdot)$ of the differential inclusion, we can associate an extended control $a(\cdot) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu)(\cdot) \in A := A_1 \times A_2 \times [0, 1]$ so that (X, a) becomes a controlled trajectory of the system. More precisely, introducing the following notations

$$\mathcal{E}_1 := \{t : X(t) \in \Omega_1\}, \quad \mathcal{E}_2 := \{t : X(t) \in \Omega_2\}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}} := \{t : X(t) \in \mathcal{H}\},$$

then the result is the following. For more details see [3, Th. 2.1].

Theorem 2.1. *For each solution $X(\cdot)$ of the differential inclusion (2.4), there exists a control $a(\cdot) = (\alpha_1(\cdot), \alpha_2(\cdot), \mu(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A} := L_{loc}^\infty(0, \infty; A)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}(t) = & b_1(X(t), \alpha_1(t)) \mathbf{1}_{\{X(t) \in \Omega_1\}} + b_2(X(t), \alpha_2(t)) \mathbf{1}_{\{X(t) \in \Omega_2\}} \\ & + b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(t), a(t)) \mathbf{1}_{\{X(t) \in \mathcal{H}\}} \quad \text{for a.e. } t > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover,

$$b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(t), a(t)) \cdot e_N = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}. \quad (2.6)$$

The set of trajectories starting from $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ can then be defined by

$$\tau_A(x) := \left\{ (X(\cdot), a(\cdot)) \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{A} \text{ satisfying (2.5) and } X(0) = x \right\}, \quad (2.7)$$

and for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$, we define $A_0(x) := \{a \in \mathcal{A} : b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) \cdot e_N = 0\}$, the set of controls maintaining the trajectory on \mathcal{H} .

As we saw in the introduction, regular dynamics and trajectories are also of interest. They are defined as follows:

Definition 2.2.

(i) *Given $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $a = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \in A_0(x)$, we say that $a = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu)$ is a **regular control** if*

$$b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot e_N \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N \geq 0. \quad (2.8)$$

We denote by $A_0^{\text{reg}}(x)$ the subset of controls in $A_0(x)$ which are regular.

(ii) *If $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\alpha \in A_0^{\text{reg}}(x)$, we say that the dynamic $b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, \alpha)$ is regular.*

(iii) The set of **regular trajectories** is defined as

$$\tau_A^{\text{reg}}(x) := \left\{ (X(\cdot), a(\cdot)) \in \tau_A(x) : \text{for a.e. } t \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(t), a(t)) \text{ is regular} \right\}. \quad (2.9)$$

We will also use some intermediate set between the set of regular and general trajectories in Section 5, by relaxing condition (2.8) with a parameter $\eta > 0$ instead of 0.

Notice that, given a controlled trajectory (X, a) , we can define (b, l) globally by setting $(b, l) = (b_i, l_i)$ in Ω_i for $i = 1, 2$ and $(b, l) = (b_{\mathcal{H}}, l_{\mathcal{H}})$ on \mathcal{H} . We then define two value functions by

$$U_A^-(x) := \inf_{(X, a) \in \tau_A(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right). \quad (2.10)$$

$$U_A^+(x) := \inf_{(X, a) \in \tau_A^{\text{reg}}(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right). \quad (2.11)$$

We detail some properties of U_A^- and U_A^+ in Section 3. Of course, similar definitions are used for the case of compact control sets, and the notation of the respective value functions are $U_{A^m}^-$ and $U_{A^m}^+$.

2.3 Hamiltonians

As is well-known, optimal control problems are related to some Hamilton-Jacobi equation satisfied by value functions. The natural Hamiltonian associated to the control problem is defined by

$$H(x, u, p) := \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \lambda u - b(x, a) \cdot p - l(x, a) \right\}, \quad (2.12)$$

where we recall that the extended control takes the form $a = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu)$. We refer to [2, Lemma 7.3] for proof of the fact that

$$H(x, u, p) := \begin{cases} H_1(x, u, p) & \text{in } \Omega_1, \\ H_2(x, u, p) & \text{in } \Omega_2, \\ \max\{H_1(x, u, p), H_2(x, u, p)\} & \text{on } \mathcal{H}. \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

Moreover, as mentioned in the introduction, in order to get a comparison result for (1.3), we need to define the tangential Hamiltonian. For $(x, u, q) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ we set

$$H_T(x, u, q) = \sup_{a \in A_0(x)} \left\{ \lambda u - b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) \cdot (q, 0) - l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) \right\}. \quad (2.14)$$

We can similarly define H_T^{reg} by using regular controls, as is done in [3]:

$$H_T^{\text{reg}}(x, u, q) = \sup_{a \in A_0^{\text{reg}}(x)} \left\{ \lambda u - b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) \cdot (q, 0) - l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) \right\}, \quad (2.15)$$

however, this second tangential Hamiltonian is not as useful as H_T in the sense that it does not lead to a characterization of U^+ , nor a satisfying comparison result. We now turn to the regularity of Hamiltonians, proving that the H_i are well defined, continuous, attain their supremum in a compact control set and are locally coercive with respect to the third variable.

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that (HA), (HB) and (HC) hold. Then,*

- (i) *If $K \subset \overline{\Omega}_i \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N$ is compact, there exists $\tilde{A} \subset A_i$ compact such that for any $(x, u, p) \in K$, the supremum defining $H_i(x, u, p)$ is attained for $\alpha_i \in \tilde{A}$.*
- (ii) *$H_i(x, u, p) : \overline{\Omega}_i \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous with respect to all the variables.*
- (iii) *$H_i(x, u, p)$ is coercive in p , locally uniformly with respect to (x, u) .*

As a consequence, the same properties are valid for H and H_T .

Proof. Recall that the Hamiltonian H_i is defined by

$$H_i(x, u, p) := \sup_{\alpha \in A_i} \{ \lambda u - b_i(x, \alpha) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha) \}.$$

(i) On $X = \overline{\Omega}_i \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N \times A_i$, let us define $h_i : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h_i(x, u, p, \alpha_i) := \lambda u - b_i(x, \alpha_i) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha_i),$$

and notice that h_i is a continuous function. Notice also that there exists $M = M(K) > 0$ such that $K \subset V_i \times [-M, M] \times B_M$, where $V_i := \overline{\Omega}_i \cap B_M$, and B_M is a ball centered in zero with radius M . Thanks to hypothesis (HB), for any $(x, u, p) \in K$, there exists a control $\alpha_i^x \in A_i^M \subset A_i$ such that $b_i(x, \alpha_i^x) = 0$. So, for any $(x, u, p) \in K$

$$\sup_{\alpha_i \in A_i} \{ -b_i(x, \alpha_i) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha_i) \} \geq -b_i(x, \alpha_i^x) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha_i^x) \geq -\|l_i\|_{L^\infty(V_i \times A_i^M)}.$$

Let us fix

$$\tilde{M}_i > \max \left\{ \max_{|p| \leq M} |p|, \|l_i\|_{L^\infty(V_i \times A_i^M)} \right\} = \max \left\{ M, \|l_i\|_{L^\infty(V_i \times A_i^M)} \right\}. \quad (2.16)$$

Thanks to hypothesis (HC), there exists $\Gamma_{\tilde{M}_i} > 0$ such that if $|\alpha_i| > \Gamma_{\tilde{M}_i}$ then

$$l_i(x, \alpha_i) > \tilde{M}_i(1 + |b_i(x, \alpha_i)|) \quad \forall x \in V_i. \quad (2.17)$$

Hence, $-b_i(x, \alpha_i) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha_i) < -\|l_i\|_{L^\infty(V_i \times A_i^M)}$, for controls such that $|\alpha_i| \geq \Gamma_{\tilde{M}_i}$. Therefore, for any $(x, u, p) \in K$, the supremum of $h_i(x, u, p, \alpha_i) = \lambda u - b_i(x, \alpha_i) \cdot p - l_i(x, \alpha_i)$ is attained for $\alpha_i \in A_i^M$, which is a compact subset of A_i . This proves (i).

(ii) The fact that H_i is continuous just derives from (i): since h_i is continuous and the supremum is locally attained on a compact set of controls, the supremum of h_i is continuous with respect to (x, u, p) , which proves (ii).

(iii) Let us turn to the coercivity property. Let $(x, u) \in V_i \times [-M, M]$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Due to (HB), for any $x \in V_i$, there exists $\tilde{\alpha}_i^x \in A_i^M$ such that $|b_i(x, \tilde{\alpha}_i^x)| = \delta$ and $-b_i(x, \tilde{\alpha}_i^x) \cdot p = \delta|p|$. This implies that

$$H_i(x, u, p) \geq \lambda u + \delta|p| - \|l_i\|_{L^\infty(V_i \times A_i^M)},$$

therefore, $\lim_{|p| \rightarrow \infty} H_i(x, u, p) = +\infty$, and (iii) holds.

Looking at the definition of H and H_T , it is clear that those Hamiltonians enjoy the same properties as H_1 and H_2 , the proofs being essentially identical. \square

Approximations

Let us introduce a family $(H^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}_*}$ of Hamiltonians by reducing the control problem to compact control sets $A^m = A_1^m \times A_2^m \times [0, 1]$:

$$H^m(x, u, p) := \sup_{a \in A^m} \{ \lambda u - b(x, a) \cdot p - l(x, a) \}, \quad (2.18)$$

where of course $\mathcal{A}^m := L_{loc}^\infty(0, \infty; A^m)$. It is clear from the definition of A^m that for any fixed (x, u, p) , $H^m(x, u, p)$ converges monotonically to $H(x, u, p)$. Notice that both Hamiltonians are upper semi-continuous by construction, and that of course for fixed (x, u, p) , $H^m(x, u, p) \rightarrow H(x, u, p)$ monotonically.

Now, in order to connect H^m and H we need to introduce the half-relaxed limits of H^m . We refer the reader to [2] for more precise results on the semi-continuous envelopes as well as upper and lower semi-continuous functions (usc and lsc for short). Let us just recall here that for any locally bounded function f on a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, the lower and upper semi-continuous envelopes are defined respectively by

$$f_*(x) := \liminf_{y \rightarrow x} f(y), \quad f^*(x) := \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} f(y).$$

Moreover, if $(f_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is a family of locally uniformly bounded functions, the half-relaxed limits as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ are defined similarly as

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f_\varepsilon(x) := \liminf_{\substack{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ y \rightarrow x}} f_\varepsilon(y), \quad \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}^* f_\varepsilon(x) := \limsup_{\substack{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ y \rightarrow x}} f_\varepsilon(y).$$

Of course, $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f_\varepsilon$ and $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}^* f_\varepsilon$ are respectively lower semi-continuous and upper semi-continuous. We will need the following result, which appears in [2] as an exercise (we provide here a full proof for completeness):

Lemma 2.4. *Let $(u_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ be a non-decreasing (with respect to ε) sequence of continuous functions which are locally uniformly bounded on some set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u_\varepsilon &= \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} u_\varepsilon, \\ \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}^* u_\varepsilon &= \left(\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} u_\varepsilon \right)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us first notice that since (u_ε) is locally uniformly bounded, the various quantities in this result are well-defined. Notice also that by monotonicity, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $u_\varepsilon(x) \rightarrow \left(\sup_{\varepsilon > 0} u_\varepsilon \right)(x)$.

Let $\varepsilon' > 0$ be fixed and consider a sequence $(\varepsilon_n, y_n) \rightarrow (0, x)$. Then for $\varepsilon_n < \varepsilon'$, i.e., n big enough,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\varepsilon_n}(y_n) &= \left[u_{\varepsilon_n}(y_n) - u_{\varepsilon'}(y_n) \right] + \left[u_{\varepsilon'}(y_n) - u_{\varepsilon'}(x) \right] + u_{\varepsilon'}(x) \\ &\geq o_n(1) + u_{\varepsilon'}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, this is obtained by using the monotonicity of (u_ε) for the first bracket, and the continuity of $u_{\varepsilon'}$ for the second one. By taking the liminf, we deduce that $\liminf_* u_\varepsilon(x) \geq u_{\varepsilon'}(x)$ for any $\varepsilon' > 0$. Now, since by monotonicity, $u_{\varepsilon'} \rightarrow \sup u_\varepsilon$, we get the inequality $\liminf_* u_\varepsilon \geq \sup_{\varepsilon>0} u_\varepsilon$. For the converse inequality, it is enough to notice that taking $(\varepsilon_n, x) \rightarrow (0, x)$ leads to

$$\liminf_* u_\varepsilon(x) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0} u_{\varepsilon_n}(x) = \sup_{\varepsilon>0} u_\varepsilon(x)$$

and the first result of the Lemma follows.

For the limsup property, we first notice that of course $\limsup^* u_\varepsilon \geq \liminf_* u_\varepsilon = \sup_{\varepsilon>0} u_\varepsilon$, and since $\limsup^* u_\varepsilon$ is upper semi-continuous, necessarily $\limsup^* u_\varepsilon \geq (\sup_{\varepsilon>0} u_\varepsilon)^*$. For the converse inequality, using the monotonicity property of (u_ε) we see that

$$\limsup^* u_\varepsilon(x) \leq \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \left(\sup_{\varepsilon>0} u_\varepsilon \right)(y) = \left(\sup_{\varepsilon>0} u_\varepsilon \right)^*$$

and the second result follows. □

Let us give an important consequence:

Corollary 2.5. *The following limits hold:*

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow +\infty}^* H^m(x, u, p) = H(x, u, p).$$

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow +\infty}^* U_{A^m}^-(x) = U_A^-(x).$$

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the previous Lemma. Take $u_{\varepsilon_n} = H^m$: we already noticed that for fixed (x, u, p) , the sequence $(H^m(x, u, p))_m$ is non-decreasing; each H^m is continuous and $H^m \leq H$ which yields a local uniform bound. Hence, using that H is upper semi-continuous,

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow +\infty}^* H^m(x, u, p) = \left(\sup_m H^m(x, u, p) \right)^* = \left(H(x, u, p) \right)^* = H(x, u, p).$$

For the case of $U_{A^m}^-$, let us notice that since A^m is compact, $U_{A^m}^-$ is continuous. Moreover, $m \mapsto U_{A^m}^-$ is non-increasing, and that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} U_{A^m}^-(x) &= \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}_*} U_{A^m}^-(x) = \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}_*} \inf_{(X, a) \in \tau_{A^m}(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right) \\ &= \inf_{(X, a) \in \tau_A(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right) = U_A^-(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by using again Lemma 2.4 with the nondecreasing sequence $(-U_{A^m}^-)$, we end up with the second result. □

2.4 Viscosity solutions

By solutions of Problem 1.3 we mean of course **viscosity solutions**. Let us briefly recall some definitions:

Definition 2.6. *Let us consider an abstract Hamilton-Jacobi equation $H(x, u, Du) = 0$ posed in a set Ω .*

- (i) *An upper semi-continuous function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity subsolution in Ω if for any C^1 -smooth test-function ϕ , at any local maximum point $x \in \Omega$ of $u - \phi$ we have*

$$H(x, u, D\phi(x)) \leq 0.$$

- (ii) *A lower semi-continuous function $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity supersolution in Ω if for any C^1 -smooth test-function ϕ , at any local minimum point $x \in \Omega$ of $u - \phi$ we have*

$$H(x, u, D\phi(x)) \geq 0.$$

- (iii) *A continuous function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution of $H(x, u, Du) = 0$ in Ω if it is at the same time a subsolution and a supersolution.*

In the rest of the paper, we use the abbreviation u.s.c. and l.s.c. for upper semi-continuous and lower semi-continuous respectively.

Notice that if u is only (locally) bounded, we can still consider its upper semi-continuous and lower semi-continuous envelopes, u^* and u_* , which allows to define sub/super solutions through u^* and u_* . But in this paper, we will always consider u.s.c. subsolutions and l.s.c. supersolutions.

The Ishii conditions in (1.3), *i.e.* the min and max conditions on \mathcal{H} are checked as above by using also C^1 -smooth test functions ϕ , where (i) $u - \phi$ reaches a maximum at $x \in \mathcal{H}$ for the min equation (subsolution condition); (ii) $u - \phi$ reaches a minimum at $x \in \mathcal{H}$ for the max equation (supersolution condition).

The case of H_T or H_T^{reg} is particular since it is a $(N - 1)$ -dimensional equation. So, Definition 2.6 has to be applied with test-functions $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and considering local maximum/minimum of $u - \phi$ on \mathcal{H} . Equivalently, we can use ϕ as a test function in \mathbb{R}^N and consider the max/min in $x' \in \mathcal{H}$ of $u(x', 0) - \phi(x', 0)$.

We end up this section by defining the notion of stratified solution, by adding H_T to the set of inequations. Following [6] we introduce the following definition.

Definition 2.7. *Let us consider problem (1.3) that we write under the abstract form $\mathbb{H}(x, u, Du) = 0$.*

- (i) *An u.s.c. function $u : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a stratified subsolution of $\mathbb{H}(x, u, Du) \leq 0$ $\mathbb{H}(x, u, Du) = 0$ if it is a subsolution of (1.3) satisfying the additional inequality $H_T(x, u, Du) \leq 0$ in \mathcal{H} .*
- (ii) *A l.s.c. function $v : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a stratified supersolution of $\mathbb{H}(x, u, Du) \geq 0$ $\mathbb{H}(x, u, Du) = 0$ if it is a supersolution of (1.3).*

(iii) *A continuous function is a stratified solution of $\mathbb{H}(x, u, Du) = 0$ if it is at the same time a stratified subsolution and a stratified supersolution.*

Notice that of course, only the subsolution condition is complemented by $H_T \leq 0$, stratified supersolutions are nothing but standard (Ishii) supersolutions of (1.3). We also want to comment on the fact that in [6], the notion of weak and strong stratified solutions are used, due to some specific regularity properties of subsolutions. In our situation, we are assuming total controllability and Ishii inequalities on \mathcal{H} so that weak stratified subsolutions are necessarily also strong ones. For more details, see [6, Prop. 19.2].

One of the main goals of this paper is to establish a global comparison result for stratified solutions of $\mathbb{H}(x, u, Du) = 0$, or more precisely problem (1.3). By global and local comparison results, as in [6] we mean here:

(GCR): *For any u.s.c. subsolution, u , and l.s.c. supersolution, v , $u \leq v$ in \mathbb{R}^N .*

(LCR): *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists $\bar{r} > 0$ such that for any u.s.c. subsolution, u , and l.s.c. supersolution, v , and any $0 < r < \bar{r}$,*

$$\max_{B_r(x)}(u - v)^+ = \max_{\partial B_r(x)}(u - v)^+.$$

We refer to Section 4 below where both type of results are proved.

3 Value functions

Let us begin by recalling that in the bounded control case, *i.e.*, considering control sets A^m for $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$, the results in [3] directly apply. If H_i^m , H_T^m and $H_T^{m,\text{reg}}$ are the Hamiltonians associated to the compact control set A^m and $U_{A^m}^-$, $U_{A^m}^+$ are the associated value functions, the following result holds:

Theorem 3.1 ([3], Thm. 2.5). *Assuming (HA), (HB) and (HC), $U_{A^m}^+$ and $U_{A^m}^-$ are viscosity solutions of the Ishii problem (1.3).*

(i) *$U_{A^m}^-$ is a stratified subsolution, associated to the tangential Hamiltonian H_T^m , *i.e.*, for any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, $U_{A^m}^-(\bar{x}, 0)$ satisfies*

$$H_T^m(x, u, D_{\mathcal{H}}u) \leq 0.$$

(ii) *$U_{A^m}^+$ is a supersolution of the tangential Hamiltonian $H_T^{m,\text{reg}}$, *i.e.*, for any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, $U_{A^m}^+(\bar{x}, 0)$ satisfies*

$$H_T^{m,\text{reg}}(x, u, D_{\mathcal{H}}u) \geq 0.$$

We now go back to the non-bounded case.

3.1 The dynamic programming principle

The result below is the Dynamic Programming Principle which is the main result to prove that the value functions are subsolutions and supersolutions of (1.3).

Theorem 3.2 (Dynamic Programming Principle).

$$U_A^-(x) = \inf_{(X,a) \in \tau_A(x)} \left(\int_0^T l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt + U_A^-(X(T)) e^{-\lambda T} \right). \quad (3.1)$$

$$U_A^+(x) = \inf_{(X,a) \in \tau_A^{\text{reg}}(x)} \left(\int_0^T l(X(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt + U_A^+(X(T)) e^{-\lambda T} \right). \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. The proof is standard, cf. [2, p. 65]. □

In the following result, we prove that the trajectories in $\tau_{A^m}(x)$ are locally bounded for time small enough.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and let $b_i : \overline{\Omega}_i \times A_i^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be continuous. Given $r > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exist $\bar{t} > 0$ such that for any trajectory $(X, a) \in \tau_{A^m}(x)$, we obtain*

$$|X_x(s) - x| \leq r, \quad \forall s \leq \bar{t}.$$

Proof. Integrating (2.5), we consider $\bar{t} \leq r \cdot (\|b\|_{L^\infty(B_r(x) \times A^m)})^{-1}$ to obtain the result. □

3.2 Regularity

The main result here is the following

Proposition 3.4. *Let us assume that hypotheses (HA), (HB), (HC) hold. Then U_A^- and U_A^+ are locally bounded and locally Lipschitz continuous functions.*

Proof. We first prove some local bound, the Lipschitz regularity follows almost directly.

Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a convex compact set, and assume $x \in \Omega_i \cap V$. Thanks to hypothesis (HB), there exists a control $\alpha_i^* \in A_i$ such that $b_i(x, \alpha_i^*) = 0$, yielding the constant trajectory $X_x(t) = x$ with associated control $\alpha_i(t) = \alpha_i^*$ for all t . Hence,

$$U_A^-(x) = \inf_{\tau(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X_x(t), \alpha(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right) \leq \int_0^\infty l(x, \alpha_i^*) e^{-\lambda t} dt = \frac{l(x, \alpha_i^*)}{\lambda}.$$

Using hypothesis (HA), it is clear that U_A^- is bounded in $\Omega_i \cap V$.

Now, if $x \in \mathcal{H} \cap V$, we use the same approach with some controls $\alpha_1^* \in A_1$, $\alpha_2^* \in A_2$ such that $b_1(x, \alpha_1^*) = 0 = b_2(x, \alpha_2^*)$. The trajectory $X(t) = x$ associated to $a(t) = (\alpha_1^*, \alpha_2^*, \mu)$, with $\mu = 1/2$

for instance, yields a similar bound. So, U_A^- is also bounded in $V \cap \mathcal{H}$ and finally, U_A^- is bounded in V . Of course the same arguments work for U_A^+ because the control $a = (\alpha_1^*, \alpha_2^*, \mu)$ is obviously regular.

For the local Lipschitz continuity, the proof is analogous to [3, Th. 2.3]: fix as above $V \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ compact and given $x, y \in V$, let us consider the constant dynamic

$$\tilde{b} := -\delta \frac{x - y}{|x - y|}.$$

Since $|\tilde{b}| = \delta$, by (HB), $\tilde{b} \in \mathcal{B}^{A^m}(z)$ for all $z \in [x, y]$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ is fixed. Notice here that x, y may be on the same side of \mathcal{H} or on the opposite sides, and even one or both may be located on \mathcal{H} . In all these cases, the trajectory $X(t) := x + t\tilde{b}$ is an admissible straight line associated to some extended control $a(\cdot) \in A^m$, i.e. $|a(\cdot)| \leq m$, such that

$$X(0) = x, \quad X(|x - y|/\delta) = y.$$

Using $X(t)$ in the dynamic programming principle yields

$$U_A^-(x) \leq \int_0^{\frac{|x-y|}{\delta}} l(X(s), a(s)) e^{-\lambda s} ds + U_A^-(y) e^{-\lambda \frac{|x-y|}{\delta}}.$$

Using (HA), we deduce that

$$U_A^-(x) - U_A^-(y) \leq \left(\sup_{V \times A^m} l(z, a) \right) \frac{|x - y|}{\delta} + \left(e^{-\lambda \frac{|x-y|}{\delta}} - 1 \right) \sup_V U_A^-(z) \leq C|x - y|$$

for some constant $C = C(V)$. Since x, y are arbitrary in V this implies the local Lipschitz bound: $|U_A^-(x) - U_A^-(y)| \leq C(V)|x - y|$.

The same arguments work for U_A^+ because the trajectory is of course regular: if x, y are located on the same side of \mathcal{H} there is nothing to do; if they are on opposite sides the trajectory is just reaching \mathcal{H} for one specific time t but we do not take it into account since this is a neglectable set in time; finally if $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ the trajectory is purely tangential by construction, so it is regular. \square

3.3 Value functions are solutions of the Ishii problem

In order to prove that value functions U_A^- and U_A^+ are both solutions in the sense of Ishii of problem (1.3), we use the approximations by compact control sets and pass to the limit.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that (HA), (HB) and (HC) hold. Then*

- (i) *the value functions U_A^- and U_A^+ are both viscosity solutions of (1.3) in the sense of Ishii;*
- (ii) *$x' \mapsto U_A^-(x', 0)$ satisfies the tangential subsolution inequality*

$$H_T(x, u, Du) \leq 0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{H}.$$

Proof. We first prove the supersolution property, then the subsolution one and finally the tangential property of U_A^- .

(i) In order to prove that U_A^- is a supersolution, we proceed as in [1]. We recall that by Corollary 2.5, the following limits hold:

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow +\infty}^* H^m(x, u, p) = H(x, u, p), \quad \liminf_{m \rightarrow +\infty} U_{A^m}^-(x) = U_A^-(x),$$

which allow to apply the half-relaxed limit method directly (cf. [6, Section 2.1.2]): since for each m fixed, $U_{A^m}^-$ is a supersolution of the Ishii problem associated to H^m , then $U_A^- = \liminf_* U_{A^m}^-$ is also a supersolution of the problem associated to $H = \limsup^* H^m$. In view of (2.13), in other words, we have proved that U_A^- is a supersolution of (1.3). Of course the same argument is valid for U_A^+ .

(ii) To prove that U_A^+ and U_A^- are subsolutions we proceed exactly as in [3, Thm. 2.5]. For the sake of completeness we provide here the main arguments but the proof readily applies to our case, using some compactness arguments that we proved above (typically, the fact that the H_i are continuous, etc.). Of course the proof in each Ω_i is standard so we focus on getting the inequality $\min(H_1, H_2) \leq 0$ on \mathcal{H} , and we only do so for U_A^+ since the proof for U_A^- is similar.

Let $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and consider $x \in \mathcal{H}$, a local maximum point of $U_A^+ - \phi$. Assuming without loss of generality that this maximum is zero, there exists $r > 0$ such that $U_A^+(y) - \phi(y) \leq 0$ for all $y \in B_r(x) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $U_A^+(x) = \phi(x)$. Thanks to Lemma 2.3, H_i attains its supremum in a bounded control set, so there exist $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in A_1 \times A_2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(x, \phi(x), \nabla \phi(x)) &= \lambda \phi(x) - b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) - l_1(x, \alpha_1). \\ H_2(x, \phi(x), \nabla \phi(x)) &= \lambda \phi(x) - b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) - l_2(x, \alpha_2). \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove that U_A^+ is subsolution of $\min\{H_1, H_2\}$, we use specific trajectories that we build using the constant controls α_1 and α_2 . Notice that such controls may not necessarily be regular, but in each case we find a suitable regular trajectory in order to use the dynamic programming principle for U_A^+ .

Let us focus on the (regular) case where

$$b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot e_N < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N > 0.$$

The proof for all the other possible combinations of signs of $b_i(x, \alpha_i) \cdot e_N$ is similar with a few adaptations using normal controllability, see [3, Thm. 2.5].

The idea is to construct a regular trajectory, $(X, a) \in \tau_A^{\text{reg}}(x)$, staying on \mathcal{H} , at least for a while. Since the dynamic functions b_i are continuous, there exists $\bar{\delta} > 0$, such that for any $y \in \mathcal{H} \cap B_{\bar{\delta}}(x)$ the following quantity is well-defined:

$$\mu(y) := \frac{-b_2(y, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N}{(b_1(y, \alpha_1) - b_2(y, \alpha_2)) \cdot e_N} \in (0, 1). \quad (3.3)$$

Next, we consider the local trajectory defined by solving for $t > 0$ small enough,

$$\dot{X}(t) = \mu(X(t))b_1(X(t), \alpha_1) + (1 - \mu(X(t)))b_2(X(t), \alpha_2), \quad (3.4)$$

with $X(0) = x$. Since b_1, b_2 and μ are continuous functions, (3.4) has a local solution and substituting $\mu(X(t))$ in (3.4), we easily check that by construction, $\dot{X}(t) \cdot e_N = 0$ for $t > 0$ small enough. Hence $X(\cdot)$ stays on \mathcal{H} for a while. Moreover, thanks to the continuity of $X(\cdot)$, there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$0 < \mu(X(t)) < 1, \quad b_1(X(t), \alpha_1) \cdot e_N < 0, \quad b_2(X(t), \alpha_2) \cdot e_N > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Let us define the following trajectory

$$X_x(t) := \begin{cases} X(t), & \text{if } 0 \leq t < T \\ X(T), & \text{if } t \geq T. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

By the continuity of b_i and the trajectory, the trajectory is Lipschitz. From hypothesis (HB), there exists $\alpha_i^* \in A_i$ such that $b_i(X_x(T), \alpha_i^*) = 0$, and we may consider the extended control

$$a(t) := \begin{cases} (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu(X(t))) & \text{if } 0 \leq t < T, \\ (\alpha_1^*, \alpha_2^*, \mu) & \text{if } t \geq T, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

obtaining a regular trajectory $(X_x, a) \in \tau_A^{\text{reg}}$. Observe that μ for $t \geq T$ is any value in $[0, 1]$.

Recall $U_A(y) - \phi(y) \leq 0$ for all $y \in B_r(x)$ and $U_A(x) = \phi(x)$. Since X_x is Lipschitz, then there exists $0 < T' < T$ such that $X_x(t) \in B_r(x)$ for all $t < T'$. Now, by the Dynamic Programming Principle, we have

$$\phi(x) \leq \int_0^{T'} l_{\mathcal{H}}(X_x(t), a(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt + \phi(X_x(T')) e^{-\lambda T'}.$$

From the Fundamental Calculus Theorem, we have

$$0 \geq \int_0^{T'} \left[-l_{\mathcal{H}}(X_x(t), a(t)) + \lambda \phi(X_x(t)) - b_{\mathcal{H}}(X_x(t), a(t)) \cdot \nabla \phi(X_x(t)) \right] e^{-\lambda t} dt.$$

Dividing by T' and taking the limit as T' goes to 0, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \lambda \phi(x) - b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu(x)) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) - l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu(x)) \\ &= \mu(x) (\lambda \phi(x) - b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) - l_1(x, \alpha_1)) \\ &\quad + (1 - \mu(x)) (\lambda \phi(x) - b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) - l_2(x, \alpha_2)). \end{aligned}$$

So, finally we end up with,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \min \{ \lambda \phi(x) - b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) - l_1(x, \alpha_1), \lambda \phi(x) - b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) - l_2(x, \alpha_2) \} \\ &= \min \{ H_1(x, \phi(x), \nabla \phi(x)), H_2(x, \phi(x), \nabla \phi(x)) \}. \end{aligned}$$

As we said, the other cases are treated by the same approach, the conclusion being that U_A^+ is subsolution of $\min\{H_1, H_2\}$ on \mathcal{H} .

Proving the tangential inequalities is analogous: by constructing a trajectory staying on \mathcal{H} , the extended control $a(\cdot)$ belongs to A_0 and we get the subsolution inequality $H_T(x, u, Du) \leq 0$ as above, by using the dynamic programming and passing to the limit. We refer again to [3, Thm. 2.5] for more details. \square

4 Comparison results

In this section, we prove that stratified subsolutions and supersolutions of the Ishii problem are ordered. We start giving a local comparison result for the Ishii problem, meaning that the maximum of $u - v$ in the closure of a ball is attained in the boundary. Then, under some localization hypotheses we deduce a Global Comparison Result in \mathbb{R}^N . As a consequence of this comparison results, the value functions U_A^- and U_A^+ are extremal Ishii solutions.

We recall that by definition, a stratified subsolution satisfies the additional subsolution inequality $H_T \leq 0$ while a stratified supersolution is nothing but a usual Ishii supersolution.

4.1 Local comparison result

Let us first recall that in the case of compact control sets, a Local Comparison Result for stratified solutions can be found in [4], which translates here directly as a Local Comparison Result for each problem associated to the control set A^m :

Theorem 4.1 (see [4]). *Assume hypotheses (HA), (HB) and let $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ be fixed. Let u be a locally bounded stratified subsolution of Ishii problem (1.3) with Hamiltonians H_1^m, H_2^m, H_T^m and v be a locally bounded supersolution of the same problem. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$, the following comparison result holds:*

$$\max_{B_r(x)}(u - v)^+ \leq \max_{\partial B_r(x)}(u - v)^+.$$

While it is clear from the definition that if $H_i^m(x, u, Du) \leq 0$ in \mathbb{R}^N the same holds for $H_i \leq H_i^m$, getting a similar property for supersolutions can only be obtained under some restrictions. In order to do so, let us introduce the notation $V \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^N$, meaning that $V \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is open, and \bar{V} is compact. The result is the following.

Proposition 4.2. *Assume hypotheses (HA), (HB), (HC) and let v be a locally bounded l.s.c. supersolution of Ishii problem (1.3). Then, for any $V \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists $m = m_V \in \mathbb{N}_*$ such that v is a supersolution in V of the Ishii problem associated to A^m .*

Proof. First we fix $\bar{m} \in \mathbb{N}_*$ arbitrary. Due to hypothesis (HA), the following quantity is well-defined:

$$K := \frac{\|l\|_{L^\infty(V \times A_i^{\bar{m}})} + \lambda \|v\|_{L^\infty(V)}}{\delta}.$$

To begin, we fix a test function $\phi \in C^1(V)$ such that $x \in V \cap \Omega_i$ is a local minimum point of $v - \phi$, (we explain how to treat the case $x \in \mathcal{H}$ at the end of the proof).

Let us assume on one hand, that $|\nabla\phi(x)| \geq K$. Notice that thanks to (HB), for any $\omega \in \overline{B_\delta(0)}$ and $x \in V \cap \Omega_i$, there exists $\alpha_i \in A_i^{\bar{m}}$ such that $b_i(x, \alpha_i) = \omega$. Applying this to $\omega := -\delta\nabla\phi(x)/|\nabla\phi(x)|$, we find some $\alpha_i \in A_i^{\bar{m}}$ such that $b_i(x, \alpha_i) = \omega$.

It follows that $-b_i(x, \alpha_i) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) = \delta |\nabla \phi(x)|$, which implies that

$$H_i^{\bar{m}}(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x)) \geq -\lambda \|v\|_{L^\infty(V)} + \delta |\nabla \phi(x)| - \|l_i\|_{L^\infty(V \times A_i^{\bar{m}})} \geq 0.$$

Let us assume now that on the other hand, $|\nabla \phi(x)| < K$. Then, thanks to Proposition 2.3, there exists $m(K) > 0$ independent of $x \in V \cap \Omega_i$ such that

$$H_i^{m(K)}(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x)) = H_i(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x)) \geq 0.$$

Taking $m_V := \max\{\bar{m}, m(K)\}$, we have that for any $x \in V \cap \Omega_i$,

$$H_i^{m_V}(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x)) \geq 0,$$

because the supremum is taken over a larger set in each case. Therefore, v is a supersolution of $H_i^{m_V}$ in Ω_i .

Let us study now the case, when $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Of course, if $x \in V \cap \mathcal{H}$, then since

$$\max\{H_1(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x)), H_2(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x))\} \geq 0,$$

there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ with $H_i(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x)) \geq 0$ and from the above arguments we deduce that for some $m_V \in \mathbb{N}_*$,

$$\max\{H_1^{m_V}(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x)), H_2^{m_V}(x, v(x), \nabla \phi(x))\} \geq 0,$$

which ends the proof. \square

Now we can prove the local comparison result for the Ishii problem associated to the complete problem, associated to the unbounded control set \mathcal{A} .

Corollary 4.3. *Assume (HA), (HB) and (HC). Let u be a locally bounded stratified subsolution of Ishii problem (1.3) and let v be a locally bounded l.s.c. supersolution of the same problem. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$, the following result holds:*

$$\max_{B_r(x)}(u - v)^+ \leq \max_{\partial B_r(x)}(u - v)^+. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$, we apply Proposition 4.2 with $V := B_r(x)$. It follows that v is a supersolution of the Ishii problem associated to A^{m_V} , for some $m_V \in \mathbb{N}_*$. On the other hand, as we already noticed, u is obviously a stratified subsolution of the Ishii problem associated to this same compact control set A^{m_V} . So, applying Theorem 4.1 with $m = m_V$ we deduce that (4.1) holds. \square

4.2 Global comparison results

As explained in [6], a (GCR) can be reduced to a (LCR) which is simpler, by requiring two additional assumptions. The framework in [6] is far more general than what we need here and leads to some complexities that are not necessary in the present situation. For this reason, we provide here a simplified version, well adapted to our needs, introducing (LOC1) and (LOC2) below.

Let \mathcal{C}_* be a set of subsolutions with certain growing hypotheses, and let \mathcal{C}^* be a set of supersolutions with certain growing hypotheses. Of course, we have in mind *stratified* subsolutions here. Here are the localization assumptions we will use:

(LOC1): *Given an u.s.c. subsolution $u \in \mathcal{C}_*$ and a l.s.c. supersolution $v \in \mathcal{C}^*$ there exists a sequence of u.s.c. subsolutions $(u_\beta)_\beta$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$,*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} (u_\beta - v)(x) = -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} u_\beta(x) = u(x).$$

(LOC2): *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r > 0$, if u is an u.s.c. subsolution, there exists a sequence $(u_\gamma)_{\gamma > 0}$ of u.s.c. subsolutions such that for each $\gamma > 0$,*

$$u_\gamma(x) - u(x) \geq u_\gamma(y) - u(y) + d(\gamma) \quad \text{for all } y \in \partial B_r(x), \text{ for some } d(\gamma) > 0.$$

Moreover, $u_\gamma(z) \rightarrow u(z)$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ for any $z \in B_r(x)$.

The growth conditions included in \mathcal{C}_* and \mathcal{C}^* have to be specified in each case. Notice that in [6], the fact that the control spaces are bounded implies implicitly that the various comparison results are obtained for *bounded* sub and supersolutions, so that no growth conditions are required.

But, for instance, in the quadratic example (1.7), the typical growth assumption for sub and supersolutions is that both should grow strictly less than quadratically. In that case, (LOC1) and (LOC2) can be obtained by using

$$u_\beta(x) := \beta u(x) + (1 - \beta)|x|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad u_\gamma(x) := u(x) + \gamma(|x - x_0|^2).$$

We refer to Section 6 for a detailed and more general example.

For the sake of completeness we provide here the proof that with those assumptions, (LCR) implies (GCR), this is, subsolutions and supersolutions of the Ishii problem are ordered:

Proposition 4.4. *Under hypotheses (LOC1) and (LOC2), a Local Comparison Result implies a Global Comparison Result.*

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{C}_*$ and $v \in \mathcal{C}^*$ be respectively an u.s.c. subsolution and a l.s.c. supersolution. Thanks to (LOC1) there exists $x_\beta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$M_\beta := \max_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_\beta - v) = u_\beta(x_\beta) - v(x_\beta). \tag{4.2}$$

We assume that $M_\beta > 0$ and fix some $r > 0$ for which the (LCR) holds around x_β . Notice that by the maximum point property, in particular

$$M_\beta = u_\beta(x_\beta) - v(x_\beta) \leq \max_{\partial B_r(x_\beta)} (u_\beta - v).$$

Now thanks to (LOC2), there exists a sequence of subsolutions $(u_{\beta\gamma})_\gamma$ that are approximations of u_β in $B_r(x_\beta)$ and using the Local Comparison Result with $u_{\beta\gamma}$ and v in $B_r(x_\beta)$ yields

$$\max_{\bar{B}_r(x_\beta)} (u_{\beta\gamma} - v)^+ \leq \max_{\partial B_r(x_\beta)} (u_{\beta\gamma} - v)^+. \quad (4.3)$$

Notice that since $M_{\beta,\gamma} := \max_{\bar{B}_r(x_\beta)} (u_{\beta\gamma} - v) \rightarrow M_\beta > 0$, for γ close enough to zero we can leave out the positive part of the functions in the previous inequality (4.3). Consequently, thanks to (4.2) and (LOC2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\beta,\gamma}(x_\beta) - v(x_\beta) &\leq \max_{\partial B_r(x_\beta)} (u_{\beta,\gamma} - v) \\ &\leq \max_{\partial B_r(x_\beta)} (u_\beta - v) + \max_{\partial B_r(x_\beta)} (u_{\beta,\gamma} - u_\beta) \\ &\leq M_\beta + (u_{\beta,\gamma}(x_\beta) - u_\beta(x_\beta)) - d(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

leading to $M_\beta \leq M_\beta - d(\gamma) < M_\beta$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, $M_\beta \leq 0$ for any $\beta > 0$ small enough and taking limits as $\beta \rightarrow 0$ in (4.2), we end up with $u(x) \leq v(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. \square

As a consequence of the previous Proposition 4.4, we obtain the uniqueness of a stratified solution of the Ishii problem:

Corollary 4.5. *Assume (HA), (HB), (HC), (LOC1) and (LOC2). Then a Global Comparison Result holds between locally bounded stratified subsolutions and supersolutions of (1.3). As a consequence, there exists a unique stratified solution of (1.3).*

4.3 Extremal Ishii Solution

We prove here that U_A^- and U_A^+ are respectively the minimal and maximal solutions in the sense of Ishii. Of course, we recall that U_A^- is the unique *stratified* solution, the only one enjoying the complementary inequality $H_T \leq 0$ among all Ishii subsolutions.

Proposition 4.6. *Under hypotheses (HA), (HB), (HC), (LOC1), (LOC2),*

- (i) U_A^- is the minimal locally bounded u.s.c. supersolution (and solution) of the Ishii problem (1.3);
- (ii) U_A^+ is the maximal locally bounded l.s.c. subsolution (and solution) of the Ishii problem (1.3);
- (iii) U_A^- is the unique stratified solution of (1.3).

Proof. Let v be any supersolution of (1.3). Since U_A^- is a stratified subsolution, we can apply the global comparison result to U_A^- and v , then we have that $U_A^- \leq v$ in \mathbb{R}^N . As U_A^- is itself of course a

supersolution, it is clearly the minimal one. Of course, since any viscosity solution is a supersolution by definition, then for any solution u , the argument proves that $U_A^- \leq u$ so that U_A^- is also the minimal viscosity solution.

Concerning the maximal subsolution, the simplest way to obtain the result it is to recall that if u is any viscosity subsolution in the sense of Ishii (we do not require here that it is a stratified subsolution), it is also a viscosity subsolution of the Ishii problem associated to the compact control spaces A^m for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$.

Using the fact that $U_{A^m}^+$ is the maximal subsolution for the bounded control case (see [3, Corollary 4.4]), we deduce that $u \leq U_{A^m}^+$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$. Then, passing to the limit as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ yields the result : $u \leq U_A^+$.

The proof of (iii) just follows from Corollary 4.5. Since U_A^- is a stratified solution of (1.3), it is the unique one. \square

5 A continuous family of solutions

In this section we build a whole family of value functions, U^η , with $\eta > 0$. Those turn out to be locally Lipschitz Ishii solutions which yield a continuous path between U_A^- and U_A^+ .

To build them, let us start with defining η -trajectories. For $\eta > 0$ we set

$$\tau_A^\eta(x) := \left\{ (X(\cdot), \alpha(\cdot)) \in \tau_A(x) \mid \text{for a.e. } t \in \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{H}, \right. \\ \left. b_2(X(t), \alpha(t)) \cdot e_N \geq -\eta, b_1(X(t), \alpha(t)) \cdot e_N \leq \eta \right\}. \quad (5.1)$$

All η -trajectories are of course not necessarily regular, however they are close to regular for $\eta > 0$ small. Notice that for all $0 < \eta \leq \eta'$,

$$\tau_A^{\text{reg}}(x) \subset \tau_A^\eta(x) \subset \tau_A^{\eta'}(x) \subset \tau_A(x).$$

Now, let us define the associated η -value function as usual:

$$U_A^\eta(x) = \inf_{\tau_A^\eta(x)} \left(\int_0^\infty l(X_x(t), \alpha(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \right). \quad (5.2)$$

Of course, for $0 < \eta \leq \eta'$ as above,

$$U_A^- \leq U_A^{\eta'} \leq U_A^\eta \leq U_A^+. \quad (5.3)$$

Having a look at Proposition 3.4, it is easy to see that the same arguments work for any η -value function. So, we claim that U_A^η is locally bounded and locally Lipschitz continuous. We omit the details here since we actually prove a stronger result below, see Lemma 5.5: the $(U_A^\eta)_\eta$ are locally uniformly Lipschitz and bounded.

5.1 η -value functions are Ishii solutions

As is standard, let us begin with the Dynamic Programming Principle:

Theorem 5.1 (Dynamic Programming Principle). *Let $\eta > 0$. Then for any $T > 0$,*

$$U_A^\eta(x) = \inf_{\tau_A^\eta(x)} \left(\int_0^T l(X(t), \alpha(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt + U_A^\eta(X(T)) e^{-\lambda T} \right). \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to Theorem 3.2 in section 3. □

We also define a η -tangential Hamiltonian that will play the role of H_T or H_T^{reg} for U_A^η . Let

$$A_0^\eta(x) = \{\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \mu) \in A_0 \mid b_1(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N \leq \eta, b_2(x, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N \geq -\eta\},$$

we define the η -tangential Hamiltonian as

$$H_T^\eta(x, \phi(x), D_{\mathcal{H}}\phi) = \sup_{\alpha \in A_0^\eta(x)} \{\lambda \phi(x) - b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, \alpha) \cdot (D_{\mathcal{H}}\phi(x), 0) - l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, \alpha)\} \quad (5.5)$$

and notice that Proposition 2.3 obviously applies to H_T^η as well.

Let us prove below that the η -value functions are Ishii solutions.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that (HA), (HB), (HC) hold and let $\eta > 0$. Then the value function U_A^η is a viscosity solution of the Ishii problem, (1.3). Moreover, U_A^η satisfies $H_T^\eta(x, u, Du) \leq 0$ on \mathcal{H} .*

Proof. Since the Dynamic Programming Principle 5.1 holds, the proof that U_A^η is at the same time a sub and supersolutions of (1.3) is analogous to the standard case, see Theorem 3.5.

In order to prove the H_T^η property we need some adaptations which follow the lines of Theorem 3.5-(ii). Here we face several cases as follows:

1. $b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot e_N < \eta$ and $b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N > -\eta$.
2. $b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot e_N = \eta$ and $b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N = -\eta$.
3. $b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot e_N = \eta$ and $b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N > -\eta$.
4. $b_1(x, \alpha_1) \cdot e_N < \eta$ and $b_2(x, \alpha_2) \cdot e_N = -\eta$.

We do not detail more the computations since they are obvious adaptations. Here also we use the controllability for dealing with the limit cases $b_i \cdot e_N = \eta$ or $-\eta$. The reader can also check similar proofs in [3, Theorem 2.5] for the case $\eta = 0$. □

5.2 Asymptotics as $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$ of U_A^η

In this section we prove the asymptotic results for the Hamiltonian H_T^η and the η value function U_A^η .

Let us begin with the results related to the Hamiltonian H_T^η .

Lemma 5.3. *Assume (HA), (HB) and (HC). Then the following limits are monotone and locally uniform in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N$:*

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow +\infty} H_T^\eta = H_T, \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} H_T^\eta = H_T^{\text{reg}}.$$

Proof. It is clear from the definition of A_0^η that this sequence of sets is monotone with respect to η and that moreover $A_0^\eta \rightarrow A_0$ as $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$ while $A_0^\eta \rightarrow A_0^{\text{reg}}$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, from Proposition 2.3, we know that on any fixed compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N$, the sup defining H_T^η is attained on a compact control set $A_K \subset A_0$ which can be chosen uniformly with respect to η .

Let us consider the case $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$. We already know that obviously $H_T^\eta \leq H_T$ since the control sets involved are ordered the same way. Now let us fix a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N$. There exists $\tilde{A}_K \subset A_0$ such that for any $(x, u, p) \in K$, we have an optimal control $a \in \tilde{A}_K$. In other words,

$$H_T(x, u, p) = \lambda u - b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a) \cdot p - l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a).$$

But since \tilde{A}_K is compact, it follows that there exists $\eta = \eta(K)$ big enough such that $\tilde{A}_K \subset A_0^\eta$. In other words, for any $(x, u, p) \in K$, $H_T(x, u, p) \leq H_T^\eta(x, u, p)$ since this last Hamiltonian is taken as the supremum over A_0^η . This implies that in fact $H_T = H_T^\eta$ on K and of course the same property holds for $\eta' > \eta$. The asymptotic result follows.

We turn now to the case $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Here the inequality $H_T^\eta \geq H_T^{\text{reg}}$ is the obvious one. To get the reverse, we use a similar approach as above, but with some adaptations.

Since H_T^η is non-increasing with respect to η and bounded from below by H_T^{reg} , the following limit is well-defined for any (x, u, p)

$$h(x, u, p) := \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} H_T^\eta(x, u, p).$$

Now consider K compact as above and $(x, u, p) \in K$. Given a decreasing sequence $\eta_n \rightarrow 0$, there exists a sequence of associated optimal controls $(a_n)_n$ for $H_T^{\eta_n}(x, u, p)$. As we already did above, there exists a compact set $\tilde{A}_K \subset A_0^{\eta_n}$ uniformly with respect to n , such that $a_n \in \tilde{A}_K$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

So, we can extract a subsequence still denoted by $(a_n)_n$ converging to some control $a_* \in \tilde{A}_K$. Since for any n , the optimal control $a_n \in A_0^{\eta_n}$, we deduce that $a_* \in A_0^{\text{reg}}$ and passing to the limit in the Hamiltonian we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} H_T^{\eta_n}(x, u, p) = \lambda u - b_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a_*) \cdot p - l_{\mathcal{H}}(x, a_*) \leq H_T^{\text{reg}}(x, u, p).$$

This implies in the end that $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} H_T^\eta = H_T^{\text{reg}}$, and the limit is uniform on K because the controls involved remain in a fixed compact set, and (b, l) are continuous with respect to a . \square

Remark 5.4. *Actually we have proved a stronger property for the case $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$: for any compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^N$ there exists $\eta_0(K) > 0$ such that*

$$\text{for any } \eta \geq \eta_0, \quad H_T^\eta = H_T \text{ on } K.$$

Lemma 5.5. *Assume that (HA), (HB) and (HC) hold. The sequence $(U_A^\eta)_{\eta>0}$ is non-increasing with respect to η , locally uniformly bounded and locally uniformly Lipschitz in \mathbb{R}^N with respect to η . As a consequence, the following limits*

$$w^-(x) := \lim_{\eta \rightarrow +\infty} U_A^\eta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad w^+(x) := \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} U_A^\eta(x) \quad (5.6)$$

are classical (Ishii) viscosity solutions of (1.3).

Proof. Let us first notice that the monotonicity property is obvious since the sequence of controlled trajectories τ_A^η is non-decreasing as η increases. As we already noticed, for any $\eta > 0$, $U_A^- \leq U_A^\eta \leq U_A^+$, so the sequence is locally uniformly bounded in \mathbb{R}^N .

Taking a look at the proof of Proposition 3.4, it is clear that the same computations are valid for U_A^η , and the local Lipschitz constant $C(V)$ does not depend on η since it only depends on the local bound of U_A^η , and the parameter $\delta > 0$ in (HB). So, the result holds.

Thanks to the former properties, the two functions w^- and w^+ are well-defined and continuous functions in \mathbb{R}^N . Moreover, by the standard stability properties of viscosity solutions, it is clear that both are viscosity solutions in the sense of Ishii of (1.3). \square

Now we can prove easily one of the convergence result :

Proposition 5.6. *Assume (HA), (HB), (HC), (LOC1), (LOC2). Then the following limit holds*

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow +\infty} U_A^\eta = U_A^- \quad \text{locally uniformly in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, we already know that w^- is a viscosity solution in the sense of Ishii of (1.3). Moreover, H_T^η converges locally uniformly to H_T , we also deduce that w^- satisfies the subsolution inequality $H_T(x, w^-, Dw^-) \leq 0$ in the viscosity sense on \mathcal{H} . In other words, w^- is a stratified solution of (1.3). But by uniqueness of such solution (see Proposition 4.6-(iii)), it follows that $w^- \equiv U_A^-$ and the result is proved. \square

Remark 5.7. *Another proof can be obtained by performing a detailed analysis of the trajectories involved in the definition of the value functions, proving that $U_A^\eta \rightarrow U_A^-$ directly without using the comparison argument. However, this analysis requires some extra assumptions on the elements (b, l) in order to estimate the spreading of optimal trajectories. This is the approach that we use below when $\eta \rightarrow 0$. Here, on the contrary, using the comparison argument for stratified solutions yields an easy proof. Notice however that we need hypotheses (LOC1) and (LOC2) to use such arguments.*

5.3 Asymptotics as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ of U_A^η

Unfortunately, getting a similar result when $\eta \rightarrow 0$ is not so easy since it requires to check that the convergence of η -trajectories yield regular trajectories as $\eta \rightarrow 0$. What seems like an obvious result actually requires a fine proof, adapting the strategy used in [4, Lemma 5.3]. We prove this result for compact control sets A^m . To simplify the notation of the controls in the lemma below, we do not use the notation a^m , and substitute it by a , although the controls belong to A^m .

Lemma 5.8. *Assume (HA), (HB), (HC). Let $\eta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $(X^n, \alpha^n) \in \tau_{A^m}^{\eta_n}$ be a sequence of η -trajectories defined on $[0, T]$. We assume that (X^n) converges uniformly to some admissible trajectory X on $[0, T]$. Then the trajectory X is regular. In other words, there exists a control, a , such that $(X, a) \in \tau_{A^m}^{\text{reg}}$.*

Proof. Since X is an admissible trajectory, there exists a control α such that $(X, \alpha) \in \tau_{A^m}$. Let $z \in \mathcal{H}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} K(z) &:= \{b_{\mathcal{H}}(z, \alpha') : \alpha' \in A_0^{\text{reg}, m}(z)\}. \\ E_{\text{sing}}^\Upsilon &:= \{s \in [0, T] : X(s) \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \text{dist}(b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(s), \alpha(s)), K(X(s))) \geq \Upsilon\}. \\ E_{\text{sing}} &:= \{s \in [0, T] : X(s) \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \text{dist}(b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(s), \alpha(s)), K(X(s))) > 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{dist}(\cdot)$ is the euclidian distance in \mathbb{R}^N . Our aim is to prove that $|E_{\text{sing}}| = 0$, which will prove that the trajectory is regular. To this end, since $E_{\text{sing}} = \cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} E_{\text{sing}}^{1/j}$, it is enough to prove that for any $\Upsilon > 0$, $|E_{\text{sing}}^\Upsilon| = 0$.

Assuming that there exists $\Upsilon > 0$ such that $|E_{\text{sing}}^\Upsilon| > 0$, we prove that we can find a control $\tilde{\alpha}(\cdot) \in L^\infty(E_{\text{sing}}^\Upsilon; A^m)$ satisfying the following conditions: for any s in E_{sing}^Υ , $\tilde{a}(s) \in A_0^{\text{reg}, m}(X(s))$ and

$$b_{\mathcal{H}}(X^n(s), \alpha^n(s)) = b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(s), \tilde{a}(s)) + \zeta^n(s) \quad (5.7)$$

where $\zeta^n(\cdot)$ is measurable and goes uniformly to 0 when n goes to infinity. By doing so, we prove that we can redefine the control α so that $|E_{\text{sing}}^\Upsilon| = 0$. Indeed, by passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ we see that the dynamics associated to α and \tilde{a} are the same on E_{sing}^Υ , so that the trajectory X can be also constructed by using the control \tilde{a} , which is regular.

Writing $\alpha^n = (\alpha_1^n, \alpha_2^n, \mu^n)$, notice that in what follows, we will not modify the parameter μ^n , only the controls α_i^n , and that of course, no change is needed if $X_n \notin \mathcal{H}$.

Step 1: The first step consists in finding for each n a *regular* control $a^n(\cdot)$ for the trajectory $X^n(\cdot)$ satisfying on $\Delta_n := (X_n)^{-1}(\mathcal{H}) \cap E_{\text{sing}}^\Upsilon$

$$b_{\mathcal{H}}(X^n(s), \alpha^n(s)) = b_{\mathcal{H}}(X^n(s), a^n(s)) + o_n(1).$$

Denoting by $\alpha^n = (\alpha_1^n, \alpha_2^n, \mu^n)$ we set

$$\gamma_1^n(s) := -\max\{0, b_1(X^n(s), \alpha_1^n(s)) \cdot e_N\}, \quad \gamma_2^n(s) := -\min\{0, b_2(X^n(s), \alpha_2^n(s)) \cdot e_N\} \quad (5.8)$$

and we claim that

$$\mu^n \gamma_1^n(s) + (1 - \mu^n) \gamma_2^n(s) = 0, \text{ for a.e. } s \in \Delta_n. \quad (5.9)$$

Indeed, if $\alpha^n(s) \in A_0^{\text{reg},m}(X^n(s))$, then $\gamma_1^n(s) = 0 = \gamma_2^n(s)$ and the claim is obvious. So, assume that $\alpha^n(s) \notin A_0^{\text{reg},m}(X^n(s))$. By Theorem 2.1, since $X^n(s) \in \mathcal{H}$, we have that $b_{\mathcal{H}}(X_x^n(s), \alpha^n(s)) \cdot e_N = 0$ almost everywhere on Δ_n and we face three cases which lead to (5.9):

1. $\gamma_i^n(s) := -b_i(X_x^n(s), \alpha_i^n(s)) \cdot e_N$ if $\mu^n(s) \in (0, 1)$;
2. $\gamma_1^n(s) = 0$ if $\mu^n(s) = 1$;
3. $\gamma_2^n(s) = 0$ if $\mu^n(s) = 0$.

Notice that since b_i and X^n are continuous and $\alpha_i^n(\cdot)$ is measurable, then γ_i^n is measurable. Moreover, since $|\gamma_i^n(s)| \leq \eta_n$ almost everywhere on Δ_n , it follows that

$$\gamma_i^n \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{uniformly as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.10)$$

Furthermore, by construction we have approximating regular dynamics

$$(b_1(X^n(s), \alpha_1^n(s)) + \gamma_1^n(s)e_N) \cdot e_N \leq 0, \quad (b_2(X^n(s), \alpha_2^n(s)) + \gamma_2^n(s)e_N) \cdot e_N \geq 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Now, we use γ_i^n to build the regular control $a^n(\cdot)$. To do so, we define

$$\beta^n(s) := \min \left\{ \frac{\delta - 2|\gamma_1^n(s)|}{\delta}, \frac{\delta - 2|\gamma_2^n(s)|}{\delta} \right\}.$$

Thanks to (5.10), we have that $\beta^n(s) \rightarrow 1$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 2: We claim that there exists $\tilde{\alpha}_i^n(s) \in A_i^m$ such that

$$b_i(X^n(s), \alpha_i^n(s)) = b_i(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}_i^n(s)) + p_i^n(s), \quad (5.12)$$

where $p_i^n(s) := (1 - \beta^n(s))(b_i(X^n(s), \alpha_i^n(s)) + \gamma_i^n(s)) - \gamma_i^n(s)$. Note that p_i^n is measurable and goes uniformly to 0 when n goes to infinity. Indeed, if $\beta^n(s) = 1$, then $|\gamma_1^n(s)| = 0 = |\gamma_2^n(s)|$. In this case we can take

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i^n(s) := \alpha_i^n(s) \quad \text{and} \quad p_i^n(s) = (1 - 1)(b_i(X_x^n(s), \alpha_i^n(s)) + 0) - 0 = 0.$$

Otherwise, assume that $\beta^n(s) \neq 1$. Since $\kappa_n(s) := \beta^n(s) \frac{\gamma_i^n(s)e_N}{1 - \beta^n(s)} \in \{z \in \mathbb{R}^N : |z| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}\}$, for n big enough, it follows that

$$\beta^n(s) (b_i(X^n(s), \alpha_i^n(s)) + \gamma_i^n(s)e_N) = \beta^n(s) b_i(X^n(s), \alpha_i^n(s)) + (1 - \beta^n(s)) \kappa_n(s)$$

belongs to $\mathcal{B}(X^n(s))$. This is due to (HB) and the convexity property of the images $\mathcal{B}(X(s))$. In other words, there exists $\tilde{\alpha}_i^n(s) \in A_i^m$ such that

$$\beta^n(s) (b_i(X^n(s), \alpha_i^n(s)) + \gamma_i^n(s)e_N) = b_i(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}_i^n(s)).$$

Furthermore, $\tilde{\alpha}^n$ is a regular control. Indeed, thanks to (5.11)

$$b_1(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}_1^n(s)) \cdot e_N = \beta^n(s)(b_1(X^n(s), \alpha_1^n(s)) + \gamma_1^n(s)e_N) \cdot e_N \leq 0$$

$$b_2(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}_2^n(s)) \cdot e_N = \beta^n(s)(b_2(X^n(s), \alpha_2^n(s)) + \gamma_2^n(s)e_N) \cdot e_N \geq 0$$

and thanks to Theorem 2.1 and (5.11)

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu^n(s)b_1(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}_1^n(s)) \cdot e_N + (1 - \mu^n(s))b_2(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}_2^n(s)) \cdot e_N \\ &= \mu^n(s)\beta^n(s)b_1(X^n(s), \alpha_1^n(s)) \cdot e_N + (1 - \mu^n(s))\beta^n(s)(b_2(X^n(s), \alpha_2^n(s)) \\ & \quad + \beta^n(s)\mu^n(s)\gamma_1^n(s) + \beta^n(s)(1 - \mu^n(s))\gamma_2^n(s)) \\ &= 0 \text{ a.e on } \Delta_n. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we constructed $(\tilde{\alpha}_1^n(\cdot), \tilde{\alpha}_2^n(\cdot))$ pointwise for $s \in \Delta_n$, so that they may not necessarily be measurable. However, thanks to a measurable selection argument (Filippov's Lemma) we can find measurable controls $a_i^n(\cdot)$ such that

$$b_i(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}_i^n(s)) - p_i^n(s) = b_i(X^n(s), a_i^n(s)).$$

Thus, $a^n(\cdot) := (a_1^n(\cdot), a_2^n(\cdot), \mu^n(\cdot)) \in A_0^{\text{reg},m}(X^n(s))$ is measurable. Consequently,

$$b_{\mathcal{H}}(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}^n(s)) - p^n(s) = b_{\mathcal{H}}(X^n(s), a^n(s))$$

where $p^n(s) = \mu^n(s)p_1^n(s) + (1 - \mu^n(s))p_2^n(s)$. Note that p^n is measurable and goes uniformly to 0 when n goes to infinity since p_i^n goes to zero as n goes to infinity.

Step 3: Since $(a_1^n(s), a_2^n(s), \mu^n(s)) \in A_0^{\text{reg},m}(X^n(s))$, thanks to [4, Lemma 5.3] there exists a measurable control $\tilde{a} \in A_0^{\text{reg},m}(X(s))$, i.e. a control associated to the limit trajectory, satisfying

$$b_{\mathcal{H}}(X^n(s), a^n(s)) = b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(s), \tilde{a}(s)) + \sigma^n(s). \quad (5.13)$$

with $\sigma^n(\cdot)$ measurable that goes uniformly to 0 when n goes to infinity. Therefore,

$$b_{\mathcal{H}}(X^n(s), \tilde{\alpha}^n(s)) = b_{\mathcal{H}}(X(s), \tilde{a}(s)) + \sigma^n(s) + p^n(s),$$

leading to (5.7) with $\zeta^n(s) := \sigma^n(s) + p^n(s)$. As we said, this modification allows to associate the trajectory X with a regular control on $E_{\text{sing}}^{\mathcal{X}}$. By doing the same procedure on each $E_{\text{sing}}^{1/j}$, we end up with the fact that for some control a such that $(X, a) \in \tau_{A^m}$, $|E_{\text{sing}}| = 0$, the trajectory (X, a) is regular. \square

Next we need some assumptions on the cost and dynamics so that we can control the asymptotic behaviour of trajectories.

Lemma 5.9. *Assume (HA), (HB), (HC) and let $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$. Assume there exist λ, C and \overline{C} such that*

(HD) $|b_i(x, \alpha_i^m)| \leq \lambda(1 + |\alpha_i^m| + |x|)$ and $l_i(x, \alpha_i^m) \leq C|x|^{1-\epsilon} + \overline{C}|\alpha_i^m|$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\alpha_i^m \in A_i^m$, $i = 1, 2$.

Let $(X, \alpha) \in \tau_{A^m}(x)$. Then,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} U_{A^m}^\eta(X(T))e^{-\lambda T} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} U_{A^m}^-(X(T))e^{-\lambda T} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} U_{A^m}^+(X(T))e^{-\lambda T} = 0.$$

Proof. Denote $U_{A^m}^+$, $U_{A^m}^-$ and $U_{A^m}^\eta$ by U for simplicity since the argument is the same for all of them. Actually, it is enough prove it for $U_{A^m}^+$ only.

Thanks to hypotheses (HB) and (HC), there exists a regular control $\alpha^* = (\alpha_1^*, \alpha_2^*, \mu^*) \in A^m$ such that $b_i(X(T), \alpha_i^*) = 0$. The associated trajectory is just $X(t) = X(T)$ for all $t \geq T$. By definition of U as the infimum and hypothesis (HD) we get

$$U(X(T))e^{-\lambda T} \leq \frac{l(X(T), \alpha_*)}{\lambda} e^{-\lambda T} \leq \frac{C|X(T)|^{1-\epsilon} + \bar{C}|\alpha_*|}{\lambda} e^{-\lambda T}.$$

Thanks to (HD), it follows from Gronwall's lemma on $X(\cdot)$ that $|X(T)| \leq |x + c|e^{\lambda T}$ so that

$$U(X(T))e^{-\lambda T} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(C|x + c|^{1-\epsilon} e^{\lambda(1-\epsilon)T} + \bar{C}|\alpha_*| \right) e^{-\lambda T} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which proves the result. \square

The following theorem states the convergence of $U_{A^m}^\eta$ to $U_{A^m}^+$ as η goes to zero on compact control sets.

Theorem 5.10. *Under the hypotheses (HA), (HB), (HC) and (HD), it follows that*

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} U_{A^m}^\eta(x) = U_{A^m}^+(x).$$

Proof. Let us consider a strictly positive decreasing sequence $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = 0$. We assume that for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

$$U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x) < U_{A^m}^+(x), \quad (5.14)$$

otherwise, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x) = U_{A^m}^+(x)$ for all $n \geq N$ and the result holds.

Step 1: Given $T > 0$, thanks to (5.14) and Theorem 5.1, there exists $(X_x^{\eta_n}, \alpha^{\eta_n}) \in \tau_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x)$ satisfying

$$\int_0^T l(X_x^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt + U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(X_x^{\eta_n}(T)) e^{-\lambda T} \leq U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x) + \frac{U_{A^m}^+(x) - U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x)}{2} < U_{A^m}^+(x). \quad (5.15)$$

Let us define

$$Y^{\eta_n}(s) := \int_0^s l(X_x^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t)) dt.$$

Since $b_i(X_x^{\eta_n}, \alpha^{\eta_n})$ and $l_i(X_x^{\eta_n}, \alpha^{\eta_n})$ are bounded in $[0, T]$, it follows that the curves $(X_x^{\eta_n}, Y^{\eta_n})(\cdot)$ are equicontinuous and uniformly bounded in $[0, T]$. Therefore, by Ascoli Arzela's Theorem, we can extract a subsequence $(X_x^{\eta_n}, Y^{\eta_n})(\cdot)$ which converges uniformly to $Z^T := (X_x^T, Y^T)$ in $[0, T]$. Proceeding as in [4, Lemma 5.3], we find a measurable control $\alpha^T(\cdot)$ such that

$$(\dot{X}_x^T(t), \dot{Y}^T(t)) = (b(X_x^T(t), \alpha^T(t)), l(X_x^T(t), \alpha^T(t))) \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.16)$$

Thus, $((b(X^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t)), l(X^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t))))$ converges weakly* to $(b(X^T(t), \alpha^T(t)), l(X^T(t), \alpha^T(t)))$ in $L^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{N+1})$. Moreover, by Lemma 5.8, we may assume that α^T is regular.

Step 2: Since $l(X_x^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t))$ converges weakly* to $l(X_x^T(t), \alpha^T(t))$ in $L^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ and the exponential is in $L^1([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T l(X_x^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt = \int_0^T l(X_x^T(t), \alpha^T(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt.$$

Thanks to hypotheses (HB) there exists a bounded control α_i^* such that $b_i(X_x^T(T), \alpha_i^*) = 0$, which allows to consider the trajectory $X_x^T(t) := X_x^T(T)$ associated to $\alpha_i^T(t) := \alpha_i^*$ for any $t \geq T$. Thus, $(X_x^T(\cdot), \alpha^T(\cdot)) \in \tau_{A^m}^{\text{reg}}(x)$ and thanks to the Dynamic Programming Principle, (5.14) and (5.15),

$$\begin{aligned} U_{A^m}^+(x) - U_{A^m}^+(X_x^T(T)) e^{-\lambda T} &\leq \int_0^T l(X_x^T(t), \alpha^T(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T l(X_x^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^T l(X_x^{\eta_n}(t), \alpha^{\eta_n}(t)) e^{-\lambda t} dt + U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(X_x^{\eta_n}(T)) e^{-\lambda T} \right) \quad (5.17) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U_{A^m}^+(x) - U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x)}{2} \\ &\leq U_{A^m}^+(x). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: Taking limits in (5.17) as T goes to infinity and using Lemma 5.9, we obtain that

$$U_{A^m}^+(x) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U_{A^m}^+(x) - U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x)}{2} \leq U_{A^m}^+(x)$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_{A^m}^{\eta_n}(x) = U_{A^m}^+(x),$$

and the result follows by the monotonicity of $U_{A^m}^\eta$ with respect to η . \square

Unfortunately, we are not able to prove that the previous convergence result holds for unbounded control sets, but at least we can prove that the η -value functions on compact control sets, A^m , converge to the value function U_A^+ on the unbounded control set, A .

Corollary 5.11. *Under the hypotheses in Lemma 5.9, there exists a sequence $(\eta_j, M_j) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, such that*

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_{A^{M_j}}^{\eta_j}(x) = U_A^+(x).$$

Proof. Given $j \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists m_j such that for $m \geq m_j$,

$$|U_A^+(x) - U_{A^m}^+(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2j}.$$

Besides that, by Theorem 5.10, there exists η_j such that for $\eta'_j \leq \min\{\frac{1}{j}, \eta_j\}$

$$|U_{A^{m_j}}^+(x) - U_{A^{m_j}}^{\eta'_j}(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2j}.$$

Consequently,

$$|U_A^+(x) - U_{A^{m_j}}^{\eta_j}(x)| \leq |U_A^+(x) - U_{A^{m_j}}^+(x)| + |U_{A^{m_j}}^+(x) - U_{A^{m_j}}^{\eta_j}(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2j} + \frac{1}{2j} = \frac{1}{j}.$$

Taking limits as j goes to ∞ then $(\eta_j, m_j) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, and we get the result. \square

6 Application to a superlinear example

The aim of this section is to give a quite general example of superlinear Hamiltonian and the associated control problem satisfying the hypotheses (HA), (HB), (HC), (LOC1), (LOC2), which allow to apply all the results of this article.

We consider the following Hamiltonian:

$$H_i(x, u, p) = \lambda u + d_i(x)^r |p|^r - f_i(x), \quad (6.1)$$

where $r > 1$, $d_i, f_i : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions in $\overline{\Omega}_i$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < d_i(x) &\leq |x|^\kappa \text{ is locally Lipschitz,} \\ 0 \leq f_i(x) &\leq C_f |x|^{a-\epsilon} + \overline{C}_f, \\ a &\geq (a-1 + \kappa)r, \quad \lambda \geq a^r. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, here, $\epsilon > 0$ is a small constant. For instance, if the d_i functions are bounded and f_i are sublinear functions, we can take $\kappa = 0$ and $a = 1$ which allows r to be as big as we want, and $\lambda = 1$.

6.1 The control problem

This above Hamiltonian is obtained by considering the control problem deriving from the following dynamics and costs:

$$\begin{aligned} b_i(x, \alpha_i) &:= c_r d_i(x) |\alpha_i|^{r-2} \alpha_i, \\ l_i(x, \alpha_i) &:= f_i(x) + |\alpha_i|^r, \\ c_r &= \frac{r}{\sqrt[r]{(r-1)^{r-1}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that b_i and l_i satisfy hypotheses (HA), (HB) and (HC). Indeed $b_i(x, 0) = 0$, and given v in \mathbb{R}^N different from zero and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, there exists a control α_i such that $b_i(x, \alpha_i) = v$, where

α_i is given by $\alpha_i = \left(\frac{|v|}{c_r d_i(x)}\right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \frac{v}{|v|}$. This implies that $\mathbb{R}^N \subset \mathcal{B}^{A_i}(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, hypothesis (HC) is also satisfied since

$$\lim_{|\alpha_i| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{l_i(x, \alpha_i)}{1 + |b_i(x, \alpha_i)|} = \lim_{|\alpha_i| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_i(x) + |\alpha_i|^r}{c_r d_i(x) |\alpha_i|^{r-1}} = \infty,$$

uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^N .

6.2 Convexifying the problem

Concerning the set (b, l) we face a problem here. Though the sets $B_i(x) = \{b(x, \alpha_i) : \alpha_i \in A_i\}$ and $L_i(x)$ (defined similarly) are convex, nothing indicates that the set $BL_i(x) := \{(b_i(x, \alpha_i), l_i(x, \alpha_i)) | \alpha_i \in A_i\}$ is also convex.

In order to bypass this difficulty, we introduce the convex envelope of BL and solve the associated PDE problem. However, this approach requires some compactness argument to prove that by enlarging BL we get the same Hamiltonians.

So, let us consider the convex hull of $BL_i^m(x)$ where the exponent m indicates that we are taking the compact control sets $A^m := B_m(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. We now work with $\mathcal{BL}^m(x)$ defined as

$$\mathcal{BL}^m(x) := \begin{cases} \overline{\text{co}}(B_1^m(x) \times L_1^m(x)) & \text{if } x_N > 0, \\ \overline{\text{co}}(B_2^m(x) \times L_2^m(x)) & \text{if } x_N < 0, \\ \overline{\text{co}}((B_1^m(x) \times L_1^m(x)) \cup (B_2^m(x) \times L_2^m(x))) & \text{if } x_N = 0. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

We skip all the notations and details but this time, the control problem satisfies all the needed hypotheses to get a suitable framework. We denote by \bar{H}_i^m, \bar{H}_T^m the Hamiltonians associated to the convex hull.

Now, in order to connect \bar{H}_i^m, \bar{H}_T^m to H_i^m, H_T^m we need the following result:

Lemma 6.1. *Let $F : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ compact. Then*

$$\sup_{\Lambda \in \overline{\text{co}}(K)} F(\Lambda) = \sup_{\Lambda \in K} F(\Lambda).$$

Proof. For each $\epsilon > 0$, we consider $F_\epsilon(\Lambda) := F(\Lambda) + \epsilon|\Lambda|^2$ which is strictly convex. Notice that $\overline{\text{co}}(K)$ is compact. The supremum of F_ϵ over $\overline{\text{co}}(K)$ is attained at a point Λ_ϵ in $\overline{\text{co}}(K)$. From Jensen's inequality, for a strictly convex function, we have

$$\sup_{\Lambda \in \overline{\text{co}}(K)} F_\epsilon(\Lambda) = F_\epsilon \left(\int_K \Lambda d\mu_\epsilon(\Lambda) \right) < \int_K F_\epsilon(\Lambda) d\mu_\epsilon(\Lambda) \leq \sup_{\Lambda \in K} F_\epsilon(\Lambda).$$

So, necessarily the convex combination for Λ_ϵ is trivial, in other words $\mu_\epsilon = \delta_{\Lambda_\epsilon}$ and $\Lambda_\epsilon \in K$. Now,

$$\sup_{\overline{\text{co}}(K)} F \leq \sup_{\overline{\text{co}}(K)} F_\epsilon = F(\Lambda_\epsilon) + \epsilon|\Lambda_\epsilon|^2 \leq \sup_K F + \epsilon|\Lambda_\epsilon|^2$$

and since K is compact, $\Lambda_\epsilon \rightarrow \Lambda_* \in K$ at least along a subsequence. So, passing to the limit as ϵ goes to 0, yields that

$$\sup_{\overline{\text{co}}(K)} F \leq \sup_K F.$$

which gives the result. The other inequality is trivial. \square

We apply this lemma to the Hamiltonians associated to compact control sets:

Corollary 6.2. *The Hamiltonians H_i^m , H_T^m and $H_T^{m,\text{reg}}$ satisfy*

$$H_i^m = \overline{H}_i^m, \quad H_T^m = \overline{H}_T^m, \quad \text{and} \quad H_T^{m,\text{reg}} = \overline{H}_T^{m,\text{reg}}.$$

Proof. Thanks to Lemma 6.1, considering $F(b, l) = -b \cdot p - l$ and $K = BL_i^m(x)$, $K = BL_T^m(x)$ and $K = BL_T^{m,\text{reg}}(x)$, respectively, we obtain the results. \square

The last step consists in remembering that on each compact set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, any supersolution of the Ishii problem is actually a supersolution of H_i^m for some $m \in \mathbb{N}_*$ while any stratified subsolution is always a stratified subsolution of H_i^m and H_T^m .

So, provided (LOC1) and (LOC2) are satisfied, the (LCR) is enough to ensure a comparison result. And this (LCR) can be performed by using H_i^m , H_T^m or equivalently, \overline{H}_i^m , \overline{H}_T^m .

This proves that the comparison result for stratified solutions works for the superlinear example. And most associated results also follow.

Observe that thanks to Proposition 2.3 the supremum that defines H_i and H_T are attained on compact control sets under hypotheses (HA), (HB), (HC). From Corollary 6.2 we know that the the Hamiltonians on compact control sets are equal to the Hamiltonians defined on the convex hull. Therefore, the problem is well defined using the convexifying arguments.

6.3 Checking (LOC1) and (LOC2)

Checking (LOC1) and (LOC2) requires first to set some growth conditions. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of subsolutions of (1.3),(1.4) and supersolutions of (1.3), ω , such that for $\epsilon > 0$

$$|\omega(x)| \leq C_\omega |x|^{a-\epsilon} + \overline{C}_\omega \quad \text{with} \quad a \geq (a-1+\kappa)r. \quad (6.3)$$

where r , κ are the constants that define the dynamic and cost functions. Lengthy but straightforward computations show that

$$\psi(x) := -(1 + |x|^{2a})^{1/2} \quad (6.4)$$

is a stratified subsolution of (1.3) for all $a > 1/2$. Moreover, (LOC1) is satisfied with $u_\beta(x) := (1 - \beta)u(x) - \beta\psi(x)$. Concerning (LOC2), it is satisfied with

$$u_{\beta\gamma}(x) := u_\beta(x) - \gamma(1 + |x - x_\beta|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

6.4 Filippov approximations of the superlinear example.

In this subsection we consider Filippov approximations. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a continuous function satisfying $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(y) = 1$ and $\lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} \varphi(y) = 0$. Let

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(y) := \varphi\left(\frac{y}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

We extend H_1 and H_2 for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as follows

$$H_\varepsilon(x, u, p) := \varphi_\varepsilon(x_N)H_1(x, u, p) + (1 - \varphi_\varepsilon(x_N))H_2(x, u, p), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \quad (6.5)$$

In the following result we prove that there exists a unique solution of the Filippov approximation Hamiltonian, and this solution converges to the value function U_A^- .

Theorem 6.3. *There exists a unique locally Lipschitz continuous solution u_ε of (6.5) satisfying*

$$-C(1 + |x|^{2a})^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} - C \leq u_\varepsilon(x) \leq C(1 + |x|^{2a})^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{2a}} + C$$

where $C > \max\left\{C_m, \frac{C_f}{\lambda}, \frac{\bar{C}_f}{\lambda}\right\}$. Moreover, u_ε converges to U_A^- as ε goes to 0, locally uniformly in \mathbb{R}^N .

Proof. We only sketch the proof since it follows the arguments of [3]: existence of solution for (6.5) is obtained using the Perron Method (see [2, p. 52]) in the following class of solutions:

$$\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon := \{u \text{ solution of (6.5)} : -C(1 + |x|^{2a})^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} - C \leq u(x) \leq C(1 + |x|^{2a})^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\epsilon}{2a}} + C \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^N\}.$$

By standard comparison arguments, since H_ε is continuous and coercive, we know that there is at most one solution u_ε .

Finally, taking the limit of u_ε when ε goes to 0 is done as in [3, p. 31]: this limit is a viscosity solution in the sense of Ishii of (1.3) and moreover, since it satisfies the H_T subsolution inequality, it is the unique stratified solution of (1.3). Therefore, by uniqueness the limit of u_ε is U_A^- . \square

References

- [1] BARLES, G. An approach of deterministic control problems with unbounded data. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 7, 4 (1990), 235–258.
- [2] BARLES, G. *Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi*, vol. 17 of *Mathématiques & Applications (Berlin) [Mathematics & Applications]*. Springer-Verlag, Paris, 1994.
- [3] BARLES, G., BRIANI, A., AND CHASSEIGNE, E. A Bellman approach for two-domains optimal control problems in \mathbb{R}^N . *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 19, 3 (2013), 710–739.

- [4] BARLES, G., BRIANI, A., AND CHASSEIGNE, E. A Bellman approach for regional optimal control problems in \mathbb{R}^N . *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 52, 3 (2014), 1712–1744.
- [5] BARLES, G., AND CHASSEIGNE, E. (Almost) everything you always wanted to know about deterministic control problems in stratified domains. *Netw. Heterog. Media* 10, 4 (2015), 809–836.
- [6] BARLES, G., AND CHASSEIGNE, E. An illustrated guide of the modern approaches of hamilton-jacobi equations and control problems with discontinuities. *arXiv:1812.09197* (2018).
- [7] CRANDALL, M. G., EVANS, L. C., AND LIONS, P.-L. Some properties of viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 282, 2 (1984), 487–502.
- [8] CRANDALL, M. G., ISHII, H., AND LIONS, P.-L. User’s guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 27, 1 (1992), 1–67.
- [9] CRANDALL, M. G., AND LIONS, P.-L. Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 277, 1 (1983), 1–42.
- [10] MISZTELA, A. Representation of Hamilton-Jacobi equation in optimal control theory with unbounded control set. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 185, 2 (2020), 361–383.
- [11] MOTTA, M. Viscosity solutions of HJB equations with unbounded data and characteristic points. *Appl. Math. Optim.* 49, 1 (2004), 1–26.
- [12] SORAVIA, P. Optimality principles and representation formulas for viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. I. Equations of unbounded and degenerate control problems without uniqueness. *Adv. Differential Equations* 4, 2 (1999), 275–296.