

Long-Time Behavior of Zero-Sum Linear-Quadratic Stochastic Differential Games

Jingrui Sun* and Jiongmin Yong†

June 5, 2024

Abstract. The paper investigates the long-time behavior of zero-sum linear-quadratic stochastic differential games, aiming to demonstrate that, under appropriate conditions, both the saddle strategy and the optimal state process exhibit the exponential turnpike property. Namely, for the majority of the time horizon, the distributions of the saddle strategy and the optimal state process closely stay near certain (time-invariant) distributions ν_1^* , ν_2^* and μ^* , respectively. Additionally, as a byproduct, we solve the infinite horizon version of the differential game and derive closed-loop representations for its open-loop saddle strategy, which has not been proved in the literature.

Key words. Stochastic differential game, zero-sum, linear-quadratic, saddle strategy, turnpike property, Riccati equation.

AMS 2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 91A05, 91A15, 49N10, 49N70.

1 Introduction

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions. Suppose that a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion $W = \{W(t); t \geq 0\}$ is defined on this space with $\mathbb{F} \equiv \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ being its natural filtration augmented by all the \mathbb{P} -null sets in \mathcal{F} . Consider the controlled linear stochastic differential equation (SDE, for short)

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = [AX(t) + B_1u_1(t) + B_2u_2(t) + b]dt \\ \quad + [CX(t) + D_1u_1(t) + D_2u_2(t) + \sigma]dW(t), & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ X(0) = x \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

and the quadratic performance functional

$$J_T(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1^\top & S_2^\top \\ S_1 & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2 & R_{21} & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle + 2 \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} q \\ r_1 \\ r_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right] dt, \quad (1.2)$$

where in state equation (1.1), the coefficients

$$A, C, \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad B_i, D_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_i}, \quad b, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

are constant matrices/vectors, and in cost functional (1.2), the weighting coefficients

$$Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}, \quad R_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times m_j}, \quad q \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad r_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}, \quad (i, j = 1, 2)$$

*Department of Mathematics and SUSTech International Center for Mathematics, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518055, China (Email: sunjr@sustech.edu.cn). This author is supported in part by NSFC grants 12322118 and 12271242, and Shenzhen Fundamental Research General Program JCYJ20220530112814032.

†Department of Mathematics, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32816, USA (Email: jiongmin.yong@ucf.edu). This author is supported in part by NSF grant DMS-2305475.

are also constant matrices, with the square block matrix in (1.2) being symmetric. The superscript \top in (1.2) denotes the transpose of matrices, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ stands for the usual Euclidean inner product of vectors (whose induced norm is denoted by $|\cdot|$). For simplicity of notation, we write $\varphi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{F}$ if a process $\varphi(\cdot)$ is \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable. Let

$$\mathcal{U}_i[0, T] \triangleq \left\{ \varphi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \mid \varphi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{F} \text{ and } \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\varphi(t)|^2 dt < \infty \right\}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (1.3)$$

It is clear that for each initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and control pair $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, T] \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, T] \equiv \mathcal{U}[0, T]$, the state equation (1.1) admits a unique square-integrable solution $X(\cdot) \equiv X(\cdot; x, u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$. Thus, the corresponding cost functional (1.2) is well-defined. The *zero-sum linear-quadratic (LQ, for short) stochastic differential game* over the finite time horizon $[0, T]$ can be stated as follows.

Problem (DG) $_T$. For any initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, find a pair $(\bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, T] \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, T]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(x; \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) &\leq J_T(x; \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot)) \equiv V_T(x) \leq J_T(x; u_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot)), \\ &\forall (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, T] \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

From the above, we see that Player 1 is the minimizer (by taking $u_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, T]$) and Player 2 is the maximizer (by taking $u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_2[0, T]$). The pair $(\bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ (if it exists) is called an *open-loop saddle strategy* of Problem (DG) $_T$ at the initial state x , $\bar{X}_T(\cdot)$ is called the corresponding *open-loop optimal state process*, and $V_T(\cdot)$ is called the *value function* of the game. We also refer to $(\bar{X}_T(\cdot), \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ as an *open-loop optimal triple* at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. When such a triple exists for every initial state x , we say that Problem (DG) $_T$ is *open-loop solvable*. In the case that b, σ, q, r_1, r_2 all vanish, we denote the corresponding game by Problem (DG) $_T^0$ and call it a *homogenous differential game* on $[0, T]$. The performance functional and value function of Problem (DG) $_T^0$ are denoted by $J_T^0(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ and $V_T^0(\cdot)$, respectively.

It is clear that in the above, the open-loop saddle strategy (if it exists) is seemingly anticipating. Namely, in determining the value $(\bar{u}_{1,T}(t), \bar{u}_{2,T}(t))$ of $(\bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ at $t \in [0, T]$, some future information on the triple $(\bar{X}_T(s), \bar{u}_{1,T}(s), \bar{u}_{2,T}(s))$ for $s \in [t, T]$ will be used. This can be seen, at least, from the optimality conditions. Thus, from this point of view, the above open-loop saddle strategy is not practically realizable. To get practical feasibility, one could introduce the set of state-feedback controls. For any $(\Theta_i(\cdot), v_i(\cdot)) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}) \times \mathcal{U}_i[0, T]$, ($i = 1, 2$), the closed-loop system reads:

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = \{[A + B_1\Theta_1(t) + B_2\Theta_2(t)]X(t) + [B_1v_1(t) + B_2v_2(t) + b]\}dt \\ \quad + \{[C + D_1\Theta_1(t) + D_2\Theta_2(t)]X(t) + [D_1v_1(t) + D_2v_2(t) + \sigma]\}dW(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ X(0) = x. \end{cases}$$

Correspondingly, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(x; (\Theta_1(\cdot), v_1(\cdot)), (\Theta_2(\cdot), v_2(\cdot))) &\triangleq J_T(x; \Theta_1(\cdot)X(\cdot) + v_1(\cdot), \Theta_2(\cdot)X(\cdot) + v_2(\cdot)) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1^\top & S_2^\top \\ S_1 & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2 & R_{21} & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ \Theta_1(t)X(t) + v_1(t) \\ \Theta_2(t)X(t) + v_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ \Theta_1(t)X(t) + v_1(t) \\ \Theta_2(t)X(t) + v_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} q \\ r_1 \\ r_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ \Theta_1(t)X(t) + v_1(t) \\ \Theta_2(t)X(t) + v_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

The above amounts to saying that the controls take the following forms:

$$u_i(t) = \Theta_i(t)X(t) + v_i(t), \quad t \in [0, T]; \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Clearly, the above controls are anti-participating, meaning they do not rely on future information. Consequently, they are practically feasible, in principle. Now, a four-tuple $(\bar{\Theta}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{v}_{1,T}(\cdot); \bar{\Theta}_{2,T}(\cdot), \bar{v}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ is called a *closed-loop saddle strategy* of Problem $(DG)_T$, if for any initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $(\Theta_i(\cdot), v_i(\cdot)) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}) \times \mathcal{U}_i[0, T]$; $i = 1, 2$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(x; (\bar{\Theta}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{v}_{1,T}(\cdot)), (\Theta_{2,T}(\cdot), v_{2,T}(\cdot))) &\leq J_T(x; (\bar{\Theta}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{v}_{1,T}(\cdot)), (\bar{\Theta}_{2,T}(\cdot), \bar{v}_{2,T}(\cdot))) \\ &\leq J_T(x; (\Theta_1(\cdot), v_1(\cdot)), (\bar{\Theta}_{2,T}(\cdot), \bar{v}_{2,T}(\cdot))). \end{aligned}$$

Recently, extensive research has been conducted on LQ stochastic differential games and their various extensions in the literature. In [15], Mou–Yong approached Problem $(DG)_T$ from an open-loop perspective using the Hilbert space method. Sun–Yong [22] characterized open-loop and closed-loop saddle strategies for Problem $(DG)_T$ and established their certain properties. Subsequently, Sun [20] furthered the study of Problem $(DG)_T$, revealing fundamental properties of this class of games and illustrating differences between stochastic and deterministic cases. Bardi–Priuli [1] delved into ergodic nonzero-sum LQ stochastic differential games with N players, while Duncan [7] investigated a class of zero-sum LQ stochastic differential games with the noise process being an arbitrary square-integrable stochastic process with continuous sample paths. Sun–Yong–Zhang [27] tackled the infinite horizon version of Problem $(DG)_T$, followed by additional work of Li–Shi–Yong [11] incorporating mean-field terms. Moon [13, 14] explored LQ stochastic leader-follower Stackelberg differential games for jump-diffusion and Markov jump-diffusion systems. Yu–Zhang–Zhang [31] extended the framework of Problem $(DG)_T$ to include Poisson jumps. Additionally, numerous other works on LQ differential games exist, including [9, 10] on nonzero-sum LQ games and [2, 4] on mean-field LQ games for large-population systems.

In this paper, we will assume certain conditions that guarantee that for any given time horizon $[0, T]$, $u_1(\cdot) \mapsto J_T(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ is uniformly convex and $u_2(\cdot) \mapsto J_T(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ is uniformly concave. In this case, it is known the following facts: (i) For any given initial state, Problem $(DG)_T$ admits a unique open-loop saddle strategy; (ii) Problem $(DG)_T$ admits a unique closed-loop saddle strategy, determined by the solution to the corresponding differential Riccati equation, and a terminal value problem of ordinary differential equation (ODE, for short); (iii) The outcome of the closed-loop saddle strategy corresponding to an initial state is the open-loop saddle strategy (for that given initial state); and (iv) For a given initial state, the open-loop saddle strategy admits a unique closed-loop representation, and it coincides with the outcome of the closed-loop saddle strategy corresponding to that initial state. See Sun–Yong [24] for details.

From the above-mentioned facts, we see that for the open-loop saddle strategy at any initial state, one has its closed-loop representation, or regarded it as the outcome of the closed-loop saddle strategy (corresponding to the initial state). Thus, the open-loop saddle strategy can always be thought of initial state dependent and time anti-participating.

In this paper, we are going to investigate the asymptotic behavior of Problem $(DG)_T$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. It turns out that under appropriate conditions, the optimal triple of Problem $(DG)_T$ exhibits the so-called *exponential turnpike property*. Specifically, let $(\bar{X}_T(\cdot), \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ be the optimal triple of Problem $(DG)_T$ for the initial state x , with $\mu_T(t; x)$, $\nu_{1,T}(t; x)$, and $\nu_{2,T}(t; x)$ representing the corresponding distributions of $\bar{X}_T(t)$, $\bar{u}_{1,T}(t)$, and $\bar{u}_{2,T}(t)$, respectively. The exponential turnpike property asserts the existence of unique probability distributions μ^* , ν_1^* , and ν_2^* (on \mathbb{R}^m , \mathbb{R}^{m_1} , and \mathbb{R}^{m_2} , respectively), independent of x and T , such that for some constants $K, \lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &d(\mu_T(t; x), \mu^*) + d(\nu_{1,T}(t; x), \nu_1^*) + d(\nu_{2,T}(t; x), \nu_2^*) \\ &\leq K(|x|^2 + 1) \left[e^{-\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where d is the Wasserstein distance on the set of distributions (see later for a definition). We have misused the notation a little here, since the random variables could be valued in the space of different dimensions, which can be identified from the context. In what follows, $K, \lambda > 0$ are generic constants which could be different from line to line.

Let $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ be an arbitrary number. Then inequality (1.4) implies that

$$d(\mu_T(t; x), \mu^*) + d(\nu_{1,T}(t; x), \nu_1^*) + d(\nu_{2,T}(t; x), \nu_2^*) \leq 2K(|x|^2 + 1)e^{-\lambda\kappa T}, \quad \forall t \in [\kappa T, (1 - \kappa)T].$$

Since K and λ are independent of T , when the time horizon $[0, T]$ is very large, the distributions of the optimal triple $(\bar{X}_T(\cdot), \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ remain very close to the time-invariant and x -independent distributions μ^* , ν_1^* , and ν_2^* , respectively, for most of $[0, T]$. Consequently, we could use μ^* as the initial distribution of the state equation and (ν_1^*, ν_2^*) as the law of the control processes of the players to approximately solve Problem $(DG)_T$. Additionally, we will show that the invariant distribution μ^* is determined by a stable SDE, or it can be constructed by solving a stationary Fokker-Planck equation, according to the classical theory of SDEs, and ν_1^* and ν_2^* are determined by μ^* .

The turnpike property, initially realized by Ramsey [18] and von Neumann [16] in the early part of the last century, originated from the study of optimal solutions to dynamic optimization problems with an infinite time horizon in the context of economic growth. The term ‘‘turnpike’’ was coined by Dorfman, Samuelson, and Solow [6] in 1958, inspired by a similar feature observed in toll highways in the United States. In recent years, significant progress has been made in addressing deterministic optimal control problems, as evidenced by studies such as [17, 5, 29, 32, 28, 8, 12, 3, 19] and the references cited therein. However, in the realm of stochastic optimal control problems, the investigation of corresponding turnpike properties is relatively nascent. To the best of our knowledge, the work of [21] marked the first attempt to uncover such properties for LQ stochastic optimal control problems, followed by a more comprehensive and generalized study presented in [25].

As previously mentioned, this paper aims to investigate the turnpike property for zero-sum LQ stochastic differential games. In this context, the primary contributions and challenges of our paper can be summarized as follows:

(i) Establishing the turnpike property requires analyzing the behavior of the solution $P_T(t)$ to the associated differential Riccati equation as the time horizon T tends to infinity. In the optimal control case [21, 25], under the stabilizability condition of the state equation over $[0, \infty)$, positive definiteness conditions are imposed on the weighting coefficients of the performance functional, which implies the monotonicity of $T \mapsto P_T(t)$. Now, such a monotonicity is lost due to the opposing roles played by the weighting coefficients for the two players. This poses significant challenges, and we have to seek a different approach.

(ii) The exponential turnpike property (1.4) is established for the zero-sum LQ stochastic differential game in the distributional sense. Since in reality people primarily care about the distributions of stochastic processes, this result suggests that we may use (ν_1^*, ν_2^*) as an approximate solution to Problem $(DG)_T$, which is more convenient since it is independent of time and the initial state. Thus, our result offers more potential applications in practical settings.

(iii) As a byproduct and an intermediate step in the analysis of the turnpike property for Problem $(DG)_T$, we solve the infinite horizon version of Problem $(DG)_T^0$, denoted by Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$, under the stability condition. We prove that the associated algebraic Riccati equation is uniquely solvable, under our assumed conditions, ensuring that Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$ is both open-loop and closed-loop solvable, and that the open-loop saddle strategy admits a closed-loop representation. Recall that in [27] (see also [24]), it was only proved the equivalence of closed-loop solvability and the algebraic Riccati equation’s solvability. No sufficient conditions were given for the closed-loop solvability of Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we introduce some frequently used notation and present some preliminary results. Problem $(DG)_\infty^o$ is introduced in [Section 3](#), together with some fundamental analysis on the problem. In [Section 4](#), we investigate the asymptotic behavior of the solution $P_T(\cdot)$ to the differential Riccati equation associated with Problem $(DG)_T$. Finally, we establish the exponential turnpike property for Problem $(DG)_T$ in [Section 5](#).

2 Preliminaries

We start by introducing some frequently used notation. Let $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be the space of $n \times m$ real matrices equipped with the Frobenius inner product. Denote by \mathbb{S}^n the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ consisting of symmetric matrices and by \mathbb{S}_+^n the subset of \mathbb{S}^n consisting of positive definite matrices. For \mathbb{S}^n -valued functions $M(\cdot)$ and $N(\cdot)$, we write $M(\cdot) \geq N(\cdot)$ (respectively, $M(\cdot) > N(\cdot)$) if $M(\cdot) - N(\cdot)$ is positive semidefinite (respectively, positive definite) almost everywhere with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The identity matrix of size n is denoted by I_n (or simply I when no confusion arises), and a vector is always considered as a column vector unless otherwise specified. For a Euclidian space \mathbb{H} (which could be \mathbb{R}^n , $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, etc.), we define (recalling that $\varphi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{F}$ means that the process $\varphi(\cdot)$ is progressively measurable with respect to \mathbb{F})

$$\begin{aligned} C([0, T]; \mathbb{H}) &\triangleq \left\{ \varphi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{H} \mid \varphi \text{ is continuous} \right\}, \\ L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{H}) &\triangleq \left\{ \varphi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{H} \mid \varphi \text{ is Lebesgue measurable and essentially bounded} \right\}, \\ L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{H}) &\triangleq \left\{ \xi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{H} \mid \xi \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_T\text{-measurable and } \mathbb{E}|\xi|^2 < \infty \right\}, \\ L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{H}) &\triangleq \left\{ \varphi : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{H} \mid \varphi(\cdot) \in \mathbb{F} \text{ and } \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\varphi(t)|^2 dt < \infty \right\}, \\ L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, \infty; \mathbb{H}) &\triangleq \left\{ \varphi : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{H} \mid \varphi \in \mathbb{F} \text{ and } \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty |\varphi(t)|^2 dt < \infty \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we will denote $m = m_1 + m_2$, and

$$B = (B_1, B_2), \quad D = (D_1, D_2), \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ R_{21} & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad r = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.1)$$

Also, we let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the inner product in various spaces which can be identified from the context. Next, we introduce the following hypothesis.

(A1) There exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that for every $T > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} J_T^o(0; u_1(\cdot), 0) \geq \delta \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |u_1(t)|^2 dt, & \forall u_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, T], \\ J_T^o(0; 0, u_2(\cdot)) \leq -\delta \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |u_2(t)|^2 dt, & \forall u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_2[0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

For convenience, we refer to [\(2.2\)](#) as the *uniform convexity/concavity condition*. The following result essentially is taken from [\[20\]](#) and [\[24\]](#).

Theorem 2.1. *Let (A1) hold. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *For any initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, Problem $(DG)_T$ has a unique open-loop saddle strategy.*
- (ii) *Let $\bar{u}_T(\cdot) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot) \\ \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, T] \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, T]$. Let $\bar{X}_T(\cdot)$ be the corresponding state process with initial state x and $(\bar{Y}_T(\cdot), \bar{Z}_T(\cdot))$ the adapted solution to the following backward stochastic*

differential equation (BSDE, for short):

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{Y}_T(t) = -[A^\top \bar{Y}_T(t) + C^\top \bar{Z}_T(t) + Q\bar{X}_T(t) + S^\top \bar{u}_T(t) + q]dt + \bar{Z}_T(t)dW(t), \\ \bar{Y}_T(T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Then $(\bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ is the unique open-loop saddle strategy of Problem $(DG)_T$ for x if and only if the following stationarity condition holds:

$$B^\top \bar{Y}_T(t) + D^\top \bar{Z}_T(t) + S\bar{X}_T(t) + R\bar{u}_T(t) + r = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.4)$$

(iii) Problem $(DG)_T$ has a unique closed-loop saddle strategy $(\bar{\Theta}_T(\cdot), \bar{v}_T(\cdot))$.

(iv) The following differential Riccati equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{P}_T + P_TA + A^\top P_T + C^\top P_TC + Q \\ \quad - (P_TB + C^\top P_TD + S^\top)(R + D^\top P_TD)^{-1}(B^\top P_T + D^\top P_TC + S) = 0, \\ P_T(T) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

admits a unique strongly regular solution $P_T(\cdot) \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{S}^n)$, which means that for some constant $\alpha > 0$,

$$(-1)^{i+1}[R_{ii} + D_i^\top P_T(t)D_i] \geq \alpha I, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]; \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (2.6)$$

(implicitly implying the invertibility of the matrix $R + D^\top P_T(t)D$) and that (2.5) holds.

(v) Let $P_T(\cdot) \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{S}^n)$ be the strongly regular solution of (2.5) and set

$$\bar{\Theta}_T(t) \triangleq -[R + D^\top P_T(t)D]^{-1}[B^\top P_T(t) + D^\top P_T(t)C + S], \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.7)$$

The following terminal value problem of an ODE admits a unique solution $\varphi_T(\cdot)$:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\varphi}_T(t) + [A + B\bar{\Theta}_T(t)]^\top \varphi_T(t) + [C + D\bar{\Theta}_T(t)]^\top P_T(t)\sigma + \bar{\Theta}_T(t)^\top r + P_T(t)b + q = 0, \\ \varphi_T(T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

If we set

$$\bar{v}_T(t) \triangleq -[R + D^\top P_T(t)D]^{-1}[B^\top \varphi_T(t) + D^\top P_T(t)\sigma + r], \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.9)$$

then the unique closed-loop saddle strategy of Problem $(DG)_T$ is given by $(\bar{\Theta}_T(\cdot), \bar{v}_T(\cdot))$.

(vi) For any initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\bar{X}_T(\cdot)$ be the solution of the state equation (1.1) under the state feedback

$$\bar{u}_T(t) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_{1,T}(t) \\ \bar{u}_{2,T}(t) \end{pmatrix} \triangleq \bar{\Theta}_T(t)\bar{X}_T(t) + \bar{v}_T(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

which is called the outcome of $(\bar{\Theta}_T(\cdot), \bar{v}_T(\cdot))$ corresponding to x . Then $\bar{u}_T(\cdot)$ is the open-loop saddle strategy Problem $(DG)_T$ for x .

3 The Infinite Horizon Problem

In establishing the turnpike property for Problem $(DG)_T$, a crucial step is to demonstrate the exponential convergence of the solution $P_T(\cdot)$ to the differential Riccati equation (2.5) as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Note that in the current case, as mentioned in the introduction, we do not have the monotonicity of $T \mapsto P_T(\cdot)$. Thus, the approach used for optimal control problems like in [21] and [25] do not apply. To tackle this challenge, we need to carefully investigate Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$, and conduct some fundamental analysis, making full use of the structure of the problem. We now carry out this.

Consider the following state equation, i.e., (1.1) with $b = \sigma = 0$, and $T = \infty$:

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = [AX(t) + B_1 u_1(t) + B_2 u_2(t)]dt + [CX(t) + D_1 u_1(t) + D_2 u_2(t)]dW(t), & t \geq 0, \\ X(0) = x \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

and the following quadratic performance functional over $[0, \infty)$, i.e., in (1.2), $r = 0$ and $q = 0$:

$$J_\infty^0(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1^\top & S_2^\top \\ S_1 & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2 & R_{21} & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt. \quad (3.2)$$

Similar to (1.3), we can define $\mathcal{U}_i[0, \infty)$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\mathcal{U}[0, \infty) \triangleq \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty)$. We call a control pair

$$(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty),$$

admissible for the initial state x if the corresponding state process $X(\cdot; x, u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ is square-integrable over $[0, \infty)$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty |X(t; x, u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))|^2 dt < \infty.$$

Clearly, the performance functional (3.2) is well-defined for such control pairs. We denote the set of admissible control pairs for the initial state x by $\mathcal{U}_{ad}(x)$.

In general, $\mathcal{U}_{ad}(x)$ depends on the initial state x and is only a subset of $\mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty)$. However, it can be shown that

$$\mathcal{U}_{ad}(x) = \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (3.3)$$

under the L^2 -stability condition, which we now recall.

Definition 3.1. The system

$$dX(t) = AX(t)dt + CX(t)dW(t),$$

denoted by $[A, C]$, is called L^2 -stable if its solution $X(\cdot; x)$ with initial state x satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty |X(t; x)|^2 dt < \infty, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (3.4)$$

We now present the following result, from which it is not difficult to see that (3.3) holds when the system $[A, C]$ is L^2 -stable.

Proposition 3.2. Suppose that $[A, C]$ is L^2 -stable. Then there exist constants $K, \lambda > 0$ such that for any $b(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the solution $X(\cdot) \equiv X(\cdot; x)$ to the SDE

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = [AX(t) + b(t)]dt + [CX(t) + \sigma(t)]dW(t), & t \geq 0, \\ X(0) = x \end{cases}$$

satisfies the following estimates:

$$\mathbb{E}|X(t)|^2 \leq K \left[e^{-\lambda t} |x|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (|b(s)|^2 + |\sigma(s)|^2) ds \right], \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^t |X(s)|^2 ds \leq K \left[|x|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t (|b(s)|^2 + |\sigma(s)|^2) ds \right], \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Since $[A, C]$ is L^2 -stable, by [23, Theorem 3.2.3], there exists a positive definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$ such that

$$PA + A^\top P + C^\top PC + 2I_n = 0.$$

Applying Itô's rule to $t \mapsto \langle PX(t), X(t) \rangle$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \langle PX(t), X(t) \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \left[\langle (PA + A^\top P + C^\top PC)X(t), X(t) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \langle Pb(t) + C^\top P\sigma(t), X(t) \rangle + \langle P\sigma(t), \sigma(t) \rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[-2|X(t)|^2 + 2 \langle Pb(t) + C^\top P\sigma(t), X(t) \rangle + \langle P\sigma(t), \sigma(t) \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\gamma > 0$ be the largest eigenvalue of P and set

$$\lambda \triangleq \gamma^{-1}, \quad \alpha(t) \triangleq Pb(t) + C^\top P\sigma(t), \quad \beta(t) \triangleq \langle P\sigma(t), \sigma(t) \rangle; \quad t \geq 0.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} -|X(t)|^2 &\leq -\lambda \langle PX(t), X(t) \rangle, \\ 2 \langle Pb(t) + C^\top P\sigma(t), X(t) \rangle &\leq |X(t)|^2 + |\alpha(t)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \langle PX(t), X(t) \rangle &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[-|X(t)|^2 + |\alpha(t)|^2 + \beta(t) \right] \\ &\leq -\lambda \mathbb{E} \langle PX(t), X(t) \rangle + \mathbb{E} [|\alpha(t)|^2 + \beta(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality in differential form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle PX(t), X(t) \rangle &\leq \langle Px, x \rangle e^{-\lambda t} + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \mathbb{E} [|\alpha(s)|^2 + \beta(s)] ds \\ &\leq |P| e^{-\lambda t} |x|^2 + K \mathbb{E} \int_0^t [|b(s)|^2 + |\sigma(s)|^2] ds, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \langle PX(s), X(s) \rangle ds &\leq |P| |x|^2 \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} ds + K \int_0^t \int_0^s e^{-\lambda(s-r)} \mathbb{E} [|b(r)|^2 + |\sigma(r)|^2] dr ds \\ &\leq K \left(|x|^2 + \mathbb{E} \int_0^t [|b(s)|^2 + |\sigma(s)|^2] ds \right), \quad \forall t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $P > 0$, the desired estimates can be readily obtained. \blacksquare

As a consequence of Proposition 3.2, the following result provides an equivalent statement for the L^2 -stability, commonly referred to as the *mean-square exponential stability* of $[A, C]$.

Corollary 3.3. *System $[A, C]$ is L^2 -stable if and only if there exist constants $K, \lambda > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} |X(t; x)|^2 \leq K e^{-\lambda t} |x|^2, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. Clearly, (3.7) implies (3.4). On the other hand, if $[A, C]$ is L^2 -stable, applying (3.5) to the case $b(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot) = 0$ yields the mean-square exponential stability of $[A, C]$. \blacksquare

In our game setting over the interval $[0, \infty)$, the performance functional needs to be well-defined, which is essential for ensuring the well-formulation of Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$, and exhibit uniform convexity in $u_1(\cdot)$ and uniform concavity in $u_2(\cdot)$, which, corresponds to (A1), guarantees the existence of a unique open-loop saddle strategy. In order to satisfy the former condition, any

admissible control pair must consist of two parts: The first part is to cooperatively stabilize the state equation (assuming the homogeneous state equation is stabilizable). The second part involves choosing suitable controls from $\mathcal{U}_i[0, \infty)$ to achieve the goal of minimization/maximization. To avoid additional technicalities, we directly assume that the state system is stable to ensure that the performance functional is well-defined over $\mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty)$, rather than requiring stabilizability as assumed in the optimal control case. Therefore, we introduce the following hypothesis.

(A2) System $[A, C]$ is L^2 -stable.

Similar to the finite horizon case, we introduce the notion of open-loop saddle strategy for Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$.

Definition 3.4. A control pair $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty)$ is called an *open-loop saddle strategy* of Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$ for the initial state x if

$$\begin{aligned} J(x; \bar{u}_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) &\leq J(x; \bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \leq J(x; u_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)), \\ \forall (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) &\in \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

To establish the uniqueness and existence of an open-loop saddle strategy for Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$, let us consider, for $i = 1, 2$, the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dX_i(t) = [AX_i(t) + B_i u_i(t)]dt + [CX_i(t) + D_i u_i(t)]dW(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ X_i(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

Since $[A, C]$ is L^2 -stable, by [Proposition 3.2](#), there exists a constant $K > 0$, independent of T , such that the solution $X_i(\cdot)$ of (3.8) satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |X_i(t)|^2 dt \leq K \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |u_i(t)|^2 dt, \quad \forall u_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i[0, T], \quad \forall T > 0. \quad (3.9)$$

By the linearity of (3.8), the linear operators

$$\mathcal{L}_{i,T} : \mathcal{U}_i[0, T] \rightarrow L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i,T} : \mathcal{U}_i[0, T] \rightarrow L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n); \quad i = 1, 2,$$

defined by

$$[\mathcal{L}_{i,T} u_i](\cdot) \triangleq X_i(\cdot), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{i,T} u_i \triangleq X_i(T); \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (3.10)$$

where $X_i(\cdot)$ is the solution of (3.8) corresponding to $u_i(\cdot)$, are bounded uniformly in T . Similarly, the linear operators

$$\mathcal{N}_T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{N}}_T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$$

defined by

$$[\mathcal{N}_T x](\cdot) \triangleq X_0(\cdot), \quad \widehat{\mathcal{N}}_T x \triangleq X_0(T),$$

where $X_0(\cdot)$ is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} dX_0(t) = AX_0(t)dt + CX_0(t)dW(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ X_0(0) = x, \end{cases}$$

are also bounded, uniformly in T . Further, it is easily seen that the solution of

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = [AX(t) + B_1 u_1(t) + B_2 u_2(t)]dt + [CX(t) + D_1 u_1(t) + D_2 u_2(t)]dW(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ X(0) = x \end{cases}$$

can be decomposed into

$$X(\cdot) = X_0(\cdot) + X_1(\cdot) + X_2(\cdot) = [\mathcal{N}_T x](\cdot) + [\mathcal{L}_{1,T} u_1](\cdot) + [\mathcal{L}_{2,T} u_2](\cdot),$$

and in particular,

$$X(T) = X_0(T) + X_1(T) + X_2(T) = \widehat{\mathcal{N}}_T x + \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,T} u_1 + \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{2,T} u_2.$$

Denote by \mathcal{A}^* the adjoint operator of a linear operator \mathcal{A} . Then the performance functional

$$J_T^0(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1^\top & S_2^\top \\ S_1 & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2 & R_{21} & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt$$

can be represented as follows:

$$J_T^0(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) = \langle \mathcal{M}_T u, u \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{K}_T x, u \rangle + \langle \mathcal{O}_T x, x \rangle, \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_T \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{11,T} & \mathcal{M}_{12,T} \\ \mathcal{M}_{21,T} & \mathcal{M}_{22,T} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{K}_T \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}_{1,T} \\ \mathcal{K}_{2,T} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{O}_T \triangleq \mathcal{N}_T^* Q \mathcal{N}_T, \quad u(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} u_1(\cdot) \\ u_2(\cdot) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.12)$$

with

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij,T} \triangleq R_{ij} + S_i \mathcal{L}_{j,T} + \mathcal{L}_{j,T}^* S_i^\top + \mathcal{L}_{i,T}^* Q \mathcal{L}_{j,T}; \quad i, j = 1, 2, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{i,T} \triangleq \mathcal{L}_{i,T}^* Q \mathcal{N}_T + S_i \mathcal{N}_T; \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (3.14)$$

Note that the linear operators

$$\mathcal{M}_T : \mathcal{U}[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}[0, \infty), \quad \mathcal{K}_T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}[0, \infty), \quad \mathcal{O}_T \in \mathbb{S}^n$$

are all bounded uniformly in T , and \mathcal{M}_T is self-adjoint.

Similar to the previous discussion, replacing the interval $[0, T]$ by $[0, \infty)$, we can derive a similar operator representation for the performance functional (3.2):

$$J_\infty^0(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) = \langle \mathcal{M} u, u \rangle + 2\langle \mathcal{K} x, u \rangle + \langle \mathcal{O} x, x \rangle, \quad (3.15)$$

where $\mathcal{O} \in \mathbb{S}^n$, and the linear operators

$$\mathcal{M} \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{11} & \mathcal{M}_{12} \\ \mathcal{M}_{21} & \mathcal{M}_{22} \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{U}[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}[0, \infty), \quad \mathcal{K} \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}_1 \\ \mathcal{K}_2 \end{pmatrix} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}[0, \infty)$$

are bounded with \mathcal{M} being self-adjoint.

Observe that condition (A1) is equivalent to the uniform positivity of $\mathcal{M}_{11,T}$ and $-\mathcal{M}_{22,T}$, meaning there exists a constant $\delta > 0$, independent of T , such that

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_{11,T} u_1, u_1 \rangle \geq \delta \|u_1(\cdot)\|^2, \quad \langle \mathcal{M}_{22,T} u_2, u_2 \rangle \leq -\delta \|u_2(\cdot)\|^2$$

for all $u_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i[0, T]$; $i = 1, 2$. Furthermore, condition (A1) implies that

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_{11} u_1, u_1 \rangle \geq \delta \|u_1(\cdot)\|^2, \quad \langle \mathcal{M}_{22} u_2, u_2 \rangle \leq -\delta \|u_2(\cdot)\|^2$$

for all $u_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_i[0, \infty)$; $i = 1, 2$.

With the functional representation (3.15) and the above analysis, we derive the following uniqueness and existence result.

Theorem 3.5. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Then for each initial state x , Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$ has a unique open-loop saddle strategy. Moreover, a control pair $\bar{u}(\cdot) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_1(\cdot) \\ \bar{u}_2(\cdot) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty)$ is the saddle strategy if and only if*

$$B^\top \bar{Y}(t) + D^\top \bar{Z}(t) + S\bar{X}(t) + R\bar{u}(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, \infty), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (3.16)$$

where $(\bar{Y}(\cdot), \bar{Z}(\cdot))$ is the L^2 -stable adapted solution¹ to the following linear BSDE over $[0, \infty)$:

$$d\bar{Y}(t) = -[A^\top \bar{Y}(t) + C^\top \bar{Z}(t) + Q\bar{X}(t) + S^\top \bar{u}(t)] dt + \bar{Z}(t) dW(t), \quad (3.17)$$

where $\bar{X}(\cdot)$ is the state process in (3.1) corresponding to $\bar{u}(\cdot)$.

Proof. By definition, a pair $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is an open-loop saddle strategy if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} J_\infty^0(x; \bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot) + \varepsilon v_2(\cdot)) &\leq J_\infty^0(x; \bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \leq J_\infty^0(x; \bar{u}_1(\cdot) + \varepsilon v_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)), \\ \forall \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall (v_1(\cdot), v_2(\cdot)) &\in \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty) \times \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

The operator representation (3.15) of the performance functional (3.2) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} J_\infty^0(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) &= \langle \mathcal{M}_{11}u_1, u_1 \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}_{22}u_2, u_2 \rangle + 2\langle u_1, \mathcal{M}_{12}u_2 \rangle \\ &\quad + 2\langle u_1, \mathcal{K}_1x \rangle + 2\langle u_2, \mathcal{K}_2x \rangle + \langle \mathcal{O}x, x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In terms of this representation, (3.18) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \varepsilon^2 \langle \mathcal{M}_{11}v_1, v_1 \rangle + 2\varepsilon \langle v_1, \mathcal{M}_{11}\bar{u}_1 + \mathcal{M}_{12}\bar{u}_2 + \mathcal{K}_1x \rangle \geq 0, & \forall \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall v_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty); \\ \varepsilon^2 \langle \mathcal{M}_{22}v_2, v_2 \rangle + 2\varepsilon \langle v_2, \mathcal{M}_{22}\bar{u}_2 + \mathcal{M}_{21}\bar{u}_1 + \mathcal{K}_2x \rangle \leq 0, & \forall \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall v_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty). \end{cases}$$

The above is in turn equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{M}_{11}\bar{u}_1 + \mathcal{M}_{12}\bar{u}_2 + \mathcal{K}_1x = 0, \\ \mathcal{M}_{22}\bar{u}_2 + \mathcal{M}_{21}\bar{u}_1 + \mathcal{K}_2x = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

since for any $v_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, \infty)$ and any $v_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_2[0, \infty)$,

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_{11}v_1, v_1 \rangle \geq 0, \quad \langle \mathcal{M}_{22}v_2, v_2 \rangle \leq 0.$$

Note that the operator \mathcal{M} is invertible, with the inverse \mathcal{M}^{-1} given by

$$\mathcal{M}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{11}^{-1} + [\mathcal{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{M}_{12}]\Phi^{-1}[\mathcal{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{M}_{12}]^* & -[\mathcal{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{M}_{12}]\Phi^{-1} \\ -\Phi^{-1}[\mathcal{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{M}_{12}]^* & \Phi^{-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Phi \triangleq \mathcal{M}_{22} - \mathcal{M}_{21}\mathcal{M}_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{M}_{12}$ is a negative (and hence invertible) operator. This shows that Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$ has a unique open-loop saddle strategy, given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_1(\cdot) \\ \bar{u}_2(\cdot) \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{11} & \mathcal{M}_{12} \\ \mathcal{M}_{21} & \mathcal{M}_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{K}_1x \\ \mathcal{K}_2x \end{pmatrix}.$$

If we substitute the integral form of the performance functional (3.2) instead of the operator representation (3.15) into (3.18), then a straightforward computation reveals that the criterion (3.19) transforms into (3.16). \blacksquare

¹See the appendix of [23] for the definition and unique existence of such a kind of solution.

Remark 3.6. Suppose that the control pair $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ in [Theorem 3.5](#) is an open-loop saddle strategy for the initial state x . Since by [Proposition 3.2](#),

$$\varphi(\cdot) \triangleq Q\bar{X}(\cdot) + S^\top \bar{u}(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^n),$$

we conclude from (A.2.7) in the proof of [[23](#), Proposition A.2.3] that the L^2 -stable adapted solution of (3.17) has the following property:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} |\bar{Y}(t)|^2 = 0. \quad (3.20)$$

The following result further establishes a convergence of Problem (DG) $_T^0$ to Problem (DG) $_\infty^0$ in a suitable sense. Such a result essentially implies the convergence of the solution to the differential Riccati equation (2.5).

Proposition 3.7. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. For a given initial state x , let $(\bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ and $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ be the open-loop saddle strategies of Problem (DG) $_T^0$ and Problem (DG) $_\infty^0$, respectively. Then*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[|\bar{u}_{1,T}(t) - \bar{u}_1(t)|^2 + |\bar{u}_{2,T}(t) - \bar{u}_2(t)|^2 \right] dt = 0. \quad (3.21)$$

Consequently, for the corresponding state processes $\bar{X}_T(\cdot)$ and $\bar{X}(\cdot)$, we have

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\bar{X}_T(t) - \bar{X}(t)|^2 dt = 0. \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. Let $\bar{u}_T(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot) \\ \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot) \end{pmatrix}$ and $\bar{u}(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_1(\cdot) \\ \bar{u}_2(\cdot) \end{pmatrix}$. By [Theorem 2.1\(ii\)](#), the adapted solution $(\bar{X}_T(\cdot), \bar{Y}_T(\cdot), \bar{Z}_T(\cdot))$ of the forward-backward SDE (FBSDE, for short)

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}_T(t) = [A\bar{X}_T(t) + B\bar{u}_T(t)]dt + [C\bar{X}_T(t) + D\bar{u}_T(t)]dW(t), \\ d\bar{Y}_T(t) = -[A^\top \bar{Y}_T(t) + C^\top \bar{Z}_T(t) + Q\bar{X}_T(t) + S^\top \bar{u}_T(t)]dt + \bar{Z}_T(t)dW(t), \\ \bar{X}_T(0) = x, \quad \bar{Y}_T(T) = 0 \end{cases}$$

satisfies

$$B^\top \bar{Y}_T(t) + D^\top \bar{Z}_T(t) + S\bar{X}_T(t) + R\bar{u}_T(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \text{ a.s.}$$

On the other hand, by [Theorem 3.5](#),

$$B^\top \bar{Y}(t) + D^\top \bar{Z}(t) + S\bar{X}(t) + R\bar{u}(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, \infty), \text{ a.s.}$$

where $\bar{X}(\cdot)$ is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}(t) = [A\bar{X}(t) + B\bar{u}(t)]dt + [C\bar{X}(t) + D\bar{u}(t)]dW(t), \quad t \in [0, \infty), \\ \bar{X}(0) = x, \end{cases}$$

and $(\bar{Y}(\cdot), \bar{Z}(\cdot))$ is the L^2 -stable adapted solution of

$$d\bar{Y}(t) = -[A^\top \bar{Y}(t) + C^\top \bar{Z}(t) + Q\bar{X}(t) + S^\top \bar{u}(t)]dt + \bar{Z}(t)dW(t), \quad t \in [0, \infty).$$

Define for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_T(t) &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u}_{1,T}(t) \\ \hat{u}_{2,T}(t) \end{pmatrix} \triangleq \bar{u}(t) - \bar{u}_T(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_1(t) - \bar{u}_{1,T}(t) \\ \bar{u}_2(t) - \bar{u}_{2,T}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{X}_T(t) &\triangleq \bar{X}(t) - \bar{X}_T(t), \quad \hat{Y}_T(t) \triangleq \bar{Y}(t) - \bar{Y}_T(t), \quad \hat{Z}_T(t) \triangleq \bar{Z}(t) - \bar{Z}_T(t). \end{aligned}$$

Then on the interval $[0, T]$,

$$\begin{cases} d\widehat{X}_T(t) = [A\widehat{X}_T(t) + B\widehat{u}_T(t)]dt + [C\widehat{X}_T(t) + D\widehat{u}_T(t)]dW(t), \\ d\widehat{Y}_T(t) = -[A^\top \widehat{Y}_T(t) + C^\top \widehat{Z}_T(t) + Q\widehat{X}_T(t) + S^\top \widehat{u}_T(t)]dt + \widehat{Z}_T(t)dW(t), \\ \widehat{X}_T(0) = 0, \quad \widehat{Y}_T(T) = \bar{Y}(T), \end{cases} \quad (3.23)$$

and the following holds:

$$B^\top \widehat{Y}_T(t) + D^\top \widehat{Z}_T(t) + S\widehat{X}_T(t) + R\widehat{u}_T(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (3.24)$$

Again, by [Theorem 2.1\(ii\)](#), we see from (3.23)–(3.24) that $\widehat{u}_T(\cdot)$ is the (unique) open-loop saddle strategy for the initial state $x = 0$ of the zero-sum stochastic LQ differential game with the state equation

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = [AX(t) + B_1u_1(t) + B_2u_2(t)]dt + [CX(t) + D_1u_1(t) + D_2u_2(t)]dW(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ X(0) = x \end{cases}$$

and the performance functional

$$\widehat{J}_T(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[2\langle \bar{Y}(T), X(T) \rangle + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1^\top & S_2^\top \\ S_1 & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2 & R_{21} & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right].$$

In terms of the operator \mathcal{M}_T defined in (3.12) and the operator

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_T \triangleq (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,T}, \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{2,T}),$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{1,T}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{2,T}$ are defined in (3.10), we can represent $\widehat{J}_T(0; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ as

$$\widehat{J}_T(0; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) = \langle \mathcal{M}_T u, u \rangle + 2\langle \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_T^* \bar{Y}(T), u \rangle.$$

Form this representation it is easily seen that the saddle strategy $\widehat{u}_T(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\widehat{u}_T(\cdot) = -\mathcal{M}_T^{-1} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_T^* \bar{Y}(T).$$

Observe that

$$\mathcal{M}_T^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{11,T}^{-1} + [\mathcal{M}_{11,T}^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{12,T}] \Phi_T^{-1} [\mathcal{M}_{11,T}^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{12,T}]^* & -[\mathcal{M}_{11,T}^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{12,T}] \Phi_T^{-1} \\ -\Phi_T^{-1} [\mathcal{M}_{11,T}^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{12,T}]^* & \Phi_T^{-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\Phi_T \triangleq \mathcal{M}_{22,T} - \mathcal{M}_{21,T} \mathcal{M}_{11,T}^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{12,T}$. By (A1), there exists a constant $\delta > 0$, independent of T , such that the self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{M}_{11,T}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{22,T}$ satisfy

$$\mathcal{M}_{11,T} \geq \delta \mathcal{I}, \quad \mathcal{M}_{22,T} \leq -\delta \mathcal{I}, \quad (3.25)$$

where \mathcal{I} denotes the identity operator. Clearly, (3.25) implies that $\mathcal{M}_{11,T}^{-1}$, Φ_T^{-1} , and hence \mathcal{M}_T^{-1} are bounded linear operators, and that the operator norm

$$\|\mathcal{M}_T^{-1}\| \leq K,$$

for some constant $K > 0$ that is independent of T . Recall that the operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_T$ is also bounded uniformly in T . Thus, the following holds for some constant $K > 0$ independent of T :

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left[|\bar{u}_{1,T}(t) - \bar{u}_1(t)|^2 + |\bar{u}_{2,T}(t) - \bar{u}_2(t)|^2 \right] dt = \|\widehat{u}_T(\cdot)\|^2 \leq K \mathbb{E} |\bar{Y}(T)|^2.$$

The desired (3.21) then follows from [Remark 3.6](#). Moreover, as $\widehat{X}_T(\cdot) \triangleq \bar{X}(\cdot) - \bar{X}_T(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} d\widehat{X}_T(t) = [A\widehat{X}_T(t) + B\widehat{u}_T(t)]dt + [C\widehat{X}_T(t) + D\widehat{u}_T(t)]dW(t), \\ \widehat{X}_T(0) = 0, \end{cases}$$

by applying [Proposition 3.2](#) along with (3.21), we obtain (3.22). ■

4 Riccati Equations

Based on the results of the above section, in this section, we explore the asymptotic behavior of the solution $P_T(\cdot)$ to the differential Riccati equation (2.5) as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Additionally, as a byproduct, we establish a closed-loop representation for the open-loop saddle strategy of Problem (DG) $_\infty^o$.

First, let us consider the following differential Riccati equation over $[0, T]$:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{P}_{1T} + P_{1T}A + A^\top P_{1T} + C^\top P_{1T}C + Q \\ \quad - (P_{1T}B_1 + C^\top P_{1T}D_1 + S_1^\top)(R_{11} + D_1^\top P_{1T}D_1)^{-1}(B_1^\top P_{1T} + D_1^\top P_{1T}C + S_1) = 0, \\ P_{1T}(T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

By (A1), there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$J_T^o(0; u_1(\cdot), 0) \geq \delta \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |u_1(t)|^2 dt, \quad \forall u_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_1[0, T].$$

According to [23, Theorem 2.5.6], (4.1) admits a unique solution $P_{1T}(\cdot) \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{S}^n)$ satisfying

$$R_{11} + D_1^\top P_{1T}(t)D_1 \geq \alpha I_n, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad (4.2)$$

for some constant $\alpha > 0$. Note that if we let

$$\Theta_{1T}(\cdot) \triangleq -(R_{11} + D_1^\top P_{1T}D_1)^{-1}(B_1^\top P_{1T} + D_1^\top P_{1T}C + S_1)(\cdot),$$

the equation (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{P}_{1T} + P_{1T}(A + B_1\Theta_{1T}) + (A + B_1\Theta_{1T})^\top P_{1T} + (C + D_1\Theta_{1T})^\top P_{1T}(C + D_1\Theta_{1T}) \\ \quad + \Theta_{1T}^\top R_{11}\Theta_{1T} + S_1^\top \Theta_{1T} + \Theta_{1T}^\top S_1 + Q = 0, \\ P_{1T}(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then by [23, Proposition 2.5.5], the constant α in (4.2) can be chosen to be the same as the δ in (A1), that is, the following holds:

$$R_{11} + D_1^\top P_{1T}(t)D_1 \geq \delta I_n, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.3)$$

Likewise, the differential Riccati equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{P}_{2T} + P_{2T}A + A^\top P_{2T} + C^\top P_{2T}C + Q \\ \quad - (P_{2T}B_2 + C^\top P_{2T}D_2 + S_2^\top)(R_{22} + D_2^\top P_{2T}D_2)^{-1}(B_2^\top P_{2T} + D_2^\top P_{2T}C + S_2) = 0, \\ P_{2T}(T) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

admits a unique solution $P_{2T}(\cdot) \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{S}^n)$ satisfying

$$R_{22} + D_2^\top P_{2T}(t)D_2 \leq -\delta I_n, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.5)$$

Taking into account [20, Proposition 4.7], we obtain the following result.

Proposition 4.1. *Let (A1) hold. Let $P_T(\cdot)$, $P_{1T}(\cdot)$, and $P_{2T}(\cdot)$ be the solutions to (2.5), (4.1), and (4.4), respectively. Then*

$$P_{1T}(t) \leq P_T(t) \leq P_{2T}(t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Consequently,

$$R_{11} + D_1^\top P_T(t)D_1 \geq \delta I_n, \quad R_{22} + D_2^\top P_T(t)D_2 \leq -\delta I_n, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (4.6)$$

To further discuss the properties of $P_T(\cdot)$, let us revisit the concept of L^2 -stabilizability. Recall the following notation:

$$m \triangleq m_1 + m_2, \quad B \triangleq (B_1, B_2), \quad D \triangleq (D_1, D_2).$$

Denote by $[A, C; B, D]$ the following controlled linear system:

$$dX(t) = [AX(t) + Bu(t)]dt + [CX(t) + Du(t)]dW(t), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Definition 4.2. System $[A, C; B, D]$ is called L^2 -stabilizable if there exists a matrix $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ such that the (closed-loop) system $[A + B\Theta, C + D\Theta]$ is L^2 -stable. In this case, Θ is called a *stabilizer* of $[A, C; B, D]$.

Now, we present the following result, which establishes the convergence of $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_T(t)$ and provides some properties for the limit matrix P .

Theorem 4.3. Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Let $P_T(\cdot)$ be the unique strongly regular solution to the differential Riccati equation (2.5). Then the limit

$$P \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_T(t)$$

exists, is independent of t , and has the following properties:

(i) $R_{11} + D_1^\top P D_1 > 0$, $R_{22} + D_2^\top P D_2 < 0$.

(ii) P satisfies the following algebraic Riccati equation (ARE, for short):

$$\begin{aligned} PA + A^\top P + C^\top P C + Q \\ - (PB + C^\top P D + S^\top)(R + D^\top P D)^{-1}(B^\top P + D^\top P C + S) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

(iii) The matrix

$$\Theta \triangleq -(R + D^\top P D)^{-1}(B^\top P + D^\top P C + S) \quad (4.9)$$

is a stabilizer of the system $[A, C; B, D]$.

Proof. According to [20, Theorem 4.4], the value function $V_T^0(\cdot)$ of Problem (DG) $_T^0$ is given by

$$V_T^0(x) = \langle P_T(0)x, x \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Denote by $V_\infty^0(\cdot)$ the value function of Problem (DG) $_\infty^0$, and let

$$\bar{u}_T(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot) \\ \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{u}(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_1(\cdot) \\ \bar{u}_2(\cdot) \end{pmatrix}$$

be the open-loop saddle strategies of Problem (DG) $_T^0$ and Problem (DG) $_\infty^0$ for the initial state x , respectively. Then, by Proposition 3.7,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \langle P_T(0)x, x \rangle &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} V_T^0(x) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} J_T^0(x; \bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot)) \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S^\top \\ S & R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}_T(t) \\ \bar{u}_T(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}_T(t) \\ \bar{u}_T(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S^\top \\ S & R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}(t) \\ \bar{u}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \bar{X}(t) \\ \bar{u}(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt = J_\infty^0(x; \bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = V_\infty^0(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since the initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is arbitrary, we conclude that the limit $P \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_T(0)$ exists. Observe that for any $0 \leq t \leq T$ and any $0 \leq s \leq T - t$,

$$P_T(t + s) = P_{T-t}(s). \quad (4.10)$$

In particular, taking $s = 0$, we get

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_T(t) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_{T-t}(0) = P. \quad (4.11)$$

The property (i) follows directly from (4.6). To prove (ii), let

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_T(t) &\triangleq P_T(t)A + A^\top P_T(t) + C^\top P_T(t)C + Q \\ &\quad - [P_T(t)B + C^\top P_T(t)D + S^\top][R + D^\top P_T(t)D]^{-1}[B^\top P_T(t) + D^\top P_T(t)C + S]. \end{aligned}$$

From (4.10) and ODE (2.5), we have

$$P_T(1) - P_T(0) = - \int_0^1 \Lambda_T(t) dt = - \int_0^1 \Lambda_{T-t}(0) dt = \int_{T-1}^T \Lambda_t(0) dt.$$

Letting $T \rightarrow \infty$ in the above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_t(0) = PA + A^\top P + C^\top PC + Q \\ &\quad - (PB + C^\top PD + S^\top)(R + D^\top PD)^{-1}(B^\top P + D^\top PC + S). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove (iii). Applying Theorem 2.1 to the case of Problem $(DG)_T^0$, we see that the open-loop saddle strategy $(\bar{u}_{1,T}(\cdot), \bar{u}_{2,T}(\cdot))$ of Problem $(DG)_T^0$ has the following closed-loop representation:

$$\bar{u}_T(t) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_{1,T}(t) \\ \bar{u}_{2,T}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \bar{\Theta}_T(t) \bar{X}_T(t), \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where $\bar{\Theta}_T(\cdot)$ is defined by (2.7) and $\bar{X}_T(\cdot)$ is the solution of the closed-loop system

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}_T(t) = [A + B\bar{\Theta}_T(t)]\bar{X}_T(t)dt + [C + D\bar{\Theta}_T(t)]\bar{X}_T(t)dW(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \bar{X}_T(0) = x. \end{cases}$$

Note that by (4.10) and (4.11), the following holds for some constant $K > 0$:

$$|P_T(t)| = |P_{T-t}(0)| \leq K, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (4.12)$$

which in turn implies that

$$|\bar{\Theta}_T(t)| \leq K, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (4.13)$$

for some possibly different constant $K > 0$. Also, note that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\Theta}_T(t) = \Theta = -(R + D^\top PD)^{-1}(B^\top P + D^\top PC + S). \quad (4.14)$$

Let $\bar{X}(\cdot)$ be the state process corresponding to the saddle strategy $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ of Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$. Then by Proposition 3.7, (4.13), and (4.14),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty |\bar{u}(t) - \Theta \bar{X}(t)|^2 dt &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\bar{u}(t) - \Theta \bar{X}(t)|^2 dt \\ &\leq 2 \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\bar{u}(t) - \bar{u}_T(t)|^2 dt + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\bar{u}_T(t) - \Theta \bar{X}(t)|^2 dt \right] \\ &= 2 \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\bar{\Theta}_T(t) \bar{X}_T(t) - \Theta \bar{X}(t)|^2 dt \\ &\leq 4 \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\bar{\Theta}_T(t)|^2 |\bar{X}_T(t) - \bar{X}(t)|^2 dt + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\bar{\Theta}_T(t) - \Theta|^2 |\bar{X}(t)|^2 dt \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\bar{u}(\cdot) = \Theta \bar{X}(\cdot)$ and hence

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}(t) = (A + B\Theta)\bar{X}(t)dt + (C + D\Theta)\bar{X}(t)dW(t), & t \geq 0, \\ \bar{X}(0) = x. \end{cases}$$

Since we already know that $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, \infty)$ (implying $\bar{X}(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^n)$ by [Proposition 3.2](#)), Θ is, by definition, a stabilizer of the system $[A, C; B, D]$. \blacksquare

From the above proof, we also obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Then there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that*

$$|[R + D^\top P_\tau(t)D]^{-1}| \leq K, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T < \infty.$$

Proof. For notational simplicity, let us fix $0 \leq t \leq T < \infty$ and set

$$M_{ij}(t) \triangleq R_{ij} + D_i^\top P_\tau(t)D_j; \quad i, j = 1, 2.$$

From [\(4.6\)](#) and [\(4.12\)](#), we see that for some constants $\delta, \rho > 0$ that are independent of t and T ,

$$M_{11} \geq \delta I, \quad M_{22} \leq -\delta I, \quad |M_{12}| = |M_{21}| \leq \rho.$$

It is easy to verify that the inverse of

$$R + D^\top P_\tau(t)D = \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} + D_1^\top P_\tau(t)D_1 & R_{12} + D_1^\top P_\tau(t)D_2 \\ R_{21} + D_2^\top P_\tau(t)D_1 & R_{22} + D_2^\top P_\tau(t)D_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11}(t) & M_{12}(t) \\ M_{21}(t) & M_{22}(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

is given by

$$[R + D^\top P_\tau(t)D]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11}^{-1} + (M_{11}^{-1}M_{12})N^{-1}(M_{11}^{-1}M_{12})^\top & -(M_{11}^{-1}M_{12})N^{-1} \\ -N^{-1}(M_{11}^{-1}M_{12})^\top & N^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.15)$$

where

$$N \triangleq M_{22} - M_{21}M_{11}^{-1}M_{12} \leq -\delta I.$$

Note that

$$|M_{11}^{-1}| \leq \sqrt{n}\delta^{-1}, \quad |N^{-1}| \leq \sqrt{n}\delta^{-1}, \quad |M_{12}| = |M_{21}| \leq \rho.$$

The desired result then follows from [\(4.15\)](#). \blacksquare

[Theorem 4.3](#) establishes the existence of a solution to the ARE [\(4.8\)](#). The following result further confirms the uniqueness of this solution.

Theorem 4.5. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. The ARE [\(4.8\)](#) has unique solution $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$ satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i) $R_{11} + D_1^\top P D_1 > 0$, $R_{22} + D_2^\top P D_2 < 0$;
- (ii) $-(R + D^\top P D)^{-1}(B^\top P + D^\top P C + S)$ is a stabilizer of the system $[A, C; B, D]$.

Proof. Suppose that P is a solution of [\(4.8\)](#) such that the conditions stated in (i) and (ii) hold. According to [Theorem 3.5](#), Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$ has a unique open-loop saddle strategy for every initial state x . If we can prove that the value function $V_\infty^0(\cdot)$ of Problem $(DG)_\infty^0$ takes the form

$$V_\infty^0(x) = \langle Px, x \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (4.16)$$

then uniqueness follows immediately. To this end, let Θ be defined by [\(4.9\)](#) and consider the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dX(t) = (A + B\Theta)X(t)dt + (C + D\Theta)X(t)dW(t), & t \geq 0, \\ X(0) = x. \end{cases}$$

Since Θ is a stabilizer of system $[A, C; B, D]$, we have

$$X(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^n), \quad u(\cdot) \triangleq \Theta X(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, \infty).$$

Define

$$Y(t) \triangleq PX(t), \quad Z(t) \triangleq P(C + D\Theta)X(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

It is straightforward to verify that

$$B^\top Y(t) + D^\top Z(t) + SX(t) + Ru(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, \infty), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Furthermore, noting that

$$PA + A^\top P + C^\top PC + Q + (PB + C^\top PD + S^\top)\Theta = 0,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} dY(t) &= PdX(t) = P[AX(t) + Bu(t)]dt + P[CX(t) + Du(t)]dW(t) \\ &= -[A^\top P + C^\top PC + Q + (PB + C^\top PD + S^\top)\Theta - PB\Theta]X(t)dt + Z(t)dW(t), \\ &= -[A^\top Y(t) + C^\top Z(t) + QX(t) + S^\top u(t)]dt + Z(t)dW(t). \end{aligned}$$

Using [Theorem 3.5](#) again, we conclude that $u(\cdot) \triangleq \Theta X(\cdot)$ is the unique open-loop saddle strategy of Problem $(DG)_\infty^o$ for x . Substituting $u(\cdot) \triangleq \Theta X(\cdot)$ into the performance functional yields

$$J_\infty^o(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \langle (Q + S^\top \Theta + \Theta^\top S + \Theta^\top R\Theta)X(t), X(t) \rangle dt. \quad (4.17)$$

On the other hand, by Itô's rule,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \langle PX(t), X(t) \rangle - \langle Px, x \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \langle [P(A + B\Theta) + (A + B\Theta)^\top P + (C + D\Theta)^\top P(C + D\Theta)]X(s), X(s) \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ gives

$$-\langle Px, x \rangle = \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \langle [P(A + B\Theta) + (A + B\Theta)^\top P + (C + D\Theta)^\top P(C + D\Theta)]X(t), X(t) \rangle dt.$$

Adding the above to [\(4.17\)](#) and noting that [\(4.8\)](#) can be rewritten as

$$P(A + B\Theta) + (A + B\Theta)^\top P + (C + D\Theta)^\top P(C + D\Theta) + Q + S^\top \Theta + \Theta^\top S + \Theta^\top R\Theta = 0,$$

we obtain $J_\infty^o(x; u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) - \langle Px, x \rangle = 0$, which implies [\(4.16\)](#). ■

From the proof of [Theorem 4.5](#), we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.6. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Let $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$ be the unique solution of the ARE [\(4.8\)](#) satisfying the conditions in [Theorem 4.5](#). Then the unique open-loop saddle strategy of Problem $(DG)_\infty^o$ (for the initial state x) is given by*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_1(t) \\ \bar{u}_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \Theta \bar{X}(t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

where Θ is defined by [\(4.9\)](#) and $\bar{X}(\cdot)$ is the solution to the closed-loop system

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}(t) = (A + B\Theta)\bar{X}(t)dt + (C + D\Theta)\bar{X}(t)dW(t), & t \geq 0, \\ \bar{X}(0) = x. \end{cases}$$

We have shown in [Theorem 4.3](#) that the solution $P_T(\cdot)$ to the differential Riccati equation (2.5) converges to some constant matrix P as $T \rightarrow \infty$. In the subsequent result, we quantify the rate of this convergence.

Theorem 4.7. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Let $P_T(\cdot)$ be the unique strongly regular solution to the differential Riccati equation (2.5), and let P be as in [Theorem 4.5](#). There exist constants $K, \lambda > 0$, independent of T , such that*

$$|P_T(t) - P| \leq K e^{-\lambda(T-t)}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. Set $\Sigma_T(t) \triangleq P - P_T(t)$. Then a direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Sigma}_T(t) + \Sigma_T(t)(A + B\Theta) + (A + B\Theta)^\top \Sigma_T(t) + (C + D\Theta)^\top \Sigma_T(t)(C + D\Theta) \\ + [\Theta - \Theta_T(t)]^\top [R + D^\top P_T(t)D][\Theta - \Theta_T(t)] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Theta_T(t)$ and $\Theta(t)$ are defined by

$$\Theta_T(t) \triangleq -[R + D^\top P_T(t)D]^{-1}[B^\top P_T(t) + D^\top P_T(t)C + S]$$

and

$$\Theta \triangleq -(R + D^\top P D)^{-1}(B^\top P + D^\top P C + S),$$

respectively. Observe that

$$\Theta - \Theta_T(t) = -[R + D^\top P_T(t)D]^{-1}[B^\top \Sigma_T(t) + D^\top \Sigma_T(t)(C + D\Theta)].$$

Thus, by [Corollary 4.4](#),

$$|[\Theta - \Theta_T(t)]^\top [R + D^\top P_T(t)D][\Theta - \Theta_T(t)]| \leq K_1 |\Sigma_T(t)|^2, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T < \infty \quad (4.18)$$

for some constant $K_1 > 0$ that is independent of T . Let $\Phi(\cdot)$ be the solution to the following matrix SDE:

$$\begin{cases} d\Phi(t) = (A + B\Theta)\Phi(t)dt + (C + D\Theta)\Phi(t)dW(t), & t \geq 0, \\ \Phi(0) = I_n. \end{cases}$$

By [Theorem 4.5](#), the system $[A + B\Theta, C + D\Theta]$ is L^2 -stable. Thus, by [Corollary 3.3](#), there exist constants $K_2, \lambda > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}|\Phi(s)\Phi(t)^{-1}|^2 = \mathbb{E}|\Phi(s-t)|^2 \leq K_2 e^{-\lambda(s-t)}, \quad \forall s \geq t \geq 0. \quad (4.19)$$

By [Theorem 4.3](#), we can choose an integer $N > 0$ such that

$$K_2 |\Sigma_T(0)| \leq \rho \triangleq \frac{\lambda}{2K_1 K_2}, \quad \forall T \geq N. \quad (4.20)$$

Now we claim that for any $T \geq 2N$, the inequality

$$|\Sigma_T(t)| \leq K e^{-\lambda(T-t)}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \quad (4.21)$$

holds for some constant $K > 0$ independent of T . To prove this claim, let $T \geq 2N$ be fixed but arbitrary. Let $k \geq N$ be the integer such that

$$N + k \leq T < N + k + 1.$$

By the proof of [\[30, Lemma 7.3, Chapter 6\]](#), we see that for any $t \leq k$,

$$\Sigma_T(t) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_t^k [\Phi(s)\Phi(t)^{-1}]^\top [\Theta - \Theta_T(s)]^\top [R + D^\top P_T(s)D][\Theta - \Theta_T(s)][\Phi(s)\Phi(t)^{-1}] ds \right\}$$

$$+ [\Phi(k)\Phi(t)^{-1}]^\top \Sigma_T(k) [\Phi(k)\Phi(t)^{-1}] \}, \quad (4.22)$$

which, together with (4.10) and (4.18)–(4.20), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma_T(t)| &\leq |\Sigma_T(k)| \cdot \mathbb{E}|\Phi(k)\Phi(t)^{-1}|^2 + K_1 \int_t^k \mathbb{E}|\Phi(s)\Phi(t)^{-1}|^2 \cdot |\Sigma_T(s)|^2 ds \\ &= |\Sigma_{T-k}(0)| \cdot \mathbb{E}|\Phi(k)\Phi(t)^{-1}|^2 + K_1 \int_t^k \mathbb{E}|\Phi(s)\Phi(t)^{-1}|^2 \cdot |\Sigma_T(s)|^2 ds \\ &\leq \rho e^{-\lambda(k-t)} + K_1 K_2 \int_t^k e^{-\lambda(s-t)} |\Sigma_T(s)|^2 ds, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

Set $K_3 \triangleq K_1 K_2$ and

$$h(t) \triangleq K_3 e^{\lambda t} |\Sigma_T(k-t)|, \quad 0 \leq t \leq k.$$

Then for any $0 \leq t \leq k$,

$$h(t) \leq K_3 \rho + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} h(s)^2 ds = \frac{\lambda}{2} + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} h(s)^2 ds.$$

Set for $t \in [0, k]$,

$$H(t) \triangleq \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} h(s)^2 ds.$$

Then $H(0) = 0$ and

$$e^{\lambda t} H'(t) = h(t)^2 \leq [\lambda/2 + H(t)]^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, k].$$

or equivalently,

$$d \left[\frac{-1}{\lambda/2 + H(t)} \right] \leq e^{-\lambda t}, \quad \forall t \in [0, k].$$

Integration gives

$$\frac{2}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda/2 + H(t)} \leq \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} ds \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}, \quad \forall t \in [0, k],$$

from which we have

$$h(t) \leq \lambda, \quad \forall t \in [0, k].$$

Thus (noting that $T - k < N + 1$),

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma_T(t)| &= \frac{1}{K_3} e^{-\lambda(k-t)} h(k-t) \leq \frac{\lambda}{K_3} e^{-\lambda(k-t)} = \frac{\lambda}{K_3} e^{\lambda(T-k)} e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{K_3} e^{\lambda(N+1)} e^{-\lambda(T-t)}, \quad \forall t \in [0, k]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

For $t \in [k, T]$, we have $0 \leq T - t \leq T - k \leq N + 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma_T(t)| &= |\Sigma_{T-t}(0)| \leq K_4 \triangleq \max_{s \in [0, N+1]} |\Sigma_s(0)| \\ &\leq K_4 e^{\lambda(N+1)} e^{-\lambda(T-t)}, \quad \forall t \in [k, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Combining (4.23) and (4.24) yields the desired (4.21). It remains to show that (4.21) also holds for $T < 2N$ with a possibly different constant $K > 0$ that is independent of T . This can be proved in a similar way as (4.24):

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma_T(t)| &= |\Sigma_{T-t}(0)| \leq K_5 \triangleq \max_{s \in [0, 2N]} |\Sigma_s(0)| \\ &\leq (K_5 e^{2N\lambda}) e^{-\lambda(T-t)}, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T \leq 2N. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. ■

5 The Turnpike Property

With the above preparations, we are ready to establish the turnpike property for Problem $(DG)_T$. This will be done in the current section. Denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of probability distributions on $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n))$ having finite second moment, i.e., if $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 \mu(dx) < \infty$. We equip $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the L^2 -Wasserstein distance:

$$d(\mu_1, \mu_2) \triangleq \inf \left\{ \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^2} \mid \xi_i \text{ is an } \mathbb{R}^n\text{-valued random variable with } \mu_{\xi_i} = \mu_i; i = 1, 2 \right\},$$

where μ_{ξ_i} denotes the probability distribution of ξ_i . Consider the following SDE over $[0, \infty)$:

$$d\mathcal{X}(t) = [\mathcal{A}\mathcal{X}(t) + \alpha]dt + [\mathcal{C}\mathcal{X}(t) + \beta]dW(t), \quad (5.1)$$

where $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are constant valued.

The following result, found in [26, Proposition 4.2], establishes the uniqueness and existence of a stationary solution to (5.1).

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that the system $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}]$ is L^2 -stable. Then there exists a unique distribution μ with finite second moment such that the solution $\mathcal{X}(\cdot)$ of (5.1) with initial distribution μ has a stationary distribution. Namely, for any Borel set Γ in \mathbb{R}^n ,*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X}(t) \in \Gamma] = \mu(\Gamma), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Next, consider, for each $T > 0$, the following SDE over $[0, T]$:

$$\begin{cases} d\mathcal{X}(t) = [\mathcal{A}_T(t)\mathcal{X}(t) + \alpha_T(t)]dt + [\mathcal{C}_T(t)\mathcal{X}(t) + \beta_T(t)]dW(t), \\ \mathcal{X}(0) = x, \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_T, \mathcal{C}_T : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and $\alpha_T, \beta_T : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are deterministic Lebesgue measurable, bounded functions. We denote by $\mathcal{X}_T(\cdot; x)$ the solution of (5.2) over $[0, T]$ and by $\mu_T(t; x)$ the probability distribution of $\mathcal{X}_T(t; x)$.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that the system $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}]$ is L^2 -stable, and let μ be the unique distribution in Lemma 5.1. If there exist constants $K, \lambda > 0$, independent of T , such that*

$$|\mathcal{A}_T(t) - \mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{C}_T(t) - \mathcal{C}| + |\alpha_T(t) - \alpha| + |\beta_T(t) - \beta| \leq K \left[e^{-\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad (5.3)$$

then for any initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$d(\mu_T(t; x), \mu) \leq K(|x|^2 + 1) \left[e^{-\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

with possibly different constants $K, \lambda > 0$ that are independent of x and T .

Proof. Let ξ be an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable, \mathbb{R}^n -valued random variable with distribution μ , and let $\mathcal{X}(\cdot)$ be the solution of (5.1) with initial condition $\mathcal{X}(0) = \xi$. Then for any $t \geq 0$, the distribution of $\mathcal{X}(t)$ is identically equal to μ . Define, for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) &\triangleq \mathcal{X}_T(t; x) - \mathcal{X}(t), \\ \hat{\alpha}_T(t) &\triangleq [\mathcal{A}_T(t) - \mathcal{A}]\mathcal{X}(t) + \alpha_T(t) - \alpha, \\ \hat{\beta}_T(t) &\triangleq [\mathcal{C}_T(t) - \mathcal{C}]\mathcal{X}(t) + \beta_T(t) - \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{Y}_T(0; x) = x - \xi$ and

$$d\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) = [\mathcal{A}_T(t)\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) + \hat{\alpha}_T(t)]dt + [\mathcal{C}_T(t)\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) + \hat{\beta}_T(t)]dW(t).$$

Since $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}]$ is L^2 -stable, by [23, Theorem 3.2.3], there exists a matrix $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$ such that

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{C}^\top \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C} = -I_n.$$

By applying Itô's rule to $t \mapsto \langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ 2 \langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{A}_T(t)\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) + \hat{\alpha}_T(t) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle \mathcal{P}[\mathcal{C}_T(t)\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) + \hat{\beta}_T(t)], \mathcal{C}_T(t)\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) + \hat{\beta}_T(t) \rangle \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \langle [\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A}_T(t) + \mathcal{A}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{C}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C}_T(t)]\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \langle \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{P}\hat{\alpha}_T(t) + \mathcal{C}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P}\hat{\beta}_T(t) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{P}\hat{\beta}_T(t), \hat{\beta}_T(t) \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

To estimate the right-hand side of (5.4), we first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A}_T(t) + \mathcal{A}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{C}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C}_T(t) \\ &= \mathcal{P}\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}^\top \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{C}^\top \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C} + \mathcal{P}[\mathcal{A}_T(t) - \mathcal{A}] + [\mathcal{A}_T(t) - \mathcal{A}]^\top \mathcal{P} \\ &\quad + [\mathcal{C}_T(t) - \mathcal{C}]^\top \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C}_T(t) + \mathcal{C}^\top \mathcal{P}[\mathcal{C}_T(t) - \mathcal{C}] \\ &= -I_n + \mathcal{P}[\mathcal{A}_T(t) - \mathcal{A}] + [\mathcal{A}_T(t) - \mathcal{A}]^\top \mathcal{P} + [\mathcal{C}_T(t) - \mathcal{C}]^\top \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C}_T(t) + \mathcal{C}^\top \mathcal{P}[\mathcal{C}_T(t) - \mathcal{C}], \end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.3), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \langle [\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A}_T(t) + \mathcal{A}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{C}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P}\mathcal{C}_T(t)]\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle \\ &\leq [-1 + K\psi(t, T)] \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x)|^2, \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

for some constant $K > 0$ independent of T and x , where

$$\psi(t, T) \triangleq e^{-\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda(T-t)}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Further, since $\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{X}(t)|^2$ is finite and time-invariant by Lemma 5.1, we have (for possibly a different $K > 0$ that is independent of T and x)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\hat{\alpha}_T(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E} |[\mathcal{A}_T(t) - \mathcal{A}]\mathcal{X}(t) + \alpha_T(t) - \alpha|^2 \leq K\psi(t, T), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \\ \mathbb{E}|\hat{\beta}_T(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E} |[\mathcal{C}_T(t) - \mathcal{C}]\mathcal{X}(t) + \beta_T(t) - \beta|^2 \leq K\psi(t, T), \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[2 \langle \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{P}\hat{\alpha}_T(t) + \mathcal{C}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P}\hat{\beta}_T(t) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{P}\hat{\beta}_T(t), \hat{\beta}_T(t) \rangle \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} |\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x)|^2 + 2 |\mathcal{P}\hat{\alpha}_T(t) + \mathcal{C}_T(t)^\top \mathcal{P}\hat{\beta}_T(t)|^2 + \langle \mathcal{P}\hat{\beta}_T(t), \hat{\beta}_T(t) \rangle \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x)|^2 + K\psi(t, T), \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

for some constant $K > 0$ independent of T and x . Let $\gamma_1 > 0$ and $\gamma_2 > 0$ be the smallest and largest eigenvalues of \mathcal{P} , respectively. Substituting (5.5)–(5.6) into (5.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle &\leq \left[-\frac{1}{2} + K\psi(t, T) \right] \mathbb{E} |\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x)|^2 + K\psi(t, T) \\ &\leq \left[-\frac{1}{2\gamma_1} + \frac{K}{\gamma_1} \psi(t, T) \right] \mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle + K\psi(t, T) \\ &\leq [-\rho + K\psi(t, T)] \mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle + K\psi(t, T), \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where the constant $K > 0$ at the end might be different, and $\rho < \min\{\frac{1}{2\gamma_2}, \lambda\}$. By the differential form of the Gronwall inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle &\leq \mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(0; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(0; x) \rangle \exp\left(\int_0^t [-\rho + K\psi(s, T)] ds\right) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t K\psi(s, T) \exp\left(\int_s^t [-\rho + K\psi(r, T)] dr\right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\int_s^t [-\rho + K\psi(r, T)] dr \leq -\rho(t-s) + \frac{2K}{\lambda}$$

leading to

$$\exp\left(\int_s^t [-\rho + K\psi(r, T)] dr\right) \leq e^{\frac{2K}{\lambda}} e^{-\rho(t-s)}, \quad \forall 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T.$$

Also, we have (recalling $\rho < \lambda$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t K\psi(s, T) \exp\left(\int_s^t [-\rho + K\psi(r, T)] dr\right) ds \\ &\leq K e^{\frac{2K}{\lambda}} \int_0^t \left(e^{-\lambda s} + e^{-\lambda(T-s)}\right) e^{-\rho(t-s)} ds \\ &= K e^{\frac{2K}{\lambda}} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda - \rho} (e^{-\rho t} - e^{-\lambda t}) + \frac{e^{-\lambda T}}{\lambda + \rho} (e^{\lambda t} - e^{-\rho t}) \right] \\ &\leq K e^{\frac{2K}{\lambda}} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda - \rho} e^{-\rho t} + \frac{1}{\lambda + \rho} e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \right] \\ &\leq K \left[e^{-\rho t} + e^{-\rho(T-t)} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, $K > 0$ is a possible different constant, independent of $T > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{X}_T(t; x) - \mathcal{X}(t)|^2 &= \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{P}\mathcal{Y}_T(t; x), \mathcal{Y}_T(t; x) \rangle \\ &\leq K \left[\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{P}(x - \xi), x - \xi \rangle e^{-\rho t} + (e^{-\rho t} + e^{-\rho(T-t)}) \right] \\ &\leq K \left[(|x|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\xi|^2) e^{-\rho t} + (e^{-\rho t} + e^{-\rho(T-t)}) \right] \\ &\leq K(|x|^2 + 1) \left[e^{-\rho t} + e^{-\rho(T-t)} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $K > 0$ that is independent of T and x . It follows that

$$d(\mu_T(t; x), \mu) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{X}_T(t; x) - \mathcal{X}(t)|^2} \leq K(|x| + 1) \left[e^{-\rho t/2} + e^{-\rho(T-t)/2} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

This completes the proof. ■

Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Let $P \in \mathbb{S}^n$ be the unique solution to the ARE (4.8) such that the conditions (i)–(ii) in Theorem 4.5 hold. Let Θ be defined as in (4.9). Let φ be the solution to the algebra equation

$$(A + B\Theta)^\top \varphi + (C + D\Theta)^\top P\sigma + \Theta^\top r + Pb + q = 0, \quad (5.8)$$

that is,

$$\varphi = -[(A + B\Theta)^\top]^{-1}[(C + D\Theta)^\top P\sigma + \Theta^\top r + Pb + q],$$

and define

$$v \triangleq -(R + D^\top PD)^{-1}(B^\top \varphi + D^\top P\sigma + r). \quad (5.9)$$

Consider the following SDE over $[0, \infty)$:

$$dX(t) = [(A + B\Theta)X(t) + Bv + b]dt + [(C + D\Theta)X(t) + Dv + \sigma]dW(t). \quad (5.10)$$

Since $[A + B\Theta, C + D\Theta]$ is L^2 -stable (see [Theorem 4.3](#)), by [Lemma 5.1](#), there exists a unique initial distribution μ^* with finite second moment such that the corresponding solution $X^*(\cdot)$ of (5.10) has a stationary distribution. This means

$$\mathbb{P}(X(t) \in \Gamma) = \mu^*(\Gamma), \quad \forall \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (5.11)$$

Let

$$u^*(t) \triangleq \Theta X^*(t) + v, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (5.12)$$

and denote the (stationary) distribution of $u^*(t)$ by ν^* . Also, denote by $\mu_T(t, x)$ and $\nu_T(t, x)$ the distributions of the optimal state process $\bar{X}_T(t)$ and the open-loop saddle strategy $\bar{u}_T(t) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_{1,T}(t) \\ \bar{u}_{2,T}(t) \end{pmatrix}$ of Problem $(\text{DG})_T$ for the initial state x , respectively. We now present the following result, which establishes the exponential turnpike property for Problem $(\text{DG})_T$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let (A1)–(A2) hold. Then there exist constants $K, \lambda > 0$, independent of x and T , such that*

$$d(\mu_T(t; x), \mu^*) + d(\nu_T(t; x), \nu^*) \leq K(|x|^2 + 1) \left[e^{-\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. By [Theorem 2.1](#),

$$\bar{u}_T(t) = \bar{\Theta}_T(t)\bar{X}_T(t) + \bar{v}_T(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (5.13)$$

where $\bar{\Theta}_T(\cdot)$ and $\bar{v}_T(\cdot)$ are defined by (2.7) and (2.9), respectively. Upon substitution of (5.13) into the state equation (1.1), we see that $\bar{X}_T(\cdot)$ satisfies the following closed-loop system:

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{X}_T(t) = \{ [A + B\bar{\Theta}_T(t)]\bar{X}_T(t) + B\bar{v}_T(t) + b \} dt \\ \quad + \{ [C + D\bar{\Theta}_T(t)]\bar{X}_T(t) + D\bar{v}_T(t) + \sigma \} dW(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \bar{X}_T(0) = x. \end{cases} \quad (5.14)$$

According to [Corollary 4.4](#) and [Theorem 4.7](#), there exist constants $K, \lambda > 0$, independent of T such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Theta - \bar{\Theta}_T(t)| &= |[R + D^\top P_T(t)D]^{-1} \{ B^\top [P - P_T(t)] + D^\top [P - P_T(t)](C + D\Theta) \}| \\ &\leq |[R + D^\top P_T(t)D]^{-1}| (|B| + |D||C + D\Theta|) |P - P_T(t)| \\ &\leq K e^{-\lambda(T-t)}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $|\bar{v}_T(t) - v|$, let

$$\phi_T(t) \triangleq \varphi_T(T - t), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

where $\varphi_T(\cdot)$ is the solution to the ODE (2.8). Then

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\phi}_T(t) = [A + B\bar{\Theta}_T(T - t)]^\top \phi_T(t) + [C + D\bar{\Theta}_T(T - t)]^\top P_T(T - t)\sigma \\ \quad + \bar{\Theta}_T(T - t)^\top r + P_T(T - t)b + q, \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \phi_T(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

Comparing (5.15) and (5.8), and then applying [Proposition 5.2](#) to the case of ordinary differential equations yields

$$|\varphi - \varphi_T(t)| = |\varphi - \phi_T(T - t)| \leq K \left[e^{-\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

for some constants $K, \lambda > 0$ independent of T . As a consequence,

$$|v - \bar{v}_T(t)| \leq K \left[e^{-\lambda t} + e^{-\lambda(T-t)} \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

with possibly different constants $K, \lambda > 0$ that are independent of T . Comparing (5.14) and (5.10), and the applying [Proposition 5.2](#) again yields the desired result. \blacksquare

References

- [1] M. Bardi and F. S. Priuli, *Linear-quadratic N -person and mean-field games with ergodic cost*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 52 (2014), pp. 3022–3052.
- [2] A. Bensoussan, K. C. J. Sung, S. C. P. Yam, and S. P. Yung, *Linear-quadratic mean field games*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 169 (2016), pp. 496–529.
- [3] T. Breiten and L. Pfeiffer, *On the turnpike property and the receding-horizon method for linear-quadratic optimal control problems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 58 (2020), pp. 1077–1102.
- [4] P. E. Caines and M. Huang, *Graphon mean field games and their equations*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 59 (2021), pp. 4373–4399.
- [5] T. Damm, L. Grüne, M. Stieler, and K. Worthmann, *An exponential turnpike theorem for dissipative discrete time optimal control problems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 52 (2014), pp. 1935–1957.
- [6] R. Dorfman, P. A. Samuelson, and R. M. Solow, *Linear Programming and Economics Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1958).
- [7] T. E. Duncan, *Linear-quadratic stochastic differential games with general noise processes*, Internat. Ser. Oper. Res. Management Sci., 198 Springer, Cham, 2014, pp. 17–25.
- [8] L. Grüne and R. Guglielmi, *Turnpike properties and strict dissipativity for discrete time linear quadratic optimal control problems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 56 (2018), pp. 1282–1302.
- [9] S. Hamadène, *Backward-forward SDE's and stochastic differential games*, Stoch. Proc. Appl., 77 (1998), pp. 1–15.
- [10] S. Hamadène, *Nonzero sum linear-quadratic stochastic differential games and backward-forward equations*, Stoch. Anal. Appl., 17 (1999), pp. 117–130.
- [11] X. Li, J. Shi, and J. Yong, *Mean-field linear-quadratic stochastic differential games in an infinite horizon*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 27 (2021), Paper No. 81.
- [12] H. Lou and W. Wang, *Turnpike properties of optimal relaxed control problems*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 25 (2019), Paper No. 74.
- [13] J. Moon, *Linear-quadratic stochastic Stackelberg differential games for jump-diffusion systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 59 (2021), pp. 954–976.
- [14] J. Moon, *Linear-quadratic stochastic leader-follower differential games for Markov jump-diffusion models*, Automatica J. IFAC, 147 (2023), Paper No. 110713.
- [15] L. Mou and J. Yong, *Two-person zero-sum linear quadratic stochastic differential games by a Hilbert space method*, J. Industrial Management Optim., 2 (2006), pp. 95–117.
- [16] J. von Neumann, *A model of general economic equilibrium*, Rev. Econ. Stud., 13 (1945), pp. 1–9.
- [17] A. Porretta and E. Zuazua, *Long time versus steady state optimal control*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 51 (2013), pp. 4242–4273.
- [18] F. P. Ramsey, *A mathematical theory of saving*, The Economic Journal, 38 (1928), pp. 543–559.
- [19] N. Sakamoto and E. Zuazua, *The turnpike property in nonlinear optimal control—A geometric approach*, Automatica J. IFAC, 134 (2021), Paper No. 109939.
- [20] J. Sun, *Two-person zero-sum stochastic linear-quadratic differential games*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 59 (2021), pp. 1804–1829.
- [21] J. Sun, H. Wang, and J. Yong, *Turnpike properties for stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problems*, Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B, 43 (2022), pp. 999–1022.

- [22] J. Sun and J. Yong, *Linear quadratic stochastic differential games: Open-loop and closed-loop saddle points*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 52 (2014), pp. 4082–4121.
- [23] J. Sun and J. Yong, *Stochastic Linear-Quadratic Optimal Control Theory: Open-Loop and Closed-Loop Solutions*, SpringerBriefs in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2020.
- [24] J. Sun and J. Yong, *Stochastic Linear-Quadratic Optimal Control Theory: Differential Games and Mean-Field Problems*, SpringerBriefs in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2020.
- [25] J. Sun and J. Yong, *Turnpike properties for mean-field linear-quadratic optimal control problems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 62 (2024), pp. 752–775.
- [26] J. Sun and J. Yong, *Turnpike properties for stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problems with periodic coefficients*, J. Diff. Equ., to appear.
- [27] J. Sun, J. Yong, and S. Zhang, *Linear quadratic stochastic two-person zero-sum differential games in an infinite horizon*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 22 (2016), pp. 743–769.
- [28] E. Trélat and C. Zhang, *Integral and measure-turnpike properties for infinite-dimensional optimal control systems*, Math. Control Signals Syst., 30 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00498-018-0209-1>.
- [29] E. Trélat and E. Zuazua, *The turnpike property in finite-dimensional nonlinear optimal control*, J. Differ. Equ., 258 (2015), pp. 81–114.
- [30] J. Yong and X. Y. Zhou, *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.
- [31] Z. Yu, B. Zhang, and F. Zhang, *One kind of linear-quadratic zero-sum stochastic differential game with jumps*, Internat. J. Control, 95 (2022), pp. 1470–1481.
- [32] A. J. Zaslavski, *Turnpike Conditions in Infinite Dimensional Optimal Control*, Springer Optim. Appl. 80, Springer, Cham, 2019.