

# Viscosity Solutions of Second Order Path-Dependent Partial Differential Equations and Applications

Shanjian Tang\* Jianjun Zhou†

## Abstract

In this article, a notion of viscosity solutions is introduced for fully nonlinear second order path-dependent partial differential equations in the spirit of [Zhou, *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33 (2023), 5564-5612]. We prove the existence, comparison principle, consistency and stability for the viscosity solutions. Application to path-dependent stochastic differential games is given.

**Key Words:** Path-dependent partial differential equations; Viscosity solutions; Backward stochastic differential equations; Comparison principle; Stochastic differential games

**2020 AMS Subject Classification:** 93E20; 60H30; 49L20; 49L25.

## 1 Introduction

This paper studies viscosity solutions of the following fully nonlinear path-dependent partial differential equation (PPDE):

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}V(\gamma_t) := \partial_t V(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, V(\gamma_t), \partial_x V(\gamma_t), \partial_{xx} V(\gamma_t)) = 0, & (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda, \\ V(\gamma_T) = \phi(\gamma_T), & \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here,  $\Lambda_t$  is the set of all continuous  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued functions  $\gamma$  defined over  $[0, t]$ , and let  $\Lambda^s = \bigcup_{t \in [s, T]} \Lambda_t$  and  $\Lambda$  denote  $\Lambda^0$ ; the pathwise (or functional or Dupire; see [6, 3, 4]) derivatives  $\partial_t, \partial_x$  and  $\partial_{xx}$  are defined through a functional Itô formula initiated by [6] (see also [3, 4]). Such equations arise naturally in many applications. For example, the dynamic programming equation associated with a stochastic control problem of non-Markov diffusions (see [8, 19]) and the one associated with a stochastic differential game with non-Markov dynamics (see [15, 17]) both fall in the class of (1.1).

Studies of the path-dependant Bellman equation are referred to Peng [14], and the series of papers: Ekren, Keller, Touzi and Zhang [7] and Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [8, 9], which developed a notion of viscosity solutions for the path-dependant Bellman equation in terms of a nonlinear expectation. The second author [19] proposed a notion of viscosity solutions for the path-dependant Bellman equation in the Crandall-Lions framework, which is further used in this paper, and established its wellposedness: existence, uniqueness, consistency and stability. The main innovation of our approach is that, due to the lack of regularity of the supremum norm  $\|\cdot\|_0$ , we construct a smooth gauge-type functional which is equivalent to  $\|\cdot\|_0^6$ .

---

\*Institute of Mathematical Finance and Department of Finance and Control Sciences, School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, P. R. China, sjtang@fudan.edu.cn. This author is partially supported by National Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11631004) and National Key R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2018YFA0703903).

†College of Science, Northwest A&F University, Yangling 712100, Shaanxi, P. R. China, zhoujianjun@nwsuaf.edu.cn.

Fleming and Souganidis [12] first studied the zero-sum stochastic differential games (SDGs) and showed that the lower and upper game values are the viscosity solutions of the corresponding Bellman-Isaacs equations and coincide under the Isaacs condition. Since then, a lot of work followed the approach in [12]. Buckdahn and Li [2] generalized the result in [12] with the help of the theory of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs). Pham and Zhang [15] and Possamai, Touzi and Zhang [16] studied the game value of zero-sum path-dependent SDGs (PSDGs) in weak formulation by the dynamic programming principle and the viscosity solution theory of path-dependent Isaacs equation. Zhang [17] considered the zero-sum PSDGs and showed that the existence of game values under Isaacs condition utilizing a series of approximate state dependent games and their viscosity solution theory.

Our first objective in this paper is to extend the theory of Crandall-Lions viscosity solutions to general fully nonlinear PPDE (1.1). We adopt the notion of viscosity solutions introduced in Zhou [19] and give assumptions to ensure the wellposedness. Similar to Zhou [19], we overcome the difficulty that the supremum norm is not differentiable, and prove the comparison principle of viscosity solutions. The main difference from Zhou [19] is that we prove the existence of viscosity solutions with the Peron's method, while Zhou [19] proved the existence of viscosity solutions with the value function of the optimal control problem.

An alternative objective of the paper is to apply our results to PSDGs and show that the upper and the lower value functionals are the unique viscosity solutions of the upper and the lower path-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equations (PHJBIEs) when the coefficients are uniformly Lipschitz in the path function under  $\|\cdot\|_0$ . We remark that, Pham and Zhang [15] proved the uniqueness only when the diffusion coefficient is uniformly non-degenerate and the dimension  $d$  is either 1 or 2; Possamai, Touzi and Zhang [16] did not consider the uniqueness of viscosity solutions; and Zhang [17] did not study the existence and uniqueness of viscosity solutions. Then none of these results in the above papers are directly applicable to our case.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the following section, we provide the notations of pathwise derivatives introduced in [4] and [6], a modification of Ekeland-Borwein-Preiss variational principle and the smooth gauge-type functions  $\overline{\Upsilon}_0^m$  which are useful in what follows. In Section 3, we define classical and viscosity solutions to our PPDE (1.1) and prove the existence of viscosity solutions. The consistency with the notion of classical solutions and the stability result are also given. Section 4 is devoted to proof of the comparison principle of viscosity solutions to PPDE (1.1). In Section 5, we apply our results to PSDGs and show that the upper and the lower value functionals are the unique viscosity solutions of the upper and the lower PHJBIEs.

## 2 Preliminaries

2.1. *Pathwise derivatives.* For the vectors  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the scalar product is denoted by  $(x, y)_{\mathbb{R}^d}$  and the Euclidean norm  $(x, x)_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  is denoted by  $|x|$  (we use the same symbol  $|\cdot|$  to denote the Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , for any  $k \in \mathbf{N}^+$ ). If  $A$  is a vector or a matrix, its transpose is denoted by  $A^\top$ ; For a matrix  $A$ , denote its operator norm and Hilbert-Schmidt norm by  $|A|$  and  $|A|_2$ , respectively. Denote by  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the set of all  $(d \times d)$  symmetric matrices. Let  $T > 0$  be a fixed number. For each  $t \in [0, T]$ , let  $\Lambda_t := C([0, t], \mathbb{R}^d)$  be the set of all continuous  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued functions defined over  $[0, t]$ . We denote  $\Lambda^t = \bigcup_{s \in [t, T]} \Lambda_s$  and let  $\Lambda$  denote  $\Lambda^0$ . We define a norm on  $\Lambda_t$  and a metric on  $\Lambda$  as follows: for any  $0 \leq t \leq \bar{t} \leq T$  and  $\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}} \in \Lambda$ ,

$$\|\gamma_t\|_0 := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\gamma_t(s)|, \quad d_\infty(\gamma_t, \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}) = d_\infty(\bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}, \gamma_t) := |t - \bar{t}| + \|\gamma_{t, \bar{t}} - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}\|_0, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\gamma_{t,\bar{t}}(s) := \gamma_t(s)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t)}(s) + \gamma_{\bar{t}}(s)\mathbf{1}_{[t,\bar{t}]}(s), \quad s \in [0, \bar{t}].$$

In the sequel, for notational simplicity, we use  $\|\gamma_t - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}\|_0$  to denote  $\|\gamma_{t,\bar{t}} - \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{t}}\|_0$ . Then  $(\Lambda_t, \|\cdot\|_0)$  is a Banach space and  $(\Lambda^t, d_\infty)$  is a complete metric space.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $f : \Lambda^t \rightarrow K$  be given for some Hilbert space  $K$ .

(i) We say  $f \in C^0(\Lambda^t, K)$  (resp.,  $f \in USC^0(\Lambda^t, K)$ ,  $f \in LSC^0(\Lambda^t, K)$ ) if  $f$  is continuous (resp., upper semicontinuous, lower semicontinuous) in  $\gamma_s$  on  $\Lambda^t$  under  $d_\infty$ .

(ii) We say  $f \in C_p^0(\Lambda^t, K) \subset C^0(\Lambda^t, K)$  if  $f$  grows in a polynomial way.

For notational simplicity, we abbreviate  $C^0(\Lambda^t, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $USC^0(\Lambda^t, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $LSC^0(\Lambda^t, \mathbb{R})$  and  $C_p^0(\Lambda^t, \mathbb{R})$  as  $C^0(\Lambda^t)$ ,  $USC^0(\Lambda^t)$ ,  $LSC^0(\Lambda^t)$  and  $C_p^0(\Lambda^t)$ , respectively.

We now define the path derivatives via the functional Itô formula, which is initiated by Dupire [6], and plays a crucial role in this paper.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $t \in [0, T]$  be given. We say  $f \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^t)$  if  $f \in C_p^0(\Lambda^t)$  and there exist  $\partial_t f \in C_p^0(\Lambda^t)$ ,  $\partial_x f \in C_p^0(\Lambda^t, \mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\partial_{xx} f \in C_p^0(\Lambda^t, \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  such that, for any continuous adapted process  $X$  on  $[0, T]$  which is a semi-martingale on  $[t, T]$ ,

$$f(X_s) = f(X_t) + \int_t^s \partial_t f(X_l) dl + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^s \partial_{xx} f(X_l) d\langle X \rangle(l) + \int_t^s \partial_x f(X_l) dX(l), \quad s \in [t, T], \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.2)$$

Here and in the following, for every  $s \in [0, T]$ ,  $X(s)$  denotes the value of  $X$  at time  $s$ , and  $X_s$  the whole history path of  $X$  from time 0 to  $s$ .

We remark that the above  $\partial_t f, \partial_x f, \partial_{xx} f$ , if they exist, are unique. In fact, for every  $(\hat{t}, \gamma_{\hat{t}}) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ , let

$$X(s) = \gamma_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) + \int_{\hat{t}}^s \alpha dl + \int_{\hat{t}}^s \beta dW(l), \quad s \in [\hat{t}, T],$$

and  $X(s) = \gamma_{\hat{t}}(s)$ ,  $s \in [0, \hat{t})$ , where  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  be a  $n$ -dimensional standard Wiener process. Then  $X(\cdot)$  is a continuous semi-martingale on  $[t, T]$ . First, let  $\alpha = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\beta = \mathbf{0}$ , together with the required regularity  $\partial_t f \in C_p^0(\Lambda^t)$  we get

$$\partial_t f(\gamma_{\hat{t}}) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0, h > 0} \frac{1}{h} \left[ f(\gamma_{\hat{t}, \hat{t}+h}) - f(\gamma_{\hat{t}}) \right], \quad (\hat{t}, \gamma_{\hat{t}}) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda. \quad (2.3)$$

Here and in the sequel, for notational simplicity, we use  $\mathbf{0}$  to denote the element or the function which is identically equal to zero. Next, let  $\beta = \mathbf{0}$ , by the continuity of  $\partial_x f$  and the arbitrariness of  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have the uniqueness of  $\partial_x f$ . Finally, let  $\alpha = \mathbf{0}$ , by the continuity and symmetry of  $\partial_{xx} f$  and the arbitrariness of  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ , we see that  $\partial_{xx} f$  is also unique.

**2.2. Ekeland-Borwein-Preiss variational principle.** In this subsection, we introduce a modification of Ekeland-Borwein-Preiss variational principle (see Theorem 2.5.2 in Borwein & Zhu [1]) which plays a crucial role in the proof of the comparison principle. We firstly recall the definition of a gauge-type function for the specific set  $\Lambda^t$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $t \in [0, T]$  be fixed. We say that a continuous functional  $\lambda : \Lambda^t \times \Lambda^t \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  is a gauge-type function on  $\Lambda^t$  provided that:

(i)  $\lambda(\gamma_s, \gamma_s) = 0$  for all  $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t$ ,

(ii) we have

$$\lim_{\lambda(\gamma_s, \eta_t) \rightarrow 0} d_\infty(\gamma_s, \eta_t) = 0.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** (see Lemma 2.13 in Zhou [19]) Let  $t \in [0, T]$  be fixed and let  $f : \Lambda^t \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an upper semicontinuous functional bounded from above. Suppose that  $\lambda$  is a gauge-type function on  $\Lambda^t$  and  $\{\delta_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  is a sequence of positive number, and suppose that  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $(t_0, \gamma_{t_0}^0) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t$  satisfy

$$f(\gamma_{t_0}^0) \geq \sup_{(s, \gamma_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t} f(\gamma_s) - \varepsilon.$$

Then there exist  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t$  and a sequence  $\{(t_i, \gamma_{t_i}^i)\}_{i \geq 1} \subset [t, T] \times \Lambda^t$  such that

(i)  $\lambda(\gamma_{t_0}^0, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta_0}$ ,  $\lambda(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i \delta_0}$  and  $t_i \uparrow \hat{t}$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ ,

(ii)  $f(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_i \lambda(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \geq f(\gamma_{t_0}^0)$ , and

(iii)  $f(\gamma_s) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_i \lambda(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_s) < f(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_i \lambda(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  for all  $(s, \gamma_s) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}} \setminus \{(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})\}$ .

**2.3. Functionals  $\Upsilon^m$ .** In this subsection we introduce the functionals  $\Upsilon^m$ , which are the key to proving the comparison principle and stability of viscosity solutions.

For every  $m \in \mathbf{N}^+$ , introduce

$$\Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) := \frac{(\|\gamma_t\|_0^{2m} - |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m})^3}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^{4m}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\|\gamma_t\|_0 \neq 0\}} + 3|\gamma_t(t)|^{2m}, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda;$$

$$\Upsilon_0^m(\gamma_t, \eta_s) := \Upsilon^m(\gamma_{t \vee s} - \eta_{s \vee t}), \quad (t, \gamma_t), (s, \eta_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda;$$

$$\bar{\Upsilon}_0^m(\gamma_t, \eta_s) := \Upsilon_0^m(\gamma_t, \eta_s) + |s - t|^2, \quad (t, \gamma_t), (s, \eta_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda.$$

For simplicity, we let  $\Upsilon$ ,  $\Upsilon_0$  and  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0$  denote  $\Upsilon^3$ ,  $\Upsilon_0^3$  and  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0^3$ , respectively. Combining Theorem 2.3 and Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 and 3.4 in [19], we have

**Lemma 2.5.** For any integer  $m \geq 2$ ,  $\Upsilon^m(\cdot) \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda)$  and

$$\partial_t \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) = 0; \tag{2.4}$$

$$\partial_x \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) = 6m \left( 1 - \frac{(\|\gamma_t\|_0^{2m} - |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m})^2}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^{4m}} \right) |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m-2} \gamma_t(t) \mathbf{1}_{\{\|\gamma_t\|_0 \neq 0\}}; \tag{2.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) &= \left[ \frac{24m^2 (\|\gamma_t\|_0^{2m} - |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m}) |\gamma_t(t)|^{4m-4} \gamma_t(t) (\gamma_t(t))^\top}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^{4m}} \right. \\ &\quad + 12m(m-1) \left( 1 - \frac{(\|\gamma_t\|_0^{2m} - |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m})^2}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^{4m}} \right) |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m-4} \gamma_t(t) (\gamma_t(t))^\top \\ &\quad \left. + 6m \left( 1 - \frac{(\|\gamma_t\|_0^{2m} - |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m})^2}{\|\gamma_t\|_0^{4m}} \right) |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m-2} I \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{\|\gamma_t\|_0 \neq 0\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, the following estimates hold: for any  $(t, \gamma_t, \eta_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \Lambda$ ,

$$|\partial_x \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t)| \leq 6m |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m-1}, \quad |\partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t)| \leq 6m(6m-1) |\gamma_t(t)|^{2m-2}; \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\|\gamma_t\|_0^{2m} \leq \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) \leq 3\|\gamma_t\|_0^{2m}, \quad (\Upsilon^m(\gamma_t + \eta_t))^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq (\Upsilon^m(\gamma_t))^{\frac{1}{2m}} + (\Upsilon^m(\eta_t))^{\frac{1}{2m}}. \tag{2.8}$$

Finally, for every  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a gauge-type function on complete metric space  $(\Lambda^t, d_\infty)$ .

### 3 Viscosity solutions to PPDEs: Existence.

In this section, we consider the second order path-dependent partial differential equation (PPDE) (1.1). As usual, we start with classical solutions. For every fixed  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ , define

$$B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) := \{\eta_s : s \geq \hat{t}, d_\infty(\eta_s, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) < r\}.$$

It is clear that  $\Lambda^{\hat{t}} = B_\infty(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  for every  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ .

**Definition 3.1.** (Classical solution) For every fixed  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ , A functional  $v \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$  is called a classical solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) to the PPDE (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  if the terminal condition,  $v(\gamma_T) =$  (resp.,  $\leq, \geq$ )  $\phi(\gamma_T)$  for all  $\gamma_T \in B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  is satisfied, and

$$\mathcal{L}v(\gamma_t) = (\text{resp. } \geq, \leq) 0, \quad \forall (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}).$$

In what follows, by a *modulus of continuity*, we mean a continuous function  $\rho : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , with  $\rho(0) = 0$  and subadditivity:  $\rho(t+s) \leq \rho(t) + \rho(s)$ , for all  $t, s > 0$ ; by a *local modulus of continuity*, we mean a continuous function  $\rho : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , with the properties that, for each  $r \geq 0$ ,  $t \rightarrow \rho(t, r)$  is a modulus of continuity and  $\rho$  is non-decreasing in second variable.

We will make the following assumptions about the function  $\mathbf{F} : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Hypothesis 3.2.** (i)  $\mathbf{F}$  is continuous on  $\Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

(ii) There exists a constant  $\nu \geq 0$  such that, for every  $(t, \gamma_t, r, p, X) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, r, p, X) - \mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, s, p, X) \geq \nu(s - r) \quad \text{when } r \leq s.$$

(iii) For every  $(t, \gamma_t, r, p) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, r, p, X) \leq \mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, r, p, Y) \quad \text{when } X \leq Y.$$

(iv) There exists a local modulus of continuity  $\rho$  such that, for every  $(t, \gamma_t, \eta_t, r) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}$ , for any  $\beta > 0$ , for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying

$$-3\beta \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix} \leq 3\beta \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, r, \beta(\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)), X) - \mathbf{F}(\eta_t, r, \beta(\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)), -Y) \\ & \leq \rho(\beta \|\gamma_t - \eta_t\|_0^2 + \|\gamma_t - \eta_t\|_0, |r| \vee \|\gamma_t\|_0 \vee \|\eta_t\|_0). \end{aligned}$$

(v) There exists a constant  $M_F \geq 0$  such that

$$|\mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, r, p + q, X + Y) - \mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, r, p, X)| \leq M_F[(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0)|q| + (1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0^2)|Y|].$$

Now we turn to viscosity solutions. For every  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$  and  $w \in C^0(\Lambda)$ , define

$$\mathcal{A}^+(\gamma_t, w) := \left\{ \varphi \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^t) : 0 = (w - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = \sup_{(s, \eta_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda} (w - \varphi)(\eta_s) \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}^-(\gamma_t, w) := \left\{ \varphi \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^t) : 0 = (w - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = \inf_{(s, \eta_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda} (w - \varphi)(\eta_s) \right\}.$$

**Definition 3.3.**  $w \in USC^0(\Lambda)$  (resp.,  $w \in LSC^0(\Lambda)$ ) is called a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to (1.1) if the terminal condition,  $w(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T)$  (resp.,  $w(\gamma_T) \geq \phi(\gamma_T)$ ) for all  $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$  is satisfied, and whenever  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\gamma_s, w)$  (resp.,  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^-(\gamma_s, w)$ ) with  $(s, \gamma_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ , we have

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi(\gamma_s) \geq 0 \quad (\text{resp.}, \quad \mathcal{L}\varphi(\gamma_s) \leq 0).$$

$w \in C^0(\Lambda)$  is said to be a viscosity solution to PPDE (1.1) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution.

We are now in a position to give the existence result for the viscosity solutions.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let Hypothesis 3.2 (i) be satisfied. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a family of viscosity subsolution of (1.1). Suppose that there exist a local modulus of continuity  $\rho$  and a constant  $\Delta > 0$  such that, for every  $(t, \gamma_t, w) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \mathcal{A}$ ,*

$$w(\gamma_t) \leq w(\gamma_{t,s}) + \rho(|s - t|, \|\gamma_t\|_0), \quad s \in [t, T \wedge (t + \Delta)]. \quad (3.1)$$

Let

$$u(\gamma_t) := \sup\{w(\gamma_t) : w \in \mathcal{A}\}, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \quad (3.2)$$

and assume that  $u^*(\gamma_t) < \infty$  for all  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ . Then  $u^*$  is a viscosity subsolution of (1.1). Here  $u^*$  is the upper semicontinuous envelope of  $u$  (see [11, Definition D.10]), i.e.,

$$u^*(\gamma_t) = \limsup_{(s, \eta_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda, (s, \eta_s) \rightarrow (t, \gamma_t)} u(\eta_s).$$

Similarly,  $u_*$  is the lower semicontinuous envelope of  $u$ , i.e.,

$$u_*(\gamma_t) = \liminf_{(s, \eta_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda, (s, \eta_s) \rightarrow (t, \gamma_t)} u(\eta_s).$$

**Proof.** First, for every  $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$ , by (3.1), there exists a sequence  $(\gamma_T^n, u_n) \in \Lambda_T \times \mathcal{A}$  such that

$$(\gamma_T^n, u_n(\gamma_T^n)) \rightarrow (\gamma_T, u^*(\gamma_T)) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $u_n \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have

$$u_n(\gamma_T^n) \leq \phi(\gamma_T^n).$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$u^*(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T).$$

Next, let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^*)$  with  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ . By (3.1), there is a sequence  $(t_n, \gamma_{t_n}^n, u_n) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda \times \mathcal{A}$  such that

$$(t_n, \gamma_{t_n}^n, u_n(\gamma_{t_n}^n)) \rightarrow (\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^*(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

Set

$$\Gamma_n(\gamma_t) := (u_n - \varphi)(\gamma_t) - \overline{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_t, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}.$$

Then, the functional  $\Gamma_n$  is upper semicontinuous. By  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^*)$  and the definition of  $u^*$ ,

$$\Gamma_n(\gamma_t) \leq (u_n - \varphi)(\gamma_t) \leq (u^* - \varphi)(\gamma_t) \leq 0, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}. \quad (3.4)$$

This means that  $\Gamma_n$  is bounded from above on  $\Lambda^{\hat{t}}$ . Define a sequence of positive numbers  $\{\delta_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  by  $\delta_i = \frac{1}{2^i}$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . Since  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a gauge-type function on complete metric space  $(\Lambda^{\hat{t}}, d_\infty)$ , for every  $n > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , from Lemma 2.4 it follows that, for every  $(\check{t}_0, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_0}^0) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$  satisfying

$$\Gamma_n(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_0}^0) \geq \sup_{(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}} \Gamma_n(\gamma_t) - \frac{1}{n} \geq \Gamma_n(\gamma_{\hat{t}_n}^n) - \frac{1}{n}, \quad (3.5)$$

there exist  $(\hat{t}_n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$  and sequence  $\{(\check{t}_i, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i)\}_{i \geq 1} \subset [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$  such that

- (i)  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_0}^0, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$ ,  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) \leq \frac{1}{2^i n}$  and  $\check{t}_i \uparrow \hat{t}_n$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- (ii)  $\Gamma_n(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) \geq \Gamma_n(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_0}^0)$ , and
- (iii) for all  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}_n, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}_n} \setminus \{(\hat{t}_n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n)\}$ ,

$$\Gamma_n(\gamma_t) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i, \gamma_t) < \Gamma_n(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n).$$

By (3.4), we have  $u_n - \varphi \leq 0$  on  $\Lambda^{\hat{t}}$ . Then by (3.5) and the property (ii) of  $(\hat{t}_n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) &\geq (u_n - \varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) - \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = \Gamma_n(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) \\ &\geq \Gamma_n(\gamma_{\hat{t}_n}^n) - \frac{1}{n} = (u_n - \varphi)(\gamma_{\hat{t}_n}^n) - \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \frac{1}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Notice that, by (3.3),  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^*)$ , (2.8) and the definition of  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0$ ,

$$(u_n - \varphi)(\gamma_{\hat{t}_n}^n) \rightarrow (u^* - \varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = 0 \text{ and } \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.6), we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Since  $\hat{t} < T$ , then for sufficiently large integers  $n$ ,

$$\varphi_1 := \varphi + \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\cdot, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i, \cdot) \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, u_n)$$

with  $(\hat{t}_n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ . Since  $u_n$  is a viscosity subsolution of (1.1), we have

$$\partial_t \varphi_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n) + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, u_n(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n), \partial_x \varphi_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n), \partial_{xx} \varphi_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n)) \geq 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \varphi_1(\gamma_t) &= \partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) + 2(t - \hat{t}) + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (t - \check{t}_i), \\ \partial_x \varphi_1(\gamma_t) &= \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t) + \partial_x \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t}) + \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i, t}^i) \right], \\ \partial_{xx} \varphi_1(\gamma_t) &= \partial_{xx} \varphi(\gamma_t) + \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t}) + \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i, t}^i) \right], \end{aligned}$$

and, by (2.7) and the property (i) of  $(\check{t}_i, \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{t}_n - \hat{t}| &\leq \overline{\Upsilon}_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \\
|\partial_x \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, \hat{t}_n})| &\leq 18|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n(\hat{t}_n) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^5 \leq 18\overline{\Upsilon}_0^{\frac{5}{6}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \\
|\partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, \hat{t}_n})| &\leq 306|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n(\hat{t}_n) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 \leq 306\overline{\Upsilon}_0^{\frac{2}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \\
\left| \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i}(\hat{t}_n - \check{t}_i) \right| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{1}{2^i n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 2 \left( \frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\
\left| \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n - \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i, \hat{t}_n}^i) \right] \right| &\leq 18 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n(\hat{t}_n) - \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i(\check{t}_i)|^5 \leq 18 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{1}{2^i n} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}} = 36 \left( \frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}}, \\
\left| \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n - \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i, \hat{t}_n}^i) \right] \right| &\leq 306 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}_n}^n(\hat{t}_n) - \check{\gamma}_{\check{t}_i}^i(\check{t}_i)|^4 \leq 306 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{1}{2^i n} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} = 612 \left( \frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.8), by (3.3), (3.7) and Hypothesis 3.2 (i), we have

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^*(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \geq 0.$$

Thus we show that  $u^*$  is a viscosity subsolution to (1.1).  $\square$

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let Hypothesis 3.2 (i) and (iii) be satisfied and comparison hold for (1.1); i.e., if  $w$  is a subsolution of (1.1) and  $v$  is a supersolution of (1.1), then  $w \leq v$ . Suppose  $\underline{u}$  and  $\overline{u}$  be respectively a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution of (1.1) such that  $\underline{u}(\gamma_T) = \overline{u}(\gamma_T)$ ,  $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$  and  $\overline{u}^*(\gamma_t) < \infty$ ,  $\underline{u}_*(\gamma_t) > -\infty$  for all  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ , and suppose that there exist a local modulus of continuity  $\rho$  and a constant  $\Delta > 0$  such that, for every  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ ,*

$$|\underline{u}(\gamma_t) - \underline{u}(\gamma_{t,s})| \vee |\overline{u}(\gamma_t) - \overline{u}(\gamma_{t,s})| \leq \rho(|s - t|, \|\gamma_t\|_0), \quad s \in [t, T \wedge (t + \Delta)]. \quad (3.9)$$

Then the function

$$u(\gamma_t) = \sup\{w(\gamma_t) : \underline{u} \leq w \leq \overline{u}, w \text{ is a viscosity subsolution of (1.1) and satisfies (3.9) for the same local modulus of continuity } \rho \text{ and constant } \Delta > 0\} \quad (3.10)$$

is a viscosity solution of (1.1).

**Proof.** It is clear that  $\underline{u}_* \leq u_* \leq u \leq u^* \leq \overline{u}^*$ . By Theorem 3.4  $u^*$  is a viscosity subsolution of (1.1) and hence, by comparison,  $u^* \leq \overline{u}$ . It then follows from the definition of  $u$  that  $u = u^*$  (so  $u$  is a viscosity subsolution). If the condition for  $u_*$  being a viscosity supersolution of (1.1) is violated at  $\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}$  with  $\hat{t} \in [0, T]$  for the test function  $\psi$  then

$$\psi \in \mathcal{A}^-(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u_*) \text{ and } \partial_t \psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \psi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) > 0,$$

and by continuity,  $u_{\delta, \alpha}(\eta_s) = \delta + \psi(\eta_s) - \alpha \overline{\Upsilon}_0(\eta_s, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  is a classical subsolution of (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  for all small  $r, \alpha > 0$  and  $0 < \delta \leq \alpha(T - \hat{t})^2$ . Since

$$u(\eta_s) \geq u_*(\eta_s) \geq \psi(\eta_s), \quad (s, \eta_s) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda,$$



if we choose  $\delta = \left(\frac{r^6}{4^6} \wedge \frac{r^2}{4^2} \wedge (T - \hat{t})^2\right) \alpha$  then  $u(\eta_s) > u_{\delta, \alpha}(\eta_s)$  for  $s \in [\hat{t}, T]$  and  $d_\infty(\eta_s, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) > \frac{r}{2}$ , and then, by Lemma 3.8, the function

$$U(\eta_s) = \begin{cases} \max\{u(\eta_s), u_{\delta, \alpha}(\eta_s)\}, & \text{if } \eta_s \in B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}); \\ u(\eta_s), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

is a viscosity subsolution of (1.1). We observe that there are points such that  $U(\eta_s) > u(\eta_s)$ ; in fact, by definition of  $u_*$ , there is a sequence  $(s_n, \eta_{s_n}^n) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda$  such that  $(\eta_{s_n}^n, u(\eta_{s_n}^n)) \rightarrow (\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u_*(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}))$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (U(\eta_{s_n}^n) - u(\eta_{s_n}^n)) \geq u_{\delta, \alpha}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - u_*(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = u_*(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \delta - u_*(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) > 0.$$

Clearly,  $\underline{u} \leq U$ . By comparison,  $U \leq \bar{u}$  and since  $u$  is the maximal subsolution between  $\underline{u}$  and  $\bar{u}$ , we arrive at the contradiction  $U \leq u$ . Therefore,  $u_*$  is a supersolution of (1.1) and then, by comparison for (1.1),  $u^* = u \leq u_*$ , showing that  $u$  is continuous and is a viscosity solution of (1.1).  $\square$

To complete the proof of Theorem 3.5, it remains to state and prove the following two lemmas. Before doing that, we give the following definition.

**Definition 3.6.** For every fixed  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$  and  $r > 0$ ,  $w \in USC^0(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$  is called a viscosity subsolution to PPDE (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  if the terminal condition,  $w(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T)$  for all  $\gamma_T \in B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  is satisfied, and whenever  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\gamma_s, w)$  with  $(s, \gamma_s) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$ , we have

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi(\gamma_s) \geq 0.$$

**Lemma 3.7.** Fix  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$  and  $r > 0$ . Let Hypothesis 3.2 (iii) hold true and  $v \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$  be a classical subsolution of PPDE (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$ . Then  $v$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$ .

The proof is rather standard and is postponed to Appendix A.

**Lemma 3.8.** Let Hypothesis 3.2 (iii) hold true. Then the function  $U$  defined in (3.11) is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1).

**Proof.** First, from  $u = u^* \in USC^0(\Lambda)$  and  $u_{\delta, \alpha} \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$ , it follows that  $U \in USC^0(\Lambda)$ . Second, since  $u$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1) and  $u_{\delta, \alpha}$  is a classical subsolution of PPDE (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$ , we have

$$u(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T, \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\delta, \alpha}(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}).$$

Then, by the definition of  $U$ , the terminal condition  $U(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T)$ ,  $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$  is satisfied. Third, let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\gamma_t, U)$  with  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ . If  $\gamma_t \notin B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$ , by the definition of  $U$ ,

$$0 = (u - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = (U - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = \sup_{(s, \eta_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t} (U - \varphi)(\eta_s) \geq \sup_{(s, \eta_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t} (u - \varphi)(\eta_s). \quad (3.12)$$

Since  $u$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1), we have

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi(\gamma_s) \geq 0. \quad (3.13)$$

If  $\gamma_t \in B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  and  $u(\gamma_t) \geq u_{\delta, \alpha}(\gamma_t)$ , by the definition of  $U$ , we also have (3.12) and (3.13). If  $\gamma_t \in B_r(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  and  $u(\gamma_t) < u_{\delta, \alpha}(\gamma_t)$ , noting that  $u(\eta_s) > u_{\delta, \alpha}(\eta_s)$  if  $s \in [\hat{t}, T]$  and  $d_\infty(\eta_s, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) > \frac{r}{2}$ , by the definition of  $U$ ,

$$0 = (u_{\delta, \alpha} - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = (U - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = \sup_{(s, \eta_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t} (U - \varphi)(\eta_s) \geq \sup_{(s, \eta_s) \in [t, T] \times \Lambda^t} (u_{\delta, \alpha} - \varphi)(\eta_s).$$

Since  $u_{\delta,\alpha}$  is a classical subsolution of PPDE (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_t)$ , by Lemma 3.7,  $u_{\delta,\alpha}$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1) on  $B_r(\hat{\gamma}_t)$  and (3.13) holds true.

From above all, the function  $U$  defined in (3.11) is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1).  $\square$

We conclude this section with the consistency and stability of viscosity solutions.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let Hypothesis 3.2 (iii) hold true and  $v \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ . Then  $v$  is a classical solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) of PPDE (1.1) on  $\Lambda$  if and only if it is a viscosity solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) of PPDE (1.1).*

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $\mathbf{F}$  satisfy Hypothesis 3.2 (i), and  $v \in C^0(\Lambda)$ . Assume*

(i) *for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $\mathbf{F}^\varepsilon$  and  $v^\varepsilon \in C^0(\Lambda)$  such that  $\mathbf{F}^\varepsilon$  satisfy Hypothesis 3.2 (i) and  $v^\varepsilon$  is a viscosity solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) of PPDE (1.1) with generator  $\mathbf{F}^\varepsilon$ ;*

(ii) *as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $(\mathbf{F}^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$  converge to  $(\mathbf{F}, v)$  uniformly in the following sense:*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{(\gamma_t, x, y, z) \in \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)} [(\mathbf{F}^\varepsilon - \mathbf{F})(\gamma_t, x, y, z) + |(v^\varepsilon - v)(\gamma_t)|] = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

*Then  $v$  is a viscosity solution (resp. subsolution, supersolution) of PPDE (1.1) with generator  $\mathbf{F}$ .*

The proof of Theorems 3.9 and 3.10 is rather standard, and is given in the appendix A for the convenience of the reader.

## 4 Viscosity solutions to PPDEs: Comparison principle.

This section is devoted to proof of the comparison principle of viscosity solutions to (1.1), which is required in Theorem 3.5. The main result of this section is stated as follows.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose Hypothesis 3.2 holds. Let  $W_1 \in C^0(\Lambda)$  (resp.,  $W_2 \in C^0(\Lambda)$ ) be a viscosity subsolution (resp., supersolution) to PPDE (1.1) and let there exist constant  $L > 0$ ,  $m \geq 3$  and a local modulus of continuity  $\rho$ , such that, for any  $(t, \gamma_t), (s, \eta_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ ,*

$$|W_1(\gamma_t)| \vee |W_2(\gamma_t)| \leq L(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0^m); \quad (4.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & |W_1(\gamma_t) - W_1(\eta_s)| \vee |W_2(\gamma_t) - W_2(\eta_s)| \\ & \leq \rho(|s - t|, \|\gamma_t\|_0 \vee \|\eta_s\|_0) + L(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0^m + \|\eta_s\|_0^m) \|\gamma_t - \eta_s\|_0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

*Then  $W_1 \leq W_2$ .*

The proof follows from the analysis in [19]. We note that for  $\varrho > 0$ , the functional defined by  $\tilde{W} := W_1 - \frac{\varrho}{t+1}$  is a viscosity subsolution for

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{W}(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, \tilde{W}(\gamma_t), \partial_x \tilde{W}(\gamma_t), \partial_{xx} \tilde{W}(\gamma_t)) = \frac{\varrho}{(t+1)^2}, & (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda, \\ \tilde{W}(\gamma_T) = \phi(\gamma_T), & \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T. \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

As  $W_1 \leq W_2$  follows from  $\tilde{W} \leq W_2$  in the limit  $\varrho \downarrow 0$ , it suffices to prove  $W_1 \leq W_2$  under the following additional assumption:

$$\partial_t W_1(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{F}(\gamma_t, W_1(\gamma_t), \partial_x W_1(\gamma_t), \partial_{xx} W_1(\gamma_t)) \geq c, \quad c := \frac{\varrho}{(T+1)^2}, \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda.$$

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** We only need to prove that  $W_1(\gamma_t) \leq W_2(\gamma_t)$  for all  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [T - \bar{a}, T) \times \Lambda$ . Here,

$$\bar{a} = \frac{1}{144m^2M_F} \wedge T.$$

Then, we can repeat the same procedure for the case  $[T - i\bar{a}, T - (i-1)\bar{a})$ . Thus, we assume the converse result that  $(\tilde{t}, \tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) \in (T - \bar{a}, T) \times \Lambda$  exists such that  $\tilde{m} := W_1(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) - W_2(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) > 0$ .

Consider that  $\varepsilon > 0$  is a small number such that

$$W_1(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) - W_2(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) - 2\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \tilde{t}}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) > \frac{\tilde{m}}{2},$$

and

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} \leq \frac{c}{4}, \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$\nu = 1 + \frac{1}{144m^2M_FT}.$$

Next, let  $\Lambda^t \otimes \Lambda^t := \{(\gamma_s, \eta_s) | \gamma_s, \eta_s \in \Lambda^t\}$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , we define for any  $\beta > 0$  and  $(\gamma_t, \eta_t) \in \Lambda^{T-\bar{a}} \otimes \Lambda^{T-\bar{a}}$ ,

$$\Psi(\gamma_t, \eta_t) = W_1(\gamma_t) - W_2(\eta_t) - \beta \Upsilon_0(\gamma_t, \eta_t) - \beta^{\frac{1}{3}} |\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)|^2 - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} (\Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) + \Upsilon^m(\eta_t)).$$

By Step 1-Step 3 in the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [19], for every  $(\gamma_{t_0}^0, \eta_{t_0}^0) \in \Lambda^{\tilde{t}} \otimes \Lambda^{\tilde{t}}$  satisfying

$$\Psi(\gamma_{t_0}^0, \eta_{t_0}^0) \geq \sup_{(s, (\gamma_s, \eta_s)) \in [\tilde{t}, T] \times (\Lambda^{\tilde{t}} \otimes \Lambda^{\tilde{t}})} \Psi(\gamma_s, \eta_s) - \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(\gamma_{t_0}^0, \eta_{t_0}^0) \geq \Psi(\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}, \tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{t}}) > \frac{\tilde{m}}{2},$$

there exist  $(\hat{t}, (\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})) \in [\tilde{t}, T] \times (\Lambda^{\tilde{t}} \otimes \Lambda^{\tilde{t}})$  and a sequence  $\{(t_i, (\gamma_{t_i}^i, \eta_{t_i}^i))\}_{i \geq 1} \subset [\tilde{t}, T] \times (\Lambda^{\tilde{t}} \otimes \Lambda^{\tilde{t}})$  such that

$$(i) \quad \Upsilon_0(\gamma_{t_0}^0, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \Upsilon_0(\eta_{t_0}^0, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + |\hat{t} - t_0|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad \Upsilon_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \Upsilon_0(\eta_{t_i}^i, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + |\hat{t} - t_i|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\beta 2^i} \quad \text{and} \quad t_i \uparrow \hat{t} \quad \text{as} \quad i \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$(ii) \quad \Psi_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) \geq \Psi(\gamma_{t_0}^0, \eta_{t_0}^0), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(iii) \quad \text{for all } (s, (\gamma_s, \eta_s)) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times (\Lambda^{\tilde{t}} \otimes \Lambda^{\tilde{t}}) \setminus \{(\hat{t}, (\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}))\},$$

$$\Psi_1(\gamma_s, \eta_s) < \Psi_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}), \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\Psi_1(\gamma_t, \eta_t) := \Psi(\gamma_t, \eta_t) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} [\Upsilon_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_t) + \Upsilon_0(\eta_{t_i}^i, \eta_t) + |t - t_i|^2], \quad (\gamma_t, \eta_t) \in \Lambda^{\tilde{t}} \otimes \Lambda^{\tilde{t}}.$$

Moreover, there exist  $M_0, N > 0$  independent of  $\beta$  such that

$$\|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 \vee \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 < M_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{t} \in [\tilde{t}, T) \quad \text{for all} \quad \beta \geq N. \quad (4.6)$$

We also have the following result holds true:

$$\beta \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^6 + \beta |\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \beta \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.7)$$

We should note that the point  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})$  depends on  $\beta$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

We define, for  $(t, \gamma_t, \eta_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \Lambda$ ,

$$w_1(\gamma_t) = W_1(\gamma_t) - 2^5 \beta \Upsilon_0(\gamma_t, \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) - \varepsilon \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_t, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_t), \quad (4.8)$$

$$w_2(\eta_t) = -W_2(\eta_t) - 2^5 \beta \Upsilon_0(\eta_t, \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\eta_t) - \varepsilon \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\eta_t, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon_0(\eta_{t_i}^i, \eta_t), \quad (4.9)$$

where  $\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}} = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} + \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}}{2}$ . We note that  $w_1, w_2$  depend on  $\hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}$ , and thus on  $\beta$  and  $\varepsilon$ . By Step 4 in the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [19], there exist sequences  $(l_k, \check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k), (s_k, \check{\eta}_{s_k}^k) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$  and the sequences of functionals  $(\varphi_k, \psi_k) \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{l_k}) \times C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{s_k})$  bounded from below such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [d_{\infty}(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + d_{\infty}(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})] = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

the functional

$$w_1(\gamma_t) - \varphi_k(\gamma_t), \quad \gamma_t \in \Lambda^{l_k} \quad (4.11)$$

has a strict global maximum 0 at  $\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k$ , while the functional

$$w_2(\eta_t) - \psi_k(\eta_t), \quad \eta_t \in \Lambda^{s_k} \quad (4.12)$$

has a strict global maximum 0 at  $\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k$ , and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\partial_t \varphi_k(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k), \partial_x \varphi_k(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k), \partial_{xx} \varphi_k(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k)) = (b_1, 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})), X), \quad (4.13)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\partial_t \psi_k(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k), \partial_x \psi_k(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k), \partial_{xx} \psi_k(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k)) = (b_2, 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})), Y), \quad (4.14)$$

where  $b_1 + b_2 = 0$  and  $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfy the following inequality:

$$-6\beta^{\frac{1}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix} \leq 6\beta^{\frac{1}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.15)$$

We note that sequence  $(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k, \check{\eta}_{s_k}^k, l_k, s_k, \varphi_k, \psi_k)$  and  $b_1, b_2, X, Y$  depend on  $\beta$  and  $\varepsilon$ .

For every  $(t, \gamma_t), (s, \eta_s) \in [T - \bar{a}, T] \times \Lambda^{T - \bar{a}}$ , let

$$\chi^k(\gamma_t) := \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) + \varepsilon \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_t, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_t) + 2^5 \beta \Upsilon_0(\gamma_t, \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}) + \varphi_k(\gamma_t),$$

$$\hbar^k(\eta_s) := -\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - s}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\eta_s) - \varepsilon \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\eta_s, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon_0(\eta_{t_i}^i, \eta_s) - 2^5 \beta \Upsilon_0(\eta_s, \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}) - \psi_k(\eta_s).$$

Then  $\chi^k(\cdot) \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{l_k}), \hbar^k(\cdot) \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{s_k})$ . Moreover, by (4.11), (4.12) and definitions of  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ ,

$$(W_1 - \chi^k)(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k) = \sup_{(t, \gamma_t) \in [l_k, T] \times \Lambda^{l_k}} (W_1 - \chi^k)(\gamma_t),$$

$$(W_2 - \bar{h}^k)(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k) = \inf_{(s, \eta_s) \in [s_k, T] \times \Lambda^{s_k}} (W_2 - \bar{h}^k)(\eta_s).$$

From  $l_k \rightarrow \hat{t}$ ,  $s_k \rightarrow \hat{t}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\hat{t} < T$  for  $\beta \geq N$ , it follows that, for every fixed  $\beta \geq N$ , constant  $K_\beta > 0$  exists such that

$$l_k \vee s_k < T, \quad \text{for all } k \geq K_\beta.$$

Now, for every  $\beta \geq N$  and  $k > K_\beta$ , from the definition of viscosity solutions it follows that

$$\partial_t \chi^k(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k) + \mathbf{F}(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k, W_1(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k), \partial_x \chi^k(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k), \partial_{xx} \chi^k(\check{\gamma}_{l_k}^k)) \geq c, \quad (4.16)$$

and

$$\partial_t \bar{h}^k(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k) + \mathbf{F}(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k, W_2(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k), \partial_x \bar{h}^k(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k), \partial_{xx} \bar{h}^k(\check{\eta}_{s_k}^k)) \leq 0, \quad (4.17)$$

where, for every  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [l_k, T] \times \Lambda^{l_k}$  and  $(s, \eta_s) \in [s_k, T] \times \Lambda^{s_k}$ , from Lemma 2.5,

$$\partial_t \chi^k(\gamma_t) = \partial_t \varphi_k(\gamma_t) - \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) + 2\varepsilon(t - \hat{t}) + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (t - t_i),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \chi^k(\gamma_t) &= \partial_x \varphi_k(\gamma_t) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} \partial_x \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) + \varepsilon \partial_x \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t}) + 2^5 \beta \partial_x \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}, t}) \\ &\quad + \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \gamma_{t_i, t}^i) \right], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{xx} \chi^k(\gamma_t) &= \partial_{xx}(\varphi_k)(\gamma_t) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - t}{\nu T} \partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\gamma_t) + \varepsilon \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t}) + 2^5 \beta \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}, t}) \\ &\quad + \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\gamma_t - \gamma_{t_i, t}^i) \right], \end{aligned}$$

$$\partial_t \bar{h}^k(\eta_s) = -\partial_t \psi_k(\eta_s) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\eta_s) - 2\varepsilon(s - \hat{t}),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \bar{h}^k(\eta_s) &= -\partial_x \psi_k(\eta_s) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - s}{\nu T} \partial_x \Upsilon^m(\eta_s) - \varepsilon \partial_x \Upsilon(\eta_s - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}, s}) - 2^5 \beta \partial_x \Upsilon(\eta_s - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}, s}) \\ &\quad - \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\eta_s - \eta_{t_i, s}^i) \right], \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{xx} \bar{h}^k(\eta_s) &= -\partial_{xx} \psi_k(\eta_s) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - s}{\nu T} \partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\eta_s) - \varepsilon \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\eta_s - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}, s}) - 2^5 \beta \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\eta_s - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}, s}) \\ &\quad - \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\eta_s - \eta_{t_i, s}^i) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (4.16) and (4.17), and using (2.7), Hypothesis 3.2 (i), (4.10), (4.13) and (4.14), we obtain

$$b_1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (\hat{t} - t_i) + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, W_1(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \chi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \chi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \geq c; \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$-b_2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} \Upsilon^m(\hat{\eta}_t) + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\eta}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_x \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_{xx} \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t)) \leq 0, \quad (4.19)$$

where

$$\partial_x \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t) := 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{t})) + 2^5 \beta \partial_x \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \hat{\xi}_t) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_x \Upsilon^m(\hat{\gamma}_t) + \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right],$$

$$\partial_{xx} \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t) := X + 2^5 \beta \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \hat{\xi}_t) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\hat{\gamma}_t) + \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right],$$

$$\partial_x \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t) := 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{t})) - 2^5 \beta \partial_x \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_t - \hat{\xi}_t) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_x \Upsilon^m(\hat{\eta}_t) - \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_t - \eta_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right],$$

and

$$\partial_{xx} \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t) := -Y - 2^5 \beta \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_t - \hat{\xi}_t) - \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\hat{\eta}_t) - \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_t - \eta_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right].$$

Notice that  $b_1 + b_2 = 0$  and  $\hat{\xi}_t = \frac{\hat{t} + \hat{\eta}_t}{2}$ , combining (4.18) and (4.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & c + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} (\Upsilon^m(\hat{\gamma}_t) + \Upsilon^m(\hat{\eta}_t)) - 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (\hat{t} - t_i) \\ & \leq \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_t, W_1(\hat{\gamma}_t), \partial_x \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t), \partial_{xx} \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t)) - \mathbf{F}(\hat{\eta}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_x \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_{xx} \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

On the other hand, by Hypothesis 3.2 (ii) and via a simple calculation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_t, W_1(\hat{\gamma}_t), \partial_x \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t), \partial_{xx} \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t)) - \mathbf{F}(\hat{\eta}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_x \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_{xx} \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t)) \\ & \leq \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_x \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t), \partial_{xx} \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t)) - \mathbf{F}(\hat{\eta}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_x \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_{xx} \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t)) \\ & = \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_x \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t), \partial_{xx} \chi(\hat{\gamma}_t)) - \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{t})), X) \\ & \quad + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{t})), X) - \mathbf{F}(\hat{\eta}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{t})), -Y) \\ & \quad + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\eta}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), 2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}(\hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{t})), -Y) - \mathbf{F}(\hat{\eta}_t, W_2(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_x \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t), \partial_{xx} \hbar(\hat{\eta}_t)) \\ & = J_1 + J_2 + J_3, \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

where, from Hypothesis 3.2 (v) and (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 & \leq M_F (1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_t\|_0) \left| 2^5 \beta \partial_x \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \hat{\xi}_t) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_x \Upsilon^m(\hat{\gamma}_t) + \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right] \right| \\ & \quad + M_F (1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_t\|_0^2) \left| 2^5 \beta \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \hat{\xi}_t) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\hat{\gamma}_t) + \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\gamma}_t - \gamma_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right] \right| \\ & \leq 18M_F (1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_t\|_0) \left( \beta |\hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_t(\hat{t})|^5 + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\gamma_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i - \hat{\gamma}_t(\hat{t})|^5 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +306M_F(1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2) \left( 2\beta|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\gamma_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 \right) \\
& +6m\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} M_F(1 + 2\|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^{2m}) + 6m(6m-1)\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} M_F(1 + 2\|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^{2m}); \tag{4.22}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3 & \leq M_F(1 + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0) \left| 2^5 \beta \partial_x \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_x \Upsilon^m(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}} - \eta_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right] \right| \\
& + M_F(1 + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2) \left| 2^5 \beta \partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\xi}_{\hat{t}}) + \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} \partial_{xx} \Upsilon^m(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}) + \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}} - \eta_{t_i, \hat{t}}^i) \right] \right| \\
& \leq 18M_F(1 + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0) \left( \beta|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^5 + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\eta_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^5 \right) \\
& +306M_F(1 + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2) \left( 2\beta|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\eta_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 \right) \\
& +6m\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} M_F(1 + 2\|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^{2m}) + 6m(6m-1)\varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} M_F(1 + 2\|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^{2m}); \tag{4.23}
\end{aligned}$$

and, from Hypothesis 3.2 (iv), (4.1), (4.6) and (4.15)

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 & \leq \rho(2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0, |W_2(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})| \vee \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0 \vee \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0) \\
& \leq \rho(2\beta^{\frac{1}{3}}\|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^2 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}} - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0, L(1 + M_0^m) \vee M_0). \tag{4.24}
\end{aligned}$$

We have from the property (i) of  $(\hat{t}, (\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}))$  that

$$2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (\hat{t} - t_i) \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{1}{2^i \beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 4 \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left[ |\gamma_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^5 + |\eta_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^5 \right] \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{1}{2^i \beta} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}} \leq 4 \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}},$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left[ |\gamma_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 + |\eta_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t})|^4 \right] \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{1}{2^i \beta} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq 4 \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Combining (4.20)-(4.24), we see from (4.6) and (4.7) that for sufficiently large  $\beta > 0$ ,

$$c \leq -\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} (\Upsilon^m(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \Upsilon^m(\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}})) + 72m^2 \varepsilon \frac{\nu T - \hat{t}}{\nu T} M_F(1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^{2m} + \|\hat{\eta}_{\hat{t}}\|_0^{2m}) + \frac{c}{4}. \tag{4.25}$$

Since  $\nu = 1 + \frac{1}{144m^2 M_F T}$  and  $\bar{a} = \frac{1}{144m^2 M_F} \wedge T$ , (2.8) and (4.4) lead to the following contradiction:

$$c \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu T} + \frac{c}{4} \leq \frac{c}{2}.$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

## 5 Application to path-dependent stochastic differential games.

Let  $\Omega := \{\omega \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n) : \omega(0) = \mathbf{0}\}$ , the set of continuous functions with initial value  $\mathbf{0}$ ,  $W$  the canonical process,  $\mathbb{P}$  the Wiener measure,  $\mathcal{F}$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -field over  $\Omega$ , completed with respect to the Wiener measure  $\mathbb{P}$  on this space. Then  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is a complete space. By  $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  we denote the filtration generated by  $\{W(t), 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ , augmented with the family  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathbb{P}$ -null of  $\mathcal{F}$ . The filtration  $\mathbb{F}$  satisfies the usual conditions.

We introduce the admissible control and admissible strategy. Let  $t, s$  be two deterministic times,  $0 \leq t < s \leq T$ .

**Definition 5.1.** *An admissible control process  $u = \{u(r) : r \in [t, s]\}$  (resp.,  $v = \{v(r) : r \in [t, s]\}$ ) for player I (resp., II) on  $[t, s]$  ( $t < s \leq T$ ) is an  $\mathbb{F}$ -progressively measurable process taking values in some  $\sigma$ -compact metric space  $(U, d_1)$  (resp.,  $(V, d_2)$ ). The set of all admissible controls for player I (resp., II) on  $[t, s]$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{U}[t, s]$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{V}[t, s]$ ). We identify two processes  $u$  and  $\tilde{u}$  in  $\mathcal{U}[t, s]$  and write  $u \equiv \tilde{u}$  on  $[t, s]$ , if  $\mathbb{P}(u = \tilde{u} \text{ a.e. in } [t, s]) = 1$ . Similarly we interpret  $v \equiv \tilde{v}$  on  $[t, s]$  in  $\mathcal{V}[t, s]$ .*

**Definition 5.2.** *A nonanticipative strategy for player I on  $[t, s]$  ( $t < s \leq T$ ) is a mapping  $\alpha : \mathcal{V}[t, s] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}[t, s]$  such that, for any  $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping time  $S : \Omega \rightarrow [t, s]$  and any  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{V}[t, s]$ , with  $v_1 \equiv v_2$  on  $[[t, S]]$ , it holds that  $\alpha(v_1) \equiv \alpha(v_2)$  on  $[[t, S]]$ . Nonanticipative strategies for player II on  $[t, s]$ ,  $\beta : \mathcal{U}[t, s] \rightarrow \mathcal{V}[t, s]$ , are defined similarly. The set of all nonanticipative strategies  $\alpha$  (resp.,  $\beta$ ) for player I (resp., II) on  $[t, s]$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{A}_{[t, s]}$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{B}_{[t, s]}$ ).*

We consider the following controlled path-dependent stochastic differential game (PSDG):

$$\begin{cases} dX^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s) = b(X_s^{\gamma_t, u, v}, u(s), v(s))ds + \sigma(X_s^{\gamma_t, u, v}, u(s), v(s))dW(s), & s \in [t, T], \\ X_t^{\gamma_t, u, v} = \gamma_t \in \Lambda_t. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

The cost functional (interpreted as a payoff for player I and as a cost for player II) is introduced by a backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE):

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s) &= \phi(X_T^{\gamma_t, u, v}) + \int_s^T q(X_\sigma^{\gamma_t, u, v}, Y^{\gamma_t, u, v}(\sigma), Z^{\gamma_t, u, v}(\sigma), u(\sigma), v(\sigma))d\sigma \\ &\quad - \int_s^T Z^{\gamma_t, u, v}(\sigma)dW(\sigma), \quad \text{a.s., all } s \in [t, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The payoff is given by

$$J(\gamma_t, u, v) := Y^{\gamma_t, u, v}(t), \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda. \quad (5.3)$$

We define the lower value functional of our PSDG:

$$\underline{V}(\gamma_t) := \operatorname{essinf}_{\beta(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}[t, T]} \operatorname{esssup}_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, T]} Y^{\gamma_t, u, \beta(u)}(t), \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda, \quad (5.4)$$

and its upper value functional:

$$\overline{V}(\gamma_t) := \operatorname{esssup}_{\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}[t, T]} \operatorname{essinf}_{v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[t, T]} Y^{\gamma_t, \alpha(v), v}(t), \quad (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda. \quad (5.5)$$

For  $(t, \gamma_t, r, p, l) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , define

$$\mathbf{H}^-(\gamma_t, r, p, l) := \sup_{u \in U} \inf_{v \in V} \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, r, p, l, u, v),$$



$$\mathbf{H}^+(\gamma_t, r, p, l) := \inf_{v \in V} \sup_{u \in U} \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, r, p, l, u, v),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}(\gamma_t, r, p, l, u, v) &:= [(p, b(\gamma_t, u, v))_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[l \sigma(\gamma_t, u, v) \sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v)] \\ &\quad + q(\gamma_t, r, \sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v) p, u, v)]. \end{aligned}$$

The goal of this section is to characterize the lower and upper value functionals  $\underline{V}$  and  $\overline{V}$  as the unique viscosity solution of the following path-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equations (PHJBIEs):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \underline{V}(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}^-(\gamma_t, \underline{V}(\gamma_t), \partial_x \underline{V}(\gamma_t), \partial_{xx} \underline{V}(\gamma_t)) = 0, & (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda; \\ \underline{V}(\gamma_T) = \phi(\gamma_T), & \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \overline{V}(\gamma_t) + \mathbf{H}^+(\gamma_t, \overline{V}(\gamma_t), \partial_x \overline{V}(\gamma_t), \partial_{xx} \overline{V}(\gamma_t)) = 0, & (t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda; \\ \overline{V}(\gamma_T) = \phi(\gamma_T), & \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T, \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

respectively.

We make the following assumption.

**Hypothesis 5.3.**  $b : \Lambda \times U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\sigma : \Lambda \times U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ ,  $q : \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\phi : \Lambda_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are continuous, and  $b, \sigma, q$  are continuous in  $\gamma_t \in \Lambda$ , uniformly in  $(u, v) \in U \times V$ . Moreover, there exists  $L > 0$  such that, for all  $(t, \gamma_t, \eta_T, y, z, u, v)$ ,  $(t, \gamma'_t, \eta'_T, y', z', u, v) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \Lambda_T \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U \times V$ ,

$$|b(\gamma_t, u, v)|^2 \vee |\sigma(\gamma_t, u, v)|_2^2 \leq L^2(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0^2), \quad (5.8)$$

$$|b(\gamma_t, u, v) - b(\gamma'_t, u, v)| \vee |\sigma(\gamma_t, u, v) - \sigma(\gamma'_t, u, v)|_2 \leq L \|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0, \quad (5.9)$$

$$|q(\gamma_t, y, z, u, v)| \leq L(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0 + |y| + |z|), \quad (5.10)$$

$$|q(\gamma_t, y, z, u, v) - q(\gamma'_t, y', z', u, v)| \leq L(\|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0 + |y - y'| + |z - z'|), \quad (5.11)$$

$$|\phi(\eta_T) - \phi(\eta'_T)| \leq L \|\eta_T - \eta'_T\|_0. \quad (5.12)$$

**Lemma 5.4.** ([17, Lemma 2.3]) *Assume that Hypothesis 5.3 holds. Then for every  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$ ,  $v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[0, T]$ ,  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$  and  $p \geq 2$ , PSDE (5.1) admits a unique strong solution  $X^{\gamma_t, u, v}$ , and BSDE (5.2) admits a unique pair of solutions  $(Y^{\gamma_t, u, v}, Z^{\gamma_t, u, v})$ . Furthermore, let  $X^{\gamma'_t, u, v}$  and  $(Y^{\gamma'_t, u, v}, Z^{\gamma'_t, u, v})$  be the solutions of PSDE (5.1) and BSDE (5.2) corresponding  $(t, \gamma'_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ ,  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[0, T]$  and  $v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[0, T]$ . Then, there is a positive constant  $C_p$  only depending on  $p, T$  and  $L$ , such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} |X^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s) - X^{\gamma'_t, u, v}(s)|^p \right] \leq C_p \|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0^p; \quad (5.13)$$

$$\mathbb{E} [\|X_T^{\gamma_t, u, v}\|_0^p] \leq C_p(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0^p); \quad (5.14)$$

$$\mathbb{E} [\|X_r^{\gamma_t, u, v} - \gamma_t\|_0^p] \leq C_p(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0^p)(r - t)^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad r \in [t, T]; \quad (5.15)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} |Y^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s) - Y^{\gamma'_t, u, v}(s)|^p \right] \leq C_p \|\gamma_t - \gamma'_t\|_0^p; \quad (5.16)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{t \leq s \leq T} |Y^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s)|^p \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_t^T |Z^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right] \leq C_p(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0^p). \quad (5.17)$$

Formally, under the assumptions Hypothesis 5.3, the lower value functional  $\underline{V}(\gamma_t)$  as well as the upper value function  $\overline{V}(t, x)$  are  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable. However, by the similar proof procedure of Proposition 3.3 in Buckdahn and Li [2], we can prove the following.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Suppose the Hypothesis 5.3 holds true. Then lower value functional  $\underline{V}$  and upper value functional  $\overline{V}$  are deterministic functionals.*

We now discuss the dynamic programming principle (DPP) for PSDG (5.1), (5.2), (5.4) and (5.5). For this purpose, we define the family of backward semigroups associated with BSDE (5.2), following the idea of Peng [13].

Given the initial condition  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda$ , a positive number  $\delta \leq T - t$ , two admissible controls  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, t + \delta]$ ,  $v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[t, t + \delta]$  and a real-valued random variable  $\eta \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{t+\delta}, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R})$ , we put

$$G_{s, t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u, v}[\eta] := \tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s), \quad s \in [t, t + \delta], \quad (5.18)$$

where  $(\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s), \tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s))_{t \leq s \leq t+\delta}$  is the solution of the following BSDE with the time horizon  $t + \delta$ :

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s) = -q(X_s^{\gamma_t, u, v}, \tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s), \tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s), u(s), v(s))ds + \tilde{Z}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(s)dW(s), \\ \tilde{Y}^{\gamma_t, u, v}(t + \delta) = \eta, \end{cases} \quad (5.19)$$

and  $X^{\gamma_t, u, v}(\cdot)$  is the solution of PSDE (5.1).

**Theorem 5.6.** *([17, Theorem 2.9]) Assume Hypothesis 5.3 holds true, the lower value functional  $\underline{V}$  and upper value functional  $\overline{V}$  obey the following DPPs: for any  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda$  and  $0 < \delta \leq T - t$ ,*

$$\underline{V}(\gamma_t) = \operatorname{essinf}_{\beta(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}[t, t+\delta]} \operatorname{esssup}_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[t, t+\delta]} G_{t, t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u, \beta(u)} \left[ \underline{V}(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, u, \beta(u)}) \right]; \quad (5.20)$$

$$\overline{V}(\gamma_t) = \operatorname{esssup}_{\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}[t, t+\delta]} \operatorname{essinf}_{v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[t, t+\delta]} G_{t, t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, \alpha(v), v} \left[ \overline{V}(X_{t+\delta}^{\gamma_t, \alpha(v), v}) \right]. \quad (5.21)$$

From Lemma 5.4 and Theorem 5.6, it follows that the regularity of the value functionals  $\underline{V}$  and  $\overline{V}$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** ([17, Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.13]) *Assume that Hypothesis 5.3 holds, then there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that, for every  $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T$  and  $\gamma_t, \eta_s \in \Lambda$ ,*

$$|\underline{V}(\gamma_t)| \vee |\overline{V}(\gamma_t)| \leq C(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0). \quad (5.22)$$

$$|\underline{V}(\gamma_t) - \underline{V}(\eta_s)| \vee |\overline{V}(\gamma_t) - \overline{V}(\eta_s)| \leq C[\|\gamma_t - \eta_s\|_0 + (1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0)(s - t)^{\frac{1}{2}}]. \quad (5.23)$$

We are now in a position to give the existence result for viscosity solutions. The proof will be given in Appendix B.

**Theorem 5.8.** *Suppose that Hypothesis 5.3 holds. Then  $\underline{V}$  (resp.,  $\overline{V}$ ) is a viscosity solution to equation (5.6) (resp., (5.7)).*

Hypothesis 3.2 (i) follows from the continuity of  $b(\cdot, u, v)$ ,  $\sigma(\cdot, u, v)$ ,  $q(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, u, v)$ , uniform in  $(u, v) \in U \times V$ . For Hypothesis 3.2 (iii) we can argue as follows: since  $\sigma(\gamma_r, u, v)\sigma^\top(\gamma_r, u, v)$  is a nonnegative, self-adjoint, trace class operator, it is obvious that, for  $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $X \leq Y$ ,

$$\text{tr}[X\sigma(\gamma_t, u, v)\sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v)] \leq \text{tr}[Y\sigma(\gamma_t, u, v)\sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v)],$$

and then taking the infimum over  $v \in V$  and supremum over  $u \in U$  we see that  $\mathbf{H}^-$  satisfies Hypothesis 3.2 (iii). Similarly, taking the supremum over  $u \in U$  and infimum over  $v \in V$  we see that  $\mathbf{H}^+$  satisfies Hypothesis 3.2 (iii).

To show that Hypothesis 3.2 (iv) holds observe that, using Hypothesis 5.3, for every  $(t, \gamma_t, \eta_t, r) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}$ , for any  $\beta > 0$ , for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying

$$-3\beta \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix} \leq 3\beta \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{H}^-(\gamma_t, r, \beta(\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)), X) - \mathbf{H}^-(\eta_t, r, \beta(\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)), -Y) \\ & \leq \sup_{(u, v) \in U \times V} \left[ (b(\gamma_t, u, v) - b(\eta_t, u, v), \beta(\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)))_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[X\sigma(\gamma_t, u, v)\sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v)] \right. \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[Y\sigma(\eta_t, u)\sigma^\top(\eta_t, u, v)] + q(\gamma_t, r, \sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v)\beta(\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)), u, v) \\ & \quad \left. - q(\eta_t, r, \sigma(\eta_t, u)^\top\beta(\gamma_t(t) - \eta_t(t)), u, v) \right] \\ & \leq \beta L \|\gamma_t - \eta_t\|_0^2 + \frac{3}{2} \beta L^2 \|\gamma_t - \eta_t\|_0^2 + L \|\gamma_t - \eta_t\|_0 + \beta L^2 \|\gamma_t - \eta_t\|_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\rho(s, r) = (L + 3L^2)s$ , Hypothesis 3.2 (iv) is satisfied for  $\mathbf{H}^-$ . Similarly,  $\mathbf{H}^+$  satisfies Hypothesis 3.2 (iv). Hypothesis 3.2 (v) follows from (5.8) and (5.11). By [18, Proposition 11.2.13], without loss of generality we may assume that there exists a constant  $\nu \geq 0$  such that, for every  $(t, \gamma_t, p, X) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$(\mathbf{H}^-(\gamma_t, r, p, X) - \mathbf{H}^-(\gamma_t, s, p, X)) \vee (\mathbf{H}^+(\gamma_t, r, p, X) - \mathbf{H}^+(\gamma_t, s, p, X)) \geq \nu(s - r) \quad \text{when } r \leq s.$$

Then Theorems 5.8 and 4.1 lead to the result (given below) that the viscosity solution to PHJBIE given in (5.6) (resp., (5.7)) corresponds to the lower value functional  $\underline{V}$  (resp., upper value functional  $\overline{V}$ ) of our PSDG given in (5.1), (5.2) and (5.4) (resp., (5.5)).

**Theorem 5.9.** *Let Hypothesis 5.3 hold. Then  $\underline{V}$  (resp.,  $\overline{V}$ ) defined by (5.4) (resp., (5.5)) is the unique viscosity solution to (5.6) (resp., (5.7)) in the class of functionals satisfying (4.1) and (4.2).*

**Remark 5.10.** *If the Isaacs' condition holds, that is, if for all  $(t, \gamma_t, r, p, X) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

$$\mathbf{H}^-(\gamma_t, r, p, X) = \mathbf{H}^+(\gamma_t, r, p, X),$$

*then (5.6) and (5.7) coincide, and from the uniqueness of viscosity solutions it follows that the lower value functional  $\underline{V}$  equals the upper value functional  $\overline{V}$  which means that the associated stochastic differential game has a value.*

## Appendix A Consistency and stability for viscosity solutions.

**Proof of Lemma 3.7.** Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\gamma_t, v)$  with  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times B_r(\hat{\gamma}_t)$ . For every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ , let

$$X(s) = \gamma_t(t) + \int_t^s \alpha dl + \int_t^s \beta dW(l), \quad s \in [t, T],$$

and  $X(s) = \gamma_t(s)$ ,  $s \in [0, t)$ . Then  $X(\cdot)$  is a continuous semi-martingale on  $[t, T]$ . Applying functional Itô formula (2.2) to  $\varphi$  and noticing that  $(v - \varphi)(\gamma_t) = 0$ , we have, for every  $0 < \delta \leq T - t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathbb{E}(\varphi - v)(X_{t+\delta}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+\delta} [\partial_t(\varphi - v)(X_l) + (\partial_x(\varphi - v)(X_l), \alpha)_{\mathbb{R}^d}] dl + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+\delta} \text{tr}[(\partial_{xx}(\varphi - v)(X_l))\beta\beta^\top] dl \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+\delta} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(X_l) dl, \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\eta_s) = \partial_t(\varphi - v)(\eta_s) + (\partial_x(\varphi - v)(\eta_s), \alpha)_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[(\partial_{xx}(\varphi - v)(\eta_s))\beta\beta^\top], \quad (s, \eta_s) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda.$$

Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  in (A.1),

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\gamma_t) \geq 0. \tag{A.2}$$

Let  $\beta = \mathbf{0}$ , by the arbitrariness of  $\alpha$ ,

$$\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) \geq \partial_t v(\gamma_t), \quad \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t) = \partial_x v(\gamma_t).$$

Let  $\alpha = \mathbf{0}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[(\partial_{xx}(\varphi - v)(\gamma_t))\beta\beta^\top] + \partial_t(\varphi - v)(\gamma_t) \geq 0.$$

By the arbitrariness of  $\beta$ ,

$$\partial_{xx} \varphi(\gamma_t) \geq \partial_{xx} v(\gamma_t).$$

Note that  $\mathcal{L}v(\gamma_t) \geq 0$ , by Hypothesis 3.2 (iii), we have  $\mathcal{L}\varphi(\gamma_t) \geq \mathcal{L}v(\gamma_t) \geq 0$ . Thus,  $v$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1).  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.9.** We prove the subsolution property only. Assume  $v$  is a viscosity subsolution. It is clear that  $v(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T)$  for all  $\gamma_T \in \Lambda_T$ . For any  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ , since  $v \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ , by definition of viscosity subsolutions we see that  $\mathcal{L}v(\gamma_t) \geq 0$ .

On the other hand, assume  $v$  is a classical subsolution on  $\Lambda$ . Let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\gamma_t, v)$  with  $t \in [0, T]$ . By the same proof procedure of Lemma 3.7, we have  $\mathcal{L}\varphi(\gamma_t) \geq \mathcal{L}v(\gamma_t) \geq 0$  and  $v$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1).  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.10.** Without loss of generality, we shall only prove the viscosity subsolution property. First, since  $v^\varepsilon$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1) with generator  $\mathbf{F}^\varepsilon$ , we have

$$v^\varepsilon(\gamma_T) \leq \phi^\varepsilon(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T.$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$v(\gamma_T) \leq \phi(\gamma_T), \quad \gamma_T \in \Lambda_T.$$

Next, let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, v)$  with  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ . By (3.14), there exists a constant  $\Delta > 0$  such that for all  $\varepsilon \in (0, \Delta)$ ,

$$\sup_{(t, \gamma_t) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}} (v^\varepsilon(\gamma_t) - \varphi(\gamma_t)) \leq 1.$$

Denote  $\varphi_1(\gamma_t) := \varphi(\gamma_t) + \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_t, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})$  for all  $(t, \gamma_t) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ . By Lemma 2.5, we have  $\varphi_1 \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$ . For every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \Delta)$ , it is clear that  $v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1$  is an upper semicontinuous functional and bounded from above on  $\Lambda^{\hat{t}}$ . Define a sequence of positive numbers  $\{\delta_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  by  $\delta_i = \frac{1}{2^i}$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . Since  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a gauge-type function on complete metric space  $(\Lambda^{\hat{t}}, d_\infty)$ , from Lemma 2.4 it follows that, for every  $(t_0, \gamma_{t_0}^0) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$  satisfying

$$(v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_{t_0}^0) \geq \sup_{(s, \gamma_s) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}} (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_s) - \varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_{t_0}^0) \geq (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

there exist  $(t_\varepsilon, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$  and a sequence  $\{(t_i, \gamma_{t_i}^i)\}_{i \geq 1} \subset [\hat{t}, T] \times \Lambda^{\hat{t}}$  such that

- (i)  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_0}^0, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$ ,  $\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i}$  and  $t_i \uparrow t_\varepsilon$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- (ii)  $(v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \geq (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_{t_0}^0)$ , and
- (iii)  $(v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_s) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_s) < (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)$  for all  $(s, \gamma_s) \in [t_\varepsilon, T] \times \Lambda^{t_\varepsilon} \setminus \{(t_\varepsilon, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)\}$ .

We claim that

$$d_\infty(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Indeed, if not, by (2.8) and the definition of  $d_\infty$ , we can assume that there exists a constant  $\nu_0 > 0$  such that

$$\bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \geq \nu_0.$$

Thus, by (A.3) and the property (ii) of  $(t_\varepsilon, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (v - \varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[ (v^\varepsilon - \varphi_1)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \right] \\ &= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[ (v^\varepsilon - \varphi)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \right] \\ &\leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left[ (v - \varphi)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) + (v^\varepsilon - v)(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \right] - \nu_0 \leq (v - \varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \nu_0 = -\nu_0, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting  $\nu_0 > 0$ . We notice that, by (2.7) and the property (i) of  $(t_\varepsilon, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)$ , exists a generic constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (t_\varepsilon - t_i) \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}};$$

$$|\partial_x \Upsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t_\varepsilon})| \leq C|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon)|^5; \quad |\partial_{xx} \Upsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon - \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}, t_\varepsilon})| \leq C|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) - \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon)|^4;$$

$$\left| \partial_x \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon - \gamma_{t_i, t_\varepsilon}^i) \right] \right| \leq 18 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\gamma_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon)|^5 \leq 18 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}} \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{6}};$$

and

$$\left| \partial_{xx} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \Upsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon - \gamma_{t_i, t_\varepsilon}^i) \right] \right| \leq 306 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} |\gamma_{t_i}^i(t_i) - \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon)|^4 \leq 306 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Then for any  $\varrho > 0$ , by (3.14), (A.4) and Hypothesis 3.2 (i), there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough such that

$$\hat{t} \leq t_\varepsilon < T, \quad 2|t_\varepsilon - \hat{t}| + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} (t_\varepsilon - t_i) \leq \frac{\varrho}{3},$$

and

$$|\partial_t \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - \partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})| \leq \frac{\varrho}{3}, \quad |I| \leq \frac{\varrho}{3},$$

where

$$I := \mathbf{F}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon), \partial_x \varphi_2(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon), \partial_{xx} \varphi_2(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) - \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})),$$

and

$$\varphi_2(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) = \varphi_1(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \bar{\Upsilon}_0(\gamma_{t_i}^i, \gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon).$$

Since  $v^\varepsilon$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1) with generators  $\mathbf{F}^\varepsilon$ , we have

$$\partial_t \varphi_2(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) + \mathbf{F}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon), \partial_x \varphi_2(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon), \partial_{xx} \varphi_2(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) \geq 0.$$

Thus

$$0 \leq \partial_t \varphi(\gamma_{t_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) + 2(t_\varepsilon - \hat{t}) + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (t_\varepsilon - t_i) + \mathbf{F}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) + I \leq \mathcal{L}v(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \varrho.$$

Letting  $\varrho \downarrow 0$ , we show that  $\mathcal{L}v(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \geq 0$  and  $v$  is a viscosity subsolution of PPDE (1.1) with generator  $\mathbf{F}$ .  $\square$

## Appendix B Existence for viscosity solutions to PHJBIEs.

**Proof of Theorem 5.8.** We shall only prove that  $\underline{V}$  satisfies viscosity property of equation (5.6). The other statements can be proved similarly. First, let us show that  $\underline{V}$  is a viscosity subsolution of (5.6). We let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \underline{V})$  with  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda$ . We need to prove that

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}^-(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Thus, we assume the converse result that  $\theta > 0$  exists such that

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}^-(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \leq -2\theta < 0.$$

Then by the following Lemma B.1. we can find a measurable function  $\pi : U \rightarrow V$  such that

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), u, \pi(u)) \leq -\theta, \quad \text{for all } u \in U. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

On the other hand, for  $0 < \delta \leq T - \hat{t}$ , we have  $\hat{t} < \hat{t} + \delta \leq T$ , then by the DPP (Theorem 5.6), we obtain the following result:

$$0 = \underline{V}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\beta(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)})] - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

In particular,

$$0 = \underline{V}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \pi(u)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \pi(u)})] - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Here, by putting  $\pi(u)(s, \omega) = \pi(u(s, \omega))$ ,  $(s, \omega) \in [\hat{t}, T] \times \Omega$ , we identify  $\pi$  as an element of  $\mathcal{B}_{[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]}$ . Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < \delta \leq T - \hat{t}$ , we can find a control  $u^\varepsilon(\cdot) \equiv u^{\varepsilon, \delta}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]$  such that the following result holds:

$$-\varepsilon \delta \leq G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)})] - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We note that  $G_{s, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)})]$  is defined in terms of the solution of the BSDE:

$$\begin{cases} dY^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s) = -q(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, Y^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), Z^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), u^\varepsilon(s), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(s)) ds \\ \quad + Z^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s) dW(s), \quad s \in [\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta], \\ Y^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(\hat{t} + \delta) = \underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}), \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

by the following formula:

$$G_{s, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)})] = Y^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), \quad s \in [\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta].$$

Applying functional Itô formula (2.2) to  $\varphi(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)})$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}) \\ &= \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \int_{\hat{t}}^s (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) dl - \int_{\hat{t}}^s q(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, \varphi(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}), \\ & \quad \sigma^\top(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) \partial_x \varphi(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}), u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) dl \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \int_{\hat{t}}^s \sigma^\top(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) \partial_x \varphi(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}) dW(l), \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(\gamma_t, u, v) &= \partial_t \varphi(\gamma_t) + (\partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t), b(\gamma_t, u, v))_{\mathbb{R}^d} + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[\partial_{xx} \varphi(\gamma_t) \sigma(\gamma_t, u, v) \sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v)] \\ &\quad + q(\gamma_t, \varphi(\gamma_t), \sigma^\top(\gamma_t, u, v) \partial_x \varphi(\gamma_t), u, v), \quad (t, \gamma_t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times U \times V. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} Y^2(s) &:= \varphi(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}) - Y^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), \quad s \in [\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta], \\ Z^2(s) &:= \sigma^\top(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(s), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(s)) \partial_x \varphi(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}) - Z^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), \quad s \in [\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing (B.6) and (B.7), we have,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned} dY^2(s) &= [(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(s), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(s)) - q(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, \varphi(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}), \\ &\quad \sigma^\top(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(s), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(s)) \partial_x \varphi(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}), u^\varepsilon(s), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(s)) \\ &\quad + q(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, Y^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), Z^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(s), u^\varepsilon(s), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(s))] ds + Z^2(s) dW(s) \\ &= [(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_s^{\hat{\gamma}_s, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(s), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(s)) - A(s)Y^2(s) - (\bar{A}(s), Z^2(s))_{\mathbb{R}^n}] ds + Z^2(s) dW(s), \end{aligned}$$

where  $|A| \vee |\bar{A}| \leq L$ . By Proposition 2.2 in [10], we have

$$Y^2(\hat{t}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ Y^2(\hat{t} + \delta) \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(\hat{t} + \delta) - \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(l) (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) dl \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\hat{t}} \right], \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where  $\Gamma^{\hat{t}}(\cdot)$  solves the linear SDE

$$d\Gamma^{\hat{t}}(s) = \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(s) (A(s) ds + \bar{A}(s) dW(s)), \quad s \in [\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]; \quad \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(\hat{t}) = 1.$$

It is clear that  $\Gamma^{\hat{t}} \geq 0$ . Combining (B.5) and (B.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\varepsilon &\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ -Y^2(\hat{t} + \delta) \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(\hat{t} + \delta) + \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(l) (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) dl \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ Y^2(\hat{t} + \delta) \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(\hat{t} + \delta) \right] + \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) dl \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} [(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) - (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l))] dl \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} (\Gamma^{\hat{t}}(l) - 1) (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_l, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) dl \right] \\ &:= I + II + III + IV. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Since the coefficients in  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  satisfy linear growth condition, combining the regularity of  $\varphi \in C_p^{1,2}(\Lambda^{\hat{t}})$ , there exist a integer  $\bar{p} \geq 1$  and a constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $(u, v) \in U \times V$  such that, for all  $(t, \gamma_t, u, v) \in [0, T] \times \Lambda \times U \times V$ ,

$$|\varphi(\gamma_t)| \vee |(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(\gamma_t, u, v)| \leq C(1 + \|\gamma_t\|_0)^{\bar{p}}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$



In view of Lemma 5.4, we also have

$$\sup_{u^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{\hat{t} \leq s \leq \hat{t} + \delta} |\Gamma^{\hat{t}}(s) - 1|^2 \right] \leq C\delta.$$

Thus, by  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \underline{V})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} I &= -\frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \varphi(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}) - Y^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}(\hat{t} + \delta) \right) \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(\hat{t} + \delta) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}) - \varphi(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}) \right) \Gamma^{\hat{t}}(\hat{t} + \delta) \right] \leq 0; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

and by (B.2),

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \left[ \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} \sup_{u \in U} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \pi(u)) dl \right] \\ &= \partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \sup_{u \in U} \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), u, \pi(u)) \leq -\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Now we estimate higher order terms *III* and *IV*. By (5.15),

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} d_{\infty}^{\bar{p}}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = 0.$$

Then by (B.10) and the dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\hat{t} \leq l \leq \hat{t} + \delta} |(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) - (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l))| = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} |III| \leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\hat{t} \leq l \leq \hat{t} + \delta} \mathbb{E} |(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l)) - (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l))| = 0; \quad (\text{B.13})$$

and, for some finite constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |IV| &\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} \mathbb{E} |\Gamma^{\hat{t}}(l) - 1| |(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l))| dl \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{\hat{t}}^{\hat{t} + \delta} (\mathbb{E}(\Gamma^{\hat{t}}(l) - 1)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbb{E}((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\varphi)(X_l^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u^\varepsilon, \pi(u^\varepsilon)}, u^\varepsilon(l), \pi(u^\varepsilon)(l))^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} dl \\ &\leq C(1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0)^{\bar{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Substituting (B.11), (B.12) and (B.14) into (B.9), we have

$$-\varepsilon \leq -\theta + III + C(1 + \|\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}\|_0)^{\bar{p}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Sending  $\delta$  to 0, and then  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , by (B.13) we deduce that  $\theta \leq 0$ , which induces a contradiction. Therefore, (B.1) holds true, and by the arbitrariness of  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^+(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \underline{V})$ , we show  $\underline{V}$  is a viscosity subsolution to (1.1).

Now let us prove that  $\underline{V}$  is a viscosity supersolution of (5.6). We let  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^-(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \underline{V})$  with  $(\hat{t}, \hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \in [0, T) \times \Lambda$ . For  $0 < \delta \leq T - \hat{t}$ , we have  $\hat{t} < \hat{t} + \delta \leq T$ , then by the DPP (Theorem 5.6), we obtain the following result:

$$0 = \underline{V}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\beta(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)})] - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}). \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Since  $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, v} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, v})] \leq G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)})]$  for all  $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]$  and  $\beta(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_{[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]}$ , we get

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, v} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, v})] \leq \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\beta(\cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_{[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]} G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, \beta(u)})].$$

Then, for any  $u \in U$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < \delta \leq T - \hat{t}$ , we can find a control  $v^\varepsilon(\cdot) \equiv v^{\varepsilon, \delta}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}[\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta]$  such that the following result holds:

$$G_{\hat{t}, \hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, v^\varepsilon} [\underline{V}(X_{\hat{t} + \delta}^{\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, u, v^\varepsilon})] - \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) \leq \varepsilon \delta. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Now following similar arguments as above we can show

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}^-(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}})) \leq 0.$$

By the arbitrariness of  $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}^-(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \underline{V})$ , we show  $\underline{V}$  is a viscosity supersolution to (1.1). This step completes the proof.  $\square$

To complete the previous proof, it remains to state and prove the following lemma.

**Lemma B.1.** Assume that Hypothesis 5.3 holds. Then there exists a measurable function  $\pi : U \rightarrow V$  such that (B.2) holds true.

**Proof.** Define  $\Pi : U \rightarrow 2^V$  by

$$\Pi(u) = \{v \in V \mid \partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), u, v) \leq -\theta\}, \quad u \in U.$$

It is clear that  $\Pi(u)$  is a nonempty and closed subset. Now we prove  $\Pi$  is measurable. For every compact set  $O \in V$ , define

$$\Pi^-(O) = \{u \in U \mid \Pi(u) \cap O \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Assume  $\{u_i\}_{i \geq 1} \in \Pi^-(O)$  and  $u_i \rightarrow u$  in  $U$ , then there exist  $\{v_i\}_{i \geq 1} \in V$  such that

$$v_i \in O, \text{ and } \partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), u_i, v_i) \leq -\theta. \quad (\text{B.18})$$

Since  $O$  is a compact subset, then a  $v \in O$  and a subsequence of  $\{v_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  still denoted by itself exist such that  $v_i \rightarrow v$  in  $V$ . Letting  $i \rightarrow \infty$  in (B.18), we get that

$$\partial_t \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}) + \mathbf{H}(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}, \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_x \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), \partial_{xx} \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{t}}), u, v) \leq -\theta.$$

Thus,  $u \in \Pi^-(O)$ . Therefore,  $\Pi^-(O)$  is closed. Then, by Proposition 4.2.9 in [5],  $\Pi$  is measurable. From Theorem 4.3.1 in [5], it follows that  $\Pi$  admits a measurable selection  $\pi : U \rightarrow V$  such that (B.2) holds true. The proof is now complete.  $\square$

## References

- [1] J. M. Borwein and Q. J. Zhu, Techniques of Variational Analysis, volume 20 of CMS Books in Mathematics/Ouvrages de Mathématiques de la SMC. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.
- [2] R. Buckdahn, J. Li, Stochastic differential games and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman-Isaacs equations, SIAM J. Control Optim., 47 (2008), No. 1, 444-475.
- [3] R. Cont and D.-A. Fournié, Change of variable formulas for non-anticipative functionals on path space, J. Funct. Anal., 259 (2010), no. 4, 1043-1072.

- [4] R. Cont and D.-A. Fournié, Functional Itô calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales, *Ann. Probab.*, 41 (2013), 109-133.
- [5] Z. Denkowski, S. Migorski, N.S. Papageorgiou, *An Introduction to Nonlinear Analysis: Theory*, Kluwer/Plenum, New York, 2003.
- [6] B. Dupire, Functional Itô calculus, Preprint. Available at [papers.ssrn.com](http://papers.ssrn.com), (2009).
- [7] I. Ekren, C. Keller, N. Touzi and J. Zhang, On viscosity solutions of path dependent PDEs, *Ann. Probab.*, 42 (2014), 204-236.
- [8] I. Ekren, N. Touzi and J. Zhang, Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic path dependent PDEs: Part I, *Ann. Probab.*, 44 (2016), 1212-1253.
- [9] I. Ekren, N. Touzi and J. Zhang, Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic path dependent PDEs: Part II, *Ann. Probab.*, 44 (2016), 2507-2553.
- [10] N. El Karoui, S. Peng, and M. C. Quenez, Backward stochastic differential equations in finance, *Mathematical Finance*, 7 (1997), no. 1, 1-71.
- [11] G. Fabbri, F. Gozzi, A. Świąch, *Stochastic Optimal Control in Infinite Dimension. Dynamic Programming and HJB Equations*, in: *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*, volume 82, Springer, 2017.
- [12] W. H. Fleming and P. E. Souganidis, On the existence of value functions of two-player, zero-sum stochastic differential games, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 38 (1989), 293-314.
- [13] S. Peng, BSDE and stochastic optimizations, *Topics in Stochastic Analysis*, 1997.
- [14] S. Peng, Backward stochastic differential equation, nonlinear expectation and their applications, In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, volume 901, pages 393-432, 2010.
- [15] T. Pham and J. Zhang, Two person zero-sum game in weak formulation and path dependent Bellman-Isaacs equation, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 52 (2014), 2090-2121.
- [16] D. Possamai, N. Touzi and J. Zhang, Zero-sum path-dependent stochastic differential games in weak formulation, *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 30 (2020), 1415-1457.
- [17] F. Zhang, The existence of game value for path-dependent stochastic differential game, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 55 (2017), 2519-2542.
- [18] J. Zhang, *Backward Stochastic Differential Equations-From Linear to Fully Nonlinear Theory*, Springer, New York, 2017.
- [19] J. Zhou, Viscosity solutions to second order path-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations and applications, *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, (33) 2023, 5564-5612.