

Necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for relaxed and strict control problems

Seid BAHMALI

Laboratory of Applied Mathematics, University Med Khider,
Po. Box 145, Biskra 07000, Algeria.
sbahlali@yahoo.fr

Abstract

We consider a stochastic control problem where the set of strict (classical) controls is not necessarily convex, and the system is governed by a nonlinear stochastic differential equation, in which the control enters both the drift and the diffusion coefficients. By introducing a new approach, we establish necessary as well as sufficient conditions of optimality for two models. The first concerns the relaxed controls, who are a measure-valued processes in which an optimal solution exists. The second is a particular case of the first and relates to strict control problems. These results are given in the form of global stochastic maximum principle by using only the first order expansion and the associated adjoint equation. This improves all the previous works on the subject.

AMS Subject Classification. 93 Exx

Keywords. Stochastic differential equation, strict control, relaxed control, maximum principle, adjoint process, variational inequality..

1 Introduction

We study a stochastic control problem where the system is governed by a nonlinear stochastic differential equation (SDE for short) of the type

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^v = b(t, x_t^v, v_t) dt + \sigma(t, x_t^v, v_t) dW_t, \\ x_0^v = \xi, \end{cases}$$

where, b and σ are given deterministic functions, ξ is the initial data and $W = (W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion, defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{P})$ satisfying the usual conditions.

The control variable $v = (v_t)$, called strict (classical) control, is an \mathcal{F}_t adapted process with values in some set U of \mathbb{R}^k . We denote by \mathcal{U} the class of all strict controls.

The criteria to be minimized, over the set \mathcal{U} , has the form

$$J(v) = \mathbb{E} \left[g(x_T^v) + \int_0^T h(t, x_t^v, v_t) dt \right],$$

where, g and h are given maps and x_t^v is the trajectory of the system controlled by v .

A control $u \in \mathcal{U}$ is called optimal if it satisfies

$$J(u) = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{U}} J(v).$$

This kind of stochastic control problems have been studied extensively, both by the dynamic programming approach and by the Pontryagin stochastic maximum principle. In this paper, we are concerned with the second approach, whose objective is to establish necessary as well as sufficient conditions for optimality of controls. There are many works concerning this subject. The first contribution in this direction is made by Kushner [18]. The other fundamental advance was developed by Haussmann [11, 12]. Versions of the stochastic maximum principle in which the diffusion coefficient is allowed to depend explicitly on the control variable were derived by Arkin and Saksonov [1], Bensoussan [5], Elliot [8], Elliot and Kohlmann [9] and Peng [23]. Necessary (as well as sufficient) optimality conditions for linear systems with random coefficients, where no L^p -bounds are imposed on the controls, are established by Cadellinas and Karatzas [6].

The common fact in most of these works is that an optimal solution in the class of strict controls may fail to exist. Existence of such a strict optimal control follows from the Fillipov convexity condition, who is the convexity of the image of the action space U by the map $(b(t, x, \cdot), \sigma^2(t, x, \cdot), h(t, x, \cdot))$, see [4], [7], [13], [14], [19]. Without this convexity condition, an optimal strict control does not necessarily exist in \mathcal{U} . To overcome this problem of existence without imposing the Fillipov condition, the idea is then to introduce a bigger new class \mathcal{R} of processes in which the controller chooses at time t , a probability measure $q_t(da)$ on the control set U , rather than an element v_t of U . This new class of processes is called relaxed controls and have a richer topological structure, for which the control problem becomes solvable.

In the relaxed model, the system is governed by the SDE

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^q = \int_U b(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) dt + \int_U \sigma(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) dW_t, \\ x_0^q = \xi. \end{cases}$$

The functional cost to be minimized, over the class \mathcal{R} of relaxed controls, is defined by

$$J(q) = \mathbb{E} \left[g(x_T^q) + \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) dt \right].$$

A relaxed control μ is called optimal if it solves

$$J(\mu) = \inf_{q \in \mathcal{R}} J(q).$$

The relaxed control problem finds its interest in two essential points. The first is that an optimal solution exists. Fleming [10] derived an existence result of an optimal relaxed control with uncontrolled diffusion coefficient. The existence of an optimal solution, where the drift and the diffusion coefficients depend explicitly on the relaxed control variable, has been solved by El Karoui et al [7]. The relaxed optimal control in this general case is shown to be Markovian. See Bahlali-Mezerdi-Djehiche [2] for an alternative proof for existence of an optimal relaxed control. The second is that it is a generalization of the strict control problem. Indeed, if $q_t(da) = \delta_{v_t}(da)$ is a Dirac measure concentrated at a single point v_t , then we get a strict control problem as a particular case of the relaxed one.

Motivated by the existence of an optimal solution, the unique versions of stochastic maximum principle for relaxed controls were established by Mezerdi-Bahlali [22] in the case of uncontrolled diffusion, Bahlali-Mezerdi-Djehiche [2] where the drift and the diffusion coefficients depend explicitly on the relaxed control variable and Bahlali-Djehiche-Mezerdi [3] for the problem of mixed singular-relaxed controls. All these results are obtained by using the previous works on strict controls, Ekeland's variational principle and some stability properties of the trajectories and adjoint processes with respect to the control variable.

The general stochastic maximum principle for strict controls established by Peng [23] and its extension to the class of measure-valued processes developed by Bahlali-Mezerdi-Djehiche [2], have been both obtained by using the second order expansion. Then, these two results are given with two adjoint processes and a variational inequality of the second order.

Our aim in this paper, is to establish necessary as well as sufficient conditions of optimality in the form of global stochastic maximum principle, for relaxed and strict controls, without using the second order expansion. To achieve this goal, we introduce a new approach and we derive these two main results as follows.

Firstly, we give the optimality conditions for relaxed controls. The main idea is to use the fact that the set of relaxed controls is convex. Then, we establish necessary optimality conditions by using the classical way of the convex perturbation method. More precisely, if we denote by μ an optimal relaxed control and q is an arbitrary element of \mathcal{R} , then with a sufficiently small $\theta > 0$ and for each $t \in [0, T]$, we can define a perturbed control as follows

$$\mu_t^\theta = \mu_t + \theta(q_t - \mu_t).$$

We derive the variational equation from the state equation, and the variational inequality from the inequality

$$0 \leq J(\mu^\theta) - J(\mu).$$

By using the fact that the drift, the diffusion and the running cost coefficients are linear with respect to the relaxed control variable, necessary optimality conditions are obtained directly in the global form. This result improves

significantly that of Bahlali-Mezerdi-Djehiche [2], in the sense where, we use only the first-order expansion with only one adjoint process.

To achieve this part of the paper, we prove under minimal additional hypothesis, that these necessary optimality conditions for relaxed controls are also sufficient.

The second main result in the paper characterizes the optimality for strict control processes. It is directly derived from the above result by restricting from relaxed to strict controls. The main idea is to replace the relaxed controls by a Dirac measures charging a strict controls. Thus, we reduce the set \mathcal{R} of relaxed controls and we minimize the cost J over the subset $\delta(\mathcal{U}) = \{q \in \mathcal{R} \mid q = \delta_v \ ; \ v \in \mathcal{U}\}$. Then, we derive necessary optimality conditions by using only the first order expansion and the associated adjoint equation. We don't need anymore the second order expansion. This result improves considerably the Peng stochastic maximum principle [23]. Moreover, we prove that these necessary conditions becomes sufficient, without imposing neither the convexity of U nor that of the Hamiltonian H in v .

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate the strict and relaxed control problems and give the various assumptions used throughout the paper. Section 3 is devoted to study the relaxed control problems and we establish necessary as well as sufficient conditions of optimality for relaxed controls. In the last Section, we derive directly from the results of Section 3, the optimality conditions for strict controls.

Along this paper, we denote by C some positive constant and for we need the following matrix notations. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{n \times d}(\mathbb{R})$ the space of $n \times d$ real matrices and by $\mathcal{M}_{n \times n}^d(\mathbb{R})$ the linear space of vectors $M = (M_1, \dots, M_d)$ where $M_i \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R})$.

For any $M, N \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times n}^d(\mathbb{R})$, $L, S \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times d}(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we use the following notations

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\beta &= \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \beta_i \in \mathbb{R} \text{ is the product scalar in } \mathbb{R}^n; \\ LS &= \sum_{i=1}^d L_i S_i \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ where } L_i \text{ and } S_i \text{ are the } i^{th} \text{ columns of } L \text{ and } S; \\ ML &= \sum_{i=1}^d M_i L_i \in \mathbb{R}^n; \\ M\alpha\gamma &= \sum_{i=1}^d (M_i \alpha) \gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}^n; \\ MN &= \sum_{i=1}^d M_i N_i \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R}); \\ MLN &= \sum_{i=1}^d M_i L N_i \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R}); \end{aligned}$$

$$ML\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^d M_i L \gamma_i \in \mathcal{M}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R}).$$

We denote by L^* the transpose of the matrix L and $M^* = (M_1^*, \dots, M_d^*)$.

2 Formulation of the problem

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions, on which a d -dimensional Brownian motion $W = (W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is defined. We assume that (\mathcal{F}_t) is the \mathcal{P} -augmentation of the natural filtration of W .

Let T be a strictly positive real number and U a non-empty compact set of \mathbb{R}^k .

2.1 The strict control problem

Definition 1 *An admissible strict control is an \mathcal{F}_t -adapted process $v = (v_t)$ with values in U such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |v_t|^2 \right] < \infty.$$

We denote by \mathcal{U} the set of all admissible strict controls.

For any $v \in \mathcal{U}$, we consider the following controlled SDE

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^v = b(t, x_t^v, v_t) dt + \sigma(t, x_t^v, v_t) dW_t, \\ x_0^v = \xi, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} b &: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \sigma &: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{n \times d}(\mathbb{R}). \end{aligned}$$

and ξ is an n -dimensional \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable such that

$$\mathbb{E} |\xi|^2 < \infty.$$

The expected cost to be minimized is defined from \mathcal{U} into \mathbb{R} by

$$J(v) = \mathbb{E} \left[g(x_T^v) + \int_0^T h(t, x_t^v, v_t) dt \right], \quad (2)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} g &: \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ h &: [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

A strict control u is called optimal if it satisfies

$$J(u) = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{U}} J(v). \quad (3)$$

The following assumptions will be in force throughout this paper

$$b, \sigma, g, h \text{ are continuously differentiable with respect to } x. \quad (4)$$

They and all their derivatives b_x, σ_x, g_x, h_x are continuous in (x, v) .

b_x, σ_x, g_x, h_x are uniformly bounded. b, σ, g, h are bounded by $C(1 + |x| + |v|)$.

Under the above assumptions, for every $v \in \mathcal{U}$, equation (1) has a unique strong solution and the functional cost J is well defined from \mathcal{U} into \mathbb{R} .

2.2 The relaxed model

The strict control problem $\{(1), (2), (3)\}$ formulated in the last subsection may fail to have an optimal solution without the Fillipov convexity condition, who is the convexity of the image of the action space U by the map $(b(t, x, \cdot), \sigma^2(t, x, \cdot), h(t, x, \cdot))$, see [4], [7], [13], [14], [19]. Let us begin by a deterministic example which shows that even in simple cases, existence of a strict optimal control is not ensured (see Fleming [10] and Yong-Zhou [24] for other examples).

The problem is to minimize, over the set of measurable functions $v : [0, T] \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$, the following functional cost

$$J(v) = \int_0^T (x_t^v)^2 dt,$$

where, x_t^v denotes the solution of

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^v = v_t dt, \\ x_0^v = 0. \end{cases}$$

We have

$$\inf_{v \in \mathcal{U}} J(v) = 0.$$

Indeed, consider the following sequence of controls

$$v_t^n = (-1)^k \quad \text{if } \frac{k}{n}T \leq t \leq \frac{k+1}{n}T, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1.$$

Then, clearly

$$\begin{aligned} |x_t^{v^n}| &\leq \frac{T}{n}, \\ |J(v^n)| &\leq \frac{T^3}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Which implies that

$$\inf_{v \in \mathcal{U}} J(v) = 0.$$

There is however no control v such that $J(v) = 0$. If this would have been the case, then for every t , $x_t^v = 0$. This in turn would imply that $v_t = 0$, which is impossible. The problem is that the sequence (v^n) has no limit in the space of strict controls. This limit if it exists, will be the natural candidate for optimality. If we identify v_t^n with the Dirac measure $\delta_{v_t^n}(da)$ and set $q_n(dt, dv) = \delta_{v_t^n}(dv) dt$, we get a measure on $[0, 1] \times U$. Then, the sequence $(q_n(dt, dv))_n$ converges weakly to $\frac{1}{2}dt \cdot [\delta_{-1} + \delta_1](da)$.

This suggests that the set \mathcal{U} of strict controls is too narrow and should be embedded into a wider class with a richer topological structure, for which the control problem becomes solvable.

The idea of relaxed controls is to replace the U -valued process (v_t) with $\mathbb{P}(U)$ -valued process (q_t) , where $\mathbb{P}(U)$ is the space of probability measures equipped with the topology of weak convergence.

Definition 2 A relaxed control is the term $q = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{P}, W_t, q_t, x_t, \xi)$ such that

- 1) $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathcal{P})$ is a filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions.
- 2) $(q_t)_t$ is a $\mathbb{P}(U)$ -valued process, progressively measurable with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_t)_t$ and such that for each t , $\mathbf{1}_{[0, t]} \cdot q$ is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable.
- 3) $(x_t)_t$ is \mathbb{R}^n -valued, \mathcal{F}_t -adapted with continuous paths such that $x_0 = \xi$ and for each $f \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$

$$f(x_t) - f(\xi) - \int_0^t \int_U Lf(s, x_s, a) q_s(\omega, da) ds,$$

is a \mathcal{P} -martingale.

Where, L is the infinitesimal generator associated with (5), acting on a map f in $C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$.

By a slight abuse of notations, we will often denote a relaxed control by q instead of specifying all the components.

Remark 3 The set of strict controls is embedded into the set of relaxed controls by the mapping

$$f : v \longmapsto f_v(dt, da) = dt \delta_{v_t}(da),$$

where, δ_v is the atomic measure concentrated at a single point v .

For more details on relaxed controls, see [2], [3], [7], [10], [20], [21], [22].

Definition 4 An admissible relaxed control is a relaxed control $q = (q_t)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |q_t|^2 \right] < \infty.$$

We denote by \mathcal{R} the set of all admissible relaxed controls.

For any $q \in \mathcal{R}$, we consider the following relaxed SDE

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^q = \int_U b(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) dt + \int_U \sigma(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) dW_t, \\ x_0^q = \xi. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The expected cost to be minimized, in the relaxed model, is defined from \mathcal{R} into \mathbb{R} by

$$J(q) = \mathbb{E} \left[g(x_T^q) + \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) dt \right]. \quad (6)$$

A relaxed control μ is called optimal if it solves

$$J(\mu) = \inf_{q \in \mathcal{R}} J(q). \quad (7)$$

Existence of an optimal solution for the problem $\{(5), (6), (7)\}$ has been solved by El Karoui et al [7] by using a compactification method. The relaxed optimal control in this general case is shown to be Markovian. See Bahlali-Mezerdi-Djehiche [2] for an alternative proof for existence of an optimal relaxed control.

Remark 5 If we put

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{b}(t, x_t^q, q_t) &= \int_U b(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da), \\ \bar{\sigma}(t, x_t^q, q_t) &= \int_U \sigma(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da), \\ \bar{h}(t, x_t^q, q_t) &= \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da). \end{aligned}$$

Then, equation (5) becomes

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^q = \bar{b}(t, x_t^q, q_t) dt + \bar{\sigma}(t, x_t^q, q_t) dW_t, \\ x_T^q = \xi. \end{cases} \quad (5')$$

With a functional cost given by

$$J(q) = \mathbb{E} \left[g(x_T^q) + \int_0^T \bar{h}(t, x_t^q, q_t) dt \right].$$

Hence, by introducing relaxed controls, we have replaced U by a larger space $\mathbb{P}(U)$. We have gained the advantage that $\mathbb{P}(U)$ is both compact and convex. Furthermore, the new coefficients of equation (5) and the running cost are linear with respect to the relaxed control variable.

Remark 6 The coefficients \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$ (defined in the above remark) check respectively the same assumptions as b and σ . Then, under assumptions (4), \bar{b} and $\bar{\sigma}$ are uniformly Lipschitz and with linear growth. Then, by classical results on SDEs (The Itô theorem, see : Ikeda-Watanabe [15], Karatzas-Shreve [17]), for every $q \in \mathcal{R}$, equation (5') admits a unique strong solution. Consequently, for every $q \in \mathcal{R}$, equation (5) has a unique strong solution.

On the other hand, It is easy to see that \bar{h} checks the same assumptions as h . Then, the functional cost J is well defined from \mathcal{R} into \mathbb{R} .

Remark 7 If $q_t = \delta_{v_t}$ is an atomic measure concentrated at a single point $v_t \in \mathbb{P}(U)$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U b(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) &= \int_U b(t, x_t^q, a) \delta_{v_t}(da) = b(t, x_t^q, v_t), \\ \int_U \sigma(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) &= \int_U \sigma(t, x_t^q, a) \delta_{v_t}(da) = \sigma(t, x_t^q, v_t), \\ \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) &= \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) \delta_{v_t}(da) = h(t, x_t^q, v_t). \end{aligned}$$

In this case $x^q = x^v$, $J(q) = J(v)$ and we get a strict control problem. So the problem of strict controls $\{(1), (2), (3)\}$ is a particular case of relaxed control problem $\{(5), (6), (7)\}$.

Remark 8 We note that the relaxed equation (5) can be expressed in terms of martingale-measure (see El Karoui et al [7] and Bahlali-Mezzerdi-Djehiche [2]). If we follow this formulation, the state equation is governed by a martingale measure and it is given by

$$\begin{cases} dx_t^q = \int_U b(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) dt + \int_U \sigma(t, x_t^q, a) M(da, dt), \\ x_0^q = \xi. \end{cases}$$

where, $M(da, dt)$ is a martingale-measure with intensity the relaxed control $q_t(da) dt$.

In our formulation of relaxed stochastic control problem, the state equation (5) is governed by the Brownian motion W . This formulation was used by Ma-Yong [20] for a relaxed control problem of forward-backward systems. See Ma-Yong [20] for more details.

3 Necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for relaxed controls

In this section, we study the problem $\{(5), (6), (7)\}$ and we establish necessary as well as sufficient conditions of optimality for relaxed controls.

3.1 Preliminary results

Since the set of relaxed controls \mathcal{R} is convex, a classical way of treating such a problem is to use the convex perturbation method. More precisely, let μ be an optimal relaxed control and x_t^μ the solution of (5) controlled by μ . Then, we can define a perturbed relaxed control as follows

$$\mu_t^\theta = \mu_t + \theta (q_t - \mu_t), \quad (8)$$

where, $\theta > 0$ is sufficiently small and q is an arbitrary element of \mathcal{R} .

Denote by x_t^θ the solution of (5) associated with μ^θ .

From optimality of μ , the variational inequality will be derived from the fact that

$$0 \leq J(\mu^\theta) - J(\mu). \quad (9)$$

For this end, we need the following classical lemmas.

Lemma 9 *Under assumptions (4), we have*

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} |x_t^\theta - x_t^\mu|^2 \right] = 0. \quad (10)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} x_t^\theta - x_t^\mu &= \int_0^t \left[\int_U b(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left[\int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right] dW_s \\ &= \int_0^t \left[\int_U b(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left[\int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left[\int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) \right] dW_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \left[\int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right] dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

By using the definition of μ_t^θ and taking expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |x_t^\theta - x_t^\mu|^2 &\leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \int_U b(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \theta^2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \int_U b(s, x_s^\theta, a) q_s(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s(da) \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right|^2 ds \\ &\quad + C \theta^2 \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \left| \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\theta, a) q_s(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s(da) \right|^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

By (4), b and σ are uniformly Lipschitz with respect to x . Hence

$$\mathbb{E} |x_t^\theta - x_t^\mu|^2 \leq C \mathbb{E} \int_0^t |x_s^\theta - x_s^\mu|^2 ds + C\theta^2.$$

By using Gronwall's lemma and Buckholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, we obtain the desired result. ■

Lemma 10 *Let z_t be the solution of the following linear equation (called variational equation)*

$$\begin{cases} dz_t = \int_U b_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) z_t dt + \int_U \sigma_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) z_t dW_t \\ \quad + \left[\int_U b(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) - \int_U b(t, x_t^\mu, a) q_t(da) \right] dt \\ \quad + \left[\int_U \sigma(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) - \int_U \sigma(t, x_t^\mu, a) q_t(da) \right] dW_t, \\ z_0 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Then, we have

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{x_t^\theta - x_t^\mu}{\theta} - z_t \right|^2 = 0. \quad (12)$$

Proof. For simplicity, we put

$$X_t = \frac{x_t^\theta - x_t^\mu}{\theta} - z_t. \quad (13)$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= \frac{1}{\theta} \int_0^t \int_U b(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\theta} \int_0^t \left[\int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\theta} \int_0^t \left[\int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\theta, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) \right] dW_s \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\theta} \int_0^t \left[\int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s^\theta(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right] dW_s \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \int_U b_x(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) z_s ds - \int_0^t \int_U \sigma_x(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) z_s dW_s \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \left[\int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) - \int_U b(s, x_s^\mu, a) q_s(da) \right] ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \left[\int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) - \int_U \sigma(s, x_s^\mu, a) q_s(da) \right] dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

By using the definition of μ^θ and taking expectation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|X_t|^2 &\leq C\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U|b_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)X_s|^2\mu_s(da)d\lambda ds \\ &\quad + C\mathbb{E}\int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U|\sigma_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)X_s|^2\mu_s(da)d\lambda ds \\ &\quad + C\mathbb{E}|\alpha_t^\theta|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where, α_t^θ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_t^\theta &= \int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U b_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)(x_s^\theta-x_s^\mu)q_s(da)d\lambda ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U b_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)(x_s^\theta-x_s^\mu)\mu_s(da)d\lambda ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U \sigma_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)(x_s^\theta-x_s^\mu)q_s(da)d\lambda dW_s \\ &\quad - \int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U \sigma_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)(x_s^\theta-x_s^\mu)\mu_s(da)d\lambda dW_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U b_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)z_s\mu_s(da)d\lambda ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t\int_0^1\int_U \sigma_x(s,x_s^\mu+\lambda\theta(X_s+z_s),a)z_s\mu_s(da)d\lambda dW_s \\ &\quad - \int_0^t\int_U b_x(s,x_s^\mu,a)z_s\mu_s(da)ds - \int_0^t\int_U \sigma_x(s,x_s^\mu,a)z_s\mu_s(da)dW_s.\end{aligned}$$

Since b_x and σ_x are continuous and bounded, then

$$\mathbb{E}|X_t|^2 \leq C\mathbb{E}\int_0^t|X_s|^2 ds + C\mathbb{E}|\alpha_t^\theta|^2,$$

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0}\mathbb{E}|\alpha_t^\theta|^2 = 0.$$

We conclude by using Gronwall's lemma in the above inequality. ■

Lemma 11 *Let μ be an optimal relaxed control minimizing the cost J over \mathcal{R} and x_t^μ the associated optimal trajectory. Then, for any $q \in \mathcal{R}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\leq \mathbb{E}[g_x(x_T^\mu)z_T] + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_U h_x(t,x_t^\mu,a)\mu_t(da)z_t dt \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T\left[\int_U h(t,x_t^\mu,a)q_t(da) - \int_U h(t,x_t^\mu,a)\mu_t(da)\right]dt.\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

Proof. By (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \mathbb{E} [g(x_T^\theta) - g(x_T^\mu)] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^\theta, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) dt - \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} [g(x_T^\theta) - g(x_T^\mu)] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^\theta, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) dt - \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) dt \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) dt - \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the definition of μ_t^θ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \mathbb{E} [g(x_T^\theta) - g(x_T^\mu)] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\int_U h(t, x_t^\theta, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) - \int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) \right] dt \\
&+ \theta \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) q_t(da) - \int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) \right] dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 g_x(t, x_t^\mu + \lambda \theta (X_t + z_t)) z_t d\lambda \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U \int_0^1 h_x(t, x_t^\mu + \lambda \theta (X_t + z_t), a) \mu_t^\theta(da) z_t d\lambda dt \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) q_t(da) - \int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t^\theta(da) \right] dt \\
&+ \rho_t^\theta,
\end{aligned}$$

where, X is defined in (13) and ρ_t^θ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_t^\theta &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 g_x(t, x_t^\mu + \lambda \theta (X_t + z_t)) X_t d\lambda \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \int_U \int_0^1 h_x(t, x_t^\mu + \lambda \theta (X_t + z_t), a) \mu_t^\theta(da) X_t d\lambda dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, lemma 10 and the fact that g_x and h_x are continuous and bounded, we get

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \rho_t^\theta = 0.$$

The proof is completed by letting θ go to 0 in the above inequality. ■

3.2 Variational inequality and adjoint equation

In this subsection, we introduce the adjoint process. With this process, we derive the variational inequality from (14). The linear terms in (11) may be treated in the following way (see Bensoussan [5]). Let Φ be the fundamental solution of the linear equation

$$\begin{cases} d\Phi_t = \int_U b_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) \Phi_t dt + \int_U \sigma_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) \Phi_t dW_t, \\ \Phi_0 = I_d. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

This equation is linear with bounded coefficients. Hence, it admits a unique strong solution which is invertible, and its inverse Ψ_t is the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} d\Psi_t = \left[\int_U \sigma_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) \Psi_t \int_U \sigma_x^*(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) \right] dt \\ \quad - \int_U b_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) \Psi_t dt - \int_U \sigma_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) \Psi_t dW_t, \\ \Psi_0 = I_d. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Moreover, Φ and Ψ satisfy

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\Phi_t|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\Psi_t|^2 \right] < \infty. \quad (17)$$

We introduce the following processes

$$\alpha_t = \Psi_t z_t, \quad (18)$$

$$X = \Phi_T^* g_x(x_T^\mu) + \int_0^T \left[\Phi_t^* \int_U h_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) \right] dt, \quad (19)$$

$$Y_t = \mathbb{E}[X / \mathcal{F}_t] - \int_0^t \left[\Phi_s^* \int_U h_x(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) \right] ds. \quad (20)$$

We remark from (18), (19), (20) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha_T Y_T] = \mathbb{E}[g_x(x_T^\mu) z_T]. \quad (21)$$

Since g_x and h_x are bounded, then by (17), X is square integrable. Hence, the process $(\mathbb{E}[X / \mathcal{F}_t])_{t \geq 0}$ is a square integrable martingale with respect to the natural filtration of the Brownian motion W . Then, by Itô's representation theorem we have

$$Y_t = \mathbb{E}[X] + \int_0^t Q_s dW_s - \int_0^t \int_U \Phi_s^* h_x(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) ds,$$

where, Q is an adapted process such that $\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |Q_s|^2 ds < \infty$.

By applying the Itô formula to α_t then with $\alpha_t Y_t$ and using (21), the variational inequality (14) becomes

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T [\mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) - \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu)] dt, \quad (22)$$

where, the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} is defined from $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{P}(U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_{n \times d}(\mathbb{R})$ into \mathbb{R} by

$$\mathcal{H}(t, x, q, p, P) = \int_U h(t, x, a) q(da) + \int_U b(t, x, a) q(da) p + \int_U \sigma(t, x, a) q(da) P,$$

(p^μ, P^μ) is a pair of adapted processes given by

$$p_t^\mu = \Psi_t^* Y_t \ ; \ p^\mu \in \mathcal{L}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n), \quad (23)$$

$$P_t^\mu = \Psi_t^* Q_t - \int_U \sigma_x^*(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) p_t^\mu \ ; \ P^\mu \in \mathcal{L}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}), \quad (24)$$

and the process Q satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t Q_s dW_s &= \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi_T^* g_x(x_T^\mu) + \int_0^T \Phi_t^* \int_U h_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) dt / \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi_T^* g_x(x_T^\mu) + \int_0^T \Phi_t^* \int_U h_x(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) dt \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The process p^μ is called the adjoint process and from (19), (20), (23), it is given explicitly by

$$p_t^\mu = \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi_t^* \Phi_T^* g_x(x_T^\mu) + \Psi_t^* \int_t^T \Phi_s^* \int_U h_x(s, x_s^\mu, a) \mu_s(da) ds / \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

By applying Itô's formula to the adjoint processes p^μ in (23), we obtain the adjoint equation, which is a linear backward stochastic differential equation, given by

$$\begin{cases} -dp_t^\mu = \mathcal{H}_x(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) dt - P_t^\mu dW_t, \\ p_T^\mu = g_x(x_T^\mu). \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

3.3 Necessary optimality conditions for relaxed controls

Starting from the variational inequality (22), we can now state the necessary optimality conditions, for the relaxed control problem $\{(5), (6), (7)\}$, in the global form.

Theorem 12 (*Necessary optimality conditions for relaxed controls in global form*) Let μ be an optimal relaxed control minimizing the cost J over \mathcal{R} and

x^μ denotes the corresponding optimal trajectory. Then, there exists a unique pair of adapted processes

$$(p^\mu, P^\mu) \in \mathcal{L}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}),$$

solution of the backward stochastic differential equations (26) such that

$$\mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) = \inf_{q_t \in \mathbb{P}(U)} \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) \quad ; \quad a.e., \quad a.s. \quad (27)$$

Proof. The result follows immediately from (22). ■

Remark 13 Bahlali-Mezerdi-Djehiche [2] established necessary optimality conditions for relaxed controls of the second-order with two adjoint processes. The result of the above theorem improves that of [2], in the sense where, we consider the same relaxed control problem, in which the control variable enters both the drift and the diffusion coefficients, and we establish necessary optimality conditions of the first-order with only one adjoint process.

3.4 Sufficient optimality conditions for relaxed controls

In this subsection, we study when the necessary optimality conditions (27) becomes sufficient. We recall assumptions (4) and the adjoint equation (26). For any $q \in \mathcal{R}$, we denote by x^q the solution of equation (5) controlled by q .

Theorem 14 (Sufficient optimality conditions for relaxed controls). *If we assume that the functions g and $x \mapsto \mathcal{H}(t, x, q, p, P)$ are convex. Then, μ is an optimal solution of problem the $\{(5), (6), (7)\}$ if it satisfies (27).*

Proof. We know that the set of relaxed controls \mathcal{R} is convex and the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} is linear in q .

Let μ be an arbitrary element of \mathcal{R} (candidate to be optimal). For any $q \in \mathcal{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mu) - J(q) &= \mathbb{E}[g(x_T^\mu) - g(x_T^q)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) - \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since g is convex, we get

$$g(x_T^q) - g(x_T^\mu) \geq g_x(x_T^\mu)(x_T^q - x_T^\mu).$$

Thus,

$$g(x_T^\mu) - g(x_T^q) \leq g_x(x_T^\mu)(x_T^\mu - x_T^q).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mu) - J(q) &\leq \mathbb{E}[g_x(x_T^\mu)(x_T^\mu - x_T^q)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) - \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that $p_T^\mu = g_x(x_T^\mu)$, then we have

$$J(\mu) - J(q) \leq \mathbb{E}[p_T^\mu(x_T^\mu - x_T^q)] \\ + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\int_U h(t, x_t^\mu, a) \mu_t(da) - \int_U h(t, x_t^q, a) q_t(da) \right] dt.$$

Applying the Itô formula to $p_t(x_t^\mu - x_t^q)$ and taking expectation, we obtain

$$J(\mu) - J(q) \leq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T [\mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) - \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^q, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu)] dt \quad (28) \\ - \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \mathcal{H}_x(t, x_t^\mu, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu)(x_t^\mu - x_t^q) dt.$$

Since \mathcal{H} is convex in x and linear in μ , then by using the Clarke generalized gradient of H evaluated at (x_t, μ_t) and the necessary optimality conditions (27), it follows by [25, lemmas 2.2 (4) and 2.3] that

$$\mathcal{H}(t, x_t^q, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) - \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) \geq \mathcal{H}_x(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu)(x_t^q - x_t^\mu).$$

Or equivalently

$$0 \geq \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) - \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^q, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) - \mathcal{H}_x(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu)(x_t^\mu - x_t^q).$$

By the above inequality and (28), we have

$$J(\mu) - J(q) \leq 0.$$

The theorem is proved. ■

4 Necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for strict controls

In this section, we study the strict control problem $\{(1), (2), (3)\}$ and from the results of section 3, we derive the optimality conditions for strict controls. For this end, consider the following subset of \mathcal{R}

$$\delta(\mathcal{U}) = \{q \in \mathcal{R} \mid q = \delta_v \text{ ; } v \in \mathcal{U}\}. \quad (29)$$

The set $\delta(\mathcal{U})$ is the collection of all relaxed controls in the form of Dirac measure charging a strict control.

Denote by $\delta(U)$ the action set of all relaxed controls in $\delta(\mathcal{U})$.

If $q \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$, then $q = \delta_v$ with $v \in \mathcal{U}$. In this case we have for each t , $q_t \in \delta(U)$ and $q_t = \delta_{v_t}$.

Remark 15 *The relaxed necessary optimality conditions (27) holds if we replace \mathcal{R} by $\delta(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathbb{P}(U)$ by $\delta(U)$.*

Lemma 16 *The relaxed control $\mu = \delta_u$ minimizes J over $\delta(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if the strict control u minimizes J over \mathcal{U} .*

Proof. Let $\mu = \delta_u$ be an optimal relaxed control minimizing the cost J over $\delta(\mathcal{U})$, we have then

$$J(\mu) \leq J(q), \quad \forall q \in \delta(\mathcal{U}). \quad (30)$$

Since $q \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$, then there exists $v \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $q = \delta_v$.

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{cases} x^\mu = x^u, \\ x^q = x^v, \\ J(\mu) = J(u), \\ J(q) = J(v). \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

By (30), we get

$$J(u) \leq J(v), \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Conversely, let u be a strict control minimizing the cost J over \mathcal{U} . Then

$$J(u) \leq J(v), \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Since the controls $u, v \in \mathcal{U}$, then there exist $\mu, q \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$ such that

$$\mu = \delta_u, \quad q = \delta_v.$$

This implies that relations (31) hold. Consequently, we get

$$J(\mu) \leq J(q), \quad \forall q \in \delta(\mathcal{U}).$$

The proof is completed. ■

Remark 17 1) *The relaxed optimal control μ exists, but it is not necessary an element of $\delta(\mathcal{U})$. A strict optimal control u does not necessary exist.*

2) *If the relaxed optimal control $\mu \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$, we get existence of strict optimal control. In this case, if we reduce the class of relaxed controls \mathcal{R} to the set $\delta(\mathcal{U})$, then the relaxed control problem simply becomes a strict control problem in which an optimal solution exists.*

3) *We know that existence of an optimal solution of strict control problem is ensured by the Fillipov condition. It is interesting to see that if we have the Fillipov condition, the relaxed optimal control is an element of $\delta(\mathcal{U})$.*

4.1 Necessary optimality conditions for strict controls

Define the Hamiltonian in the strict case from $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}_{n \times d}(\mathbb{R})$ into \mathbb{R} by

$$H(t, x, v, p, P) = h(t, x, v) + b(t, x, v)p + \sigma(t, x, v)P.$$

Theorem 18 (*Necessary optimality conditions for strict controls in global form*)
Suppose that u is an optimal strict control minimizing the cost J over \mathcal{U} and x^u denotes the solution of (1) controlled by u . Then, there exists a unique pair of adapted processes

$$(p^u, P^u) \in \mathcal{L}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}),$$

solution of the following backward stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{cases} -dp_t^u = H_x(t, x_t^u, u_t, p_t^u, P_t^u) dt - P_t^u dW_t, \\ p_T^u = g_x(x_T^u), \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

such that

$$H(t, x_t^u, u_t, p_t^u, P_t^u) = \inf_{v_t \in U} H(t, x_t^u, v_t, p_t^u, P_t^u) \quad ; \quad a.e, \quad a.s. \quad (33)$$

Proof. Let u be an optimal solution of the strict control problem $\{(1), (2), (3)\}$ and v be an arbitrary element of \mathcal{U} . Then, there exist $\mu, q \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$ such that

$$\mu = \delta_u, \quad q = \delta_v. \quad (34)$$

Since u minimizes the cost J over \mathcal{U} , then by lemma 16, μ minimizes J over $\delta(\mathcal{U})$. Hence, by the necessary optimality conditions for relaxed controls (Theorem 12), there exists a unique pair of adapted processes (p_t^μ, P_t^μ) solution of (26) such that

$$\mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) = \inf_{q_t \in \delta(U)} \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) \quad ; \quad a.e, \quad a.s.$$

By (34) we can easily see that

$$\begin{aligned} x^\mu &= x^u, \\ \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) &= H(t, x_t^u, u_t, p_t^u, P_t^u), \\ \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) &= H(t, x_t^u, v_t, p_t^u, P_t^u), \end{aligned}$$

where, the pair (p^u, P^u) is the unique solution of equation (32).

The theorem is proved. ■

Remark 19 *S. Peng [23] established necessary optimality conditions for strict controls of the second-order with two adjoint processes. The result of the above theorem improves that of Peng, in the sense where, we consider the same strict control problem, with nonconvex control domain and a general state equation in which the control variable enters both the drift and the diffusion coefficients, and we establish necessary optimality conditions of the first-order with only one adjoint process.*

4.2 Sufficient optimality conditions for strict controls

We recall assumptions (4) and the adjoint equation (32).

Theorem 20 (*Sufficient optimality conditions for strict controls*). *If we assume that g and the map $x \mapsto H(t, x, v, p, P)$ are convex. Then, u is an optimal solution of the problem $\{(1), (2), (3)\}$, if it satisfies (33).*

Proof. Let u be a strict control (candidate to be optimal) such that the necessary optimality conditions for strict controls (33) hold. Then, we have

$$H(t, x_t^u, u_t, p_t^u, P_t^u) = \inf_{v_t \in U} H(t, x_t^u, v_t, p_t^u, P_t^u) \quad ; \quad a.e., a.s.$$

The controls u, v are elements of \mathcal{U} , then there exist $\mu, q \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$ such that

$$\mu = \delta_u, \quad q = \delta_v.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} x^\mu &= x^u, \\ \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) &= H(t, x_t^u, u_t, p_t^u, P_t^u), \\ \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) &= H(t, x_t^u, v_t, p_t^u, P_t^u). \end{aligned}$$

By the above equalities and the necessary optimality conditions for strict controls (33), we deduce that

$$\mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, \mu_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) = \inf_{q_t \in \delta(U)} \mathcal{H}(t, x_t^\mu, q_t, p_t^\mu, P_t^\mu) \quad ; \quad a.e., a.s.$$

Since H is convex in x , it is easy to see that \mathcal{H} is convex in x , and since g is convex, then from the sufficient optimality conditions for relaxed controls (Theorem 14), μ minimizes the cost J over $\delta(\mathcal{U})$.

By lemma 16, we deduce that u minimizes the cost J over \mathcal{U} . The theorem is proved. ■

Remark 21 *The sufficient optimality conditions for strict controls are proved without assuming neither the convexity of U nor that of H in v .*

Acknowledgement. The author thanks the referee who offered many useful remarks and suggestions that improved the first version of the paper.

References

- [1] V.I. Arkin, M.T. Saksonov (1979), *Necessary optimality conditions for stochastic differential equations*, Soviet. Math. Dokl. 20, pp 1-5.

- [2] S. Bahlali, B. Mezerdi and B. Djehiche, *Approximation and optimality necessary conditions in relaxed stochastic control problems*, Journal of Applied Mathematics and Stochastic Analysis, Volume 2006, pp 1-23.
- [3] S. Bahlali, B. Djehiche and B. Mezerdi, *The relaxed maximum principle in singular control of diffusions*, SIAM J. Control and Optim, 2007, Vol 46, Issue 2, pp 427-444.
- [4] H. Becker and V. Mandrekar, *On the existence of optimal random controls*, Journal of mathematics and mechanics, 18, 1969, No 12, pp 1151-1166.
- [5] A. Bensoussan, *Lecture on stochastic control. in non linear filtering and stochastic control*, Lecture notes in mathematics, 972. Proc. Cortona, Springer Verlag, 1981.
- [6] Cadenillas. A, Karatzas. I. (1995), *The stochastic maximum principle for linear convex optimal control with random coefficients*, SIAM J. Cont. Optim., Vol. 33, No 2, pp.590-624.
- [7] N. El Karoui, N. Huu Nguyen and N. Jeanblanc Piqué, *Compactification methods in the control of degenerate diffusions*, Stochastics, 1987, Vol. 20, pp 169-219.
- [8] Elliott. R.J. (1990), *The optimal control of diffusions*, Appl. Math. Optim., 22, pp.229-240.
- [9] Elliott. R.J, Kohlmann. M. (1994), *The second order minimum principle and adjoint process*. Stochastics and Stoch. Rep., Vol. 46, pp.25-39.
- [10] W.H. Fleming, *Generalized solutions in optimal stochastic control*, Differential games and control theory 2, (Kingston conference 1976), Lect. Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.30, 1978.
- [11] U.G. Haussmann, *General necessary conditions for optimal control of stochastic systems*, Math. Programming Studies 6, 1976, pp 30-48.
- [12] U.G. Haussmann, *A Stochastic maximum principle for optimal control of diffusions*, Pitman Research Notes in Math, 1986, Series 151.
- [13] U.G. Haussmann, *Existence of optimal Markovian controls for degenerate diffusions*, Stochastic differential systems, Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci, vol 78, Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp 171-186.
- [14] U.G. Haussmann and J.P. Lepeltier, *On the existence of optimal controls*, SIAM J. Control and Optim 28, 1990, No 4, pp 851-902.
- [15] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe, *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, 1989, Kodansha North Holland, 2nd Edition.

- [16] J. Jacod and J. Mémin, *Sur un type de convergence intermédiaire entre la convergence en loi et la convergence en probabilité*, Sem. Proba.XV, Lect. Notes in Math, 851, 1980, Springer Verlag.
- [17] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, 1989, Springer Verlag.
- [18] H.J. Kushner, *Necessary conditions for continuous parameter stochastic optimization problems*, SIAM J. Control Optim, Vol. 10, 1973, pp 550-565.
- [19] H.J. Kushner, *Existence results for optimal stochastic controls*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications 15, 1976, pp 347-359.
- [20] J. Ma and J. Yong, *Solvability of forward-backward SDEs and the nodal set of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*. A Chinese summary appears in Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. A 16 (1995), no. 4, 532. Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B 16 (1995), no. 3, pp 279-298.
- [21] B. Mezerdi and S. Bahlali, *Approximation in optimal control of diffusion processes*, Rand. Operat. and Stoch. Equ, 2000, Vol.8, No 4, pp 365-372.
- [22] B. Mezerdi and S. Bahlali, *Necessary conditions for optimality in relaxed stochastic control problems*, Stochastics And Stoch. Reports, 2002, Vol 73 (3-4), pp 201-218.
- [23] S. Peng, *A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems*, SIAM Jour.Cont. Optim, 1990, 28, N° 4, pp 966-979.
- [24] J. Yong and X.Y. Zhou, *Stochastic controls, Hamilton systems and HJB equations*, vol 43, Springer, New York, 1999.
- [25] X.Y. Zhou, *Sufficient conditions of optimality for stochastic systems with controllable diffusions*. IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, 1996, 41, pp 1176-1179.