

Closed-loop Equilibria for Mean-Field Games in Randomly Switching Environments with General Discounting Costs*

Hongwei Mei,[†] Son Luu Nguyen[‡] and George Yin[§]

March 4, 2024

Abstract

This work is devoted to finding the closed-loop equilibria for a class of mean-field games (MFGs) with infinite many symmetric players in a common switching environment when the cost functional is under general discount in time. There are two key challenges in the application of the well-known Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman and Fokker-Planck (HJB-FP) approach to our problems: the path-dependence due to the conditional mean-field interaction and the time-inconsistency due to the general discounting cost. To overcome the difficulties, a theory for a class of systems of path-dependent equilibrium Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations (HJBs) is developed. Then closed-loop equilibrium strategies can be identified through a two-step verification procedure. It should be noted that the closed-loop equilibrium strategies obtained satisfy a new form of local optimality in the Nash sense. The theory obtained extends the HJB-FP approach for classical MFGs to more general conditional MFGs with general discounting costs.

Keywords. Conditional mean-field game, closed-loop equilibrium, switching diffusion, general discount, path-dependence, Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation.

MSCcodes. 60H10, 91A16, 93E03, 34K50.

1 Introduction

Since the publications of the seminal works of Huang, Caines, and Malhamé [21, 22], and Lasry and Lions [26, 27] (published independently), the mean-field game (MFG) theory has drawn increasing attention in the last two decades. In a mean-field system, each agent (also known as a player) plays an insignificant role, however the system as a whole is significantly impacted by the agents' combined efforts. Bensoussan, Frehse, and Yam [4] provided an illuminating discussion of certain aspects of mean-field games and mean-field type controls, describing their similarities and differences together with a unified approach for treating them. For a survey, see also [20] and references therein. For the most recent developments, we refer to [2, 3, 5, 6, 35, 37] among others. A comprehensive treatment of mean-field game theory can be found in the recent book of Carmona and Delarue [8].

Along another line, hybrid systems have gained increasing popularity owing to their ability to handle numerous real-world applications in which discrete events and continuous dynamics coexist and interact. One of the commonly used models is switching diffusion. The switching process is used to depict random jumps that can be modeled using a continuous-time Markov chain; see [41] for switching diffusions and applications. For a wide range of applications, we mention the work on controlled piecewise deterministic Markov processes

*H. Mei was partially supported by Simons Foundation's Travel Support for Mathematicians Program (No. 00002835); G. Yin was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grants DMS-2204240.

[†]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409. Email: hongwei.mei@ttu.edu

[‡]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL 32901 Email: snguyen@fit.edu

[§]Department of Mathematics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269. Email: gyin@uconn.edu

[13], population dynamics, mathematical biology and ecology [32, 33], among others. Furthermore, there were also efforts in treating switching diffusions in conjunction with mean-field interactions [40].

The current paper aims to find closed-loop equilibria for a class of MFGs with infinitely-many symmetric players sharing a common switching environment. Different from classical MFGs, the mean-field interaction takes a form of conditional expectation in this paper (see [34]) and our problems belong to a wider class of the conditional MFGs.

In general, the equilibria for (conditional) MFGs can be classified into two categories, namely open-loop and closed-loop. The open-loop equilibria take the form of stochastic processes that depend on the initial time and the initial state of an agent (see, for example, [24, 31]). In contrast, closed-loop equilibria are deterministic strategies represented as feedback functions of the observations. Our paper focuses on the latter one. Moreover, we will consider more complex MFGs with generalized discounting cost functional in time (compared to the special exponential discounting). The different discounting preference originated from different subjectivity of people's preference on the future risks in the decision process leads to a wider range of applications in different areas (see [16, 42] for more details).

To find the closed-equilibria, there are two key challenges in the application of the well-known HJB-FP (Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman and Fokker-Planck) approach to our problems: the path-dependence structure due to the conditional mean-field interaction and the time-inconsistency due to the general discounting cost. To overcome the first challenge, a path-dependence theory for HJBs is needed. Due to the second feature, the optimal control problem in the HJB-step becomes time-inconsistent. To overcome this challenge, we introduce the equilibrium HJB inspired by J. Yong (see [42]) to seek a time-consistent closed-loop equilibrium which satisfies some local optimality only. Combining those two parts, our main efforts are devoted to developing a theory for a class of systems of path-dependent equilibrium HJBs such that a new type of local-optimal closed-loop equilibrium strategies can be identified through a two-step verification procedure. The cases without switching were treated in [30], whereas the current paper focuses on hybrid systems and the path-dependence yields further technical challenges. Let us highlight the main contributions of the current paper.

- (a) Using a conditional mean field, we formulate the controlled switching diffusion with mean-field interactions.
- (b) In addition to the mean-field interactions, we also take into account general discounting costs, which result in time inconsistency. The time-inconsistency leads to a new local version of Nash's optimality.
- (c) In light of (a), our primary focus is on resolving the issues brought on by path dependence. We develop novel methods for solving a class of systems of path-dependent equilibrium HJBs on the path space of the Markov chain that is piecewise constant. In contrast to the use of viscosity solutions in the previous works (e.g., [17, 18]), because of the special structure, we are able to find a classical solution in an appropriate sense by the fundamental solution method in partial differential equations (PDEs) [19]. Some critical and technical estimates are derived as a by-product, which are interesting in their own right.
- (d) Based on the theory of path-dependent HJB equations that we develop, we prove the existence and uniqueness of a closed-loop equilibrium strategy for the MFG sharing the same environment and with a general discounting cost.

Example 1.1. Before proceeding further, let us begin with a motivational heterogeneous agent model in macroeconomics; see [23]. Suppose that there are N agents, that α is a finite-state Markov chain with state space $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$ representing the aggregate shocks from the market, that $w_t^i : i = 1, 2, \dots$ are independent Brownian motions being independent of α , which represent the heterogeneous market fluctuations for different agents, that the wealth of agent i is denoted by X_t^i , and the average wealth process is defined by $\Pi_t^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_t^{i,N}$. Suppose the wealth of the agent i satisfies

$$(1.1) \quad dX_t^{i,N} = b(t, X_t^{i,N}, \alpha_t, \Pi_t^N; u_t^i)dt + \sigma(t, X_t^{i,N})dw_t^i.$$

The agent i takes the action $u^i := \{u_t^i : t \in [0, T]\}$ to maximize a profit functional as follows

$$J^i(t, x; u^i) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_t^T e^{-\lambda(s-t)} g(X_s^{i,N}, \alpha_s, \Pi_s^N; u_s^i) ds + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} h(X_T^{i,N}, \alpha_T, \Pi_T^N) \right).$$

The interest to find the appropriate behavior of each agent when the system consists of a large number of agents. Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, by the law of large numbers, it can be proved that $\Pi_t^N \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_t^\alpha]$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where X_t is a “representative” of X_t^i and \mathcal{F}_t^α is the filtration of α up to time t^- . Note that all the agents are symmetric because b, σ, f, g are the same for different agents. The superscript i can be omitted in the sequel. Denote by $X^{\xi, u}$ the solution to (1.3) with initial $X_0 = \xi$ (the wealth distribution of all agents initially) and the average wealth process by $\eta_s^{\xi, u} := \mathbb{E}[X_t^{\xi, u} | \mathcal{F}_t^\alpha]$. Then, the heterogeneous agent model with infinite-many symmetric players reduces to optimizing

$$(1.2) \quad J(t, x; \eta^{\xi, u}, u) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_t^T e^{-\lambda(s-t)} g(s, X_s, \alpha_s, \eta_s^{\xi, u}; u_s) ds + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} h(X_T, \alpha_T, \eta_T^{\xi, u}) \right),$$

subject to

$$(1.3) \quad dX_t = b(t, X_t, \alpha_t, \eta_t^{\xi, u}; u_t) dt + \sigma(t, X_t) dw_t.$$

Such a problem (especially when α is a constant process) has been well studied in the mean-field game theory where the main object is to find an equilibrium strategy u^* (under suitable conditions) in Nash’s sense such that

$$(1.4) \quad J(t, x; \eta^{\xi, u^*}, u) \leq J(t, x; \eta^{\xi, u^*}, u^*) \text{ for any strategy } u.$$

Here η^{ξ, u^*} is considered as a pre-committed average wealth process if all the agents take the same “rational” strategy u^* . The optimality in (1.4) essentially says that the equilibrium strategy is optimal if all other agents adopt such a strategy. We emphasize that our problem is different from a McKean-Vlasov optimal control problem where an optimal control u^* satisfies $J(t, x; \eta^{\xi, u^*}, u) \leq J(t, x; \eta^{\xi, u^*}, u^*)$ for any strategy u . The exponential discounting structure in the profit functional in (1.2) essentially leads to a time-consistent optimal control problem for each agent to solve. In reality, it is often necessary to consider some general discounting profits functionals. That is, the discounting factors might be replaced by some other functions $\mu(s, t)$ and $\nu(T, t)$. The so-called hyperbolic discounting is such an example by letting $\mu(s, t) = \frac{1}{1+\lambda(s-t)}$, $\nu(T, t) = \frac{1}{1+\lambda(T-t)}$. For general μ and ν , the optimization problem for each agent is time-inconsistent; the dynamic programming principle fails. For more details, the reader is referred to Section 2 in [42]. In this paper, we will consider the following profit-functional $V(t, x; \eta^{\xi, u}, u) = \tilde{J}(t; t, x; \eta^{\xi, u}, u)$ where

$$(1.5) \quad \tilde{J}(\tau; t, x; \eta^{\xi, u}, u) = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_t^T \tilde{g}(\tau; s, X_s, \alpha_s, \eta_s^{\xi, u}; u_s) ds + \tilde{h}(\tau, X_T, \alpha_T, \eta_T^{\xi, u}) \right).$$

Because of the same reason, it is impossible to find an equilibrium strategy satisfying (1.4). Instead, a local version of (1.4) will be proved in the future to illustrate the local optimality of the new equilibrium strategy in our paper (see (4.18)).

The rest of the paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 presents the formulation of our problem. In addition we introduce the path space of the Markov chain and work out the calculus on the path space. To go through the HJB-FP method in our problems, we detail the FP-step and HJB-step in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively. Especially, a theory on path-dependent systems of equilibrium HJBs is developed, which presents the main contribution of the paper. Using the results of Section 4, we proceed with our final goal—to obtain the closed-loop equilibria for MFGs with switching under general discounting in Section 5. We also revisit the motivational example on heterogeneous agent model in Section 5 to illustrate the theory developed. Finally, concluding remarks are made in Section 6.

2 Formulation

On a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with \mathcal{N} being the set of all \mathbb{P} -null sets, let $\alpha(\cdot)$ be a finite-state Markov chain with state space $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$ and generator $Q = (q_{ij})_{m \times m}$. Denote by \mathcal{F}_{t^-} the smallest σ -algebra containing $\{\alpha(s) : 0 \leq s < t\}$ augmented with all \mathbb{P} -null sets, and \mathbb{F} be the natural filtration of $\alpha(\cdot)$ augmented with all \mathbb{P} -null sets. Assume that $\mathcal{F}_{0^-}^\alpha = \{\emptyset, \Omega\} \vee \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{F}_0^\alpha$. Let $B(\cdot)$ be a standard n -dimensional Brownian motion (independent of α) and \mathcal{F}^B be its natural filtration augmented with all \mathbb{P} -null sets. Denote $\mathcal{F}_t := \mathcal{F}_t^\alpha \vee \mathcal{F}_t^B \vee \mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{F}_{t^-} := \mathcal{F}_{t^-}^\alpha \vee \mathcal{F}_t^B \vee \mathcal{N}$. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ($\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, resp.) be the space of probability measures (with finite second moment, resp.) on \mathbb{R}^n . It is assumed that there are infinite many symmetric players. We formulate the conditional MFGs as controlled McKean-Vlasov dynamics with switching.

Consider

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} dX(t) = \mathbf{b}(t, \alpha(t^-), X(t), \eta(t); u(t))dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, X(t))dB(t), \\ \eta(t) = \text{law}(X(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}^\alpha), \quad X(0) = \xi, \quad \alpha(0^-) = i, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{b} : [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are appropriate maps. The $B(\cdot)$ is a standard n -dimensional Brownian motion. Especially $\eta(t)$ is the conditional probability law of $X(t)$ on the filtration $\mathcal{F}_{t^-}^\alpha$ in the sense that for any bounded and continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}[f(X(t))|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}^\alpha] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)\eta(t, dx)$. In our problem, the player aims to find an appropriate $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ in accordance with the cost functional

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbf{V}(t, \xi, i; u(\cdot)) = \mathbf{J}(t; t, \xi, i; u(\cdot)).$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{J}(\tau; t, \xi, i; u(\cdot)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{t, \xi, i} \left(\int_t^\tau \mathbf{g}(\tau; s, \alpha(s^-), X(s), \eta(s); u(s))ds + \mathbf{h}(\tau; \alpha(T^-), X(T), \eta(T)) \right), \\ \mathcal{U}[0, T] &:= \left\{ u : [0, T] \times \Omega \mapsto U \mid u(\cdot) \text{ is } \mathbb{F}\text{-adapted with } \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |u(s)|^2 ds < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The set U is the action space, and $\mathbf{g} : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbf{h} : [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ are two appropriate functions denoting the running cost and terminal cost respectively. Note that the additional time factor τ yields a general discounting cost in our problem. As was mentioned, we aim to find closed-loop equilibria instead of optimal controls for the McKean-Vlasov dynamics. We will follow the well-known HJB-FP approach while some substantial modifications are needed for our problems. The following is the main assumption for our problem. Let $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be equipped with the Wasserstein 2 metric \mathbf{w} (see [38]).

Assumption 2.1. (1) Suppose there exist $b_1 : [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, $b_2 : [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g_1 : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, $g_2 : [0, T] \times [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{b}(t, i, x, \rho; v) = b_1(t, i, x; v) + b_2(t, i, x, \rho)$, $\mathbf{g}(\tau; t, i, x, \rho; v) = g_1(t, i, x; v) + g_2(\tau; t, i, x, \rho)$.

(2) The action space U is a compact subset of \mathbb{R} and there exists a mapping $\psi : [0, T] \times M \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto U$ defined by

$$(2.3) \quad \psi(t, i, x, p) = \underset{v \in U}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(\langle p, b_1(t, i, x; v) \rangle + g_1(t, i, x; v) \right),$$

which is continuous w.r.t. t and uniformly Lipschitz w.r.t. x and p with Lipschitz constant L_ψ and $|\psi(t, i, 0, v)| < K$.

(3) b_1 and g_1 are continuous w.r.t. t , and g_2, \mathbf{h} are continuous w.r.t. (τ, t) satisfying

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} |b_1(t, i, x; v)| + |b_2(t, i, x, \rho)| + |g_1(t, i, 0; 0)| + |g_2(\tau; t, i, 0, \rho)| \leq K, \\ |b_1(t, i, x_1; v_1) - b_1(t, i, x_2; v_2)| + |g_1(t, i, x_1; v_1) - g_1(t, i, x_2; v_2)| \\ \leq K(|x_1 - x_2| + |v_1 - v_2|), \\ |b_2(t, i, x_1, \rho_1) - b_2(t, i, x_2, \rho_2)| + |g_2(\tau; t, i, x_1, \rho_1) - g_2(\tau; t, i, x_2, \rho_2)| \\ + |\mathbf{h}(\tau; i, x_1, \rho_1) - \mathbf{h}(\tau; i, x_2, \rho_2)| \leq K(|x_1 - x_2| + \mathbf{w}(\rho_1, \rho_2)), \\ |\mathbf{h}(\tau, t, 0, \rho)| + |D_{xx}\mathbf{h}| + |\boldsymbol{\sigma}(s, 0)| + |D_x\boldsymbol{\sigma}(s, x)| \leq K, \\ \lambda_0^{-1}I \leq \boldsymbol{\sigma}(s, x)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top(s, x) \leq \lambda_0 I \text{ for some } \lambda_0 > 1. \end{array} \right.$$

From Assumption 2.1, we see that v and ρ are separated in \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{g} , which is a general assumption for mean-field game theory (see [7] for example). In this scenario, we have a separated Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\tau; t, i, x, \rho, p, q) &:= \langle p, b_1(t, i, x; \psi(t, x, i, q)) \rangle + g_1(t, i, x; \psi(t, x, i, q)) \\ &+ \langle p, b_2(t, i, x, \rho) \rangle + g_2(\tau; t, i, x, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

In fact, if \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{h} are independent of τ , the Hamiltonian can be simplified by letting $p = q$, which reduces to the classical case

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}(t, i, x, \rho, p) = \min_{v \in U} \left(\langle p, b_1(t, i, x; v) \rangle + g_1(t, i, x; v) \right) + \langle p, b_2(t, i, x, \rho) \rangle + g_2(t, i, x, \rho).$$

The introduction of τ and q in \mathcal{H} is inspired by [42] to tackle the time-inconsistency. With all those notations, our modified HJB-FP approach can be summarized as follows.

(1) *FP-step*: Given a pre-committed feedback strategy u depending on time, state, and the path of the Markov chain, the solution to (2.1) leads to a map $\zeta(t, \alpha_t)$ representing the conditional distribution of $X(t)$ on \mathcal{F}_t^α .

(2) *HJB-step*: Replace $\eta(t)$ by the feedback form of $\zeta(t, \alpha_t)$ where α_t is the path of $\alpha(\cdot)$ up to time t^- . Then we solve a control problem subject to (2.1) under the general discounting cost (2.2). Different from the classical MFGs, our control problem turns out to be time-inconsistent and path-dependent. To work with the two features, we develop a theory for systems of path-dependent equilibria of HJBs

$$(2.4) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\partial^\alpha + \mathcal{A})\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) + \mathcal{H}(\tau; t, w_t(t^-), x, \zeta(t, w_t), D_x\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x), D_x\Theta(t; t, w_t, x)) = 0, \\ \Theta(\tau; T, w_T, x) = \mathbf{h}(\tau; w_T(T^-), x, \zeta(t, w_T)); \end{array} \right.$$

where the operator $\mathcal{A}\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) := \text{Trace}[a(t, x)D_x^2\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x)]/2$ and ∂^α is some appropriate path-derivative to be defined later. The w_t denotes a path of α upto time t^- and $w_t(s) = \alpha(s)$ for $s < t$. If (2.4) can be solved appropriately, one can derive a closed-loop control $u^*(t, \alpha_t, X(t)) = \psi(t, \alpha(t^-), X(t), D_x\Theta(t, \alpha_t, X_t))$.

(3) *Closed-loop equilibrium*: If u^* coincides with the pre-committed u , the feedback strategy u is the required closed-loop equilibrium whose exact definition will be given later in Section 5.

From the discussion above, a closed-loop equilibrium is essentially a fixed point in a two-step verification procedure, where the key challenge lies in developing a theory on the path-dependent HJBs (2.4). This presents the main novelty of the paper. Moreover, we will derive a new local optimality (comparable to (1.4)) for the closed-loop equilibrium obtained. In particular, if the cost functional in (2.2) is exponential discounting, the local optimality is equivalent to (1.4). This further signifies that our theory is a generalization of the classical HJB-FP approach for MFGs with switching under general discounting costs. Now, it is natural to start our investigation on the path space of α and the path-derivative ∂^α . More details will be presented in the following subsection.

2.1 Path Space and the Calculus

In this subsection, we develop the calculus on the path space of Markov chain α . Write $\alpha_t := \{\alpha(s) : 0 \leq s < t\}$ by the path of $\alpha(\cdot)$ up to time t^- . Note that all the paths of $\alpha(\cdot)$ are piecewise constant and càdlàg (right continuous with left limit). We equip M , the state space of α , with the discrete metric $d_M(i, j) = \delta_{ij}$, where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta function.

Write $w_{[t_1, t_2]} : [t_1, t_2] \mapsto M$ by a possible path of $\alpha(\cdot)$ on time interval $[t_1, t_2]$. The set of all possible paths of $\alpha(\cdot)$ on $[t_1, t_2]$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}[t_1, t_2] := \{w_{[t_1, t_2]}(\cdot) : [t_1, t_2] \mapsto M \mid w_{[t_1, t_2]}(\cdot) \text{ is càdlàg}\}.$$

For any $w_{[t_1, t_2]} \in \mathcal{M}[t_1, t_2]$, we can continuously extend the path to the right-endpoint t_2 by

$$w_{[t_1, t_2]}^+(s) := \begin{cases} w_{[t_1, t_2]}(s) & \text{for } s \in [t_1, t_2); \\ w_{[t_1, t_2]}(t_2^-) & \text{for } s = t_2. \end{cases}$$

Such an observation allows us to define the Skorohod-type metric \mathcal{D} for $\mathcal{M}[t_1, t_2]$ by

$$\mathcal{D}(w_{[t_1, t_2]}, \tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]}) = \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sup_{t_1 \leq s \leq t_2} \left(|\lambda(s) - s| + d_M(w_{[t_1, t_2]}^+(\lambda(s)), \tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]}^+(s)) \right), \text{ where}$$

$$\Lambda := \left\{ \lambda : [t_1, t_2] \mapsto [t_1, t_2] \mid \begin{array}{l} \lambda \text{ is continuous and strictly increasing} \\ \text{with } \lambda(t_1) = t_1 \text{ and } \lambda(t_2) = t_2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{N}(w_{[t_1, t_2]})$ the number of jumps in $w_{[t_1, t_2]}$. Note that the definitions of \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{N} depend on the time-interval $[t_1, t_2]$, while we will omit such dependence in the notations for the sake of simplicity. The combination of two paths $w_{[t_0, t_1]}$ and $w_{[t_1, t_2]}$ for $t_0 < t_1 < t_2$ is defined by

$$[w_{[t_0, t_1]} \oplus w_{[t_1, t_2]}](t) := \begin{cases} w_{[t_0, t_1]}(t) & \text{for } t \in [t_0, t_1), \\ w_{[t_1, t_2]}(t) & \text{for } t \in [t_1, t_2). \end{cases}$$

For simplicity, we write $\mathcal{M}_t = \mathcal{M}[0, t]$, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}[0, T]$, and $w_{[0, t]} = w_t$. Moreover, for $w \in \mathcal{M}$, write w_t as the restriction of w on $[0, t]$. We have the following observations for \mathcal{D} of which the proof is obvious.

Proposition 2.2. (1) *If $\mathcal{D}(w_{[t_1, t_2]}, \tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]}) < 1$, then $\mathcal{N}(w_{[t_1, t_2]}) = \mathcal{N}(\tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]})$, and*

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{t_1}^{t_2} I(w_{[t_1, t_2]}(t) \neq \tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]}(t)) dt \leq \mathcal{N}(w_{[t_1, t_2]}) \mathcal{D}(w_{[t_1, t_2]}, \tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]}).$$

(2) *It follows that*

$$\mathcal{D}(\gamma_{[t_0, t_1]} \oplus w_{[t_1, t_2]}, \gamma_{[t_0, t_1]} \oplus \tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]}) \leq \mathcal{D}(w_{[t_1, t_2]}, \tilde{w}_{[t_1, t_2]}).$$

Define time-augmented path spaces of $\alpha(\cdot)$ as follow

$$\mathbb{M} := \bigcup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \{t\} \times \mathcal{M}_t,$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{\gamma_t} := \{(s, w_s) \in \mathbb{M} : s \in [t, T] \text{ and } w_s(r) = \gamma_t(r), \text{ for } 0 \leq r < t\}.$$

\mathbb{M}_{γ_t} is a subset of \mathbb{M} containing all paths sharing the same path γ_t until time t^- . Next, define $w_t^{-\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{M}_{t-\varepsilon}$, the restriction of w_t on $[0, t - \varepsilon)$, and $w_t^{+\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{M}_{t+\varepsilon}$, the (continuous) extension of w_t to $[0, t + \varepsilon)$, by $w_t^{-\varepsilon}(s) = w_t(s)$, $0 \leq s < t - \varepsilon$, and $w_t^{+\varepsilon}(s) = \begin{cases} w_t(s), & 0 \leq s < t, \\ w_t(t^-), & t \leq s < t + \varepsilon. \end{cases}$ We proceed with the following definitions.

Definition 2.3. A measurable function $h : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

- (1) *path-right-continuous* (PR-continuous for short) if $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) = h(t, w_t)$ for any $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}$;
- (2) *path-left-continuous* (PL-continuous for short) if $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} h(t - \varepsilon, w_t^{-\varepsilon}) = h(t, w_t)$ for any $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}$;
- (3) *path-continuous* (P-continuous for short) if it is PL- and PR-continuous. Denote by $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{M})$ the set of P-continuous functions on \mathbb{M} ;
- (4) *horizontally differentiable*, if there exists a $\partial^H h(t, w_t)$ such that

$$\partial^H h(t, w_t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) - h(t, w_t)}{\varepsilon} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{h(t, w_t) - h(t - \varepsilon, w_t^{-\varepsilon})}{\varepsilon},$$

for any $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}$;

- (5) *vertically differentiable*, if there exists $\{\partial_j^V h(t, w_t)\}_{j \in M}$ such that for any $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}$,

$$\partial_j^V h(t, w_t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} h(t + \varepsilon, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t+\varepsilon)}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} h(t, w_t^{-\varepsilon} \oplus j_{[t-\varepsilon, t)});$$

- (6) *α -continuous*, if

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathbb{E}[h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}) | \alpha_t = w_t] = h(t, w_t) \text{ for any } (t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M};$$

- (7) *α -differentiable*, if there exists a $\partial^\alpha h : \mathbb{M} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad \partial^\alpha h(t, w_t) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{E}[h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}) | \alpha_t = w_t] - h(t, w_t)}{\varepsilon} \text{ for any } (t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M};$$

- (8) A function $h : \mathbb{M} \mapsto \mathbb{H}$ is called P-Lipschitz if there exists a uniform constant $\kappa_h > 0$ such that

$$(2.7) \quad D_{\mathbb{H}}(h(t, w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r, t)}), h(t, \tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r, t)}))_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \kappa_h \sqrt{\mathcal{N}(w_r) \mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r)}$$

for $\mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r) < 1$. Here \mathbb{H} are some appropriate metric spaces with metric $D_{\mathbb{H}}(\cdot, \cdot)$. For example \mathbb{H} can be \mathbb{R}^n , U and $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, we always write κ_h for the P-Lipschitz constant for the P-Lipschitz function h .

The following lemma reveals some general relationships among the above definitions.

Lemma 2.4. *Let h be a function defined on \mathbb{M} .*

- (1) *If h is bounded, then h is α -continuous if and only if h is PR-continuous.*
- (2) *If h is PR-continuous, then $\partial_{w_t(t^-)}^V h(t, w_t) = h(t, w_t)$.*
- (3) *If h is bounded and horizontally and vertically differentiable with*

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)} \left| h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\delta} \oplus j_{[t+\delta, t+\varepsilon)}) - h(t + \varepsilon, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t+\varepsilon)}) \right| = 0,$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sup_{\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)} \left| h(t, w_t^{-\delta} \oplus j_{[t-\delta, t)}) - h(t, w_t^{-\varepsilon} \oplus j_{[t-\varepsilon, t)}) \right| = 0,$$

then h is α -differentiable with

$$\partial^\alpha h(t, w_t) = \partial^H h(t, w_t) + \sum_{j \in M} q_{w_t(t^-), j} \partial_j^V h(t, w_t).$$

(4) For $s > t$, let $\hat{h}(t, w_t) := \mathbb{E}[h(s, \alpha_s) | \alpha_t = w_t]$. If h is bounded, P -continuous, and P -Lipschitz, then $\hat{h}(\cdot)$ is vertically and horizontally differentiable with P -continuous derivatives. As a consequence, $\partial^\alpha \hat{h}(t, w_t) = 0$ for $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}$.

(5) If h is horizontally differentiable with P -continuous derivative, then there exists $\delta \in [0, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$(2.10) \quad h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) - h(t, w_t) = \varepsilon \partial^H h(t + \delta, w_t^{+\delta}).$$

Proof. (1) Note that all the paths in \mathbb{M} are right-continuous. Denote by N_ε the number jumps of $\alpha(\cdot)$ in $[t, t + \varepsilon)$. Given $\alpha_t = w_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}) &= \mathbb{E}[h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon})I(N_\varepsilon = 0)] + \mathbb{E}[h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon})I(N_\varepsilon \geq 1)] \\ &= h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon})\mathbb{P}(N_\varepsilon = 0) + \|h\|_\infty O(\varepsilon) = h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) + \|h\|_\infty O(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, the equivalence is clear.

(2) The claim is clear from the definition of vertical derivatives.

(3) Set $\alpha_t = w_t$. On $\{N_\varepsilon = 1, \alpha((t + \varepsilon)^-) = j \neq w(t^-)\}$, the possible values of $\alpha_{t+\varepsilon}$ are in the form of $w_t^{+\delta} \oplus j_{[t+\delta, t+\varepsilon)}$ for some $0 \leq \delta < \varepsilon$. Note that

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}) &= \mathbb{E}\left[h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon})[I(N_\varepsilon = 0) + I(N_\varepsilon = 1) + I(N_\varepsilon \geq 2)]\right] \\ &= h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon})\mathbb{P}(N_\varepsilon = 0) + \sum_{j \neq w_t(t^-)}^m \mathbb{E}[h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon})I(N_\varepsilon = 1, \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j)] + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= h(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon})[1 + q_{w_t(t^-), w_t(t^-)}\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon)] + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \neq w_t(t^-)} \mathbb{E}\left[h(t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}) - \partial_j^V h(t, w_t)\right]I(N_\varepsilon = 1, \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \neq w_t(t^-)} \partial_j^V h(t, w_t)\mathbb{P}(N_\varepsilon = 1, \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.8), it follows that $\partial^\alpha h(t, w_t) = \partial^H h(t, w_t) + \sum_{j \in M} q_{w_t(t^-), j} \partial_j^V h(t, w_t)$.

(4) Since $\alpha(\cdot)$ is a Markov process, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\delta} \oplus j_{[t+\delta, t+\varepsilon)}) &= \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_t^{+\delta} \oplus j_{[t+\delta, t+\varepsilon)}) \oplus \alpha_{[t+\varepsilon, s)} | \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t+\varepsilon)}) \oplus \alpha_{[t+\varepsilon, s)} | \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j] + o(1) = \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t+\varepsilon)}) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the $o(1)$ is uniformly depending on ε but independent of δ . This verifies (2.8) and (2.9) can be verified similarly. Moreover, since the probability of α jumps more than once in $[t, t + \varepsilon)$ is $o(\varepsilon)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t+\varepsilon)}) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t+\varepsilon)}) \oplus \alpha_{[t+\varepsilon, s)} | \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_t \oplus \alpha_{[t, s)}) | \alpha(t) = j]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \hat{h}(t - \varepsilon, w_t^{-\varepsilon} \oplus j_{[t, t-\varepsilon)}) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_{t-\varepsilon} \oplus j_{[t-\varepsilon, t)}) \oplus \alpha_{[t, s)} | \alpha(t^-) = j] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_t \oplus \alpha_{[t, s)}) | \alpha(t) = j]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the vertical derivative of $\hat{h}(t, w_t)$ exists with $\partial^V \hat{h}(t, w_t) = \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_t \oplus \alpha_{[t, s)}) | \alpha(t) = j]$. Moreover, we can verify that $\partial^V \hat{h}(t, w_t)$ is P -continuous.

Now, let us prove that $\hat{h}(t, w_t)$ is horizontally differentiable. Let $\alpha_t = w_t$ and $s > t$. Note that if α has only one jump in $[t, t + \varepsilon)$ and $\alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j$, we have $\mathcal{D}(w_t \oplus \alpha_{[t, t + \varepsilon)}, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t + \varepsilon)}) \leq \varepsilon$. Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) - \hat{h}(t, w_t) = \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) - \mathbb{E}[h(s, \alpha_s)] \\
& = \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) - \mathbb{E}[h(s, \alpha_s)I(N_\varepsilon = 0)] - \mathbb{E}[h(s, \alpha_s)I(N_\varepsilon = 1) + h(s, \alpha_s)I(N_\varepsilon = 2)] \\
& = \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon}) - \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t^{+\varepsilon})(1 + q_{ii}\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)) + \|h\|_\infty O(\varepsilon^2) \\
& \quad - \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{h}(t + \varepsilon, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t + \varepsilon)}) \mathbb{E}I(N_\varepsilon = 1, \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j) \\
& \quad + \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}[h(s, w_t \oplus j_{[t, t + \varepsilon)} \oplus \alpha_{[t + \varepsilon, s)}) - h(s, \alpha_s)] I(N_\varepsilon = 1, \alpha(t + \varepsilon^-) = j) \\
& = -\varepsilon \sum_{j \neq w_t(t^-)} q_{w_t(t^-), j} \partial_j^V \hat{h}(t, w_t) + o(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\hat{h}(t, w_t) - h(t - \varepsilon, w_t^{-\varepsilon}) = -\varepsilon \sum_{j \in M} q_{w_t^{-\varepsilon}(t - \varepsilon^-), j} \partial_j^V \hat{h}(t - \varepsilon, w_t^{-\varepsilon}) + o(\varepsilon)$. By the P-continuity of $\partial_j^V \hat{h}(t, w_t)$, we have $\hat{h}(t, w_t)$ is horizontally differentiable with $\partial^H \hat{h}(t, w_t) = -\sum_{j \in M} q_{w_t(t^-), j} \partial_j^V \hat{h}(t, w_t)$. Moreover, $\partial^H \hat{h}(t, w_t)$ is also P-continuous. Consequently, $\partial^\alpha \hat{h}(t, w_t) = 0$.

(5) As long as $h(t, w_t)$ is horizontally differentiable with P-continuous derivative, (2.10) holds by the mean-value theorem. \blacksquare

We emphasize that the P-Lipschitz property is new in the literature, which is used to guarantee the α -differentiability of the solutions of path-dependent HJBs. In fact, if the optimal control problem does not involve mean-field interactions, then no path-dependence is needed, and its value function takes the form of $V(t, w_t, x) = V(t, w_t(t^-), x)$, which is naturally P-Lipschitz with P-Lipschitz constant 0. Then the study on P-Lipschitz property is not needed for such special scenario. Because we need to consider the path-dependence in our paper, we need to generalize the calculus on the path-space from the classical theories for switching diffusions without mean-field terms. With the path-space of α , we will focus on the HJB-FP approach for our problems in the next two sections.

3 FP-Step

This section is devoted to the FP-step. Let $L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$ be the Banach space of \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable processes with continuous paths equipped with the sup-norm $\|X\|_{\mathcal{L}^2}^2 := \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t)|^2$. First, we present a proposition concerning the existence and uniqueness of a solution to SDE (2.1) for $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$. The proof is based on a standard Picard's iteration and thus is omitted here.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. For any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$, there exists a unique solution $X \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega, C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n))$ to (2.1).*

To construct the mapping ζ , we need to restrict u in a feedback strategy instead. Let \mathcal{U} be the set of Lipschitz feedback strategies defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.1) \quad \mathcal{U} & := \bigcup_{\kappa \geq 0} \mathcal{U}_\kappa \text{ and} \\
\mathcal{U}_\kappa & := \left\{ u: \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto U \mid u(\cdot) \text{ is P-continuous, uniformly P-Lipschitz with constant } \kappa, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{and } |u(t, w_t, 0)| \leq \kappa, |u(t, w_t, x) - u(t, w_t, y)| \leq \kappa|x - y| \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Given $u \in \mathcal{U}$, inspired by [34], let us construct ζ as follows.

For any $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}$, consider the following SDE on $[0, t]$,

$$(3.2) \quad dY(s) = \mathbf{b}(s, w(s^-), Y(s), \text{law}(Y(s)); u(s, w_s, Y(s)))ds + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(s, Y(s))dB(s),$$

with $\text{law}(Y(0)) = \mu_0$. Because $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}$ is given, one can solve the above SDE until time t . Set $\zeta_{\mu_0}^u(t, w_t) := \text{law}(Y(t))$ to emphasize the dependence of ζ on u and μ_0 . The following proposition is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.6 in [34], which guarantees that $\zeta_{\mu_0}^u(t, \alpha_t)$ is the correct feedback function for the conditional distribution $\eta(t)$.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. Let X^u be the solution to (2.1) under strategy $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and recall that $\eta^u = \{\eta^u(t) = \text{law}(X^u(t)|\mathcal{F}_t^\alpha) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta^u(\cdot) = \zeta_{\mu_0}^u(\cdot, \alpha_\cdot) \text{ in } D([0, T], \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))) = 1.$$

Here $D([0, T], \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ denotes the space of $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -valued càdàg curves on $[0, T]$ endowed with the Skorohod metric.

With the exact form of the feedback function ζ given a $u \in \mathcal{U}$, let us present the following lemma on P-Lipschitz property of ζ which will be used in the future.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds and let $u \in \mathcal{U}_{L_0}$. Then $\zeta_{\mu_0}^u(t, w_t)$ is P-Lipschitz with a constant $\sqrt{\beta_0(T)}(1 + L_0)$. Moreover, for any $u, \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}$,*

$$(3.3) \quad \sup_{(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}} \mathbf{w}(\zeta_{\mu_0}^u(t, w_t), \zeta_{\mu_0}^{\tilde{u}}(t, w_t)) \leq \sqrt{\beta_1(T)} \sup_{(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, w_t, x) - \tilde{u}(t, w_t, x)|.$$

Here the two constants $\beta_0(T)$ and $\beta_1(T)$ are independent of L_0 and are small when T is small.

Proof. Let $Z(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{Z}(\cdot)$ be the solutions to (3.2) under the same strategy u and the same initial distribution μ_0 , but with different paths $w_t = w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r, t]}$ and $\tilde{w}_t = \tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r, t]}$, respectively. Then, for $s \in [0, t]$, Itô's formula implies that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E}|Z(s) - \tilde{Z}(s)|^2 &= |\sigma(s, Z(s)) - \sigma(s, \tilde{Z}(s))|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}\langle Z(s) - \tilde{Z}(s), \mathbf{b}(s, Z(s), w(s^-), \text{law}(Z(s)), u(s, w_s, Z(s))) \\ &\quad \quad - \mathbf{b}(s, \tilde{Z}(s), \tilde{w}(s^-), \text{law}(\tilde{Z}(s)), u(s, \tilde{w}_s, \tilde{Z}(s))) \rangle \\ &\leq K(1 + L_0) [\mathbb{E}|Z(s) - \tilde{Z}(s)|^2 + \mathcal{N}(w_r)\mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r) + I(w(s) \neq \tilde{w}(s), 0 \leq s \leq r)]. \end{aligned}$$

By (2.5), Gronwall's inequality yields $\mathbb{E}|Z(t) - \tilde{Z}(t)|^2 \leq Kt(1 + L_0^2)\mathcal{N}(w_r)\mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r)$. Note that $Z(t)$ and $\tilde{Z}(t)$ have distribution $\zeta_{\mu_0}^u(t, w_t)$ and $\zeta_{\mu_0}^u(t, \tilde{w}_t)$ respectively, by the definition of Wasserstein-2 metric, we know that $\zeta_{\mu_0}^u(t, w_t)$ is P-Lipschitz with constant $KT L_0$.

To prove (3.3), let $Z(t)$ and $\tilde{Z}(t)$ be the solutions to (3.2) with the same initial distribution and path w but with different strategies u and \tilde{u} , resp. Similar to (3.4), one has

$$\frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E}|Z(s) - \tilde{Z}(s)|^2 \leq K\mathbb{E}|Z(s) - \tilde{Z}(s)|^2 + K \sup_{(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |u(t, w_t, x) - \tilde{u}(t, w_t, x)|^2.$$

Using Gronwall's inequality again, we have (3.3) similarly. ■

At the end of this section, we denote by Υ the set of all such $\zeta_{\mu_0}^u$ for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. To show the dependence on the initial μ_0 , we write $\Upsilon_{\mu_0} := \{\zeta \in \Upsilon : \zeta(0, w_0) = \mu_0\}$. We also equip Υ with the supremum metric, $d_\Upsilon(\zeta, \tilde{\zeta}) := \sup_{(s, w_s) \in \mathbb{M}} d(\zeta(s, w_s), \tilde{\zeta}(s, w_s))$. Now, we can complete the FP-step by defining a map $\mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0} : \mathcal{U} \mapsto \Upsilon_{\mu_0}$ by

$$(3.5) \quad [\mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0} u](s, w_s) := \zeta_{\mu_0}^u(s, w_s) \text{ for all } (s, w_s) \in \mathbb{M}.$$

We will work with the HJB-step in the next section.

4 HJB-Step

In this section, we focus on the HJB-step. Replacing $\eta(t)$ by the feedback form $\zeta(t, \alpha_t)$, the HJB-step is equivalent to solving a path-dependent but distribution-independent control problem under general discounting cost. As mentioned, we will tackle the control problem by studying the equilibria of HJBs. We note that compared to the path-dependence theory using viscosity solutions developed in the literature such as [17, 18, 9], the solutions constructed here are in the classical sense due to the special structure of the path space. Such strong solutions are necessary for us to work with the path-dependent equilibrium HJBs (2.4). Write

$$\begin{aligned} b(t, w_t, y; v) &= \mathbf{b}(t, y, w_t(t^-), \zeta(t, w_t); v), \quad \sigma(t, x) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, x), \\ g(\tau; t, w_t, y; v) &= \mathbf{g}(\tau; t, y, w_t(t^-), \zeta(t, w_t); v), \quad h(\tau; w, y) = \mathbf{h}(\tau; w(T^-), y, \zeta(t, w)). \end{aligned}$$

Here b , g , and h are dependent on ζ while we omit this dependence in the notations for simplicity.

Given ζ , the SDE in (2.1) reduces to

$$(4.1) \quad dX(t) = b(t, \alpha_t, X(t); u(t))dt + \sigma(t, X(t))dB(t).$$

The general discounting cost functional becomes

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} V(t, w_t, x; u(\cdot)) &= J(t; t, w_t, x; u(\cdot)), \\ J(\tau; t, w_t, x; u(\cdot)) &= \mathbb{E}_{t, w_t, x} \left(\int_t^T g(\tau; s, \alpha_s, X(s); u(s))dt + h(\tau; \alpha_T, X(T)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to find a closed-loop strategy for the control problem subject to (4.1) under the cost (4.2). Due to the general discounting structure, the control problem is time-inconsistent where no optimal control exists. Therefore, we turn to find a local optimal *equilibrium strategy* inspired by [42] where the key step lies in solving an equilibrium for a systems of HJBs. In our case, the equilibrium HJBs turn out to be path-dependent, leading to

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial^\alpha + \mathcal{A})\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) + \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau; t, w_t, x, D_x\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x), D_x\Theta(t; t, w_t, x)) = 0, \\ \Theta(\tau; T, w, x) = h(\tau; w, x), \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau; t, w_t, x, p, q) = \mathcal{H}(\tau; t, w_t(t^-), x, \zeta(t, w_t), p, q)$. Here, D_x and D_x^2 are the gradient and Hessian matrix with respect to x and recall that ∂^α has been defined in (2.6). Compared to the classical HJB, the additional time factor τ is introduced due to the general discounting structure. Our goal is to show (i) there exists a unique classical solution to (4.3), which is regular enough such that a feedback strategy can be identified, (ii) the feedback strategy is local optimal in some appropriate sense. The two assertions are to be studied in the following subsections separately. Before moving on, we present the following proposition whose proof is straightforward by Assumption 2.1 and thus is omitted.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds and ζ is P -continuous and P -Lipschitz.*

(1) *The mappings $(t, w_t, x, v) \mapsto b(t, w_t, x, v)$ and $(\tau; t, w_t, x, v) \mapsto g(\tau; t, w_t, x, v)$ are P -continuous and continuous with respect to (τ, t, x, v) ; $h(\tau; w, x)$ is continuous in τ . It satisfies that*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} |b(t, w_t, x, v)| + |g(\tau; t, w_t, 0, 0)| + |h(\tau; w, 0)| \leq K, \\ |b(t, w_t, x_1, v_1) - b(t, w_t, x_2, v_2)| \leq K(|x_1 - x_2| + |v_1 - v_2|), \\ |g(\tau; t, w_t, x_1, v_1) - g(\tau; t, w_t, x_2, v_2)| \leq K(|x_1 - x_2| + |v_1 - v_2|), \\ |D_x h(\tau; w, x)| + |D_x^2 h(\tau; w, x)| \leq K, \\ b, D_x h \text{ and } D_x g \text{ are } P\text{-Lipschitz with } \kappa_b, \kappa_{D_x h}, \kappa_{D_x g} \leq K\kappa_\zeta \end{array} \right.$$

(2) The Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau; t, w_t, x, p, q)$ is P -continuous with $|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)| \leq K(1 + |p| + |x|)$, $|D_q \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)| \leq K(1 + |p|)$, $|D_p \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\cdot)| \leq K$ and

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau; t, w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]}, x, p, q) - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau; t, \tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]}, x, p, q)| \leq K\kappa_\zeta(1 + |p|)\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(w_r)\mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r)},$$

if $\mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r) < 1$.

4.1 Path-Dependent PDEs

To work on path-dependent equilibrium HJBs (4.3), we will adopt the classical fundamental solution method. To better illustrate the details, we start with a path-dependent PDE first instead of the complex equilibrium HJBs (4.3).

For some appropriate functions b , g , and h , we consider the following path-dependent PDE,

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial^\alpha + \mathcal{A})\Theta(t, w_t, x) + \langle b(t, w_t, x), D_x \Theta(t, w_t, x) \rangle + g(t, w_t, x) = 0, \\ \Theta(T, w, x) = h(w, x). \end{cases}$$

In this subsection only, b , g , and h are not necessarily the same as those in the previous sections. The key idea of this subsection lies in applying the fundamental solution method for parabolic PDEs. Then we will extend the results to the equilibrium HJBs in our paper.

Due to ∂^α and \mathcal{A} , the fundamental solution consists of two parts here. Define

$$(4.5) \quad \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) := \frac{1}{(4\pi(s-t))^{\frac{n}{2}}(\det[a(s, y)])^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\langle x-y, a^{-1}(s, y)(x-y) \rangle}{4(s-t)} \right\},$$

which is the fundamental solution to $\partial_s \pi(s, x) + \mathcal{A}\pi(s, x) = 0$. Straightforward calculation yields that

$$\begin{cases} |\Psi_1(t, x; s, y)| \leq K(s-t)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\lambda_0 \frac{|x-y|^2}{4(s-t)} \right\}, \\ |D_y \Psi_1(t, x; s, y)| \leq K(s-t)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\lambda_0 \frac{|x-y|^2}{4(s-t)} \right\}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.6) \quad D_y \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) = -D_x \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) + \Psi_1(t, x; s, y)\rho(t, x; s, y),$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \rho(t, x; s, y) = -\frac{D_y(\det[a(s, y)])}{2\det[a(s, y)]} - \frac{\langle [a^{-1}(s, y)]_y(x-y), x-y \rangle}{4(s-t)}, \\ \langle [a^{-1}(s, y)]_y(x-y), x-y \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} [a^{-1}(s, y)]_{y_1}(x-y), x-y \\ \vdots \\ [a^{-1}(s, y)]_{y_n}(x-y), x-y \end{pmatrix}. \end{cases}$$

It can be checked that under our assumption, one has

$$(4.7) \quad |\rho(t, x; s, y)| + |D_y \rho(t, x; s, y)| \leq K \left(1 + \frac{|x-y|^2}{s-t} \right).$$

Let us introduce the second part of the fundamental solution from the path process. Since $\alpha(\cdot)$ is a homogeneous Markov chain, we can define $\Phi_2(i, d\gamma_t) := \mathbb{P}(\alpha_t \in d\gamma_t | \alpha(0) = i)$. It can be seen that $\Phi_2(i, d\gamma_t)$ is supported in $\gamma_t(0) = i$ only. Then the transition law of α . can be written as $\Psi_2(t, w_t; s, d\tilde{w}_s) := \mathbb{P}(\alpha_s \in d\tilde{w}_s | \alpha_t = w_t) = \Phi_2(w_t(t^-), d\gamma_{[t,s]})$ where $\gamma_{[t,s]}(r) = \tilde{w}_s(r)$ for $t \leq r < s$.

Write

$$\Psi(t, w_t, x; s, d\tilde{w}_s, y) := \Psi_1(t, x; s, y)\Psi_2(t, w_t; s, d\tilde{w}_s).$$

The function Ψ plays a role as a fundamental solution in our path-dependent PDE. Note that $\Psi_2(t, w_t; s, \cdot)$ has support in $\{\tilde{w}_s \in \mathcal{M}_s : \tilde{w}_s(r) = w_t(r), r \in [0, t]\}$ only. Before presenting our results, we first introduce some notation of the spaces for the solution to our path-dependent PDE.

Define $\mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^m)$ by the set of all \mathbb{R}^m -valued functions $\theta(t, w_t, x)$ which are P-continuous for each fixed x and are continuous with respect to x for each $w_t \in \mathcal{M}_t$. Define the sup-norm on $\mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^m)$ by $\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{C}^{0,0}} := \sup_{\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\theta|$. Note that \mathbb{M}_{w_t} is a subset of \mathbb{M} , $\mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{w_t} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^m)$ can be defined similarly. For $\theta \in \mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{w_t} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^m)$, the sup-norm is defined by $\|\theta\|_{\mathcal{C}_{w_t}^{0,0}} := \sup_{\mathbb{M}_{w_t} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\theta|$. Note that $\mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{w_t} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^m)$ are complete under the respective norms. Now, we can solve (4.4).

Proposition 4.2. *Let $b(t, w_t, x)$ and $g(t, w_t, x)$ be P-continuous for each x and are continuously differentiable with respect x . Suppose $h(w, x)$ is twice continuously differentiable in x . Further suppose that $g_x(t, w_t, x)$ is P-continuous and*

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{cases} |b(t, w_t, x)| + |b_x(t, w_t, x)| + |g(t, w_t, 0)| + |h(w, 0)| \leq K, \\ |g_x(t, w_t, x)| + |h_x(w, x)| + |h_{xx}(w, x)| \leq K, \\ b(t, w_t, x), g(t, w_t, x), h_x(w, x) \text{ are P-Lipschitz uniformly in } x. \end{cases}$$

Then the path-dependent PDE (4.4) admits a unique solution Θ in the classical sense in the class of functions satisfying $|\Theta(t, w_t, x)| \leq Ce^{\delta x^2}$ for any $\delta > 0$. The solution has the following representation

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \Theta(t, w_t, x) &= \int_{\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(\tilde{w}, y) \Psi(t, w_t, x; T, d\tilde{w}, y) dy \\ &+ \int_t^T \int_{\mathcal{M}_s \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left(\langle b(s, \tilde{w}_s, y), D_y \Theta(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \rangle + g(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \right) \Psi(t, w_t, x; s, d\tilde{w}_s, y) dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $D_x \Theta(t, w_t, x)$, $D_x^2 \Theta(t, w_t, x)$, $\partial^\alpha \Theta(t, w_t, x)$ are P-continuous for each x and is continuous w.r.t. x for each $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}_t$. In addition, $D_x \Theta(t, w_t, x)$ is P-Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $\beta_2(T)(1 + \kappa_\zeta)$ for some constant $\beta_2(T) > 0$. Here the solution in the classical sense means that $\Theta(t, w_t, x)$ is twice differentiable in x , α -differentiable in (t, w_t) (see Definition 2.3) and satisfies (4.4).

Proof. The proof is based on a fixed point theory. We first prove there exists a solution on $[T - \delta, T]$ for some positive constant δ . Then similar idea can be extended to the whole time interval $[0, T]$. Our proof is divided into several steps.

(1) *Construction of the map Π on $[T - \delta, T]$.* We fix a $(T - \delta, \gamma_{T-\delta}) \in \mathbb{M}$ and take a $\theta \in \mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^n)$. We will define a map $\Pi : \mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that Π admits a fixed point.

For any $(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, define

$$(4.10) \quad \Theta(t, w_t, x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Psi_1(t, x; T, y) \hat{h}(t, w_t, y) dy + \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y) dy ds.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{h}(t, w_t, y) &:= \int_{\mathcal{M}} h(\tilde{w}, y) \Psi_2(t, w_t; T, d\tilde{w}) = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{[t, T]}} h(w_t \oplus \gamma_{[t, T]}, y) \Phi_2(w_t(t^-), d\gamma_{[t, T]}); \\ \hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y) &:= \int_{\mathcal{M}_s} \left(\langle b(s, \tilde{w}_s, y), \theta(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \rangle + g(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \right) \Psi_2(t, w_t; s, d\tilde{w}_s) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}_{[t, s]}} \left(\langle b(s, w_t \oplus \gamma_{[t, s]}, y), \theta(s, w_t \oplus \gamma_{[t, s]}, y) \rangle + g(s, w_t \oplus \gamma_{[t, s]}, y) \right) \Phi_2(w_t(t^-), d\gamma_{[t, s]}). \end{aligned}$$

By the P-continuity of b, θ, g , and $|D_y h| < K$, it can be seen that $\hat{h}(t, w_t, y)$ is uniformly Lipschitz in y and $\hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y)$ is continuous in (s, y) . By [19, Theorem 12, p25], $\Theta(t, w_t, x)$ is second order differentiable w.r.t

x . Using integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.11) \quad D_x \Theta(t, w_t, x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} D_x \Psi_1(t, x; T, y) \left[\int_{\mathcal{M}} h(\tilde{w}, y) \Psi_2(t, w_t; T, d\tilde{w}) \right] dy \\
&+ \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} D_x \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \int_{\mathcal{M}_s} [\langle b(s, \tilde{w}_s, y), \theta(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \rangle + g(s, \tilde{w}_s, y)] \Psi_2(t, w_t; s, d\tilde{w}_s) dy ds \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} [\Psi_1(t, x; T, y) \rho(t, x; T, y) - D_y \Psi_1(t, x; T, y)] \left[\int_{\mathcal{M}} h(\tilde{w}, y) \Psi_2(t, w_t; T, d\tilde{w}) \right] dy \\
&+ \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} D_x \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \int_{\mathcal{M}_s} [\langle b(s, \tilde{w}_s, y), \theta(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \rangle + g(s, \tilde{w}_s, y)] \Psi_2(t, w_t; s, d\tilde{w}_s) dy ds \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Psi_1(t, x; T, y) \left[\int_{\mathcal{M}} [D_y + \rho(t, x; T, y)] h(\tilde{w}, y) \Psi_2(t, w_t; T, d\tilde{w}) \right] dy \\
&+ \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} D_x \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \int_{\mathcal{M}_s} [\langle b(s, \tilde{w}_s, y), \theta(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \rangle + g(s, \tilde{w}_s, y)] \Psi_2(t, w_t; s, d\tilde{w}_s) dy ds.
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.6) and the P-continuity of b, θ, g , we see that $D_x \Theta(t, w_t, x)$ is P-continuous with

$$(4.12) \quad \sup_{(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |D_x \Theta(t, w_t, x)| \leq \ell_0 (1 + \sqrt{\delta}) \sup_{(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\theta(t, w_t, x)| < \infty.$$

Here ℓ_0 is a constant independent of θ and t . Now we can define the map Π by $\Pi[\theta] = D_x \Theta$.

(2) *Fixed-point of Π .* By (4.11), we have a constant ℓ_1 depending on b and σ only such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\Pi[\theta_1](t, w_t, x) - \Pi[\theta_2](t, w_t, x)| \\
&\leq \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} D_x \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \left[\int_{\mathcal{M}_s} |b, \theta_1 - \theta_2|(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \Psi_2(t, w_t; s, \tilde{w}_s) \right] dy ds \\
&\leq \ell_0 \sqrt{\delta} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_{\mathcal{C}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}}^{0,0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Take $\delta = \min(\ell_0^{-2}/2, \ell_1^{-2}/2)$, we see that Π is a contraction on $\mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^n)$ which admits a unique fixed point θ^* . Write Θ^* be the function Θ in (4.10) by taking $\theta = \theta^*$ and Θ^* is the solution to (4.9) for $(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that δ is independent of the choice $\gamma_{T-\delta}$ and we can take arbitrary $\gamma_{T-\delta} \in \mathcal{M}_{T-\delta}$. Then we construct a solution Θ^* to (4.9) for $t \geq T - \delta$. By (4.12), we have $|D_x \Theta(T - \delta, w_{T-\delta}, x)| \leq \ell_0 (1 - \ell_0 \sqrt{\delta})$.

(3) *Extension to the full time horizon $[0, T]$.* Repeat the above process on $[T - 2\delta, T - \delta]$ with $\delta = \ell_0^2/2$ and use $\Theta(T - \delta, w_{T-\delta}, x)$ as a terminal condition. Note that $\delta = \min(\ell_0^{-2}/2, \ell_1^{-2}/2)$ is an absolute constant independent of time, we can get a solution on $[T - 2\delta, T - \delta]$ similarly. Hence, we are allowed to repeat the above process to $[T - 2\delta, T - \delta]$, $[T - 3\delta, T - 2\delta]$, \dots , until reaching the initial time 0. Then (4.4) admits a unique solution Θ^* on $[0, T]$ with $\theta^* = D\Theta^* \in \mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^n)$.

(4) *Verification of classical solution.* Now we want to verify Θ^* is the classical solution to path-dependent PDE (4.4). First, we know that Θ^* is twice differentiable w.r.t. x with

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.13) \quad \mathcal{A}\Theta^*(t, w_t, x) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Trace}[a(t, x) D_x^2 \Theta^*(t, w_t, x)] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \text{Trace}[a(t, x) D_x^2 \Psi_1(t, x; T, y)] \hat{h}(t, w_t, y) dy \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \text{Trace}[a(t, x) D_x^2 \Psi_1(t, x; T, y)] \hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y) dy ds \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_t \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \hat{h}(t, w_t, y) dy - \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_t \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y) dy ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we want to show that Θ^* is α -differentiable. By Lemma 2.4 and (4.10), it suffices to show $\hat{h}(t, w_t, x)$ and $\hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y)$ are P-Lipschitz in (t, w_t) . The P-Lipschitz property of \hat{h} is true by that of h directly. By the definition of $\hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y)$, we need only show θ^* is P-Lipschitz.

For $\mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r) < 1$, we know that $w_r(r^-) = \tilde{w}_r(r^-)$. For $s \geq t$, write

$$\kappa_{\theta^*}(s) = \sup_{\gamma_{[r,s']} \in \mathcal{M}[r,s'], s' \geq s} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\theta^*(t, w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,s]}, x) - \theta^*(t, \tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,s]}, x)|}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}(w_r) \mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r)}}.$$

Note that for $t \geq r$,

$$\begin{aligned} (4.14) \quad & |D_x \Theta^*(t, w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]}, x) - D_x \Theta^*(t, \tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]}, x)| \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |(D_y + \rho(t, x; T, y))h(w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]} \oplus \gamma_{[t,T]}, y) \\ & \quad - (D_y + \rho(t, x; T, y))h(\tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]} \oplus \gamma_{[t,T]}, y)| \Psi_1(t, x; T, y) dy \Phi_2(\gamma_{[r,t]}(t^-), d\gamma_{[t,T]}) \\ & \quad + \int_t^T \int_{\mathcal{M}_s \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\langle b, \theta^* \rangle(s, w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]} \oplus \gamma_{[t,s]}, y) - \langle b, \theta^* \rangle(s, \tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]} \oplus \gamma_{[t,s]}, y)| \\ & \quad \quad \times |D_x \Psi_1(t, x; s, y)| dy \Phi_2(\gamma_{[r,t]}(t^-), d\gamma_{[t,s]}) ds \\ & \quad + \int_t^T \int_{\mathcal{M}_s \times \mathbb{R}^n} |g(s, w_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]} \oplus \gamma_{[t,s]}, y) - g(s, \tilde{w}_r \oplus \gamma_{[r,t]} \oplus \gamma_{[t,s]}, y)| \\ & \quad \quad \times |D_x \Psi_1(t, x; s, y)| dy \Phi_2(\gamma_{[r,t]}(t^-), d\gamma_{[t,s]}) ds \\ & \leq \ell_2(1 + \kappa_\zeta) \left(1 + \int_t^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-s}} \kappa_{\theta^*}(s) ds \right) \sqrt{\mathcal{N}(w_r) \mathcal{D}(w_r, \tilde{w}_r)} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant ℓ_2 . Then taking all possible $\gamma_{[r,t]} \in \mathcal{M}[r, t]$ and $t \geq t'$, we have

$$\kappa_{\theta^*}(t') \leq \ell_2 \left(1 + \int_{t'}^T \kappa_{\theta^*}(s) / \sqrt{T-s} ds \right) \text{ for all } t' \in [r, T].$$

Note that $\kappa_{\theta^*}(T) \leq \ell_2 \kappa_\zeta$, we have $\kappa_{\theta^*}(t) \leq \beta_2(T)(1 + \kappa_\zeta)$ for some $\beta_2(T)$ i.e. θ^* is P-Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $\beta_2(T)(1 + \kappa_\zeta)$.

By Lemma 2.4 and (4.10), $\Theta^*(t, w_t, x)$ is horizontally and vertically differentiable for each fixed x (thus P-continuous and α -differentiable) with

$$\begin{aligned} (4.15) \quad & \partial^\alpha \Theta(t, w_t, x) \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Psi_1(t, x; T, y) \partial^\alpha \hat{h}(t, w_t, y) dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{d}{dt} [\Psi_1(t, x; T, y)] \hat{h}(t, w_t, y) dy \\ & \quad - \langle b(t, w_t, y), \theta(t, w_t, y) \rangle - g(t, w_t, x) + \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \partial^\alpha \hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y) dy ds \\ & \quad + \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \partial_t \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \hat{g}(t, w_t, s, y) dy ds. \\ & = -\langle b(t, w_t, y), \theta(t, w_t, y) \rangle - g(t, w_t, x) - \mathcal{A}\Theta(t, w_t, x). \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we used (4.13). Moreover, when $t \rightarrow T^-$, it is easy to see that $\Theta(T, w, x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} \Theta(t, w_t, x) = h(w, x)$. Putting the above together, we conclude that Θ is the classical solution of (4.4).

(5) *Some uniform estimates.* Finally, we prove the boundedness of $D_x \Theta^*$ and $D_x^2 \Theta^*$. By (4.11), for all $t \in [0, T]$, it follows that

$$\sup_{(r, w_r, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n, r \geq t} |D_x \Theta^*(r, w_r, x)| \leq \ell_3 \left(1 + \int_t^T \sqrt{T-s} \sup_{(r, w_r, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n, r \geq s} |D_x \Theta^*(r, w_r, x)| ds \right)$$

for some absolute constants ℓ_3 . By Gronwall's inequality, there exists a constant $\beta_3(T)$ such that $|D_x \Theta^*| \leq \beta_3(T)$. By (4.6) and (4.10), using integration by parts, we have

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} D_{x_i, x_j} \Theta^*(t, w_t, x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \\ &\quad \times \left[\int_{\mathcal{M}} \left[(D_{y_j} + \rho(t, x; s, y))(D_{y_i} + \rho(t, x; s, y))h(\tilde{w}, y) \right] \Psi_2(t, w_t; T, d\tilde{w}) \right] dy \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \int_{\mathcal{M}_s} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} D_{x_i} \Psi_1(t, x; s, y) \Psi_2(t, w_t; s, d\tilde{w}_s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left[(D_{y_j} + \rho(t, x; s, y))(\langle b(s, \tilde{w}_s, y), \theta^*(s, \tilde{w}_s, y) \rangle + g(s, \tilde{w}_s, y)) \right] \right] dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.7), it follows that for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\sup_{(r, w_r, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n, r \geq t} |D_{x_i, x_j} \Theta^*(r, w_r, x)| \leq \ell_4 \left(1 + \int_t^T \sqrt{T-s} \sup_{(r, w_r, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n, r \geq s} |D_{x_i, x_j} \Theta^*(r, w_r, x)| ds \right).$$

Then Gronwall's inequality yields that $D_x^2 \Theta^*$ is bounded uniformly with a constant $\beta_4(T)$. The proof is complete. \blacksquare

We remark that the two constants $\beta_2(T)$ and $\beta_3(T)$ depend on T and are bounded if T belongs to a finite horizon. Until now, we developed a theory for path-dependent PDEs. We are ready to apply the idea to path-dependent equilibrium HJBs.

4.2 Path-Dependent Equilibrium HJBs and Local Optimality

In this subsection, we focus on the existence and uniqueness of the solution to path-dependent equilibrium HJBs in (4.3). The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that ζ is P-continuous and P-Lipschitz and that Assumption 2.1 holds. The path-dependent system of equilibrium HJBs in (4.3) admits a unique classical solution Θ^ζ such that $\partial^\alpha \Theta^\zeta(\tau; t, w_t, x)$ and $D_x \Theta^\zeta(\tau; t, w_t, x)$ are P-continuous for each x . Moreover, $D_x \Theta^\zeta(t, w_t, x)$ is P-Lipschitz with P-Lipschitz constant $\beta_2(T)(1 + \kappa_\zeta)$ and $|D_x \Theta^\zeta(t, w_t, x)| + |D_x^2 \Theta^\zeta(t, w_t, x)| \leq \beta_5(T)$ for some constants $\beta_2(T), \beta_5(T) > 0$ independent of ζ .*

Proof. Similar to Proposition 4.2, the proof is based on a fixed point theory. Given a $\gamma_{T-\delta} \in \mathcal{M}_{T-\delta}$ and a $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M}_{\gamma_{T-\delta}} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, for each $\tau \in [0, T]$, we solve the following path-dependent PDE

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{cases} (\partial^\alpha + \mathcal{A})\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) + \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau; t, w_t, x, D_x \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x), \theta_1(t, w_t, x)) = 0, \\ \Theta(\tau; T, w, y) = h(\tau; w, y). \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 4.1, all the conditions in Proposition 4.2 are fulfilled for each $\tau \in [0, T]$. Then for $\tau \in [0, T]$, there exists a unique solution $\Theta_1(\tau; \cdot)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_1(\tau; t, w_t, x) &= \int_{\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} h(\tau; \tilde{w}, y) \Psi(t, w_t, x; T, d\tilde{w}, y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \int_{\mathcal{M}_s \times \mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, x, D_x \Theta_1(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, x), \theta_1(s, \tilde{w}_s, x)) \Psi(t, w_t, x; s, d\tilde{w}_s, y) dy ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\theta_2(t, w_t, x) := D_x \Theta_1(t; t, w_t, x)$. Repeating such process, we get a sequence $\{(\theta_i, \Theta_i)\}$ such that $\theta_{i+1}(t, w_t, x) := D_x \Theta_i(t; t, w_t, x)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Similar to the proof of Proposition 4.2, one can prove there exists a limit (θ^*, Θ^*) satisfying $\theta^*(t, w_t, x) = D_x \Theta^*(t; t, w_t, x)$ and $D_x \Theta^*(t; t, w_t, x), D_x^2 \Theta^*(t; t, w_t, x), \partial^\alpha \Theta^*(t; t, w_t, x)$ are P-continuous for each x and is continuous w.r.t. x for each $(t, w_t) \in \mathbb{M}_t$. Moreover, $D_x \Theta(t; t, w_t, x)$ is P-Lipschitz with P-Lipschitz constant $\beta_2(T)(1 + \kappa_\zeta)$. \blacksquare

The solution $\Theta^*(\tau; t, w_t, x)$ is the cost function when $u(\cdot)$ is taken as the equilibrium strategy. Therefore, we can define the second mapping for HJB step by letting $\mathcal{T}_2 : \Upsilon_{\mu_0} \mapsto \mathcal{U}$ by $\mathcal{T}_2(\zeta) = u^\zeta$ where $u^\zeta(t, w_t, x) = \varphi(t, w_t(t^-), x, D_x \Theta^\zeta(t; t, w_t, x))$ for all $(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Different from [42] and [30], our feedback strategy is path-dependent. Similar to [30], let us show that the feedback strategy satisfies a version of local optimality in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *Given ζ , let Θ be the solution to the path-dependent equilibrium HJBs in (4.3). For any $u_0 \in U$, it follows that*

$$(4.18) \quad \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[J(t; t, w_t, x; u^*) - J(t; t, w_t, x; u_0|_{[t, t+\varepsilon]} \oplus u^*|_{[t+\varepsilon, T]}) \right] \leq 0,$$

where $u_0|_{[t, t+\varepsilon]} \oplus u^*|_{[t+\varepsilon, T]}(t, w_t, x) := \begin{cases} u_0, & \text{for } s \in [t, t+\varepsilon]; \\ u^*(t, w_t, x), & \text{for } s \in [t+\varepsilon, T]. \end{cases}$

The proof is based on a functional Itô's formula for $\Theta(\tau; t, \alpha_t, X(t))$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *Given ζ , let X be the solution to the following SDE,*

$$(4.19) \quad dX(t) = \mathbf{b}(t, \alpha(t^-), X(t), \zeta(t, \alpha_t); u_0)dt + \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t, X(t))dB(t).$$

Then

$$(4.20) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, X(t + \varepsilon)) \Big| \alpha_t = w_t, X(t) = x \right] - \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \\ = \varepsilon \langle \partial^\alpha + \mathcal{A} \rangle \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) + \varepsilon \langle \mathbf{b}(t, w_t(t^-), x, \zeta(t, w_t), u_0), D_x \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \rangle + o(\varepsilon).$$

Proof. Let N_ε be the number of transitions of $\alpha(\cdot)$ in $[t, t + \varepsilon]$. Define the following events $A_\varepsilon(0) = I(N_\varepsilon = 0)$, $A_\varepsilon(1) = I(N_\varepsilon = 1)$, $A_\varepsilon(2) = I(N_\varepsilon \geq 2)$. One have $\mathbb{P}(A_\varepsilon(1)) = \lambda\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_\varepsilon(2)) = O(\varepsilon^2)$. Taylor's expansion yields that for some ξ on the line segment connecting x and $X(t + \varepsilon)$,

$$(4.21) \quad \mathbb{E}_t \Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, X(t + \varepsilon)) - \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, x) - \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \right] \\ + \mathbb{E}_t \left[D_x \Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, x) (X(t + \varepsilon) - x) \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle X(t + \varepsilon) - x, D_{xx}^2 \Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, \xi) (X(t + \varepsilon) - x) \rangle \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\left(\Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, w_t^\varepsilon, x) - \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \right) I(A_\varepsilon(0)) \right] \\ + \mathbb{E}_t \left[\left(\Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, x) - \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \right) I(A_\varepsilon(1)) \right] + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ + \varepsilon \left[\mathbb{E}_t D_x \Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, x) \right] \mathbf{b}(t, w_t(t^-), x, \zeta(t, w_t), u_0) \\ + \mathbb{E}_t \left[D_x \Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, x) \int_t^{t+\varepsilon} \mathbf{b}(s, w_s(s^-), X(s), \zeta(s, \alpha_s), u_0) \right. \\ \left. - \mathbf{b}(t, w_t(t^-), x, \zeta(t, w_t), u_0) ds \right] \\ + \mathbb{E}_t \left[\left(D_x \Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, x) - \partial_x \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \right) \int_t^{t+\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(s, x) dW(s) \right] \\ + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle X(t + \varepsilon) - x, D_{xx}^2 \Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, \xi) (X(t + \varepsilon) - x) \rangle \right] \\ = \varepsilon \left[\partial^H \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) + \sum_{j=1}^m \partial_j^V \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) q_{ij} \right. \\ \left. + \langle D_x \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x), \mathbf{b}(t, w_t(t^-), x, \zeta(t, w_t), u_0) \rangle + \mathcal{A} \Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \right] + o(\varepsilon).$$

The last equality holds because $\varepsilon^{-1/2}(X_{t+\varepsilon} - X_t)$ converges weakly to a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^\top(t, x)\sigma(t, x)$, $\sup_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon^{-1/2}(X_{t+\varepsilon} - X_t)|^4 \leq L$ and $D_{xx}^2\Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, \xi)$ is bounded and converges $D_{xx}^2\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, \xi)$ almost surely. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\langle X(t + \varepsilon) - x, D_{xx}^2\Theta(\tau; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, \xi)(X(t + \varepsilon) - x) \rangle \right] \\ &= (\partial^\alpha + \mathcal{A})\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) + \langle \mathbf{b}(t, w_t(t^-), x, \zeta(t, w_t), u_0), D_x\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 4.4. Let X be the solution under strategy u^* and \bar{X} be the solution under strategy $u_0|_{[t, t+\varepsilon]} \oplus u^*(\cdot)|_{[t+\varepsilon, T]}$. Note that

$$\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x) = J(\tau; t, w_t, x; u^*(\cdot)),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J(t; t, w_t, x; u_0|_{[t, t+\varepsilon]} \oplus u^*|_{[t+\varepsilon, T]}) - J(t; t, w_t, x; u^*(\cdot)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{t, w_t, x} \left[\int_t^{t+\varepsilon} g(t; s, \alpha_s, \bar{X}(s), u_0) ds + \Theta(t; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, \bar{X}(t + \varepsilon)) \right] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}_{t, w_t, x} \left[\int_t^{t+\varepsilon} g(t; s, \alpha_s, X(s), u^*(s, \alpha_s, X(s))) ds + \Theta(t; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, X(t + \varepsilon)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, by the regularity for $\Theta(\tau; t, w_t, x)$ in Theorem 4.3 and by virtue of estimates obtained in Lemma 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[J(t; t, w_t, x; u_0|_{[t, t+\varepsilon]} \oplus u^*|_{[t+\varepsilon, T]}(\cdot)) - J(t; t, w_t, x; u^*(\cdot)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_t^{t+\varepsilon} g(t; s, \alpha_s, \bar{X}(s), u_0) - g(t; s, \alpha_s, X(s), u^*(s, \alpha_s, X(s))) ds \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\Theta(t; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, \bar{X}(t + \varepsilon)) - \Theta(t; t + \varepsilon, \alpha_{t+\varepsilon}, X(t + \varepsilon)) \right] \right] \\ &= g(t; t, w_t, x, u_0) - g(t; t, w_t, x, u^*(t, w_t, x)) \\ & \quad + \langle D_x\Theta(t; t, w_t, x), b(t, x, w_t; u_0) - b(t, x, w_t; u^*(t, w_t, x)) \rangle + o(1) \geq o(1). \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we have used the definition of

$$u^*(t, w_t, x) = \psi(t, w_t(t^-), x, D_x\Theta(t; t, w_t, x))$$

defined in (2.3). This verifies the local optimality in (4.18). \blacksquare

We remark that the local optimality (4.18) yields the optimality of u^* by dynamic programming principle if the cost functional is exponential discounting. Therefore, our result also solves the time-consistent optimal control problem with path-dependence on a switching environment. As the HJB-step is completed, we are ready to combine the HJB-step and the FP-step for our MFG problem.

5 MFGs with Switching under General Discounting Costs

In this section, we solve our main problem as stated in (2.2) corresponding to SDE (2.1). Our ultimate goal is to find a closed-loop equilibrium $u \in \mathcal{U}$ as previously mentioned. Recalling $\mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0}$ and \mathcal{T}_2 from Section 3 and Section 4 respectively, let us proceed with the definition of a closed-loop equilibrium.

Definition 5.1. Given a $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, a feedback strategy $u \in \mathcal{U}$ is called a *closed-loop equilibrium* for initial μ_0 if $u = \mathcal{T}_2 \circ \mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0}(u)$.

Our goal is to obtain the existence and uniqueness of an equilibrium strategy. It suffices to show $\mathcal{T}_2 \circ \mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0}$ is a contraction. To achieve this, we proceed with some *a priori* estimates.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds and $\zeta \in \Upsilon_{\mu_0}$ is P -continuous and P -Lipschitz. Let Θ_i be the solution of (4.3) using ζ_i for $i = 1, 2$. Then there exists a constant $\beta_5(T) > 0$ such that*

$$|D_x \Theta_1(\tau; t, w_t, x) - D_x \Theta_2(\tau; t, w_t, x)| \leq \beta_5(T) d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2).$$

Epecially, $\beta_5(T)$ is bounded if T is bounded.

Proof. Write

$$c_1 = \sup_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \tau, (w, x) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|h^{\zeta_1}(\tau, w, x) - h^{\zeta_2}(\tau, w, x)|}{d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)}.$$

Note that given a $\delta > 0$, by (4.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |D_x \Theta_1(\tau; t, w_t, x) - D_x \Theta_2(\tau; t, w_t, x)| \\ & \leq \int_{\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |(D_y + \rho(t, x; s, y))(\mathbf{h}^{\zeta_1}(\tau; \tilde{w}, y) - \mathbf{h}^{\zeta_2}(\tau; \tilde{w}, y))| \Psi(t, w_t, x; T, d\tilde{w}, y) dy \\ & \quad + \int_t^T \int_{\mathcal{M}_s \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\mathcal{H}^{\zeta_1}(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y, D_y \Theta_1(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y), D_y \Theta_1(s; s, \tilde{w}_s, y)) \\ & \quad - \mathcal{H}^{\zeta_1}(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y, D_y \Theta_2(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y), D_y \Theta_1(s; s, \tilde{w}_s, y))| \\ & \quad \times \frac{|y - x|}{s - t} \Psi(t, w_t, x; s, d\tilde{w}_s, y) dy ds \\ & \quad + \int_t^T \int_{\mathcal{M}_s \times \mathbb{R}^n} |\mathcal{H}^{\zeta_1}(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y, D_y \Theta_2(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y); D_y \Theta_1(s; s, \tilde{w}_s, y)) \\ & \quad - \mathcal{H}^{\zeta_2}(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y, D_y \Theta_2(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y), D_y \Theta_2(s; s, \tilde{w}_s, y))| \\ & \quad \times \frac{|y - x|}{s - t} \Psi(t, w_t, x; s, d\tilde{w}_s, y) dy ds \\ & \leq L \left[d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)(1 + c_1) + \int_t^T (s - t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathcal{M}_s \times \mathbb{R}^n} \left(|D_y \Theta_1(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y) - D_y \Theta_2(\tau; s, \tilde{w}_s, y)| \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + |D_y \Theta_1(s; s, \tilde{w}_s, y) - D_y \Theta_2(s; s, \tilde{w}_s, y)| + \frac{d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)|y - x|}{(s - t)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \Psi(t, w_t, x; s, d\tilde{w}_s, y) dy ds \right) \right] \\ & \leq L \left[d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)(1 + c_1) + (T - t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{\tau, r \geq T - \delta, (r, \tilde{w}_r, y) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |D_y \Theta_1(\tau; r, \tilde{w}_r, y) - D_y \Theta_2(\tau; r, \tilde{w}_r, y)| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\tau, t \geq T - \delta, (t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |D_y \Theta_1(\tau; t, \tilde{w}_t, y) - D_y \Theta_2(\tau; t, \tilde{w}_t, y)| \\ & \leq C_3(T) \left[d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)(1 + c_1) + \sqrt{\delta} \sup_{\tau, t \geq T - \delta, (t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |D_y \Theta_1(\tau; t, \tilde{w}_t, y) - D_y \Theta_2(\tau; t, \tilde{w}_t, y)| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C_3(T)$ is a constant dependent of T but independent of c_1, ζ_i . Take $\delta = C_3^{-2}(T)/2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (5.1) \quad & \sup_{\tau, t \geq T - \delta, (t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |D_x \Theta_1(\tau; t, w_t, x) - D_x \Theta_2(\tau; t, w_t, x)| \\ & \leq C_3(T)(1 + c_1)(1 - C_3(T)\sqrt{\delta})^{-1} d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2). \end{aligned}$$

Because δ is independent of c_1 and ζ_i , we can repeat the above procedure on $[T - 2\delta, T - \delta]$ using $\Theta_i(T - \delta, w_{T - \delta}, x)$ as a terminal condition. Especially, on the terminal, we have

$$|\Theta_1(\tau; T - \delta, w_{T - \delta}, x) - \Theta_2(\tau; T - \delta, w_{T - \delta}, x)| \leq C_3(T)(1 + c_1)(1 - C_3(T)\sqrt{\delta})^{-1} d_{\Upsilon}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2).$$

Write $c_2 = C_3(T)(1 + c_1)(1 - C_3(T)\sqrt{\delta})^{-1}$. Then we have a similar result to (5.1) by replacing c_1 with c_2 , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\tau, t \geq T - 2\delta, (t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |D_x \Theta_1(\tau; t, w_t, x) - D_x \Theta_2(\tau; t, w_t, x)| \\ & \leq C_3(T)(1 + c_2)(1 - C_3(T)\sqrt{\delta})^{-1} d_\Upsilon(\zeta_1, \zeta_2). \end{aligned}$$

Because the choice of δ is independent of c_i , we repeat the procedure until $t = 0$ in finite induction. Then there exists a $\beta_5(T) > 0$ such that $|D_x \Theta_1 - D_x \Theta_2| \leq \beta_5(T) d_\Upsilon(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$. The proof is complete. \blacksquare

Now, we are ready to present the main result of this paper.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds. Given $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, if*

$$(5.2) \quad L_\psi \beta_5(T) \sqrt{\beta_1(T)}, \beta_2(T) \sqrt{\beta_0(T)} < 1,$$

then $\mathcal{T}_2 \circ \mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0}$ admits a unique fixed point in \mathcal{U} , which is the closed-loop equilibrium in the form of

$$u^*(t, w_t, x) = \psi(t, w_t(t^-), x, D_x \Theta^*(t; t, w_t, x)),$$

where $\Theta^*(\tau; t, w_t, x)$, is the solution to (4.3).

Proof. For $i = 0, 1, \dots$, let $\zeta_{i+1} = \mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0}(u_i)$ and $u_{i+1} = \mathcal{T}_2(\zeta_{i+1})$. Let Θ_i be the solution to (4.3) w.r.t. ζ_i . Then $u_i(t, w_t, x) = \psi(t, w_t(t^-), x, D_x \Theta_i(t; t, w_t, x))$. By Theorem 4.3, we have

$$(5.3) \quad |D_x u_i(t, w_t, x)| \leq L(1 + |D_x^2 \Theta_i(t; t, w_t, x)|) \leq L(1 + C_2(T)).$$

By (3.3), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |u_{i+1}(t, w_t, x) - u_i(t, w_t, x)| \leq L_\psi |D_x \Theta_{i+1}(t; t, w_t, x) - D_x \Theta_i(t; t, w_t, x)| \\ & \leq L_\psi \beta_5(T) d_\Upsilon(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \leq T L_\psi \beta_5(T) \sqrt{\beta_1(T)} \sup_{(t, w_t, x) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n} |u_i(t, w_t, x) - u_{i-1}(t, w_t, x)|. \end{aligned}$$

Our assumption yields that the mapping $\mathcal{T}_2 \circ \mathcal{T}_1^{\mu_0}$ is a contraction which admits a fixed point $u^* \in \mathcal{C}^{0,0}(\mathbb{M} \times \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbb{R}^n)$. By (3.3) and Proposition 4.2, for the P-Lipschitz constant κ_{u_i} of u_i , we have

$$\kappa_{u_{i+1}} \leq \beta_2(T)(1 + \kappa_{\zeta_{i+1}}) \leq \beta_2(T)(1 + (1 + \kappa_{u_i})\sqrt{\beta_0(T)}).$$

Given $\beta_2(T)\sqrt{\beta_0(T)} < 1$, $\sup_i \kappa_{u_i} < \infty$ and therefore u^* is P-Lipschitz. Moreover, by the uniform estimate in (5.3), we have $u^* \in \mathcal{U}$, which is the closed-loop equilibrium. The proof is complete. \blacksquare

Now we have derived the existence and uniqueness of a closed-equilibrium for our MFG problems in a switching environment under general discounting costs. In our main theorem, the smallness assumption (5.2) is assumed such that the map is a contraction. As we mentioned in Remark 3.3 and Lemma 5.2, $\beta_0(T)$ and $\beta_1(T)$ are small when T is small, and $\beta_5(T)$ and $\beta_2(T)$ are bounded when T is bounded. Therefore when T is small, (5.2) holds and our results follow.

Finally, let us return to the motivational example given in the introduction. Theorem 5.3 and Proposition 4.4 lead to the following corollary directly.

Corollary 5.4. *For the motivational Example 1.1, suppose all the assumptions in Theorem 5.3 holds. Then there exists a closed-loop equilibrium $u^* \in \mathcal{U}$ which is the fixed-point of the HJB-FP method such that the following local optimality holds,*

$$(5.4) \quad \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\tilde{J}(t; t, x; \eta^{\varepsilon, u^*}, u_0|_{[t, t+\varepsilon]} \oplus u^*|_{[t+\varepsilon, T]}) - \tilde{J}(t; t, x; \eta^{\varepsilon, u^*}, u^*) \right) \leq 0$$

for any $u_0 \in U$.

Note that in the above, we used “ \leq ” because of the maximization of the profit functional in the motivational example. Different from (1.4), (5.4) only requires that the closed-loop equilibrium to be asymptotically optimal at a small time horizon $[t, t + \varepsilon)$ if all the agents follow the pre-committed closed-loop equilibrium afterward and the agent adopts the discounting factor τ as the decision time t . In fact, the new closed-loop equilibrium is also a generalization of the previous one, because (5.4) is sufficient for (1.4) by the dynamical programming principle if \tilde{J} in (1.5) is independent of τ . As can be seen, our result has extended the classical MFG theory to conditional MFGs with general discounting costs.

6 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we focused on a class of MFGs in randomly switching environments with general discounting costs. The problem has two main features, namely, path-dependence due to conditional mean-field interactions, and time-inconsistency due to general discounting costs. We studied the calculus on the path space of the Markov chain and developed a theory on path-dependent equilibrium HJB equations to overcome the difficulties brought by the two new features. Finally, we proved the existence of a unique closed-loop equilibrium for the problem of interest and verified that the closed-loop equilibrium satisfies a local Nash’s optimality instead. As a result, this paper presents a substantial extension to classical MFG theory as well as the theory of equilibrium HJB equations in a path-dependent setting (c.f., for example, [42, 30] and references therein for previous works in the literature). It is conceivable that techniques developed in this work can also be used to treat mean-field optimal control of switching diffusions. For future works, a number of problems may be considered further. One may wish to consider the Hamiltonian that is not in the separable form; one may also consider the diffusion coefficient depending on the control process. All of these deserve careful thought and further consideration.

References

- [1] BALLY, V., CARAMELLTNO, L., CONT, R., UTZET, F. and VIVES, J. (2016). *Stochastic Integration by Parts and Functional Itô Calculus*. Birkhäuser.
- [2] BARREIRO-GOMEZ, J., DUNCAN, T. E., and TEMBINE, H. (2019). Linear-quadratic mean-field-type games: jump-diffusion process with regime switching. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **64** 4329–4336.
- [3] BAYRAKTAR, E., BUDHIRAJA, A., and COHEN, A. (2018). A numerical scheme for a mean field game in some queueing systems based on Markov chain approximation method. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **56** 4017–4044.
- [4] BENSOUSSAN, A., FREHSE, J., and YAM, P. (2013). *Mean Field Games and Mean Field Type Control Theory*, SpringerBriefs in Mathematics, Springer, New York.
- [5] BENSOUSSAN, A., CHAU, M. H. M., LAI, Y., and YAM, S. C. P. (2017). Linear-quadratic mean field Stackelberg games with state and control delays. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **55** 2748–2781.
- [6] BENSOUSSAN, A., DJEHICHE, B., TEMBINE, H., and YAM, S. C. P. (2020). Mean-field-type games with jump and regime switching. *Dyn. Games Appl.* **10** 19–57.
- [7] CARDALIAGUET, P. and GRABER, P. J. (2015). Mean field games systems of first order. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* **21(3)** 690–722.
- [8] CARMONA, R. and DELARUE, F. (2018). *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications. I and II*, Springer, Cham.

- [9] COSSO, A. and RUSSO, F. (2022). Crandall–Lions viscosity solutions for path-dependent PDEs: The case of heat equation. *Bernoulli* **28**(1) 481–503.
- [10] CONT, R. and FOURNIÉ, D. A. (2013). Functional Itô calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales. *Ann. Probab.* **41** 109–133.
- [11] CONT, R. and FOURNIÉ, D. A. (2016). Functional Itô calculus and functional Kolmogorov equations. In *Stochastic integration by parts and functional Itô calculus*, 115–207, Adv. Courses Math. CRM Barcelona, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham.
- [12] COSSO, A. and RUSSO, F. (2022). Crandall-Lions viscosity solutions for path-dependent PDEs: The case of heat equation. *Bernoulli* **28** 481–503.
- [13] COSTA, O. L. V. and DUFOUR, F. (2010). Average continuous control of piecewise deterministic Markov processes. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **48** 4262–4291.
- [14] DAWSON, D. A. (1983). Critical dynamics and fluctuations for a mean-field model of cooperative behavior. *J. Statist. Phys.* **31** 29–85.
- [15] DUPIRE, B. (2009). Functional Itô Calculus. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1435551>
- [16] EKELAND, I., and LAZRAK, A. (2010). The golden rule when preferences are time inconsistent. *Mathematics and Financial Economics* **4** 29–55.
- [17] EKREN, I., TOUZI, N., and ZHANG, J. (2016). Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic path dependent PDEs: Part I. *Ann. Probab.* **44** 1212–1253.
- [18] EKREN, I., TOUZI, N., and ZHANG, J. (2016). Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic path dependent PDEs: Part II. *Ann. Probab.* **44** 2507–2553.
- [19] FRIEDMAN, A. (1964). *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- [20] GOMES, D. A. and SAÚDE, J. (2014). Mean field games models-a brief survey. *Dyn. Games Appl.* **4** 110–154.
- [21] HUANG, M., CAINES P. E., and MALHAMÉ, R. P. (2003). Individual and mass behaviour in large population stochastic wireless power control problems: centralized and Nash equilibrium solutions. In *42nd IEEE Conference on Decision Control* **1** 98–103, Maui, HI.
- [22] HUANG, M., CAINES P. E., and MALHAMÉ, R. P. (2007). Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: individual-mass behavior and decentralized ϵ -Nash equilibria. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **52** 1560–1571.
- [23] HUGGETT, M. (1993) The risk-free rate in heterogeneous-individual incomplete-insurance economies. *J. Economic Dyn. Control* **17**(5-6) 953–969.
- [24] JIAN, J., LAI, P., SONG, Q., and YE, J. (2024). The convergence rate of the equilibrium measure for the hybrid LQG mean field game. *Nonlinear Anal. Hybrid Syst.* **52** 101454.
- [25] KURTZ, T. G. (1975). Semigroups of conditioned shifts and approximation of Markov processes. *Ann. Probab.* **3** 618–642.
- [26] LASRY, J. M. and LIONS, P. L. (2006). Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **343** 619–625.

- [27] LASRY, J. M. and LIONS, P. L. (2006). Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **343** 679–684.
- [28] MAO, X. (2008). *Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications*. Horwood Publishing Limited, Chichester.
- [29] MEI, H. and YONG, J. (2019). Equilibrium strategies for time-inconsistent stochastic switching systems. *ESAIM Control, Optim. Cal. Var.* **25** 64.
- [30] MEI, H. and ZHU, C. (2020). Closed-loop equilibrium for time-inconsistent McKean-Vlasov controlled problem. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **58** 3842–3867.
- [31] MOTTE, M. and PHAM, H. (2022). Mean-field Markov decision processes with common noise and open-loop controls. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **32(2)** 1421–1458.
- [32] NGUYEN, D. H., NGUYEN, N. N., and YIN, G. (2021). Stochastic functional Kolmogorov equations I: Persistence. *Stochastic Process Appl.* **142** 319–364.
- [33] NGUYEN, D. H., NGUYEN, N. N., and YIN, G. (2021). Stochastic functional Kolmogorov equations II: Extinction. *J. Differential Equations* **294** 1–39.
- [34] NGUYEN, S. L., YIN, G., and HOANG, T. A. (2020). On laws of large numbers for systems with mean-field interactions and Markovian switching. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **130** 262–296.
- [35] NUTZ, M. (2018). A mean field game of optimal stopping. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **56** 1206–1221.
- [36] PENG, S. and WANG, F. (2016). BSDE, path-dependent PDE and nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula. *Sci. China Math.* **59** 19–36.
- [37] ŞEN, N. and CAINES, P. E. (2019). Mean field games with partial observation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **57** 2064–2091.
- [38] VILLIANI, C. (2009). *Optimal Transport: Old and New*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer.
- [39] WANG, B. C., and ZHANG, J. F. (2012). Mean field games for large-population multiagent systems with Markov jump parameters. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **50(4)** 2308–2334.
- [40] XI, F. and YIN, G. (2009). Asymptotic properties of a mean-field model with a continuous-state-dependent switching process. *J. Appl. Probab.* **46** 221–243.
- [41] YIN, G. and ZHU, C. (2009). *Hybrid Switching Diffusions: Properties and Applications*. Springer.
- [42] YONG, J. (2012). Time-inconsistent optimal control problems and the equilibrium HJB equation. *Math. Control Relat. Fields* **2** 271–329.