

Necessary Condition for Near Optimal Control of Linear Forward-backward Stochastic Differential Equations

Liangquan Zhang^{1*}; Jianhui Huang^{2†}; Xun Li^{2 ‡}

1. INRIA, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes, France.

2. Department of Applied Mathematics

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China.

February 19, 2022

Abstract

This paper investigates the near optimal control for a kind of linear stochastic control systems governed by the forward backward stochastic differential equations, where both the drift and diffusion terms are allowed to depend on controls and the control domain is not assumed to be convex. In the previous work (Theorem 3.1) of the second and third authors [*Automatica* **46** (2010) 397-404], some problem of near optimal control with the control dependent diffusion is addressed and our current paper can be viewed as some direct response to it. The necessary condition of the near-optimality is established within the framework of optimality variational principle developed by Yong [*SIAM J. Control Optim.* **48** (2010) 4119–4156] and obtained by the convergence technique to treat the optimal control of FBSDEs in unbounded control domains by Wu [*Automatica* **49** (2013) 1473–1480]. Some new estimates are given here to handle the near optimality. In addition, an illustrating example is discussed as well.

AMS subject classifications: 93E20, 49L20.

Key words: Near optimal control, Forward backward stochastic differential equations, Adjoint equations, Ekeland's principle.

1 Introduction

Due to the nature of uncertainty, solutions to a forward stochastic system governed by Itô-based *stochastic differential equations* (SDEs in short) need to be non-anticipative. The equation for a conventional Itô SDEs can be naturally solved in a forward-looking way by starting with the initial state. In some financial engineering problems, however, it is inherent that some terminal states are specified and one must consider a stochastic dynamic system in a backward fashion. For example,

*L. Zhang acknowledges the financial support partly by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (No. 11201263 and No. 11201264) and the Nature Science Foundation of Shandong Province (No. ZR2012AQ004). E-mail: xiaoquan51011@163.com.

†J. Huang acknowledges the financial support partly by Hong Kong RGC grant 501010. E-mail: ma-jhuang@polyu.edu.hk.

‡X. Li acknowledges the financial support partly by Hong Kong RGC grant 524109. E-mail: malixun@polyu.edu.hk.

one needs to determine the option price with a given terminal payoff (as a random variable on the underlying asset). This results in a *backward stochastic differential equations* (BSDEs in short) with a terminal condition. This theory can be traced back to Bismut [2] who studied linear BSDEs motivated by stochastic control problems, and Pardoux and Peng [22] who proved the well-posedness for nonlinear BSDEs. Since then, BSDEs have been extensively studied and used in the areas of applied probability and optimal stochastic controls, particularly in financial engineering. Moreover, initiated by Antonelli [1], *forward-backward stochastic differential equations* (FBSDEs in short) have also been investigated systematically. For instance, Ma, Protter and Yong [19] established the four-step-scheme, Pardoux and Tang [24], Hu and Peng [6], Peng and Wu [23] and Yong [29] developed the method of continuation, Huang, Li and Wang [7, 8] analyzed partial information control problems using FBSDEs, Lim and Zhou [17] formulated and solved backward linear-quadratic controls, and Yong [31, 32] further considered coupled FBSDEs with mixed initial-terminal conditions. See also relevant work by Wu [26, 25, 27], more references therein.

Near optimization has been investigated by many literatures for both theory and applications. On the one hand, near optimal controls are more available than optimal ones. Indeed, optimal controls may not exist in lots of situations, while near optimal controls always exist, and it is much easier to derive the near optimal controls than optimal ones, both analytically and numerically. On the other hand, since there are many candidates for near optimal controls, it is possible to select among them appropriate ones that are easier for analysis and implementation (see [36] reference therein).

As a matter of fact, the near optimal control for the forward deterministic and stochastic systems have been extensively studied. We refer the reader to the monographs [4, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36] for deterministic and stochastic cases. Bahlali, Khelfallah and Mezerdi [3] investigated the near optimal control of FBSDEs (see also references therein Hafayed et al. [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]). Based on Ekeland's principle and spike variation, a necessary and sufficient condition of near optimality for the near optimal control are established. However, in their work, the diffusion coefficient is independent of the control variable. The similar hypothesis was put in the work of Huang, Li and Wang [7] for linear case. Besides, Hui, Huang, Li and Wang [9] also considered the near optimal control for general form of FBSDEs, with the assumption that the control domain is convex. It is remarkable that some problem to near optimal control is addressed in previous work of second and third authors (see [7]) in which the diffusion term depends on the control. The difficulty to this problem when the controlled systems are FBSDEs is also discussed. Our aims in this paper is to fulfill this research gap by removing this assumption, that is, *the diffusion coefficient is independent of the control variable and control domain is convex*. Our methods are mainly based on the Ekeland's principle, spike variation and reduction technique developed recently by Yong [31] and the methodology recently introduced by Wu [26] to consider the optimal control problem for FBSDEs in the general case of control domains including Lagrange multipliers.

Let us make it more precise. First of all, we introduce the controlled initial value problem for a system of SDEs, where the pair $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot))$ is regarded as the state process and $(z(\cdot), u(\cdot))$ is regarded as the control process in bounded control domains. Meanwhile, we regard the original terminal condition $y(T) = Mx(T)$ as the terminal state constraint. Next it is possible to translate the near optimal control Problem (\tilde{C}^ϵ) into a high-dimensional reduced near optimal control problem driven by the standard SDEs with state constraint (for more information see Problem (C^ϵ) in Section 3). We mention that the advantage of this reduced near optimal control problem is that one needs not much regularity/integrability of process $z(\cdot)$ since it is treated as a control process. Hence, it is

possible to apply the Ekeland's variational principle to handle this high-dimensional reduced near optimal control problem with state constraint. Afterwards, the necessary conditions for the near optimal control of Problem (C) are derived by Problem (\tilde{C}^ε). Finally, by convergence technique we obtain the general case of control domains and complete our proof.

The paper is organized as follows. The notations, preliminaries and some basic definitions are given in Section 2. In Section 3, under some suitable assumptions, we state the main result of this paper, together with some discussions of special cases. The application of our theoretical results will be shown in Section 4. Some conclusion is given in Section 5. Finally, we present some technique proofs in Appendix. For the simplicity of notations, we consider the case where both x and y are one-dimensional, and the control u is also one-dimensional.

2 Notation and preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we denoted by \mathbb{R} the space of one-dimensional Euclidean space, by $\mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ the space the matrices with order $n \times d$, by \mathbf{S}^n the space of symmetric matrices with order $n \times n$. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $|\cdot|$ denote the scalar product and norm in the Euclidean space, respectively. \top is the transpose of a matrix.

Let \mathbb{U} be a given set in some Euclidean space \mathbb{R} . Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, P)$ be a complete filtered probability space on which a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion $W(\cdot)$ is defined, with $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ being its natural filtration, augmented by all the P -null sets.

We now introduce the following spaces of process:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) &\triangleq \left\{ \mathbb{R}\text{-valued } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-adapted process } \phi(t); \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\phi(t)|^2 \right] < \infty \right\}, \\ \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) &\triangleq \left\{ \mathbb{R}\text{-valued } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-adapted process } \varphi(t); \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 |\varphi(t)|^2 dt \right] < \infty \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and denote $\mathcal{N}^2[0, 1] = \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$. Clearly, $\mathcal{N}^2[0, 1]$ forms a Banach space. Any process in $\mathcal{N}^2[0, 1]$ is denoted by $\Theta(\cdot) = (x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot))$, whose norm is given by

$$\|\Theta(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{N}^2[0,1]} = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |x(t)|^2 + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |y(t)|^2 + \int_0^1 |z(t)|^2 dt \right].$$

2.1 Formulation of Near Optimal Control Problem and Basic Assumptions

We study the stochastic control systems which are described by a linear FBSDEs of the type:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) &= [A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t)] dt + [C(t)x(t) + D(t)u(t)] dW(t), \\ dy(t) &= -[a(t)x(t) + b(t)y(t) + c(t)u(t)] dt + z(t)dW(t), \\ x(0) &= x_0, \quad y(1) = Mx(1), \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where $A(\cdot), B(\cdot), C(\cdot), D(\cdot), a(\cdot), b(\cdot)$ and $c(\cdot)$ are bounded deterministic functions with values in \mathbb{R} , M is a constant, and $u(\cdot)$ is a control process.

The control process $u(\cdot) : [0, 1] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ is called admissible, if it is an \mathcal{F}_t -adapted process with values in \mathbb{U} . The set of all admissible controls is denoted by $\mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$.

Under the above assumptions, for any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, it is easy to check that FBSDEs (2.1) admit a unique \mathcal{F}_t -adapted solution denoted by the triple $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$.

The cost functional is given by

$$J(u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 l(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) dt + \phi(x(1)) + \gamma(y(0)) \right], \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \gamma &: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ l &: [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

The classical object of the optimal control problem is to minimize the cost functional $J(u(\cdot))$, over all $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$. We denote the above problem by (C).

Problem (C). Find $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, such that

$$J(\bar{u}(\cdot)) = \inf_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]} J(u(\cdot)). \quad (2.3)$$

Any $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ satisfying (2.3) is called an optimal control process of Problem (C), and the corresponding state process, denoted by $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{z}(\cdot))$, is called optimal state process. We also refer to $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{z}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$ as an optimal 4-tuple of Problem (C).

However, the control problem under consideration in this paper is to find the a control in $\mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, which minimizes or “nearly” minimizes $J(\bar{u}(\cdot))$ over $\mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$. From this point, we need the following definitions.

Definition 1 (Optimal Control). Any admissible control $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, is called optimal, if $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ attains the minimum of $J(u(\cdot))$.

Definition 2 (ε -Optimal Control). For a given $\varepsilon > 0$, an admissible control $u^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is called ε -optimal if

$$|J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot))| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Definition 3. Both a family of admissible controls $\{u^\varepsilon(\cdot)\}$ parameterized by $\varepsilon > 0$ and any element $u^\varepsilon(\cdot)$, in the family, are called near optimal if

$$|J(u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - J(\bar{u}(\cdot))| \leq r(\varepsilon)$$

holds for sufficient small ε , where r is a function of ε satisfying $r(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The estimate $r(\varepsilon)$ is called an error bound. If $r(\varepsilon) = C\varepsilon^\delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ independent of the constant C , then $u^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is called near optimal with order ε^δ .

Problem (C $^\varepsilon$). Find $\bar{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, such that

$$J(\bar{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) = \inf_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]} J(u(\cdot)) + \varepsilon. \quad (2.4)$$

Any $\bar{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ satisfying (2.4) is called a near optimal control process of Problem (C), and the corresponding state process, denoted by $(\bar{x}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \bar{y}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \bar{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$, is called optimal state process. We also refer to $(\bar{x}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \bar{y}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \bar{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \bar{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ as an optimal 4-tuple of Problem (C).

Hereafter, $C > 0$ stands for a generic constant which can be different at different places.

3 Main Result

3.1 Necessary Condition of Near Optimality

In this section, we first present our necessary conditions for the near optimal control of Problem (C) under some suitable assumptions. Due to the assumptions introduced in Section 2. There exists a constant $L > 0$ such that

$$|A(t)(x - x')|^2 + |C(t)(x - x')|^2 + |a(t)(x - x') + b(t)(y - y')|^2 \leq L(|x - x'|^2 + |y - y'|^2),$$

$$\forall t \in [0, 1], (x, y), (x', y') \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$|A(t)x + B(t)u|^2 + |C(t)x + D(t)u|^2 + |a(t)x + b(t)y + c(t)u|^2 \leq L(1 + |x|^2 + |y|^2),$$

$$\forall (t, z, u) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{U}, (x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

To establish the necessary condition, we need the following assumption:

- (H1)** The maps ϕ, γ are twice continuously differentiable with respect to (x, y) . l_x, l_y, ϕ_x and γ_y grow linearly about (x, y, u) and is continuous in (t, u) . Moreover, $l_{xx}, l_{yy}, l_{xy}, \phi_{xx}$ and γ_{yy} are bounded.

Now, let $(x^\varepsilon(\cdot), y^\varepsilon(\cdot), z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ be a near optimal 4-tuple of Problem (C^ε) . We introduce

$$\mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} A(t) & 0 \\ -a(t) & -b(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Sigma_X(t, \cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} C(t) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Our main result of this paper is following:

Theorem 1. *Suppose (H1) holds. Then, for any $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{3})$, there exist a constant $C_1 = C_1(\beta)$ such that for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ and any ε -optimal $(x^\varepsilon(\cdot), y^\varepsilon(\cdot), z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ of the problem (C), there exist two parameters θ_0^ε and θ_1^ε (\mathcal{F}_1 -measurable random variable) with $|\theta_0^\varepsilon|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\theta_1^\varepsilon|^2 = 1$, $\theta_0^\varepsilon \geq 0$ holds that*

$$\int_0^1 \left[\langle p^\varepsilon(t), B(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle + \langle k^\varepsilon(t), D(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle - \langle q^\varepsilon(t), c(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \right. \\ \left. + \theta_0^\varepsilon [l(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u) - l(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u^\varepsilon(t))] + \frac{1}{2} D^\varepsilon(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t))^2 P_1(t) \right] dt \geq -C_1 \theta_0^\varepsilon \varepsilon^\beta, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} -dp^\varepsilon(t) &= [A(t)p^\varepsilon(t) - a(t)q^\varepsilon(t) + C(t)k^\varepsilon(t) + \theta_0^\varepsilon l_x^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)] dt - k^\varepsilon(t) dW(t), \\ dq^\varepsilon(t) &= [-b(t)q^\varepsilon(t) - \theta_0^\varepsilon l_y^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)] dt, \\ p^\varepsilon(1) &= \theta_0^\varepsilon \phi_x(x^\varepsilon(1)) - M\theta_1^\varepsilon, \quad q^\varepsilon(0) = -\theta_0^\varepsilon \gamma_y(y^\varepsilon(0)), \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -dP^\varepsilon(t) &= [\mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot)^\top P^\varepsilon(t) + P^\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot) + \Sigma_X(t, \cdot)^\top P^\varepsilon(t)\Sigma_X(t, \cdot) \\ &+ \Sigma_X(t, \cdot)^\top Q^\varepsilon(t) + Q^\varepsilon(t)\Sigma_X(t, \cdot) + H_{XX}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)]dt - Q^\varepsilon(t)dW(t), \\ P^\varepsilon(1) &= \begin{pmatrix} \theta_0^\varepsilon \phi_{xx}(x^\varepsilon(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} l_x^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) &= l_x(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u^\varepsilon(t)), \\ H_{XX}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot) &= H_{XX}(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u^\varepsilon(t), p^\varepsilon(t), q^\varepsilon(t), k^\varepsilon(t), \theta_0^\varepsilon), \end{cases}$$

and the Hamiltonian function $H : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, x, y, u, p, q, k, \theta) &\triangleq \langle p, A(t)x + B(t)u \rangle - \langle q, a(t)x + b(t)y + c(t)u \rangle \\ &+ \langle k, C(t)x + D(t)u \rangle + \theta l(t, x, y, u). \end{aligned}$$

The proof can be seen in Appendix. Some remarks are in order.

Remark 1. Actually, the second order adjoint equations (3.3) can be rewritten as the following three BSDEs if we introduce that

$$P^\varepsilon(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} P_1^\varepsilon(\cdot) & P_2^\varepsilon(\cdot) \\ P_2^\varepsilon(\cdot) & P_3^\varepsilon(\cdot) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q^\varepsilon(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} Q_1^\varepsilon(\cdot) & Q_2^\varepsilon(\cdot) \\ Q_2^\varepsilon(\cdot) & Q_3^\varepsilon(\cdot) \end{pmatrix},$$

then we have

$$\begin{cases} -dP_1^\varepsilon(t) &= [2A(t)P_1^\varepsilon(t) + 2C(t)P_1^\varepsilon(t) + 2C(t)Q_1^\varepsilon(t) - 2a(t)P_2^\varepsilon(t) - \theta_0^\varepsilon l_{xx}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)]dt - Q_1^\varepsilon(t)dW(t), \\ P_1^\varepsilon(1) &= \theta_0^\varepsilon \phi_{xx}(x^\varepsilon(1)), \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} -dP_2^\varepsilon(t) &= [A(t)P_2^\varepsilon(t) + C(t)Q_2^\varepsilon(t) - a(t)P_3^\varepsilon(t) - P_2^\varepsilon(t)b(t) - \theta_0^\varepsilon l_{xy}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)]dt - Q_2^\varepsilon(t)dW(t), \\ P_2^\varepsilon(1) &= 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -dP_3^\varepsilon(t) &= [-2b(t)P_3^\varepsilon(t) - \theta_0^\varepsilon l_{yy}^\varepsilon(t, \cdot)]dt - Q_3^\varepsilon(t)dW(t), \\ P_3^\varepsilon(1) &= 0. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2. The necessary condition of near optimal controls are derived in terms of the near maximum condition in an integral form. It is well known that, for exact optimality, the integral form and the pointwise form of the maximum condition are equivalent, however it is certainly not the case for near optimality.

Remark 3. In the work of Bahlali, Khelfallah, Mezerdi [3], they also considered the near optimal control problem for general FBSDEs where the diffusion term doesn't contain control variable. However, inspired by this paper, we have noticed that, if σ contains control variable, then this problem becomes more difficult. This topic will be carried out as our future publication.

4 Example

We now validate our theoretical results of Section 3 by looking an example which is modified from Zhou [35]. Observe that the FBSDEs considered in this paper are linear, it is possible to implement our principles directly.

Example 1 (Necessary condition). *Let the admissible control domain $\Gamma = [0, 1]$. Consider the following ε -optimal control problem*

$$\min_{u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0,1]} J(u(\cdot)),$$

where

$$J(u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 u(t) dt + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} x^2(1) + x(1) - y(0) \right], \quad (4.1)$$

with

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) &= u(t) dW(t), \\ dy(t) &= -(1 + \sqrt{2}) u(t) dt + z(t) dW(t), \\ x(0) &= 0, \quad y(1) = x(1). \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Set $\theta_0^\varepsilon = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. For a given admissible triple $(x^\varepsilon(\cdot), y^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$, the corresponding first and second adjoint equations are

$$\begin{cases} dp^\varepsilon(t) &= k^\varepsilon(t) dW(t), \\ dq^\varepsilon(t) &= 0, \\ p^\varepsilon(1) &= x^\varepsilon(1), \quad q^\varepsilon(0) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dP_1^\varepsilon(t) &= Q_1^\varepsilon(t) dW(t), \\ P_1^\varepsilon(1) &= 1, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

respectively. Obviously, by the uniqueness of equations (4.3) and (4.4), we derive

$$\begin{cases} p^\varepsilon(t) &= u^\varepsilon(t) W(t), \\ k^\varepsilon(t) &= u^\varepsilon(t), \\ q^\varepsilon(t) &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \quad t \in [0, 1], \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} P_1^\varepsilon(t) &= 1, \\ Q_1^\varepsilon(t) &= 0, \quad t \in [0, 1], \end{cases}$$

respectively. On the other hand, Theorem 1 gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left[\frac{1}{2} (u(t))^2 + u(t)(k^\varepsilon(t) - u^\varepsilon(t) - 1) + \frac{1}{2} (u^\varepsilon(t))^2 - k^\varepsilon(t)u^\varepsilon(t) + u^\varepsilon(t) \right] dt \right\} \geq -C\varepsilon^\beta.$$

Hence a simple calculation shows that if

$$u^\varepsilon(t) + 1 - k^\varepsilon(t) \in \Gamma, \quad (4.5)$$

then, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (k^\varepsilon(t) - 1)^2 dt \right] \leq C\varepsilon^\beta. \quad (4.6)$$

The above condition reveals the “minimum” qualification for the pair $(x^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ to be ε -optimal. Actually, $u^\varepsilon(t) = 1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is one of the candidates for ε -optimal. Indeed, if we choose $u^\varepsilon(t) = 1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with the corresponding state

$$x^\varepsilon(t) = (1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})W(t), \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

then the solutions of first order adjoint equations are

$$(p^\varepsilon(t), k^\varepsilon(t)) = \left((1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})W(t), 1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \right).$$

Obviously, (4.5) and (4.6) are fulfilled.

5 Concluding Remarks

In this article, by Ekeland’s principle, a spike variation, some dedicated estimates and reduction method, we have established necessary condition for near optimal controls to stochastic recursive optimization problems in terms of a small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, we solve the problems posed in [7] (Huang, Li and Wang *Near optimal control problems for linear forward-backward stochastic systems*, Automatica 46 (2010), 397-404) Page 402 for control domain which is not necessarily convex and diffusion term containing control variable. This result is partially based on the work from [3, 5, 7, 26, 31, 35] etc. Our results extends that of Zhou’s [35] with second order adjoint equations in the setup of FBSDEs. Hopefully, the theoretical result obtained in this paper may inspire some real applications in finance and economics.

Appendix

A The Proof of Theorem 1

To establish the necessary condition, we need the following results mainly from Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2, Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 in [7] (note that $|\theta_0^\varepsilon|^2 + \mathbb{E}|\theta_1^\varepsilon|^2 = 1$, $1 \geq \theta_0^\varepsilon \geq 0$ for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ which don’t change these results). For simplicity, we omit the superscript ε .

Lemma 1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\alpha \geq 0$ and any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |x(t)|^\alpha \right] \leq C, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |y(t)|^\alpha \right] \leq C.$$

Lemma 2. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |q(t)|^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |p(t)|^2 + \int_0^1 |k(t)|^2 dt \right] \leq C,$$

where C is independent of $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot))$.

Lemma 3. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |P_1(t)|^2 + \int_0^1 |Q_1(t)|^2 dt \right] \leq C,$$

where C is independent of $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot))$.

Proof. Applying Itô's formula to $|P_3(t)|^2$, we have

$$|P_3(t)|^2 + \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{F}_t} \left[\int_t^1 |Q_3(s)|^2 ds \right] \leq C' \mathbb{E} \int_t^1 |P_3(s)|^2 ds + 2 \int_t^1 |l_{yy}|^2 ds.$$

By Burkholder-Davis-Gundy's inequality and Gronwall inequality, there is a constant C such that,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |P_3(t)|^2 + \int_t^1 |Q_3(s)|^2 ds \right] \leq C.$$

The same method to deal with $P_2(t)$, and $P_1(t)$, we get the desired result. \square

Lemma 4. *For any $\tau \geq 0$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ satisfying $\tau\beta < 1$, there is a positive constant $C > 0$ such that for any $u(\cdot)$ and $u'(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ along with the corresponding trajectories $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ and $(x'(\cdot), y'(\cdot), z'(\cdot))$, it follows that*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |x(t) - x'(t)|^{2\tau} \right] \leq Cd(u(\cdot), u'(\cdot))^{\tau\beta}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |y(t) - y'(t)|^{2\tau} \right] \leq Cd(u(\cdot), u'(\cdot))^{\tau\beta}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5. *Assume (H1)-(H2) hold. For any $1 < \tau < 2$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ satisfying $(1+\beta)\tau < 2$, there is a constant C such that for any $u(\cdot)$ and $u'(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ along with the corresponding trajectories $\eta(\cdot) = (x(\cdot), y(\cdot), z(\cdot))$, $\eta'(\cdot) = (x'(\cdot), y'(\cdot), z'(\cdot))$, and solutions $(p(\cdot), q(\cdot), k(\cdot))$, $(p'(\cdot), q'(\cdot), k'(\cdot))$ of the corresponding adjoint equations, it holds that*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |q(t) - q'(t)|^\tau \right] \leq Cd(u(\cdot), u'(\cdot))^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|p(t) - p'(t)|^\tau + |k(t) - k'(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \leq Cd(u(\cdot), u'(\cdot))^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}}, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|P_i(t) - P'_i(t)|^\tau + |Q_i(t) - Q'_i(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \leq Cd(u(\cdot), u'(\cdot))^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We are going to prove the third assertion. Note that $(\bar{P}_3(t), \bar{Q}_3(t)) = (P_3(t) - P'_3(t), Q_3(t) - Q'_3(t))$ satisfies the following BSDEs

$$\begin{cases} -d\bar{P}_3(t) = [-2b(t)\bar{P}_3(t) - \theta_0(l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t)))] dt \\ \quad - Q_3(t)dW(t), \\ \bar{P}_3(1) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Set $\rho_3(\cdot)$ to be the following linear SDEs:

$$\begin{cases} d\rho_3(t) = [2b(t)\rho_3(t) + |\bar{P}_3(t)|^{\tau-1} \text{sgn}(\bar{P}_3(t))] dt + |\bar{Q}_3(t)|^{\tau-1} \text{sgn}(\bar{Q}_3(t))dW(t), \\ \rho_3(0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

It is easy to check that (A.1) admit a unique solution, and the following estimate can be obtained by Cauchy-Schwartz's inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\rho_3(t)|^\gamma \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|\bar{P}_3(t)|^\tau + |\bar{Q}_3(t)|^\tau) dt \right], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\gamma > 2$ and $\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\tau} = 1$.

Applying Itô's formula to $\bar{P}_3(\cdot)\rho_3(\cdot)$ on $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|\bar{P}_3(t)|^\tau + |Q_3(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (\rho_3(t)\theta_0(l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t)))) dt \right] \\ &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 (|l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t))|^\tau) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |\rho_3(t)|^\gamma dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}. \quad (\text{A.3}) \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (A.2) into (A.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|\bar{P}_3(t)|^\tau + |Q_3(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (\theta_0 |l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t))|^\tau) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

From (H1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\int_0^1 (\theta_0 |l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t))|^\tau) dt \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u'(t))|^\tau \mathcal{X}_{u(t)=u'(t)}) dt \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u'(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t))|^\tau) dt \right] \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^1 (|l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{yy}(t, x(t), y(t), u'(t))|^2) dt \right)^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_0^1 d(u(t), u'(t))^{1-\frac{\tau}{2}} dt \right] \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|x(t) - x'(t)|^\tau + |y(t) - y'(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \\ &\leq Cd(u(t), u'(t))^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (A.3) with the above inequality, the result for $i = 3$ holds immediately.

We proceed to estimate the case, $i = 2$. Similarly, we define the following SDEs:

$$\begin{cases} d\rho_2(t) &= \left[(b(t) - A(t))\rho_2(t) + |\bar{P}_2(t)|^{\tau-1} \text{sgn}(\bar{P}_2(t)) \right] dt \\ &\quad + \left[c(t)\rho_2(t) + |\bar{Q}_2(t)|^{\tau-1} \text{sgn}(\bar{Q}_2(t)) \right] dW(t), \\ \rho_2(0) &= 0. \end{cases}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\bar{P}_2(\cdot)\rho_2(\cdot)$ on $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|\bar{P}_2(t)|^\tau + |Q_2(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (\rho_2(t) [\theta_0(l_{xy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{xy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t))) + a(t)\bar{P}_3(t)]) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|\bar{P}_2(t)|^\tau + |Q_2(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \\
& \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 |a(t)\bar{P}_3(t)|^\tau dt \right] \\
& \quad + C \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (\theta_0 |l_{xy}(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) - l_{xy}(t, x'(t), y'(t), u'(t))|^\tau) dt \right] \\
& \leq Cd(u(\cdot), u'(\cdot))^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we define the following SDEs:

$$\begin{cases} d\rho_1(t) &= \left[(2A(t) + C(t)^2)\rho_1(t) + |\bar{P}_1(t)|^{\tau-1} \text{sgn}(\bar{P}_1(t)) \right] dt \\ &+ \left[2C(t)\rho_1(t) + |\bar{Q}_1(t)|^{\tau-1} \text{sgn}(\bar{Q}_1(t)) \right] dW(t), \\ \rho_1(0) &= 0. \end{cases}$$

Repeating the method used above, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (|\bar{P}_1(t)|^\tau + |\bar{Q}_1(t)|^\tau) dt \right] \leq Cd(u(t), u'(t))^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

The proof of Theorem 1 will be accomplished step by step. As the reduction method developed by Yong [31] and Wu [26], independently, we adopt the method by Yong [31] to derive the first and second adjoint equations and the idea by Wu [26] to deal with unbounded control problem together.

Proof of Theorem 1.

Step 1 (The bounded control domains).

When $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot))$ is regarded as the state process and $(z(\cdot), u(\cdot))$ as the control process, we consider the following initial value problem for a control system of SDEs:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) &= [A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t)] dt + [C(t)x(t) + D(t)u(t)] dW(t), \\ -dy(t) &= [a(t)x(t) + b(t)y(t) + c(t)u(t)] dt - z(t)dW(t), \\ x(0) &= x_0, \quad y(0) = y_0, \end{cases} \tag{A.4}$$

Clearly, it is easy to check that, for any $(z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique strong solution

$$(x(\cdot), y(\cdot)) \equiv (x(\cdot, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)), y(\cdot, z(\cdot), u(\cdot))) \in \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$$

to (A.4) depending on $(z(\cdot), u(\cdot))$. Next, we regard the original terminal condition as the terminal state constraint:

$$y(1) = Mx(1). \tag{A.5}$$

Since \mathbb{R} , $\mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$ are all unbounded, Thus, we adopt a convergence technique developed by Wu [26].

Let $y_0, z(\cdot)$ take value in $\mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{R}$, and \mathbb{M} be convex. Moreover, \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{N} are all bounded. Let \mathcal{A} be the set of all 3-triples $(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ such that the unique corresponding state process $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot))$ satisfies the constraint (A.5). Note that, for any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, there exists a unique $(y_0, z(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$ such that state equation (2.1) admits a unique state process $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{S}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$ satisfying the state constraint (A.5). Hence, (H1) implies $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$. The cost functional is given by

$$J(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 l(t, x(t), y(t), u(t)) dt + \phi(x(1)) + \gamma(y(0)) \right].$$

We state the following problem.

Problem (\tilde{C}^ε). Find $(y_0^\varepsilon, z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}$, such that

$$J(y_0^\varepsilon, z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot)) = \inf_{(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}} J(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) + \varepsilon.$$

We, respectively, refer to $(y_0^\varepsilon, z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ as a near optimal control process, to $(x^\varepsilon(\cdot), y^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ as the corresponding near optimal state process, and to $(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ as a near optimal 3-tuple of Problem (\tilde{C}^ε).

Problem (C^ε) is embedded into (\tilde{C}^ε). Suppose that $(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ is the near optimal control of Problem (\tilde{C}^ε), clearly, we know that $\tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is the near optimal control of Problem (C^ε). The advantage of Problem (\tilde{C}^ε) is that one does not need much regularity/integrability on $z(\cdot)$ since it is treated as part of a control process; the disadvantage is that one has to treat terminal constraint (A.5).

Lemma 6 (Ekeland Principle [5]). *Let (S, d) be a complete metric space and $\rho : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a lower semicontinuous function, bounded from below. If for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $u^\varepsilon \in S$ such that $\rho(u^\varepsilon) \leq \inf_{u \in S} \rho(u) + \varepsilon$. Then for any $\lambda > 0$, there exists $u^\lambda \in S$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} (i) & \rho(u^\lambda) \leq \rho(u^\varepsilon), \\ (ii) & d(u^\lambda, u^\varepsilon) \leq \lambda, \\ (iii) & \rho(u^\lambda) \leq \rho(u) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda} d(u, u^\lambda), \quad \text{for all } u \in S. \end{cases}$$

For u, v in $\mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ or in $\mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$, we define

$$d(u, v) = dt \otimes P \{(t, \omega) \in [0, 1] \times \Omega : u(t, \omega) \neq v(t, \omega)\},$$

where $dt \otimes P$ is the product measure of the Lebesgue measure dt with the probability measure P . It is well known that $(\mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1], d)$ is a complete metric space (see [28]). Then $\mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ is a complete metric space under the following metric: for any $(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)), (\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{z}(\cdot), \tilde{u}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$d_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}(\cdot)) = \left[|y_0 - \tilde{y}_0|^2 + d(z(\cdot), \tilde{z}(\cdot))^2 + d(u(\cdot), \tilde{u}(\cdot))^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\theta(\cdot) = (y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot))$ and $\tilde{\theta}(\cdot) = (\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{z}(\cdot), \tilde{u}(\cdot))$, respectively.

By assumption (H1), it is easy to see that $J(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot))$ is lower semicontinuous on \mathcal{A} . By virtue of Ekeland principle (Lemma 6) with $\lambda = \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}$ (fixed $\varepsilon > 0$) there is an admissible 3-triple $(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$d_{\mathcal{A}}((y_0^\varepsilon, z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot)), (\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))) \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and

$$\tilde{J}^\varepsilon((\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))) \leq \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(v(\cdot)), \text{ for any } v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A},$$

where

$$\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(v(\cdot)) = J(v(\cdot)) + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} d_{\mathcal{A}}(v(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}^\varepsilon(\cdot)), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which means that $(\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ is an optimal triple for the system (A.4) with a new cost functional \tilde{J}^ε .

Let $(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ be an optimal 3-triple of Problem (\tilde{C}^ε) with new functional (A.7), with the corresponding optimal state process $(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$. For any $\delta > 0$, we define, for any $\forall(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$,

$$J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) = \left\{ \left[(\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) + \delta)^+ \right]^2 + \mathbb{E} |y(1) - Mx(1)|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $(x(\cdot), y(\cdot))$ is the unique solution of (A.4). Also, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) &> 0, \quad \forall(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1], \\ J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) &= \delta \leq \inf_{(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]} J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 6, there exists a 3-triple $(y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon}, z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ such that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1) \quad J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon}, z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot)) \leq J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) = \delta, \\ (2) \quad \left| y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon} - \tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon \right|^2 + d(z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot) - z(\cdot))^2 + d(u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))^2 \leq \delta, \\ (3) \quad -\sqrt{\delta} \left[\left| y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon} - y_0 \right|^2 + d(z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot) - z(\cdot))^2 + d(u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u(\cdot))^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \quad \leq J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) - J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon}, z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot)), \\ \quad \forall(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \in \mathbb{M} \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]. \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Hence, $(y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon}, z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot))$ is a global minimum point of the following penalized cost functional

$$J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) + \sqrt{\delta} \left[\left| y_0 - y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon} \right|^2 + d(z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot) - z(\cdot))^2 + d(u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u(\cdot))^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

In other words, fix $\varepsilon > 0$, if we pose a penalized optimal control problem with the state constraint (A.5) and the cost functional (A.9), then $(y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon}, z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot))$ is an optimal 3-triple of the problem. Note that this problem does not have state constraints, and the optimal 3-triple $(y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon}, z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot))$ approaches $(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Let us turn back to the new cost functional

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) &= J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\delta} \left[\left| y_0 - y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon} \right|^2 + d(z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot) - z(\cdot))^2 + d(u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(\cdot), u(\cdot))^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Denote

$$X \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \quad v(\cdot) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} z \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \quad X_0 \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad X(1) \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} x(1) \\ y(1) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}(t, X, v(\cdot)) &\triangleq \begin{pmatrix} A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t) \\ -a(t)x(t) - b(t)y(t) - c(t)u(t) \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Sigma(t, X, v(\cdot)) &\triangleq \begin{pmatrix} C(t)x(t) + D(t)u(t) \\ z \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Xi(X(0), X(1)) &\triangleq \phi(x(1)) + \gamma(y(0)), \\
\Pi(X(0), X(1)) &\triangleq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y(1) - Mx(1) \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H} &\triangleq \mathbb{R}^2 \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}_1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \equiv \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathcal{X}_2^2, \\
\mathcal{H}_0 &\triangleq \mathbb{R} \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}_1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \equiv \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X}_1^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) &= \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0, v(\cdot)), \\
J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, z(\cdot), u(\cdot)) &= J^{\delta, \varepsilon}(y_0, v(\cdot)).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}_0 are Hilbert spaces. We identify $\mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_0^* = \mathcal{H}_0$. Also

$$\Xi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \Pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0.$$

The gradient of $D\Xi$ and the Hessian $D^2\Xi$ of Ξ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
D\Xi(X(0), X(1)) &= (D_{X_0}\Xi(X(0), X(1)), D_{X_1}\Xi(X(0), X(1))) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathbb{R}) \equiv \mathcal{H}^* = \mathcal{H}, \\
D^2\Xi(X(0), X(1)) &= \begin{pmatrix} D_{X_0X_0}\Xi(X(0), X(1)) & D_{X_0X_1}\Xi(X(0), X(1)) \\ D_{X_1X_0}\Xi(X(0), X(1)) & D_{X_1X_1}\Xi(X(0), X(1)) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}_s(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1; \mathcal{H}_2)$ is the set of all linear bounded operator from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_2 , and $\mathcal{L}_s(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H})$ is the set of all linear bounded self-adjoint operators from \mathcal{H} to itself. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi_{X_0}(X(0), X(1)) &= (0, \gamma_y(y_0))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2, \\
\Xi_{X_1}(X(0), X(1)) &= (\phi_x(x(1)), 0)^\top \in \mathcal{X}_1^2, \\
\Xi_{X_0X_0}(X(0), X(1)) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_{yy}(y_0) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}^2, \\
\Xi_{X_0X_1}(X(0), X(1)) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_1^2; \mathbb{R}^2), \\
\Xi_{X_1X_0}(X(0), X(1)) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathcal{X}_1^2), \\
\Xi_{X_1X_1}(X(0), X(1)) &= \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{xx}(x(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_2^2; \mathcal{X}_2^2).
\end{aligned}$$

For

$$\begin{aligned}
D\Pi(X(0), X(1)) &= (D_{X_0}\Pi(X(0), X(1)), D_{X_1}\Pi(X(0), X(1))) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H}_0), \\
D^2\Pi(X(0), X(1)) &= \begin{pmatrix} D_{X_0X_0}\Pi(X(0), X(1)) & D_{X_0X_1}\Pi(X(0), X(1)) \\ D_{X_1X_0}\Pi(X(0), X(1)) & D_{X_1X_1}\Pi(X(0), X(1)) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H}_0)).
\end{aligned}$$

Take any $\hat{\Phi} = (\hat{\Phi}_0, \hat{\Phi}_1) \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Then,

$$\left\langle \Pi(X(0), X(1)), \hat{\Phi} \right\rangle = \left\langle y(1) - M(1)x(1), \hat{\Phi} \right\rangle.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} D\Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= D \left[\left\langle \Pi(X(0), X(1)), \hat{\Phi} \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \left(\left\langle \Pi(X(0), X(1)), \hat{\Phi} \right\rangle_{X_0}, \left\langle \Pi(X(0), X(1)), \hat{\Phi} \right\rangle_{X_1} \right) \\ &= (\Pi_{X_0}(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi}, \Pi_{X_1}(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi}), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{X_0}(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= (0, 0), \\ \Pi_{X_1}(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= (-M\hat{\Phi}_1, \hat{\Phi}_1), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} D^2\Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= D^2 \left[\left\langle \Pi(X(0), X(1)), \hat{\Phi} \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} D_{X_0 X_0} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} & D_{X_0 X_1} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} \\ D_{X_1 X_0} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} & D_{X_1 X_1} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}; \mathcal{H}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_{X_0 X_0} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ D_{X_1 X_0} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ D_{X_0 X_1} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ D_{X_1 X_1} \Pi(X(0), X(1))\hat{\Phi} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We now construct spike variation. For, $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, and any $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $y_0 \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon} + y_0 \in \mathbb{M}$. Define

$$y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} = \alpha y_0 + y_0^{\delta, \varepsilon}, \quad (z^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t), u^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t)) = \begin{cases} (z, u), & t \in [\tau, \tau + \alpha], \\ (z^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t)), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $z \in \mathbb{N}$, $u \in \mathbb{U}$ are \mathcal{F}_τ -measurable random variables, such that $\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} |u(\omega)| < +\infty$ and $\sup_{\omega \in \Omega} |z(\omega)| < +\infty$. Note that y_0 is a control independent of time variable, so convex perturbation can be applied here.

Let $X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(\cdot)$ be the state process (A.4) corresponding to $(X_0^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}, v^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(\cdot))$. Let $X_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(\cdot)$ and $X_2^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(\cdot)$ be, respectively, the solutions to the following SDEs:

$$\begin{cases} dX_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t) &= \mathcal{B}_X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t, \cdot) X_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t) dt + \left[\Sigma_X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t, \cdot) X_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t) + \Delta \Sigma^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t, \cdot) I_{S_\alpha} \right] dW(t), \\ X_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t) &= \sqrt{\alpha} y_0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dX_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) &= \mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \Delta\mathcal{B}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)I_{S_\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{B}_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)^2 dt \\ &+ \left[\Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \Delta\Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)I_{S_\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\Sigma_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)^2 \right] dW(t), \\ X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0) &= 0, \end{cases}$$

where I_{S_α} denotes the indicator function of the set S_α and for any $X \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \mathcal{B}_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)), \\ \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \Sigma_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)), \\ \Delta\mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \mathcal{B}(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v(t)) - \mathcal{B}(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)), \\ \Delta\Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \Sigma(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v(t)) - \Sigma(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)), \\ \Delta\Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \Sigma_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v(t)) - \Sigma_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} \langle \mathcal{B}_{XX}^{1,\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X, X \rangle \\ \langle \mathcal{B}_{XX}^{2,\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X, X \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \mathcal{B}_{XX}^{i,\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \mathcal{B}_{XX}^i(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)), \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \Sigma_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \begin{pmatrix} \langle \Sigma_{XX}^{1,\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X, X \rangle \\ \langle \Sigma_{XX}^{2,\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot)X, X \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ \Sigma_{XX}^{i,\delta,\varepsilon}(t,\cdot) &= \Sigma_{XX}^i(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), v^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)), \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

The following results can be seen in Wu [26]:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \left| X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \right|^{2k} + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \left| X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t) \right|^{2k} &\leq C\alpha^k, \\ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \left| X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \right|^{2k} + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \left| X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t) - X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \right|^{2k} &\leq C\alpha^{2k}, \\ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbb{E} \left| X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t) - X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \right|^{2k} &= o(\alpha^{2k}). \end{aligned}$$

Now from the last relation in (A.8), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
-\sqrt{\delta}\alpha\sqrt{2+|y_0|^2} &\leq J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \\
&= \frac{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot))^2}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \\
&\quad - \frac{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))^2}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \\
&= \frac{[(\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) + \delta)^+]^2}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \\
&\quad - \frac{[(\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) + \delta)^+]^2}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1))^2 - \Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))^2]}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \\
&= \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix}, \Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1)) - \Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \right\rangle \\
&= (\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon} + o(1)) \left[\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon} + o(1) \end{pmatrix}, \Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1)) - \Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \right\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} &= \frac{2}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) + J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \int_0^1 \left[\beta(\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + (1-\beta)(\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))) \right] d\beta + \delta \right\}^+, \\
\theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} &= \frac{y^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) - Mx^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) + y^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1) - Mx^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) + J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))}, \\
\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon} &= \frac{(\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon, \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) + \delta)^+}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \in [0, 1], \\
\theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon} &= \frac{y^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1) - Mx^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)}{J^{\delta,\varepsilon}(y^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))} \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[\tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - \tilde{J}^\varepsilon(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \right] \\
&= \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) \right] \\
&= \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \right] \\
&\quad + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) \right] \\
&\leq \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \right] + \alpha \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \sqrt{|y_0|^2 + 2},
\end{aligned}$$

since the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) - d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), \tilde{\theta}^\varepsilon(\cdot)) \\
&\leq d_{\mathcal{A}} \left((y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)), (y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \right) \leq \alpha \sqrt{|y_0|^2 + 2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) - l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) dt \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1)) - \Xi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \right] \\
&= I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

We deal with I_1, I_2 , respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 \left(l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) - l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) \right) dt \right. \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 l_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) (X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2} l_{XX}(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) (X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t))^2 dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 (l_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) - l_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t))) (X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) dt \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^1 (l_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t))) (X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t) - X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) dt \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 \left(\beta \left[l_{XX}(t, \beta X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t) + (1-\beta) X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - l_{XX}(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) \right] (X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t))^2 \right) d\beta \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (l_{XX}(t, X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t), u^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t)) - l_{XX}(t, X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t))) (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t))^2 \right] dt \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 \left(l_{XX}(t, X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t)) (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t) - X_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t)) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \times (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(t) + X_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(t)) \right) dt \right],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi(X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(0), X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1)) - \Xi(X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi_{X(0)}(X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(0) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0)) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi_{X(1)}(X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \Xi_{X(0)X(0)}(X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(0) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0))^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \Xi_{X(1)X(1)}(X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1))^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left\langle D^2 \Xi^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} \begin{pmatrix} X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(0) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0) \\ X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1) \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(0) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0) \\ X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1) \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D^2 \Xi^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} &= \int_0^1 [\beta D^2 \Xi(\beta X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0) + (1 - \beta) X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(0), \beta X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1) + (1 - \beta) X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1)) \\
&\quad - D^2 \Xi(X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1))] d\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Besides,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} \end{pmatrix}, \Pi(X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(0), X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1)) - \Pi(X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \right\rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} \end{pmatrix}, \Pi(0, X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1)) - \Pi(0, X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \right\rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Pi_{X(1)}(0, X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} \end{pmatrix} (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \right\rangle \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} \end{pmatrix} (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1))^2 \right\rangle \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[D^2 \Pi^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} \end{pmatrix} (X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1) - X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1))^2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$D^2 \Pi^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha} = \int_0^1 \beta \left[\Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, \beta X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1) + (1 - \beta) X^{\delta, \varepsilon, \alpha}(1)) - \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, X^{\delta, \varepsilon}(1)) \right] d\beta.$$

Clearly, under assumptions (H1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\alpha\sqrt{|y_0|^2 + 2} \left(\sqrt{\delta} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \right) \\
\leq & \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - J(y_0^{\delta,\varepsilon}, z^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix}, \Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1)) - \Pi(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \right\rangle \\
= & \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 \left(l_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t))(X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) - l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) + \frac{1}{2} l_{XX}(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t))(X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t))^2 \right) dt \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\Xi_{X(0)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0)) + \Xi_{X(1)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \Xi_{X(0)X(0)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0))^2 \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \Xi_{X(1)X(1)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))(X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))^2 \right] \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left\langle \Pi_{X(1)}(0, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix} (X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \right\rangle \\
& + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left\langle \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix} (X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) - X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1))^2 \right\rangle \right] + o(\alpha) \\
= & \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^1 \left\{ \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) - l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) \right] \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \left[l_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t))(X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) \right] \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \frac{1}{2} \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} l_{XX}(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t)) \left(X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \right)^2 \right\} dt \right. \\
& \left. + \sqrt{\alpha} \left\langle \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \Xi_{X(0)} \left(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1) \right), \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\alpha}{2} \left\langle \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \Xi_{X(0)X(0)} \left(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1) \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right. \\
& \left. + \left(\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \Xi_{X(1)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) + \Pi_{X(1)}(0, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right) (X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) + X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1)) \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left[\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \Xi_{X(1)X(1)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot)) + \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right] (X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1))^2 \right\} + o(\alpha).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

Let us introduce the following the first order BSDEs:

$$\begin{cases} -d\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) & = \left[\mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) \tilde{\Psi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} l_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) \right] dt - \tilde{\Psi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) dW(t), \\ \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) & = \left[\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \Xi_{X(1)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) + \Pi_{X(1)}(0, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right], \end{cases}$$

where $l_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) = l_X(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t))$.

The second order BSDEs:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -d\tilde{P}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) = \left[\mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{P}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \tilde{P}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) + \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{P}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) \right. \\ \left. \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{Q}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \tilde{Q}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) + H_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \right] dt - \tilde{Q}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) dW(t), \\ \tilde{P}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) = \left[\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \Xi_{X(1)X(1)}(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) + \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \right], \end{array} \right.$$

where

$$\tilde{H}_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) = \tilde{H}_{XX}(t, \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), \tilde{\Psi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)),$$

with $\tilde{H}_{XX}(t, \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), \tilde{\Psi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t))$ is defined as follows:

$$\tilde{H}(t, \theta, X, v, p, k) = \langle p, \mathcal{B}(t, X, v) \rangle + \langle k, \Sigma(t, X, v) \rangle + \theta l(t, X, v).$$

Set $\mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot) = X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot) X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)$. Then,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} d\mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) = \left\{ \mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \mathcal{B}_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top + \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top \right. \\ \left. + \left[\Delta \Sigma^\delta(t, \cdot) \Delta \Sigma^\delta(t, \cdot)^\top + \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Delta \Sigma^\delta(t, \cdot)^\top \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \Delta \Sigma^\delta(t, \cdot) X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Sigma^\delta(t, \cdot)^\top \right] I_{S_\alpha}(t) \right\} dt \\ \left. + \left\{ \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Sigma_X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \left[X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Delta \Sigma^\delta(t, \cdot)^\top + \Delta \Sigma^\delta(t, \cdot) X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)^\top \right] I_{S_\alpha}(t) \right\} dW(t), \\ \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha y_0^2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{array} \right.$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\langle \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot) + X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot) \rangle$ and $P^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot) \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)$ respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1), X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) + X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) \rangle \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0), \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{\alpha} y_0 \end{pmatrix} \rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 - \langle \theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha} l_X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t, \cdot), (X_2^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) + X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)) \rangle \right. \\ & \quad + \langle \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), \Delta \mathcal{B}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) I_{S_\alpha}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B}_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) (X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t))^2 \rangle \\ & \quad \left. + \langle \tilde{\Psi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), \Delta \Sigma^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) I_{S_\alpha}(t) + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) (X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t))^2 \rangle dt \right] + o(\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr} \left[P^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) \mathcal{Y}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) \right] - \left\langle P^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{\varepsilon} y_0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{\varepsilon} y_0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_0^1 \text{tr} \left[\Delta \Sigma^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top P^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \Delta \Sigma^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot) - \langle H_{XX}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), X_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t) \rangle \right] dt \right\} + o(\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Then, from (A.11), (A.12) and (A.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\alpha\sqrt{|y_0|^2 + 2}\left(\sqrt{\delta} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}\right) \\
\leq & \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^1\left[\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}\left[l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) - l(t, X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t), u^{\delta,\varepsilon}(\cdot))\right]\right.\right. \\
& + \left\langle\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), \Delta\mathcal{B}^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)\right\rangle + \left\langle\tilde{\Psi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t), \Delta\Sigma^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)\right\rangle \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Sigma^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)^\top P^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(t)\Delta\Sigma^{\delta,\varepsilon}(t, \cdot)\right]dt \\
& + \mathbb{E}\left[\sqrt{\alpha}\left\langle\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}\Xi_{X(0)}\left(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)\right) + \tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0), \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}\right\rangle\right] \\
& + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\alpha}{2}\left\langle\left(\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}\Xi_{X(0)X(0)}\left(X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(0), X^{\delta,\varepsilon}(1)\right) + P^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(0)\right)\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}\right\rangle\right] + o(\alpha). \tag{A.14}
\end{aligned}$$

To derive the adjoint equations, in (A.14), dividing $\sqrt{\alpha}$ and then sending $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, followed by sending $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \leq \mathbb{E}\left\langle\theta_0^\varepsilon\Xi_{X(0)}(\tilde{X}^\varepsilon(0), \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) + \tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(0), \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}\right\rangle \\
& = \mathbb{E}\left\langle\theta_0^\varepsilon\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma_y(\tilde{y}_0^\varepsilon) \end{pmatrix} + \tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(0), \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y_0 \end{pmatrix}\right\rangle. \tag{A.15}
\end{aligned}$$

From continuous dependence of the solution of BSDEs on parameters $(\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(\theta_0^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}, \theta_1^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}) & \rightarrow (\theta_0^\varepsilon, \theta_1^\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R} \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}_1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}), \text{ weakly,} \\
(\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), \tilde{\Psi}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) & \rightarrow (\tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon(\cdot)), \text{ in } \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}), \\
(\tilde{P}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot), \tilde{Q}^{\delta,\varepsilon,\alpha}(\cdot)) & \rightarrow (\tilde{P}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{Q}^\varepsilon(\cdot)), \text{ in } \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}), \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0, \alpha \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(\cdot) \\ \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(\cdot) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon(\cdot) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{k}^\varepsilon(\cdot) \\ \tilde{h}^\varepsilon(\cdot) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, from (A.15), we derive that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(0) \\ \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -\theta_0^\varepsilon\mathbb{E}\gamma_y(\tilde{y}^\varepsilon(1)) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.16}$$

Note that

$$\begin{cases} \Xi_{X(1)}(\tilde{X}^\varepsilon(0), \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) & = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_x(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(1)) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Xi_{X(1)X(1)}(\tilde{X}^\varepsilon(0), \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) & = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{xx}(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_{X(1)}(0, \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1))\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} & = \begin{pmatrix} -M\theta_1^\varepsilon \\ \theta_1^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1))\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} & = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{cases}$$

Next, for the first and second order BSDEs for Problem (\tilde{C}^ε) , we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(1) \\ \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(1) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_0^\varepsilon \phi_x(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(1)) - M\theta_1^\varepsilon \\ \theta_1^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(1) &= \left[\theta_0^\varepsilon \Xi_{X(1)X(1)}(\tilde{X}^\varepsilon(0), \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) + \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \right] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \theta_0^\varepsilon \phi_{xx}(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where the first and second order BSDEs are

$$\begin{cases} -d\tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(t) &= \left[\mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot) \tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(t) + \Sigma_X(t, \cdot) \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon(t) + \theta_0^\varepsilon l_X(t, \cdot) \right] dt \\ &\quad - \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon(t) dW(t), \\ \tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(1) &= \left[\theta_0^\varepsilon \Xi_{X(1)}(\tilde{X}^\varepsilon(0), \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) + \Pi_{X(1)}(0, \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \right], \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -d\tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) &= \left[\mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) + \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) \mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot) + \Sigma_X(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) \Sigma_X(t, \cdot) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \Sigma_X(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{Q}^\varepsilon(t) + \tilde{Q}^\varepsilon(t) \Sigma_X(t, \cdot) + H_{XX} \right] dt - \tilde{Q}^\varepsilon(t) dW(t), \\ \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(1) &= \left[\theta_0^\varepsilon \Xi_{X(1)X(1)}(\tilde{X}^\varepsilon(0), \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) + \Pi_{X(1)X(1)}(0, \tilde{X}^\varepsilon(1)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \theta_1^\varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \right]. \end{cases}$$

Then using a standard argument of [28], taking $y_0 = 0$, we have the following variational inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} -\sqrt{2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}\theta_0^\varepsilon &\leq \theta_0^\varepsilon [l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u) - l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))] \\ &\quad + \left\langle \tilde{\Phi}^\varepsilon(t), \mathcal{B}(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u) - \mathcal{B}(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \left\langle \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon(t), \Sigma(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u, z) - \Sigma(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(t)) \right\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\Sigma(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u, z) - \Sigma(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(t)))^\top \\ &\quad \times \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) (\Sigma(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u) - \Sigma(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))) + o(\alpha), \\ &\quad \forall u \in \mathbb{U}, \forall z \in \mathbb{N}, u \in \mathbb{U}, \text{ a.e., a.s..} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Then (A.19) can be rewrote as

$$\begin{aligned} -\sqrt{2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}\theta_0^\varepsilon &< \theta_0^\varepsilon [l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u) - l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))] \\ &\quad + \langle \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(t), B(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle + \langle \tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t), D(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \tilde{h}^\varepsilon(t), z - \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(t) \rangle - \langle \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t), c(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} D^2(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))^2 \tilde{P}_1^\varepsilon(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} D(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \\ z - \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(t) \end{pmatrix}^\top \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) \begin{pmatrix} D(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \\ z - \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(t) \end{pmatrix}, \\ &\quad \forall z \in \mathbb{N}, u \in \mathbb{U}, \text{ a.e., a.s..} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Taking $u(t) = \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)$, $z(t) = \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(t) + \varepsilon z_0$, $\forall z_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, then dividing by sending $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$-\sqrt{2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}\theta_0^\varepsilon \leq \langle \tilde{h}^\varepsilon(t), z_0 \rangle.$$

Hence, we derive that $\tilde{h}^\varepsilon(t) \equiv 0$ since $\theta_0^\varepsilon \geq 0$. From (A.16)-(A.18) we get

$$\begin{cases} -d\tilde{p}^\varepsilon(t) &= \left[A(t)\tilde{p}^\varepsilon(t) - a(t)\tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t) + C(t)\tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t) + \theta_0^\varepsilon l_x(t, \cdot) \right] dt - \tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t)dW(t), \\ d\tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t) &= [-b(t)\tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t) - \theta_0^\varepsilon l_y(t, \cdot)] dt, \\ \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(1) &= \theta_0^\varepsilon \phi_x(x^\varepsilon(1)) - M\theta_1^\varepsilon, \quad \tilde{q}(0) = -\theta_0^\varepsilon \gamma_y(\tilde{y}^\varepsilon(0)), \quad \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(1) = \theta_1^\varepsilon, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -d\tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) &= \left[\mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t) + \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{B}_X(t, \cdot) + \Sigma_X(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(t)\Sigma_X(t, \cdot) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Sigma_X(t, \cdot)^\top \tilde{Q}^\varepsilon(t) + \tilde{Q}^\varepsilon(t)\Sigma_X(t, \cdot) + H_{XX}(t, \cdot) \right] dt - \tilde{Q}^\varepsilon(t)dW(t), \\ \tilde{P}^\varepsilon(1) &= \begin{pmatrix} \theta_0^\varepsilon \phi_{xx}(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(1)) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

where

$$H_{XX}(t, \cdot) = H_{XX}(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t), \theta_0^\varepsilon),$$

and the Hamiltonian function $H : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, x, y, u, p, q, k, \theta) &\triangleq \langle p, A(t)x + B(t)u \rangle - \langle q, a(t)x + b(t)y + c(t)u \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle k, C(t)x + D(t)u \rangle + \theta l(t, x, y, u). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $y_0 = 0$ and $z(t) = \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(t)$ in (A.20), we have the following variational inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(t), B(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle + \langle \tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t), D(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t), c(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + \theta_0^\varepsilon [l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u) - l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}D^2(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))^2 \tilde{P}_1^\varepsilon(t) \\ &\geq -\sqrt{2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}}\theta_0^\varepsilon, \quad \text{a.e., a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Now consider (A.21)-(A.22) again but only $(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ replaced by $(x^\varepsilon(\cdot), y^\varepsilon(\cdot), z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$. We need to derive an estimate for the term similar to the right hand side of (A.23) with all $(\tilde{x}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{z}^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ replaced by $(x^\varepsilon(\cdot), y^\varepsilon(\cdot), z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$. To this end, we first estimate the following difference:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 D(t) [(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))\tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t)] dt \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 D(t) [(u - u^\varepsilon(t))k^\varepsilon(t)] dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 D(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))(\tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t) - k^\varepsilon(t)) dt \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 D(t)(u^\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))k^\varepsilon(t) dt \right] \end{aligned}$$

with

$$I_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 D(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))(\tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t) - k^\varepsilon(t))dt \right],$$

$$I_2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 D(t)(u^\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))k^\varepsilon(t)dt \right].$$

Due to Lemma 5, for any $1 < \tau < 2$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ satisfying $(1 + \beta)\tau < 2$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |\tilde{k}^\varepsilon(t) - k^\varepsilon(t)|^\tau dt \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \times \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)|^{\frac{\tau}{\tau-1}} dt \right)^{\frac{\tau-1}{\tau}} \\ &\leq C \left(d(u^\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))^{\frac{\tau\beta}{2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}} \times \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 (|u|^{\frac{\tau}{\tau-1}} + |\tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)|^{\frac{\tau}{\tau-1}}) dt \right)^{\frac{\tau-1}{\tau}} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{3}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |k^\varepsilon(t)|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |u^\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)|^2 I_{u^\varepsilon(t) \neq \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)}(t) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |u^\varepsilon(t) - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)|^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 I_{u^\varepsilon(t) \neq \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)}(t) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 |u^\varepsilon(t)|^4 + |\tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)|^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^1 I_{u^\varepsilon(t) \neq \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)}(t) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\leq Cd(u^\varepsilon(\cdot), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(\cdot))^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{6}} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 \left(\langle \tilde{p}^\varepsilon(t), B(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle - \langle p^\varepsilon(t), B(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad + \langle q^\varepsilon(t), c(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle - \langle \tilde{q}^\varepsilon(t), c(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), u) - l(t, \tilde{x}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{y}^\varepsilon(t), \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \\ &\quad - l(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u) + l(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u^\varepsilon(t)) \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}D^2(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t))^2 \tilde{P}_1^\varepsilon(t) - \frac{1}{2}D^2(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t))^2 P_1^\varepsilon(t) \right) dt \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get the first result on bounded control domains

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 \langle p^\varepsilon(t), B(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle + \langle k^\varepsilon(t), D(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle - \langle q^\varepsilon(t), c(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}D^2(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t))^2 P_1^\varepsilon(t) + \theta_0^\varepsilon [l(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u) - l(t, x^\varepsilon(t), y^\varepsilon(t), u^\varepsilon(t))] dt \\ &\geq -C\varepsilon^\beta \theta_0^\varepsilon, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{U}, \quad \text{a.e. a.s..} \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. (The general case of control domains).

For every $K = 1, 2, \dots$, set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{M}^K &\triangleq \{y_0 \in \mathbb{R} \mid |y_0| \leq |y_0^\varepsilon| + K\}, \\ \mathbb{N}^K &\triangleq \{z(t) \in \mathbb{R} \mid |z(t)| \leq |z^\varepsilon(t)| + K\}, \\ \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}^K) &\triangleq \{z(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) \mid z(t) \in \mathbb{N}^K\}.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, \mathbb{M}^K is convex and $y_0^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{M}^K \subseteq \mathbb{M}^{K+1}$, $\mathbb{R} = \cup_{K=1}^\infty \mathbb{M}^K$. $z^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}^K) \subseteq \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}^{K+1})$, and $\mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R}) = \cup_{K=1}^\infty \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}^K)$. Note that $(y_0^\varepsilon, z^\varepsilon(\cdot), u^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ is still a near optimal 3-triple of Problem (\tilde{C}^ε) when the original admissible control set is replaced by $\mathbb{M}^K \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}^K) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$, $K = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, (A.6) also holds for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ on $\mathbb{M}^K \times \mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{N}^K) \times \mathcal{U}_{ad}[0, 1]$ for every $K = 1, 2, \dots$. Then there exists a subsequence

$$\left(\theta_0^{\varepsilon, K}, \theta_1^{\varepsilon, K}, p^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), q^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), k^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), P^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), Q^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot)\right)$$

satisfying $\left|\theta_0^{\varepsilon, K}\right|^2 + \mathbb{E}\left|\theta_1^{\varepsilon, K}\right|^2 = 1$, $\theta_0^{\varepsilon, K} \geq 0$, (A.21)-(A.22) such that the following

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^1 \langle p^{\varepsilon, K}(t), B(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle + \langle k^{\varepsilon, K}(t), D(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle \\ &- \langle q^{\varepsilon, K}(t), c(t)(u - \tilde{u}^\varepsilon(t)) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} D^2(t)(u - u^\varepsilon(t))^2 P_1^{\varepsilon, K}(t) \\ &+ \theta_0^{\varepsilon, K} [l(t, x^{\varepsilon, K}(t), y^{\varepsilon, K}(t), u) - l(t, x^{\varepsilon, K}(t), y^{\varepsilon, K}(t), u^\varepsilon(t))] dt \geq -C\varepsilon^\beta \theta_0^{\varepsilon, K},\end{aligned}$$

holds. Since $\left|\theta_0^{\varepsilon, K}\right|^2 + \mathbb{E}\left|\theta_1^{\varepsilon, K}\right|^2 = 1$, there is a subsequence also denoted by $(\theta_0^{\varepsilon, K}, \theta_1^{\varepsilon, K})$, such that $(\theta_0^{\varepsilon, K}, \theta_1^{\varepsilon, K}) \rightarrow (\theta_0^\varepsilon, \theta_1^\varepsilon)$, weakly in $\mathbb{R} \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}_1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$, $\theta_0^\varepsilon \geq 0$. Hence, from continuous dependence of the solution of BSDEs on parameters (see Yong and Zhou [28]), we have

$$(p^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), q^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), k^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), P^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot), Q^{\varepsilon, K}(\cdot)) \rightarrow (p^\varepsilon(\cdot), q^\varepsilon(\cdot), k^\varepsilon(\cdot), P^\varepsilon(\cdot), Q^\varepsilon(\cdot))$$

in $\mathcal{M}^2(0, 1; \mathbb{R})$ as $K \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, $(p^\varepsilon(\cdot), q^\varepsilon(\cdot), k^\varepsilon(\cdot), P^\varepsilon(\cdot), Q^\varepsilon(\cdot))$ satisfies (A.21)-(A.22). Consequently, we get (3.1). The proof is complete. \square

Acknowledgments. *The authors would like to thank three anonymous referees, AE, Professor Zhen Wu, Dr. Guangchen Wang, Dr. Zhiyong Yu for their valuable comments, which led to a much better version of this article. This article was partially done while the first author was visiting The Hong Kong Polytechnic University in the summer of 2012.*

References

- [1] Antonelli, F. (1993). Backward-forward stochastic differential equations, *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 3, 777-793.
- [2] Bismut, J. M. (1973). Théorie Probabiliste du Contrôle des Diffusions, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 176, Providence, Rhode Island.

- [3] Bahlali, K., Khelfallah, N., & Mezerdi, B. (2009). Necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimality in stochastic control of FBSDEs, *Systems & Control Letters*, 58, 857-864.
- [4] Chighoub, F., & Mezerdi, B. (2011). Near optimality conditions in stochastic control of jump diffusion processes, *Systems & Control Letters*, 60, 907-916.
- [5] Ekeland, I. (1974). On the variational principle, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 47, 324-353.
- [6] Hu, Y., & Peng, S. (1995). Solution of forward-backward stochastic differential equations, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 103, 273-283.
- [7] Huang, J., Li, X., & Wang, G. (2010). Near-optimal control problems for linear forward-backward stochastic systems, *Automatica*, 46, 397-404.
- [8] Huang, J., Li, X., & Wang, G. (2010). Maximum principles for a class of partial information risk-sensitive optimal controls, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55, 1438-1443.
- [9] Hui, E., Huang, J., Li, X., & Wang, G. (2011). Near-optimal control for stochastic recursive problems, *Systems & Control Letters*, 60, 161-168.
- [10] Hafayed, M., & Abbas, S. (2014). On near-optimal mean-field stochastic singular controls: necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimality, *J. Optim Theory Appl*, 160(3), 778-808.
- [11] Hafayed, M., Abba, A., & Abbas, S. (2014). On mean-field stochastic maximum principle for near-optimal controls for Poisson jump diffusion with applications, *Int. J. Dynam. Control*, 2, 262-284.
- [12] Hafayed, M., & Abbas, S. (2013). Stochastic near-optimal singular controls for jump diffusions: necessary and sufficient conditions, *Journal of Dynamical and Control Systems*, 19(4), 503-517.
- [13] Hafayed, M., Abbas S., & Veverka, P. (2013). On necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimal singular stochastic controls. *Optim. Lett.*, (7)5, 949-966.
- [14] Hafayed, M., Veverka, P., & Abbas, S. (2012). On Maximum Principle of near-optimality for diffusions with Jumps, with Application to Consumption-Investment Problem, *Differ. Equ. Dyn. Syst.*, 20(2), 111-125.
- [15] Hafayed, M., Veverka, P., & Abbas, A. (2014). On Near-optimal Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Forward-backward Stochastic Systems with Jumps, with Applications to Finance. *Applications of Mathematics*, 59(4), 407-440.
- [16] Kohlmann, M., & Zhou, X. (2000). Relationship between backward stochastic differential equations and stochastic controls: a linear-quadratic approach. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 38, 1392-1407.
- [17] Lim, A.E.B., & Zhou, X.Y. (2001). Linear-quadratic control of backward stochastic differential equations, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 40, 450-474.
- [18] Liu, Y., Yin, G., & Zhou, X.Y. (2005). Near-optimal controls of random-switching LQ problems with indefinite control weight costs, *Automatica*, 41, 1063-1070.

- [19] Ma, J., Protter, P., & Yong, J. (1994). Solving forward-backward stochastic differential equations explicitly—a four step scheme, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 98, 339-359.
- [20] Ma, J., & Yong, J. (1999). *Forward-Backward Stochastic Differential Equations and their Applications*, Springer.
- [21] Peng, S. (1990). A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problem, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 28, 966-979.
- [22] Pardoux, E., & Peng, S. (1990). Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation, *Systems & Control Letters*, 14, 55-61.
- [23] Peng, S., & Wu, Z. (1999). Fully Coupled Forward-Backward Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications to Optimal Control, *SIAM Control Optim.*, 37 (3): 825-843.
- [24] Pardoux, E., & Tang, S. (1999). Forward-backward stochastic differential equations and quasi-linear parabolic PDEs, *Probab, Theory Relat. Fields*, 114, no. 2, 123-150.
- [25] Wu, Z. (1998). Maximum principle for optimal control problem of fully coupled forward-backward stochastic systems, *Systems Sci. Math. Sci.*, 11, 249-259.
- [26] Wu, Z. (2013). A general maximum principle for optimal control of forward-backward stochastic systems, *Automatica*, 49, 1473-1480.
- [27] Wu, Z., & Yu, Z. (2008). Dynamic programming principle for one kind of stochastic recursive optimal control problem and Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 47 (5), 2616-2641.
- [28] Yong, J., & Zhou, X. Y. (1999). *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, Springer, New York.
- [29] Yong, J. (1997). Finding adapted solutions of forward-backward stochastic differential equations—method of continuation, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 107, 537-572.
- [30] Yong, J. (2002). Stochastic optimal control and forward-backward stochastic differential equations, *Comput. Appl. Math.*, 21, 369-403.
- [31] Yong, J. (2010). Optimality variational principle for controlled forward-backward stochastic differential equations with mixed initial-terminal conditions, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48, 4119-4156.
- [32] Yong, J. (2010). Forward-backward stochastic differential equations with mixed initial-terminal conditions, *Transactions of American Mathematical Society*, 362, 1047-1096.
- [33] Zhou, X. Y. (1995). Deterministic near-optimal controls, part I: Necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimality, *Journal of Optimization Theory Applications*, 85, 473-488.
- [34] Zhou, X. Y. (1996). Deterministic near-optimal controls, part II: Dynamic programming and viscosity solution approach, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 21, 655-674.
- [35] Zhou, X. Y. (1998). Stochastic near-optimal controls: Necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimality, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 39, 929-947.

- [36] Zhou, X. Y., & Sethi, S. (1994). A sufficient condition for near optimal stochastic controls and its applications to manufacturing systems, *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 29, 67-92.