

A criterion for the viability of stochastic semilinear control systems via the quasi-tangency condition

Goreac, Dan

Universit Paris-Est Marne-la-Valle, Laboratoire LAMA, UMR 8050, 5, boulevard Descartes, Cit Descartes - Champs-sur-Marne, 77454 Marne-la-Valle cedex 2

Abstract

In this paper we study a criterion for the viability of stochastic semilinear control systems on a real, separable Hilbert space. The necessary and sufficient condition is given using the notion of stochastic quasi-tangency. As a consequence, we prove that approximate viability and the viability property coincide for stochastic linear control systems. The paper generalizes recent results from the deterministic framework.

Key words: Viability, semilinear evolution, stochastic control, stochastic quasi-tangency

1 Introduction

We begin by introducing the basic notations and main assumptions. The spaces $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H)$, $(\Xi, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Xi)$ are separable real Hilbert spaces. We let $L_2^0(\Xi; H)$ be the space of Hilbert-Schmidt linear operators endowed with its usual norm. We consider a linear operator $A : D(A) \subset H \rightarrow H$ which generates a C_0 -semigroup of linear operators $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$. We let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a complete probability space. The process W will denote a cylindrical Wiener process with values in Ξ . The probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) is endowed with the natural, complete filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ generated by W . We consider $(G, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_G)$ a real separable Hilbert space and a bounded and closed subset $U \subset G$. For a finite time horizon $T > 0$, we let \mathcal{A} denote the space of all predictable processes $u : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow U$. We consider the coefficient functions $f : H \times U \rightarrow H$

Email address: dan.goreac@univ-mlv.fr (Goreac, Dan).

and $g : H \times U \rightarrow L_2^0(\Xi; H)$ such that, for some positive constant $c > 0$,

$$|f(x, u) - f(y, u)| + |g(x, u) - g(y, u)|_{L_2^0(\Xi; H)} \leq c|x - y|, \quad (\text{A1})$$

and

$$|f(x, u)| + |g(x, u)| \leq c(|x| + 1), \quad (\text{A2})$$

for all $x, y \in H$ and all $u \in U$.

Finally, we consider a closed and convex set $K \subset H$ and we let d_K be the distance function to the set K and π_K the projection onto K .

Given a stochastic control system

$$\begin{cases} dX^{t, \xi, u}(s) = \left(AX^{t, \xi, u}(s) + f\left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s)\right) \right) ds \\ + g\left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s)\right) dW_s, \text{ for all } s \in [t, T], \\ X^{t, \xi, u}(t) = \xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; H), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

the aim of this paper is to give a necessary and sufficient condition for which, for every $t \in [0, T]$, every $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; H)$, one can find an admissible control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$ such that the mild solution of (1) associated to u remains inside the set K , or, at least, in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of K . These properties are called viability, respectively ε -viability, and they have been extensively studied both in deterministic and stochastic setting. In the finite-dimensional deterministic framework, the first result on viability goes back to Nagumo [14] and it has been rediscovered several times in the late sixties. For stochastic finite-dimensional systems, the methods used to characterize viability rely either on stochastic contingent cones (e.g. [1], [2], [3], [12]) or on viscosity solutions (e.g. [5], [4], [6], [13]). We also recall [7] for a necessary condition for the viability of semilinear evolution systems using viscosity solutions of a class of fully nonlinear Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations in abstract Hilbert spaces.

Recently, the authors of [8], [9] and [10] have provided a characterization for the viability of (deterministic) multi-valued nonlinear evolutions on Banach spaces via the quasi-tangency condition. Our main objective is to extend the notion of quasi-tangency to the stochastic framework and to prove that it provides a necessary and sufficient criterion for the viability of stochastic semilinear control systems.

The paper is organized as follows: In the first section, we introduce the concept of quasi-tangency and state the main results. The second section is dedicated to the proof of the equivalence between stochastic quasi-tangency and the property of ε -viability for stochastic semilinear control systems. In the last section, two particular examples are considered. First, we prove that, for infinite-dimensional stochastic linear control systems, ε -viability and viability

coincide. Second, we give Nagumo's stochastic Theorem as a consequence of our main result.

2 Main result

Given $t \in [0, T]$ and an admissible control process $u \in \mathcal{A}$, we recall that an (\mathcal{F}_t) -predictable process $X^{t,\xi,u}$ with $E \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} |X^{t,\xi,u}(s)|^2 \right] < \infty$ is a mild solution of (1) if, for all $s \in [t, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} X^{t,\xi,u}(s) &= S(s-t)\xi + \int_t^s S(s-r) f(X^{t,\xi,u}(r), u(r)) dr \\ &\quad + \int_t^s S(s-r) g(X^{t,\xi,u}(r), u(r)) dW_r, \quad dP - a.s. \end{aligned}$$

Under the standard assumptions (A1) and (A2), there exists a unique mild solution of (1). For further results on mild solutions, the reader is referred to [11].

Let us introduce the concept of stochastic quasi-tangency.

Definition 1 (*Quasi-tangency condition*) *A closed, convex set $K \subset H$ satisfies the quasi-tangency condition with respect to the control system (1) if for every $t \in [0, T)$ and every $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$ we have*

$$\liminf_{h \searrow 0} \inf_{\zeta \in \mathcal{S}(t,h)\xi} \left[\frac{1}{h} E \left[|(1 - \pi_K)\zeta|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{h^2} E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} \left[|(1 - \pi_K)\zeta|^2 \right] \right|^2 \right] \right] = 0, \quad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(t, h)\xi &= \left\{ S(h)\xi + \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) f(\xi, u(s)) ds, \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) g(\xi, u(s)) dW_s, \quad u \in \mathcal{A} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2 *The term involving the conditional expectation in (2) corresponds to the deterministic quasi-tangency condition. The term $\frac{1}{h} E[d_K^2(\zeta)]$ is specific to the stochastic part of the equation (1).*

We recall the definitions of ε -viability and viability.

Definition 3 (a) *A nonempty, closed and convex set $K \subset H$ is called (mild) viable with respect to the control system (1) if, for every $t \in [0, T]$ and every initial condition $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$, there exists an admissible control process u such that*

$$X^{t,\xi,u}(s) \in K, \quad dP\text{-a.s., for all } s \in [t, T].$$

(b) A nonempty, closed and convex set $K \subset H$ is called (mild) ε -viable with respect to the control system (1) if, for every $t \in [0, T]$ and every initial condition $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$,

$$\inf_{u \in \mathcal{A}} \sup_{s \in [t, T]} E \left[d_K^2 \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s) \right) \right] = 0.$$

The main result of the paper is

Theorem 4 (Necessary and sufficient condition for ε -viability)

Let us suppose that (A1) and (A2) hold true. Moreover, we suppose that $K \subset H$ is a nonempty, closed and convex set. Then K is ε -viable with respect to the control system (1) if and only if it satisfies the quasi-tangency condition (2) with respect to the control system (1).

3 Proof of the main result

The following simple proposition provides a sequential formulation of the stochastic quasi-tangency condition.

Proposition 5 A nonempty, closed and convex set $K \subset H$ satisfies the quasi-tangency condition with respect to the control system (1) if and only if, for every $t \in [0, T)$ and every $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$, there exist a sequence of positive real constants $h_n \searrow 0$, a sequence of functions $p_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t+h_n}, P; H)$ and a sequence of admissible control processes $(u_n)_n$ such that the following assertions hold simultaneously:

(a) $\lim_n E \left[|p_n|^2 \right] = 0,$

(b) $\lim_n \frac{1}{h_n} E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [p_n] \right|^2 \right] = 0,$ and

(c) $S(h_n)\xi + \int_t^{t+h_n} S(t+h_n-s) f(\xi, u_n(s)) ds +$

$\int_t^{t+h_n} S(t+h_n-s) g(\xi, u_n(s)) dW_s + \sqrt{h_n} p_n \in K,$ dP -almost surely, for all n .

Proof. We only need to prove the necessity of conditions (a), (b) and (c). We consider $t \in [0, T]$ and a random variable $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$. If (2) holds true, then there exist some sequences $h_n \searrow 0$ and $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{h_n} E \left[|(1 - \pi_K) \zeta_n|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{h_n^2} E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [(1 - \pi_K) \zeta_n] \right|^2 \right] < n^{-1}, \quad (3)$$

for all $n \geq 1$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_n &= S(h_n)\xi + \int_t^{t+h_n} S(t+h_n-s)f(\xi, u_n(s))ds \\ &\quad + \int_t^{t+h_n} S(t+h_n-s)g(\xi, u_n(s))dW_s.\end{aligned}$$

For every $n \geq 1$, we let q_n be the \mathcal{F}_{t+h_n} -measurable random variable which is the projection of ζ_n on K and introduce

$$p_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_n}}(q_n - \zeta_n). \quad (4)$$

The inequality (3) implies

$$\frac{1}{h_n}E[|q_n - \zeta_n|^2] + \frac{1}{h_n^2}E\left[\left|E^{\mathcal{F}_t}[q_n - \zeta_n]\right|^2\right] < n^{-1}, \quad (5)$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Then, using (5), we deduce that the conditions (a) and (b) are also satisfied. The proof of the Proposition is now complete. ■

3.1 Necessary condition for the ε -viability property

Proof. (of the "only if" part in Theorem 3). We begin by proving that, whenever K enjoys the ε -viability property, it satisfies the quasi-tangency condition. We consider arbitrary $t \geq 0$, $h \in (0, 1)$ and $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$. If K enjoys the ε -viability property, then there exists an admissible control process u (which may depend on t , h and ξ) such that the mild solution of (1) issued from ξ and associated to u (denoted by $X^{t,\xi,u}$) satisfies

$$E\left[d_K^2\left(X^{t,\xi,u}(s)\right)\right] < h^3 \text{ for all } s \in [t, T].$$

Then there exists an \mathcal{F}_{t+h} -measurable random variable $\eta \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t+h}, P; K)$ such that

$$E\left[\left|X^{t,\xi,u}(t+h) - \eta\right|^2\right] < h^3. \quad (6)$$

Using the continuity property of the mild solution (see, for example Th. 9.9.1, DaPrato, Zabczyk [11]), we get

$$\sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} E\left[\left|X^{t,\xi,u}(s) - \xi\right|^2\right] \leq C\left(\sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} E\left[|S(s-t)\xi - \xi|^2\right] + h\right), \quad (7)$$

where C is a generic constant which may change from one line to another. This constant only depends on the Lipschitz coefficients and the time horizon $T > 0$ (but not on h). Using the Lipschitz continuity of f and g uniformly

with respect to the control and the inequality (7), one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} \left(E \left[\left| f \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - f(\xi, u(s)) \right|^2 \right] \right. \\
& \left. + E \left[\left| g \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - g(\xi, u(s)) \right|^2 \right] \right) \\
& \leq C \left(\sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} E \left[|S(s-t)\xi - \xi|^2 \right] + h \right). \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now introduce

$$\begin{aligned}
q_h &= \eta - S(h)\xi - \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) f(\xi, u(s)) ds \\
& \quad - \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) g(\xi, u(s)) dW_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (8) and (6) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[|q_h|^2 \right] \\
&= E \left[\left| \eta - X^{t, \xi, u}(t+h) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) \left[f \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - f(\xi, u(s)) \right] ds \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) \left[g \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - g(\xi, u(s)) \right] dW_s \right|^2 \Bigg] \\
&\leq C \left(E \left[\left| X^{t, \xi, u}(t+h) - \eta \right|^2 \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + E \left[\left| \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) \left[f \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - f(\xi, u(s)) \right] ds \right|^2 \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + E \left[\left| \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) \left[g \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - g(\xi, u(s)) \right] dW_s \right|^2 \right] \right) \\
&\leq C \left(h^3 + h^2 \sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} E \left[\left| f \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - f(\xi, u(s)) \right|^2 \right] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + h \sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} E \left[\left| g \left(X^{t, \xi, u}(s), u(s) \right) - g(\xi, u(s)) \right|^2 \right] \right) \\
&\leq Ch \left(\sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} E \left[|S(s-t)\xi - \xi|^2 \right] + h \right). \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we notice that

$$E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [q_h] = E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [\eta] - S(h)\xi - E^{\mathcal{F}_t} \left[\int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) f(\xi, u(s)) ds \right].$$

Thus, using Jensen's inequality and (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [q_h] \right|^2 \right] &\leq 2 \left(E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [\eta - X^{t,\xi,u}(t+h)] \right|^2 \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} \left[\int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) [f(X^{t,\xi,u}(s), u(s)) - f(\xi, u(s))] ds \right] \right|^2 \right] \right) \\
&\leq 2 \left(E \left[\left| X^{t,\xi,u}(t+h) - \eta \right|^2 \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E \left[\left| \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) [f(X^{t,\xi,u}(s), u(s)) - f(\xi, u(s))] ds \right|^2 \right] \right) \\
&\leq 2 \left(h^3 + h^2 \sup_{s \in [t, t+h]} E \left[|S(s-t)\xi - \xi|^2 \right] \right). \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

We introduce the \mathcal{F}_{t+h} -measurable random variable

$$p_h = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} q_h.$$

The inequalities (9) and (10) imply

$$E \left[|p_h|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{h} E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [p_h] \right|^2 \right] \leq C \left(\sup_{r \in [0, h]} E \left[|S(r)\xi - \xi|^2 \right] + h \right).$$

Using the strong continuity of $(S(r))_{r \geq 0}$ and a dominated convergence argument, we get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \left(E \left[|p_h|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{h} E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [p_h] \right|^2 \right] \right) = 0.$$

Also, by the choice of η and p_h ,

$$\begin{aligned}
S(h)\xi + \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) f(\xi, u(s)) ds \\
+ \int_t^{t+h} S(t+h-s) g(\xi, u(s)) dW_s + \sqrt{h} p_h = \eta \in K,
\end{aligned}$$

dP -almost surely. The proof is now complete. ■

3.2 Sufficient condition for the ε -viability property

In order to prove the converse, we introduce the notion of ε -approximate mild solution.

Definition 6 For every $0 \leq t \leq \tilde{T} \leq T$, every initial condition $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$ and every positive real constant ε , an ε -approximate mild solution of (1) defined on $[t, \tilde{T}]$ is a quintuple $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ such that

(a) the function $\sigma : [t, \tilde{T}] \longrightarrow [t, \tilde{T}]$ is non decreasing and such that

$$s - \varepsilon \leq \sigma(s) \leq s, \text{ for all } s \in [t, \tilde{T}].$$

(b) the process u is an admissible control process.

(c) the process $\varphi : [t, \tilde{T}] \longrightarrow H$ is predictable and such that

$$E \left[\int_t^{\tilde{T}} |\varphi(s)|^2 ds \right] \leq (\tilde{T} - t) \varepsilon.$$

(d) the process $\psi : [t, \tilde{T}] \longrightarrow L_2^0(\Xi; H)$ is predictable and such that

$$E \left[\int_t^{\tilde{T}} |\psi(s)|^2 ds \right] \leq (\tilde{T} - t) \varepsilon.$$

(e) the process $Y : [t, \tilde{T}] \longrightarrow H$ is predictable. Moreover, the process $Y_\sigma : [t, \tilde{T}] \longrightarrow H$ defined by

$$Y_\sigma(s) = Y(\sigma(s)), \text{ for all } s \in [t, \tilde{T}]$$

is predictable and

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= S(s-t)\xi + \int_t^s S(s-r) f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) dr \\ &\quad + \int_t^s S(s-r) g(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) dW_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^s \varphi(r) dr + \int_t^s \psi(r) dW_r, \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in [t, \tilde{T}]$.

(f) for all $s \in [t, \tilde{T}]$, $Y(\sigma(s)) \in K$, dP -almost surely and $Y(\tilde{T}) \in K$, dP -almost surely. Moreover,

$$E \left[|Y(\sigma(s)) - Y(s)|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon, \text{ for all } s \in [t, \tilde{T}].$$

Proposition 7 *We suppose that (A1) and (A2) hold true. If $t, \tilde{T} \in [0, T]$, such that $t \leq \tilde{T}$, $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ is a positive real constant and $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is an ε -approximate mild solution of (1), then*

$$\sup_{s \in [t, \tilde{T}]} E \left[|Y(s)|^2 \right] \leq C. \tag{11}$$

Here C is a positive real constant which only depends on T and ξ (but not on $t, \tilde{T}, \varepsilon$ nor on $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$).

Proof. Let us fix $s \in [t, \tilde{T}]$. In order to prove (11), one uses the conditions (c) and (d) in Definition 6 to have

$$\begin{aligned} E[|Y(s)|^2] &\leq C \left(E[|S(s-t)\xi|^2] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + E \left[\left(\int_t^s |S(s-r)f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))| dr \right)^2 \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + E \left[\int_t^s |S(s-r)g(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))|^2 dr \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon \right) = C(I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + \varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

To estimate I_1 , we use the properties of the semigroup $(S(r))_{0 \leq r \leq T}$ and obtain

$$I_1 \leq CE[|\xi|^2]. \quad (13)$$

For I_2 , we write

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq CE \left[\left(\int_t^s |f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))| dr \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq C(s-t) \int_t^s E[|f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))|^2] dr \\ &\leq C \left(\int_t^s E[|f(Y(r), u(r))|^2] dr \right) + \int_t^s E[|Y(r) - Y(\sigma(r))|^2] dr, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Using property (f) in Definition 6 and the assumption (A2), the inequality (14) yields

$$I_2 \leq C \left(\int_t^s E[|Y(r)|^2] dr + 1 \right). \quad (15)$$

Similar arguments allow to obtain

$$I_3 \leq C \left(\int_t^s E[|Y(r)|^2] dr + 1 \right). \quad (16)$$

We substitute (13), (15) and (16) in (12) to finally get

$$E[|Y(s)|^2] \leq C \left(1 + \int_t^s E[|Y(r)|^2] dr \right),$$

for all $s \in [t, \tilde{T}]$. The conclusion follows from Gronwall's inequality. ■

The following result proves further regularity properties of the Y component of an approximate mild solution.

Proposition 8 *If $t, \tilde{T} \in [0, T]$, such that $t \leq \tilde{T}$, the initial condition $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ is a positive real constant and $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is an ε -approximate mild solution of (1), then Y is mean-square continuous.*

Proof. We let $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ be an ε -approximate mild solution of (1) defined on $[t, \tilde{T}]$. Let us fix $s \in [t, \tilde{T}]$. For every $s \leq s'$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[|Y(s') - Y(s)|^2 \right] \\
& \leq C \left(E \left[|S(s' - s)\xi - \xi|^2 \right] \right. \\
& \quad + E \left[\left| \int_s^{s'} S(s' - r) f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) dr \right|^2 \right] \\
& \quad + E \left[\left| \int_t^s (S(s' - r) - S(s - r)) f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) dr \right|^2 \right] \\
& \quad + E \left[\left| \int_s^{s'} S(s' - r) g(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) dW_r \right|^2 \right] \\
& \quad + E \left[\left| \int_t^s (S(s' - r) - S(s - r)) g(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) dW_r \right|^2 \right] \\
& \quad \left. + E \left[\left| \int_s^{s'} \varphi(r) dr \right|^2 + \left| \int_s^{s'} \psi(r) dW_r \right|^2 \right] \right) \\
& = C (I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6) \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

The strong continuity of the semigroup S and a simple dominated convergence argument yield

$$\lim_{s' \searrow s} (I_1 + I_6) = 0. \tag{18}$$

For the term I_2 we use (A2) and (11) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 & \leq E \left[\left(\int_s^{s'} |S(s' - r) f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))| dr \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq CE \left[\left(\int_s^{s'} |f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))| dr \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq C(s' - s) E \left[\int_s^{s'} |f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))|^2 dr \right] \\
& \leq C(s' - s)^2 \sup_{r \in [t, \tilde{T}]} |f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))|^2 \\
& \leq C(s' - s)^2 \left(1 + \sup_{r \in [t, \tilde{T}]} E \left[|Y(r)|^2 \right] \right) \\
& \leq C(s' - s)^2. \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

Similar arguments allow to prove

$$I_4 \leq C(s' - s). \tag{20}$$

For the terms I_3 and I_4 we use the continuity of the semigroup S and a dominated convergence argument to finally get

$$\lim_{s' \searrow s} I_3 = 0 = \lim_{s' \searrow s} I_5. \quad (21)$$

Combining (17), (18), (19), (20) and (21), we prove the mean-square right-continuity of Y . Similar arguments give the left-continuity. The proof of the Proposition is now complete. ■

Lemma 9 *Let us suppose that (A1) and (A2) hold true and that $K \subset H$ is a nonempty, closed and convex set which satisfies the quasi-tangency condition with respect to the control system (1). Then, for every $t \in [0, T]$, every initial condition $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$, every time horizon $\tilde{T} \in [t, T]$ and for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists an ε -approximate mild solution of (1) $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ defined on $[t, \tilde{T}]$.*

Proof. Let us fix $t \in [0, T]$, $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$, $\tilde{T} \in [t, T]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. The proof of the Lemma will be given in three steps.

Step 1. We will first show the existence of an ε -approximate mild solution on some small interval $[t, t + \delta]$. We fix $\varepsilon' \in (0, \varepsilon)$. We will latter specify how ε' should be chosen. Using the quasi-tangency property of K , one gets the existence of some $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon')$, of an admissible control process u and of a random variable $p \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t+\delta}, P; H)$ such that

$$E[|p|^2] + \frac{1}{\delta} E\left[|E^{\mathcal{F}_t}[p]|^2\right] \leq \varepsilon'$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S(\delta)\xi + \int_t^{t+\delta} S(t+\delta-s)f(\xi, u(s))ds \\ + \int_t^{t+\delta} S(t+\delta-s)g(\xi, u(s))dW_s + \sqrt{\delta}p \in K, dP - \text{almost surely.} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We define the functions $\sigma : [t, t + \delta] \longrightarrow [t, t + \delta]$ by imposing $\sigma(s) = t$, for all $s \in [t, t + \delta]$. Using the martingale representation theorem for the random variable p , we get the existence of some $L_2^0(\Xi; H)$ -valued predictable process η , defined on $[t, t + \delta]$ such that

$$p = E^{\mathcal{F}_t}[p] + \int_t^{t+\delta} \eta_s dW_s, \quad dP - a.s.$$

We introduce $\varphi : [t, t + \delta] \longrightarrow H$ given by

$$\varphi(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} E^{\mathcal{F}_t}[p], \quad \text{for all } s \in [t, t + \delta],$$

and $\psi : [t, t + \delta] \rightarrow L_2^0(\Xi; H)$ given by

$$\psi(s) = \sqrt{\delta} \eta_s, \text{ for all } s \in [t, t + \delta].$$

Next, we define a process Y by imposing

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= S(s-t)\xi + \int_t^s S(s-r)f(\xi, u(r))dr \\ &\quad + \int_t^s S(s-r)g(\xi, u(r))dW_r + \int_t^s \varphi(r)dr + \int_t^s \psi(r)dW_r, \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in [t, t + \delta]$. We claim that $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is an ε -approximate mild solution. The conditions (a), (b) and (e) of Definition 6 are obviously satisfied. From the choice of p , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} &E[|p|^2] + \frac{1}{\delta}E\left[|E^{\mathcal{F}_t}[p]|^2\right] \\ &= E\left[|E^{\mathcal{F}_t}[p]|^2\right] + E\left[\int_t^{t+\delta} |\eta_s|^2 ds\right] + \frac{1}{\delta}E\left[|E^{\mathcal{F}_t}[p]|^2\right] \leq \varepsilon'. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the conditions (c) and (d) are also satisfied. Hence, we only need to check the last condition of Definition 6. To this purpose, we recall that $\delta < \varepsilon'$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} E[|Y(s) - \xi|^2] &\leq C\left(E[|S(s-t)\xi - \xi|^2] \right. \\ &\quad + E\left[\left(\int_t^s |S(s-r)f(\xi, u(r))| dr\right)^2\right] \\ &\quad + E\left[\int_t^s |S(s-r)g(\xi, u(r))|^2 dr\right] \\ &\quad \left. + E\left[\left(\int_t^s |\varphi(r)| dr\right)^2\right] + E\left[\int_t^s |\psi(r)|^2 dr\right]\right) \\ &\leq C\left(\sup_{r \in [0, \varepsilon']} E[|S(r)\xi - \xi|^2] + I_1 + I_2 + \varepsilon'\right), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

for all $s \in [t, t + \delta]$. Using (A2), we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= E\left[\int_t^s |S(s-r)g(\xi, u(r))|^2 dr\right] \leq C(s-t)\sup_{u \in U} E[|g(\xi, u)|^2] \\ &\leq C\varepsilon'(E[|\xi|^2] + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Similar estimates hold true for I_1 . We return to (23) and get

$$E[|Y(s) - \xi|^2] \leq C\left(\sup_{r \in [0, \varepsilon']} E[|S(r)\xi - \xi|^2] + \varepsilon'\right),$$

for all $s \in [t, t + \delta]$. The constant C may be chosen to depend only on T , ξ and the Lipschitz constant of f and g (but not on δ , nor ε'). Thus, by diminishing

the value of ε' , we may assume, without loss of generality, that

$$E \left[|Y(s) - \xi|^2 \right] \leq \varepsilon, \text{ for all } s \in [t, t + \delta].$$

By the choice of σ , $Y(\sigma(s)) = \xi \in K$, dP -almost surely, for all $s \in [t, t + \delta]$ and (22) implies that $Y(t + \delta) \in K$, dP -almost surely. It follows that the condition (f) is also satisfied and, thus, $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is an ε -approximate mild solution.

Step 2. To prove the existence of some approximate solution on the whole interval $[t, \tilde{T}]$, we use the following result, also known as the Brezis-Browder Theorem:

Theorem 10 *Let \mathcal{S} be a nonempty set, $\preceq \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ a preorder on \mathcal{S} and let $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be an increasing function. Suppose that each increasing sequence in \mathcal{S} is bounded from above. Then, for each $a_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists an \mathcal{N} -maximal element $a^* \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $a_0 \preceq a^*$.*

For proof of this result and further remarks, the reader is referred to Theorem 2.2.1 in [10] and references therein.

We now return to the proof of the Lemma. We introduce the set \mathcal{S} of all ε -approximate mild solutions defined on intervals of the form $[t, t + \alpha] \subset [t, \tilde{T}]$. On this set, we define the following preorder relation \preceq : given two ε -approximate mild solutions $(\sigma_1, u_1, \varphi_1, \psi_1, Y_1)$ defined on $[t, t + \alpha_1]$, respectively $(\sigma_2, u_2, \varphi_2, \psi_2, Y_2)$ defined on $[t, t + \alpha_2]$, we write

$$(\sigma_1, u_1, \varphi_1, \psi_1, Y_1) \preceq (\sigma_2, u_2, \varphi_2, \psi_2, Y_2)$$

if $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$, $u_1 = u_2$, $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2$, $\psi_1 = \psi_2$ on $[t, t + \alpha_1] \times \Omega$ up to an evanescent set. We consider an increasing arbitrary sequence in \mathcal{S}

$$\mathcal{L} = \{(\sigma_n, u_n, \varphi_n, \psi_n, Y_n) \text{ defined respectively on } [t, t + \alpha_n], n\}.$$

We define

$$\alpha = \sup_n \alpha_n.$$

If $\alpha = \alpha_n$ for some index, then the element $(\sigma_n, u_n, \varphi_n, \psi_n, Y_n)$ is an upper bound for \mathcal{L} . Otherwise, since σ_n are increasing functions satisfying (a), there exists the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \uparrow \sigma_n(\alpha_n) \in [t, t + \alpha].$$

This allows us to define an increasing function $\sigma : [t, t + \alpha] \rightarrow [t, t + \alpha]$ by setting

$$\sigma(s) = \begin{cases} \sigma_n(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha_n], \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \uparrow \sigma_n(t + \alpha_n), & \text{if } s = t + \alpha. \end{cases}$$

The function σ satisfies the condition (a) of Definition 6. We consider an element $u^0 \in U$ and introduce the control process

$$u(s) = 1_{[t, t+\alpha_n]}(s)u_n(s) + 1_{\{t+\alpha\}}(s)u^0,$$

for $s \in [t, t + \alpha]$. Next, we define

$$\varphi(s) = \begin{cases} \varphi_n(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha_n], \\ 0, & \text{if } s = t + \alpha. \end{cases}$$

and

$$\psi(s) = \begin{cases} \psi_n(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha_n], \\ 0, & \text{if } s = t + \alpha. \end{cases}$$

For every n , one can extend φ_n on $[t, t + \alpha]$ by setting

$$\varphi_n(s) = 0, \text{ for all } s \in (t + \alpha_n, t + \alpha].$$

Then φ is the pointwise limit of φ_n (except for an evanescent set). Thus, φ is predictable. Property (c) of ε -approximate mild solutions yields

$$E \left[\int_t^{t+\alpha} |\varphi_n(s)|^2 ds \right] \leq \alpha_n \varepsilon, \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then, by Fatou's lemma, one gets

$$E \left[\int_t^{t+\alpha} |\varphi(s)|^2 ds \right] \leq \alpha \varepsilon, \tag{24}$$

and the condition (c) holds for φ . Moreover, a simple dominated convergence argument proves that $\varphi_n \rightarrow_n \varphi$ in $L^2(\Omega; H)$. The condition (d) follows in the same way. We recall that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_n(t + \alpha_n) &= S(\alpha_n) \xi + \int_t^{t+\alpha_n} 1_{[t, t+\alpha_n]}(r) S(t + \alpha_n - r) f(Y_n(\sigma_n(r)), u_n(r)) dr \\ &\quad + \int_t^{t+\alpha_n} 1_{[t, t+\alpha_n]}(r) S(t + \alpha_n - r) g(Y_n(\sigma_n(r)), u_n(r)) dW_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^{t+\alpha_n} 1_{[t, t+\alpha_n]}(r) \varphi_n(r) dr + \int_t^{t+\alpha_n} 1_{[t, t+\alpha_n]}(r) \psi_n(r) dW_r. \end{aligned}$$

We also recall that (11) holds true for every $(\sigma_n, u_n, \varphi_n, \psi_n, Y_n)$. Then, a simple dominated convergence argument allows us to obtain the existence of the limit

$$\lim_n Y_n(t + \alpha_n) \text{ in } L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t+\alpha}, P; H).$$

Moreover, since K is closed, the limit lies in K dP -almost surely. We can now define

$$Y(s) = \begin{cases} Y_n(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha_n], \\ \lim_n Y_n(t + \alpha_n), & \text{if } s = t + \alpha. \end{cases}$$

We notice that, whenever $\sigma(t + \alpha) > \sigma(t + \alpha_n)$, for all $n \geq 1$, by the continuity of Y , the process Y_σ can be seen as the pointwise limit of the sequence

$$Y_n(\sigma_n(\cdot)) 1_{[t, t + \alpha_n]}(\cdot) + Y(\sigma_n(t + \alpha_n)) 1_{(t + \alpha_n, t + \alpha]}(\cdot).$$

Thus, Y_σ is predictable.

Let us check the condition (f) of Definition 6. We need to show that $Y(\sigma(s)) \in K$, dP -a.s. and for all $s \in [t, t + \alpha]$. If $s \leq t + \alpha_n$ for some n , then $Y(\sigma(s)) \in K$, dP -a.s. Otherwise, using the fact that $\sigma(t + \alpha) = \lim_n \sigma_n(t + \alpha_n)$, and Y is mean-square continuous, we get $Y(\sigma(t + \alpha)) \in K$, dP -a.s. In order to prove that $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is an ε -approximate mild solution on $[t, t + \alpha]$ one only needs to verify

$$E[|Y(s) - Y(\sigma(s))|^2] \leq \varepsilon,$$

for all $s \in [t, t + \alpha]$. If $s \leq t + \alpha_n$ for some n , we have nothing to prove. We recall that

$$E[|Y(t + \alpha_n) - Y(\sigma(t + \alpha_n))|^2] \leq \varepsilon,$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Using the definition of Y and σ and the continuity of Y , we also get

$$E[|Y(t + \alpha) - Y(\sigma(t + \alpha))|^2] \leq \varepsilon.$$

It follows that $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is an ε -approximate mild solution on $[t, t + \alpha]$ and an upper bound for \mathcal{L} . We introduce the increasing function

$$\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \text{ given by } \mathcal{N}((\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)) = \alpha,$$

whenever $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is defined on $[t, t + \alpha]$. We apply the Brezis-Browder Theorem to obtain the existence of an \mathcal{N} -maximal element of \mathcal{S} denoted by $(\sigma^*, u^*, \varphi^*, \psi^*, Y^*)$ and defined on $[t, t + \alpha^*]$.

Step 3. We claim that $t + \alpha^* = \tilde{T}$. Let us assume, for the moment, that $t + \alpha^* < \tilde{T}$. By definition, $Y^*(t + \alpha^*) \in K$ dP -a.s. We recall that K satisfies the quasi-tangency condition with respect to the control system (1). Therefore, for every $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ there exists $0 < \delta^* \leq \min\{\tilde{T} - t - \alpha^*, \varepsilon'\}$, $p^* \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t + \alpha^* + \delta^*}, P; H)$ and an admissible control process \tilde{u} such that

$$E[|p^*|^2] + \frac{1}{\delta^*} E\left[\left|E^{\mathcal{F}_{t + \alpha^*}}[p^*]\right|^2\right] \leq \varepsilon', \text{ and} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& S(\delta^*)Y^*(t + \alpha^*) + \int_{t+\alpha^*}^{t+\alpha^*+\delta^*} S(t + \alpha^* + \delta^* - s) f(Y^*(t + \alpha^*), \tilde{u}(s)) ds \\
& + \int_{t+\alpha^*}^{t+\alpha^*+\delta^*} S(t + \alpha^* + \delta^* - s) g(Y^*(t + \alpha^*), \tilde{u}(s)) dW_s + \sqrt{\delta^*}p^* \in K, \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

dP -almost surely. The martingale representation theorem yields the existence of some predictable process η^* defined on $[t + \alpha^*, t + \alpha^* + \delta^*]$ such that

$$p^* = E^{F_{t+\alpha^*}} [p^*] + \int_{t+\alpha^*}^{t+\alpha^*+\delta^*} \eta_s^* dW_s.$$

We introduce the functions

$$\sigma(s) = \begin{cases} \sigma^*(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha^*], \\ t + \alpha^*, & \text{if } s \in (t + \alpha^*, t + \alpha^* + \delta^*], \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

$$u(s) = \begin{cases} u^*(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha^*], \\ \tilde{u}(s), & \text{if } s \in (t + \alpha^*, t + \alpha^* + \delta^*], \end{cases}$$

$$\varphi(s) = \begin{cases} \varphi^*(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha^*], \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta^*}} E^{F_{t+\alpha^*}} [p^*], & \text{if } s \in (t + \alpha^*, t + \alpha^* + \delta^*], \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

$$\psi(s) = \begin{cases} \psi^*(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha^*], \\ \sqrt{\delta^*} \eta_s, & \text{if } s \in (t + \alpha^*, t + \alpha^* + \delta^*]. \end{cases}$$

and

$$Y(s) = \begin{cases} Y^*(s), & \text{if } s \in [t, t + \alpha^*], \\ S(s - t - \alpha^*)Y^*(t + \alpha^*) + \int_{t+\alpha^*}^s S(s - r) f(Y^*(t + \alpha^*), u(r)) dr \\ \quad + \int_{t+\alpha^*}^s S(s - r) g(Y^*(t + \alpha^*), u(r)) dW_r + \int_{t+\alpha^*}^s \varphi(r) dr \\ \quad + \int_{t+\alpha^*}^s \psi(r) dW_r, & \text{if } s \in (t + \alpha^*, t + \alpha^* + \delta^*]. \end{cases}$$

It suffices now to choose ε' as in Step 1 to prove that $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ is an element of \mathcal{S} . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\sigma^*, u^*, \varphi^*, \psi^*, Y^*) \preceq (\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y) \text{ and} \\
& \mathcal{N}((\sigma^*, u^*, \varphi^*, \psi^*, Y^*)) < \mathcal{N}((\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)).
\end{aligned}$$

This inequalities come in contradiction with the initial assumption of

$(\sigma^*, u^*, \varphi^*, \psi^*, Y^*)$ being maximal. We deduce that $(\sigma^*, u^*, \varphi^*, \psi^*, Y^*)$ is an ε -approximate mild solution defined on $[t, \tilde{T}]$ and this completes the proof of our Lemma. ■

Using this result, we are now able to prove that the quasi-tangency condition (2) is sufficient for ε -viability.

Proof. (of the "if" part in Theorem 3). We assume that K satisfies the quasi-tangency condition. Let us fix $t \in [0, T]$, $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We apply the previous Lemma and get the existence of an ε -approximate mild solution of (1) denoted $(\sigma, u, \varphi, \psi, Y)$ which is defined on $[t, T]$. From the definition of ε -approximate mild solutions,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= S(s-t)\xi + \int_t^s S(s-r)f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))dr \\ &\quad + \int_t^s S(s-r)g(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r))dW_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^s \varphi(r)dr + \int_t^s \psi(r)dW_r, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

$dP - a.s.$, for all $s \in [t, T]$, $Y(\sigma(s)) \in K$, dP -almost surely, for all $s \in [t, T]$ and $Y(T) \in K$, dP -almost surely. Moreover,

$$E[|Y(\sigma(s)) - Y(s)|^2] \leq \varepsilon, \tag{30}$$

for all $s \in [t, T]$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E[d_K^2(X^{t,\xi,u}(s))] &\leq E[|X^{t,\xi,u}(s) - Y(\sigma(s))|^2] \\ &\leq E[|Y(s) - Y(\sigma(s))|^2] + E[|X^{t,\xi,u}(s) - Y(s)|^2], \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

for all $s \in [t, T]$. Next, in order to estimate $E[|X^{t,\xi,u}(s) - Y(s)|^2]$, we use

$$\begin{aligned} &E[|X^{t,\xi,u}(s) - Y(s)|^2] \\ &\leq C \left(E \left[\left| \int_t^s S(s-r) \left(f(Y(r), u(r)) - f(X^{t,\xi,u}(r), u(r)) \right) dr \right|^2 \right] \right. \\ &\quad + E \left[\left| \int_t^s S(s-r) \left(f(Y(r), u(r)) - f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) \right) dr \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + E \left[\left| \int_t^s S(s-r) \left(g(Y(r), u(r)) - g(X^{t,\xi,u}(r), u(r)) \right) dW_r \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad + E \left[\left| \int_t^s S(s-r) \left(f(Y(r), u(r)) - f(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) \right) dW_r \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad \left. + E \left[\left| \int_t^s \varphi(s) ds \right|^2 \right] + E \left[\left| \int_t^s \psi(s) dW_s \right|^2 \right] \right) \\ &= C(I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6), \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

for all $s \in [t, T]$. In order to estimate I_1 , we use Hölder's inequality and the Lipschitz property of f , and get

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq CE \left[\left(\int_t^s |Y(r) - X^{t,\xi,u}(r)| dr \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq C(s-t) \int_t^s E \left[|Y(r) - X^{t,\xi,u}(r)|^2 \right] dr. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

For I_2 , similar arguments combined with (30) yield

$$I_2 \leq C\varepsilon. \quad (34)$$

The Lipschitz property of g gives

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= E \left[\int_t^s |S(s-r) (g(Y(\sigma(r)), u(r)) - g(X^{t,\xi,u}(r), u(r)))|^2 dr \right] \\ &\leq C \int_t^s E \left[|Y(r) - X^{t,\xi,u}(r)|^2 \right] dr \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

and

$$I_4 \leq C\varepsilon \quad (36)$$

For the last terms $I_{5,6}$ it suffices to recall properties (c) and (d) of Definition 6 and get

$$I_5 + I_6 \leq C\varepsilon. \quad (37)$$

We substitute the estimates (33), (34), (35), (36) and (37) in (32) to obtain

$$E \left[|X^{t,\xi,u}(s) - Y(s)|^2 \right] \leq C \left(\varepsilon + \int_t^s E \left[|Y(r) - X^{t,\xi,u}(r)|^2 \right] dr \right),$$

for all $s \in [t, T]$. Then, applying Gronwall's inequality, we have

$$E \left[|X^{t,\xi,u}(s) - Y(s)|^2 \right] \leq C\varepsilon, \quad (38)$$

for all $s \in [t, T]$. We substitute (30) and (38) in (31) to finally get

$$E \left[d_K^2(X^{t,\xi,u}(s)) \right] \leq C\varepsilon,$$

for all $s \in [t, T]$. The conclusion follows by recalling that C can be chosen independent of ε and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary. The proof of the main result is now complete. ■

4 Applications

4.1 The linear case

Let us now consider the following particular case of the control system (1):

$$\begin{cases} dX^{t,\xi,u}(s) = \left(AX^{t,\xi,u}(s) + Bu(s) \right) ds + \left(CX^{t,\xi,u}(s) + Du(s) \right) dW_s, \\ \text{for } s \in [t, T], \\ X^{t,\xi,u}(t) = \xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; H), \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

where A is a linear unbounded operator on H that generates a C_0 -semigroup of linear operators $(S(t))_{t \geq 0}$, $B \in \mathcal{L}(G; H)$, C is an $L^0_2(\Xi; H)$ -valued linear bounded operator on H and D is an $L^0_2(\Xi; H)$ -valued linear bounded operator on G . We also suppose that $U \subset G$ is closed, bounded and

$$U \text{ is a convex subset of } G. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Remark 11 *If the assumption (A3) holds true, the space of admissible control processes \mathcal{A} is convex. As a consequence, \mathcal{A} is a closed subspace of $L^2([t, T] \times \Omega; E)$ with respect to the weak topology on $L^2([t, T] \times \Omega; E)$.*

It is obvious that viability implies ε -viability for a closed set $K \subset H$. For the particular case of a linear control system we will prove that the quasi-tangency condition is a sufficient condition not only for the ε -viability, but also for the viability property of an arbitrary nonempty, closed and convex set $K \subset H$. Hence, viability and ε -viability of closed, convex sets are equivalent with respect to a linear control system. The main result of this section is

Theorem 12 *Let us suppose that (A1) and (A2) hold true. Moreover, we suppose that $K \subset H$ is a nonempty, closed and convex set that satisfies the quasi-tangency condition with respect to the control system (39). Then K is viable with respect to the control system (39).*

Proof. Let us fix $t \in [0, T)$ and $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$. For every $n \geq 2$, Lemma 8 gives the existence of an n^{-1} -approximate mild solution

$(\sigma_n, u_n, \varphi_n, \psi_n, Y_n)$ defined on $[t, T]$. Then, for all $s \in [t, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_n(s) = & S(s-t)\xi + \int_t^s S(s-r)Bu_n(r)dr + \int_t^s S(s-r)CY_n(\sigma_n(r))dW_r \\ & + \int_t^s S(s-r)Du_n(r)dW_r + \int_t^s \varphi_n(r)dr + \int_t^s \psi_n(r)dW_r, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

for all $n \geq 2$. We apply the estimates of Proposition 6 and get that

$$\sup_{n \geq 2} \sup_{s \in [t, T]} E \left[|Y_n(s)|^2 \right] \leq c,$$

for a generic constant c . Moreover, since U is bounded,

$$\sup_{n \geq 2} \sup_{s \in [t, T]} E \left[|u_n(s)|^2 \right] \leq c.$$

The above estimate, together with the assumption (A3), allow to find a subsequence (still denoted by (Y_n, u_n)), a process $Y \in L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$ and an admissible control process u such that $(Y_n, u_n) \rightarrow (Y, u)$ in the weak topology on

$$L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H \times U)).$$

Step 1. We begin by showing that Y can be identified with $X^{t, \xi, u}$ (the unique mild solution of (39) starting from ξ and associated to the control process u). We make the following notations

$$\begin{aligned} M_s^{1,n} &= \int_t^s S(s-r) B u_n(r) dr, & M_s^1 &= \int_t^s S(s-r) B u(r) dr, \\ M_s^{2,n} &= \int_t^s S(s-r) C Y_n(\sigma_n(r)) dW_r, & M_s^2 &= \int_t^s S(s-r) C Y(r) dW_r, \\ M_s^{3,n} &= \int_t^s S(s-r) D u_n(r) dW_r, & M_s^3 &= \int_t^s S(s-r) D u(r) dW_r, \\ M_s^{4,n} &= \int_t^s \varphi_n(r) dr + \int_t^s \psi_n(r) dW_r, & & \text{for all } s \in [t, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Let us fix $\phi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_s, P; H)$. Using the weak convergence of (u_n) , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\langle M_s^{1,n}, \phi \rangle \right] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\int_t^s \langle S(s-r) B u_n(r), \phi \rangle dr \right] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\int_t^s \langle u_n(r), B^* S^*(s-r) \phi \rangle dr \right] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\int_t^s \langle u_n(r), B^* S^*(s-r) \phi \rangle dr \right] \\ &= E \left[\langle M_s^1, \phi \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $\Phi \in L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$ is an (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted process, the previous inequality, combined with a dominated convergence argument, allows to prove that

$$\lim_n E \left[\int_t^T \langle M_s^{1,n}, \Phi(s) \rangle ds \right] = E \left[\int_t^T \langle M_s^1, \Phi(s) \rangle ds \right].$$

Since Φ is arbitrary, this proves that $M^{1,n}$ converges in the weak topology on $L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$ to M^1 . Using condition (f) in the Definition 6 of approx-

imate mild solutions, we get

$$\sup_{s \in [t, T]} E \left[|Y_n(s) - Y_n(\sigma_n(s))|^2 \right] \leq n^{-1}.$$

Thus, in order to prove that $M^{2,n}$ converges in the weak topology on

$L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$ to M^2 , one can replace $M^{2,n}$ by the process $N^{2,n}$ given by

$$N_s^{2,n} = \int_t^s S(s-r) C Y_n(r) dW_r, \text{ for all } s \in [t, T].$$

If $\phi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_s, P; H)$, using the martingale representation theorem we prove

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\langle N_s^{2,n}, \phi \rangle \right] = E \left[\langle M_s^2, \phi \rangle \right].$$

Using, as before, the dominated convergence theorem, we get that $N^{2,n}$ converges in the weak topology on $L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$ to M^2 . Similar arguments allow to prove that $M^{3,n}$ converges in the weak topology on

$L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$ to M^3 . The conditions (c) and (d) in the Definition 6 of approximate mild solutions imply that $M^{4,n}$ converges strongly to 0 on $L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$. It follows that the limit (Y, u) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Y(s) &= S(s-t)\xi + \int_t^s S(s-r) B u(r) dr + \int_t^s S(s-r) C Y(r) dW_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^s S(s-r) D u(r) dW_r. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

This equation is, a priori, satisfied $dPds$ -almost everywhere. We may now identify Y with its continuous version $X^{t, \xi, u}$.

Step 2. We claim that $Y_s \in K$ $dPds$ -almost everywhere on $\Omega \times [t, T]$. Indeed, let us consider the following application $\gamma : L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\gamma(Z) = E \left[\int_t^T d_K^2(Z(s)) ds \right].$$

Obviously, this application is convex. Using the fact that Y_n converges in the weak topology on $L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$ to Y , one finds a sequence of convex combinations of (Y_n) , denoted by Z_n , which converges strongly to Y in $L^2([t, T]; L^2(\Omega; H))$. For every $n \geq 2$,

$$\gamma(Y_n) \leq E \left[\int_t^T |Y_n(s) - Y_n(\sigma(s))|^2 ds \right] \leq T n^{-1}.$$

Thus, using the convexity of γ , one can assume, without loss of generality, that

$$\gamma(Z_n) \leq n^{-1}, \quad (42)$$

for all $n \geq 2$. Then

$$\gamma(Y) \leq 2 \left(\gamma(Z_n) + E \left[\int_t^T |Y(s) - Z_n(s)|^2 ds \right] \right).$$

We let $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the last inequality. Due to (42) and to the strong convergence of Z_n to Y , one has

$$\gamma(Y) = 0.$$

In other words, $Y(s) \in K$, $dPds$ - almost everywhere on $\Omega \times [t, T]$. The conclusion follows from the continuity of Y . ■

4.2 Nagumo's stochastic theorem

We consider $F : H \rightarrow H$ and $G : H \rightarrow L_2^0(\Xi; H)$ such that, for some positive constant $c > 0$,

$$|F(x) - F(y)| + |G(x) - G(y)|_{L_2^0(\Xi; H)} \leq c|x - y|, \quad (\text{A1}')$$

for all $x, y \in H$. We consider the stochastic semilinear equation

$$\begin{cases} dX^{t,\xi,u}(s) = \left(AX^{t,\xi,u}(s) + F(X^{t,\xi,u}(s)) \right) ds \\ \quad + G(X^{t,\xi,u}(s)) dW_s, \text{ for all } s \in [t, T], \\ X^{t,\xi,u}(t) = \xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; H), \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

Theorem 13 (Nagumo's stochastic theorem) *A closed, convex set $K \subset H$ is ε -viable with respect to (43) if and only if, for every $t \in [0, T]$ and every $\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, P; K)$, there exist a sequence $h_n \searrow 0$ and a sequence of random variables $p_n \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t+h_n}, P; H)$ such that*

$$E[|p_n|^2] + \frac{1}{h_n} E \left[\left| E^{\mathcal{F}_t} [p_n] \right|^2 \right] \leq n^{-1}$$

and $S(h_n)\xi + h_n F(\xi) + G(\xi)(W_{t+h_n} - W_t) + \sqrt{h_n} p_n \in K$, dP -almost surely, for all n .

References

- [1] J.,-P., Aubin, *Viability Theory*, Birkhäuser (1992).

- [2] J.-P., Aubin, G., Da Prato, Stochastic viability and invariance, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Pisa* 27 (1990), pp. 595-694.
- [3] J.-P., Aubin, H., Frankowska, *Set-valued analysis, Systems& Control: Foundations& Applications*, vol. 2. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA (1990).
- [4] R., Buckdahn, P., Cardaliaguet, M., Quincampoix, *A representation formula for the mean-curvature motion*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 33 (2001), pp. 827-846.
- [5] R., Buckdahn, S., Peng, M., Quincampoix, C., Rainer, *Existence of stochastic control under state constraints*, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math.* 327 (1998), pp. 17-22.
- [6] R., Buckdahn, M., Quincampoix, A., Rascanu, *Viability property for backward stochastic differential equation and applications to partial differential equations*, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 116(2000), pp. 485-504.
- [7] R., Buckdahn, M., Quincampoix, G., Tessitore, *Controlled stochastic differential equations under constraints in infinite dimensional spaces*. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 47 (2008), no. 1, pp. 218–250.
- [8] O., Carja, I.I., Vrabie, *Some new viability results for semilinear differential inclusions*, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 4(1997), pp. 401-424.
- [9] O., Carja, M., Necula, I.I., Vrabie, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for viability for semilinear differential inclusions*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 361 (2009), pp. 343-390.
- [10] O., Carja, M., Necula, I.I., Vrabie, *Viability, Invariance and Applications*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies (2007).
- [11] G., Da Prato, J., Zabczyk, *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1992).
- [12] S., Gautier, L., Thibault, *Viability for constrained stochastic differential equations*, *Differential Integral Equations* 6 (1993), pp. 433-466.
- [13] D., Goreac, *Non-compact-valued stochastic control under state constraints*, *Bull. Sci. Math.*, vol. 131, no8 (2007), pp. 716-737.
- [14] M., Nagumo, *Über die Lage der Integralkurven gewöhnlicher Differentialgleichungen*, *Proc. Phys. Math. Soc. Japan*, 24 (1942), pp. 551-559.