

A user's guide to 1D nonlinear backward stochastic differential equations with applications and open problems^{*}

Shengjun Fan^a, Ying Hu^b, Shanjian Tang^c

^a*School of Mathematics, China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou 221116, China*

^b*Univ. Rennes, CNRS, IRMAR-UMR6625, F-35000, Rennes, France*

^c*Department of Finance and Control Sciences, School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

Abstract

We present a comprehensive theory on the well-posedness of a one-dimensional nonlinear backward stochastic differential equation (1D BSDE for short), where the generator g has a one-sided linear/super-linear growth in the first unknown variable y and an at most quadratic growth in the second unknown variable z . We first establish several existence theorems and comparison theorems with the test function method and the a priori estimate technique, and then immediately give several existence and uniqueness results. We also overview relevant known results and introduce some practical applications of our theoretical results. Finally, we list some open problems on the well-posedness of 1D BSDEs.

Keywords: Backward stochastic differential equation, A unified theory, Feynman-Kac formula
Existence and uniqueness, Comparison theorem, Open problems, g -expectation.

2010 MSC: 60H10

1. Introduction

Fix a real $T > 0$ and an integer $d \geq 1$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space equipped with augmented filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ generated by a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, and assume that $\mathcal{F}_T = \mathcal{F}$. The equality and inequality between random elements are usually understood in the sense of $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ We consider the following one-dimensional backward stochastic differential equation (1D BSDE in short):

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (1.1)$$

where ξ is called the terminal condition being an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable real random variable, the random field

$$g(\omega, t, y, z) : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is called the generator of (1.1), which is (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted for each (y, z) , and the pair of (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted and $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ -valued processes $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is called a solution of (1.1) if $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$, $t \mapsto Y_t$ is continuous,

^{*}This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 12171471, 12031009 and 11631004), by Key Laboratory of Mathematics for Nonlinear Sciences (Fudan University), Ministry of Education, Handan Road 220, Shanghai 200433, China; by Lebesgue Center of Mathematics "Investissements d'avenir" program-ANR-11-LABX-0020-01, by CAESARS-ANR-15-CE05-0024 and by MFG-ANR-16-CE40-0015-01.

Email addresses: f_s_j@126.com (Shengjun Fan), ying.hu@univ-rennes1.fr (Ying Hu), sjtang@fudan.edu.cn (Shanjian Tang)

$t \mapsto |g(t, Y_t, Z_t)| + |Z_t|^2$ is integrable, and (1.1) is satisfied. Denote by $\text{BSDE}(\xi, g)$ the BSDE with the terminal condition ξ and the generator g , which are the parameters of BSDEs.

For convenience of exposition, throughout the paper, let us always fix the constants $\alpha \in [1, 2]$, $\beta, \bar{\beta} \geq 0$, $\gamma > 0$, $\delta \in [0, 1]$, and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and an (\mathcal{F}_t) -progressively measurable \mathbb{R}_+ -valued stochastic process $(f_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. We assume that the generator g satisfies $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$,

$$\forall (y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \text{sgn}(y)g(\omega, t, y, z) \leq f_t(\omega) + \beta|y|(\ln(e + |y|))^\delta + \gamma|z|^\alpha(\ln(e + |z|))^\lambda. \quad (1.2)$$

We usually say that g has a one-sided linear growth in the state variable y when $\delta = 0$, and a one-sided super-linear growth in y when $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Furthermore, for the case of $\lambda = 0$, we say that g has a power sub-linear growth in the state variable z when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, a linear growth in z when $\alpha = 1$, a sub-quadratic growth in z when $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, a quadratic growth in z when $\alpha = 2$, a super-quadratic growth in z when $\alpha > 2$, and for the case of $\alpha = 1$ and $\lambda \neq 0$, we say that g has a logarithmic sub-linear growth in z when $\lambda < 0$, and a logarithmic super-linear growth in z when $\lambda > 0$.

1.1. Overview of relevant existing results

BSDEs were initiated by Bismut [15, 16, 17], in particular for the linear case. General nonlinear BSDEs were founded by Pardoux and Peng [80], where an existence and uniqueness result was established on adapted solutions of multidimensional BSDEs with square-integrable parameters and uniformly Lipschitz continuous generators. Subsequently, BSDEs have received an extensive attention due to its various connections to numerous topics such as partial differential equations (PDEs in short), mathematical finance, stochastic control, nonlinear mathematical expectation and so on. The reader is referred to for example [83, 84, 85, 86, 40, 38, 82, 68, 65, 63, 64, 81] for more details.

Particularly, much attentions have been paid on the well-posedness of adapted solutions of BSDEs under various growth and/or continuity of the generator g with respect to the two unknown variables (y, z) and various integrability of the parameters (ξ, f) . Generally speaking, these efforts can be classified into three different directions. The first one focuses on L^p ($p \geq 1$) solution of BSDEs. Relevant classical results are available in [69, 79, 18, 19, 61, 60, 55, 62, 56, 53, 54, 43, 44, 45, 46, 95] when the generators g have a linear/sub-linear growth in the unknown variable z . The reader is also referred to [2, 3, 9, 71, 6, 8, 11, 5, 96] when the generators g have a super-linear growth in the unknown variable z . The second one is devoted to the bounded solution of BSDEs when the generators g have a quadratic/super-quadratic growth in the unknown variable z , see for example [70, 68, 44, 23, 94, 34, 20, 14, 44, 66, 57] for more details. The last one concerns the weakest possible integrability of (ξ, f) for existence and uniqueness of adapted solution of BSDEs when the generators g have some growth and/or continuity in (y, z) . Such a study can be dated back to [21, 22, 35, 92, 36] for the quadratic BSDEs, and subsequently continued in [67, 24, 47, 78] for the linearly growing BSDEs, and recently sprang up in [48, 50, 51, 52] when the generator g has a sub-quadratic, super-linear or logarithmic sub-linear growth in the unknown variable z . The so-called localization procedure, θ -difference technique and the test function method were combined to obtain the following existence and uniqueness of a BSDE when the generator g satisfies (1.2).

Firstly, suppose that the generator g has a one-sided linear growth in y and a linear growth in z , i.e., it satisfies (1.2) with $\delta = 0$, $\alpha = 1$ and $\lambda = 0$. It is well known that if the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^p$ for some

$p > 1$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution in $\mathcal{S}^p \times \mathcal{M}^p$, and the solution is unique when g further satisfies the uniformly Lipschitz continuity in (y, z) . The reader is referred to [80, 40, 69, 19, 53] for more details. Recently, [67, 24, 47, 78] obtained existence of an unbounded solution to a linearly growing BSDE(ξ, g) under the more general condition $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L \exp(\mu\sqrt{2\ln L})$ for some $\mu \geq \gamma\sqrt{T}$ (which is weaker than L^p ($p > 1$)-integrability and stronger than $L \ln L$ -integrability). They also established uniqueness of the unbounded solution provided that g satisfies a monotonicity in y and the uniformly Lipschitz continuity in z . Generally speaking, the generator g allows a general growth in y when g satisfies the monotonicity in y . Relevant works are available in [79, 18, 19, 72, 23, 54, 43, 73, 44, 75].

Secondly, suppose that the generator g has a one-sided linear growth in y and a power sub-linear growth in z , i.e., it satisfies (1.2) with $\delta = 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\lambda = 0$. Briand et al. [19] show that if the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^1$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D), and the solution is unique when g further satisfies an extended monotonicity in y and the uniformly Lipschitz continuity in z . See for example [21, 44, 46] for more details. Very recently, the three authors [51] prove the existence and uniqueness result when the generator g has a one-sided linear growth in y and a logarithmic sub-linear growth in z , i.e., it satisfies (1.2) with $\delta = 0$, $\alpha = 1$ and $\lambda \in (-\infty, -1/2)$, see also [52] for deeper discussions.

Thirdly, suppose that the generator g has a one-sided linear/super-linear growth in y and a logarithmic super-linear growth in z , i.e., it satisfies (1.2) with $\delta \in [0, 1]$, $\alpha = 1$ and $\lambda \in [0, +\infty)$. Let $p := \delta \vee (\lambda + \frac{1}{2}) \vee (2\lambda) \in [\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)$. Very recently, it was shown in [50] that if the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L \exp(\mu(\ln L)^p)$ for some $\mu > \mu_0$ with a certain value μ_0 , then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(|Y_t| \exp(\mu(t)(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for some nonnegative and increasing function $\mu(t)$ defined on $[0, T]$ with $\mu(T) = \mu$, and the solution is unique when the generator g further satisfies an extended monotonicity in y and a uniform continuity in z , or a convexity/concavity in (y, z) , see assumptions (UN1)-(UN3) in [50] for more details. Furthermore, [6, 11] verified existence of a solution to BSDE(ξ, g) in the space of $\mathcal{S}^p \times \mathcal{M}^2$ for some sufficiently large $p > 2$, when the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^p$ and the generator g satisfies (1.2) with $\delta = 1$, $\lambda = 1/2$ and $|g(\omega, t, y, z)|$ instead of the left side of (1.2). They also proved uniqueness of the solution when g further satisfies a local monotonicity in (y, z) . Related works on super-linearly growing BSDEs are available in [2, 3, 9, 70, 7, 10, 8, 74], where the solution of BSDE(ξ, g) in the space of $\mathcal{S}^p \times \mathcal{M}^p$ is considered under the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^p$ for some $p > 1$, and several kinds of locally Lipschitz continuity or local monotonicity of g in (y, z) are usually used in order to guarantee uniqueness of the solution of BSDE(ξ, g).

Fourthly, suppose that the generator g has a one-sided linear growth in y and a sub-quadratic growth in z , i.e., it satisfies (1.2) with $\delta = 0$, $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ and $\lambda = 0$. Let α^* represent the conjugate of α . It was proved in [48] that if the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \exp(\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}})$ for some $\mu > \mu_0$ with a certain value μ_0 , which is weaker than $\exp(\mu L)$ -integrability and stronger than L^p ($p > 1$)-integrability, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(\exp(\mu(t)|Y_t|^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for some nonnegative and increasing function $\mu(t)$ defined on $[0, T]$ with $\mu(T) = \mu$, and the solution is unique when $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \exp(\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}})$ for each $\mu > 0$ and the generator g further satisfies an extended convexity/concavity in (y, z) , see assumption (H2') in [48] for more details.

Finally, suppose that the generator g has a one-sided linear growth in y and a quadratic growth in z , i.e., it satisfies (1.2) with $\delta = 0$, $\alpha = 2$ and $\lambda = 0$. It is well known from [68] that if the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T |f_s| ds \in L^\infty$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}^\infty$, and the solution is unique if g further satisfies the uniformly Lipschitz continuity in y and a locally Lipschitz continuity in z . The reader is referred to [20, 44, 57, 76] for more details on the bounded solution of quadratic BSDEs. Subsequently, [21, 22, 35, 36] proved existence and uniqueness of an unbounded solution to quadratic BSDE(ξ, g) under the data $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \exp(\mu L)$ for $\mu := \gamma e^{\beta T}$, where g is required to be uniformly Lipschitz continuous in y and convex/concave in z for the uniqueness of the solution, see also [14, 49] for more details. A class of quadratic BSDEs subject to L^p ($p > 1$)-integrable terminal values are studied in several recent works, see for example [5, 96, 4, 12]. In addition, [34] show that super-quadratic BSDEs (1.2) (here $\delta = 0$, $\alpha > 2$ and $\lambda = 0$), are not solvable in general and the solution is not unique even if the solution exists. Some relevant solvability results under the Markovian setting are available in [34, 77, 92, 28].

The preceding brief review is flavored with the authors' own tastes, and is also restricted within the scope of their knowledge. Certainly, it does not exhaust all the developments of BSDEs in the last half a century, which seems to be an impossible task to the authors within such a very limited space, and is also not the objective of the paper. We would apologize to all those authors of possibly neglected papers on BSDEs.

1.2. Organization of the paper

The paper will present a comprehensive theory on the well-posedness of 1D nonlinear BSDEs to cover most existing results mentioned above. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate the test function method and prove with the combined techniques of a priori estimate and localization a general existence result (see Definition 2.1 and Theorem 2.2), which yield via right test functions several existence theorems on the adapted solutions of 1D BSDEs (see Theorems 2.3 and 2.7) for both cases of logarithmic quasi-linear growth and the sub-quadratic/quadratic growth, respectively. In Section 3, we focus on the comparison theorems of the adapted solutions of 1D BSDEs for both cases of at most linear growth (see Theorem 3.3) and super-linear at most quadratic growth (see Theorem 3.9), respectively, and establish some existence and uniqueness results (see Theorems 3.12 and 3.13). We first give a crucial a priori estimate (see Proposition 3.1) associated with the test function, and prove Theorems 3.3 and 3.9 with the proper test function and the θ -difference technique, respectively. This yields naturally the desired uniqueness results. Some examples and remarks are provided in the last two sections to illustrate the preceding results. See Remarks 2.4 and 2.9 and Examples 2.5 and 2.8 in section 2 as well as Remarks 3.2, 3.8, 3.10 and 3.11, Examples 3.4 to 3.6 and Proposition 3.7 in section 3. In section 4, several practical applications of our results are introduced including the conditional g -expectation (see Definition 4.1 and Propositions 4.2 and 4.3), the dynamic utility process (see Proposition 4.5 and Theorem 4.6), risk measure (Example 4.8) and nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula (see Definition 4.9 and Theorem 4.10), and some commentaries on known related works are also made, see Remarks 4.4, 4.7 and 4.11. Finally, in section 5 we list several open problems on 1D BSDEs to be further studied, and

in Appendix we prove a key inequality (see Proposition 2.6) used in section 2, which is interesting in its own right.

1.3. Notations and spaces

In this subsection, we give some necessary notations and spaces used in this paper. Let $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, +\infty)$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$, $a^+ := \max\{a, 0\}$ and $a^- := -\min\{a, 0\}$, and $\text{sgn}(x) := \mathbf{1}_{x>0} - \mathbf{1}_{x\leq 0}$, where $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator function of set A . Denote by \mathbf{S} the set of \mathbb{R}_+ -valued continuously differentiable functions $\phi(s, x)$ defined on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\phi_s(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$, $\phi_x(s, \cdot) > 0$ and $\phi_{xx}(s, \cdot) > 0$, where $\phi_s(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the first-order partial derivative of $\phi(\cdot, \cdot)$ with respect to the first variable, and by $\phi_x(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\phi_{xx}(\cdot, \cdot)$ respectively the first- and second-order partial derivative of $\phi(\cdot, \cdot)$ with respect to the second variable. Denote by $\bar{\mathbf{S}}$ the set of \mathbb{R}_+ -valued functions $h(t, x, \bar{x})$ defined on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $h(t, \cdot, \bar{x})$ is nondecreasing for each $(t, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ (or \mathcal{S}^∞) the set of (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted and continuous bounded real processes $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. For each $p > 0$, let $\mathcal{S}^p([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ (or \mathcal{S}^p) be the set of (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted and continuous real processes $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ satisfying

$$\|Y\|_{\mathcal{S}^p} := \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t|^p \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{p} \wedge 1} < +\infty,$$

and $\mathcal{M}^p([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ (or \mathcal{M}^p) the set of all (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted \mathbb{R}^d -valued processes $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ satisfying

$$\|Z\|_{\mathcal{M}^p} := \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^T |Z_t|^2 dt \right)^{p/2} \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{p} \wedge 1} < +\infty.$$

Denote by Σ_T the set of all (\mathcal{F}_t) -stopping times τ valued in $[0, T]$. For an (\mathcal{F}_t) -adapted real process $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, if the family $\{X_\tau : \tau \in \Sigma_T\}$ is uniformly integrable, then we call that it is of class (D).

Now, fix $t \in [0, T]$. For $p, \mu > 0$, we denote by $L^p(\mathcal{F}_t)$ and $L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t)$ the set of \mathcal{F}_t -measurable real random variables ξ such that $\mathbb{E}[|\xi|^p] < +\infty$ and $|\xi| \leq M$ for some real $M > 0$, respectively, and define the following three spaces of \mathcal{F}_t -measurable real random variables:

$$L(\ln L)^p(\mathcal{F}_t) := \{ \xi \in \mathcal{F}_t \mid \mathbb{E}[|\xi|(\ln(e + |\xi|))^p] < +\infty \},$$

$$L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p](\mathcal{F}_t) := \{ \xi \in \mathcal{F}_t \mid \mathbb{E}[|\xi| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |\xi|))^p)] < +\infty \}$$

and

$$\exp(\mu L^p)(\mathcal{F}_t) := \{ \xi \in \mathcal{F}_t \mid \mathbb{E}[\exp(\mu|\xi|^p)] < +\infty \}.$$

It is clear that for each $0 < p < q$ and $0 < \bar{\mu}, \tilde{\mu} < \mu$, we have

$$L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L^q(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L^p(\mathcal{F}_t), \quad L(\ln L)^q(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L(\ln L)^p(\mathcal{F}_t),$$

$$L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^q](\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L \exp[\bar{\mu}(\ln L)^q](\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L \exp[\tilde{\mu}(\ln L)^p](\mathcal{F}_t),$$

and

$$\exp(\mu L^q)(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset \exp(\bar{\mu} L^q)(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset \exp(\tilde{\mu} L^p)(\mathcal{F}_t).$$

It can also be verified that for each $\mu, \bar{\mu}, r > 0$ and $0 < p < 1 < q$, we have

$$L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset \exp(\mu L^r)(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L \exp[\bar{\mu}(\ln L)^q](\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L \exp[\mu \ln L](\mathcal{F}_t) = L^{1+\mu}(\mathcal{F}_t)$$

and

$$L^q(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p](\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L(\ln L)^r(\mathcal{F}_t) \subset L^1(\mathcal{F}_t).$$

Furthermore, for each $p, \mu > 0$ and $0 < \bar{p} \leq 1 < \tilde{p}$, the spaces

$$L(\ln L)^p(\mathcal{F}_t), \quad L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^{\bar{p}}](\mathcal{F}_t), \quad \bigcup_{\bar{\mu} > \mu} L \exp[\bar{\mu}(\ln L)^{\tilde{p}}](\mathcal{F}_t) \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcap_{\bar{\mu} > 0} \exp(\bar{\mu} L^p)(\mathcal{F}_t)$$

are all the Orlicz hearts corresponding, respectively, to the following Young functions

$$x(\ln(e+x))^p, \quad x \exp[\mu(\ln(e+x))^{\bar{p}}], \quad x \exp[\mu(\ln(e+x))^{\tilde{p}}] \quad \text{and} \quad \exp(x^p) - 1.$$

More details on the Orlicz space, the Orlicz class and the Orlicz heart are referred to [39, 27]. Finally, in all notations of the spaces on random variables, the σ -algebra (\mathcal{F}_T) is usually omitted when there is no confusion.

2. Existence results

2.1. The test function method and a general existence result

Let us first introduce the following assumptions on the generator g .

(EX1) $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, $g(\omega, t, \cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous.

(EX2) There exist two \mathbb{R}_+ -valued functions $H(\omega, t, x)$ and $\Gamma(\omega, t, x)$ defined on $\Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$, which are (\mathcal{F}_t) -progressively measurable for each $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and nondecreasing with respect to the variable x , such that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|g(\omega, t, y, z)| \leq H(\omega, t, |y|) + \Gamma(\omega, t, |y|)|z|^2,$$

and $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\Gamma(\omega, \cdot, x)$ is left-continuous on $[0, T]$ and

$$\int_0^T H(\omega, t, x) dt + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \Gamma(\omega, t, x) < +\infty.$$

(EX3) There exists a function $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \in \bar{\mathbf{S}}$ such that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\text{sgn}(y)g(\omega, t, y, z) \leq f_t(\omega) + h(t, |y|, |z|).$$

Definition 2.1. Assume that the generator g satisfies assumption (EX3). A function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ is called a test function for g or h if it satisfies that for each $(s, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$-\varphi_x(s, x)h(s, x, \bar{x}) + \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{xx}(s, x)|\bar{x}|^2 + \varphi_s(s, x) \geq 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Theorem 2.2. Assume that ξ is an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable random variable and the generator g satisfies the above assumptions (EX1)-(EX3). If there exists a test function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ for g such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(T, |\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \right) \right] < +\infty, \quad (2.2)$$

then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(\varphi(t, |Y_t| + \int_0^t f_s ds))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D). Furthermore, the process $(\varphi(t, |Y_t| + \int_0^t f_s ds))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a sub-martingale on $[0, T]$. In particular, we have

$$\varphi \left(t, |Y_t| + \int_0^t f_s ds \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(T, |\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. The whole proof is divided into the following two steps.

Step 1. We first prove the inequality (2.3) for a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ of BSDE(ξ, g) if further $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^\infty$. Define

$$\bar{Y}_t := |Y_t| + \int_0^t f_s ds \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Z}_t := \text{sgn}(Y_t)Z_t, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

We have from Itô-Tanaka's formula that

$$\bar{Y}_t = \bar{Y}_T + \int_t^T (\text{sgn}(Y_s)g(s, Y_s, Z_s) - f_s) ds - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s \cdot dB_s - \int_t^T dL_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where L is the local time of Y at 0. Applying Itô's formula to the process $\varphi(s, \bar{Y}_s)$ and using assumption (EX3), we have that for each $s \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} d\varphi(s, \bar{Y}_s) &= \varphi_x(s, \bar{Y}_s) (-\text{sgn}(Y_s)g(s, Y_s, Z_s) + f_s) ds + \varphi_x(s, \bar{Y}_s) \bar{Z}_s \cdot dB_s \\ &\quad + \varphi_x(s, \bar{Y}_s) dL_s + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{xx}(s, \bar{Y}_s) |\bar{Z}_s|^2 ds + \varphi_s(s, \bar{Y}_s) ds \\ &\geq \left[-\varphi_x(s, \bar{Y}_s) h(s, |Y_s|, |Z_s|) + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{xx}(s, \bar{Y}_s) |Z_s|^2 + \varphi_s(s, \bar{Y}_s) \right] ds + \varphi_x(s, \bar{Y}_s) \bar{Z}_s \cdot dB_s. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|Y_s| \leq \bar{Y}_s$ and $h(t, \cdot, \bar{x})$ is nondecreasing, we see from (2.1) that

$$d\varphi(s, \bar{Y}_s) \geq \varphi_x(s, \bar{Y}_s) \bar{Z}_s \cdot dB_s, \quad s \in [0, T],$$

which yields that

$$\varphi(T, \bar{Y}_T) - \varphi(t, \bar{Y}_t) \geq \int_t^T \varphi_x(s, \bar{Y}_s) \bar{Z}_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Since $|\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^\infty$ and $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$, taking the expectation conditioned on \mathcal{F}_t on both sides of the last inequality, we have (2.3).

Step 2. Based on Step 1, we use the localization procedure of Briand and Hu [21] to construct the desired solution. For each $n, p \geq 1$ and $(\omega, t, y, z) \in \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, denote

$$\xi^{n,p} := \xi^+ \wedge n - \xi^- \wedge p \quad \text{and} \quad g^{n,p}(\omega, t, y, z) := g^+(\omega, t, y, z) \wedge n - g^-(\omega, t, y, z) \wedge p. \quad (2.4)$$

It is clear that $|\xi^{n,p}| \leq |\xi| \wedge (n \vee p)$ and $|g^{n,p}| \leq |g| \wedge (n \vee p)$ for each $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. It can also be verified that the generator $g^{n,p}$ satisfies assumptions (EX1)-(EX3) with $f \wedge (n \vee p)$ instead of f . Then,

according to [68], the following BSDE $(\xi^{n,p}, g^{n,p})$ has a maximal bounded solution $(Y_t^{n,p}, Z_t^{n,p})_{t \in [0, T]}$ in the space of processes $\mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$Y_t^{n,p} = \xi^{n,p} + \int_t^T g^{n,p}(s, Y_s^{n,p}, Z_s^{n,p}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s^{n,p} \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.5)$$

The comparison theorem shows that $(Y_t^{n,p})_{t \in [0, T]}$ is nondecreasing in n and non-increasing in p . Furthermore, we know from Step 1 that for each $n, p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi \left(t, |Y_t^{n,p}| + \int_0^t [f_s \wedge (n \vee p)] ds \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(T, |\xi^{n,p}| + \int_0^T [f_s \wedge (n \vee p)] ds \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(T, |\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Now, for each pair of integers $m, l \geq 1$, we define the following stopping times:

$$\tau_m := \inf \left\{ t \in [0, T] : \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(T, |\xi| + \int_0^T f_s ds \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \geq \varphi(t, m) \right\} \wedge T$$

and

$$\sigma_{m,l} := \inf \left\{ t \in [0, T] : \int_0^t H(s, m) ds + \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \Gamma(s, m) \geq l \right\} \wedge \tau_m$$

with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. Then $(Y_{m,l}^{n,p}(t), Z_{m,l}^{n,p}(t))_{t \in [0, T]} := (Y_{t \wedge \sigma_{m,l}}^{n,p}, Z_{t \wedge \sigma_{m,l}}^{n,p} \mathbf{1}_{t \leq \sigma_{m,l}})_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a solution in the space of processes $\mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ to the following BSDE:

$$Y_{m,l}^{n,p}(t) = Y_{\sigma_{m,l}}^{n,p} + \int_t^{\sigma_{m,l}} \mathbf{1}_{s \leq \sigma_{m,l}} g^{n,p}(s, Y_{m,l}^{n,p}(s), Z_{m,l}^{n,p}(s)) ds - \int_t^{\sigma_{m,l}} Z_{m,l}^{n,p}(s) \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Observe that for each fixed $m, l \geq 1$, $(Y_{m,l}^{n,p}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is nondecreasing in n and non-increasing in p , and that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, $(g^{n,p})_{n,p}$ converges locally uniformly in (y, z) to g as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\varphi(t, \cdot)$ is nondecreasing for each $t \in [0, T]$, by (2.6) together with the definitions of τ_m and $\sigma_{m,l}$ we can obtain that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$,

$$\sup_{n,p \geq 1} |Y_{m,l}^{n,p}(t)| \leq m.$$

Furthermore, since $|g^{n,p}| \leq |g|$ and g satisfies assumption (EX2), we know that $d\mathbb{P} \times ds - a.e.$,

$$\forall (y, z) \in [-m, m] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sup_{n,p \geq 1} (\mathbf{1}_{s \leq \sigma_{m,l}} |g^{n,p}(s, y, z)|) \leq \mathbf{1}_{s \leq \sigma_{m,l}} H(s, m) + l|z|^2$$

with $\int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{s \leq \sigma_{m,l}} H(s, m) ds \leq l$. Thus, for each fixed $m, l \geq 1$, we can apply the stability result for the bounded solutions of BSDEs (see for example Proposition 3.1 in [76]). Setting $Y_{m,l}(t) := \inf_p \sup_n Y_{t \wedge \sigma_{m,l}}^{n,p}$, then $(Y_{m,l}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is continuous and the sequence $(Z_t^{n,p} \mathbf{1}_{t \leq \sigma_{m,l}})_{t \in [0, T]}$ converges to $(Z_{m,l}(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ strongly in $\mathcal{M}^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$Y_{m,l}(t) = \inf_{p \geq 1} \sup_{n \geq 1} Y_{\sigma_{m,l}}^{n,p} + \int_t^{\sigma_{m,l}} \mathbf{1}_{s \leq \sigma_{m,l}} g(s, Y_{m,l}(s), Z_{m,l}(s)) ds - \int_t^{\sigma_{m,l}} Z_{m,l}(s) \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Finally, in view of the last equation and the stability of stopping times τ_m and $\sigma_{m,l}$, since we have $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $m, l \geq 1$,

$$Y_{m+1, l+1}(t \wedge \sigma_{m,l}) = Y_{m, l+1}(t \wedge \sigma_{m,l}) = Y_{m,l}(t \wedge \sigma_{m,l}) = \inf_{p \geq 1} \sup_{n \geq 1} Y_{t \wedge \sigma_{m,l}}^{n,p}$$

and

$$Z_{m+1,l+1}\mathbf{1}_{t \leq \sigma_{m,l}} = Z_{m,l+1}\mathbf{1}_{t \leq \sigma_{m,l}} = Z_{m,l}\mathbf{1}_{t \leq \sigma_{m,l}} = \lim_{n,p \rightarrow \infty} Z_t^{n,p}\mathbf{1}_{t \leq \sigma_{m,l}},$$

we see that $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is an adapted solution of BSDE (ξ, g) , where

$$Y_t := \inf_p \sup_n Y_t^{n,p} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_t := \sum_{m=1}^{+\infty} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{+\infty} Z_{m,l}(t) \mathbf{1}_{t \in [\sigma_{m,l-1}, \sigma_{m,l})} \right) \mathbf{1}_{t \in [\tau_{m-1}, \tau_m)}, \quad t \in [0, T]$$

with $\tau_0 := 0$ and $\sigma_{m,0} := 0$ for each $m \geq 1$. And, (2.3) follows from (2.6) by sending $n, p \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, according to (2.5), in a way similar to step 1, we also verify that for each $n, p \geq 1$ and $0 \leq t \leq r \leq T$,

$$\varphi \left(t, |Y_t^{n,p}| + \int_0^t [f_s \wedge (n \vee p)] ds \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(r, |Y_r^{n,p}| + \int_0^r [f_s \wedge (n \vee p)] ds \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

Thus, in view of (2.6), setting $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ and using Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem in the last inequality, we see that the process $(\varphi(t, |Y_t| + \int_0^t f_s ds))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is indeed a sub-martingale. The proof is then complete. \square

As applications of Theorem 2.2, we shall prove Theorems 2.3 and 2.7 below, where the function $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ in (EX3) takes the following form:

$$h(t, x, \bar{x}) := \beta x (\ln(e + x))^\delta + \gamma \bar{x}^\alpha (\ln(e + \bar{x}))^\lambda, \quad (t, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (2.7)$$

Both theorems can be compared to existing existence results (for example, see [68, 21, 67, 47, 48, 51, 50]) on adapted solutions of one-dimensional BSDEs.

2.2. The logarithmic quasi-linear growth case

Let us first consider the case that the generator g has a logarithmic quasi-linear growth in the unknown variables (y, z) , i.e., the case of $\alpha = 1$ in (2.7).

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that ξ is an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable random variable and the generator g satisfies (EX1)-(EX3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\alpha = 1$. Then, the following assertions hold.*

(i) *Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda \in (-\infty, -\frac{1}{2})$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^1$, then BSDE (ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D);*

(ii) *Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L(\ln L)^p$ for some $p > 0$, then BSDE (ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t|(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D);*

(iii) *If $p := \delta \vee (\lambda + \frac{1}{2}) \vee (2\lambda) \in (0, +\infty)$ and $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p]$, then BSDE (ξ, g) has a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(|Y_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$;*

(iv) *Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^p$ for some $p > 1$, then BSDE (ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D).*

Remark 2.4. *When the generator g grows faster in both unknown variables (y, z) , a stronger integrability on $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds$ is required for the existence of a solution of BSDE (ξ, g) . In addition, the case of $\lambda \in [-\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ seems to be first given in (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 2.3.*

Example 2.5. Consider the following simple BSDE:

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T (f_s + \beta|Y_s| + \gamma|Z_s|)ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.8)$$

where $\xi \geq 0$ and $f \in L^1(0, T)$. It is the special case of $\delta = 0$, $\lambda = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$ in (2.7). Theorem 2.1 of [67] states that BSDE (2.8) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $Y \geq 0$ if and only if there exists a locally bounded process \bar{Y} such that

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q \in \mathcal{A}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_q \left[e^{\beta(T-t)} |\xi| \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \right\} + \int_t^T e^{\beta(s-t)} f_s ds \leq \bar{Y}_t,$$

where \mathcal{A} is the set of (\mathcal{F}_t) -progressively measurable \mathbb{R}^d -valued process $(q_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $|q| \leq \gamma$, and

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^q}{d\mathbb{P}} := M_T^q$$

with

$$M_t^q := \exp \left\{ \int_0^t q_s \cdot dB_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |q_s|^2 ds \right\}, \quad t \in [0, T]$$

and \mathbb{E}_q is the expectation operator with respect to \mathbb{Q}^q . In particular, if BSDE (2.8) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $Y \geq 0$, then $\xi e^{\gamma|B_T|} \in L^1$.

The following example is taken from Example 2.3 of [67]. Set $d = 1$, $T = 1$, $\gamma = 1$ and the terminal variable $\xi := e^{\frac{1}{2}(|B_1| - 1)^2} - 1$. Then, BSDE (2.8) has no solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $Y \geq 0$, as $\xi e^{|B_T|} \notin L^1$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\xi e^{|B_T|} \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{\frac{1}{2}(|x| - 1)^2} e^{|x|} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} dx = +\infty.$$

Whereas it can be directly checked that this ξ belongs to the space of $\cap_{0 < \mu < \sqrt{2}} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p]$ and then $\cap_{q > 0} L(\ln L)^q$, but does not belong to $L \exp[\sqrt{2}(\ln L)^p]$, where $p = \frac{1}{2}$ is defined in (iii) of Theorem 2.3.

Furthermore, [67, 47] show that for a linearly growing BSDE(ξ, g) to have a solution, an $L \exp(\mu\sqrt{\ln L})$ -integrability of $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds$ is sufficient for $\mu = \gamma\sqrt{2T}$, but not for any $\mu \in (0, \gamma\sqrt{2T})$, which can not follow from (iii) of Theorem 2.3.

To prove Theorem 2.3, we introduce the following Proposition 2.6, whose proof is given in Appendix.

Proposition 2.6. For each $p > 1$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a sufficiently large positive constant $k_{\lambda, p} \geq e$ depending only on (λ, p) such that for each $k \geq k_{\lambda, p}$,

$$2xy (\ln(k + y))^\lambda \leq px^2 (\ln(k + x))^{2\lambda} + y^2, \quad \forall x, y > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

In particular, when $p = 1$, there is no constant k such that (2.9) holds true unless $\lambda = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Since the generator g satisfies (EX1)-(EX3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\alpha = 1$, a function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ is a test function for g if for each $(s, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$, it holds that

$$-\varphi_x(s, x) \left(\beta x (\ln(e + x))^\delta + \gamma \bar{x} (\ln(e + \bar{x}))^\lambda \right) + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{xx}(s, x) |\bar{x}|^2 + \varphi_s(s, x) \geq 0.$$

It follows from Proposition 2.6 with $p = 2$ that there exists a sufficiently large positive constant $k_\lambda \geq e$ depending only on λ such that for each $k \geq k_\lambda$ and $(s, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} & -\gamma\varphi_x(s, x)\bar{x}(\ln(k + \bar{x}))^\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{xx}(s, x)|\bar{x}|^2 \\ &= \frac{\varphi_{xx}(s, x)}{2} \left(-2\frac{\gamma\varphi_x(s, x)}{\varphi_{xx}(s, x)}\bar{x}(\ln(k + \bar{x}))^\lambda + |\bar{x}|^2 \right) \\ &\geq -\frac{\gamma^2(\varphi_x(s, x))^2}{\varphi_{xx}(s, x)} \left(\ln \left(k + \frac{\gamma\varphi_x(s, x)}{\varphi_{xx}(s, x)} \right) \right)^{2\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if a function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ satisfies that for some $k \geq k_\lambda \geq e$ and each $(s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$-\beta\varphi_x(s, x)(k + x)(\ln(k + x))^\delta - \frac{\gamma^2(\varphi_x(s, x))^2}{\varphi_{xx}(s, x)} \left(\ln \left(k + \frac{\gamma\varphi_x(s, x)}{\varphi_{xx}(s, x)} \right) \right)^{2\lambda} + \varphi_s(s, x) \geq 0, \quad (2.10)$$

then it is a test function for the generator g .

(i) Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda \in (-\infty, -\frac{1}{2})$. By a similar computation as in [51], one can verify that for sufficiently large $k \geq k_\lambda$ and $c \geq 2\beta - \frac{8\gamma^2}{1+2\lambda}$, the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k + x) \left(1 - (\ln(k + x))^{1+2\lambda} \right) \exp(cs), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

satisfies the inequality (2.10) with $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda < -1/2$, and thus is a test function for the generator g .

Since

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\varphi(s, x)}{x} = \exp(cs) \in [1, \exp(cT)], \quad s \in [0, T],$$

we see from Theorem 2.2 that BSDE (ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^1$.

(ii) Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$. It is not very hard to verify that for $p > 0$, sufficiently large $k \geq k_\lambda$ and $c \geq 2\beta + \frac{4\gamma^2}{p}$, the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k + x) (\ln(k + x))^p \exp(cs), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

satisfies the inequality (2.10) with $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = -1/2$, and thus is a test function for the generator g .

Since

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\varphi(s, x)}{x (\ln(e + x))^p} = \exp(cs) \in [1, \exp(cT)], \quad s \in [0, T],$$

we see from Theorem 2.2 that if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L(\ln L)^p$ for some $p > 0$, then BSDE (ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t|(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D).

(iii) Let $p := \delta \vee (\lambda + \frac{1}{2}) \vee (2\lambda) \in (0, +\infty)$. By a similar computation as in [50], one can verify that for sufficiently large $k \geq k_\lambda$, $c_1 \geq 1$ and $c_2 \geq (p + 1)\beta - 4\lambda^+ \gamma^2$, the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k + x) \exp(c_1 \exp(c_2 s) (\ln(k + x))^p), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

satisfies the inequality (2.10) with $p > 0$, and thus is a test function for the generator g . Since

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\varphi(s, x)}{x \exp(c_1 \exp(c_2 s) (\ln(e + x))^p)} = 1, \quad s \in [0, T],$$

we see from Theorem 2.2 that if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu>0} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p]$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that for each $\mu > 0$, $(|Y_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D).

(iv) Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$. It is easy to verify that for each $p > 1$, $k \geq k_\lambda$ and $c \geq p\beta + \frac{p}{p-1}\gamma^2$, the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k + x)^p \exp(cs), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

satisfies the inequality (2.10) with $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$, and thus is a test function for the generator g . Since

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\varphi(s, x)}{x^p} = \exp(cs) \in [1, \exp(cT)], \quad s \in [0, T],$$

we see from Theorem 2.2 that if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^p$ for some $p > 1$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D). \square

2.3. The sub-quadratic/quadratic growth case

Let us further consider the case that the generator g has a one-sided linear growth in the unknown variable y and has a super-linear at most quadratic growth in the unknown variable z .

Theorem 2.7. *Assume that ξ is an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable random variable and the generator g satisfies assumptions (EX1)-(EX3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\delta = 0$, $\lambda = 0$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$. Let α^* be the conjugate of α , i.e.,*

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha^*} = 1.$$

If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu>0} \exp(\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^}})$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(\exp(\mu|Y_t|^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$. In particular, if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^\infty$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$.*

Example 2.8. *Let us consider the following typical BSDE:*

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T \frac{1}{2} |Z_s|^2 ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.11)$$

The change of variables leads to the equation

$$e^{Y_t} = e^\xi - \int_t^T e^{Y_s} Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

which has a solution as $e^\xi \in L^1$. On the other hand, since $\{e^{Y_t}\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a positive super-martingale, Theorem 3.1 of [23] observes that the inclusion $e^\xi \in L^1$ is also necessary for this BSDE to have a solution.

Furthermore, we consider the case where the generator g satisfies assumptions (EX1)-(EX3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\delta = 0$, $\lambda = 0$ and $\alpha = 2$. [21] show that for BSDE(ξ, g) to have a solution, an $\exp(\mu L)$ -integrability of $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds$ is sufficient for $\mu = 2\gamma e^{\beta T}$, but not for any $\mu \in (0, 2\gamma e^{\beta T})$, which can not follow from Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. Consider both cases of $\alpha = 2$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$.

(i) The case of $\alpha = 2$. In this case, a function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ is a test function for g if

$$-\varphi_x(s, x) (\beta x + \gamma \bar{x}^2) + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_{xx}(s, x) |\bar{x}|^2 + \varphi_s(s, x) \geq 0, \quad \forall (s, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

It is easy to verify that for each $c_1 \geq 2\gamma$ and $c_2 \geq \beta$, the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = \exp(c_1 \exp(c_2 s)x), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

satisfies the last inequality, and thus is a test function for the generator g . It follows from Theorem 2.2 that if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu>0} \exp(\mu L)$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(\exp(\mu|Y_t|))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$, which is the desired assertion since $\alpha^* = 2$ in this case.

(ii) The case of $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. In this case, a function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ is a test function for g if

$$-\varphi_x(s, x)(\beta x + \gamma \bar{x}^\alpha) + \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{xx}(s, x)|\bar{x}|^2 + \varphi_s(s, x) \geq 0, \quad \forall (s, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Using Young's inequality, we have that for each $(s, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} & -\gamma\varphi_x(s, x)\bar{x}^\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\varphi_{xx}(s, x)|\bar{x}|^2 \\ &= \varphi_{xx}(s, x) \left(-\frac{\gamma\varphi_x(s, x)}{\varphi_{xx}(s, x)}\bar{x}^\alpha + \frac{1}{2}|\bar{x}|^2 \right) \\ &\geq -\frac{2-\alpha}{2\alpha} \cdot \frac{(\alpha\gamma\varphi_x(s, x))^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}}{(\varphi_{xx}(s, x))^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}} \geq -\frac{(2\gamma\varphi_x(s, x))^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}}{(\varphi_{xx}(s, x))^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if a function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ satisfies

$$-\beta\varphi_x(s, x)x - \frac{(2\gamma\varphi_x(s, x))^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}}{(\varphi_{xx}(s, x))^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}} + \varphi_s(s, x) \geq 0, \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (2.12)$$

then it is a test function for the generator g . Furthermore, by a similar computation as in [48], it can be verified that for each $c_1 \geq 1$, $k \geq k_{\alpha, c_1}$ with k_{α, c_1} being a positive constant depending only on α and c_1 , and $c_2 \geq \beta + (1 + c_1)2^{\frac{6}{2-\alpha}}(2\alpha - 2)^{\frac{2-2\alpha}{2-\alpha}}\gamma^{\frac{2}{2-\alpha}}$, the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = \exp\left(c_1 \exp(c_2 s)(x + k)^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}\right), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$$

satisfies the inequality (2.12), and thus is a test function for the generator g . Since

$$\exp\left(x^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}\right) \leq \varphi(s, x) \leq \exp\left(c_1 \exp(c_2 T)k^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}\right) \exp\left(c_1 \exp(c_2 T)x^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}\right), \quad \forall (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+,$$

we see from Theorem 2.2 that if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu>0} \exp(\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}})$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(\exp(\mu|Y_t|^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$.

Finally, by (2.3) it can be concluded that if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^\infty$, then $(\varphi(t, |Y_t| + \int_0^t f_s ds))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a bounded process, and then $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$. The proof is complete. \square

Remark 2.9. *Some finer integrability of the data $\xi + \int_0^T f_t dt$ might be found for the existence of an adapted solution to BSDE(ξ, g) with new test functions different from those in the proof of Theorems 2.3 and 2.7. The reader is referred to [21, 47, 48, 50] for more details.*

3. Comparison theorems and existence and uniqueness results

In this section, we prove two comparison theorems under different growth of the generator g in the unknown variables (y, z) , which immediately yield the desired uniqueness and can be compared to some existing comparison results given in for example [40, 68, 65, 22, 44, 48, 50, 51].

First, we have the following a priori estimate.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that there exists a function $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \in \bar{\mathbf{S}}$ such that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$,*

$$\mathbf{1}_{Y_t > 0} g(t, Y_t, Z_t) \leq f_t + h(t, Y_t^+, |Z_t|),$$

and that $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbf{S}$ is a test function for h . If $(\varphi(t, Y_t^+ + \int_0^t f_s ds))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D), then we have

$$\varphi\left(t, Y_t^+ + \int_0^t f_s ds\right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi\left(T, \xi^+ + \int_0^T f_s ds\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. Note that $(\varphi(t, Y_t^+ + \int_0^t f_s ds))_{t \in [0, T]}$ belongs to class (D). The desired conclusion can be easily obtained by a similar computation to step 1 in the proof of Theorem 2.2 with Y_t^+ , Y_s^+ , $\mathbf{1}_{Y_t > 0}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{Y_s > 0}$ instead of $|Y_t|$, $|Y_s|$, $\text{sgn}(Y_t)$ and $\text{sgn}(Y_s)$, respectively. \square

3.1. Comparison results for the case of an at most linear growth

Now, let us introduce the following assumptions on the generator g , where g has a one-sided linear growth in y and an at most linear growth in z .

(UN1) g has an extended monotonicity in y , i.e., there exists a continuous, increasing and concave function $\rho(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $\rho(0) = 0$, $\rho(u) > 0$ for $u > 0$ and

$$\int_{0^+} \frac{du}{\rho(u)} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{du}{\rho(u)} = +\infty$$

such that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $(y_1, y_2, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\text{sgn}(y_1 - y_2) (g(\omega, t, y_1, z) - g(\omega, t, y_2, z)) \leq \rho(|y_1 - y_2|).$$

(UN2) g has a logarithmic uniform continuity in z , i.e., there exist a non-positive constant $\lambda \in (-\infty, 0]$ and a nondecreasing continuous function $\kappa(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with linear growth and $\kappa(0) = 0$ such that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $(y, z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|g(\omega, t, y, z_1) - g(\omega, t, y, z_2)| \leq \kappa(|z_1 - z_2| (\ln(e + |z_1 - z_2|))^\lambda) \leq \kappa(|z_1 - z_2|).$$

Remark 3.2. *Since the function $\rho(\cdot)$ appearing in (UN1) is nondecreasing and concave with $\rho(0) = 0$, we can verify that $\rho(\cdot)$ has a linear growth. We always assume that there exists a $A > 0$ such that*

$$\forall u \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \rho(u) \leq A(u + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(u) \leq A(u + 1). \quad (3.1)$$

Thus, if the generator g satisfies (UN1) and (UN2), then we have $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sgn}(y)g(\omega, t, y, z) &\leq |g(t, 0, 0)| + \rho(|y|) + \kappa(|z| (\ln(e + |z|))^\lambda) \\ &\leq |g(t, 0, 0)| + 2A + A|y| + A|z| (\ln(e + |z|))^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

which means that the generator g has a one-sided linear growth in y and a logarithmic sub-linear/linear growth in the unknown variable z , and then satisfies assumption (EX3) with $f_t := |g(t, 0, 0)| + 2A$ and $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\beta = \gamma = A$, $\delta = 0$, $\alpha = 1$ and $\lambda \leq 0$. In addition, in the case of $\lambda = 0$, assumption (UN2) is equivalent to saying that the function $g(t, \omega, y, z)$ is uniformly continuous in the variable z uniformly with respect to the variables (t, ω, y) ; the assumption (UN2) becomes stronger as λ decreases.

Theorem 3.3. *Let ξ and ξ' be two terminal conditions such that $\xi \leq \xi'$, the generator g (resp. g') satisfy assumptions (UN1) and (UN2), and $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(Y'_t, Z'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be, respectively, adapted solutions to BSDE(ξ, g) and BSDE(ξ', g') such that*

$$\mathbf{1}_{Y_t > Y'_t} (g(t, Y'_t, Z'_t) - g'(t, Y'_t, Z'_t)) \leq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } \mathbf{1}_{Y_t > Y'_t} (g(t, Y_t, Z_t) - g'(t, Y_t, Z_t)) \leq 0). \quad (3.2)$$

Then, we have $Y_t \leq Y'_t$ for each $t \in [0, T]$, if either of the following four conditions is true:

(i) $\lambda < -1/2$ and both processes $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(Y'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ are of class (D).

(ii) $\lambda = -1/2$ and both processes $(|Y_t|(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t|(\ln(e + |Y'_t|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ are of class (D) for some constant $p > 0$.

(iii) $\lambda \in (-1/2, 0]$ and both processes $(|Y_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y'_t|))^{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ are of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$.

(iv) $\lambda = 0$ and both processes $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ are of class (D) for some $p > 1$.

[40] show that the strict comparison theorem is true for solutions of two BSDEs when either of both generators is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in (y, z) . However, the following two examples indicate that the strict comparison theorem fails to hold in general when the generator g satisfies only assumptions (UN1) and (UN2), which are provided in Section 5.3 of [81] and Example 3.2 of [62], respectively. In finance, this means that there are infinitely many opportunities of arbitrage.

Example 3.4. *Let $d = 1$ and consider the following BSDE:*

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T (-2\sqrt{Y_s^+}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.3)$$

Clearly, the generator $g(\omega, t, y, z) := -2\sqrt{y^+}$ satisfies assumptions (UN1) and (UN2) with $\rho(x) = x$ and $\kappa(x) \equiv 0$. It is not hard to verify that $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} := (0, 0)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(Y'_t, Z'_t)_{t \in [0, T]} := (t^2, 0)_{t \in [0, T]}$ are respectively the unique solution to (3.3) with $\xi = 0$ and $\xi = T^2$ such that $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ belong to class (D) for each $p > 0$. Note that $Y'_T = T^2 > 0 = Y_T$, but $Y_0 = Y'_0 = 0$.

Example 3.5. *Let $d = 1$ and consider the following BSDE:*

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T (-3|Z_s|^{\frac{2}{3}}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.4)$$

Clearly, the generator $g(\omega, t, y, z) := -3|z|^{\frac{2}{3}}$ satisfies (UN1) and (UN2) with $\rho(x) = x$ and $\kappa(x) = 3x^{\frac{2}{3}}$. It is not hard to verify that $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} := (0, 0)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(Y'_t, Z'_t)_{t \in [0, T]} := (\frac{1}{4}B_t^4, B_t^3)_{t \in [0, T]}$ are respectively the unique solution to (3.4) with $\xi = 0$ and $\xi = \frac{1}{4}B_T^4$ such that $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ belong to class (D) for each $p > 0$. Note that $\mathbb{P}(Y'_T > Y_T) = 1 > 0$, but $Y_0 = Y'_0 = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. We only prove the case that the generator g satisfies assumptions (UN1) and (UN2), and $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$,

$$\mathbf{1}_{Y_t > Y'_t} (g(t, Y'_t, Z'_t) - g'(t, Y'_t, Z'_t)) \leq 0. \quad (3.5)$$

The other case can be proved in the same way. According to Theorem 2.1 in [44] and the above assumptions, it suffices to prove that the process $((Y_t - Y'_t)^+)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is bounded whenever either of four conditions (i)-(iv) holds.

Define $\hat{Y} := Y - Y'$ and $\hat{Z} := Z - Z'$. Then, the pair of processes $(\hat{Y}_t, \hat{Z}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ verifies

$$\hat{Y}_t = \hat{\xi} + \int_t^T \hat{g}(s, \hat{Y}_s, \hat{Z}_s) ds - \int_t^T \hat{Z}_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.6)$$

where $\hat{\xi} := \xi - \xi'$ and

$$\hat{g}(s, \hat{Y}_s, \hat{Z}_s) := g(s, Y_s, Z_s) - g'(s, Y'_s, Z'_s).$$

From assumptions (UN1) and (UN2) together with inequalities (3.5) and (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{\hat{Y}_t > 0} \hat{g}(t, \hat{Y}_t, \hat{Z}_t) &= \mathbf{1}_{\hat{Y}_t > 0} (g(s, Y_s, Z_s) - g'(s, Y'_s, Z'_s)) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\hat{Y}_t > 0} (g(s, Y_s, Z_s) - g(s, Y'_s, Z_s) + g(s, Y'_s, Z_s) - g(s, Y'_s, Z'_s) + g(s, Y'_s, Z'_s) - g'(s, Y'_s, Z'_s)) \\ &\leq \rho(\hat{Y}_t^+) + \kappa \left(|\hat{Z}_t| (\ln(e + |\hat{Z}_t|))^\lambda \right) \\ &\leq 2A + A\hat{Y}_t^+ + A|\hat{Z}_t| \left(\ln(e + |\hat{Z}_t|) \right)^\lambda = f_t + h(t, \hat{Y}_t^+, |\hat{Z}_t|), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where $f_t := 2A$ and for each $(t, x, \bar{x}) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$h(t, x, \bar{x}) := Ax + A\bar{x} (\ln(e + \bar{x}))^\lambda. \quad (3.8)$$

Using Proposition 3.1 together with (3.7) and (3.8), we now verify that \hat{Y}^+ is a bounded process whenever either of conditions (i)-(iv) is true.

(i) Let $\lambda < -1/2$ and both processes $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(Y'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be of class (D). For each $k \geq e$ sufficient large and each $c \geq 2A - \frac{8A^2}{1+2\lambda}$, define the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k + x) \left(1 - (\ln(k + x))^{1+2\lambda} \right) \exp(cs), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Since $0 \leq \varphi(s, x) \leq (k + x) \exp(cT)$ for each $(s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$, the process $\{\varphi(t, \hat{Y}_t^+ + 2At)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D). On the other hand, a similar analysis to that in (i) of the proof of Theorem 2.3 yields that the last function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies (2.1), and thus is a test function for h defined in (3.8). It then follows from Proposition 3.1 that

$$\varphi(t, Y_t^+ + 2At) \leq \mathbb{E}[\varphi(T, \xi^+ + 2AT) | \mathcal{F}_t] = \varphi(T, 2AT), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

which means that $(\hat{Y}_t^+)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a bounded process.

(ii) Let $\lambda = -1/2$ and both processes $(|Y_t|(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t|(\ln(e + |Y'_t|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be of class (D) for some constant $p > 0$. For each $k \geq e$ sufficient large and each $c \geq 2A + \frac{4A^2}{p}$, define the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k + x) (\ln(k + x))^p \exp(cs), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Since $0 \leq \varphi(s, x) \leq Kx (\ln(e + x))^p$ for each $(s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and some positive constant $K > 0$ depending only on (k, T) , we can deduce that $\{\varphi(t, \hat{Y}_t^+ + 2At)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D). On the other hand, a similar analysis to that in (ii) of the proof of Theorem 2.3 yields that the last function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies (2.1), and hence is a test function for h defined in (3.8). Thus, the boundedness of the process $(\hat{Y}_t^+)_{t \in [0, T]}$ follows immediately as in (i).

(iii) Let $\lambda \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$ and both processes $(|Y_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y'_t|))^{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ be of class (D) for any $\mu > 0$. For each $k \geq e$ sufficient large, $c_1 \geq 1$ and $c_2 \geq (\lambda + 3/2)\beta - 4^{\lambda^+} \gamma^2$, define the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k + x) \exp\left(c_1 \exp(c_2 s) (\ln(k + x))^{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}\right), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Since $0 \leq \varphi(s, x) \leq Kx \exp\left(K(\ln(e + x))^{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}\right)$ for each $(s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and some positive constant $K > 0$ depending only on (k, T) , we can deduce that $\{\varphi(t, \hat{Y}_t^+ + 2At)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D). On the other hand, a similar analysis to that in (iii) of the proof of Theorem 2.3 yields that the last function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies (2.1), and is a test function for h defined in (3.8). Thus, the boundedness of the process $(\hat{Y}_t^+)_{t \in [0, T]}$ follows immediately as in (i).

(iv) Let $\lambda = 0$ and both processes $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ be of class (D) for some $p > 1$. Note that for each $\mu > 0$, there exists a positive constant $K > 0$ depending only on (μ, p) such that

$$0 \leq x \exp\left(\mu(\ln(e + x))^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \leq Kx^p, \quad x \geq 1.$$

The desired assertion is a direct consequence of (iii). \square

The following example is taken from Remark 6 of [61], which indicates that the uniform continuity of the generator g in the unknown variable y is not sufficient for the uniqueness of the solution to a BSDE(ξ, g).

Example 3.6. *Let us consider the following BSDE:*

$$Y_t = \int_t^T \sqrt{|Y_s|} ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.9)$$

Clearly, $g(\omega, t, y, z) \equiv \sqrt{|y|}$ is uniformly continuous. It is not hard to check that for each $c \in [0, T]$,

$$(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} := \left(\frac{[(c - t)^+]^2}{4}, 0 \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$$

is a solution to (3.9) such that $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ belongs to class (D) for each $p > 0$.

3.2. Comparison results for the super-linear at most quadratic growth case

In the following comparison theorem, we will use the following assumption on the generator g , where the generator g admits a super-linear at most quadratic growth in (y, z) in general.

(UN3) It holds that $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_{\delta_\theta y > 0} \frac{g(\omega, t, y_1, z) - \theta g(\omega, t, y_2, z)}{1 - \theta} &\leq f_t(\omega) + \bar{\beta}(|y_1| + |y_2|) + h(t, (\delta_\theta y)^+, |\delta_\theta z|), \\ \forall (y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2) &\in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{and } \theta \in (0, 1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbf{1}_{\delta_\theta y < 0} \frac{g(\omega, t, y_1, z) - \theta g(\omega, t, y_2, z)}{1 - \theta} &\leq f_t(\omega) + \bar{\beta}(|y_1| + |y_2|) + h(t, (\delta_\theta y)^-, |\delta_\theta z|), \\ \forall (y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2) &\in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{and } \theta \in (0, 1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \in \bar{\mathbf{S}}$ is defined in (2.7) for $\lambda \geq 0$,

$$\delta_\theta y := \frac{y_1 - \theta y_2}{1 - \theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_\theta z := \frac{z_1 - \theta z_2}{1 - \theta}.$$

Proposition 3.7. *Assume that the generator g satisfies (EX3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \in \bar{\mathbf{S}}$ being defined in (2.7) for $\lambda \geq 0$. Then, assumption (UN3) holds true for g if either of the following three conditions is true:*

- (i) $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, $g(\omega, t, \cdot, \cdot)$ is convex or concave;
- (ii) $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $g(\omega, t, \cdot, z)$ is Lipschitz continuous and $g(\omega, t, y, \cdot)$ is convex or concave;
- (iii) $g(t, y, z) \equiv l(y)q(z)$, where both $l : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $q : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are bounded and Lipschitz continuous, and the function $q(\cdot)$ has a bounded support.

The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3.5 of [48], and is omitted here.

Remark 3.8. *One typical example of (UN3) is $g(\omega, t, y, z) := g_1(y) + g_2(y)$, where $g_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex or concave with a one-sided logarithmic sup-linear growth, i.e., there exists a nonnegative constant $A \geq 0$ such that for each $y \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\text{sgn}(y)g_1(y) \leq A + \beta|y|(\ln(e + |y|))^\delta,$$

and $g_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function. In other words, g is a Lipschitz continuous perturbation of some convex (concave) function. Another typical example of (UN3) is $\bar{g}(\omega, t, y, z) := g_3(z) + g_4(z)$, where $g_3 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex or concave with a logarithmic sub-quadratic growth, i.e., there exists a non-negative constant $A \geq 0$ such that for each $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|g_3(z)| \leq A + \gamma|z|^\alpha(\ln(e + |z|))^\lambda,$$

and $g_4 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous function with a bounded support. In other words, \bar{g} is a local Lipschitz continuous perturbation of some convex (concave) function. Furthermore, it is easy to verify that if both generators g_1 and g_2 satisfies (3.10) (resp. (3.11)), then $g_1 + g_2$ also satisfies (3.10) (resp. (3.11)). Consequently, the generator g satisfying (UN3) may be not necessarily convex (concave) or Lipschitz continuous in (y, z) , and it can have a general growth in y . Finally, a similar argument to that in Section 4 of [58] gives that if the generator g satisfies (UN3), then it has to be local Lipschitz continuous in (y, z) , and then satisfies (EX1).

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose that ξ and ξ' are two terminal conditions such that $\xi \leq \xi'$, the generator g (resp. g') satisfies assumption (UN3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\lambda \geq 0$, and $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(Y'_t, Z'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ are, respectively, adapted solutions to BSDE(ξ, g) and BSDE(ξ', g') such that*

$$g(t, Y'_t, Z'_t) \leq g'(t, Y'_t, Z'_t) \quad (\text{resp. } g(t, Y_t, Z_t) \leq g'(t, Y_t, Z_t)).$$

Then the following two assertions hold true:

- (i) *Let $\alpha = 1$ and $p := \delta \vee (\lambda + \frac{1}{2}) \vee (2\lambda)$. If $\int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p]$ and both processes $(|Y_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(|Y'_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y'_t|))^p))_{t \in [0, T]}$ are of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, we have $Y_t \leq Y'_t$.*

(ii) Let $\delta = 0$, $\lambda = 0$, $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ and α^* be the conjugate of α . If $\int_0^T f_s ds \in \exp(\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}})$ and both processes $(\exp(\mu(|Y_t|)^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and $(\exp(\mu(|Y'_t|)^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ are of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, we have $Y_t \leq Y'_t$. In particular, if the random variable $\int_0^T f_s ds$ and both processes Y and Y' are all bounded, then for each $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t \leq Y'_t$.

Remark 3.10. Let us suppose that the generator g satisfies assumption (EX3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\delta = 0$, $\lambda = 0$, $\alpha = 2$. For the case of the bounded terminal condition, it has been shown in [44] and [68] that in order to ensure that the (strictly) comparison result in Theorem 3.9 holds, the assumption (UN3) can be weakened such that the generator g further satisfies assumption (UN1) and the following locally Lipschitz condition in z : $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, for each $(y, z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$,

$$|g(\omega, t, y, z_1) - g(\omega, t, y, z_2)| \leq \gamma(1 + |z_1|^\delta + |z_2|^\delta)|z_1 - z_2| \quad (3.12)$$

with $\delta \in [0, 1]$ and $\gamma > 0$. For the case of the unbounded terminal condition, it has been shown in [49] that in order to ensure that the comparison result in Theorem 3.9 holds, the assumption (UN3) can be weakened such that the generator g is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in y and further satisfies (3.12) with $\delta \in [0, 1)$ and an additional strictly positive/negative quadratic condition of the generator g in z , see assumptions (H3) and (H3') in [49] for more details.

Proof of Theorem 3.9. (i) We first consider the case when the generator g satisfies (3.10) in assumption (UN3), and $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$,

$$g(t, Y'_t, Z'_t) \leq g'(t, Y'_t, Z'_t). \quad (3.13)$$

The θ -technique put forward initially in Briand and Hu [22] will be used in the following argument. For each fixed $\theta \in (0, 1)$, define

$$\delta_\theta U := \frac{Y - \theta Y'}{1 - \theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_\theta V := \frac{Z - \theta Z'}{1 - \theta}. \quad (3.14)$$

Then the pair $(\delta_\theta U_t, \delta_\theta V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ verifies the following BSDE:

$$\delta_\theta U_t = \delta_\theta U_T + \int_t^T \delta_\theta g(s, \delta_\theta U_s, \delta_\theta V_s) ds - \int_t^T \delta_\theta V_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (3.15)$$

where $d\mathbb{P} \times ds - a.e.$,

$$\delta_\theta g(s, \delta_\theta U_s, \delta_\theta V_s) := \frac{(g(s, Y_s, Z_s) - \theta g(s, Y'_s, Z'_s)) + \theta(g(s, Y'_s, Z'_s) - g'(s, Y'_s, Z'_s))}{1 - \theta}. \quad (3.16)$$

It follows from the assumptions that $d\mathbb{P} \times ds - a.e.$, for each $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathbf{1}_{\delta_\theta U_s > 0} \delta_\theta g(s, \delta_\theta U_s, \delta_\theta V_s) \leq \bar{f}_s + h(s, (\delta_\theta U_s)^+, |\delta_\theta V_s|) \quad (3.17)$$

with

$$\bar{f}_s := f_s + \bar{\beta}(|Y_s| + |Y'_s|).$$

On the other hand, for each $k \geq e$ sufficient large, $c_1 \geq 1$ and $c_2 \geq (p+1)\beta - 4^{\lambda^+} \gamma^2$, define the following function

$$\varphi(s, x) = (k+x) \exp(c_1 \exp(c_2 s) (\ln(k+x))^p), \quad (s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Since $0 \leq \varphi(s, x) \leq Kx \exp(K(\ln(e+x))^p)$ for each $(s, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and some positive constant $K > 0$ depending only on (k, T) , according to the assumptions it is not hard to verify that the process $\{\varphi(t, (\delta_\theta U_t)^+ + \int_0^t \bar{f}_s ds)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D). On the other hand, by a similar analysis to that in (iii) of the proof of Theorem 2.3 we can conclude that the last function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies (2.1), and hence is a test function for h defined in (2.7) with $\alpha = 1$ and $\lambda \geq 0$. It then follows from Proposition 3.1 that

$$(\delta_\theta U_t)^+ \leq \varphi\left(t, (\delta_\theta U_t)^+ + \int_0^t \bar{f}_s ds\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(T, (\delta_\theta U_T)^+ + \int_0^T \bar{f}_s ds\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.18)$$

Moreover, since

$$\delta_\theta U_T^+ = \frac{(\xi - \theta\xi')^+}{1 - \theta} = \frac{[\xi - \theta\xi + \theta(\xi - \xi')]^+}{1 - \theta} \leq \xi^+, \quad (3.19)$$

it follows that

$$(Y_t - \theta Y_t')^+ \leq (1 - \theta)\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(T, \xi^+ + \int_0^T \bar{f}_s ds\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Thus, the desired assertion follows by sending θ to 1 in the last inequality.

For the case that (3.13) holds and the generator g satisfies (3.11), we need to use $\theta Y - Y'$ and $\theta Z - Z'$, respectively, instead of $Y - \theta Y'$ and $Z - \theta Z'$ in (3.14). In this case, the generator $\delta_\theta g$ in (3.15) and (3.16) should be

$$\delta_\theta g(s, \delta_\theta U_s, \delta_\theta V_s) := \frac{(\theta g(s, Y_s, Z_s) - g(s, Y'_s, Z'_s)) + (g(s, Y'_s, Z'_s) - g'(s, Y'_s, Z'_s))}{1 - \theta}.$$

It follows from (3.11) that the generator $\delta_\theta g$ still satisfies (3.17). Consequently, (3.18) still holds. Moreover, by using

$$\delta_\theta U_T^+ = \frac{(\theta\xi - \xi')^+}{1 - \theta} = \frac{[\theta\xi - \xi + (\xi - \xi')]^+}{1 - \theta} \leq (-\xi)^+ = \xi^-$$

instead of (3.19), by virtue of (3.18) we deduce that

$$(\theta Y_t - Y_t')^+ \leq (1 - \theta)\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(T, \xi^- + \int_0^T \bar{f}_s ds\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Thus, the desired assertion follows by sending θ to 1 in the last inequality.

Finally, in the same way we can prove the desired assertion under the conditions that the generator g' satisfies assumption (UN3) and $d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e.$, $g(t, Y_t, Z_t) \leq g'(t, Y_t, Z_t)$.

(ii) The desired assertion can be proved in the same way as in (i). The only difference lies in that the test function used in (i) needs to be replaced with those used, respectively, in (i) and (ii) of the proof of Theorem 2.7 for two different cases of $\alpha = 2$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. \square

Remark 3.11. Both assertions (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 3.3 seem to be new, and the key idea in the proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.9 can be dated back to [21, 44, 48, 51].

3.3. Existence and uniqueness

Using Theorems 2.3, 2.7, 3.3 and 3.9, we easily have the following two existence and uniqueness results, whose proofs are omitted here.

Theorem 3.12. *Assume that ξ is an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable random variable and the generator g satisfies (EX1)-(EX3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\alpha = 1$. Then, the following assertions hold.*

(i) *Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda \in (-\infty, -\frac{1}{2})$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^1$ and the generator g further satisfies (UN1) and (UN2), then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D);*

(ii) *Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L(\ln L)^p$ for some $p > 0$ and the generator g further satisfies (UN1) and (UN2), then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t|(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D);*

(iii) *Let $p := \delta \vee (\lambda + \frac{1}{2}) \vee (2\lambda) \in (0, +\infty)$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p]$ and the generator g further satisfies (UN1) and (UN2) for the case of $\lambda \in (-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$ and (UN3) for the case of $\lambda \in [0, +\infty)$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y_t|))^p))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$;*

(iv) *Let $\delta = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^p$ for some $p > 1$ and g further satisfies (UN1) and (UN2), then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D).*

Theorem 3.13. *Assume that ξ is an \mathcal{F}_T -measurable random variable and the generator g satisfies assumptions (EX2), (EX3) and (UN3) with $h(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ being defined in (2.7) for $\delta = 0$, $\lambda = 0$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$. If $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in \cap_{\mu > 0} \exp(\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}})$ with α^* being the conjugate of α , then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(\exp(\mu |Y_t|^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$. In particular, if $\xi + \int_0^T f_s ds \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$, then BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{S}^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$.*

4. Applications

In this section, we will introduce some applications of our theoretical results obtained in the last two sections, which are enlightened by for example [83, 84, 87, 22, 60, 48, 51, 50].

4.1. The (conditional) g -expectation defined on $L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$

First of all, we extend the notion of (conditional) g -expectation of [87] defined on the space $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ of squarely integrable random variables to the larger one $L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ of integrable random variables.

Definition 4.1. *Let the generator g satisfy assumptions (EX1)-(EX2) and (UN1)-(UN2) with $\lambda \in (-\infty, -\frac{1}{2})$ and $\int_0^T f_s ds \in L^1$. Assume further that g satisfies the following assumption:*

$$d\mathbb{P} \times dt - a.e., \quad g(\omega, t, y, 0) \equiv 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.1)$$

By virtue of (i) in Theorem 3.12, for each $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $t \in [0, T]$, we can denote the conditional g -expectation $\mathcal{E}_g[\xi | \mathcal{F}_t]$ of ξ with respect to \mathcal{F}_t by the following formula:

$$\mathcal{E}_g[\xi | \mathcal{F}_t] := Y_t^\xi, \quad (4.2)$$

where $(Y_t^\xi, Z_t^\xi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is the unique solution of BSDE(ξ, g) such that Y_t^ξ belongs to class (D). In particular, we call $\mathcal{E}_g[\xi] := \mathcal{E}_g[\xi | \mathcal{F}_0]$ the g -expectation of ξ .

It is clear that the conditional g -expectation operator $\mathcal{E}_g[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ defined by (4.2) maps $L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ to $L^1(\mathcal{F}_t)$ for each $t \in [0, T]$, which shares the same domain with the classical mathematical expectation operator. Furthermore, proceeding identically as in [88] and [64], from (i) of Theorem 3.3 and (i) of Theorem 3.12 together with (4.1) we easily (thus omitting the proof) have the following two propositions.

Proposition 4.2. $\mathcal{E}_g[\cdot]$ possesses the following properties:

- (i) **Preserving of constants:** For each constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{E}_g[c] = c$;
- (ii) **Monotonicity:** For each $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$, if $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$, then $\mathcal{E}_g[\xi_1] \geq \mathcal{E}_g[\xi_2]$.

Proposition 4.3. For each $t \in [0, T]$, $\mathcal{E}_g[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ possesses the following properties:

- (i) If $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_t)$, then $\mathcal{E}_g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t] = \xi$;
- (ii) For each $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$, if $\xi_1 \geq \xi_2$, then $\mathcal{E}_g[\xi_1|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq \mathcal{E}_g[\xi_2|\mathcal{F}_t]$;
- (iii) For each $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $r \in [0, T]$, we have $\mathcal{E}_g[\mathcal{E}_g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t]|\mathcal{F}_r] = \mathcal{E}_g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_{t \wedge r}]$;
- (iv) For each $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $\mathcal{E}_g[\mathbf{1}_A \xi|\mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbf{1}_A \mathcal{E}_g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t]$ and $\mathcal{E}_g[\mathbf{1}_A \xi] = \mathcal{E}_g[\mathbf{1}_A \mathcal{E}_g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t]]$.

It can be indicated from both propositions that the (conditional) g -expectation preserves essential properties (but except linearity) of the classical expectations. Some extensive issues on the (conditional) g -expectation still remain to be further studied along the lines of [87, 26, 88, 29, 91, 89, 90, 64, 33].

Remark 4.4. In the same way as above, by Theorems 3.3, 3.9, 3.12 and 3.13 one can define the (conditional) g -expectation via the solutions of BSDEs on the spaces

$$L(\ln L)^p \ (p > 0), \quad \bigcap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p] \ (p > 0), \quad L^p \ (p > 1), \quad \bigcap_{\mu > 0} \exp(\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}) \ (\alpha^* \geq 2) \quad \text{and} \quad L^\infty$$

respectively. It is clear that the generator g of BSDEs needs to satisfy some stronger conditions as the space becomes larger. In particular, when $g(t, y, z) := \gamma|z|$, the corresponding conditional g -expectation $\mathcal{E}_g[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ for $t \in [0, T]$ can be defined on the space $\bigcap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu\sqrt{\ln L}]$, which is bigger than L^p ($p > 1$) used for example in [87, 26, 29, 91, 89, 90, 93, 60, 62]. Furthermore, according to (iii) of Theorem 3.3 and (iii) of Theorem 3.12, we can verify that for each $t \in [0, T]$ and $\xi \in \bigcap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu\sqrt{\ln L}]$,

$$\mathcal{E}_g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t] := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_q[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t]$$

with \mathcal{A} being defined in Example 2.5. This is just the maximal conditional expectation on \mathcal{A} .

4.2. Dynamic utility process and risk measure

In the sequel, we introduce an application of our theoretical results in mathematical finance. For simplicity of notations, we set for each $t \in [0, T]$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$

$$E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_t) := \bigcap_{\mu > 0} \exp[\mu L^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}](\mathcal{F}_t)$$

with $\alpha^* := \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \geq 2$ being the conjugate of α . Clearly, $E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_t)$ is a linear space containing $L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t)$ of bounded random variables. The following proposition is a direct consequence of (iii) of Theorem 3.12, and the proof is omitted.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that the generator $g(z) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a concave function satisfying $g(0) = 0$ and*

$$|g(z)| \leq a + \gamma|z|^\alpha \quad (4.3)$$

with $a \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ being two given constants. Then, for each $\xi \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$, BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $Y_t \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_t)$ for each $t \in [0, T]$.

Now, by virtue of Proposition 4.5, for each $\xi \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$ we can define

$$U_t^g(\xi) := Y_t^\xi, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (4.4)$$

where $(Y_t^\xi, Z_t^\xi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is the unique solution of BSDE(ξ, g) such that $Y_t^\xi \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_t)$ for each $t \in [0, T]$.

The following theorem indicates that the family of operators $\{U_t^g(\cdot)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ defined via (4.4) constitutes a dynamic utility process defined on $E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$.

Theorem 4.6. *For each $t \in [0, T]$, the mapping $U_t^g(\cdot) : E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T) \rightarrow E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_t)$ defined via (4.4) satisfies the following properties:*

- (i) **Positivity:** $U_t^g(0) = 0$ and $U_t^g(\xi) \geq 0$ for each nonnegative random variable $\xi \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$;
- (ii) **Monotonicity:** for each $\xi, \eta \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$, if $\xi \geq \eta$, then $U_t^g(\xi) \geq U_t^g(\eta)$;
- (iii) **Monetary:** $U_t^g(\xi + \eta) = U_t^g(\xi) + \eta$ for each $\xi \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $\eta \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_t)$;
- (iv) **Concavity:** $U_t^g(\theta\xi + (1 - \theta)\eta) \geq \theta U_t^g(\xi) + (1 - \theta)U_t^g(\eta)$ for all $\xi, \eta \in E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. In view of $g(0) = 0$ and the fact that g is independent of y , (i)-(iii) are the direct consequences of (iii) of Theorem 3.12 and (i) of Theorem 3.9. Furthermore, proceeding identically as Proposition 3.5 in [40], by virtue of (i) of Theorem 3.9 and the concavity of g we can get (iv). \square

Now, we let the function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be convex, satisfy $f(0) = 0$, and $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} f(x)/|x|^2 > 0$. For each $\xi \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$, define

$$\bar{U}_t(\xi) := \text{essinf} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_q \left[\xi + \int_t^T f(q_u) du \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \middle| \mathbb{Q}^q \sim \mathbb{P} \right\}, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (4.5)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_q[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t]$ is the conditional expectation operator with respect to \mathcal{F}_t under the probability measure \mathbb{Q}^q , which is equivalent to \mathbb{P} and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^q}{d\mathbb{P}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = \exp \left\{ \int_0^t q_u \cdot dB_u - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |q_u|^2 du \right\}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

It is not difficult to check that $\{\bar{U}_t(\cdot)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ defined via (4.5) constitutes a dynamic utility process defined on $L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$. And, it follows from Theorems 2.1-2.2 in [34] that there exists a $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{M}^2$ such that $(\bar{U}_t(\xi), Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is the unique bounded solution of the following BSDE

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T g(Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$g(z) := - \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (-z \cdot x - f(x)) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} (z \cdot x + f(x)) \leq 0, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (4.7)$$

is a concave function with $g(0) = 0$, and $\limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |g(x)|/|x|^2 < \infty$. For example, if $c > 0$ and

$$f(x) = c|x|^{\alpha^*} \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

then

$$0 \geq g(z) = -\frac{1}{c^{\alpha-1}} \frac{\alpha^* - 1}{(\alpha^*)^\alpha} |z|^\alpha, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

which means that g satisfies the conditions in Proposition 4.5.

Remark 4.7. *It is well known that (4.5) is usually used to define the utility of bounded endowments in mathematical finance, see for example [34] for details. However, it is only defined on the space $L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$. This motivates the definition (4.4) via a BSDE, which can be defined on a larger space $E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$ than $L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Some relevant results are available in [40, 37, 50]. In a symmetric way to the above, we can also define a convex risk measure on $E^\alpha(\mathcal{F}_T)$, see [59, 64] among others for more details.*

Example 4.8. *Let the generator*

$$g(z) := c(\mathbf{1}_{\lambda \geq 0} - \mathbf{1}_{\lambda < 0})|z|(\ln(e + |z|))^\lambda, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $c > 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ are two given constants. From Theorem 3.12, we easily have the following three assertions:

- (i) *If $\lambda \in (-\infty, -\frac{1}{2})$, then for each $\xi \in L^1$, BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t^\xi, Z_t^\xi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that $(Y_t^\xi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D);*
- (ii) *If $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$, then for each $\xi \in L(\ln L)^p$ with $p > 0$, BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t^\xi, Z_t^\xi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t^\xi|(\ln(e + |Y_t^\xi|))^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D);*
- (iii) *If $\lambda \in (-\frac{1}{2}, +\infty)$ and $p := (\lambda + \frac{1}{2}) \vee (2\lambda)$, then for each $\xi \in \cap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p]$, BSDE(ξ, g) admits a unique solution $(Y_t^\xi, Z_t^\xi)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that the process $(|Y_t^\xi| \exp(\mu(\ln(e + |Y_t^\xi|))^p))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$.*

Thus, for the preceding three different ranges of λ , we can define the following operator

$$\varrho(\xi) := Y_0^{-\xi}$$

in three different spaces of contingent claims: L^1 , $L(\ln L)^p$ and $\cap_{\mu > 0} L \exp[\mu(\ln L)^p]$. Moreover, according to the properties of the generator g together with Theorems 3.3, 3.9 and 3.12, in the same spirit as in for example [1, 59, 64, 27, 33, 25], we verify that whenever $\lambda > 0$, $\lambda < 0$ and $\lambda = 0$, $\varrho(\cdot)$ is respectively a convex risk measure, a star-shaped risk measure (see the precise definition in page 2641 of [25, Definition 1]) and a coherent risk measure on the corresponding space of contingent claims. In addition, in the same way, we can also define the corresponding dynamic risk measure with the solution $Y_t^{-\xi}$ of BSDE(ξ, g) for $t \in [0, T]$.

4.3. Nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula

As another application of our theoretical results, in this subsection we will derive a nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula for PDEs which are at most quadratic with respect to the gradient of the solution. Let us consider the following semi-linear PDE:

$$\partial_t u(t, x) + \mathcal{L}u(t, x) + g(t, x, u(t, x), \sigma^* \nabla_x u(t, x)) = 0, \quad u(T, \cdot) = h(\cdot), \quad (4.8)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the infinitesimal generator of the solution $X^{t,x}$ to the following SDE:

$$X_s^{t,x} = x + \int_t^s b(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr + \int_t^s \sigma(r, X_r^{t,x}) dB_r, \quad t \leq s \leq T. \quad (4.9)$$

For each $(t_0, x_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$, $(Y_t^{t_0, x_0}, Z_t^{t_0, x_0})_{t \in [t_0, T]}$ is the solution to the BSDE

$$Y_t = h(X_T^{t_0, x_0}) + \int_t^T g(s, X_s^{t_0, x_0}, Y_s, Z_s) ds + \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [t_0, T], \quad (4.10)$$

The nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula says that the function

$$u(t, x) := Y_t^{t,x}, \quad \forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (4.11)$$

is a viscosity solution to PDE (4.8).

Let us first recall the definition of a continuous viscosity solution in our framework, see e.g. [30].

Definition 4.9. *A continuous function $u : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $u(T, \cdot) = h(\cdot)$ is said to be a viscosity super-solution (resp. sub-solution) to PDE (4.8) if the inequality*

$$\partial_t u(t_0, x_0) + \mathcal{L}u(t_0, x_0) + g(t_0, x_0, u(t_0, x_0), \sigma^* \nabla_x \varphi(t_0, x_0)) \leq 0 \quad (\text{resp. } \geq 0)$$

holds true for any smooth function $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that the function $u - \varphi$ attains a local minimum (resp. maximum) at the point $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, a viscosity super-solution is said to be a viscosity solution if it is also a viscosity sub-solution.

Let us now introduce the following assumptions on the coefficients of SDE (4.9).

(A1) Both functions $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ are jointly continuous and there is a positive constant $K > 0$ such that for each $(t, x, x') \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$|b(t, 0)| + |\sigma(t, x)| \leq K \quad \text{and} \quad |b(t, x) - b(t, x')| + |\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, x')| \leq K|x - x'|.$$

Classical results on SDEs show that under the assumption (A1), SDE (4.9) has a unique solution $X^{t,x} \in \cap_{q \geq 1} \mathcal{S}^q$ for each $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$. And, since σ is bounded, the argument in page 563 of Briand and Hu [22] yields that for each $\mu > 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$, depending only on (q, μ, T, K) , such that for each $q \in [1, 2)$ and $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t, T]} \exp(\mu |X_s^{t,x}|^q) \right] \leq C \exp(\mu C |x|^q). \quad (4.12)$$

Let us further give our assumptions on the generator g and the terminal condition of BSDE (4.10).

(A2) Both functions $g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are jointly continuous and there are three real constants $k \geq 0$, $\alpha \in (1, 2]$ and $p \in [1, \alpha^*)$ with α^* being the conjugate of α such that for each $(t, x, y, z) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\operatorname{sgn}(y)g(t, x, y, z) \leq k(1 + |x|^p + |y| + |z|^\alpha), \quad (4.13)$$

$$|g(t, x, y, z)| + |h(x)| \leq k \left(1 + |x|^p + \exp(k|y|^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}) + |z|^2 \right) \quad (4.14)$$

and either inequality

$$\mathbf{1}_{y-\theta y' > 0} (g(t, x, y, z) - \theta g(t, x, y', z')) \leq (1 - \theta)k \left(1 + |x|^p + |y'| + \left(\frac{y - \theta y'}{1 - \theta} \right)^+ + \left| \frac{z - \theta z'}{1 - \theta} \right|^\alpha \right)$$

or

$$-\mathbf{1}_{y-\theta y' < 0} (g(t, x, y, z) - \theta g(t, x, y', z')) \leq (1 - \theta)k \left(1 + |x|^p + |y'| + \left(\frac{y - \theta y'}{1 - \theta} \right)^- + \left| \frac{z - \theta z'}{1 - \theta} \right|^\alpha \right)$$

is satisfied for $\forall (t, x, y, y', z, z') \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$.

Since $p \in [1, \alpha^*)$, we have from (4.12) that for each $(t_0, x_0) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and each $\mu > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\mu (|X_T^{t_0, x_0}|^p)^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}} \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t_0, T]} \exp \left(\mu |X_s^{t_0, x_0}|^{\frac{2p}{\alpha^*}} \right) \right] \leq \bar{C} \exp(\mu \bar{C} |x_0|^{\frac{2p}{\alpha^*}}) < +\infty$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\mu \left(\int_{t_0}^T |X_s^{t_0, x_0}|^p ds \right)^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}} \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{s \in [t_0, T]} \exp \left(\mu T^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}} |X_s^{t_0, x_0}|^{\frac{2p}{\alpha^*}} \right) \right] < +\infty,$$

for a constant $\bar{C} > 0$ depending only on (p, α, μ, T, K) . Then, in view of the assumption (A2) and the last two inequalities, we can apply Theorem 3.13 to construct a unique solution $(Y_t^{t_0, x_0}, Z_t^{t_0, x_0})_{t \in [t_0, T]}$ to BSDE (4.10) such that $(\exp(\mu |Y_t^{t_0, x_0}|^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [t_0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$. Furthermore, a classical argument yields that the function u defined by (4.11) is deterministic.

The following theorem constitutes the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 4.10. *Let assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold. Then, the function u defined in (4.11) is continuous on $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\forall (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n, \quad |u(t, x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^p).$$

Moreover, u is a viscosity solution to PDE (4.8).

The proof is available in [48, 22]. Similar results can also be found in [31, 32].

Remark 4.11. *The nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula for solution of PDEs can be dated back to [84], in the spirit of which numerical discussions appeared successively in for example [85, 86, 79, 82, 68, 60, 22, 81, 48]. In fact, according to Theorems 3.3, 3.9, 3.12 and 3.13, we can establish a one-to-one correspondence between solutions of PDEs and BSDEs via the Feynman-Kac formulas, as mentioned in section 4 of [60]. In general, the generator g and the terminal condition h of BSDE (4.10) can admit a more general growth in the unknown variable x when g has a lower growth in the unknown variable z .*

5. Open problems

In this section, we describe five open problems. The first two concern the existence of a solution to a BSDE and a PDE, and the last three address the uniqueness.

Problem 5.1. Consider the following BSDE:

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T \frac{|Z_s|}{\sqrt{\ln(e + |Z_s|)}} ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (5.1)$$

For $\xi \in L^1$, does BSDE (5.1) admit a solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ such that Y is of class (D)? Note that Assertion (ii) of Theorem 2.3 concerns existence for $\xi \in L(\ln L)^p$ only when $p > 0$, while Assertion (i) of Theorem 2.3 concerns the BSDE of a slower growing generator.

Problem 5.2. Let assumption (A1) be satisfied and that the functions g and h only satisfy (4.13) and (4.14) of assumption (A2) in the last section. Does the semi-linear PDE (4.8) admit a viscosity solution? Note that the PDE is associated to a BSDE (4.10), which has (from Theorem 2.7) a solution $(Y_t^{t_0, x_0}, Z_t^{t_0, x_0})_{t \in [t_0, T]}$ such that $(\exp(\mu |Y_t^{t_0, x_0}|^{\frac{2}{\alpha^*}}))_{t \in [t_0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$.

Problem 5.3. Let $p > 1$ and consider the following BSDE:

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T |Z_s| \sin |Z_s| ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

For each $\xi \in L^p$, is the solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ to the last BSDE with $(|Y_t|^p)_{t \in [0, T]}$ being of class (D) unique? We note that the generator g is not uniformly continuous in z , while the uniqueness assertion (iv) of Theorem 3.3 requires the uniform continuity of the generator g in z .

Problem 5.4. Let $d = 2$ and consider the following BSDE:

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T \frac{1}{2} |Z_s^1|^2 ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (5.2)$$

where $Z := (Z^1, Z^2)$. For each $\xi \in \exp(L)$, is the solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ to the last BSDE with $(\exp(|Y_t|))_{t \in [0, T]}$ being of class (D) unique? Note that the generator g is only convex, rather than strongly convex (see assumption B in page 5276 of [36] for the precise definition) in z . Whenever the quadratic generator g is strongly convex in z , Theorem 4.1 of [36] gives the uniqueness of the solution to BSDE(ξ, g) for $\xi \in \exp(L)$. While for a terminal value $\xi \in \exp(pL)$ with $p > 1$, Theorem 3.3 of [35] gives the uniqueness of the solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ to BSDE (5.2) such that $(\exp(p|Y_t|))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D).

Problem 5.5. Let $d = 2$ and consider the following BSDE:

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T (|Z_s^1|^2 - |Z_s^2|^2) ds - \int_t^T Z_s \cdot dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (5.3)$$

where $Z := (Z^1, Z^2)$. For each $\xi \in \cap_{\mu > 0} \exp(\mu L)$, is the solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ to BSDE (5.3) with $(\exp(\mu |Y_t|))_{t \in [0, T]}$ being of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$ unique? We note that the generator g is neither convex nor concave in z , but satisfies (3.12) with $\delta = 1$ and $\gamma = 2$. When $\xi \in L^\infty$, it is well known from [68] that the solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ to BSDE (5.3) with $Y \in \mathcal{S}^\infty$ is unique. For $\xi \in \cap_{\mu > 0} \exp(\mu L)$, if the quadratic generator g has a strictly positive (or negative) quadratic growth and an extended convexity (or concavity) in z , Theorem 5 together with Remark 7 of [49] already give the uniqueness of the solution $(Y_t, Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ to BSDE(ξ, g) such that $(\exp(\mu |Y_t|))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is of class (D) for each $\mu > 0$.

Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 2.6

Proof of Proposition 2.6. The case of $\lambda = 0$ is clear. Let us consider the case of $\lambda \neq 0$. Given $k \geq k_{\lambda,p}$ with $\bar{p} := p^{\frac{1}{2+|\lambda|}} > 1$, $\bar{\lambda} := 2|\lambda|(2 + |\lambda - 1|)$, $k_{\lambda,p} \geq e^{|\lambda-1|+1}$,

$$\bar{\lambda} (\ln k_{\lambda,p})^{\lambda-1} < k_{\lambda,p}^{1-\frac{1}{\bar{p}}}, \quad k_{\lambda,p}^{\bar{p}} - k_{\lambda,p} - 2\sqrt{p}k_{\lambda,p}(\ln k_{\lambda,p})^\lambda > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad k_{\lambda,p}^{\frac{1}{\bar{p}}} < \sqrt{p}k_{\lambda,p}(\ln k_{\lambda,p})^\lambda. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For each $(x, y) \in (0, +\infty) \times (0, +\infty)$, define the function

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &:= y^2 - 2xy(\ln(k+y))^\lambda + px^2(\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} \\ &= \left(y - x(\ln(k+y))^\lambda\right)^2 + px^2(\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} - x^2(\ln(k+y))^{2\lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Clearly, in order to prove (2.9), it is enough to prove that $f(x, y) \geq 0$ for each $x, y > 0$. Fix arbitrarily $x \in (0, +\infty)$ and let $\bar{f}(y) := f(x, y)$, $y \in (0, +\infty)$. A simple calculation gives that for each $y \in (0, +\infty)$,

$$\bar{f}'(y) = 2y - 2x \left(y(\ln(k+y))^\lambda\right)' = 2y - 2x(\ln(k+y))^\lambda \left[1 + \frac{\lambda y}{(k+y)\ln(k+y)}\right] \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and

$$\bar{f}''(y) = 2 - 2x \left(y(\ln(k+y))^\lambda\right)'' = 2 - \frac{2\lambda x[(2k+y)\ln(k+y) - (1-\lambda)y]}{(k+y)^2(\ln(k+y))^{2-\lambda}}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Furthermore, let $y_0 > 0$ be the unique constant depending only on (p, k, λ, x) and satisfying

$$p(\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} = (\ln(k+y_0))^{2\lambda} \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad x = (k+y_0)^{\frac{1}{p^{2\lambda}}} - k \quad \text{or} \quad y_0 = (k+x)^{p^{\frac{1}{2\lambda}}} - k. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It then follows from (A.2) that $\bar{f}(y_0) = f(x, y_0) \geq 0$.

In the sequel, we will distinguish two different cases to prove the desired inequality (2.9).

Case 1: $\lambda > 0$. In this case, by (A.2) and (A.5) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}(y) &\geq px^2(\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} - x^2(\ln(k+y))^{2\lambda} \\ &\geq x^2 \left[p(\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} - (\ln(k+y_0))^{2\lambda} \right] = 0, \quad y \in (0, y_0]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to verify that $\bar{f}(y) \geq 0$ for $y \in [y_0, +\infty)$. In fact, by (A.4), (A.5) and (A.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}''(y) &\geq 2 - \frac{2|\lambda|x[2(k+y)\ln(k+y) + |\lambda-1|(k+y)\ln(k+y)]}{(k+y)^2(\ln(k+y))^{2-\lambda}} \\ &= 2 - \frac{\bar{\lambda}(\ln(k+y))^{\lambda-1}}{k+y} \left((k+y_0)^{\frac{1}{\bar{p}}} - k \right) \\ &\geq 2 - \frac{\bar{\lambda}(\ln(k+y_0))^{\lambda-1}}{(k+y_0)^{1-\frac{1}{\bar{p}}}} > 2 - \frac{\bar{\lambda}(\ln k)^{\lambda-1}}{k^{1-\frac{1}{\bar{p}}}} > 1, \quad y \in [y_0, +\infty). \end{aligned}$$

And, by (A.3), (A.5) and (A.1) we can deduce that, in view of $\bar{p} > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}'(y_0) &\geq 2y_0 - 2x(\ln(k+y_0))^\lambda \left[1 + \frac{\lambda}{\ln(k+y_0)} \right] \\ &\geq 2y_0 - 4x(\ln(k+y_0))^\lambda \\ &= 2(k+x)^{\bar{p}} - 2k - 4\sqrt{p}x(\ln(k+x))^\lambda \\ &\geq 2(k+x)^{\bar{p}} - 2(k+x) - 4\sqrt{p}(k+x)(\ln(k+x))^\lambda \\ &\geq 2k^{\bar{p}} - 2k - 4\sqrt{p}k(\ln k)^\lambda > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Consequently, for each $y \in [y_0, +\infty)$, we have $\bar{f}'(y) \geq \bar{f}'(y_0) > 0$ and then $\bar{f}(y) \geq \bar{f}(y_0) \geq 0$.

Case 2: $\lambda < 0$. In this case, by (A.2) and (A.5) we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{f}(y) &\geq px^2 (\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} - x^2 (\ln(k+y))^{2\lambda} \\ &\geq x^2 \left[p (\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} - (\ln(k+y_0))^{2\lambda} \right] = 0, \quad y \in [y_0, +\infty).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to verify that $\bar{f}(y) \geq 0$ for $y \in (0, y_0]$. In fact, by (A.4) and (A.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{f}''(y) &\geq 2 + \frac{2|\lambda|x [(k+y) \ln(k+y) - |1-\lambda|(k+y)]}{(k+y)^2 (\ln(k+y))^{2-\lambda}} \\ &= 2 + \frac{2|\lambda|x [\ln(k+y) - |1-\lambda|]}{(k+y) (\ln(k+y))^{2-\lambda}} > 2, \quad y \in (0, y_0].\end{aligned}$$

And, by (A.3), (A.5) and (A.1) we can deduce that, in view of $\bar{p} > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{f}'(y_0) &\leq 2y_0 - 2x(\ln(k+y_0))^\lambda \\ &\leq 2(k+x)^{\frac{1}{\bar{p}}} - 2k - 2\sqrt{\bar{p}}x(\ln(k+x))^\lambda \\ &\leq 2(k+x)^{\frac{1}{\bar{p}}} - 2\sqrt{\bar{p}}(k+x)(\ln(k+x))^\lambda \\ &\leq 2k^{\frac{1}{\bar{p}}} - 2\sqrt{\bar{p}}k(\ln k)^\lambda < 0.\end{aligned}\tag{A.7}$$

Consequently, for each $y \in (0, y_0]$, we have $\bar{f}'(y) \leq \bar{f}'(y_0) < 0$ and then $\bar{f}(y) \geq \bar{f}(y_0) \geq 0$.

In conclusion, (2.9) holds. Finally, we verify that when $p = 1$ and $\lambda \neq 0$, the constant k such that (2.9) holds does not exist. In fact, assume that (2.9) holds for some $k \geq e$. Let $x, y > 0$ satisfy

$$y = x (\ln(k+y))^\lambda.$$

It is clear that $y > x$ for $\lambda > 0$, and $y < x$ for $\lambda < 0$. Then, in view of (A.2),

$$y^2 - 2xy (\ln(k+y))^\lambda + x^2 (\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} = x^2 \left[(\ln(k+x))^{2\lambda} - (\ln(k+y))^{2\lambda} \right] < 0,$$

which immediately yields the desired assertion. The proof is then complete. \square

Remark A.1. *The case of $\lambda < 0$ in Proposition 2.6 has been established in Proposition 3.2 of [51]. However, our proof is more direct and simpler. The case of $\lambda > 0$ in Proposition 2.6 can be compared to Proposition 3.2 of [50], where the constant p appearing in (2.9) is required to be strictly bigger than $4^{(\lambda-1)^+}$. From this point of view, Proposition 2.6 improves Proposition 3.2 in [50] for the case of $\lambda > 1$.*

References

- [1] Artzner P., Delbaen F., Eber J.-M., Heath D., 1999. Coherent measures of risk. *Math. Finance* 9(3), 203–228.
- [2] Bahlali K., 2001. Backward stochastic differential equations with locally Lipschitz coefficient. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 333 (5), 481–486.
- [3] Bahlali K., 2002. Existence and uniqueness of solutions for BSDEs with locally Lipschitz coefficient. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 7, 169–179.
- [4] Bahlali K., 2019. Solving unbounded quadratic BSDEs by a domination method. [arXiv:1903.11325v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.11325) [math.PR].

- [5] Bahlali K., Eddahbi M., Ouknine Y., 2017. Quadratic BSDE with L^2 -terminal data: Krylov's estimate, Itô-Krylov's formula and existence results. *Ann. Probab.* 45 (4), 2377–2397.
- [6] Bahlali K., El Asri B., 2012. Stochastic optimal control and BSDEs with logarithmic growth. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 136 (6), 617–637.
- [7] Bahlali K., Essaky E.-H., Hassani M., 2010. Multidimensional BSDEs with superlinear growth coefficient. Application to degenerate systems of semilinear PDEs. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 348 (11-12), 677–682.
- [8] Bahlali K., Essaky E.-H., Hassani M., 2015. Existence and uniqueness of multidimensional BSDEs and of systems of degenerate PDEs with superlinear growth generator. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 47 (6), 4251–4288.
- [9] Bahlali K., Essaky E.-H., Hassani M., Pardoux E., 2002. Existence, uniqueness and stability of backward stochastic differential equations with locally monotone coefficient. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 335 (9), 757–762.
- [10] Bahlali K., Hakassou A., Ouknine Y., 2015. A class of stochastic differential equations with superlinear growth and non-Lipschitz coefficients. *Stochastics* 87 (5), 806–847.
- [11] Bahlali K., Kebiri O., Khelfallah N., Moussaoui H., 2017. One-dimensional BSDEs with logarithmic growth application to PDEs. *Stochastics* 89 (6-7), 1061–1081.
- [12] Bahlali K., Tangpi L., 2019. BSDEs driven by $|z|^2/y$ and applications. [arXiv:1810.05664v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.05664v2) [math.PR].
- [13] Bao X., Delbaen F., Hu Y., 2010. Existence and non-uniqueness of solutions for BSDE. In Chiarella C. and Novikov A., editors, *Contemporary quantitative finance. Essays in honour of Eckhard Platen*, pages 123–134. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- [14] Barrieu P., El Karoui N., 2013. Monotone stability of quadratic semimartingales with applications to unbounded general quadratic BSDEs. *Ann. Probab.* 41 (3B), 1831–1863.
- [15] Bismut J.-M., 1973. Conjugate convex functions in optimal stochastic control. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 44, 384–404.
- [16] Bismut J.-M., 1976. Linear quadratic optimal stochastic control with random coefficients. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 14, 419–444.
- [17] Bismut J.-M., 1978. An introductory approach to duality in optimal stochastic control. *SIAM Review* 20 (1), 62–78.
- [18] Briand P., Carmona R., 2000. BSDEs with polynomial growth generators. *International J. Stoch. Anal.* 13 (3), 207–238.
- [19] Briand P., Delyon B., Hu Y., Pardoux E., Stoica L., 2003. L^p solutions of backward stochastic differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 108 (1), 109–129.
- [20] Briand P., Elie R., 2013. A simple constructive approach to quadratic BSDEs with or without delay. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 123, 2921–2939.
- [21] Briand P., Hu Y., 2006. BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 136 (4), 604–618.
- [22] Briand P., Hu Y., 2008. Quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 141 (3), 543–567.
- [23] Briand P., Lepeltier J.-P., San Martin J., 2007. One-dimensional backward stochastic differential equations whose coefficient is monotonic in y and non-Lipschitz in z . *Bernoulli* 13 (1), 80–91.
- [24] Buckdahn R., Hu Y., Tang S., 2018. Uniqueness of solution to scalar BSDEs with $L \exp\left(\mu\sqrt{2\log(1+L)}\right)$ -integrable terminal values. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 23, Paper No. 59, 8pp.
- [25] Castagnoli E., Cattelan G., Maccheroni F., Tebaldi C., Wang R., 2022. Star-shaped risk measures. *Operations Research* 70(5), 2637–2654.
- [26] Chen Z., 1998. A property of backward stochastic differential equations. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 326, 483–488.
- [27] Cheridito P., Li T., 2009. Risk measures on Orlicz hearts. *Math. Finance* 19(2), 189–214.
- [28] Cheridito P., Nam K., 2014. BSDEs with terminal conditions that have bounded Malliavin derivative. *Journal of Functional Analysis* 266, 1257–1285.
- [29] Coquet F., Hu Y., Memin J., Peng S., 2002. Filtration consistent nonlinear expectations and related g -expectation, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 123: 1–27.

- [30] Crandall M.G., Ishii H., Lions P.L., 1992. User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations, *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.* 27:1–67.
- [31] Da Lio F., Ley O., 2006. Uniqueness results for second-order Bellman-Isaacs equations under quadratic growth assumptions and applications. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 45(1), 74–106.
- [32] Da Lio F., Ley O., 2011. Convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations under superlinear growth conditions on data, *Appl. Math. Optim.* 63, 309–339.
- [33] Delbaen F., 2009. Risk measures for non-integrable random variables. *Math. Finance* 19(2), 329–333.
- [34] Delbaen F., Hu Y., Bao X., 2011. Backward SDEs with superquadratic growth. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 150 (24), 145–192.
- [35] Delbaen F., Hu Y., Richou A., 2011. On the uniqueness of solutions to quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* 47, 559–574.
- [36] Delbaen F., Hu Y., Richou A., 2015. On the uniqueness of solutions to quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions: the critical case. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 35 (11), 5273–5283.
- [37] Delbaen F., Peng S., Rosazza Gianin E., 2010. Representation of the penalty term of dynamic concave utilities. *Finance Stoch.* 14 (3), 449–472.
- [38] Delbaen F., Tang S., 2010. Harmonic analysis of stochastic equations and backward stochastic differential equations. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 146 (1-2), 291–336.
- [39] Edgar G.-A., Sucheston L., 1992. *Stopping Times and Directed Processes*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, 47, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [40] El Karoui N., Peng S., Quenez M.-C., 1997. Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. *Math. Finance* 7 (1), 1–71.
- [41] Essaky E.-H., Hassani M., 2011. General existence results for reflected BSDE and BSDE. *Bull. Sci. Math.* 135 (5), 442–466.
- [42] Essaky E.-H., Hassani M., 2013. Generalized BSDE with 2-reflecting barriers and stochastic quadratic growth. *J. Differential Equations* 254(3), 1500–1528.
- [43] Fan S., 2015. L^p solutions of multidimensional BSDEs with weak monotonicity and general growth generators. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 432, 156–178.
- [44] Fan S., 2016. Bounded solutions, L^p ($p > 1$) solutions and L^1 solutions for one-dimensional BSDEs under general assumptions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 126, 1511–1552.
- [45] Fan S., 2016. Existence of solutions to one-dimensional BSDEs with semi-linear growth and general growth generators. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 109, 7–15.
- [46] Fan S., 2018. Existence, uniqueness and stability of L^1 solutions for multidimensional BSDEs with generators of one-sided osgood type. *J. Theoret. Probab.* 31, 1860–1899.
- [47] Fan S., Hu Y., 2019. Existence and uniqueness of solution to scalar BSDEs with $L \exp\left(\mu\sqrt{2\log(1+L)}\right)$ -integrable terminal values: the critical case. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 24, Paper No. 49, 10pp.
- [48] Fan S., Hu Y., 2021. Well-posedness of scalar BSDEs with sub-quadratic generators and related PDEs. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 131, 21–50.
- [49] Fan S., Hu Y., Tang S., 2020. On the uniqueness of solutions to quadratic BSDEs with non-convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 358 (2), 227–235.
- [50] Fan S., Hu Y., Tang S., 2023. Existence, uniqueness and comparison theorem on unbounded solutions of scalar super-linear BSDEs. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 157,335–375.
- [51] Fan S., Hu Y., Tang S., 2023. L^1 solution to scalar BSDEs with logarithmic sub-linear growth generators. *Syst. Control Lett.* 177, 105553.
- [52] Fan S., Hu Y., Tang S., 2023. Scalar BSDEs of iterated-logarithmically sublinear growth generators with integrable parameters. [arXiv:2307.11300v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.11300) [math.PR].
- [53] Fan S., Jiang L., 2012. L^p ($p > 1$) solutions for one-dimensional BSDEs with linear-growth generators. *Journal of*

Applied Mathematics and Computing 38 (1–2), 295–304.

- [54] Fan S., Jiang L., 2013. Multidimensional BSDEs with weak monotonicity and general growth generators. *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series* 29 (10), 1885–1907.
- [55] Fan S., Jiang L., Davison M., 2010. Uniqueness of solutions for multidimensional BSDEs with uniformly continuous generators. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 348 (11–12), 683–687.
- [56] Fan S., Liu D., 2010. A class of BSDE with integrable parameters. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 80 (23–24), 2024–2031.
- [57] Fan S., Luo H., 2017. Minimal and maximal bounded solutions for quadratic BSDEs with stochastic conditions. *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* 54 (6), 2065–2079.
- [58] Fan S., Wang T., Yong J., 2022. Multi-dimensional super-linear backward stochastic volterra integral equations. [arXiv:2211.04078v1](#) [math.PR].
- [59] Föllmer H., Schied A., 2002. Convex measures of risk and trading constraints. *Finance Stoch.* 6, 429–447.
- [60] Jia G., 2008. Backward stochastic differential equations, g -expectations and related semilinear PDEs:[PH.D Thesis]. ShanDong University, China.
- [61] Jia G., 2008. A uniqueness theorem for the solution of backward stochastic differential equations. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 346, 439–444.
- [62] Jia G., 2010. Backward stochastic differential equations with a uniformly continuous generator and related g -expectation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 120, 2241–2257.
- [63] Jiang L., 2005. Representation theorems for generators of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) and their applications. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 115 (12), 1883–1903.
- [64] Jiang L., 2008. Convexity, translation invariance and subadditivity for g -expectations and related risk measures. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 18 (1), 245–258.
- [65] Hu Y., Imkeller P., Müller M., 2005. Utility maximization in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 15 (3), 1691–1712.
- [66] Hu Y., Tang S., 2016. Multi-dimensional backward stochastic differential equations of diagonally quadratic generators. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 126 (4), 1066–1086.
- [67] Hu Y., Tang S., 2018. Existence of solution to scalar BSDEs with $L \exp \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda} \log(1+L)}$ -integrable terminal values. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 23, Paper No. 27, 11pp.
- [68] Kobylanski M., 2000. Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth. *Ann. Probab.* 28 (2), 558–602.
- [69] Lepeltier J.-P., San Martin J., 1997. Backward stochastic differential equations with continuous coefficient. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 32 (4), 425–430.
- [70] Lepeltier J.-P., San Martin J., 1998. Existence for BSDE with superlinear-quadratic coefficient. *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.* 63, 227–240.
- [71] Lepeltier J.-P., San Martin J., 2002. On the existence or non-existence of solutions for certain backward stochastic differential equations. *Bernoulli* 8 (1), 123–137.
- [72] Lepeltier J.-P., Matoussi A., Xu M., 2005. Reflected backward stochastic differential equations under monotonicity and general increasing growth conditions. *Advances in Applied Probability* 37 (1), 134–159.
- [73] Lionnet A., Dos Reis G., Szpruch L., 2015. Time discretization of FBSDE with polynomial growth drivers and reaction-diffusion PDEs. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 25 (5), 2563–2625.
- [74] Lionnet A., Dos Reis G., Szpruch L., 2016. Full-projection explicit FBSDE scheme for parabolic PDEs with superlinear nonlinearities. [arXiv:1612.00078v1](#) [math.NA].
- [75] Lionnet A., dos Reis G., Szpruch L., 2018. Convergence and qualitative properties of modified explicit schemes for BSDEs with polynomial growth. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 28 (4), 2544–2591.
- [76] Luo H., Fan S., 2018. Bounded solutions for general time interval BSDEs with quadratic growth coefficients and stochastic conditions. *Stoch. Dynam.* 18 (5), Paper No. 1850034, 24pp.
- [77] Masiero F., Richou A., 2013. A note on the existence of solutions to Markovian superquadratic BSDEs with an

- unbounded terminal condition. *Electron. J. Probab* 18 (50), 1–15.
- [78] O H., Kim M.-C., Pak C.-G., 2021. Uniqueness of solution to scalar BSDEs with $L \exp\left(\mu_0 \sqrt{2 \log(1+L)}\right)$ -integrable terminal values: an L^1 -solution approach. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 359 (9), 1085–1095.
- [79] Pardoux E., 1999. BSDEs, weak convergence and homogenization of semilinear PDEs. In Clarke F.-H., Stern R.-J. and Sabidussi G., editors, *Nonlinear analysis, differential equations and control*, volume 528 of NATO science series, pages 503–549. Springer.
- [80] Pardoux E., Peng S., 1990. Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Syst. Control Lett.* 14 (1), 55–61.
- [81] Pardoux E., Rascanu A., 2014. *Stochastic differential equations, backward SDEs, partial differential equations*. In: *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability Series*. New York: Springer international publishing.
- [82] Pardoux E., Tang S., 1999. Forward-backward stochastic differential equations and quasilinear parabolic pdes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 114, 123–150.
- [83] Peng S., 1990. A generalized stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 28, 966–979.
- [84] Peng S., 1991. Probabilistic interpretation for systems of quasilinear parabolic partial differential equations. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports* 37, 61–74.
- [85] Peng S., 1992. A generalized dynamic programming principle and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports* 38, 119–134.
- [86] Peng S., 1993. Backward stochastic differential equations and applications to optimal control. *Appl. Math. Optimization* 27(2), 125–144.
- [87] Peng S., 1997. Backward SDE and related g -expectation, *Backward Stochastic Differential Equations* (El Karoui, N., Mazliak, L. Eds.), Pitman Research Notes Mathematical Series, vol. 364. Longman, Harlow, pp. 141–159.
- [88] Peng S., 1999. Monotonic limit theorem of BSDE and nonlinear decomposition theorem of Doob-Meyer’s type. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 113 (4), 23–30.
- [89] Peng S., 2004. Dynamical evaluations. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* 339, 585–589.
- [90] Peng S., 2004. Nonlinear expectations, nonlinear evaluations and risk measures. In: Frittelli, M., Runggaldier, W.(Eds.), *Stochastic Methods in Finance. Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1856. Springer, Berlin, pp. 165–253.
- [91] Peng S., 2004. Filtration consistent nonlinear expectations and evaluations of contingent claims. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica, English Series*, 20, 1–24.
- [92] Richou A., 2012. Markovian quadratic and superquadratic BSDEs with an unbounded terminal condition. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 122, 3173–3208.
- [93] Tang S., 2006. Dual representation as stochastic differential games of backward stochastic differential equations and dynamic evaluations. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 342, 773–778.
- [94] Tevzadze, R., 2008. Solvability of backward stochastic differential equations with quadratic growth. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 118 (3), 503–515.
- [95] Xiao L., Fan S., 2020. L^p ($p \geq 1$) solutions of multidimensional BSDEs with time-varying quasi-Hölder continuity generators in general time intervals. *Commun. Korean Math. Soc.* 35 (2), 667–684.
- [96] Yang H., 2017. L^p solutions of quadratic BSDEs. [arXiv:1506.08146v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.08146v2) [math.PR].