

Numerical analysis of a Neumann boundary control problem with a stochastic parabolic equation

Qin Zhou^{1,2} & Binjie Li^{1,*}

¹*School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, China;*

²*School of Mathematics, China West Normal University, Nanchong 637002, China*

Email: zhouqinmath@stu.scu.edu.cn, libinjie@scu.edu.cn

Received May 9, 2021; accepted August 30, 2022

Abstract This paper analyzes the discretization of a Neumann boundary control problem with a stochastic parabolic equation, where an additive noise occurs in the Neumann boundary condition. The convergence is established for general filtration, and the convergence rate $O(\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon})$ is derived for the natural filtration of the Q -Wiener process.

Keywords Neumann boundary control, stochastic parabolic equation, Q -Wiener process, boundary noise, discretization, convergence

MSC(2020) 65C30, 65K10

Citation: Qin Zhou, Binjie Li. Numerical analysis of a Neumann boundary control problem with a stochastic parabolic equation. *Sci China Math*, 2022, , <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11425-000-0000-0>

1 Introduction

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a given complete probability space with a normal filtration $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ (i.e., \mathbb{F} is right-continuous and \mathcal{F}_0 contains all \mathbb{P} -null sets in \mathcal{F}). Assume that $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d = 2, 3$) is a convex polygonal domain with the boundary Γ . Let W be a Q -Wiener process in $L^2(\Gamma)$ of the form

$$W(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\lambda_n} \beta_n(t) \phi_n, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where the following conditions hold: $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of strictly positive numbers satisfying $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n < \infty$; $\{\phi_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Gamma)$; $\{\beta_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of real valued Brownian motions defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, mutually independent and \mathbb{F} -adapted. We consider the following model problem:

$$\min_{u \in U_{\text{ad}}} \mathcal{J}(u, y) := \frac{1}{2} \|y - y_d\|_{L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})))}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)))}^2, \quad (1.1)$$

subject to the state equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} y(t, x) - \Delta y(t, x) + y(t, x) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathcal{O}, \\ \partial_n y(t, x) = u(t, x) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n^{1/2} (\sigma(t) \phi_n)(x) \frac{d\beta_n(t)}{dt}, & 0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \Gamma, \\ y(0, x) = 0, & x \in \mathcal{O}, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

* Corresponding author

where $0 < \nu, T < \infty$, y_d and σ are two given processes, and \mathbf{n} is the outward unit normal vector to Γ . The above admissible space U_{ad} is defined by

$$U_{\text{ad}} := \{u \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))) \mid u_* \leq u \leq u^*\},$$

where $u_* < u^*$ are two given constants.

In the past four decades, a considerable number of papers have been published in the field of optimal control problems of stochastic partial differential equations; see [2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21, 27, 28, 34, 38] and the references therein. By now it is still a highly active research area. However, the numerical analysis of stochastic parabolic optimal control problems is quite rare. The numerical analysis of stochastic parabolic optimal control problems consists of two main challenges. The first is to derive convergence rate for rough data. To keep the co-state \mathbb{F} -adapted, the adjoint equation has a correction term $z(t) dW(t)$. The process z is of low temporal regularity for rough data, and this makes the convergence rate difficult to derive. Here we especially emphasize the case that the filtration is not the natural one of the Wiener process. Since in this case the martingale representation theorem can not be utilized, generally there is essential difficulty in analyzing the adjoint equation of the stochastic optimal control problems; see [27]. The second is to design efficient fully implementable algorithms. Generally, the discretization of the adjoint equation will be used for the construction of an efficient algorithm for a parabolic optimal control problem. The adjoint equation of a stochastic optimal control problem is a backward stochastic parabolic equation. To solve a backward parabolic equation requires computing a conditional expectation at each time step. However, computing conditional expectations is a challenging problem; see [1, 3, 14, 26] and the references therein.

We briefly summarize the numerical analysis of stochastic parabolic optimal control problems in the literature as follows. Dunst and Prohl [10] analyzed a spatial semi-discretization of a forward-backward stochastic heat equation, and, using the least squares Monte-Carlo method to compute the conditional expectations, they constructed two fully implementable algorithms. Levajković et al. [22] presented an approximation framework for computing the solution of the stochastic linear quadratic control problem on Hilbert spaces; however, the time variable is not discretized in this framework. Recently, Prohl and Wang [32, 33] analyzed numerically the distributed optimal control problems of stochastic heat equation driven by additive and multiplicative noises, and Li and Zhou [25] analyzed a distributed optimal control problem of a stochastic parabolic equation driven by multiplicative noise. Li and Xie [23, 24] analyzed the discretizations of general stochastic linear quadratic control problems. We also refer the reader to [15] and the references therein for the numerical analysis of optimal control problems governed by stochastic differential equations, and refer the reader to [5, 19] and the references therein for the numerical analysis of optimal control problems governed by random partial differential equations. The above works of stochastic parabolic optimal control problems generally require that \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of the Wiener process, and, to our best knowledge, no numerical result is available for the stochastic parabolic optimal control problems with boundary noises.

Since the noise is additive and the state equation is linear, we essentially use a backward parabolic equation parameterized by the argument $\omega \in \Omega$ as the adjoint equation, instead of using the backward stochastic parabolic equation. This enables us to establish the convergence of the discrete stochastic optimal control problem for general filtration, which is the main novelty of our theoretical results. Furthermore, under the condition that \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$, we mainly use the mild solution theory of the backward stochastic parabolic equations to derive the convergence rate $O(\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon})$ for the rough data $y_d \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathcal{O})))$ and

$$\sigma \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}^0_2)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{L}^0_2)),$$

where ϵ is a sufficiently small number. Our numerical analysis can be easily extended to the distributed optimal control problems governed by linear stochastic parabolic equations with additive noise and general filtration. When the filtration is the natural one of the Q -Wiener process, our analysis can remove the restrictions on the data imposed in [33].

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce some notations and the first-order optimality condition of problem (1.1). In section 3 we present a discrete stochastic optimal control

problem, and in section 4 we prove the convergence of this discrete stochastic optimal control problem. Finally, in section 5 we conclude this paper.

2 Preliminaries

Conventions. For any random variable v defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, $\mathbb{E}v$ denotes the expectation of v , and $\mathbb{E}_t v$ denotes the conditional expectation of v with respect to \mathcal{F}_t for any $t > 0$. We use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Gamma}$ to denote the inner products of $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ and $L^2(\Gamma)$, respectively, and use $[\cdot, \cdot]$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to denote the inner products of $L^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathcal{O}))$ and $L^2(\Omega; L^2(\Gamma))$, respectively. The notation I denotes the identity mapping. For any Hilbert space X , we simply use $\|\cdot\|_X$ to denote the norm of the Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega; X)$. For any two separable Hilbert spaces X_1 and X_2 , $\mathcal{L}(X_1, X_2)$ denotes the set of all bounded linear operators from X_1 to X_2 , and $\mathcal{L}_2(X_1, X_2)$ denotes the set of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators from X_1 to X_2 . Define

$$L_{\lambda}^2 := \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \sqrt{\lambda_n} \phi_n \mid \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n^2 < \infty \right\}$$

and endow this space with the inner product

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \sqrt{\lambda_n} \phi_n, \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n \sqrt{\lambda_n} \phi_n \right)_{L_{\lambda}^2} := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n d_n$$

for all $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \sqrt{\lambda_n} \phi_n, \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n \sqrt{\lambda_n} \phi_n \in L_{\lambda}^2$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}_2(L_{\lambda}^2, L^2(\Gamma))$ is abbreviated to \mathcal{L}_2^0 . For any separable Hilbert space X , define

$$L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; X)) := \left\{ \varphi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow X \mid \varphi \text{ is } \mathbb{F}\text{-progressively measurable and} \right. \\ \left. \|\varphi\|_{L^2(0, T; X)} < \infty \right\},$$

and let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}}$ be the $L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; X))$ -orthogonal projection onto $L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; X))$. In addition, let $L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; C([0, T]; X))$ be the space of all X -valued and \mathbb{F} -adapted continuous processes. By saying that \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$, we mean that \mathbb{F} is generated by $W(\cdot)$ and augmented by

$$\{\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{F} \mid \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}) = 0\}.$$

Definition of \dot{H}^{γ} . Let A be the realization of the partial differential operator $\Delta - I$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition. More precisely,

$$\text{Domain}(A) := \{v \in H^2(\mathcal{O}) \mid \partial_n v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\} \\ \text{and } Av := \Delta v - v \text{ for all } v \in \text{Domain}(A).$$

For any $\gamma \geq 0$, define

$$\dot{H}^{\gamma} := \{(-A)^{-\gamma/2} v \mid v \in L^2(\mathcal{O})\}$$

and endow this space with the norm

$$\|v\|_{\dot{H}^{\gamma}} := \|(-A)^{\gamma/2} v\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O})} \quad \forall v \in \dot{H}^{\gamma}.$$

For each $\gamma > 0$, we use $\dot{H}^{-\gamma}$ to denote the dual space of \dot{H}^{γ} , and use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\dot{H}^{\gamma}}$ to denote the duality pairing between $\dot{H}^{-\gamma}$ and \dot{H}^{γ} . In the sequel, we will mainly use the notation \dot{H}^0 instead of $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ for convenience.

Definitions of S_0 and S_1 . Extend A as a bounded linear operator from \dot{H}^0 to \dot{H}^{-2} by

$$\langle Av, \varphi \rangle_{\dot{H}^2} := \langle v, A\varphi \rangle_{\mathcal{O}}$$

for all $v \in \dot{H}^0$ and $\varphi \in \dot{H}^2$. The operator A then generates an analytic semigroup $\{e^{tA}\}_{t \geq 0}$ in \dot{H}^{-2} (cf. [36, Theorems 2.5 and 2.8]), possessing the following property (cf. [31, Theorem 6.13, Chapter 2]): for any $-2 \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq 2$ and $t > 0$,

$$\|e^{tA}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^\beta, \dot{H}^\gamma)} \leq Ct^{(\beta-\gamma)/2}, \quad (2.1)$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on β and γ . For any $g \in L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-2})$, the equation

$$\begin{cases} y'(t) - Ay(t) = g(t) & \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ y(0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

admits a unique mild solution

$$(S_0g)(t) := \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A}g(s) \, ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \quad (2.3)$$

Symmetrically, for any $g \in L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-2})$, the equation

$$\begin{cases} -z'(t) - Az(t) = g(t) & \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ z(T) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

admits a unique mild solution

$$(S_1g)(t) := \int_t^T e^{(s-t)A}g(s) \, ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \quad (2.5)$$

For any $f, g \in L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-1})$, a routine energy argument yields

$$\|S_0f\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1)} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-1})}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\|S_1g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1)} \leq \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-1})}, \quad (2.7)$$

and it is easily verified that

$$\int_0^T \langle g(t), (S_0f)(t) \rangle_{\dot{H}^1} \, dt = \int_0^T \langle f(t), (S_1g)(t) \rangle_{\dot{H}^1} \, dt. \quad (2.8)$$

Definition of G . Assume that $\sigma \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}^0_2))$. Let G be the mild solution of the stochastic evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} dG(t) = AG(t) \, dt + \mathcal{R}\sigma(t) \, dW(t), & \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ G(0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

where $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon})$, $0 < \epsilon \leq 1/2$, is defined by

$$\langle \mathcal{R}v, \varphi \rangle_{\dot{H}^{1/2+\epsilon}} := \langle v, \varphi \rangle_{\Gamma} \quad \text{for all } v \in L^2(\Gamma) \text{ and } \varphi \in \dot{H}^{1/2+\epsilon}. \quad (2.10)$$

For any $0 \leq t \leq T$, we have (cf. [13, Chapter 3] and [7, Chapter 5])

$$G(t) = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A} \mathcal{R}\sigma(s) \, dW(s) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad (2.11)$$

$$G(t) = \int_0^t AG(s) \, ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{R}\sigma(s) \, dW(s) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.12)$$

If $\sigma \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}^0_2)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{L}^0_2))$, then, for any $0 < t \leq T$ and $0 \leq \gamma < (1/2 - \epsilon)/2$,

$$\|G(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{2\gamma}}^2 = \int_0^t \left\| e^{(t-s)A} \mathcal{R}\sigma(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_\lambda, \dot{H}^{2\gamma})}^2 \, ds$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)A}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon}, \dot{H}^{2\gamma})}^2 \|\mathcal{R}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon})}^2 \|\sigma(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2^0}^2 ds \\ &\leq C \int_0^t (t-s)^{-2\gamma-1/2-\epsilon} \|\mathcal{R}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon})}^2 \|\sigma(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2^0}^2 ds \quad (\text{by (2.1)}) \\ &\leq Ct^{1/2-2\gamma-\epsilon} \|\mathcal{R}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon})}^2 \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2, \end{aligned}$$

so that by the fact $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon})$ we obtain

$$\|G(t)\|_{\dot{H}^{2\gamma}} \leq Ct^{1/4-\gamma-\epsilon/2} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{L}_2^0))}. \tag{2.13}$$

The above C denotes a positive constant depending only on ϵ, γ and \mathcal{O} , and its value may differ in different places. For more theoretical results, we refer the reader to [6].

Remark 2.1. By [16, Theorem 1.5.1.2], we have that $\dot{H}^{1/2+\epsilon}$ is continuously embedded into $L^2(\Gamma)$, and so the above operator \mathcal{R} is well-defined.

First-order optimality condition. We call $\bar{u} \in U_{\text{ad}}$ a solution to problem (1.1) if \bar{u} minimizes the cost functional

$$\mathcal{J}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|S_0 \mathcal{R}u + G - y_d\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\mathcal{O}))}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2, \quad u \in U_{\text{ad}}.$$

It is standard that problem (1.1) admits a unique solution \bar{u} . Moreover, by (2.8) and (2.10) we have the first-order optimality condition

$$\int_0^T \langle \bar{p} + \nu \bar{u}, u - \bar{u} \rangle dt \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in U_{\text{ad}}, \tag{2.14}$$

where

$$\bar{y} := S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} + G, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\bar{p} := S_1(\bar{y} - y_d). \tag{2.16}$$

It follows that

$$\bar{u} = \mathcal{P}_{[u_*, u^*]} \left(-\frac{1}{\nu} \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{tr } \bar{p}) \right), \tag{2.17}$$

where tr is the trace operator from \dot{H}^1 to $L^2(\Gamma)$ and

$$\mathcal{P}_{[u_*, u^*]}(r) := \begin{cases} u_* & \text{if } r < u_*, \\ r & \text{if } u_* \leq r \leq u^*, \\ u^* & \text{if } r > u^*. \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

Remark 2.2. Assume that \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$. The usual first-order optimality condition of problem (1.1) is that (cf. [2, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18])

$$\int_0^T \langle \bar{p} + \nu \bar{u}, u - \bar{u} \rangle dt \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } u \in U_{\text{ad}}.$$

The above \bar{p} is the first component of the solution (\bar{p}, \bar{z}) to the backward stochastic parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{p}(t) = -(A\bar{p} + S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} + G - y_d)(t) dt + \bar{z}(t) d\widetilde{W}(t), & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \bar{p}(T) = 0, \end{cases}$$

where \widetilde{W} is a cylindrical Wiener process in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ defined later by (4.33). Moreover, following the proof of Lemma 4.15, we can obtain

$$\bar{u} \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; C([0, T]; H^{1/2}(\Gamma))),$$

where $H^{1/2}(\Gamma)$ is a standard fractional order Sobolev space on Γ .

3 Discrete stochastic optimal control problem

Let $J > 0$ be an integer and define $t_j := j\tau$ for each $0 \leq j \leq J$, where $\tau := T/J$. Let \mathcal{K}_h be a conventional conforming, shape regular and quasi-uniform triangulation of \mathcal{O} consisting of d -simplexes, and we use h to denote the maximum diameter of the elements in \mathcal{K}_h . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_h &:= \{v_h \in C(\bar{\mathcal{O}}) \mid v_h \text{ is linear on each } K \in \mathcal{K}_h\}, \\ \mathcal{X}_{h,\tau} &:= \{V : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h \mid V(t_j) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{V}_h) \text{ and } V \text{ is constant} \\ &\quad \text{on } [t_j, t_{j+1}) \text{ for each } 0 \leq j < J\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $V \in \mathcal{X}_{h,\tau}$, by V_j we mean $V(t_j)$ for each $0 \leq j \leq J$. Define $Q_h : \dot{H}^{-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h$ by

$$\langle Q_h v, v_h \rangle_{\mathcal{O}} = \langle v, v_h \rangle_{\dot{H}^1} \quad \text{for all } v \in \dot{H}^{-1} \text{ and } v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h,$$

and define $A_h : \mathcal{V}_h \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_h$ by

$$\langle A_h v_h, w_h \rangle_{\mathcal{O}} = - \int_{\mathcal{O}} \nabla v_h \cdot \nabla w_h + v_h w_h \quad \text{for all } v_h, w_h \in \mathcal{V}_h.$$

For any $g \in L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-1}))$, define $S_0^{h,\tau} g \in \mathcal{X}_{h,\tau}$, an approximation of $S_0 g$, by

$$\begin{cases} (S_0^{h,\tau} g)_0 = 0, \\ (S_0^{h,\tau} g)_{j+1} - (S_0^{h,\tau} g)_j = \tau A_h (S_0^{h,\tau} g)_{j+1} + \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} Q_h g(t) dt, \quad 0 \leq j < J. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Define $G_{h,\tau} \in \mathcal{X}_{h,\tau}$, an approximation of G , by

$$\begin{cases} (G_{h,\tau})_0 = 0, \\ (G_{h,\tau})_{j+1} - (G_{h,\tau})_j = \tau A_h (G_{h,\tau})_{j+1} + \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} Q_h \mathcal{R} \sigma(t) dW(t), \quad 0 \leq j < J. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Remark 3.1. For any $g \in L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)))$, a routine energy argument (cf. [35, Chapter 12] and [30]) yields that

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq J} \left\| (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} g)_j \right\|_{\dot{H}^0} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}, \quad (3.3)$$

where C is a positive constant depending only on \mathcal{O} .

Remark 3.2. Although $\mathcal{X}_{h,\tau} \not\subset L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0))$, we have

$$G_{h,\tau} \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{V}_h)).$$

Moreover, $S_0^{h,\tau} g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{V}_h))$ for all $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-1}))$.

The discrete stochastic optimal control problem is to seek a discrete control $\bar{U} \in U_{\text{ad}}^{h,\tau}$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_{h,\tau}(\bar{U}) = \min_{U \in U_{\text{ad}}^{h,\tau}} \mathcal{J}_{h,\tau}(U), \quad (3.4)$$

where the discrete admissible control space is defined by

$$U_{\text{ad}}^{h,\tau} := \{U \in U_{\text{ad}} \mid U \text{ is constant on } [t_j, t_{j+1}) \quad \forall 0 \leq j < J\}$$

and the discrete cost functional is defined by

$$\mathcal{J}_{h,\tau}(U) := \frac{1}{2} \left\| S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} U + G_{h,\tau} - y_d \right\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2} \|U\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \quad \forall U \in U_{\text{ad}}^{h,\tau}.$$

Remark 3.3. Note that the discrete control is not discretized in space. This is just for the sake of numerical analysis, and there is no essential difficulty in extending the numerical analysis of this paper to the case that the discrete control is discretized by the standard continuous piecewise linear element method in space.

Then, let us present the first-order optimality condition for the above discrete problem. For any $g \in L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{-1}))$, define $S_1^{h, \tau} g \in \mathcal{X}_{h, \tau}$ by

$$\begin{cases} (S_1^{h, \tau} g)_J = 0, \\ (S_1^{h, \tau} g)_j - (S_1^{h, \tau} g)_{j+1} = \tau A_h(S_1^{h, \tau} g)_j + \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} Q_h g(t) dt, \quad 0 \leq j < J. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

In view of (3.1) and (3.5), a straightforward calculation yields that, for any $f \in L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)))$ and $g \in L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0))$,

$$\int_0^T [S_0^{h, \tau} \mathcal{R} f, g] dt = \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle f(t), (S_1^{h, \tau} g)_{j+1} \rangle dt. \quad (3.6)$$

Using this equality, we readily conclude that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{P}_{j+1} + \nu \bar{U}, U - \bar{U} \rangle dt \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } U \in U_{\text{ad}}^{h, \tau}, \quad (3.7)$$

where \bar{U} is the unique solution of problem (3.4) and

$$\bar{P} := S_1^{h, \tau} (S_0^{h, \tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} + G_{h, \tau} - y_d). \quad (3.8)$$

It is evident from (3.7) that, for any $0 \leq j < J$,

$$\bar{U}_j = \mathcal{P}_{[u_*, u^*]} \left(-\frac{1}{\nu} \mathbb{E}_{t_j} \text{tr } \bar{P}_{j+1} \right).$$

Remark 3.4. Let \bar{U} be the solution to problem (3.4), and let

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y} &:= S_0^{h, \tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} + G_{h, \tau}, \\ \bar{P} &:= S_1^{h, \tau} (\bar{Y} - y_d). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that there exist deterministic functions \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{P} such that

$$\bar{U} = \mathcal{U}(\bar{Y}) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{P} = \mathcal{P}(\bar{Y}). \quad (3.9)$$

Assume that $\sigma(t) = 0$ for all $0 \leq t \leq T$. From the fact that $\bar{U}(t_0)$ is deterministic, it follows that $\bar{Y}(t_1)$ is deterministic. Hence, according to the assumption, $\bar{U}(t_1)$ and $\bar{P}(t_1)$ are deterministic. Similarly, $\bar{Y}(t_j)$, $\bar{U}(t_j)$ and $\bar{P}(t_j)$ are deterministic for all $2 \leq j \leq J$. It follows that \bar{Y} , \bar{U} and \bar{P} are deterministic. However, in general this is evidently incorrect, since y_d is a stochastic process. The above example illustrates that, for our model problem, generally we can not expect the existence of deterministic functions \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{P} such that (3.9) holds. Since (3.9) is crucial for the application of the algorithms in [10] to problem (3.4), these algorithms are not applicable.

Finally, we present the convergence of the discrete stochastic optimal control problem (3.4). For any $v \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; X))$ with X being a separable Hilbert space, define $\mathcal{P}_\tau v$ by

$$(\mathcal{P}_\tau v)(t) = \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbb{E}_{t_j} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} v(s) ds \quad (3.10)$$

for all $t_j \leq t < t_{j+1}$ with $0 \leq j < J$.

Theorem 3.5. Assume that $y_d \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0))$ and

$$\sigma \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2^0)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{L}_2^0)).$$

Let \bar{u} be the solution of problem (1.1), let \bar{p} be defined by (2.16), and let \bar{U} be the solution of problem (3.4). Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} + \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h, \tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} \\ & \leq C \left(\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon} + \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} + \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Moreover, if \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))} + \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \\ & \leq C(\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

The above ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number and the above C is a positive constant depending only on u_* , u^* , y_d , ϵ , σ , ν , \mathcal{O} , T and the regularity parameters of \mathcal{K}_h .

4 Proofs

Throughout this section, we will use the following conventions: $\epsilon > 0$ denotes a sufficiently small number, and its value may differ in different places; $a \lesssim b$ means $a \leq Cb$, where C is a positive constant depending only on ϵ , \mathcal{O} , T , the regularity parameters of \mathcal{K}_h and the indexes of the Sobolev spaces where the underlying functions belong to.

4.1 Preliminary estimates

For each $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, let \dot{H}_h^γ be the space \mathcal{V}_h endowed with the norm

$$\|v_h\|_{\dot{H}_h^\gamma} := \|(-A_h)^{\gamma/2} v_h\|_{\dot{H}^0} \quad \forall v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h.$$

By the facts $\mathcal{R} \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon})$ and

$$\|Q_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon}, \dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon})} \lesssim 1, \quad (4.1)$$

we obtain

$$\|Q_h \mathcal{R}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}_h^{-(1/2+\epsilon)})} \lesssim 1. \quad (4.2)$$

We also have the following two well-known estimates (cf. [4, Theorems 4.4.4, 4.5.11 and 5.7.6]):

$$\|I - Q_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^1, \dot{H}^0)} \lesssim h, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\|I - A_h^{-1} Q_h A\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^1, \dot{H}^0)} \lesssim h. \quad (4.4)$$

Remark 4.1. For any $v \in \dot{H}^{-1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_h v\|_{\dot{H}_h^{-1}} &= \sup_{0 \neq \varphi_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \frac{\langle Q_h v, \varphi_h \rangle_{\mathcal{O}}}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\dot{H}_h^1}} \\ &= \sup_{0 \neq \varphi_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \frac{\langle v, \varphi_h \rangle_{\dot{H}^1}}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\dot{H}_h^1}} \quad (\text{by the definition of } Q_h) \\ &\leq \sup_{0 \neq \varphi_h \in \mathcal{V}_h} \frac{\|v\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}} \|\varphi_h\|_{\dot{H}^1}}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\dot{H}_h^1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting the fact $\|\varphi_h\|_{\dot{H}^1} = \|\varphi_h\|_{\dot{H}_h^1}$, $\forall \varphi_h \in \mathcal{V}_h$, we readily conclude that

$$\|Q_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}_h^{-1})} \leq 1.$$

In addition, by definition, the restriction of Q_h to \dot{H}^0 is the $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ -orthogonal projection onto \mathcal{V}_h , and hence

$$\|Q_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}_h^0)} \leq 1.$$

Using the above two estimates, by interpolation (cf. [27, Theorems 2.6 and 4.36]) we readily obtain (4.1).

By the techniques in the proofs of [35, Lemmas 3.2 and 7.3], a straightforward computation yields the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. For any $-2 \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq 2$ and $t > 0$, we have

$$\|e^{tA_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^\beta, \dot{H}_h^\gamma)} \lesssim t^{(\beta-\gamma)/2}. \quad (4.5)$$

For any $0 \leq \beta \leq \gamma \leq 2$ and $t > 0$,

$$\|I - e^{tA_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^\gamma, \dot{H}_h^\beta)} \lesssim t^{(\gamma-\beta)/2}. \quad (4.6)$$

For any $0 \leq \gamma \leq 2$ and $j > 1$,

$$\|(I - \tau A_h)^{-j}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-\gamma}, \dot{H}_h^0)} < (j\tau)^{-\gamma/2}. \quad (4.7)$$

Lemma 4.3. Assume that $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, $0 \leq k \leq j < J$ and $t_k \leq t < t_{k+1}$. Then

$$\|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - e^{(t_{j+1}-t_k)A_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-\gamma}, \dot{H}_h^0)} \lesssim \tau^{(1-\gamma)/2} (t_{j+1} - t)^{-1/2}. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - e^{(t_{j+1}-t_k)A_h} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-\gamma}, \dot{H}_h^0)} \\ &= \left\| (I - e^{(t-t_k)A_h}) e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-\gamma}, \dot{H}_h^0)} \\ &\leq \|I - e^{(t-t_k)A_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{1-\gamma}, \dot{H}_h^0)} \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-\gamma}, \dot{H}_h^{1-\gamma})}, \end{aligned}$$

and so (4.8) follows from (4.5) and (4.6). \square

Lemma 4.4. For any $0 \leq \gamma \leq 2$ and $1 \leq j \leq J$,

$$\|e^{j\tau A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-j}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-\gamma}, \dot{H}_h^0)} \lesssim \tau^{-\gamma/2} j^{-1}. \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. By [35, Theorem 7.2] we have

$$\|e^{j\tau A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-j}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^0, \dot{H}_h^0)} \lesssim j^{-1}.$$

Also, by (4.5) and (4.7) we have

$$\|e^{j\tau A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-j}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-2}, \dot{H}_h^0)} \lesssim (j\tau)^{-1}.$$

Hence, by interpolation (cf. [29, Theorems 2.6 and 4.36]) we obtain (4.9). \square

4.2 Convergence of $G_{h,\tau}$

Let G_h be the mild solution of the equation

$$\begin{cases} dG_h(t) = A_h G_h(t) dt + Q_h \mathcal{R}\sigma(t) dW(t), & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ G_h(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Similar to (2.11), we have, for each $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$G_h(t) = \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A_h} Q_h \mathcal{R}\sigma(s) dW(s) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (4.11)$$

Let us first estimate $\|G - G_h\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}$.

Lemma 4.5. If

$$\sigma \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2^0)),$$

then

$$\|G - G_h\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \lesssim h^{1/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^2(0,T;\mathcal{L}_2^0)}. \quad (4.12)$$

Proof. For any

$$g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1}))),$$

let Πg and $\Pi_h g$ be the mild solutions of the equations

$$\begin{cases} d(\Pi g)(t) = A(\Pi g)(t)dt + g(t) dW(t), & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ (\Pi g)(0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d(\Pi_h g)(t) = A_h(\Pi_h g)(t)dt + Q_h g(t) dW(t), & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ (\Pi_h g)(0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

respectively. By the celebrated Itô's formula, we have the following standard estimates:

$$\|\Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^{\alpha+1})} \lesssim \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{\alpha})}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\|\Pi_h g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}_h^{\alpha+1})} \lesssim \|Q_h g\|_{L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}_h^{\alpha})}, \quad (4.15)$$

for any

$$g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{\alpha}))) \quad \text{with } \alpha \geq -1.$$

Using the above estimates with $\alpha = -1$ and the fact

$$\|Q_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}_h^{-1})} \leq 1,$$

we then obtain

$$\|\Pi - \Pi_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0))), \dot{H}^0} \lesssim 1. \quad (4.16)$$

Let $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0)))$. For any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have (cf. [13, Chapter 3])

$$(\Pi g)(t) = \int_0^t A(\Pi g)(s) ds + \int_0^t g(s) dW(s) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

and so

$$(Q_h \Pi g)(t) = \int_0^t Q_h A(\Pi g)(s) ds + \int_0^t Q_h g(s) dW(s) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{cases} dQ_h(\Pi g)(t) = Q_h A(\Pi g)(t) dt + Q_h g(t) dW(t), & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ Q_h(\Pi g)(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

Letting $e_h := \Pi_h g - Q_h \Pi g$, by (4.13) and (4.17) we get

$$\begin{cases} de_h(t) = A_h e_h(t) dt + (A_h Q_h \Pi g - Q_h A \Pi g)(t) dt, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ e_h(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_h\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}_h^0)} &\lesssim \|(A_h Q_h - Q_h A) \Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}_h^{-2})} \\ &= \|(Q_h - A_h^{-1} Q_h A) \Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}_h^0)}, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\Pi - \Pi_h)g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} \\ &\leq \|e_h\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} + \|(I - Q_h)\Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} \\ &\lesssim \|(Q_h - A_h^{-1} Q_h A) \Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} + \|(I - Q_h)\Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} \\ &\lesssim \|(I - A_h^{-1} Q_h A) \Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} + \|(I - Q_h)\Pi g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim h \|\Pi g\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^1)} \quad (\text{by (4.3) and (4.4)}) \\ &\lesssim h \|g\|_{L^2(0,T;\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2,\dot{H}^0))} \quad (\text{by (4.14) with } \alpha = 0). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\|\Pi - \Pi_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega;L^2(0,T;\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2,\dot{H}^0))),\dot{H}^0)} \lesssim h. \tag{4.19}$$

In view of (4.16), (4.19) and Lemma A.1, by interpolation we obtain

$$\|\Pi - \Pi_h\|_{\mathcal{L}(L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega;L^2(0,T;\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2,\dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon}))),\dot{H}^0)} \lesssim h^{1/2-\epsilon}.$$

Therefore, the desired estimate (4.12) follows from the following facts:

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \Pi \mathcal{R} \sigma, \\ G_h &= \Pi_h \mathcal{R} \sigma, \\ \mathcal{R} &\in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}^{-1/2-\epsilon}), \\ \sigma &\in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2^0)). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Then let us estimate $\|G_h - G_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}_h^0)}$.

Lemma 4.6. *If*

$$\sigma \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2^0)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{L}_2^0)),$$

then

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq J} \|(G_h - G_{h,\tau})(t_j)\|_{\dot{H}_h^0} \lesssim \tau^{1/4-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}. \tag{4.20}$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq j < J$ be arbitrary but fixed. By (3.2) and (4.11) we obtain \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$(G_h - G_{h,\tau})(t_{j+1}) = \sum_{k=0}^j \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)} \right) Q_h \mathcal{R} \sigma(t) \, dW(t),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(G_h - G_{h,\tau})(t_{j+1})\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^j \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)} \right) Q_h \mathcal{R} \sigma(t) \, dW(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^j \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left\| \left(e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)} \right) Q_h \mathcal{R} \sigma(t) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2,\dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \, dt \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^j \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon},\dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \\ &\quad \times \|Q_h \mathcal{R}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma),\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon})}^2 \|\sigma(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2^0}^2 \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.2) we then conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(G_h - G_{h,\tau})(t_{j+1})\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 &\lesssim \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2 \times \\ &\quad \sum_{k=0}^j \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon},\dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

By (4.5) and (4.7), we have

$$\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon},\dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \, dt \lesssim \tau^{1/2-\epsilon},$$

and by (4.8) and (4.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon}, \dot{H}_h^0)}^2 dt \\
\lesssim & \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - e^{(t_{j+1}-t_k)A_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon}, \dot{H}_h^0)}^2 dt + \\
& \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \tau \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t_k)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon}, \dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \\
\lesssim & \tau^{1/2-\epsilon} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (t_{j+1} - t)^{-1} dt + \tau^{1/2-\epsilon} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (j - k + 1)^{-1} \\
\lesssim & \tau^{1/2-\epsilon} (\ln(1/\tau) + \ln(j + 1)) \\
\lesssim & \tau^{1/2-\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two estimates yields

$$\sum_{k=0}^j \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \|e^{(t_{j+1}-t)A_h} - (I - \tau A_h)^{-(j-k+1)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon}, \dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \lesssim \tau^{1/2-\epsilon}.$$

Hence, by (4.21) we get

$$\| (G_h - G_{h,\tau})(t_{j+1}) \|_{\dot{H}_h^0} \lesssim \tau^{1/4-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}.$$

Hence, as $0 \leq j < J$ is arbitrary, (4.20) follows from the fact

$$(G_h - G_{h,\tau})(0) = 0.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Under the condition of Lemma 4.6, we have*

$$\|G_h - G_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}_h^0)} \lesssim \tau^{1/4-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}. \quad (4.22)$$

Proof. By (4.20), we only need to prove

$$\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|G_h - G_h(t_j)\|_{L^2(t_j,t_{j+1};\dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \lesssim \tau^{1/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2. \quad (4.23)$$

To this end, we proceed as follows. For any $t_j \leq t \leq t_{j+1}$ with $0 \leq j < J$, we have

$$G_h(t) - e^{(t-t_j)A_h} G_h(t_j) = \int_{t_j}^t e^{(t-s)A_h} Q_h \mathcal{R} \sigma(s) dW(s) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| G_h(t) - e^{(t-t_j)A_h} G_h(t_j) \right\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 \\
= & \int_{t_j}^t \left\| e^{(t-s)A_h} Q_h \mathcal{R} \sigma(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}_h^0)}^2 ds \\
\leq & \int_{t_j}^t \|e^{(t-s)A_h}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon}, \dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \|Q_h \mathcal{R}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Gamma), \dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon})}^2 \|\sigma(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2^0}^2 ds \\
\lesssim & \int_{t_j}^t (t-s)^{-1/2-\epsilon} ds \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2 \quad (\text{by (4.2) and (4.5)})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim (t - t_j)^{1/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left\| G_h(t) - e^{(t-t_j)A_h} G_h(t_j) \right\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 dt \lesssim \tau^{3/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2. \quad (4.24)$$

Following the proof of (2.13), we obtain

$$\|G_h(t_j)\|_{\dot{H}_h^{1/2-\epsilon}} \lesssim \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left\| (I - e^{(t-t_j)A_h}) G_h(t_j) \right\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} (t - t_j)^{1/2-\epsilon} \|G_h(t_j)\|_{\dot{H}_h^{1/2-\epsilon}}^2 dt \quad (\text{by (4.6)}) \\ & \lesssim \tau^{3/2-\epsilon} \|G_h(t_j)\|_{\dot{H}_h^{1/2-\epsilon}}^2 \\ & \lesssim \tau^{3/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above estimate with (4.24) yields

$$\|G_h - G_h(t_j)\|_{L^2(t_j,t_{j+1};\dot{H}_h^0)}^2 \lesssim \tau^{3/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|G_h - G_h(t_j)\|_{L^2(t_j,t_{j+1};\dot{H}_h^0)}^2 & \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \tau^{3/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2 \\ & \lesssim \tau^{1/2-\epsilon} \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.23) and thus concludes the proof. \square

Finally, combining Lemmas 4.5 and 4.7, we readily conclude the following error estimate.

Lemma 4.8. *If*

$$\sigma \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2^0)) \cap L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega; \mathcal{L}_2^0)),$$

then

$$\|G - G_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \lesssim (\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon}) \|\sigma\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega;\mathcal{L}_2^0))}. \quad (4.25)$$

4.3 Convergence of $S_0^{h,\tau}$ and $S_1^{h,\tau}$

Lemma 4.9. *For any $g_h \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{V}_h)$, define $\{Y_j\}_{j=0}^J \subset \mathcal{V}_h$ by*

$$\begin{cases} Y_0 = 0, \\ Y_{j+1} - Y_j = \tau A_h Y_{j+1} + \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} g_h(t) dt, \quad 0 \leq j < J. \end{cases} \quad (4.26)$$

Then, for any $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$,

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|Y_{j+1} - Y_j\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \tau^{(1-\gamma)/2} \|g_h\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}_h^{-\gamma})}. \quad (4.27)$$

Proof. Following the proof of [30, Theorem 4.6], we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|Y_{j+1} - Y_j\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2 \right)^{1/2} \lesssim \tau^{1/2} \|g_h\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}_h^0)}, \quad (4.28)$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \tau \|Y_j\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2\right)^{1/2} \lesssim \|g_h\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}_h^{-2})}. \quad (4.29)$$

From (4.29) it follows that

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|Y_{j+1} - Y_j\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2\right)^{1/2} \lesssim \tau^{-1/2} \|g_h\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}_h^{-2})}. \quad (4.30)$$

In view of (4.28) and (4.30), by interpolation we obtain (4.27). This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.10. *For any $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)))$, we have*

$$\left\| (S_0 - S_0^{h,\tau}) \mathcal{R}g \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \lesssim (\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon}) \|g\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}. \quad (4.31)$$

Proof. A routine energy argument (cf. [35, Chapter 12] and [30, Theorems 5.1 and 5.5]) gives that

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R}g - (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}g)_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \dot{H}^0)}^2\right)^{1/2} \lesssim (\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon}) \|g\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}.$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}g)_{j+1} - (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}g)_j \right\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2\right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim \tau^{1/4-\epsilon} \|Q_h \mathcal{R}g\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}_h^{-1/2-\epsilon})} \quad (\text{by (4.27)}) \\ & \lesssim \tau^{1/4-\epsilon} \|g\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))} \quad (\text{by (4.2)}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (S_0 - S_0^{h,\tau}) \mathcal{R}g \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \\ & = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R}g - (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}g)_j \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \dot{H}^0)}^2\right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R}g - (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}g)_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \dot{H}^0)}^2\right)^{1/2} + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \tau \left\| (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}g)_{j+1} - (S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}g)_j \right\|_{\dot{H}_h^0}^2\right)^{1/2} \\ & \lesssim (\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon}) \|g\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.31) and thus concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.11. *For any $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0))$, we have*

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| S_1 g - (S_1^{h,\tau} g)_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2\right)^{1/2} \lesssim (\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon}) \|g\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}. \quad (4.32)$$

Since this lemma can be proved by using similar techniques as that in the proof of Lemma 4.10, its proof is omitted here.

4.4 Proof of Theorem 3.5

Let $\{\varphi_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \dot{H}^0$ be an orthonormal basis of \dot{H}^0 such that (cf. [16, Theorem 3.2.1.3] and [37, Theorem 4.A and Section 4.5])

$$-A\varphi_n = r_n \varphi_n \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\{r_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a nondecreasing sequence of strictly positive numbers with limit $+\infty$. Let $\widetilde{W}(t)$, $t \geq 0$, be a cylindrical Wiener process in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$ defined by

$$\widetilde{W}(t)(v) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle v, \varphi_n \rangle_{\mathcal{O}} \beta_n(t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } v \in \dot{H}^0. \quad (4.33)$$

Under the condition that \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$, for any $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0))$, the backward stochastic parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} dp(t) = -(Ap + g)(t) dt + z(t) d\widetilde{W}(t) & \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ p(T) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (4.34)$$

admits a unique strong solution (p, z) , and

$$\|p\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^2)} + \|p\|_{C([0, T]; \dot{H}^1)} + \|z\|_{L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^1))} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}, \quad (4.35)$$

where C is a positive constant independent of g and T . Moreover, for any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$,

$$p(s) - e^{(t-s)A}p(t) = \int_s^t e^{(r-s)A}g(r) dr - \int_s^t e^{(r-s)A}z(r) d\widetilde{W}(r) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (4.36)$$

Using the fact $p(T) = 0$, by (4.36) we obtain, for any $0 \leq s \leq T$,

$$p(s) = \int_s^T e^{(r-s)A}g(r) dr - \int_s^T e^{(r-s)A}z(r) d\widetilde{W}(r) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (4.37)$$

Remark 4.12. For the above theoretical results of equation (4.34), we refer the reader to [21] and [28, Chapter 4].

Lemma 4.13. Assume that \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$. For any $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0))$, we have

$$\|(I - \mathcal{P}_\tau)\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}}S_1g\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \lesssim \tau^{1/2} \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}. \quad (4.38)$$

Proof. Let (p, z) be the strong solution of equation (4.34). Since (4.37) implies, for each $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$p(t) = \mathbb{E}_t \left(\int_t^T e^{(s-t)A}g(s) ds \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

by (2.5) we then obtain

$$p = \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}}S_1g. \quad (4.39)$$

It remains, therefore, to prove

$$\|(I - \mathcal{P}_\tau)p\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \lesssim \tau^{1/2} \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}. \quad (4.40)$$

To this end, we proceed as follows. Let $1/2 < \gamma < 1$ be arbitrary but fixed. For any $t_j \leq t \leq t_{j+1}$ with $0 \leq j < J$, by (4.36) we have

$$p(t_j) - e^{(t-t_j)A}p(t) = \int_{t_j}^t e^{(s-t_j)A}g(s) ds - \int_{t_j}^t e^{(s-t_j)A}z(s) d\widetilde{W}(s) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| p(t_j) - e^{(t-t_j)A}p(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 \\ & \leq 2 \left\| \int_{t_j}^t e^{(s-t_j)A}g(s) ds \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 + 2 \left\| \int_{t_j}^t e^{(s-t_j)A}z(s) d\widetilde{W}(s) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 \\ & = 2 \left\| \int_{t_j}^t e^{(s-t_j)A}g(s) ds \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 + 2 \int_{t_j}^t \left\| e^{(s-t_j)A}z(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^\gamma)}^2 ds \\ & \leq 2 \left(\int_{t_j}^t \left\| e^{(s-t_j)A}g(s) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 ds \right) + 2 \int_{t_j}^t \left\| e^{(s-t_j)A}z(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^\gamma)}^2 ds \\ & \lesssim \left(\int_{t_j}^t (s-t_j)^{-\gamma/2} \|g(s)\|_{\dot{H}^0} ds \right)^2 + \int_{t_j}^t \|z(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^\gamma)}^2 ds \quad (\text{by (2.1)}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim (t - t_j)^{1-\gamma} \|g\|_{L^2(t_j, t; \dot{H}^0)}^2 + \|z\|_{L^2(t_j, t; \mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^\gamma))}^2.$$

It follows that, for any $0 \leq j < J$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left\| p(t_j) - e^{(t-t_j)A} p(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \tau^{2-\gamma} \|g\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \dot{H}^0)}^2 + \tau \|z\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^\gamma))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left\| p(t_j) - e^{(t-t_j)A} p(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \tau^{2-\gamma} \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}^2 + \tau \|z\|_{L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^\gamma))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left\| (I - e^{(t-t_j)A}) p(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} (t - t_j)^{2-\gamma} \|p(t)\|_{\dot{H}^2}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \tau^{2-\gamma} \|p\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^2)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

by the evident estimate (cf. (4.6))

$$\|I - e^{tA}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\dot{H}^2, \dot{H}^\gamma)} \lesssim t^{1-\gamma/2}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|p - p(t_j)\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \dot{H}^\gamma)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left\| p(t_j) - e^{(t-t_j)A} p(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 dt + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \left\| (I - e^{(t-t_j)A}) p(t) \right\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma}^2 dt \\ & \lesssim \tau^{2-\gamma} \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}^2 + \tau \|z\|_{L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(\dot{H}^0, \dot{H}^\gamma))}^2 + \tau^{2-\gamma} \|p\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^2)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \tau \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

by (4.35). Therefore, from the inequality

$$\|(I - \mathcal{P}_\tau)p\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \leq \|p - p(t_j)\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \quad \forall 0 \leq j < J,$$

we conclude that

$$\|(I - \mathcal{P}_\tau)p\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^\gamma)} \lesssim \tau^{1/2} \|g\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}. \tag{4.42}$$

The desired estimate (4.40) then follows from the trace inequality (cf. [16, Theorem 1.5.1.2])

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \lesssim \|v\|_{\dot{H}^\gamma} \quad \forall v \in \dot{H}^\gamma.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.14. *For any $v \in L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1))$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \operatorname{tr} v = \operatorname{tr} \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} v. \tag{4.43}$$

Proof. Let $\text{tr}^* : L^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow \dot{H}^{-1}$ be the adjoint of tr . By definition, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \text{tr} v$ is the $L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)))$ -orthogonal projection of $\text{tr} v$ onto $L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)))$, and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} v$ is the $L^2(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1))$ -orthogonal projection of v onto $L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1))$. For any $\varphi \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma)))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \text{tr} v, \varphi \rangle dt &= \int_0^T \langle \text{tr} v, \varphi \rangle dt = \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \langle \text{tr}^* \varphi, v \rangle_{\dot{H}^1} dt \\ &= \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \langle \text{tr}^* \varphi, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} v \rangle_{\dot{H}^1} dt = \int_0^T \langle \text{tr} \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} v, \varphi \rangle dt, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.43). □

Lemma 4.15. *Assume that \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$. For any $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0))$, we have*

$$\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{\tau})u \|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \lesssim \tau^{1/2} \nu^{-1} \| g \|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}, \tag{4.44}$$

where

$$u := \mathcal{P}_{[u_*, u^*]}(-\nu^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}}(\text{tr} S_1 g)).$$

Proof. Let (p, z) be the solution of equation (4.34). As stated in the proof of Lemma 4.13, we have

$$p = \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} S_1 g,$$

so that by (4.43) we get

$$u = \mathcal{P}_{[u_*, u^*]}(-\nu^{-1} \text{tr} p).$$

From the fact $p \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; C([0, T]; \dot{H}^1))$, we then conclude that

$$u \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; C([0, T]; L^2(\Gamma))).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \| u - u(t_j) \|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \| \mathcal{P}_{[u_*, u^*]}(-\nu^{-1} \text{tr} p(t)) - \mathcal{P}_{[u_*, u^*]}(-\nu^{-1} \text{tr} p(t_j)) \|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 dt \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \| (p(t) - p(t_j)) / \nu \|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 dt \\ &\lesssim \tau \nu^{-2} \| g \|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

by (4.41) and the trace inequality

$$\| v \|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \lesssim \| v \|_{\dot{H}^{\gamma}} \quad \forall v \in \dot{H}^{\gamma}.$$

Therefore, (4.44) follows from the inequality

$$\| (I - \mathcal{P}_{\tau})u \|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \| u - u(t_j) \|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Finally, we will use the argument in the numerical analysis of optimal control problems with PDE constraints (cf. [20, Theorem 3.4]) to prove Theorem 3.5.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. In this proof, C is a positive constant depending only on u_* , u^* , y_d , ϵ , σ , ν , \mathcal{O} , T and the regularity parameters of \mathcal{K}_h , and its value may differ in different places. Let \bar{P} be defined by (3.8), and define

$$P := S_1^{h, \tau} (S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} + G - y_d). \tag{4.45}$$

By (4.31) and the fact $\bar{u} \in U_{\text{ad}}$, we obtain

$$\left\| (S_0 - S_0^{h,\tau}) \mathcal{R} \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \leq C(\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon}). \quad (4.46)$$

By (2.6) and (2.13) we have

$$\|S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} + G - y_d\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \leq C,$$

so that (4.32) implies

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|\bar{p} - P_{j+1}\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C(\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon}). \quad (4.47)$$

By the definition of \mathcal{P}_τ , we have the following two evident equalities:

$$\int_0^T \langle \bar{U}, \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} \rangle dt = \int_0^T \langle \bar{U}, \bar{u} \rangle dt, \quad (4.48)$$

$$\|\bar{u} - \bar{U}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2 = \|\bar{u} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2 + \|\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2. \quad (4.49)$$

Since (3.12) follows from (3.11) and Lemmas 4.13 and 4.15, we only need to prove (3.11). The rest of the proof is divided into the following three steps.

Step 1. Let us prove that

$$\nu \|\bar{u} - \bar{U}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 \leq I_0 + I_1 + I_2, \quad (4.50)$$

where

$$I_0 := \frac{1}{2} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2, \quad (4.51)$$

$$I_1 := \int_0^T [G - G_{h,\tau}, S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} (\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u})] dt, \quad (4.52)$$

$$I_2 := \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{p} - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt. \quad (4.53)$$

Inserting $u := \bar{U}$ into (2.14) yields

$$\int_0^T \langle \bar{p} + \nu \bar{u}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt \geq 0,$$

which implies

$$\nu \int_0^T \langle \bar{u}, \bar{u} - \bar{U} \rangle dt \leq \int_0^T \langle \bar{p}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt. \quad (4.54)$$

Inserting $U := \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u}$ into (3.7) gives

$$\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{P}_{j+1} + \nu \bar{U}, \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} - \bar{U} \rangle dt \geq 0,$$

which, together with (4.48), implies

$$-\nu \int_0^T \langle \bar{U}, \bar{u} - \bar{U} \rangle dt \leq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{P}_{j+1}, \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} - \bar{U} \rangle dt. \quad (4.55)$$

From (4.54) and (4.55) we conclude that

$$\nu \|\bar{u} - \bar{U}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \int_0^T \langle \bar{p}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{P}_{j+1}, \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} - \bar{U} \rangle dt \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{p} - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt \\
 &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{P}_{j+1}, \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} - \bar{U} \rangle dt \\
 &= I_2 + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \bar{P}_{j+1}, \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} - \bar{U} \rangle dt \quad (\text{by (4.53)}) \\
 &= I_2 + \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle P_{j+1} - \bar{P}_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} \rangle dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

by the definition of \mathcal{P}_τ . Since

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle P_{j+1} - \bar{P}_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} \rangle dt \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle (S_1^{h,\tau} (S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U}) + G - G_{h,\tau})_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} \rangle dt \quad (\text{by (3.8) and (4.45)}) \\
 &= \int_0^T [S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} + G - G_{h,\tau}, S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} (\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u})] dt \quad (\text{by (3.6)}) \\
 &= I_1 + \int_0^T [S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U}, S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} (\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u})] dt \quad (\text{by (4.52)}),
 \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\nu \|\bar{u} - \bar{U}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \leq I_1 + I_2 + \int_0^T [S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U}, S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} (\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u})] dt. \quad (4.56)$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\int_0^T [S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U}, S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} (\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u})] dt \\
 &= - \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 + \int_0^T [S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U}, S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u}] dt \\
 &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 \\
 &= -\frac{1}{2} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 + I_0 \quad (\text{by (4.51)}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above inequality into (4.56) yields

$$\nu \|\bar{u} - \bar{U}\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 \leq I_1 + I_2 - \frac{1}{2} \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 + I_0,$$

and then a simple calculation proves (4.50).

Step 2. Let us estimate I_0 , I_1 and I_2 . For I_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| (S_0 - S_0^{h,\tau}) \mathcal{R} \bar{u} + S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 \quad (\text{by (4.51)}) \\
 &\leq \left\| (S_0 - S_0^{h,\tau}) \mathcal{R} \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 + \left\| S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R} (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 \\
 &\leq \left\| (S_0 - S_0^{h,\tau}) \mathcal{R} \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)}^2 + C \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \quad (\text{by (3.3)}),
 \end{aligned}$$

so that (4.46) implies

$$I_0 \leq C(\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon})^2 + C \|(I - \mathcal{P}_\tau)\bar{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2. \quad (4.57)$$

For I_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \|G - G_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \left\| S_0^{h,\tau} \mathcal{R}(\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u}) \right\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \quad (\text{by (4.52)}) \\ &\leq C \|G - G_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \|\bar{U} - \mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))} \quad (\text{by (3.3)}) \\ &\leq C \|G - G_{h,\tau}\|_{L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^0)} \|\bar{u} - \bar{U}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))} \quad (\text{by (4.49)}), \end{aligned}$$

so that by (4.25) we obtain

$$I_1 \leq C(\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon}) \|\bar{u} - \bar{U}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}. \quad (4.58)$$

Now let us estimate I_2 . By definition, we have

$$(\mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{p})(t_j) = (\mathcal{P}_\tau \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p})(t_j), \quad \forall 0 \leq j < J,$$

and so

$$\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} - (\mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{p})(t_j)\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 = \|(I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))}^2. \quad (4.59)$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| (\mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{p})(t_j) - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \tau \left\| (\mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{p})(t_j) - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \tau^{-1} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{t_j} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \bar{p}(t) - P_{j+1} dt \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \tau^{-1} \left\| \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \bar{p}(t) - P_{j+1} dt \right\|_{L^2(\Gamma)}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|\bar{p} - P_{j+1}\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combing the above estimate with (4.59) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1}\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} - (\mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{p})(t_j)\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \\ &\quad \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| (\mathcal{P}_\tau \bar{p})(t_j) - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|(I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))} + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \|\bar{p} - P_{j+1}\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$I_2 = \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \text{tr } \bar{p} - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt \quad (\text{by (4.53)})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1}, \bar{U} - \bar{u} \rangle dt \quad (\text{by (4.43)}) \\
 &\leq \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} - \mathbb{E}_{t_j} P_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \\
 &\leq \left(\left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} + \left(\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\| \bar{p} - P_{j+1} \right\|_{L^2(t_j, t_{j+1}; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \\
 &\quad \times \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))},
 \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (4.47), implies

$$I_2 \leq (C(\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon}) + \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}) \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}. \quad (4.60)$$

Step 3. Combining (4.50), (4.57), (4.58) and (4.60), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\nu \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 + \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h, \tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)}^2 \\
 &\leq C \left((\tau^{3/4-\epsilon} + h^{3/2-\epsilon})^2 + \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))}^2 \right. \\
 &\quad + (\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon}) \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \\
 &\quad \left. + \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the Young's inequality with ϵ , we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left\| \bar{u} - \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} + \left\| S_0 \mathcal{R} \bar{u} - S_0^{h, \tau} \mathcal{R} \bar{U} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^0)} \\
 &\leq C \left(\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon} + \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \bar{u} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} + \left\| (I - \mathcal{P}_\tau) \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{F}} \bar{p} \right\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Gamma))} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

namely inequality (3.11). This completes the proof. ■

5 Conclusion

In this paper we analyzed the discretization of a Neumann boundary control problem, where the state equation is a linear stochastic parabolic equation with boundary noise. With rough data, we have established the convergence for general filtration, and we have derived the convergence rate $O(\tau^{1/4-\epsilon} + h^{1/2-\epsilon})$ for the natural filtration of the Q -Wiener process, where $0 < \epsilon < 1/4$ can be arbitrarily small.

The numerical analysis in this paper can be extended to the distributed optimal control problems governed by linear stochastic parabolic equations with additive noise and general filtration. For the case that the noise is multiplicative or the coefficient before the Q -Wiener process contains the control variable, there will be essential difficulty in the numerical analysis, especially for general filtration. To solve these issues is our ongoing work.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11901410) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities in China (Grant No. 2020SCU12063).

References

- 1 Bender C, Denk R. A forward scheme for backward SDEs. *Stochastic Process Appl*, 2007, 117: 1793–1823
- 2 Bensoussan A. Stochastic maximum principle for distributed parameter systems. *J Franklin Institute*, 1983, 315: 387–406
- 3 Bouchard B, Touzi N. Discrete-time approximation and Monte-Carlo simulation of backward stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Process Appl*, 2004, 111: 175–206
- 4 Brenner S C, Scott R. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2008

- 5 Choi Y, Lee H. Error analysis of finite element approximations of the optimal control problem for stochastic Stokes equations with additive white noise. *Appl Numer Math*, 2018, 133: 144–160
- 6 Da Prato G, Zabczyk J. Evolution equations with white-noise boundary conditions. *Stochastics Stochastic Rep*, 1993, 42: 167–182
- 7 Da Prato G, Zabczyk J. Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014
- 8 Debussche A, Fuhrman M, Tessitore G. Optimal control of a stochastic heat equation with boundary-noise and boundary-control. *ESAIM Control Optim Calc Var*, 2007, 13: 178–205
- 9 Du K, Meng Q. A maximum principle for optimal control of stochastic evolution equations. *SIAM J Control Optim*, 2013, 51: 4343–4362
- 10 Dunst T, Prohl A. The forward-backward stochastic heat equation: numerical analysis and simulation. *SIAM J Sci Comput*, 2016, 38: A2725–A2755
- 11 Fuhrman M, Hu Y, Tessitore G. Stochastic maximum principle for optimal control of SPDEs. *C R Acad Sci Paris, Ser I*, 2012, 350: 683–688
- 12 Fuhrman M, Hu Y, Tessitore G. Stochastic maximum principle for optimal control of SPDEs. *Appl Math Optim*, 2013, 68: 181–217
- 13 Gawarecki L, Mandrekar V. Stochastic differential equations in infinite dimensions. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2011
- 14 Gobet E, Lemor J P, Warin X. A regression-based Monte-Carlo method to solve backward stochastic differential equations. *Ann Appl Probab*, 2005, 15: 2172–2202
- 15 Gong B, Liu W, Tang T, Zhao W, Zhou T. An efficient gradient projection method for stochastic optimal control problems. *SIAM J Numer Anal*, 2017, 55: 2982–3005
- 16 Grisvard P. Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains. Pitman, Boston, 1985
- 17 Guatteri G. Stochastic maximum principle for SPDEs with noise and control on the boundary. *Syst Control Lett*, 2011, 60: 198–204
- 18 Guatteri G, Masiero F. On the existence of optimal controls for SPDEs with boundary noise and boundary control. *SIAM J Control Optim*, 2013, 51: 1909–1939
- 19 Gunzburger M, Lee H, Lee J. Error estimates of Stochastic optimal Neumann boundary control problems. *SIAM J Numer Anal*, 2011, 49: 1532–1552
- 20 Hinze M, Pinnau R, Ulbrich M, Ulbrich S. Optimization with PDE Constraints. Dordrecht: Springer, 2009
- 21 Hu Y, Peng S. Adapted solution of a backward semilinear stochastic evolution equation. *Stoch Anal Appl*, 1991, 9: 445–459
- 22 Levajković T, Mena H, Tuffaha A. A numerical approximation framework for the stochastic linear quadratic regulator on Hilbert spaces. *Appl Math Optim*, 2017, 75: 499–523
- 23 Li B, Xie X. Convergence of a spatial semi-discretization for a backward semilinear stochastic parabolic equation. *ArXiv: 2105.10130*, 2022
- 24 Li B, Xie X. Temporal semi-discretizations of a backward semilinear stochastic evolution equation. *ArXiv: 2016.13428*, 2022
- 25 Li B, Zhou Q. Discretization of a distributed optimal control problem with a stochastic parabolic equation driven by multiplicative noise. *J Sci Comput*, 2021, 87: 68
- 26 Longstaff F A, Schwartz E S. Valuing American options by simulation: a simple least-squares approach. *Rev Financ Stud*, 2001, 14: 113–147
- 27 Lü Q, Zhang X. General Pontryagin-type stochastic maximum principle and backward stochastic evolution equations in infinite dimensions. Cham: Springer, 2014
- 28 Lü Q, Zhang X. Mathematical control theory for stochastic partial differential equations. Cham: Springer, 2021
- 29 Lunardi A. Interpolation theory. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2018
- 30 Meidner D, Vexler B. A priori error estimates for space-time finite element discretization of parabolic optimal control problems part I: problems without control constraints. *SIAM J Control Optim*, 2008, 47: 1150–1177
- 31 Pazy A. Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1983
- 32 Prohl A, Wang Y. Strong error estimates for a space-time discretization of the linear quadratic control problem with the stochastic heat equation with linear noise. *ArXiv: 2012.04418v1*, 2020
- 33 Prohl A, Wang Y. Strong rates of convergence for space-time discretization of the backward stochastic heat equation, and of a linear-quadratic control problem for the stochastic heat equation. *ESAIM Coccv*, 2021, 27: 54
- 34 Świech A. Viscosity solutions to HJB equations for boundary-noise and boundary-control problems. *SIAM J Control Optim*, 2020, 58: 303–326
- 35 Thomée V. Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2006
- 36 Yagi A. Abstract parabolic evolution equations and their applications. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2010
- 37 Zeidler E. Applied functional analysis. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1995
- 38 Zhou X. On the necessary conditions of optimal controls for stochastic partial differential equations. *SIAM J Control*

Optim, 2012, 31: 1462–1478

Appendix A An interpolation space result

Throughout this section, let $(\cdot, \cdot)_{1-\theta, 2}$, $0 < \theta < 1$, denote the interpolation space defined by the K -method (cf. [29, Chapter 1]).

Lemma A.1. *The space*

$$L^2_{\mathbb{F}}\left(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-\theta}))\right)$$

is continuously embedded into

$$\left(L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1}))), L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0)))\right)_{1-\theta, 2},$$

where $0 < \theta < 1$.

Proof. For any $B \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, (\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}^0)_{1-\theta, 2})$, by definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|B\|^2_{(\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1}), \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0))_{1-\theta, 2}} \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} t^{2\theta-3} \left(\inf_{\substack{B=B_0+B_1 \\ B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1}) \\ B_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0)}} \left(\|B_0\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1})} + t\|B_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0)} \right) \right)^2 dt \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^{\infty} t^{2\theta-3} \inf_{\substack{B=B_0+B_1 \\ B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1}) \\ B_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0)}} \left(\|B_0\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1})} + t^2\|B_1\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0)} \right) dt \\ &= 2 \int_0^{\infty} t^{2\theta-3} \inf_{\substack{B=B_0+B_1 \\ B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1}) \\ B_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0)}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\|B_0\phi_n\|^2_{\dot{H}^{-1}} + t^2\|B_1\phi_n\|^2_{\dot{H}^0} \right) dt \\ &= 2 \int_0^{\infty} t^{2\theta-3} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \inf_{\substack{B\phi_n=v_0+v_1 \\ v_0 \in \dot{H}^{-1} \\ v_1 \in \dot{H}^0}} \left(\|v_0\|^2_{\dot{H}^{-1}} + t^2\|v_1\|^2_{\dot{H}^0} \right) dt \quad (\text{by Lemma A.2}) \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^{\infty} t^{2\theta-3} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\inf_{\substack{B\phi_n=v_0+v_1 \\ v_0 \in \dot{H}^{-1} \\ v_1 \in \dot{H}^0}} \left(\|v_0\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}} + t\|v_1\|_{\dot{H}^0} \right) \right)^2 dt \\ &= 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \int_0^{\infty} t^{2\theta-3} \left(\inf_{\substack{B\phi_n=v_0+v_1 \\ v_0 \in \dot{H}^{-1} \\ v_1 \in \dot{H}^0}} \left(\|v_0\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}} + t\|v_1\|_{\dot{H}^0} \right) \right)^2 dt \\ &= 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \|B\phi_n\|^2_{(\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}^0)_{1-\theta, 2}} \\ &= 2\|B\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, (\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}^0)_{1-\theta, 2})}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, (\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}^0)_{1-\theta, 2})$ is continuously embedded into

$$(\mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^{-1}), \mathcal{L}_2(L^2_{\lambda}, \dot{H}^0))_{1-\theta, 2}.$$

Since $\dot{H}^{-\theta} = (\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}^0)_{1-\theta,2}$ with equivalent norms, we readily conclude that $\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-\theta})$ is continuously embedded into

$$(\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-1}), \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^0))_{1-\theta,2}.$$

Therefore, the desired claim follows from the result that (cf. [29, p. 38])

$$L_{\mathbb{F}}^2\left(\Omega; L^2\left(0, T; (\mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-1}), \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^0))_{1-\theta,2}\right)\right)$$

is identical to

$$\left(L_{\mathbb{F}}^2\left(\Omega; L^2\left(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-1})\right)\right), L_{\mathbb{F}}^2\left(\Omega; L^2\left(0, T; \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^0)\right)\right)\right)_{1-\theta,2},$$

with equivalent norms. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma A.2. For any $t > 0$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, (\dot{H}^{-1}, \dot{H}^0)_{1-\theta,2})$ with $0 < \theta < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\substack{B=B_0+B_1 \\ B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-1}) \\ B_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^0)}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\|B_0 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|B_1 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \inf_{\substack{B\phi_n=v_0+v_1 \\ v_0 \in \dot{H}^{-1} \\ v_1 \in \dot{H}^0}} \left(\|v_0\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|v_1\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. By the evident inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\substack{B=B_0+B_1 \\ B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-1}) \\ B_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^0)}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\|B_0 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|B_1 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right) \\ & \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \inf_{\substack{B\phi_n=v_0+v_1 \\ v_0 \in \dot{H}^{-1} \\ v_1 \in \dot{H}^0}} \left(\|v_0\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|v_1\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

it remains only to prove

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\substack{B=B_0+B_1 \\ B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-1}) \\ B_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^0)}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\|B_0 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|B_1 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \inf_{\substack{B\phi_n=v_0+v_1 \\ v_0 \in \dot{H}^{-1} \\ v_1 \in \dot{H}^0}} \left(\|v_0\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|v_1\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

To this end, we proceed as follows. Let $\{v_{0,n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \dot{H}^{-1}$ and $\{v_{1,n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \dot{H}^0$ be arbitrary such that

$$B\phi_n = v_{0,n} + v_{1,n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\|v_{0,n}\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|v_{1,n}\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right) < \infty. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Define $B_0 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^{-1})$ by

$$B_0 \phi_n := v_{0,n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and define $B_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(L_\lambda^2, \dot{H}^0)$ by

$$B_1 \phi_n := v_{1,n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By (A.3), it is easily verified that the above B_0 and B_1 are both well-defined. Clearly, we have

$$B = B_0 + B_1$$

and

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\|B_0 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|B_1 \phi_n\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left(\|v_{0,n}\|_{\dot{H}^{-1}}^2 + t^2 \|v_{1,n}\|_{\dot{H}^0}^2 \right).$$

Because of the arbitrary choices of $\{v_{0,n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{v_{1,n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, we readily conclude (A.2). This completes the proof. \square