

Copyright © 1970, by the author(s).  
All rights reserved.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission.

ON THE SOLUTIONS OF A STOCHASTIC CONTROL SYSTEM

by

T. Duncan and P. Varaiya

Memorandum No. ERL-M273

3 August 1970

ELECTRONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY

College of Engineering  
University of California, Berkeley  
94720

# ON THE SOLUTIONS OF A STOCHASTIC CONTROL SYSTEM

by

Tyrone Duncan<sup>†</sup> and Pravin Varaiya<sup>††</sup>

## ABSTRACT

The control system considered in this paper is modeled by the stochastic differential equation

$$dx(\omega, t) = f(t, x(\cdot, \omega), u(t, \omega))dt + dB(t, \omega),$$

where  $B$  is  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion, and the control  $u$  is a non-anticipative functional of  $x(\omega, \cdot)$ , and takes its values in a fixed set  $U$ . Under various conditions on  $f$  it is shown that for every admissible control a solution is defined whose law is absolutely continuous with respect to the Wiener measure  $\mu$ , and the corresponding set of densities on the space  $C$  forms a strongly closed, convex subset of  $L^1(C, \mu)$ . Applications of this result to optimal control and two - person, zero-sum differential games are noted. Finally, an example is given which shows that in the case where only some of the components of  $x$  are observed, the set of attainable densities is not weakly closed in  $L^1(C, \mu)$ .

---

<sup>†</sup>Computer Information and Control Engineering, University of Michigan. Research sponsored by the Office of Naval Research under Contract N00014-67-A-081-0021, NR 041-376.

<sup>††</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, Electronics Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, California. Research sponsored by the U.S. Army Research Office -- Durham under Contract DAHC04-67-C-0046.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTENTS

A stochastic control problem is defined by the specification of the stochastic differential equation which models the system dynamics, the information available to the controller and the corresponding set of admissible control laws, and the cost incurred by each control law. Of theoretical interest is the "existence" problem, which means determining in terms of the above three defining characteristics a class of control problems for which there exist control laws achieving minimum cost. Published results ([1, 2, 3], see especially the excellent survey article [4] of Fleming) differ from one another and are not usually comparable because either the models are different or the set of admissible control laws are different.

There are two basic steps involved in obtaining an existence result. The first step involves determining conditions which guarantee that a solution of the stochastic differential equation is defined for every admissible control law. The next step involves the search for a topology under which the set of solutions (or an equally good substitute) is compact, and the cost function is lower semi-continuous. Thus, for instance Fleming and Nisio [1] consider stochastic differential equations of the form

$$dx(t) = f(t, x(\cdot)) u(t)dt + \sigma(t, x(\cdot), B(\cdot)) dB(t), 0 \leq t < \infty$$

where  $u(t)$  is any process taking values in the unit cube, and independent of future increments  $B(t_2) - B(t_1)$ ,  $t \leq t_1 \leq t_2$ , of the Brownian motion  $B$ . Various conditions on  $f$ ,  $\sigma$  are imposed to guarantee a solution for every admissible control. It is then shown that the set of laws of all the solutions of the differential equation corresponding to the different

control laws is compact in the Prohorov metric. Beneš [3] considers stochastic differential equations of the form

$$dx(t, \omega) = f(t, x(\cdot, \omega), u(t, \omega))dt + dB(t, \omega), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1. \quad (1)$$

where  $f$  is measurable with respect to its arguments and continuous in  $u$ . The control law is any non-anticipative, measurable functional  $u(t, \omega) = \psi(t, x(\cdot, \omega))$  which takes values in a compact set  $U$ . He assumes that  $f$  satisfies a linear growth condition,

$$|f(t, x(\cdot, \omega), u)|^2 \leq K(1 + \|x(\cdot, \omega)\|^2).$$

The existence of solution to (1) for every control law is guaranteed by a result of Girsanov [5] (see Corollary 3 below). The resulting law is absolutely continuous with respect to the Wiener measure  $\mu$  on the space  $C$  of all continuous functions from  $[0, 1]$  into  $R^n$ . Beneš shows that if  $f(t, x(\cdot, \omega), U)$  is convex for every  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $x(\cdot, \omega) \in C$ , then the set of densities corresponding to all the admissible control laws is convex and strongly closed (hence weakly compact) subset of  $L^1(C, \mu)$ .

In this paper, we show that the above result holds, if the linear growth condition is replaced by the growth condition (2),

$$|f(t, x(\cdot, \omega), u)| \leq f_0(\|x(\cdot, \omega)\|) \quad (2)$$

where  $f_0 : R \rightarrow R$  is increasing, and the condition

$$\int_C \left[ \exp \left\{ \int_0^1 \langle f(t, B, u), dB(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |f(t, B, u)|^2 dt \right\} \right] \mu(dB) = 1 \quad (3)$$

for every admissible control law. An example is given to show that (2) does not imply (3). The linear growth condition implies (3) (see Corollary 3). Condition (3) also follows from (2), if the drift term  $f$  in (1) has a delay (see Corollary 4). Finally we show that in the important case where the control is allowed to depend only on some components of the state  $x$ , the set of densities is in general not weakly closed in  $L^1(C, \mu)$ .

In Section 2 we give some preliminary results and definitions, and in Section 3 we present the main result on weak compactness of the attainable densities. In Section 3 we give conditions which guarantee (3), in Section 4 we present applications to optimal control and stochastic differential games, and in the final section we present the negative example for the problem with partial observations.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In the main, we adopt the notations and definitions of Benes [3]. Consider the stochastic differential equation (1),

$$\begin{aligned} dx(t) &= f(t, x, u(t, x)) dt + dB(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \\ x(0) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $B(t)$  is a standard  $n$ -dimensional Brownian motion process with continuous sample paths,  $x(t)$  is the state of the system and  $u(t, x)$  is the control law which takes values in a compact subset  $U$  of  $R^m$ . To state the

precise conditions which  $f, u$  must satisfy we need the following definition.

Definition 1

(a) Let  $C$  be the Banach space of all continuous functions  $z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  with norm  $\|z\| = \max \{ \|z(t)\| \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1 \}$ , where  $\|y\|$  is the Euclidean norm of  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

(b) For each  $t \in [0, 1]$  let  $\mathcal{S}_t$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of  $C$  which contains all sets of the form  $\{z \mid z(\tau) \in \Lambda\}$  where  $\tau \in [0, t]$  and  $\Lambda$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

(c) Let  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1$ .

We shall define the solution of (1) in such a way that the sample paths of  $x$  are continuous (and have no explosions), so that  $f$  is a map from  $[0, 1] \times C \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . We impose throughout the following conditions on  $f$ .

C1  $f$  is measurable with respect to the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{B}_u$ , where  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}_u)$  is the set of Borel measurable subsets of  $[0, 1] \times U$ .

C2 For fixed  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $f(t, \cdot, \cdot)$  is measurable with respect to the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{S}_t \otimes \mathcal{B}_u$ .

C3 For fixed  $(t, z) \in [0, 1] \times C$ ,  $f(t, z, \cdot)$  is continuous on  $U$ .

C4 There exists an increasing function  $f_0 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|f(t, z, u)| \leq f_0(\|z\|)$  for all  $(t, z, u)$ .

C5  $f(t, z, U)$  is closed and convex for every  $(t, z)$ .

Definition 2

(a) An admissible control (law) is any map  $u : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow U$  which is

measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ , and for each fixed  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $u(t, \cdot)$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{S}_t$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the set of all admissible control laws.

(b) For each  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , the drift corresponding to  $u$  is the function  $g = g_u : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  defined by,

$$g(t, z) = f(t, z, u(t, z)).$$

Let  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u \mid u \in \mathcal{U}\}$ .

(c) For  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , and  $N \geq 0$ , let  $g^N : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  be defined by

$$g^N(t, z) = \begin{cases} g(t, z) & \text{if } |z(\tau)| \leq N \text{ for } \tau \leq t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let  $\mathcal{G}^N = \{g^N \mid g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ .

### Definition 3

A function  $\psi : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  will be said to be causal if it is  $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{S}$  measurable, and if for each fixed  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\psi(t, \cdot)$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{S}_t$ .

From [6, Lemmas 1,2] we can obtain the following useful characterization of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Condition C3 is needed only for Lemma 1.

### Lemma 1

A causal function  $g : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  belongs to  $\mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $g(t, z) \in f(t, z, U)$  for all  $(t, z)$ .

It will prove convenient to work with sets larger than  $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}^N$ .



#### Definition 4

Let  $\Phi$  be the set of all causal maps  $\phi: [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  such that  $|\phi(t, z)| \leq f_0(\|z\|)$  for all  $(t, z)$ . Let  $\Phi^N = \{\phi \mid \phi \in \Phi, |\phi(t, z)| \leq N \text{ for all } (t, z)\}$ .

Throughout the rest of this paper let  $\Omega$  be a fixed space and let  $\mathcal{A}_t$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , be a fixed, increasing family of  $\sigma$ -fields of subset of  $\Omega$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1$ . We say that  $z(t)$  or  $z(t, \omega)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , is a family of  $n$ -dimensional random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t)$ , if for each  $t$ ,  $z(t, \cdot)$  is a map from  $\Omega$  into  $R^n$  which is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{A}_t$ . We shall need to consider various probability measures on  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $z(t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , is a family of  $n$ -dimensional random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t)$  and we wish to consider the stochastic process generated by  $z(t)$  corresponding to a particular probability measure  $P$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ , we will say that  $z(t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , is an  $n$ -dimensional stochastic process on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t, P)$ . Finally let  $P_0$  be a distinguished probability measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $x(t, \omega)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  be a fixed  $n$ -dimensional, Brownian motion process on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t, P_0)$  with sample paths  $x(\cdot, \omega) \in C$ . We assume that the  $\sigma$ -fields  $\mathcal{A}_t$  are complete with respect to  $P_0$ .

#### Definition 5

Let  $\psi: [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  be a causal function such that

$$\int_0^1 |\psi(t, z)|^2 dt < \infty \quad \text{for all } z \in C. \quad (4)$$

Then  $\zeta^t(\psi)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , is the stochastic process on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t, P_0)$  with continuous sample paths, defined by

$$\zeta^t(\psi) = \int_0^t \langle \psi(\tau, x), dx(\tau) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |\psi(\tau, x)|^2 d\tau. \quad (5)$$

For convenience, let  $\zeta(\psi) = \zeta^1(\psi)$ . (In (5), the first integral is to be interpreted as an Ito stochastic integral).

The results of this section are immediate consequences of the work of Girsanov [5].

Theorem 1 (Existence)

Let  $\psi: [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  be a causal function such that (4) holds.

(i) Then,

$$\int_{\Omega} \exp [\zeta(\psi)] P_0(d\omega) \leq 1.$$

(ii) Suppose,

$$\int_{\Omega} \exp [\zeta(\psi)] P_0(d\omega) = 1, \tag{6}$$

and define the probability measure  $P_{\psi}$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  by

$$P_{\psi}(A) = \int_A \exp [\zeta(\psi)] P(d\omega), \quad A \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Then the stochastic process  $B(t)$  defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t, P_{\psi})$  by

$$B(t, \omega) = x(t, \omega) - \int_0^t \psi(\tau, x(\cdot, \omega)) dt, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$

is a Brownian motion.

(iii) If  $\psi$  is bounded, then (6) holds.

Proof

(i), (ii) and (iii) are immediate consequences of Lemma 2, Theorem 1, and Lemma 1 respectively, of [5].

Theorem 1 immediately gives us a sufficient condition for the existence of a solution to (1). Because let  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , and let  $g$  be the drift

corresponding to  $u$ . If,

$$\int_{\Omega} \exp [ \zeta(g) ] P_0(d\omega) = 1,$$

then the stochastic process  $x(t)$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t, P_g)$  satisfies the equation

$$x(t) = \int_0^t g(\tau, x) d\tau + \text{Brownian motion.}$$

The following results show that at least when  $\psi(\cdot, z)$  is bounded for bounded  $z$ , (6) is essential (Cor. 1), and furthermore, every solution of (1) has the same law (Cor. 2). Recall Definition 4.

Lemma 2

Let  $\psi \in \Phi$ . Let  $y(t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  be a stochastic process on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t, P)$  with continuous sample paths, such that the stochastic process  $B(t)$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_t, P)$  defined by

$$B(t) = y(t) - \int_0^t \psi(\tau, y) dt, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad (7)$$

is a Brownian motion. Then, the measure  $\nu$  induced by  $y$  on  $(C, \mathcal{B})$  is mutually absolutely continuous with respect to the Wiener measure  $\mu$ , and

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\nu} (y) = \exp \left[ - \int_0^1 \langle \psi(t, y), dB(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\psi(t, y)|^2 dt \right]. \quad (8)$$

Proof

Since  $|\psi(\cdot, z)| \leq f_0(\|z\|)$ , it follows from Lemma 7 of [5], that the measure  $\mu$  on  $(C, \mathcal{B})$  defined by

$$\mu(S) = \int_S \exp \left[ - \int_0^1 \langle \psi, dB \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\psi|^2 dt \right] d\nu$$

coincides with the Wiener measure. It is easy to see that

$$\exp \left[ - \int_0^1 \langle \psi, dB \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\psi|^2 dt \right] > 0$$

$\nu$ -almost everywhere. The result follows.

Corollary 1.

Let  $\psi \in \Phi$ , and let  $y(t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  satisfy the hypothesis of

Lemma 2. Then

$$\int_C \exp \left[ \int_0^1 \langle \psi(t, z), dz(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\psi(t, z)|^2 dt \right] \mu(dz) = 1. \quad (9)$$

Proof

From (8),

$$1 = \int_C \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(y) \mu(dy) = \int_C \exp \left[ \int_0^1 \langle \psi(t, y), dB(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\psi(t, y)|^2 dt \right] \mu(dy)$$

From (7) we can substitute

$$dB(t) = dy(t) - \psi(t, y)dt$$

into the previous equality, and obtain (9).

Corollary 2

Let  $\psi \in \Phi$ , and let  $y(t)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , satisfy the hypothesis of

Lemma 2. Then the measure  $\nu$  on  $(C, \mathfrak{B})$  induced by  $y$  is uniquely specified

by  $\psi$  and is given by

$$v(S) = \int_S \exp \left[ \int_0^1 \langle \psi(t, z), dz(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\psi(t, z)|^2 dt \right] \mu(dz). \quad (10)$$

Proof

From (8)

$$v(S) = \int_S \exp \left[ \int_0^1 \langle \psi(t, y), dB(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\psi(t, y)|^2 dt \right] \mu(dy).$$

Substituting  $dB = dy - \psi(t, y)dt$  gives (10).

### 3. MAIN RESULTS

#### Definition 6

For any subset  $\Sigma \subset \Phi$ , let  $\mathcal{D}(\Sigma)$  be the subset of  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$  defined by,

$$\mathcal{D}(\Sigma) = \{ \exp \Sigma(\phi) \mid \phi \in \Sigma \}$$

#### Lemma 3

$\mathcal{D}(\Phi^N)$  is a bounded subset of  $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ .

Proof

If  $\phi \in \Phi^N$ , then by definition  $|\phi| \leq N$ . By Lemma 1 of [5], it follows that

$$\int_{\Omega} \exp 2 \int_0^1 \phi^2 dt P_0(d\omega) \leq \exp tN^2.$$

For the rest of this paper let  $E_0$  denote expectation with respect to the probability measure  $P_0$ . Also if  $\gamma \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$  then  $E_0(\gamma | \mathcal{A}_t)$  denotes the conditional expectation of  $\gamma$  with respect to  $\mathcal{A}_t$ .

Lemma 4

$\mathcal{D}(\phi^N)$  is a closed subset of  $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ .

Proof (Beneš [3])

Let  $\phi_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  be a sequence from  $\mathcal{D}(\phi^N)$  and let  $\rho$  be such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0 |\rho - \exp \zeta(\phi_n)|^2 = 0 \quad (11)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \zeta(\phi_n) = \rho \text{ a.s. } P_0. \quad (12)$$

First of all  $\rho > 0$  a.s.  $P_0$ . Because, let  $A = \{\omega | \rho(\omega) = 0\}$ . Then from (12),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(\phi_n)(\omega) = -\infty \text{ for } \omega \in A \quad (13)$$

Also,

$$\zeta(\phi_n) = \int_0^1 \langle \phi_n(s, x), dx(s) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\phi_n(s, x)|^2 ds$$

and,  $|\phi_n| \leq N$  so that from (13),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \langle \phi_n(s, x), dx(s) \rangle = -\infty \text{ on } A.$$

But

$$E_0 \left[ \int_0^1 \langle \phi_n, dx(s) \rangle \right]^2 = E_0 \int_0^1 |\phi_n(s)|^2 ds \leq N^2,$$

so that  $P_0(A) = 0$ . By Ito's representation [7], there is a causal map

$\psi : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  with,

$$\int_0^1 |\psi(t, z)|^2 dt < \infty$$

for  $z$  in  $C$ , such that

$$\rho = 1 + \int_0^1 \langle \psi(t, x), dx(t) \rangle \text{ a.s. } P_0.$$

Let,

$$\rho(t) = E_0(\rho | \mathcal{A}_t) = 1 + \int_0^t \langle \psi(s, x), dx(s) \rangle.$$

Then, by Jensen's inequality

$$\int_0^1 E_0 |\rho(t) - \exp \zeta^t(\phi_n)|^2 dt \leq \int_0^1 E_0 |\rho - \exp \zeta(\phi_n)|^2 dt$$

which converges to zero, so that taking subsequences if necessary we can assume that

$$\rho(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \zeta^t(\phi_n) \text{ a.s. } \ell(\otimes) P_0, \quad (14)$$

where  $\ell$  denotes Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ . Next, by Ito's differentiation rule,

$$\exp \zeta(\phi_n) = 1 + \int_0^1 \exp \zeta^t(\phi_n) \langle \phi_n(t), dx(t) \rangle \text{ a.s. } P_0$$

so that

$$E_0 \int_0^1 |\exp \zeta^t(\phi_n) \phi_n(t) - \psi(t)|^2 dt = E_0 |\exp \zeta(\phi_n) - \rho|^2$$

converges to zero, and therefore, taking subsequences if necessary, we can assume that

$$\psi(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \zeta^t(\phi_n) \phi_n(t) \text{ a.s. } \ell(\otimes) P_0.$$

Since  $\rho(t) > 0$  a.s.  $P_0$ , we see using (14) that

$$\frac{\psi(t)}{\rho(t)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(t) \text{ a.s. } \ell(\otimes) P_0. \quad (15)$$

It follows that there is a causal map  $\phi : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$

$$\phi(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) \quad \text{a.s. } \mathcal{L} \times P_0$$

and

$$\rho(t) = 1 + \int_0^t \rho(s) \langle \phi(s, x), dx(s) \rangle .$$

From Ito's differential rule we see that

$$d(\log \rho(t)) = \langle \phi(t), dx(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} |\phi(t)|^2 dt,$$

and hence

$$\rho = \exp \zeta(\phi).$$

Because of (15) we can assume that  $|\phi| \leq N$ , so that the lemma is proved.

We shall also need the next result.

Lemma 5

$\mathcal{D}(\phi^N)$  is a convex set.

Proof

Let  $\phi_i \in \phi^N$ ,  $\lambda_i \geq 0$ ,  $i=1,2$ , with  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$ . By Ito's differentiation rule,

$$d[\exp \zeta^t(\phi_i)] = \exp \zeta^t(\phi_i) \langle \phi_i(t), dx(t) \rangle .$$

Define,

$$\rho(t) = \lambda_1 \exp \zeta^t(\phi_1) + \lambda_2 \exp \zeta^t(\phi_2).$$

Then

$$d\rho(t) = \lambda_1 \exp \zeta^t(\phi_1) \langle \phi_1(t), dx(t) \rangle + \lambda_2 \exp \zeta^t(\phi_2) \langle \phi_2(t), dx(t) \rangle$$

which we can rewrite as

$$d\rho(t) = \rho(t) \langle \phi(t), dx(t) \rangle , \quad (16)$$

where

$$\phi(t) = \frac{\lambda_1 \exp \zeta^t(\phi_1)}{\sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \exp \zeta^t(\phi_i)} \phi_1(t) + \frac{\lambda_2 \exp \zeta^t(\phi_2)}{\sum_{i=1}^2 \lambda_i \exp \zeta^t(\phi_i)} \phi_2(t).$$



Evidently  $\phi \in \Phi^N$  since  $\phi(t, z)$  is a convex combination of  $\phi_1(t, z)$  and  $\phi_2(t, z)$ . By Ito's differentiation rule from (16) we obtain (17)

$$d(\log \rho(t)) = \langle \phi(t), dx(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} |\phi(t)|^2 dt$$

and  $\rho(0) = 1$  from (14) so that integrating (17) yields

$$\log \rho(t) = \int_0^t \langle \phi(s), dx(s) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |\phi(s)|^2 ds.$$

Hence  $\rho(1) = \exp \zeta(\phi)$  and the lemma is proved.

We can now prove our main result.

### Theorem 2

(i)  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Y})$  is a convex set.

(ii) Let

$$\mathcal{Y}^0 = \{g \mid g \in \mathcal{Y}, E_0(\exp \zeta(g)) = 1\}.$$

Then,  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Y}^0)$  is a closed, convex, subset of  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ .

We shall develop the proof through a sequence of lemmas.

### Lemma 6

$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Y})$  is convex.

### Proof

Let  $g_i(t, z) = f(t, z, u_i(t, z))$  with  $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$ ,  $i=1,2$  and let  $\lambda_i \geq 0$ , with  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$ . By Ito's differentiation rule,

$$d(\exp \zeta^t(g_i)) = \exp \zeta^t(g_i) \langle g_i(t), dx(t) \rangle \quad i=1,2.$$

Define,

$$\rho(t) = \lambda_1 \exp \zeta^t(g_1) + \lambda_2 \exp \zeta^t(g_2).$$

Then if we repeat the proof of Lemma 5 we can conclude that, (noting  $\rho(0) = 1$ ),

$$\rho(1) = \lambda_1 \exp \zeta(g_1) + \lambda_2 \exp \zeta(g_2) = \exp \zeta(\phi),$$

where  $\phi(t, z)$  is a convex combination of  $g_1(t, z)$  and  $g_2(t, z)$ . Since  $g_i(t, z) \in f(t, z, U)$ , and since this set is convex by condition C5, we see that

$$\phi(t, z) \in f(t, z, U)$$

and hence  $\phi \in \mathcal{Y}$  by Lemma 1. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 7

$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Y}^0)$  is convex.

Proof

The set

$$\mathcal{R} = \{\rho \mid \rho \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0), \rho \geq 0, E_0 \rho = 1\}$$

is convex, and

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Y}^0) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{Y}) \cap \mathcal{R},$$

so that the result follows from Lemma 6.

Next let  $g_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$  be a sequence from  $\mathcal{Y}^0$  and let  $\rho$  be in  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \zeta(g_n) = \rho \quad \text{a.s. } P_0 \quad \text{and in } L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0) \quad (18)$$

For each positive integer  $N$ , let

$$g_n^N(t, z) = \begin{cases} g_n(t, z) & \text{if } |z(\tau)| \leq N \text{ for } \tau \leq t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and for  $N = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  define inductively, subsequences  $g_k^N$ ,  $k \in K_N$ , and  $\phi^N \in \Phi^N$  as follows:

For  $N=1$ , let  $g_k^1$ ,  $k \in K_1$ , be a subsequence of  $g_n^1$ ,  $n=1,2,3,\dots$  and let  $\phi^1 \in \Phi^1$  be such that

$$\exp \zeta(\phi^1) = w. \lim_{k \in K_1} \exp \zeta(g_k^1)$$

(Here and in the remainder  $w. \lim$  means the weak limit in  $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ .)

From Lemmas 4 and 5  $\mathcal{D}(\Phi^N)$  is a weakly, sequentially compact subset of  $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  and  $g_n^N \in \Phi^N$  so that the above construction makes sense.

Suppose  $g_k^N$ ,  $k \in K_N$ , and  $\phi^N \in \Phi^N$  are defined. Then let  $g_k^{N+1}$ ,  $k \in K_{N+1}$  be a subsequence of  $g_n^{N+1}$ ,  $n \in K_N$  and let  $\phi^{N+1} \in \Phi^{N+1}$  be such that

$$\exp \zeta(\phi^{N+1}) = w. \lim_{k \in K_{N+1}} \exp \zeta(g_k^{N+1})$$

### Lemma 8

Let  $C_N^t = \{z \mid z \in C, |z(\tau)| \leq N \text{ for } \tau \leq t\}$ . Then we can assume that for  $i \geq 0$ ,

$$\phi^{N+i}(t, z) = \phi^N(t, z) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad z \in C_N^1.$$

### Proof

First of all from

$$\exp \zeta(\phi^N) = w. \lim_{k \in K_N} \exp \zeta(g_k^N),$$

it is immediate that

$$E_0(\exp \zeta(\phi^N) | \mathcal{A}_t) = w. \lim_{k \in K_N} E_0(\exp \zeta(g_k^N) | \mathcal{A}_t).$$

Secondly since

$$E_0(\zeta(\phi^N)) = 1, \quad E_0(\zeta(g_k^N)) = 1$$

it follows that a.s.  $P_0$ ,

$$\exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) = E_0(\exp \zeta(\phi^N) | \mathcal{A}_t), \quad \exp \zeta^t(g_k^N) = E_0(\exp \zeta(g_k^N) | \mathcal{A}_t)$$

and hence,

$$\exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) = w. \lim_{k \in K_N} \exp \zeta^t(g_k^N). \quad (19)$$

Next let

$$\Omega_N^t = \{\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega, x(\cdot, \omega) \in C_N^t\}.$$

By definition, for  $i \geq 0$

$$g_k^N(\tau, x(\cdot, \omega)) = g_k^{N+i}(\tau, x(\cdot, \omega)) \quad \text{for } \tau \leq t, \omega \in \Omega_N^t$$

so that from (19) we can assume that for  $i \geq 0$ ,

$$\exp \zeta^t(\phi^{N+i})(\omega) = \exp \zeta^t(\phi^N)(\omega), \quad \tau \leq t, \omega \in \Omega_N^t.$$

The result now follows if we note that

$$0 = \int_{\Omega_N^1} |\exp \zeta(\phi^{N+i}) - \exp \zeta(\phi^N)|^2 P_0(d\omega) = \int_{\Omega_N^1} \left[ \int_0^1 \exp \zeta^t(\phi^{N+i}) \langle \phi^{N+i}(t), dx(t) \rangle \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \exp \left[ \zeta^t(\phi^N) \langle \phi^N(t), dx(t) \rangle \right]^2 P_0(d\omega) \\
& = \int_{\Omega_N^1} \left[ \int_0^1 \exp 2\zeta^t(\phi^N) |\phi^{N+i}(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) - \phi^N(t, x(\cdot, \omega))|^2 dt \right] P_0(d\omega)
\end{aligned}$$

so that since  $\exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) > 0$  a.s.  $P_0$ , we must have

$$\int_{\Omega_N^1} \left[ \int_0^1 |\phi^{N+i}(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) - \phi^N(t, x(\cdot, \omega))|^2 dt \right] P_0(d\omega) = 0$$

and the lemma is proved.

Because of Lemma 8 we can define a causal function  $\phi: [0,1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  such that

$$\phi(t, z) = \phi^{N+i}(t, z) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad \|z\| \leq N, \quad i \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

From the proof of Lemma 8, and from (18) it follows that

$$\rho = \exp \zeta(\phi) \quad \text{a.s. } P_0$$

Lemma 9 completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 9 We can assume that,

$$\phi \in \mathcal{H}$$

Proof

Because of (20) and Lemma 1 it is enough to show that

$$\phi^N(t, z) \in f(t, z, U) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad \|z\| \leq N. \quad (21)$$

By our construction

$$\exp \zeta(\phi^N) = w. \lim_{k \in K_1} \exp \zeta(g_k^N).$$

From the properties of weak  $L^2$  convergence it is known that there is a convex combination of the  $\exp \zeta(g_k^N)$  which converges to  $\exp \zeta(\phi^N)$  in the  $L^2$  norm topology. More precisely, for each  $n$ , there are non-negative numbers  $\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_n^n$  with  $\lambda_1^n + \dots + \lambda_n^n = 1$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0 \left| \exp \zeta(\phi^N) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^n \exp \zeta(g_i^N) \right|^2 = 0. \quad (22)$$

Let,

$$h_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^n \exp \zeta(g_i^N).$$

Repeating the proof of Lemma 5, we can conclude that

$$h_n(t) = \exp \zeta^t(\eta_n) \text{ a.s. } P_0,$$

where,  $\eta_n(t, z)$  is a convex combination of  $g_1^N(t, z), \dots, g_n^N(t, z)$ . In particular, from the convexity of  $f(t, z, U)$  and the fact that  $g_i^N(t, z) = g_i(t, z) \in f(t, z, U)$  for  $\|z\| \leq N$ , it follows that for  $\|z\| \leq N$ ,

$$\eta_n(t, z) \in f(t, z, U). \quad (23)$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 \left| \exp \zeta(\phi^N) - \exp \zeta(\eta_n) \right|^2 &= E_0 \left| \int_0^1 \exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) \langle \phi^N(t), dx(t) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_0^1 \exp \zeta^t(\eta_n) \langle \eta_n(t), dx(t) \rangle \right|^2 = E_0 \int_0^1 \left| \exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) \phi^N(t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \exp \zeta^t(\eta_n) \eta_n(t) \right|^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

converges to zero by (22). Taking subsequences if necessary we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \zeta^t(\phi^N)(\omega) \phi^N(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \zeta^t(\eta_n)(\omega) \eta_n(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) \text{ a.s. } \ell \otimes P_0 \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where  $\ell$  denotes Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ .

Also a.s.  $P_0$ ,

$$\exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) = E_0(\zeta(\phi^N) | \mathcal{A}_t), \quad \exp \zeta^t(\eta_n) = E_0(\zeta(\eta_n) | \mathcal{A}_t)$$

so that from (22)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 E_0 |\exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) - \exp \zeta^t(\eta_n)|^2 dt = 0$$

and hence we can assume taking subsequences if necessary that,

$$\exp \zeta^t(\phi^N)(\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \zeta^t(\eta_n)(\omega) \quad \text{a.s. } \ell \otimes P_0.$$

Since  $\exp \zeta^t(\phi^N) > 0$  a.s.  $P_0$ , we conclude from (24) that

$$\phi^N(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) \quad \text{a.s. } \ell \otimes P_0$$

and hence from (23), and the fact that  $f(t, z, U)$  is closed, we see that

$$\phi^N(t, x(\cdot, \omega)) \in F(t, x(\cdot, \omega), U) \quad \text{for } \|x(\cdot, \omega)\| \leq N, \quad \text{a.s. } \ell \otimes P_0.$$

By appropriately modifying  $\phi^N$  we can assume that (21) is satisfied.

From Corollary 1 of Lemma 2 and from Theorem 2 we obtain Theorem 3.

### Theorem 3

Suppose  $f$  satisfies C1 - C5 of Section 2.

- (i) For an admissible control  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , there exists a solution to (1) with continuous sample paths (without explosions), if and only if

$$E_0 \exp \zeta(g_u) = 1.$$

- (ii) The set of densities  $\{\exp \zeta(g_u) \mid E_0 \exp \zeta(g_u) = 1\}$  is a convex set, which is closed in the norm topology of  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ .

### 3. SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR $E_0 \exp \zeta(\phi) = 1$

#### Lemma 10

Let  $\phi : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a causal map such that  $\int_0^1 |\phi(t, z)|^2 dt < \infty$  for all  $z$  in  $C$ . Define  $T_\phi : C \rightarrow C$  by

$$T_\phi(z)(t) = z(t) - \int_0^t \phi(\tau, z) d\tau. \quad (25)$$

Suppose that for each  $N > 0$  there is  $M > 0$  such that  $\|T_\phi(z)\| \leq N$  implies  $\|z\| \leq M$ . Then,

$$E_0 \exp \zeta(\phi) = 1.$$

#### Proof

Immediate from Lemma 7 of [5].

As a consequence of Lemma 10, we can obtain the following sufficient conditions. The first result is due to Beneš [3].

#### Collary 3

Let  $\phi : [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a causal map and suppose there is a constant  $K$  such that

$$|\phi(t, z)| \leq K(1 + \max_{1 \leq \tau \leq t} |z(\tau)|)$$



Then,

$$E_0 \exp \zeta(\phi) = 1.$$

Proof

Let  $T_\phi(z)(t) = y(t)$ , and let  $\gamma(t) = \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} |z(\tau)|$ . Then, from (25)

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(t) &\leq |y(t)| + \int_0^t K(1 + \gamma(\tau)) dt \\ &\leq (\|y\| + K) + \int_0^t K \gamma(\tau) dt. \end{aligned}$$

By the Bellman-Gronwall inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\| = \gamma(1) &\leq (\exp K) \gamma(0) + (\exp K) (\|y\| + K) \\ &\leq (\exp K) (2\|y\| + K), \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows from Lemma 10.

The next result is useful if we have a control system with delay.

Corollary 4

Let  $\phi: [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow R^n$  be a causal map such that for some  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$|\phi(t, z)| \leq f_0 \left( \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t-\delta} |z(\tau)| \right)$$

where  $f_0: R \rightarrow R$  is increasing. Then,

$$E_0 \exp \zeta(\phi) = 1.$$

Proof

Let  $y, \gamma$  be defined as in the previous proof. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma(\delta) &\leq \|y\| + f_0(\gamma(0)), \\
\gamma(2\delta) &\leq \|y\| + f_0(\gamma(\delta)) \\
&\leq \|y\| + f_0(\|y\| + f_0(\gamma(0))) \\
&= f_1(\|y\|, \gamma(0)) \text{ say.}
\end{aligned}$$

By induction,

$$\gamma(i\delta) \leq f_i(\|y\|, \gamma(0))$$

where  $f_i$  is increasing in each argument. Evidently if  $(m-1)\delta < 1 \leq m\delta$ , we see that

$$\gamma(1) = \|z\| \leq f_m(\|y\|, |z(0)|)$$

and the result follows from Lemma 10.

#### Remark

McKean (p. 66 of [8]) has shown that if  $\delta > 0$  then all solutions of the one-dimensional diffusion equation

$$dx(t) = |x|^{1+\delta} dt + dB(t), \quad 0 \leq t < \infty$$

explode with probability 1. It follows that condition (6) is a non-trivial restriction.

#### 4. APPLICATIONS

Consider a control system

$$dx(t, \omega) = f(t, x(\cdot, \omega), u(t, x(\cdot, \omega)))dt + dB(\omega, t),$$

where the control  $u$  takes values in a set  $U$  and  $f$  obeys the conditions C1 - C5 of Section 2. Let us impose an additional restriction.

C6 For every admissible  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ ,

$$E_0 \exp \zeta(g_u) = 1$$

or equivalently (and directly in terms of  $u$ ) for

$$\rho_u(z) = \exp \left[ \int_0^1 \langle f(t, z, u(t, z)), dz(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |f(t, z, u(t, z))|^2 dt \right] \quad (26)$$

C'6

$$\int_C \rho_u(z) \mu(dz) = 1$$

Instead we can limit ourself to the subset  $\mathcal{U}^0$  consisting of those  $u$  in  $\mathcal{U}$  which satisfy C'6.

Next let  $L : C \rightarrow R$  be a bounded function, measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{S}$ .  $L$  is the cost function, and assigns to every  $u \in \mathcal{U}^0$  the cost

$$J(u) = \int_C L(z) \rho_u(z) \mu(dz). \quad (27)$$

Theorem 4

Suppose  $\mathcal{U}^0$  is non-empty. Then, there exists  $u^* \in \mathcal{U}^0$  such that

$$J(u^*) \leq J(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{U}^0.$$

Proof

By Theorem 3, the set  $\{\rho_u \mid u \in \mathcal{U}^0\}$  is a strongly closed, convex subset of  $L^1(C, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Hence it is weakly compact. Since

$$\int_C L(z) \rho_u(z) \mu(dz)$$

is linear and continuous in  $\rho_u$ , the result follows.

Let us note that a cost functional of the type (27) allows for a variable endpoint problem as follows. Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a closed subset of  $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^n$  which includes the set  $\{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\lambda: [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded, causal function, and to each  $u \in \mathcal{U}^0$  assign the cost

$$J(u) = \int_C \left[ \int_0^{t(z)} \lambda(t, z) dt \right] \rho_u(z) \mu(dz),$$

where  $t(z) = \min \{ \tau \mid z(\tau) \in \mathcal{J} \}$ . The term in brackets is clearly of the form  $L(z)$  in (27).

As a second application consider a zero-sum stochastic differential game, with two players I and II, with controls  $u_1(t) \in U_1$  and  $u_2(t) \in U_2$  respectively, and dynamics given by

$$dx(t) = f(t, x, u_1(t), u_2(t))dt + dB(t).$$

Suppose that  $f$  splits as

$$f(t, x, u_1, u_2) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(t, x, u_1) \\ f_2(t, x, u_2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Assume that  $f$  satisfies C1 - C5 with C5 now restated as

" $f_1(t, z, U_1)$  and  $f_2(t, z, U_2)$  are closed and convex for each  $(t, z)$ ".

As before, we define the admissible controls for player  $i$ , as all causal map  $u_i: [0, 1] \times C \rightarrow U_i$ ,  $i=1,2$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_i^0$  consist of those admissible controls  $u_i$  which satisfy

$$\int_C \rho_{u_i}^i(z) \mu(dz) = 1,$$

where,

$$\rho_{u_i}^i = \exp \left[ \int_0^1 \langle f_i(t, z, u_i(t, z)), dz_i(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |f_i(t, z, u_i(t, z))|^2 dt \right]. \quad (28)$$

Here we have split  $z = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix}$  to be compatible with  $f = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}$ . Let

$L: C \rightarrow R$  be a bounded function, measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{G}$  and to each pair  $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{U}_1^0 \times \mathcal{U}_2^0$  assign the payoff to player  $i$

$$J(u_1, u_2) = \int_C L(z) \rho_{(u_1, u_2)}(z) \mu(dz). \quad (29)$$

### Theorem 5

Suppose  $\mathcal{U}_i^0$  is non-empty for  $i=1,2$ . Then, there exist  $u_i^* \in \mathcal{U}_i^0$ ,  $i=1,2$  such that

$$J(u_1, u_2^*) \leq J(u_1^*, u_2^*) \leq J(u_1^*, u_2) \quad \text{for all } u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i^0, i=1,2.$$

### Proof

From the definition (26) of  $\rho_{(u_1, u_2)}$  and the definition (28) we see that

$$J(u_1, u_2) = \int_C L(z) \rho_{u_1}^1(z) \rho_{u_2}^2(z) \mu(dz) \quad (30)$$

Next, from Theorem 3, the sets  $\{\rho_{u_i}^i \mid u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i^0\}$  are convex, closed subsets of  $L^1(C, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$ , hence weakly compact. Finally the integral in (30) is concave (in fact linear) and continuous in  $\rho_{u_1}^1$  for fixed  $\rho_{u_2}^2$ , and convex (in fact linear) and continuous in  $\rho_{u_2}^2$  for fixed  $\rho_{u_1}^1$ . Hence from the well-known results on two-person zero-sum games the existence of a saddle-point  $(u_1^*, u_2^*)$  follows.

5. PARTIAL OBSERVATIONS: A NEGATIVE EXAMPLE.

Again consider the stochastic differential equation (1).

$$dx(t) = f(t, x, u)dt + dB(t) \quad (1)$$

The conditions on  $f$  are as before, but now suppose that we consider the important case where the control  $u$  can only depend upon the past history of the last  $m$  ( $m < n$ ) components of  $x$ . More precisely, let  $Q_t$  be the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{F}_t$  generated by all sets of the form

$$\{z \mid z \in C, z_i(\tau) \in A\}$$

where  $\tau \leq t$ ,  $A$  is a Borel subset of  $R$  and  $n-m+1 \leq i \leq n$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}_m$  be the set of all causal maps  $u: [0,1] \times C \rightarrow U$  such that  $u(t, \cdot)$  is measurable with respect to  $Q_t$ . Evidently,

$$\mathcal{U}_m \subset \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_n.$$

First of all we can see from the proof of Lemmas 5 and 6 that the set

$$\{\exp \zeta(g_u) \mid u \in \mathcal{U}_m\}$$

may fail to be convex. Also we know from Theorem 3, that this set is weakly compact in  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$  if and only if it is weakly closed, and then we could obtain an "existence" result like Theorem 4. We give a simple example to show that in general we do not have weak closure.

Consider the two-dimensional system,  $x = (x_1, x_2)$ , with  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  depending only on  $x_2$ ,

$$dx_1(t) = f(t, x_1)u + dB_1(t)$$

$$dx_2(t) = dB_2(t)$$

where,

$$f(t, x_1) = \begin{cases} 0 & , & t \leq 1/2 \\ 2 & , & t > 1/2, x_1(1/2) > 0 \\ 1 & , & t > 1/2, x_1(1/2) \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

The control set is  $U = [-1, 1]$ . We shall define a sequence of control laws  $u_n(t, x_2)$  such that

$$u_n(t, x_2) = \begin{cases} 0 & t \leq 1/2 \\ \gamma_n(x_2(1/2)) & t > 1/2, \end{cases}$$

where the functions  $\gamma_n$  are defined below. It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_n = \zeta(g_{u_n}) &= \int_0^1 f(t, x_1) u_n(t) dx_1(t) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 f^2(t, x_1) u_n^2(t) dt \\ &= \alpha \beta \gamma_n - \frac{1}{4} \beta^2 \gamma_n^2 \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\alpha = x_1(1) - x_1(1/2), \quad \beta = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } x_1(1/2) > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x_1(1/2) \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\exp \zeta_n = \exp(\alpha\beta \gamma_n) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} \beta^2 \gamma_n^2\right) \quad (31)$$

We shall select  $\gamma_n$  such that  $|\gamma_n| = 1$ , so that (31) simplifies to

$$\exp \zeta_n = \exp(\alpha\beta \gamma_n) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} \beta^2\right). \quad (32)$$

We define  $\gamma_n$  as follows:

Let  $\xi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable function such that under  $P_0$ ,  $\xi(x_2(1/2))$  is uniformly distributed over  $[0,1]$ . For each integer  $n \geq 0$ , define  $\eta_n: [0,1] \rightarrow \{-1,1\}$  by

$$\eta_n(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \frac{2m}{2n} \leq \xi < \frac{2m+1}{2n}, \quad m=0,1,\dots, n-1 \\ -1 & \text{if } \frac{2m+1}{2n} \leq \xi < \frac{2m+2}{2n}, \quad m=0,1,\dots, n-1 \end{cases}$$

Finally, let

$$\gamma_n(x_2(1/2)) = \eta_n(\xi(x_2(1/2))).$$

#### Lemma 11

$\exp \zeta_n$  converges to  $\frac{1}{2} [\exp(\alpha\beta) + \exp(-\alpha\beta)] \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} \beta^2\right)$  in the weak topology of  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ .



Proof

Let  $A_\alpha, A_\beta, A_\xi$  be Borel subsets of  $R$  and let  $I_A$  denote the indicator function of a set  $A$ . Let

$$\Pi_n = \int_{\Omega} I_{A_\alpha}(\alpha(\omega)) I_{A_\beta}(\beta(\omega)) I_{A_\xi}(\xi(\omega)) (\exp \zeta_n)(\omega) P_0(d\omega).$$

Now under  $P_0$  the random variables  $\alpha, \beta, \xi$  are independent, so that

$$\Pi_n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} I_{A_\alpha}(\alpha) I_{A_\beta}(\beta) I_{A_\xi}(\xi) \exp(\alpha\beta\eta_n(\xi)) \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2) P_\xi(d\xi) P_\beta(d\beta) P_\alpha(d\alpha), \quad (33)$$

where  $P_\alpha, P_\beta, P_\xi$  are the marginal distributions of  $\alpha, \beta, \xi$  respectively.

From the way  $\eta_n$  is defined and the fact that  $\xi$  is uniformly distributed on  $[0,1]$  it follows that for fixed  $\alpha, \beta$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-\infty}^t \exp(\alpha\beta\eta_n(\xi)) \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2) P_\xi(d\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^t \frac{1}{2} [\exp(\alpha\beta) + \exp(-\alpha\beta)] \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2) P_\xi(d\xi)$$

uniformly for  $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$ . It follows that  $\exp(\alpha\beta\eta_n(\xi)) \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2)$  converges to  $\frac{1}{2} [\exp(\alpha\beta) + \exp(-\alpha\beta)] \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2)$  weakly in  $L^1(R, P_\xi)$ .

Since the integrands in (33) are uniformly integrable, it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_n = \int_{R^3} I_{A_\alpha}(\alpha) I_{A_\beta}(\beta) I_{A_\xi}(\xi) \frac{1}{2} [\exp(\alpha\beta) + \exp(-\alpha\beta)] \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2) P_\xi(d\xi) P_\beta(d\beta) P_\alpha(d\alpha).$$

From this it follows easily that  $\exp(\alpha\beta\eta_n(\xi)) \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2)$  converges to  $\frac{1}{2} [\exp(\alpha\beta) + \exp(-\alpha\beta)] \exp(-\frac{1}{4}\beta^2)$  weakly in  $L^1(R^3, P_\alpha \otimes P_\beta \otimes P_\xi)$

and the lemma is proved.

Finally, we can see that there is a function  $\hat{u}(t) \in [-1,1]$ , with  $u(t) = 0$ , for  $t \leq 1/2$  and  $u(t)$  depending on the past of  $x_2$  and  $x_1$  such that  $\exp \zeta_n$  converges to  $\exp \zeta(g_{\hat{u}})$  in the weak topology of  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ . Next, if  $u$  is any control law such that  $\exp \zeta(g_u) = \exp \zeta(g_{\hat{u}})$  we must have  $g_u = g_{\hat{u}}$  a.s.  $\mathcal{L}(\otimes) P_0$ . It follows that the set of densities  $\exp \zeta(g_u)$  with  $u$  depending only on  $x_2$  is not weakly closed in  $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P_0)$ .

Incidentally this example also shows that to guarantee weak closure, the convexity condition C5 is necessary. Because even though  $u_n(t) \in \{-1, 1, 0\}$  for all  $t$ , it is not the case for  $\hat{u}(t)$ .

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It should be obvious to anyone who has read [3] our great debt to V. E. Beneš. E. Wong clarified many subtle points about Ito's calculus and suggested the proofs in Section 2. M. Davis caught many errors in earlier proofs. It is a pleasure to acknowledge our gratitude to them. This work was done while the first author was visiting the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences at the University of California, Berkeley. He wishes to thank them for their hospitality.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. H. Fleming and M. Nisio, "On the Existence of Optimal Stochastic Controls", J. Math. Mech. (15), No. 5, (1966), pp. 777-794.
- [2] H. J. Kushner, "On the Existence of Optimal Stochastic Controls", SIAM J. Control, (3), (1965), pp. 463-474.
- [3] V. E. Beneš, "Existence of Optimal Stochastic Control Laws", to appear.
- [4] W. H. Fleming, "Optimal Continuous - Parameter Stochastic Control", SIAM Review (11), No. 4, (1969), pp. 470-509.

- [5] I. V. Girsanov, "On Transforming a Certain Class of Stochastic Processes by Absolutely Continuous Substitution of Measures", Theory of Probability and its Applications (5), No. 3, (1960), pp. 285-301.
- [6] V. E. Beneš, "Existence of Optimal Strategies Based on Specified Information, for a Class of Stochastic Decision Problems", J. SIAM Control (8), No. 2, (1970), pp. 179-188.
- [7] K. Ito, "Multiple Wiener Integral," J. Math. Soc. Japan, (3), (1951), pp. 158-161.
- [8] H. P. McKean, Jr., Stochastic Integrals, Academic Press, New York and London, (1969).