

# Singular control of SPDEs with space-mean dynamics

Nacira AGRAM<sup>1</sup> Astrid HILBERT<sup>1</sup> and Bernt ØKSENDAL<sup>2</sup>

3 May 2019

## Abstract

We consider the problem of optimal singular control of a stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) with space-mean dependence. Such systems are proposed as models for population growth in a random environment. We obtain sufficient and necessary maximum principles for such control problems. The corresponding adjoint equation is a reflected backward stochastic partial differential equation (BSPDE) with space-mean dependence. We prove existence and uniqueness results for such equations. As an application we study optimal harvesting from a population modelled as an SPDE with space-mean dependence.

**MSC(2010):** 60H05, 60H15, 93E20, 91G80,91B70.

**Keywords:** Stochastic partial differential equations; space-mean dependence; maximum principle; backward stochastic partial differential equations; space-mean reaction diffusion equation; optimal harvesting.

## 1 Introduction

We start by a motivation for the problem that will be studied in this paper:

Consider a problem of optimal harvesting from a fish population in a lake  $D$ . We assume that the density  $u(t, x)$  of the population at time  $t \in [0, T]$  and at the point  $x \in D$  is modelled by a *stochastic reaction-diffusion equation with neighbouring interactions*. By this we mean

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, Linnaeus University (LNU), Sweden.  
Emails: [nacira.agram@lnu.se](mailto:nacira.agram@lnu.se), [astrid.hilbert@lnu.se](mailto:astrid.hilbert@lnu.se).

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Oslo, Norway.  
Email: [oksendal@math.uio.no](mailto:oksendal@math.uio.no).

This research was carried out with support of the Norwegian Research Council, within the research project Challenges in Stochastic Control, Information and Applications (STOCONINF), project number 250768/F20.

a stochastic partial differential equation of the form

$$\begin{cases} du(t, x) = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(t, x) + \alpha \bar{u}(t, x) \right] dt + \beta \bar{u}(t, x) dB(t) - \lambda_0 \xi(dt, x); & (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) > 0; & x \in D, \\ u(t, x) = u_1(t, x) \geq 0; & (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D, \end{cases}$$

where  $\bar{u}(t, x)$  is the space-averaging operator

$$\bar{u}(t, x) = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{K_\theta} u(x + y) dy, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $V(\cdot)$  denotes Lebesgue volume and

$$K_\theta = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n; |y| < \theta\}$$

is the ball of radius  $r > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  centered at 0, where  $D$  is a bounded Lipschitz domain in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $u_0(x), u_1(t, x)$  are given deterministic functions.

In the above  $B(t) = B(t, \omega); (t, \omega) \in [0, \infty) \times \Omega$ , is an  $m$ -dimensional Brownian motion on a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, \infty)}, \mathbb{P})$ . Moreover,  $\alpha, \beta$  and  $\lambda_0 > 0$  are given constants and

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$$

is the Laplacian differential operator on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

We may regard  $\xi(dt, x)$  as the harvesting effort rate, and  $\lambda_0 > 0$  as the harvesting efficiency coefficient. The performance functional is assumed to be of the form

$$J(\xi) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \int_0^T (h_0(t, x)u(t, x) - c(t, x))\xi(dt, x)dx + \int_D h_0(T, x)u(T, x)dx \right], \quad (1.2)$$

where  $h_0(t, x) > 0$  is the unit price of the fish and  $c(t, x)$  is the unit cost of energy used in the harvesting and  $T > 0$  is a fixed terminal time. Thus  $J(\xi)$  represents the expected total net income from the harvesting. The problem is to maximise  $J(\xi)$  over all (admissible) harvesting strategies  $\xi(t, x)$ .

*Remark 1.1 This population growth model, which was first introduced in Agram et al [1], is a generalisation of the classical stochastic reaction-diffusion model, in that we have added the term  $\bar{u}(t, x)$  which represents an average of the neighbouring densities. Thus our model allows for the growth at a point to depend on interactions from the whole vicinity. This space-mean interaction is different from the pointwise interaction represented by the Laplacian.*

The problem above turns out to be related to a problem of the following form:

Let  $\phi(x) = \phi(x, \omega)$  be an  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable  $H = L^2(D)$ -valued random variable. Let

$$g : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a given measurable mapping and  $L(t, x) : [0, T] \times D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a given continuous function. Consider the problem to find an  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted random fields  $Y(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $Z(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\xi(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^+$  left-continuous and increasing with respect to  $t$ , such that

$$\begin{cases} dY(t, x) = -AY(t, x)dt - F(t, x, Y(t, x), Y(t, \cdot), Z(t, x))dt + Z(t, x)dB(t) \\ \quad - \xi(dt, x), t \in (0, T), \\ Y(t, x) \geq L(t, x), \\ \int_0^T \int_D (Y(t, x) - L(t, x))\xi(dt, x)dx = 0, \\ Y(T, x) = \phi(x) \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where  $A$  is a second order linear partial differential operator. We call the equation (1.3) a *reflected stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE) with space-mean dynamics*. We will come back to this equation in the last section.

## 2 The optimization problem

We now give a general formulation of the problem discussed in the Introduction:

Let  $T > 0$  and let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open set with  $C^1$  boundary  $\partial D$ . Specifically, we assume that the state  $u(t, x)$  at time  $t \in [0, T]$  and at the point  $x \in \overline{D} := D \cup \partial D$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} du(t, x) = Au(t, x)dt + b(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot))dt + \sigma(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot))dB(t) \\ \quad + f(t, x, u)\xi(dt, x); \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D, \\ u(0^-, x) = u_0(x); \quad x \in \overline{D}, \\ u(t, x) = u_1(t, x); \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Here  $B = \{B(t)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion, defined in a complete filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The filtration  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is assumed to be the  $\mathbb{P}$ -augmented filtration generated by  $B$ .

We denote by  $A$  the second order partial differential operator acting on  $x$  given by

$$A\phi(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i(x) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i}; \quad \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $(\alpha_{ij}(x))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$  is a given nonnegative definite  $n \times n$  matrix with entries  $\alpha_{ij}(x) \in C^2(D) \cap C(\overline{D})$  for all  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $\beta_i(x) \in C^2(D) \cap C(\overline{D})$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

Let  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  denote the set of real measurable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For each  $t, x, u, \zeta$  the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi &\mapsto b(t, x, u, \varphi) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \varphi &\mapsto \sigma(t, x, u, \varphi) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ u &\mapsto f(t, x, u) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

are  $C^1$  functionals on  $L^2(D) = L^2(D, m)$ , where  $dm(x) = dx$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Here  $Au(t, x)$  is interpreted in the sense of distribution. Thus  $u$  is understood as a weak (mild) solution to (2.1), in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} u(0, x) &= u_0(x) + \int_0^t P_s^A b(s, \cdot, u(s, x), u(s, \cdot))(x) ds + \int_0^t P_s^A \sigma(s, \cdot, u(s, x), u(s, \cdot))(x) dB(s) \\ &+ \int_0^t P_s^A f(s, \cdot, u(s, x))(x) \xi(ds, x), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $P_t^A$  is the semigroup associated to the operator  $A$ . Thus we see that we can in the usual way apply the Itô formula to such SPDEs.

Moreover, the adjoint operator  $A^*$  of an operator  $A$  on  $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  is defined by the identity

$$(A\phi, \psi) = (\phi, A^*\psi), \quad \text{for all } \phi, \psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}),$$

where  $\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} := (\phi_1, \phi_2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_1(x) \phi_2(x) dx$  is the inner product in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . In our case we have

$$A_x^* \phi(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} (\alpha_{ij}(x) \phi(x)) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (\beta_i(x) \phi(x)); \quad \phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

We interpret  $u$  as a weak (variational) solution to (2.1), in the sense that for  $\phi \in C_0^\infty(D)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u(t), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} &= \langle \eta(\cdot), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} + \int_0^t \langle u(s), A_x^* \phi \rangle ds + \int_0^t \langle b(s, u(s)), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \langle \sigma(s, u(s)), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} dB(s) + \int_0^t \langle f(s, u(s)), \phi \rangle_{L^2(D)} \xi(ds, x), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  represents the duality product between  $W^{1,2}(D)$  and  $W^{1,2}(D)^*$ , with  $W^{1,2}(D)$  the Sobolev space of order 1. In the above equation, we have not written all the arguments of  $b, \sigma, \gamma$ , for simplicity.

We want to maximize the performance functional  $J(\xi)$ , given by

$$\begin{aligned} J(\xi) &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D h_0(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot)) dx dt + \int_0^T \int_D h_1(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot)) \xi(dt, dx) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_D g(x, u(T, x), u(T, \cdot)) dx \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

over all  $\xi \in \mathcal{A}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the set of all adapted processes  $\xi(t, x)$  that are nondecreasing and left continuous with respect to  $t$  for all  $x$ , with  $\xi(0, x) = 0$ ,  $\xi(T, x) < \infty$  and such that  $J(\xi) < \infty$ . We call  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of admissible singular controls. Thus we want to find  $\widehat{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}$ , such that

$$J(\widehat{\xi}) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}} J(\xi). \quad (2.5)$$

For each  $t, x, u$  we assume that the functions  $\varphi \mapsto h_0(t, x, u, \varphi) : [0, T] \times D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\varphi \mapsto g(x, u, \varphi) : D \times \mathbb{R} \times L(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , are  $C^1$  functionals on  $L^2(D)$ .

The Hamiltonian  $H$  is defined by

$$H(t, x, u, \varphi, p, q)(dt, \xi(dt, x)) = H_0(t, x, u, \varphi, p, q)dt + H_1(t, x, u, \varphi, p)\xi(dt, x). \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$H_0(t, x, u, \varphi, p, q) = h_0(t, x, u, \varphi) + b(t, x, u, \varphi)p + \sigma(t, x, u, \varphi)q \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$H_1(t, x, u, \varphi, p) = f(t, x)p + h_1(t, x, u, \varphi) \quad (2.8)$$

We assume that  $H, f, b, \sigma, \gamma$  and  $g$  admit Fréchet derivatives with respect to  $u$  and  $\varphi$ . In general, if  $h : L^2(D) \mapsto L^2(D)$  is Fréchet differentiable, we denote its Fréchet derivative (gradient) at  $\varphi \in L^2(D)$  by  $\nabla_\varphi h$ , and we denote the action of  $\nabla_\varphi h$  on a function  $\psi \in L^2(D)$  by  $\langle \nabla_\varphi h, \psi \rangle$ .

**Definition 2.1** *We say that the Fréchet derivative  $\nabla_\varphi h$  of a map  $h : L^2(D) \mapsto L^2(D)$  has a dual function  $\nabla_\varphi^* h \in L^2(D \times D)$  if*

$$\langle \nabla_\varphi h, \psi \rangle(x) = \int_D \nabla_\varphi^* h(x, y)\psi(y)dy; \quad \text{for all } \psi \in L^2(D). \quad (2.9)$$

By Fubini's theorem, we get

$$\overline{\nabla}_\varphi^* h(x) = \int_D \nabla_\varphi^* h(y, x)dy. \quad (2.10)$$

We associate to the Hamiltonian the following reflected BSPDE

$$\begin{cases} dp(t, x) &= -A_x^* p(t, x)dt - \left\{ \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial u}(t, x) + \overline{\nabla}_\varphi^* H_0(t, x) \right\} dt \\ &\quad - \left\{ \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial u}(t, x) + \overline{\nabla}_\varphi^* H_1(t, x) \right\} \xi(dt, x) \\ &\quad + q(t, x)dB(t); \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D, \\ p(T, x) &= \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(T, x) + \overline{\nabla}_\varphi^* g(T, x); \quad x \in D, \\ p(t, x) &= 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

where we have used the simplified notation

$$H_i(t, x) = H_i(t, x, u, \varphi, p, q)|_{u=u(t,x), \varphi=u(t, \cdot), p=p(t,x), q=q(t,x)}, \quad i = 0, 1$$

and similarly with  $g$ .

## 2.1 A sufficient maximum principle

We now formulate a sufficient version ( a verification theorem) of the maximum principle for the optimal control of the problem (2.1)-(2.5).

**Theorem 2.2 (Sufficient Maximum Principle)** *Suppose  $\widehat{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}$ , with corresponding  $\widehat{u}(t, x), \widehat{p}(t, x), \widehat{q}(t, x)$ . Suppose the functions  $(u, \varphi) \mapsto g(x, u, \varphi)$  and  $(u, \varphi, \xi) \mapsto H(t, x, u, \varphi, \widehat{p}(t, x), \widehat{q}(t, x))(dt, \xi(dt, dx))$  are concave for each  $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times D$ . Moreover, suppose that*

$$\widehat{\xi}(dt, x) \in \arg \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}} H(t, x, \widehat{u}(t, x), \widehat{u}(t, \cdot), \widehat{p}(t, x), \widehat{q}(t, x))(dt, \xi(dt, x));$$

*i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \{H(t, x, \widehat{u}(t, x), \widehat{u}(t, \cdot), \widehat{p}(t, x), \widehat{q}(t, x))\} \xi(dt, x) \\ & \leq \{H(t, x, \widehat{u}(t, x), \widehat{u}(t, \cdot), \widehat{p}(t, x), \widehat{q}(t, x))\} \widehat{\xi}(dt, x); \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

*Then  $\widehat{\xi}$  is an optimal singular control.*

Proof. Consider

$$J(\xi) - J(\widehat{\xi}) = I_1 + I_2 + I_3,$$

where

$$I_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \{h_0(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot)) - h_0(t, x, \widehat{u}(t, x), \widehat{u}(t, \cdot))\} dx dt \right],$$

$$I_2 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \{h_1(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot))\} \xi(dt, x) - \int_0^T \int_D h_1(t, x, \widehat{u}(t, x), \widehat{u}(t, \cdot)) \widehat{\xi}(dt, x) \right],$$

and

$$I_3 = \int_D \mathbb{E} [g(x, u(T, x), u(T, \cdot)) - g(x, \widehat{u}(T, x), \widehat{u}(T, \cdot))] dx. \quad (2.13)$$

By concavity on  $g$  together with the identity (2.9)-(2.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 & \leq \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial \widehat{g}}{\partial u}(T, x)(u(T, x) - \widehat{u}(T, x)) + \langle \nabla_{\varphi} \widehat{g}(T, x), u(T, \cdot) - \widehat{u}(T, \cdot) \rangle \right] dx \\ & = \int_D \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial \widehat{g}}{\partial u}(T, x)(u(T, x) - \widehat{u}(T, x)) + \overline{\nabla}_{\varphi}^* \widehat{g}(T, x)(u(T, x) - \widehat{u}(T, x)) \right] dx \\ & = \int_D \mathbb{E} [\widehat{p}(T, x)(u(T, x) - \widehat{u}(T, x))] dx \\ & = \int_D \mathbb{E} [\widehat{p}(T, x) \tilde{u}(T, x)] dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{u}(t, x) = u(t, x) - \widehat{u}(t, x); t \in [0, T]$ .

Applying the Itô formula to  $\widehat{p}(t, x)\widetilde{u}(t, x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 \leq & \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left( \widehat{p}(t, x) \left\{ A_x \widetilde{u}(t, x) + \widetilde{b}(t, x) \right\} - \widetilde{u}(t, x) A_x^* \widehat{p}(t, x) \right. \right. \\
& - \widetilde{u}(t, x) \left\{ \frac{\partial \widehat{H}_0}{\partial u}(t, x) + \nabla_\varphi^* \widehat{H}_0(t, x) \right\} + \widehat{q}(t, x) \widetilde{\sigma}(t, x) \Big) dx dt \\
& \left. + \int_0^T \int_D \left( \widehat{p}(t, x) f(t, x) \left( \xi(dt, x) - \widehat{\xi}(dt, x) \right) - \widetilde{u}(t, x) \left\{ \frac{\partial \widehat{H}_1}{\partial u}(t, x) + \nabla_\varphi^* \widehat{H}_1(t, x) \right\} \right) \xi(dt, x) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

By the first Green formula (see e.g. Wloka [19], page 258) there exist first order boundary differential operators  $A_1, A_2$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_D \{ \widehat{p}(t, x) A_x \widetilde{u}(t, x) - \widetilde{u}(t, x) A_x^* \widehat{p}(t, x) \} dx \\
& = \int_{\partial D} \{ \widehat{p}(t, x) A_1 \widetilde{u}(t, x) - \widetilde{u}(t, x) A_2 \widehat{p}(t, x) \} dS,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last integral is the surface integral over  $\partial D$ . We have that

$$\widetilde{u}(t, x) = \widehat{p}(t, x) \equiv 0, \tag{2.15}$$

for all  $(t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D$ .

Substituting (2.15) in (2.16), yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 \leq & \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left( \widehat{p}(t, x) \widetilde{b}(t, x) - \widetilde{u}(t, x) \left\{ \frac{\partial \widehat{H}_0}{\partial u}(t, x) + \nabla_\varphi^* \widehat{H}_0(t, x) \right\} + \widehat{q}(t, x) \widetilde{\sigma}(t, x) \right) dx dt \right. \\
& \left. + \int_0^T \int_D \left( \widehat{p}(t, x) f(t, x) \left( \xi(dt, x) - \widehat{\xi}(dt, x) \right) - \widetilde{u}(t, x) \left\{ \frac{\partial \widehat{H}_1}{\partial u}(t, x) + \nabla_\varphi^* \widehat{H}_1(t, x) \right\} \right) \xi(dt, x) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Using the definition of the Hamiltonian  $H$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 = & \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left( H_0(t, x) - \widehat{H}_0(t, x) \right) dx dt \right. \\
& \left. - \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \widehat{p}(t, x) \widetilde{b}(t, x) + \widehat{q}(t, x) \widetilde{\sigma}(t, x) \right\} dx dt \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Summing the above we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}
J(\xi) - J(\hat{\xi}) &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left( H_0(t, x) - \hat{H}_0(t, x) - \tilde{u}(t, x) \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{H}_0}{\partial u}(t, x) + \nabla_\varphi^* \hat{H}_0(t, x) \right\} \right) dx dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left( H_1(t, x) \xi(dt, x) - \hat{H}_1(t, x) \hat{\xi}(dt, x) - \tilde{u}(t, x) \left\{ \frac{\partial \hat{H}_1}{\partial u}(t, x) + \nabla_\varphi^* \hat{H}_1(t, x) \right\} \hat{\xi}(dt, x) \right) dx \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\langle \nabla_\xi \hat{H}(t, x), \xi(dt, x) - \hat{\xi}(dt, x) \right\rangle dx \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By the maximum condition of  $H$  (2.12), we have

$$J(\xi) - J(\hat{\xi}) \leq 0.$$

□

## 2.2 A necessary maximum principle

The concavity conditions in the sufficient maximum principle imposed on the involved coefficients are not always satisfied. Hence, we will derive now a necessary optimality conditions which do not require such an assumptions. We shall first need the following Lemmas:

For  $\xi \in \mathcal{A}$ , we let  $\mathcal{V}(\xi)$  denote the set of adapted processes  $\zeta(dt, x)$  of finite variation with respect to  $t$ , such that there exists  $\delta = \delta(\xi) > 0$ , such that  $\xi + y\zeta \in \mathcal{A}$  for all  $y \in [0, \delta]$ .

**Lemma 2.3** *Let  $\xi(dt, x) \in \mathcal{A}$  and choose  $\zeta(dt, x) \in \mathcal{V}(\xi)$ . Define the derivative process*

$$\mathcal{Z}(t, x) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (u^{\xi + \epsilon\zeta}(t, x) - u^\xi(t, x)). \quad (2.17)$$

*Then  $\mathcal{Z}$  satisfies the following singular linear SPDE*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d\mathcal{Z}(t, x) = A_x \mathcal{Z}(t, x) dt + \left( \frac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi b(t, x), \mathcal{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle \right) dt \\ \quad + \left( \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi \sigma(t, x), \mathcal{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle \right) dB(t) \\ \quad + f(t, x) \zeta(dt, x); \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times D, \\ \mathcal{Z}(t, x) = 0; \quad (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D, \\ \mathcal{Z}(0, x) = 0; \quad x \in D. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.18)$$

**Lemma 2.4** *Let  $\xi(dt, x) \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\zeta(dt, x) \in \mathcal{V}(\xi)$ . Put  $\eta = \xi + \epsilon\zeta; \epsilon \in [0, \delta(\xi)]$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (J(\xi + \epsilon\zeta) - J(\xi)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \{ f(t, x) p(t, x) + h_1(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot)) \} d\zeta(dt, x) \right].
\end{aligned}$$



Proof. By (2.4) and (2.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (J(\xi + \epsilon\zeta) - J(\xi)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial h_0}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi h_0(t, x), \mathcal{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle \right\} dx dt \right. \\
&+ \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(T, x) \mathcal{Z}(T, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi g(T, x), \mathcal{Z}(T, \cdot) \rangle \right\} dx \\
&+ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi h_1(T, x), \mathcal{Z}(T, \cdot) \rangle \right\} d\xi(t, x) \\
&+ \left. \int_0^T \int_D h_1(t, x) d\zeta(t, x) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial h_0}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* h_0(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) \right\} dx dt \right. \\
&+ \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(T, x) \mathcal{Z}(T, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* g(T, x) \mathcal{Z}(T, x) \right\} dx dt \\
&+ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* h_1(T, x) \mathcal{Z}(T, x) \right\} \xi(dt, x) dx \\
&+ \left. \int_0^T \int_D h_1(t, x) \zeta(dt, x) dx \right]. \tag{2.19}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the definition (2.6) of the Hamiltonian, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial h_0}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* h_0(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) \right\} dx dt \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \int_0^T \left\{ \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* H_0(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) \right\} dx dt \right. \\
&- \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ p(t, x) \left( \frac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* b(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) \right) \right. \\
&+ \left. \left. q(t, x) \left( \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* \sigma(t, x) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) \right) \right\} dx dt, \right. \tag{2.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the simplified notation

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u}(t, x) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial u}(t, x, u(t, x), u(t, \cdot), p(t, x), q(t, x))$$

etc.

Applying the Itô formula to  $p(T, x)\mathcal{Z}(T, x)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \left\{ \frac{\partial g}{\partial u}(T, x)\mathcal{Z}(T, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi g(T, x), \mathcal{Z}(T, \cdot) \rangle \right\} dx \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D p(T, x)\mathcal{Z}(T, x) dx \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \left\{ p(t, x) \left( A_x \mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \frac{\partial b}{\partial u}(t, x)\mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi b(t, x), \mathcal{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - A_x^* p(t, x)\mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \left( \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial u}(t, x)\mathcal{Z}(t, x) + \langle \nabla_\varphi \sigma(t, x), \mathcal{Z}(t, \cdot) \rangle \right) q(t, x) \right\} dx dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^T \int_D f(t, x)p(t, x)\zeta(dt, x) dx \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_D \int_0^T \left( \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial u}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* H_0(t, x) \right) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) dx dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \int_D \int_0^T \left( \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial u}(t, x) + \bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* H_1(t, x) \right) \mathcal{Z}(t, x) \xi(dt, x) dx \right]. \tag{2.21}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $p(t, x) = \mathcal{Z}(t, x) = 0$  for  $x \in \partial D$ , we deduce that

$$\int_D p(t, x)A_x \mathcal{Z}(t, x) dx = \int_D A_x^* p(t, x)\mathcal{Z}(t, x) dx.$$

Therefore, substituting (2.21) and (2.20) into (2.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (J(\xi + \epsilon\zeta) - J(\xi)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D \{f(t, x)p(t, x) + h_1(t, x)\} \zeta(dt, x) dx \right].
\end{aligned}$$

□

We can now state our necessary maximum principle:

**Theorem 2.5 (Necessary Maximum Principle)** (i) Suppose  $\xi^* \in \mathcal{A}$  is optimal, i.e.

$$\max_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}} J(\xi) = J(\xi^*). \tag{2.22}$$

Let  $u^*, (p^*, q^*)$  be the corresponding solution of (2.1) and (2.11), respectively, and assume that (2.17) holds with  $\xi = \xi^*$ . Then

$$f(t, x)p^*(t, x) + h_1(t, x, u^*(t, x), u^*(t, \cdot)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t, x \in [0, T] \times D, \text{ a.s.}, \tag{2.23}$$

and

$$\{f(t, x)p^*(t, x) + h_1(t, x, u^*(t, x), u^*(t, \cdot))\} \xi^*(dt, x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t, x \in [0, T] \times D, \text{ a.s.} \tag{2.24}$$

(ii) Conversely, suppose that there exists  $\hat{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}$ , such that the corresponding solutions  $\hat{u}(t, x)$ ,  $(\hat{p}(t, x), \hat{q}(t, x))$  of (2.1) and (2.11), respectively, satisfy

$$f(t, x)\hat{p}(t, x) + h_1(t, x, \hat{u}(t, x), \hat{u}(t, \cdot)) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } t, x \in [0, T] \times D, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.25)$$

and

$$\{f(t, x)\hat{p}(t, x) + h_1(t, x, \hat{u}(t, x), \hat{u}(t, \cdot))\} \hat{\xi}(dt, x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t, x \in [0, T] \times D, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.26)$$

Then  $\hat{\xi}$  is a directional sub-stationary point for  $J(\cdot)$ , in the sense that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left( J(\hat{\xi} + \epsilon\zeta) - J(\hat{\xi}) \right) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in \mathcal{V}(\hat{\xi}). \quad (2.27)$$

Proof. The proof is just a consequence of Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 3 in Øksendal *et al* [13].  $\square$

### 3 Application to Optimal Harvesting

We now return to the problem of optimal harvesting from a fish population in a lake  $D$  stated in the Introduction. Thus we suppose the density  $u(t, x)$  of the population at time  $t \in [0, T]$  and at the point  $x \in D$  is given by the stochastic reaction-diffusion equation

$$\begin{cases} du(t, x) = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(t, x) + \alpha \bar{u}(t, x) \right] dt + \beta u(t, x) dB(t) - \lambda_0 u(t, x) \xi(dt, x); & (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) > 0; & x \in D, \\ u(t, x) = u_1(t, x) \geq 0; & (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\lambda_0 > 0$  is a constant and, as in (1.1),

$$\bar{u}(t, x) = \frac{1}{V(K_\theta)} \int_{K_\theta} u(x + y) dy.$$

The performance criterion is assumed to be

$$J(\xi) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \int_0^T h_{10}(t, x) u(t, x) \xi(dt, x) dx + \int_D g_0(T, x) u(T, x) dx \right],$$

where  $h_{10} > 0$  and  $g_0 > 0$  are given deterministic functions. We can interpret  $\xi(dt, x)$  as the harvesting effort at  $x$ .

**Problem 3.1** We want to find  $\hat{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\sup_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}} J(\xi) = J(\hat{\xi})$ .

In this case the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, x, u, \bar{u}, p, q)(dt, \xi(dt, x)) \\ = (\alpha \bar{u}p + \beta uq)dt + [-\lambda_0 p + h_{10}(t, x)]u\xi(dt, x). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that for the map  $L : L^2(D) \mapsto L^2(D)$  given by  $L(u) = \bar{u}$  we know that

$$\bar{\nabla}_\varphi^* L = \frac{V((x + K_\theta) \cap D)}{V(K_\theta)}.$$

See Example 3.1 in Agram *et al* [1]. Therefore the adjoint equation is

$$\begin{cases} dp(t, x) = - \left[ \frac{1}{2} \Delta p(t, x) + \alpha p(t, x) \frac{V((x+K_\theta) \cap D)}{V(K_\theta)} + \beta q(t, x) \right] dt \\ \quad + [\lambda_0 - h_{10}(t, x)] \xi(dt, x) + q(t, x) dB(t, x); & (t, x) \in (0, T) \times D, \\ p(T, x) = g_0(T, x); & x \in D, \\ p(t, x) = 0; & (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \partial D. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

The variational inequalities for an optimal control  $\hat{\xi}(dt, x)$  and the associated  $\hat{p}$  are:

$$\begin{aligned} & [-\lambda_0 \hat{p}(t, x) + h_{10}(t, x)] \hat{u}(t, x) \xi(dt, x) \\ & \leq [-\lambda_0 \hat{p}(t, x) + h_{10}(t, x)] \hat{u}(t, x) \hat{\xi}(dt, x); \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times D, \text{ for all } \xi. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$u(t, x) > 0 \text{ for all } (t, x) \in [0, T] \times D. \quad (3.3)$$

Suppose this claim is proved. Then, choosing first  $\xi = 2\hat{\xi}$  and then  $\xi = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\xi}$  in the above we obtain that

$$\left[ \hat{p}(t, x) - \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_{10}(t, x) \right] \hat{\xi}(dt, x) = 0; \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times D.$$

In addition we get that

$$\left[ \hat{p}(t, x) - \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_{10}(t, x) \right] \hat{\xi}(dt, x) \leq 0;$$

which implies that  $\hat{p}(t, x) - \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_{10}(t, x) \leq 0$  always.

Summarising, we have proved the following:

**Theorem 3.2** *Suppose that  $\hat{u} > 0$  and  $(\hat{p}, \hat{\xi})$  satisfies the following variational inequality*

$$\max \left\{ \hat{p}(t, x) - \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_{10}(t, x), -\hat{\xi}(dt, x) \right\} = 0; \quad (t, x) \in [0, T] \times D. \quad (3.4)$$

*Then  $\hat{\xi}$  is an optimal singular control for the space-mean SPDE singular control problem (3.1)*

We see that this, together with (3.2) constitute a reflected BSPDE, albeit of a slightly different type than the one that will be discussed in the next section.

We summarize the above in the following:

**Theorem 3.3 (a)** *Suppose  $\xi(dt, x) \in \mathcal{A}$  is an optimal singular control for the harvesting problem*

$$\sup_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_D \int_0^T h_1(t, x) \xi(dt, x) dx + \int_D g_0(T, x) u(T, x) dx \right],$$

where  $u(t, x)$  is given by the SPDE (3.1). Then  $\xi(dt, x)$  solves the reflected BSPDE (3.2), (3.4).

**(b)** *Conversely, suppose  $(p, q, \xi)$  is a solution of the reflected BSPDE (3.2), (3.4). Then  $\xi(dt, x)$  is an optimal control for the problem to maximize the performance (1.2).*

Heuristically we can interpret the optimal harvesting strategy as follows:

- As long as  $p(t, x) < \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_1(t, x)$ , we do nothing.
- If  $p(t, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_1(t, x)$ , we harvest immediately from  $u(t, x)$  at a rate  $\xi(dt, x)$  which is exactly enough to prevent  $p(t, x)$  from dropping below  $\frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_1(t, x)$  in the next moment.
- If  $p(t, x) > \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_1(t, x)$ , we harvest immediately what is necessary to bring  $p(t, x)$  up to the level of  $\frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_1(t, x)$ .

*Remark 3.4* Note that if  $p(t, x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_{10}(t, x)$  and

$$\lambda_0 > h_{10}(t, x),$$

then an immediate harvesting of an amount  $\Delta\xi > 0$  from  $u(t, x)$  produces an immediate decrease in the process  $p(t, x)$  and hence pushes  $p(t, x)$  below  $\frac{1}{\lambda_0} h_{10}(t, x)$ . This follows from the comparison theorem for reflected BSPDEs of the type (3.2).

## 4 Existence and uniqueness of solutions of space-mean reflected backward SPDEs

Let  $W, H$  be two separable Hilbert spaces such that  $W$  is continuously, densely imbedded in  $H$ . Identifying  $H$  with its dual we have

$$W \subset H \cong H^* \subset W^*,$$

where we have denoted by  $W^*$  the topological dual of  $W$ . Let  $A$  be a bounded linear operator from  $W$  to  $W^*$  satisfying the following Gårding inequality (coercivity hypothesis): There exist constants  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$  so that

$$2\langle Au, u \rangle + \lambda \|u\|_H^2 \geq \alpha \|u\|_W^2; \quad \text{for all } u \in W, \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\langle Au, u \rangle = Au(u)$  denotes the action of  $Au \in W^*$  on  $u \in W$  and  $\|\cdot\|_H$  (respectively  $\|\cdot\|_W$ ) the norm associated to the Hilbert space  $H$  (respectively  $W$ ). We will also use the following spaces:

- $L^2(D)$  is the set of all Lebesgue measurable  $Y : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , such that

$$\|Y\|_{L^2(D)} := \left( \int_D |Y(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

- $L^2(H)$  is the set of  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable  $H$ -valued random variables  $\varsigma$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\|\varsigma\|_H^2] < \infty$ .

We let  $W := W^{1,2}(D)$  and  $H = L^2(D)$ .

Denote by  $L(t, x)$  the barrier which is a measurable function that is differentiable in time  $t$  and twice differentiable in space  $x$ , such that

$$\int_0^T \int_D L'(t, x)^2 dx dt < \infty, \quad \int_0^T \int_D |\Delta L(t, x)|^2 dx dt < \infty.$$

$\eta$  is a  $H$ -valued continuous process, nonnegative, nondecreasing in  $t$  and  $\eta(0, x) = 0$ .

We now consider the adjoint equation (2.11) as a reflected backward stochastic evolution equation

$$\begin{cases} dY(t, x) = -AY(t, x)dt - F(t, Y(t, x), \bar{Y}(t, x), Z(t, x), \bar{Z}(t, x))dt \\ \quad + Z(t, x)dB(t) - \eta(dt, x), t \in (0, T), \\ Y(t, x) \geq L(t, x), \\ \int_0^T \int_D (Y(t, x) - L(t, x))\eta(dt, x)dx = 0, \\ Y(T, x) = \phi(x); \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $Y(t, x)$  stands for the  $W$ -valued continuous process  $Y(t, x)$  and the solution of equation (4.2) is understood as an equation in the dual space  $W^*$  of  $W$ .

We mean by  $dY(t, x)$  the differential operator with respect to  $t$ , while  $A_x$  is the partial differential operator with respect to  $x$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}(t, x) &= G(x, Y) = \frac{1}{V} \int_{K_\theta} Y(x + \rho) d\rho, \\ \bar{Z}(t, x) &= G(x, Z) = \frac{1}{V} \int_{K_\theta} Z(x + \rho) d\rho. \end{aligned}$$

The following result is essential due to Agram *et al* [1]:

**Lemma 4.1** *For all  $\varphi \in H$  we have*

$$\|G(\cdot, \varphi)\|_H \leq \|\varphi\|_H. \quad (4.3)$$

We shall now state and prove our main result of existence and uniqueness of solutions to reflected BSPDE.

**Theorem 4.2 (Existence and uniqueness of solutions)** *The space-mean reflected BSPDE (4.2) has a unique solution  $(Y(t, x), Z(t, x), \eta(t, x)) \in W \times L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m) \times H$ -valued progressively measurable process, provided that the following assumptions hold:*

(i) *The terminal condition  $\phi$  is  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable and satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} [ \|\phi\|_H^2 ] < \infty.$$

(ii) *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|F(t, y_1, \bar{y}_1, z_1, \bar{z}_1) - F(t, y_2, \bar{y}_2, z_2, \bar{z}_2)\|_H \\ & \leq C (\|y_1 - y_2\|_H + \|\bar{y}_1 - \bar{y}_2\|_H + \|z_1 - z_2\|_H + \|\bar{z}_1 - \bar{z}_2\|_H), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $t, y_i, \bar{y}_i, z_i, \bar{z}_i; i = 1, 2$ .

Proof. For the proof of the theorem, we introduce the penalized backward SPDEs:

$$\begin{cases} dY^n(t, x) = -AY^n(t)dt - F(t, Y^n(t, x), \bar{Y}^n(t, x), Z^n(t, x), \bar{Z}^n(t, x))dt \\ \quad + Z^n(t, x)dB(t) - n(Y^n(t, x) - L(t, x))^- dt, \quad t \in (0, T), \\ Y^n(T, x) = \phi(x) \quad \text{a.s.} \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

According to Agram *et al* [1], the solution  $(Y^n, Z^n)$  of the above equation (4.4) exists and is unique. We are going to show that  $(Y^n, Z^n)_{n \geq 1}$  forms a Cauchy sequence, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|Y^n(t) - Y^m(t)\|_H^2 \right] = 0, \\ & \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|Y^n(t) - Y^m(t)\|_W^2 dt \right] = 0, \\ & \lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \|Z^n(t) - Z^m(t)\|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 dt \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Itô's formula, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Y^n(t) - Y^m(t)|_H^2 \\
&= 2 \int_t^T \langle Y^n(s) - Y^m(s), A(Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)) \rangle ds \\
&+ 2 \int_t^T \langle Y^n(s) - Y^m(s), \\
&F(s, Y^n(s), \bar{Y}^n(s), Z^n(s), \bar{Z}^n(s)) - F(s, Y^m(s), \bar{Y}^m(s), Z^m(s), \bar{Z}^m(s)) \rangle ds \\
&- 2 \int_t^T \langle Y^n(s) - Y^m(s), Z^n(s) - Z^m(s) \rangle dB(s) \\
&+ 2 \int_t^T \langle Y^n(s) - Y^m(s), n(u^n(s) - L(s))^- - m(Y^m(s) - L(s))^- \rangle ds \\
&- \int_t^T |Z^n(s) - Z^m(s)|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate each of the terms on the right side:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \int_t^T \langle Y^n(s) - Y^m(s), A(Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)) \rangle ds \\
& \leq \lambda \int_t^T \|Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)\|_H^2 ds - \alpha \int_t^T \|Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)\|_V^2 ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

By the Lipschitz continuity of  $b$  and the inequality  $ab \leq \varepsilon a^2 + C_\varepsilon b^2$ , together with inequality (4.3), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \int_t^T \langle Y^n(s) - Y^m(s), \\
&F(s, Y^n(s), \bar{Y}^n(s), Z^n(s), \bar{Z}^n(s)) - F(s, Y^m(s), \bar{Y}^m(s), Z^m(s), \bar{Z}^m(s)) \rangle ds \\
& \leq C \int_t^T |Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)|_H^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T |Z^n(s) - Z^m(s)|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

It follows from (4.5) and (4.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[|Y^n(t) - Y^m(t)|_W^2] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T |Z^n(s) - Z^m(s)|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 ds \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \|Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)\|_W^2 ds \right] \\
& \leq C \int_t^T \mathbb{E}[|Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)|_W^2] ds + C' \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m} \right).
\end{aligned}$$



Gronwall inequality, yields

$$\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[|Y^n(t) - Y^m(t)|_H^2] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T |Z^n(s) - Z^m(s)|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 ds \right] \right\} = 0, \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \|Y^n(s) - Y^m(s)\|_H^2 ds \right] = 0.$$

By inequality (4.7) and the Burkholder inequality we get

$$\lim_{n,m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y^n(t) - Y^m(t)|_H^2 \right] = 0.$$

Under the conditions of Theorem 4.2 and by Lemma 5 in Øksendal *et al* [13], there exists a constant  $C$ , such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D ((Y^n(t, x) - L(t, x))^-)^2 dx dt \right] \leq \frac{C}{n^2}. \quad (4.8)$$

Denote by  $Y(t, x)$ ,  $Z(t, x)$  the limit of  $Y^n$  and  $Z^n$ , respectively. Put

$$\bar{\eta}^n(t, x) = n(Y^n(t, x) - L(t, x))^-.$$

Inequality (4.8) implies that  $\bar{\eta}^n(t, x)$  admits a non-negative weak limit, denoted by  $\bar{\eta}(t, x)$ , in the following Hilbert space:

$$\bar{H} = \left\{ h; \quad h \text{ is a } H\text{-valued adapted process, such that } \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T |h(s)|_H^2 ds \right] < \infty \right\},$$

with inner product

$$\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle_{\bar{H}} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D h_1(t, x) h_2(t, x) dt dx \right].$$

Set  $\eta(t, x) = \int_0^t \bar{\eta}(s, x) ds$ . Then  $\eta$  is a continuous  $H$ -valued process which is increasing in  $t$ . Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (4.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Y(t, x) &= \phi(x) + \int_t^T AY(s, x) ds + \int_t^T F(s, Y(s, x), \bar{Y}(s, x), Z(s, x), \bar{Z}(s, x)) ds \\ &\quad - \int_t^T Z(s, x) dB(s) + \eta(T, x) - \eta(t, x); \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Inequality (4.8) and the Fatou Lemma imply that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \int_D ((Y(s, x) - L(s, x))^-)^2 dx ds \right] = 0$ . In view of the continuity of  $Y$  in  $t$ , we conclude  $Y(t, x) \geq L(t, x)$  a.e. in  $x$ , for every  $t \geq 0$ .

Combining the strong convergence of  $Y^n$  and the weak convergence of  $\bar{\eta}^n$ , we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D (Y(s, x) - L(s, x)) \eta(dt, x) dx \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D (Y(s, x) - L(s, x)) \bar{\eta}(t, x) dt dx \right] \\
&\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^T \int_D (Y^n(s, x) - L(s, x)) \bar{\eta}^n(t, x) dt dx \right] \leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Hence,

$$\int_0^T \int_D (Y(s, x) - L(s, x)) \eta(dt, x) dx = 0, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We have shown that  $(Y, Z, \eta)$  is a solution to the reflected backward SPDE (4.2).

**Uniqueness.** Let  $(Y_1, Z_1, \eta_1)$ ,  $(Y_2, Z_2, \eta_2)$  be two such solutions to equation (4.2). By Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |Y_1(t) - Y_2(t)|_H^2 \\
&= 2 \int_t^T \langle Y_1(s) - Y_2(s), \Delta(Y_1(s) - Y_2(s)) \rangle ds \\
&+ 2 \int_t^T \langle Y_1(s) - Y_2(s), \\
&F(s, Y_1(s), \bar{Y}_1(s), Z_1(s), \bar{Z}_1(s)) - F(s, Y_2(s), \bar{Y}_2(s), Z_2(s), \bar{Z}_2(s)) \rangle ds \\
&- 2 \int_t^T \langle Y_1(s) - Y_2(s), Z_1(s) - Z_2(s) \rangle dB(s) \\
&+ 2 \int_t^T \langle Y_1(s) - Y_2(s), \eta_1(ds) - \eta_2(ds) \rangle \\
&- \int_t^T |Z_1(s) - Z_2(s)|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Similar to the proof of existence, we have

$$2 \int_t^T \langle Y_1(s) - Y_2(s), A(Y_1(s) - Y_2(s)) \rangle ds \leq 0, \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \int_t^T \langle Y_1(s) - Y_2(s), \\
&F(s, Y_1(s), \bar{Y}_1(s), Z_1(s), \bar{Z}_1(s)) - F(s, Y_2(s), \bar{Y}_2(s), Z_2(s), \bar{Z}_2(s)) \rangle ds \\
&\leq C \int_t^T |Y_1(s) - Y_2(s)|_H^2 ds + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^T |Z_1(s) - Z_2(s)|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 ds
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \langle Y_1(s) - Y_2(s), \eta_1(ds) - \eta_2(ds) \rangle \right] \\
&= 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \int_D (Y_1(s, x) - L(s, x)) \eta_1(ds, x) dx \right] \\
&\quad - 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \int_D (Y_1(s, x) - L(s, x)) \eta_2(ds, x) dx \right] \\
&\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \int_D (Y_2(s, x) - L(s, x)) \eta_2(ds, x) dx \right] \\
&\quad - 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T \int_D (Y_2(s, x) - L(s, x)) \eta_1(ds, x) dx \right] \\
&\leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Combining (4.11)-(4.14) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[|Y_1(t) - Y_2(t)|_H^2] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^T |Z_1(s) - Z_2(s)|_{L^2(D, \mathbb{R}^m)}^2 ds \right] \\
&\leq C \int_t^T \mathbb{E}[|Y_1(s) - Y_2(s)|_H^2] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Appealing to the Gronwall inequality, this implies

$$Y_1 = Y_2, \quad Z_1 = Z_2$$

which further gives  $\eta_1 = \eta_2$  from the equation they satisfy.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Agram, Nacira, Hilbert, Astrid & Øksendal, Bernt: SPDEs with Space-Mean Dynamics. arXiv:1807.07303 (2018).
- [2] Bensoussan, A. (1983): Maximum principle and dynamic programming approaches of the optimal control of partially observed diffusions. *Stochastics* 9(3), 169-222.
- [3] Bensoussan, A. (1991): Stochastic maximum principle for systems with partial information and application to the separation principle. *Applied Stochastic Analysis*. Gordon and Breach, 157-172.
- [4] Bensoussan, A. (2004): *Stochastic Control of Partially Observable Systems*. Cambridge University Press.

- [5] Donati-Martin, Catherine & Pardoux, Etienne (1993): White noise driven SPDEs with reflection. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 95(1),1-24.
- [6] Holden, H. , Øksendal, B., Ubøe, J. & Zhang, T. (2010): *Stochastic Partial Differential Equations. A Modelling, White Noise Functional Approach*. Springer Universitext, Second Edition.
- [7] Hu, Y., Ma, J., & Yong, J. (2002): On semi-linear degenerate backward stochastic partial differential equations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 123(3), 381-411.
- [8] Hu, Y., & Peng, S. (1990): Maximum principle for semilinear stochastic evolution control systems. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 33(3-4), 159-180.
- [9] Hairer, M. (2009): *An Introduction to Stochastic PDEs*. Lecture Notes.
- [10] Ma, J., & Yong, J. (1999): On linear, degenerate backward stochastic partial differential equations. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 113(2), 135-170.
- [11] Øksendal, B. (2005): Optimal control of stochastic partial differential equations. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications* 23, 165-179.
- [12] Øksendal, B., Proske F. and Zhang T. (2005) : Backward stochastic partial differential equations with jumps and application to optimal control of random jump fields. *Stochastics* 77(5), 381-399.
- [13] Øksendal, B., Sulem, A., & Zhang, T. (2013): Singular control and optimal stopping of SPDEs, and backward SPDEs with reflection. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(2), 464-486.
- [14] Pardoux, É. (1980): Stochastic partial differential equations and filtering of diffusion processes. *Stochastics*, 3(1-4), 127-167.
- [15] Pardoux, É. (1991): Filtrage non linéaire et équations aux dérivées partielles stochastiques associées. In *Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989* (pp. 68-163). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [16] Da Prato, G., & Zabczyk, J. (2014): *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*. Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Prévôt, C., & Röckner, M. (2007): *A Concise Course on Stochastic Partial Differential Equations*. Springer.
- [18] Röckner, M., & Zhang, T. (2007): Stochastic evolution equations of jump type: existence, uniqueness and large deviation principles. *Potential Analysis*, 26(3), 255-279.
- [19] Wloka, J.(1987): *Partial Differential Equations*.Cambridge University Press.