

# Causal feedback strategies for controlled stochastic Volterra systems: a unified treatment\*

Jiayin Gong<sup>†</sup>      Tianxiao Wang<sup>‡</sup>

June 18, 2024

## Abstract

This paper is concerned with a unified treatment of linear quadratic control problem for stochastic Volterra integral equations (SVIEs), motivated by the various approaches and scattered results in the existing literature. A novel class of optimal causal feedback strategy is introduced and characterized by means of a new Riccati system. To this end, a fundamental function space and an appropriate multiplicative rule among functions are defined for the first time. In contrast with the existing works, our unified treatment not only provides a new approach, but also extends or improves the known conclusions in stochastic differential equations, convolution SVIEs, stochastic Volterra integro-differential equations (VIDEs), deterministic VIEs, deterministic VIDEs. In addition, an interesting phenomenon is revealed by the current study: for SVIEs the conventional structure of state feedback is replaced by a suitable causal form, and the original state process no longer plays an indispensable role in the feedbacks while an auxiliary state process does.

**Keywords.** stochastic Volterra integral equations, linear-quadratic control, optimal causal feedback strategy, Riccati system

**AMS Mathematics subject classification.** 93E20, 49N10, 60H20, 45D05

## 1 Introduction

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a complete filtered probability space on which a standard one-dimension Brownian motion  $W$  is defined and  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is the natural filtration of  $W$  augmented by all the  $\mathbb{P}$ -null sets in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Given  $\tau \in [0, T]$ , we consider the following stochastic Volterra integral equations (SVIEs for short):

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= \varphi(t) + \int_{\tau}^t [A(t, s)X(s) + B(t, s)u(s)] ds \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau}^t [C(t, s)X(s) + D(t, s)u(s)] dW(s), \quad t \in [\tau, T], \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

---

\***Funding:** This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (11971332, 11931011, 12371449), the Science Development Project of Sichuan University (2020SCUNL201).

<sup>†</sup>School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China. (gongjiayin916@163.com).

<sup>‡</sup>Corresponding author. School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China. (wt-xiao2014@scu.edu.cn).

where  $A, B, C, D$  are given deterministic matrix-valued functions,  $\varphi$  is a given deterministic function called *free term*,  $u$  is the *admissible control process* in

$$\mathcal{U}[\tau, T] \triangleq \left\{ u: [\tau, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l \mid u(\cdot) \text{ is } \mathbb{F}\text{-adapted, measurable, } \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T |u(s)|^2 ds < \infty \right\}.$$

We introduce the following cost functional:

$$\mathcal{J}(\tau, \varphi; u) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle GX(T), X(T) \rangle + \int_{\tau}^T (\langle Q(s)X(s), X(s) \rangle + \langle R(s)u(s), u(s) \rangle) ds \right], \quad (1.2)$$

where  $G, Q$  and  $R$  are given deterministic matrix-valued functions. The LQ problem for SVIE can be stated as follows:

**Problem (LQ-SVIE).** Given  $\tau \in [0, T], \varphi \in L^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , find a  $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$  s.t.

$$\mathcal{J}(\tau, \varphi; \hat{u}) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]} \mathcal{J}(\tau, \varphi; u) \equiv V(\tau, \varphi). \quad (1.3)$$

Any  $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$  satisfying (1.3) is called an *optimal open-loop control* of Problem (LQ-SVIE) corresponding to  $(\tau, \varphi)$ ,  $\hat{X}(\cdot) \equiv X(\cdot; \tau, \varphi, \hat{u}(\cdot))$  is called an *optimal open-loop state process*,  $V$  is called the *value function*.

The classical optimal control theory was originally developed to deal with ordinary differential equations (ODEs). However, it is found that there are many physical phenomena (e.g., the hereditary property in Bellman–Cooke [2], Bellman–Danskin [3], Volterra [26]) that cannot be adequately described by ODEs but by Volterra integral equations (VIEs for short). VIEs were introduced by Italian mathematician Vito Volterra, and have brought us new theories (e.g., Volterra operator theory in Gohberg–Krein [10]). Up until now, it is still an active research topic, see, e.g., the recent monograph of Brunner [4]. As to the optimal control theory of VIEs, it seems that one of the earliest paper was given Friedman [9] to our best knowledge. In the stochastic case, Yong [34] studied the maximum principle of optimal controls by introducing proper backward stochastic Volterra integral equations (BSVIEs for short), while Wang-Yong [30] recently extended it into the general case with arbitrary non-empty control domain. Some relevant papers include Hamaguchi [13, 14], Shi et al [23], Viens-Zhang [27], Wang [31], Wang-Zhang [32], to mention a few.

At this moment, let us return back to the linear quadratic problem. Practically, people expect the optimal control to have state feedback representation which is non-anticipating. In the case of ODEs or SDEs, this can be done by a proper Riccati system. Nevertheless, in the SVIEs (or even VIEs) case, it becomes quite challenging to seek appropriate feedback optimal control (see e.g. Lindquist [17]). We believe one important reason lies in the lack of *flow property for SVIEs or VIEs*. In order to overcome this essential difficulty, let us look at the following auxiliary function  $\mathcal{X}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}(s, t) &= \varphi(s) + \int_{\tau}^t [A(s, r)X(r) + B(s, r)u(r)] dr \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau}^t [C(s, r)X(r) + D(s, r)u(r)] dW(r), \quad \tau \leq t \leq s \leq T. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

It is non-anticipating in the sense that  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot, t)$  is determined by the information of  $X, u$  up to the current time  $t$ . In addition, the flow property can be reestablished via  $\mathcal{X}$  (see e.g. Viens-Zhang [27]). According to monograph Corduneanu [6], we can regard  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot, t)$  as a *causal operator/abstract Volterra operator* acting on the function space of  $(X, u)$ , and name it the *causal state trajectory* in our LQ problems. In the deterministic case, this term was used in

LQ problems, see e.g. Lee-You [18, 19], Pritchard-You [20], and recent Han et al [15]. In the stochastic case, it was useful in Hamaguchi-Wang [11, 12], Wang [29], Wang et al [28] for the LQ problems and Coutin-Decreusefond [7], Viens-Zhang [27] for other problems.

To explain the motivations of the current study, let us give a closer revisit to the existing literature on LQ problem of VIEs (e.g. De Acutis [8], Han et al [15], Lindquist [17], Lee-You [18, 19], Pritchard-You [20], Pandolfi [21], Shaikhet [22]) and that of SVIEs (e.g. Abi Jaber et al [1], Chen-Yong [5], Hamaguchi-Wang [11, 12], Wang et al [28]). Let us demonstrate the details from four standpoints.

- As we know, the difference between optimal control problem of Bolza type and that of Lagrange type lies in the terminal cost. On the one hand, the previous one provides a general framework to deal with more practical problem such as mean-variance optimization problem or expected utility maximization problems. On the other hand, in the literature of ODEs/SDEs, it seems that there are not too much essential difference between the Bolza and the Lagrange type since in some sense the previous can be transformed into the later. Back to the LQ problem of SVIEs, Hamaguchi-Wang [11, 12] recently investigated the particular Lagrange type and characterized optimal causal feedback strategy via the above  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Then one may ask (Q1): *for SVIEs, is it still nearly trivial extension from the Lagrange type to the Bolza type in the characterization of causal feedback strategy?*

- Mathematical speaking, the matrix-valued Riccati equation should be more natural and easily acceptable for the finite-dimensional Problem (LQ-SVIE). However, Abi Jaber et al [1] studied the LQ problem of convolution SVIE, a special form of (1.1), based on an infinite-dimensional lifting approach and ended up with operator-valued Riccati equations for feedback controls. Wang et al [28] introduced an operator-valued path-dependent Riccati equation to characterize the feedback representation of the optimal control, and their controlled SVIE, another special form of (1.1), is an essential particular integro-differential type. One may ask (Q2): *can we use the matrix-value Riccati equation to represent optimal (causal) feedback strategy like that in the SDEs case (e.g. Sun-Yong [24])?*

- Based on the semigroup theory approach, De Acutis [8] studied the representation of an optimal feedback control for a deterministic VIDE. Pandolfi [21] obtained system of Riccati differential equations by dynamic programming method and state space approach. We found that both papers obtained the optimal control of the type

$$u(t) = p_0(t)X(t) + \int_{\tau}^t p_1(s, t)X(s)ds, \quad t \in [\tau, T], \quad (1.5)$$

where  $(p_0, p_1)$  is the solution to certain Riccati equations and  $X$  corresponds to the optimal state. Notice that similar form of (1.5) also appeared in Shaikhet [22]. Considering the fact that the above representation (1.5) for optimal control is also non-anticipated/causal, it then becomes quite natural to ask

(Q3): *For Problem (LQ-SVIE), can we obtain the optimal causal feedback representation without using the auxiliary  $\mathcal{X}$  in (1.4), but in the manner of representation (1.5)?*

- If (1.1) reduces to deterministic VIE, a so-called *projection causality approach* was introduced in Pritchard-You [20], and the optimal control was represented in linear causal feedback way with the feedback strategy determined by a Fredholm integral equation. Notice that this feedback representation is different from (1.5), and it relies on the above casual state  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Such Fredholm idea also happened in Lee-You [18, 19]. On the other hand, if (1.1) reduces to

a SDEs, there are abundant papers on representing optimal controls via Riccati equations (see e.g. Sun-Yong [24]). At this moment, one may ask

(Q4): *For Problem (LQ-SVIE), can we mix the projection causality idea in [20] with the Riccati equation idea in [24]? If so, what are the relationships between the study here and theirs?*

The purpose of this paper is to give a unified treatment to the Problem (LQ-SVIE), from which the above four different questions can be answered carefully. Inspired by the previous works (e.g. [11, 12, 20, 21, 28]), we introduce a new feedback representation of control process:

$$u(t) = \Theta_1(t)X(t) + \int_{\tau}^T \Theta_2(s, t)(X(s) \otimes \mathcal{X}(s, t))ds + \Theta_3(t)\mathcal{X}(T, t) + v(t), \quad t \in [\tau, T], \quad (1.6)$$

where  $\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3$  and  $v$  are deterministic functions merely depending on the data of Problem (LQ-SVIE) and

$$X(s) \otimes \mathcal{X}(s, t) \triangleq X(s)I_{[\tau, t]}(s) + \mathcal{X}(s, t)I_{[t, T]}(s), \quad t, s \in [\tau, T]. \quad (1.7)$$

Clearly, the representation (1.6) of  $u$  at current time  $t$  does not involve future information of the corresponding state process  $X$ . In this sense, we call  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v)$  a *causal feedback strategy* (see Definition 2.1 for a precise definition). The main result of the current paper is to characterize  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v)$  by introducing appropriate Riccati system which to our best knowledge is quite new in the literature. To indicate the unified powerfulness, we give detailed comparisons with the existing literature.

Now we highlight the innovations of this paper, together with some interesting phenomena revealed under our unified framework.

- From the notion viewpoint, the unified treatment requires us to introduce a new class of causal feedback strategy (1.6) and its characterization via the a new Riccati system (2.4). To this end, we define *suitable space* (Definition 2.4) and *appropriate multiplicative rule* (Definition 2.5) which appear for the first time in the literature.

- From the methodology standpoint, our unified treatment provides a new approach to study the LQ problem of SVIEs. For example, to obtain the explicit representation of optimal causal feedback strategy and the uniqueness of Riccati system, we introduce *strongly* optimal causal feedback strategy and the *extended* cost functional (see Remark 2.3, Remark 3.3, Remark 3.5 for details). Both notions reduce to the conventional case in [11, 12] when there is no terminal cost. This shows the nontrivial extension to the literature and it corresponds to (Q2) above.

- From the conclusion standpoint, we give a unified treatment to the existing literature in several cases, including SVIEs [12], SVIDE [28], convolution SVIE [1], VIDEs [21], VIEs [20], SDEs in e.g. [24], to mentioned a few. We provide explicit representation of causal feedback strategies via finite dimensional Riccati system, which is consistent with the Fredholm idea in [20], clarifies the operator-valued counterparts in [1, 28], and extends that in e.g. [12, 21, 24]. This corresponds to the above (Q1), (Q2), (Q4).

- The unified treatment helps us to reveal two interesting phenomena. First of all, we found that optimal control (if it exists) generally does not have representation in the spirit of (1.5). It gives us an answer to the above (Q3), and is based on three observations. First, in the deterministic case, our result (Theorem 3.1) shows  $p_1$  plays role only when  $R(\cdot)$  is singular. Second, in particular case (see Corollary 3.3), we prove it is contradictory once the above optimal representation (1.5) exists. Third, in contrast with  $X(\cdot)$  in the integral of (1.6), the term  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot, t)$  is more essential and appropriate in the sense that the later reduces to the former

in particular case (see Subsection 4.5). Second of all, we point out that another phenomenon when the drift term is not controlled ( $B=0$  in (1.1)). Once optimal causal feedback strategy exists, it is a *Markovian state feedback* in the sense that it only depends on  $X$  but not  $\mathcal{X}$  (see Remark 3.4).

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. The next section is devoted to some preliminaries. In Section 3 we establish an equivalent characterization of the existence of the strongly optimal feedback strategy. In Section 4 we apply our result to some special cases. Section 5 concludes this paper.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times l}$  be the usual  $d$ -dimensional space of real numbers and the set of all  $(d \times l)$  real matrices,  $\mathbb{S}^d$  be the set of all  $(d \times d)$  real symmetric matrices, and  $I_d$  be the  $(d \times d)$ -identity matrix.  $M^\top$  and  $M^\dagger$  denote the transpose and the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of matrix  $M$ , respectively.  $\mathcal{R}(M)$  denotes the range. We shall use  $|\cdot|$  and  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  to denote the Euclidean norm and product.  $\mathcal{B}([0, T])$  denotes the Borel  $\sigma$ -field of  $[0, T]$ . We define a triangle region and a square pyramid region:

$$\Delta_*[0, T] = \{(r, s) \in [0, T]^2 \mid 0 \leq s < r \leq T\}, \quad \square_3[0, T] = \{(s_1, s_2, t) \in [0, T]^3 \mid t < s_1 \wedge s_2\}.$$

For any  $\tau \in [0, T]$  and Euclidean space  $\mathbb{H}$  which could be  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times l}$ , or  $\mathbb{S}^d$ , and so on, we define several spaces. Let  $L^\infty(\tau, T; \mathbb{H})$  be the set of  $\mathbb{H}$ -valued essentially bounded measurable functions,  $L^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{H})$  the set of  $\mathbb{H}$ -valued and square-integrable deterministic functions,  $L^{2,2,1}(\square_3[\tau, T]; \mathbb{H})$  the set of  $f : \square_3[\tau, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$  such that  $\int_\tau^T \int_\tau^T (\int_\tau^{s_1 \wedge s_2} |f(s_1, s_2, t)| dt)^2 ds_1 ds_2 < \infty$ ,  $L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{H})$  the set of  $\mathbb{H}$ -valued, square-integrable and  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable processes,  $L_{\mathbb{F}}^2([\tau, T]^2; \mathbb{H})$  the set of  $f : [\tau, T]^2 \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$  such that  $f(t, \cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{H})$  for  $t \in [\tau, T]$  and  $\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_\tau^T |f(t, s)|^2 ds dt < \infty$ ,  $L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{H})$  the set of  $f : \Delta_*[\tau, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$  such that  $f(t, \cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\tau, t; \mathbb{H})$  for  $t \in [\tau, T]$  and  $\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_\tau^t |f(t, s)|^2 ds dt < \infty$ ,  $L_{\mathbb{F},c}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{H})$  the set of  $f \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{H})$  such that  $s \rightarrow f(t, s)$  is uniformly continuous on  $(\tau, t)$  and  $\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \sup_{s \in [\tau, t]} |f(t, s)|^2 dt < \infty$ .

Inspired by [11, 12], let  $\mathcal{L}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{H})$  be the set of  $f \in L^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{H})$  satisfying  $\text{esssup}_{t \in [\tau, T]} (\int_t^T |f(s, t)|^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a finite partition  $\{U_i\}_{i=0}^m$  of  $[\tau, T]$  with  $\tau = U_0 < U_1 < \dots < U_m = T$  satisfying  $\text{esssup}_{t \in (U_i, U_{i+1})} (\int_t^{U_{i+1}} |f(s, t)|^2 ds)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \varepsilon$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ .

For the coefficients in the state equation and cost functional, we impose the following assumptions throughout this paper:

(H1).  $A, C \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ ,  $B, D \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times l})$ .

(H2).  $Q \in L^\infty(\tau, T; \mathbb{S}^d)$ ,  $R \in L^\infty(\tau, T; \mathbb{S}^l)$ ,  $G \in \mathbb{S}^d$ .

(H3). For  $f \stackrel{\Delta}{=} A, B, C, D$ , there exist a modulus of continuity  $\rho(\cdot)$  and  $\delta$  such that

$$|f(T, s) - f(t, s)| + |\varphi(T) - \varphi(t)| \leq \rho(T - t), \quad \tau \leq s, T - \delta \leq t \leq T.$$

**Remark 2.1.** For any  $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we see that the terminal cost is not well-defined. However, under (H3) a proof similar to that of [15, Theorem 2.4] guarantees the left-continuity of the state process  $X(\cdot)$  at  $t = T$ , and then  $X(T)$  makes sense.

For the sake of symbolic simplicity, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I} &\triangleq \{(\tau, \varphi) \mid \tau \in [0, T], \varphi \in L^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d) \text{ satisfies (H3)}\}, \\ \mathcal{S}[0, T] &\triangleq L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}) \times L^2([0, T]^2; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}) \times L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}) \times \mathcal{U}[0, T].\end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.1.** (i) Any 4-tuple  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  is called a causal feedback strategy. (ii) For any  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  and  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , the pair  $(X, \mathcal{X}) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2_{\mathbb{F}, c}(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is called the causal feedback solution of (1.1) if it satisfies

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} X(t) &= \varphi(\tau) + \int_{\tau}^t [A(t, r)X(r) + B(t, r)u^{\Theta, v}(r)] dr \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau}^t [C(t, r)X(r) + D(t, r)u^{\Theta, v}(r)] dW(r), \quad t \in [\tau, T], \\ \mathcal{X}(s, t) &= \varphi(s) + \int_{\tau}^t [A(s, r)X(r) + B(s, r)u^{\Theta, v}(r)] dr \\ &\quad + \int_{\tau}^t [C(s, r)X(r) + D(s, r)u^{\Theta, v}(r)] dW(r), \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T], \\ u^{\Theta, v}(t) &\triangleq \Theta_1(t)X(t) + \int_{\tau}^T \Theta_2(r, t)(X(r) \otimes \mathcal{X}(r, t)) dr \\ &\quad + \Theta_3(t)\mathcal{X}(T, t) + v(t), \quad t \in [\tau, T]. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (2.1)$$

Here,  $X \otimes \mathcal{X}$  is in (1.7),  $u^{\Theta, v}$  is called the outcome of  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v)$  at  $(\tau, \varphi)$ .

**Remark 2.2.** As to the above definition, let us point out two interesting facts. First, we observe  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  does not rely on  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$  while  $u^{\Theta, v}$  does. Second, there are some important differences from [11, 12] even when the terminal cost disappear. In fact, our strategy  $\Theta_2$  is defined on  $[0, T]^2$  instead of  $\Delta_*[0, T]$ . Therefore, the  $u^{\Theta, v}$  in (2.1) have additional dependence on the value of  $X(\cdot)$  in  $[\tau, t]$ .

The following lemma gives the existence and uniqueness of a causal feedback solution. Since its proof is almost the same as [11, Theorem 2.4], we omit the details.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let (H1)-(H3) hold. For each causal feedback strategy  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  and each input condition  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , the controlled SVIE (1.1) has a unique causal feedback solution  $(X, \mathcal{X}) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2_{\mathbb{F}, c}(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ .

If  $(X, \mathcal{X})$  is the causal feedback solution of (1.1), then it is easy to see  $u^{\Theta, v}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ . At this moment, let us present the definition of optimal causal feedback strategy.

**Definition 2.2.** A 4-tuple  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, \widehat{v}) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  is called optimal causal feedback strategy of Problem (LQ-SVIE) if

$$\mathcal{J}(\tau, \varphi; u^{\widehat{\Theta}, \widehat{v}}) \leq \mathcal{J}(\tau, \varphi; u), \quad \forall (\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}, \quad u \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T].$$

Since the cost functional depends on the terminal state, we have to introduce some new concepts. Instead of the above *original framework* (including notations  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ , etc.) with optimal strategy, we will work in the *extended framework* with *stronger optimality* to obtain the explicit forms and uniqueness of causal feedback strategy (once it exists). We refer to the following Remark 2.3, Remark 3.3 and Remark 3.5 for more detailed explanations. To begin with, inspired by [31], we define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{I}} \triangleq \{(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \mid \tau \in [0, T], \varphi_1 \in L^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d), \varphi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

For any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$ , consider the following system:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} X_1(t) = \varphi_1(t) + \int_{\tau}^t [A(t, r)X_1(r) + B(t, r)u_1^{\Theta, v}(r)] dr \\ \quad + \int_{\tau}^t [C(t, r)X_1(r) + D(t, r)u_1^{\Theta, v}(r)] dW(r), \quad t \in [\tau, T], \\ \mathcal{X}_1(s, t) = \varphi_1(s) + \int_{\tau}^t [A(s, r)X_1(r) + B(s, r)u_1^{\Theta, v}(r)] dr \\ \quad + \int_{\tau}^t [C(s, r)X_1(r) + D(s, r)u_1^{\Theta, v}(r)] dW(r), \quad \tau \leq t \leq s < T, \\ \mathcal{X}_2(t) = \varphi_2 + \int_{\tau}^t [A(T, r)X_1(r) + B(T, r)u_1^{\Theta, v}(r)] dr \\ \quad + \int_{\tau}^t [C(T, r)X_1(r) + D(T, r)u_1^{\Theta, v}(r)] dW(r), \quad t \in [\tau, T], \\ u_1^{\Theta, v}(t) \triangleq \Theta_1(t)X_1(t) + \int_{\tau}^T \Theta_2(r, t)(X_1(r) \otimes \mathcal{X}_1(r, t)) dr \\ \quad + \Theta_3(t)\mathcal{X}_2(t) + v(t), \quad t \in [\tau, T]. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.2)$$

A method similar to [11, Theorem 2.4] ensures the existence and uniqueness of  $(X_1, \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L_{\mathbb{F}, c}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . We call  $(X_1, \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2)$  the *extended causal feedback solution* of controlled SVIE,  $u_1^{\Theta, v}$  the *extended outcome* of  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v)$  at  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ , and (2.2) the *extended closed-loop system*.

For any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , we further introduce

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle G\mathcal{X}_2(T), \mathcal{X}_2(T) \rangle + \int_{\tau}^T (\langle Q(s)X_1(s), X_1(s) \rangle + \langle R(s)u(s), u(s) \rangle) ds \right], \quad (2.3)$$

where  $X_1, \mathcal{X}_1$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2$  are the solutions of the first, second and third equations in (2.2) replacing  $u_1^{\Theta, v}$  with any  $u \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , respectively. We name (2.3) the *extended cost functional* and define the corresponding *extended value function*

$$\tilde{V}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \triangleq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]} \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u).$$

Similar to Definition 2.2, we give the following definition.

**Definition 2.3.** A 4-tuple  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  is called *strongly optimal causal feedback strategy* of Problem (LQ-SVIE) if

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\hat{\Theta}, \hat{v}}) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u), \quad (\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}, \quad u \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T].$$

**Remark 2.3.** At this moment, let us explain the terms *extended* and *strongly* in the above.

First, for any  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , by taking  $\varphi_1 \triangleq \varphi$  and  $\varphi_2 \triangleq \varphi(T)$ , we see that the extended causal feedback solution in (2.2) naturally reduces to causal feedback solution in (2.1). Similar principle also holds for the outcome, the closed-loop system, the cost functional and the value function.

Second, since the set  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  is *larger* than  $\mathcal{I}$ , it is clear that a strongly optimal causal feedback strategy is also optimal in the spirit of Definition 2.2. This explains the term *strongly*. If  $G=0$ , the two concepts of strongly optimal causal feedback strategy and optimal causal feedback strategy are equivalent.

To introduce the Riccati type system, we define a suitable space and certain right (or left) multiplicative rule. Both of them appear for the first time in the literature.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\Upsilon[0, T]$  be the set of  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$  with  $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^d$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_3 : \Delta_*[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_4 : \square_3[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that

- (i)  $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^d)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_3 \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Delta_*[0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_4 \in L^{2,2,1}(\square_3[0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ ;
- (ii) for a.e.  $(s_1, s_2) \in [0, T]^2$ ,  $t \mapsto \mathcal{P}_4(s_1, s_2, t)$  is absolutely continuous on  $(0, s_1 \wedge s_2)$ , and for a.e.  $(s_1, s_2, t) \in \square_3[0, T]$ , it holds that  $\mathcal{P}_4(s_1, s_2, t) = \mathcal{P}_4(s_2, s_1, t)^\top$ .

The above  $\Upsilon[0, T]$  will be the solution space for our Riccati system. Next we define some multiplicative rules that are frequently used in the Riccati system.

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4) \in \Upsilon[0, T]$ . For each  $M : \Delta_*[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d}$  and  $N : \Delta_*[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_2}$ , we define:

$$\begin{aligned}
(M \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t) &\triangleq M(T, t) \mathcal{P}_2(t) + \int_t^T M(s, t) \mathcal{P}_3(s, t)^\top ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \\
(\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright N)(t) &\triangleq \mathcal{P}_2(t) N(T, t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) N(s, t) ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \\
(M \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(s, t) &\triangleq M(s, t) \mathcal{P}_1(s) + M(T, t) \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) + \int_t^T M(r, t) \mathcal{P}_4(r, s, t) dr, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\
(\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright N)(s, t) &\triangleq \mathcal{P}_1(s) N(s, t) + \mathcal{P}_3(s, t)^\top N(T, t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_4(s, r, t) N(r, t) dr, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\
(M \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright N)(t) &\triangleq M(T, t) \mathcal{P}_2(t) N(T, t) + \int_t^T \left[ M(s, t) \mathcal{P}_1(s) N(s, t) + M(T, t) \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) N(s, t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + M(s, t) \mathcal{P}_3(s, t)^\top N(T, t) + \int_t^T M(s, t) \mathcal{P}_4(s, \theta, t) N(\theta, t) d\theta \right] ds, \quad t \in [0, T].
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark 2.4.** Notice that if we take  $M(s, t) \equiv M(t)$ ,  $N(s, t) \equiv N(t)$ , then “ $\triangleleft$ ” and “ $\triangleright$ ” in Definition 2.5 reduces to the classical multiplicative rule, e.g.,

$$(M \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright N)(t) = M(t) \left\{ \mathcal{P}_2(t) + \int_t^T \left( \mathcal{P}_1(s) + \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) + \mathcal{P}_3(s, t)^\top + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_4(s, \theta, t) d\theta \right) ds \right\} N(t).$$

At this moment, it is time for us to present the following system:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}_1(t) = Q(t) + (C^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t) \\
&\quad - (C^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t) (R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^\dagger (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\
&\mathcal{P}_2(t) = G - \int_t^T (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright B)(s) (R(s) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(s))^\dagger (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(s) ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \\
&\mathcal{P}_3(t, r) = (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright A)(t) - (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright B)(t) (R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^\dagger (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t) \\
&\quad - \int_r^t (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright B)(\theta) (R(\theta) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(\theta))^\dagger (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(t, \theta) d\theta, \quad (t, r) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\
&\mathcal{P}_4(s, t, r) = \mathcal{P}_4(t, s, r)^\top \\
&\quad = (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright A)(s, t) - (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright B)(s, t) (R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^\dagger (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t) \\
&\quad - \int_r^t (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright B)(s, \theta) (R(\theta) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(\theta))^\dagger (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(t, \theta) d\theta, \quad 0 \leq r \leq t \leq s \leq T.
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{2.4}$$

In Subsection 4.1 and 4.2, we shall show that (2.4) reduces to the so-called *Riccati-Volterra equation* in [12] and the classical Riccati equation in LQ problem for SDE, respectively. Therefore, in the current paper we will name (2.4) a *Riccati system*. Following the terminology in [12], we give the concept of the regular solution for (2.4). Due to notational simplicity, we denote  $\mathbf{R}(\cdot) \triangleq R(\cdot) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(\cdot)$ ,  $\mathbf{D}(\cdot) \triangleq (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(\cdot)$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_1(\cdot, \cdot) \triangleq (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\mathbf{B}_2(\cdot) \triangleq (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(\cdot)$ .



**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4) \in \Upsilon[0, T]$  be a solution to the Riccati system (2.4). It is called regular if

- (i)  $\mathbf{R}(t) \geq 0$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{D}(t) + \mathbf{B}_2(t)) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{R}(t))$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{B}_1(r, t)) \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{R}(t))$  for a.e.  $(r, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T]$ ,
- (iii)  $(\mathbf{R}^\dagger \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{R}^\dagger \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{R}^\dagger \mathbf{B}_2) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}) \times L^2(\Delta_*[0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}) \times L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d})$ .

### 3 Strongly optimal strategy and Riccati equation

This section is devoted to the equivalence (Theorem 3.1) between the existence of strongly optimal causal feedback strategy and the regular solvability of Riccati system (2.4). To achieve this goal, we first give a representation of the extended cost functional (Lemma 3.2).

To begin with, for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$ , we introduce the following SVIE:

$$\mathbb{X}(t) = \Phi(t) + \int_\tau^t \mathbb{A}(t, s) \mathbb{X}(s) ds + \int_\tau^t \mathbb{C}(t, s) \mathbb{X}(s) dW(s), \quad t \in [\tau, T]. \quad (3.1)$$

Here, the coefficients  $\Phi, \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{C}$  are defined by:

$$\Phi(t) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1(t) \\ \Theta_1(t)\varphi_1(t) + \int_\tau^T \Theta_2(r, t)\varphi_1(r) dr + \Theta_3(t)\varphi_2 + v(t) \\ \varphi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [\tau, T], \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\mathbb{A}(t, s) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} A(t, s) & B(t, s) & 0 \\ A_{12}(t, s) & B_{12}(t, s) & 0 \\ A(T, s) & B(T, s) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbb{C}(t, s) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} C(t, s) & D(t, s) & 0 \\ C_{12}(t, s) & D_{12}(t, s) & 0 \\ C(T, s) & D(T, s) & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where for  $f \triangleq A, B, C, D$ ,

$$f_{12}(t, s) \triangleq \Theta_1(t)f(t, s) + \int_s^T \Theta_2(r, t)f(r, s) dr + \Theta_3(t)f(T, s), \quad (t, s) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T]. \quad (3.3)$$

**Remark 3.1.** Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (H1), it is easy to see that  $\Phi(\cdot) \in L^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^{2d+l})$ ,  $\mathbb{A} \in L^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^{6d+3l})$  and  $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^{6d+3l})$ . Similarly to [11, Theorem 2.4], we can show the well-posedness of above system (3.1). Here, for the sake of page limit, we omit the proof.

Next we give a result which reveals the structure of the extended causal feedback solution. Its proof is slight adjustment to [11, Lemma A.4]. We omit the details.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let (H1)-(H2) hold and  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  be fixed. For any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ ,  $(X_1, \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2_{\mathbb{F}, c}(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is a extended causal feedback solution if and only if the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} X_1(t) \\ u_1^{\Theta, v}(t) \\ \mathcal{X}_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbb{X}(t), \quad t \in [\tau, T], \\ \mathcal{X}_1(s, t) = \varphi_1(s) + \int_\tau^t (A(s, r) \ B(s, r) \ 0) \mathbb{X}(r) dr \\ \quad + \int_\tau^t (C(s, r) \ D(s, r) \ 0) \mathbb{X}(r) dW(r), \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T], \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\mathbb{X} \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^{2d+l})$  is the solution of the SVIE (3.1).

The above Lemma 3.1 helps us to provide some new ideas different from [12, Theorem 4.1] in the representation of the extended cost functional (see Remark 3.2). Next, for each  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3) \in L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}) \times L^2([0, T]^2; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}) \times L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d})$ , we introduce a deterministic system inspired by [30, Theorem 4.1]:

$$\begin{cases} P_1(t) = \mathbb{Q}(t) + \int_t^T \mathbb{C}(s, t)^\top P_1(s) \mathbb{C}(s, t) ds + \int_t^T \int_t^T \mathbb{C}(s, t)^\top P_2(\theta, s) \mathbb{C}(\theta, t) d\theta ds, t \in [\tau, T], \\ P_2(r, t) = \mathbb{A}(r, t)^\top P_1(r) + \int_t^T \mathbb{A}(s, t)^\top P_2(r, s) ds \\ \quad = P_2(t, r)^\top, (r, t) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T], \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

where  $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{C}$  are defined by (3.3) and

$$\mathbb{Q}(t) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} Q(t) + C(T, t)^\top GC(T, t) & C(T, t)^\top GD(T, t) & A(T, t)^\top G \\ D(T, t)^\top GC(T, t) & R(t) + D(T, t)^\top GD(T, t) & B(T, t)^\top G \\ GA(T, t) & GB(T, t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.6)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (H1) and  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$ , it is easy to show that  $\mathbb{Q} \in L^\infty(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^{6d+3l})$ ,  $\mathbb{A} \in L^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^{6d+3l})$  and  $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^{6d+3l})$ . Similarly to the proof of [11, Theorem 4.11], we can obtain the well-posedness of (3.5) in the sense that  $(P_1, P_2) \in L^\infty(\tau, T; \mathbb{S}^{6d+3l}) \times L^2([\tau, T]^2; \mathbb{R}^{6d+3l})$  with  $P_2(s, t) = P_2(t, s)^\top$ .

We now state the representation result for the extended cost functional.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let (H1)-(H2) hold and  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  be fixed. Then for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\Theta, v+\tilde{v}})$  admits the following representation:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\Theta, v+\tilde{v}}) = \varphi_2^\top G \varphi_2 + \int_\tau^T \tilde{\Phi}(t)^\top P_1(t) \tilde{\Phi}(t) dt + \int_\tau^T \int_\tau^T \tilde{\Phi}(t)^\top P_2(s, t) \tilde{\Phi}(s) ds dt,$$

where  $\tilde{\Phi}(t)$  is defined by

$$\tilde{\Phi}(t) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_1(t) \\ \Theta_1(t) \varphi_1(t) + \int_\tau^T \Theta_2(r, t) \varphi_1(r) dr + \Theta_3(t) \varphi_2 + v(t) + \tilde{v}(t) \\ \varphi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in [\tau, T].$$

*Proof.* For any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v + \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$ , let  $(X_1, \mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2)$  be the extended causal feedback solution corresponding to  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v + \tilde{v})$  (recall (2.2)). Then, by Lemma 3.1,  $\mathbb{X}$  satisfies the SVIE (3.1) replacing  $\Phi$  with  $\tilde{\Phi}$ . We begin to treat the first term  $\mathbb{E}\langle G \mathcal{X}_2(T), \mathcal{X}_2(T) \rangle$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\Theta, v+\tilde{v}})$ . Applying the Itô's formula to  $t \mapsto \mathcal{X}_2(t)^\top G \mathcal{X}_2(t)$  on  $[\tau, T]$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}_2(T)^\top G \mathcal{X}_2(T)] \\ &= \varphi_2^\top G \varphi_2 + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T 2 \mathcal{X}_2(t)^\top G (A(T, t) X_1(t) + B(T, t) u_1^{\Theta, v+\tilde{v}}(t)) dt \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T (X_1(t)^\top C(T, t)^\top + u_1^{\Theta, v+\tilde{v}}(t)^\top D(T, t)^\top) G (C(T, t) X_1(t) + D(T, t) u_1^{\Theta, v+\tilde{v}}(t)) dt \\ &= \varphi_2^\top G \varphi_2 + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \mathbb{X}(t)^\top \mathbb{G}(T, t) \mathbb{X}(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbb{G}(T, t) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} C(T, t)^\top GC(T, t) & C(T, t)^\top GD(T, t) & A(T, t)^\top G \\ D(T, t)^\top GC(T, t) & D(T, t)^\top GD(T, t) & B(T, t)^\top G \\ GA(T, t) & GB(T, t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, the extended cost functional (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\Theta, v+\bar{v}}) = \varphi_2^\top G \varphi_2 + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \mathbb{X}(t)^\top \mathbb{Q}(t) \mathbb{X}(t) dt, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\mathbb{Q}$  is defined by (3.6).

In the following, we turn to calculating the term  $\mathbb{X}(t)^\top \mathbb{Q}(t) \mathbb{X}(t)$  with the help of Itô's formula. To this end, we introduce the following auxiliary process  $\mathcal{X}(\cdot, \cdot)$ :

$$\mathcal{X}(t, r) = \tilde{\Phi}(t) + \int_\tau^r \mathbb{A}(t, s) \mathbb{X}(s) ds + \int_\tau^r \mathbb{C}(t, s) \mathbb{X}(s) dW(s), \quad (t, r) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T].$$

Then, applying Itô's formula to  $\theta \mapsto \mathcal{X}(r, \theta)^\top P_1(r) \mathcal{X}(r, \theta)$  on  $[\tau, r]$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{X}(r)^\top P_1(r) \mathbb{X}(r)] - \tilde{\Phi}(r)^\top P_1(r) \tilde{\Phi}(r) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}(r, r)^\top P_1(r) \mathcal{X}(r, r)] - \tilde{\Phi}(r)^\top P_1(r) \tilde{\Phi}(r) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^r [2\mathcal{X}(r, \theta)^\top P_1(r) \mathbb{A}(r, \theta) + \mathbb{X}(\theta)^\top \mathbb{C}(r, \theta)^\top P_1(r) \mathbb{C}(r, \theta)] \mathbb{X}(\theta) d\theta, \quad r \in [\tau, T]. \end{aligned}$$

By integrating it over  $[\tau, T]$  and using Fubini theorem, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \mathbb{X}(r)^\top P_1(r) \mathbb{X}(r) dr - \int_\tau^T \tilde{\Phi}(r)^\top P_1(r) \tilde{\Phi}(r) dr \\ = \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_r^T [2\mathcal{X}(\theta, r)^\top P_1(\theta) \mathbb{A}(\theta, r) + \mathbb{X}(r)^\top \mathbb{C}(\theta, r)^\top P_1(\theta) \mathbb{C}(\theta, r)] \mathbb{X}(r) d\theta dr. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

We see that the new term of the form  $\mathcal{X}(\theta, r)^\top (\dots) \mathbb{X}(r)$  appears on the right hand. Next, to handle this new term, for any  $(\theta, r) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T]$ , using the Itô's formula to  $\theta' \mapsto \mathcal{X}(\theta, \theta')^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \mathcal{X}(r, \theta')$  on  $[\tau, r]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{X}(\theta, r)^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \mathbb{X}(r)] - \tilde{\Phi}(\theta)^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \tilde{\Phi}(r) &= \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^r \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{X}(\theta')^\top G_2(\theta, r, \theta') \mathbb{X}(\theta') \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{X}(\theta')^\top \mathbb{A}(\theta, \theta')^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \mathcal{X}(r, \theta') + \mathcal{X}(\theta, \theta')^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \mathbb{A}(r, \theta') \mathbb{X}(\theta') \right] d\theta', \end{aligned}$$

where

$$G_2(\theta, r, \theta') \triangleq \mathbb{C}(\theta, \theta')^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \mathbb{C}(r, \theta') + \mathbb{C}(r, \theta')^\top P_2(\theta, r) \mathbb{C}(\theta, \theta'), \quad \tau \leq \theta' \leq r \leq \theta \leq T.$$

Combining Fubini theorem with  $P_2(\theta, r)^\top = P_2(r, \theta)$ ,  $(\theta, r) \in [\tau, T]^2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_r^T [\mathcal{X}(\theta, r)^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \mathbb{X}(r) - \tilde{\Phi}(\theta)^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \tilde{\Phi}(r)] d\theta dr \\ = \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_r^T \left[ \int_\theta^T \mathbb{X}(r)^\top \mathbb{A}(\theta', r)^\top P_2(\theta', \theta)^\top \mathcal{X}(\theta, r) d\theta' \right. \\ \quad \left. + \int_r^\theta \mathcal{X}(\theta, r)^\top P_2(\theta, \theta')^\top \mathbb{A}(\theta', r) \mathbb{X}(r) d\theta' + \int_\theta^T \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{X}(r)^\top G_2(\theta', \theta, r) \mathbb{X}(r) d\theta' \right] d\theta dr \\ = \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_r^T \left[ \int_r^T \mathcal{X}(\theta, r)^\top P_2(\theta, \theta')^\top \mathbb{A}(\theta', r) \mathbb{X}(r) d\theta' + \int_\theta^T \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{X}(r)^\top G_2(\theta', \theta, r) \mathbb{X}(r) d\theta' \right] d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows from (3.8) and the above equality that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\Theta, v+\bar{v}}) &= \varphi_2^\top G \varphi_2 + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \mathbb{X}(r)^\top \mathbb{Q}(r) \mathbb{X}(r) dr \\ &= \varphi_2^\top G \varphi_2 + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \tilde{\Phi}(r)^\top P_1(r) \tilde{\Phi}(r) dr + 2\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_r^T \tilde{\Phi}(\theta)^\top P_2(\theta, r)^\top \tilde{\Phi}(r) d\theta dr \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \mathbb{X}(r)^\top \left[ \mathbb{Q}(r) + \int_r^T \left( \mathbb{C}(\theta, r)^\top P_1(\theta) \mathbb{C}(\theta, r) + \int_\theta^T G_2(\theta', \theta, r) d\theta' \right) d\theta - P_1(r) \right] \mathbb{X}(r) dr \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_r^T \left[ \mathcal{X}(\theta, r)^\top \left( P_1(\theta) \mathbb{A}(\theta, r) - P_2(\theta, r)^\top + \int_r^T P_2(\theta, \theta')^\top d\theta' \right) \mathbb{X}(r) \right] d\theta dr. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.5) into the above equality yields the representation of  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\Theta, v+\bar{v}})$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *As is shown in Remark 2.2, both the causal feedback strategy and feedback outcome are different from [11, 12]. Therefore, the methodology in [12, Theorem 4.1] may not work well in our framework which prompts us to seek for new ideas. Thanks to the first equality in (3.4), one can transform the cost functional into a pure quadratic form without control by some lifting up arguments, see (3.7). Considering the fact that  $\mathbb{X}$  satisfies a linear SVIE (3.1), it then becomes natural for us to borrow the arguments in [30] and come up with the above (3.5), as well as the procedures involved with Itô's formula and Fubini theorem in the previous proof.*

The following conclusion can be obtained directly by Lemma 3.2.

**Corollary 3.1.** *Let (H1)-(H2) hold and  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  be fixed. For any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ , it holds that*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\Theta, v}) = \varphi_2^\top G \varphi_2 + \int_\tau^T \Phi(t)^\top P_1(t) \Phi(t) dt + \int_\tau^T \int_\tau^T \Phi(t)^\top P_2(s, t) \Phi(s) ds dt,$$

where  $\Phi(t)$  is defined by (3.2) and  $(P_1, P_2)$  is the solution of the system (3.5).

To present the main result of this paper, i.e. Theorem 3.1, let us give one more preliminary result.

**Lemma 3.3.** *(i) Let  $f_1 \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d})$  and  $f_2 \in L^2(\square_3[0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{l \times d})$  be given functions such that for a.e.  $(s_1, s_2) \in [0, T]^2$ ,  $t \mapsto f_2(s_1, s_2, t)$  is continuous on  $[0, s_1 \wedge s_2]$ . Assume that for any  $\tau \in [0, T]$ ,  $x \in L^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , it holds that*

$$\int_\tau^T v(s)^\top f_1(s) x(s) ds + \int_\tau^T \int_\tau^T v(s_2)^\top f_2(s_1, s_2, \tau) x(s_1) ds_1 ds_2 = 0.$$

Then  $f_1(t) = 0$ , a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $f_2(s_1, s_2, t) = 0$ , a.e.  $(s_1, s_2) \in [0, T]^2$ ,  $\forall t \in [0, s_1 \wedge s_2]$ .

*(ii) Let  $f : \Delta_*[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$  such that for a.e.  $s \in [0, T]$ ,  $t \mapsto f(s, t)$  is continuous on  $[0, s]$ . Assume that*

$$\int_\tau^T v(s)^\top f(s, \tau) ds = 0$$

for any  $\tau \in [0, T]$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ . Then  $f(s, t) = 0$  for a.e.  $s \in [0, T]$  and any  $t \in [0, s]$ .

The proof of the above lemma is a proper adjustment to [11, Lemma 4.4]. We omit the details for the sake of limitation space.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose (H1)-(H2) hold. Then Problem (LQ-SVIE) admits a strongly optimal causal feedback strategy  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v})$  if and only if the Riccati system (2.4) admits a regular solution  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4) \in \Upsilon[0, T]$ . In this case,*

$$\begin{cases} (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t) + (R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t)) \hat{\Theta}_1(t) = 0, & t \in [0, T], \\ (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t) + (R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t)) \hat{\Theta}_3(t) = 0, & t \in [0, T], \\ (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(r, t) I_{[0, r]}(t) + (R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t)) \hat{\Theta}_2(r, t) = 0, & (r, t) \in [0, T]^2, \\ (R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t)) \hat{v}(t) = 0, & t \in [0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

Further, for each  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ , the extended value function is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{V}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) &= \varphi_2^\top \mathcal{P}_2(\tau) \varphi_2 + \int_\tau^T \left[ \varphi_1(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) \varphi_1(s) + 2\varphi_2^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, \tau) \varphi_1(s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_\tau^T \varphi_1(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_4(s, r, \tau) \varphi_1(r) dr \right] ds.\end{aligned}\quad (3.10)$$

*Proof. The necessity:* Suppose  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  is a strongly optimal causal feedback strategy. By Lemma 3.2 and Corollary 3.1, for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}& \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\hat{\Theta}, \hat{v}+v}) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\hat{\Theta}, \hat{v}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T v(t)^\top \left[ P_{22}^{(1)}(t) v(t) + \int_\tau^T P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) v(s) ds + 2P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{v}(t) + 2 \int_\tau^T P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) \hat{v}(s) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\mathcal{M}_1(t) \varphi_1(t) + 2\mathcal{M}_2(t, \tau) \varphi_2 + 2 \int_\tau^T \mathcal{M}_3(s, t, \tau) \varphi_1(s) ds \right] dt,\end{aligned}$$

where  $P_{ij}^{(1)}, P_{ij}^{(2)}, i, j = \{1, 2, 3\}$  are components of the solution  $(P_1, P_2)$  of (3.5) and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_1(t) &\triangleq P_{21}^{(1)}(t) + P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{\Theta}_1(t), \\ \mathcal{M}_2(t, \tau) &\triangleq P_{23}^{(1)}(t) + P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{\Theta}_3(t) + \int_\tau^T (P_{23}^{(2)}(s, t) + P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) \hat{\Theta}_3(s)) ds, \\ \mathcal{M}_3(s, t, \tau) &\triangleq P_{21}^{(2)}(s, t) + P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) \hat{\Theta}_1(s) + P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{\Theta}_2(s, t) + \int_\tau^T P_{22}^{(2)}(s_1, t) \hat{\Theta}_2(s_1, s) ds_1.\end{aligned}$$

By the strongly optimality of  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v})$ , for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , we can obtain that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\hat{\Theta}, \hat{v}+v}) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\hat{\Theta}, \hat{v}}) \geq 0,$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T v(t)^\top P_{22}^{(1)}(t) v(t) dt + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_\tau^T v(t)^\top P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) v(s) ds dt \geq 0, \quad (3.11)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T v(t)^\top \left[ P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{v}(t) + \mathcal{M}_1(t) \varphi_1(t) + \mathcal{M}_2(t, \tau) \varphi_2 + \int_\tau^T (P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) \hat{v}(s) + \mathcal{M}_3(s, t, \tau) \varphi_1(s)) ds \right] dt = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

Now we take  $v(\cdot) \triangleq v I_{[\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}+\varepsilon]}(\cdot)$ ,  $\bar{\tau} \in [\tau, T]$ , with  $\bar{\tau} + \varepsilon < T$  and any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^l$ . Then (3.11) becomes

$$\int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} v^\top P_{22}^{(1)}(t) v dt + \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} v^\top P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) v ds dt \geq 0.$$

By Lebesgue differentiation theorem,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} v^\top P_{22}^{(1)}(t) v dt = v^\top P_{22}^{(1)}(\bar{\tau}) v, \quad \text{a.e. } \bar{\tau} \in [\tau, T].$$

On the other hand, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} v^\top P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) v ds dt \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left( \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\tau}}^{\bar{\tau}+\varepsilon} |v^\top P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) v|^2 ds dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.$$

Therefore, the arbitrariness of  $v$  leads to

$$P_{22}^{(1)}(\bar{\tau}) \geq 0, \quad \text{a.e. } \bar{\tau} \in [\tau, T]. \quad (3.13)$$

By the arbitrariness of  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ , let us take  $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 0$ . Then, for any  $\tau \in [0, T]$  and  $v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , (3.12) becomes

$$\mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T v(t)^\top P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{v}(t) dt + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \int_\tau^T v(t)^\top P_{22}^{(2)}(s, t) \hat{v}(s) ds dt = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Thus, it follows from (3.12) and (3.14) that for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T v(t)^{\top} \left[ \mathcal{M}_1(t) \varphi_1(t) dt + \mathcal{M}_2(t, \tau) \varphi_2 + \int_{\tau}^T \mathcal{M}_3(s, t, \tau) \varphi_1(s) ds \right] dt = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Again by the arbitrariness of  $\varphi_1$ , let us take  $\varphi_1 = 0$ . Then (3.15) becomes

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T v(t)^{\top} \mathcal{M}_2(t, \tau) \varphi_2 dt = 0, \quad \tau \in [0, T], v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T], \varphi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

For a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\tau \mapsto \mathcal{M}_2(t, \tau)$  is absolutely continuous on  $[0, t]$ . Therefore, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\mathcal{M}_2(t, t_1) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad \forall t_1 \in [0, t]. \quad (3.16)$$

Then, by (3.15) and (3.16), for any  $\tau \in [0, T]$ ,  $\varphi_1 \in L^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T v(t)^{\top} \mathcal{M}_1(t) \varphi_1(t) dt + \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T \int_{\tau}^T v(t)^{\top} \mathcal{M}_3(s, t, \tau) \varphi_1(s) ds dt = 0.$$

For a.e.  $(s, t) \in [0, T]^2$ , we have  $\tau \mapsto \mathcal{M}_3(s, t, \tau)$  is absolutely continuous on  $[0, s \wedge t]$  due to the absolute continuity of Lebesgue integral. Thus, by Lemma 3.3,

$$\mathcal{M}_1(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \quad \mathcal{M}_3(s, t, t_1) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } (s, t) \in [0, T]^2, \quad \forall t_1 \in [0, s \wedge t]. \quad (3.17)$$

Recall system (3.5), we can rewrite  $P_{12}^{(2)}$ , the components of  $P_2$ , as follows:

$$P_{12}^{(2)}(r, t) = A(r, t)^{\top} \mathcal{M}_1(t)^{\top} + A(T, t)^{\top} \mathcal{M}_2(r, t)^{\top} + \int_t^T A(s, t)^{\top} \mathcal{M}_3(r, s, t)^{\top} ds, \quad (r, t) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T].$$

By (3.16), (3.17) and the fact that  $P_2(r, t) = P_2(t, r)^{\top}$ , it is easily seen that

$$P_{12}^{(2)}(r, t) = P_{21}^{(2)}(t, r)^{\top} = 0, \quad (r, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T]. \quad (3.18)$$

Similarly, it holds that

$$P_{22}^{(2)}(r, t) = 0, \quad (r, t) \in [0, T]^2. \quad (3.19)$$

In addition, it follows directly from the structure of the system (3.5) that

$$P_{31}^{(2)}(r, t) = P_{32}^{(2)}(r, t) = P_{33}^{(2)}(r, t) = 0, \quad (r, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T]. \quad (3.20)$$

Plugging (3.19) into (3.14) and utilizing the arbitrariness of  $v$ , we can obtain

$$P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{v}(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.21)$$

Substituting (3.18)–(3.20) into (3.16) and (3.17), respectively, we can see that

$$\begin{cases} P_{21}^{(1)}(t) + P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{\Theta}_1(t) = 0, & \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T], \\ P_{21}^{(2)}(r, t) I_{[0, r]}(t) + P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{\Theta}_2(r, t) = 0, & \text{a.e. } (r, t) \in [0, T]^2, \\ P_{23}^{(1)}(t) + P_{22}^{(1)}(t) \hat{\Theta}_3(t) + \int_t^T P_{23}^{(2)}(s, t) ds = 0, & \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (3.22)$$

By inserting (3.18)–(3.22) into the system (3.5), we can rewrite  $P_1$  as

$$P_1(t) = \begin{pmatrix} Q(t) + (C^{\top} \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t) & (C^{\top} \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t) & A(T, t)^{\top} G \\ (D^{\top} \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t) & R(t) + (D^{\top} \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t) & B(T, t)^{\top} G \\ GA(T, t) & GB(T, t) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.23)$$

where  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$  is given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_1(s) \triangleq P_{11}^{(1)}(s) + \hat{\Theta}_1(s)^{\top} P_{21}^{(1)}(s), & s \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_2(s) \triangleq G - \int_s^T \hat{\Theta}_3(r)^{\top} P_{22}^{(1)}(r) \hat{\Theta}_3(r) dr, & s \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) \triangleq P_{31}^{(1)}(s) + \hat{\Theta}_3(s)^{\top} P_{21}^{(1)}(s) + \int_t^s \hat{\Theta}_3(\theta)^{\top} P_{21}^{(2)}(s, \theta) d\theta + \int_s^T P_{31}^{(2)}(s, \theta) d\theta, & (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_4(s, \theta, t) \triangleq P_{11}^{(2)}(\theta, s) + \hat{\Theta}_1(s)^{\top} P_{21}^{(2)}(\theta, s) + P_{12}^{(2)}(\theta, s) \hat{\Theta}_1(\theta) + \int_t^{\theta \wedge s} P_{12}^{(2)}(r, s) P_{22}^{(1)}(r)^{\dagger} P_{21}^{(2)}(\theta, r) dr \\ \quad = \mathcal{P}_4(\theta, s, t)^{\top}, & (s, \theta, t) \in \square_3[0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Next we represent the components of  $P_2$  in terms of  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$ . By Fubini theorem and the structure of the system (3.5), we can get, for  $(s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{11}^{(2)}(s, t) + P_{12}^{(2)}(s, t)\widehat{\Theta}_1(s) \\
&= A(s, t)^\top [P_{11}^{(1)}(s) + \widehat{\Theta}_1(s)^\top P_{21}^{(1)}(s)] \\
&\quad + A(T, t)^\top \left[ P_{31}^{(1)}(s) + \widehat{\Theta}_3(s)^\top P_{21}^{(1)}(s) + \int_t^s \widehat{\Theta}_3(\theta)^\top P_{21}^{(2)}(s, \theta) d\theta + \int_s^T P_{31}^{(2)}(s, \theta) d\theta \right] \\
&\quad + \int_t^T A(r, t)^\top \left[ P_{11}^{(2)}(s, r) + \widehat{\Theta}_1(r)^\top P_{21}^{(2)}(s, r) + P_{12}^{(2)}(s, r)\widehat{\Theta}_1(s) + \int_t^{r \wedge s} \widehat{\Theta}_2(r, \theta)^\top P_{21}^{(2)}(s, \theta) d\theta \right] dr \\
&= A(s, t)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) + A(T, t)^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) + \int_t^T A(r, t)^\top \mathcal{P}_4(r, s, t) dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above equality with (3.18), we obtain that

$$P_{11}^{(2)}(s, t) = (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(s, t), \quad P_{11}^{(2)}(t, s) = (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright A)(s, t), \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T]. \quad (3.24)$$

Similarly, it also holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{21}^{(2)}(s, t) = (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(s, t), \quad P_{12}^{(2)}(t, s) = (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright B)(s, t), \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\
& P_{13}^{(1)}(t) + \int_t^T P_{13}^{(2)}(r, t) dr = (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t), \quad P_{31}^{(1)}(t) + \int_t^T P_{31}^{(2)}(t, r) dr = (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright A)(t), \\
& P_{23}^{(1)}(t) + \int_t^T P_{23}^{(2)}(r, t) dr = (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t), \quad P_{32}^{(1)}(t) + \int_t^T P_{32}^{(2)}(t, r) dr = (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright B)(t).
\end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Substituting the representations (3.23)–(3.25) of the components of  $(P_1, P_2)$  into (3.21) and (3.22), we then obtain that  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, \widehat{v})$  satisfies (3.9). Finally, combining (3.9) with (3.23)–(3.25) we see that  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$  satisfies the system (2.4). Furthermore, by slightly modifying [24, Proposition A.1.5] and (3.13) it follows from that  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$  is a regular solution of the Riccati system (2.4).

**The sufficiency:** Assume that  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4) \in \Upsilon[0, T]$  is a regular solution of the Riccati system (2.4). Let  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, \widehat{v})$  satisfy (3.9). It suffices to prove that

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{v} + \widehat{v}}) \geq \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{v}}) \quad (3.26)$$

for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}, \widehat{v} \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ . We first give a representation of  $\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{v} + \widehat{v}})$  by the Riccati system (2.4). In the following, for notational simplicity, we denote

$$\widetilde{u}(t) \triangleq u_1^{\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{v} + \widehat{v}}(t), \quad \dot{\mathcal{P}}_3(s, t) \triangleq \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}_3}{\partial t}(s, t), \quad \dot{\mathcal{P}}_4(s_1, s_2, t) \triangleq \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}_4}{\partial t}(s_1, s_2, t). \quad (3.27)$$

Moreover, by (H1)–(H2), Hölder inequality and  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4) \in \Upsilon[0, T]$ , it is easy to see that  $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_3 \in L^2(\Delta_*[0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$  and  $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_4 \in L^{2,2,1}(\square_3[0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ .

To begin with, we represent the first term  $\mathbb{E}\langle G\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(T), \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(T) \rangle$  in  $\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; \widetilde{u})$  (recall (2.3)). Applying the Itô's formula to  $s \mapsto \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_2(s) \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)$  on  $[\tau, T]$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(T)^\top G \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(T)] - \varphi_2^\top \mathcal{P}_2(\tau) \varphi_2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \left[ \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \dot{\mathcal{P}}_2(s) \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s) + 2\widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_2(s) (A(T, s)\widetilde{X}_1(s) + B(T, s)\widetilde{u}(s)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\widetilde{X}_1(s)^\top C(T, s)^\top + \widetilde{u}(s)^\top D(T, s)^\top) \mathcal{P}_2(s) (C(T, s)\widetilde{X}_1(s) + D(T, s)\widetilde{u}(s)) \right] ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $(\widetilde{X}_1, \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_1, \widetilde{\mathcal{X}}_2)$  is the extended causal feedback solution at  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)$  corresponding to  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, \widehat{v} + \widehat{v})$  (recall (2.2)).

We see that the new terms of the form  $\tilde{X}_1(s)^\top(\cdots)\tilde{X}_1(s)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top(\cdots)\tilde{X}_1(s)$  appear on the right hand for  $s \in [\tau, T]$ . Next, to deal with these new terms, we use the Itô's formula to  $t \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, t)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, t)$  and  $t \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(t)^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, t)$  on  $[\tau, s]$ , respectively. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_1(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) \tilde{X}_1(s)] &= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, s)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, s)] \\ &= \varphi_1(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) \varphi_1(s) + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^s \left[ 2\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, r)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) (A(s, r) \tilde{X}_1(r) + B(s, r) \tilde{u}(r)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\tilde{X}_1(r)^\top C(s, r)^\top + \tilde{u}(r)^\top D(s, r)^\top) \mathcal{P}_1(s) (C(s, r) \tilde{X}_1(r) + D(s, r) \tilde{u}(r)) \right] dr, \end{aligned}$$

and (recall (3.27) for  $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_3$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, s) \tilde{X}_1(s)] &= \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, s)] \\ &= \varphi_2^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, \tau) \varphi_1(s) + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^s \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(r)^\top \dot{\mathcal{P}}_3(s, r) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, r) + \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(r)^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, r) (A(s, r) \tilde{X}_1(r) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B(s, r) \tilde{u}(r)) + (\tilde{X}_1(r)^\top A(T, r)^\top + \tilde{u}(r)^\top B(T, r)^\top) \mathcal{P}_3(s, r) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, r) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\tilde{X}_1(r)^\top C(T, r)^\top + \tilde{u}(r)^\top D(T, r)^\top) \mathcal{P}_3(s, r) (C(T, r) \tilde{X}_1(r) + D(T, r) \tilde{u}(r)) \right] dr. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can utilize the Itô's formula to  $\theta \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, \theta)^\top \mathcal{P}_4(s, r, \theta) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, \theta)$  on  $[\tau, r]$  to deal with the new term  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(s, r)^\top(\cdots)\tilde{X}_1(r)$ . Finally, by Fubini theorem and Riccati system (2.4), it follows from some calculations that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; \tilde{u}) &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \left\{ [\tilde{X}_1(s)^\top \mathbf{D}(s)^\top + 2\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \mathbf{B}_2(s)^\top + 2 \int_s^T \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, s)^\top \mathbf{B}_1(r, s)^\top dr] \mathbf{R}(s)^\dagger \mathbf{D}(s) \tilde{X}_1(s) \right\} ds, \end{aligned}$$

where (recall the notations of  $\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{B}_1$  and  $\mathbf{B}_2$  in the Definition 2.6)

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\triangleq \varphi_2^\top \mathcal{P}_2(\tau) \varphi_2 + \int_\tau^T \left[ \varphi(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s) \varphi_1(s) + 2\varphi_2^\top \mathcal{P}_3(s, \tau) \varphi_1(s) + \int_\tau^T \varphi_1(s)^\top \mathcal{P}_4(s, r, \tau) \varphi_1(r) dr \right] ds, \\ I_2 &\triangleq \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \left\{ \tilde{u}(s)^\top \left[ \mathbf{R}(s) \tilde{u}(s) + 2\mathbf{D}(s) \tilde{X}_1(s) + 2\mathbf{B}_2(s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s) + 2 \int_s^T \mathbf{B}_1(r, s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, s) dr \right] \right\} ds, \\ I_3 &\triangleq \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \dot{\mathcal{P}}_2(s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s) + \int_s^T \left[ 2\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \dot{\mathcal{P}}_3(r, s) + \int_s^T \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(\theta, s)^\top \dot{\mathcal{P}}_4(\theta, r, s) d\theta \right] \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, s) dr \right\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the representation (3.9) of  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v})$ , we observe the fact of

$$-\mathbf{R}(t) \tilde{u}(t) = \mathbf{D}(t) \tilde{X}_1(t) + \int_t^T \mathbf{B}_1(r, t) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, t) dr + \mathbf{B}_2(t) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(t) + \mathbf{R}(t) \tilde{v}(t).$$

Thus the term  $I_2$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; \tilde{u})$  can be rewritten as

$$I_2 = \mathbb{E} \int_\tau^T \left\{ 2\tilde{u}(s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s) \tilde{v}(s) - \tilde{u}(s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s) \tilde{u}(s) \right\} ds. \quad (3.28)$$

We compute the second term  $\tilde{u}(s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s) \tilde{u}(s)$  in (3.28). Using the representation (3.9) of  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v})$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{u}(s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s) \tilde{u}(s) \\ &= \left[ \tilde{X}_1(s)^\top \mathbf{D}(s)^\top + 2\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \mathbf{B}_2(s)^\top + 2 \int_s^T \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, s)^\top \mathbf{B}_1(r, s)^\top dr \right] \mathbf{R}(s)^\dagger \mathbf{D}(s) \tilde{X}_1(s) \\ &\quad + \int_s^T \int_s^T \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, s)^\top \mathbf{B}_1(r, s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_1(\theta, s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(\theta, s) d\theta dr + (\hat{v}(s) + \tilde{v}(s))^\top \mathbf{R}(s) (2\tilde{u}(s) - \tilde{v}(s)) \\ &\quad + \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s)^\top \mathbf{B}_2(s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s)^\dagger \left[ \mathbf{B}_2(s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(s) + 2 \int_s^T \mathbf{B}_1(r, s) \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(r, s) dr \right]. \end{aligned}$$



Plugging the above into (3.28) and recalling the Riccati system (2.4), we can get

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; \tilde{u}) = I_1 + \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T \tilde{v}(s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s) \tilde{v}(s) ds. \quad (3.29)$$

Therefore, for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , it is easy to see that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{v}+\tilde{v}}) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2; u_1^{\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{v}}) = \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T \tilde{v}(s)^\top \mathbf{R}(s) \tilde{v}(s) ds.$$

Since  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4) \in \Upsilon[0, T]$  is a regular solution of the Riccati system (2.4), that is,  $\mathbf{R}(t) \geq 0, t \in [0, T]$ , we see that (3.26) holds for any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  and  $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , which implies that  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v})$  is a strongly optimal causal feedback strategy. Further, it follows from (3.29) that the representation of the extended value function satisfies (3.10). The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.** We point out that the above proof, especially the necessity part, indicates one important reason of introducing extended notions in Section 2. In fact, by the previous procedures we see the arbitrariness of  $\varphi_1(\cdot)$  and  $\varphi_2$  is frequently used and becomes very crucial in obtaining (3.16), (3.17) and eventually the representation of  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v})$ , the Riccati system (2.4). Nevertheless, if we follow the original framework by using  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , we then obtain (3.15) with  $\varphi_1(\cdot) \triangleq \varphi(\cdot), \varphi_2 \triangleq \varphi(T)$ . The point is we may fail to obtain (3.16), (3.17) due to the lack of enough freedom for  $\varphi$ , not to mention the other desired conclusions. Therefore, the set of input condition  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  allows us to have more *test conditions* than  $\mathcal{I}$ . We point out that such an obstacle does not appear in the Lagrange cost functional of [11, 12].

**Remark 3.4.** Let us point out two interesting facts derived from Theorem 3.1. First, we see that the value of  $\hat{\Theta}_2(s, t)$  with  $s \leq t$  only makes sense if when  $R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t) = 0$ . In other words, if  $D = 0$ , and  $R(\cdot) > 0$ , then this term vanishes. Second, if the drift term is not controlled ( $B = 0$  in (1.1)) while the diffusion term does, the optimal causal feedback strategy must be  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, 0, 0, 0)$ , if it exists. In other words, the optimal causal feedback strategy is a Markovian state feedback in the sense that it only depends on the current state and not on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

The following result shows the uniqueness of regular solution to Riccati system (2.4) in Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 3.2.** The Riccati system (2.4) has at most one regular solution.

*Proof.* Assume that  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4), (\text{resp. } (\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_2, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_3, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_4)) \in \Upsilon[0, T]$  is a regular solution of the Riccati system (2.4). For any  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ , the representation (3.10) of the extended value function and the uniqueness of the infimum yield that

$$\varphi_2^\top \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_2(\tau) \varphi_2 + \int_{\tau}^T \left[ \varphi_1(s)^\top \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1(s) + 2\varphi_2^\top \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_3(s, \tau) + \int_{\tau}^T \varphi_1(\theta)^\top \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_4(\theta, s, \tau) d\theta \right] \varphi_1(s) ds = 0, \quad (3.30)$$

where  $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_i \triangleq \mathcal{P}_i - \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ .

By the arbitrariness of  $\varphi_2$ , let  $\varphi_2 = 0$ . From Lemma 3.3, we get that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1(t) = 0, \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T]; \quad \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_4(s, t, r) = 0, \text{ a.e. } (s, t) \in [0, T]^2, \forall r \in [0, s \wedge t]. \quad (3.31)$$

Choosing  $\varphi_1 = 0$  in (3.30), it is clear that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_2(t) = 0, \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T]. \quad (3.32)$$

From (3.30), (3.31) and (3.32), it follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_3(s, t) = 0, \text{ a.e. } s \in [0, T], \forall t \in [0, s]. \quad (3.33)$$

Combining (3.31)–(3.33), we complete our proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** By the above proof, we see that the arbitrariness of  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  is essential to ensure the uniqueness of the regular solution. In other words, if we follow the framework of  $\mathcal{I}$  rather  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ , we may not derive (3.31) and (3.32) due to the lack of enough test initial conditions. This gives another reason of introducing the *extended language* in Section 2.

Next we show that under proper conditions, there exists  $(\tau, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$  such that the optimal control, if it exist, can not be the following form,

$$\hat{u}(t) \triangleq \hat{\Theta}_1(t)\hat{X}(t) + \int_{\tau}^t \Theta_2(s,t)\hat{X}(s)ds + \tilde{v}(t), \quad t \in [\tau, T],$$

which gives an answer to (Q3) in the Introduction from another standpoint.

**Corollary 3.3.** Suppose (H1)-(H2) hold s.t.  $A \equiv B$  in (1.1) is invertible,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(t) + C(T,t)^\top GC(T,t) - C(T,t)^\top GD(T,t) \left[ R(t) + D(T,t)^\top GD(T,t) \right]^\dagger \\ D(T,t)^\top GC(T,t) \neq 0, \quad t \in [\tau, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

Assume the 4-tuple  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{S}[0, T]$  is strongly optimal. Then it must not be the form of  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, 0, \hat{v})$  with  $\hat{\Theta}_2(r, t) = 0$  ( $r > t$ ).

*Proof.* We prove the conclusion by contradiction. Suppose Problem (LQ-SVIE) admits a strongly optimal  $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, 0, \hat{v})$  such that  $\hat{\Theta}_2(r, t) = 0$  with  $r > t$ . Then, following the necessity proof in Theorem 3.1 we can obtain

$$(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(r, t) = 0, \quad (r, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T],$$

where  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$  is a regular solution of the following system

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_1(t) = Q(t) + (C^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t) \\ -(C^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t)(R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^\dagger (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_2 = G, \quad \mathcal{P}_3 = \mathcal{P}_4 = 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, in this case, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_1(t) = Q(t) + C(T,t)^\top GC(T,t) + \int_t^T C(s,t)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s)C(s,t)ds - \left[ C(T,t)^\top GD(T,t) \right. \\ \left. + \int_t^T C(s,t)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s)D(s,t)ds \right] \left[ R(t) + D(T,t)^\top GD(T,t) + \int_t^T D(s,t)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s)D(s,t)ds \right]^\dagger \\ \times \left[ D(T,t)^\top GC(T,t) + \int_t^T D(s,t)^\top \mathcal{P}_1(s)C(s,t)ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the above (3.34), we see that  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is nonzero. On the other hand, using the facts that  $(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(r, t) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{P}_3 = \mathcal{P}_4 = 0$ , and  $B$  is invertible, we obtain that  $\mathcal{P}_1 = 0$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

We point out that (3.34) is easy to check. For example, in the one-dimensional case, if  $Q(\cdot) \geq 0$ ,  $R(\cdot) \geq 0$ ,  $G \geq 0$  such that either  $R(\cdot) > 0$  or  $G > 0$ , then (3.34) hold true.

## 4 Five special cases

To demonstrate our unified treatment, we revisit several relevant literature as special cases and give the detailed comparisons, as well as some interesting phenomena.

## 4.1 The case of $G = 0$

In this subsection, we revisit the particular case (see e.g. [11, 12]) when the terminal cost functional disappear (i.e.,  $G = 0$ )

$$\mathcal{J}(\tau, \varphi; u) = \mathbb{E} \int_{\tau}^T (\langle Q(s)X(s), X(s) \rangle + \langle R(s)u(s), u(s) \rangle) ds. \quad (4.1)$$

Here the corresponding state equation is given by (1.1) with  $(\tau, \varphi)$ ,  $\tau \in [0, T]$ ,  $\varphi \in L^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . We will show that both the causal feedback strategy and the Riccati system (2.4) reduce to those in [12] under proper conditions.

Suppose  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, \widehat{v})$  is optimal. It is easy to see that  $(\mathcal{P}_1, 0, 0, \mathcal{P}_4)$  is a solution of Riccati system (2.4). By Corollary 3.2, this 4-tuple  $(\mathcal{P}_1, 0, 0, \mathcal{P}_4)$  is also unique solution. Then, for each  $M : \Delta_*[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d}$  and  $N : \Delta_*[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_2}$  with  $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , the notations in Definition 2.5 can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} (M \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t) &= 0, \quad (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright N)(t) = 0, \quad t \in (0, T), \\ (M \times \mathcal{P})(s, t) &\triangleq (M \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(s, t) = M(s, t) \mathcal{P}_1(s) + \int_t^T M(r, t) \mathcal{P}_4(r, s, t) dr, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\ (\mathcal{P} \times N)(s, t) &\triangleq (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright N)(s, t) = \mathcal{P}_1(s) N(s, t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_4(s, r, t) N(r, t) dr, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\ (M \times \mathcal{P} \times N)(t) &\triangleq (M \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright N)(t) = \int_t^T M(s, t) \left[ \mathcal{P}_1(s) N(s, t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_4(s, \theta, t) N(\theta, t) d\theta \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

We point out that the notations  $\times$  and  $\times$  are consistent with those in [11, 12].

As to Riccati system (2.4), it reduces to (recall  $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_4$  in (3.27)):

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_1(t) = Q(t) + (C^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times C)(t) \\ \quad - (C^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times D)(t) (R(t) + (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times D)(t))^\dagger (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times C)(t), \quad t \in (0, T), \\ \mathcal{P}_4(s, t, t) = (\mathcal{P} \times A)(s, t) - (\mathcal{P} \times B)(s, t) (R(t) + (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times D)(t))^\dagger (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times C)(t) \\ \quad = \mathcal{P}_4(t, s, t)^\top, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\ \dot{\mathcal{P}}_4(s_1, s_2, t) = (\mathcal{P} \times B)(s_1, t) (R(t) + (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times D)(t))^\dagger (B^\top \times \mathcal{P})(s_2, t), \quad (s_1, s_2, t) \in \square_3(0, T), \end{cases}$$

which is exactly the *Riccati-Volterra equation* in [12]. In this case, the optimal causal feedback strategy  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, \widehat{v})$  admits

$$\begin{cases} (R(t) + (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times D)(t)) \widehat{\Theta}_1(t) + (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times C)(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T), \\ (R(t) + (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times D)(t)) \widehat{\Theta}_2(r, t) + (B^\top \times \mathcal{P})(r, t) I_{[0, r]}(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } (r, t) \in [0, T]^2, \\ (R(t) + (D^\top \times \mathcal{P} \times D)(t)) (\widehat{\Theta}_3(t) + \widehat{v}(t)) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T), \end{cases}$$

In particular, if we are given  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, \widehat{v})$  satisfying  $\widehat{\Theta}_2(r, t) = 0$  with  $r \leq t$ , then it is easy to see that the above obtained equalities for  $\widehat{\Theta}_i$  are consistent with [11, 12].

## 4.2 The case of SDEs

Let us consider one particular case with  $f(s, t) \equiv f(t)$ ,  $f(\cdot, \cdot) \triangleq A(\cdot, \cdot), B(\cdot, \cdot), C(\cdot, \cdot), D(\cdot, \cdot)$ ,  $\varphi(t) \equiv \varphi$ ,  $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The state equation (1.1) becomes a SDE and Problem (LQ-SVIE) reduces to classical stochastic LQ problem. Next we show that our obtained result fully covers those in the SDEs case.

To begin with, let us define  $\mathcal{P}(t)$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}(t) \triangleq \mathcal{P}_2(t) + \int_t^T \left( \mathcal{P}_1(s) + \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) + \mathcal{P}_3(s, t)^\top + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_4(s, \theta, t) d\theta \right) ds, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Clearly, inserting the Riccati system (2.4) into  $\dot{\mathcal{P}}(t)$ , it follows that

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathcal{P}}(t) = -A(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t) - \mathcal{P}(t)A(t) - C(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t)C(t) - Q(t) + [\mathcal{P}(t)B(t) \\ + C(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t)D(t)] [R(t) + D(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t)D(t)]^\dagger [B(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t) + D(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t)C(t)], \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}(T) = G. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, it is just the traditional Riccati equation in stochastic LQ problem. Further, it follows from Theorem 3.1 that

$$\widehat{\Theta}(t) \triangleq \widehat{\Theta}_1(t) + \int_t^T \widehat{\Theta}_2(s, t) ds + \widehat{\Theta}_3(t) = -[R(t) + D(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t)D(t)]^\dagger [B(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t) + D(t)^\top \mathcal{P}(t)C(t)],$$

which is consistent with the result in the SDEs case.

### 4.3 The case of stochastic VIDE with continuous free term

In this subsection, we will investigate the connections between the matrix-valued optimal causal feedback strategy in this paper and the optimal feedback operator in [28]. To begin with, we give the following assumptions which is useful in the sequel.

(H4).  $Q(t) \geq 0$ ,  $R(t) \geq \lambda I_t$  for  $t \in [0, T]$  and some  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $G \geq 0$ .

We call the regular solution  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$  *strongly regular* if there exists a constant  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t) \geq \lambda I_t$  for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ . From Theorem 3.1, we can obtain the following result.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Suppose (H1)–(H4) hold, and the Riccati system (2.4) admits a regular solution  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$ . Then the regular solution must be strongly regular, and for any  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , it holds that  $(\varphi^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright \varphi)(\tau) \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, v)$  satisfy (3.9),  $(X, \mathcal{X})$  and  $u_1$  are the corresponding causal feedback solution and outcome of (1.1) at  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ . By the sufficiency proof of Theorem 3.1, it follows that

$$(\varphi^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright \varphi)(\tau) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle GX(T), X(T) \rangle + \int_\tau^T (\langle Q(s)X(s), X(s) \rangle + \langle R(s)u_1(s), u_1(s) \rangle) ds \right] \geq 0,$$

where the first equality and the last inequality are due to (3.29) and (H4), respectively. Hence, for any  $t \in [0, T]$ , it follows from (H1), (H3) and the arbitrariness of  $\varphi$  that  $(D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t) \geq 0$ , which implies that the desired result.  $\square$

By Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 4.1, it is easy to show the following result.

**Corollary 4.2.** *Suppose (H1)–(H4) hold, and the Riccati system (2.4) admits a regular solution  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$ . Then Problem (LQ-SVIE) admits a unique optimal 4-tuple  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, 0)$  such that  $\widehat{\Theta}_2(r, t) = 0$  with  $r < t$ , and*

$$\begin{cases} \widehat{\Theta}_1(t) = -(R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^{-1} (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \widehat{\Theta}_3(t) = -(R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^{-1} (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \widehat{\Theta}_2(r, t) = -(R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^{-1} (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(r, t), \quad r \geq t. \end{cases}$$

Further, for each  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , the value function is given by  $V(\tau, \varphi) = (\varphi^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright \varphi)(\tau)$ .

**Remark 4.1.** We make two points on the solvability of Riccati system (2.4). First, once it holds true, by Corollary 3.2, the strong regular solution must be unique. Second, if  $G = 0$ , the well-posedness has been done in [12]. For the general situation with (2.4), it is undergoing project and we shall report that in the near future.

By Corollary 4.2 and the fact that

$$(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t)\widehat{\mathcal{X}}(T,t) + \int_t^T (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(s,t)\widehat{\mathcal{X}}(s,t)ds = (B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright \widehat{\mathcal{X}})(t), t \in [\tau, T],$$

the following defined control process  $\hat{u}$  is optimal

$$\hat{u}(t) \triangleq -(R(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright D)(t))^{-1} [(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright \widehat{\mathcal{X}})(t) + (D^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright C)(t)\widehat{\mathcal{X}}(t,t)], \quad (4.2)$$

where  $(\widehat{X}, \widehat{\mathcal{X}}) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\tau, T; \mathbb{R}^d) \times L_{\mathbb{F},c}^2(\Delta_*[\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is causal feedback solution of (1.1) at  $(\tau, \varphi)$  corresponding to the optimal  $(\widehat{\Theta}_1, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, 0)$ .

To define the optimal feedback operator similar to [28], for each  $\tau \in [0, T)$  and any Banach space  $\Lambda_\tau$ , we first introduce the bilinear functional  $\mathbb{P}(\tau) : \Lambda_\tau \times \Lambda_\tau \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau)(N(\cdot, \tau), M(\cdot, \tau)) \triangleq (M^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P} \triangleright N)(\tau), \quad \forall M(\cdot, \tau), N(\cdot, \tau) \in \Lambda_\tau, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$  is the strongly regular solution of the Riccati system (2.4). Let  $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda_\tau)$  be the set of all bounded  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued bilinear functionals on  $\Lambda_\tau \times \Lambda_\tau$  such that

$$P(\tau)(M(\cdot, \tau), N(\cdot, \tau)) = P(\tau)(N(\cdot, \tau), M(\cdot, \tau)), \quad \forall M(\cdot, \tau), N(\cdot, \tau) \in \Lambda_\tau,$$

under the norm

$$\|P(\tau)\|_{\mathcal{S}} \triangleq \sup_{\|M\| \leq 1} |P(\tau)(M(\cdot, \tau), M(\cdot, \tau))|, \quad \forall P(\tau) \in \mathcal{S}(\Lambda_\tau).$$

It follows from the Riccati system (2.4) that  $\mathbb{P}(\tau) \in \mathcal{S}(\Lambda_\tau)$ . Further, for any  $t \in [\tau, T]$  and  $f \triangleq B, D$ , let us denote

$$f(\cdot, t) \triangleq (f_1(\cdot, t), f_2(\cdot, t), \dots, f_l(\cdot, t)),$$

where  $B_i(\cdot, t), D_i(\cdot, t) \in L^2(t, T; \mathbb{R}^d), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$ . Then, we take  $\Lambda_t \triangleq L^2(t, T; \mathbb{R}^d)$  and define a bilinear functional  $\mathbb{P}_1(t) : L^2(t, T; \mathbb{R}^{d \times l}) \times L^2(t, T; \mathbb{R}^{d \times l}) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^l$ :

$$\mathbb{P}_1(t)(D(\cdot, t), D(\cdot, t)) \triangleq (\mathbb{P}(t)(D_i(\cdot, t), D_j(\cdot, t))), \quad i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}. \quad (4.4)$$

Moreover, we introduce a linear functional  $\mathbb{P}_2(t) : \Lambda_t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ :

$$\mathbb{P}_2(t)M(\cdot, t) \triangleq (\mathbb{P}(t)(B_i(\cdot, t), M(\cdot, t)) + \mathbb{P}(t)(D_i(\cdot, t), C(\cdot, t)M(t, t))) \quad (4.5)$$

for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$  and any  $M(\cdot, t) \in \Lambda_t$ . Hence, for each  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , the value function can be rewritten as:

$$V(\tau, \varphi) = \mathbb{P}(\tau)(\varphi(\cdot), \varphi(\cdot)), \quad (4.6)$$

and the optimal control defined by (4.2) can be denoted as:

$$\hat{u}(t) \triangleq -[R(t) + \mathbb{P}_1(t)(D(\cdot, t), D(\cdot, t))]^{-1} \mathbb{P}_2(t)\widehat{\mathcal{X}}(\cdot, t), \quad t \in [\tau, T],$$

which inspires us to define the optimal feedback operator as follows:

$$\widehat{\Gamma}(t) \triangleq -[R(t) + \mathbb{P}_1(t)(D(\cdot, t), D(\cdot, t))]^{-1} \mathbb{P}_2(t). \quad (4.7)$$

Next, in order to compare with the relevant results in [28], we take

$$\Lambda_\tau \triangleq C([\tau, T]; \mathbb{R}^d) = \{\varphi(\cdot, \tau) : [\tau, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \mid \varphi(\cdot, \tau) \text{ is continuous}\}, \tau \in [0, T],$$

and consider the state equation in [28], i.e., (1.1) with the free term  $\varphi(\cdot, \tau) \in \Lambda_\tau$  and its coefficients satisfy the following stronger assumption:

**(H5).**  $A, C : \Delta_*[\tau, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, B, D : \Delta_*[\tau, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times l}$  are bounded and partially differentiable with respect to the two variables, with bounded derivatives.

Then, similar to (4.4) and (4.5), for any  $t \in [\tau, T]$ , we can define the bilinear operator  $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_1(t)$  and the linear operator  $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_2(t)$  on  $C([t, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times l}) \times C([t, T]; \mathbb{R}^{d \times l})$  and  $\Lambda_t$ , respectively. In this case, utilizing (4.6), the arbitrariness of  $\varphi$  and the result of [28, Lemma 2.8], it follows that the bilinear functional  $\mathbb{P}(\tau)$  defined by (4.3) is consistent with the strongly regular solution of so-called *path-dependent Riccati equation* in [28]. Consequently, we can obtain that the optimal feedback operator determined by  $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_1(t)$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_2(t)$  coincides with that in [28].

#### 4.4 The case of VIEs

In this subsection, we look at one particular case with  $A = C = D \equiv 0$  in (1.1). Hence (1.1) reduces to the deterministic VIEs, i.e.,

$$X(t) = \varphi(t) + \int_\tau^t B(t, s)u(s)ds, \quad t \in [\tau, T], \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\varphi$  and  $B$  satisfy (H1) and (H3). The corresponding  $\mathcal{X}$  becomes

$$\mathcal{X}(r, t) = \varphi(r) + \int_\tau^t B(r, s)u(s)ds, \quad (r, t) \in \Delta_*[\tau, T].$$

For any  $u \in \mathcal{U}[\tau, T]$ , we see that  $\mathcal{X}(r, t)$  is equivalent to the so-called *t-causal trajectory*  $X_t(r)$  for  $r > t$  in [20], where

$$X_t(r) \triangleq \varphi(r) + \int_\tau^r B(r, s)(\pi_t u)(s)ds, \quad r \in [\tau, T], \quad (4.9)$$

and  $\pi_t$  is a truncation operator defined as  $(\pi_t u)(s) \triangleq u(s)I_{[0, t]}(s)$ .

In this case, the Riccati system (2.4) can be simplified as

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_1(t) = Q(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_2(t) = G - \int_t^T (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright B)(s)R(s)^{-1}(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(s)ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_3(t, r) = - \int_r^t (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright B)(\theta)R(\theta)^{-1}(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(t, \theta)d\theta, \quad (t, r) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_4(s, t, r) = - \int_r^{s \wedge t} (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright B)(s, \theta)R(\theta)^{-1}(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(t, \theta)d\theta, \quad (s, t, r) \in \square_3[0, T]. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Here, we assume that (H1)-(H4) hold and the above Riccati system (4.10) admits a regular solution  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$ , then Corollary 3.2 and Corollary 4.1 follow that the regular solution must be strongly regular and unique. Further, Theorem 3.1 implies that the LQ problem admits the unique optimal 4-tuple  $(0, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, 0)$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Theta}_3(t) &= -R(t)^{-1}(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t), \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \widehat{\Theta}_2(r, t) &= -R(t)^{-1}(B^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(r, t)I_{[0, r]}(t), \quad (r, t) \in [0, T]^2. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, for any  $(\tau, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}$ , the following defined  $\hat{u}(\cdot)$  is optimal

$$\hat{u}(t) \triangleq \int_t^T \widehat{\Theta}_2(r, t)\hat{\mathcal{X}}(r, t)dr + \widehat{\Theta}_3(t)\hat{\mathcal{X}}(T, t), \quad t \in [\tau, T], \quad (4.11)$$

where  $(\hat{X}, \hat{\mathcal{X}})$  is causal feedback solution of (4.8) corresponding to  $(0, \widehat{\Theta}_2, \widehat{\Theta}_3, 0)$ .

We recall the relevant result in [20]. Under (H1)-(H4),  $\hat{u}(\cdot)$  is the optimal control

$$\hat{u}(t) = \int_t^T \Xi_1(r, t) X_t(r) dr + \Xi_2(t) X_t(T), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (4.12)$$

where  $X_t(\cdot)$  is the corresponding  $t$ -causal trajectory defined by (4.9), and  $(\Xi_1, \Xi_2)$  is determined by the solution of a Fredholm integral equation. In addition, utilizing (H1)-(H4) and the result of [20, Theorem 5.3], it follows that the 4-tuple  $(0, \Xi_1, \Xi_2, 0)$  is a causal feedback strategy.

Notice that Theorem 3.1 and the strongly regular solvability of the Riccati system (4.10) guarantee the uniqueness of the optimal feedback strategy  $(0, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, 0)$ . Therefore, combining (4.11), (4.12) and  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}(r, t) = X_t(r)$ ,  $r > t$ , it follows that  $(\hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3) = (\Xi_1, \Xi_2)$ , i.e., the optimal causal feedback strategy in this paper is consistent with that in [20].

## 4.5 The case of VIDEs

In this subsection, let us revisit the particular VIDEs case in [21] and make careful comparisons. Consider the following controlled VIDE:

$$\dot{X}(t) = \int_0^t N(t-s) X(s) ds + Bu(t), \quad X(0) = \varphi, \quad (4.13)$$

where  $\dot{X}$  denotes the derivative of  $X$ . It corresponds to the case of

$$A(t, s) \equiv \int_s^t N(\theta-s) d\theta, \quad B(s, t) \equiv B, \quad C(s, t) = D(s, t) \equiv 0, \quad \varphi(t) \equiv \varphi,$$

with  $B, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Moreover, let  $Q(\cdot) \equiv Q, R(\cdot) \equiv 1$  with any  $Q \in \mathbb{S}^d$  in (1.2). Then Problem (LQ-SVIE) reduces to the VIDEs case in [21].

It is clear that the corresponding  $\mathcal{X}$  can be rewritten as:

$$\mathcal{X}(s, t) = X(t) + \int_0^t \int_t^s N(\theta-r) d\theta X(r) dr, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T]. \quad (4.14)$$

Also the Riccati system (2.4) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_1(t) = Q, \\ \mathcal{P}_2(t) = G - \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(s)^\top BB^\top \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(s) ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_3(t, r) = (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright A)(t) - \int_r^t \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(\theta)^\top BB^\top \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(t, \theta) d\theta, \quad (t, r) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_4(s, t, t) = \mathcal{P}_4(t, s, t)^\top = (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright A)(s, t), \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_4(s, t, r) = \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(s, r)^\top BB^\top \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(t, r), \quad (s, t, r) \in \square_3[0, T], \end{cases} \quad (4.15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(t) &\triangleq \mathcal{P}_2(t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_3(s, t)^\top ds, \quad t \in [0, T], \\ \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(s, t) &\triangleq \mathcal{P}_1(s) + \mathcal{P}_3(s, t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_4(r, s, t) dr, \quad (s, t) \in \Delta_*[0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose (4.15) admits a strongly regular solution  $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \mathcal{P}_4)$ . Then, by Theorem 3.1, the LQ problem admits an optimal 4-tuple  $(0, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, 0)$  and optimal control

$$\hat{u}(t) = -B^\top \left[ \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(s, t) \mathcal{X}(s, t) ds + \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(t) \mathcal{X}(T, t) \right], \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (4.16)$$

where  $(X, \mathcal{X})$  is causal feedback solution of (4.13) at  $(\tau, \varphi)$  corresponding to  $(0, \hat{\Theta}_2, \hat{\Theta}_3, 0)$ . Plugging (4.14) into (4.16), we can obtain relationship w.r.t. control

$$\hat{u}(t) = -B^\top \left[ p_0(t)X(t) + \int_0^t p_1(t, s)X(s)ds \right], \quad t \in [\tau, T], \quad (4.17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_0(t) &\triangleq \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(s, t)ds, \\ p_1(t, s) &\triangleq \int_t^T \left[ \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(t) + \int_\theta^T \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(r, t)dr \right] N(\theta - s)d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Let us show the coincidence between (4.15) and the *Riccati differential equation* in [21]. First, by the definition of  $p_0(\cdot)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_0(t) &= \left[ \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(t)^\top + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(r, t)^\top dr \right] BB^\top \left[ \mathcal{P}_{2,3}(t) + \int_t^T \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4}(s, t)ds \right] - Q \\ &\quad - (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t) - \int_t^T \left( (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(s, t) + (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright A)(s, t) \right) ds - (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright A)(t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Using Fubini theorem and the fact of  $A(t, s) \equiv \int_s^t N(\theta - s)d\theta$ , we obtain that

$$p_1(t, t) = (\mathcal{P}_{2,3} \triangleright A)(t) + \int_t^T (\mathcal{P}_{1,3,4} \triangleright A)(s, t)ds.$$

Plugging it into (4.18), we find that

$$\dot{p}_0(t) = p_0(t)BB^\top p_0(t) - Q - p_1(t, t) - p_1(t, t)^\top, \quad p_0(T) = G. \quad (4.19)$$

Next, let us calculate the derivative of  $p_1(\cdot, \cdot)$  w.r.t the first variable,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} p_1(t, s) &= p_0(t)N(t-s) + p_0(t)BB^\top p_1(t, s) - \int_t^T \left[ (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_\theta^T (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(r, t)dr \right] N(\theta - s)d\theta, \quad (t, s) \in \Delta_*[0, T]. \end{aligned}$$

To calculate the last term on the right-hand, we define

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, s, \rho) &\triangleq \int_t^T \left\{ \int_t^T N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \mathcal{P}_2(t) + \int_t^T \int_t^r N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \mathcal{P}_3(rt)^\top dr + \int_{\theta_1}^T \left[ \int_t^r N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \mathcal{P}_1(t) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_t^T N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \mathcal{P}_3(r, t) + \int_t^T \int_t^{r_1} N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \mathcal{P}_4(r_1, r, t)dr_1 \right] dr \right\} N(\theta_1 - s)d\theta_1 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $0 \leq s, \rho \leq t \leq T$ . It is easy to see that

$$K(t, s, t) = \int_t^T \left[ (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{2,3})(t) + \int_\theta^T (A^\top \triangleleft \mathcal{P}_{1,3,4})(r, t)dr \right] N(\theta - s)d\theta,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} p_1(t, s) = p_0(t)N(t-s) + p_0(t)BB^\top p_1(t, s) - K(t, s, t), \quad p_1(T, s) = 0. \quad (4.20)$$

At last, it is time for us to treat the new term  $K(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ . By the definition of  $p_1$  and Fubini theorem, a direct computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} K(t, s, \rho) &= -I_1 - I_2 + \int_t^T \left\{ \int_t^T N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \dot{\mathcal{P}}_2(t) + \int_t^T \int_t^r N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \dot{\mathcal{P}}_3(r, t)^\top dr \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\theta_1}^T \left[ \int_t^T N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \dot{\mathcal{P}}_3(r, t) + \int_t^T \int_t^{r_1} N(\theta - \rho)^\top d\theta \dot{\mathcal{P}}_4(r_1, r, t)dr_1 \right] dr \right\} N(\theta_1 - s)d\theta_1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_1 = p_1(t, \rho)^\top N(t-s), \quad I_2 = N(t-\rho)^\top p_1(t, s). \quad (4.21)$$



By (4.21), Fubini theorem, the definition of  $p_1$  and the Riccati system (4.15),

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}K(t, s, \rho) = -p_1(t, \rho)^\top N(t-s) - N(t-\rho)^\top p_1(t, s) + p_1(t, \rho)^\top BB^\top p_1(t, s), K(T, s, \rho) = 0. \quad (4.22)$$

Combining (4.19), (4.20), (4.22) and (4.17), we can see that our Riccati system (2.4) reduces to the so-called *Riccati differential equation* in [21] and our outcome process  $\hat{u}(\cdot)$  also coincides with their feedback control. To sum up the above arguments, we point out several differences/advantages of the current study. First, one key notion here is optimal causal feedback strategy while [21] is concerned with the closed-loop/feedback representation of optimal controls. These two notions may be essentially different in the games framework. Second, our stochastic framework is a nontrivial extension of their deterministic one. Third, we provide the necessary and sufficient conditions of causal feedback strategy, not just the sufficiency as in [21].

## 5 Concluding remarks

In this paper we introduce a new kind of optimal causal feedback strategy and characterize it in terms of a novel Riccati system. We also establish the connection between different forms of causal feedback for optimal control under our unified framework. Clearly the Riccati system is a part of novelty. A natural question is about its well-posedness. In addition, under SVIEs framework, many issues concerning controllability, stability and games (especially mean-field games) remain open and challenging. We will present some relevant results in our future work.

## References

- [1] E. ABI JABER, E. MILLER, AND H. PHAM, *Linear-Quadratic control for a class of stochastic Volterra equations: solvability and approximation*, Ann. Appl. Probab., 31 (2021), pp. 2244–2274.
- [2] R. BELLMAN AND K. L. COOKE, *Differential-Difference Equations*, Academic Press, New York, 1963.
- [3] R. E. BELLMAN AND J. M. DANSKIN, *A Survey of the Mathematical Theory of Time-Lag, Retarded Control, and Hereditary Processes*, RAND Rep. R-256, Rand Corp., Santa Monica, California, 1954.
- [4] H. BRUNNER, *Volterra Integral Equations: An Introduction to Theory and Applications*, Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, 30, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.
- [5] S. CHEN AND J. YONG, *A linear quadratic optimal control problem for stochastic Volterra integral equations*, Control theory and related topics-in memory of professor Xunjing Li, Fudan university, China, (2007), pp. 44–66.
- [6] C. CORDUNEANU, *Functional Equations with Causal Operators*, Stability and Control: Theory, Methods and Applications. London, UK: Taylor and Francis, 2002.

- [7] L. COUTIN AND L. DECREUSEFOND, *Abstract nonlinear filtering theory in the presence of fractional Brownian motion*, Ann. Appl. Probab. 9 (1999), pp. 1058–1090.
- [8] M. DE ACUTIS, *On the quadratic optimal control problem for Volterra integro-differential equation*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova, 73 (1985), pp. 231–247.
- [9] A. FRIEDMAN, *Optimal control for hereditary processes*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 15 (1964), pp. 396–416.
- [10] I. C. GOHBERG AND M. G. KREIN, *Theory and Applications of Volterra Operators in Hilbert Space*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Reprinted Edition, AMS, 2004.
- [11] Y. HAMAGUCHI AND T. WANG, *Linear-quadratic stochastic Volterra controls I: causal feedback strategies*, [arXiv:2204.08333](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.08333), 2022, submitted to Stochastic Process. Appl.
- [12] Y. HAMAGUCHI AND T. WANG, *Linear-quadratic stochastic Volterra controls II: optimal strategies and Riccati-Volterra equations*, [arXiv:2204.10239](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.10239), 2022, to appear in ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var..
- [13] Y. HAMAGUCHI, *Infinite horizon backward stochastic Volterra integral equations and discounted control problems*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 27 (2021), 47.
- [14] Y. HAMAGUCHI, *On the maximum principle for optimal control problems of stochastic Volterra integral equations with delay*, Appl. Math. Optim., 87 (2023), 42.
- [15] S. HAN, P. LIN AND J. YONG, *Causal state feedback representation for linear quadratic optimal control problems of singular Volterra integral equations*, Math. Control Relat. Fields, 13 (2023), pp. 1282–1317.
- [16] P. LIN AND J. YONG, *Controlled singular Volterra integral equations and Pontryagin maximum principle*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 58 (2020), pp. 136–164.
- [17] A. LINDQUIST, *On feedback control of linear stochastic systems*, SIAM J. Control, 11 (1973), pp. 323–343.
- [18] E. B. LEE AND Y. YOU, *Optimal syntheses for infinite-dimensional linear delayed state-output systems: a semicausality approach*, Appl. Math. Optim., 19 (1989), pp. 113–136.
- [19] E. B. LEE AND Y. YOU, *Quadratic optimization for infinite-dimensional linear differential difference type systems: syntheses via the Fredholm equation*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 28 (1990), pp. 265–293.
- [20] A. J. PRITCHARD AND Y. YOU, *Causal feedback optimal control for Volterra integral equations*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 34 (1996), pp. 1874–1890.
- [21] L. PANDOLFI, *The quadratic regulator problem and the Riccati equation for a process governed by a linear Volterra integro-differential equations*, IEEE Trans. Automat. Control., 63 (2018), pp. 1517–1522.
- [22] L. E. SHAIKHET, *On a linearly quadratic problem of optimal control of a stochastic Volterra equation*, Mathematical notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 48 (1990), pp. 1249–1252.

- [23] Y. SHI, T. WANG, AND J. YONG, *Optimal control problems of forward-backward stochastic Volterra integral equations*, Math. Control Relat. Fields, 5 (2015), pp. 613–649.
- [24] J. SUN AND J. YONG, *Stochastic Linear-Quadratic Optimal Control Theory: Open-loop and Closed-loop Solutions*, Springer Briefs in Mathematics, 2020.
- [25] V. R. VINOKUROV, *Optimal control of processes described by integral equations, I, II, III*, English transl. in SIAM J. Control, 7 (1969), pp. 324–336, pp. 337–345, pp. 346–355.
- [26] V. VOLTERRA, *Theory of Functional and Integral and Integro-Differential Equations*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York 1959.
- [27] F. VIENS AND J. ZHANG, *A martingale approach for fractional Brownian motions and related path dependent PDEs*, Ann. Appl. Probab., 29 (2019), pp. 3489–3540.
- [28] H. WANG, J. YONG AND C. ZHOU, *Linear-quadratic optimal controls for stochastic Volterra integral equations: causal state feedback and path-dependent Riccati equations*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 61 (2023), pp. 2595–2629.
- [29] T. WANG, *Linear quadratic control problems of stochastic Volterra integral equations*, ESAIM: Control Optim. Calc. Var., 24 (2018), pp. 1849–1879.
- [30] T. WANG AND J. YONG, *Spike variations for stochastic Volterra integral equations*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 61 (2023), pp. 3608–3634.
- [31] T. WANG, *Necessary conditions of Pontryagin’s type for general controlled stochastic Volterra integral equations*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 26 (2020), 29.
- [32] T. WANG AND H. ZHANG, *Optimal control problems of forward-backward stochastic Volterra integral equations with closed control regions*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 55 (2017), pp. 2574–2602.
- [33] K. YOSIDA, *Lectures on differential and integral equations*, Interscience, New York, 1960.
- [34] J. YONG, *Well-posedness and regularity of backward stochastic Volterra integral equation*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, 142 (2008), pp. 21–77.
- [35] J. YONG AND X. ZHOU, *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, Berlin, 1999.