

Direct Approach of Linear-Quadratic Stackelberg Mean Field Games of Backward-Forward Stochastic Systems *

Wenyu Cong[†], Jingtao Shi[‡]

June 28, 2024

Abstract: This paper is concerned with a linear-quadratic (LQ) Stackelberg mean field games of backward-forward stochastic systems, involving a backward leader and a substantial number of forward followers. The leader initiates by providing its strategy, and subsequently, each follower optimizes its individual cost. A direct approach is applied to solve this game. Initially, we address a mean field game problem, determining the optimal response of followers to the leader's strategy. Following the implementation of followers' strategies, the leader faces an optimal control problem driven by high-dimensional forward-backward stochastic differential equations (FBSDEs). Through the decoupling of the high-dimensional Hamiltonian system using mean field approximations, we formulate a set of decentralized strategies for all players, demonstrated to be an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium.

Keywords: Stackelberg mean field game, direct approach, linear-quadratic stochastic optimal control, forward-backward stochastic differential equation, Stackelberg equilibrium

Mathematics Subject Classification: 93E20, 60H10, 49K45, 49N70, 91A23

1 Introduction

Mean field games (MFGs) have garnered increasing scholarly attention, finding applications in diverse fields such as system control, applied mathematics, and economics ([6], [13], [8], [9]). MFG theory serves as a framework for describing the behavior of models characterized by large

*This work is supported by National Key R&D Program of China (2022YFA1006104), National Natural Science Foundations of China (11971266, 12271304, 11831010), and Shandong Provincial Natural Science Foundations (ZR2022JQ01, ZR2020ZD24, ZR2019ZD42).

[†]*School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, P.R. China, E-mail: congwenyu@mail.sdu.edu.cn*

[‡]*Corresponding author. School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, P.R. China, E-mail: shijingtao@sdu.edu.cn*

populations, where the influence of the overall population is significant, despite the negligible impact on individual entities. The methodological foundations of MFG, initially proposed by Lasry and Lions [21] and independently by Huang et al. [19], have proven effective and tractable for analyzing weakly coupled stochastic controlled systems with mean field interactions, establishing approximate Nash equilibria. In particular, within the *linear-quadratic* (LQ) framework, MFGs offer a versatile modeling tool applicable to a myriad of practical problems. The solutions derived from LQ-MFGs exhibit noteworthy and elegant properties. Current scholarly discourse has extensively explored MFGs, particularly within the LQ framework ([22], [7], [26], [20]). Huang et al. [18] conducted a study on ϵ -Nash equilibrium strategies in the context of LQ-MFGs with discounted costs. This investigation was rooted in the *Nash certainty equivalence* (NCE) approach. Subsequently, the NCE approach was applied to scenarios involving long run average costs, in Li and Zhang [22]. In the domain of MFGs featuring major players, Huang [17] delved into continuous-time LQ games, providing insights into ϵ -Nash equilibrium strategies. Huang et al. [15] introduced a backward-major and forward-minor setup for an LQ-MFG, and decentralized ϵ -Nash equilibrium strategies for major and minor agents were obtained. Huang et al. [16] examined the backward LQ-MFG of weakly coupled stochastic large population systems under both full and partial information scenarios. Huang and Li [14] delved into an LQ-MFG concerning a class of stochastic delayed systems. Xu and Zhang [39] explored a general LQ-MFG for stochastic large population systems, where the individual diffusion coefficient is contingent on the state and control of the agent. Bensoussan et al. [5] considered an LQ-MFG with partial observation and common noise.

The Stackelberg differential game problem, also known as the leader-follower differential game problem, arises in markets where certain companies possess greater authority to dominate others or individual entities. In response to this characteristic, Stackelberg [34] introduced the concept of hierarchical solution. Within the context of the Stackelberg differential game, there are two players with asymmetric roles, one designated as the leader and the other as the follower. To attain a pair of Stackelberg equilibrium solutions, the differential game problem is typically bifurcated into two segments. In the first segment, the problem of the follower is addressed. Initially, the leader publicly announces their strategy, transforming the two-player differential game into the single-player optimal control problem for the follower. In other words, the follower promptly reacts, selecting an optimal strategy in response to the strategy disclosed by the leader, aiming to minimize (or maximize) their own cost functional. The second segment involves the leader choosing an optimal strategy, given the assumption that the follower will adopt such an optimal strategy, to minimize their own cost functional. This constitutes another optimal control problem for the leader. In summary, decision-making must be jointly accomplished by both players. Due to the asymmetry in roles, one player must be subordinate to the other, necessitating that one player makes their decision after the other has concluded their decision-making process. The Stackelberg differential game problem holds significant relevance

in financial and economic practices, prompting an increasing focus in applied research. Bagchi and Başar [1] explored an LQ Stackelberg stochastic differential game, where the diffusion coefficient in the state equation does not involve state and control variables. Yong [41] delved into a more generalized framework of LQ leader-follower differential game problems. In this study, coefficients of the state system and cost functional are stochastic, the diffusion coefficient in the state equation includes control variables, and the weight matrix in front of the control variables in the cost functional is not necessarily positive definite. Bensoussan et al. [2] introduced several solution concepts based on players' information sets and investigated LQ Stackelberg differential games under adaptive open-loop and closed-loop memoryless information structures, where control variables do not enter the diffusion coefficient in the state equation. Zheng and Shi [42] investigated a Stackelberg game involving *backward stochastic differential equations* (BSDEs) (Pardoux and Peng [31], Ma and Yong [25]). Feng et al. [12] examined a Stackelberg game associated with BSDE featuring constraints. Sun et al. [33] conducted research on a zero-sum LQ Stackelberg stochastic differential game.

Stackelberg mean field games (Stackelberg MFGs), distinct from Stackelberg stochastic differential games of mean field type (incorporating the expected values of state and control variables, as seen in references [11], [23], [38], [28], [24], etc.), have been increasingly capturing the attention of researchers. Nourian et al. [30] studied a large population LQ leader-follower stochastic multi-agent systems and established their (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg-Nash equilibrium. Bensoussan et al. [4] and Bensoussan et al. [3] investigated Stackelberg MFGs featuring delayed responses. Wang and Zhang [37] examined hierarchical games for multi-agent systems involving a leader and a large number of followers with infinite horizon tracking-type costs. Moon and Başar [27] considered the LQ Stackelberg MFG with the adapted open-loop information structure, and derived (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg-Nash equilibrium. Yang and Huang [40] conducted a study on LQ Stackelberg MFGs involving a major player (leader) and N minor players (followers). Si and Wu [32] explored a backward-forward LQ Stackelberg MFG, where the leader's state equation is backward, and the followers' state equation is forward. Wang [35] employed a direct method to solve LQ Stackelberg MFGs with a leader and a substantial number of followers. A static output feedback strategy for robust incentive Stackelberg games with a large population for mean field stochastic systems was investigated in Mukaidani et al. [29]. Dayanikli and Laurière [10] proposed a numerical approach of machine learning techniques to solve Stackelberg problems between a principal and a mean field of agents.

Conventionally, two approaches are employed in the resolution of mean field games. One is termed the fixed-point approach (or top-down approach, NCE approach, see [18], [19], [22], [6], [9]), which initiates the process by employing mean field approximation and formulating a fixed-point equation. By tackling the fixed-point equation and scrutinizing the optimal response of a representative player, decentralized strategies can be formulated. The alternative approach is known as the direct approach (or bottom-up approach, refer to [21], [36], [20], [35]). This method

commences by formally solving an N -player game problem within a vast and finite population setting. Subsequently, by decoupling or reducing high-dimensional systems, centralized control can be explicitly derived, contingent on the state of a specific player and the average state of the population. As the population size N approaches infinity, the construction of decentralized strategies becomes feasible. In [20], the authors addressed the connection and difference of these two routes in an LQ setting.

In this paper, we explore a backward-forward LQ Stackelberg MFG with a leader and multiple followers. The leader initiates the process by disclosing their strategy, following which each follower optimizes its individual cost. Employing the direct approach, we formulate (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium strategies. With the leader's strategy given, we first address a MFG by the *stochastic maximum principle* (SMP), resulting in a system of *forward-backward stochastic differential equations* (FBSDEs). Subsequent to the followers implementing their strategies, the leader is encounters an optimal control problem driven by a forward SDE and two BSDEs. By variational analysis, we obtain the centralized strategy for the leader. By decoupling a high-dimensional FBSDE with mean field approximations, we construct a set of decentralized (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium strategies, in terms of a 6-dimensional FBSDE.

The main contributions of the paper are outlined as follows.

- We formulate a new type of LQ Stackelberg MFGs, where the state of leader is a backward equation, and followers are forward equations. Note that in our model, both the state and control variables of the leader enter into the drift coefficient of the forward equation, which is different from those in [15], [32]. Our model is also different with that in [35], where the leader's state is a forward equation. Moreover, the cross terms of the leader's and followers' control variables enter into the followers' cost functionals. These new structures bring mathematical difficulties, and, to some degree, they have some potential applications in reality.

- In lieu of the traditional fixed-point methodology, we embrace a direct approach to tackle the complexities of our game problem, which was used in [20], [35]. This strategic shift involves the meticulous decoupling of the high-dimensional Hamiltonian system using mean field approximations. By disentangling the high-dimensional Hamiltonian system through mean field approximations, we formulate a set of decentralized strategies for all players. This set is subsequently demonstrated to constitute an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we formulate the problem of backward-forward LQ Stackelberg MFG. In Section 3, we explore and determine centralized strategies for N followers and the leader. In Section 4, we construct decentralized strategies and the proof of the asymptotic optimality is rigorously presented. Section 5 engages in a numerical simulation to demonstrate the effectiveness of our obtained results. Finally, some conclusions and future research directions are given in Section 6.

The following notations will be used throughout this paper. We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the norm of a Euclidean space, or the Frobenius norm for matrices. \top denotes the transpose of a vector

or matrix. For a symmetric matrix Q and a vector z , $\|z\|_Q^2 \equiv z^\top Q z$. For any real-valued scalar functions $f(\cdot)$ and $g(\cdot)$ defined on \mathbb{R} , $f(x) = O(g(x))$ means that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \right| = C$, where $|\cdot|$ is an absolute value, which is also equivalent to saying that there exist $C > 0$ and x such that $|f(x)| \leq C|g(x)|$ for any $x \geq x'$.

Let $T > 0$ be a finite time duration and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{H}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space with the filtration $\{\mathcal{H}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ augmented by all the \mathbb{P} -null sets in \mathcal{F} . \mathbb{E} denoted the expectation with respect to \mathbb{P} . Let $L_{\mathcal{H}}^2(0, T; \cdot)$ be the set of all vector-valued (or matrix-valued) \mathcal{H}_t -adapted processes $f(\cdot)$ such that $\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \|f(t)\|^2 dt \right] < \infty$ and $L_{\mathcal{H}_t}^2(\Omega; \cdot)$ be the set of \mathcal{H}_t -measurable random variables, for $t \in [0, T]$.

2 Problem formulation

We consider a large-population system with one leader and N followers, where N can be arbitrarily large. The states equation of the leader and the i th follower, $1 \leq i \leq N$, are given by the following controlled linear BSDE and SDE, respectively:

$$\begin{cases} dx_0(t) = [A_0 x_0(t) + B_0 u_0(t) + C_0 z_0(t) + f_0] dt + z_0(t) dW_0(t), \\ dx_i(t) = [A x_i(t) + B u_i(t) + F x_0(t) + G u_0(t) + f] dt + D dW_i(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ x_0(T) = \xi_0, \quad x_i(0) = \xi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $x_0(\cdot)$, $u_0(\cdot)$ are the state process and the control process, $\xi_0 \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T^0}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ is the given terminal value of the leader; similarly, $x_i(\cdot)$, $u_i(\cdot)$ and ξ_i are the state process, control process and initial value (random variable) of the i th follower. In this paper, for simplicity, we assume the dimensions of state process and control process are both one-dimensional. Here, $A_0, B_0, C_0, f_0, A, B, F, G, f, D$ are scalar constants. $W_i(\cdot), i = 0, \dots, N$ are a sequence of one-dimensional Brownian motions defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$. Let \mathcal{F}_t be the σ -algebra generated by $\{\xi_i, W_0(s), W_i(s), s \leq t, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. Denote \mathcal{F}_t^0 be the σ -algebra generated by $\{W_0(s), s \leq t\}$ and \mathcal{F}_t^i be the σ -algebra generated by $\{\xi_i, W_0(s), W_i(s), s \leq t, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. Define the decentralized control set for the leader as

$$\mathcal{U}_0[0, T] := \{u_0(\cdot) | u_0(\cdot) \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T^0}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R})\}.$$

Define the decentralized control set for the followers and i th follower as

$$\mathcal{U}_d[0, T] := \{(u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_N(\cdot)) | u_i(\cdot) \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T^i}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R})\},$$

$$\mathcal{U}_i[0, T] := \{u_i(\cdot) | u_i(\cdot) \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T^i}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R})\},$$

and the centralized control set for the followers as

$$\mathcal{U}_c[0, T] := \{(u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_N(\cdot)) | u_i(\cdot) \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}), 1 \leq i \leq N\}.$$

The cost functional of the leader is given by

$$J_0^N(u_0(\cdot), u^N(\cdot)) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|x_0(t) - \Gamma_0 x^{(N)}(t) - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|u_0(t)\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|x_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $u^N(\cdot) := (u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_N(\cdot))$, $x^{(N)}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i(\cdot)$ is called the state average or mean field term of all followers, Q_0, R_0, H_0, Γ_0 and η_0 are scalar constants. Notice that Q_0, Γ_0 and η_0 determine the coupling between the leader and the mean field of the N followers, R_0 is the control performance weighting parameter of the leader, and H_0 is the initial state cost parameter of the leader.

For the i th follower, the cost functional is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} & J_i^N(u_i(\cdot), u_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|x_i(t) - \Gamma x^{(N)}(t) - \Gamma_1 x_0(t) - \eta\|_Q^2 + \|u_i(t)\|_R^2 + 2u_i(t)Lu_0(t) \right] dt + \|x_i(T)\|_H^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where $u_{-i}(\cdot) := (u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_{i-1}(\cdot), u_{i+1}(\cdot), \dots, u_N(\cdot))$, $Q, R, L, H, \Gamma, \Gamma_1$ and η are scalar constants. Q, Γ, Γ_1 and η determine the coupling between the i th follower, leader and followers' mean field, whereas L influences the coupling between the leader and the i th follower through control term. Also, R serves as the control performance weighting parameter of the i th follower, and H represents the terminal state cost parameter. It is noteworthy that the followers are (weakly) coupled with each other through the mean field term $x^{(N)}$, and are (strongly) coupled with the leader's state x_0 and control u_0 included in their cost functionals.

We posit the following assumptions:

(A1) $\{\xi_i\}, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d., for short) random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i] = \bar{\xi}, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, and there exists a constant c such that $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq N} \mathbb{E}[\|\xi_i\|^2] \leq c$.

(A2) $\{W_i(t), 0 \leq i \leq N\}$ are independent of each other, which are also independent of $\{\xi_i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$.

(A3) $Q_0 \geq 0, R_0 > 0, H_0 \geq 0$ and $Q \geq 0, R > 0, H \geq 0$.

Now, we present the precise definition of an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium.

Definition 2.1. A set of strategies $(u_0^*(\cdot), u_1^*(\cdot), \dots, u_N^*(\cdot))$ is an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium with respect to $\{J_i^N, 0 \leq i \leq N\}$ if the following hold:

(i) For a given strategy of the leader $u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$, $u^{N*}(\cdot) = (u_1^*(\cdot), \dots, u_N^*(\cdot))$ constitutes an ϵ_1 -Nash equilibrium, if there exists a constant $\epsilon_1 \geq 0$ such that for all $i, 1 \leq i \leq N$,

$$J_i^N(u_i^*(\cdot), u_{-i}^*(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) \leq \inf_{u_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i[0, T]} J_i^N(u_i(\cdot), u_{-i}^*(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) + \epsilon_1;$$

(ii) There exists a constant $\epsilon_2 \geq 0$ such that

$$J_0^N(u_0^*(\cdot), u^{N*}[\cdot; u_0^*(\cdot)]) \leq \inf_{u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]} J_0^N(u_0(\cdot), u^{N*}[\cdot; u_0(\cdot)]) + \epsilon_2.$$

In this paper, we investigate the following problem.

(P0): Find an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium solution to (2.2), (2.3), subject to (2.1).

3 Centralized strategies

3.1 Mean field Nash games for the N followers

In this subsection, we consider the mean field Nash game for the N followers under an arbitrary strategy of the leader $u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$. We suppose $u_0(\cdot)$ is fixed. Then, due to first equation of (2.1), $x_0(\cdot)$ is also fixed. We now consider the following game problem for N followers.

(P1): Minimize $J_i^N, i = 1, \dots, N$ of (2.3) over $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_c[0, T]$.

For the sake of simplicity, the time variable t will be omitted without ambiguity.

We have the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *Under Assumption (A1)-(A3), let $u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$ be given, for the initial value $\xi_i, i = 1, \dots, N$, (P1) admits an optimal control $\tilde{u}_i(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}), i = 1, \dots, N$, if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

(i) *The adapted solution $(\tilde{x}_i(\cdot), \tilde{p}_i(\cdot), \tilde{q}_i^j(\cdot), i = 1, \dots, N, j = 0, 1, \dots, N)$ to the FBSDE*

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{x}_i = [A\tilde{x}_i + B\tilde{u}_i + Fx_0 + Gu_0 + f]dt + DdW_i, \\ d\tilde{p}_i = - \left[A\tilde{p}_i + \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q \left(\tilde{x}_i - \Gamma\tilde{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right) \right] dt + \sum_{j=0}^N \tilde{q}_i^j dW_j, \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \tilde{x}_i(0) = \xi_i, \quad \tilde{p}_i(T) = H\tilde{x}_i(T), \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

satisfies the following stationarity condition:

$$B\tilde{p}_i + R\tilde{u}_i + Lu_0 = 0, \quad a.e., a.s., \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.2)$$

(ii) *For $i = 1, \dots, N$, the following convexity condition holds:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right)^2 \tilde{x}_i^2 + R\tilde{u}_i^2 \right] dt + H\tilde{x}_i^2(T) \right\} \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad \forall u_i(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}), \quad (3.3)$$

where $\tilde{x}_i(\cdot)$ is the solution to the following random differential equation (RDE):

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{x}_i = [A\tilde{x}_i + Bu_i]dt, \\ \tilde{x}_i(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. We consider the i th follower. For given $\xi_i \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_0}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}), u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T], \tilde{u}_i(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R})$, suppose that $(\tilde{x}_i(\cdot), \tilde{p}_i(\cdot), \tilde{q}_i^j(\cdot), j = 0, 1, \dots, N)$ is an adapted solution to FBSDE

(3.1). For any $u_i(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R})$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, let $x_i^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ be the solution to the following perturbed state equation:

$$\begin{cases} dx_i^\varepsilon = [Ax_i^\varepsilon + B(\check{u}_i + \varepsilon u_i) + Fx_0 + Gu_0 + f]dt + DdW_i, \\ x_i^\varepsilon(0) = \xi_i. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

Then, $\tilde{x}_i^\varepsilon(\cdot) := \frac{x_i^\varepsilon(\cdot) - \check{x}_i(\cdot)}{\varepsilon}$ is independent of ε and satisfies (3.4).

Applying Itô's formula to $\check{p}_i(\cdot)\tilde{x}_i(\cdot)$, integrating from 0 to T , and taking the expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[H\check{x}_i(T)\tilde{x}_i(T)] &= \mathbb{E}[\check{p}_i(T)\tilde{x}_i(T) - \check{p}_i(0)\tilde{x}_i(0)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\{ - \left[A\check{p}_i + \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) Q \left(\check{x}_i - \Gamma\check{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right) \right] \tilde{x}_i + [A\tilde{x}_i + Bu_i]\check{p}_i \right\} dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\{ - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) Q \left(\check{x}_i - \Gamma\check{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right) \tilde{x}_i + Bu_i\check{p}_i \right\} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &J_i^N(\check{u}_i(\cdot) + \varepsilon u_i(\cdot), u_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) - J_i^N(\check{u}_i(\cdot), u_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|x_i^\varepsilon - \Gamma x^\varepsilon^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta\|_Q^2 + \|\check{u}_i + \varepsilon u_i\|_R^2 + 2(\check{u}_i + \varepsilon u_i)Lu_0 \right] dt + \|x_i^\varepsilon(T)\|_H^2 \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|\check{x}_i - \Gamma\check{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta\|_Q^2 + \|\check{u}_i\|_R^2 + 2\check{u}_iLu_0 \right] dt + \|\check{x}_i(T)\|_H^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\| \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) (\check{x}_i + \varepsilon\tilde{x}_i) - \Gamma x_{-i}^{(N-1)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right\|_Q^2 + \|\check{u}_i + \varepsilon u_i\|_R^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2(\check{u}_i + \varepsilon u_i)Lu_0 \right] dt + \|(\check{x}_i(T) + \varepsilon\tilde{x}_i(T))\|_H^2 \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\| \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \check{x}_i - \Gamma x_{-i}^{(N-1)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right\|_Q^2 + \|\check{u}_i\|_R^2 + 2\check{u}_iLu_0 \right] dt + \|\check{x}_i(T)\|_H^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right)^2 \tilde{x}_i^2 + Ru_i^2 \right] dt + H\tilde{x}_i^2(T) \right\} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \tilde{x}_i \left(\check{x}_i - \Gamma\check{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right) + u_iR\check{u}_i + u_iLu_0 \right] dt + H\check{x}_i(T)\tilde{x}_i(T) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right)^2 \tilde{x}_i^2 + Ru_i^2 \right] dt + H\tilde{x}_i^2(T) \right\} + \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T u_i [B\check{p}_i + R\check{u}_i + Lu_0] dt \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where only here $x^\varepsilon^{(N)}(\cdot) := \frac{x_i^\varepsilon(\cdot)}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} x_j(\cdot)$, $\check{x}^{(N)}(\cdot) := \frac{\check{x}_i(\cdot)}{N} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} x_j(\cdot)$, and $x_{-i}^{(N-1)}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} x_j(\cdot)$. Therefore,

$$J_i^N(\check{u}_i(\cdot), u_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) \leq J_i^N(\check{u}_i(\cdot) + \varepsilon u_i(\cdot), u_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot))$$

if and only if (3.2) and (3.3) hold. The proof is complete. \square

Based on Assumption (A3), we can figure out that the open-loop optimal strategies for followers are

$$\check{u}_i = -R^{-1}[B\check{p}_i + Lu_0], \quad a.e., a.s., \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.6)$$

so the related Hamiltonian system can be represented by

$$\begin{cases} d\check{x}_i = [A\check{x}_i - BR^{-1}B\check{p}_i + Fx_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + f]dt + DdW_i, \\ d\check{p}_i = - \left[A\check{p}_i + \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q \left(\check{x}_i - \Gamma\check{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right) \right] dt + \sum_{j=0}^N \check{q}_i^j dW_j, \\ \check{x}_i(0) = \xi_i, \quad \check{p}_i(T) = H\check{x}_i(T), \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

We consider the transformation $\check{p}_i(\cdot) = P_N(\cdot)\check{x}_i(\cdot) + K_N(\cdot)\check{x}^{(N)}(\cdot) + \check{\phi}_N(\cdot)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, where $P_N(\cdot)$, $K_N(\cdot)$ are differential functions with $P_N(T) = H$, $K_N(T) = 0$, process pair $(\phi_N(\cdot), V_N(\cdot))$ satisfies a BSDE as follows:

$$d\phi_N(t) = \Lambda_N(t)dt + V_N(t)dW_0(t), \quad \phi_N(T) = 0,$$

where process $\Lambda_N(\cdot)$ will be determined later. By Itô's formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{p}_i &= \dot{P}_N\check{x}_i dt + P_N \left\{ [A\check{x}_i - BR^{-1}B(P_N\check{x}_i + K_N\check{x}^{(N)} + \check{\phi}_N) + Fx_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + f] dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + DdW_i \right\} + \dot{K}_N\check{x}^{(N)} dt + K_N \left\{ [A\check{x}^{(N)} - BR^{-1}B((P_N + K_N)\check{x}^{(N)} + \check{\phi}_N) + Fx_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + f] dt + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N DdW_j \right\} + \check{\Lambda}_N dt + \check{V}_N dW_0 \\ &= - \left[A \left(P_N\check{x}_i + K_N\check{x}^{(N)} + \check{\phi}_N \right) + \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) Q \left(\check{x}_i - \Gamma\check{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right) \right] dt + \sum_{j=0}^N \check{q}_i^j dW_j, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to the second equation of (3.7). Comparing the coefficients of the corresponding terms, we have

$$\check{q}_i^j = P_N D + \frac{K_N D}{N}, \quad \check{q}_i^j = \frac{K_N D}{N}, \quad 1 \leq j \neq i \leq N, \quad \check{q}_i^0 = \check{V}_N,$$

$$\dot{P}_N + AP_N + P_N A - P_N BR^{-1}BP_N + \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q = 0, \quad P_N(T) = H, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\dot{K}_N + AK_N + K_N A - P_N BR^{-1}BK_N - K_N BR^{-1}B(P_N + K_N) - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q\Gamma = 0, \quad K_N(T) = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{\phi}_N &= - \left\{ [A - (P_N + K_N)BR^{-1}B] \check{\phi}_N + (P_N + K_N)(G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + (P_N + K_N)Fx_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (P_N + K_N)f - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q(\Gamma_1x_0 + \eta) \right\} dt + \check{V}_N dW_0, \quad \phi_N(T) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Let $\Pi_N(\cdot) := P_N(\cdot) + K_N(\cdot)$, then $\Pi_N(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\dot{\Pi}_N + A\Pi_N + \Pi_N A - \Pi_N B R^{-1} B \Pi_N + \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q \Gamma = 0, \quad \Pi_N(T) = H, \quad (3.11)$$

thus (3.10) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} d\check{\phi}_N = & - \left\{ [A - \Pi_N B R^{-1} B] \check{\phi}_N + \Pi_N (G - B R^{-1} L) u_0 + \Pi_N F x_0 \right. \\ & \left. + \Pi_N f - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q (\Gamma_1 x_0 + \eta) \right\} dt + \check{V}_N dW_0, \quad \phi_N(T) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Note that (3.8) is a symmetric Riccati differential equation, if it satisfies Assumption (A3) and $1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \geq 0$, then it admits a unique solution. Similarly, (3.11) is a symmetric Riccati differential equation, if it satisfies Assumption (A3) and $(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N})(1 - \Gamma) \geq 0$, then it admits a unique solution. Thus (3.9) admits a unique solution. And then (3.12) admits a unique solution.

From the above discussion, Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 on page 47 of Ma and Yong [25], we have the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A3), for given $u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$, if $1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \geq 0$ and $(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N})(1 - \Gamma) \geq 0$, then Problem (P1) admits a unique solution*

$$\check{u}_i = -R^{-1} \left[B(P_N \check{x}_i + K_N \check{x}^{(N)} + \check{\phi}_N) + L u_0 \right], \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.13)$$

3.2 Optimal strategy of the leader

Upon implementing the strategies of followers $\check{u}_i(\cdot), i = 1, \dots, N$ according to (3.13), we delve into an optimal control problem for the leader.

(P2): Minimize $\check{J}_0^N(u_0(\cdot))$ over $u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$, where

$$\check{J}_0^N(u_0(\cdot)) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|x_0(t) - \Gamma_0 \check{x}^{(N)}(t) - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|u_0(t)\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|x_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\}, \quad (3.14)$$

subject to

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} dx_0 &= [A_0 x_0 + B_0 u_0 + C_0 z_0 + f_0] dt + z_0 dW_0, \quad x_0(T) = \xi_0, \\ d\check{x}_i &= [(A - B R^{-1} B P_N) \check{x}_i - B R^{-1} B K_N \check{x}^{(N)} - B R^{-1} B \check{\phi}_N + F x_0 \\ &\quad + (G - B R^{-1} L) u_0 + f] dt + D dW_i, \quad \check{x}_i(0) = \xi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ d\check{\phi}_N &= - \left[(A - \Pi_N B R^{-1} B) \check{\phi}_N + \Pi_N (G - B R^{-1} L) u_0 + \Pi_N F x_0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Pi_N f - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q (\Gamma_1 x_0 + \eta) \right] dt + \check{V}_N dW_0, \quad \check{\phi}_N(T) = 0. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (3.15)$$

Note that here $\check{x}^{(N)}(\cdot)$ means that all $x_i(\cdot), i = 1, \dots, N$ take the optimal $\check{x}_i(\cdot)$, i.e., $\check{x}^{(N)}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \check{x}_i(\cdot)$. Denote $W^{(N)}(\cdot) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(\cdot)$, and $\xi^{(N)} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i$.

The result of this subsection is as follows.

Theorem 3.2. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A3), let the followers adopt the optimal strategy (3.13). Then Problem (P2) admits an optimal control $\check{u}_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$, if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

(i) *The adapted solution $(\check{x}_0(\cdot), \check{z}_0(\cdot), \check{x}^{(N)}(\cdot), \check{\phi}_N(\cdot), \check{V}_N(\cdot), \check{y}_0(\cdot), \check{y}^{(N)}(\cdot), \check{\beta}^{(N)}(\cdot), \check{\psi}_N(\cdot))$ to the FBSDE*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d\check{x}_0 = [A_0\check{x}_0 + B_0\check{u}_0 + C_0\check{z}_0 + f_0]dt + \check{z}_0dW_0, \quad x_0(T) = \xi_0, \\ d\check{x}^{(N)} = [(A - BR^{-1}B\Pi_N)\check{x}^{(N)} - BR^{-1}B\check{\phi}_N + F\check{x}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\check{u}_0 + f]dt \\ \quad + DdW^{(N)}, \quad \check{x}^{(N)}(0) = \xi^{(N)}, \\ d\check{\phi}_N = - \left[(A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\check{\phi}_N + \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)\check{u}_0 + \Pi_N F\check{x}_0 \right. \\ \quad \left. + \Pi_N f - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q(\Gamma_1\check{x}_0 + \eta) \right]dt + \check{V}_N dW_0, \quad \check{\phi}_N(T) = 0, \\ d\check{y}_0 = - \left[Q_0(\check{x}_0 - \Gamma_0\check{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0) + A_0\check{y}_0 + F\check{y}^{(N)} - \left(\Pi_N F - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q\Gamma_1\right) \check{\psi}_N \right]dt \\ \quad - C_0\check{y}_0dW_0, \quad \check{y}_0(0) = H_0\check{x}_0(0), \\ d\check{y}^{(N)} = - [(A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\check{y}^{(N)} - Q_0\Gamma_0(\check{x}_0 - \Gamma_0\check{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0)]dt \\ \quad + \check{\beta}^{(N)}dW^{(N)}, \quad \check{y}^{(N)}(T) = 0, \\ d\check{\psi}_N = [BR^{-1}B\check{y}^{(N)} + (A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\check{\psi}_N]dt, \quad \check{\psi}_N(0) = 0, \end{array} \right. \quad (3.16)$$

satisfies the following stationarity condition:

$$B_0\check{y}_0 + R_0\check{u}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\check{y}^{(N)} - \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)\check{\psi}_N = 0, \quad a.e., a.s.. \quad (3.17)$$

(ii) *The following convexity condition holds:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q_0(\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0\tilde{x}^{(N)})^2 + R_0u_0^2 \right] dt + H_0\tilde{x}_0^2(0) \right\} \geq 0, \quad \forall u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T], \quad (3.18)$$

where $(\tilde{x}_0(\cdot), \tilde{z}_0(\cdot), \tilde{x}^{(N)}(\cdot), \tilde{\phi}_N(\cdot), \tilde{V}_N(\cdot))$ is the solution to the following FBSDE

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d\tilde{x}_0 = [A_0\tilde{x}_0 + B_0u_0 + C_0\tilde{z}_0]dt + \tilde{z}_0dW_0, \quad \tilde{x}_0(T) = 0, \\ d\tilde{x}^{(N)} = [(A - BR^{-1}B\Pi_N)\tilde{x}^{(N)} - BR^{-1}B\tilde{\phi}_N + F\tilde{x}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0]dt, \quad \tilde{x}^{(N)}(0) = 0, \\ d\tilde{\phi}_N = - \left[(A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\tilde{\phi}_N + \left(\Pi_N F - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q\Gamma_1\right) \tilde{x}_0 \right. \\ \quad \left. + \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 \right]dt + \tilde{V}_N dW_0, \quad \tilde{\phi}_N(T) = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.19)$$

Proof. For given $\xi_0 \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ and $\check{u}_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$, let $(\check{x}_0(\cdot), \check{z}_0(\cdot), \check{x}^{(N)}(\cdot), \check{\phi}_N(\cdot), \check{V}_N(\cdot), \check{y}_0(\cdot), \check{y}^{(N)}(\cdot), \check{\beta}^{(N)}(\cdot), \check{\psi}_N(\cdot))$ be an adapted solution to FBSDE (3.16). For any $u_0(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_0[0, T]$

and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, let $(x_0^\varepsilon(\cdot), z_0^\varepsilon(\cdot), x^{\varepsilon(N)}(\cdot), \phi_N^\varepsilon(\cdot), V_N^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ be the solution to the following perturbed state equation of the leader:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dx_0^\varepsilon = [A_0 x_0^\varepsilon + B_0(\check{u}_0 + \varepsilon u_0) + C_0 x_0^\varepsilon + f_0] dt + z_0^\varepsilon dW_0, \quad x_0^\varepsilon(T) = \xi_0, \\ dx^{\varepsilon(N)} = [(A - BR^{-1}B\Pi_N)x^{\varepsilon(N)} - BR^{-1}B\phi^\varepsilon + Fx_0^\varepsilon + (G - BR^{-1}L)(\check{u}_0 + \varepsilon u_0) \\ \quad + f] dt + DdW^{(N)}, \quad x^{\varepsilon(N)}(0) = \xi^{(N)}, \\ d\phi_N^\varepsilon = - \left[(A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\phi_N^\varepsilon + \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)(\check{u}_0 + \varepsilon u_0) + \Pi_N Fx_0^\varepsilon \right. \\ \quad \left. + \Pi_N f - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) Q(\Gamma_1 x_0^\varepsilon + \eta) \right] dt + V_N^\varepsilon dW_0, \quad \phi_N^\varepsilon(T) = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.20)$$

Then, denoting by $(\tilde{x}_0(\cdot), \tilde{z}_0(\cdot), \tilde{x}^{(N)}(\cdot), \tilde{\phi}_N(\cdot), \tilde{V}_N(\cdot))$ the solution to (3.19), we have $x_0^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \tilde{x}_0(\cdot) + \varepsilon \tilde{x}_0(\cdot)$, $z_0^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \tilde{z}_0(\cdot) + \varepsilon \tilde{z}_0(\cdot)$, $x^{\varepsilon(N)}(\cdot) = \tilde{x}^{(N)}(\cdot) + \varepsilon \tilde{x}^{(N)}(\cdot)$, $\phi_N^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \tilde{\phi}_N(\cdot) + \varepsilon \tilde{\phi}_N(\cdot)$, $V_N^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \tilde{V}_N(\cdot) + \varepsilon \tilde{V}_N(\cdot)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \check{J}_0^N(\check{u}_0(\cdot) + \varepsilon u_0(\cdot)) - \check{J}_0^N(\check{u}_0(\cdot)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|x_0^\varepsilon - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{\varepsilon(N)} - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|\check{u}_0 + \varepsilon u_0\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|x_0^\varepsilon(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|\check{u}_0\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|\tilde{x}_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|(\tilde{x}_0 + \varepsilon \tilde{x}_0) - \Gamma_0(\tilde{x}^{(N)} + \varepsilon \tilde{x}^{(N)}) - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|\check{u}_0 + \varepsilon u_0\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|\tilde{x}_0(0) + \varepsilon \tilde{x}_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|\check{u}_0\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|\tilde{x}_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q_0(\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{(N)})^2 + R_0 u_0^2 \right] dt + H_0 \tilde{x}_0^2(0) \right\} \\ & \quad + \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q_0(\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{(N)})(\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0) + R_0 \check{u}_0 u_0 \right] dt + H_0 \tilde{x}_0(0) \tilde{x}_0(0) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying Itô's formula to $\tilde{x}_0(\cdot)\check{y}_0(\cdot) + \tilde{x}^{(N)}(\cdot)\check{y}^{(N)}(\cdot) + \tilde{\phi}_N(\cdot)\check{\psi}_N(\cdot)$, integrating from 0 to T and taking expectation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & - \mathbb{E}[H_0 \tilde{x}_0(0) \tilde{x}_0(0)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[Q_0(\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{(N)}) \left(\tilde{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \tilde{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0 \right) - B_0 \check{y}_0 u_0 - (G - BR^{-1}L) \check{y}^{(N)} u_0 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L) \check{\psi}_N u_0 \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\check{J}_0^N(\check{u}_0(\cdot)) \leq \check{J}_0^N(\check{u}_0(\cdot) + \varepsilon u_0(\cdot))$$

if and only if (3.17) and (3.18) hold. The proof is complete. \square

Based on Assumption (A3), we can compute out the optimal control of the leader is

$$\check{u}_0 = -R_0^{-1}[B_0\check{y}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\check{y}^{(N)} - \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)\check{\psi}_N], \quad a.e., a.s.. \quad (3.21)$$

So the related Hamiltonian system can be represented by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d\check{x}_0 = \left\{ A_0\check{x}_0 - B_0R_0^{-1}[B_0\check{y}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\check{y}^{(N)} - \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)\check{\psi}_N] \right. \\ \quad \left. + C_0\check{z}_0 + f_0 \right\} dt + \check{z}_0 dW_0, \quad x_0(T) = \xi_0, \\ d\check{x}^{(N)} = \left\{ (A - BR^{-1}B\Pi_N)\check{x}^{(N)} - BR^{-1}B\check{\phi}_N + F\check{x}_0 - (G - BR^{-1}L)R_0^{-1}[B_0\check{y}_0 \right. \\ \quad \left. + (G - BR^{-1}L)\check{y}^{(N)} - \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)\check{\psi}_N] + f \right\} dt + DdW^{(N)}, \quad \check{x}^{(N)}(0) = \xi^{(N)}, \\ d\check{\phi}_N = - \left\{ (A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\check{\phi}_N + \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)R_0^{-1}[B_0\check{y}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\check{y}^{(N)} \right. \\ \quad \left. - \Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L)\check{\psi}_N] + \Pi_N F\check{x}_0 + \Pi_N f - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right)Q(\Gamma_1\check{x}_0 + \eta) \right\} dt \\ \quad + \check{V}_N dW_0, \quad \check{\phi}_N(T) = 0, \\ d\check{y}_0 = - \left[Q_0(\check{x}_0 - \Gamma_0\check{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0) + A_0\check{y}_0 + F\check{y}^{(N)} - \left(\Pi_N F - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right)Q\Gamma_1 \right) \check{\psi}_N \right] dt \\ \quad - C_0\check{y}_0 dW_0, \quad \check{y}_0(0) = H_0\check{x}_0(0), \\ d\check{y}^{(N)} = - \left[(A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\check{y}^{(N)} - Q_0\Gamma_0(\check{x}_0 - \Gamma_0\check{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0) \right] dt \\ \quad + \check{\beta}^{(N)} dW^{(N)}, \quad \check{y}^{(N)}(T) = 0, \\ d\check{\psi}_N = [BR^{-1}B\check{y}^{(N)} + (A - \Pi_N BR^{-1}B)\check{\psi}_N] dt, \quad \check{\psi}_N(0) = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.22)$$

4 Decentralized strategies and (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibria

Let $N \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.8) and (3.9), then $P_N(\cdot) \rightarrow \bar{P}(\cdot)$, $K_N(\cdot) \rightarrow \bar{K}(\cdot)$, where $\bar{P}(\cdot)$, $\bar{K}(\cdot)$ satisfy

$$\dot{\bar{P}} + A\bar{P} + \bar{P}A - \bar{P}BR^{-1}B\bar{P} + Q = 0, \quad \bar{P}(T) = H, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\dot{\bar{K}} + A\bar{K} + \bar{K}A - \bar{P}BR^{-1}B\bar{K} - \bar{K}BR^{-1}B(\bar{P} + \bar{K}) - Q\Gamma = 0, \quad \bar{K}(T) = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Let $\bar{\Pi}(\cdot) := \bar{P}(\cdot) + \bar{K}(\cdot)$, then $\bar{\Pi}(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\dot{\bar{\Pi}} + A\bar{\Pi} + \bar{\Pi}A - \bar{\Pi}BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi} + Q - Q\Gamma = 0, \quad \bar{\Pi}(T) = H, \quad (4.3)$$

From Assumption (A3), it follows that (4.1) and (4.2) admits a unique solution, respectively.

Inspired by (3.22), we consider

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
d\bar{x}_0 &= \left\{ A_0\bar{x}_0 - B_0R_0^{-1}[B_0\bar{y}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{y}] - \bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{\psi} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + C_0\bar{z}_0 + f_0 \right\} dt + \bar{z}_0 dW_0, \quad x_0(T) = \xi_0, \\
d\bar{x} &= \left\{ (A - BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi})\bar{x} - BR^{-1}B\bar{\phi} + F\bar{x}_0 - (G - BR^{-1}L)R_0^{-1}[B_0\bar{y}_0 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{y}] - \bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{\psi} \right\} + f \Big\} dt, \quad \bar{x}(0) = \bar{\xi}, \\
d\bar{\phi} &= - \left\{ (A - \bar{\Pi}BR^{-1}B)\bar{\phi} + \bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L)R_0^{-1}[B_0\bar{y}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{y} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{\psi}] + \bar{\Pi}F\bar{x}_0 + \bar{\Pi}f - Q(\Gamma_1\bar{x}_0 + \eta) \right\} dt + \bar{V}dW_0, \quad \bar{\phi}(T) = 0, \\
d\bar{y}_0 &= - [Q_0(\bar{x}_0 - \Gamma_0\bar{x} - \eta_0) + A_0\bar{y}_0 + F\bar{y} - (\bar{\Pi}F - Q\Gamma_1)\bar{\psi}] dt \\
&\quad - C_0\bar{y}_0 dW_0, \quad \bar{y}_0(0) = H_0\bar{x}_0(0), \\
d\bar{y} &= - [(A - \bar{\Pi}BR^{-1}B)\bar{y} - Q_0\Gamma_0(\bar{x}_0 - \Gamma_0\bar{x} - \eta_0)] dt, \quad \bar{y}(T) = 0, \\
d\bar{\psi} &= [BR^{-1}B\bar{y} + (A - \bar{\Pi}BR^{-1}B)\bar{\psi}] dt, \quad \bar{\psi}(0) = 0.
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{4.4}$$

Denote $X := [\bar{x}_0, \bar{y}, \bar{\phi}]^\top$, $Y := [\bar{y}_0, \bar{x}, \bar{\psi}]^\top$, $Z := [\bar{z}_0, 0, \bar{V}]^\top$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_1 &:= \begin{bmatrix} A_0 & -B_0R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L) & 0 \\ Q_0\Gamma_0 & -A + BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi} & 0 \\ -\bar{\Pi}F + Q\Gamma_1 & \bar{\Pi}R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 & -A + BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi} \end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathcal{B}_1 &:= \begin{bmatrix} B_0R_0^{-1}B_0 & 0 & -B_0R_0^{-1}\bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L) \\ 0 & Q_0\Gamma_0^2 & 0 \\ -B_0R_0^{-1}\bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L) & 0 & \bar{\Pi}^2R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 \end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathcal{A}_2 &:= \begin{bmatrix} -Q_0 & -F & 0 \\ F & -R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 & -BR^{-1}B \\ 0 & BR^{-1}B & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathcal{B}_2 &:= \begin{bmatrix} A_0 & -Q_0\Gamma_0 & -\bar{\Pi}F + Q\Gamma_1 \\ B_0R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L) & -A + BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi} & -\bar{\Pi}R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 \\ 0 & 0 & -A + BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi} \end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathcal{C} &:= \begin{bmatrix} C_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathfrak{f}_0 := \begin{bmatrix} f_0 \\ -Q_0\Gamma_0\eta_0 \\ Q\eta - \bar{\Pi}f \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathfrak{f} := \begin{bmatrix} Q_0\eta_0 \\ f \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

With the above notions, we can rewrite (4.4) as

$$\begin{cases} dX = [\mathcal{A}_1X - \mathcal{B}_1Y + CZ + \mathfrak{f}_0]dt + ZdW_0, & X(T) = [\xi_0, 0, 0]^\top, \\ dY = [\mathcal{A}_2X - \mathcal{B}_2Y + \mathfrak{f}]dt - CYdW_0, & Y(0) = [H_0\bar{x}_0(0), \bar{\xi}, 0]^\top. \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

Suppose $(X(\cdot), Y(\cdot), Z(\cdot))$ is an adapted solution to (4.5). We assume that $X(\cdot)$ and $Y(\cdot)$ are related by the following affine transformation

$$X(\cdot) = \Phi(\cdot)Y(\cdot) + \Psi(\cdot), \quad (4.6)$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\Psi(\cdot)$ are both differentiable functions, with $\Phi(T) = 0$ and $\Psi(T) = [\xi_0, 0, 0]^\top$. Next, by Itô's formula, we have

$$dX = [\dot{\Phi}Y + \dot{\Psi}]dt + \Phi[\mathcal{A}_2(\Phi Y + \Psi) - \mathcal{B}_2Y + \mathfrak{f}]dt - \Phi CY dW_0. \quad (4.7)$$

Now, comparing (4.7) with the first equation in (4.5), it follows that

$$Z = -\Phi CY. \quad (4.8)$$

We can rewrite the first equation in (4.5) as

$$dX = [\mathcal{A}_1X - \mathcal{B}_1Y - \mathcal{C}\Phi CY + \mathfrak{f}_0]dt - \Phi CY dW_0, \quad X(T) = [\xi_0, 0, 0]^\top. \quad (4.9)$$

This together with (4.7) gives

$$\dot{\Phi} - \Phi \mathcal{B}_2 + \Phi \mathcal{A}_2 \Phi - \mathcal{A}_1 \Phi + \mathcal{B}_1 + \mathcal{C} \Phi \mathcal{C} = 0, \quad \Phi(T) = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

$$\dot{\Psi} + \Phi \mathcal{A}_2 \Psi + \Phi \mathfrak{f} - \mathcal{A}_1 \Psi - \mathfrak{f}_0 = 0, \quad \Psi(T) = [\xi_0, 0, 0]^\top. \quad (4.11)$$

Note that the Riccati equation (4.10) is nonsymmetric. By Theorem 4.1 on page 47 of [25] again, if (4.10) admits a solution $\Phi(\cdot)$, then FBSDE (4.5) admits a unique adapted solution $(X(\cdot), Y(\cdot), Z(\cdot))$.

We are going to identify conditions for the existence of a unique solution to (4.10).

Proposition 4.1. *Let the pair $(\alpha(\cdot), \beta(\cdot))$ be the solution to the following differential equation:*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(t) \\ \beta(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_1 & -\mathcal{B}_1 \\ \mathcal{A}_2 & -\mathcal{B}_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(t) \\ \beta(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(T) \\ \beta(T) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{3 \times 3} \\ I_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $\beta(t)$ is invertible for all $t \in [0, T]$, then the Riccati equation (4.10) has a unique solution $\Phi(t) = \alpha(t)\beta^{-1}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{d\beta^{-1}(t)}{dt} = -\beta^{-1}(t) \frac{d\beta(t)}{dt} \beta^{-1}(t) = -\beta^{-1}(t) \mathcal{A}_2 \alpha(t) \beta^{-1}(t) + \beta^{-1}(t) \mathcal{B}_2,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Phi(t)}{dt} &= \frac{d\alpha(t)}{dt} \beta^{-1}(t) + \alpha(t) \frac{d\beta^{-1}(t)}{dt} \\ &= \mathcal{A}_1 \alpha(t) \beta^{-1}(t) - \mathcal{B}_1 - \alpha(t) \beta^{-1}(t) \mathcal{A}_2 \alpha(t) \beta^{-1}(t) + \alpha(t) \beta^{-1}(t) \mathcal{B}_2 \\ &= \mathcal{A}_1 \Phi(t) - \mathcal{B}_1 - \Phi(t) \mathcal{A}_2 \Phi(t) + \Phi(t) \mathcal{B}_2, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is achieved. □

Motivated by (3.13) and (3.21), we design the decentralized strategies below:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{u}_0 = -R_0^{-1} [B_0 \bar{y}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{y} - \bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L)\bar{\psi}], \\ \hat{u}_i = -R^{-1} [B(\bar{P}\hat{x}_i + \bar{K}\bar{x} + \bar{\phi}) + Lu_0], \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

where $\bar{y}_0(\cdot), \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{\psi}(\cdot), \bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{\phi}(\cdot)$ are given by (4.4), and $\hat{x}_i(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{x}_i &= [(A - BR^{-1}B\bar{P})\hat{x}_i - BR^{-1}B(\bar{K}\bar{x} + \bar{\phi}) + Fx_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + f] dt \\ &+ DdW_i, \quad \hat{x}_i(0) = \xi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Next, we will show that the decentralized strategies (4.12) of the leader and the followers, constitute an approximated (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that Assumptions (A1)-(A3) hold. Then $(\hat{u}_0(\cdot), \hat{u}_1(\cdot), \dots, \hat{u}_N(\cdot))$ given in (4.12) constitutes an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium, where $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}})$.*

Proof. The followers' problem.

By (4.13) and the second equation of (4.4), it can be verified that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\hat{x}^{(N)} - \bar{x}\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \quad (4.14)$$

For $i = 1, \dots, N$, denote $\tilde{u}_i(\cdot) := u_i(\cdot) - \hat{u}_i(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{x}_i(\cdot) := x_i(\cdot) - \hat{x}_i(\cdot)$. Then $\tilde{x}_i(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$d\tilde{x}_i = (A\tilde{x}_i + B\tilde{u}_i)dt, \quad \tilde{x}_i(0) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \int_0^T (\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\|^2 + \|\tilde{u}_i(t)\|^2) dt < \infty.$$

From (2.3), we have

$$J_i^N(u_i(\cdot), \hat{u}_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) = J_i^N(\hat{u}_i(\cdot), \hat{u}_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) + \tilde{J}_i^N(\tilde{u}_i(\cdot), \hat{u}_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) + \mathcal{I}_i^N, \quad (4.15)$$

where

$$\tilde{J}_i^N(\tilde{u}_i(\cdot), \hat{u}_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\left\| \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) \tilde{x}_i \right\|_Q^2 + \|\tilde{u}_i\|_R^2 \right] dt + \|\tilde{x}_i(T)\|_H^2 \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_i^N := \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N}\right) \tilde{x}_i \left(\hat{x}_i - \Gamma \hat{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1 x_0 - \eta \right) + R \tilde{u}_i \hat{u}_i + \tilde{u}_i Lu_0 \right] dt + H \tilde{x}_i(T) \hat{x}_i(T) \right\}.$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\tilde{x}_i(\cdot)(\bar{P}(\cdot)\hat{x}_i(\cdot) + \bar{K}(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot) + \bar{\phi}(\cdot))$, integrating from 0 to T , and taking expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[H\tilde{x}_i(T)\hat{x}_i(T)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}_i(T)(\bar{P}(T)\hat{x}_i(T) + \bar{K}(T)\bar{x}(T) + \bar{\phi}(T)) - \tilde{x}_i(0)(\bar{P}(0)\hat{x}_i(0) + \bar{K}(0)\bar{x}(0) + \bar{\phi}(0))] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\{ (A\tilde{x}_i + B\tilde{u}_i)(\bar{P}\hat{x}_i + \bar{K}\bar{x} + \bar{\phi}) + \tilde{x}_i \left[\dot{\bar{P}}\hat{x}_i + \bar{P}[(A - BR^{-1}B\bar{P})\hat{x}_i \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - BR^{-1}B(\bar{K}\bar{x} + \bar{\phi}) + Fx_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + f \right] + \dot{\bar{K}}\bar{x} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{K}[(A - BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi})\bar{x} - BR^{-1}B\bar{\phi} + F\bar{x}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + f] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - [(A - \bar{\Pi}BR^{-1}B)\bar{\phi} - (G - BR^{-1}L)u_0 + \bar{\Pi}F\bar{x}_0 + \bar{\Pi}f - Q(\Gamma_1\bar{x}_0 + \eta)] \right\} dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\{ \tilde{x}_i\hat{x}_i[A\bar{P} + \dot{\bar{P}} + \bar{P}(A - BR^{-1}B\bar{P})] + \tilde{x}_i\bar{x}[A\bar{K} - \bar{P}BR^{-1}B\bar{K} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \dot{\bar{K}} + \bar{K}(A - BR^{-1}B\bar{\Pi})] - \tilde{x}_iQ(\Gamma_1\bar{x}_0 + \eta) + B\tilde{u}_i(\bar{P}\hat{x}_i + \bar{K}\bar{x} + \bar{\phi}) \right\} dt \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[-\tilde{x}_iQ(\hat{x}_i - \Gamma\bar{x} - \Gamma_1\bar{x}_0 - \eta) - \tilde{u}_iR\hat{u}_i - \tilde{u}_iLu_0 \right] dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_i^N &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \tilde{x}_i \left(\hat{x}_i - \Gamma\hat{x}^{(N)} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta \right) + R\tilde{u}_i\hat{u}_i + \tilde{u}_iLu_0 \right] dt + H\tilde{x}_i(T)\hat{x}_i(T) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \tilde{x}_i(\hat{x}_i - \Gamma\bar{x} - \Gamma_1x_0 - \eta) + Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \tilde{x}_i\Gamma(\bar{x} - \hat{x}^{(N)}) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + R\tilde{u}_i\hat{u}_i + \tilde{u}_iLu_0 \right] dt + H\tilde{x}_i(T)\hat{x}_i(T) \right\} \\
&= - \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T [\tilde{u}_iR\hat{u}_i + \tilde{u}_iLu_0] dt + H\tilde{x}_i(T)\hat{x}_i(T) \right\} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \tilde{x}_i\Gamma(\bar{x} - \hat{x}^{(N)}) + R\tilde{u}_i\hat{u}_i + \tilde{u}_iLu_0 \right] dt + H\tilde{x}_i(T)\hat{x}_i(T) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\frac{\Gamma}{N}\tilde{u}_iR\hat{u}_i + \frac{\Gamma}{N}\tilde{u}_iLu_0 + Q \left(1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N} \right) \tilde{x}_i\Gamma(\bar{x} - \hat{x}^{(N)}) \right] dt + \frac{\Gamma}{N}H\tilde{x}_i(T)\hat{x}_i(T) \right\} = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby,

$$J_i^N(\hat{u}_i(\cdot), \hat{u}_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) \leq J_i^N(u_i(\cdot), \hat{u}_{-i}(\cdot), u_0(\cdot)) + \epsilon_1.$$

Thus, $(\hat{u}_1(\cdot), \dots, \hat{u}_N(\cdot))$ is an ϵ_1 -Nash equilibrium, where $\epsilon_1 = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$.

Problem of the leader.

Let $\check{X} := [\check{x}_0, \check{y}^{(N)}, \check{\phi}]^\top$, $\check{Y} := [\check{y}_0, \check{x}^{(N)}, \check{\psi}]^\top$, $\check{Z} := [\check{z}_0, 0, \check{V}_N]^\top$, $\check{D} := [-C_0\check{y}_0, 0, 0]^\top$, $\check{Z}^{(N)} :=$

$[0, \check{\beta}^{(N)}, 0]^\top$, $\check{D}^{(N)} := [0, D, 0]^\top$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\mathcal{A}}_1 &:= \begin{bmatrix} A_0 & -B_0 R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L) & 0 \\ Q_0 \Gamma_0 & -A + BR^{-1}B\Pi_N & 0 \\ -\Pi_N F + (1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N})Q\Gamma_1 & \Pi_N R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 & -A + BR^{-1}B\Pi_N \end{bmatrix}, \\ \check{\mathcal{B}}_1 &:= \begin{bmatrix} B_0 R_0^{-1}B_0 & 0 & -B_0 R_0^{-1}\Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L) \\ 0 & Q_0 \Gamma_0^2 & 0 \\ -B_0 R_0^{-1}\Pi_N(G - BR^{-1}L) & 0 & \Pi_N^2 R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \check{\mathcal{A}}_2 &:= \begin{bmatrix} -Q_0 & -F & 0 \\ F & -R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 & -BR^{-1}B \\ 0 & BR^{-1}B & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \check{\mathcal{B}}_2 &:= \begin{bmatrix} A_0 & -Q_0 \Gamma_0 & -\Pi_N F + (1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N})Q\Gamma_1 \\ B_0 R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L) & -A + BR^{-1}B\Pi_N & -\Pi_N R_0^{-1}(G - BR^{-1}L)^2 \\ 0 & 0 & -A + BR^{-1}B\Pi_N \end{bmatrix}, \\ \check{C} &:= \begin{bmatrix} C_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{f}_0 := \begin{bmatrix} f_0 \\ -Q_0 \Gamma_0 \eta_0 \\ (1 - \frac{\Gamma}{N})Q\eta - \Pi_N f \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{f} := \begin{bmatrix} Q_0 \eta_0 \\ f \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

With the above notions, we can rewrite (3.22) as

$$\begin{cases} d\check{X} = [\check{\mathcal{A}}_1 \check{X} - \check{\mathcal{B}}_1 \check{Y} + \check{C} \check{Z} + \check{f}_0] dt + \check{Z} dW_0 + \check{Z}^{(N)} dW^{(N)}, & \check{X}(T) = [\xi_0, 0, 0]^\top, \\ d\check{Y} = [\check{\mathcal{A}}_2 \check{X} - \check{\mathcal{B}}_2 \check{Y} + \check{f}] dt + \check{D} dW_0 + \check{D}^{(N)} dW^{(N)}, & \check{Y}(0) = [H_0 \check{x}_0(0), \xi^{(N)}, 0]^\top. \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

Denote $\tilde{X} := \check{X} - X$, $\tilde{Y} := \check{Y} - Y$, $\tilde{Z} := \check{Z} - Z$, $\tilde{D} := \check{D} - D$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1 := \check{\mathcal{A}}_1 - \mathcal{A}_1$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1 := \check{\mathcal{B}}_1 - \mathcal{B}_1$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_2 := \check{\mathcal{B}}_2 - \mathcal{B}_2$, $\tilde{f}_0 := \check{f}_0 - f_0$, we have

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{X} = [\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{X} + \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1 \check{X} - \mathcal{B}_1 \tilde{Y} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1 \check{Y} + \mathcal{C} \tilde{Z} + \tilde{f}_0] dt + \tilde{Z} dW_0 + \check{Z}^{(N)} dW^{(N)}, \\ d\tilde{Y} = [\mathcal{A}_2 \tilde{X} - \mathcal{B}_2 \tilde{Y} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_2 \check{Y}] dt + \tilde{D} dW_0 + \check{D}^{(N)} dW^{(N)}, \\ \tilde{X}(T) = [\xi_0, 0, 0]^\top, \quad \tilde{Y}(0) = [H_0(\check{x}_0(0) - \bar{x}_0(0)), \xi^{(N)} - \bar{\xi}, 0]^\top. \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

We denote $\varpi := \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1 \check{X} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_1 \check{Y} + \tilde{f}_0$, $\rho := -\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_2 \check{Y}$. By the continuous dependence of the solution on the parameter in Theorem 4 of [20], we have $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\varpi\|^2 = O(\frac{1}{N})$, $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|\rho\|^2 = O(\frac{1}{N})$. Then we can rewrite (4.17) as

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{X} = [\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{X} - \mathcal{B}_1 \tilde{Y} + \mathcal{C} \tilde{Z} + \varpi] dt + \tilde{Z} dW_0 + \check{Z}^{(N)} dW^{(N)}, \\ d\tilde{Y} = [\mathcal{A}_2 \tilde{X} - \mathcal{B}_2 \tilde{Y} + \rho] dt + \tilde{D} dW_0 + \check{D}^{(N)} dW^{(N)}, \\ \tilde{X}(T) = [\xi_0, 0, 0]^\top, \quad \tilde{Y}(0) = [H_0(\check{x}_0(0) - \bar{x}_0(0)), \xi^{(N)} - \bar{\xi}, 0]^\top. \end{cases} \quad (4.18)$$

We assume that $\tilde{X}(\cdot) = \Theta(\cdot) \tilde{Y}(\cdot)$, where $\Theta(\cdot)$ is a differential function with $\Theta(T) = 0$. By

Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{X} &= \dot{\Theta}\tilde{Y}dt + \Theta[(\mathcal{A}_2\Theta\tilde{Y} - \mathcal{B}_2\tilde{Y} + \rho)dt + \tilde{\mathcal{D}}dW_0 + \check{\mathcal{D}}^{(N)}dW^{(N)}] \\ &= [\mathcal{A}_1\Theta\tilde{Y} - \mathcal{B}_1\tilde{Y} + \mathcal{C}\tilde{Z} + \varpi]dt + \tilde{Z}dW_0 + \check{Z}^{(N)}dW^{(N)}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the corresponding coefficients, we have

$$\dot{\Theta} + \Theta\mathcal{A}_2\Theta - \Theta\mathcal{B}_2 - \mathcal{A}_1\Theta + \mathcal{B}_1 = 0, \quad \Theta(T) = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Then we achieve

$$d\tilde{Y} = [(\mathcal{A}_2\Theta - \mathcal{B}_2)\tilde{Y} + \rho]dt + \tilde{\mathcal{D}}dW_0 + \check{\mathcal{D}}^{(N)}dW^{(N)},$$

with $\tilde{Y}(0) = [H_0(\check{x}_0(0) - \bar{x}_0(0)), \xi^{(N)} - \bar{\xi}, 0]^\top$. This implies

$$\tilde{Y}(t) = e^{(\mathcal{A}_2\Theta - \mathcal{B}_2)t}\tilde{Y}(0) + \int_0^t e^{(\mathcal{A}_2\Theta - \mathcal{B}_2)(t-s)}[\rho ds + \tilde{\mathcal{D}}dW_0(s) + \check{\mathcal{D}}^{(N)}dW^{(N)}(s)],$$

which gives

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}\|\tilde{Y}(t)\|^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \quad (4.20)$$

and since $\tilde{X}(\cdot) = \Theta(\cdot)\tilde{Y}(\cdot)$, then

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}\|\tilde{X}(t)\|^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \quad (4.21)$$

which means

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\check{x}_0 - \bar{x}_0\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \quad \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\check{x}^{(N)} - \bar{x}\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \quad (4.22)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\check{y}_0 - \bar{y}_0\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \quad \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\check{y}^{(N)} - \bar{y}\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \quad \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\check{\psi} - \bar{\psi}\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \quad (4.23)$$

Combined with (4.14), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\hat{x}^{(N)} - \check{x}^{(N)}\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \quad (4.24)$$

and $\bar{x}_0(t) = \hat{x}_0(t)$, for all $t \in [0, T]$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\hat{x}_0 - \check{x}_0\|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right). \quad (4.25)$$

We need two steps. First, by (4.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_0^N(\check{u}_0(\cdot), \check{u}^N[\cdot; \check{u}_0(\cdot)]) &\leq J_0^N(u_0(\cdot), \check{u}^N[\cdot; u_0(\cdot)]) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|x_0 - \Gamma_0\check{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|u_0\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|x_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|x_0 - \Gamma_0\hat{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0 + \Gamma_0(\hat{x}^{(N)} - \check{x}^{(N)})\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|u_0\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|x_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\ &\leq J_0^N(u_0(\cdot), \hat{u}^N[\cdot; u_0(\cdot)]) + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Next, from (4.23)-(4.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_0^N(\hat{u}_0(\cdot), \hat{u}^N[\cdot; \hat{u}_0(\cdot)]) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|\hat{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \hat{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|\hat{u}_0\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|\hat{x}_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|\hat{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \hat{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0\|_{Q_0}^2 + \|R_0^{-1} [B_0 \bar{y}_0 + (G - BR^{-1}L) \bar{y}] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L) \bar{\psi}\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|\hat{x}_0(0)\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\|\check{x}_0 - \Gamma_0 \check{x}^{(N)} - \eta_0 + (\hat{x}_0 - \check{x}_0) + \Gamma_0 (\check{x}^{(N)} - \hat{x}^{(N)})\|_{Q_0}^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \|R_0^{-1} [B_0(\check{y}_0 + (\bar{y}_0 - \check{y}_0)) + (G - BR^{-1}L)(\check{y}^{(N)} + (\bar{y} - \check{y}^{(N)}))] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \bar{\Pi}(G - BR^{-1}L)(\check{\psi} + (\bar{\psi} - \check{\psi}))\|_{R_0}^2 \right] dt + \|\check{x}_0(0) + (\hat{x}_0(0) - \check{x}_0(0))\|_{H_0}^2 \right\} \\
&\leq J_0^N(\check{u}_0(\cdot), \check{u}^N[\cdot; \check{u}_0(\cdot)]) + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

Hence, from (4.26) and (4.27), we have

$$J_0^N(\hat{u}_0(\cdot), \hat{u}^N[\cdot; \hat{u}_0(\cdot)]) \leq J_0^N(u_0(\cdot), \hat{u}^N[\cdot; u_0(\cdot)]) + \epsilon_2.$$

Thus, by Definition 2.1, $(\hat{u}_0(\cdot), \hat{u}_1(\cdot), \dots, \hat{u}_N(\cdot))$ is an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium, where $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$. The proof is complete. \square

5 Numerical simulation

This section provides numerical examples for Problem **(P0)** to verify our results. We set $A_0 = B_0 = C_0 = f_0 = A = B = F = G = f = G = Q_0 = R_0 = \eta_0 = Q = R = H = \eta = L = 1$, $D = 0.05$, $H_0 = 0$, $\Gamma = \Gamma_0 = \Gamma_1 = 0.5$. The time interval is $[0, 5]$. The initial states of followers are independently drawn from a uniform distribution on $[0, 10]$, and the terminal condition of the leader is $\xi_0 \sim N(0, 5)$. The curve of $\bar{P}(t)$, $\bar{K}(t)$ and $\bar{\Pi}(t)$, described by (4.1)-(4.3), are shown in Figure 1.

The solution to the Riccati equation (4.10), $\Phi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$, is depicted in Figure 2. Note that $\Phi(\cdot)$ is neither symmetric nor positive semi-definite.

We denote $\epsilon(N) = \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \|\hat{x}^{(N)} - \bar{x}\|^2 dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to depict the performance of the decentralized strategies. The graph of $\epsilon(N)$ with respect to N is shown in Figure 3, which confirms the consistency of the mean field approximation.




Figure 1: The curves of $\bar{P}(t)$, $\bar{K}(t)$ and $\bar{\Pi}(t)$




Figure 2: The curve of $\Phi(t)$




Figure 3: $\epsilon(N)$ with respect to N

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have explored a backward-forward mean field LQ Stackelberg stochastic differential game featuring a backward leader and numerous forward followers. Initially, we address a mean field game problem concerning N followers. Through the decoupling of the high-dimensional Hamiltonian system using mean field approximations, we formulate a set of open-loop decentralized strategies for all players. Subsequently, these strategies are demonstrated to constitute an (ϵ_1, ϵ_2) -Stackelberg equilibrium.

Other topics including the case when the diffusion coefficients are dependent of state and control variables ([39], [32]), and with common noise ([5]), are our future research interests.

References

- [1] A. Bagchi, T. Başar, Stackelberg strategies in linear-quadratic stochastic differential games. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 1981, 35(3): 443-464.
- [2] A. Bensoussan, S.K. Chen, and S.P. Sethi, The maximum principle for global solutions of stochastic Stackelberg differential games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2015, 53(4): 1956-1981.

- [3] A. Bensoussan, M.H.M. Chau, Y. Lai, and S.C.P. Yam, Linear-quadratic mean field Stackelberg games with state and control delays. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2017, 55(4): 2748-2781.
- [4] A. Bensoussan, M.H.M. Chau, and S.C.P. Yam, Mean field Stackelberg games: aggregation of delayed instructions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2015, 53(4): 2237-2266.
- [5] A. Bensoussan, X.W. Feng, and J.H. Huang, Linear-quadratic-Gaussian mean-field-game with partial observation and common noise. *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 2021, 11(1): 23-46.
- [6] A. Bensoussan, J. Frehse, and P. Yam, *Mean Field Games and Mean Field Type Control Theory*. Springer, New York, 2013.
- [7] A. Bensoussan, K.C.J. Sung, S.C.P. Yam, and S.P. Yung, Linear-quadratic mean field games. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 2016, 169(2): 496-529.
- [8] P.E. Caines, M.Y. Huang, and R.P. Malhamé, Mean field games. In T. Başar, G. Zaccour, *Handbook of Dynamic Game Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 2017.
- [9] R. Carmona, F. Delarue, *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I, II*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2018.
- [10] G. Dayanıklı, M. Laurière, A machine learning method for Stackelberg mean field games. *arXiv:2302.10440*
- [11] K. Du, Z. Wu, Linear-quadratic Stackelberg game for mean-field backward stochastic differential system and application. *Math. Prob. Engin.*, 2019, 1798585, 17 pages.
- [12] X.W. Feng, Y. Hu, and J.H. Huang, Backward Stackelberg differential game with constraints: a mixed terminal-perturbation and linear-quadratic approach. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2022, 66(3): 1488-1518.
- [13] D.A. Gomes, J. Saúde, Mean field games models-a brief survey. *Dyn. Games Appl.*, 2014, 4(2): 110-154.
- [14] J.H. Huang, N. Li, Linear-quadratic mean-field game for stochastic delayed systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2018, 63(8): 2711-2729.
- [15] J.H. Huang, S.J. Wang, and Z. Wu, Backward-forward linear-quadratic mean-field games with major and minor agents. *Probab. Uncer. Quant. Risk*, 2016, 1: 8.
- [16] J.H. Huang, S.J. Wang, and Z. Wu, Backward mean-field linear-quadratic-Gaussian (LQG) games: full and partial information. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2016, 61(12): 3784-3796.
- [17] M.Y. Huang, Large-population LQG games involving a major player: the Nash certainty equivalence principle, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2010, 48(5): 3318-3353.

- [18] M.Y. Huang, P.E. Caines, and R.P. Malhamé, Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized ϵ -Nash equilibria. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2007, 52(9): 1560-1571.
- [19] M.Y. Huang, R.P. Malhamé, and P.E. Caines, Large population stochastic dynamic games: closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inf. Syst.*, 2006, 6(3): 221-251.
- [20] M.Y. Huang, M.J. Zhou, Linear quadratic mean field games: asymptotic solvability and relation to the fixed point approach. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2020, 65(4): 1397-1412.
- [21] J.M. Lasry, P.L. Lions, Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2007, 2(1): 229-260.
- [22] T. Li, J.F. Zhang, Asymptotically optimal decentralized control for large population stochastic multiagent systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2008, 53(7): 1643-1660.
- [23] Y.N. Lin, X.S. Jiang, and W.H. Zhang, An open-loop Stackelberg strategy for the linear quadratic mean-field stochastic differential game. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2019, 64(1): 97-110.
- [24] Y.N. Lin, W.H. Zhang, Feedback Stackelberg solution for mean-field type stochastic systems with multiple followers. *J. Syst. Sci. Complex.*, 2023, 36(4): 1519-1539.
- [25] J. Ma, J.M. Yong, *Forward-backward Stochastic Differential Equations and Their Applications*. Lecture Notes Math., Springer, New York, 1999.
- [26] J. Moon, T. Başar, Linear quadratic risk-sensitive and robust mean field games. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2017, 62(3): 1062-1077.
- [27] J. Moon, T. Başar, Linear quadratic mean field Stackelberg differential games. *Automatica*, 2018, 97: 200-213.
- [28] J. Moon, H.J. Yang, Linear-quadratic time-inconsistent mean-field type Stackelberg differential games: time-consistent open-loop solutions. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2021, 66(1): 375-382.
- [29] H. Mukaidani, S. Irie, H. Xu, and W.H. Zhuang, Robust incentive Stackelberg games with a large population for stochastic mean-field systems. *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, 2022, 6: 1934-1939.
- [30] M. Nourian, P.E. Caines, R.P. Malhamé, and M.Y. Huang, Mean field LQG control in leader-follower stochastic multi-agent systems: likelihood ratio based adaptation. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2012, 57(11): 2801-2816.

- [31] E. Pardoux, S.G. Peng, Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Syst. & Control Lett.*, 1990, 14(1): 55-61.
- [32] K.H. Si, Z. Wu, Backward-forward linear-quadratic mean-field Stackelberg games. *Adv. Difference Equ.*, 2021, 73: 23.
- [33] J.R. Sun, H.X. Wang, and J.Q. Wen, Zero-sum Stackelberg stochastic linear-quadratic differential games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2023, 61(1): 250-282.
- [34] H. von Stackelberg, *The Theory of the Market Economy*. Oxford University Press, London, 1952.
- [35] B.C. Wang, Leader-follower mean field LQ games: a direct method. *Asian J Control*, 2024, 26(2): 617-625.
- [36] B.C. Wang, H.S. Zhang, J.F. Zhang, Mean field linear-quadratic control: uniform stabilization and social optimality. *Automatica*, 2020, 121: 109088.
- [37] B.C. Wang, J.F. Zhang, Hierarchical mean field games for multiagent systems with tracking-type costs: distributed ϵ -Stackelberg equilibria. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 2014, 59(8): 2241-2247.
- [38] G.C. Wang, S.S. Zhang, A mean-field linear-quadratic stochastic Stackelberg differential game with one leader and two followers. *J. Syst. Sci. Complex.*, 2020, 33(5): 1383-1401.
- [39] R.M. Xu, F. Zhang, ϵ -Nash mean-field games for general linear-quadratic systems with applications. *Automatica*, 2020, 114: 108835.
- [40] X.W. Yang, M.Y. Huang, Linear quadratic mean field Stackelberg games: master equations and time consistent feedback strategies. *Proc. 60th IEEE Conf. Decision Control*, 171-176, December 13-15, Austin, Texas, 2021.
- [41] J.M. Yong, A leader-follower stochastic linear quadratic differential games. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 2002, 41(4): 1015-1041.
- [42] Y.Y. Zheng, J.T. Shi, A Stackelberg game of backward stochastic differential equations with applications. *Dyna. Games Appl.*, 2020, 10(4): 968-992.