arXiv:1804.10880v2 [math.PR] 12 Mar 2021

Non-semimartingale solutions of reflected BSDEs and applications to Dynkin games

Tomasz Klimsiak
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Nicolaus Copernicus University
Chopina 12/18, 87–100 Toruń, Poland
E-mail address: tomas@mat.umk.pl

Abstract

We introduce a new class of reflected backward stochastic differential equations with two càdlàg barriers, which need not satisfy any separation conditions. For that reason, in general, the solutions are not semimartingales. We prove existence, uniqueness and approximation results for solutions of equations defined on general filtered probability spaces. Applications to nonlinear Dynkin games are given.

1 Introduction

In the present paper, we consider backward stochastic differential equations (RBSDEs) with two reflecting barriers L and U. We assume merely that L, U are adapted càdlàg processes such that L^+, U^- are of class (D) and $L_t \le U_t$, $t \ge 0$. Because, in general, the barriers L, U do not satisfy Mokobodzki's condition (existence of a special semimartingale between the barriers), treating such equations requires extending the notion of a solution to encompass the case where the first component of the solution is not a semimartingale. One of the main novelty of the paper is that we provide such an extension. We show that it is right in the sense that it coincides with the "classical" definition (semimartingale solutions) if Mokobodzki's condition holds. Our generalized non-semimartingale solutions are unique under the monotonicity assumption on the generators of the equations. Furthermore, we show that under reasonable assumptions on the terminal condition and the generator the solutions exist and can be approximated by a penalization scheme. We also prove some stability result and show that there is one-to-one correspondence between the solutions and the value processes in some generalized Dynkin games (with nonlinear expectation). Let us also stress that in the paper we consider equations on probability spaces equipped with general filtration satisfying only the usual conditions. Our motivation for studying such general setting comes from applications to Dynkin games and variational inequalities.

Let us mention here that in [15, 16] Hamadène and Hassani introduced a definition of solution to RBSDE without Mokobodzki's condition, and proposed a technique to solve it. Based on this technique and definition, in the literature there appeared some further results devoted to RBSDEs without Mokobodzki's condition but, as in the first papers

Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60H20; Secondary 60G40
Keywords: Reflected backward stochastic differential equations, Dynkin games
This work was supported by Polish National Science Centre (grant no. 2016/23/B/ST1/01543).

[15, 16], under rather restrictive assumptions on data (see [2, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20]). We propose a new definition (similar in spirit) of solution to RBSDE without Mokobodzki's condition, which enables us to provide a different technique to prove its existence, uniqueness, approximation and stability that works in a general framework described below.

We now describe the content of the paper and give more information about our motivations. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a complete probability space equipped with a right-continuous complete filtration $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0\}$, and let T be a (possibly infinite) $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time. We assume that we are given an $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable integrable random variable ξ, a function $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \ni (\omega, t, y) \mapsto f(\omega, t, y) \in \mathbb{R}$ (called generator) which is progressively measurable with respect to (ω, t), and $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes L, U such that L^+, U^- are of class (D), $L \leq U$ and

$$\limsup_{a\to\infty} L_{T\wedge a} \leq \xi \leq \liminf_{a\to\infty} U_{T\wedge a}. \tag{1.1}$$

Let us recall (see Appendix) that a (semimartingale) solution of the reflected backward stochastic differential equation with terminal value ξ, generator f and barriers L and U (RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ for short) is a triple (Y, M, R) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes such that Y is of class (D), M is a local martingale with $M_0 = 0$, R is a predictable process of finite variation with $R_0 = 0$, and

$$dY_t = -f(t, Y_t)\, dt - dR_t + dM_t, \quad Y_{T\wedge a} \to \xi \quad \text{as } a \to \infty, \tag{1.2}$$

$$L \leq Y \leq U, \quad (Y_{t-} - L_{t-})\, dR_t^+ = (U_{t-} - Y_{t-})\, dR_t^- = 0. \tag{1.3}$$

The crucial part of the above definition is condition (1.3), the so-called Skorokhod condition or minimality condition, which guarantees uniqueness of solutions. The Skorokhod condition involves the predictable finite variation part of Y, so the semimartingale structure of a solution is inherent in the notion of a solution. Clearly, the fact that each solution Y to RBSDE with barriers L and U is a semimartingale forces Mokobodzki's condition (Y is a semimartingale between L and U). One of the main goal of the paper is to introduce a right definition of a solution to RBSDE in the case were Mokobodzki's condition is not satisfied (we merely assume that $L \leq U$). In this case it may happen that every càdlàg process between the barriers L and U is "nowhere a semimartingale", i.e. there is no nontrivial random interval on which it is a semimartingale. This forces a complete change of the notion of a solution. In particular, to get uniqueness, we are forced to replace the Skorokhod condition (1.3) by a new minimality condition.

It is worth mentioning that usually in the literature there are considered BSDEs with generator f depending also on the martingale part M of a solution. In the whole paper, we focus on RBSDEs with generator f depending only on Y as we are interested in the case where Y is not a semimartingale, therefore the martingale part is not well defined. The case of RBSDEs with generator f depending on M requires further analysis and its full examination is beyond the scope of the paper, so we shall postpone it for the future papers.

Reflected BSDEs with two barriers satisfying Mokobodzki's condition were introduced by Cvitanic and Karatzas [6] in the case where the barriers L, U are continuous and their supremums are square-integrable, the terminal value ξ is square-integrable, the terminal time T is constant and finite, the generator f is Lipschitz continuous and the underlying filtration $\mathbb{F}$ is Brownian. Since then the notion of

reflected BSDEs was recognized as a very useful and important tool having applications to stochastic control, mathematical finance and the variational inequalities theory (see, e.g., [5, 18, 22, 25, 27, 28, 33, 40] and the references therein). Subsequently, in many papers the assumptions adopted in [6] were weakened (see, e.g., [2, 13, 14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 39] and the references therein) but in the vast majority of the papers Mokobodzki's condition was required to hold (see Remark A.8).

Reflected BSDEs without Mokobodzki's condition have been much less studied. In [15, 17] the authors considered RBSDEs on Brownian filtered space with L^2-data, T bounded, and Lipschitz continuous generator f. In [2] the authors generalized the results of [15, 16] by considering L^1-data and monotone f (with linear growth), however the authors additionally assumed that barriers are continuous and they required $\sup_{t\leq t} L_t^+, \sup_{t\leq T} U_t^-$ to be in L^1 (see also [11], where the authors considered similar framework to [2] but with L^p data for $p \in (1,2)$). To the authors' best knowledge the only papers on RBSDEs without Mokobodzki's condition on Brownian-Poisson filtered space are [16, 20], where the authors considered L^2 data, T bounded, Lipschitz continuous generator f. However uniqueness is proved only in [16], where it is assumed additionally that the barriers have only totally inaccessible jumps. It is worth mentioning here that the main goal of the papers mentioned in this paragraph is to prove the existence of semimartingale solutions to RBSDEs with barriers satisfying the so called complete separation condition, i.e.

$$L_t < U_t,\ t \in [0,T], \quad L_{t-} < U_{t-},\ t \in (0,T]. \tag{1.4}$$

The existence of non-semimartingale solution for RBSDEs with barriers satisfying merely $L \leq U$ is hidden in the proof technique considered in these papers: first step is to find a unique non-semimartingale - the so called *local solution* - under assumption that $L \leq U$; second step is to show that under additional condition (1.4) local solution is in fact a semimartingale and solves RBSDE by means of the classical definition. As a by-product we get that (1.4) implies Mokobodzki's condition. At this point we would like to mention the paper [45], where the author proposed completely different method of solving RBSDEs with barriers satisfying (1.4).

One of the most important result proved in [6] concerns the connection between (semimartingale) solutions of RBSDEs and so-called Dynkin games introduced in [10] and studied extensively by many authors (see, e.g., [1, 3, 9, 10, 30, 32, 34, 41, 46]). In [6] (see [24] for the general setting) it is proved that if Y is the first component of a (semimartingale) solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$, then for any stopping time $\alpha \leq T$,

$$Y_\alpha = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma\geq\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau\geq\alpha} E\Big(\int_\alpha^{\tau\wedge\sigma} f(r, Y_r)\, dr + L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma<\tau} + U_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau\leq\sigma<T} + \xi \mathbf{1}_{\sigma=\tau=T} | \mathcal{F}_\alpha \Big). \tag{1.5}$$

Recently it was proved in [8] for Brownian-Poisson filtration and L^2-data (see also [2] for Brownian filtration and L^1-data) that under some conditions on f the above equality may be equivalently stated as

$$Y_\alpha = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma\geq\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau\geq\alpha} \mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\tau\wedge\sigma}(L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma<\tau} + U_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau\leq\sigma<T} + \xi \mathbf{1}_{\sigma=\tau=T}), \tag{1.6}$$

where $\mathcal{E}^f$ is the nonlinear f-expectation introduced by Peng [35] (see also [36]). In [12] it was shown that the theory of nonlinear pricing systems has wide applications in mathematical finance. When $f = 0$, (1.6) reduces to the classical Dynkin game, and when $f \neq 0$, it is called a generalized Dynkin game (see [8]).

Assume that Y is a solution to (1.5) or (1.6). Here arises a natural question whether Y is the first component of a solution to some reflected BSDE. In general, the answer is "no", because if $f = 0$ and $L = U$, then from (1.6) it follows that $Y = L$. Hence, since we only assume that L^+ is a càdlàg process of class (D), the process Y need not be a semimartingale. On the other hand, by the classical definition of a solution to (1.2) and (1.3), the first component Y of the solution is a semimartingale. We see that to obtain a one-to-one correspondence between solutions of RBSDEs and solutions to Dynkin games requires an extension of the notion of a solution to RBSDE.

The need of extending the notion of reflected BSDEs also arises in the problems of approximation of the value process in Dynkin games. Recall that there are basically two methods of solving RBSDEs with two reflecting barriers (or solving the related Dynkin game problem). The first one consists in solving the following system of optimal stopping problems introduced in [3, 4]:

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^1 = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t\le\tau\le T} E(Y_\tau^2 \mathbf{1}_{\tau<T} + \int_t^\tau f(r)\,dr + L_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau<T} + \xi \mathbf{1}_{\tau=T}|\mathcal{F}_t), \\ Y_t^2 = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t\le\tau\le T} E(Y_\tau^1 \mathbf{1}_{\tau<T} - U_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau<T}|\mathcal{F}_t), \end{cases}$$

where f is independent of Y. Putting $Y = Y^1 - Y^2$, we obtain a solution of the linear RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. Next, by a fixed point argument, one can obtain the existence of a solution in the nonlinear case. Note that the above methods always leads to a semimartingale solution, i.e. Y is a semimartingale, because Y^1, Y^2 are supermartingales. The second method is the so-called penalty method. It is known (see, e.g., [24]) that if Mokobodzki's condition is satisfied, then under some assumptions on the data, the first component Y^n of the solution (Y^n, M^n) of the BSDE

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^n = \xi &+ \int_t^T f(r, Y_r^n)\,dr + n\int_t^T (Y_r^n - L_r)^-\,dr \\ &- n\int_t^T (Y_r^n - U_r)^+\,dr - \int_t^T dM_r^n, \quad t \in [0,T], \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

converges as $n \to \infty$ to a process Y being the first component of the (semimartingale) solution to RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. The question arises whether $\{Y^n\}$ converges if we omit the assumption of the existence of a special semimartingale between the barriers. Secondly, if the answer is "yes", what kind of equation does the limit process solve? The problem is rather subtle. It is worth noting here that the penalty method had been applied to Dynkin games problems much before the notion of BSDEs was introduced (see [38, 41, 42, 44]). From the results of Stettner [42] (see also [41, 43] for the Markovian case) it follows (see Remark 5.5 for details) that in the linear case, under some additional assumptions on the barriers, the solutions of (1.7) can converge to a solution of (1.5) without Mokobodzki's condition. Part of our results may be viewed as a far reaching generalization of Stettner's results on approximation of the value process in Dynkin games.

As explained above, to show the one-to-one correspondence between solutions to RBSDEs and solutions of the generalized Dynkin problem (1.5) or (1.6) and its approximation by a penalization scheme, we find ourselves forced to introduce a new definition of a solution in which we do not require that the process Y is a semimartingale. Aiming for this, in the paper we consider the notion of a local solution to RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ on a progressively measurable set $A \subset [0,T] \times \Omega$. By local solution we mean an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process Y of class (D) such that $Y_{T\wedge a} \to \xi$ and for every random

interval $[[\alpha,\beta]] \subset A$, where $\alpha \le \beta$ are stopping times, (1.2) and (1.3) hold on $[[\alpha,\beta]]$. In this notion it is hidden that Y must be a special semimartingale locally on A, i.e. on every random interval $[[\alpha,\beta]] \subset A$.

One of the main achievement of the paper is the observation that for a given $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes L, U such that $L \le U$ there always exists a family $\{A_\tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$ of progressively measurable sets such that Mokobodzki's condition is satisfied locally on each set A_τ and there exists at most one càdlàg process Y of class (D) which solves $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ locally on each A_τ for every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. We call Y the solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. More precisely, to define a solution, we first set

$$\gamma_\tau = \inf\{\tau < t \le T : L_{t-} = U_{t-}\} \wedge \inf\{\tau \le t \le T : L_t = U_t\} \wedge T$$

and

$$\Lambda_\tau = \{L_{\gamma_\tau -} = U_{\gamma_\tau -}\} \cap \{\tau < \gamma_\tau < \infty\}.$$

We call the family $\{(\gamma_\tau, \Lambda_\tau), \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$ the ℓ-system associated with L, U. We then say that a càdlàg process X is a special ℓ-semimartingale, if for every stopping time $\tau \le T$, X is a special semimartingale locally on the set A_τ defined by

$$A_\tau(\omega) := [\tau(\omega), \gamma_\tau(\omega)\} = \begin{cases} [\tau(\omega), \gamma_\tau(\omega)], & \omega \notin \Lambda_\tau, \\ [\tau(\omega), \gamma_\tau(\omega)), & \omega \in \Lambda_\tau. \end{cases}$$

By a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ we mean a pair (Y, Γ) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes such that Y, Γ are special ℓ-semimartingales satisfying

$$\begin{cases} Y_t = Y_{T_a} + \int_t^{T_a} f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \Gamma_{T_a} - \Gamma_t, \quad t \in [0, T_a],\ a \ge 0, \\ L_t \le Y_t \le U_t, \quad t \in [0, T_a],\ a \ge 0, \\ \int_{[\tau,\gamma_\tau\}} (Y_{r-} - L_{r-})\, d\Gamma_r^{v,+}(\tau) = \int_{[\tau,\gamma_\tau\}} (U_{r-} - Y_{r-})\, d\Gamma_r^{v,-}(\tau) = 0, \\ Y_{T_a} \to \xi \quad \text{a.s. as } a \to \infty. \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

In (1.8), $T_a = T \wedge a$, $\Gamma^v(\tau)$ is the (unique) predictable finite variation process on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ from the Doob-Meyer decomposition of Γ on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$:

$$\Gamma_t = \Gamma_\tau + \Gamma_t^v(\tau) + \Gamma_t^m(\tau), \quad t \in [\tau, \gamma_\tau\},$$

where $\Gamma^m(\tau)$ is a local martingale on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ with $\Gamma_\tau^m(\tau) = 0$. At first glance the above definition of a solution, making use of the family $\{A_\tau\}$, may seem a bit intricate. In Examples 3.2–3.4 we shall show that to get uniqueness of solutions it cannot be simpler in the sense that in general we cannot replace $\{A_\tau\}$ by a single progressively measurable set or by intervals $[[\tau, \gamma_\tau[[$ or $[[\tau, \gamma_\tau]]$ defined independently of Y through L and U.

From now on, solutions of RBSDEs in the sense of (1.2), (1.3) will be called semimartingale solutions, and the solutions in the generalized sense will be called non-semimartingale solutions or simply solutions. In Section 4, we show that if (Y, Γ) satisfies (1.8) and there exists a special semimartingale between the barriers L and U, then Y, Γ are special semimartingales and the triple (Y, Γ^v, Γ^m), where Γ^v (resp. Γ^m) is the predictable finite variation part (resp. martingale part) from the Doob-Meyer decomposition of Γ on $[0, T]$, is a semimartingale solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$.

In the context of reflected BSDEs, the concept of local solutions (somewhat different from ours, since we consider here arbitrary progressively measurable set A) was

considered for the first time by Hamadène and Hassani in [15] (see also [16, 17]) and also, as it is in the present paper, this concept was used to define a unique solution to RBSDE without Mokobodzki's condition. The definition proposed in [15] is similar in spirit to ours but instead of intervals $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ the authors in [15] consider shorter closed intervals $[[\tau, \delta_\tau]]$, with δ_τ defined through Y. However, the main difference between our definition and the one considered in [15] is that here intervals $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ are defined *independently* of Y. For this "independence" we pay a small price by using slightly more complex intervals $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ that are randomly closed/open from the right. In return, based on this new definition, we may provide new techniques thanks to which we can prove in a simple way the existence, uniqueness and approximation results in our general framework.

We now describe the content of the paper. In Sections 3 and 4, we introduce in more detail the notion of non-semimartingale solutions of RBSDEs, and we prove our main results on existence, uniqueness and approximation of solutions. First, we show that under the assumption that $y \mapsto f(t, y)$ is nonincreasing a comparison theorem for solutions to RBSDEs holds true. It implies uniqueness of solutions. Moreover, we prove stability of solutions, i.e. we show that if (Y^i, Γ^i), $i = 1, 2$, are solutions of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi^i, f^i, L^i, U^i)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y^1 - Y^2\|_{1;T} \le E|\xi^1 - \xi^2| + E\int_0^T |f_1(t, Y_t^2) - f_2(t, Y_t^2)|\, dt \\ + \|L^1 - L^2\|_{1;T} + \|U^1 - U^2\|_{1;T}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.9}$$

where $\|Y\|_{1;T} = \sup_{\tau \le T, \tau < \infty} E|Y_\tau|$. To show the existence of a solution, we additionally impose some integrability conditions on f. In the paper, we assume that

$$\int_0^T |f(t, y)|\, dt < \infty \quad \text{for every } y \in \mathbb{R} \tag{1.10}$$

and there exists a càdlàg process S being a difference of supermartingales of class (D) such that

$$E\int_0^T |f(t, S_t)|\, dt < \infty. \tag{1.11}$$

The second condition is commonly used in the literature with $S = 0$. Both conditions are the minimal known conditions ensuring the existence of solutions of BSDEs with no reflection (condition (1.11) is necessary when f is positive). We prove that if the function $y \mapsto f(t, y)$ is continuous and nonincreasing, and moreover, f satisfies (1.10) and (1.11), then there exists a unique solution (Y, Γ) of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. We also show that under these assumptions for every strictly positive bounded $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process η such that

$$E\int_0^T \eta_t (S_t - L_t)^-\, dt + E\int_0^T \eta_t (S_t - U_t)^+\, dt < \infty$$

there exists a unique solution to the following penalized BSDE

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^n = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, Y_r^n)\, dr + n\int_t^T \eta_r (Y_r^n - L_r)^-\, dr \\ - n\int_t^T \eta_r (Y_r^n - U_r)^+\, dr - \int_t^T dM_r^n, \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

and for every $a \geq 0$,

$$Y_t^n \to Y_t, \quad \int_0^t n(Y_r^n - L_r)^- \, dr - \int_0^t n(Y_r^n - U_r)^+ \, dr - M_t^n \to \Gamma_t, \quad t \in [0, T_a].$$

In the case where T is bounded, one can take $\eta \equiv 1$, so (1.12) reduces to the usual penalization scheme (1.7). Moreover, we show that if

$$^pL \geq L_-, \qquad ^pU \leq U_-, \tag{1.13}$$

where ^pL (resp. ^pU) is the predictable projection of L (resp. U), then the convergence of $\{Y^n\}$ is uniform in probability on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}_+$ (the so-called ucp convergence).

In Section 5, under the additional assumption that L, U are of class (D) (and not merely L^+ and U^-), we study connections of RBSDEs with Dynkin games and nonlinear expectation. We show that if Y is a solution of (1.5), then Y is the first component of a solution of RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$, and conversely, if (Y, Γ) is a solution of RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ and $E\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r)| \, dr < \infty$, then Y is a solution to (1.5). We also prove that if (1.13) is satisfied, then $(\sigma_\alpha^*, \tau_\alpha^*)$ defined by

$$\sigma_\alpha^* = \inf\{t \geq \alpha : Y_t = L_t\} \wedge T, \qquad \tau_\alpha^* = \inf\{t \geq \alpha : Y_t = U_t\} \wedge T \tag{1.14}$$

is a saddle point for (1.5). Moreover, the process $Y + \int_\alpha^\cdot f(r, Y_r) \, dr$ is a uniformly integrable martingale on the closed interval $[\alpha, \sigma_\alpha^* \wedge \tau_\alpha^*]$.

We next generalize the notion of the nonlinear f-expectation introduced in [35] for Brownian filtration and square integrable data, and then extended in [37] to the case of filtration generated by Brownian motion and an independent Poisson random measure, and we show that

$$(Y, \Gamma) \text{ is a solution of RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U) \quad \text{iff} \quad Y \text{ satisfies (1.6).} \tag{1.15}$$

Let us stress here that (1.15) holds true although in general the integral $E\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r)| \, dr$ may be infinite. Furthermore, we show that under (1.13) the pair (1.14) is a saddle point for the generalized Dynkin game (1.6).

Finally, in Section 6, we show that if L and U are of class (D), then there is a solution of RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ even if we drop condition (1.11). Unfortunately, we do not know whether it is a limit of some penalization scheme. Nevertheless, this result is interesting because it implies that there exist data ξ, f ($\xi \in L^1$ and f is continuous and nonincreasing with respect to y and satisfies (1.10)) such that there is no solution of class (D) to BSDE$^T(\xi, f)$ but there exists a solution to RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ for all càdlàg barriers of class (D) satisfying (1.1) (see Example 6.2).

In Section A (Appendix), we collect results on semimartingale solutions to RBSDEs on general filtered space. We also extend the results of [24] to the case of arbitrary, possibly unbounded terminal time T.

2 Notation and standing assumptions

In the paper, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is a complete probability space equipped with a right-continuous complete filtration $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t, t \in [0, \infty]\}$ with $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \bigvee_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_t$. We assume that we are given a function

$$\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \ni (\omega, t, y) \mapsto f(\omega, t, y) \in \mathbb{R}$$

which is $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable with respect to (ω, t) for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Throughout the paper, unless stated otherwise, we assume that T is an $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time, i.e. $T : \Omega \to [0, \infty]$ is a random variable, and $\{T \le t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t$ for any $t \ge 0$, and ξ is an $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable. We also assume that L, U are $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes such that L^+, U^- are of class (D), and moreover, $L_t \le U_t$, $t \in [0, T \wedge a]$, $a \ge 0$, and

$$\limsup_{a\to\infty} L_{T\wedge a} \le \xi \le \liminf_{a\to\infty} U_{T\wedge a}. \tag{2.1}$$

In the sequel, for given processes X, Y, we write $X \le Y$ if $X_t \le Y_t$, $t \in [0, T \wedge a]$, $a \ge 0$ a.s. Let us recall that and $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process K is called an increasing process if its trajectories are nonincreasing a.s. For a given finite variation process V, we denote by V^+, V^- the unique increasing processes from the Hahn-Jordan decomposition of V ($V = V^+ - V^-$).

Let α, β be two stopping times such that $\alpha \le \beta$. We say that an $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process Y is of class (D) on $[\alpha, \beta]$ if the family $\{Y_\tau, \alpha \le \tau \le \beta, \tau < \infty\}$ is uniformly integrable. We set

$$\|Y\|_{1;\alpha,\beta} = \sup_{\alpha\le\tau\le\beta,\tau<\infty} E|Y_\tau|, \qquad \|Y\|_{1;\beta} = \|Y\|_{1;0,\beta}. \tag{2.2}$$

We say that a nonincreasing sequence of stopping times $\{\tau_k\}$ is a chain on $[\alpha, \beta]$ if $\alpha \le \tau_k \le \beta$, $k \ge 1$, and the set $\{k \ge 1 : \tau_k < \beta\}$ is finite a.s.

We denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the set of all $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times τ such that $\tau \le T$, and for given $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$, we denote by $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ the set of all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\tau \ge \alpha$. For a stopping time σ and $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma$, we set

$$\sigma_\Lambda(\omega) = \begin{cases} \sigma(\omega), & \omega \in \Lambda, \\ \infty, & \omega \notin \Lambda. \end{cases}$$

It is well known that σ_Λ is a stopping time.

For stopping times $\alpha \le \beta$, we denote by $[[\alpha, \beta]]$ the random interval defined as

$$[[\alpha, \beta]] = \{(t, \omega) \in [0, \infty) \times \Omega : \alpha(\omega) \le t \le \beta(\omega)\}.$$

We put $[[\alpha]] := [[\alpha, \alpha]]$, $]]\alpha, \beta]] := [[\alpha, \beta]] \setminus [[\alpha]]$, $[[\alpha, \beta[[:= [[\alpha, \beta]] \setminus [[\beta]]$, $]]\alpha, \beta[[:= [[\alpha, \beta]] \setminus ([[\alpha]] \cup [[\beta]])$.

In the sequel, for a given progressively measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega$, we say that some property holds locally on A if it holds on $[[\alpha, \beta]] \subset A$ for every $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\alpha \le \beta$.

In the paper, we use frequently the notions and results concerning semimartingale solutions to BSDEs and reflected BSDEs which are collected in Appendix. Especially, we use the notions of solutions to $\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi, f)$, $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi, f, L)$, $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, U)$, $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi, f, L, U)$ for given $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$, $\alpha \le \beta$. We also use the convention that BSDE^T stands for $\mathrm{BSDE}^{0,T}$.

3 Reflected BSDEs with bounded terminal time

In this section, we assume that T is a bounded $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time.

Definition 3.1. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega$ be a progressively measurable set. We say that a càdlàg progressively measurable process Y is a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ locally on A if $Y_T = \xi$, and for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\alpha \le \beta$ and $[[\alpha, \beta]] \subset A$, Y is a semimartingale solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(Y_\beta, f, L, U)$.

In the present paper, we assume merely that $L \leq U$, so in general the barriers do not satisfy Mokobodzki's condition. For that reason, solutions to reflected BSDEs need not be semimartingales. Therefore, as already explained in Introduction, to deal with equations with such barriers requires the introduction of new definition of a solution. The problem with new definition is rather subtle. Consider some reflected equation with càdlàg barriers L and U such that $L \leq U$. The first (naive) idea to solve it is the following. We find a progressively measurable set A (the bigger the better) on which Mokobodzki's condition is locally satisfied. We then solve the equation locally on A and get the solution by aggregation local solutions on A and by putting some natural value on the set A^c. For instance, we solve locally the equation on the progressively measurable set $A = \{L < U\}$ and next we put $Y = L = U$ on the set $\{L = U\}$. Unfortunately, this approach fails. This follows from Examples 3.2–3.4 given below.

(a) In Example 3.2, we show that there exist $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg barriers L, U $(L \leq U)$ such that there is no càdlàg process between the barriers such that it is a semimartingale locally on the set $\{L < U\}$. This shows that we cannot expect that a solution to RBSDE is a semimartingale locally on the set $\{L < U\}$ and, as a consequence, we cannot solve RBSDE locally on the set $\{L < U\}$.

(b) By Remark A.8, for any $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg barriers L, U $(L \leq U)$ Mokobodzki's condition is satisfied locally on the set $\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\}$, so it is possible to solve RBSDE locally on the set $\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\}$. In Example 3.3, we show that there may be infinitely many processes Y of class (D) which solve some linear RBSDE locally on the set $\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\}$.

(c) By (a), the set $\{L < U\}$ is too big to satisfy locally Mokobodzki's condition. On the other hand, although Mokobodzki's condition is satisfied locally on the set $\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\}$, (b) shows that it is to small to get uniqueness. In Example 3.4, we show that it may happen that there is no progressively measurable set A such that

$$\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\} \ \subset \ A \ \subset \ \{L < U\}$$

having the property that Mokobodzki's condition is satisfied locally on A and we get uniqueness by solving RBSDE locally on A.

Example 3.2. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$, $T = 2$ and $\mathcal{F}_t = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t, t \in [0,T]\}$. We set $f \equiv 0$, $\xi \equiv 0$, and

$$L_t = (1-t)\cos(\frac{\pi}{1-t})\mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}(t), \quad t \in [0,T],$$

$$U_t = (L_t + \frac{1}{2}(1-t))\mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}(t) + \mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}(t), \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Since the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ is trivial, a process Y is an $\mathbb{F}$-semimartingale if and only if it is a process of finite variation. Of course, any solution of the problem $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ has to satisfy $L \leq Y \leq U$. In particular, putting $t_n = (n-1)/n$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2n} = L_{t_{2n}} \leq Y_{t_{2n}}, \quad Y_{t_{2n+1}} \leq U_{t_{2n+1}} = \frac{-1}{2n+1} + \frac{1}{4n+2}\,.$$

Observe that $\{L = U\} = \emptyset$ and

$$\mathrm{Var}_{[0,1]}(Y) \geq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |Y_{t_{2n}} - Y_{t_{2n+1}}| \geq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2n+1} = \infty,$$

so Y is not a semimartingale. Observe that $L_{-1} = U_{1-}$, so the above example is not in contradiction with Remark A.8.

Example 3.3. We define Ω, T and $\mathbb{F}$ as in Example 3.2. Let

$$L_t = -t\mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}(t) + (t-1)\sin[\pi(t-1)]\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}(t), \quad t \in [0,2],$$

$$U_t = t\mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}(t) + (t-1)\sin[\pi(t-1)]\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}(t), \quad t \in [0,2].$$

Observe that $\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\} = \{L < U\} = [0,1)$. Let $r \in (0,1)$ and

$$Y^r_t = t\mathbf{1}_{[0,r)}(t) + r\mathbf{1}_{[r,1)}(t) + (t-1)\sin[\pi(t-1)]\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}(t), \quad t \in [0,2].$$

It is easy to verify that for every $r \in (0,1)$ the process Y^r is a special semimartingale of class (D) with $Y^r_T = 0$, and that Y^r is a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{a,b}(Y_b, 0, L, U)$ for every $a, b \in [0,1)$ with $a \le b$.

Example 3.4. We define Ω, T and $\mathbb{F}$ as in Example 3.2. We set

$$L^0_t = 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(t - \frac{1}{n+1})\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{n+1},\frac{1}{n})}(t), \quad t \ge 0,$$

$$U^0_t = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(t - \frac{1}{n+1})\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{n+1},\frac{1}{n})}(t), \quad t \ge 0,$$

and then, for $t \in [0,2]$ we set

$$L_t = (1 + (t+1)\cos\frac{\pi}{1+t})L^0_{1+t} - \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}(t),$$

$$U_t = (1 + (t+1)\cos\frac{\pi}{1+t})U^0_{1+t} + \mathbf{1}_{[0,1)}(t).$$

Observe that $\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\} = [0,2] \setminus N$, where $N = \{1\} \cup \{1 + \frac{1}{n},\, n \ge 2\}$. From Example 3.3 it follows that for every $a \in N$, if there exists a càdlàg progressively measurable process Y of class (D) with $Y_T = \xi$ such that Y solves $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(0,0,L,U)$ locally on $[0,T] \setminus \{a\}$, then there are infinitely many processes with these properties. Therefore the only extension of $\{L < U\} \cap \{L_- < U_-\}$ ensuring uniqueness of Y is the whole interval $[0,2]$. However, from the construction of L, U it follows that each process Y lying between L and U is of infinite variation on $[0,2]$, so it is not a special semimartingale.

3.1 Definition of a solution

For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, we define the stopping time $\dot\gamma_\tau$ by

$$\dot\gamma_\tau = \inf\{\tau < t \le T : L_{t-} = U_{t-}\} \wedge \inf\{\tau \le t \le T : L_t = U_t\},$$

and then we set

$$\gamma_\tau = \dot\gamma_\tau \wedge T, \qquad \Lambda_\tau = \{L_{\gamma_\tau -} = U_{\gamma_\tau -}\} \cap \{\tau < \gamma_\tau\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Observe that $\Lambda_\tau \in \mathcal{F}_{\gamma_\tau -}$ and the stopping time $(\gamma_\tau)_{\Lambda_\tau}$ is predictable since the sequence $\{\alpha_n := \inf\{\tau < t < \gamma_\tau : |L_t - U_t| \le \frac{1}{n}\} \wedge n$ announces it. Let $\{\dot\delta^k_\tau\}$ $(\dot\delta^k_\tau \ge \tau)$ be an announcing sequence for $(\gamma_\tau)_{\Lambda_\tau}$ and let $\delta^k_\tau = \dot\delta^k_\tau \wedge T$. We put

$$\gamma^k_\tau = \delta^k_\tau \wedge \gamma_\tau. \tag{3.2}$$

In the whole paper we use the following notation

$$[\tau(\omega), \gamma_\tau(\omega)\} = \begin{cases} [\tau(\omega), \gamma_\tau(\omega)], & \omega \notin \Lambda_\tau, \\ [\tau(\omega), \gamma_\tau(\omega)), & \omega \in \Lambda_\tau. \end{cases}$$

We call the family $\{(\gamma_\tau, \Lambda_\tau), \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$ the ℓ-system associated with L and U. Observe that

$$[\tau, \gamma_\tau\} = \bigcup_{k\ge 1} [\tau, \gamma^k_\tau].$$

In what follows we also adopt the convention that $[a, a] = [a, a) = \{a\}$.

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ $(\alpha \le \beta)$. We say that an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process Γ is a (local) martingale (resp. (predictable) increasing process) on $[\alpha, \beta]$ if there exist a (local) $\mathbb{F}$-martingale M (resp. a (predictable) increasing $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process A) such that $\Gamma_t = M_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$ (resp. $\Gamma_t = A_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$).

We say that an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process Γ is a (local) martingale (resp. (predictable) increasing process) on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ if it is a (local) martingale (resp. (predictable) increasing process) on $[\tau, \gamma^k_\tau]$ for $k \ge 1$.

Definition 3.5. We say that an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process Γ is an ℓ-martingale (resp. local ℓ-martingale) if it is a martingale (resp. local martingale) on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ for every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. We say that Γ is an ℓ-semimartingale (resp. special ℓ-semimartingale) if Γ is a semimartingale (resp. special semimartingale) on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ for every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.

For a given special ℓ-semimartingale Γ, we denote by $\Gamma^v(\tau)$ (resp. $\Gamma^m(\tau)$) its predictable finite variation part (resp. local martingale part) from the Doob-Meyer decomposition on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$. For a process Γ and finite $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\alpha \le \beta$, we denote by $\int_\alpha^\beta d\Gamma_r$ the difference $\Gamma_\beta - \Gamma_\alpha$.

Definition 3.6. We say that a pair (Y, Γ) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process is a solution of the reflected backward stochastic differential equation on the interval $[0, T]$ with terminal time ξ, generator f, lower barrier L and upper barrier U (RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ for short) if

(a) Y is of class (D), Γ is a special ℓ-semimartingale,

(b) $\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr < \infty$ and

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^T d\Gamma_r, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

(c) $L_t \le Y_t \le U_t$, $t \in [0, T]$,

(d) for every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\int_{[\tau,\gamma_\tau\}} (Y_{r-} - L_{r-})\, d\Gamma^{v,+}_r(\tau) = \int_{[\tau,\gamma_\tau\}} (U_{r-} - Y_{r-})\, d\Gamma^{v,-}_r(\tau) = 0.$$

Remark 3.7. Of course, in the above definition the process Γ is determined by Y through the formula

$$\Gamma_t = Y_0 - Y_t - \int_0^t f(r, Y_r)\, dr, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

That is why in the whole paper we shall write that a solution of RBSDE is Y and (Y,Γ) interchangeably.

Remark 3.8. Consider the very special case where $L = U$. If (Y,Γ) is a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$, then of course

$$Y_t = L_t, \qquad \Gamma_t = -\int_0^t f(r, L_r)\, dr - L_t + L_0, \quad t \in [0,T],$$

and $\gamma_\tau = \tau$ for every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.

3.2 Existence, uniqueness and approximation of solutions

Let us consider the following hypotheses:

(H1) $E|\xi| < \infty$ and there exists a càdlàg process S, which is a difference of supermartingales of class (D), such that $E\int_0^T |f(r, S_r)|\, dr < \infty$.

(H2) there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$,

$$(y - y')(f(t,y) - f(t,y')) \le \mu |y - y'|^2, \quad y, y' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

(H3) For a.e. $t \in [0,T]$ the function $y \mapsto f(t,y)$ is continuous a.s.

(H4) For every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\int_0^T |f(r,y)|\, dr < \infty$ a.s.

We start with a comparison result.

Theorem 3.9. *Assume that $\xi_1 \le \xi_2$, $L_t^1 \le L_t^2$, $U_t^1 \le U_t^2$, $t \in [0,T]$, and for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$ we have $f^1(t,y) \le f^2(t,y)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume also that f^1 satisfies* (H2). *Let (Y^i, Γ^i), $i = 1,2$, be a solution to* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi^i, f^i, L^i, U^i)$. *Then*

$$Y_t^1 \le Y_t^2, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Proof. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $(\gamma_\tau^1, \Lambda_\tau^1), (\gamma_\tau^2, \Lambda_\tau^2)$ be defined by (3.1) but with L, U replaced by L^1, U^1 and L^2, U^2, respectively. Let $\{\gamma_\tau^{1,k}\}$, $\{\gamma_\tau^{2,k}\}$ be the sequences constructed as in (3.2) but for γ_τ replaced by γ_τ^1 and γ_τ^2, respectively. By the definition, Y^i is a special semimartingale on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau^i\}$, $i = 1,2$. In particular, Y^1, Y^2 are special semimartingales on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau^{1,k} \wedge \gamma_\tau^{2,k}]$. By the Tanaka-Meyer formula and (H2),

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y_\tau^1 - Y_\tau^2)^+ &\le E(Y^1_{\gamma_\tau^{1,k} \wedge \gamma_\tau^{2,k}} - Y^2_{\gamma_\tau^{1,k} \wedge \gamma_\tau^{2,k}})^+ \\ &\quad + E\int_\tau^{\gamma_\tau^{1,k} \wedge \gamma_\tau^{2,k}} \operatorname{sgn}(Y_{r-}^1 - Y_{r-}^2)\, d(\Gamma_r^{1,v}(\tau) - \Gamma_r^{2,v}(\tau)) \\ &\quad + \mu^+ E\int_\tau^{\gamma_\tau^{1,k} \wedge \gamma_\tau^{2,k}} (Y_r^1 - Y_r^2)^+\, dr. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by condition (d) of Definition 3.6,

$$E(Y^1_\tau - Y^2_\tau)^+ \le E(Y^1_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau} - Y^2_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau})^+ + \mu^+ E \int_\tau^{\gamma^1_\tau \wedge \gamma^2_\tau} |Y^1_r - Y^2_r|\, dr. \tag{3.3}$$

We will show that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} (Y^1_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau} - Y^2_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau})^+ = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

The reasoning below is for fixed $\omega \in \Omega$. We consider several cases.

Case I: $\gamma^1_\tau = \tau$ or $\gamma^2_\tau = \tau$. Then $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau = \tau$. If $\tau < T$, then $Y^1_\tau = L^1_\tau$ or $Y^2_\tau = U^2_\tau$. In both cases (3.4) is satisfied. If $\tau = T$, then the limit in (3.4) equals $(\xi_1 - \xi_2)^+$, so (3.4) is satisfied by the assumptions.

Case II: $\gamma^1_\tau > \tau$ and $\gamma^2_\tau > \tau$. We divide the proof into several sub-cases.

Case II(a): $\gamma^1_\tau < \gamma^2_\tau$. First suppose that there exists k_0 such that $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau = \gamma^1_\tau$, $k \ge k_0$. Then $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau = \gamma^1_\tau$, $k \ge k_0$. Hence $\omega \notin \Lambda^1_\tau$, which implies that $L^1_{\gamma^1_\tau} = U^1_{\gamma^1_\tau}$. Hence we get easily (3.4). Suppose now that $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau < \gamma^1_\tau$, $k \ge 1$. Then $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau < \gamma^1_\tau$, $k \ge 1$, which implies that $\omega \in \Lambda^1_\tau$. Thus $L^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} = U^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -}$. Therefore

$$(Y^1_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau} - Y^2_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau})^+ \to (Y^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} - Y^2_{\gamma^1_\tau -})^+ = (L^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} - Y^2_{\gamma^1_\tau -})^+ = 0.$$

Case II(b): $\gamma^1_\tau > \gamma^2_\tau$. The proof is analogous to that in Case II(a).

Case II(c): $\gamma^1_\tau = \gamma^2_\tau < T$. First suppose that $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau < \gamma^1_\tau = \gamma^2_\tau$, $k \ge 1$. Then $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau < \gamma^1_\tau$, $k \ge 1$ or $\gamma^{2,k}_\tau < \gamma^1_\tau$, $k \ge 1$, which implies that $\omega \in \Lambda^1_\tau \cup \Lambda^2_\tau$ or equivalently $L^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} = U^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} \vee L^2_{\gamma^2_\tau -} = U^2_{\gamma^2_\tau -}$. Therefore

$$(Y^1_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau} - Y^2_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau})^+ \to (Y^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} - Y^2_{\gamma^1_\tau -})^+ = (Y^1_{\gamma^2_\tau -} - Y^2_{\gamma^2_\tau -})^+.$$

If $\omega \in \Lambda^1_\tau$, then $(Y^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} - Y^2_{\gamma^1_\tau -})^+ = (L^1_{\gamma^1_\tau -} - Y^2_{\gamma^1_\tau -})^+ = 0$. If $\omega \in \Lambda^2_\tau$, then $(Y^1_{\gamma^2_\tau -} - Y^2_{\gamma^2_\tau -})^+ = (Y^1_{\gamma^2_\tau -} - U^2_{\gamma^2_\tau -})^+ = 0$.

Case II(d): $\gamma^1_\tau = \gamma^2_\tau = T$. If there exists $k_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau = T$, then $(Y^1_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau} - Y^2_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau})^+ = (\xi_1 - \xi_2)^+ = 0$, $k \ge k_0$. If $\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau < T$, $k \ge 1$, then $\omega \in \Lambda^1_\tau \cup \Lambda^2_\tau$ or equivalently $L^1_{T-} = U^1_{T-} \vee L^2_{T-} = U^2_{T-}$. If $\omega \in \Lambda^1_\tau$, then $(Y^1_{T-} - Y^2_{T-})^+ = (L^1_{T-} - Y^2_{T-})^+ = 0$. If $\omega \in \Lambda^2_\tau$, then $(Y^1_{T-} - Y^2_{T-})^+ = (Y^1_{T-} - U^2_{T-})^+ = 0$. We have showed that (3.4) is satisfied. Since Y^1, Y^2 are of class (D), it follows from (3.4) that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} E(Y^1_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau} - Y^2_{\gamma^{1,k}_\tau \wedge \gamma^{2,k}_\tau})^+ = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

By this and (3.3),

$$E(Y^1_\tau - Y^2_\tau)^+ \le \mu^+ E \int_\tau^{\gamma^1_\tau \wedge \gamma^2_\tau} (Y^1_r - Y^2_r)^+\, dr. \tag{3.6}$$

Let $a \ge 0$ be such that $T \le a$. Put $Y^1_t = \xi_1$, $Y^2_t = \xi_2$, $t \ge T$. Then from (3.6) we conclude that for every stopping time $\tau \le a$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y^1_\tau - Y^2_\tau)^+ = E(Y^1_{\tau\wedge T} - Y^2_{\tau\wedge T})^+ &\le \mu^+ E \int_{\tau\wedge T}^a (Y^1_r - Y^2_r)^+\, dr \\ &= \mu^+ E \int_\tau^a (Y^1_r - Y^2_r)^+\, dr. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Gronwall's lemma yields $Y^1_t \le Y^2_t$, $t \in [0, T]$. □

Corollary 3.10. *Assume that* (H2) *is satisfied. Then there exists at most one solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$.

Theorem 3.11. *Assume that* (H1)–(H4) *are satisfied.*

(i) *There exists a unique solution* (Y, Γ) *of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$.

(ii) *Let* $\{\xi_n\}$ *be a sequence of integrable* $\mathcal{F}_T$*-measurable random variables such that* $\xi_n \nearrow \xi$, *and let*

$$f_n(t, y) = f(t, y) + n(y - L_t)^-.$$

Then for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$ *there exists a unique solution* (Y^n, M^n, A^n) *of the equation* $\overline{R}BSDE^T(\xi_n, f_n, U)$, *and moreover,* $Y_t^n \nearrow Y_t$, $\Gamma_t^n \to \Gamma_t$, $t \in [0, T]$, *where* $\Gamma_t^n = \int_0^t n(Y_r^n - L_r)^- \, dr - A_t^n - M_t^n$, $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. By Proposition A.4, for every $n \geq 1$ there exists a unique solution (Y^n, M^n, A^n) of $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi_n, f_n, U)$. By [24, Proposition 2.1], $Y^n \leq Y^{n+1}$. Set

$$Y_t = \lim_{n \to \infty} Y_t^n, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

By [24, Proposition 2.1] $Y^n \leq \bar{Y}^n$, where $(\bar{Y}^n, \bar{M}^n)$ is the solution of the problem $\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi_n, f_n)$. By Proposition A.4, $\bar{Y}^n \nearrow \bar{Y}$, where $(\bar{Y}, \bar{M}, \bar{K})$ is the solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi, f, L)$. Hence $Y^1 \leq Y^n \leq \bar{Y}$, $n \geq 1$, so Y is of class (D). By Proposition A.4, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \geq 1$ there exists a unique solution $(Y^{n,\varepsilon}, M^{n,\varepsilon}, A^{n,\varepsilon})$ of $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi_n, f_{n,\varepsilon}, U)$ with

$$f_{n,\varepsilon}(t, y) = f(t, y) + n(y - L_t^\varepsilon)^-, \quad L^\varepsilon = L - \varepsilon.$$

By [24, Proposition 2.1], $Y^{n,\varepsilon} \leq Y^n$, while by Proposition A.7 and Remark A.8, $Y_t^{n,\varepsilon} \nearrow Y_t^\varepsilon$, $t \in [0, T]$, where the triple $(Y^\varepsilon, M^\varepsilon, R^\varepsilon)$ is the unique solution to the problem $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L^\varepsilon, U)$. Therefore $L^\varepsilon \leq Y$, and since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, $L \leq Y$. Of course $Y \leq U$. Now we will show that Y is càdlàg. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Applying Proposition A.7 (see also Remark A.8, Remark A.14) on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau^k]$ (see (3.1), (3.2) for the definition of $\gamma_\tau, \gamma_\tau^k$) with $\hat{\xi}^n = Y_{\gamma_\tau^k}^n$, we see that Y is càdlàg on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$. If $\tau < \gamma_\tau$, then we get that Y is right-continuous in τ, and if $\tau = \gamma_\tau$, then $L_\tau = U_\tau = Y_\tau$, so Y is right-continuous in τ by the right-continuity of L, U and the fact that $L \leq Y \leq U$. Hence, by [7, IV.T28], Y is right-continuous on $[0, T]$. Now let $\{\tau_m\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ be an increasing sequence and $\tau := \sup_{m \geq 1} \tau_m$. It is clear that on the set $\{\omega \in \Omega;\, \tau_m(\omega) = \tau(\omega),\, m \geq m_\omega\} \cup \{L_{\tau-} = U_{\tau-}\}$ the limit $\lim_{m \to \infty} Y_{\tau_m}$ exists. Now we will show that this limit exists on the set

$$A = \{\tau_m < \tau,\, m \geq 1\} \cap \{L_{\tau-} < U_{\tau-}\}.$$

Applying Proposition A.7 (see also Remark A.8, Remark A.14) on the interval $[\tau_m, \gamma_{\tau_m}^k]$ with $\hat{\xi}^n = Y_{\gamma_{\tau_m}^k}^n$ for every $k \geq 1$ we see that Y is càdlàg on $[\tau_m, \gamma_{\tau_m}\}$. Since $A \subset \{L_{\tau-} < U_{\tau-}\}$, for every $\omega \in A$ there exists m_ω such that

$$[\tau_{m_\omega}(\omega), \tau(\omega)] \subset [\tau_{m_\omega}(\omega), \gamma_{\tau_{m_\omega}}(\omega)\}.$$

Therefore $\lim_{m \to \infty} Y_{\tau_m}$ exists on A. Summing up, we have that $\lim_{m \to \infty} Y_{\tau_m}$ exists a.s., so again by [7, IV.T28], Y has left limits on $[0, T]$. Set

$$\Gamma_t^n = \int_0^t n(Y_r^n - L_r)^- \, dr - A_t^n - M_t^n, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

It is clear that

$$Y_t^n = \xi_n + \int_t^T f(r, Y_r^n)\, dr + \int_t^T d\Gamma_r^n, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

By (H2) and (H4) we may pass to the limit in the above equation. We then get condition (c) of the definition of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ with $\Gamma_t = -Y_t + Y_0 - \int_0^t f(r, Y_r)\, dr$. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Applying Proposition A.7 (see also Remark A.14) on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau^k]$, $k \geq 1$ with $\hat{\xi}^n = Y^n_{\gamma_\tau^k}$ (see also Remark A.8) we see that Γ is a special semimartingale on $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ and

$$\int_{[\tau,\gamma_\tau\}} (Y_{r-} - L_{r-})\, d\Gamma_r^{v,+}(\tau) = \int_{[\tau,\gamma_\tau\}} (U_{r-} - Y_{r-})\, d\Gamma_r^{v,-}(\tau) = 0,$$

which completes the proof. □

Corollary 3.12. *Assume that* (H1)–(H4) *are satisfied. Let* (Y, Γ) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ *and* (Y^n, M^n) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi, f_n)$ *with*

$$f_n(t,y) = f(t,y) + n(y - L_t)^- - n(y - U_t)^+.$$

Then $Y_t^n \to Y_t$, $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.11, $\overline{Y}^n \nearrow Y$, where $(\overline{Y}^n, \overline{M}^n, \overline{A}^n)$ is a solution of the equation $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi, \overline{f}_n, U)$ with $\overline{f}_n(t,y) = f(t,y) + n(y - L_t)^-$. In much the same manner one can show that $\underline{Y}^n \searrow Y$, where $(\underline{Y}^n, \underline{M}^n, \underline{K}^n)$ is a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi, \underline{f}_n, U)$ with $\underline{f}_n(t,y) = f(t,y) - n(y - U_t)^+$. By [24, Proposition 2.1], $\overline{Y}^n \leq Y^n \leq \underline{Y}^n$, which implies the desired result. □

Corollary 3.13. *Let* $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* (Y, Γ) *be a solution of the problem* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. *Then* $(Y^\alpha, \Gamma^\alpha)$ *is a solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi^\alpha, f^\alpha, L^\alpha, U^\alpha)$ *with*

$$\xi^\alpha = e^{\alpha T}\xi, \quad f^\alpha(t,y) = e^{\alpha t} f(t, e^{-\alpha t} y) - \alpha y, \quad L_t^\alpha = e^{\alpha t} L_t, \quad U_t^\alpha = e^{\alpha t} U_t,$$

where

$$Y_t^\alpha = e^{\alpha t} Y_t, \qquad \Gamma_t^\alpha = e^{\alpha t}\Gamma_t - \int_0^t \alpha e^{\alpha r}\Gamma_r\, dr.$$

Proof. We first assume that $E\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr < \infty$. By Theorem 3.11, $Y_t^n \nearrow Y_t$, $t \in [0,T]$, and $\Gamma_t^n \to \Gamma_t$, $t \in [0,T]$, where (Y^n, M^n, A^n) is a solution of $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi_n, f_n, U)$ with $f_n(t,y) = f(t, Y_t) + n(y - L_t)^-$ and

$$\Gamma_t^n = \int_0^t n(Y_r^n - L_r)^-\, dr - A_t^n - M_t^n, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

It is clear that

$$Y_t^n = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^T d\Gamma_r^n, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Integrating by parts, we obtain

$$e^{\alpha t} Y_t^n = \xi^\alpha + \int_t^T e^{\alpha r} f(r, Y_r)\, dr - \int_t^T \alpha e^{\alpha r} Y_r^n\, dr + \int_t^T d\Gamma_r^{n,\alpha}, \quad t \in [0,T], \qquad (3.7)$$

with

$$\Gamma_t^{n,\alpha} = e^{\alpha t}\Gamma_t^n - \int_0^t \alpha e^{\alpha r}\Gamma_r^n\, dr.$$

Therefore letting $n \to \infty$ in (3.7) we get

$$Y_t^\alpha = \xi^\alpha + \int_t^T f^\alpha(r, Y_r^\alpha)\, dr + \int_t^T d\Gamma_r^\alpha, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

It is clear that Y^α is of class (D) and $L^\alpha \le Y^\alpha \le U^\alpha$. What is left is to show that condition (d) of Definition 3.6 is satisfied. However, this condition easily follows from the fact that on the interval $[\tau, \gamma_\tau\}$ we have

$$\Gamma_t^{\alpha,v} - \Gamma_\tau^{\alpha,v} = \int_\tau^t e^{\alpha r}\, d\Gamma_r^v.$$

Let $\{\tau_k\}$ be a chain on $[0,T]$ such that $E\int_0^{\tau_k} |f(r,Y_r)|\, dr < \infty$, $k \ge 1$. By what has already been proved the pair $(Y^\alpha, \Gamma^\alpha)$ is a solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\tau_k}(Y^\alpha_{\tau_k}, f^\alpha, L^\alpha, U^\alpha)$. Since $\{\tau_k\}$ is a chain, we get the result. □

The following theorem shows that the solutions of reflected BSDEs are stable with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1;T}$ defined by (2.2).

Theorem 3.14. *Let (Y^i, Γ^i) be a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi^i, f^i, L^i, U^i)$, $i = 1, 2$, and f^1 satisfy* (H2). *Then for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}(Y_\tau^1 - Y_\tau^2)^+ \le E\Big(& e^{(T-\tau)\mu^+}(\xi^1 - \xi^2)^+ \\ &+ \int_\tau^{\hat\beta_\tau} e^{(r-\tau)\mu^+}(f_1(r, Y_r^2) - f_2(r, Y_r^2))^+\, dr \\ &+ e^{(\hat\beta_\tau - \tau)\mu^+}\mathbf{1}_{\hat\beta_\tau < T}[(L^1_{\hat\beta_\tau} - L^2_{\hat\beta_\tau})^+ + (U^1_{\hat\beta_\tau} - U^2_{\hat\beta_\tau})^+]|\mathcal{F}_\tau\Big) + \varepsilon,\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat\beta_\tau = \beta_\tau^1 \wedge \beta_\tau^2$ and

$$\beta_\tau^1 = \inf\{t \ge \tau : Y_t^1 \le L_t^1 + \varepsilon\} \wedge T, \quad \beta_\tau^2 = \inf\{t \ge \tau : Y_t^2 \ge U_t^2 - \varepsilon\} \wedge T.$$

Proof. By Corollary 3.13, we may assume that $\mu^+ = 0$. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and γ_τ^i, $\{\gamma_\tau^{i,k}\}$ be defined as in (3.1), (3.2) but with L, U replaced by L^i, U^i. We put $\hat\gamma_\tau^k = \gamma_\tau^{1,k} \wedge \gamma_\tau^{2,k}$, $\hat\gamma_\tau = \gamma_\tau^1 \wedge \gamma_\tau^2$ and $\sigma_\tau^k = \hat\beta_\tau \wedge \hat\gamma_\tau^k$. Observe that $\hat\beta_\tau \le \hat\gamma_\tau$. By the minimality condition (d) in Definition 3.6 and the definition of $\hat\beta_\tau$, we have

$$\int_\tau^{\sigma_\tau^k} d\Gamma^{1,v,+}(\tau)_r + \int_\tau^{\sigma_\tau^k} d\Gamma^{2,v,-}(\tau)_r = 0.$$

Therefore applying the Tanaka-Meyer formula on $[\tau, \sigma_\tau^k]$ and using (H2) we get

$$(Y_\tau^1 - Y_\tau^2)^+ \le E\Big((Y^1_{\sigma_\tau^k} - Y^2_{\sigma_\tau^k})^+ + \int_\tau^{\sigma_\tau^k}(f_1(r, Y_r^2) - f_2(r, Y_r^2))^+\, dr|\mathcal{F}_\tau\Big). \tag{3.8}$$

The following calculations are made for fixed $\omega \in \Omega$. We consider two cases.

Case I: $\hat{\gamma}_\tau = \tau$. If $\tau < T$, then $L^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} = U^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} = Y^1_{\sigma^k_\tau}$, $k \geq 1$ or $L^2_{\sigma^k_\tau} = U^2_{\sigma^k_\tau} = Y^2_{\sigma^k_\tau}$, $k \geq 1$. In both cases we have

$$\begin{aligned}(Y^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - Y^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+ &\leq \max\{(L^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - L^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+, (U^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - U^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+\} \\ &= \max\{(L^1_{\hat{\beta}_\tau} - L^2_{\hat{\beta}_\tau})^+, (U^1_{\hat{\beta}_\tau} - U^2_{\hat{\beta}_\tau})^+\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

If $\tau = T$, then $(Y^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - Y^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+ = (\xi^1 - \xi^2)^+$.

Case II: $\hat{\gamma}_\tau > \tau$. We consider the following three sub-cases.

Case II(a): $\hat{\beta}_\tau \in [\tau, \hat{\gamma}_\tau)$. Then $\hat{\beta}_\tau < \hat{\gamma}^k_\tau$, $k \geq k_0$. Moreover, $Y^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} \leq L^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} + \varepsilon$ or $Y^2_{\sigma^k_\tau} \geq U^2_{\sigma^k_\tau} - \varepsilon$, $k \geq k_0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}(Y^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - Y^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+ &\leq \max\{(L^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - L^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+, (U^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - U^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+\} + \varepsilon \\ &= \max\{(L^1_{\hat{\beta}_\tau} - L^2_{\hat{\beta}_\tau})^+, (U^1_{\hat{\beta}_\tau} - U^2_{\hat{\beta}_\tau})^+\} + \varepsilon, \quad k \geq k_0. \end{aligned}$$

Case II(b): $\hat{\gamma}_\tau = \hat{\beta}_\tau < T$. Then $\omega \notin \Lambda^1_\tau \cup \Lambda^2_\tau$. Hence $L^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} = U^1_{\sigma^k_\tau}$ or $L^2_{\sigma^k_\tau} = U^2_{\sigma^k_\tau}$, $k \geq k_0$. In both cases (3.9) is satisfied.

Case II(c): $\hat{\gamma}_\tau = \hat{\beta}_\tau = T$. Then $\omega \notin \Lambda^1_\tau \cup \Lambda^2_\tau$, so $(Y^1_{\sigma^k_\tau} - Y^2_{\sigma^k_\tau})^+ = (\xi_1 - \xi_2)^+$, $k \geq k_0$. Combining Case I with Case II and (3.8), we get the desired result.

□

Corollary 3.15. *Let (Y^i, Γ^i) be a solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi^i, f^i, L^i, U^i)$, $i = 1, 2$, *and f^1 satisfy* (H2) *with $\mu \leq 0$, then (1.9) holds.*

4 Reflected BSDEs with arbitrary terminal time

In this section, we prove an existence and uniqueness result for reflected BSDEs without any restriction on the terminal time T. Moreover, we show that if the processes L and $-U$ are subregular, i.e. (1.13) holds, then the convergence in the penalization scheme is uniform on compacts.

We modify the definition of the set Λ_τ introduced in Section 3. Now, we set

$$\Lambda_\tau = \{L_{\gamma_\tau -} = U_{\gamma_\tau -}\} \cap \{\tau < \gamma_\tau < \infty\}.$$

We also put $[\alpha(\omega), \beta(\omega)\} = [\alpha(\omega), \infty)$ if $\beta(\omega) = \infty$.

The main difference between reflected BSDEs with bounded and unbounded terminal times lies in the definition of a solution, especially in formulation of terminal condition which in the general case is of the following form

$$Y_{T \wedge a} \to \xi, \quad a \to \infty. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, in case of unbounded terminal times, we assume additionally that $\mu \leq 0$ in hypothesis (H2). One another difficulty which appears in the case of unbounded terminal time concerns the integrability of f. For bounded terminal time, $f_n(\cdot, S)$ (see Theorem 3.11 for the definition of f_n) is integrable if and only if $f(\cdot, S)$ is integrable for S appearing in (H1), because L^+, S are of class (D). This is no longer true for unbounded terminal time. This forces some additional assumptions when considering the penalization scheme.

Definition 4.1. We say that a pair (Y,Γ) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a solution of the reflected backward stochastic differential equation on the interval $[0,T]$ with terminal condition ξ, generator f, lower barrier L and upper barrier U (RBSDE$^T(\xi,f,L,U)$ for short) if for every $a\geq 0$ it is a solution of RBSDE$^{T\wedge a}(Y_{T\wedge a},f,L,U)$ and (4.1) is satisfied.

Remark 4.2. Let (H2) be satisfied with $\mu\leq 0$. Then Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.14 hold true for unbounded T. The proofs of these results run, without any changes, as the proofs of Theorems 3.9 and 3.14 (the proof of Theorem 3.9 is even simpler since the right-hand side of (3.6) equals zero).

Remark 4.3. A brief inspection of the proofs reveals that all the results of Section 3 concerning the convergence of the penalization schemes, i.e. schemes including the term $n(y-L_t)^+$ or $n(y-U_t)^-$ (see Theorem 3.11 (ii), Corollary 3.12), remain valid if we replace the constants n by any positive bounded $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes N^n such that $N^n_t\nearrow\infty$ a.s. as $n\to\infty$ for every $t\in[0,T]$.

From now on, η is a strictly positive bounded $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process such that $E\int_0^T\eta_t(S_t-L_t)^-\,dt+E\int_0^T\eta_t(S_t-U_t)^+\,dt<\infty$, where S is a process from condition (H1). Such a process η always exists. For instance, the process defined as

$$\eta_t=\frac{2}{\pi}\frac{1}{1+t^2}\,,\quad t\geq 0,$$

has the desired property because

$$E\int_0^T\eta_t(S_t-L_t)^-\,dt+E\int_0^T\eta_t(S_t-U_t)^+\,dt\leq\|S\|_{1;T}+\|L^+\|_{1;T}+\|U^-\|_{1;T}\,.$$

Theorem 4.4. *Assume that* (H1)–(H4) *are satisfied with* $\mu\leq 0$.

(i) *There exists a unique solution* (Y,Γ) *of RBSDE*$^T(\xi,f,L,U)$.

(ii) *Let* $\{\xi_n\}$ *be an increasing sequence of integrable* $\mathcal{F}_T$*-measurable random variables such that* $\xi_n\nearrow\xi$, *and let*

$$f_n(t,y)=f(t,y)+n\eta_t(y-L_t)^-.$$

Then for each $n\in\mathbf{N}$ *there exists a unique solution* (Y^n,M^n,A^n) *of the equation* $\overline{R}BSDE^T(\xi_n,f_n,U)$. *Moreover,* $Y^n_t\nearrow Y_t$ *and* $\Gamma^n_t\to\Gamma_t$, $t\in[0,T\wedge a]$, *where* $\Gamma^n_t=\int_0^t n\eta_t(Y^n_r-L_r)^-\,dr-A^n_t-M^n_t$, $t\in[0,T\wedge a]$, $a\geq 0$.

Proof. By Proposition A.16, for each $n\in\mathbf{N}$ there exists a unique solution (Y^n,M^n,A^n) of $\overline{R}BSDE^T(\xi_n,f_n,U)$. By Theorem 3.9, $Y^n\leq Y^{n+1}$. Set

$$Y_t=\lim_{n\to\infty}Y^n_t,\quad t\in[0,T].$$

Observe that $Y^n\leq\bar{Y}^n$, where $(\bar{Y}^n,\bar{M}^n)$ is the solution of BSDE$^T(\xi_n,f_n)$. By Proposition A.16, $\bar{Y}^n\nearrow\bar{Y}$, where $(\bar{Y},\bar{M},\bar{K})$ is a solution of $\underline{\text{R}}$BSDE$^T(\xi,f,L)$. Hence $Y^1\leq Y^n\leq\bar{Y}$, $n\geq 1$, so Y is of class (D). From Proposition A.16 and Remark 4.3 applied on the interval $[0,T\wedge a]$ it follows that $Y^n\nearrow Y^a$, where (Y^a,Γ^a) is a solution of RBSDE$^{T\wedge a}(Y_{T\wedge a},f,L,U)$. Set $\Gamma_t=\Gamma^a_t$, $t\in[0,T\wedge a]$. It is clear that Γ is well defined. What is left is to show that (4.1) is satisfied. But this is a consequence of the inequality $Y^1\leq Y\leq\bar{Y}$. □

The following theorem says that under Mokobodzki's condition a solution in the sense of Definition 4.1 becomes semimartingale solution.

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that* (Y,Γ) *is a solution to* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$*. If there exists a special semimartingale between the barriers* L,U*, then* Y,Γ *are special semimartingales and the triple* (Y,Γ^v,Γ^m) *is a semimartingale solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$*, i.e. in the sense of Definition A.6, where* Γ^v *(resp.* Γ^m*) is a predictable finite variation part (resp. local martingale part) from the Doob-Meyer decomposition of the special semimartingale* Γ*.*

Proof. Let $\{\theta_k\}$ be a chain on $[0,T]$ such that $E\int_0^{\theta_k}|f(r,Y_r)|\,dr<\infty$ for every $k\geq 1$, and let $\tau_k=\theta_k\wedge k$. Write $f_Y(t)=f(t,Y_t)$. It is clear that (Y,Γ) is a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\tau_k}(Y_{\tau_k},f_Y,L,U)$ for every $k\geq 1$. By Theorem 4.4, $Y_t^{k,n}\nearrow Y_t$, $t\in[0,\tau_k]$, where $(Y^{k,n},A^{k,n},M^{k,n})$ is a solution of $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\tau_k}(Y_{\tau_k},f_Y^n,U)$ with

$$f_Y^n(t,y)=f_Y(t)+n\eta_t(y-L_t)^-.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition A.7, $Y_t^{k,n}\nearrow\tilde{Y}_t^k$, $t\in[0,\tau_k]$, where the triple $(\tilde{Y}^k,\tilde{R}^k,\tilde{M}^k)$ is a semimartingale solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(Y_{\tau_k},f_Y,L,U)$. By Theorem 3.9, $Y=\tilde{Y}^k$ on $[0,\tau_k]$, $k\geq 1$. From this the result follows. □

Remark 4.6. Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.4, $Y^n\to Y$, where (Y^n,M^n) is a solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi,f_n)$ and

$$f_n(t,y)=f(t,y)+n\eta_t(y-L_t)^--n\eta_t(y-U_t)^+.$$

To see this, we denote by $(\overline{Y}^n,\overline{M}^n,\overline{A}^n)$ a solution of $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi,\overline{f}_n,U)$ with

$$\overline{f}_n(t,y)=f(t,y)+n\eta_t(y-L_t)^-,$$

and by $(\underline{Y}^n,\underline{M}^n,\underline{K}^n)$ a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi,\underline{f}_n,L)$ with

$$\underline{f}_n(t,y)=f(t,y)-n\eta_t(y-U_t)^+.$$

By Theorem 4.4, $\overline{Y}^n\nearrow Y$ and $\underline{Y}^n\searrow Y$, whereas by Theorem 3.9, $\overline{Y}^n\leq Y^n\leq\underline{Y}^n$, from which the desired result follows.

Theorem 4.7. *Assume that* (H1)–(H4) *with* $\mu\leq 0$ *are satisfied and* ${}^pL\geq L_-$, ${}^pU\leq U_-$*. Then*

$$\bar{Y}_n\to Y\quad \textit{in ucp},$$

where $(\bar{Y}^n,\bar{M}^n,\bar{A}^n)$*,* (Y,Γ) *are processes defined in Theorem 4.4.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.4, $\bar{Y}^n\nearrow Y$, so $(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-\searrow 0$, and hence ${}^p(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-\searrow 0$. By the assumption on U and [24, Proposition 4.3], $\bar{A}^n$ is continuous, so ${}^p\bar{Y}^n=Y_-^n$. Therefore by the assumption on L,

$${}^p(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-=(\bar{Y}_-^n-{}^pL)^-\geq(\bar{Y}_-^n-L_-)^-.$$

Consequently, $(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-\searrow 0$ and $(\bar{Y}_-^n-L_-)^-\searrow 0$, which by Dini's theorem implies that $(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-\to 0$ in ucp. Since $0\leq(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-\leq|\bar{Y}^1|+L^+$ and $\bar{Y}^1,L^+$ are of class (D), it follows that for every $a\geq 0$, $\|(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-\|_{1;T\wedge a}\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. Observe that the triple $(\bar{Y}^n,\bar{M}^n,\bar{R}^n)$ is a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi_n,f,L_n,U)$ with

$$L_n=L-(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-,\quad \bar{R}^n=n(\bar{Y}^n-L)^--\bar{A}^n.$$

By Theorem 3.14, $\|\bar{Y}^n-Y\|_{1;T\wedge a}\leq E|\bar{Y}^n_{T\wedge a}-Y_{T\wedge a}|+\|(\bar{Y}^n-L)^-\|_{1;T\wedge a}$. Combining the above arguments, we easily obtain the desired result. □

Corollary 4.8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.7,*

$$Y_n \to Y \quad \textit{in ucp},$$

where (Y^n, M^n) *is defined in Remark 4.6.*

Proof. See the reasoning in Remark 4.6. □

5 Dynkin games, RBSDEs and nonlinear f-expectation

In this section, we assume additionally that L, U are of class (D) (not merely L^+, U^-). As in Section 4 terminal time T is an arbitrary stopping time.

5.1 Dynkin games and RBSDEs

Theorem 5.1. *Let* (Y, Γ) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. *Assume additionally that* $E\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr < \infty$. *Then for every* $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$Y_\alpha = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma\geq\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau\geq\alpha} J_\alpha(\tau,\sigma) = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau\geq\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma\geq\alpha} J_\alpha(\tau,\sigma), \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$J_\alpha(\tau,\sigma) = E\Big(\int_\alpha^{\tau\wedge\sigma} f(r, Y_r)\, dr + L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma<\tau} + U_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau\leq\sigma<T} + \xi \mathbf{1}_{\sigma=\tau=T} | \mathcal{F}_\alpha\Big). \tag{5.2}$$

Moreover, for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$,

$$J_\alpha(\tau_\varepsilon, \sigma) - \varepsilon \leq Y_\alpha \leq J_\alpha(\tau, \sigma_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \tag{5.3}$$

where

$$\tau_\varepsilon = \inf\{t \geq \alpha : Y_t \geq U_t - \varepsilon\} \wedge T, \qquad \sigma_\varepsilon = \inf\{t \geq \alpha : Y_t \leq L_t + \varepsilon\} \wedge T. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Let $\tau, \sigma \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$. It is clear that $\sigma_\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon \leq \gamma_\alpha$. Let $\{\delta_n\}$ be a fundamental sequence for the local martingale $\Gamma^m(\alpha)$ on $[\alpha, \gamma_\alpha\}$, and let

$$\theta_k = \tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma \wedge \gamma_\alpha^k.$$

By the minimality condition on U (see Definition 3.6(d)),

$$Y_\alpha = Y_{\theta_k\wedge\delta_n} + \int_\alpha^{\theta_k\wedge\delta_n} f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_\alpha^{\theta_k\wedge\delta_n} d\Gamma_r^{v,+}(\alpha) - \int_\alpha^{\theta_k\wedge\delta_n} dM_r. \tag{5.5}$$

Since Y is of class (D), taking the conditional expectation with respect to $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ of both sides of the above equality and then letting $n \to \infty$, we get (observe that $(\theta_k \wedge \delta_n)(\omega) = \theta_k(\omega)$, $n \geq n_0(\omega)$)

$$Y_\alpha = E\Big(Y_{\theta_k} + \int_\alpha^{\theta_k} f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_\alpha^{\theta_k} d\Gamma_r^{v,+}(\alpha) | \mathcal{F}_\alpha\Big). \tag{5.6}$$

As $k \to \infty$, we have

$$Y_{\theta_k} \to Y_{\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\sigma}. \tag{5.7}$$

To see this, let us consider two cases: (a) $\theta_k = \tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma$ for some $k \geq k_0$ (k_0 depends on ω), and (b) $\theta_k < \tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma$, $k \geq 1$. Let us fix $\omega \in \Omega$. It is clear that (5.7) is satisfied in case (a). In case (b), $\omega \notin \Lambda_\alpha$ for otherwise we would have $\tau_\varepsilon < \gamma_\alpha$ (since $L_{\gamma_\alpha -} = U_{\gamma_\alpha -}$ if $\omega \in \Lambda_\alpha$), which in turn implies (a) since $\gamma_\alpha^k \nearrow \gamma_\alpha$. Hence, in case (b), $\gamma_\alpha^k < \gamma_\alpha$, $k \geq 1$ and $\omega \notin \Lambda_\alpha$. This is possible only if $\gamma_\alpha = \infty$, so $\gamma_\alpha^k \to \infty$. Since $\theta_k = \gamma_\alpha^k$ in case (b), it follows that $\theta_k \to \infty$ and $\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma = \infty$, which implies that $Y_{\theta_k} \to \xi = Y_{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma}$, i.e. (5.7) is satisfied. Letting $k \to \infty$ in (5.6), using (5.7) and the fact that $\theta_k \to \tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma$, we get

$$Y_\alpha \geq E\Big(Y_{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma} + \int_\alpha^{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma} f(r, Y_r)\, dr | \mathcal{F}_\alpha\Big).$$

By the definition of τ_ε and the fact that $Y \geq L$, we conclude from the above inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\alpha &\geq E\Big(Y_{\tau_\varepsilon} \mathbf{1}_{\tau_\varepsilon \leq \sigma < T} + Y_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma < \tau_\varepsilon} + \xi \mathbf{1}_{\tau_\varepsilon = \sigma = T} + \int_\alpha^{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma} f(r, Y_r)\, dr | \mathcal{F}_\alpha\Big) \\ &\geq E\Big((U_{\tau_\varepsilon} - \varepsilon) \mathbf{1}_{\tau_\varepsilon \leq \sigma < T} + L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma < \tau_\varepsilon} + \xi \mathbf{1}_{\tau_\varepsilon = \sigma = T} + \int_\alpha^{\tau_\varepsilon \wedge \sigma} f(r, Y_r)\, dr | \mathcal{F}_\alpha\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$J_\alpha(\tau_\varepsilon, \sigma) - \varepsilon \leq Y_\alpha.$$

A similar argument applied to the pair τ, σ_ε gives the second inequality in (5.3). From (5.3) we easily deduce (5.1). □

Corollary 5.2. *Assume that Y is a progressively measurable process such that we have $E\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr < \infty$ and (5.1) holds for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$. Then Y is a solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.4, there exists a unique solution $\bar{Y}$ to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f_Y, L, U)$ with $f_Y(t) = f(t, Y_t)$. By Theorem 5.1, for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\bar{Y}_\alpha = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma \geq \alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau \geq \alpha} J_\alpha(\tau, \sigma) = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau \geq \alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma \geq \alpha} J_\alpha(\tau, \sigma),$$

where $J_\alpha(\tau, \sigma)$ is given by (5.2). Thus $Y = \bar{Y}$, so Y is a solution of the problem $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. □

Theorem 5.3. *Assume that*

$$^p L \geq L_-\,, \quad ^p U \leq U_-\,. \tag{5.8}$$

Let (Y, Γ) be a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ *such that $E\int_0^T |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr < \infty$. Then for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$Y_\alpha = J_\alpha(\sigma_\alpha^*, \tau_\alpha^*), \tag{5.9}$$

where J_α is given by (5.2) *and*

$$\sigma_\alpha^* = \inf\{t \geq \alpha : Y_t = L_t\} \wedge T, \qquad \tau_\alpha^* = \inf\{t \geq \alpha : Y_t = U_t\} \wedge T. \tag{5.10}$$

Proof. Step 1. We assume additionally that Y (or, equivalently, Γ) is a special semimartingale. Under this additional condition we will show that

$$\int_\alpha^{\sigma_\alpha^*} d\Gamma_r^{v,+} = \int_\alpha^{\tau_\alpha^*} d\Gamma_r^{v,-} = 0. \tag{5.11}$$

By Theorem 4.5, the triple (Y,Γ^v,Γ^m) is a semimartingale solution of the equation $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$. Let $\{\tau_k\}$ be a fundamental sequence for the local martingale $\Gamma^m_\cdot-\Gamma^m_\alpha$ on $[[\alpha,T]]$. We set

$$\theta_k=\tau^*_\alpha\wedge\sigma^*_\alpha\wedge\tau_k,$$

and then

$$A_k=\{(t,\omega)\in]]\alpha,\theta_k]]:Y_{t-}(\omega)=L_{t-}(\omega),\ \Delta\Gamma^{v,+}_t(\alpha)(\omega)>0\},$$

$$B_k=\{(t,\omega)\in]]\alpha,\theta_k]]:Y_{t-}(\omega)=U_{t-}(\omega),\ \Delta\Gamma^{v,-}_t(\alpha)(\omega)>0\}.$$

We will show that $P(\Pi(A_k))=P(\Pi(B_k))=0$. Assume that $P(\Pi(A_k))>0$. Since A_k is predictable, by the Section Theorem, for every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a predictable stopping time τ (depending on k,ε) such that

$$[[\tau]]\subset A_k,\quad P(\Pi(A_k))\le P(\tau<\infty)+\varepsilon. \tag{5.12}$$

Observe that on the set $\{\tau<\infty\}$ we have

$$Y_\tau-L_{\tau-}+\Delta\Gamma^{v,+}_\tau=\Delta\Gamma^m_\tau. \tag{5.13}$$

Since τ is predictable and $L_\tau\le Y_\tau$, we have $E\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<\infty\}}(Y_\tau-L_{\tau-})\ge 0$ by (5.8). By predictability of τ, we also have $E\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<\infty\}}\Delta\Gamma^m_\tau=0$. Hence, by (5.13), $E\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<\infty\}}\Delta\Gamma^{v,+}_\tau=0$. Therefore $P(\Pi(A_k))=0$ by (5.13). In much the same way one can show that $P(\Pi(B_k))=0$. From this and Definition A.6(c) we get (5.11).

Step 2. The general case. Let $(Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}},\Gamma^{\overline{\varepsilon}})$ be a unique solution of the linear problem $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f(\cdot,Y),L,U+\varepsilon)$, and $(Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}},\Gamma^{\underline{\varepsilon}})$ be a unique solution of the linear problem $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f(\cdot,Y),L-\varepsilon,U)$ (in both cases Y is frozen, where Y is the solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$). By Remark A.8 and Theorem 4.5, $Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}},Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}}$ are special semimartingales and $(Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}},\Gamma^{\overline{\varepsilon},v},\Gamma^{\overline{\varepsilon},m})$, $(Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}},\Gamma^{\underline{\varepsilon},v},\Gamma^{\underline{\varepsilon},m})$ are semimartingale solutions. Moreover, by Theorem 3.9, $Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}}\le Y\le Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}}$. Hence $\tau^{*,\underline{\varepsilon}}_\alpha\ge\tau^*_\alpha$ and $\sigma^{*,\overline{\varepsilon}}_\alpha\ge\sigma^*_\alpha$, where

$$\tau^{*,\underline{\varepsilon}}_\alpha=\inf\{t\ge\alpha:Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}}_t=U_t\}\wedge T,\quad \sigma^{*,\overline{\varepsilon}}_\alpha=\inf\{t\ge\alpha:Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}}_t=L_t\}\wedge T.$$

By the first step (see (5.11)),

$$Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}}_t=Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}}_\alpha-\int_\alpha^t f(r,Y_r)\,dr+\int_\alpha^t d\Gamma^{\overline{\varepsilon},v,-}_r+\int_\alpha^t d\Gamma^{\overline{\varepsilon},m}_r,\quad t\in[\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha\wedge\sigma^*_\alpha],$$

and

$$Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}}_t=Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}}_\alpha-\int_\alpha^t f(r,Y_r)\,dr-\int_\alpha^t d\Gamma^{\underline{\varepsilon},v,+}_r+\int_\alpha^t d\Gamma^{\underline{\varepsilon},m}_r,\quad t\in[\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha\wedge\sigma^*_\alpha].$$

Therefore $Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}}+\int_\alpha^\cdot f(r,Y_r)\,dr$ is a submartingale of class (D) on $[\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha\wedge\sigma^*_\alpha]$ and $Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}}+\int_\alpha^\cdot f(r,Y_r)\,dr$ is a supermartingale of class (D) on $[\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha\wedge\sigma^*_\alpha]$. By Theorem 3.14, $Y^{\overline{\varepsilon}}+\int_\alpha^\cdot f(r,Y_r)\,dr\to Y+\int_\alpha^\cdot f(r,Y_r)\,dr$ and $Y^{\underline{\varepsilon}}+\int_\alpha^\cdot f(r,Y_r)\,dr\to Y+\int_\alpha^\cdot f(r,Y_r)\,dr$ in the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1;\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha\wedge\sigma^*_\alpha}$ as $\varepsilon\searrow 0$. It follows that $Y+\int_\alpha^\cdot f(r,Y_r)\,dr$ is a uniformly integrable martingale on $[\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha\wedge\sigma^*_\alpha]$. From this one can deduce (5.9). □

Remark 5.4. Assume that (H1), (H2), (5.8) are satisfied. Let (Y,Γ) be a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$. Then for every $\alpha\in\mathcal{T}$,

$$E\int_\alpha^{\sigma^*_\alpha\wedge\tau^*_\alpha}|f(r,Y_r)|\,dr<\infty, \tag{5.14}$$

where $\sigma^*_\alpha, \tau^*_\alpha$ are defined by (5.10). Moreover, the process $Y + \int_\alpha^\cdot f(r, Y_r)\, dr$ is a uniformly integrable martingale on the closed interval $[\alpha, \sigma^*_\alpha \wedge \tau^*_\alpha]$. To see this, we set

$$\tau_k = \inf\{t \geq \alpha : \int_\alpha^t |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr \geq k\} \wedge T, \qquad \theta_k = \sigma^*_\alpha \wedge \tau^*_\alpha \wedge \tau_k.$$

By Theorem 5.3, the process $Y + \int_\alpha^\cdot f(r, Y_r)\, dr$ is a uniformly integrable martingale on $[\alpha, \theta_k]$. Therefore Y is the first component of the solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\theta_k}(Y_{\theta_k}, f)$. By (H1), (H2) and [26, Theorem 2.9],

$$E\int_\alpha^{\theta_k} |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr \leq E|Y_{\theta_k}| + E|S_{\theta_k}| + E\int_\alpha^{\theta_k} |f(r, S_r)|\, dr + E\int_\alpha^{\theta_k} d|S^v|_r,$$

where S^v is the predictable finite variation part of the Doob-Meyer decomposition of S. Letting $k \to \infty$ and using (H1), (H2) and the fact that Y is of class (D) yields (5.14). From this we easily conclude that the process $Y + \int_\alpha^\cdot f(r, Y_r)\, dr$ is a uniformly integrable martingale on $[\alpha, \sigma^*_\alpha \wedge \tau^*_\alpha]$.

Remark 5.5. By Theorem 5.1 and Remark 4.6, the value process Y in the Dynkin game (1.5) can be approximated by solutions Y^n of the penalized equation (1.7). This kind of results had appeared in the literature much before the notion of reflected BSDEs was introduced. In [42] (see also [41, 43] for Markovian case) Stettner proved that Y given by (1.5), but with $f \equiv 0$, $T = \infty$ and barriers of the following special form

$$L_t = e^{-at}\hat{L}_t, \quad U_t = e^{-at}\hat{U}_t, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $a > 0$ and $\hat{L}, \hat{U}$ are bounded right-continuous adapted processes, can by approximated by solutions of the following equation

$$Y^n_t = nE\Big(\int_t^\infty (Y^n_r - L_r)^-\, dr - \int_t^\infty (Y^n_r - U_r)^+\, dr|\mathcal{F}_t\Big).$$

Observe that if we define M^n as

$$M^n_t = nE\Big(\int_0^\infty (Y^n_r - L_r)^-\, dr - \int_0^\infty (Y^n_r - U_r)^+\, dr|\mathcal{F}_t\Big) - Y^n_0,$$

then the pair (Y^n, M^n) is a solution of the penalized BSDE (1.7) with $f(r, y) \equiv 0$, $\xi = 0$ and $T = \infty$.

5.2 Nonlinear f-expectation and generalized Dynkin games

We now introduce the notion of the nonlinear expectation

$$\mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\beta} : L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\beta; P) \to L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\alpha; P)$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\alpha \leq \beta$ and for f satisfying (H1)–(H4) with $\mu \leq 0$. For $\xi \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\beta; P)$, we put

$$\mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\beta}(\xi) = Y_\alpha,$$

where (Y, M) is the unique solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^\beta(\xi, f)$.

We say that a càdlàg process X of class (D) is an $\mathcal{E}^f$-supermartingale (resp. $\mathcal{E}^f$-submartingale) on $[\alpha, \beta]$ if $\mathcal{E}^f_{\sigma,\tau}(X_\tau) \leq X_\sigma$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}^f_{\sigma,\tau}(X_\tau) \geq X_\sigma$) for all $\tau, \sigma \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\alpha \leq \sigma \leq \tau \leq \beta$. Of course, X is called an $\mathcal{E}^f$-martingale on $[\alpha, \beta]$ if it is both $\mathcal{E}^f$-supermartingale and $\mathcal{E}^f$-submartingale on $[\alpha, \beta]$. For a given càdlàg process V and stopping times α, β ($\alpha \leq \beta$) we denote by $|V|_{\alpha,\beta}$ the total variation of the process V on $[\alpha, \beta]$.

Proposition 5.6. *Assume that f satisfies* (H1)–(H4) *with $\mu \le 0$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$, $\alpha \le \beta$.*

(i) *Let $\xi \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\beta; P)$ and V be a càdlàg $\mathbb{F}$-adapted finite variation process such that $V_\alpha = 0$ and $E|V|_{\alpha,\beta} < \infty$. Then there exists a unique solution (X, N) of BSDE$^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi, f + dV)$. Moreover, if V (resp. $-V$) is an increasing process, then X is an $\mathcal{E}^f$-supermartingale (resp. $\mathcal{E}^f$-submartingale) on $[\alpha, \beta]$.*

(ii) *If $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\beta; P)$ and $\xi_1 \le \xi_2$, then $\mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\beta}(\xi_1) \le \mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\beta}(\xi_2)$.*

(iii) *If f_1, f_2 satisfy* (H1)–(H4) *with $\mu \le 0$, $\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathcal{T}$, $\alpha \le \beta_1 \le \beta_2$, $\xi_1 \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{\beta_1}; P)$, $\xi_2 \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{\beta_2}; P)$ then*

$$|\mathcal{E}^{f_1}_{\alpha,\beta_1}(\xi_1) - \mathcal{E}^{f_2}_{\alpha,\beta_2}(\xi_2)| \le E\Big(|\xi_1 - \xi_2| + \int_\alpha^{\beta_1} |f^1(r, Y^1_r) - f^2(r, Y^1_r)|\, dr + \int_{\beta_1}^{\beta_2} |f^2(r, Y^2_r)|\, dr | \mathcal{F}_\alpha\Big),$$

where $Y^1_t = \mathcal{E}^{f^1}_{t\wedge\beta_1,\beta_1}(\xi_1)$, $Y^2_t = \mathcal{E}^{f^2}_{t\wedge\beta_2,\beta_2}(\xi_2)$.

Proof. Assertion (iii) follows from Theorem 3.14 and (ii) follows from Theorem 3.9. The existence part in (i) follows from [26, Theorem 2.9]. Now assume that X is as in (i) and V is an increasing process. Let $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{T}$ be such that $\alpha \le \sigma \le \tau \le \beta$, and let (X^τ, N^τ) be a solution of BSDE$^{\alpha,\tau}(X_\tau, f)$. It is clear that (X, N) is a solution of BSDE$^{\alpha,\tau}(X_\tau, f + dV)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.9, $X \ge X^\tau$ on $[\alpha, \tau]$. In particular, $X_\sigma \ge X^\tau_\sigma$. By the definition of the nonlinear expectation, $\mathcal{E}^f_{\sigma,\tau}(X_\tau) = X^\tau_\sigma$, so $\mathcal{E}^f_{\sigma,\tau}(X_\tau) \le X_\sigma$. A similar reasoning in the case where $-V$ is increasing gives the result. □

Theorem 5.7. *Assume that* (H1)–(H4) *are satisfied with $\mu \le 0$.*

(i) *(Y, Γ) is a solution of* RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$ *if and only if for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$Y_\alpha = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma\ge\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau\ge\alpha} J^f_\alpha(\tau, \sigma) = \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau\ge\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\sigma\ge\alpha} J^f_\alpha(\tau, \sigma), \tag{5.15}$$

where

$$J^f_\alpha(\tau, \sigma) = \mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\tau\wedge\sigma}(L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma<\tau} + U_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau\le\sigma<T} + \xi \mathbf{1}_{\sigma=\tau=T}). \tag{5.16}$$

(ii) *Let (Y, Γ) be a solution of* RBSDE$^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. *Then for all $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ we have*

$$J^f_\alpha(\tau_\varepsilon, \sigma) - \varepsilon \le Y_\alpha \le J^f_\alpha(\tau, \sigma_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \tag{5.17}$$

where $\tau_\varepsilon, \sigma_\varepsilon$ are defined by (5.4).

Proof. The proof of (ii) and the necessity part of (i) is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.1. The only difference is that the sequence $\{\delta_n\}$ defined in that proof should now satisfy the additional condition $E\int_\alpha^{\delta_n} |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr + E\int_\alpha^{\delta_n} d\Gamma^{v,+}_r(\alpha) < \infty$. Indeed, by (5.6) and Proposition 5.6(i), we get

$$\mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\theta_k}(Y_{\theta_k}) \le Y_\alpha.$$

By the reasoning following (5.6), we know that $Y_{\theta_k} \to Y_{\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\sigma}$ as $k \to \infty$. So, by Proposition 5.6(iii) and the above inequality

$$\mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\sigma}(Y_{\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\sigma}) \le Y_\alpha.$$

By the definition of τ_ε and Proposition 5.6(ii), we conclude from the above inequality

$$\mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\tau_\varepsilon\wedge\sigma}(L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma<\tau_\varepsilon} + U_{\tau_\varepsilon}\mathbf{1}_{\tau_\varepsilon\le\sigma<T} - \varepsilon + \xi\mathbf{1}_{\sigma=\tau_\varepsilon=T}) \le Y_\alpha.$$

From this and Proposition 5.6(iii), we get the left-hand side inequality in (5.17). An analogous reasoning applied to the pair $(\sigma_\varepsilon, \tau)$ gives the right-hand side inequality in (5.17). From (5.17), we easily get (5.15). For the sufficiency in (i) let us denote by G_α the right-hand side of (5.15). By Theorem 4.4 there exists a unique solution (Y,Γ) to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$. By the necessity part in (i), $G_\alpha = Y_\alpha$, $\alpha\in\mathcal{T}$, so (G,Γ) is a solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$. □

Proposition 5.8. *Assume that* (H1)–(H4) *with* $\mu \le 0$ *hold true and* (5.8) *is satisfied. Let* (Y,Γ) *be a solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$. *Then for every* $\alpha\in\mathcal{T}$,

$$Y_\alpha = J^f_\alpha(\sigma^*_\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha), \tag{5.18}$$

where J^f_α *is defined by* (5.16) *and* $\sigma^*_\alpha,\tau^*_\alpha$ *are defined by* (5.10).

Proof. By Remark 5.4 and Proposition 5.6(i), $\mathcal{E}^f_{\alpha,\sigma^*_\alpha\wedge\tau^*_\alpha}(Y_{\sigma^*_\alpha\wedge\tau^*_\alpha}) = Y_\alpha$. From this we get (5.18). □

6 Existence result for RBSDEs: the general result

Our main existence theorem for RBSDEs (Theorem 4.4) says that under (H1)–(H4) there exists a unique solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$. In this section, we will show that under the assumption that L,U are of class (D) (not merely L^+,U^-) one can dispense with condition (1.11), which is part of (H1), and still get an existence result for $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$. This result is interesting since it implies that there exist data (ξ,f,T) such that there is no solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi,f)$ and, at the same time, for every $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg barriers L,U of class (D) ($L\le U$) there exists a solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$ (see Example 6.2). As in the previous section T is an arbitrary stopping time.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume that* $E|\xi|<\infty$, (H2)–(H4) *are satisfied with* $\mu\le 0$. *Then there exists a unique solution of* $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f,L,U)$.

Proof. We only need to prove the existence of a solution. To this end, we write

$$f_{n,m}(t,y) = (f(t,y)\wedge n\eta_t)\vee(-m\eta_t).$$

By Theorem 4.4 there exists a unique solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi,f_{n,m},L,U)$. By Theorem 3.9, $Y^{n,m}\le Y^{n+1,m}$ and $Y^{n,m}\ge Y^{n,m+1}$. We put $Y^m = \lim_{n\to\infty} Y^{n,m}$. Of course, $L\le Y^m\le U$, so Y^m is of class (D). Next, we observe that $Y^m\ge Y^{m+1}$ and we put $Y=\lim_{m\to\infty}Y^m$. Of course, $L\le Y\le U$, so Y is of class (D). By the definition,

$$Y^{n,m}_t = Y^{n,m}_{T\wedge a} + \int_t^{T\wedge a} f_{n,m}(r,Y^{n,m}_r)\,dr + \int_t^{T\wedge a} d\Gamma^{n,m}_r, \quad t\in[0,T\wedge a].$$

Since $L \le Y^{n,m} \le U$, letting $n \to \infty$ and then $m \to \infty$ in the above equation and using (H2)–(H4) we obtain

$$Y_t = Y_{T\wedge a} + \int_t^{T\wedge a} f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^{T\wedge a} d\Gamma_r, \quad t \in [0, T \wedge a].$$

Since L, U are of class (D), by (H4) there exists a chain $\{\tau_k\}$ on $[0,T]$ such that

$$E\int_0^{\tau_k} |f(r, L_r)|\, dr + E\int_0^{\tau_k} |f(r, U_r)|\, dr < \infty.$$

From what has already been proved and (H2)–(H4) it follows that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^{\tau_k} |f_{n,m}(r, Y_r^{n,m}) - f(r, Y_r)|\, dr = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Hence, by Theorem 3.14, $\lim_{m\to\infty}\lim_{n\to\infty} \|Y^{n,m} - Y\|_{1;\tau_k} = 0$. Therefore Y is a càdlàg process and $Y_{\tau_k\wedge a} \to Y_{\tau_k}$ as $a \to \infty$. Since $\{\tau_k\}$ is a chain on $[0,T]$, we get (4.1). By Theorem 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\alpha^{n,m} = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau_k\wedge a\ge\sigma\ge\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau_k\wedge a\ge\tau\ge\alpha} E\Big(\int_\alpha^{\tau\wedge\sigma} f_{n,m}(r, Y_r^{n,m})\, dr \\ + L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma<\tau} + U_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau\le\sigma<\tau_k\wedge a} + Y^{n,m}_{\tau_k\wedge a}\mathbf{1}_{\sigma=\tau=\tau_k\wedge a} | \mathcal{F}_\alpha \Big). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and then $m \to \infty$ and using (6.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\alpha = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau_k\wedge a\ge\sigma\ge\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\tau_k\wedge a\ge\tau\ge\alpha} E\Big(\int_\alpha^{\tau\wedge\sigma} f(r, Y_r)\, dr \\ + L_\sigma \mathbf{1}_{\sigma<\tau} + U_\tau \mathbf{1}_{\tau\le\sigma<\tau_k\wedge a} + Y_{\tau_k\wedge a}\mathbf{1}_{\sigma=\tau=\tau_k\wedge a} | \mathcal{F}_\alpha \Big). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 5.2, (Y, Γ) is a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\tau_k\wedge a}(Y_{\tau_k\wedge a}, f, L, U)$. Since $\{\tau_k\}$ is a chain, we conclude that the pair (Y, Γ) is a solution of the equation $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. □

Example 6.2. Let c be a positive $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process such that $E\int_0^T c_t\, dt = \infty$. Assume that T is bounded. We put $f(t,y) = -c_t(1 + y^+)$ and $\xi \equiv 1$. Then, by Proposition 6.1, for all càdlàg L, U of class (D) ($L \le U$) there exists a unique solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^T(\xi, f, L, U)$. However, there is no solution to $\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi, f)$. Indeed, assume that (Y, M) is a solution to $\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi, f)$. Then, in particular, Y is of class (D). Let $\{\tau_k\}$ be a fundamental sequence for the local martingale M. By the definition of a solution to $\mathrm{BSDE}^T(\xi, f)$,

$$Y_0 = Y_{\tau_k} + \int_0^{\tau_k} f(r, Y_r)\, dr - \int_0^{\tau_k} dM_r.$$

Since $-f$ is positive, we have

$$\int_0^{\tau_k} |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr = -Y_0 + Y_{\tau_k} - \int_0^{\tau_k} dM_r.$$

Taking the expectation of both sides of the equation and using the fact that $\{\tau_k\}$ is a fundamental sequence for M yields $E\int_0^{\tau_k}|f(r,Y_r)|\,dr = -EY_0 + EY_{\tau_k}$. Since Y is of class (D), we get

$$E\int_0^T |f(r,Y_r)|\,dr \le 2\|Y\|_{1;T} < \infty.$$

On the other hand,

$$E\int_0^T |f(r,Y_r)|\,dr \ge E\int_0^T c_r\,dr = \infty.$$

A Semimartingale solutions to RBSDEs

In this section, we collect and extend the results on semimartingale solutions to RBSDEs on general filtered spaces. As in the whole paper, we consider only reflected BSDEs with generator f independent of the martingale part of solution. However, in the case of L^2 data, based on the results of this section, one can easily get the existence result in general case by the fixed point theorem (see [24, Section 6]).

In the whole section, we assume that L, U satisfy Mokobodzki's condition. Therefore, according to the terminology of the paper, we are dealing with semimartingale solutions of RBSDEs. As it is not standard terminology used in the literature (we introduced it here to distinguish our new kind of solutions from that existing in the literature), we keep it only in the definitions, and in all the results we drop the word "semimartingale".

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{T}$ be such that $\alpha \le \beta$. In what follows $\hat{\xi}$ is an $\mathcal{F}_\beta$-measurable random variable and V is an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process of finite variation on $[\alpha,\beta]$ with $V_\alpha = 0$.

A.1 Semimartingale solutions with bounded terminal time

In this section, we assume that T is a bounded stopping time.

Definition A.1. We say that a pair (Y,M) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a solution of the backward stochastic differential equation on $[\alpha,\beta]$ with terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator $f + dV$ (BSDE$^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f+dV)$ for short) if

(i) Y is of class (D) on $[\alpha,\beta]$, M is a local martingale on $[\alpha,\beta]$ with $M_\alpha = 0$,

(ii) $\int_\alpha^\beta |f(r,Y_r)|\,dr < \infty$ and

$$Y_t = \hat{\xi} + \int_t^\beta f(r,Y_r)\,dr + \int_t^\beta dV_r - \int_t^\beta dM_r, \quad t \in [\alpha,\beta].$$

Definition A.2. We say that a triple (Y,M,K) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a (semimartingale) solution of reflected backward stochastic differential equation on $[\alpha,\beta]$ with terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator f and lower barrier L ($\underline{\text{R}}$BSDE$^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L)$ for short) if

(i) Y is of class (D) on $[\alpha,\beta]$, K is an increasing predictable process on $[\alpha,\beta]$ with $K_\alpha = 0$, M is a local martingale on $[\alpha,\beta]$ with $M_\alpha = 0$,

(ii) $\int_\alpha^\beta |f(r,Y_r)|\,dr < \infty$ and

$$Y_t = \hat{\xi} + \int_t^\beta f(r,Y_r)\,dr + \int_t^\beta dK_r - \int_t^\beta dM_r, \quad t \in [\alpha,\beta],$$

(iii) $L_t \le Y_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$, and

$$\int_\alpha^\beta (Y_{r-} - L_{r-})\, dK_r = 0.$$

Definition A.3. We say that a triple (Y, M, A) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a (semimartingale) solution of reflected backward stochastic differential equation on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator f and upper barrier U ($\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, U)$ for short) if $(-Y, A, -M)$ is a (semimartingale) solution to $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(-\hat{\xi}, \tilde{f}, -U)$, where $\tilde{f}(t, y) = -f(t, -y)$.

Let us consider the following hypotheses:

(A1) $\hat{\xi}$ is $\mathcal{F}_\beta$-measurable, $E|\hat{\xi}| < \infty$ and there exists a càdlàg process S, which is a difference of supermartingales of class (D), such that

$$E \int_\alpha^\beta |f(r, S_r)|\, dr < \infty.$$

(A2) There exists $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for a.e. $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$.

$$(y - y')(f(t, y) - f(t, y')) \le \mu |y - y'|^2, \quad y, y' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

(A3) For a.e. $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$ the function $y \mapsto f(t, y)$ is continuous a.s.

(A4) For every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\int_\alpha^\beta |f(r, y)|\, dr < \infty$ a.s.

Proposition A.4. *Assume that $\hat{\xi}, f$ satisfy* (A1)–(A4), *$L_\beta \le \hat{\xi}$ and L^+ is of class* (D) *on $[\alpha, \beta]$.*

(i) *There exists a unique solution (Y, M, K) of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L)$.*

(ii) *Let $\{\hat{\xi}_n\}$ be a sequence of integrable $\mathcal{F}_\beta$-measurable random variables such that $\hat{\xi}_n \nearrow \hat{\xi}$, and let (Y^n, M^n) be a solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}_n, f_n)$ with $f_n(t, y) = f(t, y) + n(y - L_t)^-$. Then $Y_t^n \nearrow Y_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$.*

Proof. By [27, Theorem 2.7], there exists a unique solution $(\hat{Y}, \hat{M})$ of $\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f)$. Since $\hat{Y} \vee L$ is of class (D) on $[\alpha, \beta]$, by [24, Theorem 4.1] there exists a unique solution (Y, M, K) of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L \vee \hat{Y})$. Let $(\hat{Y}^n, \hat{M}^n)$ be a solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}^n, f^n)$ with $\hat{\xi}^n = \hat{\xi} \wedge (-n)$ and $f^n = f \wedge (-n)$. By [24, Theorem 4.1], there exists a unique solution $(\bar{Y}^n, \bar{M}^n, \bar{K}^n)$ of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L \vee \hat{Y}^n)$. Furthermore, by [24, Proposition 2.1], $\hat{Y}^n \le \hat{Y} \le \bar{Y}^n$, which implies that $\hat{Y}^n \vee L \le \hat{Y} \vee L \le \bar{Y}^n$. Thus $(\bar{Y}^n, \bar{M}^n, \bar{K}^n)$ is a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L \vee \hat{Y})$. Consequently, by uniqueness (see [24, Corollary 2.2]), $(\bar{Y}^n, \bar{M}^n, \bar{K}^n) = (Y, M, K)$, $n \ge 1$. In particular, for any $n \ge 1$,

$$\int_\alpha^\beta (Y_{r-} - L_{r-} \vee \hat{Y}_{r-}^n)\, dK_r = 0.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ we get $\int_\alpha^\beta (Y_{r-} - L_{r-})\, dK_r = 0$. Since $Y \ge L$, we see that in fact (Y, M, K) is a solution to $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L)$. We may now repeat step by step the proof of [24, Theorem 4.1], with obvious changes, to show the convergence of $\{Y^n\}$. □

Remark A.5. In the proof of Proposition A.4 we have showed that under (A1)–(A4) a triple (Y, M, K) is a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L)$ if and only if it is a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L \vee \hat{Y})$, where $(\hat{Y}, \hat{M})$ is the solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f)$. Therefore, without loss of generality, one can assume that L is of class (D) (and not merely that L^+ is of class (D)).

Definition A.6. We say that a triple (Y, M, R) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a (semimartingale) solution to reflected BSDE on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator f, lower barrier L and upper barrier U ($\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L, U)$ for short) if

(a) Y is of class (D) on $[\alpha, \beta]$, R is a finite variation predictable process on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with $R_\alpha = 0$, M is a local martingale on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with $M_\alpha = 0$,

(b) $\int_\alpha^\beta |f(r, Y_r)|\, dr < \infty$ and

$$Y_t = \hat{\xi} + \int_t^\beta f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^\beta dR_r - \int_t^\beta dM_r, \quad t \in [\alpha, \beta],$$

(c) $L_t \le Y_t \le U_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$, and

$$\int_\alpha^\beta (Y_{r-} - L_{r-})\, dR_r^+ = \int_\alpha^\beta (U_{r-} - Y_{r-})\, dR_r^- = 0.$$

If $\alpha = 0$, we write RBSDE^β instead of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{0,\beta}$.

Proposition A.7. *Assume that $\hat{\xi}, f$ satisfy* (A1)–(A4)*, $L_\beta \le \hat{\xi} \le U_\beta$ and L^+, U^- are of class* (D) *on $[\alpha, \beta]$.*

(i) *There exists a solution (Y, M, R) of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L, U)$ if and only if there exists a special semimartingale X such that $L_t \le X_t \le U_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$.*

(ii) *Let $\{\hat{\xi}_n\}$ be a sequence of $\mathcal{F}_\beta$-measurable integrable random variables such that $\hat{\xi}_n \nearrow \hat{\xi}$, and let $(\bar{Y}^n, \bar{A}^n, \bar{M}^n)$, $n \ge 1$, be a solution of $\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}_n, f_n, U)$ with*

$$f_n(t, y) = f(t, y) + n(y - L_t)^-.$$

Then $\bar{Y}_t^n \nearrow Y_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$.

Proof. Of course, if there exists a solution (Y, M, R) of the problem $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L, U)$, then Y is a special semimartingale which lies between the barriers. Suppose now that there exists a special semimartingale X such that $L_t \le X_t \le U_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$. To show the existence of a solution it suffices to modify slightly the proof of [24, Theorem 4.2]. Indeed, in [24] the existence of a solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L, U)$ is proved under the additional assumption that $E\int_\alpha^\beta d|V|_r < \infty$, where V is the finite variation part from the Doob-Meyer decomposition of X, and L, U are of class (D). However, the proof of [24, Theorem 4.2] applies also to our case. The only difference is that in the present situation the sequence $\{\delta_k\}$ appearing in the proof of [24, Theorem 4.2] should be defined as follows:

$$\delta_k = \inf\{t \ge \beta : \int_\alpha^t |f(r, X_r)|\, dr \ge k\} \wedge \sigma_k,$$

where $\{\sigma_k\}$ is a chain on $[\alpha, \beta]$ such that $E\int_\alpha^{\sigma_k} d|V|_r < \infty$. Such a chain exists since V is predictable (and X_α is integrable). The fact that L, U are of class (D) was used in

the proof of [24, Theorem 4.2] only to apply [24, Theorem 2.13] to some reflected BSDE with upper barrier U. However, we have shown in Proposition A.4 that [24, Theorem 2.13] is still true when we only assume that U^- is of class (D). The proof of part (ii) runs as the proof of [24, Theorem 4.2] with obvious changes (in [24, Theorem 4.2] the case of terminal conditions not depending on n is considered). □

Remark A.8. If $L_t < U_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$, and $L_{t-} < U_{t-}$, $t \in (\alpha, \beta]$, then one can easily show that there exists a special semimartingale X such that $L_t \leq X_t \leq U_t$, $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$ (see [45]).

A.2 Semimartingale solutions with arbitrary terminal time

In this section, we extend some results of the previous section by dropping the assumption that T is bounded.

Definition A.9. We say that a pair (Y, M) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a solution of the backward stochastic differential equation on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator f ($\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f)$ for short) if for every $a \geq 0$ it is a solution of $\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha}(Y_{(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha}, f)$ and

$$Y_{(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha} \to \hat{\xi} \quad \text{a.s. as } a \to \infty. \tag{A.1}$$

Definition A.10. We say that a triple (Y, M, K) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a (semimartingale) solution of the reflected BSDE on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with an $\mathcal{F}_\beta$-measurable terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator f and lower barrier L ($\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L)$ for short) if for every $a \geq 0$ it is a (semimartingale) solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha}(Y_{(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha}, f, L)$ and (A.1) is satisfied.

Definition A.11. We say that a triple (Y, M, A) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a (semimartingale) solution of the reflected backward stochastic differential equation on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator f and upper barrier U ($\overline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, U)$ for short) if $(-Y, A, -M)$ is a (semimartingale) solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}\mathrm{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(-\hat{\xi}, \tilde{f}, -U)$ with

$$\tilde{f}(t, y) = -f(t, -y).$$

Definition A.12. We say that a triple (Y, M, R) of $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg processes is a (semimartingale) solution of reflected backward stochastic differential equation on $[\alpha, \beta]$ with terminal condition $\hat{\xi}$, generator f and barriers L and U ($\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi}, f, L, U)$ for short) if (A.1) is satisfied, and for any $a \geq 0$, (Y, M, R) is a (semimartingale) solution to $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha}(Y_{(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha}, f, L, U)$.

Remark A.13. If $\beta < \infty$, then the above definitions are equivalent to the corresponding definitions of Section A.1.

Remark A.14. Let S, T be stopping times such that $0 \leq S \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq T$. If the triple (Y, M, R) is a (semimartingale) solution of $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{S,T}(\xi, f, L, U)$, then the triple $(Y, M - M_\alpha, R - R_\alpha)$ is a (semimartingale) solution of the problem $\mathrm{RBSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(Y_\beta, f, L, U)$.

Remark A.15. A brief inspection of the proofs of Proposition A.4, Proposition A.7 shows that Proposition A.4 (ii), Proposition A.7 (ii) hold true if we replace the constants n in the definition of f_n by any positive bounded $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes N^n such that $N^n_t \nearrow \infty$ a.s. as $n \to \infty$ for every $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$.

From now on, η is a strictly positive bounded $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable process such that $E\int_0^T \eta_t(S_t - L_t)^-\,dt + E\int_0^T \eta_t(S_t - U_t)^+\,dt < \infty$, where S is the process appearing in (A1) (for the existence of η see the comments after Remark 4.3).

Proposition A.16. *Assume that f satisfies* (H1)–(H4) *on $[\alpha,\beta]$ with $\mu \le 0$, $\hat{\xi}$ is an $\mathcal{F}_\beta$-measurable integrable random variable such that*

$$\limsup_{a\to\infty} L_{(\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha} \le \hat{\xi}$$

and L^+ is of class (D) *on $[\alpha,\beta]$. Then there exists a unique solution (Y,M,K) of* $\underline{\text{R}}\text{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi},f,L)$. *Moreover, $Y_t^n \nearrow Y_t$, $t\in[\alpha,\beta]$, where (Y^n,M^n) is a solution to* $\text{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi,f_n)$ *with*

$$f_n(t,y) = f(t,y) + n\eta_t(y-L_t)^-.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that L is of class (D) (see Remark A.5). By [26, Theorem 2.9], for every $n\ge 1$ there exists a unique solution (Y^n,M^n) of $\text{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\xi,f_n)$. By [27, Proposition 3.1], $Y_t^n \le Y_t^{n+1}$, $t\in[\alpha,\beta]$. Define Y as $Y_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} Y_t^n$, $t\in[\alpha,\beta]$. Observe that (Y^n,M^n,K^n) with $K_t^n = \int_0^t n(Y_r^n - L_r)^-\,dr$ is a solution of $\underline{\text{R}}\text{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta}(\hat{\xi},f,L^n)$ with $L^n = L - (Y^n - L)^-$. Let

$$S_t = S_\alpha + V_t + N_t, \quad t\in[\alpha,\beta],$$

be the Doob-Meyer decomposition of S (V is a finite variation predictable càdlàg process with $V_\alpha = 0$ and N is a local martingale with $N_\alpha = 0$). Let τ be a stopping time such that $\alpha\le\tau\le\beta$ and let

$$\sigma_n = \inf\{t\ge\tau : Y_t^n \le L_t^n + \varepsilon\}\wedge\beta.$$

By the Tanaka-Meyer formula, (H2) and the minimality condition (see (iii) of Definition A.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
(Y_\tau^n - S_\tau)^+ &\le E\Big((Y_{\sigma_n}^n - S_{\sigma_n})^+ + \int_\tau^{\sigma_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{r-}^n > S_{r-}\}} f(r,Y_r^n)\,dr \\
&\quad + \int_\tau^{\sigma_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{r-}^n > S_{r-}\}}\,dV_r + \int_\tau^{\sigma_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{r-}^n > S_{r-}\}}\,dK_r^n|\mathcal{F}_\tau\Big) \\
&\le E\Big((L_{\sigma_n} - S_{\sigma_n})^+\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma_n<\beta\}} + (\xi - S_\beta)^+\mathbf{1}_{\{\sigma_n=\beta\}} \\
&\quad + \int_\tau^{\sigma_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{r-}^n > S_{r-}\}} f(r,S_r)\,dr + \int_\tau^\beta d|V|_r|\mathcal{F}_\tau\Big) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

From this inequality, the fact that L^+, S are of class (D), $Y^n\nearrow Y$ and $E\int_\alpha^\beta |f(r,S_r)|\,dr + E\int_\alpha^\beta d|V|_r < \infty$ we get that Y^+ is of class (D). Since $Y^1\le Y$ we have that Y is of class (D). Write $\beta_a = (\beta\wedge a)\vee\alpha$. By Proposition A.4 and Remark A.15 applied on the interval $[\alpha,\beta_a]$, $Y_t^n\nearrow Y_t^a$, $t\in[\alpha,\beta_a]$, where (Y^a,M^a) is a solution of $\underline{\text{R}}\text{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta_a}(Y_{\beta_a},f,L)$. Let $M_t = M_t^a$, $t\in[\alpha,\beta_a]$. By uniqueness, M is well defined. We see that (Y,M) is a solution to $\underline{\text{R}}\text{BSDE}^{\alpha,\beta_a}(Y_{\beta_a},f,L)$ for every $a\ge 0$. What is left is to show that (A.1) is satisfied. Since Y is of class (D), $\sup_{t\in[\alpha,\beta]}|Y_t|$ is finite a.s. Hence, by (H2) and (H4), there exists a chain $\{\tau_k\}$ on $[\alpha,\beta]$ such that

$$E\int_\alpha^{\tau_k} |f(r,Y_r)|\,dr < \infty, \quad k\ge 1.$$

Applying now [26, Lemma 3.8] on the interval $[\alpha, \tau_k]$, we get

$$Y_{(\tau_k \wedge a) \vee \alpha} \to Y_{\tau_k}$$

as $a \to \infty$, Since $\{\tau_k\}$ is a chain on $[\alpha, \beta]$, $P(\tau_k < \beta) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Consequently, (A.1) is satisfied. □

References

[1] Alario-Nazaret, M., Lepeltier, J.P. and Marchal, B.: Dynkin games. *Lect. Notes Control Inf. Sci.* **43** (1982) 23–32, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[2] Bayraktar, E. and Yao, S.: Doubly reflected BSDEs with integrable parameters and related Dynkin games. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **125** (2015) 4489–4542.

[3] Bismut, J.M.: Sur un problème de Dynkin. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **39** (1977) 31–53.

[4] Bismut, J.M.: Contrôle de processus alternants et applications. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **47** (1979) 241–288.

[5] Buckdahn, R. and Li, J.: Probabilistic interpretation for systems of Isaacs equations with two reflecting barriers. *Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* **16** (2009) 381–420.

[6] Cvitanic, J. and Karatzas, I.: Backward Stochastic Differential Equations with Reflection and Dynkin Games. *Ann. Probab.* **19** (1996) 2024–2056.

[7] Dellacherie, C.: *Capacitiés et processus stochastiques.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1972).

[8] Dumitrescu, R., Quenez, M.-C. and Sulem, A.: Generalized Dynkin games and doubly reflected BSDEs with jumps. *Electron. J. Probab.* **21** (2016) 1–32.

[9] Dynkin, E.B.: Game variant of a problem on optimal stopping. *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **10** (1969) 270–274.

[10] Dynkin, E.B. and Yushkevich, A. A.: *Theorems and problems in Markov processes.* Plenum Press, New York (1968).

[11] El Asri, B., Hamadène, S., Wang, H.: L^p-solutions for doubly reflected backward stochastic differential equations. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* **29** (2011) 907–932.

[12] El Karoui, N. and Quenez, M.C.: *Non-linear pricing theory and backward stochastic differential equations.* Financial mathematics (Bressanone, 1996), 191–246, Lecture Notes in Math. **1656** Springer, Berlin (1997).

[13] Grigorova, M., Imkeller, P., Ouknine, Y. and Quenez, M.-C.: Doubly reflected BSDEs and $\mathcal{E}^f$-Dynkin games: beyond the right-continuous case. *Electron. J. Probab.* **23** No. 122 (2018) 38 pp.

[14] Grigorova, M., Imkeller, P., Offen, E., Ouknine, Y. and Quenez, M.-C.: Reflected BSDEs when the obstacle is not right-continuous and optimal stopping. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **27** (2017). 3153–3188.

[15] Hamadène, S. and Hassani, M.: BSDEs with two reflecting barriers : the general result. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **132** (2005) 237–264

[16] Hamadène, S. and Hassani, M.: BSDEs with two reflecting barriers driven by a Brownian and a Poisson noise and related Dynkin game. *Electron. J. Probab.* **11** (2006) 121–145.

[17] Hamadène, S., Hassani, M. and Ouknine, Y.: Backward SDEs with two rcll reflecting barriers without Mokobodski's hypothesis. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **134** (2010) 874–899.

[18] Hamadène, S. and Lepeltier, J.-P.: Reflected BSDEs and mixed game problem. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **85** (2000) 177–188.

[19] Hamadène, S. and Ouknine, Y.: Reflected backward SDEs with general jumps. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **60** (2016) 263–280.

[20] Hamadène, S. and Wang, H.: BSDEs with two RCLL reflecting obstacles driven by Brownian motion and Poisson measure and related mixed zero-sum game. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **119** (2009) 2881–2912.

[21] Klimsiak, T.: Reflected BSDEs with monotone generator. *Electron. J. Probab.* **17** (2012) 25 pp.

[22] Klimsiak, T.: Cauchy problem for semilinear parabolic equation with time-dependent obstacles: a BSDEs approach. *Potential Anal.* **39** (2013) 99–140.

[23] Klimsiak, T.: BSDEs with monotone generator and two irregular reflecting barriers. *Bull. Sci. Math.* **137** (2013) 268–321.

[24] Klimsiak, T.: Reflected BSDEs on filtered probability spaces. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **125** (2015) 4204–4241.

[25] Klimsiak, T.: Obstacle problem for evolution equations involving measure data and operator corresponding to semi-Dirichlet form. *J. Evol. Equ.* **18** (2018) 681–713.

[26] Klimsiak, T.: Systems of quasi-variational inequalities related to the switching problem. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **129** (2019) 1259–1286.

[27] Klimsiak, T. and Rozkosz, A.: Dirichlet forms and semilinear elliptic equations with measure data. *J. Funct. Anal.* **265** (2013) 890–925.

[28] Klimsiak, T. and Rozkosz, A.: Obstacle problem for semilinear parabolic equations with measure data. *J.* Evol. Equ. **15** (2015) 457–491.

[29] Klimsiak, T., Rzymowski, M. and Słomiński, L.: Reflected BSDEs with regulated trajectories. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **129** (2019) 1153–1184.

[30] Kobylanski, M., Quenez, M.-C. and Campagnolle, M.: Dynkin games in a general framework. *Stochastics* **86** (2014) 304–329.

[31] Lepeltier, J.-P., Matoussi, A. and Xu, M.: Reflected bakcward stochastic differential equations under monotonicity and general increasing growth conditions. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **37** (2005) 134–159.

[32] Lepeltier, J.-P. and Maingueneau, M.A.: Le jeu de Dynkin en theorie generale sans l'hypothese de Mokobodski. *Stochastics* **13** (1984) 25–44.

[33] Q. Lin.: Nash Equilibrium Payoffs for Stochastic Differential Games with two Reflecting Barriers. *Advances in Applied Probability* **47** (2015) 355–377.

[34] Morimoto, H.: Dynkin games and martingale methods. *Stochastics* **13** (1984) 213–228.

[35] Peng, S.: *Backward SDE and related g-expectations*. In: Backward Stochastic Differential Equations, N. El Karoui and L. Mazliak, Eds., vol. 364 of Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, Longman, Harlow, UK (1997).

[36] Peng, S.: *Nonlinear expectations, nonlinear evaluations and risk measures*. Lecture Notes in Math. **1858**, Springer, Berlin (2004).

[37] Quenez M.-C. and Sulem, A.: Reflected BSDEs and robust optimal stopping for dynamic risk measures with jumps. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **124** (2014) 3031–3054.

[38] Robin, M.: *Controle impulsionnel des processus de Markov*. Thesis, University of Paris IX (1978).

[39] Rozkosz, A. and Słomiński, L.: L^p solutions of reflected BSDEs under monotonicity condition. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **122** (2012) 3875–3900.

[40] Rozkosz, A. and Słomiński, L.: Stochastic representation of entropy solutions of semilinear elliptic obstacle problems with measure data. *Electron. J. Probab.* **17**, no. 40 (2012) pp. 27.

[41] Stettner, Ł.: Zero-sum Markov games with stopping and impulsive strategies. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **9** (1982) 1–24.

[42] Stettner, Ł.: On closedness of general zero-sum stopping game. *Bull. Polish Acad. Sci.* **32** (1984) 351–361.

[43] Stettner, Ł.: Penalty method for finite horizon stopping problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **49** (2011) 1078–1099.

[44] Stettner, Ł. and Zabczyk, J.: Strong envelopes of stochastic processes and a penalty method. *Stochastics* **4** (1980/1981) 267–280.

[45] Topolewski, M.: Reflected BSDEs with general filtration and two completely separated barriers. *Probab. Math. Statist.* **39** (2019) 199–218.

[46] Zabczyk, J.: Stopping games for symmetric Markov processes. *Probab. Math. Statist.* **4** (1984) 185–196.