

# Quantum stochastic linear quadratic control theory: Closed-loop solvability <sup>\*</sup>

Penghui Wang, Shan Wang and Shengkai Zhao  
School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan, 250100, China

**Abstract.** In this paper, we investigate the closed-loop solvability of the quantum stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problem. We derive the Pontryagin maximum principle for the linear quadratic control problem of infinite-dimensional quantum stochastic systems. The equivalence between unique closed-loop solvability for quantum stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems and the well-posedness of the corresponding quantum Riccati equations is established. Notably, although the quantum Riccati equation is an infinite-dimensional deterministic operator-valued ordinary differential equation, classical methods are not applicable. Inspired by Lü and Zhang's approach [Q. Lü and X. Zhang, Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling, 101. Springer, Cham, (2021) & Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 294 (2024)] to stochastic Riccati equations, we prove the existence and uniqueness of its solutions. The results provide a theoretical foundation for the optimal design of quantum control.

**2020 AMS Subject Classification:** 46L53; 49N10; 81S25; 93E20

**Keywords.** Quantum stochastic linear quadratic control problem; Quantum Riccati equation; The Pontryagin maximum principle; Closed-loop solvability.

## 1 Introduction

Linear quantum stochastic systems are a class of models used in quantum optics, circuit quantum electrodynamics systems, quantum opto-mechanical systems, and elsewhere [8, 11, 12, 42]. The mathematical framework for these models is provided by the theory of quantum Wiener processes, and the associated quantum stochastic differential equations. With the rapid development of quantum technology, effectively controlling quantum systems to achieve specific functionalities has become a critical area of research [14, 25, 26]. Furthermore, control problems for linear systems often enjoy analytical or computationally tractable solutions. In particular, the linear quadratic control problem has gained widespread attention due to its effectiveness in optimizing system performance [15, 16, 35, 42].

In this paper, we study the linear quadratic optimal control problem of quantum stochastic systems. First, we present a brief introduction to noncommutative spaces. Let  $(\Lambda(\mathcal{H}), m, \mathcal{C})$  be a quantum (noncommutative) probability space [3, 4, 29, 34, 37, 38, 40] on which the anti-symmetric Fock space  $\Lambda(\mathcal{H})$  over  $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$  is defined. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the von Neumann algebra generated by  $\{\Psi(v) : v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)\}$ , and let  $\{\mathcal{C}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  denote the increasing family of von Neumann subalgebras of  $\mathcal{C}$  generated by

---

<sup>\*</sup>This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China(no.12271298 and no.11871308).

$\{\Psi(v) : v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^+) \text{ and } \text{ess sup} v \subseteq [0, t]\}$ . The Fermion Brownian motion  $W(\cdot)$  is given by

$$W(t) := \Psi(\chi_{[0,t]}) = \mathcal{A}^*(\chi_{[0,t]}) + \mathcal{A}(J\chi_{[0,t]}), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1.1)$$

which is self-adjoint and satisfies  $W(t)^2 = tI$  by the canonical anti-commutation relation (CAR for short) of Fermion fields, where  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}^*$  and  $J$  are annihilation, creation and complex conjugation operators, respectively. For the Fock vacuum  $\Omega \in \Lambda_0(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \Lambda(\mathcal{H})$ , define  $m(\cdot) := \langle \Omega, \cdot \Omega \rangle_{\Lambda(\mathcal{H})}$ , which is a faithful, normal, central state on  $\mathcal{C}$ . For any  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , let  $L^p(\mathcal{C})$  denote the completion of  $\mathcal{C}$  with the norm  $\|f\|_p = m(|f|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \langle \Omega, |f|^p \Omega \rangle_{\Lambda(\mathcal{H})}^{\frac{1}{p}}$  (see [10] for details).

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a Banach space and  $T > 0$  be a fixed time horizon. Denote by  $C([0, T]; \mathcal{X})$  the Banach space of all continuous  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued functions on  $[0, T]$ . For each  $q \in [1, \infty)$ , let  $L^q([0, T]; \mathcal{X})$  be the Banach space of all  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued functions that are  $q$ th power Lebesgue integrable on  $[0, T]$ . Moreover,  $L^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{X})$  is the Banach space of all  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued, Lebesgue measurable functions that are essentially bounded on  $[0, T]$ . In particular, let

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^p(\mathcal{C})) &:= \{f \in C([0, T]; L^p(\mathcal{C})); f(t) \in L^p(\mathcal{C}_t), \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T]\}, \\ L_{\mathbb{A}}^q([0, T]; L^p(\mathcal{C})) &:= \{f \in L^q([0, T]; L^p(\mathcal{C})); f(t) \in L^p(\mathcal{C}_t), \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{X}_1$  and  $\mathcal{X}_2$  be Banach spaces. Denote by  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_1; \mathcal{X}_2)$  the Banach space of all bounded linear operators from  $\mathcal{X}_1$  to  $\mathcal{X}_2$  with the usual operator norm, and denote  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_1)$  simply as  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_1; \mathcal{X}_1)$ . Moreover, define

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}; L^2(\mathcal{C}))) &:= \{F \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}; L^2(\mathcal{C}))); F(t)\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_t), \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T], \xi \in \mathcal{X}\}, \\ L_{\mathbb{A}}^q([0, T]; \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}; L^2(\mathcal{C}))) &:= \{F \in L^q([0, T]; \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}; L^2(\mathcal{C}))); F(t)\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_t), \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T], \xi \in \mathcal{X}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$L_{\mathbb{A}}^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}; L^2(\mathcal{C}))) := \{F \in L^\infty([0, T]; \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}; L^2(\mathcal{C}))); F(t)\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_t), \text{ a.e. } t \in [0, T], \xi \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space. Set

$$\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{H}) := \{F \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}); F = F^*\},$$

and

$$\mathbb{S}_+(\mathcal{H}) := \{F \in \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{H}); \langle F\xi, \xi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 0, \xi \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

Let  $U$  be a separable Hilbert space. Consider the following controlled linear quantum stochastic system in noncommutative space  $L^2(\mathcal{C})$ :

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = \{A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t)\}dt + \{C(t)x(t) + D(t)u(t)\}dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ x(t_0) = \eta, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} A(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{A}}^1([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))), & B(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(U; L^2(\mathcal{C}))), \\ C(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))), & D(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{A}}^\infty([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(U; L^2(\mathcal{C}))). \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

In the above,  $x(\cdot)$  is the state process, and  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T] := L^2([t_0, T]; U)$  is the control process. Any  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]$  is called an admissible control. For any initial pair  $(t_0, \eta) \in [0, T] \times L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$  and admissible control  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]$ , it follows from [4, Theorem 2.1] that the equation (1.2) admits a unique solution  $\bar{x}(\cdot) \equiv x(\cdot; t_0, \eta, \bar{u}(\cdot))$ .

We introduce the following cost functional:

$$\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u(\cdot)) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T \{ \langle M(t)x(t), x(t) \rangle + \langle R(t)u(t), u(t) \rangle_U \} dt + \langle Gx(T), x(T) \rangle \right\}. \quad (1.4)$$

where

$$M(\cdot) \in L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathbb{S}_+(L^2(\mathcal{C}))), \quad R(\cdot) \in L^\infty([t_0, T]; \mathbb{S}_+(U)), \quad G \in \mathbb{S}_+(L^2(\mathcal{C}_T)). \quad (1.5)$$

Here and in what follows, we shall use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  for the inner product in  $L^2(\mathcal{C})$ , where it is conjugate-linear with respect to the first variable and linear with respect to the second variable.

The optimal control problem studied in this paper is as follows.

**Problem (QSLQ).** For any given  $(t_0, \eta) \in [0, T] \times L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$ , find a  $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]$  such that

$$V(t_0, \eta) = \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \bar{u}(\cdot)) = \inf_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]} \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u(\cdot)). \quad (1.6)$$

Any  $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]$  satisfying (1.6) is called an *optimal control* of **Problem (QSLQ)** for the initial pair  $(t_0, \eta)$ , and the corresponding  $\bar{x}(\cdot) \equiv x(\cdot; t_0, \eta, \bar{u}(\cdot))$  is called an *optimal state process*; the pair  $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$  is called an *optimal pair*. The function  $V(\cdot, \cdot)$  is called the *value function* of **Problem (QSLQ)**.

Similar to [20, 21, 33], we provide the definitions of optimal feedback operators and the closed-loop solvability about **Problem (QSLQ)**.

**Definition 1.1.** A stochastic process  $\Theta(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}); U))$  is called an optimal feedback operator for **Problem (QSLQ)** on  $[t_0, T]$  if

$$\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot)) \leq \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u(\cdot)), \quad \eta \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0}), \quad u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T], \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\bar{x}(\cdot) = x(\cdot; t_0, \eta, \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot))$  is the solution to (1.2) with  $\bar{u}(\cdot) = \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot)$ .

**Definition 1.2. Problem (QSLQ)** is said to be (uniquely) closed-loop solvable on  $[t_0, T]$  if an optimal feedback operator (uniquely) exists on  $[t_0, T]$ .

Closed-loop feedback control is an effective method for addressing linear quadratic control problems. In this framework, **Problem (QSLQ)** typically involves minimizing a quadratic cost functional that considers both the state process and the control process, thereby ensuring the realization of an optimal control strategy. By formulating an optimization problem, the Riccati equation can be derived from the perspectives of the calculus of variations or dynamic programming. This provides the necessary theoretical foundation for describing optimal control, extensively studied in classical optimal linear quadratic control theory, as noted in [1, 20, 22, 23, 24, 31, 32, 33, 41]. Analogous to classical closed-loop feedback control theory, the following quantum Riccati equation is the main technique for studying **Problem (QSLQ)**:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dP}{dt} = \{-PA - A^*P - C^*PC - M + L^*K^{-1}L\}, & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ P(T) = G, \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

where

$$L := B^*P + D^*PC, \quad K := R + D^*PD, \quad (1.9)$$

and  $K^{-1}$  is inverse of  $K$ .

Next, we introduce the following quantum stochastic differential equations in  $L^2(\mathcal{C})$ :

$$\begin{cases} dz_1(s) = \{A(s)z_1(s) + \mu_1(s)\} ds + \{C(s)z_1(s) + \nu_1(s)\} dW(s), & \text{in } [t, T], \\ z_1(t) = \xi_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dz_2(s) = \{A(s)z_2(s) + \mu_2(s)\} ds + \{C(s)z_2(s) + \nu_2(s)\} dW(s), & \text{in } [t, T], \\ z_2(t) = \xi_2, \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

where  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)$ ,  $\mu_1(\cdot), \mu_2(\cdot), \nu_1(\cdot), \nu_2(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ . It can be shown that (1.10) (resp.(1.11)) admits a unique solution  $z_1(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$  (resp.  $z_2(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ ).

**Definition 1.3.** We call  $P(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathbb{S}(L^2(\mathcal{C})))$  a weak solution to (1.8) if the following conditions hold:

- (i)  $K(t)(\equiv R(t) + D(t)^*P(t)D(t)) > 0$  and its left inverse  $K(t)^{-1}$  is a densely defined closed operator for a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ;
- (ii) For any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)$ ,  $\mu_1(\cdot), \mu_2(\cdot), \nu_1(\cdot), \nu_2(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle Gz_1(T), z_2(T) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle M(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds - \int_t^T \langle L(s)^*K(s)^{-1}L(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\ &= \langle P(t)z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle P(s)z_1(s), \mu_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P(s)\mu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\ & \quad + \int_t^T \langle P(s)\{C(s)z_1(s) + \nu_1(s)\}, \nu_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P(s)\nu_1(s), C(s)z_2(s) \rangle ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $z_1(\cdot)$  and  $z_2(\cdot)$  solve (1.10) and (1.11), respectively.

We present the main result, which reveals the relationship between the closed-loop solvability of **Problem (QSLQ)** and the existence of solutions to the quantum Riccati equation (1.8).

**Theorem 1.1.** *Problem (QSLQ) is uniquely closed-loop solvable if and only if the quantum Riccati equation (1.8) admits a uniqueness weak solution  $P(\cdot)$  in  $C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathbb{S}(L^2(\mathcal{C})))$ . In this case, the optimal feedback operator  $\Theta(\cdot)$  is given by*

$$\Theta(\cdot) = -K(\cdot)^{-1}L(\cdot), \quad (1.12)$$

and the value function is

$$V(t_0, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \langle P(t_0)\eta, \eta \rangle. \quad (1.13)$$

Belavkin [5] was the first to develop the mathematical theory of feedback control in quantum systems. Subsequent work by Edwards, Nurdin, James, and others further explored quantum filtering dynamics and optimal feedback control. They applied dynamic programming principles to investigate the optimal control problem for finite-dimensional quantum systems and derived the corresponding finite-dimensional Riccati equations [7, 9, 19, 27, 39].

To obtain the above result, we must overcome the following difficulties:

- The quantum Riccati equations currently being studied are typically finite-dimensional [9, 19], i.e., matrix-valued, with relatively little research on infinite-dimensional quantum Riccati equations.
- Unlike standard one-dimensional Brownian motions [20, 31, 32], the Fermion Brownian motion  $W(\cdot)$  does not commute with the diffusion term.
- In this case, although the quantum Riccati equation (1.8) is deterministic, the images of its solutions acting on any element of its domain form an adapted process. Therefore, the classical methods [20, 31] for solving the deterministic Riccati equation are not applicable.

- In the study of classical infinite-dimensional Riccati equations [20, 21, 22], since forward (backward) stochastic differential equations possess sample paths, the resulting equations obtained through orthogonal projection onto finite-dimensional subspaces preserve their original adaptedness. In contrast, quantum stochastic differential equations lack sample path structures, thus rendering this methodology inapplicable to solving quantum Riccati equations.

To achieve this, we first truncate the initial (terminal) values of the quantum stochastic differential equations, which allows us to obtain approximate solutions for these equations. Next, we derive the Pontryagin maximum principle for **Problem (QSLQ)** concerning infinite-dimensional quantum stochastic systems (1.2). This derivation is based on the canonical anticommutation relations (CAR) of Fermion fields and classical variational methods. Our result builds upon previous contributions in the quantum stochastic theory of Fermion fields by scholars such as Gardiner [11, 12], Gough [13], and Hudson and Parthasarathy [6, 17, 18, 28]. Notably, the diffusion terms in the operator-valued quantum stochastic differential equations must incorporate the action of the parity operator  $\Upsilon$  [3, 4, 29], which is both self-adjoint and unitary. Finally, we prove that the unique existence of optimal feedback controls for the linear quadratic optimal control problem is equivalent to the well-posedness of solutions to the quantum Riccati equation (1.8). This result provides new approaches and insights for the control and optimization of *infinite-dimensional quantum stochastic systems*.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 presents the relevant results concerning the solutions of forward and backward quantum stochastic differential equations. In section 3, we obtain the Pontryagin-type maximum principle for **Problem (QSLQ)**. Section 4 is devoted to proving Theorem 1.1. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 prove the sufficiency and necessity of Theorem 1.1, respectively. In the appendix, we give the proof for preliminary result in section 2.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we provide some preliminaries which would be useful in the sequel. For any  $t_0 \in [0, T]$ , consider the quantum stochastic differential equation (QSDE for short):

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = \{A(t)x(t) + f(t)\}dt + \{C(t)x(t) + g(t)\}dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ x(t_0) = \eta, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$ ,  $A \in L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C})))$ ,  $C \in L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C})))$ ,  $f \in L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$  and  $g \in L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** [4, Theorem 2.1] *The equation (2.1) has a unique solution  $x(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , and*

$$\sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x(t)\|_2 \leq \mathcal{C} \left( \|\eta\|_2 + \|f\|_{L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))} + \|g\|_{L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

Consider the following backward quantum stochastic differential equation (BQSDE for short):

$$\begin{cases} dy(t) = \{A(t)^*y(t) + C(t)^*Y(t) + h(t)\}dt + Y(t)dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ y(T) = \xi, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_T)$  and  $h \in L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** [37, Theorem 4.1] For any  $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_T)$ , the equation (2.3) admits a unique solution  $(y(\cdot), Y(\cdot)) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , and it holds that

$$\|(y(\cdot), Y(\cdot))\|_{C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))}^2 \leq \mathcal{C} \left( \|\xi\|_2^2 + \|h\|_{L_{\mathbb{A}}^1([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))}^2 \right). \quad (2.4)$$

By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we can obtain the following result.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let  $\Theta(\cdot)$  be an optimal feedback operator of **Problem (QSLQ)**. The triple  $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), Y(\cdot))$  is the unique solution to the following forward-backward QSDE:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = \{A(t) + B(t)\Theta(t)\}x(t)dt + \{C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)\}x(t)dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ dy(t) = -\{A(t)^*y(t) + C(t)^*Y(t) - M(t)x(t)\} dt + Y(t)dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ x(t_0) = \varsigma, \quad y(T) = -Gx(T). \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover,

$$\|(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), Y(\cdot))\|_{C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))} \leq \mathcal{C} \|\varsigma\|_2. \quad (2.6)$$

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $\Theta(\cdot)$  be an optimal feedback operator of **Problem (QSLQ)**. Then, for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , the following set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S} := & \left\{ x(t; \varsigma); x(t; \varsigma) = \varsigma + \int_{t_0}^t \{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\}x(s; \varsigma)ds \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{t_0}^t \{C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\}x(s; \varsigma)dW(s), \varsigma \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

is dense in  $L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)$ .

*Proof.* Let us prove this conclusion by contradiction. If this is not the case, then, for given  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , we can find a nonzero  $\rho \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)$  such that

$$\langle \rho, x(t; \varsigma) \rangle = 0, \quad x(t; \varsigma) \in \mathfrak{S}. \quad (2.7)$$

For the above  $\rho$ , we consider the following BQSDE:

$$\begin{cases} d\alpha(s) = -\{(A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s))^*\alpha(s) + (C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s))^*\beta(s)\} ds \\ \quad + \beta(s)dW(s), & \text{in } [t_0, t], \\ \alpha(t) = \rho. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

It is clear that (2.8) admits a unique solution  $(\alpha(\cdot), \beta(\cdot)) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, t]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, t]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ . Applying Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2], we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \alpha(t), x(t; \varsigma) \rangle - \langle \alpha(t_0), \varsigma \rangle \\ &= - \int_{t_0}^t \langle (A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s))^*\alpha(s) + (C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s))^*\beta(s), x(s; \varsigma) \rangle ds \\ & \quad + \int_{t_0}^t \langle \alpha(s), \{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\}x(s; \varsigma) \rangle ds + \int_{t_0}^t \langle \beta(s), \{C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\}x(s; \varsigma) \rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (2.7), shows that

$$\langle \alpha(t_0), \varsigma \rangle = 0.$$

According to the arbitrariness of  $\varsigma$ ,  $\alpha(t_0) = 0$ .

Similarly, for any  $s \in [t_0, t]$ , we can obtain that  $\alpha(s) = 0$ . Moreover, due to the continuity of  $\alpha(\cdot)$ , this contradicts  $\alpha(t) = \rho \neq 0$ .  $\square$

For the sake of subsequent research, consider the following QSDE:

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{x}(t) = \{-A(t) - B(t)\Theta(t) + (C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t))^2\}^* \tilde{x}(t)dt \\ \quad - \{C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)\}^* \tilde{x}(t)dW(t), \text{ in } [t_0, T], \\ \tilde{x}(t_0) = \gamma, \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\gamma \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$ . Clearly, the equation (2.9) admits a unique solution  $\tilde{x}(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ . Next, we consider the approximated solutions of (2.5) and (2.9), respectively. Let  $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  be an orthonormal basis of  $L^2(\mathcal{C})$ , and let  $\Gamma_n$  denote the orthonormal projection from  $L^2(\mathcal{C})$  onto its subspace  $\text{span}\{e_j; 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ .

For any  $\varsigma, \gamma \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$ , consider the following approximated QSDEs:

$$\begin{cases} dx_n(t) = \{A(t) + B(t)\Theta(t)\}x_n(t)dt + \{C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)\}x_n(t)dW(t), \text{ in } [t_0, T], \\ dy_n(t) = -\{A(t)^*y_n(t) + C(t)^*Y_n(t) - M(t)x_n(t)\}dt + Y_n(t)dW(t), \text{ in } [t_0, T], \\ x_n(t_0) = \Gamma_n\varsigma, \quad y_n(T) = -Gx_n(T), \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{x}_n(t) = \{-A(t) - B(t)\Theta(t) + (C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t))^2\}^* \tilde{x}_n(t)dt \\ \quad - \{C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)\}^* \tilde{x}_n(t)dW(t), \text{ in } [t_0, T], \\ \tilde{x}_n(t_0) = \Gamma_n\gamma. \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

By Lemma 2.3, the equation (2.10) has a unique solution  $(x_n(\cdot), y_n(\cdot), Y_n(\cdot)) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , and it holds that

$$\|(x_n(\cdot), y_n(\cdot), Y_n(\cdot))\|_{C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))} \leq \mathcal{C}\|\varsigma\|_2. \quad (2.12)$$

By Lemma 2.1, the equation (2.11) admits a unique solution  $\tilde{x}_n(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , and

$$\|\tilde{x}_n(\cdot)\|_{C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))} \leq \mathcal{C}\|\gamma\|_2. \quad (2.13)$$

Then, we have the following result, and the proof is provided in the Appendix.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Under the given conditions above, for any  $\varsigma, \gamma \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ , let  $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), Y(\cdot))$  (resp.  $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$ ) satisfy (2.5) (resp. (2.9)), it holds that*

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n(\cdot) = x(\cdot), & \text{in } C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})), \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n(\cdot) = y(\cdot), & \text{in } C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})), \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_n(\cdot) = Y(\cdot), & \text{in } L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})), \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_n(\cdot) = \tilde{x}(\cdot), & \text{in } C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})). \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

### 3 Pontryagin maximum principle for Problem (QSLQ)

This section focuses on deriving the Pontryagin maximum principle for **Problem (QSLQ)**.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let **Problem (QSLQ)** be solvable at  $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$  with  $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$  being an optimal pair of quantum stochastic control system (1.2). Then, for the solution  $(y(\cdot), Y(\cdot))$  to*

$$\begin{cases} dy(t) = -\{A(t)^*y(t) + C(t)^*Y(t) - M(t)\bar{x}(t)\}dt + Y(t)dW(t), \text{ in } [t_0, T], \\ y(T) = -G\bar{x}(T), \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

and the relaxed transposition solution  $(\phi(\cdot), \Phi(\cdot), \widehat{\Phi}(\cdot))$ , introduced by [38, Definition 1.1], to the following adjoint equation

$$\begin{cases} d\phi(t) = -\{A^*\phi + \phi A + C^*\phi C + \Phi\Upsilon C + C^*\Phi\Upsilon - M\} dt + \Phi(t)dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ \phi(T) = -G, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

it holds that

$$R(t)\bar{u}(t) - B(t)^*y(t) - D(t)^*Y(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } [t_0, T], \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\text{Re}\langle\{R(t) - D(t)^*\phi(t)D(t)\}u, u\rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{a.e. } [t_0, T], \quad u \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]. \quad (3.4)$$

*Proof.* We divide the proof into two steps.

**Step 1.** In this step, we shall prove (3.3) by the convex perturbation technique. For the optimal pair  $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$  and a control variable  $u(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ , we have that, for  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$u^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \bar{u}(\cdot) + \varepsilon(u(\cdot) - \bar{u}(\cdot)) = (1 - \varepsilon)\bar{u}(\cdot) + \varepsilon u(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T]; U).$$

Let  $x^\varepsilon(\cdot)$  be the solution of (1.2) corresponding to the control  $u^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ , that is,

$$\begin{cases} dx^\varepsilon(t) = \{A(t)x^\varepsilon(t) + B(t)u^\varepsilon(t)\}dt + \{C(t)x^\varepsilon(t) + D(t)u^\varepsilon(t)\}dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ x^\varepsilon(t_0) = \eta. \end{cases}$$

For any  $t \in [0, T]$ , let

$$x_1^\varepsilon(t) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(x^\varepsilon(t) - \bar{x}(t)), \quad \delta u(t) := u(t) - \bar{u}(t). \quad (3.5)$$

It can be easily seen that  $x_1^\varepsilon(\cdot)$  is the solution to the following QSDE:

$$\begin{cases} dx_1^\varepsilon(t) = \{A(t)x_1^\varepsilon(t) + B(t)\delta u(t)\} dt + \{C(t)x_1^\varepsilon(t) + D(t)\delta u(t)\} dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ x_1^\varepsilon(t_0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Since  $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$  is an optimal pair of **Problem (QSLQ)**, and  $M(\cdot), R(\cdot), G$  are positive, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \bar{u}(\cdot))}{\varepsilon} \\ &= \text{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \{\langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), x_1^\varepsilon(t) \rangle + \langle R(t)\bar{u}(t), \delta u(t) \rangle_U\} dt + \text{Re}\langle G\bar{x}(T), x_1^\varepsilon(T) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Applying Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2] to  $\langle y(t), x_1^\varepsilon(t) \rangle$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} & - \langle G\bar{x}(T), x_1^\varepsilon(T) \rangle \\ &= \int_{t_0}^T \langle y(t), A(t)x_1^\varepsilon(t) + B(t)\delta u(t) \rangle dt + \int_{t_0}^T \langle Y(t), C(t)x_1^\varepsilon(t) + D(t)\delta u(t) \rangle dt \\ & \quad - \int_{t_0}^T \{\langle A(t)^*y(t), x_1^\varepsilon(t) \rangle + \langle Y(t), C(t)x_1^\varepsilon(t) \rangle - \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), x_1^\varepsilon(t) \rangle\} dt \\ &= \int_{t_0}^T \{\langle y(t), B(t)\delta u(t) \rangle + \langle Y(t), D(t)\delta u(t) \rangle + \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), x_1^\varepsilon(t) \rangle\} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

By substituting (3.8) into (3.7), we obtain that, for any  $u \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ ,

$$\text{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \langle R(t)\bar{u}(t) - B(t)^*y(t) - D(t)^*Y(t), \delta u(t) \rangle_U dt \geq 0.$$



Then,

$$R(t)\bar{u}(t) - B(t)^*y(t) - D(t)^*Y(t) = 0, \text{ a.e. } t \in [t_0, T].$$

**Step 2.** In this step, we shall prove (3.4) by the spike variation method. For each  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\tau \in [t_0, T - \varepsilon)$ , let  $E_\varepsilon := [\tau, \tau + \varepsilon]$ . For any  $u \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ , put

$$u^\varepsilon(t) := \begin{cases} \bar{u}(t), & t \in [t_0, T] \setminus E_\varepsilon, \\ u(t), & t \in E_\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Let  $x^\varepsilon(\cdot)$  be the solution to (1.2) with the corresponding to the control  $u^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ . Consider the following two QSDEs:

$$\begin{cases} dx_2^\varepsilon(t) = A(t)x_2^\varepsilon(t)dt + \{C(t)x_2^\varepsilon(t) + \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t)D(t)\delta u(t)\}dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ x_2^\varepsilon(t_0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dx_3^\varepsilon(t) = \{A(t)x_3^\varepsilon(t) + \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t)B(t)\delta u(t)\}dt + C(t)x_3^\varepsilon(t)dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ x_3^\varepsilon(t_0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

It is clear that  $x^\varepsilon - \bar{x} = x_2^\varepsilon + x_3^\varepsilon$ . By [37, Theorem 3.2], it holds that

$$\sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_2^\varepsilon(t)\|_2 \leq \mathcal{C}\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_3^\varepsilon(t)\|_2 \leq \mathcal{C}\varepsilon. \quad (3.11)$$

Hence, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \bar{u}(\cdot)) \\ &= \text{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \left\{ \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), x_2^\varepsilon(t) + x_3^\varepsilon(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle M(t)x_2^\varepsilon(t), x_2^\varepsilon(t) \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \left( \langle R(t)\bar{u}(t), \delta u(t) \rangle_U + \frac{1}{2} \langle R(t)\delta u(t), \delta u(t) \rangle_U \right) \right\} dt \\ & \quad + \text{Re} \langle G\bar{x}(T), x_2^\varepsilon(T) + x_3^\varepsilon(T) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \langle Gx_2^\varepsilon(T), x_2^\varepsilon(T) \rangle + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Applying Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2] to  $\langle y(t), x_2^\varepsilon(t) \rangle$  and  $\langle y(t), x_3^\varepsilon(t) \rangle$  again, we have that

$$-\langle G\bar{x}(T), x_2^\varepsilon(T) \rangle = \int_{t_0}^T \{ \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \langle Y(t), D(t)\delta u(t) \rangle + \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), x_2^\varepsilon(t) \rangle \} dt, \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$-\langle G\bar{x}(T), x_3^\varepsilon(T) \rangle = \int_{t_0}^T \{ \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \langle y(t), B(t)\delta u(t) \rangle + \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), x_3^\varepsilon(t) \rangle \} dt. \quad (3.14)$$

From (3.13) and (3.14), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\langle G\bar{x}(T), x_2^\varepsilon(T) + x_3^\varepsilon(T) \rangle \\ &= \int_{t_0}^T \{ \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) (\langle y(t), B(t)\delta u(t) \rangle + \langle Y(t), D(t)\delta u(t) \rangle) + \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), x_2^\varepsilon(t) + x_3^\varepsilon(t) \rangle \} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

By the definition of the relaxed transposition solution [38, Theorem 1.1] to (3.2), together with (3.11), one has that:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\langle Gx_2^\varepsilon(T), x_2^\varepsilon(T) \rangle + \int_{t_0}^T \langle M(t)x_2^\varepsilon(t), x_2^\varepsilon(t) \rangle dt \\ &= \int_{t_0}^T \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \left\{ \langle \phi(t)D(t)\delta u(t), C(t)x_2^\varepsilon(t) + D(t)\delta u(t) \rangle + \langle \phi(t)C(t)x_2^\varepsilon(t), D(t)\delta u(t) \rangle \right\} dt + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

By substituting (3.15)-(3.16) into (3.12), together with (3.3), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \bar{u}(\cdot)) \\
&= \operatorname{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \left\{ \langle R(t)\bar{u}(t) - B(t)^*y(t) - D(t)^*Y(t), \delta u(t) \rangle_U \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \langle (R(t) - D(t)^*\phi(t)D(t)) \delta u(t), \delta u(t) \rangle_U \right\} dt + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \langle (R(t) - D(t)^*\phi(t)D(t)) \delta u(t), \delta u(t) \rangle_U dt + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\bar{u}(\cdot)$  is an optimal control,  $\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \bar{u}(\cdot)) \geq 0$ . Thus,

$$\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \chi_{E_\varepsilon}(t) \langle (R - D^*\phi D) \delta u, \delta u \rangle_U dt \geq \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon).$$

By Lebesgue differentiation theorem [30, Theorem 7.10], for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$  and  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]$ , we obtain that

$$\operatorname{Re} \langle (R(t) - D(t)^*\phi(t)D(t)) u, u \rangle_U = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_t^{t+\varepsilon} \operatorname{Re} \langle (R - D^*\phi D) u, u \rangle_U d\tau \geq 0,$$

which gives (3.4).  $\square$

*Remark 3.1.* In [37, Theorem 3.3], we utilized the spike variation to derive the Pontryagin maximum principle for quantum stochastic control systems, while the convex variation provides an effective method for determining the optimal feedback operator. Therefore, Theorem 3.1 employs the spike variation and the convex variation.

## 4 The main result

This section is devoted to investigating the relation between the existence of optimal feedback controls for **Problem (QSLQ)** and the solvability of the quantum Riccati equation.

Let  $\Theta(\cdot) \in L^2([0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}); U))$  be an optimal feedback operator of **Problem (QSLQ)**. From (3.3), we deduce that

$$R(t)\Theta(t)\bar{x}(t) - B^*(t)y(t) - D^*(t)Y(t) = 0, \text{ a.e. } t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.1)$$

By Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2], we can obtain the following result.

**Proposition 4.1.** *If  $P(\cdot)$  is a weak solution to (1.8), and  $z_1(\cdot)$  and  $z_2(\cdot)$  are the solutions to (1.10) and (1.11), respectively, then,  $\langle P(\cdot)z_1(\cdot), z_2(\cdot) \rangle$  is differentiable in  $[t_0, T]$ , and for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned}
d\langle P(t)z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle &= \langle dP(t)z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \langle P(t)dz_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \langle P(t)z_1(t), dz_2(t) \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle dP(t)dz_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \langle dP(t)z_1(t), dz_2(t) \rangle + \langle P(t)dz_1(t), dz_2(t) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

For the need of subsequent proof, let us recall the following result [36].

**Lemma 4.2.** [36, Theorem 4.2] *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space. Let  $F : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow 2^H$  be a closed-valued set mapping such that  $F(\omega) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and for each open set  $O \in H$ ,*

$$\{\omega \in \Omega; F(\omega) \cap O \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

*Then there is an  $H$ -valued,  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable  $f$  such that  $f(\omega) \in F(\omega)$  for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ .*

Next, we prove the ‘‘if’’ part and the ‘‘only if’’ part of Theorem 1.1, respectively.

## 4.1 Proof of the Necessity of Theorem 1.1

This subsection is devoted to the proof of “only if” part of Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of the Necessity of Theorem 1.1.* Let us assume that the equation (1.8) admits a weak solution  $P(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C})))$ . Then,

$$-K^{-1}L = -K^{-1}(B^*P + D^*PC) \in L^2([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}); U)).$$

For any  $t_0 \in [0, T]$ ,  $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \eta \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$ , choose  $z_1(\cdot) = z_2(\cdot) = \bar{x}(\cdot)$ ,  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = Bu$  and  $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = Du$  in (1.10)-(1.11). From (1.9) and Definition 1.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle G\bar{x}(T), \bar{x}(T) \rangle + \int_{t_0}^T \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t) \rangle dt \\ &= \langle P(t_0)\eta, \eta \rangle + \int_{t_0}^T \langle P(t)B(t)u(t), \bar{x}(t) \rangle dt + \int_{t_0}^T \langle P(t)\bar{x}(t), B(t)u(t) \rangle dt \\ & \quad + \int_{t_0}^T \langle P(t)D(t)u(t), D(t)u(t) \rangle dt + \int_{t_0}^T \langle K^{-1}(t)L(t)\bar{x}(t), L(t)\bar{x}(t) \rangle dt \\ & \quad + \int_{t_0}^T \langle P(t)C(t)\bar{x}(t), D(t)u(t) \rangle dt + \int_{t_0}^T \langle P(t)D(t)u(t), C(t)\bar{x}(t) \rangle dt. \end{aligned}$$

Under the case  $\Theta(\cdot) := -K^{-1}(\cdot)L(\cdot)$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot)) \\ &= \text{Re} \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T \{ \langle M(t)\bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t) \rangle + \langle R(t)\Theta(t)\bar{x}(t), \Theta(t)\bar{x}(t) \rangle \} dt + \langle G\bar{x}(T), \bar{x}(T) \rangle \right\} \\ &= \text{Re} \left\{ \langle P(t_0)\eta, \eta \rangle + \int_{t_0}^T \{ \langle K^{-1}(t)L(t)\bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t) \rangle + \langle P(t)D(t)\Theta(t)\bar{x}(t), D(t)\Theta(t)\bar{x}(t) \rangle \} dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{t_0}^T \{ \langle L(t)\bar{x}(t), \Theta(t)\bar{x}(t) \rangle + \langle \Theta(t)\bar{x}(t), L(t)\bar{x}(t) \rangle + \langle R(t)\Theta(t)\bar{x}(t), \Theta(t)\bar{x}(t) \rangle \} dt \right\} \\ &= \text{Re} \langle P(t_0)\eta, \eta \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T]$ , let  $x(\cdot) \equiv x(\cdot; t_0, \eta, u(\cdot))$  be the corresponding state process to (1.2), we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u(\cdot)) \\ &= \text{Re} \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T \langle M(t)x(t), x(t) \rangle dt + \int_{t_0}^T \langle R(t)u(t), u(t) \rangle dt + \langle Gx(T), x(T) \rangle \right\} \\ &= \text{Re} \langle P(t_0)\eta, \eta \rangle + \text{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \langle L(t)^* K(t)^{-1} L(t)x(t), x(t) \rangle dt \\ & \quad + 2\text{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \langle L(t)x(t), u(t) \rangle dt + \text{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \langle K(t)u(t), u(t) \rangle dt \\ &= 2\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot)) + \text{Re} \int_{t_0}^T \langle K(t)(u(t) + K^{-1}(t)L(t)x(t)), (u(t) + K^{-1}(t)L(t)x(t)) \rangle dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot)) \leq \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u(\cdot)), \quad u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t_0, T],$$

which implies that  $\bar{u}(\cdot) = \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot)$  is an optimal control,  $\Theta(\cdot) = -K^{-1}(\cdot)L(\cdot)$  is an optimal feedback operator, and (1.13) holds. Further, by Definition 1.3,  $K(t) > 0$ , a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , then we know that the optimal control is unique. The proof is complete.  $\square$

## 4.2 Proof of the Sufficiency of Theorem 1.1

This subsection focuses on proving the “if” part of Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of the Sufficiency of Theorem 1.1.* Because the proof process is too long, it can be divided into a few steps.

**Step 1.** In this step, we introduce the following four operators and study their strong approximation by the truncated systems. Let  $\Theta(\cdot)$  be an optimal feedback operator of **Problem (QSLQ)** on  $[t_0, T]$ , for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , we define four operators  $X(t)$ ,  $\bar{Y}(t)$ ,  $\tilde{X}(t)$  and  $\tilde{Y}(t)$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{E})$  as follows:

$$X(t)_\varsigma := x(t; \varsigma), \quad \bar{Y}(t)_\varsigma := y(t; \varsigma), \quad \tilde{X}(t)_\varsigma := \tilde{x}(t; \varsigma), \quad \tilde{Y}(t)_\varsigma := Y(t; \varsigma), \quad \varsigma \in L^2(\mathcal{E}), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), Y(\cdot))$  is the solution to (2.5) and  $\tilde{x}(\cdot)$  is the solution to (2.9). Next, we present some properties of the above four operators.

Consider the following QSDEs:

$$\begin{cases} dX_n(t) = \{A(t) + B(t)\Theta(t)\} X_n(t)dt + \{C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)\} X_n(t)\Upsilon dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ d\bar{Y}_n(t) = -\left\{A(t)^*\bar{Y}_n(t) + C(t)^*\tilde{Y}_n(t) - M(t)X_n(t)\right\} dt + \tilde{Y}_n(t)\Upsilon dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ X_n(t_0) = \Gamma_n, \quad \bar{Y}_n(T) = -GX_n(T), \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{X}_n(t) = \{-A(t) - B(t)\Theta(t) + (C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t))^2\}^* \tilde{X}_n(t)dt \\ \quad - \{C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)\}^* \tilde{X}_n(t)\Upsilon dW(t), & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ \tilde{X}_n(t_0) = \Gamma_n, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $X_n(T) \in \mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{E}_T))$  and  $\Gamma_n$  is defined in Section 2. Both (4.4) and (4.5) can be regard as  $\mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{E}))$ -valued equations. By [38, Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 3.2], it is clear that the equation (4.4) has a unique solution  $(X_n(\cdot), \bar{Y}_n(\cdot), \tilde{Y}_n(\cdot)) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{E}))) \times C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{E}))) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{E})))$ , and the equation (4.5) admits a unique solution  $\tilde{X}_n(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{E})))$ . Here  $\mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{E}))$  denotes the Hilbert space of all Hilbert-Schmidt operators on  $L^2(\mathcal{E})$  with the inner product  $\langle X_1, X_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \text{tr}(X_1^* X_2)$ .

Let  $\varsigma, \gamma \in L^2(\mathcal{E})$ . It is evident that  $x_n(t) = X_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma$ ,  $y_n(t) = \bar{Y}_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma$ ,  $Y_n(t) = \tilde{Y}_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma$ , and  $\tilde{x}_n(t) = \tilde{X}_n(t)\Gamma_n\gamma$ . Thus,  $(X_n(\cdot)\Gamma_n\varsigma, \bar{Y}_n(\cdot)\Gamma_n\varsigma, \tilde{Y}_n(\cdot)\Gamma_n\varsigma)$  is the solution of (2.10), and  $\tilde{X}_n(\cdot)\Gamma_n\gamma$  is the solution of (2.11). By (2.12) and (2.13), we conclude that, for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma\|_2 &\leq \mathcal{C}\|\varsigma\|_2, & \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma\|_2 &\leq \mathcal{C}\|\varsigma\|_2, \\ \|\tilde{X}_n(t)\Gamma_n\gamma\|_2 &\leq \mathcal{C}\|\gamma\|_2, & \|\tilde{Y}_n(\cdot)\Gamma_n\varsigma\|_{L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{E}))} &\leq \mathcal{C}\|\varsigma\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant  $\mathcal{C}$  is independent of  $n$ . This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_n(t)\Gamma_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}); L^2(\mathcal{E}_t))} &\leq \mathcal{C}, & \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\Gamma_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}); L^2(\mathcal{E}_t))} &\leq \mathcal{C}, \\ \|X_n(t)\Gamma_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}); L^2(\mathcal{E}_t))} &\leq \mathcal{C}, & \|\tilde{Y}_n(t)\Gamma_n\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}); L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{E})))} &\leq \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

By Lemma 2.5, we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} (s) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma = X(t)_\varsigma, & \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{E}_t), \\ (s) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{Y}_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma = \bar{Y}(t)_\varsigma, & \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{E}_t), \\ (s) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}_n(t)\Gamma_n\gamma = \tilde{X}(t)_\gamma, & \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{E}_t), \\ (s) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{Y}_n(t)\Gamma_n\varsigma = \tilde{Y}(t)_\varsigma, & \text{in } L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{E})). \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

Applying Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2] to  $\langle x(t), \tilde{x}(t) \rangle$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle x(t), \tilde{x}(t) \rangle - \langle \varsigma, \gamma \rangle \\
&= \int_{t_0}^t \langle (A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s))x(s), \tilde{x}(s) \rangle ds \\
&\quad - \int_{t_0}^t \langle (C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s))x(s), (C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s))^* \tilde{x}(s) \rangle dt \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0}^t \langle x(s), \{-A(s) - B(s)\Theta(s) + (C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s))^2\}^* \tilde{x}(s) \rangle dt = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

It follows that

$$\langle X(t)\varsigma, \tilde{X}(t)\gamma \rangle = \langle x(t), \tilde{x}(t) \rangle = \langle \varsigma, \gamma \rangle,$$

which implies that  $\tilde{X}(t)^*X(t) = I$ . Thus, for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$  and  $\gamma \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_0})$ ,  $\tilde{X}(t)^*X(t)\gamma = \gamma$ . Further, by (4.3), there exists a constant  $\mathcal{C} > 0$  such that

$$\|\tilde{X}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))} < \mathcal{C}, \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

Hence,

$$\|\gamma\|_2 = \|\tilde{X}(t)^*X(t)\gamma\|_2 \leq \|\tilde{X}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))} \|X(t)\gamma\|_2 \leq \mathcal{C} \|X(t)\gamma\|_2, \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

which shows that  $X(t)$  is bounded below. By Lemma 2.4, for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , the range  $X(t)$  is dense in  $L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)$ . Therefore, we conclude that for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , the operator  $X(t)$  is invertible, and

$$\tilde{X}(t)^* = X(t)^{-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

**Step 2.** In this step, we present an explicit formula of  $P(\cdot)$  and give the estimate of the norm of  $P(\cdot)$ . By means of (4.1) and (4.3), we find that

$$R(t)\Theta(t)X(t) - B(t)^*\bar{Y}(t) - D(t)^*\tilde{Y}(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [t_0, T]. \tag{4.10}$$

Put

$$P(\cdot) := -\bar{Y}(\cdot)\tilde{X}(\cdot)^*, \quad \Pi(\cdot) := -\tilde{Y}(\cdot)\tilde{X}(\cdot)^*. \tag{4.11}$$

It follows from (4.9) and (4.10) that

$$R(t)\Theta(t) + B(t)^*P(t) + D(t)^*\Pi(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [t_0, T]. \tag{4.12}$$

Let  $s \in [t_0, T]$ ,  $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_s)$ , we consider the following forward-backward QSDE:

$$\begin{cases} dx^s(t) = \{A(t) + B(t)\Theta(t)\}x^s(t)dt + \{C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)\}x^s(t)dW(t), & \text{in } [s, T], \\ dy^s(t) = -\{A(t)^*y^s(t) + C(t)^*Y^s(t) - M(t)x^s(t)\}dt + Y^s(t)dW(t), & \text{in } [s, T], \\ x^s(s) = \eta, \quad y^s(T) = -Gx^s(T). \end{cases} \tag{4.13}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.3 and (4.1) that the equation (4.13) admits a unique solution  $(x^s(\cdot), y^s(\cdot), Y^s(\cdot)) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([s, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times C_{\mathbb{A}}([s, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})) \times L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([s, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$  such that

$$R(t)\Theta(t)x^s(t) - B^*(t)y^s(t) - D(t)^*Y^s(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [s, T]. \tag{4.14}$$

Next, for each  $t \in [s, T]$ , define two families of operators  $X_t^s$  and  $\bar{Y}_t^s$  on  $L^2(\mathcal{C}_s)$  as follows:

$$X_t^s \eta := x^s(t; \eta), \quad \bar{Y}_t^s \eta := y^s(t; \eta). \tag{4.15}$$

Then, from Lemma 2.1 and 2.2, one has that

$$\|X_t^s \eta\|_2 = \|x^s(t; \eta)\|_2 \leq \mathcal{C} \|\eta\|_2, \quad \|\bar{Y}_t^s \eta\|_2 = \|y^s(t; \eta)\|_2 \leq \mathcal{C} \|\eta\|_2. \quad (4.16)$$

This implies that  $X_t^s, \bar{Y}_t^s \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}_s); L^2(\mathcal{C}_t))$  for any  $t \in [s, T]$ .

From (4.15), it is clear that, for any  $\zeta \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ ,

$$X_t^s X(s) \zeta = x^s(t; X(s) \zeta) = x(t, \zeta), \quad \bar{Y}_t^s X(s) \zeta = y^s(t; X(s) \zeta) = \bar{Y}(t) \zeta.$$

Hence,

$$\bar{Y}_s^s = \bar{Y}(s) X(s)^{-1} = \bar{Y}(s) \tilde{X}(s)^*, \quad \text{for all } s \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.17)$$

Let  $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_s)$ . Then  $X_t^s \eta_1 = x^s(t; \eta_1)$  and  $\bar{Y}_t^s \eta_2 = y^s(t; \eta_2)$ . Applying Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2] to  $\langle y^s(\cdot; \eta_2), x^s(\cdot; \eta_1) \rangle$  and noting (4.13)-(4.14), one has

$$-\langle GX_T^s \eta_2, X_T^s \eta_1 \rangle = \left\langle \bar{Y}_s^s \eta_2, \eta_1 \right\rangle + \int_s^T \langle M(t) X_t^s \eta_2, X_t^s \eta_1 \rangle + \langle R(t) \Theta(t) X_t^s \eta_2, \Theta(t) X_t^s \eta_1 \rangle dt.$$

Therefore,

$$\left\langle \bar{Y}_s^s \eta_2, \eta_1 \right\rangle = -\langle GX_T^s \eta_2, X_T^s \eta_1 \rangle - \int_s^T \langle M(t) X_t^s \eta_2, X_t^s \eta_1 \rangle + \langle R(t) \Theta(t) X_t^s \eta_2, \Theta(t) X_t^s \eta_1 \rangle dt. \quad (4.18)$$

Analogous to the reasoning presented in (4.18), we apply Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2] to  $\langle x^s(\cdot; \eta_2), y^s(\cdot; \eta_1) \rangle$  and utilize the self-adjointness of  $G$ ,  $M(\cdot)$ , and  $R(\cdot)$ . This leads us to conclude that

$$\left\langle \eta_2, \bar{Y}_s^s \eta_1 \right\rangle = -\langle GX_T^s \eta_2, X_T^s \eta_1 \rangle - \int_s^T \langle M(t) X_t^s \eta_2, X_t^s \eta_1 \rangle + \langle R(t) \Theta(t) X_t^s \eta_2, \Theta(t) X_t^s \eta_1 \rangle dt. \quad (4.19)$$

From (4.18) and (4.19), we deduce that  $\bar{Y}_s^s = \bar{Y}(s) \tilde{X}(s)^*$  is self-adjoint for any  $s \in [t_0, T]$ . Furthermore, (4.16) implies that for any  $s \in [t_0, T]$  and  $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_s)$ ,

$$\|\bar{Y}_s^s \eta\|_2 \leq \mathcal{C} \|\eta\|_2, \quad (4.20)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is independent of  $s \in [t_0, T]$ . Therefore, we have that

$$\left\| \bar{Y}(s) \tilde{X}(s)^* \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}_s))} \leq \mathcal{C}. \quad (4.21)$$

From (4.11), (4.17) and (4.21), we conclude that  $P(\cdot)$  is self-adjoint, and there exist a positive constant  $\mathcal{C}$  such that

$$\|P(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}_s))} \leq \mathcal{C}, \quad s \in [t_0, T]. \quad (4.22)$$

**Step 3.** In this step, we show that  $P(\cdot)$  is a solution to an operator-valued differential equation. For any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , define

$$P_n(t) := -\bar{Y}_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^*, \quad \Pi_n(t) := -\tilde{Y}_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^*. \quad (4.23)$$

By (4.7), we can obtain that for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$  and  $\eta, \xi \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle X_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \Gamma_n \eta, \xi \right\rangle &= \left\langle X(t) \tilde{X}(t)^* \eta, \xi \right\rangle, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \bar{Y}_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \Gamma_n \eta, \xi \right\rangle &= \left\langle \bar{Y}(t) \tilde{X}(t)^* \eta, \xi \right\rangle, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \tilde{Y}_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \Gamma_n \eta, \xi \right\rangle &= \left\langle \tilde{Y}(t) \tilde{X}(t)^* \eta, \xi \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

By Fermion Itô's formula [2, Theorem 5.2], the properties of  $\Upsilon$  and (4.23), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
dP_n(t) &= - (d\bar{Y}_n(t)) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* - \bar{Y}_n(t) \left( d\tilde{X}_n(t)^* \right) - d(\bar{Y}_n(t)) d(\tilde{X}_n(t)^*) \\
&= \left\{ A(t)^* \bar{Y}_n(t) + C(t)^* \tilde{Y}_n(t) - M(t) X_n(t) \right\} \tilde{X}_n(t)^* dt - \tilde{Y}_n(t) \Upsilon dW(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \\
&\quad - \bar{Y}_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \{ A(t) + B(t) \Theta(t) - (C(t) + D(t) \Theta(t))^2 \} dt \\
&\quad + \bar{Y}_n(t) dW \Upsilon \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \{ C(t) + D(t) \Theta(t) \} + \tilde{Y}_n(t) \Upsilon \Upsilon \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \{ C(t) + D(t) \Theta(t) \} dt \\
&= - \left\{ A(t)^* P_n(t) + C(t)^* \Pi_n(t) + M(t) X_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* + P_n(t) B(t) \Theta(t) + P_n(t) A(t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - P_n(t) (C(t) + D(t) \Theta(t))^2 + \Pi_n(t) (C(t) + D(t) \Theta(t)) \right\} dt \\
&\quad + \{ \Pi_n(t) - P_n(t) (C(t) + D(t) \Theta(t)) \} dW(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\Xi_n(\cdot) := \Pi_n(\cdot) - P_n(\cdot) \{ C(\cdot) + D(\cdot) \Theta(\cdot) \}$ . Then

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
dP_n(t) &= - \left\{ A(t)^* P_n(t) + P_n(t) A(t) + C(t)^* \Xi_n(t) + \Xi_n(t) C(t) + C(t)^* P_n(t) C(t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \{ P_n(t) B(t) + \Xi_n(t) D(t) + C(t)^* P_n(t) D(t) \} \Theta(t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + M(t) X_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* \right\} dt + \Xi_n(t) dW(t), \quad \text{in } [t_0, T], \\
P_n(T) &= G\Gamma_n.
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{4.25}$$

The equation (4.25) is regard as  $\mathcal{L}_2(L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ -valued BQSDE. By Proposition 4.1, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&d \langle P_n(t) z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle \\
&= - \langle \{ P_n(t) B(t) + \Xi_n(t) D(t) + C(t)^* P_n(t)^* D(t) \} \Theta(t) z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle dt \\
&\quad - \langle M(t) X_n(t) \tilde{X}_n(t)^* z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle dt + \langle P_n(t) \mu_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle dt \\
&\quad + \langle P_n(t) z_1(t), \mu_2(t) \rangle dt + \langle P_n(t) \nu_1(t), C(t) z_2(t) + \nu_2(t) \rangle dt \\
&\quad + \langle P_n(t) C(t) z_1(t), \nu_2(t) \rangle dt + \langle \Xi_n(t) z_1(t), \nu_2(t) \rangle dt + \langle \Xi_n(t) \nu_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle P_n(T) z_1(T), z_2(T) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle M(s) X_n(s) \tilde{X}_n(s)^* z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
&= \langle P_n(t) z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s) \mu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s) z_1(s), \mu_2(s) \rangle ds \\
&\quad - \int_t^T \langle \{ P_n(s) B(s) + \Xi_n(s) D(s) + C(s)^* P_n(s) D(s) \} \Theta(s) z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
&\quad + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s) C(s) z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s) \nu_1(s), C(s) z_2(s) + \nu_2(s) \rangle ds \\
&\quad + \int_t^T \langle \Xi_n(s) z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle \Xi_n(s) \nu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by (4.24), we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \langle P_n(T) z_1(T), z_2(T) \rangle - \langle P_n(t) z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle \} \\
&= \langle P(T) z_1(T), z_2(T) \rangle - \langle P(t) z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

It follows from (4.7) and (4.23) that we conclude that for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left\langle \left\{ M(t)X_n(t)\tilde{X}_n(t)^* + (P_n(t)B(t) + \Xi_n(t)D(t) + C(t)^*P_n(t)D(t))\Theta(t) \right\} z_1(t), z_2(t) \right\rangle \right| \\
& \leq \left\{ \|M(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|X_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \right. \\
& \quad + \|C(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|D(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \\
& \quad + \{ \|\tilde{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} + \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} (\|C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \\
& \quad + \|D(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E});U)}) \} \|D(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E});U)} \\
& \quad \left. + \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E});U)} \right\} \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|z_2(t)\|_2 \\
& \leq \mathcal{C} \left\{ (1 + \|C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} + \|D(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E});U)}) \|D(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E});U)} \right. \\
& \quad + \|C(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|D(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E});U)} \\
& \quad \left. + \|M(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} + \|B(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(U;L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\Theta(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E});U)} \right\} \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|z_2(t)\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle P_n(t)\mu_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \langle P_n(t)z_1(t), \mu_2(t) \rangle \\
& \quad + \langle P_n(t)\nu_1(t), C(t)z_2(t) + \nu_2(t) \rangle + \langle P_n(t)C(t)z_1(t), \nu_2(t) \rangle| \\
& \leq \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\mu_1(t)\|_2 \|z_2(t)\|_2 \\
& \quad + \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|\mu_2(t)\|_2 \\
& \quad + \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\nu_1(t)\|_2 \{ \|C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|z_2(t)\|_2 + \|\nu_2(t)\|_2 \} \\
& \quad + \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|\nu_2(t)\|_2 \\
& \leq \mathcal{C} \left\{ \|\mu_1(t)\|_2 \|z_2(t)\|_2 + \|\nu_1(t)\|_2 \{ \|C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|z_2(t)\|_2 + \|\nu_2(t)\|_2 \} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|\mu_2(t)\|_2 + \|C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|\nu_2(t)\|_2 \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\langle \Xi_n(t)z_1(t), \nu_2(t) \rangle + \langle \Xi_n(t)\nu_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle| \\
& \leq \|\Xi_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|\nu_2(t)\|_2 + \|\Xi_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\nu_1(t)\|_2 \|z_2(t)\|_2 \\
& \leq \|\tilde{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|\nu_2(t)\|_2 \\
& \quad + \|\bar{Y}_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\tilde{X}_n(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} \|\nu_1(t)\|_2 \|z_2(t)\|_2 \\
& \leq \mathcal{C} \left\{ \|z_1(t)\|_2 \|\nu_2(t)\|_2 + \|\nu_1(t)\|_2 \|z_2(t)\|_2 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

These, together with (4.9), (4.24) and Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_t^T \langle M(s)X_n(s)\tilde{X}_n(s)^* z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& = \int_t^T \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle M(s)X_n(s)\tilde{X}_n(s)^* z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& = \int_t^T \langle M(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$



Similar to (4.27), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \int_t^T \langle \{ (P_n(s)B(s) + C(s)^*P_n(s)^*D(s))\Theta(s) \} z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle dt \right. \\
& \quad + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s)C(s)z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s)\nu_1(t), C(s)z_2(s) + \nu_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad \left. + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s)\mu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P_n(s)z_1(s), \mu_2(s) \rangle ds \right\} \\
& = \int_t^T \langle \{ P(s)B(s) + C(s)^*P(s)^*D(s) \} \Theta(t) z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_{t_0}^T \langle P(s)C(s)z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad + \int_t^T \{ \langle P(s)\mu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle + \langle P(s)z_1(s), \mu_2(s) \rangle + \langle P(s)\nu_1(t), C(s)z_2(s) + \nu_2(s) \rangle \} ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_t^T \{ \langle \Xi_n(s)z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle + \langle \Xi_n(s)\nu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle + \langle \Xi_n(s)D(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle \} ds \\
& = \int_t^T \langle \{ \Pi(s) - P(s)(C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)) \} z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad + \int_t^T \langle \{ \Pi(s) - P(s)(C(s) + D(s)\Theta(t)) \} \nu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad + \int_t^T \langle \{ \Pi(s) - P(s)(C(s) + D(s)\Theta(t)) \} D(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

By (1.9) and (4.12), we can show that

$$\Pi(t) - P(t)(C(t) + D(t)\Theta(t)) = 0, \text{ a.e. } t \in [t_0, T]. \tag{4.30}$$

It follows from (4.26)-(4.30) that we have that for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle P(T)z_1(T), z_2(T) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle M(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad + \int_t^T \langle P(s)B(s)\Theta(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle C(s)^*P(s)D(t)\Theta(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& = \langle P(t)z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle P(s)\mu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P(s)z_1(s), \mu_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad + \int_t^T \langle P(s)C(s)z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P(s)\nu_1(s), C(s)z_2(s) + \nu_2(s) \rangle ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

Then  $P(\cdot)$  satisfies the following

$$\begin{cases} dP = -\{A^*P + PA + C^*PC + (PB + C^*PD)\Theta + M\}dt, & \text{in } [t_0, T], \\ P(T) = G. \end{cases} \tag{4.32}$$

**Step 4.** In this step, we shall prove that  $P(\cdot)$  is the solution to the quantum Riccati equation (1.8) in the sense of Definition 1.3. From (4.12), we can see that

$$0 = B^*P + R\Theta + D^*P(C + D\Theta) = B^*P + D^*PC + K\Theta, \text{ a.e. } t \in [t_0, T]. \tag{4.33}$$

Then

$$PB + C^*PD = -\Theta^*K^*. \tag{4.34}$$

Since  $K(\cdot)^* = K(\cdot)$ , we can infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle P(T)z_1(T), z_2(T) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle M(s)z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds - \int_t^T \langle \Theta(s)^* K(s)^* \Theta(s) z_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds \\
&= \langle P(t)z_1(t), z_2(t) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle P(s)\mu_1(s), z_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P(s)z_1(s), \mu_2(s) \rangle ds \\
& \quad + \int_t^T \langle P(s)C(s)z_1(s), \nu_2(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle P(s)\nu_1(s), C(s)z_2(s) + \nu_2(s) \rangle ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

For any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,  $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)$ ,  $u(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ , let  $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \eta$ ,  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = Bu$ ,  $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = Du$  and  $z_1 = z_2 = x$  in (1.10)-(1.11). Similar to the proof of (4.2), together with (4.35), noting with (1.9) and (4.34), we show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}(t, \eta; u(\cdot)) &= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \langle Gx(T), x(T) \rangle + \int_t^T \langle M(s)x(s), x(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle R(s)u(s), u(s) \rangle_U ds \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \langle P(t)\eta, \eta \rangle + \int_t^T \langle K(s)(u(s) - \Theta(s)x(s)), u(s) - \Theta(s)x(s) \rangle_U ds \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \langle P(t)\eta, \eta \rangle = \mathcal{J}(t, \eta; \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot)) \leq \mathcal{J}(t, \eta; u(\cdot)), \quad u(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T]; U), \tag{4.37}$$

if and only if  $K \geq 0$ , a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ .

Put

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}_1 &:= \{t \in (t_0, T); K(t)h = 0 \text{ for some nonzero } h \in U\}, \\
\mathfrak{U}_2 &:= \{t \in (t_0, T); \|K(t)h\|_U > 0, \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{B}_U\},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{B}_U := \{h \in U; \|h\|_U = 1\}$ . Clearly,  $\mathfrak{U}_1 \cap \mathfrak{U}_2 = \emptyset$  and  $\mathfrak{U}_1 \cup \mathfrak{U}_2 = (t_0, T)$ . By definition, we have that

$$\mathfrak{U}_2 = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); \|K(t)h\|_U > \frac{1}{k}, \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{B}_U \right\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{B}_U^0$  be the countable dense subset of  $\mathcal{B}_U$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{U}_2 &= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); \|K(t)h\|_U > \frac{1}{k}, \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0 \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); \|K(t)h\|_U > \frac{1}{k} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

Since  $K(\cdot)h \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ , we deduce that, for any  $h \in U$ ,  $\{t \in (t_0, T); \|K(t)h\|_U > \frac{1}{k}\}$  is Lebesgue measurable. Hence both  $\mathfrak{U}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{U}_2$  are Lebesgue measurable.

Now we prove that  $K(t) > 0$  for a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ . Let us use the contradiction argument and assume that this were untrue. Then,  $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{U}_1)$ , the Lebesgue measure of  $\mathfrak{U}_1$ , would be positive.

For a.e.  $t \in \mathfrak{U}_1$ , put

$$\mathcal{T}(t) := \{h \in \mathcal{B}_U; K(t)h = 0\}.$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{T}(t)$  is closed in  $U$ . Define a map  $F : (t_0, T) \rightarrow 2^U$  as follows:

$$F(t) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{T}(t), & t \in \mathfrak{U}_1, \\ 0, & t \in \mathfrak{U}_2. \end{cases}$$

Then,  $F(t)$  is closed for a.e.  $t \in (t_0, T)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a closed subset of  $U$  and  $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_U$ . Put

$$\Omega_1 := \{t \in (t_0, T); F(t) \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset\}, \quad \Omega_2 := \{t \in (t_0, T); F(t) \cap \mathcal{O}_1 \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (4.39)$$

Clearly,  $\Omega_2 \subset \Omega_1$ . Moreover,

$$\Omega_1 = \begin{cases} \Omega_2 \cup \mathfrak{A}_2, & 0 \in \mathcal{O}, \\ \Omega_2, & 0 \notin \mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

Write

$$\Omega_3 := \{t \in (t_0, T); \|K(t)h\|_U > 0 \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{O}_1\}.$$

It is easy to see that  $\Omega_3 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$  and  $\Omega_3 \cup \Omega_2 = (t_0, T)$ . Furthermore, we can show that  $\Omega_1$ ,  $\Omega_2$  and  $\Omega_3$  are Lebesgue measurable.

Applying Lemma 4.2 to  $F$  with  $(t_0, T)$  to find a function  $f : [t_0, T] \rightarrow U$  such that

$$f(t) \in F(t) \text{ and } Kf = 0, \text{ a.e. } t \in (t_0, T).$$

Noting that  $\|f(t)\|_U \leq 1$ , a.e.  $t \in (t_0, T)$ , we find  $f \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ . Moreover, we have

$$\|f(t)\|_U = 1, \text{ a.e. } t \in \mathfrak{A}_1.$$

Hence, we conclude that  $\|f\|_{L^2([t_0, T]; U)} > 0$ .

By (4.36), we see that  $\Theta\bar{x} + f$  is also an optimal control. This contradicts the uniqueness of the optimal control. Hence,  $\mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{A}_1) = 0$ , i.e.

$$K(t) \text{ is injective for a.e. } t \in [t_0, T].$$

Further, we show that  $\mathcal{R}(K(t))$  is dense in  $U$  for a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , where  $\mathcal{R}(K(t))$  is the range of  $K(t)$ . Put

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_1 := \{t \in (t_0, T); \mathcal{R}(K(t))^\perp \neq \emptyset\}, \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_2 := \{t \in (t_0, T); \mathcal{R}(K(t))^\perp = \emptyset\}.$$

Clearly,  $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_1 \cup \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_2 = (t_0, T)$ . By the definition of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_2$ , we see that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_2 = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); \text{for all } \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}_U^0, \text{ there exists } h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0 \text{ such that } |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > \frac{1}{k} \right\}.$$

Then

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_2 = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}_U^0} \bigcap_{h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > \frac{1}{k} \right\}. \quad (4.40)$$

Since  $K(\cdot)h \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ , it follows that for any  $h, \tilde{h} \in U$ ,

$$\left\{ t \in (t_0, T); |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > \frac{1}{k} \right\} \quad (4.41)$$

is Lebesgue measurable. From (4.40) and (4.41), we can see that both  $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_1$  and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_2$  are also Lebesgue measurable.

To prove that  $\mathcal{R}(K(t))$  is dense in  $U$ , we use the contradiction argument. If  $\mathcal{R}(K(t))$  were not dense in  $U$  for a.e.  $t \in (t_0, T)$ , then  $\mathfrak{m}(\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_1) > 0$ .

For a.e.  $t \in \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}_1$ , put

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(t) := \left\{ \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{B}_U; \langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle = 0, \text{ for all } h \in U \right\}.$$

Clearly,  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(t)$  is closed in  $U$ . Define a map  $\tilde{F} : (t_0, T) \rightarrow 2^U$  as follows:

$$\tilde{F}(t) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(t), & t \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1, \\ 0, & t \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_2. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\tilde{F}(t)$  is closed for a.e.  $t \in (t_0, T)$ .

Similar to (4.39), let

$$\tilde{\Omega}_1 := \{t \in (t_0, T); \tilde{F}(t) \cap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset\}, \quad \tilde{\Omega}_2 := \{t \in (t_0, T); \tilde{F}(t) \cap \mathcal{O}_1 \neq \emptyset\}.$$

If  $0 \in \mathcal{O}$ , then  $\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \tilde{\Omega}_2 \cup \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_2$ . If  $0 \notin \mathcal{O}$ , then  $\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \tilde{\Omega}_2$ . Hence, we only need to prove that  $\tilde{\Omega}_2$  is measurable. Define

$$\tilde{\Omega}_3 = \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); \text{for all } \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{O}_1, \text{ there exists } h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0 \text{ such that } |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > 0 \right\}.$$

Then  $\tilde{\Omega}_2 \cup \tilde{\Omega}_3 = (t_0, T)$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}_2 \cap \tilde{\Omega}_3 = \emptyset$ . Hence, it is enough to prove that  $\tilde{\Omega}_3$  is Lebesgue measurable. Let  $\mathcal{O}_0$  be a countable dense subset of  $\mathcal{O}_1$ . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_3 &= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); \text{for all } \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{O}_1, \text{ there exists } h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0 \text{ such that } |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > \frac{1}{k} \right\} \\ &= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); \text{for all } \tilde{h} \in \mathcal{O}_0, \text{ there exists } h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0 \text{ such that } |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > \frac{1}{k} \right\} \\ &= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{O}_0} \bigcup_{h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0} \left\{ t \in (t_0, T); |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > \frac{1}{k} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{O}_0$  and  $h \in \mathcal{B}_U^0$ , noting that  $K(\cdot)h \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ , we deduce that

$$\left\{ t \in (t_0, T); |\langle K(t)h, \tilde{h} \rangle_U| > \frac{1}{k} \right\} \quad (4.43)$$

is Lebesgue measurable. From (4.42) and (4.43), it follows that  $\tilde{\Omega}_3$  is Lebesgue measurable. Hence,  $\tilde{\Omega}_2$  is also Lebesgue measurable.

Now we apply Lemma 4.2 to  $\tilde{F}$  with  $(t_0, T)$  to find a function  $\tilde{f} : [t_0, T] \rightarrow U$  such that

$$\tilde{f}(t) \in \tilde{F}(t) \text{ and } \langle K(t)h, \tilde{f}(t) \rangle_U = 0, \quad h \in U, \text{ a.e. } t \in (t_0, T).$$

Since

$$\|\tilde{f}(t)\|_U \leq 1, \text{ a.e. } t \in (t_0, T),$$

it holds that  $\tilde{f} \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ . Furthermore, it infers that

$$\|\tilde{f}(t)\|_U = 1, \text{ a.e. } t \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1,$$

which implies that  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2([t_0, T]; U)} > 0$ .

We prove that  $\Theta\bar{x} + \tilde{f}$  is also an optimal control. Indeed, by the choice of  $\tilde{f}$ , it holds that for any  $t \in [t_0, T)$ ,

$$\int_{t_0}^T \langle K(u - \Theta\bar{x} - \tilde{f}), \tilde{f} \rangle_U ds = 0,$$

and

$$\int_{t_0}^T \langle K\tilde{f}, u - \Theta\bar{x} - \tilde{f} \rangle_U ds = \int_t^T \langle \tilde{f}, K(u - \Theta\bar{x} - \tilde{f}) \rangle_U ds = 0.$$

Therefore, for any  $u(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T]; U)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{t_0}^T \langle K(u - \Theta\bar{x} - \tilde{f}), u - \Theta\bar{x} - \tilde{f} \rangle_U ds \\
&= \int_{t_0}^T \langle K(u - \Theta\bar{x} - \tilde{f}), u - \Theta\bar{x} \rangle_U ds \\
&= \int_{t_0}^T \langle K(u - \Theta\bar{x}), u - \Theta\bar{x} \rangle_U ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

By (4.36) and (4.44), we obtain that

$$\mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; \Theta(\cdot)\bar{x}(\cdot) - \tilde{f}(\cdot)) \leq \mathcal{J}(t_0, \eta; u(\cdot)), \quad u(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T]; U).$$

This indicates that  $\Theta\bar{x} + \tilde{f}$  is also an optimal control, which contradicts the uniqueness of the optimal controls. Hence,  $\mathcal{R}(K(t))$  is dense in  $U$  for a.e.  $t \in (t_0, T)$ . For a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$  and any  $u \in U$ ,  $K(t)^{-1} : \mathcal{R}(K(t)) \rightarrow U$ ,  $K(t)^{-1}K(t)u = u$ , which is densely defined in  $U$ .

We prove that  $K(t)^{-1}$  is a closed operator for a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ . Since  $K(t)$  is bounded for a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , it follows that  $K(t)$  is a closed operator for a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ , and thus  $K(t)^{-1}$  is also a closed operator for a.e.  $t \in [t_0, T]$ . Hence, Definition 1.3 (i) holds.

From (4.33),

$$-K^{-1}(B^*P + D^*PC) = \Theta. \tag{4.45}$$

By substituting (4.45) into (4.35), we can demonstrate that Definition 1.3 (ii) holds.

**Step 5.** Finally, we prove the uniqueness of the weak solutions to (1.8). Assume  $P_1(\cdot), P_2(\cdot) \in C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; \mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E})))$  are two weak solution to (1.8). By (4.2), one gets that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_t^T \langle M(s)x(s), x(s) \rangle ds + \int_t^T \langle R(s)u(s), u(s) \rangle_U ds + \langle Gx(T), x(T) \rangle \\
&= \langle P_1(t)\eta, \eta \rangle + \int_t^T \langle K_1(s)(u(s) - \Theta(s)x(s)), u(s) - \Theta(s)x(s) \rangle ds \\
&= \langle P_2(t)\eta, \eta \rangle + \int_t^T \langle K_2(s)(u(s) - \Theta(s)x(s)), u(s) - \Theta(s)x(s) \rangle ds,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

where  $K_i = R + D^*P_iD$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Taking  $u = \Theta x$  in (4.46), we deduce that for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,

$$\langle P_1(t)\eta, \eta \rangle = \langle P_2(t)\eta, \eta \rangle, \quad \eta \in L^2(\mathcal{E}_t). \tag{4.47}$$

Hence, for any  $\xi, \eta \in L^2(\mathcal{E}_t)$ , we have that

$$\langle P_1(t)(\xi + \eta), \xi + \eta \rangle = \langle P_2(t)(\xi + \eta), \xi + \eta \rangle,$$

and

$$\langle P_1(t)(\eta - \xi), \eta - \xi \rangle = \langle P_2(t)(\eta - \xi), \eta - \xi \rangle.$$

These, together with  $P_1(\cdot) = P_1(\cdot)^*$  and  $P_2(\cdot) = P_2(\cdot)^*$ , imply that

$$\langle P_1(t)\eta, \xi \rangle = \langle P_2(t)\eta, \xi \rangle, \quad \xi, \eta \in L^2(\mathcal{E}_t).$$

Hence,  $P_1(t) = P_2(t)$  for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ . Consequently, the uniqueness of the desired solution follows. Then, we complete the proof of the “if” part.  $\square$

## 5 Appendix

To prove Lemma 2.5, we first present the following auxiliary result.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $W(\cdot)$  be the Fermion Brownian motion defined by (1.1). Then, for any  $f \in L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , there exists a unique  $\mathcal{K}(\cdot, \cdot) \in L^1([0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))$  satisfying the following conditions:*

(i)  $\mathcal{K}(s, \sigma) = 0, \quad \sigma > s;$

(ii) For any  $s \in [0, T]$ ,

$$f(s) = m(f(s)) + \int_0^s \mathcal{K}(s, \sigma) dW(\sigma); \quad (5.1)$$

(iii)

$$\|\mathcal{K}\|_{L^1([0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))} \leq 2\|f\|_{L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))}. \quad (5.2)$$

*Proof.* For any  $f \in L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , we can find a sequence of simple processes  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))} = 0,$$

where  $f_n(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \chi_{[t_i^n, t_{i+1}^n)}(t) a_{t_i^n}$  for partitions  $\{t_i^n\}_{i=0}^n$  of  $[0, T]$ , and  $a_{t_i^n} \in L^2(\mathcal{C}_{t_i^n})$ .

By the noncommutative martingale representation theorem [4, Theorem 4.1], for any  $a_{t_i^n}$ , there is a  $k_{t_i^n} \in L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$  such that

$$a_{t_i^n} = m(a_{t_i^n}) + \int_0^{t_i^n} k_{t_i^n}(\sigma) dW(\sigma); \quad k_{t_i^n}(\sigma) = 0, \quad \sigma > t_i^n. \quad (5.3)$$

For any  $(s, \sigma) \in [0, T] \times [0, T]$ , put

$$\mathcal{K}_n(s, \sigma) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \chi_{[t_i^n, t_{i+1}^n)}(s) \chi_{[0, s]}(\sigma) k_{t_i^n}(\sigma).$$

Then

$$f_n(s) = m(f_n(s)) + \int_0^s \mathcal{K}_n(s, \sigma) dW(\sigma). \quad (5.4)$$

Hence, for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \left\{ \int_0^T \|\mathcal{K}_i(s, t) - \mathcal{K}_j(s, t)\|_2^2 dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\ &= \int_0^T \left\{ \int_0^s \|\mathcal{K}_i(s, t) - \mathcal{K}_j(s, t)\|_2^2 dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\ &= \int_0^T \left\| \int_0^s \{\mathcal{K}_i(s, t) - \mathcal{K}_j(s, t)\} dW(t) \right\|_2 ds \\ &= \int_0^T \|f_i(s) - f_j(s) - m(f_i(s) - f_j(s))\|_2 ds \\ &\leq 2\|f_i - f_j\|_{L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Since  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ , by (5.5), we deduce that  $\{\mathcal{K}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $L^1([0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))$ . Thus, there is a  $\mathcal{K} \in L^1([0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))$  so that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}$  in  $L^1([0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))$ . Combining with (5.4), we can obtain that (5.1).

Similar to (5.5), one has

$$\int_0^T \left\{ \int_0^t \|\mathcal{K}_n(s, t)\|_2^2 dt \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \leq 2 \|f_n\|_{L^1_{\mathbb{A}}([0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{E}))}. \quad (5.6)$$

Taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (5.6), (5.2) holds.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 2.5.** First, we prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n(\cdot) = x(\cdot) \text{ in } C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{E})).$$

It follows from (2.5) and (4.4) that for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= \varsigma + \int_{t_0}^t \{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\}x(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^t \{C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\}x(t)dW(s), \\ x_n(t) &= \Gamma_n\varsigma + \int_{t_0}^t \{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\}x_n(s)ds + \int_{t_0}^t \{C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\}x_n(s)dW(s). \end{aligned}$$

By Minkowski's inequality, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq 3 \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \left\{ \|\Gamma_n\varsigma - \varsigma\|_2^2 + \left\| \int_{t_0}^t \{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\} \{x_n(s) - x(s)\} ds \right\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\| \int_{t_0}^t \{C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\} \{x_n(s) - x(s)\} dW(s) \right\|_2^2 \right\}. \quad (5.7) \\ & \leq 3 \left\{ \|\Gamma_n\varsigma - \varsigma\|_2^2 + \left\| \int_{t_0}^T \{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\} \{x_n(s) - x(s)\} ds \right\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left\| \int_{t_0}^T \{C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\} \{x_n(s) - x(s)\} dW(s) \right\|_2^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we calculate each item of the right of the above inequality. By Hölder's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_{t_0}^T \{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\} \{x_n(s) - x(s)\} ds \right\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \left( \int_{t_0}^T \|\{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\} \{x_n(s) - x(s)\}\|_2 ds \right)^2 \quad (5.8) \\ & \leq \left( \int_{t_0}^T \|\{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))} ds \right)^2 \left\{ \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the isometry of the Itô-Clifford stochastic integral in  $L^2(\mathcal{E})$  [3, Theorem 3.5(c)],

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_{t_0}^T \{C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\} \{x_n(s) - x(s)\} dW(s) \right\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \int_{t_0}^T \|C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))}^2 \|x_n(s) - x(s)\|_2^2 ds \quad (5.9) \\ & \leq \int_{t_0}^T \|C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))}^2 ds \left\{ \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  on both sides of (5.7), and using (5.8) and (5.9), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 \\ & \leq 3 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Gamma_n \varsigma - \varsigma\|_2^2 + 3 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_{t_0}^T \|\{A(s) + B(s)\Theta(s)\}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))} ds \right)^2 \left\{ \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 \right\} \\ & \quad + 3 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_0}^T \|C(s) + D(s)\Theta(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))}^2 ds \left\{ \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $\Gamma_n$ , we observe that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Gamma_n \varsigma - \varsigma\|_2^2 = 0. \quad (5.10)$$

Then, by Gronwall's inequality, we obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 = 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Similar to the proof of (5.11),  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|\tilde{x}_n(t) - \tilde{x}(t)\|_2^2 = 0$  holds. Next, we prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n(\cdot) = y(\cdot) \text{ in } C_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})),$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_n(\cdot) = Y(\cdot) \text{ in } L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{M} := \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \{\|A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))} + \|C(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))}\}. \quad (5.12)$$

Put

$$\tilde{T}_1 := \inf \left\{ t \in [t_0, T]; [6(5\mathcal{M} + 1)\mathcal{M} + 5\mathcal{M}] \cdot \max\{(T - t)^2, T - t\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Recall that for any  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,

$$y(t) = -Gx(T) + \int_t^T \{A(s)^*y(s) + C(s)^*Y(s) - M(s)x(s)\} ds - \int_t^T Y(s)dW(s). \quad (5.13)$$

From (1.3) and (1.5), it follows that  $A(\cdot)^*y(\cdot) + C(\cdot)^*Y(\cdot) - M(\cdot)x(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{A}}^1([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$ . Then, by Lemma 5.1, we can find that there is an  $\mathcal{K}(\cdot, \cdot) \in L^1([t_0, T]; L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & A(s)^*y(s) + C(s)^*Y(s) - M(s)x(s) \\ & = m(A(s)^*y(s) + C(s)^*Y(s) - M(s)x(s)) + \int_{t_0}^s \mathcal{K}(s, \tau)dW(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{K}(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^1([t_0, T]; L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))} \leq 2\|A^*y + C^*Y - Mx\|_{L_{\mathbb{A}}^1([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))}. \quad (5.15)$$

By the noncommutative martingale representation theorem [4, Theorem 4.1], there exists an  $l \in L_{\mathbb{A}}^2([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$  such that

$$m(y_T | L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)) = m(y_T) + \int_{t_0}^t l(\sigma)dW(\sigma), \quad t \in [t_0, T]. \quad (5.16)$$



Put

$$y(t) := m \left( y_T - \int_t^T \{A(s)^*y(s) + C(s)^*Y(s) - M(s)x(s)\} ds \middle| L^2(\mathcal{C}_t) \right), \quad t \in [t_0, T].$$

Similar to classical stochastic Fubini theorem [21, Theorem 2.141], we can prove that if  $\mathcal{K}(\cdot, \cdot) \in L^1([t_0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))$ , then

$$\int_{t_0}^T \left\| \int_{t_0}^T \mathcal{K}(s, \sigma) dW(\sigma) \right\|_2 ds < \infty,$$

and

$$\int_{t_0}^T \int_{t_0}^T \mathcal{K}(s, \sigma) dW(\sigma) ds = \int_{t_0}^T \int_{t_0}^T \mathcal{K}(s, \sigma) ds dW(\sigma).$$

Then, by (5.14) and (5.16), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= y_T - \int_t^T \{A(s)^*y(s) + C(s)^*Y(s) - M(s)x(s)\} ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T l(\sigma) dW(\sigma) + \int_t^T \int_t^s \mathcal{K}(s, \sigma) dW(\sigma) ds \\ &= y_T - \int_t^T \{A(s)^*y(s) + C(s)^*Y(s) - M(s)x(s)\} ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T l(\sigma) dW(\sigma) + \int_t^T \int_s^T \mathcal{K}(\sigma, s) d\sigma dW(s). \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (5.13), implies that

$$Y(s) = l(s) - \int_s^T \mathcal{K}(\sigma, s) d\sigma. \quad (5.17)$$

Similarly, we can obtain that

$$Y_n(s) = l_n(s) - \int_s^T \mathcal{K}_n(\sigma, s) d\sigma,$$

and

$$y_n(t) = -Gx_n(T) + \int_t^T \{A(s)^*y_n(s) + C(s)^*Y_n(s) - M(s)x_n(s)\} ds - \int_t^T Y_n(s) dW(s),$$

where  $l_n(\cdot) \in L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))$  such that

$$m(Gx_n(T) | L^2(\mathcal{C}_t)) = m(Gx_n(T)) + \int_{t_0}^t l_n(s) dW(s), \quad (5.18)$$

and  $\mathcal{K}_n(\cdot, \cdot) \in L^1([t_0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} &A(s)^*y_n(s) + C(s)^*Y_n(s) - M(s)x_n(s) \\ &= m(A(s)^*y_n(s) + C(s)^*Y_n(s) - M(s)x_n(s)) + \int_{t_0}^s \mathcal{K}_n(s, \tau) dW(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{K}_n(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^1([t_0, T]; L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C})))} \leq C \|A^*y_n + C^*Y_n - Mx_n\|_{L^2_{\mathbb{A}}([t_0, T]; L^2(\mathcal{C}))}. \quad (5.20)$$

For any  $t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]} \|y_n(t) - y(t)\|_2^2 + (5\mathcal{M} + 1) \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|Y_n(t) - Y(t)\|_2^2 dt \\
& \leq (10\mathcal{M} + 2) \left\{ \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|l_n(t) - l(t)\|_2^2 dt + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \left\| \int_t^T \mathcal{K}_n(s, t) - \mathcal{K}(s, t) ds \right\|_2^2 dt \right\} \\
& \quad + 5 \|Gx(T) - Gx_n(T)\|_2^2 + 5 \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|Y_n(s) - Y(s)\|_2^2 ds \\
& \quad + 5(T - \tilde{T}_1) \sup_{t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]} \left\{ \int_t^T \|A(s)^* y_n(s) - A(s)^* y(s)\|_2^2 ds + \int_t^T \|C(s)^* Y_n(s) - C(s)^* Y(s)\|_2^2 ds \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \int_t^T \|M(s)x_n(s) - M(s)x(s)\|_2^2 ds \right\}. \tag{5.21} \\
& \leq (10\mathcal{M} + 2) \left\{ \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|l_n(t) - l(t)\|_2^2 dt + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \left\| \int_t^T \mathcal{K}_n(s, t) - \mathcal{K}(s, t) ds \right\|_2^2 dt \right\} \\
& \quad + 5 \|Gx(T) - Gx_n(T)\|_2^2 + 5 \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|Y_n(s) - Y(s)\|_2^2 ds \\
& \quad + 5(T - \tilde{T}_1) \left\{ \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|A(s)^* y_n(s) - A(s)^* y(s)\|_2^2 ds + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|C(s)^* Y_n(s) - C(s)^* Y(s)\|_2^2 ds \right. \\
& \quad \quad \left. + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|M(s)x_n(s) - M(s)x(s)\|_2^2 ds \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (5.11), we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Gx(T) - Gx_n(T)\|_2^2 = 0, \tag{5.22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|M(s)x_n(s) - M(s)x(s)\|_2^2 ds \\
& \leq \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|M(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))}^2 \|x_n(s) - x(s)\|_2^2 ds \\
& \leq \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|M(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))}^2 ds \left\{ \sup_{t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]} \|x_n(t) - x(t)\|_2^2 \right\} \\
& = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Besides that,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|A(s)^*(y_n(s) - y(s))\|_2 ds \right)^2 + \left( \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|C(s)^*(Y_n(s) - Y(s))\|_2 ds \right)^2 \\
& \leq \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|A(s)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))}^2 ds \left\{ \sup_{t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]} \|y(t) - y_n(t)\|_2^2 \right\} \\
& \quad + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|C(s)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{E}))}^2 ds \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|Y_n(s) - Y(s)\|_2^2 ds. \tag{5.23}
\end{aligned}$$

From (5.16) and (5.18), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|l_n(t) - l(t)\|_2^2 ds \\
& \leq \left\| Gx(T) - m \left( Gx(T) | L^2(\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{T}_1}) \right) - Gx_n(T) + m \left( Gx_n(T) | L^2(\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{T}_1}) \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
& \leq 2 \|Gx(T) - Gx_n(T)\|_2^2 + 2 \left\| m \left( Gx(T) | L^2(\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{T}_1}) \right) - m \left( Gx_n(T) | L^2(\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{T}_1}) \right) \right\|_2^2 \\
& \leq \mathcal{C} \|Gx(T) - Gx_n(T)\|_2^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

This, together with (5.22), implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|l_n(t) - l(t)\|_2^2 ds = 0. \tag{5.25}$$

From (5.17), (5.15), (5.19) and (5.20), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \left\| \int_t^T \{ \mathcal{K}_n(s, t) - \mathcal{K}(s, t) \} ds \right\|_2^2 dt \\
& \leq \left\{ \left( \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \left( \int_t^T \| \mathcal{K}_n(s, t) - \mathcal{K}(s, t) \|_2 ds \right)^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}^2 \\
& \leq \left\{ \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \left( \int_t^T \| \mathcal{K}_n(s, t) - \mathcal{K}(s, t) \|_2^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \right\}^2 \\
& \leq 3 \left\{ \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|A(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))}^2 dt \left\{ \sup_{t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]} \|y(t) - y_n(t)\|_2^2 \right\} \right. \\
& \quad + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|C(t)^*\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))}^2 dt \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|Y(t) - Y_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))}^2 dt \\
& \quad \left. + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|M(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\mathcal{C}))}^2 dt \left\{ \sup_{t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]} \|x(t) - x_n(t)\|_2^2 \right\} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

Combining with (5.21)-(5.26), we obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [\tilde{T}_1, T]} \|y(t) - y_n(t)\|_2^2 + \int_{\tilde{T}_1}^T \|Y(t) - Y_n(t)\|_2^2 dt \right\} = 0.$$

By repeating the above argument, we obtain the second and third equality in (2.14).  $\square$

## References

- [1] M. Ait Rami, J.B. Moore, X.Y. Zhou, Indefinite stochastic linear quadratic control and generalized differential Riccati equation, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 40(4), (2001/02), 1296-1311.
- [2] D.B. Applebaum, R.L. Hudson, Fermion Itô's formula and stochastic evolutions, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 96(4), (1984), 473-496.
- [3] C. Barnett, R.F. Streater, I.F. Wilde, The Itô-Clifford integral, *J. Funct. Anal.* 48(2), (1982), 172-212.

- [4] C. Barnett, R.F. Streater, I.F. Wilde, The Itô-Clifford integral. II. Stochastic differential equations, *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 27(2), (1983), 373-384.
- [5] V.P. Belavkin, Quantum stochastic calculus and quantum nonlinear filtering, *J. Multivar. Anal.* 42(2), (1992), 171-201.
- [6] L. Bouten, R. Van Handel, M.R. James, An introduction to quantum filtering, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 46(6), (2007), 2199-2241.
- [7] A.C. Doherty, K. Jacobs, Feedback-control of quantum systems using continuous state-estimation, *Phys. Rev. A*, 60, (1999), 2700.
- [8] D. Dong, I.R. Petersen, Quantum control theory and applications: a survey, *IET Control Theory Appl.* 4(12), (2010), 2651-2671.
- [9] S.C. Edwards, V.P. Belavkin, Optimal quantum filtering and quantum feedback control, (2005), quant-ph/0506018.
- [10] T. Fack, H. Kosaki, Generalized  $s$ -numbers of  $\tau$ -measurable operators, *Pacific J. Math.* 123(2), (1986), 269-300.
- [11] C.W. Gardiner, Input and output in damped quantum systems III: formulation of damped systems driven by Fermion fields, *Opt. Commun.* 243, (2004), 57-80.
- [12] C.W. Gardiner, M.J. Collett, Input and output in damped quantum systems: quantum stochastic differential equations and the master equation, *Phys. Rev. A*, 31(6), (1985), 3761-3774.
- [13] J.E. Gough, M.I. Guta, M.R. James, H.I. Nurdin, Quantum filtering for systems driven by fermion fields, *Commun. Inf. Syst.* 11(3), (2011), 237-267.
- [14] J.E. Gough, M.R. James, H.I. Nurdin, Squeezing components in linear quantum feedback networks, *Phys. Rev. A*, 81, (2010), 023804.
- [15] S. Grivopoulos, I.R. Petersen, Linear quantum system transfer function realization using static networks for input/output processing and feedback, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 55(5),(2017), 3349-3369.
- [16] S. Grivopoulos, I.R. Petersen, Bilinear Hamiltonian interactions between linear quantum systems via feedback, *Automatica J. IFAC*, 89, (2018), 103-110.
- [17] R.L. Hudson, J.M. Lindsay, A noncommutative martingale representation theorem for non-Fock quantum Brownian motion, *J. Funct. Anal.* 61(2), (1985), 202-221.
- [18] R.L. Hudson, K.R. Parthasarathy, Quantum Ito's formula and stochastic evolutions, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 93(3), (1984), 301-323.
- [19] M.R. James, H.I. Nurdin, I.R. Petersen,  $H^\infty$  control of linear quantum stochastic systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53 (8), (2008), 1787-1803.
- [20] Q. Lü, Well-posedness of stochastic Riccati equations and closed-loop solvability for stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems. *J. Differential Equations*, 267(1), (2019), 180-227.

- [21] Q. Lü, X. Zhang, *Mathematical Theory for Stochastic Distributed Parameter Control Systems*, Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling, 101. Springer, Cham, 2021.
- [22] Q. Lü, X. Zhang, Optimal feedback for stochastic linear quadratic control and backward stochastic Riccati equations in infinite dimensions. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 294, 2024.
- [23] M. Kohlmann, S. Tang, Global adapted solution of one-dimensional backward stochastic Riccati equations, with application to the mean-variance hedging. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 97(2), (2002), 255-288.
- [24] M. Kohlmann, S. Tang, Multidimensional backward stochastic Riccati equations and applications, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 41(6), (2003), 1696-1721.
- [25] Z. Miao, M. R. James, I.R. Petersen, Coherent observers for linear quantum stochastic system, *Automatica J. IFAC*, 71, (2016), 264-271.
- [26] H. Nurdin, Synthesis of linear quantum stochastic systems via quantum feedback networks, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 55(4), (2010), 1008-1013.
- [27] H. Nurdin, M.R. James, I.R. Petersen, Coherent quantum LQG control, *Automatica*, 45(8), (2009), 1837-1846.
- [28] K.R. Parthasarathy, *An Introduction to Quantum Stochastic Calculus*, Birkhäuser Verlag, 1992.
- [29] G. Pisier, Q. Xu, Non-commutative martingale inequalities, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 189, (1997), 667-698.
- [30] W. Rudin. *Real and complex analysis*. Third edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987.
- [31] J. Sun, X. Li, J. Yong, Open-loop and closed-loop solvabilities for stochastic linear quadratic optimal control problems, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 54(5), (2016), 2274-2308.
- [32] J. Sun, J. Yong, Linear quadratic stochastic differential games: open-loop and closed-loop saddle points, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 52(6), (2014), 4082-4121.
- [33] J. Sun, J. Yong, *Stochastic linear-quadratic optimal control theory: open-loop and closed-loop solutions*. Springer Briefs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [34] M. Takesaki, Conditional expectations in von Neumann algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.* 9, (1972), 306-321.
- [35] O. Techakesari, H. Nurdin, Tangential interpolatory projection for model reduction of linear quantum stochastic systems, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 62(1), (2017), 5-17.
- [36] D.H. Wagner, Survey of measurable selection theorems, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 15(5), (1977), 859-903.
- [37] P. Wang, S. Wang, Optimal control of quantum stochastic systems in fermion fields: Pontryagin maximum principle (I), arXiv:2406.08153.
- [38] P. Wang, S. Wang, Optimal control of quantum stochastic systems in fermion fields: The Pontryagin maximum principle (II), arXiv:2409.01684.

- [39] S. Wang, M.R. James, Quantum feedback control of linear stochastic systems with feedback-loop time delays, *Automatica J. IFAC*, 52, (2015), 277-282.
- [40] I.F. Wilde, The free fermion field as a Markov field, *J. Funct. Anal.* 15, (1974), 12-21.
- [41] W.M. Wonham, On a matrix Riccati equation of stochastic control, *SIAM J. Control*, 6, (1968), 681-697.
- [42] G. Zhang, Z. Dong, Linear quantum systems: a tutorial, *Annu. Rev. Control*, 54, (2022), 274-294.

Penghui Wang, School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, Shandong, P. R. China,  
Email: phwang@sdu.edu.cn

Shan Wang, School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, Shandong, P. R. China, Email:  
202020244@mail.sdu.edu.cn

Shengkai Zhao, School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, Shandong, P. R. China,  
Email: 202420320@mail.sdu.edu.cn