

# Extended mean-field control problems with Poissonian common noise: Stochastic maximum principle and Hamiltonian-Jacobi-Bellman equation

Lijun Bo <sup>\*</sup>      Jingfei Wang <sup>†</sup>      Xiaoli Wei <sup>‡</sup>      Xiang Yu <sup>§</sup>

## Abstract

This paper studies the extended mean-field control problems with state-control joint law dependence and Poissonian common noise. We develop the stochastic maximum principle (SMP) and establish the connection to the Hamiltonian-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation on the Wasserstein space. The presence of the conditional joint law in the McKean-Vlasov dynamics and its discontinuity caused by the Poissonian common noise bring us new technical challenges. To develop the SMP when the control domain is not necessarily convex, we first consider a strong relaxed control formulation that allows us to perform the first-order variation. We also propose the technique of extension transformation to overcome the compatibility issues arising from the joint law in the relaxed control formulation. By further establishing the equivalence between the relaxed control formulation and the strict control formulation, we obtain the SMP for the original problem in the strict control formulation. In the part to investigate the HJB equation, we formulate an auxiliary control problem subjecting to a controlled measure-valued dynamics with Poisson jumps, which allows us to derive the HJB equation of the original problem through an equivalence argument. We also show the connection between the SMP and HJB equation and give an illustrative example of linear quadratic extended mean-field control with Poissonian common noise.

**Keywords:** Extended mean-field control, Poissonian common noise, relaxed control formulation, stochastic maximum principle, HJB equation

## 1 Introduction

Mean-field control (MFC) problem, also known as the optimal McKean-Vlasov control problem, has attracted great attention in recent years. This type of control problem is closely related to mean-field games (MFG) initially introduced by Larsy-Lions [35] and Huang-Caines-Malhamé [29] as both problems are used to approximate the asymptotic behavior of large population systems of agents with weak interactions to the whole population. On the other hand, it is well known that these two problems focus on different types of interactions and objectives. The MFG problem models the competitive interactions where each agent aims to maximize his own cost that results in the Nash equilibrium as the solution, while the MFC problem models the cooperative interactions where all agents jointly optimize the social optimum that leads to the optimal control by the social planner. The scope of this paper is to investigate a type of MFC problems, new to the literature, by featuring both the state-action joint law dependence and Poissonian common noise.

<sup>\*</sup>Email: lijunbo@ustc.edu.cn, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xidian University, Xi'an, 710126, China.

<sup>†</sup>Email: wjf2104296@mail.ustc.edu.cn, School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, China.

<sup>‡</sup>Email: xiaoli.wei@hit.edu.cn, Institute for Advance Study in Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China.

<sup>§</sup>Email: xiang.yu@polyu.edu.hk, Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Kowloon, Hong Kong.

Stochastic maximum principle (SMP) and dynamic programming principle (DPP) are two fundamental and powerful methods that have been used in tackling a wide variety of optimal control problems in different contexts. In particular, SMP aims at establishing some necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality of control by using the techniques in calculus of variations. It states that any optimal control and the resulting controlled state process must solve the so-called extended Hamiltonian system comprised of an adjoint process in terms of the backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE), the controlled state equation, and the maximum condition. Bensoussan [6] derived a form of SMP via the first-order variation for controlled diffusion processes when the domain of control is convex. For systems of controlled diffusion and possibly non-convex control domain, Peng [39] established a generalized SMP with two adjoint equations, usually referred as Peng’s SMP, by utilizing the “spike-variation method” and the second-order expansion. Bahlali [3] considered stochastic control problems in a relaxed (measure-valued) control formulation and established SMP through the first-order expansion even when the control domain is not convex thanks to the fact that the space of relaxed controls is inherently convex regardless of the space of strict controls being convex or not. The SMP is further derived for problems with strict controls in [3] by showing the equivalence between the relaxed and strict control formulations. The methodology and main ideas in Bensoussan [6] and Peng [39] have also been generalized to cope with MFC problems in mean-field models recently. For example, [2, 9, 20, 31] addressed MFC problems with coefficients depending on the moments of the population state distribution. Li [36] explored MFC problems and the SMP in scalar interaction forms. Carmona and Delarue [14] solved a MFC problem with general dependence on the distribution of the state process. [8] examined a linear quadratic (LQ) MFC problem with Brownian common noise by focusing on the Gamma convergence of the optimal controls from the N-player games to the mean-field model. Acciaio et al. [1] considered extended MFC problems involving the joint law of the controlled state process and the control process without common noise. Some previous studies, for instance [25, 43, 51], also addressed MFC problems in jump diffusion or regime switching models without common noise. Recently, Nie and Yan [37] investigated extended MFC problems with partial observations.

On the other hand, DPP is to decompose a global optimization problem into a series of recursive local optimization problems. Due to the presence of the (conditional) distribution of the controlled process in the coefficients, the value function needs to be defined on the lifted space of probability measures to recover the time consistency. The DPP in the mean-field model has been established in various contexts, such as [7, 30] under the assumption that the distribution of the state admits a density function; Pham and Wei [41] under a Brownian common noise setting with the closed-loop controls; [4, 17] for MFC control problem with open-loop controls and coefficients relying on the marginal laws of the state and the control; Djete et al. [22] for a general framework of MFC with common noise, open-loop controls and coefficients depending on the joint conditional law of the path of the state-control; Cosso et al. [18] for path-dependent Hilbert space valued MFC problem whose control is open-loop and coefficients depend on the marginal laws of the state and the control. On the strength of the established DPP, one can apply some recent developments of stochastic calculus on flow of measures to derive and study the associated HJB equation in the Wasserstein space of probability measures. Different notions of solutions to the HJB equation and some existence results can be found in some recent studies. To name a few, we refer to [10, 16] for discussions on the classical solution and refer to [5, 13, 19, 44, 49, 52] for some investigations on the viscosity solutions in Wasserstein space and the various comparison principles.

All aforementioned studies focused on the common noise that is driven by a Brownian motion while the idiosyncratic noise can either be a Brownian motion or a Poisson random measure. Recently, [27, 28] introduced some interesting mean-field game problems where the common noise is driven by a Poisson random measure. Unlike the common Brownian noise, Poissonian common noise can effectively capture unexpected or rare events that simultaneously impact the

entire system of players, leading to distinct phenomena and mathematical conclusions comparing with the existing results with common Brownian noise in the literature. Inspired by these MFG problems in [27, 28], we are interested in MFC problems in the setting of Poissonian common noise from the social planner’s perspective and aim to lay new theoretical foundations to develop SMP and HJB equation in the presence of both Poissonian common noise and the dependence on the conditional joint law of state-control.

Our first main contribution lies in establishing SMP for the extended MFC problem to provide a necessary and sufficient condition for the optimality in both relaxed and strict (open) control formulations for a general control domain (not necessarily convex) under minimal assumptions. We generalize and refine the methodology in Bahlali [3] to the mean-field model to cope with our extended MFC problem with Poissonian common noise. We first establish SMP for the problem in the strong relaxed control formulation (see Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 3.10), which does not require the original domain of strict control to be convex and the first order variation can be successfully exercised (see Subsection 3.1). Contrary to classical single agent’s control problems in [3], the dependence on the conditional joint law significantly hinders some standard arguments to prove SMP within the relaxed control formulation. In response, we propose several new key ingredients to overcome these issues. Firstly, we propose the extension transformation (see its definition in (3)) such that we can work with the joint conditional law of the state process and the relaxed control (instead of the strict control). Moreover, we demonstrate that this extension transformation maintains smooth properties of original functionals, see Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3. Secondly, we choose to work with the linear derivative of functionals in Banach product spaces equipped with some suitable norms. We then establish its equivalence to the strict control formulation by using Chattering Lemma and other technical arguments; see Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 3.12. As a consequence, we obtain the SMP in the strict control formulation and establish the sufficient and necessary condition on the optimal strict control as desired; see Theorem 3.13 and Theorem 3.14. It is worth mentioning that although the strong relaxed control formulation is used for deriving SMP in the present paper, it is also of independent interest. For example, the weak relaxed control formulation based on martingale problem has been popularized in continuous time reinforcement learning thanks to its natural connection to policy exploration during the continuous time learning procedure, see [46, 47] for single agent’s control problems and [48] for MFC problems without common noise. Thanks to our established equivalence between the strong relaxed control formulation and the strict control formulation under some conditions, it will be an interesting future work to examine whether the strong relaxed control formulation can also be utilized as a new reinforcement learning framework, especially for learning extended MFC problems with common noise.

Our second main contribution is the formal derivation of HJB equation and the establishment of the relation between the SMP and HJB equation using strict open-loop controls. Unlike existing studies, the presence of Poissonian common noise gives rise to the discontinuity of the conditional joint law of the state-action, thereby posing new challenges in deriving the HJB equation. In particular, it becomes crucial to understand how the jumps of conditional joint law of state-action affect the value function and how to rigorously check that the HJB equation can lead to the same BSDE problem resulting from the SMP. Motivated by Motte and Pham [40], which addressed the extended MFC problems in the discrete time setting with common noise and open-loop controls, we derive the HJB equation by first introducing an auxiliary lifted control problem. To this end, we construct a new extended MFC problem (a new lifted control problem in Subsection 4.1) with Markovian relaxed controls adapted to the Poissonian common noise filtration (see the problem formulation in (51) and (52)) and derive the corresponding stochastic Fokker-Planck (FP) equation for the conditional joint law of state-action (see Lemma 4.2). We reveal in the present paper that the conditional law of the state-action has jumps whose sizes are characterized by *generalized* measure shifts in terms of some adjoint operator; see Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2. This fact, combined with the Itô’s formula on

flows of conditional probability measures (see [Lemma 4.5](#)), leads us to consider an associated HJB equation in the space of probability measures in (54). By some technical arguments, we can show the equivalence between the value functions of these two control problems, we conclude that the value function of the original problem indeed satisfies the derived HJB equation; see [Remark 4.11](#). As a byproduct, the value function of the original problem satisfies the *conditional law invariance* property; see [Remark 4.13](#). We highlight that our new approach, based on the new lifted control problem and its associated FP equation, can effectively resolve all issues caused by the discontinuity of the joint law and is applicable to more general settings beyond the Poissonian common noise such as the semimartingale common noise. Moreover, we also show in the present paper that the derived HJB equation differs substantially from the counterpart in jump diffusion models without common noise. Finally, when the HJB equation has a smooth solution (which coincides with the value function under a measurable assumption), we verify that the solution to the adjoint BSDE can be expressed in terms of the value function and its derivatives with respect to the probability measures along the optimal state trajectory, and the connection between the SMP and HJB equation holds; see [Theorem 4.15](#). We further illustrate this connection with explicit results in a LQ-type extended MFC problem with Poissonian common noise, in which we can fully understand how the Poissonian common noise affects the forms of the derived BSDE and the HJB equation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces some technical preparations and two formulations of the extended mean-field control problems with Poissonian common noise in both the strict and relaxed sense. In Section 3, we first develop the SMP for the extended MFC problems with Poissonian common noise in the relaxed formulation using the first order variation. We then establish the equivalence result between two different formulations to drive the SMP for the strict extended MFC problems. Section 4 investigates the HJB equation of our extended MFC problem and reveals its connection to the SMP and the associated BSDE. Section 5 studies a LQ-type example of the MFC problem with Poissonian common noise using both the SMP and the HJB equation methods, and further illustrates the connections between these two approaches. Finally, the proofs of some auxiliary results in previous sections are reported in [Appendix A](#).

*Notations.* We list below some notations that will be used frequently throughout the paper:

$T \in (0, \infty)$	Terminal time horizon
$\text{Lip}_1(E)$	Set of Lipschitz continuous functions on $E$ with Lipschitz coefficient no more than 1
$\text{Lip}_b(E)$	Set of bounded Lipschitz continuous functions on $E$
$ \cdot $	Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$
$a \cdot b$	Dot product of vectors $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$
$C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$	Set of bounded and continuous real-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$
$C(I; E)$	Set of $E$ -valued continuous functions defined on $I$
$L^2((A, \mathcal{B}(A), \lambda_A); E)$	Set of square-integrable $E$ -valued random variable (r.v.) defined on measure space $(A, \mathcal{B}(A), \lambda_A)$ . We shall abbreviate it as $L^2(A; E)$ or $L^2(A)$ when there is no confusion.
$\mathcal{P}(E)$	Set of probability measures on $E$
$\mathcal{P}_p(E)$	Set of probability measures on $E$ with finite $p$ -order moments
$d_{p,E}$	$p$ -order Wasserstein metric on $\mathcal{P}_p(E)$
$\partial_x$	Partial derivative w.r.t. the argument $x \in \mathbb{R}$
$\nabla_x (\nabla_x^2)$	Gradient (Hessian) operator w.r.t. the argument $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$
$\mathcal{L}(\xi)$	Law of a $E$ -valued random variable (r.v.) $\xi$
$\mathcal{L}(\xi \mathcal{G})$	Regular conditional law of a $E$ -valued r.v. $\xi$ given a $\sigma$ -field $\mathcal{G}$
$\mathbb{E}$	Expectation operator under probability measure $\mathbb{P}$
$\mathbb{E}'$	Expectation operator under probability measure $\mathbb{P}'$

## 2 Setup and Problem Formulation

In this section, we first introduce two formulations of the extended MFC problem with Poissonian common noise, namely the strict control formulation and the (strong) relaxed control formulation. The main feature of the extended MFC problem lies in the presence of the joint law of the state and control in the controlled McKean-Vlasov dynamics and the objective functional. More precisely, in the strict control formulation of our MFC problem, the mean-field interaction is captured by the joint law of the state and strict control that belongs to  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$ , where  $U$  is referred to as control space. In the relaxed control formulation of the MFC problem, we consider the joint law of the state and relaxed control that belongs to  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ . This essential difference motivates us to construct an extension transformation from a mapping  $h : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  to the corresponding mapping  $\tilde{h} : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , which can preserve some smooth properties of  $h$ . This key extension plays an important role in our analysis, which will be introduced with details in (2)-(3).

### 2.1 Basic spaces and extension transformation

Let  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  be a Banach space and  $U \subset B$  be a compact subset. Define the product space  $K := \mathbb{R}^n \times B$ , endowed with the product norm  $\|(x, u)\|_K := |x| + \|u\|$  for  $(x, u) \in K$ . Thus,  $(K, \|\cdot\|_K)$  is again a Banach space. Denote by  $\mathcal{M}(U)$  the set of finite signed Radon measures on the measurable space  $(U, \mathcal{B}(U))$ , equipped with the Fortet-Mourier norm that

$$\|q\|_{U, \text{FM}} := \sup_{\substack{f \in \text{Lip}_1(U) \\ \|f\|_\infty \leq 1}} \int_U f(u)q(du), \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{M}(U),$$

where  $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{u \in U} |f(u)|$  for  $f : U \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  being in  $C(U; \mathbb{R})$ . Then  $(\mathcal{M}(U), \|\cdot\|_{U, \text{FM}})$  is a separable Banach space. Let  $d_{U, \text{FM}}$  be the metric induced by the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{U, \text{FM}}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(U)$ , and it follows that  $(\mathcal{P}(U), d_{U, \text{FM}})$  is a compact Polish space. Here, we consider  $\mathcal{M}(U)$  instead of  $\mathcal{P}(U)$  directly because we are going to define partial  $L$ -derivative with respect to  $q \in \mathcal{M}(U)$ .

Let  $V := \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}(U)$  be a separable Banach product space equipped with the product norm  $\|(x, q)\|_V := |x| + \|q\|_{U, \text{FM}}$  for  $(x, q) \in V$ . For any  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(V)$ , consider the Kantorovich-Rubinstein metric (which is equivalent to 1-Wasserstein metric according to Kantorovich duality) that

$$d_{\text{KR}}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_1(V)} \left( \int_V f(x, q)\xi_1(dx, dq) - \int_V f(x, q)\xi_2(dx, dq) \right). \quad (1)$$

Then,  $(\mathcal{P}_2(V), d_{\text{KR}})$  is a Polish space and we have the next result.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(V)$  (one can identify  $\xi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  as an element in  $\mathcal{P}_2(V)$  with support in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$ ), it holds that*

$$d_{\text{KR}}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathcal{P}(U)} f(x, q)\xi_1(dx, dq) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathcal{P}(U)} f(x, q)\xi_2(dx, dq) \right).$$

*Proof.* On one hand, the restriction of  $f \in \text{Lip}_1(V)$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$  belongs to  $\text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ . On the other hand, any  $f \in \text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  can be extended to be an element in  $\text{Lip}_1(V)$  according to McShane [32].  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{M}(K)$  be the set of finite signed Radon measures on the measurable space  $(K, \mathcal{B}(K))$  equipped with the following Fortet-Mourier norm:

$$\|\rho\|_{K, \text{FM}} = \sup_{\substack{f \in \text{Lip}_1(K) \\ \|f\|_\infty \leq 1}} \int_K f(w) \rho(dw), \quad \forall \rho \in \mathcal{M}(K).$$

In the sequel, we denote by  $x, u, q, \rho, \xi$  the generic elements in  $\mathbb{R}^n, U, \mathcal{M}(U), \mathcal{M}(K), \mathcal{P}_2(V)$  respectively, and denote by  $\mu, \nu$  the marginals of  $\xi$ . Note that  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(K) \subset \mathcal{M}(K)$ . We endow  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$  with the metric induced by  $\|\cdot\|_{K, \text{FM}}$ , and hence it becomes a Polish space. Similar to [Lemma 2.1](#), the topology induced by this metric is equivalent to the weak convergence topology on  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$ . Because  $U$  is compact, it holds that, for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ ,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}(U)} q(du) \xi(dx, dq) = \int_{\mathcal{P}(U)} q(du) \xi(dx, dq) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U).$$

We can then define an affine mapping  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$  as a Bochner integral that

$$\mathcal{P}(\xi)(dx, du) := \int_{\mathcal{M}(U)} q(du) \xi(dx, dq), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)). \quad (2)$$

For any mapping  $h : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define  $\tilde{h} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  as its *extension transformation* to  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  in the sense that

$$\tilde{h}(\xi) := h(\mathcal{P}(\xi)), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)). \quad (3)$$

Then, we have the next result.

**Lemma 2.2.** *If  $h : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz continuous, so is its extension transformation  $\tilde{h} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  defined by (3).*

*Proof.* In view of the definition in (3), it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$  given by (2) is Lipschitz continuous. We have that, for any  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(V)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}(\xi_1) - \mathcal{P}(\xi_2)\|_{K, \text{FM}} &= \sup_{\substack{f \in \text{Lip}_1(K) \\ \|f\|_\infty \leq 1}} \left( \int_K \int_{\mathcal{M}(U)} f(x, u) q(du) (\xi_1(dx, dq) - \xi_2(dx, dq)) \right) \\ &= \sup_{\substack{f \in \text{Lip}_1(K) \\ \|f\|_\infty \leq 1}} \left( \int_V \int_U f(x, u) q(du) (\xi_1(dx, dq) - \xi_2(dx, dq)) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{F \in \text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathcal{P}(U)} F(x, q) (\xi_1(dx, dq) - \xi_2(dx, dq)) \right) \\ &= d_{\text{KR}}(\xi_1, \xi_2). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality above holds because the mapping  $F_f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  that

$$F_f(x, q) := \int_U f(x, u) q(du), \quad \forall (x, q) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \quad (4)$$

belongs to the space  $\text{Lip}_1(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  for each fixed  $f \in \text{Lip}_1(K)$  satisfying  $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ . In fact, it follows from (4) that, for any  $(x_i, q_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$  with  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$|F_f(x_1, q_1) - F_f(x_2, q_2)| = \left| \int_U f(x_1, u) q_1(du) - \int_U f(x_2, u) q_2(du) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_U |f(x_1, u) - f(x_2, u)| q_1(du) + \int_U f(x_2, u)(q_1(du) - q_2(du)) \\
&\leq \int_U |x_1 - x_2| q_1(du) + \sup_{\substack{g \in \text{Lip}_1(U) \\ \|g\|_\infty \leq 1}} \left( \int_U g(u)(q_1(du) - q_2(du)) \right) \\
&= |x_1 - x_2| + \|q_1 - q_2\|_{U, \text{FM}} \\
&= \|(x_1, q_1) - (x_2, q_2)\|_V.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we complete the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

The next result also holds.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a given probability space and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra. Then, for any  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued square-integrable random variable  $X$  and  $U$ -valued random variable  $\alpha$ , it holds that,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.*

$$\tilde{h}(\mathcal{L}((X, \delta_\alpha)|\mathcal{G})) = h(\mathcal{L}((X, \alpha)|\mathcal{G})),$$

where  $\delta_\alpha$  denotes the Dirac measure concentrated on  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* The claim can be easily verified by noting the equivalence that

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}(U)} q(du) \mathcal{L}((X, \delta_\alpha)|\mathcal{G})(dx, dq) = \int_U \delta_{u'}(du) \mathcal{L}((X, \alpha)|\mathcal{G})(dx, du') = \mathcal{L}((X, \alpha)|\mathcal{G})(dx, du).$$

$\square$

## 2.2 Linear derivatives w.r.t. measures of the extension

We adopt the definition of linear derivative in Banach space as in Buckdahn et al. [12].

**Definition 2.4.** *Let  $(\mathcal{K}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{K}})$  be a Banach space and  $I \subset \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{K})$  be a convex subset. We say that a mapping  $h : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  has a linear derivative  $\frac{\delta h}{\delta m} : I \times \mathcal{K} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , if  $\frac{\delta h}{\delta m}$  is a continuous function over  $I \times \mathcal{K}$  such that, for all  $m, m' \in I$ ,*

$$h(m') - h(m) = \int_0^1 \int_{\mathcal{K}} \frac{\delta h}{\delta m}(m + \lambda(m' - m), y)(m' - m)(dy) d\lambda.$$

Moreover, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $|\frac{\delta h}{\delta m}(m, y)| \leq C(1 + \|y\|_{\mathcal{K}}^2)$  for all  $y \in \bigcup_{m \in I} \text{supp}(m)$ .

Then, we have the following result regarding the extension transformation.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Assume the existence of the linear derivative  $\frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times \mathcal{K} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  for a given mapping  $h : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . Then, the associated extended mapping  $\tilde{h} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(V) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  in (3) also has a linear derivative  $\frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \times V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  such that, for all  $(x, q) \in V$ ,*

$$\frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q) = \int_U \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi))(x, u) q(du), \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$  is the affine mapping given in (2).

*Proof.* First of all, we have from (2) that, for any  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}(\xi_2) - \tilde{h}(\xi_1) &= h(\mathcal{P}(\xi_2)) - h(\mathcal{P}(\xi_1)) \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_B \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi_1) + \lambda(\mathcal{P}(\xi_2) - \mathcal{P}(\xi_1)))(x, u) (\mathcal{P}(\xi_2) - \mathcal{P}(\xi_1))(dx, du) d\lambda \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_B \int_{\mathcal{M}(U)} \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi_1 + \lambda(\xi_2 - \xi_1)))(x, u) q(du) (\xi_2 - \xi_1)(dx, dq) d\lambda \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathcal{M}(U)} \left( \int_U \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi_1 + \lambda(\xi_2 - \xi_1)))(x, u) q(du) \right) (\xi_2 - \xi_1)(dx, dq) d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where we apply Fubini theorem to interchange the order of integral in the last line and recall that  $B$  stands for the Banach space introduced in Subsection 2.1. In lieu of Definition 2.4, the representation (5) holds. It remains to show that the growth condition in Definition 2.4 is satisfied by the linear derivative  $\frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}$ .

According to Definition 2.4, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that  $\left| \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi))(x, u) \right| \leq C(1 + \|(x, u)\|_K^2)$  for all  $(x, u) \in \bigcup_{\eta \in I} \text{supp}(\eta)$  with  $I := \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$ . Then, by (5) and the compactness of the control space  $U$ , for all  $(x, q) \in \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))} \text{supp}(\xi) = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q) \right| &= \left| \int_U \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi))(x, u) q(du) \right| \leq \left| \int_U C(1 + |x|^2 + \|u\|^2) q(du) \right| \\ &\leq C_U(1 + |x|^2 + \|q\|_{U, \text{FM}}) \\ &= C_U(1 + \|(x, q)\|_V^2), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_U$  is a positive constant that depends on  $U$ . Thus, the proof is completed.  $\square$

In what follows, we consider a mapping  $h : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  such that its linear derivative  $\frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}$  exists. We also assume that the partial derivative  $\partial_x \left( \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, u) \right)$  w.r.t. the argument  $x$  exists, is continuous and of at most linear growth, i.e., there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\left| \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, u) \right) \right| \leq C(1 + |x|), \quad \forall (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U.$$

The next result is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.5.

**Lemma 2.6.** *The linear derivative  $\frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}$  is Frechét differentiable, and the vector of partial derivatives:*

$$\partial \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi} = \left( \partial_x \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}, \partial_q \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi} \right) : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(U)) \times V \rightarrow V^* := \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{M}^*(U)$$

*is continuous. Furthermore, it holds that*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q) \right) = \int_U \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi))(x, u) \right) q(du) \in \mathbb{R}^n; \\ \partial_q \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q) \right) (\cdot) = \int_U \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi))(x, u) (\cdot) (du) = \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{M}^*(U). \end{cases}$$

*In particular, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that, for all  $(x, q) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$ ,*

$$\left| \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q) \right) \right| \leq C(1 + |x|).$$



Notably, by [Lemma 2.6](#), the differentiability of  $\frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}$  w.r.t.  $q \in \mathcal{P}(U)$  after extension does not require the differentiability of  $\frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}$  w.r.t.  $u \in U$ . Hence, the extension lifts the differentiability in this sense.

Similar to Proposition 4.1 in Buckdahn et al. [[12](#)], we also have the following result.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. For any  $(X, q) \in L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ , as  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ , it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}(\mathcal{L}((X, q) + \epsilon(X' - X, q' - q))) - \tilde{h}(\mathcal{L}(X, q)) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\mathcal{L}(X, q))(X, q) \right) \epsilon \cdot (X' - X) \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_U \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}(X, q)))(X, q) \epsilon(q' - q)(du) \right] + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $(X', q') \in L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ .

We also give the definition of the (partial)  $L$ -derivative as below.

**Definition 2.8.** *The partial  $L$ -derivative of the mapping  $h : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  w.r.t. the probability measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is defined by, for all  $(\rho, x, u) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U$ ,*

$$\partial_\mu h(\rho)(x, u) := \partial_x \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, u).$$

Similarly, we can also define the partial  $L$ -derivative w.r.t. the probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathcal{M}(U))$  for the mapping  $\tilde{h} : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . The partial  $L$ -derivative of  $\tilde{h}$  with respect to  $\nu$  is defined by, for all  $(\xi, x, q) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$ ,

$$\partial_\nu \tilde{h}(\xi)(x, q) := \partial_q \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q).$$

Note that we are not using the classical definition of  $L$ -differentiability here (more precisely, define the  $L$ -derivative via lifting functions) because we are considering the joint law involving the law of controls that are defined on another Banach space. This leads that the classical methods are not applicable here. It follows from [Lemma 2.6](#) that, the (partial)  $L$ -derivative of the extension of  $h$  is given by

$$\partial_\mu \tilde{h}(\xi)(x, q) = \partial_x \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q) = \int_U \partial_\mu h(\mathcal{P}(\xi))(x, u) q(du), \quad (6)$$

$$\partial_\nu \tilde{h}(\xi)(x, q)(\cdot) = \partial_q \frac{\delta \tilde{h}}{\delta \xi}(\xi)(x, q)(\cdot) = \int_U \frac{\delta h}{\delta \rho}(\mathcal{P}(\xi))(x, u)(\cdot)(du). \quad (7)$$

### 2.3 Formulations of extended MFC with Poissonian common noise

Let  $(\Omega^0, \mathcal{F}^0, \mathbb{F}^0, \mathbb{P}^0)$  be a Polish atomless filtered probability space with filtration  $\mathbb{F}^0 = (\mathcal{F}_t^0)_{t \in [0, T]}$  satisfying the usual conditions. Consider a standard  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion  $W = (W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  defined on the probability space  $(\Omega^1, \mathcal{F}^1, \mathbb{P}^1)$  and a Poisson random measure  $N(dz, dt)$  on some measurable space  $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$  with intensity  $\lambda(dz)dt$  satisfying  $\lambda(Z) < \infty$  on the probability space  $(\Omega^2, \mathcal{F}^2, \mathbb{P}^2)$ . Furthermore, we define

$$\Omega = \Omega^0 \times \Omega^1 \times \Omega^2, \quad \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^0 \otimes \mathcal{F}^1 \otimes \mathcal{F}^2, \quad \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^0 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2. \quad (8)$$

To simplify the notations, we denote by  $W$  and  $N$  the natural extensions of  $W$  and  $N$  to  $\Omega$ , respectively. Define the filtration  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  by

$$\mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_t^0 \otimes \mathcal{F}_t^W \otimes \mathcal{F}_t^N, \quad \mathcal{F}_t^W = \sigma(W_s; s \leq t) \subset \mathcal{F}^1,$$

$$\mathcal{F}_t^N = \sigma(N((0, s] \times A); s \leq t, A \in \mathcal{Z}) \subset \mathcal{F}^2.$$

Let  $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the natural extensions of  $\mathbb{F}^N = (\mathcal{F}_t^N)_{t \in [0, T]}$  to  $\Omega$ , and also denote by  $\mathcal{F}_t^W$  the natural extension of  $\mathcal{F}_t^W$ .

We also assume that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ ,  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}^W, \mathbb{P})$  and  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{G}, \mathbb{P})$  satisfy the usual conditions without loss of generality. Then, for any  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process  $Y = (Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , it holds that,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$\mathcal{L}(Y_t | N) = \mathcal{L}(Y_t | \mathcal{G}_t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

where the notation  $\mathcal{L}(\cdot | N)$  stands for the conditional distribution given the Poisson random measure  $N$  under the probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ .

Consider measurable functions  $b : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times U \times Z \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times U \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  as the coefficients of the underlying controlled state process and the objective functional. We impose the following assumptions throughout the paper.

**Assumption 1.** *We make the following assumptions on model coefficients:*

- (A.1)  $b(x, \rho, u), \sigma(x, \rho, u), \gamma(x, \rho, u, z), f(x, \rho, u), g(x, \mu)$  are continuous functions on their domains of definition;  $b(x, \rho, u), \sigma(x, \rho, u), \gamma(x, \rho, u, z)$  are uniformly Lipschitz continuous in  $(x, \mu)$  in the sense that, there is a constant  $L > 0$  independent of  $u \in U$  such that, for all  $(x, \rho), (x', \rho') \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$ ,

$$|\phi(x', \rho', u) - \phi(x, \rho, u)| \leq L (|x - x'| + \|\rho - \rho'\|_{K, \text{FM}}),$$

where  $\phi = b(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot)$  or  $\gamma(\cdot, z)$ .

- (A.2) the partial derivatives  $\nabla_x b, \nabla_x \sigma, \nabla_x \gamma, \nabla_x f, \nabla_x g$  are uniformly bounded and continuous.

- (A.3) there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that, for all  $(x, \rho, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times U$ ,

$$|\phi(x, \rho, u)| \leq K (1 + |x| + M_2(\rho)),$$

with  $\phi = b(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot), f(\cdot)$  or  $\gamma(\cdot, z)$  and  $M_2(\rho) := (\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} (|x|^2 + \|u\|^2) \rho(dx, du))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Moreover, it holds that  $\int_Z |\gamma(x, \rho, u, z)|^2 \lambda(dz) \leq K (1 + |x|^2 + M_2(\rho)^2)$ .

- (A.4) the coefficients  $b, \sigma, \gamma, f, g$  have linear derivatives  $\frac{\delta b}{\delta \rho}, \frac{\delta \sigma}{\delta \rho}, \frac{\delta \gamma}{\delta \rho}, \frac{\delta f}{\delta \rho}, \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}$ , respectively. These linear derivatives have bounded continuous partial derivatives w.r.t. the state variables. That is, the  $L$ -derivatives of  $b, \sigma, \gamma, f, g$  with respect to  $\mu$  defined in [Definition 2.8](#) are bounded and continuous.

We are now at the position to formulate the extended MFC problem with Poissonian common noise in both strict and relaxed senses. To this purpose, let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the set of  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process  $\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  taking values in  $U$  with càdlàg trajectory such that  $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T \|\alpha_t\|^2 dt] < +\infty$ . We first introduce the following extended MFC problem with Poissonian common noise in strict sense, which is given by

$$J(\alpha) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T f(X_t, \mathcal{L}((X_t, \alpha_t) | \mathcal{G}_t), \alpha_t) dt + g(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T | \mathcal{G}_T)) \right] \quad (9)$$

subject to the constraint:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = b(X_t, \mathcal{L}((X_t, \alpha_t) | \mathcal{G}_t), \alpha_t) dt + \sigma(X_t, \mathcal{L}((X_t, \alpha_t) | \mathcal{G}_t), \alpha_t) dW_t \\ \quad + \int_Z \gamma(X_{t-}, \mathcal{L}((X_{t-}, \alpha_{t-}) | \mathcal{G}_{t-}), \alpha_{t-}, z) \tilde{N}(dt, dz), \\ \mathcal{L}(X_0) = \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n). \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Here,  $\tilde{N}(dz, dt) := N(dz, dt) - \lambda(dz)dt$  is the compensated Poisson random measure. It is not difficult to show that problem (9)-(10) is well-defined under [Assumption 1](#). An adapted process  $\alpha^* \in \mathcal{U}$  is an optimal (strict) control of problem (9)-(10) if it holds that

$$J(\alpha^*) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} J(\alpha).$$

Next, we consider the relaxed control formulation of the extended MFC problem with Poissonian common noise. Denote by  $\mathcal{Q}$  the set of  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process taking values in  $\mathcal{P}_2(U)$  with càdlàg trajectory such that  $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^T \int_U \|u\|^2 q_t(du)dt] < +\infty$ . Furthermore, we also define that

$$\delta(\mathcal{U}) := \{q = (q_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \text{ with } q_t = \delta_{\alpha_t}; \alpha = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{U}\}. \quad (11)$$

Then, it automatically holds that  $\delta(\mathcal{U}) \subset \mathcal{Q}$ .

Let  $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{f}$  be the respective extensions of the coefficients  $b, \sigma, \gamma, f$  according to (3). Then, under [Assumption 1](#), by applying [Lemma 2.2](#), [Lemma 2.3](#), [Lemma 2.5](#) and [Lemma 2.6](#), we can obtain that the corresponding extensions  $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{f}$  satisfy the following properties:

- (B.1)  $\tilde{b}(x, \xi, u), \tilde{\sigma}(x, \xi, u), \tilde{\gamma}(x, \xi, u, z), \tilde{f}(x, \xi, u), g(x, \mu)$  are continuous functions on their domains of definition;  $\tilde{b}(x, \xi, u), \tilde{\sigma}(x, \xi, u), \tilde{\gamma}(x, \xi, u, z)$  are uniformly Lipschitz continuous in  $(x, \xi)$  in the sense that, there is a constant  $L > 0$  independent of  $u \in U$  such that, for all  $(x, \xi), (x', \xi') \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ ,

$$|\phi(x', \xi', u) - \phi(x, \xi, u)| \leq L(|x - x'| + d_{\text{KR}}(\xi, \xi')),$$

where  $\phi = \tilde{b}(\cdot), \tilde{\sigma}(\cdot)$  or  $\tilde{\gamma}(\cdot, z)$ .

- (B.2) the partial derivatives  $\nabla_x \tilde{b}, \nabla_x \tilde{\sigma}, \nabla_x \tilde{\gamma}, \nabla_x \tilde{f}, \nabla_x g$  are uniformly bounded and continuous.

- (B.3) there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that, for all  $(x, \xi, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \times U$ ,

$$|\phi(x, \xi, u)| \leq K(1 + |x| + M_2(\xi)),$$

with  $\phi = \tilde{b}(\cdot), \tilde{\sigma}(\cdot), \tilde{f}(\cdot)$  or  $\tilde{\gamma}(\cdot, z)$  and  $M_2(\xi) := (\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} (|x|^2 + \|u\|^2) \mathcal{P}(\xi)(dx, du))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Moreover, it holds that  $\int_Z |\tilde{\gamma}(x, \xi, u, z)|^2 \lambda(dz) \leq K(1 + |x|^2 + M_2(\xi)^2)$ .

- (B.4) the extensions  $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{f}, g$  have linear derivatives  $\frac{\delta \tilde{b}}{\delta \xi}, \frac{\delta \tilde{\sigma}}{\delta \xi}, \frac{\delta \tilde{\gamma}}{\delta \xi}, \frac{\delta \tilde{f}}{\delta \xi}, \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}$ , respectively. These linear derivatives have bounded continuous partial derivatives w.r.t. the state variables. That is, the partial  $L$ -derivatives of  $\tilde{b}, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{f}, g$  with respect to  $\mu$  defined in [Definition 2.8](#) are bounded and continuous.

- (B.5) for any  $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$ , any square-integrable  $\mathbb{R}^n \times U$ -valued random variable  $(X, \alpha)$  on some probability space and a  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{G}$  on it, we have

$$\begin{cases} \phi(x, \mathcal{L}((X, \alpha)|\mathcal{G}), u) = \tilde{\phi}(x, \mathcal{L}((X, \delta_\alpha)|\mathcal{G}), u), \\ \frac{\delta \phi}{\delta \rho}(x, \mathcal{L}((X, \alpha)|\mathcal{G}), u) = \frac{\delta \tilde{\phi}}{\delta \xi}(x, \mathcal{L}((X, \delta_\alpha)|\mathcal{G}), u), \end{cases}$$

where  $\phi = b(\cdot), \sigma(\cdot), f(\cdot)$  or  $\gamma(\cdot, z)$ .

For any  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ , the controlled state process in the relaxed control formulation is now governed by, for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \int_U \tilde{b}(X_t, \mathcal{L}((X_t, q_t)|\mathcal{G}_t), u) q_t(du) dt + \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_t, \mathcal{L}((X_t, q_t)|\mathcal{G}_t), u) q_t(du) dW_t \\ \quad + \int_U \int_Z \tilde{\gamma}(X_{t-}, \mathcal{L}((X_{t-}, q_{t-})|\mathcal{G}_{t-}), u, z) q_{t-}(du) \tilde{N}(dt, dz), \\ \mathcal{L}(X_0) = \mu. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

We then aim to minimize the following cost functional over  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  that

$$\mathcal{J}(q) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_U \tilde{f}(X_t, \mathcal{L}((X_t, q_t)|\mathcal{G}_t), u) q_t(du) dt + g(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T|\mathcal{G}_T)) \right] \rightarrow \inf_{q \in \mathcal{Q}}. \quad (13)$$

A standard moment estimate under [Assumption 1](#) yields that  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t|^2] < \infty$ , which implies that the control problem (12)-(13) is well-defined under [Assumption 1](#). It is straightforward to see that the problem (12)-(13) will reduce to the problem (9)-(10) when  $q \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$ . If one can find a control  $q^* \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that

$$\inf_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{J}(q) = \mathcal{J}(q^*),$$

we call  $q^*$  an optimal relaxed extended mean-field control.

We provide below the so-called *chattering lemma* without proof (c.f. Lemma 4.2 in Mezardi [33]), which will be used later.

**Lemma 2.9** (Chattering Lemma). *Let  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Then, there exists a sequence of adapted process  $(\alpha^n)_{n \geq 1}$  taking values in  $U$  such that the sequence of random measures  $\delta_{\alpha^n}$  converges to  $q$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the sense that, for any continuous function  $f : [0, T] \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , it holds that, a.s.*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T f(t, \alpha_t^n) dt = \int_0^T \int_U f(t, u) q_t(du) dt,$$

or equivalently  $\int_0^T \|\delta_{\alpha_t^n} - q_t\|_{U, \text{FM}} dt = 0$ , a.s.. Moreover, due to the boundedness of the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{U, \text{FM}}$ , we have  $\int_0^T \|\delta_{\alpha_t^n} - q_t\|_{U, \text{FM}}^p dt = 0$ , a.s., for any  $p \geq 1$ .

The above lemma, together with Lemma 3.3 in Ma and Yong [34], yields the following convergence result.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  and  $\alpha^n$  be stated in [Lemma 2.9](#). For any  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ -valued r.v.  $(X, \xi)$  defined on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[|X|^2 + |M_2(\xi)|^2] < +\infty$ , we introduce that, for  $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$ ,*

$$\begin{cases} M_{\tilde{b}}^n(t, \omega) = \tilde{b}(X(\omega), \xi(\omega), \alpha_t^n(\omega)), & M_{\tilde{b}}(t, \omega) = \int_U \tilde{b}(X(\omega), \xi(\omega), u) q(\omega, du); \\ M_{\tilde{\sigma}}^n(t, \omega) = \tilde{\sigma}(X(\omega), \xi(\omega), \alpha_t^n(\omega)), & M_{\tilde{\sigma}}(t, \omega) = \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X(\omega), \xi(\omega), u) q(\omega, du); \\ M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^n(t, \omega, z) = \tilde{\gamma}(X(\omega), \xi(\omega), \alpha_t^n(\omega), z), & M_{\tilde{\gamma}}(t, \omega, z) = \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X(\omega), \xi(\omega), u, z) q(\omega, du). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Then, it holds that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\tilde{b}}^n &\rightarrow M_{\tilde{b}}, \quad M_{\tilde{\sigma}}^n \rightarrow M_{\tilde{\sigma}}, \quad \text{in } L^2([0, T] \times \Omega), \\ M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^n &\rightarrow M_{\tilde{\gamma}}, \quad \text{in } L^2([0, T] \times \Omega \times Z). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can show an equivalence result on the value functions between two formulations.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let [Assumption 1](#) hold. The (MFC) value function defined by (9) in the strict control formulation coincides with the one defined by (13) in the relaxed control formulation, i.e., it holds that*

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} J(\alpha) = \inf_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{J}(q). \quad (15)$$

*Proof.* For any  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ , let  $(\alpha^n)_{n \geq 1}$  be stated as in [Lemma 2.10](#). For any  $n \geq 1$ , denote by  $X^n = (X_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and  $\xi^n = (\xi_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$  the corresponding state processes (10) but under  $\alpha^n$  and the joint conditional law  $(\mathcal{L}((X_t^n, \delta_{\alpha_t^n})|\mathcal{G}_t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ , respectively. With the help of [Lemma 2.9](#) and [Lemma 2.10](#), one can obtain  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[|X_t^n - X_t|^2 + d_{\text{KR}}^2(\xi_t^n, \xi_t)] = 0$ . Here, we recall that  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is the state process (12) controlled by the relaxed control  $q$ , and  $\xi_t = \mathcal{L}((X_t, q_t)|\mathcal{G}_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Hence, the desired result follows from the continuity of the coefficients  $f$  and  $g$  imposed in [Assumption 1](#).  $\square$

### 3 Stochastic Maximum Principle

In this section, we develop the SMP for the extended MFC problem with Poissonian common noise. Recall that the strong relaxed control formulation of the extended MFC problem has been given in the previous section. We will first prove the SMP for the relaxed extended MFC problem using the first order variation and then derive an equivalence result of the value functions between the strict control formulation and the relaxed control formulation. Building upon these two key results, we finally establish the SMP using the first order adjoint process for the original extended MFC problem with strict controls on general control domain that may not be convex.

#### 3.1 First-order variation

For the relaxed control problem,  $\mathcal{P}(U)$  is compact and convex, and hence we can apply the first-order variation. That is, for any two relaxed controls  $q, v \in \mathcal{Q}$ , we define a new relaxed control as follows  $q^\epsilon := q + \epsilon(v - q) \in \mathcal{Q}$  for  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ . Denote by  $X^\epsilon = (X_t^\epsilon)_{t \in [0, T]}$  the state process under the relaxed control  $q^\epsilon$  according to the dynamics (12).

We first have the following lemma, whose proof is given in Appendix A.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the state process satisfying (12). Then, under Assumption 1, we have, as  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ ,*

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|X_t^\epsilon - X_t|^2] = O(\epsilon^2). \quad (16)$$

For  $\omega \in \Omega$ , let  $Q_\omega$  be the r.c.p.d. of the probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  in (8) given  $\mathcal{G}_T$ . It is clear that, under  $Q_\omega$ , the law of  $(X_t, q_t)$  coincides with  $\mathcal{L}((X_t, q_t)|\mathcal{G}_t)(\omega)$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. We consider the copy measurable space  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}') \equiv (\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ . For any  $\omega \in \Omega$ , let us define by r.c.p.d. that

$$\mathbb{P}' := Q_\omega,$$

which is a probability measure on  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$ . We can define a copy random variable  $X'$  on  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$  for every random variable  $X$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  in the sense that  $X'(\omega) = X(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega' = \Omega$ . It is easy to see that  $X'$  is indeed a random variable on  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ , and moreover we have

$$\mathcal{L}^{Q_\omega}(X') = \mathcal{L}(X|\mathcal{G}_T)(\omega), \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}^{Q_\omega}(X')$  denotes the law of the random variable  $X'$  under the probability measure  $Q_\omega$ . In the sequel,  $\mathbb{E}'$  refers to the expectation in  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$  under the probability measure  $\mathbb{P}'$ .

**Remark 3.2.** *We also stress the next property of the expectation w.r.t.  $\mathbb{P}'$ . For random variables  $X$  and its copy  $X'$  respectively defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ , and let  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$  be measurable, the expectation is understood in the following sense:*

$$\mathbb{E}' [F(X(\omega), X')] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'} [F(x, X')] |_{x=X(\omega)} = \mathbb{E}^{Q_\omega} [F(x, X')] |_{x=X(\omega)} = \mathbb{E}[F(x, X)|\mathcal{G}_T] |_{x=X(\omega)}.$$

*It is emphasized that the above equality should not be limited to Euclidean-valued random variables. For any random variables defined on the new space  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$  taking values in any measurable space, the above equality still holds.*

Thus, we have the following result on the variational equation whose proof is reported in Appendix A. Recall that  $\xi_t = \mathcal{L}((X_t, q_t)|\mathcal{G}_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$  is defined in the proof of Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let Assumption 1 hold. Then, there exists a unique solution  $V = (V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to the following variational equation,  $V_0 = 0$ , and*

$$dV_t = \{\lambda_t V_t + \beta_t + \mathbb{E}'[\eta_t V_t' + \zeta_t]\}dt + \{\hat{\lambda}_t V_t + \hat{\beta}_t + \mathbb{E}'[\hat{\eta}_t V_t' + \hat{\zeta}_t]\}dW_t$$

$$+ \int_Z \{ \tilde{\lambda}_{t-}(z)V_{t-} + \tilde{\beta}_{t-}(z) + \mathbb{E}'[\tilde{\eta}_{t-}(z)V'_{t-} + \tilde{\zeta}_{t-}(z)] \} \tilde{N}(dt, dz). \quad (18)$$

Here,  $V' = (V'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a copy of  $V = (V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  on  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$ , and the coefficients are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_t &= \int_U \partial_x \tilde{b}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad \beta_t = \int_U \tilde{b}(X_t, \xi_t, u) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{b}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \eta_t &= \int_U \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{b}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad \zeta_t = \int_U \partial_q \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{b}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u) (v'_t - q'_t) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \hat{\lambda}_t &= \int_U \partial_x \tilde{\sigma}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times d}, \quad \hat{\beta}_t = \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_t, \xi_t, u) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \\ \hat{\eta}_t &= \int_U \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{\sigma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times d}, \quad \hat{\zeta}_t = \int_U \partial_q \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{\sigma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u) (v'_t - q'_t) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_t(z) &= \int_U \partial_x \tilde{\gamma}(X_t, \xi_t, u, z) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad \tilde{\beta}_t(z) = \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_t, \xi_t, u, z) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_t, \xi_t, u, z) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \tilde{\eta}_t(z) &= \int_U \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{\gamma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u, z) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad \tilde{\zeta}_t(z) = \int_U \partial_q \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{\gamma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u, z) (v'_t - q'_t) q_t(du) \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{X_t^\epsilon - X_t}{\epsilon} - V_t \right|^2 \right] = 0.$$

Here, we have used the notation  $Mz := (M_1 z, \dots, M_d z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  for any  $M = (M_1, \dots, M_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n \times d}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Remark 3.4.** In the variational equation (18), the coefficient processes  $(\zeta, \hat{\zeta}, \tilde{\zeta})$  admit the presentations:

$$\begin{cases} \zeta_t = \int_U \frac{\delta \tilde{b}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t)(X_t, X'_t, v'_t, u) q_t(du) - \int_U \frac{\delta \tilde{b}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t)(X_t, X'_T, q'_t, u) q_t(du), \\ \hat{\zeta}_t = \int_U \frac{\delta \tilde{\sigma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t)(X_t, X'_t, v'_t, u) q_t(du) - \int_U \frac{\delta \tilde{\sigma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t)(X_t, X'_T, q'_t, u) q_t(du), \\ \tilde{\zeta}_t(z) = \int_U \frac{\delta \tilde{\gamma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t)(X_t, X'_t, v'_t, u, z) q_t(du) - \int_U \frac{\delta \tilde{\gamma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t)(X_t, X'_T, q'_t, u, z) q_t(du), \end{cases}$$

which are consistent with  $\beta_t, \hat{\beta}_t, \tilde{\beta}_t$  according to Lemma 2.6.

We also need the following auxiliary result whose proof is delegated to Appendix A.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  be an optimal relaxed control that minimizes the cost functional  $\mathcal{J}$  in (13) over  $\mathcal{Q}$  and let  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be its resulting state process satisfying the dynamics (12). For any  $v \in \mathcal{Q}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot V_T + \int_0^T \int_U \partial_x \tilde{f}(X_t, \xi_t, u) \cdot V_t q_t(du) dt \right. \\ \left. + \int_0^T \left( \int_U \tilde{f}(X_t, \xi_t, u) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{f}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \right) dt \right. \\ \left. + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T, X'_T) \cdot V'_T + \int_0^T \int_U \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{f}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u) \cdot V'_t q_t(du) dt \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \int_0^T \int_U \partial_q \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{f}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u) (v'_t - q'_t) q_t(du) dt \right] \right\}. \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

Here, the process  $V = (V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is given in Lemma 3.3, and  $\mu_T = \mathcal{L}(X_T | \mathcal{G}_T)$  is the marginal law of  $\xi_T$ , and the copies  $(X', q', V')$  of  $(X, q, V)$  are constructed on  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ .

We will first prove the SMP in the relaxed control formulation, and then employ the above equivalence result in [Lemma 2.11](#) to establish the SMP for the problem in the strict control formulation without imposing the convexity assumption on the control space  $U$ .

### 3.2 Hamiltonian and first-order adjoint process

In this subsection, we introduce the so-called relaxed Hamiltonian and the first-order adjoint process. Let us first define the relaxed Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(x, q, \xi, p, P, K) &:= \int_U \tilde{b}(x, \xi, u)q(du) \cdot p + \text{tr} \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(x, \xi, u)q(du)P^\top \right) + \int_U \tilde{f}(x, \xi, u)q(du) \\ &\quad + \int_Z \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(x, \xi, u, z)q(du) \cdot K(z)\lambda(dz). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The term appeared in the second line of (20) is due to Poissonian common noise. Moreover, we define the relaxed  $\delta$ -Hamiltonian  $\delta\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{H}(x, q, \xi, x', q', p, P, K) &:= \int_U \frac{\delta\tilde{b}}{\delta\xi}(\xi)(x, x', q', u)q(du) \cdot p + \text{tr} \left( \int_U \frac{\delta\tilde{\sigma}}{\delta\xi}(\xi)(x, x', q', u)q(du)P^\top \right) \\ &\quad + \int_U \frac{\delta\tilde{f}}{\delta\xi}(\xi)(x, x', q', u)q(du) + \int_Z \int_U \frac{\delta\tilde{\gamma}}{\delta\xi}(\xi)(x, x', q', u, z)q(du) \cdot K(z)\lambda(dz). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Then, for any  $(x, q, \xi, x', q', p, P, K) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n)$ , it holds that

$$\delta\mathcal{H}(x, q, \xi, x', q', p, P, K) = \frac{\delta\mathcal{H}}{\delta\xi}(\xi)(x, q, x', q', p, P, K). \quad (22)$$

The adjoint process is defined as a (triplet)  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process  $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{P}, \tilde{K}) = (\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n)$  that satisfies the integrability condition

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\tilde{p}_t|^2 + \int_0^T |\tilde{P}_t|^2 dt + \int_0^T \int_Z |\tilde{K}_t|^2 \lambda(dz) dt \right] < \infty, \quad (23)$$

and the BSDE:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} d\tilde{p}_t &= - \left\{ \partial_x \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_{x'} \delta\mathcal{H}(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t) \right] \right\} dt \\ &\quad + \tilde{P}_t dW_t + \int_Z \tilde{K}_{t-} \tilde{N}(dt, dz) + dM_t, \\ \tilde{p}_T &= \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T, X'_T) \right]. \end{aligned} \right. \quad (24)$$

Here, recall that  $X'$  is a copy of the random variable  $X$  constructed on the probability space  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$  as before. The same fashion applies to the notations  $\tilde{p}'$ ,  $\tilde{P}'$  and  $\tilde{K}'$ . In addition,  $W = (W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion,  $\tilde{N}(dt, dz)$  is a compensated Poisson random measure and  $M = (M_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is an  $\mathbb{F}$ -martingale with  $M_0 = 0$  independent of  $(\mathbb{F}^W, \mathbb{G})$  and has zero covariance with  $W$  and  $N$ .

**Remark 3.6.** *It can be observed that the BSDE (24) is a linear BSDE. Hence, with the help of [Assumption 1](#), for any relaxed control  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  and the corresponding state process  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  satisfying the dynamics (12), the BSDE (24) always admits an  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted and  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n)$ -valued solution  $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{P}, \tilde{K}) = (\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  (c.f. [Hao \[26\]](#)).*

### 3.3 Necessary and sufficient conditions for optimal relaxed control

For the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , we recall the specific definition of its copy  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$  given in Section 3.1. We then define a unique probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  on  $(\tilde{\Omega} := \Omega \times \Omega', \tilde{\mathcal{F}} := \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}')$  via:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(A \times B) = \int_{A \times B} \mathbb{P}'(d\omega')\mathbb{P}(d\omega), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}, B \in \mathcal{F}'.$$

Recall that, for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\mathbb{P}' := Q_\omega$  is the r.c.p.d., which is a probability measure on  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$ . Denote by  $R$  the second marginal law of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ . Then, for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ ,

$$R(A) = \int_{\Omega \times A} \mathbb{P}'(d\omega')\mathbb{P}(d\omega) = \int_{\Omega \times A} Q_\omega(d\omega')\mathbb{P}(d\omega) = \int_{\Omega} Q_\omega(A)\mathbb{P}(d\omega) = \mathbb{P}(A). \quad (25)$$

We can thus write  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  in the disintegration form due to Radon-Nikodym theorem  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d\omega, d\omega') = Q'_{\omega'}(d\omega)R(d\omega')$  where  $Q'_{\omega'}(\cdot)$  is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  w.r.t.  $R$  given  $\omega'$ . Recall that  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}') = (\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  is Polish, and hence is countably determined, we can conclude that  $Q_\omega = Q'_{\omega'}$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. Then, we have the next result.

**Theorem 3.7** (Necessary Condition). *Let  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  be an optimal relaxed control attaining the minimum of the cost function  $J$  in (9) over  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the associated controlled state process satisfying the dynamics (12). Then, there exists an  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted solution  $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{P}, \tilde{K}) = (\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  to the BSDE (24). Furthermore, for the relaxed Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}$  defined by (20) and the relaxed  $\delta$ -Hamiltonian  $\delta\mathcal{H}$  defined by (21), we have that,  $dt \times d\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \delta\mathcal{H}(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t) \right] \\ & \leq \mathcal{H}(X_t, v, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \delta\mathcal{H}(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, v, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t) \right], \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{P}(U). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Here,  $X'_t, q'_t, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t$  with  $t \in [0, T]$  are the corresponding copies defined on the space  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{E}^R, \mathbb{E}^{Q_\omega}$  and  $\mathbb{E}^{Q_{\omega'}}$  represent expectation operators under probability measures  $R, Q_\omega$  and  $Q_{\omega'}$  introduced above, respectively (recall that  $\mathbb{E}$  is the expectation w.r.t.  $\mathbb{P}$  but here we use  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}$  to emphasize which probability measure we are taking expectations with respect to). Then, it follows from Fubini's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\tilde{p}_T \cdot V_T] &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) + \mathbb{E}^{Q_\omega} \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X'_T, X_T) \cdot V_T \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot V_T] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \mathbb{E}^{Q_\omega} \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T(\omega'), X_T(\omega)) \cdot V_T(\omega) \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot V_T] + \mathbb{E}^R \left[ \mathbb{E}^{Q_{\omega'}} \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T(\omega'), X_T(\omega)) \cdot V_T(\omega) \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot V_T] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \mathbb{E}^{Q_\omega} \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T(\omega), X_T(\omega')) \cdot V_T(\omega') \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot V_T] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T, X'_T) \cdot V'_T \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the process  $V = (V_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  satisfies (18) provided in Lemma 3.3. The fourth equality in the above display stems from the representation (25) and the fact  $Q_\omega = Q_{\omega'}$ , on  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and  $\mathbb{P} = R$  on  $\mathcal{F}$ . On the other hand, we have from Itô's formula that

$$\mathbb{E} [\tilde{p}_T \cdot V_T] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \{ \tilde{p}_t \cdot \{ \alpha_t V_t + \beta_t + \mathbb{E}'[\eta_t V'_t + \zeta_t] \} - \{ \partial_x \mathcal{H} + \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta\mathcal{H}] \} \cdot V_t \right]$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& + \operatorname{tr} \left[ \tilde{P}_t^\top (\hat{\alpha}_t V_t + \hat{\beta}_t + \mathbb{E}'[\hat{\eta}_t V_t' + \hat{\zeta}_t]) \right] \\
& + \int_Z \tilde{K}_{t-} \cdot \left\{ \tilde{\alpha}_{t-}(z) V_{t-} + \tilde{\beta}_{t-}(z) + \mathbb{E}'[\tilde{\eta}_{t-}(z) V_{t-}' + \tilde{\zeta}_{t-}(z)] \right\} \lambda(dz) \Big\} dt \Big].
\end{aligned}$$

By combining the above two equalities with (20) and (24), inserting them into (19) and recalling Remark 3.4, we obtain that, for all  $v \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \left\{ \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}'[\delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t')] \right\} dt \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \left\{ \mathcal{H}(X_t, v_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}'[\delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, v_t, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t')] \right\} dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The desired result then follows from the arbitrariness of  $v \in \mathcal{Q}$ .  $\square$

Before introducing our sufficient condition, let us follow Acciaio et al. [1] to give a definition of so-called  $L$ -convexity (note that here we are considering the joint law):

**Definition 3.8** ( $L$ -convexity). *A continuously differentiable function  $l : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to be  $L$ -convex, if for every  $(x_1, \xi_1), (x_2, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$ , it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
& l(x_2, \xi_2) - l(x_1, \xi_1) \\
& \geq \partial_x l(x_1, \xi_1) \cdot (x_2 - x_1) + \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P} [\partial_\mu l(x_1, \xi_1)(X_1, q_1) \cdot (X_2 - X_1) + \partial_\nu l(x_1, \xi_1)(X_2, q_2)(q_2 - q_1)],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $(X_1, q_1)$  and  $(X_2, q_2)$  are  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$ -valued r.v.s defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  such that their distributions coincide with  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$ , respectively.

**Remark 3.9.** *Note that there are several notions of “convexity”. For example, by McCann [38] and Villani [42], we have*

- (i) *A function  $l : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to be convex in the classical sense if for any  $(x_1, \xi_1), (x_2, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ , we have*

$$l(\theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)x_2, \theta \xi_1 + (1 - \theta)\xi_2) \leq \theta l(x_1, \xi_1) + (1 - \theta)l(x_2, \xi_2). \quad (27)$$

- (ii) *A function  $l : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is said to be convex in the displacement convex sense if for any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U)$ -valued random variables  $(X_1, q_1), (X_2, q_2)$  on some probability space and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& l(\theta x_1 + (1 - \theta)x_2, \mathcal{L}(\theta X_1 + (1 - \theta)X_2, \theta q_1 + (1 - \theta)q_2)) \\
& \leq \theta l(x_1, \mathcal{L}(X_1, q_1)) + (1 - \theta)l(x_2, \mathcal{L}(X_2, q_2)).
\end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The above two definitions do not require the  $L$ -differentiability of the mapping  $l$ . However, we choose to use the  $L$ -convexity in Definition 3.8 because it is most suitable in our setting. By using Proposition 5.79 in Carmona and Delarue [15], if  $l$  is  $L$ -differentiable, then  $L$ -convexity and displacement convexity are equivalent in the space of measures on Euclidean space.

**Theorem 3.10** (Sufficient Condition). *Let  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  be a relaxed control,  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the resulting controlled state process, and  $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{P}, \tilde{K}) = (\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the adjoint process satisfying BSDE (24). Assume that the Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $L$ -convex in  $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  and  $g$  is  $L$ -convex in  $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Then, this  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  is an optimal relaxed control provided the inequality (26) holds.*

*Proof.* For any  $v \in \mathcal{Q}$ , denote by  $X^v = (X_t^v)_{t \in [0, T]}$  the resulting controlled state process. By the convexity of  $g$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [g(X_T^v, \mu_T^v) - g(X_T, \mu_T)] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot (X_T^v - X_T^q) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T, X_T') \cdot (X_T^{v'} - X_T') \right] \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot (X_T^v - X_T) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T', X_T) \cdot (X_T^v - X_T) \right] \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} [\tilde{p}_T \cdot (X_T^v - X_T)]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô's formula to  $\tilde{p}_t \cdot (X_t^v - X_t^q)$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{p}_T \cdot (X_T^v - X_T)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \left[ \tilde{p}_t \cdot \left( \int_U \tilde{b}(X_t^v, \xi_t^v, u) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{b}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - (X_t^v - X_t) \cdot \left( \partial_x \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t')] \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \text{tr} \left( \tilde{P}_t^\top \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_t^v, \xi_t^v, u) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \right) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \tilde{K}_t \cdot \int_Z \left( \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_t^v, \xi_t^v, u, z) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_t, \xi_t, u, z) q_t(du) \right) \lambda(dz) \right] dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we recall  $\xi_t^v = \mathcal{L}((X_t^v, v_t) | \mathcal{G}_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J(v) - J(q) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \left( \int_U \tilde{f}(X_t^v, \xi_t^v, u) v_t(du) - \int_U \tilde{f}(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \right) dt + g(X_T^v, \mu_T^v) - g(X_T, \mu_T) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{H}(X_t^v, v_t, \xi_t^v, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) - \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \partial_x \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \cdot (X_t^v - X_t) - \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t')] \cdot (X_t^v - X_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{H}(X_t^v, v_t, \xi_t^v, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) - \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \partial_x \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \cdot (X_t^v - X_t) - \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, X_t', q_t', \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)] \cdot (X_t^v - X_t') \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $L$ -convex in  $(x, \xi)$  and is linear in  $q$ . Using the Clarke generalized gradient of  $\mathcal{H}$ , we then have from [Lemma 2.6](#) that

$$\begin{aligned} & J(v) - J(q) \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{H}(X_t^v, v_t, \xi_t^v, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) - \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \partial_x \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \cdot (X_t^v - X_t) - \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, X_t', q_t', \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)] \cdot (X_t^v - X_t') \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ \partial_x \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \cdot (X_t^v - X_t) - \partial_x \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \cdot (X_t^v - X_t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, X_t', q_t', \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)] \cdot (X_t^{v'} - X_t') \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, X_t', q_t', \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)] \cdot (X_t^{v'} - X_t') \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathcal{H}(X_t, v_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) - \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, v, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t') - \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t') \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{H}(X_t, v_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) - \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, v, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t') - \delta \mathcal{H}(X_t', q_t', \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}_t', \tilde{P}_t', \tilde{K}_t') \right] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from [\(26\)](#). As  $v \in \mathcal{Q}$  is arbitrary, we can finally conclude that  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  is an optimal relaxed control.  $\square$

### 3.4 Necessary and sufficient condition for optimal strict control

Define the Hamiltonian  $H : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  in the strict control formulation that

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, u, \rho, p, P, K) &:= b(x, \rho, u) \cdot p + \text{tr} \left( \sigma(x, \rho, u) P^\top \right) + f(x, \rho, u) \\ &\quad + \int_Z \gamma(x, \rho, u, z) \cdot K(z) \lambda(dz), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

and consider the strict  $\delta$ -Hamiltonian  $\delta H : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta H(x, u, \rho, x', u', p, P, K) &= \frac{\delta b}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, x', u', u) \cdot p + \text{tr} \left( \frac{\delta \sigma}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, x', u', u) P^\top \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta f}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, x', u', u) + \int_Z \frac{\delta \gamma}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, x', u', u, z) \cdot K(z) \lambda(dz). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

It then holds that  $\delta H(x, u, \rho, x', u', p, P, K) = \frac{\delta H}{\delta \rho}(\rho)(x, u, x', u', p, P, K)$ .

Consider the triplet  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  as an  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n)$ -valued  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted process that satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |p_t|^2 + \int_0^T |P_t|^2 dt + \int_0^T \int_Z |K_t|^2 \lambda(dz) dt \right] < \infty, \quad (31)$$

and solves the BSDE under the strict control that

$$\begin{cases} dp_t = - \left\{ \partial_x H(X_t, \alpha_t, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_{x'} \delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, \alpha_t, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t) \right] \right\} dt \\ \quad + P_t dW_t + \int_Z K_{t-} \tilde{N}(dt, dz) + dM_t, \\ p_T = \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X'_T, X_T) \right], \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

where  $\rho_t = \mathcal{L}((X_t, \alpha_t) | \mathcal{G}_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then, we call the above triplet  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  a solution to BSDE (32).

It is stressed that, when  $q = (\delta_{\alpha_t})_{t \in [0, T]} \in \delta(\mathcal{U})$  with  $\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$ , the dynamics in the relaxed control formulation is the same as the one in the strict control formulation, and hence the two state processes must be indistinguishable. Moreover, it holds that, for  $\tilde{P}$ -a.s.  $\tilde{\omega} = (\omega, \omega') \in \tilde{\Omega}$ ,  $\forall (x, x', p, P, K) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\begin{cases} H(x, \alpha_t, \rho_t, p, P, K) = \mathcal{H}(x, u, q_t, p, P, K), \\ \delta H(x, \alpha_t, \rho_t, x', \alpha'_t, p, P, K) = \delta \mathcal{H}(x, q_t, \xi_t, x', q'_t, p, P, K), \\ \partial_{x'} \delta H(x, \alpha_t, \rho_t, x', \alpha'_t, p, P, K) = \partial_{x'} \delta \mathcal{H}(x, q_t, \xi_t, x', q'_t, p, P, K). \end{cases}$$

Here, for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\alpha'_t$  and  $q'_t$  defined on the new space  $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$  are copies of  $\alpha_t$  and  $q_t$ , respectively. Therefore, by using the pathwise uniqueness of BSDE (32), the solution  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  to BSDE (32) is indistinguishable from the solution  $(\tilde{p}, \tilde{P}, \tilde{K}) = (\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  to BSDE (24).

**Remark 3.11.** *If we set  $\xi = \mathcal{L}(X, \delta_\alpha)$  when  $\mathcal{L}(X, \alpha) = \rho$  with  $(X, \alpha)$  being an  $\mathbb{R}^n \times U$ -valued random variable on some probability space, then  $\mathcal{P}(\xi) = \rho$  and for any  $(x, q, p, P, K) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n)$ , it holds that*

$$\mathcal{H}(x, q, \xi, p, P, K) = \int_U \tilde{H}(x, u, \xi, p, P, K) q(du) = \int_U H(x, u, \rho, p, P, K) q(du).$$

Here,  $\mathcal{H}$  is the relaxed Hamiltonian defined by (20) and  $\tilde{H}$  is the extension of  $H$  defined by (3).

Before stating our stochastic maximum principle under the strict control, we need the following auxiliary result whose proof is the similar to that of Lemma 16 in Bahlali [3].

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$ . Then,  $\alpha$  minimizes the objective functional (9) of the strict MFC problem over  $\mathcal{U}$  if and only if  $q = (\delta_{\alpha_t})_{t \in [0, T]}$  minimizes the objective functional (13) of the relaxed MFC problem over  $\delta(\mathcal{U})$ .*

Based on the above results, we have the following necessary condition for the existence of an optimal strict control.

**Theorem 3.13** (Necessary Condition for Strict Control). *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  be an optimal strict control minimizing the cost  $J$  in (9) over  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the corresponding state process under this strict control  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ . Consider the solution  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  of BSDE (32). Then, we have,  $dt \times d\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.*

$$\begin{aligned} & H(X_t, \alpha_t, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, \alpha_t, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)] \\ & \leq H(X_t, u, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, u, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)], \quad \forall u \in U, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

with  $\rho_t = \mathcal{L}((X_t, \alpha_t) | \mathcal{G}_t)$  with  $t \in [0, T]$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 2.11, Lemma 3.12 and the prescribed optimal condition stated that, one can conclude that  $q = (\delta_{\alpha_t})_{t \in [0, T]}$  minimizes the objective functional  $J$  defined by (13) over  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Hence, we have from Theorem 3.7 that,  $dt \times d\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta \mathcal{H}(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t)] \\ & \leq \mathcal{H}(X_t, v, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta \mathcal{H}(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, v, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t)], \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{P}(U). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\delta(U) = \{\delta_u; u \in U\} \subset \mathcal{P}(U)$ , it holds that,  $dt \times d\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta \mathcal{H}(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t)] \\ & \leq \mathcal{H}(X_t, v, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta \mathcal{H}(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, v, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t)], \quad \forall v \in \delta(U). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we arrive at,  $dt \times d\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} & H(X_t, \alpha_t, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, \alpha_t, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)] \\ & \leq H(X_t, u, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, u, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)], \quad \forall u \in U. \end{aligned}$$

which yields (33) as desired.  $\square$

The next result provides the sufficient condition for the strict control formulation:

**Theorem 3.14** (Sufficient Condition for Strict Control). *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ , and  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the corresponding state process under this strict control  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ , and  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the corresponding adjoint process satisfying (31)-(32). Assume that the extension of the Hamiltonian  $H$  in Remark 3.11, denoted by  $\tilde{H}$ , is  $L$ -convex in  $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  and  $g$  is  $L$ -convex in  $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Then, this  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  is an optimal strict control in the sense that it minimizes the cost functional (9) over  $\mathcal{U}$  provided the inequality (33) holds.*

*Proof.* In view of Remark 3.11 and the discussion above Remark 3.11, we deduce that, for any  $v \in \mathcal{P}(U)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(X_t, v, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta \mathcal{H}(X'_t, \delta_{\alpha'_t}, \xi_t, X_t, v, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t)] \\ & \geq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{ H(X_t, u, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta \mathcal{H}(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, u, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)] \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= H(X_t, \alpha_t, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, \alpha_t, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)] \\
&= \mathcal{H}(X_t, q_t, \xi_t, \tilde{p}_t, \tilde{P}_t, \tilde{K}_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, q'_t, \xi_t, X_t, q_t, \tilde{p}'_t, \tilde{P}'_t, \tilde{K}'_t)],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $q_t = \delta_{\alpha_t}$ ,  $\rho_t = \mathcal{L}((X_t, \alpha_t)|\mathcal{G}_t)$  and  $\xi_t = \mathcal{L}((X_t, \delta_{\alpha_t})|\mathcal{G}_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Thus, using [Theorem 3.10](#), we conclude that  $q = (q_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is an optimal relaxed control and  $\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$  is an optimal strict control.  $\square$

**Remark 3.15.** *When applying first order variation to prove the SMP, there is always a trade-off in choosing an appropriate control space  $U$ . When  $U$  is convex, such as in [Acciaio et al. \[1\]](#), one can directly derive the SMP for strict control. When  $U$  is nonconvex, a common method is to consider relaxed control by imposing compactness on  $U$  and make use of Chattering Lemma ([Lemma 2.9](#)) to derive the SMP, such as in [Bahali \[3\]](#). Here we adapt the latter methodology.*

**Remark 3.16.** *It should be noted that we do not require the convexity of the Hamiltonian w.r.t. the control variable, the  $L$ -differentiability w.r.t. the second marginal law (the law of control) and the control space  $U$  which is restricted to be compact in our framework is not necessary to be convex. Compared with [Acciaio et al. \[1\]](#), they work in a framework without common noise and can not remove the three assumptions we stated above, we strongly alleviate the condition there and we arrive at a more powerful result—the equivalence of minimizing the Hamiltonian and minimizing the original problem which can not be deduced in [Acciaio et al. \[1\]](#). This is due to the use of relaxed formulation we introduced before.*

**Remark 3.17.** *However, one can also follow the method in [Acciaio et al. \[1\]](#) to directly prove the SMP for strict control by assuming the convexity of the policy space  $U$  (hence we can remove the compactness of  $U$ ). But, in the sufficient part, the convex condition on the Hamiltonian should be enhanced to match that of [Acciaio et al. \[1\]](#). Hence, the SMP will always hold when either convexity or compactness is fulfilled by the policy space  $U$ .*

### 3.5 Poissonian common noise vs McKean-Vlasov jump-diffusion model

To better elaborate how the Poissonian common noise affects our SMP and the associated adjoint equation, we next apply our previous SMP to the extended MFC problem in the jump-diffusion model without common noise, where the jump term only stands for idiosyncratic noise. The McKean-Vlasov jump-diffusion controlled state process is given by

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = b(X_t, \mathcal{L}(X_t, \alpha_t), \alpha_t)dt + \sigma(X_t, \mathcal{L}(X_t, \alpha_t), \alpha_t)dW_t \\ \quad + \int_Z \gamma(X_{t-}, \mathcal{L}(X_{t-}, \alpha_{t-}), \alpha_{t-}, z)\tilde{N}(dt, dz), \\ \mathcal{L}(X_0) = \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n), \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

where  $\tilde{N}(dz, dt) := N(dz, dt) - \lambda(dz)dt$  is the compensated Poisson random measure and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  is an admissible strict control. Now, the Brownian motion and Poisson random measure are both idiosyncratic noises and there is no common noise. Hence, the mean field term appeared in the controlled dynamics (34) is merely joint law of state and control instead of their conditional law. We aim to minimize the following cost functional over  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ :

$$J(\alpha) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T f(X_t, \mathcal{L}(X_t, \alpha_t), \alpha_t)dt + g(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T)) \right] \rightarrow \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}}. \quad (35)$$

It is not difficult to show that problem (35)-(34) is well-defined under [Assumption 1](#). We then replace the probability measure on the copy measurable space with  $\mathbb{P}$ . In other words, we use  $\mathbb{P}' = \mathbb{P}$  as the probability measure on the copy measurable space instead of  $\mathbb{P}' = Q_\omega$  and other

notations follow as before. Then, we follow closely the above derivation, we can derive a similar result for this jump diffusion case. Now the adjoint BSDE can be verified to be

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dp_t = - \left\{ \partial_x H(X_t, \alpha_t, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}'[\partial_{x'} \delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, \alpha_t, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)] \right\} dt \\ \quad + P_t dW_t + \int_Z K_{t-} \tilde{N}(dt, dz) + dM_t, \\ p_T = \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X'_T, X_T) \right], \end{array} \right. \quad (36)$$

where  $\rho_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t, \alpha_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ , and the other notations are the same as before. Similarly as before, we have

**Corollary 3.18** (Necessary Condition). *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  be an optimal strict control minimizing the cost  $J$  in (35) over  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the state process (34) under this  $\alpha$ . Then, there exists an  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted and  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R}^n)$ -valued solution  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  to BSDE (36). Furthermore, we have,  $dt \times d\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.*

$$\begin{aligned} & H(X_t, \alpha_t, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, \alpha_t, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)] \\ & \leq H(X_t, u, \rho_t, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' [\delta H(X'_t, \alpha'_t, \rho_t, X_t, u, p'_t, P'_t, K'_t)], \quad \forall u \in U \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

with  $\rho_t = \mathcal{L}(X_t, \alpha_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ .

On the other hand, we also have that

**Corollary 3.19** (Sufficient Condition). *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  be a strict control,  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the corresponding controlled state process in (34) under  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$ , and  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the corresponding adjoint process satisfying (31) and (36). If the extension of the Hamiltonian  $H$ , denoted by  $\tilde{H}$ , is  $L$ -convex in  $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  and  $g$  is  $L$ -convex in  $(x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Then,  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  is an optimal strict control if the equality (37) holds.*

Although it looks like that the adjoint BSDE (36) of the jump diffusion resembles (32), the solutions are in fact fundamentally different, primarily due to the different interpretations of  $\mathbb{E}'$  in (32) and (36), see Theorem 4.15 and Section 5 for more details.

## 4 Connection to the HJB Equation

This section is devoted to deriving the HJB equation for our extended MFC problem with strict open-loop controls and relate the PDE to our BSDE under the previous SMP. To derive the HJB equation, we generalize the method proposed in Motte and Pham [40] in a discrete-time setting to our continuous-time setting with Poissonian common noise. Firstly, we shall propose a new lifted control problem whose state process related to the Fokker-Planck equation of the original problem. Thus, we can heuristically establish the HJB equation from the new problem. Secondly, by imposing some mild assumptions, we show that, given a smooth solution to the HJB equation, this candidate coincides with the value function of the original extended MFC problem, which can be almost viewed as a verification theorem. As a result, we prove the equivalence between the value functions of these two control problems, and the two value functions should solve the HJB equation we derived in the last step. The conditional law invariance can be obtained as a byproduct. Thirdly, we will relate the HJB equation to the BSDE derived from our previous stochastic maximum principle.

Recall the original MFC problem as follows. The state process is given by, for  $s \in (t, T]$ ,

$$dX_s = b(X_s, \mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s)|\mathcal{G}_s), \alpha_s)ds + \sigma(X_s, \mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s)|\mathcal{G}_s), \alpha_s)dW_s$$

$$+ \int_Z \gamma(X_{s-}, \mathcal{L}((X_{s-}, \alpha_{s-} | \mathcal{G}_{s-}), \alpha_{s-}, z) \tilde{N}(ds, dz), \quad X_t = \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (38)$$

Note that here in this section we refer  $\xi$  to a square-integrable random variable in  $L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P}), \mathbb{R}^n)$  instead of an element of  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}(U))$  in last section. The cost functional is given by, for  $(t, \xi, \alpha) \in [0, T] \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{U}$ ,

$$J(t, \xi; \alpha) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T f(X_s, \mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s) | \mathcal{G}_s), \alpha_s) ds + g(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T | \mathcal{G}_T)) \right]. \quad (39)$$

We aim to minimize the above cost functional  $J$ , and the value function is given by

$$J^*(t, \xi) := \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} J(t, \xi; \alpha). \quad (40)$$

#### 4.1 Lifted control problem

Before formulating the lifted control problem, we first make the following preparations. Denote by  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  the set of transition kernels on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times U$ . That is, an element of  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a measurable mapping  $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathcal{P}(U)$  in the sense that  $x \rightarrow \pi(x)(A)$  is measurable for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(U)$ , where  $\mathcal{B}(U)$  is the Borel sigma algebra of  $U$ .

We denote by  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}$  the set of  $\mathcal{G}$ -adapted process valued in  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and introduce functions  $\hat{b} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\hat{\sigma} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  and  $\hat{\gamma} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  by

$$\begin{cases} \hat{b}(x, \mu, \hat{u}) = \int_U b(x, \mu \cdot \hat{u}, u) \hat{u}(x, du), \\ \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu, \hat{u}) = \int_U \sigma \sigma^\top(x, \mu \cdot \hat{u}, u) \hat{u}(x, du), \\ \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu, \hat{u}, z) = \int_U \gamma(x, \mu \cdot \hat{u}, u, z) \hat{u}(x, du). \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

For any  $(\mu, \hat{u}, z) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times Z$ , let us consider the following linear mapping  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z} : C_b(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$  defined by

$$I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}(g)(\cdot) := \int_U g(\cdot + \gamma(\cdot, \mu \cdot \hat{u}, u, z)) \hat{u}(\cdot, du), \quad \forall g \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (42)$$

It can be easily verified that  $\|I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}\| = 1$  for all  $\hat{u} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Define  $\langle g, \mu \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(x) \mu(dx)$  for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Denote by  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z, *} : C_b^*(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto C_b^*(\mathbb{R}^n)$  the adjoint operator of the mapping  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}$  with  $C_b^*(\mathbb{R}^n)$  being the dual space of  $C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . By virtue of Riesz Representation Theorem, one can identify any element in  $C_b^*(\mathbb{R}^n)$  as a signed Radon measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by noting that  $C_0(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

We claim that  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z, *}$  maps each  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  into  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  for any  $\hat{u} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . In fact, it holds that  $\langle I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}(g), \nu \rangle = \langle g, I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z, *} \nu \rangle$  for all  $g \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . As a result,  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z, *} \nu$  is a (positive) measure. By considering  $g \equiv 1$ , it is then indeed a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus, it remains to show that  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z, *} \nu$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  whenever  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . However, this can be easily verified by considering  $g_n(x) = |x|^2 \wedge n$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , using the linear growth of  $\gamma$  with respect to  $x$  and then letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For this adjoint operator, we have the next important observation:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $(X, \alpha)$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^n \times U$ -valued random variable defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Set  $\rho = \mathcal{L}((X, \alpha) | \mathcal{G})$ ,  $\mu = \mathcal{L}(X | \mathcal{G})$  and  $\hat{\alpha}(x)(du) = \mathcal{L}(\alpha | \mathcal{G}, X = x)(du)$ . Then, it holds that,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.*

$$I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *} \mu = \mathcal{L}(X + \gamma(X, \rho, \alpha, z) | \mathcal{G}). \quad (43)$$

Let us define  $h^{\rho, u, z}(x) := x + \gamma(x, \rho, u, z)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *}\mu = \mathcal{L}(h^{\rho, \alpha, z}(X)|\mathcal{G})$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. Here  $I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *}\mu(\omega)$  should be interpreted as  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}\mu(\omega)|_{\hat{u}=\hat{\alpha}(\omega)}$  for any  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Thus the adjoint operator  $I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *}$  can be identified as a generalized measure shift.

*Proof.* For any  $\phi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , note that,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s..

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi, I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *}\mu \rangle &= \langle I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z}(\phi), \mu \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_U \phi(x + \gamma(x, \rho, u, z)) \hat{\alpha}(x, du) \mu(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{E}[\phi(x + \gamma(x, \rho, \alpha, z)) | \mathcal{G}, X = x] \mu(dx) = \mathbb{E}[\phi(X + \gamma(X, \rho, \alpha, z)) | \mathcal{G}]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the desired result follows from the arbitrariness of  $\phi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .  $\square$

For any  $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , applying Itô's formula to  $\phi(X_s)$  from  $t$  to  $s \in [t, T]$ , and taking the conditional expectation on  $\mathcal{G}_s$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\phi(X_s) | \mathcal{G}_s] - \mathbb{E}[\phi(X_t) | \mathcal{G}_t] \\ &= \int_t^s \mathbb{E}[(b(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \alpha_r) \partial_x \phi(X_r) - \langle \gamma(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \alpha_r, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x \phi(X_r) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \sigma \sigma^\top(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \alpha_r) \partial_{xx} \phi(X_r) \right)] | \mathcal{G}_r] dr \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_Z \mathbb{E}[(\phi(X_{r-} + \gamma(X_{r-}, \mathcal{L}((X_{r-}, \alpha_{r-}) | \mathcal{G}_{r-}), \alpha_{r-}, z)) - \phi(X_{r-})) | \mathcal{G}_{r-}] N(dr, dz). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Observing that R.H.S. of (44) is expressed in terms of  $\mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r)$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(b(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \alpha_r) \partial_x \phi(X_r) - \langle \gamma(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x \phi(X_r) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \sigma \sigma^\top(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \alpha_r) \partial_{xx} \phi(X_r) \right)] | \mathcal{G}_r] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} \left\{ (b(x, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), u) - \langle \gamma(x, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), u, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x \phi(x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \sigma \sigma^\top(x, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), u) \partial_{xx} \phi(x) \right] \right\} \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r)(dx, du), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(\phi(X_{r-} + \gamma(X_{r-}, \mathcal{L}((X_{r-}, \alpha_{r-}) | \mathcal{G}_{r-}), \alpha_{r-}, z)) - \phi(X_{r-})) | \mathcal{G}_{r-}] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} (\phi(x + \gamma(x, \mathcal{L}((X_{r-}, \alpha_{r-}) | \mathcal{G}_{r-}), u, z)) - \phi(x)) \mathcal{L}((X_{r-}, \alpha_{r-}) | \mathcal{G}_{r-})(dx, du), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall  $\langle \gamma(x, \mu_r \cdot \hat{\alpha}_r, u, \cdot), \lambda \rangle = \int_Z \gamma(x, \mu_r \cdot \hat{\alpha}_r, u, \cdot) \lambda(dz)$ . This motivates us to consider the following relaxed control associated with the open-loop control  $\alpha = (\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$  that, for  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$\hat{\alpha}_s(x)(du) := \mathcal{L}(\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s, X_s = x)(du), \quad (45)$$

which is  $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$ -adapted process taking values in  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . For  $s \in [t, T]$ , let  $\mu_s$  be the regular conditional distribution of  $X_s$  given  $\mathcal{G}_s$ . It results from the Bayes' formula that

$$\mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s) | \mathcal{G}_s)(dx, du) = \mu_s(dx) \cdot \hat{\alpha}_s(x)(du). \quad (46)$$

We then have the next auxiliary result.



**Lemma 4.2.** Fix  $t \in [0, T]$ , for any  $s \in [t, T]$ ,  $\mu_s$  satisfies the following (Fokker-Planck) SPDE (in the sense of distributions):

$$d\mu_s = A_0^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_s ds + \int_Z A_1^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_{s-} N(ds, dz), \quad \mu_t = \mathcal{L}(\xi | \mathcal{G}_t). \quad (47)$$

Here,  $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_s)_{s \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$ ,  $\hat{\alpha}_s(\cdot) = \mathcal{L}(\alpha_s | X_s = \cdot, \mathcal{G}_s) \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}$ , and  $A_0^{\hat{\alpha}}$  and  $A_1^{\hat{\alpha}}$  are operators defined by

$$\begin{cases} A_0^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_s := -\partial_x \left( \left( \hat{b}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \cdot), \lambda \rangle \right) \mu_s \right) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) \mu_s \right), \\ A_1^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_s := I^{\mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, z, *} \mu_s - \mu_s. \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

*Proof.* In view of (41), we have that, for  $r \in [t, s]$  and  $\phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( b(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \alpha_r) \partial_x \phi(X_r) - \langle \gamma(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \cdot), \lambda \rangle \partial_x \phi(X_r) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \sigma \sigma^\top(X_r, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), \alpha_r) \partial_{xx} \phi(X_r) \right] \right) \Big| \mathcal{G}_r \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} \left\{ \left( b(x, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), u) - \langle \gamma(x, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), u, \cdot), \lambda \rangle \right) \partial_x \phi(x) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \sigma \sigma^\top(x, \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r), u) \partial_{xx} \phi(x) \right] \right\} \mathcal{L}((X_r, \alpha_r) | \mathcal{G}_r)(dx, du) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \left( \hat{b}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \cdot), \lambda \rangle \right) \partial_x \phi(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) \partial_{xx} \phi(x) \right] \right\} \mu_r(dx) \\ &= \langle \phi, A_0^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_r \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \phi(X_{s-} + \gamma(X_{r-}, \mathcal{L}((X_{r-}, \alpha_{r-}) | \mathcal{G}_{r-}), \alpha_{r-}, z)) - \phi(X_{r-}) \right) \Big| \mathcal{G}_{r-} \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} \left( \phi(x + \gamma(x, \mathcal{L}((X_{r-}, \alpha_{r-}) | \mathcal{G}_{r-}), u, z)) - \phi(x) \right) \mathcal{L}((X_{r-}, \alpha_{r-}) | \mathcal{G}_{r-})(dx, du) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( I^{\mu_{r-}, \hat{\alpha}_{r-}, z, *}(\phi)(x) - \phi(x) \right) \mu_{r-}(dx) = \langle \phi, I^{\mu_{r-}, \hat{\alpha}_{r-}, z, *} \mu_{r-} - \mu_{r-} \rangle = \langle \phi, A_1^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_{r-} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The desired result readily follows.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** By virtue of Lemma 4.2, we highlight that the measure  $\mu_s$  has jumps caused by the Poissonian common noise, which differs substantially from the case of jump diffusion model in which the measure  $\mu_s$  is continuous in time  $s$  (see the discussion in Burzoni et al. [13] and Guo et al. [23]). Moreover, from Lemma 4.2, we can observe that the state  $X_s$  and the conditional law  $\mu_s$  have exactly the same jumps.

We next give an alternative representation of the objective functional in (39). By the law of iterated conditional expectation, for  $(t, \xi, \alpha) = [0, T] \times L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{U}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} J(t, \xi; \alpha) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T f(X_s, \mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s) | \mathcal{G}_s), \alpha_s) ds + g(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T | \mathcal{G}_T)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T f(X_s, \mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s) | \mathcal{G}_s), \alpha_s) ds + g(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T | \mathcal{G}_T)) \Big| \mathcal{G}_T \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \mathbb{E} [f(X_s, \mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s) | \mathcal{G}_s), \alpha_s) | \mathcal{G}_s] ds + \mathbb{E} [g(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T | \mathcal{G}_T)) | \mathcal{G}_T] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \hat{f}(\mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) ds + \hat{g}(\mu_T) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where we define

$$\hat{f}(\mu, \hat{\alpha}) := \int_{\mathbb{R} \times U} f(x, \mu \cdot \hat{\alpha}, u) (\mu \cdot \hat{\alpha})(dx, du), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{g}(\mu) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(x) \mu(dx). \quad (50)$$

From the above argument, we shall consider a lifted stochastic control problem described by (51)-(52) below with the new state space  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the new control space  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the transition dynamics (52) and running cost function (50). In general, the new control space  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  will cause some measurability issues (see Motte and Pham [40]). This, however, does not affect the heuristic derivation of the HJB equation. Therefore, we do not take into account the measurability issue for the moment.

Recall that  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$  is the set of  $\mathbb{G}$ -adapted process valued in  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Let us consider the lifted stochastic control problem whose value function is defined by

$$\tilde{J}(t, \mu; \hat{\alpha}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \hat{f}(\mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) ds + \hat{g}(\mu_T) \right], \quad \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu) = \inf_{\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}} \tilde{J}(t, \mu; \hat{\alpha}), \quad (51)$$

where the controlled dynamics is given by, for all  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$d\mu_s = A_0^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_s ds + \int_Z A_1^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_{s-} N(ds, dz), \quad \mu_t = \mu. \quad (52)$$

**Remark 4.4.** *The discussion in last subsection shows that we can construct a lifted problem from an original problem. However, we cannot recover an original problem from the lifted one.*

## 4.2 Derivation of the HJB equation

Let us introduce the space  $C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$  as the set of mapping  $J : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\partial_t J(t, \mu)$ ,  $\partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x)$  and  $\partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x)$  are jointly continuous, where  $\partial_\mu J$  stands for the  $L$ -derivative of the mapping  $J$ . We first provide below the Itô's rule to be used in deriving the HJB equation, whose proof is reported in Appendix A.

**Lemma 4.5** (Itô's formula). *Suppose that the measure-valued process  $\mu = (\mu_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$  satisfies the dynamics (47) and assume that  $J \in C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ . Then, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} dJ(s, \mu_s) &= \left[ \partial_s J(s, \mu_s) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( (\hat{b}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \cdot \partial_\mu J(s, \mu_s)(x) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(s, \mu_s)(x)) \right) \mu_s(dx) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_Z \left( J(s, I^{\mu_{s-}, \hat{\alpha}_{s-}, z, *}, \mu_{s-}) - J(s, \mu_{s-}) \right) N(ds, dz). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 4.6.** *It follows from Lemma 4.1 that, when the control  $\hat{\alpha}$  can be related to an original control  $\alpha$  as in (45), the jump term can be rewritten as a measure shift form:*

$$\begin{aligned} dJ(s, \mu_s) &= \left[ \partial_s J(s, \mu_s) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( (\hat{b}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \cdot \partial_\mu J(s, \mu_s)(x) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(s, \mu_s)(x)) \right) \mu_s(dx) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_Z \left( J(s, \mathcal{L}(h^{\mu_{s-}, \hat{\alpha}_{s-}, \alpha_{s-}, z}(X_{s-}) | \mathcal{G}_{s-})) - J(s, \mathcal{L}(X_{s-} | \mathcal{G}_{s-})) \right) N(ds, dz), \end{aligned}$$

where  $h^{\rho, u, z}(\cdot)$  is defined in Lemma 4.1.

It is easy to verify that  $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  satisfies the flow property whenever (47) has a unique solution. We assume that the following dynamic programming principle (DPP) for the value function  $\tilde{J}^*$  holds in order to heuristically derive the HJB equation that, for  $h \geq 0$ ,

$$\tilde{J}^*(t, \mu) = \inf_{\hat{\alpha} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^{t+h} \hat{f}(\mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) ds + \tilde{J}^*(t+h, \mu_{t+h}) \right]. \quad (53)$$

Suppose that  $\tilde{J}^*$  has sufficient regularity. Then, for any  $\hat{\alpha} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}$ , from Lemma 4.5, the DPP (53) and Lemma 4.2, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^{t+h} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{J}^*}{\partial s}(s, \mu_s) + \hat{f}(\mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) + (\hat{b}(X_s, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(X_s, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \cdot \partial_\mu \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_s)(X_s) \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(X_s, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) \partial_x \partial_\mu \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_s)(X_s)) \right) ds + \int_t^{t+h} \int_Z \left( \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_{s-} + A_1^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_{s-}) - \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_{s-}) \right) N(ds, dz) \middle| \mathcal{G}_T \right] \right] \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^{t+h} \frac{\partial \tilde{J}^*}{\partial s}(s, \mu_s) ds + \int_t^{t+h} \hat{f}(\mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) ds + \int_t^{t+h} \left( (\hat{b}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \cdot \partial_\mu \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_s)(x) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu_s, \hat{\alpha}_s) \partial_x \partial_\mu \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_s)(x) \right) \right) \mu_s(dx) ds + \int_t^{t+h} \int_Z \left( \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_{s-} + A_1^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_{s-}) - \tilde{J}^*(s, \mu_{s-}) \right) N(ds, dz) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of  $\hat{\alpha} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}$ , we arrive at the following dynamic programming equation satisfied by the value function  $\tilde{J}^*$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu) + \inf_{\hat{\alpha} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( \hat{f}(\mu, \hat{\alpha}) + (\hat{b}(x, \mu, \hat{\alpha}) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu, \hat{\alpha}, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \cdot \partial_\mu \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu)(x) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu, \hat{\alpha}) \partial_x \partial_\mu \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu)(x) \right) \right) \mu(dx) + \int_Z \left( \tilde{J}^*(t, I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *}\mu) - \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu) \right) \lambda(dz) \right] = 0, \\ \tilde{J}^*(T, \mu) = \hat{g}(\mu), \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where  $\hat{b}$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}$ ,  $\hat{\gamma}$  and  $\hat{f}$  are given in (41) and (50), respectively.

It is easy to see from Remark 4.4 that  $\tilde{J}^*(t, \mu) \leq J^*(t, \xi)$  with  $\mathcal{L}(\xi | \mathcal{G}_t) = \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  which is deterministic. We are going to show that the converse inequality holds. Similar to the result in Motte and Pham [40], we provide several alternative forms of the HJB equation (54).

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let us define the following operator on  $C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$  that, for any  $J \in C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}J(t, \mu) := \inf_{\hat{\alpha} \in \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R})} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[ \hat{f}(\mu, \hat{\alpha}) + (\hat{b}(x, \mu, \hat{\alpha}) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu, \hat{\alpha}, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(x, \mu, \hat{\alpha}) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x) \right) \right] \mu(dx) + \int_Z \left[ J(t, I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *}\mu) - J(t, \mu) \right] \lambda(dz) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any  $J \in C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ , it holds that

$$\mathcal{T}J(t, \mu) = \mathbb{T}J(t, \mu) = \mathbb{T}J(t, \mu), \quad \forall (t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Here, the operators  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  are defined respectively by, for  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}J(t, \mu) := \inf_{\alpha \in L(\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]; U)} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ f(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha(\xi, I)), \alpha(\xi, I)) + (b(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha(\xi, I)), \alpha(\xi, I)) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \langle \gamma(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha(\xi, I), \alpha(\xi, I), \cdot), \lambda) \rangle) \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(\xi) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \sigma \sigma^\top(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha(\xi, I)), \alpha(\xi, I)) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(\xi) \right) \right] \right. \\ \left. + \int_Z \left( J(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi + \gamma(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha(\xi, I), \alpha(\xi, I), z)))) - J(t, \mu) \right) \lambda(dz) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}J(t, \mu) := & \inf_{\alpha \in L(\Omega, U)} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ f(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha), \alpha) + (b(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha), \alpha) - \langle \gamma(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha), \alpha, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(\xi) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \sigma \sigma^\top (\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha), \alpha) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(\xi) \right) \right] + \int_Z (J(t, \mathcal{L}(\xi + \gamma(\xi, \mathcal{L}(\xi, \alpha), \alpha, z))) - J(t, \mu)) \lambda(dz) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the random variable  $(\xi, I) \sim \mu \times \mathbb{U}(0, 1)$ , we denote by  $L(\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]; U)$  the set of measurable functions from  $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$  to  $U$ , and  $L(\Omega, U)$  is denoted as the set of all measurable random variables valued in  $U$ .

**Remark 4.8.** It is straightforward to verify that the operator  $\mathbb{T}$  also admits following equivalent form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}J(t, \mu) = & \inf_{\substack{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \\ \rho_1 = \mu}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} \left( f(x, \rho, u) + (b(x, \rho, u) - \langle \gamma(x, \rho, u, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \sigma \sigma^\top (x, \rho, u) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x) \right) \right) \rho(dx, du) + \int_Z \left( J(t, I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *}\mu) - J(t, \mu) \right) \lambda(dz), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  stands for the first marginal of  $\rho$  and  $\hat{\alpha}$  is the regular conditional distribution of the second variable given the first variable (or more precisely, it is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\rho$  w.r.t.  $\mu$  when  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is given).

In the sequel, we will impose the next assumption:

**Assumption 2** (Regularity). *There exists a solution  $\hat{J} \in C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$  to the HJB equation  $\partial_t J(t, \mu) + \mathcal{T}J(t, \mu) = 0$  with  $J(T, \mu) = \hat{g}(\mu)$ .*

When the dynamic programming principle (DPP) for the lifted control problem holds and the new value function  $\tilde{J}^*$  is smooth in the sense that  $\tilde{J}^* \in C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ , **Assumption 2** is automatically fulfilled. Then, under **Assumption 2**, by applying Itô's rule to  $\hat{J}(t, \mu_t)$  for any  $\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}$ , one can easily conclude that

$$\hat{J}(t, \mu) \leq \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu), \quad \forall (t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (55)$$

To show the equivalence, it is enough to verify that  $J^*(t, \mu) \leq \hat{J}(t, \mu)$  for all  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Thus, we will prove that  $\hat{J} = \tilde{J}^* = J^*$ , and both  $J^*, \tilde{J}^*$  solve the same HJB equation in (54).

We call that  $\pi = (\pi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a feedback control if there exists some measurable mapping  $\pi : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $\pi_t = \pi(t, \mu_t)$ . There may be some confusion between the control process  $\pi = (\pi_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and merely the measurable mapping  $\pi : [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \mapsto \hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , but readers can easily tell apart when we use this notation. Then, we define that, for all  $J \in C^{1;1,1}([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^\pi J(t, \mu) := & \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[ \hat{f}(\mu, \pi(t, \mu)) + (\hat{b}(x, \mu, \pi(t, \mu)) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(x, \mu, \pi(t, \mu), \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top (x, \mu, \pi(t, \mu)) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(x) \right) \right] \mu(dx) + \int_Z \left[ J(t, I^{\mu, \pi(t, \mu), z, *}\mu) - J(t, \mu) \right] \lambda(dz). \end{aligned}$$

Recall the objective functional  $\tilde{J}(t, \mu; \hat{\alpha})$  defined by (51). Introduce  $\tilde{J}^\pi(t, \mu) = \tilde{J}(t, \mu; \pi)$ , and it then holds that

$$\partial_t \tilde{J}^\pi(t, \mu) + \mathcal{T}^\pi \tilde{J}^\pi(t, \mu) = 0, \quad \tilde{J}^\pi(T, \mu) = \hat{g}(\mu).$$

We follow Motte and Pham [40] to define the lifted randomized control.

**Definition 4.9** (Lifted Randomized Feedback Policy). *A policy  $\pi \in L([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n); \hat{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbb{R}^n))$  is called a lifted randomized feedback policy if there exists a measurable mapping  $a \in L([0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathbb{R}^n \times [0, 1]; U)$ , called a randomized feedback policy, such that  $a(t, \mu, \xi, I) \sim \pi(t, \mu)$ , for all  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $(\xi, I) \sim \mu \times U(0, 1)$ .*

The randomized feedback policy  $a(t, \mu, \xi, I)$  is termed as the action in reinforcement learning. The (lifted) randomized feedback policy is a bridge to link controls of the original extended MFC problem with those of the lifted control problem. We also make the following assumption:

**Assumption 3** (Measurability). *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a randomized feedback policy  $a^\epsilon$  such that the lifted randomized feedback policy  $\pi_\epsilon(t, \mu)(\cdot) = \mathcal{L}(a^\epsilon(t, \mu, \cdot, I))$  is an  $\epsilon/T$ -optimal control of  $\hat{J}$  in the sense that  $\mathcal{T}^{\pi_\epsilon} \hat{J}(t, \mu) < \mathcal{T} \hat{J}(t, \mu) + \epsilon/T$  for all  $(t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $I \sim U(0, 1)$ .*

In the case of LQ mean-field control, it is easy to verify that both [Assumption 2](#) and [Assumption 3](#) above are satisfied (c.f. [Section 5](#)). Then, as one of the main results of this section, the next result holds.

**Theorem 4.10.** *Fix  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Assume that there is an  $\epsilon/T$ -optimal feedback control  $\pi_\epsilon$  for  $\hat{J}$  in the sense that*

$$\mathcal{T}^{\pi_\epsilon} \hat{J}(t, \mu) < \mathcal{T} \hat{J}(t, \mu) + \epsilon/T, \quad \forall (t, \mu) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

*Then,  $\pi_\epsilon$  is also  $\epsilon$ -optimal for  $\tilde{J}$ . Moreover, let [Assumption 3](#) hold true. Then,  $\alpha_t^\epsilon = a^\epsilon(t, \mu_t, X_t, I_t)$  with  $t \in [0, T]$  is an  $\epsilon$ -optimal control for  $J$  (here the state process  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is controlled by the (feedback) control  $\alpha^\epsilon$ ), and thus  $J^*(t, \xi) \leq \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu) - \epsilon$  with  $\mu = \mathcal{L}(\xi | \mathcal{G}_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Here,  $(I_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a family of independent r.v.s which have the common law  $U(0, 1)$  and are independent of state process  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , where the existence of independent  $(I_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is guaranteed by Fubini extension (c.f. [\[45\]](#)).*

*Proof.* For the first assertion, let  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $(\mu_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$  satisfies the controlled dynamics [\(52\)](#) with  $\mu_t = \mu$  under the control  $\pi_\epsilon$ . Then, it follows from Itô's rule that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{J}(T, \mu_T) - \hat{J}(t, \mu) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \left( \partial_s \hat{J}(s, \mu_s) + \mathcal{T}^{\pi_\epsilon} \hat{J}(s, \mu_s) - \hat{f}(s, \mu_s, \pi_\epsilon(s, \mu_s)) \right) ds \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \left( \partial_s \hat{J}(s, \mu_s) + \mathcal{T} \hat{J}(s, \mu_s) \right) ds + \int_t^T \left( \mathcal{T}^{\pi_\epsilon} \hat{J}(s, \mu_s) - \mathcal{T} \hat{J}(s, \mu_s) \right) ds - \int_t^T \hat{f}(s, \mu_s, \pi_\epsilon(s, \mu_s)) ds \right] \\ &< \epsilon + \mathbb{E} \left[ \tilde{J}^{\pi_\epsilon}(T, \mu_T) \right] - \tilde{J}^{\pi_\epsilon}(t, \mu), \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where in the last inequality we have exploited the fact that

$$\tilde{J}^{\pi_\epsilon}(t, \mu) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \hat{f}(s, \mu_s, \pi_\epsilon(s, \mu_s)) ds + \hat{g}(\mu_T) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \hat{f}(s, \mu_s, \pi_\epsilon(s, \mu_s)) ds + \tilde{J}^{\pi_\epsilon}(T, \mu_T) \right].$$

By noting  $J^{\pi_\epsilon}(T, \mu_T) = \hat{g}(\mu_T) = \hat{J}(T, \mu_T)$  and [\(55\)](#), the desired result holds. For the last two assertions, just notice the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} J(t, \xi; \alpha^\epsilon) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T f(X_s, \mathcal{L}((X_s, \alpha_s^\epsilon) | \mathcal{G}_s), \alpha_s^\epsilon) ds + \hat{g}(X_T, \mathcal{L}(X_T | \mathcal{G}_T)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \hat{f}(s, \mu_s, \pi_\epsilon(s, \mu_s)) ds + \hat{J}(T, \mu_T) \right], \end{aligned}$$

whenever  $\mu = \mathcal{L}(\xi | \mathcal{G}_t)$ . Then, one can conclude that  $J(t, \xi; \alpha^\epsilon) \leq \hat{J}(t, \mu) - \epsilon$  by using [\(56\)](#). Thus, the assertions follow through  $J^*(t, \xi) \leq J(t, \xi; \alpha^\epsilon)$  and  $\hat{J}(t, \mu) \leq \tilde{J}^*(t, \mu) \leq J^*(t, \xi)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.11.** From [Theorem 4.10](#), we can conclude that  $\hat{J} = \tilde{J}^* = J^*$  when [Assumption 2](#) and [Assumption 3](#) are both fulfilled. As a byproduct of [Theorem 4.10](#), the conditional law invariance holds for the original MFC problem, and hence we can denote by  $J^*(t, \mu)$  the original value function instead of merely  $J^*(t, \xi)$  and it holds that  $\partial_t J^*(t, \mu) + \mathbb{T}J^*(t, \mu) = 0$ .

Also note that, in [Assumption 2](#), we do not assume the uniqueness of the solution. It may happen that there are multiple  $\hat{J}$  solving the HJB equation. However, once some of  $\hat{J}$  satisfies [Assumption 3](#), they must coincide with  $J^*$  due to [Theorem 4.10](#).

We also have the following remark when the jump coefficient in the state process does not depend on the control.

**Remark 4.12.** In particular, when the jump coefficient  $\gamma(\cdot)$  does not depend on the control variable, the above results can be reduced to a simpler formulation. In this case,  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}$  becomes an explicit measure shift operator that

$$I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z} g(x) = g(h^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}(x)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where  $h^{\mu, \hat{u}, z}(x) = x + \gamma(x, \mu \cdot \hat{u}, z)$  for any  $(\mu, \hat{u}, z) \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \hat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times Z$  and  $g \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Hence,  $I^{\mu, \hat{u}, z, *} \mu$  can be rewritten by a push-forward form  $\mu \circ h^{\mu, \hat{u}, z^{-1}}$ .

**Remark 4.13.** Without proving the DPP and the law invariance property, we obtain the PDE characterization of the value function for the original extended MFC problem as the solution to the HJB equation by appropriately introducing the lifted control problem over the space of probability measures and its associated stochastic Fokker-Planck equation. We expect that the derived stochastic Fokker-Planck equation is of help to prove a propagation of chaos result (c.f. [\[21\]](#)). The formal derivation of the HJB equation of  $J^*$  can be alternatively accomplished by establishing the DPP for the original MFC problem, proving the conditional law invariance property of  $J^*$  (c.f. [Cosso et al. \[18\]](#)), and applying Itô's formula (c.f. [Theorem 2.7](#) in [Guo and Zhang \[24\]](#)) to  $J^*(s, \mu_s)$  with  $\mu_s = \mathcal{L}(X_s | \mathcal{G}_s)$ , and  $X_s$  is the solution to [\(38\)](#):

$$\begin{aligned} dJ(s, \mu_s) = & \left\{ \partial_s J(s, \mu_s) + \mathbb{E} \left[ (b(X_s, \rho_s, \alpha_s) - \langle \gamma(X_s, \rho_s, \alpha_s, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \cdot \partial_\mu J(s, \mu_s)(X_s) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\sigma \sigma^\top(X_s, \rho_s, \alpha_s) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(s, \mu_s)(X_s)) \Big| \mathcal{G}_s \right] \right\} ds + \int_Z (J(s, \mu_s) - J(s, \mu_{s-})) N(ds, dz). \end{aligned}$$

Noting [\(41\)](#), [Lemma 4.1](#) and [Remark 4.6](#), one can then observe that the above Itô's formula coincides with the one in [Lemma 4.5](#), and hence the two HJB equations derived from two different methods are the same, which is consistent with our result  $\tilde{J}^* = J^*$ .

### 4.3 Relationship between HJB equation and SMP

In this subsection, we investigate the connection of the HJB equation to the BSDE induced by the SMP. A simple calculation, together with [Lemma 4.1](#), results in the next result, whose proof is hence omitted.

**Lemma 4.14.** For any  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U)$ ,  $z \in Z$  and  $L \in C^{1;1}(\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ , let  $(X, \alpha)$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^n \times U$ -valued random variable defined on some probability space such that  $\mu = \mathcal{L}(X)$ ,  $\hat{\alpha}(x)(du) = \mathcal{L}(\alpha | X = x)(du)$  and  $\rho = \mathcal{L}(X, \alpha)$ . Define  $L_1 : \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n \times U) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as  $L_1(\rho) := L(I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *} \mu)$ . Then,  $\partial_\mu L_1$  (recall [Definition 2.8](#)) exists, and for all  $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$ ,

$$\partial_\mu L_1(\rho)(x, u) = \partial_\mu L(I^{\mu, \hat{\alpha}, z, *} \mu)(x + \gamma(x, \rho, u, z)) \{1 + \partial_x \gamma(x, \rho, u, z) + \mathbb{E}[\partial_\mu \gamma(X, \rho, \alpha, z)(x, u)]\}.$$

The next theorem is the main result of this subsection.

**Theorem 4.15.** Let [Assumption 2](#) and [Assumption 3](#) both hold. Suppose that the original extended MFC problem (9)-(10) has an optimal control  $\alpha^* = (\alpha_t^*)_{t \in [0, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$ , and let  $X^* = (X_t^*)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the resulting state process. Define  $\mu_t^* = \mathcal{L}(X_t^* | \mathcal{G}_t)$  and  $\rho_t^*(\cdot) = \mathcal{L}((X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) | \mathcal{G}_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then, by [Theorem 4.10](#),  $J^*$  solves the PDE that,  $dt \times d\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} \left( f(x, \rho_t^*, u) + \left( b(x, \rho_t^*, u) - \langle \gamma(x, \rho_t^*, u, \cdot), \lambda \rangle \partial_\mu J(t, \mu_t^*)(x) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \sigma \sigma^\top(x, \rho_t^*, u) \partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu_t^*)(x) \right) \right) \rho_t^*(dx, du) \\ & + \int_Z \left( J(t, I^{\mu_t^*, \hat{\alpha}_t^*, z, *}, \mu_t^*) - J(t, \mu_t^*) \right) \lambda(dz) + \partial_t J^*(t, \mu_t^*), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where  $\hat{\alpha}_t^*(x)(du) := \mathcal{L}(\alpha_t^* | \mathcal{G}_t, X_t^* = x)(du)$ . Moreover, consider the processes defined by

$$\begin{aligned} p_t &= \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*), \quad P_t = \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \sigma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*), \\ K_t &= \partial_\mu J^*(t, I^{\mu_t^*, \hat{\alpha}_t^*, z, *}, \mu_t^*, X_t^* + \gamma(X_t^*, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)) - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the  $L$ -derivatives are defined in the sense of [Definition 2.8](#). We then have that the triplet  $(p, P, K) = (p_t, P_t, K_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  defined above is the unique solution to the BSDE in (32) that

$$\begin{aligned} dp_t &= - \left\{ \partial_x H(X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, \rho_t^*, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_{x'} \delta H(X_t^{*'}, \alpha_t^{*'}, \rho_t^*, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, p_t', P_t', K_t') \right] \right\} dt \\ &+ P_t dW_t + \int_Z K_{t-} \tilde{N}(dt, dz), \\ p_T &= \partial_x g(X_T^*, \mu_T^*) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu g(X_T^{*'}, \mu_T^*, X_T^*) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The first assertion of the theorem results directly from [Lemma 4.7](#) and [Remark 4.8](#). We next verify the second assertion. Note that  $J^*(T, \mu) = \hat{g}(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(x, \mu) \mu(dx)$ , and hence

$$p_T = \partial_\mu J^*(T, \mu_T^*) = \partial_x g(X_T^*, \mu_T^*) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu g(X_T^{*'}, \mu_T^*, X_T^*) \right].$$

As a result, the terminal condition is fulfilled. Differentiating on both sides of (57) with respect to  $\mu$  and evaluating at  $(t, X_t^*, \mu_t^*)$ , one can conclude by [Lemma 4.14](#) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \partial_t \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) + \partial_x b(X_t^*, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*) p_t + b(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \\ & + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu b(X_t^{*'}, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) p_t' + b(X_t^{*'}, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_\mu \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*, X_t^{*'}) \right] \\ & + \text{tr} \left( P_t \partial_x \sigma(X_t^*, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*)^\top + \frac{1}{2} \sigma \sigma^\top(X_t^*, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_{xx} \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \right) \\ & + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \text{tr} \left( P_t' \partial_\mu \sigma(X_t^{*'}, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma \sigma^\top(X_t^{*'}, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_\mu \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*, X_t^{*'}) \right) \right] \\ & + \partial_x f(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu f(X_t^{*'}, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \right] - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \\ & + \int_Z \partial_\mu J^*(t, I^{\mu_t^*, \hat{\alpha}_t^*, z, *}, \mu_t^*, X_t^* + \gamma(X_t^*, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)) (1 + \partial_x \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)) \lambda(dz) \\ & + \int_Z \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu J^*(t, I^{\mu_t^*, \hat{\alpha}_t^*, z, *}, \mu_t^*, X_t^{*'} + \gamma(X_t^{*'}, \mu_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)) \partial_\mu \gamma(X_t^{*'}, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \right] \lambda(dz) \\ & - \int_Z (\partial_x \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z) p_t + \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z) \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*)) \lambda(dz) \\ & - \mathbb{E}' \left[ \int_Z \left( \partial_\mu \gamma(X_t^{*'}, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) p_t' + \gamma(X_t^{*'}, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z) \partial_\mu \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*, X_t^{*'}) \right) \lambda(dz) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, applying Itô's formula (c.f. Theorem 2.7 in Guo and Zhang [24]) to  $p_t = \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*)$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
dp_t &= \partial_t \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) dt + b(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t, X_{t-}) dt \\
&\quad - \int_Z \gamma(X_{t-}^*, \rho_{t-}^*, \alpha_{t-}^*, z) \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t, X_{t-}) \lambda(dz) dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \sigma \sigma^\top (X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_{xx} \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \right) dt + \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \sigma (X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) dW_t \\
&\quad + \int_Z (\partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_{t-}^*)) N(dt, dz) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}' \left[ b(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_\mu \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_{t-}^*, X_{t-}^*, X_t^*) \right] dt \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}' \left[ \sigma \sigma^\top (X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \partial_\mu \partial_x \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_{t-}^*, X_{t-}^*, X_t^*) \right] dt \\
&\quad + \int_Z (\partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_{t-}^*) - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_{t-}^*, X_{t-}^*)) N(dt, dz) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}' \left[ \int_Z \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z) \partial_\mu \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*, X_t^*) \lambda(dz) \right] dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two terms, one can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
dp_t &= - \left\{ \partial_x H(X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, \rho_t^*, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_{x'} \delta H(X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, \rho_t^*, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, p_t', P_t', K_t') \right] \right\} dt + P_t dW_t \\
&\quad + \int_Z K_{t-} \tilde{N}(dt, dz) - \left\{ \int_Z \partial_\mu J^*(t, I^{\mu_t^*, \hat{\alpha}_t^*, z, *}, \mu_t^*, X_t^* + \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)) (1 + \partial_x \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)) \lambda(dz) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_Z \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu J^*(t, I^{\mu_t^*, \hat{\alpha}_t^*, z, *}, \mu_t^*, X_t^* + \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)) \partial_\mu \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \right] \right\} \lambda(dz) dt \\
&\quad - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) - \int_Z \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \partial_\mu \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*) \right] \lambda(dz) \\
&\quad + \int_Z (\partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_{t-}^*, X_{t-}^*)) \lambda(dz) dt + \int_Z \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) \partial_x \gamma(X_{t-}^*, \rho_{t-}^*, \alpha_{t-}^*, z) \lambda(dz) dt \\
&\quad + \int_Z \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_t^*, X_t^*) - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mu_{t-}^*, X_{t-}^*) \right] \lambda(dz) \\
&= - \left\{ \partial_x H(X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, \rho_t^*, p_t, P_t, K_t) + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_{x'} \delta H(X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, \rho_t^*, X_t^*, \alpha_t^*, p_t', P_t', K_t') \right] \right\} dt + P_t dW_t \\
&\quad + \int_Z K_{t-} \tilde{N}(dt, dz).
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds by using the fact that the jump time is at most countable, and hence a.s.  $\{t \in [0, T]; X_t^* \neq X_{t-}^*\}$  forms a Lebesgue zero measure set while the remainders vanish on the set  $\{t \in [0, T]; X_t^* = X_{t-}^*\}$ . Thus, we complete the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 4.16.** Let  $Y_t^* = X_t^* + \gamma(X_t^*, \rho_t^*, \alpha_t^*, z)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then  $K_t = \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mathcal{L}(Y_t^* | \mathcal{G}_t), Y_t^*) - \partial_\mu J^*(t, \mathcal{L}(X_t^* | \mathcal{G}_t), X_t^*)$  includes both jumps in the conditional law and the state process. The jump of the measure term comes from the existence of jump common noise. While in jump diffusion case, the law of  $X_t$  is continuous in  $t$ , and hence the jumps only come from the state (c.f. Remark 4.3).

**Remark 4.17.** Note that we only require the existence of an optimal open-loop control instead of the existence of a feedback control here.



## 5 An Example of Linear-Quadratic Extended MFC

In this section, we study a concrete example of LQ-type extended MFC problem to further illustrate the relationship between stochastic maximum principle and HJB equation we obtained in last two sections ([Theorem 4.15](#)) and the difference between the adjoint BSDE ([\(32\)](#)) and ([\(36\)](#)). In particular, we will apply both methods to solve the LQ MFC problem. For comparison purpose, we also present the results under a jump diffusion dynamics with the same coefficients to illustrate the distinctions in the adjoint processes caused by the common noise. To ease the presentation, we only consider one dimensional state process with the control space  $U = \mathbb{R}$ .

Fix  $t \in [0, T]$ , for any  $s \in [t, T]$ , the controlled state process considered in this section is governed by the dynamics that

$$dX_s = \{b_1\mathbb{E}[X_s|\mathcal{G}_s] + b_2\mathbb{E}[\alpha_s|\mathcal{G}_s] + b_3\alpha_s\} ds + \sigma X_s dW_s + \int_Z \gamma(z)\alpha_{s-}\tilde{N}(ds, dz), \quad X_t = \xi, \quad (58)$$

where  $b_1, b_2, b_3, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\gamma(\cdot) \in L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R})$  and other notations remain the same as before. We aim to minimize the following cost functional over  $\alpha = (\alpha_s)_{s \in [t, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$ :

$$J(t, \xi; \alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \alpha_s^2 ds + c |X_T - \mathbb{E}[X_T|\mathcal{G}_T]|^2 \right]. \quad (59)$$

Here, we recall that  $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is the natural extensions of  $\mathbb{F}^N = (\mathcal{F}_t^N)_{t \in [0, T]}$  to  $\Omega$  given in [Section 2.3](#), and  $c \geq 0$  is a parameter for regulating the weight of deviation of the dynamics from its conditional expectation. This yields from our objective functional ([\(59\)](#)) that we are considering the case where the Poisson noise is viewed as the common noise. The value function is thus defined by

$$J^*(t, \xi) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} J(t, \xi; \alpha). \quad (60)$$

We first apply the SMP method to solve the LQ MFC problem ([\(58\)](#))-(a href="#">(60)). Recall ([\(29\)](#)) and ([\(30\)](#)). Then, the Hamiltonian and delta Hamiltonian can be written as, for  $(x, u, \rho, p, P, K) \in \mathbb{R} \times U \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R} \times U) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, u, \rho, p, P, K) &= \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} (b_1x + b_2u)\rho(dx, du) + b_3u \right) p + \sigma x P + \int_Z \gamma(z)uK(z)\lambda(dz) + \frac{1}{2}u^2, \\ \delta H(x, u, \rho, x', u', p, P, K) &= (b_1x' + b_2u')p. \end{aligned}$$

The extension of  $H$  clearly satisfies the  $L$ -convexity stated in [Definition 3.8](#), and hence we can apply [Theorem 3.14](#) to conclude that  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  is an optimal control if

$$\alpha_s = - \left( \int_Z \gamma(z)K_s(z)\lambda(dz) + b_2\mathbb{E}[p_s|\mathcal{G}_s] + b_3p_s \right), \quad \forall s \in [t, T], \quad (61)$$

where the adjoint process  $(p, P, K(z)) = (p_s, P_s, K_s(z))_{s \in [t, T]}$  is the unique solution to the following BSDE that, for  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$\begin{cases} dp_s = -\{\sigma P_s + b_1\mathbb{E}[p_s|\mathcal{G}_s]\}ds + P_s dW_s + \int_Z K_s(z)\tilde{N}(ds, dz), \\ p_T = c\{X_T - \mathbb{E}[X_T|\mathcal{G}_T]\}. \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

Consider  $p = (p_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$  with the form given by

$$p_s = \beta_s X_s + \eta_s \mathbb{E}[X_s|\mathcal{G}_s], \quad \forall s \in [t, T], \quad (63)$$

with the deterministic functions  $\beta, \eta \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$  that  $\beta_T = c$  and  $\eta_T = -c$ . Differentiating on both sides of (63) leads to that, for  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dp_s &= \dot{\beta}_s X_s ds + \beta_s dX_s + \dot{\eta}_s \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] ds + \eta_s d\mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] \\ &= \dot{\beta}_s X_s ds + \beta_s \left\{ (b_1 \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] + b_2 \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s] + b_3 \alpha_s) ds + \sigma X_s dW_s + \int_Z \gamma(z) \alpha_s \tilde{N}(ds, dz) \right\} \\ &\quad + \dot{\eta}_s \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] ds + \eta_s \left\{ [b_1 \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] + (b_2 + b_3) \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s]] ds + \int_Z \gamma(z) \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s] \tilde{N}(ds, dz) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used notations  $\dot{\beta}_s := \frac{d\beta_s}{ds}$  and  $\dot{\eta}_s := \frac{d\eta_s}{ds}$ . Comparing the above equation with (62), we can conclude that

$$\begin{cases} -\{\sigma P_s + b_1 \mathbb{E}[p_s | \mathcal{G}_s]\} = \dot{\beta}_s X_s + \dot{\eta}_s \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] + (\beta_s + \eta_s) \{b_1 \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] + b_2 \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s]\} \\ \quad + b_3 \{\beta_s \alpha_s + \eta_s \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s]\}, \\ P_s = \beta_s \sigma X_s, \quad K_s(z) = \gamma(z) \{\beta_s \alpha_s + \eta_s \mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s]\}. \end{cases} \quad (64)$$

Combining with (61) and taking the conditional expectation, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s] = -\frac{(b_2 + b_3)(\beta_s + \eta_s)}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz)(\beta_s + \eta_s)} \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s], \quad (65)$$

$$\alpha_s = -\frac{(b_2 + b_3)(\beta_s + \eta_s)}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz)(\beta_s + \eta_s)} \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s] - \frac{b_3 \beta_s}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_s} \{X_s - \mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s]\}. \quad (66)$$

Substituting  $\alpha_s$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_s | \mathcal{G}_s]$  into the first equation of (64) according to (66), (65), and comparing coefficients before  $X_s$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X_s | \mathcal{G}_s]$ , one can derive the following Riccati equation satisfied by  $\beta_s$  and  $\eta_s$  that, for  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\beta}_s + \sigma^2 \beta_s - \frac{b_3^2}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_s} \beta_s^2 = 0; \\ \dot{\eta}_s + \frac{b_3^2}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_s} \beta_s^2 + \left( 2b_1 - \frac{(b_2 + b_3)^2 (\beta_s + \eta_s)}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) (\beta_s + \eta_s)} \right) (\beta_s + \eta_s) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (67)$$

with terminal conditions  $\beta_T = c$  and  $\eta_T = -c$ .

In fact, Eq. (67) is a decoupled Riccati equation. From Theorem 7.2 in Chapter 6 of Yong and Zhou [50], it follows that (67) admits a unique (smooth) solution  $(\beta, \eta) = (\beta_s, \eta_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$  satisfying  $1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_s > 0$ ,  $1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) (\beta_s + \eta_s) > 0$  and  $\beta_T = c$ ,  $\eta_T = -c$ . Moreover, using the uniqueness of the solution to the BSDE (62), we deduce that Eq. (67) has a unique solution  $(\beta, \eta) = (\beta_s, \eta_s)_{s \in [t, T]}$  and the optimal control is given by (66).

Before deriving the HJB equation, we need a technical lemma whose proof is delegated into Appendix A.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfy  $a > 0$  and  $a + c > 0$ . For a given squared-integrable r.v.  $X$  on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , introduce the functional  $F : L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P); \mathbb{R}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  by*

$$F(\xi) = a\mathbb{E}[\xi^2] + b\mathbb{E}[\xi X] + c|\mathbb{E}[\xi]|^2 + d\mathbb{E}[\xi], \quad \forall \xi \in L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P); \mathbb{R}).$$

*Then, the functional  $F$  admits a unique minimizer which is given by*

$$\xi^* = -\frac{b\mathbb{E}[X] + d}{2(a + c)} - \frac{b}{2a} \{X - \mathbb{E}[X]\}.$$

*Moreover, the minimum of the functional  $F$  is given by*

$$F(\xi^*) = -\frac{b^2}{4a} \text{Var}(X) - \frac{|b\mathbb{E}[X] + d|^2}{4(a + c)}.$$

It follows from (54) and Lemma 4.7, the HJB equation can be written as:

$$\partial_t J(t, \mu) + \mathbb{T}J(t, \mu) = 0, \quad J(T, \mu) = \frac{c}{2} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 \mu(dx) - \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mu(dx) \right)^2 \right], \quad (68)$$

where the operator  $\mathbb{T}$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}J(t, \mu) = & \inf_{\alpha \in L(\Omega; U)} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 + \left( b_1 \mathbb{E}[X] + b_2 \mathbb{E}[\alpha] + b_3 \alpha - \int_Z \gamma(z) \lambda(dz) \alpha \right) \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(X) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 X^2 \partial_x \partial_\mu J(t, \mu)(X) \right] + \int_Z \{ J(t, \mathcal{L}(X + \gamma(z) \alpha)) - J(t, \mu) \} \lambda(dz) \right\}, \quad X \sim \mu. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

From BSDE and Theorem 4.15, we assume heuristically that Eq. (68) has a classical solution  $\hat{J}$  (note that the classical solution may not be unique) takes the following form:

$$\hat{J}(t, \mu) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \beta_t \mathbb{E}[X^2] + \eta_t |\mathbb{E}[X]|^2 \right\}, \quad X \sim \mu, \quad \forall t \in [0, T]. \quad (70)$$

Here,  $\beta, \eta \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$  satisfy  $1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_t > 0$  and  $1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) (\beta_t + \eta_t) > 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Hence, we also have  $\beta_T = c$  and  $\eta_T = -c$ . Thus, it holds that

$$\hat{J}(t, \mathcal{L}(X + \gamma(z) \alpha)) - \hat{J}(t, \mu) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 2\gamma(z) (\beta_t \mathbb{E}[\alpha X] + \eta_t \mathbb{E}[\alpha] \mathbb{E}[X]) + \gamma^2(z) (\beta_t \mathbb{E}[\alpha^2] + \eta_t (\mathbb{E}[\alpha])^2) \right\}.$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\partial_\mu \hat{J}(t, \mu)(X) = \beta_t X + \eta_t \mathbb{E}[X], \quad \partial_x \partial_\mu \hat{J}(t, \mu)(X) = \beta_t.$$

Inserting the above equations into (69), and by applying Lemma 5.1, we conclude that the optimizer of operator  $\mathbb{T}$  in (69) satisfies

$$\alpha_t = -\frac{(b_2 + b_3)(\beta_t + \eta_t)}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) (\beta_t + \eta_t)} \mathbb{E}[X] - \frac{b_3 \beta_t}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_t} \{X - \mathbb{E}[X]\}, \quad (71)$$

which resembles the optimal control of the form in (66). The HJB equation then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \left[ \dot{\eta}_t + \frac{b_3^2 \beta_t^2}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_t} + \left( 2b_1 - \frac{(b_2 + b_3)^2 (\beta_t + \eta_t)}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) (\beta_t + \eta_t)} \right) (\beta_t + \eta_t) \right] |\mathbb{E}[X]|^2 \\ & + \left( \dot{\beta}_t + \sigma^2 \beta_t - \frac{b_3^2 \beta_t^2}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_t} \right) \mathbb{E}[X^2]. \end{aligned}$$

It thus leads to the following Riccati equations, for  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\beta}_t + \sigma^2 \beta_t - \frac{b_3^2 \beta_t^2}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_t} = 0, \\ \dot{\eta}_t + \frac{b_3^2 \beta_t^2}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_t} + \left( 2b_1 - \frac{(b_2 + b_3)^2 (\beta_t + \eta_t)}{1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) (\beta_t + \eta_t)} \right) (\beta_t + \eta_t) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (72)$$

with  $1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) \beta_t > 0$ ,  $1 + \int_Z \gamma^2(z) \lambda(dz) (\beta_t + \eta_t) > 0$  and  $\beta_T = c$ ,  $\eta_T = -c$ . Using Theorem 7.2 in Chapter 6 of Yong and Zhou [50] again, we can claim its well-posedness. By the uniqueness, the solutions should coincide. In fact, one can find that the above Riccati equation resembles (67) and by uniqueness, these two solutions should coincide with each other. Now,  $\hat{J}$  defined in (70) with  $(\beta, \eta) = (\beta_t, \eta_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  the unique solution to Eq. (72) is indeed a classical solution to (68), and hence Assumption 2 is fulfilled. Moreover, (71) ensures the existence of optimal lifted (randomized) feedback policy, and thus Assumption 3 holds. Then, we may apply Theorem 4.10 to conclude the value function  $J^*(t, \mu) = \hat{J}(t, \mu)$ . As a consequence, Theorem 4.15 also holds.

**Remark 5.2.** *With the aid of Theorem 7.2 in Chapter 6 of Yong and Zhou [50], both our two methods can handle the general type of LQ extended MFC with Poissonian common noise. When dealing with the general case, the above procedures still work well, but the computations might be more complicated. To simplify the illustration of how to apply these two methods to solve the LQ problems, we only consider a simple example (uncontrolled diffusion) in this section to work with details.*

To compare with the case in the presence of Poissonian common noise, we here discuss the MFC problem with Poisson idiosyncratic noise as McKean-Vlasov jump-diffusion dynamics that, for  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$dX_s = \{b_1\mathbb{E}[X_s] + b_2\mathbb{E}[\alpha_s] + b_3\alpha_s\}ds + \sigma X_s dW_s + \int_Z \gamma(z)\alpha_s \tilde{N}(ds, dz), \quad X_t = \xi \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (73)$$

To this end, in contrast to (59), we introduce the following objective functional without common noise, for  $\alpha = (\alpha_s)_{s \in [t, T]} \in \mathcal{U}$ ,

$$J(t, \xi; \alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \alpha_s^2 ds + c |X_T - \mathbb{E}X_T|^2 \right], \quad (74)$$

where  $c \geq 0$  is a parameter for regulating the weight of deviation of the dynamic from its conditional expectation. The value function is thus defined by

$$J^*(t, \xi) = \inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{U}} J(t, \xi; \alpha). \quad (75)$$

Similar to the case with Poissonian common noise, with the help of Corollary 3.18 and Corollary 3.19, the Hamiltonian and delta Hamiltonian here can be written as, for  $(x, u, \rho, p, P, K) \in \mathbb{R} \times U \times \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R} \times U) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times L^2((Z, \mathcal{Z}, \lambda); \mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, u, \rho, p, P, K) &= \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times U} (b_1x + b_2u)\rho(dx, du) + b_3 \right) p + \sigma x P + \int_Z \gamma(z)uK(z)\lambda(dz) + \frac{1}{2}u^2, \\ \delta H(x, u, \rho, x', u', p, P, K) &= (b_1x' + b_2u')p. \end{aligned}$$

The extension of  $H$  clearly satisfies  $L$ -convexity stated in Definition 3.8, and hence we are ready to apply Theorem 3.14 to conclude that  $\alpha \in \mathcal{U}$  is an optimal control if

$$\alpha_s = - \left( \int_Z \gamma(z)K_s(z)\lambda(dz) + b_2\mathbb{E}[p_s] + b_3p_s \right), \quad \forall s \in [t, T]. \quad (76)$$

Here, the adjoint process  $(p, P, K(z)) = (p_s, P_s, K_s(z))_{s \in [t, T]}$  is the unique solution to the following BSDE, for  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$\begin{cases} dp_s = -\{\sigma P_s + b_1\mathbb{E}[p_s]\}ds + P_s dW_s + \int_Z K_s(z)\tilde{N}(ds, dz), \\ p_T = c\{X_T - \mathbb{E}[X_T]\}. \end{cases} \quad (77)$$

Let us consider  $p_s$  in the form given by

$$p_s = \beta_s X_s + \eta_s \mathbb{E}[X_s], \quad \forall s \in [t, T] \quad (78)$$

with deterministic coefficients  $\beta, \eta \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ . Then, we have  $\beta_T = c$  and  $\eta_T = -c$  by matching (77), and letting  $s = T$ . Moreover, differentiating both sides of (78) with respect to  $t$  leads to

$$dp_s = \dot{\beta}_s X_s ds + \beta_s dX_s + \dot{\eta}_s \mathbb{E}[X_s] ds + \eta_s d\mathbb{E}[X_s]$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) \right) ds \\
& + \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s, u) q_s(du) \right) ds \\
& + \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s^\epsilon(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) \right) dW_s \\
& + \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) \right) dW_s \\
& + \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s, u) q_s(du) \right) dW_s \\
& + \int_0^t \int_Z \left( \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}^\epsilon, \xi_{s-}^\epsilon, u, z) q_{s-}^\epsilon(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}^\epsilon, \xi_{s-}^\epsilon, u, z) q_{s-}(du) \right) \tilde{N}(dt, dz) \\
& + \int_0^t \int_Z \left( \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}^\epsilon, \xi_{s-}^\epsilon, u, z) q_{s-}(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}^\epsilon, u, z) q_{s-}(du) \right) \tilde{N}(dt, dz) \\
& + \int_0^t \int_Z \left( \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}^\epsilon, u, z) q_{s-}(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}, u, z) q_{s-}(du) \right) \tilde{N}(dt, dz)
\end{aligned}$$

By applying Itô's lemma and utilizing the martingale term, we get that (in the sequel, let  $C$  be a generic constant that may be different from line to line):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|X_t^\epsilon - X_t|^2] & \leq C\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) v_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) \right)^2 ds \right. \\
& + C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) \right)^2 ds \right] \\
& + C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s, u) q_s(du) \right)^2 ds \right] \\
& + C\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) v_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) \right)^2 ds \right] \\
& + C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) \right)^2 ds \right] \\
& + C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \left( \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s, u) q_s(du) \right)^2 ds \right] \\
& + C\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \int_Z \left( \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u, z) v_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u, z) q_s(du) \right)^2 \lambda(dz) ds \right] \\
& + C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \int_Z \left( \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u, z) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u, z) q_s(du) \right)^2 \lambda(dz) ds \right] \\
& + C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t \int_Z \left( \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u, z) q_s(du) - \int_U \tilde{\gamma}(X_s, \xi_s, u, z) q_s(du) \right)^2 \lambda(dz) ds \right] \\
& \leq C\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |X_s^\epsilon - X_s|^2 ds \right] + C\mathbb{E} \int_0^t d_{\text{KR}}^2(\xi_s^\epsilon, \xi_s) ds + C\epsilon^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $d_{\text{KR}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the metric defined by (1).

Recall that, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $Q_\omega$  denotes the r.c.p.d. of the probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  (c.f. (8)) given  $\mathcal{G}_T$ . Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [d_{\text{KR}}^2(\xi_s^\epsilon, \xi_s)] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}^{Q_\omega} [|X_s^\epsilon - X_s| + \|q_s^\epsilon - q_s\|_{U, \text{FM}}] \right|^2 \right]$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ |X_s^\epsilon - X_s|^2 \right] + \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \|v_s - q_s\|_{U, \text{FM}}^2 \right].$$

We can conclude by Gronwall's inequality that  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|X_t^\epsilon - X_t|^2] \leq C\epsilon^2$ , which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* Let us set  $Y_t := \frac{X_t^\epsilon - X_t}{\epsilon} - V_t$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t &= \int_0^t \int_U \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} (\tilde{b}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) - \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s, u) - \partial_x \tilde{b}(X_t, \xi_t, u) V_t) \right) q_s(du) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_U \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} (\tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) - \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s, u)) - \mathbb{E}'[\eta_t V_t' + \zeta_t] \right) q_s(du) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_U \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} (\tilde{\sigma}(X_s^\epsilon, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) - \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s, u) - \partial_x \tilde{\sigma}(X_t, \xi_t, u) V_t) \right) q_s(du) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_U \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} (\tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s^\epsilon, u) - \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s, u)) - \mathbb{E}'[\hat{\eta}_t V_t' + \hat{\zeta}_t] \right) q_s(du) dW_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_Z \int_U \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} (\tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}^\epsilon, u, z) - \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}, u, z)) - \partial_x \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}, u, z) V_t \right) q_{s-}(du) \tilde{N}(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_Z \int_U \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} (\tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}^\epsilon, u, z) - \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}, u, z)) - \mathbb{E}'[\tilde{\eta}_{s-} V_{s-}' + \tilde{\zeta}_{s-}] \right) q_{s-}(du) \tilde{N}(ds, dz) \\ &= \int_0^t \int_U \left\{ \partial_x \tilde{b}(X_s, \xi_s, u) Y_s + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{b}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_s) \right) (X_s, X_s', q_s', u) Y_s' \right] \right\} q_s(du) ds + \int_0^t \{ \kappa_s + \mathbb{E}'[\delta_s] \} ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_U \left\{ \partial_x \tilde{\sigma}(X_s, \xi_s, u) Y_t + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{\sigma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_s) \right) (X_s, X_s', q_s', u) Y_t' \right] \right\} q_s(du) dW_s + \int_0^t \{ \hat{\kappa}_s + \mathbb{E}'[\hat{\delta}_s] \} dW_s \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_U \int_Z \left\{ \partial_x \tilde{\gamma}(X_{s-}, \xi_{s-}, u, z) Y_s + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{\gamma}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_{s-}) \right) (X_{s-}, X_{s-}', q_{s-}', u, z) Y_{s-}' \right] \right\} q_{s-}(du) N(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \{ \tilde{\kappa}_{s-} + \mathbb{E}'[\tilde{\delta}_{s-}] \} \tilde{N}(ds, dz), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\kappa_t, \delta_t, \hat{\kappa}_t, \hat{\delta}_t, \tilde{\kappa}_t, \tilde{\delta}_t$ , thanks to Lemma 2.7, Assumption 1 and (16), satisfy that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\kappa_t|^2 + |\mathbb{E}'[\delta_t]|^2 + |\hat{\kappa}_t|^2 + |\mathbb{E}'[\hat{\delta}_t]|^2 + |\tilde{\kappa}_t|^2 + |\mathbb{E}'[\tilde{\delta}_t]|^2 \right] = 0. \quad (82)$$

In lieu of the boundedness of derivatives in Assumption 1, we can derive that, a.s.

$$|Y_t|^2 \leq C \int_0^t |Y_s|^2 ds + C \int_0^t |Y_s|^2 ds + \rho_t, \quad \forall t \in [0, T],$$

where  $\rho_t$  is the remainder satisfying  $\rho_t \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$  in light of (82). Thus, similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1, we can conclude with the help of Gronwall's inequality that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{X_t^\epsilon - X_t}{\epsilon} - V_t \right|^2 \right] = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|Y_t|^2] = 0.$$

$\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* We have from the definition of the relaxed cost functional  $\mathcal{J}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathcal{J}(q^\epsilon) - \mathcal{J}(q) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ g(X_T^\epsilon, \mu_T^\epsilon) - g(X_T, \mu_T) + \int_0^T \left( \int_U f(X_t^\epsilon, \xi_t^\epsilon, u) q_t^\epsilon(du) - \int_U f(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \right) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.7, Lemma 3.3 and Assumption 1, one can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq o(\epsilon) + \epsilon \mathbb{E} \left\{ \partial_x g(X_T, \mu_T) \cdot V_T + \int_0^T \int_U \partial_x f(X_t, \xi_t, u) \cdot V_t q_t(du) dt \right. \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \left( \int_U f(X_t, \xi_t, u) v_t(du) - \int_0^T \int_U f(X_t, \xi_t, u) q_t(du) \right) dt \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}' \left[ \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta g}{\delta \mu}(\mu_T) \right) (X_T, X'_T) \cdot V'_T + \int_0^T \int_U \partial_x \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{f}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_s) \right) (X_s, X'_s, q'_s, u) \cdot V'_t q_t(du) dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \int_0^T \int_U \partial_q \left( \frac{\delta \tilde{f}}{\delta \xi}(\xi_t) \right) (X_t, X'_t, q'_t, u) (v'_t - q'_t) q_t(du) dt \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The desired result holds by taking  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$  on both sides of the inequality above.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.5.* Fix  $t \in [0, T]$ . Let  $(\sigma_k)_{k \geq 0}$  be the jump times of the Poisson noise with  $\sigma_0 = t$ . Then, for  $s \in [t, T]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J(s, \mu_s) - J(t, \mu_t) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (J(\sigma_m \wedge s, \mu_{\sigma_m \wedge s}) - J(\sigma_m \wedge s, \mu_{\sigma_m \wedge s-})) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (J(\sigma_m \wedge s, \mu_{\sigma_m \wedge s-}) - J(\sigma_{m-1} \wedge s, \mu_{\sigma_{m-1} \wedge s})) \\
&:= I_1 + I_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first term can be written as:

$$I_1 := \int_t^s \int_Z (\tilde{J}^*(r, I^{\mu_{r-}, \hat{\alpha}_{r-}, z, *}, \mu_{r-}) - \tilde{J}^*(r, \mu_{r-})) N(dr, dz).$$

It thus suffices to analyze the term  $I_2$ . To this end, let us set  $\tau = (\sigma_m \wedge s) - (\sigma_{m-1} \wedge s)$  and

$$r_i = (\sigma_{m-1} \wedge s) + \frac{i\tau}{j}, \quad m, j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, j. \quad (83)$$

Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
J(r_{i+1}, \mu_{r_{i+1}}) - J(r_i, \mu_{r_i}) &= J(r_{i+1}, \mu_{r_{i+1}}) - J(r_i, \mu_{r_{i+1}}) + J(r_i, \mu_{r_{i+1}}) - J(r_i, \mu_{r_i}) \\
&= \int_0^1 \partial_s J(r_i + \lambda(r_{i+1} - r_i), \mu_{r_{i+1}})(r_{i+1} - r_i) d\lambda \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\delta J}{\delta \mu}(r_i, \mu_{r_i} + \lambda(\mu_{r_{i+1}} - \mu_{r_i}))(x) (\mu_{r_{i+1}} - \mu_{r_i})(dx) d\lambda \\
&= \partial_s J(r_i, \mu_{r_i}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\delta J}{\delta \mu}(r_i, \mu_{r_i})(x) (\mu_{r_{i+1}} - \mu_{r_i})(dx) + R_i,
\end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

where the remainder is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
R_i &= \int_0^1 (\partial_s J(r_i + \lambda(r_{i+1} - r_i), \mu_{r_{i+1}}) - \partial_s J(r_i, \mu_{r_i})) (r_{i+1} - r_i) d\lambda \\
&\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\delta J}{\delta \mu}(r_i, \mu_{r_i} + \lambda(\mu_{r_{i+1}} - \mu_{r_i}))(x) - \frac{\delta J}{\delta \mu}(r_i, \mu_{r_i})(x) \right) (\mu_{r_{i+1}} - \mu_{r_i})(dx) d\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us set

$$F(x) := \frac{\delta J}{\delta \mu}(r_i, \mu_{r_i})(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$



it then holds that  $F \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Choose a sequence  $(F_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $F_k(x) = F(x)$  when  $|x| \leq k$  and  $F_k(x) = 0$  when  $|x| \geq k$  and  $|F_k(x)| \leq |F(x)|$ . Then, it is easy to see that  $F_k(x)$  converges to  $F(x)$  pointwise, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . For each  $F_k$ , we can always select  $\phi_{k,l} \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  converging to  $F_k$  in  $C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , which yields that

$$\|\phi_{k,l} - F_k\|_\infty + \|\partial_x \phi_{k,l} - \partial_x F_k\|_\infty + \|\partial_{xx} \phi_{k,l} - \partial_{xx} F_k\|_\infty \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (85)$$

Hence, by (47), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F_k, \mu_{r_{i+1}} - \mu_{r_i} \rangle &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \langle \phi_{k,l}, \mu_{r_{i+1}} \rangle - \langle \phi_{k,l}, \mu_{r_i} \rangle = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} \langle \phi_{k,l}, A_0^{\hat{\alpha}} \mu_r \rangle dr \\ &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} \langle A_0^{\hat{\alpha},*} \phi_{k,l}, \mu_r \rangle dr \\ &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} \left\langle (\hat{b}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x \phi_{k,l}(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) \partial_{xx} \phi_{k,l}(\cdot) \right), \mu_r \right\rangle dr \\ &= \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} \left\langle (\hat{b}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x F_k(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) \partial_{xx} F_k(\cdot) \right), \mu_r \right\rangle dr. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (85) and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in the above equality, we can derive by Dominated Convergence Theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F, \mu_{r_{i+1}} - \mu_{r_i} \rangle &= \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} \left\langle (\hat{b}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x F(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) \partial_{xx} F(\cdot) \right), \mu_r \right\rangle dr. \quad (86) \end{aligned}$$

As a result of (86), we also have  $R_i = o(r_{i+1} - r_i)$ . Recalling (83) and dividing both sides of (84) by  $r_{i+1} - r_i$  and letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J(r_{i+1}, \mu_{r_{i+1}}) - J(r_i, \mu_{r_i})}{r_{i+1} - r_i} &= \left\langle (\hat{b}(\cdot, \mu_{r_i}, \hat{\alpha}_{r_i}) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(\cdot, \mu_{r_i}, \hat{\alpha}_{r_i}, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x F(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(\cdot, \mu_{r_i}, \hat{\alpha}_{r_i}) \partial_{xx} F(\cdot) \right), \mu_{r_i} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_{\sigma_{m-1} \wedge s}^{\sigma_m \wedge s} \left\langle (\hat{b}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x F(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) \partial_{xx} F(\cdot) \right), \mu_r \right\rangle dr \\ &= \int_t^s \left\langle (\hat{b}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) - \langle \hat{\gamma}(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r, \cdot), \lambda \rangle) \partial_x F(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( \hat{\sigma} \hat{\sigma}^\top(\cdot, \mu_r, \hat{\alpha}_r) \partial_{xx} F(\cdot) \right), \mu_r \right\rangle dr \end{aligned}$$

Putting  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  together, we complete the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* Note that, for any  $\xi, \eta \in L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P); \mathbb{R})$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , it holds that

$$\lambda F(\xi) + (1 - \lambda)F(\eta) - F(\lambda\xi + (1 - \lambda)\eta) = a \text{Var}(\xi - \eta) + (a + c) \mathbb{E}[\xi - \eta]^2.$$

Then,  $F : L^2((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P); \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a strictly convex functional, so it suffices to find the unique zero of its Fréchet differential. That is, it is sufficient to solve

$$2a\xi + bX + 2c\mathbb{E}[\xi] + d = 0. \quad (87)$$

Taking expectations on both sides leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi] = -\frac{b\mathbb{E}[X] + d}{2(a + c)}.$$

Inserting this result into (87), we conclude that the unique minimizer of  $F$  is given by

$$\xi^* = -\frac{b\mathbb{E}[X] + d}{2(a+c)} - \frac{b}{2a}\{X - \mathbb{E}[X]\}.$$

The last assertion on the minimum of  $F$  readily follows by some simple calculations. □

## References

- [1] B. Acciaio, J. Backhoff-Veraguas, and R. Carmona (2017): Extended mean field control problems: stochastic maximum principle and transport perspective. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 57(6), 3666-3693.
- [2] D. Andersson, and B. Djehiche (2010): A maximum principle for SDEs of mean-field type. *Appl. Math. Optim.* 63, 341-356.
- [3] S. Bahlali (2008): Necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for relaxed and strict control problems. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 47(4), 2078-2095.
- [4] E. Bayraktar, A. Cosso, and H. Pham (2018): Randomized dynamic programming principle and Feynman-Kac representation for optimal control of McKean-Vlasov dynamics. *Trans. AMS* 370(3), 2115-60.
- [5] E. Bayraktar, I. Ekren, and X. Zhang (2023): Comparison of viscosity solutions for a class of second-order PDEs on the Wasserstein space. Preprint, available at arXiv:2309.05040.
- [6] A. Bensoussan (1981): *Lecture on Stochastic Control, in Nonlinear Filtering and Stochastic Control*. Lecture Notes in Math. 972, Proc. Cortona, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York.
- [7] A. Bensoussan, J. Frehse, and S. Yam (2015): The master equation in mean field theory. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 103(6), 1441-1474.
- [8] L. Bo, T. Li and X. Yu (2022): Centralized systemic risk control in the interbank system: Weak formulation and Gamma-convergence. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, 150, 622-654.
- [9] R. Buckdahn, B. Djehiche, and J. Li (2011): A general maximum principle for SDEs of mean-field type. *Appl. Math. Optim.* 64(2), 197-216.
- [10] R. Buckdahn, J. Li, S. Peng, and C. Rainer (2017): Mean-field stochastic differential equations and associated PDEs. *Ann. Probab.* 45(2), 824-878.
- [11] R. Buckdahn, Y. Chen, and J. Li (2021): Partial derivative with respect to the measure and its application to general controlled mean-field systems. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* 134, 265-307.
- [12] R. Buckdahn, J. Li, J.S. Li, and C.Z. Xing (2023): Path-depending controlled mean-field coupled forward-backward SDEs. The associated stochastic maximum principle. Preprint, available at arXiv:2307.14148.
- [13] M. Burzoni, V. Ignazio, M. Reppen, and H.M. Soner (2020): Viscosity solutions for controlled McKean-Vlasov jump diffusions. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 58(3), 1676-1699.
- [14] R. Carmona, and F. Delarue (2015): Forward-backward stochastic differential equations and controlled McKean-Vlasov dynamics. *Ann. Probab.* 43(5), 2647-2700.
- [15] R. Carmona, and F. Delarue (2017): *Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications*. Volume I: Mean Field FBSDEs, Control and Games, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [16] J.F. Chassagneux, D. Crisan, and F. Delarue (2022): A probabilistic approach to classical solutions of the master equation for large population equilibria. *Memoirs AMS* 280(1379), 1-121.

- [17] A. Cosso, and H. Pham (2019): Zero-sum stochastic differential games of generalized McKean–Vlasov type. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 129, 180-212.
- [18] A. Cosso, F. Gozzi, I. Kharroubi, H. Pham, and M. Rosestolato (2023): Optimal control of path-dependent McKean–Vlasov SDEs in infinite-dimension. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 33(4), 2863-918.
- [19] A. Cosso, F. Gozzi, I. Kharroubi, H. Pham, and M. Rosestolato (2024): Master Bellman equation in the Wasserstein space: Uniqueness of viscosity solutions. *Trans. AMS* 377(01), 31-83.
- [20] B. Djehiche, H. Tembine, and R. Tempone (2015): A stochastic maximum principle for risk-sensitive mean-field type control. *IEEE Trans. Auto. Contr.* 60(10), 2640-2649.
- [21] M.F. Djete (2022): Extended mean field control problem: a propagation of chaos result. *Electronic J. Probab.* 27, 1-53.
- [22] M.F. Djete, D. Possamai, and X. Tan (2022): McKean–Vlasov optimal control: limit theory and equivalence between different formulations. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 47(4), 2891-930.
- [23] X. Guo, H. Pham, and X. Wei (2023): Itô’s formula for flows of measures on semimartingales. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* 159, 350-390.
- [24] X. Guo, and J. Zhang (2024): Itô’s formula for flows of conditional measures on semimartingales. Preprint, available at arXiv:2404.11167.
- [25] M. Hafayed, A. Abba, and S. Abbas (2014): On mean-field stochastic maximum principle for near-optimal controls for Poisson jump diffusion with applications. *Inter. J. Dyn. Contr.* 2, 262-284.
- [26] T. Hao (2020): Anticipated mean-field backward stochastic differential equations with jumps. *Lithuanian Math. J.* 60(3), 359–375.
- [27] D. Hernández-Hernández, and J.H. Ricalde-Guerrero(2023): Conditional McKean-Vlasov differential equations with common Poissonian noise: Propagation of chaos. Preprint, available at arXiv:2308.11564.
- [28] D. Hernández-Hernández, and J.H. Ricalde-Guerrero (2024): Mean-field games with common Poissonian noise: A maximum principle approach. Preprint, available at arXiv:2401.10952.
- [29] M. Huang, R.P. Malhamé, and P.E. Caines (2006): Large population stochastic dynamic games closed-loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the nash certainty equivalence principle. *Commun. Inform. Syst.* 6(3), 221-252.
- [30] M. Laurière, and O. Pironneau (2014): Dynamic programming for mean–field type control. *Comptes Rendus Math.*, 352(9), 707–713.
- [31] T. Meyer-Brandis, B. Øksendal, and X.Y. Zhou (2012): A mean-field stochastic maximum principle via Malliavin calculus. *Stochastics.* 84(5-6), 643-666.
- [32] E.J. McShane (1934): Extension of range of functions. *Bull. AMS* 40(12), 837-842.
- [33] M.A. Mezerdi (2020): Equations différentielles stochastiques de type McKean-Vlasov et leur contrôle optimal. Analyse numérique Université de Toulon; Université Mohamed Khider (Biskra, Algérie), 2020. Français.NNT : 2020TOUL0014. tel-03278583.
- [34] J. Ma, and J. Yong (1995): Solvability of forward-backward SDEs and the nodal set of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. A Chinese summary appears in *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. A* 16 (1995), no. 4, 532. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B* 16 (1995), no. 3, pp 279–298.
- [35] J.M. Lasry, and P.L. Lions (2007): Mean field games. *Japanese J. Math.* 2(1), 229-260.
- [36] J. Li (2012): Stochastic maximum principle in the mean-field controls. *Automatica.* 48(2), 366-73.
- [37] T. Nie, and K. Yan(2022): Extended mean-field control problem with partial observation. *ESAIM: Contr. Optim. Cal. Variat.* 28:17.

- [38] R.J. McCann (1997): A convexity principle for interacting gases. *Adv. Math.* 128(1), 153-179.
- [39] S. Peng (1990): A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 28(4), 966-979.
- [40] M. Motte, and H. Pham (2022): Mean-field Markov decision process with common noise and open-loop controls. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 32(2), 1421-1458.
- [41] H. Pham, and X. Wei (2017): Dynamic programming for optimal control of stochastic McKean-Vlasov dynamics. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 55(2), 1069–1101.
- [42] C. Villani (2009): *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [43] Y. Shen, Q. Meng, and P. Shi (2014): Maximum principle for mean-field jump–diffusion stochastic delay differential equations and its application to finance. *Automatica.* 50(6), 1565-1579.
- [44] H. M. Soner, and Q. Yan (2022): Viscosity solutions for McKean-Vlasov control on a torus. Preprint, available at arXiv:2212.11053.
- [45] Y. Sun(2006): The exact law of large numbers via Fubini extension and characterization of insurable risks. *J. Econ. Theory*, 126(1), pp.31-69.
- [46] H. Wang, and X.Y. Zhou (2020): Continuous-time mean–variance portfolio selection: A reinforcement learning framework. *Math. Finance* 30(4), 1273–1308.
- [47] H. Wang, T. Zariphopoulou, and X.Y. Zhou (2020): Reinforcement learning in continuous time and space: A stochastic control approach. *J. Machine Learning Res.* 21(1), 8145-8178.
- [48] X. Wei and X. Yu (2023): Continuous-Time q-learning for mean-field control problems. Preprint, available at arXiv:2306.16208.
- [49] C. Wu, and J. Zhang (2020): Viscosity solutions to parabolic master equations and McKean-Vlasov SDEs with closed-loop controls. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 30(2), 936–986.
- [50] J. Yong, and X.Y. Zhou (1999): *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations.* Appl. Math. Vol. 43, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [51] X. Zhang, Z. Sun, and J. Xiong (2018): A general stochastic maximum principle for a Markov regime switching jump-diffusion model of mean-field type. *SIAM J. Contr. Optim.* 56(4), 2563-2592.
- [52] J. Zhou, N. Touzi, and J. Zhang (2024): Viscosity solutions for HJB equations on the process space: Application to mean field control with common noise. Preprint, available at arXiv:2401.04920.