

Constrained portfolio game with heterogeneous agents

Zongxia Liang*

Keyu Zhang[†]

Yaqi Zhuang[‡]

Abstract

We investigate stochastic utility maximization games under relative performance concerns in both finite-agent and infinite-agent (graphon) settings. An incomplete market model is considered where agents with power (CRRA) utility functions trade in a common risk-free bond and individual stocks driven by both common and idiosyncratic noise. The Nash equilibrium for both settings is characterized by forward-backward stochastic differential equations (FBSDEs) with a quadratic growth generator, where the solution of the graphon game leads to a novel form of infinite-dimensional McKean-Vlasov FBSDEs. Under mild conditions, we prove the existence of Nash equilibrium for both the graphon game and the n -agent game without common noise. Furthermore, we establish a convergence result showing that, with modest assumptions on the sensitivity matrix, as the number of agents increases, the Nash equilibrium and associated equilibrium value of the finite-agent game converge to those of the graphon game.

Keywords: Stochastic graphon games, FBSDE, McKean-Vlasov equations

AMS subject classifications: 91A06, 91A07, 91A15

1 Introduction

This paper contributes to both the theory of finite population and graphon games and to optimal portfolio management under competition and relative performance criteria. We construct a novel class of competitive and relative performance optimal investment problems for agents with power (CRRA) utility, applicable to both a finite number and a continuum of agents.

The finite-population financial market consists of n agents trading in a common risk-less bond with interest rate $r = 0$ and an individual d -dimensional vector of stocks. The price of each stock is driven by a common market noise and an idiosyncratic noise. Precisely, the agent i trades in a d -dimensional vector of stocks with price S^i following the dynamics

$$dS_t^i = \text{diag}(S_t^i)(\mu_t^i dt + \sigma_t^i dW_t^i + \sigma_t^{*i} dW_t^{*}), \quad (1.1)$$

where W^i is a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion describing the idiosyncratic noise and W^* is a (one-dimensional) standard Brownian motion describing the common noise to all stocks. $\{W^i, i \geq 1\}$ and W^* are independent on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. $\mu_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\sigma_t^{*i} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are assumed to be bounded stochastic processes and predictable with respect to $\mathbb{F}^n :=$

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084 People's Republic of China.
Email: liangzongxia@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

[†]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084 People's Republic of China.
Email: zhangky21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

[‡]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084 People's Republic of China.
Email: zyq23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

$(\mathcal{F}_t^n)_{t \in [0, T]}$, where \mathbb{F}^n is defined as the \mathbb{P} -completion of the natural filtration of $\{W^i, W^*, i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

Fixed a common time horizon $T > 0$, all agents aim to maximize their expected utility at time T in an incomplete market. The risk preferences of the agents are assumed to be characterized by power utility functions. The utility functions U_1, \dots, U_n are agent-specific functions concerning both their own terminal wealth and the performance of their peers. To be precise, agent i aims to choose a self-financing strategy $\pi^i = \{\pi_t^i : t \in [0, T]\}$, which is constrained within heterogeneous closed convex sets A_i , to solve

$$\sup_{\pi^i} \mathbb{E} \left[U_i \left(X_T^i, \bar{X}_T^{-i} \right) \right] = \sup_{\pi^i} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \left(X_T^{i, \pi^i} \left(\bar{X}_T^{-i} \right)^{-\rho} \right)^{\gamma^i} \right], \quad (1.2)$$

where the wealth process X^{i, π^i} follows

$$dX_t^{i, \pi^i} = \pi_t^i X_t^{i, \pi^i} \cdot (\mu_t^i dt + \sigma_t^i dW_t^i + \sigma_t^{*i} dW_t^*), \quad X_0^{i, \pi^i} = x^i, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\bar{X}_T^{-i} := \prod_{j \neq i} (X_T^{j, \pi^j})^{\frac{1}{n-1} \lambda_{ij}}$ is the weighted geometric average of the other agents' terminal values, x^i is the initial wealth, $\gamma^i \in (-\infty, 1) \setminus \{0\}$ is the degree of risk aversion of agent i and $\rho \in (0, 1]$ models the interaction weight. In particular, the term $\lambda_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ measures agent i 's sensitivity to agent j 's wealth ($i \neq j$). The objective is to find a Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^1, \tilde{\pi}^2, \dots, \tilde{\pi}^n)$ where $\tilde{\pi}^i$ represents the optimal strategy for agent i , and no agent has the incentive to deviate from their strategy unilaterally.

The infinite-population case is formulated by introducing the graphon game framework. For a more rigorous probabilistic setup related to this introduction, please refer to Section 2.2. Below, we will present the problem intuitively, omitting certain technical details for clarity. In the context of an infinite-agent graphon game, each agent within the continuum is labeled by $u \in I := [0, 1]$. The interaction among the continuum of agents will be modeled by a graphon, which is a symmetric and measurable function

$$G : I \times I \rightarrow I.$$

As (1.2) can be rewritten as

$$\sup_{\pi^i} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i, \pi^i} - \rho \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\lambda_{ij}}{n-1} \hat{X}_T^{j, \pi^j} \right) \right\} \right], \quad (1.4)$$

where $\hat{X} := \log(X)$, inspired by the spirit of the mean field game, in the continuum case, the problem of agent u becomes

$$\sup_{\pi^u} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^u} \exp \left(\gamma^u \left(\hat{X}_T^{u, \pi^u} - \mathbb{E} \left[\rho \int_I \hat{X}_T^{v, \pi^v} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_T^* \right] \right) \right) \right], \quad (1.5)$$

where $\mathbb{F}^* := (\mathcal{F}_t^*)_{t \in [0, T]}$ denoted the \mathbb{P} -completion of the filtration generated by W^* . It is worth noting that the admissible strategy sets for problems (1.4) and (1.5) differ. The key distinction lies in that in problem (1.4), the strategy $\tilde{\pi}^i$ is a \mathbb{F}^n -predictable process, whereas in problem (1.5), the strategy $\tilde{\pi}^u$ is a \mathbb{F}^u -predictable process, where \mathbb{F}^u denoted the completion of the filtration generated by (W^u, W^*) . Intuitively, in the n -agent setting, each agent can make decisions based on the information of all agents. In contrast, in the infinite-population case, each agent makes decisions based only on their own information and public information. The precise definitions

of the admissible strategy sets in both cases can be found in Section 2.1 and Section 2.2. As in the case of the n -agent setting, our objective remains to find the Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^u)_{u \in I}$.

Using the martingale optimality principle, we can establish a one-to-one correspondence between Nash equilibrium with certain regularity conditions and a system of (quadratic) FBSDEs, which is an extension of the classical methods in papers [19] and [31]. Thus, the problem of finding the Nash equilibrium is reduced to solving the FBSDEs.

The pioneering work on portfolio games with relative utility under finite-population was introduced by [11, 12]. This work inspired a large body of literature, such as [14], [24], [22], and [13]. In [11, 12, 14, 13], all agents are assumed to trade in common stocks. Using the BSDE approach, [11, 12] established the existence and uniqueness of Nash equilibrium for general utility functions in a complete market and the existence and uniqueness of Nash equilibrium for exponential utility under incomplete markets with deterministic market parameters. [14, 13] consider a similar problem as [11, 12]. In [14], by constructing a counterexample, it was demonstrated that in some cases, equilibrium does not exist, i.e., the BSDE characterizing the equilibrium has no solution. [13] showed that multi-dimensional quadratic BSDEs are typically solvable only locally (i.e., solutions exist only within small time intervals), defined the concept of a split solution for BSDEs, and provided sufficient conditions for the existence of such solutions. [24] extended the assumption of agents trading common stocks in [11, 12, 14, 13] and studied a model with asset specialization where both idiosyncratic and common noise drives stock prices. In a market with constant parameters, using PDE methods, [24] proved the existence and uniqueness of constant equilibrium. [22] further incorporated consumption and relative consumption considerations into the CRRA model presented in [24]. [18] studied portfolio games in the context of Itô's diffusion. [16] extended the framework of [24] by incorporating stochastic market parameters and obtain the well-posedness of the n -agent game under exponential utility. Additionally, [9], [10] and [2] extended the study of this problem through the concept of forward performance, introduced by [28].

The mean field game theory, first introduced independently by [25], [20], provides a theoretical framework for analyzing individual decision-making in large-scale multi-agent systems. In recent years, it has been widely applied in fields such as economics, finance, engineering, and control theory. With the symmetry assumption, the complex interactions in the large population game can be approximated by the mean field, simplifying the original problem both mathematically and computationally. In the aforementioned works, [24] and [22] were the first to introduce the mean field and derive the mean field equilibrium under deterministic coefficients; [16] and [15] subsequently obtained the mean field equilibrium under random coefficients for CARA and CRRA utilities, respectively. A recent paper by [33] further extended this problem by allowing each agent to have different sensitivity factors towards other agents. This is a realistic assumption, as funds with different sizes, risk levels, or investment directions are often not compared directly; funds typically aim to outperform competitors within the same category. This heterogeneity among agents limits the applicability of the mean field game theory, and [33] instead considers introducing the graphon game framework for further study. The graphon game framework allows for a more flexible representation of the complex relationships between agents, potentially leading to more accurate models of competitive investment scenarios.

The concept of graphons was first introduced by [27] to study the limit objects of dense graph sequences. [26] serves as the standard reference for graphon theory. This theory provides a powerful framework for analyzing large graphs by examining their limiting behavior. Graphon games, the application of graphon theory in game theory, were proposed by [29, 30] and are particularly suitable for the study of large-scale network games. In the field of graphon game research, [29], [8] conducted studies in static environments, while [6, 7] focused on well-posedness

in dynamic environments and established an ε -Nash theory connecting equilibrium of infinite population games with those of finite population games. Furthermore, [3] explored stochastic graphon games in linear-quadratic environments. Additional research in this area can be found in [17], [23], [4], [1]. [33] was the first to introduce graphon games with common noise.

In this paper, we investigate portfolio games with power utility functions. Our setting differs from [15] by incorporating heterogeneous interactions among agents and trading constraints. It also differs from [33] by using CRRA utility instead of exponential utility. Notably, in the exponential utility case, [33] only considers cases that are without constraints or without common noise. In the former case, the generator of graphon FBSDE system in [33] degenerates from quadratic to linear, whereas in our setting, the generator remains quadratic in both cases.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We derive explicit characterizations of Nash equilibrium in both finite-agent and graphon utility maximization games.
- We prove the existence of Nash equilibrium for the graphon game.
- We prove the existence of Nash equilibrium for the n -agent game in the absence of common noise.
- We show that if the sensitivity matrix in the finite-agent game converges to a graphon in a suitable sense, then the heterogeneous finite-agent game converges to the graphon game. Specifically, the sequence of Nash equilibrium and associated equilibrium value (up to a subsequence) converge to those of the graphon equilibrium.

For proving the existence of Nash equilibrium in the graphon game, we adopt an approach similar to [15], transforming the FBSDEs into BSDEs and applying the contraction mapping argument. It's worth noting that [15] focused on one-dimensional FBSDEs and BSDEs in their mean field framework, while our work addresses infinite-dimensional graphon FBSDEs and BSDEs due to agent heterogeneity, leading to more complex proofs. The proof of existence for Nash equilibrium in the n -agent game draws inspiration from [16]. We consider the difference between two BSDEs, using the solution to graphon BSDEs as a benchmark, and apply the contraction mapping theorem to complete the proof. Notably, this proof leads to the convergence of n -agent game Nash equilibrium to graphon Nash equilibrium, establishing a crucial link between finite-agent and graphon games.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. After introducing the necessary notation, we present the n -agent game model in Section 2.1 and the graphon game model in Section 2.2. Section 2.3 outlines our main results, which include the existence of Nash equilibrium for both the n -agent and graphon games, as well as the convergence results between them. In Section 3, we formulate the FBSDE characterizations for both types of games. Section 4 is dedicated to proofs: Section 4.1 proves the theorems presented in Section 3, Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 demonstrate the existence of Nash equilibrium for the graphon and n -agent games respectively, and Section 4.4 establishes the convergence results.

Notation. Now we introduce some spaces and norms that will be used throughout this paper. Fix a generic finite-dimensional normed vector space $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$, let \mathbb{G} be a filtration, and \mathcal{G} a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} .

- For any $p \in [1, \infty]$, $\mathbb{L}^p(E, \mathcal{G})$ is the space of E -valued, \mathcal{G} -measurable random variables R

such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|R\|_{\mathbb{L}^p(E, \mathcal{G})} &:= \left(\mathbb{E}[\|R\|_E^p] \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty, \text{ when } p < \infty, \\ \|R\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(E, \mathcal{G})} &:= \inf \{ \ell \geq 0 : \|R\|_E \leq \ell, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \} < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

- For any $p \in [1, \infty)$, $\mathbb{H}^p(E, \mathbb{G})$ is the space of E -valued, \mathbb{G} -predictable processes Z such that

$$\|Z\|_{\mathbb{H}^p(E, \mathbb{G})}^p := \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^T \|Z_s\|_E^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] < \infty.$$

- $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{G})$ (or simply \mathbb{H}_{BMO}) is a subset of $\mathbb{H}^2(E, \mathbb{G})$ satisfying

$$\|Z\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{G})}^2 := \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{G})} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^T \|Z_s\|_E^2 ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(E, \mathcal{G}_T)} < \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{G})$ is the set of \mathbb{G} -stopping times with values in $[0, T]$. For any $\kappa > 0$, we define a norm equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{G})}$ as follows:

$$\|Z\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(E, \mathbb{G})}^2 := \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{G})} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^T e^{\kappa s} \|Z_s\|_E^2 ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(E, \mathcal{G}_T)}.$$

- For any $p \in [1, \infty]$, $\mathbb{S}^p(E, \mathbb{G})$ is the space of E -valued, continuous, \mathbb{G} -adapted processes Y such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|Y\|_{\mathbb{S}^p(E, \mathbb{G})} &:= \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|Y_t\|_E^p \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty, \text{ when } p < \infty, \\ \|Y\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(E, \mathbb{G})} &:= \left\| \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|Y_t\|_E \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(E, \mathcal{G}_T)} < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

- Throughout this paper, $C(\cdot)$ denotes a generic positive constant that depends on the parameters inside the parentheses. This constant may vary from line to line. No explicit distinction will be made unless it is necessary for clarity. In some cases, to differentiate between constants, we may use $C^{(i)}(\cdot)$ to represent specific constants.

- δ represents the indicator function, which is defined as:

$$\delta_{(a, b]}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in (a, b], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

When the probability measure in the definition of these norms is different, specifically for a probability measure \mathbb{Q} defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , we append the subscript \mathbb{Q} to denote these spaces as $\mathbb{L}_{\mathbb{Q}}^p(E, \mathcal{G})$, $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^p(E, \mathbb{G})$, $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{Q}}(E, \mathbb{G})$, and $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Q}}^p(E, \mathbb{G})$.

2 Probabilistic setting and main results

In this section, building on the introduction, we rigorously define the corresponding n -agent and graphon game problems and present the main results of this paper.

2.1 The n -agent game

Assumption 2.1. Throughout, we assume that the \mathbb{F}^n -predictable stochastic processes μ^i , σ^i and σ^{*i} are bounded coefficients. Denoting $\Sigma_t^i := (\sigma_t^i, \sigma_t^{*i})$, we further assume that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the matrix $\Sigma^i(\Sigma^i)^\top$ is uniformly elliptic in the sense that there exist constants $K > \varepsilon > 0$ such that $KI_d \geq \Sigma^i(\Sigma^i)^\top \geq \varepsilon I_d$ holds \mathbb{P} -a.s..

Define the process $\theta^i = \{\theta_t^i : t \in [0, T]\}$ by

$$\theta_t^i := (\Sigma_t^i)^\top (\Sigma_t^i (\Sigma_t^i)^\top)^{-1} \mu_t^i.$$

Based on Assumption 2.1, we know that θ is bounded. For notational simplicity, in the subsequent proof, we will use $\|\theta\|$ to denote $\|\theta\|_\infty$ when no ambiguity arises. The equation for the wealth process X^{i, π^i} can be transformed from (1.3) to

$$dX_t^{i, \pi^i} = \pi_t^i X_t^{i, \pi^i} \cdot (\Sigma_t^i \theta_t^i dt + \sigma_t^i dW_t^i + \sigma_t^{*i} dW_t^{*i}), \quad X_0^{i, \pi^i} = x^i. \quad (2.1)$$

For brevity, let us introduce the following notation:

$$\lambda_{ij}^n := \frac{1}{n-1} \lambda_{ij} \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_{ii} := 0.$$

The optimization problem for agent i thus takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} V_0^{i, n} &:= V_0^{i, n}((\pi^j)_{j \neq i}) \\ &:= \sup_{\pi^i \in \mathcal{A}_i} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i, \pi^i} - \rho \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \hat{X}_T^{j, \pi^j} \right) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where \mathcal{A}_i denotes the set of admissible strategies for agent i defined by the following.

Definition 2.2 (Admissibility). Let A_i be a closed convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d , referred to as a constraint set. A strategy π^i for agent i is admissible if $\pi^i \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(A_i, \mathbb{F}^n)$. In this case, we denote $\pi^i \in \mathcal{A}_i$.

At this point, the definition of Nash equilibrium is as follows.

Definition 2.3. A vector $(\tilde{\pi}^1, \tilde{\pi}^2, \dots, \tilde{\pi}^n)$ ¹ of admissible strategies in $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_n$ is a Nash equilibrium if for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, the strategy $\tilde{\pi}^i$ is a solution to the portfolio optimization problem (2.2). That is, for each i ,

$$V_0^{i, n}((\tilde{\pi}^j)_{j \neq i}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i, \tilde{\pi}^i} - \rho \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \hat{X}_T^{j, \tilde{\pi}^j} \right) \right\} \right].$$

Remark 2.4. In [33], $(\lambda_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ were set as independent random variables following Bernoulli distributions. In this paper, we set $(\lambda_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ as constants, eliminating the stochastic element. This simplification is made for technical reasons, while still capturing the heterogeneous interactions among agents.

¹We mention that Nash equilibrium also depends on n and should be denoted as $(\tilde{\pi}^{1, n}, \tilde{\pi}^{2, n}, \dots, \tilde{\pi}^{n, n})$. However, for notational simplicity, we will use the abbreviated form $(\tilde{\pi}^1, \tilde{\pi}^2, \dots, \tilde{\pi}^n)$ when it does not lead to ambiguity.

2.2 The graphon game

The graphon game framework is similar to that in [33]. In the Introduction, we have provided a general overview. The rigorous probabilistic setup is as follows.

Consider \mathcal{B}_I as the Borel σ -field of I and μ_I as the Lebesgue measure on I . Given a probability space (I, \mathcal{I}, μ) that extends the usual Lebesgue measure space $(I, \mathcal{B}_I, \mu_I)$, and the sample space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, consider a rich Fubini extension $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \mu \boxtimes \mathbb{P})$ of the product space $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{F}, \mu \otimes \mathbb{P})$. Please refer to [32] for a comprehensive introduction to the theory of rich Fubini extensions. Let $C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the space of continuous functions from $[0, T]$ to \mathbb{R}^d . According to [32], we construct $\mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable processes $W : I \times \Omega \rightarrow C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$ with *essentially pairwise independent* (e.p.i.)², and identically distributed random variables $(W^u)_{u \in I}$, such that for each $u \in I$, the process $W^u = (W_t^u)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion supported on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Additionally, assume that the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ also supports a one-dimensional Brownian motion W^* independent of $(W^u)_{u \in I}$.

Remark 2.5. According to [32, Lemma 2.3], we have the standard Fubini property on the rich product space $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \mu \boxtimes \mathbb{P})$, meaning we can freely exchange the order of integration, i.e., given a measurable and integrable function f on $(I \times \Omega, \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}, \mu \boxtimes \mathbb{P})$, we have

$$\int_{I \times \Omega} f(u, \omega) \mu \boxtimes \mathbb{P}(d\omega, du) = \int_I \mathbb{E}[f(u)] \mu(du) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I f(u) \mu(du) \right].$$

This property will be frequently used in the proofs without further reference. In addition, we will simplify the notation by writing $\mu(du) \equiv du$.

In addition to the filtrations \mathbb{F}^u and \mathbb{F}^* defined in the introduction, we introduce a new filtration \mathbb{F} , which denotes the completion of the filtration generated by $((W^u)_{u \in I}, W^*)$. With these fundamental probabilistic structures in place, we now provide a rigorous definition of the strategy profile.

Definition 2.6. A strategy profile is a family $(\pi^u)_{u \in I}$ of \mathbb{F}^u -progressive processes taking values in \mathbb{R}^d and such that $(t, u, \omega) \mapsto \pi_t^u(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable.

Similar to the case with n -agent, the stocks price S^u following the dynamics

$$dS_t^u = \text{diag}(S_t^u) (\mu_t^u dt + \sigma_t^u dW_t^u + \sigma_t^{*u} dW_t^*), \quad u \in I, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.3)$$

and the wealth process of agent u under strategy π^u satisfies the dynamics

$$dX_t^{u, \pi^u} = \pi_t^u X_t^{u, \pi^u} \cdot (\Sigma_t^u \theta_t^u dt + \sigma_t^u dW_t^u + \sigma_t^{*u} dW_t^*), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad X_0^u = x^u, \quad (2.4)$$

where the processes Σ and θ are respectively defined by

$$\Sigma_t^u := (\sigma_t^u, \sigma_t^{*u}) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_t^u := \Sigma_t^{u\top} (\Sigma_t^u \Sigma_t^{u\top})^{-1} \mu_t^u, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

In this case, we also have an assumption similar to Assumption 2.1.

Assumption 2.7. Assume that μ , σ and σ^* are $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable stochastic processes on $[0, T] \times I \times \Omega$, uniformly bounded in $u \in I$, respectively. For μ -almost every $u \in I$, μ^u , σ^u and σ^{*u} are \mathbb{F}^u -predictable, and $(\mu^u)_{u \in I}$, $(\sigma^u)_{u \in I}$, and $(\sigma^{*u})_{u \in I}$ are e.p.i.. Additionally, we assume that $\Sigma_t^u \Sigma_t^{u\top}$ are uniformly elliptic, and $x^u : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is \mathcal{I} -measurable and assume to be bounded uniformly in $u \in I$.

²Here, following [32, Definition 2.7], essentially pairwise independent means that for μ -almost every $u \in I$ and μ -almost every $v \in I$, the processes W^u and W^v are independent.

We further impose the following assumption.

Assumption 2.8. Let the mapping $\gamma : I \rightarrow (-\infty, 1) \setminus \{0\}$ be \mathcal{I} -measurable and bounded away from zero uniformly in u , i.e., $0 < \underline{\gamma} \leq |\gamma^u|$ for some constants $\underline{\gamma}$. Moreover, we assume that there exist constants $0 < \bar{\gamma} < 1$ and $0 < \tilde{\gamma}$ such that $\gamma^u \leq \bar{\gamma}$ and $|\gamma^u| \leq \tilde{\gamma}$ for $u \in I$. To be precise, the mapping γ is valued on $(-\tilde{\gamma}, -\underline{\gamma}) \cup (\underline{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma})$.

According to (1.5), the optimization problem for agent u takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} V_0^{u,G} &= V_0^{u,G}((\pi^v)_{v \neq u}) \\ &:= \sup_{\{\pi^u | (\pi^v)_{v \in I} \in \mathcal{A}_G\}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^u} \exp \left(\gamma^u \left(\hat{X}_T^{u, \pi^u} - \rho \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \hat{X}_T^{v, \pi^v} G(u, v) dv | \mathcal{F}_T^* \right] \right) \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where the set of admissible strategies \mathcal{A}_G in the graphon game is defined by the following.

Definition 2.9. For any $u \in I$, let A_u be a closed convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d . A strategy profile $(\pi^u)_{u \in I}$ is admissible if for μ -almost every $u \in I$, it holds $\pi^u \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(A_u, \mathbb{F}^u)$. In this case, we will say that $(\pi^u)_{u \in I} \in \mathcal{A}_G$.

The definition of the *graphon Nash equilibrium* is as follows:

Definition 2.10. A family of admissible strategy profiles $(\tilde{\pi}^u)_{u \in I}$ is called a graphon Nash equilibrium if for μ -almost every u , the strategy $\tilde{\pi}^u$ is optimal for (2.5) with $(\pi^v)_{v \neq u}$ replaced by $(\tilde{\pi}^v)_{v \neq u}$. That is,

$$V_0^{u,G}((\tilde{\pi}^v)_{v \neq u}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^u} \exp \left(\gamma^u \left(\hat{X}_T^{u, \tilde{\pi}^u} - \rho \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \hat{X}_T^{v, \tilde{\pi}^v} G(u, v) dv | \mathcal{F}_T^* \right] \right) \right) \right].$$

Before presenting the results, we align the probabilistic settings of the n -agent problem and the graphon problem, as done by [33, Remark 2.10].

Remark 2.11. To maintain consistency with our graphon game notation, we rebrand the sequence of d -dimensional Brownian motions from Section 2.1 by $\{W^{\frac{i}{n}} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. This ensures that the completed natural filtration generated by $\{W^{\frac{i}{n}} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ and W^* is a subfiltration of \mathbb{F} . Consequently, all indices $i \in \mathbb{N}$ from the n -agent section should now be interpreted as $\frac{i}{n}$. Now, the coefficients in the game of the n -agent, $\{(\sigma^i, \sigma^{*i}, \theta^i, \gamma^i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, become $\{(\sigma^{\frac{i}{n}}, \sigma^{*\frac{i}{n}}, \theta^{\frac{i}{n}}, \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. For notational simplicity, we will retain the original indexing in subsequent sections. This rebranding will reappear in the results and proofs related to the convergence problem.

2.3 Main results

In this subsection, we present the main results of this paper: Theorem 2.14, Theorem 2.17 and Theorem 2.22, which address the existence of a Nash equilibrium in both the graphon game and the n -agent game, as well as the convergence of the finite-agent game to the graphon game.

2.3.1 Existence of the graphon game

We first consider the graphon game case. To establish the existence results, we impose the following condition.

Condition 2.12. There exists a constant $C_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$|P_t^u(x)| \leq |x| + C_0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, u \in [0, 1],$$

where $P_t^u(\zeta)$ denotes the projection of a vector ζ onto the constraint set $(\Sigma_t^u)^\top A_u$.

Remark 2.13. This condition is quite natural. In fact, due to the Lipschitz property of the projection operator, it holds as long as the projection is uniformly bounded at zero. A sufficient condition is that the zero vector belongs to A_u for all $u \in [0, 1]$. This is equivalent to assuming that each agent is allowed to invest solely in risk-free bonds, which is a reasonable assumption. In particular, under this condition, $C_0 = 0$.

Now we state the first result.

Theorem 2.14. *Assume that Condition 2.12 holds. Then there exist a positive constant ρ^* such that for all $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho^*$, the graphon game admits a graphon Nash equilibrium in $[0, T]$.*

Remark 2.15. The weak interaction assumption, that is, ρ is small, is essential for establishing the well-posedness result via the standard contraction mapping approach. Analogous assumptions have been observed in [33], [16] and [15].

2.3.2 Existence of the n -agent game

The second result establishes the existence of an equilibrium in the n -agent game. Due to technical limitations, we only prove existence in the absence of common noise.

In parallel with Condition 2.12, a mild condition is required for the n -agent case.

Condition 2.16. There exists a constant $C_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$|P_t^i(x)| \leq |x| + C_0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

where $P_t^i(\zeta)$ denotes the projection of a vector ζ onto the constraint set $(\sigma_t^i)^\top A_i$.

Theorem 2.17. *Assume there is no common noise and that Condition 2.16 holds. Then there exist positive constants ρ^* and T^* such that for all $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho^*$ and $0 < \tilde{T} \leq T^*$, the n -agent game admits a Nash equilibrium in $[0, \tilde{T}]$.*

Remark 2.18. The necessity of ρ^* is analogous to that discussed in Remark 2.15 and will not be reiterated here. However, unlike the graphon game, only local well-posedness can be expected in the n -agent game, even in the absence of constraints. As indicated in [13], multidimensional quadratic BSDEs are generally only locally solvable.

2.3.3 Convergence

The proof of Theorem 2.17 naturally leads to a corollary concerning convergence. Specifically, we derive a convergence result for the equilibrium as n tends to infinity, provided there is an appropriate relationship between the sensitivity parameters $(\lambda_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ of the n -agent problem and their graphon counterpart $G(u, v)$.

Let us consider the usual \mathbb{L}^2 norm on graphons, which is defined as

$$\|G\|_2 := \left(\int_{I \times I} |G(u, v)|^2 dudv \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We impose the following assumptions.

Condition 2.19. There exists a sequence of graphons $(G_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that:

(1) the graphons G_n are step functions, i.e., they satisfy

$$G_n(u, v) = G_n\left(\frac{\lceil nu \rceil}{n}, \frac{\lceil nv \rceil}{n}\right) \quad \text{for } (u, v) \in I \times I, \text{ and for every } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

(2) $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji} = G_n(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{j}{n})$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$,

(3) $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{u \in (\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]} \int_I |G(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(u, v)|^2 dv \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

(4) $n \|G_n - G\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 2.20. The graphons G_n introduced above are called step graphons, which are piecewise constant. In essence, this condition can be decomposed into three parts: Conditions (1) and (2) transform the n -agent sensitivity parameters λ_{ij} into step graphons. Condition (3) outlines the technical requirements on the function G that are essential for subsequent proofs. Condition (4) serves as the core condition linking the n -agent and graphon frameworks.

It is worth noting that Condition (3) is not particularly stringent for a graphon. Common graphons, such as the Uniform Attachment Graphon $U(x, y) = 1 - \max(x, y)$, satisfy this condition. In fact, all continuous graphons on $I \times I$ fulfill this requirement.

Furthermore, we need to impose additional technical requirements on the parameters.

Condition 2.21. Assume that

(1) $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{u \in (\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]} \|\theta_n^{\frac{i}{n}} - \theta^u\|_{\text{BMO}} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

(2) $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{u \in (\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]} |\gamma_n^{\frac{i}{n}} - \gamma^u| \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

(3) $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{u \in (\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]} |\log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) - \log(x^u)| \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

(4) $\|\log(x)\| := \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\log(x^u)| < \infty$.

Consequently, we establish the following convergence result.

Theorem 2.22. *Assume that there is no common noise, A^u is independent of u , that is the investment restrictions are the same for all agents and that Condition 2.19 and Condition 2.21 hold. Then there exist positive constants ρ^* and T^* such that for all $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho^*$ and $0 < \tilde{T} \leq T^*$:*

(1) *The n -agent game admits a Nash equilibrium for any $n \geq 2$,*

(2) *The graphon game admits a graphon Nash equilibrium in $[0, \tilde{T}]$,*

(3) *The n -agent Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^{i,n})_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ obtained in (1) converges to the graphon Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^u)_{u \in I}$ obtained in (2), in the sense that up to a subsequence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$|\tilde{\pi}_t^{i,n} - \tilde{\pi}_t^{\frac{i}{n}}| \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{dt} \otimes \mathbb{P})\text{-a.s.}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$|V_0^{i,n}((\tilde{\pi}^{j,n})_{j \neq i}) - V_0^{\frac{i}{n}, G}((\tilde{\pi}^v)_{v \neq \frac{i}{n}})| \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Before proceeding further, we deal with the case with deterministic market coefficients, without trading constraints and common noise. In this simplified setting, we explicitly derive the Nash equilibrium for both the n -agent and graphon games, thereby enabling a direct verification of convergence.

Proposition 2.23. *Assume that, for all $u \in I$, $A_u = \mathbb{R}^d$, $\sigma^{*u} = 0$ and σ^u, μ^u are deterministic measurable functions of time. Consider a slight modification of the utility maximization problem where $\lambda_{ii} \neq 0$, i.e., agent i takes into account a weighted average of all agents' final wealths as their benchmark. Under this modification, the utility maximisation problem for agent i now becomes*

$$\begin{aligned} V_0^{i,n} &= V_0^{i,n}((\pi^j)_{j \neq i}) \\ &:= \sup_{\pi^i \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i,\pi^i} - \rho \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{ij}^n \hat{X}_T^{j,\pi^j} \right) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^{i,n})_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ given by

$$\sigma_t^{i, \tilde{\pi}^{i,n}} = \frac{\theta_t^i}{1 - \gamma^i + \rho \gamma^i \lambda_{ii}^n} \quad \text{for all } (n, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and a.s. } t.$$

Furthermore, there is a graphon Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^u)_{u \in I}$ given by

$$\sigma_t^{u, \tilde{\pi}^u} = \frac{\theta_t^u}{1 - \gamma^u} \quad \text{for a.s. } (u, t) \in I \times [0, T].$$

In particular, $\tilde{\pi}^{i,n}$ and $\tilde{\pi}^u$ are deterministic and we have

$$\left| \sigma_t^{i, \tilde{\pi}^{i,n}} - \sigma_t^{i, \tilde{\pi}^u} \right| \leq \frac{\rho \tilde{\gamma} \lambda_{ii}^n |\theta_t^i|}{|(1 - \gamma^i)(1 - \gamma^i + \rho \gamma^i \lambda_{ii}^n)|} \quad \text{for all } (n, i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and a.s. } t.$$

3 Characterizations of the utility maximization games

This section presents characterizations of the Nash equilibrium for the two aforementioned games in terms of solutions to FBSDEs. These characterizations are fundamental to the proof of our results.

3.1 FBSDE characterization of the n -agent game

The following theorem provides an FBSDE characterization for the n -agent utility maximization problem (2.2). Specifically, it expresses the Nash equilibrium and the associated utilities as functions of solutions to a system of (quadratic) FBSDEs. This result extends the FBSDE characterization of [15] to include cases with portfolio constraints. For notational convenience, we define $\bar{X}_t^i := \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \hat{X}_t^{j, \tilde{\pi}^j}$.

To establish this characterization, we first introduce a regular class R_p , within which FBSDEs can characterize the equilibrium. This approach traces its origins to [14], who demonstrated that the R_p regularity condition is crucial for applying the powerful BMO martingale techniques.

Definition 3.1. For some $p > 1$, we say that a stochastic process D satisfies the reverse Hölder inequality R_p (with respect to filtration $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$) if there exists a constant C such that for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{G})$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{D_T}{D_\tau} \right|^p \middle| \mathcal{G}_\tau \right] \leq C.$$

Theorem 3.2. (1) If the n -agent game admits a Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$, such that for any i , there exists $p > 1$ with

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i, \tilde{\pi}^i} - \rho \bar{X}_T^i \right) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}^n \right] \text{ satisfies the reverse Hölder inequality } R_p, \quad (3.1)$$

then the FBSDEs

$$\begin{cases} d\hat{X}_t^i = \left((\tilde{\pi}_t^i)^\top \Sigma_t^i \theta_t^i - \frac{1}{2} |(\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i|^2 \right) dt + (\tilde{\pi}_t^i)^\top \Sigma_t^i d \begin{pmatrix} W_t^i \\ W_t^{*i} \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{X}_0^i = \log(x^i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ -dY_t^i = \left(\frac{1}{2} |Z_t^{*i}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n |Z_t^{ij}|^2 + \frac{\gamma^i}{2(1-\gamma^i)} \left| \begin{pmatrix} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^i \right|^2 - \frac{\gamma^i(1-\gamma^i)}{2} \left| (I - P_t^i) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^i} \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^i \right) \right) \right|^2 \right) dt \\ - \sum_{j=1}^n Z_t^{ij} \cdot dW_t^j - Z_t^{*i} dW_t^{*i}, & Y_T^i = -\rho \gamma^i \bar{X}_T^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

admit a solution with $((Z^{ij})_{1 \leq j \leq n}, Z^{*i}) \in (\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n))^n \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(2) If the FBSDEs (3.2) admits a solution with

$$((Z^{ij})_{1 \leq j \leq n}, Z^{*i}) \in (\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n))^n \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then the n -agent game admits a Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ such that (3.1) holds and it holds that for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$V_0^i = \frac{1}{\gamma^i} (x^i)^{\gamma^i} \exp(Y_0^i). \quad (3.3)$$

In both cases, the relationship is given by

$$\tilde{\pi}_t^i = \left(\Sigma_t^i \Sigma_t^{i\top} \right)^{-1} \Sigma_t^i P_t^i \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^i} \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^i \right) \right), \quad dt \otimes \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. The proof is presented in Section 4.1. □

3.2 FBSDE characterization of the graphon game

Analogous to the n -agent game discussed above, we now derive FBSDE characterizations for the graphon game. In this case, the characterization is obtained with respect to a system of (infinitely many) McKean-Vlasov FBSDEs. We refer to these equations as graphon FBSDEs to emphasize that the interdependence among the equations is mediated through the graphon G .

Proposition 3.3. (1) If the graphon game described in (2.5) admits a graphon Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^u)_{u \in I}$ such that for μ -almost every $u \in I$, there exists $p > 1$ with

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^u} \exp \left\{ \gamma^u \left(\hat{X}_T^{u, \tilde{\pi}^u} - \rho \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \hat{X}_T^{v, \tilde{\pi}^v} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_T^* \right] \right) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}^u \right] \text{ satisfies the reverse Hölder inequality } R_p, \quad (3.5)$$

then the following graphon FBSDE

$$\begin{cases} d\hat{X}_t^u = \left((\tilde{\pi}_t^u)^\top \Sigma_t^u \theta_t^u - \frac{1}{2} |(\Sigma_t^u)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^u|^2 \right) dt + (\tilde{\pi}_t^u)^\top \Sigma_t^u d \begin{pmatrix} W_t^u \\ W_t^* \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{X}_0^u = \log(x^u), \\ -dY_t^u = \left(\frac{1}{2} |Z_t^{*u}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |Z_t^u|^2 + \frac{\gamma^u}{2(1-\gamma^u)} \left| \begin{pmatrix} Z_t^u \\ Z_t^{*u} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^u \right|^2 - \frac{\gamma^u(1-\gamma^u)}{2} \left| (I-P_t^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z_t^u \\ Z_t^{*u} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^u \right) \right) \right|^2 \right) dt \\ - Z_t^u \cdot dW_t^u - Z_t^{*u} dW_t^*, & Y_T^u = -\rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \hat{X}_T^v G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_T^* \right] \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

admits a solution with $(Z^u, Z^{*u}) \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^u) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)$ for μ -almost every $u \in I$.

(2) If the graphon FBSDE (3.6) admits a solution such that $(t, u, \omega) \rightarrow (\hat{X}_t^u, Y_t^u, Z_t^u, Z_t^{*u})$ is $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable and

$$(Z^u, Z^{*u}) \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^u) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u) \text{ for } \mu\text{-almost every } u \in I.$$

Then the graphon game admits a graphon Nash equilibrium $(\tilde{\pi}^u)_{u \in I}$ such that (3.5) holds and, for μ -almost every $u \in I$, we have

$$V_0^{u, G} = \frac{1}{\gamma^u} (x^u)^{\gamma^u} \exp(Y_0^u). \quad (3.7)$$

In both cases, the relationship is given by

$$\tilde{\pi}_t^u = \left(\Sigma_t^u \Sigma_t^{u\top} \right)^{-1} \Sigma_t^u P_t^u \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z_t^u \\ Z_t^{*u} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^u \right) \right) dt \otimes \mu \boxtimes \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 3.2 and is therefore omitted. \square

4 Proofs

4.1 Characterization result: Proofs of Theorem 3.2

We now present the proof of the characterization result for the n -agent game.

Proof of (1). Let $(\tilde{\pi}^i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ be a Nash equilibrium such that (3.1) holds. For any $\pi^i \in \mathcal{A}_i$, define

$$M^{i, \pi^i}(t) = \exp(\gamma^i \hat{X}_t^{i, \pi^i}) \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\kappa \in \mathcal{A}_i} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i, \kappa} - \hat{X}_t^{i, \kappa} - \rho \hat{X}_T^i \right) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right].$$

Following the arguments presented in [12, Theorem 4.7], and [14, Theorem 3.2], using dynamic programming, we establish that M^{i, π^i} admits a continuous version, which is a supermartingale for all π^i and a martingale for $\tilde{\pi}^i$. The origin of this proof can be traced back to [19].

By a variant of the martingale representation theorem, we express $M^{i, \tilde{\pi}^i}$ as:

$$M^{i, \tilde{\pi}^i}(t) = M^{i, \tilde{\pi}^i}(0) \mathcal{E}_t \left(\int_0^\cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{Z}^{ij} \cdot dW^j + \tilde{Z}^{*i} dW^* \right),$$

where

$$\tilde{Z}^{ij} \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n), \quad \tilde{Z}^{*i} \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^n), \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (4.1)$$

The BMO property (4.1) is obtained from [21, Theorem 3.4] and (3.1).

Straightforward calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
M^{i,\pi^i}(t) &= \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_t^{i,\pi^i} - \hat{X}_t^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i} \right) \right\} M^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i}(t) \\
&= M^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i}(0) \mathcal{E}_t \left(\int_0^\cdot \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{Z}^{ij} \cdot dW^j + \tilde{Z}^{*i} dW^* \right) \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_t^{i,\pi^i} - \hat{X}_t^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i} \right) \right\} \\
&= M^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i}(0) \mathcal{E}_t \left(\int_0^\cdot \sum_{j \neq i} \tilde{Z}^{ij} \cdot dW^j + \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \tilde{Z}^{ii} \\ \tilde{Z}^{*i} \end{array} \right)^\top + \gamma^i (\pi^i)^\top \Sigma^i - \gamma^i (\tilde{\pi}^i)^\top \Sigma^i \right) d \left(\begin{array}{c} W^i \\ W^* \end{array} \right) \right) \exp \left(\int_0^t \tilde{f}_s ds \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{f}_t &= \gamma^i (\pi_t^i)^\top \Sigma_t^i \theta_t^i - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^i |(\Sigma_t^i)^\top \pi_t^i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^i |(\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i|^2 - \gamma^i (\tilde{\pi}_t^i)^\top \Sigma_t^i \theta_t^i + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^i)^2 |(\Sigma_t^i)^\top \pi_t^i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^i)^2 |(\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i|^2 \\
&\quad - (\gamma^i)^2 (\tilde{\pi}_t^i)^\top \Sigma_t^i (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \pi_t^i + \gamma^i (\pi_t^i)^\top \Sigma_t^i \left(\begin{array}{c} \tilde{Z}_t^{ii} \\ \tilde{Z}_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) - \gamma^i (\tilde{\pi}_t^i)^\top \Sigma_t^i \left(\begin{array}{c} \tilde{Z}_t^{ii} \\ \tilde{Z}_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) \\
&= \frac{\gamma^i (1 - \gamma^i)}{2} \left[\left| (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma^i} \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \tilde{Z}_t^{ii} \\ \tilde{Z}_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) + \theta_t^i - \gamma^i (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i \right) \right|^2 - \left| (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \pi_t^i - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma^i} \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \tilde{Z}_t^{ii} \\ \tilde{Z}_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) + \theta_t^i - \gamma^i (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i \right) \right|^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Define $Z_t^{ij} = \tilde{Z}_t^{ij}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, $j \neq i$, $Z_t^{ii} = \tilde{Z}_t^{ii} - \gamma^i (\sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i$ and $Z_t^{*i} = \tilde{Z}_t^{*i} - \gamma^i (\sigma_t^{*i})^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i$. Then we have

$$Z^{ij} \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n), \quad Z^{*i} \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^n), \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

as $\tilde{\pi}^i$ and π^i belong to \mathcal{A}_i . Consequently, \tilde{f}_t can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{f}_t = \frac{\gamma^i (1 - \gamma^i)}{2} \left[\left| (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma^i} \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) + \theta_t^i \right) \right|^2 - \left| (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \pi_t^i - \frac{1}{1 - \gamma^i} \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) + \theta_t^i \right) \right|^2 \right].$$

Because M^{i,π^i} is a supermartingale, $\exp \left(\int_0^\cdot \tilde{f}_s ds \right)$ is non-increasing if $\gamma^i > 0$ and non-decreasing if $\gamma^i < 0$. As such, $\frac{\tilde{f}}{\gamma^i}$ is non-positive. Thus we have

$$(\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i = P_t^i \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma^i} \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) + \theta_t^i \right) \right), dt \otimes \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

which implies

$$\tilde{\pi}_t^i = \left(\Sigma_t^i \Sigma_t^{i\top} \right)^{-1} \Sigma_t^i P_t^i \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma^i} \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{array} \right) + \theta_t^i \right) \right), dt \otimes \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s..}$$

Furthermore, define $Y^i = \log \left(\gamma^i M^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i} \exp \left(-\gamma^i \hat{X}^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i} \right) \right)$. Then $(\hat{X}^{i,\tilde{\pi}^i}, Y^i, Z^{i1}, \dots, Z^{in}, Z^{*i})$ satisfies (3.2). \square

Proof of (2). Fix an $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For each strategy $\pi^i \in \mathcal{A}_i$, define

$$R_t^{\pi^i} = \frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp(Y_t^i + \gamma^i \hat{X}_t^{i,\pi^i}),$$

where Y_t^i is the solution of the FBSDE (3.2). We claim that R^{π^i} is a supermartingale for all π^i and a martingale for $\pi^i = \tilde{\pi}^i$ defined by (3.4).

Indeed, using Itô's formula, we have

$$R_t^{\pi^i} = \frac{1}{\gamma^i} (x^i)^{\gamma^i} \exp(Y_0^i) \mathcal{E}_t \left(\int_0^\cdot \sum_{j \neq i} Z^{ij} \cdot dW^j + \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z^{ii} \\ Z^{*i} \end{pmatrix}^\top + \gamma^i (\pi^i)^\top \Sigma^i \right) d \begin{pmatrix} W^i \\ W^* \end{pmatrix} \right) \exp \left(\int_0^t \tilde{f}_s(\pi^i) ds \right),$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_t(\pi^i) = \frac{\gamma^i(1-\gamma^i)}{2} \left[\left| (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \tilde{\pi}_t^i - \frac{1}{1-\gamma^i} \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^i \right) \right|^2 - \left| (\Sigma_t^i)^\top \pi_t^i - \frac{1}{1-\gamma^i} \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z_t^{ii} \\ Z_t^{*i} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^i \right) \right|^2 \right].$$

The stochastic exponential

$$\mathcal{E}_t \left(\int_0^\cdot \sum_{j \neq i} Z^{ij} \cdot dW^j + \left(\begin{pmatrix} Z^{ii} \\ Z^{*i} \end{pmatrix}^\top + \gamma^i (\pi^i)^\top \Sigma^i \right) d \begin{pmatrix} W^i \\ W^* \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

is a uniformly integrable martingale since $\pi^i \in H_{\text{BMO}}$, as established by [21, Theorem 2.3]. Notice that $\frac{\tilde{f}}{\gamma^i}$ is non-positive for all $\pi^i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and zero for $\tilde{\pi}^i$, R^{π^i} is a supermartingale for all π^i and a martingale for $\pi^i = \tilde{\pi}^i$. Consequently, we have $\mathbb{E}[R_T^{\tilde{\pi}^i}] = \mathbb{E}[R_0^{\tilde{\pi}^i}] = \mathbb{E}[R_0^{\pi^i}] \geq \mathbb{E}[R_T^{\pi^i}]$, which implies that

$$V_0^i((\tilde{\pi}^j)_{j \neq i}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i, \tilde{\pi}^i} - \rho \bar{X}_T^i \right) \right\} \right] = \frac{1}{\gamma^i} (x^i)^{\gamma^i} \exp(Y_0^i).$$

Thus (3.3) holds and $(\tilde{\pi}^i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ is a Nash equilibrium of the n -agent game. Notice that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \exp \left\{ \gamma^i \left(\hat{X}_T^{i, \tilde{\pi}^i} - \rho \bar{X}_T^i \right) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}^n \right] = R^{\tilde{\pi}^i}$$

is a uniformly integrable martingale, (3.1) follows from [21, Theorem 3.4]. \square

4.2 Wellposedness of graphon McKean–Vlasov FBSDEs: Proof of Theorem 2.14

In the ensuing statements and proofs, we will use the space $\mathbb{S}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)$ defined as the space of families of processes $(Y^u)_{u \in I}$ such that $(t, u, \omega) \mapsto Y_t^u(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathbb{F}$ -measurable and for μ -almost every u , it holds $Y^u \in \mathbb{S}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^u)$. This space is equipped with the norm

$$\|Y\|_{\mathbb{S}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} := \sup_{u \in I} \|Y^u\|_{\mathbb{S}^p(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^u)}$$

which makes it a Banach space. The space $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)$ is defined analogously to $\mathbb{S}^p(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ with the norm

$$\|Z\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} := \sup_{u \in I} \|Z^u\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^u)}.$$

In the following proof, we assume that Condition 2.12 in Theorem 2.14 holds. By Proposition 3.3, we have transformed our problem into proving the existence of solutions for the graphon McKean–Vlasov FBSDEs (3.6). To proceed, we need to convert these FBSDEs into equivalent BSDEs. The following lemma is crucial for this transformation and partially motivates the weak interaction assumption on ρ .

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a positive constant ρ_1 such that for all $0 \leq \rho < \rho_1$, for each given $\tilde{Z}^* \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ and $\tilde{Z} \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)$, the equation*

$$\tilde{Z}_t^{*u} = Z_t^{*u} + \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Z}_t^v \\ Z_t^{*v} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^v \right) \right)^\top (\Sigma_t^v)^\top (\Sigma_t^v \Sigma_t^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma_t^{*v} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^* \right] \quad (4.2)$$

has a unique solution $Z^* \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$, which is denoted by $Z_t^{*u} = g_t^u(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})$ for $t \in [0, T]$ and $u \in I$. Moreover, $g(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})$ is linear growth under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}$, i.e.,

$$\|g(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0) \left(1 + \|\tilde{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\tilde{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

and is Lipschitz w.r.t \tilde{Z}^* and \tilde{Z} under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}$, i.e.,

$$\|g(\tilde{Z}^{*1}, \tilde{Z}^1) - g(\tilde{Z}^{*2}, \tilde{Z}^2)\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}) \left(\|\tilde{Z}^{*1} - \tilde{Z}^{*2}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\tilde{Z}^1 - \tilde{Z}^2\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} \right). \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. The equation (4.2) has a unique solution if and only if the map $M(Z^*; \tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})$ defined as

$$M_t^u(Z^*; \tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) = \tilde{Z}_t^{*u} - \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Z}_t^v \\ Z_t^{*v} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^v \right) \right)^\top (\Sigma_t^v)^\top (\Sigma_t^v \Sigma_t^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma_t^{*v} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^* \right]$$

has a unique fixed point.

First, note that $\left| \sigma_t^{*v\top} (\Sigma_t^v \Sigma_t^{v\top})^{-1} \Sigma_t^v \right|^2 < 1$. For notational convenience, let us omit all t subscripts. Notice that $\Sigma^v \Sigma^{v\top} = \sigma^v \sigma^{v\top} + \sigma^{*v} \sigma^{*v\top}$. Using the Sherman-Morrison formula, we have

$$\left(\Sigma^v \Sigma^{v\top} \right)^{-1} = (\sigma^v \sigma^{v\top})^{-1} - \frac{(\sigma^v \sigma^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma^{*v} \sigma^{*v\top} (\sigma^v \sigma^{v\top})^{-1}}{1 + \sigma^{*v\top} (\sigma^v \sigma^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma^{*v}}.$$

Thus

$$\left| \sigma^{*v\top} \left(\Sigma^v \Sigma^{v\top} \right)^{-1} \Sigma^v \right|^2 = \frac{\sigma^{*v\top} (\sigma^v \sigma^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma^{*v}}{1 + \sigma^{*v\top} (\sigma^v \sigma^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma^{*v}} < 1,$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that σ^v is uniformly elliptic. Moreover, as the projection operator is 1-Lipschitz, using Hölder inequality, Cauchy inequality and Lemma B.1 we obtain

$$\|M(Z^{*1}; \tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) - M(Z^{*2}; \tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \leq \frac{\rho\tilde{\gamma}}{(1-\tilde{\gamma})} \|Z^{*1} - Z^{*2}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}.$$

Therefore, by choosing $\rho < \frac{1-\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\gamma}}$, we get that the map $M(Z^*; \tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})$ is a contraction under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}$, hence it has a unique fixed point.

Next, we prove the linear growth and Lipschitz continuity of $g(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})$. Given that

$$g_t^u(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) = \tilde{Z}_t^{*u} - \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Z}_t^v \\ g_t^v(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) \end{pmatrix} + \theta_t^v \right) \right)^\top (\Sigma_t^v)^\top (\Sigma_t^v \Sigma_t^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma_t^{*v} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^* \right],$$

we apply Condition 2.12, Hölder inequality, Cauchy inequality and Lemma B.1 to obtain:

$$\|g(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0) \left(1 + \|\tilde{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\tilde{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \rho^2 \|g(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \right).$$

Similarly, leveraging the 1-Lipschitz property of the projection operator, we derive:

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(\tilde{Z}^{*1}, \tilde{Z}^1) - g(\tilde{Z}^{*2}, \tilde{Z}^2)\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}) \left(\|\tilde{Z}^{*1} - \tilde{Z}^{*2}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\tilde{Z}^1 - \tilde{Z}^2\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \rho^2 \|g(\tilde{Z}^{*1}, \tilde{Z}^1) - g(\tilde{Z}^{*2}, \tilde{Z}^2)\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by choosing ρ sufficiently small, we establish (4.3) and (4.4). \square

Lemma 4.2. *For the same ρ_1 as in Lemma 4.1, for any $0 \leq \rho < \rho_1$, there is a one-to-one correspondence between a solution to the graphon FBSDEs (3.6) and a solution $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{Z}^*) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ to the following graphon BSDEs:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_t^u &= -\rho\gamma^u \int_I \log(x^v) dv - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^* \\ &\quad + \int_t^T \left(\frac{1}{2} (|\tilde{Z}_s^u|^2 + |g_s^u(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z})|^2) + \frac{\gamma^u}{2(1-\gamma^u)} \left| \left(g_s^u(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) \right) + \theta_s^u \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\gamma^u(1-\gamma^u)}{2} \left| (I - P_s^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \left(\left(g_s^u(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) \right) + \theta_s^u \right) \right) \right|^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \theta_s^v \cdot P_s^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(g_s^v(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) \right) + \theta_s^v \right) \right) G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_s^* \right] \\ &\quad + \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \frac{1}{2} \left| P_s^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(g_s^v(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) \right) + \theta_s^v \right) \right) \right|^2 G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_s^* \right] ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

The relationship is given, for each $t \in [0, T]$, by

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_t^u &= Y_t^u + \rho\gamma^u \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \theta_s^v \cdot P_s^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(\begin{matrix} Z_s^v \\ Z_s^{*v} \end{matrix} \right) + \theta_s^v \right) \right) G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_s^* \right] ds \\ &\quad - \rho\gamma^u \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \frac{1}{2} \left| P_s^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(\begin{matrix} Z_s^v \\ Z_s^{*v} \end{matrix} \right) + \theta_s^v \right) \right) \right|^2 G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_s^* \right] ds \\ &\quad + \rho\gamma^u \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I P_s^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(\begin{matrix} Z_s^v \\ Z_s^{*v} \end{matrix} \right) + \theta_s^v \right) \right)^\top (\Sigma_t^u)^\top (\Sigma_t^u \Sigma_t^{u\top})^{-1} \sigma_t^{*u} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_s^* \right] dW_s^*, \\ \tilde{Z}_t^{*u} &= Z_t^{*u} + \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(\begin{matrix} Z_t^v \\ Z_t^{*v} \end{matrix} \right) + \theta_t^v \right) \right)^\top (\Sigma_t^u)^\top (\Sigma_t^u \Sigma_t^{u\top})^{-1} \sigma_t^{*u} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^* \right], \\ \tilde{Z}_t^u &= Z_t^u. \end{aligned} \right. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. See the proof of [15, Proposition 3.5]. \square

The subsequent proofs rely on the one-to-one correspondence result in Lemma 4.2. Therefore, in the following proofs, we assume $\rho \leq \rho_1$. Under this assumption, our problem transforms into establishing the wellposedness of graphon BSDEs (4.5). We aim to solve these BSDEs under the weak interaction assumption. To avoid unnecessary restrictions on the time horizon T imposed by the non-homogeneous term without ρ , we compare it with the benchmark BSDE associated with the single-agent utility maximization problem, i.e., the case where $\rho = 0$. In this scenario,

the BSDEs reduce to:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_t^u &= - \int_t^T Z_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T Z_s^{*u} dW_s^* \\
&+ \int_t^T \left(\frac{1}{2} (|Z_s^u|^2 + |Z_s^{*u}|^2) + \frac{\gamma^u}{2(1-\gamma^u)} \left| \begin{pmatrix} Z_s^u \\ Z_s^{*u} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^u \right|^2 \right. \\
&\left. - \frac{\gamma^u(1-\gamma^u)}{2} \left| (I - P_s^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \begin{pmatrix} Z_s^u \\ Z_s^{*u} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^u \right) \right|^2 \right) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

[19, Theorem 14] ensures the existence of a unique triple $(Y, Z, Z^*) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ satisfying the BSDE in (4.7). Let $(Y^o, Z^o, Z^{*,o})$ denote the unique solution to (4.7). Consider a solution $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{Z}^*)$ to (4.5) and examine the difference:

$$(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) := (\tilde{Y} - Y^o, \tilde{Z} - Z^o, \tilde{Z}^* - Z^{*,o}).$$

This difference satisfies the following BSDEs:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{Y}_t^u &= - \rho \gamma^u \int_I \log(x^v) dv - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^* \\
&+ \int_t^T \left(\frac{1}{2} (|\bar{Z}_s^u + Z_s^{u,o}|^2 - |Z_s^{u,o}|^2) + \frac{1}{2} (|g_s^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})|^2 - |Z_s^{*,o}|^2) \right. \\
&+ \frac{\gamma^u}{2(1-\gamma^u)} \left(\left| \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z}_s^u + Z_s^{u,o} \\ g_s^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z}) \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^u \right|^2 - \left| \begin{pmatrix} Z_s^{u,o} \\ Z_s^{*,o} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^u \right|^2 \right) \\
&- \frac{\gamma^u(1-\gamma^u)}{2} \left(\left| (I - P_s^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z}_s^u + Z_s^{u,o} \\ g_s^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z}) \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^u \right) \right|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left| (I - P_s^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \begin{pmatrix} Z_s^{u,o} \\ Z_s^{*,o} \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^u \right) \right|^2 \right) \\
&- \rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \theta_s^v \cdot P_s^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z}_s^v + Z_s^{v,o} \\ g_s^{v,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z}) \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^v \right) G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_s^* \right] \\
&+ \rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \frac{1}{2} \left| P_s^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z}_s^v + Z_s^{v,o} \\ g_s^{v,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z}) \end{pmatrix} + \theta_s^v \right) \right|^2 G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_s^* \right] \Big) ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where $g_s^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z}) := g_s^u(\tilde{Z}^*, \tilde{Z}) = g_s^u(\bar{Z}^* + Z^{*,o}, \bar{Z} + Z^o)$. Thus, the problem is further reduced to establishing the wellposedness of BSDEs (4.8).

The generator of BSDEs (4.8) can be decomposed into two parts, $f_1^{u,o}$ and $f_2^{u,o}$, where:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) &= \frac{1}{2}(|\bar{Z}_t^u + Z_t^{u,o}|^2 - |Z_t^{u,o}|^2) + \frac{1}{2}(|\bar{Z}_t^{*u} + Z_t^{*u,o}|^2 - |Z_t^{*u,o}|^2) \\
&+ \frac{\gamma^u}{2(1-\gamma^u)} \left(\left| \left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^u + Z_t^{u,o}}{\bar{Z}_t^{*u} + Z_t^{*u,o}} \right) + \theta_t^u \right|^2 - \left| \left(\frac{Z_t^{u,o}}{Z_t^{*u,o}} \right) + \theta_t^u \right|^2 \right) \\
&- \frac{\gamma^u(1-\gamma^u)}{2} \left(\left| (I - P_t^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \left(\left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^u + Z_t^{u,o}}{\bar{Z}_t^{*u} + Z_t^{*u,o}} \right) + \theta_t^u \right) \right) \right|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left| (I - P_t^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \left(\left(\frac{Z_t^{u,o}}{Z_t^{*u,o}} \right) + \theta_t^u \right) \right) \right|^2 \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_2^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*, \rho) &= \frac{1}{2}(|g_t^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})|^2 - |\bar{Z}_t^{*u} + Z_t^{*u,o}|^2) \\
&+ \frac{\gamma^u}{2(1-\gamma^u)} \left(\left| \left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^u + Z_t^{u,o}}{g_t^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})} \right) + \theta_t^u \right|^2 - \left| \left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^u + Z_t^{u,o}}{\bar{Z}_t^{*u} + Z_t^{*u,o}} \right) + \theta_t^u \right|^2 \right) \\
&- \frac{\gamma^u(1-\gamma^u)}{2} \left(\left| (I - P_t^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \left(\left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^u + Z_t^{u,o}}{g_t^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})} \right) + \theta_t^u \right) \right) \right|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left| (I - P_t^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} \left(\left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^u + Z_t^{u,o}}{\bar{Z}_t^{*u} + Z_t^{*u,o}} \right) + \theta_t^u \right) \right) \right|^2 \right) \\
&- \rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \theta_t^v \cdot P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^v + Z_t^{v,o}}{g_t^{v,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})} \right) + \theta_t^v \right) \right) G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^* \right] \\
&+ \rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \frac{1}{2} \left| P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^v + Z_t^{v,o}}{g_t^{v,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})} \right) + \theta_t^v \right) \right) \right|^2 G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^* \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Through calculation, we find that $f_1^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*)$ can be expressed in the following form:

$$f_1^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) = L_t^u(|\bar{Z}_t^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_t^{*u}|^2) + L_t^{1,u} \cdot \bar{Z}_t^u + L_t^{2,u} \bar{Z}_t^{*u}, \tag{4.11}$$

where the stochastic processes $\{L_t^u\}$, $\{L_t^{1,u}\}$, and $\{L_t^{2,u}\}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
|L_t^u| &\leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{5\tilde{\gamma}}{2(1-\tilde{\gamma})}, \\
|L_t^{1,u}| &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T)(1 + |Z_t^{u,o}|), \\
|L_t^{2,u}| &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T)(1 + |Z_t^{*u,o}|).
\end{aligned}$$

According to [21, Theorem 2.3], we define a probability $\mathbb{P}^{u,o}$ by

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^{u,o}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \mathcal{E} \left(\int_0^\cdot L_s^{1,u} \cdot dW_s^u + \int_0^\cdot L_s^{2,u} dW_s^* \right).$$

Consequently, we rewrite the (4.8) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{Y}_t^u &= -\rho \gamma^u \int_I \log(x^v) dv - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^{u, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}} - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}} \\
&+ \int_t^T L_s^u(|\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) + f_2^{u,o}(s; \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*, \rho) ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

where $W_t^{u, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}} = W_t^u - \int_0^t L_s^{1,u} ds$ and $W_t^{*, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}} = W_t^* - \int_0^t L_s^{2,u} ds$ are Brownian motions under $\mathbb{P}^{u,o}$.

It should be noted that the norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u, o}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)}$ (where $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ or \mathbb{R}) are equivalent, which can be observed to be written as

$$\begin{aligned} C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}, \|Z^{*, o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}) \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)} &\leq \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u, o}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)}, \\ \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u, o}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)} &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}, \|Z^{*, o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}) \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

For the subsequent proof, we supplement the definition of the space $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(E, \mathbb{F}, I)$, defined as the space of families of processes $(Z^u)_{u \in I}$ such that $(t, u, \omega) \mapsto Z^u(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{I} \boxtimes \mathbb{F}$ -measurable and for μ -almost every u , it holds $Z^u \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u, o}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)$. This space is equipped with the norm

$$\|Z\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(E, \mathbb{F}, I)} := \sup_{u \in I} \|Z^u\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u, o}}(E, \mathbb{F}^u)},$$

which makes it a Banach space. Noting that the equivalence coefficient in (4.13) is independent of u , we obtain the following equivalence relation:

$$\begin{aligned} C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}, \|Z^{*, o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}) \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{F}, I)} &\leq \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(E, \mathbb{F}, I)} \\ \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{F}, I)} &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}, \|Z^{*, o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}) \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(E, \mathbb{F}, I)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready for the proof of the wellposedness of graphon BSDEs (4.12). Our proof is inspired by [5, Proposition 3], [15, Lemma 3.7] and [33, Proposition 6.2].

Theorem 4.3. *There exists a constant R^* such that for each fixed $0 < R \leq R^*$, there exists a positive constant $\rho(R)$ depending on R such that for each $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho(R)$, the BSDEs (4.12) admits a unique solution $(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ with $\begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z} \\ \bar{Z}^* \end{pmatrix}$ located in the R -ball of $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{F}, I)$.*

Proof. The proof's central idea revolves around constructing a suitable mapping Ψ that transforms the question of solution existence into a fixed-point problem, which is then resolved using the contraction mapping theorem. The proof is structured as follows: Step 1 provides a rigorous construction and analysis of the mapping Ψ , while Step 2 demonstrates that the constructed Ψ is indeed a contraction.

Step 1: Construction and analysis of the mapping Ψ .

We begin by restricting the domain of Ψ to $(\hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*) \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ satisfying $\|\hat{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\hat{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \leq R^2$, where R is to be determined. We define $\Psi(\hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*)$ as the solution $(\bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ obtained from BSDEs (4.14) below:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_t^u &= -\rho\gamma^u \int_I \log(x^v) dv - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^{u, \mathbb{P}^{u, o}} - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*, \mathbb{P}^{u, o}} \\ &+ \int_t^T L_s^u (|\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) + f_2^{u, o}(s; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho) ds, \quad u \in I, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

which differs from (4.12) in that the variables of function $f_2^{u, o}$ are replaced with (\hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*) . To establish that Ψ is well-defined, we must demonstrate the existence and uniqueness of a solution (\bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) to BSDEs (4.14) that belongs to $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$.

We now proceed with the rigorous proof. We first address the existence of a solution to the graphon BSDEs (4.14). Denote $c_1 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{5\tilde{\gamma}}{2(1-\tilde{\gamma})}$. From the definition of $f_2^{u,o}$ in (4.10), we obtain

$$\| |2c_1 f_2^{u,o}(\cdot; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^2 \leq \rho C_1(R), \quad (4.15)$$

where C_1 is an increasing positive locally bounded function depending on $\rho_1, \tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}$ and $\|Z^{*,o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}$. Choose $\rho_2 \leq \rho_1$ such that $\rho_2 C_1(R) < 1$. This implies that for any $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_2$:

$$\| |2c_1 f_2^{u,o}(\cdot; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^2 \leq \rho C_1(R) < 1,$$

which implies by [21, Theorem 2.2] that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{u,o}} \left[e^{2c_1 \int_t^T f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho) ds} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \leq \frac{1}{1 - \| |2c_1 f_2^{u,o}(\cdot; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^2} < \infty.$$

Consequently, all conditions in [5, Proposition 3] are satisfied and we get a solution $(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*)$ of (4.14) such that \bar{Y} satisfies the estimate

$$\|\bar{Y}^u\|_{\text{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)} \leq |\rho \gamma^u \int_I \log(x^v) dv| - \frac{1}{2c_1} \log(1 - \| |2c_1 f_2^{u,o}(\cdot; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^2). \quad (4.16)$$

In order to obtain the estimate for $(\bar{Z}^u, \bar{Z}^{*u})$, we define $\mathcal{T}(y) = \frac{\frac{1}{2c_1} e^{2c_1|y|} - \frac{1}{2c_1} - |y|}{c_1}$. Applying Itô's formula, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(\bar{Y}_t^u) &= \mathcal{T} \left(-\gamma^u \rho \int_I \log(x^v) dv \right) + \int_t^T \mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u) (L_s^u (|\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) + f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho)) ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T \mathcal{T}''(\bar{Y}_s^u) (|\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) ds - \int_t^T \mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u) \bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^{u, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}} - \int_t^T \mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u) \bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}} \\ &\leq \mathcal{T} \left(-\gamma^u \rho \int_I \log(x^v) dv \right) + \int_t^T \left(c_1 |\mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u)| - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{T}''(\bar{Y}_s^u) \right) (|\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) ds \\ &\quad + \int_t^T |\mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u)| f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho) ds - \int_t^T \mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u) \bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T \mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u) \bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*u} \\ &= \mathcal{T} \left(-\gamma^u \rho \int_I \log(x^v) dv \right) - \int_t^T (|\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) ds + \int_t^T |\mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u)| f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho) ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T \mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u) \bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T \mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u) \bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*u}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\mathcal{T}'(y)| = \frac{e^{2c_1|y|} - 1}{c_1}$ is increasing for $|y|$, for any stopping time τ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{u,o}} \left[\int_\tau^T (|\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) ds \Big| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \\ &\leq \mathcal{T} \left(-\gamma^u \rho \int_I \log(x^v) dv \right) + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{u,o}} \left[\int_\tau^T |\mathcal{T}'(\bar{Y}_s^u)| f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho) ds \Big| \mathcal{F}_\tau \right] \\ &\leq \frac{e^{\rho \tilde{\gamma} \int_I \log(x^v) dv} - 1 - c_1 \gamma \rho \int_I \log(x^v) dv}{2c_1^2} + \frac{e^{2c_1 \|\bar{Y}^u\|_{\text{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)} - 1}}{2c_1} \| |f_2^{u,o}(\cdot; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

As such $(\bar{Z}^u, \bar{Z}^{*u}) \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^u) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)$. Combining (4.15) and (4.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar{Z}^u\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F})}^2 + \|\bar{Z}^{*u}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^{u,o}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F})}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{e^{\rho \tilde{\gamma} \int_I \log(x^v) dv} - 1 - c_1 \gamma \rho \int_I \log(x^v) dv}{2c_1^2} + \frac{\rho C_1(R)}{4c_1^2(1 - \rho C_1(R))} e^{2c_1 \rho \tilde{\gamma} \int_I \log(x^v) dv}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Furthermore, following the arguments of [33, Proposition 6.1, 6.2] and references therein (using Picard iteration), we establish that $(t, u, \omega) \mapsto (\bar{Y}_t^u, \bar{Z}_t^u, \bar{Z}_t^{*u})$ is measurable. Combining with (4.16) and (4.17), we know that $(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) \in \mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ is a solution to graphon BSDEs (4.14) with

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\bar{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\bar{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \\ & \leq \frac{e^{\rho\tilde{\gamma}|\int_I \log(x^v)dv|} - 1 - c_1\tilde{\gamma}\rho|\int_I \log(x^v)dv|}{2c_1^2} + \frac{\rho C_1(R)}{4c_1^2(1 - \rho C_1(R))} e^{2c_1\rho\tilde{\gamma}|\int_I \log(x^v)dv|}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Next, we prove the uniqueness of the solution to the graphon BSDEs (4.14). For any two solutions $(\bar{Y}^1, \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1})$ and $(\bar{Y}^2, \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2})$ in $\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$, due to the equivalence of norms, we know that $(\bar{Y}^1, \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1})$ and $(\bar{Y}^2, \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2})$ also belong to $\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$. Combining the equivalence relation of BSDEs (4.8) and (4.12), we deduce that $(\bar{Y}^1, \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1})$ and $(\bar{Y}^2, \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2})$ are also solutions to the BSDEs

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_t^u &= -\rho\gamma^u \int_I \log(x^v)dv - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^* \\ &+ \int_t^T f_1^{u,o}(s; \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) + f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}, \hat{Z}^*, \rho)ds, \quad u \in I. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing $u \in I$, the difference $(\Delta\bar{Y}^u, \Delta\bar{Z}^u, \Delta\bar{Z}^{*u})$ follows

$$\Delta\bar{Y}^u = \int_t^T \left(f_1^{u,o}(s; \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1}) - f_1^{u,o}(s; \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2}) \right) ds - \int_t^T \Delta\bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T \Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*u}. \quad (4.19)$$

By the definition of $f_1^{u,o}$ in (4.9), similar to the treatment in (4.11), we represent

$$f_1^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1}) - f_1^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2}) = \tilde{L}_t^{1,u} \cdot \Delta\bar{Z}_t^u + \tilde{L}_t^{2,u} \Delta\bar{Z}_t^{*u}, \quad (4.20)$$

where the stochastic processes $\{\tilde{L}_t^{1,u}\}$ and $\{\tilde{L}_t^{2,u}\}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{L}_t^{1,u}| &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0)(1 + |Z_t^{u,o}| + |\bar{Z}_t^{u1}| + |\bar{Z}_t^{u2}|), \\ |\tilde{L}_t^{2,u}| &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0)(1 + |Z_t^{*u,o}| + |\bar{Z}_t^{*u1}| + |\bar{Z}_t^{*u2}|). \end{aligned}$$

Using [21, Theorem 2.3], we define a probability \mathbb{Q}^u by

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^u}{d\mathbb{P}} = \mathcal{E} \left(\int_0^\cdot \tilde{L}_s^{1,u} \cdot dW_s^u + \int_0^\cdot \tilde{L}_s^{2,u} dW_s^* \right).$$

Consequently, we rewrite the (4.19) as

$$\Delta\bar{Y}^u = - \int_t^T \Delta\bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^{u, \mathbb{Q}^u} - \int_t^T \Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*u, \mathbb{Q}^u}, \quad (4.21)$$

where $W^{u, \mathbb{Q}^u} = W^u - \int_0^\cdot \tilde{L}_s^{1,u} ds$ and $W^{*, \mathbb{P}^u} = W^* - \int_0^\cdot \tilde{L}_s^{2,u} ds$ are Brownian motions under \mathbb{Q}^u . Evidently, it holds that $\Delta\bar{Y}^u = \Delta\bar{Z}^u = \Delta\bar{Z}^{*u} = 0$ and the uniqueness result follows.

Thus, so far, we have established the existence and uniqueness of the solution to the BSDEs (4.14). Consequently, we conclude that Ψ is well-defined.

Step 2: Proving Ψ is a contraction.

According to the estimate (4.18) in Step 1, we choose sufficiently small $\tilde{\rho}(R) \leq \rho_2$ such that for any $0 \leq \rho \leq \tilde{\rho}(R)$, we have $\|\bar{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}^d, I)}^2 + \|\bar{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}, I)}^2 \leq R^2$. Consequently, we now know that Ψ is a map from the R -ball of $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ into itself. To complete our proof, it remains to be shown that this mapping is a contraction.

For any two $(\hat{Z}^1, \hat{Z}^{*1})$ and $(\hat{Z}^2, \hat{Z}^{*2})$ in the R -ball of $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \mathbb{P}^o}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$, Step 1 yields unique solutions $(\bar{Y}^1, \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1})$ and $(\bar{Y}^2, \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2})$. Similar to the proof above, we know that for $i = 1, 2$, $(\bar{Y}^i, \bar{Z}^i, \bar{Z}^{*i}) \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ and is a solution to the BSDEs:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_t^{ui} &= -\rho\gamma^u \int_I \log(x^v) dv - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^{ui} \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T \bar{Z}_s^{*ui} dW_s^* \\ &\quad + \int_t^T f_1^{u,o}(s; \bar{Z}^i, \bar{Z}^{*i}) + f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^i, \hat{Z}^{*i}, \rho) ds, \quad u \in I. \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of notational simplicity, we will continue to use $(\Delta\bar{Y}, \Delta\bar{Z}, \Delta\bar{Z}^*)$ to represent the differences. Additionally, we introduce $\Delta\hat{Z}$ and $\Delta\hat{Z}^*$ to denote the corresponding differences.

Let $\kappa > 0$ and ϵ be constants to be determined. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} |f_1^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1}) - f_1^{u,o}(t; \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2})| &\leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0)(1 + |Z^o| + |\bar{Z}_t^{u1}| + |\bar{Z}_t^{u2}|) |\Delta\bar{Z}_t^u| \\ &\quad + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0)(1 + |Z^{*,o}| + |\bar{Z}_t^{*u1}| + |\bar{Z}_t^{*u2}|) |\Delta\bar{Z}_t^{*u}|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $e^{\kappa t} |\Delta\bar{Y}_t^u|^2$, for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{F}^u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\kappa\tau} |\Delta\bar{Y}_\tau^u|^2 &= \int_\tau^T 2e^{\kappa s} \Delta\bar{Y}_s^u \left(f_1^{u,o}(s; \bar{Z}^1, \bar{Z}^{*1}) - f_1^{u,o}(s; \bar{Z}^2, \bar{Z}^{*2}) + f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^1, \hat{Z}^{*1}, \rho) - f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^2, \hat{Z}^{*2}, \rho) \right) ds \\ &\quad - \kappa \int_\tau^T e^{\kappa s} |\Delta\bar{Y}_s^u|^2 ds - \int_\tau^T e^{\kappa s} (|\Delta\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T 2e^{\kappa s} \Delta\bar{Y}_s^u \Delta\bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T 2e^{\kappa s} \Delta\bar{Y}_s^u \Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*u}, \\ &\leq \int_\tau^T \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \kappa \right) e^{\kappa s} |\Delta\bar{Y}_s^u|^2 ds \\ &\quad + \int_\tau^T \epsilon C^{(1)}(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, \|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}, \|Z^{*,o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}) e^{\kappa s} \left(|\Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2 + |\Delta\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_\tau^T C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0) e^{\kappa T} |\Delta\bar{Y}_s^u| (|\Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u}| + |\Delta\bar{Z}_s^u|) (|\bar{Z}^{u1}| + |\bar{Z}^{u2}| + |\bar{Z}^{*u1}| + |\bar{Z}^{*u2}|) ds \\ &\quad + \int_\tau^T 2e^{\kappa T} |\Delta\bar{Y}_s^u| |f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^1, \hat{Z}^{*1}, \rho) - f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^2, \hat{Z}^{*2}, \rho)| ds - \int_\tau^T e^{\kappa s} (|\Delta\bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T 2e^{\kappa s} \Delta\bar{Y}_s^u \Delta\bar{Z}_s^u \cdot dW_s^u - \int_t^T 2e^{\kappa s} \Delta\bar{Y}_s^u \Delta\bar{Z}_s^{*u} dW_s^{*u}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Young's inequality. Choose ϵ such that

$$\epsilon C^{(1)}(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, \|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}, \|Z^{*,o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}) \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

then select κ such that $\kappa > \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Taking conditional expectation on both sides, applying Lemma B.1 and Young's inequality again, as well as the equivalence of norms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\Delta \bar{Y}_\tau^u|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^T e^{\kappa s} (|\Delta \bar{Z}_s^u|^2 + |\Delta \bar{Z}_s^{*u}|^2) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau^u \right] \\
& \leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) R \|\Delta \bar{Y}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \left(\|\Delta \bar{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\Delta \bar{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \right) \\
& \quad + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) \|\Delta \bar{Y}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \|f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^1, \hat{Z}^{*1}, \rho) - f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^2, \hat{Z}^{*2}, \rho)\|_{\frac{1}{2}}^2 \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^2 \\
& \leq \|\Delta \bar{Y}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + C^{(2)}(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) R^2 \left(\|\Delta \bar{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\Delta \bar{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \right) \\
& \quad + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) \|f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^1, \hat{Z}^{*1}, \rho) - f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^2, \hat{Z}^{*2}, \rho)\|_{\frac{1}{2}}^4 \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^4.
\end{aligned}$$

where we write $\|Z^o\|$ and $\|Z^{*,o}\|$ as shorthand notations for $\|Z^o\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}$ and $\|Z^{*,o}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}$, respectively. Choose R^* such that $C^{(2)}(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) (R^*)^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Then for any $0 \leq R \leq R^*$, taking the supremum over all stopping times $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{F}^u)$ and then all $u \in I$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Delta \bar{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\Delta \bar{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \\
& \leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) \|f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^1, \hat{Z}^{*1}, \rho) - f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^2, \hat{Z}^{*2}, \rho)\|_{\frac{1}{2}}^4 \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $g_s^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})$ can be written as:

$$g_s^{u,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z}) = \bar{Z}^* + Z^{*,o} - \rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} \left(\left(\frac{\bar{Z}_t^v + Z_t^{v,o}}{g_s^{v,o}(\bar{Z}^*, \bar{Z})} \right) + \theta_t^v \right) \right)^\top (\Sigma_t^v)^\top (\Sigma_t^v \Sigma_t^{v\top})^{-1} \sigma_t^{*v} G(u, v) dv \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^* \right].$$

By evaluating each term in (4.10) and utilizing the linear growth and 1-Lipschitz continuity of the projection operator, along with Lemma 4.1, Lemma B.1 and the equivalence of norms, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^1, \hat{Z}^{*1}, \rho) - f_2^{u,o}(s; \hat{Z}^2, \hat{Z}^{*2}, \rho)\|_{\frac{1}{2}}^2 \|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}^u)}^2 \\
& \leq \rho C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) \left(\|\Delta \hat{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\Delta \hat{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \right) \\
& \quad \times \left(1 + \|\hat{Z}^1\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\hat{Z}^{*1}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\hat{Z}^2\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\hat{Z}^{*2}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \right) \\
& \leq \rho C(\tilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) R \left(\|\Delta \hat{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\Delta \hat{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \right) \\
& \leq \rho C(\tilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) \left(\|\Delta \hat{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)} + \|\Delta \hat{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above arguments, we obtain the following result:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Delta \bar{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\Delta \bar{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \\
& \leq \rho^2 C^{(3)}(\tilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) \left(\|\Delta \hat{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\Delta \hat{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \right). \tag{4.23}
\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\rho(R) \leq \tilde{\rho}(R)$ such that $\rho(R)^2 C^{(3)}(\tilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, T, \|Z^o\|, \|Z^{*,o}\|) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then, for any $\rho \leq \rho(R)$, we have

$$\|\Delta \bar{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\Delta \bar{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\hat{Z}\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 + \|\hat{Z}^*\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}, \kappa}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)}^2 \right).$$

This inequality demonstrate the contraction property of Ψ , thus completing our proof. \square

Due to the equivalence of the norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO},\mathbb{P}^o}(E,\mathbb{F},I)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E,\mathbb{F},I)}$ (where $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ or \mathbb{R}), and combining the equivalence relation of BSDEs (4.8) and (4.12), we obtain the following corollary of Theorem 4.3.

Corollary 4.4. *There exists a constant R^* such that for each fixed $0 < R \leq R^*$, there exists a positive constant $\rho(R)$ depending on R such that for each $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho(R)$, the BSDEs (4.8) admits a unique solution $(\bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{Z}^*) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ with $\begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z} \\ \bar{Z}^* \end{pmatrix}$ located in the R -ball of $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{F}, I)$.*

Synthesizing the above proof, we conclude that the graphon McKean-Vlasov FBSDEs (3.6) admit a solution $(Y, Z, Z^*) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$. Finally, invoking Proposition 3.3, we assert that the graphon game admits a graphon Nash equilibrium. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.14. \square

For the convenience of the proofs in the next section, we derive the following corollary from the above results:

Corollary 4.5. *There exists a positive constant R^* such that for each fixed $0 < R \leq R^*$, there exists positive constants $T(R) \leq T$ and $\rho(R) \leq \rho_1$ such that for all $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho(R)$, $0 \leq \tilde{T} \leq T(R)$, there exists a unique $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{Z}^*) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ with $\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Z} \\ \tilde{Z}^* \end{pmatrix}$ located in the R -ball of $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ satisfying (4.5) in time $[0, \tilde{T}]$.*

Proof. First, it is important to note that our definition of the BMO norm adjusts with changes in the time horizon. Consequently, we select a sufficiently small $T(R) \leq T$ such that for any $0 \leq \tilde{T} \leq T(R)$, $\begin{pmatrix} Z^o \\ Z^{*,o} \end{pmatrix}$ is situated within the $\frac{R}{2}$ -ball of $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathbb{F}, I)$ when the time horizon is set as $[0, \tilde{T}]$. Combining these observations with the results of Corollary 4.4 and utilizing the relation $(\tilde{Z}, \tilde{Z}^*) = (\bar{Z} + Z^o, \bar{Z}^* + Z^{*,o})$, we arrive at the desired result. \square

4.3 Wellposedness of n -dimensional FBSDEs: proof of Theorem 2.17

This theorem considers the case without common noise. For notational simplicity, we maintain the previously introduced notation. Consistent with the content in Section 3, we derive the FBSDE characterization of the problem. In the same way as in Lemma 4.2, we further transform the FBSDE characterizations into BSDE characterizations.

Lemma 4.6. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between a solution to the n -agent FBSDEs and a solution $(\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}, (\mathcal{Z}^{ij,n})_{1 \leq j \leq n})_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in (S^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n) \times (\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n))^n)^n$ to the following*

n -agent BSDEs:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -d\mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij,n} - \rho\gamma^i \lambda_{ij}^n P_t^j \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^j} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{jj,n} + \theta_t^j) \right) \right|^2 + \frac{\gamma^i}{2(1-\gamma^i)} |\mathcal{Z}_t^{ii,n} + \theta_t^i|^2 \right. \\ \quad - \frac{\gamma^i(1-\gamma^i)}{2} \left| (I - P_t^i) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^i} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{ii,n} + \theta_t^i) \right) \right|^2 \\ \quad \left. - \rho\gamma^i \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \left((\theta_t^j)^\top P_t^j \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^j} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{jj,n} + \theta_t^j) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left| P_t^j \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^j} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{jj,n} + \theta_t^j) \right) \right|^2 \right) \right) dt \\ \quad - \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij,n} \cdot dW_t^j, \\ \mathcal{Y}_T^{i,n} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{array} \right. \quad (4.24)$$

The relationship is given, for each $t \in [0, T]$, by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n} = Y_t^{i,n} + \rho\gamma^i \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \hat{X}_t^{j,n}, \\ \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij,n} = Z_t^{ij,n} + \rho\gamma^i \lambda_{ij}^n P_t^j \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^j} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{jj,n} + \theta_t^j) \right). \end{array} \right. \quad (4.25)$$

Lemma 4.7. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between a solution to the graphon FBSDE and a solution $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)$ to the following graphon BSDEs:*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -d\mathcal{Y}_t^u = \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathcal{Z}_t^u|^2 + \frac{\gamma^u}{2(1-\gamma^u)} |\mathcal{Z}_t^u + \theta_t^u|^2 - \frac{\gamma^u(1-\gamma^u)}{2} \left| (I - P_t^u) \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} (\mathcal{Z}_t^u + \theta_t^u) \right) \right|^2 \right. \\ \quad \left. - \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \left((\theta_t^v)^\top P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} (\mathcal{Z}_t^v + \theta_t^v) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left| P_t^v \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^v} (\mathcal{Z}_t^v + \theta_t^v) \right) \right|^2 \right) G(u, v) dv \right] \right) dt \\ \quad - \mathcal{Z}_t^u \cdot dW_t^u, \\ \mathcal{Y}_T^u = 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.26)$$

The relationship is given, for each $t \in [0, T]$, by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{Y}_t^u = Y_t^u + \rho\gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I \hat{X}_t^v G(u, v) dv \right], \\ \mathcal{Z}_t^u = Z_t^u. \end{array} \right. \quad (4.27)$$

In the absence of common noise, we can obtain a result similar to Corollary 4.5, namely, the existence of a solution to (4.26). Therefore, to establish the existence of a solution to (4.24), we only need to consider the difference between the two solutions. Define $\Delta\mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n} = \mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n} - \mathcal{Y}_t^{\frac{i}{n}}$ and $\Delta\mathcal{Z}_t^{ij,n} = \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij,n} - \delta_{ij} \mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}}$. For simplicity, we introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} g^{j,n}(t, \mathcal{Z}^{jj,n}) &:= P_t^j \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^j} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{jj,n} + \theta_t^j) \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \\ g^u(t, \mathcal{Z}^u) &:= P_t^u \left(\frac{1}{1-\gamma^u} (\mathcal{Z}_t^u + \theta_t^u) \right), \quad u \in I. \end{aligned}$$

To ease the presentation, we use $g_t^{j,n}$ to represent $g^{j,n}(t, \mathcal{Z}^{j,n})$ and g_t^u to represent $g^u(t, \mathcal{Z}^u)$ when there is no risk of confusion. Similarly, until we prove the convergence results, we will simply write $\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{i,j,n}$ as $\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ij}$ for notational simplicity, where it does not cause ambiguity.

According to (4.24) and (4.26), $\Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i,n}$ satisfies the following BSDEs:

$$\begin{cases} d\Delta \mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n} &= F\left((\mathcal{Z}_t^u)_{u \in I}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij})_{i \neq j}\right) dt + \sum_{j=1}^n \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij} dW_t^j, \\ \Delta \mathcal{Y}_T^{i,n} &= 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (4.28)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & F\left((\mathcal{Z}_t^u)_{u \in I}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij})_{i \neq j}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}}|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\mathcal{Z}_t^{ii}|^2\right) + \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \left((\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}} + \theta_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^T g_t^{\frac{i}{n}} - (\mathcal{Z}_t^{ii,n} + \theta_t^{ii,n})^T g_t^{i,n} \right) - \frac{\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}(1 - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}})}{2} (|g_t^{\frac{i}{n}}|^2 - |g_t^{i,n}|^2) \\ & \quad - \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\int_I (\theta_t^v)^T g_t^v G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right] - \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n (\theta_t^j)^T g_t^{j,n} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\int_I |g_t^v|^2 G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right] - \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n |g_t^{j,n}|^2 \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} |\mathcal{Z}_t^{ij}|^2 + \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n (\mathcal{Z}_t^{ij})^T g_t^{j,n} - \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 (\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}})^2 \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^n)^2 |g_t^{j,n}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

Based on the above results, we can establish the wellposedness of BSDEs (4.24).

Theorem 4.8. *There exist positive constants ρ^* and T^* such that for all $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho^*$ and $0 < \tilde{T} \leq T^*$, the BSDEs (4.24) admits a solution $(\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}, (\mathcal{Z}^{ij,n})_{1 \leq j \leq n})_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in (\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n) \times (\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n))^n)^n$.*

Proof. Similar to Corollary 4.5, we assert that there exists a positive constant R^* such that for each fixed $0 < R \leq R^*$, there exist positive constants $T(R) \leq T$ and $\rho(R) \leq \rho_1$ such that for all $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho(R)$ and $0 \leq \tilde{T} \leq T(R)$, there exists a unique $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}) \in S^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I) \times \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)$ with \mathcal{Z} located in the R -ball of $\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)$ satisfying (4.26). Here we will fix an R to be determined.

Therefore, to establish the wellposedness of BSDEs (4.24), it suffices to prove the wellposedness of BSDEs (4.28). The proof follows a similar idea as in Theorem 4.3 by utilizing the contraction mapping theorem. For the sake of notational simplicity, in the following proof, we will use $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BMO}}$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BMO}, I}$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}, I)}$ where it does not cause ambiguity.

Step 1: Construction and analysis of the mapping Ψ .

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_t^{i,n(1)} &= \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n (\theta_t^j)^T g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I (\theta_t^v)^T g_t^v G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right], \\ \Gamma_t^{i,n(2)} &= \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n |g_t^{\frac{j}{n}}|^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I |g_t^v|^2 G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$A^{i,n} = \sqrt{2\rho\tilde{\gamma} \left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma^{i,n(1)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO}, I}^2 + \rho\tilde{\gamma} \left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma^{i,n(2)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO}, I}^2 + \frac{\rho^2(\tilde{\gamma})^2}{(n-1)^2} \left(\frac{1}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} R + \frac{1}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \sqrt{\tilde{T}} \|\theta\| + \sqrt{\tilde{T}C_0} \right)^2}.$$

Based on the linear growth property of g^u , there exists a positive constant $C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R)$ such that

$$\max_i A^{i,n} \leq C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R)\sqrt{\rho}, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (4.30)$$

We begin by restricting the domain of Ψ to $(\hat{z}^{ii}, (\hat{z}^{ij})_{j \neq i})_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in (\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n))^{n \times n}$ satisfying

$$\|\hat{z}^{ii}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \leq (\max_i A^{i,n})^2, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \quad (4.31)$$

and consider the corresponding BSDEs:

$$\begin{cases} d\Delta \mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n} &= F\left((\mathcal{Z}_t^u)_{u \in I}, (\hat{z}_t^{ii})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\hat{z}_t^{ij})_{i \neq j}\right) dt + \sum_{j=1}^n \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij} dW_t^j, \\ \Delta \mathcal{Y}_T^{i,n} &= 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (4.32)$$

which differs from BSDEs (4.28) in that the variables in the generator F are fixed.

By [16, Proposition A.3], there exists a unique solution

$$(\Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i,n}, \Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ii}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ij})_{j \neq i}) \in \mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n) \times (\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n))^n$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ to the BSDEs (4.32). We thus define

$$\Phi((\hat{z}^{ii}, (\hat{z}^{ij})_{j \neq i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}) := (\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ii}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ij})_{j \neq i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}.$$

In the following, we will prove

$$\|\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} \|\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \leq (\max_i A^{i,n})^2, \quad (4.33)$$

which is crucial for the subsequent application of the contraction mapping theorem.

For notational simplicity, we denote $\Delta g_t^{j,n} = g^{j,n}(t, \mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{j}{n}} + \hat{z}^{jj}) - g_t^{\frac{j}{n}}(t, \mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{j}{n}})$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & F\left((\mathcal{Z}_t^u)_{u \in I}, (\hat{z}_t^{ii})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\hat{z}_t^{ij})_{i \neq j}\right) \\ &= \left(-(\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^\top \hat{z}_t^{ii} - \frac{1}{2} |\hat{z}_t^{ii}|^2\right) - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \left((\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}} + \theta_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^\top \Delta g_t^{i,n} + (\hat{z}_t^{ii})^\top (g_t^{\frac{i}{n}} + \Delta g_t^{i,n})\right) \\ &+ \frac{\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}(1 - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}})}{2} \left(2(g_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^\top \Delta g_t^{i,n} + |\Delta g_t^{i,n}|^2\right) + \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\Gamma_t^{i,n(1)} + \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n (\theta_t^j)^\top \Delta g_t^{j,n}\right) \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\Gamma_t^{i,n(2)} + \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \left(2(g_t^{\frac{j}{n}})^\top \Delta g_t^{j,n} + |\Delta g_t^{j,n}|^2\right)\right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} |\hat{z}_t^{ij}|^2 \\ &+ \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n (\hat{z}_t^{ij})^\top (g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} + \Delta g_t^{j,n}) - \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 (\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}})^2 \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^n)^2 |g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} + \Delta g_t^{j,n}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $(\Delta\mathcal{Y}_\tau^{i,n})^2$, by lemma B.1 and Young's inequality, we have, for each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\Delta\mathcal{Y}_\tau^{i,n})^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^{\tilde{T}} \sum_{j=1}^n |\Delta\mathcal{Z}_t^{ij}|^2 dt \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau^n \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^{\tilde{T}} |\Delta\mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n}| \cdot \left\{ 2|\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}}| |\hat{z}_t^{ii}| + |\hat{z}_t^{ii}|^2 + 2\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} |\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}}| |\Delta g_t^{i,n}| + 2\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} |\theta_t^{\frac{i}{n}}| |\Delta g_t^{i,n}| + 2\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} |\hat{z}_t^{ii}| |g_t^{\frac{i}{n}}| + 2\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} |\hat{z}_t^{ii}| |\Delta g_t^{i,n}| \right. \right. \\
& \quad + 2\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} (1 - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}) |g_t^{\frac{i}{n}}| |\Delta g_t^{i,n}| + \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} (1 - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}) |\Delta g_t^{i,n}|^2 + 2\rho\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} |\Gamma_t^{i,n(1)}| + \rho\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} |\Gamma_t^{i,n(2)}| + \sum_{j \neq i} |\hat{z}_t^{ij}|^2 \\
& \quad + \rho\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \left(2|\theta_t^{\frac{j}{n}}| |\Delta g_t^{j,n}| + 2|g_t^{\frac{j}{n}}| |\Delta g_t^{j,n}| + |\Delta g_t^{j,n}|^2 + 2|\hat{z}_t^{ij}| |g_t^{\frac{j}{n}}| + 2|\hat{z}_t^{ij}| |\Delta g_t^{j,n}| \right) \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \rho^2 (\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}})^2 \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^n)^2 \left(|g_t^{\frac{j}{n}}|^2 + 2|g_t^{\frac{j}{n}}| |\Delta g_t^{j,n}| + |\Delta g_t^{j,n}|^2 \right) \right\} \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau^n \right] \\
& \leq \left\{ \left(\left(2 + \frac{6\tilde{\gamma}}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \right) \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + \frac{6\tilde{\gamma}}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \sqrt{\tilde{T}} \|\theta\| + 4\tilde{\gamma} \sqrt{\tilde{T}} C_0 \right) \|\hat{z}^{ii}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \left(1 + \frac{3\tilde{\gamma}}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \right) \|\hat{z}^{ii}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \right. \\
& \quad + 2\rho\tilde{\gamma} \left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma_t^{i,n(1)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO},I}^2 + \rho\tilde{\gamma} \left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma_t^{i,n(2)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO},I}^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{\rho\tilde{\gamma}}{n-1} \left[\frac{2\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + (4-2\tilde{\gamma})\sqrt{\tilde{T}}\|\theta\| + 2(1-\tilde{\gamma})\sqrt{\tilde{T}}C_0}{(1-\tilde{\gamma})^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{jj}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \frac{1}{(1-\tilde{\gamma})^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{jj}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{2\rho\tilde{\gamma}}{n-1} \left[\frac{\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + \sqrt{\tilde{T}}\|\theta\| + (1-\tilde{\gamma})\sqrt{\tilde{T}}C_0}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \frac{1}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}} \|\hat{z}^{jj}\|_{\text{BMO}} \right] \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\rho^2(\tilde{\gamma})^2}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[\frac{1}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + \frac{1}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \|\hat{z}^{jj}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \frac{1}{1-\tilde{\gamma}} \sqrt{\tilde{T}}\|\theta\| + \sqrt{\tilde{T}}C_0 \right]^2 \right\} \cdot \|\Delta\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the estimation from (4.30) and (4.31), and taking the supremum over all stopping times τ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Delta\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \|\Delta\mathcal{Z}_t^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \\
& \leq \|\Delta\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)} \cdot \left(\left(C(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\gamma})R + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R)(\sqrt{\tilde{T}} + \rho) \right) (\max_i A^{i,n}) + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\gamma}, R)(\max_i A^{i,n})^2 \right) \\
& \leq \left(C(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\gamma})R + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R)(\sqrt{\tilde{T}} + \sqrt{\rho}) \right) \|\Delta\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)} \cdot (\max_i A^{i,n}).
\end{aligned}$$

We first choose a sufficiently small $R_1(\leq R^*)$, and for each $R \leq R_1$, select sufficiently small $\rho_1(R) \leq \rho(R)$ and $T_1(R) \leq T(R)$, such that for any $\rho \leq \rho_1(R)$ and $\tilde{T} \leq T_1(R)$, the coefficient in the last line of the above equation is less than or equal to 1. Consequently, for each $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_1(R)$ and $0 \leq \tilde{T} \leq T_1(R)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \|\Delta\mathcal{Z}_t^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 & \leq \|\Delta\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)} \cdot (\max_i A^{i,n}) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\Delta\mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + (\max_i A^{i,n})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it holds that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i,n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + \|\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ii}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} \|\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \leq (\max_i A^{i,n})^2, \quad (4.34)$$

which directly yields (4.33).

Step 2. Proving Ψ is a contraction.

Now fix $\{(\hat{z}^{ii}, (\hat{z}^{ij})_{j \neq i})\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ and $\{(\hat{z}^{ii'}, (\hat{z}^{ij'})_{j \neq i})\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{z}^{ii}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 &\leq (\max_i A^{i,n})^2, \\ \|\hat{z}^{ii'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 &\leq (\max_i A^{i,n})^2, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\left\{ \left(\Delta \mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n}, \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij})_{j \neq i} \right) \right\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ and $\left\{ \left(\Delta \mathcal{Y}_t^{i',n}, \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii'}, (\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij'})_{j \neq i} \right) \right\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ be the corresponding solutions. Then it follows that

$$d(\Delta \mathcal{Y}_t^{i,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Y}_t^{i',n}) = \tilde{F} \left((\mathcal{Z}_t^u)_{u \in I}, (\hat{z}_t^{ii})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\hat{z}_t^{ij})_{i \neq j}, (\hat{z}_t^{ii'})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\hat{z}_t^{ij'})_{i \neq j} \right) dt + \sum_{j=1}^n (\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij} - \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij'}) dW_t^j,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{F} \left((\mathcal{Z}_t^u)_{u \in I}, (\hat{z}_t^{ii})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\hat{z}_t^{ij})_{i \neq j}, (\hat{z}_t^{ii'})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, (\hat{z}_t^{ij'})_{i \neq j} \right) \\ &= - (\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^\top (\hat{z}_t^{ii} - \hat{z}_t^{ii'}) - \frac{1}{2} (|\hat{z}_t^{ii}|^2 - |\hat{z}_t^{ii'}|^2) - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}} + \theta_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^\top (\Delta g_t^{i,n} - \Delta g_t^{i',n}) - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} (\hat{z}_t^{ii} - \hat{z}_t^{ii'})^\top (g_t^{\frac{i}{n}} + \Delta g_t^{i,n}) \\ &\quad - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} (\hat{z}_t^{ii'})^\top (\Delta g_t^{i,n} - \Delta g_t^{i',n}) + \frac{\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} (1 - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}})}{2} \left(2(g_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^\top (\Delta g_t^{i,n} - \Delta g_t^{i',n}) + (|\Delta g_t^{i,n}|^2 - |\Delta g_t^{i',n}|^2) \right) \\ &\quad + \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n (\theta_t^j)^\top (\Delta g_t^{j,n} - \Delta g_t^{j',n}) - \frac{1}{2} \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \left(2(g_t^{\frac{j}{n}})^\top (\Delta g_t^{j,n} - \Delta g_t^{j',n}) + (|\Delta g_t^{j,n}|^2 - |\Delta g_t^{j',n}|^2) \right) \\ &\quad + \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \left((\hat{z}_t^{ij} - \hat{z}_t^{ij'})^\top (g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} + \Delta g_t^{j,n}) + (\hat{z}_t^{ij'})^\top (\Delta g_t^{j,n} - \Delta g_t^{j',n}) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 (\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}})^2 \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^n)^2 \left(|g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} + \Delta g_t^{j,n}|^2 - |g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} + \Delta g_t^{j',n}|^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} (|\hat{z}_t^{ij}|^2 - |\hat{z}_t^{ij'}|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then the same argument as above yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\Delta \mathcal{Y}_\tau^{i,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Y}_\tau^{i',n} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\int_\tau^{\tilde{T}} |\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij',n}|^2 dt \middle| \mathcal{F}_\tau^n \right] \\
\leq & \left\{ \left[\left(1 + \frac{3\tilde{\gamma}}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \right) (2\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + \|\hat{z}^{ii}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|\hat{z}^{ii'}\|_{\text{BMO}}) + \frac{6\tilde{\gamma}}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \sqrt{\tilde{T}}\|\theta\| + 4\tilde{\gamma}\sqrt{\tilde{T}}C_0 \right] \cdot \|\hat{z}^{ii} - \hat{z}^{ii'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \right. \\
& + \frac{2\rho\tilde{\gamma}}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[\frac{1}{(1-\bar{\gamma})^2} \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + \frac{2-\bar{\gamma}}{(1-\bar{\gamma})^2} \sqrt{\tilde{T}}\|\theta\|_\infty + \frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \sqrt{\tilde{T}}C_0 \right] \cdot \|\hat{z}^{jj} - \hat{z}^{jj'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \\
& + \frac{\rho\tilde{\gamma}}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[\frac{1}{(1-\bar{\gamma})^2} (\|\hat{z}^{jj}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|\hat{z}^{jj'}\|_{\text{BMO}}) + \frac{2}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \|\hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \right] \cdot \|\hat{z}^{jj} - \hat{z}^{jj'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \\
& + \frac{2\rho\tilde{\gamma}}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[\frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + \frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \sqrt{\tilde{T}}\|\theta\|_\infty + \sqrt{\tilde{T}}C_0 + \frac{1}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \|\hat{z}^{jj}\|_{\text{BMO}} \right] \cdot \|\hat{z}^{ij} - \hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \\
& + \frac{\rho^2\tilde{\gamma}^2}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[\frac{2\|\mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{BMO},I} + \|\hat{z}^{jj}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|\hat{z}^{jj'}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \sqrt{\tilde{T}}\|\theta\|}{(1-\bar{\gamma})^2} + \frac{2}{1-\bar{\gamma}} \sqrt{\tilde{T}}C_0 \right] \cdot \|\hat{z}^{jj} - \hat{z}^{jj'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \\
& \left. + \sum_{j \neq i} \left[\|\hat{z}^{ij}\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|\hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \right] \cdot \|\hat{z}^{ij} - \hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}} \right\} \cdot \|\Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i',n}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Utilizing the previously derived estimates, Cauchy's inequality, and taking the supremum over stopping times τ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i',n'}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n \|\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij} - \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \\
\leq & C_1 \left(\|\hat{z}^{ii} - \hat{z}^{ii'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{jj} - \hat{z}^{jj'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{ij} - \hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2} \right) \|\Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i',n'}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)} \\
\leq & \|\Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Y}^{i',n'}\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + C_2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{z}^{ij} - \hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \|\hat{z}^{jj} - \hat{z}^{jj'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where C_1 and C_2 are positive constants depending on $\tilde{\gamma}$, $\bar{\gamma}$, $\|\theta\|$, C_0 , and R . Specifically,

$$C_2 = C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma})R^2 + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R)(\tilde{T} + \rho).$$

We choose a sufficiently small $R_2 (\leq R_1)$, and for each $R \leq R_2$, select sufficiently small $\rho_2(R) \leq \rho_1(R)$ and $T_2(R) \leq T_1(R)$, such that for any $\rho \leq \rho_2(R)$ and $\tilde{T} \leq T_2(R)$, $C_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Consequently, for each $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_2(R)$ and $0 \leq \tilde{T} \leq T_2(R)$, taking an average over i on both sides and rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|\Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii,n} - \Delta \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii',n}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \|\hat{z}^{ij} - \hat{z}^{ij'}\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \right).$$

Thus, Ψ is a contraction mapping. By the contraction mapping theorem, there exists a fixed point, which implies the existence of a solution to BSDEs (4.28). This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Combining the above arguments, we have thus proved Theorem 2.17. \square

4.4 Convergence result

4.4.1 Proofs of Theorem 2.22

Parts (1) and (2) of the Theorem 2.22 follow from Theorem 2.14 and Theorem 2.17, as it is noteworthy that in the proof of Theorem 2.17, the selection of ρ^* and T^* does not depend on n . It remains to prove part (3) of the Theorem 2.22.

From Theorem 3.2, Proposition 3.3, Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7, we derive

$$\tilde{\pi}_t^{i,n} - \tilde{\pi}_t^{\frac{i}{n}} = (\sigma_t^{\frac{i}{n}})^{-\top} \left(P_t^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{ii,n} + \theta_t^{\frac{i}{n}}) \right) - P_t^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}} (\mathcal{Z}_t^{\frac{i}{n}} + \theta_t^{\frac{i}{n}}) \right) \right).$$

Observing that

$$\|\tilde{\pi}^{i,n} - \tilde{\pi}^{\frac{i}{n}}\|_{\text{BMO}} \leq \frac{\|\sigma^{-1}\|}{1 - \bar{\gamma}} \|\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ii,n}\|_{\text{BMO}}$$

and using the energy inequality in the form of Itô integrals, with reference to [21, Sect. 2.1] or [15, Appendix C], we need only prove

$$\|\Delta \mathcal{Z}^{ii,n}\|_{\text{BMO}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.35)$$

to establish (2.6). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} V_0^{i,n} ((\tilde{\pi}^{j,n})_{j \neq i}) - V_0^{\frac{i}{n},G} ((\tilde{\pi}^v)_{v \neq \frac{i}{n}}) &= \frac{1}{\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}} (x^{\frac{i}{n}})^{\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}}} \left(\exp \left(\mathcal{Y}_0^{i,n} - \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \exp \left(\mathcal{Y}_0^{\frac{i}{n}} - \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \int_I \log(x^v) G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

To establish (2.7), it suffices to prove

$$\Delta \mathcal{Y}_0^{i,n} - \rho \gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) - \int_I \log(x^v) G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.36)$$

Using Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.4, in conjunction with the estimate (4.34), both (4.35) and (4.36) hold. Thus, the theorem is proven. \square

4.4.2 Proofs of Proposition 2.23

It is readily observed that $\mathcal{Z}_t^{ij,n} = 0$ and $\mathcal{Z}_t^u = 0$ are particular solutions to the BSDEs in Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7, respectively. By (4.25) and (4.27), we deduce that both FBSDEs admit particular solutions corresponding to

$$\mathcal{Z}_t^{ii,n} = \frac{(1 - \gamma^i) \mathcal{Z}_t^{ii,n} - \rho \gamma^i \lambda_{ii}^n \theta_t^i}{1 - \gamma^i + \rho \gamma^i \lambda_{ii}^n} = \frac{-\rho \gamma^i \lambda_{ii}^n \theta_t^i}{1 - \gamma^i + \rho \gamma^i \lambda_{ii}^n}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_t^u = \mathcal{Z}_t^u = 0.$$

Substituting these into (3.4) and (3.8) completes the proof of this proposition.

A Auxiliary results

The following lemmas are used in the proof of Theorem 2.22. As Theorem 2.22 can be deduced from the proof of Theorem 2.17, we may use intermediate results and notation from that proof without explicit reintroduction, provided no ambiguity arises.

Lemma A.1. *Under the Conditions in Theorem 2.22, we have the following conclusion*

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \max_{u \in (\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{n})} \|\mathcal{Z}_n^j - \mathcal{Z}^u\|_{\text{BMO}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of [4, Lemma 2.1], we consider \mathcal{Y}_n^j and \mathcal{Y}^u as being driven by the same Brownian motion W . Subtracting the two BSDEs,

$$-d(\mathcal{Y}_t^j - \mathcal{Y}_t^u) = \hat{F}(\mathcal{Z})dt - \left(\mathcal{Z}_t^j - \mathcal{Z}_t^u \right) dW_t,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}(\mathcal{Z}) = & \frac{1}{2} \left(|\mathcal{Z}_t^j|^2 - |\mathcal{Z}_t^u|^2 \right) + \left(\gamma_n^j (\mathcal{Z}_t^j + \theta_t^j)^\top g_t^j - \gamma^u (\mathcal{Z}_t^u + \theta_t^u)^\top g_t^u \right) - \left(\frac{\gamma_n^j (1 - \gamma_n^j)}{2} |g_t^j|^2 - \frac{\gamma^u (1 - \gamma^u)}{2} |g_t^u|^2 \right) \\ & - \left(\rho \gamma_n^j \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I (\theta_t)^\top g_t^v G(\frac{j}{n}, v) dv \right] - \rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I (\theta_t)^\top g_t^v G(u, v) dv \right] \right) \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho \gamma_n^j \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I |g_t^v|^2 G(\frac{j}{n}, v) dv \right] - \frac{1}{2} \rho \gamma^u \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I |g_t^v|^2 G(u, v) dv \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Employing an analogous argument to that presented in the proof of Theorem 4.8, we obtain the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{Y}_n^j - \mathcal{Y}^u\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + \|\mathcal{Z}_n^j - \mathcal{Z}^u\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \\ & \leq \|\mathcal{Y}_n^j - \mathcal{Y}^u\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)} \cdot \left(D_1 \|\mathcal{Z}_n^j - \mathcal{Z}^u\|_{\text{BMO}} + D_2 \left(\|\theta_n^j - \theta^u\|_{\text{BMO}} + |\gamma_n^j - \gamma^u| + \int_I |G(\frac{j}{n}, v) - G(u, v)| dv \right) \right) \\ & \leq \|\mathcal{Y}_n^j - \mathcal{Y}^u\|_{\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{F}^n)}^2 + D_3 \|\mathcal{Z}_n^j - \mathcal{Z}^u\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + D_4 \left(\|\theta_n^j - \theta^u\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + |\gamma_n^j - \gamma^u|^2 + \int_I |G(\frac{j}{n}, v) - G(u, v)|^2 dv \right), \end{aligned}$$

where D_1, D_2, D_3 and D_4 are positive constants depending on $\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0$, and R . Specifically,

$$D_3 = C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma})R^2 + C(\tilde{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R)(T + \rho).$$

We choose a sufficiently small $R_3 (\leq R_2)$ and, for any $R \leq R_3$, select constants $\rho_3(R) \leq \rho_2(R)$ and $T_3(R) \leq T_2(R)$ depending on R to ensure that for any $\rho \leq \rho_3(R)$ and $\tilde{T} \leq T_3(R)$, $D_5 \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Consequently, for each $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_3(R)$ and $0 \leq \tilde{T} \leq T_3(R)$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{Z}_n^j - \mathcal{Z}^u\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 \leq 2D_4 \left(\|\theta_n^j - \theta^u\|_{\text{BMO}}^2 + |\gamma_n^j - \gamma^u|^2 + \int_I |G(\frac{j}{n}, v) - G(u, v)|^2 dv \right).$$

The lemma is thus established, contingent on Condition 2.19 and Condition 2.21. \square

Lemma A.2. *Under Condition 2.19, we have*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \int_I |G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(\frac{i}{n}, v)| dv \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\int_I |G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(\frac{i}{n}, v)| dv \leq \int_I |G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(\frac{i}{n}, v)|^2 dv.$$

Subsequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \int_I |G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(\frac{i}{n}, v)|^2 dv &= \int_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^{\frac{i}{n}} \int_I |G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(\frac{i}{n}, v)|^2 dv du \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^{\frac{i}{n}} \int_I |G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(u, v)|^2 dv du + 2 \int_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^{\frac{i}{n}} \int_I |G(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(u, v)|^2 dv du \\ &\leq 2 \|G_n - G\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{n} \cdot \max_{u \in (\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]} \int_I |G(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(u, v)|^2 dv. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two equations, we obtain

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \int_I |G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(\frac{i}{n}, v)| dv \leq 2n \|G_n - G\|_2^2 + 2 \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{u \in (\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]} \int_I |G(\frac{i}{n}, v) - G(u, v)|^2 dv.$$

The result follows directly from Condition 2.19. \square

Lemma A.3. *Under the Conditions in Theorem 2.22, we have the following conclusion:*

$$\max_i A^{i,n} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\max_i \left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma^{i,n(1)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \max_i \left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma^{i,n(2)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. We only prove $\left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma^{i,n(1)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO}}$, as the proof for $\left\| \sqrt{|\Gamma^{i,n(2)}|} \right\|_{\text{BMO}}$ is similar.

As $(W^u)_{u \in I}$ are e.p.i., it follows that $(Z^u)_{u \in I}$ are also e.p.i., using the exact law of large numbers, see [32, Theorem 2.16], we have

$$\int_I (\theta_t^v)^\top g_t^v G(\frac{i}{n}, v) dv = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I (\theta_t^v)^\top g_t^v G(\frac{i}{n}, v) dv \right], \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_t^{i,n(1)}| &= \left| \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n (\theta_t^j)^\top g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_I (\theta_t^v)^\top g_t^v G(\frac{i}{n}, v) dv \right] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{ij}^n (\theta_t^j)^\top g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} \right| + \left| \int_I F_t^n(v) G_n(\frac{i}{n}, v) dv - \int_I F_t^n(v) G(\frac{i}{n}, v) dv \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_I F_t^n(v) G(\frac{i}{n}, v) dv - \int_I (\theta_t^v)^\top g_t^v G(\frac{i}{n}, v) dv \right|, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_t^n(v) = \sum_{j=1}^n (\theta_t^j)^\top g_t^{\frac{j}{n}} \delta_{(\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{n}]}(v).$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\tau}^T \frac{1}{(n-1)n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{ij} (\theta_t^j)^\top g_t^{\frac{i}{n}} \right| dt \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\tau} \right] \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^{\infty}} \leq \frac{1}{n} C(\bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R), \\
& \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\tau}^T \left| \int_I F_t^n(v) G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv - \int_I F_t^n(v) G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right| dt \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\tau} \right] \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^{\infty}} \\
& \leq C(\bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R) \int_I \left| G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) - G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) \right| dv \\
& \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \left\| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\tau}^T \left| \int_I F_t^n(v) G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv - \int_I (\theta_t^v)^\top g_t^v G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right| dt \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\tau} \right] \right\|_{\mathbb{L}^{\infty}} \\
& \leq C(\bar{\gamma}, \|\theta\|, C_0, R) \int_I \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\|\mathcal{Z}^{\frac{i}{n}} - \mathcal{Z}^v\|_{\text{BMO}} + \|\theta^{\frac{i}{n}} - \theta^v\|_{\text{BMO}} + |\gamma^{\frac{i}{n}} - \gamma^v| \right) \delta_{(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]}(v) dv.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Condition 2.21 with Lemma A.1 and Lemma A.2, the proof is complete. \square

Lemma A.4. *Under the Conditions in Theorem 2.22, we have the following conclusion*

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) - \int_I \log(x^v) G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Applying an analogous decomposition and estimation technique to that utilized in the proof of Lemma A.3, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^n \log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) - \int_I \log(x^v) G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{(n-1)n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{ij} \log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) \right| + \left| \int_I \sum_{j=1}^n \log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) \delta_{(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]}(v) \left(G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) - G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) \right) dv \right| \\
& \quad + \left| \int_I \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) \delta_{(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]}(v) - \log(x^v) \right) G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) dv \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \|\log(x)\| + \|\log(x)\| \int_I |G_n\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right) - G\left(\frac{i}{n}, v\right)| dv + \int_I \sum_{j=1}^n |\log(x^{\frac{i}{n}}) - \log(x^v)| \delta_{(\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}]}(v) dv.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the lemma follows directly from the application of Condition 2.21 in conjunction with Lemma A.2. \square

B Inequality

The following inequality is frequently used throughout the proof.

Lemma B.1. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{G})$. For each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{G})$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\tau}^T \mathbb{E}[f_s g_s | \mathcal{F}_s^*] ds \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\tau}^n \right] \leq \|f\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{G})} \cdot \|g\|_{\mathbb{H}_{\text{BMO}}(E, \mathbb{G})}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proof. For the proof of this lemma, we refer the reader to [16, Lemma A.1]. \square

References

- [1] H. Amini, Z. Cao, and A. Sulem. Stochastic graphon mean field games with jumps and approximate nash equilibria. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04112*, 2023.
- [2] M. Anthropolos, T. Geng, and T. Zariphopoulou. Competition in fund management and forward relative performance criteria. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 13(4): 1271–1301, 2022.
- [3] A. Aurell, R. Carmona, and M. Lauriere. Stochastic graphon games: II. the linear-quadratic case. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 85(3):39, 2022.
- [4] E. Bayraktar, R. Wu, and X. Zhang. Propagation of chaos of forward–backward stochastic differential equations with graphon interactions. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 88(1):25, 2023.
- [5] P. Briand and Y. Hu. Quadratic bsdes with convex generators and unbounded terminal conditions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 141:543–567, 2008.
- [6] P. E. Caines and M. Huang. Graphon mean field games and the GMFG equations. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 4129–4134, 2018.
- [7] P. E. Caines and M. Huang. Graphon mean field games and the gmfg equations: ε -nash equilibria. In *2019 IEEE 58th conference on decision and control (CDC)*, pages 286–292. IEEE, 2019.
- [8] R. Carmona, D. B. Cooney, C. V. Graves, and M. Lauriere. Stochastic graphon games: I. the static case. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(1):750–778, 2022.
- [9] G. Dos Reis and V. Platonov. Forward utilities and mean-field games under relative performance concerns. In *From Particle Systems to Partial Differential Equations: International Conference, Particle Systems and PDEs VI, VII and VIII, 2017-2019 VIII*, pages 227–251. Springer, 2021.
- [10] G. Dos Reis and V. Platonov. Forward utility and market adjustments in relative investment–consumption games of many players. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 13(3):844–876, 2022.
- [11] G.-E. Espinosa. Stochastic control methods for optimal portfolio investment. *HAL*, 2010, 2010.
- [12] G.-E. Espinosa and N. Touzi. Optimal investment under relative performance concerns. *Mathematical Finance*, 25(2):221–257, 2015.
- [13] C. Frei. Splitting multidimensional bsdes and finding local equilibria. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 124(8):2654–2671, 2014.
- [14] C. Frei and G. Dos Reis. A financial market with interacting investors: does an equilibrium exist? *Mathematics and financial economics*, 4:161–182, 2011.
- [15] G. Fu and C. Zhou. Mean field portfolio games. *Finance and Stochastics*, 27(1):189–231, 2023.

- [16] G. Fu, X. Su, and C. Zhou. Mean field exponential utility game: A probabilistic approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07684*, 2020.
- [17] S. Gao, P. E. Caines, and M. Huang. Lqg graphon mean field games: Graphon invariant subspaces. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5253–5260. IEEE, 2021.
- [18] R. Hu and T. Zariphopoulou. N-player and mean-field games in itô-diffusion markets with competitive or homophilous interaction. In *Stochastic Analysis, Filtering, and Stochastic Optimization: A Commemorative Volume to Honor Mark HA Davis’s Contributions*, pages 209–237. Springer, 2022.
- [19] Y. Hu, P. Imkeller, and M. Müller. Utility maximization in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(3):1691–1712, 2005.
- [20] M. Huang, P. E. Caines, and R. P. Malhamé. An invariance principle in large population stochastic dynamic games. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 20(2):162–172, 2007.
- [21] N. Kazamaki. *Continuous Exponential Martingales and BMO*. Springer, 2006.
- [22] D. Lacker and A. Soret. Many-player games of optimal consumption and investment under relative performance criteria. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 14(2):263–281, 2020.
- [23] D. Lacker and A. Soret. A label-state formulation of stochastic graphon games and approximate equilibria on large networks. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(4):1987–2018, 2023.
- [24] D. Lacker and T. Zariphopoulou. Mean field and n-agent games for optimal investment under relative performance criteria. *Mathematical Finance*, 29(4):1003–1038, 2019.
- [25] J.-M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Japanese journal of mathematics*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.
- [26] L. Lovász. *Large networks and graph limits*, volume 60. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.
- [27] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy. Limits of dense graph sequences. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(6):933–957, 2006.
- [28] M. Musiela, B. Paribas, and T. Zariphopoulou. Optimal asset allocation under forward exponential performance criteria. In *Markov processes and related topics: a Festschrift for Thomas G. Kurtz*, volume 4, pages 285–301. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2008.
- [29] F. Parise and A. Ozdaglar. Graphon games. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 457–458, 2019.
- [30] F. Parise and A. Ozdaglar. Graphon games: A statistical framework for network games and interventions. *Econometrica*, 91(1):191–225, 2023.
- [31] R. Rouge and N. El Karoui. Pricing via utility maximization and entropy. *Mathematical Finance*, 10(2):259–276, 2000.
- [32] Y. Sun. The exact law of large numbers via fubini extension and characterization of insurable risks. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 126(1):31–69, 2006.

- [33] L. Tangpi and X. Zhou. Optimal investment in a large population of competitive and heterogeneous agents. *Finance and Stochastics*, 28(2):497–551, 2024.