Partial Information Stochastic Differential Games for Backward Stochastic Systems Driven By Lévy Processes *

Fu Zhang[a] Qingxin Meng[b] † Maoning Tang[b]

[a]Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai 200433, China
[b]Department of Mathematics, Huzhou University, Zhejiang 313000, China

arXiv:1708.03899v1 [math.OC] 13 Aug 2017

Abstract

In this paper, we consider a partial information two-person zero-sum stochastic differential game problem where the system is governed by a backward stochastic differential equation driven by Teugels martingales associated with a Lévy process and an independent Brownian motion. One sufficient (a verification theorem) and one necessary conditions for the existence of optimal controls are proved. To illustrate the general results, a linear quadratic stochastic differential game problem is discussed.

Keywords Stochastic control; Stochastic differential game; Lévy processes; Teugels martingales, Backward stochastic differential equations; Partial Information

1 INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider a partial information two-person zero-sum stochastic differential game problem where the system is governed by the following nonlinear backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE)

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= \xi + \int_t^T f(s, y(s), q(s), z(s), u_1(t), u_2(t))ds \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{d} \int_t^T q^i(s) dW^i(s) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_t^T z^i(s) dH^i(s),\ t \in [0, T] \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

with the cost functional

$$J(u(\cdot)) = E\Big[\int_0^T l(t, y(t), q(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t))dt + \phi(y(0)) \Big], \tag{1.2}$$

where $\{W(t), 0 \le t \le T\}$ is a standard d-dimensional Brownian motion and Teugel's martingales $H(t) = \{H^i(t)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}, 0 \le t \le T$ associated with a Lévy processes $\{L(t), 0 \le t \le T\}$ (see section 2 for more details). The filtration generated by the underlying Brownian motion W and the Lévy process $\{L(t), 0 \le t \le T\}$ is denoted by $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \le t \le T}$.

In the above, the processes $u_1(\cdot)$ and $u_2(\cdot)$ are our open-loop control processes which present the controls of the two players. Let $U_1 \subset R^{k_1}$ and $U_2 \subset R^{k_2}$ are two given nonempty convex sets. Under many situations under which the full information $\mathcal{F}_t$ is inaccessible for players, ones can only observe a partial information. For this, an admissible control process $u_i(\cdot)$ for the player i is defined as a $\mathcal{G}_t$-predictable process with values in U_i s.t. $E\int_0^T |u_i(t)|^2 dt < +\infty$ where $i = 1, 2$. Here $\mathcal{G}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t$ for all $t \in [0,\ T]$ is a given subfiltration representing the information available to the controller at time t. For example, we could have $\varepsilon_t = \mathcal{F}_{(t-\delta)^+}, \quad t \in [0,\ T]$, where $\delta > 0$ is a fixed delay of information.

The set of all admissible open-loop controls $u_i(\cdot)$ for the player i is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_i, (i = 1, 2)$. $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ is called the set of open-loop admissible controls for the players. We denote the strong solution of (1.1) by $(y^{u_1,u_2}(\cdot), q^{u_1,u_2}(\cdot), z^{u_1,u_2}(\cdot))$, or $(y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ if its dependence on admissible control $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ is clear from context. Then we call $(y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ the state processes corresponding to the control process $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ and call $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot), y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ the admissible pair.

*This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province for Distinguished Young Scholar (No.LR15A010001), and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11471079, 11301177)

†Corresponding author. E-mail: mqx@zjhu.edu.cn

The partial information two-person zero-sum stochastic differential game amounts to determining an admissible open-loop control $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ over $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$ such that

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} \big(\inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))\big). \tag{1.3}$$

Such control $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is called an optimal control. The corresponding strong solution $(\bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{q}(\cdot), \bar{z}(\cdot))$ of (1.1) is called the optimal state process. Then $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot); \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{q}(\cdot), \bar{z}(\cdot))$ is called an optimal pair. For this partial stochastic differential game problem, we denote by Problem (P).

Roughly speaking, for the zero-sum differential game, Player I seek control $\bar{u}_1(\cdot)$ to minimize (1.2), and Player II seek control $\bar{u}_2(\cdot)$ to maximize (1.2). Therefore, (1.2) represents the cost for Player I and the payoff for Player II. There are basically two types of controls for both players: open-loop controls and closed- loop controls. In this paper, we concentrate on the open-loop case. If $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is an optimal open-loop control, then

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \leq J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \leq J(u_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \tag{1.4}$$

for all admissible open-loop controls $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$. We refer to $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ as an open-loop saddle point of Problem (P).

Game theory had been an active area of research and a useful tool in many applications, particularly in biology and economic. For the partial information two-person zero-sum stochastic differential games, the objective is to find an saddle point for which the controller has less information than the complete information filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$. Recently, An and Øksendal [1] established a maximum principle for stochastic differential games of forward systems with Poisson jumps for the type of partial information in our paper. Moreover, We refer to [2-3] and the references therein for more associated results on the partial information stochastic differential games.

In 2000, Nualart and Schoutens[4] got a martingale representation theorem for a type of Lévy processes through Teugel's martingales, where Teugel's martingales are a family of pairwise strongly orthonormal martingales associated with Lévy processes. Later, they [5] proved the existence and uniqueness theory of BSDE driven by Teugel's martingales. The above results are further extended to the one-dimensional BSDE driven by Teugel's martingales and an independent multi-dimensional Brownian motion by Bahlali et al[6].

Since the theory of BSDE driven by Teugels martingales and an independent Brownian motion is established, it is natural to apply the theory to the stochastic optimal control problem. Now the full information stochastic optimal control problem related to Teugel's martingales has been studied by many authors. For example, the stochastic linear-quadratic problem with Lévy processes was studied by Mitsui and Tabata[7]. Motivated by[7], Meng and Tang[8] studied the general full information stochastic optimal control problem for the forward stochastic systems driven by Teugel's martingales and an independent multi-dimensional Brownian motion and prove the corresponding stochastic maximum principle. Furthermore, Tang and Zhang [9] extend [8] to the Backward stochastic systems and obtain the the corresponding stochastic maximum principle. For the case of the partial information, in 2012, Bahlali, Khelfallah and Mezerdi [10] studied the stochastic control problem for forward system and obtain the corresponding stochastic maximum principle. In the meantime, Meng, Zhang and Tang [11] extend [9] to the the partial information stochastic optimal control problem of backward stochastic systems and get the corresponding optimality conditions.

But to our best knowledge, there is no discussion on the partial information stochastic differential games for the system driven by Teugel martingales and an independent Brownian motion, which motives us to write this paper. The main purpose of this paper is to establish partial information necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality for Problem (P) by using of the results in [9]. The results obtained in this paper can be considered as a generalization of stochastic optimal control problem to the two-person zero-sum case. As an application, a two-person zero-sum stochastic differential game of linear backward stochastic differential equations with a quadratic cost criteria under partial information is discussed and the optimal control is characterized explicitly by adjoint processes.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We introduce useful notation and give needed assumptions in section 2. Section 3 is devoted to present sufficient conditions for the existence of the optimal control control. In section 4, we establish necessary conditions of optimality. In the last section, a linear quadratic stochastic differential game problem is solved by applying the theoretical results.

2 Preliminaries and assumptions

Let $(\Omega, F, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0\le t\le T}, P)$ be a complete probability space. The filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0\le t\le T}$ is right-continuous and generated by a d-dimensional standard Brownian motion $\{W(t), 0 \le t \le T\}$ and a one-dimensional Lévy process $\{L(t), 0 \le t \le T\}$. It is known that $L(t)$ has a characteristic function of the form: $Ee^{i\theta L(t)} = \exp\left[ia\theta t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\theta^2 t + t\int_{R^1}(e^{i\theta x} - 1 - i\theta x I_{\{|x|<1\}})v(dx)\right]$, where $a \in R^1$, $\sigma > 0$ and v is a measure on R^1 satisfying (i)$\int_0^T (1 \wedge x^2)v(dx) < \infty$ and (ii) there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, s.t. $\int_{\{-\varepsilon,\varepsilon\}^c} e^{\lambda|x|}v(dx) < \infty$. These settings imply that the random variables $L(t)$ have moments of all orders. We denote by $\{H^i(t), 0 \le t \le T\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ the Teugel's martingales associated with the Lévy process $\{L(t), 0 \le t \le T\}$. Here $H^i(t)$ is given by

$$H^i(t) = c_{i,i}Y^{(i)}(t) + c_{i,i-1}Y^{(i-1)}(t) + \cdots + c_{i,1}Y^{(1)}(t),$$

where $Y^{(i)}(t) = L^{(i)}(t) - E[L^{(i)}(t)]$ for all $i \ge 1$, $L^{(i)}(t)$ are so called power-jump processes with $L^{(1)}(t) = L(t)$, $L^{(i)}(t) = \sum_{0<s\le t}(\Delta L(s))^i$ for $i \ge 2$ and the coefficients $c_{i,j}$ correspond to the orthonormalization of polynomials $1, x, x^2, \cdots$ w.r.t. the measure $\mu(dx) = x^2v(dx)+\sigma^2\delta_0(dx)$. The Teugel's martingales $\{H^i(t)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ are pathwise strongly orthogonal and their predictable quadratic variation processes are given by

$$\langle H^{(i)}(t), H^{(j)}(t)\rangle = \delta_{ij}t.$$

For more details of Teugel's martingales, we invite the reader to consult Nualart and Schoutens [10,11]. Denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the predictable sub-σ field of $\mathcal{B}([0,T]) \times \mathcal{F}$, then we introduce the following notation used throughout this paper.

In the following, we introduce some basic spaces.

- H: a Hilbert space with norm $\|\cdot\|_H$.
- $\langle\alpha, \beta\rangle$: the inner product in $R^n, \forall\alpha, \beta \in R^n$.
- $|\alpha| = \sqrt{\langle\alpha, \alpha\rangle}$: the norm of $R^n, \forall\alpha \in R^n$.
- $\langle A, B\rangle = tr(AB^T)$: the inner product in $R^{n\times m}, \forall A, B \in R^{n\times m}$.
- $|A| = \sqrt{tr(AA^T)}$: the norm of $R^{n\times m}, \forall A \in R^{n\times m}$.
- l^2: the space of all real-valued sequences $x = (x_n)_{n\ge0}$ satisfying

$$\|x\|_{l^2} \le \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i^2} < +\infty.$$

- $l^2(H)$: the space of all H-valued sequence $f = \{f^i\}_{i\ge1}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{l^2(H)} \le \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ||f^i||_H^2} < +\infty.$$

- $l^2_{\mathscr{F}}(0, T, H)$: the space of all $l^2(H)$-valued and $\mathscr{F}_t$-predictable processes $f = \{f^i(t,\omega),\ (t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega\}_{i\ge1}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{l^2_{\mathscr{F}}(0,T,H)} \le \sqrt{E\int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ||f^i(t)||_H^2 dt} < \infty.$$

- $M^2_{\mathscr{F}}(0, T; H)$: the space of all H-valued and $\mathscr{F}_t$-adapted processes $f = \{f(t,\omega),\ (t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega\}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{M^2_{\mathscr{F}}(0,T;H)} \le \sqrt{E\int_0^T \|f(t)\|_H^2 dt} < \infty.$$

- $S^2_{\mathscr{F}}(0, T; H)$: the space of all H-valued and $\mathscr{F}_t$-adapted càdlàg processes $f = \{f(t,\omega),\ (t,\omega) \in [0,T] \times \Omega\}$ satisfying

$$\|f\|_{S^2_{\mathscr{F}}(0,T;H)} \le \sqrt{E\sup_{0\le t\le T} \|f(t)\|_H^2 dt} < +\infty.$$

- $L^2(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, P; H)$: the space of all H-valued random variables ξ on $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, P)$ satisfying

$$\|\xi\|_{L^2(\Omega,\mathscr{F},P;H)} \le E\|\xi\|_H^2 < \infty.$$

The coefficients of the state equation (1.1) and the cost functional (1.2) are defined as follows

$$\xi : \Omega \longrightarrow R^n,$$

$$f : [0,T] \times \Omega \times R^n \times R^{n\times d} \times l^2(R^n) \times U_1 \times U_2 \longrightarrow R^n,$$

$$l : [0,T] \times \Omega \times R^n \times R^{n\times d} \times l^2(R^n) \times U_1 \times U_2 \longrightarrow R^1$$

and

$$\phi : \Omega \times R^n \longrightarrow R^1$$

Throughout this paper, we introduce the following basic assumptions on coefficients (ξ, f, l, ϕ).

Assumption 2.1. *$\xi \in L^2(\Omega, \mathscr{F}_T, P; R^n)$ and the random mapping f is $\mathscr{P} \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(R^n) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(R^{n\times d}) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(l^2(R^n)) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(U_1) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(U_2)$ measurable with $f(\cdot, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) \in M^2_{\mathscr{F}}(0, T; R^n)$. For almost all $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$, $f(t, \omega, y, p, z, u_1, u_2)$ is Fréchet differentiable w.r.t. (y, p, z, u_1, u_2) and the corresponding Fréchet derivatives $f_y, f_p, f_z, f_{u_1}, f_{u_2}$ are continuous and uniformly bounded.*

Assumption 2.2. *The random mapping l is $\mathscr{P} \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(R^n) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(R^{n\times d}) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(l^2(R^n)) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(U_1) \bigotimes \mathscr{B}(U_2)$ measurable and for almost all $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$, l is Fréchet differentiable w.r.t. (y, p, z, u_1, u_2) with continuous Fréchet derivatives $l_y, l_q, l_z, l_{u_1}, l_{u_2}$. The random mapping ϕ is measurable and for almost all $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$, ϕ is Fréchet differentiable w.r.t. y with continuous Fréchet derivative ϕ_y. Moreover, for almost all $(t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega$, there exists a constant C s.t. for all $(p, q, z, u_1, u_2) \in R^n \times R^{n\times d} \times l^2(R^n) \times U_1 \times U_2$,*

$$|l| \le C(1 + |y|^2 + |q|^2 + |z|^2 + |u|_1^2 + |u|_2^2), \quad |\phi| \le C(1 + |y|^2),$$

$$|l_y| + |l_q| + |l_z| + |l_{u_1}| + |l_{u_2}| \le C(1 + |y| + |q| + |z| + |u_1| + |u_2|)$$

and

$$|\phi_y| \le C(1 + |y|).$$

Under Assumption 2.1, we can get from Lemma 2.3 in [7] that for each $\big(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)\big) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$, the system (1.1) admits a unique strong solution. Furthermore, by Assumption 2.2 and a priori estimate for BSDE driven by teugel martingales (see lemma 3.2 in [7]), it is easy to check that

$$|J(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))| < \infty.$$

So the Problem (P) is well-defined.

3 A PARTIAL INFORMATION SUFFICIENT MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE

In this section we want to study the sufficient maximum principle for Problem (P).

In our setting the Hamiltonian function $H : [0, T] \times R^n \times R^{n\times d} \times l^2(R^n) \times U_1 \times U_2 \times R^n \to R^1$ gets the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, y, q, z, u_1, u_2, k) = \quad & \langle k, -f(t, y, q, z, u_1, u_2)\rangle \\ & + l(t, y, q, z, u_1, u_2) \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

The adjoint equation which fits into the system (2.1) corresponding to the given admissible pair $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ is given by the following forward stochastic differential equation driven by multi-dimensional Brownian motion W and Teugel's martingales $\{H^i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$:

$$\begin{cases} dk(t) = -H_y(t, y(t), q(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), k(t))dt \\ \qquad\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{d} H_{q^i}(t, y(t), \bar{q}(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), k(t))dW^i(t) \\ \qquad\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{z^i}(t, y(t), q(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), k(t))dH^i(t) \\ k(0) = -\phi_y(y(0)). \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

Under Assumptions 2.1-2.2, the forward stochastic differential equation (3.2) has a unique solution $k(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}^2_{\mathcal{F}}(0,T;R^n)$ by Lemma 2.1 in [7].

We now coming to a verification theorem for Problem (P).

Theorem 3.1 (A partial information sufficient maximum principle) Let Assumptions 2.1-2.2 holds. Let $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot), \bar{u}_2(\cdot); \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{q}(\cdot)$ be an admissible pair and $\bar{k}(\cdot)$ be the unique strong solution of the corresponding adjoint equation (3.2). Suppose that the Hamiltonian function H satisfies the following conditional mini-maximum principle:

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{u_1\in\mathcal{U}_1} E[H(t,\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t),u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{k}(t))|\mathcal{G}_t]\\&= E[H(t,\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{k}(t))|\mathcal{G}_t]\\&= \sup_{u_2\in\mathcal{U}_2} E[H(t,\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),u_2,\bar{k}(t))|\mathcal{G}_t].\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

(i) Suppose that, for all $t \in [0,T]$, $\phi(y)$ is convex in y, and

$$(y,q,z,u_1) \mapsto H(t,y,q,z,u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{k}(t))$$

is convex. Then,

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \le J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)), \quad for \ \ all \ \ u_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_1,$$

and

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)).$$

(ii) Suppose that, for all $t \in [0,T]$, $\phi(y)$ is concave in y and

$$(y,q,z,u_2) \mapsto H(t,y,q,z,\bar{u}_1(t),u_2,\bar{k}(t))$$

is concave. Then,

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \ge J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)), \quad for \ \ all \ \ u_2(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_2,$$

and

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)).$$

(iii) If both case (i) and (ii) hold (which implies, in particular, that $\phi(y)$ is an affine function), then $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is an open-loop saddle point and

$$\begin{aligned}&J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2}(\inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)))\\&= \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1}(\sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))).\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Proof: (i) In the following, we consider a stochastic optimal control problem over $\mathcal{A}_1$ where the system is

$$\begin{aligned}&y(t) = \xi + \int_t^T f(s,y(s),q(s),z(s),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))ds\\&-\sum_{i=1}^d \int_t^T q^i(s)dW^i(s) - \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int_t^T z^i(s)dH^i(s), \ t\in[0,T]\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

with the cost functional

$$\begin{aligned}&J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))\\&= E\Big[\int_0^T l(t,y(t),q(t),z(t),u_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t))dt + \phi(y(0))\Big].\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Our optimal control problem is minimize $J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ over $u_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_1$, i.e., find $\bar{u}_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_1$ such that

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)). \tag{3.7}$$

Then for this case, it is easy to check that the Hamilton is $H(t,y,q,z,u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),k)$ and for the admissible control $\bar{u}_1(\cdot) \in \mathcal{A}_1$, the corresponding sate process and the adjoint process is still $(\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t))$ and $\bar{k}(t)$, respectively. And the optimality condition is

$$\begin{aligned}&\inf_{u_1\in\mathcal{U}_1} E[H(t,\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t),u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{k}(t))|\mathcal{G}_t]\\&= E[H(t,\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t)|\mathcal{G}_t].\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Thus from the partial information sufficient maximum principle for optimal control (see Theorem 3.1 in [9]), we conclude that $\bar{u}_1(\cdot)$ is the optimal control of the optimal control problem, i.e.,

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \leq J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)), \quad for \ \ all \ \ u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1,$$

and

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)).$$

The proof of (i)is complete .

(ii)This statement can be proved in a similar way as (i).

(iii) if both (i) and (ii) hold, then

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)) \leq J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \leq J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)),$$

for any $(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))\in\mathcal{A}_1\times\mathcal{A}_2$. Thereby,

$$\begin{aligned} J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) &\leq \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \\ &\leq \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2}(\inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) &\geq \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)) \\ &\geq \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1}(\sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))). \end{aligned}$$

Now, due to the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1}(\sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))) \\ \geq\ & \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2}(\inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) &= \sup_{u_2\in\Pi}(\inf_{u_1\in\Theta} J(u_1,u_2)) \\ &= \inf_{u_1\in\Theta}(\sup_{u_1\in\Pi} J(u_1,u_2)). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is completed.

If the control process $(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))$ is admissible adopted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$ we have the following full information sufficient maximum principle.

Corollary 3.1 Suppose that $\mathcal{G}_t=\mathcal{F}_t$. Moreover, suppose that, for all $t\in[0,T]$, the following maximum principle holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{u_1\in\mathcal{U}_1} H(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{k}(t)) \\ =\ & H(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{k}(t)) \\ =\ & \sup_{u_2\in\mathcal{U}_2} H(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{y}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),u_2,\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{k}(t)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

(i) Suppose that, for all $t\in[0,T]$, $\phi(y)$ is convex in y and

$$(x,y,z,u_1)\mapsto H(t,x,y,z,u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{k}(t))$$

is convex. Then,

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \leq J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)), \quad for \ \ all \ \ u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1,$$

and

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)).$$

(ii) Suppose that, for all $t\in[0,T]$, $\phi(y)$ is concave in y, and

$$(x,y,z,u_2)\mapsto H(t,x,y,z,\bar{u}_1(t),u_2,\bar{p}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{k}(t))$$

is concave. Then,

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \geq J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)), \quad for \ \ all \ \ u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2,$$

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)).$$

(iii) If both case (i) and (ii) hold (which implies, in particular, that $\phi(y)$ is an affine function), then $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is an open-loop saddle point based on the information flow $\mathcal{F}_t$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) &= \sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2}\big(\inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))\big) \\ &= \inf_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1}\big(\sup_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot))\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

4 A PARTIAL INFORMATION NECESSARY MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE

In this section, we give a necessary maximum principle for Problem (P).

Theorem 4.1 (A partial information necessary maximum principle) Under Assumptions 2.1-2.2, let $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ be an optimal pair of Problem (P). Suppose that $(\bar{y}(\cdot),\bar{q}(\cdot),\bar{z}(\cdot))$ is the state process of the system (1.1) corresponding to the admissible control $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$. Let $(\bar{k}(\cdot))$ be the unique solution of the adjoint equation (3.2) corresponding $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot);\bar{y}(\cdot),\bar{q}(\cdot),\bar{z}(\cdot))$. Then for $i=1,2$, we have

$$\big\langle E[H_{u_i}(t)|\mathcal{G}_t], u_i-\bar{u}_i(t)\big\rangle \geq 0, \forall u_i\in U_i a.s.a.e., \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$H_{u_i}(t) =: H_{u_i}(t,\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t),\bar{u}_1(t),\bar{u}_2(t),\bar{k}(t)).$$

Proof: Since $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is an optimal open-loop control, then $(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot))$ is an open-loop saddle point, i.e.,

$$J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)) \leq J(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) \leq J(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)). \tag{4.2}$$

So we have

$$J_1(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \min_{u_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1} J_1(u_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)), \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$J_2(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),\bar{u}_2(\cdot)) = \max_{u_2(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_2} J_2(\bar{u}_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)). \tag{4.4}$$

By (4.3), $\bar{u}_1(\cdot)$ can be regarded as an optimal control of the optimal control problem where the controlled system is (3.5) and the cost functional is (3.6). Then for this case, it is easy to check that the Hamilton is $H(t,y,q,z,u_1,\bar{u}_2(t),k)$ and for the optimal control $\bar{u}_1(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}_1$, the corresponding optimal sate process and the adjoint process is still $(\bar{y}(t),\bar{q}(t),\bar{z}(t))$ and $\bar{k}(t)$, respectively. Thus applying the partial necessary stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems (see Theorem 4.1 in [9]), we can obtain 4.1 for $i=1$. Similarly, from (4.4), we can obtain (4.1) for $i=2$.

The proof is complete.

5 An EXAMPLE: A Linear quadratic problem

In this section, we will apply our stochastic maximum principles to a Linear quadratic problem under partial information, i.e. minimizing the following quadratic cost functional over $u(\cdot)\in\mathcal{A}$:

$$\begin{aligned} J(u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)) := \quad & E\langle M,y(0)\rangle + E\int_0^T \langle E(s),y(s)\rangle ds \\ & + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^d E\int_0^T \langle F^i(s),q^i(s)\rangle ds \\ & + \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^\infty E\int_0^T \langle G^i(s),z^i(s)\rangle ds \\ & + E\int_0^T \langle N_1(s)u_1(s),u_1(s)\rangle ds \\ & - E\int_0^T \langle N_2(s)u_2(s),u_2(s)\rangle ds, \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where the state process $(y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ is the solution to the controlled linear backward stochastic system below:

$$\begin{cases} dy(t) = -\Big[A(t)y(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} B^i(t)q^i(t) \\ \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} C^i(t)z^i(t) + D_1(t)u_1(t) + D_2(t)u_2(t)\Big]dt \\ \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{d} q^i(t)dW^i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} z^i(t)dH^i(t), \\ y(T) = \xi. \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

This problem we denote by Problem (LQ). To study this problem, we need the assumptions on the coefficients as follows.

Assumption 5.1. *The matrix-valued functions* $A : [0,T] \to R^{n\times n}; B^i : [0,T] \to R^{n\times n}, i = 1,2,\cdots,d; C^i : [0,T] \to R^{n\times n}, i = 1,2,\cdots; D^i : [0,T] \to R^{n\times m_i}, i = 1,2; E : [0,T] \to R^{n\times n}; F^i : [0,T] \to R^{n\times m}; R^n, i = 1,2,\cdots d, G^i : [0,T] \to R^n, i = 1,2,\cdots; N^i : [0,T] \to R^{m_i\times m_i}, i = 1,2$ *and the matrix* $M \in R^n$ *are uniformly bounded. Moreover,* N^i *is uniformly positive, i.e.* $N^i \geq \delta I, (i = 1,2)$ *for some positive constant* δ *a.s..*

Assumption 5.2. *There is no further constraint imposed on the control processes, the set all admissible control processes is*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 = \Big\{ & (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) : (u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot)) \text{ is } \mathcal{G}_t \\ & - \text{predictable process with values in } R^{m_1} \times R^{m_2} \\ & \text{and } E\int_0^T |u(t)|^2 dt < \infty \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we will utilize the stochastic maximum principle to study the dual representation of the optimal control to Problem (LQ).

We first define the Hamiltonian function $H : \Omega \times [0,T] \times R^n \times R^{n\times d} \times l^2(R^n) \times U_1 \times U_2 \times R^n \to R^1$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & H(t,y,q,z,u_1,u_2,k) \\ & = -\Big\langle k, A(t)y + \sum_{i=1}^{d} B^i(t)q^i + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} C^i(t)z^i \\ & + D_1(t)u_1 + D_2(t)u_2 \Big\rangle + \langle E(t), y\rangle \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \langle F^i(t), q^i\rangle + \langle N_1(t)u_1, u_1\rangle \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle G^i(t), z^i\rangle - \langle N_2(t)u_1, u_1\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Then the adjoint equation corresponding to an admissible pair $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot)))$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} dk(t) = -H_y(t, y(t), q(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), k(t))dt \\ \quad - \sum_{i=1}^{d} H_q^i(t, y(t), q(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), k(t))dW^i(t) \\ \quad - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} H_{z^i}(t, y(t-), q(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), k(t))dH^i(t), \\ k(0) = -M. \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

Under Assumption 5.1, for any admissible pair $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$, the adjoint equation (4.8) has a unique solution $k(\cdot)$ in view of Lemma 2.1 in [9].

It is time to give the the dual characterization of the optimal control.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Assumptions 5.1-5.2 be satisfied. Then, a necessary and sufficient condition for an admissible pair* $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q$ *to be an optimal pair of Problem (LQ) is the control* $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ *has the representation*

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_1(t) = & -\frac{1}{2}N_1^{-1}(t)D_1^*(t)E[k(t)|\mathcal{G}_t], \\ u_2(t) = & \frac{1}{2}N_2^{-1}(t)D_2^*(t)E[k(t)|\mathcal{G}_t], \end{array} \tag{4.9}$$

where $k(\cdot)$ *is the unique solution of the adjoint equation (4.8) corresponding to the admissible pair* $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$.

Proof: For the necessary part, let $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot),$
$z(\cdot))$ be an optimal pair, then by the necessary optimality condition (4.1) and $U_i = R^{m_i}(i = 1, 2)$, we have

$$H_{u_i}(t, y(t), q(t), z(t), u_1(t), u_2(t), k(t)) = 0, \quad a.e.\ a.s..$$

Noticing the definition of H in (4.7), we get

$$2N_1(t)u_1(t) + D_1^*(t)E[k(t)|\mathcal{G}_t] = 0, \quad a.e.\ a.s.$$

and

$$-2N_2(t)u_2(t) + D_2^*(t)E[k(t)|\mathcal{G}_t] = 0, \quad a.e.\ a.s.$$

So the optimal control $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot))$ has the dual presentation (4.9).
For the sufficient part, let $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ be an admissible pair satisfying (4.9). By the classical technique of completing squares, from (4.9), we can claim that $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ satisfies the optimality condition (3.3) in Theorem 3.1. Moreover, from Assumption 5.1-5.2, it is easy to check that all other conditions in Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Hence $(u_1(\cdot), u_2(\cdot); y(\cdot), q(\cdot), z(\cdot))$ is an optimal pair by Theorem 3.1.

6 Conclusion

In this paper we have proved partial information necessary as well as sufficient conditions of optimality for the stochastic differential games driven by backward stochastic control systems associated with Lévy process. As an application, some linear quadratic stochastic differential games problem of backward stochastic system is discussed and the optimal control process is characterized explicitly by adjoint process. Our main results could be seen as an extension of the stochastic optimal control problem studied in [9], to the stochastic differential games problem.

References

[1] T.T.K. An, B. Øksendal,. A Maximum Principle for Stochastic Differential Games with Partial Information. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 2008, 139: 463-483.

[2] G. Wang, Z. Yu. A partial information non-zero sum differential game of backward stochastic differential equations with applications *Automatica*, 2011,48:342-352.

[3] B. Øksendal, A. Sulem. Forward-backward SDE games and stochastic control under model uncertainty. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, published online 01 sepetember 2012.

[4] D. Nualart, W. Schoutens. Chaotic and predicatable representation for Lévy processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*,2000, 90:109–122.

[5] D. Nualart, W. Schoutens. Backward stochastic differential equations and Feynman-Kac formula for Lévy processes with applications in finance . *Bernouli*, 2001, 7:761–776.

[6] K. Bahlali, M. Eddahbi, E. Essaky. BSDE associated with Lévy processes and application to PDIE. *J. Appl. Math. Stochastic Anal.*, 2003: 16:1–17.

[7] K. Mitsui and Y. Tabata. A stochastic linear-quadratic problem with Lévy processes and its application to finance. *Stochastic Proecss. Appl.*, 2008, 118:120–152.

[8] Q. Meng and M. Tang. Necessary and sufficient conditions for optimal control of stochastic systems associated with Lévy processes. *Sci. China Ser. F*, 2009, 52:1982–1992.

[9] M. N. Tang, Q. Zhang. Optimal variational principle for backward stochastic control systems associated with Lévy Processes. *Sci. China Ser. A*, 2012, 55:745-761.

[10] K. Bahlali, N. Khelfallah and B. Mezerdi Optimality conditions for partial information stochastic control problems driven by Lévy processes. *Systems and Control Letters*, 2012, 11: 1079-1084.

[11] Q. Meng, F. Zhang, M. Tang. Maximum principle for backward stochastic systems associated with Lévy processes under partial information. // Proceedings of the 31th Chinese Control Conference July 25-27, 2012, Hefei, Anhui, China, 2012: 1 - 6.