

Indefinite linear quadratic control of mean-field backward stochastic differential equation

Wencan Wang^{a,b}, Huanjun Zhang^{c,*}

^a*School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Wuhan Textile University, Wuhan 430200, Hubei, PR China*

^b*School of Control Science and Engineering, Shandong University, Jinan 250061, Shandong, PR China*

^c*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong Normal University, Jinan 250014, Shandong, PR China*

Abstract

This paper is concerned with a general linear quadratic (LQ) control problem of mean-field backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE). Here, the weighting matrices in the cost functional are allowed to be indefinite. Necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality are obtained via a mean-field forward-backward stochastic differential equation (FBSDE). By investigating the connections with LQ problems of mean-field forward systems and taking some limiting procedures, we establish the solvabilities of corresponding Riccati equations in the case that cost functional is uniformly convex. Subsequently, an explicit formula of optimal control and optimal cost are derived. Moreover, some sufficient conditions for the uniform convexity of cost functional are also proposed in terms of Riccati equations, which have not been considered in existing literatures for backward systems. Some examples are provided to illustrate our results.

Keywords: Mean-field, indefinite linear quadratic control, backward stochastic differential equation, Riccati equation, uniform convexity

1. Introduction

In recent years, there is an increasing interest on mean-field type stochastic control problems due to their wide applications in mathematics, engineering and finance. Different from classical stochastic control problems, a new feature of the problems is that both stochastic system and cost functional embody the state and the control along with their statistical distributions, which provides a simple but effective technique for describing individuals' mutual interactions. In this case, the controlled system is an SDE of McKean-Vlasov type, which was first introduced by Kac [1]. Since then, there have been considerable results on related topics. Interested readers may refer to [2, 3] for the theory of mean-field BSDEs, [4–8] for various versions of stochastic maximum principles for mean-field models. The past few years have also witnessed rapid development of mean-field LQ control theory, both in finite and infinite horizons [9–12]. Yong [9] investigated a mean-field LQ problem in finite horizon systemically by using a decoupling technique. A feedback optimal control is characterized by two coupled Riccati equations. Further in [10], Huang et. al. studied an infinite horizon case, where an optimal control is expressed via two

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: wwencan@163.com (Wencan Wang), zhuanjun@163.com (Huanjun Zhang)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

December 31, 2024

coupled algebraic Riccati equations. Elliott et. al. [11] and Ni et. al. [12] dealt with discrete time mean-field LQ problems for finite horizon and infinite horizon, respectively. We remark that all the aforementioned papers followed the standard assumption, that is the weighting matrices in cost functional are imposed with some positive-definite conditions.

The study of indefinite LQ control problems can be traced back to Chen et. al. [13], who first pointed out that some stochastic LQ problems with indefinite (in particular, negative) control weighting matrices may still be sensible and well-posed. An equivalent cost functional method was introduced in [14] to study an indefinite LQ control problem, which was extended to mean-field case in [15]. Li et. al. [16] studied an indefinite LQ problem of mean-field SDE by introducing relax compensators. The open-loop and closed-loop solvabilities for LQ control problems of mean-field type are discussed in [18] and [17], respectively. It was shown that the standard assumption is not necessary for the solvabilities of mean-field LQ control problems. Ni et. al. [19, 20] considered discrete time indefinite LQ optimal control problems of mean-field type with infinite horizon and finite horizon, respectively. Wang and Zhang [21] investigated uniform stabilization and asymptotic optimality for indefinite mean-field LQ social control system with multiplicative noises. We point out that the existing literatures on indefinite LQ control problems focused on forward stochastic systems.

In financial investment, a European contingent claim ζ , which is a random variable, can be regarded as a contract to be guaranteed at maturity T . One frequently encounters the situation that funds may be injected or withdrawn from the replication process of a contingent claim so as to achieve some other goals. This naturally results in stochastic control problems of BSDEs [22–25]. Li et. al. [22] considered an LQ control problem of mean-field BSDE, where explicit formulas of optimal control and optimal cost are derived. Mean-field games and social optimal problems of backward stochastic systems with LQ formulation are discussed in [23–25]. However, the study on indefinite LQ control problems of BSDEs is quite lacking in literatures. To our best knowledge, there are only a few papers on this type of control problems, including [?] and [27], which constructed the optimal control in terms of a Riccati equation, an adjoint equation and a BSDE under the uniform convexity of cost functional for homogeneous and nonhomogeneous cases, respectively. Indefinite LQ control problems of mean-field BSDEs are underdeveloped in literatures and many fundamental questions remain unsolved.

This paper is concerned with an indefinite LQ control problem of mean-field BSDE. As preliminary results, we derive necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality. The optimal control is characterized via a mean-field FBSDE, together with a stationarity condition. By investigating the connections with forward mean-field LQ problems, we introduce some reductions of Problem (BLQ), which leads to an equivalent control problem with (13) holds. Combining with this transformation and some limiting procedures, we derive the solvabilities of Riccati equations associated with Problem (BLQ). With these results, we construct an explicit formulas of optimal control and optimal cost under the uniform convexity of cost functional in terms of Riccati equations, an adjoint process and a mean-field BSDE. Finally, by employing the equivalent cost functional method, we proposed some sufficient conditions for the uniform convexity of cost functional in terms of Riccati equations.

Our work distinguishes itself from existing literatures in the following aspects. (i) We develop a general procedure of constructing optimal control of Problem (BLQ) under the uniform convexity of cost functional (Assumption A3), which extends the results in [26, 27]. With the appearance of mean-field term, we need to introduce two coupled Riccati equations (16)-(17), which play important roles in deriving explicit formulas of optimal control and optimal cost. Moreover, it takes more efforts to establish the connections between Problem (BLQ) and Prob-

lem (FLQ_λ) as well as simplify Problem (BLQ), due to our mean-field setting. (ii) In this paper, a general indefinite LQ control problem of mean-field BADE is considered, where the cross-product terms of control and state processes are involved in cost functional. Moreover, both the state equation and the cost functional contain the nonhomogeneous terms. As we can see in Section 3, the cross-product terms and nonhomogeneous terms bring lots of difficulties in deriving optimal control and optimal cost of Problem (BLQ). Compared with [22], the representations of solution Z and optimal control u in Theorem 3.4 deserves more complex structures. (iii) We provide some necessary and sufficient conditions for the uniform convexity of cost functional in terms of Riccati equations (16) and (17). Due to the special structure of backward systems, we adopt the equivalent cost functional method to prove the sufficiency in our paper, which is quite different from mean-field LQ control problems of forward stochastic systems. Moreover, as we will see in Example 6.2, the equivalent cost functional method also provides an alternative and effective way to obtain the uniform convexity of cost functional. In fact, (27) implies that the uniform convexity is equivalent for a family of cost functional $J_h(\zeta; u)$. Thus, in order to obtain the uniform convexity of cost functional for original control problem, we need only to find an equivalent cost functional satisfying Assumption A3.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate an indefinite LQ control problem of mean-field BSDE and give some preliminary results. Section 3 aims to derive explicit formulas of optimal control and optimal cost in the case that the cost functional is uniformly convex. In Section 4, we devoted to giving sufficient conditions for the uniform convexity of cost functional in terms of Riccati equations. Section 5 gives several illustrative examples. Finally, we conclude this paper.

2. Problem formulation and preliminaries

Throughout this paper, $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ denotes the set of all $n \times m$ matrices and \mathbb{S}^n denotes the set of all $n \times n$ symmetric matrices. In particular, we mean by $S \geq 0$ ($S > 0$) if S is a nonnegative (positive) definite matrix. For a matrix valued function $S : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^n$, we mean by $S \gg 0$ that $S(t)$ is uniformly positive, i. e., there is a positive real number α such that $S(t) \geq \alpha I$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, let M^\top be its transpose. The inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is defined by $\langle M, N \rangle \mapsto \text{tr}(M^\top N)$ with an induced norm $|M| = \sqrt{\text{tr}(M^\top M)}$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space and let $T > 0$ be a fixed time horizon. $W(t) : 0 \leq t \leq T$ is an \mathbb{R} -valued standard Wiener process, defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$. $\mathbb{F} \equiv \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a natural filtration of $W(\cdot)$ augmented by all \mathbb{P} -null sets. For any Euclidean space \mathbb{M} , we give the following notations:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{M}) = \left\{ \zeta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \mid \zeta \text{ is an } \mathcal{F}_T\text{-measurable random variable, } \mathbb{E}[|\zeta|^2] < \infty \right\};$$

$$\mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{M}) = \left\{ v : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \mid v \text{ is a bounded and deterministic function} \right\};$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{M}) = \left\{ v : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \mid v \text{ is an } \mathbb{F}\text{-progressively measurable stochastic process, } \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |v(t)|^2 dt \right] < \infty \right\};$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{M}) = \left\{ v : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \mid v \text{ is an } \mathbb{F}\text{-progressively measurable stochastic process and has continuous paths, } \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |v(t)|^2 \right] < \infty \right\}.$$

Consider a controlled mean-field linear BSDE

$$\begin{cases} dY(t) = [A(t)Y(t) + \widehat{A}(t)\mathbb{E}[Y(t)] + B(t)u(t) + \widehat{B}(t)\mathbb{E}[u(t)] + C(t)Z(t) + \widehat{C}(t)\mathbb{E}[Z(t)] + f(t)]dt \\ \quad + Z(t)dW(t), \\ Y(T) = \zeta, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\zeta \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u(\cdot)$, valued in \mathbb{R}^m , is a control process. Introduce an admissible control set $\mathcal{U}[0, T] = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Any $u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ is called an admissible control.

Assumption A1: The coefficients of system (1) satisfy

$$A(\cdot), \widehat{A}(\cdot), C(\cdot), \widehat{C}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}), B(\cdot), \widehat{B}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}), f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Under Assumption A1, system (1) admits a unique solution pair $(Y, Z) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$, which is called the corresponding state process, for any $u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ (see Li et. al. [22]). We introduce a quadratic cost functional

$$\begin{aligned} J(\zeta; u) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle GY(0), Y(0) \rangle + \langle \widehat{G}\mathbb{E}[Y(0)], \mathbb{E}[Y(0)] \rangle + 2\langle g, Y(0) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad + 2 \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} q(t) \\ \rho_1(t) \\ \rho_2(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y(t) \\ Z(t) \\ u(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q(t) & S_1(t) & S_2(t) \\ S_1^\top(t) & R_{11}(t) & R_{12}(t) \\ S_2^\top(t) & R_{12}^\top(t) & R_{22}(t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y(t) \\ Z(t) \\ u(t) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y(t) \\ Z(t) \\ u(t) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{Q}(t) & \widehat{S}_1(t) & \widehat{S}_2(t) \\ \widehat{S}_1^\top(t) & \widehat{R}_{11}(t) & \widehat{R}_{12}(t) \\ \widehat{S}_2^\top(t) & \widehat{R}_{12}^\top(t) & \widehat{R}_{22}(t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y(t)] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z(t)] \\ \mathbb{E}[u(t)] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y(t)] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z(t)] \\ \mathbb{E}[u(t)] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where g is an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable satisfying $\mathbb{E}[|g|^2] < \infty$. For simplicity, we may suppress time t and use the following notations in this paper:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \begin{pmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{pmatrix}, \widehat{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{S}_1 & \widehat{S}_2 \end{pmatrix}, R = \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} & R_{12} \\ R_{12}^\top & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \widehat{R} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{R}_{11} & \widehat{R}_{12} \\ \widehat{R}_{12}^\top & \widehat{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \widehat{P} &= P + \widehat{P}, \text{ for } P = A, B, C, Q, S_1, S_2, S, R_{11}, R_{12}, R_{22}, R, G. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption A2: The weighting matrices in cost functional (2) satisfy

$$\begin{cases} G, \widehat{G} \in \mathbb{S}^n, Q, \widehat{Q} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^n), S_1, \widehat{S}_1 \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}), S_2, \widehat{S}_2 \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}), \\ R_{11}, \widehat{R}_{11} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^n), R_{12}, \widehat{R}_{12} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}), R_{22}, \widehat{R}_{22} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^m), \\ q \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n), \rho_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n), \rho_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m). \end{cases}$$

Our mean-field backward stochastic LQ control problem can be stated as follows.

Problem (BLQ). Find a $u^* \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ such that

$$V(\zeta) = J(\zeta; u^*) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]} J(\zeta; u). \quad (3)$$

Any $u^* \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ satisfying (3) is called an optimal control of Problem (BLQ), and the corresponding state process (Y^*, Z^*) is called an optimal state process. (Y^*, Z^*, u^*) is called an optimal triple. In the special case that f, g, q, ρ_1, ρ_2 vanish, we denote the corresponding Problem (BLQ) by Problem (BLQ)₀. The corresponding cost functional is denoted by $J_0(\zeta; u)$. Under Assumption A2, cost functional (2) is well-defined. The following theorem gives a characterization of optimal control for Problem (BLQ).

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that Assumptions A1-A2 hold and $\zeta \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is given. $u^* \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ is an optimal control of Problem (BLQ) if and only if the following conditions hold:*

(i) $J_0(0; u) \geq 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$.

(ii) *The mean-field FBSDE*

$$\begin{cases} dX^* = -\left(A^\top X^* + \widehat{A}^\top \mathbb{E}[X^*] + QY^* + \widehat{Q}\mathbb{E}[Y^*] + S_1 Z^* + \widehat{S}_1 \mathbb{E}[Z^*] + S_2 u^* + \widehat{S}_2 \mathbb{E}[u^*] + q\right) dt \\ \quad - \left(C^\top X^* + \widehat{C}^\top \mathbb{E}[X^*] + S_1^\top Y^* + \widehat{S}_1^\top \mathbb{E}[Y^*] + R_{11} Z^* + \widehat{R}_{11} \mathbb{E}[Z^*] + R_{12} u^* + \widehat{R}_{12} \mathbb{E}[u^*] + \rho_1\right) dW, \\ dY^* = (AY^* + \widehat{A}\mathbb{E}[Y^*] + Bu^* + \widehat{B}\mathbb{E}[u^*] + CZ^* + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[Z^*] + f)dt + Z^*dW, \\ X^*(0) = -GY^*(0) - \widehat{G}\mathbb{E}[Y^*(0)] - g, Y(T) = \zeta \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

admits unique solution (X^*, Y^*, Z^*) , such that

$$B^\top X^* + \widehat{B}^\top \mathbb{E}[X^*] + S_2^\top Y^* + \widehat{S}_2^\top \mathbb{E}[Y^*] + R_{12}^\top Z^* + \widehat{R}_{12}^\top \mathbb{E}[Z^*] + R_{22} u^* + \widehat{R}_{22} \mathbb{E}[u^*] + \rho_2 = 0.$$

Proof. $u^* \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ is an optimal control of Problem (BLQ) if and only if

$$J(\zeta; u^* + \varepsilon u) - J(\zeta; u^*) \geq 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T], \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $(Y^\varepsilon, Z^\varepsilon)$ be the solution to system (1) corresponding to $u^\varepsilon = u^* + \varepsilon u$. It is clearly that $(Y^\varepsilon, Z^\varepsilon) = (Y^*, Z^*) + \varepsilon(\delta Y, \delta Z)$, where $(\delta Y, \delta Z)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} d\delta Y = (A\delta Y + \widehat{A}\mathbb{E}[\delta Y] + Bu + \widehat{B}\mathbb{E}[u] + C\delta Z + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[\delta Z])dt + \delta Z dW, \\ \delta Y(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & J(\zeta; u^\varepsilon) - J(\zeta; u^*) \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} J_0(0; u) + \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\langle g, \delta Y(0) \rangle] + \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\langle G\delta Y(0), Y^*(0) \rangle] + \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\langle \widehat{G}\mathbb{E}[\delta Y(0)], \mathbb{E}[Y^*(0)] \rangle] \\ &+ \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1 & S_2 \\ S_1^\top & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2^\top & R_{12}^\top & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \delta Y \\ \delta Z \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y^* \\ Z^* \\ u^* \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right] + \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} q \\ \rho_1 \\ \rho_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \delta Y \\ \delta Z \\ u \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right] \\ &+ \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{Q} & \widehat{S}_1 & \widehat{S}_2 \\ \widehat{S}_1^\top & \widehat{R}_{11} & \widehat{R}_{12} \\ \widehat{S}_2^\top & \widehat{R}_{12}^\top & \widehat{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\delta Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[\delta Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y^*] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z^*] \\ \mathbb{E}[u^*] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right] \\ &= \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \langle B^\top X^* + \widehat{B}^\top \mathbb{E}[X^*] + S_2^\top Y^* + \widehat{S}_2^\top \mathbb{E}[Y^*] + R_{12}^\top Z^* + \widehat{R}_{12}^\top \mathbb{E}[Z^*] + R_{22} u^* + \widehat{R}_{22} \mathbb{E}[u^*] + \rho_2, u \rangle \right] \\ &+ \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} J_0(0; u). \end{aligned}$$

From the above arguments, it is easy to draw the conclusions. □

3. The optimal control and Riccati equations

From the above arguments, it is difficult to check whether Problem (BLQ) admits a unique optimal control when $J_0(0; u) \geq 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$, due to the fact that the unique solvability of mean-field FBSDE (4) is hard to tackle without the positive definiteness assumptions on the weighting matrices. In the following, we introduce a condition slightly stronger than $J_0(0; u) \geq 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$, which enables us to overcome the challenge brought by the indefiniteness of weighting matrices.

Assumption A3: There exists a constant $\alpha > 0$, such that

$$J_0(0, u) \geq \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right], \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T].$$

Actually, Assumption A3 is also called the uniform convexity of cost functional, which is sufficient for the existence and uniqueness of optimal control of Problem (BLQ). In this section, we will give a more specific characterization of optimal control and construct an explicit formula of the corresponding optimal cost under Assumption A3 via two Riccati equations with terminal conditions, a mean-field BSDE.

3.1. Connections with LQ problems of mean-field forward systems

Consider a controlled mean-field forward system

$$\begin{cases} dX = (AX + \widehat{A}\mathbb{E}[X] + Bu + \widehat{B}\mathbb{E}[u] + Cv + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[v])dt + vdW, \\ X(0) = \xi, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where ξ is an \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\xi^2] < \infty$. The control process is the pair $(u, v) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n) = \mathcal{U}[0, T] \times \mathcal{V}[0, T]$. Introduce a quadratic cost functional

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(\xi; u, v) = & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda(X(T), X(T)) + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1 & S_2 \\ S_1^\top & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2^\top & R_{12}^\top & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X \\ v \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X \\ v \\ u \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{Q} & \widehat{S}_1 & \widehat{S}_2 \\ \widehat{S}_1^\top & \widehat{R}_{11} & \widehat{R}_{12} \\ \widehat{S}_2^\top & \widehat{R}_{12}^\top & \widehat{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X] \\ \mathbb{E}[v] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X] \\ \mathbb{E}[v] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant parameter. We pose an LQ problem associate with system (5) and cost functional (6) as follows.

Problem (FLQ $_\lambda$): Find a $(u^*, v^*) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T] \times \mathcal{V}[0, T]$, such that

$$\mathcal{V}_\lambda(\xi) = \mathcal{J}_\lambda(\xi; u^*, v^*) = \inf_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T] \times \mathcal{V}[0, T]} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(\xi; u, v).$$

We now give the following result, which indicates some connections between Problem (BLQ) and Problem (FLQ $_\lambda$).

Theorem 3.1. *Let Assumptions A1-A3 hold. Then there exist constants $\rho > 0$, and $\lambda_0 > 0$, such that for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,*

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(0; u, v) \geq \rho \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (|u|^2 + |v|^2) dt \right], \forall (u, v) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T] \times \mathcal{V}[0, T].$$

If, in addition, $-G \geq 0$, $-\widehat{G} \geq 0$, then for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(\xi; u, v) \geq \rho \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (|u|^2 + |v|^2) dt \right], \forall (u, v) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T] \times \mathcal{V}[0, T].$$

Proof. For any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T] \times \mathcal{V}[0, T]$, let X be the corresponding solution of (5). It is obvious that $\zeta \triangleq X(T) \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Regard (X, u) as the solution of

$$\begin{cases} dX = (AX + \widehat{A}\mathbb{E}[X] + Bu + \widehat{B}\mathbb{E}[u] + Cv + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[v])dt + v dW, \\ X(T) = \zeta. \end{cases}$$

Further, we introduce the following two mean-field BSDEs:

$$\begin{cases} dy_0 = (Ay_0 + \widehat{A}\mathbb{E}[y_0] + Bu + \widehat{B}\mathbb{E}[u] + Cz_0 + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[z_0])dt + z_0 dW, \\ y_0(T) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dy_1 = (Ay_1 + \widehat{A}\mathbb{E}[y_1] + Cz_1 + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[z_1])dt + z_1 dW, \\ y_1(T) = \zeta. \end{cases}$$

Thus we have

$$X = y_0 + y_1, v = z_0 + z_1.$$

Denote

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} Q & S_1 & S_2 \\ S_1^\top & R_{11} & R_{12} \\ S_2^\top & R_{12}^\top & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \widehat{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{Q} & \widehat{S}_1 & \widehat{S}_2 \\ \widehat{S}_1^\top & \widehat{R}_{11} & \widehat{R}_{12} \\ \widehat{S}_2^\top & \widehat{R}_{12}^\top & \widehat{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \theta_0 = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 \\ z_0 \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \theta_1 = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ z_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

With these notations,

$$\begin{aligned} J_0(0; u) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle Gy_0(0), y_0(0) \rangle + \langle \widehat{G}\mathbb{E}[y_0(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)] \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^T \langle M\theta_0, \theta_0 \rangle dt + \int_0^T \langle \widehat{M}\mathbb{E}[\theta_0], \mathbb{E}[\theta_0] \rangle dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $K > 0$ be a constant, which is large enough such that $\max\{|M(t)|, |\widehat{M}(t)|\} \leq K$ for a. e. $t \in [0, T]$. We then further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{J}_\lambda(\xi; u, v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda \langle X(T), X(T) \rangle + \int_0^T \left(\langle M(\theta_0 + \theta_1), \theta_0 + \theta_1 \rangle + \langle \widehat{M}\mathbb{E}[\theta_0 + \theta_1], \mathbb{E}[\theta_0 + \theta_1] \rangle \right) dt \right] \\ &= J_0(0; u) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda \langle X(T), X(T) \rangle - \langle Gy_0(0), y_0(0) \rangle - \langle \widehat{G}\mathbb{E}[y_0(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)] \rangle \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left(2 \langle M\theta_0, \theta_1 \rangle + \langle M\theta_1, \theta_1 \rangle + 2 \langle \widehat{M}\mathbb{E}[\theta_0], \mathbb{E}[\theta_1] \rangle + \langle \widehat{M}\mathbb{E}[\theta_1], \mathbb{E}[\theta_1] \rangle \right) dt \right] \\ &\geq J_0(0; u) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\lambda \langle X(T), X(T) \rangle - \langle Gy_0(0), y_0(0) \rangle - \langle \widehat{G}\mathbb{E}[y_0(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)] \rangle \right] \\ &\quad - K \left\{ (\mu + 1) \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\theta_1|^2 dt \right] + \frac{1}{\mu} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\theta_0|^2 dt \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu > 0$ is a constant to be determined later. According to Theorem 2.1 in Li et. al. [22],

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\theta_0|^2 dt \right] \leq K \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right], \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\theta_1|^2 dt \right] \leq K \mathbb{E} [|\zeta|^2] = K \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2].$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |v|^2 dt \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T 2(|z_0|^2 + |z_1|^2) dt \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\theta_0|^2 dt \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |\theta_1|^2 dt \right] \\ &\leq 2K \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right] + 2K \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $\xi = 0$, we further have

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle Gy_0(0), y_0(0) \rangle] = \mathbb{E} [\langle Gy_1(0), y_1(0) \rangle] \leq K \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2],$$

and

$$\langle \widehat{G} \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)] \rangle = \langle \widehat{G} \mathbb{E}[y_1(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_1(0)] \rangle \leq K \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2],$$

by Theorem 2.1 in Li et. al. [22]. Combining the above equations and letting $\mu = \frac{2K^2}{\alpha}$, $\lambda \geq \lambda_0 = \frac{\alpha}{2} + 2K^2(\mu + 1) + 2K$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_\lambda(\xi; u, v) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda - 2K^2(\mu + 1) \right] \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2] + \left(\alpha - \frac{K^2}{\mu} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [\langle Gy_0(0), y_0(0) \rangle + \langle \widehat{G} \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)] \rangle] \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2] + \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right] + K \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [\langle Gy_0(0), y_0(0) \rangle + \langle \widehat{G} \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)] \rangle] \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{8K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |v|^2 dt \right] + \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right] + K \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} [\langle Gy_0(0), y_0(0) \rangle + \langle \widehat{G} \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)], \mathbb{E}[y_0(0)] \rangle]. \end{aligned}$$

If $\xi = 0$, it is obvious that

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(0; u, v) \geq \frac{\alpha}{8K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |v|^2 dt \right] + \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right].$$

Further, if $-G \geq 0$, $-\widetilde{G} \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{J}_\lambda(\xi; u, v) \geq \frac{\alpha}{8K} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |v|^2 dt \right] + \frac{\alpha}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right] + K \mathbb{E} [|X(T)|^2].$$

The proof is completed. □

Corollary 3.1. *Let Assumptions A1-A3 hold. Problem $(FLQ)_\lambda$ is uniquely solvable for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. If, in addition, $-G \geq 0$, $-\tilde{G} \geq 0$, then for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,*

$$\mathcal{V}_\lambda(\xi) \geq 0.$$

Corollary 3.2. *Let Assumptions A1-A3 hold. Then for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, Riccati equations*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Pi}_\lambda + \Pi_\lambda A + A^\top \Pi_\lambda + Q \\ - \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & R_{12} \\ R_{12}^\top & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \Pi_\lambda(T) = \lambda I, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\tilde{\Pi}}_\lambda + \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda \tilde{A} + \tilde{A}^\top \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \tilde{Q} \\ - \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}^\top \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \tilde{S}_1^\top \\ \tilde{B}^\top \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \tilde{S}_2^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & \tilde{R}_{12} \\ \tilde{R}_{12}^\top & \tilde{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}^\top \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \tilde{S}_1^\top \\ \tilde{B}^\top \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \tilde{S}_2^\top \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda(T) = \lambda I \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

admit unique solutions $\Pi_\lambda, \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^n)$, respectively, such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & R_{12} \\ R_{12}^\top & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \gg 0, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & \tilde{R}_{12} \\ \tilde{R}_{12}^\top & \tilde{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \gg 0. \quad (9)$$

Further, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_\lambda(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \Pi_\lambda(0)(\xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi]), \xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi] \rangle + \langle \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda(0) \mathbb{E}[\xi], \mathbb{E}[\xi] \rangle \right].$$

Remark 3.1. From (9) and Schur Lemma [28], we can see that $R_{22} \gg 0, \tilde{R}_{22} \gg 0$ under Assumption A3. These features are quite different from mean-field LQ problems of forward stochastic systems, where the uniform positive definiteness of control weighting matrices are neither necessary nor sufficient for the uniform convexity of cost functional (see [17, 18]).

3.2. Reductions of Problem (BLQ)

Based on the above arguments, we make some reductions of Problem (BLQ) . For this end, we introduce a controlled system

$$\begin{cases} dY_0 = (AY_0 + \hat{A}\mathbb{E}[Y_0] + Bu_0 + \hat{B}\mathbb{E}[u_0] + CZ_0 + \hat{C}\mathbb{E}[Z_0] + f) dt + Z_0 dW, \\ Y_0(T) = \zeta, \end{cases}$$

and a cost functional

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}(\zeta; u_0) = & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[2 \langle g, Y_0(0) \rangle + 2 \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{q} \\ \tilde{\rho}_1 \\ \tilde{\rho}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y_0 \\ Z_0 \\ u_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right. \\ & + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S_1 & S_2 \\ S_1^\top & \mathcal{R}_{11} & 0 \\ S_2^\top & 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y_0 \\ Z_0 \\ u_0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y_0 \\ Z_0 \\ u_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\ & \left. + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hat{S}_1 & \hat{S}_2 \\ \hat{S}_1^\top & \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{11} & 0 \\ \hat{S}_2^\top & 0 & \hat{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[u_0] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[u_0] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \bar{q} = q + \Phi f + (\bar{\Phi} - \Phi)\mathbb{E}[f], \bar{\rho}_1 = \rho_1 - R_{12}R_{22}^{-1}\rho_2 - (\bar{R}_{12}\bar{R}_{22}^{-1} - R_{12}R_{22}^{-1})\mathbb{E}[\rho_2], \\ C = C - BR_{22}^{-1}R_{12}^\top, \bar{C} = C + \bar{C} = \bar{C} - \bar{B}\bar{R}_{22}^{-1}\bar{R}_{12}^\top, \\ S_1 = S_1 - S_2R_{22}^{-1}R_{12}^\top + \Phi C, \bar{S}_1 = S_1 + \bar{S}_1 = \bar{S}_1 - \bar{S}_2\bar{R}_{22}^{-1}\bar{R}_{12}^\top + \bar{\Phi}\bar{C}, \\ S_2 = S_2 + \Phi B, \bar{S}_2 = S_2 + \bar{S}_2 = \bar{S}_2 + \bar{\Phi}\bar{B}, \\ \mathcal{R}_{11} = R_{11} - R_{12}R_{22}^{-1}R_{12}^\top + \Phi, \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{11} = \mathcal{R}_{11} + \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{11} = \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{11} - \bar{R}_{12}\bar{R}_{22}^{-1}\bar{R}_{12}^\top + \Phi, \end{cases}$$

with Φ and $\bar{\Phi}$ being the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Phi} + \Phi A + A^\top \Phi + Q = 0 \\ \Phi(0) = -G, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\bar{\Phi}} + \bar{\Phi}\bar{A} + \bar{A}^\top \bar{\Phi} + \bar{Q} = 0 \\ \bar{\Phi}(0) = -\bar{G}, \end{cases}$$

respectively. The corresponding stochastic optimal control problem is stated as follows.

Problem (NC-BLQ). Find a $u_0^* \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ such that

$$\bar{V}(\zeta) = \bar{J}(\zeta; u_0^*) = \inf_{u_0 \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]} \bar{J}(\zeta; u_0).$$

Here, ‘‘NC’’ implies that the cross-product term of u_0 and Z_0 does not appear in $\bar{J}(\zeta; u_0)$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let Assumptions A1-A3 hold. For any two pairs (Y, Z, u) and (Y_0, Z_0, u_0) , we introduce a linear transformation*

$$\begin{pmatrix} Y_0 - \mathbb{E}[Y_0] \\ Z_0 - \mathbb{E}[Z_0] \\ u_0 - \mathbb{E}[u_0] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22}^{-1}R_{12}^\top & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[u_0] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{R}_{22}^{-1}\bar{R}_{12}^\top & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

Then the following two statements are equivalent:

- (1): (Y, Z, u) is an admissible (optimal) triple of Problem (BLQ).
- (2): (Y_0, Z_0, u_0) is an admissible (optimal) triple of Problem (NC-BLQ).

Moreover, we have

$$J(\zeta; u) = \bar{J}(\zeta; u_0) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} \left[\langle \Phi(T)(\zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]), \zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle + \langle \bar{\Phi}(T)\mathbb{E}[\zeta], \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle \right].$$

Proof. Applying Itô formula to $\langle \Phi(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]), Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \rangle + \langle \tilde{\Phi}\mathbb{E}[Y], \mathbb{E}[Y] \rangle$ on time interval $[0, T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \Phi(T)(\zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]), \zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle + \langle \tilde{\Phi}(T)\mathbb{E}[\zeta], \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle \right] \\ & + \mathbb{E} \left[\langle G(Y(0) - \mathbb{E}[Y(0)]), Y(0) - \mathbb{E}[Y(0)] \rangle + \langle \tilde{G}\mathbb{E}[Y(0)], \mathbb{E}[Y(0)] \rangle \right] \\ = & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -Q & \Phi C & \Phi B \\ C^\top \Phi & \Phi & 0 \\ B^\top \Phi & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right. \\ & + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -\tilde{Q} & \tilde{\Phi} \tilde{C} & \tilde{\Phi} \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{C}^\top \tilde{\Phi} & \Phi & 0 \\ \tilde{B}^\top \tilde{\Phi} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\ & \left. + \int_0^T \left(2\langle \Phi(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]), f - \mathbb{E}[f] \rangle + 2\langle \tilde{\Phi}\mathbb{E}[Y], \mathbb{E}[f] \rangle \right) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$J(\zeta; u) = \widehat{J}(\zeta; u) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \Phi(T)(\zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]), \zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle + \langle \tilde{\Phi}(T)\mathbb{E}[\zeta], \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle \right]. \quad (12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{J}(\zeta; u) \\ = & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & S_1 + \Phi C & S_2 + \Phi B \\ (S_1 + \Phi C)^\top & R_{11} + \Phi & R_{12} \\ (S_2 + \Phi B)^\top & R_{12}^\top & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right. \\ & + \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tilde{S}_1 + \tilde{\Phi} \tilde{C} & \tilde{S}_2 + \tilde{\Phi} \tilde{B} \\ (\tilde{S}_1 + \tilde{\Phi} \tilde{C})^\top & \tilde{R}_{11} + \Phi & \tilde{R}_{12} \\ (\tilde{S}_2 + \tilde{\Phi} \tilde{B})^\top & \tilde{R}_{12}^\top & \tilde{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\ & \left. + 2 \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{q} \\ \rho_1 \\ \rho_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y \\ Z \\ u \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt + 2\langle g, Y(0) \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We pose an LQ problem as follows.

Problem (BLQA): Find a $u^* \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$, such that

$$\widehat{J}(\zeta; u^*) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]} \widehat{J}(\zeta; u).$$

We observe from (12) that $J(\zeta; u)$ and $\widehat{J}(\zeta; u)$ differ by only a constant. It is obvious that (Y, Z, u) is an admissible (optimal) triple of Problem (BLQA) if and only if (Y, Z, u) is an admissible (optimal) triple of Problem (BLQ). In the following, we investigate the relationship between Problem (BLQA) and Problem (NC-BLQ). From (10) and (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & -R_{22}^{-1}R_{12}^\top & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y_0 - \mathbb{E}[Y_0] \\ Z_0 - \mathbb{E}[Z_0] \\ u_0 - \mathbb{E}[u_0] \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & -\tilde{R}_{22}^{-1}\tilde{R}_{12}^\top & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z_0] \\ \mathbb{E}[u_0] \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Linear transformation (10) with (11) is invertible. Through direct calculations, we can verify that (Y, Z, u) is an admissible (optimal) triple of Problem (BLQA) if and only if (Y_0, Z_0, u_0) is an admissible (optimal) triple of Problem (NC-BLQ). Moreover, $\widetilde{J}(\zeta; u_0) = \widetilde{J}(\zeta; u)$. The others follow immediately. \square

According to Theorem 3.2, we may assume

$$G = 0, \widetilde{G} = 0, Q = 0, \widetilde{Q} = 0, R_{12} = 0, \widetilde{R}_{12} = 0, \quad (13)$$

in cost functional (2) without lose of generality throughout this paper. In the case that (13) holds, Riccati equations (7) and (8) take

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Pi}_\lambda + \Pi_\lambda A + A^\top \Pi_\lambda \\ - \left(\begin{array}{c} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{array} \right)^\top \left(\begin{array}{cc} R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{array} \right)^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{array} \right) = 0, \\ \Pi_\lambda(T) = \lambda I, \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\widetilde{\Pi}}_\lambda + \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda \widetilde{A} + \widetilde{A}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda \\ - \left(\begin{array}{c} \widetilde{C}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_1^\top \\ \widetilde{B}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \end{array} \right)^\top \left(\begin{array}{cc} \widetilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{R}_{22} \end{array} \right)^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} \widetilde{C}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_1^\top \\ \widetilde{B}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \end{array} \right) = 0, \\ \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(T) = \lambda I, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

respectively.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Assumptions A1-A3 and (13) hold. For $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, let $\Pi_\lambda, \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda$ be the unique solutions of (14) and (15), respectively. Then we have*

$$\Pi_\lambda(t) \geq 0, \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(t) \geq 0, \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Moreover, for $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$, we have

$$\Pi_{\lambda_2}(t) > \Pi_{\lambda_1}(t), \widetilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_2}(t) > \widetilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_1}(t), \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. For Problem (FLQ $_\lambda$) with $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 give

$$\mathcal{V}_\lambda(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \Pi_\lambda(0)(\xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi]), \xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi] \rangle + \langle \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(0)\mathbb{E}[\xi], \mathbb{E}[\xi] \rangle \right] \geq 0.$$

For any $\xi \neq 0$ with $\mathbb{E}[\xi] = 0$,

$$\mathcal{V}_\lambda(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \Pi_\lambda(0)(\xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi]), \xi - \mathbb{E}[\xi] \rangle \right] \geq 0,$$

which implies that $\Pi_\lambda(0) \geq 0$. For any $\xi \neq 0$ with $\xi = \mathbb{E}[\xi]$,

$$\mathcal{V}_\lambda(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(0)\mathbb{E}[\xi], \mathbb{E}[\xi] \rangle \right] \geq 0,$$

which implies that $\widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(0) \geq 0$. Denote

$$\mathcal{Q}_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{C}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_1^\top \\ \widetilde{B}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{C}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_1^\top \\ \widetilde{B}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, let Φ and $\widetilde{\Phi}$ be solutions of matrix ODEs

$$\begin{cases} d\Phi = A\Phi dt, \\ \Phi(0) = I, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d\widetilde{\Phi} = \widetilde{A}\widetilde{\Phi} dt, \\ \widetilde{\Phi}(0) = I, \end{cases}$$

respectively. Equations (13) and (14) imply that

$$\Pi_\lambda(t) = [\Phi(t)^{-1}]^\top \left[\Pi_\lambda(0) + \int_0^t \Phi(s)^\top \mathcal{Q}_\lambda(s) \Phi(s) ds \right] \Phi(t)^{-1},$$

and

$$\widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(t) = [\widetilde{\Phi}(t)^{-1}]^\top \left[\widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(0) + \int_0^t \widetilde{\Phi}(s)^\top \widetilde{\mathcal{Q}}_\lambda(s) \widetilde{\Phi}(s) ds \right] \widetilde{\Phi}(t)^{-1}.$$

From Corollary 3.2, it is easy to see that

$$\Pi_\lambda(t) \geq 0, \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(t) \geq 0, \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Denote $\mathcal{B} = (C, B)$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = (\widetilde{C}, \widetilde{B})$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B} + \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, $\mathcal{D} = (I, 0)$. With these notations, Riccati equations (14) and (15) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Pi}_\lambda + \Pi_\lambda A + A^\top \Pi_\lambda - (\Pi_\lambda \mathcal{B} + S) (R + \mathcal{D}^\top \Pi_\lambda \mathcal{D})^{-1} (\Pi_\lambda \mathcal{B} + S)^\top = 0, \\ \Pi_\lambda(T) = \lambda I, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\widetilde{\Pi}}_\lambda + \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda \widetilde{A} + \widetilde{A}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda - (\widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} + \widetilde{S}) (\widetilde{R} + \mathcal{D}^\top \Pi_\lambda \mathcal{D})^{-1} (\widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} + \widetilde{S})^\top = 0, \\ \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(T) = \lambda I, \end{cases}$$

respectively. For $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$, letting $\Delta = \Pi_{\lambda_2} - \Pi_{\lambda_1}$, $\widetilde{\Delta} = \widetilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_2} - \widetilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Delta} + \Delta A + A^\top \Delta + (\Pi_{\lambda_1} \mathcal{B} + S) (R + \mathcal{D}^\top \Pi_{\lambda_1} \mathcal{D})^{-1} (\Pi_{\lambda_1} \mathcal{B} + S)^\top \\ - (\Delta \mathcal{B} + \Pi_{\lambda_1} \mathcal{B} + S) (R + \mathcal{D}^\top \Pi_{\lambda_1} \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}^\top \Delta \mathcal{D})^{-1} (\Delta \mathcal{B} + \Pi_{\lambda_1} \mathcal{B} + S)^\top = 0, \\ \Delta(T) = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) I, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\tilde{\Delta}} + \tilde{\Delta}\tilde{A} + \tilde{A}^\top\tilde{\Delta} + (\tilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_1}\tilde{\mathcal{B}} + \tilde{S})(\tilde{R} + \mathcal{D}^\top\Pi_{\lambda_1}\mathcal{D})^{-1}(\tilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_1}\tilde{\mathcal{B}} + \tilde{S})^\top \\ - (\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{\mathcal{B}} + \tilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_1}\tilde{\mathcal{B}} + \tilde{S})(\tilde{R} + \mathcal{D}^\top\Pi_{\lambda_1}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}^\top\Delta\mathcal{D})^{-1}(\tilde{\Delta}\tilde{\mathcal{B}} + \tilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_1}\tilde{\mathcal{B}} + \tilde{S})^\top = 0, \\ \tilde{\Delta}(T) = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)I. \end{cases}$$

According to Corollary 2.3 in Sun et. al. [27], we have

$$\Pi_{\lambda_2}(t) > \Pi_{\lambda_1}(t), \tilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_2}(t) > \tilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_1}(t), \forall t \in [0, T].$$

□

3.3. Optimal control and value function

In this subsection, we construct the optimal control of Problem (BLQ) in the case that Assumption A3 and (13) hold via an adjoint process, two Riccati equations with terminal conditions and a mean-field BSDE. For this end, we introduce the following Riccati equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Upsilon} - \Upsilon A^\top - A\Upsilon \\ + \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top\Upsilon \\ B^\top + S_2^\top\Upsilon \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} I + \Upsilon R_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon C^\top + \Upsilon S_1^\top\Upsilon \\ B^\top + S_2^\top\Upsilon \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \Upsilon(T) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\tilde{\Upsilon}} - \tilde{\Upsilon}\tilde{A}^\top - \tilde{A}\tilde{\Upsilon} \\ + \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{C}^\top + \tilde{S}_1^\top\tilde{\Upsilon} \\ \tilde{B}^\top + \tilde{S}_2^\top\tilde{\Upsilon} \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} I + \tilde{\Upsilon}\tilde{R}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\Upsilon}\tilde{C}^\top + \tilde{\Upsilon}\tilde{S}_1^\top\tilde{\Upsilon} \\ \tilde{B}^\top + \tilde{S}_2^\top\tilde{\Upsilon} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \tilde{\Upsilon}(T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let Assumptions A1-A3 and (13) hold. Then Riccati equations (16) and (17) admit unique solutions $\Upsilon \geq 0, \tilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0$, such that $I + \Upsilon R_{11}, I + \tilde{\Upsilon}\tilde{R}_{11}$ are invertible on $[0, T]$, $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1}, (I + \tilde{\Upsilon}\tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$, $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1}\Upsilon \geq 0, (I + \tilde{\Upsilon}\tilde{R}_{11})^{-1}\tilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0$.*

Proof. Uniqueness: Suppose that Riccati equation (16) admits two solutions Υ^1 and Υ^2 . Letting $\delta\Upsilon = \Upsilon^1 - \Upsilon^2$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}\delta\Upsilon \\ &= \delta\Upsilon A^\top + A\delta\Upsilon - \delta\Upsilon S_1(I + \Upsilon^1 R_{11})^{-1}\Upsilon^1(C^\top + S_1^\top\Upsilon^1) \\ & \quad - (C + \Upsilon^2 S_1) \left[(I + \Upsilon^1 R_{11})^{-1}\Upsilon^1(C^\top + S_1^\top\Upsilon^1) - (I + \Upsilon^2 R_{11})^{-1}\Upsilon^2(C^\top + S_1^\top\Upsilon^2) \right] \\ & \quad - \delta\Upsilon S_2 R_{22}^{-1}(B^\top + S_2^\top\Upsilon^1) - (B + \Upsilon^2 S_2) R_{22}^{-1} S_2^\top \delta\Upsilon \\ &= \delta\Upsilon A^\top + A\delta\Upsilon - \delta\Upsilon S_1(I + \Upsilon^1 R_{11})^{-1}\Upsilon^1(C^\top + S_1^\top\Upsilon^1) \\ & \quad - (C + \Upsilon^2 S_1) \left\{ - (I + \Upsilon^1 R_{11})^{-1}\delta\Upsilon R_{11}(I + \Upsilon^2 R_{11})^{-1}\Upsilon^1(C^\top + S_1^\top\Upsilon^1) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (I + \Upsilon^2 R_{11})^{-1} \left[\delta\Upsilon(C^\top + S_1^\top\Upsilon^1) + \Upsilon^2 S_1^\top \delta\Upsilon \right] \right\} \\ & \quad - \delta\Upsilon S_2 R_{22}^{-1}(B^\top + S_2^\top\Upsilon^1) - (B + \Upsilon^2 S_2) R_{22}^{-1} S_2^\top \delta\Upsilon \\ & \triangleq f(t, \delta\Upsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\delta\Upsilon(T) = 0$ and $f(t, x)$ is Lipschitz with respect to x , Gronwall's inequality implies that $\delta\Upsilon = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Existence: For $\lambda > \lambda_0$, let Π_λ and $\tilde{\Pi}_\lambda$ be unique solutions of (14) and (15), respectively. According to Proposition 3.1,

$$\Pi_\lambda(t) > 0, \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda(t) > 0, \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Defining

$$\Upsilon_\lambda = \Pi_\lambda^{-1}, \tilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda = \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda^{-1},$$

we have $\Upsilon_\lambda(t) \geq 0$ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda(t) \geq 0$ are decreasing with respect to λ . Assuming that Υ_λ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda$ converge pointwise to Υ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}$, respectively, we obtain $\Upsilon \geq 0$ and $\tilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0$.

We now proceed to prove the following:

- (i). $I + \Upsilon R_{11}, I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11}$ are invertible on $[0, T]$;
- (ii). $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}), (I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$;
- (iii). $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \geq 0, (I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \tilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0$;
- (iv). Υ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ satisfy equations (16) and (17), respectively.

For (i) and (ii), we note that for $\lambda > \lambda_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\lambda(I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11}) &= \Pi_\lambda + R_{11} \gg 0, \\ \Pi_\lambda(I + \Upsilon_\lambda \tilde{R}_{11}) &= \Pi_\lambda + \tilde{R}_{11} \gg 0, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

which imply that $I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11}, I + \Upsilon_\lambda \tilde{R}_{11}$ are invertible on $[0, T]$. By Proposition 3.1, for $\lambda > \lambda_0$,

$$\Pi_\lambda(t) > \Pi_{\lambda_0}(t), \tilde{\Pi}_\lambda(t) > \tilde{\Pi}_{\lambda_0}(t), \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Thus,

$$0 \leq (R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda)^{-1} \leq (R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1},$$

and

$$0 \leq (\tilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_\lambda)^{-1} \leq (\tilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1}.$$

From the above arguments, we obtain for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Pi_\lambda(R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda)^{-2} \Pi_\lambda x, x \rangle \\ &= |(R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0} + \Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1} (\Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0} + \Pi_{\lambda_0}) x|^2 \\ &\leq 2|(R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0} + \Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1} (\Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0}) x|^2 + 2|(R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0} + \Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1} \Pi_{\lambda_0} x|^2 \\ &= 2|x - (R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0} + \Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1} (R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0}) x|^2 + 2|(R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0} + \Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1} \Pi_{\lambda_0} x|^2 \\ &\leq 4 \left[1 + |(R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0} + \Pi_\lambda - \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1}|^2 (|R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0}|^2 + |\Pi_{\lambda_0}|^2) \right] |x|^2 \\ &\leq 4 \left[1 + |(R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1}|^2 (|R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0}|^2 + |\Pi_{\lambda_0}|^2) \right] |x|^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$(\Pi_\lambda + R_{11})^{-1} \Pi_\lambda (I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11}) (I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^\top \Pi_\lambda (\Pi_\lambda + R_{11})^{-1} = I,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & (I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})(I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^\top \\ &= \left[\Pi_\lambda (\Pi_\lambda + R_{11})^{-2} \Pi_\lambda \right]^{-1} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \left| (R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1} \right|^2 \left(|R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0}|^2 + |\Pi_{\lambda_0}| \right) \right]^{-1} I. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, we get

$$(I + \Upsilon R_{11})(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^\top \geq \frac{1}{4} \left[1 + \left| (R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0})^{-1} \right|^2 \left(|R_{11} + \Pi_{\lambda_0}|^2 + |\Pi_{\lambda_0}| \right) \right]^{-1} I.$$

Thus, $I + \Upsilon R_{11}$ is invertible on $[0, T]$ and $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$. $I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11}$ is invertible on $[0, T]$ and $(I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ can be derived similarly.

For (iii), (18) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda &= (\Pi_\lambda + R_{11})^{-1} \geq 0, \\ (I + \Upsilon_\lambda \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda &= (\Pi_\lambda + \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda$, $(I + \Upsilon_\lambda \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda$ are both decreasing with respect to λ and bounded below by zero. Letting $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain

$$(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \geq 0, (I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \geq 0.$$

In the following, we prove that Υ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ satisfy equations (16) and (17), respectively. From the definition of Υ_λ , we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Upsilon_\lambda(t) \Pi_\lambda(t) + \Upsilon_\lambda(t) \frac{d}{dt} \Pi_\lambda(t) = \frac{d}{dt} (\Upsilon_\lambda(t) \Pi_\lambda(t)) = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \dot{\Upsilon}_\lambda \\ &= \Upsilon_\lambda \left[\Pi_\lambda A + A^\top \Pi_\lambda - \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix} \right] \Upsilon_\lambda \\ &= A \Upsilon_\lambda + \Upsilon_\lambda A^\top - \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \\ &= A \Upsilon_\lambda + \Upsilon_\lambda A^\top - \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} (I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Upsilon_\lambda(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda} I - \int_t^T \left[A \Upsilon_\lambda + \Upsilon_\lambda A^\top - \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} (I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, then $\Upsilon(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\Upsilon(t) = - \int_t^T \left[A \Upsilon + \Upsilon A^\top - \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} (I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon \end{pmatrix} \right] ds,$$

which definitely satisfies Riccati equation (16). Following a similar procedure as above, we obtain $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ satisfies Riccati equation (17). \square

We now introduce the following mean-field BSDE.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d\eta = \left[A(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + \tilde{A}\mathbb{E}[\eta] + f + \Upsilon(q - \mathbb{E}[q]) + \tilde{\Upsilon}\mathbb{E}[q] \right. \\ \left. - \left(\begin{array}{cc} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon & \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon \end{array} \right)^\top \left(\begin{array}{cc} I + \Upsilon R_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{array} \right)^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} \Upsilon S_1^\top (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + \Upsilon(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) - (\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) \\ S_2^\top (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\rho_2 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2]) \end{array} \right) \right. \\ \left. - \left(\begin{array}{cc} \tilde{C}^\top + \tilde{S}_1^\top \tilde{\Upsilon} & \\ \tilde{B}^\top + \tilde{S}_2^\top \tilde{\Upsilon} \end{array} \right)^\top \left(\begin{array}{cc} I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{R}_{22} \end{array} \right)^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} \Upsilon \tilde{S}_1^\top \mathbb{E}[\eta] + \Upsilon \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] - \mathbb{E}[\beta] \\ \tilde{S}_2^\top \mathbb{E}[\eta] + \mathbb{E}[\rho_2] \end{array} \right) \right] dt + \beta dW, \\ \eta(T) = \zeta. \end{array} \right. \quad (19)$$

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose Assumptions A1-A3 and (13) hold. Let Υ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ be solutions of Riccati equations (16) and (17), respectively. Let (η, β) be an adapted solution of mean-field BSDE (19). Then the optimal control of Problem (BLQ) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} u = & -R_{22}^{-1} \left[(B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon)(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) + S_2^\top (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\rho_2 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2]) \right] \\ & - \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \left[(\tilde{B}^\top + \tilde{S}_2^\top \tilde{\Upsilon})\mathbb{E}[X] + \tilde{S}_2^\top \mathbb{E}[\eta] + \mathbb{E}[\rho_2] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where X is given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dX = - \left\{ \left[A^\top - S_1(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon (C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon) - S_2 R_{22}^{-1} (B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon) \right] (X - \mathbb{E}[X]) \right. \\ \quad - S_1(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \left[\Upsilon S_1^\top (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + \Upsilon(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) - (\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) \right] \\ \quad - S_2 R_{22}^{-1} (S_2^\top (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\rho_2 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2])) \\ \quad + \left[\tilde{A}^\top - \tilde{S}_1(I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon (\tilde{C}^\top + \tilde{S}_1^\top \tilde{\Upsilon}) - \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{B}^\top + \tilde{S}_2^\top \tilde{\Upsilon}) \right] \mathbb{E}[X] \\ \quad \left. - \tilde{S}_1(I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \left[\Upsilon \tilde{S}_1^\top \mathbb{E}[\eta] + \Upsilon \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] - \mathbb{E}[\beta] \right] - \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} (\tilde{S}_2^\top \mathbb{E}[\eta] + \mathbb{E}[\rho_2]) + q \right\} dt \\ \quad - \left\{ (I + R_{11} \Upsilon)^{-1} \left[(C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon)(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) + S_1^\top (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) + R_{11}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) \right] \right. \\ \quad \left. + (I + \tilde{R}_{11} \Upsilon)^{-1} \left[(\tilde{C}^\top + \tilde{S}_1^\top \tilde{\Upsilon})\mathbb{E}[X] + \tilde{S}_1^\top \mathbb{E}[\eta] + \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] + \tilde{R}_{11} \mathbb{E}[\beta] \right] \right\} dW, \\ X(0) = -g. \end{array} \right. \quad (21)$$

Moreover, the value function of Problem (BLQ) is

$$\begin{aligned}
V(\zeta) = & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle g, 2\eta(0) - \Upsilon(0)(g - \mathbb{E}[g]) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(0)\mathbb{E}[g] \rangle \right. \\
& + \int_0^T \left\{ \langle \rho_1, -(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) - (I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] \rangle \right. \\
& - \langle \rho_2, R_{22}^{-1}(\rho_2 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2]) + \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2] \rangle + \langle \beta, (I + R_{11} \Upsilon)^{-1} R_{11}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) + (I + \tilde{R}_{11} \Upsilon)^{-1} \tilde{R}_{11} \mathbb{E}[\beta] \rangle \\
& - \langle \eta, (S_1(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon S_1^\top + S_2 R_{22}^{-1} S_2^\top)(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\tilde{S}_1(I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \tilde{S}_1^\top + \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \tilde{S}_2^\top) \mathbb{E}[\eta] \rangle \\
& + 2\langle \rho_1, (I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) + (I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\beta] \rangle \\
& - 2\langle \eta, S_1(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} [\Upsilon(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) - (\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta])] + S_2 R_{22}^{-1}(\rho_2 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2]) \rangle \\
& \left. \left. - 2\langle \eta, \tilde{S}_1(I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} [\Upsilon \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] - \mathbb{E}[\beta]] + \tilde{S}_2 \tilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2] - q \rangle \right\} dt \right]. \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
Y &= \Upsilon(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) + \tilde{\Upsilon} \mathbb{E}[X] + \eta, \\
Z &= -(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \left[\Upsilon(C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon)(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) + \Upsilon S_1^\top (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + \Upsilon(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) - (\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) \right] \\
&\quad - (I + \Upsilon \tilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \left[\Upsilon(\tilde{C}^\top + \tilde{S}_1^\top \tilde{\Upsilon}) \mathbb{E}[X] + \Upsilon \tilde{S}_1^\top \mathbb{E}[\eta] + \Upsilon \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] - \mathbb{E}[\beta] \right].
\end{aligned}$$

With these notations, (21) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} dX = - \left[A^\top X + \hat{A}^\top \mathbb{E}[X] + S_1 Z + \hat{S}_1 \mathbb{E}[Z] + S_2 u + \hat{S}_2 \mathbb{E}[u] + q \right] dt \\ \quad - \left[C^\top X + \hat{C}^\top \mathbb{E}[X] + S_1^\top Y + \hat{S}_1^\top \mathbb{E}[Y] + R_{11} Z + \hat{R}_{11} \mathbb{E}[Z] + \rho_1 \right] dW, \\ X(0) = -g. \end{cases}$$

Further, by Itô formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
dY &= \dot{\Upsilon}(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) dt - \Upsilon \left[A^\top (X - \mathbb{E}[X]) + S_1(Z - \mathbb{E}[Z]) + S_2(u - \mathbb{E}[u]) + (q - \mathbb{E}[q]) \right] dt \\
&\quad - \Upsilon \left[C^\top X + \hat{C}^\top \mathbb{E}[X] + S_1^\top Y + \hat{S}_1^\top \mathbb{E}[Y] + R_{11} Z + \hat{R}_{11} \mathbb{E}[Z] + \rho_1 \right] dW \\
&\quad + \dot{\tilde{\Upsilon}} \mathbb{E}[X] dt - \tilde{\Upsilon} \left[\hat{A}^\top \mathbb{E}[X] + \tilde{S}_1 \mathbb{E}[Z] + \tilde{S}_2 \mathbb{E}[u] + \mathbb{E}[q] \right] dt + d\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Through some straightforward calculations, we derive

$$\begin{cases} dY = \left[AY + \hat{A} \mathbb{E}[Y] + Bu + \hat{B} \mathbb{E}[u] + CZ + \hat{C} \mathbb{E}[Z] + f \right] dt + ZdW, \\ Y(T) = \zeta. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$B^\top X + \hat{B}^\top \mathbb{E}[X] + S_2^\top Y + \hat{S}_2^\top \mathbb{E}[Y] + R_{22} u + \hat{R}_{22} \mathbb{E}[u] + \rho_2 = 0.$$

Theorem 2.1 implies that the optimal control of Problem (BLQ) is given by (20). In the following, we prove that the value function of Problem (BLQ) is given by (22). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
V(\zeta) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[2\langle g, Y(0) \rangle + \int_0^T \left(2\langle q, Y \rangle + 2\langle \rho_1, Z \rangle + 2\langle \rho_2, u \rangle + 2\langle S_1 Z, Y \rangle + 2\langle S_2 u, Y \rangle + \langle R_{11} Z, Z \rangle \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \langle R_{22} u, u \rangle + 2\langle \hat{S}_1 \mathbb{E}[Z], \mathbb{E}[Y] \rangle + 2\langle \hat{S}_2 \mathbb{E}[u], \mathbb{E}[Y] \rangle + \langle \hat{R}_{11} \mathbb{E}[Z], \mathbb{E}[Z] \rangle + \langle \hat{R}_{22} \mathbb{E}[u], \mathbb{E}[u] \rangle \right) dt \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle g, Y(0) \rangle - \langle X(T), Y(T) \rangle + \int_0^T \left(\langle f, X \rangle + \langle q, Y \rangle + \langle \rho_1, Z \rangle + \langle \rho_2, u \rangle \right) dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

From equations (21) and (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\langle X(T), Y(T) \rangle] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\langle X(T), \eta(T) \rangle] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\langle X(0), \eta(0) \rangle] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \langle X, f + \Upsilon(q - \mathbb{E}[q]) + \widetilde{\Upsilon} \mathbb{E}[q] - (C + \Upsilon S_1)(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) \right. \\
&\quad - (B + \Upsilon S_2) R_{22}^{-1} (\rho_2 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2]) - (\widetilde{C} + \widetilde{\Upsilon} \widetilde{S}_1)(I + \Upsilon \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] - (\widetilde{B} + \widetilde{\Upsilon} \widetilde{S}_2) \widetilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2] \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle \eta, (S_1(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon S_1^\top + S_2 R_{22}^{-1} S_2^\top) (\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\widetilde{S}_1(I + \Upsilon \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \widetilde{S}_1^\top + \widetilde{S}_2 \widetilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \widetilde{S}_2^\top) \mathbb{E}[\eta] \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle \eta, S_1(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} [\Upsilon(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) - 2(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta])] + S_2 R_{22}^{-1} (\rho_2 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_2]) \\
&\quad + \widetilde{S}_1(I + \Upsilon \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} [\Upsilon \mathbb{E}[\rho_1] - 2\mathbb{E}[\beta]] + \widetilde{S}_2 \widetilde{R}_{22}^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\rho_2] - q \rangle \\
&\quad \left. - \langle \beta, (I + R_{11} \Upsilon)^{-1} [(\rho_1 - \mathbb{E}[\rho_1]) + R_{11}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta])] + (I + \widetilde{R}_{11} \Upsilon)^{-1} (\mathbb{E}[\rho_1] + \widetilde{R}_{11} \mathbb{E}[\beta]) \rangle dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above equations, we obtain $V(\zeta)$ satisfies (22). \square

4. Sufficiency of Riccati equations

In the above, we construct the optimal control of Problem (BLQ) under Assumption A3. However, it is not easy to determine whether Assumption A3 is satisfied for a general LQ control problem of mean-field BSDE. In this section, we give a sufficient condition, which ensures the uniform convexity of cost functional $J(\zeta; u)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Assumptions A1-A2 and (13) hold. If $R_{22} \gg 0, \widetilde{R}_{22} \gg 0$, Riccati equations (16) and (17) admit unique solutions $\Upsilon \geq 0, \widetilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0$ such that $I + \Upsilon R_{11}, I + \Upsilon \widetilde{R}_{11}$ are invertible on $[0, T]$, $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1}, (I + \Upsilon \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ and $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \geq 0, (I + \Upsilon \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \widetilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0$, then there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$, such that*

$$J_0(0; u) \geq \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right], \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T].$$

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, we need the following results.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Assumptions A1-A2 hold. For any $u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$, let (y, z) be the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} dy = (Ay + \widehat{A} \mathbb{E}[y] + Bu + \widehat{B} \mathbb{E}[u] + Cz + \widehat{C} \mathbb{E}[z]) dt + z dW, \\ y(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then for any $\Theta, \widetilde{\Theta} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$, there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u - \Theta(y - \mathbb{E}[y])|^2 dt \right] &\geq \gamma \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right], \\
\int_0^T \mathbb{E}[u] - \widetilde{\Theta} \mathbb{E}[y] dt &\geq \gamma \left[\int_0^T \mathbb{E}[u]^2 dt \right]. \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any $\Theta \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$, we define a bounded linear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m)$ by

$$\mathcal{A}u = u - \Theta(y - \mathbb{E}[y]).$$

Then \mathcal{A} is bijective and its inverse \mathcal{A}^{-1} is given by

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1}u = u + \Theta(\widehat{y} - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{y}]),$$

where

$$\begin{cases} d\widehat{y} = \left((A + B\Theta)\widehat{y} + (\widehat{A} - B\Theta)\mathbb{E}[\widehat{y}] + Bu + \widehat{B}\mathbb{E}[u] + C\widehat{z} + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[\widehat{z}] \right) dt + \widehat{z}dW, \\ \widehat{y}(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By the bounded inverse theorem, \mathcal{A}^{-1} is bounded with norm $\|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\| > 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u(t)|^2 dt \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |(\mathcal{A}^{-1}\mathcal{A}u)(t)|^2 dt \right] \leq \|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\|^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |(\mathcal{A}u)(t)|^2 dt \right] \\ &= \|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\|^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u - \Theta(y - \mathbb{E}[y])|^2 dt \right], \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the first inequality in (23) with $\gamma = \|\mathcal{A}^{-1}\|^2$.

To prove the second inequality, for any $\widetilde{\Theta} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$, we define a bounded linear operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m)$ by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}u = u - \widetilde{\Theta}\mathbb{E}[y].$$

Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is bijective and its inverse $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}$ is given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}u = u + \widetilde{\Theta}\mathbb{E}[\widehat{y}],$$

where

$$\begin{cases} d\widehat{y} = \left[A\widehat{y} + (\widehat{A} + \widetilde{B}\widetilde{\Theta})\mathbb{E}[\widehat{y}] + Bu + \widehat{B}\mathbb{E}[u] + C\widehat{z} + \widehat{C}\mathbb{E}[\widehat{z}] \right] dt + \widehat{z}dW, \\ \widehat{y}(T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By the bounded inverse theorem, $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}$ is bounded with norm $\|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}\| > 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T |\mathbb{E}[u(t)]|^2 dt &= \int_0^T |(\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}u])(t)|^2 dt \leq \|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}\|^2 \int_0^T |(\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}u])(t)|^2 dt \\ &= \|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}\|^2 \int_0^T |\mathbb{E}[u] - \widetilde{\Theta}\mathbb{E}[y]|^2 dt, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the second inequality in (23) with $\gamma = \|\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}\|^2$. □

We now proceed to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof. By the continuity theorem of solution on initial condition, there exists λ_2 , such that for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_2$, Riccati equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Upsilon}_\lambda - \Upsilon_\lambda A^\top - A\Upsilon_\lambda \\ + \left(\begin{array}{c} C^\top + S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{array} \right)^\top \left(\begin{array}{cc} I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{array} \right)^{-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} \Upsilon_\lambda C^\top + \Upsilon_\lambda S_1^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \\ B^\top + S_2^\top \Upsilon_\lambda \end{array} \right) = 0, \\ \Upsilon_\lambda(T) = \lambda^{-1}I, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Upsilon}_\lambda - \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda \widetilde{A}^\top - \widetilde{A} \Upsilon_\lambda \\ + \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{C}^\top + \widetilde{S}_1^\top \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda \\ \widetilde{B}^\top + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} I + \Upsilon_\lambda \widetilde{R}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_\lambda \widetilde{C}^\top + \Upsilon_\lambda \widetilde{S}_1^\top \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda \\ \widetilde{B}^\top + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda(T) = \lambda^{-1} I \end{cases}$$

admit unique solutions $\Upsilon_\lambda, \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda$. Moreover, by the comparison theorem, we further have $\Upsilon_\lambda > \Upsilon \geq 0, \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda > \widetilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0$, and $\Upsilon_\lambda, \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda$ are monotonically decreasing with respect to λ . In the following, we prove that $(I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda \geq 0, (I + \Upsilon_\lambda \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda \geq 0$. Actually,

$$\begin{aligned} (I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda &= (R_{11} + \Upsilon_\lambda^{-1})^{-1}, \\ (I + \Upsilon_\lambda \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda &= (\widetilde{R}_{11} + \Upsilon_\lambda^{-1})^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which imply that $(I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda$ and $(I + \Upsilon_\lambda \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda$ are monotonically decreasing with respect to λ . Combining with the fact that $(I + \Upsilon R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \geq 0, (I + \Upsilon \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon \geq 0$, we have $(I + \Upsilon_\lambda R_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda \geq 0, (I + \Upsilon_\lambda \widetilde{R}_{11})^{-1} \Upsilon_\lambda \geq 0$.

Defining $\Pi_\lambda = \Upsilon_\lambda^{-1}, \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda = \widetilde{\Upsilon}_\lambda^{-1}$ for $\lambda \geq \lambda_2$, then $\Pi_\lambda > 0, \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda > 0$. It is clear that Π_λ and $\widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda$ satisfy Riccati equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Pi}_\lambda + \Pi_\lambda A + A^\top \Pi_\lambda \\ - \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_1^\top \\ B^\top \Pi_\lambda + S_2^\top \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \Pi_\lambda(T) = \lambda I, \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\widetilde{\Pi}}_\lambda + \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda \widetilde{A} + \widetilde{A}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda \\ - \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{C}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_1^\top \\ \widetilde{B}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_\lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{C}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_1^\top \\ \widetilde{B}^\top \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda + \widetilde{S}_2^\top \end{pmatrix} = 0, \\ \widetilde{\Pi}_\lambda(T) = \lambda I, \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

respectively. Moreover, $R_{11} + \Pi_\lambda \gg 0, \widetilde{R}_{11} + \Pi_\lambda \gg 0$.

Let

$$\Sigma = \{\psi \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{S}^n) \mid \psi \text{ is a deterministic continuous differential function}\}.$$

For $h = (H, \widetilde{H}) \in \Sigma \times \Sigma$, we define

$$\begin{cases} Q_h = \dot{H} + HA + A^\top H, S_{1,h} = S_1 + HC, S_{2,h} = S_2 + HB, N_{1,h} = R_{11} + H, \\ \widetilde{Q}_h = \dot{\widetilde{H}} + \widetilde{H} \widetilde{A} + \widetilde{A}^\top \widetilde{H}, \widetilde{S}_{1,h} = \widetilde{S}_1 + \widetilde{H} \widetilde{C}, \widetilde{S}_{2,h} = \widetilde{S}_2 + \widetilde{H} \widetilde{B}, \widetilde{N}_{1,h} = \widetilde{R}_{11} + H, \\ \widetilde{q}_h = q + Hf + (\widetilde{H} - H) \mathbb{E}[f]. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

We introduce a family of equivalent cost functionals

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_h(\zeta; u) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q_h & S_{1,h} & S_{2,h} \\ S_{1,h}^\top & N_{1,h} & 0 \\ S_{2,h}^\top & 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y - \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ Z - \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right. \\
&+ \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Q}_h & \bar{S}_{1,h} & \bar{S}_{2,h} \\ \bar{S}_{1,h}^\top & \bar{N}_{1,h} & 0 \\ \bar{S}_{2,h}^\top & 0 & \bar{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[Y] \\ \mathbb{E}[Z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\
&+ 2 \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \bar{q} \\ \rho_1 \\ \rho_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} Y \\ Z \\ u \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt + 2 \langle g, Y(0) \rangle \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle H(0)(Y(0) - \mathbb{E}[Y(0)]), Y(0) - \mathbb{E}[Y(0)] \rangle + \langle \bar{H}(0) \mathbb{E}[Y(0)], \mathbb{E}[Y(0)] \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Actually, we have

$$J(\zeta; u) = J_h(\zeta; u) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle H(T)(\zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta]), \zeta - \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle + \langle \bar{H}(T) \mathbb{E}[\zeta], \mathbb{E}[\zeta] \rangle \right]. \quad (27)$$

Thus we may take $h = (H, \bar{H}) = (\Pi_\lambda, \bar{\Pi}_\lambda)$ with $\lambda \geq \lambda_2$. It is obviously that

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_0(0; u) = J_{0,h}(0; u) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} Q_h & S_{1,h} & S_{2,h} \\ S_{1,h}^\top & N_{1,h} & 0 \\ S_{2,h}^\top & 0 & R_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y - \mathbb{E}[y] \\ z - \mathbb{E}[z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} y - \mathbb{E}[y] \\ z - \mathbb{E}[z] \\ u - \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \right. \\
&+ \int_0^T \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Q}_h & \bar{S}_{1,h} & \bar{S}_{2,h} \\ \bar{S}_{1,h}^\top & \bar{N}_{1,h} & 0 \\ \bar{S}_{2,h}^\top & 0 & \bar{R}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[y] \\ \mathbb{E}[z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[y] \\ \mathbb{E}[z] \\ \mathbb{E}[u] \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle dt \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\langle H(0)(y(0) - \mathbb{E}[y(0)]), y(0) - \mathbb{E}[y(0)] \rangle + \langle \bar{H}(0) \mathbb{E}[y(0)], \mathbb{E}[y(0)] \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $R_{22} \gg 0, \bar{R}_{22} \gg 0$ and combining with Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& J_0(0; u) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left(\langle R_{22}(u - \mathbb{E}[u] + R_{22}^{-1} S_{2,h}^\top (y - \mathbb{E}[y])), u - \mathbb{E}[u] + R_{22}^{-1} S_{2,h}^\top (y - \mathbb{E}[y]) \rangle \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \langle \bar{R}_{22}(\mathbb{E}[u] + \bar{R}_{22}^{-1} \bar{S}_{2,h}^\top \mathbb{E}[y]), \mathbb{E}[u] + \bar{R}_{22}^{-1} \bar{S}_{2,h}^\top \mathbb{E}[y] \rangle \right) dt \right] \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \delta \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T (|u - \mathbb{E}[u] + R_{22}^{-1} S_{2,h}^\top (y - \mathbb{E}[y])|^2 + \gamma |\mathbb{E}[u]|^2) \right] \\
&\geq \frac{\delta \gamma}{2(1 + \gamma)} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u + R_{22}^{-1} S_{2,h}^\top (y - \mathbb{E}[y])|^2 \right] \\
&\geq \frac{\delta \gamma^2}{2(1 + \gamma)} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. \square

5. Examples

In this section, we present two illustrative examples. In the first example, the assumptions (H2) in [22] does not hold, but the corresponding Riccati equations admit unique solutions which satisfy Theorem 4.1. Thus, the cost functional is uniformly convex. This example shows that the uniform convexity condition (Assumption A3) is indeed weaker than assumptions (H2) in [22]. In Example 5.2, it is difficult to prove the existence and uniqueness of solutions to related Riccati equations. We use the equivalent cost functional method to construct an equivalent functional which satisfies Assumption A3 first, and then we obtain an optimal control of the original stochastic control problem via solutions of Riccati equations.

Example 6.1 Consider a one-dimensional controlled mean-field BSDE

$$\begin{cases} dY = (2Y - 2\mathbb{E}[Y] + 2u - \mathbb{E}[u]) dt + Z dW, & t \in [0, 1], \\ Y(1) = \xi, \end{cases}$$

with cost functional

$$J(\xi; u) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (-Z^2 + 2u^2 - 2\mathbb{E}[Y]\mathbb{E}[u] - \mathbb{E}[Z]^2 - \mathbb{E}[u]^2) dt \right].$$

It is difficult to check that whether $J(0; u) \geq \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right]$ holds for some $\alpha > 0$. With the data, Riccati equations (16) and (17) are

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Upsilon} - 4\Upsilon + 2 = 0, \\ \Upsilon(1) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\tilde{\Upsilon}} + (1 - \tilde{\Upsilon})^2 = 0, \\ \tilde{\Upsilon}(1) = 0, \end{cases}$$

respectively. Solving them, we get

$$\Upsilon(t) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\exp(4t - 4)}{2}, \quad \tilde{\Upsilon}(t) = \frac{1}{t - 2} + 1.$$

Note that

$$\Upsilon \geq 0, \tilde{\Upsilon} \geq 0, 1 - \Upsilon = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\exp(4t - 4)}{2}, 1 - 2\Upsilon = \exp(4t - 4).$$

Theorem 4.1 implies that there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$, such that

$$J(0; u) \geq \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt \right], \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T].$$

We now introduce the following mean-field BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} d\eta = [2(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (1 - \tilde{\Upsilon})\mathbb{E}[\eta]] dt + \beta dW, \\ \eta(T) = \zeta. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

According Theorem 3.4, the optimal control is given by

$$u = -X + \tilde{\Upsilon}\mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[\eta], \quad (29)$$

where X is given by

$$\begin{cases} dX = -\left\{2(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) + (1 - \tilde{\Upsilon})\mathbb{E}[X] - \mathbb{E}[\eta]\right\}dt \\ \quad + \left\{(I - \Upsilon)^{-1}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) + 2(I - 2\Upsilon)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\beta]\right\}dW, \\ X(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Moreover, the corresponding value function is

$$V(\zeta) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^T \left[\langle \beta, (I - \Upsilon)^{-1}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) + 2(I - 2\Upsilon)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\beta] \rangle + \langle \eta, \mathbb{E}[\eta] \rangle\right] dt\right\}.$$

Example 6.2 Consider a one-dimensional controlled mean-field BSDE

$$\begin{cases} dY = (Y + \mathbb{E}[Y] + u + \mathbb{E}[u] + Z)dt + ZdW, \quad t \in [0, 1], \\ Y(1) = \xi, \end{cases}$$

with cost functional

$$J(\xi; u) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^1 (-8YZ - 6Yu - 2Z^2 + u^2 + 4\mathbb{E}[Y]\mathbb{E}[Z] - 2\mathbb{E}[Y]\mathbb{E}[u] + \mathbb{E}[Z]^2)dt\right].$$

It is difficult to check that whether an optimal control exists. With the data, Riccati equations (16) and (17) are

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\Upsilon} - 2\Upsilon + \frac{\Upsilon(1 - 4\Upsilon)^2}{1 - 2\Upsilon} + (1 - 3\Upsilon)^2 = 0, \\ \Upsilon(1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\tilde{\Upsilon}} - 4\tilde{\Upsilon} + \frac{\tilde{\Upsilon}(1 - 2\tilde{\Upsilon})^2}{1 - \tilde{\Upsilon}} + (2 - 4\tilde{\Upsilon})^2 = 0, \\ \tilde{\Upsilon}(1) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

respectively. It is difficult to give the solvabilities of Riccati equations (31) and (32) due to the complexity. According to (26), we have for $h_0 = (H_0, \tilde{H}_0) = (3, 2)$,

$$\begin{cases} Q_{h_0} = 6, S_{1,h} = -1, S_{2,h} = 0, N_{1,h} = 1, \\ \tilde{Q}_h = 8, \tilde{S}_{1,h} = 0, \tilde{S}_{2,h} = 0, \tilde{N}_{1,h} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

We can check that

$$J_{h_0}(0; u) \geq \alpha\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt\right], \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T].$$

According to (27), we have

$$J(0; u) = J_{h_0}(0; u) \geq \alpha\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T |u|^2 dt\right], \forall u \in \mathcal{U}[0, T],$$

which implies that Assumption A3 holds. Thus we obtain that Riccati equations (31) and (32) admits unique solutions Υ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}$, respectively from Theorem 3.3. Further, mean-field BSDE (19) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} d\eta = \left[\eta + \mathbb{E}[\eta] + (1 - 4\Upsilon)(1 - 2\Upsilon)^{-1} (4\Upsilon(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta])) + 3(1 - 3\Upsilon)(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) \right. \\ \quad \left. + [(1 - 2\tilde{\Upsilon})(I - \Upsilon)^{-1}(2\Upsilon\mathbb{E}[\eta] + \mathbb{E}[\beta]) + 4(2 - 4\tilde{\Upsilon})\mathbb{E}[\eta]] \right] dt + \beta dW, \\ \eta(T) = \zeta. \end{cases}$$

According to Theorem 3.4, the corresponding optimal control is given by

$$u = -[(1 - 3\Upsilon)(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) - 3(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta])] - [(2 - 4\tilde{\Upsilon})\mathbb{E}[X] - 4\mathbb{E}[\eta]],$$

where X satisfies

$$\begin{cases} dX = - \left\{ \left[4 - 9\Upsilon + 4\Upsilon(1 - 2\Upsilon)^{-1}(1 - 4\Upsilon) \right] (X - \mathbb{E}[X]) \right. \\ \quad - 4(I - 2\Upsilon)^{-1} [4\Upsilon(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta])] - 9(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) \\ \quad + \left[2 + 2(I - \Upsilon)^{-1}\Upsilon(1 - 2\tilde{\Upsilon}) + 4(2 - 4\tilde{\Upsilon}) \right] \mathbb{E}[X] \\ \quad \left. - 2(I - \Upsilon)^{-1} (2\Upsilon\mathbb{E}[\eta] + \mathbb{E}[\beta]) - 16\mathbb{E}[\eta] \right\} dt \\ \quad - \left\{ (I - 2\Upsilon)^{-1} [(1 - 4\Upsilon)(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) - 4(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) - 2(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta])] \right. \\ \quad \left. + (I - \Upsilon)^{-1} [(1 - 2\tilde{\Upsilon})\mathbb{E}[X] - 2\mathbb{E}[\eta] - \mathbb{E}[\beta]] \right\} dW, \\ X(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the corresponding value function is

$$\begin{aligned} V(\zeta) = & -\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^T \left[\langle \beta, 2(1 - 2\Upsilon)^{-1}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) + (1 - \Upsilon)^{-1}E[\beta] \rangle \right. \right. \\ & + \langle \eta, (16\Upsilon(1 - 2\Upsilon)^{-1} + 9)(\eta - \mathbb{E}[\eta]) + (4\Upsilon(1 - \Upsilon)^{-1} + 16)\mathbb{E}[\eta] \rangle \\ & \left. \left. + 2\langle \eta, 4(1 - 2\Upsilon)^{-1}(\beta - \mathbb{E}[\beta]) + 2(1 - \Upsilon)^{-1}\mathbb{E}[\beta] \rangle \right] dt \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we study an indefinite LQ control problem of mean-field BSDE. By using the limiting procedure and equivalent cost functional method, we propose some necessary and sufficient conditions for the uniform convexity of cost functional are given in terms of two coupled Riccati equations with terminal conditions. Further, we develop general procedures for deriving explicit formulas of optimal control and optimal cost under the uniform convexity of cost functional. The theoretical results obtained in this paper provide an insight into LQ zero-sum game problems of mean-field backward stochastic systems. Well-posedness of Riccati equation plays a crucial role in deriving the explicit representation of saddle point. Inspired by the general procedures developed in this paper, we may investigate the well-posedness of Riccati equation by establishing the relationship between forward and backward mean-field LQ zero-sum game problems. We will further investigate some results on this problem and related topics in future.

References

- [1] M. Kac, Foundations of kinetic theory. Proceedings of the 3rd Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1956, 3: 171-197.
- [2] R. Buckdahn, B. Djehiche, J. Li, S. Peng, Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations: a limit approach. *Annals of Probability*, 2009, 37: 1524-1565.
- [3] R. Buckdahn, J. Li, S. Peng, Mean-field backward stochastic differential equations and related partial differential equations. *Stochastic Processes and Their Application*. 2019, 119: 3133-3154.
- [4] D. Andersson, B. Djehiche, A maximum principle for SDEs of mean-field type. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 2011, 63(3): 341-356.
- [5] R. Buckdahn, J. Li, J. Ma, A stochastic maximum principle for general mean-field systems. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 2016, 74(3): 507-534.
- [6] G. Wang, C. Zhang, W. Zhang, Stochastic maximum principle for mean-field type optimal control under partial information. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2013, 59(2): 522-528.
- [7] G. Wang, H. Xiao, G. Xing, An optimal control problem for mean-field forward-backward stochastic differential equation with noisy observation. *Automatica*, 2017, 86: 104-109.
- [8] G. Wang, Z. Wu, A maximum principle for mean-field stochastic control system with noisy observation. *Automatica*, 2022, 137: 110135.
- [9] J. Yong, Linear-quadratic optimal control problems for mean-field stochastic differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 2013, 51(4): 2809-2838.
- [10] J. Huang, X. Li, J. Yong, A linear-quadratic optimal control problem for mean-field stochastic differential equations in infinite horizon. *Mathematical Control and Related Fields*, 2017, 5(1): 97-139.
- [11] R. Elliott, X. Li, Y. Ni, Discrete time mean-field stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problems. *Automatica*, 2013, 49(11): 3222-3233.
- [12] Y. Ni, R. Elliott, X. Li, Discrete-time mean-field stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problems, ii: Infinite horizon case. *Automatica*, 2015, 57: 65-77.
- [13] S. Chen, X. Li, X. Zhou, Stochastic linear quadratic regulators with indefinite control weight costs. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 1998, 36(5): 1685-1702.
- [14] Z. Yu, Equivalent cost functionals and stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 2013, 19(1): 78-90.
- [15] G. Wang, W. Wang, Indefinite linear-quadratic optimal control of mean-field stochastic differential equation with jump diffusion: an equivalent cost functional method. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024, 69(11): 7449-7462.
- [16] N. Li, X. Li, Z. Yu, Indefinite mean-field type linear-quadratic stochastic optimal control problems. *Automatica*, 2020, 122, no. 109627.
- [17] X. Li, J. Sun, J. Yong, Mean-field stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems: closed-loop solvability. *Probability, Uncertainty and Quantitative Risk*, 2016, 1(2): 1-24.
- [18] J. Sun, Mean-field stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems: open-loop solvabilities. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 2017, 23(3): 1099-1127.
- [19] Y. Ni, X. Li, J. Zhang, Indefinite mean-field stochastic linear quadratic optimal control: from finite horizon to infinite horizon. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2015, 61(11): 3269-3284.
- [20] Y. Ni, J. Zhang, X. Li, Indefinite mean-field stochastic linear quadratic optimal control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2014, 60(7): 1786-1800.
- [21] B. Wang, H. Zhang, Indefinite linear quadratic mean-field social control problems with multiplicative noise. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021, 66(11): 5221-5236.
- [22] X. Li, J. Sun, J. Xiong, Linear quadratic optimal control problems for mean-field backward stochastic differential equations. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 2019, 80: 223-250.
- [23] K. Du, J. Huang, Z. Wu, Linear quadratic mean-field-game of backward stochastic differential systems. *Mathematical Control and Related Fields*, 2018, 8(3&4): 653-678.
- [24] X. Feng, J. Huang, S. Wang, Social optima of backward linear-quadratic-gaussian mean-field teams. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 2021, 84 (Suppl 1): 651-694.
- [25] J. Huang, S. Wang, Z. Wu, Backward mean-field linear-quadratic-Gaussian (LQG) games: full and partial information. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2016, 61: 3784-3796.
- [26] J. Sun, Z. Wu, J. Xiong, Indefinite backward stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problems. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 2023, 29: 1-30.
- [27] J. Sun, J. Wen, J. Xiong, General indefinite backward stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control problems. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 2022, 28: 1-17.
- [28] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, V. Balakrishnan, *Linear Matrix Inequality in Systems and Control Theory*. 1st edition, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1994.