

# Mean-field reflected BSDEs with jumps

Yiqing Lin<sup>1</sup> and Kun Xu<sup>\*1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 200240 Shanghai, China.

June 19, 2024

## Abstract

In this paper, we study a class of mean-field reflected backward stochastic differential equations (MF-RBSDEs) driven by a marked point process and also analyze MF-RBSDEs driven by a poisson process. Based on a g-expectation representation lemma, we give the existence and uniqueness of the particle system of MF-RBSDEs driven by a marked point process under Lipschitz generator conditions and obtain a convergence of this system. We also establish the well-posedness of the MF-RBSDEs driven by a poisson process and the rate of convergence of the corresponding particle system towards the solution to the MF-RBSDEs driven by a poisson process under bounded terminal, bounded obstacle conditions.

**Keywords:** Mean-field RBSDEJ, convergence, particle system.

## 1 Introduction

Inspired by particle systems, the mean-field backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs, for short) were introduced by Buckdahn, Djehiche, Li, Peng [12] and Buckdahn, Li, Peng [13]. Since then, mean-field BSDEs and the related nonlocal partial differential equations (PDEs, for short) have received intensive attention. Consider the following general mean-field BSDE:

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (1.1)$$

where the random variable  $\xi$  is called the terminal value and the coefficient  $f$  is called the generator. The adapted pair  $(Y, Z)$  are called an solution of (1.1), with  $\mathbb{P}_{Y_s}$  being the law of  $Y_s$ . BSDE (1.1) is called a quadratic mean-field BSDE or a mean-field BSDE with quadratic growth if the generator  $f$  in BSDE (1.1) grows quadratically in the second last argument  $Z$ , and the terminal value  $\xi$  is called bounded if it is bounded.

Lions [65] at Collège de France introduced the derivative of a functional  $\varphi : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with respect to the measure argument. After that, this definition is adopted by many works. Chassagneux, Crisan, and Delarue [16] (see also Carmona and Delarue [15]) studied the general mean-field BSDE (1.1) coupled with a McKean-Vlasov forward equation, and proved that this class of equations admits unique adapted solution under globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients. Buckdahn, Li, Peng and Rainer [14] studied the general forward mean-field stochastic differential equations and the associated PDEs. Li [62] studied the general mean-field forward-backward SDEs with jumps and associated nonlocal quasi-linear integral-PDEs. Besides, for the applications of the mean-field framework in stochastic control problems, Yong [82] studied a linear-quadratic optimal control problem of mean-field SDEs, and Buckdahn, Chen and Li [11] studied the partial derivative with respect to the measure and its application to general controlled mean-field systems.

When the law of  $Y$  appear as the expectation of  $Y$ , the mean-field BSDE (1.1) was studied by Buckdahn, Djehiche, Li, Peng [12] and Buckdahn, Li, Peng [13], where the existence, uniqueness, a comparison theorem, and the relation with a nonlocal PDE are given for the case of uniformly Lipschitz continuous coefficients. When the generator  $f$  depends on the expectation of  $(Y, Z)$ , Cheridito and Nam [17] discussed the existence of a class of mean-field BSDE with quadratic growth. Hibon, Hu, and Tang [43] studied the existence and uniqueness of one-dimensional mean-field BSDEs with quadratic growth, and Hao, Wen, and Xiong [41] studied a class of multidimensional mean-field BSDEs with quadratic growth and with small terminal value. When the generator  $f$

\*Corresponding author. Email address: [1949101x\\_k@sjtu.edu.cn](mailto:1949101x_k@sjtu.edu.cn) (K. Xu).

depends on the laws of  $(Y, Z)$ , Hao, Hu, Tang and Wen [40] study the one-dimensional mean-field BSDE (1.1) with quadratic growth and with bounded terminal value.

When the generator  $f$  is independent of  $\mathbb{P}_Y$ , the general mean-field BSDE (1.1) is reduced to the following BSDE:

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dW_s, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

which were introduced by Pardoux and Peng [74], where the existence and uniqueness were obtained for the case of Lipschitz continuous coefficients. Due to a wide range of applications, the research of BSDEs with a quadratic generator (quadratic BSDEs) has attracted many people's attention. In particular, quadratic BSDEs for a bounded terminal value  $\xi$  was studied by Kobylanski [55] via an approximation procedure of the driver. Thereafter, the result was generated by Briand and Hu [9, 10] for unbounded terminal value  $\xi$  of some suitable exponential moments. In contrast, Tevzadze [81] proposed a fundamentally different approach by means of a fixed point argument. Fairly large number of applications of quadratic BSDEs can be found in literature, for instance, on PDEs [25], risk sensitive control problems [46], indifference pricing in incomplete market [45, 70] and etc.

Moreover, El Karoui et al. [53] studied reflected backward stochastic differential equations (RBSDEs) in order to solve an obstacle problem for PDEs. The solution  $Y$  of a RBSDE is required to be above a given continuous process  $L$ , i.e.,

$$L_t \leq Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds + K_T - K_t - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where the solution  $(Y, Z, K)$  satisfies the so-called flat-off condition (or, Skorokhod condition):

$$\int_0^T (Y_t - L_t) dK_t = 0,$$

where  $K$  is an increasing process. El Karoui et al. [53] proved the solvability of RBSDE with Lipschitz  $f$  and square integrable terminal  $\xi$ . After that, the result of [53] is generated by Kobylanski et al. [56] for quadratic RBSDEs with bounded terminal values and bounded obstacles. Lepeltier and Xu [60] constructed the existence of a solution with unbounded terminal values, but still with a bounded obstacle. Bayrakstar and Yao [4] studied the well-posedness of quadratic RBSDE under unbounded terminal and unbounded obstacles. For more studies related to RBSDEs, we refer the readers to Essaky and Hassani [33], Ren and Xia [77], Jia and Xu [49] and so on.

Apart from BSDEs in a Brownian framework, the generalizations of BSDEs to a setting with jumps enlarges the scope of applications of BSDEs, for instance in insurance modeling which is discussed in Liu and Ma [66]. Taking advantage of a fixed point approach similar to that used in [74] (see also Papapantoleon, Possamaï, and Saplaio [73] for a more general framework), Li and Tang [80] and Barles, Buckdahn and Pardoux [2] obtained the well-posedness for Lipschitz BSDEs with jumps (BSDEJ). Since then, different kind of BSDEJs have been investigated by many researchers. In particular, BSDEJs driven by quadratic coefficients were studied by Becherer [5] and Morlais [71] in an exponential utility maximization problem. Besides, Antonelli and Mancini [1] constructed the well-posedness of BSDEJs with local Lipschitz drivers. [5, 71, 1] all adopted Kobylanski's approach [55] to the jump setting. In contrast, Cohen and Elliott [19], Kazi-Tani, Possamaï and Zhou [54] made use of the fixed-point approach of Tevzadze [81]. Well-posedness of BSDEJs with bounded terminal was verified in these works. Moreover, based on the stability of quadratic semimartingales, Barrieu and El Karoui [3] showed the existence of a solution with unbounded terminal under a quadratic structure condition in a continuous setup. To cope with BSDEJs, the quadratic structure condition was generalized to a quadratic exponential structure condition in Ngoupeyou [72], Jeanblanc, Matoussi & Ngoupeyou [48], and El Karoui, Matoussi & Ngoupeyou [30]. However, those results for unbounded terminals only provided existence without uniqueness. Recently, relying on  $\theta$ -method, Kaakäi, Matoussi and Tamtalini [50] obtained the well-posedness of a special class of quadratic exponential BSDEJs with unbounded terminal conditions aroused in a robust utility maximization problem, under several special structural conditions.

In particular, a class of BSDEs driven by a random measure associated with a marked point process as follows is investigated by many researchers.

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(t, Y_s, U_s) dA_s - \int_t^T \int_E U_s(e) q(ds, de). \quad (1.2)$$

Here  $q$  is a compensated integer random measure corresponding to some marked point process  $(T_n, \zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , and  $A$  is the dual predictable projection of the event counting process related to the marked point process, which is a continuous and increasing process. The well-posedness of BSDEs driven by general marked point processes were investigated in Confortola & Fuhrman [21] for the weighted- $L^2$  solution, Becherer [5] and Confortola & Fuhrman [22] for the  $L^2$  case, Confortola, Fuhrman & Jacod [23] for the  $L^1$  case and Confortola [20] for the  $L^p$  case. A

more general BSDE with both Brownian motion diffusion term and a very general marked point process, which is non-explosive and has totally inaccessible jumps was studied in Foresta [34].

In this paper, we consider the particle system of following type of mean field RBSDEs driven by a marked point process, which generalized the results of Brownian driven BSDEs studied in [4] and Poisson driven BSDEJs attributed to e.g. Hamadéne and Ouknine [38, 39], Djehiche, Dumitrescu and Zeng [26].

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, U_s, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dA_s + \int_t^T dK_s - \int_t^T \int_E U_s(e) q(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ Y_t \geq h(t, Y_t, \mathbb{P}_{Y_t}), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-} - h(t^-, Y_{t^-}, \mathbb{P}_{Y_{t^-}})) dK_t = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

Some related studies on doubly RBSDEJs can be found in Crépey and Matoussi [24]. Moreover, RBSDEJs driven by Lévy process considered in for instance, Ren and El Otmani [75], Ren and Hu [76] and El Otmani [31] are also enlightening. Compared with the jump setting in e.g. Matoussi and Salhi [68], the process  $A$  is not necessarily absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. This type of RBSDEs has been investigated in Foresta [34]. The author established the well-posedness with Lipschitz drivers with the help of a fixed point argument. The extension to the case of reflected BSDEs with jumps can also be found in e.g. [27, 28, 29, 32].

The theory of propagation of chaos can be traced back to the work by Kac [51] whose initial aim was to investigate the particle system approximation of some nonlocal partial differential equations (PDEs) arising in thermodynamics. Kac's intuition was put into firm mathematical ground notably by Henry P McKean [69], Alain-Sol Sznitman [79] and Jürgen Gärtner [37]. Further development and applications of propagation of chaos theory can be found in [47, 57, 78]. Besides, Buckdahn et al. [12], Hu, Ren and Yang [44], Laurière and Tangpi [59] and Briand et al. [7] studied the limit theorems for weakly interacting particles whose dynamics is given by a system of BSDEs in the case of non-reflected BSDE driven by Brownian motion. Li [61] extends the results of [12] to reflected BSDEs where the weak interaction enters only the driver, while the work by Briand and Hibon [8] considers a particular class of mean reflected BSDEs. Djehiche, Dumitrescu and Zeng [26] establish a propagation of chaos result for weakly interacting nonlinear Snell envelopes which converge to a class of mean-field RBSDEs with jumps and right-continuous and left-limited obstacle, where the mean-field interaction in terms of the distribution of the  $Y$ -component of the solution enters both the driver and the lower obstacle.

Similar with [26], in this paper we first consider the following particle system:

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s^i, U_s^{i,i}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) dA_s + K_T^i - K_t^i - \int_t^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n U_s^{i,j}(e) q^j(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ Y_t^i \geq h(t, Y_t^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t]), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-}^i - h(t^-, Y_{t^-}^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_{t^-}])) dK_t^i = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

and prove that the mean-field limit of the  $N$ -particle system (1.4) converges to the mean-field RBSDE (1.3) under the framework of marked point process which means the BSDE is driven by a random measure associated with a marked point process. Then we study a family of weakly interacting process

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s^i, U_s^{i,i}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) ds + K_T^i - K_t^i - \int_t^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n U_s^{i,j}(e) \tilde{\mu}^j(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ Y_t^i \geq h(t, Y_t^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t]), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-}^i - h(t^-, Y_{t^-}^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_{t^-}])) dK_t^i = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

and show the convergence rate of the solution of this system (1.5) to the solution of the corresponding mean-field RBSDE under bounded terminal and obstacle condition.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some preliminary notations. In Section 3, we prove the existence and uniqueness of system (1.4) and give the convergence result of system (1.4). In Section 4, we show the convergence rate of the solution of this system (1.5) to the solution of the corresponding mean-field RBSDE.

## 2 Preliminaries

First of all, we need to explain the settings and notations in this paper. We call the BSDE driven by a marked point process as the marked point process framework, and the BSDE driven by Poisson process as the Poisson process framework. Because the above two frameworks are both involved in this paper, we use the same notations to represent some definitions under the two frameworks to simplify the symbols without causing ambiguity.

## 2.1 General setting

Under the MPP framework, we introduce some notions about marked point processes and some basic assumptions. More details about marked point processes can be found in [34, 6, 58, 18]. We assume that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is a complete probability space and  $E$  is a Borel space. We call  $E$  the mark space and  $\mathcal{E}$  is its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Given a sequence of random variables  $(T_n, \zeta_n)$  taking values in  $[0, \infty] \times E$ , set  $T_0 = 0$  and  $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$

- $T_n \leq T_{n+1}, \forall n \geq 0$ ;
- $T_n < \infty$  implies  $T_n < T_{n+1} \forall n \geq 0$ .

The sequence  $(T_n, \zeta_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is called a marked point process (MPP). Moreover, we assume the marked point process is non-explosive, i.e.,  $T_n \rightarrow \infty, \mathbb{P} - a.s.$

Define a random discrete measure  $p$  on  $((0, +\infty) \times E, \mathcal{B}((0, +\infty) \otimes \mathcal{E}))$  associated with each MPP:

$$p(\omega, D) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{(T_n(\omega), \zeta_n(\omega)) \in D}. \quad (2.1)$$

For each  $\tilde{C} \in \mathcal{E}$ , define the counting process  $N_t(\tilde{C}) = p((0, t] \times \tilde{C})$  and denote  $N_t = N_t(E)$ . Obviously, both are right continuous increasing process starting from zero. Define for  $t \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{G}_t^0 = \sigma(N_s(\tilde{C}) : s \in [0, t], \tilde{C} \in \mathcal{E})$$

and  $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_t^0, \mathcal{N})$ , where  $\mathcal{N}$  is the family of  $\mathbb{P}$ -null sets of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Note by  $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  the completed filtration generated by the MPP, which is right continuous and satisfies the usual hypotheses. Given a standard Brownian motion  $W \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , independent with the MPP, let  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)$  be the completed filtration generated by the MPP and  $W$ , which satisfies the usual conditions as well.

Each marked point process has a unique compensator  $\lambda$ , a predictable random measure such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{+\infty} \int_E C_t(e) p(dt, de) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{+\infty} \int_E C_t(e) \lambda(dt, de) \right]$$

for all  $C$  which is non-negative and  $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{G}} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ -measurable, where  $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{G}}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{G}$ -predictable processes. Moreover, in this paper we always assume that there exists a function  $\phi$  on  $\Omega \times [0, +\infty) \times \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\lambda(\omega, dtde) = \phi_t(\omega, de) dA_t(\omega)$ , where  $A$  is the dual predictable projection of  $N$ . In other words,  $A$  is the unique right continuous increasing process with  $A_0 = 0$  such that, for any non-negative predictable process  $D$ , it holds that,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^\infty D_t dN_t \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^\infty D_t dA_t \right].$$

Fix a terminal time  $T > 0$ , we can define the integral

$$\int_0^T \int_E C_t(e) q(dtde) = \int_0^T \int_E C_t(e) p(dtde) - \int_0^T \int_E C_t(e) \phi_t(de) dA_t,$$

under the condition

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_E |C_t(e)| \phi_t(de) dA_t \right] < \infty.$$

Indeed, the process  $\int_0^\cdot \int_E C_t(e) q(dt, de)$  is a martingale. Note that  $\int_a^b$  denotes an integral on  $(a, b]$  if  $b < \infty$ , or on  $(a, \infty)$  if  $b = \infty$ .

Under the Poisson process framework, let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}, \mathbb{P})$  be a filtered probability space, whose filtration satisfies the usual hypotheses of completeness and right-continuity. We suppose that this filtration is generated by the following two mutually independent processes:

- a  $d$ -dimensional standard Brownian motion  $\{B_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , and
- a Poisson random measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times E$ , where  $E \triangleq \mathbb{R}^\ell \setminus \{0\}$  is equipped with its Borel field  $\mathcal{E}$ , with compensator  $\lambda(\omega, dt, de)$ . We assume in all the paper that  $\lambda$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $dt$ , i.e.  $\lambda(\omega, dt, de) = \nu_t(\omega, de) dt$ . Finally, we denote  $\tilde{\mu}$  the compensated jump measure

$$\tilde{\mu}(\omega, de, dt) = \mu(\omega, de, dt) - \nu_t(\omega, de) dt.$$

Denote by  $\mathbb{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  the completion of the filtration generated by  $\tilde{\mu}$ . Following Li and Tang [80] and Barles, Buckdahn and Pardoux [2], the definition of a BSDE with jumps is then

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\xi$  be a  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable. A solution to the BSDEJ with terminal condition  $\xi$  and generator  $f$  is a triple  $(Y, Z, U)$  of progressively measurable processes such that

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f_s(Y_s, Z_s, U_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s - \int_t^T \int_E U_s(x) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de), t \in [0, T], \mathbb{P} - a.s., \quad (2.2)$$

where  $f : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{A}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a given application and

$$\mathcal{A}(E) := \{u : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(E) - \text{measurable}\}.$$

Then, the processes  $Z$  and  $U$  are supposed to satisfy the minimal assumptions so that the quantities in (2.2) are well defined:

$$\int_0^T |Z_t|^2 dt < +\infty, \left( \text{resp. } \int_0^T \int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \nu_t(dx) dt < +\infty \right), \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

As the Brownian motion  $B$  and the integer valued random measure  $\mu$  is independent, proof related to the two does not interfere with each other. In order to highlight the key points of this article, we only consider equation without the Brownian motion term.

## 2.2 Notation

We denote a generic constant by  $C$ , which may change line by line, is sometimes associated with several subscripts (such as  $C_{K,T}$ ) showing its dependence when necessary. Let us introduce the following spaces for stochastic processes:

- For any real  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{S}^p$  denotes the set of real-valued, adapted and càdlàg processes  $\{Y_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  such that

$$\|Y\|_{\mathcal{S}^p} := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t|^p \right]^{1/p} < +\infty.$$

Then  $(\mathcal{S}^p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{S}^p})$  is a Banach space.

- $\mathcal{M}^{2,p}$  the set of predictable processes  $U$  such that

$$\|U\|_{\mathcal{M}^{2,p}} := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{[0, T]} \int_E |U_s(e)|^2 \nu_s(de) ds \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

- $H_v^{2,p}$  is the space of predictable processes  $U$  such that

$$\|U\|_{H_v^{2,p}} := \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{[0, T]} \int_E |U_s(e)|^2 \phi_s(de) dA_s \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

- $L^0(\mathcal{B}(E))$  denotes the space of  $\mathcal{B}(E)$ -measurable functions. For  $u \in L^0(\mathcal{B}(E))$ , define

$$L^2(E, \mathcal{B}(E), \phi_t(\omega, dy)) := \left\{ u \in L^0(\mathcal{B}(E)) : \|u\|_t := \left( \int_E |u(e)|^2 \phi_t(de) \right)^{1/2} < \infty \right\},$$

$$L^2(E, \mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t(\omega, dy)) := \left\{ u \in L^0(\mathcal{B}(E)) : \|u\|_v := \left( \int_E |u(e)|^2 \nu_t(de) \right)^{1/2} < \infty \right\}.$$

- $\mathcal{S}^\infty$  is the space of  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued càdlàg and  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable processes  $Y$  such that

$$\|Y\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} := \left\| \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t| \right\|_\infty < +\infty.$$

- $\mathcal{J}^\infty$  is the space of functions which are  $d\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu(dz)$  essentially bounded i.e.,

$$\|\Psi\|_{\mathcal{J}^\infty} := \left\| \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\Psi_t\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\nu)} \right\|_\infty < \infty,$$

where  $\mathcal{L}^\infty(\nu)$  is the space of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued measurable functions  $\nu(dz)$ -a.e. bounded endowed with the usual essential sup-norm.

- $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$  is the collection of all probability measures over  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  with finite  $p^{\text{th}}$  moment, endowed with the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance  $W_p$ ;
- $\mathcal{A}^2$  the closed subset of  $\mathcal{S}^2$  consisting of non-decreasing processes starting from 0.
- $\mathcal{A}^D$  is the closed subset of  $\mathcal{S}^\infty$  consisting of non-decreasing processes  $K = (K_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  starting from the origin, i.e.  $K_0 = 0$ ;
- $\mathcal{A}_D$  is the space of all càdlàg non-decreasing deterministic processes  $K = (K_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  starting from the origin;
- $\mathcal{A}_D^\infty$  is the closed subset of  $\mathcal{S}^\infty$  consisting of deterministic non-decreasing processes  $K = (K_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  starting from the origin.

For  $\beta > 0$ , we introduce the following spaces.

- $\mathcal{S}_\beta^p$  is the set of real-valued càdlàg adapted processes  $y$  such that  $\|y\|_{\mathcal{S}_\beta^p}^p := \mathbb{E} [\sup_{0 \leq u \leq T} e^{\beta p s} |y_u|^p] < \infty$ . We set  $\mathcal{S}^p = \mathcal{S}_0^p$ .
- $\mathbb{L}_\beta^p$  is the set of real-valued càdlàg adapted processes  $y$  such that  $\|y\|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^p}^p := \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_0} \mathbb{E} [e^{\beta p \tau} |y_\tau|^p] < \infty$ , where  $\mathcal{T}_t$  is the set of  $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping times  $\tau$  such that  $\tau \in [t, T]$  a.s.  $\mathbb{L}_\beta^p$  is a Banach space. We set  $\mathbb{L}^p = \mathbb{L}_0^p$ .

### 3 Well-posedness and convergence result of MF-RBSDEs driven by a MPP

In this section, we study the following MF-RBSDE driven by a MPP.

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, U_s, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dA_s + \int_t^T dK_s - \int_t^T \int_E U_s(e) q(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ Y_t \geq h(t, Y_t, \mathbb{P}_{Y_t}), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-} - h(t^-, Y_{t^-}, \mathbb{P}_{Y_{t^-}})) dK_t = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Next, we will now discuss the interpretation of (3.1) at the particle level and study the well-posedness of the associated particle system.

Consider a family of weakly interacting processes  $\mathbf{Y} := (Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  evolving backward in time as follows: for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s^i, U_s^{i,i}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) dA_s + K_T^i - K_t^i - \int_t^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n U_s^{i,j}(e) q^j(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ Y_t^i \geq h(t, Y_t^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t]), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-}^i - h(t^-, Y_{t^-}^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_{t^-}])) dK_t^i = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases}, \quad (3.2)$$

where the empirical measure associated to  $\mathbf{Y}$  is denoted by

$$L_n[\mathbf{Y}] := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{Y^k}$$

and  $\xi^i$   $_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ ,  $f^i$   $_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  and  $q^i$   $_{1 \leq i \leq n}$  are independent copied of  $\xi$ ,  $f$  and  $q$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{F}^n := \{\mathcal{F}_t^n\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  the completion of the filtration generated by  $\{q^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_t^n$  be the set of  $\mathbb{F}^n$  stopping times with values in  $[t, T]$ .

#### 3.1 Well-posedness result

We first introduce some basic assumptions that run through this section.

**(H1)** The process  $A$  is continuous with  $\|A_T\|_\infty < \infty$ .

The first assumption is on the dual predictable projection  $A$  of the counting process  $N$  relative to  $p$ . We would like to emphasize that for  $A_t$ , we do not require absolute continuity with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

**(H2)** For every  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$  the mapping  $f(\omega, t, r, \cdot, \mu) : L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \phi_t(\omega, dy); \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies: for every  $U \in H_V^{2,2}$ ,

$$(\omega, t, r, \mu) \mapsto f(\omega, t, r, U_t(\omega, \cdot), \mu)$$

is  $\text{Prog} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable.

**(H3)**

**(a) (Continuity condition)** For every  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \phi_t(\omega, dy); \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $(y, u, \mu) \rightarrow f(t, y, u, \mu)$  is continuous.

**(b) (Lipschitz condition)** There exists  $C_f \geq 0$ , such that for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \phi_t(\omega, dy); \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$|f(\omega, t, y_1, u_1, \mu_1) - f(\omega, t, y_2, u_2, \mu_2)| \leq C_f (|y_1 - y_2| + \|u_1 - u_2\|_t + \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2)).$$

**(c) (Growth condition)** For all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $(y, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \phi_t(\omega, dy); \mathbb{R})$ :  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s, there exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that,

$$\underline{q}(t, y, u) = -\frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(t, -u) - \alpha_t - \beta (|y| + \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \delta_0)) \leq f(t, y, u, \mu) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(t, u) + \alpha_t + \beta (|y| + \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \delta_0)) = \bar{q}(t, y, u),$$

where  $\{\alpha_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is a progressively measurable nonnegative stochastic process.

**(d) (Integrability condition)** We assume necessarily,

$$\forall p > 0, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ p \lambda e^{\beta A_T} (|\xi| \vee h_*) + p \lambda \int_0^T e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s \right\} + \int_0^T \alpha_s^2 dA_s \right] < \infty, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $h_* := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |h_t|$ .

**(e) (Convexity/Concavity condition)** For each  $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \phi_t(\omega, dy); \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $u \rightarrow f(t, y, u, \mu)$  is convex or concave.

**(H4)**  $h$  is a mapping from  $[0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  such that

**(a) (Continuity condition)** For all  $(y, \mu) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $(h(t, y, \mu))_t$  is a right-continuous left-limited process the process.

**(b) (Lipschitz condition)**  $h$  is Lipschitz w.r.t.  $(y, \mu)$  uniformly in  $(t, \omega)$ , i.e. there exists two positive constants  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$|h(t, y_1, \mu_1) - h(t, y_2, \mu_2)| \leq \gamma_1 |y_1 - y_2| + \gamma_2 \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2)$$

for any  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ .

**(c)** The final condition  $\xi^i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_T^n$ -measurable,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and satisfies  $\xi^i \geq h(T, \xi^i, L_n[\xi^n])$  a.s.  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

**(H5) (Uniform linear bound condition)** There exists a positive constant  $C_0$  such that for each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $u \in L^2(E, \mathcal{B}(E), \phi_t(\omega, dy))$ , if  $f$  is convex (resp. concave) in  $u$ , then  $f(t, 0, u, \mu) - f(t, 0, 0, \mu) \geq -C_0 \|u\|_t$  (resp.  $f(t, 0, u, \mu) - f(t, 0, 0, \mu) \leq C_0 \|u\|_t$ ).

Note that we have the inequality

$$\mathcal{W}_p^p(L_n[\mathbf{x}], L_n[\mathbf{y}]) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |x_j - y_j|^p, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} := (x^1, \dots, x^n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and, in particular,

$$\mathcal{W}_p^p(L_n[\mathbf{x}], L_n[\mathbf{0}]) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |x_j|^p,$$

where we note that  $L_n[\mathbf{0}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_0 = \delta_0$ .

Endow the product space  $\mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n} := \mathbb{L}_\beta^p \times \mathbb{L}_\beta^p \times \dots \times \mathbb{L}_\beta^p$  with the respective norm

$$\|h\|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}}^p := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|h^i\|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^p}^p.$$

$\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_V^{2, p, n, \otimes n}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_D^{\otimes n}$  are defined in a similar way.

Note that  $\mathcal{S}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$  and  $\mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$  are complete metric spaces. We denote by  $\mathcal{S}^{p, \otimes n} := \mathcal{S}_0^{p, \otimes n}$ ,  $\mathbb{L}^{p, \otimes n} := \mathbb{L}_0^{p, \otimes n}$ . Let  $\tilde{\Phi} : \mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$  to be the mapping that associates to a process  $\mathbf{Y} := (Y^1, Y^2, \dots, Y^n)$  the process  $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{Y}) = (\tilde{\Phi}^1(\mathbf{Y}), \tilde{\Phi}^2(\mathbf{Y}), \dots, \tilde{\Phi}^n(\mathbf{Y}))$  defined by the following system: for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $t \leq T$ ,

$$\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{Y})_t = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} \mathcal{E}_{t, \tau}^{f^i \circ \mathbf{Y}} [\xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s])_{s=\tau} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}}], \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y} : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{E})^n &\mapsto \mathbb{R} \\ (\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y})(t, \omega, y, u) &= f(t, \omega, y, u^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t](\omega)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose that Assumption (H1), (H2), (H3), (H4) and (H5) are satisfied for some  $p \geq 2$ . Suppose further that  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  satisfy

$$\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{p\beta A_T} \right] < 2^{2 - \frac{3p}{2}},$$

where  $2\beta \geq 2C_f + \frac{2}{\eta}$  and  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{C_f}$ . Then the system (3.2) has a unique solution in  $\mathcal{E}^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_V^{2, p, n, \otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{A}_D^{\otimes n}$ .

*Proof. Step 1.* We first show that  $\tilde{\Phi}$  is a well-defined map from  $\mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$  to itself. To this end, we linearize the mapping  $h$  as follows: for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $0 \leq s \leq T$ ,

$$h(s, Y_s^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) = h(s, 0, L_n[\mathbf{0}]) + a_h^i(s) Y_s^i + b_h^i(s) \mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\mathbf{0}])$$

where  $a_h^i(\cdot)$  and  $b_h^i(\cdot)$  are adapted processes given by

$$\begin{cases} a_h^i(s) := \frac{h(s, Y_s^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) - h(s, 0, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s])}{Y_s^i} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_s^i \neq 0\}}, \\ b_h^i(s) := \frac{h(s, 0, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) - h(s, 0, L_n[\mathbf{0}])}{\mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\mathbf{0}])} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\mathbf{0}]) \neq 0\}}. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

and which, by the Lipschitz continuity of  $h$ , satisfy  $|a_h^i(\cdot)| \leq \gamma_1$ ,  $|b_h^i(\cdot)| \leq \gamma_2$ . By Proposition 3.1 in [64] we obtain the following for any stopping time  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} &| \mathcal{E}_{t, \tau}^{f^i \circ \mathbf{Y}} [\xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s])_{s=\tau} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}}] |^p \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \left( \mathbb{E}_t \left[ e^{p\beta(A_\tau - A_t)} | \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s])_{s=\tau} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} |^p \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left\{ \int_t^\tau e^{2\beta(A_s - A_t)} |f|^2(s, 0, 0, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) dA_s \right\}^{p/2} \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

with  $\eta, \beta > 0$  such that  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{C_f^2}$  and  $2\beta \geq 2C_f + \frac{3}{\eta}$ . Moreover, since  $f(t, 0, 0, \delta_0) \in \mathcal{H}^{p,1}$ ,  $\xi^i \in L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ ,  $(h(t, 0, \delta_0))_{0 \leq t \leq T} \in \mathcal{S}_\beta^p$  and  $(Y^i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in \mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$ , the non-negative càdlàg process  $(M_t^{i,\beta})_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} M_t^{i,\beta} &:= \left( e^{\beta A_t} |h(t, 0, L_n[\mathbf{0}])| + \gamma_1 e^{\beta A_t} |Y_t^i| + \gamma_2 e^{\beta A_t} \mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t], L_n[\mathbf{0}]) + e^{\beta A_t} |\xi^i| \mathbf{1}_{\{t=T\}} \right)^p \\ &\quad + \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( \int_0^t \left\{ e^{\beta A_s} |f(s, 0, 0, L_n[\mathbf{0}])| + C_f e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\mathbf{0}]) \right\}^2 dA_s \right)^{p/2} \end{aligned}$$

belongs to  $\mathbb{L}^1$ . Thus for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , it follows that  $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{Y}) \in \mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$ .

**Step 2.** We now show that  $\tilde{\Phi}$  is a contraction on the time interval  $[T-h, T]$ . Fix  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$ ,  $\check{\mathbf{Y}}^n = (\check{Y}^1, \dots, \check{Y}^n) \in \mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$ ,  $(\hat{Y}, \check{Y}) \in (\mathcal{S}_\beta^p)^2$ ,  $(\hat{U}, \check{U}) \in (\mathcal{H}_V^p)^2$ . By the Lipschitz continuity of  $f$  and  $h$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |f(s, \hat{Y}_s, \hat{U}_s, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) - f(s, \check{Y}_s, \check{U}_s, L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}_s])| &\leq C_f (|\hat{Y}_s - \check{Y}_s| + \|\hat{U}_s - \check{U}_s\|_t + \mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}_s])), \\ |h(s, Y_s^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) - h(s, \check{Y}_s^i, L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}_s])| &\leq \gamma_1 |Y_s^i - \check{Y}_s^i| + \gamma_2 \mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}_s]). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

By (3.4), we have

$$\mathcal{W}_p^p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}_s]) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |Y_s^j - \check{Y}_s^j|^p. \quad (3.8)$$

Then, using equation (3.5) and Proposition 3.1 in [64] again, for any  $t \leq T$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \tilde{\Phi}^i(\mathbf{Y}^n)_t - \tilde{\Phi}^i(\check{\mathbf{Y}}^n)_t \right|^p \\ &= \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} \mathcal{E}_{t,\tau}^{\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y}} \left[ h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}]_{s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} \right] \\ &\quad - \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} \mathcal{E}_{t,\tau}^{\mathbf{f}^i \circ \check{\mathbf{Y}}} \left[ h(\tau, \check{Y}_\tau^i, L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}]_{s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} \right] \Big|^p \\ &\leq \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( \int_t^\tau e^{2\beta(A_s - A_t)} \left| (\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y})(s, \hat{Y}_s^{i,\tau}, \hat{U}_s^{i,\tau}) - (\mathbf{f}^i \circ \check{\mathbf{Y}})(s, \hat{Y}_s^{i,\tau}, \hat{U}_s^{i,\tau}) \right|^2 dA_s \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{p\beta(A_\tau - A_t)} |h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}]_{s=\tau}) - h(\tau, \check{Y}_\tau^i, L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}]_{s=\tau})|^p \right] \\ &\leq \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( \int_t^\tau e^{2\beta(A_s - A_t)} \left| f(s, \hat{Y}_s^{i,\tau}, \hat{U}_s^{i,\tau}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) - f(s, \hat{Y}_s^{i,\tau}, \hat{U}_s^{i,\tau}, L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}_s]) \right|^2 dA_s \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{p\beta(A_\tau - A_t)} |h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}]_{s=\tau}) - h(\tau, \check{Y}_\tau^i, L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}]_{s=\tau})|^p \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\hat{Y}^{i,\tau}, \hat{U}^{i,\tau})$  is the solution of the BSDE associated with driver  $\mathbf{f}^i \circ \check{\mathbf{Y}}^n$ , terminal time  $\tau$  and terminal condition  $h(\tau, \check{Y}_\tau^i, L_n[\check{\mathbf{Y}}]_{s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}}$ . Therefore, using (3.7) and (3.8), we have, for any  $t \in [T-h, T]$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{p\beta A_t} \left| \tilde{\Phi}^i(\mathbf{Y})_t - \tilde{\Phi}^i(\check{\mathbf{Y}})_t \right|^p \\ &\leq \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \int_t^\tau e^{p\beta A_s} \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} C_f^p (A_T - A_{T-h})^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |Y_s^j - \check{Y}_s^j|^p \right) dA_s \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{p\beta A_\tau} \left( \gamma_1 |Y_\tau^i - \check{Y}_\tau^i| + \gamma_2 \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |Y_\tau^j - \check{Y}_\tau^j|^p \right) \right\}^{1/p} \right)^p \right] \\ &\leq \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} C_f^p (A_T - A_{T-h})^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \sup_{s \in [T-h, T]} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |Y_s^j - \check{Y}_s^j|^p \right) \int_{T-h}^T e^{p\beta A_s} dA_s \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{p\beta A_\tau} \left\{ 2^{p-1} \gamma_1^p |Y_\tau^i - \check{Y}_\tau^i|^p + 2^{p-1} \gamma_2^p \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |Y_\tau^j - \check{Y}_\tau^j|^p \right) \Big|_{s=\tau} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$e^{\rho\beta A_t} \left| \tilde{\Phi}^i(\mathbf{Y})_t - \tilde{\Phi}^i(\check{\mathbf{Y}})_t \right|^p \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} \mathbb{E}_t [G(\tau)] := V_t,$$

in which

$$G(\tau) := 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} C_f^p (A_T - A_{T-h})^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \sup_{s \in [T-h, T]} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |Y_s^j - \check{Y}_s^j|^p \right) \int_{T-h}^T e^{\rho\beta A_s} dA_s \\ + e^{\rho\beta A_\tau} \left( 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} 2^{p-1} \gamma_1^p |Y_\tau^i - \check{Y}_\tau^i|^p + 2^{p-1} \gamma_2^p \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |Y_s^j - \check{Y}_s^j|^p \right) \Big|_{s=\tau} \right),$$

which yields

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{T-h}^n} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\rho\beta A_\tau} \left| \tilde{\Phi}^i(\mathbf{Y}^n)_\tau - \tilde{\Phi}^i(\check{\mathbf{Y}})_\tau \right|^p \right] \leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{T-h}^n} \mathbb{E}[V_\tau].$$

By Lemma D.1 in [52], for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{T-\delta}^n$ , there exists a sequence  $(\tau_n)_n$  of stopping times in  $\mathcal{T}_\sigma^n$  such that

$$V_\sigma = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[G(\tau_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_\sigma]$$

and so, by Fatou's Lemma, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V_\sigma] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[G(\tau_n)] \leq \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{T-h}^n} \mathbb{E}[G(\tau)].$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{Y}) - \tilde{\Phi}(\check{\mathbf{Y}}) \right\|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}[T-\delta, T]}^p \leq \alpha \|\mathbf{Y} - \check{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{\mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}[T-\delta, T]}^p.$$

where  $\alpha := 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} C_f^p (A_T - A_{T-h})^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \int_{T-h}^T e^{\rho\beta A_s} dA_s + 2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} 2^{p-1} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p \mathbb{E}[e^{\rho\beta A_T}])$ . As  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  satisfies

$$\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p \mathbb{E}[e^{\rho\beta A_T}] < 2^{2-\frac{3p}{2}},$$

we can choose a  $\beta$  and a small enough  $h$  such that  $T = nh$  and

$$e^{\rho\beta A_T} \|A_{ih} - A_{(i-1)h}\|_\infty^{2-\frac{2}{p}} < \frac{1}{2^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} C_f^p} \left( 1 - 2^{\frac{3p}{2}-2} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p \mathbb{E}[e^{\rho\beta A_T}]) \right) \quad (3.9)$$

to make  $\tilde{\Phi}$  a contraction on  $\mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}([T-h, T])$ , i.e.  $\tilde{\Phi}$  admits a unique fixed point over  $[T-h, T]$ .

**Step 3.** Check that the system (3.2) has a unique solution. We first denote

$$\xi := (\xi^1, \dots, \xi^n); \mathbf{U} := (U^{i,1}, \dots, U^{i,n})_{i=1, \dots, n}; \mathbf{K} := (K^1, \dots, K^n).$$

Given  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y^1, \dots, Y^n) \in \mathbb{L}_\beta^{p, \otimes n}$  the solution obtained in Step 2, let  $(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}, \hat{\mathbf{U}}, \hat{\mathbf{K}}) \in \mathcal{E}^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_v^{2, p, n \otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{A}_D^{\otimes n}$  be the unique solution of the BSDE system over  $[T-h, T]$ , with barrier  $(h(t, Y^i, L_n(\mathbf{Y})))_{i=1, \dots, n}$  (which belongs to  $\mathcal{S}^{p, \otimes n}$ ) and driver  $(\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y})_{i=1, \dots, n}$ . Then, for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , we get

$$\hat{Y}_t^i = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} \mathcal{E}_{t, \tau}^{\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y}} [h(\tau, \mathbf{Y}_\tau) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau = T\}}].$$

By the fixed point argument from Step 2, we have  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{Y}$  a.s., where the equality is component-wise. This implies that  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{S}^{p, \otimes n}$  and for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $T-h \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$Y_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s^i, \hat{U}_s^{i,i}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) dA_s + \hat{K}_T^i - \hat{K}_t^i - \int_t^T \int_{R^*} \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{U}_s^{i,j}(e) q^j(ds, de).$$

Therefore, we obtain existence of a solution. Note that, for each  $i$ , the process  $Y_t^i$  is a nonlinear  $\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y}$ -supermartingale. Hence, by the uniqueness of the nonlinear Doob-Meyer decomposition, we get uniqueness of the associated processes  $(\hat{\mathbf{U}}, \hat{\mathbf{K}})$ . This yields existence and uniqueness of (3.2) on the time interval  $[T-h, T]$  in this general case.

Applying the same reasoning on each time interval  $[T-(j+1)h, T-jh]$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , with a similar dynamics but terminal condition  $\mathbf{Y}_{T-jh}$  at time  $T-jh$ , we build recursively, for  $j = 1$  to  $n$ , a solution  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K})$  on each time interval  $[T-(j+1)h, T-jh]$ . Pasting properly these processes, we naturally derive a unique solution  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K})$  satisfying (3.2) on the full time interval  $[0, T]$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Convergence result

Let us consider  $(\bar{Y}^i, \bar{U}^i, \bar{K}^i)$  independent copies of  $(Y, U, K)$ . More precisely, for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $(\bar{Y}^i, \bar{U}^i, \bar{K}^i)$ , is the unique solution of the reflected MF-BSDE

$$\begin{cases} \bar{Y}_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f\left(s, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}\right) dA_s + \bar{K}_T^i - \bar{K}_t^i - \int_t^T \int_E \bar{U}_s^i(e) q^i(ds, de), \\ \bar{Y}_t^i \geq h\left(t, \bar{Y}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}\right), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \\ \int_0^T \left(\bar{Y}_{t-}^i - h\left(t, \bar{Y}_{t-}^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_{t-}^i}\right)\right) dK_t^i = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

In the sequel, we denote  $(f \circ \bar{Y}^i)(t, y, u) := f\left(t, y, u, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}\right)$ .

With the help of Lemma 4.1 in [63], we have the following a priori estimate for  $Y, U$  and  $K$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Under assumptions (H1)-(H5), assume that  $(\bar{Y}, \bar{U}, \bar{K})$  is a solution to MF-BSDE (3.10). Suppose that for some  $p \geq 1$ , then for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , we have the following a priori estimate.*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ \lambda \bar{Y}_*^i \right\} \right] \leq \frac{e}{e-1} \left\{ 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ 2\lambda e^{\beta A_T} (|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_0^T 2\lambda e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s \right\} \right] \right\}, \quad (3.11)$$

where  $\bar{Y}_*^i \triangleq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\bar{Y}_t^i|$ .

For each  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} + (\bar{K}_T^i)^p \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty)\bar{Y}_*^i} \right] < \infty, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $C_p$  is a constant depending on  $p$  and the constants in (H1)-(H5).  $Y^i, U^i, K^i$  have similar estimates.

*Proof.* Consider the following reflected BSDE with jumps:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{Y}_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f\left(s, \hat{Y}_s^i, \hat{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}_s^i}\right) dA_s + \int_t^T d\hat{K}_s^i - \int_t^T \int_E \hat{U}_s^i(e) q^i(ds, de), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \hat{Y}_t^i \geq h\left(t, \hat{Y}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}_t^i}\right), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

In view of Lemma 4.1 in [63], we know that  $\hat{Y}_t^i = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \hat{Y}_\tau^i$ , where

$$y_t^{\tau,i} = \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h\left(\tau, \bar{Y}_\tau^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_\tau^i}\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \int_t^\tau f\left(s, y_s^{\tau,i}, u_s^{\tau,i}, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}\right) dA_s - \int_t^\tau \int_E u_s^{\tau,i}(e) q^i(ds, de). \quad (3.14)$$

Obviously,  $(\bar{Y}_t^i, \bar{U}_t^i, \bar{K}_t^i)$  is also a solution to (3.13). From [63], we know that BSDE (3.13) has a unique solution, thus we have

$$\bar{Y}_t^i = \hat{Y}_t^i = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \hat{Y}_\tau^i. \quad (3.15)$$

Applying Itô's formula to  $|y^{\tau,i}|$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d|y_t^{\tau,i}| &= \text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) dy_t^{\tau,i} + dL_t^y + \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| - \text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) u_t^{\tau,i}(e) \right) p(dt, de) \\ &= -\text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) f\left(t, y_t^{\tau,i}, u_t^{\tau,i}, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}\right) dA_t + dL_t^y + \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| - \text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) u_t^{\tau,i}(e) \right) \phi_t(de) dt \\ &\quad + \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| \right) q^i(dt, de). \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Define  $G_t = \lambda e^{\beta A_t} |y_t^{\tau,i}| + \int_0^t \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s + \int_0^t \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p\left(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}, \delta_0\right) dA_s$ . Then applying Itô's formula to  $G_t$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} dG_t &= e^{\beta A_t} \left[ \lambda \beta |y_t^{\tau,i}| dA_t + \lambda d|y_t^{\tau,i}| + \lambda \alpha_t dA_t + \lambda \beta e^{\beta A_t} \mathcal{W}_p\left(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0\right) dA_t \right] \\ &= e^{\beta A_t} \lambda \left( -\text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) f\left(t, y_t^{\tau,i}, u_t^{\tau,i}, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}\right) + \alpha_t + \beta |y_t^{\tau,i}| + \beta \mathcal{W}_p\left(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0\right) \right) dA_t + dL_t^y \\ &\quad + \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| - \text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) u_t^{\tau,i}(e) \right) \phi_t(de) dt + \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| \right) q^i(dt, de) \\ &\geq -j\lambda \left( \text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) e^{\beta A_t} u_t^{\tau,i} \right) dA_t + e^{\beta A_t} \lambda \left( dL_t^y + \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| - \text{sign}(y_t^{\tau,i}) u_t^{\tau,i}(e) \right) \phi_t(de) dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| \right) q^i(dt, de) \right) \\ &\geq e^{\beta A_t} \lambda \int_E \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| \right) q^i(dt, de) - j\lambda \left( e^{\beta A_t} \left( |y_t^{\tau,i} + u_t^{\tau,i}(e)| - |y_t^{\tau,i}| \right) \right) dA_t, \end{aligned}$$

where, for the first inequality, we make use of the observation, for any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$j_\lambda(ku) \geq kj_\lambda(u).$$

Moreover, the last inequality follows from the fact  $|y+u| - |y| \geq \text{sign}(y)u$ .

Finally, applying Itô's formula to  $e^{G_t}$ , thanks to condition (3.3), it turns out that  $e^{G_t}$  is a submartingale, which implies,

$$\exp\left\{\lambda|y_t^{\tau,i}|\right\} \leq \exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta A_t}|y_t^{\tau,i}|\right\} \leq \mathbb{E}_t\left[\exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta A_T}(|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p\left(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0\right) dA_s\right\}\right].$$

Hence, from equation (3.15), we have

$$\exp\left\{\lambda|\bar{Y}_t^i|\right\} = \exp\left\{\lambda \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t} |y_t^{\tau,i}|\right\} \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t \in [0,T]} \mathbb{E}_t\left[\exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta A_T}(|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p\left(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0\right) dA_s\right\}\right].$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i\right\}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \mathbb{E}_t\left[\exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta A_T}(|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_0^T \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p\left(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0\right) dA_s\right\}\right]\right]. \quad (3.17)$$

By Jensen's inequality and Doob's inequality, we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left\{\mathbb{E}\left[\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i\right]\right\} &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i\right\}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{e}{e-1} \left\{1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{2\lambda e^{\beta A_T}(|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_0^T 2\lambda e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s\right\}\right]\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Both sides take logarithm at the same time and by the fact that  $\log(a+b) \leq \log 2a + \log b$ , ( $a > 1, b > 1$ ), we can imply that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i\right] \leq C_1 + \log C_2, \quad (3.19)$$

where  $C_1 = \log \frac{2e}{e-1} + \log \frac{e}{e-1}$ ,  $C_2 = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{2\lambda e^{\beta A_T}(|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_0^T 2\lambda e^{\beta A_s} \alpha_s dA_s\right\}\right]$ . The proof of the estimate about  $\bar{U}^i$  and  $\bar{K}^i$  can be found in Appendix A which is similar with Proposition 4.5 in [63].  $\square$

Now we are going to derive the following law of large numbers.

**Theorem 3.3** (Law of Large Numbers). *Let  $\bar{Y}^1, \bar{Y}^2, \dots, \bar{Y}^n$  with terminal values  $\bar{Y}_T^i = \xi^i$  be independent copies of the solution  $Y$  of (3.1). Define  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}} = (\bar{Y}^1, \bar{Y}^2, \dots, \bar{Y}^n)$ , then we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{W}_p^p\left(L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_t], \mathbb{P}_{Y_t}\right)\right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathcal{W}_p^p\left(L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_t], \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}\right)\right] = 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 3.3 similar with Theorem 4.1 in [26].

We now provide the following convergence result for the solution  $Y^i$  of (3.2).

**Proposition 3.4** (Convergence of the  $Y^i$ 's). *Assume that for some  $p \geq 2, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  satisfy*

$$2^{\frac{5p}{2}-2} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p) < 1 \quad (3.20)$$

*Then, under Assumption (H1),(H2),(H3), (H4) and (H5), we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} E\left[|Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p\right] = 0$$

*In particular,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Y^i - \bar{Y}^i\|_{\mathcal{H}^{p,1}} = 0$$

*Proof.* For any  $t \in [0, T]$ , let  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_t^n$ . By the estimates on BSDEs from Proposition 3.1 in [64], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Y_\vartheta^i - \bar{Y}_\vartheta^i|^p \\
& \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\vartheta^n} \left| \mathcal{E}_{\vartheta, \tau}^{\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y}} [h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_\tau]) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau = T\}}] - \mathcal{E}_{\vartheta, \tau}^{\mathbf{f}^i \circ \bar{Y}^i} [h(\tau, \bar{Y}_\tau^i, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s|s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau = T\}}] \right|^p \\
& \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\vartheta^n} 2^{p/2-1} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \eta^{p/2} \left( \int_\vartheta^\tau e^{2\beta(A_s - A_\vartheta)} \left| (\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y})(s, \widehat{Y}_s^{i, \tau}, \widehat{U}_s^{i, \tau}) - (\mathbf{f}^i \circ \bar{Y}^i)(s, \widehat{Y}_s^{i, \tau}, \widehat{U}_s^{i, \tau}) \right|^2 dA_s \right)^{p/2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left( e^{\beta(A_\tau - A_\vartheta)} |h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_\tau]) - h(\tau, \bar{Y}_\tau^i, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s|s=\tau})| \right)^p \right] \\
& \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\vartheta^n} 2^{p/2-1} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \int_\vartheta^\tau e^{p\beta(A_s - A_\vartheta)} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \eta^{p/2} C_f^p \mathcal{W}_p^p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dA_s + \left( \gamma_1 e^{\beta(A_\tau - A_\vartheta)} |Y_\tau^i - \bar{Y}_\tau^i| \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \gamma_2 e^{\beta(A_\tau - A_\vartheta)} \mathcal{W}_p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_\tau], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s|s=\tau}) \right)^p \right], \tag{3.21}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta, \beta > 0$  such that  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{C_f}$  and  $2\beta \geq 2C_f + \frac{3}{\eta}$ , and  $(\widehat{Y}^{i, \tau}, \widehat{U}^{i, \tau})$  is the solution of the BSDE associated with driver  $\mathbf{f}^i \circ \mathbf{Y}$ , terminal time  $\tau$  and terminal condition  $h(\tau, Y_\tau^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]_{s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \xi^i \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau = T\}}$ . Therefore, we have

$$e^{p\beta\vartheta} |Y_\vartheta^i - \bar{Y}_\vartheta^i|^p \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\vartheta^n} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta [G_{\vartheta, \tau}^{i, n}]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\vartheta, \tau}^{i, n} & := \int_\vartheta^\tau 2^{3p/2-2} \eta^{p/2} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{p-2}{p}} C_f^p \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n e^{p\beta A_s} |Y_s^j - \bar{Y}_s^j|^p \right) dA_s \\
& \quad + 2^{\frac{5p}{2}-3} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p) \left( e^{p\beta A_\tau} |Y_\tau^i - \bar{Y}_\tau^i|^p + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n e^{p\beta A_\tau} |Y_\tau^j - \bar{Y}_\tau^j|^p \right) \\
& \quad + 2^{p/2-1} \left( 2^{2p-2} \gamma_2^p + 2^{p-1} \eta^{p/2} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{p-2}{p}} C_f^p \right) \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} e^{p\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p^p(L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}).
\end{aligned}$$

Setting  $V_t^{n, p} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^j - \bar{Y}_t^j|^p$  and

$$\Gamma_{n, p} := 2^{p/2-1} \left\{ \left( 2^{2p-2} \gamma_2^p + 2^{p-1} \eta^{p/2} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{p-2}{p}} C_f^p \right) \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} e^{p\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p^p(L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) \right\}.$$

we obtain

$$V_\vartheta^{n, p} \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\vartheta^n} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \int_\vartheta^\tau 2^{3p/2-2} \eta^{p/2} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{p-2}{p}} C_f^p V_s^{n, p} dA_s + 2^{5p/2-2} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p) V_\tau^{n, p} + \Gamma_{n, p} \right].$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V_\vartheta^{n, p}] \leq 2^{5p/2-2} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p) \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_\vartheta^n} \mathbb{E}[V_\tau^{n, p}] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_\vartheta^T 2^{3p/2-2} \eta^{p/2} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{p-2}{p}} C_f^p V_s^{n, p} dA_s + \Gamma_{n, p} \right].$$

Since for any  $\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_t^n$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_\vartheta^n \subset \mathcal{T}_t^n$ , we have

$$\lambda \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} \mathbb{E}[V_s^{n, p}] \leq \lambda \sup_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{T}_t^n} \mathbb{E}[V_\vartheta^{n, p}] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T 2^{3p/2-2} \eta^{p/2} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{p-2}{p}} C_f^p V_s^{n, p} dA_s + \Gamma_{n, p} \right].$$

In particular,

$$\lambda \mathbb{E}[V_t^{n, p}] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T 2^{3p/2-2} \eta^{p/2} C_f^p V_s^{n, p} dA_s + \Gamma_{n, p} \right]$$

where  $\lambda := 1 - 2^{5p/2-2} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p) > 0$  by the assumption (3.20). Now, by the backward Gronwall inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[V_t^{n, p}] \leq \frac{e^{K_p}}{\lambda} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{n, p}]$$

where  $K_p := \frac{1}{\lambda} 2^{3p/2-2} \eta^{p/2} \|A_T\|_{\infty}^{\frac{2p-2}{p}} C_f^p$ . Hence, since the choice of  $t \in [0, T]$  is arbitrary, we must have

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} [V_t^{n,p}] \leq \frac{e^{K_p}}{\lambda} \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_{n,p}]$$

Indeed, we have  $\mathbb{E} [V_t^{n,p}] = \mathbb{E} [e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p]$ . Thus,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} [e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p] \leq \frac{e^{K_p}}{\lambda} \mathbb{E} [\Gamma_{n,p}] \rightarrow 0 \quad (3.22)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , in view of Theorem 3.3, as required.  $\square$

In the next proposition we provide a convergence result for the whole solution  $(Y^i, U^i, K^i)$  of (3.2).

**Proposition 3.5.** *Assume that, for some  $p > 2, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  satisfy*

$$2^{\frac{7p}{2}-4} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p) < \left( \frac{p-\kappa}{p} \right)^{p/\kappa} \quad (3.23)$$

for some  $\kappa \in [2, p)$ . Then, under Assumption (H1), (H2), (H3), (H4) and (H5), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \|Y^i - \bar{Y}^i\|_{\mathcal{S}^p} + \|U^i - \bar{U}^i \mathbf{e}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}_t^{p,n}} + \|K^i - \bar{K}^i\|_{\mathcal{S}^p} \right) = 0,$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$  are unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof. Step 1.* Let us first show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Y^i - \bar{Y}^i\|_{\mathcal{S}^p} = 0$ . Let  $u \in [0, T]$ . In view of (3.21), for any  $\kappa \geq 2$  and any  $u \leq t \leq T$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^\kappa &\leq \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{F}_t^n} 2^{\kappa/2-1} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \int_t^\tau e^{\kappa\beta(A_s-A_t)} \eta^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|A_T\|_{\infty}^{\frac{\kappa-2}{\kappa}} C_f^\kappa \mathcal{W}_p^\kappa (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dA_s + \left( \gamma_1 e^{\beta(A_\tau-A_t)} |Y_\tau^i - \bar{Y}_\tau^i| \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \gamma_2 e^{\beta(A_\tau-A_t)} \mathcal{W}_p (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_\tau], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s|s=\tau}) \right)^\kappa \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta, \beta > 0$  such that  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{C_f^2}$  and  $2\beta \geq 2C_f + \frac{3}{\eta}$ . Therefore, for any  $p > \kappa \geq 2$ , we have

$$e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{G}_{u,T}^{i,n} \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right]^{p/\kappa},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{u,T}^{i,n} &:= 2^{\kappa/2-1} \left( \int_u^T e^{\kappa\beta A_s} \eta^{\kappa/2} \|A_T\|_{\infty}^{\frac{\kappa-2}{\kappa}} C_f^\kappa \mathcal{W}_p^\kappa (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dA_s \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \gamma_1 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} |Y_s^i - \bar{Y}_s^i| + \gamma_2 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) \right)^\kappa \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $\mathcal{G}_{u,T}^{i,n}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mathcal{G}_{u,T}^{i,n} \right)^{p/\kappa} &\leq 2^{p-1} \left[ 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} \left( \int_u^T e^{\kappa\beta A_s} \eta^{\frac{\kappa}{2}} \|A_T\|_{\infty}^{\frac{\kappa-2}{\kappa}} C_f^\kappa \mathcal{W}_p^\kappa (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dA_s \right)^{\frac{p}{\kappa}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} \left( \gamma_1 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} |Y_s^i - \bar{Y}_s^i| + \gamma_2 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) \right)^p \right] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{1-p} \left( \mathcal{G}_{u,T}^{i,n} \right)^{p/\kappa} &\leq 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} \left[ \int_u^T e^{p\beta A_s} \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} \|A_T\|_{\infty}^{\frac{(\kappa-2)(p-\kappa)}{\kappa p}} C_f^p \mathcal{W}_p^p (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dA_s \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2^{p-1} \left( \gamma_1 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} |Y_s^i - \bar{Y}_s^i| + \gamma_2 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s]) \right)^p \right] + \Lambda_n \\ &\leq C_1 \int_u^T \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{p\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p^p (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s]) dA_s \\ &\quad + 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} 2^{p-1} \left( \gamma_1 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} |Y_s^i - \bar{Y}_s^i| + \gamma_2 \sup_{u \leq s \leq T} e^{\beta A_s} \mathcal{W}_p (L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s]) \right)^p + \Lambda_n \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1 := 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} 2^{p-1} \|A_T\|_\infty^{\frac{(\kappa-2)(p-\kappa)}{\kappa p}} \eta^{\frac{p}{2}} C_f^p$  and

$$\Lambda_n := C_1 \|A_T\|_\infty \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} e^{p\beta A_s} \mathscr{W}_p^p(L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) + 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} 2^{p-1} \left( \gamma_2^p \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} e^{p\beta A_s} \mathscr{W}_p^p(L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) \right).$$

For each  $s \in [0, T]$  and  $u \in [0, T]$  we have,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{u \leq t \leq s} e^{p\beta A_t} \mathscr{W}_p^p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t], L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_t]) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{u \leq t \leq s} e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p \right], \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Thus, by Doob's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{u \leq t \leq T} e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p \right] &\leq \left( \frac{p}{p-\kappa} \right)^{p/\kappa} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \mathscr{G}_{u,T}^{i,n} \right)^{p/\kappa} \right] \\ &\leq \left( \frac{p}{p-\kappa} \right)^{p/\kappa} 2^{p-1} \left( C_1 \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_u^T \sup_{u \leq t \leq T} e^{p\beta A_t} \mathscr{W}_p^p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t], L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_t]) dA_s \right] + \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_n] \right) \\ &\quad + 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} 2^{2p-2} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p) \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{u \leq t \leq T} e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p \right] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mu \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{u \leq t \leq T} e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p \right] \leq C_1 \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_u^T \sup_{s \leq t \leq T} e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p dA_s \right] + \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_n].$$

where  $\mu := 2^{1-p} \left( \frac{p}{p-\kappa} \right)^{-p/\kappa} - 2^{\frac{\kappa}{2}-1} 2^{2p-2} (\gamma_1^p + \gamma_2^p)$ . Using the condition of this thm (3.23), to see that  $\mu > 0$ , and the backward Gronwall inequality, we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{p\beta A_t} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^p \right] \leq \frac{e^{\frac{C_1}{\mu} \|A_T\|_\infty}}{\mu} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_n]. \quad (3.24)$$

Next, by Theorem 3.3 we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_n] = 0,$$

which yields the desired result.

**Step 2.** We now show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|U^i - \bar{U}^i \mathbf{e}_i\|_{\mathscr{H}_t^{p,n}} = 0$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|K^i - \bar{K}^i\|_{\mathscr{S}^p} = 0$ . We first prove that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|U^i - \bar{U}^i \mathbf{e}_i\|_{\mathscr{H}_t^{p,n}} = 0$ .

For  $s \in [0, T]$ , denote  $\delta Y_s^i := Y_s^i - \bar{Y}_s^i$ ,  $\delta U_s^i := U_s^i - \bar{U}_s^i \mathbf{e}_i$ ,  $\delta K_s^i := K_s^i - \bar{K}_s^i$ ,  $\delta f_s^i := f(s, Y_s^i, U_s^{i,i}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) - f(s, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i})$  and  $\delta h_s^i := h(s, Y_s^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) - h(s, \bar{Y}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i})$ . By applying Itô's formula to  $|\delta Y_t^i|^2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta Y_t^i|^2 + \int_t^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n |\delta U_s^{i,j}(e)|^2 p^j(ds, de) &= 2 \int_t^T \delta Y_s^i \delta f_s^i dA_s - 2 \int_t^T \int_E \delta Y_s^i \sum_{j=1}^n \delta U_s^{i,j}(e) q^j(ds, de) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_t^T \delta Y_s^i d(\delta K_s^i). \end{aligned}$$

By standard estimates, from the assumptions on the driver  $f$ , we get, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^T \delta Y_s^i \delta f_s^i dA_s &\leq \int_t^T C_f |\delta Y_s^i|^2 dA_s + \int_t^T \frac{2}{\varepsilon} C_f^2 |\delta Y_s^i|^2 dA_s + \int_t^T \int_E \frac{\varepsilon}{4} |\delta U_s^i|^2 \phi_s(de) dA_s \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \mathscr{W}_p^2(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}) dA_s. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that, for a given constant  $C_p > 0$ , independent of  $n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\delta Y_0^i|^p + \left( \int_0^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n |\delta U_s^{i,j}(e)|^2 p^j(ds, de) \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \leq C_p \left\{ \left( 2C_f + \frac{4}{\varepsilon} C_f^2 \right) \|A_T\|_\infty \right\}^{\frac{p}{2}} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |\delta Y_s^i|^p + C_p \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \left( \int_0^T \int_E |\delta U_s^i|^2 \phi_s(de) dA_s \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \quad + C_p \left( \int_0^T \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathcal{W}_p^2(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}) dA_s \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \quad + C_p \left\{ \left| \int_0^T \int_E \delta Y_s^i \sum_{j=1}^n \delta U_s^{i,j}(e) q^j(ds, de) \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \left| \int_0^T \delta Y_s^i d(\delta K_s^i) \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

By applying the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, we derive that there exist a constant  $l_p > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \int_E \delta Y_s^i \sum_{j=1}^n \delta U_s^{i,j}(e) q^j(ds, de) \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] & \leq l_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T (\delta Y_s^i)^2 \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n (\delta U_s^{i,j}(e))^2 p^j(ds, de) \right)^{\frac{p}{4}} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{l_p^2}{2} \|\delta Y_s^i\|_{\mathcal{S}^p}^p + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n (\delta U_s^{i,j}(e))^2 p^j(ds, de) \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Also recall that, for some constant  $e_p > 0$  we have (cf. Eq. (1.3) in [67])

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E |\delta U_s^i(e)|^2 \phi_s(de) dA_s \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \leq e_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n |\delta U_s^{i,j}(e)|^2 p^j(de, ds) \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right].$$

Now, we take the expectation in (3.25), by using the above inequalities and taking  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T |\delta U_s^i|^2 \phi_s(de) dA_s \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] & \leq C_{C_f, \varepsilon, \|A_T\|_\infty, p} \|\delta Y_s^i\|_{\mathcal{S}^p}^p \\
& \quad + C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \mathcal{W}_p^p(L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s], \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |\delta Y_s^i| (K_T^i + \bar{K}_T^i) \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemma 3.2 and  $\|\delta Y^i\|_{\mathcal{S}^p}^p \rightarrow 0$ , we can obtain the desired result. The above inequality, together with the equations

$$K_T^i = Y_0^i - \xi^i - \int_0^T f(s, Y_s^i, U_s^{i,j}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) dA_s + \int_0^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n U_s^{i,j}(e) q^j(ds, de)$$

and

$$\bar{K}_T^i = \bar{Y}_0^i - \xi^i - \int_0^T f(s, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}) dA_s + \int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_s^i(e) q^i(ds, de),$$

We can also show that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|K^i - \bar{K}^i\|_{\mathcal{S}^p} = 0$ .  $\square$

## 4 Well-posedness and convergence result of MF-RBSDEs driven by a Poisson process

In this section, we consider a special mean-field reflected BSDE with jumps:

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s, U_s, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) ds + \int_t^T dK_s - \int_t^T \int_E U_s(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ Y_t \geq h(t, Y_t, \mathbb{P}_{Y_t}), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-} - h(t^-, Y_{t^-}, \mathbb{P}_{Y_{t^-}})) dK_t = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.,} \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where we define a random measure  $\mu(\omega, dt, de)$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times E$ , where  $E \triangleq \mathbb{R}^\ell \setminus \{0\}$  is equipped with its Borel field  $\mathcal{E}$ , with compensator  $\lambda(\omega, dt, de)$ . We assume in all the paper that  $\lambda$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $dt$ , i.e.  $\lambda(\omega, dt, de) = \nu_t(\omega, de) dt$ . Finally, we denote  $\tilde{\mu}$  the compensated jump measure

$$\tilde{\mu}(\omega, de, dt) = \mu(\omega, de, dt) - \nu_t(\omega, de) dt.$$

Similar with Section 3, we study a family of weakly interacting process

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f(s, Y_s^i, U_s^{i,j}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_s]) ds + K_T^i - K_t^i - \int_t^T \int_E \sum_{j=1}^n U_s^{i,j}(e) \tilde{\mu}^j(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ Y_t^i \geq h(t, Y_t^{i,n}, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_t]), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-}^i - h(t^-, Y_{t^-}^i, L_n[\mathbf{Y}_{t^-}])) dK_t^i = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\xi_{1 \leq i \leq N}^i$ ,  $f_{1 \leq i \leq N}^i$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_{1 \leq i \leq N}^i$  are independent copies of  $\xi, f$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$ . The augmented natural filtration of the family of  $\{\tilde{\mu}^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{F}_t^{(N)}$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{F}^N := \{\mathcal{F}_t^{(N)}\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  the completion of the filtration generated by  $\{\tilde{\mu}^i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_t^N$  be the set of  $\mathbb{F}^N$  stopping times with values in  $[t, T]$ .

#### 4.1 Well-posedness result

In order to show the convergence rate of the solution of this system to the solution of the mean field reflected BSDE (4.1), we need some stricter assumptions.

**(H2')** For every  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$  the mapping  $f(\omega, t, r, \cdot, \mu) : L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies: for every  $U \in H_V^{2,2}$ ,

$$(\omega, t, r, \mu) \mapsto f(\omega, t, r, U_t(\omega, \cdot), \mu)$$

is  $\text{Prog} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable.

**(H3')**

**(a) (Continuity condition)** For every  $\omega \in \Omega, t \in [0, T], y \in \mathbb{R}, u \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t; \mathbb{R}), \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}), (y, u, \mu) \rightarrow f(t, y, u, \mu)$  is continuous.

**(b) (Lipschitz condition)** There exists  $\lambda \geq 0$ , such that for every  $\omega \in \Omega, t \in [0, T], y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, u \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t, \mathbb{R}), \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$|f(\omega, t, y_1, u_1, \mu_1) - f(\omega, t, y_2, u_2, \mu_2)| \leq \lambda (|y_1 - y_2| + |u_1 - u_2|_V + \mathcal{W}_p(\mu_1, \mu_2)).$$

**(c) (Growth condition)** For all  $t \in [0, T], (y, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t; \mathbb{R}) : \mathbb{P}$ -a.s, there exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that,

$$-\frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(t, -u) - \alpha_t - \beta (|y| + \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \delta_0)) \leq f(t, y, u, \mu) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(t, u) + \alpha_t + \beta (|y| + \mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \delta_0)),$$

where  $\{\alpha_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is a progressively measurable nonnegative stochastic process with  $\|\alpha\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty} < \infty$ .

**(d) (Bounded condition)** For each  $t \in [0, T], f(t, 0, 0, \delta)$  is bounded by some constant  $M, \mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

**(e) (Convexity/Concavity condition)** For each  $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}, u \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t; \mathbb{R}), \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}), u \rightarrow f(t, y, u, \mu)$  is convex or concave.

**(f) (A $_\Gamma$ -condition)** For all  $t \in [0, T], M > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}, u_1, u_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t; \mathbb{R}), \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ , with  $|y|, \|u_1\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty}, \|u_2\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty} \leq M$ , there exists a  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ -measurable process  $\Gamma^{y, u_1, u_2}$  satisfying  $dt \otimes d\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.

$$f(t, y, u_1, \mu) - f(t, y, u_2, \mu) \leq \int_E \Gamma_t^{y, u_1, u_2}(x) [u_1(x) - u_2(x)] \nu(dx)$$

and  $C_M^1(1 \wedge |x|) \leq \Gamma_t^{y, u_1, u_2}(x) \leq C_M^2(1 \wedge |x|)$  with two constants  $C_M^1, C_M^2$ . Here,  $C_M^1 > -1$  and  $C_M^2 > 0$  depend on  $M$ . (Hereafter, we frequently omit the superscripts to lighten the notation.)

**(H4')**  $h$  is a mapping from  $[0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$  into  $\mathbb{R}$  such that

**(a) (Continuity condition)** For all  $(y, \mu) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $(h(t, y, \mu))_t$  is a right-continuous left-limited process the process.

**(b) (Lipschitz condition)**  $h$  is Lipschitz w.r.t.  $(y, \mu)$  uniformly in  $(t, \omega)$ , i.e. there exists two positive constants  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$|h(t, y_1, \mu_1) - h(t, y_2, \mu_2)| \leq \gamma_1 |y_1 - y_2| + \gamma_2 \mathcal{W}_1(\mu_1, \mu_2)$$

for any  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ .

**(c)** The final condition  $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable and essentially bounded, i.e.,  $\|\xi\|_\infty < \infty$ . Besides,  $\xi \geq h(T, \xi, \mathbb{P}_\xi)$ .

**(d) (Bounded condition)** For each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $h(t, 0, \delta)$  is bounded by some constant  $M$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

**(H5') (Uniform linear bound condition)** There exists a positive constant  $C_0$  such that for each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $u \in L^2(E, \mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t)$ , if  $f$  is convex (resp. concave) in  $u$ , then  $f(t, 0, u, \mu) - f(t, 0, 0, \mu) \geq -C_0|u|_\nu$  (resp.  $f(t, 0, u, \mu) - f(t, 0, 0, \mu) \leq C_0|u|_\nu$ ).

The following a priori estimate for MF-BSDE (4.1) is crucial.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Under assumptions (H2')-(H5'), assume that  $(Y, U, K)$  is a solution to MF-BSDE (4.1). Then for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , then, we have the following a priori estimate.*

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\lambda Y_*\}] \leq \frac{e}{e-1} \left\{ 1 + C_2 \exp \left\{ \int_0^T 2e^{\beta t} C_1 \exp \left\{ \int_0^T 2e^{\beta t} (\log C_2) dt \right\} dt \right\} \right\}, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $Y_* \triangleq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t|$ ,  $C_1 = \log \frac{2e}{e-1} + \log \frac{e}{e-1}$  and  $C_2 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left\{ 2\lambda e^{\beta T} |\xi| + 2\lambda \int_0^T e^{\beta t} \alpha_t dt \right\} \right]$ .

*Proof.* Consider the following reflected BSDE with jumps:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{Y}_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, \hat{Y}_s, \hat{U}_s, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) ds + \int_t^T d\hat{K}_s - \int_t^T \int_E \hat{U}_s(e) \hat{\mu}(ds, de), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \hat{Y}_t \geq h(t, Y_t, \mathbb{P}_{Y_t}), & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

In view of Lemma 4.1 in [63], we know that  $\hat{Y}_t = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} y_t^\tau$ , where

$$y_t^\tau = \xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h(\tau, Y_\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \int_t^\tau f(s, y_s^\tau, u_s^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) ds - \int_t^\tau \int_E u_s^\tau(e) \hat{\mu}(ds, de). \quad (4.5)$$

Obviously,  $(Y_t, U_t, K_t)$  is also a solution to (4.4). From [26], we know that BSDE (4.4) has a unique solution, thus we have

$$Y_t = \hat{Y}_t = \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t, T}} y_t^\tau. \quad (4.6)$$

Applying Itô's formula to  $|y^\tau|$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d|y^\tau| &= \text{sign}(y_{t-}^\tau) dy_t^\tau + dL_t^y + \int_E (|y_{t-}^\tau + u_t^\tau(e)| - |y_{t-}^\tau| - \text{sign}(y_{t-}^\tau) u_t^\tau(e)) \mu(dt, de) \\ &= -\text{sign}(y_{t-}^\tau) f(s, y_t^\tau, u_t^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) dt + dL_t^y + \int_E (|y_{t-}^\tau + u_t^\tau(e)| - |y_{t-}^\tau| - \text{sign}(y_{t-}^\tau) u_t^\tau(e)) \nu_t(de) dt \\ &\quad + \int_E (|y_{t-}^\tau + u_t^\tau(e)| - |y_{t-}^\tau|) \hat{\mu}(dt, de). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Define  $G_t = \lambda e^{\beta t} |y_t^\tau| + \int_0^t \lambda e^{\beta s} \alpha_s ds + \int_0^t \lambda e^{\beta s} \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbb{P}_{Y_t}, \delta_0) ds$ . Then applying Itô's formula to  $G_t$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
dG_t &= e^{\beta t} \left[ \lambda \beta |y_t^\tau| dt + \lambda d|y_t^\tau| + \lambda \alpha_t dt + \lambda \beta e^{\beta t} \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbb{P}_{Y_t}, \delta_0) dt \right] \\
&= e^{\beta t} \lambda \left( (-\text{sign}(y_t^\tau)) f(t, y_t^\tau, u_t^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_t}) + \alpha_t + \beta |y_t^\tau| + \beta \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbb{P}_{Y_t}, \delta_0) \right) dt + dL_t^Y \\
&\quad + \int_E (|y_t^\tau + u_t^\tau(e)| - |y_t^\tau| - \text{sign}(y_t^\tau) u_t^\tau(e)) \nu_t(de) dt + \int_E (|y_{t-}^\tau + u_{t-}^\tau(e)| - |y_{t-}^\tau|) \tilde{\mu}(dt, de) \\
&\geq -j_\lambda(\text{sign}(y_{t-}^\tau)) e^{\beta t} u_{t-}^\tau dt + e^{\beta t} \lambda \left( dL_t^Y + \int_E (|y_t^\tau + u_t^\tau(e)| - |y_t^\tau| - \text{sign}(y_t^\tau) u_t^\tau(e)) \nu_t(de) dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_E (|y_{t-}^\tau + u_{t-}^\tau(e)| - |y_{t-}^\tau|) \tilde{\mu}(dt, de) \right) \\
&\geq e^{\beta t} \lambda \int_E (|y_{t-}^\tau + u_{t-}^\tau(e)| - |y_{t-}^\tau|) \tilde{\mu}(dt, de) - j_\lambda \left( e^{\beta t} (|y_{t-}^\tau + u_{t-}^\tau(e)| - |y_{t-}^\tau|) \right) dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where, for the first inequality, we make use of the observation, for any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$j_\lambda(ku) \geq kj_\lambda(u).$$

Moreover, the last inequality follows from the fact  $|y+u| - |y| \geq \text{sign}(y)u$ .

Finally, applying Itô's formula to  $e^{G_t}$ , it turns out that  $e^{G_t}$  is a submartingale, which implies,

$$\exp\{\lambda |y_t^\tau|\} \leq \exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta t} |y_t^\tau|\right\} \leq \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta T} (|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta s} \alpha_s ds + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta s} \mathbb{E}[|Y_s|] ds\right\} \right].$$

Hence, from equation (4.6), we have

$$\exp\{\lambda |Y_t|\} = \exp\left\{\lambda \text{ess sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} |y_t^\tau|\right\} \leq \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0,T]} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta T} (|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta s} \alpha_s ds + \int_t^T \lambda e^{\beta s} \mathbb{E}[|Y_s|] ds\right\} \right].$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\lambda Y_t^*\}] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \exp\left\{\lambda e^{\beta T} (|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_0^T \lambda e^{\beta s} \alpha_s ds + \int_0^T \lambda e^{\beta s} \mathbb{E}[|Y_s|] ds\right\} \right] \right]. \quad (4.8)$$

By Jensen's inequality and Doob's inequality, we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\{\mathbb{E}[\lambda Y_t^*]\} &\leq \mathbb{E}[\exp\{\lambda Y_t^*\}] \\
&\leq \frac{e}{e-1} \left\{ 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp\left\{ 2\lambda e^{\beta T} (|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_0^T 2\lambda e^{\beta s} \alpha_s ds + \int_0^T 2\lambda e^{\beta s} \mathbb{E}[|Y_s|] ds \right\} \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Both sides take logarithm at the same time and by the fact that  $\log(a+b) \leq \log 2a + \log b$ , ( $a > 1, b > 1$ ), we can imply that

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda Y_t^*] \leq C_1 + \log C_2 + \int_0^T 2e^{\beta s} \mathbb{E}[\lambda |Y_s|] ds, \quad (4.9)$$

where  $C_1 = \log \frac{2e}{e-1} + \log \frac{e}{e-1}$ ,  $C_2 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp\left\{ 2\lambda e^{\beta T} (|\xi| \vee h_*) + \int_0^T 2\lambda e^{\beta s} \alpha_s ds \right\} \right]$ . Using Backward Gronwall inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda Y_t^*] \leq (C_1 + \log C_2) \exp\left\{ \int_0^T 2e^{\beta s} ds \right\}. \quad (4.10)$$

Take inequality (4.10) to inequality (4.8), we can deduce the final result

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp\{\lambda Y_t^*\}] \leq \frac{e}{e-1} \left\{ 1 + C_2 \exp\left\{ \int_0^T 2e^{\beta s} (C_1 + \log C_2) \exp\left\{ \int_0^T 2e^{\beta s} ds \right\} ds \right\} \right\}.$$

□

Next, we give a well-posedness result of the mean field reflected BSDE (4.1).

**Theorem 4.2.** *Assume (H2'), (H3'), (H4') and (H5') hold. Then the MF-BSDE (4.1) has a unique solution  $(Y, U, K)$  in the space  $\mathcal{S}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}^\infty \times \mathcal{A}^D$ .*

In order to prove Theorem 4.2, we need to recall some proposition to analyze the solution map.

**Proposition 4.3.** *Assume that:*

(i) *The map  $(\omega, t) \mapsto f(\omega, t, \cdot)$  is  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable. There exist a positive  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable process  $(\alpha_t, t \in [0, T])$  such that  $-\alpha_t - \frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(t, -u) \leq f(t, u) \leq \alpha_t + \frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(t, u) dt \otimes d\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ .*

(ii)  *$|\xi|, (\alpha_t, t \in [0, T])$  are essentially bounded, i.e.,  $\|\xi\|_\infty, \|\alpha\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} < \infty$ .*

(iii) *There exists  $\lambda \geq 0$ , such that for every  $\omega \in \Omega, t \in [0, T], y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}, u_1, u_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t; \mathbb{R})$ , we have*

$$|f(\omega, t, y_1, u_1) - f(\omega, t, y_2, u_2)| \leq \lambda (|y_1 - y_2| + |u_1 - u_2|_\nu).$$

(iv) ( $A_\gamma$ -condition). *For all  $t \in [0, T], M > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}, u_1, u_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{B}(E), \nu_t; \mathbb{R})$  with  $|y|, \|u_1\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty}, \|u_2\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} \leq M$ , there exists a  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ -measurable process  $\gamma^{y, u_1, u_2}$  satisfying  $dt \otimes d\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.*

$$f(t, y, u_1) - f(t, y, u_2) \leq \int_E \gamma_t^{y, u_1, u_2}(x) [u_1(x) - u_2(x)] \nu(dx)$$

and  $C_M^1(1 \wedge |x|) \leq \gamma_t^{y, u_1, u_2}(x) \leq C_M^2(1 \wedge |x|)$  with two constants  $C_M^1, C_M^2$ . Here,  $C_M^1 > -1$  and  $C_M^2 > 0$  depend on  $M$ . (Hereafter, we frequently omit the superscripts to lighten the notation.)

Then BSDE

$$\bar{Y}_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, \bar{U}_s(e)) ds - \int_t^T \int_E \bar{U}_s(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de) \quad (4.11)$$

has a unique solution  $(\bar{Y}, \bar{U})$  in the space  $\mathcal{S}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}^\infty$ .

*Proof.* The well-posedness can be deduced from [36].  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4.** *Assume that the same conditions as Theorem 4.2 hold.  $P \in \mathcal{S}^\infty$ . Then the following BSDE*

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(s, P_s, U_s, \mathbb{P}_{P_s}) ds - \int_t^T \int_E U_s(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de) + K_T - \tilde{K}_t, & \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}; \\ Y_t \geq h(t, P_t, \mathbb{P}_{P_t}), & 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t^-} - h(t^-, P_{t^-}, \mathbb{P}_{P_{t^-}})) dK_t = 0, & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \end{cases} \quad (4.12)$$

has a unique solution  $(Y, U, K)$  in the space  $\mathcal{S}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}^\infty \times \mathcal{A}^D$ .

*Proof.* Obviously, the generator  $f(s, P_s, U_s, \mathbb{P}_{P_s})$ , the terminal  $\xi$  and the loss function  $h$  satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4.1 in [34], thus the BSDE (4.12) admits a unique deterministic flat solution  $(\bar{Y}, \bar{U}, \bar{K}) \in L^{2,\beta}(s) \times L^{2,\beta}(p) \times \mathcal{A}^D$ .

Moreover, for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , in view of the  $g$ -expectation representation lemma in [64], we have

$$Y_t = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t} \mathcal{E}_{t,\tau}^{f \circ P} [\xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h(\tau, P_\tau, \mathbb{P}_{P_s|s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}}],$$

where  $(f \circ P)(t, y, u) = f(t, P_t, u, \mathbb{P}_{P_t})$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{t,\tau}^{f \circ P} [\xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h(\tau, P_\tau, \mathbb{P}_{P_s|s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}}] := y_t^\tau \in \mathcal{S}^\infty$  is the solution to the following standard BSDE:

$$y_t^\tau = \xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h_\tau(P_\tau, \mathbb{P}_{P_s|s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \int_t^\tau f(s, P_s, u_s^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{P_s}) ds - \int_t^\tau \int_E u_s^\tau(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de). \quad (4.13)$$

Consequently,  $Y_t \in \mathcal{S}^\infty$  and from Corollary 1 in [70], we know that  $\|U\|_{\mathcal{J}^\infty} \leq 2\|Y\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} < \infty$ , Thus  $(Y, U, K) \in \mathcal{S}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}^\infty \times \mathcal{A}^D$  is the unique solution to the BSDE (4.12).  $\square$

We are now ready to complete the proof Theorem 4.2.

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* Let  $P^i \in \mathcal{S}^\infty, i = 1, 2$ . It follows from the  $g$ -expectation representation lemma that

$$\Gamma(P^i)_t := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t} y_t^{i,\tau}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]$$

in which  $y_t^{i,\tau}$  is the solution to the following BSDE:

$$y_t^{i,\tau} = \xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h_\tau(P_\tau^i, \mathbb{P}_{P_s^i|s=\tau}^i) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \int_t^\tau f(s, P_s^i, u_s^{i,\tau}, \mathbb{P}_{P_s^i}^i) ds - \int_t^\tau \int_E u_s^{i,\tau}(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de). \quad (4.14)$$

For each  $t \in [0, T]$ , denote by

$$f^{P^i}(s, u_s^{i,\tau}) = f\left(t, P_t^i, u_t^{i,\tau}, \mathbb{P}_{P_t^i}^i\right).$$

Then, the pair of processes  $(y^{1,\tau} - y^{2,\tau}, u^{1,\tau} - u^{2,\tau})$  solves the following BSDE in  $t \in [T - h, T]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
y_t^{1,\tau} - y_t^{2,\tau} &= h \left( \tau, P_\tau^1, \mathbf{P}_{P_s^1|s=\tau} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} - h \left( \tau, P_\tau^2, \mathbf{P}_{P_s^2|s=\tau} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \int_t^\tau \left( f^{P^1}(s, u_s^{1,\tau}) - f^{P^2}(s, u_s^{2,\tau}) \right) ds \\
&\quad + \int_t^\tau \int_E \left( u_s^{1,\tau}(e) - u_s^{2,\tau}(e) \right) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de) \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau]}(s) ds \\
&= h \left( \tau, P_\tau^1, \mathbf{P}_{P_s^1|s=\tau} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} - h \left( \tau, P_\tau^2, \mathbf{P}_{P_s^2|s=\tau} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} \\
&\quad + \int_t^\tau \left[ f^{P^1}(s, u_s^{1,\tau}) - f^{P^2}(s, u_s^{1,\tau}) + f^{P^2}(s, u_s^{1,\tau}) - f^{P^2}(s, u_s^{2,\tau}) \right] ds \\
&\quad + \int_t^\tau \int_E \left( u_s^{1,\tau}(e) - u_s^{2,\tau}(e) \right) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de) \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau]}(s) ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_t^{\tilde{\mu}^\gamma} \left[ h \left( \tau, P_\tau^1, \mathbf{P}_{P_s^1|s=\tau} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} - h \left( \tau, P_\tau^2, \mathbf{P}_{P_s^2|s=\tau} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \int_t^\tau \lambda \left( |P_s^1 - P_s^2| + \mathcal{W}_p \left( \mathbb{P}_{P_s^1}, \mathbb{P}_{P_s^2} \right) \right) ds \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_t^{\tilde{\mu}^\gamma} \left[ (\gamma_1 + \lambda h) \sup_{T-h, T} |P_s^1 - P_s^2| + (\gamma_2 + \lambda h) \sup_{T-h, T} \mathbb{E} [|P_s^1 - P_s^2|] \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\mu}^\gamma := \tilde{\mu} - \langle \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \tilde{\mu} \rangle$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma(u, u')$ . Thus, we can deduce that

$$\|\Gamma(P^1) - \Gamma(P^2)\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty} \leq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + 2\lambda h) \|P^1 - P^2\|_{\mathcal{S}^\infty}.$$

We can then find a small enough constant  $h$  depending only on  $\lambda, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  such that  $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + 2\lambda h < 1$ . It is now obvious that  $\Gamma$  defines a contraction map on the time interval  $[T - h, T]$ . The uniqueness of the global solution on  $[0, T]$  is inherited from the uniqueness of the local solution on each small time interval. It suffices to prove the existence.

We already know that there exists a constant  $\delta > 0$  depending only on  $\lambda, \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ , such that the mean-field reflected BSDE (4.1) admits a unique solution

$$(Y^1, U^1, K^1) \in \mathcal{S}_{[T-\delta, T]}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}_{[T-\delta, T]}^\infty \times \mathcal{A}_{[T-\delta, T]}^D$$

on the time interval  $[T - \delta, T]$ . Next, taking  $T - \delta$  as the terminal time, then the mean-field reflected BSDE (4.1) admits a unique solution

$$(Y^2, U^2, K^2) \in \mathcal{S}_{[T-2\delta, T-\delta]}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}_{[T-2\delta, T-\delta]}^\infty \times \mathcal{A}_{[T-2\delta, T-\delta]}^D$$

on the time interval  $[T - 2\delta, T - \delta]$ . Denote by

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_t &= \sum_{i=1}^2 Y_t^i \mathbf{1}_{[T-i\delta, T-(i-1)\delta)} + Y_T^1 \mathbf{1}_{\{T\}}, U_t = \sum_{i=1}^2 U_t^i \mathbf{1}_{[T-i\delta, T-(i-1)\delta)} + U_T^1 \mathbf{1}_{\{T\}}, \\
K_t &= K_t^2 \mathbf{1}_{[T-i\delta, T-(i-1)\delta)} + (K_{T-\delta}^2 + K_t^1) \mathbf{1}_{[T-\delta, T]}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that  $(Y, U, K) \in \mathcal{S}_{[T-2\delta, T-\delta]}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}_{[T-2\delta, T-\delta]}^\infty \times \mathcal{A}_{[T-2\delta, T-\delta]}^D$  is a solution to the mean-field reflected BSDE (4.1). Repeating this procedure, we get a global solution  $(Y, U, K) \in \mathcal{S}^\infty \times \mathcal{J}^\infty \times \mathcal{A}^D$ . The proof of the theorem is complete.  $\square$

## 4.2 Convergence result

The following proposition is crucial to prove convergence result.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $p \geq 2$  and assume that the same conditions as Theorem 4.2 hold. Let  $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T$  be such that  $t_2 - t_1 \leq 1$ . There exists a constant  $C$  depending on  $p, T, \kappa$ , and  $h$  such that the following hold:*

- (i)  $\forall t_1 \leq s \leq t \leq t_2, \quad \mathbb{E}[|Y_t - Y_s|^p] \leq C|t - s|.$
- (ii)  $\forall t_1 \leq r < s < t \leq t_2, \quad \mathbb{E}[|Y_s - Y_r|^p | Y_t - Y_s|^p] \leq C|t - r|^2.$

$Y$  is the first part of the solution of BSDE (4.1).

*Proof.* (i).

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|Y_t - Y_s|^p] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq t} Y_t^\tau - \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq s} Y_s^\tau \right|^p \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq t} |y_t^\tau - y_s^\tau|^p \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where  $y_t^\tau$  is the solution of BSDE

$$y_t^\tau = \xi \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau=T\}} + h_\tau(P_\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s|s=\tau}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}} + \int_t^\tau f(s, Y_s, u_s^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}) ds - \int_t^\tau \int_E u_s^\tau(e) \tilde{\mu}(ds, de).$$

Then, by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |y_t^\tau - y_s^\tau|^p &= \left( \left| \int_s^t f(u, Y_u, u_u^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_u}) du \right| + \left| \int_s^t \int_E u_u^\tau(e) \tilde{\mu}(du, de) \right| \right)^p \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left[ \left( \int_s^t |f(u, Y_u, u_u^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_u})| du \right)^p + \left| \int_s^t \int_E u_u^\tau(e) \tilde{\mu}(du, de) \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left[ (t-s)^{p-1} \int_s^t |f(u, Y_u, u_u^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_u})|^p du + \left| \int_s^t \int_E u_u^\tau(e) \tilde{\mu}(du, de) \right|^p \right] \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [|y_t^\tau - y_s^\tau|^p] &\leq 2^{p-1} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ (t-s)^{p-1} \int_s^t |f(u, Y_u, u_u^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_u})|^p du \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_s^t \int_E |u_u^\tau(e)|^2 \nu(de) du \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_s^t \int_E |u_u^\tau(e)|^p \nu(de) du \right] \right\} \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ (t-s)^{p-1} \int_s^t \left| \alpha_t + \beta |Y_u| + \beta \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{Y_u}, \delta_0) + \frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(u, u_s^\tau(e)) \right|^p du \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_s^t \int_E |u_u^\tau(e)|^2 \nu(de) du \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_s^t \int_E |u_u^\tau(e)|^p \nu(de) du \right] \right\} \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left\{ (t-s)^{p-1} C_1 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t|^p \right] + 1 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (t-s)^{p-1} C_2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_s^t \int_E e^{u_u^\tau(e)} - 1 - u_u^\tau(e) \nu(de) du \right)^p \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_3 |t-s|^{p/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|u_s^\tau(e)\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty}^p \left( \int_E \nu(de) \right)^{p/2} \right] + C_4 |t-s| \mathbb{E} \left[ \|u_s^\tau(e)\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty}^p \int_E \nu(de) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.15) we can also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [|Y_t - Y_s|^p] &\leq 2^{p-1} \left\{ (t-s)^{p-1} C_1 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t|^p \right] + 1 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (t-s)^{p-1} C_2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_s^t \int_E e^{u_u^\tau(e)} - 1 - u_u^\tau(e) \nu(de) du \right)^p \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_3 |t-s|^{p/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|u_s^\tau(e)\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty}^p \left( \int_E \nu(de) \right)^{p/2} \right] + C_4 |t-s| \mathbb{E} \left[ \|u_s^\tau(e)\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty}^p \int_E \nu(de) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, in view of Theorem 4.2, we conclude that there exists a constant  $C$ , such that

$$\forall 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T, \quad \mathbb{E} [|Y_t - Y_s|^p] \leq C|t-s|.$$

(ii).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [|Y_s - Y_r|^p | Y_t - Y_s|^p] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq s} y_t^\tau - \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq r} y_s^\tau \right|^p \left| \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq t} y_t^\tau - \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq s} y_s^\tau \right|^p \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq s} |y_t^\tau - y_s^\tau|^p \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq r} |y_s^\tau - y_r^\tau|^p \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq s} |y_t^\tau - y_s^\tau|^p \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq r} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_r \left[ \left| \int_r^s f(u, Y_u, u_u^\tau, \mathbb{P}_{Y_u}) du \right|^p \right] + \mathbb{E}_r \left[ \left| \int_r^s \int_E u_u^\tau(e) \tilde{\mu}(du, de) \right|^p \right] \right\} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq s} |y_t^\tau - y_s^\tau|^p \left\{ \mathbb{E}_r \left[ \text{ess sup}_{\tau \geq r} \|u_u^\tau(e)\|_{\mathcal{G}^\infty}^p \int_E \nu(de) \right] |s-r| \right\} \right] \\ &\leq C|t-s||s-r| \\ &\leq C|t-r|^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let us consider  $(\bar{Y}^i, \bar{U}^i, \bar{K}^i)$  independent copies of  $(Y, U, K)$  which are the solution of MF-BSDE (4.1). More precisely, for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $(\bar{Y}^i, \bar{U}^i, \bar{K}^i)$ , is the unique solution of the reflected MF-BSDE

$$\begin{cases} \bar{Y}_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f\left(s, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}\right) ds + \bar{K}_T^i - \bar{K}_t^i - \int_t^T \int_E \bar{U}_s^i(e) \bar{\mu}^i(ds, de), \forall t \in [0, T], & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \bar{Y}_t^i \geq h\left(t, \bar{Y}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}\right), \quad \forall t \in [0, T], & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \\ \int_0^T \left(\bar{Y}_{t^-}^i - h\left(t^-, \bar{Y}_{t^-}^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_{t^-}^i}\right)\right) d\bar{K}_t^i = 0 & \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

**Theorem 4.6.** Assume assumptions (H2'), (H3'), (H4') and (H5') hold. Define  $\Delta Y^i := Y^i - \bar{Y}^i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . Then

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} E \left[ |\Delta Y^i|^2 \right] = \mathcal{O}\left(N^{-1/2}\right).$$

*Proof.* From equation (3.22) in the proof of Proposition 3.4, we can deduce that:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^2 \right] \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2\beta T} |Y_t^i - \bar{Y}_t^i|^2 \right] \leq \frac{e^{K_2}}{\lambda} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{n,2}], \quad (4.17)$$

where  $\lambda := 1 - 8(\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_2^2) > 0$ ,  $K_2 := \frac{1}{\lambda} 2\eta T C_f^2$  and

$$\Gamma_{n,2} := (4\gamma_2^2 + 2\eta C_f^2) \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} e^{2\beta T} \mathcal{W}_1^2(L_n[\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_s], \mathbb{P}_{Y_s}).$$

We recall the bound of the right hand side of the previous inequality from [8, 35]. Based on the regularity in Proposition 4.5 and the estimate of Y in Lemma 4.1, we have:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} E \left[ |\Delta Y^i|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{N}}$$

with C depending all parameters. Hence, we deduce that  $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} E \left[ |\Delta Y^i|^2 \right] = \mathcal{O}\left(N^{-1/2}\right)$ . □

## A Proof of Lemma 3.2

*Proof of the estimate about  $\bar{U}^i$  and  $\bar{K}^i$  in Lemma 3.2.* In the sequel, we assume without loss of generality that all local martingales in the derivation are true martingales, otherwise one can take advantage of a standard localization and monotone convergence argument. Define  $\underline{G}_t = -\bar{Y}_t^i + \int_0^t \alpha_s dA_s + \int_0^t \beta |\bar{Y}_s^i| dA_s + \int_0^t \beta \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}, \delta_0) dA_s$ . We first claim that  $e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t}$  is a positive submartingale. Indeed, applying Itô's formula to  $e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t}$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} de^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} &= e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} \left( \lambda d\underline{G}_t + \int_E \left( e^{\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - \lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e) - 1 \right) p(dt, de) \right) \\ &= e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} \left( \left[ \lambda \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| dA_t - \lambda d\bar{Y}_t^i + \lambda \alpha_t dA_t + \lambda \beta \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0) dA_t \right] + \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} + \lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e) - 1 \right) p(dt, de) \right) \\ &= e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} \left( \left[ \lambda \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| dA_t + \lambda \left( f(t, \bar{Y}_t^i, \bar{U}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}) dA_t - \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) + d\bar{K}_t^i \right) + \lambda \alpha_t dA_t + \lambda \beta \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0) dA_t \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} + \lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e) - 1 \right) p(dt, de) \right) \\ &= e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} \left( \left[ \lambda \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| + \lambda f(t, \bar{Y}_t^i, \bar{U}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}) + \lambda \alpha_t + j_1(-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i) + \lambda \beta \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0) \right] dA_t + \lambda d\bar{K}_t^i + \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(dt, de) \right) \\ &\geq e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(dt, de), \end{aligned} \quad (A.1)$$

where we make use of the growth condition of  $f$  in the last inequality.

Then,

$$de^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} = e^{\lambda \underline{G}_t} (d\underline{A}_t + \lambda d\bar{K}_t^i + d\underline{M}_t). \quad (A.2)$$

where,

$$\underline{M}_t = \int_0^t \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_s^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(ds, de),$$

and  $\underline{A}$  is a non-decreasing process with  $\underline{A}_0 = 0$ , with the form

$$\underline{A}_t = \int_0^t \left( \lambda \left( f(t, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}^i) + \alpha_s + \beta |\bar{Y}_s^i| + \beta \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i, \delta_0}^i) \right) + j_1(-\lambda \bar{U}_s^i(e)) \right) dA_s.$$

Now we are going to estimate the quadratic variation of  $\underline{M}$ :

$$d[\underline{M}]_t = \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t + \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 q(dt, de).$$

Obviously, by (A.2),

$$d[e^{\lambda \underline{G}}]_t = e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_t} d[\underline{M}]_t.$$

We also find the predictable quadratic variations by direct calculation,

$$d\langle \underline{M} \rangle_t = \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t,$$

and

$$d\langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_t = e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_t} d\langle \underline{M} \rangle_t.$$

Then, for any stopping time  $\sigma \leq T$ , it holds that

$$\langle \underline{M} \rangle_T - \langle \underline{M} \rangle_\sigma = \int_\sigma^T \frac{d\langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_t}{e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_t}} \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left( e^{-2\lambda \underline{G}_t} \right) \left( \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_T - \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_\sigma \right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Next, we find a priori estimate of  $\langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_T - \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_\sigma$  via Itô's formula,

$$de^{2\lambda \underline{G}_t} = 2e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_t} (d\underline{M}_t + d\underline{A}_t + \lambda d\bar{K}_t^i) + d[e^{\lambda \underline{G}}]_t \geq 2e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_t} d\underline{M}_t + e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_t} \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 q(dt, de) + d\langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_t. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Taking conditional expectation on both sides of (A.4), we obtain,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_T - \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_\sigma \mid \mathcal{G}_\sigma \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_T} - e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_\sigma} \mid \mathcal{G}_\sigma \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2\lambda \underline{G}_T} \mathbf{1}_{\sigma < T} \mid \mathcal{G}_\sigma \right].$$

Then, making use of Garsia-Neveu Lemma, see for example [3, Lemma 4.3], it turns out that for each  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_T \right)^p \right] \leq p^p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2p\lambda \underline{G}_T} \right].$$

Then, by (A.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [(\langle \underline{M} \rangle_T)^p] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left( e^{-2p\lambda \underline{G}_t} \right) \left( \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_T \right)^p \right] \\ &\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-4p\lambda \underline{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \langle e^{\lambda \underline{G}} \rangle_T \right)^{2p} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-4p\lambda \underline{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (2p)^p \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{4p\lambda \underline{G}_T} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq (2p)^p \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{4p\lambda \widetilde{G}_t} \right] \\ &\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{8p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty)\bar{Y}_*^i} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where  $\widetilde{G}_t = |\bar{Y}_t^i| + \int_0^t \alpha_s dA_s + \int_0^t \beta |\bar{Y}_s^i| dA_s + \int_0^t \beta \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i, \delta_0}^i) dA_s$ , and  $C_p$  is a positive constant depending on  $p$ . That is to say, for each  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^p \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{8p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty)Y_*} \right] < \infty. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Next, applying Itô's formula to  $e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i}$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_T^i} - e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_0^i} &= \int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_s^i} f(s, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}^i) dA_s + \int_0^T \int_E e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_s^i} \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_s^i(e)} + \lambda \bar{U}_s^i(e) - 1 \right) \phi_s(de) dA_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^T e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} \int_E \left( e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(dt, de) + \int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} d\bar{K}_t^i \leq e^{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i}. \end{aligned}$$

With the help of the growth condition of  $f$ , it turns out that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} (-\alpha_t - \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| - \frac{1}{\lambda} j_\lambda(t, -\bar{U}_t^i) - \beta \mathscr{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0)) dA_t + \int_0^T \int_E e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} + \lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e) - 1) \phi_t(de) dA_t \\ & + \int_0^T e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} \int_E (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1) q(dt, de) + \int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} d\bar{K}_t^i \leq e^{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i}. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently,

$$\lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \bar{K}_T^i \leq \int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} d\bar{K}_t^i \leq \int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} (\alpha_s + \beta |\bar{Y}_s^i| + \beta \mathscr{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}, \delta_0)) dA_s + e^{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} - \int_0^T e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} \int_E (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1) q(dt, de). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Note that  $\int_0^T \lambda e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} (\alpha_s + \beta |\bar{Y}_s^i| + \beta \mathscr{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}, \delta_0)) dA_s + e^{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \leq \lambda e^{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \int_0^T \alpha_s dA_s + 2\beta e^{2\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \|A_T\|_\infty + e^{\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \leq \tilde{C} e^{2\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i}$ , for some positive random variable  $\tilde{C} \in L^p$  for each  $p \geq 1$ . With the help of Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality and making use of (A.5) for  $p = 2$ , we obtain, for each  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \lambda^2 e^{-2p\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} (\bar{K}_T^i)^2 \right] & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \lambda^2 e^{-2\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} (\bar{K}_T^i)^2 \right] \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{C}^2 e^{4\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T e^{-\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} \int_E (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1) q(dt, de) \right|^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{C}^2 e^{4\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + 2C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T e^{-2\lambda \bar{Y}_t^i} \int_E (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{C}^2 e^{4\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + 2C\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \int_0^T \int_E (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{C}^2 e^{4\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + C\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{4\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + C\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{C}^2 e^{4\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + C\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{4\lambda \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + C\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{16\lambda(1+\beta)\|A_T\|_\infty \bar{Y}_*^i} \right] \\ & \leq C\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{16\lambda(1+\beta)\|A_T\|_\infty \bar{Y}_*^i} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant depending only on the constants given in the assumptions and differing from line to line.

Similarly, define  $\bar{G}_t = \bar{Y}_t^i + \int_0^t \alpha_s dA_s + \int_0^t \beta |\bar{Y}_s^i| dA_s + \int_0^t \beta \mathscr{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}, \delta_0) dA_s$  and for each  $p \geq 1$ , applying Itô's formula to  $e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t}$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} de^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} & = e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \left( p\lambda d\bar{G}_t + \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e) - 1 \right) p(dt, de) \right) \\ & = e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \left( \left[ p\lambda \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| dA_t + p\lambda d\bar{Y}_t^i + p\lambda \alpha_t dA_t + p\lambda \beta \mathscr{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0) dA_t \right] + \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e) - 1 \right) p(dt, de) \right) \\ & = e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \left( \left[ p\lambda \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| dA_t + p\lambda \left( -f(t, \bar{Y}_t^i, \bar{U}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}) dA_t + \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) - d\bar{K}_t^i \right) + \lambda \alpha_t dA_t \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e) - 1 \right) p(dt, de) \right) \\ & = e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \left( \left[ p\lambda \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| - p\lambda f(t, \bar{Y}_t^i, \bar{U}_t^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}) + p\lambda \alpha_t + j_1(p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i) + p\lambda \beta \mathscr{W}_p(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_t^i}, \delta_0) \right] dA_t \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(dt, de) - p\lambda d\bar{K}_t^i \right) \\ & \geq e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \left( \left[ -pj_\lambda(\bar{U}_t^i) + j_1(p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i) \right] dA_t + \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(dt, de) - p\lambda d\bar{K}_t^i \right) \\ & \geq e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(dt, de) - p\lambda e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} d\bar{K}_t^i, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where we make use of the growth condition of  $f$  in the first inequality and the last inequality follows from the fact that  $j_\lambda(ku) \geq kj_\lambda(u)$ , for each  $k \geq 1$ .

Then,

$$de^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} = e^{p\lambda \bar{G}_t} (d\bar{A}_t + d\bar{M}_t - p\lambda d\bar{K}_t^i), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where

$$\bar{M}_t = \int_0^t \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_s^i(e)} - 1 \right) q(ds, de),$$

and  $\bar{A}$  is a non-decreasing process with  $\bar{A}_0 = 0$ , with the form

$$\bar{A}_t = \int_0^t \left( p\lambda \left( -f(t, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}) + \alpha_s + \beta|Y_s| \right) + j_1(p\lambda U_s(e)) \right) dA_s.$$

Now we are going to estimate the quadratic variation of  $\bar{M}$  :

$$d[\bar{M}]_t = \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t + \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 q(dt, de).$$

Obviously, by (A.10),

$$d[e^{p\lambda \bar{G}}]_t = e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d[\bar{M}]_t.$$

We also find the predictable quadratic variations by direct calculation,

$$d\langle \bar{M} \rangle_t = \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t,$$

and

$$d\langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_t = e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d\langle \bar{M} \rangle_t.$$

Then, for any stopping time  $\sigma \leq T$ , it holds that

$$\langle \bar{M} \rangle_T - \langle \bar{M} \rangle_\sigma = \int_\sigma^T \frac{d\langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_t}{e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}}} \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left( e^{-2p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right) \left( \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_T - \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_\sigma \right). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Next, we find a priori estimate of  $\langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_T - \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_\sigma$  via Itô's formula to  $e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}}$ ,

$$de^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_t} + 2p\lambda e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d\bar{K}_t^i = 2e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} (d\bar{M}_t + d\bar{A}_t) + d[e^{p\lambda \bar{G}}]_t \geq 2e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d\bar{M}_t + e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 q(dt, de) + d\langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_t. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Taking conditional expectation on both sides of (A.12), we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_T - \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_\sigma \mid \mathcal{G}_\sigma \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_T} + \int_0^T 2p\lambda e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d\bar{K}_t^i - e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_\sigma} - \int_0^\sigma 2p\lambda e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d\bar{K}_t^i \mid \mathcal{G}_\sigma \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_T} + \int_0^T 2p\lambda e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d\bar{K}_t^i \right) 1_{\sigma < T} \mid \mathcal{G}_\sigma \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, making use of Garsia-Neveu Lemma again, it turns out that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_T \right)^{3/2} \right] \leq \left( \frac{3}{2} \right)^{3/2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_T} + \int_0^T 2p\lambda e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_{t-}} d\bar{K}_t^i \right)^{3/2} \right].$$

Then, by (A.11) and (A.8),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\langle \bar{M} \rangle_T] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left( e^{-2p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right) \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_T \right] \\
&\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-6p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \langle e^{p\lambda \bar{G}} \rangle_T \right)^{3/2} \right] \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-6p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_T} + \int_0^T 2p\lambda e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_t} d\bar{K}_t^i \right)^{3/2} \right] \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\leq C \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-6p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{3p\lambda \bar{G}_T} + \left( \int_0^T 2p\lambda e^{2p\lambda \bar{G}_t} d\bar{K}_t^i \right)^{3/2} \right] \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\leq C_p \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-6p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{3p\lambda \bar{G}_T} + e^{3p\lambda \bar{G}_*} (\bar{K}_T^i)^{3/2} \right] \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&= C_p \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-6p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{3p\lambda \bar{G}_T} + e^{3p\lambda \bar{G}_* + \frac{3}{2}p\lambda \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} e^{-\frac{3}{2}p\lambda \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} (\bar{K}_T^i)^{3/2} \right] \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\leq C_p \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-6p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{3p\lambda \bar{G}_T} \right] + \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{12p\lambda \bar{G}_* + 6p\lambda \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] \right)^{1/4} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2p\lambda \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} (\bar{K}_T^i)^2 \right] \right)^{3/4} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\leq C_p \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} e^{-6p\lambda \bar{G}_t} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{3p\lambda \bar{G}_T} \right] + \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{12p\lambda \bar{G}_* + 6p\lambda \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] \right)^{1/4} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{16\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty) \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] \right)^{3/4} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty) \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] < \infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant depending only on the constants given in the assumptions and  $C_p$  is a positive constant also depending on  $p$  however varies from line to line. That is to say,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty) \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] < \infty. \tag{A.14}$$

We want to clarify that in fact, the constant  $\frac{3}{2}$  in the derivation above does not matter too much and can be replaced by any  $1 < q < 2$ .

Making use of the inequality  $(x-1)^{2p} \leq (x^p-1)^2$  for  $x > 0$  and  $p \geq 1$ , we observe that for  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_E \left( e^{\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^{2p} \phi_t(de) dA_t \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_E \left( e^{p\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty) \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] < \infty. \tag{A.15}$$

Thus, with the help of Hölder's inequality, we obtain, for each  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E \left( e^{\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^p \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_E \left( e^{\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 \right)^{2p} \phi_t(de) dA_t \right] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty) \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] < \infty. \tag{A.16}$$

Then, combining (A.6) and (A.16), we conclude that for each  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_E |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right]^p \right)^{1/2} \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty) \bar{Y}_*^{i,+}} \right] < \infty.$$

We finish the proof by showing that for each  $p \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[(\bar{K}_T^i)^p] < \infty$ . Note that  $\bar{K}_T^i = \bar{Y}_0^i - \xi^i - \int_0^T f(s, \bar{Y}_s^i, \bar{U}_s^i, \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}^i) dA_s +$

$\int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_s^i(e) q(ds, de)$ , then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [(\bar{K}_T)^p] &\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ (\bar{Y}_*^i)^p + \left( \int_0^T \alpha_t dA_t + \int_0^T \beta |\bar{Y}_t^i| dA_t + \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^T (j_\lambda(\bar{U}_t^i) + j_\lambda(-\bar{U}_t^i)) dA_t + \int_0^T \beta \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{P}_{\bar{Y}_s^i}, \delta_0) dA_s \right)^p \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) \right|^p \right] \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 + (\bar{Y}_*^i)^p + \left( \int_0^T \int_E (e^{\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1 + e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1) \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^p + \left| \int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) \right|^p \right] \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ 1 + (\bar{Y}_*^i)^p + \left( \int_0^T \int_E (e^{\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{p/2} + \left( \int_0^T \int_E (e^{-\lambda \bar{U}_t^i(e)} - 1)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{p/2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) \right|^p \right] \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty)\bar{Y}_*^i} \right] + C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) \right|^p \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we make use of (A.6), (A.16) and Hölder's inequality in the last inequality. To deal with the second term, we take advantage of a generalized Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality ([42, Theorem 2.1]) and obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) \right|^p \right] &\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \left[ \int_0^T \int_E \bar{U}_t^i(e) q(dt, de) \right]_T \right)^{p/2} \right] \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \max \left\{ \left( \int_0^T \int_E |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{p/2}, \int_0^T \int_E |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|^p \phi_t(de) dA_t \right\} \right] \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \max \left\{ \left( \int_0^T \int_E (e^{\lambda |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|} - 1) \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{p/2}, \int_0^T \int_E (e^{\lambda |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|} - 1) \phi_t(de) dA_t \right\} \right] \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^T \int_E (e^{\lambda |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|} - 1)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{p/4} + \left( \int_0^T \int_E (e^{\lambda |\bar{U}_t^i(e)|} - 1)^2 \phi_t(de) dA_t \right)^{1/2} \right] \\
&\leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty)\bar{Y}_*^i} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we make use of (A.6), (A.16) and Hölder's inequality again in the last inequality. Thus, we conclude that for each  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} [(\bar{K}_T)^p] \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{36p\lambda(1+\beta\|A_T\|_\infty)\bar{Y}_*^i} \right] < \infty,$$

and end the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Fabio Antonelli and Carlo Mancini. Solutions of BSDE's with jumps and quadratic/locally lipschitz generator. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 126(10):3124–3144, 2016.
- [2] Guy Barles, Rainer Buckdahn, and Étienne Pardoux. Backward stochastic differential equations and integral-partial differential equations. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 60(1-2):57–83, 1997.
- [3] Pauline Barrieu and Nicole El Karoui. Monotone stability of quadratic semimartingales with applications to unbounded general quadratic BSDEs. *The Annals of Probability*, 41(3B), 2013.
- [4] Erhan Bayraktar and Song Yao. Quadratic reflected BSDEs with unbounded obstacles. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 122(4):1155–1203, 2012.
- [5] Dirk Becherer. Bounded solutions to backward SDEs with jumps for utility optimization and indifference hedging. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 16(4):2027–2054, 2006.
- [6] Pierre Brémaud. *Point Processes and Queues*. Springer New York, 1981.

- [7] Philippe Briand, Pierre Cardaliaguet, Paul-Eric Chaudru De Raynal, and Ying Hu. Forward and backward stochastic differential equations with normal constraints in law. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130(12):7021–7097, 2020.
- [8] Philippe Briand and H el ene Hiban. Particles systems for mean reflected BSDEs. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 131:253–275, 2021.
- [9] Philippe Briand and Ying Hu. BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 136(4):604–618, 2006.
- [10] Philippe Briand and Ying Hu. Quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 141(3):543–567, 2008.
- [11] Rainer Buckdahn, Yajie Chen, and Juan Li. Partial derivative with respect to the measure and its application to general controlled mean-field systems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 134:265–307, 2021.
- [12] Rainer Buckdahn, Boualem Djehiche, Juan Li, and Shige Peng. Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations: A limit approach. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1524–1565, 2009.
- [13] Rainer Buckdahn, Juan Li, and Shige Peng. Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations and related partial differential equations. *Stochastic processes and their Applications*, 119(10):3133–3154, 2009.
- [14] Rainer Buckdahn, Juan Li, Shige Peng, and Catherine Rainer. Mean-field stochastic differential equations and associated pdes. *THE ANNALS*, 45(2):824–878, 2017.
- [15] Ren e Carmona, Fran ois Delarue, et al. *Probabilistic theory of mean field games with applications I-II*. Springer.
- [16] Jean-Fran ois Chassagneux, Dan Crisan, and Fran ois Delarue. A probabilistic approach to classical solutions of the master equation for large population equilibria. *HAL*, 2015, 2015.
- [17] Patrick Cheridito and Kihun Nam. Bse’s, bsde’s and fixed-point problems. *The Annals of Probability*, 45(6A):3795–3828, 2017.
- [18] Samuel N. Cohen and Robert J. Elliott. Existence, uniqueness and comparisons for BSDEs in general spaces. *The Annals of Probability*, 40(5):2264–2297, 2012.
- [19] Samuel N. Cohen and Robert J. Elliott. *Stochastic calculus and applications*, volume 2. Springer, 2015.
- [20] Fulvia Confortola.  $L^p$  solution of backward stochastic differential equations driven by a marked point process. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems*, 31(1), 2018.
- [21] Fulvia Confortola and Marco Fuhrman. Backward stochastic differential equations and optimal control of marked point processes. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(5):3592–3623, 2013.
- [22] Fulvia Confortola and Marco Fuhrman. Backward stochastic differential equations associated to jump markov processes and applications. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 124(1):289–316, 2014.
- [23] Fulvia Confortola, Marco Fuhrman, and Jean Jacod. Backward stochastic differential equation driven by a marked point process: An elementary approach with an application to optimal control. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 26(3), 2016.
- [24] St ephane Cr epey and Anis Matoussi. Reflected and doubly reflected BSDEs with jumps: A priori estimates and comparison. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 18(5):2041–2069, 2008.
- [25] Freddy Delbaen, Ying Hu, and Adrien Richou. On the uniqueness of solutions to quadratic BSDEs with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions: the critical case. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series A*, 35(11):5273–5283, 2015.
- [26] Boualem Djehiche, Roxana Dumitrescu, and Jia Zeng. A propagation of chaos result for weakly interacting nonlinear snell envelopes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.14315*, 2021.
- [27] Roxana Dumitrescu and C eline Labart. Reflected scheme for doubly reflected BSDEs with jumps and RCLL obstacles. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 296:827–839, 2016.

- [28] Roxana Dumitrescu, Marie-Claire Quenez, and Agnès Sulem. Optimal stopping for dynamic risk measures with jumps and obstacle problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 167:219–242, 2015.
- [29] Roxana Dumitrescu, Marie-Claire Quenez, and Agnès Sulem. Generalized dynkin games and doubly reflected bsdes with jumps. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 2016.
- [30] Nicole El Karoui, Anis Matoussi, and Armand Ngoupeyou. Quadratic exponential semimartingales and application to BSDEs with jumps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.06191*, 2016.
- [31] Mohamed El Otmani. Reflected BSDE driven by a lévy process. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 22:601–619, 2009.
- [32] EH Essaky. Reflected backward stochastic differential equation with jumps and RCLL obstacle. *Bulletin des sciences mathématiques*, 132(8):690–710, 2008.
- [33] E.H. Essaky and M. Hassani. General existence results for reflected BSDE and BSDE. *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques*, 135(5):442–466, 2011.
- [34] Nahuel Foresta. Optimal stopping of marked point processes and reflected backward stochastic differential equations. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 83(3):1219–1245, 2021.
- [35] Nicolas Fournier and Arnaud Guillin. On the rate of convergence in wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability theory and related fields*, 162(3):707–738, 2015.
- [36] Masaaki Fujii and Akihiko Takahashi. Quadratic–exponential growth BSDEs with jumps and their malliavin’s differentiability. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 128(6):2083–2130, 2018.
- [37] Jürgen Gärtner. On the McKean-Vlasov limit for interacting diffusions. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 137(1):197–248, 1988.
- [38] S Hamadène and Y Ouknine. Reflected backward stochastic differential equation with jumps and random obstacle. *Electronic Communications in Probability [electronic only]*, 8, 2003.
- [39] S Hamadène and Y Ouknine. Reflected backward SDEs with general jumps. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 60(2):263–280, 2016.
- [40] Tao Hao, Ying Hu, Shanjian Tang, and Jiaqiang Wen. Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations and nonlocal pdes with quadratic growth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05676*, 2022.
- [41] Tao Hao, Jiaqiang Wen, and Jie Xiong. Solvability of a class of mean-field bsdes with quadratic growth. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 191:109652, 2022.
- [42] Ma. Elena Hernández-Hernández and Saul D. Jacka. A generalisation of the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 27(50), 2022.
- [43] Hélène Hibon, Ying Hu, and Shanjian Tang. Mean-field type quadratic bsdes. *Numerical Algebra, Control and Optimization*, 13(3&4):392–412, 2023.
- [44] Kaitong Hu, Zhenjie Ren, and Junjian Yang. Principal-agent problem with multiple principals. *Stochastics*, 95(5):878–905, 2023.
- [45] Ying Hu, Peter Imkeller, and Matthias Müller. Utility maximization in incomplete markets. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 15(3):1691–1712, 2005.
- [46] Ying Hu and Martin Schweizer. Some new BSDE results for an infinite-horizon stochastic control problem. *Advanced mathematical methods for finance*, pages 367–395, 2011.
- [47] Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin and Zhenfu Wang. Mean field limit and propagation of chaos for Vlasov systems with bounded forces. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 271(12):3588–3627, 2016.
- [48] Monique Jeanblanc, Anis Matoussi, and Armand Ngoupeyou. Robust utility maximization problem in model with jumps and unbounded claim. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1201.2690*, 2012.
- [49] Guangyan Jia and Mingyu Xu. Construction and uniqueness for reflected BSDE under linear increasing condition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0801.3718*, 2008.

- [50] Sarah Kaakaï, Anis Matoussi, and Achraf Tamtalini. Utility maximization problem with uncertainty and a jump setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07640*, 2022.
- [51] Mark Kac. Foundations of kinetic theory. In *Proceedings of The third Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, volume 3, pages 171–197, 1956.
- [52] Ioannis Karatzas, Steven E Shreve, I Karatzas, and Steven E Shreve. *Methods of mathematical finance*, volume 39. Springer, 1998.
- [53] Nicole El Karoui, Christophe Kapoudjian, Étienne Pardoux, Shige Peng, and Marie Claire Quenez. Reflected solutions of backward SDE’s, and related obstacle problems for PDE’s. *The Annals of Probability*, 25:702–737, 1997.
- [54] Nabil Kazi-Tani, Dylan Possamaï, and Chao Zhou. Quadratic BSDEs with jumps: a fixed-point approach. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20(66):1–28, 2015.
- [55] Magdalena Kobylanski. Backward stochastic differential equations and partial differential equations with quadratic growth. *The Annals of Probability*, 28(2):558–602, 2000.
- [56] Magdalena Kobylanski, J.P. Lepeltier, Marie-Claire Quenez, and Soledad Torres. Reflected BSDE with superlinear quadratic coefficient. *Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 22, 01 2002.
- [57] Daniel Lacker. On a strong form of propagation of chaos for McKean-Vlasov equations. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–1805, 2018.
- [58] Günter Last and Andreas Brandt. *Marked Point Processes on the real line: the dynamical approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1995.
- [59] Mathieu Laurière and Ludovic Tangpi. Backward propagation of chaos. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 27:1–30, 2022.
- [60] J-P Lepeltier and M Xu. Reflected BSDE with quadratic growth and unbounded terminal value. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0711.0619*, 2007.
- [61] Juan Li. Reflected mean-field backward stochastic differential equations. approximation and associated non-linear pdes. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 413(1):47–68, 2014.
- [62] Juan Li. Mean-field forward and backward sdes with jumps and associated nonlocal quasi-linear integral-pdes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 128(9):3118–3180, 2018.
- [63] Yiqing Lin, Zihao Gu, and Kun Xu. Reflected BSDE driven by a marked point process with a convex/concave generator. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2310.20361, October 2023.
- [64] Yiqing Lin and Kun Xu. Mean-field reflected bsdes driven by a marked point process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07723*, 2024.
- [65] Pierre-Louis Lions. Cours au college de france. Available at [www.college-de-france.fr](http://www.college-de-france.fr), 2007.
- [66] Yuping Liu and Jin Ma. Optimal reinsurance/investment problems for general insurance models. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 19(4), 2009.
- [67] Carlo Marinelli and Michael Röckner. On maximal inequalities for purely discontinuous martingales in infinite dimensions. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XLVI*, pages 293–315. Springer, 2014.
- [68] Anis Matoussi and Rym Salhi. Generalized bsde with jumps and stochastic quadratic growth. *hal preprint: hal-03091716*, 2020.
- [69] Henry P McKean. Propagation of chaos for a class of non-linear parabolic equations. *Stochastic Differential Equations (Lecture Series in Differential Equations, Session 7, Catholic Univ., 1967)*, pages 41–57, 1967.
- [70] Marie-Amélie Morlais. Quadratic bsdes driven by a continuous martingale and applications to the utility maximization problem. *Finance and Stochastics*, 13:121–150, 2009.
- [71] Marie-Amélie Morlais. A new existence result for quadratic BSDEs with jumps with application to the utility maximization problem. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 120(10):1966–1995, 2010.

- [72] Armand Brice Ngupeyou. *Optimisation des portefeuilles d'actifs soumis au risque de défaut*. PhD thesis, Evry-Val d'Essonne, 2010.
- [73] Antonis Papantoleon, Dylan Possamaï, and Alexandros Sapsoulas. Existence and uniqueness results for BSDE with jumps: the whole nine yards. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 23:1–68, 2018.
- [74] Étienne Pardoux and Shige Peng. Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Systems & control letters*, 14(1):55–61, 1990.
- [75] Yong Ren and Mohamed El Otmani. Generalized reflected BSDEs driven by a lévy process and an obstacle problem for pdies with a nonlinear neumann boundary condition. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 233(8):2027–2043, 2010.
- [76] Yong Ren and Lanying Hu. Reflected backward stochastic differential equations driven by lévy processes. *Statistics & probability letters*, 77(15):1559–1566, 2007.
- [77] Yong Ren and Ningmao Xia. Generalized reflected BSDE and an obstacle problem for PDEs with a nonlinear neumann boundary condition. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, 24(5):1013–1033, 2006.
- [78] Mykhaylo Shkolnikov. Large systems of diffusions interacting through their ranks. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 122(4):1730–1747, 2012.
- [79] Alain-Sol Sznitman. Topics in propagation of chaos. *Lecture notes in mathematics*, pages 165–251, 1991.
- [80] Shanjian Tang and Xunjing Li. Necessary conditions for optimal control of stochastic systems with random jumps. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 32(5):1447–1475, 1994.
- [81] Revaz Tevzadze. Solvability of backward stochastic differential equations with quadratic growth. *Stochastic processes and their Applications*, 118(3):503–515, 2008.
- [82] Jiongmin Yong. Linear-quadratic optimal control problems for mean-field stochastic differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(4):2809, 2013.